

Joint RBMS/MLA Task Group for Developing Rules for Rare Music Cataloging

Public Hearing at ALA Midwinter 2007

Saturday, January 20, 5-7 pm - Convention Center, rm. 210 - Seattle, Washington

Questions and Topics for Public Hearing on DCRM(M)

Overall Issues

Alignment of text between DCRB/DCRM(B) and DCRM(M) draft

The original work of the DCRB creators and the edits and decisions of the DCRM(B) Editorial Team have considerably improved an already excellent document. So, a part of the advantage of aligning with “Books” text as much as possible is to take advantage of the improvements in text and clarity. Does the alignment of the texts make for sensible and clear guidelines, especially where it merges with specific music guidelines? The JTG would welcome suggestions to aid in further clarity.

Transcription

There has been much discussion on transcription among the JTG members. Title page transcription has been a central point, since title pages in music are presented so differently between publishers and time periods. The solution currently given in **M1B2** represents the JTG’s solution to the balance between recommending transcription and making a clear title statement without requiring a note on transposed elements every time. (This also takes into account long-term guidelines used by the cataloging community, as represented in AACR2, Ch. 5.) Notice that it also gives a typical instance as a helpful example. One other question is, should additional guidance, “*Optionally*, make a note to indicate the original position of transposed elements”, also be given for less typical instances?

Broad terminology to be inclusive of published and manuscript music

Most of the occurrences of the term “publication” (and variations thereof) in DCRB/DCRM(B) were originally changed to “item” for DCRM(M) as a way to be more inclusive of non-published material. In some places, this term has been alternated with what is intended to be a generic usage of the term “music”. (These terms have been highlighted in blue in the draft.) In general, do these terms convey the points well? It is worth noting that RDA tends to use the word “resource” to cover a broad array of material, but there is not much enthusiasm in the JTG for this term (for a variety of reasons). Are there other ideas for using a broad term to cover published and non-published material?

Some alignment with AMREMM?

Despite the professed intention of giving general guidelines for manuscript while not going too deeply into complex manuscript issues, there may be some areas where some alignment with AMREMM guidance could be considered. For instance:

1) Guidance probably should be added to incorporate a “Cite as:” note (MARC 524); allusions to how to cite the manuscript is currently subsumed in “local note” text.

2) Adding more options for the formal “Contents” field, with options ranging from the method used in AMREMM, to a hybrid between AMREMM and “regular” contents, to a quick list.

References to AACR2 in the rules

The JTG made a decision at its last face-to-face meeting at MLA (February 2005) to avoid references either to AACR2 or to RDA in its guidelines, preferring, if possible, broader terminology in its guidance. The reason for this is AACR2 will soon be superceded and may soon or eventually not be on the shelves (or in Cataloger’s Desktop) as a reference to be consulted. The case for avoiding references to RDA is that it is perceived (so far) as not being transcription or artifact-friendly. Here are the places where AACR2 is mentioned in DCRM(M): **M0A**, pars. 1, 4-5; **M0F3**, par. 3; **M0H**; **M1B5**; **M1C1**. Two places where AACR2 had been mentioned but new, broader guidance has been substituted as a “tryout” are: **M4B4** and **M5C2**. How does this seem to work? If specific reference tools should be cited, what are the likely resources--dictionaries, *Chicago Manual of Style*, others?

Area Issues

M0H

DCRM(M) will differ from DCRM(B) in their use of a “the solution of last resort” by using it as its only solution. (This issue has been checked and re-checked with RBMS Bib Standards Committee in discussions over time.) However, the way to state it in the rule itself is still not settled, as can be seen. Any thoughts or comments would be welcome.

M1A-B.

The JTG is still looking for ways of giving guidelines for two common occurrences in music. Here is the issue as outlined by JTG member Nancy Lorimer, with some ideas for solutions: “1) The list t.p. As a peculiar type of t.p., with a lot of extraneous information, it seems to me that some specific mention about how to deal with it would be very helpful. It could be part of **M1A** or within the rules themselves, perhaps part of **M1B3**.

“2) When the t.p. is for an entire work (e.g. an opera), but the item is actually one aria from that opera, as given in the caption. With the emphasis on the t.p. as the primary source, this can cause confusion. This might actually belong in **M0C2a** rather than in Area 1.”

(Please note: This question refers to how to give guidelines for recording the appropriate title when it is found in a list, not the general choosing the list t.p. as title proper, as in **M0C**.)

M1B, E, G (or...?)

Should statements like “as performed at [place], [exact date]” or “as performed by [person]” be put into the title, other title, statement of responsibility or should it go into a note? It *is* a common phrase, so the JTG believes it should be transcribed, but where?

M4. The topic of fictitious imprints

If a strict alliance to DCRM(B) is followed there are still places where there may be too much guidance on “book-like” issues. One of these is the concept of “fictitious imprints” whose guidance is not as pertinent to music. Fictitious imprints are sometimes associated with music, but do not occur often as scores (an example would be compilations of lyrics--along the lines of bawdy ballad texts--which usually appear without music [meaning not

covered by DCRM(M)], but these lyrics could also appear with music). Therefore, a single overall reference to them should suffice, probably in **M4A4**, probably edited somewhat. (For consideration of this topic, here are where the rules related to fictitious imprints are found in DCRM(M): **M4A4**, **M4B9**, **M4C5**, **M4D2(Fictitious or incorrect dates)** and **M7B6(Authorship)**.) It is worth noting that if a single reference to fictitious imprints is made in **M4A4**, this would change the rule numbering in the places where the other rules were deleted.

M5B

The composition of bound manuscripts (with respect to the way the leaves are included in the binding) can diverge from publishers' usual practices of compiling published books. Also, the owner/user's use of the leaves within a manuscript's binding does not always follow the publishers' customary placement of text. For instance, a person may start writing on the first blank free leaf, which may well be a binder's free end leaf. Therefore, it is not necessarily as straightforward to describe how to account for manuscript leaves/pages as it is for published leaves/pages. That being said, **M5B1-13** seems to be straightforward guidance; however, there has already been at least one question requesting more clarity from one of our "beta catalogers". Please run through these rules and try to see if you can discern any that might cause confusion, considering the often non-standard way of compiling or using the sheets within manuscript covers. Another question: should there be some kind of added instruction in **M5B1** that could help to address this potential confusion?

M5D1. Formats, especially oblong format

Please see the penultimate paragraph of this rule (the one that refers to Bowers). There is no standard for bibliographic description that actually addresses oblong format; the text used here was an attempt to indicate that perhaps oblong folding *might* be readily ascertainable by looking at Bowers or Gaskell's model for other foldings. However, this is actually quite a difficult topic (the folding of oblong music) and has already caused confusion in beta cataloging. Not wanting anyone to agonize over how any particular oblong folding came about, we will be adding a footnote to point to Donald Krummel's definitive article on oblong format in music from this paragraph (or the next). Still, we would like to be able to put some indication of oblong in this area. (Krummel suggested "(obl.)" in an e-mail message.) In short, we are exploring options here; any ideas?