

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Dave Reser, LC Representative
Subject: Fictitious Families and Corporate Bodies (Revision of RDA 10.0, 10.3.1.3, 10.11.1.2, 11.0, 11.7.1.4, 11.13.1.2)

Thanks to the British Library for analyzing the issues related to fictitious families and corporate bodies, we generally agree with the proposal.

Challenges in Application

We note that there will be challenges in applying these concepts in reality, especially given the overlap with the *Library of Congress Subject Headings* and when to move certain named entities from “subjects” to “names.” We caution that not all groupings of fictitious, legendary, non-human entities, etc., constitute a family or a corporate body—the RDA definition of corporate body must still apply. For example, in our opinion the “escaped pigs” used in the proposal is merely an appellation applied by the press to two individual pigs with a shared experience, and not a corporate entity as defined in RDA. Likewise, we do not consider “the three little pigs” of nursery rhyme fame or the Gorgons of Greek mythology to be corporate bodies. Should the proposal be approved, the movement of headings from LCSH to the LC/NACO authority file will need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis, with many issues to be resolved. Not all groupings will be converted.

We also note that there are problems when dealing with families and corporate bodies that are not issues for persons:

- Families composed of human and non-human members (e.g., Obama (Family) contains a mother, father, two daughters, and two dogs)
- Fictitious families that are real corporate bodies with identical or similar names (e.g., the actors who played the fictitious family the Bradys performed in Brady character as the musical group The Brady Bunch)
- Corporate bodies that have real and fictitious elements (e.g., the G.I. Joe Team is a fictional national-level armed services unit of a real national government, the United States)
- Real families with fictitious members (e.g., in television show *Reign* the real French royal family Valois (Royal house) has a fictitious member, Sebastian, brother of Francis II)

1. Add text to 10.0: We agree, with the deletion noted in the ALA response. We also ask whether “sacred scriptures or apocryphal books” is needed here and for corporate bodies. As we noted previously, there was no doubt that persons included persons named in sacred scriptures or apocryphal books, the problem was where to include terms like

“Biblical figure” in the RDA instructions. Since there is no need to use these labels for families and corporate bodies, we wonder if the scope may be shortened to say,

Families include fictitious and legendary families, and real non-human families.

2. Add example to 10.3.1.3: We agree to add **Fictitious family** as an example. We do not agree to add the “Tribe of Israel” example. Our Hebraica catalogers do not believe it is accurate to call any Tribe of Israel a family. Although these tribes are descended from the sons of Jacob, they are better described as large social groupings. We do not agree with ALA’s suggested addition to the parenthetical phrase, and we wonder if the parenthetical phrase should be deleted. According to section 7.6 of the Editor’s Guide, a parenthetical phrase should not be used “if the instruction can be readily illustrated or clarified either by a list of specified terms or by one or more examples following the instruction.” The parenthetical phrase adds no additional clarity to the instruction here.

3. Add example to 10.11.1.2: Agree to add examples, but would like to replace the one and not add the other. We suggest using **Walton (Fictitious family)** because examples relating to The Simpsons television program have already been used in five different instructions in RDA. (We also note that “Simpson” is the preferred name of the family in the television program “The Simpsons”, so the example would need to remove the final “s”.) As we stated above, we do not agree to the Zebulun (Tribe of Israel) example. The problem with providing an example of a family from a sacred scripture is that either the family has no surname or surname equivalent by which they may be called collectively, or they are royal houses already covered in the examples. For real non-human families, there is a similar difficulty. We think the one new example is sufficient for now.

4. Add text to 11.0: Agree; see our comment above about 10.0. We note that there is little likelihood of identifying corporate bodies in most sacred scriptures, but this structure does promote consistency with parallel instructions in Chapters 9 and 10 if text in 10.0 is approved with the phrase “sacred scriptures or apocryphal books.” Also agree with the deletion noted by the ALA response.

5. Add example to 11.7.1.4: As noted above, we do not believe the escaped pigs are really a corporate body; we agree with the replacement example for the Cat circus supplied in the ALA response. We would prefer not to add the additional parenthetical phrase proposed for 11.7.1.4 in the ALA response (see “Additional issues not addressed in this proposal” below).

6. Add example to 11.13.1.2: Agree with the ALA-proposed replacement of the Tamworth Two example with “The Amazing Acro-Cats (Cat Circus)” example. We would like to retain the Niagara examples because they show using different types of

ships in the authorized access points for ships to break conflict instead of double qualifying by ship and model number. We suggest adding this example instead of one for Enterprise: **Reliant (Fictitious spacecraft)**. We note that the number of Enterprise ships in Star Trek television programs and motion pictures combined with the alternative histories and inconsistencies in registry numbers make an Enterprise example unnecessarily complex.

The ALA response also identified examples elsewhere in RDA:

10.3.1.3: we agree

10.11.1.2: “Clan” should be omitted from the preferred name “MacKenzie” as it is a type of family not the preferred name. We suggest removing the proposed “Yngling” example, as it likely represents a mix of both real and legendary family members, and is thus not a clear example.

11.2.2.3: we agree

11.2.2.5.3: we agree

11.2.2.3.4: we agree

11.2.3.5: we agree

11.13.1.2: we would prefer to keep only the WKRP example. The UNACO example represents a fictional part of a real organization, an issue that may be too distracting for a typical example.

Additional issues not addressed in this proposal

Thanks to ALA for raising these additional issues:

1. Fictional events. Because the additional attributes for a fictional event (e.g., a fictional place) needs clarification, we would prefer to wait until the JSC Places Working Group has had an opportunity to think through the issue.
2. Fictitious governments. We would prefer that the JSC Places Working Group consider the impact of fictitious governments as they discuss the broader issues with chapters 16 and 11.
3. Jurisdictions. We would prefer that the JSC Places Working Group consider the impact of fictitious governments as they discuss the broader issues with chapters 16 and 11.
4. Additional examples needed in Chapters 19 and 20: we agree with the example proposed for 20.2.1.3. Although an example for Chapter 19 was not proposed, we note that for a work of a fictional corporate body, we assume that the corporate body could be considered a creator only if the 19.2.1.1.1 thresholds are met.