

20 December 2006

**TO:** Pat Riva, Chair, FRBR Review Group  
Anders Cato, Chair, Working Group on the Expression Entity

**FROM:** Music Library Association, Bibliographic Control Committee  
(Kathy Glennan, Chair, Subcommittee on Descriptive Cataloging)

**SUBJECT:** MLA response to the world-wide review of revisions to FRBR section 3.2.2

The Bibliographic Control Committee of the Music Library Association has reviewed the proposed revisions to FRBR section 3.2.2. We commend the FRBR IFLA Working Group on the Expression Entity for their efforts in expanding the model to clarify the application of the FRBR model in this area. We submit the following comments for further consideration.

1. While we appreciate the need for flexibility in considering minor variations as part of the same expression, we have concerns about the resulting possible differences in interpreting when a new expression exists.
2. How do the changes in this section relate to the 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph of 5.3.1.1? Has FRBR always considered the “component” described there as a separate work?

“There often will be no reason for a dependent part of a *work* to be separately identified or described in a bibliographic record. In certain instances, however, such as when a preface or introduction has been written by a well-known author who is not the author of the main text, it may be considered useful to identify and describe the component in its own right.”

3. When do augmentations to an expression create a separate work?

For example, the 1972 Norton critical score edition of Bach’s Cantata 140 includes a historical background in three sections (p. 3-57), the musical score (p. 61-101), textual note (p. 102-105), analysis (p. 109-150), brief commentaries by 10 different authors (p. 153-173), and a bibliography. Does this publication constitute an aggregation (thus treated as a “work” in the FRBR model per section 3.3), or are there multiple expressions of their own separate works included here? When would such a distinction prove useful? Current cataloging practice would not normally convey this level of detail in a bibliographic record:

- expression: Preface by Gerard Herz
- expression: New chronology of Bach’s vocal music
- expression: The history and dating of Cantata no. 140
- expression: The history of the hymn and its melody
- expression: Bach’s Cantata no. 140 in miniature score format
- expression: Textual note

- expression: The chorale melody as used by Bach
- expression: The remainder of the text and the overall form of the cantata
- expression: Analysis of movements I-VII (each could be considered a separate expression)
- expression: commentary by Carl von Winterfeld (previously published in German as part of a facsimile score of this cantata; translated by the editor)
- expression: commentary by Carl Hermann Bitter (previously published in German as part of a Bach biography; translated by the editor)
- expression: commentary by Philipp Spitta (previously published in German as part of a Bach biography; later translated into English and published; that translation reproduced here)
- expression: commentary by Albert Schweitzer (previously published in German as part of a Bach biography; later translated into English and published; that translation reproduced here, without the musical examples)
- expression: commentary by André Pirro (previously published in German as part of a Bach biography; later translated into English and published; that translation reproduced here)
- expression: commentary by C. Hubert H. Parry (previously published as part of a Bach biography)
- expression: commentary by W.G. Whittaker (previously published as part of an analysis of selected Bach cantatas and motets)
- expression: commentary by Friedrich Smend (previously published in German as part of an analysis of Bach cantatas; translated by the editor)
- expression: commentary by Karl Geiringer Parry (previously published as part of a Bach biography)
- expression: commentary by Alfred Dürr (previously published in German as part of an analysis of Bach cantatas; translated by the editor)

4. Should FRBR set a clearer limit for what constitutes a “minor change?”

For example, jazz recordings may include multiple “takes” of the same musical work. When do these “takes” constitute a new expression, and how would anyone applying the model know when to make this distinction? The wording in the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph allows for significant leeway in this area.

5. This revision still does not directly address the situation of an expression realized from an expression.

In the Schubert Trout quintet example, the musical performance (one expression) has to be based on a score (a separate expression), not on the work itself.

6. We agree with the Library of Congress response about the need to change the Trout Quintet example to reflect actual expressions of the same work; the current e<sub>3</sub> example appears to be for D. 956 instead of D. 667.
7. Should FRBR include reasons for justifying a new bibliographic record? This appears in the proposed revision (6<sup>th</sup> paragraph), but not elsewhere in the model. If such rationale is important to include, it should have its own section.
8. In the examples for musical performances, we prefer yet another modification of the text:

Change “the music as performed” to “the musical work as performed”

9. We recommend substituting a different example for the Bach Six suites for unaccompanied cello; this example actually represents an aggregation of six individual works; thus, the hierarchy of relationships between expressions and manifestations is more complex than represented here. Changing this example to one that reflects a single work would address the concerns about the multiple recording dates mentioned in the Library of Congress response.
10. We agree with the Library of Congress recommendation to correct the spelling from “Glen Gould” to “Glenn Gould” in the Goldberg variations example.