

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)

ABSTRACT: This proposal seeks to clarify how the instructions in 6.27.1.6 are applied in relation to other instructions in 6.27 and clarify which “work” is being referenced in an instruction that seems to involve multiple works.

### **Justification**

The current instructions in 6.27.1.6 need revision to ensure that the authorized access point for a work is consistent whether it appears by itself or as part of a particular type of compilation.

### **Issues requiring resolution**

Should a resource consisting of a work by one creator and a commentary on that work by a different creator be treated like other compilations of works by different creators in 6.27.1.4?

Should 6.27.1.6 allow for the possibility that the creator of a commentary may be unknown and that a commentary may be a compilation of works by different creators?

Should 6.27.1.6 allow for the possibility that the creator of a work may provide a commentary, etc. for the creator’s own work?

### **Impact of the revisions**

We believe that there will be minimal impact of the revisions to either RDA or user communities because this proposal is a clarification of instructions based on the principles given throughout RDA, rather than a change in instructions.

### **Background**

RDA 6.27.1.4 addresses compilations of works by different creators. The authorized access point for the compilation of works is based on the preferred title of the compilation because no creator is responsible for ALL the works. Authorized access points for the individual works in the compilation may be provided as related works per 25.1.

When a previously existing work is presented with a commentary on that work, the commentary will usually take either of these forms: a) annotations given as footnotes or marginalia throughout the text of the original work or b) a discrete text (usually) attributed to a creator. The second part of 6.27.1.6 suggests that the situation described in a) be

treated as a new expression of the original work (just like other types of supplementary content are considered part of an expression of the work). However, the first part of 6.27.1.6 is written in such a way that catalogers can have three interpretations:

- **Interpretation 1:** When there is a compilation of an original work and a commentary on that work, and the resource presents itself as a commentary, the commentator should be considered the creator of the compilation regardless of the fact that the commentator has no responsibility for the previously existing work contained within the compilation.
- **Interpretation 2:** When there is such a resource presented as the work of the commentator, it somehow is not a compilation. The presence of an original work that is clearly not created by the commentator does not mean 6.27.1.4 should be applied. Instead, this is a new individual work with the commentator as the creator. Thus, a container of/contained in relationship for the previously existing work cannot be recorded because that would be an acknowledgement of a compilation. The previously existing work should be ignored despite the FR user tasks *find* and *identify*.
- **Interpretation 3:** The commentary should be treated as the work of the commentator and the original work should be treated as the work of whoever has been previously attributed as the creator. This assumes that such a resource is no different than any other compilation of works by different creators covered by 6.27.1.4. Why should the fact that one of the works is the subject of the other mean that they are not both works in their own right?

We do not believe that **Interpretations 1 or 2** can be correct in RDA. We feel the problem is a result of AACR2 21.13 being added to RDA without proper thought for the differences between treatment of compilations of works in AACR2 and RDA and AACR2 chapter 21's reliance on the presentation of information on a particular manifestation.

We acknowledge that the application of 6.27.1.6 is complicated by the numerous possibilities for commentary, etc. plus previously existing work that can occur. Regardless, the line between compilation of works and new expression of previously existing work is blurry, and different agencies may prefer different approaches.

This is an issue involving compilations (or aggregates as they are called in FRBR). As such, some communities might respond that a revision of this instruction is best referred to the RSC Aggregates Working Group, or deferred until after the final impact of FRBR-LRM is understood. However, this instruction can be modified with little or no impact on other instructions in RDA in a way that allows for great flexibility of the treatment of these types of compilations, which we believe will be part of the final FRBR-LRM: to treat each as a separate work if considered important, or to treat the commentary, etc., as augmentations to a new expression of the preexisting work.

Because the current instruction is so confusing and seems to contradict many other

instructions in RDA, we believe that we should not wait to revise this instruction. We think it would be better for RDA to contain no instructions on cataloging “previously existing work with added commentary, etc.” than to retain this one in its present form. Therefore, we have presented three options in our proposal, including an option to delete the instruction based on the assumption that it is covered in principle by 6.27.1.4.

The three options we present all achieve these goals:

- solve the problem that 6.27.1.6 currently does not allow for the commentary to be a compilation in itself nor an anonymous work
- do not imply that the relationship between the creator and previously existing work has changed simply because of a presentation on a resource
- allow agencies flexibility in considering when the commentary is a separate work and when it is supplemental material for an existing work.

### **Other Affected Instructions**

The impact on other instructions is dependent upon which option the RSC prefers to implement. If the RSC prefers Option C, there are two small changes in other instructions to be made. If the RSC prefers Option A or B, the references to 6.27.1.6 in other instructions would still be appropriate.

We think that the last paragraph in 20.2.1.1 can remain unchanged for now. It is consistent with Appendix I.3.1 relationship designators such as *writer of added commentary* and *illustrator*. The second part of 6.27.1.6 currently allows for this treatment and that idea is retained in both Options A and B. Even if Option C is chosen, the last paragraph in 20.2.1.1 is still consistent with the scope notes for Expression in the FRBR-LRM draft.

We suggest that the Examples Editor review the examples box labelled “Writer of Added Commentary, Etc.” in 20.2.1.3 for any needed changes if this proposal is approved.

### **Proposed Revisions**

A description of each option and our preference is provided below. Mark-up and clean copy text for the options follows.

**Option A:** This is our preferred option because it provides the most guidance for catalogers while still allowing for flexibility in different agency policies based on their institutional practices. It explains how to construct the authorized access point for the commentary, etc. **and** the compilation of the previously existing work plus commentary while retaining existing instructions for considering it an expression of the existing work.

**Option B:** This is a more streamlined approach that depends upon catalogers to infer when a commentary, etc. and a previously existing work should be treated as a compilation. It assumes they would understand that existing instructions in 6.27 should be used to construct the authorized access point for the commentary when treating such a resource as

a compilation of works.

**Option C:** Is the most radical option for those with an AACR2 background. It proposes to delete 6.27.1.6 because the situations covered in 6.27.1.6 are already covered by existing RDA instructions, although catalogers may not realize this. This option assumes that catalogers will correctly understand when 6.27.1.4 should be applied to treat the commentary, etc. plus existing work as a compilation and when 6.27.3 is sufficient to treat it as an expression of an existing work. An example showing such a compilation could be added to 6.27.1.4 and/or 25.1.1.3. Although we are not overly fond of this option because it provides no help for a difficult cataloging issue, we prefer it to retaining the existing instruction.

### **Option A:**

#### **Mark-up:**

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

*If:*

~~the work consists of a previously existing work with added commentary, annotations, illustrative content, etc., is added to a previously existing work~~  
and

~~it is considered important to identify presented as the work of the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the commentary, etc., as a work~~

*then:*

~~construct the authorized access point representing the commentary, etc., by applying the instructions at 6.27.1.2-6.27.1.4, as applicable. work by combining (in this order):~~

- ~~a) the authorized access point representing the person (see [9.19.1 RDA](#)); family (see [10.11.1 RDA](#)), or corporate body (see [11.13.1 RDA](#)) responsible for the commentary, etc., as applicable~~
- ~~b) the preferred title for the commentary, etc. (see [6.2.2 RDA](#)).~~

Clausen, Wendell, 1923–2006. A commentary on Virgil's *Bucolica*

**Authorized access point for the commentary in a compilation also containing a translation of Virgil's *Bucolica*.** ~~Authorized access point for the compilation:~~ A commentary on Virgil's *Bucolica*

~~If more than one person is responsible for the added commentary, etc., apply the instructions on collaborative works at [6.27.1.3 RDA](#).~~

Apply the instructions at 6.27.1.4 to construct an authorized access point for the compilation of the previously existing work and the commentary, etc.

If the work is presented simply as an expression of the previously existing work, use 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 RDA](#).

*If:*

it is not considered important to identify the commentary, etc., as a work,

*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 RDA](#).

[examples omitted]

## 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., as a work

*then:*

construct the authorized access point representing the commentary, etc., by applying the instructions at 6.27.1.2-6.27.1.4, as applicable.

Clausen, Wendell, 1923–2006. A commentary on Virgil's *Bucolica*

**Authorized access point for the commentary in a compilation also containing a translation of Virgil's *Bucolica***

Apply the instructions at 6.27.1.4 to construct an authorized access point for the compilation of the previously existing work and the commentary, etc.

*If:*

it is not considered important to identify the commentary, etc., as a work,

*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 RDA](#).

[examples omitted]

## **Option B:**

### **Mark-up:**

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

*#:*

~~the work consists of a previously existing work with added commentary, annotations, illustrative content, etc.~~

*and*

~~it is presented as the work of the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the commentary, etc.~~

*then:*

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

- ~~a) the authorized access point representing the person (see [9.19.1 RDA](#)), family (see [10.11.1 RDA](#)), or corporate body (see [11.13.1 RDA](#)) responsible for the commentary, etc., as applicable~~
- ~~b) the preferred title for the commentary, etc. (see [6.2.2 RDA](#)).~~

~~Clausen, Wendell, 1923–2006. A commentary on Virgil's Bucolica~~

~~Authorized access point for the commentary in a compilation also containing a translation of Virgil's Bucolica.~~

~~Authorized access point for the compilation: A commentary on Virgil's Bucolica~~

If a compilation of works contains a previously existing work and a commentary, etc., construct an authorized access point for the compilation by applying the instructions at 6.27.1.2-6.27.1.4, as applicable.

~~If more than one person is responsible for the added commentary, etc., apply the instructions on collaborative works at [6.27.1.3 RDA](#).~~

~~If the work is presented simply as an expression of the a previously existing work with new added commentary, etc., is presented simply as an expression of the previous work, use 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 RDA.

[examples omitted]

#### Clean Copy:

##### 6.27.1.6 Commentary, Etc., Added to a Previously Existing Work

If a compilation of works contains a previously existing work and a commentary, etc., construct an authorized access point for the compilation by applying the instructions at 6.27.1.2-6.27.1.4, as applicable.

If a previously existing work with new added commentary, etc., is presented simply as an expression of the previous work, use 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 RDA](#).

[examples omitted]

#### Option C:

Because Option C is deleting 6.27.1.6, we have not provided mark-up or clean copy for it. There are two other revisions to RDA that should be made if Option C is approved:

##### Revision C1: delete 6.29.1.3.3:

##### ~~6.29.1.3.3 Annotated Editions of Laws and Commentaries~~

~~For annotated editions of laws and commentaries, see 6.27.1.6 [RDA](#).~~

##### Revision C2: delete last paragraph of 6.30.1.3:

##### 6.30.1.3 Harmonies of Scriptural Passages

[1st paragraph and example omitted]

~~For harmonies accompanied by commentary, apply the instructions at [6.27.1.6 RDA](#).~~