Explanations of recurring issues from the LRM World-Wide Review
December 2016

1) *Nomen as an entity*

FRAD and FRSAD both recognized that the thing itself and the labels used to refer to it should be separate entities to enable manipulation within the model, such as participation in relationships or bearing attributes. In the formal structure of entity-relationship models, only entities can serve as domains and ranges of relationships, only entities can have attributes.

Being able to make distinctions of this sort is an important feature of bibliographic systems, and is the basis for authority control. Although the labels are strongly associated with their referents in our minds, this should not obscure the fact that these are in fact different things.
Language (value=English) is an attribute of the label 'lion' but not of {lions} as a group of mammals. 410 (meaning Linguistics) is a *nomen* in the DDC, but not in UDC. The source vocabulary is essential in interpreting the string.

Without the entity *nomen* in IFLA LRM, then attributes LRM-E9-E1 to LRM-E9-E9 inclusive would have to be deleted, and the relationships LRM-R13 has-appellation, LRM-R14 *nomen*-assignment, as well as LRM-15 to LRM17 (*nomen* equivalence, whole/part, and derivation) would all have to be deleted. Without these we could no longer indicate anything about the scheme or system that uses a *nomen*, or any of its characteristics, nor what *agent* is responsible for assigning it.

Implementing *nomen* as a mere attribute of the entity *res* would have the effect of listing an entirely undifferentiated list of terms that have been used to refer to the entity without being able to understand anything about their context of use or record any of their interrelationships.

2) *Res as an entity*

Similarly, unless an entity with the function of LRM-E1 *res* (whatever label is given to it) is declared in the model, all relationships that apply to "all" entities would have to be declared individually with every entity in the model. This includes the subject relationship, nomen-assignment, and association to *place* or *time-span*. Again the model would have considerably less utility without all of these relationships. Declaring the relationships separately does not work for the subject relationship unless entities are declared for all "topics" that may be subjects but have no other role in the model.

3) *Inheritance of properties*

The introduction of entity hierarchy in the model (using an enhanced entity-relationship model) specifically allows for the transfer of properties (attributes, relationships) "down" from the superclass entity to its subclasses. The superclasses must be declared as entities for this mechanism to be formally available within a model or other implementation structure (such as a namespace). For a machine it is not enough for the concept of "applying to all" to be simple to grasp by a human being.

4) *What is the real world?*

The term *real world* is not restricted to physical things. It includes the world of concepts and ideas, which are quite real even though they are not physical. The bibliographic universe is a subset of the real world, and includes some physical things and some conceptual objects.

5) *Interaction or interpretation of existing authority files*

Many current authority files concern names used as personal or corporate body names, including "real names", "pseudonyms" or other names presumed to be required as access points; they do not directly cover the persons or corporate bodies themselves. IFLA LRM does not require that authority files be considered as recording data about *persons* as such. The role of authority files is to control *nomens* of all kinds.

6) *Fictional agents*

Whenever evidence seems to point to a fictional agent, we know that some physical individual or existing group actually produced the action, using the particular name which is perceived as fictional. This is formally identical to the case of a pseudonym, it is only due to cultural knowledge that the name chosen by the *agent* is perceived as fictional. If I write under the name Jane Marple, it is a plausible "real name", a plausible "pseudonym" and only if I am a fan of Agatha Christie, I will also recognize it as a reference to a fictional character. This must be very annoying to any real Jane Marples in the world.

The implication for library authority files is that distinct identification is needed for a fictional character used as a subject (such as for the biography of Agatha Christie's Jane Marple) and for each use of a "known" fictional character as a pseudonym by a different real agent.

The fact that IFLA LRM excludes personas, spirits, fictitious characters, etc., from the scope of the *person* entity does in no way indicate that IFLA LRM prescribes that the current practice of creating authority records for personas, spirits, etc., <u>as authors</u>, should be abandoned: it simply indicates that the semantics of such authority records is that some non-fictitious *agent* (either a *person* or a *corporate body*), created some *work* that was published under a *nomen* that is understood as referring to some fictitious being.

7) *Fictional places and time-spans*

We need *places* and *time-spans* in the model to model the physical world and the actual events that happen in it. This link to the physical world serves for useful retrieval. The distinction is important to users for subject retrieval.

Fictional places or time-spans are valid concepts and can be used as such, for instance as objects of the subject relationship, or can bear *nomens*. As concepts, fictional places and fictional time-spans are instances of *res*, but not of the entities *place* or *time-span*.

A place of publication may be deliberately erroneous but refer to an actual place, or it may refer to a fictional place. In some MARC formats this distinction (a level of data about data) is recorded.

Consider the example under LRM-E4-A4 where "chez Pluton, aux portes de l'Enfer" is transcribed as a place of publication: we all know that publication event happened in some physical location, and not at the Gates of Hell, whether we know what place it is or not. Naturally the phrase "portes de l'Enfer" is transcribed in the publication statement (one of the *Manifestation statements*) since transcribed data is significant in bibliographic description.