

A presentation slide with a white background and a thin black border. At the top, the title "RDA: A Hands-On Interaction" is written in a green, sans-serif font. Below the title, the subtitle "Identifying Works" is written in a black, sans-serif font. In the bottom left corner, there is the Library of Congress logo, which consists of a blue stylized wave icon above the text "LIBRARY OF CONGRESS". In the bottom right corner, the presenter's name "Laura Yust" and the event details "MLA Preconference February 9, 2011" are listed in a black, sans-serif font.

RDA:
A Hands-On Interaction

Identifying Works

LIBRARY OF
CONGRESS

Laura Yust
MLA Preconference
February 9, 2011

I'm happy to be here to talk about works in RDA.

Before I start, I need to let you know that Steve Yusko and I are here as representatives of the Library of Congress, so we'll be presenting LC policy. This fact will affect what we say about RDA. It will not necessarily reflect what each of us personally thinks about RDA. Steve and I will be presenting information based on RDA testing that is fairly basic and straightforward. With the examples we present we'll be able to say with some confidence how RDA accomplishes certain tasks. There are a few issues and problems with some of the instructions for music, particularly for expressions, so I'm sure there will be questions that we will not be able to answer. Please defer those questions to the RDA session during the conference proper.

I want to acknowledge and thank Judy Kuhagen for the use of her power point slides on which this presentation is based and Gerry Ostrove for her contributions, and I want to thank fellow LC RDA music testers Valerie Weinberg and Sharon McKinley for their knowledge and assistance. Speaking of knowledge, I am mindful that many in the audience today have as much or more experience with RDA than I. During the question and answer period I welcome your input. I have lots of slides to cover and we're under time constraints, so please hang onto your questions until the end. Thanks!

Earlier today you heard about the descriptive aspect of RDA. This afternoon we'll be talking about the 'A' in 'RDA;' that is, access. Specifically, I'll talk about constructing access points to identify works and Steve will present information about constructing access points to identify expressions. In each case we'll go over the basic information in RDA, point out similarities with AACR2 and differences from AACR2, and show you some examples. We'll have a chance to do some exercises and review our answers together. Afterwards there will be time for questions. So let's begin.

AACR2 vs. RDA

- Some similarities between RDA and AACR2 in creating access points for works
- Some important differences



There are many similarities between RDA and AACR2 in naming works but there are some important differences. Not all of the material I will cover will be specific to music, but hold on to your hats! -- we'll get to the music-specific information soon enough.

Identifying Works

- Also called “naming the work”
- Same as AACR2 “main entry” if the manifestation contains that work:

Bibl. records:

- 100/110/111 + 240
- 100/110/111 + 245
- 130
- 245

Auth. records:

- 100/110/111 \$a \$t
- 100/110/111 \$a \$t
- 130

Another way of referring to identifying works is to say we’re naming the work, just as we name persons and corporate bodies.

In AACR2 this concept and process was called determining the main entry. MARC has four possibilities for containing the information that AACR2 called main entry and RDA calls identifying the work. The fields are slightly different depending on whether the form of the main entry is given in a bib record or an authority record.

Bibliographic or Authority Data?

- RDA does not prescribe if attributes about the work and the access points are to be recorded as bibliographic data or authority data
- **At LC the music catalogers testing RDA named the work by giving the access point in the bibliographic record, and by creating name/title authority records.**

RDA elements for works can be given in the context of either bib record data or authority record data.

During the RDA Test at LC the work was identified by creating an authorized access point and then giving that access point in the bib record.

What's a work according to RDA?

- **Work:** A distinct intellectual or artistic creation (i.e., the intellectual or artistic content)

Here is an essential point that can be confusing at first. The work is an abstract idea or the intellectual content that exists in the creator's mind. As catalogers, we usually only deal with the work after it has been manifested in some form. The MARC bib record, therefore, can contain aspects of the work, the expression, the manifestation, and the item. The name/title authority record contains the attributes of the work alone. This is not dictated by RDA, but was a decision made at LC for LC catalogers. The important thing to remember is that no matter how your institution decides to assign the attributes, you will usually be working with all four attributes. Our concern now is the attributes of the **Work**.

Core Elements to Distinguish

- If elements are being recorded to distinguish one work from another or from the name of a person, family, or corporate body, record the elements (RDA 0.6.4 and RDA 0.6.5) either as:
 - additions to the authorized access point representing the work -- yes, they were for RDA Test
 - separate elements only -- no
 - both -- cataloger's judgment.

Some elements for works are core, or obligatory, if they are needed to break conflicts. Because RDA is not an encoding standard, it doesn't prescribe how those distinguishing elements should be recorded. RDA says in 0.6.4 that those elements can be given as additions to the authorized access point, as separate elements, or as both. During the RDA Test, these elements were always given as part of the authorized access point – and you'll see some examples of this later. Apply cataloger's judgment about giving those elements also as separate fields if title or name/title authority records are being made.

Identifier for the Work (RDA 6.8 & 6.13)

- Scope: “a character string uniquely associated with a work, or with a surrogate for a work (e.g., an authority record) that serves to differentiate that work from other works”
 - If making an authority record for the work: the LCCN in MARC 010 field is the identifier
 - When giving the access point for a work in bibliographic records, do not use new subfield \$0 (Authority record control number)

One of the core elements is the identifier for the work. RDA includes surrogates for the work such as title or name/title authority records within the scope of those elements. If an authority record exists for the work, the LCCN for that authority record is the identifier.

Do not use the new subfield \$0 defined for access points in bib records. Some systems are able to use these unique identifiers in a bib record instead of an entire character string, enabling links to compile the data, thus saving time, effort, and bytes.

Language and Script

- **Title for a work** in the language and script in which it appears in the resource – RDA 5.4
 - LC: in authorized and variant access points: apply the alternative to give a **romanized form**.
 - For some languages (see LCPS 5.4), permissible to give variant access points in original language/script in authority records
- **Other attributes** for a work in RDA chapter 6 in language and script prescribed in instructions

RDA gives you choices for language and script of the title for the work. There is an alternative agencies may choose to apply, which is to give a transliterated form as a substitute if the title is given in a non-Latin script in accordance with the principle of the convenience of the user.

LC will continue to give names of those entities in the Latin script in the authorized access points in authority records and in bib records. LC will also continue its current policy for some languages to give variant access points (MARC 4XX fields) in the original language or script in authority records.

Terminology

■ Title of the work

- “word, character, or group of words and/or characters by which a work is known”

■ Preferred title

- For current implementations = the form of title used when constructing the authorized access point

■ Variant title

- For current implementations = the form of title used when constructing a variant access point

Let's review some terminology. "Title of the work" is fairly straightforward, as you see on the slide. "Preferred title" is the counterpart to AACR2's "uniform title." This title is the form used when constructing the authorized access point to name the work. A "Variant title" can occur in many forms.

General Guidelines for Titles (RDA 6.2.1)

- Capitalization of title – see RDA appendix A.3
- Numbers in title in found form
 - For parts of works, see RDA 6.2.2.9
- Accents in title as found; can add accents

The F.R.B.R. representation principle informs the general guidelines for recording titles of works listed on this and the following slide. For some aspects, such as capitalization and abbreviation, you'll consult appendices A and B.

The possibility of using found capitalization does not apply to authorized access points for works, but only to text you transcribe.

General Guidelines for Titles (RDA 6.2.1)

- Omit initial article unless intent is to file on and access by that article
- Do not give space between a period and an initial
- If initials lacking periods have spaces, retain spaces
- Abbreviations in title – see RDA appendix B.3

Here are some further details about the treatment of initial articles, spacing, and punctuation in titles.

Sources of Information

- Sources for preferred title for work (RDA 6.2.2.2):
 - For a work created after 1500: from resources embodying the work (usually the first manifestation received) or reference sources
 - For a work created before 1501: from modern reference sources

RDA retains a cut-off date when specifying sources for the preferred title. The usual source for a work created after 1500 is the first manifestation received.

Sources of Information

- If the evidence of modern reference sources is inconclusive for a work created before 1501, use (in this order of preference):
 - a) modern editions
 - b) early editions
 - c) manuscript copies

- **All other elements** for works and expressions: any source

Listed here is the priority order of sources if modern reference sources have inconclusive evidence for a work created before 1501.

For chapter 6 elements other than title, any source may be used.

Preferred Title for the Work

- General instructions in RDA 6.2.1
- Specific instructions:
 - parts (RDA 6.2.2)
 - compilations (RDA 6.2.2)
 - some musical works (RDA 6.14.2)

Listed here are the instruction numbers for preferred title, the first core element we're discussing, as well as general instructions and specific instructions for certain categories of works, including musical works.

Preferred Title: Changes from AACR2

- No longer routinely omit introductory phrases (e.g., “Here beginneth ...”) and statements of responsibility
 - Remember: preferred title based on first manifestation received
 - If later manifestations have different forms, determine the most common form of the preferred title -- it may not have such a phrase or statement

RDA changes the AACR2 rule on omissions from the title of the work. Don't omit introductory phrases or statements of responsibility from a title UNTIL there is evidence of more than one form of title and the most common form can be determined. (Remember that we're talking about the title of the work given in a MARC 130 or 240 field in a bib record and not the title proper of the manifestation given in a 245 field.)

Preferred Title: Other Changes from AACR2

- “Selections” not used alone as the preferred title -- instead, “Works. Selections”
- For simultaneous publications with different titles: choice based on first resource received

Two other changes are noted on this slide:

First, “Selections” is no longer to be used by itself as a preferred title. We’ll come back to this topic when we look at conventional collective titles.

Also, when simultaneous publications have different titles, the choice of preferred title is now based on the first resource received. The next two slides illustrate this change.

Simultaneous Publication: Different Titles, Same Language

- Choose the preferred title based on title of the resource first received (not the resource published in the home country)

U.K. volume received first: **Callas**
U.S. volume received later: **Maria Callas**

Preferred title = Callas



There is no longer a preference for the title found on the resource published in the home country when a resource is published simultaneously with different titles in the same language. Use the title of the first-received resource.

Simultaneous Publication: Different Titles/Languages

- No longer a priority order of languages – use title in resource first received

Item published simultaneously in German and English versions

**German-language version received first
English-language version received later**

Preferred title = title from German-language version

When the same resource is published simultaneously with different titles in different languages, there is no longer a priority order of languages when selecting the preferred title. Instead, use the title in the first-received resource.

Preferred Title: Name of One Type of Musical Composition (RDA 6.14.2.5)

Record accepted form of name in English if there is one

- No longer requirement that must have cognates in English, French, German, & Italian or be same in those languages

Another change from AACR2 is for musical works having a preferred title consisting of the name of one type of musical composition. Use the accepted form of name in English whether or not the English form has a cognate in the language of the resource.

Example: Name of One Type of Musical Composition

AACR2

100 1# \$a Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, \$d 1756-1791. \$t **Stücke**, \$m musical clock, \$n K. 608, \$r F minor

RDA

100 1# \$a Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus \$q (Johann Chrysostom Wolfgang Amadeus), \$d 1756-1791. \$t **Pieces**, \$m musical clock, \$n K. 608, \$r F minor

In AACR2 the term *Stücke* was used, but in RDA the cataloger can use the term *Pieces*.

Responsible Entity Related to Work?

- RDA 0.6.3 and RDA 6.27.1: when creating the authorized access point for the work, precede the preferred title for the work, if appropriate, by the authorized access point representing the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the work

So far we've been focusing on the preferred title for naming the work. But, if a person, family, or corporate body is responsible for the work (in other words, is the creator), precede the preferred title for the work by the authorized access point for that person, family, or corporate body.

Chapter 19: Entity Responsible for a Work

- Sources (RDA 19.1.1):
 - Preferred sources of information (RDA 2.2.2)
 - Other statements appearing **prominently** in the resource
 - Information appearing only in the content
 - Other sources

The instructions for identifying the entity responsible for a work are in RDA chapter 19. The instructions on sources are different from those for other elements because there is a restriction that only statements appearing prominently be used from sources beyond the preferred sources of information. This restriction coincides with paying attention to how the resource represents the responsibility for the work. “Prominently” isn’t defined in RDA. Apply cataloger’s judgment, considering the presentation on the source.

Creator (RDA 19.2)

- Creator = “person, family, or corporate body **responsible** for the creation of a work”
- If more than one, only the creator having **principal responsibility named first** in resource is required
- If more than one and principal responsibility not indicated, only the **first-named creator** is required

The creator is the first core element we'll discuss from chapter 19. Sometimes there is more than one creator. In such cases, look first for a creator having principal responsibility. If there is more than one in this category, only the first-named is required. If there is no indication of principal responsibility, only the first-named creator is required.

Collaborative Works

- For collaborative works, the creators may perform the same or different roles
- (RDA 19.2.1 and 6.27.1.3, 6.27.1.4)
- (RDA 6.28.1.2, 6.28.1.3, 6.28.1.4 for music)
 - Choosing the first-named creator to name the work may mean that the result is not the same as applying the AACR2 rule due to the order of names on the source

Choosing the creator when making an authorized access point for a collaborative work is the same whether the creators are performing the same or different roles. You're still selecting the first-named creator according to the guidelines on the previous slide. Sometimes the result will be different from the AACR2 result depending on the order of names on the source.

It is important to note that we're principally talking about more general resources in this slide. For those more general resources refer to 6.27.1.3 through 6.27.1.4 in RDA on constructing authorized access points. For music-specific collaborative resources, refer to 6.28.1.2 through 6.28.1.4 for guidelines on constructing authorized access points, which make exceptions for musical works that are collaborative, but where the composer is regarded as the creator.

There are some exceptions in RDA 6.27.1.3 for collaborative works when the first-named creator is not used to name the work. These are moving image resources (named by preferred title) and some resources having both corporate bodies and persons as responsible entities, such as sound recordings. There will be more about this on a later slide.

Example: Creators with Principal Responsibility

```
100 1# $a Masselos, Jim.  
245 10 $a ... / Ꞇc Jim Masselos, Jackie  
Menzies, Pratapaditya Pal ;  
with contributions by Reis  
Flora [and four others] ;  
edited by Pratapaditya Pal.  
*700 1# $a Manzies, Jackie.  
*700 1# $a Pal, Pratapaditya.  
*700 1# $a Flora, Reis Wenger, $d 1939-  
  
* number of access points for other creators:  
cataloger judgment
```

RDA: A Hands-On Interaction: Works

Feb. 9, 2011

25

In this example, three individuals (Masselos, Menzies, and Pal) have principal responsibility. The first-named of those three persons is chosen as the creator. As an aside, notice you no longer use the abbreviation et al. in the 245 field, but use an English phrase instead.

Apply judgment when deciding if more than one creator should be represented by access points in the bib record.

Sound Recordings: Different Works/Composers

- RDA doesn't have instructions comparable to those in AACR2 21.23 for sound recordings saying to enter under principal performer without considering the responsibility of the performer
- RDA requirement: **performer must be creator** (role is more than "mere performance")

RDA doesn't have the AACR2 category of compilations of works by different composers on a sound recording being named automatically by the principal performer. That performer's role must go beyond "mere performance" in order to be considered the creator. The feedback so far from the Policy and Standards Division is that we have to live with this situation. So in a sound recording of a recital performance of a group of compositions by many different composers, performed by Yo-Yo Ma, the principal performer will no longer be present in a 100 field. The cataloger would record the title of the compilation to name the work in this case and give Yo-Yo Ma an access point.

Sound Recording Example 1

AACR2

100 1# \$a Bell, Joshua, \$d 1967-

245 14 \$a The romantic violin \$h [sound recording].

505 0# \$a Brahms, Bruch, Barber, etc., etc.

RDA

245 04 \$a The romantic violin.

336 ## \$a performed music \$2 rdacontent

337 ## \$a audio \$2 rdamedia

338 ## \$a audio disc \$2 rdacarrier

700 1# \$a Bell, Joshua, \$d 1967-

Here are the AACR2 and RDA constructions of the situation just described.

Sound Recordings Example 2
RDA 6.28.1.5.1 d) & 6.28.1.5.2

110 2# \$a Miles Davis Quintet.

**245 10 \$a Miles smiles / \$c Miles Davis
Quintet.**

**336 ## \$a performed music \$2
rdacontent**

337 ## \$a audio \$2 rdamedia

338 ## \$a audio disc \$2 rdacarrier

This example shows that there are some instances in RDA when the performer is used to name the work. RDA 6.28.1.5.1 paragraph D addresses performances of musical works involving substantial creative responsibility for the adaptation or improvisation on the part of the performer. RDA 6.28.1.5.2 says that the performer becomes an “adapter,” who has in effect become the creator of a new work.

Librettos (RDA 6.27.1.2)

- No longer considered to be musical works with composers as the creators
- Determine **creator(s) of the text**
- To assist users in finding resources, can give a variant access point using the access point for the musical work (RDA 6.27.4.2)

Another change from an Alternative rule in AACR2 is in naming a work that is a libretto. RDA views a libretto as a textual work and a separately created work. In RDA the librettist is recorded as the creator, rather than the composer of the related musical work.

To help users who are accustomed to finding librettos under composers, a cataloger can give a variant access point (a 4XX field) in the authority record that is based on the access point for the musical work.

Librettos in RDA

■ Bib record

- 100 1# \$a Ghislanzoni, Antonio, \$d 1824-1893.
- 245 10 \$a Aida : \$b opera in quattro atti / \$c libretto di Antonio Ghislanzoni ; musica di Giuseppe Verdi.
- *700 1# \$i Libretto for (work) \$a Verdi, Giuseppe, \$d 1813-1901. \$t Aida.
*Only if composer mentioned on libretto.

Here is how the bib record will be constructed in RDA. The music testers at LC made an access point for the composer and the work only if that person was mentioned in the libretto. RDA Appendix J.2.5 tells the cataloger to use the phrase \$i Libretto for (work), in order to provide an access point for the libretto, which is a related work to the musical work. Just a reminder: the relationship designators are not core elements, so the music cataloging community may want to decide on some 'best practices' guidelines here.

Librettos in RDA

NAR

100 1# \$a Ghislanzoni, Antonio, \$d 1924-1893. \$t Aida
400 1# \$a Verdi, Giuseppe, \$d 1813-1901. \$t Aida. \$s Libretto

In the name authority record, the name/title variant access point will lead the user back to the libretto recorded under the librettist.

Example of Libretto in RDA

- On the title page for the item in hand:

La Clemenza di Tito

By Pietro Metastasio
Music by W.A. Mozart

Let's look at this situation in a little more detail. Remember, librettos are no longer recorded under the composer according to the AACR2 alternative rule. They will be recorded under the author of the libretto. If the composer is mentioned in the libretto, especially if mentioned prominently, an access point may be made for the composer. Imagine this is the title page for a libretto you have to catalog.

Libretto in AACR2 and RDA

AACR2 21.28A1 Alternative rule, footnote 7

100 1# \$a Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, \$d 1756-1791.
240 10 \$a Clemenza di Tito. \$s Libretto
245 13 \$a La clemenza di Tito.
700 1# \$a Metastasio, Pietro, \$d 1698-1782.

RDA Appendix J.2.5

100 1# \$a Metastasio, Pietro, \$d 1698-1782.
245 13 \$a La clemenza di Tito.
700 1# \$i Libretto for (work) \$a Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus
\$q (Johann Chrysostom Wolfgang Amadeus),
\$d 1756-1791. \$t Clemenza di Tito.

Here is the treatment of a libretto in AACR2 that we're accustomed to constructing. The librettist is given an access point.

Appear RDA part:

Here's how we'll be constructing the bib record in RDA. LC music testers decided to make an access point for the composer only when mentioned on the libretto, otherwise, theoretically, it would be necessary to make an access point for any composer who had set the libretto to music. You can imagine the list of access points in the authority record that would be needed for a work such as Metastasio's *La clemenza di Tito* or other work frequently set by different composers. LC testers also decided to omit the \$e relator term for the composer after the access point, because in a libretto where no notated music is present it seemed inaccurate to refer to the composer's role.

Appendix J.2.5 instructs the cataloger to add \$i Libretto for (work) in order to form a relationship with the musical work from the libretto. A corresponding phrase \$i Libretto (work) can be added to the access point for the librettist on the bib record for the notated music.

NAR for RDA Treatment of Librettos

100 1# \$a Metastasio, Pietro, \$d 1698-1782. \$t Clemenza di Tito.

400 1# \$a Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus \$q (Johann Chrysostom Wolfgang Amadeus), \$d 1756-1791. \$t Clemenza di Tito. \$s Libretto

The variant access point leads the user back to the libretto recorded under the librettist.

Here the variant access point will lead the user back to the libretto recorded under the librettist. An expression of a work, such as a vocal score, will be recorded under the composer as in AACR2, but you'll hear more about that in the next session.

Compilation of Works

- RDA: do not name the compilation by the first work in the compilation as AACR2 does in some situations, because doing so misidentifies the compilation (a work of works)
- Can give authorized access points for each work/expression
- If no collective title, alternative to devise a title proper (cataloger's judgment)

AACR2 says to base the main entry for some compilations on the first work in the compilation. That's a problem because that choice misidentifies that compilation (a work of works). RDA doesn't have the comparable instructions to those AACR2 rules. Instead, give the appropriate authorized access point for each work in the aggregate work.

Sometimes such compilations lack a collective title. There is an RDA alternative to devise a title proper in such situations.

We'll look at some examples of compilations after we discuss conventional collective titles because they sometimes are used when naming compilations.

Preferred Title for Compilations of One Person, Family, Body

- RDA 6.2.2.10
- Categories:
 - Complete works = use “Works”
 - Complete works in a single form = use term chosen by cataloger
 - Other compilations of two or more works in same form or different forms = give preferred title for each work

RDA: A Hands-On Interaction: Works

Feb. 9, 2011

36

If the compilation has works by a single person, family, or corporate body, the basic instruction for preferred titles says that the preferred title for the compilation may be one of two possible conventional collective titles:

- 1) ‘Works’ if the compilation represents the complete works of the creator;
- 2) A term chosen by the cataloger if the compilation contains the complete works in a single form.

No longer will a cataloger need to determine what AACR2 requires: knowing if the creator created works only in a single form. For any other compilation, preferred titles are given for each separate work.

Note that there are some additional instructions about conventional collective titles in the section for musical works.

Alternative: “Other Compilations ...”

- Instead of or in addition to giving the preferred title for each work, use a **conventional collective title**, e.g.,:
 - Works. Selections
 - Posters. Selections
 - Orchestra music. Selections

- For **music** conventional collective titles, see RDA 6.14.2.8

There is an alternative for the last category on the previous slide. Instead of giving separate preferred titles for each work, you can use one preferred title consisting of either “Works” or a term for a single form plus the term “Selections.” Or you can give this single conventional collective title in addition to the preferred titles for the separate works. (These points are illustrated on the following slides.)

There are also some RDA instructions about specific conventional collective titles for music.

Compilations of Musical Works RDA 6.14.2.8

- Complete works = use “Works”
- Works of various types for one broad medium = “Keyboard music, Vocal music”
- Works of various types for one specific medium = “Piano music, Orchestra music”
- Works of one type for one specific medium or various media = “Concertos, Symphonies, no. 1-3”

The instructions for compilations of music works will be familiar to everyone. For the complete musical works of a composer, record the conventional collective title “Works.” For a compilation that is all the works in one broad medium by a composer, record the designation of that medium as the conventional collective title. For a compilation that consists of all the works for one specific medium by a composer, record a conventional collective title generally descriptive of that medium. For a compilation that consists of all the works of one type by a composer, record the name of that type as the conventional collective title. If the compilation consists of a consecutively numbered group, record the inclusive numbering following the name of the type.

Compilation of Two Works by Same Creator

AACR2:

```
100 1# $a Miller, Arthur, $d 1915-2005
240 10 $a Archbishop's ceiling
245 10 $a Two plays / $c Arthur Miller.
505 0# $a The Archbishop's ceiling -- The
        American clock.
700 12 $a Miller, Arthur, $d 1915-2005.
        $t American clock.
```

This first example shows how a compilation of two works by the same creator would be cataloged according to AACR2, using the title of the first work as the uniform title. This way of naming the aggregate work in the 100/240 fields misidentifies the compilation because it contains more than the work listed in the 240 field.

Compilation: Two Works, Same Creator

RDA with alternative for conventional collective title:

```
100 1# $a Miller, Arthur, $d 1915-2005
240 10 $a Plays. $k Selections
245 10 $a Two plays / $c Arthur Miller.
505 0# $a The Archbishop's ceiling -- The
        American clock.
700 12 $a Miller, Arthur, $d 1915-2005.
        $t Archbishop's ceiling.
*700 12 $a Miller, Arthur, $d 1915-2005.
        $t American clock.
```

* This access point is not a core requirement.

The basic RDA instruction says to name the works separately (shown here in the 700 fields). An alternative says a conventional collective title shown here in the 240 field can be used in addition to the 700 fields. The alternative also says the 240 field can be used in lieu of the 700 fields. Also note the asterisk saying that access points for any work in the compilation after the first are not a core requirement. Giving access points for other works would be cataloger's judgment.

Compilations in RDA: Same Creator Music Example: Selections (2 Works)

100 1# \$a Druelle, Hervé, \$d 1959-
240 10 \$a Drum set, piano music. \$k Selections
245 10 \$a Quatre câpres ; \$b et Douze huîtres :
pour batterie et piano / \$c Hervé
Druelle.
700 12 \$a Druelle, Hervé, \$d 1959- \$t Quatre
câpres.
*700 12 \$a Druelle, Hervé, \$d 1959- \$t Douze
huîtres.

Here is a music example of a compilation of two works by one creator. The Alternative Library of Congress Policy Statement at RDA 6.14.2.8.6 says instead of recording the preferred title for each of the works in the compilation, record conventional collective title followed by Selections. Give an authorized access point for the first or predominant work (which fulfills RDA 17.8). The second 700 is left to cataloger's judgment.

Compilations in RDA: Same Creator Music Example: Selections

100 1# \$a Stricklan, Jim.
240 10 \$a Songs. \$k Selections
245 10 \$a Universal sigh : \$b the best songs of
Jim Stricklan / \$c music transcribed
by Elbereth Howard.
505 0# \$a Christmas carol – Dance the Milky Way
– Django – [etc. (21 songs)].
700 1# \$a Howard, Elbereth, \$e transcriber.
700 1# \$a Stricklan, Jim. \$t Christmas carol.

RDA: A Hands-On Interaction: Works

Feb. 9, 2011

42

This is an example of a common configuration: an incomplete collection of many works by one creator. The option in the Library of Congress Policy Statement at the alternative says that instead of, or in addition to, recording the preferred title for each of the works in the compilation, the cataloger may record a conventional collective title as instructed followed by *Selections* and include an access point for the first work. The Policy Statement at 17.8 would allow the cataloger to make additional access points for the other works in the compilation according to cataloger judgment. In case you're wondering, the Library of Congress Policy Statements are the successor to the Library of Congress Rule Interpretations.

Compilation of Works by Different Creators



AACR2

100 1# \$a Beethoven, Ludwig van, \$d 1770-1827.

240 10 \$a Symphonies, \$n no. 7, op. 92, \$r A major

245 10 \$a Symphony no. 7 in A major, op. 92 / \$c Ludwig van Beethoven. Symphony no. 3 in D major, D. 200 / Schubert \$h [sound recording].

700 12 \$a Schubert, Franz, \$d 1797-1828. \$t Symphonies, \$n D. 200, \$r D major.

When a compilation lacks a collective title, AACR2 says to use the first work as the main entry for the compilation. This result also misidentifies the resource because naming the aggregate work with the 100/240 information doesn't indicate that there is also a work by Franz Schubert.

Compilation of Works by Different Creators



RDA without alternative for devised title

```
245 00 $a Symphony no. 7 in A major, op. 92 /  
          $c Beethoven. Symphony no. 2 in D  
          major, D. 200 / Schubert.  
700 12 $a Beethoven, Ludwig van, $d 1770-1827.  
          $t Symphonies, $n no. 7, op. 92, $r  
          A major.  
*700 12 $a Schubert, Franz, $d 1797-1828. $t  
          Symphonies, $n D. 200, $r D major.
```

* This access point is not a core requirement.

Applying the basic RDA instruction results in 700 fields for each work. There isn't a creator for the aggregate work (that is, the compilation).

Compilation of Works by Different Creators



RDA with alternative for devised title

245 00 \$a [Two Symphonies].

505 0# \$a Symphony no. 7, op. 92, in A major /
Beethoven - Symphony no. 2, D. 200, in
D major.

700 12 \$a Beethoven, Ludwig van, \$d 1770-1827. \$t
Symphonies, \$n no. 7, op. 92, \$r A
major.

*700 12 \$a Schubert, Franz, \$d 1797-1828. \$t
Symphonies, \$n D. 200, \$r D major.

*** This access point is not a core requirement.**

This slide shows the same example using a devised title for the title proper of this aggregate work. Whether to devise a title proper was cataloger's judgment for LC testers during the RDA Test.

Form of Work (RDA 6.3)

- Scope = class or genre to which a work belongs -- no controlled vocabulary
- Core if needed to differentiate a work
- Access point: added in parentheses to preferred title for the work (subfielding will vary)

```
130 0# $a Nutcracker (Choreographic work)  
130 0# $a NuTCRACKER (Computer file)
```

Form of work is a core element if needed to break a conflict. RDA 6.3 doesn't have a controlled vocabulary. A cataloger would choose a term. Genre/form terms being developed by LC with other communities could be used.

Date of Work (RDA 6.4)

- Scope = “earliest date associated with a work”
 - Date work was created, first published, or released
- Core if needed to differentiate a work
- Access point: added to preferred title for the work (subfielding will vary)

100 1# \$a Beethoven, Ludwig van, \$d 1770-1827. \$t Fidelio \$n (1805)

100 1# \$a Beethoven, Ludwig van, \$d 1770-1827. \$t Fidelio \$n (1814)

Date of work is a core element if needed to break a conflict. If the date of creation is not available, the date of first publication or release can be used.

Place of Origin of the Work (RDA 6.5)

- Scope = “country or other territorial jurisdiction from which a work originated” (includes local place)
- In authorized access point form (RDA ch. 16)
- Core **if needed** to differentiate a work
- Access point: **added to preferred title** for the work (subfielding will vary)

130 0# \$a Music for brass (Kirchheim bei München, Germany)

130 0# \$a Music for brass (New York, N.Y.)

130 0# \$a Music for brass (North Vancouver, B.C.)

Place of creation of the work is a core element if needed to differentiate. It is given in its form as an authorized access point. Technically, you use the place of origin of the work which may not be the place of publication of the manifestation or the place of the publisher. Keep in mind that this works very well for books and serials, and even law, but for music it can be difficult to determine the place of creation.

Medium of Performance (RDA 6.15)

- Scope = “instrument, instruments, voice, voices, etc., for which a musical work was originally conceived”
- Core: if title is not distinctive, give if applicable when creating the authorized access point (RDA 6.28.1.9)
- Core if needed to differentiate a work with a distinctive title

Medium of performance is a core element for musical works in two situations:

1) if the preferred title is not distinctive, it may be applicable when creating the authorized access point;

2) if the preferred title is distinctive, it may be needed to break a conflict.

RDA still uses standard combinations of instruments (see RDA 6.15.1.5).

Medium of Performance

- No limitation on recording medium of performance (no longer AACR2 “rule of three”)
- More possibilities for indeterminate medium of performance (RDA 6.15.1.13)
- Access point: in subfield \$m as applicable

```
100 1# $a Beethoven, Ludwig van, $d 1770-1827. $t Sonatas, $m piano, $n ...
```

Two changes from AACR2 are given here, resulting in more information being given for this element in RDA records. These elements are given in \$m in the access point. The options at 6.15.1.13. range from one collective term for a family of instruments (plucked instruments); a term for the range of instrument or voice (low instrument); a way to indicate the number of parts or voices when medium of performance has not been indicated (4 voices); and the term unspecified instrument when no other information is available.

Distinctive Titles That Conflict RDA 6.28.1.10

100 1# \$a Debussy, Claude, \$d 1862–1918. \$t Images, \$m orchestra

100 1# \$a Debussy, Claude, \$d 1862–1918. \$t Images, \$m piano

not 100 1# \$a Debussy, Claude, \$d 1862–1918. \$t Images (Piano work)

100 1# \$a Granados, Enrique, \$d 1867–1916. \$t Goyescas (Opera)

100 1# \$a Granados, Enrique, \$d 1867–1916. \$t Goyescas (Piano work)

not 100 1# \$a Granados, Enrique, 1867–1916. \$t Goyescas, \$m piano

If the access point representing a musical work with a distinctive title is the same as or similar to an access point representing a different work, or to an access point representing a person, family, corporate body, or place, add:

either

a) a term indicating medium of performance (see [6.15](#))

or

b) another distinguishing characteristic of the work (see [6.6](#)).

Use the same type of addition for each of the access points.

Additions to Resolve Conflict RDA 6.28.1.10.1

100 1# \$a Bach, Johann Sebastian, \$d 1685–
1750. \$t Was Gott tut, das ist
wohlgetan (Chorale prelude)

100 1# \$a Bach, Johann Sebastian, \$d 1685–
1750. \$t Was Gott tut, das ist
wohlgetan (Cantata), \$n BWV 98

100 1# \$a Bach, Johann Sebastian, \$d 1685–
1750. \$t Was Gott tut, das ist
wohlgetan (Cantata), \$n BWV 99

If these additions do not resolve the conflict, add one or more of the following:

a) a numeric designation (see [6.16](#))

b) key (see [6.17](#))

c) the year of completion of composition (see [6.4](#))

d) the year of original publication (see [6.4](#))

or

e) any other identifying element, such as place of composition (see [6.5](#)), or the name of the first publisher (see [6.6](#)).

Additions to Access Points
Representing Compilations of
Musical Works
RDA 6.28.1.11

100 1# \$a Chopin, Frédéric, \$d 1810–1849.
\$t Polonaises, \$m piano
100 1# \$a Haydn, Joseph, \$d 1732–1809.
\$t Quartets, \$m strings
100 1# \$a Grieg, Edvard, \$d 1843–1907. \$t
Sonatas, \$m violin, piano

Add the medium of performance to the access point representing a compilation containing works of one type unless the medium is obvious or unless the works are for various media.

Example for Additions to Non-Distinctive Works
RDA 6.28.1.9

100 1# \$a Enesco, Georges, \$d 1881–
1955. \$t Sonatas, \$m violin,
piano, #n no. 2, op. 6, \$r F minor

If the preferred title for the work consists solely of the name of a type of composition, or of two or more types, add one or more of the following to the access point representing the work (in this order):

- a) a term indicating medium of performance (see [6.15](#))
- b) a numeric designation (see [6.16](#)) or the
- c) key (see [6.17](#)).

Exceptions Examples: A) Medium Implied by Title or Other Than Implied

100 1# \$a Peeters, Flor, \$d 1903–1986. \$t Chorale preludes, \$n op. 69

Implied medium: organ

100 1# \$a Poulenc, Francis, \$d 1899–1963. \$t Mass, \$r G major

Implied medium: voices, with or without accompaniment

100 1# \$a Martinů, Bohuslav, \$d 1890–1959. \$t Overture

Implied medium: orchestra

This is still an example for 6.28.1.9. Do not add the medium of performance if the medium is implied by the title, but if the medium is other than that implied by the title, add the medium of performance. Do not add the medium of performance if the work is a set of compositions for different media or is one of a series of sets with the same title but for different media.

More Exceptions Examples

100 1# \$a Widor, Charles Marie, \$d 1844-1937. \$t Symphonies, \$m organ

Implied medium: orchestra

100 1# \$a Rapf, Kurt. \$t Requiem, \$m organ, brasses, percussion

Implied medium: voices, with or without accompaniment

Here are examples of what to do when the implied medium is not the actual medium of performance.

Further Exceptions Examples

B) 100 1# \$a Monteverdi, Claudio, \$d 1567–1643.
\$t Madrigals, \$n book 1

For 5 voices

C) 100 1# \$a Monteverdi, Claudio, \$d 1567–1643.
\$t Madrigals, \$n book 7

For 1–6 voices and instruments

D) 100 1# \$a Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, \$d
1756–1791. \$t Divertimenti, \$n K.
251, \$r D major

Still under 6.28.1.9., do not add the medium of performance

- b) if the work is a set of compositions for different media or is one of a series of sets with the same title but for different media
- c) if the medium was not designated by the composer
- d) if the complexities of stating the medium are such that an arrangement by other identifying elements (such as thematic index number or opus number, see [6.16](#)) would be more useful.

Additions to Access Points Examples RDA 6.28.1.9.1

A) 100 1# \$a Delius, Frederick, \$d 1862–
1934. \$t Pieces, \$m piano \$n
(1890)

B) 100 1# \$a Delius, Frederick, \$d 1862–
1934. \$t Pieces, \$m piano \$n
(1923)

If the medium of performance, numeric designation, and key are not sufficient, or are not available, to distinguish between two or more such works, add (in this order of preference):

a) the year of completion of composition (see [6.4](#))

b) the year of original publication (see [6.4](#))

or

Additions to Access Points Examples RDA 6.28.1.9.1

C1) 100 1# \$a Krebs, Johann Ludwig, \$d 1713–1780. \$t Trio sonatas, \$m flutes, continuo (Nuremberg, Germany)

C2) 100 1# \$a Geminiani, Francesco, \$d 1687–1762. \$t Solos, \$m flute, continuo (Bland)

C2) 100 1# \$a Philidor, Pierre Danican, \$d 1681–1731. \$t Suites, \$n op. 1 (Foucault)

c) any other identifying element, such as place of composition (see [6.5](#)), or the name of the first publisher (see [6.6](#)).

If this text is sounding familiar it's because it was essentially taken from AACR2 and entered into RDA.

Numeric Designation of a Musical Work (RDA 6.16)

- Scope = “a serial number, opus number, or thematic index number assigned to a musical work by the composer, publisher, or a musicologist”
- Can give as many as available
- Use abbreviations per appendix B.5.4

Numeric designation of a musical work includes three types of designations (serial numbers, opus numbers, and thematic index numbers). As many as are available can be given and abbreviations are used.

Numeric Designation of a Musical Work

- Core: if title is not distinctive, give if applicable when creating the authorized access point
- Core if needed to differentiate a work with a distinctive title
- Access point: subfield \$n if applicable

```
100 1# $a Beethoven, Ludwig van, $d 1770-1827. $t Sonatas, $m piano, $n no. 14, op. 27, no. 2 ...
```

Numeric designation of a musical work is a core element in two situations:

- 1) if the title is not distinctive, it may be applicable when creating the authorized access point;
- 2) if the title is distinctive, it may be needed to break a conflict.

Key (RDA 6.17)

- Scope = “the set of pitch relationships that establishes the tonal centre, or principal tonal centre, of a musical work. Key is designated by its pitch name and its mode, when it is major or minor”
- No longer dependent upon time period of the work

Assigning the element Key is no longer dependent upon the time period of the work.

Key

- Core: if title is **not distinctive**, give if applicable when creating the authorized access point
- Core if needed to **differentiate** a work with a distinctive title
- Access point: **subfield \$r** if applicable

```
100 1# $a Beethoven, Ludwig van, $d 1770-1827. $t Sonatas, $m piano, $n no. 14, op. 27, no. 2, $r C# minor
```

Key is a core element for musical works in two situations: First, if the title is not distinctive, it may be applicable when creating the authorized access point. Second, if the title is distinctive, it may be needed to break a conflict.

Other Distinguishing Characteristic of the Work (RDA 6.6)

- Scope = “a characteristic other than form of work, date of work, or place of origin of the work that serves to differentiate a work from another work or from the name of a person, family, or corporate body”
- Core if needed to differentiate ...
- Access point: added to the preferred title for the work (subfielding will vary)

130 #0 \$a Research paper (JJ Society)

This element is the last core element for works; it is whatever characteristic breaks a conflict when the other elements we've discussed don't differentiate.

Let's move onto some exercises. I'll give you the pertinent information from the title page, then give you a moment to think about how the work would be named in RDA. Then we'll see both the AACR2 and RDA answers so you can compare the similarities and differences.

Exercise 1

- On the title page for the item in hand:

Konzert
für
Orchester

Christian Jost

For the first exercise, we have a basic score. Assume that this title and statement of responsibility are on the title page. Since we're only talking about the work itself, I have omitted any other bibliographic information. Of course it would help to know that this composer has also composed other concertos. This work was recently written and is not tonal, so the key is not a relevant piece of information.

Answer 1

- **AACR2 25.28 and 25.30B1**

100 1# \$a Jost, Christian, \$d 1963-
240 10 \$a Concertos, \$m orchestra
245 10 \$a Konzert für Orchester / \$c Christian Jost.

- **RDA 6.14.2.4 and 6.14.2.5**

100 1# \$a Jost, Christian, \$d 1963-
240 10 \$a Concertos, \$m orchestra
245 10 \$a Konzert für Orchester / \$c Christian Jost.

You can see the way this ‘type’ of composition is treated in AACR2.

In RDA, when you apply 6.14.2.4 to omit the medium of performance and 6.14.2.5 to record the type of composition in the language preferred by the agency creating the data, we are left with the same term as in AACR2: Concertos. Again, the key is omitted because it is not a tonal work.

According to AACR2 25.30B1 we would then add the medium of performance.

In RDA we do the same thing, according to 6.15.1.3

Much of AACR2 Chapter 25 was transferred into RDA unchanged.

Exercise 2

- On the title page for the item in hand:

Trio for Violin,
Clarinet and
Piano

Gregory J. Hutter

Here is another basic work with rather standard instrumentation.

Answer 2

- **AACR2 25.28 and 25.30B1**

100 1# \$a Hutter, Gregory J., \$d 1971-

240 10 \$a Trios, \$m piano, clarinet, violin

245 10 \$a Trio for violin, clarinet and piano / \$c
Gregory J. Hutter.

- **RDA 6.14.2.4 and 6.14.2.5**

100 1# \$a Hutter, Gregory J., \$d 1971-

240 10 \$a Trios, \$m piano, clarinet, violin

245 10 \$a Trio for violin, clarinet and piano / \$c
Gregory J. Hutter.

The same sections of RDA apply to the preferred titles in this example as well.

Exercise 3

- On the title page for the item in hand:

Trio no. 2, opus
85, for Piano,
Violin and
Violoncello

James Cohn

This example involves medium of performance as well as serial and opus numbers.

Answer 3

- **AACR2 25.28, 25.30B1, 25.30B3, 25.30C1, 2, & 3**

100 1# \$a Cohn, James, \$d 1928-

240 10 \$a Trios, \$m piano, strings, \$n no. 2, op. 85

245 10 \$a Trio no. 2, opus 85, for piano, violin and
violoncello / \$c James Cohn.

- **RDA 6.15.1.5, 6.16.1.3.1 and 6.16.1.3.2**

100 1# \$a Cohn, James, \$d 1928-

240 10 \$a Trios, \$m piano, strings, \$n no. 2, op. 85

245 10 \$a Trio no. 2, opus 85, for piano, violin and
violoncello / \$c James Cohn.

Different rule numbers to remember, but we still end up with the same result in RDA as in AACR2.

NAR for Example 3

100 1# \$a Cohn, James, \$d 1928- \$t Trios,
\$m piano, strings, \$n no. 2, op.
85

382 ## \$a piano \$a violin \$a violoncello

383 ## \$a no. 2 \$b op. 85

670 ## \$a Cohn, James. Trio no. 2, opus
85, for piano, violin and
violoncello, 2007, ©2007

Here is an example of an authority record for the previous work that uses the 382 and 383 fields to record the medium of performance and the serial and opus numbers.

Exercise 4

- On the title page for the item in hand:

An Introduction to the
Piano Works of Turetsky

Edited by Kamelija Galijan-
Simovic, Margaret Summers

505: Evening at Shepherd's -- Thoughts of
spring -- Les plusiers humeurs de Charlie
-- Leonora -- Interlude -- [etc., (8 works)].

This is an example of a collection of 8 works by Turetsky, which are a selection of her works for piano.

Answer 4 (AACR2)

AACR2 25.34C1 and 25.34C3

100 1# \$a Turetsky, D. \$q (Dara), \$d 1967-
240 10 \$a Piano music. \$k Selections
245 13 \$a An introduction to the piano music
of Turetsky /edited by ...
700 1# \$a Galijan-Simovic, Kamelija.
700 1# \$a Summer, Margaret.

Here is the AACR2 way of handling an incomplete collection of works.

Answer 4 (RDA)

RDA 6.14.2.8.6 and LCPS 6.14.2.8.6

100 1# \$a Turetsky, D. \$q (Dara), \$d 1967-
240 10 \$a Piano music. \$k Selections
245 13 \$a An introduction to the piano music of Turetsky /edited
by ...
700 1# \$a Galijan-Simovic, Kamelija, \$e editor.
700 1# \$a Summer, Margaret, \$e editor.
700 1# \$a Turetsky, D. \$q (Dara), \$d 1967- \$t Evening at
Shepherd's.
700 1# \$a Turetsky, D. \$q (Dara), \$d 1967- \$t Thoughts of
spring.
700 1# \$a Turetsky, D. \$q (Dara), \$d 1967- \$t Plusiers humeurs
de Charlie.
700 1# \$a Turetsky, D. \$q (Dara), \$d 1967- \$t Leonora.
700 1# \$a Turetsky, D. \$q (Dara), \$d 1967- \$t Interlude.

An Alternative in RDA at 6.14.2.8.6 states that instead of (or in addition to) recording the preferred title for each of the works in the compilation, the cataloger can record a conventional collective title, followed by *Selections*. If a 240 is given, only the first 700 is required (which fulfills the RDA 17.8 core requirement).

Exercise 5

- On the title page for the item in hand:

Suor Angelica

Libretto by
Giovacchino Forzano

For the opera by
Giacomo Puccini

Here we have a libretto example that mentions the composer prominently.

Answer 5

AACR2

100 1# \$a Puccini, Giacomo, \$d 1858-1924.
240 10 \$a Suor Angelica. \$s Libretto
245 10 \$a Suor Angelica.

RDA

100 1# \$a Forzano, Giovacchino, \$d 1884-
245 10 \$a Suor Angelica.
700 1# \$i Libretto for (work) \$a Puccini, Giacomo,
\$d 1858-1924. \$t Suor Angelica.

You know already how we would've constructed this bib record in AACR2.

In RDA, as we studied, the librettist is the creator. Following Appendix J.2.5 an access point for the related musical work is provided.

RDA NAR for Exercise 5

100 1# \$a Forzano, Giacchino, \$d 1884- \$t
Suor Angelica

400 1# \$a Puccini, Giacomo, \$d 1858-1924.
\$t Suor Angelica. \$s Libretto

Here is the name authority record showing the variant access point leading the user to the libretto recorded under the librettist.

Example 6

- On the title page for the item in hand:

Andante for 2 Flutes,
2 Oboes, 2 Clarinets,
2 Bassoons and 2 Horns

1883

Sergey Taneyef

This example has a medium of performance that is slightly more complicated.

Answer 6

AACR2 25.30B5 and LCRI 25.30B5

100 1# \$a Taneev, Sergeĭ Ivanovich, \$d 1856-1915.
240 10 \$a Andante, \$m woodwinds, horns (2)
245 10 \$a Andante (1883) for 2 flutes, 2 oboes, 2 clarinets,
2 bassoons and 2 horns / \$c Sergey Taneyef.

RDA 6.15.1.7 Groups of Instruments OR 6.15.1.6

100 1# \$a Taneev, Sergeĭ Ivanovich, \$d 1856-1915.
240 10 \$a Andante, \$m winds -- OR --
240 10 \$a Andante, \$m flutes (2), oboes (2), clarinets (2),
bassoons (2), horns (2)
245 10 \$a Andante (1883) for 2 flutes, 2 oboes, 2 clarinets,
2 bassoons and 2 horns / \$c Sergey Taneyef.

RDA: A Hands-On Interaction: Works

Feb. 9, 2011

79

In AACR2, according to 25.30B5 and the LCRI, the uniform title would've been: **Andante, woodwinds, horns (2)**

but in RDA section 6.15.1.4 covers this. Regarding the order of preference for recording medium it says:

For instrumental music intended for one performer to a part, record the medium of performance in one of, or a combination of, the following ways (in this order of preference): a) by certain standard chamber music combinations (see 6.15.1.5); b) by individual instruments (see 6.15.1.6); c) by groups of instruments (see 6.15.1.7).

The real question then is when do you decide that there are just too many instruments to list? There is no explicit statement anywhere in RDA, but the idea and common practice from AACR2 is that once you move beyond nonets, you revert to groups of instruments. Since this work is for one performer to a part, with a total of 10 parts, we seem to have hit upon a grey area.

According to 6.15.1.7 'Groups of Instruments' we have to structure the preferred title like this: **Andante, winds**

because the LCRI 25.30B5 was deliberately omitted from the Library of Congress Policy Statements. During the RDA test LC wanted to test what would happen if we used RDA as written, so some of the policy statements were left out for this purpose.

RDA 6.15.1.6 mentions the individual instruments without specifying how many or what kind of limits.

It hasn't been stated specifically in RDA because in future the sense of a 1xx main entry will probably go away. RDA is not attempting to codify it because the essence of how we describe those elements may very well change. This is a major paradigm shift in how we describe works but the change hasn't been made yet because we're still tied to MARC.

The LC music testers are working with the Policy and Standards Division to see if we can get important music rule interpretations reinstated in the LC Policy Statements.

RDA NAR for Exercise 6

100 1# \$a Taneev, Sergeĭ Ivanovich, \$d 1856-1915.
\$t Andante, \$m winds

--OR--

100 1# \$a Taneev, Sergeĭ Ivanovich, \$d 1856-1915.
\$t Andante, \$m flutes (2), oboes (2),
clarinets (2), bassoons (2), horns (2)

382 ## \$a flutes (2) \$a oboes (2) \$a clarinets (2) \$a
bassoons (2) \$a horns (2)

670 ## \$a Taneev, Sergeĭ Ivanovich. Andante
(1883), 2005, ©2005: \$b t.p. (Andante
(1883) : for 2 flutes, 2 clarinets, 2 oboes, 2
bassoons and 2 horns)

Here is the name authority record for the previous exercise that also shows the use of the 382 field plus both options for the heading.

Questions?

LChelp4rda@loc.gov

I hope this whirlwind introduction to works in RDA has been helpful. Please feel free to email the LChelp4rda email account with any questions. The Policy and Standards Division always involves cataloger experts when they receive queries about specific categories of resources.