

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Barbara Tillett, LC Representative
Subject: Terms of rank, honour or office: Revision of RDA 9.4.1 and 9.19.1

LC thanks the British Library for further analyzing the situation in RDA with terms that can be used to differentiate personal names. We remain concerned about several unresolved issues raised in constituent responses to the earlier proposal (6JSC/BL/1) as noted here:

- “Terms of address” such as “Mr.” and “Mrs.” are too broad a category and introduce complexity in some cases when that term of address is also considered part of a preferred name (ACOC/CCC/LC)
- There is still potential confusion between titles of nobility and terms of honour (ACOC, with a suggested explanation for any example with “Sir”)
- A concern that “Title of person” is a core element in RDA for all element subtypes; while the BL proposal provides some scoping in the wording for 9.19.1.7 when such terms are used in access points, the ‘core’ issue needs to be addressed also at 0.6.4, 8.3, and the core statement in 9.4 that this element subtype is only core when needed to distinguish (CCC/LC)
- Instructions for selecting appropriate terms (e.g., in what language, whether found with the name) are still missing at the proposed base instruction for the element subtype (the words “if the term appears with the name” was added to 9.19.1.7 for the authorized access point, but is not given in the proposed 9.4.1.9) (ALA/LC)
- Apparent overlap with other elements (e.g., proposed examples for “Captain,” “Rev.,” and “Professor” introduce confusion between this element and Profession or Occupation). (ALA/LC)

LC does appreciate that the BL proposal is more limited in scope than the AACR2 instruction 22.19, but is concerned that without clear and unambiguous definitions of what is meant by “term of rank,” “term of honour,” and “term of office” we could end up with the same result as in AACR2.

Until these issues are resolved, LC does not support the proposal.