

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

**Selected *DCRM Music* Editorial Notes
for discussion at the
RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee Meeting
ALA Meeting in Chicago
Saturday, July 11, 2009 - 8:00 am-12:00 pm**

Identification members of the Joint Task Group (JTG)

<i>MLA representatives:</i>	<i>RBMS representatives:</i>
CW – Charlotte Wolfe	JF – Jain Fletcher
KS – Karen Spicher	RM – Bob Maxwell
NL – Nancy Lorimer	BT – Bruce Tabb

*With extra acknowledgment and huge gratitude to **Laura Yust** and **Maarja Vigorito**, who are both music catalogers at the Library of Congress, for their help in finding a slew of new examples in time for this draft so that it could be made more presentable for public review.*

General information

Current proposed review plan: As of this ALA Meeting, the *DCRM(M)* Version 5A draft is being submitted to the appropriate standards groups of both RBMS and of MLA for its first full review. One document being supplied is a draft of our overview of considerations for both sets of reviewers, for suggested changes and approval of the Bibliographic Standards Committee at this meeting.

If there is time at the Bibliographic Standards Committee meeting after discussion of the review considerations, the following is a list of specific rules that can be treated either as “information” or starting points for further discussion.

====oO=====oO=====

General

During this editing period, KS made some changes to her manuscript guidance throughout, about which she has given this rationale: “[Many] of the edits are an effort to clarify why a ms might have publication, series, edition, or plate no information, by changing the wording in these rules to ‘manuscript draft or copy of a publication, or manuscript rented or sold by a publisher’. More wordy, but I think it makes the reason for the rules clearer.”

*One example of the change in wording can be found in **2B1**, where the 1st portion of the last sentence has been changed to:*

If an edition statement is present on a manuscript draft or copy of a publication, or manuscript rented or sold by a publisher, give the edition statement in a note.

*Similar such changes can be found at: **4A2.3**, **4C7**, **6B**, **7B8**, **7B13**, and **7B18.2.1**.*

Area 0

0C1.2

The JTG had originally omitted this rule (same as *DCRM(B)*) since (as one member had pointed out) “music cataloging gives preference to the caption ...”. However, we realized

only recently that *DCRM(M)* does not otherwise deal with the issue of using a publisher-issued cover as the t.p. (which may even be more common for music material, with its printed wrappers, than it is for books), for those times when there is not a caption (or a usable caption) to use. Therefore, **0C1.2** from “*DCRM Books*” was re-inserted “as is” (turning the existing rule with that number into **0C1.3**). We expect to further edit **0C1.2** to make it more music-oriented.

0C2.1

0C2.1 (e)

The existing rule started out (à la *DCRM(B)*): “If the music has the same title pages in more than one language or script ..”. However, the phrase “same title page” caused some concern because, if the title pages are in different languages, they are not the same. Different wording has been put into place:

If the music has the same information on title pages in more than one language or script ...

0C2.1 - final para.

The wording for this paragraph, taken mostly from *DCRM(B)*, starts out: “Indicate in a note the source chosen as the chief source of information if other than the usual title page ...”, but the phrase “usual title page” began to concern the JTG, since the concept of a “usual title page” is a fairly foreign one for music. Suggestions for changes included omitting the phrase and just moving on:

Indicate in a note the source chosen as the chief source of information if other than the title page specified in this rule.

However, a more recent suggestion surfaced, after taking a broader look at the intent of the rule; it represents summary guidance related to the enumerative list of various title presentations:

Whenever any of the above criteria are applied, indicate in a note the source chosen as the chief source of information.

0D

The last sentence of the first paragraph was taken directly from *DCRM(B)*: “Do not transcribe any information not present in a prescribed source for that area.” There was some question about how one could transcribe information not present, then much discussion about how this guidance could be made clearer. The following is the latest state of our re-write of this rule:

Do not interpolate transcribed information from elsewhere on the item if it is not present in a prescribed source for that area.

0G1

The following rule for transcribing accidentals in music has just been inserted:

Transcribe accidentals (flat and sharp signs, etc.) adjacent (without space) following the key letters they modify. If minor keys are represented by lower-case letters in the chief source, transcribe them as lower-case. Otherwise, record any letter(s) representing the key in uppercase.

0G7

At *ALA MW09*, Erin Blake (*DCRM Graphics*) had asked us about this rule, wondering if we had thought about changing the heading for it, which at present reads, “**Misprints, etc.**” She specifically wanted to know if this squared with Karen’s wishes, saying that the *Graphics* group had changed that heading to “Inaccuracies” (or maybe it was, “Misprints and inaccuracies”). We are all grateful that Erin brought this up and KS has given it much thought. She recently decided that, “It would be a good idea to incorporate ms inaccuracies here, since this is not addressed elsewhere in the draft. And really it is the same issue, whether ms or print: whether and how to correct an inaccuracy in transcription. Ideally the rule should give the option of making a correction, leaving room for judgment, and without trying to define all possible kinds of issues. The two most likely issues for mss are probably misspellings or letters or words accidentally left out.” Here follows KS’s suggested change (not yet in the draft, since this decision came after I sent the files to Randy to pdf):

0G7. Misprints and other inaccuracies

0G7.1. Misprints. Transcribe a misprint, misspelling, or other inaccuracy in printed or manuscript music as it appears in the music. Follow such an inaccuracy either by...

Area 1**1B5.3**

Another issue that KS revisited recently is devised titles for ms fragments. “As genres such as fragments, drafts, and sketches can be difficult to define, and can overlap, I think it is difficult to make a useful rule. So, I am ... giving more examples in **1B5.3** for titles devised from content [*done*]. If this works, I can add instructions to Area 7. I have been talking with Diane Ducharme about how the *DCRM(Mss)* Task Group is addressing these issues; they are seeing the same problems, and are likely to do something similar.”

1E2.2

We have added another rule about a situation that occurs often in music, which will be familiar to those who catalog plays, about performances (people and/or places). Here’s our current rule, with one sample example (with many more in the actual document):

Transcribe performance information appearing in the chief source as other title information, or give in a quoted note. Do not transcribe this information as part of the statement of responsibility.

[sample:] Choose me your valentine : as sung by Madame Vestris / composed by Charles E. Horn

Area 4***Copyright symbol discussion:-***

We are including a part of our discussion about the copyright symbol, since we think we may wish to summarize it somewhere in the Manual; there is some useful information here.

<RM - 1/9/09> I think it would be a good idea to try to find out exactly when the copyright symbol was first used. It would be good to include this information in *DCRM(M)* because if the cataloger sees a piece of music with a date using the copyright symbol from before the year the symbol was first used it would be a big red flag that the copyright date is not the same as the publication date of the music, as in the example to **4D6.2**. And in fact, if 1955 is

really the earliest date; that means that the piece of music cataloged in **4D6.2** cannot have been published before 1955, since it has the copyright symbol on it. So this is useful information and perhaps we should pass it on in a footnote to **4D6.2**.

<RM - 1/15/09> I put my law librarian friends [primarily Galen Fletcher of BYU] to work and we've discovered that the copyright symbol appears in the *1909 Copyright Act* as a notice option, so although this doesn't necessarily give the earliest usage of the symbol (it might have been invented before it got incorporated into copyright law), we can say that it was in use as early as 1909. This appears to have been the first official notice of it.

Some other interesting and useful facts I've learned:

- 1831 is the earliest that musical compositions could be copyrighted in the U.S.
- The 1802 act is the law that required the long 19th century language we're all familiar with. Authors of were required to place the following notice on copies of the work, on the t.p. or verso:

Entered according to act of Congress, the ___ day of ___ 18__ by ___
[name of author] of the State of ___.

- This was the first notice requirement in U.S. copyright law.
- Administration of copyright was centralized in the Library of Congress in 1870.
- The 1874 act allowed the 1802 notice to be abbreviated to
Copyright, 18__, by ___.
- The 1909 act allowed the word "Copyright", "Copr." or the copyright symbol.

Copies of musical works were required to include the year of first publication.

DATING - 4D? 4H?

<JF - 5/21/09> Are instances like the following covered in the rules? Thinking that the multiple statement of dates on the t.p. verso of this score would probably be a good example of *something* in our rules, I took the info down and then looked around for a place to put it, but couldn't find a logical place for it anywhere. Now it looks to me as if it is not necessarily covered after all! Here's the situation:

TITLE: The songs of Father Goose / verse by L. Frank Baum ; music by Alberta N. Burton ; pictures by Wm. W. Denslow.

(no date on t.p.)

T.P. VERSO: Copyright, 1900, by L. Frank Baum, W.W. Denslow, Alberta N. Hall.
Copyright, 1928, by Maude Gage Baum

Reprinted, 1952

Even though this is a relatively "modern" score, it could fall into a Music Special Collections purview, since it is music with an L. Frank Baum connection. Since the item in hand just seems to be some kind of a photo-reproduction of the original, it is technically the "same" (unchanged) text, but as a photo-reproduction, it really is changed (date of manufacture!?) Here are my questions: 1) What do most music catalogers do about something like this? 2) Is a situation like this represented in the rules and if so, where? 3) If not, should there be a rule that represents realistic treatment of such a situation? (OCLC deals with it, but more for its own sake. Is there an LCRI that could be adapted?)

<NL - 5/21/09> Well, by OCLC standards, you would probably just have c1928, though if you are making the first bib record of this "expression" in OCLC, you might put [1952], c1928 (i.e. implied pub date + copyright date), but according to OCLC, any with the c1928 should be on the same master record if all the other information is the same (title, etc.), though you can modify your own local or institutional record with the implied publication

date (i.e. the reprint date). You will find it both ways, though, since not everyone follows OCLC standards.

The use of an implied pub date, as opposed to calling it a manufacture date again stems from how music is printed. This situation is quite common in music, especially music from plates. Reprints, often with new title pages, are a typical of republishing something; the original plates (or now a computer copy of them) are used, rather than redoing the whole thing. I believe it a somewhat loose interpretation of **LCRI 1.4F5**.

*Nothing has been done yet with this situation, but **LCRI 1.4F5** is included here in case we want to consider or discuss this issue...*

LCRI 1.4F5

Option Decision

LC practice: Apply the optional rule to materials other than books and printed serials whenever the copyright date of the item is different from the date of publication etc. (For books and printed serials, do not add a copyright date after the publication date.)

LC practice: For LC original cataloging, if a copyright date other than a phonogram copyright date is being recorded, transcribe the copyright date preceded by a lowercase "c"; transcribe the phonogram copyright date preceded by a lowercase "p." When either "©" or "Ⓢ" is used in other than LC original cataloging, retain it and treat as a "pass through" data element.

Area 5

5B14.3

*After **ALA MW'09** and subsequent e-mail discussions of this rule, this is what I interpreted that we might be able to do with it. Question directed mostly to DJL, did I interpret correctly?*

I *did* decide to “collapse” these rules into one, moving it to the rule above the one about “double leaves”. In the end (after *quite* a bit of consideration), it was the model provided by the “double leaves” rule (which incorporates guidance for both the 1st and 2nd “sub-elements”) that guided my final decision.

Area 7

7B9

A rule (or enhancement to the existing rule about recording the notation style used) is being considered for encouraging as specific an identification of notation as possible. The present state of the wording follows, but it needs to be honed (help!) before it can be added:

Identify the notation as specifically and accurately as possible within each cataloger’s knowledge base, without going to great lengths to identify it through research tools.

I will bring examples of notation to the meeting, with varying “layers” of description for each, so BSC members can understand better what is meant here.

Area 8

Much help is needed here. We are going to rely on MLA catalogers to give us better examples and wording for this Area.

===+o0o+===

One final thought: cover images

The *DCRM Music* Joint Task Group has tentatively agreed to request that a “teal” or “aqua” tone could be reserved for its underlying cover color. It has also agreed that, although *DCRM Music* deals with manuscripts which, as a group, have a vast array of hugely attractive images from which to choose, if notated music is shown on the cover, it should come from a printed resource. That being said, one idea put forward for choice of images would be a page from a score with any of the less common-looking notations or notation styles. This would include, for instance, the elegant look of early French Baroque engraved scores, almost any music printed with movable type (especially that from the 1500s), shape-notes, keyboard or plucked instrument tablatures, but would avoid the more obvious “quaint” notations, such as some of the more typical liturgical styles. Another idea for images would bypass notations, and would instead encompass the entire concept of music (therefore democratically covering both print and manuscript material). These would include some of the older music theory books, such as some of the clever “scientific” graphs that early theorists would contrive to show the mathematical proportions of tones and rhythms. One of these, *Recanetum de Musica Aurea a Magistro Stephano Vanneo Recinensi* (1533) has some really neat images of highly stylized Guidonian hands, a chart naming the keys (which really could have been the basis for the “circle of fifths”!), etc. Other acceptable ideas in this vein would include some of the wonderful old images with old instruments (especially if there is a musical note or two showing), such as the cover of Praetorius’ *Hymnodia Sionia* (1611), the first full image in the Vanneo, or the cover or colophon of Gaffurius’ *De Harmonia Musicorum Instrumentorum Opus* (1518).

(If I can find time to gather them, I’ll try to pass around a set of examples of some of the above-suggested images.)