FROM THE CHAIR--

From the comments at the meeting by members and letters received afterwards, the annual meeting of MOUG at Columbus, March 26-27, was very successful. Due first to the turnout of the membership (118 registrants, approximately 70% of the individual members were present), then to the excellent presentations by workshop leaders, special guests, Kitty Skrobela, Marie Griffin and Robert Cunningham and members of the OCLC staff, the results were most gratifying. As could be predicted the largest representations were from Ohio, New York and Illinois with 6 persons from Texas and one each from Vermont, Florida and California! Six networks and 25 states were represented.

MOUG is particularly appreciative of the efforts by Helen Hughes, Ann Ekstrom, Sharon Walbridge and other members of the OCLC staff to make this a worthwhile meeting. Many members availed themselves of the opportunity to visit OCLC. Thanks are also due to Ann Hess, Pamela Starr and Karl Van Ausdal for the program and local arrangements. Lois Rowell and Tom Heck of the OSU Music Library contributed generously of their time. Nor should we overlook the entertaining reminiscences by Fred Kilgour, Executive Director of OCLC, at the banquet on Monday evening. His ingenuity, imagination and determination have resulted in a unique contribution to the library world.

At the business meeting, the membership voted to empower the Board to explore with the Board of the Music Library Association, the feasibility of establishing an organizational relationship with the MLA such as ALA has with its separate divisions. We wish to insure that the development of programs affecting the activities of music libraries and collections are effectively influenced by the professional librarians involved.

A letter will be written by the Board to Joseph Howard at the Library of Congress expressing the concern of the membership that the implementation of the MARC music format continues to be delayed.

The annual meeting in 1980 will be held February 25 in San Antonio, preceding the MLA conference. Judy Weidow, University of Texas at Austin, is the local arrangements chairperson. Robert Cunningham, Smith
College, is chairperson of the program committee. The MLA pre-conference meeting on AACR 2 is scheduled for February 26. We hope members will be able to attend both meetings.

Karl Van Ausdal is chairman of the nominating committee for new officers. Jan Cody, Rutgers, and David Knapp, Oberlin, will serve with him.

And finally encourage non-members to join MOUG and renew your own membership!

Olga Buth

REPORT ON THE ANNUAL MEETING, MARCH 26-27, 1979, COLUMBUS, OHIO

The following is a summary report on the last annual meeting in Columbus. Since the editors have access to more detailed notes on the meeting, we would be pleased to try to answer any specific questions members might have.

A. Workshop for leaders of music tagging workshops. Karl Van Ausdal (MOUG Continuing Education Coordinator) presided. As could be expected in a workshop for workshop leaders (!), many of the mysterious codes of the MARC format for music were discussed in detail. Individuals whose daily tagging activities concentrate on the OCLC documentation for scores and sound recordings might have some of their tagging questions answered by referring to the documentation for books.

B. Authority work in music libraries: An overview. Karl Van Ausdal, moderator of the session, introduced the speakers by posing several questions: What has LC's authority system been in the past? Where are our authority systems going as we begin to use AACR 2? What effect does a machine readable catalog have on authority systems? And what effect can authority systems have on mechanized catalogs?

The 1st speaker, Fred Bindman, Head of the Music Section of the Descriptive Cataloging Division at the Library of Congress, read and discussed a paper by C. Sumner Spalding entitled "The Tradition of Authority Work at the Library of Congress." Mr. Spalding, who recently retired from LC as Assistant Director for Cataloging, began his career as a music cataloger in the Music Division prior to World War II. The paper began with an outline history of music cataloging at LC, noting that prior to 1943, music materials were cataloged in the Music Division (the public service division) without an authority control system. With the reorganization of LC in 1943, music cataloging was transferred to the processing depts. At the same time decisions were made to: a. print cards for selected musical compositions b. utilize the same system of authority control for names and subject headings as used for book cataloging, and c. develop a system of conventional and uniform titles for musical works that would be printed on cards. Mr. Bindman then described the contents of the composer/uniform title authority cards used at LC (composer, chosen uniform title, tracers for composer/title and title references, bio-bibliographical sources for choice of titles and references) as well as the kinds of composer/title references that are normally made. The paper concluded with a brief description of the emerging automated system of authority control: authority and reference information for new music uniform titles are now in machine readable form, and LC's Name Headings With References will soon be expanded to include name/uniform titles with references for music and books.

The next speaker was Katherine Skrobela, Music Librarian at Middlebury College, former editor of the Music Cataloging Bulletin and Music Library Association representative to the ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee.

Ms. Skrobela pointed out that an authority file record must contain: a. the authorized form of heading (name or name/uniform title); b. tracers for references; and c. the source of authority. In the case of uniform title, the record might additionally list added entries that are normally associated with the title, and related work references. The situations in which headings are recorded in local authority files vary with the following possibilities: a. every heading used; b. only in cases of conflict; c. when there is a need for filing instructions; d. new names only; e. headings requiring references; f. headings available from the Music Cataloging Bulletin but not yet used. The way authority files are used locally also varies, with a wide range in verification procedures: a. complete verification; b. in cases of possible references; c. new headings discovered at filing; d. in cases of conflict. Consistency in practice requires written policies for
the formulation and use of authority files. Ms. Skrobela then indicated that the adoption of AACR 2 and the end of the policy of superimposition at the Library of Congress provided the opportunity for consistency in cataloging practice. AACR 2 will allow, generally, for more added entries instead of cross references. Ms. Skrobela concluded with a discussion of the possibilities offered by a national, cooperatively created, automated authority file. Records in such a file might be regarded as skeleton catalog records to which the descriptions for individual manifestations of a work can be added. These records might then include full MARC coding, added entries and bibliographic notes that are common to all manifestations of a work. There remain the technical questions about the interaction between authority files and catalog records.

The final speaker was Ann Ekstrom, who began her library career as Music Librarian and Cataloger at Indiana University and is now Director of the Library Systems Division at OCLC. She began her discussion of the role of automation in authority control by questioning the need for traditional library authority files especially in light of the possibilities provided by computers. It was suggested that an on-line computerized authority control system could provide direct access to all appropriate bibliographic records regardless of the form of name selected by a user. Such a system would have to link all forms of name but would not require selection of a single form of name. Ms. Ekstrom pointed out that OCLC has not developed a specific authority system as yet but is actively studying various possibilities. As an interim measure, OCLC will provide, within a year, on-line access to LC’s machine readable authority file (this will be for searching only). Also, OCLC is studying possible ways to fulfill individual library needs for authority control prior to a total on-line system, as well as providing automated assistance for converting to AACR 2. The session concluded with a brief question-answer period and a description by Thomas Heck (Music Librarian, OSU) of the on-line subject search available at The Ohio State University.

C. Rutgers Institute of Jazz Studies. This presentation was inadvertently omitted from the program distributed at the meeting. Marie Griffin, Rutgers University, reported on the progress made to date on the jazz cataloging project at the Institute. (An early report on the project appeared in issue no. 3 of this Newsletter) Ms. Griffin also described the procedures used in archival cataloging on the OCLC system. [Many OCLC users have already benefited by this laudable project—our thanks to the Institute and all of the participants in the project.]

D. Open Forum and Workshops. Sharon Walbridge (Coordinator of the OCLC Users Council) described the reorganization of OCLC and the function of the Users Council. In order for the Council to be effective, it is important for users to express their concerns to their Council delegates. Richard Greene of the Bibliographic Record Management Division of OCLC reported on the valuable activities of the Division devoted to updating the data base. Helen Hughes (User Services Division, OCLC) and Karl Van Ausdal (MOUG) were also on the panel which responded to numerous questions and comments from the floor. Workshops on tagging manuscripts, facsimiles, microforms, and sound recordings were subsequently conducted by Pamela Starr, University of Wisconsin; Robert Cunningham, Smith College; Kim Schmidt, OCLC; and Ann Hess, University of Cincinnati. Similar workshops, which are particularly useful to new users of the OCLC system, are planned for the next meeting in San Antonio.

SAN ANTONIO TOUR

Members interested in a tour of San Antonio on Feb. 24, the day preceding the next annual meeting, should quickly write to Olga Buth (Battle Hall 200, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712). This tour, which will cost about $18.00 was described in the previous issue of the Newsletter (p. 3-4). So that arrangements can be made in time, Olga needs an expression of interest from 40 people.
MAKING MEMORY SERVE: Hints on inputting cataloging copy for musical sound recordings.

Since so many added entries for musical sound recordings are largely repetitions of names or titles appearing in the body of the record, it is possible when inputting records for this material to use the computer’s memory in order to save typing, as illustrated by the following examples.

I. To create author/title added entry (1.)

1. Return cursor to line 18 and change line number to 19.
2. Following #!, delete Fest- und Gedenksprüche and insert Motets, #b mixed voices, #a op. 110. #d [Sound recording] #! 1978.
3. Advance line; send.

III. To create name added entries for performers and performing groups

A. Return cursor to line 10 and change line number to 20.
B. Change tag number and indicators to 705 21.
C. Delete forename; following surname insert, Ana. #!
D. Send.

IV. Continue this procedure until all added entries are completed, always remembering these points:

A. Change line number. This is of supreme importance. Only by changing the line number can the computer retain what was in its memory under the previous line number while duplicating the desired characters under the new line number.
B. Change tag numbers if necessary.
C. Utilize as much already-present typing as possible by skillful deletion and insertion.

V. When all added entries are input, reformat and carefully proofread the entire record.

With a bit of practice using the procedure, a terminal operator inputting cataloging copy for musical sound recordings can save much time and repetitious typing. Obviously, the same principles can be applied to any record on any format to the same advantage.

Andrea Watson Davis
The University of Alabama

AACR 2

MOUG members may be interested in reading the following recent publication:

Ravilious, C. P. "AACR 2 and Its Implications for Music Cataloging," Brío, XVI, No. 1 (Spring, 1979)
The variety of numbers one finds on a single record album is sometimes incredible to behold, never mind the confusion attending multiple disc sets. Yet if it should ever become possible to retrieve an OCLC record by the publisher's number, then it is obviously important that the information input into this field contain only the principal number(s). This article will discuss some of the numbering systems in use today on domestic discs as an aid in identifying those which are important from a retrieval standpoint.

To begin with, one finds two categories of numbers on recordings: catalog and matrix. (There is, of course, no law which says that a record company cannot use one number to serve both purposes, and many do.) The matrix number, if separate, is primarily of value to the record manufacturer's internal operations, and contains coded information on the recording sessions, pressing plant, etc. The matrix number will always be impressed in the vinyl between the label and the inside record grooves, but may also be found on the label itself.

The catalog number, in contrast, is widely used, as befits its inclusion on the jacket or container (remember that most recordings are sold in shrink wrapping, and any numbers existing solely on the label are of little use to record jobbers, stores or prospective purchasers). Catalog numbers may indicate any or all of the following: 1) whether the album is a single or multiple record set; 2) its retail price; 3) the mode (i.e., mono, stereo, quad, or electronically rechanneled); and 4) genre (e.g., classical, country and western, musical shows, special issues, etc.).

As if the catalog and perhaps a separate matrix number for each disc were not enough, multiple record sets will frequently have a set number covering the album as a whole, as in the following example:

**MEYERBEER:**

**LE PROPHETE**

(M4) 34340  
M 34341  
SIDE 1  
AL 34341  
STEREO  
P 1976 CBS

M4 34340 is the set number for this Columbia four record album (the number of discs is indicated by the 4 in M4), and it is found both on the label and the container. The M 34341 immediately below it is the catalog number for the first of the four discs (the second disc is M 34342, the third, M 34343, and the last, M 34344; these numbers are not listed anywhere on the container). Note on the right under Side 1 is the number AL 34341. With the record in hand, we can determine that this is the matrix number since it is the same as the number impressed in the vinyl (not reproduced here). In this case, obviously, the catalog number and matrix number are for all practical purposes identical.

A number of companies use variations on this system; i.e., an alphanumeric prefix plus a three or more digit number. For example, RCA CRL2-5100 is a two record set; the recording immediately before this in the RCA catalog might be CRL3-5099 comprised of three discs, and the album following, CRL1-5101, a single record.

Another numbering system in common use is exemplified by Angel's practice.

**ANGEL**

Bellini: I Capuleti e i Montecchi (...)  
SCLX-3824-1  
SQ-1-37137  
STEREO

The set number is SCLX-3824 (a three record set: SBLX would be a two, SDLX, four, etc.) as given on the container. The extra "-1" added to this number on the label is simply a "this is the first disc in the set" notation. The SQ-1-37173 is the individual disc's number (comparable to the M 34341 in our previous example), although here again the extra "-1" is only a side indication (the number on the reverse is SQ-2-37173). Once more, by comparing the catalog number with the matrix number, we find these to be substantially the same.

This set provides a good example of the types of prefixes and suffixes that are valuable. The SCLX is important, not only because it tells the number of records and retail price, among other things, but also because it helps make the 3824 a unique number in the Angel catalog. Large record manufacturers may reuse the same multi-digit number many times over the years in different series, differentiated only by an alpha- or alpha-numeric prefix or suffix (Columbia has issued, for instance, an MPS1, S001, NZ1, A1, ...). Another substantiation of a prefix's or suffix's
importance is that it is invariable from the jacket to the label, and in the case of multiple record sets, from one disc to another. In our Angel example, the "-1", "-2", and "-3" are obviously not of retrieval value. Likewise, for the "-1-" and "-2-" in the SQ catalog number.

Although the set number if present is the chief identifying number for a multiple record set, in some cases it is also useful to know the catalog numbers of the individual discs: namely, when these are non-consecutive. To pick on Columbia again, their D3S 737 is a three record set titled the "Great romantic symphonies" which contains three discs separately released by Columbia in previous years (catalog numbers MS 6393, MS 6072 and MS 6818, respectively). Incidentally, each of these records has matrix numbers different from the catalog number (for example, MS 6072's matrix number is XSM45884-45886).

The remaining problem to discuss is the one of changed or concurrent numbering systems. Most domestic labels have simply changed numbers in midstream without renumbering existing discs. (Such a change is usually to accommodate a more international numbering system.) When Deutsche Grammophon changed systems in the 1960's, however, they renumbered earlier discs, too. So has Telefunken, and frequently the old and new numbers are both given on the jacket (for example, 6.41076 is the new number of a disc in the Alte Werk series, SAWT 9511-B, the old). DG will sometimes cover up the superceded number with a label on one part of the container, but leave it exposed in another place. Even American companies are not immune to such foolishness. CRI recently redid two of its albums (192 and 248) and changed the couplings of the pieces, but kept the old numbers!

If there are any questions on the above, or on manufacturer numbers in general, I will be happy to try to answer them in a future issue of this Newsletter. Please write me at the Owen Arts Center, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas 75275.

Robert Skinner
Southern Methodist University

MEMORANDUM from Helen Hughes, User Advisor, User Services Division, OCLC, to Network Coordinators

The Music Cataloging Bulletin (MCB) announces revisions to LC cataloging of books about music (classified ML or MT), scores, and sound recordings. Ms. Ruth Henderson, editor of the MCB, receives copy of the changes from the Music Section at LC. MCB's copy deadline is the 25th of the month two months prior to publication, i.e., the information published in the 79 March issue was submitted by 25 January 1979.

The Music Section notifies MCB at the time the decision is made to change the cataloging of MARC and non-MARC records. As LC is not using the MARC music format, cataloging of scores and sound recordings is not part of the LC-MARC database. LC does use the MARC format for books about music. At the present time, MCB does not specifically note if a record is a MARC record. The media qualifier, Sound recording, identifies cataloging of a sound recording (non-MARC). To distinguish between a score (non-MARC) and a book (MARC) record, it may be necessary to check the piece, the OCLC record, or the library's own catalog.

After making the decision to change MARC cataloging, LC completes many internal procedures before changing their on-line record. The change of their on-line record results in a revised record on an LC-MARC tape which we receive. The revised LC records are loaded into the On-line Union Catalog (OLUC) as we process the weekly LC-MARC tape. LC also uses their MARC system to reprint catalog cards. Therefore, MARC records are revised before new cards are printed for MARC items. The revised LC-MARC record should be available on OCLC at approximately the same time that LC has new cards available.

Generally by the time an issue of MCB is distributed, the changes to LC-MARC records will be reflected in the OLUC. If LC's internal procedures take more time to complete than usual, the new LC-MARC record may not yet be in the OLUC.

OCLC members may report LC cataloging changes that are not reflected in the OLUC, following the instructions in Cataloging: User Manual, p. 7-10.
If the change is for an LC-MARC record, Bibliographic Records Management will check with LC to see if the change has been made in LC's system. If it has not yet been changed in LC's system, LC will follow up.

Please address questions and comments as follows:

Network libraries to Network offices;
Western Service Center libraries to Western Service Center office;
Independent libraries and others to User Contact Desk, OCLC, Inc., 1125 Kinnear Rd., Columbus, Ohio 43212.
Telephone: (614) 486-3661.

The Music Cataloging Bulletin is a monthly publication of the Music Library Association, and includes communications from the Library of Congress concerning the cataloging of music materials. Subscriptions are $8.00 per year; $.75 per single issue, from Music Library Association, 2017 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103.

OCLC MUSIC CATALOGING USER SURVEY

To date, there has been a very good response to the survey questionnaire printed in the previous issue of the Newsletter (well over half of the individual members of MOUG have responded). We would like to request that those who have not as yet filled out the questionnaire do so by Nov. 7, 1979. This should allow enough time for us to compile and report the results by the next annual meeting. Due to a space problem, the instructions for the questionnaire were printed on the page preceding it (p. 4). Please read the instructions prior to filling out the form. It is important to have all of your opinions represented.

Richard Smiraglia, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
A. Ralph Papakhian, Indiana University

OCLC USERS COUNCIL RESOLVES

The following is a letter sent earlier this summer to Daniel J. Boorstin, Librarian of Congress, from Joseph F. Boykin, President, OCLC Users Council. It concerns the implementation of the MARC system for music materials at the Library of Congress. We are pleased the Users Council has acted in behalf of music cataloging, and encourage it to continue its effort. The reply to Mr. Boykin's letter came from William J. Welsh, Deputy Librarian of Congress. It basically reiterated the letter of Joseph Howard printed in the Music Cataloging Bulletin, vol. 10, no. 83.

Dear Mr. Boorstin:

At its annual meeting of June 4-5, 1979, the OCLC Users Council passed the following resolution:

Whereas, over 2,000 libraries are currently engaged in on-line networking in which Library of Congress MARC cataloging is a vital service, and Whereas, the Library of Congress cataloging of sound recordings, tape cassettes and music scores is not yet available in machine readable form in the MARC format, and Whereas, access to authoritative Library of Congress cataloging in machine readable form significantly reduces the cost of cataloging sound recordings, tape cassettes, and music scores in U. S. libraries, Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Librarian of Congress make known to Congress and to the Library of Congress staff the need for funding and other resources to make MARC cataloging records available.

The OCLC Users Council was established in 1978 to facilitate communication between OCLC and its users. The Council delegates are primarily library and network directors from across the United States. One of the Council's main responsibilities is to advise OCLC of user concerns. The above resolution is evidence of such a concern. I am aware that the Music Library Association has on a number of occasions indicated the same concern.

I sincerely hope that you will take the matter of music bibliographic records under consideration. The service that Library of Congress provides in distributing machine readable records for books, serials, maps, and audiovisual items has made an incalculable impact on libraries across the country. Machine readable records for music titles would have the same positive impact on libraries.

Joseph F. Boykin
President
OCLC Users Council
ORDER SEARCHING ON OCLC

OCLC, Inc., plays a significant role in the pre-order search and verification procedure for books and scores at the Music Library of Indiana University. The initial search stages undoubtedly are not unlike those in most libraries. After suggestions for purchase are received from members of the music or library faculty or student body, the public card catalog and orders-in-process file are searched by student assistants to make a preliminary determination that the item is not already in the library's collections or on order. "Preliminary" is used advisedly here, because initial sources of bibliographic information in these instances (e.g. dealers' catalogs or patrons' memories) are notoriously inaccurate or incomplete. With a few exceptions, we seldom rely on the information in hand for the final typing and processing of orders. We have learned that establishing correct entry and--in the case of major composers--uniform title prior to typing orders is essential to the proper maintenance of an orders-in-process file that at the current time occupies four full catalog drawers. Experience has shown that the OCLC, Inc., CRT provides the fastest access to main entry, uniform title, publisher, and series information for a large percentage of recent publications of books and scores being accessioned by the Indiana University Music Library. (No attempt is made to verify sound recordings prior to ordering due to the frequent variants in particular label ordered and label received, and to a different ordering and bill-paying system). And to the advantage of almost instantaneous access to bibliographic records can be added the wider variety of search keys available than in most printed bibliographies and catalogs.

At this searching stage, distinctions between DLC and member records are ignored. The few duplicate orders or other errors that have resulted from ordering from substandard cataloging in the system are substantially outweighed by the time saved in not having to search the multiple volumes of the Library of Congress Music, Books on Music and Sound Recordings, the Bibliographic Guide to Music, and other pertinent printed catalogs.

All pre-acquisition searchers in the Indiana University Music Library are trained in OCLC, Inc., search procedures, and three hours per week of terminal time are scheduled for their exclusive use. When a search results in a "hit," the searcher may choose to copy the necessary information by hand directly onto the catalog or other item being searched; but for the sake of accuracy (and despite the high cost of printer paper) he/she is encouraged to reproduce the record on the printer adjacent to the CRT. The printout, catalog, or search slip is then given directly to a clerk for final typing of the order. The OCLC record number is included on the typed order form along with the other required information. These forms, when returned by the vendor with the new book or score, enable the catalogers to retrieve the record immediately without repeating the original search strategy. It is then the cataloger's option, in the case of non-LC records, to continue or not the search in the printed catalogs for LC copy.

No statistics have been kept on the percentage of records found in the system during pre-order searching, but estimates are that more than 50 percent of all items searched are found, and perhaps between 60 and 70 percent of items with post-1975 imprints. Whatever the rate, the savings in time, reduction of wear and tear on the printed catalogs, and less tedious procedure required of the searchers indicate that pre-order searching is a logical extension of the use of the OCLC, Inc., data base beyond its primary intent.

Michael Fling
Indiana University

FROM THE EDITORS

The function of the Newsletter is to communicate information on the use of the OCLC system for processing music materials and to report on the activities of MOUG. Contributions from MOUG members are just as important as communications from OCLC. The following topics are certainly of interest to all members: (a.) OCLC use in the University of California System (a relatively new addition to OCLC); (b.) Use of COM catalogs for accessing music materials; (c.) Non-cataloging use of OCLC (ILL, reference, etc.); (d.) Innovative local procedures (work-flow, authority control, etc.) (e.) Impact of OCLC in staffing; (f.) Local use of archive tapes (are those MARC codes used?). We encourage the submission of correspondence and articles on these topics or any other matter of interest to the membership.
Cataloging statistics from two music libraries using OCLC for scores and sound recordings. Backlogs included both current and retrospective materials. Any other library's statistics are welcome and will be published in upcoming newsletters. Send statistics to: Sue Stancu, Music Library, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405.

**University of Illinois, Urbana IL** (July 1979-September 1979)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>in data base</th>
<th>input by Univ. of Illinois original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Records: 484</td>
<td>290 (60%)</td>
<td>LC 88 (18%) 106 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores: 526</td>
<td>336 (64%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State University of New York, Stony Brook, NY** (April 1978-August 1979)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>in data base</th>
<th>input by SUNY, Stony Brook original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Records: 2,099</td>
<td>1,467 (70%)</td>
<td>LC 504 (24%) 128 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Ralph Papakhian
Sue Stancu
MOUG Newsletter
Music Library
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

Susanne Bell
Gaylord Music Library
6500 Forsyth Ave.
St. Louis, Missouri 63105