

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: John Attig, ALA Representative
Subject: Revision of RDA 2.5.2.1, 2.5.2.2, Designation of Edition; addition in Chapter 2 of a core element for Format of Notated Music Statement ...

ALA thanks IAML for its proposal to introduce a new core element for Format of Notated Music Statement. We note that this is a response to the elimination from RDA of the Musical Presentation Statement (AACR) and is motivated in part by a desire to harmonize RDA and ISBD.

ALA's position on the Musical Presentation Statement has evolved over time. In response to 4JSC/LC/4 (2005), ALA noted that elimination of the musical presentation statement would not simplify the identification of versions of musical works, and opposed the proposal to record musical presentation statements as edition statements. However, during the JSC discussions on this issue, ALA accepted the consensus that resulted in the current instructions in RDA.

ALA's response to the IAML proposal is mixed. Some reviewers are sympathetic to the proposal, agreeing with the original ALA position that musical presentation statements are in important ways different from edition statements, and that the distinction is useful in identifying versions of musical works. They are also sympathetic to the goal of harmonization between RDA and ISBD. There is no question that the two standards are currently inconsistent in this regard. By failing to include a separate element for music format statements, round-trip mapping between RDA and ISBD is not possible. RDA 7.20, Format of Notated Music, is a recorded element using a controlled vocabulary, whereas the musical presentation statement is transcribed from the resource; they are not the same.

The proposal itself introduces inconsistencies in name and structure between the Music Format Statement in ISBD and the proposed Format of Notated Music Statement in RDA. The proposal, if approved, would require further harmonization between a revised RDA and ISBD (and FRBR as well).

On the other hand, the Music Library Association has expressed its disagreement with the IAML proposal and its preference for the current RDA instructions that treat music format statements as edition statements. The MLA statement is given at the end of this response. Many ALA reviewers agree with this position.

Finally, ALA notes that the definition of the concept of *edition* is critical to this discussion. The AACR2 definition of *edition* is seriously problematic in the context of the FRBR model; that definition combines criteria relating to changes in content (which would result in a new expression) with criteria relating to publication (which would result in a new manifestation). Rather than attempt to reconcile that definition with the FRBR model, RDA tried to concentrate on the concept of *edition statement* – which was clearly

a manifestation attribute – and to avoid reference to the concept of *edition*. This attempt was not completely successful, and the concept of *edition* is still referenced in some RDA instructions. This issue is much broader than the concept of the Music Format Statement, but it may be necessary to deal with these broader issues before we can decide whether it is conceptually appropriate to treat Music Format Statements as Edition Statements.

To summarize, ALA is opposed to the IAML proposal in its current form, although we do not agree on our reasons for this position or on how we would like to see the issue resolved.

Appendix: Statement from the MLA Bibliographic Control Committee

Sept. 28, 2012

Prepared by Beth Iseminger, Chair, MLA Bibliographic Control Committee

Summary: The Music Library Association (MLA) does not support the IAML proposal regarding the music format statement for the following reasons: 1) MLA believes the proposal does not harmonize RDA and ISBD. In attempting to harmonize RDA and ISBD, the proposal would cause RDA to fall out of harmonization with FRBR. 2) MLA believes that library users as well as music catalogers are better served through the RDA simplification of including edition, music format statement, and statements of responsibility relating to edition or format (such as vocal score) together in the edition area. 3) In order to solve the dilemma of multiple edition statements in a single field or subfield, MLA references the pending revision of MARBI 2012-05 by MLA and LC.

FRBR Problems

- In aligning RDA with ISBD by making the music format statement a separate attribute, this proposal would dis-align RDA with FRBR, since the music format statement is not a separate FRBR attribute.
- Music format statement is not a FRBR entity. The closest thing in FRBR is 4.3.16 Type of Score (Musical notation), but this is an expression level attribute.
- While this proposal goes to great lengths to show that music format statements are not part of the edition attribute, it does not state what attribute the music format statement does belong to.

Harmonization of RDA and ISBD

- MLA agrees that RDA and ISBD are out of synch with the music format statement. The problem that MLA sees is not that the proposal attempts to break

out the music format statement (ISBD 3.2) from the edition statement (ISBD 2.1), but that it goes beyond the ISBD standard.

- Under ISBD 2.1.1, a statement indicating the version, arrangement, etc., would appear in the statement of responsibility. In this RDA proposal, however, such a statement would be considered a music format statement.
- This document may harmonize with ISBD in the separating edition and music format statement, but does not follow ISBD for details.
- There is no loss of information by not having a music format statement in RDA. That information will be present in the Extent and can also be present as its own element as indicated in RDA 7.20. We concede that this could be a loss of granularity.

Simplicity

- RDA simplifies the recording of data by putting music format statement, edition information, and certain statements of responsibility (such as vocal scores) together in the edition area. The AACR2 way of separating the information was complicated for both catalogers and library users. As long as these bits of information can still be separately parsed in some way, having a single edition area is a helpful development.
- The combined edition/music format statement is flexible. It can describe just the manifested format (miniature score, large print edition), the expressed work (vocal score, corrected edition), or something in between (parts, high voice, score in C).
- While music format statements are not exactly like edition statements, they are treated similarly in RDA in that they are both transcribed statements from the piece which describes some aspect of the content or format but isn't part of the title or statement of responsibility, and both may or may not be present on the item.

Specific criticisms

- MLA does not agree that the difference between music format statement and edition is as striking as the IAML document suggests.
 - The FRBR definition of edition as cited on p. 2 of the document stresses differences between related manifestations. However, neither music format statements nor edition statements necessarily depend on the existence of related manifestations. For example, it is often the case to have a statement for a first edition, while no second edition is ever issued.
 - Edition statements have historically indicated potential changes in content (added or deleted content, etc.), changes in how content is presented (large format, re-set type, etc.), or a combination of the two. The music format statement fits this idea of edition.

- The proposal should use the RDA/ISBD name for the area (Music Format Statement, not Format of Notated Music).
- The scope statement at 2.X.1.1 is nearly identical to RDA 7.20.1.1. It should go further in addressing how the elements are different.
- The statements in 2.X.1.1 (2nd paragraph), 2.X.1.2.c, and 2.X.1.2.d are not in harmony with ISBD.
- Sections 2.X.4 through 2.X.5.3 are not compatible with ISBD and should not be included in RDA.
- Statements of responsibility – if persons are not associated with music format statements, instructions relating to statements of responsibility are not necessary.
 - The proposed change to 18.6 is not needed.
 - The final two glossary definitions are not appropriate (Parallel Statement of Responsibility Relating to the Format of Notated Music, Statement of Responsibility Relating to the Format of Notated Music).