

TO: RDA Steering Committee

FROM: Dave Reser, LC Representative

SUBJECT: Revision to instructions for Commentary, Etc. Added to a Previously Existing Work (6.27.1.6)

Thanks to the RSC communities for their comments on this proposal. The constituency responses were mixed. ACOC and the Aggregates Working Group expressed a desire to review the RSC responses to the Aggregates WG for compatibility of RSC/AggregatesWG/1 with our proposal. Since the response to AggregatesWG/1 has been generally favorable and it will be discussed further at the RSC meeting, LC wishes the RSC to consider a revision of our proposal at the November meeting. We saw nothing in AggregatesWG/1 or the responses that would render our proposal incompatible with the continuing work of the Aggregates WG. We feel that our proposal is consistent with RSC/AggregatesWG/1 in these ways:

- recognizes that sometimes not all components of an aggregating work (or Aggregation Work in the WG terminology) are significant enough to warrant identification or description
- recognizes that sometimes all components of an aggregating work are significant and in these cases bibliographic distinctions should be made between an aggregation work and a distinct work expressed in the aggregation work
- recognizes that the relationship between a commentary and another work is not a whole-part relationship.

As indicated by the Aggregates Working Group, every instruction in RDA, including 6.27.1.6, that touches on the issue of aggregates will have to be changed using the AWG model of aggregates. However, the changes suggested in this revised proposal will make updating both 6.27.1.6 and 6.27.1.4 easier when that time comes because the two instructions will no longer be in opposition. This current paradox between 6.27.1.4 and 6.27.1.6 makes applying the instructions in 6.27 confusing when cataloging an aggregation of a previously existing work and a commentary, etc., because there is no reference between the two instructions and a cataloger may have a completely different result depending on which instruction is being used. This is why we had suggested Option C in the original proposal, but we are in agreement with everyone that having instructions for this type of compilation in RDA is useful.

CCC's Response

CCC's response agreed with Option A, but provided different wording for the instruction. We struggled with revising existing instructions, and we took the suggestions of CCC into consideration when preparing our revised proposal. We did not use CCC's wording because we thought that if the "then" clause said to apply 6.27.1.4 to identify the work as a compilation, then the "and" clause should be focused on when it was important to

identify the work as a **compilation**, not as two distinct works. We did not use CCC's reference to 25.1 since 6.27.1.4 does not contain such a reference, but we are not opposed to the idea of such a reference in both 6.27.1.4 and 6.27.1.6 if the RSC wishes to add one.

Europe's Rev Response

We note that the current third paragraph in 6.27.1.6 reflects a revision to both 6.27.1.6 and 6.27.1.5 as a result of 6JSC/LC/33/rev/Sec final. Both instructions contain similar wording, so both would need to be changed to accommodate's Europe's Alternative. However, we do not believe it is necessary to have an **Alternative** for either the second paragraph of 6.27.1.5 or the current third paragraph in 6.27.1.6. The first sentence in the paragraph says, "You do not have a new work, you have an expression of an existing work." The second sentence in that paragraph says, "If you think it is important to identify the particular expression of that existing work, follow the instructions at 6.27.3 to construct an authorized access point for the expression." Thus the first two examples in 6.27.1.6, 2nd example box, show the authorized access points for the works *only* and the third example (Laozi. Da de jing. English) shows an authorized access point for a particular expression of that existing work. The current instructions already allow Europe *not* to identify the particular expression without adding an **Alternative**.

ALA's Response

ALA also commented on our proposed last paragraph in Option A, suggesting that it should say, "treat the resource as an expression of the previously existing work..." because a "work is not an expression." Yes, a work is not an expression, but the authorized access point for an expression of a work is constructed by combining the authorized access point for the work and one or more of the elements listed at 6.27.3 if it is considered important to identify that particular expression. For this reason, we felt our proposed wording was not ambiguous and we would prefer not to introduce the word "resource" in the instruction since 1) it is not used in 6.27.1.5 which has the same instruction, and 2) the Chair is examining problems with the use of the word in RDA. However, we welcome any editorial refinements to the wording in our revised proposal that would not create inconsistencies or problems with other instructions.

ALA's assertion that our proposal was a change in cataloging practice proves the point that this instruction is currently ambiguous. In the context of 6.27.1.6, it has already been determined that there is a previously existing **work** within a resource. The key point for us is to determine if the commentary, etc., can also be considered a work, which would mean that we have a **compilation** of works. According to RDA 6.27.1.4, if you have a compilation of works by different creators, the authorized access point for the compilation is constructed using the preferred title without the authorized access point for any of the creators. Since there is no current Exception at 6.27.1.4 referring to 6.27.1.6, we do not believe ALA's desire to identify the compilation using the authorized access point for the commentary, etc., is unambiguously allowed by RDA. Depending on whether a cataloger went to 6.27.1.4 or 6.27.1.6, they might create two different access

points for the same work (previously existing work plus commentary, etc.). ALA's Option D does not solve this problem. **Example 1** below shows how two different agencies might apply ALA's Option D for 6.27.1.6, and how they would apply 6.27.1.4 for contrast.

Example 1: Greek theatre

Resource described: Greek theatre. **Contains:** A commentary on Sophocles' greatest play / by Kate James – Antigone : a tragedy / by Sophocles

Applying ALA's proposed wording for 6.27.1.6, we see how two different agencies might identify the work with preferred title *Greek theatre* completely differently:

Agency A's authorized access point for the compilation:

James, Kate. A commentary on Sophocles' greatest play

Agency B's authorized access point for the compilation: Sophocles. Antigone

However, this is how both agencies would identify this compilation applying 6.2.2.11.1 and 6.27.1.4:

Authorized access point for the compilation: Greek theatre

Applying 25.1.1.3, the cataloger might also provide a relationship between the compilation and the two individual works:

Optional related work: James, Kate. A commentary on Sophocles' greatest play

Optional related work: Sophocles. Antigone

We also note that if the first individual work were *The Frogs* by Aristophanes instead of *A commentary on Sophocles' greatest play*, there would be no question about how the compilation should be described currently in RDA (6.27.1.4). It does not seem logical that the subject content of one work (the commentary) within a compilation should influence the formulation of the authorized access point for the compilation of works.

Example 2 below shows how when a work containing a previously existing work and a commentary, etc., is presented neither as the work of the commentator nor as an edition of the previously existing work, the only logical approach may be to apply RDA 6.2.2.11 and 6.27.1.4.

Example 2: First part of the institutes of the laws of England

Resource described: The first part of the institutes of the laws of England, or, A commentary upon Littleton / by Edward Coke. To which is added, Littleton's Tenures

RDA 6.2.2.11.2 (No Collective Title) says that a compilation of different works by different persons, etc., not commonly identified by a collective title should be identified by recording the preferred title of each of the works or alternatively, devising a title. However, ALA's proposed wording for 6.27.1.6 would create a paradox by which the preferred title recorded according to 6.2.2.11.2 is *not* used in the authorized access point for the compilation that contains both works. Here are the differences in treatment:

Authorized access point for the compilation using Coke as the predominant work: Coke, Edward. First part of the institutes of the laws of England

Authorized access points for the compilation using the basic instructions at 6.27.1.4:

Coke, Edward. First part of the institutes of the laws of England

AND

Littleton, Thomas. Tenures

Authorized access point for the compilation using the Alternative at 6.27.1.4:
Property law in England

Optional related work: Coke, Edward. First part of the institutes of the laws of England

Optional related work: Littleton, Thomas. Tenures

We note that both of these works are often published separately and often published together. In its response to RSC/AggregatesWG/1, ALA says in its point 4 that "If an aggregating expression entity is used and a user is looking for a particular expression of a distinct work, manifestations that embody the aggregating expression are relevant." Unfortunately, if a user is looking for an expression of Littleton's work contained in the aggregation example above, and the authorized access point for the aggregation is given as the one for Coke's work, a user will never find the expression of Littleton's work in this aggregation. However, a user would find Littleton's *Tenures* using the basic instructions in 6.27.1.4.

Summary of Proposed Revisions

Both the LC original proposal and the CCC response approach allow for identifying the compilation as a whole, or the original work (if the commentary, etc., portion of the compilation is not considered important). ALA expressed a desire for a possible third approach as well, to identify only the commentary, etc., and not the original work or the compilation separately. We agree that agencies should be allowed this approach as well when that solution is warranted. In order to accommodate ALA's desire to ignore the previously existing work we think that 6.27.1.4 must be revised as well. We considered whether 6.2.2.11 also required revision, but decided it does not because we came up with wording that allows cataloging agencies **Alternatives** not to identify the compilation rather than instructions that suggest a compilation should be identified using an authorized access point for only one of its works.

Change 1 adds an Alternative to 6.27.1.4 that connects it to the proposed Alternatives in 6.27.1.6. This solves the current problem of catalogers treating certain compilations differently depending on which instruction they looked at in RDA.

Change 2 replaces 6.27.1.6 with a basic instruction to treat commentary, etc., added to a previously existing work as a compilation and two **Alternatives**. The first **Alternative**, based on the current final paragraph of 6.27.1.6 and CCC's wording, allows for identification of the previously existing work instead of the compilation of works. The second **Alternative**, based on ALA's response, allows for identification of the commentary, etc., instead of the compilation of works. The allowance of these alternatives should give the needed flexibility to cataloging agencies, and should be compatible with the Aggregates Working Group's model.

Change 1:

Add alternative to 6.27.1.4 referring to new alternative instructions added at 6.27.1.6 so the disconnect between 6.27.1.4 and 6.27.1.6 would be resolved.

Mark-up (using October 2016 Toolkit wording):

6.27.1.4 Compilations of Works by Different Persons, Families, or Corporate Bodies

If the work is a compilation of works by different persons, families, or corporate bodies, construct the authorized access point representing the work by using the preferred title for the compilation (see [6.2.2 RDA](#)).

[examples omitted]

Alternative

Commentary, etc. added to a previously existing work. Apply the alternative instructions at 6.27.1.6 if it is not considered important to identify a compilation containing a commentary, annotations, illustrative content, etc., and a previously existing work.

If the compilation lacks a collective title, construct separate access points for each of the works in the compilation.

[remainder of instruction omitted]

Clean copy:

6.27.1.4 Compilations of Works by Different Persons, Families, or Corporate Bodies

If the work is a compilation of works by different persons, families, or corporate bodies, construct the authorized access point representing the work by using the preferred title for the compilation (see [6.2.2 RDA](#)).

[examples omitted]

Alternative

Commentary, etc. added to a previously existing work. Apply the alternative instructions at 6.27.1.6 if it is not considered important to identify a compilation containing a commentary, annotations, illustrative content, etc., and a previously existing work.

If the compilation lacks a collective title, construct separate access points for each of the works in the compilation.

[remainder of instruction omitted]

Change 2:

Because only the second example box (moved to 1st Alternative) and the second sentence in the third paragraph from the current RDA Toolkit wording are being retained, we have provided clean copy only.

Clean copy:

6.27.1.6 Commentary, Annotations, Illustrative Content, Etc., Added to a Previously Existing Work

If:

commentary, annotations, illustrative content, etc., is added to a previously existing work

and

it is considered important to identify the commentary, etc., and the previously existing work as a compilation

then:

apply the instructions at 6.27.1.4 to construct the authorized access point representing the compilation.

A commentary on Virgil's *Bucolica*

Resource described: A commentary on Virgil's *Bucolica*. **Contains:** A commentary on Virgil's *Bucolica* / by Wendell Clausen — *Bucolica* / by Virgil

Alternatives

If:

the work is presented simply as an expression of a previously existing work

and

it is not considered important to identify the commentary, etc., and the previously existing work as a compilation

then:

treat the previously existing work with added commentary, etc., as an expression of the previously existing work by using the authorized access point representing the previously existing work. If it is considered important to identify the particular expression, construct an authorized access point representing the expression as instructed at 6.27.3.

Plato. *Gorgias*

Resource described: *Gorgias* : a revised text / Plato ; with introduction and commentary by E.R. Dodds

Joyce, James, 1882–1941. *Dubliners*

Resource described: James Joyce's *Dubliners* : an illustrated edition with annotations / [edited by] John Wyse Jackson & Bernard McGinley

Laozi. *Dao de jing*. English

Resource described: *The Tao te ching* : a new translation with commentary / Ellen M. Chen

If:

the work is presented as a commentary, etc.,

and

it is not considered important to identify the commentary, etc., and the previously existing work as a compilation

then:

treat the previously existing work with added commentary, etc., as an expression of the commentary, etc., by using the authorized access point representing the commentary, etc. If it is considered important to identify the particular expression, construct an authorized access point representing the expression as instructed at 6.27.3.

Weinberger, Moshe. Song of teshuvah

Resource described: Song of teshuvah : a commentary on Rav Avraham Yitzchak Hakohen Kook's Oros hateshuvah / by Rav Moshe Weinberger ; text of Oros HaTeshuvah translated by Yaacov Dovid Shulman