

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Dave Reser, LC Representative
Subject: Eliminating the instructions for Date of Expression of a Religious Work (RDA 6.24) and modifying the instructions for Authorized Access Point Representing an Expression of the Bible (RDA 6.30.3.2)

LC thanks ALA for its effort to resolve one of the “issues deferred until after the first release of RDA.” We agree in theory that the current instructions in 6.24 and 6.30.3.2 are problematic because they explicitly say to record a date associated with a manifestation (date of publication) as the date of expression. However, we believe that identifying the date of expression is much more complicated for the Bible than for most other works. Because of these complexities, we ask which factor is more important—1) the necessity to be true to the FRBR model in recording the date of expression for a Bible or 2) the practicality of implementing this for the most published, translated, and edited work in history?

Complexities of Versions of the Bible

The complication with describing expressions of the Bible is that there are often multiple derivative expressions of an expression that we describe as a “version.”

The examples proposed by ALA for 6.10.1.3 do not reflect the date of expression as defined in the scope at 6.10.1.1—the earliest date associated with the expression. The first Authorized Bible (aka King James Bible) was first printed in 1611, but the **earliest** date associated with the expression is 1604 because King James *authorized* a new translation of the Bible in 1604 at Hampton Court.¹ Thus, the date of expression that should be recorded is 1604 according to the definition for the element date of expression.

In 1769, a new revision by Benjamin Blayney of the Authorized version was published. Although it is still the Authorized version, it is different expression so we believe that 1604 is not appropriate to record as the date of expression. For this expression, the manifestation date of 1769 is appropriate to consider as the date of expression. Most Bibles published in the United States that describe themselves as a “King James Version” are manifestations of the 1769 expression, not the 1604 expression². Unfortunately, this information is often not stated on the manifestation, and so a cataloger must either compare the text of the manifestation in hand to authoritative manifestations of the 1604 and 1769 versions to determine the difference, or they must already possess enough knowledge of the different versions to determine this difference. Many catalogers may

¹ See <http://exhibits.lib.byu.edu/kingjamesbible/why-kjv.php>, <http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/exhibitions/KJV/hamptoncourt.html>, and <http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/sacredtexts/kingjames.html> for information about the history of this expression.

²David Norton. *A textual history of the King James Bible* (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2005), 103-109.

not even be aware that this is an issue, and they will record the incorrect date of expression based on the popular association of 1611 with the KJV. Although we do not have the resource described in the example, we suspect that the date of expression for ALA's 1611 example would probably be 1769. As this paragraph demonstrates, determining the appropriate date of expression is complicated. Some might ask if it matters to users whether 1604 or 1769 is recorded as the date of expression. We think it does because many of our users find the first quotation difficult to read but not the second:

But wee are not of them who draw backe vnto perdition: but of them that beleeeue, to the sauing of the soule.

But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul.

The Problem of Application with Legacy Data

If ALA's proposal is accepted, LC would not be able to apply the changes retrospectively due to our large legacy file. It would be impossible to determine the correct date of expression without examining each Bible, and we have over 10,000 resources containing the Bible or its parts. In addition, even if we were to examine the Bibles, the level of textual analysis required to determine the real date of expression would make the task impossible.

We appreciate that many libraries adopting RDA do not have the problem with AACR2 legacy data that LC has, so we would be willing to support this proposal with some minor revisions. However, we have also suggested an alternative approach for keeping 6.24, in place and providing instructions for catalogers when date of expression for the Bible is difficult to determine, thus hopefully negating the need to be an expert in the history of versions of the Bible in order to construct an authorized access point.

Punctuation Issue with Date of Expression

Finally, we note that ALA's proposal does not address Appendix E. E.1.2.5 says that date of work and date of expression should be punctuated the same way: "Enclose a word, phrase, date, or other designation used for conflict resolution in parentheses." The reason dates in authorized access points for Bibles are punctuated differently is because of this instruction in E.1.2.5: "Precede the year of publication of a sacred scripture by a full stop and a space." Since ALA has removed the instructions to use date of publication for the Bible, the authorized access points would look like this:

Bible. Old Testament. Ethiopic (1923)

However, we note that the conflation of date of work and date of expression in E.1.2.5 (taken from AACR2 instructions) has been problematic since RDA was published because many catalogers did not follow AACR2 instructions for punctuation of dates of expression. Instead, they followed punctuation conventions outlined in the LCRIs, which treated a date of expression like the date of publication of a sacred scripture. Because many RDA examples were taken from the LC/NACO authority file, the ones in 6.27.3 using date of expression do not actually conform to the instructions in E.1.2.5. We propose to rectify this problem now by changing the instructions in E.1.2.5 to reflect the actual practice. We have not proposed a change to the highlighted phrase, because of the changes we proposed in 6JSC/Music/4/LC response to E.1.2.5. If the JSC agrees to the concepts for both of the revisions we proposed, we can provide a mark-up version of E.1.2.5 that reconciles both revisions.

[...]

Enclose an ~~word, phrase, date, or~~ other designation used for conflict resolution in parentheses.

Enclose a date of work in parentheses.

Separate a word, phrase, date, or other designation used for conflict resolution from another word, phrase, date, or other designation also used for conflict resolution by a space, colon, space.

Precede the date of expression by a full stop and a space.

[remainder omitted]

Other Issues Raised by ALA's Proposal

1) Different date applicable to different parts

The 1971 example proposed by ALA for 6.10.1.3 raises an interesting question of what to do when the earliest date of expression is different for different parts. In the resource described, it appears that the date of expression for the Old Testament is 1946-1952, for the New Testament, 1971, and for the Apocrypha, 1957. Our proposal for 6.24.1.4 addresses this issue.

2) Further difficulty in determining which date applies to which version

ALA's proposed revision to the Martin example in the 1st example box at 6.30.3.2 may be incorrect. The expression is a translation by David Martin. Martin died in 1721 so it

is unlikely that he produced a translation in 1855. (We were unable to determine why ALA decided that 1855 should be the date of expression. We verified that it is one of many publication dates associated with the title in this example, but it is not the earliest.) Martin appears to have produced multiple translations of parts of the Bible. In 1696, his translation of the New Testament was published. In 1707, his translation of the whole Bible was published, but we were unable to determine whether the New Testament in this publication was the same expression as the 1696 one, or if it was another expression. Many subsequent publications of Martin's translation say that it has been revised from the original, but we could not determine if this was a repetition of language found on the 1707 publication, or if further revisions had been made. Without examining all manifestations of the Bible that involve David Martin, we cannot say how many expressions are involved.

3) Facsimile reproductions

We agree to this Alternative deletion at 6.24.1.4 and 6.30.3.2.

4) Elements listed at 6.30.3.2

The ALA mark-up does not show a change in instruction reference iii) from 6.24 to 6.10. If 6.24 remains as LC suggests below, the instruction reference should not change.

5) Changing 6.24 to a reference to relevant instructions

As we stated in our response to 6JSC/ALA/32, LC would like the JSC to discuss the precedent of 6.22. We would also suggest that the added complexity of date of expression of a religious work, including the Bible and its parts, merits a separate instruction. We suggest that a future expansion of 6.24 for other sacred scriptures might be desirable as RDA becomes more international.

LC proposed revisions for 6.24.1.4

This proposed revision leaves 6.24 as an element, with the current scope, sources, and general recording instruction. We propose alternative wording for 6.24.2.4. Note that using a manifestation date for an expression date is allowed in the current scope statement of 6.24.1. Because of time constraints, we have not included any examples. We have confirmed that the Examples Editor would be willing to provide them if this revision is accepted by the JSC.

6.24.1.4 The Bible and Parts of the Bible

Record the year of publication of the resource: date of the expression for the Bible or a part or parts of the Bible by giving the year or years alone unless a more specific date is needed to distinguish one expression from another expression.

[EXAMPLES TO BE ADDED]

If no specific date can be identified as the date of expression, treat the date of the earliest manifestation embodying the expression as the date of expression.

[EXAMPLES TO BE ADDED]

If:

neither the earliest date of expression nor manifestation can be determined

and

a date of expression is needed to differentiate one expression from another

then:

record the year of publication of the manifestation.

For a Bible which contains parts associated with different dates of expression, record the dates of expression for each part.

[EXAMPLES TO BE ADDED]

EXAMPLE

1959

1848

1964?

Resource described: The Old and New Testaments of the Holy Bible.— Revised Standard Version.—
New York : Nelson, [1964?]

Alternative

If the resource is a facsimile reproduction, identify the original expression and the facsimile separately. Record the year of publication appropriate for each one.

EXAMPLE

1534

2002

Resource described: Biblia, das ist, Die gantze Heilige Schrift deudsch / Mart. Luth. ; begnadet mit kü
rfurstlicher zu sachsen Freiheit.— Köln : Taschen, ©2002. Facsimile of a 1534 publication

If the resource was published over more than one year, record the earlier or earliest year.

EXAMPLE

~~1883~~

Resource described: La Sagrada Biblia / traducida de la Vulgata latina al español, aclarado el sentido de algunos lugares con la luz que dan los textos originales hebreo y griego, é ilustrada con varias notas sacadas de los santos padres y expositores sagrados, por d. Félix Torres Amat. — Barcelona : Montaner y Simon, ~~1883~~ 1884