

To: ALA/ALCTS/CCS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

From: Bibliographic Control Committee, Music Library Association

Subject: MLA response to 5JSC/LC/12

The BCC has authorized this document as a response to 5JSC/LC/12. 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

In general, the membership found the document difficult to follow; the preface acknowledges the shortcomings in formatting, but a larger problem is the presentation of such a large body of suggested revisions in isolation from the surrounding instructions. That said, it must be admitted that our response is also guilty of this, with the redeeming feature of providing clean versions of extensive changes proposed. One group observed that the document appeared to have been hastily put together, not at all unusual in this *RDA* process. The *RDA* draft for 6.17-6.22 is largely a “drop-in” of rules from *AACR2* with some (but not enough) adjustments for terminology and *RDA* concepts, most notably the attempts to root out “rules of three.” The LC proposal contains some significant departures from *AACR2*, perhaps enough so to jeopardize any concept of “backward compatibility” with access points formulated according to the earlier rules. Those departures will be noted in the body of this document. The LC proposals seem to devalue the collocation function that uniform titles traditionally provided, and give more emphasis to identification; they seem to assume a “scenario 1” world where relationships can be made without resort to pre-coordinated character strings, while most of us will be living in a flat-file “scenario 3” world for some time to come. Lest this seem too negative, there is much in the document that we find appealing in the short term, and other things that would seem to be good practices in a more advanced data environment than the one most of us work in.

Goals of proposals

1. (Maintain music instructions intact, while looking for future integration into general instructions): Agree with keeping instructions together, with expectation that any generalization would follow very deliberate and careful consideration. The first part of this goal is not pursued as thoroughly as we would prefer.
2. (Filling in gaps left from *AACR2*): Agree this is of value, in particular for bringing practices documented in LCRI's into the instructions.
3. (Simplification): Not always achieved.
4. (Reorganization): Some improvement noted, but the hasty assembly makes it difficult to assess.

5. (Representation): Agree that representation is an important principle, while observing that it seems to have been elevated over other principles, particularly for non-distinctive titles, with resulting difficulties.
6. (Unworkable instructions): The example provided may not prove to be any more workable (q.v.).
7. (“Vexing terms”): Without the Glossary, it is difficult to determine whether “non-distinctive” is indeed an improvement on “types of composition;” “score order” is another example of a move that works better in a “scenario 1” world.

Organization of the document—see comments above.

Comments on specific proposals

A. Proposed deletion of draft 6.1.1.2.5

A.1. RDA 6.1.1.2.5.

This change is good in that it is part of the larger task of moving directions for all music resources to 6.17 ff.

B. Proposed revision of draft 6.1.3

B.1. RDA 6.1.3.1

MLA is agreed that the concepts embodied in LC’s 6.1.3.3 do not belong here if the first edition of *RDA* is to have all the music-specific instructions together. A less-elegant alternative would be to have a placeholder reference back to the appropriate place in 6.17. MLA is proposing its own wording for this instruction, which will be found under D.11 (q.v.)

The addition of 6.1.3.2, while perhaps justifiable as an expression of symmetry with 6.1.1.0.3, raises more questions than it answers. As discussed in the CC:DA wiki, 6.1.3.1 itself has an incongruence that raises a basic question. While 6.1.3.1 says to construct an access point to represent “a particular expression,” the examples not only do not identify a “particular” expression, but illustrate the common practice of allowing an access point to stand for a “cloud of expressions.” Is there an expectation that this will change? It’s also not clear what the expected qualification process is that would invoke 6.1.3.2. Does it anticipate that a cataloger will add terms one at a time, testing them after each addition for conflict? If conflict still exists after exhausting the list, what next? While we recognize that this is as much a problem with 6.1.3.1 as with the proposed addition, it is a question that should be addressed.

C. Proposed revision of draft 6.2.7.3

C.1. RDA 6.2.7.3.

MLA agrees vigorously with LC that there is a need for collective titles that express selected portions of a composer’s oeuvre, whether *in toto* or in a particular form or medium. It seems a

bit odd to leave the musical examples here, given the general movement elsewhere to consolidate the special musical instructions in 6.17-6.22 for this edition of *RDA*, but the proposed reference might be acceptable. One thing that might argue for providing a separate statement at 6.18.5.5 is that the current wording of 6.2.7.3, and LC's proposed revision of it, does not provide for collective titles naming medium of performance (e.g. the LC example *Selected piano music*). If there is to be a single list of examples, the prefacing text should define the scope of those examples; the mention of "media" back in 6.18.5.5 is not sufficient.

MLA and other constituencies have already expressed reservations about using the *Selected ...* format for such collective titles, rather than *Selections* as a subelement of the preferred aggregate-work title. Further comment will be found later in this document, at 6.18.5.5.

D. Proposed revision of draft 6.17.1

MLA appreciates the tacit reunification of instructions for instrumental and vocal music into a single location in *RDA*; the editor's draft has a loop that begins with 6.1.1.0.2 (go to the special instructions for music in 6.17.1), then back to 6.1.1 (direction in 6.17.1.0.3). The "division of the world" that LC proposes ("Instrumental music" and "Collaborative works"), however, is problematic. Some instrumental works are the results of collaboration, whether of shared or mixed responsibility; some vocal works are the product of a single entity responsible for both music and text. We suggest that a better approach might be to use "'Musical works created by one composer" and "Collaborative works," respectively.

We note that the last sentence in the LC explanatory paragraph is that "Adaptations appear last in this section [6.17.1] because they are expressions." However, the title of 6.17.1 is "Preferred access point representing a musical work." Since the actual text of the instructions for adaptations of musical works (LC modified 6.17.1.3, edited from draft *RDA* 6.17.1.1) specifically addresses adaptations that result in new works, this doesn't require further alteration, assuming that LC's later untangling of "arrangement" and "adaptation" is sufficiently defined somewhere. We agree with LC's position on language consistency for "the preferred access point for"

D.1. RDA 6.17.1.0.

MLA supports these deletions, with suggestions as found elsewhere.

D.2. RDA 6.17.1.1

As stated above, MLA proposes to provide a different caption and scope for *RDA* 6.17.1.1.

Clean copy of LC's proposal:

6.17.1.1 Instrumental music

-
- 6.17.1.1.1 ➤ For an instrumental work with a title that is not distinctive, construct the preferred access point representing the work by combining (in this

order):

- a) the preferred access point for the composer of the music, formulated according to the guidelines and instructions given under [9.1.1](#), [10.1.1](#), or [11.1.1](#), as applicable
- b) the preferred title for the work, formulated according to the instructions given under [6.18](#).

MLA markup of LC copy:

6.17.1.1 Instrumental music Music created by one composer

- 6.17.1.1.1 ➤ For an instrumental work with a title that is not distinctive, If one composer is responsible for creating the musical work, construct the preferred access point ~~representing~~ for the work by combining (in this order):
- a) the preferred access point for the composer ~~of the music~~, formulated according to the guidelines and instructions given under [9.1.1](#), [10.1.1](#), or [11.1.1](#), as applicable
 - b) the preferred title for the work, formulated according to the instructions given under [6.18](#).

Clean copy of MLA version:

6.17.1.1 Music created by one composer

- 6.17.1.1.1 ➤ If one composer is responsible for creating the musical work, construct the preferred access point for the work by combining (in this order):
- a) the preferred access point for the composer, formulated according to the guidelines and instructions given under [9.1.1](#), [10.1.1](#), or [11.1.1](#), as applicable
 - b) the preferred title for the work, formulated according to the instructions given under [6.18](#).

LC's 6.17.1.1.1 is the first instance in the document that reflects the abandonment of "types of composition" as the counterpart to "distinctive" when determining how and to what extent to modify or make additions to preferred titles to uniquely name musical works. Unless a clear definition of what constitutes a "distinctive title" surfaces, (and the LC draft proposals for what is now in 6.18.0.4 don't provide one, either) we don't see how "distinctive/non-distinctive" is an improvement. "Distinctive" is commonly understood to be akin to "distinguishing" or "not common." The composer Vincent Persichetti wrote at least 15 compositions titled "Parable." Would common understanding lead the cataloger to regard this as a "non-distinctive" title? And since Edvard Grieg wrote only one work titled "Concerto," should it be considered a "distinctive" title in his oeuvre? The presence of the phrase "types of composition" in several

parts of the LC draft suggest an ambivalence about its continued utility; Kathy Glennan has listed 7 uses of the phrase in the LC draft in the CC:DA wiki.

D.3. RDA 6.17.1.2

We are curious as to the source from which this analysis seems to have been excerpted. The assertion in the first sentence that cadenzas, librettos, and performance parts are works seems contradicted by the subsequent analysis characterizing them as “parts of works.” Our reservations about this analysis and the subsequent decisions will be elaborated at the portions of the LC draft that propose the corresponding changes.

D.4. RDA 6.17.1.2.2.

MLA agrees with the changes proposed.

D.5. RDA 6.17.1.2.3.

MLA agrees with the LC changes, in particular the substitution of “Excerpt” for “Song” in 6.17.1.2.3.1d. Additionally, we propose that 6.17.1.2.3.1c be supplied with two subinstructions, so as to cover situations where the compilation of excerpts represents the work of a single composer. This is a logical extension of the principle followed for a single excerpt. Since the compilation may represent only part of a composer’s contribution to the pasticcio, etc., some provision for expressing the concept of “selections” needs to be developed. Proposed language is put forth below.

Clean copy of LC proposal:

6.17.1.2.3.1c

6.17.1.2.3.1c.1

c) Compilation of excerpts

If the work is a compilation of musical excerpts from a pasticcio, ballad opera, etc., use the preferred access point for the work from which the excerpts were taken.

Beggar's wedding

(Preferred access point for: Songs in the opera call'd The beggar's wedding, as it is perform'd at the theatres)

MLA markup of LC proposal:

6.17.1.2.3.1c

6.17.1.2.3.1c.1

c) Compilation of excerpts

If the work is a compilation of musical excerpts from a pasticcio, ballad opera, etc., ~~use~~ construct the preferred access point for the work ~~from which the excerpts were taken.~~ by combining (in this order):

- a) the preferred access point for the composer of the excerpts, formulated according to the guidelines and instructions given under [9.1.1](#), [10.1.1](#), or [11.1.1](#), as

applicable

b) the preferred title for the work, formulated according to the instructions given under 6.18. [further revision for selections needed]

Handel, George Frideric, 1685–1759. Muzio Scaevola

(Preferred access point for: Muzio Scevola : opera : atto terzo / di G.F. Händel. Act 3 by Handel)

6.17.1.2.3.1c.2

If the work is a compilation of musical excerpts from a pasticcio, ballad opera, etc., and the excerpts are by multiple composers or the composer is unknown, use the preferred access point for the work from which the excerpts were taken. [further revision for selections needed]

Beggar's wedding

(Preferred access point for: Songs in the opera call'd The beggar's wedding, as it is perform'd at the theatres)

Clean copy of MLA proposal:

6.17.1.2.3.1c

6.17.1.2.3.1c.1

c) Compilation of excerpts

If the work is a compilation of musical excerpts from a pasticcio, ballad opera, etc., construct the preferred access point for the work by combining (in this order):

a) the preferred access point for the composer of the excerpts, formulated according to the guidelines and instructions given under [9.1.1](#), [10.1.1](#), or [11.1.1](#), as applicable

b) the preferred title for the work, formulated according to the instructions given under [6.18](#). [further revision for selections needed]

Handel, George Frideric, 1685–1759. Muzio Scaevola

(Preferred access point for: Muzio Scevola : opera : atto terzo / di G.F. Händel. Act 3 by Handel)

6.17.1.2.3.1c.2

If the work is a compilation of musical excerpts from a pasticcio, ballad opera, etc., and the excerpts are by multiple composers or the composer is unknown, use the preferred access point for the work from which the excerpts were taken. [further revision for selections needed]

Beggar's wedding

(Preferred access point for: Songs in the opera call'd The beggar's wedding, as it is perform'd at the theatres)

D.6. RDA 6.17.1.2.4.

MLA supports the substance of the LC proposal.

D.7. Draft RDA 6.17.1.3

If this instruction is deleted, we don't understand how LC has arrived at the conclusion that such compilations would have the writer of the words as the preferred access point. By our reckoning, the decision-making starts at 6.1.1.3, for a compilation of works by different persons, families, or corporate bodies. Point a) identifies the compiler as the first part of the preferred access point if the compiler is considered to be the creator of the work. Even given the ambiguities attending application of 6.1.1.3.3 as noted in the CC:DA wiki, it would seem clear that the compilers in the examples found in the *RDA* draft (Frederick Sternfeld for the 1st example; no compiler named in the 2nd) don't meet that test. 6.1.1.3.3 says to use the title of the compilation as the preferred access point. We would request that LC explain its reasoning, and that this instruction not be deleted.

D.8. New RDA 6.17.1.3.

MLA is very supportive of the LC draft's untangling of "adaptations" and "arrangements," whose intermingling in the *RDA* draft is particularly confusing. While we can understand the rationale for deletion of *RDA* draft paragraph c) if thought of in regard to Western popular music, this might not be so clear if applied to folk and traditional musics. This also explains our proposal to remove the instruction numbered in *RDA* as 6.17.1.5.4 (AKA LC's 6.17.1.3.4). The whole concept about how these *RDA* instructions 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. This notion is more fully developed in F.3 of the LC draft, but to a more restrictive conclusion than we are advocating. Since the LC draft does not provide a "clean" copy of their proposal, one has been devised so as to clarify our proposed changes. It is followed by a markup with MLA changes, and a clean copy of the MLA version.

Clean copy of LC proposal:

6.17.1.3 Adaptations of musical works

- 6.17.1.3.1 ➤ Consider a modification of the types listed below to be an adaptation that results in a new work.
- a) works described as freely transcribed, based on, etc., and other modifications incorporating new material
 - b) paraphrases of works or of the general style of another composer
 - c) performances of a compilation of musical works by more than one composer that involve substantial creative responsibility on the part of the performer(s)

- 6.17.1.3.2 ➤ Construct the preferred access point for the adaptation by combining (in this order):
- a) the preferred access point for the composer of the adaptation, formulated according to the guidelines and instructions given under [9.1.1](#), [10.1.1](#), or [11.1.1](#), as applicable
 - b) the preferred title for the work, formulated according to the instructions given under [6.18](#).

[examples need to be evaluated]

Tausig, Carl, 1841-1871. Nouvelles soirées de Vienne

(Preferred access point for: Nouvelles soirées de Vienne : valse-caprices d'après J. Strauss / Ch. Tausig)

Rachmaninoff, Sergei, 1873-1943. Rapsodie sur un thème de Paganini

(Preferred access point for: Rapsodie sur un thème de Paganini : pour piano et orchestre, op. 43 / S. Rachmaninoff)

Wuorinen, Charles. Magic art

(Preferred access point for: The magic art : an instrumental masque drawn from works of Henry Purcell, 1977-1978 : in two acts / Charles Wuorinen)

- 6.17.1.3.3 ➤ If two or more composers have collaborated in the adaptation, follow the instructions given under [6.1.1.2](#).
- 6.17.1.3.4 ➤ If the adaptation is commonly cited by title, use the preferred title for the adaptation as the preferred access point representing the work.

Peter go ring dem bells

(An arrangement for voice and piano by Florence B. Price of the traditional Negro spiritual)

- 6.17.1.3.5 ➤ In case of doubt about whether a work is an adaptation that is a new work or an arrangement, etc., that is a new expressions of a previously existing work, treat it as a new expression.

MLA markup of LC proposal:

6.17.1.3.5 Adaptations of musical works

- 6.17.1.3.5.1 ➤ ~~Consider a modification of the types listed below to be an adaptation that results in a new work. Follow the instructions given below for an adaptation or revision of a previously existing musical work that substantially changes the nature and content of that work. Consider such adaptations or revisions to be new works, including: that falls into one or more of the following categories:-~~
- a) ~~works-modifications~~ described as freely transcribed, based on, etc., and other modifications incorporating new material
 - b) paraphrases of works or of the general style of another

composer

c) modifications in which the harmony or musical style of the original has been changed

de) performances of a compilation of musical works by more than one composer that involve substantial creative responsibility for adaptation, improvisation, etc., on the part of the performer(s)

6.17.1.3-5.2 ➤ Construct the preferred access point for the adaptation by combining (in this order):

- a) the preferred access point for the composer of the adaptation, formulated according to the guidelines and instructions given under [9.1.1](#), [10.1.1](#), or [11.1.1](#), as applicable
- b) the preferred title for the new work, formulated according to the instructions given under [6.18](#).

[examples need to be evaluated]

Tausig, Carl, 1841-1871. Nouvelles soirées de Vienne

(Preferred access point for: Nouvelles soirées de Vienne : valse-caprices d'après J. Strauss / Ch. Tausig)

Rachmaninoff, Sergei, 1873-1943. Rapsodie sur un thème de Paganini

(Preferred access point for: Rapsodie sur un thème de Paganini : pour piano et orchestre, op. 43 / S. Rachmaninoff)

Wuorinen, Charles. Magic art

(Preferred access point for: The magic art : an instrumental masque drawn from works of Henry Purcell, 1977-1978 : in two acts / Charles Wuorinen)

Bennett, David. Swing low, sweet chariot

(Preferred access point for: Swing low, sweet chariot (spiritual) : quartet for B♭ clarinets / arranged by David Bennett)

6.17.1.3-5.3 ➤ If two or more composers have collaborated in the adaptation, follow the instructions given under [6.1.1.2](#).

~~6.17.1.3-4 ➤ If the adaptation is commonly cited by title, use the preferred title for the adaptation as the preferred access point representing the work.~~

~~Peter go ring dem bells~~

~~*(An arrangement for voice and piano by Florence B. Price of the traditional Negro spiritual)*~~

6.17.13-5.5-4 ➤ In case of doubt about whether the modifications result in work is an adaptation that is a new work or in an arrangement, etc., that is a new expressions of the a previously existing work, treat the modifications it as a new expression. [The utility of the rule reference in the RDA draft needs to be assessed]

Clean copy of MLA proposal:

6.17.1.5 Adaptations of musical works

- 6.17.1.5.1 ➤ Follow the instructions given below for an adaptation or revision of a previously existing musical work that substantially changes the nature and content of that work. Consider such adaptations or revisions to be new works, including:
- a) modifications described as freely transcribed, based on, etc., and other modifications incorporating new material
 - b) paraphrases of works or of the general style of another composer
 - c) modifications in which the harmony or musical style of the original has been changed
 - d) performances of a compilation of musical works by more than one composer that involve substantial creative responsibility for adaptation, improvisation, etc., on the part of the performer(s)

- 6.17.1.5.2 ➤ Construct the preferred access point for the adaptation by combining (in this order):

- a) the preferred access point for the composer of the adaptation, formulated according to the guidelines and instructions given under [9.1.1](#), [10.1.1](#), or [11.1.1](#), as applicable
- b) the preferred title for the new work, formulated according to the instructions given under [6.18](#).

[examples need to be evaluated]

Tausig, Carl, 1841-1871. Nouvelles soirées de Vienne

(Preferred access point for: Nouvelles soirées de Vienne : valse-caprices d'après J. Strauss / Ch. Tausig)

Rachmaninoff, Sergei, 1873-1943. Rapsodie sur un thème de Paganini

(Preferred access point for: Rapsodie sur un thème de Paganini : pour piano et orchestre, op. 43 / S. Rachmaninoff)

Wuorinen, Charles. Magic art

(Preferred access point for: The magic art : an instrumental masque drawn from works of Henry Purcell, 1977-1978 : in two acts / Charles Wuorinen)

Bennett, David. Swing low, sweet chariot

(Preferred access point for: Swing low, sweet chariot (spiritual) : quartet for B♭ clarinets / arranged by David Bennett)

- 6.17.1.5.3 ➤ If two or more composers have collaborated in the adaptation, follow the instructions given under [6.1.1.2](#).

- 6.17.1.5.4 ➤ In case of doubt about whether the modifications result in a new work or in a new expressions of the a previously existing work, treat the modifications as a new expression. [The utility of the rule reference in the *RDA* draft needs to be assessed]

D.9. RDA 6.17.1.4.

We're not sure why there is no reference to 6.18 in LC's 6.17.1.4.1. We presume it was omitted inadvertently in the process of reversing the order of *RDA* 6.17.1.10 and 6.17.1.11. If that's not the case, a rationale would be called for. In general, we prefer the order and wording of the *RDA* text.

D.10. RDA 6.17.1.5.

MLA concurs with the utility of removing the exceptions to the list of additions to the 6.20 neighborhood. We prefer the wording and order of appearance of the *RDA* draft to that proposed by LC.

D.11. Draft RDA 6.17.1.6

MLA disagrees with LC's proposal to move this to the proposed 6.1.3.3. This is such a music-specific instruction that it should remain in 6.17 until/if a general integration of music instructions into the general instructions occurs. Furthermore, MLA has proposed in the CC:DA wiki that this instruction describes new expressions, and should be moved to 6.17.3.3, with subsequent instructions re-numbered. The proposal is given below.

6.17.3.3 Alterations or omissions of the text, plot, setting, or other verbal element of a musical work

- 6.17.3.3.1 ➤ If the text, plot, setting, or other verbal element of a musical work is adapted or if a new text is supplied, and the title has changed, construct the preferred access point for the expression by adding the title of the new expression (enclosed in parentheses) to the preferred access point representing the original work (see 6.17.1) or part(s) of the work (see 6.17.2), as applicable, combining (in this order):
- a) the preferred access point representing the original work
 - b) the title of the adaptation (enclosed in parentheses).

Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, 1756–1791. *Così fan tutte* (Dame Kobold)
 (Preferred access point for: Die Dame Kobold (Così fan tutte) / bearbeitet von Carl Scheidemantel. *Scheidemantel* substituted an entirely new libretto based on the play by Calderón de la Barca)

Herbert, Victor, 1859-1924. Babes in Toyland

Herbert, Victor, 1859-1924. Babes in Toyland
(Toyland tintype)

(Preferred access point for: A Toyland tintype : a musical mini-melodrama for middle and junior high schools / music by Victor Herbert ; lyrics by Glen MacDonough ; musical adapted by John Henson ; arranged by Joyce Merman)

Arcadelt, Jacob, approximately 1505-1568.
Nous voyons que les hommes

Arcadelt, Jacob, approximately 1505-1568.
Nous voyons que les hommes (Ave Maria)

(Preferred access point for: Ave Maria : for mixed chorus, a cappella / Arcadelt ; text adapted and music arranged by Pierre-Louis-Philippe Dietsch)

Greensleeves (What Child is this?)

(Preferred access point for: What child is this : for full chorus of mixed voices, a cappella : English tune Greensleeves, before 1642 / arr. by Alice Parker and Robert Shaw ; words by W.C. Dix.)

6.17.3.3.2

- If the text of a musical work is omitted, follow the instructions for constructing the preferred access point representing adaptations of musical works, if the modifications result in a new work (see 6.17.1.5) or the instructions for constructing the preferred access point representing arrangements, transcriptions, etc., if the modifications result in a new expression (see 6.17.3.1). [completely new; instruction numbers refer to those of current RDA draft]

Wagner, Richard, 1813-1883. Tristan und Isolde.
Liebestod; arranged

(Preferred access point for: Mild und Leise / Wagner. For orchestra, without words)

D.12. Draft RDA 6.17.1.12

MLA is OK with this, provided that the topic is truly reflected elsewhere.

E. Proposed revision of 6.17.2

E.1. RDA 6.17.2.2.2

There is some uncertainty in MLA about whether we agree with LC's analysis of a libretto as being a part of a work. What seems clear to us is that this revision of 6.17.1.9, paired with the proposed deletion of 6.17.3.5, would produce a preferred access point for a setting-specific libretto that is identical to that of the opera, oratorio, etc. This is a disservice to our users and is another example of subverting *FRBR* principles by equating a whole with what is (at least in LC's analysis) a part of the whole. At the very least, the instructions contained in 6.17.3.5 should be referred to in LC's 6.17.2.2.2.1, and moved to a more suitable locale if the analysis of

a libretto as part of a work persists. Also, the leading “If” in LC’s 6.17.2.2.2 could be changed to “When.”

MLA does support the regularization of “Librettos” and “Librettos and song texts” to “Librettos and other texts.”

E.2. RDA 6.17.2.2.3.

MLA strongly disagrees with LC’s proposal. First, the analysis presented in D.3 contradicts this proposal in that the opening sentence calls a cadenza a work, but here we are to consider a cadenza a part of a work. Doing so seems an easy call on its face, but the situation is more complex. The need to include recordings in a consideration of how to treat cadenzas produces a wide spectrum of possible relationships between a given cadenza and another musical work. LC’s analysis is valid in that cadenzas are virtually never performed apart from a larger musical work for which they have been composed. Cadenzas are almost never named in bibliographic records for performances of larger works containing them, and so they get subsumed into the larger work by omission. They are not infrequently published as separate resources, however; at this point the analysis gets frayed, particularly since *AACR2*, the *RDA* draft, and the LC proposal seem clearly aimed at printed cadenzas. Even if the composer of the “target” work is also the composer of the cadenza, that composer may have published several cadenzas to be played at the same spot in a larger work in different performances. A larger work by a composer may have several cadenzas, even within the same movement. These situations could, at least, produce a result that looks something like the result of LC’s proposal.

But the possibilities do not stop there. Cadenzas are composed by composer X to be played in a performance of composer Y’s work, but cadenzas can also be composed by composer X without identifying what musical work is their “target.”

The decision to sanction the addition of “Cadenza” here, while not that of “Libretto” or “Text” in the previously-examined instruction, seems particularly curious.

F. Proposed revision of 6.17.3

F.1. RDA 6.17.3

MLA concurs with the proposal to add versions to the list in 6.17.3.0.1. We propose, however, that the “see” reference in that line be to LC’s 6.17.3.1.1, which describes the conditions under which 6.14 is to be applied.

F.2. RDA 6.17.3.1.

The wording of the instruction may need adjustment if our proposal under F.1 is accepted. MLA had proposed different wording for this in the CC:DA wiki, but the LC approach achieves what was desired.

F.3. RDA 6.17.3.2.

MLA appreciates the characterization of “stable” vs. “flexible” musical works, and agrees that this concept should prove useful in efforts to better equip future editions of *RDA* to handle world/folk/traditional musics. We note our proposal under D.8, which takes this line of thought in another direction.

Collaborative works can be arranged, too, but the wording of the instruction seems to limit its application to music of a single composer. We suggest the amendment of LC’s 6.17.3.2.1 as shown below.

Clean copy of LC proposal:

6.17.3.2	Arrangements, transcriptions, etc.
6.17.3.2.1	➤ Follow the instructions given below for an arrangement, transcription, etc., of one or more works of one composer (or of parts of one composer’s works) that falls into one or more of the following categories:

Markup of MLA proposal:

6.17.3.2	Arrangements, transcriptions, etc.
6.17.3.2.1	➤ Follow the instructions given below for an arrangement, transcription, etc., of one or more works of one composer, (or of part(s) of one composer’s works) , <u>or all or parts of a collaborative work</u> that falls into one or more of the following categories:

Clean copy of MLA proposal:

6.17.3.2	Arrangements, transcriptions, etc.
6.17.3.2.1	➤ Follow the instructions given below for an arrangement, transcription, etc., of one or more works of one composer, of part(s) of one composer’s works, or all or parts of a collaborative work that falls into one or more of the following categories:

We note that the 1st sentence of LC’s explanatory paragraph appears to have a typographical error; it’s likely that the second instruction number cited should be 6.17.3.2.3.

We presume that LC’s deletion of “part(s) of a” in the subinstructions to 6.17.3.2 reflect the belief that they are redundant. That could be so if some general editorial policy that made

“work” a shorthand for the laundry list of possibilities (see our suggested rewrite of 6.17.3.2.1 above) were in effect. In light of thinking such as that found in *RDA* draft 6.17.2.3.3, where an access point for an entire work is allowed to represent a compilation of excerpts from it, we’re not so sure that their deletion is a good idea.

MLA feedback to the 2 additional conditions for adding *arranged* to an access point for “flexible” music works in LC 6.17.3.2.3 indicates satisfaction with LC’s category a), but not with category b). This may reflect our experience with musical works that appear in an array of vocal settings simultaneously with no indication of which is “original.”

F.4. RDA 6.17.3.3.

The word “parts” is problematic; this instruction already contains two distinct meanings for it. Adding it to the caption seems to unnecessarily invite confusion.

MLA disagrees with the expansion of this instruction to cover the addition or substitution of text; we prefer the scope and language of the *RDA* draft version. For situations involving added or substituted text, we offer our proposal under D.11. We would also point out that as things stand, the LC proposal here conflicts with LC’s proposed 6.1.3.3

F.5. RDA 6.17.3.4.

MLA sees merit in this proposal, with the exception of its treatment of chorus scores (q.v.) and the introduction of the term “concerto-like instrumental work.” Though MLA is a community of music specialists, we find it curious that the LC proposal uses vague musical jargon. We might find such language handy to use among ourselves, but in a code that must be usable by generalists, it would not seem helpful. We recommend “A work for solo instrument(s) with ensemble accompaniment” be substituted, with needed adjustments for plural.

MLA finds value in LC’s proposal to allow “built terms” such as *Trumpet-piano score* to reduce the use of *arranged*. LC did not choose to extend this to vocal works; if consistency is desired and a decision is made to do so, we recommend *Piano-vocal score* or the suitable equivalent for some other specified keyboard instrument. This term, though in the opposite order from the instrumental pattern, is in common use; in fact, over 35 years of *AACR2* doesn’t seem to have retrained users to refer to “vocal scores.” We strongly prefer the “built term” to the proposed *Piano reduction*. Our sense is that users would interpret this term to be a reduction of the entire work for piano solo (a situation which matches the Glossary definition of *Piano score*), rather than just the accompaniment. This would be especially confusing for those “concerto-like” works that have distinctive titles and therefore no indication of the original medium of performance in the preferred access point for the original work.

MLA strongly disagrees with LC’s analysis of chorus scores. The assertion that a performance part, such as the solo violin part of a concerto, is a work is not supported by *FRBR*: “...when the modification of a work involves a significant degree of independent or artistic effort, the result is viewed, for the purpose of this study, as a new work.” (*FRBR* final report, p. 17) This analysis seems to equate the solo violin part (or a chorus score with accompaniment omitted) with an

abstract, digest, or summary, three sorts of reductions that *FRBR* considers to be new works. If so, it's an analysis that is not only far-fetched, but unhelpful to users. If there is concern about distinguishing between the two sorts of chorus scores, a modification to the Glossary definition should suffice. The conditions in 6.17.3.4.3.3 and 6.17.3.4.3.4 should be consolidated into a single instruction. This may also require rethinking of the structure of this section, since LC's proposed caption specifically refers to accompaniments.

F.6. RDA 6.17.3.5.

MLA appreciates the desire to extend to uncompleted works the use of *Sketches* as an addition to the preferred access point. As worded, however, the instruction suggests that the sketches themselves are a work, and in essence should "name" themselves; this was true of the *RDA* draft as well. But the *RDA* draft did explicitly link the sketches to one or more "target" musical compositions, which allowed the preferred access point for the sketches to be based on that of the "target." Lacking that language, the LC instruction is vague. It's also unclear whether LC's reference to "uncompleted works" refers to only sketches that have an identifiable intended "target," or also to those that do not. The press of time has made it difficult to come up with an alternative, but the concept of complete/incomplete but identifiable and namable vs. a compilation of fragments with no identifiable "destination" might be a starting place. We're not sure if the Douglas Moore example would represent situations where a composer's sketches do not have an identifiable composition as their destination.

We disagree that the provisions of draft 6.17.3.5 are covered by LC's 6.17.2.2.2, for reasons stated at E.1 of this document.

G. Proposed revision of 6.17.4.1.3

G.1. RDA 6.17.4.1.3.

No objection; this is dependent on where the intended instructions land in the final version of *RDA*. Note the discrepancy in instruction numbers between the explanatory text and the instruction.

H. Proposed revision of 6.18.0

H.1. RDA 6.18.0.

MLA agrees with LC's proposal to incorporate wording from *LCRI* 25.27A1 into 6.18.0.3.1. Some, though not all, in MLA think that the exception for long titles could be deleted entirely, since many circumstances might be covered by 6.18.0.3a.1.

There is little enthusiasm in MLA for the closed list presented in 6.18.0.3c.1. LC has already acknowledged elsewhere that "Concerto" was inadvertently omitted. "Mass" has been offered as another term that probably belongs in the list. It's hard to tell, though, because LC has offered no rationale in the document for its choices for the list. Rather than an arbitrary list, we propose that the concept of "types of composition" be restored. If this closed list is chosen by the JSC, and presuming that some rationale is developed for the choices made in it, language should be added to explain the presence of titles such as "Solo," "Duet," etc. Further comments at I.1.

There is sentiment for and against the inclusion of the principle articulated in 6.18.0.3c.2, point a) among MLA members. Once again, the tacit equation of “type of composition” with “non-distinctive” is instructive. One argument in its favor would be to prevent situations where a composer’s title appears to be a non-distinctive title expressing the number of performers, but the actual number of performers is different, e.g. Ezra Sims’ *String quartet #2*, for which the preferred title would be [Quartets, flute, clarinet, violin, viola, violoncello]. We support point b).

MLA agrees with LC’s analysis of *RDA* 6.18.0.4.3 as more properly being an illustration of the instruction above rather than an instruction in itself. We agree with their corrections to incorrect underlining and the addition of *concerto à cinque*. We don’t see the rationale for changing the *Zauberflöte* example to English; the caption of 6.18.0.4 is “Recording the preferred title.” 6.18.0.3 gives directions on how to choose the preferred title. If LC’s choice of Magic flute represents an application of its 6.18.0.3a.1, that should be annotated, but we don’t think there would be widespread agreement with such a decision. The observation that “Preferred titles for musical works are established using reference sources” is a useful one, which might profitably be applied in evaluating other instructions.

MLA agrees with the moving of 6.18.0.4.4

I. Proposed revision of 6.18.1-6.18.3

I.1. *RDA* 6.18.1.

MLA notes that in the 3rd paragraph on p. 24 of the LC document, the reference to draft 6.18.0.2 must be incorrect; it most likely is to LC’s 6.18.0.3c.1. Similarly, the instruction reference in LC’s 6.18.1.2 should be to the 6.18.0.3c.1. This frazzled writer sympathizes with the difficulties of instruction citation in *RDA*!

MLA has stated elsewhere its preference for retaining “type of composition” as a formal concept. The revision of the last sentence of 6.18.1.1 from “one work of this type” to “one such work” muddies, rather than clarifies things. What does “such” really refer to? And there is still the ambiguity of what to do when a composer has written more than one work of a type, but has named only one of them such that the preferred title includes only the name of that type. There has been back-and-forth for years on whether the preferred title for Liszt’s piano sonata in B minor [*Sonata, piano, B minor*] should be in the singular or plural, because his [*Duet, violin, piano*] has also been titled “Violin sonata” in some manifestations, which produces the variant title [*Sonata, violin, piano*]. And if the composer wrote only one “such work,” would its title not be by definition “distinctive?” Without a definition, who knows?

Again, LC’s choice not to revise the caption of 6.18.1 is telling in its discrepancy with the wording of the subinstruction (“type of composition” vs. “non-distinctive”).

LC’s change to the *RDA* draft of 6.18.1.1 to prefer the composer’s language to that of the language preferred by the agency creating the data will create significant backward-compatibility issues with existing *AACR2* headings. While this may be in large part an issue for the “techie’s.” the fix cannot be assumed to be simple as, say, globally swapping in *Sonaten* for *Sonatas* in

headings for Beethoven works; some of the works may have preferred titles in French rather than German. This could cause inconsistencies even within a single composer's work list, and certainly with any desire to do cross-composer title searching. To this last, some have suggested that subject searching is a better way. That is currently not an option for *Preludes* or *Fantasias*, titles for which the proposed practice is already in place.

MLA agrees with the move and placement of draft 6.18.0.4.4. Depending on whether or not "type of composition" is retained as a formal concept, the need for the draft 6.18.1.2 should be re-evaluated. The same would be true for draft 6.18.1.3 and 6.18.1.4. Further, MLA believes that if the LC rationale for its closed list in its 6.18.0.3c.1 was "common usage," *Trio sonata* would certainly qualify.

J. Proposed revision of 6.18.5

J.1. RDA 6.18.5.1.

MLA strongly supports the alternative in 6.18.5.1.2, with the hope that catalogers will do the research needed to produce accurate results. A reference to draft 6.18.5.2 ff. might be called for to tell the cataloger how such a title should be formulated; that reference could be inserted in lieu of "that," whose antecedent is fuzzy.

J.2. RDA 6.18.5.5.2.

MLA agrees with the intent of this instruction, but would prefer the continued use of *Selections*.

K. Proposed revision of 6.20.0

MLA members find themselves in agreement, to a great degree, with assertions 1 and 2 of the explanatory paragraph. There is no consensus regarding assertion 3.

K.1. RDA 6.20.0.3.

MLA members generally, though not universally, approve of the removal of the "rule of three" from the instructions for recording medium statements, even as we recognize the significant backward-compatibility issues involved—again, in many cases not allowing an automated fix.

LC's proposed 6.20.0.3.2 raises a basic question. The placement of this exception suggests that LC is proposing that preferred access points with titles such as *Song*, *Lieder*, etc. should routinely be provided with statements of medium—at least this was a strong impression among many MLA reviewers of the document. However, the examples illustrating titles with implied medium of performance that LC's 6.20.0.3.4.1 says are to be carried forward from the draft 6.17.1.10.2a (note the corrected number) include *Songs* and *Lieder*. Comments here and at K.8 work from the assumption that LC intended *Songs* and *Lieder* to be titles with implied medium; if that is not so, this needs to be made very clear, and would likely change the analysis presented below.

The proposal for 6.20.0.3.2 met with some resistance from MLA members. The example in LC's 6.20.0.3.2 is in conflict with draft 6.20.0.10.1, which LC did not propose to change; the proper

voice term from 6.20.0.10.1 would be *alto*. We don't believe that 6.20.0.10.2 would apply here. This would also be better placed under LC's 6.20.0.3.4.1, point a), since this actually constitutes an exception to the exception (admittedly a bit ungraceful). "Specific singing voice" seems an awkward formulation; perhaps "If a composer specifies a particular voice type such as those named in 6.20.0.10.1 ..." would work better? Note also the discrepancy with a similar situation in LC's 6.20.0.12.2. The same revised placement would apply to 6.20.0.3.3.

Ensembles can be elements of a statement of medium of performance. Both the *RDA* draft and the LC proposal fail to acknowledge that in 6.20.0.3.1. If they can't be readily incorporated into the instructions here, consider a reference out to the later sections in which they are covered.

6.20.0.3.4 presents a broad ordering of elements in the medium statement, but no guidance as to order within categories, either in *RDA* or in the LC response. For instruments, this was a deliberate choice on LC's part, and one that MLA members have mixed opinions about. Was this a choice for voices as well? *Duets, bass, soprano, piano* would look a bit funny. As arbitrary and Western-centered as "score order" might seem, it can provide assistance in creating rational access points that can function well in the flat-file environment that many of us will be in for some time to come. MLA has elsewhere volunteered to develop a regularized "score order."

All the bracketed references to examples to be brought forward into the text in 6.20.0.3.4.1 are incorrect; the 3rd and 4th digits in the instruction number should be 1.10 rather than 0.1

K.2. RDA 6.20.0.5.3.

MLA approves this proposal, provided that the rule of three for recording medium is removed from the final version of *RDA*.

K.3. RDA 6.20.0.6.

MLA agrees with the wording change proposed in 6.20.0.6.1.

MLA is sharply divided over the proposal to retain designations of range in names of instruments. In fact, "bass clarinet" has already crawled into a number of uniform titles found in the LC/NACO authority file, so it may be a moot point. There is a bit of user convenience lost here, if a solo musical work is usable by any member of an instrument family where the notated music has the same compass (clarinets and saxophones in particular); the more specific designation filters out material that might be useful to a baritone saxophone player, even if the composer has specified alto saxophone as the solo instrument.

We agree with having added language in 6.20.0.6.3 to cover the situation where a single player alternates among instruments during a performance, but doubt that "doubling instruments" is understandable on its face as a descriptive term.

LC's 6.20.0.6.2 is a repetition of its 6.10.0.3.5. Was this deliberate?

MLA agrees with adding LC's 6.20.0.6.5.

MLA suggests that the direction in its 6.20.0.6.6 to use *electronics* in the absence of more specific terms be revised to reflect internationalization: “Use names of electronic instruments if given in the resource or other source; otherwise, use *electronics* or its cognate in the language preferred by the agency creating the data.”

K.4. RDA 6.20.0.7.

We’re not clear about the distinction (if any) between *strings* and *string ensemble*, etc., in the absence of any definition of size.

There is a preference for *electronics* over *electronic instruments* as a term to put in the list. This is consistent with *percussion*, and avoids the problem of electronically-produced sounds/music by mechanisms that are not strictly speaking or at all times considered instruments.

K.5. RDA 6.20.0.8.

Opinions among MLA members vary about this proposal. Some welcome the greater specificity it offers. Others question how a “wind ensemble” named according to LC’s 6.20.0.7 would be distinguished from a “wind ensemble” named according to this instruction. Not everyone is convinced that the inconsistencies noted in LC’s introduction really “don’t matter.” We recommend that such a major change be postponed or at least tempered somewhat.

It’s hard to say how MLA members really feel about the proposal in 6.20.0.8.1; there was initial confusion that this was intended to apply to a “concerto-like” work, such as described in 6.20.0.9. Even after things were cleared up, there remained the question about what is being served by changing from our current practice of listing the singled-out instruments first. If there is a compelling reason to implement this proposal, clearer language would help; perhaps “are included with” could be changed to “are considered to be part of.” Three extra words that stave off confusion are worth the ink (or electrons, more rightly).

K.6. RDA 6.20.0.9

The instruction referred to in the instruction should be LC’s 6.20.0.14.

K.7. RDA 6.20.0.10.

MLA agrees with this change.

K.8. RDA 6.20.0.12

The exception being made in LC’s 6.20.0.12.2 (which, by the way, is a proposal, and not a revision of draft 6.20.0.12.2, since no such instruction number is to be found in the draft) is really not an exceptional practice for naming accompaniment, but rather for including “a specific voice type or register” as part of a medium statement when the title would normally be considered to contain an implicit medium. As such, it belongs as an “exception to the exception”

back in 6.20.0.3.4.1, point a) (again assuming the correctness of our analysis in K.1). The term *contralto* in the Brahms example does not conform to the list in 6.20.0.10.1.

The wording of LC's 6.20.0.12.2 differs from that of its 6.20.0.3.2—here, “a specific voice type or register” compared with “specific singing voice” in 6.20.0.3.2. Is the variation deliberate? And if the language here is preferred, is “register” intended to take in “high voice,” “low voice,” etc.?

The final example should have *accompaniment* added at the end of the medium statement.

K.9. RDA 6.20.0.13

MLA members had difficulty interpreting 6.20.0.13.1 a) because the example does not identify the element that is being illustrated. This is as much *RDA*'s problem as LC's, but deserves mention. In light of the changes proposed in LC's 6.20.0.6.3 to stop omitting terms indicating range, is “saxophone” an indeterminate statement of medium? If “bass” in the last example under point b) is some unspecified bass instrument, something needs to be done to distinguish it from the voice part (“bass” is a prescribed term in 6.20.0.10.1). This should be no problem, since information can come from any source.

MLA would prefer that 6.20.0.13.2 remain in the instructions in this section, renumbered as necessary. It is admittedly a conflict-resolution instruction, but one that we wish to see retained, and is best presented near the exposition of its intended use. In a pinch, it could conceivably be worked into LC's 6.20.0.3.4 as a special use of “voices” as a specific term rather than a category of performance medium, but that would be ungraceful.

K. 10. RDA 6.20.0.14.

MLA appreciates the extension of adding enumeration to performing forces other than individual instruments and voices.

It's unclear why 6.20.0.14.3 is needed; in fact, *chorus* is given in 6.20.0.14.1, though not illustrated with an example. Suggest amending 6.20.0.14.1 as needed to take in scope of 6.20.0.14.3.

It would be helpful to offer an example under 6.20.0.14.2, point b) for *piano, 4 hands*.

Points c) and e) under 6.20.0.14.2 illustrate that this instruction is performing two functions—an acknowledged one of defining when a designation of number of hands should be added, and an unacknowledged one of illustrating how keyboard instruments should be enumerated. This should be made explicit.

Is there a principled explanation for using two keyboard instruments as the cutoff point for recording number of hands? Some of the “monster concert” repertoire displays something other than the 2-hands-per-piano pattern implicit in *pianos* (8). Is this another “rule of three?”

MLA supports LC's proposed 6.20.0.14.4, but would like to see the rationale in LC's explanatory paragraph incorporated into the instruction.

L. Proposed revision of 6.21.0.3

L.1. RDA 6.21.0.3.

The instruction in 6.21.0.3.1 to "Record as many of the following numeric elements as can readily be ascertained" conflicts with the direction in 6.21.0.3c.1 to record the thematic-index number "in the absence of, or in preference to, a serial number and/or opus number." We recommend that 6.21.0.3.1 be amended to "Record as many of the following numeric elements in a) and b) below as can readily be ascertained."

The *RDA* draft offers surprisingly little guidance on how to record numeric designations. MLA appreciates any further guidance that can be provided. That said, LC's 6.21.0.3a.2 does not describe the situation seen in the example, unless the "and" after the first comma in the instruction was to have read "or." Assuming that to be the case, three further comments: 1) the example would benefit from a "not this," to make clear just what is being illustrated; 2) an example of the 2nd situation would be very helpful; 3) some statement, or reference to another instruction, should explain how "libro" in the original title became "book" in the preferred title. If this is being derived from the instructions regarding numeric designations for parts of works (which would cause its own problems), that needs to be made explicit.

M. Proposed revision of 6.22

M.1. RDA 6.22.

MLA members are divided over whether to make key an optional element. Those wishing to keep it as a required element also wish to leave the footnote as it is. If LC's revised footnote is adopted, "access point representing the work" should be "access point for the work"

M.2. RDA 6.22.0.3.

MLA members seem willing to abandon a chronological divide for making decisions about recording key. 6.22.0.3.1, point a) might be amended to substitute "commonly identified" for "commonly given;" the former is still idiomatic and is a common phrase in the *RDA* draft. Point c) may need qualification to offer the caution that the notated music (a manifestation, after all) be known not to represent a transposition of the work to a different key from the original.

AACR2 25.30D1, 2nd sentence reads: "If the mode is major or minor, add the appropriate word." This formulation saved a generation of specialist catalogers from confusing the intended modes with the church modes that they learned about in their music history classes. A possible remedy in 6.22.0.3.1 would be "Record the key, or key and mode (that is, major or minor), using one or more of the following"

M.3. *RD4 6.22.0.3b.1.*

MLA recommends that “(that is, major or minor)” be added after “Add the mode” if this is chosen instead of M.2.