

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative
Subject: Evaluating authorized access point instructions for musical works at 6.28.1.1-6.28.1.8

ALA thanks the JSC Music Working Group for this discussion paper which assesses the potential for improving the instructions in 6.28.1.1-6.28.1.8. We offer the following comments on the questions raised in the paper.

Question #1: Does the JSC agree with the Music Working Group's analysis of the instruction? Should the Music Working Group pursue revision of 6.28.1.2 taking into account the issues raised above?

ALA agrees with the Working Group that 6.28.1.2 works best when naming works from the Western art music tradition. However, if the instructions for constructing authorized access points (AAPs) continue to favor naming a single creator, then catalogers will still need guidance for selecting the appropriate creator when the work is of shared responsibility. We believe that there is no perfect solution here; AAPs that name a single creator in this situation are always a compromise.

This is true even within the Western art music tradition, and thus ALA does not support changing the instruction to more closely mirror those for collaborative works. For example, if we wanted to reflect how users identify the responsible person for joint musical/textual works, we would name operettas by Gilbert and Sullivan under Gilbert (the librettist), but musicals by Rodgers and Hammerstein under Rodgers (the composer). While this could be seen as a principled approach in one sense (reflecting how the resources are commonly identified), it is not principled in another way (the result of applying the instructions would vary based on cultural context and cataloger knowledge). ALA continues to support a pragmatic instruction that uses a single approach, and therefore does not require catalogers to conduct extensive research in order to correctly apply the instructions.

If the vision for RDA is to move instructions for constructing AAPs into application profiles, we wonder if it is worth spending the time and effort to revise these instructions within RDA itself.

Question #2: Does the JSC agree that this paragraph is needed in 6.14.2.5?

ALA believes that the act of selecting and compiling preexisting musical works, and occasionally writing additional material for a pasticcio to complete it, makes the resulting compilation a new (individual) work. We observe that pasticcios most often contain works by multiple composers, although occasionally only the music of a single composer is used. Thus, the suggested addition to 6.14.2.5 is problematic; it would only allow pasticcios that consist of music from a single composer to be an individual work, with all other pasticcios being compilations. We do not support adding this paragraph.

The reason RDA contains separate instructions for individual musical works and compilations of musical works by a single composer is to offer different outcomes when determining the preferred title. For individual works, this includes omitting certain terms from the preferred title (6.14.2.5.1) and selecting the language and form (singular vs. plural) of a term that represents a type of composition (6.14.2.5.2). For compilations of works by a single composer, the instructions allow for the use of a conventional collective title (6.14.2.8). The instructions for building AAPs obviously build on the decisions made in choosing the preferred title.

ALA has not identified any other reason to make this distinction between individual works and compilations by one composer. Thus we recommend referring to the specific instructions (6.14.2.5 and 6.14.2.8) as needed, rather than regularly incorporating language regarding individual works in other instructions. We also believe that this distinction should be minimized whenever possible. We observe that for pasticcios and ballad operas, the general instructions for works with distinctive titles in 6.2.2 will normally apply.

Question #3: Does the JSC agree with this analysis? Does the JSC want the Music Working Group to pursue revisions based on maintaining or removing this exceptional practice?

Because ALA does not consider pasticcios as compilations, we are in favor of removing this exceptional practice. This would allow them to be treated like other musical works. We see no principled reason why the individual excerpts should not be identified by the name of the creator and the title of the excerpt. We also believe that the usual alternative to use “Selections” instead of identifying the separate excerpts should be included. We believe that a reference to 6.14.2.7.2, *Two or More Parts*, is all that is required.

We recognize that this would be a significant departure from Anglo-American practice. However, we also observe that identifying a collection of excerpts from a pasticcio is problematic in any case. If ALA’s recommendation is followed, the primary instruction to provide individual access points would frequently result in having different creators identified for each excerpt from a single pasticcio. Applying the alternative to use “Selections” would generate a strikingly different AAP.

Question #4: Does the JSC agree with this analysis? Does the JSC want the Music Working Group to pursue revisions based on maintaining or removing this exceptional practice?

ALA recommends continuing the practice of naming the excerpt, which in most cases was pre-existing, by the name of its composer. We observe that a cataloger could always create a variant access point to name the excerpt as part of the pasticcio, if considered important. We note again the problem of trying to incorporate language here that distinguishes between individual works and compilations.

Question #5: Does the JSC agree that a paragraph should be added to 6.28.1 for choreographic movement?

ALA would support such an addition.

Question #6: Does the JSC agree that the above text should be added to 6.14.2.3? Should general guidance on adaptations also be added to 6.2.2?

ALA does not agree with adding the paragraph regarding adaptations of musical works. Adaptations are by definition new works. Thus the current instructions in both 6.14.2.3 and 6.2.2 should suffice.

Question #7: Does the JSC agree that guidance for adaptors of musical works is appropriate in 19.2.1.1?

ALA has no particular preference about where these instructions reside, although we do not agree with repeating the same basic instruction in two different places. We think that a reference from 19.2.1.1 to 6.28.1.5.1 would suffice. Under this scenario, if new text is needed in 19.2.1.1 for musical adaptations, we recommend using a summary statement, along the lines of the second Glossary definition for “adaptation”.

If the JSC prefers to expand 19.2.1 to address the creative role of musical adaptors, then we recommend simplifying 6.28.1.5.1 at the same time.

Question #8: Does the JSC agree that changes should be made to paragraphs 1 and 2 of 6.28.1.5.2 using language already present at 6.27.1.5?

ALA generally agrees, although we recommend inserting the word “musical” before “work” at least once (in the “if” clause, and possibly also in the “then” clause).

Question #9: Should 6.28.1.6 remain at its current location, should it be moved to an exception at 6.28.1.5, or should it be moved to an exception at 6.28.1.2?

ALA respectfully disagrees with the Working Group’s recommendation to retain this exceptional instruction. It is difficult to see how the complete replacement of a libretto would not result in a new work – such a modification certainly appears to meet the criteria for identifying an adaptation as a new work per 6.27.1.5.

If this instruction needs to be retained, ALA recommends including it as an exception to 6.28.1.2, because it is the text associated with the musical work that has changed.

Question #10: Does the JSC agree that the above text is needed in 6.2.2.9.1?

ALA supports adding text along these lines, but we think it belongs in 6.2.2.9, rather than in 6.2.2.9.1. We observe that any new wording should use the general phrasing already present in 6.28.1.8, so we suggest the following for the proposed first sentence:

Do not consider music and incidental music for a dramatic work, film, etc. to be a part of the work.