

To: Jain Fletcher, Chair, RBMS/MLA Joint Task Group for Developing Rules for Rare Music Cataloging  
From: Mark Scharff, Chair, Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee, Bibliographic Control Committee, Music Library Association  
RE: BCC response to *DCRM(M)*

The Music Library Association's Bibliographic Control Committee (BCC) has authorized the preparation of this document as a response to the draft of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music)*.

The BCC commends the Joint Task Force for developing a document that in the main does an effective job of recognizing and providing for the special features of music printing and publishing that fall outside the conventions of rare-book cataloging. Music catalogers who choose to use *DCRM(M)*, but who have not used *DCRM(B)* or its predecessor, have some adjustments to make; in general, the text of *DCRM(M)* provides context to help rationalize those differences in practice.

A recurring problem in the text is ambiguous uses of some fundamental terms and phrases. In particular, the terms "part," "source," and the phrase "in the music" are used at one time or another in ways that are either unclear or at odds with what we think is the intent of the instruction. There are also some Glossary definitions that bear re-examination.

Users of the code may be called on to apply it to nearly any sort of music published; even a vocal score of selections from the musical "Wicked" would likely go in a special collection if Stephen Schwartz had signed it. Some transcription problems that music presents have not been dealt with in this code. The Introduction does direct users to the Library of Congress Rule Interpretations to cover situations not given explicit attention, but since it appears that other provisions in the code represent LCRIs rather than AACR2, it becomes confusing.

Finally, the press of time in reviewing such a large document meant that some sections did not get examined as thoroughly as others—in particular, the appendices. We hope for the best.

This response is divided into two sections—that dealing with matters of meaning and interpretation of the intellectual content, and that noting problems with formatting, typographical errors and the like.

## **COMMENTS ON CONTENT**

### Introduction

**IX.2, Wrappers**--Despite the authors' attempts to be clear about what a wrapper is (e.g. the reference to the Glossary definition of Cover), the reference here to "easy detachability" was confusing, since some wrappers would never have been attached in the first place. Perhaps more clear would be a simple statement that wrappers tend to disappear.

### Area 0

**0C1.3**—We understand the intent of this rule, but wonder how this would work if a later copyright date on a cover was known to apply to the design (e.g. G. Schirmer scores, which bear a 1939 copyright date that applies to the familiar yellow cover). Also, should this principle be applied to the even more common situation in 19<sup>th</sup>-century sheet music where the copyright date on a list title page might apply to the title page itself (often to pictorial elements), and not to the music contained therein? Given that caption titles are usually preferable to those found on a list title page, this might not be a happy thing, but be more consistent. We recognize that this might be tied to a decision in X.1.5 about how many bibliographic records will be prepared for variants.

The verb “bears” may be too restrictive if “cover” encompasses undetached wrappers.

**0C2.1**—We recommend wording (e.g. “in one physical unit”) that makes clear that this section does not apply to score-and-parts, which would be a fairly common situation.

In point e), if our assumption that the principle here is to match up language/script of chief source with that of intellectual content is true, it’s then unclear how this would be applied to instrumental music, or even what is meant by “the main part of the resource.” Further, the parenthetical plural seems redundant in an instruction that requires multiple title pages for its application. Assuming that “main part of the resource” for a vocal work would be the text, we would suggest “If the music has title pages in different languages or scripts, choose the title page that is in the language or script of the main part of the resource. For music without a predominant language (including instrumental music), choose the title page that appears first.” [or whatever other specific language instruction the Task Force prefers].

**0C2.2**—Here and elsewhere, “the music” appears when we suspect “the resource” would be a better term—that is, a term that refers to the physical thing rather than the intellectual content.

In this context, the phrase “simultaneous parts” is confusing and unhelpful, akin to “concerto-like works” that LC proposed for RDA. “Simultaneously-issued parts” might be an improvement, but does not solve the problems with the multiple meanings of “part.” What if the resource consists of different types of score? A possible rewrite: “If the resource consists of a set of score and parts, a set of parts with no score, or multiple scores for performance, use as the chief source whatever provides the most information, usually the score. Indicate in a note whatever other part is chosen besides the score to be the chief source. Optionally, if the title pages of other parts differ from the chief source, indicate the variations in a note.”

**0C3**—One reviewer questioned the need for the statement equating “title page” with “title page or title page substitute.” It probably is needed in OD to allow a page of a preface, for example, to be a prescribed source of information for edition if that page is a title page substitute. We hope that this is true all the rest of the way.

**0G1.3**—Unless there is some situation being addressed here that we haven’t imagined, we recommend for the first sentence: “Transcribe accidentals (flat and sharp signs, etc.) adjacent to the key letters they modify (i.e. [not e.g.] without a space).”

**0G2.2**—One reviewer found the placement of the “If the source uses a gothic typeface ...” instruction to be very confusing. Perhaps because it follows a chart, it took him several minutes to realize that the examples following illustrated the general rule.

**0G4.1**—Judging from the examples, the alternative rule would appear to conflict with 0G3.4, unless the cataloger has already chosen the alternative rule in 0G3.1. How much mix-and-match is possible with the alternative rules in this section?

**0G6.4**—We think we understand the principle behind this instruction, but it will definitely present challenges to users who have to pick a desired item from a display where uniform titles aren't being shown. This rule alone could dissuade one reviewer from using the standard at all. There is also a slight disconnect with 0G7.3, which calls for filling in a blank space that has been left for an initial. While it certainly is a sensible thing to complete the first word of a title, the sorts of fill-ins in 0G6.4 are no less important for music.

**0G7.1**—If there's a standard or “obvious” source to look up these older or non-standard orthographic conventions, citing it here would be helpful. Given the wide range of languages a music cataloger has to negotiate, it's not unlikely that he or she would not recognize non-standard usages without some help.

**0G8.1**—A particularly curious instance where “from the music” certainly means something other than the musical notation. For that matter, is the instruction necessary, i.e., can “transcription” involve the act of supplying abbreviations?

#### Area 1

**1A2.3**—There's a tacit assumption that the description being prepared pertains to the “overall group.” This ought to be made explicit—if the bibliographic record describes only the Cantus part of a book of motets (as judged by the extent, for example), that word would seem to be an important part of the title.

**1B1.1**—While the concept of “chief title” would seem to be second nature for many rare-book catalogers, it's going to be new for many music catalogers, and could well merit a section in the Introduction that explains its purpose and the principles that guide its identification. Since its identification seems to bear some resemblance to the process of identifying the “initial title element” in AACR2, that discussion seems even more necessary to avoid confusion.

In AACR2 25.28A, underlining identifies the “initial title element.” That practice might be suitable here to identify the chief title. The last example would be clearer if a comment identified the composer as Johann Rist; the composer is obscure, and thus the genitive case is not obvious.

It's not clear to us what condition is being invoked in the Agostini example, where “Musica ...” looks like a statement of responsibility.

**1B1.4**—Unless the first example is considered to fall under the rubric of 1F11, most music catalogers using AACR2 would treat the “Klavierauszug” phrase as a statement of responsibility.

If *DCRM(M)* considers it other title information, then the punctuation should be corrected to a colon.

**1B4**—We don't see how the numbering is grammatically inseparable in the example, except that the gender of the adjective "premiere" does not match that of "livre." If a more obvious example is available, we recommend using it.

**1B5.1**—The rule is clear enough, but the comment is confusing. What exactly is meant by "the first page of text?" Does "text" here mean "musical text?" Or are the words written as text preceding the music?

**1E6**—We gather that *DCRM(M)* has no equivalent to LCRI 5.1B1's Multiple parallel data, which serves to keep data in the same language together. If we're wrong, that should be made more explicit.

**1F2**—We recommend adding an example of a statement of responsibility found only in the caption, which is very common in sheet music for arrangers and writers of text.

**1F10**—It's unclear whether the transposition called for in situations where all elements are parallel in 1F10.2 extends to situations such as 1F10.1, where only the title elements are parallel, particularly since the example does not include other title information.

## Area 2

**2C1.3**—The principle illustrated by the "Revised and enlarged" statement would be effectively conveyed with an example.

## Area 3

We observe that *DCRM(M)* retains the AACR2 restrictions on where data recorded here may appear in the item, it differs significantly from AACR2 in how much of the data will be recorded.

## Area 4

**4A5**—Reviewers wondered why the language here did not parallel that in AACR2 1.4B5, in particular the choice of the phrase "showing later information." Is this ambiguity intended to encompass manuscripts?

**4B1.1**—One reviewer wished for a reference to 4B10 here as a shortcut for the cataloger whose item in hand does not have a place of publication, given the large number of instructions in between. If that's seen as a good thing to do, there are probably several other places in the document where a similar situation occurs.

**4B7**—Some reviewers thought that the instruction here had been rendered obsolete by the introduction of repeatable 260 fields to the MARC format. Since AACR2 offers only notes as places to record changes in place and in publisher, such a criticism might seem misplaced. However, it would not be out of line to offer repeatable imprint fields as an alternative.

**4B13**—An example using Cyrillic script would be welcome here.

**4C1**—The reviewer who wanted the shortcut reference in 4B1.1 asked for one here, too. To be fair, AACR2 had a similar span of instructions between the two points, but they took up only a page or two.

**4C7**—This instruction seems very out of place in a code based on AACR2. Even AACR1 placed this data after the date of publication.

**4C8**—The repeatable MARC 260 (cf. 4B7) was mentioned again here. An alternative might be good here, too.

**4C12.1**—We recommend adding an example here.

**4D8**—This rule would seem to have applicability to situations where a collection of musical pieces has copyright statements at the bottom of the first page of music of each piece. But the explicit mention of “title pages” seems to preclude that. Consider extending the principle.

#### Area 5

**5B1.4**—This instruction uses the printed AACR2 category of “p. of music” [etc.]. While that's fine in and of itself, the use of cm & mm as symbols (not abbreviations) is justified in the Preface (p. 7) because it was a change approved for AACR2 but with the implementation deferred until publication in RDA. The replacement of “p. of music” with “score” usage falls into the same category, although this change was approved later than the metric symbol change (2006). The difference in treatment of these two approved but not implemented changes in AACR2 should be clarified somewhere.

**5B1.6**—Consider adding an example to illustrate the use of uppercase roman numerals.

The use of “each” in the example “2 ms. scores (20 p. each)” is not really justified in any subsequent rule. Use of “each” is only mentioned in relation to parts (5B1.8). This needs to be clarified for use with scores ; we presume that this formulation would apply only to identical scores (2 different scores would be described as “1 score (2 v.)” Doing this offers *DCRM(M)* an opportunity to improve on AACR2, where this use of “each” also occurred with no justification.

Another reviewer wished for a reference to 5B11 for quicker resolution of questions about how to describe a publication with multiple sequences of pages.

**5B1.8**--The phrasing here is not as clear as in the LCRI (“its pagination” could refer to either the score or the part). While the 2nd sentence and the example make the intent clear, it would be better to rephrase the 1st sentence to something like “If a publication or manuscript consists of or contains only one score and one part, include the pagination of each.”

**5B14, footnote 21**—It’s not a bad idea to clarify the difference between plates as illustrations and plates in the music-printing process, but this could be dealt with just as well with a reference to the Glossary.

**5E1.2**—The example uses “folded to...” which is not justified anywhere in *DCRM(M)*. We suggest the inclusion of text from AACR2 2.5D4 earlier in this chapter to explain.

### Area 6

A general comment: there seems to be no suggestion that the instructions on series would include monographic sets, such as Gesamtausgaben. For music, this is a **major** omission.

**6D2**—Here and in 6E2.3 and 6G3.3, we suggest explicit directions that when parallel data is being omitted from the series area and given as a note instead, that elements in the same language be kept together in the same note (e.g. a title and other title information).

**6.E2**—One reviewer asked what would be done in a case where multiple parallel series statements were accompanied by a “partially parallel” statement of responsibility (e.g. “by” and its equivalents in languages matching the titles, but the name printed only once). This is an example of a place where *DCRM(M)* has not chosen to delve as deeply as the LCRIs into transcription complexities. As said before, this may present problems.

**6F**—Here, and in 6G1.2 and 7B5, “in the music” almost certainly would be better expressed as “in the publication” or “in the resource.”

**6G2**—Several reviewers recommended that the rule should prescribe that the numbering and any information about the series should be in the \*same\* note, unless there are situations where that is a problem.

**6H1**—“--in the music” is problematic as indicated above. Furthermore, it's unclear as to whether the series and subseries have to appear together in the item; there's a whiff of such in the instruction on transposing data, with its reference to “the source,” but that's pretty flimsy. There is a stronger preference in 62A.1 that they be together, and reference back to that instruction would help matters. In general, this section is not well-developed, particularly since it should be covering monographic sets where there will be statements of responsibility, and situations where a statement of responsibility will encompass both series and subseries, and other cases where it may take in only one or the other.

**6J**—“on music” is another poor use of the term.

### Area 7

**7A1.2**—“Privilege statement” is a term that is common knowledge in the rare-book community, but which might warrant at least a parenthetical example to help out the rest of us.

**7A1.3**—Since the rules have largely been using “source” to mean “title page” or “series title page” or some other specific location within the item being cataloged, in this rule, perhaps “specific source” should say “specific reference source.” The usage of “source” should be evaluated throughout the document.

**7A1.5**—Some reviewers objected to the instructions prescribing the terminology to be used in added entries and referring to controlled lists as being out of scope for a descriptive cataloging code, citing I.5 (page 11). Others are not as perturbed about the reference to controlled vocabularies; rare-materials cataloging seems an area where a *lingua franca* can be helpful.

**7A3**—Is there a good rationale for specifying that a source must be “suitable?” This is more restrictive than AACR2.

**7A4.2**—An example of a note where one might be tempted to employ prescribed punctuation (e.g. “This is an unaltered reprint of *Two Years Before the Mast*, by Charles Dana” rather than “This is an unaltered reprint of: *Two Years Before the Mast* / by Charles Dana”) would seem useful here.

**7A4.3**—An example of a formal note, or reference to such a note elsewhere in the code, would be useful.

**7B1.2**—The first sentence introduces the notion of implied medium of performance, but loses some clarity in the process. We recommend replacing with: “Name the medium of performance for which a musical work is intended unless it is named in the rest of the description in English or in foreign language terms that can be readily understood. Do not name the medium of performance in a note if it is implied by the title or other title information (e.g., “Chorale prelude”; “*Manfred* : symphonie en 4 tableaux”) or by the musical form stated in a note made under this rule (e.g., “Opera in two acts”; “Ballet”).”

As in other places where “in the music” is employed, the statement about what order to record the voices and/or instruments is problematic. Literally interpreted, this might mean score order, i.e. the order of the staves from top to bottom. We presume that the intent was to include verbal listings. There’s still the question of how to choose between listings that differ in order, or whether one should prefer a more specific listing (“for organ, 2 trumpets, horn, and trombone” vs. “for organ and brass quartet”).

In the last sentence, use “voice type or instrument name.”

**7B2.1**—We suggest adding an example for a piano score, such as an arrangement of a Wagner opera for solo piano, that contains interlinear or superlinear words.

**7B3.1**—Assuming that the last example is meant to illustrate the situation where a title has been added later in a different hand, we wonder about a situation where the scribe of the older portion is unknown as well. Is this ambiguity deliberate?

**7B6.3.3**—One reviewer suggested “*Pietà signore*” by “*Stradella*” and the “*Prince of Denmark’s march*” by “*Purcell*” (i.e. Jeremiah Clarke) as examples.

**7B17.3**—We understand that this rule carries over AACR2 practice, but it's surprising that this shortcut would be used for rare/manuscript materials, at least not without a note about not transcribing everything. We don't see much in the way of similar rules elsewhere in *DCRM(M)*,

which goes to great pains to identify when elements are grouped outside of their appearance on the t.p., for example. It's even more surprising that transcribing opus numbers is optional if they are in the source from which the content title is coming.

**7B18.2**—Is it really appropriate to \*require\* catalogers to apply the “rule of three” here for more than three individual numbers which aren't consecutive? The rule of three should be an option, e.g. “... otherwise give individual numbers. Optionally, if there are more than three of these, give the first number and the last number separated by a diagonal slash.” Additionally, the rule allows this only for things published in several volumes. What about a song anthology where the individual songs bear scattered plate numbers? It would appear that all numbers must be transcribed in that instance. The 1 volume/several volume divide also causes problems for opera scores that consist of individually-issued numbers (with different plate nos.) that have been assembled by the publisher and also issued as a monograph.

**7B18.2.5**—The rule and example fail to deal with the most common situation—that where the resource has been reprinted from plates of a different publisher.

**7B19.1**—An opera score that consist of individually-issued numbers (with different plate nos.) that have been assembled by the publisher and also issued as a monograph might fall into this category. One would hope for an “out” that would allow such things to be excluded from this rule.

**7B19.2**—Even for a code derived from AACR2, it seems curious to call the initial element of a citation “the heading.” Would it include MARC-130 uniform titles?

#### Area 8

**8B1.2**—There are factual errors here. First: To convert an ISMN beginning with “M”, replace the “M” with “9790”. Thus, the first example here is wrong, since “M” never appears in a 13-digit ISMN. Second: The phrasing of the 1st sentence implies that recording these 13-digit international numbers is required in all situations. Since that's clearly not the case (not everything cataloged post 2007 has an ISMN or ISBN -- like manuscripts!), this sentence needs to be clarified, for example: “ In 2007, 13-digit International Standard Numbers were implemented and, if present on the item, must be recorded in catalog records. The 13-digit number must also be supplied for publications with 10-digit International Standard Numbers. For the ISMN, simply substitute “9790” for the “M” to obtain the 13-digit ISMN. For ISBNs the conversion is more complex, since the check digit changes. Give this number with the agreed abbreviation and with the standard spacing or hyphenation.”

#### Appendix H, Standard Citations

We recommend two additional resources:

1. Deutsch, Otto Erich. Musikverlags Nummern : eine Auswahl von 40 datierten Listen, 1710-1900. Berlin : Merseburger, 1961. Cite as: Deutsch., O.E. Musikverlags Nummern.

2. A citation for the Hofmeister XIX database (<http://www.hofmeister.rhul.ac.uk/2008/index.html>)

### Glossary

**Caption title:** the reference to “a musical score” is problematic, since the definition of “score” in this document is the old AACR2 one; it excludes music for a single instrument and parts as a result.

**Cover/Decorative title page:** more thought may be in order in how these two interact, particularly for sheet music where the title-page may be coated to provide a better surface for the illustration, but the verso is uncoated and sometimes bears the first page of music.

**Libretto:** “The libretto of a musical comedy is sometimes called its book”. Not quite--the libretto of a musical comedy would include the words of the sung numbers as well as the dialogue, it's the latter that is usually called the “book.”

**Mensural notation:** consider adapting the definition in RDA: “A system of notating duration, beginning around 1260 and continuing through about 1600, employing four principal note-values and associated rests: long, breve, semibreve, and minim.”

**Miniature score:** this definition considers only the size of the object, with no reference to the size of the image of the musical text. Was that change from AACR2 deliberate?

**Number notation:** consider adapting the definition in RDA: “A system of musical notation conveying pitch by use of numbers, assigned to the notes of a scale, the keys of a keyboard, the finger positions or frets of a string instrument, or to the holes or valves of a wind instrument.”

**Superlinear words:** It's curious that this definition is given, since the term does not appear elsewhere in the document. It could be made to appear if the recommendation for an example in 7B2.1 is followed.

### **COMMENTS ON FORMATTING, ETC.**

**X.1.1**—“OCLC’s Bibliographic Standards and Formats” should read: “OCLC’s Bibliographic Formats and Standards.”

**X.1.4**—The last 2 paragraphs are in a smaller font than the surrounding document.

**0C2.2**—the font changes within the paragraph for no apparent reason.

**0F2.1**—“Piesen” is lacking a ligature.

**1B1.4**—“Nürnberg” lacks an umlaut.