The month of October was an especially full one for me, beginning with my daughter's wedding on October 9, followed by a lecture on "Music in Early Hyde Park" for the Hyde Park Historical Society on the 16th. (Hyde Park, originally a separate town, is the neighborhood around the University of Chicago.) On October 28-29, the Flascal Committee, chaired by Michael Ochs, met in Washington to consider the budget for the year 1978. Other members of the Committee are James Coover, Shirley Emanuel, Melva Peterson, William Weichlein, and Dena Epstein, ex-officio. The proposed budget had an alarming apparent deficit of over $22,000. By the most painful paring, deferring and cutting, the Committee reduced the deficit to a few hundred dollars, submitting to the Board of Directors an austerity budget that still maintains most of our services and activities. On Saturday afternoon, October 29, the Association's books were audited by a committee composed of David Sommerfield, Michael Ochs, and Dena Epstein. The books were found to be in excellent order.

At the Santa Barbara meeting the Board had authorized a modest sum for paid advertising to make our publications known to a wider public in hopes of increasing their sales. Harold Diamond, advertising manager for NOTES, agreed to undertake this new project. His first advertisement appeared in the October 15 issue of Library Journal on p. 216, next to the music reviews. If orders demonstrate the value of this program, it will be extended.

I received a friendly reply dated November 4 from Elizabeth Tate, chairperson of the Resources and Technical Services Division Cataloging & Classification Committee of ALA to my request for MLA representation on whatever committee succeeds the Catalog Code Revision Committee. The request will be included in the Committee's agenda at the ALA midwinter meetings.

On November 11-12, the Board of Directors met in Evanston, Illinois, the guests of the Music Library of Northwestern University and Don Roberts, its librarian. It was a most productive meeting as will be demonstrated in the days to come.

A number of new appointments have been made. The reactivated Education Committee has now been named, and will hold its first meeting in Boston in February. Its members are Constance Nisbet, Robert Parks, Susan Sonnet, and Ruth Tucker, with Kathryn Logan, chairperson. The first MLA prize award will be adjudicated by Vincent Duk les, Donald Krummel, and Donald Thompson.

During the next few months, MLA's committee structure will be reviewed, an annual procedure. Anyone interested in a committee assignment should make his or her interests known to me. I look forward to seeing you in Boston.

Dena Epstein

SANTA BARBARA 1977: THE LAST SUMMER ROSE

An informal and relaxed feeling, prompted by the bright, lazy sun of Southern California and the Holiday Inn's refreshing pool, pervaded the last scheduled summer meeting of the Music Library Association, hosted by the University of California at Santa Barbara. Not even the recent frightening Santa Barbara fires or the first conference-day rains could abate the good spirits in this meeting's exciting atmosphere.

Preceding the main program, Garrett Bowles (Stanford University) led an open discussion in his session: "A Union Catalog of Pre-LP Classical Music and Spoken-Word Sound Recordings Project." This NEH sponsored project will inventory the early recording collections of six major archives in the U.S., using a format which incorporates ARCL rules and MARC format.

The second session Thursday afternoon brought a distinguished panel of Hollywood film art television composers together to discuss their art. David Raksin (The Bad and the Beautiful, Separate Tables, etc.) chaired the session, introducing his colleagues Elmer Bernstein, Ernest Gold, and Fred Steiner. Clips from David Raksin's classic film Laura and his Al Capone were run without and then with music, demonstrating the sound track's dramatic purpose. Fred Steiner ("Perry Mason," "Falcon," "Star Trek," etc.) next showed a clip from his tense Korean war film Time Limit to show subtle uses of music to focus attention on specific dramatic ideas. Initial scenes from Judgement at Nuremberg, one of the excellent scores by Ernest Gold ( Exodus, On the Beach, etc.) showed the integration of a specific related musical style, German martial music, into the film. Finally, Elmer Bernstein ( Man with the Golden Arm, The Ten Commandments, To Kill a Mockingbird, etc.) screened his Toccata for Toy Trains, the delightful combination of a musical work with an independently conceived film. Each of the composers artfully and candidly revealed their purposes and techniques in putting music to film and answered questions of scores from the floor. Fred Steiner, a scholar of film music as well as a practitioner, itemized the collections of those studios which still exist and called for music librarians to be concerned with their preservation. He also had copies available of The Art of Film Music by Allan Ulrich, a catalog of the film tribute program at the Oakland Museum, March 12-14, 1976.

Friday morning the third session brought Fraser G. Poole, Assistant Director of Preservation at the Library
NOTES ON NOTES: NEWEST

William M. McClellan, Music Librarian at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, has been appointed Editor of NOTES starting with the December 1977 issue. He succeeds James W. Pruett who served as Editor from 1974-77. Mr. McClellan is former president (1971-73) and member of the Board of Directors of the Music Library Association. He has also served as a consultant on several projects concerning the development of academic music library facilities, services, and resources, and has directed and organized programs and workshops on music librarianship. During 1976-77 he was the recipient of a Council on Library Resources fellowship.

Mr. McClellan welcomes manuscripts for NOTES in the areas of music bibliography and discography, music library problems, records, records of music librarianship, and library-related articles concerning musicology, music publishing, and music printing. Articles, correspondence, news items, and matters involving editorial policy should be addressed to William M. McClellan, Music Library, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801.

FULBRIGHT-HAYS AWARDS

The Board of Foreign Scholarships has announced $82 awards to American scholars for work in 81 countries in a variety of disciplines for the program year 1977-78, and affiliation arrangements on U.S. campuses have been made for a comparable number of scholars from abroad. Lists are available.

There are four awards in MUSIC in as many countries:


WILLIAM FORDYCE BROOKS—Assistant Professor of Music, University of California San Diego, La Jolla. American music, University of Keele, United Kingdom, 9/77-6/78.


The Council for International Exchange of Scholars is reviewing applications for the 1978-79 program year in order to make recommendations to the Board of Foreign Scholarships and oversees Fulbright agencies. The Council has waived deadline requirements in some cases, and will accept additional applications for a number of positions—mostly teaching in Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe, particularly in the fields of American literature, business and economics, science and engineering, linguistics and teaching English as a foreign language. Applicants must be U.S. citizens and have appropriate educational and professional qualifications. Further information, is available from the Council for International Exchange of Scholars, Eleven DuPont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

There are no awards still available in MUSIC but CIES welcomes enquiries and registration for the next annual announcement in March, 1978.

NEWS FROM THE A-V AND MICROFORM COMMITTEE

Bodleian Manuscripts Available on Microfilm

Britannica's Harvester Press has announced for May, 1978 publication: Unpublished Music Manuscripts of the 16th and 17th Centuries: The Oxford Music Collection at the Bodleian Library. The project, to be issued on 35mm film, is edited by Roger Bray and will cost $1,020.00.

AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY SETS FEBRUARY 1 DEADLINES FOR 1978-79 FELLOWSHIP APPLICATIONS

Worcester, Mass. -- The American Antiquarian Society will award in 1978-79 a number of research grants in two categories: long-term National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Fellowships and short-term Fred Harris Daniels Fellowships.

NEH Fellowships

At least two NEH Fellowships will be awarded. The stipend and duration of each fellowship are negotiable up to a limit of $1,666 per month for six to twelve months' residence at the Society. The Society's NEH Fellowships may not be awarded to degree candidates or for study leading to advanced degrees; nor may they be granted to foreign nationals unless they have resided in the US for the preceding three years. Recipients must devote full time to their study and may not accept teaching assignments or undertake any other major activities while in residence. Also, they may not hold other major fellowships except sabbaticals or grants from their own institutions. Funds for these fellowships have come from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Daniels Fellowships

Four to six Fred Harris Daniels Fellowships will be awarded. The Fellowships vary in duration from one to three months. Stipends may vary in amount, according to a fellow's need, to a maximum of $1,800. The Fellowships, derived from the Society's Fred Harris Daniels Fund, are open to individuals engaged in scholarly research and writing, including foreign nationals and persons at work on doctoral dissertations. Because the purpose of the Daniels awards is to enable persons who might not otherwise be able to do so to travel to the Society, grants will be made only to those who reside more than fifty miles from Worcester, Massachusetts where the Society is located.

Procedures

The deadline for applications for both NEH and Daniels Fellowships is February 1, 1978. It is the responsibility of the applicant to see that three letters of recommendation have also reached the Society by that date.

Interested persons may write for application forms to the Director, American Antiquarian Society, 185 Salisbury Street, Worcester, Massachusetts 01609.

Announcement of the awards will be made by March 15, 1978.

The American Antiquarian Society is the oldest national historical society in the United States. Its library collections are rich in materials for the study of all aspects of American history and culture through 1876. The collections of material printed in what is now the United States are preeminent for the period through 1820; they are among the strongest anywhere for the period 1821-1876.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY: Mellon Postdoctoral Fellowships in the Humanities

Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, is offering for September 1978 three two-year postdoctoral fellowships in 13 areas of the humanities. Music is seeking a musicologist with strong research interests in either the Renaissance or the 18th century. Preference will be given to a scholar whose work is interdisciplinary in character. The fellowships, at $12,000 per year, include teaching two undergraduate seminars per year and pursuing research and advanced study.

Eligible candidates, who are to be citizens of the U. S. or Canada, must have received the Ph. D. since 1973 or essentially completed the degree before the application deadline. Applicants are to submit before Feb. 24, 1978, a curriculum vitae, three letters of recommendation, a statement of teaching interests including a course proposal to Anna D. Genke, Mellon Postdoctoral Fellowships, A.D. White House, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853.
It's all over now, but the shouting, as far as the writing of AACR II goes. And perhaps there will be some shouting when the rules are published, but not necessarily for joy.

In this writer's opinion, the Music Library Association has come out of it reasonably well after all. It brings to mind that old saying about "falling in the privy and coming out smelling like a rose." Well, perhaps we didn't come out smelling like a rose, but considering the possibilities, we came out smelling no worse than an onion, or perhaps a cabbage.

This article will not attempt to evaluate the rules themselves, it is too early for that. They are not yet in print, and we need to live with them for awhile to get them in true perspective. My hunch is that even the new rules that seem most odious to music librarians at present, will become second nature in time and even prove to have hidden merits unsuspected now.

It is not too soon, however, to make some observations about the rule-writing process and MLA's involvement in it. Certain things about that process were not very good. By examining it, we may learn much which will help us to make better arrangements in the future.

Let me add immediately that if things went wrong during the rule revision it was not through lack of good will or hard work related to AACR II. The representatives were told that the writing of AACR II was a much bigger job than any one had imagined; time ran out near the end and with it the opportunity for meaningful dialogue, of which, more anon.

A brief background on AACR II is that its five authors are, for North America: The Library of Congress, The American Library Association and The Canadian Committee on Cataloging, and for Great Britain: The Library Association and the British Library. Their chief purposes in writing it were:

1. Harmonisation of the North American and British texts of AACR I.
2. Encorporation of all rules and revisions appearing since AACR I, with hospitality toward new ideas as well.

In December of 1974, MLA invited the Music Library Association, along with other specialized library groups, to send a representative to join in the rule revision process. The special representatives were to meet with the Cataloging Code Revision Committee, MLA's working arm in matters related to the earlier days of rule revision. Some of these thoughts found their way into AACR II and some did not. It would be a pity of the latter were to be lost. We might be able to build on the ideas in the future. Rule revision (God help us) will never cease, and to make a good job of it, we need all the creative and diversified thinking we can get in our heads and minds on.

It would seem most appropriate if the MLA Board would begin now to look for grant monies so that someone both involved and detached could write for us a history of the rule revision process and all the thinking that went into it. Interests in the rule revision process was the contrast between MLA and LC approaches. MLA thinkers tended to push for "tighter" rules. They wanted rules written in such detail that LC and the British Library could independently catalog the same score and come up with the same uniform title. Unfortunately this kind of work was beyond the experience of local catalogers who for years have had to assign uniform titles before LC has gotten around to it and have tried to produce work that would not have to be revised once LC did the job.

In contrast, LC personnel seemed to say: "Give us breathing room, give us choices so that we may use our judgement and pick the most appropriate title to fit the individual case." Inevitably, since LC have written the final draft of the rules, and also appropriately, I believe, it is the national library point of view that has won out here. Local librarians will simply have to adjust themselves to sometimes modifying their original uniform titles after LC has made its own decisions.

It would be interesting to know if LC and the British Library plan to consult on specific uniform titles, or if, having established a common set of rules, they plan to implement them separately. Would it not be calamitous if LC (and the British Library) would tackle the uniform titles of such a composer as J. S. Bach in toto before the actual implementation of AACR II? If these new titles could then be distributed to American (and British) libraries, we could all begin conversion in advance.

The whole process was a stimulating and creative one. Music librarians, who up to that time may have thought chiefly about how to apply LC rules, were now actively considering the reasons behind the rules. Kitty, in particular, should be complimented for helping us to keep our minds stretched and our options open. She avoided the dangers of getting locked into favorite points of view, and instead continued to present in her communications a diversity of possibilities relating to all major issues.

Among the various useful thoughts generated at that time, was one that appealed particularly because of its potential for useful development in the future. This sequence of ideas started off by identifying five major elements found in uniform titles, viz:

1. The Entry element (i.e.: initial terms such as Aida, Sonate, etc.)
2. The Language element (used with certain vocal works)
3. The Version element (i.e.: Piano-vocal score)
4. The Excerpt element (i.e.: Celeste Aida)
5. The Modifying element (i.e.: medium, number and key, a characteristic group of modifiers used chiefly with form entry words; all three terms usually present in the order given)

It was then suggested that if each of the elements 2 through 5 were preceded by a characteristic punctuation mark and if, in the case of a technical marking system such as the truncation marks, it would be possible to get automatic filing in a logical order. (Examples: [Prelude: piano] before [Prelude, fugue and allegro]; [Boris Godunov - Russian] before [Boris Godunov, Piano-vocal score])

This and a number of other interesting ideas were under consideration during the earlier days of rule revision. Some of these thoughts found their way into AACR II and some did not. It would be a pity of the latter were to be lost. We might be able to build on the ideas in the future. Rule revision (God help us) will never cease, and to make a good job of it, we need all the creative and diversified thinking we can get in our heads and minds on.

It would seem most appropriate if the MLA Board would begin now to look for grant monies so that someone both involved and detached could write for us a history of the rule revision process and all the thinking that went into it. Interests in the rule revision process was the contrast between MLA and LC approaches. MLA thinkers tended to push for "tighter" rules. They wanted rules written in such detail that LC and the British Library could independently catalog the same score and come up with the same uniform title. Unfortunately this kind of work was beyond the experience of local catalogers who for years have had to assign uniform titles before LC has gotten around to it and have tried to produce work that would not have to be revised once LC did the job.

In contrast, LC personnel seemed to say: "Give us breathing room, give us choices so that we may use our judgement and pick the most appropriate title to fit the individual case." Inevitably, since LC have written the final draft of the rules, and also appropriately, I believe, it is the national library point of view that has won out here. Local librarians will simply have to adjust themselves to sometimes modifying their original uniform titles after LC has made its own decisions.

It would be interesting to know if LC and the British Library plan to consult on specific uniform titles, or if, having established a common set of rules, they plan to implement them separately. Would it not be calamitous if LC (and the British Library) would tackle the uniform titles of such a composer as J. S. Bach in toto before the actual implementation of AACR II? If these new titles could then be distributed to American (and British) libraries, we could all begin conversion in advance.

The whole process was a stimulating and creative one. Music librarians, who up to that time may have thought chiefly about how to apply LC rules, were now actively considering the reasons behind the rules. Kitty, in particular, should be complimented for helping us to keep our minds stretched and our options open. She avoided the dangers of getting locked into favorite points of view, and instead continued to present in her communications a diversity of possibilities relating to all major issues.

Among the various useful thoughts generated at that time, was one that appealed particularly because of its potential for useful development in the future. This sequence of ideas started off by identifying five major elements found in uniform titles, viz:

1. The Entry element (i.e.: initial terms such as Aida, Sonate, etc.)
2. The Language element (used with certain vocal works)
3. The Version element (i.e.: Piano-vocal score)
4. The Excerpt element (i.e.: Celeste Aida)
5. The Modifying element (i.e.: medium, number and key, a characteristic group of modifiers used chiefly with form entry words; all three terms usually present in the order given)

It was then suggested that if each of the elements 2 through 5 were preceded by a characteristic punctuation mark and if, in the case of a technical marking system such as the truncation marks, it would be possible to get automatic filing in a logical order. (Examples: [Prelude: piano] before [Prelude, fugue and allegro]; [Boris Godunov - Russian] before [Boris Godunov, Piano-vocal score])

This and a number of other interesting ideas were under consideration during the earlier days of rule revision. Some of these thoughts found their way into AACR II and some did not. It would be a pity of the latter were to be lost. We might be able to build on the ideas in the future. Rule revision (God help us) will never cease, and to make a good job of it, we need all the creative and diversified thinking we can get in our heads and minds on.

It would seem most appropriate if the MLA Board would begin now to look for grant monies so that someone both involved and detached could write for us a history of the rule revision process and all the thinking that went into it. Interests in the rule revision process was the contrast between MLA and LC approaches. MLA thinkers tended to push for "tighter" rules. They wanted rules written in such detail that LC and the British Library could independently catalog the same score and come up with the same uniform title. Unfortunately this kind of work was beyond the experience of local catalogers who for years have had to assign uniform titles before LC has gotten around to it and have tried to produce work that would not have to be revised once LC did the job.

In contrast, LC personnel seemed to say: "Give us breathing room, give us choices so that we may use our judgement and pick the most appropriate title to fit the individual case." Inevitably, since LC have written the final draft of the rules, and also appropriately, I believe, it is the national library point of view that has won out here. Local librarians will simply have to adjust themselves to sometimes modifying their original uniform titles after LC has made its own decisions.
practically nothing. Nevertheless, it was fruitful while it lasted and, in any case, a useful precedent for cooperative efforts in the future.

One of these days, no matter how painful it may be to contemplate, AACR II itself will require revision and clarification. When problems concerning music arise, we should be in close communication with our British allies. American and British music librarians in agreement can exert a powerful influence (for truth, naturally) on whatever international cooperative group is formed to approve rule changes. It would be highly appropriate for MLA to begin now to negotiate with its British counterpart towards the formation of a permanent cooperative liaison in matters affecting cataloging.

Having discussed MLA's role in rule revision at some length, this article will now turn its attention to the international scene, specifically to an important decision of the joint authors of the new code. This decision could be characterized as both wise and inevitable in its general features. It was, however, to have far-reaching consequences, including some serious or even dangerous ones for music.

It was decided to reorganize the new rules in a significant way. A large portion of AACR I had been given over to the chapters dealing with special rules for special types of materials. With AACR II, there was to be a shift toward bringing together similar steps in the cataloging process.

Thus, AACR II is divided into two large sections, the first devoted to rules for description and the second to rules for access. The section on description, for instance, contains a chapter on general procedures, followed by a series of chapters on descriptive rules for various types of materials, e.g.: monographs, serials, music, sound recordings, manuscripts, etc.

The section on entry or access points includes chapters on personal name entries, corporate entries, uniform titles, etc. The chapter on uniform titles begins with general rules for formulation, followed by special rules for legal materials, secured scriptures and liturgical works as well as for legal music.

Throughout the code, it was hoped to gain greater consistency of approach by bringing into close proximity similar cataloging steps for variant materials.

A greater consistency! In that concept resided both promise of improvement and considerable danger. The chief danger lay in a "foolish consistency," or the possibility that "that which is identical must be held identical". This means that general rules always be applied, even though they might cause serious malfunction in specific cases.

(Parenthetically, if there was a danger that generalists might be inflexible in the application of general principles, there also was a danger that music librarians might be inflexible in the application of specific principles. It seems to this writer that rule revisions can be opposed wisely only if there is sound theoretical basis for that opposition. It is not enough to oppose new rules because they run counter to long-established practices--assumed to be better because of longevity--or because changes are a lot of work to implement.)

At any rate, the attempt to apply music the general rule for excerpt titles seemed to be a clear case of "foolish consistency". The general rule reads: "If a separately cataloged part of a work has a title of its own, use the title of the part by itself as the uniform title." If one can find a single example from examples given in the draft rules, this rule got launched in the rather remote area of novel cycles. The original question seems to have been: is it better to enter a separately published novel from a cycle under its own title, or under the title of the cycle following the individual volume (e.g.: [Two towers])? A parallel and equally debatable case in music might be: is it better to enter under [Siegfried] or under [Der Ring des Nibelungen. Siegfried]?

In the literary instance, the decision was to enter directly under the title of the individual novel. Later, when time for mature consideration had run quite short, it was decided to apply this principle to music. The results would have been much uniform titles as [Celeste Aida] instead of the currently preferred [Aida. Aida].

Such a development proved to be immediately repugnant to the music library community. It was rightly judged that, in uniform titles for music, the principle of subdivision of part to whole must be defended at all costs. This principle was proven itself over the years to be the best way of organizing files under composers' names since it leads to the most productive searches on the part of the public.

Another general rule applied to music with highly controversial results was the provision for entering collective uniform titles in direct rather than in inverted word order. In the literature, here, this meant [Prose works] rather than [Works, prose].

In this case, the general rule seemed to have a much sounder philosophical underpinning. It could be seen as part of the trend to natural language forms as opposed to artificial constructions. Behind that could be discerned another trend toward giving preference to the "sought entry", i.e.: the entry most likely to be sought by the public (however difficult that might be to determine in specific instances). The current preference for Mark Twain over Samuel Langhorn Clemens is an example of this move toward the "sought entry".

As applied to music, the new rule meant that our familiar [Works, piano] would be replaced by [Piano music]. Interestingly enough, a check of the British text of AACR I reveals that the English have been using direct word order right along.

There were other controversial uniform title proposals, including the preference for "broad scope", first edition titles, and a rule for using principal performers as main entry for recordings containing the works of more than one composer.

These were shocking propositions and the music library community needed a substantial block of time to consider them. The new rules reveal an attempt to balance the two extreme forms of dialogue, after which they would be accepted, modified or rejected as was appropriate. Unfortunately, as we shall see, time ran exceedingly short, and meaningful dialogue on uniform titles was virtually non-existent.

Looking back a step: in the final drafting of the new rules, the section on description was written first. There was adequate time to do a careful job on this major portion. The "gentlemens' agreement" between CCRC and the special library representatives was honored. Although we music librarians did not get everything we wanted, there was adequate time to present our views and articulate our needs, and we listened to them.

When it came to writing the rules for entry, however, both time and the grant funds supporting the process were in short supply. A number of people involved in the revision process openly voiced their concern. There were suggestions that the rules for description might be published first and separately, and additional funds sought to finish the entry rules without unseemly haste. Ultimately, it was decided to push everything through to a conclusion by a summer 1977 deadline.

As a result, the final draft of rules for entry was prepared in a hurry. The section on uniform titles seemed particularly slow in making its appearance. When it was finally distributed, it was found to contain the controversial provisions mentioned above (and more), and there was almost no time for MLA to respond to it. Our representative, Kitty Skrobels, found herself at the final meeting of CCRC actually squaring the schedule. She had less than an hour to try to persuade the Committee to change some of the most troublesome rules. Under the pressure of time, she faced the usual difficulties of trying to explain the needs and problems of music librarians to a group of generalists not much familiar with our literature and its organization. To make matters worse, her hour came at the very end of days of meetings when everybody was exhausted and not at all in the mood for stretching their minds.

Things looked very bad indeed. Before continuing this story to its somewhat happier conclusion, however, it might be appropriate to pause here for a recommendation. I don't believe that we, the American music librarians, would like...
to find ourselves in a similar position again. We should consider our relationship to future rule revision processes in the light of what happened this time. My conclusion is that being in an advisory role is not always enough. "Gentlemen's agreements" break down. In the future, I believe we should make every effort to negotiate ourselves into a stronger position. At the very least, we should have the power to postpone decisions on issues vital to us until we have had time to make our position clearly understood. We may not always get things our way. Other library groups may not agree with us, but they must at least listen to us.

To conclude the rule-revision story: MLA was seething with discontent. A number of otherwise conservative music catalogers were beginning to counsel non-implementation of certain new rules should they be passed unchanged. The President of MLA, Dena Epstein, was so concerned that she took several days off from a busy schedule to draft a strong letter of protest to the chairman of CCRC.

Ultimately, it was our shared interests with the Library of Congress, specifically with the Music Section, that saved us. The final meeting of the Joint Steering Committee was scheduled for August 1977, and this would be the last chance to effect any rule changes. Our voice at the Joint Steering Committee sessions should have been through MLA, but as we have seen, that voice was effectively silenced. LC's voice was not, however. They were still coming through loud and clear.

The Music Section worked intensively with Ben Tucker, who was to be the LC spokesman at those final sessions. All troublesome rule proposals were discussed in depth. Various comments sent in by MLA were perused, and there were telephone conversations with a few of MLA's leaders in the cataloging area.

Finally, Ben went into the JSC sessions as our "White Knight", seated on the steed of sound thinking and persuasive argument. With considerable ease, he was able to make important changes on behalf of LC and MLA. Music was exempted from the notorious except clause. The rule giving preference to "best known" titles was improved and even made attractive to many by being modified to read "best known in the original language." For other results of that meeting, see the MCB of October 1977.

All in all, Ben came away from those final sessions covered with glory. The MLA Board has voted him an honorary member, which includes a lifetime subscription to NOTES, and we ourselves are looking forward to more effective participation in the rule revision processes of the future.

Don Seifert
Syracuse University
Chairman, MLA Cataloging and Classification Committee

THE NEW GROVE'S DICTIONARY OF MUSIC AND MUSICIANS


NEW FACES, NEW JOBS

TIMOTHY ROBSON, Music cataloger, State University of New York, Stony Brook.

RICHARD EARL JONES, Music Librarian, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

OLGA RUTH, Music Librarian, University of Texas at Austin.

REPORT FROM MAINZ 1977

IAML - IASA XI;
Or, Meet Me on Einbahnstrasse

One of the major advantages of being a first-time attendee at any international congress is that, not being yet drawn up in a web of officers and attendance forms and commissions and subcommissions, you are free to attend a variety of meetings and to sample the flavor of what is going on overall. At least, that was my experience at the eleventh Congress of the International Association of Music Libraries and the International Association of Sound Archives, which was held in Mainz, Germany, 11-17 September, 1977. Mainz, a city largely destroyed in World War II and subsequently rebuilt, is of course the home town of J. Gutenberg, as well as the headquarters of the music publishing firm, B. Schott's Söhne. Otto Harrasowitz, Buchhandlung und Antiquariat, are (as the British say) just across the Rhine in Wiesbaden. So Mainz would make any music librarian--even one who is non-German-speaking, like me--feel quite at home.

Embattled--like all such congresses--by receptions, wine-tastings, welcoming speeches, tours, and more wine-tastings--the IAML/IASA Congress consisted primarily of hard work. Each day's session began at 9 in the morning, and meetings continued (after a lunch break) until 1 or 5 in the afternoon, with additional evening meetings for several groups. Some of the commissions and working groups that I attended carried on their business in a straightforward, direct manner, while others bordered on bureaucratic issues and hair-splitting, and moved forward at a barely discernible pace. Overall, I found the Congress much more substantial and worthwhile than I had imagined from reading the initial prospectus. In fact, like many delegates, I frequently faced the problem of choosing among several equally promising, but unfortunately simultaneous, sessions.

The Working Group on Computer Cataloging, a subgroup of the Cataloging Commission, admirably fulfilled its information-sharing function. Chairman Garrett Bowlen (U.S.) reported on recent developments in the MARC Music Format, and he and Olga Buch (U.S.) described such networks as OCRC and BOLLOTB. Hanna Schütte (Denmark), Eckhard Baer (Germany), and Patrick Mills and Miriam Miller (CT. Brit.) described the various, frequently uncoordinated, activities of their countries in the field of computer cataloging of music and phonorecords. Everyone agreed that such an exchange of information was useful, and all regretted the small attendance, due to an unfortunate and incorrect note in the program that the meeting was open only to members.

The Bibliographical Research Commission's Subcommission on Terminology continued a discussion, begun at the Bergen meeting, on the basic terms needed in the descriptive cataloging of variant editions of a musical work. (What is an "edition"? What is a "work"? What does "date" mean--date of publication? Erscheinungsjahr? How do you say all these in French, German, English?) With "Jahrgang-Heft-volume-tome-année-issue-nummer-noméro-livraison-fascicule" ringing in my ears, and with the feeling that I now knew less than I had before (such as what "date" really means), I stumbled onwards to hear Carl Dahlhaus's lecture on "Types of musical editions." (Or rather, "Typen musikalischer Editionen," because his speech was given in German.) Dahlhaus touched upon some interesting points that filtered through even my language barrier--among them, the cultural, nationalistic, and psychological reasons for producing Denkmäler; the influence of philology upon musical scholarly editions; the problem of dealing with recorded performance; and the coming together of the two types of editorial practice used in producing scholarly and performing editions.

In the multi-lingual discussion that followed, Pierluigi Petrubelli (CT. Brit. and Italy) touched upon the ethical motives behind the publication of Classici Musicali Italiani, Richard Andrews (CT. Brit.) pointed out that modern, practical editions have made possible
many new performances, and someone—I forget who—brought up the excellent point that perhaps the only real Btexts are facsimiles of composers’ manuscripts. (The reader should understand that several intermezzos, in the form of unwirist and Rheinwein, da capo al fine, are to be imagined, punctuating this account from time to time.)

Many of the meetings of the Music Information Centers (MISCs) are open to non-MIC members. I attended two and heard not only some of the usual national reports of new developments, but also a most informative run-down—requested by Claire Brook of the American Music Center—of each center’s objectives and on-going activities. MICs vary from those centers that had been established long enough to be able to store scores, to those (notably the Gulbenken Foundation) that commission and perform new works.

Three developments seemed particularly notable to me: First, Alan Pope announced that Blackwell’s in England is (or are) about to undertake a “British contemporary composers on microfilm” project, in which holograph scores of new British music will be available for purchase in microform. (For information, write to the Microform Division, Blackwell’s Hythe Bridge St., Oxford OX1 2ET, England.)

Second, James Murdoch, the energetic Australian MIC representative, described his impressive new center in Sydney and the branch-MICs that are planned for other Australian cities. Third, and of particular interest to U.S. composers who do not live on the East Coast, the American Music Center (official MIC for the U.S., and located in New York City) is considering the establishment of regional branches, according to Claire Brook.

Computers raised their heads again, at the second meeting of the Commission of Libraries in Academies, Conservatories, and Music Colleges: Carl Johnson’s paper, "The new numeric code thematic catalog in the Library of the Royal Swedish Academy of Music," described a computer-aided project for cataloging both thematic and text sections. Because of this project, the library has been able to make contributions for anonymous works and to correct previous misattributions.

The Commission of Research Libraries, at its second meeting, discussed policies restricting the circulation or copying of microfilms held by libraries and archives. Several librarians expressed concern because they have no control over how the microfilms disseminated by their libraries will be used. Copyright and contract laws cover microfilms, but the former are complicated and vary from country to country. Richard Andrews (Gr. Brit.) discussed copyright problems, and Lenore Carl (U.S.) explained a number of features of the new U.S. copyright law. For the next IAMC meeting, the Commission will prepare a guide to copyright problems for use by libraries.

Barry Brook reported, in what he called the third or fourth reading of the BTLM Commission on new developments in RILM, namely: vol. VIII of the Abstracts is complete; vol. IX will appear in a double issue and is almost ready for publication; vol. X/4, instead of being the usual author-subject index, will contain a collection of abstracts previously omitted from 1967-76; the subject index to vol. X will appear in the second five-year cumulation instead. (The author index to vol. X will be in vol. X/4, as usual.)

In addition, RILM has a new input method that is faster; RILM will be linked to the New York Public Library’s book-catalog-production system and can use the system’s excellent computer programs and printer; and (possibly) Lockheed’s DIALOG may put the RILM Abstracts data base on-line soon.

At the General Assembly, Anders Löhn, the Secretary General, reported on IAMC’s new publications, new working groups, current membership patterns (Italy, Gr. Brit., and Australia), and discussed relationships with other international organizations (TAML is a member of the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) and of the International Music Council (IMC)). Wolfgang Rehm, Treasurer, gave us the welcome news that, for the first time, TAML has a surplus, so that no increase in dues will be necessary.

Following these reports, a long, detailed, multilingual, and occasionally comic discussion of proposed changes to the by-laws took up a remarkable amount of time, so that the election of new officers was delayed until the very end of the meeting. President Harold Beckmann explained that the General Council, after much discussion at its own meeting, had decided to name only one candidate for each office. Although the General Assembly could nominate several candidates from the floor, or even ignore the General Council’s slate, there was little discussion, and all members of the slate were elected.

The new officers are: Barry Brook, President; Anders Löhn (Incumbent), Secretary General; Wolfgang Rehm (Incumbent), Treasurer. Harold Beckmann was given a well-deserved recognition for his skillful work as President.

At this point, like many colleagues, I caught my breath and spent a (perhaps I should say "the") free morning on my own. I visited the Don, the Roman-Germanic Museum, and the innehautsche wonderful Gutenberg Museum. We had all previously been treated to a fine tour of the city, during which we had watched a music engraver at work and had delighted in a display of autograph manuscripts of Chopin, Wagner, Hindemith, Liszt, uaw. And one afternoon four busloads of us had gone on a slightly mad excursion to the Rheingau, to visit St. Valentine’s Church in Kiedrich (which has the oldest playable organ in the world: a crystaline, sparkling sound!), and to taste wine at the Cistercian abbey at Eberbach. They evidently weren’t expecting us at Eberbach. For a while things fell somewhat apart. And then there was an evening of new music (works by Wolff, Cardew, Logothetis, Engel, and Shrapnel), performed by pianist Puy in Paris, with slides and comments between and Rheinwein after.

But there was still work to be done. At the closing meeting of the General Assembly, all of the final reports were presented, and future meetings were announced. For the 1978 meeting, Maria Fontana Rodrigues invited us, on behalf of the Gulbenken Foundation to Lisbon. There are no branches of TAML/IASA in Portugal, she said; perhaps a Lisbon meeting of these organizations will act as a catalyst. One or two sessions will be devoted to computer applications in music documentation, for which a planning group (Harald Beckmann, Garrett Bowers) has been established. The dates are 24-28 July, and Barry Brook assured us that the hotel has an inviting swimming pool.

The 1979 meeting will be held in Salzburg, probably in August, sponsored by the Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum. The Congress for 1980 will be in Cambridge, England. Possible choices for 1981-83 (in no order) are Brussels, Budapest, and Melbourne.

From the various oral reports (which will soon be published in Forecast), a few items particularly caught my attention: First, a study group has been formed over the past two years to reconsider and possibly to redefine IAML’s goals (Brook, Löhn, Beckmann, Andrews, Lassou, and Werner are its members). Second, IFLA will establish a round table on music, with representatives from TAML. Third, TAML and IASA will try to clarify their future relations.

From the reports given by the chairman of Subcommittees and Working Groups, I learned that both the Bibliographical Terminology group and the Classification Subcommission intend to develop multi-lingual thesauri (for different purposes); that the Cataloguing Commission had held a meeting to discuss the International Standard Bibliographical Description (ISBD) for non-book material (the Commission felt that the ISBD was insufficient, particularly for sound recordings); that RISM II/A (manuscripts, 1600-1800) is working on a pilot project for computer-manipulated and computer-printed musical incipits; and that RIDM has held a series of recent conferences on musicology.
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EARTHWATCH AND ORAL HISTORY

A unique opportunity to collect oral histories of those prominent in the field of music is currently being offered by EARTHWATCH. Volunteers are needed to support the work of Dr. Barry Brook (City University of New York), national director of the Project for the Oral History of Music in America and Dr. Bernard Rosenberg, professor of Sociology, at the City University of New York. Using the methods and techniques of the oral historian, participants will interview composers, instrumentalists, singers, conductors, club owners, and lyricists in the study areas of the contemporary classical composer, the performing classical musician, jazz and the musical theater. One three-week team of assistants will aid in the research during the period from March 19 to April 8.

The project is sponsored by EARTHWATCH, of Belmont, Massachusetts. This non-profit organization offers interested amateurs the opportunity to join prominent scholars on field research projects worldwide, both near and far. Team members share the work and the costs of real, no-nonsense research projects in a wide variety of fields -- ecology, archaeology, geology, marine biology, historic restoration, and many others.

The two- and three-week projects run throughout the year. They are open to all between the ages of 16 and 75. Generally no special qualifications are necessary, but for this project a serious interest in music is required; interviewing skills would also be an asset.

Contributions to support your choice of some 50 projects offered in 1978 range from $500-$950, not including airfare. For more information, and a free brochure describing in detail all the projects offered, call or write to EARTHWATCH, Box 127H, Belmont, Massachusetts 02178. Telephone (617) 489-3030.
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of Congress, to help music librarians cope with the many difficult and esoteric materials that end up in music library collections. His lecture, "The Preservation of Music Archives: Materials," emphasized that the most important priorities for librarians are to prevent further deterioration of materials, without altering the materials irrevocably. He noted that variations in temperature and humidity, dust, gases (smog and exhaust fumes), and lighting were controllable enemies of paper and lothier. He also demonstrated polyester encapsulation as a protective measure for fragile documents and explained about LC's "phase box," designed to arrest deterioration until restoration is possible. For librarians untrained in preservation techniques, Mr. Poole gave this advice: "Err on the side of not doing enough."

Cheryl Osborne (Greater Victoria Public Library) and Carol Lawrence (Cornell University) led the Open Forum which brought together public library music specialists for discussions of mutual interest. Stanley Sadie, general editor of the new Grove's described the format and content of the new Dictionary and its progress. Carol Lawrence reported on the joint Public Library Association/Music Library Association Audio Visual meeting.

The fourth session presented Dr. Harald Heckmann, director of the Deutsches Rundfunkarchiv in Frankfurt-am-Main and President of IAML. Dr. Heckmann, whose topic was "Documentation of Music in Radio," spoke about the responsibilities of his archive in documenting German radio broadcasts. He noted use of ultrasonic clearing and computer cataloging as projects the Rundfunkarchiv is focusing on. He also gave an impressive demonstration of recent work on encoding early records using modern electronics techniques. Sousa's "Stars and Stripes Forever," as regenerated from the Sousa band's 190th cylinder recording, has seldom sounded so good.

President Dena Epstein presided over a brief business meeting, and, following a refreshing dip in the pool, members whisked themselves off for a night of revelry and reflection on the day's events.

Saturday morning Don Selbert (Syracuse University) led a lively open meeting of the Cataloging and Classification Committee. Uniform titles of music were a major concern of the committee since there have been several recently recommended changes in their form. Other changes, mostly accommodating computerization of music cataloging, were mostly accommodating computerization of music cataloging, and discussed, sometimes heatedly.

Fred Bindman (Library of Congress) brought attention to a proposed Master Register soon to be published by LC. We also mentioned LC's work in developing ISBD numbers for music for IFLA. Judy Kaufman (SUNY, Stonybrook) explained the progress of her subcommittee on subject headings for non-Western music in developing subject headings, cross-references and standardized tribal names for cataloging information.

After a thorough tour of the University of California at Santa Barbara Music Library, members again said their goodbyes and made their ways back to various parts of the country, taking with them the inspiration and information gleaned from this exciting meeting.

Stephen H. Fry University of California at Los Angeles

PUBLIC LAW 94-553

The problem of the new copyright law was attacked at the first session of the summer meeting of the Music Library Association. Susan Sommer of the New York Public Library opened the meeting with several comments on copyright and introduced the first speaker, Carolyn Hunter of the Copyright Office at the Library of Congress. She gave a brief yet comprehensive history of the copyright law from the Statue of Anna through the latest revision, concentrating on legislation in the United States. The thrust of her statements pointed to the idea that court decisions to be handed down under the new law will probably rely heavily on older rulings, except where there are major changes in the law.
The next speaker was Marybeth Peters of the Copyright Office. She spoke on the new law, the major changes from the previous law, and how these changes will affect librarians. Some major changes include the duration of the copyright of the rights holder. For example, under the new law the copyright will be held for the life of the author plus fifty (50) years. In the case of pseudonymous works, rights will be held for 75 years from date of publication or 100 years from creation. The rights of the copyright owner include: the rights of reproduction, the rights to make arrangements, the right to first publication, the rights for public performance, and the right of public display.

Other effects of provisions in the law of importance to the music librarian include the following: pre-1972 sound recordings are protected until 2047; a sound recording is considered publication of a composition; no liability by a library is entailed with unsupervised copier equipment in a library as long as the machine has a notice that copying of copyrighted material may be illegal. Another minor fact which will ease the job of some people is that the copyright expires on Dec. 30 of the year in question, so only the year of publication will be needed rather than the exact date as in the old law.

Ms. Peters stressed that of great importance to the librarian is Section 107: Fair Use. Three main criteria for its application are the type (profit or non-profit, educational or personal); the amount of the work being copied; the market value (if supplanting the purchase of a copy). The guidelines given in the house report are to be considered minimum, not maximum standards. Section 108 covers library use, which allows copying for replacement if a copy is not available at a "reasonable price" and after a "reasonable search" has been made. Although music is excluded from some sections of 108, fair use (107) may still be applied to particular cases of music copying.

The final speaker was David S. Koslow, a lawyer from Los Angeles. He emphasized the importance of learning the definitions of terms as set up in Section 106 and the limits of Fair Use under Section 107. The major thrust of his comments dealt with rights to make copies when it is legal. Librarians must remember that it is not always illegal to copy.

Susan Sommer then summed up the relationship between the potential copiers, librarians, and copyright proprietors with an analogy to the Old West: Imagine that the settlers have drawn up an encampment and put up a fence around it. The surrounding hills are hostile territory where it is not safe to venture, but in between there is a great uncharted plain where it may - or may not - be safe to wander. A settler who sets up a house on the far edge of the plain may draw attacks from the enemy tribes, while one who merely ventures forth now and then to pick flowers will probably be left undisturbed. Librarians are like the settlers with the new copyright law; the law's Congressional interpretation serves as the fence. Out in the hills are the copyright proprietors. So long as librarians adhere to the minimum standards for allowable photocopying described in the House Report they will be perfectly safe. They may also be relatively free from attack on the open plain of fair use, if they do not incite the copyright proprietors by taking unfair advantage of the freedom available to them. In the course of years to come, landmarks determined by court decisions in individual cases will be set up on the yet uncharted territory serving as further guides for would-be traveleers. Meanwhile use your judgement, maintain a low profile, and try not to strike oil!

Richard LeSueur  Ann Arbor Public Library

---

**MIDWEST**

The Midwest Chapter held its annual meeting October 21 and 22 in Evanston, Illinois. The three sessions dealt with jazz, library management, and co-operative projects. Charles Suber, publisher of Downbeat, discussed the strengths and weaknesses of various music education materials on jazz; Don DeMichael, president of the Chicago Jazz Institute, and a performing jazz musician, presented a short history of jazz on record, and guidelines for choosing from the multitude of recordings and reissues. Richard Wang, on the faculty at the University of Illinois-Chicago Circle, surveyed the recent literature of jazz. For the second session, William McClellan profiled for the audience twelve music libraries offering graduate degrees in music with comparisons of budgets, organization charts, collection, and staff. David Penske presented an interim report undertaken for Indiana University on budgetary management in music libraries. Judy Labash opened the third session with her findings regarding a WPA Index of 19th-century music periodicals currently housed at DePaul University, Chicago. Gordon Williams explained to those present what musical sources were available at the Center for Research Libraries, Chicago, Illinois. Hans Lemberg reflected upon implications of certain types of library co-operation, and the removal of what could be critical materials from the hands of the browsing researcher.

The meeting was hosted by Northwestern University, and included a reception and open house at the music library's spacious new quarters.

New officers are:

- Marion Korda, chairperson, 111 Talsman Road, Louisville, Ky. 40220
- Connie Nibet, secretary-treasurer, Music Library, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 60201

The fall 1979 Midwest Chapter meeting will be held in Lexington, Ky. The date is not yet fixed.

Marianne Kozlowski  Southern Illinois University (Edwardsville)