ISO7098 Romanization of Chinese draft 2013-07-04	ALA-LC Romanization Table Chinese 2011
7.2.2. Syllabic forms: Final. Articulation D: Articulation with *ü* as medial or main vowel. E.g. *ü*, *üe*, *üan*, *ün*. I do have a concern about section 7.2.2, which calls for romanizing a syllable that includes the letter u with an umlaut when there is no direct conflict with a matching syllable that includes the letter u without an umlaut -- the ue and uan and un. For example, lue (with umlaut) does not conflict with a syllable lue (without umlaut), so technically the umlaut is unnecessary, and, I believe, should be eliminated. Why use a diacritic when it is not absolutely necessary, and is an inconsistent practice? (We don´t add umlaut to uan or un finals, after all...) I brought this up at the time of conversion, but the community wanted to follow the iso standard... The above question for the umlaut is a good one that CEAL may act as a mediator/liaison to work with these standards and rules for operation/technical practices and for users input.	
11 Transcription rules for personal names and geographic names 11.1 The double two-character surnames are to be written together with a hyphen … Example 4 Zhang-Wang Shufang (张王淑芳) Initially, I didn't think it is not a bad idea to have the hyphen added in this situation because it helps indicate the unique nature of the surnames. Also, since I assumed the hyphen does not cause discrepancy in search results, I didn't have any objection to this proposal. However, once I take into the consideration both double-two character surnames and married women taking husbands' last names, I feel a little bit uncomfortable with this proposal. The different treatments in both situations translate into burden for catalogers who have to determine which category a person falls into. This research might not be difficult in some cases but will be in others. Based on the assumption that the hyphen doesn't have much impact on result, it seems wiser to avoid unnecessary research efforts. Not sure whether to respond to this one since I don't know if all systems treat "-" as a space or whether it will cause index differently I found all ISO7098 updates are according to the 2012 汉语拼音正词法基本规则 which Shi sent us today. 6.2.1.1 (p. 12) top of page: 双姓中间加连接号. In machine search and filing, hyphenated words are considered as one word. The hyphenation here doesn't change the meaning of Chinese women's married names with married (male) family names. Zhang Wang xx. Ex. Jiang-Song Meiling, and Jiang Song Meiling is the same. However, Jiang-Song Meiling may retrieve quickly and with accurate results than the separate two last names. As for the concern mentioned above, there is only a small number of double-character	Connection of syllables 1B. Married women. Separate and capitalized family names. 蔣宋美齡 Jiang Song Meiling 陳趙月英 Chen Zhao Yueying Is the ISO decision in line with Chinese common understanding of those who 冠夫姓? If, so, it makes sense to combine the two last names with hyphen. However, this will affect indexing of headings since the last name element will be changed. I do not have a strong opinion on which way (with or without hyphen between the two surnames) makes better sense. I would say I see no problem with the current ALA-LC practice. My concern as a cataloger is that the rule difference with this regard would lead to inconsistent cataloging practice in an internationally shared cataloging environment, such as OCLC Connexion. Adding hyphen or not may affect indexing and searching depending on how a given system functions. By the same token as above, the two separate (all in Caps) last names are the same as the hyphenated two last names. The paper filing may be different, but in retrieving information, it makes no difference. Hyphenated names are searched as one word (ex. use the Word Doc. and try to hyphen two words, and the word count will be reduced) in any system applications, and same as all punctuation is eliminated by system (men's and mens are the same in search). [p.s. Chinese hyphenated married name is different than U.S. practice. Since Chinese are in characters, there is no hyphen between characters. Married last name is always in front of the maiden name. U.S. married double last names will be adding the husband's family name after the woman's maiden name, and in filing, it is actually

last names (複姓), e.g., 歐陽, 上官, etc. Therefore, the likely hood of confusion might not be too big.

Hyphen between last names also seen in English (or other languages) last names, how that be handled? Is this consistent with practices in other languages? I think it make sense in Zhang-Wang format, however, it does make difference in searching and retrieving results. Users will also be confused with searching old records vs new records.

Our concern is legitimate, but at least in OCLC and Voyager, hyphen does not make difference in term of searching, since both systems normalize hyphen to blank.

(1) Authentic two-character surnames, e.g. 司马 Sima and 欧阳 Ouyang, are to be written as one word, without hyphen.

(2) Two-character surnames without philological permanence (e.g. those linked by marriage) -- 蒋宋美龄 Jiang Song Meiling and 张王淑芳 Zhang Wang Shufang -- should be separated without hyphenation.

under the maiden name. ex. Mrs. Amy B-C (B is her maiden name). Filing under B.

Description is one thing, authorized heading is another. AACR2 treats hyphenated and unhyphenated surnames differently when it comes to headings (see 22.5C5, then 22.5C3. By the way, I just noticed that there might be an error in the Chinese example under 22.5C5. The instruction says "In all other cases, enter under the husband's surname," while the example actually uses both surnames--Wang Ma, Hsi-ch'un.) If the compound surname is hyphenated, both names will be treated as the surname in authorized form in all languages. But, if it's not hyphenated, it will depend on the language. [Note: This is a confusing rule.] If I'm not mistaken, RDA did not change this practice. Therefore, using hyphen or not is a bigger deal than it looks for catalogers.

Jiang-Song and Jiang Song retrieve different results.

As to AAP, I agree with the above per RDA 9.2.2.10 & 9.2.2.9. I prefer current practice.

11.2 The surname, given name, seniority order after the adjuncts "Lao", "Xiao", "Da", "A" are to be written separately …

Example 3 Lao Zhang tour (老张头儿, older Zhang)

Should "头儿" be "tour" or "tou er"?

Should this be "张老头儿" instead? We can say 老张, but 老张头儿 sounds a little strange.

This is the area I always find it difficult to determine. I will choose "Lao Zhang Touer" over the other way though I am not confident at all. I agree with Sarah that this is a rather strange example. Just out of curiosity, I did a quick Google search. It turns out 老张头儿 seems quite a common nickname. There must be other names like this out there. It would be great if we can figure out a consistent way to handle this type of names and support whatever decision with a justification.

To answer the first question above, I would go for "tou er" by using standardized Pinyin form, unless the "tour" is in Romanized form or is becoming a standard practice internationally. Otherwise, it will create inconsistent practice or challenge for systematically converting Chinese scripts into Romanized form. If it is becoming a standard practice, it should not only apply to name, but also should be the same way with any other terms ends with such a suffix term such as 小孩儿, 花儿, 等等带 "儿"字的后缀词组? Are there any other similar situations like "儿" as suffix?

To the 2nd question above, 老张头儿 is a possible form to be used.

Agree. I think 老张头儿 in standard Pinyin is Lao Zhang tou er.

In this one, the 老张头（儿 small), is not read as each romanized Pinyin form. The er is a end of the noun, and read as with the 头 together as 音节后附成分子. (see 2012 汉语拼音

Separation of Syllables
1. Terms of address. A term of address may follow a surname, a courtesy name, or another appellation. Separate syllables in the term of address.

林老师 Lin lao shi
韦大夫 Wei dai fu

If the international standard is to combine characters into words, then the ISO practice is OK as is. Since ALA/LC Chinese romanization rule choose to separate characters, we can continue separating them.

I concur. I think the different rationale in choosing basic grouping unit (word v.s. character) causes the major differences between the two documents (same problem with 11.5 below).

(1) Agree. 老 and 师 should be two words -- thus, 林老师 Lin lao shi.

<table>
<tr>
<td>

正词法基本规则 5.5; 6.1.3.2; 6.1.4.2; 6.2.1.3 (where this were cited).

BTW, just a side note: "tour" happens to be the same as an English word. It might confuse English speakers.

"touer" together is more consistent with other rules in han yu pin yin, and it is more consistent with people's habit of typing. I also support that Lao or Xiao be written separately with the surname as a general practice.

I think in this case "tour" is closer to its actual pronunciation than "tou er." But it's not always true, for example "花儿為什麼这樣红." So for easy input and system maintenance/conversion, I'll go with "tou er." It also make the library instruction easier.

If keeping the example Lao Zhang tour, making a footnote explaining the special situation would be helpful for the rule-uers and end users in the world.

(1) Not all readers, Chinese and Western alike, fully understand the 儿化 practice in Chinese linguistics. They might be more comfortable if 头 and 儿 are treated as two words -- thus, 老张头儿 Lao Zhang tou er.

</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>

11.5 If a geographical proper name or geographical feature name has a monosyllabic adjunct, write them together as one word.

EXAMPLE 1 Jingshan Houjie (景山后街, Jingshan Back Street)
EXAMPLE 2 Chaoyangmennei Nanxiaojie (朝阳门内南小街, South Street inside Chaoyangmen Gate)
EXAMPLE 3 Dongsi Shitiao (东四十条，Dongsi tenth Street)

This one is complicated. It's gray area in ALA-LC Table. , we didn't have example for street name and/or instruction on whether a street name is a place name, but ALA-LC table has some examples fit this instruction, such as 水库, 保护区, 高原, 半岛. The problem is that we have inconsistent practice on transliterating street names per ALA-LC table:

牛街 Niu Jie or Niujie?
花园街 Hua yuan Jie or Huayuan Jie?
华尔街 Hua er Jie or Hua'er Jie or Hua'erjie?
米兰一街 Mi lan yi Jie or Milan Yijie?
秀水东街 Xiu shui dong Jie or Xiushui Dongjie?
米市大街 Mi shi da Jie or Mishi Dajie

Any idea how to address this issue that is triggered by this instruction?

2012 汉语拼音正词法基本规则 6.2.2.2

It might be useful to see what's the official standard, if any, the Chinese Post Office use for street names. Do any of you know off hand?

</td>
<td>

Connection of syllables
2B. Generic terms for geographical features are capitalized and separated from the names of the features.

汾河水库 Fenhe Shuiku

梵净山自然保护区 Fanjingshan Ziran Baohuqu

黄土高原 Huangtu Gaoyuan

印度半島 Yindu Bandao

My understanding of this rule is keep them consistent with their English equivalents, such as Fenhe Reservoir, xx Natural Preserve, xx Plateau, xx Peninsula

(1) "Fanjingshan Ziran Baohuqu" (for 梵净山自然保护区) is the preferred form.

(2) Generic term for geographical feature which is part of a place names should be capitalized.

This instruction has no association with 11.5 which I shouldn't list here. Apologize.

</td>
</tr>
</table>

Here are some examples from vendors & friends' business cards:

CIBTC: 车公庄西路: Chegongzhuang Xilu
CNPIEC: 安定门外安华里: Andingmen Wai Anhuali
社科院近史所: 东厂胡同: Dongchang Hutong
北大宿舍: 西二旗: Xi er qi

According to 正词法, street name is treated as a place name.

It makes more sense to have "houjie" or "nanxiaojie" as one word. Chinese speakers take it as granted that these words staying together. Similar examples are Shanghai's street names such as 三弄，四弄 (sannong, sinong). There are also new names such as 新村 (xincun), 小区(xiaoqu) etc.

I feel it's hard to follow, depending on individual's judgement. I think no grouping will make retrieval more effective, esp. we're English cataloging agencies, it's very important to make rules as simple as possible since the majority of library users are not native Chinese speakers.

(1) "Xiushui Dongjie" (for 秀水东街) is the preferred form. "Xiu shui dong jie" doesn't suggest a place name.

(2) All words, including aggregated words, constituting a place name should be capitalized.

11.6 The names of smaller villages and towns and other place names in which it is not necessary to distinguish between the proper place name and the geographical feature name are to be written together as one unit.

Example 1 Wangcun (王村, Wang Village)

This instruction creates potential arbitrary interpretation on when a smaller place such as village, town, etc. is not necessary to distinguish between the proper place name and the geographical feature. How do you define a place is small and is not necessary. It would potentially create an inconsistent interpretation/practice in transliteration.

Suggest remove such an instruction, apply instruction 11.4

ISO 7098 11.4 instructs that Chinese place names should separate the geographical proper name from the geographical feature name, for example Beijing Shi, Hebei Sheng.

But, it seems to me ISO 7098 11.6 makes an exception for the names of small villages and towns and other place names. As commented above, this would create inconsistent interpretation by catalogers. I would also suggest not making such a special rule, instead, applying 11.4 instruction.

2012 汉语拼音正词法基本规则 6.2.2.3 已专名化的地名不再区分专名和通名，各音节连写
A place name is already a proper name, write all words in the name together without

---

Connection of syllables
2C. Two-syllable place names, in which the second syllable is a generic term. Separate and capitalize a generic term for jurisdiction.

吴縣 Wu Xian 祁縣 Qi Xian

2D. Place names consisting of more than two syllables. Separate and capitalize a generic term for jurisdiction.

宝山区 Baoshan Qu
鹿港镇 Lugang Zhen
翠亨村 Cuiheng Cun

If I remember it correctly, the ALA/LC practice used to be the same as the ISO practice. It was changed later after pinyin conversion. It might be good to be consistent for all characters representing "jurisdictions." Other characters not referring to jurisdiction can be joined.

You are right. It appears in the pinyin conversion project document (2001). I prefer current ALA-LC instruction.

separation of space. Wangcun (王村【镇】). ex 二道白河 it is a proper township name ignore the general geographic "river" in the name. (This was used for smaller villages and towns and was according to the Pinyin Zhengci 法) If general practice is to have jurisdiction unit written separately from the proper name, it then should be consistent, "Wangcun" should be "Wang Cun", as examples in 县、镇 in ALA-LC table. Having a "see" reference between 11.6 (the special rule for smaller place names) and 11.4 (the general rule for Chinese place names) would be better than the current version. (1) It is too demanding for a cataloger to determine a village as large or small. Besides, the size of a village can change, while a place name is hard to change once a form is used. (2) I suggest "Wang Cun" (for 王村), not "Wangcun." The latter can cause confusion. (3) But when the small administrative units 村 and 乡 become parts of proper names, they can be aggregated. Example: 萍乡煤矿 Pingxiang Meikuang.	
11.7 In accordance with the principle of adhering to the original, non-Chinese personal names and place names are to be written in their original Roman (Latin) spelling … Under certain conditions, the *Hanyu Pinyin* may precede or replace the original spelling. Example 1 Marx (马克思, Makesi) Example 9 New York (纽约, Niuyue) Example 10 Tokyo (东京, Dongjing) Example 11 Ürümqi (乌鲁木齐, Wulumuqi) This is a major difference between ISO 7098 and current version of ALA-LC Table. ISO 7098 11.7 follows the principle of adhering to the original and instructs that non-Chinese personal names and place names are to be written in their original Roman (Latin) spelling. On the contrary, ALA-LC Table Romanzation 3. instructs that Romanize words of non-Chinese origin systematically IN ALL CASES, EVEN THOUGH normalized non-systematic romanizations are known or the word comes from a Latin script language. I am supporting the practice of ALA-LC Table with this regard. 2012 汉语拼音正词法基本规则 6.2.3 非汉语人名，地名的汉字名称，用汉语拼音拼写. ISO Romanization of Chinese follows the Hanyu pinyin Zhengci fa: Pinyin romanization first plus qualifiers in parenthesis with Chinese characters, and English/Latin name).	Romanization 3. Romanize words of non-Chinese origin systematically in all cases, even though normalized non-systematic romanizations are known or the word comes from a Latin script language. 乌鲁木齐 Wulumuqi not Urumchi 東京 Dongjing not Tokyo Connection of syllables 2F. Names of non-Chinese jurisdictions are romanized in the same manner as the names of Chinese jurisdictions. 紐約市 Niuyue Shi By definition, transliterations should always match the characters they transliterate. If the original name or commonly known Roman (Latin) spelling is desirable for clarification, it can be provided in parentheses. Examples, 马克思 = Makesi (Marx) 纽约 = Niuyue (New York) 纽约市 = Niuyue Shi (New York City) 东京 = Dongjing (Tokyo) 乌鲁木齐 = Wulumuqi (Ürümqi)

Exceptions are always hard to determine. ALA-LC's instruction is good and no need to change: "Romanize words of non-Chinese origin systematically in all cases, even though normalized non-systematic romanizations are known or the word comes from a Latin script language."	I agree. I also think it is easier for catalogers to transliterate what appears on a resource than trying to figure out "their original Roman (Latin) spelling."
Agree with most comments. One of the principles of RDA is to transcribe information as it appears. "Adhering to the original" is not supposed to be a concern.	Agree. Another argument is that often with bibliographic data, one may not know the original form in Latin script. This instruction is not practical and will create inconsistent practice. It's better not making a conditional instruction on when to use pinyin and when to use original form. It may create confusion and/or barrier to users' bibliographic search.
Justify LC's current practice, romanize words of non-Chinese origin: no research is needed to find the original name, therefore more user friendly; as Dongyun commented, the LC practice adheres to the RDA principle "to transcribe information as it appears"; cite GB 汉语拼音正词法基本规则 6.3.2 非汉语人名、地名的汉字名称，用汉语拼音拼写。 Wulanfu （乌兰夫）Makesi （马克思）	
(1) Many, if not the vast majority of, Chinese translations of non-Chinese (including Western) works do NOT mention the original author's name or the original title. Catalogers have no obligation to do intensive research to find out the original work.	
(2) If information of the original author and title are known, they can be given in a note in the bibliographic record.	
(3) Despite its Uighur origin, 乌鲁木齐 is a Chinese city. All Chinese cities should use Hanyu Pinyin for romanization -- is "Wulumuqi," not "Urumqi."	
(4) By the same token, old postal names of Chinese place names should be replaced by their Hanyu Pinyin equivalents -- 福州 is "Fuzhou," not "Foochow"; 哈尔滨 is "Haerbin," not "Harbin."	
11.8 Transcribed names which have already become Chinese words are to be spelled according to their Chinese pronunciation.	Connection of syllables 2I. Names of continents and regions. Generic terms are separated and capitalized in the names of continents and regions.
Example 1 Feizhou (非洲, Africa) Example 2 Nanmei (南美, South America) Example 4 Dongnanya (东南亚, Southeast Asia)	亞洲 Ya Zhou 東南亞 Dong nan Ya 北美洲 Bei Mei Zhou
I am no sure about this proposal either. But, I have to say that the justification for ALA-LC 2F. makes more sense than ISO7098-11.8.	If I remember it correctly, the ALA/LC practice used to be the same as the ISO practice. It was changed later after pinyin conversion. The ISO practice might be more intuitive for most people, but the question is what is more logical and easy to understand. I'm undecided on this.
If geo names already become Chinese words and are to be spelled according to their Chinese pronunciation, it should also follow instruction 11.4 to separate the geographical proper name from the geographical feature name and capitalize the first letter of both.	If we advocate for keeping the ALA-LC practice, I will suggest we suggest to LC to use upper case for all characters for the place name since it is a proper name, e.g., Dong Nan Ya.
Agree, there is no need to make a special rule for the names of continents and regions in ISO7098 11.8, instead, apply ISO 7098 11.4 instruction to keep the practice consistent.	
This creates confusion as well in interpreting what "have already become Chinese word", ALA-LC instruction is more clear.	

Agree. Having a "see" reference between 11.8 (the special rule for names that became Chinese words) and 11.4 (the general rule for Chinese place names) would be better than the current version.	