

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative to JSC

Subject: **Proposed revision of RDA chap. 6 Additional instructions for musical works and expressions**

ACOC thanks LC for their proposed revision to Ch 6 Additional instructions for musical works and expressions, and offers the following comments on 5JSC/LC/12.

ACOC understands that the special instructions are planned to be incorporated into the general instructions after the first release of RDA. In view of that we would like JSC to discuss whether it is desirable to make these proposed changes now. Although ACOC has consulted with experts in music cataloguing in composing this response, a more extensive period of consultation would be desirable, and would help ensure that any changes made were consistent with RDA's direction.

Given the extent of the proposed changes ACOC found it difficult at times to evaluate individual proposals without a clean copy of the instructions to give us an overview of the new framework. Some of our comments may reflect misunderstandings that have arisen as a result.

General comments

These general comments relate to the existing draft of the chapter, not to LC's proposals. However they may be best considered in relation to this proposal.

In the existing draft the placement of the exceptions for music varies between instructions (Similar issues may exist for the other special instructions).

6.1.1.01 (access point) refers to 6.1.1.1-6.1.1.6

6.1.1.02 (exception for music) refers to 6.17.1

6.1.1.03 (additions) refers to 6.1.1.7 (exception for music at 6.1.1.7.2 refers to instructions 6.17.10—6.17.12)

6.1.1.04 (parts) refers to 6.1.2 (exception for music at 6.1.2.1.2 refers to instructions 6.17.2)

6.1.1.05 (new expressions) refers to 6.1.3 (which lacks an exception for music) although 6.17.3 has instructions.

- To be specific, should the reference to 6.17.1 at 6.1.1.02 be a reference to 6.17.1-6.17.9?
- To be consistent, should the references at 6.1.2 and 6.1.3 be given at 6.1.1.03 and 6.1.1.04 instead?
- For completeness, should an exception for music be given at 6.1.3 that refers to the 6.17.3 instructions?

Specific comments

A. Proposed deletion of draft 6.1.1.2.5

ACOC agrees with LC that this reference from the general instruction on collaborative works to the specific instruction on collaborative works for music may not be needed.

B. Proposed revision of draft 6.1.3

ACOC agrees with LC that an instruction similar in intent to 6.1.1.0.3 is needed; however the wording given needs to be revised to suit this location, i.e. if you have already added the terms given in 6.1.3.1, why would you add them again in 6.1.3.2?

ACOC agrees with the LC rewording of 6.17.1.6, given in their paper at 6.1.3.3.

Placement of this instruction at this point in the general instructions now seems to go against goal 1 of the proposal, i.e. to maintain the additional instructions intact. It would also require a reference from 6.17 back to this general instruction.

C. Proposed revision of draft 6.2.7.3

ACOC agrees that music collective titles could be included here. However, we are uncertain about doing so now and separating these instructions from those at 6.18.5.

In addition, the list at 6.2.7.3.1 is a closed list, and we uncertain why LC is proposing the inclusion of such a limited set of collective titles, e.g. why include *Selected piano music* but not also *Selected violin music*? Would either a comprehensive list, or an open list be better?

D. Proposed revision of draft 6.17.1

“Preferred access point for ...”, as opposed to “Preferred access point representing ...”. ACOC agrees that this wording should be made consistent.

D.1 RDA 6.17.1.0

Proposed simplification and new order. ACOC agrees with the broad proposal to condense the categories, and give the instructions in the proposed order.

Deletion of 6.17.1.0.3. Assuming that the instructions at 6.17.1.0.1 and 6.17.1.0.2 are comprehensive, ACOC agrees with this deletion.

Deletion of 6.17.1.0.6. ACOC is uncertain why LC is suggesting this reference be deleted, and where would a reference to the instruction at 6.17.3 on new expressions now appear?

D.2 RDA 6.17.1.1

ACOC found it confusing to have this instruction presented as a re-wording of the instruction for musical works with lyrics, etc., when it is actually a new instruction for a different category. However, the proposed instruction appears logical.

D.3 RDA 6.17.1.2

ACOC agrees with the proposal.

D.4 RDA 6.17.1.2.2

ACOC agrees with the proposals to delete word “or works” for the reason given; and to add “film etc.” so as to encompass all dramatic collaborative works involving music.

D.5 RDA 6.17.1.2.3

ACOC agrees with LC-that “excerpt” is highly preferable to the usage of “song”, as it can accurately represent arias, duets and other small ensembles, choruses, songs, and instrumental excerpts, all of which can occur in pasticcios, ballad operas, etc.

D.6 RDA 6.17.1.2.4

ACOC agrees that “work composed for choreographed movement, such as” is appropriate, but note that “setting for” is shorter and simpler. A combination of the two might be considered, e.g. “For a musical work composed for choreographed movement, such as a setting for a ballet, pantomime, etc.”

D.7 RDA 6.17.1.3

ACOC questions whether deleting 6.17.1.3 is desirable, as a reference to 6.1.1.3 still seems needed.

D.8 RDA 6.17.1.3

ACOC supports LC’s suggestion that an exact distinction be made between “Adaptations” and “Arrangements”, and agree that there must be no ambiguity in usage. As stated on p. 11, par. 2 of the LC submission, “arrangement” should be used when referring to a new expression, and “adaptation” when referring to a new work.

We also agree that the use of “alteration” should be avoided in this context as it is too vague.

ACOC would prefer that the first sentence of 6.17.1.3 be worded “Consider the types of modification listed below to be adaptations that result in a new work.”

D.9 RDA 6.17.1.4

ACOC agrees with the proposal but notes that 6.17.1.4 should read “Additions to access points for musical works with distinctive titles”.

D.10 RDA 6.17.1.5

ACOC agrees with LC’s proposals; however we wonder whether it would be worth giving extra guidance, e.g. by saying “for example, a title which consists of the names of types of composition”?

D.11 RDA 6.17.1.6

Please see our comments under B.

D.12 RDA 6.17.1.12

ACOC tentatively agrees with the deletion of this instruction, but see also our comments under C.

E. Proposed revision of draft 6.17.2

E.1 RDA 6.17.2.2.2

ACOC agrees with LC's proposal to use the phrase "Librettos and other texts", as opposed to "Librettos and song texts". "Song texts" (i.e. lyrics) is too narrow a term, and is not the preferred term for poetry to which music is subsequently set (German Lieder, French art song, etc.). The broader "other texts" is preferable.

E.2 RDA 6.17.2.2.3

ACOC agrees with the proposed changes which treat cadenzas as parts of works.

This is consistent with historical and current performance practice and would be a logical and important improvement. The composer of the work for which the cadenza has been written (regardless of whether the composer of the work, or someone else, has written the actual cadenza) should be the preferred access point, followed by the work itself, and then "Cadenza".

F. Proposed revision of draft 6.17.3

F.1 RDA 6.17.3

ACOC agrees with the proposed order of these instructions, including placing "Versions" first; incorporating "vocal and chorus scores" into broader categories is also a desirable amendment.

F.2 RDA 6.17.3.1

ACOC agrees with the proposed changes.

F.3 RDA 6.17.3.2

ACOC agrees broadly with LC's discussion concerning stable and flexible works (p. 17) and agree that these issues should be addressed after the first release of RDA.

6.17.3.2.2.

ACOC agrees with the proposed revision, but would like to see a definition of "Western art music" incorporated.

In view of the fact that the heading is "Arrangements, transcription, etc.", and the fact that there is a fine distinction between the two terms (although it could be argued that a transcription is a form of arrangement), it might be prudent to have the proposed last sentence of this retain "transcription". That is, "Apply this instruction also to an arrangement or transcription by the original composer".

F.4 RDA 6.17.3.3

6.17.3.1 ACOC agrees with the proposed revision.

F.5 RDA 6.17.3.4

ACOC agrees with the proposed revisions to reduce the use of “arranged”.

6.17.3.4.2 ACOC would prefer use of the alternative “Keyboard reduction” as this might also cover not only piano reductions, but also sacred works (which often have similar reductions, more usually played on pipe organ), and more contemporary works (whose reduction might be played on piano or synthesizer).

F.6 RDA 6.17.3.5

ACOC would agree to not limiting sketches to completed works.

ACOC notes that LC’s revision of this instruction says that Sketches should be added to “the preferred access point for the work”. However each of the examples show preferred access points constructed using the title only, and the examples showing both the name of the composer and the title of the work have been deleted. ACOC considers that the preferred access point for the work should be constructed using the name of the composer and the title of the work, and would like appropriate examples to be given.

G. Proposed revision of draft 6.17.4.1.3

ACOC agrees, if other proposals are accepted.

H. Proposed revision of draft 6.18.0

6.18.0.3.1 ACOC considers that the proposed additional instructions are too long and unnecessary. A simple statement, following the RDA original statement, directing the cataloguer to reference sources should be sufficient.

ACOC also finds the addition of references to the “first edition” to be inappropriate in RDA.

6.18.03a-c

Are these instructions numbered correctly?

ACOC considers the proposed addition at 6.18.0.3b.1 both logical and preferable.

ACOC consider the wording of a number of these instructions to be convoluted, for example, 6.18.0.3c.1 “If the title in any language can be translated to a term in the language of the cataloging agency, if there is one, that conforms to the list below, follow the instructions in 6.18.1-6.18.3 when formulating the preferred title.” Does this mean ““If the title ~~in any language~~ can be translated to a term in the language of the cataloging agency, ~~if there is one~~, that conforms to the list below, follow the instructions in 6.18.1-6.18.3 when formulating the preferred title.”?”

Some examples might be useful at 6.18.0.3c.2 a) and b).

6.18.0.4.2

ACOC questions the change of the example from Die Zauberflöte (language of origin) to The magic flute.

I. Proposed revision of draft 6.18.1-6.18.3

Although the proposals here are logical, retaining the existing RDA categories could be quite helpful to cataloguers whose musical training is not sophisticated.

J. Proposed revision of draft 6.18.5

ACOC would like the JSC to discuss whether the proposal, i.e. to specify more precisely a single medium of performance and/or form of composition where this single form represents the composer's entire output, could lead to an assumption that it is not representative of an entire output.

K. Proposed revision of draft 6.20.0

ACOC agrees that cataloguers are describing an increasingly broad range of resources, and an appropriately adequate vocabulary needs to be available for this.

K.1 RDA 6.20.0.3 Recording medium of performance.

Re "If a composer names a specific singing voice in the original title give the medium in the preferred title".

ACOC has received the following advice:

"The performance of songs with larger forces (orchestra, band, etc.) or those accompanied by instruments other than keyboard or guitar, do maintain a stability of performance in the composer's original key for practical reasons, and for these the proposed amendment would be perfectly precise and appropriate.

The majority of publications of Western art song (solo voice with piano accompaniment) (Lieder of Schubert, Schumann, Brahms, Hugo Wolf, Mahler ..., chansons of Duparc, Poulenc, Chausson ..., songs of Quilter, Copland, Diack ...) are published for at least two, and often three different voice types. That is, they are (and have been historically – apart from original manuscript, and perhaps earliest print editions), published simultaneously in different keys – to accommodate the different voice types. Also, it is, and has been, an expectation of skilled piano/organ/harpsichord accompanists that they be able to transpose the key at sight to accommodate different singers' voices."

ACOC questions how the voice-type of a publication in the non-original key (or for the non-original voice) would be recorded. It is not a new work, there is no provision for treating it as a new expression, and the preferred title based on the original key would be misleading. Using 'voice' alone avoids these problems.

ACOC generally supports the proposals in K2. 6.20.0.5.3; K4. 6.20.0.7; K5. 6.20.0.8; K6. 6.20.0.9; K9. 6.20.0.13; K10. 6.20.0.14.

K.3. RDA 6.20.0.6 ACOC agrees, but finds the wording at 6.20.0.6.5 cumbersome.

K.7 RDA 6.20.0.10 See comments at K1. 6.20.0.3.2 re voice types.

K.8 RDA 6.20.0.12 See comments at K1. 6.20.0.3.2 re voice types

L. Proposed revision of draft 6.21.0.3

ACOC agrees with the proposed additions, but would like to evaluate them in terms of their suitability for incorporation into the general instructions.

M. Proposed revision of draft 6.22

ACOC agrees with LC that key should be required only in the circumstances given in 6.22.0.3.1, and would like JSC to discuss how to indicate this. Such elements are usually given as required in RDA even if they are required subject to some limitations.

We question the use of the term ‘first edition’ in RDA.

We note that both alternatives are more all-encompassing (in either form) than RDA draft, which is unnecessarily prescriptive in its statements concerning “major or minor, add the appropriate word”.