**To:**       Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

**From:**     Bill Leonard, CCC representative

## Subject:   Fictitious and other entities in RDA and the consolidated FR models

CCC thanks the Fictitious Working Group for their exploration of the treatment of place as an entity in RDA. CCC's response is informed by its members who are also involved in the IFLA FRBR Review Group and the Consolidation Editorial Group. CCC cannot support the consideration of non-human entities as persons. The proposal is going in the opposite direction from the anticipated FRBR Library Reference Model.

An initial assumption made in the summary of this report is faulty and undermines any further conclusions. The working group has decided that the consolidated FRBR LRM *should* use the FRAD definition of Person, regardless of what is actually happening. That leads to the assumption that one can simply change FRBRoo and FRBR LRM, changes that are outside the bounds of the jurisdiction of this working group.

It is useful to be reminded of the Fictitious Working Group's terms of reference.
> "The FRBR Review Group's Consolidation Editorial Group (CEG) is now in the final stages of its work on consolidating the three conceptual models. The JSC anticipates the consolidated model to treat the names of fictitious agents as name entities associated with the persons, families, and corporate bodies that are responsible in the real world for works, expressions, manifestations, and items. This will diverge from the current RDA treatment of the Person entity, which includes fictitious and legendary persons in its scope. The difference is significant, and moves the focus from the Person entity to a new Name (or Nomen) entity."
> http://www.rda-jsc.org/archivedsite/docs/6JSC-Chair-19.pdf

The current provisional definition of person in FRBR LRM is an individual human being, a subclass of agent, and agent is an entity capable of exercising responsibility relationships relating to works, expressions, manifestations or items.

Therefore a person in the FRBR LRM is being modeled as a real human being capable of exercising responsibility for a resource. The relationship between Nomen and Agent or Nomen and Person is what allows for flexibility in terms of dealing with multiple bibliographic identities, different types of pseudonyms and individuals or groups, same person with multiple pseudonyms, some used alone, some in collaboration with others, etc. This is not very different from the treatment of Party and Public Identity with ISNI.

When we look at RDA chapters 9-11, those are not chapters about persons, families, and corporate bodies, but they are chapters about the *names* for persons, families and corporate bodies.

We can use the nomen of a fictitious entity when describing who wrote the work, but the nomen has a relationship not to an imaginary person, but to a real person who created the work "in the name of the fictitious person". Neither ISNI nor the anticipated FRBR LRM are modelling for unreal persons. The nomen of the fictitious character who is purported to have created the work can be used to identify the work -- but there is an underlying understanding that the fictitious character did not actually write the novel. Rather, a human or a group of humans engaged in creating an intellectual or artistic creation is

responsible for the work's creation.  Even if we don't know the nomen of the real human, in terms of a conceptual model, one or more humans were actually involved in the creation of that work.

We may use AAPs representing names of agents as access points to find resources. This does not mean that the *only* access points that can be made to find resources have to be for names of agents. We also allow access to resources by subject, genre, etc, etc. Saying that an animal does not meet the model's definition of an agent does not mean that no access point can be given for a prominently named animal actor (the use case that seems to the most likely to actually occur in real library collections), it just means that we consider this access point to be for something else, not for an agent. In a general model such as FRBR LRM, this use case is too specialized to have a lot of mechanics devoted to it.

There is no reason that the same modelling must be applied to pseudonyms, characters in fiction, legendary beings, and those animals we take enough interest in to give names to. This makes the discussion of all three options presented on p. 6-7 moot.

In the past the tool at hand, the name authority file, was used to find a convenient home for names that were formulated like personal names (legendary beings, fictional people).  That does not make them people, nor does it tie us to this work-around forever.  Similarly, the subject file was a convenient home for terms that describe genres and forms, but in respect for the accurate definition of subject, genre and form terms have been moved elsewhere.

When considering whether one class of entities can be a sub-class of another, one must remember that all of the relationships and attributes defined for the super-class must make logical sense if applied to all members of the sub-class. This means that if we adopt a definition of "person" that includes animals and fictitious entities, and we still want to consider "person" to be a sub-class of agent then we must remove from agent all of the relationships and attributes that cannot be applied to all agents.  For instance the roles, agent owns item; agent publishes; agent distributes a manifestation, cannot be performed by an animal so, these must be moved downward to a sub-class specifically for real people.  Also, the relationships to timespan sub-types date of birth and date of death will have to be removed from "person" and moved down to a new sub-class of "person" because they are not logical for fictitious or mythological entities.  It is also useful to accept that there is a difference between not knowing a person's date of birth and considering that concept impossible.  The use of super-classes is supposed to allow machine short-cuts or chains of relationships, for these to be valid, all the links have to make sense.

Anything, not just agents, can have a nomen.  Simply being named does not make something into an agent. The argument that the nomen of an animal is viewed in FRBR-LRM as the nomen of an associated human is a fabrication.

The FRBR LRM model separates out the Nomen (as an entity) from the Agent entity.  The paper's conclusion that "nomens of fictitious and non-human persons described as agents can therefore only be Nomens of real persons" contravenes the model.  Pseudonyms can still be associated with manifestations by associating (or linking) the Nomen entity to the manifestation description.   It need not be a problem (or even evident) for a catalogue user that the underlying agent entity is a person or persons with real (or other) names.

CCC has sympathy with the desire to allow non-human real entities to be agents, for the very rare occasions when, for example, an animal actually participates in the creation of a work of art by willingly making paw prints on a canvas.  It must be admitted that occurrences of these animals-as-agents would be very rare, and that there is usually a human behind the agency.

CCC recognizes the recent effort undertaken by PCC to move the names of fictitious entities from the LCSH subject file to the LC/NACO file.  While the LC/NACO file is the largest file of RDA names, it is not the only such file.  Analysis of the VIAF file shows that there are only about 2,000 authority records for fictitious entities.  These cause problems way out of proportion to their number.

The solution could be the creation of a separate chapter in RDA for the nomens of fictitious entities.