

## **Parallel Rules in DCRM Music** **-- Overview --**

I am bringing the issue of guidance for the transcription of parallel bibliographic information to BSC and the Editorial Teams because I think we need to make some text changes in our rules. While, this topic is pertinent to all the DCRM formats, it is a crucial issue in music cataloging, and is potentially so in the cartographic and graphic formats.

My reason for highlighting these 3 formats has to do with the mostly graphical (non-language based) nature of their primary content. My guess is that these formats may have more commonly used multiple languages for their external aspects (e.g., the overall title, publisher, etc. information), perhaps spurred by publishers' desire to create even more sales by targeting multiple countries at once. For that reason, the outward labeling and information on these formats may offer more instances (than other formats) to be treated as parallel in the catalog record. It certainly seems to be true for music scores, particularly those of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. It is for this reason that I believe this is a crucial issue that needs to be taken care of in DCRM(M) and I am also drawing attention to it for the other two graphical formats. On the "plus" side, if people are not feeling as compelled to change these rules in "Books" and "Serials", then at least there is still time for the uncompleted graphical formats.

This entire issue arose out of one of the projects I volunteered to work on with respect to the review comments about DCRM(M). Reviewers had mentioned that some of the rules about parallel information were not complete enough or did not always supply sufficient guidance for the types of situations expected to be encountered. In some case, they had made specific requests for us to cover situations or to provide examples for better comprehension. This seemed to be an interesting challenge, but it also seemed to be something that would be fairly easily resolved with a bit more guidance and a few more examples. In working through it, however, I began to realize I needed to review all the places in DCRM text where there was guidance for parallel treatment, if only to make sure some of the same types of concerns were not also to be found elsewhere. As I got further into that review, I realized that there seemed to be more places where the DCRM rules were not particularly helpful where parallel guidance is concerned. In some cases, there was very little guidance at all (Area 4 is of particular concern in this matter; of this, more below). My apprehensions continued to increase until I finally realized I needed to lay everything out in order to analyze the situation better. So, I decided to look back at how AACR2 and the LCRIs treated the parallel guidance, specifically focusing on Chapters 1, 2 & 5 and compare those to DCRM (B) and (M).

The enterprise has resulted in three documents: 1) "Selected Parallel Guidelines in AACR2, the LCRIs and the DCRMs"; 2) "Analysis of Parallel Treatments in the Cataloging Rules"; and, most pertinently to our present efforts, 3) "Suggested Additional Parallel Rules in DCRM Music". These three documents will be explained below, but not before laying out a few overall issues discovered in the process.

### ***Discoveries--some of them surprising--in doing this work***

In comparing all the rules pertaining to the handling of parallel text, it actually came as a surprise to me to realize that AACR2 seems to come from a position of “2nd-level” transcription as its preferred starting point for its parallel treatment guidelines. I was surprised by this realization because of what AACR2 says in 1.0D: “The elements of description provided in the rules in this and in following chapters constitute a maximum set of information”, with the 3rd level intended to include “all elements set out in the ... rules that are applicable to the item being described”. Of course, the DCRMs really do come from a position of “full-level” transcription for everything, including parallel information (with a liberal number of optional guidelines throughout for omission). This means that, coming from its 2nd level position, AACR2’s “optional” rules address how to create a fuller parallel statement, while the DCRM’s “optional” rules tell the cataloger how to “omit” portions--or all--of the transcription. So, right away, I realized I needed to distinguish between the two in my analytical table. How this decision was carried out is explained further in the section called *Description of the “Analysis of Parallel Treatments...”* document below.

The differing perspective towards cataloging levels between AACR2 and the DCRMs seems to have had a “special” effect on the outcome of the rules in Area 4. The treatment of place and publisher information in AACR2 is to keep the statement(s) as brief as possible. (It seems to me this is the only place where transcription is so thoroughly eschewed in AACR2.) The DCRM(B) editors have generally done a great job of turning Area 4 back into transcription mode, but even there, the parallel rules somehow still receive the short end of the stick. My conjecture is that there was so little with which to work in AACR2 that DCRB editors did not have much to add to it (see DCRB 4B13 & 4C11). Later, the DCRM(B) editors made a creditable improvement by creating two rules out of one in each case, while utilizing the better syntax in which the DCRMs are now written. However, in each case, ***there are no examples***. In addition, users are given no direction on how to “tie” the 1st element to the 2nd, since each rule is given without that context. It is my belief that users of DCRB and the DCRMs have relied on their understanding of AACR2 for deciding how to treat parallel statements in general and applied them to this specific situation in DCRB and DCRM(B). This alone has had a deleterious effect, since both sets of rules have mostly given different treatments for handling the transcription of multiple languages. For that reason, or even without that outcome, now that AACR2 no longer has primary status among the rules, it is important for the DCRMs to make sure they are providing explicit guidance.

Not even ISBD actually covers parallel issues fully, as the following snippet from *ISBD Consolidated* (2011) shows. This is from the Publication area, which gives only 2 types of instances related to patterns for parallel (though it seems to have some “wobble room” for all the others with its sentence above, starting with “Elements ...” Bob Maxwell found this for us, saying:

“I don’t have access to the new ISBD consolidated edition, but I was able to peek in the preview version in Google Books and it does show how the ISBD order for this situation (6th and 7th example). I’m attaching a snippet:

[E]F: please note that the 6th pattern, stated more concisely, gives the situation for  
Place = ParaPlace : PubDist, date

The 7th pattern, stated more concisely, gives the situation for  
Place : PubDist = ParaPlace ; ParaPubDist, date

These represent just two of the situations covered in the docs being distributed.]

4	ISBD 2011
<p>distinct from the publishing statement) are enclosed in one pair of parentheses ( ( ) ). Within the parentheses the same punctuation is used as in B, C and E.</p> <p>Elements in this area can be repeated in any pattern that is appropriate to the resource being described.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Punctuation patterns</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>. — Place of <b>publication</b> or production : name of publisher or producer, date</li><li>. — Place of <b>publication</b> or production : name of publisher or producer ; place of <b>publication</b> or production : name of publisher or producer, date</li><li>. — Place of <b>publication</b> or production ; place of <b>publication</b> or production : name of publisher or producer, date (place of printing or manufacture : name of printer or manufacturer, date)</li><li>. — Place of <b>publication</b> or production : name of publisher or producer, date ; place of distribution : name of distributor, date</li><li>. — Place of <b>publication</b> or production ; place of <b>publication</b> or production : name of publisher or producer, date (place of printing or manufacture ; place of printing or manufacture : name of printer or manufacturer, date)</li><li>. — Place of <b>publication</b> or production = parallel statement of place of <b>publication</b> or production : name of publisher or producer, date</li><li>. — Place of <b>publication</b> or production : name of publisher or producer = parallel statement of place of <b>publication</b> or production : parallel statement of name of publisher or producer, date</li><li>. — Place of distribution : name of distributor, date (place of printing or manufacture : name of printer or manufacturer, date)</li><li>. — Place of <b>publication</b> or production : name of publisher or producer, date (place of printing or manufacture : name of printer or manufacturer)</li><li>. — Place of <b>publication</b> or production : name of publisher or producer : name of publisher or producer, date</li><li>. — Place of distribution : name of distributor, date</li><li>. — Place of <b>publication</b> : name of publisher ; place of production : name of producer, date ; place of distribution : name of distributor, date</li></ul>	

### ***Description of the “Selected Parallel Guidelines...” document***

This document lays out all the pertinent references to parallel/multilingual/multiscript guidance in the three sets of rulebooks given in its title. It was devised in AACR2 rule order, with Ch. 1 being primary, then Ch.2 & 5 following that, into which the LCRI's are inserted where applicable. Once each area completes its AACR2/ LCRI guidelines for the parallel rules, the DCRM rules are added at the end of the area in question.

***A TIP for easier reading: if you do not have a color printer available, at least take the time to highlight each resource with its own color. This just helps to see the transitions between resources more readily.***

All of the rules shown in this doc have been analyzed as to their significance as guidance and are reflected as such in “code” in the “Analysis” table.

### ***Description of the “Analysis of Parallel Treatments in the Cataloging Rules” table***

The abbreviations given at the top were devised to render this table easier to read. These same abbreviations are used in a few places in the “Suggested Additional Parallel Rules...” document, so it is worth keeping that abbreviation chart at hand when reading through these 2 documents.

Unlike the “Selected Parallel Guidelines ...” doc, the table was arranged in element order, per area, with DCRM rules inserted into the appropriate places.

The concept of describing “non-full” guidelines has been broken out into “abbreviated” (“Abb”) for AACR2 and “provisions for omission” (“Prov for Om”) for DCRM. Rules that are AACR2-biased (in this way) will provide, first, the “abbreviated” (“Abb”, or 2nd-level) treatment, then move to the “full” (“Ful”, or 3rd-level) treatment. Since DCRM starts with “full” then moves to help with abbreviating, it needs a different focus. In addition, along with the DCRM bias for full and faithful transcription is the idea of making 2 specific kinds of notes, which are: 1) to let the user know that some parts were omitted from the record (=full) and 2) to indicate the original positions of transposed elements (=faithful), so, in almost every case, each element of each Area discussing parallel rules has a N(ote) for Om(ission) and a N(ote) for transposed elements.

The point of this table was to see (at-a-glance) where the DCRMs could give better direction in some instances. The word “add” has been put on the table for places where some kind of helpful text may be needed (though not necessarily a whole rule; perhaps a summary statement to cover many instances within the same elements).

### ***Description of the Suggested Additional Parallel Rules ...” document***

Text that is not highlighted comes directly from the existing version (5A) of DCRM(M). Any added text is highlighted in yellow. Some examples have been taken directly from AACR2 or the LCRI's, so they will definitely need to be “musicked”.

I believe I have added sufficient comments in the margin (and sometimes below each rule) that my reason for adding these and how I had derived them should be clear.

***A TIP for easier reading: “Zooming” this doc to about 125% makes the marginal comments easier to read. (“Zooming” much larger than that “hides” the comments to the right from ready viewing.)***

***Concluding comments ...***

I think readers will see that the additional guidance does not make the rules overlong. Furthermore, the added guidelines give help in all the primary ways these statements might be found and recorded. Also, I have been told that RDA is actually taking more care in giving guidance on parallel statements, so this work seems relevant in that way, too.

***... and questions to ponder while considering the suggested added rules***

*(in addition to a few questions asked in the 3 documents)*

1. What is the overall intent of DCRM’s parallel guidelines. Is it --
  - a) to transcribe as closely as possible to the original layout on the title page?
  - b) to try to keep languages together, despite the fact that this could involve much transposition? *(One JTG member notes that transposition normally requires notes to indicate what has been transposed, which, in some cases, “... is sort of like cataloging the thing twice.” This problem can probably be resolved with some kind of overall note stating the fact that data was transposed.)*
  - c) to have a “house rules” preferred order of languages, much like AACR2 has done (in some cases)?
  - d) to do anything else not mentioned above?
2. How should “grammatically inseparable” phrases (connecting 2 elements) be accounted for within these guidelines?
3. Would it be desirable to include an overall note as a “preamble” to the first parallel rule (in Area 1) to give the general intent of all of DCRM’s parallel guidelines, giving references to the subsequent rule numbers where they come up? (This could reduce some verbiage—and possibly examples--in the later rules.)
4. Are the additional rules being suggested in alignment with existing DCRM rules (as an example, in the series area, does the number labeling always agree with the rule above to transcribe what is on the piece, whether fully spelled out or abbreviated)?
5. Are the additional rules being suggested in alignment with my own belief that the overall intent should be to keep the languages together in transcription, with notes for transposition?