



# MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP

<http://www.musicoclcusers.org/>

## NEWSLETTER

UNIVERSITY OF  
NORTHERN COLORADO  
(MUSIC LIBRARY)  
GREELEY, COLO. 80639

ISSN: 0161-1704

December 2002

No. 82

### From the Chair

**Ruthann McTyre, University of Iowa**

As I write this, our membership will gather in Austin in just 3 short months. Our annual meetings always offer great opportunities to learn about OCLC-related technological wonders and how to use them to aid our work and the work of our clientele. This year is no exception. Breakout sessions will cover topics that include MARS authority control and the cataloging of websites, with Mickey Koth and Robert Freeborn as featured speakers. Stephen Luttmann and members of the Reference Products Committee will discuss FirstSearch products, netLibrary, RILM and WorldCat. This meeting will also include "Ask MOUG" sessions for both technical and public services. These sessions are always helpful and enlightening and offer members the kind of "group therapy" that sends us back to our jobs refreshed and rejuvenated. The plenary session is one that I wouldn't miss, if I were you. "The Truth about CAT(alogers) and DOG(ged reference librarians)" promises to be a lively discussion--without venturing (I hope!) into Jerry Springer Land.

As if the program put together by Continuing Education Coordinator Mary Jenkins and his Program Committee isn't enticement enough, this year we celebrate our 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary! Marty and his crew have taken the celebratory aspect of this meeting into consideration by planning an extra-special reception for Tuesday night, followed by an anniversary luncheon on Wednesday with our own celebrity speakers, Steve Wright and Judy Weidow. Need I say more? All signs indicate a fantastic meeting in a great city with a great bunch of colleagues all joining together to celebrate MOUG's silver anniversary.

One other matter of business: you will be receiving ballots in the mail soon to elect a new Vice Chair/Chair-Elect and a new Treasurer. There will also be a ballot to accept (or not) some revisions to the bylaws. Make your voice heard! My thanks to Kerri Scannell and Julia Graepel for their help in drafting the proposed revisions to the bylaws.

I'm pleased to report that we will be presenting our Distinguished Service Award for the second time in as many years. This award was established to honor a librarian who has made significant professional contributions to OCLC music users. The Executive Board selects a recipient based on MOUG member nominations. There are three criteria for nomination: 1) nominees must have made professional contributions which significantly address the needs and concerns of music-oriented users of OCLC products and services; 2) nominees may be MOUG members, but membership in the organization is not a requirement; and 3) the nomination must be accompanied by a statement that provides supporting evidence of the nominee's qualifications.

One of the first tasks for the newly-appointed Vice Chair/Chair-Elect will be to put out a call for nominations to the membership soon after our meeting in February, so it isn't too soon to start thinking of possible candidates for this award. If nothing else, when I start to bore you during the business meeting, look around the room and see who might be "the one" who will be Recipient Number Three. If you want to know who Recipient Number Two is, come to Austin and find out!

So--y'all get those registration forms sent back to Marty and get the ballots back to Ruth.

I look forward to seeing all of y'all (as they say down in those parts) in Austin,

Ruthann

### IN THIS ISSUE:

News from OCLC .....	p. 3
Q&A .....	p. 5
2003 Annual Meeting information.....	p. 10

---

**MOUG Executive Board 2002-2003**

---

**CHAIR**

Ruthann Boles McTyre  
Rita Benton Music Library  
2000 Voxman Music Building  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, IA 52242-1795  
(319) 335-3088 (o)  
ruthann-mctyre@uiowa.edu

**PAST CHAIR**

Jean Harden  
Libraries  
PO Box 305190  
University of North Texas  
Denton, TX 76203-5190  
(940) 565-2860 (o)  
jharden@library.unt.edu

**TREASURER**

Ruth A. Inman, Librarian  
Kennedy-King College Library  
10109 S. Prospect Ave.  
Chicago, IL 60643  
(773) 602-5454 (o)  
rinman@ccc.edu or rinman@niu.edu

**SECRETARY/NEWSLETTER EDITOR**

Stephen Luttmann, Music Librarian  
Music Library, Campus Box 68  
University of Northern Colorado  
Greeley, CO 80639-0100  
(970) 351-2281 (o)  
luttmann@arts.unco.edu

**CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR**

Marty Jenkins  
Music & Humanities Librarian  
M148 Creative Arts Center  
Wright State University  
Dayton, OH 45435  
(937) 775-4983 (o)  
martin.jenkins@wright.edu

**OCLC LIAISON**

Jay Weitz, Consulting Database Specialist  
WorldCat Content Management Division  
OCLC, Inc.  
6565 Frantz Road  
Dublin, OH 43017-0702  
(800) 848-5878 (o)  
jay\_weitz@oclc.org

Thanks to all who contributed to this issue of the *Newsletter*. The *Newsletter* is an occasional publication of the Music OCLC Users Group. Editor: Stephen Luttmann, Music Library, University of Northern Colorado, Campus Box 68, Greeley, CO 80639-0100.

Communications concerning the contents of the *Newsletter* and materials for publication should be addressed to the Editor. Articles should be submitted on 3.5" disk in ASCII format or in WordPerfect, or sent electronically. Articles should be consistent in length and style with other items published in the *Newsletter*. Permission is granted to copy and disseminate information contained herein, provided the source is acknowledged. Correspondence on subscription or membership (including change of address) should be forwarded to Ruth Inman, MOUG Treasurer, Kennedy-King College, 10109 S. Prospect Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60643 (Dues in North America, \$15.00 for personal members, \$20.00 for institutional members; outside North America, \$30.00; back issues for the previous two years are available from the Treasurer for \$5.00 per copy). A copy of the quarterly financial report is available from the Treasurer on request.

The Music OCLC Users Group is a non-stock, nonprofit association organized for these purposes:

(1) to establish and maintain the representation of a large and specific group of individuals and institutions having a professional interest in, and whose needs encompass, all OCLC products, systems, and services and their impact on music libraries, music materials, and music users; (2) to encourage and facilitate the exchange of information between OCLC and members of MOUG; between OCLC and the profession of music librarianship in general between members of the Group and appropriate representatives of the Library of Congress; and between members of the Group and similar users' organizations; (3) to promote and maintain the highest standards of system usage and to provide for continuing user education that the membership may achieve those standards; and (4) to provide a vehicle for communication among and with the members of the Group.

**MOUG MISSION STATEMENT**

The mission of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is to identify and provide an official means of communication and assistance for those users of the products and services of the Online Computer Library Center, Inc. (OCLC) concerned with music materials in any area of library service, in pursuit of quality music coverage in these products and services.

Join us in Austin, Texas on February 11-12, 2003, as MOUG celebrates the 25th anniversary of its first annual meeting. The program committee has come up with a slate of events worthy of the occasion. My thanks go out to the committee members: Tracey Rudnick, Margaret Kaus, Diane Napert, Bruce Evans, Keith Chapman, Lee Richardson, and Jack Knapp.

Celebratory events include an opening reception on Tuesday evening, sponsored by our friends at OCLC, and a special anniversary luncheon on Wednesday, with reminiscences of the "good old days" from Steve Wright and Judy Weidow.

At our plenary session on Wednesday morning, we will learn "The Truth about Cats and Dogs," that is, CATalogers and DOGged reference librarians! We will share experience and engage in conversation about building a symbiotic relationship between reference and cataloging, and how that relationship benefits our users. The session will begin with brief presentations from Steve Luttmann and Kay Lowell (University of Northern Colorado), and Jean Harden and Donna Arnold (University of North Texas), public service and catalog librarians who "work and play well" together, and Margaret Kaus (University of Tennessee, Knoxville), who works in both areas. We hope to engender a great deal of audience participation as well.

Breakout sessions will follow the luncheon. Mickey Koth will present on MARS Authority Control and Robert Freeborn will discuss cataloging of websites in one session, while in the other members of the Reference Products Committee will review RILM and WorldCat on FirstSearch, featuring the latest enhancements and pointing out improvements we would still like to see.

The popular Ask MOUG sessions return this year, one each for Technical Services and Public Services. There will be also be the usual NACO and Enhance working sessions, a working session for the Reference Products Committee, and of course our business meeting.

And finally, let me add the annual call for volunteers to assist me by staffing the registration table. I'll need folks for 1 hour shifts (of course, you can stay longer if you want!) on Tuesday evening, 6:00 to 9:00, and Wednesday morning from 8:00 to 9:00.

## General News

### *OCLC Documentation List Available*

A complete listing of OCLC documentation is available on at <http://www2.oclc.org/documentation/>. The new list is aimed at making it easier to find and print electronic copies (HTML or PDF), or order documentation available in hard copy. The new Web page includes links to a list of recent updates (revised or issued in the last three months) and other lists of documentation by specific type and language.

## Collections and Technical Services

### *Windows Client Interface to OCLC Connexion Update*

OCLC has added additional information to the Connexion web site (<http://www.oclc.org/connexion/>) about the upcoming Windows client interface to OCLC Connexion. You can view the data online, or you can print the PDF version for easier viewing. We will continue to add information to the web site in the coming months. Here is a summary of the first three releases of the client:

- Release 1, 2nd quarter 2003 (April-June), will include interactive, online functionality along with macros and labels.
- Release 2, 3rd quarter 2003 (July-September), will add functionality for cataloging electronic resources and performing NACO activities for authority records.
- Release 3, 4th quarter 2003 (October-December), will add additional offline and batch functionality, including offline local files and other "CatME-like" functionality.

### *OCLC CatME Versions 1.20, 1.21, 2.00 End of Support*

OCLC ended support for CatME for all versions of CatME except versions 2.10 (English) and 2.11 (Spanish) on October 31, 2002. If you are still using an older version of CatME, please upgrade to CatME version 2.10 or 2.11 as soon as possible. CatME software is available for download from the OCLC Web site, and it is included on the OCLC Access Suite compact disc. Consult the CatME home page (<http://www.oclc.org/catme/>) for more information on downloading the software or ordering the OCLC Access Suite CD. CatME versions 2.10 and 2.11 are the final releases of CatME software. OCLC is focusing on developing the new Windows client for OCLC Connexion (see above). Eventually, Connexion will

replace all currently existing cataloging interfaces including CatME. OCLC has not yet established a timeframe for the end of support for CatME 2.10 and 2.11.

It will be sometime after 2004, after all CatME functionality has been added to Connexion, and once CatME users have had time to migrate to the new interface. OCLC will notify users at least one year in advance of discontinuing CatME support.

## Reference Services

### *Availability Indicator on FirstSearch WorldCat for netLibrary eBooks*

OCLC has added indicators that designate whether a library has access to the full text of netLibrary eBooks in the WorldCat brief record and detailed record displays. Currently, users can link from netLibrary eBook records in WorldCat to those eBooks on the netLibrary site, but users do not know whether they will have full-text access to them until they arrive at the netLibrary site. Users will now see a link to "Full Text" in the record display of those eBooks to which the library has purchased access, or a link to "Description" when the library has not purchased access. When they click on the "Full Text" link, users will be able to directly access the full text of the eBook and browse through its contents. When users click on the "Description" link, they will be taken to a page providing a short description and (when available) summary of the eBook. Public domain books remain available to all accounts, and are flagged with the "Full Text" indicator.

### *NetLibrary Tables of Contents Available in WorldCat on the OCLC FirstSearch Service*

Users can now see tables of contents available in netLibrary's collection of eBooks in detailed WorldCat records via FirstSearch. Tables of contents for these items will appear regardless of whether the user's library has purchased these eBooks. Users will find the tables of contents helpful in evaluating the contents of the netLibrary eBooks they retrieve in their searches. Book selectors and collection development librarians can use the tables of contents as a tool to evaluate new titles for possible acquisition by their libraries.

### *Thesaurus Now Available in Sociological Abstracts Database*

Users of the Sociological Abstracts database on FirstSearch are now able to search the *Thesaurus of Sociological Indexing Terms*. As in the thesauri and subject heading files available in other FirstSearch databases, users access the *Thesaurus* by clicking the Subjects icon in Basic, Advanced, or Expert Search modes,

then typing in a word or concept. The *Thesaurus* supplies preferred terms for the search concept, along with broader and narrower terms that may be expanded. Clicking a hotlinked term automatically launches a search.

### *ATLA Religion and ATLA Serials (ATLAS) Databases Reloaded*

The ATLA Religion and ATLA Serials (ATLAS) databases have been reloaded, resulting in the following changes:

- The number of titles indexed in ATLA Religion has increased to 1,553.
- The following new bibliographic information now appears in the records: additional language for multilingual items, variant title, physical details for articles/essays, bibliographic notes, citation information for related works, genre/form subject headings, more information on uniform titles, ATLA classification codes, ATLA record streams, and ATLA product codes.
- Several new indexes have been added. The most significant, in Expert search mode, is the Subject All Phrase index (sa=), which allows users to browse and search for a complete string of subject headings and subheadings (ex: sa= war biblical teaching).
- The Scripture Citation field in the full display is now hotlinked.
- A new linking mechanism allows users to find related records quickly from within a retrieved record. ATLA records include vertical links between a component record and its host record, and horizontal links to related records. For example, from an article or review record, users can link to the host issue record and all articles and reviews contained in that issue. From an issue record, users can link to the host serial record and all issues contained in the title. From an essay record, users can link to the host book record and all essays contained in that book. From a review record, users can link to the book reviewed and other reviews on the same book. From a serial record, users can link to the preceding title or succeeding title record. ATLAS subscribers will see links to ATLAS remote full text from within serial and issue records.

## Digital and Preservation Resources

### *National Library of the Netherlands and OCLC Establish Digital Preservation Center*

The National Library of the Netherlands (Koninklijke Bibliotheek, or KB), OCLC, and OCLC PICA are working together to provide preservation, digitization and

retrospective conversion services that will increase access to valuable European library materials. OCLC and the KB will operate Strata Preservation N.V., a center to digitize and preserve the rich history recorded in centuries-old European collections. The KB, which already operates a microfilming service in The Hague, will work with OCLC Digital & Preservation Resources to digitize, microfilm and preserve library materials in Europe. OCLC Digital & Preservation Resources operates digital and preservation service centers in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and Lacey, Washington, in the United States. Strata Preservation focuses primarily on microfilming and digitizing the vulnerable and unique collections of European cultural heritage that need to be preserved and become more accessible to the public. In a separate agreement, OCLC and OCLC PICA will work with the KB to convert 400,000 of its records to machine-readable form in a three-year project beginning in September 2002, making the records available online and the materials they represent more accessible to library users worldwide. OCLC staff will use the OCLC PICA GGC (Gemeenschappelijk Geautomatiseerd Catalogiseersysteem) database, PICA's Shared Cataloguing System, and WorldCat to convert the records. The work will be converted to the GGC database offered through OCLC PICA.

### Resource Sharing Services

#### *Local Data Record Batchloading Service Offered at No Charge Through June 2003*

Libraries wishing to update their local data records (LDR) can do so through OCLC Batch Processing for a limited time at no charge, provided the data are compliant with the MARC 21 Format for Holdings Data. A nominal fee is charged for patterned data submitted in non-MARC formats. Libraries must request to have their holdings batchloaded before June 30, 2003 to take advantage of the promotion. A library may submit batch files on a regular schedule of their choice, or update with one-time batch project and then maintain LDRs online through the OCLC Union List service.

#### *Delivery Formats for the Serial Union List Offline Products*

Starting in January 2003, libraries will be able to order Serial Union List Offline Products (SULOP) in the following formats: paper, microfiche, IBM cartridge, EDX FTP, and Product Services Web. The paper and microfiche formats are designed for use by staff or patrons and contain a basic level of bibliographic and holdings information. Libraries can optionally choose to add additional bibliographic fields and holdings information as needed. Details on which fields can be added can be found

on the Serials Union List Offline Product order form. The IBM Cartridge, EDX FTP file, and the Product Services Web file are designed to be used by libraries/vendors to load the libraries' union list information into their local systems. The files contain the complete master bibliographic record, institution-level holdings (SIHD field), and optionally the copy-specific holdings (SCHD & CLNO). These files are not designed to be used with spreadsheet or word processing packages. Detailed information on the format of the files can be found in OCLC-MARC Records.

---

### Questions and Answers

by Jay Weitz

---

**Q:** This is another curiosity in the department of "cataloging questions I always wondered about but was afraid to ask." OCLC has many examples (e.g. #12737157) of cataloging for sound recordings in which some of the added entries for performers include a subfield ‡4 and others don't. I have never been able to see a pattern or explanation for this inconsistency (unless, perhaps, someone is both performer and composer of part of the contents--but that is not the case here or usually). Can you shed some light on the situation?

**A:** There are several reasons why an OCLC record may be inconsistent in the presence of subfield ‡4 for performer added entries. Occasionally, one can make an educated guess about it, and in other cases (such as here), it will probably remain a mystery. Of course, it can be a simple case of inconsistency on the part of the original inputting institution. If a record has been edited by another institution (such as an Enhance participant), it could be the result of differing practices from institution to institution. If a merge has been involved somewhere along the line (indicated by the presence of field 019; not the case in the record you cite), it's possible that manually transferred data from the deleted record may not have followed the same subfield ‡4 practice as the existing data in the retained record.

Another possibility is that OCLC could have updated (manually or with a macro or other automated process) one or more of the added entries to conform to a change in the authority file, in which case subfields ‡4 could get written over. Those are the most obvious circumstances that come to mind.

**Q:** Following the examples and explanation from OCLC's online *Bibliographic Formats and Standards*

(<http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/0xx/007sound.shtml>), I code and transcribe garden-variety cassettes that are Dolby processed as in the example given:

```
007    s ꞑb s ꞑd l ꞑe s ꞑf n ꞑg j ꞑh l ꞑi c ꞑm c ꞑn e
300    1 sound cassette : ꞑb analog, stereo., Dolby
processed
```

I routinely code the piece for Dolby processed if the cassette says Dolby processed. However, a colleague of mine cites the following passage from the *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* with regard to 007 subfield ꞑm:

Use only if a special process applied during recording must also be applied during reproduction. Subfield ꞑm applies to both discs and tapes. If the item specifies one characteristic, enter the code for that characteristic. If no characteristic is specified, do not use subfield ꞑm.

- a NAB standard
- b CCIR standard
- c Dolby-B encoded, standard  
Dolby

[etc.]

My colleague reads "must be applied during reproduction" in the rule to mean that in coding this subfield at all I am saying that a specific feature is required on the equipment used to listen to the tape:

Following from the above, I also transcribe "Dolby processed" into the 300 field when the piece is Dolby processed (as per the Dolby symbol on the cassette). Are my practices actually correct, optional, necessary, unnecessary?

**A:** If a commercial cassette tape indicates that it is Dolby processed, the 007 subfield ꞑm should be coded "c" for the standard Dolby-B encoding. This simply means that, for optimal playback quality, Dolby-capable equipment is required. Dolby-processed cassettes may also be played back on non-Dolby equipment, but the sound quality will be inferior.

Regarding the 300 field, under AACR2 6.5C8, it is an optional addition to indicate the recording and reproduction characteristics of a sound recording (including "Dolby processed") in the physical description. LCRI 6.5C8, however, says "Apply the rule whenever the information would be needed for selecting playback equipment." MCD 6.5C8 goes even further: "Apply this option whenever the information would be needed for selecting playback equipment to get the full audio effect of the recording; e.g., record the quadrasonic process in the

physical description area when special equipment is required to listen to the recording in quad., even if it can be listened to in stereo. without the special equipment." This reinforces what we've already suggested about coding the 007 subfield ꞑm.

**Q:** For the 007 subfield ꞑn for cassettes I have been coding "e" for the medium in hand (tape) at all times, not coding the recording technology used. But should I code this subfield "d" if the music on the cassette was "digitally recorded"?

- d Digital storage. Captured using electrical equipment and stored using digital techniques. Do not confuse with digital playback techniques.
- e Analog electrical storage. Captured on electrical equipment and stored on magnetic surface (e.g., a coated tape). Includes most recordings from the late 1940s until the early 1980s.

**A:** The 007 subfield ꞑn is supposed to reflect the original capture technique, that is, the manner in which the sound was originally captured and stored. This has nothing necessarily to do with the playback medium that you have in hand. If the recording you have in hand indicates that the sound was "digitally recorded," code "d" would be correct. Note that many vinyl recordings from the 1980s were actually digitally captured, even though they were published in an analog medium. Likewise, many CDs contain sound that was captured using earlier recording technology--acoustical, direct, or analog electric.

In the many cases where the item in hand doesn't give any direct hint of the original capture technique, you can sometimes make an educated guess by the date of the original recording (before 1927/1929, acoustical code "a"; 1927/1929 through late 1940s, plus anything that is touted as "direct-to-disc" and the like, direct storage code "b"; late 1940s through early 1980s, analog electric code "e"; since the early 1980s, generally digital code "d"). You always have the option of using "u" for "unknown" when there's no evidence and you can't make a reasonable guess.

**Q:** I'd like to make sure I'm transcribing durations correctly, using MCD 6.5B2 and MCD 6.7B10. The duration in the 300 field should be used to indicate duration when there is only one work on the recording, for example, an opera, or perhaps a CD single of one song. If a sound recording consists of more than one work the durations are transcribed in the 505 note field, or 500 note field if the title proper is non-collective. What about the 306 field? Can I use that to transcribe a disc's entire duration (say a jazz CD's entire play list of 53 min., 23 sec.

or 306 005323) and then the 505 to list each song's duration? Or is the 306 only to match up with the durations listed in the 505 (or 500)?

**A:** Your interpretations of MCD 6.5B2 and MCD 6.7B10 are right on the money. Regarding field 306, first remember that it's optional. There are no hard and fast rules about exactly how it should be used, but here's my take. Like many other elements in the MARC format, field 306 is a product of the days before keyword and full-text searching and before we had the so-called "enhanced" contents notes that allow separate subfielding for different types of data. My guess is that the 306 was intended as a coded point of access for durations for such uses as finding a recording of an exactly certain length (for radio or commercial purposes, let's say). That would explain why LC's internal "Music and Sound Recording Online Manual" says that "[i]f the durations of two works are the same, give the playing time only once in the 306 field."

If you are going to use 306 at all, I think it makes sense for it to reflect the individual durations that are listed in a 500 or 505 rather than the summed-up length of a multi-work item. But you may record in the 306 whichever you feel to be useful. Of course, if there is only a single work, the question is moot.

**Q:** Is it okay to use the 300 ‡e field for simple inserts, not necessarily for accompanying material of major significance? For example, most cassettes and CDs have inserts as part of the packaging, and we like to routinely include that aspect of the item in hand in that field. Is that okay for master records?

**A:** We've got to look at AACR2 Rules 1.5E1, 6.5E1, and 6.7B11, and more importantly, at the MCDs for 1.5E1 and 6.7B11. Rule and MCD 1.5E1 together suggest that you can choose either to make a note about this sort of accompanying material, or you can include it in the physical description (field 300 subfield ‡e), but not both. (I'm not sure that anyone actually adheres to this restriction, however.) MCD 6.7B11 states in part: "Make notes on accompanying program notes, etc., only if they are important, either because of their content or because they are physically separable. Do not, however, make a note for physically separable materials accompanying a compact disc unless their content is important."

Taken all together, the implication seems to be that you may generally indicate such CD inserts in field 300 subfield ‡e, but then not describe them further in a note. If the material is something substantial, and especially if it has a title of its own or you feel the need to mention a prominent program annotator or the like, go with the note

and omit the 300 subfield ‡e. Otherwise, you can use 300 subfield ‡e and omit any note.

**Q:** I have a uniform title question for you. I am cataloging a piece entitled *Fantasy on Mr. Hyde's Song* by Donald Grantham, which is for band. Upon doing research for this piece, I found one other bibliographic record in OCLC for it. This record is for a sextet version of the piece. So I thought I would need to qualify this by "‡m band" in the uniform title, especially since the preface seems to say that the piece I have in hand was meant for band and there is no mention of this being an arrangement. I then went to New Grove, and it says the following: "Fantasy on Mr. Hyde's Songs [with an 's' on the end], 1993, rev. of chbr. work 1988." So this made me wonder if I should make the uniform title exactly as it is noted in NG, or with the title as it appears on the item [i.e. with the word "song" singular] with the qualifier "‡m band." How would you tackle this?

**A:** The answer depends on a number of things. If New Grove is accurate in suggesting that the title of this revision has actually changed (from "... song" to "... songs"), then you can simply invoke the first part of MCD 25.25A, Footnote 9 and use "Fantasy on Mr. Hyde's Songs" as the uniform title of this revision and be done with it. (Note that the online Grove lists this under Grantham's orchestral works; are you certain this refers to the band version that you have?) So, if your item (is it a score or a recording?) has the plural "songs," you're all set. But if your item has the singular "song," as you imply, then we have to read further into MCD 25.25A, Footnote 9, and look at MCD 25.35C. Since we seem to have a change of broad medium from the sextet version to the band version, neither MCD 25.35C nor the third section of MCD 25.25A, Footnote 9 seem to apply. The title hasn't changed. There seem to be no other identifying elements (such as opus number) to consider. But since Grantham has revised (apparently) extensively from sextet to band, your addition of the subfield ‡m seems a reasonable choice.

**Q:** I have been working on a vocal score of Mozart's *Nozze di Figaro* that I believe is going to need a new record in OCLC. I found a record in OCLC with the same ISBN and publisher's number (BA 4565b), but there are several differences that I believe cause a need for new record. The current record in OCLC has 528 pages; my vocal score has 537 pages. The current record in OCLC has preface in German; my vocal score has preface in German and English. The current record in OCLC has a date of c1999; my vocal score has a c1999--but on the verso of the title page, it also has this statement: "Revidierte 2. Auflage / Revised 2nd printing 2002." What should I do with the phrase "Revised 2nd printing"? Should I treat this an edition statement and place it in the

250 field? Perhaps a quoted note? Fixed field: DtSt: t, Dates: 2002, 1999? Please let me know if there are some other options for this score.

**A:** All of these differences together sure sound as though they justify a new record. That clear statement of revision on the title page verso should be transcribed as an edition statement ("Auflage" is usually translated as "edition," as far as I'm aware). And your DtSt/Dates choices also seem right on the mark. You seem to have made all the right moves.

**Q:** I am cataloging a score, Elam Sprenkle's *Three Sketches on a Southern Hymn Tune*, that has the following date statement:

c1983 Atlantis Publications  
First publication for sale 1995

I have coded the DtSt: t, and have the 260 subfield †c "first publication for sale 1995, c1983." Is this the best way to handle the dates on this score?

**A:** You don't really need to include the explanatory text in the 260 subfield †c. The "1995, c1983" should suffice, I would think. You could certainly include a quoted note explaining the 1995 date, if you wish.

**Q:** In reading the questions and answers in the *MOUG Newsletter* no. 81, the question on Musica Rara caught my eye. Musica Rara, located in Monteux, France, was bought by Breitkopf & Härtel in 2000, and the ownership of the copyrights was assigned to Breitkopf. It appears Breitkopf is using the name "Musica Rara" almost like a series. They kept the original catalog and are now expanding on it. Would this really be considered a reprint? I always get tripped up in this area. It is easy when one publishing house gives permission to another publishing house to publish an item--then it is a reprint--but I don't have a good answer when a publishing house is absorbed by another.

My take on this would be to do a new record based on the fact that the title proper changed, but I would make the publisher statement: "Wiesbaden : †b Breitkopf & Härtel : †b Musica Rara, †c [2000?]." I'm not sure about the c1961 because the copyright was reassigned to Breitkopf and so the item has a new copyright date, yet I'm not totally comfortable using c2000. (I'm more familiar with books than scores when it comes to this.) If I were following the LCRIs laid down for copyright dates before and after 1978, then I would go with c2000 since it is a later copyright date. Any thoughts on this approach?

**A:** As I noted in my answer in *MOUG Newsletter* no. 81, I wasn't sure if my answer was correct, but given the information I was presented (and lacking proof from the

actual item), it seemed to be a reasonable solution. The whole issue of "copyright assigned to" leaves me totally confused. I have now looked at DLC and PCC records for several Breitkopf imprints with "Musica Rara" as some sort of appendage (searching "fin pb breitkopf and pb rara/sco/dlc/2000-") and most seem to treat the publisher as "Wiesbaden : †b Breitkopf & Härtel, Musica Rara" and a single, recent copyright date. Of course, one of the risks of such cataloging by example is that we don't know the exact circumstances of these other publications, which may or may not be similar. A few of the records treat "Musica Rara" as a separate publisher in a separate subfield †b (either with another place of publication, or not), but of the dozen records, only one treats the dates roughly as I have in my answer. (Authority record n2001082669 suggests not treating "Musica Rara" as a series, and implies that including it in the imprint is preferable.) I'm not entirely comfortable calling a "copyright assignment" an actual copyright date, which is why I opted for the bracketed questioned date, but your interpretation seems as legitimate as mine.

**Q:** I was wondering if you could give me a better clarification on the 245 subfielding change. I understand that with this change I can now place the subfields †n and †p before or after the †h depending upon my interpretation of which would best serve to describe my item. Another question: Does the order have to remain †n and then †p, or can I interchange those subfields, thus †p and then †n?

**A:** The only change that has occurred is that subfields †n and/or †p (in any order) may follow subfield †b. Previously, any data that would have qualified as subfield †n (Number of part/section of a work) or subfield †p (Name of a part/section of a work) would *not* have been separately subfielded following a coded subfield †b. The placement of subfield †h (following the entire title proper, including subfields †a and †n and/or †p, if present, but before any subfield †b) has not changed. The order (and any necessary repetition) of subfields †n and †p has always been dependent on how the information appears on the resource being cataloged; there is no order prescribed in either AACR2 or MARC 21.

**Q:** Recently, I have come across some vinyl records from the late 70s/early 80s, and have noticed that the labels on some of the records state a publisher name other than the label name, e.g. one record that was released on Sain (a Welsh record label), but stated Universal Music as the publishers. Having checked MARC 21, I know that the label name goes in 028 subfield †b, but which should I put in 260 subfield †b? If I use the name given in these statements (which are in extremely small print usually), won't that just confuse the patrons? I would greatly

appreciate any suggestions, as we have quite a lot of these records.

A: AACR2 6.4D2 states that "[i]f a sound recording bears both the name of the publishing company and the name of a subdivision of that company or a trade name used by that company, give the name of the subdivision or the trade name or brand name as the name of the publisher." It's not clear from your explanation what the relationship, if any, may be between Sain and Universal Music (and judging from the Sain Web site's "About us" page at <http://www.sain.wales.com/english/aboutus/about.shtml>, there is not a readily apparent one), but it sounds as though Sain would also be the correct choice for the sound recording publisher in field 260 subfield 1b. What might very well be the case is that Universal Music is the publisher of the (published) music itself, rather than the publisher of the recording per se. In that case, you could follow 6.7B7 and add an "Ed. recorded" note.

Q: I am originally cataloging a score for a work by Eric P. Mandat. On the cover, the title appears like so: Sub(t)rains O' Strata's fearS. Caption titles for the two parts appear as: "Sub(t)rains" and "Strata's fears". Try as I might, I have been unable to find rules on how to deal with unusual capitalization. Do I use the composer's capitalization in the 240 and the 245 or just the 245 or not at all? I'll make 246s to cover alternatives. Help!

A: AACR2, the LCRIs, and the MCDs offer little explicit guidance on this, except for the statement in 1.1B1: "Transcribe the title proper exactly as to wording, order, and spelling, but not necessarily as to punctuation and capitalization. [...] Capitalize according to appendix A." Appendix A does not address this issue directly. So here is my guess based on a single example with which I'm familiar. The Philip Glass/Robert Wilson opera "CIVIL warS" had similarly unusual capitalization. There are no LC or PCC bibliographic records for the work, as far as I've been able to find (although it is interesting to note that none of the bibliographic records I found transcribed the unusual capitalization). The authority records for the work (nr2001009613, n84226749) and its parts (nr2001009614, nr2001009615, no00024491), however, are consistent in using only standard capitalization. Given 1.1B1, the silence of Appendix A, and this (non-authoritative) example, I'd say not to transcribe the odd capitalization. If you want to be precise about it, you might mention the unusual capitalization in a 500 note. Regarding 246s, however, you may want to add a variant form without the parentheses (which will no doubt play havoc with indexing and display), and possibly another transcribing "Strata's fearS" as the homophonic "stratospheres." Other variants may be appropriate, as you see fit.

## THE BEST OF MOUG, 7th EDITION, 2000 STILL AVAILABLE!

The 7th edition of *The Best of MOUG* is still available. It contains Library of Congress Name Authority File records for C.P.E. and J.S. Bach, Beethoven, Boccherini, Brahms, Clementi, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Schubert, Schumann, Telemann, and Vivaldi, with lists arranged by thematic number for Bach, Handel, Mozart, Schubert, Telemann, and Vivaldi (F. and RV). It also contains English cross references for Bartok, Dvorak, Glazunov, Gliere, Glinka, Grechaninov, Janacek, Kodaly, Martinu, Mussorgsky, Prokofiev, Rachmaninoff, Rimsky-Korsakov, Shostakovich, Smetana, Stravinsky, and Tchaikovsky. Each list includes uniform titles and corresponding authority record control numbers and is current to August 1999.

What's new in this edition? Gliere, Grechaninov, and Martinu.

The Best of MOUG is an excellent tool for catalogers and public service librarians because it can be kept at a desk, card catalog, or online terminal for quick access to uniform titles for the composers that are the most difficult to search online. The authority control numbers are given so that the authority record can be verified.

The cost is \$20.00 (North America) \$30.00 (Overseas, U.S. funds). All orders must be prepaid, with checks made out to the **Music OCLC Users Group**.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY \_\_\_\_\_  
COUNTRY \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

Please send your checks to MOUG care of:

Judy Weidow  
Cataloging S5453  
The General Libraries  
The University of Texas at Austin  
P.O. Box P  
Austin, TX 78713-8916

TAX NO: 31-0951917



# Music OCLC Users Group Annual Meeting

11-12 February 2003  
Renaissance Austin Hotel, Austin, TX

## REGISTRATION FORM

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State/Province: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip/PostalCode: \_\_\_\_\_

Country: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

Electronic mail address: \_\_\_\_\_

Institutional affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_

### Registration Fees

Early Registration Deadline: Postmarked by **January 13, 2003**

Annual Meeting - Personal Member	\$95 US	_____
Annual Meeting - Non-Member	\$120 US	_____
Annual Meeting - Student	\$55 US	_____
Late Registration (add to all registrations postmarked after 13 Jan '03 or on-site <sup>1</sup> )	\$30 US	_____
<b>Total amount enclosed:</b>		\$ _____

\*Registration fee includes 1 ticket for the Anniversary Luncheon on Wednesday, 12 February, 11:30am

Will you be attending the Anniversary luncheon ?    YES    NO

The entree will be Chicken Saltimbocca. If you must have a different Entree due to dietary or religious restrictions, please indicate below and we will see that your needs are met.

So that we may judge room size accurately, please indicate your session of choice for the 1:30-2:50 breakout sessions:

MARS Authority Control/Cataloging Websites                       netLibrary; RILM; WorldCat

Please indicate your session of choice for the 3:00-4:30 breakout session:

Ask MOUG - Technical Services                                       Ask MOUG - Public Services

If you have any questions for the speakers, feel free to submit them with your registration and we will forward your question to the speaker. Questions will be addressed during the appropriate sessions.

---

Registration fees will be refunded only in emergency situations and with the approval of the MOUG Chair. Make checks payable to the **Music OCLC Users Group**.<sup>2</sup> Receipts will be provided at the meeting. Personal membership dues are \$15.00 US per year. If you wish to join, please enclose a separate check for your dues.

Mail this form with your check to:

**Martin Jenkins**

**MOUG Continuing Ed. Coordinator**

**Music Library**

**M148B Creative Arts Center**

**Wright State University**

**Dayton, OH 45435**

**Email (inquiries only) [martin.jenkins@wright.edu](mailto:martin.jenkins@wright.edu)**

**Please make hotel reservations directly with the hotel at:**

Renaissance Austin Hotel  
9721 Arboretum Boulevard  
Austin, TX 78759

Reservations: 1-800-228-9898

Direct: (512) 343-2626

Fax: (512) 346-7953

**Hotel registration deadline is February 21, 2003.**

Request the group rate for "MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION."

Room rates are:

\$154 single or double; \$195 Atrium Suite; \$250 Luxury King Suite; \$300 Conference Suite  
+15 % tax

---

<sup>1</sup>)Please do not send registration forms by mail after January 24, 2003.

<sup>2</sup>)For institutions who pay directly on a registrant's behalf, MOUG's Federal Employer Identification Number (FEIN) is **31-0951917**.

**MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP**  
**Application for New Members**

Personal Membership is \$15.00 (North America); institutional membership is \$20.00 (North America); international membership (outside North America) is \$30.00. Membership includes subscription to the *Newsletter*. New members receive all newsletters for the year, and any mailings from date of membership through December (issues are mailed upon receipt of dues payment). We encourage institutional members to subscribe via their vendor.

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

PREFERRED ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_ STATE \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_ COUNTRY \_\_\_\_\_

WORK PHONE: (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ FAX NUMBER: (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

INSTITUTION NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

E-MAIL ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

A check for membership dues, payable to MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP must accompany this application:

- \$15.00 Personal (North America)
- \$20.00 Institutional (North American)
- \$30.00 Personal and Institution (outside North America)

Please complete this form, enclose check, and mail to: Ruth A. Inman, MOUG Treasurer, Kennedy-King College, 10109 S. Prospect Ave. , Chicago, IL 60643

---

Stephen Luttmann  
MOUG Secretary/Newsletter Editor  
University of Northern Colorado Music Library  
Campus Box 68  
Greeley, CO 80639-0100

UNIV OF NORTHERN COLORADO  
JAMES A. MICHENER LIBRARY  
SERIALS DIVISION  
501 20TH ST  
GREELEY CO 80639