

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Damian Iseminger, Chair, JSC Music Working Group

Subject: Evaluating authorized access point instructions for musical works at 6.28.1.1—6.28.1.8

Abstract

This discussion paper evaluates the authorized access point instructions for musical works in 6.28.1.2—6.28.1.8.

Justification

As part of its tasks for 2014 and 2015, the Music Working Group was asked to “Review the instructions at RDA 6.28.1-6.28.3 and determine if any of the instructions would be better suited as instructions in RDA 6.14 or in chapters 19-20, especially as it concerns the treatment of adaptations, arrangements, and added accompaniments.” In its review, the Music Working Group narrowed the scope of its inquiry to the instructions for creating authorized access points for musical works at 6.28.1.2—6.28.1.8.

Review of 6.28.1.2—6.28.1.3

6.28.1.2 Musical Works with Lyrics, Libretto, Text, Etc.

While the Music Working Group agrees that this instruction needs to remain here for the time being, paralleling 6.27.1.3 for collaborative works, the Music Working Group is concerned that this instruction is far too overreaching to be applicable for all styles and genres of music because it does not take into account cultural contexts. For works like opera or art song that come from the Western art music tradition, the instruction is adequate. But there are large bodies of musical works, such as rap music, where the culture milieu it is centered in considers the lyrics or text to be the primary aspect of the music; the composer of the music is often of secondary importance, if even formally credited at all on resources.

One possible way forward would be to create an exception to the current instruction that would accommodate different styles and genres of music and would allow the use of the authorized access point for the creator of the words in the first half of the access point. However this does have a drawback in that it would still be privileging in the main instruction the cultural traditions of Western art music.

Another way forward would be to model the instruction more closely on 6.27.1.3, Collaborative Works. There the primary driver of which creator is used in the access point is governed by the concept of principal responsibility. This has the advantage

of allowing RDA users to determine, based on cultural context, the creator most appropriate in the access point. However such an approach for musical works could prove problematic when RDA users unfamiliar with the cultural context of a musical work attempt to construct an access point to represent it.

Question #1: Does the JSC agree with the Music Working Group's analysis of the instruction? Should the Music Working Group pursue revision of 6.28.1.2 taking into account the issues raised above?

6.28.1.3 Pasticcios, Ballad Operas, Etc.

A pasticcio, as defined in the *New Harvard Dictionary of Music*, is a composite vocal work, usually an opera, containing music by several different composers or music originally intended for several different works. This instruction is a mish-mash of different ways of treating these types of works. The instructions boil down to the following: when the pasticcio is treated as a work (6.28.1.3.1) or as a compilation (6.28.1.3.2), excerpts from a pasticcio, irrespective if it is a collaborative work or a compilation (6.28.1.3.3), and a single excerpt from a pasticcio, irrespective if it is a collaborative work or a compilation (6.28.1.3.4).

Individual Work or Compilation of Works

The choice in 6.28.1.3.1 and 6.28.1.3.2 of whether to treat a pasticcio as an individual work or a compilation by different people has to be made in 6.14. This is important, because individual works are subject to the instructions on omissions, choice of language, and singular or plural form in 6.14.2.5, while compilations by different persons depend on 6.2.2.11. The treatment of these titles in access points is also determined by whether the work is collaborative or a compilation by different persons

One solution for deciding whether to treat a pasticcio as an individual work or a compilation of works would be to add an additional paragraph to 6.14.2.5 reading:

Consider pasticcios, ballad operas, etc. to be individual works. If the pasticcio, ballad opera, etc. consists of previously existing ballads, songs, arias, etc. by various composers, consider the work to be a compilation of musical works by different composers (see [6.2.2.11](#)).

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

Multiple excerpts from pasticcios

This instruction represents an exceptional practice for a set of excerpts from a pasticcio. Normally, if there are multiple parts of an individual work, each part is

given its own title, which, in turn, is given its own access point. An alternative exists to use the title for the whole, followed by *Selections*. However, in the current instruction at 6.28.1.3.3, one is told instead to use the authorized access point representing the work from which the group of excerpts were taken. There is nothing here about using *Selections* or naming each of the individual works. In other words, if the instructions for preferred titles for parts of work were followed in 6.14.2.7 for a group of excerpts from a pasticcio, the result would be completely different from that detailed in 6.28.1.3.3.

The other problem in 6.28.1.3.3 concerns the situation where the pasticcio is considered a compilation by different creators. In RDA the concept of excerpts from a compilation does not exist. Excerpts from a compilation would just be treated as another compilation. Here 6.28.1.3.3 appears to be saying that if one has a compilation of excerpts from a pasticcio considered to be a compilation, then one should use the title of the complete compilation to represent those excerpts.

To keep this exceptional practice, several revisions would be necessary. For pasticcios considered to be individual works, revisions would be needed at 6.14.2.7.2 and at 6.28.2.3. For 6.14.2.7.2 this could be an additional paragraph or an exception. The text could read:

If the parts consist of a group of excerpts from a pasticcio, ballad opera, etc., record the preferred title of the pasticcio (see [6.14.2.4](#)) as the preferred title of the parts.

The additional text for 6.28.2.3 would reference the instruction at 6.28.1.3.3:

Exception

If the parts consist of a group of excerpts from a pasticcio, ballad opera, etc. considered to be an individual work, see [6.28.1.3.3](#).

For pasticcios considered to be compilations, an exception would need to be added to 6.2.2.11.1 that would say to use the title of the original compilation for a compilation that consists of excerpts from the original compilation:

Exception

If:

the compilation consists of a group of excerpts from a single pasticcio, ballad opera, etc.

and

the original pasticcio is considered a compilation

then:

use the title of the original pasticcio as the title of the compilation.

The other option would be to do away with this exceptional practice for multiple parts of pasticcios by removing or modifying 6.28.1.3.3. Parts of pasticcios considered to be individual works would follow the same instructions for multiple parts of musical works. If a group of excerpts came from a pasticcio considered to be a compilation, that compilation would be identified by its own collective title, not by the title of the earlier compilation. The excerpts could be linked to the pasticcio that they are taken from through an appropriate relationship.

Question #3: 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?

Single excerpt from a pasticcio

This instruction also represents an exceptional practice. Normally, for parts of musical works, the access point for the whole work is followed by the preferred title of the part. In this instruction, the authorized access point uses the authorized access point for the composer followed by the preferred title of the part.

If it is desired that this practice should be continued, the instructions for access points for parts of works at 6.28.2.2 could have an exception for pasticcios treated as individual works that references 6.28.1.3.4, so that the access point uses the access point for the composer of the part followed by the title of the part. The text could read:

Exception

If the part is from a pasticcio, ballad opera, etc. considered to be an individual work, see [6.28.1.3.4](#).

For pasticcios treated as compilations, no additional guidance would be needed since a single excerpt would be considered its own work.

The other option would be to do away with this exceptional practice for a single part of a pasticcio by either removing or modifying 6.28.1.3.4. A single part of a pasticcio considered to be an individual work would follow the same general instructions for other parts of musical works. A single excerpt from a pasticcio considered to be a compilation would be identified by its own access point.

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?

6.28.1.4 Musical Works Composed for Choreographic Movement

The instruction here is appropriate, since a work composed for choreographic movement could have more than one creator and is analogous to the situation encountered in 6.28.1.2.

In RDA, textual components of musical works may be considered works in their own right and the access points for these works are covered by the general instructions. 6.28.1 contains the following paragraph:

For librettos, lyrics, and other texts for musical works, see [6.27.1](#).

The Music Working Group believes that this same principle applies to works where only the choreographic movement is expressed. To cover this situation, the Music Working Group recommends adding the following paragraph to 6.28.1:

For choreographic works, see [6.27.1](#).

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

6.28.1.5 Adaptations of Musical Works

Choice of title

Because the construction of an authorized access point for an adaptation is dependent on using the title of the adaptation (not the title of the original work), the choice on which title to use has to be made in 6.14.2.3. The following text could be added to 6.14.2.3, or repeated in 6.14.2.3.1 and 6.14.2.3.2:

If the work is an adaptation▼ choose as the preferred title the title of the adaptation. In case of doubt about whether the work is an adaptation, choose as the preferred title the title of the original work.

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?

The Music Working Group also feels that the guidance present in 6.28.1.5.1 should also be present in 19.2.1.1. The Music Working Group feels that the current

paragraph on creators who adapt a work is too general for adaptors of musical works. The Music Working Group suggests the following text be added to 19.2.1.1 after paragraph 4 (included below for context):

In some cases, the modification of a previously existing work substantially changes the nature or content of the original and results in a new work. When this occurs, the person, family, or corporate body responsible for modifying the previously existing work is considered to be the creator of the new work.

For modifications of musical works, consider the person, family, or corporate body responsible for modifying the musical work to be the creator of a new work if the work:

a) is an arrangement described as freely transcribed, based on, etc., or is an arrangement that incorporates new material

b) is a paraphrase of various works or of the general style of another composer

c) is an arrangement in which the harmony or musical style of the original has been changed

d) involves substantial creative responsibility for adaptation, improvisation, etc., on the part of the performer or performers

and/or

e) contains any other substantial alterations.

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

Instruction Language of 6.28.1.5.2

Some members of the Music Working Group felt that 6.28.1.5.2 would be better served by replacing the language in paragraphs 1 and 2 with the language already present in the general instruction at 6.27.1.5. Those members felt that moving the emphasis from the person who has modified the music to the person who is *presented* as the one responsible for the modifications is a positive step forward in making the music instructions more broadly applicable across styles and genres, such as popular music, in which recording artists are given greater prominence than songwriters and have creative responsibility beyond mere performance of fully written out music.

6.28.1.5.2 Construction of Authorized Access Points for Adaptations of Musical Works

~~Construct the authorized access point representing the adaptation by combining (in this order):~~

- ~~a) the authorized access point representing the adapter of the music (see [9.19.1](#) for persons, [10.11.1](#) for families, or [11.13.1](#) for corporate bodies, as applicable)~~
- ~~b) the preferred title for the adaptation (see [6.14.2](#)).~~

~~If two or more composers have collaborated in the adaptation, apply the instructions at [6.27.1.3](#).~~

If:

one person, family, or corporate body is responsible for an adaptation or revision of a previously existing work that substantially changes the nature and content of that work

and

the adaptation or revision is presented as the work of that person, family, or body

then:

construct the authorized access point representing the new work by combining (in this order):

- a) the authorized access point representing the person (see [9.19.1](#)), family (see [10.11.1](#)), or corporate body (see [11.13.1](#)) responsible for the adaptation or revision, as applicable
- b) the preferred title for the adaptation or revision (see [6.14.2](#)).

If more than one person, family, or corporate body is responsible for the adaptation or revision, apply the instructions on collaborative works at [6.27.1.3](#).

[Remainder of 6.28.1.5.2 the same]

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?

6.28.1.6 Operas and Other Dramatic Works with New Text and Title

In examining the instruction, the Music Working Group agreed that the practice described in the instruction should remain. However resolution could not be

reached on whether the instruction actually functions as an exception for adaptations or as an exception for music works that include words.

The case for the instruction as an exception for adaptations comes from RDA itself. The final paragraph of the general instruction for adaptations at 6.27.1.5 implies that 6.28.1.6 represents a class of adaptation, because while the original music was not altered, the text was replaced. In the current iteration of 6.28.1.5, the instruction makes clear that it is the music that is adapted, not the words.

The case for this instruction as an exception to 6.28.1.2 can also be made. The title of a work consisting of a dramatic musical work with a replacement text is placed in parenthesis after the authorized access point for the whole work. Normally, in a musical work with words, the access point is the composer of the music followed by the title of the work. Because 6.28.1.6 is different in this regard, this instruction could be considered an exception to 6.28.1.2.

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?

In examining the instruction, the Working Group also investigated whether the practice described in 6.28.1.6 was applicable more broadly to all musical works that have text added or replaced, not just dramatic musical works. These types of works can include parody songs, such as those created by “Weird Al” Yankovic, or the setting of a poem to previously existing music, such as Francis Scott Key’s poem “The Star-Spangled Banner” using the music from John Stafford Smith’s “To Anacreon in Heaven”. The Music Working Group concluded that using this method would lead to less than desirable results for other musical works with text. As was detailed in the discussion concerning 6.28.1.2 above, many issues need to be worked out concerning access points for music that includes words and until those issues are resolved, the issue of replacement texts for non-dramatic musical works cannot adequately be dealt with.

6.28.1.7 Cadenzas

The Music Working Group does not feel that changes or modifications are needed for this instruction. The Music Working Group was unable to come to an agreement whether additional guidance was necessary in 6.14 or in chapter 19 for these types of works.

6.28.1.8 Music and Incidental Music for Dramatic Works

The instruction is necessary in 6.28 because music of this kind could be considered as component part of a dramatic work or as its own work. But this guidance should also appear in the preferred title instructions. The Music Working Group suggests

that the following should be added to the general instructions for parts of works at 6.2.2.9.1:

Do not consider music and incidental music for dramatic works etc. to be a part of a work. Record the preferred title for the musical work by applying the instructions at [6.14.2](#).

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

Conclusions

The intent of this examination was to determine if the guidance provided in 6.28.1.2—6.28.1.8 for constructing authorized access points was also needed in instructions for selecting the preferred title of a musical work or in determining the creators for a musical work. However this examination was not done for the general instructions in 6.27.1 or for the specialist instructions at 6.29.1, 6.30.1, and 6.31.1. If the JSC agrees with most of the conclusions of the Music Working Group in this discussion paper, a similar evaluation should also happen with those instructions.