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Abstract

Purpose: This study was conducted to investigate Feasibility of Resource Description and Access (RDA) implementation in manuscripts’ bibliographic records.

Methodology: The present research is based on the Research and Development based on documentary and the comparative approach.

Findings: The findings prove that out of the identified elements in RDA, (chapter 1 to chapter 7) 33 elements are related to manuscripts. Thus, 77.88 percent of the elements in RDA correspond with the elements used in cataloguing of Astan Quds Razavi and only 12.12 percent does not correspond with them, which demonstrates a near relationship between the elements and rules related to cataloguing of manuscripts in Astan Quds Razavi and RDA.

Conclusion: This research is not only a comparative study of the rules and the elements of bibliographic records of manuscripts database of Astan Quds Razavi to the rules and the elements of standard manuscripts of RDA, but it also demonstrates the situation of description of manuscripts in the manuscripts database of Astan Quds Razavi and RDA. This study demonstrates the capabilities of the RDA for cataloging rare materials in Persian and Arabic language script.
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Introduction

The main task of libraries is to provide services to users; and organizing the information plays an important role in accomplishing this task. On the other hand, users’ expectations necessitate changing the approaches and strategies of organizing the information in libraries. Thus, within the last decades, we have observed a wide variety of developments in the field of organizing information, from Anglo-American cataloging rules, that is an international cataloguing standard, to Resource Description and Access (RDA), which is based on Anglo-American rules but different in terms of structure and content. RDA standard has adopted its entities, relations and terminology from three conceptual models, “Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR)”, “Functional Requirements for Authority Data (FRAD)” and “Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data (FRSAD)” that its instructions has been adapted from International Cataloging Principles (ICP) designed by IFLA (Moradi, 1391). RDA’s main aim is to discover the effective information resources and display the conceptual relations between them for users.

Astan Quds Razavi Library, that officially dates from the 9th century SH, with more than 84 thousand unique manuscripts, claims to contain the largest collection of manuscripts in the Middle East (“the largest collection of manuscripts of the Middle East in Astan Quds Razavi library”, (2012-2013)). Due to the superior features of the new standard of RDA, such weaknesses have led us to adjust the elements of this standard to the elements used in bibliographic records in the manuscripts database of Astan Quds Razavi in this research. So this research tries to answer:

**Question 1: How is the compliance status of the elements of Astan Quds Razavi manuscripts and its related rules comparing to the elements related to the manuscripts and the standard rules of the Resource Description and Access(RDA)?**

* Punctuation marks: The question mark is used in Anglo-American to refer to the doubts; andin the terms of librarians’ knowledge to interpret a question mark, using this symbol to show the falsity of a scribe causes confusion in understanding the information. Therefore, providing a note to express the falsity like what is offered in RDA is a more useful option. Also,
using phrases such as: “Perhaps, it is from …”, “Probably, it is one of the works of …”, given that each of these phrases has different extents of intensity and weakness, does not seem suitable in the cases in which there is a doubt about the creator of the work. Since to interpret such phrases there is uncertain information on the part of the users and on the part of the cataloguers, applying the known symbols like question mark seems more useful.

* In terms of description, given that in RDA, the approach of describing the elements of the core has been taken into consideration and in the cataloguing rules of Astan Quds Razavi, describing the source is considered as much as possible, a required level for description leads to harmony in cataloguing manuscripts by different cataloguers and thus consistent records.

**Abbreviations**

It seems that manuscript cataloging does not emphasize the brevity, except where duplicate information exists, providing clear words seems suitable for abbreviations and also emphasis on the use of defined and single terms is necessary. On the other hand, using full terms instead of abbreviations is because of user-oriented RDA standard, which considers users’ understanding and usability of the phrases to provide the information. The information source in manuscript cataloguing is at first the source itself and if it is needed, any sources in which reliable information can be found unlike RDA whose sources have been prioritized and respectively they are the main source of information, the source itself and the Supplementary materials. The approach of gaining information from reliable sources to describe the scare sources like manuscripts seems useful.

**Titles:** According to the explanation provided below the element of Title Proper in RDA and the explanation provided for manuscript cataloguing, the Title Proper and the Main Titles are equal to this difference that in RDA, the title is transcribed in accordance with the Preferred Title for the Work. First, the information source is the source itself, but if there is no title, the other sources describing the source and each source that is available like the reference source is used. However, according to Astan Quds Razavi manuscript cataloguing rules, the title is not transcribed but it is written in the correct form and the information source is at first the source itself and
the preferred source of information is endowment or dedicate\(^1\) and other source of information is the text of the resource and the table of contents.

In RDA, it has been expressed that in a work that has a common title and also especial content titles, the common title is recorded as the Title Proper and especial content titles as related works. On the other hand, in terms of content, sources of manuscripts can be divided into two main groups: single items and the collection. Collections themselves include a variety of types such as: Jong\(^4\), Bayazes\(^5\), treatises, articles and Moraqqas. About cases like jongs or bayazes, which consist of various sources, an approach close to RDA is applied in a way that the name of the first existing title in the source is considered as the framework of the cataloguing and for other titles exist in the item, an identifier like added entry of the title of the author is considered. According to manuscript cataloguing rules of Astan Quds, the title comes to explain the Title Proper or it is inserted by the author or writer is placed below a Variant Title, while based on the explanation provided in RDA about subtitles, such titles should be considered equal to the Title Proper. According to RDA, Other Title Information element, which demonstrates characteristics or content source/inspiration of Resource publication, is a title which precedes Title Proper after two dots. According to manuscript cataloguing rules, this title is inserted after “in” by the author or writer and is recorded as Other Title element (Variant Title). While in RDA, Other Title element has a different definition, and considering a title that follows and explains the Title Proper as Other Title element (Variant Title) is wrong. According to RDA, Other Title element is a title related to the source, which is different from Title Proper, Alternative Title, Parallel Title, and Other Title information. This title is placed against Other Title information in Astan Quds manuscript cataloguing rules. Below Other Title, it has been

---

\(^1\)Endowment or Dedicate is an inalienable religious endowment in Islamic law, typically donating a building or plot of land or even cash for Muslim religious or charitable purposes with no intention of reclaiming the assets. (See also: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Waqf](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Waqf))

\(^2\)It is a manuscript in which only one work has been inserted. Here, by one work, it means that the work has been written or gathered or named by only one person (Safari AghGhale, 1390).

\(^3\)A collection consists of some independent works. It can consist of several treatises with a few pages or several thick books.

\(^4\)This word has been used to name poetic collections.

\(^5\)The items whose one or some pages were written by scientists or known people.
mentioned that the titles which have been determined by the Recording and Preparing Describing the Sources Organization are considered as Other Title and this is against the definition provided for Devised Title.

Devised Title is a title made by the cataloguing organization for a source without any titles. This title can be placed against Subjective Title in Astan Quds manuscript cataloguing rules. When a title for a manuscript cannot be found, a title is considered based on its content. In the edition provided in 2008, Devised Title was considered as an independent title. However, in the edition provided in 2014, this title has been defined and explained below Main Proper and not as an independent title. It can be interpreted in this way that in terms of informational value, Main Title and Devised Title are equal.

According to RDA, Preferred Title for the Work is a title by which a work is known. It is also a title used in creating the Access Points. According to the present definition, the known titles of a work and its Main Title can be considered as its Preferred Title. According to the rules provided below the element of Preferred Title for the Work, it is implicitly pointed out that the Preferred Title for the Work is used to compile a work with various titles or a work consists of some works performed by one author or a part or some parts of one work and it uses various title entries to build a relationship between related works. While according to Astan Quds manuscript cataloguing rules, for a work with a known title, another title is also used, and to build a relationship between related works such as Sharh and Taligh, an element named Uniform Title is considered, which includes the title of the main work along with an explanatory expression like statement.

The approach applied in Astan Quds manuscript cataloguing towards Related Titles (Expression) Related Titles (Related resources) is that sources such as commentaries, marginal notes, summarizations, and critiques are considered as related sources and also listed independently and they build the relation between the main source and related ones using the Uniform title and also the added entry.

---

1Uniform Title in Anglo-American.
2Title Entry or Name/Title Entry in Anglo-American
3Two terms in traditional codicography which mean explanation and Suspension.
4Preferred Title for the Work in RDA
Mentioning the Exordium and Colophon in manuscripts cataloguing looks suitable because it provides useful information about the manuscript and it differentiates one work with various similar names from others. That is why in cataloguing, a great emphasis is put on this element.

At the first glance, a corrector can be regarded as an editor. However, the editor changes some information based on his/her own opinion while a corrector does not correct the materials based on his/her own opinion but based on the original manuscript. Such corrections are not visible in the text and generally, the corrected points are mentioned in commentaries or next to false items. Mentioning the name of corrector like other people who have had a role to create the manuscript sounds suitable because s/he attempts to approach the item to its initial originality. It is noteworthy that sometimes, correctors are well-known people whose names give value to the source.

It is important to mention the MahdialeKetab (similar author) and the author because referring to the founders and guardians of culture and science in the past is important and sometimes such information is as significant as the author or scribe of the book.

Considering the font type of commentaries is as significant as the font type of original text. The way of numbering old manuscripts has not directly mentioned in RDA and just it has been generally mentioned that the source is recorded depending to the way of numbering the source. While most of the manuscripts have not had numbering and they have related the pages to each other using rade\(^1\). Therefore, considering how to number a source without numbering is required. Moreover, sometimes, white pages in manuscripts were meaningful and valuable so they had better be mentioned. This issue has been mentioned in RDA and also to face with various numberings in one source, numbering the empty and advertising pages is overlooked, which is contrary to the Accessibility Title in RDA and it is better to mention all these issues below this element. To number white pages, two approaches can be considered: defining them as an independent element or mentioning them in notes.

\(^1\)A viscous material
Referring to the Exquisite is emphasized because it can rank various manuscripts of one work in terms of their value and mention to rare issues in them, which has not been considered in RDA and it is suggested to be considered in next editions.

**Statement of Responsibility Relating to Title Proper**

According to manuscript rules, an author has various roles: author, Expositionner\(^1\), commentator, scrivener\(^2\), translator, and summarizer. Based on the explanation given in RDA, all these roles are placed against the Statement of Responsibility Relating to Title Proper and by mentioning the role of each, its relation with the title is determined with this difference that in cataloguing manuscripts, along with the name of the author, other useful information used to identify the author is also mentioned. However, talking about corrector is a bit more complicated. In manuscripts, a corrector has been a person who removes the mistakes, misspellings and content mistakes from the scribed item by contrasting the scribed item to those items that are near the original ones in terms of originality and accuracy. This role can be considered as: 1. the originator of the manuscript because s/he attempts to give originality to the scribed items; 2. the editor of the manuscript with this difference that the corrections done by him/her are not based on his/her personal opinions but based on adapting the item.

The possibility of removing the author in statement of responsibility is contrary to what RDA claims, which leads to getting far from the goal of “finding” in FRBR and also to inconsistency among the catalogues related to one source.

**Statement of Production**

This statement in RDA somehow reflects reproduction of a non-printed source. Just the element of date is a core element and considering the elements of place and producer is optional, which shows that according to an

---

\(^1\) A specialized term in codicography that describes a viewpoint and a commentary about a subject (Mogharrar)

\(^2\) A person who uses a simple and understandable language to simplify a difficult subject.
information searcher, the date of production is considered as important information. However, this is under question because a searcher may use the cases, which may be deleted, to search the desired source, which is as important as other related elements. This element can be placed against the scribe in manuscripts while in manuscripts, a scribe has the role of reproduction of manuscripts and the name of a scribe, the data of scribing and the place of scribing are all the elements that must be recorded if the related information exists. In RDA, if the name of a producer is not real, a note conveys the real name of the author is provided. In manuscripts, by putting a question mark next to the name of a scribe, it gets clear that the name of the scribe is not real. In this case, in a note, it is explained that the name of the scribe is not real and if his/her real name is known, it is mentioned. Comparing to RDA in which the date of scribing the manuscript should be rewritten based on A.D., the date on the source is recorded using the symbols in that language. If the year and the month in which a manuscript was finished are not clear, the century is mentioned. In addition, if a source has more than one producer, their names are respectively mentioned. In manuscripts, recording the names of all scribes and that much of book they scribed is necessary.

Custodial History of Item

This element has been known as “possession of item or custody of item, which can be found in notes above or below the item, which shows its especial personal custody. In addition to custodian’s name and custodial history of item, other information is found in the custodial note such as the price of purchasing the item, the shape and design of custodian’s seal, which is found in the custodian’s note, which have been all neglected in RDA. Given that custodial history of item can be considered to discriminate the originality and significance of the item due to the item’s custodian, considering this point along with all details is useful and mentioning such information below a separate element in RDA confirms this issue.

Immediate Source of Acquisition of Item
In cataloguing manuscripts rules, there is an element named Production Type that under this element the manner of acquisition the information source is mentioned. Other information related to this element is the element of Production Date and if needed a brief commentary on the manner of production. This element is placed against Immediate Source of Acquisition of Item in RDA rules.

Media Type, Carrier Type, and Content Type are new terms in the organization area which have been widely and comprehensively explained and separated into three separable elements in RDA. Such elements have not been defined in Astan Quds manuscripts rules. Applying without carrier and without media terms in two elements of media and carrier seems unnecessary for textual sources and mentioning such cases do not help to search, find, identify and select the manuscripts sources while using the term of text in the element of content type can help searcher to identify the required content type. Moreover, considering textual content indirectly refers to this issue that the media type of required source is a no-intermediary media.

In Edition Statement among textual sources, printed sources have been more emphasized and the type of edition, which is known as correction in manuscripts, has not been considered. Moreover, emphasis on four edition signs have caused that correction of manuscripts can not be placed against this element while it seems useful to define an exception to consider correction as a subset of edition.

The Extent in RDA shows the number of volumes or the number of pages of a textual source. This element in Astan Quds manuscripts rules is called the number of pages and volumes. The element of dimensions in RDA consists of the extents of Carrier Characteristics. These dimensions have been considered in Astan Quds rules with a difference that the extent of volume is recorded in any circumstances and it is not limited to a special situation. Moreover, “the width of line” and “the width and length of text” are also recorded in special situations. The Material Type is considered as an informational element in RDA as well as manuscripts rules with a difference that the material type is implicitly mentioned while referring to the color or the quality of the material. The Used Material Type in RDA emphasizes the
typographic material and it does not consider details while in manuscript cataloguing, as the material type, it is implicitly mentioned while referring to details of the material. This is because the material type of most eastern manuscripts has been ink and all details about the ink type are considerable.

In RDA, to produce the source, which also consists manuscripts, an element named Production Method has been considered. This element, in manuscripts, considers the manner of creating the item. However, due to this fact that in English, generally, a hand-written text is called manuscript and there is no difference between an old manuscript from the manuscripts written by hand at the present, below this element, under the title of Production Method, different expressions are used to differentiate them. In eastern codicology, each old valuable hand-written text which was written using ink and inkwell and ink pad is called manuscript and it is differentiated from an hand-written item which is not old and written using new material. However, what Astan Quds does in cataloguing is to separate the manuscript written by the original author with the expression of black-colored from the other texts which were written by writer, expositionner, etc. but all of them are recorded with the name of manuscript while hand-written manuscripts are separated from other manuscripts with the expression of hand-written. The element of Layout is applied in both RDA and manuscript rules with this difference that in RDA, by layout we mean ordering the text, pictures, etc. However, according to manuscript rules, it means ordering the place of the main text, statement, place of poems etc. in the text and also the text format.

The element of book format in RDA has been named according to the manner of folding the pages and a name has been devoted to it based on the number of folding the pages, one time the pages have been folded or two times. This element also exists in manuscript cataloguing rules but in past, various book formats had especial names and now a book is measured based on centimeter. The element of font size is one of the elements which exists in both sets of rules with this difference that in RDA, a very big font size and a font size for those who are visually impaired have been more emphasized.

---

Such as italic, Chalipa(One of the Iranian traditional handwritings used for calligraphy), and official style.
However, in manuscript rules, in which it has been known as “[Dung] Font Size”, font size should be emphasized in any circumstances and for recognizing the font size, expressions like hidden, displayed have been considered.

Item-Specific Carrier Characteristics in RDA include every kind of carrier characteristic which are not applied for other items with a similar format and they are specific for that item. According to Astan Quds rules, layout of items, harms and deficiencies to items, the notes above and below the items, commentaries and the signs of items, exquisite, and other item-specific characteristics are like item-specific carrier characteristics which differentiate the item from other written ones. Thereupon there is an ambiguity to define this element in RDA because due to the given explanation, the scope consists of each characteristic which separates the item from other items which can be consisted of the majority of discussed cases in codicology about manuscripts. To describe item-specific characteristics of printed sources, some generalities have been also mentioned as specific characteristics that each one can be considered as a separate and important element in manuscripts studied in this research. Probably, to consider this element, the significance of other elements related to manuscripts have not been considered and perhaps this is because of focusing on various elements which may be dealt with in manuscripts. In this case, because just the generalities have been mentioned, RDA has neglected to consider the significant details about manuscripts to introduce and illustrate the item. Accordingly, it is better to consider the elements separately and for each its special rules be mentioned.

According to RDA, below the element of Restrictions on Access, restrictions on access to sources including the nature and the duration of restrictions on access are recorded. Such an element has not been considered in Astan Quds manuscript rules with this arguing that there is no access in manuscripts naturally due to antiquity and the unavailability of such

---

1 A very tiny and soft font which can be read hard and if you read it using a magnifier, it does not lose its beauty and style. It usually has the style of Nask [Ghobar] (MayelHeravi, Gholam Reza, 1974-1975, p. 81).
2 A tiny but readable font that is based on penmanship element [Khafi] (Ibid., P. 79).
3 A big font that is readable from a far distant [Jali].
resources. While this kind of restriction can be applied in Astan Quds manuscripts cataloguing in agreement with the worth of item and exquisite.

According to RDA, the element of content type is a categorization that reflects the base form of relationships by which the content and the human concept, that is to be transferred to audience, is expressed. Such an element has not been applied in Astan Quds manuscripts.

The element of Content Nature shows the main content of the source and it can be placed against descriptor or the explanation about the content of the item in Astan Quds manuscript cataloguing which both refer to the content of the work.

The element of Summary of Content, which gives a summary about the source’s material, has not been considered based on this approach in manuscripts. However, an explanation given about the content of the item sometimes consists a summary of the content of the source.

In RDA and Astan Quds manuscripts, below the Language of the Content, the language used to express the content of the work is recorded. In this case, there is no difference between RDA and manuscripts rules.

In RDA, an element has been devoted to the font that includes the alphanumeric typefaces. In Astan Quds manuscripts cataloguing rules, the element has been considered for this aim in addition to alphanumeric typefaces also consists of written Persian alphanumeric typefaces and it is better that such cases be also considered in RDA. The element of Content Color in RDA, which is the same content color used in various parts of Astan Quds manuscripts, is used in both sets of rules but in Astan Quds manuscript rules, there is no especial name for it.

Table 1. Adaptation of Extracted Elements from RDA and the Extracted Elements from Astan Quds Manuscript Cataloguing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The elements they are consistent.</th>
<th>The elements they are not consistent.</th>
<th>The total number of the elements in RDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.88%</td>
<td>12.12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In table 2, which adapts extracted elements from Astan Quds manuscript cataloguing and the extracted elements from RDA, out of 46 extracted elements, 63 percent has adaptation and out of 17 elements out of RDA scope, 37 percent does not have adaptation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The total number of the elements in RDA</th>
<th>The elements they are consistent.</th>
<th>The elements they are not consistent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The Unique Elements of Astan Quds Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>Donator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codicology</td>
<td>Exordium and Colophon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of Manuscript (Reason of exquisite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volume Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of Handwriting (Quality of Handwriting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of Exquisite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Color of Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Color of Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Pages (number of white pages rule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volume Decoration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. The Similar Elements in Two Sets of Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Manuscript elements in RDA</th>
<th>Manuscript elements in Astan Quds</th>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Manuscript elements in RDA</th>
<th>Manuscript elements in Astan Quds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>Title Proper</td>
<td>Main Title</td>
<td>2.7.4</td>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.11</td>
<td>Devised Title</td>
<td>Subject Title</td>
<td>2.7.6</td>
<td>Production Date</td>
<td>Writing Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4</td>
<td>Other Title information</td>
<td>Variant Title</td>
<td>Other title element</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>Custodial History of Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6</td>
<td>Variant Title</td>
<td>Other title element</td>
<td>Other Title information</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>Immediate Source of Acquisition of Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2</td>
<td>Statement of Responsibility Relating to Title Proper</td>
<td>Author – Commentator – Translator – Margin writer</td>
<td>Expositionner Writer – Compiler</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Identifier for the Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.2</td>
<td>Place of Production</td>
<td>Place of Writing</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Base Material</td>
<td>Paper Type</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Number of Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Applied Material</td>
<td>Ink Type</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>Language of the Content</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Production Method</td>
<td>Item Type</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Date of Work</td>
<td>Writing Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Layout</td>
<td>Layout Type</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Font Size</td>
<td>Font Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Book Format</td>
<td>Item Size</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>Color Content</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.5</td>
<td>Font Size</td>
<td>Number of Pages</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>Preferred Title for the Work</td>
<td>Uniform Title – Predominant Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.5</td>
<td>Font Size</td>
<td>Number of Volumes</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>Summarization of the Content</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Item Size</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>Item Decorations</td>
<td>Item Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Page Size</td>
<td>Item-Specific Carrier Characteristic</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
<td>Font – Font Type (various alphanumeric typefaces in one language)</td>
<td>Item Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin of the Work</td>
<td>Place of Writing</td>
<td>Nature of the Content</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The elements have been shown with one star are applied in Astan Quds manuscript cataloguing but they are not under a special title.
2 The elements have been shown with two stars are the same as the elements in RDA in terms of nature but they can be completely adapted or a suitable rule for it has not been considered yet.
Question 2: What characteristics does the proposed model for applying RDA to define bibliographic Persian/Arabic manuscripts have?

Emphasis on printed sources is one of the problems of RDA standard. This standard always emphasizes that if an element or some information is needed, it should be mentioned, while according to manuscript rules, all points are significant not to select but to define a non-accessible source to visualize the information. In terms of the element of layout, the layout mentioned in eastern manuscripts has not been considered in RDA rules and it is necessary that in RDA, such an element be mentioned. In RDA, book format is based on the number of folding pages which is not accurate enough for manuscripts and measuring the book format based on centimeter is more reasonable. Font size is more emphasized in manuscript rules while in RDA, it has not been more considered to record this element for scarce sources like manuscripts. According to manuscript cataloguing rules, comparing to RDA, to record font type two methods are considered: 1) scribed Persian alphabetic, 2) alphanumeric typefaces. While in RDA, just the alphanumeric typefaces have been considered. It seems suitable that such an aspect of font be considered in RDA too. Comparing to RDA in which font degree more refers to readability, in manuscripts rules, font degree more emphasizes the abnormal sizes like a very tiny font readable using a magnifier or a very big font.

In manuscripts, two aspects of beauty and readability had been considered and that is why various forms of calligraphy have been common during periods and now it is necessary that this aspect of quality be considered in RDA. Recoding the extent of text (the length of lines and the dimensions of text) is suitable because the real dimensions of the item even after its rebinding can be distinguished and the approximate number of words of a text can be guessed. In addition to the editor statement in RDA, some changes should be done to include corrector in eastern manuscripts too. Scope notes and the rules given below the element of statement are not complete and most given rules below this element are not suitable to this kind of source. Therefore, it is necessary to refer to old manuscript reproducer who is the same as the writer in statement of producer. Based on RDA standard, sometimes generalization to define the scope has caused that
some informational aspects in manuscripts, which are especially significant, be placed below a unique element and when it is necessary to provide some exceptions for these scarce sources, information is not carefully provided. For instance, to define the element of item-specific carrier characteristics, there is an ambiguity in RDA because due to the given explanation, the scope consists of each characteristic that differentiates the item from other items and about manuscripts; this can include most discussed cases in codicology.

Moreover, if we refer to the definition given for item-specific characteristics of printed sources, some generalizations have been mentioned as specific characteristics that can be considered as a separate and significant element in manuscripts. It is better to consider the elements separately and provide their special rules for each. In addition, in many cases, the elements of the two sets of rules are the same or similar in terms of nature while the rules provided below them in RDA have not included manuscripts. Because out of 37 percent inconsistency in Astan Quds cataloguing elements 97.3 percent is related to codicology, some revisions should be done to explain the dominant characteristics and especially item in RDA. In the element of the statement of edition, more printed sources have been emphasized and no attention has paid to the type of edition which is known as correction in manuscripts and emphasis on the four signs of edition has caused that correcting manuscripts cannot be placed against this element.

The element of Exordium and Colophon have been especially emphasized in manuscript cataloguing due to the useful information it provides about the item and because it differentiates one work with several similar names from each other. Moreover, mentioning the author and scribe is significant because it refers to originators and custodians of culture and science in the past and sometimes, such information is as significant as the name of creator or writer and it is necessary that such information be considered in RDA.

Referring to font type of commentaries in manuscripts is as significant as font type of the main text and the element of exquisite and it is because such information can be used to rank several items of a work in terms of their value and it refers to the scarce cases in it. That is why it should be
considered in RDA too. Given that referring to the number of white pages in manuscript cataloguing is also significant, RDA can consider two approaches to record it: it can either define it as an independent element or mention it in notes.
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