

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR  
FROM: Jennifer Bowen, ALA representative  
SUBJECT: 5JSC/LC/4: Rule proposals for musical format information

ALA has reviewed 5JSC/LC/4, and has been advised in preparing this response by the Subcommittee on Descriptive Cataloging of the Music Library Association's Bibliographic Control Committee.

ALA appreciates LC's efforts to simplify and standardize the recording of musical format information, which we agree is currently quite problematic in AACR2. We agree with the bulk of LC's analysis of the use of this field and its limitations in AACR2. However, while we agree with the goal of simplifying the decision-making process for transcription of the musical presentation statement, we do not believe that the LC proposal solves this problem. We have many reservations about the current LC proposal and are concerned that it creates additional problems. ALA believes that the issue requires more discussion.

### **Elimination of Musical Presentation Area**

While we can support the recommendation to eliminate the Musical Presentation area, we question whether this change would truly eliminate the need to make "fine distinctions" in determining where this information belongs in the bibliographic record.

Current practice according to AACR2 and various Library of Congress Rule Interpretations requires catalogers to decide whether to place musical format information in:

- Area 1, as part of the Statement of responsibility (for those terms or phrases that imply a modification of the music)
- Area 2, as an Edition statement (for "book type" edition statements)
- or Area 3, as the Musical presentation statement (for statements that indicate the physical presentation of the music).

Eliminating Area 3 for notated music will only address part of this conundrum; RDA will still need to provide guidance about when to place this type of information in Area 1 or Area 2. Catalogers will also need further instructions for when this "edition" type of information applies to only one work in the publication or is embedded in part of the title proper or other title information. Examples include:

Klavierbegleitung der Arie von Fanny Hensel  
*[publication contains both a recitative and an aria]*  
für höhere Stimme und Klavier  
opera completa per canto e pianoforte

vocal score ; text compiled by R. Ellis Roberts ; concert version prepared by Donald Mitchell

reduction for voice and piano based on the critical edition of the orchestral score edited by David Lawton

Music publishers' practices also contribute to this problem. Scores do not always include a printed statement of musical format for catalogers to transcribe. For example, when using AACR2, "vocal score" will sometimes first appear in Area 5, and not at all in Areas 1-3. In addition, statements such as "Edition Peters" or "Wilhelm Hansen Edition" do not belong in Area 2 (or in Area 6), in spite of the presence of the term "edition."

### Recording Musical Format Statements as Edition Statements

ALA is opposed to recording musical format statements as edition statements for several reasons.

- We find it confusing that a general rule to transcribe an edition statement is to be taken (without explanation) as applying to musical format statements. The major clarification is in the Glossary definition of Edition, but giving musical format as a second definition of the term isn't a definitive statement that the rule on edition statements applies to musical format.
- AACR has been quite clear that Musical Presentation Statements are **not** Edition Statements; we believe that catalogers will find it disconcerting that this is being changed.
- Most significantly, musical format statements in some cases identify distinct expressions and in some cases distinct manifestations. While acknowledging that the same ambiguity is already true of edition statements, this has been identified as a problem by the JSC on a number of occasions (one of which is cited in *5JSC/LC/4/ACOC response*). Adding yet another ambiguous category to this element would only exacerbate this situation.

ALA has additional questions about the impact of recording musical format statements as edition statements:

- Would adding musical format statements to Area 2 make this area more subjective than it has been in AACR2? If so, what are the implications?
- Would Area 2 be expanded to include transcribed or supplied statements about different "versions" of works (such as the 13 instrument vs. full orchestra "versions" of *Appalachian Spring*)?
- From the perspective of FRBR user tasks, does it matter where the musical format type of information appears in a bibliographic record?
- Would stringing multiple "edition"-type statements together in Area 2 provide enough clarity for our catalog users? For example (using ISBD punctuation):

Revisione secondo le fonti / a cura di Ursula Günther e Luciano Petazzoni ; comprendente gli inediti verdiani / a cura di Ursula Günther ; riduzione per canto e pianoforte con testo francese e italiano.

### **Terminology Issues**

ALA agrees with LC's concerns about the term "musical presentation", and welcomes the proposed change in terminology for this type of information from "musical presentation" to "musical format" in RDA. However, we note that musical format information now appears in both the Musical Presentation Statement and in the Statement of Extent. ALA is not convinced that the term "musical format" can safely be limited to the former.

Aside from the proposed change to the definition of Edition (which we oppose), ALA accepts the proposed changes to the Glossary in the LC proposal.