To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative to the JSC

Subject: Representing language of expressions in RDA: Discussion Paper

ALA thanks EURIG for raising the issues surrounding language of expression in RDA. We offer the following comments:

Identification of language of the original expression

ALA agrees with EURIG's observations that it would be useful in many cases to be able to clearly identify the language in which the work was originally expressed. Based on the FRBR model, however, it would not be appropriate to associate this with the work. We suggest that it is already possible to identify the original expression (and therefore the language of the original expression) using the ''Translation/Translation of'' relationships. If something more explicit is desired, we suggest that the FRBR model be expanded to include the concept of the original expression of a work as an attribute. This would include all of the various attributes that define an expression, including language, date, form, etc. With this approach, the original expression of the work could then serve as a benchmark against which all subsequent expressions are defined.

Attributes vs. relationships

As mentioned in the ALA response to 6JSC/EURIG/3, we believe that the details about the expressions (like direct translation, dubbed, etc.) would be better handled as relationships than as attributes. As noted above, RDA Appendix J already provides the tools for this in the ''Translation/Translation of'' expression-to-expression relationship designators.

Direct/indirect translation

EURIG identifies one use case for identifying a direct vs. indirect translation: indirect translations may be less faithful to the original conceptual content than direct translations. ALA wonders if another use case is to identify the relationship between expressions. We observe that it will not always be possible to identify whether a translation is direct or indirect.

Language of the content

ALA notes that the Language of the Content element in RDA (7.12) is explicitly defined for recording details of the language content that cannot already be conveyed in the Language of Expression element (RDA 6.11).

Language of captions, dubbing, etc.

ALA feels strongly that a dubbed version of a film is a different expression than a subtitled version of a film, regardless of whether or not they use the same text, since the form of expression differs.

Response to Questions at 2.1.1

1. Do you agree that this element is an attribute of the work?
   No; we would prefer addressing this through relationships, or perhaps expanding the FRBR/FRAD models to include the concept of original expression of a work. See discussion above.

2. If so where should it go in RDA?
   Not applicable. If the language of the original expression of the work is needed in the description of the work, it can already be accommodated through a Cataloguer's Note (RDA 5.9).

Response to Questions at 2.2.1

1. Do you agree with this approach?
   No; we would prefer a solution involving relationships rather than attributes.

2. We have called this umbrella element a "Statement" – is that appropriate in this context?
   We think it would be better to avoid using ISBD terminology to name elements in Chapter 6.

3. Are the proposed terms sufficient to meet known requirements?
   We believe that they are insufficient, especially in relation to moving images.

4. Are there other sub-elements that should be included?
   Consideration should be given to the changes in the use of captions in moving images. Originally there were captions (open and closed) for accessibility and subtitles for translations. Now we commonly have "subtitles for the deaf and hearing impaired," which are functionally captions and technologically like other subtitle tracks on DVDs. Problems also arise with intertitles. This type of information is currently split between Language of the Content (7.12) and Accessibility Content (7.14).