

**MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION  
BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**COMMENTS ON FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR AUTHORITY  
RECORDS: A CONCEPTUAL MODEL (DRAFT 2005-06-15)**

The Bibliographic Control Committee of the Music Library Association has reviewed the current FRAR draft. We submit the following comments for further consideration.

1. We believe the treatment of name/title access points needs to be more explicit and further developed in this document.

Specifically, we think that the FRBR Group 1 entities (work / expression / manifestation / item) cannot normally stand alone as specific entities; they need a direct connection to their creator(s) from the FRBR Group 2 entities.<sup>1</sup> This connection goes beyond a generic “associated with” relationship and has influenced the structure of authority records in Anglo-American practice. The FRAR model would work better if it were clear that the name and identifier attributes encompass an author/uniform title combination that uniquely identifies a work. These name/title headings become more than just a combination of separate identifiers – they become a single identifier (or “name”) in and of themselves. Nothing in the FRAR model represents this name/title combination and the ability to relate that as a whole to other entities in an authority record context, for example, Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet* as a play, various movie adaptations of the play, operas and ballets based on the play, etc. We feel this is an important concept to include.

The FRAR model does include references to name/title authority records, both explicitly and implicitly. Clearly, the inclusion of standard numbers such as the ISRC and ISWC as identifiers (p. 16) includes composer/title combinations. Musical examples also appear in section 6.3.6. However, after p. 8-9, the analysis of this type of authority record mostly disappears from the model.

Part of the challenge is the terminology FRAR uses in expressing the relationship between a person and a work. In spite of the bi-directional arrows in Figure 2 linking person / family / corporate body with work / expression / manifestation / item, all of the verbal description refers to persons being associated with works, with no reference to works being associated with persons.

In Table 1, no Entity Type/Relationship Type appears for “Person → Work” or “Corporate Body → Work.” We do not believe the description in section 6.2 sufficiently address these relationships.

---

<sup>1</sup> These include titles such as “*Midsummer night’s dream*” (by Shakespeare? Mendelssohn? Britten?) as well as generic music titles such as “piano concerto no. 5,” “symphony no. 3,” or “cello sonata no. 2.”

We support the CC:DA recommendation to include a composer/title example with cross references in section 6.4.4 to help clarify this situation.

2. Inclusion of additional identifying information in authority records for works

We are uncertain if the following characteristics related to works are included in the existing FRAR model; if they are, the document should reflect these options more clearly:

Musical incipit, a recent addition to the MARC21 Authority Format

Subject access as appropriate

(For example, the original version of Prokofiev's ballet, Romeo i Dzhuletta, will always have a core subject heading of Ballets" in LCSH)

Because these are attributes associated with a work, we believe these belong in the FRAR model and not exclusively in the future FRSAR model.

3. Relationships between Persons and Corporate Bodies (section 6.3.3)

We would like to see a musical example added here, such as the "Buddy Rich Band."