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So far we have mostly been creating descriptions of instances of the FRBR entities: works, expressions, manifestations, items, persons, corporate bodies. All of these exist in isolation in our information system. Now we need to put them all together by recording the relationships between them . . .
Between the work, expression, manifestation, and item . . .

. . . between a person and the work and/or a person and the expression . . .

. . . between a person and a corporate body . . .

. . . etc.
Relationships in RDA include several types:
- “primary” relationships
- relationships between the resource described and persons, etc.
- relationships among works, etc.
- relationships among persons, families and corporate bodies
There are basically four types of relationships:

a. “primary” relationships [Section 5 of RDA]

b. Relationships between the resource described and persons, families and corporate bodies responsible for the resource [Section 6]

c. Relationships among instances of group 1 entities, i.e., among works, expressions, etc. [Section 8]

d. Relationships among instances of group 2 entities, i.e., among persons, families, corporate bodies [Section 9]

There are placeholders for relationships between the resource and subject entities [Section 7] and relationships among subject entities [Section 10].
There are three basic conventions for recording relationships in RDA:

1. Authorized access point representing the related entity:
   - Bibliographic records: access points for the related entities
   - Authority records: see also references to related entities

2. Structured or unstructured description of the relationship
   - Notes can describe relationships. For example, the contents note [505] is a description of a set of part-to-whole relationships

3. Identifier for the related entity
   - URIs [MARC subfield $0$]
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The “primary” relationships are those inherent in the structure of FRBR group 1 entities: between the item, manifestation, expression, and work.

Each of these could be separate “records” with links between them, but ...

Current bibliographic records are composites:
  - Describe manifestation, but also include information/access points for works and expressions

Current authority records can represent works or expressions

Bibliographic records contain explicit or implicit links between the bibliographic record and the authority records for works and expressions

Core requirement: Work Manifested

The “primary” relationships are those inherent in the structure of FRBR group 1 entities: between the item, manifestation, expression, and work.

Each of these could be separate “records” with links, but that isn’t the way our current databases are structured. Current bibliographic records are composites: they describe a manifestation, but contain information and access points for works and expressions embodied in the manifestation.

Current authority records can represent works or expressions, and bibliographic records contain explicit (identifiers) or implicit (access points) links between bibliographic and authority records.

Only the Work Manifested relationship is required in a RDA core record; in practice, this is satisfied by including in the bibliographic record an access point representing the work.
Section 6 of RDA is a recasting of Chapter 21 of AACR2 as a series of instructions about relationships.

This includes the Chapter 21 rules on choosing a main entry, or (in RDA-speak) the Creator, which is used (according to Chapter 6) as part of the authorized access point for the work. The Authorized Access Point is constructed from the authorized access point for the creator (if any) plus the preferred title of the work.

Section 6 covers (a) the determination of the Creator or other Person, Family or Body responsible for the work, and (b) the choice of other important relationships, such as editors, translators, publishers, owners, for which access points may be made – i.e., the choice of added entries.

RDA includes provisions for identifying the specific nature of the relationship through relationship designators: terms indicating the role played by the person, etc., in this resource. Relationship designators of this type are a controlled vocabulary defined in Appendix I.
See also references in authority records for works, etc. are covered by RDA instructions for establishing relationships among works, expressions, manifestations, and items.

- Relationship designations [Appendix J]
- Work-to-work:
  - libretto based on
  - sequel to
  - continued by

- Expression-to-expression:
  - translation of

- Manifestation-to-manifestation:
  - contains

See also references in authority records for works, etc. are covered by RDA instructions in Section 8.

As with the previous section, there is a controlled list of relationship designators in Appendix J of RDA.

Examples of specific work-to-work relationships include “libretto based on”, “sequel to” and “continued by”.

[etc.]
See also references in authority records for persons, etc., are covered by RDA instructions in Section 9.

Again, there is a controlled vocabulary of relationship designators in Appendix K. However, this list is not fully developed and is considered provisional.

The relationships include some familiar ones:

- earlier/later name for a corporate name change;
- alternative identity [aka pseudonym]

These relationships can be used to relate persons to bodies, e.g., the founder of a corporate body, the incumbent in a corporate office, the individual members of a group (such as the performers making up a string quartet).
Persons & corporate bodies: examples of new attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDA</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 1#</td>
<td>$a Bernstein, Leonard, $d 1918-1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373 ##</td>
<td>$a New York Philharmonic $s 1957 $t 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510 2#</td>
<td>$i conductor of: $a New York Philharmonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 2#</td>
<td>$a New York Philharmonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 1#</td>
<td>$i conductor: $a Bernstein, Leonard, $d 1918-1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just to take one example: The two examples I used for person and corporate body are related to each other.

Although we are not used to making explicit *see also* references in this case, there is no reason why this should not be done.

Note that Appendix K does not provide an adequate relationship designator, so I have proposed my own. As with all the Appendices listing relationship designators, there is a need for community-specific terms – a task that MLA might wish to take on.

There will be no exercises on relationships, but you can play with the exercises for persons and corporate bodies – and perhaps those for works and expressions and tease out the relationships.
There is one very noteworthy change from AACR2: the demise of the Rule of Three. It was decided that the limitation to three authors was an arbitrary legacy of an outdated technology. RDA places no limitations on the number of Creators or Editors or Translators, or whatever, that may be recorded.

On the other hand, the RDA core requirement is limited to only one creator, the one principally responsible for the work.

This is typical of the RDA approach: virtually any relevant piece of information is allowed, but very few are required. It is expected that actual practice will be governed by cataloger judgment and institutional policy. If there is a need to either require or limit the number of access points, that is an application decision made by the cataloger or institution, NOT an RDA requirement.

In order to promote consistency where necessary, a national or even international policy may be created by national libraries or cooperative efforts like the PCC or OCLC.

RDA provides a flexible framework that can support whatever application decisions may be made.

Final point: there will always be more information that you can possibly record. While this is true in all aspects of RDA, it is particularly true of relationships. Everything is related, but not every relationship needs to be recorded. You need to make judgments, guided by experience and institutional policies.