

From: Mark Scharff, Liaison to CC:DA from the Bibliographic Control Committee of the Music Library Association

To: John Myers, Chair, ALA ALCTS CC:DA (Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access)

Subject: MLA response to 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up

The Bibliographic Control Committee has authorized this response to 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up. It represents discussion within the Committee and its Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee, as well as input from other MLA members. Inasmuch as there are members of the Music Library Association who work at LC and who had a hand in drafting that document, this response generally should be considered at most to express the sentiments of the rest of the music library community.

#### General comments

The developers of RDA have taken on an immense challenge in moving from the AACR2 notions of main entry and uniform titles to that of “preferred title” and “preferred access point,” and in separating the acts of “choosing” and “recording.” The additional hurdle of doing so in a way that is not specific to a particular display decision or type of structure in which data will be recorded, while still seeking results that are compatible with existing structures, has complicated the review of 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up. The instructions for recording medium of performance, numeric designations, and key presume that the data that results will be ready to drop into a preferred access point. In some cases, this places limits on what and how data is to be recorded (e.g. for the standard combinations of instruments in 6.16.0.5.1, the conventional medium statement at the right is recorded in lieu of the instruments themselves; there is a prescribed order for recording medium statements given in 6.16.0.3.2; thematic-index numbers are recorded only “in the case of certain composers”) that might seem odd to users who are looking for guidance on populating what we might call “work records.” MLA reviewers often wondered why these restrictions would be present at the point of recording, and needed frequent reminding of the “access-point-ready” orientation of the instructions. There are also issues with attributes that would not be part of a preferred access point for a work, but would be needed in a variant access point (e.g. key and instrumentation for a Menuet from a Haydn symphony). There may not be time now to deal with this, but we would recommend that the JSC be open to reconsideration of where the instructions for the sorts of manipulations of data that make attributes usable in access points are placed.

#### Specific comments

##### 6.2.1

The reference to the music rules for compilations of works that is given in 6.2.1.15.2 is misplaced, since it is worded to cover all sorts of musical compilations, not just those analogous to those for literary works in 6.2.1.15. Since the music rules contain a full suite of instructions for compilations, a blanket reference in 6.2.1.13 would be far better, or more specifically-worded references under each subsection of 6.2.1.15 to the appropriate places in the music instructions. This would also allow for the removal of the

parenthetical exception in 6.2.1.15 main paragraph. As things stand, however, a collection of Wagner's musical works and one of his literary works would both be described with the conventional title "Works." It would seem preferable to adopt the language in LCRI 25.8 that allows "Literary works" and "Musical works" as preferred titles for such compilations by persons who are active in both spheres, choosing one sphere as the "primary" one with which to use the preferred title "Works." Here and in 6.15.1.12, we would welcome language that would incorporate this provision.

## 6.2

MLA has reservations about the placement of the Alternative Name for Work instructions (6.2.3). This may reflect uncertainty as to how and where this information would be recorded. If it is to be recorded only in an authority record, its placement here is logical, though the instructions are more in line with those for creating preferred access points (6.28). If such data were to be in a bibliographic record, it would almost certainly be expressed as an access point. We also wonder if the wording of the Scope in 6.2.3.1 suggests a whole-part relationship which is not technically correct (though the full RDA draft does consider it so; see Appendix J.2.4). Possible alternate wording: "...relationship between a work and another work into which the work has been subsumed."

There was some concern that the alternative title for the work, taken on its own terms, looked more like the title of an expression, but this may be more perception than reality. There is the question of whether an unqualified "Cadenzas" would clearly identify the cadenzas as having been composed by the composer of the "larger work." It was also suggested that the instructions in 6.2.3.3.2 and 6.2.3.3.3 could be simplified by simply directing the recording of the preferred access point for the "larger work," rather than breaking it out into composer and title. The 1<sup>st</sup> example in 6.2.3.3.2 would seem to need "Previn" as a qualifier.

We note the issue that arises when the composer of an opera or cadenza is the same as the writer of the libretto or the composer of the larger work. If the full-RDA-draft concept of librettos and cadenzas as being part of the larger work holds, there probably needs to be some exception made here with reference to 6.28.2.2, and the instructions at that point would have to provide for a conventionalized "part title." Otherwise, we would seem to need parenthetical qualifiers added to the preferred access point for both the opera and the libretto (this would presumably not be an issue for cadenzas). Having varying approaches for the addition of "Libretto" (parenthetical in an access point, a form sub-element in an alternative title) would invite confusion, we suspect.

## 6.15.1

There's inconsistency in the captions in 6.15 with use of plural vs. singular ("a musical work" vs. "musical works"). The caption for 6.15.0 should probably be plural, rather than the hybrid in the draft ("a musical works").

Some MLA reviewers questioned the need for the 1500 chronological divide in 6.15.1.2, though it is consistent with other RDA instructions.

6.15.1.3 purports to be instructions for *choosing* the preferred title for a work, but there's nothing to explain why the "Präludium et Fuge" example does not include the key and medium of performance; such an omission would seem to be more accurately considered a function of *recording* the preferred title (assuming the purpose for the recording activity outlined in the General Comments above). And if *choosing* is really the point here, one might argue for the inclusion of an example where the composer's original title includes medium of performance, key, etc., but at core is a non-distinctive title in a different language than that of the resource being described (analogous to the "Damnation de Faust" example).

There was disagreement among reviewers over the placement and wording of 6.15.1.3.4, known to music catalogers as the "Eroica rule" (we note that LC chose not to include the example itself). Some see this as describing a recording function, rather than a choosing function, particularly in its appeal to 6.15.1.4 and also to 6.17 in adding the serial numbering. Others are OK with the placement, since the process involves some level of research (which is inherently a choosing activity); the wording, however, is problematic. For the Eroica example, applying 6.15.1.4 would not produce the title "Sinfonia," since "Eroica" does not fit any of the categories in 6.15.1.4.2. The LC proposal attempts to skip over the stage where "Sinfonia eroica" has been chosen as the preferred title. We suggest wording closer to that of AACR2: "If all of a composer's works with titles (selected according to 6.15.1.3) that include a non-distinctive title [probably need a reference to explain this concept] are also cited as a numbered sequence of compositions with that title, formulate a preferred title using the non-distinctive title and apply the sequential numbering according to 6.17.0.3a. (followed by Eroica example).

We question the decision to assign a number (6.15.1.4.3) to the examples illustrating the application of the instructions in 6.15.1.4.2. We think that examples that include information about the resource from which the titles come would be more helpful, and such is attached as an appendix. If the current list is retained, we express relief that the inappropriate "Magic flute" example has been replaced. On the other hand, "The celebrated Sophie waltz" is such a problematic example that it should probably be scrapped. Nothing suggests that "Sophie" is an epithet not part of the original title; in fact, this is likely an English-language title for Johann Strauss Vater's Sofien-Tänze, op. 185. If it has to be retained, "Sophie waltz" would be the result of following the instruction.

The language instruction in 6.15.1.5 is very broad. Presumably "Lieder" could become "Songs." While at least one person liked that idea, broader opinion seems to be that something incorporating the notion of cognates would be more helpful, particularly if the act of translating loses important distinctions (e.g. the French "Mélodie"). This would also minimize the disconnection between AACR2- and RDA-formulated titles. That said, we prefer this instruction to that proposed in 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up/2 at 6.15.1.3.4.

A major question raised by 6.15.1.8 is the extent to which part titles are subject to manipulation using the instructions in 6.15.1.4-6.15.1.7. While numbers and related designations have always been open to regularization, abbreviation, etc, part titles consisting of words or phrases have generally been treated as being distinctive, even if they consist only of a word that is normally non-distinctive (e.g. [Carulli, Fernando, 1770-1841. Divertimenti, guitar, op. 18. Sonate]); that is, they don't get translated, and are qualified under the same conditions that distinctive titles are. It would appear that this would not be the case under 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up; such a change could produce some confusing results, and is one place where the principle of representation would be best honored. If that was not the intent, and part titles are to continue to be treated as distinctive, then some provision in 6.28.2 needs to be made for constructing a variant access point for the work named above, since its preferred variant title would begin "Sonatas ..."

A favorable comment on the reference to 6.28.2 in 6.15.1.8.2 raised the question of providing links from other areas of the preferred-title sections to the corresponding preferred-access-point sections.

6.15.1.9, while clearly intended to support some continuity with current practice, is incomplete:

6.15.1.9a has to cover situations where parts are identified only by number, with or without an accompanying designation; yet the example illustrates only a situation where a designation is found with the number. An elaborate LCRI to AACR2 25.30B2 includes guidance on how to supply a designation when one is not present in the source upon which the uniform title is being based. This is another case where the preferred title/preferred access point distinction is unclear. While one might argue that adding a designation would be an access-point-construction function, the LC draft of 6.28.2.2.1 provides no guidance, either. There is also the question of whether designations are to be abbreviated or not. If there is some general instruction to take care of this, we haven't found it. Again, the LCRI had detailed instructions on what to do. Some commentators wondered if the general instructions from 6.2.2.10.1 of the full draft might be better for this section, with whatever abbreviation provisions needed put in 6.28; but see below.

6.15.1.9c would be a desired exception to the principles in the general rules if those were to be adopted. When parts of larger musical works are titled, users have no use or patience for intervening numbering; provision in 9d is an exception to that to provide consistency in a file.

6.15.1.9e, like point a), is another place where the preferred title/preferred access point divide becomes murky. The process of determining what part titles need to be recorded seems more an access-point issue, though this provision probably is more comfortable here. This instruction's presentation in a single paragraph is needlessly dense, and makes it difficult to match up provisions with examples. We re-submit our recommended wording from the ALA response to LC/12, with renumbering and a bit of tweaking:

6.15.1.9e e) Part of a larger part of a work

6.15.1.9e.1 If the part is part of a larger part:

6.15.1.9e.1a a) If the larger part has a distinctive title, record the title of the larger part preceding the title and/or designation of the smaller part.

Cantiones sacrae. O vos omnes  
(*Part of Hieronymus Praetorius's Opus musicum*)

6.15.1.9e.1b b) If the title of the larger part is not distinctive, record the title and/or designation of the smaller part as the preferred title.

Pifa  
*not* Part 1. Pifa

**Exception:**

6.15.1.9e.2 If an indistinctive designation of the larger part is required to identify the smaller part, record that designation, followed by a full stop, preceding the title or designation of the smaller part

Atto 3o. Preludio  
(*Part of Giuseppe Verdi's Traviata*)

6.15.1.10.1 refers to general instructions at “6.2.1.12.” No such instruction is found in either RDA draft, nor in LC/12. What does this refer to? 6.2.6.3.1 of the Section 2-4, 9 draft of RDA? 6.2.2.10 of the full draft? We presume that it is the latter.

The examples in 6.15.1.10.1, as presented, rely on the cataloger to match them up with the corresponding provision in the general instruction. AACR2 made it clear that the excerpts were found in the same resource; while this may not be judged necessary in RDA, the examples need to clearly “track” to corresponding provisions. Either repeat the language of full-draft 6.2.2.10 here and insert examples accordingly (preferable), or refer to the appropriate area of instructions in the general instruction. We agree with LC’s addition of 6.15.1.10.2, though the example is problematic because it introduces the element of numbering without describing how that numbering is to be added. Less problematic would be an example such as “Appalachian spring. Suite” or “Billy the Kid. Suite.”

We recommend adding a reference to 6.15.1.12.1 from 6.2.1.14. The presentation of 6.15.1.12.3 as an “alternative” is puzzling; what default instruction applies to the situation being described? To us, this appears to be covered by the instructions in 6.15.1.16, with the added bonus of not re-introducing “Works. Selections.”

While MLA is quite relieved that the concept of “Selections” at all levels has been restored to RDA, we strongly disagree with its addition to collective titles of incomplete compilations being presented as an “alternative” in 6.15.1.12-6.15.1.15 (it’s fine in

6.15.1.16 because it's an alternative to recording individual works). We would be interested in hearing an explanation of how this could be in a code that purports to be modeled on FRBR and has Representation as a guiding principle. This is particularly egregious for titles in 6.15.1.15; for the Beethoven piano sonatas, a user would find a resource containing two of the sonatas to be far different in utility than one containing all 32 of the sonatas. This misrepresentation is also an issue in the general rules (cf. 6.2.2.11.3 of the full draft)

The provision in 6.15.1.15.3 to deal with consecutively-numbered parts of a compilation seems to get ahead of itself by including additions of medium of performance without any reference as to how and why such an addition would appear. It looks like a tacit assumption is made that "works of one type" will have "non-distinctive" titles; such assumptions are hazardous in a document that has to be used by generalists. It would also be good to make a reference to the instructions for how to formulate the numbering.

## 6.15.2

To parallel captions in the subsections, the caption at 6.15.2 should read "Variant titles for musical works."

The provisions for recording variant titles for musical works in 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up would seem to extend to recording variants for non-distinctive titles, e.g. "Sonaten" when the preferred title is "Sonatas." This is not current practice. Is this deliberate? Or is there some sense that the Exception at full-draft 6.2.3.3 kicks in?

We recommend adding "for the work" to the end of 6.15.2.2.1, to parallel the wording in 6.2.2.1.1.

Both the general instructions and the music instructions fail to mention cataloger manipulations of titles that should be recorded as variant titles, such as lopping off numbers not integral to a title not chosen as the basis for the preferred title, swapping numerals for numbers expressed as words, and the like. The general instructions include an example for the latter, but neither section includes one for the former situation. Add relevant examples to the music instruction, or make reference back to the instructions for description (2.3.6.3).

We're not sure what purpose the footnote to 6.15.2.3.2 serves; wouldn't such a title proper be "a title under which the work has been issued?" Or is this phrasing specifically intended to cover only those titles that can be associated solely with the work (as opposed to non-collective titles that have a preferred title that is collective?)

In 6.15.2.5.1, the first example would have the preferred title of "Quintets;" what has been given is something that could be a preferred access point. The third example gives the preferred title as "Selected works." Depending on how things shake out in 6.15.1.12-16, this should either be "Works. Selections" or (our preference) "Selections."

## 6.16

We offer what we think would be a more logical ordering of the instructions in 6.16 as an appendix at the end of this document. One provision (highlighted in blue) has been added to cover a situation not currently addressed. The intent of the appendix is solely to propose re-ordering; with the exception noted above, the text has not been changed from the presentation in the LC proposal. All the issues raised in our response with the instructions in this section still pertain; all citations reflect numbering from the LC proposal.

In 6.16, the statement under the Core Element is an example of expecting that readers know what you mean. There's a tacit assumption that the comparison is between two or among more than two works with the same title \*by the same composer\* or of unknown composition. Consider making this an explicit assertion by adding that phrase to the statement.

While MLA recognizes the difficulties inherent in choosing a sufficiently comprehensive basis for arranging instruments in 6.16.0.3.2, we don't believe that silence on the matter serves anyone. The best solution would likely be to refer to the most comprehensive "score order" that is widely accepted. This will also make life easier when the resource being cataloged is a sound recording, where "score order" does not represent a tangible concept. This comment is offered in the understanding that 6.16 will continue to be expected to produce "access-point-ready" strings.

We are frustrated that we once again need to point out that 6.16.0.5.1 as presented is nonsensical, since it does not specify that the terms in the right column must be combined with the appropriate preferred title "Trio," "Quartet," or "Quintet." The language in 6.16.0.5.2 does not suffice. Add to the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence: "when the preferred title is trio, quartet or quintet (or the plural)" Also, using the verb "includes" in 6.16.0.5.2 renders the instruction too broad, doesn't it? Would one add "strings" to "Prelude and quartet?" To "Little quartet?" While obvious to experienced catalogers, it might be necessary to make clear in 6.16.0.5.2 that the term to be used from the left-hand column does not include the parentheticals; either say that, or put the parenthetical information in a suitably-captioned center column. In the interests of simplifying language, we suggest using "instrument" rather than "medium" in 6.16.0.5.3.

We suggest providing these LCCN citations to the Examples Working Group: "marimba, 4 hands" [LCCN 87770460]; "organ, 6 hands" [LCCN 2002317543]. Since a general principle of RDA seems to be to use real examples, the 3-hands example should be changed to one for piano, 3 hands; the P.D.Q. Bach sonata that presumably is the basis for that example is actually for 4 hands. One possibility is [Szymanowska, Maria Agata Wołowska, 1789-1831. Waltzes, piano, 3 hands] (LCCN n 2006033318)

We think that the term "doubling instruments" in 6.16.0.6.3b will be unclear to non-musicians, and would appreciate some sort of clarification here, or a proposal to define it in the Glossary. For the latter, a possibility would be: "Additional instruments that are

played by a single performer in the course of a work, e.g. an orchestral work in which the 2<sup>nd</sup> oboe part calls for some passages to be played on English horn.”

We point out that 6.16.0.6.3, by not including range terms such as “alto,” “tenor,” etc. as elements to omit from names of instruments, produces a change in practice whose effect is not inconsiderable. It may hide some performance options for clarinetists and saxophonists, instruments for which the same piece of music often can be played by several members of the instrument family without transposition. On the other hand, “bass clarinet” is already found in a number of headings in the authority file. MLA does not have a unified position on this item.

LC’s version of 6.16.0.6.5 is a poorly-advised rewriting of LCRI 25.30B4. That LCRI, by specifying harpsichord, clavichord, and piano as the instruments from which to choose a predominant one and use it consistently, applies the instruction to music of a particular historical period—the 18<sup>th</sup> and very early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries—in which the piano, harpsichord, and clavichord were treated more or less interchangeably, and in which composers wrote large numbers of works with non-distinctive titles—Sonata, Fantasia, Preludes, etc. Applied to music after ca. 1820, it would have ludicrous outcomes. Petr Eben’s [Sonatas, harpsichord] undoubtedly reflects compositional choices suited to that instrument, vs. his [Sonatas, piano]. Substituting “piano” in the preferred access point for Elliott Carter’s [Sonatas, harpsichord, woodwinds, violoncello] would be a gross distortion. By not retaining the instruction in full-draft 6.16.1.6, last paragraph, to use keyboard instrument when no specific instrument is named and the piece can be played on any keyboard instrument, the LC proposal fails to deal with situations where works could be and were played on either stringed keyboard or organ, including many compositions by Frescobaldi and Froberger. One commentator felt that the instruction’s homogenizing effect was inappropriate for data that would be in a work record; this is another point of tension between the current and potential purposes of the data being recorded.

In 6.16.0.6.6, we reiterate our suggestion to add at the end of the instruction “..., or its cognate in the language preferred by the agency creating the data.”

We question the removal of a definition for “Instrumental (wind, string, etc.) ensembles” in 6.16.0.6.7. What is the difference between “winds” and “wind ensemble?” Also, the instruction is applied when “no more specific medium is given in the preferred source of information.” How does this square with 6.16.0.2.1: “Take information on medium of performance from any source?” And requiring specific instrumentation to be presented on the preferred source of information for a resource would invoke this instruction to a needless degree; a score titled only “Sextet” on the title page likely has specific instrumentation in the music itself. The same relationship would often occur between the label and the container/insert of a sound recording.

MLA appreciates the LC decision to go back to the AACR2 terms for large ensembles. We recommend re-captioning the instruction “Instrumental music for orchestra, string orchestra, or band” to be consistent with the instruction itself and with the table of contents. The Exception here could be removed, since it is covered by 6.16.0.3. If

retained, the provision for choral works should be moved since the caption of the instruction is specific to instrumental ensembles. A larger issue is that the example in 6.16.0.14 for choral works [Magnificats, choruses (2)] contains a term for medium of performance that has no instruction for its formulation (6.16.0.11 is captioned “Choruses,” but the instructions say to name choruses in terms of their voicing). This will have to be addressed. [Note: 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up/2 reverses this decision, and we’ve noted problems in our response to that document. We offer that this could be a situation where the more specific terms would be appropriate as data elements in work records, but would be replaced by more general terms in preferred access points].

6.16.0.9.1 and 6.16.0.9.2 illustrate an editorial discrepancy that probably needs more general examination. Note the use of “name of the accompanying ensemble” in the former vs. “term for the accompanying ensemble” in the latter. “Term for” is probably preferable.

The “clarinets (2)” example in 6.16.0.9.2, while within the parameter of the instruction, has no preceding justification for its construction (i.e., the parenthetical “2”) beyond the general rubric in 6.16.0.3.4—and that instruction does not fall within the range specified as being the basis for formulating the statement. The easiest solution is to move this example under 6.16.0.9.3; a more thorough-going approach would be to move all such examples to 6.16.0.14.

6.16.0.10 reads like a closed list, at least in the sense that it specifies the term to be used for the six vocal ranges listed. This does not align with the use of “contralto” in 6.16.0.3.3. Our preference would be for consistent use of “alto,” in the interest of simplicity. “Type of voice” is too vague; it would seem to open the door to formulations such as “lyric soprano,” “Heldentenor,” “spinto.” If the primary aspect being documented here is range, then perhaps the instruction should say so (e.g. “voice register”).

6.16.0.12 is an awkward attempt to produce the effect of “implied medium of performance” without explicitly invoking it (“the vocals” is a particularly infelicitous term; splurge on the electrons and use “voice or voices.”) Is the reference to 6.15.1.15 to that instruction in this document, or an instruction in another?

6.16.0.13 brings to mind a question: what would a preferred title look like for a work titled “Eight songs with pianoforte accompaniment, op. 47” (MacDowell) or “5 songs, opus 39” (Clarence Cameron White)? Are these considered to have an “indeterminate” medium element?

The last example in 6.16.0.13.1b is unduly ambiguous. “Bass” is not always an indeterminate medium of performance, especially when it is not presented in a context that explicitly identifies it as a designation for an instrument. Delete, or change to “bass instrument.” The example under 6.16.0.13c poorly illustrates the instruction, since it does not include a specific medium statement that would justify “unspecified instruments” as part of the medium statement.

In attempting to incorporate the use of “ballpark” statements of medium, the LC proposal has made what was the rule a set of exceptions. This looks very odd, especially 6.16.0.13.3a, which follows hard on examples of Renaissance pieces which \*have\* been given medium statements. Even more confusing is that the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> examples are not self-evident, since no work by the same composer with the same title is presented. It might be an improvement to make 6.16.0.13.3a, at least, a “point d)” in the priority listing of 6.16.0.13.1. This might work for the other points as well.

The wording of 6.16.0.13.2 suggests that a cataloger would proceed directly to it from 6.16.0.13.1. Given all the intervening examples and the expected non-linear use patterns for RDA, we suggest “If, however, two or more works of indeterminate medium of performance by the same composer have the same title, record the number of parts or voices.”

In 6.16.0.14.1, we recommend removing “part for a” from the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence. Otherwise, what would be a “part for an ensemble?”

## 6.17

Since most instructions under 6.17 refer to “musical works,” the caption should be in the plural, too.

6.17.0.3a.1 offers no rationale for the use of “no.” If this is the result of an instruction elsewhere, we don’t see it. Similarly, 6.17.0.3a.2 offers no rationale for the use of an English rather than an Italian term. Recommend revising the instruction to read “If different works in a consecutively numbered series have different forms of numerical designation, or different words introducing the number in the sources on which the preferred access **points for the individual works are** based, select one of the forms to use in all the numbers in the series.”

## 6.18

From the perspective of a work record, 6.18 offers no opportunity to record the key of a transposed expression. While it’s unlikely that the transposed key would be used in any preferred access point, it could well be needed in a variant access point.

In 6.18.0.3.1, we suggest rewording: “Record the key **of a musical work** ...” to make clear that the instructions only apply to individual works or parts of works.

## 6.19

It’s not the fault of the LC proposal, but the use of “arrangement” and “transcription” in 6.19.0.4 is unclear. Particularly puzzling is 6.19.0.4.2, where the use of different terms obscures what we think is the main point—that arrangements can come from the pen of

the composer or from others. We note that this last appears to undo a certain amount of LCRI 25.25A, footnote 9.

In 6.19.0.4.1, change the parenthetical to “(or of **one or more** parts of one composer’s works)”

## 6.27

The instructions in 6.28 do not cover all categories of musical works, though the verbiage at 6.27.1.0.2 would suggest that. It would be more accurate to have the parenthetical following the link for 6.28.1. read “(**certain categories of musical works**)” In a similar vein, we think it would be more efficient in 6.27.1.1.1 to send users to the specific rules for constructing preferred titles for musical works rather than to the general instruction, which will simply refer out to 6.15. Another such roundabout reference comes at 6.27.3.1d; is there a particular reason to refer there rather than directly to the music instructions at 6.28.3?

6.27.1.2.2 is presented as an alternative to 6.27.1.2.1 alone; in fact, it could serve as an alternative to 6.27.1.2.6, 7 or 8. Move to the end of the sequence.

6.27.1.2.3 seems to dictate that the preferred access point for any moving-image material will be based on the preferred title, and will not include a preferred name in any case. There is tension between this instruction and 6.27.1.2.4, particularly when the latter involves performances where the performers qualify as creators (e.g. video of a rock concert).

It’s not clear in 6.27.3.1 whether the attributes listed are to be routinely added to the preferred access point, whether the list represents an order of preference, and whether any accretions from 6.28.3 would remain if the directive in 6.28.3.0.2 were invoked to return to 6.27.3. This might offer the odd result of adding a content type like “performed music” to the preferred access point for a recording of Wagner’s Lohengrin in the original German because none of the expression categories in 6.28.3 pertained, but adding “English” to a performance of the same opera in that language because language is one of the 6.28.3 attributes.

## 6.28

We like 6.28.1.2.1 if the examples truly illustrate the outcome of applying “6.27.1.3” (which should probably be 6.27.1.4 of the full draft); RDA’s vagueness as to when a compiler qualifies as a “creator,” however, makes this unclear for the first example.

6.28.1.3 and its subinstructions still jumble the terms “adaptation” and “arrangement.” We are glad to see that this has been corrected in 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up/2.

Editorial—it would seem that 6.28.1.3.1 should use the plural for “adaptation,” to match the caption and the instructions below it. In point b), we wonder if the word “various” is

necessary or appropriate; paraphrases that fall under this instruction can be of a single work, e.g. Hugo Wolf's Paraphrase über Die Walküre von Richard Wagner. Substitute "one or more" for "various." [We see that this, too, has been corrected in 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up/2]. 6.28.1.3.2 does not contain examples of each of the conditions laid out in the previous instruction. This is not inherently wrong, but what examples are there should at least "track" the order of the instructions above; the Tausig example illustrates condition b), while the other two examples seem to fall under condition a).

6.28.1.3.4 describes a situation where a very fundamental issue complicates matters – that of identifying what the "original work" is for folk music, spirituals, and the like. If Florence Price's contribution is merely that of an "added accompaniment," then this is actually an expression of a work of unknown authorship (6.28.3.2). If it is indeed some sort of adaptation, why would one assume this to be a case where the adaptation is "commonly cited by title?" Absent an authoritative musical text for the "original work," how does one determine the scope of Price's contributions? ALA argued in its response to LC/12 that "The whole concept about how these *RDA* instructions [LC/12 6.17.1.3.4] apply to world/traditional/folk music is extremely difficult and complex, since works in these genres rarely exhibit a stable "original form" against which other music incorporating them can be compared to differentiate between mere additions and substantive changes." We would prefer a bias toward having the preferred access point for the work be a combination of the preferred title for the adaptation with the preferred access point for the adapter.

5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up perpetuates the discrepancy between the scope of the caption of 6.28.1.4 and the text in 6.28.1.4.1. As before, MLA would prefer the more inclusive reach of the instruction, which would put us closer to a reasonable preferred title for "My country 'tis of thee" (i.e. "God save the King (America))" We have more to say about this in 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up/2.

We recognize that in FRBR, "work" encompasses single works as well as aggregates, and 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up has dropped special instructions in 6.28 for additions to non-distinctive preferred titles for compilations under that understanding. We will only mention that reviewers found this confusing, and it could well be so for users, at least in the short term.

The "If, however ..." statement in 6.28.1.6.2 would seem more logically presented as an exception, or given its own number. We do recognize that other places in Chapter 6 of the full draft incorporate "however" instructions in a single rule, both with and without intervening examples. In point d) of this instruction, the reference to 6.21 in the context of 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up should be to 6.17.

The LCRI to AACR2 25.31B1 provided for the omission of medium of performance if it would serve no distinguishing function, i.e. if all a composer's works with a distinctive title were for the same medium of performance. That provision is not present in 6.28.1.7. We think this was a useful provision, and wonder if its omission was deliberate.

For internal consistency in 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up, the reference to 6.15.1.4 in 6.28.2.2.1 and 6.28.2.3.1 should be to 6.15.1.9 and 6.15.1.10, respectively.

Change the parenthetical statement in 6.28.3.1.1 to read “(or of part or parts of one composer's works)”

We propose an added example under 6.28.3.1.2 to illustrate another situation not dealt with elsewhere in the rules:

Wagner, Richard, 1813-1883. *Tristan und Isolde. Liebestod*; arranged  
(Preferred access point for: *Mild und Leise* / Wagner. For orchestra, without words)

We would appreciate terminology in 6.28.3.1.3 that acknowledged that most folk music and much of what is called “world music” falls into this camp.

MLA reviewers' discomfort with the treatment of the string quartet expression of the Brubeck example in 6.28.3.1.3 signals that treating all expressions of a piece of “popular” music that fall on the same side of the instrumental/vocal divide as namable with the same access point may call for further thinking in the future to ensure alignment with FRBR principles. Similar sentiments were expressed regarding the instruction for added accompaniments (6.28.3.2.1).

6.28.3.3.1 is a direction for creating preferred access points, yet the examples are presented as preferred titles. The preferred access point for the composer needs to be added in each case.

6.28.3.5.2 demonstrates a problem with the RDA draft in that it is a musical application of the general instruction in full-draft 6.27.3. A work in its original language can be represented by a preferred access point with or without a language attribute added, depending on the composition of the resource for which the access point is made. This may prove to be less a problem when we've moved past character strings as access points, but in the meantime it causes undesirable split files. For the preferred access point (as opposed to the preferred title), it would seem doable to allow for the omission of the language when it is the original language.

6.28.4 leaves some thorny issues unresolved from AACR2. Among them: whether to use singular or plural in situations where the variant title is non-distinctive (which can also be considered an issue affecting that decision for a preferred title beginning with that element, exemplified by vacillating treatment of the Samuel Barber [*Nocturne*, piano, op. 33] vs. the variant title of his [*Songs*, op. 13. *Nocturne*], i.e. [*Nocturne*, voice, piano]), and provision for variant titles that incorporate different numbering system (e.g. Ryom numbers versus Pincherle numbers for Antonio Vivaldi's works).

The struck-out provision of 6.28.4.2.1 and 6.28.4.2.2 should be restored, or references will ensue such as [Veracini, Francesco Maria, 1690-1768. 6] as a reference from his [Sonate accademiche. 6].

**Appendix: Proposed re-ordering of instructions in 6.16 (5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up)****6.16.0.1 Scope**

---

- 6.16.0.1.1  **Medium of performance** is the instruments, voices, etc., for which a musical work was originally conceived.

**6.16.0.2 Sources of information**

---

- 6.16.0.2.1 ➤ Take information on medium of performance from any source.

**6.16.0.3 Recording medium of performance**

---

- 6.16.0.3.1 ➤ Record the medium of performance in the language preferred by the agency creating the data, applying the instructions given under [6.16.0.4–6.16.0.14](#).
- 6.16.0.3.4 ➤ If there is more than one part for a particular instrument, voice, or ensemble, follow the instructions under [6.16.0.14](#).
- 6.16.0.3.5 ➤ If there is a number of hands other than two for any performer, follow the instructions given under [6.16.0.6.2](#).
- 6.16.0.3.6 ➤ If the medium, or any part of it, is not stated specifically, is indeterminate, or is unspecified, see [6.16.0.13](#).

**6.16.0.10 Solo voices**

---

- 6.16.0.10.1 ➤ Record one of the following terms as appropriate to name a type of solo voice:

soprano  
mezzo-soprano  
alto  
tenor  
baritone  
bass

sopranos (2)  
alto  
orchestra  
(Preferred title: Cantatas)

soprano  
piano  
(Preferred title: Romances)

- 6.16.0.10.2 ➤ Use other terms (e.g., *high voice*, *countertenor*) as appropriate.

- 6.16.0.3.3 ➤ If a composer names a specific voice type or register (see 6.16.0.10.1-6.16.0.10.2) in the original title, record that medium.

contralto

*(Resource described: Three songs for contralto with piano accompaniment, op. 2 / by Frederic Ayres)*

tenor

*(Resource described: 3 songs for tenor and piano 1978/9 / by Charles Wuorinen)*

- 6.16.0.10.3 ➤ Use a one of the following terms for two or more solo voices of different ranges

mixed solo voices

men's solo voices

women's solo voices

- 6.16.0.10.4 ➤ Use other terms (e.g., *children's solo voices*) as appropriate.

- 6.16.0.10.5 ➤ For compositions that include solo voices with chorus, record only the appropriate terms for the chorus (see [6.16.0.11](#)) and the accompaniment, if any.

### 6.16.0.11 Choruses

---

- 6.16.0.11.1 ➤ Use one of the following terms as appropriate to name a choral ensemble:

mixed voices

men's voices

women's voices

unison voices

- 6.16.0.11.2 ➤ Use other terms (e.g., *children's voices*) as appropriate.

### 6.16.0.6 Individual instruments

---

- 6.16.0.6.1 ➤ When recording an individual instrument, use a term in the language preferred by the agency creating the data whenever possible. Use the following list of terms as a guide. When alternatives are given, choose a term and use it consistently

cello *or* violoncello

cor anglais *or* English horn

double bass (*not* bass viol *or* contrabass)

double bassoon *or* contrabassoon

harpsichord (*not* cembalo *or* virginal)

horn (*not* French horn)

kettle drums *or* timpani

viol (*for sizes of viola da gamba other than bass*)

viola da gamba (*not* bass viol *or* gamba)

viols (*for viols of different sizes*)

- 6.16.0.6.2 ➤ For one instrument, other than one performer, 2 hands, specify the number of hands.
- piano, 1 hand  
(Preferred title: Études)
- viola, 3 hands  
(Preferred title: Sonatas)
- marimba, 4 hands  
(Preferred title: Duets)
- organ, 6 hands  
(Preferred title: Sonatas)
- 6.16.0.6.3 ➤ Omit the following elements:
- a) the designation of the key in which an instrument is pitched  
clarinet (*not* clarinet in A)
  - b) the names of alternative or doubling instruments.
- 6.16.0.6.4 ➤ Use *continuo* for a thorough bass part, with or without figures, realized or unrealized, whether it is named as *basso continuo*, *figured bass*, *thorough bass*, or *continuo*.
- 6.16.0.6.5 ➤ For stringed keyboard instruments, if the application of this instruction could result in the separation of a composer's works for or including stringed keyboard instruments between more than one instrument, such as harpsichord (or clavichord) and piano, choose the instrument for which the major portion of the composer's works were intended and specify that as the medium of performance in all medium statements.
- 6.16.0.6.6 ➤ Use names of electronic instruments if given in the resource or other source; otherwise, use *electronics*.

#### 6.16.0.4 Instrumental music intended for one performer to a part

---

- 6.16.0.4.1 ➤ 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 [6.16.0.5](#))
  - b) by individual instruments (see [6.16.0.6](#))
  - c) by groups of instruments (see [6.16.0.7](#)).

#### 6.16.0.5 Standard combinations of instruments

---

- 6.16.0.5.1 ➤ For the following standard chamber music combinations, use the terms given in the column on the right:

INSTRUMENT COMBINATION	TERM(S) RECORDED
string trio (violin, viola, violoncello)	strings
string quartet (2 violins, viola, violoncello)	strings
woodwind quartet (flute, oboe, clarinet, bassoon)	woodwinds
wind quintet (flute, oboe, clarinet, horn, bassoon)	winds
piano trio (piano, violin, violoncello)	piano strings
piano quartet (piano, violin, viola, violoncello)	piano strings
piano quintet (piano, 2 violins, viola, violoncello)	piano strings

6.16.0.5.2 ➤ If the preferred title does not include *trio*, *quartet*, or *quintet* (or the plural), record the name of the standard combination as given in the left column above.

6.16.0.5.3 ➤ If the preferred title is *Trio*, *Quartet*, or *Quintet* (or the plural), and the work is for a combination other than one listed above, record each medium.

violin  
viola  
violoncello  
double bass  
(Preferred title: Quartets)

flute  
oboe  
saxophone  
bassoon  
(Preferred title: Quartets)

piano  
violin  
viola  
violoncello  
double bass  
(Preferred title: Quintets)

flute  
clarinets  
bassoon  
horn  
(Preferred title: Quintets)

**6.16.0.X Order of instruments or voices, if no larger ensemble**

---

- 6.16.0.3.2 ➤ If the instrumental or vocal music does not include a group of instruments or a larger ensemble, such as an instrumental ensemble or an orchestra, record the elements in the following order:
- a) when there is one non-keyboard instrument, etc.:
    - voice(s)
    - non-keyboard instrument (including media other than voices or instruments)
    - keyboard instrument
    - continuo
    - electronics
  - b) when there is more than one non-keyboard instrument
    - voices
    - keyboard instrument(s)
    - other instruments, etc. (including media other than voices or instruments)
    - continuo
    - electronics

**6.16.0.7 Groups of instruments**

---

- 6.16.0.7.1 ➤ Record one of the following terms in the language of the cataloguing agency for a group of instruments with one performer to a part when no more specific medium is given in the preferred source of information:
- woodwinds
  - brasses
  - winds (*for woodwinds and brasses*)
  - percussion
  - plucked instruments
  - keyboard instruments
  - strings
  - instrumental [string, wind, etc.] ensemble
  - electronics
- 6.16.0.7.2 ➤ For standard chamber music combinations, see the instructions given under [6.16.0.5](#).
- 6.16.0.7.3 ➤ For instrumental music intended for large ensembles, see the instructions given under [6.16.0.8](#).

**6.16.0.8 Instrumental music for large ensembles**

---

- 6.16.0.8.1 ➤ For instrumental music intended for large ensembles, record one of the following terms:
- orchestra (*for full or reduced orchestra*)
  - string orchestra

band

- 6.16.0.8.2 ➤ Disregard continuo when it is part of an orchestra or string orchestra.

**Exception:**

- 6.16.0.8.3 ➤ If there is more than one of a particular instrumental or vocal ensemble, follow the instructions given under [6.16.0.14](#).

### **6.16.0.12 Accompaniment for songs, Lieder, etc.**

---

- 6.16.0.12.1 ➤ If the preferred title for a work (other than one in a “popular” idiom) is a conventional collective title such as *Songs*, *Lieder*, etc. (see [6.15.1.15](#)), and the vocals are to be accompanied by anything other than a keyboard stringed instrument alone, record the name of the accompanying instrument or instruments and *accompaniment*. If such a work is not accompanied record *unaccompanied*.

guitar accompaniment

(Preferred title: Chansons)

Unaccompanied

(Preferred title: Lieder)

percussion accompaniment

(Preferred title: Songs)

Clarinet, viola accompaniment

(Preferred title: Songs)

### **6.16.0.9 One or more solo instruments and accompanying ensemble**

---

- 6.16.0.9.1 ➤ For a work for one solo instrument and accompanying ensemble, record the name of the solo instrument and the name of the accompanying ensemble, in that order.

violin

orchestra

(Preferred title: Rhapsodies)

piano

orchestra

(Preferred title: Concertos)

harpsichord

instrumental ensemble

(Preferred title: Concertos)

- 6.16.0.9.2 ➤ For a work for two or more solo instruments and accompanying ensemble, record the medium for the solo instruments applying the instructions given under [6.16.0.4–6.16.0.8](#) above, and the term for the accompanying ensemble, in that order.

piano trio

orchestra

*(Preferred title: Concertos)*

woodwind quartet  
string orchestra

*(Preferred title: Concertos)*

clarinets (2)  
string orchestra

*(Preferred title: Divertimenti)*

violin  
viola  
orchestra

*(Preferred title: Sinfonie concertanti)*

**Exceptions:**

- 6.16.0.9.3 ➤ For a work for two or more of the same solo instrument with accompanying ensemble, record the medium for the solo instrument applying the instructions given under [6.16.0.14](#).
- 6.16.0.9.4 ➤ For a work for a solo instrument for other than one performer, two hands, and accompanying ensemble, record the medium for the solo instrument applying the instructions given under [6.16.0.6.2](#).

**6.16.0.13 Indeterminate medium of performance**

---

- 6.16.0.13.1 ➤ If the medium of performance, or any part of it, is not stated specifically in the resource or other source, or if it is unspecified, record that part of the medium element in the following order of priority:
- a) If only the family of instruments or voices, or a collective term for other media, is indicated by the composer, or is available from any other source, give the family, collective term, etc.
    - accordion
    - violin
    - chordal instrument  
*(Preferred title: Trio)*
  - b) If only the range or general type of instrument or voice is indicated by the composer, or is available from any other source, give the range:
    - low instrument  
orchestra  
*(Preferred title: Concertos)*
    - treble instrument  
organ  
*(Preferred title: Chorale preludes)*
    - melody instrument  
piano  
*(Preferred title: Suites)*

violoncello  
bass

(Preferred title: Sonatas)

- c) If some parts of the medium are indicated by the composer, or are available from any other source, and others are unspecified or are indicated as “unspecified” or a similar term, give the individual parts of the medium as instructed under [6.16.0.4-6.16.0.12](#), also using “unspecified” or a similar term as appropriate.

unspecified instruments  
(Preferred title: Pieces)

- 6.16.0.13.2 ➤ If, however, two or more such works by the same composer have the same title, record the number of parts or voices. Use voices to designate both vocal and instrumental parts.

voices (3)

(Resource described: Canzonets, or, Little short songs to three voices / published by Thomas Morley)

voices (5-6)

(Resource described: Canzonets, or, Little short aers to five and six voices / by Thomas Morley)

voices (4)

(Resource described: Fourteen canzonas for four instruments / Claudio Merulo)

voices (5-6)

(Resource described: Madrigals of 5 and 6 parts, apt for the viols and voices / made & published by Thomas Weelkes)

**Exceptions:**

- 6.16.0.13.3 ➤ Do not record a statement of the medium of performance in the case of:
- a) a work (especially of the Renaissance period) intended for performance by voices and/or instruments;
  - b) an instrumental chamber work for which the precise medium is not clearly defined and cannot be ascertained from any other source;
  - c) no medium of performance is specified by the composer and none can be ascertained from any other source.

**6.16.0.14 More than one particular instrument, ensemble, or voice**

---

- 6.16.0.14.1 ➤ If there is more than one part for a particular instrument, ensemble, or voice, add the appropriate arabic numeral after the name of that instrument, ensemble or voice.

flutes (2)

oboes (2)

clarinets (2)

horns (2)

bassoons (2)

(Preferred title: Parthien)

viols (5)  
(Preferred title: Fantasias)

violins (2)  
viola  
violoncellos (2)  
(Preferred title: Quintets)

choruses (2)  
(Preferred title: Magnificats)

violin  
string orchestras (2)  
(Preferred title: Concertos)

- 6.16.0.14.2 ➤ For two keyboard or mallet (marimba, vibraphone, xylophone, etc.) instruments other than 4 hands, and for more than two keyboard or mallet instruments, specify the number of hands.

pianos (2), 8 hands

pianos (2), 6 hands

marimbas (4), 8 hands

- 6.16.0.14.3 ➤ For electronics or percussion, do not record the number of performers even if indicated in the resource or available from any other source.