

The University of Akron

From the Selected Works of David Procházka

2002

Cataloging Contemporary Music Manuscripts and Related Materials: A Look at Library of Congress Practices--Part II

David Procházka, *The University of Akron*



Available at: <https://works.bepress.com/david-prochazka/16/>

Cataloging Contemporary Music Manuscripts and Related Materials: A Look at Library of Congress Practices: Part II

David Procházka

ABSTRACT. This article examines Library of Congress's descriptive cataloging for manuscript music and related materials, and determines patterns of consistent practice as well as areas of the record and types of information that are handled inconsistently. Focus is on practices for MARC coding. Several bibliographic records are presented and analyzed. Part I of the article described how the study set was developed and examined areas of the records governed by AACR2. [Article copies available for a fee from *The Haworth Document Delivery Service*: 1-800-HAWORTH. E-mail address: <getinfo@haworthpressinc.com> Website: <<http://www.HaworthPress.com>> © 2002 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.]

KEYWORDS. Cataloging, MARC, music manuscripts, standards, unpublished materials

INTRODUCTION

In the first part of this article, which appeared in the previous issue of *Technical Services Quarterly* (vol. 19, no. 4), the existing literature

David Procházka is Music/Special Materials Cataloger for University Libraries, University of Akron, Bierce Library 176, Akron, OH 44325-1712 (E-mail: davidp@uakron.edu). He received his Bachelor's of Music from Chicago Musical College, Roosevelt University, and his MA in Library and Information Science from Rosary College (now Dominican University).

The author gratefully acknowledges the encouragement and editorial advice offered by Delmus Williams, Dean of University Libraries, University of Akron.

Technical Services Quarterly, Vol. 20(1) 2002
<http://www.haworthpressinc.com/store/product.asp?sku=J124>
© 2002 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

about cataloging music manuscripts was examined, but no mention was made of problems relating to contemporary manuscripts or related materials such as computer printouts, photocopies, and microreproductions. Nor was there a discussion of applying the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* (Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR 1998; hereafter AACR2) or the *MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data* (Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office 1999; hereafter MARC) when cataloging these materials.

The second part of this article is designed to fill some of that void. A search was conducted in the *Library of Congress Online Catalog* (Library of Congress 2001) to identify relevant bibliographic records. Records in the resulting study set were examined to determine if consistent patterns could be identified in Library of Congress (LC) cataloging. In the previous article, features of the descriptive cataloging were examined and compared. In this article, the use of descriptive access points will be briefly examined, followed by a detailed look at MARC coding. Several examples of LC cataloging will then be discussed.

ACCESS POINTS

An examination of the study set of 720 bibliographic records from LC's online catalog shows that, in general, access points are applied in much the same way when cataloging music manuscripts as they are in the cataloging of published music. There are, however, several practices that deserve mention.

Personal Name Access Points

Main entries, with uniform titles, are added as they would be if the music were published. Added entries for lyricists, arrangers, translators, and related works are also routinely added. Of 202 records with notes beginning "Gift of . . ." or "Previously owned by . . ." the personal name appears as an added entry only four times. Likewise, of the 90 records that include information about a dedicatee, only five contain tracings for the dedicatee. Four records include a person's name after "in honor of . . ." On three of these records, the honoree is traced as a personal name. On the remaining record, the honoree is traced as a subject.

Two records that indicate "Ms. in the hand of . . ." trace the person's name. However, one with the phrase "Presumably in the hand of . . ."

does not include a personal name tracing. Two records contain a note starting "Commissioned by . . ." The commissioning person is not traced on either record. (See also following discussion of corporate commissions.) One statement of responsibility includes the phrase "as sung by Alberta Hunter." Comparable phrases appear on a great deal of twentieth-century, published American sheet music, but they are not typically transcribed. In addition to the transcription, Hunter also receives a tracing.

Corporate Name Access Points

Corporate names are traced on 147 of the 720 bibliographic records in the study set. In all but 12 instances, the tracing is for an LC fund or foundation that commissioned the work being cataloged. The Serge Koussevitzky Music Foundation was traced most frequently: 80 times. There are two instances in which only the first of four commissioning agencies is traced, though all are identified in a note. Beyond these 147 records with tracings, there are only 12 records identifying commissioning agencies that do not include corporate name access points. These include works commissioned by LC funds and foundations as well as works commissioned by outside agencies. The pattern is clear: commissioning agencies are traced as corporate names. Compare this to the previously mentioned fact that commissioning individuals are not traced.

Topical Access Points

As with name access points, the majority of subject headings are assigned as they would be for published music. An exception should be noted: there is great irregularity in the assignment of subject headings that collocate reproductions (e.g., Music—Manuscripts—Facsimiles); however, an analysis of this aspect of the records in the study set is beyond the scope of this investigation. Likewise, a discussion of the variety of classification numbers used in the records would extend this report beyond a reasonable length.

MARC CODING

The MARC format was initially developed by LC "as a means of converting the information on the Library's catalog cards to machine readable form for the purpose of printing bibliographical products by

computer" (Cundiff 1993, 50). MARC quickly evolved into a communications format, capable of transmitting data from one automated system to another (Taylor 1999, 59). The MARC format was an essential component for the development of cooperative cataloging services such as OCLC Online Computer Library Center.

As with AACR2, consistency in the application of MARC 21 is essential to the success of shared cataloging. It is not surprising then, that the bibliographic records in the current study set are coded in much the same way as are bibliographic records for published music. The following discussion considers MARC coding in the study set that may not be consistent with coding found in other LC bibliographic records.

Leader Position 06—Type of Record

Within the context of this investigation, the two possible values for type of record are "c" for printed music and "d" for manuscript music. The original expectation was that, because none of the records contained either a publisher or a place of publication, and because all of the records bore a note about the form of the manuscript (e.g., "Ms." or "Computer printout"), all of the records would use value "d" for type of record. However, in the study set, 148 of the records are tagged "c" and 572 of the records are tagged "d." There is some correlation between the note about the form and the value of the type of record code, but the distinction is far from exact. Just how exact is delineated in Table 1.

In general, original manuscripts and computer printouts are coded as manuscript music, while photocopies of these materials are coded as published music. If this were considered to be actual coding policy, however, then 62 of the 720 records (> 8.6 percent) are coded incorrectly. Weitz (2001, 44) discusses some confusing aspects of applying this code, but does not address coding for reproductions of manuscripts. Of the 148 records coded as printed (record type "c"), none contain bibliographic information about a publisher or place of publication. This will be examined more fully later in the report.

Field 008, Position 06—Type of Date/Publication Status

All records in the study set are assigned "s," "m," or "q" as the type of date(s), which indicate a single date, a span of multiple dates (for a multi-volume work), or a questionable date, respectively. No records are coded "r" for reprint or reissue. Date type "r" is applied when a previously published item is reprinted or reissued, so it would not be an appropriate choice for materials in the study set. On the other hand,

TABLE 1. Notes on General Nature of the Manuscript and Corresponding MARC Coding for Type of Record

Type of bibliographic note	MARC coded "c" (printed music)	MARC coded "d" (manuscript music)
None	0	8
Holograph & variants	5	489
Holograph (photocopy) & variants	79	19
Ms. & variants	2	27
Ms. (photocopy) & variants	50	27
Computer printout & variants	6	19
Computer printout (photocopy)	5	2
Photocopy & variants	1	1

because LC treats photocopied manuscripts as printed materials, it would seem reasonable to use date type "p" (date of distribution/release/issue and date of production/recording session when different). Then two dates could be coded: one for the date of the photocopy and another for the date of the original manuscript. Instead, LC typically uses only the date of the original manuscript and codes it as a single date, not accounting for the possibility that the copy might have been made much later than the original document.

Field 008, Positions 15-17—Place of Publication, Production, or Execution

For printed materials (e.g., books and music scores), a two- or three-letter code for the place of publication is to be added in these positions. For their manuscript counterparts, the place of production or execution is to be added instead. In the study set, 357 records (nearly 50 percent) are coded "dcu," meaning that they were published or produced in the District of Columbia. Comparing this value with information in the notes about where manuscripts were created shows that there is very little correlation between the two. Of the 72 records with the type of record code "c" (printed music) and the place of publication code "dcu," only one includes a note indicating that the work was created in Washington, D.C. On the other hand, 13 of these records contain notes indicating that the work was created elsewhere. The remaining 58 records bear no indication of where the works may have been created, other than the value "dcu" in the place-of-publication positions.

A similar pattern of inconsistency holds true for the 285 records with type of record code "d" and place of publication code "dcu." There is no correlation between the use of code "dcu" and notes indicating that compositions were commissioned using a Library of Congress fund, so this does not provide the explanation for the inconsistency. Indeed, no possible explanation could be identified by examining the records in the study set.

Other frequently occurring codes for place of publication include "nyu" for New York (in 124 records), "xxu" for an unknown place within the United States (in 78 records), and "xx" for a completely unknown place (in 73 records). The remaining 88 records include a smattering of codes for 29 other locations. While these show a bit more correlation between notes contained in the records, there is still no clear indication about the logic used in choosing a value for the place of publication code. It is apparent however, that for those materials with record type code "c" (printed music), there is no attempt to code for a possible place of publication. Instead, these records tend to be coded with a value indicating the place of creation of the original manuscript. In short, coding of this value is almost completely unreliable.

Field 008, Position 23 for Music--Form of Item

The value "r" for regular print reproduction is typically assigned for photocopies of published materials, but LC does not assign it to photocopies of music manuscripts. As noted above, these are treated as publications in their own right. In the entire study set, only two records are assigned a form of item value other than "blank." One is for a microfiche reproduction of a holograph. The form of item value is "b." As with microfiche of published materials, the description is that of the work being reproduced, in this case the holograph; the microfiche reproduction is described in a single note. This record bears a type of record value of "d" (manuscript music). The other record is for a holograph reproduced on microfilm. The form of item value is "a." The other pertinent details of the record closely parallel those of the microfiche record just described.

The "blank" value in this position on most of the records in the study set indicates that the material being cataloged is not considered a "reproduction in regular eye-readable print, such as a photocopy" (Library of Congress. Network Development and MARC Standards Office 1999, 008-Music-7). It would be worthwhile to consider coding photo-

copies of manuscripts with form of item value "r" rather than treating them as printed materials with the "blank" value.

Field 042—Authentication Code

The coding of the rest of the information in the bibliographic records under examination matches the coding used for other types of materials. It is worth noting that five of the records contain "lccopycat" as an authentication code in field 042, meaning that LC used a bibliographic record created by another institution for their cataloging. This code appears on records for manuscripts and for photocopies of manuscripts. Five records constitute a very small number of cases; even so, it seems appropriate to think of copy cataloging as an option when cataloging music manuscripts and related materials. It is likely that the percentage will increase as LC continues to incorporate more copy cataloging into its own workflow. This supports the main premise of these articles: there would be value in standardizing the cataloging of music manuscripts and related materials because the cataloging can be shared.

THE RECORDS

Thus far, individual components of the records in the study set have been examined. To provide a broader perspective, several records are presented here and discussed individually to highlight aspects of the preceding discussions. The records are not complete, but sufficient information has been included to demonstrate particular points and to let the reader retrieve the complete record if desired.

Figure 1 is an example of a straightforward record for a music manuscript. Note that the type of record is coded "d" (for manuscript music) and a single date is assigned: that of the probable date of the creation of the manuscripts. Because Koussevitzky's home at the time was Boston, the place code "dcu" seems curious. No cataloging is provided to explain this value. Though AACR2 chapter 4 ("Manuscripts") precludes the use of the material specific details area, musical presentation statements such as the one in Figure 1 ("Partition d'orchestre") are not uncommon on music manuscripts. In keeping with the guidelines of AACR2 chapter 4, only a date is provided in the publication, distribution, etc., area. Also, "ms." is included in the physical description. As in most of the examples in the study set, the note about the nature, scope, or form ("Arranger's holograph") precedes the note about form of com-

FIGURE 1. Record for Music Manuscript

LC Control Number: 90751338
 Type of Record: d
 Type of Date/Publication Status: s
 Date 1: 1938
 Place of Publication, Production, or Execution: dcu
 Form of Item: [blank]
 040 __ DLC |c DLC |d DLC
 245 00 Fair Harvard / |c arranged for chorus and orchestra for the tercentenary of
 Harvard University by Serge Koussevitzky.
 254 __ Partition d'orchestre.
 260 __ |c [1938?]
 300 __ 1 ms. score (14 p.) ; |c 35 cm.
 500 __ Arranger's holograph.
 500 __ Chorus: SSAATTBB.

position and medium of performance ("Chorus: SSAATTBB"), showing precedence of AACR2 chapter 4 ("Manuscripts") over chapter 5 ("Music").

Computer printouts are cataloged quite similarly to original manuscripts, as demonstrated in Figure 2. The type of record is still coded "d" (music manuscript). Note that "ms." has been dropped from the physical description. Also note that, although the commissioning agency is noted, it is not traced in this case. In this example, accompanying material is mentioned only in a note. Great variety exists in the description of accompanying materials among records in the study set. In some cases, materials that presumably could have been cataloged together were cataloged on separate bibliographic records. In other cases, a single bibliographic record describes multiple manuscripts and reproductions. It would be dangerous to speculate on the rationale for these variations without examining the actual materials and knowing their provenance.

Figure 3 is cataloging for a set of transparencies. Note that these are identified by "ms." in the physical description. Also notice that the commissioning agency is traced. In this example, the transparencies are accompanied by sketches, which are provided controlled access via the subject heading "Musical sketches." A detailed date ("1975 Nov. 10") is given in the date area, and a copyright date ("c1975") is quoted in a note.

A photocopy of a holograph is cataloged in Figure 4. The type of record is now "c" (printed record). The date type remains "s" (single date), and the coded date is that of the original manuscript, not necessarily of

FIGURE 2. Record for Computer Printout

LC Control Number: 00521455
 Type of Record: d
 Type of Date/Publication Status: s
 Date 1: 1999
 Place of Publication, Production, or Execution: xxu
 Form of Item: [blank]
 040 __ DLC |c DLC
 100 1_ Copland, Aaron, |d 1900-
 240 10 Selections; |p arr.
 245 13 An act of becoming : |b The Graham Copland collaboration / |c music by
 Aaron Copland ; arr. and orch. by Allen Krantz.
 260 __ |c 1999.
 300 __ 1 score (23 leaves) ; |c 28 cm.
 500 __ Computer printout.
 500 __ For 2 speakers (Aaron Copland and Martha Graham) flute, bass clarinet,
 bassoon, piano, 2 violins, viola, and violoncello.
 500 __ "Commissioned by the Martha Graham Company."
 500 __ Accompanied by: 1 computer disk (3 1/2 in) for Macintosh (1.40 MB).
 600 10 Copland, Aaron, |d 1900- |v Drama.
 600 10 Graham, Martha |v Drama.
 700 1_ Krantz, Allen. |4 arr

the photocopy. In spite of the fact that the type of record is "c," no place of publication or name of publisher is included, just the date of the original manuscript. Note that, even though the photocopy has been altered by hand, the work being cataloged is still treated as a copy. Although a copyright date is quoted in a note ("c1968"), that date is not used to determine the date of publication in either the publication area (where "1963 Mar." is given) or in the fixed field (where "1963" is given). Also in this record, notice that the subject headings are assigned as prescribed on the instruction sheet for facsimiles (H 1595, dated Feb. 2000) in the *Subject Heading Manual, Subject Headings* (Library of Congress, Cataloging Policy and Support Office 1996). These headings for facsimiles are inconsistently applied on appropriate records in the study set.

It would be very interesting to compare the actual document described in Figure 4 with that described in Figure 5. In the latter record, "S.I." and "s.n." were supplied as place of publication and name of publisher respectively. The "Holograph (photocopy)" note in Figure 3 has been replaced with "Reproduced from holograph." Despite the fact that

FIGURE 3. Record for Transparencies

LC Control Number: 90753801
 Type of Record: d
 Type of Date/Publication Status: s
 Date 1: 1975
 Place of Publication, Production, or Execution: dcu
 Form of Item: [blank]
 040 __ DLC |c DLC
 100 1_ Feldman, Morton, |d 1926-
 240 10 Instruments, |n no. 2
 245 10 Instruments (II) / |c Morton Feldman.
 260 __ |c 1975 Nov. 10.
 300 __ 1 ms. score (27 leaves) ; |c 35 cm.
 500 __ Holograph.
 500 __ For alto flute, oboe, clarinet, trumpet, trombone, tuba, harp, piano, percussion, and double bass.
 500 __ Caption title.
 500 __ "For the Serge Koussevitzky [Music] Foundation in the Library of Congress, and dedicated to the memory of Serge and Natalie Koussevitzky."
 500 __ "c1975 Universal Edt."
 500 __ Transparencies.
 500 __ Accompanied by sketches (28 p. of ms. music ; 32 cm.).
 650 _0 Musical sketches.
 710 2_ Library of Congress. |b Serge Koussevitzky Music Foundation.

FIGURE 4. Record for Photocopy of Holograph

LC Control Number: 92763333
 Type of Record: c
 Type of Date/Publication Status: s
 Date 1: 1963
 Place of Publication, Production, or Execution: nyu
 Form of Item: [blank]
 040 __ DLC |c DLC
 100 1_ Aitken, Hugh.
 240 10 Suites, |m double bass
 245 00 suite [sic] for solo bass / |c Hugh Aitken.
 260 __ |c 1963 Mar.
 300 __ 4 p. music ; |c 32 cm.
 500 __ |a Holograph (photocopy).
 500 __ Caption title.
 500 __ Edited and annotated in pencil for publication.
 500 __ "c1968, Oxford University Press."
 541 __ Placed on deposit in 1970.
 650 _0 Music |x Manuscripts |x Facsimiles.
 600 10 Aitken, Hugh |x Manuscripts |x Facsimiles.

FIGURE 5. Record for Reproduction of Holograph

LC Control Number: 98703152
 Type of Record: c
 Type of Date/Publication Status: s
 Date 1: 1975
 Place of Publication, Production, or Execution: xx
 Form of Item: [blank]
 040 __ DLC |c DLC |d DLC
 100 1_ Zimmermann, Walter, |d 1949-
 245 10 Beginners mind = |b Anfänger sein : 4, für einen Pianisten, 1975 / |c
 Walter Zimmermann.
 260 __ [S.l. : |b s.n., |c 1977?]
 300 __ 101 p. of music ; |c 30 cm.
 548 __ Includes English words by Shunryū Suzuki to be spoken and sung by the
 pianist.
 500 __ Reproduced from holograph. At end: Köln, den 10.4.1975 & (19.11.1977).
 650 _0 Music |v Manuscripts |v Facsimiles.
 600 10 Zimmermann, Walter, |d 1949- |v Manuscripts |v Facsimiles.

the original holograph was labeled as being made in Cologne, no possible place of publication is offered in this latter record. The differences between the two records are quite numerous, if one pictures the materials being cataloged as being fairly similar in nature. Clearly, the former was cataloged based on the manuscript model of AACR2 chapter 4, while the latter was cataloged using chapter 5 for published music. The record included in Figure 5 did not end up being part of the study set because "S.l." and "s.n." were used in the publication area, and records with any values in this area were excluded from the study set.

CONCLUSION

Many more records could be examined in detail, but the preceding selection demonstrates many of the unexpected and sometimes inconsistent practices encountered in LC's cataloging of music manuscripts and related materials. They also show the unusual mixture of rules from AACR2 chapters 2, 4, and 5 used to catalog these materials. It is hoped that this investigation will stimulate discussion and debate that might ultimately lead to more thoroughly developed and more consistently applied guidelines for the cataloging of music manuscripts and related materials.

REFERENCES

- Cundiff, M. W. 1993. *Cataloging Concepts: Descriptive Cataloging: Instructor's Manual*. Washington: Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service.
- Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR. 1998. *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*. 2d ed., 1998 rev. Ottawa: Canadian Library Association; Chicago: American Library Association. (With 1999 Amendments).
- Library of Congress. 2001. *Library of Congress Online Catalog*. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress. Updated March 13, 2001. (<http://catalog.loc.gov/>). Accessed March 18-April 21, 2001.
- Library of Congress. Cataloging Policy and Support Office. 1996. *Subject Cataloging Manual, Subject Headings*. 5th ed. Washington, D.C.: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress. (Loose-leaf; examined Dec. 9, 2001).
- Library of Congress. Network Development and MARC Standards Office. 1999. *MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data: Including Guidelines for Content Designation*. 1999 ed. Washington: Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service. (Loose-leaf; examined September 16, 2001).
- Taylor, A. G. 1999. *The Organization of Information*. Library and Information Science Text Series. Englewood, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited.
- Weitz, J. 2001. *Music Coding and Tagging: MARC 21 Content Designation for Scores and Sound Recordings*. 2nd ed. Soldier Creek Music Series. Belle Plaine, Minn.: Soldier Creek Press.