

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative to JSC

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

General comments

ACOC appreciates the efforts of all those involved in developing these proposed revisions. The proposed revisions were evaluated by both experienced music cataloguers and those less familiar with music cataloguing, and our comments reflect these two perspectives.

- Overall, the instructions remain extremely complex. The development of additional tools to assist in navigating these instructions would be helpful, e.g. the development of workflows or decision trees.
- More general guidance on the treatment of music could be usefully given at various points, and additional Glossary definitions and links to the Glossary made. For example:
 - at 6.15.1.5 it would be useful to give background on distinctive titles (per Glossary definition of Type of musical composition)
 - at 6.15.1.11 it would be useful to give information on the meaning of broad versus specific mediums of performance and forms or types of composition.
- A number of instructions have had words to the effect of “in the language of the cataloguing agency” added. This situation is covered in *0.10.2 Language and script*, and does not need to be repeated at every relevant instruction.
- It is unfortunate that no explanation of the proposed revisions has been given. This is particularly problematic in cases where the proposed revision is completely different from the original proposals, e.g. the case of cadenzas.

Specific comments

ACOC supports the proposed revisions, except as specified below.

6.2.1.15 Complete works in a single form (6.2.2.11.2 in draft)

The exception at 6.2.1.15.2 is covered already by the reference “other than music, see 6.15.1” in the first sentence of 6.2.1.15.1. Only one of these references is needed: we suggest that the Editor choose the most appropriate way to make the reference.

6.2.3 Alternative name for the work (new)

We note that this proposal is a reversal of that originally contained in 5JSC/LC/12, and which ACOC supported, which proposed treating cadenzas as parts of works, and

naming them by the composer and title of the larger work. We presume that this was unacceptable to the May Group, and that this proposal represents a compromise position.

- If this instruction were intended to be an instruction about a variant title of a work, it would belong here provided that the word “name” was changed to “title” and information on combining the title with the access point for the composer was removed.
- However, this instruction appears to be designed to function as a variant access point representing a musical work or expression to parallel the instruction at 6.28.1.5.1 on constructing the preferred access point for a cadenza. ACOC would appreciate further discussion on the best placement of this instruction. Does it belong in 6.28.4 Variant access point representing a musical work or expression?

6.2.3.3.2 1st example

We note that the examples need to be reviewed. It is unclear why “Previn” has not been given as another distinguishing term.

6.15.1.3.4 (6.15.2.4 in draft. Moved and reworded)

Comment 1 If this is to be treated as an exception it would be helpful to introduce it with a short bolded phrase as with the other exceptions.

Comment 2 We agree with the replacement of “titles ... that include the name of a type of composition” with “non-distinctive title”. However we note that an explanation of this term is needed both for new cataloguers and for consistency amongst experienced cataloguers.

6.15.1.4.3 examples (comment on RDA full draft 6.15.2.4 examples)

The italics are missing in the RDA full draft, although they are present in 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up. We greatly prefer the underlining used in AACR to the use of italics - it is simply much more readable.

6.15.1.12.3 (new instruction re Selections)

Comment 1 The instruction at 6.15.1.12 concerns Complete works, whereas the new instruction at 6.15.1.12.3 concerns “two or more but not all”. It is therefore not an alternative to the general instruction and should be given separately.

Comment 2 The changes made to the following instructions seem to imply that, for consistency, an alternative should be added to 6.15.1.12.3 allowing for the use of preferred titles such as *Lute music. Selections*.

6.15.1.13, 6.15.1.14, 6.15.1.15

Comment 1 It is unclear why similar changes have not been proposed to 6.15.1.15.

Comment 2 In the alternatives for these instructions it is not clear whether the “conventional collective title” being referred to is the one devised according to the preceding instruction (e.g. Chamber music, Brass music or Cadenzas), or the title *Works*.

Comment 3: The existence of alternatives which apply to “two or more but not all” raises the question of whether the instruction to which they are an alternative is intended to be used only when the compilation is of the complete works within that medium of performance, etc.

6.15.2.5 Recording other variant titles for musical works

The final example (Bax) says: preferred title recorded as Selected works. Shouldn't this be “Works. Selections” according to the alternative at 6.15.1.12.3?

6.16.0.3.3 (new)

This instruction says to use a specific term such as *contralto* when it's specified by composer, whereas 6.16.0.10.1 has a specified list of terms, e.g. *alto*. Does this mean you use different terms depending on whether or not the item specifically states a term? The relationship between these two instructions is not clear.

6.16.0.5 Standard combinations of instruments

The rationale for the use of the terms recorded according to 6.16.0.5.1 and 6.16.0.5.2 is not apparent. Although these instructions existed in similar form in AACR2, for RDA we would like to see the principles behind these instructions explained.

6.16.0.6.2

We suggest that this instruction needs to be reworded for clarity, e.g.

“Specify the number of hands except if it is for one performer, two hands.”

6.16.0.6.3

The use of the term ‘doubling’ is ambiguous, and an example should be added for clarification.

6.16.0.6.5

The wording of the suggested instruction presents several difficulties:

- a) The definition of Medium of performance is “... the instruments, voices, etc., for which a musical work was originally conceived”. The proposed instruction overrides how the work was originally conceived, and therefore does not fit within the definition of this element.
- b) The context of the instruction is the specific work being described, it cannot go beyond that and give information on how to handle all of a composer's works as is implied by wording such as “separation of a composer's works” and “all medium statements”.
- c) The wording
“... a composer's works *for or including stringed keyboard instruments ...*”

results in the instruction being applicable to all of a composer's works, providing the composer's works included some for stringed keyboard instruments. We assume this goes well beyond what was intended.

d) The mention of “this instruction” is ambiguous - clearly the instruction is not referring to itself, but it is uncertain which instruction it is referring to.

e) A new term “medium statements” is introduced.

ACOC would appreciate an explanation of the rationale for this addition. If, as we expect, it is actually intended to provide consistency in situations where there is uncertainty over which stringed keyboard instrument a work was originally composed for, it needs to be re-worded to address that situation, e.g.

6.16.0.6.5. If there is uncertainty regarding which stringed keyboard instrument a work was originally composed for, choose the stringed keyboard instrument for which the major portion of the composer’s works were intended and specify that as the medium of performance for the work being described.

Harpsichord, clavichord and piano could be added as parenthetical examples if needed.

6.16.0.6.6

Comment 1 We would prefer the CILIP suggestion of “electronic instrument(s)”.

Comment 2 We would be interested to discuss how a recorded part of a score might be treated.

6.16.0.9.2

The example “clarinets (2)” seems to anticipate the instruction at 6.16.0.14.

6.16.0.9.3

This instruction does not seem to be an exception. Is a reference to the instructions at 6.16.0.14 all that is required?

6.16.0.13.1 Indeterminate medium of performance

Comment 1 It is unclear what the difference is between a medium of performance which is “not stated specifically in the resource or other source” and one which is “unspecified”.

Comment 2 The example in 6.16.0.13.1 b), i.e.

treble instrument
organ
(Preferred title: Chorale preludes)

does not seem appropriate. The medium of performance (organ) is implied in the title Chorale preludes. Chorale preludes are for organ only, with no additional treble instrument. See 6.28.1.6.2 a).

6.16.0.13.3 (existing instruction revised and treated as exception)

The exception in a) says not to record a statement of the medium of performance for "works intended for performance by voices and/or instruments". This exception appears to contradict all the preceding instructions at 6.16.0.13.1 and 6.16.0.13.2

which are about **how** to record the medium of performance. It also contradicts the example above in 6.16.0.13.2 for Weelkes. If there is a particular situation related to works of the Renaissance period, then that needs to be clarified.

6.18.0.3.1

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

6.27.3 Preferred access point representing an expression.

6.27.3.2

Although at B.1 in the tracking table it says “JSC constituencies agreed to add what was numbered at 6.1.3.2”, ACOC had noted reservations in our response. To reiterate and expand on that response:

This instruction as written does not seem necessary as the situation is already covered by 6.27.3.1. The reference back to “one or more of the terms in 6.27.3.1” does not make sense, as these terms will have already been used when applying 6.27.3.1. In addition, by referring only to “terms” the cataloguer is left in doubt about the addition of dates per 6.27.3.1 c).

6.28.1.5 Cadenzas

Please see the ACOC comments under 6.2.3 Alternative name for the work.

6.28.1.6

We repeat our suggestion that extra guidance is needed on what is meant by titles that are not distinctive.

6.28.3.3 Sketches

We repeat our concern that, by omitting the name of the composer, these examples do not illustrate the instruction.

6.28.3.5.2

The preferred access point for vocal score of a work in the original language only does not include language (6.28.3.4.1). Should these preferred access points for original language match? E.g. when in original (English) language only: *Messiah. Vocal score*; but when item is in English with German translation: *Messiah. Vocal score. English* and *Messiah. Vocal score. German*?