

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

**From:** Marg Stewart, CCC representative

**Subject:** **Proposed revision of RDA chap. 6, Additional instructions for musical works and expressions**

The CCC response was prepared by the Canadian Association of Music Libraries. CAML has reviewed LC's proposed revisions and offers the following comments:

**#1 : RDA 6.15.1 (choosing and recording the preferred title)**

**6.15.1.3.3:** CAML agrees with the proposed revision, except for the deletion of the example, which CAML would like to keep.

**6.15.1.3.4, paragraph a):** CAML doesn't support the proposed revision for the following reasons:

1. The revision goes against the principle of language preference (RDA 0.4.3.7). Respecting this principle is critical because non-distinctive titles are generally known to users in their own language. CAML strongly believes that it would be a disservice to users to give titles in the language preferred by the agency creating the data only when they belong to the list. For these reasons, CAML feels that the principle of language preference should override the principle of representation as far as non-distinctive titles are concerned. It makes sense to us that these titles be treated the same way as names of persons known under their given name (see 9.2.2.5.2) which are also generally known to users in their language and for which an exception to the principle of representation was deemed justified.
2. Finding the original title in the language of the composer for non-distinctive titles that are not included in the list would involve more research on the part of the cataloguers and would be more time-consuming since such titles are usually given in references sources in the language of these resources.
3. LC's proposal would have the consequence of creating two or more sequences for a composer's works with non-distinctive titles not included in the list: one or more in the original languages and one in the language of the agency for compilations (per 6.15.1.15) (e.g., *Wälzer* versus *Waltzes*). CAML feels that this would make resource discovery more difficult for catalogue users.
4. As LC already noted in its proposal, the revision goes against the objective of continuity (RDA 0.4.2.4). LC's suggestion to maintain patterns of preferred titles for existing composers in an agency's catalogue is not an acceptable solution; it would only cause confusion to users who wouldn't understand why the same non-distinctive title is translated for some composers and not for others.

If the proposal is accepted, CAML believes that it should be moved to 6.15.1.5.1 since it is about recording the preferred title, not choosing it, and since it applies to the preferred title only after 6.15.1.4 has been applied. The instruction to follow 6.15.1.5-6.15.1.14 is not only irrelevant but also incorrect since some of the instructions referred to concern preferred titles for compilations,

which are devised by the cataloguer and are not governed by the same principles as preferred titles for individual works.

Wording would need to be clarified, since there is no explicit instruction to translate the title, either in 6.15.1.3.4 itself or 6.15.1.5-6.15.1.14 to which 6.15.1.3.4 refers. Wording the instruction in terms of “the language of the cataloging agency” makes it convoluted, yet fails to express the intent of the instruction clearly. CAML believes that the clarity of the instruction would be greatly improved if it were reworded with the assumption that agencies applying the instruction would use terms in English.

In the eventuality that LC’s proposal is accepted, CAML would therefore suggest rewording LC’s proposed text for clarity and incorporating it in 6.15.1.5.1 as follows:

- 6.15.1.5.1 If the preferred title resulting from the application of ~~6.15.1.1-6.15.1.4~~ 6.15.1.1-6.15.1.4 is not distinctive and can be translated to a term that conforms to the list below, use the equivalent term in the list as the preferred title.

[list of terms]

- 6.15.1.5.2 Record ~~record~~ the preferred title ~~it~~ in the plural unless the composer wrote only one ~~such~~ work with that title.

CAML would also like the list of terms to be expanded by including a much greater number of types of composition taken from the MLA resource entitled *Types of compositions for use in music uniform titles : a manual for use with AACR2 chapter 25* (<http://www.library.yale.edu/cataloging/music/types.htm>), even though this could mean having to give these terms in an appendix.

**6.15.1.3.4, paragraph b):** CAML agrees that RDA could introduce guidelines to help determine when a title is distinctive or not, but CAML feels that these guidelines would be better located in the Glossary, as part of a definition of “Non-distinctive title,” since they would be applicable not only in the process of recording the preferred title of a musical work but also in the process of recording the title proper of a resource (see 2.3.2.8.1).

Since a definition of “Non-distinctive title” is currently lacking, CAML suggests the following definition which is partly based on the Glossary definition of “Type of Musical Composition” and which incorporates an additional guideline taken from the *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations* (LCRI 5.1B1). The text of paragraph ii) has not been incorporated because it only rephrases the last sentence of the definition of “Type of Musical Composition” which CAML suggest transferring under “Non-Distinctive Title,” where it is more appropriate. CAML has however added the “Double concerto” example in the definition.

#### Non-Distinctive Title

In the context of musical works, a title that consists only of the name or names of one or more types of musical composition. The title of a work that is definitely not a work of the type normally designated by the term is however considered distinctive (e.g., Requiem, when the work is for solo violoncello). A title that consists of two words that are each the name of a type of composition is considered distinctive if the combination of the words produces a distinctive title (e.g., Fantaisie-impromptu, Humoresque-bagatelles). Other titles (including those that consist of such terms plus an additional word or words, e.g.,

Chamber concerto, Double concerto, Konzertstück, Little suite) are considered to be distinctive.

The Glossary definition of “Type of Musical Composition”, which would need to be kept since RDA refers to that concept (e.g. in 6.15.1.3.4), would have to be revised as follows:

Type of Musical Composition

~~A The name of a type of composition, as distinguished from a distinctive title, is considered to be the name of a form, the name of a genre, or a generic term used frequently by different composers (e.g., capriccio, concerto, intermezzo, Magnificat, mass, movement, muziek, nocturne, requiem, Stück, symphony, suite, Te Deum, trio sonata). Other titles (including those that consist of such terms plus an additional word or words, e.g., chamber concerto, Konzertstück, little suite) are considered to be distinctive.~~

Clean copy:

Type of Musical Composition

A form, a genre, or a generic term used frequently by different composers (e.g., capriccio, concerto, intermezzo, Magnificat, mass, movement, muziek, nocturne, requiem, Stück, symphony, suite, Te Deum, trio sonata).

**Paragraph i):** The example is problematic because it includes elements (medium of performance, number, date) that have to be omitted per 6.15.1.4.3 in order to determine that the title would normally be considered non-distinctive, were it not for this exception. If LC’s proposal is accepted, CAML suggests substituting the following example:

Requiem

(*Resource described:* Requiem : for cello alone)

The *String quartet* example illustrates an additional but infrequent problem which occurs when elements like medium of performance, number, date, etc., should not be omitted per 6.15.1.4.2. CAML believes that this problem would be better addressed separately as an exception to 6.15.1.4.2.

**Paragraph ii):** If LC’s proposal is accepted, CAML suggests deleting this paragraph because it only rephrases the last sentence of the Glossary definition of “Type of Musical Composition” (“including those [titles] that consist of such terms plus an additional word or words”).

**6.15.1.4.3:** CAML doesn’t support the proposed revision, except for the addition of “*Concerto a cinque*” as an example. It is clear to us that the preferred title is the title chosen per 6.15.1.3, which then undergoes a series of modifications (e.g. omission of elements, translation, plural form, etc.) per 6.15.1.4-5.15.1.7. The process is similar to the one that a preferred title chosen per 6.2.2.4 must go through in order to be recorded according to 6.2.1 (e.g., omission of initial article, addition of accents, etc.). Treating preferred titles for musical works differently than other preferred titles would be inconsistent. CAML also notes that, in order to follow LC’s logic, it would not be sufficient to correct 6.15.1.4.3; it would also be necessary to remove references to “preferred titles” in 6.15.1.3 and elsewhere in 6.15.1.4, and to use a different terminology.

**6.15.1.5.1:** CAML doesn’t support the proposed revision. CAML recommends restoring the AACR2 notion of cognate form (see our response to 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up). Suggest revising as follows:

- 6.15.1.5 If the preferred title resulting from the application of ~~6.15.0~~ 6.15.1.4 is not distinctive, record it in the language preferred by the agency creating the data, if there is a cognate form in the language preferred by the agency creating the data, or if the same form is used in this language. Record the name in the plural unless the composer wrote only one such work with that title.

Therefore, CAML does not support the deletion of 6.15.1.5.2, 6.15.1.6 and 6.15.1.7 either.

However, to address LC's concern and in order to simplify the decision-making process, CAML suggests adding an "in case of doubt" instruction, as follows:

- 6.15.1.5.2 In case of doubt as to whether a title is distinctive or not, consider the title to be distinctive if the title is not defined in reference sources as a type of musical composition.

### **#2: RDA 6.16.0.8 (instrumental music for large ensembles)**

**6.16.0.8.1:** The priority source for the name of the ensemble should be the composer's original title, not the title of the resource, as LC's wording implies. CAML therefore suggests the following wording, which would be consistent with wording used elsewhere in 6.16 (e.g., in 6.16.0.13):

- 6.16.0.8.1 For instrumental music intended for large ensembles, generally ensembles with more than one player to a part, record the name of the ensemble as designated by the composer found in the resource or in any other source.

CAML notes that preferred titles are not indicated for 5 of the examples.

**6.16.0.8.2:** CAML doesn't support the proposed revision. CAML believes that large ensembles should be treated in a consistent manner, i.e. that instruments that are included in a large ensemble should always be disregarded, as is the case for continuo. If the proposal is accepted, CAML notes that the instruction on continuo (6.16.0.8.3 in LC numbering) should be labelled as an exception to 6.16.0.8.2.

### **#3: RDA 6.16.0.10 (solo voices)**

**6.16.0.10.3:** CAML supports the proposed revision. However, in order to ensure some uniformity, CAML suggests revising as follows:

- 6.16.0.10.3 Use a ~~general~~ term incorporating the words *solo voices* for two or more solo voices if no specific voice types or registers can be ascertained.

**6.16.0.10.4:** CAML supports the proposed deletion.

### **#4: former RDA 6.28.1.2 (writer's works set by several composers)**

CAML agrees with the proposed deletion.

### **#5: new 6.28.1.2 (former RDA 6.28.1.3 - Adaptations of musical works)**

**6.28.1.3:** CAML agrees with the proposed revision of the 1st sentence.

**Paragraph a):** CAML believes that this category would be better defined if the wording stated the main attribute of the works belonging to it (i.e. the fact that they are modifications incorporating new material) instead of simply giving instances of these works. The words “based on” should be deleted because these works are now covered under paragraph c). CAML suggests revising the paragraph as follows:

- a) modifications of other musical works incorporating new material (e.g., free transcriptions) ~~works described as freely transcribed, based on, etc., and other modifications incorporating new material~~

**Paragraph b):** CAML agrees with the proposed revision.

**Former paragraph c):** CAML doesn't support the deletion of this paragraph since CAML believes that a change in the harmony or in the musical style can result in a new work depending on the idiom of the original work. In order to respond to LC's concerns, CAML suggests addressing changes in the harmony and in the musical style in separate paragraphs and introducing a conditional clause in the paragraph dealing with changes in the harmony, as follows:

- c) ~~modifications arrangements~~ in which the harmony ~~or musical style~~ of the original has been changed, provided that the original work belongs to an idiom where the harmony is intended to remain the same with each performance (e.g. a work that belongs to the category of western art music)  
 e) modifications in which the musical style of the original has been changed

CAML would like to introduce an exception stipulating that changes in musical style would not be considered adaptations when both the original work and the modified work belong to the category of works whose form, medium of performance, text, etc., is intended to change with each performance. In other words, adapting an opera excerpt in the jazz idiom would result in a new work but doing the same for a popular song or adapting a folk song in the popular idiom would not. CAML doesn't have a specific wording to propose however, nor do CAML know what would be the best way to incorporate this exception in RDA.

**Paragraph c):** CAML agrees with the proposed revision.

**Former paragraph e):** CAML supports the proposed deletion.

#### **#6: RDA 6.28.1.3 (operas, etc., with new text and title)**

**6.28.1.3:** CAML supports changing the caption of the instruction but feel that the wording proposed by LC doesn't make quite clear that the works covered are restricted to dramatic musical works. Suggest the following wording instead:

- 6.28.1.3 Dramatic musical works ~~Operas, etc.,~~ with new text and title

CAML considers that the works covered by this instruction are expressions and suggest that the instruction be relocated under 6.28.3. CAML feels that the wording should be modified so as to fit the new location better and propose the following:

- Construct the preferred access point representing a work where the text, plot, setting, or other verbal element was substantially modified or where a new text was substituted, and which bears a new title, by adding the new title (enclosed in parentheses) to the preferred access point representing the work.

**#7: RDA 6.28.3.2 (added performance parts)**

**6.28.3.2:** CAML agrees with the proposed revision of the caption.

**6.28.3.2.1:** CAML does not support expanding this instruction to cover new texts and substitute texts since this would create conflicts with other instructions: with 6.28.3.1 because adding a new text to an instrumental part amounts to turning an instrumental work into a vocal one, thus making it an arrangement; with 6.28.1.3 which covers substitute texts for dramatic works; and with 6.28.3.5, because substitute texts in languages other than the original should be treated as translations (except for dramatic musical works).

To clarify that the “additional parts” are systemic and not segmental parts (e.g., added numbers), CAML suggests using “additional performance parts” in the instruction instead of simply “additional parts.” CAML also recommends adding a conditional clause to clarify that the instruction only applies when the added parts do not change the substance of the original work.

6.28.3.2.1 For a work or part or parts of a work to which an instrumental accompaniment or additional performance part(s), ~~new text, or substitute text, etc.,~~ has been added, use the preferred access point representing the original work (see 6.28.1) or part or parts of the work (see 6.28.2), as applicable, provided that the substance of the original work has remained essentially unchanged.

**#8: RDA 6.28.3.3 (arranged accompaniment)**

CAML sees some merit in LC’s proposal, even though it has the consequence of making the instructions somewhat more complex. It has also the effect of emphasizing the inconsistency in treatment between works with arranged accompaniment depending on their content type. In the case of notated music, the addition not only conveys the meaning that the accompaniment is arranged but also indicates the content type; in the case of performed music, what exactly is arranged is not specified by the addition and the content type is not indicated. CAML feels that this inconsistency will need to be resolved someday so that the various expressions of a musical work that differ only in content type can be identified in the same manner and so that the difference in content type can be consistently indicated using the standard terms prescribed by 6.10.

In the meantime, CAML supports the proposed revision although CAML objects to using an imprecise term like “concerto-like” and suggest using “work for one or more solo instruments and accompanying ensemble” instead. CAML also suggests moving the examples under the relevant instructions, i.e. 6.28.3.3.3.2 and 6.28.3.3.3.3. Other suggestions of corrections, mainly editorial, follow:

### 6.28.3.3 Arranged accompaniment

6.28.3.3.1 Construct the preferred access point representing ~~for~~ the following types of expressions applying according to the instructions given under 6.28.3.3.2-6.28.3.3.3, as applicable:

- a) a ~~concerto-like~~ work for one or more solo instruments and accompanying ensemble or part(s) of such a concerto-like work in which the accompaniment has been arranged for one or two keyboard instruments;
- b) an accompanied vocal work or part(s) of such a work in notated form in which the accompaniment has been arranged for one or two keyboard instruments or has been omitted.

6.28.3.3.2 Works for one or more solo instruments and accompanying ensemble  
~~Concerto-like instrumental works~~

6.28.3.3.2.1 Construct the preferred access point representing ~~for~~ a ~~concerto-like~~ work for one or more solo instruments and accompanying ensemble in which the accompaniment has been arranged for one or two keyboard instruments by adding *arranged* to the preferred title representing ~~for~~ the work.

6.28.3.3.3 Vocal works

6.28.3.3.3.1 Construct the preferred access point representing ~~for~~ an accompanied vocal work or part(s) of a vocal work in notated form in which the instrumental accompaniment has been arranged for one or two keyboard instruments or has been omitted by adding to the preferred access point representing ~~for~~ the work applying following the instructions given under ~~in~~ 6.28.3.3.3.2-6.28.3.3.3.3 6.28.3.4.3.2 6.28.3.4.3.3, as applicable.

6.28.3.3.3.2 For an accompanied vocal work, or part(s) of such a work, in notated form in which the instrumental accompaniment has been arranged for one or two keyboard instruments or has been omitted and all of the vocal parts are included, add *Vocal score* or *Vocal scores*.

Handel, George Frideric, 1685-1759. Messiah. Vocal score

Wagner, Richard, 1813-1883. Operas. Vocal scores

6.28.3.3.3.3 For an accompanied vocal work for soloists and chorus, or part(s) of such a ~~vocal~~ work, in which the parts for the soloists have been omitted where the resource contains only the parts for the chorus, at least in those portions of the work in which the chorus sings, and the instrumental accompaniment has been arranged for one or two keyboard instruments or has been omitted, add *Chorus score* or *Chorus scores*.

Sullivan, Arthur, 1842-1900. Mikado. Chorus score

Clean copy:

### **6.28.3.3 Arranged accompaniment**

- 6.28.3.3.1 Construct the preferred access point representing the following types of expressions applying the instructions given under 6.28.3.3.2-6.28.3.3.3, as applicable:
- a) a work for one or more solo instruments and accompanying ensemble or part(s) of such work in which the accompaniment has been arranged for one or two keyboard instruments;
  - b) an accompanied vocal work or part(s) of such a work in notated form in which the accompaniment has been arranged for one or two keyboard instruments or has been omitted.
- 6.28.3.3.2 Works for one or more solo instruments and accompanying ensemble
- 6.28.3.3.2.1 Construct the preferred access point representing a work for one or more solo instruments and accompanying ensemble in which the accompaniment has been arranged for one or two keyboard instruments by adding *arranged* to the preferred title representing the work.
- 6.28.3.3.3 Vocal works
- 6.28.3.3.3.1 Construct the preferred access point representing an accompanied vocal work or part(s) of a vocal work in notated form in which the instrumental accompaniment has been arranged for one or two keyboard instruments or has been omitted by adding to the preferred access point representing the work applying the instructions given under 6.28.3.3.3.2-6.28.3.3.3.3, as applicable.
- 6.28.3.3.3.2 For an accompanied vocal work, or part(s) of such a work, in notated form in which the instrumental accompaniment has been arranged for one or two keyboard instruments or has been omitted and all of the vocal parts are included, add *Vocal score* or *Vocal scores*.

Handel, George Frideric, 1685-1759. Messiah. Vocal score

Wagner, Richard, 1813-1883. Operas. Vocal scores

- 6.28.3.3.3.3 For an accompanied vocal work for soloists and chorus, or part(s) of such a work, in which the parts for the soloists have been omitted, at least in those portions of the work in which the chorus sings, and the instrumental accompaniment has been arranged for one or two keyboard instruments or has been omitted, add *Chorus score* or *Chorus scores*.

Sullivan, Arthur, 1842-1900. Mikado. Chorus score

CAML notes that the definition of Vocal Score in the Glossary doesn't provide for the possibility of the accompaniment being omitted, which is incorrect. CAML also notes that a reference would

need to be made under 6.28.3.1 because works with arranged accompaniment are arrangements,  
e.g.:

***Exception***

6.28.3.1.4 For instructions on constructing access points for works with arranged accompaniment, see 6.28.3.4.