To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, Chair, JSC

Subject: RDA: Resource Description and Access Sections 2-4, 9 – Review by other
         rule makers of December 2007 Draft – Sweden

These are comments on the draft Sections 2-4 and 9 of RDA received from The Swedish
Library Association, Cataloguing Committee together with The National Library of
Sweden.

Comments on the draft of RDA, chapters 2-4, 9

From *Svensk Biblioteksförenings kommitté för katalogisering* (The Swedish Library Association, Cataloguing Committee) together with the national bibliographic agency, *The National Library of Sweden*

Stockholm, 14 March 2008
Anders Cato

General views

All in all we believe that the text has become much more understandable in this latest draft. FRBR terminology is much more consistently used, which makes the text easier to follow. However it is very detailed in some parts, sometimes too detailed, making the underlying rules difficult to grasp. Maybe this is owing to the fact that the text is primarily intended for web reading, but as long as it is not possible to read it in that way it makes us somewhat confused.

It is said that this set of rules are not supposed to reflect the Anglo-American way of cataloguing, but we still see many Anglo-American influences shining through.

We agree with the general statement that abbreviations should be avoided, but are a bit amazed that abbreviations are still being used when the abbreviation refers to a phenomenon in the Anglo-American world. Why abbreviate the individual states of the United States for example? These abbreviations are of course very well-known to the citizens of the US, but are they to the rest of the world?

We regret that the use of non-filing characters could not be introduced in the first version of RDA. The removal of unwanted definite and indefinite articles in titles etc. has been possible in library OPACs in Europe for decades. It was our hope that this possibility would be entered into the new cataloguing rules of the 21st century. Regretfully it looks as if we will have to wait for yet some years for that. Cataloguing rules should not be written for the library OPACs. The OPACs should be adapted to the library catalogues and not the other way around. Another question that has been discussed mainly at the National Library of Sweden is whether articles should be taken into account whatsoever. Why not just include them and let them be used for filing as well? It does not matter outside the card catalogue.

The views given in the report "On the record" give very important input to the future of cataloguing and bibliographic control and must not be left unconsidered.

Chapter-specific remarks

5.8.0.3.1 Why distinguish between *fully established* and memorandum? Are they not describing the same access point even though one of them has not yet been used in a bibliographic description in which case we feel the remark could be hard to keep up-to-date? This comment also applies to 8.10.0.3.1.

5.9.0.3.2 Does there really need to be so many, and elaborate, examples? Will there actually be a librarian with that much time available to be able to make such a thorough source description? Could not bibliographic notes etc. also be handled by links to other online resources, such as online encyclopedias?

6.1.1.2 Is it really user friendly to make a preferred access point for a collaborative work between many collaborators on the first person mentioned plus the preferred access point of the title? Would it not be better to just use the preferred access point for the title?

6.1.1.2.2 Alternative: This is a way used when creating bibliographic references, but why does RDA introduce this complex system in the bibliographic record? We would like to discourage the use of a solution like the one prescribed in the alternative for other use than for creating bibliographic references. Also, when working in a union catalogue, is it really possible to have alternative rules for different libraries?

6.1.1.3 Making the compiler the preferred access point seems to us like going back to the cataloguing rules we had before 1970! Does this really make any sense? We suppose it has something to do with getting closer to the FRBRization of the catalogue, that compilers sometimes become creators of the compilation they are responsible for. This must be used very cautiously however.

6.2.1.3.1 Simultaneous publication under different titles. None of the solutions is really good, neither the old AACR2 solution, nor the new RDA solution.

6.2.7.3 We agree to the removal of Selections, but why replace it by "Selected essays", "Selected novels" etc.? That is just moving the problem from one part of the catalogue to another! Is it not wiser to have all novels gathered in the same place in the catalogue, instead of having the complete collections under "Novels" and the not complete selections under "Selected novels". As it looks in 6.2.7.3 we prefer the old AACR2 solution.

6.13.0.4.1 Polyglot. Solution OK to us. However polyglot works are sometimes being asked for and now they can no more be searched.

6.14 Extended use of version OK. But when is a version considered a new expression?

6.16 Here we would like to see more examples, not only ISMN. And is ISMN really on the expression level? Is it not, like the ISBN, on manifestation level?

6.23.1.14.1 This solution of making the first named government the preferred access points for treaties between several national governments is definitely not user friendly. Who would ever consider looking for the Schengen Agreement under Belgium?? Why not have it under European Union, or preferably entered under the title of the agreement?

6.24 We have really nothing to add to the question concerning adding "etc." to Laws, Treaties etc. How else should one express it?

6.28.1.3 In Sweden we have never distinguished between a creed belonging to one or several denominational bodies, i.e. AACR2 25.19B has never been applied.

6.28.1.3.2 Why is no denominational body mentioned in the last example?

6.29.7 Old and New Testaments in their spelled out forms. OK, as long as the change in library catalogues can be made automatically. However we cannot see the point in excluding the Old and New testaments when naming a single book. Is that not of help to the users? Not all users know which book belongs to which testament.
Why make [Bible. Apocrypha]? There are no canonical apocrypha in the New Testament. Why not keep them under [Bible. Old Testament. Apocrypha]?

9.8.0.3.1 OK to us, but is that in accordance with all national laws to record this information? Is it not sometimes against personal integrity?

10.4.0.3 Why not add the now popular "Extended family"?

Comments from the Swedish National Bibliography on the treatment of personal names in RDA (Chapter, 6, 8 and 9)

The views expressed below are the views of the Swedish National Bibliography and do not necessarily to every extent correspond with the views of the Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association, but were still considered valuable to include.

General considerations:
Examples have caused some confusion while reading the text of the RDA. Of course it is the principles that are important in the new code, but it has been difficult not to comment on examples since they give the background and illustrate certain principles and conflicts.

Also, we must make reservations for any misinterpretation in these comments. When reading through this massive amount of pages, it is easy to overlook important passages, making a comment irrelevant.

We have found Library of Congress rule interpretations helpful. The new code needs to state priorities clearly. When important principles are in conflict, the rules must specify which paragraph is to have precedence over the other.

There exists a very clear trend in authority work today to establish forms of names using the form found in the various national authority files or national library catalogues (this trend usually exempting medieval and classical antiquity persons). For Swedish-Finnish names, Danish, German, English, French, Spanish etc we follow the form of name established by the respective national agency, although its form of name may differ from the form found in the Swedish national encyclopaedia (NE) or any other Swedish reference source. This is illustrated by the famous French writer Colette, whose form of name in the Bibliothéque National authority file has taken precedence over the longer form in the NE (Colette, Sidonie Gabrielle).

The trend towards more cooperative authority work should be supported by the RDA and probably does so if our interpretation of the text in 8.2.5 is correct. But it has to be stated more clearly. The paragraphs 8.2.3 and 8.2.4 on the other hand, can cause conflict.

As far as anonymous classics are concerned we take it for granted that examples in the text use the established forms in IFLA:s anonymous classics.

8.12.03 Conflicting with 9.8-?
We do not disagree with this LC-practice of giving biographical information in connection with the reference source. But for reasons of clarity and for the sake of the catalogue being as userfriendly as possible (for librarians, scholars, etc as well as for the public at large), a short biographical note of the kind found in the BnF (or the

authority file of the National Library of Sweden), is much to be preferred.

9.1.1.2 The question of nobility titles. (Also 9.2.10.1 and 9.5.0.5)
Titles of nobility often create problems. The question of their validity should be asked, in our eyes they are part of an outdated practice. However, if the person in question always has his title in connection with his/her name in the resources (like Sir Thomas More, who is so presented in most records), the title should of course be part of the preferred form of name.
As for the example "Otto, von Botenlauben, Graf von Henneberg": the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek has the title of nobility only as a variant form of name, not as the preferred access point.
Examples should be illustrative and not cause confusion.

For Swedish nobility, the title of nobility is not part of the preferred name. That information is given (although not always) in a biographical note where the profession, field of activity, etc are also specified (usually in the 678 field). Example:
> Heading: Mörner, Adolf Göran, 1773-1838
> Note: Greve, ämbetsman, politiker.

Obviously, national usage of titles of nobility vary across nations. German usage seems to correspond to the Swedish usage. In the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek the heading is simply "Dönhoff, Marion" and her title of nobility is not even given as a variant form of name, or in a note. From our experience, **only English peerage is treated consistently** with the title in the preferred form of name in authority headings.

Hans Christoff Königsmarck, a German who achieved the highest political office (riksråd) in Sweden in the 17th century, is a case in point. His title of nobility is mentioned in a note in the Swedish authority record. However, in the authority record for Königsmarck in the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, his title (Graf) is not even mentioned in that record. And both authority records have skipped the "von" as well in the preferred form of access. Apparently, titles are of even less interest to Germans than to Swedes.

The RDA should stress that usage of nobility titles should follow the national convention.

Recommendation:
To 9.1.1.2 should be added a recommendation: "Do not establish a title of nobility as an attribute to the preferred form of name if that is not supported by the resources or the national usage in that person's language."

9.2.1.2a. The text needs to be modernized.
The text from AACR2 22.3B2 has been kept almost completely intact. From our daily authority work however, we have noticed that the vernacular form can take precedence over the Latin form even for persons before 1400. As mentioned before, the LCRI should be implemented somewhere in the RDA. "Gherardo, da Cremona", a 12th century scholar, is chosen over the English form in the LC file, although this usage is not supported in the resources concerned. In this case LC has applied its RI

22.1B, and not chosen the English form of name which is supported by the resources (and the current AACR rule.)

The RDA needs to specify very clearly when a certain rule should take precedence over another. The conflict between the form of name found in the resources against the form found in reference sources must be resolved in the RDA. For persons of classical antiquity as well as medieval persons, this is usually not a conflict situation, if you can find the name in relevant reference sources (in spite of the example above).

We have a case in point that illustrates this conflict of different name usage in resources vs. reference sources: the renowned scholar Gershom Scholem. In the resources this is the form of name in the great majority of the titles, which is also the case in Google Scholar and his form of name in the Encyclopaedia of religion as well as in Wikipedia. Authorizing Scholem should be easy by applying AACR2 22.1B (or RDA 9.2.1.1.) But Scholem has been authorized according to the form found in the Encyclopaedia of Judaica and/or the Jewish National & University Library's authority file as "Scholem, Gershom Gerhard".

We see this conflict between principles daily in our authority work and it needs to be resolved in the new cataloguing code. Otherwise, authority work will continue to be inconsistent, unnecessarily time-consuming, or haphazard at worst.

9.2.6.6b Caution: this paragraph valid for Norwegian names, not valid for Swedish, only partly valid for Danish names.

This paragraph is illustrated by a Norwegian example (correct) and a Danish author (incorrect) who's name should be treated as a compound "Spang Olsen, Ib" according to Danish filing rules.

This paragraph is in conflict with 9.2.6.5 where a Danish compound name is treated correctly as a compound (i.e. Quist Möller, Flemming) and a Norwegian politician incorrectly treated as a compound when it should be "Ingebretsen, Herman Smitt" as can easily be verified in the Norwegian national cooperative catalogue Bibsys.

From a Swedish viewpoint, Danish names are notoriously difficult to handle. There should be a statement in this paragraph about Danish usage since it is so confusing with the Möller and "–sen" compound names. Even more confusing, outside the library world, the Danish academic community consistently use the last element of the compound as the entry element, as we have noticed lately.

Recommendation: Add a note referring Danish name usage to Names of persons. Or treat Danish names with a separate paragraph in Appendix F.

Also add a note of caution, you cannot always discern the nationality from the name, you actually have to check the nationality of the person to be able to establish the correct form. Se also comment under 9.8-.9.17.

For Swedish contemporary names consisting of a compound, the first part of the name is usually recorded as the first element. Since Swedish naming customs have undergone changes over the last few decades, it can sometimes be difficult to establish which form to choose. It is not unusual that a person continues to use the original surname in the spite of the official compound name. If in doubt, we contact the person in question to ascertain his/her name usage.

Today with quite a few outstanding authority files available worldwide to consult, there is no need to establish a foreign name yourself unless it does not exist in the relevant national catalogue or authority file. For Swedish names, we expect other libraries to consult the Libris database or, preferably, the authority file in the catalogue of the Royal Library, the National Library of Sweden.

9.2.14.1.3
Traditionally, Greek and Roman as well as medieval persons with a first name and an attribute or a place name have been considered as an entity in Swedish reference sources. These type of names (like "Teresa av Ávila") are authorized as an entity and consequently without a comma. It is acceptable for us to change to international practice.

9.2.15 Swedish patronymics
Swedish names containing a "–son"-name before 1700 are treated as patronymics. Example: Jakob Ulvsson, ca 1430-1521 (not Ulvsson, Jakob).

9.4.0.3.6
"Approximately" is a most unwieldy word. We would much prefer "circa" instead which is shorter, easier understood internationally, and agrees with the practice of "ca." in name headings today. In this globalized world, catalogues are used by any users, there are no country borders, and the word "approximately" for non-native English speakers would cause confusion. The word "circa", on the other hand, is international, and in Sweden used in normal daily speech.

9.4.3.3.2
A note is lacking specifying that this is not valid for 20th century persons. The time period for contemporary people (i.e. 20th century and later) surely has to be more specific.

9.8-9.17 Conflicting with 8.12.0.3?
Although optional, some of these paragraphs are of little interest from a library viewpoint in establishing an authority heading, others are of utmost importance for the identification of a person and his/her authorship. **Language, nationality, profession, field of activity and country, are such important areas**. This kind of information should be succinct and given in a note.

As can be seen from the comment on Scandinavian names above, nationality is of great importance for establishing a correct form of name. This also holds true in many more instances, for example when to use, or not to use a prefix as an entry element in name. If the person is American, the prefix will be the entry element. This is contrary

to the usage for a German or a Frenchman with an identical name. If you do not know a person's nationality, the form of name is at risk to be treated incorrectly.

Information regarding a person's nationality should be compulsory information, clearly readable and not as a code in 043.

9.18 Biographical information in authority records should be concise

Also an optional paragraph. Maybe this is intended for another type of agency than a library. However, it should be pointed out that library catalogues are not encyclopaedias or dictionaries. Biographical information should be short and to the point since the supreme purpose is to identify a person among other persons and to facilitate the identification an author's works.

A more comprehensive biographical sketch is only motivated in those rare cases you happen to have information that is not found elsewhere in other reference sources, as is the case when you find unique biographical information in the introduction of a monograph.

6.28.3.1.2 Bible parallel versions

We can accept this new usage if necessary. But, there is certainly a drawback.

Interlinear and parallel versions are of great interest, not only to scholars of religious studies and linguists, but also to the different Christian religious communities themselves. If you do not have a subject system similar to the Library of Congress Subject Headings, that can handle the information of parallel and interlinear versions, this information will be hidden and you will not be able to infer parallel/interlinear versions from the Bible access points any more.

This holds true also for other religious scriptures but this can not be a problem since the amount of records concerned is small in comparison with the immense Bible literature.

6.29.7.3 Groups of Bible books - an improvement

This is indeed an improvement. But basically the problem is still left. The Jewish Bible should be separated from the Christian Bible, they should not be intertwined, which still will be the case with this solution.
In our opinion, it's time to show respect for the Jewish religion and the Jewish community.
Recommendation: Mark which groups of books on the list that belong to the Jewish Bible. This would be helpful to all cataloguers who do not do Bible-cataloguing on a daily basis.

6.29.2 Apocrypha should be treated with respect

From the wording of the text it is obvious that this paragraph only refers to New Testament apocrypha. These books are not canonical (although a few of them have been part of Early Church Bibles), but in content they are closely connected to the Bible, and basically have the same user groups. It is not acceptable to treat collections of these books as if the compiler would be the primary author. That would be ludicrous.

There is the paragraph 25.12 in AACR2 (RDA 6.3.2.1 and 6.3.2.2 are stripped of the most helpful solution) that could solve this problem: a uniform title in connection with the translated language as an added entry. As with the Bible, the user should be able to see the translations directly from the title index. This is a working solution for cataloguing agencies without a LCSH-similar system. 6.29.2 actually presupposes the existence of a subject system.

The solution proposed above is not a new usage. You find such uniform titles for this material in the German cooperative online catalogues Kobv and SWB:

    Apocrypha Testamenti Novi <engl.>

Apocrypha Testamenti Novi <dt.>

Evangelia apocrypha <engl.>

Evangelia apocrypha <dt..>