

5JSC/RDA/Sections 2-4, 9/Chair follow-up/4
21 March 2008

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 – France

These are comments on the draft Sections 2-4 and 9 of RDA received from AFNOR CG 46/CN357/GE6.

AFNOR CG 46/CN357/GE6
«Évolution de la description bibliographique»

French Comments about RDA, sections 2-4 and 9

Preliminary remark:

The Bibliothèque nationale de France doesn't apply the AACR2. Therefore some of our comments may surprise people who are used to catalogue according to AACR2.

General comments

We're aware of the big amount of work done to develop RDA in close connection with the FRBR and FRAD models and we congratulate the JSC for that effort. Nevertheless, we consider that the task is not yet successfully accomplished. Furthermore, RDA at the present stage of development is far from presenting the features of an international cataloguing code.

The whole text is too much "printed materials" or "textual works" oriented. Some principles declared as universally applicable are as a matter of fact not at all applicable to domains other than that of "printed materials" and "textual works". For example the chronological cut "before and after 1501", certainly a very traditional one with regard to "textual uniform titles", can in no way be applied to musical works, to archival documents and other types of works.

Is the concept of authority record implicit in the document? We note that it is never clearly mentioned. Yet, international cataloguing principles still acknowledge the concept of authority record.

In RDA it is difficult for the user to understand whether reference is made to access points in the authority record or in the bibliographic records, and this becomes particularly annoying in chapters 5 and 6.

Whenever a definition is issued from exterior sources such as FRBR, FRAD, IFLA's reference documents, etc., distinguish typographically the definition (e.g.: by putting it under quotation marks). The definition should then be followed by the citation of the source itself.

We strongly suggest that this guideline be applied not only as regards definitions issued from exterior sources but also for definitions issued from the AACR2 or even for newly and for the purpose of RDA by JSC coined definitions.

Beside the advantage of clarity, this facilitates the process of updating of RDA to bring them in conformity with these reference documents, whenever these documents are updated.

The document tremendously lacks reference to from ISO or IFLA produced international normative documents, whether to IFLA's "Guidelines for authority records and references" or to the ISO standard about the sorting of index or event to a normative document applicable to a particular type of authority data such as "Names of persons" (chapter 9). However, all these documents are validated by IME/ICC.

If RDA decides not to follow the international rules about a precise issue, the reason for it should be clearly given.

Throughout the document there is a striking confusion between the notions of "romanisation", "transcription" and "transliteration". The ISO standards give a precise definition of these terms. In RDA the phrase "transliterated form" seems to designate indifferently and according to the context either a commonly used form "transcribed" from a script to another or a "transliterated" form according to a recognised standard system. The document would gain precision by using a clear-cut

terminology. Distinction should be made between “usual transcriptions” (or current), “ISO transliterations” and the other transliterations, either established at a national level or internationally recognised ones.

Frequently the text makes reference, either explicitly or implicitly, to a specific data format. This kind of information/instruction is quite out of place in a document such as RDA. Cataloguing rules should be format independent.

Quantities of elements are declared as « required », but they appeal to other parts and/or annexes which, in their turn, are not available! Furthermore the footnotes give you the impression that these so-called “required” elements are but in case of homonymy.

The identifiers are unacceptable as presented in the different parts, since they designate records and not entities. Reference is constantly made to the Library of Congress authority record numbers.

While, the wording “in the language preferred by the agency” appears in different paragraphs, when appropriate, reference is constantly made in the text and in the examples to the English language, e.g. in paragraph 6.2.2.2.2 “if there is no such English title...” and in paragraph 6.2.2.2.3 “If there is neither a well established English title...”. This is quite unacceptable in an international cataloguing code.

In the parts of the chapters dedicated to variants of names or titles distinction should be made between parallel forms in another language or in another script and other variant forms.

Within the different chapters there is not a clear distinction between, on one side, the identification elements which should appear in the access points and, on the other, the information which is likely to be recorded in other parts of the authority record. Where in the record should the attributes be recorded? in the preferred form, in the other parts of the record?

Comments about the structure of the document

- We are inclined to criticise the very formal approach in the organisation of the present document, an intellectually related issues approach would be preferable. For example, as regards the punctuation: the precise list of different cases should be given prior to instructions about the presentation or the punctuation, and not the inverse.
- The information is strikingly partitioned and split up. One has to jump from one paragraph to another (without being sure to have read every relevant information) in order to bring together the instructions on how to construct a heading. A synthesis of how to construct the full preferred form is seriously lacking. The full examples given in the front matter would be more useful, had they been placed at the end of the document
- The wording of some paragraphs is not clear and remains too general. Precise instructions are lacking. The user has to deduce them frequently from the examples.
- Is the construction of access points not to be processed after the choice of the name or title and the attributes?
- Are the attributes not to be treated before dealing with the variants, in order that the preferred form chosen for the preferred access point is viewed in its continuity? It would be more consistent for the cataloguer.

Comments about the form of the document in general:

- It would be possible to simplify the document by avoiding the abundant and constant repetitions from one chapter to the other. These repetitions are particularly striking in chapters concerning relationships (29 to 32). In these chapters while the information about the nature of the relations themselves is scarce, precisions are made as to the information elements of the related entities, which information has already been largely developed in the

preceding chapter.

- These repetitions are all the more surprising as the user is constantly reoriented to other parts of the document.
- Constant references to other parts of the document, certainly made for the purposes of a Web like publication, make however the reading tiresome and sometimes lead to a deadlock and the reader doesn't manage to obtain a full explanation in neither of the related paragraphs.
- The document being intended to be read on-line please integrate all the footnotes within the body of the text.

Comments about the presentation of the examples:

- In order to simplify the reading, precede the variants by the chevron sign (<) prescribed by GARR.
- To ameliorate the readability of the examples, group them by category or by type whenever possible and don't list them at random as is the case in page 6-14. Make them more explicit by adding comments.
- It is true that examples are intended to illustrate instructions. However, very frequently, examples in the document contain only a tiny piece of information and are intended to illustrate a very punctual instruction. That piece of information is absolutely detached from its natural environment.
The reader is disconcerted because he never knows how this piece of information will be integrated in its environment for it is well known that each piece of information gains its full significance when it is viewed as part of a whole, and where each of the constituent pieces of information have a role and can be understood but in their relationships with the others. It would be advisable that these kind of examples contain the full form of an access point and that the piece of information intended to illustrate the punctual instruction be highlighted in a way of your choice (say by bold characters).
- The use of capitals and low case letters is not coherent throughout all the examples of the document.
- Some examples appear to have been copied from AACR2 without being updated.

Sources :

- There are no instructions as to the order of priority of the different types of sources.
- The terms used for their designation are too vague: "publications" or "reference sources" and the reader is not informed about the related authoritative sources. A list of reference sources should be given in an annex (IFLA documents, different authority files, etc.)
- Reference to national authority files is totally lacking.
- In all the examples which give as source Wikipedia, supersede it by another source: given the high amount of errors noted in this source it seems unadvisable to make it appear as a source of reference in an international cataloguing code. It pertains than to each bibliographic agency to authorise or not the use Wikipedia as a reference source by the cataloguers.
- In the sources of information not mix up information about the entity, information about the source itself and about the form under which the entity is cited in the source.
- The citation of the source might be done in an automated way, by a hyperlink (as in the Italian catalogues).
- The consulted source should always be dated.
- The preferred order: year-month-day for a correct sorting. The presence of the year at first position gives rapidly an idea about the freshness of information.

Comments on RDA Chapter 5 General guidelines on recording attributes of works and expressions

General In terms of traditional categories such as bibliographic records and authority records, in both chapters 5 and 6 the reader wonders at what level of processing the information is to be situated: at authority record level or at bibliographic record level.
Sometimes it seems that we are at the level of manifestation and not at level of the work or the expression.

General question:

Always speaking in terms of authority records: if it is assumed that the levels *work* and *expression* cannot be mixed up within the same authority record, would that lead to a multiplication of dedicated authority records, as appear to indicate examples E and F (p. 21-22): i.e. one authority record for the work and as much authority records for the expressions of this work as needed?

If the expression level is intended to give birth to separate authority records, the cataloguing treatments would be very heavy. A distinct authority record for a sound recording would be justified in cases of subject matter entry about that record. But if the sound recording is the recording of a version, the performers should be mentioned. For the time being they are recorded in the bibliographic record and no authority record is made at that level.

General Rules are far too implicit and are often to be deduced from given examples

General References to International documents are missing (ISO, IFLA Anonymous classics, Liturgical works for Catholic Church, etc.).

Generally the resources embodying the work seem to be the preferred source instead of the reference sources for all types of documents and for all historical periods. For ancient works (ancient Greek and Latin, Mediaeval works, etc.) reference sources which are an authority on this field must be used as preferred sources.

IFLA *Anonymous Classics* list is quoted only once p. 5-11, only as source that provided no information.

Wikipedia is not the utmost reliable reference source and thus should be taken with great caution, therefore we can question why it is mentioned in RDA Cataloging Rules as THE major source to be used. Wikipedia will be used depending on the various libraries requirements for reliability.

General Transliteration should follow international standards (ISO standards) whenever they exist.

General In Chapter 5 and 6, distinguish on the one hand anonymous works, and on the other hand works with an author.

A better use of typo could help for a better reading of the titles given along with the examples, by distinguishing the title of the work from the name of the author (personal name or corporate body).

For examples lists, gather the examples by type or categories, eventually with sub-titles to facilitate the reading.

General Do not use footnotes in a web document. Their content should be embedded in the body of the text.

General Submit dates according international rules, i.e. in figures: year-month-day).

General In the examples, when a title is quoted in comments put it within quotation marks.

5.1.3.3 “The term preferred access point refers to an access point representing a work or expression that is constructed using the preferred access point for the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the work **and/or** the preferred title for the work.”

Our comment:

Do not use of the formulation “and/or...”: it will be better to distinguish in chapter 6 Anonymous works, on one hand, from Author-Titles one the other hand.

5.2.4 “**Representation.** The title or form of title designated as the preferred title for a work should be either a commonly used title or form of title in the language and script preferred by the agency creating the data, the original title of the work, or the title most commonly found in resources embodying the work. Variant titles and variant forms of the title that are found in resources embodying the work or in reference sources, or that the user might be expected to use when conducting a search, should be recorded as variant titles.”

Our comment:

Rules are too flexible to allow the accurate choice of the preferred title: current title, original title or most common title found in resources?

Rules contradict between 5.2.5 where mentioned to use the current title and 5.4.1 that specifies to use the title as mentioned in the resource found.

5.2.5 “**Language preference.** If there is a commonly used title for a work in the language and script preferred by the agency creating the data, preference should be given to that title.”

Our comment:

Instructions about the language of the title are too loose and sometimes contradictory.

Inconsistencies between chapter 5.2.5 and chapter 5.4.1 : “Record titles for works in the language and script in which they **appear on the sources** from which they are taken.”

Would it be possible from chapter 5 to find out a general principle as in chapter 6 different rules are prescribed according to geographic areas and periods ?

5.3 “When the preferred title is recorded as part of the preferred access point representing the work, **it is preceded by** the preferred access point representing the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the creation, etc., of the work, as specified in the instructions given under 6.1.1.”

Our comment:

The approach is excessively formal. We would prefer to say that a title matches with an author name or is in relation with him . Nevertheless every library should have the capacity to pair off data as needed.

- 5.3.1 “When recording data identifying a work or expression, include as a minimum the elements listed below that are applicable to that work or expression.

Title

Preferred title for the work

Identifier

Identifier for the work

Identifier for the expression”

Our comment:

Add links to 6.10 (Identifier for the work) and to 6.16 (Identifier for the expression).

- 5.3.2 “If the preferred access point representing a work is **the same as or similar** to an access point representing a different work, or to an access point representing a person, family, corporate body, record as many of the additional identifying elements listed below as necessary to differentiate them.”

Our comment:

What stands for « the same as or similar » ? (similar was already used 5.2.1 b) – An example would be needed to illustrate the slight difference.

“Other identifying attributes of works

Form of work

Date of work

Place of origin of the work

Other distinguishing characteristic of the work”

Our comment:

Is there n order of preference?

Add « language of work » (as given by FRAD) to this list of identifying attributes of works.

“Place of origin of the work” is not pertinent for all ages, it can’t always be established accurately.

Addenda:

Medium of performance (*for music*)

Numeric designation (*for music*)

Key (*for music*)

The « medium of performance » and « key » are considered as additional elements (attributes) needed to focus on a specific expression.

We consider that the two features: distribution of performance and key are components of the work itself as they were defined when the work itself was written. As stands the form of the work which in RDA is considered as an attribute of the work, as confirmed in part 6.17.1.10 -

Medium of performance and key can be found at the « expression » level as they are permanent elements.

5.3.4 “When describing a work or expression **more fully**, ...”

Our comment:

Please explain the expression « more fully ».

5.3.5 “Include additional elements designated in chapters 6 and 7 as *optional* in accordance with the policy of the agency creating the data, or as **judged appropriate by the cataloguer**.”

Our comment:

The instruction may induce too subjective choice; last part of it should be deleted: “as judged appropriate by the cataloguer”.

5.4.1 “Record titles for works in the language and script in which they appear on the sources from which they are taken.

Alternative:

5.4.2 Record a transliterated form of the title either as a substitute for, or in addition to, the form that appears on the source.”

Our comment:

Add “When the work is in a script different from the script used by the agency, “record a transliterated...”

Instructions given about the language use should be integrated with 5.2.4 and 5.2.5 Rule (recommendation) given with 5.4.1 seems more restricted than the one given in § 5.2.4 where language and script of the preferred form of the title may be the one of the original title of the work, the common title in use in a given Agency creating the data or the title mentioned in Reference resources (« resources embodying the work »). If this paragraph deals exclusively with titles in non-Roman script, add them possibly to § 5.4.1 – As for transliteration, specify the chosen system and give advantage to ISO first.

Cataloguing rules NF Z-44079 (Musical uniform titles) states that « significant titles » are transcribed in the original language (i.e. *Le Nozze di Figaro*) – As «non-significant titles » which qualify a musical category (i.e. sonatas, concertos, symphonies...) are transcribed into French, as are additional information like key (i.e. C: major, for instance) –

As stated in: 6.18.0.3 and 6.18.1.1, the recommendations conform with Cataloguing rule NF Z-44079 detailing the use of the language for “significant titles” and “non-significant titles”.

5.5.1.1 “Capitalize the first word in the title for a work and in each subdivision of the title.”

Our comment :

This instruction solely concerns Roman scripts.

At the end of this sentence, add : for all languages when written in Roman script.

5.5.1.1a a) Arabic and Hebrew articles

5.5.1.1a.1 If a transliterated title begins with the Arabic article *al* in any of its various orthographic forms (e.g., *al*, *el*, *es*) or with the Hebrew article *ha* (*he*), and the article is recorded (e.g., in a variant title), do not capitalize it, whether written separately or hyphenated with the following word.

Our comment:

Add the term “initial” in the title : “Arabic and hebrew **initial** articles”

Guidelines in this paragraph contradict with § 5.4.1 : « Record titles for works in the language and script in which they appear on the sources from which they are taken » unless it is the transliterated form which is given in the document and not the Hebrew form.

In the list there is a transliteration like “al” but also transcriptions like “el” and “es”.

- 5.5.2.1 “When recording a title for a work, record numbers expressed as numerals or as words in the form in which they appear on the source of information.”

Our comment:

A certain amount of liberty would be preferred when referring to Music Titles as the script of the document is not relevant if the number heads first before the title shown. According to the French standard **Z 44-079 “Documentation – Cataloguing – Form and Structure of Headings for Uniform Titles for Musical Works”**, the title is given with letters or numbers whether it is significant or not. It is a cardinal number expressing the number of works. Script is to be followed when the number is shown within the title.

A number located within a title must be transcribed as mentioned in the reference material.

- 5.5.3.1 Examples:
Sur l'état du système des timars des XVIIe-XVIIIe ss.

Our comment :

The example should be corrected as follows:

Sur l'état du système des **Timars** des **XVIIe-XVIIIe** ss.

- 5.5.4.1 “Omit an initial article (see appendix C)...”

Our comments:

Do not omit the initial article. It falls to the library software system to manage the omission of the initial article in indexing.

If Mozart chose his title « Le nozze di Figaro » we need to respect the title and cannot choose « Nozze di Figaro » instead.

We must clearly separate what is written or displayed from what is relevant to the position of the title in the index. The article will appear but will be considered as an empty word.

Example: The |Damnation of Faust.

In some languages the omission of the initial article may alter the meaning of a word. In German sometimes it may be erroneous.

We suggest to add the following example:

La ville dont le prince est un enfant

- 5.5.5.1 “When recording a title for a work:
a) do not leave a space between a full stop, etc., and an initial following it
b) if separate letters or initials appear on the source of information without full stops between them, record the letters without spaces between them.”

Our comment:

This paragraph must be reworded. We suggest:

“Transcription must always be made without space.”

5.8 STATUS OF PREFERRED ACCESS POINT

Our comment:

What is the real status and role of “memorandum”? The sense of “memorandum” should be clearly explained. What exactly does it refer to?

5.9 Sources consulted

Our comment:

The examples of this chapter tend to mix sources and notes. Information notes must provide elements of identification and not be mixed with consulted recording sources. Take in consideration this comment for the examples.

5.9.0.1.1 “**Sources consulted** are publications or reference sources used in establishing the form of name or title on which the preferred access point or a variant access point is based.”

Our comment:

Mention international reference sources such as IFLA *Anonymous Classics* lists.

5.9.0.3.2 “When recording other identifying attributes of a work (see 6.4–6.10) or expression (see 6.11–6.16), indicate, when appropriate, the source from which the information was derived.”

Our comment:

There is a lack of precision in the given examples of this paragraph. We need to distinguish text from notes and the information given from the preferred access form. The identification notes should appear separately from the historical notes to allow an easier reading.

5.10 Cataloguer’s annotation

Our comment:

Among cataloguer’s annotations, separate the ones which are useful for other cataloguers (explanation about the choice of the preferred title, for example) from those which can help final users. Do not mix them.

5.10.0.3.1 “Make the following annotations, if they are considered to be important:
a) annotations on the specific instructions applied in creating the preferred access point
b) annotations justifying the choice of preferred title, the form of the access point, etc.
c) annotations limiting the use of the access point
d) annotations differentiating works with similar titles.”

Our comment:

We suggest to reverse the order in the list and put c) and d) before a) and b):
a) annotations limiting the use of the access point
b) annotations differentiating works with similar titles.”
c) annotations on the specific instructions applied in creating the preferred access point
d) annotations justifying the choice of preferred title, the form of the access point, etc.

Example:

“Preferred title chosen as Don Giovanni **per 6.18.0.3a.1**, better known title in the same language”

Our comment:

The reference is correct but too laconic when included in an International Cataloguing code.

Comments on RDA Chapter 6 Identifying works and expressions

- General This chapter corresponds to works and expressions, so:
- Guidelines about the construction of access points for the creators of these works are out of the scope of this chapter
 - All the guidelines concerning the creation of access points for works are based on the static, ISBD like pattern “creator + work”. Different national experiences, practices and applications witness that this is not the only way to deal with this kind of access points. RDA doesn’t take into consideration these other ways of modelling and representing the information, which are far more FRBR like that that adopted by this chapter of RDA.
- The relation between a person, family or corporate body responsible of a work on one side, and the work on the other can be expressed by a dynamic link between a distinct description of the work and a distinct description of the creator of this work: this way offers several advantages:
- It guarantees the consistency of catalogues by allowing the automatic update of the preferred access point of the creator in the description of the work, whenever the description of the creation is updated.
 - It allows links between work (one entity as work) and each creator for collaborative works (several entities of creators)
 - It allows links between a work and all the supposed authors for this work if the work had been ascribed to various creators according the experts, the times, editors or publishers. Cataloguers don’t know what creator is/are better known by the final users.
- General We notice that the choice of the component elements of the preferred access point for a work or an expression is rather frequently made after the physical presentation of the resource embodying the work, or the expression of the work, (i.e. based on the editorial choice of presenting these elements on the manifestation) and not according to absolute intellectual criteria allowing to accurately identify the work or the expression.
- General Comment on the distribution of instructions throughout this chapter:
Abundant repetitions and references, bits of information regarding data of the same nature fragmented and scattered throughout the different parts of the document, namely *Access points* and *Preferred title*, etc.: all these contribute to produce a document with a rather heavy structure and where it is difficult to bring together information and instructions necessary to the comprehension and processing of a single entity.
- General Comments on the structure of this chapter :
It is disconcerting to shift in a non explicit way from instructions concerning a work to instructions concerning an expression.
- In terms of traditional categories such as bibliographic records and authority records, in both chapters 5 and 6 the reader wonders at what level of processing the information is to be situated: at the authority record level or at the bibliographic record level.
- General question:
(See also our general comments on chapter 5)
- For each category of title, variants are dealt with before dealing with attributes. This order of occurrence of information is not coherent, all the more so as some of these

attributes are necessary to the construction of the full form of a preferred access point (e.g.: the form comprising additional elements)

- General Given the crucial importance of the relationships in the understanding of the universe of works and expressions (and especially of adaptations, arrangements and parts of works) it is regrettable that in chapter 6 no explicit reference is made to the other chapters of RDA where relationships are specifically treated.
- While reading this chapter one is under the impression that items are processed only for the purpose of constructing indexes to access information contained in the catalogues.
Yet, identifying and choosing elements to represent works and expressions cannot be done in a disruptive way and without making constant reference to the appropriate relationships which give sense to the existence and evolution of these works and expressions.
It is regrettable that the intention to describe distinctive entities in the purpose of creating links between them and creating networking information systems is not that obvious in the document.
- General We disagree to consider a compilation as a work or even as an expression. As such no authority record should be created for them.
- General Anonymous works and works with known author(s) (Name/title) are generally not treated in the same way in catalogues. In our opinion, it is reducing not to take into account the difference in nature between these two types of works. They should be treated separately.
- General Works of uncertain or unknown origin are treated in a very schematic way. (for more details see our comment on 6.1.1.6.1)
- General There is a certain degree of inconsistency in the treatment of the parts of a title throughout this chapter. Depending on whether the instructions concern the full title or a title of a part, the examples are not presented in the same way.
- General Specific cases are dealt with without addressing the general case. Either the specific cases have to be deemed as an exception with regard to the general case or they serve as a simple illustration of a general instruction.
- General There are principles which are not clearly stated. The user has to deduce them frequently from the examples.
(See also our general comments on RDA)
- General Initial articles:
We disagree with the omission of the initial articles in the titles. They are a constitutive parts of the titles and should not be omitted under the pretext that they have not to be taken into account for the alphabetical sorting of titles. Distinction should be made between two, by nature, quite separate questions: on one side the question of titles integrity (the initial articles are inseparable part of the titles of works), on the other the technical question of issuing guidelines to construct coherent indexes. Dropping the initial articles is a matter of software programming. Furthermore, nowadays it is quite arguable whether or not articles have to be dropped for the alphabetical sorting. Anyway this is part of another debate. Nevertheless for the purposes of a cataloguing code we insist that the initial articles be taken into account as a constitutive part of the title.

General Whenever the name of a person is cited, whether in the examples or in the text, give all the necessary information to his/her identification. Giving only the family name may be confusing because of risk of homonymy. At least, accompany the family name by the initial of the forename. (see our comment on the comment which accompanies the example comprising the name Emerson in 6.2.1.1).

General Punctuation:
No general instructions are provided as to the punctuation to be applied between the elements composing an access point. It is from the examples that the instructions are to be deduced.
In our opinion, an international cataloguing code should give clear instructions; the examples are but an illustration of the instructions.
(See also our general comments about RDA)

General Remove “etc.” in all examples, in conformity with the explanations given in the front matter of the present release of RDA.

General Use a different typo (e.g.: italics) to distinguish titles from the other environing elements of another nature, as in the examples of 6.1.1.1.1:
e.g.: American bar association...*Directory*

General In the parts of the chapters dedicated to variants of titles distinction should be made between parallel forms in another language or in another script and other variant forms.

6.0.2.2 “Determine the title to be used as the preferred title for a work created before 1501 from modern sources. If the evidence of modern reference sources is inconclusive, use (in this order of preference):
a) modern editions
b) early editions
c) manuscript copies.”

Our suggestion:

For more clarity we propose the following wording:

“Determine the title to be used as the preferred title for a work created before 1501 from ~~modern~~ the sources below ~~If the evidence of modern reference sources is inconclusive, use~~ (in this order of preference):

a) modern references sources

b) modern editions

c) early editions

d) manuscript copies.”

6.1.1.0.3 If the access point constructed following the instructions given under 6.1.1.1–6.1.1.6 is **identical or similar** to an access point representing a different work, or to an access point representing a person, family, or corporate body, make additions to the access point following the instructions given under 6.1.1.7.”

Our comment:

« if the access point... is identical or similar » : what does this exactly mean ?
Could you give examples?

6.1.1.1 Works created by one person, family, or corporate body

Our comment:

This is a relation between a work and its creator.

See our general comment about processing relationships between creators and works in a dynamic way, by establishing a relation between them and not in a static way by combining within the same preferred access point the preferred access point for the creator and the preferred access point for the work.

6.1.1.2. Collaborative works

For collective musical works, RDA gives two choices: either record the first author appearing in the resource described or in reference sources or record all the authors. The choice of the first author must not depend on the resource embodying the work.

The French standard **Z 44-079 “Documentation – Cataloguing – Form and Structure of Headings for Uniform Titles for Musical Works”** considers works composed by more than three authors as anonymous. Consequently for works composed by three authors the three of them can be recorded. We consider this guideline to be a rather practical one.

Furthermore we disagree with the choice of recording the first author **appearing in the resource** embodying the work (i.e. a choice made after the editorial presentation of the embodied work) and not according to intellectual criteria for identifying the work and constructing the standardized access point.

(See also our general comment about the choice of the preferred access point for a work based upon the resource embodying that work)

A collaborative work implies a relation between a work and its creators. See also our general comment about processing relationships between creators and works dynamically, according to which we should have, on one side, the work deemed as an intellectual entity and, on the other, the distinct entities of each of the creators having collaborated to accomplish the work.

6.1.1.2.2 “Include in the preferred access point representing the work the preferred access points for all creators named in resources embodying the work or in reference sources (**in the order in which they are named in those sources**), formulated according to the guidelines and instructions given under [9.1.1](#), [10.1.1](#), or [11.1.1](#), as applicable.”

Our comment:

We disagree with the choice being made after the presentation of the resource embodying the work (i.e. to the editorial presentation of the embodied work) and not according to intellectual criteria for identifying the work and constructing the standardized access point. (Same as our comment above).

(See also our general comment about the choice of the preferred access point for a work based upon the presentation of the resource embodying that work)

(See also our general comment about processing relationships between creators and works.)

- 6.1.1.2.3 **“Exceptions:**
For *moving images* (motion pictures, videos, video games, etc.), construct the preferred access point representing the work using the preferred title for the work, formulated according to the instructions given under 6.2.
Gunner palace
(*Preferred access point for: Gunner palace / Palm Pictures*)
- Our comment:**
We disagree to consider moving images as an exception to the collaborative works. They **are** collaborative works (more than 3 creators, consequently the preferred access point will be the title).
(See also our general comment about processing relationships between creators and works.)
The relation between the work and each of the persons or corporate bodies having collaborated to the creation of this work should be expressed by links (relations).
- 6.1.1.2.7 “If there is no consistency in the order in which the collaborators are named in resources embodying the work or in reference sources, construct the preferred access point representing the work using the preferred access point for the person, family, or corporate body **named first in the first resource received**, followed by the preferred title for the work.”
- Our comment :**
We propose in this case to choose as preferred access point the title of the work.
(See also our general comment about processing relationships between creators and works.)
- 6.1.1.3.2 “If there is more than one compiler, include in the preferred access point representing the compilation the preferred access points for all compilers commonly named when citing the compilation (in the order commonly cited), formulated according to the guidelines and instructions given under 9.1.1, 10.1.1, or 11.1.1, as applicable.
Berry, W. Turner (William Turner); Johnson, A. F. (Alfred Forbes). Catalogue of specimens of printing types by English and Scottish printers and founders, 1665-1830”
- Our comment :**
It seems quite unusual to record the two compilers one after the other in a preferred access point.
(See also our general comment about processing relationships between creators and works.)
- 6.1.1.3.3 “If the compiler **is not considered the creator of the work**, construct the preferred access point representing the work using the preferred title for the compilation...”
- Our comment :**
As worded, this criterion seems quite subjective: By whom the compiler is not considered the creator of the work? by the creator of the word or by the publisher
It is necessary to clarify this point.
(See also our general comment about processing relationships between creators and works.)

6.1.1.4.1 Example
Vande Velde, Vivian. Tales from the Brothers Grimm and the Sisters Weird
(*A parody by Vande Velde of some Grimm's fairy tales*)

Our comment :

Correct typo:
Add blank after “parody” in the comment.

6.1.1.4.3 “If the **adaptation or revision** is commonly cited by title, use the preferred title for the adaptation or revision as the preferred access point representing the work.”
Don Giovanni
(*A film adaptation of Mozart's opera*) ”

Our comment :

This is a film. An addition should be made to the access point to distinguish it from Mozart's opera. The preferred access point would then read:

Don Giovanni (Motion picture)
(See also your instructions about additions to access points representing works
6.1.1.7.1)

6.1.1.6 Works of uncertain or unknown origin

“6.1.1.6.1 If the work has been attributed to one or more persons, families, or corporate bodies, but **there is uncertainty as to the probable person, family, or body responsible, ...**”

“6.1.1.6.2 If reference sources indicate that **one person, family, or corporate body is probably responsible** for creating the work...”

“6.1.1.6.3 If the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the work is **unknown, or if the work originates from an unnamed group, ...**”

Our comments :

- 1) Modify the order of the parts : move 6.1.1.6.3 on the top.
 - 2) In 6.1.1.6.3 for clarification purposes, it would be preferable to deal separately with each of the two mentioned cases: the “unknown” and the “unnamed group”
 - 3) Generally speaking, the guidelines proposed in 6.1.1.6 appear to be based upon very formal and schematic principles
- Cf. general comment about management between creator and work

We find it useful to give some examples illustrating our practices, issued from the Authority file of the BnF:

- for a work first attributed to an composer and then to another :
<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb13963970r>
Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus (1756-1791)
[**Wiegenlied. KV 350**] *allemand*
Berceuse sur un texte de Friedrich Wilhelm Gotter, faussement attribuée à Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart. - Dates de composition : 1795?-1796?
- for a work began by a composer and finished by another :
<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb147249881>
Varèse, Edgard (1883-1965)

[Tuning up] anglais

Oeuvre laissée par Varèse à l'état d'esquisse (1947), reconstruite et complétée par Chou Wen-chung (1998)

Forme(s) associée(s) :

>> << Achevé par : **Chou, Wen-chung (1923-....)**

Example

Unknown Memphis family photo collection

(Unpublished collection in the Mississippi Valley Collection of the University of Memphis. Title devised by cataloging agency)

Our comment :

An explanation is needed in this case. In our opinion the preferred access point would be the one constructed for the manifestation; which corresponds to the Title and responsibility statement.

Is it necessary to make an authority access point in this case?

6.1.1.7 Additions to access points representing works

General comment on this section:

In several sections the choice the additions to access points representing the work is made after the editorial presentation of the resource embodying the work and not according to intellectual criteria for the identification of the work (See also our general comment about the choice of the preferred access point for a work based upon the presentation of the resource embodying that work)

- 6.1.1.7.1 “If the access point constructed according to the instructions given under 6.1.1.1–6.1.1.6 is identical or similar to an access point representing a different work, or to an access point representing a person, family, corporate body, or place, add:
- a) a term indicating the form of work (see 6.4)
 - b) the date of the work (see 6.5)
 - c) the place of origin of the work (see 6.6)
- and/or* d) a term indicating another distinguishing characteristic of the work (see 6.7).”

General comments on the presentation of the examples of p. 14:

Instead of a single list of examples, organise them by bringing together examples by type of addition.

Add also explanatory comments.

Is there a preferred order to record these additions? Is the same order as that presented in 5.3.2: “Form of work, Date of work, Place of origin of the work, Other distinguishing characteristic of the work”? If yes, some of the examples seem not to respect that order.

“Genesis (Anglo-Saxon poem)”:

We agree with the additions but, once more, if the recommendation of 5.3.2 has to be applied, the example should read:

“Genesis (poem, 6th c., Great Britain)”

“Genesis (Middle High German poem)”:

According to the recommendation 5.3.2 the example should read:

“Genesis (poem, ca 11th c., Austria)”

While according to IFLA *Anonymous classics* it must read:
“Altdeutsche Genesis”

- “Genesis (Old Saxon poem) “
according to the rule of 5.3.2 it must be: (poem, 9th c., Germany)
according to IFLA *Anonymous classics* must be: Altsächsische Genesis

The examples concerning periodicals must be consistent with international standards: A periodical publication has an ISSN and a key title and additional elements in case of homonymy, so preferred additions must be here the same as ISSN additional elements.

“Bulletin (Geological Survey (South Africa))”
“Bulletin (New York State Museum : 1945)”
...
“Dublin magazine (1762)”
“Dublin magazine (1965)”
etc.”

Do the following examples concern works or expressions ?

“Oxford economic papers (CD-ROM)”
“Oxford economic papers (Online)”

p.6-15

“Guillaume (Chanson de geste)
(To distinguish the access point for the work from the access point for the 13th century person known as Guillaume)”

The example must be consistent with the recommendation of international documents (IFLA anonymous)
IFLA preferred form: “Chanson de Guillaume” → this form (title of the work) and that of the person (Guillaume) are consequently not homonyms. The qualifier is not justified.

6.1.2.2.1 “Construct the preferred access point representing a part of a work by adding to the preferred access point representing the work as a whole (see 6.1.1) the preferred title for the part, formulated according to the instructions given under 6.2.6.2”

Our comments:

We agree with this instruction in cases when the title of the part is not distinctive and is represented by verbal designations such as Book, Theil, etc.)

Examples :

“Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 1749-1832. Faust. 1. Theil”
“Homer. Iliad. Book 1”

We disagree with the instruction if the work has an author and the title of the part is significant: for example “Purgatorio” part of the “Divina commedia”.

For example, we would recommend to record:

“Proust, Marcel, 1871-1922. Du côté de chez Swann”

and not :

“Proust, Marcel, 1871-1922. À la recherche du temps perdu. Du côté de chez Swann”

If the work is anonymous, we agree :

Example

“Arabian nights. Sindbad the sailor”

Example

“Manet, Édouard, 1832-1883. Luncheon on the grass. **Detail**”

Our comment :

This example must be deleted :

The term « detail » used as a title of the part for the picture is useless, this term is general and not precise, it does not afford any information about the part of the picture concerned.

6.1.2.3

Two or more parts

“6.1.2.3.1 Construct the preferred access point representing two or more **consecutively** numbered parts of a work, each of which is identified only by a general term and a number, by adding to the preferred access point representing the work as a whole (see 6.1.1) the preferred title for the sequence of parts, formulated according to the instructions given under 6.2.6.3.”

“6.1.2.3.2 When identifying two or more unnumbered or **non-consecutively** numbered parts of a work, construct preferred access points for each of the parts following the instructions given under 6.1.2.2. Dante Alighieri, 1265-1321. Divina commedia.”

Our comment:

It would be preferable to highlight the terms “consecutively” and “non-consecutively”, for example by putting them in bold.

“Alternative:

6.1.2.3.3 When identifying two or more unnumbered or non-consecutively numbered parts of a work, use the preferred access point for the work as a whole.

Gibbon, Edward, 1737-1794. History of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire”

Our comment:

The relation between 6.1.2.3.2 and 6.1.2.3.3 that is supposed to be an alternative is not clear. RDA does not precise the limit about number of parts to scribe, we do not understand in what the alternative is different from the previous paragraphs?

What are the reasons to add this alternative to the last version of AACR2?

Anyway, the sentence must be formulated more clearly.

“Gibbon, Edward, 1737-1794. History of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire
Empire
(Selections from Gibbon’s work).

Add : “Selections” to the preferred access point.

- 6.1.4.1.3 “Make additions to the access point, if considered to be important for identification, following the instructions given under 6.1.1.7, as applicable.”

Examples :

Professional development series (Boston, Mass.)
(Preferred access point for the work: Pace, Joe (Joseph). Professional development series)

Afrique et développement (Éditions Karthala)
(Preferred access point for the work: Collection Afrique et développement)

Our comment:

We disagree with the creation of preferred access point for the title of series and other continuing resources as the key title is normally the standardized form of the title for a continuing resource that identifies it uniquely at an international level.

- 6.1.4.2 Examples

“Tolkien, J. R. R. (John Ronald Reuel), 1892-1973. Fellowship of the ring
(Preferred access point: Tolkien, J. R. R. (John Ronald Reuel), 1892-1973. Lord of the rings. Fellowship of the ring)”

“Tolkien, J. R. R. (John Ronald Reuel), 1892-1973. Two towers
(Preferred access point: Tolkien, J. R. R. (John Ronald Reuel), 1892-1973. Lord of the rings. Two towers)”

“Tolkien, J. R. R. (John Ronald Reuel), 1892-1973. Return of the king
(Preferred access point: Tolkien, J. R. R. (John Ronald Reuel), 1892-1973. Lord of the rings. Return of the king)”

Our comment:

The initial article must not be omitted. The titles should read as follows

The Fellowship of the ring,

The Two towers,

The Return of the king

Same thing for the following example :

“Proust, Marcel, 1871-1922. Côté de Guermantes
(Preferred access point: Proust, Marcel, 1871-1922. À la recherche du temps perdu. Côté de Guermantes)”

The initial article must not be omitted : **Le**

See comment for 5.5.5.4.1 (omit an initial article).

See also our general comment about the initial articles

- 6.1.4.2.3 “Make additions to the access point, if considered to be important for identification, following the instructions given under 6.1.1.7, as applicable.”

King of the hill (Episode of The Simpsons)
(Preferred access point: Simpsons (Television program). King of the hill)

King of the hill (Episode of Cheers)
(Preferred access point: Cheers (Television program). King of the hill)”

Our comment :

It would be preferable to maintain the qualifier “Television program” even in the variant forms for more clarity in the index as follows:

- “King of the hill (Television program ; episode of The Simpsons)
- “King of the hill (Television program ; episode of Cheers)

6.1.4.3

Variant access point representing a compilation of works

“6.1.4.3.1 If the preferred access point representing a compilation of a person’s works has been constructed using the preferred access point for that person followed by a collective title (see 6.2.7), construct a variant access point representing the compilation using the preferred access point for the person followed by the title proper of the resource being described or the title found in a reference source, unless the title proper of the resource being described or the title found in a reference source is the same as, or very similar to, the collective title.”

Our comment :

If the preferred form is « Tales » ou « Works », it is not useful to add variants to the title proper of each edition.

6.2.0.2.2

“Determine the title to be used as the preferred title for a work created before 1501 from modern sources. If the evidence of modern reference sources is inconclusive, use (in this order of preference):

- a) modern editions
- b) early editions
- c) manuscript copies.”

Our comment:

This paragraph is equal to 6.0.2.2.

If this repetition is kept, please modify it in the same way :

Proposal :

Determine the title to be used as the preferred title for a work created before 1501 from ~~modern~~ the sources below ~~If the evidence of modern reference sources is inconclusive, use~~ (in this order of preference):

- a) modern references sources**
- b) modern editions
- c) early editions
- d) manuscript copies.

Establish an hyperlink to § 6.0.2.2

For anonymous works, use preferably IFLA, Anonymous classics.

6.2.1

Works created after 1500

6.2.1.1 General guidelines

Our comments :

In the comments to the examples of page 22 add at least the initials of the forenames of persons, whenever possible, in order to better identify the authors in cases of risk of homonymy as is the case in the following example:

- “American scholar
(Preferred title for work by **Emerson** first published under the title: An oration delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa Society, at Cambridge, August 31, 1837)”

Modify the comment of the following example:

“Trial of treasure
(Preferred title for work first published under the title: A new and mery
interlude called the Triall of treasure)”

by adding “ the anonymous” before “work”. The comment should read as follows:

“Preferred title **for anonymous** work first published”

NB : The other examples being name/title works

- 6.2.1.2.1 “If no title in the original language is established as being the one by which the work is best known, or in case of doubt, choose the title proper of the original edition (see 2.3.1) as the preferred title.”

Our comment:

The following example is not clear :

Treatyse of a galaunt
(Title proper of the original edition: Treatyse of a galaut ...)

In the previous editions of AACR2 the title proper is

“Here begynneth a treatyse of a galaunt”.

In “Background to each section of the draft”, p. 9, this example is referred to in the following case : Statements of responsibility and introductory phrases that are part of the title will no longer routinely omitted from preferred titles (AACR2 25.3 B ; RDA 6.2.1.2);

Furthermore there is an error in the title given in the comment « galaut ».

- 6.2.2. Works created before 1501

Our comment :

Treat separately anonymous works and works with authors.
(See also our general comment on part 6)

- 6.2.2.1 Classical and Byzantine Greek works

- 6.2.2.2

Our comment :

Why not adopt the same reasoning as regards the works of Greek and Latin Antiquity and patrology. Instructions are given to record Latin works in the original language Greek and works in the language preferred by the agency.

We propose to adopt the same approach in both cases:

- Either record in the language preferred by the agency
- Or record in the original language
- Or record in both cases the Latin form (given that for nearly 99% of Greek works there is an attested Latin form) as is the proposal of RDA for cases in which no English form exists

- 6.2.2.1.1 “For works created before 1501 (other than those covered by 6.2.2.2– 6.2.2.3), choose the title or form of title in the original language by which the work is identified in modern sources as the preferred title. If the evidence of modern reference sources is inconclusive, choose (in this order of preference) the title most frequently found in:
- a) modern editions
 - b) early editions
 - c) manuscript copies.”

Our comment

Reword as proposed for 6.0.2.2 and 6.2.0.2.2 as follows:

“For works created before 1501 (other than those covered by 6.2.2.2–6.2.2.3), choose the title or form of title in the original language by which the work is identified in ~~modern~~ the sources **below** as the preferred title. ~~If the evidence of modern reference sources is inconclusive,~~ Choose (in this order of preference) the title most frequently found in:

- a) modern reference sources (IFLA, Anonymous classics should be preferred)
- b) modern editions
- c) early editions
- d) manuscript copies. »

The following examples should be recorded in the form they appear in IFLA, Anonymous classics :

- “Beowulf”
- “Chanson de Roland”
- “Nibelungenlied”

- 6.2.2.2.1 “choose a well-established title in **the language preferred by the agency**”
6.2.2.2.2 “If there no such **English title**, choose the Latin title”

Our comment:

A regrettable shift for a cataloguing code that aims to be international!

- 6.2.2.2.3 “If there is neither a well-established English title nor a Latin title, choose the Greek title.”

Our comment :

There exist Latin titles for the following works (Reference information source: DOC / Vittorio Volpi, 1994).

- “Synopsis historike
(Preferred title for work by Constantine Manasses)
- Georgos
(Preferred title for work by Menander of Athens)
- Perikeiromene
(Preferred title for work by Menander of Athens)
- Katamyomachia
(Preferred title for work by Theodore Prodromus)”

There is a typographic error in the last example: Katamyomachia = Katomyomachia

- 6.2.2.3 Anonymous works written neither in Greek nor in the preferred script of the agency

Our comment :

It would be more logical in part **6.2.2. Works created before 1501**, to deal first with anonymous works, eventually note the exceptions to the general rule, and only then, deal with works of authors. This would allow to avoid the mix up of works of authors and anonymous works as is the case currently in 6.2.2.1.1.

The examples “Arabian nights” and “Book of dead” are not of the same nature. “Arabian nights” is a work expressed in a language written in non-Latin characters. The original title is in Arabian “Alf laylah wa laylah” (transliterated (romanised)

form of the title).

“Book of dead” is a denomination for a text. There are the egyptologues that have denominated the text; no title exists for that textual work in the original language.

For anonymous classics refer to IFLA, *Anonymous classics*.

6.2.3 Cycles and stories with many versions

Our comment :

We propose the following title for this section :

Cycles and works with several versions

- 6.2.3.1.1 Record the names of the cycle in conformity with IFLA Anonymous classics and not after the resource described.
(see also our general comment not to construct the preferred access points for works after the manifestation embodying these works)

➤record:

“Cycle de Guillaume d’Orange”

and not

“Guillaume d’Orange”

(just as you have “Ulster cycle” (LC authority), “Baal cycle” (LC authority), “Cycle des Lorrains” (BnF authority), “Geste Rainouart” (IFLA Anonymous classics)

comment on “Guillaume d’Orange” :

- the component titles of the cycle should be given in modern spelling
- the list of works composing the cycle is not complete: ➔ add “etc.” if this example is maintained
-

- 6.2.3.1.2 “If the cycle is only identified by a descriptive phrase (e.g., “the Arthurian romances,” “the Grail legends,” “the St. Francis legends”) or has no established title, use the title proper of the first resource received as the preferred title for the work.”

Légende arthurienne

(*Resource described*: La légende arthurienne : études et documents ...les plus anciens textes) »

Our comment :

The example is not correct, “Légende arthurienne” is but a generic title coined by the author of the resource described.

- 6.2.3.2 Stories with many versions :

“Reynard the Fox
Amis et Amiles”

Our comment:

- 1) Replace Stories by Works in the title: ~~Stories~~ **Works** with many versions
- 2) None of the examples illustrating this paragraph respects the form of IFLA, Anonymous classics. We disagree to maintain them. The second example is given in French, but the exact title is « Ami et Amile » (cf. IFLA, Anonymous classics)

6.2.4 Manuscripts and manuscript group
“Codex Amiatinus”

Our comment:

We contest this example because the work is the Bible, Vulgate is the version.
Codex Amiatinus is but an expression.

6.2.4.1 “c) ...If the manuscript is a single item within a collection, add the **foliation** if known.”

Our comment:

It is not specified whether the manuscript identifiers are always given in their full form (as in the examples) or whether the cataloguer may abridge them.
Cod. Cap. 74 ? Cap. 74? or Codice Capponiano 74 ? Capponiano 74 ?

6.2.5 Incunabula

Our comment:

The denomination « incunables » corresponds to a document published at a certain period and not to a type of work. → No specific case should be made of them as far as the construction of the access points is concerned.
The example « De viris illustribus urbis Romae » of Pliny has to be recorded as a Latin work, according to the guidelines in 6.2.2.1, just like « De bello Gallico ».

6.2.6.2 “Record the preferred title for the part following the general guidelines on recording titles for works given under 5.5.”

Our comment:

Why reference is made only to 5.5 (General guidelines on recording titles for works)?
A reference should also be made to 6.1.2.2 in order to help the cataloguer understand that titles of parts are to be recorded as subdivisions of the principal title and not directly, as the examples of 6.2.6.2 may let him think.

Exemple :

Two towers
(*Part of J.R.R. Tolkien's Lord of the rings*)

in 6.1.2.2 :

Tolkien, J. R. R. (John Ronald Reuel), 1892-1973.
Lord of the rings. Two towers

6.2.6.2.2 “If the part is identified only by a general term (with or without a number) such as
Preface
~~Detail (for a graphic resource)~~
Epilogue
Book 1
Part 2
Number 1
Band 3
record the designation”

Our comment:

See our comment in 6.1.2.2.1 : An authority is not relevant for a detail of a picture.

6.2.7.3 Other compilations of two or more works

Our comment:

RDA proposes either to use collective titles or to create separate access for each of the works. It seems to us that the French practice to limit the access points to three is a rather simple one to apply. However in a networking context it may become obsolete and it is more appropriate to recommend the creation of access points to all the works of a compilation.

6.3.2.3 Recording other variant titles

6.3.2.3.1 Example 8 :

Aristophanous...
Aristophanis...

Our comment:

Recording a variant title which comprises a genitive form of the author's name is not at all justified. Delete the author's name in both variant forms.

Exemple 10 :

Here begynneth a lytell treatyse for to lerne Englysshe and Frensshe
Here is a good boke to lerne to speke French
(*Preferred title recorded as: Lytell treatyse for to lerne Englysshe and Frensshe*)

Our comment:

We agree with the preferred title. But it is to be noted that the example is in opposition with the proposal of RDA (see our comment on 6.2.1.2.1)

6.4.0.3 Form of work

Our comment:

Where this information is recorded? It is not indicated.

6.5.0.1.1 “**Date of work** is the first date (normally the year) associated with a work.”

Our comment:

Add “for modern works”: “**Date of work** is the first date (normally the year **for modern works**) associated with a work.”

6.5.0.3.1 “Record dates in terms of the calendar preferred by the agency creating the data.”

Our comment:

We agree with the choice of the calendar, BUT the date must be recorded in a standardized form in order to be understandable internationally and to allow a real chronological filing.

6.5.1 Date of creation

Our comment:

The date is required only “when needed to distinguish an access point representing the work from another access point”. This instruction applies only to recording the date in the preferred access point. As important information about the work, the date associated with the work should be given in the authority record whenever it is known.

The term “creation” is ambiguous in the case of musical or dramatic works, as it can designate the first performance or representation of the work, and not the date of composition or writing. The two kinds of dates should be mentioned in RDA and instructions given on the preferred order for recording these dates.

6.5.2.3.1 Examples

Our comment:

We disagree with the creation of preferred access point for the title of periodicals as the key title is normally the standardized form of the title for a continuing resource that identifies it uniquely at an international level.

6.6 Place of origin

Our comment:

Precise the categories of works for which this information is useful.

Where this information is recorded: in the access point? in a note? It is not indicated.

Examples

Our comment:

We disagree with the creation of preferred access point for the title of periodicals as the key title is normally the standardized form of the title for a continuing resource that identifies it uniquely at an international level.

According to ISSN rules, only the town is given. However using the preferred form for the place enhances the consistency of the rules and of the catalogue.

6.7.0.3.1 Examples:

“Choreographic work : Baryshnikov

(Other characteristic of the work named The nutcracker, recorded to distinguish between other works with the same name)

Choreographic work : Nureyev, after Vaïnonen

(Other characteristic of the work named The nutcracker, recorded to distinguish between other works with the same name)”

Our comment:

The name of the choreographer is added as a qualifier in order to *distinguish between other works with the same name*.

According to the French practice, the choreography of a ballet is considered as a work in its own and the choreographer as the creator of the work. The preferred access point is constructed by combining in this order :

- the preferred access point for the choreographer and
- the title of the ballet.

6.8 ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE WORK
OPTIONAL”

Our comment:

Why is the original language of the work optional when the language is required when needed to distinguish between different expressions of the same work? Isn't it inconsistent?

Even it is not given in the access point for a work, the original language of the work, if applicable, should be recorded whenever it is known, because it is important information about the work.

6.8.0.3.1 “Record the language or languages in which the work was first expressed using an appropriate term or terms from the list of languages specified in ISO 639-2 (<http://www.loc.gov/standards/iso639-2/langhome.html>).”

Our comment:

How this information is recorded? as coded information in a format or as a note ? It is not clear at all, owing to the fact that the ISO standard ISO 639-2 “Codes for the representation of names of languages -- Part 2: Alpha-3 code” is mentioned, but the examples give only names (and not codes) of languages.

If the name of the language is to be taken from the list of languages specified in ISO 639-2, there will be a problem with dialects or languages for which a specific code do not exist in ISO 639-2 : the precise name of the language should be given (and not a group of languages).

6.10 Identifier for the work

Our comment:

Examples given in paragraph 6.10.0.3.1 seem indicate that authority record identifiers are considered as identifier for persons, which is not correct: an authority record identifier pertains to the record, not to the entity described by the record. Such confusion should be avoided.

A list of identifiers for works with the indication of the kinds of works for which they are relevant would be useful. In particular,

- international standard as ISAN (for audiovisual works) ISTC (for textual works) or ISWC (for musical works)
- number of thematic index number (for musical works).

6.11.03. Recording content type

Our comment:

“multimedia” as a specific form that integrate closely the “fundamental forms of communication” should be added in Table 1.

Otherwise, recording “multimedia” should be offered as a second alternative to repeating as many terms as applicable.

6.12.0.1.1 “Date of expression is the date the expression was **created**”.

Our comment:

The term “created” is ambiguous for musical works as for dramatic or choreographic works.

See our comment under 6.5.1.

- 6.12.0.3.1 “Record dates in terms of the Christian era. Add **B.C.** when appropriate.
Record dates from 1582 on **in terms of the Gregorian calendar.**”

Our comment:

Dates should be recorded in a standardized format: « B.C. » can be expressed by the use of the sign minus before the date.

If given in a textual form, this precision should be given in the language preferred by the agency creating the data.

- 6.12.0.3.2 “Record the date of the expression by giving the year or years **alone.**”

Our comment:

Dates more precise than the year alone can be useful to distinguish one expression from another, for example in the case of different versions of the same opera. This possibility should be given when appropriate.

- 6.13 Language of expression

Our comment:

Where is given this information? As an addition in the access points or as complementary information (note, coded information) for identification in the authority record?

Is there a limit in recording multiple languages?

- 6.13.0.3.1 “Record the language or languages of the expression using an appropriate term or terms from the list of languages specified in ISO 639-2 (<http://www.loc.gov/standards/iso639-2/langhome.html>). Follow the additional instructions given under 6.13.0.4–6.13.0.6.”

Our comment:

How this information is recorded? as coded information in a format or as a note ? It is not clear at all, owing to the fact that the ISO standard ISO 639-2 “Codes for the representation of names of languages -- Part 2: Alpha-3 code” is mentioned, but the examples give only names (and not codes) of languages.

If the name of the language is to be taken from the list of languages specified in ISO 639-2, there will be a problem with dialects or languages for which a specific code do not exist in ISO 639-2 : the precise name of the language should be given (and not a group of languages).

- 6.13.0.4.1 “If a single expression of a work involves two or more languages, record each of the languages. »

Our comment:

Is there a limit in recording multiple languages?

- 6.13.0.5.2 Do not record the name of the language for a motion picture with subtitles.

Our comment:

Why the language of subtitles is not recorded? It is an important aspect of the expression. Three cases are to distinguished:

- silent motion picture without subtitles
- silent motion picture with subtitles
- talking motion picture with subtitles

6.13.0.6.1 “If the resource described contains expressions of the work in two or more languages, create access points for each of the language”

Our comment:

According to this instruction, in the case of DVDs that contain several versions in diverse languages of the same work, as many expressions (and authority records) as versions will be created. It will increase a lot the cataloguing process of these resources.

6.14

Version

REQUIRED¹⁶

Note 16: Version is required when needed to distinguish an access point representing an expression of a work from an access point for different expression of the work (see 6.1.3).

Our comment:

We agree with the rule, BUT we think it has to be nuanced. If there is no difficulty to indicate the version for modern and contemporary works, it is not always applicable for medieval or traditional works. Some medieval works that were spread widely can have as many versions as manuscripts exist. Indicating the version is possible only for the great et well-identified traditions or versions. So we suggest adding “if applicable”.

Examples

Chamber version

(One version of Stephen Albert's Distant hills coming nigh)

Orchestra version

(Another version of Stephen Albert's Distant hills coming nigh)

Our comment:

According to the French rules, each adaptation for another medium of performance is not identified as an expression with a specific access point controlled by an authority record. We just add the precision “arrangement” to the access point for the musical work in the relation between the manifestation and the work. A specific access point (and authority record) is created only in the case of the transcription for another instrument by the creator of the musical work himself, as it is considered as a new work.

Creating specific access points identifying each adaptation of a musical work for various medium of performance is interesting but it will increase a lot the cataloguing process.

6.15

Technique

Our comment:

Our opinion is that most often the technique can pertain either to the work level (particularly in the case of a motion picture, the choice of the technique of realisation is essential in the creation process) or to the expression level (engraving of a still image as a reproduction technique for the diffusion of paintings in the 18th or 19th century, for example).

6.16

Identifier for the expression

Our comment:

ISRC (International Standard Record Code) should be mentioned as identifier for

recorded expressions of musical or audiovisual works.
ISMN that is given as example under 6.16.0.3.1 must be removed, because this identifier pertains to the manifestation level.

6.16.0.3.2

Example

Wolfgang's Vault ID: 20049774|1647

(*Wolfgang's Vault identifier for David Bowie concert recorded March 23, 1976*)

Our comment:

This example is not explicit enough. Is the concert (as spectacle) or the recording that implies it is an expression?

We suggest the following example that gives recording numbers and matrix record numbers: such number is given by the recording studio to each record and is an unique identifier; it is the precursor of ISRC.

matrices : 2 LA 3083-2 et 2 LA 3089-2

(*identifier for Symphonie fantastique / H. Berlioz ; Orchestre de la Société des concerts du Conservatoire ; sous la dir. de Bruno Walter. Voix de son maître DB 3856*)

Comment: It is the second recording of the matrix records 2 LA 3083 et 2 LA 3089. In this example the recording number is connected to the matrix record number by a hyphen. Most often, the recording number is given in superscript.

6.17

ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR MUSICAL WORKS

General comments on this part of RDA:

- Lack of consistency as to the boundary between works and expressions on one side and manifestations embodying these works and expressions on the other. Sometimes the reader is under the impression that titles of manifestations are the unique basis for the definition of the name of a work or expression.
- In the examples the titles of works seem to be taken as they appear in the titles of manifestations embodying these works.
- As regards the numeric designation for a musical work:
We consider that the thematic index number is always recorded in the access point for the musical uniform title whenever it exists and in an unconditional way, whether the title is distinctive or not and whether there is homonymy or not. Even at an international level, this number is acknowledged as the most reliable identifying element. If no thematic index number exists for the work in question, the opus number should be deemed as mandatory, whether the title of the work is distinctive or not and whether there is risk of homonymy or not. If a thematic index number exists for the work, the opus number is recorded in a variant form of the title.
- As far as the musical works is concerned, it is acknowledged that the sources of information taken into account for the identification of these works of whatever period, are considered in the following order of reliability:
 - Thematic indexes, catalogues of works, monumental editions
 - Encyclopedias and music dictionaries (such as The new Grove dictionary of music an musicians)
 - The document itself and the information it provides and that can be inferred form it comes in last position

- The initial articles are omitted
(See our general comments on chapter 5 and chapter 6)
- No general instructions are given as to the punctuation to be applied between the elements composing an access point. It is from the examples that the instructions are to be deduced. In our opinion, an international cataloguing code should give clear instructions; the examples are but an illustration of the instructions
(See also our general comments on RDA)

6.17.1.0.1 The instrumental works are lacking in the list of the different types of musical works.

6.17.1.0.2 “For music that is officially prescribed as part of a liturgy, construct the preferred access point following the instructions given under 6.28.1.4–6.28.1.6.”

Our comment:

The reference made to chapters 6.28.1.4 (general instructions on liturgical works) is not sufficient. Only titles of liturgical works feature in these chapters. There are neither guidelines nor examples regarding the liturgical musical works or liturgical texts set to music.

A separate part dedicated to these kinds of works is indispensable.

The French standard **Z 44-079 “Documentation – Cataloguing – Form and Structure of Headings for Uniform Titles for Musical Works”** gives in paragraph § 1.5.4 some guidelines to handle with a psalm, an Ave Maria, a set of hymns in a given liturgy, as follows:

1.5.4. Liturgical works

They comprise both liturgical musical works and liturgical texts set to music.

1.5.4.1. Liturgical musical works

If the work belongs to a musical repertoire with liturgical functions, appropriate uniform headings are provided: “Chant grégorien” (= Gregorian chant), “Chant byzantin” (= Byzantine chant), etc.

a) If the work is a single unit, the initial title element is the textual incipit, in the language of the Church considered, preceded by a statement relating to the musical repertoire.

Example: [Chant grégorien. Dies irae]

b) If the work is complex (i.e., it consists of several sections: a mass, vespers, etc., or it is published in a collection), the heading will comprise a statement of the musical/liturgical repertoire (“Chant grégorien”, “Chant byzantin”, etc.) and a term that accounts for the concept on which the collection is centered: genre, liturgical occasion, person, liturgical tide, etc.

Examples: [Chant grégorien. Hymnes] (= hymns)
[Chant grégorien. Messe des défunts] (= burial service)
[Chant grégorien. Office de la Vierge] (= Lady mass)
[Chant grégorien. Avent] (= Advent)
[Chant grégorien. Complies] (= compline)

1.5.4.2. Liturgical texts set to music

a) If the work is a single unit setting a liturgical text to music, the uniform

title heading will consist of the textual incipit, in the language in usage in the liturgy concerned: Latin, Arabic, Slavonic, etc., and of a statement of the language, if the work is in another language.

Examples: [Ave Maria (français)]
not:
[Bible. N.T. Évangiles. Luc]
nor:
[Je vous salue Marie]

[Venite, exultemus Domino]
not:
[Bible. A.T. Psaumes, 94 (latin)]

b) If the work is a collection that has neither a specific title nor a textual incipit but that consists of musical works setting liturgical texts to music (e.g., collections of psalms, hymns, etc.), the uniform title heading will follow the same pattern as the uniform title heading for the text itself (see NF Z 44-061, 3.1.3.-3.1.5.).

Examples: [Upanisad]
[Bible. A.T. Psaumes]

6.17.1.0.3 “For other types of musical works, construct the preferred access point following the instructions given under 6.1.1.”

Our comment:

See above : comments on 6.1.1

6.17.1.2 Pasticcios, ballad operas, etc.

“6.17.1.2a a) Original composition

6.17.1.2a.1 If the music of a pasticcio was especially composed for it, construct the preferred access point representing the work by combining (in this order):

a) the preferred access point for the composer named first in resources embodying the work or in reference sources”

Our comment:

The construction of the title of a work based on information found in the manifestations embodying that work seems incoherent.

The information sources used for each level: work, expression, manifestation, should be précised.

Same comment as for 6.1.1.2.1 and 6.1.1.2.2:

Why is only the composer named first taken into account for the construction of the preferred access point?

6.17.1.2b b) Previously existing compositions

Example given :

“Beggar’s opera

(Preferred access point for: The beggar’s opera / written by John Gay ; the overture composed and the songs arranged by John Christopher Pepusch. A vocal score)”

Our comment :

We don’t see any reason why the preferred access point for the pasticcio doesn’t

begin with the preferred access point for the pasticcio author.

6.17.1.3 Writer's works set by several composers

Our comment :

This entire paragraph seems to us out of place. Should we construct authoritative access points for titles of manifestations?

In particular the 2nd example « et voici mes chansons » is definitely the title of a manifestation.

6.17.1.4 Music settings for ballets, etc.

Our comment :

We notice that no mention is made of the author of the argument for these works. We consider that an access point to the author of the argument is necessary for these works.

Here below is the example of the BnF authority record for the ballet Gisele. Not only reference is made, in the form of a textual note, to the author of the argument, but a *see also reference* is also made in the form of a hyperlink to the authority record of this author.

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb13907669f>

[Adam, Adolphe \(1803-1856\)](#)

[Giselle] français

Argument de Théophile Gautier et Henri Vernoy de Saint-Georges.

See also reference :

>> << Argument de : [Gautier, Théophile \(1811-1872\)](#)

>> << Argument de : [Saint-Georges, Henri de \(1799-1875\)](#)

6.17.1.7 Cadenzas

Our comment :

We agree with the proposed processing, but the present examples are manifestation titles.

6.17.1.8 Music and incidental music for dramatic works

Our comment :

The illustrative examples are simple cases. How to deal with cases when scene music is integrated?

6.17.1.9 Librettos

Our comment :

Whether published with reference to its musical setting or not, a libretto (or work about a libretto) deserves an access point constructed by combining the librettos author's name (in the form of a preferred access point) and the title of the work (same thing for the lyrics).

The examples given in 6.17.1.9.2 are right.

While the examples given in 6.17.1.9.1 are false:

“Britten, Benjamin, 1913-1976. Curlew River
(Preferred access point for: Curlew River : a parable for church
performance / by William Plomer ; set to music by Benjamin Britten. A

libretto)”

The preferred access point for the libretto of “Curlew River” should be constructed by combining the preferred access point for the librettist William Plomer (and not the name of the composer) and the title for the work (the libretto being considered a work)

Same thing for the following example:

“Strauss, Richard, 1864-1949. Rosenkavalier (Opera)
(*Preferred access point for: Der Rosenkavalier : Komödie für Musik in 3 Aufzügen / von Hugo von Hofmannsthal ; Musik von Richard Strauss*)”

the preferred access point should combine the preferred access point for the librettist Hugo von Hofmannsthal and the title of the opera Der Rosenkavalier.

- 6.17.1.10. Additions to access points with titles consisting of the name(s) of one or more type(s) of composition

General comment:

No general instructions are provided as to the punctuation to be applied between the elements composing an access point. It is from the examples that the instructions are to be deduced.

In our opinion, an international cataloguing code should give clear instructions; the examples are but an illustration of the instructions.

(See also our general comments about RDA)

- 6.17.1.10.1 “If the preferred title for the work (see 6.18) consists solely of the name of a type, **or of two or more types, of composition**, add the following elements to the access point representing the work (in this order):
a) **medium of performance** (see 6.20)
b) numeric designation (see 6.21)
and c) **key** (see 6.22)”

Our comment :

We consider it helpful to give here our normative practice :

The French standard NF Z 44-079 “**Documentation – Cataloguing – Form and Structure of Headings for Uniform Titles for Musical Works**” gives in § 1.2.2 the following instruction :

1.2.2. The initial title element consists of several words or phrases
Even if each of those words or phrases designates a form/genre, and whether they are juxtaposed, coordinated, or written as a single word, the title is considered to be distinctive.
Examples: Beethoven, Ludwig van. – [Präludium und Fuge. Hess 29]
Ravel, Maurice. – [Introduction et allegro]

See also the following example issued from the Authority file of the BnF :

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb139163191>
[Milhaud, Darius \(1892-1974\)](#) *forme internationale*
[Introduction et allegro. Op. 220] *français*
[...]

Forme(s) rejetée(s) :

< [Orchestrations. Couperin, François. La sultane. Ouverture et allegro]
français

The title is thus given in the original language, it is not followed by the statement of the medium of performance neither of the key. As to the thematic index number and/or opus number, it is always provided.

- 6.17.1.10.2 (p. 60) “d) the complexities of stating the medium are such that an arrangement by other identifying elements (e.g., thematic index number or opus number, see 6.21) would be more useful.”

Our comment:

1) This sentence is unintelligible. What does the word “arrangement” refer to?
2) We disagree all the more with this instruction, that we consider the thematic index number and/or the opus number as THE fundamental and even mandatory elements of identification (whenever they exist) and they are not to be treated as OTHER identifying elements.

(See also our general comments on chapters on Musical works)

- 6.17.1.11 Additions to other access points representing musical works

General comment:

In the examples there are additions which are enclosed within parenthesis. There is no instruction as to the kind of additions enclosed within parenthesis, as distinguished from others which are just added out of parenthesis. If two or more additions are enclosed within parenthesis, what is the order of the terms occurring within the same parenthesis?

- 6.17.1.11.1 “If the access point for a musical work other than one covered under 6.17.1.10 is identical or similar to an access point representing a different work, **or to an access point representing a person, family, corporate body, or place, add:**
either a) medium of performance (see 6.20)
or b) another distinguishing characteristic of the work (see 6.7)”

Our comment:

What does the second part of sentence (in bold) mean? Does it make reference to works the title of which is constituted by a name of person or a name of place? Even if that is the case, why add a distinctive element? We consider that these kinds of titles are distinctive ones. For example, does the following title fall under the scope of this instruction?

Donizetti, Gaetano (1797-1848). Anna Bolena

- 6.17.1.11.3 “If these additions do not resolve the conflict, add one or more of the following:
a) numeric designation (see 6.21)”

Our comment:

We consider that the thematic index number is always recorded in the access point for the musical uniform title whenever it exists and in an unconditional way, whether the title is distinctive or not and whether there is homonymy or not.

The French standard NF Z 44-079 “**Documentation – Cataloguing – Form and Structure of Headings for Uniform Titles for Musical Works**” gives in § 2.2 the following instruction :

In all cases, the thematic index number is mandatory, if extant.

Example: Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. – [Le nozze di Figaro. KV 492]

(See also our general comments on chapters on Musical works)

According to this rule even the last example given under this paragraph of RAD should comprise the thematic index number BWV 1116. It would read than as follows:

Bach, Johann Sebastian, 1685-1750. Was Gott tut, das ist wohlgetan (Chorale prelude), BWV 1116

6.17.2.2.1 Preferred access point representing part or parts of a musical work
One part

Our comment :

Modify examples as follows :

☞ record:

“Larson, Jonathan. Seasons of love”

and not:

“Larson, Jonathan. ~~Reit~~. Seasons of love”

The titre of the part is distinctive; it must consequently follow the preferred access point for the composer.

☞ record:

“Beethoven, Ludwig van, 1770-1827. Symphonies, no. 1, op. 21, C major
and not:

“Beethoven, Ludwig van, 1770-1827. Symphonies, no. 1, op. 21, C major.

~~Andante cantabile con moto”~~

This is a movement and we disagree to construct preferred access points (musical uniform title headings) for movements. This increases the fragmentation of information.

We consider it helpful to give here our practice in cases like that. According to our rules the preferred access point (uniform title heading) would be:

Beethoven, Ludwig van, 1770-1827. Symphonies, no.1, op. 21, C major

a statement of the part “Extrait” would be added in the bibliographic record, but in no way in the authority record. In that way the relevance of information is preserved – information related to the work is recorded in the authority record and information related to the manifestation is recorded in the bibliographic record.

☞ record:

“Schumann, Robert, 1810-1856. Soldatenmarsch”

and not:

“Schumann, Robert, 1810-1856. ~~Album für die Jugend. Nr. 2~~, Soldatenmarsch”

☞ record:

“Praetorius, Hieronymus, 1560-1629. O vos omnes”

and not:

“Praetorius, Hieronymus, 1560-1629. ~~Opus musicum. Cantiones sacrae~~. O vos omnes”

In both cases the title of the part is distinctive and should be recorded immediately after the preferred access point for the composer.

In the French standard NF Z 44-079 “Documentation – Cataloguing – Form and Structure of Headings for Uniform Titles for Musical Works” the rule is made depending on the distinctive or not distinctive nature of the title of the part, see below § 3.1.1. :

3.1 Title of a part

3.1.1. The part has a distinctive title

When the part of a work that is published has a distinctive title of its own, that distinctive title is chosen as the initial title element of the uniform title heading.

Examples: Wagner, Richard. – [Das Rheingold. WWV 86]¹

not:

Wagner, Richard. – [Der Ring der Nibelungen. WWV 86. Das Rheingold]

☞ record:

“Verdi, Giuseppe (1813-1901). **La traviata**. Acte 3. Prélude”

and not:

“Verdi, Giuseppe, 1813-1901. Traviata. Atto 3o. Preludio”

- *The initial article of the original title is preserved; this article will anyhow not be taken into account for the sorting.*

- *For a better understanding, the statement of act is recorded in the language of the cataloguing agency.*

- *The title of the part consists in a term designating a musical genre (prelude, overture, ballet, etc.); it is consequently transcribed in the language of the cataloguing agency.*

- 6.17.2.3.1 Preferred access point representing part or parts of a musical work
Two or more parts

Example

Brahms, Johannes, 1833-1897. Ungarische Tänze. Nr. 5-6

Our comment:

The following example is to be cancelled. It represents an editorial decision to bring together two dances, i.e. two distinct works, for the purpose of issuing a publication. It corresponds thus to a manifestation title.

- 6.17.2.4.1 “If a part of a musical work is designated by the same general term as other parts
and lacks a number, add to the access point for the part enough of the identifying
6.17.2.4.2 terms covered in the instructions given under 6.17.1.10–6.17.1.11 as are necessary
to distinguish the part.”

Our comment:

We disagree in this point. Access should be made directly to the title of the concerned work, i.e. of the sonata, and not to the title of the whole set of which it is a part (*Concerti ecclesiastici*).

In both examples of Cima’s works remove the statement “*Concerti ecclesiastici*” occurring in the midst of the access point.

According to the same principle, in the four examples illustrating the instruction given in 6.17.2.4.2, remove the statement “*Maestro*”.

¹ The accurate thematic index number is WWV 86A, as WWV 86 is the thematic index number for the complete *Ring*. (*Translator’s note*)

- 6.17.3 6.17.3.5 Librettos and song texts
6.17.3.1 a) 6.17.3.1 e) librettos and song texts

Our comment :

We wonder whether this point should be dealt within 6.17.3. It has already been dealt with in point 6.17.1.9 as part of chapter 6.17.1 Preferred access point representing a musical work.

Are librettos and song texts as dealt with in this chapter distinct expressions? In our opinion – not!

- 6.17.3.1 Arrangements, transcriptions, etc.

- 6.17.3.1.2 “Construct the preferred access point representing an arrangement, etc., of a work or part(s) of a work that belongs, broadly speaking, to the category of “serious,” “classical,” or “art” music by adding **arranged** to the preferred access point representing the original work (see 6.17.1) or part(s) of the work (see 6.17.2), as applicable. Apply this instruction also to a transcription by the original composer.”

Our comment :

We disagree in this point. The arrangement statement should in no way be deemed as a constituent part of the preferred access point. It is in the bibliographic record (i.e. that such a statement may eventually be adjoined to the preferred access point for the musical work.

See below the example of the bibliographic record for an arrangement of Musorgskij’s [Pictures at an exhibition] in the Authority file of the BnF. The arrangement statement features only in the bibliographic record :

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb38275250k>

Type : enregistrement sonore, monographie

Auteur(s) : [Musorgskij, Modest Petrovič \(1839-1881\)](#) . Compositeur

Titre conventionnel : [\[Kartinki s vystavki\]](#). **Arr.**

Titre(s) : Tableaux d'une exposition [Enregistrement sonore] : une transcription pour orgue / Moussorgsky ; Vincent Genvrin, arr. ; Vincent Genvrin, org.

Publication : Paris : Studio SM ; Paris : distrib. Studio SM, 1994 (P)

Description matérielle : 1 disque compact (40 min 56 s) : DDD + 1 brochure ([20] p. ; 12 cm)

Collection : Vox humana

The two first examples and the last one (Berlioz, Respighi and Satie) would have been deemed correct **if the arrangement statement had not been comprised in the preferred access point.**

In the example:

“Ravel, Maurice, 1875-1937. Pavane pour une infante defunte ; arranged”

This is not an arrangement. Actually there are two distinct works for which two distinct preferred access points should be created. They have been both written from the hand of the composer and have distinct opus numbers.

Two distinct authority records (musical uniform titles) coexist in the Authority file of the BnF:

1) <http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb139177499>

[Ravel, Maurice \(1875-1937\)](#) *forme internationale*

[Pavane pour une infante défunte. Orchestre. O 19]

Genre musical : pavane **Date de l'oeuvre :** 1910

Orchestration par le compositeur de la pièce pour piano. - Créée à Paris sous la dir. d'Alfredo Casella le 25 décembre 1910

Distribution musicale : orchestre - orchestre symphonique XIXe-XXe s. (1)

Source(s) : Grove 6. - Marnat, Ravel

2) <http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb13917750h>

[Ravel, Maurice \(1875-1937\)](#) *forme internationale*

[Pavane pour une infante défunte. Piano. O 19]

Genre musical : pavane **Date de l'oeuvre :** 1899

Création le 5 avril 1902. - Il existe une version orchestrée par le compositeur

Distribution musicale : clavier - piano (1)

Source(s) : Grove 6. - Marnat, Ravel

The case of Schubert is a more delicate one. Anyhow we wouldn't have comprised the statement of arrangement in the preferred access point itself.

Generally speaking, whenever a transcription has a distinct thematic index number or a opus number, a distinct preferred access point (musical uniform title) should be created.

(See also our general comments on chapters on Musical works)

There are no instructions as to the treatment of variations, improvisations of works of parts of works of another composer.

(See also our general comments on chapters on Musical works)

In our catalogues they are treated in a peculiar way. See the following authority record from the Authority file of the BnF:

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb140121689>

[Beethoven, Ludwig van \(1770-1827\)](#) *forme internationale*

[10 Variations. Salieri, Antonio. Falstaff. La stessa, la stessissima.

Piano. WoO 73. Si bémol majeur]

Genre musical : variations **Date de l'oeuvre :** 1799

Dédié à la comtesse von Keglevics. - Éd. à Vienne en 1799

Distribution musicale : clavier - piano (1)

Forme(s) rejetée(s) :

< [10 Variations sur "La stessa, la stessissima". WoO 73]

Source(s) : Grove 6

6.17.3.1.3 “either a) an instrumental work arranged for vocal or choral performance
or b) a vocal work arranged for instrumental performance.”

Our comment:

Why that constraint?

6.17.3.2 Added accompaniments, etc.

“Bach, Johann Sebastian, 1685-1750. Sonaten und Partiten, violin, BWV 1001-1006

(*Preferred access point for:* Sechs Sonaten für Violine solo / von Joh. Seb. Bach ; herausgegeben von J. Hellmesberger ; Klavierbegleitung von Robert Schumann. *Solo violin sonatas by Bach with added piano accompaniment by Schumann*) ”

Our comment :

According to French rules, two distinct preferred access points would have been created in that case.

6.17.3.4 Vocal score(s) and Chorus score(s)

Our comment:

These statements might be useful, for example when the score of an opera chorus is to be catalogued. The French standard NF Z 44-079 “**Documentation – Cataloguing – Form and Structure of Headings for Uniform Titles for Musical Works**” makes a specific mention of it in: § 2.4.4. :

2.4.4. Statement of the type of score

In the case of published scores, the title heading for a work can be followed by an additional statement indicating the type of score. This is strictly limited to such cases when many bibliographic records must be sorted, as there are many editions of the same work.

Example: Händel, Georg Friedrich. – [Messiah. HWV 56]. Parties vocales

6.17.3.5 Librettos and song texts

1) **General comment**

We wonder whether this point should be dealt within 6.17.3. Do librettos and song texts constitute distinct expressions? The point has already been dealt with in 6.17.1.9 as part of chapter 6.17.1 Preferred access point representing a musical work. (See our comment about 6.17.3 and 6.17.3.1 e)

2) **See our comment about 6.17.1.9**

This instruction is opposed to the instruction given in 6.17.1.9.2. If the work contains only the text of an opera, etc., this text is deemed to constitute a work in itself. Consequently the preferred access point (for the musical uniform title) should be constructed by combining the preferred access point for the author of the text and the preferred title for the work:

According to this unique principle the two first examples should be recorded as follows :

☞ record as preferred access point:

“Piave, Francesco Maria, 1810-1876. La forza del destino”
and not

“Verdi, Giuseppe, 1813-1901. Forca del destino. Libretto”
this last may be useful as a *variant* access point.

☞ record as preferred access point:

“Taupin, Bernie. Crocodile rock”
and not

“John, Elton. Crocodile rock. Text”
this last may be useful as a *variant* access point.

3) As to the 3rd and the 4th examples (Mozart and Debussy), we disagree to consider a compilation as a work or even as an expression. As such no authority record should be created for them. (See also our general comments on chapters on Musical works)

- 6.17.4.1.3 “Make additions to the access point, if considered to be important for identification, following the instructions given under 6.17.1.10–6.17.1.12, as applicable.”

Our comment :

In absolute terms we agree, but for “Orpheus and Eurydike” the thematic index number should however be required as the first distinctive element.
(See also our general comments on chapters on Musical works)

- 6.17.4.2.1 Variant access point representing a part of a musical work

“Schumann, Robert, 1810-1856. Soldatenmarsch
(*Preferred access point:* Schumann, Robert, 1810-1856. Album für die Jugend. Nr. 2, Soldatenmarsch)”

Our comment:

See also our comment on 6.17.2.2.1 about the preferred access point for the same work.

The title of the part is distinctive. The preferred access point representing a part of musical work designated by a distinctive title should be constructed using the preferred access point for the composer **followed directly by the title of the part.**

Accordingly, the variant access point should be:

“Schumann, Robert, 1810-1856. Album für die Jugend. Nr. 2, Soldatenmarsch
(*Preferred access point:* Schumann, Robert, 1810-1856. Soldatenmarsch)“

- 6.17.4.2.2 “Sanctus (Messe de Tournai)
(*Preferred access point:* Messe de Tournai. Sanctus)”

Our comment :

This variant access point is quite useless.

- 6.17.4.3 Variant access point representing a compilation of musical works

Our comment :

We are definitely opposed to those manifestation titles whether in the preferred access points or in the variant access points.

- 6.18 PREFERRED TITLE FOR A MUSICAL WORK

Our comment :

The guidelines of this section regarding the *preferred title* are fundamental for the choice of the preferred access point representing a work, as stated in the scope of this section in 6.18.0.1.1. Therefore, it seems to us more logical to discuss the choice of the preferred title as the basis for the preferred access point representing a work prior to giving instructions of how to construct that preferred access point.
We suggest thus placing this section before section 6.17.

- 6.18.0.1 “Determine the title to be used as the preferred title for a musical work created after 1500 from **resources embodying the work** or reference sources.”

Our comment:

We notice that reference sources of information and resources embodying the work are treated together without any order of priority according to their degree of reliability. (See also our general comments on this part of RDA)

The French standard Z 44-079 “Documentation – Cataloguing – Form and Structure of Headings for Uniform Titles for Musical Works” gives rather detailed guidelines about the sources of information to be used for the choice of the musical title heading :

1. Choice of the musical title heading

As a rule, the title used as the basis for the heading is the composer's original title, in the language in which it was presented.

1.1. Sources

The original form of the title of a musical work is determined with reference to sources of information that are chosen in accordance with the institution's bibliographic resources and cataloguing policy.

The present standard suggests a number of usable sources.

The most complete and reliable sources of information are:

a) Authority lists established by national bibliographic agencies:

1) The list of uniform titles for musical works established by the National Library of France (Music Department, Audio-visual Materials Department),

2) The Library of Congress's catalogue of music materials (printed scores, books on music, sound recordings),

3) The Deutsche Nationalbibliographie (printed scores, sound recordings);

b) Thematic indexes, catalogues of works, monumental editions:

1) Thematic indexes that list each of the works composed by a given composer, with musical and textual incipits, and identify them through specific numbers,

2) Catalogues of works that list all works composed by a given composer,

3) Monumental editions of a given composer's complete works (either as scores or sound recordings),

4) Monographs devoted to a given composer or musical genre and that list all works associated with the topic;

Examples: Marnat, Marcel. – Maurice Ravel. – Paris, 1986.

Loewenberg, Alfred. – Annals of opera, 1597-1940. – 3rd edition revised and corrected. – Totowa, NJ ; London, 1978.

c) Encyclopedias and music dictionaries:

1) The new Grove dictionary of music and musicians / ed. by Stanley Sadie. London ; Washington, 1980,

2) Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart / herausgegeben von Friedrich Blume. Kassel ; Basel, 1949-1963,

3) Diapason. Catalogue général classique. Paris, 1964- . Annual.

d) The document itself and the information it provides and that can be inferred from it.

In all cases, the source of information should be approached critically, and in accordance with the rules for creating uniform title headings for musical works and with the consistency of bibliographic indexes. The way bibliographic records are sorted can depend on both the specific features of a given composer's musical output and the cataloguing policy of a given institution.

With regard to point 1.1.a) of the above cited French standard, it should be kept in

mind that that guidelines released by this standard are applied for the choice of access points in French catalogues. In an international context reference sources listed under points b) and c) should be given a higher degree of importance.

- 6.18.0.2 “Determine the title to be used as the preferred title for a musical work created before 1501 from modern sources. If the evidence of modern reference sources is inconclusive, use (in this order of preference):
- a) modern editions
 - b) early editions
 - c) manuscript copies.”

Our comment :

The chronological cut “before and after 1501”, certainly a very traditional one with regard to “textual uniform titles”, can in no way be applied to musical works.

(See also our general comments on RDA)

- 6.18.0.3b.1 Long titles

Our comment:

While we agree with point a), we disagree with the instruction and the example given in point b)

“St John Passion”

The cataloguer should not be allowed to formulate a brief title for the preferred access point. If there is no “brief” title by which the work is commonly identified in the reference sources, the cataloguer may be allowed to formulate one and use it as the basis for a variant access point but not for the preferred access point.

- 6.18.0.4.2 “Omit from the title [...] g) an initial article.”

Our comment:

We disagree with this instruction. In the example “La damnation de Faust” the article is part of the title.

See also our general comments on chapter 6.

- 6.18.0.4.4 “*Exception:*

If all of a composer’s works with titles (selected according to [6.18.0.3](#)) that include the name of a type of composition are also cited as a numbered sequence of compositions of that type, formulate a preferred title using the name of the type of composition following the instructions given under [6.18.1](#). ”

Our comment:

We don’t understand this instruction.

- 6.18.1.1 “If the preferred title resulting from the application of [6.18.0](#) consists solely of the name of one type of composition, record the accepted form of name in the language preferred by the agency creating the data, if there is one. Record the name in the plural unless the composer wrote only one work of the type.”

Our comment:

Our practice is currently in conformity with this instruction. Nevertheless, persisting to use the plural form as the conventional one, even if this is in conformity with the

current international usages, seems to us quite unsatisfying in cases when the preferred access point for the title of a unique work has to be established.

For example the form :

“*Quintettes. Violons (2), alto, violoncelles (2). D 956. Do majeur*”, established for only one of the quintets of Schubert is contrary to good sense and certainly doesn't help natural process of searching and retrieving information in catalogues. The argument is, in our opinion, all the more convincing considering the cases when a given composer has composed a unique work of a given type of composition.

We are of the opinion that the work for developing RDA is a good opportunity to reconsider this rule. The use of singular forms should be promoted.

6.18.1.2
and
6.18.2

“Record the original language form of name for works intended for concert performance called *étude, fantasia, or sinfonia concertante* or their cognates.”

Our comment :

Why do not these genres obey the general rule? *Étude, fantasia, sinfonia concertante* are types of compositions and as such must be recorded in the language preferred by the agency creating the data.

The same reasoning applies to Duets and Trio sonatas. In French catalogues, for example, the terms “Duos”, “Sonates en trio” are recorded.

6.18.4.2

One part

Our comment:

In a general way we're not comfortable with this section of RDA. The guidelines seem to us not based upon simple clear-cut principles but they take the form of a rather complicated range of instructions depending on the circumstances.

Rather than argue about the well-foundedness of these instructions we prefer to give here the rationale **the French standard Z 44-079 “Documentation – Cataloguing – Form and Structure of Headings for Uniform Titles for Musical Works”** which gives two principal alternatives depending on whether the title is distinctive or not:

3.1. Title of a part

3.1.1. The part has a distinctive title

When the part of a work that is published has a distinctive title of its own, that distinctive title is chosen as the initial title element of the uniform title heading.

[...]

3.1.2. The part has no distinctive title

When the part of a work that is published has no distinctive title of its own, but just a number or a generic term for a movement, the uniform title heading for the complete work is followed by the number of part and/or the statement of the movement.

Examples:

Brahms, Johannes. – [Ungarische Tänze. N° 5]

Beethoven, Ludwig van. – [Symphonies. N° 1. Op. 21. Do majeur. Andante cantabile con moto]

Things are more nuanced as regards arias of operas; a different treatment is foreseen depending on whether the same aria is to be found in several operas by the same composer or by distinct composers, or whether aria belongs to only one opera, as follows:

3.4.2. Opera arias

Whenever the same aria is to be found in several operas by the same composer or by distinct composers, the aria is entered under its own title, not under the title of the operas.

Example: Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. – [Voi avete un cor fedele. KV 217]

Comment: the aria was composed for Galuppi's opera *Le nozze di Dorina*.

Conversely, when an aria belongs to only one opera, if it is published separately, it is entered under the title of the opera, followed by the title of the aria.

In the case of opera seria or opera buffa, the title of the aria is always regarded as the title of the part, whether the publication contains the aria alone or the aria preceded by its recitative or complete scene. An additional element about the state of edition can contain, if needed, an appropriate qualifier: "récitatif et air", "scène", etc.

Example: Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. – [Le nozze di Figaro. KV 492. Dove sono i bei momenti (Récitatif et air)]

The title of the aria can be preceded by a statement of the act, scene, or number within the score, if such statements are to be found in the thematic index or the reference document chosen for establishing the uniform title heading.

It can be followed by a statement of the medium of performance, especially a specific voice, of key, language, date, etc.

Example:

Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. – [Idomeneo. KV 366. N° 2. Non ho colpa, e mi condanni. Ténor. Si bémol majeur]

Comment: this is the version of Idamante's part rewritten for a tenor voice on the occasion of the revival of the work in Vienna, 1786.

By contrast, a nickname for an aria (*Brindisi*, *madness aria*, etc.) is dealt with as a cross reference.

- 6.18.4.2c.1 "If each of the parts is identified both by a number and by a title or other verbal designation, record the title or other verbal designation of the part.
Come scoglio"

Our comment :

We disagree not to record the numerical designation, which in the case of the given example, identifies the title of the aria within the opera.

The example should rather look like :

"Cosi fan tutte. No 14. Come scoglio"

6.18.4.2d.1 “Nr. 2, Soldatenmarsch
(Part of Robert Schumann’s Album für die Jugend)”

Our comment:

See above our rationale as regards the processing of distinct titles. *Soldatenmarsch* is a distinctive title excerpt from a cycle, should be recorded separately and not preceded by the number that identifies it as being part of the cycle.

6.18.4.2^e.1 “O vos omnes”

Our comment :

Same thing, should be recorded separately and not

6.18.4.3 **Two or more parts**

Our comment:

The 1st example (Nr. 5-6) is to be removed. This is a compilation as appearing in a manifestation and as such does not constitute a distinct work.

6.18.5.4.2 “If the compilation consists of a consecutively numbered group, record the inclusive numbering following the name of the type.”

Our comment :

We disagree with this guideline. We do not recommend the construction of preferred titles for partial compilations. The compilation should be treated at manifestation level.

We recommend using the collective title and add the statement “Selection” only at manifestation level. In the following example for an access point at a manifestation level the preferred access point for the collective title ends with the word *Sonate*. The cataloguer adds the statement of selection while describing the resource:

“Skrâbin, Aleksandr Nikolaevič (1872-1915). Sonates. **Choix**”

6.18.5.5.1 “For a compilation containing various types of composition for various instrumental and vocal media by a single composer, record the collective title *Selected works*.”

We disagree with the instruction to record collective titles for various types of compilations for various instrumental and vocal media by a single composer. In those cases no specific preferred access point for the “Selected works” is recorded. We rather record the preferred access point for the complete works of the composer. Then, at the manifestation level, the cataloguer adds a simple statement “Selections”

6.19 **VARIANT TITLE FOR A MUSICAL WORK**

Our comment :

In an international perspective, it is necessary to distinguish

- the variant titles
- the variant forms of the preferred title in another language and/or script

In the French authority records, the variant forms of the preferred title in another language and/or script are recorded as “parallel forms” (and are not mixed with the other variant forms)

- 6.19.1.3.1 Recording alternative linguistic forms as variant titles
Different transliteration
Khovanchtchina
(*Transliteration recorded as preferred title: Khovanshchina*)

Our comment:
What about ISO transliteration?

- 6.19.2.3 Recording other variant titles

Our comment :
We disagree to record any non structured variants and variant forms for the title of the work regardless of their origine.
Examples 2 and 3 are titles of manifestations. As such they shouldn't be recorded as variant titles of works.
The first example may be taken into account as a recordable one, not because the form of the title as appears on the resource is recorded, but because in this variant title reference is made from an opus number to a thematic index number – both of these elements appearing in reference sources for musical works. However, this variant title should be constructed following the rules for the construction of a preferred access point, as follows:

“6 quintettes. Flûte ou hautbois, quatuor à cordes. Op. 45”

- 6.20 MEDIUM OF PERFORMANCE

Our comment:
No mention is made as to the language in which the medium of performance is recorded. A specific statement regarding the language should be made under 6.20.0.3.1. The medium of performance should be recorded in the langue preferred by the cataloguing agency.

“Note 21 : Medium of performance is **required when needed** to distinguish an access point representing the work from another access point (see 6.17.1.10–6.17.1.12).”

Our comment:
The medium of performance is required whenever the musical works are named by titles consisting of the name(s) of one or more type(s) of composition.

- 6.20.0.3.1 “...the other instruments in score order
continuo
voices
piano
...etc.”

Our comment :
Is there any particular reason for having defined an order different form that applied by the LCSH? The French standard **Z 44-079 “Documentation – Cataloguing – Form and Structure of Headings for Uniform Titles for Musical Works”** recommends also the same order of instruments as that adopted by LCSH.

As an illustration, in the last example of 6.20.0.5.3, according to those recommendations the instruments would have been ordered in alphabetical order (current usage for wind instruments): “bassoon, clarinets (2), horn, flute”

6.20.0.5.1 “For the following standard chamber music combinations, use the terms given in the column on the right:
INSTRUMENT COMBINATION TERM(S) RECORDED
string trio (violin, viola, violoncello) strings”

6.20.0.5.2 If the preferred title does not include trio(s), quartet(s), or quintet(s), record the name of the standard combination as given in the left column above.

Our comment:

Instructions in 6.20.0.5.1 and 6.20.0.5.2 are not clear. In which cases are recorded the terms defined in the right column. What is to be done when the title comprises the terms trio(s) etc.?

6.20.0.6.3 “Omit the following elements:
c) the names of alternative instruments.”

Our comment:

This instruction is in contradiction with our practices, the French standard **Z 44-079 “Documentation – Cataloguing – Form and Structure of Headings for Uniform Titles for Musical Works”**, § 2.2.1.1d, requires that these elements be recorded. (It is only in cases when there are more than 2 alternative media that these elements are omitted):

2.2.1.1.d) By contrast, if a work was composed for 2 alternative media, both media are stated.
Examples:
Brahms, Johannes. – [Sonates. Clarinette ou alto, piano. Op. 120 n° 1. Fa mineur]
Leclair, Jean-Marie. – [Sonates. Flûte ou violon, basse continue. Op. 1 n° 2. Do mineur]²
If there are more than 2 alternative media, the work is dealt with as though the medium had not been designated by the composer (references are provided as needed).

6.20.0.10 Solo voices

Our comment:

We don't see the reason why terms mentioned under 6.20.0.10.2 do not fall under 6.20.0.10.1.

6.20.0.13.2 “If, however, two or more such works by the same composer have the same title, record the number of parts or voices. Use voices to designate both vocal and instrumental parts.”

Our comment:

We disagree to mix up voices and instruments

6.21 NUMERIC DESIGNATION
“Note 22 : Numeric designation is required when needed to distinguish an access

² Both examples contradict provision 0.5, according to which such opus numbers should be written, respectively: “Op. 120, n° 1”, and “Op. 1, n° 2”, with a comma, space, between the opus number and the serial number within the opus. (*Translator's note*)

point representing the work from another access point (see 6.17.1.10–6.17.1.12).”

Our comment:

We strongly disagree with this note. Some numeric designations in particular the thematic index number should be declared as mandatory.

(See also our general comments on Musical works)

(See also our comment on 6.21.0.3b b)

6.21.0.3b b Opus number

General comment on the Opus number:

If no thematic index number exists for the work in question, the opus number should be deemed as mandatory, whether the title of the work is distinctive or not and whether there is risk of homonymy or not.

If a thematic index number exists for the work, the opus number is recorded in a variant form of the title.

(See also our general comments on Musical works)

6.21.0.3b.2 “If there is a conflict in opus numbering among works of the same title and medium, or if the overall opus numbering of a composer’s works is confused and conflicting, add to the opus number the name of the publisher originally using the number chosen. Add the publisher’s name in parentheses.”

Our comment:

We agree with this instruction.

Just correct in the example : “LeDuc” into “Leduc”

6.21.0.3c.1 Thematic index number

Our comment:

Instructions concerning the Thematic index number should be put in top of the list under 6.21.0.3. It is the most important of the numeric designations as regards the identification of a musical work.

The wording of the paragraph should be modified in order to take into account the mandatory character of this number whenever it exists.

(See also our general comments on Musical works)

6.22.0.3 KEY

Our comment:

We disagree with the chronological cut proposed in this section as a criterion for recording the statement of key.

1) Regardless the epoch to which the work belongs, and regardless the resource described, the acknowledged reference sources should serve as the basis for recording the key in the preferred access point for a musical work.

(See also our general comment on Musical works and our comments on Sources of information for Musical works)

2) The key should be given in the language preferred by the cataloguing agency and in conformity with the notation system in use in the country of the cataloguing agency.

Thus the examples of this section would be recorded as follows in the BnF :

Do mineur

Ré majeur

then :

La majeur

Si bémol

Add another example:

3^e ton

6.23 *ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR LEGAL WORKS*

General comments on this part of RDA:

The instructions for legal works are too detailed and they correspond to the Anglo-Saxon law and not to the Roman law.

In an international perspective, only general rules on the principal categories of legal works that are present in all countries must be given. Detailed rules on legal works that correspond to specific judicial practices should be given at a national level.

Collective titles are defined in RDA for compilation of works of a person, or corporate body in a particular form (cf 6.2.7.2)

Similar list of collective titles should be added for legal works :

Acts

Codes

Constitutions

Decrees

Laws

See also our comment under 6.24.

- 6.23.1.5. 1 “For the laws of ancient jurisdictions ; laws of non western jurisdictions before the adoption of legislative institutions based on western models ; and customary laws, tribal laws, etc., use as the preferred access point (in this order of preference)”

Our comment:

“certain medieval laws”: this definition is not sufficiently precise.

Example:

Gesetze des Merowingerreiches, 481-714

(Preferred access point for : Die Gesetze des Merowingerreiches, 481-714 / herausgegeben von Karl August Eckhardt)

Our comment:

The access point, which is the title proper of the resource, is not correct: it is a compilation of laws “Lex salica” and “Lex Alamannorum”.

We propose to create two standardized access points “Lex salica” and “Lex Alamannorum”.

- 6.23.1.7.1 Laws and derived regulations, etc., issued together

Our comment:

Why create preferred access points controlled by authority records that repeat the title proper of the manifestation being described, especially in the case of compilations? They are not uniform titles that gather the different editions of the same work, and the resource can be searched by the title proper and the creator (corporate body or person).

- 6.23.1.14.1 “For a treaty, or any other formal agreement, between two or more national governments,²⁶ construct the preferred access point representing the work by combining (in this order):
- a) the preferred access point for the government named first in resources embodying the work or in reference sources, formulated according to the guidelines and instructions given under 11.1.1
 - b) the preferred title for the work, formulated according to the instructions given under 6.24.2”

Our comment:

We totally disapprove this rule. It seems neither convenient nor apposite to choose the government named first in resources as the entry element of the preferred access point for multilateral treaties. Besides, for the same treaty, the order of the governments listed can change according to the language of the resource: it will be the case for European treaties.

Why the preferred access point is not the title of the treaty when they are more than two parties?

- 6.23.1.16.1 Examples
Catholic Church. Treaties, etc.
(*Preferred access point for: Das Konkordat zwischen dem Heiligen Stuhle und dem Freistaate Baden*)

Catholic Church. Treaties, etc.
(*Preferred access point for: Základná zmluva medzi Svätou stolicou a Slovenskou republikou*)

Our comment:

A concordat is a very specific kind of agreement. So « Treaties » seems to us a too generic term to be used as preferred title for a concordat. Why not include « concordat » in the list of (collective) titles corresponding to the diverse forms of legal works?

- 6.23.1.22 Citations, digests, etc

Our comment:

Why create preferred access points controlled by authority records that repeat the title proper of the manifestation being described? They are not uniform titles that gather the different editions of the same work, and the resource can be searched by the title proper and the creator (corporate body or person).

- 6.23.1.32.4 “If the access point for a single treaty is constructed using the preferred access point for one of the parties, and if there is only one party on the other side, add (in this order):

- a) the name of the other party (see 6.27)
- b) the date, earlier date, or earliest date of signing (see 6.26.2).”

Our comment:

A variant access point should be made using the preferred access point for the other party as entry element.

The date should be given in the standardized form in order to allow a real chronological filing and to be internationally understandable.

6.24 PREFERRED TITLE FOR A LEGAL WORK

Our comment:

We prefer to avoid the use of « etc » in access points constructed using collective titles such as « Laws », « Treaties », « Protocols ». The list of such collective title can be enlarged in order to take into account some specific forms of legal works (for example, concordats) and each term of the list should be accompanied by a definition indicating the range of resources covered by each term.

6.24.0.2.2 Sources of information

Our comment:

Modify the wording in order to be more consistent with 6.0.2.2:
Determine the title to be used as the preferred title of a legal work created before 1501 from ~~modern~~ the sources **below**. ~~If the evidence of modern reference sources is inconclusive, use~~ (in this order of preference):

- a) modern reference sources
- b) modern editions
- c) early editions
- d) manuscript copies.

6.24.2.2.2 Example Treaty of Utrecht

Our comment:

A comment explaining that “Treaty of Utrecht” is a collective name for treaties signed from 1713 to 1715 would be useful. Besides, if it is a compilation of treaties, the plural form should be used: “Treaties of Utrecht”. See the BnF authority record: <http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb12109460r>
The use of the plural form allows to make the distinction with the title of the specific treaty that gives its name to the compilation. Under 6.25.1.3.1, one can see the preferred title for this specific treaty with the addition of the date 1713 that allows to identify the treaty signed in 1713.

6.26.0.1.1 “**Date of work** is the first date (normally the year) associated with a work.”

Our comment:

The precision « normally the year » pertains only to modern and contemporary works. For more ancient works, the date should be as precise as possible: decade, quarter of century, century.

6.26.1.3.1 “Record the year in which a law, etc., was promulgated following the basic instructions given under 6.26.0.”

Our comment:

Why not give the precise date (year, month and day) of promulgation of a law when it is known (as it is done for a treaty)? The precise date can be recorded in the authority record even it is not part of the preferred access point.

6.26.2.3.1 Record the date a treaty, etc., or a protocol to a treaty, etc., was signed following the basic instructions given under 6.26.0. Record the date in the form: year, name of the month, number of the day. 1948 March 2

1783 September 3

Our comment:

The date should be recorded in a standardized form YYYY-MM-DD in order to be understandable in an international context.

ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR RELIGIOUS WORKS

6.28 Constructing access points to represent **religious works** and expressions

Our comment:

“Religious works” is a too broad title, as instructions concern only Sacred Scripture, confessions of faith and liturgical texts.

6.28.1.1 Works accepted as sacred scripture
“For a work that is accepted as sacred scripture by a religious group, construct the preferred access point representing the work using the preferred title for the work, formulated according to the instructions given under 6.29. »

Our comment:

The acceptance of “sacred scripture” is very broad. Why not distinguish between :

1. anonymous sacred books of the old great religions of the world, with the examples given in 6.28.1.1.1
2. works with an author which are considered as fundamental books by a religious group : the general rule for a work with an author applies to this category of works.

6.28.1.2 Harmonies of scriptural passages

Our comment:

In the title and the text of the instructions, replace « passages » by « texts ».
Concordances: What about Biblical concordances? Is it only mentioned in subject access points?

6.28.1.3 Theological creeds, confessions of faith, etc.
Question: Advice is requested on the use whether the distinction between one and more than one body should be retained in 6.28.1.3.

Our comment:

We advocate entering always a theological creed, confession of faith, etc. in the same way **with the preferred access point under title**, and not constructing the preferred access point by combining the corporate body and the title.
Besides we advocate establishing relationship(s) between the work and the appropriate corporate body (or bodies) regardless of their number, because there are very various possibilities for confessions of faith (one Church but editor unknown, Church and editor(s) known, confession of faith adopted successively by diverse Churches, etc.) and because it is not possible without thorough research to make sure if one confession of faith is used by several Churches.

6.28.1.4 Liturgical works
and

6.28.5

Our comment:

Catholic Eastern rites are omitted. Instructions and examples would be necessary.
Eastern rites are present only in **6.28.1.5 Liturgical works of the Orthodox**

Eastern Church.

What is the rule

- when the origin of a Byzantine liturgical book is unknown?
- when the name of a particular Church is inappropriate (for example, manuscripts or editions which are not published by a Church) ?

The solution of creating 2 access points:

Catholic Church. Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom

Orthodox Eastern Church. Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom

is unsatisfactory.

6.28.1.4.1 “e) prayer books known as « books of hours”.

Our comment:

We disagree with including “prayer books” among liturgical works.

Such “prayer books” are “intended for private devotions, not for liturgical use”, and this point should be specified in the definition.

Therefore these books are not liturgical works, and they should be dealt with in another paragraph.

6.28.1.4.2 “For a liturgical work falling into one or more of the categories listed above, construct the preferred access point representing the work by combining (in this order):
a) the preferred access point for the church or denominational body to which it pertains, formulated according to the instructions given under 11.1.1
b) the preferred title for the liturgical work, formulated according to the instructions given under 6.29.”

Our comment:

Gather examples by religious body, and number them.

“Church or denominational body” as the first part of the constructed access point does not seem easy for Christian Churches except for Catholic Church. Under what corporate body liturgical works used by several Churches should be entered?

Example 4

United Lutheran Church in America. Common service book ~~of the Lutheran Church~~
~~Church~~

Our comment:

It does not seem necessary to repeat the name of the Church in the preferred title.

Omit it in the preferred title allows to avoid useless redundancy.

For liturgical works of Catholic Church published subsequently to Council of Trent, the preferred title **must conform to the *List of uniform titles for liturgical works of the Latin rites of the Catholic Church, 2nd ed., 1981***

Example 5

Catholic Church. Missal

Example 6

Catholic Church. Missale Romanum

Example 9

Catholic Church. Liber usualis

Our comment:

Examples 5 & 6 are inconsistent regarding to the language and the form of the preferred title.

We propose to mention always the rite, as an **separate addition**, in the **language of the agency** creating the data: See in Appendix 2 below the French proposal for the mention of the rite.

Example 5 & 6

Catholic Church. Missale (Roman rite)

Example 9

Catholic Church. Liber usualis (Roman rite)

Example 7

Church of England. Calendar, lectionary, and collects

Our comment:

We disagree with this access point: if the manifestation contains 3 works, 3 access points (one by work) should be created.

Example 10 :

Catholic Church. Restored Holy Week liturgy

Our comment:

If it is a liturgical **text**, the preferred title must conform to the *List of uniform titles for liturgical works of the Latin rites of the Catholic Church*; if it is only the musical work (as it seems from the comment), it must be constructed according to the instructions that applies to uniform musical titles.

- 6.28.1.4.3 “For a single passage from a sacred scripture used in religious services, construct the preferred access point representing the work following the instructions given under 6.28.1.1.”

Our comment:

The biblical “Book of Psalms” and the liturgical book “Psalter” (Psalterium) should be distinguished: The instructions for the Bible apply to the first one, and the preferred title for the second one must conform to the *List of uniform titles for liturgical works of the Latin rites of the Catholic Church*.

- 6.28.3.1.1 Examples

Our comment:

See our comment under 6.29.7.

- 6.28.3.1.1 Example
Bible. French. Le Maistre. 1848

Our comment:

Version: See our comment under 6.31. The name of the version should be “Port-Royal” instead of “Le Maistre”

Date: 1848 pertains to the manifestation, not to the expression.

- 6.28.3.1.4 and
6.32.0.4.2 « facsimile reproduction »

Our comment:

Our analysis is that such information pertains to the manifestation level.

Otherwise why this instruction about the mention of date for facsimile is given here and not in the general instructions? Is it specific to the expressions of the Bible?
Add “facsimile” after the date of the original publication.

Example

Bible. German. Luther. 1534 facsimile

Bible. German. Luther. 1934

6.28.3.2.2

“Exception

If the resources consists of the original text and a translation, **do not add the name of the language**. Create a second access point using the name of the language of the translation as an addition.”

Talmud

Talmud. English

Our comment :

Why this exception ? The language of the expression must always be indicated: implied information should be avoided in an on-line catalogue, and in a multicultural context as the web context.

It would be better to have to access points as follows:

Talmud. Hebrew

Talmud. English

Is this exception applicable only to Hebrew in the case of the sacred scriptures of Judaism? Or is it a general rule, applicable to the original language of the work for all kinds of works? In the last case, where is it formulated in chapter 6?

s

« If the resource being described is a particular version of one of the four standard compilations of Vedas, add the name of the version in parentheses. »

Our comment:

There is no consistency with the instructions given for the expressions of other sacred texts: for the Bible, versions are given after a full stop (in a specific subfield in MARC), but for “Vedas”, versions are given in brackets after the name of the work (same subfield in MARC). Why such a difference?

6.28.3.4.1

“If the resource being catalogued contains an authorized or traditional variant or special text of a liturgical work, add to the preferred access point representing the work (in this order of preference):

a) the name of a special rite (e.g., a Latin rite other than the Roman rite for Catholic works; a rite other than the unmodified Ashkenazic rite for Jewish works)”

Our comment:

In order to have consistent access points, **the rite** should always be given as a **separate addition**, in the **language of the agency** creating the data. This rule should be a general rule that applies to all religions when it is pertinent.

This practice has the advantage to avoid any implicit element in a web context and to facilitate searching.

There is a need for an authoritative list for denomination of rites

Latin rites for Roman Catholic Church (See Appendix 2 below)

Eastern rites

Jewish rites

- 6.28.3.4.1 b) the name of the place (e.g., country, diocese) or institution (e.g., monastery) in which the variant is authorized or traditional; if necessary, add both elements, with the institution preceding the place
Example
Catholic Church. Officia propria (Ireland)

Our comment:

The preferred title doesn't conform to the *List of uniform titles for liturgical works of the Latin rites of the Catholic Church*, 2nd ed., 1981.
It should be : Proprium officii (Ireland)

- 6.28.3.4.3 “For post-Vatican II liturgical texts that vary in language and content, use the individual title of the resource being described as the preferred title, and add a term to distinguish between different texts that have the same title.”

Our comment:

We totally disagree with this rule: the preferred titles for post-Vatican II liturgical texts must conform to the *List of uniform titles for liturgical works of the Latin rites of the Catholic Church*, 2nd ed., 1981.
The unique option may be the language chosen : either latin (language of *editio typica*) or language of the agency creating the data

Examples are inconsistent. The preferred titles in examples 3 & 4 should have the same structure as those in examples 2 of this paragraph.

Example 3

“Order of Holy Cross” must be indicated as the mention of the particular rite (as Servite in example 2)

➔ Liturgy of Hours (Order of Holy Cross)

Example 4:

The preferred access point should be constructed as follows :

- 1) The preferred title must conform to the *List of uniform titles for liturgical works of the Latin rites of the Catholic Church*, 2nd ed., 1981, with the option of choosing the language of the agency.
- 2) “Order of the brothers of the blessed Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel” should be added as the mention of the particular rite

➔ Proper of the Office (Order of the brothers of the blessed Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel)

It is the only way to gather the same liturgical works and to arrange them according to the rite. In a web context the preferred title, with all its elements (additions), must be comprehensive without reference to the related corporate body.

- 6.29.2.1 “Choose the title commonly found in sources in the language preferred by the agency creating the data as the preferred title for an apocryphal book (i.e., one included neither in the Catholic canon nor in the Protestant Apocrypha).”

Our comment:

Examples are Biblical apocryphal texts. Is the rule exclusive? If not, add apocryphal books of other religions. For example, apocryphal sutras for the Buddhism:

The preferred title is directly the title of the particular book, BUT in chapter 6.30 “Variant title for a religious work”, there is no example of variant of title with the structure: Bible. Apocryphal books. Book of Jubilees.

- 6.29.5.1.1 “If a Catholic liturgical work compiled before the Council of Trent (1545–1563) has a close counterpart in a Tridentine work, use the Tridentine title. »

Our comment:

Replace

“If a Catholic liturgical work compiled before the Council of Trent (1545-1563) has a close counterpart in a Tridentine work, use the Tridentine title”

by

“If a Catholic liturgical work compiled before the Council of Trent (1545-1563) has a close counterpart in a Tridentine work, use the preferred title of the *List of uniform titles for liturgical works of the Latin rites of the Catholic Church*, 2nd ed., 1981 for Tridentine liturgical works, in Latin or in the language of the agency.”

Caution! Some pre-Tridentine liturgical works have the same title than a post-Tridentine liturgical works but are not identical, it must be clear in the explanation

- 6.29.5.2.1 “Titles of Tridentine texts are not applicable to those post-Vatican II texts that vary in language and content. Where such variations exist, use the individual title of the resource being described as the preferred title. »

Our comment:

We totally disagree with this rule: the proper title of the resource must not be the preferred title, as there are variants for the same book (for example, Liturgie des Heures, Prière du temps présent).

The *List of uniform titles for liturgical works of the Latin rites of the Catholic Church*, 2nd ed., 1981 makes a clear distinction between the post-Vatican II and Tridentine liturgical books when the content has changed. The international document says:

BREVIARIUM

A book containing all texts recited daily by clerics and by certain religious as the Divine Office. Frequently divided into several parts mainly according to the Seasons. **Since the Second Vatican Council the Breviary has been replaced by Liturgia horarum**

LITURGIA HORARUM

A **Post-conciliar book** containing all the texts to be recited daily by clerics in major orders and by certain religious as the Divine Office. Replaces the Breviary (3).

“For further parts of the post-conciliar *Rituale* which will be published separately the corresponding official Latin titles are to be used as uniform titles.”

ORDO BAPTISMI PARVULORUM

Instructions (rubrics) and texts for the baptism of children. Post-conciliar.

ORDO INITIATIONIS CHRISTIANAE ADULTORUM

Instructions (rubrics) and texts for the baptism of adults. Post-conciliar.

Variants corresponding to the translations/adaptations in vernacular language of the Latin “*editio typica*” must be an addition.

For versions in vernacular language, the **guidelines of IFLA** are:

Additions Showing Versions of Post-Conciliar Books in Different Languages

Dutch	Versio Batava
English	Versio Anglica
French	Versio Gallica
German	Versio Germanica

Hungarian	Versio Hungarica
Italian	Versio Italiana
Polish	Versio Polonica
Portuguese	Versio Lusitana
Serbo-Croatian	Versio Serbo-Croatica
Spanish	Versio Hispanica

The option may be: addition of the “version” in the language of the agency: English version, German version, etc.

- 6.29.6 “Choose as the preferred title for a Jewish liturgical work its name as found in the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*.”

Our comment:

The source prescribed to choose the preferred title is “*Encyclopaedia Judaica*”. This reference book is in English. Each agency should be allowed to choose the preferred source.

We wonder that there is no other rule for Jewish liturgical works. How construct the preferred title in the case of part of a whole: is the title of the part chosen as the preferred title or is it recorded as a part of the whole?

Guidelines about mention of the rite are necessary. An appendix with the list of the rites and the prescribed form for this addition is needed.

- 6.29.7 Bible

Our comment:

We agree with the fact that the headings “Bible. O.T.” represents a Christian approach, unsatisfactory for Hebrew Bible.

We also agree with the choice of fuller forms for “Old Testament” and “New Testament”, instead of abbreviations, especially in a web context.

BUT

We disagree with the choice made between possible scenarios for an “alternative approach models” for Bible (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsa/BibleOTtable7.pdf>). We preferred scenario D2 because it presents the advantage to gather books of the same religious tradition in the indexes for final users.

Model E, chosen by LC and RDA, presents a great disadvantage: Bible will be the heading for the corpus of Hebrew Bible and for corpus of Christian Bible.

- 6.29.7.2.3 “If the resource described is part of a book...”

Our comment:

We do not see the point of creating so specific access points controlled by authority records. Besides, we do not consider that such little quotations are “works”.

The precision of the chapter and verse can be made at the manifestation level in recording the relation between the resource and the work embodied in this resource.

- 6.29.7.4 Apocrypha

Our comment:

The word “**Apocrypha**” has not the same meaning in a catholic or protestant context. The denomination “**Apocrypha**” corresponds to Catholic “**Deuterocanonical books**” and other books (Prayer of Manasses, 3-4 Maccabees, 3-4 Esdras).

What is the preferred title for a compilation of Deuterocanonical books?

“Apocryphal books”: what is the preferred title for a compilation? Is the preferred title “Pseudepigraphs” ?

6.29.18.2 6.29.18.2 Offices and masses
Ici sont traités très rapidement des œuvres qui sont des œuvres à la fois musicales et liturgiques.

6.29.18.2.1 “If the day is a saint’s day, add only the saint’s name in direct order and in the language of the access point for the saint”.

Our comment:

The direct order is not satisfactory.

Example:

Mass, Sainte Thérèse

Our comment:

The example raises the problem of homonyms. We suggest to add the saint’s name using the preferred access point for the saint :

Mass, Thérèse de l'Enfant-Jésus (sainte)

See also our comments under 6.17.1.0.2 for liturgical works that are also musical works.

6.31. Version

Our comment:

A list of the preferred names of the versions seems necessary.

In **Appendix 1**, we give the complete list used at the BnF. We wish the integration in RDA of the preferred forms in this list **for French versions** (for example, “Port-Royal” instead of “Le Maistre” cf 6.28.3.1.1). We are ready to complete this list.

6.32.0.4.1 “Record the year of publication of the resource.”

Our comment:

The year of publication of the resource pertains to the manifestation level (and not to the expression).

6.32.0.4.2 “If the resource is a facsimile reproduction...”

Our comment:

See our comment under **6.28.3.1.4**.

This instruction about the mention of date for facsimile seems to apply only to the expressions of the Bible. Why?

Add “facsimile” after the date of the original publication.

Example

Bible. German. Luther. 1534 facsimile

Bible. German. Luther. 1934

This example illustrates also an instruction given the following paragraph “resource published over more than one year”.

6.32.04.3 “If the resource was published over more one year, record the earlier or earliest year”

Our comment:

This instruction does not allow to distinguish between an edition of a single year and an edition published over more one year. It would be better to give the two dates connected by a hyphen.

Examples:

Bible. French. 1965
(Paris : Club français du livre)

Bible. French. 1965-1966
(Paris : Editions Planète)

6.33.1.3 6.33.1.3 Compilations of official communications of more than one holder of an office
Ex. Catholic church. Pope. Gli anni santi attraverso le bolle
Le point d'accès est créé au titre propre du document : pour quoi ne pas créer
Catholic church. Bulls ? comme pour l'exemple précédent : Catholic church. Pope.
Encyclicals.

6.33.1.3 Compilations of official communications of more than one holder of an office

Our comment:

The examples show some inconsistency in the construction of the preferred title.

Example 3 should have the same structure than example 2, i. e.

Catholic Church. ~~Pope. Gli anni santi attraverso le bolle~~
Catholic Church. ~~Pope.~~ Bulls (1300-1998)

See also our comment on chapter 11.2.7.2 Heads of state, etc.

Appendix 1:
Version of the Bible, list of preferred forms of Bibliothèque nationale de France

Bold characters = preferred forms	Variants	Identification data
Abrégée		Bible, français
Amelot		N.T., français, XVIIe s. (1666), catholique
Aquila		A.T., grec, IIe s., hébraïque
Authorised		N.T., anglais, XVIIe s. (1611), sous la dir. d'Andrewes, anglicane
Authorized	Utiliser : Authorised	
Barneville		N.T., français, XVIIIe s.
Beaumont		Bible, français, XXe s. Traduction adaptée
Beausobre		N.T., français, XVIIIe s. (1718), protestante
Benois		Bible, français, XVIe s. (1566)
Bèze		N.T., grec-latin, XVIe s., protestante N.T., latin Psaumes, français
Bible des communautés chrétiennes	Utiliser : Hurault	
Bible des peuples	Utiliser : Hurault	
Bibliothèque de la Pléiade		Bible, français, 1971, non confessionnelle
Bishop's version		Bible, anglais, XVIe s. (1568), par Parker, protestante
Bouhours		N.T., français, XVIIe s. (1697), catholique
Boyer		Bible, français (2001), traduction littéraire, travail collectif, binômes exégètes-écrivains
Breeches	Utiliser : Genève	
Brucioli		Bible, italien, XVIe s.
Castellion		Bible, latin, XVIe s. (1551), protestante Bible, français (1555)
Centenaire		Bible, français, XXe s. (1916-1947), protestante (A.T. par A. Lods, N.T. par M. Goguel)
Chouraqui		Bible, français, XXe s.
Corbin		Bible, français, XVIIe s. (1643), catholique
Coverdale		Bible, anglais, XVIe s. (1535 à Cologne). Pour la dir. de l'éd. de 1539, voir "Great Bible"
Cranmer	Utiliser : Great Bible	
Crampon		Bible, français, XIXe s. (1894-1904), éd. <i>post mortem</i> , catholique
Cyrille et Méthode		Bible, slavon, IXe s.
Dietenberger		N.T., allemand, XVIe s. (1535)
Diodati		Bible, italien, XVIIe s. (1607) Bible, français (1644), protestante
Douai		Bible, anglais, XVIe s. (1609-1610), catholique

Bold characters = preferred forms	Variants	Identification data
Emser		N.T., allemand
Érasme		N.T., grec, XVIe s. (1516) N.T., latin
Estienne		N.T., grec, XVIe s.
Français courant		Bible, français, XXe s. (1982), œcuménique
Genève		Bible, anglais, XVIe s. (1560), protestante Bible, français (Bible d'Olivétan, 1535 ; rév. par Calvin "Bible de Genève", 1562 ; rév. sous la dir. de T. de Bèze, 1588) N.T., français, protestante
Genève-Tomson		N.T., anglais (différente de celle de 1560 ci-dessus)
Godeau		N.T., français, XVIIe s. (1668), catholique
Great Bible		Bible, anglais, XVIe s. (1539)
Guyart Des Moulins	Utiliser : Historiale	
Historiale		Bible, français, XIIIe s., par Guyart Des Moulins
Hurault		Bible, français (1998) traduction par Bernard et Louis Hurault sous le titre « Bible des communautés chrétiennes » ; éd. révisée, 2002, sous le titre « Bible des peuples »
Huré		N.T., français, XVIIe s. (1667-1702) janséniste Bible, français
Jérusalem		Bible, français, sous la direction de l'École biblique de Jérusalem, XXe s. (1956). Versions dans la majorité des langues européennes
Jud	Utiliser : Zurich	
King James	Utiliser : Authorised	
Lallemant		N.T., français, XVIIIe s., catholique
Le Grost		N.T., français
Le Maître de Sacy	Utiliser : Port-Royal	
Leclerc		N.T., français
Lefèvre d'Étaples		Bible, français, XVIe s. (1523-1528), catholique N.T., français
Lemaître de Sacy	Utiliser : Port-Royal	
Liturgique		N.T., traduction fragmentaire, XXe s., catholique, correspondant aux extraits lus lors des célébrations, conforme aux dispositions du Concile Vatican II
Louvain		Bible, français, XVIe s. (1550), catholique N.T., français
Luther		N.T., XVIe s., allemand (1522), protestante Bible, allemand (1534) Adaptations en danois, suédois, néerlandais
Malermi		Bible, italien, XVe s.

Bold characters = preferred forms	Variants	Identification data
Marmochino		Bible, italien, XVIe s.
Martianay		N.T., français, XVIIIe s. (1712), catholique
Martin		N.T., français, XVIIIe s. (1707) protestante (David Martin)
Matthew		Bible, anglais, XVIe s. (1537)
Mesenguy		N.T., français, XVIIIe s. (1729), janséniste
Nary		N.T., anglais, XVIIe s.
New world		Bible, anglais, XXe s., Témoins de Jéhovah, traduit par le New world Bible translation committee. Traductions dans d'autres langues à partir de la version anglaise
Œcuménique, traduction	Utiliser : TOB	
Olivétan		Bible, français, XVIe s. (1535), protestante
Ostervald		Bible, français, XVIIIe s. (1744), protestante
Osty		Bible, français, XXe s., catholique Traduction publiée d'abord de façon fragmentaire. 1 ^{re} éd. complète 1973.
Parry		N.T., gallois
Peschitta	Utiliser : Pšitta	
Peschitto	Utiliser : Pšitta	
Port-Royal		N.T., français, XVIIe s. (1667) Bible, français (1702)
Pšitta		Bible, syriaque, vers IVe s.
Pšittō	Utiliser : Pšitta	
Quesnel		N.T., français, XVIIe-XVIIIe s. (1692)
Reims		N.T., anglais, XVIe s. (1582), catholique
Saadia		A.T., trad. arabe de la Bible hébraïque, IX-Xe s.
Saadiah	Voir : Saadia	
Salesbury		N.T., gallois, XVIe s. (1567)
Scarlett		N.T., anglais, XVIIIe s. (1798)
Se'adyah	Voir : Saadia	
Segond		A.T., français, XXe s. (1874), protestante N.T., français (1880) Bible, français (1880)
Septante		Traduction grecque de la Bible hébraïque, IIIe s.-IIe s. av. J.-C.
Simon		N.T., français, XVIIIe s. (1702) catholique
Socinienne		N.T., allemand
Stuart		N.T., gaélique
Synodale		Bible, français, XXe s. (1910), protestante
Témoins de Jéhovah, New world Bible translation committee	Voir : New world	
TOB		Bible, français, XXe s. (1975), œcuménique

Bold characters = preferred forms	Variants	Identification data
Tyndale		A.T. Pentateuque, anglais, XVIe s. (1530) A.T. Jonas (1531) A.T., Juges à Chroniques 2 N.T. (1525)
Valart		N.T., français, XVIIIe s. (1783), catholique
Vulgate		Bible, latin, IVe s. Appellation commune, à partir de la fin du Moyen âge, de la traduction de saint Jérôme Reconnue comme officielle par l'Église catholique, Concile de Trente (1546)
Vulgate sixtine	Utiliser : Vulgate	Bible, latin, texte de la Vulgate fixé par Sixte Quint (1590)
Vulgate sixto-clémentine	Utiliser : Vulgate	Bible, latin, Vulgate sixtine révisée (1592)
Whiston		N.T., anglais, XVIIIe s.
Wyclif	Utiliser : Wycliffe	
Wycliffe		Bible, anglais, XIVe s. (ca 1382)
Zurich		Bible, allemand, XVIe s. (1529 ; 1540, éd. révisée par Jud)

Appendix 2: Liturgical rites of the Roman Catholic Church

The form introduced by = is the Latin equivalent of the preferred form for this addition
The form introduced by < is a variant

1. Period before the Council of Trent (1545-1563)

- Roman rite = *Ritus Romanus*
 - < Rite romain
- Gallican rite = *Ritus Gallicanus*
 - < Rite gallican
 - < Rite in Gaul

- Ambrosian rite = *Ritus Ambrosianus*
 - < Ambrosian rite
 - < Rite milanais = *Ritus Mediolanensis*
 - < Milanese rite
 - < Rite ambrosien
 - < Rite ambrosien

- Hispano-Mozarabic rite = *Ritus Hispano-Mozarabicus*
 - < Hispanic rite = *Ritus Hispanicus*
 - < Hispano-Gothic rite = *Ritus Hispano-Gothicus*
 - < Hispano-Visigothic Rite = *Ritus Hispano-Visigothicus*
 - < Isidorian rite = *Ritus Isidorianus*
 - < Mozarabic rite = *Ritus Mozarabicus*
 - < Rite hispanique
 - < Rite hispano-gothique
 - < Rite hispano-mozarabe
 - < Rite hispano-wisigothique
 - < Rite isidorien
 - < Rite mozarabe
 - < Rite tolétain
 - < Rite wisigothique
 - < Toledan rite = *Ritus Toletanus*
 - < Visigothic rite = *Ritus Visigothicus*

- Celtic rite = *Ritus Celticus*
 - < Rite celtique
- Other local variations of rites :
 - Italy :
 - Benevento rite = *Ritus Beneventanus*
 - < Rite bénévain
 - < Rite de Bénévent
 - < Rite of Beneventanus

 - Aquileian rite = *Ritus Aquileiensis*
 - < Rite d'Aquilée
 - < Rite of Aquilea

 - etc.

- France :
 - Lyonese rite = *Ritus Lugdunensis*
 - < Rite de Lyon
 - < Rite of Lyon
 - < Rite of Lyons
- Anglo-Saxon = *Ritus Nidrosiensis*
- Scandinavia :
 - Nidaros rite = *Ritus Bracarensis*
 - < Rite de Nidaros
- Iberic :
 - Bragan rite
 - < Rite de Braga
 - < Rite of Braga
- Rites of religious orders
use the preferred form of the corporate body
- Local rites
use the preferred form of the diocese, town or parish

2. Period from Council of Trent to Second Vatican Council

- Roman rite = *Ritus Romanus*
 - < Rite romain
- Ambrosian rite = *Ritus Ambrosianus*
= *Ritus Mediolanensis*
 - < Milanese rite
 - < Rite ambrosien
 - < Rite milanais
- Hispano-Mozarabic rite = *Ritus Hispano-Mozarabicus*
 - < see the variations above (§1)
- Bragan rite = *Ritus Bracarensis*
 - < Rite de Braga
 - < Rite of Braga
- Lyonese rite = *Ritus Lugdunensis*
 - < Rite lyonnais
 - < Rite of Lyon
 - < Rite of Lyons
 - < Romano-Lyonese rite
- Rites of religious orders
use the preferred form of the corporate body
- Local rites
use the preferred form of the diocese, town or parish

3. Period after Second Vatican Council (1962-1965)

- Roman rite = *Ritus Romanus*

- Roman-Zairian rite = *Ritus Zairensis*
 - < Rite of Zaire
 - < Rite romano-zairois

- Ambrosian rite = *Ritus Ambrosianus*

- Hispano-Mozarabic rite = *Ritus Hispano-Mozarabicus*
 - < see the variations above
 - (§1)

- Rites of religious orders
 - use the preferred form of the corporate body
- Local rites
 - use the preferred form of the diocese, town or parish

The Zaire rite has not been given the official status of a specific rite. Nevertheless it has been approved as « Missel romain pour les diocèses du Zaïre » (“Roman Missal for the Dioceses of Zaire”) (1989) and is therefore included in this list.

For ecumenical rites used as addition: “ecumenical liturgy”

Comments on RDA Chapter 8

General guidelines on recording attributes of persons, families, and corporate bodies

General No mention is made either of IFLA's normative documents such as "Guidelines for authority records and references", "Names of persons" and "Form and structure of Corporate Headings" or of ISO standards about transliteration and index sorting. (See also our general comments about RDA)

General No reference is made to authority files of each country and to national usages. (See also our general comments about RDA)

General This chapter should contain only the information and instructions which are common to persons, families and corporate bodies and which cross refer to the dedicated chapters of each of these entities, as is the case in 8.5. (See also our general comments about RDA)

8.1.1 "Person, family, and corporate body"

Our comment:

We note that the definitions given in this chapter diverge from the definitions of FRAD. Is there any particular reason?

8.1.3 "The term **access point** refers to a name, term, code, etc., under which information pertaining to a specific person, family, or corporate body will be found."

Our comment:

The definition given in FRAD is more complete and precise:

"**Controlled Access Point** : A name, term, code, etc. under which a bibliographic or authority record or reference will be found. [GARR, modified]" (FRAD p. 14)

This definition was it considered as very narrow from the viewpoint of the structure of information in a catalogue?

The notion of "Controlled access point" appears also in the International Principles of Cataloguing. Why has the term "controlled" been omitted in RDA?

8.2.1 "The data recorded to reflect the attributes of a person, family, or corporate body should enable the user to:

- a) *find* information on that person, family, or corporate body"

Our comment :

We disagree with this point. The issue is not about finding information in absolute terms but to obtain information allowing the identification of a person and distinguish that person from others in order to provide an trustful access point for the bibliographic records.

8.2.4 "**Representation.** The name or form of name designated as the preferred name for a person, family, or corporate body should be the name or form of name **most commonly found** in resources associated with that person, family, or corporate body, or a **well-accepted name or form of name** in the language and script preferred by the agency creating the data."

Our comment:

What is the usefulness of these general guidelines? When compared to the precise and contextualised guidelines given for each point in each of the specialised chapters one gets aware that they are rather reducing and may even induce the user in error. Here below just some examples:

as regards the person's names in :

9.2.0.3.1 "the name by which the person is commonly known as the preferred name",
or in 9.2.1.1.1 "the form most commonly found",
or in 9.2.1.1.2 "the latest form...or in case of doubt...the fuller or fullest form",
ETC.

or as regards the corporate bodies in:

11.2.0.3.2 "the name by which a corporate body is commonly identified as the preferred name...",
11.2.0.4.2 "the name as it appears in resources associated...or the form most commonly found in reference sources",
11.2.1.1.4, "a brief form...",
11.2.1.2 "the form found in the first resource received...",
11.2.1.5 "choose this conventional name", ETC.

For the principal access point, the BnF's practice is generally to choose the most "well known" name and not "the most commonly found" one.

8.2.5 Language preference

8.2.5 : "in the original language and script of the content » or "found in resources associated..., or in reference sources, in the language and script preferred by the agency"

8.4 : "... in the language and script in which they appear on the sources from which they are taken"

8.4.2 : "Alternative : record a transliterated form of the name either as a substitute for, or in addition to, the form that appears on the source."

Our comment:

Are these instructions clear for the cataloguer?
All the more so since, just as for the choice of the name, they are very diversifying in chapters 9 and 11:

Examples:

Persons :

9.2.1.2.1 : "the form corresponding to the language of most of the resources";
9.2.1.2a.2 : "...choose the form in the person's native or adopted language"
9.2.1.2b.2 : "...choose the form in the person's native or adopted language or the latin form"

Etc.

Corporate bodies :

Cf. the choices proposed in :

11.2.1.3 : "more than one language for of the name",
11.2.1.3 : "choose the form in the official language of the body"

11.2.7.2.1 : “record the title in the language preferred by the agency”
Etc.

- 8.2.6 **“Common usage.** The part of the name of a person or family used as the first element in the preferred name should reflect conventions used in the country and language most closely associated with that person or family”

Our comment:

Establish a hyperlink from this paragraph to “Names of persons” or to the appropriate national authority file.

- 8.3.2

Our comment

Is the order of additional identifying elements as appearing under 8.2.3 a prescriptive one?

In French authority records the order is different since the biographical dates associated with a person precede all the other qualifiers.

The place of these attributes in the authority records is not clearly indicated: which are the criteria defining whether these attributes are to be included in access points or elsewhere in the record?

- 8.3.4

“include additional elements designated in chapters 9-11 as optional in accordance with the policy of the agency creating the data, **or as judged appropriate by the cataloguer**”

Our comment:

It would be preferable to end the sentence just after: “the agency creating the data” and cancel the following words. They imply a degree of subjectivity which may be rather harmful for the coherence of the cataloguing.

- 8.5.1.1

“Capitalize the first **word** in the first element and in each subdivision of the name”

Our comment:

1) Replace “first word” par “first letter”

2) This instruction is however too vague. Just follow national usages.

- 8.5.1.1.b.1

“corporate names with unusual capitalization”

“...follow the capitalization practice of the body”

Our comment:

The French normative practice is to transcribe the corporate body names “in low case letters, respecting the typographical usages of the used language” (cf. NF Z 44-060, § 0.4.1).

We’re however ready to suggest from now that the specific typos be respected provided that this contributes to the interpretation of the meaning of the word.

- 8.5.3.1

“Record accents and other diacritical marks appearing in a name as they appear in the **source of information.**”

Our comment:

“Source of information” is not precise enough. This statement could be replaced by “reference source”.

In any case, reference should be made to the appropriate National authority file if the authority record for the entity in question exists in that file.

8.5.5 “Spacing of initials and acronyms”

8.5.5.1 **Our comment :**

and It seems to us that there is some incoherence between point a) in 8.5.5.1 about a
8.5.5.2 person’s names and point a) in 8.5.5.2 about corporate bodies.

Compare :

For persons :

“a) Leave a space between a full stop following an initial...and the subsequent initial or name”

For corporate bodies :

“a) do not leave a space between a full stop, etc., and a initial following it”

Examples:

p. 9-10 : D.W. Griffith

p. 9-11 : H.D.

According to the French normative practice, the initials in the corporate body names are followed by a full stop, space (NF Z 44-060 §0.4.4)

8.5.5.1 b) if the name consists entirely or primarily of separate letters, leave a space between the letters (regardless of whether they are followed by full stops or not)”

Our comment:

Is it possible to give an example of name of person “consisting of entirely or primarily of separate letters”

Is the instruction to leave constantly a space between the initials even when it doesn’t happen to be one in the resource? Doesn’t this fall in contradiction with the instruction according to which the form of the name most frequently found in the resource should be respected?

8.5.5.2 “b) if separate letters or initials appear on the source of information without full stops between them, record the letters without spaces between them.”

Our comment:

The French instruction is not to respect the typo of the publication (cf NF Z 44-060, note 7.) and to transcribe without developing, without full stops and without spaces. (§ 0.4.3, § 1.2.2.2).

This is in conformity with the revised text of IFLA’s “Form and structure of corporate headings”, published in *International cataloguing & bibliographic control*, October/December 1992.

Citation from that source:

“this text is to be added at the end of the chapter « general recommendations” as 7.6 alinea.

When choosing an abbreviated form [...] transcribe the abbreviated form, without dots and without spaces, whatever the form of name used in the publication may be, be it an initialism or an acronym”

- 8.5.6.1 “use abbreviations only as follows :
a)...if the person, family, or corporate body uses the abbreviated form”

Our comment:

For persons the French standard prescribes :

“an author’s name is provided in the heading in the form that he or she has chosen or by which he or she is commonly known. Any peculiarities as to spelling (spaces, abbreviations, etc.) should be painstakingly recorded.” (NF Z 44-061, § 1)

For corporate bodies, the French normative practice is to transcribe the abbreviations **according to national usages**(NF Z 44-060, § 0.4.2)

- 8.6.3 “If none of the specified additions can be **readily** ascertained, designate the name as an undifferentiated name (see 8.11).”

Our comment:

Our position is that the cataloguer should always try to find an element to distinguish a name from another even if this is not easy. The undifferentiated names constitute a serious problem for the search of information.

- 8.8. à 8.13 From “Scope of usage” to “cataloguer’s annotation”

Our comment:

The chaining is not clear enough. The reader exits the realm of access points to implicitly enter that of notes. For more clarity, it would be preferable in this part of the document to follow the order prescribed by GARR.

- 8.9 Date of usage

Our comment:

This proposal to enter a date of usage for a specific entity might be interesting. It seems however rather difficult to be put in practice, particularly for a name of person. Except for famous authors, is the cataloguer in possession of reliable sources to enter this information?

One must get sure that that date is clearly distinguished from the biographical dates (date of birth and date of death, or other types of dates), i.e. the dates linked with the life of the entity and not that of his or her name.

- 8.10 Status of preferred access point

Our comment:

What is the real status and role of “memorandum”? The sense of “memorandum” should be clearly explained. What exactly does it refer to?

- 8.12.0.1.1 “**Sources consulted** are publications or reference sources used in establishing the form of name or title on which the preferred access point or a variant access point is based.”

Our comment:

This definition is too vague. We suggest replacing the term “publications” by “resources” and citing as first source the resource associated with the given person, family or corporate body and which “gave birth” to the authority record for that person, family or corporate body.

And, of course, reference should be made to the appropriate national authority file.

8.12.0.3 Recording sources consulted

Our comment:

The examples given in this part, p. 8-13, are difficult to read. It is not easy to distinguish the information for which the source is consulted from the name of the source consulted.

In the example:

“Michael D. Palm Center home page, Mar. 2, 2007 (Michael D. Palm Center, a new research institute at the University of California, Santa Barbara) about us (Palm Center, formerly the Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities in the Military; official unit of the Institute for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Research)”
give the precise Internet address (URL) of the corporate body and record the date of the consultation in a normalised form, i.e.: 2007-03-02.

8.13.0.1.1 “A **cataloguer’s annotation** is an annotation that might be helpful to a cataloguer using or revising the preferred access point, or creating a preferred access point for a related person, family, or corporate body”

Our comment:

This scope lacks precision. Different types of annotations are made reference to without any explicit differentiation as to their nature and purpose. The paragraph mixes up different kinds of annotations, some of them being helpful to the cataloguer for establishment of access point, others being useful to all the users since they serve to identify the entity and distinguish it from other entities.

Although this “mixture” is also foreseen by GARR, the definition given in GARR § 1.5.1.1 (see below) appears however more precise than that of RDA.

GARR’s définition:

“The cataloguer’s note area may include notes on sources consulted in establishing the heading, references to specific rules applied, notes limiting the use of the heading and/or differentiating persons or bodies with similar names, notes justifying the choice of form of name, etc.”

A distinction should equally be made between public notes and notes which should remain confidential for privacy reasons during the lifetime of the person, as is the case of notes about the usage of pseudonyms when the person doesn’t wish that the relationships between his/her identities be revealed.

8.13.0.3.1 “... the following annotations”

Our comment:

We suggest to change the order of the items of the list as follows: place c) and d) before a) and b):

The list would read as follows if the suggested change is accepted:

- a) annotations limiting the use of the access point
- b) annotations differentiating persons, families, or corporate bodies with similar names.
- c) annotations on the specific instructions applied in creating the preferred access point
- d) annotations justifying the choice of preferred name, the form of the access point, etc.

Comments on RDA Chapter 9 Identifying persons

- General There is no reference to the international standards or IFLA recommendations that are the basic reference tools
- ISO transliteration standards
 - Names of persons, 1996
- General Chapter 9 is full of instructions about national usages. Such instructions should not be present, but references should be made to *Names of persons*
- General Why not add systematically the biographical dates, when they are known, in the access points, in addition to the title of nobility or another additional element? Dates are indeed the only data that are independent from the language of cataloguing and then really intelligible at the international level. They are the best data element to bring together the records from different libraries or countries.
- General The approach is too formal. The rules are explained from the form of the name (names containing a surname, names containing a title of nobility, names containing neither a surname nor a title of nobility,...; name with or without given name, name with a term of address,...), but there is no presentation from an intellectual analysis of the diverse categories of names, such as pseudonyms, names of the Middle Age, names of the Antiquity, oriental names in non-Latin scripts, etc.
The new organization seems less helpful for the cataloguer as it implies the rules for the diverse categories of names are already known.
- General The framework is problematic: why handle the construction of access point before the choice of the preferred name?
- General The following cases are not really addressed :
- joint pseudonyms : there are only some examples scattered in the text, but the explanations are missing
 - variant names with the expended form of numerals when the preferred name contains a numeral
- General The term “patronymic” has different meanings depending on the usages in constructing the names in different times or cultures (names of the European Middle Age, Russian names, Scandinavian names before the XXe century, etc.). The exact meaning of the term should explained in each case :
- surname transmitted by the father
 - or*
 - name(or part of the name) constructed from the father’s name
- General On the whole, the definitions are not precise enough.
- General Other identifying attributes
Some information relating to persons have to remain confidential, but the text doesn’t deal with this question. However legal problems could arise from not respecting the confidentiality.
- General FRAD attributes qualifying the form of a name or of an access point are missing in RDA:
- Language of name: The language in which the name is expressed.

Ex :

Thomas d'Aquin (saint ; 1225?-1274) *forme courante* **français**

Thomas Aquinas (saint ; 1225?-1274) *forme internationale* **latin**

- Script of name: The script in which the name is rendered.
- Transliteration scheme of name : The scheme used to produce the transliterated form of the name.

Such attributes are important to understand the different forms and to select one form as the preferred access point in a given catalogue.

There is no mention of the possible (and desirable) combination of the attribute Date with other attributes as Place of residence, Address, Affiliation or Profession.

General

General remarks on examples

Examples should be followed by comments in order to make them more explicit and significant for the cataloguer.

More examples in other languages than English are requested.

9.0.2.1

“Determine the preferred name...from the following sources (in order of preference)...

c) other sources (including reference sources)”

Our comment :

Add : “giving priority to the national authority file responsible for this person at an international level”

e.g. the German authority file for a German author, the French authority file for a French author, etc.

9.1.1.1.2

“Make additions to the name as instructed under 9.1.1.2–9.1.1.4, as applicable, in the order listed.”

Our comment :

The order listed under 9.1.1.2–9.1.1.4 for the additions to access points representing persons differs from the order given by the French rules : according to French rules, the first qualifier to a name of person is generally the biographical dates, as it is the most objective information and the most effective way of distinguishing between homonyms. The unique exception to this rule is the case of saints, popes and sovereigns entered under direct order for which the title is given first.

9.1.1.1.2

Example :

“More, Thomas, Saint”

Our comment :

According to French rules, the names of Saints are always entered under direct order. The name under which the person was known before being canonized is considered as a variant form.

Ex : Thomas More (Saint ; 1478-1535)

< More, Thomas (1478-1535)

9.1.1.1.3

“**If no suitable addition is available**, use the same access point for all persons with the same name, and use an undifferentiated name indicator (see 8.11) to designate the name as one that is undifferentiated.”

Our comment :

In order to make the wording more explicit, use the same wording as in § 8.11.03 and add a reference to this paragraph: replace “if no suitable addition is available” with

“if the preferred access point is insufficient to differentiate between two or more entities identified by the same name”.

Precise that an undifferentiated name should be used only

- when it is impossible to ascertain if the name correspond to one or more persons
- when the persons have not been identified

because,

- when it is certain that there are different persons, qualifiers must be added to the access point in order to distinguish one person from an another.
- when one person is identified, a specific authority record must be established with additions in the preferred access point in order to make it unique.

9.1.1.2.1 “Add to the name one or more of the following elements (in this order), as applicable...

“a) a title of royalty (see 9.5.0.4) or nobility (see 9.5.0.5)” :

Our comment :

Titles of royalty should be separated from titles of nobility, as they differ in nature. A title of nobility is not mandatory when the person is not well-known under this title. It can be added to the name in order to distinguish between homonyms. When a title of nobility is given, the preferred access point is entered under the territorial designation associated with the title of nobility.

Ex. : Sévigné, Marie de Rabutin-Chantal (1626-1696 ; marquise de)

Example:

Sévigné, Marie Rabutin-Chantal, marquise de

Our comment :

« de » is missing between « Marie » and « Rabutin » : Marie **de** Rabutin-Chantal The correct form is :

Sévigné, Marie de Rabutin-Chantal, marquise de

NB : The correct heading according to French rules is :

Sévigné, Marie de Rabutin-Chantal (1626-1696 ; marquise de)

Example:

Arundel, Philip Howard, Earl of, Saint

Our comment :

Known under the name “Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel”, then under the name “Saint Philip Howard” after being canonized in 1970 (source : Oxford Dictionary of national biography). It is the case of two successive names for the same person. It is not right to combine them in one form Two distinct forms are needed:

Arundel, Philip Howard (1557-1595 ; comte d’)

Philip Howard (Saint ; 1557-1595)

NB : According to French rules, the names of Saints are always entered under direct order.

9.1.1.2.1 “Add to the name one or more of the following elements (in this order), as applicable...

“d) the term *Spirit* “

Our comment :

There is also the case of names that do not correspond to physical persons: for example virtual singers.

Add “Virtual person” to the list of qualifiers.

Examples from BnF authority file :

King Cool (personne virtuelle)

Personnage de synthèse créé vers 1994. - Chanteur virtuel qui reprend les grands standards de la musique soul et funk version reggae

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb13967798j>

Bébé Lilly (personne virtuelle)

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb150691712>

Example :

Molinari, Ricardo E. (Spirit)

Our comment :

This example is ambiguous. In the BnF authority file, this person is considered as a poet, and not as a spirit.

We propose another example from BnF authority file :

Collins (esprit)

Esprit se manifestant à Daniel Caloch

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb13543414s>

9.1.1.2.1

“Add to the name one or more of the following elements (in this order), as applicable...

“e) a term indicating profession or occupation (see 9.17) for a person whose name consists of a phrase or appellation not conveying the idea of a person.”

Our comment :

Such a term can be useful for browsing the index, as it clarifies immediately that the name refers to a person (and what kind of person). But at the international level the most objective and understandable way to qualify a name of person is the addition of the biographical dates.

Biographic notes and the attribute “gender” allow also to remove the ambiguity.

9.1.1.4.1

“Fuller form of name”

“9.1.1.4.1 If a date or dates associated with the person (see 9.1.1.3) are not available to distinguish one access point from another, add a fuller form of the person’s name (see 9.6).”

Johnson, A. W. (Alva William)

Johnson, A. W. (Anthony W.)”

Our comment :

Instead of adding two different forms in the preferred access point, it should better to choose the fuller form of the person’s name in the preferred access point and to treat the abbreviated form as a variant name for the person.

9.1.1.4.2 “*Optional addition. Add a fuller form of name even if there is no need to distinguish between access points*”

Our comment :

It should be easier (and more consistent) to use the fuller form of the person’s name as the preferred form.

In the BnF authority file, the access points corresponding to the example “Lawrence, D. H. (David Herbert)”

are :

Lawrence, David-Herbert (1885-1930)

< Lawrence, D. H. (1885-1930)

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb119114561>

9.1.2.1.1 “When constructing a variant access point to represent a person, use a variant name for the person (see 9.3) as the basis for the access point.”

Our comment :

Add comments to make some examples more explicit.

Use the symbol <, prescribed by the GARR before the variant forms

Ex. :

< Dudevant, Amandine-Aurore-Lucile

< Dudevant, Aurore

< Dupin, Amandine-Aurore-Lucile

< Dupin, Aurore

(*Pseudonym recorded as preferred name: Sand, George*)

9.1.2.1.1 Example ::
Barrett, Elizabeth Barrett
(*Later name recorded as preferred name: Browning, Elizabeth Barrett*)”

Our comment :

This form is strange. Isn’t :

Barrett, Elizabeth Moulton

9.1.2.1.1 Example :
Terencio
Terencjusz
Terenz
Terenzio
(*English language form recorded as preferred name: Terence*)”

Our comment :

The Latin form of the name should be added :

Terentius Afer, Publius

9.1.2.1.1 Examples :
Wodehouse, Pelham Grenville
(*Form recorded as preferred name: Wodehouse, P. G.*)

Mills, Jack, 1918-

(*Form recorded as preferred access point: Mills, J. (Jack), 1918-*)

Our comment :

The presentation of these two examples is not consistent. Why the preferred access point in the first example isn't "Wodehouse, P.G. (Pelham Grenville)" in conformity with the one of the second example?
An explanation should be added.

- 9.2.0.1.2 "If an individual has more than one identity, **a preferred name is chosen for each identity (see 9.2.4).**"

Our comment :

This practice should be optional.
In some cases, when an individual as used numerous identities, it is useful to gather his diverse identities under the best-known identity of this individual. Such a gathering is generally done after the death of this individual.
Examples in the BnF authority file:
Boris Vian
<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb13091689x>
Romain Gary
<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb11904228r>

- 9.2.0.2 "**Sources of information**
9.0.2.2.1 Determine the preferred name for a person from the following sources (in order of preference) » :

Our comment :

Erroneous numbering : it should be 9.2.0.2.1

- 9.2.0.3.1 « In general, choose the name by which the person is **commonly known** as the preferred name for that person. "

Our comment :

This rule seems in contradiction with the instructions given under 9.2.1.1.1 and 9.2.1.1.2 :

9.2.1.1.1 If the forms of a person's name vary in fullness, choose the form most **commonly found** as the preferred name.

9.2.1.1.2 If no one form predominates, choose the **latest form** as the preferred name. In case of doubt about which is the latest form, choose the **fuller or fullest form**.

It should be useful to formulate them with more details in order to give guidance to the cataloguer in the choice of the preferred name.

In the BnF authority file, the preferred access point corresponding to the example "Duke of Wellington"

is :

Wellington, Arthur Wellesley (1769-1852 ; duc de)
<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb11887871r>

- 9.2.0.4.2 "If the name consists of several parts, record as the first element that part of the name under which the person would normally be listed in authoritative alphabetic lists in his or her language or country of residence or activity, followed by other parts of the name. "

Our comment :

This rule can only apply in languages using an alphabetic script. Change the wording to make it applicable to other scripts.

9.2.1.1.1

“If the forms of a person’s name vary in fullness, choose the form most commonly found as the preferred name.”

Our comment :

The criterion « most commonly found » doesn’t apply to classical authors frequently and universally cited.

Example :

J. Barbey d’Aurevilly

(*Most common form*: J. Barbey d’Aurevilly)

(*Occasional forms*: Jules Barbey d’Aurevilly; Jules-Amédée Barbey d’Aurevilly)

(*Rare form*: J.-A. Barbey d’Aurevilly) »

Our comment :

We refuse this example. The abbreviated form of the given name is not commonly used for French authors and is not used in the preferred access point.

For a French author, the preferred form should be the form chosen as the preferred access point in the BnF authority record.

Barbey d’Aurevilly, **Jules** (1808-1889)

< Barbey d’Aurevilly, Jules Amédée (1808-1889)

< Aurevilly, Jules Amédée Barbey d’ (1808-1889)

< Aurevilly, Jules Barbey d’ (1808-1889)

< Aurevilly, Barbey d’ (1808-1889)

< Barbey, Jules (1808-1889)

< Syrène, Maximilienne de (1808-1889)

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb118901433>

Note that in this example the abbreviated form of the given name is not used even as a variant access point.

9.2.1.2b

“**b**)Established form in the language preferred by the agency creating the data

9.2.1.2b.1 If there is a well-established form of name in reference sources for a person whose given name, **etc.**, is recorded as the first element in the preferred name (see 9.2.14) in the language preferred by the agency creating the data, choose that form of name as the preferred name.”

Our comment :

What is referring to the « etc. » following “given name”?

9.2.1.2b

Examples

Our comment :

In order to be consistent with the general instruction given under 9.2.1.2b « language preferred by the national agency creating the data », the examples should not give only the English form as the preferred form, but the form in diverse languages with a comment:

Saint Francis of Assisi (*when English is the language preferred by the national agency*)

Saint François d’Assise (*when French is the language preferred by the national*

agency)
San Francisco de Asis (*when Spanish is the language preferred by the national agency*)

Pope Benedict XVI (*when English is the language preferred by the national agency*)
Pape Benoît XVI (*when French is the language preferred by the national agency*)
Papa Benedicto XVI (*when Spanish is the language preferred by the national agency*)

9.2.1.2b.2 “In case of doubt, choose the form in the **person’s native or adopted language or the Latin form.**”

Our comment :

Add some explanations to make this rule should be more explicit and useful for the cataloguer: in particular, when the Latin form is to be preferred to the form in the person’s native or adopted language.

Example :

« Sainte Thérèse de Lisieux
not Saint Theresa of Lisieux »

Our comment :

In the BnF authority file, the preferred access point corresponding to the example is :

Thérèse de l'Enfant-Jésus (sainte ; 1873-1897) *nom en religion*
< Thérèse de l'Enfant-Jésus (carmélite ; 1873-1897) *nom en religion*
< Thérèse de l'Enfant-Jésus et de la Sainte-Face (sainte ; 1873-1897) *nom en religion*
< Thérèse de Lisieux (sainte ; 1873-1897) *nom en religion*
< Martin, Thérèse (1873-1897)
<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb11926349w>

9.2.1.3.1 followed by 9.2.1.3a
Our comment : From page 9-14 to 9-17, the instruction numbering seems unnecessarily complex . Why not 9.2.1.3.2., etc. ?

9.2.1.3a.1 to 9.2.1.3a.3
9.2.1.3b.1 to 9.2.1.3b.5
page 16 : why give in a note (note 6) this « Alternative instruction », and not as a distinct paragraph ?

9.2.1.3a.2 “If no form in the language preferred by the agency creating the data is found, or if no one form in that language predominates, transliterate the name according to the table for the language adopted by the agency creating the data.”

Our comment :

In an international perspective, ISO transliteration standards, when they exist, should be preferred to national tables
Furthermore, for some scripts, ISO transliteration standards ensure the reversibility of the transliteration and the possibility of automatic data processing, that rarely the case with other transliteration systems.

9.2.1.3a.1 Examples

Our comment :

Same comment as under 9.2.1.2b.1: examples should present diverse preferred forms according to the preferred language of the national agency creating the data..

Not only:

Homer

(Name appears in original script as: Ὅμηρος)

but also:

Homer *(when English is the language preferred by the national agency)*

Homère *(when French is the language preferred by the national agency)*

Homero *(when Spanish is the language preferred by the national agency)*

Some examples are questionable, as the first element is not a given name:

For example, Avicenna or Isaiah.

9.2.1.3a.3 “Record the other forms of the name as variant names (see 9.3.6).”

Our comment :

in an international perspective, it is necessary to distinguish

- the variant names
- the variant forms of the preferred name in another language and/or script

In the French authority records, the variant forms of the preferred name in another language and/or script are recorded as “parallel forms” (and are not mixed with the other variant forms)

9.2.1.3b p. 9-16

“Note 6: Alternative instruction...”

b) Surname recorded as the first element

...Choose the form of name that has become well-established in reference sources in the language preferred by the agency creating the data for a person whose surname is recorded as the first element in the name (see 9.2.5–9.2.9) and whose name is in a language written in a script that differs from the preferred script of the agency creating the data. **For a person who uses Hebrew or Yiddish** and whose name is not found to be well-established in those sources, choose the transliterated form appearing in resources associated with the person”

Our comment :

Why a particular rule for these two languages?

9.2.1.4.1 “If variant spellings of a person’s name are found, and these variations are not the result of different transliterations, choose the form found in the **first resource received.**”

Our comment :

This rule seems in contradiction with the paragraph 9.2.2.2. The change in spelling can result from the choice of the person.

For ancient authors, according to the international rules, the modern form of the name is chosen when available, otherwise the well-known form in the spelling most frequently found in the resources.

9.2.3 **Change of name**

Our comment :

The presentation of the examples given under 9.2.3.1, page 9-18, lacks consistency: in almost all of the examples the names are given in direct order, e.g.

Dorothy B. Hughes

not Dorothy Belle Flanagan

(Name used in works before author’s marriage)

except in one example where the name is constructed as an access point :

Roughgarden, Joan
not Roughgarden, Jonathan
(*Name used in works before author's sex change*)

- 9.2.4.1 “...Consider an individual who uses one or more pseudonyms, or his or her real name as well as one or more pseudonyms, to have more than one identity.”

Our comment :

See our comment under 9.2.0.1.2

There are a lot of examples illustrating the same case: they should be listed together in order to clarify the reading.

- 9.2.5.1.3 « Record the surname as the first element. If the surname is not the first part of the name, **follow it by a comma** and transpose the parts of the name that precede it. If the first part of the name is the surname, **follow it by a comma**... »

Our comment :

In an international perspective (and also with the objective to define **data elements** pertaining to access points), it would be better to adopt a less formal approach and to avoid prescribed punctuation (it can be a layout option). Why not distinguish “entry element” and “inverted element” (or part of name other than entry element)?

It would be useful to have some comments accompanying the examples.

- 9.2.5.1.4 “Omit terms of address from any name that includes a surname unless:
a) the name consists only of a surname (see 9.2.5.4)
or b) the name is of a married woman identified only by her husband's name and a term of address (see 9.2.5.5).

Read, Miss
Ward, Humphry, Mrs. »

Our comment :

Examples could be distributed under the a) and b).

When a married woman is identified only by her husband's name and a term of address, it is clearer when the order in which the elements appear in the name is respected in the part of name other than entry element:

Ward, Mrs Humphry

not

Ward, Humphry, Mrs.

Besides, some given name can be used equally for men and women (e.g. “Dominique” in French names), and the construction such as Ward, Humphry, Mrs. doesn't allow to resolve the ambiguity.

- 9.2.5.2.1 «If the surname is represented by an initial, but at least one **other** part of the name is given in full, record the initial that represents the surname at the first element”

Our comment :

Precise what is covered by the term “other”.

9.2.5.3.1 « If the name does not contain a surname but contains a part that identifies the individual and functions as a surname, record that part as the first element, followed by a comma and the rest of the name. »

Our comment :

See also our comment regarding the punctuation under 9.2.5.1.3: identifying the data elements constituting the access point should take precedence over the layout.

9.2.5.4 “Persons known by a surname only”

Our comment :

Two cases have to be distinguished:

- Persons whose the surname is known, but not the given name ; the form of the name found in the resources associated with the person is the surname preceded by a term of address or a title such an university title, etc.
Ex. Marchand (18..-18.. ; abbé)
 Monot (18..-19.. ; abbé)
 Grimaldy, Mademoiselle de
 Haudry, Mademoiselle (17..-17.. ? ; romancière)
- Persons who have chosen as pseudonym a surname preceded by a term of address (Dr Seuss, Grandma Nichols, etc.): in this case, the name should be in direct order in order to reflect the form of the pseudonym chosen by the person.
Ex. **Dr Seuss (1904-1991)**
 <http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb12044517b>

9.2.5.5.1 « If a married woman is identified only by her husband’s name, treat a term of address as an integral part of her name. Record the term of address following the part of the husband’s name that is recorded as the last element in his name.”

Our comment :

See our comment under 9.2.5.1.4

Example :

Ward, Humphry, Mrs.

Our comment :

In the BnF authority record, this form of the name is recorded as a variant form:

Ward, Mary Augusta Arnold (1851-1920)

< Ward, Mary Augusta (1851-1920) *nom d'alliance*

< Ward, Mary Arnold (1851-1920) *nom d'alliance*

< Ward, Mrs. Humphry (1851-1920) *pseudonyme*

< Ward, Mrs. Humphrey (1851-1920) *pseudonyme*

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb120492360>

9.2.5.6 « Words indicating relationship following surnames »

Our comment :

Why distinguish Portuguese names from other names?

The general rule is to maintain such terms in the preferred form of the name when it is the usage of the language. Otherwise, such indication should be recorded in a note,

as part of the FRAD attribute “Other designation associated with the person”.
We think that this paragraph should be deleted and superseded by a reference to
"Names of persons".

9.2.6.2.1 Example:
Fénelon, François de Salignac de La Mothe-

Our comment :

In the BnF authority record, this form of the name is recorded as a variant form; the preferred form of the name in the BnF authority record is:

Fénelon (1651-1715)

< Fénelon, François de Salignac de La Mothe (1651-1715)

< Salignac de La Mothe Fénelon, François de (1651-1715)

< La Mothe Fénelon, François de Salignac de (1651-1715)

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb11886277x>

9.2.6.4 «Married women whose surname consists of surname before marriage and husband’s surname »

Our comment :

Compound surnames of married women should not be treated as a specific case.
The order surname before marriage followed by husband’s name is an Occidental usage: it should not be presented as general and extended to other cultures or geographical areas. It is important to respect national usages and refer to "Names of persons".

Examples illustrate names of persons from very diverse countries and would benefit from explanatory comments.

9.2.6.5 « Other compound surnames »

Our comment :

Examples without explanatory comments don’t have any instructive value.
Examples of Scandinavian names do not take into account the fine distinctions between the diverse Scandinavian languages. Reference should be made to "Names of persons"

9.2.6.5.2 “If the person’s language is Portuguese...”

Our comment :

Reference should be made to "Names of persons", instead of having a specific paragraph for the case of Portuguese names.

9.2.6.6.1 “If a name has the appearance of a compound surname but its nature is not certain, treat it as a compound surname.

Exceptions:

a) Names of persons whose language is English

b) Names of persons whose language is Danish, Faroese, Norwegian, or Swedish”

Our comment :

Why these two exceptions are the only dealt with?
For example, the case of African names is lacking.

9.2.6.6b.1 “If the person’s language is Danish, Faroese, Norwegian, or Swedish, **record the last part of the name as the first element.**”

Our comment :

Due to the fine distinctions between the diverse Scandinavian languages, it would be more appropriate to consider each language separately (one paragraph per language). Besides, the instruction is wrong because, according to “Names of persons, 1996”, it is the first part of the name that is recorded as the first element.

9.2.6.7.1 “Treat a place name added to a person’s surname and connected to it by a hyphen as part of the surname (see 9.2.6.3).”

Our comment :

Is this paragraph necessary and useful?

This case could be illustrated by an example accompanied by a comment under 9.2.6.3 “Hyphenated surnames”

9.2.7.3.1 Example
Al Yasin, Muhammad Hasan

Our comment :

In this example, the name should begin with a lower-case letter, according to the instructions in 8.5.1.1a.1.

9.2.9 Example
Paris, Henri

Our comment :

We refuse this example that is false according to the French rules.

For a French author, the preferred form should be the form chosen as the preferred access point in the BnF authority record.

The correct heading according to French rules is :

Paris, Henri d'Orléans (1908-1999 ; comte de)

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb119181995>

9.2.10.1.2 “Record as the first element the proper name in a title of nobility (including courtesy titles) if the person:

a) uses his or her title rather than surname **in his or her works**

or

b) is listed under his or her title in reference sources.”

Our comment :

This paragraph seems dealing only with persons who have written a work.

This is simplistic and partial: there are other creators of works (artistic works, etc.) and also persons who have not produced works but are the subject of a work. Their name should be recorded in the same way.

9.2.10.1.4 “Do not include the term *Saint* as part of the name of a canonized person known by a title of nobility. Record the term as a designation associated with the person (see 9.7.0.4).”

Our comment :

An example would be useful.

- 9.2.11 et 9.2.12 “TITLES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM PEERAGE THAT INCLUDE A TERRITORIAL DESIGNATION”
“JUDGES OF THE SCOTTISH COURT OF SESSION BEARING A LAW TITLE BEGINNING WITH *LORD*”

Our comment :

Why two sub-chapters only for the peculiar case of title of nobility of the United Kingdom? It is disproportionate in an international perspective.
A reference should be made to “Names of persons”.

- 9.2.14.1.3 « Include as part of the name any words or phrases denoting place of origin, domicile, occupation, or other characteristics that are commonly associated with the name in resources associated with the person or in reference sources. Precede such words or phrases by a comma.”

Our comment :

Such words or phrase are an integral part of the name: consequently, there is no need to introduce a comma when the name is recorded in direct order. The comma can introduce some confusion with other elements of the names of persons that are postponed after the entry element (given name, title of nobility, etc.) in the inverted part of the name

Example

« Helena, Maria »
(Listed in reference sources under Helena) »

Our comment :

A comment to this example would be useful.
“Maria” seems to be a given name recorded in the inverted part of the name. If it is, this example has no place here. If it is not, an explanation is needed.

- 9.2.15 « Names including a patronymic »

Our comment :

See our general comment at the head of this chapter on the definition of the term “patronymic”.

- 9.2.15.2 « Record the first given name as the first element, followed by the rest of the name in direct order. **If the patronymic precedes the first given name, transpose the parts of the name to bring the first given name into first position**”.

Our comment :

It seems that there is no example illustrating the second part of the instruction.
Different categories of names are mixed in the examples, without any precision, to the prejudice of clarity.

There are Ethiopic names as
Kidana Maryam Gétahun
(Given names: Kidana Maryam)
(Patronymic: Gétahun)

and names of the Middle Age
« Moses ben Jacob, of Coucy
(Given name: Moses)
(Patronymic: ben Jacob)
(Words denoting place: of Coucy) »

9.2.16.2 “If the name by which a royal person is known includes the name of a royal house, dynasty, territorial designation, etc., or a **surname**, record the name in direct order. Record titles following the instructions given under 9.5.0.4.”

Our comment :

According to French rules, the names of royal persons are recorded in direct order without including a surname. The surname is considered as a variant form.

Example :

Louis Bonaparte

Our comment :

In the BnF authority record, this form of the name is recorded as a variant form; the correct form of the name according to the French rules is:

Louis (roi de Hollande ; 1778-1846)

(see the BnF authority record)

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb12653242q>

9.2.17.1.2 “Include any typographic devices when they appear as part of multi-letter abbreviations of a name, but omit them when they follow single-letter initials”.

Our comment :

We totally disagree with this practice.

The number of stars or dots for example can be a discriminating element to distinguish between two authors.

Here are examples from the BnF authority file:

C * (17..-18..? ; avocat)**

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb12555860m>

C *** (17..-18.. ; romancier)**

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb15071877b>

9.3.1.3

Example

Dudevant, Amandine-Aurore-Lucile

(*Pseudonym recorded as preferred name: Sand, George*)

Our comment :

This example is incorrect, as the variant form is not complete and combines two distinct attested forms of the given names:

In the BnF authority record there are two variant names:

< Dudevant, **Amandine** Aurore **Lucie Dupin** (1804-1876 ; baronne) *nom d'alliance*

< Dudevant, **Amantine** Aurore **Lucile Dupin** (1804-1876 ; baronne) *nom d'alliance*

with an explanatory note:

État-civil : Dupin, Amantine, Aurore, Lucile [baptisée Amandine, Aurore, Lucie]

épouse du baron Dudevant, François-Casimir

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb119236010>

9.3.2.3.1

Example

« Ratzinger, **John** »

(*Name used in religion recorded as preferred name: Benedict XVI*) »

Our comment :

Correct “John” in “Joseph”

9.3.3.1.1 “A **name in religion** is a name assumed by a person upon entering a religious order ».

Our comment :

The definition is too narrow. We suggest to add to the definition “or carrying out religious duties” in order to bring it closer to FRAD:

FRAD 5.4.1

Name in religion relationship

The relationship between a person and a name that person **uses in religion**.

Example from the BnF authority file :

Étienne Pierre X (patriarche de l'Église catholique arménienne ; 1826-1899)

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb103852034>

9.3.6.3.1 “If the name recorded as the preferred name for a person has one or more alternative linguistic forms, record them as variant names”.

Our comment :

The variant forms of the name in another language and/or script should not be mixed with variant forms of other nature (variant names, earlier names, etc.). They should be recorded as “parallel forms”.

Example from the BnF authority file :

Plante (0427?-0348? av. J.-C.) forme courante français

Plato (0427?-0348? av. J.-C.) *forme internationale latin*

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb11920019p>

9.3.7.3.1 Examples

Our comment :

The presentation of the examples, p. 46-47, should be consistent : either lower-case are used, or national usages are respected, but it should be the same choice throughout the examples.

9.4 “Dates associated with the person”

Our comment :

Dates should be recorded under a standardized form, with numbers in the following order Year-Month-Day (YYYY-MM-DD). It is the only way to make the dates understandable internationally.

As they are expressed in a specific language, words should also be avoided in recording dates and international abbreviations are to be preferred : for example, “ca 1003” in preference to “approximately 1003”
“-361” in preference to “361 B.C.”

9.4.1 Date of birth

Our comment :

We wish to make it clear that only the year is given in the access points, but the complete dates of birth or death, when known, are to be recorded in the authority records.

In the attribute « dates associated with the person » FRAD allows to give a period or a century : this possibility seems to be given by RDA only for the activity.

9.4.1.3 Recording date of birth

Our comment :

As they are expressed in a specific language, words should avoided in recording dates and international abbreviations are to be preferred : for example, “ca 1003” in preference to “approximately 1003”
“-361” in preference to “361 B.C.”
“1936-05-05” in preference to “1936 May 5”
See also our comment under 9.4.1.

9.4.3.3 Recording period of activity

Our comment :

In the French authority records, dates indicative of the person’s period of activity are particularly used for printers and booksellers of the hand press period, or for engravers or artists. They should be used with caution and have to be clearly distinguishable from the dates of birth and death.

Moreover, when two homonyms have identical biographical dates (approximate dates) and occupation, the French standard NF Z 44-061 « Form and structure of headings for persons and uniform titles » §2.1.3. requires the addition of the dates of activity in the heading in order to distinguish one from the other.

Example :

(19.-..... ; médecin ; actif en 1940)

(19.-..... ; médecin ; actif en 1960)

9.5.0.4a “ a)Person with the **highest royal status** within a state, etc.

9.5.0.4a.1 For the person with the **highest royal status** within a state or people...”

Our comment :

We suggest using the term “sovereign” instead of the phrase “person with highest royal status”.

9.5.0.4b.1 “For a consort of a person with the highest royal status within a state or people, record his or her title followed by *consort of* [the preferred name for the royal person and his or her title as prescribed in 9.5.0.4a]. Record the title of the consort in the language preferred by the agency creating the data if there is a satisfactory equivalent in that language.”

Our comment :

This rule cannot be generalized : how to deal with consorts depends from national usages:

- the title may contain the term “consort”, as in the United Kingdom

Example :

Albert (prince consort de Grande-Bretagne ; 1819-1861)

but

- the title may not contain the term “consort”, as in France : it is only a biographical information and, as such, it has to be recorded among the biographical notes and not in the preferred access point.

It is necessary to refer to national usages and to “Names of persons”.

Example :
Queen, consort of Louis XIII, King of France.

Our comment :

This example is not correct as regards the French usage : the royal title was conferred de jure to the wife of the king by the Salic law; therefore the consorts of the kings of France had the title of Queen of France.

In the BnF authority record the preferred access point is:

Anne d'Autriche (Reine de France ; 1601-1666)

with a biographical note:

Fille de Philippe II, roi d'Espagne. Épouse de Louis XIII, roi de France

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb119384982>

9.5.0.4c c) Children and grandchildren of royal persons

Our comment :

Such data are biographical information and have not to be recorded in the access points.

9.5.0.4c.2 “If such a child or grandchild is known only as *Prince* or *Princess* or a similar title (or the equivalent in another language) without a territorial designation, record that title followed by:

a) another title associated with the name

or b) *daughter of . . . , son of . . . , granddaughter of . . . ,*
or *grandson of . . .*”

Our comment :

See comment under 9.5.0.4b : according to national usages, the term may be a part of the title, but if it is neither a name nor a title but biographical information, it should be recorded among the biographical notes and not in the preferred access point.

9.6.0.3 Recording fuller forms of names

Our comment :

It is necessary to make sure that the abbreviated forms are really the common usage in the country of the person and that the fuller form should not be recorded as the preferred name.

In the absence of any comment, examples listed p. 62 cannot be checked.

For instance, the following example is correct only in the case of a South-American author ; it is false in the case of a Spanish author.

Rodríguez Larralde

(*Preferred name recorded as: Rodríguez L., Oswaldo*)

See also our comment above (in § 9.1.1.4.1) :

Instead of adding two different forms in the preferred access point, it would be better to choose one form of the person's name in the preferred access point and to treat the other form (abbreviated form or fuller form) as a variant name for the person.

Adding the fuller form as a qualifier after the abbreviated form disturbs the index filing.

9.7 Other designation associated with the person

Our comment :

This information corresponds (partially) to a FRAD attribute :
FRAD §4.1, Attributes of a person, p.16

A designation other than a name or title by which a person is known or identified.

Includes designations such as “Saint”, “Spirit”, etc.

Includes designations such as “Jr.”, “III”, etc. when associated with a person whose name includes a surname. (See also “number” under section 4.12 - Attributes of a name.)

Includes phrases associating the person with a particular work (e.g., “Author of Early Impressions”).

Includes phrases associating the person with another person (e.g., “Follower of Rembrandt”)

Where is this attribute recorded ? as part as the preferred access point? as a note? In which language should it be given ?

This paragraph deals only with “Saint” and “Spirit”. It is only one aspect of the FRAD definition, even if some other aspects are treated elsewhere in RDA.

9.8.0.3.1 “Record the gender with which a person identifies using an appropriate term from the list below.

female

male

other

not known”

Our comment :

The value « other » should be clarified or its use explained.

We suggest adding a value “not applicable” for entities that are not physical persons (such as spirits or virtual persons).

9.9 to 9.17 From “Place of birth” to “Profession or occupation”

Our comment :

These data are of interest but some of them must remain confidential for contemporary people. Place of birth, address or place of residence are normally reserved for librarians when they have to distinguish homonyms who are still alive. Such information can be made public only after the death of the person.

It is necessary to associate a date with them in order to know their validity.

9.9 and 9.10 “Place of birth” and “Place of death”

Our comment :

We suggest insisting on the fact that cataloguers must give the places of birth and death accurately whenever they are known.

Instructions on the form and language in which places of birth and death should be recorded are missing.

The practice in the French authority files is to give the names of places of birth and death in the language of the bibliographic agency, whenever such a form exists.

For example, in a French authority record, the French form of a name of a place is preferred :

Rome (*and not* Roma)

Londres (*and not* London)

Pologne (*and not* Polska)

Nouvelle Zélande (*and not* New Zealand)

For names of modern places, the preferred form is the current form.

For names of places of the Middle Age, the preferred form is the last attested form.

9.9 Place of birth

Our comment :

This information may be confidential for a living person, because of the laws on civil status.

9.11 Country associated with the person

Our comment :

This information can be of great interest, but it would be useful to make it clear that it is different from nationality or citizenship, and to indicate the cases when it is relevant to give it : is it a place of practice, a place of travel (for example, Italy for artists), a place that has had an influence on the person's work ?

9.12.0.3.1 "Record the place or places (town, city, province, state, and/or country) in which the person resides or has resided"

Our comment :

It is necessary to have the possibility of giving the dates pertaining to each residence. We suggest choosing as example an author less known than Ernest Hemingway, because such information is particularly useful to distinguish homonyms or authors who are not precisely identified.

9.13 Address of the person

Our comment :

This information is confidential for a living person.

For a deceased person, it can occur that several successive addresses are to be recorded, and it is necessary to indicate the dates associated with each of them.

Example of the authority record of a publisher of the hand press period in the BnF authority file :

Bance, Charles (17..-18.. ; éditeur)

Adresse : Paris : 1793. rue Zacharie-Saint-Séverin, maison du Passage, n.72

Adresse : 1798. Paris : rue du Petit-Pont. Enseigne(s) : au Grand Balcon

Adresse : 181. . Paris : rue Jean-Jacques-Rousseau, n.10

Adresse : 1815?. Paris : rue Porte-foin, n.15, près le Temple

Adresse : 1822. Paris : rue Jean-Jacques-Rousseau, près la poste

Adresse : 1789. Paris : rue St Severin, n.25

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb14954494j>

9.14 Affiliation

Our comment :

It is an interesting information if the person is acting as member of a given group, as an orchestra or a musical group for example, or belongs to an artistic movement. A relation may be established with that entity.

If the work of the person has not been produced in the framework of his job, this information is recorded as an element of identification (for example, the membership of an university).

This information must always be dated.

Example :

Department of Entomology, Cornell university

Our comment :

The name of the corporate body is given as textual information only if the affiliation is mentioned in a note.

If the affiliation is recorded as a link towards the corporate body, the form used should be the preferred access point and/or the identifier for that corporate body.

9.15.0.3.1 “...using an appropriate term or terms from the list of languages specified in ISO 639-2 (<http://www.loc.gov/standards/iso639-2/langhome.html>).

Icelandic

(Language used by the author Halldór Laxness)

Russian

English

(Languages used by the author Vladimir Nabokov) “

Our comment :

How this information is recorded? as coded information in a format or as a note ? It is not clear at all, owing to the fact that the ISO standard ISO 639-2 “Codes for the representation of names of languages -- Part 2: Alpha-3 code” is mentioned, but the examples give only names (and not codes) of languages.

If the name of the language is to be taken from the list of languages specified in ISO 639-2, there will be a problem with dialects or languages for which a specific code do not exist in ISO 639-2 : the precise name of the language should be given (and not a group of languages).

RDA doesn't provide information about the language from which a person makes translation: it is a lack!

9.16.0.3.1 “Record the field or fields of endeavour, area or areas of expertise, etc., in which the person is engaged or was engaged.”

Our comment :

Such information is very important in specific cases, particularly in the case of artists, for example to precise that an engraver has also an activity of publisher and printseller.

Example

Anglo-Norman poet

(Field of activity of a person identified only as Thomas)

Our comment :

This example isn't a good one, because two kinds of information are mixed: language and field of activity.

9.17 PROFESSION OR OCCUPATION

Our comment :

This information also must be dated.

9.18 Recording biographical information

Our comment :

Such a very detailed note can be necessary for producer of archival material or must be used only in the case of specific projects, as a dictionary of artists. In fact, authority records for engravers established by the Département des Estampes at the Bibliothèque nationale de France contain such biographical notes.

But in the current practice, this note is too literary and doesn't point to the main information. Links towards Internet sources as the "Encyclopaedia Universalis" seem to be more appropriate.

9.19.0.3 "Recording identifier for persons"

Our comment :

Examples given in paragraph 9.19.0.3.1 seem indicate that authority record identifiers are considered as identifier for persons, which is not correct: an authority record identifier pertains to the record, not to the entity described by the record. Such confusion is damaging.

Comments on RDA Chapter 10 Identifying families

General In all chapter definitions are lacking and the instructions are not precise enough.

10.2.0.3 Choosing the preferred name

Our comment :

National usages should be followed.

The examples given p. 6 are non significant if the nationality of the family is not indicated in a comment.

Royal families and other families should not be mixed in a same list of examples.

10.2.3.2 “For instructions on recording relationships between the earlier and later names of the family, **see chapter 31**”

Our comment :

Chapter 31 does not seem completely finalized and such instructions are still missing.

A example should be added.

10.1.1.2 Type of family

Our comment :

The addition of the type of family (family, dynasty, clan, house) is interesting: it allows to distinguish between two families, for example the Valois house and the Valois family.

10.1.1.3 Date associated with the family

Our comment :

In the French practice, date is added in the access point only to distinguish homonymous dynasties, as it is illustrated in the examples.

10.1.1.4 Place associated with the family

and

10.1.1.5 Prominent number of the family

Our comment :

In the case of families used as entry element of a subject access points (the more frequent case for families), we prefer adding geographical subdivision to the name of the family, or adding the topical subdivision “family” to the name of the prominent member of the family.

Example: Müller (famille) – Suisse

Example: Müller, Marie-Louise Alphonsine (dates à trouver) – Famille

10.1.1.4 Place associated with the family

Our comment :

The addition of the place associated with the family seems easy to apply, but it is more delicate: two families in different countries can be connected (a same family can emigrate, etc.)

10.1.1.5 Prominent number of the family

Our comment :

This attribute is not present in FRAD.

The French rules do not use this qualifier to distinguish between two families, because the addition of the name of a prominent member of the family is to the detriment of the legibility of the access point; furthermore the choice of the prominent member is not objective and can vary depending on the cataloguer.

Examples :

Peale (Family : Peale, Charles Willson, 1741-1827)

Peale (Family : Peale, Norman Vincent, 1898-1993)

Our comment :

The addition of the name of a prominent member of the family in the access point should be avoided, as it is to the detriment of the legibility of the access point. Prominent member(s) of the family may be mentioned in a note.

10.1.2.1 General guidelines on constructing variant access points to represent families

Our comment :

Constructing variant access points should also follow the national usages.

10.1.2.1.1 Example :

Generes,

(*Form recorded as preferred name* : De Generes)

Our comment :

Add “de” in the variant form: Generes, **de**

10.2.5 Names of Royal houses, dynasties, clans, etc.

Our comment :

The reference to paragraph 8.5 for capitalization, accents, etc is inadequate. More detailed instructions are necessary to explain to the cataloguers how record the name.

10.3.1.3 Recording alternative linguistic forms as variant names

“If the name recorded as the preferred name for a family has one or more alternative linguistic forms, record them as variant names.”

Our comment :

In the examples, there is a mix of alternative linguistic forms and other variant forms (different spelling)

When different transliteration schemas are used, the schema used for each different form should be mentioned (it is an attribute of the name and of the access point in FRAD).

10.3.2.3.1 Exemple :

Brogliè

(*Form recorded as preferred name* : De Brogliè)

Our comment :

Add “de” in the variant form: Brogliè, **de**

10.4.0.3.1 “Record a term indicating the type of family using an appropriate term from the list below.”

family
clan
royal house
dynasty

Our comment :

Add

house
tribe

Precise that the term indicating the type of family is given in the language preferred by the agency creating the data.

10.5 Date associated with the family

Our comment :

See our comment on recording date under 9.4 and 9.4.1.3.

Precise the kind of dates that can be associated with the family: date of the origin of the family, date of activity, other ?

Dates are added in the access point only in the case of dynasties. In other case, date may be indicated in a note.

10.6.0.3.1 “Record the place or places (town, city, province, state, and/or country) in which the family resides or has resided or has some connection.”

Our comment :

Add: “Place associated with the family are given in the language preferred by the agency creating the data, whenever such a form exists.”

10.7 Recording a prominent member of the family

Our comment :

Our opinion is that this information should be given either as a textual note, or as a link towards the authority record established for this prominent member. The link can be made using the preferred access point representing the person and/or an identifier associated with the person.

10.8.0.1.1 “A hereditary title is a title of nobility, **etc.**, associated with a family”

Our comment :

What means “**etc.**” in this context ?

Precise the definition in order to make a clear distinction from or the relation with a territorial designation associated with a title of nobility used in the name of a individual.

10.8.0.3 Examples

Our comment :

Examples should be listed by country, with a comment.

10.9 Family history

Our comment :

Same comment as for 9.18 “Recording biographical information“.

10.10 “Sources of information”

Our comment :

Same comment as for 9.19 “Recording identifier for persons“.

Comments on RDA Chapter 11 Identifying corporate bodies

- General See our general comments on RDA about :
- transliteration, romanisation and transcription
 - lack of references about standardization ISO
 - integration of footnotes within the body of the text
- General The definition for corporate body is given in a footnote, p. 11-3. It would be preferable to give it at the beginning of the chapter, within the text. The definition should be more complete. It is necessary for example to explain why spacecrafts or ships are treated as corporate bodies.
- In the Authority file of the BnF. spacecrafts and ships are recorded in a subject authority.
- General The cataloguer must choose between many proposals in order to choose the preferred access point depending on the form of the name or the language. It may lead to confusion :
- For example :
- 11.2.1.1.2 : “choose the name as it appears in the preferred sources of information (see 2.2.1)
- 11.2.1.1.3 “choose the name that is presented formally as the preferred name. If no name is presented formally, or if all names are presented formally, choose the most commonly found form of name.
- 11.2.1.1.4 “If there is no most commonly found form, choose a brief form (including an initialism or an acronym)...”
- 11.2.1.1.5 “choose the form found in reference sources or the official form,
- 11.2.1.2 «The form found in the first resource received «
- 11.2.1.3 : “More than one language form of the name” :
- 11.2.1.5.1 “the form in the official language of the body”
- 11.2.7.2.1: in the language preferred by the agency creating the data
- 11.2.7.3.1: “in the official language of the jurisdiction”
- 11.2.7.4.1 : “Record the title of the official in the language of the access point for the organization.”
- 11.2.7.5.1: « in the language of the governing power.»
- 11.2.14.2 : « the language form presented first in the first resource received. »
- 11.2.15.1.1: “record the tittle of the official in the language of the access preferred by the agency...”
- Etc.
- 11.1.1.1.2 “Make additions to the name as instructed under 11.1.1.2–11.1.1.8, as applicable, **in the order listed.**
- Elks (Fraternal order)
National Gallery of Art (Nigeria)
National Gallery of Art (U.S.)
Fusion (Organization : Brighton, England)
Fusion (Organization : Chichester, England)”
- Our comment:**
Would you, please, give more precise instructions as to the order of the additions to the name. Is it really the order prescribed in (11.1.1.2-11.1.1.8)?
The examples are not sufficient and they lack comments. They should not be a

substitute for precise guidelines. (See also our general comments about RDA)

- 11.1.1.3.5 “ Add the name of the place in which a radio or television station is located, if the preferred name for the station consists solely or principally of its call letters”
11.1.1.3.6 “ Add the place in which any other radio or television station is located unless the name of the place is an integral part of the name of the station”

Our comment:

There is no reason to make two different parts. The cases can be brought together.

- 11.1.1.4 “Associated institution”
11.1.1.4.1 Add the name of an institution instead of the local place name (see [11.1.1.3](#)) if the institution’s name is commonly associated with the name of the body (see [11.7.0.6](#)) and an addition is needed to distinguish between access points for two or more bodies that have the same name, or names so similar that they may be confused.”

Our comment:

We have doubts about this guideline.

The IFLA’s “ Form and structure of corporate headings” (FSC), 1980, rev. 1992 includes in the term «qualifier», besides geographical name, dates or type, «words or expressions characterizing the corporate body».

Within the text, both examples illustrating the term « expression » are

“Church of God (Adventist)”,

“Church of God (Apostolic)”.

The French standard «NF Z 44-060 Catalogue d’auteurs et d’anonymes: forme et structure des vedettes de collectivités auteurs,» déc. 1996, which is an adaptation of the international standard, handles with «all expression characterizing the corporate body».

In practice, we add an expression at a name not conveying the idea of a corporate body (as it is explained in 11.1.1.2 of RDA,) for example « musical group » or « firm ».

The present instruction of RDA is not coherent with French uses.

Nevertheless, we can accept to add an institution associated when a corporate body is located in another institution without having a hierarchical relationship with it.

Exemples

“ B’nai B’rith Hillel Federation Jewish Student
Center (University of Cincinnati)
not B’nai B’rith Hillel Federation Jewish Student
Center (Cincinnati, Ohio)
B’nai B’rith Hillel-Federation Jewish Student
Center (University of Maryland, College Park)
not B’nai B’rith Hillel-Federation Jewish Student
Center (College Park, Md.) »

Our comment:

We can agree with these examples, although, in actual practice, we would have rather qualified the name by the geographical name. And we record the information in the area of the address.

On the contrary, we totally disagree with the following examples :

« Institut geologii (Akademiia nauk SSSR. Karelskii
nauchnyi tsentr)
Institut geologii (Akademiia nauk SSSR. Komi
nauchnyi tsentr)
Computer Law Institute (Practising Law Institute)
Computer Law Institute (University of Southern
California. Law School) »

Our comment:

Because, in these cases, the bodies are subordinated to higher institutions.
The French standard NF Z 44-060, (§4) prescribes to record a variant name
beginning by the name of the higher body, followed by the name of the subordinate
body.

If a cataloguer follows the instruction of RDA and omits to add a variant in the
record, this may be confusing.

We suggest that, prior adopting this instruction, a discussion at the international
level would be organized.

11.1.1.5 “Date associated with the body”

“Gesellschaft für Musikforschung (1868-1906)”
“Gesellschaft für Musikforschung (1946-)”

Our comment:

It would be preferable to introduce in these examples the name of the place between
the name of the body and the dates (here Germany).
This reinforces the idea that it would be necessary to transcribe the entire form of
the access point and not just the element concerned by the instruction.

(See also our general comments about RDA)

11.1.1.7.1 “If none of the additions covered under 11.1.1.2–11.1.1.6 is sufficient or appropriate
for distinguishing between two or more bodies, record an appropriate general
designation (see 11.7.0.8)”.

“World Cup (Cricket)
World Cup (Soccer)”

Our comment:

The terms “Cricket” and “Soccer” appear in some reference sources cited in records
of the Library of Congress Authorities. We do not understand why in each of these
cases these terms are not treated as constitutive parts of the name itself but as an
addition (qualifier).

11.1.1.8.1 “Add to the name of a conference, etc... “

Example :
ACISP 99

Our comment:

It seems contrary to the 11.2.09.1 :”Omit from the name of a conference, congress,

or meeting (including that of a conference, etc., treated as a subordinate body, see 11.2.3.2), indications of its number, frequency, or year or years of convocation, etc.”

11.1.2.1 VARIANT ACCESS POINT

Our comment:

To improve the readability of the examples, precede the variants by the chevron sign (<) prescribed by GARR.

(See also our general comments for RDA)

- 11.1.2.1.1 « When constructing a variant access point to represent a corporate body use a variant name for the corporate body (see 11.3) as the basis for a variant access point. »

Our comment:

The examples proposed p.12 and 13, present two problems :

1) They mix different types of variants (different names, names in different languages, variants expressing a hierarchical relationship) without any comment or particular instruction to help the cataloguer.

It would be advisable to group the examples by category.

Different name (Other name, expanded name) :

“Hertfordshire Technical Information Service
Uffizi Gallery
Order of preachers
West Virginia Agricultural College”

Name in different languages :

« Concours Eurovision de la chanson
Eurovisie Songfestival
Festival de la Canción de Eurovisión
Festival Eurovisão da Canção
Gran premio Eurovisione della canzone europea
Grand Prix Eurovision de la chanson
Söngvakeppni evrópskra sjónvarpsstöðva
(*English language form recorded as preferred name: Eurovision Song Contest*)”

Variants expressing a hierarchical relationship

“London School of Economics and Political Science.
British Library of Political and Economic Science
(*Form recorded as preferred name: British Library of Political and Economic Science*)

Yale University. ITSMed. Media Services. Video
Production

(*Form recorded as preferred name: Yale University. ITSMed. Video Production*)

2) we think in this example that the fuller form is more significant than acronym.

Hertfordshire Technical Information Service
(Acronym recorded as preferred name: Hertis)

- 11.2.0.5.1 (See also our comment 11.2.1.1.4)
“If the name of a corporate body consists of or contains initials, omit or include full stops and other marks of punctuation according to the most commonly found usage of the body. In case of doubt, omit the full stops, etc.”

Examples :
Aslib
L.I.F.E. Choir

Our comment:

We disagree with this different transcription (with or without full stops and spaces) according to the most commonly found usage of the body that is opposite to the FSCCH and the French standard.

(See our comment on 8.5.5.2)

- 11.2.0.6.2 “Alternative:
Omit an initial article if the name is not to be filed under the article (see [appendix C](#)) and a **filing control mechanism** is not available.”

Our comment:

This alternative is out of context because an international cataloguing code must not take computer problems into account.

- 11.2.0.8.2 “If such a term is needed to make it clear that the name is that of a corporate body and it occurs at the beginning of the name, transpose it to the end.”

Example :
Stockholms handelsbank, Aktiebolaget
not Aktiebolaget Stockholms handelsbank

Our comment:

We don't understand why the term « Aktiebolaget” is transposed at the end. It seems opposite to the general guideline : “record the name...as it appears in resources associated with the body (11.2.0.4.2)”.

- 11.2.1.1 11.2.1 DIFFERENT FORMS OF THE SAME NAME
11.2.1.1 General guidelines

Our comment:

This part 11.2.1.1, in its entirety, is unreadable and instructions lack clarity. In definitive, what does the cataloguer do and is it sure that all the cataloguers will do the same choice for a same case ?

See our comment at the head of this chapter 11.

- 11.2.1.1.2 “If variant forms⁴ of the name are found in resources associated with the body, choose the name as it appears in the preferred sources of information”

“⁴ Variant forms do not include names that the body has abandoned in the past or adopted for the future”

Our comment:

Does this footnotes 4, p.20, imply that the cataloguer must do a new record for every change of name ?

(See also our comment at 11.2.2)

- 11.2.1.1.4 “If there is no most commonly found form, choose a brief form (including an initialism or an acronym) that would differentiate the body from others with the same or similar brief names as the preferred name.”

“AFL-CIO
not American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations”

Our comment:

We disagree with this guideline :

It is contrary to the guidelines of the FSCH §4.2 and the French standard NF Z 44-060 §1.2.2.2, that favours the expanded form of the name, unless the initialism or the acronym are the most used.

To make access points more meaningful for users, we think that it would be preferable to maintain this rule.

- 11.2.1.2.1 “If variant spellings of the name appear in resources associated with the body, choose the form found in the **first resource received.**”

Our comment:

It is contrary to the instruction to choose the latest name.

- 11.2.1.3.3 “If the language preferred by the agency creating the data is not one **of the official languages** or if the official language is not known, choose the form in the language used predominantly in resources associated with the body as the preferred name.”

Our comment:

Please, for more clarity, add : “of the official languages **of the body**”

Exemple :

“Schweizerische Landesbibliothek

not Biblioteca nazionale svizzera

not Bibliothèque nationale suisse

(German is the language used predominantly by the body in its publications)”

Our comment:

The german name must be corrected : The real name is : “Schweizerische Nationalbibliothek”

We disagree with the comment, the Schweizerische Nationalbibliothek” publishing documents in the three official languages of the Switzerland.

The BnF, in the case where the country has several official languages, records three parallel forms in preferred access points :

Bibliothèque nationale Suisse

Schweizerische Nationalbibliothek

Biblioteca nazionale svizzera

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb11871413t>

- 11.2.1.3.4 “**In case of doubt**, choose the form that is presented **first in the first resource**

received.”

Our comment:

What does it mean « in case of doubt »?

It seems to us incoherent with the previous proposals for the choice of the preferred name.

11.2.1.4.1

Example :

Societas Heraldica Scandinavica

not Heraldinen seura

not Heraldisk selskab

not Heraldisk selskap

not Heraldiska sällskapet

not **Skjaldfrædafélagid**

(Official name is Latin; name appears in Danish, Finnish, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish)

Our comment:

The last variant must be corrected : Skjaldfrædafélagid in one word and with an accent on the “e”.

11.2.1.5

« Conventional name »

Our comment:

Please, would you precise this term ?

Is it the same thing that the 11.2.0.3.2 (the name by which a corporate body is commonly identified) ?

11.2.1.5b b

Autocephalous patriarchates, archdioceses, etc.

11.2.1.5b.1 Record the name of an ancient autocephalous patriarchate, archdiocese, etc., of the Eastern Church using the name of the place by which it is identified. Add, in parentheses, a word or phrase designating the type of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

Antioch (Orthodox patriarchate)

Constantinople (Ecumenical patriarchate)

Cyprus (Archdiocese)

Jerusalem (Orthodox patriarchate)

Our comment:

We do not understand why the names of these bodies are recorded as additional elements of the name of the place and not subordinately after the name of the higher religious body as in 11.2.16.2

For example :

In the Authority file of the BnF :

Eglise orthodoxe. Patriarcat de Constantinople *forme courante français*

< Eglise orthodoxe. Ecumenical patriarchate

< Eglise orthodoxe. Patriarcat oecuménique

< Eglise orthodoxe. Patriarcatus Constantinopolitanus

< Eglise orthodoxe. Patriarchat von Konstantinopel

< Eglise orthodoxe. Patriarcat oecuménique de Constantinople

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb11869208d>

11.2.1.5d.1

Governments

“Choose the conventional name of a government⁷ as the preferred name, unless the

official name is in common use. The conventional name of a government is the name of the area (e.g., country, province, state, county, municipality) over which the government exercises jurisdiction (see [chapter 16](#)).”

Our comment:

Please, establish a hyperlink from this paragraph to 16.2.0.3. where instructions are given for the choice of language.

Footnote 7, P 26 :

“7 *Government* is used here to mean the totality of corporate bodies (**executive, legislative, and judicial**) exercising the powers of a jurisdiction”

Our comment:

In France, The word “government” is reserved to the executive.
Why RDA doesn’t use, as FSCH, the term “Territorial authority” which really means the totality of corporate bodies, whatever their level. ?

11.2.1.5e.3 “If a conference has both a specific name of its own and a more general name as one of a series of conferences, choose the specific name as the preferred name.”

“Northwest Conference on the Role of Nuclear Energy (1969 : Portland, Or.)
not Governor’s Conference on Conservation (2nd : 1969 : Portland, Or.)
EuroSSC 2006 (2006 : Enschede, Netherlands)
not European Conference on Smart Sensing and Context (1st : 2006 : Enschede, Netherlands)
EuroSSC 2007 (2007 : Kendal, England) not European Conference on Smart Sensing and Context (2nd : 2007 : Kendal, England) »

Our comment:

We think the last two examples do not illustrate the rule as the first example. They are just variants to a fuller name.
According to our rules, we would have chosen this fuller name as preferred name.

11.2.2 “Change of name
11.2.2.1 If the name of a corporate body has changed (including changes from one language to another), choose the new name as the preferred name for use with resources associated with that name.”

Our comment:

Does this instruction mean that the cataloguer must make a new record every time the name changes ?
The French standard NF Z 44-06O (§1.2.3) recommends to choose the latest name or as attested name “provided that the change of name does not reflect “a fundamental change”.
In practice, we make a new record for example when a body merges with another or when an official organism became a private society. When the institution changes simply of name but not status or objectives, we choose the new name as the preferred name and record the earlier name as variant name.
We would prefer maintain this use. Can be possible to define in this part what is a Minor or Major change, as for the key titles of serials and continuing resources, and decide to keep the same record for a minor name ?
And to make systematically a new record may increase the task of cataloguing.

11.2.3.2.5 “TYPE 3. A name that is general in nature or that does no more than indicate a geographic, chronological, or numbered or lettered subdivision of a parent body.”

Example :

Jean and Alexander Heard Library. Friends of the Library
(Name: Friends of the Library)

Our comment:

1) This example is repeated.

2) At the BnF, we should record the name in a direct order : Friends of the Jean and Alexander Heard Library.

(And we do not understand why, in this case, the name of the institution “Jean and Alexander Heard Library” is not added at Friends of the library, according to the 11.1.1.4, p. 8)

11.2.3.2.9 « TYPE 6. A name that includes the entire name of the higher or related body. »

Example :

Dunedin Botanic Garden. Friends
(Name: Friends of the Dunedin Botanic Garden)

Our comment:

At the BnF, we should record the name in a direct order : Friends of the Dunedin Botanic Garden

11.2.6.2.3 “TYPE 2. An agency with a name containing a word that normally implies administrative subordination in the terminology of the government concerned (e.g., Committee, Commission), provided that the name of the government is required for the identification of the agency.”

Our comment:

The definition is not precise enough and it lacks relevant examples with the terms « **committee** », and « **commission** ».

The examples included after « but » are not very relevant without comments.

For example, we do not understand why the School board of Vancouver is different of the type 2 since the name of the government is required for the identification of the agency.

11.2.6.2.5 “**In case of doubt**, record the name of the body directly.”

National Portrait Gallery (Australia)
not Australia. National Portrait Gallery
Governor’s Cost Control Council
not Vermont. Governor’s Cost Control Council
National Health Institute (N.Z.)
not New Zealand. National Health Institute
Musées de l’État (Luxembourg)
not Luxembourg. Musées de l’État »

Our comment:

We contest the expression « in case of doubt ». There is no doubt about the nature

of these bodies.

Example :
Governor's Cost Control Council
not Vermont. Governor's Cost Control Council

Our comment:

Comment is necessary to justify the form of this access point. We don't understand why the name is recorded directly. Anyway, it would be necessary to keep the name of the place for the access point remains significant.

11.2.6.2.6 “TYPE 4. An agency with a name that does not convey the idea of a corporate body and does not contain the name of the government. “

Our comment:

This TYPE 4 could be gathered with the type 3 en 11.2.6.2.4.

“11.2.6.2.4 TYPE 3. An agency with a name that is general in nature or that does no more than indicate a geographic, chronological, or numbered or lettered subdivision of the government or of one of its agencies recorded subordinately.”

11.2.6.2.11 “TYPE 9. A head of state or head of government (see also 11.2.7).
Adelaide (S. Aust.). **Mayor**
Dublin (Ireland). **Lord Mayor**

Our comment:

It is the administrative entity that is recorded not the function of the person.

11.2.7.1.1 “Apply the instructions given under 11.2.7 only to officials of countries and other states that have existed in **post-medieval times** and to officials of international intergovernmental organizations.”

Our comment:

The French standard doesn't contain this chronological distinction.
Is it possible to precise the interest of this distinction and give some examples?

11.2.7.2.1 “Record the title of a sovereign, president, other head of state, or governor acting in an official capacity (see 6.33.1) as a subdivision of the preferred access point for the jurisdiction. **Record the title in the language preferred by the agency creating the data (unless there is no equivalent term in that language).**”

Our comment:

These guidelines are opposite to 8.2.5 :
Language preference. ...the name or form of name found in resources associated with that person, family, or corporate body in the original language and script of the content. However, if the original language and script is not the preferred language and script preferred by the agency creating the data, the preferred name or form of name should be one found in resources associated with that person, family, or corporate body, or in reference sources, in the language and script preferred by the agency.”

11.2.7.2.2 “If the access point is for a specific incumbent of the office, add, in parentheses, the inclusive years of the reign or incumbency and the name of the person in a brief

form and in the language of the access point for that person. Separate the years of the reign or incumbency from the name of the person using a space, colon, space.
Portugal. President (1996-2006 : Sampaio)
New Jersey. Governor (2002-2004 : McGreevey)
Iran. Shah (1941-1979 : Mohammed Reza Pahlavi)”

Our comment:

This practice is entirely unusual for us. We record the periods only for the ministries, in case of homonymy.

We understand the interest to record periods with dates, in the access points. It allows a finest repartition of the documents. But, is it really possible for countries which have known many governments ?

A risk is to disperse bibliographical items for the users. Another risk is to loose the idea of the “continuation of the State” and for us, it is opposed with the French law. And how maintain consistency in the authority file between the records concerning governments ?

For organes as “le Conseil d’Etat », <http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb12004873t> must we do many variants ? It may increase the cataloguer’s task.

We disagree with the fact to record a name of person in an administrative entity.

It is the administrative entity that is recorded not the function of the person.

- 11.2.7.2.3 “If the title varies with the gender of the incumbent, use a general term (e.g., Sovereign rather than King or Queen).
Spain. Sovereign (1833-1868 : Isabella II)
Russia. Sovereign (1894-1917 : Nicholas II)
Spain. Sovereign (1975- : Juan Carlos I)”

Our comment:

We suggest « Reign » instead of «Sovereign » and omit the name of the sovereign.

- 11.2.7.5.1 “Record the title of a governor of a dependent territory (e.g., a colony, protectorate) or of an occupied territory (see 11.7.0.5) acting in an official capacity as a subdivision of the preferred access point for the colony, territory, etc. Record the title of the governor in the language of the governing power.”

Our comment:

The example “French Polynesia. Gouverneur” is repeated, p. 44.

See our previous comments :

We disagree with the employ of terms as « Governor » in the examples.
(See our comment on 11.2.7.2.2)

- 11.2.7.3.1 “Record the title of a head of government or chief executive acting in an official capacity (see 6.33.1) who is not also a head of state as a subdivision of the preferred access point for the jurisdiction. **Record the title in the official language of the jurisdiction.**”

Our comment:

Is this rule different of 11.2.7.2.1 ?

« Record the title in the language preferred by the agency creating the data (unless there is no equivalent term in that language)”.

It is necessary to clarify the rule.

- 11.2.7.3.3 “If the access point is for a specific incumbent of the office, add, in parentheses, the inclusive years of the incumbency and the name of the person in a brief form and in the language of the access point for that person”

British Columbia. **Premier** (2000-2001 : Dosanjh)
Central African Republic. **Premier ministre** (2001-2003 : Ziguele)
Germany. **Bundeskanzler** (1990-1998 : Kohl)
...
Seattle (Wash.). Mayor (1978-1990 : Royer)

Our comment:

See our comment on 11.2.7.2.2

- 11.2.7.4.1 “Record the title of a head of an international intergovernmental organization acting in an official capacity as a subdivision of the preferred access point for the organization. Record the title of the official **in the language of the access point for the organization.**”

Our comment:

This instruction is still different from the previous ?
(See our comments at the head of the chapter)

- 11.2.7.5.1 “Record the title of a governor of a dependent territory (e.g., a colony, protectorate) or of an occupied territory (see 11.7.0.5) acting in an official capacity as a subdivision of the preferred access point for the colony, territory, etc. Record the title of the governor **in the language of the governing power.** »

Our comment:

This instruction is still different from the previous ?
(See our comments at the head of the chapter)

- 11.2.7.6.1 “For any official not covered under 11.2.7.2–11.2.7.5, use the preferred access point for the ministry or agency that the official represents.”

Our comment:

We do not understand the interest of this paragraph ?
The examples seem to be integrated in 11.2.6.2

For example :

“Northern Ireland Audit Office
not Northern Ireland. Comptroller and Auditor General”
could be integrated within §11.2.6.1

“United States. Public Health Service. Office of the Surgeon General

not United States. Surgeon General (Public Health Service)”
could be integrated within §11.2.6.2

- 11.2.7.6.2 “For an official who is not part of a ministry, etc., or who is part of a ministry, etc., that is identified only by the title of the official, record the title of the official as a subdivision of the preferred access point for the jurisdiction.”

Scotland. Queen's and Lord **Treasurer's Remembrancer**
North Carolina. **State Geologist**
Alberta. **Superintendent** of Insurance
Northern Ireland. **Commissioner** for Complaints
Australia. **Director** of National Parks
South Africa. **Minister** of Public Health”

Our comment:

See our comment on 1.2.7.2.2.

- 11.2.8.1.2 Legislatures

Our comment:

Add dates for each legislature as for governments?

- 11.2.8.2.1 “Record the name of a committee or other subordinate unit as a subdivision of the preferred access point for the legislature or of a particular chamber, as appropriate”.

Example :

Australia. Parliament. House of Representatives.
Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs

Our comment:

Why the intervening unit is not omitted?

- 11.2.11.1.3 “If the component branch, etc., is identified by a number, follow the style of numbering found in the name (spelled out, roman numerals, or Arabic numerals) and place the numbering after the name, preceded by a comma. »

Our comment:

It would be preferable to harmonize the expression of numbers (roman numerals, arabic numerals, words), in the examples, to facilitate distinction between homonymous corporates.

Example p. 50 :

:Soviet Union. Raboche-Krestianskaia Krasnaia Armia. Vozdushnaia armia, 5

Our comment:

In this example, it is the real name of the army that is recorded.

In the other examples, it is a generic name :

(ex « Armeekorps », « Régiment de dragons », « Fleet »).

- 11.2.13.1 “... If the name of the delegation, etc., is uncertain, record Delegation [Mission, etc.] (or equivalent terms in the language of the country represented). If considered necessary to distinguish the delegation, etc., from others of the same name, **add, in parentheses, the name, in the form and language used for it as an access point, of the international or intergovernmental body, conference, undertaking, etc.,**

to which the delegation, etc., is accredited.”

Our comment:

This construction of the access point does not facilitate research of the name.

Example :

Mexico. Delegación (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace (1936 : Buenos Aires, Argentina))

Our comment:

We do not understand why the access point doesn't begin with the name of the conference.

11.2.13.2 “If it is uncertain that a delegation represents the government of a country, record it under its own name.”

Example :

Delegation of the Parliament of Zimbabwe to Botswana, Namibia, and Zambia »

Our comment:

This name is not uncertain. It is necessary to find another example.

11.2.15.1.2 « If the access point is for a specific incumbent of the office, add, in parentheses, the inclusive years of incumbency and the name of the person in a brief form and in the language of the access point for that person.

Catholic Church. **Archdiocese** of St. Paul and Minneapolis. **Archbishop** (1995- : Flynn) »

Our comment:

See our comments on 11.2.7.2.2

11.2.15.2.2 “Catholic Church. Pope (1878-1903 : leo XIII)”

Our comment:

As for governments, it is not the French use to cite the period and the name of the Pope.

We suggest « Papacy ».

11.2.16.2 « Provinces, diocese, synods »

Our comment:

The examples are in the language of the corporate body.

Is it not opposite to the 11.2.16.3 (language preferred by the agency creating the data)?

11.2.16.3.1 “Record the name of a Catholic patriarchate, diocese, province, etc., as a subdivision of the preferred access point for the Catholic Church. Record **the name in the language preferred by the agency creating the data.**”

“Catholic Church. Archdiocese of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic)

Catholic Church. Diocese of Linköping (Sweden)

Catholic Church. Deanery of Legnica (Poland)

Catholic Church. Patriarchate of Antioch (Melchite)

Catholic Church. Patriarchate of Antioch (Syrian) “

Etc

Our comment:

We contest this rule : the name must be recorded in the language it appears in the resources associated with the body or in the reference sources.

Many examples, p. 55, are in different languages without comments.

11.3.2 ACRONYM / INITIALISM / ABBREVIATED FORM

Our comment:

See our comment on 8.5.5.2, 11.2.0.5.1 and 11.2.1.1.4

11.3.3.1 “Recording alternative linguistic forms as variant names”

Our comment:

Would you precise in this part the different transliteration systems that are used.

11.3.4.3 Recording other variant names

11.3.4.3.1, en haut de la page 64 :

General name of a conference, etc.

Examples :

“European Conference on Smart Sensing and Context

(1st : 2006 : Enschede, Netherlands)

(Specific name recorded as preferred name: EuroSSC 2006 (2006 : Enschede, Netherlands))

European Conference on Smart Sensing and Context

(2nd : 2007 : Kendal, England)

(Specific name recorded as preferred name: EuroSSC 2007 (2007 : Kendal, England))”

Our comment:

According to our practice, EuroSSC is a variant not a specific name and the fuller name is the preferred name.

(See our comment on 11.2.1.5e.3)

11.4.2.1.1 “A **location of headquarters** is a country, state, province, etc., or local place in which an organization has its headquarters.”

11.4.2.1.2 “Alternatively, location of headquarters may indicate the geographic area (state, province, city, etc.) in which a corporate body carries out its activities. »

Our comment:

This instruction is not clear enough.

Is there a distinction between territorial authorities and the other bodies?

- 11.4.2.4.1 “If the name of the local jurisdiction or geographic locality changes during the lifetime of the body, record the latest name in use in the lifetime of the body.
Harare, Zimbabwe
not Salisbury, Zimbabwe”
- Our comment:**
Is there necessary to make a variant with the name followed by the earlier name of the place?
- 11.5.2 DATE OF ESTABLISHMENT
11.5.3 DATE OF TERMINATION
- Our comment:**
We suggest to add this example :
France. Ministère de la culture (1981-1986)
Naissance : 1981-05-22
Mort : 1986-03-20
- 11.6.0.3 General guidelines
Record the type of corporate body using an appropriate term from the list below”.
conference
government body
religious body
other
- Our comments:**
This part is late in the chapter.
What does « other » mean?
The referential must be completed.
- 11.7.0.6 Associated institution
- Our comment:**
See our comment on 11.1.1.4
- 11.9.0.3.1 “ Record the address of the corporate body’s place of business and/ or an e-mail or Internet address for the body.”
- Our comment:**
Address must be transcribed according to the national uses.
- 11.9.0.3.2 “Indicate the source from which the information on address was derived following the instructions given under 8.12.”
- Our comment:**
Add the date of the consultation website.
- 11.10 et 11.11 “Field of activity of the Corporate body” and “Corporate history”
- Our comment:**
It would be necessary to make more concise notes in keeping only those are most relevant.

11.12.0.3 Recording identifier for corporate bodies

Our comment:

Examples seem indicate that authority record identifiers are considered as identifier for corporate bodies, which is not correct: an authority record identifier pertains to the record, not to the entity described by the record.

Comments on RDA Chapter 9 Identifying places

- General It would be preferable to remove the exceptions in 16.2.4 (as this is suggested in *Background to each section of the draft* p. 13.) and in 16.2.5
- We suggest to practice double localization for all places (district and country) in order to equally treat the places at international level and more accurately identify geographical entities:
For example:
 Bourges (Cher, France)
 Munich (Bavière, Allemagne)
BUT
we are aware that if this practice is adopted at an international level, this will radically change the way of a recording places in national catalogues, as the present practice is different.
- General It would be necessary to introduce within the text the idea of Overseas Territory, assimilated to independent states.
- General Non-significative elements as « arrondissement » must be recorded as subordinate.
- 16.0.2.1 “Determine the preferred name for a place from (in order of preference):
a) gazetteers and other reference sources published in the language preferred by the agency creating the data
b) gazetteers and other reference sources published in the jurisdiction in which the place is located in the official language(s) of that jurisdiction.”
- Our comment:**
Are geographical standards as ISO 3166 included in reference sources?
- 16.2.0.2.1 “Determine the preferred name for a place from (in order of preference...)”
- Our comment:**
We do not see the interest of this paragraph that is exactly the same as 16.0.2.1.
- 16.2.0.5.1 “If the name of the place is in a language written in a script that differs from the preferred script of the agency creating the data, transliterate the name according to the table for that language adopted by the agency creating the data”
- Our comment:**
Please, add an hyperlink to 8.4 Language and script
Please, add in the guideline : « if there is no form of use in non-roman characters. »
- Example
 ʿAqabah »
- Our comment:**
This does not seem correct, because it exists a form of use, cited p. 15

- 16.2.0.5.2 “If the name of the place is in a language written in a script that differs from the preferred script of the agency creating the data and a transliterated form appears in reference sources, use that transliterated form. If more than one transliterated form is found, use the form resulting from transliteration according to the table for that language adopted by the agency creating the data.”

Tétouan
not Titwān
(*Transliterated form of Arabic script name تطوان that appears in reference sources*)

Our comment:

This example is not relevant without comment because the town belongs to a french-speaking area.

More, the form « Tétouan » is a french form of use, not a transliterated form.

- 16.2.1. Different language forms of the name

Our comment:

Please, establish an hyperlink to 16.2.0.5 Transliteration

- 16.2.1.2 “If the form of name for a place in the language preferred by the agency is the name of the government that has jurisdiction over the place, choose that form.”

Soviet Union
not Sovetskii Soiuz
not Russia

Our comment:

This example is not relevant because Russia is not equal to Soviet union.

- 16.2.1.3 “If there is no form in the language preferred by the agency in general use, choose the form in the official language of the jurisdiction in which the place is located.”

Horlivka

Our comment:

This example is not significant without comment.

Is it a transliterated form?

- 16.2.1.4 “If the jurisdiction has more than one official language, choose the form most commonly found in sources in the language preferred by the agency.”

Louvain
not Leuven

Our comment:

It would be preferable to choose another example because the town « Louvain » is too « ambiguous ». It is split now in « Leuven » and « Louvain-la-Neuve ». A comment is necessary to precise the chronological period.

We suggest to replace this example by « Courtrai » :

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb11866003d>

Courtrai (Belgique)

Kortrijk (Belgique)

- 16.2.2.1 “If the name of a place changes, choose as many of the names as are required by:
a) the instructions on government names (see 11.2.1.5d)
(e.g., use *Nyasaland* or *Malawi*, as appropriate)
or b) the instructions on additions to corporate names (see 11.1.1.3) and conference
names (see 11.1.1.8) (e.g., use *Leopoldville* or *Kinshasa*, as appropriate)
or c) **other relevant instructions in chapter 11.**”

Our comment:

These instructions are too vague and general and should be developed. This lacks
precisions about ancient names, change of frontiers, birth and death of states, etc.

Examples have no place in an enumeration.

And there is no sufficient explanation in parts of chapter 11, to where the hyperlink
goes.

It lacks an hyperlink towards 11.2.2 Change of name.

- 16.2.3.1.1 “If the first part of a place name is a term indicating a type of jurisdiction and the place
is commonly listed under another part of its name **in lists** published in the language of
the country in which it is located, **omit the term indicating the type of jurisdiction**”.

Our comment:

The term « **lists** » is too vague.

Woul you precise « reference lists » (gazeteers, topographical dictionaries) ?

Guideline must be refined because it is sometimes necessary to indicate the type of
jurisdiction. For example :

Bretagne (Duché)

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb125364861>

This must be distinguished from the present administrative region « Bretagne »

- 16.2.4 PLACES IN AUSTRALIA, CANADA, MALAYSIA, UNITED STATES,
U.S.S.R., OR YUGOSLAVIA

Our comment:

This exception might be deleted as it is suggested in « Background to each section of
the draft » p. 13.

See our general comment.

URSS et Yugoslavia have disappeared.

- 16.2.4.1.1 “Do not record the name of the larger jurisdiction as part of the name of a state,
province, territory, etc., of Australia, Canada, Malaysia, the United States, the U.S.S.R.,
or Yugoslavia.”

Guam

Puerto Rico

Our comment:

It would be better to remove these examples because they concern external possessions,
as French Polynesia, and not parts of United States.

Codification ISO treat them as autonomous territories.

16.2.4.2.1 “If the place is in a state, province, territory, etc., of one of the countries listed under [16.2.4.1](#), record the name of the state, etc., in which it is located as part of the name, following the instructions given under [16.2.0.4](#).”

...

Kiev (Ukraine)

Split (Croatia)

Our comment:

It would be better to remove these examples because the places have become independant.

16.2.5.1 “England, the Republic of Ireland, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales, the Isle of Man, and the Channel Islands”

Our comment:

This exception might be deleted.
See our general comment.

16.2.5.2.1 “If a place is located in England, the Republic of Ireland, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales, the Isle of Man, or the Channel Islands, record *England, Ireland, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Isle of Man*, or *Channel Islands*, as appropriate, as part of the name, following the instructions given under [16.2.0.4](#).”

Our comment:

The cataloguer is not enlightened by the 16.2.4 because in this part, there are only hyperlinks towards paragraphs 16.2.3.-16.2.8.
Specify definitions. Add comments to examples, please.

16.2.6 Places in **other** jurisdictions

Our comment:

The term « other » is too vague.

16.2.6.1 “Record as part of the name of a place not covered by [16.2.4–16.2.5](#) the name of the **country** in which the place is located.”

Spanish Town (V.I.)

Papeete (French Polynesia)

Our comment:

The two examples « Spanish Town (V.I) » and « Papeete (French Polynesia) » are not qualified as the other examples, by the name of the state in which they are located but by an overseas territory or an external possession.

16.2.7 Places with identical names

“...include a word or phrase commonly used to distinguish them”

Our comment:

This instruction is too vague. The risk is that every cataloguer imagine a different word or expression.

16.2.8.1 « When recording the name of a place within a city, etc., record the name of the city, etc., and the larger place within which the city, etc., is located, as prescribed in the instructions given under [16.2.3–16.2.7](#).”

Example
Chelsea (London, England)

Our comment :

The name must be corrected because it has become : « Kensington and Chelsea ».

Rameau :

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb14611004k>

Londres (GB) -- Quartier de Kensington et Chelsea

Example
11e Arrondissement (Paris, France)

Our comment:

This example is different from the others of this paragraph. It does not look like an authority heading but a form in a bibliographic record transcribed as it appears in the item. The first element (11^e) is not significative and other cities in France are divided in districts (as Lyon, or Marseille)

It would be preferable to record the name of the larger place first as in Corporates bodies Authority file of the BnF ou in indexing RAMEAU. This allows to classify in numerical order the Authorities headings in the catalog.

Corporates bodies BnF :

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb131701939>

Paris (Arrondissement ; 11)

RAMEAU :

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb119572542>

Paris (France) - - Arrondissement (11e)

16.3.0.3.2 “Record as a variant name a form of name found in reference sources, or resulting from a different transliteration of the name, if that form differs *significantly* from the form recorded as the preferred name of the place.”

Our comment:

Would you precise what does “significantly” mean?

16.3.1.3 Recording expanded names as variant names

Our comment:

Is it possible to gather both parts?

16.3.1.3.1 If the name chosen as the preferred name of the place is an initialism or an abbreviated or shortened form of name, record the expanded form of the name as a variant name.

and :

16.3.1.3.2 If the name chosen as the preferred name begins with an abbreviated word or contains an abbreviated word in such a position that it affects access, and in the catalogue abbreviated words are accessed differently from words written in full, record the name with the abbreviated word written in full (in the language of the preferred

name) as a variant name.

They are very similar and we do not see the difference between examples in first and second part.

According to French standard NF Z 44-060, §0.4.2, we respect national usage for the transcription of abbreviations.

- 16.3.2.3.3 “In the context of such a catalogue, if the full name is chosen as the preferred name, record initials without full stops, as well as with full stops as variant names.”
US
USA
U.S.
U.S.A.
(*Full form recorded as preferred name: United States*) »

Our comment:

The French instruction is not to respect the typo of the publication (cf NF Z 44-060, note 7, § 0.4.3 and § 1.2.2.2) and to transcribe without developing, without full stops and without spaces. This practice concerns also variants.

See our comment on 8.5.5.2, 11.2.0.5.1 and 11.2.1.1.4

- 16.3.3.2.1 “Take alternative linguistic forms of names **from any source**”

Our comment:

It might be preferable to limit at the reference sources or resources associated with the place or the government for avoiding to have plenty of forms not attested.

- 16.3.3.3 Recording alternative linguistic forms as variant names

Example

Titwān (Morocco)

(*Different transliteration recorded as preferred name: Tétouan (Morocco)*)

Our comment:

« Tétouan (Morocco) » is not a transliterated form but a form of use.

- 16.3.3.3.2 : Example
Onzième Arrondissement (Paris, France)
(*Preferred name begins with a number expressed as a numeral: 11e Arrondissement (Paris, France)*)

Our comment :

We contest the order of the terms in the variant as we contest the preferred name (see our comment on 16.2.8.1).

- 16.3.4.3.1. Example :
The Dalles (Or.)
(Name recorded as preferred name : Dalles (Or.))

Our comment:

The omission of the article seems in contradiction with 11.2.0.6 (Initial articles)

16.6.0.3.2 “If there is no prescribed format for the identifier for the place, record it...”

Our comment:

This last paragraph is repeated.

Comments on RDA Chapters 29-32 Identifying families

Chapter 29

General guidelines on recording relationships between persons, families, and corporate bodies

- General This chapter is not finalized.
Some paragraphs give general instructions on the preferred access points for the related entities, when these instructions are already given, often with more details, in the chapters dedicated to each type of entity (chapters 9, 10 et 11).
Such redundancy is useless. Therefore we suggest to delete the following paragraphs:
- 29.1.1 Person, family, and corporate body
 - 29.1.3 Access point
 - 29.3 Required elements
- 29.4a.1 Identifier for the related person, family or corporate body
- Our comment :**
There is confusion between the identifier of the authority record established for an entity and the identifier of the entity itself.
- 29.4.2 Relationship designator
and
29.5
- Our comment :**
As Appendix L is not available for comments, it is impossible to make comments on these paragraphs.
- 29.4.3 “For guidelines on using the preferred access point representing a related person, family, or corporate body to generate a *see also* reference, see appendix E.”
- Our comment :**
As Appendix E is not available for comments, it is impossible to make comments on this paragraph.
- 29.5.0.3 **“Recording relationship designators**
29.5.0.3.1 Record an appropriate term(s) from the list in appendix L in conjunction with an identifier and/or preferred access point representing the related person, family, or corporate body to indicate explicitly the nature of the relationship.
[Example] ”
- Our comment :**
The term should be given in the language preferred by the agency creating the data.

Chapter 30
Related persons

General	This chapter is not finalized: it seems to be only an outline. Explanations on the relationships themselves (what kinds of relationships between persons) are missing. The absence of appendix E doesn't help to have a clear overview of the rules.
---------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Chapter 31
Related families

General	This chapter is not finalized: it seems to be only an outline. Explanations on the relationships themselves (what kinds of relationships between families) are missing. The absence of appendix E doesn't help to have a clear overview of the rules.
---------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Chapter 31
Related corporate bodies

General	This chapter is not finalized: it seems to be only an outline. Explanations on the relationships themselves (what kinds of relationships between corporate bodies) are missing. The absence of appendix E doesn't help to have a clear overview of the rules.
32.2.0.3.1	Explanation of relationship Our comment : The examples mix scope notes and information notes.

**Comments on RDA Appendix G
Titles of nobility, terms of rank, etc**

For addition :

TERMS OF RANK IN FRANCE

The terms of rank in France are :

duc

Duchesse

marquis

marquise

comte

comtesse

vicomte

vicomtesse

baron

baronne

prince and princesse (for the non reigning princes who claim the title)

chevalier

écuyer

cardinal