

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

FROM: Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative

SUBJECT: Rule proposals for musical format information

Whilst CILIP agrees with much of what is proposed in this document, we feel that it goes beyond what is needed (or can be justified). We are unhappy, too, that something we perceive as embodying a fundamental shift in thinking about what constitutes musical format information wasn't highlighted a little more in the introduction. LC's original title for this document carried the parenthetical explanation

(eliminating Musical presentation statement area (5.3))

but closer examination shows that rather more is proposed than the elimination of Area 3.

LC explains that the rules are deficient in three ways. We agree with the conclusions reached about the first two. But the third presents problems. If a statement of responsibility is present in what LC clearly considers to be a Musical presentation statement, then perhaps the interpretation of what does and doesn't constitute such a statement that needs to be looked at, not just the immediate shortcomings of Area 3. Since the Musical presentation statement cannot itself change the intellectual content of what is being described, it is hard to see how a statement of responsibility can apply in usual circumstances to an Area 3 element. Unfortunately, it becomes clear later on that this apparent *lacuna* in Area 3 provision is actually the result of wanting to redefine what's meant by a Musical presentation statement. So to state this shortcoming as a rationale, when it's a consequence of something which hasn't at that point been argued, seems a bit like putting the cart before the horse. We found this a little disconcerting.

Moving on... CILIP agrees the general change of terminology that is proposed. We also agree that the existence of an Area 3 for music in an RDA context is contentious, and do not wish to argue for its retention.

We note that the terminology employed in the world of music resources is problematic and can be confusing to non-specialists (occasionally to all of us, specialists and non-specialists alike!). But we cannot easily accept that the natural consequence must be that we should allow the vocabulary to drive the rules, as proposed through the medium of the new glossary definition for "Musical format". Nor are we persuaded that the distinctions that result when interpreting the current rules are "unnecessarily fine". If the type of statement is one that would have required intellectual effort (however minimal in some cases) in order to change the musical content in some way of another, then that information belongs in Area 1; if the type of statement relates solely to the manner in which content is presented to the user, then it belongs in Area 3. The distinctions are clear (and the current LCRI 5.2B1 exemplary in their elucidation); only the apparently arbitrary or nonsensical use of terminology on the items being described is problematic, and such difficulties are in no way confined to music publications (as anyone who's ever

tried to make sense of Spanish “edition” statements will surely agree). Ultimately, the actions that a cataloguer must take depend on the conceptual differences that underpin the world of music and music publishing, not on the arbitrariness of publishers.

The LC proposal seems to CILIP to significantly stretch the concept of “edition”, and to beg questions – not addressed here – about equivalent “reworkings” (which is collectively what vocal scores, piano reductions, etc. are) in other types of publishing.

It is unclear what criteria the cataloguer would be expected to apply to determine which statements of responsibility would remain with Area 1 and which would be part of Area 2. The problem here is that many of what would then be classified as “editions” aren’t what has been meant by the term thus far. It won’t always be at all clear to a cataloguer if John Smith is responsible for all “editions” (i.e. musical formats) of a specific “edition” (i.e. something requiring editorial input) of a musical work, or only for one. The concept of cataloguer judgment may be stretched to breaking point; consistency will be hard to achieve; the life of the non-specialist will be made more, not less, difficult.

Taking the specific proposals in order:

1. Agree.
2. Agree. (The Examples Group will need to tidy up the German capitalisation)
3. Agree in principle. However this would need extending to “editions of editions” in order to accommodate more effectively musical format statements (if LC’s proposed definition of “Musical format” is accepted).
4. Agree.
5. a) Edition, Format (Music), Musical presentation statement – Agree all.
 b) Musical format. Disagree. It is clear both from the last of the parenthetical examples and from pages 1-2 of this document that LC intends that this term be applied not just to the musical or physical *layout*, but to certain specific types of arrangements as well. CILIP disagrees with this proposed change. “Klavierauszug” is not primarily a statement of musical or physical layout, but an explicit statement that the musical content has been *arranged* (i.e. changed) in some way.

Finally, we offer an alternative version of the example used at the foot of p.2 of the proposal which we feel is closer to AACR2 and RDA than the original:

now:

La leggenda di Sakúntale : tre atti da “Kalidasa” / musica di Franco Alfano ; canto e pianoforte ; riduzione di Raffaele delli Ponti

would be:

La leggenda di Sakúntale : tre atti da “Kalidasa” / musica di Franco Alfano. – Canto e pianoforte / riduzione di Raffaele delli Ponti