At first, this title might seem to set something of a dark tone for my part of our presentation. However, the quotation “Vexation and menace indeed!” is drawn from the introduction of a most enlightening book on tonight’s topic as it relates to music, and I found this book anything but vexatious and menacing to read...
The title of the book to which I refer is *Uniform Titles for Music*, and it was written by Michelle Koth. Michelle – or “Mickey” as she is known to her friends and colleagues – is the music cataloger at Yale University. You see on the screen the full quotation I think is worth sharing with you. It is from an article by Michael R. Fling in description of uniform titles for music. I hope that the nature of this vexatious, menacing, but ultimately rewarding, endeavor will become clear to you as we work through some examples I’ll be sharing with you.

Although I’ll be talking a bit more about authority controlled titles than names in my discussion of music and authorities, I do want to point out as I begin that names can be problematic in music. Take, as an opening example, *Prince*... But which *prince*? Musicians seem drawn to this title of royalty... and the authority records help us keep them straight:
There is Joshua Darlington, aka “Prince Charming,” for example, who was born on Halloween in 1969 and recorded summer in paradise in 2001. It is easier to find out about this particular Prince by means of a keyword search in Google than the OCLC database. But there will come a time when he is old news and not so easy to locate – and the name authority record will be there to keep things straight.
Then there is the early 20th century song composer, Dyneley Prince, who apparently sometimes simply went by the name “Prince” and who made a single, tiny splash with his setting of Rudyard Kipling’s poem “On the road to Mandalay.” The name authority record documents this.
And then there was Prince Aubry who, whose title was actually one of his given names, and who recorded “Bom bom Sally” with the Calypso Troubadours in the 1940s. So he was an artist forever rather than formerly known as...
...*Prince* – the one I believe we all know, who is certainly far more famous now than any of the preceding musical princes I have mentioned. But you get the picture: the authority file is a foundational organizer not of *all* details but of those particular details that reward the researchers’ attention and minimize confusion.

I don’t work too much with popular music, so I want to move now to the authority work corner of the cello music cataloging world where I do spend most of my time, and tell you about one of the more interesting experiences I have had with name authorities. This experience might have proven vexatious indeed had it not led me on such a good adventure.
Have any of you heard of Louis Moseson? I had not ever heard of him before coming upon the half dozen or so photocopies of his musical compositions resting quietly in the Fritz Magg Collection. [Explain the Magg Collection and describe your work as Cello Music Cataloger here, if you have not done so already.] So, as you might already have guessed, my first action when faced with such a mystery was to consult the authority file, where a quick browse turned up a single Louis Moseson...
...who turned out to be the author of a book entitled *Unique and successful selling techniques*. Clearly this slender authority record had nothing to do with the composer in question. So, I searched further (outside the authority file) and discovered an informative newspaper article about the Kling Orchestra of Louisville KY, an all-volunteer group of very active elderly musicians, that happened to be conducted by a man named Louis Moseson. This was a promising find, but surprising, as well. In this article I also read the following: “Throughout his life, Moseson has had a love of music, but like most of us, he had other things to do. After all, he had a men’s clothing business to run.” This was enough to send me looking for an address and eventually to a phone number for Mr. Moseson, which led to a long conversation with him concerning his studies with Fritz Magg—and about the book he did in fact write on *unique and successful selling techniques*. Mr. Moseson and I talked at length about what it was like for him to take up the cello as an adult—he was in his 30s, I believe, when he started. I tried to get him to tell me more about his musical compositions. However, after he found out I was a guitarist, all he wanted to talk about was forming a duo with me. This is because he also plays the harmonica—he took it up in his 70s and stumbled into a hot gig with a guitarist on a cruise ship a few summers ago—so that’s what he was all about when we spoke together. I promise I am not making this story up!

So, you can see that this authority record needs an overhaul. But, as we here at UNCG are not yet a NACO library, I don’t have the authority to revise it. However, I have included useful information in the original input I made for this item...
Here is the record. Check out the key elements in particular MARC fields:

In field 100 you see the controlled form of the name, and in field 245 you see the title proper, followed in field 246 by a variant form of the title (“other title”). Also controlled here are the subject heading in field 650 and in field 700 the added entry personal name of Fritz Magg, linked here because he contributed to this item. This is explained in the field 500 notes, where I have also made reference to my telephone conversation with the composer.

What you don’t see in this record is field 240, in which the title portion of the name/title heading of the authority record would have been coded, if a uniform title for this composition existed (which, as you know, it does not).

But what if it did? What if our job tonight was to create an authority record for this work? How would the name/title heading of the authority record be structured?
Well, first of all you would note that the 100 field of the MARC Authority record differs structurally from the bibliographic record I just showed you. In the bibliographic record field 100 includes the controlled form of the name only, often along with name-related information such as birth and death dates, with the title information reserved for the 2XX fields. In the authority record, by contrast, the name/title heading is tagged in the $t subfield, a subfield that is not valid for the 100 field of the bibliographic record. The information included in this subfield would be tagged in field 240 of the bibliographic record, as the Preferred (or Uniform) Title.

As long as we are making things up, we might as well learn a bit more. What if Louis Moseson’s Opus 26 Allegro happened to be known by several different titles? Let’s say he once called it “How about a Fast One for Fritz?” maybe, or “Louis’s Landmark Allegro,” or “Moseson Rides the Waves?” We already know that such variant titles would be recorded in field 246 of the MARC bibliographic record. But where would they be tagged in the authority record?
In the authority record, these various titles, which are also called “references,” would be tagged in the 400 field for the purpose of bringing them under the control of the all-powerful name/title heading tagged in field 100. This “one title to rule them all” is a lot like the one Ring of Power in J.R.R. Tolkien’s immortal *Lord of the Rings*.

Continuing to make things up about this opus 26 Allegro, imagine this scenario: In 2046, Moseson’s grandson donates his grandfather’s library to the Library of Congress; a manuscript entitled “How About a Fast One for Fritz” turns up in this collection with no mention anywhere on the item of “Allegro” or “Opus 26” or “Fritz Magg.” At such a time this authority record, if it existed, would come in just a little handy, don’t you think?

But this record could be even more valuable if it included further information. What if Yo Yo Ma took a liking to Moseson and made the composer famous by means of a hit recording. And what if the creator of this authority record learned these various titles from an article in the New Grove music reference resource, an article written after Moseson’s death, when his true worth as a composer had belatedly been recognized. Wouldn’t it be a good thing if such information was recorded in the authority record?
This kind of thing would be included in the 670 field, which may contain a great variety of information – the title proper of the work on which the heading is based, the date of publication, any additional information necessary to justify the heading, and the source of that information. It may also be used to record further information used to establish the heading or to provide justification for a uniform title that varies from the title found on the item.

Now, let’s move from Moseson’s opus 26 to a few authentic examples.
Musical works routinely appear in multiple manifestations, most commonly in the form of scores, performance parts, sound recordings, and video recordings. What you see on the screen is just one of many examples I might show you. As you know very well, in order to provide library patrons comprehensive access to a musical work, the cataloger must first describe each manifestation of it in a bibliographic record and then create linkage not only among the various manifestations of the particular work but also among other works that might be related to it in significant ways. This process can be especially problematic when the musical work in question was composed long ago and has been published in many different versions over centuries.

Preferred titles help us solve the knotty problems that arise when a single item has been published under multiple titles. And as we have already seen, such titles accomplish this feat of organization by bringing all variant titles of the item together under a single, authoritative title to serve as an access point. Catalogers use access points to create entries or headings under which items will be clearly identified in the catalog. This is the way we equip the catalog to perform its finding function; and by organizing the preferred titles in authority files, we set up networks of related headings that allow the catalog to perform its collocating function. This is what makes the catalog a sophisticated collocating device rather than a simple finding list.
What often complicates the process of music cataloging is the wide variety of forms and names that appear on marketed manifestations of musical works. For example, George Frideric Handel’s “Largo” has long been a famous piece, and most people who know it nowadays refer to it simply by this title. However, throughout its long history this work has been called many different things, a sampling of which you see on the screen. Curiously, no one ever seems to have called it Larghetto, even though this is the tempo marking Handel himself wrote on the music.

You can imagine how much research is involved in creating well-organized, comprehensive access to all versions of this music that have appeared in print or manuscript since Handel composed it in 1737/38. One way of getting your mind around the complex nature of this problem is to go to your favorite search engine and play with the word largo in a “key word” search. As largo is a musical tempo marking used by countless composers over several centuries, a search on this word alone will quickly drown you in an ocean of largos, inclusive of Key Largo, Florida and countless other non-musical pieces of information. If you try “Handel and largo,” you’ll get plenty of hits you are looking for—but many, many you are not looking for, because Handel composed a number of other largos in addition to the “famous” largo we call the largo.
Now, have a look at the authority record for this work and identify the preferred title. Where would you find it? That’s right – in subfield “t” of the 100 field. So, Serse is the preferred title.

But what about the title in the “p” subfield, Ombra mai fu? (Hint: tagged in this subfield is the “Name of a part or section of a work.”)

So, we see that Ombra mai fu is part of Serse. Here is where it helps to know something about the history and literature of music. If you do, you have probably already figured out that Ombra mai fu is an aria within the opera Serse. But if you are not sure about this, the authority record provides you the sources you would need to learn all about it. Where is this information located in the authority record? Correct, in field 670.
So, now that we have described this particular manifestation of Handel’s celebrated Largo, we can set up all the necessary links to ensure that researchers who depend on our bibliographic records will experience the perfect search – which is, of course, a search that yields all the information they need and rejects all the information they don’t need.

Before we leave the subject of music, I want to return for a moment to our earlier discussion of Louis Moseson. You’ll recall that his authority record needs an important update and that I don’t yet have the authority to do that myself. As I mentioned, I could call upon a colleague to do the honors – as I did in another situation involving Laszlo Varga, another of the great cellists whose music library lives with us here at UNCG.

It was actually your fine teacher Sonia who discovered that Varga’s authority record had been updated to include a big fat error…a death date of 1982 for Varga, who only recently, in fact, celebrated his 90th birthday. This was both a vexation and a menace. I have spent a great deal of time with Varga over the last few years, recording a 10-hour video interview with him in 2011. So, I know it is nonsense to list his death date as 1982.

You can see....
...in this record from the Virtual International Authority File (VIAF) that one agency, the National Széchényi Library of Hungary retains this error. The others, The Library of Congress/NACO, The National Library of France, and the German Library, have all corrected the error in their authority records. And why did they make this update?
Because they got an email from me, the partial content of which is now recorded in field 670 of Varga’s name authority record. Sadly, there is a typo in the text, and it also lacks sufficient context: anyone looking closely at this record would wonder why on earth this guy from Greensboro wrote in to say that Varga is still alive, as there is no mention anywhere in the record of the death date error that has now been corrected. But at least the record has been fixed (except in Hungary).

An interesting final point...you have to be careful searching a name such as Laszlo Varga, as it is the Hungarian equivalent of John Smith. Search the name without consulting the authority file, and you never know who might turn up...
I once asked Laszlo if he was aware of this particular one of his many namesakes. He has a quick wit, and answered in his thick Hungarian accent, “Ha, I could take that guy – and I'm better looking than him anyway!”
“But this Laszlo Varga is better looking!”