

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Dave Reser, LC Representative
Subject: Language of expression—Revision of RDA 6.11, 6.11.1.3, 6.11.1.4, 7.12.1.3, 26.1.1.3

LC thanks EURIG for the continued discussion related to language elements in RDA. We do recognize the importance of the issue of “original language expression” vs. other language expressions (translations), though even this can get quite complicated for works that are originally expressed in more than one language (especially when later translations may not translate all of the original language material).

2.1 Language in which the Work was Originally Expressed

2.1.1 Questions

1. Do you agree that this element is an attribute of the work?

LC response: While we understand the importance of the language of the original expression, we are not sure why EURIG is attempting to solve this in RDA without first attempting the resolution in FRBR/FRAD if they disagree so strongly with the FRBR/FRAD approach. Has an attempt already been made to adjust the FR Family, and if so, what was the result? If not, why not?

2. If so, where should it go in RDA? There appear to be 3 options

- a. Following 6.5 Place of Origin of the Work, i.e., displacing Other Distinguishing Characteristics of the Work (6.6) and all subsequent elements. This would result in extensive renumbering.
- b. 6.7 History of the Work. Redefine History of the Work to accommodate “Language in which the Work was Originally Expressed” as a subelement or element subtype.
- c. At the end of Chapter 6.

LC response: We would prefer not to add language as a Work attribute until it is resolved in FRBR/FRAD.

2.2 Language of Expression Statement

2.2.1 Questions

1. Do you agree with this approach?

LC response: Not generally.

2. We have called this umbrella element a “Statement”, but that term has only been used in relation to manifestation elements (it is derived from ISBD). Is it appropriate in this context?

LC response: We were curious about the use of “statement” in this context as well, and think it is not a good fit for this (nor for Date in EURIG/Discussion/4). If anything is done for the ‘translation’ aspect, we think that it might be sufficient to have three sub-

types of “Language of expression”: 1) Language of original expression, 2) Language of translation, 3) Language of indirect translation (or, Language of secondary translation). We recognize that some language aspects such as “dubbed” or “subtitled” might also warrant sub-types. The correspondence with the many changes to MARC field 041 is noted; however, we often feel that the coding of that field has become so complex that systems have difficulty delivering the intended results (we know our system is not able to accommodate the complexity).

3. Are the proposed terms sufficient to meet known requirements?

LC response: We think many of the “known requirements” might still be satisfied by the “details on” in 7.12 Language of the content; it seems unlikely that users would seek to find resources that have abstracts, comments, etc., in certain languages, though we should provide that information in 7.12 to aid in identification and selection when possible.

4. Are there other sub-elements that should be included?

LC response: No.