

To: Library of Congress Cataloging Policy and Support Office

From: Bibliographic Control Committee, Music Library Association

Subject: Proposed revision to LCRI 22.2

Date: March 6, 2007

The Bibliographic Control Committee of the Music Library Association does not support the proposal to revise LCRI 22.2 to remove the exception for composers and performers in the treatment of contemporary authors. However, the Committee does recommend that the LCRI, in its current state, be moved from Rule 22.2 to Rule 22.2B3, where this rule interpretation seems to more directly apply.

Through discussions with the Music Library Association and NACO Music Project membership, and amongst its own membership, the Committee realized that the needs of users looking for composers or performers associated with musical works differ from the needs of users seeking literary works. Unlike most literary authors, contemporary composers and performers may use multiple names concurrently with no credible way to parse those names into separate bibliographic identities. Composers and performers seem to use different names for many more reasons than contemporary authors: for different roles on the same bibliographic manifestation; for copyright; because they are working for a different publisher; or for other reasons that defy obvious explanation. The Committee heard of one performer who changes his name with every disc he releases.

Given past cataloging practice, users of music collections are accustomed to finding works composed by, performed by or about a given musician in one place, regardless of the number of names he or she has used, unless the person has built up a sufficient body of work to create separate bibliographic identities as in Rule 22.2B2. Also, there is already a significant number of name and name-uniform titles established under the current LCRI, and this change would require a great deal of retrospective work, especially with uniform titles and classification. In addition, no one in the music library community has reported problems with the current practice. While removing the exception to the LCRI would seem to be a simplification, it actually serves to complicate heading creation for music catalogers and we believe would also be detrimental to catalog users.

The Bibliographic Control Committee would like to thank CPSO for the opportunity to respond to the proposed revision to LCRI 22.2.