Members present:

**Authorities Subcommittee:** Damian Iseminger (chair), Sharon Benamou, Paul Cauthen, Neil Hughes, Casey Mullin, Scott Phinney, Thomas Pease, Jacob Schaub, Raymond Schmidt, Tomoko Shibuya, Michi Hoban (LC representative)

**Descriptive Subcommittee:** Mark Scharff (chair), Sarah Cohen, Patty Falk, Candice Feldt, Jean Harden, Gary Markham, Mark McKnight, Tracey Snyder

Visitors present: 30

The members of the Authorities and Descriptive Subcommittees gathered for a brief, 30 minute meeting to discuss music issues in RDA chapter 6 that may lead to revision proposals. The first issue concerns the construction of access points for musical works that are considered adaptations in RDA instruction 6.28.1.5. It instructs that the access point that represents a musical work that is an adaptation be formed by combining the access point of the person responsible for the adaptation with the preferred title for the adaptation. An exception to this practice is made for music adaptations commonly known by title. Instead RDA instructs that the access point should consist solely of the title. The need for this exception will be explored by Sarah Cohen, Ray Schmidt, and Thomas Pease. They will also be working on an issue closely related to this exception in instruction 6.28.3.3. It states that the authorized access point for a work with an added accompaniment should be the authorized access point for the original work. This practice seems to discount the contributions of the composer of the added accompaniment and is also problematic in that it does not indicate that the original work has been altered in some meaningful way.

Another issue concerns the creation of authorized access points for librettos. In RDA, access points for librettos should be constructed using the access point for the author of the libretto followed by the title of the libretto. Unlike AACR2, RDA provides no alternative to instead use the authorized access point for the opera followed by the word *Libretto.* This practice is now only allowed for in variant access points in 6.27.4.2. However this causes some problems when the librettist and the composer are the same person and the title of the libretto and the opera are identical, as is the case in the operas and librettos of Richard Wagner. In RDA practice, the access point for the opera Lohengrin would look like this:

Wagner, Richard, 1813-1883. Lohengrin (Opera)

while the access point for the libretto would look like this:

Wagner, Richard, 1813-1883. Lohengrin (Libretto)

But then according to 6.27.4.2, a variant access point for the libretto would look like this:
Wagner, Richard, 1813-1883. Lohengrin. Libretto

But when computer normalization of these access points takes place in the LC/NAF, the access points for the libretto are identical. Therefore, the instruction needs to be revised so that an exception is made for the situation outlined above or a new instruction is proposed that allows for the construction of an authorized access point for this special situation in the form only reserved for access points constructed according to 6.27.4.2. Damian Iseminger, Patty Falk, and some members to be named later will collaborate on this proposal.

The final issue concerns the use of the terms lyrics and texts in authorized access points in RDA. In 6.27.4.2 it is implied in an example that an incomplete compilation of song texts should be constructed using the access point for the author of the song texts followed by the collective title of “Lyrics” followed by the term “Selections.” However when the variant access point for this incomplete compilation is made according to 6.27.4.2, only the terms “Libretto,” “Librettos,” “Text,” or “Texts” may be used. This appears to raise an issue that may need to be addressed. Closely related to this is that the terms text, libretto, and lyrics are not defined in RDA. The closest definitions available are those of the role designations “librettist” and “lyricist” in appendix I. Work on these related issues will begin in earnest after new appointments to the Authorities and Descriptive Subcommittees are made by the MLA President.

It is hoped that any proposals for revision to RDA resulting from this work will be made available to BCC for comment and revision in April, with final proposals submitted to the ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) in May, so that any changes suggested by CC:DA can be incorporated into a final form before the start of the CC:DA Meetings at ALA Annual in Anaheim, Calif.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00PM.
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