

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

Subject: Treatment of choreographic works in RDA

CCC greatly appreciates the investigation the LC representative has conducted concerning the treatment of choreographic works in RDA. We extend to LC our warmest thanks for preparing such a well thought-out and well researched discussion paper that so clearly considers all aspects of this issue. Admittedly, the proposal CCC submitted last year and subsequently withdrew [6JSC/CCC/6](#), required further investigation. That paper was simply addressed at correcting some specific issues encountered during the translation of RDA into French, but it did not step back and take a wider view of the larger issues. If the responses to the questions raised in LC's paper are positive, CCC encourages LC to develop a proposal for the next round of JSC discussion.

Questions:

1) Is a choreographic work a "work" in the RDA sense?

Agree. A choreographic work is expressed in notated movement, and as performed movement. If a choreographic work can also be considered to be expressed as performed movement would a new content type (or types) simplify or complicate the treatment? Some clarification would also be helpful to solidify the concept of what constitutes a choreographic work, i.e., is it just the dance part, or the composite of all artistic and creative aspects of the performance (dance, sound, music, speech, 2D and 3D still and moving images, and the sets), or is it sometimes one and sometimes the other.

2) Should the choreographer be considered the creator of a choreographic work?

Agree. The choreographer can be considered as the creator of a choreographic work but this does not mean that other categories of people such as composers and librettists are not creators also. Only the choreographer should be named in the access point for the choreographic work as the creator.

3) How should the preferred title of a choreographic work be chosen?

Preference should be given to the title given the work by the choreographer. Preference should be given to the title in the language used by the choreographer, subject to the limitations of the agency creating the data. Otherwise, or in case of doubt, the commonly-known title could be used. We find very compelling the point that dance reference works usually translate titles into the language of the reference work.

4) What is the relationship of a choreographic work to a musical work?

CCC's discussions led us to the conclusion that there are pit-falls in an over-simplification of this relationship or in a categorization as one type only. The relationship that exists between the choreography and the music is similar to the one that exists in an opera between the music and the libretto. The music of a choreographic work can be created as part of a collaborative process with the choreographer or can be a pre-existing work that is used by the choreographer to create a new work. In both cases, the resulting work is a distinct work and not a compilation. For a choreographic work, the movements and the music are therefore systemic parts of the work. However, when the music of a

choreographic work exists separately, its relationship to the choreographic work is derivative, as between a libretto and an opera, not whole-part.

In FRBRoo terms the relationship would be an incorporation of an expression into a new work, the choreography. In RDA terms it falls under whole-part. That has the slightly odd result that the creator of the whole (the choreographic work) is different than the creator of an important part (the music), as for librettos and operas, but in fact this is the case for many aggregate works. So there is no obligation for the preferred title of the choreographic work to be the same as that for the music.

5) Should Chapter 6 include instructions on preferred titles for untitled works?

Agree. The greater issue of non-self-identifying manifestations is broader than just choreography or performances. One cannot apply a single generalized treatment to all choreographic works and performances.

6) Is there a “superwork” that is a compilation of the music and the dance, or is there merely performance expressing these works simultaneously?

As stated in our response to question number 1 above: Some clarification would also be helpful to solidify the concept of what constitutes a choreographic work, i.e., is it just the dance part, or the composite of all artistic and creative aspects of the performance (dance, sound, music, speech, 2D and 3D still and moving images, and the sets), or is it sometimes one and sometimes the other. Perhaps it is necessary to distinguish between the choreographic work and the final finished product, the performance of the choreography, music, etc. It is desirable that we all have the same understanding.

Question number 6 seems to assume that a choreographic work does not include the other expressions, e.g. music, images, manifested during a performance. A similar debate existed in the area of music in relation to the libretti. In the case of music with words, no distinction was made in the authorized access points between works using pre-existing words and works that are truly collaborative. It is not always feasible to determine if the words existed before or not so all musical works are treated as collaborative works under RDA 6.28.1.2. Treating pre-existing texts differently would also have implied always identifying them as distinct works and thereby considering them as compilations, which was unacceptable to the music community. CCC suggests opening up the possibility of treating choreographic works in the same manner. This would require a special instruction on constructing access points for choreographic works to ensure that the choreographer is always selected as part of the authorized access point when another creator, such as a composer or librettist, is involved. The implications of treating the composite of all artistic and creative aspects together could also be examined.

Possible Solutions

CCC prefers Option C because the issues of non-self-identifying resources should be addressed rationally and in a consistent manner. There is some concern that current instructions conflates the preferred title and authorized access point instructions, so we see an opportunity to tease those apart. It will be desirable to ensure that there will be no odd effects on the preferred names and authorized access points produced for non-self-identifying resources already in RDA such as art works and manuscripts.

Special instructions may still be required for authorized access points for choreographic works which are the product of collaborations between creators.