

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/2

The Bibliographic Control Committee has authorized this response to 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up/2. 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.

We appreciated the various marking devices to highlight changes, etc.; they were effective.

#1—6.15.1

MLA has no particular problem with LC's proposal to limit short titles to those found in reference sources, but we think that there needs to be provision for choosing and recording a preferred title for a work whose embodiment bears a cataloger-devised title (2.3.11.4); 6.15.1.2.1. and 6.15.1.2.2 are worded in such a way that it could be unclear as to whether they would encompass such a situation.

MLA notes that LC's proposal for 6.15.1.3.4 has expanded somewhat the list of non-distinctive titles that are to be given in English when recording preferred titles and constructing preferred access points. We nonetheless would prefer a different approach. We reiterate points that were made in ALA's response to LC/12:

In terms of *RDA* principles, LC/12 emphasizes *representation* over other principles for creating access points. Representation may be a more compelling consideration for descriptive data (or for manifestation/item records) than for access points. The principle of representation allows for the selection of one of the following types of preferred titles:

- a) commonly used title or form of title in the language and script preferred by the agency creating the data;
- b) original title of the work;
- c) title most commonly found in resources embodying the work (*RDA Objectives and Principles*, p. 5)

The principle of *language preference* states, "If there is a commonly used title for a work in the language and script of the catalogue, preference should be given to that title." (*Ibid.*) ALA has already raised concerns about extending this too far in relation to uniform titles (in our response to IME ICC 5.2.4, Forms of Uniform Titles, in Sept. 2007). However, LC/12 goes quite far in preferring the composer's original language when recording the preferred title (for types of composition/non-distinctive titles).

The principle of *common usage or practice* states, "The formulation of name-title and title access points representing works and expressions should reflect conventions used in the country and language of the agency creating the data." (*Ibid.*) Again, ALA's response to IME ICC 5.2.4 cautions about taking this too far; however, LC's recommendations in this paper go to the other extreme, again preferring the composer's original language for "generic" titles, for example, substituting *sonate a tre* for *trio sonata* or *Musik* for *Music* in preferred access points..

The three proposals mentioned above, along with related proposals to allow more ambiguity in ordering statements of medium of performance in preferred access points, jeopardize the ability to provide meaningful "backward compatibility" with access points constructed under AACR2, particularly since many of the proposed changes will require human intervention to implement. Finally, the LC proposals seem to devalue the collocation function that uniform titles have 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. (CC:DA/MLA/2008/1, p. 1-2)

We are also disappointed in LC's denigration of the Music Library Association Web document *Types of Composition for Use in Music Uniform Titles* (<http://www.library.yale.edu/cataloging/music/types.htm>) as a "separate, constantly-changing list." We would offer these observations: 1) changes to the Types document almost always represent additions of new terms, rather than the sort of whimsical fluttering implied by the remark; 2) the Types document explicitly gives LC practice as one of its bases, so that agency has some responsibility for any ambiguities; 3) there are any number of lists to which RDA will refer that fit this description; 4) we've heard time and again how cataloging "communities" need to take ownership of making RDA work in their areas. If the Types document is a fair reflection of our community (and feedback to this LC proposal would suggest that this is so), disregarding it would seem an odd recommendation.

Our objection to 6.15.1.3.4a notwithstanding, we wonder if it's conceptually accurate to characterize the process there (or any other process more acceptable to us!) as "choosing" a preferred title. In the two previous exceptions, the title that is to be chosen is a pre-existing one. In this instruction, by contrast, what is chosen may be manipulated before it is recorded. It's also oddly-placed in that in some cases, the act of translation would occur only if a term in the list was chosen as the preferred title following the procedure for recording the title ("omissions testing") in the next instruction.

The clause "if there is one" in 6.15.1.3.4a doesn't have a clear antecedent ("cataloging agency?" "language of the cataloging agency?" "term in the language of the cataloging agency?"). Again, though we don't support this instruction, if it is to be retained, this language should be clarified.

In summary, we prefer the provisions of 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up 6.15.1.3, with the qualifications offered in our response to that document.

6.15.1.3.4b, i) in contrast to the preceding section, looks familiar to us. We wonder, however, about its relationship to 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up 6.28.1.6.2a, the “If, however ...” clause. These instructions seem to be at odds. Instruction ii) would seem to render titles such as “Orchesterlieder” and “Trio sonata” to be distinctive by our reading, since each “incorporates a type of composition.” Was that the intent? If so, then 6.15.1.4.3 has a problem, and there is a conflict with the Glossary definition of Type of Composition, which explicitly offers “trio sonata” as the name of a type.

The new “Concerto à cinque” example in 6.15.1.4.3 raises the question of how “à cinque” fits the definition of “medium of performance” as found in 6.16.0.1.1 of 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up.

We think that the list could be clearer for users if the context from which the decisions reflected in each example have come is made explicit. We offer a list as an appendix at the end of this document. The citations to authority records and OCLC numbers are for the benefit of the Examples Working Group.

The reference to 6.15.0 in 6.15.1.5.1 should presumably be to 6.15.1.4.2.

MLA is OK with eliminating 6.15.1.5.2. We are ambivalent about 6.15.1.6., with some arguing for retention of 6.15.1.7; as noted above, the discrepancy between 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up/2 instructions and the Glossary as to whether “Trio sonata” is distinctive or non-distinctive needs to be resolved.

#2: 6.16.0.8

MLA has substantial, though not unanimously-held, issues with the proposal to expand the allowable terms for large ensembles in 6.16.0.8. As has been mentioned elsewhere, this is the sort of situation where we wouldn’t object to these terms being recorded in a work record, but find them problematic in preferred access points. 1) The instruction here is inconsistent with the practice for recording other mediums of performance in that it does not direct the ensemble to be recorded in the language preferred by the cataloging agency when possible (cf. 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up 6.16.0.6.1). Not translating terms like “Kammerorchester” is problematic, but translating has its own hazards; as we noted in our original response to LC/12, “The frequency with which terms would need to be translated to English from what is found on the resource invites confusion when the same term is rendered in different ways for the same musical work (e.g. the large ensemble in Béla Bartók’s *Musik für Saiteninstrumente, Schlagzeug und Celesta*, as it was called in its first edition, has been translated as “string instruments,” “strings,” and “string orchestra” in various manifestations).” Translating these terms also waters down the representation principle on which this proposal is based. 2) There’s potential confusion in assuming that because a symphony is played on a recording by some sort of “chamber orchestra,” that term would be appropriate (many of the Beethoven symphonies get played by groups so named). 3) There are potential issues over numbered sequences of compositions with the same title, but with what under this proposal would be different instrumentation. Within the numbered sequence of Vagn Holmboe’s symphonies that are not for string orchestra, some are for full orchestra and some are for chamber orchestra. There are probably other composers whose numbered sequences would be dissected. 4) Especially

since 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up removed any definition for “instrumental (string, wind, etc.) ensemble” beyond that of being one to a part (6.16.0.7.1), “wind ensemble” is particularly problematic, since it is commonly used for ensembles that are not one to a part.

6.16.0.8.2, in calling for singled-out instruments that aren’t functioning in a solo capacity to follow the name of the large ensemble would appear to a casual observer to conflict with 6.16.0.3; there’s nothing above it that excludes large ensembles from its scope.

#3: 6.16.0.10

MLA is OK with the combination of 6.16.0.10.3 and 6.16.0.10.4, but observes that there are occasions where a composition may be for two or more voices of different registers but not identifiable as being for men, women, or children. Perhaps could add “Use a general term for two or more solo voices of different ranges if no more specific voice type(s) can be ascertained.” One example might be “treble voices.”

#4: former RDA 6.28.1.2

MLA is hard-pressed to assess the impact of removing 6.28.1.2 in favor of the general rule (6.27.1.4), since it’s not yet clear to us how RDA will sort out “creator” from “non-creator” compilers. We would want the outcome that was implicit in the examples.

#5: new 6.28.1.2

The LC rewriting aims to create a closed list of circumstances under which an adaptation is to be considered a new work. We wonder if this might not be an area where “cataloger’s judgment” should be allowed. We would also mention RDA draft 6.27.1.5, which has not been tinkered with in the LC proposals, where the sorts of situations described here are characterized as “an adaptation or revision of a previously existing work that substantially changes the nature and content of that work.” We think that similar language would be appropriate here. While LC is correct that old point c) would describe many situations in Western popular music, we also wonder if this would serve to be the justification for considering J.S. Bach to be part of the preferred access point for the 371 4-part chorales; after all, many are no more than harmonizations of pre-existing melodies. We question the need for the new point c). “Based on” in point a) seems to have served adequately in the past; if there is some special category not covered that way (and the choice of the phrase “Musical works” to open the instruction raises the question), we’d appreciate an example. Point d) has a far broader scope than what ALA proposed in the response to LC/12, where this provision was limited to compilations of musical works by more than one composer. The prospect of dozens of preferred access points like [Davis, Miles. My funny valentine] is a sobering one. On the other hand, the LC language refers specifically to “performances.” Can this be extended to published transcriptions of such performances? We think that changing the language of the opening of 6.28.1.2.2b from “the preferred title for the adaptation” to “the preferred title for the new work” would reinforce catalogers’ understanding of the outcome of the instruction. As mentioned in the response to 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up, the examples given should “track” the conditions they illustrate. While it uses the term “arranged,” we think this

additional example would represent an improvement in how adaptations of folk music are handled, and would illustrate that a lot of changes to the nature and content of a work can lie behind the term “arranged”:

Bennett, David. *Swing low, sweet chariot*

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

Presumably, the “Ur-work” is a simple melodic line. This version is at least a harmonization of that melodic line (substantial addition of material), probably alterations in the rhythm and contour of that line (though that begs the question of whether an “original version” can be determined), and a change from a vocal to an instrumental medium. It could be considered to come from point a), or from the “old point c)” if it is judged prudent to retain (Bach chorales).

#6: RDA 6.28.1.3

We fail to see how LC’s change to the caption of 6.28.1.3 clarifies anything. The instruction itself encompasses any musical work with words--period. MLA is inclined to endorse this scope. We presume that LC is not; given that, how is “Operas, etc.” more clear than “musico-dramatic?” If being a “made-up term” were an inherent liability, we would point to “concerto-like work” as being in this camp (q.v.). “Etc.” is wide enough to drive a Mack truck through. MLA would prefer the caption that it proposed in its response to LC/12: “Alterations or omissions of the text, plot, setting, or other verbal element of a musical work.” We would also re-submit these examples:

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.)

While the MLA proposal earlier characterized these as “new expressions,” we accept the placement here.

#7: 6.28.3.2

MLA thinks that LC should have left well enough alone by retaining the language of 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up for 6.28.3.2.1. By adding conditions for text, the instruction causes confusing overlap with 6.28.1.3.1, and the puzzling notion of a “substitute text” being an “addition.” The underlying rationale of this instruction has been that the original work is wholly present, unaltered.

#8: 6.28.3.3

We support the clarity of the presentation. But, we've already expressed our strong dislike for the term "concerto-like work." Using similes in place of clearly-stated delineations is not advisable in a code that will be used by non-specialists. We would re-submit the language from our response to LC/12 for the points under 6.28.3.3.1, and use the same expressions elsewhere as appropriate:

- a) a work or part(s) of a work for solo instrument(s) with ensemble accompaniment;
- b) an accompanied vocal work or part(s) of such a work.

Appendix--suggested examples for 6.15.1.4.3 (LC/12/LC follow-up/2)

Quartet

(Resource described: String quartet / Michael Finnissy) [LCCN 87752395]

Quartets

(Resource described: Viertes Streichquartett / Wolfgang Rihm) [LCCN 86752534]

Symphonies

(Resource described: Symphonie 40 : G moll : Köch. No. 550 / W.A. Mozart) [LCCN m 61001697]

Clavier Übung

(Resource described: Clavierübung / Johann Ludwig Krebs ; herausgegeben von Gerhard Weinberger) [LCCN 88753970]

Kammersymphonie

(Resource described: Kammersymphonie : in fünf Sätzen, op. 41 / H.E. Apostel) [LCCN 72217365]

Symphonie fantastique

(Resource described: Symphonie fantastique / Hector Berlioz) [LCCN 93723756]

Carnaval

(Resource described: Carnaval: op. 9, für Klavier / Robert Schumann) [LCCN 93723756]

Concertos

(Resource described: Concerto pour piano, la mineur, op. 54 / Robert Schumann) [LCCN m 55000355]

Sonatas

(Resource described: 12 sonatas, opus 1, for two violins and piano (with cello ad libitum) / Corelli) [LCCN 84759275]

Nocturnes

(Resource described: Nocturne in F sharp major, op. 15, no. 2 / Frederic Chopin) [OCLC #9750372]

Stücke

(Resource described: Sechs Stücke für grosses Orchester, Opus 6 / Anton v. Webern) [LCCN 89752185]

Stücke

(Resource described: Fünf Orchesterstücke = Five pieces for orchestra, op. 16 / Arnold Schoenberg) [LCCN 62045735]

Darabok

(Resource described: Four orchestral pieces, opus 12 / Béla Bartók) [LCCN 62045735]

Little pieces

(*Resource described*: Five little pieces : for flute & piano / by Mark Carlson.) [LCCN 2002537399]

Gesänge

(*Resource described*: Drei Gesänge : für sechsstimmigen Chor a cappella : op. 42 = Three songs : for six-part chorus a cappella / Johannes Brahms) [OCLC #222521552]

Lieder

(*Resource described*: Vier Orchesterlieder, op. 22 / Arnold Schoenberg) [LCCN 78207935]

Deux journées

(*Resource described*: Les deux journées / libretto by Jean Nicholas Bouilly ; music by Maria Luigi Cherubini) [LCCN 76049214]

Heiligen zehn Gebote

(*Resource described*: The holy Ten commandments = Die heiligen zehn Gebote : canons for 3-5 equal voices / Joseph Haydn) [LCCN 44014834]

Seventh trumpet

(*Resource described*: The seventh trumpet : for orchestra / Donald Erb) [LCCN 72213133]

Nocturnes

(*Resource described*: Le troisième nocturne pour piano / Erik Satie) [OCLC #2384329]

Minuet

(*Resource described*: A favourite minuet, with variations / Pietro Domenico Paradies) [OCLC #26072996]

Sofien-Tänze

(*Resource described*: The celebrated Sophie waltz / by John Strauss) [OCLC #25063383]

Grandes études

(*Resource described*: 25 grandes études : pour orgue / Sigismund Neukomm) (*So named by the composer*) [LCCN 2002543388]

Zauberflöte

(*Resource described*: The magic flute / by W.A. Mozart ; English translation by John Dare) [LCCN 89754265]

War requiem

(*Resource described*: War requiem : op. 66 / Benjamin Britten) [LCCN 63026469]

Concertos

(*Resource described*: Concerto a cinque op. 10/4 = Konzert G-Dur für Violine und Streichorchester = Concerto G major for violin and string orchestra / Tomaso Albinoni) [LCCN 99478622]