Pre-submitted Questions: RDA & Authorities Session at MOUG 2014

Responses prepared by Kathy Glennan, Jean Harden & Morris Levy

1. I created an authority record for a work with a distinctive title that has been arranged for another medium. It didn't make sense to me to include "arranged" in the preferred title in the AR. In the 670 I mentioned that the program notes in the resource in hand indicated it was an arrangement and listed the original medium. I included a 382 field for the *original* medium, since that is the medium for which the preferred title is for. In other words, I created an AR for the work, not the expression. Would any of the esteemed members of panel done this differently?

    Answer: No.

2. I cataloged a resource that included two arranged excerpts from a larger work, a ballet. The expression was given a title that covered both, for example: Adagio and Andante for bassoon and piano. The adagio is from one act of the ballet and the andante is from a different act. Both parts of the ballet have distinctive titles. When I create the ARs for the two, how would I use the title proper of the expression and in which AR would it be included as a VAP?

    1st AAP: 100 1 Name. $t Ballet title. $p Distinctive title of one part; $o arranged

    Possible VAP: 400 1 Name. $t Adagio, $m bassoon, piano

    2nd AAP: 100 1 Name. $t Ballet title. $p Distinctive title of the other part; $o arranged

    Possible VAP: 400 1 Name. $t Andante, $m bassoon, piano

    Would I use "Adagio and andante, $m bassoon, piano" in either AR?

    Answer:

    The cataloger needs to make some decisions here. Does the manifestation represent one or two expressions? What level of access are you looking to provide to these excerpts?

    If you consider the manifestation represents one expression, use:

    100 1 Name. $t Ballet title. $k Selections; $o arranged

    400 1 Name. $t Adagio and andante, $m bassoon, piano

    If you think that the manifestation contains two expressions, you would not use "Name. $t Adagio and andante, $m bassoon, piano" as a variant title in either authority record, although it would be referenced in the 670s.

3. I would appreciate a definitive answer: if the key is known or can be determined, is it included in an AAP with a generic title, regardless of the period of composition or whether or not it was stated on the resource or other source? Similarly, when I encounter an AAP with a generic title for a pre-20th century work in an AR that doesn't include a key, may I update the AR?

Answer:

Yes, add the key if it can be determined. Remember that one of the conditions for recording Key enumerated in 6.17.1.3 is that "it is apparent from the resource described (unless it is known to be transposed in the resource)." RDA has no chronological requirement. In terms of access points, 6.28.1.9 seems pretty clear that the key element should appear in access points representing musical works with titles that are not distinctive; an authority record meeting these conditions but lacking the key could be considered "RDA compliant" but not RDA. Thus it would be appropriate to consider adding the key as part of evaluating existing authority records for upgrade to RDA.

4. What parts of RDA and which LC-PCC Policy Statements or Best Practices can/should be brought to bear on the following situations:

a. Title consists of a word meaning Song or Lied(er). The work is for solo voice with accompanying instrumental ensemble consisting of violin, viola, clarinet, and piano.

Answer:

6.28.1.2 Musical Works with Lyrics, Libretto, Text, Etc. (Preferred title)

6.14.2.5 Preferred Title Consisting Solely of the Name of One Type of Composition and the LC-PCC PS to that rule: "Record the accepted form of name in English if the name has an English cognate form or if the same name is used in English"

6.28.1.9 Additions to Access Points Representing Music Works with Titles That Are Not Distinctive (add medium)

6.15.1.12 Accompaniment for Songs, Lieder, Etc. (how to construct the accompaniment statement)

6.15.1.7 Accompanying Ensembles with One Performer to a Part – after the example block: "Record 'instrumental ensemble' for an accompanying ensemble with one

performer to a part consisting of instruments from two or more families of instruments when a more specific term is not available.

Result:

Songs, instrumental ensemble accompaniment OR Lieder, instrumental ensemble accompaniment (If your preferred title is something else, use that.)

Note:

With the changes to 6.15 coming in the April 2014 Update to the RDA Toolkit, the following option will be available in 6.15.1.6 (formerly 6.15.1.7):

For an accompanying ensemble with one performer to a part, record the appropriate term for each instrument of the accompanying ensemble instead of the name of the ensemble.

However, you would still record the ensemble name in the AAP per 6.28.1.9.1.f:

For an accompanying ensemble with one performer to a part, record the appropriate term for the ensemble (see 6.15.1.6) rather than the individual instruments.

b. Title is distinctive but requires qualifier to break a conflict. Work is for solo voice with accompanying instrumental ensemble consisting of violin, viola, clarinet, and piano.

Answer:

6.28.1.2 for Preferred Title

6.14.2.3 Choosing the Preferred Title for a Musical Work and 6.14.2.4 Recording the Preferred Title for a Musical Work

6.28.1.10 Additions to Access Points Representing Musical Works with Distinctive Titles – add medium or another distinguishing characteristic of the work (the example straight from AACR2 with ", orchestra" or ", piano"; or "(Opera)" or "(Piano work)"

If you choose to add medium, note that this is not something titled Song or the like, so you would record the whole medium in the order prescribed by 6.15.1.3. Use 6.15.1.10 to get a term identifying the voice, then "piano", then the strings in score order ("violin, viola")

c. How would each situation change if the accompanying ensemble were larger, e.g. saxophone, flute, oboe, 2 violins, viola, 2 trombones, cello, double bass, and 2 percussionists?

Answer:

Size of ensemble would not affect the situation.

However, keep in mind the soon-to-be available optional instruction in 6.15.1.6 described above. This only affects recording of elements, not the authorized access point.

d. Are there *any* circumstances under which it would be correct to use the term "instrumental ensemble" in an authorized access point for a vocal work for solo voice?

Answer:

As the text of RDA stands right now, you can use "instrumental ensemble accompaniment" if the preferred title is Songs, Lieder, etc. (The LC-PCC PS to 6.15.1.12 has an example with "instrumental ensemble accompaniment.") If the preferred title is something else, you would not use "instrumental ensemble." Note that this instruction will still exist in the April 2014 RDA Toolkit Update, but it will be relocated to 6.28.1.9.h.

5. MARC tags 372 and 374 allow us to describe the fields of activity and professions of individuals, and LCSH is rich in terminology to help us in that regard (though it is lax in some areas, e.g., there's no "Piccolo players" yet, so one has to enter "Piccolo player," singular, in a 374 field with no subfield $2). However, there seems to be no effort to describe corporate bodies' fields of activity or essential natures to the same degree using MARC tag 368 ("Other Attributes of Person or Corporate Body"). Very few NACO-Music catalogers (or LC either, for that matter) seem to be using the 368 to any degree, and that seems to be a disservice.

LCSH is weak when it comes to terminology describing the many different kinds of "classical" performing groups out there, perhaps because those terms are too easily confused with the music the groups play. So while we do have "String quartets (Musical groups)", we don't yet have "Woodwind quartets (Musical groups)" in LCSH. There may be insufficient literary warrant (no one has written or published a book about a famous woodwind quartet? quite possible), but it seems now like there may be an opportunity to create such strings and establish them within LCSH merely because they would be convenient to use in MARC tag 368 subfield $a in authorities data. Also, the corresponding terminology for the music those groups play will soon be retagged as 155, with mediums of performance from qualifiers (or implicit mediums) all headed off to the 382, leaving the 150 fields free for topical headings describing the different standard forms of chamber music ensembles and other such entities.

Popular music is ahead of the curve, probably because there is so much literary warrant. The racks at Barnes & Noble's music section are filled with books about "Rock groups," which is established LCSH. Not so full of books about "Chamber orchestras."

Bottom line, after all that: is there any move afoot to address this, or does anyone else even see it as a gap in the more-granular metadata we're trying to create, following FRAD principles? And is there any provision being considered for entering free text in the 368 without using a subfield $2, as there is in the 374?

Answer:

The Descriptive Cataloging Manual Z1 states a preference for using terms from a controlled vocabulary in Field 368; most people are using LCSH terms when available. Free text is an option, but it should be your last choice.

It's possible that the continuing development of music-related thesauri (LCMPT, LCGFT) will help in expanding controlled vocabulary terms that will be more useful that what's currently available in LCSH.

6. Under AACR2, I sometimes punted with authorized access points. Recently I dealt with a CD of polyphonic chansons from the 1300s and 1400s by composers I'd never heard of. The authority file had records for their names and nothing else. I didn't stand a chance of determining what the preferred title for each of the pieces should be; there is no information with which to do so. So I punted, making 700s for just the composer's names. I consoled myself that likely users of this CD would probably be happy with any piece by these composers of which we know so little. At least I could get the names out there. There have been other situations where I have chosen this route. Under A2, I've added the relator code $4 cmp in such cases.

   a. Under RDA, can I do the same thing when I'm clueless? Would I just use $e composer, the relationship designator from App. I?

   Answer:

   RDA does not require authorized access points for every work in a compilation. You are only required to name the compilation itself (RDA 6.27.1.4). Thus, one way to think about this situation is that you have multiple composers associated with a work (the compilation). In that case, Chapter 19 applies. This is kind of a stretch, but if you think creatively, it might really work in this case.

Another way to "punt" is to give the title as it stands on the CD, after the composer's name of course, with $i Contains (work) or Contains (expression), as appropriate, preceding the whole thing. This would go in a 700 12. If the work recorded is anonymous, one would use 730, also with $i. This method might be useful if your patrons would be helped by having the title of the work present.

b. And since I brought up $i (Contains work), what if the authorized access point is collective, e.g., Instrumental music. Selections? Is the relationship designator then (Contains wor<u>ks</u>)? That option is not in RDA.

Answer:

The panel could not reach consensus about the appropriateness of using a collective access point in a 700 field under RDA. However, in any case, you should not be pluralizing the subfield $i term in this example.

7. Under AACR2, the prescribed order for additions to uniform titles was:
   $o arranged
   $s format
   $l language
   $k Selections

The exception to this was that $o arr. followed $k Selections when it was the last element.

Is this still the order under RDA? I have found inconsistent practice:

2013560511
100 Bortni͡anskiĭ, Dmitriĭ Stepanovich, ‡d 1751-1825, ‡e composer.
240 Faucon. ‡l Ukrainian. ‡s Vocal score

n 2010019123
100 Schütz, Heinrich, ‡d 1585-1672. ‡t Beckerscher Psalter, ‡m voices (4), continuo. ‡k Selections. ‡l English; ‡o arranged

nr 99031915 [upgraded to RDA]
100 Palestrina, Giovanni Pierluigi da, ‡d 1525?-1594. ‡t Nunc dimittis, ‡m voices (5). ‡k Selections. ‡l English; ‡o arranged

Are these just mistakes or does language now precede format and arrangement?

Answer:

The first thing to remember is that *Selections* is now considered a work attribute; thus it comes first in the list above. Note that RDA doesn't prescribe an order here. A majority of the panel recommends following the order of the RDA instructions themselves to inform the order of the subfields in the authorized access point. This would result in $k $o $s $l (Selections, arranged, format, language). However, there are reasons to consider continuing to place "arranged" at the end, so further work should be done to codify this practice, either in the MLA Best Practices or the LC-PCC Policy Statements.

8. A question about access points for arrangements:

   Here is the scope of what is considered to be an arrangement under RDA:

   6.28.3.2 Arrangements, Transcriptions, Etc.

   The instructions at 6.28.3.2.1–6.28.3.2.2 apply to an arrangement, transcription, etc., of one or more works of one composer (or of parts of one composer's works) if the arrangement, transcription, etc., falls into one or more of the following categories:

   a) arrangements, transcriptions, versions, settings, etc., in which music for one medium of performance has been rewritten for another

   b) simplified versions of previously existing musical works.

   Category b specifies simplified versions. Does this mean that we can no longer consider elaborations to be arrangements?

   For instance, Leopold Godowsky made a "concert version" of Albeniz's Tango from Espana, op. 165. Both the original and the concert version are for piano, but the concert version is more elaborate. Under AACR2, it would have been proper to call this an arrangement, but that doesn't seem to be the case under RDA.

   Answer:

   The instructions in RDA 6.28.3.2 are not significantly different from AACR2 21.18. The application of these instructions requires the same kind of analysis and decision-making, and the panel believes that both AACR2 and RDA lead you to the same basic result in this case. Elaborations are not addressed by either cataloging code; perhaps a rule revision proposal should be developed to address this situation. In the meantime, perhaps the composer/arranger's intent should be taken into consideration: Godowsky apparently considered this an arrangement himself: his title includes Albéniz's own opus number.