

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

FROM: John Attig, ALA Representative to the JSC

SUBJECT: 5JSC/LC/12, Proposed revision of *RDA* chap. 6, Additional instructions for musical works and expressions

Background

These comments are based, to a large extent, on the review of the LC proposals by the Bibliographic Control Committee of the Music Library Association. ALA wishes to thank them for their extensive contributions on this response, particularly the specific revision proposals.

General comments

Commentators 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. We found many typos, incorrect references to instructions, inconsistencies within the document itself, and a lack of examples needed to assess the intent in proposing change. There were problems with using “preferred title” and “preferred access point” interchangeably; these have been noted when thought significant.

The *RDA* draft for 6.17-6.22 is largely a “drop-in” of rules from *AACR2* with some adjustments for terminology and *RDA* concepts, most notably the attempts to root out certain instances of the “rule of three.” The LC proposal contains some significant departures from *AACR2*, noted within the body of this response. Three large changes are particularly noteworthy: “undefining” Types of Composition without proposing a definite alternative; removing the “rule of three” for naming performing forces in what are now called “non-distinctive” titles; and using the composer’s original language as the basis for most “non-distinctive” titles. The first two of these will be dealt with later in this document; comments on the third point are given below.

In terms of *RDA* principles, 5JSC/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 supports the selection of one of the following types of preferred title:

- 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, *5JSC/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 environment 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.

ALA asks that the JSC carefully consider the impact of these changes through the lens of item 6.1 in the *RDA* FAQ on the JSC Web site

Goals of proposals

1. (Maintain music instructions intact, while looking for future integration into general instructions): We agree with keeping instructions together, with the 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*): We agree that this is of value, in particular for bringing practices documented in *LCRI* into the instructions.
3. (Simplification): This has not always been achieved in the proposals.
4. (Reorganization): We note some improvement, but the hasty assembly of the document makes it difficult to assess.
5. (Representation): We agree that representation is an important principle, while observing that it seems to have been elevated over other principles to an unwarranted extent, 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 change that works better in a Scenario 1 environment.

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

ALA supports this change as part of the larger task of moving directions for all music resources to 6.17ff.

B. Proposed revision of draft 6.1.3

B.1. RDA 6.1.3.1

The concepts embodied in LC's revised 6.1.3.3 do not belong here if the initial release 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. ALA proposes 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. 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." It is also unclear 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

ALA 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, but the proposed reference might be acceptable. One thing that might argue for providing a separate statement at 6.18.5.5, with the reference at 6.2.7.3.3 retained, 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*), while instructions such as 6.18.5.2 and 6.18.5.3 do. If there is to be a single list of examples at 6.2.7.3.1, the instruction should define the scope of those examples; the mention of "media" back in 6.18.5.5 is not sufficient.

The Music Library Association and other constituencies have already expressed serious reservations about using the *Selected ...* format for such collective titles, rather than *Selections* as a part of the preferred title for an aggregate work; those comments should be included in the

ALA response to the *RDA* draft itself. That preference may be inferred as appropriate elsewhere in this response, such as J.2.

D. Proposed revision of draft 6.17.1

ALA 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 categorization 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

ALA supports some of these deletions, with suggestions as found elsewhere. We see value in retaining the *RDA* draft 6.17.1.0.6, renumbered as appropriate.

D.2. RDA 6.17.1.1

As stated above, ALA 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	<p>➤ For an instrumental work with a title that is not distinctive, construct the preferred access point representing the work by combining (in this order):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

ALA markup of LC copy:

6.17.1.1	Instrumental music Music created by one composer
6.17.1.1.1	<p>➤ For an instrumental work with a title that is not distinctive, <u>If one composer is responsible for creating the musical work</u>, construct the preferred access point representing <u>for</u> the work by combining (in this order):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 ALA version:

6.17.1.1	Music created by one composer
6.17.1.1.1	<p>➤ If one composer is responsible for creating the musical work, construct the preferred access point for the work by combining (in this order):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

Regarding ALA's proposal for 6.17.1.1.1, it is not at all uncommon for a composer of a vocal work to be responsible for both the music and the text, e.g. Scott Joplin's opera *Treemonisha* or Peter Maxwell Davies' *The turn of the tide*.

LC's proposal for 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 (seven times by one person's count) suggests ambivalence about its continued utility. ALA prefers that this term and concept be retained, at least through the first edition of *RDA*; a more thorough weighing of the benefits and drawbacks of change needs more time than the drafting process can afford. One commentator noted that the Music Library Association maintains an extensive list of types of composition on the Internet (<http://www.library.yale.edu/cataloging/music/types.htm>). The current list contains nearly 900 terms and cross references; over 300 of these name types of composition. This basic tool for

music catalogers would not be rendered obsolete by LC's proposal, but would need extensive revision.

D.3. RDA 6.17.1.2

The assertion that cadenzas, librettos, and performance parts are works seems contradicted by the subsequent analysis characterizing them as "parts of works." Also, the assertion that *RDA* treats librettos as expressions seems at odds with the provision that the preferred access point for a libretto published without reference to its musical setting is the author of the text (6.17.1.9.2), and with the placement of the instruction itself in an area titled "Preferred access point representing a musical work." Our reservations about this analysis and the subsequent decisions will be elaborated at the portions of the LC draft that propose the corresponding changes.

Acceptance of ALA's proposed categorization in D.2 would require changes to the wording of 6.17.1.2.1 to generalize the instruction to instrumental music that results from collaboration.

D.4. RDA 6.17.1.2.2

ALA agrees with the changes proposed.

D.5. RDA 6.17.1.2.3

ALA agrees with the proposed 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 sub-instructions, 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. Proposed language is given below. 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.

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)

ALA 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 ALA 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

ALA 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 noted in ALA's discussion of the RDA draft, it would seem clear that the compiler 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. We also note that similar references to 6.1.1.3 are to be found in the other "special instructions" (e.g. 6.23.1.2.1; 6.29.10.2.1).

D.8. New RDA 6.17.1.3

ALA is very supportive of the 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 (6.17.1.3.4 in the LC proposal). 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.

Clean copy of LC proposal:

6.17.1.3	Adaptations of musical works
6.17.1.3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Consider a modification of the types listed below to be an adaptation that results in a new work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Construct the preferred access point for the adaptation by combining (in this order): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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-caprises 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.

ALA 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-caprises 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 # as a new expression. [The utility of the rule reference in the *RDA* draft needs to be assessed]

Clean copy of ALA 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 are not sure why there is no reference to 6.18 in LC's proposed 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, in line with our preference for retaining "types of composition" as a defined term, at least for this edition of *RDA*; see D.2 for a fuller accounting.

D.10. RDA 6.17.1.5

ALA confirms the utility of moving the exceptions to the list of additions to the 6.20 neighborhood, while retaining the basic instruction here. We prefer the wording and order of appearance of the *RDA* draft to that proposed by LC, though as elsewhere, “representing” should be replaced by “for” in the instruction.

D.11. Draft RDA 6.17.1.6

ALA disagrees with LC’s proposal to move this to 6.1.3.3. This is such a music-specific instruction that it should remain in 6.17 unless/until a general integration of music instructions into the general instructions occurs. Furthermore, we posit that this instruction describes new expressions, and should be moved to 6.17.3.3, with subsequent instructions re-numbered. Our proposal is given below. We also suggest using the phrase “if a new text is substituted” because the instruction is not limited (as the comparable rule in AACR2 was) to “musico-dramatic works”; the change from “supplied” to “substituted” clarifies that the work originally had an associated text that has changed, not that the text has been added to a previously non-textual work.

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 substituted, 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 (Cosi 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

6.17.3.3.2

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.)

- 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

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

E. Proposed revision of 6.17.2

The caption caused some confusion. We presume that 6.17.2 itself has not been removed, and that the revision presented merely adds the proposed texts as subinstructions.

E.1. RDA 6.17.2.2.2

There is some uncertainty 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 6.17.2.2.2.2 could be changed to "When."

ALA does support the regularization of "Librettos" and "Librettos and song texts" to "Librettos and other texts."

E.2. RDA 6.17.2.2.3

ALA strongly disagrees with LC's proposal. First, the analysis presented in D.3 contradicts this proposal; the opening sentence of D.3 calls a cadenza a work, but here we are to consider a cadenza a dependent 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, though we would maintain that through this, the cadenza is a separate, albeit closely related work.

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." LC's proposal doesn't address the latter situation; for the former, its preference for naming the cadenza as part of the "target" work seems to invite a situation where any number of different cadenzas to Mozart's piano concerto, K. 503, would have the same preferred access point. There is no ready means of disambiguation provided in LC's proposal, and following the directions in RDA draft 6.17.2.4.1 produces a meandering path that would give year of composition as the preferred addition!

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

ALA 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 6.17.3.1.1 in the LC rewrite, 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, but the LC approach achieves what was desired.

F.3. RDA 6.17.3.2

ALA 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 proposed 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 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 ALA proposal:

6.17.3.2	Arrangements, transcriptions, etc.
6.17.3.2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Follow the instructions given below for an arrangement, transcription, etc., of one or more works of one composer <u>or of part(s) of one composer's works</u>, <u>or all or parts of a collaborative work</u> that falls into one or more of the following categories:

Clean copy of ALA proposal:

6.17.3.2	Arrangements, transcriptions, etc.
6.17.3.2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 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 first sentence in 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. The reference to "preferred title" in the second paragraph should be "preferred access points."

LC's proposed 6.17.3.2.2 is an improvement on the *RDA* text in some respects. We would recommend the restoration of language referring to part(s) of works (q.v.) and are curious as to the rationale for the substitution of "arrangement" for "transcription" in the last sentence.

We presume that LC's deletion of "part(s) of a" in the sub-instructions 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.

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 invite unnecessary confusion.

ALA 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 substituted text, we offer our proposal under D.11. We think that in the situation where text is added to an instrumental work, but nothing more, we think our proposal could suffice. We are concerned about situations where both new music and new text have been added to an instrumental work; in particular, we would cite Charles Gounod’s *Ave Maria* as an example. Gounod began with the Prelude in C major from Book 1 of J.S. Bach’s *Wohltemperierte Klavier*, then added a melodic line and words. Using the preferred access point for Bach’s work to represent Gounod’s work would be very unhelpful.

We would also point out that as things stand, the LC proposal here conflicts with LC’s proposal for 6.1.3.3

F.5. RDA 6.17.3.4

ALA 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.” The Music Library Association, a community of music specialists, found it curious that the LC proposal uses imprecise musical jargon. They noted that while they might find such language handy to use among themselves, it might not be helpful to use in a code that must be usable by generalists. We recommend “A work for solo instrument(s) with ensemble accompaniment” be substituted, with needed adjustments for plural.

ALA 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.

From *New Grove Online*, in its entry for “score”:

A ‘piano score’ is an arrangement for solo piano of any ensemble composition; this term is sometimes used as a synonym for ‘vocal score’.

From *The New Harvard Dictionary of Music*:

Piano reduction: An arrangement for piano of a work for orchestra or other ensemble.

Piano score: A score of a work for orchestra or other ensemble arranged on two staves in the fashion of piano music, sometimes with indications of the instruments intended for salient parts.

We also note that the instruction in LC's 6.17.3.4.2.1 refers to "preferred title" when it should read "preferred access point."

If the "built-term" approach is not accepted, we suggest retaining the current guidelines for using *arranged*.

ALA 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, as it ignores how such material is actually *used*. There's also the matter of consistency between this term and the term to be used in the technical description area (*RDA* March 2007 draft 3.4.2.1.1). 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, with suggested language below. Alternatively, since the caption of LC's 6.17.3.4 refers to accompaniments, 6.17.3.4.3.4 could be retained, but as an exception for which the same treatment as 6.17.3.4.3.3 is specified.

- 6.17.3.4.3.3 ➤ For a score that only contains the chorus parts from a larger vocal work, with accompaniment, if any, arranged for one or two keyboard instruments, or with the accompaniment omitted, add *chorus score* to the preferred access point for the work.

F.6. RDA 6.17.3.5

ALA 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 imprecise. It is 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 concept of complete/incomplete but identifiable and namable vs. a compilation of fragments with no identifiable "target" 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. Finally, we propose adding categories for part(s) of a work and for compilations of sketches in order to clarify that these situations are covered by this instruction.

Clean copy of LC proposal:

6.17.3.5	Sketches
6.17.3.5.1	<p>➤ Construct the preferred access point for a work or part(s) of a work consisting of a composer's sketches by adding <i>Sketches</i> to the preferred access point for the work.</p> <p>Selected works. Sketches (Resource described: Sketches / Douglas Moore. <i>Sketches for various works</i>)</p> <p>Quartets, strings, no. 1-6, op. 18. Sketches</p> <p>Billy the Kid. Sketches</p>

Markup copy of ALA proposal:

6.17.3.5	Sketches
6.17.3.5.1	<p>➤ Construct the preferred access point for a work or part(s) of a work consisting of a composer's sketches <u>for a completed or unfinished work, part(s) of a work, or a compilation of sketches of various works,</u> by adding <i>Sketches</i> to the preferred access point for the work.</p> <p>Selected works. Sketches (Resource described: Sketches / Douglas Moore. <i>Sketches for various works</i>)</p> <p>Quartets, strings, no. 1-6, op. 18. Sketches</p> <p>Billy the Kid. Sketches</p> <p><u>Symphonies, D. 936 A, D major. Sketches</u></p>

Clean copy of ALA proposal:

6.17.3.5	Sketches
6.17.3.5.1	<p>➤ Construct the preferred access point for a composer's sketches for a completed or unfinished work by adding <i>Sketches</i> to the preferred access point for the work.</p> <p>Selected works. Sketches (Resource described: Sketches / Douglas Moore. <i>Sketches for various works</i>)</p> <p>Quartets, strings, no. 1-6, op. 18. Sketches</p> <p>Billy the Kid. Sketches</p>

Symphonies, D. 936 A, D major. Sketches

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; references will need to be updated to reflect 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

ALA agrees with LC's proposal to incorporate wording from *LCRI 25.27A1* into 6.18.0.3.1. Some respondents think that the exception for long titles could be deleted entirely, since many circumstances might be covered by 6.18.0.3a.1. That said, ALA supports LC's language in 6.18.0.3b.1 if the instruction is retained.

There is little enthusiasm, and some strong objections, in ALA for the closed list presented in 6.18.0.3c.1. The argument against this was made in the General Comments, where we expressed dissatisfaction with the elevation of *representation* over *language preference* and *common usage or practice*, and our concern over "backward compatibility" with existing access points. LC has offered no rationale in the document for its choices for the list, and we note a total lack of terms for vocal music. 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.; since they are merely words naming a number of performers, there seems to be no reason to omit whatever word might exist, or be developed, to name a work for, say, 14 performers. LC has already acknowledged elsewhere that "Concerto" was inadvertently omitted. "Mass" has been offered as another term that probably belongs in such a list. Further comments at I.1.

There is disagreement among respondents on the inclusion of the principle articulated in 6.18.0.3c.2, point a). Once again, the tacit equation of "type of composition" with "non-distinctive" is instructive. One argument in favor of retaining the instruction 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).

ALA agrees with LC's analysis of *RDA 6.18.0.4.3* as more properly an illustration of the instruction above rather than an instruction 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, and it certainly isn't congruent with ALA's previously-stated position on IME ICC 5.2.4. 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.

ALA 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

ALA notes that in the third 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 proposed 6.18.0.3c.1. Similarly, the reference in LC's 6.18.1.2 should be to 6.18.0.3c.1.

ALA 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, this instruction cannot be applied consistently.

Again, LC's decision not to revise the caption of 6.18.1 is telling in its discrepancy with the wording of the sub-instruction ("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 a technical issue about database maintenance, the fix cannot be assumed to be as 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 objection, 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.

ALA agrees with the move and placement of the instruction at 6.18.0.4.4 in the *RDA* draft, and with the minor editorial changes up to the last sentence of the instruction. As stated before, we prefer retention of "Types of Composition" as a formal concept, so we would prefer that the last sentence of the *RDA* version of this instruction be retained. This would also apply to *RDA* 6.18.2 and 6.18.3. Even if the closed list in LC's 6.18.0.3c.1 is retained, we believe that under the principle of *common usage or practice*, *Trio sonata* would certainly qualify for inclusion.

J. Proposed revision of 6.18.5

J.1. RDA 6.18.5.1

ALA strongly supports the alternative in 6.18.5.1.2, with the hope that catalogers will do the research needed to produce accurate results. ALA recommends minor language changes to make the antecedent of the word “that” clearer, and to include references to draft 6.18.5.2 and 6.18.5.2 to tell the cataloger how such a title should be formulated.

Clean copy of LC proposal:

6.18.5.1	Complete works
6.18.5.1.1	➤ For a compilation that consists of, or purports to be, the complete musical works of a composer, including those that are complete at the time of publication, record the collective title <i>Works</i> .
6.18.5.1.2	<p>Alternative:</p> <p>If a composer’s works are entirely for one specific medium of performance and/or one form or type of composition, use that as the preferred title instead of <i>Works</i>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Lute music</p>

Markup of ALA proposal:

6.18.5.1	Complete works
6.18.5.1.1	➤ For a compilation that consists of, or purports to be, the complete musical works of a composer, including those that are complete at the time of publication, record the collective title <i>Works</i> .
6.18.5.1.2	<p>Alternative:</p> <p>If a composer’s works are entirely for one specific medium of performance and/or one form or type of composition, use that <u>medium or form</u> as the preferred title instead of <i>Works</i> <u>following the instructions given under 6.18.5.2 or 6.18.5.3</u>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Lute music</p>

Clean copy of ALA proposal:

6.18.5.1	Complete works
6.18.5.1.1	➤ For a compilation that consists of, or purports to be, the complete musical works of a composer, including those that are complete at the time of publication, record the collective title <i>Works</i> .
	<p>Alternative:</p>

6.18.5.1.2

If a composer's works are entirely for one specific medium of performance and/or one form or type of composition, use that medium or form as the preferred title instead of *Works*, following the instructions given under 6.18.5.2 or 6.18.5.3.

Lute music

J.2. RDA 6.18.5.5.2

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

K. Proposed revision of 6.20.0

ALA 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

ALA approves of the language inserted in 6.20.0.3.1, although we suggest that “in the language preferred by the agency creating the data” would be more consistent with the wording of instructions elsewhere in *RDA*. It may also be necessary to reinforce this general instruction elsewhere in 6.20; comments suggest that the point is lost further down the list. ALA has mixed feelings about the removal of the “rule of three” from the instructions for recording medium statements; we recognize the problems that AACR2's arbitrary consolidations cause, particularly when the composer has named individual instruments. On the other hand, there are significant backward-compatibility issues involved — much of the “deconstruction” of existing access points will require human intervention.

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 Music Library Association 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 are based on 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.

Assuming that we've divined LC's intent correctly, this instruction would 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 ungracefully). “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 in language with a similar situation in LC's proposed 6.20.0.12.2. The same revised placement would apply to 6.20.0.3.3; its proper home is as an exception to exception 6.20.0.3.4.1, point b), and more examples from the original placement could be brought out. A further problem is the instruction to “give the medium in the preferred title”; this certainly should read “give the medium in the preferred access point,” since *RDA*'s preferred title is the equivalent of AACR2's “initial title element,” to which medium is *added* when the preferred title is a type of composition (ALA's preference, as noted many times already). The confusion of these two terms happens twice in the explanatory paragraphs to this

proposal. Another problem: 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).

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 ALA 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. The Music Library Association has elsewhere volunteered to develop a regularized "score order." That aside, we concur with the wording and arrangement of 6.20.0.3.4–6.20.0.3.6.

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

We apologize for failing to present a markup and clean copy reflecting the comments above, since the results look significantly different from both the *RDA* draft and the LC proposal.

K.2. RDA 6.20.0.5.3

ALA 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

ALA agrees with the wording change proposed at 6.20.0.6.1, and with moving the keyboard example as proposed in 6.20.0.6.2.

ALA is sharply divided over 6.20.0.6.3, point b), 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. Considerations of user convenience cut both ways. 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. If the range designation identifies an instrument whose notated music does not have the same compass as the unqualified instrument name (e.g. alto flute, whose compass is lower than that of the flute, and alto trombone, whose compass is higher than the standard tenor trombone), the designation forestalls retrieving a score that is unplayable on the user's instrument. This is another backwards-compatibility issue that would be difficult to resolve without human intervention, though perhaps not as big as those that would result from adoption of point H.1 in the LC proposal. Following the principle of *common usage or practice* to allow an unqualified instrument name to be used when it is better-known than the qualified form ("trombone" vs. "tenor trombone" or "clarinet" vs. "soprano clarinet") would also cushion this change.

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 as a descriptive term; if retained, consider supplying a definition in the Glossary.

LC’s 6.20.0.6.2 is a repetition of its 6.20.0.3.5. Was this deliberate?

ALA agrees with adding LC’s 6.20.0.6.5.

ALA suggests that the instruction in 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 agree with LC’s analysis of electronics and percussion as exceptions to the “one performer to a part” principle, and their inclusion in this list. We further recommend that the reason for their presence be explicitly stated, perhaps as a parenthetical addition to their listings in 6.20.0.7.1. As elsewhere, we recommend changing “in the language of the cataloguing agency” to “in the language preferred by the agency creating the data” in the text of the instruction.

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.

We’re not clear about the distinction (if any) between *strings* and *string ensemble*, *winds* and *wind ensemble*, etc., in the absence of the “rule of three.” User reaction to this ambiguity needs to be considered.

ALA agrees to the new instruction in 6.20.0.7.2. Although it would be nice to define large ensembles in terms of multiple players to one part, this usually doesn’t apply to *all* parts in a large ensemble.

LC’s 6.20.0.7.3 is fine, with the caveat that *RDA* 6.20.0.5 be amended so that its introductory sentence reads: “For the following standard chamber music combinations, use the terms given in the column on the right when the preferred title includes “trio(s),” “quartet(s),” or “quintet(s):” Without this change, the instruction and the accompanying chart are gibberish.

K.5. RDA 6.20.0.8.

Opinions vary about this proposal. Some Music Library Association respondents welcomed the greater specificity it offers. Others have strong objections. 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). The presence of “wind ensemble” in this instruction raises the question of how it would be distinguished from the same term used applying LC’s 6.20.0.7. Not everyone is convinced that the inconsistencies noted in LC’s introduction really “don’t matter.” There is a general sense that the list in the *RDA* draft is too short, but we suggest postponing changes until after the initial implementation of *RDA*.

LC's 6.20.0.3.1 gives a general instruction to record medium statements in the language of the cataloguing agency, but comments to the instruction here suggest that a reinforcing statement might ease some anxiety, particularly if faced with the name of a large ensemble in Hungarian ("vonószeneke" for "string orchestra").

LC's 6.20.0.8.2 initially confused reviewers who thought that it 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. Otherwise, fine.

K.7. RDA 6.20.0.10

ALA 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 for a new instruction, and not a revision of 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. As in K.1, the phrase "preferred title" should be "preferred access point."

The wording of LC's 6.20.0.12.2 differs from that of its 6.20.0.3.2: "a specific voice type or register" in this instruction 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

Respondents had difficulty interpreting 6.20.0.13.1 point a) because the example does not identify the element that is being illustrated (*chordal instrument*). 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. Or a less-ambiguous example could be chosen.

A small editorial suggestion: for the sake of clarity in the first sentence of 6.20.0.13.1, replace "... or other source or is unspecified ..." with "... or other source, or if it is unspecified ...".

We 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

ALA appreciates the addition of 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. We suggest amending 6.20.0.14.1 as needed to take in scope of 6.20.0.14.3, or leaving 6.20.0.14.3 and omitting *chorus* from the instruction in 6.20.0.14.1.

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 demonstrate 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. The unacknowledged function is perhaps the more important; these examples might be better off in 6.20.0.14.1.

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?"

ALA 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 at 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. Music catalogers will appreciate any further guidance that can be provided, and will be happy to see LC's 6.21.0.3a.2. That said, the instruction does not describe the situation seen in the example, unless the "and" after the first comma in the instruction should 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 second 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 access point. If this last point is being justified by 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**

Opinions 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

Respondents 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. RDA 6.22.0.3b.1

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