

**TO:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

**FROM:** Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative

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

---

CILIP continues to welcome the attempt by LC, assisted in this case by experts from ALA and CCC, to tidy up some of the instructions relating to musical works and expressions. Considering the degree of expertise already committed to this task, it is unsurprising – even after having solicited the views of IAML (UK & Irl) – that we find little on which to comment, and even less with which to disagree.

**6.2.3.1.** Since, as 6.2.3.3.2 (a) makes explicit, the alternative name for the work may include not just the title but also the preferred access point for a composer, we would prefer it if the scope referred to a form of name, rather than a form of title.

**6.15.1.5.1.** This instruction neglects to say what should happen in the (admittedly unlikely) event of the cataloguing agency not having a preferred language. Applying 6.15.1.3.1 could well lead to individual works of the same type being established with quite different titles, which would seem undesirable. CILIP notes that this is no longer an issue if the further changes to 6.15.1 proposed in 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up/2 are approved.

**6.15.1.5.1.** The reference to 6.15.0 should be to 6.15.1.

**6.15.1.12.2.** Substitute entirely for for entirely of.

**6.15.1.12.3.** This instruction seems entirely out of place in a section given over to **Complete works**. It is not an alternative way of treating complete works since, as the wording indicates, it is concerned solely with compilations that are not complete works.

**6.16.0.1.1.** The wording needs to reflect that there may be only one instrument and/or voice involved (cf. 6.16.0.3.2)

**Medium of performance** is the instruments(s), voices(s), etc., for which a musical work was originally conceived.

**6.16.0.3.2.** Cf 6.16.0.1.1. There seems to be some confusion over the appropriate use of singular, plural, and/or the possibility of either applying. In (a), we would expect

keyboard instrument(s)

And in (b)

voice(s)

other instrument(s)

However, since 6.16 generally seems to have opted for plurals, even where singular might sometimes be appropriate, it might be better to use the plural consistently, except where the singular is possible (as in 6.16.0.3(a) – “non-keyboard instrument”).

**6.16.0.3.5.** To match the instruction at 6.16.0.6.2, it is necessary to substitute instrument for performer, as per the original 5JSC/LC/12. CILIP also finds “If there is a number of hands...” rather ungainly and tentatively offers as an alternative

If ~~there is a~~ the number of hands required for any instrument is other than two ~~for any performer~~, follow the instructions given under [6.16.0.6.2](#)

**6.16.0.6.5.** CILIP notes not only that this syntactically impeccable 63-word sentence is quite an achievement, but also that it cannot offer any revision that conveys the same information more concisely or clearly, despite the desirability of such an outcome reflecting the expressed wishes of its own reviewers, most of them not music specialists, but for all of whom English is a first language.

**6.16.0.6.6 / 6.16.0.7.1** (also referred to in **6.16.0.3.2**). We apologise for not having picked up on this in our response to the original 5JSC/LC/12, but we have concerns over the use of the term electronics for either unnamed electronic instruments (6.16.0.6.6) or for groups of electronic instruments (6.16.0.7.1). Many in the wider music business use the term to refer to software or technology, not instruments – and 20 years ago it might have equated to “electronic keyboard”, though not other electronic instruments. Faut de mieux, we would prefer electronic instrument(s).

**6.16.0.7.1.** Sometimes adopting a consistent approach to style results in sentences that seem odd or awkward; this is one of those occasions. The following wording is more natural in its construction, but conflicts stylistically:

Record one of the following terms in the language of the cataloguing agency one of the following terms for a group of instruments ...

**6.18.0.1.1.** It is unfortunate that the definition of “key” given here is further qualified by the parenthetical statement in 6.18.0.3.1. If what is contained within those parentheses is meant to help define what’s meant by “key”, should it not be in the Scope?