FROM THE CHAIR

Spring greetings to all! This jam-packed eleventh issue of the MOUG Newsletter features a report of last February's exciting, well-attended fourth annual meeting held in New Haven, as well as a number of other articles on topics of importance to you.

I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the Executive Board to thank our program committee for the New Haven meeting, Chris McCawley (Continuing Education Officer), Civia Tuteur (Roosevelt University), and Joseph Scott (University of Connecticut at Storrs) for their very special efforts, as well as our distinguished roster of speakers. We are also most grateful to OCLC for essential technical assistance.

Finally, I would like to bring to your attention some recent behind-the-scenes activity. After last year’s meeting in San Antonio, the Executive Board authorized an ad hoc committee to seek a means of improving and enlarging the OCLC data base for music scores and sound recordings published prior to the implementation of the MARC music format at the Library of Congress. Included in this issue is a progress report which we think holds much promise for a potential project of very great importance.

--David Knapp

FINANCIAL REPORT
4th Quarter 1980
October 1 - December 31

BALANCE in checking account
end of 3rd quarter 1980: 2634.16

INCOME 4th QUARTER:
Memberships (1980) 89.00
Memberships (1981) 48.00
Back issues 4.00
Total income 4th quarter: 141.00

EXPENDITURES 4th QUARTER:
General
printing 85.34
postage 25.04
subtotal 110.38

Newsletter
printing 77.56
postage 105.56
handling 1.00
subtotal 184.12
Total expenditures 4th quarter: 294.50

BALANCE in checking account
end of 4th quarter 1980: 2480.66

--Richard Smiraglia
MOUG Treasurer
SUMMARY OF THE ANNUAL MEETING, NEW HAVEN, FEBRUARY 9-10, 1981

The Annual Meeting of the Music OCLC Users Group was held Monday-Tuesday, Feb. 9-10, 1981, at the Sheraton Park Plaza Hotel, New Haven, CT. 106 paid registrants were in attendance. Monday was devoted to a music tagging workshop conducted by Glenn Patton and Robert Cunningham of OCLC, and Tuesday was devoted to a business meeting and program.

The first session, by Glenn Patton, was a tour through the music formats, in which changes prompted by AACR2 were pointed out and discussed. Below are some of the highlights. For ease of presentation here they are organized by MARC tag, rather than in the order they were presented at the meeting.

$\textit{907: A handout "907 Fields for Sound Recordings" (1981 February 9) was distributed.}$

The tag has a new subfield (#k) for recording and reproduction characteristics (Dolby, digital, etc.) which applies only to tapes. If #k is used, it is permissible to omit the three intervening subfields from #g to #k.

$\textit{928: A handout "Guidelines for the Use of the 928 Field" was distributed.}$

Especially note that printing of #28 on catalog cards is not affected in any way by whatever options a library has chosen for printing 5XX fields. Only the first #28 will print as a note and/or added entry. If other tracings or notes are desired, a library may use another method for local card production, but not for the master record in the on-line union catalog. Indexing of #28 is proposed, but there are no plans at present for implementation.

$\textit{933: There is an implicit relationship between fields 518 and 933.}$

If information is available and important enough for a note, then it is important enough for #33.

$\textit{543 and 562: Use of field 552 (which utilizes parts of the LC G classification schedule) is recommended to libraries who wish to input more specific geographic information than is possible in 543.}$

$\textit{945: This field is no longer restricted to decade coding; specific dates/times can now be encoded.}$

Patton described a problem which could happen with some frequency under LC's announced policy of unit description of sound recordings for which separate entries formerly would have been made. That is a situation of "mixed dates" (i.e. only a decade for one work, but a specific date for another). There is no provision currently for encoding such information. The matter has been referred to the MLA Automation Committee.

$\textit{948: A handout "948: Examples for Scores and Recordings" was distributed.}$

$\textit{110 (600, 700, etc.): The use of #c has been expanded because of the separation of forenames from the place of origin (e.g.: Josquin, #c des Prez, #d d. 1521.).}$

Subfield c is also used to designate spirit communications, following the established form of the name (e.g.: Beethoven, Ludwig van, #d 1770-1827. #c (Spirit)). Subfield q is new, used to designate fuller forms of name (e.g.: Clarke, Herbert L. #q (Herbert Lincoln), #d 1867-1945.)

$\textit{110 (710, etc.): Initial articles not grammatically necessary should be omitted from corporate body headings, since no non-filing indicator is available (e.g.: input Musici not I Musici.)}$

There is an error in the OCLC formats regarding coding for anonymous manuscripts entered under library (see Scores format SC1:7). The number of the ms. should be tagged as #a, not #g as in the example. The corrected example should read:

$\textit{110 20 British Museum. #a Manuscript. #n Arundel 384.}$

$\textit{245: While the format of some uniform titles is different under AACR2, the principles of tagging remain the same.}$

LC now deletes initial articles in uniform titles, but OCLC does not require these deletions, since a non-filing indicator is available.

A question was raised concerning the possibility of a machine conversion for Vivaldi uniform titles to the Ryom thematic catalog numbers which will be used for AACR2. This type of project is not anticipated at OCLC, but uniform titles will be corrected manually by OCLC upon request and with submission of proper proof for the change.

$\textit{245: In unit catalog records for works by more than one author, AACR2 requires the separation of the author of the first work from the title of the second work by a full stop and two blank spaces.}$

OCLC will permit either, as long as there is
at least the full stop and one blank space.

30/0: LC has prepared a rule interpretation regarding listing of durations in the physical description of sound recordings. This interpretation will be published in the usual channels: MCB, OCLC.

Several other general points were made during the session. The OCLC card print program will now supply three blank spaces before volume designations in the physical description area of open entries. This applies to all description types, not just to AACR2 cataloging.

Punctuation supplied by the card print program (e.g. square brackets around the GMD) is not included on OCLC archival tapes.

A memo from Glenn Patton to MOUG was distributed concerning OCLC's policy for the GMD. LC will display the GMD only in the title transcription area. OCLC's current policy is that the GMD must be displayed in field 130, 240, or 245. Optionally, it may also be used in any field for which subfield h is valid. Patton is asking the OCLC Cataloging Advisory Committee to reconsider its policy, and he recommends that OCLC adopt LC's policy.

The remainder of Monday's session was devoted to a presentation by Robert Cunningham on OCLC's new standards for input of retrospective cataloging copy. Published documentation was not yet available at the time of the MOUG meeting, but has now been released as section 4 of OCLC Bibliographic Input Standards. Users are referred to this document for details. Briefly stated, AACR2 (or compatible) headings in the on-line name authority file must be input. Other headings may optionally be converted to AACR2 form. If users desire, they may completely recatalog the item according to AACR2. A system of numerical codes, to be placed in subfield w, following the heading, will identify to users exactly what form the heading represents.

MOUG Chairperson David Knapp (Oberlin) presided at Tuesday's business meeting. Continuing Education Officer Chris McCawley (West Chester State College) discussed possible sites for the 1982 MOUG meeting, whether to meet in conjunction with MLA in Los Angeles or in a more central location (e.g. Columbus). A straw vote favored Los Angeles. Ms. McCawley called for volunteers for local arrangements and program committees.

Ruth Henderson (City College/CUNY) reported on REMUS (Retrospective Music), a committee formed in 1980 at the San Antonio MOUG meeting "to seek a means of improving and enlarging the OCLC data base for music scores and sound recordings published prior to the implementation of the MARC music format at the Library of Congress." The project would be similar in intent and operation to CONSER. Others on the REMUS committee are Robert Cunningham (OCLC), Marie Griffin (Rutgers), and Kitty Skrobelia (CUNY Graduate Center). Questions, suggestions, and comments are welcomed by the committee.

MOUG Newsletter editors Ralph Papakhian and Sue Stancu (both Indiana University) requested contributions to the Newsletter. Chairperson Knapp pointed out that the Newsletter is MOUG's one official means of communication among the membership, and he urged all to make use of it.

Catherine Garland (Library of Congress) reported on plans at LC for implementation of the MARC music format. Specifications are being prepared, and Ms. Garland is writing the input manual. Implementation may take place late in 1981.

Helen Hughes, manager of the Cataloging Section at OCLC reported on new developments at OCLC. Many of these developments were listed in the January 16, 1981, OCLC newsletter, and readers are referred to that publication for details. Of particular interest was Ms. Hughes' report on OCLC's move to its new building in Dublin, Ohio. Computer facilities will be moved sequentially over the Summer and Fall 1981, and OCLC hopes to have the move be as transparent to users as possible.

Helen Hughes and Glenn Patton made a presentation on the searching and use of the on-line name authority file. It was repeatedly stressed that even experienced researchers need to re-read and have available the Name Authority User Manual in order to effectively use the system. Patton and Hughes outlined the way in which the name authority file was used in OCLC's machine conversion to AACR2. Numerous short-term problems were noted, many of which will soon be corrected. It was pointed out that OCLC has no editing capabilities in the name authority file; errors must be reported to LC, which then issues corrected records. Uniform titles are not currently searchable in the name authority file, but work is under way at OCLC to make them searchable.

The first segment of Tuesday afternoon's session was on Reference Use of OCLC. The paper presented by Michael Fling
(Indiana University) is included elsewhere in this newsletter. The papers presented by Louise Goldberg (Sibley Music Library) and Jennie Howard (Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University) will be published in the next issue.

"Quality Control and Music Use of OCLC" was the title of a presentation by Robert Cunningham, quality control librarian in OCLC's Bibliographic Maintenance Section. He outlined the duties of his section, reviewed the new standards for retrospective input, and described the OCLC machine conversion to AACR2.

Cunningham referred users to Chapter 7: Quality Assurance, of the Cataloging User Manual for details on how to submit change requests, and what proof is required. Users should submit change requests for:

1) errors in search keys; 2) omitted non-filing characters (Pity the poor person at OCLC who searches all day long for "THM"); 3) entry elements misspelled. Do not send: 1) minor problems with punctuation, capitalization, abbreviations; 2) minor errors in description such as slightly wrong size.

LC updates should be submitted in 3 x 5 form (not on a change request form): a proof slip, depository card, photocopy of NUC attached to a 3 x 5 card. For the following types of change requests, identify them at the top of the form with the following: SERIALS; NAME AUTHORITY; TYPE CODE.

OCLC is not accepting duplicate reports for anything but serials, i.e. no music duplicate reports. OCLC is investigating a method of merging various duplicate records into one good record, but this procedure is not yet available. It can be expected sometime after OCLC's move.

At the close of the session, MOUG Chairperson David Knapp noted the efforts of Ralph Papakhian and Richard Smiraglia in bringing the particular problems of music catalogers to OCLC's attention. The Papakhian/Smiraglia survey of problems was originally distributed to MOUG members and other interested parties in the Fall 1979, with responses compiled and sent to the MOUG board and OCLC in May 1980. Responses were summarized in MOUG Newsletter no. 7. It was pointed out that although half of the problems in the survey have now been solved by OCLC, the other half have not been solved, and that MOUG members need to continue to lobby for necessary improvements.

Helen Hughes announced that lists of publishers' names and addresses can be submitted by libraries through their networks for inclusion in the on-line name-address directory.

As a final item of business, David Knapp thanked the folks at OCLC for their cooperation, and also the program and local arrangements committee, Chris McCawley, Joseph Scott, and Civia Tuteur, for their excellent work in planning the New Haven meeting.

--Timothy Robson
Case Western Reserve University

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MAINTENANCE: REPORT FROM OCLC

I thought it would be valuable to report occasionally about specific projects which I have completed online. The projects are the result of the Music Cataloging Bulletin, users comments, or just the luck of finding an area in need of cleaning up. The following represent projects recently completed with the number of records changed. I have not edited every record under each heading; but only those records with an incorrect heading were completely upgraded—all fields.

1) Krenek changed to: Krenek, n79068663 197 records.
2) Orrego-Salas, Juan changed to: Orrego Salas, Juan, n50002656 32 records.
3) Lutyens, Elisabeth changed to: Lutyens, Elisabeth, #c Dame, n78052244 27 records.
4) Jones, Leslie, musician changed to: Jones, Leslie, 1905—35 records. 5) Pincherle, Marc, 1888—changed to: Pincherle, n50009647 32 records.

Another matter of concern is that LC is going to stop reporting name changes to Music Cataloging Bulletin (except pre-AACR2 to AACR2). A general call of alert needs to be sent to the MOUG membership to be on the lookout for new music authority records which affect the online catalog. If for example, members discover that Haydn's lst symphony has a new uniform title: "Symphonies, H. I, 1, D major" it would be beneficial to know which records need to be changed by: 1) a list of OCLC control numbers, or 2) a logical search (sym,no,l,i). It should never be assumed that OCLC knows this already or that someone else has reported it. Since LC is suffering budget problems, we all must try to take up the slack with these reports. Reports should be sent through the networks as usual.

--Robert Cunningham
Quality Control Librarian
OCLC
REFERENCE USES OF OCLC IN THE MUSIC LIBRARY

Movie buffs will need no explanation of the connection between computerized reference service, and Katherine Hepburn and Spencer Tracy. But others might want to on the lookout for an appearance on The Late Show of the 1957 film The Desk Set, which chronicles the tribulations of Hepburn, who is cast as the head of the reference department of a large television network library. Tracy arrives on the scene with an "electronic brain" of his invention, and Hepburn soon finds a pink slip in her pay envelope. Fired! Because the machine can answer 800 times faster than she can a question about the economic effects of the atlas beetle on the teak harvest on Sumatra. By the final reel, of course, she returns in triumph, because the computer cannot recognize and give the desired response to a misspelled search key: To an enquiry about the demographics of Corfu, it prints instead stanza after stanza of Rose Hardwick Thorpe's poem Curfew Must Not Ring Tonight. Hepburn gets her job back—and Tracy to the altar!—by demonstrating that computerized information is only as accurate, retrievable, and useful as the people manipulating it.

Many of our ideas and many of the realities about the capabilities of computers in information handling have changed since 1957. But even during that infancy of computer development, and even in the popular media, the human element was recognized as a principal ingredient in the successful retrieval of machine-stored information. Much has been written in recent years about on-line reference services in libraries. But the bulk of the discussion has concentrated on those subject data bases accessed by complex Boolean conceptual formulas. Considerably less attention has been paid to the reference utility of on-line systems like OCLC that, although designed for different purposes, can easily be used for answering certain kinds of specific, limited, informational questions. Certainly that potential has long been recognized. In its Annual Report 1971/1972 OCLC reported that about 60 percent of the searches on the system were thought to be unrelated to cataloging. Librarians very quickly had learned that there was more to be got from the OCLC data base than regular shipments of catalog cards.

Probably most of us have used OCLC for some non-cataloging purpose at one time or another. We all know, of course, that it is a speedy and rich source for bibliographic verification, and that in fact it often seems to be the only source for very recent publications, particularly for scores and recordings which are inadequately represented in printed catalogs and bibliographies. And long before the implementation of the Interlibrary Loan subsystem, we were using the holdings symbols to identify potential lenders of interlibrary loan materials, as well as to facilitate control of our own holdings. Still, Reference remains the Cinderella of OCLC, crowded into her chimney corner by rich stepsisters Cataloging and Interlibrary Loan, waiting for the day when fairy godmother Subject Searching will endow her with electronic capabilities even more fabulous than a pumpkin coach. But many librarians are not waiting for that day. In increasing numbers they are recognizing and responding to user needs by making terminals available for public service uses.

Few music libraries are so affluent these days as to be able to afford terminals devoted full time to reference uses. Some general libraries are more fortunate. At Indiana University the general collection has two terminals available full-time in public service areas. But at the Indiana University Music Library the single terminal is heavily scheduled for cataloging purposes, and the reference librarians are unable to use it as often as we would like. When it was installed in the summer of 1976, a local administrative decision was made that the reference librarians would have priority to "bump" anyone else at the terminal if we thought the nature of a reference question mandated it. While it is some comfort to know that OCLC is available to us when necessary, in practice—and to maintain harmony in the ranks—we have avoided interrupting the catalogers except in emergency situations.

The problem of terminal scheduling for reference use is aggravated by local topography. As in many libraries, our reference and technical services divisions are incontiguous. The OCLC terminal is a short flight of steps, a hallway, and two rooms away from the reference desk, and therefore somewhat inconvenient to use, considering that the print reference materials are immediately at hand. Whenever possible we batch appropriate reference questions to search on the terminal at a convenient time. But more often than not, conventional routes for answering reference questions are taken, even when instinct tells us that a quicker answer probably could be got from the data
base. Consequently we do not advertise the utility of OCLC for reference uses. Not only might it be inconvenient to accommodate a patron requesting a search at a particular time, but also we have found that patrons who do know a bit about the system frequently have heightened expectations that cannot be met. I am sometimes asked to "search the computer" for some totally inappropriate reason.

In at least some libraries that have public access terminals, it seems that all has not been rosy. The two terminals in the Indiana University general library have been in place too short a time to gauge their use and effectiveness. But in the July 1980 issue of the Journal of Academic Librarianship there appeared an article by Elaine Friedman titled "Patron Access to On-Line Cataloging Systems: OCLC in the Public Service Environment." It documents the results of installation of a public terminal at the catalog information desk at the University of Michigan graduate library. Though the general tone of the article is laudatory about the experiment, the layman's confusion in analyzing the on-line records was cited as perhaps the greatest limitation to its success--more so even than the lack of subject access. Students simply could not interpret what was on the screen. It is noteworthy that in that survey patrons were not given hands-on access. A librarian was available to search the data base for the users. It seems that for now, at least, a trained information specialist--a librarian--will continue to be needed as a go-between if the library user is to get the best access to, and interpretation of, computer-stored information.

The OCLC search keys used most often in reference work--those derived from names and titles--seem simple enough. But there is ample evidence to suggest the probability of a high percentage of retrieval failure if the searcher has only minimal experience in search procedures. The pitfalls to a blind OCLC search are several. Catalogers search with a distinct advantage: The item is in hand, and the search information can be taken letter-by-letter, word-by-word from the title page, caption, or album cover. But a reference OCLC search begins with just an idea, usually supplied by the patron, who is frequently misinformed, and who may not fully appreciate the fact that a minor misspelling or slight variation in typographical convention can result in complete and total retrieval failure. In the Michigan study 30 percent of the searches are known to have begun with inaccurate or incomplete author or title information. (The number of inaccurate citations that led to dead ends, of course, can not be known.) It has been demonstrated that the truncated search keys used by OCLC can increase the likelihood of retrieving a record for which the patron has inaccurate information. But as presently designed, OCLC still sometimes fails to retrieve entries with inaccurate or incomplete citations that could easily be retrieved by human interaction with conventional catalogs. Studies have shown that under the best of circumstances, 49 percent of spelling errors in proper names occur in the first four letters, and therefore within the range of OCLC search keys, resulting in retrieval failures (see Renata Tagliacozzo, et al., "Orthographic Error Patterns of Author Names in Catalog Searches," Journal of Library Automation 8 [June 1970]). In my untested opinion, the rate of spelling error in a music library could be expected to be even higher, primarily because of the international nature of the musical language. In a general library a patron is likely to be searching for a monograph or serial in a language he reads. But musicians daily play and sing from scores with title pages in unfamiliar languages, written by European composers whose names they often cannot even pronounce. There is enormous potential for spelling error, nonrecognition of initial articles, and confusion about conventions of punctuation and diacritics. Imagine, for example, the range of errors available to the novice music student who has studied and spoken only English all his life, sent to the library to get information about the works of a composer such as Iannis Xenakis. Not only is the name foreign to common Anglo-Saxon orthographic patterns, but his works are commonly titled in French or Greek, and sometimes are merely strings of unmemorable punctuated numerals. And at the Indiana library there would be further confusion regarding name authority: If the student first located the name in the card catalog, he would find interfiled there cards with the first name spelled beginning variously with the letter "Y" or "I".

Even well-recognized names and titles can lull one into a false sense of security. Handel, Machaut, Tchaikovsky, Josquin, Mussorgsky, and other major composers have
been alphabetical obstacles in our card catalogs for decades, requiring cross references among various spellings and forms of the names. And consider the biography of Scriabin by British author Hugh Macdonald. Unless one knows in this case that Macdonald is spelled without an upper case D, and that on the title page Scriabin is transliterated with the somewhat uncommon spelling "Skryabin," it may be necessary to try several combinations of search keys before hitting upon a successful one. In such instances a librarian is more likely to have the knowledge and the patience to press on. And to expect the average library user to access and interpret the on-line authority file for cross-reference purposes in similar situations is probably asking too much.

Another stumbling block can be the generally quite wonderful date-of-publication search enhancement. Again, if you have the date on the title page in front of you, it can shorten a search considerably. But because of the historical peculiarities of music publishing, and because copyright protection was not extended to sound recordings until 1972, a very large proportion of the items in each of our music libraries carry no date at all. In the Indiana library, for example, 60 percent of all scores by Beethoven have been cataloged over the years with inexact or unknown publication dates. So an on-line reference search, particularly when dealing with scores, can produce misleading results if this search enhancement is used. For example, one of the first games I played at the terminal in using the date-of-publication enhancement was a rather naïve search for Beethoven scores published during his lifetime. A personal name search key, qualified to hunt only scores published in 1827 or earlier, hit 89 cataloging records. But a leisurely hour spent examining each of them revealed that only 14 (15 percent) were clearly published in 1827 or earlier. Seventeen turned out to be modern editions with incorrect date information in the fixed field (And this illustrates another problem that we all encounter too often: Machine readable cataloging is prone to error; over the shoulder of the unwary searcher always loom the Four Horsemen of Computerization: Casual Cataloging, Teratical Tagging, Inattentive Inputting, and Reckless Revising). The remaining 58 Beethoven scores (65 percent) were identified in the body of the entry merely as 19th-century editions, cataloged with a bracketed "18--." The dates of publication of those scores had not been determined by the catalogers. Since Oliver Goldsmith's dictum (She Stoops to Conquer) that "Women and music should never be dated" was commonly observed well into the 20th century, and additionally because a few of our colleagues out there have some fuzzy ideas about what sort of date goes in the fixed field, the librarian searching for scores and recordings in OCLC is well advised to avoid search keys with date qualifiers.

After becoming acquainted with OCLC, many reference librarians have given lip service to its usefulness for their particular needs. But most of us have had only a general idea of what OCLC could really do toward providing reference service. Real evidence has been lacking. In my particular library, since I had used the terminal often only as a last resort, I could only guess how much easier my job might be if I had a terminal at the reference desk for immediate use anytime I wanted it. So, for two and a half months I kept a log, making note of every informational question I thought had the remotest chance of being answered by OCLC. Directional questions and enquiries about the library's holdings were not tallied, only requests for certain kinds of "hard" information. Of these, 39 percent I judged to have the potential to be answered by OCLC. Regardless of the actual immediate source of an answer, I later at a convenient time put the questions to the terminal. The hit rate was 65 percent. In other words, during that survey period, one out of every four reference questions would have been answered by an OCLC search if a terminal had been available to me. This is an astonishing hit rate for any single reference tool.

What sorts of questions were they? There were the usual searches for bibliographic information, commonly to inform a patron of the publisher of a particular item. And there were a few union catalog searches to determine what particular libraries own a book or score. But a large proportion of the questions were for information for which a quite different search strategy might seem appropriate, but for which an author-title search produced a bibliographic record, some element of which—often a uniform title—provided an answer. Some examples: "Which sonata by C.P.E. Bach is the 'Hamburger' sonata?" "I think the aria 'Tacea la notte placide' is by Verdi, but which opera?" "Is Britten's Saint Nicolas cantata spelled with an H in
the title?" In other instances a simple personal or corporate author search provided the desired information: "Is the 9th-century Arabic musician al-Kindi likely to be alphabetized under A or K?" "What year did Pablo Casals die?" "Can you provide a list of EMI and ASCAP publications?" "I have a 1969 discography of Georg Solti's recordings; what has he recorded since then?"

In this last instance OCLC proved a particular godsend. Discographic information of that sort is often difficult to compile. But thanks to the new ability to search by performer name on recordings, and by format, it was possible through an extended search to identify 167 additional cataloging records to update the earlier discography. Out of curiosity—and throwing caution to the winds regarding the date qualifier—I used it to compare the pre-1969 recordings in the system with the published discography, and discovered nine additional recordings that the earlier compiler had overlooked.

Because of the scope of the data base, there are times when a negative response can be as informative as a positive one. Two examples: A student was looking for a collected edition of the works of Busnois that she thought was published. In another case a faculty member was interested in a choral work of a certain title by George Crumb that was rumored to be available. Our library had neither work, they did not turn up in the usual bibliographies and catalogs, nor were they in OCLC. If these works were in existence and available, I reasoned, surely one of my colleagues out there would have noted them. Composers of that stature or popularity are not likely to be overlooked by seemingly the entire profession of music librarianship. In both cases I regarded the absence of the works from the data base as virtually conclusive evidence of their non-existence.

The results of my survey confirmed my belief that coverage of music materials in the data base is good. But for further evidence I wanted to search at the terminal a known body of reference-related music and music literature. I chose sections A and C of Sydney Charles's Handbook of Music and Music Literature in Sets and Series (1972). Section A records sets and series containing music by more than one composer. Charles lists 87 sets containing 1566 individually identified volumes or titles. Ninety-two percent of the individual entries were found in OCLC. Furthermore, since 84 percent of the titles of the sets and series were of the traced variety, it was possible to search by the title and identify 496 "new" titles in those series published since 1972 and not included by Charles. Similarly, in Section C (Monographic Series) Charles lists 1007 titles in 84 series. 70 percent of the series were traced, and 91 percent of all the monographs listed were in the data base. And by searching the series titles, 414 "new" monograph titles were identified.

These 91 and 92 percent hit rates somewhat exceeded my expectations. But even these figures may be conservative, because the name and title authority used by Charles are not consistent with LC and Anglo-American cataloging practice, and no attempt was made to verify that the form of a name being searched was the "correct" one, or that the title entry used by Charles was what actually appeared on the title page of each volume in question. In addition, Charles listed an unknown number of titles then still in preparation, and many of those have not yet been published.

The record for sound recordings is less encouraging. While no survey as systematic as the Charles was attempted, I did search several recent discographies in their entirety. The hit rate ranged between 43 percent and 77 percent. These lower figures are due probably to two factors: First, some types of libraries regard sound recordings as expendable materials; like Barbara Cartland gothics, they are going to wear out soon and be replaced by next year's model, so they are cataloged as simply and as cheaply as possible. Second, the format for sound recordings simply has not been in use as long as those for print materials.

Another feature of OCLC that perhaps needs time to prove itself for music librarians is the Name-Address Directory. If it lives up to announced expectations, it has great potential to aid music reference and acquisitions librarians in keeping tabs on the volatile music publishing and recording industries. As of December 1980, however, only a very small number of music publishers had been entered there (about 15 percent of those listed in the 1979 Music Publishers Association and National Music Publishers Association sales agency list). As for music libraries and librarians, many of the general U.S. libraries listed in Benton's Directory of Music Research Libraries are in the on-line directory, but of the more than 200 entries
from that directory that I searched on-line, in no instance did I find subordinate units entered that would enable one to contact directly a music librarian, or a music branch, division or department.

The chronological depth of records in the data base is perhaps of more interest to reference librarians than to catalogers, who deal primarily with current publications. In its August 1977 Newsletter, OCLC reported on the chronological distribution of the some three million records then in the data base. Expecting that chronological distribution of music literature would roughly parallel those figures, and using the newly searchable indexing enhancements for record format types and years of publication, I ran author searches for books by six famous, prolific, frequently translated, edited and reprinted 19th-century writers on music: Berlioz, Eitner, Fetis, Grove, Riemann, and Wagner. The results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Monographs (July 1977)</th>
<th>Selected Music Monographs (December 1980)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1801-1900</td>
<td>169,775 (7%)</td>
<td>261 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1970</td>
<td>1,453,141 (55%)</td>
<td>594 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1977</td>
<td>1,006,453 (38%)</td>
<td>207 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,629,369 (100%)</td>
<td>1062 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While no definite conclusions can be drawn from such small, quick-and-dirty samplings as these, they do suggest that music librarians not making the fullest possible use of OCLC for reference purposes are depriving themselves and their patrons of the benefits of a rich bibliographic mine of musical materials.

To summarize: a few lines of doggerel.

With apologies to Adelaide Procter and Sir Arthur Sullivan . . .

THE LOST RECORD

Seated one day at the keyboard
I was weary and ill at ease,
As my fingers wandered idly
over the clattering keys.

A student sought verification
Of a book he had recently seen.
He wasn't quite sure of the author,
But the title was "Scriabin."

MacDowell? MacDonald? McDougal?
It surely was one of that kind.
Of "MacD" in the name he was certain.
The remainder had flown from his mind.

Unsure of the name I was searching
Or what I would ultimately find,
I typed one search key, then another,
as they formed within my mind.

Thanks to those truncated search keys
We can search several names as the same.
So "M" "A" "C" "P", in a search key
Calls up more than one name.

But "M" "A" "C" "P", then a comma,
Then "S" "C" "P" "I", in this case
Produced not the book we were seeking
From out of the whole data base.

Perhaps "S" "K" "C" "R", I pondered,
Or even "S" "K" "C" "R"
I tried first the one, then the other.
"Eureka! I found it!" cried I.

Skryabin, by author Macdonald,
With the title spelled "S" "K" "R" "Y"
The record was finally located,
Though the search took more than one try.

Scriabin, Skriabin, Skryabin:
Of spellings there's surely no dearth.
I searched one, two, THREE transliterations
In order that book to unearth.

OCLC's made verification
Of books, scores and records a breeze.
And the new name and address directory
Shows future potential to please.

The date and format enhancements
Have increased our retrieval success.
OCLC, there's just one thing lacking: PLEASE give us some subject access!

--Michael Fling
Indiana University

[The editors would like to thank Mr. Fling for designing the striking new masthead appearing in this issue of the Newsletter]
INTERLIBRARY LOAN AT THE OBERLIN COLLEGE
CONSERVATORY LIBRARY

Introduction

As the OCLC Interlibrary Loan subsystem
nears the end of its second full year of opera­
tion, it seems appropriate to examine the
system and its impact upon a music library.

In 1975 the Ohio College Library Center
(later OCLC) received a grant from the U.S.
Office of Education to develop a computerized
on-line interlibrary system. (For informa­
tion pertaining to the development of the
system and the software, see James K. Barren­
tine. "A computer-based Interlibrary loan
communications subsystem, Final report." Eric Document ED 145 861) The purpose of
this system was to substantially increase
the availability of library materials by
enabling librarians to prepare, transmit
and fill loan requests more rapidly and effi­
ciently than was currently being done by
traditional procedures. Between 1975 and
1979 the subsystem was designed and program­
ed, and during the first three months of 1979
entered its test phase. On April 2, 1979,
the OCLC Interlibrary Loan system was made
available to participating OCLC members.

Overview of the system

Upon receipt of a request by a patron for
materials not owned by the home library, the
procedure begins. The ILL librarian access­
es the subsystem by means of an authorization
number which identifies the borrowing library
to the system, then displays a summary screen
-- MESSAGE WAITING FILE -- which functions
as an on-line mailbox. Example 1 illustrates
a typical message file. The messages in
the first section require immediate attention,
and in the case of the first line the
attention must come within 4 days.

A librarian wishing to initiate a request
for material can by-pass the MESSAGE WAIT­
ing FILE and begin an immediate search of
the On-Line Union Catalog (OLUC) for the
requested item. Once the item has been
located on the OLUC and the holding symbols
of potential lenders displayed, the librar­
ian calls for a workform and inputs up to
five library symbols in the lender string.
This is shown in Example 2.

Example 1

You have the following messages in your MESSAGE WAITING file:

These require your immediate attention:

1. 6 Pending
2. 1 Unfilled
3. 1 Recalled

These are for your information:

4. 3 Will supply
5. 2 Shipped
6. 1 Renewal OK
7. 5 Returned

Example 2

ill:new borrower:obm reqdate:810105 status:pending
ocl:4736284 needbefore: recdate: renewalreq:
 lender: iul,uiu,azu,rrr,cin due: newdue:

1 callno:
2 author:
3 title:
4 edition:
5 imprint:
6 article:
7 vol: no: date: pages:
8 verified:
The system automatically transfers the bibliographic information from the cataloging record. After filling in the date by which the material is needed and the address of the borrowing library, the request is produced, as when catalog cards are requested by catalogers. The system automatically assigns a sequential number to the request and forwards it to the first library on the lender string. That library has four system days in which to respond to the request; after four days the request is automatically forwarded to the second library on the string, and can no longer be found in the MESSAGE WAITING FILE of the first library. Every four system days, the request moves down the string until a library responds that it will supply. At that point the request stays in the files of that library. Requests not filled within the time allotted by the borrowing library, or requests not available for loan from any of the five libraries on the lender string automatically return to the borrowing library's MESSAGE WAITING FILE as unfilled. Ideally, a request initiated in the morning can be filled by the afternoon, with the patron receiving the material as quickly as the lending library can wrap and ship the item.

The system also has provisions for blank workforms for items which are not located on the OCLC but whose locations are verified through other bibliographic tools. Other features which enhance the ILL system include recall, renewal request, and provisional future date ("I can loan the item but not until [date]"). In the latter instance, the system automatically records the future date. If no other library can supply the requested item, the system returns the request to the library that gave the earliest future date. (For a more detailed examination of the system's procedures, the reader is referred to the Interlibrary Loan: Users Manual available from OCLC.)

Impact upon the conservatory library

As can be imagined, the speed with which the availability of materials can be determined and requests for the items answered has increased dramatically in the last two years. In the Conservatory Library, requests for materials not owned by Oberlin have risen from 2 faculty requests in 1977-78 to 112 requests from both faculty and students in 1979-80, with requests divided primarily between photocopies from journal titles not held by Oberlin and books on esoteric subjects not normally taught at an undergraduate performance-oriented institution. In addition, as a tool for public relations, the system is proving to be a definite asset. Faculty and students requesting items can review the OCLC records with the librarian, identify the precise item desired, and watch as the request is prepared and transmitted.

However, the impact of the system is most heavily felt in the numbers of requests for materials held by Oberlin. During the 1977-78 year the Conservatory Library received 275 requests; in 1978-79, 283 requests. In the first full year of participation in the Interlibrary Loan system, we received 485 requests, 256 of which were transmitted through OCLC (52.7%). During the first seven months of this year, 195 of 331 requests have come through OCLC (59.2%). As can be seen, the number of requests nearly doubled in the first year of participation in the system, and over 50% of the requests were received through OCLC.

As the number of requests continues to climb, one question is clear — can libraries who are net-lenders continue to absorb the increased costs for resource sharing? At the Conservatory Library the amount of staff time allotted for Interlibrary Loan has quadrupled in three years. In addition, the demands placed upon a single OCLC terminal have also increased.

Regardless of these problems, however, the Interlibrary Loan system has decreased significantly the amount of time involved in the borrowing procedure, making more materials available to more users.

—Linda Fidler
Conservatory Library
Oberlin College

YOUR ADVICE IS REQUESTED!

The OCLC Musical Recordings Analytics Consortium needs your advice. As you know, we have been adding composer/uniform title analytic tracings to entries for musical recordings. Generally, these involve recording sets which include a number of different composers. Several of us, however, also analyze single-composer anthologies—i.e., record sets which include numerous but selected works by one composer. The important word here is "selected" since we do not analyze sets of complete works, or sets of complete works in a particular genre or form: "The String Quartets of Beethoven", "Mozart's Piano Sonatas Complete,"
or "All the Masses by Bach" are examples of sets we would not analyze. We generally try to add analytic entries to sets whose normal cataloging would utilize "Selections" either as the uniform title or as part of a uniform title. "Twelve Cantatas by Handel" (uniform title: [Cantatas. Selections]), "The Many Worlds of Mozart" (uniform title: [Selections]), etc. are typical record sets which we would analyze.

Take, for example, the recording:

Haydn by Dudley [sound recording].--Columbia University of South Carolina, [1980]
University of South Carolina: AS 100
OCLC no. 6687846

The standard entry for this disc uses a 240 field of:

Sonatas, #n piano. #k Selections #h sound recording

Following our OMRAC procedure, we would add eight 700 fields, each of which would use the following form:

700 12 Haydn, Joseph, #a 1732-1809. #t Sonatas, #n piano, #n no. "X", #r "X" major/minor. #n sound recording #f 1980.

At the moment, no subfield "u" in the 700 fields is searchable, but it seems very much unlikely that such an important capacity will be omitted forever. We have assumed that this capacity will be added and that we should prepare now for it. This has been our reason for adding such fields.

OCLC has asked us to ascertain how important this type of work is to the general music cataloging world. Your answer will determine what type of priority this work will have with OMRAC and with OCLC.

1) Do you think these single-composer analytics are equally important to the more usual multiple composer sets? Less important? More important?

2) If they are present on an entry, would you use them, or delete them in favor of the collective uniform title?

Please let us know your opinion by writing to:

Richard Jones,
Music Librarian
UWM Library
P.O. Box 604
Milwaukee, WI 53201

REPORT ON REMUS (RETSPECTIVE MUSIC)

A committee was appointed by the MOUG Board after the San Antonio meeting last year to seek a means of improving and enlarging the OCLC data base for music scores and sound recordings published prior to the implementation of the MARC music format at the Library of Congress, now scheduled for October 1981. The objectives of the committee are:

1) Increase the size of the data base.

2) Assure the quality of the records going into the data base.

   a) Establish standards for input.

   b) Establish an authority base that can be used by persons inputting records.

   c) Establish a means for checking on quality.

3) Enhance records already in the data base by adding contents, analytics, MARC fields, etc.

4) Improve the quality of records already in the data base.

In order to carry out the purpose and objectives, the committee has proposed the following project. Approximately ten institutions would be selected as participants. The work would be divided among them by composer or subject. Each institution would search the assigned portion of its catalog in the data base. If the item is not found, cataloging would be input; if found it would be modified to match LC copy if necessary, enhancements added as needed, and access points changed to AACR2 forms and then entered in a joint authority file. The project would not be limited to LC cataloging. It is hoped that an agreement for contributing to the LC authority file can be reached with the Library of Congress. An advisory group would oversee the project and make policy decisions. REMUS bibliographic records might be made available to non-OCLC libraries in machine-readable, microform, or printed formats. Funding for an initial two year project is being sought.

The committee met in New Haven to decide standards for the project. The only standard on which a consensus was not reached was added entries for sound recordings in which the participation of a performer (in the immortal words of AACR2) "goes beyond that of performance, execution, or interpretation of a work (as is commonly the case with "popular," rock, and jazz music)". The committee would like advice as to whether it would be best to require additional added entries beyond LC practice for: 1) Performer; 2) Title; 3) Composer/title (or none or all of the three possibilities). This is an important question for which it would be useful to receive as many responses as possible. Composer/title analytical added entries will be required for Western art music. The complete list of standards will be published in a later report.
The committee would also like to hear from libraries who have not already volunteered who might be interested in participating in the project. Volunteers should write immediately, since participants must be determined before a final proposal for funding can be submitted. Opinions on the added entries question and suggestions for participants should both be sent to Ruth Henderson, chairman (Music Library, City College, 138th St. at Convent Ave., New York, NY, 10031). Other members of the committee are Robert Cunningham; Catherine Garland, ex officio, LC; Marie Griffin, and Kitty Skrobela.

RESOLUTION

The MOUG Executive Board unanimously passed the following resolution at its last meeting on February 10, 1981 in New Haven, Conn.: Be it resolved that the Executive Board expresses its appreciation to David Knapp for assuming the Chair of MOUG in the summer of 1980. His willingness and ability to assume this position and the outstanding leadership he has provided to the Group represent a major contribution to the profession of librarianship.

THE FOLLOWING COMMUNICATIONS ON MARC TAGGING WERE DISTRIBUTED AT THE WORKSHOP PORTION OF THE MOUG ANNUAL MEETING HELD IN NEW HAVEN, FEBRUARY 9, 1981

Guidelines for the Use of the 028 Field

The 028 field was added to the MARC Music Format for two reasons: to provide automatic note-printing capabilities for AACR2 (and added entry printing for those libraries which maintain files of plate and serial numbers); and to provide an indexable field to make up for the spotty use of ISBNs for printed music and the lack of an ISN for sound recordings. OCLC has implemented, with some limitations, the automatic generation of notes and added entries as part of AACR2 changes to the card print program. Indexing of the 028 has been proposed but there is, as yet, no schedule for implementation.

Field 028 should be used for issue numbers (i.e. manufacturer's serials number) and matrix numbers for sound recordings and for plate numbers and other edition numbers for music scores. The field is repeatable; the subfields are not. The input standard for both Level I and Level K is 'R' (Required if applicable or readily available).

If a score or sound recording has been assigned an ISBN, input that number in field 020, not 028.

Use the first indicator which is appropriate to the type of number being input. Set the second indicator to fit your library's added entry requirements. For AACR2 records, the second indicator choices are 1 or 2 since the rules require the use of the note; for pre-AACR2 records, the choices are 0 or 3 since a note containing the number is not appropriate. 028 fields may be input for pre-AACR2 cataloging in order to utilize the capability to generate added entries and to take advantage of future indexing possibilities. Users may request that 028s be added to bibliographic records by submitting Change Request Forms.

Input the number, including any alphabetic prefixes or suffixes, spaces and marks of punctuation, in subfield 'a'. For scores, subfield 'b' should contain the publisher's name. For sound recordings, subfield 'b' should contain the label name.

Manufacturer's number of a Columbia recording: M 35073.
028 01 M 35073 #b Columbia
Prints as: Columbia: M 35073

Plate number of a Breitkopf & Härtel score: B. & H. 1735.
028 22 B. & H. 1735 #b Breitkopf & Härtel
Prints as: Pl. no.: B. & H. 1735.
The OCLC card print program will generate notes and added entries only from the first 028 field in each record. For scores, the note will print as the last note. For sound recordings, it will print as the first note. The printing of 028 notes is not affected by profile options related to 5xx fields. For example, 028 notes will print on shelflist cards even if the library has chosen the option to suppress 5xx notes on shelflist cards.

When both subfields print (first indicator 0 or 1), the card print program reverses the order of the subfields and supplies a colon between the label name and the serial or matrix number and a period at the end. It also supplies the print constant "Matrix no.:" for first indicator 1. For first indicators 2 and 3, the card print program supplies print constants--"Pl. no.:" for indicator 2 and "Publisher's no.:" for 3--and prints subfield 'a' followed by a period.

The added entry generated from the 028 is treated as a corporate name added entry (710). It is printed in the tracing paragraph as the last added entry before the title added entries. The heading prints all on one line (a non-separated heading) even though the library's profile may call for separated headings in that field.

Single numbers of whatever type should present few input problems. Multiple numbers, such as plate numbers for multi-volume sets or serial numbers for multi-recording sets, present some problems.

A range of non-consecutive plate numbers or serial numbers cannot be adequately covered in a note generated from the 028. A 500 note will need to be input giving the numbers and individual 028s for each disc number or plate number.

A set of Angel recordings of Satie's piano music; each disc is sold separately.

500 Angel: S 36482, S 36459, S 36485, S 36714, S 36774, S 36811.

028 00 S 36482 #b Angel
028 00 S 36459 #b Angel
028 00 S 36485 #b Angel
028 00 S 36714 #b Angel
028 00 S 36774 #b Angel
028 00 S 36811 #b Angel

The complete songs of a composer published in 4 volumes by H. Litolff; each volume bears a separate plate number

500 Pl. no.: 2842/3487.
028 20 2842 #b H. Litolff
028 20 2860 #b H. Litolff
028 20 3176 #b H. Litolff
028 20 3487 #b H. Litolff

A range of consecutive numbers may be input in one 028 using a double hyphen (--) to separate the first and last numbers:

A boxed set of two Electrola recordings with the serial numbers IC 063 30107 and IC 063 30108.
028 21 IC 063 30107--IC 063 30108 #b Electrola
Prints as: Electrola: IC 063 30107--IC 063 30108.

Or, if the consecutive numbers represent items which may be purchased separately, the pattern for non-consecutive numbers may be followed:
A boxed set of recordings which bears both a number for the set and individual numbers for each disc may be input as:

A London opera recording which bears the number OSA 1150; each of the three discs bears a number: OS 11123, OS 11124 and OS 11125.

\[\text{\(028 \ 01 \ OSA \ 1150 \ (OS \ 11123 \--11125) \ # \ London\)}\]  
Prints as: London: OSA 1150 (OS 11123--11125).

A Columbia recording of the ballet music of Aaron Copland bears the set number M3 31527; each of the discs also bears a serial number:

\[\text{\(028 \ 01 \ M3 \ 31527 \ (MS \ 6712, \ MS \ 6872, \ MS \ 7124) \ # \ Columbia\)}\]  
Prints as: Columbia: M3 31527 (MS 6712, MS 6872, MS 7124).

In each of these cases, additional \(028\)s might be added to provide access to the individual disc numbers. This would seem especially appropriate for the Copland example.

Matrix numbers will ordinarily appear in bibliographic records only if no issue number appears, as is often the case with Russian Melodiya recordings. They may be input, using first indicator 1, following the patterns for consecutive or non-consecutive issue numbers as appropriate.

Catalogers preparing bibliographic records for rare recordings or for specialized recording collections may wish to include both issue and matrix numbers in the \(028\).

\[\text{\(028 \ 01 \ 1735; \ BX \ 48754 \ (matrix)\--BX \ 48755 \ (matrix) \ # \ Brunswick\)}\]  
(Additional \(028\)s may be input for each of the matrix numbers.)  
Prints as: Brunswick: 1735; BX 48754 (matrix)--BX 48755 (matrix)

The \(028\) field can also be used for numbers related to reissue and reprint situations. If a bibliographic record for a score reprinted by Dover contains a note: "Reissued from Breitkopf & Hartel plates. Pl. no.: B. & H. 8813.", that number could be represented by a non-printing \(028\) field:

\[\text{\(028 \ 20 \ B. \ & \ H. \ 8813 \ # \ Breitkopf \ & \ Hartel\)}\]

In the same way, the \(028\) could be used for the original issue number of a reissued recording. For example, one of the examples in AACR2 rule 6.7B7 ("Recorded in Vienna in 1961, previously released as Westminster WST 17035") could be represented by the following \(028\):

\[\text{\(028 \ 00 \ WST \ 17035 \ # \ Westminster\)}\]

Please note that in these reprint and reissue uses both the 5xx note and the \(028\) field must be input; these notes cannot be generated from the \(028\). This use of the \(028\) provides a copy of linking these reprints and reissues with their original publications and may avoid some duplicate orders as well as lead one to cataloging which can be used as a basis for a new bibliographic record.
The 028 can also be used to link together various formats in which a recording is released. If the container of a cassette includes an indication that the recording is also available as a disc and gives the issue number and if the cataloger has provided a note under the provisions of AACR2 rule 6.7B16, that issue number could be entered in an 028 field.

These guidelines are designed to cover a majority of 028 situations. Member libraries should direct questions and comments to their respective network offices; independent libraries, to User Contact Desk, OCLC, Inc.

007 Fields for Sound Recordings

The following examples with accompanying notes represent 007 fields for standard formats of sound recordings. The physical descriptions for those standard formats are in AACR2 form.

Discs

Notes: The normal groove width for 33 1/3 rpm recordings is microgroove (code 'm'); the normal groove width for 78 rpm recordings is standard (code 's'). Supply the appropriate code in subfield 'd' of the 007 even though the information does not appear on the item being cataloged.

If the item being cataloged does not include an indication of kind of sound (i.e., mono, stereo, etc.) and/or LC cataloging being input omits that information from the physical description, do not guess; input 'u' in subfield 'c'.

Examples:
300 1 sound disc :  #b 33 1/3 rpm ;  #c 12 in.
007  d  #b b  #c u  #d m  #e e  #f n  #g n
300 1 sound disc :  #b 33 1/3 rpm, mono. ;  #c 12 in.
007  d  #b b  #c m  #d m  #e e  #f n  #g n
300 1 sound disc :  #b 33 1/3 rpm, stereo. ;  #c 12 in.
007  d  #b b  #c s  #d m  #e e  #f n  #g n
300 1 sound disc :  #b 33 1/3 rpm, quad. ;  #c 12 in.
007  d  #b b  #c q  #d m  #e e  #f n  #g n

Cartridges

Note: The standard tape width for a sound cartridge is 1/4" (code 'm'); the speed is 3 3/4 ips (code 'm'); the size is 5 1/4" x 3 7/8"; (code 'o'); the number of tracks is 8 (code 'd'). Supply the appropriate codes in subfields 'b', 'e', 'f', and 'g' even though the information does not appear on the item being cataloged or on the LC copy being input.

Examples:
300 1 sound cartridge :  #b 3 3/4 ips, stereo.
007  g  #b m  #c s  #d n  #e o  #f m  #g d
Cassettes

Notes: The standard tape width for a sound cassette is 1/8" (code '1'); the standard speed is 1 7/8 ips (code '1'); the size is 3 7/8" x 2 1/2" (code 'j'). Supply the appropriate codes in subfields 'b', 'e', and 'f' even though the information does not appear on the item being cataloged or on the LC copy being input.

If the item being cataloged does not specify the kind of sound (or the LC copy being input omits that information from the physical description), do not guess; input 'u' in subfield 'c'. Since, however, the standard configuration for a cassette is 4-track regardless of whether the cassette is mono or stereo, supply code 'c' in subfield 'g' for all cassettes unless the item being cataloged contains a specific indication that it is 2-track.

Examples:

300 1 sound cassette: #b 1 7/8 ips
007 s #b 1 #c u #d n #e j #f 1 #g c

300 1 sound cassette: #b 1 7/8 ips, mono.
007 s #b 1 #c m #d n #e j #f 1 #g c

300 1 sound cassette: #b 1 7/8 ips, 2 track, mono.
007 s #b 1 #c m #d n #e j #f 1 #g b

300 1 sound cassette: #b 1 7/8 ips, stereo.
007 s #b 1 #c s #d n #e j #f 1 #g c

Reel-to-reel tapes

Notes: The standard tape width for reel-to-reel sound tapes 1/4" (code 'm'). Supply that code in subfield 'f' even though the information does not appear on the item being cataloged or on the LC copy being input unless the item being cataloged varies from the standard.

If the item being cataloged does not specify the kind of sound (i.e. stereo) and/or the tape configuration (i.e. 4 track) or the LC copy being input omits that information from the physical description, do not guess; input 'u' in those subfields. In the case of locally produced tapes (such as tapes of university sponsored concerts or recitals), this information could easily be verified by personnel who are responsible for recordings.

Examples:

300 1 sound tape reel: #b 7 1/2 ips; #c 7 in.
007 t #b o #c u #d n #e c #f m #g u

300 1 sound tape reel: #b 7 1/2 ips, 2 track, mono.; #c 5 in.
007 t #b o #c m #d n #e b #f m #g b

300 1 sound tape reel: #b 7 1/2 ips, 4 track, stereo.; #c 7 in.
007 t #b o #c s #d n #e c #f m #g c

300 1 sound tape reel: #b 15 ips, 2 track, stereo.; #c 10 in.
007 t #b p #c s #d n #e d #f m #g b
048: Examples for scores and sound recordings

Subfields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>la</th>
<th>Performer or ensemble.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(String quartet):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 0  sa02  ta sb01  ta sc01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Sonata for clarinet and piano):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 0  wc01  ta ka01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Piano trio):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 0  ka01  ta sa01  ta sc01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Large orchestra):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 1  oa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(String orchestra music):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 1  oc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Chorus):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 1  ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Chorus (SAB)):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 1  ca03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 Choruses):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 1  ca  ta ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 4-part Choruses):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 1  ca04  ta ca04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Chorus (SA) and organ):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 1  cb02  ta kb01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Dance orchestra (trumpet(s), saxophone(s), violin(s), clarinet(s), etc.) using scored arrangements):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 1  oe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Jazz ensemble (unspecified instrumentation) with named vocalist):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 1  oe  ta vu01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Violoncello solo):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 0  sc01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Solo for piano or organ):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 0  ka01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>048 0  kb01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples for scores and sound recordings

Subfields

†a Performer or ensemble (continued)

(Solo for saxophone or viola):

\[\text{048} \ 0 \ \text{wi01}\]
\[\text{048} \ 0 \ \text{sb01}\]

(Song for soprano and piano):

\[\text{048} \ 0 \ \text{va01} \ 1 \ \text{ka01}\]

(Piano 4-hands):

\[\text{048} \ 0 \ \text{ka02}\]

(2 Piano music):

\[\text{048} \ 0 \ \text{ka01} \ 1 \ \text{ka01}\]

(Duet for trumpet (or horn) and trombone (or baritone)):

\[\text{048} \ 0 \ \text{bb01} \ 1 \ \text{ba01}\]
\[\text{bb01} \ 1 \ \text{ba01}\]
\[\text{ba01} \ 1 \ \text{bb01}\]

(Percussion ensemble for drums, cymbals, triangle, gong, and timpani for 3 players):

\[\text{048} \ 0 \ \text{pz03}\]

[Since percussion parts are unusual and different from other instrumental parts it is preferable to code for the number of players rather than the number of parts or the number of percussion instruments.]

(Concerto grosso for oboes and strings):

\[\text{048} \ 1 \ \text{wb} \ 1 \ \text{su}\]

(Concerto grosso for 2 oboes and string orchestra):

\[\text{048} \ 1 \ \text{wb02} \ 1 \ \text{oc}\]

(Sonata for oboe and continuo):

\[\text{048} \ 0 \ \text{wb01} \ 1 \ \text{ke}\]

[Since continuo indicates either one or two instruments it is best to omit number of parts unless they are definitely specified.]

(Sonata for bassoon and 2 unspecified continuo parts):

\[\text{048} \ 0 \ \text{wd01} \ 1 \ \text{ke02}\]

(Trio-sonata for 2 violins and continuo with continuo specified for harpsichord and cello):

\[\text{048} \ 0 \ \text{sa02} \ 1 \ \text{kc01} \ 1 \ \text{sc01}\]

(O'Bryant's Washboard Band (clarinet, piano, washboard)):

\[\text{048} \ 0 \ \text{wc01} \ 1 \ \text{ka01} \ 1 \ \text{pz01}\]
Ø48: Examples for scores and sound recordings

Subfields

†a Performer or ensemble (continued)

(Jazz septet (piano, trumpet, drums, banjo, clarinet, trombone and bass; banjo player sings a chorus)):

1  Ø48 0 ka01 †a bb01 †a pd01 †a to01 †a wc01 †a bd01 †a sd01
   Ø48 0 va01 †a ka01 †a bb01 †a pd01 †a to01 †a wc01 †a bd01 †a sd01

[If one performer plays more than one instrument, it is possible
1) show the number of performers with the predominant instrumentation, and
2) show the variation.]

†b Soloist. Subfield 'b' is used when the soloist is accompanied. Use with
either indicator Ø or 2.

(Soloists (SSATBB), chorus (SATB) and string orchestra):

Ø48 2 †b va02 †b vc01 †b vd01 †b vf02 †a ca04 †a oc

(Concerto for flute with the orchestra arranged for piano):

Ø43 0 †b wa01 †a ka01

(Concerto for piano with the orchestra arranged for piano):

Ø48 0 †b ka01 †a ka01

(Solo for English horn with string quartet accompaniment):

Ø48 0 †b wf01 †a sa02 †a sb01 †a sc01

(Concerto for guitar and orchestra):

Ø48 2 †b tb01 †a oa

(Solo for bassoon accompanied by string orchestra and harp):

Ø48 2 †b wd01 †a oc †a ta01

(Opera for 3 sopranos and piano reduction):

Ø48 2 †b va03 †a ka01

("Chicago" featuring Coleman Hawkins, only soloist, with the Ramblers;
recorded August 26, 1935.):

Ø48 0 †b wi01 †a bb02 †a bd01 †a wi02 †a ka01 †a pd01

[If it is exceedingly clear that the featured soloist is indeed
the only soloist on the selection, code the soloist in subfield b.]

(Blind Lemon Jefferson, blues singer, accompanying himself on the guitar):

Ø48 0 †b vz01 †a tb01

(Featured trumpet and alto saxophone solos with large jazz ensemble):

Ø48 2 †b bb01 †b wi01 †a oe
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