

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**From:** Dave Reser, LC Representative  
**Subject:** Parts of the Bible: Books (6.23.2.9.2)

Thanks to the DNB for helping to address the issue of the preferred name for books of the Bible. While we agree to DNB's idea in principle, we have some suggested clarifications, and raise a related issue.

### **Background**

The current instruction to use the Authorized Version of the Bible for the titles of the books in RDA 6.23.2.9.2 (and previously in AACR2 25.18A2) serves three purposes:

- 1) instructs catalogers on which language to use for the preferred titles;
- 2) tells catalogers which preferred titles to use among multiple choices in one language;
- 3) *indirectly* informs catalogers which books are considered non-canonical apocryphal books (6.23.2.6) and which books are considered books of the Apocrypha (6.23.2.9.4).

For 1), we understand the DNB's desire to use German titles for the books of the Bible; the same will be true for other agencies around the world. We appreciate their deference to the English-language cataloging community in retaining mention of the Authorized Version in 6.23.2.9.2, but we agree with ACOC that it is not needed (any agency could address the issue of version in whatever mechanism they use to state RDA policies).

For 2), we believe it is important to retain the phrase "brief citation form" in 6.23.2.9.2 (it was removed in the ACOC response). For example, *Genesis* would be preferred to *The First Booke of Moses, called Genesis*. We think that retaining the short citation instruction is consistent with the principle of using the "commonly known title."

Issue 3) above is a bit more complicated. The current use of the Authorized Version is also connected to the concept of books considered to be non-canonical Apocryphal Books at 6.23.2.6, and books treated under the subdivision *Apocrypha* using 6.23.2.9.4. This issue with the Authorized Version was also mentioned by ALA in 2006 in the context of 5JSC/LC/8.<sup>1</sup> Although different editions of the Authorized Version will differ on whether the books of the Apocrypha are included, that version does set a 'standard' with regard to treating books as part of the Old or New Testament, or as books of the Apocrypha. For example, lacking an instruction to use a Protestant Bible in 6.23.2.9.2, an agency might use a Catholic Bible which would not identify Tobit as apocryphal. Therefore, the possibility of using a version of the Bible other than the Authorized Version has the potential to create confusion over the application of 6.23.2.9.4. We do

---

<sup>1</sup> This concept was also noted by ALA in their September 18, 2006 response to 5JSC/LC/8: "...the revised rule maintains the identification of the Authorized Version as the reference source for the names of Biblical books; it is also the source for the list of books that make up the Apocrypha in a later rule. Is not this tacit elevation of one version and canon over all others (Hebrew, Catholic, or whatever) as significant a source of bias as the designation of the Old Testament as part of the (Christian) Bible? ... However, if we really want to deal with the problem of bias, then we need to deal with this reliance on the Authorized Version."

not know whether this was an intended consequence of this proposal. However, having noted it, we provide three possible options that the JSC could use to address the situation.

We present these three clarifications to this proposal for the JSC to consider. Our mark-up reflects the current text of the instruction rather than DNB or ACOC's suggested changes.

**Clarification 1: Add a sentence to 6.23.2.9 about the names of the books of the Bible used in RDA instructions and examples**

This change does not imply that the Authorized Version should be used by an agency, but simply explains the names used in the RDA instructions and examples, so that it would not be necessary to provide explanations at *each* instruction and example.

**6.23.2.9 Parts of the Bible**

Record the preferred title for parts of the Bible by applying the instructions at [6.23.2.9.1RDA](#)–[6.23.2.9.7RDA](#), as applicable. The instructions and examples in [6.23.2.9.1RDA](#)–[6.23.2.9.7RDA](#) use the brief citation form of the Authorized Version for the names of individual books.

**Clarification 2: Revise 6.23.2.9.2 to allow the agency creating the data to choose a standard version of the Bible in its preferred language and script. This is a combination of DNB and ACOC's wording for 6.23.2.9.2, that allows the agency creating the data to choose a version of the Bible while retaining the existing wording about the brief citation form.**

**6.23.2.9.2 Books**

For books of the Catholic or Protestant canon, record the brief citation form ~~of the Authorized Version~~ of a standard version of the Bible in the language and script preferred by the agency creating the data as a subdivision of the preferred title for the Bible.

**Clarification 3: Options for addressing the books of the compilation known as the Apocrypha**

We believe that there are three options for addressing the issue of the books in the compilation known as the Apocrypha (6.23.2.9.4) in the absence of an instruction to use the "Authorized Version" for naming the books of the Bible.

**Option A:** The agency creating the data does not apply 6.23.2.9.4 if they have chosen a standard version that does not consider the books to form a compilation called the Apocrypha (i.e., a Catholic Bible).

**Option B:** Continue to require books of the Apocrypha to be treated as subdivisions of the Apocrypha, regardless of the standard version chosen by the agency.

**Option C:** Remove the instructions for 6.23.2.9.4 and treat books of the Apocrypha simply as books of the Bible under 6.23.2.9.2 (i.e., remove the intervening *Apocrypha*, just as we have removed *Old Testament* and *New Testament*). Apocrypha would be added as another type of “Groups of Books” at 6.23.2.9.3 to refer to the group collectively, when appropriate. **Full disclosure:** This is the recommendation of the original proposal in 5JSC/LC/8, and confirmed in 5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up; we cannot recall why it was not incorporated into RDA.

Although we continue to prefer Option C, LC would be happy to provide marked-up text to incorporate whichever option the JSC chooses. *Note:* nothing in these proposed options would impact the instruction “Apocryphal Books” at 6.23.2.6.