

**TO:** Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

**FROM:** Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative

**SUBJECT: Bible Uniform Titles**

---

Whilst CILIP agrees with the points LC makes in respect of the need to make changes, when it comes to the proposals themselves there is far less agreement. Indeed, just about the only point on which agreement has been reached is the notion that there is no single “right” answer!

LC’s admission that its proposals are “not ideal” is noted, as is the desire to steer clear of solutions that are highly disruptive.

CILIP (as a JSC constituency) regrets that it is insufficiently knowledgeable about sacred scriptures in other faiths, so can do no more than ask whether there might be similar problems with varying traditions. For example, the **Koran** is used by both Sunni and Shia – do we know if there is any variation in the way these are referred to?

One of the fundamental points that is unclear to CILIP is how AACR2 (and, by default, *RDA*) perceives the Bible. Is it a single work, found in a number of different versions all essentially regarded as the “same” work? Or is it a collection – perhaps more accurately, a series of collections, some of whose contents overlap? This is surely fundamental to the level of collocation required (or, at least, considered desirable).

Since one of the main purposes of a uniform title is to collocate resources whose actual titles may vary, any approach which ends up with alternative uniform titles for the same work would seem to be flawed. Although the alternative proposed in **25.17** may be the best that can be achieved, it will undoubtedly work against cooperation. Also of concern is the open-ended nature of the alternative, given that what is included are only examples. Presumably, an agency that so wished could decide to use **Torah** in place of **Bible**, **Pentateuch**, without this needing to be explicitly sanctioned by *RDA*? The lack of control in implementing the alternative is worrying – one CILIP member would have preferred to see **Bible, Christian** (i.e. in inverted form, and again with a consistent approach in mind), and this is, of course, perfectly possible since the alternative proposed does not provide specific instructions.

**25.18A1** [old numbering]. The proposed removal of this rule seems to be unnecessary if the alternative suggested in 25.17 is adopted by a cataloguing agency. Since within a Christian Bible the division is not a problem, there seems to be no reason why an agency adopting the alternative should not also be allowed to retain the division into Old and New Testament for the Christian Bible. The division into testaments is a characteristic of the Christian Bible, and should be allowed for in the rules. CILIP also notes that one of LC’s aims was to preserve “the status quo with AACR2 for Biblical works in the

Christian context”, and retaining a hierarchy through the testaments for books of the Christian Bible accords with that aim in a way that the current proposal does not.

Rather than delete this instruction, CILIP wonders if LC considered creating an additional term, specifically for the Tanakh:

**Bible. Tanakh**

use of which would clearly apply only to the 24 books of the Jewish tradition? Implicitly, therefore, use of **Bible. Old Testament** would apply only to the Christian tradition. However, CILIP accepts that LC has spent some considerable time and effort in formulating its proposal and there are doubtless a number of possible alternative approaches (maybe including the one above) which were considered and subsequently rejected.

**25.18A2** [new numbering]. The elimination of the abbreviations **O.T.** and **N.T.** is acceptable to CILIP.

**25.18A3** [new numbering]. *AACR2* assumed that the only Apocryphal books were O.T., but this is not so. LC’s proposal removes this problem, because **Apocrypha** is subordinated directly to **Bible**. But some churches within Christianity would not regard these books as being part of the Bible at all, so the proposal goes only some of the way towards the removal of bias. It is not a complete solution.

In summary, it may be that the LC proposal is the least worst way of resolving the problem that LC set out to address. But CILIP is particularly anxious about the impact of the “Alternative” addition proposed for **25.17A**.