

**MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
SUBJECT ACCESS SUBCOMMITTEE
Business Meeting Report
Dallas – Feb. 16, 2012, 3:30 p.m.**

Members present: Janet Bradford, Ralph Hartsock, Marty Jenkins, Margaret Kaus, Kevin Kishimoto, Peter Lisius, Nancy Lorimer, Geraldine Ostrove (LC representative), Carlos Peña, Karen Peters, Sheila Torres-Blank, Hermine Vermeij (chair).

Members not present: none.

Visitors present: 15

Library of Congress report (Geraldine Ostrove)

Coming very soon is an official public statement from the Library of Congress that they are undertaking the medium of performance thesaurus. The current list of medium of performance terms that will be released with the statement includes many terms that are still under discussion.

Gerry led a Q&A about the medium project. This included some discussion of the various and inconsistent ways groups of instruments are represented (“[instrument] choir” and “[instrument] ensemble” are the most common). The subcommittee will discuss this issue online and send a discussion paper to the LC genre/form group.

Update from the MLA-BCC Genre/Form Task Force (Beth Iseminger)

The task force is working on finalizing the hierarchy of music genre/form terms. They are looking into seeking guidance from a technical advisor.

Medium of Performance Discussion Papers

The subcommittee reviewed and discussed three discussion papers from the LC genre/form group.

Role of speakers, dancers, etc.

LCSH does not have many provisions for performers in musical works outside of traditional instrumental and vocal roles. This paper discussed these roles and which of them should be included in the medium of performance thesaurus.

We need to communicate the forces needed to perform the music, including dancers and operators of electronic equipment. There was some discussion about, in the case of electronic music, whether or not we need to account for the performer (who may be doing anything from pushing “play” to doing advanced manipulation of digital sound, or if the medium is the electronic sound itself.

It sometimes will make a difference if one is assigning terms at the work or expression level. For example, a recording of a piece that includes dancer may not actually include any evidence of the dancer's part.

There was some discussion about electronic music, especially studio recordings that cannot be reproduced live, and that more terms beyond "electronics" may be useful. "Processed sound" was put forward as a possible new term.

New vocabulary for vocal terms

LCSH is also lacking when it comes to specific terms for vocal music, especially choral music. This paper proposed a possible new scenario for vocal terms, including using semi-composite terms like "chorus SATB."

The list currently contains many seemingly duplicate terms like "men's voices" and "men's chorus." Probably one (voices) should be a cross reference to the other (chorus), unless we want to differentiate between the two.

There was substantial discussion about the inclusion of voice types in chorus terms. Establishing these terms may open a can of worms, since there are so many different possibilities of combinations, and each would be a pre-coordinated string. Most agree that "chorus SATB" and other standard combinations would be very useful terms, but the precedent set by creating those would be worrying. The MARC field 382 as defined recently includes a \$v for "note;" this could potentially be a useful place to record voice types in conjunction with more general chorus terms.

The subcommittee will discuss these issues further after the meeting and put together an official response.

Functional Requirements for a Medium of Performance Statement in Bibliographic Records

There was agreement that some kind of conceptual basis for the medium of performance thesaurus is indeed necessary.

There was some discussion about the title of this document as well as the proposed title of the thesaurus. The subcommittee prefers the titles "Functional Requirements for a Medium of Performance Statement for Music" and "Medium of Performance Terms for Music."

We discussed whether order of terms matters, especially if the 382 field will be used primarily for indexing. If nothing else, a predictable order would be useful for catalogers trying to identify a piece, but we don't want to create any strict rules similar to the instructions in the Subject Headings Manual. It might make sense to recommend that catalogers take the order from whatever source they are looking at.

Finally, we talked about whether we need to specify "1" for singular mediums, and the consensus was that it would be useful to do so for clarity and machine manipulability.

Recognition of Service

Thank you to Ralph Hartsock and Marty Jenkins, whose terms on the Subject Access Subcommittee are now complete.