# Issue 274

**Summary of the issue:**

**GB** presented a classification of sound recordings instantiating a set of prototypical sounds and commented on the similarity of these sounds to visual images (instances of E36) from a conceptual point of view –in that they create identifiable patterns and have intellectual/conceptual aspects.

However, given the scope note of E36 starts by defining visual items as \*intellectual or conceptual aspects of recognizable marks and images\*, it could not possibly be expanded to refer to the sounds animals produce. The proposed solution to that: only consider such sounds in as much as they represent the outcome of an activity performed by a human agent (collection), which is what grants them an intellectual/conceptual aspect.

Creating a distinct class for that would be warranted to the extent that there are properties linking said sound with an event of producing it or recording it etc.

**Discussion/comments:**

**MD**: Natural history is definitely part of the CRM’s scope –be it CRMsci or some other family model. However: the notion it captures is too wide. Distinguish among the actual recording (see FRBRoo –where there is no new class for recording stuff) and the ensuing recorded sound.
Multimedia information is a specialization for the E73 Information Object –so not on a par with recorded musical performance, frog sounds, etc.

**OE**: the distinction btw the recording of a sound and the “iconographic sound” is fundamental. The sound of a motorcycle as such and the same kind of sound incorporated in a musical score for instance.

**GB**: a sound that’s recorded once and then gets remixed in some other sound file has qualities as a sound –and can be traced back to the event of producing and recording it.

**SS**: that’s on a par with incorporating text. The notion of archetypal sound lies in there being some recognizable blueprint the identity of which does not depend on the circumstances of its use.

**MD**: It’s not about showing that a class has properties, but whether the properties are relevant for information integration. It should be interesting to record who produced a particular sound. But if the question one aims at answering is for what category of things this sound is typical, then this needs to be more elaborated. In any case comparing that to the practices assumed in FRBRoo.
Regarding the connection to Oral History, the spoken text is an instance of E73 Information Object as such. So, the sounds are not excluded by E73 and do not require a specific class.

**TV**: Contemporary art uses archetypical sounds in artwork –sound art exhibitions. Curators of such exhbitions probably need to be able to integrate information on the (recorded?) sounds used in the exhibition.

**OE**: add at least one example of audio integration in E73 Infromation Object and E90 Symbolic Object.

**Decision**: reconsider the HW –continue working on that.

**TV** will ask sound art colleagues to point him in the right direction with regards to sound integration.

MD will rework the scope notes and examples for E90 Symbolic Object and E73 Information Object. GB and OE to contribute to that.