

Memorandum

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/LC response

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA DATE: Sept. 13, 2007

FROM: Barbara B. Tillett, LC Representative

SUBJECT: RDA: Resource Description and Access Part A -- Constituency Review of June 2007 Draft of Chapters 6-7

Questions in cover letter for chapters 6-7

- Re: Detailed instructions for legal works, religious works, and official communications. LC recommends leaving the detailed instructions in RDA “for now” because there is not enough time for the necessary consultation.

- Re: Originating body. LC agrees with the term “originating body” in preference to the other two terms. However, LC does propose again that such bodies just be considered creators. If combined with creators, Part B instructions on naming the work may need to include the categorizations now found for originating bodies in Ch. 6 to keep RDA basically in sync with AACR2.

LC also notes the confusion caused by the presence of the term “issuing” in several definitions and instructions (e.g., 6.3.2.0.1, 6.3.2.0.2, 6.5.2.0.1, 6.7.1.5, 6.7.2.3) and in the explanations of many of the examples (e.g., last four examples in 6.3.4.1.1). Such wording should be revised. Also see specific comments below.

- Re: Form of examples. LC prefers option 3 because this option does not cause confusion about the presence of additions to the name (dates, etc.) and the inversion of personal names. LC also recommends that the parenthetical explanation in option 3 be modified to say “(*ISBD display of resource described: _____*)” when an ISBD display is needed (e.g., so that found terminology illustrates the scope of some of the roles, especially in the contributor categories).

- Re: Missing examples: LC suggests the following as possible examples for 6.8.3.1:

Central Conference of American Rabbis

(Access point representing the denominational body for: A Passover Haggadah : the new Union Haggadah / prepared by the Central Conference of American Rabbis ; edited by Herbert Bronstein ; drawings by Leonard Baskin)

Rabbinical Council of America

(Access point representing the denominational body for: The ArtScroll Rabbinical Council of America Sabbath and festival Siddur =

סדור בית רנוב : שבת, שלוש רגלים

/ a new translation and anthologized commentary by Nosson Scherman ; co-edited by Meir Zlotowitz ; designed by Sheah Brander)

General comments about the drafts of revised chapters 6-7

1) Moving image resources. Concerns have been expressed by LC's experts in the cataloguing of moving image resources about relegating to the expression what they consider to be co-creators (directors, producers, writers, etc.) when the same roles for other content/genres are creators for the work. They also consider production companies (now at the work level) to be the same as directors, producers, writers, etc. They do realize the implications when naming the work and they do want to continue naming the work by using its title proper or a preferred title. LC recommends naming these persons/families/bodies as creators with an exception in chapter 13 saying not to name a moving image work using the first-named creator.

Two of the examples for creators are also misleading for the moving image experts:

“Friedlander, Martin” (p. 6-8): They say Friedlander is a contributor (i.e., a performer), not a creator. The moving image work is the responsibility of multiple creators.

“Wagner, Richard” (p. 6-9): They say Wagner is not the creator because the moving image work is the responsibility of multiple creators.

2) Examples in non-roman scripts. LC notes that none of the examples include access points or explanations of transcribed elements from resources other than in the roman alphabet. When a non-roman script community produces an RDA translation, it is likely that many/most of the examples will be replaced with non-roman script examples. However, it would be both an indication of internationalization and a reflection of what Anglo-American libraries have in their collections if some examples of resources with transcribed elements in non-roman scripts were added to appropriate instructions in Part A. LC would be willing to supply such examples.

Comments on the drafts of revised chapters 6-7

6.3.1: LC recommends combining 6.3.2 with 6.3.1 to consider all to be creators. If the instructions are not combined, include in 6.3.1.0 a sub-instruction for originating body and refer to 6.3.2; also modify the footnote to indicate that creators are not used when citing the work if the work fits any of the categories in the instructions for an originating body.

6.3.1.1.1, “Burden, Matthew Currier” example (p. 6-8): LC recommends deleting this example because it appears to be an anthology that better illustrates the role of compiler as contributor than compiler as creator.

6.3.1.1.1, “Gemmell, Nikki” example (p. 6-8): In parenthetical explanation, change “Access point for the creator for” to “Access point representing the creator for”

6.3.1.1.1, “Miller, Wade” example (p. 6-10): LC recommends moving this example to the first grouping (“One person responsible ...”) because this example represents one persona.

6.3.1.1.1, “Holiday, Billie ...” example (p. 6-11): LC notes that it would be helpful if the explanation clarified that the example is for a book, not for a sound recording with the same title.

6.3.1.1.1, “British American Tobacco Company ...” example (p. 6-12): LC recommends moving this example to 6.3.2 because the resource appears to represent a category for originating bodies.

6.3.1.1.1, “Hofmannsthal, Hugo von ...” example (p. 6-13): LC notes that music is not part of a libretto. Because the Strauss connection would be included in the description as a related work rather than as a creator, this is not a valid example for the category of different roles. LC recommends either deleting this example or replacing it with one that has both the libretto and the music.

6.3.1.1.1, Category “Person, family, or corporate body responsible for creating a new work based on a previously existing work” (p. 6-14): LC recommends adding an example of a new work created by the same person as the existing work:

Dufay, Guillaume

(Access point representing the creator for: Se la face ay pale : Messe für vierstimmigen gemischten Chor = Mass for four-part mixed chorus / Guillaume Dufay. Based on the tenor part of the composer’s own ballade Se la face ay pale)

6.3.2: See comment at 6.3.1 about combining these two instructions.

Also, LC asks if JSC should discuss in October the possibility of not continuing in RDA the AACR2 21.1B2 concept of including the name of the body when naming the works in these categories. If the decision is to continue that AACR2 concept, LC recommends, for purposes of clarity, making originating bodies be creators (see comment at 6.3.1). (Otherwise, chapter 13 will need the instruction LC recommended for the first draft of chapter 7 to ignore any creators when naming works in these categories.)

6.3.2.0.1: LC recommends revising the wording not to use “issuing” or “issued” to avoid confusion of “issuing body” in later specific instructions in this chapter. The beginning of the sentence could be rewritten as “An originating body is a corporate body responsible for a work that falls into one or more ...” because the criterion here is the content of the work and not the type of body.

6.3.2.0.2: To avoid the use of “issuing” and “issued” and the use of “specific” (many specific types of works are covered by the general instructions), LC recommends revising the sentence to “For corporate bodies responsible for the following types of works, see 6.7 (legal works), ...”

6.3.2.1.1, “United States. Air Force” example (p. 6-17): LC recommends deleting this example because the Air Force is not the originating body of the reproductions; the resource is an aggregate work.

6.3.3.0.1: This sentence as written covers two different concepts (as did comparable rule in AACR2). If there is substantial authority for designating a creator, then the level of attribution is not dubious. To maintain the “dubious” concept, LC recommends changing the wording at the end of the sentence to “... is one for whom there is, or once was, some authority or designating him/her/it as the creator, but that attribution is doubtful or has been disproven.”

6.3.3.1.1, “Dennis, John” example (p. 6-20): LC recommends deleting this example because the statement “generally attributed” statement does not fit with “dubiously or erroneously attributed.”

6.3.4.1.1, “Macmillan, Alexander” example (p. 6-21): LC notes that an access point for F.S. Ellis needs to be included.

6.3.4.1.1, “Lindemans, Micha F.” example (p. 6-21): LC recommends moving this example to 6.3.1.1 because the person appears to be the creator, not just the founder, of the resource.

6.3.4.1.1, “Ornes, Rafael V.” example (p. 6-21): LC recommends moving this example to 6.3.1.1 because the person appears to be the creator, not just the founder, of the resource.

6.3.4.1.1, “Vilniaus Universitetas ...” and three subsequent examples (p. 6-22/6-23): LC recommends changing the wording “issuing body” to other word (perhaps “related body”) to avoid confusion with specific issuing bodies in later instructions (6.7.1.5, 6.7.2.3, etc.)

6.3.4.2.2: Typo: The instruction should be numbered as 6.3.4.1.2.

6.4.1.1.1, additional example: LC recommends adding an example for a simple situation of a compiler as editor of a compilation of the works of other creators. LC suggests using the “Burden, Matthew Currier” example currently on p. 6-8.

6.4.1.1.1, category of “Composer of added accompaniment, etc.” (p. 6-15). LC recommends changing the wording from “Composer of added accompaniment, etc.” to “Composer of added accompaniment, parts, etc.” to convey the scope from AACR2. LC

also suggests that we don't need three examples showing exactly the same thing.

6.5.1: LC recommends changing the name of the element to “Manufacturer” to avoid confusion with the role of a producer (e.g., for a stage work, movie, or sound recording). Literary warrant would seem to go with the role rather than the element and “Manufacturer” is a good substitute for the element name. The same change would be required in chapter 2.

6.5.1.1.1, “3B Scientific” example (p. 6-31): LC notes the use of brackets for the devised title. Should these brackets and others in the same (also on p. 6-32) or similar example be removed as the result of the August 9 conference call decision?

6.5.2.0.1: LC recommends revising the wording for reasons other than just avoiding the confusion of using “issuing” in this context. For moving image resources, “releasing” really is distributing. For electronic resources, a release may often be a different edition. Possible replacement wording would be “A publisher is a person, family or corporate body responsible for publishing a manifestation.”

6.5.3.0.1: LC recommends the following replacement wording and notes that this change would also affect wording of instructions in chapter 2: “A distributor is a person, family or corporate body responsible for making a manifestation available.”

6.7: LC recommends replacing many of the examples of older resources with examples of more current resources.

6.7.1.1: In order to be able to name the works covered by 6.7.1.1-6.7.1.4 when applying chapter 13, LC recommends removing 6.7.1.5-6.7.1.6 so that 6.7.1 can be labelled as “Required.” 6.7.1.5 and 6.7.1.6 could become a new 6.7.2 “Other persons and corporate bodies associated with laws, etc.” with following instructions being renumbered.

6.7.1.5: LC didn't find “Issuing body” in the legal section of the RDA element analysis document. Is the “Issuing body” covered here at 6.7.1.5 the same as the RDA element “Issuing agency or agent,” or should a new RDA element be made for “Issuing body of law”?

6.7.1.6: LC recommends that this instruction refer back to 6.4.1.1.1 to indicate that “compiler” here is a type of “contributor,” not a new element used only for compilers of laws.

6.7.2.4: LC recommends that this instruction refer back to 6.4.1.1.1 to indicate that “compiler” here is a type of “contributor,” not a new element used only for compilers of laws.

6.7.3: LC recommends expanding the scope of this instruction to include persons and to change the name of the element to “Persons and corporate bodies associated with court

rules.”

6.7.3.4: LC recommends changing “Compiling body” to “Compiler” (because a person might be compiling court rules), and refer back to 6.4.1.1.1 to indicate that “compiler” here is a type of “contributor,” not a new element used only for compilers of court rules.

6.7.4: LC recommends deleting the word “international” in the caption and in the wording of 6.7.4.0.1 and 6.7.4.1.1 because there are intergovernmental bodies at the national level and below.

6.7.4: LC considered merging 6.7.4 with 6.7.1 by expanding captions and making slight adjustments to wording of instructions. It does seem possible to do so but LC isn’t convinced that the merger is needed unless other JSC constituencies also are interested.

6.7.5: LC notes that the label of “Optional” for the element may need to be changed to “Required” if JSC decides in chapter 13 that the first signatory is to be included when naming the work.

6.7.5.2: LC recommends deleting the word “international” in the caption and in the wording of 6.7.5.2.1, 6.7.5.2.2, and 6.7.5.5.1 (including explanations for examples) because there are intergovernmental bodies at the national level and below.

6.7.5.3: LC notes that a possible revision is proposed in 5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up.

6.7.5.7: LC recommends that this Instruction refer back to 6.4.1.1.1 to indicate that “compiler” here is a type of “contributor,” not a new element used only for compilers of treaties, etc.

6.7.6.2: LC asks if this “Reporter” is the same element as “Reporter [of court proceedings]” as given in the RDA element analysis document. Also see LC’s comment about Reporter of court proceedings at 6.7.7.9 below.

6.7.6.2.2: LC recommends deleting “named in the preferred source of information” to remove that limitation.

6.7.6.3: LC recommends that this instruction refer back to 6.4.1.1.1 to indicate that “compiler” here is a type of “contributor,” not a new element used only for compilers of court reports.

6.7.6.4: LC recommends deleting this instruction. The situation is covered by 6.5.2.

6.7.7.1.3: LC recommends removing the limitation of “first named” in this instruction. The example would need to be adjusted.

6.7.7.1.4: LC recommends removing the limitation of “first named” in this instruction. It would be helpful also to give a reference to 6.7.7.6 for the access point for the judge.

6.7.7.3.3/6.7.7.3.4: LC recommends removing the limitation of “first named” in these instructions. The examples would need to be adjusted.

6.7.7.4.3: LC recommends removing the limitation of “first named” in this instruction. The example would need to be adjusted.

6.7.7.4.4: LC recommends removing the limitation of “first named” in this instruction. The examples would need to be adjusted. It would helpful also to give a reference to 6.7.7.6 for the access point for the judge.

6.7.7.7: LC recommends changing the element name to the singular form “Party to a case” to match the style of other element names (the element is given as “Party to a case in the RDA element analysis document).

6.7.7.9: For purposes of clarification, LC recommends changing the name of the element to “Reporter of court proceedings” in the caption and in 6.7.7.9.1. LC notes that the element name was qualified as “Reporter [of court proceedings]” in the RDA element analysis document.

6.8.3.0.2, b): LC recommends removing the limitation “for congregations and choirs.” The audience for the resource is not pertinent.

6.9.3: LC recommends that this instruction refer back to 6.4.1.1.1 to indicate that “compiler” here is a type of “contributor,” not a new element used only for compilers of official communications.

7.3.1: LC recommends deleting 7.3.1 from chapter 7 and making necessary modifications to 7.3.0, including an explanation that the relationship between a work and an expression of the work is covered in Part B. The context of this chapter is bibliographic records for manifestations; there are no bibliographic records for works and expressions. 7.3.1.0.1a.1 and 7.3.1.0.1b.1 would be more appropriate in Part B in the context of authority records. 7.3.1.0.1c.1 would disappear.

If JSC does not agree with the proposed deletion of 7.3.1, LC has the following comments on 7.3.1:

7.3.1.0: LC recommends using the same example for each of the three conventions in addition to other examples for the conventions.

7.3.1.0.1c.1, example: LC recommends either deleting “New York : M. Witmark, ©1933” or adjusting the explanation to read “(Elements identifying both the work and the expression included in the description of the manifestation)”

7.3.2.0.1a.1, example: LC notes that this example is incomplete because it illustrates only one half of the relationship. LC recommends correcting the existing explanation and

adding missing information as below:

2001616153

(Library of Congress ~~system~~ control number for this manifestation of the Faroese expression of William Shakespeare's Julius Caesar)

n 2001092139

(Library of Congress control number for the Faroese expression of William Shakespeare's Julius Caesar)

7.3.3.0.1bc.1: Typo: Instruction number should be “7.3.3.0.1b.1”

7.4.1.1.1a.1, 2nd and 3rd examples: Having the URL on the second line is confusing because the first line of each example appears to be a misplaced explanatory statement instead of being an identification of the resource.

7.4.1.1.1a.1, additional example: LC suggests an additional music example:

B. et Cie 4520

(Plate number for the reprinted manifestation)

7.5.0.2: LC prefers the second choice of substitute wording suggested by the ACOC rep in her May 24, 2007 email message as copied below. (LC does not have concerns about introducing terms defined in later instructions because RDA will be a Web tool.)

Email message excerpt:

“This alternative uses the wording from the later instruction, and seems the clearest alternative *but* introduces the terms defined in later instructions.”

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 7.5.0.2.1 | ➤ Record the relationship between a work (or expression) embodied in the resource being described and a source work (or expression) following the guidelines given under 7.5.1. |
| 7.5.0.2.2 | ➤ Record the relationship between a work (or expression) embodied in the resource being described and a derivative work (or expression) following the guidelines given under 7.5.2 |

7.5.1.0.2: LC recommends including “musical arrangements” here instead of in the first part of 7.5.1.0.2 because these arrangements are generally based on works, not on expressions. (They are expressions.)

7.5.1.0.3: Based on its comment for 7.5.1.0.2, LC recommends deleting “musical arrangements” from the second and third lines and adding “musical arrangements” in the list at the end of the sentence.

7.5.1.1.1a.1, example: LC recommends changing “Paraphrase of:” to “Arrangement of:” for what is an arrangement. The term “paraphrase” is not common for such resources.

7.5.2.1.1c.1, “Published as” example (p. 7-19): LC does not understand this example. A parenthetical explanation is needed.

7.5.2.1.1c.1, “Also available in a 45 min. ...” example (p. 7-20): Typo: Change embedded quotation mark to apostrophe in “America’s”

7.5.2.1.1c.1, “Originally released as a motion picture ...” example (p. 7-20): LC recommends deleting this example because the first part is describing the source work; the complexity of multiple relationships in the one example will be confusing.

7.6.0.1: LC recommends indicating that the relationship is a subject relationship by adjusting the wording to read “A descriptive relationship is a subject relationship ...”

7.6.1.1: LC recommends adding a fourth possible convention “Subject access point to name the described entity” as 7.6.1.1d.1.

7.7.1.0.2: LC recommends clarifying that whole works can also be works with components.

7.8.1.1.1a.1, 1st example: Typo: The URL should not be in italic type.

7.9.2.1.1b.1, “Prequel to ...” example (p. 7-42): LC notes that this example needs to be corrected to name the prequel because it is the succeeding work:

Prequel: Dominion : prequel to The exorcist
(*Resource described:* The exorcist)