

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

**From:** Bill Leonard, CCC representative

**Subject: Musical arrangements: discussion paper**

CCC appreciates the observations of EURIG partners from their testing and implementation of RDA. We are very interested in the discussion of the types of relationships that are important to users and the challenge of expressing them in our current environment. We would like to contribute the following comments to this discussion.

*1 Musical arrangements: new expressions of the same work, or new works.*

*1.1 Arrangements by composers*

CCC agrees that in RDA some arrangements can be considered as new works and others are new expressions. This requires cataloguers to exercise their judgment based on the provisions of 6.28.1.5. When an arrangement does not constitute a new work because it does not fall into one of the categories of 6.28.1.5, the general instruction is followed and the access point will be based on the authorized access point representing the original work following 6.28.3.2.

CCC supports retaining this practice because it supports collocation under the name of the creator of the work. CCC does not support introducing an exception to this principle.

We are willing to live with the fact that we cannot introduce the access points for contributors to the authorized access point for a work.

We note that the relationships "musical arrangement/musical arrangement of" already exist for use between expressions. Arrangements that are regarded as new works will use the "based on (work)/derivative work" relationships.

*1.2 Works arranged by their own creator*

As EURIG notes, instruction 6.28.1.10 allows the use of medium of performance to construct unique access points for different musical works bearing the same title. To use the same method to distinguish versions of the same work would cause confusion by leading users to believe that they are in fact different works. This would also obscure the distinction that one is an arrangement of the other and hinder the collocation of arrangements. The instructions would become more complex by introducing a case-law exception for extremely rare situations.

*1.3 Arrangements by non-composers*

CCC would not support this proposed change for the reasons given above.

*2 Arrangements and Performances: inexplicit relationships*

The appropriate relationship types for related works (arrangements treated as new works) and for related expressions (arrangements treated as expressions) already exist in Appendix J.

The problem is not how RDA treats relationships but how access points are constructed applying 6.28.3.1-6.28.3.5. If the additions provided at 6.27.3 were also applicable to musical expressions, the construction of unique access points for musical expressions would be possible.

For arrangements, the access points could represent not only specific arrangements but also specific performances of specific arrangements. For example:

Wagner, Richard, 1813-1883. Tristan und Isolde. Liebestod; arranged (Liszt : Performed music : Ciccolini : 1971)

CCC feels that such an access point provides the kind of retrieval and clustering that EURIG wants without treating arrangements by composers differently from other arrangements.

Regarding complete works by a composer, we do not share EURIG's concern that Liszt's arrangements for piano that are included in editions of his complete piano works are not directly linked to the piano works that he composed himself. They are different works by different creators and we do not see the need to establish a direct relationship between them if they are only linked together by the fact that they are related to the same manifestation. We feel that relating the works to the common manifestation using a Work Manifested relationship is sufficient.