

**TO:** Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

**FROM:** Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative

**SUBJECT: RDA: Resource Description and Access Part A – Constituency Review of June 2007 Draft of Chapters 6-7**

---

## Chapter 6 – Organization

CILIP feels that the current draft of this chapter is over-complicated, when the substance of the chapter is simply to say ‘create access points for persons, families and corporate bodies associated with a resource’. Whilst we acknowledge that most users will never have cause to read the chapter in a linear fashion, and that much of the 64 pages of text is given over to examples, not to the instructions per se, the extensive repetition has nevertheless reached a point where the needs of print users, trainers, and others not simply seeing “views” comprising parts of the chapter need to be taken more carefully into account.

Now that the consequences of retaining the special instructions are clearer, and the benefits (or otherwise) reveal themselves, CILIP would like to propose that this chapter focus on reasons why specific agents should have access points. To this end, CILIP proposes a draft outline for consideration.

### 6.0 Purpose and scope

*Retain but omit 6.0.4 (additional instructions)*

### 6.1 General guidelines

*Retain*

### 6.2 Designation of role

*Retain*

### 6.3 Choice of access points (*We see no need to elaborate this text – simply provide examples*)

Create access points for one or more persons, families and corporate bodies that are, singly or jointly:

- associated with the **creation of a resource**. [e.g. *creator, author, composer, choreographer, photographer, illustrator, painter, contributor, editor.*]
- associated with the **commissioning of a resource**. [e.g. *commissioning body, originating body.*]
- associated with **resources of a legal nature**.
  - *Laws [e.g. jurisdiction, head of state, chief executive, ruling body, promulgating agency, court rules.]*
  - *Treaties and agreements [e.g. signatory.]*
  - *Law reports [e.g. court, reporter, editor, compiler, publisher.]*
  - *Court proceedings [e.g. defendant, person or corporate body indicted, person or body bringing the action, prosecutor, adjudicating body, judge, party, lawyer, reporter.]*

- associated with **resources of a religious or sacred nature (sacred scriptures, creeds, confessions of faith, and liturgical resources)**. [e.g. *creator, translator, harmonizer, commentator, denominational body.*]
- associated with the **production of a resource**. [e.g. *director, producer, actor, dancer, musician, pianist, singer, conductor, performer.*]
- associated with the **publication and distribution of a resource**. [e.g. *publisher, distributor, licensor, issuing body.*]
- associated with the **ownership or provenance of a resource**. [e.g. *owner, previous owner, joint owner, custodian, finder.*]
- associated **dubiously or erroneously under any of the above categories**. [e.g. *creator, signatory, publisher, owner.*]

## Chapter 6 – Originating body

CILIP is happy with “originating body”; it’s certainly better than “authorizing body”, but may nevertheless need defining clearly in the Glossary.

### Examples

Even taking into account the helpful background provided in the cover letter. CILIP found the presentation of examples for chapter 6 problematic and would prefer them to illustrate how headings might appear if constructed according to (later) rules.

In the context of the online RDA product, does it make sense for examples to be restricted simply to the point being made in an associated instruction? CILIP can see much merit in instructions being hyperlinked to versions of “full” records in which the example specific to a particular instruction can be seen in context. (This also obviates the need for most, if not all, of the explanatory text that is currently associated with examples since it will generally be quite obvious what’s going on.) Unfortunately, it isn’t immediately clear how this could be achieved without having different versions of the base text (or of the examples, at least) supporting the print and online versions.

The sheer number of examples provided with this draft does, though, raise a rather different point. Clearly, the expectation is that the user of the online product will be able to view the instructions with and without examples also being visible at the same time. There was even a suggestion in the past that additional examples, not officially forming part of RDA “proper”, but sanctioned by JSC, would be available elsewhere. But for the print product there is an issue to do with the “optimum” number of examples provided for a particular instruction, bearing in mind the probable relationship between the size of the print version RDA and purchase price. CILIP feels that the current draft, considered in a print context, may contain rather too many examples – especially in chapter 6.

## Comments on individual instructions

**6.4.1.1.1:** Would it be helpful to say explicitly that entries should not be made for obviously fictitious characters (cf AACR2, 21.4C1: “Make an added entry under the heading for the person to whom the authorship is attributed, unless he or she is not a real person”)?

CILIP also notes that the individual categories of contributor are not given unique numbering (presumably because of a restriction in the number of levels used in RDA). This suggests, though, that it will not be possible at this point to separate (or to view separately) instructions and/or examples specific to, say, “Editor, compiler, etc.” or “Illustrator”. If so, this is to be regretted.

**6.5.2.1.1.,** “Provide an access point(s) for a publisher(s) of the resource, if considered important for access”: CILIP recommends providing some guidance on when a publisher might be considered important for access, instead of relying on examples for inference. We would suggest including: “for example, for early printed books, especially incunabula”. For early printed books, the printer is also important (sometimes more so than the publisher).. Therefore, we should like to see the rule reading: ““Provide an access point(s) for a publisher(s) and/or printer of the resource, if considered important for access”. If this latter is accepted, then there will be consequential (self-evident) changes required to 6.5.0 and elsewhere in 6.5.2.

**6.8.1.1.1.** In the case of the Judaeo-Christian Bible, might this instruction be open to some ambiguity? Would Daniel be included (much of the book of Daniel is third-person narrative)? Or Moses for the Pentateuch? Or David for the Psalms? Would it in any case occur to anybody to look up a book of the Bible by author, Isaiah? CILIP suggests deletion of this instruction (the Smith and/or Rodwell example(s) could be moved to the section of 6.4.1.1.1 covering translators, if additional examples are useful there).

**6.9.3:** CILIP notes that an access point for an editor or compiler is to be optional? In some circumstances this is perfectly understandable. But if the editor is clearly named on the title page, as in these examples, his/her name is a handle for users. Moreover, it seems inconsistent that it should be only optional to provide an access point for an editor of official communications when it is often mandatory to provide an access point for a “compiler” (6.3.1.0.3) – sometimes it may be difficult to detect a difference between the two categories.

**7.1.5.0.1** (also 7.1.5.2): Even though it’s accompanied by the parenthetical “i.e. informal”, it may not be altogether clear what is meant by an “unstructured description”.

## Comments on specific examples

**6.3.1.1.:** Storr, Gottlob Christian (p. 6-8): It might be easier to select a different example. But if it's retained, then it needs checking. (1) u/v transcription: redvcenda, avctor, Christianvs: if the title page is in lower case, 'v' is correct, but if the title is upper case and the practice in the dissertation is to print 'u' in lower case, these words should read: reducenda, auctor, Christianus. The statement of responsibility in the example reads: praeside Ioanne Kies, die Octobr. anni MDCCLXV; without the number of the day in October; is this a fault which appears on the title page or is it an error of transcription?

**6.7.1.3.1:** The first example contains a grammatical error. The heading should read: Germany. Reichspräsident.

**7.1.4.0.1:** The article is included for "The taming of the shrew" (p. 7-4) but not for "Frères Zemganno" (p. 7-4) or "Christmas carol" (p. 7-5). Is this intentional?

**7.3.2.0.1a.1:** should the date of publication for the Faroese expression of William Shakespeare's Julius Caesar be provided here in case there are other Faroese expressions of the work? Cf 7.3.3.0.1a.1, which supplies a date for the 2002 manifestation of the Norwegian expression of Matthew Reilly's Ice station. We have been unable to determine how likely it is that the date of publication is needed in order to distinguish expressions in either case.

**7.4.1.1.1a.1:** Is it worth including an example with a 13-digit ISBN for currency?

**7.5.1.1.1c.1** and elsewhere: example: "... (Ph. D.)--Yale University, 1982: This example (and similar instances elsewhere) raises a question about the presentation of dashes and of spacing either side of the same. CILIP would welcome a space at each end of a dash between words, both for conformity with standard English usage and for consistency with ISBD punctuation, in which dashes have a space either side of them. Even if RDA declines to be prescriptive about such things, we would prefer consistency.

**7.5.1.1.1c.1:** add colon after "of" in the example: "Revised edition of Lectures chantées, originally published in 1968".

**7.6.1.1.1c.1:** Example, "An exegesis of Mark 11:15:19": the punctuation within the Bible reference is not clear. Is it "Mark 11:15 and 19" (which might be expressed Mark 11:15,19 – two verses), "Mark 11:15-19" (five verses), or "Mark 11, 15 and 19" (three chapters)?

**7.8.4.1.1c.1:** The example "Filmed with other titles" is not very precise. Something like "Filmed with three other titles" would be more helpful.

**7.9.1.1b.1:** "Separated from: International authors' and writers' who's who": Whilst CILIP acknowledges that this is the language used in MARC 21 (does it have its origins

elsewhere, perhaps?), we wonder whether it is entirely clear to users what “separated from” means, as this term has “physical” overtones. We would prefer clearer wording (e.g.: “Previously published as part of:”).