

**To:** RDA Steering Committee  
**From:** Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative  
**Subject:** Revision to instructions for Commentary, Etc. Added to a Previously Existing Work (6.27.1.6)

ALA thanks LC for this proposal to clarify the instructions in RDA 6.27.1.6. We do not endorse any of the suggested options, since we believe that the current instructions provide sufficient guidance. However, if the RSC seeks further clarification of this instruction, we suggest a different approach below (Option D).

### **Commentaries as aggregate works**

From a model perspective, commentaries which include the original text are a type of aggregate work: either an aggregate resulting from augmentation, or an aggregate collection of expressions. ALA does not believe that such commentaries consistently fall into the same category of aggregates, and thus we do not support revising RDA to always identify such aggregates by title.

Instead, cataloguer's judgment needs to be applied to determine the best means of identifying the resulting compilation, in order to fulfill the LRM user tasks: especially identify and select. In some cases the authorized access point (AAP) for the resource should be based on the work being commented on, and in others it should be based on the commentary. The decision is based on an assessment of the predominant and secondary nature of the works in the aggregation. This already happens with other aggregates, such as a novel with an introduction, preface, index, etc. We do not create AAPs for these works by considering them compilations, and ALA sees no compelling reason to change this practice at this time in relation to 6.27.1.6.

Cataloguers who work with legal and religious resources have extensive experience with these types of commentaries, and any changes proposed to this instruction need to be endorsed by these communities. During the ALA discussion, commenters with a law background were especially concerned about the changes suggested in this proposal, and those familiar with religious commentaries also had grave reservations.

As the RSC Aggregates Working group continues its investigations, these types of commentaries should be examined further. Perhaps there should be an RDA instruction that ratifies the de facto policy that in determining the AAP, the cataloguer decides if a resource is a compilation of many works (AAP based on title of the compilation), or if it is a primary work which includes lesser works (AAP constructed using the creator of the primary work + the title of the primary work). We certainly would support instructions relating to creating additional access points for the lesser works in the latter case.

## **Analysis of 6.27.1.6**

### ***In the current wording of this instruction:***

The first paragraph gives instructions for constructing the AAP when the commentary is considered the predominant work.

The second paragraph refers cataloguers to 6.27.1.3 if the first paragraph applies and more than one agent created the commentary.

The third paragraph provides instructions for constructing the AAP when the original work is considered the predominant work.

ALA believes that the example after the first paragraph is not correct. Based on the first paragraph, the AAP for the commentary + the previously existing work is the AAP for the compilation. The four-fold path would be available to provide access to the previously existing work.

We believe the previous example, present in the April 2016 Update, better illustrated the current instruction.

### ***In the proposed wording of this instruction from Option A:***

The first paragraph gives instructions for constructing the AAP when the commentary is considered “a work”.

The second paragraph refers cataloguers to 6.27.1.4 to construct the AAP for the compilation. This is not identified as conditional, so it would be applied in addition to creating the AAP for the commentary per the first paragraph.

The third paragraph provides instructions for constructing the AAP for the original work, with additions as needed to identify the particular expression.

ALA does not agree with this revision, because it does not permit the compilation to be identified by constructing an AAP for the commentary (and considering the original work to be secondary), thus eliminating cataloguer’s judgment in relation to assessing predominance. We also believe that this instruction should address creating the one and only AAP. Guidance for creating additional access points resides elsewhere in RDA (Chapters 24-28).

We also note that the suggested wording in the third paragraph is confusing. Since a work is not an expression, we think the wording would read better as “treat the resource as an expression of the previously existing work....”

### ***Impact of the proposed changes***

Although the proposal asserts that any of the options presented will have minimal impact “because this proposal is a clarification of instructions based on the principles given throughout RDA, rather than a change in instructions”, ALA disagrees with this assessment. The options all present both a change in instructions and a change in practice.

We observe that both options B and C make assumptions that may not apply to all cataloguers, leaving some without the guidance they may need.

### **Option D**

Although ALA’s preference is to retain the current instruction with no changes, we have prepared an alternative approach that addresses two concerns raised by the proposal.

#### *Constructing the authorized access point for commentaries by more than one agent*

The proposal states that 6.27.1.6 does not appropriately address the situation when a commentary is created by different persons, families, or corporate bodies. While ALA believes that the inclusion of “as applicable” in the current instruction (1<sup>st</sup> paragraph / then / “a”) addresses this concern, we could support replacing that text with a reference to 6.27.1.2-6.27.1.4. By adding this reference, the existing second paragraph can be removed.

#### *Rephrasing to emphasize cataloguer’s judgment*

ALA commenters liked the clearer language in Option A which emphasized cataloguer’s judgment over how the work “is presented”. Our revision below clarifies that this instruction applies when the cataloguing agency considers that either the commentary, etc. or the previously existing work predominates. Other existing RDA instructions address the cases where none of the works are predominate.

We have also suggested additional examples that present commentaries by: 1) a single author; 2) a collaboration of authors; 3) different authors, with an editor creating the compilation.

Proposed revision

*Marked-up copy (base text, current RDA)*

6.27.1.6 Commentary, Annotations, Illustrative Content, Etc.,  
Added to a Previously Existing Work

*If:*

the work consists of a previously existing work with added commentary, annotations, illustrative content, etc.

*and*

one of the works is considered predominant by the cataloguing agency creating the data

~~it is presented as the work of the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the commentary, etc.~~

*then:*

construct the authorized access point representing the predominant work by combining (in this order)

- ~~a) the authorized access point representing the person (see 9.19.1), family (see 10.11.1), or corporate body (see 11.13.1) responsible for the commentary, etc. applying the instructions at 6.27.1.2-6.27.1.4, as applicable~~
- ~~b) the preferred title for the commentary, etc. (see 6.2.2).~~

**EXAMPLE**

~~Clausen, Wendell, 1923–2006. A commentary on Virgil's Bucolica~~

~~Authorized access point for the commentary in a compilation also containing a translation of Virgil's Bucolica. Authorized access point for the compilation: A commentary on Virgil's Bucolica~~

If more than one person is responsible for the added commentary, etc., apply the instructions on collaborative works at 6.27.1.3.

If the work is presented simply as an expression of the previously existing work, use the authorized access point representing the previously existing work. If it is considered important to identify the particular expression, construct an authorized access point representing the expression as instructed at 6.27.3.

**EXAMPLE**

Clausen, Wendell, 1923–2006. A commentary on Virgil, Eclogues

Resource described: A commentary on Virgil, Eclogues / by Wendell Clausen

Casey-Maslen, Stuart. Arms Trade Treaty

Resource described: The Arms Trade Treaty : a commentary / Stuart Casey-Maslen, Andrew Clapham, Gilles Giacca, Sarah Parker.

Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (Commentary)

Resource described: The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development : a commentary / edited by Jorge E. Vinuales

Plato. Gorgias

Resource described: Gorgias : a revised text / Plato ; with introduction and commentary by E.R. Dodds

Joyce, James, 1882–1941. Dubliners

**Resource described:** James Joyce's Dubliners : an illustrated edition with annotations / [edited by] John Wyse Jackson & Bernard McGinley

Laozi. Dao de jing. English

**Resource described:** The Tao te ching : a new translation with commentary / Ellen M. Chen

For instructions on recording a relationship to a secondary work, see chapter 25.

*Clean copy*

## 6.27.1.6 Commentary, Annotations, Illustrative Content, Etc., Added to a Previously Existing Work

*If:*

the work consists of a previously existing work with added commentary, annotations, illustrative content, etc.

*and*

one of the works is considered predominant by the cataloguing agency creating the data

*then:*

construct the authorized access point representing the predominant work by applying the instructions at [6.27.1.2-6.27.1.4](#), as applicable.

If it is considered important to identify the particular expression, construct an authorized access point representing the expression as instructed at [6.27.3](#).

### EXAMPLE

Clausen, Wendell, 1923–2006. A commentary on Virgil, Eclogues

**Resource described:** A commentary on Virgil, Eclogues / by Wendell Clausen

Casey-Maslen, Stuart. Arms Trade Treaty

**Resource described:** The Arms Trade Treaty : a commentary / Stuart Casey-Maslen, Andrew Clapham, Gilles Giacca, Sarah Parker.

Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (Commentary)

**Resource described:** The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development : a commentary / edited by Jorge E. Vinuales

Plato. Gorgias

**Resource described:** Gorgias : a revised text / Plato ; with introduction and commentary by E.R. Dodds

Joyce, James, 1882–1941. Dubliners

**Resource described:** James Joyce's Dubliners : an illustrated edition with annotations / [edited by] John Wyse Jackson & Bernard McGinley

Laozi. Dao de jing. English

**Resource described:** The Tao te ching : a new translation with commentary / Ellen M. Chen

For instructions on recording a relationship to a secondary work, see chapter [25](#).