

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

FROM: Barbara B. Tillett, LC Representative

SUBJECT: Title of person: change to 9.4.1 and 9.19.1.2

The Library of Congress has several concerns about the proposed scope change to “Title of person,” and does not support the proposal as written.

While the BL proposal says the intention is to match the scope of FRBR (1997, revised 2009) and FRAD (2010), this seems to be a step backwards from JSC’s intentions during 1999 when we removed use of Sir and Lady from AACR2 (4JSC/BL/1). Because the British Library was the originator of the removal of these terms from AACR2, is there some evidence the BL now has to justify re-introducing them beyond alignment with FRBR and FRAD?

As for the stated intention to match the scope of FRBR and FRAD, we would prefer to consider the “Includes” statements and the “e.g.” statements from the IFLA models as suggestions, not requirements. We feel it is not necessary to use the examples in FRBR and FRAD to define the scope for RDA. FRBR’s examples were based on practice at the time of its writing in the mid-1990’s and likewise FRAD’s examples were based on practice from 1999-2009 when the Working Group was writing the text. RDA is meant to be an application of those conceptual models, and we do not feel it is essential to consider the examples as providing the interpretation we should assign to those attributes. Tom Delsey changed the definitions for RDA from FRBR and FRAD, and some of us hoped we would be submitting those suggestions to the FRBR Review Group for consideration based on our experience.

If the rest of the JSC feels strongly that this should be added back in, the remainder of this response offers some suggestions and additional concerns.

1) Because the “Core Element” status at 9.4 is currently applicable to a narrower scope, LC is concerned that the unqualified requirement is much too broad to apply to the newly defined 9.1.4.9 instruction. If left as a “Core element”, it is likely that Dr., Mr., Mrs., Ms., Miss (and similar terms) could potentially be required for a large proportion of newly established personal names. This seems unnecessary, unless in a cataloger’s judgment, it is needed to identify a person. We believe the core statement at 9.4 would need to be moved to the sub-instructions (i.e., 9.4.1.4, 9.4.1.5, 9.4.1.6, 9.4.1.7, and 9.4.1.8) so that a less stringent requirement could be used with the proposed 9.4.1.9 (e.g., only required when needed to differentiate). (Note: There was no determination of mandatory in FRAD.)

2) The BL proposal includes examples of “Rev.” under 9.4.1.9. Should we add to 9.4.1.9 to be in line with FRBR but also clarify it includes terms of respect for the clergy to say: “Record other titles of the person indicative of rank, office, honour, or other terms of address or respect”? This would expand FRBR’s “etc.” Or is it felt “terms of address”

include such terms of respect? LC notes that the equivalent instruction in AACR2 (22.19B1) provided for “term of honour, term of address, title of position or office, initials of an academic degree, initials denoting membership in an organization” (sometimes referred to as the “everything but the kitchen sink rule”), however, it was coupled with another requirement that the distinguishing term appear with the name. This requirement is not mentioned in the BL proposal—should it be?

3) We observe that *Captain* and *capitaine* shown in the BL examples on page 2 are terms of rank, and like other terms of rank, are more susceptible to change over time than other titles--this is why we would like to avoid their use in authorized access points unless that is the only element available to differentiate one name from another or that is how the person is most commonly known. Note that *Captain* and *capitaine* could also be suggestive of a profession or occupation (RDA 9.16) in many instances (e.g., Ship captain, Military officer), creating ambiguity between this element and the already-allowed profession or occupation element.

4) LC notes that some ‘title of person’ terms used under the proposed instruction are also used as part of the preferred name in some cases (see 9.2.2.9.3 and 9.2.2.9.4), making it increasingly difficult to explain why a term such as “Mrs.” may be part of a preferred name in some cases, but a title of person in others.

5) For the authorized access points for person, 9.19.1.2 assigns a priority order to the additional terms. It might be best to leave the order to cataloger’s judgment as to which is most appropriate for a given person, and suggest an “in case of doubt” order secondarily. We also would like the JSC to reconsider including “field of activity” (see related proposal response, 6JSC/CILIP/3/LC response).

6) The quote from FRAD on page 1 has a typo (Premier) and missing words (types of) in the first “Includes” statement, but they are not important to the proposal, unless the JSC decides to be very literal about copying the wording in FRAD. LC would prefer to leave RDA as written.

7) Page 2 before the Scope of Title of the person, says it is the “wording taken directly from FRBR”, but it is not the same as FRBR. We do not feel it needs to be identical, especially in light of current IFLA work to consolidate the FRBR models, which gives an opportunity to discuss the definitions and scope wording. However, if it is to be identical, it should read:

Scope: Title of the person is a word or phrase indicative of rank, office, nobility, honour, etc., or a term of address associated with the person.

Notice that we then lose the “royalty,” which the JSC felt was important to bring out explicitly when we drafted RDA, as “royalty” is only an example in FRAD. LC would prefer to retain the RDA definition.

8) Page 2 under 9.19.1.2 f), second line, missing the word “in” to read: “...in that order of preference...”