TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

FROM: Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative

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

CILIP wholeheartedly endorses the approach taken by LC in this paper, and the reasons given in justifying the changes proposed. Recognising that JSC has already noted that the work of generalising these music rules (along with the other "special" rules being carried over from AACR2) is something that will largely be considered after the first release of RDA, CILIP is impressed by just how much the LC proposal packs in, and is confident that it will be of great value to the community of users who have to deal with the intricacies of musical works and expressions.

We have only a handful of comments to offer, some of which may simply reflect the difficulty of understanding some quite substantial revisions in the context of the RDA draft of chapter 6. Silence should otherwise be taken is signifying assent.

B.1. LC's proposal to relocate RDA draft 6.17.1.6 to 6.1.3.3 requires an acceptance that the modifications described therein are aspects of an expression, and not of a work, as the earlier draft had it. If this is by no means clear-cut, perhaps this only serves to emphasise that FRBR is an attempt to provide a structure in which myriad complications of the bibliographic universe will somehow or other fit, not a straitjacket into which all those complications can be unambiguously knotted.

D.2 and elsewhere. In 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2-4, 9, sections 6.17.1.10 and 6.17.1.11 retain the distinction between "access points with titles consisting of the name(s) of one or more type(s) of composition" and "other access points representing musical works". 5JSC/LC/12 goes further and actually proposes new terminology for some of 6.17 and 6.18, introducing the concept of "distinctive" and "not distinctive" (perhaps it might be closer to the mark to say "partly re-introducing"…). It is warmly welcomed by CILIP.

D.6. To the casual reader, the rewording proposed here might seem to imply that a pantomime is most commonly regarded as a "work composed for choreographic movement". This is rather more specific than what's in the RDA draft, and would come as something of a shock to all those children (and many adults) who can be seen in British theatres during the Christmas season shouting "It's behind you" and "Oh no it isn't"!

F.4. The use of the term "parts" in the revised caption and text of this instruction is problematic because of potential ambiguity.

F.5. The term "concerto-like" is a little unwieldy, but we have been unable to think of an alternative. Also, 6.17.3.4.3.3 is contradictory – if only the chorus parts are included, then the work cannot contain any accompaniment. It would be nice if all of the instructions 6.17.3.4.3.1-4 could follow the same grammatical structure.

H.1. Right now, working from the current RDA approach (i.e. continuing AACR2 practice), LC's proposed revision has suggested a clear hierarchy:

Choose as the preferred title for a musical work the composer's original title in the language in which it was presented. If the title of the first edition of a work is not known to be different in wording or language from the composer's original title, use the title of the first edition as the basis for the preferred title unless a later title in the same language is better known.

This approach is not without its critics within the CILIP community. Just as we can also see from drafts of the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*, there are those (particularly in public libraries) who would already rather choose as the preferred title a form in the language of the library, and who disregard the provisions of AACR2 to do so. This is hardly news or surprising; whether the two views can be reconciled is doubtful.

K.1. Although the general instruction proposes recording the medium in the language of the cataloguing agency, this hasn't been carried through consistently – 6.20.0.6.5 (K.3), 6.20.0.6.6 (K.3) and 6.20.0.12.1 (K.8) all specify using English-language terms for aspects of medium in which no provision for other languages is provided.

K.8. In 6.20.0.12.2 we suggest "record" be substituted for "give".

M.2. The new version of 6.22.0.3.1 is a significant improvement. CILIP wonders if it might go further. Although key and mode are technically distinct concepts, *Grove* now effectively regards "key + mode" as being the "key" of a work –

Since each tonic governs both a major and a minor mode, there are (given equal temperament and enharmonic equivalence) a total of 24 keys, two for each of the 12 semitones within the chromatic octave.

This is in line with how most non-specialists would think of "key". The instruction would be simplified – and clearer to non-specialists – if it were to accept that the key is understood to include the mode (as well as avoiding the term "mode", which brings baggage with it from earlier centuries).