

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
FROM: Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative
SUBJECT: *RDA Part I Internationalization*

CILIP offers the following comments.

I. A. Proposed revision of 1.6.2

We are unsure how the exclusion of edition statement data from the list of elements to which this rule applies relates to the goal of the proposal as outlined on p. 1.

CILIP suggested in its response to the Part I draft (5JSC/RDA/I/CILIP response) that, with the benefit of hindsight, it might have better to concentrate first on access and rules for access points. This is an example of a situation in which that approach might have been useful – is it clear why, and in what context, edition data is required or being supplied? Is it for access, in which case consistent data inclusion and filing order is important? Is it for identification through description, in which case a “take what you see” approach is more important? Could it be that RDA needs to accommodate both functions?

LC’s proposal seems to consider that the edition statement serves only to identify, in which case there can be little objection to “take what you see”. However, CILIP questions whether the removal of a provision that provided some consistency to the recording of edition statement data is the way forward.

I. B. Proposed revision of 1.6.2.1

Whilst CILIP can see the need to cover this concept precisely, the phrase/term “Western-style arabic numerals” causes us concern. Does this term command wide acceptance as the preferred way of describing the concept? We tentatively offer “Western numerals” as a possible alternative.

We are unclear, in a context in which the proposal is aiming to make RDA more truly international, why this rule starts

Substitute Western-style arabic numerals for roman numerals unless ...

In line with the objective of internationalising the rules, CILIP would have expected to read

Substitute the numeral system of the cataloguing agency for roman numerals unless ...

Although this latter approach is catered for by the option that follows, the rationale for the preferred approach is not clear to us.

I. C. Proposed revision of 1.6.2.2

Again, as with 1.6.2.1, it is unclear why the main rule proposes Western-style substitution.

I. D. Proposed revision of 1.6.2.3

Whilst CILIP is aware of difficulties with the term “oriental”, we were previously unaware of sensitivity over “vernacular”. RDA’s proposed usage seemed to be in line with dictionary definitions. However, we accept that LC would not have raised this if there had not been some evidence and are prepared, therefore, to accept the need for change.

We note that this rule requires that numerals retain the script in which they appear on the source, with the option offered to agencies to prefer some other script if they do not use a particular script. This makes the substitution of Western-style data in 1.6.2.1 and 1.6.2.2 seem even more inconsistent (see above).

II. A. Proposed revision of 1.5

CILIP proposes the following change to the option following the first paragraph, on grounds of consistency:

Optionally, add or substitute the ~~data~~ element(s) in a transliterated form.