

To: Nina Schneider, Chair
ALA/ACRL/RBMS/Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC)
Jain Fletcher, Chair
Joint RBMS/ALA Task Group for Developing Rules for Rare Music Cataloging

From: Robert Rendall, Chair
ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

Subject: CC:DA Review of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music)*

CC:DA appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music)* (hereafter DCRM(M)), as invited by the RBMS liaison to CC:DA on March 25, 2015. In keeping with actions on *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)*¹, *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)*², and *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)*³, CC:DA has voted to approve the following report, prepared by a Task Force after thorough review of DCRM(M). A roster of the Task Force is included at the end of this report.

General Comments:

After a careful review, the Task Force agreed that DCRM(M) is overall a beneficial resource for rare music materials catalogers, and commends the editorial team for their thorough and careful work. We identified several comments for your consideration. We acknowledge that some comments below may regard formatting or presentation likely to be addressed in a later stage of the review process. Other comments may invoke larger matters of consistency across the DCRM modules which may necessitate action by the DCRM Steering Group or other internal processes.

DCRM(M) and RDA:

It is our understanding that as of January 1, 2015, BIBCO catalogers are no longer allowed to use a non-RDA compliant standard for new BIBCO-authenticated cataloging. The BSRs for individual material types have been combined into a single *PCC RDA BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) Metadata Application Profile*⁴, with guidelines that provide for the combination of RDA and the other published DCRM modules.

We are glad to learn that rare music provisions have already been included in the BSR, and that the description conventions code dcrmm has been established in advance of the

¹ CC:DA/Chair/2005-2006/1: Comments on *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)*.
<<http://downloads.alcts.ala.org/ccda/docs/chair28.pdf>>

² CC:DA/Chair/2008-2009/1: Comments on *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)*.
<<http://downloads.alcts.ala.org/ccda/docs/chair44.pdf>>.

³ CC:DA/Chair/2014-2015/3: Comments on *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)*.
<<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/CCDAChair2014-201503.pdf>>.

⁴ *PCC RDA BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) Metadata Application Profile*
<<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/bibco/documents/PCC-RDA-BSR.pdf>>.

publication of DCRM(M). It is our understanding that BIBCO-authenticated records can thus be coded as both RDA and DCRM(M) compliant, as is the case with the other published DCRM modules, and that this option is available for non-BIBCO records as well. While this was not the case at the time of publication of the other modules, the DCRM(M) text has the opportunity to indicate that catalogers will have these options. Therefore we recommend that this situation be discussed with the PCC Standing Committee on Standards, and suggest further clarification in DCRM(M) instructions on the possible combination of rules and conventions. This impacts the Introduction (specifically II.1; X.1.3; footnote 4), Appendix A, and Appendix B1.3.

Parallel elements:

When discussing parallel elements, we suggest changing “language(s) or script(s)” to “language(s) and/or script(s)” in keeping with the AACR2 Glossary definition of parallel title. Similarly, when instructions on parallel elements mention only parallel languages, we again suggest changing it to “language(s) and/or script(s)”. This is the case in 1D, 1E6, 1F10, 2B9, 2C4, 3B1, 4B13, 4C12, 6C, 6E2, 6G3, and possibly elsewhere.

Language and script of the cataloging agency:

DCRM(M) states in the Introduction Section V that “DCRM(M) is written for an English-speaking context.” However, there are several mentions in the rules about choosing the language/script of the cataloging agency. For examples, see 1B5.3, 1G2. Either one of these approaches is acceptable to us, but they should be applied consistently.

Footnote breaks:

We recommend not breaking footnotes across pages. For examples, see: footnote 4 (p. 24); footnote 6 (p. 32); footnote 11 (p. 41).

Manuscript materials:

We note that while manuscript materials are in scope for DCRM(M), several instructions use language that is specific to published materials. This can be remedied simply by changing the word “publication” to “resource” in most instances, including 4A1, 4A2.1, 4A4, 4B7, 4B9, 4B11, 4C2, 4C9, 4D1.1, 4D1.2, 4D2.4, 4D2.5, as well as 7B9, 7B20.1, Appendix F2, the glossary definition for “Fingerprints” and likely elsewhere. Some instructions may warrant more substantial rewording inclusive of manuscript material, including those cases discussed individually below.

Specific Comments:

Front Matter

Table of Contents, Area 3:

It seems odd to have “Optional area” included in the description of the chapter/area. Perhaps “Musical Presentation Statement Area (optional area)” would be clearer.

Preface

Background, 1st paragraph:

We recommend changing the description of the Music Cataloging Decisions as follows:

... in particular its music cataloging policies (formerly part of a separate publication called *Music Cataloging Decisions*),

to: ... in particular its music cataloging policies (which were separately published as *Music Cataloging Decisions* until they were merged with LCRI in 2005),

Introduction

I.2, 1st paragraph:

Suggested changes:

1st sentence: "...printed or manuscript music monographs..."

Last sentence, "... primarily textual ~~or~~ and monographs about music..."

II.1 - General question:

Should all of these standards be cited at the end, in the List of Works Cited section? Missing from that list are: LCRI, LCMPT, IFLA Statement of International Cataloguing Principles.

II.1:

The second sentence of the second paragraph: While DCRM(M) builds primarily on AACR2/LCRI provisions for description, NACO authority work has fully shifted to RDA/LC-PCC PS practices for access points. In the third paragraph, we suggest mentioning the possibility of combining RDA and DCRM(M) for description as well (see also General Comments and Appendix A.1).

II.1 last paragraph:

Later in the Objectives and Principles section the terms manifestation and expression are used. We recommend stating that FRBR vocabulary is used.

III.1.1:

This principle uses FRBR terminology, but the terms don't appear in the Glossary. In the index, only "Manifestations" appears, but not expression, work or item. Some clarification and/or glossary additions may be useful, since "Item" is used both in the FRBR sense, and to indicate the level of cataloging that is not collection-level.

III.2.2:

A wordsmithing suggestion--In the fourth and fifth line, the parenthetical statement might better read (the title and statement of responsibility, edition, publication, distribution, production, etc., and series areas)

VII:

For the full name of BIBCO, we recommend giving the form found on their web page currently: BIBCO - Monographic Bibliographic Record Cooperative Program

X.1.1 (p. 22):

In the 2nd paragraph, it looks like "OCLC's" is italicized; it should instead read "...a prominent example being OCLC's *Bibliographic Formats and Standards*."

X.1.4 (p. 24) footnote 4:

The "all subject headings" statement in the footnote seems to exclude many music subject headings which are governed by pattern headings and are not officially established in the authority file.

0. General Rules

0A:

First sentence: We believe there should be a comma after "value," consistent with the parallel instruction in DCRM(B) and with Oxford comma use elsewhere in DCRM(M).

0B2.2

2nd paragraph: Should a reference be provided for the "make a general note" statement? If so, would it just be 7B?

0C1.1:

We note some recent discussion among music catalogers (in the RDA context) about whether or not list title pages are actually title pages; can any of the "resolution" of this problem be incorporated here? Alternatively, list title pages might warrant a separate instruction from that of single title pages.

Also, the second sentence should have a comma after "cover."

0C.2.2, end of the first sentence:

We suggest revising the wording of this instruction to better distinguish between "parts" as *musical* parts and as components of aggregate/multipart resources, namely in that a score is called a "part" of a multipart resource. Perhaps "part" in this context can be replaced with a term such as: piece, component, or item.

0C3.f:

The entry for reference sources does not constitute taking a title from within the resource. This entry should be pulled from the lettered list and made a separate paragraph, with an introductory comment that indicates what to do when no title can be found within the resource.

0D, 1st paragraph:

The “do not interpolate” statement may too broad. Can we include information from elsewhere in the resource *if* enclosed in square brackets? (See 0G6.1) Perhaps the wording should be something like:

“Do not interpolate transcribed information from elsewhere in the item without enclosing it in square brackets, to indicate that it is not present in the prescribed source for that area.”

On the other hand, if this *is* what is meant (see 1F2), then it needs to be clearer that interpolation in the transcription does not apply in cases like 0G6.1, e.g.:

“Do not interpolate transcribed information from elsewhere in the item, unless instructed otherwise by specific rules.”

0D, 2nd paragraph:

Should an “otherwise” clause be added for what to do if the cataloger can’t tell if everything is in the same hand -- or is that obvious?

0E:

While the ISBD spacing conventions are given in the 3rd paragraph here, it might be helpful to have them stated in the prescribed punctuation sections of the individual areas.

0F1.1

We suggest that the “wherever feasible” parenthetical refer the cataloger to 0F2.

0G1.1:

We recommend the addition of a sentence that refers the cataloger to 0G2 for capitalization & conversion of case. This is a significant exception to the 1st sentence, and it should appear as the 2nd sentence.

0G2.2:

We suggest including an example of the i/j conversion. Both examples provided are of the u/v conversion.

0G2.4:

It might help to have an example of capitalization of a chronogram here (although there is an example at 4D2.2), and perhaps for 4D2.2 to refer back to 0G2.4

0G5.2:

Because it appears so often in printed music, it seems the word “dedications” should appear in this list. “Dedications” does appear in the index, pointing to 1A.2.2, which is about sources of information for Multipart and multivolume resources. Looking at an earlier draft, it seems that 1A.2.2 used to be Omission of pious invocations, etc. Has this been removed because it is presumed covered by 0G5.2? If so, all index entries still point to 1A.2.2. We have listed all the affected entries in comments on the Index section (below) as well.

0G6.4.2:

To help clarify the differences between the two types of rules introduced by the term “optionally”, we recommend considering the RDA convention of labeling these as “optional addition” and “optional deletion”.

0G7.1, 2nd paragraph:

We are not convinced that the phrase “correct words” is exactly the right description here.

Suggested alternative wordings:

Do not indicate misprints, etc., for words spelled according to older or non-standard orthographic conventions....

or

Do not treat words spelled according to older or non-standard orthographic conventions as misprints or misspellings ...

0G8.2:

Since manuscript music materials are in scope, we assume traditional marks of contraction in manuscripts are treated the same way as those printed in continuance of that tradition. Does the rule need to be expanded to specify that?

0G9:

Is there a music-specific case in which the use of subscript or superscript would affect sense? If so, we suggest including that instead of “in a mathematical formula” in the instruction.

Either way, we suggest including an example which preserves the superscript/subscript in transcription, such as:

E = MC² : etude equals musical canon squared / David Zinn.

Four² : for chorus / John Cage.

1. Title and Statement of Responsibility Area

1A.2.2:

Index entries for dedications, epigrams, etc. point to this rule, which apparently used to be Omission of pious invocations, etc. Was this omitted because it was assumed to be covered by 0G5.2?

1A2.2, final sentence:

Should there be an instruction reference here (presumably to 7B3)?

1A3:

We are not sure what “order” is referring to here; it is difficult to identify anything in 0G that mentions changing the order of anything. There are a lot of instructions in 1B that talk about transposing the order of elements, so the instruction reference just to 0G seems too limited. (This same problem occurs with other “see 0G” references regarding “order” throughout the text.)

1B2:

Should there be an instruction reference to 7B3 here?

1B3.2:

Footnote 9 on p. 38 says (correctly) that ISBD punctuation does not require the use of commas around “or” (or its equivalent). Yet the examples here regularly show the comma usage. Does DCRM(M) accept either approach?

1B5.1:

After reading all of the instructions in this section, it becomes obvious that “any source” means “any source within the resource” -- it does not encompass reference sources. So, we suggest the following change:

“If no title can be found within the resource, and the work includes vocal text...”

1B5.2:

Likewise, this instruction should also make it clear that the resource has no title:

If no title can be found within the resource, and no vocal text is present, ...

1B5.3:

Why is it *preferably* in the language and script of the cataloging agency? What other language/script would be chosen? We recommend dropping “preferably” if the sentence is retained. (The question remains if this language/script rule conflicts with Section V of the Introduction; see General comments above).

Or, if the cataloger may devise a title in another language (such as the language of the resource itself), an alternative instruction would be clearer, and an example would be helpful.

1B7.2:

Can this information be combined with 1B3.2? If not, should these two instructions reference each other?

1C1:

If applying LCRI 1.1C, [music] is not on the list of GMDs to be used. Perhaps a footnote to explain this would be helpful.

1E6.3:

Could the end of the first sentence be simplified as follows?

... transcribe the other title information directly after the title to which it relates, no matter the actual order in the resource.

Perhaps the example could include a comment explaining that “Officium pastorum” and “The shepherds at the manger” were transposed from their original order on the source.

In addition, should this include an instruction and/or reference to 7B5 to make a note on any transposition resulting from the application of this rule?

1F5: The final example gives only one name, which appears to contradict the instruction to optionally omit all after the *third* name.

1F8:

Is there any need for an “in case of doubt” instruction here?

1F12:

Should something like Klavierausgabe be included as an example here? (It’s clear from 2B2.3 that this is what would happen.)

1G2:

Again, we wonder about the use of the word “preferably” here for language of devised titles, and more broadly whether this conflicts with Section V (see General comments above).

If collective titles can be devised in a language other than English, and/or if there are situations where that might actually be preferable, then an alternative instruction and example of such a case would be clearer.

2. Edition Area

2B2.3:

Should this rule reference 1F12 (at least in relation to a statement like “edition for 2 pianos”)?

2B3.2:

Although we recognize this as DCRM boilerplate language, those less familiar with rare materials terminology initially had a hard time parsing the Alternative rule, because “state” could be read as a noun or a verb. We recommend considering rephrasing this, and related Alternative rules elsewhere, along the lines of the following:

For individual impressions, states, binding variants, or copies within a single edition or issue, if a decision has been made to create a separate bibliographic description,

transcribe statements containing words such as “impression” or “printing” in the edition area.

2B10:

Since DCRM(M) allows for creating a separate description for each separately titled work (in certain circumstances, see 1G2), does this rule need to be clarified that it applies when cataloging the resource as a unit? (Or this that just understood, based on the example provided?)

2B11.3:

The first sentence has odd phrasing: “If multivolume or multipart music is known....” The previous rule reads “If multivolume or multipart resources...”; should that wording be used here as well?

2C4.1:

Should a verb be added here?

If there are parallel edition statements (see 2B9) but a statement of responsibility relating to the edition appears in only one language and/or script, ...

2C4.3:

Similarly, should a 2nd occurrence of “appears” be added here?

If an edition statement appears in only one language and/or script and a statement of responsibility relating to the edition appears in more than one language and/or script...

4. Publication, Distribution, Production, Etc., Area

4A2.1:

Because the reference to 0G6 is just about punctuation conventions (enclose supplied information in square brackets), should the reason for the reference be clearer? An initial reading could lead a cataloger to assume that the reference would address using any source (and not about how to indicate that the information came from outside the list of prescribed sources). For wording that accomplishes this, see 4A3.3.

4B3:

Should the instruction read “Use a modern English form...” as in 4B5?

4B4:

Should the preferred “form of name” language be included here as well? Would it be in a modern English form here too, or in a form/language/script consistent with the transcribed abbreviation, or even both, as in 4B10.2?

4B7:

Should this be more explicit that the original place of publication, etc. is recorded as part of the statement, or is that obvious? Note the difference in phrasing at 4C8, which is more explicit.

Also note the difference in the rule title between these two: should it be “multivolume resources” or “multivolume publications”? We recommend using consistent wording for these and have a preference for “resources”.

4B8:

The first sentence here is quite long (64 words). Could it be broken up for easier comprehensibility?

4B9: We recommend changing the final sentence to “consisting of place, publisher (distributor, etc.), and date...” paralleling 4C5.

4B10.1:

Under what conditions would catalogers *not* need to provide a justification for the supplied place of publication? (Final sentence: Provide a justification... if necessary.) Would it be better to rephrase this to state that a justification is provided unless the place is apparent from the rest of the description? For wording that accomplishes this, see 4B12.3.

4B10.2:

Here there's no mention of providing the modern forms and larger jurisdictions in English. Should there be?

Also, when does this instruction trump the others that tell catalogers simply to use a “modern English term”? In 4B9, for example, should catalogers instead be supplying the term that's appropriate for the time period, followed by the modern form if important? Should these kinds of instructions refer to 4B10.2 as needed?

4B10.2, examples:

Based on conventions, we recommend preceding the “i.e.” in examples by a comma. There are no occurrences in ISBD where the use of i.e. (in the text and the examples) is not preceded by a punctuation mark.

4B11:

An explanation or glossary definition for “sign” would be helpful.

4B13:

The term “statement” has ISBD implications. Could “name” be substituted?

4C:

Would it be possible to reorder the instructions in 4C to more closely parallel the order of instructions in 4B?

4C2:

In the 3rd paragraph, the sentence ends with “publisher, distributor, etc. statement”, when we believe the concept should be “name of the publisher, distributor, etc.” “Publisher, distributor, etc. statement” could be construed to apply to the full statement including place and date. A rule to include this publisher [etc.] statement doesn’t tell you *where* to include it, and the examples shouldn’t be carrying the weight of the instruction.

4C5:

Similarly, and to parallel 4B9, this might better read:

“If the name of the publisher, distributor, etc. appearing in the resource is known to be fictitious or incorrect...”

There’s a minor difference in the final sentence between 4B9 & 4C5: including “(distributor, etc.)”. In this case we prefer 4C5 & recommend this addition to 4B9.

4C6.1:

Suggested re-wording: If the source of information includes more than one publisher, distributor, etc., transcribe all the names in the order in which they appear.

4C6.4:

This instruction is identical (except for the example) to 4B6.6. Should this just be a reference to that instruction?

4C8:

Already noted above is the difference in the rule title between this & 4B7. In addition, there’s a difference in describing the physical part:

4B7: in more than a single physical part

4C8: in more than one physical volume or part

We assume this wording should be consistent between these two related rules.

4C10:

This is another case where “publication statement” should be rephrased:

If no publisher, distributor, etc. can be supplied ...

4C11, 1st paragraph:

Suggested rewording:

If the name of the publisher, distributor, etc. has already been transcribed as part of another area...

4C12.1:

As with the related instruction in 4B, we wonder if “statement” can be replaced with “name” here.

4D2.2: Perhaps this instruction should refer back to 0G2.4 regarding capitalization of chronograms.

4D2.4:

Suggested rewording for consistency with 4B9 and 4C5:

4B9 uses “appearing in the publication” [which should probably be “in the resource”]; however, that equivalent phrase does not appear here or in 4C5.

4B9 and 4C5 also use “transcribe it nonetheless” while this instruction uses “transcribe it as it appears”.

In relation to the entire statement being incorrect, 4B9 says “... is known to be fictitious...” while 4C5 and 4D2.4 instructions say only “...is fictitious...”

4D2.7, examples:

We believe the “i.e.” should be preceded by a comma (as noted in 4B10.2 above).

4D3:

Suggested rewording:

If the date of publication, distribution, production, etc., does not appear in the ~~publication resource~~, but is found in a reliable bibliography or reference work, supply it in square brackets. Give the source of the supplied date and any needed explanation in a note.

4E2:

The equivalent instruction in 4B5 also says to add the larger jurisdiction name “if it is considered necessary to distinguish the place from others of the same name.” Shouldn’t that be here too?

5. Physical Description Area

5B1.2, examples after 2nd paragraph:

These examples do not appear to illustrate the instruction. We suggest changing the examples to reflect specific terms for special types of resources.

5B1.4:

Note that this instruction does not help if catalogers have a set of parts that are bound together. RDA was just updated to address this situation (see 2nd exception in RDA 3.4.3.2). Should DCRM(M) follow suit?

5B6.2:

In the 2nd line, “sequence” should be singular:

...either record the sequences exactly...

5B7.1:

Should this rule be clarified to choose a term based on how the pages/leaves are used? We assume that you'd use "leaves" for resources that only use one side of each page. (RDA's phrasing is "using the appropriate terms".)

5B8.1:

Given the other preciseness of DCRM(M)'s extent statement, it surprised some reviewers that a set of plates found together in the resource are not put into the extent statement in a way that conveys where they are located. (However, it's obvious why this isn't done with plates scattered throughout the resource.)

5B9:

Should the rule name be "Folded leaves of plates" or "Folded plates" so it isn't confused with 5B1.8?

In the 1st sentence: "as such" -- should this be "as folded" so it doesn't contradict the next sentence?

The first and second sentence seem redundant, and the instruction doesn't clarify how the different examples were arrived at for combining sequences of folded and unfolded plates.

Also, in the third sentence, don't plates always contain "printed resources"? Is this option meant to point out textual/musical content rather than illustration? Either way, if it's considered important to indicate the content of folded leaves (e.g. that the folded plates in the example contain solfeggio exercises), wouldn't this be equally important for non-folded plates containing the same content? So, should this instruction be moved to, or repeated in, 5B8.1?

5B11:

How does one describe an incomplete volume where the initial pages are missing, but the end of the volume is present?

5B12.2, 2nd example:

We find this example ambiguous. Are the two parts collectively in 3 v., or are they in "3 v. each"? We believe that DCRM(M) would allow for the latter, if that's the case. A similar ambiguity exists for the 3rd example.

5B13.1:

Is "by its labeling" the right term to use? Some catalogers may think that this implies physical processing. Would "by its designations" or something similar be better?

5C3:

Are sepia prints color? Should this be clarified somewhere?

5D:

It seems like a minor detail, but we prefer the terminology that is in line with ISBD, etc. here: Dimensions instead of size.

The DCRM(C) TF noticed that DCRM modules all use the letter "x" rather than the "times" symbol (×) for recording multiple dimensions. AACR2 and RDA use ×, while ISBD Consolidated Edition, MARC21 Bibliographic Format, and OCLC's *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* all use the letter x.

5D3.2:

This rule, which is about the placement of the dimensions after the details of scores and parts is subsumed under the heading 5D3 (Differing sizes), but the first sentence regards scores and parts of the *same* dimensions. So, shouldn't something this central to description of printed music be placed somewhere earlier in 5D, perhaps somewhere in 5D1.1? The second part of the rule does apply to scores and parts with dimensions that differ and that could probably stay in 5D3.

Alternatively, the heading of 5D3 could be revised to include both cases.

5E:

Is it obvious that the parts in a score & parts set should not be considered "accompanying material", or should this be explicitly stated?

5E1.2:

This rule really presents three options, although the layout doesn't make that clear. Shouldn't this be something like:

Optionally, provide the physical description of the accompanying material by:
giving it in parentheses following its name [example]
or describing the accompanying material independently
or mentioning it in a note

6. Series Area

6A2.2, examples:

Would it be possible to provide an example that shows a part/element of the series statement being taken from a source other than the series title page?

6C1:

The first two sentences under Parallel titles of series actually refer to selecting the title proper for a series when parallel titles exist. Should these sentences be moved to 6B, Title proper of

series? The instruction also states “Precede each parallel series title by an equals sign”. Since this is prescribed punctuation, covered by 6A.1, we don’t think it needs to be here.

6F:

There’s nothing in this rule that says *where* to record the ISSN. Based on the examples, and existing cataloging practice, we know that it goes after whatever is the last of the following: series title, series other title information, series statement of responsibility. (Or, more simply, immediately preceding the series numbering, if applicable.) What happens with parallel series statements? Is the ISSN repeated, or does it go after only the first occurrence of the series title [etc.]? (We assume a principle such as that stated at the end of 6G3.2 would apply here.)

7. Note Area

7A1.1:

In the final sentence, should “of the music” be “of the resource”?

7A2:

This instruction says to end notes with a final mark of punctuation. However, most of the subsequent examples in Chapter 7 do not follow this rule. (See 7A4.1, 7A4.2, 7B4.1, etc.)

7B1.2:

This rule prescribes the use of English terms for voices and instruments “unless there is no satisfactory English equivalent.” Elsewhere in DCRM(M), the cataloger is told to use terms in the language of the item is being cataloged. Why is English preferred here but not elsewhere?

7B2.1:

Should “of the item” be “of the resource”?

7B3.1:

While the phrase “if it is from a substitute for the title page” is consistent with usage in DCRM(B), we think it would be better to simply state that a source of title note is required if the title didn’t come from the title page (or in AACR2 terms, if it didn’t come from the chief source of information). For wording that follows this recommendation, see 7B7.1.

7B5:

This rule includes a broad statement that might be better if it weren’t relegated to a specific subrule: “If any element has been transposed in the description, note its original position in the resource.” If this is only meant to apply to information relating to parallel titles & other title information, this sentence should be modified accordingly. However, it is our impression that this is a general rule for DCRM(M).

The reference to 1E6.4 only applies to the last example in the parentheses. The rule about abridging very lengthy other title information is in 1E4. We can’t easily identify the rule that

supports the first example in the parentheses. In any case, we wonder if this instruction reference should be broadened, or if it should be moved to the example it refers to.

7B7.1:

The 2nd sentence is another statement about making a note when data elements have been transposed. Can this be generalized and moved elsewhere?

7B7.5:

Formatting comment: there's an extra return before the examples here.

7B8:

Here's another statement about making a note when transposing elements that might be able to be generalized. The wording problem we have with all of these examples (so far) is using the term "any element", which certainly implies a broader scope.

7B9:

Here's another statement (3rd sentence) about making a note when transposing elements that might be able to be generalized.

In the 5th example, the term "cancel slip" is used. However, the Glossary entry for "cancellation" doesn't include this terminology. Should it?

7B10:

In most cases in DCRM(M), the phrase is just "if considered important". Why is the phrase narrower here: "if considered important for bibliographic purposes"?

7B11.12

For the second example, it might be beneficial to insert a comment to explain why the signature statement is presented in this form. Reviewers had to reread the examples in the instruction a couple times before realizing that this is an example of a situation in which using the standard methods of shortening would "obscure the signing system used by the printer to differentiate parts."

7B12.2

Coloration is not a common technique of musical notation. Could a glossary entry be added for this?

For consistency, should "e.g.," be added to the beginning of the parenthetical statement?

7B12.7:

Why "autograph manuscript" instead of "holograph"? The latter was used in AACR2 (see .7B1), and is also used in RDA.

7B14:

Here's another statement (2nd sentence) about making a note when transposing elements that might be able to be generalized.

7B16.1:

We are glad to see that this instruction, examples, Appendix H, and index all appear to reflect the new *Standard Citation Forms Used in Rare Materials Cataloging*. However, the Works Cited section of DCRM(M) still references the old version:

VanWingen, Peter M. and Belinda D. Urquiza, in collaboration with the Bibliographic Standards Committee, Rare Books and Manuscripts Section, Association of College and Research Libraries. *Standard Citation Forms for Published Bibliographies and Catalogs Used in Rare Book Cataloging*. 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, 1996.

7B16.2:

In the 3rd example, we can't tell if the square brackets are providing alternatives for the cataloger to use, or if they're providing additional information about the citation. If it's the former, then we recommend using a "comment" instead.

7B18.3:

"Include or supply in brackets any important information needed for identification" seems in conflict with 7A3, which states that square brackets are only needed for interpolations within quoted material.

Perhaps 7A3 should read "transcribed or quoted material."

7B19.2.3:

It might help to say to not use the mark of omission in this case.

7B19.2.2:

There are scores that have multiple plate numbers for each piece (say each song in a song cycle) as issued by the publisher. In such a case, this rule indicates that the cataloger would have to put each one in a separate note, even if the plate numbers meet the conditions described in 7B19.2.4. Does DCRM(M) really intend a different way of recording multiple publisher/plate numbers based on issuance? (For an example, see OCLC #606695265, which we assume was cataloged correctly.)

7B21.1.1:

Should the phrase "when they are considered important" be changed to "if considered important"?

7B21.3.4:

The instruction says to begin the note with "Bound with", but the example begins with "With". This should be corrected.

8. Standard Number and Terms of Availability Area

8B2:

The check digit for the 10 & 13 digit ISMNs are the same, so the conversion is only to replace "M" with "9790". However, the check digit for the 10 & 13 digit ISBNs are always different. Should this be clarified here? And, does this instruction need an explanation about how to record/convert the 9-digit ISBNs that were printed before the 10-digit international standard was introduced? (See brief history at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Standard_Book_Number)

Appendix A.

A1:

If RDA is considered, the wording is limiting. The use of RDA is not recorded in the descriptive cataloging form (Leader/18), but in field 040, subfield \$e. It is helpful to provide an example of the order of codes: \$e rda \$e dcrmm. This was raised at a DCRM(G) training session, and the guidance provided there was appreciated by the participants.

A6:

How does this instruction mesh with Introduction, Section X.1.1? When cataloging an instrument method that could be described either as a book or a score (cataloger's judgment), and if the cataloger decides that it's a book, does this mean that "dcrmm" is invalid for use in the 040 \$e? If that's the case, it should be stated explicitly in that Introduction section. And here's another question: what DCRM manual would be used to catalog a serial score?

Appendix B.

General question:

Is a definition of "collection level" needed, or is that really just encompassed by this appendix?

B1.3:

The BSR for Archival Collections is referred to here, but is not in the List of Works Cited section. The AACR2 BSR for Archival Collections is here:

<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/bibco/bsr-maps.html>

We note however that BSRs for individual material types have since been combined into a single *PCC RDA Bibco Standard Record (BSR) Metadata Application Profile* at <http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/bibco/documents/PCC-RDA-BSR.pdf> (see General comments section above).

B2.3:

In the first bullet, should “materials” be replaced by “scores” or “music resources”, or some other term within the scope of DCRM(M)?

B4:

Control field 008/06 (Type of Date):

Coding choices listed here are only "i" and "k", but in 11-14 below, "m" is also listed as an appropriate choice for an open or incomplete collection. Why not list "m" here, as well?

008/7-10 and 008/11-14 (Date1 and Date2):

Would changing the reference to the 260 field to “260/264 field(s)” be appropriate?

008/15:

This should be “15-17”, not just “15”.

1XX:

The first example of a 245 at the top of page 174 should conclude with a period.

1XX, footnote 25:

Is this citation correct? What’s in the List of Works Cited is a bit different: “RBMS Controlled Vocabularies: Controlled Vocabularies for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloging.” Also, should it be italicized?

246:

There’s a singular/plural disconnect between “variant titles” and “provide a useful access point”.

260:

As with the comment on the 008/11-14 above, should 264 be introduced? We don’t believe that its use is limited to RDA-type descriptions.

The last two examples do not show the application of 0G6.5: “If adjacent elements are to be enclosed in square brackets, each is enclosed in its own pair of square brackets.” We believe this is the new ISBD standard and, if so, should be applied here too.

300:

Can’t the collection’s dimensions also be described in terms of linear feet? If so, an example would be helpful.

6XX:

110 in first example does not require the final period; the close parenthesis serves as end punctuation in this field.

655:

The *Ethnographic Thesaurus*, mentioned here, is not in the List of Works Cited section.

Since DCRM(M) mentions LCGFT elsewhere, an example of a 655 using that vocabulary would be a good idea here.

B5.1 & B5.2:

Again, should it be “260/264”?

Appendix C.

C1.8:

We recommend beginning that list with a colon:

Capitalize as instructed in the rules for the language involved; ...

C.3:

Change “edition” (2nd word) to “musical presentation”; drop the parenthetical.

C4.1

We would prefer the addition of “that is” in the 2nd sentence:

In general, if an element begins with a word or abbreviation that is not an integral part

...

C.4.2:

The rule name also includes “addresses” but the text of the rule does not -- shouldn't it?

C5

Should “III.” be ill.?

C6.1

We suggest deleting “the first word”. The corresponding AACR2 rule reads: Capitalize the title proper, parallel titles...

Appendix D.

D.3.3:

Consider modifying this sentence:

This appendix does not address such questions because they are out of scope for DCRM(M); but, however, ...

Appendix F.

F1:

In the 2nd paragraph, should it be “local system or discovery layer”?

F2, reference to 1B6:

In the 2nd sentence, we recommend the following rewording:

If the supplement or section title is indistinctive and dependent for its meaning on the main title (e.g., “Supplement”, “Chapter one”), generally do not provide additional access.

F2, reference to 1G1-1G2:

We prefer rewording the 1st sentence as follows:

Provide access for the titles of additional works named on a chief source without a collective title, unless it is supplementary matter.

F2, reference to 7B4-7B5:

Shouldn't this specify that it's for variants of, or alternatives to, the title proper? We don't believe that the note would be made if the title proper on the t.p., cover, and caption were all identical.

F3:

On p. 203, the two MLA “Types of Composition...” resources are mentioned, but they do not appear in the List of Works Cited.

On p. 203, the reference to MLA's “Types...” document for RDA incorrectly pluralized “compositions”. The website has the following title (as of today, 4/9/15):

Types of Composition for Use in Authorized Access Points for Music
A Manual for Use with RDA

We understand that MLA intends to move this resource from the Yale site to a MLA-hosted site sometime this year.

In the 6th line on p. 203, the capitalization of the “T” in “Cataloger's DeskTop” is incorrect.

Koth's book is cited in footnote 27 but does not appear on the formal List of Works Cited.

Appendix G.

G2: Apostrophus example.

“Roman” should not be capitalized when referring to roman numerals and scripts.

Appendix H.

On p. 215-216, it's not clear why the square brackets are being used for RISM.

Glossary

General question: Are “see also” references supposed to be reciprocal?

If so, “*See also* **Cover title, Spine title**” needs to be added to “**Binder’s title**”.

If so, “*See also* **Copy**” needs to be added to “**Impression**”.

For “**Adaptation (Music)**”: is the qualifier needed for this term within the context of DCRM(M)?

For “**Arrangement (Music)**”: is the qualifier needed for this term within the context of DCRM(M)?

Formatting comment: “**Cover**” isn’t at the right indentation in the Glossary (and it’s not properly preceded by a return). See p. 224.

Also on “**Cover**”: Why are there two definitions (Smiraglia, SMCG). Is this intentional?

Under “**Gathering**” the see also reference should say “*See also* **Format, Signature.**”

The definition of “**Integral**” is out of character with the rest of the Glossary definitions. Should it be “Integral leaf” instead?

Footnote 32, under “Key” contains a reference to a IAML publication, which does not also appear in the formal List of Works Cited.

For “**Leaf of plates**”, the “that” clause is ambiguous. We assume it applies to “publication” rather than “plate”, but it took multiple readings to make sure. Should this definition just be merged with “Plate”? How would catalogers know to look here to find what they’re supposed to do when they have pages of plates?

Under “**Musical presentation statement**”, “source” should be singular in “chief sources”.

For “**Part (Music)**”: is the qualifier needed for this term within the context of DCRM(M)? The term in 5B1.2 is just “part”.

For “**Part books**”: We think this term should be singular, as it is in 5B1.2. It’s possible that the definition will need to be adjusted accordingly.

The differences in the definition of “plate” in the entries for “**Plate**” and “**Leaf of plates**” are confusing. Under “**plate**”, it’s a leaf. In that case, how can there be a single leaf that contains plates?

For “**Plate number (Music)**”: is the qualifier needed for this term within the context of DCRM(M)?

For “**Publisher’s number (Music)**”: is the qualifier needed for this term within the context of DCRM(M)?

Footnote 34, under “Tablature” contains a reference to the *Harvard Dictionary of Music*, which does not also appear in the formal List of Works Cited.

For “**Tablebook**”: This term should be two words, as it is in 5B1.2.

The definition of “**Variant**” is out of character with the rest of the Glossary definitions. Should it be “Variant copy” instead?

List of Works Cited

We have noted above a number of cases where works are mentioned in the DCRM(M) text but do not appear on this list.

The publication date associated with RDA (p. 237) is wrong. As an integrating resource, it’s difficult to pick a single date; however, the earliest possible date would be 2010.

As mentioned above, the reference to *Standard Citation Forms for Rare Materials Cataloging* should be updated to the new online edition.

Index

General comment--when the index refers to a MARC field, it would help to indicate more clearly that this is what the numbers refers to. Example: Access, restrictions on: Appendix B4 (506). Reviewers had trouble deciphering this. Could these types of entries say instead: Appendix B4 (506 field)? This does mirror the text.

Accompanying material, title access points: Appendix F2 (7B11)
It looks like this should be 7B13.

Announcements:

1A2.2 should be 0G5.2 (or reinstate 1A2.2 as Omission of pious invocations, etc). The entry for Devices, omission of is 0G5.2, so this was probably the intention.

Dedications:

1A2.2 should be 0G5.2 (or reinstate 1A2.2 as Omission of pious invocations, etc). Also Dedications doesn’t currently appear in the text. It should be added to the list at 0G5.2

Epigrams:

1A2.2 should be 0G5.2 (or reinstate 1A2.2 as Omission of pious invocations, etc.)

Invocations:

1A2.2 should be 0G5.2 (or reinstate 1A2.2 as Omission of pious invocations, etc.)

Mottoes:

1A2.2 should be 0G5.2 (or reinstate 1A2.2 as Omission of pious invocations, etc.)

Quotations, omission of:

1A2.2 should be 0G5.2 (or reinstate 1A2.2 as Omission of pious invocations, etc.)

Task Force Roster:

Matthew Haugen, chair
Rare Book Cataloger
Columbia University Libraries
102 Butler Library
535 West 114th St.
New York, NY 10027
(212) 851-2451
matthew.haugen@columbia.edu

Laurence Creider
Head, Archives and Special Collections Dept.
University Library
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003
(575) 646-4756
lcreider@lib.nmsu.edu

Kathy Glennan
Head, Authorities and Speciality Cataloging
Metadata Services Dept.
2200 McKeldin Library
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 405-9331
kglennan@umd.edu

Elyssa Gould
Electronic Acquisitions & Serials Librarian
University of Michigan Law Library
801 Monroe Street

Ann Arbor, MI 48109
(734) 764-0935
elyssa.sanner@gmail.com

Jessica Hayden
Technical Services Manager
University of Northern Colorado
Campus Box 48
Greeley, CO 80639
(970) 351-2183
jessica.hayden@unco.edu

Mary Huismann
Music/Media Original Cataloger
University of Minnesota Libraries
160 Wilson Library
309 19th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55455
(612) 625-5616
huism002@umn.edu

Maria Oldal
Head of Cataloging and Database Maintenance
The Morgan Library & Museum
225 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10016-3403
(212) 590-0382
oldalm@themorgan.org

Tracey Snyder
Music Catalog and Instruction Librarian
Sidney Cox Library of Music and Dance
220 Lincoln Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853-4101
(607) 255-6160
tls224@cornell.edu

Sarah Theimer
Principal Cataloger and Metadata Librarian
Syracuse University Library
222 Waverly Ave
Syracuse, NY 13244
(315) 443-9777

shtheime@syr.edu

Additional input from:

Linda Blair
Head of Cataloging
Sibley Music Library, Eastman School of Music
27 Gibbs St.
Rochester, NY 14604
(585) 274-1368
lblair@esm.rochester.edu

Elizabeth Hobart
Special Collections and Humanities Cataloger
Wilson and Davis Libraries
CB #3926
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
(919) 962-4305
emccraw@email.unc.edu

Amy Strickland
Music Librarian
Marta & Austin Weeks Music Library
University of Miami
5501 San Amaro Drive
Coral Gables, FL, 3324
(305) 284-1895
a.strickland@miami.edu