

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

DCRM Music Review Notes April-May 2010

Identification members of the Joint Task Group (JTG)

MLA representatives:

CW – Charlotte Wolfe

KS – Karen Spicher

NL – Nancy Lorimer

RBMS representatives:

JF – Jain Fletcher

RM – Bob Maxwell

BT -- Bruce Tabb

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

General information

Overall reminder—

This document covers rules directed at three main sets of users: 1) music catalogers familiar with AACR2 rules for music that includes past and present printing periods (starting with engraved music from the 17th century), but who are less likely to be familiar with DCRM principles and general practices; 2) rare materials catalogers, the majority of whom may not know how to read music, but who want at least enough direction to create records for some of their most pressing backlog materials (a strong request made at the public meeting at ALA Mid-Winter in Seattle, January 2007); 3) music and rare materials catalogers who have music manuscripts in their backlogs and want to be able to deal with them in the best possible way. While all three groups have been considered in working through this draft, the decision was made early on by the JTG not to turn this book into an “instruction manual” for any of the foreseeable constituencies (instead, post-publication workshops are assumed). The JTG has been trying to ensure that the rules stand up well for all groups, but asks reviewers to keep the aims for these constituencies in mind while reading for comprehension and continuity.

The current document--

For the most part, Areas 0-8 remain very close to the version prepared for ALA 2009 in Chicago. However, as time has passed, a few issues about the DCRMs have arisen, such as a question about parallel series, an e-mail filled with errata from DCRM(B) and DCRM(S) and a few others. Since the majority were also relevant to music material, they have since been added to DCRM(M). Otherwise the wording should be fairly closely aligned with DCRM(B).

Unfortunately, the chief DCRM(M) editor has only realized recently that one topic that came up in September 2009 was not incorporated into this draft (accidentally overlooked), even though it fit into the parameters of those issues in the above paragraph. It is the topic of “brevigraphs”. Erin Blake’s message to the DCRM list from that time explained the fact that the word “brevigraphs” was the proper term for what the DCRMs had been calling “special marks of contraction”. As she stated, the conclusion of the DCRM(G) group was this: “To help make it clear that it is only brevigraphs, not modern contractions, that get expanded in square brackets, the current draft of DCRM(G) now reads: ‘If brevigraphs (special marks of contraction in continuance of the manuscript tradition) have been used...’ and subsequent uses of ‘contraction’ in this sense have been replaced by ‘brevigraph’.”

The reason this change is not yet reflected in DCRM(M) is because it was discovered after this draft was “frozen” in February 2010. It was frozen in order to prepare it for posting to the MLA wiki for their review of the draft (remember, MLA has been a joint partner in this effort from the beginning [late 1990s]). The goal is that MLA’s and BSC’s review copy will always be the same whenever a DCRM(M) version undergoes review. MLA’s review began in March and they are planning to send official comments to the JTG by May 1.

What is different about this document, however, is that it now includes the Introduction and Appendices. DCRM(M) has retained Appendices A-F from the DCRM(B) publication, with some text changes appropriate to the material. Appendix G is the standard music citation note resource, which has been planned from the beginning (and has been included in the Web version for years). However, the citations have been updated in accordance with the more recent views toward standard citations that have been taking place in the Bibliographic Standards Committee.

Some may wonder why all of the Appendices were retained, rather than omitting some that might be more relevant to books/text and are rarely found in music materials. The JTG believes that whenever there is a possibility that music catalogers may have a need for any information—no matter how rarely—they should be able to find it in the document at hand. This is because some of these users may not have a subscription to Cataloger’s Desktop; in other cases, it is not uncommon to find music catalogers situated in buildings away from the rare materials users, making it impractical to consult others’ copies. So, for these reasons, the JTG feels the material needs to be in one document to cover these kinds of possibilities.

Please note that the last draft version of the DCRM(B) Index was adapted to DCRM(M) for this review. It was gone over carefully to change the references to the correct rule numbers, since approximately a quarter of the rules have moved a few spaces away from where they were located in DCRM(B). This was done primarily for the music reviewers, who are less familiar with the DCRM structure.

Special attention needed/not needed --

Needed:

One area that stands out among the rest as needing more careful attention than others has to do with the application of examples in Area 4. After a while, it almost seemed as if the rules were repeating themselves in various small ways and it was difficult to tell whether an example was good for one rule or another.

Area 8 shows an attempt to incorporate the 13-digit ISBN and ISMN in the same way as the 10-digit ISBN. However the issues are different, since the 10-digit was always on the item, whereas the 13-digit can be figured out (by means of algorithm “translations” based on the 10-digit), whether they are on the piece or not. Any advice on how to deal with this not-always-transcription issue would be welcome!

Not needed:

JTG is polling MLA for more realistic examples of ISMNs in all their possible combinations.

JTG is asking MLA for ideas for more/better examples to illustrate all the rules.