



MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP

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

NEWSLETTER

ISSN 0161-1704

September-December 2004

No. 87-88

From the Chair

Mark Scharff, Washington University

I began this column on a plane to Phoenix, bound for a few days of family vacation. This, for me, is summer's last gasp; from here on, it's a push toward the Midwest Chapter MLA meeting, toward the holidays, and toward the winter convention season, including our own MOUG meeting in Vancouver in February. I'm sure most of you are on similar paths; I hope that each of you has had the sort of summer that prepares you for the rigors of fall.

In a sense, autumn began for me on August 20, when the MOUG Executive Board gathered for its summer meeting (a counterpoint to the session held at the MOUG Annual Meeting). It was my first meeting as chair, and things definitely look different from that side of an agenda! Many thanks to my fellow Board members, to committee chairs, and to others in positions of responsibility for their help and understanding. Special thanks to our OCLC liaison Jay Weitz for once again handling the arrangements. There are few finer or more productive venues for doing business than Jay's dining room table, with Ernie the Wonder Dog providing a head to scratch during our breaks. Much of our meeting involved getting ducks in a row for Vancouver, led by new Continuing Education Coordinator Candy Feldt. From the programs to the working meetings to the reception, this promises to be a MOUG meeting hard to resist. Candy has more to say about the meeting elsewhere in this issue. We also approved an outstanding slate of candidates for the offices of Chair-Elect and Treasurer. Please look for those ballots in your mailbox and cast your vote. We also enjoyed having Deb Bendig join us to talk about ways for OCLC and MOUG to provide more services to users of OCLC's reference products. We all came away encouraged by our mutual interest in improving communication and exchanging ideas for new and improved products.

The beginning of my summer had an OCLC flavor to it, too, as I attended the Members' Council May 23-25 (the

MOUG Chair is invited to attend as an observer). The principal theme of this session was "institutional repositories," which could simplistically be described as digital vertical files, containing various documents produced by an institution and its employees, many of which would be unpublished. Several software packages exist to search and manage such repositories, but there are large questions of levels of storage, modes of retrieval, authentication, and rights management. OCLC is exploring possible avenues of service to its members in this area. Musical applications? Think recital and concert recordings, lectures, master classes, seminar papers, performance materials OCLC is also working with ILS vendors to develop models for bringing FRBR (Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records) principles into retrieval displays. And OCLC's 2003 environmental scan, "Pattern Recognition," offers some provocative views of the landscape in which OCLC and its member libraries are operating. Read more at www.oclc.org/membership/escan/default.htm.

This column ends some time after my return from Phoenix, and family gathering for Thanksgiving is just around the corner. I attended OCLC Members' Council again in October, and look forward to sharing with you some of the "high-concept" discussion taking place. Before I sign out, let me offer congratulations to our dear friend and MOUG member Glenn Patton, Director for Metadata Standards and Quality at OCLC, who received the OCLC President's Award at the May meeting of the OCLC Members' Council in recognition of his years of service.

Enough from me--turn the page and find the good stuff!
Until Vancouver,
Mark

IN THIS ISSUE:

News from OCLC.....	p. 4
Q & A by Jay Weitz	p. 13

MOUG Executive Board 2004-2005

CHAIR

Mark Scharff, Music Cataloger
Gaylord Music Library
Washington University
Box 1032
St. Louis, MO 63130
(314) 935-5560 (o)
mscharff@wustl.edu

PAST CHAIR

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

TREASURER

Ruth A. Inman, Librarian
Kennedy-King College Library
2538 W. 119th St.
Chicago, IL 60655
(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)
stephen.luttmann@unco.edu

CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR

Candice Feldt, Senior Cataloger
Eda Kuhn Loeb Music Library
North Yard
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 495-2794 (o)
feldt@fas.harvard.edu

OCLC LIAISON

Jay Weitz, Consulting Database Specialist
WorldCat Content Management Division
OCLC, Inc.
6565 Frantz Road
Dublin, OH 43017-0702
(614) 764-6156 (o)
weitzj@oclc.org

Thanks to all who contributed to this issue. The *Newsletter* is a publication of the Music OCLC Users Group. It appears three times a year: June, September, and December. 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, Word, 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, 2538 W. 119th St., Chicago, Illinois 60655 (Dues in North America, \$15.00 for personal members, \$20.00 for institutional subscriptions; 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.

**From the Continuing Education Coordinator
Candice Feldt, Harvard University**

The excitement is building for Vancouver, February, 2005! We already have a line up of knowledgeable and fascinating speakers, and a simply fabulous reception for all attendees to enjoy on Tuesday afternoon following the plenary session.

Plenary session speakers will be Deb Bendig (OCLC) and Allyson Carlyle (University of Washington). They will be discussing FRBR and its impact on public and technical services. On Wednesday morning we will have separate sessions with the theme of "Back to Basics" for catalogers and public services librarians. Sue Stancu (Indiana University) will be discussing the basics of authority records, principally for catalogers who'd like to understand more about authorities. Stephen Luttmann (University of Northern Colorado) will be talking about the basics of MARC bibliographic records, aimed primarily at public services librarians, who need to know how the information in the MARC record helps them find information in the catalog.

For this meeting, by popular demand, the Ask MOUG session will combine public and technical services issues, instead of separating them as we have in the past. If you have questions that you would like to have addressed by the Ask MOUG panel, please feel free to email Jay Weitz (technical services) or Deb Bendig (public services) before the Vancouver meeting. We will also be happy to take questions from the audience as usual, of course.

Here's a breakdown of the schedule, with times:

Tuesday, February 15, 2005

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| 1:00-3:00 pm | MOUG Board meeting |
| 2:30 pm | Registration opens (until 7:30pm) |
| 3:00-3:50 pm | Enhance working session |
| 4:00-5:30 pm | Plenary Session:
Allyson Carlyle (University of Washington) and Deb Bendig (OCLC): FRBR, what it will mean for public and technical services |
| 5:30 pm- | Reception |
| 6:30-7:45 pm | Concurrent sessions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• NACO Music Project working session (one hour)• Reference Products Committee |

Wednesday, February 16, 2005

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| 7:30-9:00 am | Registration |
| 7:30-8:30 am | Breakfast buffet |
| 8:30-9:20 am | Concurrent sessions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Understanding MARC bibliographic records (for Reference Librarians) (Stephen Luttmann, University of Northern Colorado)• Understanding MARC authority records (for Catalogers) (Sue Ellen Stancu, Indiana University) |
| 9:30-10:45 am | Ask MOUG for public and technical services (Jay Weitz, Deb Bendig, and friends) |
| 11:00 am-noon | MOUG Business Meeting |

I hope you will join us in Vancouver. It promises to be both a practical and enjoyable meeting for all. Thanks to everyone on the program committee for your ideas and suggestions, which have proven to be so helpful! Also, if you're interested in serving on the Program Committee for the 2006 meeting in Memphis, please let me know. I already have some ideas, and would love to start the ball rolling for Memphis while we're all still in Vancouver!

**OCLC Reference and MOUG Services
Deb Bendig, OCLC**

I want to express my appreciation to the people of MOUG who have been so forthcoming and therefore useful to OCLC via the Public Services ASK MOUG sessions and via feedback at the annual MOUG meetings. Having regular interactions with and communications from this community has helped us fine tune both WorldCat and the other FirstSearch music-related databases to be as useful as possible.

Furthermore, it's extremely useful to be able to get ideas from and bounce ideas off the Public Services ASK MOUG attendees . . . surely one of the purposes of these sessions? This gives MOUG staff a chance to be proactive, instead of just reactive. As OCLC delves ever deeper into WorldCat, e.g. highlighting the coded values from the OCLC MARC records, we can find out from those who are experts in using WorldCat those aspects that will be most useful to them and their patrons.

I'm looking forward to another interesting Public Services ASK MOUG session in Vancouver!

General News

IFLA/OCLC Fellows for 2005 Named

OCLC, the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), and the American Theological Library Association announced the IFLA/OCLC Early Career Development Fellows for 2005 on August 24, 2004 at the IFLA Annual Conference in Buenos Aires, Argentina. They are:

- Mr. Thomas Bello, Systems Librarian, University of Malawi Libraries, Zomba, Malawi
- Ms. Xiaoqing Cai, Librarian, Sun Yat-sen University Library, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China
- Mr. Edwar Delgado, Library Director, Albania School, Albania, Guajira, Colombia
- Ms. Lela Nanuashvili, Lecturer, Department of Library Science, Tbilisi State University of Culture and Arts, Tbilisi, Georgia
- Rev. Gillian Wilson, Librarian, United Theological College of the West Indies, Kingston, Jamaica, West Indies

Established in 1999, the IFLA/OCLC Fellowship supports library and information science professionals from countries with developing economies. The fellowship program, hosted by OCLC at its headquarters in Dublin, Ohio, provides advanced continuing education and exposure to a broad range of issues in information technologies, library operations and global cooperative librarianship. During the 2005 program, which will run from May 2 through May 27, the IFLA/OCLC Fellows will participate in seminars, lectures, and mentoring; observe portions of an OCLC Members Council meeting to help provide more insight to issues affecting global library cooperation; and visit selected North American libraries and cultural heritage institutions to meet leading practitioners and discuss real-world solutions to the challenges facing libraries today. Fellows translate their learning and experiences into specific professional development plans that guide their continued growth as well as their personal contributions to their home institutions and country of origin. This year, the American Theological Library Association is sponsoring one Fellow. Application information for the 2006 Fellowship Program will be posted on the OCLC Web site (<http://www.oclc.org/institute/resources/fellowships/ifla/default.htm>) in October 2004.

Product Usage Statistics: OPUS Replaces MUTRS

OCLC is pleased to introduce new product usage statistics. Effective October 2004, the new OCLC Product Usage Statistics (OPUS) reports replaced the Marketing Usage Trends Reporting System (MUTRS) reports. The Online Product Usage Statistics (OPUS) reports are available online in the OCLC Product Services Web (see <http://www.oclc.org/news/announcements/announcement122.htm> for access instructions) and updated monthly for every OCLC member and participating institution. OPUS reports show cumulative activity by month and OCLC product codes for each institution, beginning with the current fiscal year. Thus reports in November show activity for July through October. Institutions that wish to retain information about their activity for the entire year should remember to print or download their reports in July before the new fiscal year reports are available. Initially, the reports will be available by 5 PM Eastern Time on the eighth of every month. The date may be sooner as the reports run in the future and data is available earlier. OCLC produced MUTRS monthly and quarterly reports for the last time in October 2004, showing activity through September 2004.

Collections and Technical Services

End-of-Life Dates for OCLC Cataloging Systems

As of May 1, 2005, all users of Passport for Cataloging must migrate to either the Connexion browser or the Connexion client. As of July 1, 2005, all users of CatME, CJK and Arabic must migrate to the Connexion client. In June 2005 OCLC will retire Passport for Union List, and Connexion will support local holdings (LDR) maintenance. OCLC will release more details over the next few months. Your migration options:

- OCLC Connexion browser
 - Take advantage of easy Internet access, simple searching, easy cataloging of Internet resources, no extra software to install and maintain, and automated heading verifications. If you do not need macros, batch processing or offline editing, and you like a system that is easy to get to, easy to use, and doesn't require a lot of training, the Connexion browser may be right for you.
 - OCLC Connexion browser is available and contains all Passport for cataloging functionality except for macros and truncated lists. Macros will not be supported in the browser, but are available in the Connexion client.
 - Truncated lists will be added to the Connexion browser, along with WorldCat true keyword

searching and support for additional browse indexes. OCLC will issue more details over the next few months.

- To begin using the Connexion browser, you can log on at <http://connexion.oclc.org> using your cataloging authorization and password.
- Connexion browser documentation, including a tutorial, can be found at <http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/connexion/browser/default.htm>.
- OCLC Connexion client
 - The client is a powerful, flexible Windows-based interface with productivity-boosting enhancements including macros, additional keyboard customization (you can perform all navigation and cataloging actions using assignable key combinations) and integrated label printing.
 - Connexion client version 1.20, scheduled for release in the fourth quarter of 2004, will contain most CatME functionality. This version will add NACO support, authority file searching enhancements, and local files including batch processing.
 - Connexion client version 1.30, scheduled for the first quarter of 2005, will add the remainder of CatME functionality, WorldCat true keyword searching, truncated lists, and CJK support.
 - Connexion client version 1.40, scheduled for the second quarter of 2005, will add support for Arabic cataloging.
 - To begin using the Connexion client, download it at <http://psw.oclc.org/software.htm>.
 - Connexion client documentation, including a tutorial, can be found at <http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/connexion/client/default.htm>.

To learn more about migrating to Connexion, visit the Connexion migration web site at <http://www.oclc.org/connexion/migrating/default.htm>.

Keyword Searching Changes

On June 6, 2004, OCLC instituted changes in keyword searching in the cataloging interface as part of the system migration to the Oracle platform. Among the user-apparent changes:

- The 18-character limit on search terms has been removed, now allowing up to 28 characters.
- The limit on matching terms when using character masking has been increased from 30 to 500.
- The Citation/Reference index has been removed.

- Author (au) and Extended Author (ea) indexes have been combined. Both index labels will work, but the "ea" index label will be removed in the future.
- Corporate (co) and Conference (cn) indexes have been combined. Both index labels will work, but the "co" index label will be removed in the future.
- Hyphens will now be converted to a space, and the system will automatically initiate a proximity search. (This does not change how ISBNs are searched.)
- Language (la) will now retrieve based on both the Fixed Field Lang and on the 041 ‡a when first indicator is 0, and the 041 ‡b, ‡d, ‡e, ‡f, and ‡g, regardless of the indicator.
- Limit by /mix or ft mix will now retrieve Type:p (Mixed material format) Type:t (Manuscript), Type:f (Manuscript map), and Type:d (Manuscript score), and all formats with Ctrl:a. Note: This does not change format limiting for derived searches.
- Publication location (pl) has been expanded to include the 261 ‡f and the 533 ‡b.
- Publisher (pb) has been expanded to include the 261 ‡a, ‡b, ‡e, and the 533 ‡c.
- Series (se) has been expanded to include the 533 ‡f and 534 ‡f.
- Standard number (nn) has been expanded to include 027 ‡a and ‡z, 028 ‡a, 037 ‡a, 088 ‡a, 262 ‡c.
- Subject/Title/Contents (st) has been expanded to include elements in the Author index, ISBNs, and publication dates.
- Title (ti) and Extended Title (et) indexes have been combined. Both index labels will work, but the "et" index label will be removed in the future.

Connexion Browser Enhancements June 2004

Among the enhancements to the Connexion Browser installed on 2004 June 6 were

- Authority searching enhancements: Connexion now supports more authority searching functionality from Passport and CatME. This includes derived and numeric (ISSN and ISBN) indexes; these will be added to Connexion client later this year.
- PCC and Peer review of bibliographic and authority records: This gives libraries the ability to share bibliographic and authority records for review: with peers from other libraries as well as with Program for Cooperative Cataloging trainers/reviewers for NACO, BIBCO, CONSER, and funnel projects. Any institution using Connexion browser at a limited or higher authorization may allow other institutions to review saved bibliographic or authority records. This replaces current Submit Record to Natl Review File

and Responded File functionality, and will be added to Connexion client later this year.

- Bibliographic Keyword searching: OCLC is moving all bibliographic searching (cataloging, interlibrary loan and reference searching) to a single shared set of indexes. Keyword searching is the first step in this move for cataloging interfaces, including Connexion. You will see few differences. Several indexes combined with other existing indexes; Citation/Reference index removed.
- Bypassing Active Records logoff warning now an option: You can now bypass the Active Records logoff warning allowing a faster system exit. If you choose this option, when you logoff you will no longer receive the Active Records warning screen. Please note: this will result in the loss of any editing you have done on these records.
- Connexion larger record size: Previous system limit of 50 occurrences of the same field is removed. You can now create records of any size in Connexion browser and client. Large records continue to truncate for Passport and CatME users.
- Display holdings enhancement: The Display Holdings command now provides a new Select the type of holdings you wish to view prompt immediately above your record display, allowing you to view holdings using only the keyboard.
- URLs in field 856 created in Passport or CatME and viewed in Connexion: This corrects a problem where a URL created in WorldCat using Passport or CatME was missing when viewed in WorldCat in Connexion on the same day.

Connexion Browser Enhancements August 2004

Among the enhancements to the Connexion Browser installed on 2004 August 22 were

- Record display delays because of bad URLs corrected:

Some Connexion browser and client users reported that some records were taking over a minute to display. OCLC determined the cause to be bad URLs in the records. This problem is corrected for both the browser and client interfaces with the August Connexion install.

- Clearing your browser cache after a Connexion Browser install:

Immediately after a new release of Connexion browser, you may need to clear your browser cache to avoid referencing old or expired copies of JavaScript files. Some symptoms of this are that you may see an

incomplete screen or get an indication of a JavaScript error, either as a popup or as a yellow icon in the lower left hand corner of the browser window. The recommended solution is to clear your browser cache using the instructions at http://www.oclc.org/connexion/support/browser_know_n_problems.htm#troubleshooting. See section 4, under "Troubleshooting Checklist."

You should only need to clear your cache once to resolve any issues caused by old files in cache. Sometimes a quicker solution is to simply refresh the page you are trying to display. This forces the browser to update any files needed for that particular page, but you might have to refresh a number of pages using this approach. However, it should only be necessary to refresh any given type of page (such as a brief list or search screen) once.

- Double-clicking and second clicking:

With this install, we have corrected problems with double clicking and second clicking in WorldCat, Save File, and Resource Catalog. In the past, we advised you not to click more than once until you got a system response as this caused performance issues. We have given the Connexion browser the ability to ignore the second click on group and brief lists, and on most edit/action/view operations, speeding up Connexion browser response times.

- Browser export and label enhancements:

- The following changes do not affect Export from the Express tab (CatExpress) or the Connexion client.
- You no longer have to download a file immediately after choosing the "Export Records in MARC," "Export," or "Flagged Records" commands. The bibliographic or authority records move to an appendable file in Connexion when the "Export to file" option is selected in Export Options. The files continue to append until you download them. The files are stored in Connexion for 90 days. TCP/IP export is still available when the TCP/IP option is selected in Export options.
- The "Create Labels for Flagged Records" command moves labels to an appendable file in Connexion. The files continue to append until you download them. Label files are stored in Connexion for 7 days. You can print labels one by one from a displayed bibliographic record as well.

- You can choose to collect export and label files by institution or by individual authorization.
 - You can set your own default file name and extension for export and label files.
 - You can download more than one bibliographic record file at a time as long as the records are in the same format, MARC, Dublin Core HTML, or Dublin Core RDF.
 - You can choose to save a record automatically with the "Mark for Export" or "Mark for Label" commands. When this option is on, either command will mark the record and automatically start the dialog to save records to the save file.
- WebDewey/Abridged WebDewey August 2004 quarterly update:
 - WebDewey and Abridged WebDewey are updated quarterly. Both services contain the latest version of the schedules, tables, Manual, and Relative Index entries from their respective enhanced DDC databases. The hierarchical displays in WebDewey and Abridged WebDewey feature updated main class and division captions (e.g., 700 Arts & recreation; 790 Sports, games & entertainment). The display of Dewey hierarchies has been improved in both WebDewey and Abridged WebDewey.

This enhancement features improved downward display of DDC hierarchies throughout schedule and table records, particularly the display of records that fall within a particular record's immediate downward hierarchy. Double and triple zero subdivisions now appear in the downward hierarchies for schedule and table records. Additionally, clicking on the standard subdivision link in a record's hierarchy no longer routes the user to the browse view. Instead, the applicable schedule record is displayed. (Note that the Browse button located in schedule and table records continues to offer you the option to browse the Dewey numbers with Captions index at any time.) The display of upward DDC hierarchies throughout schedule and table records, particularly upward hierarchies that include centered entries, or spans, has also been improved. Please refer to <http://www.oclc.org/dewey/enhancements/enhancement200408.htm> for specific examples.

- WebDewey is a web-based version of the enhanced DDC 22 database. This August 2004 release includes all updates to Dewey Decimal Classification, Edition 22, through July 2004

(corrections, new developments, new built numbers, and additional electronic index terms); thousands of Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) that have been statistically mapped to Dewey numbers from records in WorldCat and intellectually mapped by DDC editors (through LCSH Weekly List no. 36, 2003); thousands of Relative Index terms and built numbers not available in print; links from mapped LCSH to the LCSH authority records; selected mappings from Medical Subject Headings (MeSH).

- Abridged WebDewey is a web-based version of the enhanced Abridged 14 database. This August 2004 release includes all content from Abridged Edition 14, through July 2004; LCSH that have been intellectually mapped to Dewey headings by DDC editors, including mappings to Abridged Edition 13 numbers from the OCLC publication, Subject Headings for Children; links from mapped LCSH to the LCSH authority records; mappings between abridged Dewey numbers and subject headings from the 18th edition of H.W. Wilson's Sears List of Subject Headings.

Connexion Client Version 1.20 Coming 4th Quarter 2004

Connexion client version 1.20 will be released during the fourth quarter of 2004 and will include the following enhancements: Authority File searching enhancements, NACO functionality, review records, offline cataloging, local save files, local constant data, batch processing, text strings, actions on multiple records from a list, and more. During 2005 and beyond, Connexion client 1.30 and later versions will include WorldCat searching enhancements including "true" keyword searching and several new browse indexes, local accessions list, spell check, offline validation, drop down lists of valid values for fixed field elements, terminal sessions, Spanish interface, and Arabic and CJK script cataloging.

OCLC Interim Support for ISBN 13

A new international standard is expanding the current 10-digit ISBN to a 13-digit ISBN: the 3-digit prefix that identifies the book industry (currently 978), followed by the core 9-digit number, and the recalculated check digit that validates the internal integrity of the whole number. As such, it will also be identical to the EAN "Bookland" 13-digit code that already appears encoded in the bar code printed on the back of the book. While the official date for moving to this new standard is January 1, 2007, some publishers expect to begin printing both the current 10- and the new 13-digit ISBNs in materials later this year. This

will allow them to make the transition more easily to the new ISBN-13. For further details on the ISBN-13 implementation, please see <http://www.isbn-international.org/en/revision.html> and <http://www.isbn-international.org/en/download/implementation-guidelines-04.pdf>. LC expects to begin recording ISBN-13 numbers in LC records on October 1, 2004. Because OCLC is in the process of moving to a new system/database platform, and because this implementation will not be complete by October, OCLC will adopt the following interim support for ISBN-13 numbers in WorldCat. This will allow OCLC to focus on completing the migration to the new platform without having to retrofit systems that will soon be retired.

- Records loaded into WorldCat from the Library of Congress and our other trading partners:
 - OCLC will convert a 13-digit number appearing in field 020 subfield ‡a to an EAN (field 024, first indicator '3').
 - If the record contains a 13-digit ISBN without a corresponding 10-digit ISBN, OCLC will convert a 13-digit ISBN beginning with 978 to a 10-digit ISBN, modifying the check digit along the way, as well as convert to an EAN as indicated above.
- Online input:
 - For original records, OCLC libraries should input ISBN-13 numbers into an EAN field (024, first indicator '3') rather than inputting into the ISBN field (020).
 - For copy cataloging that contains an ISBN-13 on the piece but not on the record being edited, users with full-level or higher authorization may add the ISBN-13 numbers into an EAN field (024, first indicator '3') as a database enrichment using system lock and replace capabilities. Users who do not have full-level authorization may report these to OCLC Quality Control Section using one of the many error reporting options: online system, e-mail, fax, or mail.
 - OCLC libraries should NOT input ISBN-13 numbers in an 020 field. If libraries do enter the 13-digit ISBN in an 020 field, validation will move the number to ‡z indicating that it is an invalid ISBN. Such numbers will not be indexed and retrieved as the user might expect. (See Searching below).
- Searching:
 - No indexing/searching changes will be implemented at this time. Libraries can search for ISBN-13 numbers using the "Standard Number" index, which covers both the 020 ‡z and the 024 fields.

- ISBN-13 numbers will not be retrievable using the ISBN index during this interim period.

After OCLC completes the implementation of our new system/database platform, we will add support for the ISBN-13 numbers in the 020 field for Batchload, online input, and searching. Note that these practices apply also to any 13-digit ISBNs that appear on music materials. Under Database Enrichment, most OCLC users can add field 024 to a record that does not already have the field or in which the subfield ‡2 differs from an existing 024. All other things in a record being equal, the presence or absence of a standard number such as a 10- or 13-digit ISBN does not ordinarily justify the input of a new bibliographic record.

Implementation of AACR2, 2004 Update

The Library of Congress has announced that its catalogers will begin to apply new and changed rules from the 2004 Update to AACR2 on September 1, 2004. For subscribers to LC's Cataloger's Desktop, the 2004 AACR2 Update and its related LCRIs will be available on that date. Printed copies of the LCRIs have been distributed by the Cataloging Distribution Service. A list of the changes in the 2004 AACR2 Update has been posted on LC's Cataloging Policy and Support Office Web site (<http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpsa/2004upd.html>). OCLC recommends that member libraries begin applying these new and changed rules on that date. To purchase copies of the update from ALA Publishing, please visit the ALA website at <http://www.alastore.ala.org/>.

NetLibrary and Recorded Books to Offer Web-Based Audio Book Program

NetLibrary, the leading provider of eBooks to libraries worldwide, has teamed up with Recorded Books, LLC, the premier provider of unabridged audio books to libraries, to create an innovative new program for delivering audio books to libraries through the Web. Key elements to this unique program include an innovative pricing structure, unlimited access, the ability for patrons to download to a range of portable devices, and a technology solution that supports download via broadband or dial-up capabilities, ensuring reach to a wide range of library patrons. The program formally launches in December 2004. Libraries can view demos of the program upon request. Library users will be able to search for, preview, checkout, and listen to audio books via the Internet and the familiar NetLibrary platform, and can focus their search on audio titles only, or take advantage of search functionality that integrates audio titles with all electronic content their library may have in their NetLibrary collection. The

NetLibrary/Recorded Books program will launch with 500 titles, including works from notable authors who regularly appear among the top 15 works on the *New York Times* Hardcover Best Seller List, such as Patricia Cornwell, Alexander McCall Smith, Carl Hiassen, Elizabeth Peters, Nevada Barr, Pat Conroy, and more. Web-based collections of Recorded Books titles will be available for purchase through either Recorded Books or NetLibrary and will be delivered via the NetLibrary interface, already familiar to more than 12,000 libraries worldwide. NetLibrary/Recorded Books audio books can be checked out and played on desktop, laptop or any number of portable devices supporting Windows Media Player (v9), Music Match (v8.2+), or Nullsoft Winamp 5 and devices that accept protected WMA files. Supported portable devices include: Creative products (excluding the Rhumba series), Rio, iRiver flash players, RCA, Dell Digital Jukebox, Gateway Juke Box, and many more. Audiobooks from NetLibrary and Recorded Books will be available via a simplified pricing model based on library size and anticipated circulation requirements. Libraries can provide patrons with unlimited access to a collection of 500 audio content titles. New content will be added as new titles are released. For pricing and product information, contact a NetLibrary representative at sales@netLibrary.org.

NetLibrary Signs Agreement to Distribute Penguin Titles

NetLibrary has signed a distribution agreement with Penguin Group (USA), an affiliate of Penguin Group, the world's second-largest English-language trade book publisher. Penguin Group (USA) publishes under some of the most prominent and most respected imprints and trademarks in American publishing, including Berkley Books, New American Library, Penguin, G. P. Putnam's Sons, and Viking. Penguin's roster of best-selling authors includes Patricia Cornwell, Nick Hornby, Eric Jerome Dickey, Stephen King, Amy Tan, Al Franken, Catherine Coulter, and hundreds of others. In the first half of 2004 alone, Penguin had a total of 75 titles included in the *New York Times* best-seller list and established an industry benchmark in May by capturing 40 percent of the *Times* hardcover non-fiction bestseller list. In addition to selecting from a burgeoning list of best-selling frontlist titles, libraries will be able to take advantage of the Penguin Group's extensive backlist of titles from the Penguin Classics series. The largest collection of ancient and modern classic literature in the English-speaking world, Penguin Classics include a vast array of fiction, nonfiction, drama, and poetry based on definitive texts. Also available to libraries will be a complete collection of the popular "Complete Idiots" guides. For more information about Penguin Group (USA) titles available through netLibrary, contact a netLibrary representative by sending email to sales@netlibrary.com.

National Library of Australia to Use OCLC PICA Library System

The National Library of Australia has selected the OCLC PICA Central Library System to support the Australian National Bibliographic Database and Kinetica, the Internet-based service for Australian libraries and their users. The OCLC PICA System will provide the infrastructure for creation and management of the shared Australian union catalog, and tools for nationwide interlibrary loan. The system will be implemented over the next year and will be operational in December 2005. Library workstations throughout the country will be connected to the system that will support a national catalog of 13 million records and will enable researchers, librarians and students to use one system to search the collections of more 1,000 Australian libraries. According to the National Library, a significant benefit of the OCLC PICA system is its ability to search and accept records in a wide range of scripts including Chinese, Japanese and Korean. The OCLC PICA system will also provide high-quality performance for all users with improved features for contributing records. The OCLC PICA System software is UNICODE compliant, and is written expressly for union catalogs and large national catalogs. The system integrates and streamlines searching, cataloging and interlibrary loan. The OCLC PICA system is currently used in the Netherlands, Germany and France.

Reference Services

OCLC and MCLS to Combine QuestionPoint, 24/7 Reference Services

OCLC and the Metropolitan Cooperative Library System have agreed to combine QuestionPoint and 24/7 Reference to create a more powerful suite of virtual reference tools that brings together the best features of both services. The agreement for OCLC to acquire the assets of the 24/7 Reference service was signed August 10, 2004. QuestionPoint (<http://www.oclc.org/questionpoint>), developed by OCLC and LC, is a virtual reference service and knowledge resource supported by a global network of cooperating libraries and librarians, as well as an infrastructure of software and communications tools. QuestionPoint is used in more than 1,000 libraries in 20 countries. Its searchable, global Knowledge Base has grown to more than 7,000 active question/answer pairs.

24/7 Reference (<http://www.247ref.org>) is a round-the-clock reference cooperative and service that allows library patrons to ask questions and get answers from qualified reference staff in real time on the Internet. Developed by the Metropolitan Cooperative Library System in Southern California, 24/7 Reference now serves some 500 libraries.

Both QuestionPoint and 24/7 Reference libraries will continue to receive service under terms of their current contracts. The combined services will build on the unique benefits and features of each service, such as reference management and the Global Reference Network offered by QuestionPoint, and the cooperative reference coverage of 24/7 Reference.

Virtual reference offers another opportunity for OCLC to raise the visibility of libraries and librarians on the Web. Combining these two services makes possible the larger collaborative effort necessary for libraries to offer their patrons service on demand 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Susan McGlamery, 24/7 Reference Project Director, and Carol Bonnefil, 24/7 Reference Client Support Specialist, will join OCLC Cooperative Initiatives. All 24/7 Reference staff will continue to work on the project. An advisory committee, co-chaired by a QuestionPoint user and a 24/7 Reference user, is being formed to gather information and ideas from users of both services to help ensure a smooth transition. The committee's recommendations will help determine the features and functionality of the combined services.

OCLC FirstSearch Timesaving Enhancement Allows Users to Save Search Commands

OCLC has recently implemented a feature that allows individual library users and library staff to save their search commands for future use in FirstSearch databases. After users have completed a search in FirstSearch, they will see a new link at the top of the results screen allowing them to save their search. New users will be asked to register and create a user ID, password, and to enter an e-mail address. Once registered, users will be able to reexecute their saved search commands as often as needed by clicking on a link to a previously saved search.

ERIC Database Changes

Several changes to the ERIC database on FirstSearch were implemented in October 2004:

- The ERIC database is now produced by the Computer Sciences Corporation (<http://www.csc.com>).
- Over 107,000 full-text non-journal documents (issued 1993-2004), previously available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), are now available at no charge. All full-text content freely available through the ERIC website is also available through the FirstSearch version of ERIC. EDRS discontinued on-demand and subscription based document delivery services on 2004 September 30.

- The ERIC database was last updated in July 2004 and the next update is scheduled for December 2004, after which monthly updates are planned. In December 2004, ERIC will begin to add new bibliographic records and full-text journal and non-journal resources published in 2004.
- ERIC will continue to provide access to the thesaurus data.

Please note that there will be no pricing or other changes to how the ERIC database is offered on the OCLC FirstSearch service nor will there be any changes in search functionality. Please contact your regional service provider (<http://www.oclc.org/contacts/regional/>) or OCLC Customer Support (1-800-848-5800 or support@oclc.org) with questions.

H. W. Wilson Indexes Reimplemented on OCLC FirstSearch

OCLC has reimplemented index-only versions of several H. W. Wilson databases that were discontinued recently on the OCLC FirstSearch service. Because of contractual obligations, these databases will be available via subscription only. This decision has been made in response to requests from numerous libraries to provide a lower-cost alternative to the "abstracts" versions of these databases that are also available on FirstSearch.

The following six H.W. Wilson databases are now available in index versions, i.e. without abstracts in the records: Applied Science and Technology Index, Art Index, Education Index, General Science Index, Humanities Index, and Social Sciences Index. These Index versions will contain all of the bibliographic records, searching and indexing capabilities of the corresponding Abstracts databases, including any links to full text in WilsonSelectPlus and other third-party database full-text linking within FirstSearch. Libraries interested in providing access to the abstracts in these databases may subscribe to the abstracts versions of these databases that are also offered on FirstSearch.

PAIS International Database Now Links to NYPL Express

NYPL Express, a recently announced document supplier for the PAIS Archive database, is now also operational with the PAIS International database on the OCLC FirstSearch service. PAIS has indexed various collections of the New York Public Library (NYPL) since 1914. In recent years, PAIS and NYPL have agreed to establish links from the PAIS databases to the NYPL Express document delivery service.

NYPL Express (<http://www.nypl.org/express/>) will now handle document delivery for both PAIS databases: PAIS International and PAIS Archive. PAIS International is an electronic index of publications from over 120 countries throughout the world. In addition to English, some of the indexed and abstracted materials are published in French, German, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish. PAIS International is available on a variety of platforms. The PAIS Archive, a retrospective database chronicling global public policy and social issues from the early 20th century through the 1970s, has been available only as a hard copy index, but is currently being created electronically and will be released in phases. Part I, covering the years 1957 to 1976, is now available on the OCLC FirstSearch service. Periodic updates during 2004 will add content covering the years 1915 to 1956.

For more information, visit the PAIS website, <http://www.pais.org>.

FirstSearch Evaluative Content Now Available

Users of Books In Print and PAIS International on FirstSearch are now able to view the same evaluative content that is available from WorldCat, when available. This includes cover art, author notes, book summaries, tables of contents, and excerpts. The evaluative content will display automatically to users of the FirstSearch Web interface. Libraries that access FirstSearch via Z39.50 will see additional 856 fields that link to evaluative content. Books In Print and PAIS now join WorldCat in giving FirstSearch users more information on which to judge the usefulness of the material. This enhancement will increase the value of these databases on FirstSearch at no additional cost to users.

FirstSearch-Barnes & Noble Linking Now Available

FirstSearch libraries may now display a link to Barnes & Noble.com from within WorldCat detailed records, providing users with an additional means of fulfillment. To activate this link, log on to the FirstSearch administrative module, click the Resource Linking tab, and check-mark the Barnes & Noble.com box on the Online Booksellers page. The link to Barnes & Noble.com will then appear in the External Resources area of the Detailed Record screen, following FirstSearch searches.

Resource Sharing, Shelf-Ready, and Contract Services

WorldCat Resource Sharing

On August 15, 2004, OCLC completed all basic borrowing and lending in the WorldCat Resource Sharing (formerly

referred to as the FirstSearch staff view). Libraries that currently use OCLC's ILL Web and have FirstSearch access will be able to switch their workflow to the WorldCat Resource Sharing. Now is the time to migrate. In addition to the completion of borrowing and lending, the FirstSearch staff view will also include

- Multiple holdings display options, including custom holdings (persistence between holdings screens is expected to be fully implemented by August 20)
- Batch printing of Request Manager categories
- Setup and use of saved conditional notes
- Improved brief results display in Request Manager
- Limit resource sharing based on WorldCat holdings

In the FirstSearch service, including the resource sharing view, the ability for library patrons and staff to register with OCLC FirstSearch will be a new feature. Registered users will be able to save the searches conducted in FirstSearch databases (a precursor to SDI-type functionality), place resource sharing requests through ILL Direct Request, and track the status of their requests if registered when the request is placed.

In October 2004, the ability to save ILL authorizations and passwords, along with additional timesaving measures, will be implemented. Additional information about these enhancements can be found at http://www.oclc.org/ill/migration/enhancements_new.htm.

Registry of Digital Masters Record Creation Guidelines Released

OCLC announces the first release of the "Registry of Digital Masters Record Creation Guidelines," available at <http://www.diglib.org/collections/reg/reg.htm>. The Registry of Digital Masters is intended to assist with access to digital materials as well as to provide a tool to help librarians reduce duplication of digitization and preservation efforts. The Registry is available through OCLC WorldCat and is based on the DLF Digital Registry documents and MARC 21. Created by a DLF/OCLC working group, the Guidelines can be used to create metadata for born digital and digitized monographs and serials, including materials that an organization will digitize in the near future. To be listed in the Registry, materials must be digitized according to standards and best practices with preservation in mind.

OCLC Language Sets: Arabic Language Now Available

Arabic materials are now available through the OCLC Language Sets service. Currently there are three set options: Books for adults/Fiction and nonfiction, Books

for adults/Fiction, and Books for children. The shipping months for this set will be January, March, May, July, September, November (same as Spanish, Chinese, Russian). OCLC does takes care of selection, cataloging, and physical processing. Customers may order a single set of materials, or request regular deliveries in one or more languages.

Already available in twelve additional languages (Bengali, Chinese, Gujarati, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Panjabi, Russian, Spanish, Tamil, Urdu and Vietnamese), Language Sets are the fast and easy way to build multilingual collections. Books are cataloged in full MARC format and arrive ready to shelve, with holdings already set in WorldCat. Records are delivered via diskette, FTP, or e-mail attachment. Promotional language-specific posters and bookmarks are also included with the first order of each language.

Our fully secure Web store allows customers to view sample Language Sets and purchase one or more sets using an easy, step-by-step process. For more set options, visit <http://www.oclc.org/ca/en/languagesets/options/>.

CONTENTdm JPEG2000 Extension Now Available

OCLC announces the availability of the CONTENTdm JPEG2000 Extension. The JPEG2000 Extension supports both the creation and display of JPEG2000 images. The CONTENTdm JPEG2000 Extension enables collection builders to convert full resolution TIFF and JPEG files to JPEG2000 files during the import process. Existing JPEG2000 images can also be imported into CONTENTdm.

This integration of JPEG2000 technology allows conversion, storage, and delivery of JPEG2000 media items to be handled entirely within CONTENTdm. The CONTENTdm JPEG2000 Server supports dynamic decompression and display of JPEG2000 images for efficient viewing of large files without the need for browser plug-ins. Images are presented in a standard Web browser with zoom and pan toolbars. Users benefit from higher quality, detailed images without the delays normally experienced waiting for large images to be transmitted.

JPEG2000 is ideal for image archives, maps, drawings, medical images, and other large image formats requiring high compression efficiency and image quality. With JPEG2000, users can view image details that would be difficult or impossible to see at lower resolutions. JPEG2000 items can be saved to My Favorites and used by researchers or instructors in slide shows to view and compare details among primary source materials.

A demo site running the JPEG2000 Extension with JPEG2000 images can be viewed at <http://209.180.211.66/>. The JPEG2000 images include maps compressed from TIFF files as large as 887 MB, from the University of Washington Libraries Map Collection; original Frank Lloyd Wright architectural drawings from the University of Utah; and an illuminated German manuscript from the University of Illinois.

JPEG2000 is the latest in a series of standards from the international JPEG committee, providing exceptionally high quality images at low bit rates, overcoming many of the limitations of the original JPEG standard. For more information on JPEG2000, visit the Joint Photographic Experts Group at <http://www.jpeg.org>. CONTENTdm users can purchase the JPEG2000 Extension for use with their CONTENTdm installation. The JPEG2000 Extension includes the JPEG2000 Server and JPEG2000 Acquisition Station, which can be installed on different machines. Users may also purchase additional JPEG2000 Acquisition Stations in environments where more than two JPEG2000-compatible Acquisition Stations are desirable.

Updating Serials Holdings in DOCLINE

The National Library of Medicine (NLM) recently announced that libraries can update their serials holdings in DOCLINE using an OCLC Serials Union List Offline Product (SULOP) file. Libraries that wish to take advantage of this capability will need to order an EDX file from OCLC using the regular Union List Offline Products order form. The only changes to the SULOP order process for these libraries will be:

- For libraries using the online order form, a new checkbox has been added to the online order form that says: File to be retrieved by NLM for updating of holdings on DOCLINE. Libraries that have arranged with NLM to have their holdings updated using the OCLC SULOP file must check this box before submitting the form.
- Libraries submitting a paper order or reorder form will submit the form as usual for an EDX product, and include a note on the first page of the form indicating that this order will be retrieved by NLM to update holdings on DOCLINE.

Libraries should contact their Regional SERHOLD Coordinator or NLM at custserv@nlm.nih.gov for additional information on this new DOCLINE updating feature. Please contact Myrtle Myers [myrtle_myers@oclc.org] for additional information.

Q: Finally a situation comes up so many times that I can't stand it any more and have to ask. Record #32596677 indicates "Program notes by Keith Anderson in English (6 p.) inserted in container." However, the CD I have in hand has 12 numbered pages of notes, in English, German, and French. Otherwise the CD matches the record on OCLC. (It does need digits added at the beginning and end of the 024 field.) The Naxos web site (www.hnh.com) duplicates what's on the back of the container of my CD: "English Text / Deutscher Text / Texte en français."

If the note were simply "Program notes inserted in container" I would use the same record. But when a longer pagination and additional languages are in accompanying material for CDs I've had in hand, I've been doing new records for them. Auvidis has also been really bad with this, but often there is also a different (inferred) date of publication involved.

So kindly give me your judgment: new record or not? For what it's worth, my library has in its catalog v. 1, 3, 5, and 7-10 of the Naxos set of Haydn piano sonatas. Our catalog records do match the master records on OCLC in all cases here, having a range of 1-3 languages in the accompanying material. What I have in hand, not cataloged, are v. 4 and v. 6, both of which have the same "problem": master record has "6 p. in English" and my copy has 12 p. in three languages.

A: All other things being equal, such differences in this sort of accompanying material are generally not considered to justify a new record. Given the additional information about the other volumes in this set, one wonders if a cataloger may have simply (and perhaps carelessly) done a "new" command on the record for another volume and not adjusted this particular note, especially considering that the extent of the accompanying material varies from volume to volume.

Q: Ediciones Joaquin Rodrigo publications have "Deposito legal: M - xxxxx -xxxx" on t.p. versos. I've noticed that some records, including those created by LC, use the last four digits as publication date. There are usually no other indications but copyright dates on each item's first page of music, and these copyright dates are different from the assumed publication dates. I wonder if in fact that's what those numbers mean, and whether I should include the dates derived from them in brackets. Also, some records use that as ISMN. The number of digits correspond although the items don't actually identify them as ISMNs. Does anyone know for sure?

A: In the MARC 21 definition of Type of Date/ Publications Status (008/06) code "t" for Publication Date and Copyright Date, it states in part: "Deposit dates (i.e., those preceded by 'D.L.' (Dépot légal), etc.) are treated as copyright dates." Since the verso of the title page is among the prescribed sources of information for publication information (5.0B2), the date would not be bracketed. Again according to MARC 21 (field 024), ISMNs are usually preceded by the identifying initialism "ISMN," with the final (ninth) number being a check digit. Since the final four digits of these "deposit" dates are the four digit year of copyright, it's clear that there is no check digit involved. Such "deposit" dates should not be considered ISMNs.

Follow-up Question: Thanks for your observations about D.L. I knew I'd run across it before, but I couldn't find it when I was hunting for it. (I only checked in BFAS and the Concise MARC.) The way it's phrased made me wonder: Since it's to be treated as a copyright date, do you think it would be transcribed as, for example, "c1991"? That's how I read the LCRI for 1.4F6, but I'd appreciate your thoughts.

A: Actually, similar (but greatly abbreviated) information appears in BFAS under the DtSt code "t" definition: "Treat deposit dates (preceded by D.L.) as copyright dates." I think I would agree with you that the final sentence of point (1) of LCRI 1.4F6, as well as LCRI 1.4F5, imply the transcription of such a date with the lowercase "c".

Q: Regarding the 260 subfield ‡a, the document "When to Input a New Record" states that a change of place within the same country between printings of the same edition does not justify a new record. My question is: What counts as "the same country"? Scores in question have Leipzig or Wiesbaden, with Breitkopf & Härtel as publisher. But at the time of publication, Leipzig may have been in a different country, although now Germany is united. Praha and Bratislava used to be in one country, but are now in two. If I enhance a very minimal record, should I change the city to what I have, or wait until I replace the record to alter the city? Any advice?

A: Your question lends new meaning to Carole King's old question: "Doesn't anybody stay in one place anymore?" There is probably no entirely satisfactory answer, however (neither to your question nor to Ms. King's). By one logic, it would make sense to follow the spirit of the MARC Country Codes, which do after all have a formal connection to the place of publication in field 260 subfield ‡a, and basically consider such jurisdictional changes to have always been as they stand today. By another logic, we could take a cue from the Geographic Area Codes,

which roughly try to treat each jurisdiction as it changed over time. There is no reconciling these two contradictory approaches.

Here is my suggestion: In cases where such jurisdictional questions arise regarding place of publication, don't change the place or otherwise upgrade the master record. You may, of course, do what you want for your local version of the record. Use judgment when deciding about inputting a new record, with consideration given especially to the date of publication.

Q: When a composer sets a translation of a poem in a song, how should you handle the following?

- Should field 041 read "041 1 [translation] ‡h [original]", or "041 0 [translation]"?
- Should one include a "600 10 Poet ‡v Musical settings", or a "700 1 Poet", or both?
- Should a 700 1 for the translator include a "‡4 trl"?

Thanks for your help.

A: Let's treat these as separate questions. For the 041 field, the answer differs depending on whether we're dealing with a score or a recording and, in either case, which language or languages are present as printed text (in the score or as accompanying material for a recording).

If we're talking about a score, the language code for the translated language would go in the first subfield ‡a. If the text appears as well in its original (or any other) language, either between the staves of the score or as separate text, those codes would go in subsequent subfields ‡a. The language of the original text would go in subfield ‡h.

In the case of a recording, the language of the sung text would go in subfield ‡d; the language or languages of any printed text would be considered as librettos and coded in individual subfields ‡e. Once again, the language of the original poem would be coded in subfield ‡h. Since a translation is involved in all cases here, the correct first indicator of the 041 field is "1".

Subject access to the poet is appropriate, with the form subdivision "Musical settings." Likewise, an added entry for the poet is also appropriate. Tracing the name of the translator is really up to you (see AACR2 21.19 for some small guidance), and may depend upon how "big" a work it is. For a single, brief song, you may wish to omit the translator's name, whereas for an extensive song cycle, you may feel obligated to include it. Rule 21.30K1 and its LCRI also offer some help, encouraging tracing a translator when the translation is in verse, etc. When you're dealing

with a multi-work sound recording rather than a score, you may need to be much more limited in the access you provide to the names of translators and even poets/librettists.

In all cases, use your judgment. Finally, subfield ‡4 is optional and its inclusion is entirely up to your judgment.

Follow-up Question: And this is even when the original language of the song is the translated version of the poem? Hypothetically, if I translated a Goethe poem into English and used it in my song, English, in my version, is the original language of the 'song' which no one would sing in the original German. Just wanted to make sure.

A: Regarding the 041 field, I think that most of what I've said still holds regarding whichever languages are actually present. Since the original language of the *song* text is now considered English, though, I don't think you need to make any 041 reference to the German text on which it is based. In such a circumstance, however, you might want to explain the situation in a note if it's not already adequately explained in the 245.

Where all of this makes a bigger difference is in determining the uniform title. Again in the case you've described, English would be considered the original language of the song (as opposed to the original language of the poem on which the song's text is based). So the uniform title would be based on that English language text/title. We see similar situations commonly in opera, where libretti are often based on sources in another language, but the language of the opera itself is the language of the libretto that the composer set. Think, for instance, of Verdi's *Falstaff* and *Otello*, both composed to Boito's Italian libretti (hence the original language of each opera is Italian), but both based on Shakespeare. An English translation of either would actually be considered a translation of the Italian text that Verdi used, both in field 041 and in the uniform title. That gets sort of circular, as you can see, but I hope I've been clear.

Q: I'm up to my eyeballs in LPs from the '60s and '70s. I have some of those guys that have the simulated or reengineered compatible stereo sound. Do I say "stereo" for these in the 300 and 007? AACR2R and your book talk about what to do if this piece isn't mentioned at all or if you have some tracks in stereo and others in mono, but I don't see anything explicit about this simulated stereo business. Inquiring minds want to know.

A: Simulated stereo is still considered stereo, and is noted as such in the 300 field (and so coded in the 007). If there is some sort of explicit statement explaining the particular

technique used to simulate stereo, that might make a good quoted 500 note.

Q: This is a question I've had for a while. We periodically receive as gifts from individuals CDs that were bought through one of the CD clubs, e.g., BMG. These all have separate manufacturer's numbers from the regular commercial issues, although sometimes the original manufacturer's number is given as well. I have always thought that they should be entered as new records in OCLC, according to the guidelines "When to Input a New Record," since for the 028 field it says "Specific differences in numbering . . . justify a new record." I always add two 028s, one for the original and one for the club version. I also add distributor information in the 260.

I noticed recently that one like this I input had been merged, and I want to make sure I'm correct in my interpretation. I did notice that the notes under 260 might argue against doing this, since it says for name of publisher not to input a new record "as long as one on the item matches one on the record" Thanks for any clarification you can give on this.

A: In cases where the club's number is different from, and entirely replaces, the original manufacturer's number, there is no doubt that a new record would be justified. When both the club's number and the original manufacturer's number appear, the situation is more ambiguous and will usually require individual judgment. If the added club number is the only difference, you might lean toward simply editing an existing record for local use. When there are other differences as well, such as differences in dates or a club (or other) edition statement, you might lean toward a new record. In cases where there is an explicit statement about a "previous" or other release under a different music publisher's number, take that as evidence that a new record is justified. When only the original music publisher's number appears and the only difference is a club edition statement, I think we can invoke the "book club edition" analogy and consider that not to justify a new record. That should give you at least a little guidance.

Q: Are *all* unpublished photoreproductions of unpublished typescripts or music manuscripts coded for the original, i.e., record type "t" or "d"—regardless of whether they are dissertations?

A: This seems like a simple enough question, but I seem unable to find a definitive answer in either MARC 21 or in OCLC documentation. Back in 1995, the music catalogers in LC's Special Materials Cataloging Division told me that official LC policy regarding manuscript scores was that only the actual original manuscript and microform

reproductions were coded Type "d". Photocopies would be coded "c" and by that logic the same (that is, Type "a" rather than "t") would hold for other such photocopies as well. This, however, seems to contradict what both LC and OCLC say generally about coding for the original when a photocopy is involved.

In desperation, I went where I go for answers to all the *really* hard questions, LC's Cataloging Policy and Support office. Kay Guiles kindly offered the following explanation:

We think the practice the music catalogers in the Special Materials Cataloging Division (SMCD) described to you in 1995 may have been influenced by the configuration of our legacy system MUMS at that time, i.e., we had separate files based on type of material, and the practice was based on the type of record values available in any one file (not all values were available in every file). In any case, I have checked with staff in SMCD and in NDMSO, and we are now in agreement that in the case of unpublished reproductions of typescripts or music manuscripts, whether microform or macroform, the type of record value should be that of the original.

So, Type "d" should be used for photocopies of unpublished typescripts and music manuscripts.

Q: I have a CD of Musica Reservata's Concert of Early Music which has been re-issued by ArkivMusic.com as part of their Arkiv-CD "program" (not a "series"). It's a reissue of the Vanguard Classics USA CD (OCLC #40328393) reissue of the LP (OCLC #7070246). It's almost identical to the Vanguard CD rerelease, except that it has a new label number, lacks the program notes etc., and was reissued by ArkivMusic.com when we ordered it, as part of their On Demand Production process.

There appear to be enough differences to justify a new record, but perhaps there has been some discussion about how to deal with these on-demand reissues? How to avoid unnecessary iterations of the record if, say, your library orders the same thing in 2005? Any advice (or weary gesticulations towards the archives: I only found one hit, which wasn't germane) would be appreciated.

The Arkiv-CD re-release reproduces the front and back inserts from the Vanguard CD release, with the Arkiv-CD logo added. So the Vanguard number SVC-96 HD is on the back of the jewel case, as is the Vanguard Classics USA logo. I'm pretty sure it's a reproduction of the original as the message "Program notes, sources, texts, and translation included in program booklet" appears at the

bottom, even though they are not included. What you get is a blank folded sheet with a blurb about Arkiv-CD.

Phonogram copyright and copyright dates are 1972 and 1998, the first presumably for the LP and the second for the Vanguard rerelease. I'm not sure of that, as the OCLC record for the LP has a copyright date of 1980; the same two dates appear on the OCLC record for the Vanguard rerelease. The label itself makes no mention of Vanguard; it has Arkiv-CD, www.ArkivMusic.com, and their new label number, ArkivCD VC96. The blurb, in full, reads:

This ArkivCD is part of ArkivMusic's ongoing effort to make previously unavailable recordings conveniently and affordably available to classical music lovers. These reissues are made possible through special licensing and distribution arrangements with record labels, along with our innovative On Demand Production process.

Their website has this note:

An ArkivCD is a recording that is either out-of-print or otherwise generally unavailable. ArkivMusic has a growing catalog of these recordings that we can now create just for you! As a result of our innovative On Demand process, the CD and packaging are produced after your order is placed on ArkivMusic.com, and shipped out as any other title would be. The packaging may be slightly different from the original recordings, but the music and the performances are exactly the same! ArkivCDs will play in all standard CD players.

The site also notes: "[I]n 2004 we will expand our 'ArkivCD' program, allowing you to buy new copies of recordings that are no longer available in the U.S." There is no complete listing of ArkivCDs. One learns that a particular recording is part of that program by the presence of an ArkivCD logo in the listing, which gives you the above blurb. So they don't seem to constitute a browsable subclass or series. Without contacting them directly, I don't know if this was a single-copy "on-demand" reproduction or a multiple-copy edition.

Lastly, when I look at the listing for this CD *on the website*, the label is listed as Vanguard Classics, and the release date as 1998. So the question remains, is a new record justified? I'll keep fishing in the archives, but in the meantime, thanks for any help.

A: There's no doubt in my mind that a new record is justified. Exactly how to catalog that new record, however, is the puzzle.

Recently, we dealt with a question about an "on-demand" print reproduction. This case was somewhat different, both from yours and from the traditional "on-demand" reproduction in that the reproduction actually had an edition statement that read "Print-on-Demand edition." This turned out to be a multi-copy edition, which made the decisions about cataloging a little easier. In recent months, we have also dealt with the Naxos streaming audio "reproductions" of their published CDs. Neither of these situations is quite analogous to yours, but I'm thinking of those as I try to recommend a solution.

From your description, it sounds as though this may truly be "on-demand" CD publishing, which feels analogous to on-demand print publication. We do have existing rules for this, and my inclination is to follow them, adapting for sound recordings, as needed. This would involve following LCRI 1.11A and OCLC's Bibliographic Formats and Standards Section 3.2, describing the original (that is, the Vanguard CD) in the body of the record and the reproduction (the Arkiv-CD) in field 533. This would include "Sound disc" in field 533 subfield †a; the date of the reproduction in 533 subfield †d; a note for the Arkiv-CD publisher number in 533 subfield †n (and a corresponding, non-printing/displaying 028). As with other on-demand publications, future catalogers should use the same record regardless of the date of the reproduction.

In another 533 subfield †n, I think you'd want to explain briefly what the situation is with these CDs, possibly a quoted note such as: "These reissues are made possible through special licensing and distribution arrangements with record labels, along with our innovative On Demand Production process"--Container. That's just a possibility, and a more succinct statement would be even better.

One can also make an argument for ignoring my inclination (and thereby ignoring LCRI 1.11A, which is permissible), and cataloging these as Arkiv-CDs with proper reference to their previous manifestations as Vanguard CDs and LPs. This is, of course, a much simpler way to deal with these things, but it opens the door to cataloger confusion concerning the date of any post-2004 on-demand reproduction of the same CD. That's a major reason that I lean toward my previous suggestion.

Q: I am creating an original record for a new edition of a Dover edition score. The publisher information on the back cover states the item has 416 pages. The item in hand has only 407 pages. I called Dover and checked with them on the page count. The extra pages are the unnumbered pages in the front of the score, including the blank pages preceding the title page. Should I make a 500 note about the discrepancy in the pages?

A: Although it probably isn't absolutely necessary, mentioning the discrepancy wouldn't hurt. Rule 2.5B3 says in part, "Disregard unnumbered sequences of inessential matter (advertising, blank pages, etc.)," so it's safe to say that you need not account for these pages in the physical description. Depending upon the situation and how the information is presented on the back cover, you might say something along these lines: "Page count of 416 p., noted on p. [4] of cover, includes unnumbered sequence preceding t.p."

Q: I have in front of me a catalog of the works of Elliot Weisgarber, compiled by his daughter, Karen Suzanne Smithson. It has no incipits, so it doesn't seem that I can use "thematic catalog" as a subject heading. Or can I? If not, what else should I use? Is some kind of explanatory note in order? Also, the pages are numbered "Page 1 of 15" etc., but all of the page numbers are on the recto of a leaf. That is, when you open to "Page 1 of 15", both "pages" that you see (in the ordinary sense of the term) constitute page 1. There is a title page, four unnumbered preliminary pages, and the first half of page 1 is on the verso of the last unnumbered preliminary page. There are 18 leaves in all. How can I describe that? Furthermore, there is no indication of place of publication or publisher, but all of Smithson's other works in OCLC were published in Vancouver by Elliot Weisgarber Associates. Can I supply that information in square brackets?

A: Since the scope note in the authority record for the subdivision "Thematic catalogs" (sh2002012032) explicitly refers to the presence of incipits ("Use as a form subdivision under names of individual composers and forms and types of musical compositions for lists of musical compositions that include musical notation for the opening measures of individual works or section of works"), you really should not use that as the subdivision. The more general subdivisions "Catalogs" (sh99001246, which is the broader term in the 585 field under "Thematic catalogs") or "Bibliography" (sh99001362) would seem to fit the bill, depending upon what sort of information the work actually contains and which scope note covers that information more accurately. If the work calls itself a "thematic catalog," and if you feel so compelled, you may include a note explaining either what it *does* contain or its absence of incipits, whichever is more appropriate.

Regarding the pagination, I think this is covered in AACR2 2.5B4, which reads: "If the number printed on the last page or leaf of a sequence does not represent the total number of pages or leaves in that sequence, let it stand uncorrected unless it gives a completely false impression of the extent of the item, as, for instance, when only alternate pages are numbered or when the number on the last page or leaf of

the sequence is misprinted. Supply corrections in such cases in square brackets." The situation you describe, in essence, sounds as though only alternate pages are numbered, so the pagination would state the last numbered page followed by the bracketed true count: "15 [i.e. 30] p." or whatever. Rule 2.5B3 instructs us to "Disregard unnumbered sequences of inessential matter (advertising, blank pages, etc.)," so I think you would ignore the unnumbered preliminaries you mention.

"[Vancouver, B.C.?" as the bracketed and questioned place of publication does sound like a reasonable guess, especially considering the additional information about Ms. Smithson provided by the University of British Columbia in another e-mail in this thread. The addition of the abbreviation for British Columbia distinguishes it from Vancouver, Washington, as per Rule 1.4C3. Without further evidence, however, I would hesitate to guess the name of the publisher, preferring "[s.n]."

Q: If there is an errata sheet included in a book or score, is there a place in the MARC record to indicate this beyond pasting the sheet itself inside the front cover of the volume?

A: LCRI 2.7B18 suggests the inclusion of an informal contents note (field 500) for "errata slips that are not printed as part of the publication." It goes on to prefer "a standardized construct, rather than a quotation" for such informal contents notes as those for discographies, filmographies, summaries, and errata slips, including this example:

500 ## ‡a Errata slip inserted.

Q: Perhaps this is spelled out online somewhere. If I've missed it, sorry. I have looked at AACR2, LCRI, and other Web information as well as printed cataloging guides, but am still not sure of answers to some date questions for sound CDs of popular music.

Sometimes these are straight reissues of sound cassette or LP versions released in the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, etc. Dates are stated in different ways on these items, sometimes preceded by "p" and sometimes preceded by "c", and I'm not sure what criteria the publishing companies use (if any) to determine which to use, "c" or "p". In OCLC, catalogers transcribe these dates in 260 ‡ and in the fixed field in various ways.

At my library, we try to edit the records (or create new ones) according to current cataloging rules and practice, so I need to get date issues clarified. In the fixed field for CDs that have the same contents as the earlier cassette or

LP, catalogers seem to use both dates with DtSt "r" or "t", or else they use only the later date with "s." Which way is correct? In 260, can we use both dates?

Here is a typical example. "Abbey Road," by the Beatles (see OCLC #20369812). On the disc label: "p1969 original sound recordings made by EMI Records. Digitally remastered p1987 by EMI Records Ltd. c1969 EMI Records Ltd." It seems to be the same content as the LP and cassette originally issued. What goes in the DtSt ("r" or "t"?) and what goes in 260 ‡c? It doesn't seem like 260 ‡c should be p1987, c1969 as on the OCLC record.

This is another example of the type of CD I find: "Sinatra at the Sands" (see OCLC #39402213). The contents seem to be the same as the 1966 LP record. On the CD label is both "c" and "p" 1998. The container says first released in 1966 but it isn't stated as a "p" date. (Often I find the earlier date on container, such as p1966; but not on this one; I'd need to add a note about first release.) In 260 ‡c, should I use p1998 or [1998]? Using p1998 seems to imply that we have 1998 contents, not 1966 contents. It does not seem correct on the OCLC record to use 260 ‡c p1998, [1966], but to omit 1966 seems misleading, though of course a note can be used to say when originally published. What about DtSt ("r" or "t" or "s" and only one date)?

A: The "p" or "phonogram copyright date" is a creature of the international copyright convention that went into effect in 1971. If a sound recording publisher has correctly specified such a "p" date (a *very* big "if"!), it should represent the date of the original capture of the recorded sound. That (or the latest "p" date when there is more than one) usually corresponds to the date of the original publication of the sound recording. According to LCRI 6.4F1, "c" copyright dates on sound recordings cannot be regarded as the copyright date for that sound recording, *per se*. "This symbol can apply only to the printed text. However, it can be used as evidence for supplying a date of publication according to 1.4F7 when neither a date of publication nor a 'p' date appears on the item." Again, this is dependent on the publisher's having applied the copyright convention correctly and is also complicated by the 1971 enactment date of the convention. With CDs, you have the added complication that compact discs cannot possibly have a publication date earlier than 1982, when the CD format first became commercially available.

Now the fun begins. First, you need to sort out exactly what dates you have and what they mean. Generally speaking, there are four common kinds of dates that you could have associated with a particular sound recording, each corresponding to what we might call a different

bibliographic "event": (1) the date of original sound capture; (2) the date of original release as a recording; (3) the date of release in a new or different recording medium (LP versus cassette versus CD, for instance); and (4) the date of printed accompanying material (package design, program notes, etc.).

In the case of the "Abbey Road" CD, the publisher has spelled things out with relative clarity. You know that the date of capture (and first publication) was 1969. You know that the accompanying text/package design has a copyright of 1969, as well. You know that the CD you have in hand was digitally remastered (and presumably published) in 1987. Based entirely on the information you've provided, I would have put "p1987" in the 260 subfield ‡c and included a note that indicated that the recording was originally released as an LP in 1969. Given those two dates and the hierarchy of Type of Date (DtSt) codes, I would choose DtSt code "r", the 1987 date of the CD as Date 1, and the 1969 date of the original publication as Date 2.

In the case of the Sinatra CD, the "p1998" is the publication date of the CD in hand and should be transcribed in the 260 subfield ‡c as such. Include a note (it sounds as though you may even have the text for a simple quoted note) about the first release being in 1966. Again, that gives you DtSt "r" with Date 1 as the 1998 CD date and Date 2 as the 1966 original release date. Whenever you know the dates of more than one of those aforementioned bibliographic events, it's unlikely that you would have a DtSt code "s" and just one date except when those years happened to be the same (for instance, when the year of original capture and of publication are the same).

Follow-up Question: I guess what was confusing me was an example in Rule 1.4F5 as [1981], p1975. Also LCRI 1.4F5, which offers the option of adding copyright after publication date if different for items other than books and serials. I was interpreting the "copyright" date of sound recordings as the phonogram date of the original since that was the actual dates of the contents. Is the "copyright" of the sound, then, the phonogram date applying to the physical format rather than the audible content? What sort of scenario would lead to the example [1981], p1975? A simple reissue in identical format?

I wish there was a way to put both dates in the 260 (because of the display on patron index screen, which would show immediately that the actual contents go way back). At least both dates are in the fixed field, but will only help user there if his/her system will search qualified by date, I guess. If that's the way we handle the 260, then

that's what I'll do. I can remember a workshop somewhere, many years ago, that made me think [1987], p1969 was the way to do it—either I misunderstood or else the workshop presenter was mistaken, or that was the way these were done in the past but not now. Whichever. I'm glad to have a clarification.

Follow-up Answer: Because they are completely removed from any meaningful context in most cases, some examples can be difficult to explain. In this particular case, however, I think we can explain the essence of the example through reference to the common situation alluded to in my previous answer. Now that we're more than twenty years into the CD era, it happens less often, but it's still not unusual to find a CD whose only "p" date is before the availability of CDs in 1982. The date of publication cannot possibly be before 1982, so other evidence must be used to supply a date of publication. Often there will be another later "c" copyright or other date associated with a CD (package design, copyright of program notes, some other later date from a unifying element such as the container or accompanying material, etc.), from which we can infer a date of publication. So, we would have the bracketed inferred publication date followed by the "p" phonogram copyright date in the 260 subfield ‡c.

Most other sorts of dates would need to be explained in notes. For instance, if the container includes text along the lines of "Recorded in concert September 20, 1963," you could certainly include a quoted note to that effect, but you could not properly translate that into "p1963" and include it in the 260 subfield ‡c if it was not presented as such on the item.

More Follow-up: This makes sense, although I wish there were some means (new subfield or something) to include the original date in the 260 ‡c because that is what appears on the index screen for the user. Well, they can find that in a note if they'll read it. No, in any case you could not take "Recorded Sept. 20, 1963" and add a p and call the date p1963. But some do have that p date as well as the one for the CD, which does get a little confusing.

More Follow-up Answer: Unfortunately, the copyright laws weren't written to help library users (or catalogers, for that matter) make sense of all the possible dates associated with recordings. And although the cataloging rules and the MARC formats *were* (in theory) designed with those considerations in mind, there are limits to the manipulation of such data. Nor can we be sure just how users may interpret the sometimes cryptic presentations of that data in brief or otherwise truncated displays. The best and clearest way to present such information is often in an explicit note, in the hope that users will actually read it.

Q: I am attempting to original catalog a music CD and have a couple questions. (I may have more before I'm done.) There is no date on the CD itself nor on the front of the insert. At the end of the credits inside the insert is listed "all songs written and arranged by Jonathan Maracle and Kris Delorenzi © Socan 2002." Yet the copyright date listed after the brief description included of every single song is © Socan 2003, so I'm a bit confused about what date(s) to use for the record. Secondly, the statement of responsibility printed on the CD and insert is "Jonathan Maracle & Broken Walls," a combination of personal and corporate names. Would this be treated as one corporate entity and encoded as MARC 110? I've attempted to find answers in AACR2R (2004) and LCRI to no avail. Any help or suggestions would be appreciated.

A: Although a "c" copyright date cannot be considered the copyright date for the recording itself, you can use it to infer a date of publication. Here's what LCRI 6.4F1 says: "Do not regard as a copyright date for the recording a date preceded by the copyright symbol "©" that appears on the container or accompanying matter (cf. 1.4F5, 1.4F6). This symbol can apply only to the printed text. However, it can be used as evidence for supplying a date of publication according to 1.4F7 when neither a date of publication nor a "p" date appears on the item." Under these circumstances, it sounds as though "[2003?]" would be a reasonable inferred date of publication for you to supply for this CD.

MCD 24.1A deals with the common combination of a personal name with a corporate name in a configuration such as "Jonathan Maracle & Broken Walls." It reads, in part: "When the name of an individual performer appears in conjunction with the name of a performing group, ordinarily do not consider the person's name to be part of the name of the group, in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

On item: J.D. Crowe and the New South
Corporate heading: New South (Musical group)"

Neither Jonathan Maracle nor Broken Walls is found in the authority file, but separate headings for each should be devised according to the information you have and in compliance with AACR2. Following the LCRI 24.4B section on "Performing Groups," the heading for the latter would likely be "Broken Walls (Musical group)."

Q: We are a consortium with all libraries doing their own cataloging on OCLC. It was reported to me that we have three duplicate records for the CD of "Try this" by Pink. The first one is OCLC #53399775. It is one sound disc (49 min.) plus one DVD. The manufacturer's number is Arista 82876-56670-2. The second one is OCLC #53464049. It is one enhanced CD with full audio program and

multimedia computer files. The manufacturer's number is Arista 82876-52139-2. The third one is OCLC #53475391. It is one sound disc (no timing) plus one DVD. The manufacturer's number is Arista 82876-54619-2. Are these three records duplicates or should they remain as separate records?

A: The differences in the publisher numbers alone would justify separate records in all three cases. You can check OCLC's "When to Input a New Record" (<http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/input/default.shtm>), which is the initial Chapter 4 of Bibliographic Formats and Standards, as well as the new "Differences Between, Changes Within: Guidelines on When to Create a New Record" from ALCTS (for information see <http://www.ala.org/ala/alcts/alctspubs/catalog/catalog.htm>).

Q: The rules about how to use field 254 never say anything (that I can find) about what to do when such a word is on the right place on the item but doesn't in fact describe the entire publication. For instance, we have a bunch of items right now that all say "Partitur" on the title page, but each one is score and parts. So "Partitur" would be eligible to be transcribed as a musical presentation statement, except that it doesn't describe the entire publication. The majority of OCLC records for these particular publications add a bracketed statement to make the 254 more truly descriptive: something like

254 Partitur [und Stimmen]

("Stimmen" is stated nowhere on these publications.) A few simply transcribe "Partitur" as a 254 but describe the item elsewhere in the record as score and parts. A few more include no 254 field. In other cases that I've seen, a publication consists of two sets of material issued together: a score, with "Partitur" on the cover or title page, and a set of parts with Stimmen on the wrapper of the set or even on the title page, if any, of every single part. Records for such items may have no 254 or a composite such as

254 Partitur [und] Stimmen

My inclination is to omit the 254 if the statement I find in the chief source does not describe the whole publication. As a very general rule of thumb, I start getting suspicious if a 254 has square brackets, because those tend to be used for words not actually on the item. My understanding is that a 254 shouldn't normally include such words. Of course, it is possible that a publication exists with the right terms in the right place but with a word (such as "und") omitted because of the title-page design or simply by error, in which case the square brackets would be justified, I guess.

On the other hand, I can't find any rules or interpretations or explanations that mention my inclination as the proper way to handle these things. Actually, I can't find anything that even mentions this situation, and I don't recall who taught me the principle of a 254 needing to describe the whole publication. The written rules and explanations tend to concentrate on the distinctions between edition statements, musical presentation statements, and material that belongs in the statement of responsibility. Any words of wisdom?

A: As with so many of the specific instances with which catalogers may come up, this one appears not to be directly addressed by the rules. In such cases, we need to extrapolate and take guidance from other existing rules. Here, several general areas of the rules, including 1.0C1 (fifth paragraph) and 1.0F1, may show us the way. The term "Partitur" by itself is clearly inaccurate as a Musical Presentation Statement, and we probably have a few different ways in which we might legitimately go. Omitting the term "Partitur" from the description is one way, in which case I think it would be prudent to account for that omission in a note, for instance:

500 "Partitur"--t.p. of score

This is probably the simplest way to go. Alternatively, following 1.0C1, we could supply information that would render the statement more accurate, such as

254 Partitur [und Stimmen]

As further explanation, you might want to include a note on the presence of "Partitur" on the score title page but the absence of any corresponding designation on the parts, if that's appropriate. In the cases where "Partitur" appears on the score and "Stimmen" on the parts, I can think of at least two possible treatments, depending on the circumstances. The statements may be treated as contents. Or we can extrapolate from what seems like the spirit of 2.0B1 (keeping in mind the caveat of LCRI 2.0B1 about repetition of data) and consider the title pages of the score and the part(s) as a single title page and transcribe as follows:

254 Partitur ; Stimmen

Personally, I'd lean toward agreeing with you about omitting field 254 in such cases and going with the most simple solution stated first: no 254 but an explanatory note.

Q: I was watching over the shoulder of my new associate (whom I supervise). She mainly does music sound recording cataloging. I noticed that when she was doing

copy cataloging, she was stripping out the 041 tag when there was music with no words sung (libretto). I just wanted to make sure that this is the proper thing to do and I'm wondering why so many other catalogers do put the 041 tag in. The particular work that she was dealing with today was something by John Philip Sousa. The title was something like Music for Wind Band. At any rate, I have no idea why the 041 was in there to begin with and since it is for wind band and has no libretto, my associate stripped it out. Is there something that I'm missing here with the 041 tag? I just want to make sure that we're doing the right thing by taking it out in these instances.

A: Although reflecting the sung or spoken language(s) of a music work is the chief use of field 041 in musical records, there are other circumstances when field 041 may be used. The most common, even when the musical work itself has no words (a purely instrumental work, for instance), is when there are accompanying materials such as program notes or biographical text of some sort; such would usually be coded in field 041 subfield \ddagger g. You would need to look at the rest of the record to see if there happens to be a note about any textual accompaniment (or check the item itself for such a presence). In the absence of either a musical text or any sort of accompanying text, the presence of field 041 would be questionable.

Q: I've just noticed that the OCLC Bib Formats and Standards page for Form of Composition in the fixed fields has the code "st" for "Studies and exercises" with the following scope note: "Items intended for teaching purposes (often entitled 'Studies,' 'Etudes,' etc.), not for 'concert etudes.'" However, I don't see any code on the list that would apply to concert etudes. Am I missing something? Or should I just use "zz" for other forms not found on the list? Or, given that the field is optional, should I just ignore it? The item I'm cataloging is a sound recording of Liszt's 6 Grandes Etudes de Paganini and Brahms' Studies (Variations on a Theme by Paganini), op. 35 (Vox Unique: VU 9004). One of the OCLC records that I've found (#24648989) has nothing at all for Form of Comp and the other (42572159) has "mu" for multiple forms but no corresponding 047 field. My current favorite solution is the following:

```
Comp: mu
047 vr  $\ddagger$ a zz
```

But I'm ready to listen to anyone with more extensive music knowledge than myself (which leaves the field wide open).

A: There is no specific code for concert etudes. In fact, there are no specific codes for many things that people may

consider to be "forms of composition," even many things for which there are subject headings. Compare, for instance, the extensive list of "Types of Compositions for Use in Music Uniform Titles" (<http://www.library.yale.edu/cataloging/music/types.htm>) compiled by MLA with the relatively brief list of MARC 21 codes for "Form of Composition" (Music 008/18-19). Even considering the many language cognates included in the MLA list, the contrast is large. Those who maintain MARC 21 decided long ago not to further expand the code list (especially since LC officially stopped using field 047 in October 1991). It's interesting to note that in the UNIMARC bibliographic format, the decision was made (against my strong recommendation) to keep expanding its equivalent list of composition codes. Needless to say, it is a never-ending expansion.

Q: I have a CD of Pat Metheny (#15602007) which has only a date of p1976. So we have to guess at a later date of issue. The copy we are working from put "[between 1983 and 1990], p1976" in the 260. I rarely use date ranges in sound recording cataloging, but this time it makes sense. (The choice of 1990 as the end of the range of dates is interesting since the item has an Entered date of 1987, but 4 other records were merged with this one, and the 1990 date might be a result of that. Any reason I shouldn't change it to 1987? In any case that is not my real question.) This record also has a 518, showing it was recorded in 1975. Thus there are three relationships among the dates:

```
1983 & 1990 = DtSt q
1983/1990 & p1976 = DtSt t
1983/1990 & 1975 = DtSt p
```

According to the precedence table in BF&S under DtSt, the relationship shown by value p has precedence over the other two. Fine. Date 2 will have 1975. But what do I put in Date 1? 1983 or 1990? Same problem would apply if there were no recorded date and I used DtSt value t.

A: Changing the dates to "[1987?], p1976" would certainly simplify things (including this answer). Given the "Entered" date of 1987, the date range in the record does seem overly generous, with "[between 1983 and 1987]" being more precise. Like you, I've never cared much for those date ranges (sanctioned by AACR2 Rule 1.4F7), not the least because they create such complicated situations as this one. Another alternative, although even less precise, is "[198-]," which would also simplify the fixed field coding decisions. Which of these you choose is a matter of judgment about what degree of precision you believe to be justified. In order of decreasing precision, here are the options as I see them. These take the 1975 capture date

into consideration and regard the "p1976" strictly as the phonogram copyright date (rather than as the date of original release in another medium, for which we don't have any direct evidence).

260 subfield †c: [1987?], p1976.

DtSt: p.

Dates: 1987,1975.

260 subfield †c: [between 1983 and 1987], p1976.

DtSt: p.

Dates: 1983,1975.

260 subfield †c: [198-], p1976.

DtSt: p.

Dates: 198u,1975.

This is all open to interpretation. If we regarded the "p1976" as the date of original release (presumably as an LP), each DtSt "p" would become "r" and each "1975" would become "1976." If your real question is which date in a range of dates becomes Date 1 when DtSt is not coded "q," the answer is the earlier date.

Q: When is it appropriate (or required) to supply a collective uniform title in a musical sound recording record? The OCLC record that has prompted this question is #56226759. I haven't been able to find the rule or rule interpretation that describes when to use a collective uniform title, such as the 240 field in this record ("Orchestra music. Selections"). I know that the 245 field in this record is incorrect. The GMD is, of course, out of place, but this CD also has no collective title. On the disc itself there is just a list of all the works on the CD. The title on the spine of the container is "Symphony no. 3" which, of course, is the title of just the first work. I have searched AACR2 and your book (Cataloger's judgment) and cannot find any information about when to use a collective uniform title like appears in this record. Does it have to do with whether the CD has a collective title? Or does it depend on how many pieces are on the CD (rule of three)?

A: The situation about which you ask is covered in AACR2 Rule 21.23B1, which reads in part: "Enter a sound recording of two or more works all by the same person(s) or body (bodies) under the heading appropriate to those works." In this case, the heading would be that for the composer (100) and the collective uniform title (240) that covers the five works or excerpts represented on the sound recording. There is more precise guidance in LCRI 25.34B-25.34C, which reads, in part: "If a sound recording collection contains three, four, or five musical works entered under a single personal name heading, enter

the collection under the collective uniform title appropriate to the whole item. Make name-title analytical added entries for each work in the collection. For excerpts from one work, make a separate analytical added entry for each excerpt unless there are two or more excerpts numbered consecutively (25.6B1) or three or more unnumbered or nonconsecutively numbered excerpts (25.6B3)." The presence or absence of a collective title for the sound recording itself does not come into play when the recording contains works by only one composer. Determining which collective uniform title is appropriate can often be tricky and there's not a lot of guidance. The one chosen here, "Orchestra music. Selections" seems reasonable. The choice of title proper for the record does seem more questionable. Given the absence of a collective title, the first choice should probably have been the non-collective list of all the works taken from the label. If the spine title was chosen as a de facto (if somewhat misleading) collective title, there should have been a note on the source of that title.

Follow-up Question: Thank you very much. Yes, this information helps me understand the use of the collective uniform title. The information I was missing was the LCRI. I do, however, have a couple of clarifying questions. Where you quote the LCRI as stating "If a sound recording collection contains three, four, or five musical works," does this really mean "more than two"? Does it really mean that if there are six or more works that you don't use a collective uniform title? Also, you wrote: "The presence or absence of a collective title for the sound recording itself does not come into play when the recording contains works by only one composer." Is this really what you meant to say? Because my understanding is that the collective uniform title *is used* only when all works are by the same composer (and thus the composer is the main entry) and the title proper is a collective title for the entire disc. Thanks in advance for any clarification you can provide.

Follow-up Answer: LCRI 25.34B-25.34C covers sound recording collections containing three, four, or five works by the same composer. Music Cataloging Decision 25.34B-25.34C covers collections containing six or more works by the same composer. Like the LCRI, it calls for using the collective uniform title that is appropriate to the item as a whole, but goes on to suggest possibilities for grouping the individual works under less-inclusive collective uniform titles, when appropriate. Regarding my statement, "The presence or absence of a collective title for the sound recording itself does not come into play when the recording contains works by only one composer," please forgive me for not being more clear. I think you may be confusing the collective title that the publisher has applied

to a sound recording with the collective *uniform title* the cataloger assigns to cover all the works by a single composer that are represented on the recording. If there is a collective title for the recording, that will in most cases be used as the title in field 245. But the presence or absence of a collective title has no direct bearing on the cataloger's choice of a collective *uniform title* for the recording as a whole. That's *not* to say that a collective title (such as "Complete Violin Sonatas" or "Selected Choral Works") can't be a valuable hint to assist in choosing the collective *uniform title*. When the works of *more than one* composer are represented on a sound recording, different rules, LCRIs, and MCDs come into play (most notably 21.23C for when there IS a collective title, 21.23D when there is *no* collective title), but that's a whole other story. There will rarely be a collective *uniform title* assigned to a sound recording that contains works by more than one composer. The only exceptions that come readily to mind would be, for instance, *complete* recordings of the works found in such manuscript collections as "Notenbüchlein für Anna Magdalena Bach †n (1725)" (n83189427) or "Las Huelgas codex" (n89670518), or such published compilations as "English dancing master" (n85195519).

Q: I'm reviewing a new cataloger's work, and I know something to be true about the 546, but cannot find any documentation to back it up (my shortcoming, I'm sure). I seem to recall your having addressed this issue at some time, in some venue, so I'm asking you about it now. As I recall, the 546 should not include information *only* about languages other than that of the main text; e.g. "In Vietnamese; summaries in English" is OK, whereas "Summaries in English" should go in a 500, if that's the entirety of the language note. Correct?

A: MARC 21 itself is not helpful in answering your question. The only explicit guidance that I find regarding summaries in particular is in LC's "Music and Sound Recordings Online Manual" (1999, with updates), which is available on Cataloger's Desktop. The definition of field 546 reads, in part: "In Library of Congress practice the use of field 546 is limited to notes that actually state the names of the languages/scripts of the main content of the item in hand (including summaries). It is not used for notes that are limited to stating the language from which the text of an item is translated." This leads me to believe that you may code a note such as "Summaries in English" as 546. The boundary between 546 and 500 can sometimes be sort of fuzzy. Other examples in the LC manual relegate notes that talk about the languages of prefaces and program notes to field 500, for instance. Perhaps summaries are considered elements of the main contents, whereas most other text is considered accompanying material.

MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP

Financial Report 2003

Balance in savings, Jan. 1, 2003	14,629.06
Balance in checking, Jan. 1, 2003	11,713.74
Total cash available, Jan. 1, 2003	26,342.80

INCOME

Membership dues	5,695.00
Subscription fees	2,250.00
Meeting registration fees	5,660.00
Publication: Best of MOUG, 7 th ed.	100.00
Bank interest	69.04
 Total income	 13,774.04

EXPENSES

Annual Meeting	
Food, Rooms, A/V, etc.	6,169.69
Board Meeting	1,401.68
Duplication & supplies	875.13
Shipping	130.63
Refund	0.00
Summer Board Meeting	2,521.90
Publications	
Newsletter	2,117.75
Best of MOUG	37.42
Bank fees	44.50
Office expenses	0.00
Miscellaneous	875.13
 Total expenses	 14,173.23

NET GAIN/LOSS -399.19

Balance in savings, Jan. 1, 2004	14,698.70
Balance in checking, Jan. 1, 2004	11,245.51
Total cash available, Jan. 1, 2004	25,943.61

submitted by
Ruth A. Inman,
MOUG Treasurer

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 payable to MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP must accompany this application. Rates are as follows:
\$15.00 Personal Membership (North America)
\$20.00 Institutional Subscription (North American)
\$30.00 Personal Membership or Institutional Subscription (outside North America)

Please complete this form, enclose check, and mail to: Ruth A. Inman, MOUG Treasurer, Kennedy-King College, 2538 W. 119th St., Chicago, IL 60655

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



YOUNG LIBRARY
SERIALS 1AGD8000
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
500 S. LIMESTONE
LEXINGTON, KY 40506-0001