

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Dave Reser, LC Representative
Subject: Evaluating authorized access point instructions for musical works at 6.28.1.1-6.28.1.8

Question #1: Does the JSC agree with the Music Working Group's analysis of the instruction? Should the Music Working Group pursue revision of 6.281.2 taking into account the issues raised above?

Response: We agree that the current instruction assists catalogers to make quick decisions for Western art music, but may not be applicable to all music traditions—we are pleased that the working group is willing to consider the larger musical world. Although it may be useful for the working group to determine the categories that do not call for the application of 6.28.1.2, it may be easier to limit the existing instructions to Western art music, and referring all others to the general instructions at 6.27.1.3. Further discussion of aggregates may also have an impact on this instruction.

Another approach the Music WG might want to consider is not a change of instructions based on musical genre, but general vs. specialized approach that could be handled by an Alternative applying to all "Musical Works with Lyrics, Libretto, Text, Etc." Perhaps the current approach is one that is more specialized, and the idea of treating collaborations between composer and lyricist as one work no matter how parts of it are published is a more general approach. Agencies that acquire a lot of musical works might wish to use the more specialized approach, while agencies with only a few musical works might want to use the more general approach.

Question #2: Does the JSC agree that this paragraph is needed in 6.14.2.5?

Response: Yes, it seems that a paragraph or two would be useful. However, the proposed wording by the Music WG seems contradictory at first glance. The first sentence says to consider these individual works, but the second sentence says to consider them to be compilations of works under certain conditions. The group may want to incorporate some of the wording from 6.28.1.3.1 in the first sentence (e.g., Consider pasticcios, ballad operas, etc., that are original compositions to be individual works) to make this clearer. The group may also consider adding a glossary definition for *pasticcios* given that the definition implied by RDA (there are both collaborative works and compilations) is not the same as the *New Harvard Dictionary of Music* definition (all compilations). Because we found several different definitions for *pasticcio* in reference sources, we think this is a term for which an RDA definition is needed to understand how the instructions are applied.

Question #3: Does the JSC agree with the analysis? Does the JSC want the Music Working group to pursue revisions based on maintaining or removing this exceptional practice?

Response: It does seem that the exceptional practice for a compilation of excerpts from a pasticcio, ballad, opera, etc., could be replaced. We were uncertain about whether the Music WG was suggesting these were parts of a work covered by 6.28.2.3 or whether these are compilations of individual works by different creators covered by 6.27.1.4? In AACR2, the concept in 6.28.1.3.3 (second paragraph of 21.19B1) was limited to when the music of a pasticcio, etc. consisted of previously existing ballads, etc. by various composers. In RDA, there is nothing in 6.28.1.3.3 that makes it clear that this instruction applies only to the type of work described in 6.28.1.3.2, and not also to the type of work described at 6.28.1.3.1. The working group may wish to consider the AACR2 scoping in their future discussions.

Question #4: Does the JSC agree with this analysis? Does the JSC want the Music Working Group to pursue revisions based on maintaining or removing this exceptional practice?

Response: The AACR2 instruction (which was limited to pasticcios, etc. consisting of previously existing ballads, etc.) said, "Enter a single song under the heading for its own composer, or under its title if the composer is unknown, and make a title added entry for the larger work." We believe this meant that the single song would have an authorized access point using the access point for the composer if applicable and the form of title as specified by Chapter 25. This makes perfect sense in the context of the AACR2 limitation to compilations discussed in RDA 6.28.1.3.2-- if a work was known by a composer/title before it was compiled into a pasticcio, it should be known in the same manner if it is extracted from that pasticcio (the cataloger could note a relationship between the work and the pasticcio). The working group may want to consider if the exceptional practice still makes sense for the pasticcios treated under 6.28.1.3.1 as collaborative "original compositions."

Question #5: Does the JSC agree that a paragraph should be added to 6.28.1 for choreographic movement?

Response: Yes, it seems useful to add such a paragraph (but to 6.28.1.1 no 6.28.1), it may be even more useful in the 6.28.1.4 instruction given that catalogers will be drawn to the caption of the instruction because choreographic works are mentioned and it is the only instruction that mentions "choreographic" in the caption. The reference at 6.28.1.1 is still helpful, but it would be one of over a dozen references there.

Question #6: Does the JSC agree that the above text should be added to 6.14.2.3? Should general guidance on adaptations also be added to 6.2.2?

Response: Given that the cataloger has to know what work they are identifying before they begin choosing the preferred title and other attributes of the work, this seems to be a more general principle for training purposes than an instruction that needs to be explicitly made, at least for general works. If it were to be made for general works, it would need to be made more broadly since adaptation is only one type of derivative work. It would

be applicable to other work attributes as well. Given the importance of “adaptation” in the music context, we have no problem with the suggested text for 6.14.2.3.

Question #7: Does the JSC agree that guidance for adaptors of musical works is appropriate in 19.2.1.1?

Response: This does not seem necessary, since the cataloger would have made the decision that a new work exists at 6.28.1.5.2. The difficulty with adaptations is in determining whether there is a new work or an expression of an existing work. Once that determination has been made, providing the relationship between the work and the creator is easy, and the existing instructions at 19.2.1.1 are adequate. The focus of Chapter 19 is relationships between works and persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with them. Chapter 6 is where specific instructions on “what is a new work” belong.

Question #8: Does the JSC agree that changes should be made to paragraphs 1 and 2 of 6.28.1.5.2 using language already present at 6.27.1.5?

Response: We suggest that the working group monitor the decisions made on 6JSC/LC/33 before making any decisions here. We also noticed that the proposed revision by the Music WG removes the possibility of an adaptation considered a new work that has an unknown creator.

Question #9: Should 6.28.1.6 remain at its current location, should it be moved to an exception at 6.28.1.5, or should it be moved to an exception at 6.28.1.2?

Response: This is a rather interesting exception, and deserves more thought. The instruction essentially treats these types of “adaptations” as expressions of the original work in form of access point (qualified by other designation), although the instruction implies that these are new works that do not apply the instructions elsewhere in Chapter 6. We suggest the working group also consider if this concept should be moved to 6.28.3.

Question #10: Does the JSC agree that the above text is needed in 6.2.2.9.1?

Response: Yes, the text would be useful, but the working group may want to consider whether it should be treated as an Exception at 6.2.2.9 along with parts of musical works and parts of religious works. Since the concept may be valid for more than one part as well as single parts, it belongs at 6.2.2.9 instead of 6.2.2.9.1.