

THE IMPACT OF AACR-II ON CATALOGUING OF MUSIC AND SOUND
RECORDINGS: REPORTS FROM THE CATALOGUING COMMITTEE WORKSHOP,
JUNE 11, 1981 (PART II).

Popular music and AACR-2

The Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (1967) barely acknowledged the existence of popular music, both in the rules for printed music and those for sound recordings. Fortunately, the classical music bias so prevalent in AACR is not nearly as strong in AACR-2. Unlike the old rules, AACR-2 has many popular music examples throughout chapter 5 (description of printed music), chapter 6 (description of sound recordings) and chapter 21 (choice of access points). However, there are still only a very few popular music examples in the rules for uniform titles in chapter 25.

Description of sound recordings is very different now that full ISBD areas and punctuation are being used. A full publication and distribution area, including place and name of the publisher, is given. The label number is put in a note rather than in the imprint. The performer may be named in the statement of responsibility area if his participation "goes beyond that of performance, execution, or interpretation of a work" as is frequently the case with performers of popular music, jazz, etc.

A major breakthrough in the cataloguing of sound recordings is the provision for entry of collections under the name of the principal performer (21.23C). The average user of popular music sound recordings usually considers the performer to be the most important aspect of the recording. Previously, such collections of works by various composers would have been entered under title.

Often folios of popular songs are published containing the music (usually in a version for voice and piano with chord symbols) which has previously been issued on a particular sound recording. With AACR-2 an anomaly can arise in that the sound recording and the corresponding song folio could have different main entries. If the authorship is diffuse the song folio would be entered under title, as under the old rules, but now the corresponding sound recording could be entered under the performer.

In chapter 25 (Uniform titles) the rules concerning arrangements and the medium of accompaniment for songs are among the few remaining remnants of the classical music bias of AACR. Since the rules assume that the normal accompaniment for a song is keyboard, any other accompaniment is supposed to be

specified. This is very difficult and misleading for popular songs since it is often impossible to know what the original accompaniment was. Despite the fact that the first printed publication of a song is often in piano-vocal sheet music, the accompaniment was likely conceived by the composer on some other instrument, or at least in a more complicated arrangement.

Pending acceptance by the Joint Steering Committee, the National Library has been implementing changes in these areas suggested by the CAML Cataloguing Committee and accepted by the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing. In popular songs the melody line is the most important aspect. Often the accompaniment is improvised and varied at each performance. So long as the vocal element is essentially intact, the song may be considered "un-arranged" so far as the uniform title is concerned, whatever the accompaniment. The accompaniment other than keyboard need not be specified. However, if the song were changed to an instrumental piece, or if the vocal line were greatly changed, it would be considered an arrangement. These changes would allow popular songs to be handled in a manner particularly appropriate for the idiom, rather than imposing rules designed for classical art songs on contemporary popular songs.

Popular music is frequently issued on three types of sound recordings: discs, cassettes and cartridges. Cataloguing the latter two formats is often a problem since the information supplied on the container and labels is usually less complete than that supplied with the discs. This problem can be minimized by cataloguing the disc first, whenever possible, and using the information from the disc to aid in cataloguing the cassette and cartridge.

Joan Colquhoun.

Recent ISBD Developments

A summary comparison of AACR-2 Chapter 5 with the recently published ISBD (PM) points up four areas of significant discrepancy, each of which can be accounted for by reference to the context within which the respective provisions were formulated. The practical implications of these discrepancies for the exchange and use of bibliographic data on printed music vary considerably.

The first relates to the treatment of generic titles. Whereas AACR-2 uniformly calls for the inclusion of medium of performance, key, and/or opus number as part of the title proper when the title itself consists of a generic term, ISBD(PM) calls for

the inclusion of these elements as part of the title proper only when they precede the generic term or are presented typographically as part of the title proper. While the ISBD provision serves to ensure consistency in treatment of titles proper irrespective of the type of material being described, and avoids the sort of special treatment that resulted in discrepancies between earlier editions of ISBD(M) and ISBD(S), in so doing it makes the use of uniform titles for musical works with generic titles virtually obligatory. Assuming uniform titles are used, the discrepancies in treatment of generic titles are more or less inconsequential. If uniform titles are not used, however, the discrepancies are significant enough to seriously impede the automated processing of files through matching of titles and machine-sorting of records in a single logical sequence.

The second discrepancy lies in the conventions for recording other title information in more than one language. If the title proper appears in one language only but other title information appears in more than one language, both AACR-2 and ISBD(PM) make allowance for recording multiple language forms of the other title information. There is a difference, however, in the use of prescribed punctuation: AACR-2 precedes each language form by a colon; ISBD(PM) precedes the second and subsequent forms by an equals sign. Again ISBD(PM) is more consistent than AACR-2 in demarcating parallel information, regardless of its function, invariably with an equals sign, as prescribed by ISBD(G). From the point of view of clarity of presentation, for comprehension either by human or machine intelligence, however, the AACR-2 provision has the merit of unambiguously differentiating between parallel titles and other title information, a distinction which functionally is of greater import than the signalling of a parallel relationship between repetitive occurrences of other title information.

The third discrepancy relates to the treatment of statements of musical presentation, such as "score and set of parts", which often appear on the chief source of information. ISBD(PM) designates a printed music specific area (area 3) for recording such statements, and provides for supplying the information even when no statement appears in the publication. AACR-2 defines no material specific area for printed music. A proposal for the addition to AACR-2 of an area for statement of musical presentation has been put forward, but as yet there is no consensus on the criteria that would govern inclusion of such a statement.

The fourth and last discrepancy between AACR-2 and ISBD(PM) lies in the provisions for recording standard numbers, publishers'

numbers, and plate numbers. ISBD(PM) stipulates that a publishers' number is given only if there is no ISBN, and that a plate number may be given following the ISBN or publishers' number. Under AACR-2 the presence or absence of an ISBN has no bearing on the recording of other numbers. Plate numbers are to be recorded if they appear, but publishers' numbers are to be given only if the plate number is not given. Thus the record for an item that bears both a publishers' number and a plate number but no ISBN, might, under ISBD(PM), give only the publishers' number, while under AACR-2 it would give only the plate number. As a result the numbers which could confirm a match between the two records fail to do so simply because of the arbitrary exclusion of one or other of the numbers from each of the records.

The proposals for amendments and additions to ISBD(NBM) put forward by a joint IAML/LASA working group, addressing specifically the description of sound recordings, focus on four areas: statements responsibility; physical description; notes; and standard numbers.

The proposal recommends that the names of producers be included in the statement of responsibility; it sets out guidelines for the arrangement of multiple statements of responsibility in a "normal" order; and it recommends that the names of all performers deemed necessary for inclusion in the description be recorded in the statement of responsibility, and that the names not be divided between the statement of responsibility and the notes area.

For the physical description area the proposal sets out several tables of "industry norms" for sound recordings in various formats, and stipulates that characteristics of a given recording that conform with the industry norm for that particular format need not be given.

In the notes area, the proposal recommends the regular inclusion, when information is available, of details on the recording session, giving the place, the name of the recording company, the date, and the name of the producer.

Finally, in the standard numbers area, the proposal recommends that the issue number always be included, even when a standard number (ISBN, ISSN) is available. It also stipulates that the issue number must be preceded by the label name.

Tom Delsey.

The Concise AACR-2 and the Règles de catalogage anglo-américaines, 2e édition

There was little to report concerning the concise AACR-2 rules beyond a very brief summary of their overall characteristics and structure and the absence of provisions for rules for uniform titles of musical works. The lack of rules for uniform titles resulted from the recommendations of the CAML Cataloguing Committee, conveyed to Michael Gorman through the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing. Our report, drafted by Jane Baldwin, had recommended reference to the full text of the rules, since there seemed to be no satisfactory way to abridge uniform title rules; i.e., to give results which would be in harmony with the full rules.

Concerning the French text of the rules, the thorniest problems result from the text's use of terminology which is either misleading or artificial (in that it does not reflect common French usage among musicians and French language literature on music). Proposed improvements were included in the report sent to Clarisse Cardin (Secretary, Canadian Committee on Cataloguing) and the translators, Paule Rolland-Thomas and Pierre Deslauriers.

C. Gerald Parker.

The proposed new Dewey 780 schedule

Although this workshop is primarily about AACR-2, we can scarcely allow it to end without mentioning the other major event in music cataloguing this year: the proposed revision of the Dewey 780 schedule for music.

Those of us who have worked with Dewey 780 for any length of time know that Melvil Dewey was no musician, and the appearance of a phoenix schedule is not a moment too soon. The proposed schedule is a vast improvement over the present one, and if what I say seems predominantly negative, it is only because the plus side is so self-evident to anyone who spends a few minutes with it that it scarcely needs comment.

It is the drawbacks to the scheme that we need to discuss, so that we can decide if it does fundamentally meet the needs of music librarians without major modifications and, if so, what minor changes could be made to improve it still further.

The proposed schedule is fully faceted, both 0 and 1 being reserved for introducing subfacets. Increased number-building is required, e.g. previously enumerated numbers such as Suites for orchestra (formerly 785.8) and Children's songs (formerly 784.624) now have to be synthesized. The new scheme removes many anomalies present in the old one. It is generally able to

produce a more logical order of concepts and is more hospitable to the introduction of new ones. However, there are some fundamental difficulties which need discussion.

1) The new schedule no longer attempts to separate treatises, scores and sound recordings within the basic sequence of numbers. The use of -5 and -06 to indicate scores has been dropped, as has the positioning of sound recordings at 789.912. The distinction between collections and separates (to use LC terminology) has also gone. Two suggestions are made: the use of the prefix M for scores, already an option in previous editions, or the use of a new standard subdivision -027, subdivided further into manuscripts, printed scores, sound recordings, etc. Either of these could lead to problems when combining with 016 for bibliographies and discographies, as well as problems of shelf order which must be solved outside the schedule.

2) The facet ordering owes a lot to the BCM classification. For vocal music it is drastically revised and is now i) Size of ensemble, ii) Type of voice, iii) Presence or absence of accompaniment and iv) Vocal forms (sacred and secular music are distinguished only at this level, which may not be to the liking of all music librarians).

The instrumental categories are based roughly on the Sachs/Hornbostel classification of music instruments, with Western instruments brought to the beginning of each class. Restrictions imposed by the decimal system produce some strange bedfellows, such as Saxophones and bagpipes at 788.7.

The major innovation is the reservation of 789 for books about individual composers. Two alternative lists of composers are given, either grouped by chronological period or in a single alphabetical sequence. Popular and jazz composers are interfiled with classical. Several alternative forms of notations are provided within each list. The major problem is that any list must be finite, and we are instructed to class all composers not in the list in 789 without subdivision (presumably with a cutter). This inevitably creates two parallel alphabetical lists. For example, Tomasek, who is not in the list, would class in 789 before Beethoven who, being in the list, has his own number at 789.15. It would be better to use some form of cuttering to allow all composers to be accommodated in a single sequence.

3) Treatment of styles other than Western art music is better than in DDC 19, but still shows signs of less care than the rest of the schedule. Folk music can be accommodated but the numbers are longer. Jazz is no longer treated as a musical form (!) and has its own number with some breakdown into styles and

periods in 781.626. But now ragtime is separated from it amid the chaos of 781.624, Western popular music. The content and order here seem to be random: Country, Blues, Rock, Soul, Ragtime, Skiffle, Afro-American music (why skiffle and not reggae or disco?). Much more work is needed here.

4) Length of numbers is perhaps the biggest problem posed by the new schedule. Use of the full power of the scheme may allow more precision in describing the topic, but may produce numbers that many librarians will consider too long to use, e.g. Christmas carols at 782.28163293 (formerly 783.65). This is an extreme case, which incidentally illustrates the problem of synthesizing numbers that used to be enumerated; but on average numbers containing no more information than the DDC 19 number seem to be 1 to 2 digits longer, not counting the extra length required to indicate a score. On the other hand, some numbers are shorter than before. The exact impact of this depends on the size and focus of the individual collection.

Linked to this problem is the ease of shortening numbers for use in small collections. Many of the numbers cannot be abridged in this way without altering them as well; the facets dropped by simply shortening the number may be just the ones that should be retained for a small collection. This has implications for the design of the next abridged edition of the DDC schedules.

5) Apart from the longer numbers produced by having to synthesize numbers that were formerly enumerated, some of these topics now appear impossible to express at all, e.g. songs on specific topics (formerly 784.68, add 000-999), studies and exercises and teaching pieces (formerly -51 added to the number for the type of instrumental music), record reviews (formerly 789.913).

6) Some of the problems solved by the new scheme are:

- i) Chamber works with piano; e.g., piano quartets, formerly listed under 785.74 as quartets with the violin mandatorily singled out as the most important instrument(!), are now classed as keyboard and string quartets in 785.284.
- ii) The problem of distinguishing accompanied solo sonatas from chamber duos (e.g. violin and piano at 787.1 or 785.7271) is now solved because phoenix 780 would now class them all in 787.2.
- iii) Interfiling of classical and popular instrumental music is one sequence. These may now be separated by adding from the character facet in 781.5-.6 to distinguish the popular music.

[A show of hands taken at the beginning of this talk showed that only one of the librarians present was from a library currently using the Dewey Decimal Classification, so that in a sense the talk was aimed at the wrong audience.

I hope to contact users of the DDC later through this newsletter to find out their feelings about some of the features of the new scheme, and whether they would consider using it or a modified version of it. Meanwhile, if anyone has seen or used the schedule and has any comments to make about it now, I would be pleased to hear from them at the Cataloguing Branch, National Library of Canada, 395 Wellington St., Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0N4. Telephone: (613) 997-6200, extension 55.]

Anthony S. Woodward.

* * * * *

EDITOR'S
NOTES



What a year this has been for the publishing of books on music in Canada! In our April issue we read Helmut Kallmann's review of George Proctor's Canadian Music of the Twentieth Century; in November Beth Miller's review of Maria Calderisi's Music Publishing in the Canadas, 1800-1867; and in this issue George Proctor's review of the long-awaited Encyclopedia of Music in Canada.

For those of you wondering about the significance of our new logo, introduced in volume 10 of this Newsletter, I might suggest that I see three trumpets performing a fanfare. Could they be heralding the three books reviewed in our three issues this year? They certainly deserve such a welcome.