**RDA Questions from CEAL Community (**March 2, 2013)

***CJK-1. Record Chinese character numbers in date production/publication numbering within series/subseries such as***二〇一二 ***(Chinese character er ling yi er) or 2012. Follow-up question: Is the same interpretation applied to*** 民國一百年***?***

LC’s 2012 suggestion:

Apply 1.8.2 2nd alternative to also supply an Arabic date in brackets, i.e.:

[Please note below an alternative suggestion]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Example 1 | Example 3 | Example 4 |
| Source: | 二〇一二  | 二千十二[2012] | 民國一百年 |
| Record | 二〇一二 [2012] | 二千十二[2012] | 民國一百年 |
| Record (Transliteration): | Er ling yi er [2012] | Nisen-jūno [2012] | Minguo yi bai nian [2011] |

CEAL’s response:

1. Suggest to add LCPS under RDA 1.8.2 2nd alternative (“Add the equivalent numerals in the form preferred by the agency creating the data”) on “If the date found in the item is not of Gregorian or Julian calendar, give the date as found and follow it with the year(s) of the Gregorian or Julian calendar.”

LC Response: The LC-PCC Policy Statements for the optional addition of a date in the Gregorian or Julian calendar (see option decisions at 2.7.6.3, 2.8.6.3, 2.9.6.3, and 2.10.6.3) already provide for the desired addition, but we can now see the seeming conflict between those policy statements and the one for 1.8.2, 2nd alternative. We will clean this up to indicate the other policy statements to help alleviate the confusion.

1. Also suggest to add separate instruction for transliteration on “Substitute Western-style Arabic numerals for numbers expressed as both numerals and words in the transliterated form.” (see table below)

LC Response: Your suggestion on transliteration would require a change to the Romanization tables themselves where the rules for transliteration are, not RDA or the LC-PCC PS. After lengthy discussions here, we think that the issue needs a simple resolution that can be applied efficiently by CJK catalogers in both the script and transliterated forms. You have identified many of the difficulties that would need to be resolved, so we are proposing an alternative solution that differs from our earlier position, and is more in line with your proposal for the transliterated form. For a variety of reasons, we think there needs to be a Policy Statement for 1.8.2 to say that the agency decision for numbers expressed with CJK characters should be recorded as Western-style Arabic numerals (similar to AACR2 C.5, but limited to the elements identified in 1.8.1). We’ve updated your table below to reflect this approach. We think this allows for a more efficient approach for catalogers, brings the script and Romanized parallel fields into closer synchronization, and eliminates many of the thorny issues of deciding when a character represents a number or a word. While it varies from RDA’s principle of representation, we note that 1.8.2 already gives agencies this latitude, and 1.8.3 and 1.8.5 already stray somewhat from that principle. If a cataloger really wanted to show that the publication date was found on the item using characters, a note could be made (see 2.20.7.3, and the example indicating that a Hebrew date was found on the resource, but an Arabic date was recorded in the publication statement). We are quite interested in CEAL’s reaction to this proposed change, but note that any final decision would still need considerable discussion with other interested parties (see draft statement at the end).

1. Suggest for LC to look into whether these suggested instruction apply to all date elements listed in 1.8 and to all non-Latin languages.

LC Response: We will need to discuss with other language/script communities to see if a single practice can be applied, or whether a CJK policy would be separate (we know that our right-to-left script catalogers generally try to avoid mixing script directionality in the same subfield).

1. If not, CEAL will accept LC’s suggestion to supply 1.8.2 2nd alternative to also supply an Arabic date in brackets for all East Asian language materials.

LC Response: We’ve updated the examples below to reflect our latest thinking—the LC response is shaded below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Example 1 | Example 2 | Example 3 | Example 4 |
| Source: | 二〇一二 | 二千十二 | 이천십이년 | 民國一百年 |
| Record (Non-Latin): | 二〇一二 2012 | 二千十二 2012 | 이천십이년2012 \* | 民國一百年 [2011]民國 100 [2011]\* |
| Record (Translteration): | 20122012 | 20122012 | 2012- yŏn2012\* | Minguo 100 nian [2011]Minguo 100 [2011]\* |

\*While the character for yŏn or nian may be found on the resource, our practice is not to record it in the date of publication (264 $c), unless it is a rare book. The Minguo 100 example also shows the application of 2.8.6.3, option

***CJK-2. Romanization of Chinese characters numerals in edition statement such as Di yi ban or Di 1 ban for***第一版***.***

LC’s suggestion:

Apply 2.5.1.4 to transcribe in the form found on the resource, i.e.:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Example 1 | Example 3 | Example 4 |
| Source: | 第1版 | 第一版 | 第六版 |
| Record (Non-Latin): | 第1版 | 第一版 | 第六版 |
| Record (Transliteration):  | Di 1 ban | Di yi ban | Dairokuhan or Dairoppan |

CEAL’s response:

1. Given that library public services staff may not be able to understand all non-Latin languages to help provide access efficiently, CEAL suggest to add separate instruction for transliteration in 2.5.1.4 on “Substitute Western-style Arabic numerals for numbers expressed as both numerals and words in the transliterated form.” (see table below)

LC Response: This would require changing the Romanization tables themselves (i.e., where the rules for transliteration are, not RDA or the LC-PCC PSs). We do not see the need to do this, as it would create a lack of parallelization between the script field recorded per RDA and the transliterated field. We feel that the elements that RDA treats as transcribed fields, such as title and edition, should be transcribed/transliterated as found.

1. Suggest for LC to look into whether the suggested above instruction apply to all non-Latin languages.

LC Response: The RDA instruction does apply to all non-Latin languages, though each language/script has its own transliteration table and may treat numbers differently (e.g., the Japanese Romanization table already has some differences between Chinese and Korean).

1. If not, CEAL will accept LC’s suggestion to apply 2.5.1.4 and to transcribe in the form found on the resource. If so, Japanese catalogers want to clarify on how to read第六版 : Dairokuhan or Dairoppan?

LC Response: We’ve updated the examples below to reflect the suggestion above. Our Japanese cataloger indicates that while either reading is correct, we would be more likely to use “Dairokuhan.“

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Example 1 | Example 2 | Example 3 | Example 4 |
| Source: | 第1版 | 第一版 | 제일판 | 第六版 |
| Record (Non-Latin): | 第1版 | 第一版 | 제일판 | 第六版 |
| Record (Translteration): | Di 1 banDi 1 ban | Di 1 banDi yi ban | Che 1-p’anChe ilp’an | Dairokuhan or DairoppanDairokuhan |

***CJK-4. Record of Chinese character series numbering “***上卷***”*** *(*上中下巻 or 上下巻)

LC’s suggestion:

In the context of RDA 1.8.3, LC has not yet designated a preferred script for a numeral that would sbustitute for a word. LC would take the suggestion to substitute a Chinese numeral for a Chinese number expressed as a word in series numbering , i.e. 上卷🡪 一卷

CEAL’s response:

The above suggestion may not be helpful to potentially distinguish two different manifestations if one edition happened to use一卷 while the other used上卷

We came up with three options (see table below).

Option 1. Apply 1.8.2. 2nd alternative. Record the form found on the source and add the equivalent numerals in the form preferred by the agency creating the data, with a suggested LCPS phrase to “also supply AWestern-style Arabic numerals in brackets when series numerals are expressed as words上中下巻(券)” This option would be a compromise of recording what appear on the source as well as addressing issues with sorting/displaying and serving public services staff for better access.

Option 2. Apply 1.8.2 1st alternative for both non-Latin scripts and transliteration. This option might not be helpful to public services staff who do not read non-CJK languages.

Option 3. Try to be consistent with the general idea of providing separate instructions for non-Latin script data from that of transliteration, and substitute Western-style Arabic numerals for transliteration. However, transliterating上into Arabic 1 is not accurate as they are not the same (p.s. this part is not covered by CJK Romanization guidelines. Also, there is a question about recording 下巻 as vol. 2 or vol. 3 when one might not know if there is a中巻 or not. In this case, we suggest catalogers to record either 2-kan or 3-kan for option 1 or 3 based on the information available.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
| Source: | 上巻 | 上卷 | 上券 |
| Record (Non-Latin): | 上巻 [1-kan]上巻 | 上卷上卷 | 上券上卷 |
| Record (Translteration): | Jōkan [1-kan]Jōkan | Shang juanShang juan | 1-kwŏnSanggwŏn |

Questions for LC:

1. Which option would be the best alternative as a suggested and applicable to all East Asian languages?

LC Response: Your questions have helped us to recognize the problem of trying to find an equivalent to the terms for ‘up,’ ‘middle,’ and ‘down’ that does not cause confusion/error by converting to Western-style Arabic numerals. We also note that the characters for up, middle, and down are \*not\* numbers, but words, and thus RDA 1.8.3 does not really apply (the terms are not really words that mean 1, 2, and 3, but words that mean up, middle, and down). We’ve marked our preference in the examples above. Note that this answer reflects what would be recorded in the 490 $v—the series statement-- as recorded from the item itself. We recognize that the series numbering in an authorized access point may be different, as indicated by the numbering field recorded in a series authority record. Since LC no longer supplies series access points or makes series authority records, we would leave this question to the PCC. There is currently a PCC group looking at PCC series issues; one item that has already been raised is the suggestion to continue a series numbering pattern already recorded in an existing series authority record to aid in the types of sorting issues you mention. It would likely need to be addressed in the policy statement for 24.6.

1. Potential impact on LCPS 25.1.1.3 recording contents note when two or three volumes set using上中下巻(券) or other areas not covered here.

LC response: we would recommend using the form on the resource, as above.

***CJK-5. Record of Chinese-character series numbering “*** 第六卷***”***

LC’s suggestion:

No decision made yet, but LC Chinese experts are compelled to define what exact numerals are used to substitute CJK numerals for 1.8.5, for example, use Arabic numerals to replace CJK numerals …

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Series numbering |
| Source: | 第六卷 |
| Record (Non-Latin): | 第6卷 |
| Record (Translteration): | Di 6 juan |

CEAL’s response:

We would like to have separate instructions for non-Latin data and data in the transliterated form. For non-Latin data, record the form found on the source under 1.8.5, and for transliterated form, substitute Western-style Arabic numerals if numerals are expressed as both numerals and words. This way will aid the sorting and index display under series numbering. See table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Series numbering | Series numbering | Series numbering |
| Source: | 第六卷 | 卷六 | 復刊第貳五四號 |
| Record (Non-Latin): | 第六卷第 6 卷 | 卷六卷 6 | 復刊第貳五四號復刊第 254 號 |
| Record (Translteration-Chi): | Di 6 juanDi 6 juan | Juan 6Juan 6 | Fu kan di 254 haoFu kan di 254 hao |
| Record (Translteration-Jpn): | Dai 6-kanDai 6-kan | Kan-6Kan 6 | Fukkan dai 254-gó |
| Record (Translteration-Kor): | Che 6-kwŏnChe 6-kwŏn | Kwŏn-6 | Pokkan che 254-ho |

Questions for LC:

1. Does suggested instructions for data in both non-Latin and transliterated forms apply to all East Asian languages?

LC Response: For the elements applicable at 1.8.1, we think the suggestion to always use Western-style Arabic numerals as mentioned earlier is the simplest approach to apply, and as noted earlier, it keeps the parallel script/transliteration fields in closer synchronization. A policy statement for 1.8.5 would need to address this. Would this satisfy CEAL’s concern? If a cataloger really wanted to show that the publication date was found on the item using characters, a note could be made (see 2.20.4).

1. Does it apply to both 490/830 or only 830? Our preference would be both for following reasons:
	1. To keep the instruction simple.
	2. To provide the same practice to those which choose not to trace series.

LC Response: the recording referred to in 1.8.1 for series numbering applies only to the 490 field; note the comments above regarding series access fields (8XX) and series authority records.

1. Does the suggested instructions apply to data elements of series or multi-volume numbering listed under 1.8?

LC Response: not sure we understand the question.

***RDA 1.8.3 Numbers Expressed as Words. Substitute numerals for numbers expressed as words.***

CEAL suggest to remove RDA 1.8.3 and add substitution instruction for transliteration. We would like LC to confirm if this suggestion is applicable for all languages, if not, would it be possible to provide an LCPS for all non-Latin languages or all East Asian languages to not apply this instructions?

LC Response: CEAL would need to make an RDA rule change proposal to change RDA to remove 1.8.3 via the ALA Representative (CC:DA). That would be the opportunity to determine whether the removal has broad applicability/support. Instead, would CEAL be satisfied by LC’s new suggestion for 1.8.2?

***Authority question on “da shi”, “fa shi”, and “shi” in Chinese names.***

A discussion on the PCCLIST regarding “examples of upgraded NARs with $c” in September 2012 indicated that LC Chinese catalogers had determined that $c das hi was NOT a religious rank or title, and as a result it was removed from the authorized access point for an important Buddhist master “Xingyun da shi” and replaced by his year of birth (1927-). In February 2012 a group of CJK catalogers submitted recommendations to the PCC Acceptable Headings Implementation Task Group to retain these three terms as is under RDA because in the majority of cases these terms were used as religious titles/names. The summary of the findings by CEAL members is: “Da shi (大师) can exist as either a religious title or general respectful address. The treatment should be determined case by case following authoritative reference sources. “Fa shi (法师)” is more likely to be a religious title but the same instruction can be given. “Shi (释)” is an acquired Buddhist name equivalent to “last name.” Note: these terms have equivalents in Japanese and Korean. They may be pronounced differently but should be treated the same way. We hope PSD will consider issuing a statement to instruct catalogers to carefully evaluate each heading when updating records containing these terms.

LC Response: We agree with your conclusion about use of “Shi (释)” as part of the name itself, not a title or term of honour. We understand the difficulty of determining when “da shi” and “fa shi” are actually titles or a term of honour (which often requires research). We note that a new type of the RDA element “title of the person” will be added to RDA as a result of a proposal to change RDA from the British Library—it will add a category as 9.4.1.9 for “other term of rank, honour, or office” (see <http://www.rda-jsc.org/docs/6JSC-BL-3-rev-Sec-final.pdf>)-- this will allow for the recording of such terms \*to break a conflict (only)\* for those cases that it may be a term of honour rather than a religious rank. We hope such flexibility will be helpful in breaking conflicts, and eliminating some of the need for research. As noted above, it is not always easy to determine when “da shi” and “fa shi” are used as a title or a term of honour—we would propose an “in case of doubt” guideline that says to treat the term as a term of honour instead of a religious title if you don’t have evidence to the contrary; as a term of honour, it would only be added to break a conflict. Note that we would also propose that existing authority records that use “da shi” and “fa shi” should be treated as “acceptable” under RDA.

Possible wording for policy at 1.8.2 (main instruction, not alternative):

*LC practice*: For resources in Chinese, Japanese, and Korean script, substitute Western-style Arabic numerals for characters that represent numbers in the elements listed at RDA 1.8.1.

Example:

[provide some examples from this document]