Scores and Recordings

OLGA BUTH

As a preface to a consideration of the existing classification schemes for scores and recordings, it is important to establish that the immediate future may include a national network of resource centers and computerized bibliographic control of present library collections of all sizes. In less than ten years, a patron may sit down at a terminal in Columbus, Ohio, and determine that the score he needs to study is in a library in Salem, Oregon.

Library automation on this scale presupposes standardization which in turn emphasizes the need to evaluate present systems of bibliographic description and classification. The object of this article is to identify the elements of the major classification schemes for shelf arrangement of scores and sound recordings now in use, and to evaluate them as they apply to the two main groups of library collections: those organized for the researcher and those organized for the browser. The economic factors of automation and the application of industrial management techniques to libraries clearly indicate that concepts for libraries may become polarized. The general, “supermarket” approach which may serve well a casual browser using a smaller collection is anathema for the researcher. Browsing of the “serendipity” type is indeed of value to the researcher but if one credits the evidence of numerous indexing and abstracting services, his first priority is the most precise identification possible of material directly relevant to his needs.

Webster’s Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary defines classification as “a systematic arrangement in groups or categories according to established criteria.” To facilitate the use of a library, a collection is generally arranged in an ordered manner to allow the user to bypass the catalog and go directly to the shelves. Success is determined by the frequency with which he can do this. Classification schemes have been devised for this purpose.

There are some artificial divisions of materials based on physical,
polygraphic or cost factors which result in reference areas, rare book rooms and media centers. Classification *per se* is concerned with conceptual organization, regardless of the physical form in which it exists, e.g., book, score, recording, film or periodical.

Sound recordings and scores have been artificially grouped in many libraries because of their physical characteristics. This separation and a general reluctance to recognize their library value has affected their classification and resulted in frequent use of in-house schemes. They also have been separately classed as a separate group of materials because they differ from books conceptually. A score is the graphic representation of a musical composition and a record is a sound recording of the same. Neither are *about* something in the sense that a book is on a given subject. A musical composition is a more abstract entity than a painting, poem or map and therefore generally eludes classification by subject. However, a score and sound recording catalog does show subject heading cards. These “subjects” must be understood as frequently being form/subject headings, e.g., the term “Sonatas (Piano)” brings together sonatas for piano, not titles on the subject of piano sonatas. The text of a musical composition may also result in a subject heading such as “Carols” because the text of the carol is on some topic which brings Christmas to mind in a specific way.

The characteristics of scores which determine or affect classification are:

1. **Size:** A score varies in size from 19 cm for a miniature score to the average of 35 cm for a full score. The most frequent size is 32 cm. In addition, contemporary scores are being issued in formats the size of small maps and rolls. To save shelf space, miniature scores are often placed in a separate location. Further, three of the four schemes to be discussed provide a number for small scores in which they can be arranged alphabetically by composer. The oversize scores, because of their broadly varied formats, need separate shelving. One also must mention manuscripts and facsimile editions of scores in a micro format.

2. **Format:** (Format here is interpreted broadly to include the general physical makeup of a publication and the plan of musical organization.) A score may be a collection of miscellaneous titles, selections by one or more composers, or a single piece of sheet music. It may be a full score or piano-vocal score, score and parts, vocal score, arrangement, transcription, reduction, excerpt or accompaniment.
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3. Alphabetical arrangement: A score is a composition by a composer and therefore can be arranged in alphabetical sequence by composer and/or title.

4. Medium: A musical composition has been written to be performed using musical instruments. The term medium is used in classification to indicate the species of instrumentation, i.e., the composition is written to be performed on the piano or by solo voice, band, orchestra or dramatic ensemble.

5. Form: A musical form is a plan of construction for a composition which can refer to a clearly defined concept such as a sonata or stylistic concept such as the chaconne and passacaglia.

6. Subject content: The term form/subject heading is frequently used by music catalogers; much confusion arises from this dual concept. In classification of scores, if a term can be understood as both form and subject, e.g., sonata, the underlying concept is that of form, not subject.

7. Character or content: A score may be described as sacred or secular, depending on the contents of the text. Hymns, national songs and political songs also can be grouped by textual content.

8. Language of text: Maurice Line points out that a division of songs by language would be helpful to the performer since “in no musical form more than in the song does a nation betray its individuality, for apparent reasons.”

9. Geographical: Certain types of songs and instrumental music characteristic of a given nationality or race benefit from being grouped together.

10. Style relating to a historical period: A score can be a composition representative of the style of a particular period, e.g., symphonic poem, frottola, Gregorian chant.

11. Opus and thematic numbers: An opus number indicates the chronological position of a composition within the entire output of a composer. Thematic catalogs are the end product of the listing of compositions by a single composer in chronological or sequential order. The numbers provide a specific means of identification and are used in place of book or Cutter numbers for title in the full call number.

One or more of the above elements is used by all schemes for classifying scores. They have been listed to help to clarify misconceptions which are reflected in many articles written by non-musicians about the classification of music materials.
Since any useful system presupposes some knowledge—some level of thought and interest—on the part of the user, it would seem reasonable to assume that the best classification scheme for scores is one which provides ready access for the user who has some knowledge of music. No person should expect to use a collection which is systematically organized without making some effort to learn what the system is and how it works.

A classification scheme used to arrange materials on the shelf attempts to: (1) designate a relative shelving location for the piece, and (2) collocate it with editions of the same work, materials of the same form or medium and in a sequence easily recognized as relating differing groups to each other. For the purposes of this article, it is understood that all the elements of a call number, i.e. the class number, book or Cutter number, dates, opus number, etc., affect shelf arrangement; therefore reference will be made to these elements as they apply.

In this article, four classification schemes are to be evaluated: those of the Library of Congress (LCC), the Dewey decimal system (DDC), the Dickinson classification scheme (DC) and the McColvin (McC) revision of the Dewey decimal class 780. To provide for comparison, the broad framework of each scheme is charted in figures 1-4.

**Library of Congress Classification**

Within the two major divisions, subdivision proceeds by listing solo instrumental literature, chamber ensembles through the literature for orchestra and band, i.e., simple to complex followed by the division into secular and sacred vocal music, and then from the literature for large ensembles (operas and oratorios) sequentially through chamber ensembles and solo literature to several special categories in reverse order from instrumental music. Many of the subdivisions are further divided by format, i.e. miscellaneous collections, original compositions, collections and separate works and arrangements with titles following in alphabetical order by composer. The solo literature for piano and organ has some division by musical form. Vocal music for large groups is divided by format, i.e., full score, vocal score, vocal score with pianoforte accompaniment and excerpts. Choral music is subdivided by medium, i.e. mixed voices, men's voices and women's voices, then once more by size of the group. The schedule for liturgical music is detailed and useful for only the largest collections. The other special categories are divided by time and geographic subdivisions as these apply.
The description of this division is in very broad, generalized terms, but this basic structure of LCC is in terms which a musician will understand. It was developed in 1904 by Oscar Sonneck, chief of the Music Division of the Library of Congress and patterned after the classed catalogs of music publishers rather than those of libraries. As a result, it has a systematic structuring unlike the rest of LCC. It is very detailed and most appropriate for the largest libraries. However, through contraction, this scheme can be used in any size library. Since the music collection at LC numbers more than 4 million volumes, it is doubtful that many libraries have a collection which would require such a detailed schedule. For further evaluation of the collocation of music materials in LCC, Eric Bryant's review is recommended.

**DEWEY DECIMAL CLASSIFICATION**

Figure 2 was produced by extracting the numbers designated for the classification of scores in the 780s in DDC. Applying the first editions of DDC, books and scores would have been interfiled on the shelf. Later editions fortunately suggested a division between scores and books by adding an M to the class number. As is quickly obvious, there is a similarity between the LCC and DDC schemes. Both begin with the three large categories, miscellaneous collections, instrumental and vocal music. The arrangement for instrumental music for DDC is in reverse order from that of LCC. DDC does not, however, divide systematically between sacred and secular music in the same pattern. This scheme also has an artificial division between collections and...
single works in each category which allows for an alphabetical arrangement by composer and/or title but does not provide well for arrangements, excerpts, etc. The broadest criticism usually made of the DDC is that the scheme is often difficult to apply consistently and results in much cross-classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscellaneous Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Music (782-784)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oratorios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sacred and secular)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo vocal literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental music (785-789)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-sized ensembles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber ensembles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo instruments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. DEWEY DECIMAL CLASSIFICATION (1876)

 McCOLVIN CLASSIFICATION

In 1924, Lionel McColvin published a classification scheme (see figure 3) based on a revision of the Dewey 780s. He wrote that the “haphazard over-classification and the confusion of musical literature and music . . . must provoke [a] nightmare in any one who attempts to apply it in detail.” The two principles which he applied were that (1) musical scores and books on music should be clearly distinguished and separated, and (2) the purpose of the work is the primary consideration.

Again it will be seen that, in broad terms, the organization is by medium and is arranged sequentially from solo literature to the large group ensemble. The fact that its subdivisions are suitably brief, making it very usable for a small collection, also suggests that one would have difficulties using it for a large collection. Again, titles are subarranged alphabetically by composer after a division by single works and collections. Bryant reports that the McCC is used by libraries in Britain as a variant for the Dewey 780s.²

DICKINSON CLASSIFICATION

A music classification based on categories of musicological integrity was prepared and put into use by George Dickinson for the Vassar College Music Library (see figure 4). The scheme is an example of
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**Figure 3. McCOLVIN CLASSIFICATION (1924)**

```
Music

Vocal music (780-780.9)          Instrumental music (781-782.9)
  Solo literature
  Concerted vocal music
    (duets through choruses)
  Sacred music
  Oratorios
  Dramatic ensembles

Miscellaneous (782.9)

Miniature scores (782.99)
```

**Figure 4. DICKINSON CLASSIFICATION**

```
Music

Instrumental music (M 1-M 68)*    Vocal music (M 7-M 98)
  Solo literature
  Chamber ensembles
  Full-size ensembles

Miscellaneous

   Solo literature
   Choral music
     Liturgic
     Dramatic ensembles
     Ballets
```

*All of the figures have been diagrammed to show certain parallels of construction. The class numbers in parentheses will show the actual sequence of materials.

classification by original medium and was developed for a library with a primary purpose of study rather than performance. The class synopsis in the manual edited by Carol Bradley provides a simple chart of the main divisions.6

In figure 4 it can again be seen that the basic organization is by medium and is arranged in a manner applicable to and consistent with the materials of the subject area.
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THE SYSTEMS COMPARED

The four schemes used to place scores in an orderly array on the shelf all have in common a superstructure based on the instrumentation of the composition, i.e. medium. The several schemes differ, however, in the sequential arrangement or grouping within medium. For all practical purposes, it hardly seems to matter whether a miscellaneous collection is at the beginning of the section of shelves or at the end; or that the division between vocal and instrumental music is arranged in the order of vocal-instrumental or instrumental-vocal. The important fact is that within each of these broad areas, materials be collocated in a readily visible pattern.

The arrangement of instrumental music is simple to complex by solo literature first followed by ensembles in numerical order, e.g. trios, quartets, quintets, etc., and completed by the categories of orchestra and band. (The reverse of this pattern is used by Dewey.)

Within the categories of solo literature, instruments are grouped in four broad divisions. With the exception of McC, the arrangement is by keyboard, string, wind and percussion. McC arranges instruments by wind, string, keyboard and percussion. In general, this is an arrangement by mode of performance and traditional grouping of instruments. Therefore, a musician would have little difficulty recognizing that organization quickly.

The DC has an advantage in that Dickinson recognized the value of collocating scores for piano ensemble with piano solo literature. The class number of mixed keyboard ensemble is also more conveniently placed directly following the organ solo class. One might observe that no scheme follows a strictly logical organization, but, as in the case just cited, adjustments are made because of a general understanding held by performers.

Until the eighteenth edition of Dewey, the division for scores for the organ and similar instruments was headed keyboard wind instruments, technically correct, but hardly common usage.

Both Dewey and LCC subdivide piano and organ solo literature by form, undoubtedly on the basis of literary warrant. Since the arrangement for solo literature in LCC is generally systematically based, it is important to recognize that a similar arrangement could be added, if desired, for any of the other solo instruments, e.g. by a decimal division within the numbers provided for separate works. Equally, if a library preferred to maintain a consistent pattern for all solo literature, contraction is a simple matter. It is interesting to note
that literary warrant led LC to specify numbers for left-hand and right-hand pieces in M 26. A special collection of music published during the Civil War resulted in three special numbers in M 20.

The solo subdivision for piano and organ in Dewey is hardly based on sound musical definition. Fugues (786.42) does not collocate well between fantasias, rhapsodies and arabesques. Romantic and descriptive music categories must surely contain some interesting bedfellows.

The DC has an advantage in that method books, exercises, studies and orchestral studies are placed directly following the solo literature for a given instrument. However, a problem of cross-classification might arise with the categories for methods, tutors, etc., in 0 7, if carelessly selected. For the advantage of the user, it would seem logical to group all such methods, exercises and studies directly to follow solo literature. Dewey does place methods, etc. immediately before solo literature. The LCC provides the worst possible classification by assigning an MT number to instructive editions which shelves them among books at the end of the M schedule. This is logical but hardly the most convenient arrangement for the user.

For chamber music, the LCC provides a very systematic pattern for all instruments. After classes for organ and one or more solo instruments, and for piano and one or more solo instruments, various combinations such as piano, one string and one plectral or plectral trio, wind-plectral trios, etc., are listed. The organization is a set pattern of medium, subdivided by physical format arranged alphabetically by composer or title. The concept is a simple numerical pattern easily learned by a library patron.

Dewey employs nine broad class numbers to which are added numbers specifying the number of instruments within the instrumentation of the group. This would place, e.g. all ensemble music for string/bowed instruments together in two places in alphabetical arrangement by composers.

Since it is impossible to review these classification schemes in similar detail for all categories, several divisions have been selected to illustrate certain points.

In the prefatory note to the revised edition of the class M schedule, Sonneck states he had reached the "conclusion that in the interest of all concerned, it would have been better to have formed a separate group of 'early' music and books on music." Of the schemes being reviewed, only the DC and the LCC provide class numbers for Denkmaler and Monuments together with facsimile and manuscript collections.
Dickinson provides a clearer, more useful arrangement than LCC; however, single titles in both schedules will be found classed by medium with no further definition in most cases than, for example, adding TO 1800 to the subject heading as LC does. One is therefore led to agree with Sonneck that a classification scheme which would take into account special problems presented by such material would be more helpful to the user. To illustrate, where does one put Renaissance pieces “convenables tant à la voix comme aux instruments”—with vocal or instrumental music?

Because of their size (16-20 cm), miniature scores are often shelved separately. An arrangement which has been particularly useful in the Ohio State University Music Library, which uses the LCC, is an organization using MS in place of a class number followed by a book number for composer and title which places the collection in alphabetical order. The organization by title following composer specification groups the scores alphabetically by collections, unique titles or form. Particularly in a university library, patrons value this arrangement. It should be noted that full scores and scores with parts which duplicate the miniature score are classed with related materials. McColvin placed miniature scores in the last number for scores (782.99). Dewey groups them near the head of the collection with collections and anthologies in 780.8. Use of this single number also would permit an alphabetical arrangement by composer and title.

The class numbers for opera scores provide another interesting study in variations. McColvin arranges dramatic titles alphabetically in two groups: (1) operas, and (2) musical comedies, light operas, and revues. This allows no provision for types of scores. LCC does make a distinction between full scores, piano-vocal scores and excerpts. Since Sonneck makes the distinction by medium, in this case the performing ensemble, dramatic works are grouped by (1) opera, (2) incidental dramatic music, and (3) pantomimes, ballets, masques, and pageants. Dewey provides a mélangé and one wonders how many public libraries using the DDC purchase sets of parts for operas. The indication of parts is a new addition to the eighteenth edition.

Dickinson again provides for a clearer, more simple and straightforward organization with more categories. In addition to the general category of operas for works for dramatic ensembles, there are numbers for music for motion pictures, ballets, incidental music, ballad operas, forerunners of opera and ballet and madrigal opera.

Mounting interest in jazz as being worthy of serious study necessitates a closer look at the collocation this topic receives. McColvin
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provides one specific number where jazz might be grouped with other instrumental music, e.g., dance band music. Dewey provides several numbers for jazz: jazz orchestra (785.066 7), jazz band (785.067 2), under music for small ensembles, jazz (785.42) and jazz music classed with modern dance music (786.46). Cross classification is inevitable. In both Dewey and McColvin, single titles can be classed by medium.

In LCC, jazz music is classed by medium. A selection for the piano would fall somewhere between M 20 and M 82, etc. Music for jazz ensembles would be placed somewhere between M 900 and M 985. Jazz quartet with orchestra would be placed in M 1040-M 1041. But how would the patron interested in a collection of jazz music grouped in a homogeneous manner be served? One would need to possess very specific information such as composer/title or instrumentation, and browsing is certainly not facilitated for the person who has little knowledge of classical music. He would be confused by the titles collocated with the one for which he is searching.

Like LCC the DC places jazz compositions according to medium. One unfortunate lapse, however, is classing jazz orchestra with church orchestra, fife and drum corps music and special military music in M 67.

It is clearly evident at this point that a revision of all the classification schemes needs to be made to provide a more browsable arrangement for jazz and popular music. These categories of music do not fit easily into any of the schemes used because the pattern of publisher's catalogs for "classical" music simply does not fit the concepts, descriptions and categories for this music.

Dewey groups popular music by specific medium, e.g., titles for solo voice class in 784.3061. This number is also used, however, for art songs, ballads, canzonets, etc. This is hardly a recognizable concept for collocation except that each is a single title for solo voice. This is, of course, the accepted collocation for classical music because reference is generally to composer/title rather than title or type of popular music which is common in the latter category. The index to the eighteenth edition indicates the use of 780.42 for popular music. This collocates between commercial miscellany and business firms.

In LCC, titles for solo voice would class in M 1630.18 which collocates popular songs with national songs and special songs such as *Dixie*, *Hail Columbia* and *Yankee Doodle*. This is certainly more appropriate but not entirely satisfactory. Instrumental music is classed by medium.

Dickinson does not use the term "popular," so presumably any music
would be classed by medium. This leaves problems similar to those suggested under Dewey.

Another new category, electronic music, demonstrates the ease, or lack of ease, with which new categories have been classed. The division which is provided by Carol Bradley's expansion of Dickinson is certainly appropriate to the literature. M 48 is for electric or electronic instruments in combination with conventional instruments; M 49 is for solely electronic music. The basic concept applied is one of medium.6

Using the LCC scheme, one would class compositions for mixed media with solo and ensemble music for traditional instruments. Two numbers have been interjected decimally for electronic and "concrete music," M 175.E5 and C6. The collocation is with music for bandonion and mandolin harp in an "other" category.

In Dewey, the index to the eighteenth edition directs one to 789.911 for electronic music, a number which appears to be used for both music and books. "Concrete music" is in 789.98. This places an area of catalogs for recordings, etc. between the categories of scores. One assumes that catalogers are assigning the class number for conventional music to compositions employing both conventional instruments and electronically produced sounds.

One final observation is to point out the wisdom of placing thematic catalogs directly after the collected works of composers as occurs in Dickinson because these frequently provide indexes or at least reference tools to the collected editions.

In the preceding paragraphs, attention has been given to the structure of and the resulting organization provided by these four schemes. The collocation of materials appropriate to their characteristics which results in greater ease in browsing through a collection is of prime consideration.

While the LCC and DC are similar, the enormous size of the LC collection being classified has resulted in many additions to the original structure of the scheme which is undoubtedly confusing to many persons. The advantage of LCC is that it provides a highly detailed scheme which allows libraries with individual strengths to arrange those areas more successfully. The basic structure is musically valid and the end result does provide for browsing particularly if decisions are made as to the degree of specificity in classification desirable for the individual collection.

As stated earlier, McColvin is a revision of the Dewey 780 class. Since its basic structure is musically valid, it provides a very adequate scheme
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for smaller libraries. Simplification and division between books and scores is a clear improvement on the DDC.

Dewey is the least effective of the schemes because it allows frequent cross-classification. While its overall structure is similar to the other three, the end result of its use is not as musically valid. Since the DDC is primarily subject-oriented, the inescapable fact that a systematic organization not as subject oriented is more effective for scores may explain the general belief that the DDC is not entirely successful for a music classification scheme.

In evaluating these schemes on the feature of collocation, it has first been noted that in broad terms collocation is very similar. After an examination of the subdivisions, it is clear that each scheme achieves different results.

Having had the opportunity to examine the LCC carefully, Dickinson was able to benefit from both its strengths and weaknesses. The area of M 01-M 09 in Dickinson provides for a better defined separation of materials than does the M2-M4 in the LCC. It has already been noted that the organization for piano and organ literature in Dickinson relates more directly to the approach most frequently used by the patron. Providing a number for obsolete instruments at the end of each instrumental medium is superior to grouping scores for obsolete instruments with solo literature and all ensemble music in M 990-M 991 as the LCC does.

The section for dramatic ensemble in Dickinson has a better organization by category than the LCC. The structuring for liturgical music in DC is quite adequate for all except large theological collections. Above all, the emphasis on original medium provides a superior arrangement for musicians. In summary, the DC is a simple, clear and systematic organization based on valid musical connotation.

There are a few other features to be explored and evaluated briefly. Without question, the LCC has the most comprehensive and universal coverage of the four schemes. It was first developed in relation to an already large collection and has been expanded through the years where there was literary warrant. Dickinson also provides satisfactory coverage for a large research collection. Its provision for expansion would provide for a very broad coverage although one could question its present capability for jazz and popular music because the characteristics of these two genre differ from those of classical music. But this lack is common to all the schemes.

"Dewey began by classifying knowledge." His approach was subject
based. The mixture of medium and subject order has resulted in some confusion and the total result does not provide broader coverage.

The LCC and DC are based on characteristics of music other than subject. As indicated above, the organization for these two schemes is based on that of publisher’s catalogs and is therefore by medium and physical format. Of the eleven characteristics listed at the beginning of this article, style of an historical period, subject content and language of text least affect classification patterns in these schemes. In order of importance, (1) medium, (2) format, size and character, and (3) alphabetical listing, geographical and form are the elements utilized for the ordering of any one of these schemes. The opus number is used in the call number in many libraries to precisely identify a score having a form title.

In consideration of the principles of class construction, the LCC is rated as an enumerative classification scheme while Dewey is essentially a hierarchical scheme. Surprisingly, however, when one considers the classification of music scores, the LCC does provide a hierarchical relationship in contrast to other schedules in the LCC. It does provide frequently a clear division between simple and complex forms as does Dickinson. Again, Dewey is less consistent and clear in his construction. The LCC, DDC and DC all can be expanded infinitely and allow for extensive specificity. Unfortunately, expansion in Dewey frequently results in lengthy class numbers and there is no allowance for the insertion of an entirely new topic without a curious collocation resulting. The McCC suffers from the same limitation. As expressed before, Dewey allows for too frequent cross-classification.

The LCC uses “gap” notation which allows for insertion of new numbers while also in most cases providing a suitable collocation. The use of a class number in conjunction with the LC book numbers provides a simple, easily remembered call number.

The DDC does employ a decimal number which is pure notation, but too frequently as new topics are added, a number may become too long to be easily remembered and this length adds to the cost of labelling. It employs some mnemonic devices which are generally considered an aid to memory. McColvin also uses decimal notation but no number has more than six digits.

Dickinson uses a call number consisting of numerals, symbols and letters to provide maximum expansion and collocate a score with
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precision. This sometimes results in a call number which is long but highly descriptive. The use of mnemonics assists the patron in recognition of the significance of the elements in the call number. The system has a capacity for expansion and contraction without loss of significance.

One of the outstanding features of the DDC is the full alphabetical index to the system. While there is also an index to the LCC, the latest edition includes additions to the schedule through 1968. From that date on, one must use the periodic publications of changes and additions issued by LC. An attempt has been made to improve this situation by the publication of a two-volume set designed to equate subject headings and class numbers. This title is based on the seventh edition of LC subject headings and additions and changes made during the eighteen months following its publication.

McColvin provides a short index to his schedule. The manual by Carol Bradley also provides some such assistance to the Dickinson classification.

If one were to select a classification scheme for a new library collection, one would need to identify the patrons of that collection and their needs. The determination of the maximum point to which a collection would grow is a prime consideration. If one is beginning a collection for a college or university, schemes should be carefully evaluated to determine that the one chosen provides for the purposes of both researcher and student. Further, one should clearly define between the approaches of the browser and the scholar since these differ as to first priorities.

There are reports in the literature that some libraries have arranged scores by composer first and then by form. It was pointed out earlier that provision has been made to allow miniature scores to be so organized in three of the schemes. Reflecting on the obvious advantages of such an arrangement for the knowledgeable musician, it is apparent that arguments could be made to support an alphabetical arrangement rather than a classified one for a university library.

In her book on The Care and Treatment of Music in a Library, Ruth Wallace lists several problems inherent in classifying music scores. It is interesting to note that she describes the approach to classification of scores, that of medium, used by the major schemes under consideration as the arrangement which the average public library will find is a logical and practical one. Since LC is hardly the average public library, it may be theorized that the choice of arrangement by medium was a
pragmatic one. Dickinson emphasized the historical approach by bringing together all variations of a given work, an approach which is more felicitous for the researcher.

SOUND RECORDINGS

In evaluating these classification schemes for use with sound recordings, one needs first to note the differences between the formats of scores and recordings which have affected classification and shelf arrangement.

1. Size and format: Sound recordings vary in size and it is common to divide between 7-, 10-, and 12-inch discs as well as tapes, cartridges, cassettes and wire recordings to efficiently utilize shelf space. Tapes, cartridges and cassettes are packaged on a one-to-one basis, e.g. one tape to one container. Discs, however, are packaged with one or more discs in a container. Some libraries have divided between albums and “singles” in a shelving arrangement. While scores are often issued in sets of scores and one or more parts, in most libraries this does not result in a separate shelving area.

Although books are generally not considered to be fragile materials, recordings are. The average life span of a recording is much less than that of a book under normal circumstances. Librarians know that a recording may be damaged beyond use when it is circulated to the first patron. Tapes may be completely erased on a first loan. Sometimes only one band may be damaged by continued use. This plays havoc with any average withdrawal program. Some librarians have been convinced for these reasons that classification is too expensive for recordings, and decide to shelve them in accession number order and by difference in format with no browsing; or they group the recordings in a broad subject arrangement by some simple, in-house scheme in an open browsing area.

2. Problems of main entry: Although there are many collections of scores, for a large number of them, composer or editor entry is often possible. However, recordings lie in a no-man’s-land somewhere between book concepts and those applied to serials. There is a parallel to “bound withs,” but indexing by composer and title is an ideal as relevant to the needs of the musicologist and busy researcher as is scientific indexing of documentation in that area for the scientist.
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A recording may be of one composition by one composer for one medium. It may contain several compositions by one composer for one medium which collocates it with collections under medium. A recording may contain several compositions by more than one composer by one performer or performing group, but fail to have a cover or album title. Cataloging results in analytics for each title by composer, but a recording can only be assigned to one shelving space. The recording may or may not classify easily by medium; consequently, it may be classed by the first title listed or be grouped with miscellaneous collections.

In essence, any of the classification schemes described in this article would arrange sound recordings on the shelf in a manner as satisfactory as that for scores. The same benefits or disadvantages would accrue for either category except for the problem just referred to and the problem of miscellaneous collections. The advantage in using the same classification scheme for both types of materials is that the same class number would apply to both score and record unless the recording is a collection. The same advantage would exist for all four schemes.

The prime question many librarians have had to answer is: To classify or not to classify? The first professional statement of cataloging rules for music appeared in 1927 when ALA published a title in which a committee appointed to provide a manual for cataloging musical scores recommended that records did not need to be classified but could be arranged according to the record number.11

In 1933, Ralph Ellsworth wrote that the “accession number of the record is its call number, because unless the collection is very large, a classification system is unnecessary.”12

Ethel Lyman described the arrangement of recordings in the Smith College Library—an arrangement by composer first followed by a division by medium.13

Philip Miller recommended that records be shelved by accession numbers for simplification of classifying problems and to eliminate the frequent shifting of records.14

Evelyn Vaughan, in 1953, compared the receipt of recordings in the Illinois State Library to an atom bomb because cataloging procedures for recordings were in their infancy. “Recordings are classified as nearly like the book collection as possible by using the Dewey decimal classification system.”15

The second statement of cataloging principles and procedures for music by a professional organization was published in 1942 by the
Music Library Association. The committee which compiled this statement, the first comprehensive code, included representatives from both public and university libraries. In the section on shelf arrangement of records, the librarian was advised to “arbitrarily adopt the system which will best suit his needs.” Four methods were suggested and the advantages of each listed. These were (1) numerical arrangement, (2) classified arrangement, (3) trade symbol, and (4) alphabetical arrangement.

The obvious bias of the committee was for a nonclassified arrangement by accession number. The effect of this recommendation can be seen in the results of a questionnaire summarized in a 1963 article by Gordon Stevenson. Almost 38 percent of the libraries responding arranged records by accession number.

If a classified arrangement for recordings was used by a library, the committee presumably believed that it would be the same one used for other materials. In his article, Stevenson points out that approximately 13 percent of the libraries reported using an adaptation of Dewey; however, it is significant that another 15 percent were arranging their recordings by broad subject area. Only five libraries of the 392 responding reported that they were using an adaptation of LC.

The four methods of shelf arrangement of recordings listed by the Music Library Association committee account for approximately 80 percent of the schemes used by libraries twenty years later. It should be noted that various problems (e.g., multititled recordings) already suggested by the 1942 code have been increased many times by the development of the long-playing record.

Two of the schemes listed by the committee are not true classification schemes: the numerical and trade symbol arrangement.

1. Numerical arrangement: this arrangement reduces the necessity of frequent shifting of records to insert new titles. This saves “wear and tear” on the recording. A division by size is easily organized using this method. The most recent purchases will be at the end of the collection. The call number is a simple, inexpensive one, easy to assign, easy to retrieve from the shelf and economical in circulation. It is better for a nonbrowsing arrangement.

2. Manufacturer’s label and number arrangement (trade symbol): this is shelf arrangement by the name of the record company and its numbering system. It is used by the British Broadcasting Company and the Library of Congress, two of the world’s largest record collections. Both are closed access collections.
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An abbreviation of the number similar to that used in the Schwann catalog provides a short call number of mixed notation, inexpensive to assign and effective in circulation. It provides an easy control of additional copies and purchases. A subject arrangement of sorts is achieved as companies tend to specialize. This number is universally used by patrons and record stores. (The large record companies are working toward the use of an international numbering system.) It is used in discographies, reviews, lists, Schwann, etc. Use of such an arrangement permits the knowledgeable user to go directly to the shelves. Because it has a more unique meaning and use than the parallel for books, it opens approaches to a collection which one learns only by using it. The latest purchases would be shelved at the end of each label. Volumes of a set are easily shelved together by using the number of the first volume and adding successive volume numbers. This provides a compromise between accession number arrangement and classification in that it does allow certain types of browsing and is less expensive than classification.

Shelf arrangement can also be achieved by classification according to medium or an alphabetical arrangement by composer and title.

Classified Arrangement by Medium. It has already been demonstrated that classification by the four schemes under discussion is an arrangement by medium. The pros and cons as previously discussed relating to scores can be applied to recordings also; however, the difficulty posed by the need to class a multiltle recording which can only result in one shelf location will continue to send the patron to the card catalog for complete information.

This arrangement is suitable for browsing but the cost of classifying records is sometimes considered to be a deterrent to the adoption of some standard class scheme. However, in his article, Stevenson points out that 66 percent favored some form of classed arrangement though the structures of these classes varied greatly.

One phrase constantly repeated in articles describing in-house schemes is that a given scheme “works for their library.” This probably speaks well for the flexibility of the library patron but does not provide a valid qualitative evaluation. The major benefit of classification is that it groups like materials together on the shelf more than the nonclassed schemes. Unless the library prefers to maintain a nonbrowsing collection, in which case the first two methods are less expensive, this is an effective means of arranging records for browsing.

Stevenson cites a recommendation for the use of Dewey but points
out the dissatisfaction with the 780s expressed by librarians.\textsuperscript{17} His call for a uniform way to adapt it to records appears to have resulted in ANSCR—alpha-numeric scheme for classification of recordings. Or ANSCR may have been based on the scheme outlined in an article published several years earlier.\textsuperscript{18}

The authors of ANSCR call it a comprehensive system devised specifically for sound recordings and conceived for collections of any size or type.\textsuperscript{19} The strength of the scheme is that it provides one system for both musical and nonmusical recordings shelved together in one collection in a browsing arrangement. The authors have provided a detailed manual for classification of recordings which includes rules, procedures, definitions and an organization undoubtedly much appreciated by busy catalogers who have not adapted one of the standard classification schemes which have been available for many years. The system uses a mixed notation which is, however, largely composed of letters and makes extensive use of mnemonic aids. (It is interesting that so many of the in-house schemes, together with ANSCR, use letters more frequently than numbers. Is there some message in this?) A comparison of the list of “first terms” shows an organization which closely resembles the abridged Dewey with additions for topics not covered by the 780s. Although the authors claim that it is suitable for collections of any size, it would not be satisfactory for large research collections as it does not provide enough classes for several categories such as solo instrumental music, anthologies and historical collections, and liturgical music. A further claim is made that it can be easily expanded. One questions the possible collocation which this would provide since a tight structure already exists. Details of musical connotation are not always acceptable.

Classified (Alphabetical Arrangement). An alphabetical arrangement by composer and/or title has distinct advantages for a college or university library. The enthusiasm of faculty and students for the alphabetical arrangement of miniature scores at Ohio State University is convincing evidence that a similar arrangement for recordings would meet with approval. However, the difficulty with multitled recordings which exists for classification by medium persists with this arrangement also.

The record collection at Indiana University is arranged by composer and work.\textsuperscript{20}

In Recordings in the Public Library, Mary Pearson recommends an alphabetical arrangement for a collection up to 5,000 records.\textsuperscript{21}

One disadvantage for an alphabetical arrangement could exist for
the patron who believes that this shelf arrangement would show all recordings by one composer together on the shelf. Another disadvantage would be the need to construct a classification scheme in the library as no standard scheme has been devised.

Since no classified system can be completely satisfactory for recordings, because of multitled recordings, the decision is still one of "to classify or not to classify," and that is a decision that can be made only in the context of the individual library after a careful study of the immediate needs, interests and orientation of the users of a given library.

Since LC is now providing an LC class number for recordings along with cataloging copy, and the copyright law of 1972 will undoubtedly result in its receiving a far larger collection from the recording industry than ever before, LCC is the first choice for all libraries who decide to classify recordings. This has portent for the future since a MARC format for scores and records has been completed and eventually the cooperative networks referred to at the beginning of this article will provide fast access to this information.

No article on the classification of recordings and scores would be complete without a mention of a faceted classification scheme devised by Eric Coates. It is strongly recommended that readers study this entirely new approach to old, familiar problems. This is made relatively easy because of the use of this notation in the British Catalogue of Music to which many libraries subscribe.

It must be emphasized once more that no single classification scheme can provide all approaches. A short but lucid presentation of the difficulties can be found in the introduction to Dickinson in which he says: "Certainly no one rigid schedule can serve these conflicting purposes. The present system has recourse, therefore, to the device of synthesis, and accordingly consists of factors capable of assembly in various relations demanded by different needs." To be certain that he has located all of the holdings of the library on a given topic or by a given composer, a patron inevitably must use the card catalog.

While the choice of an effective scheme is a prime priority to a library, it is of even greater importance to effect the classification of materials in a highly consistent manner. No choice of a classification scheme can outweigh the lack of collocation resulting from carelessness or insufficient musical judgment on the part of the classifier. Since one of the benefits of an automated on-line catalog is the production of a list of titles arranged by call number, this list would only be as useful as the degree to which titles have been precisely classed. And finally, any
system must be presented in an effective orientation program to the patrons of a library through individual assistance, brochures, library handbooks or formal lectures to improve browsing capabilities.
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