



Bibliographic Standards Committee  
Annual Conference, June 2000  
Chicago, Illinois  
Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jane Gillis, Larry Creider, Bruce Tabb, Richard Noble, E.C. Schroeder, Bob Maxwell, Patrick Russell, Jerry Wager, Juliet McLaren, Jain Fletcher, Jennifer O'Brien Roper, James Larrabee, Gregory Pass, Sandra Sider, Martha Lawler, Elizabeth Robinson

VISITORS: Manon Th eroux, Elaine Shiner, Roberta Engleman, Margaret Nichols, Joe Springer, Joseph Ross, Melinda Hayes, Eileen Smith, Deborah J. Leslie, Phyllis Payne, Julianne Simpson, Mary Faith Pankin, Robert C. W. Hall, Jr., Beth Russell, Emily Epstein, Larry Heiman, Nancy Kandoian, Sarah Schmidt Fisher, Maria Oldal, David Faulds, Henry Raine

#### 1. SETTLEMENT OF AGENDA

After members and guests introduced themselves, the agenda was settled.

#### 2. APPROVAL OF 1999 ANNUAL MINUTES

Minutes from the 2000 Midwinter Conference were approved.

#### 3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Maxwell announced new and retiring committee members. The new committee members are Jennifer O'Brien-Roper (Intern), Gregory Pass and James Larrabee. Retiring committee members are Jane Gillis, Juliet McLaren, Jerry Wager and Sandra Sider.

Maxwell reported that he has been appointed as the new ACRL representative to CC:DA.

The Huntington Library has three professional positions open: Principal Rare Book Cataloger, Systems Librarian and Authorities Librarian.

Elizabeth Robinson is now Team Leader of the Rare Book Cataloging Team at the Library of Congress.

#### 4. BIBLIOGRAPHIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE-RULE INTERPRETATION (BSC-RI): <http://www.lib.byu.edu/~catalog/people/rlm/bsc/bscri.htm>

Wager reported on the reaction of Barbara Tillett and Ann Della Porta, both from Library of Congress, to the BSC-RI that we adopted at the midwinter meeting. Barbara Tillett suggested that this could be the first to go into a "Handbook for rare materials catalogers", such as has been done for music materials. She did not favor putting it in the AACR2 code itself. Ann Della

Porta offered the possibility of including it in the NACO Participants' Manual. There are three possibilities of where the BSC-RI(s) could reside:

1. Handbook for rare materials cataloging
2. NACO Participants' Manual
3. Descriptive Cataloging Manual Z1

Option no. 1 was not favored by the committee. Creider said he would like to see it in no. 2. Leslie asked if it could be incorporated into DCRM. Wager said that it definitely should go in Z1 and possibly into the NACO Manual. Maxwell said that the NACO Manual is where new people look. As to Z1, how many people use it? Gillis asked if it could be part of Cataloger's Desktop. Robinson said that APPM, which is part of Cataloger's Desktop, has rules on headings. If the BSC-RI would part of DCRM (in the appendix?), then it would automatically become part of Cataloger's Desktop. McLaren stated that the APPM model is the right one.

"Move that the RI(s) should go in an Appendix of Headings in DCRM."  
Seconded. Passed.

Question was raised as to what do we want the Library of Congress to do. The consensus was that the RI should definitely go into Z1 and into the NACO Participant's Manual. Maxwell was instructed to send a letter to Beacher Wiggins asking that the RI be added to Z1 and the NACO Participant's Manual.

The RI itself needs real examples for Widows Type A and C. Several people thought they had found examples of C and Maxwell will update when he gets examples (by September 15). Leslie asked if we should drop A if we can't find a real example for it. Sandra Sider thought she had an example of A and will send to Maxwell before September 15.

The need to justify cross references was raised. Noble stated we need a choice rather than form to be used; references do not hurt. Do we go beyond item in hand? Do we make cross references for variant of a variant? Wager said that it is unusual but we are asking for something special because we need both cross references.

The problem of a Family of Printers was raised. In manuscript cataloging, family names are authorized as 100's and 700's. This is a new item and Maxwell will pursue this with Eileen Smith. Russell noted that we well have to move on to provenance issues with family names. At this point Noble observed that we are in the process of authorizing a Part 2/Appendix, dealing with headings, to DCRM. We are searching for principles that would apply over wider areas, such as for pre-1801 authors, the preference for reference sources over chief sources of information.

##### 5. RESOURCES FOR THE RARE MATERIALS CATALOGER:

<http://www.library.upenn.edu/ipc/rarecat.html>

Creider reported that the Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger page has not moved and will not move from the University of Pennsylvania site for now. Another member can take over the page and move it when Creider goes off the committee next year.

There have been several additions to this page. Library of Congress Lists now include Initial Definite and Indefinite Articles (approved by the JSC and soon to be part of AACR2), LCSH Tentative Weekly Lists, and Region and Country tables from Shelflisting Manual, G300. Under Reference Sources, Language Resources includes A Web of Online Grammars (included in yourdictionary.com) and Search form for online Lewis & Short Latin Dictionary (part of the Perseus Project). Also under Reference Sources, Calendars and Computus includes The French Republican Calendar, now in English and includes conversion tables from the Republican calendar to Gregorian dates. Under Special Topics for Rare Books, a link has been added to Printers's Marks from the University of Barcelona Library and there has been an address change for The printer/publisher database at the Herzog August Bibliothek. Under Catalogs which are particularly useful for Special Collections Cataloging there has been an address change (Connecting to the Online Catalogs of the American Antiquarian Society) and two additions (The Census of Italian 16th Century Editions: EDIT 16 and Empoli Public Library "Renato Fucini" Catalogue of Sixteenth Century Editions). The Empoli site includes digitized titles pages and printer's marks. Under Medieval Manuscripts, Images of Medieval MS, a new site is Early Manuscripts at Oxford University, which includes manuscripts from the 10th through the 15th centuries and is nicely done.

#### 6. DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGING OF ANCIENT, MEDIEVAL, RENAISSANCE, AND EARLY-MODERN MANUSCRIPTS v12 (AMREMM)

Pass announced that ACRL will publish AMREMM but that publication has been delayed until after 2001 Midwinter because CC:DA needs to review it. There was the public hearing at 2000 Midwinter followed by discussion in February and March on the DCRB Revision List. It was submitted to CC:DA in April. Maxwell and Pass are on the CC:DA agenda on Monday where this will be discussed. [After the BSC meetings, the CC:DA did approve a task force to review AMREMM, chaired by Matthew Beacom.] The code has been reserved at LC for the "MARC Code List for Relators, Sources, Description Conventions."

#### 7. DCRB REVISION: <http://www.lib.byu.edu/~catalog/people/rlm/bsc/dcrb/dcrbrev.htm>

a. Midwinter action in renaming DCRB to DCRM, and organization:  
<http://www.lib.byu.edu/~catalog/people/rlm/bsc/dcrb/dcrbrev.htm>

How do we see DCRM? One large manual or separate manuals? The Joint Steering Committee (JSC) of AACR2 has discussed reorganizing AACR2 into areas of description rather than format as it is now organized. ISBD has a different model: a general publication plus separate publications for each format. Noble commented that the ISBD model is more rigorous with more intellectual coherence than DCRB. ISBD talks about elements. The General ISBD (ISBD(G)) lays out the structure of ISBD and talks about the general elements. the individual

manuals go into depth about the elements. The committee decided that DCRM should have a general manual also and Noble was made Chair of DCRM(G).

Pass asked if DCRM will take into account other rare book cataloging codes. Pass noted that here is an IFLA publication authored by Henry Snyder and Heidi Hutchinson. Pass will track down the reference and give it to Noble, who is doing the DCRB/ISBD(A) comparison.

b. Reports: Comparisons

i. DCRB/AACR2 comparison

September 15 is deadline for comparison. There will be discussion on the DCRB list about where they differ and why and what should be done about differences. Members volunteered to be in charge of different elements: Maxwell (0 and 1), O'Brien-Roper (2), Larrabee (4), Pass (5)

ii. OJ1/OJ2: <http://www.lib.byu.edu/~catalog/people/rlm/bsc/dcrb/Oj1trans.htm>

Leslie compiled list of those areas where transcription is required. She said that we should use the word "transcribe" whenever we talk about transcription and that this is not always done in DCRB. Maxwell said he would like to add to place in DCRM those areas where transcription is required. This should be in OF perhaps with a reference from OJ.

iii. DCRB/ISBD(A) comparison

Noble will complete comparison by October 1 and will mount on web. Noble said that he has noticed several areas where there are differences. According to ISBD(A) a lower case letter is never transcribed as upper case. In the publication area, subfields e, f and g are not used according to DCRB whereas in ISBD(A) one may use them in certain cases. This will solve a problem with DCRB where printer information is sometimes put in a note. ISBD(A) also includes proper treatment for series. Nobles will mount this information also.

c. Report: 19th century

Schroeder will write something up by September 15 and distribute to committee.

d. Discussion: Serials: <http://www.library.yale.edu/conser/documents/dcrs.html>

McLaren reported that she and Gillis have been revising the rules, with input from serials catalogers. There are inconsistencies between AACR2, the LCRI's, CONSER and MARC21. Gillis and McLaren met with Judy Kuhagen from LC to discuss some of these problems. McLaren talked about some areas of concern: use of multiple 260's, angle brackets in the 260, non-date information in the 260, cumulations vs. collected issues, chief source of information.

The use of multiple 260's is contained in MARBI Discussion Paper 119, Seriality and MARC 21. This could become a proposal for 2001 Midwinter.

Discussion of DCRM(S) will begin after the Annual Conference on the DCRB list. A draft should be ready by the midwinter or annual meeting, with, perhaps, a Friday night hearing.

e. Discussion: Single sheet publications:

<http://www.lib.byu.edu/~catalog/people/rlm/bsc/dcrb/single.htm>

McLaren has written comparison and this is now mounted on web. Noble and Leslie asked whether bifoliant was in DCRB? McLaren said wording is clumsy in DCRB. In regards to 1F7, Robinson said that for two works on one sheet, why not treat as uncollected title, which would be the same as for books. Discussion will continue on DCRB list.

f. Discussion: Core: <http://www.lib.byu.edu/~catalog/people/rlm/bsc/dcrb/dcrmini.htm>

Discussion centered on whether Core will replace Minimal Level in the DCRM Appendix or, if both are present, if it will be called Core/Minimal or Minimal/Core. Decision was to rename Minimal Level to Less-than-Full Level Records. "Core" will become "DCRM(B) Core"

g. Report: Music - DCRM(PM)

Fletcher reported on Task Group activity since ALA Midwinter. Five of its seven members were able to meet face-to-face in two productive sessions at the Music Library Association Annual Conference in Louisville, Kentucky in February, 2000. The main focus of its discussion was the very preliminary draft of the music rules which the group had put together prior to the meeting. Before tackling actual details of the draft itself, the Group discussed some overarching issues which had arisen in putting it together. Two of those involved how to address sheet music and whether or not DCRM(PM) should be broadened to give guidance on cataloging manuscript music. With respect to sheet music, the Group's decision was that "sheet music" is a distinct entity which has been dealt with in MLA's Sheet Music Cataloging Guidelines (SMCG). Still, DCRM(PM) will be covering a longer time period and there has been music published in single sheets which falls outside the category of "sheet music". Therefore, the Group resolved to look carefully through the latest version of the SMCG (which Nancy Lorimer said she would procure and send to the members of the Task Group) to see if it would cover "music in sheets"; if it does not do so adequately, then DCRM(PM) will address it. In doing so, the Group will also be closely following developments in DCRM(B) for "single sheet publications". With respect to manuscript music, the discussion centered around the critical need for rules for manuscript music. The point was made that, although catalogers of modern music material recognize that there are vast differences between print and manuscript materials, they still find themselves "adapting" AACR2 to cover manuscript music. With that being the case, why not make DCRM(PM) adaptable for manuscript music as well? Fletcher reminded the Group that the purpose of these rules was intended to cover only printed music. It will be a large enough undertaking to try to cover the historical context of printed music in the rules, without trying to include the extensive points which would be needed to try to make it adaptable for manuscripts. Fletcher was also able to inform the Group that BSC was in the midst of finishing a draft of an extensive new set of rules for manuscript text material for which she would send them the URL for further consideration of this point. (Bringing this point up at the BSC meeting yielded unexpected results: two of its members [E.C. Schroeder and Bruce Tabb] came up to Fletcher at

the break and provided names of two people who might be able to help work on rules for music manuscripts.)

Fletcher reported that since the MLA meeting she has been too busy to follow up on much of the actual editing of the details discussed there. However, she said that work would start up in earnest soon. She offered the expectation that there should be a draft worth sharing with BSC following next year's MLA meeting in New York City in late February.

#### h. Maps

Nancy Kandoian (NYPL) will come to our midwinter meeting.

#### 8. Thesauri

a. Discussion: <http://libweb.uoregon.edu/catdept/home/genreterms/summer.00.html>

Tabb, as Chair, reported for the Thesaurus Committee. Other members of the Committee are Richard Noble, Patrick Russell, Elizabeth Robinson, and Deborah J. Leslie (ex-officio). The Committee met Saturday after the first meeting of the Bibliographic Standards Committee.

Tabb reported that there is a preliminary page of the thesauri on the web. Bill Brown came up with suggestions on how to get ACRL to allow us to put the thesauri on the web. Should the thesauri be combined into one list? The original intention of having separate thesauri was to publish them together at some point. Question was raised as to whether we should take out the qualifiers (e.g., Calf bindings (Binding)). It was pointed out that the intellectual coherence depends on logic of hierarchy. Should be able to put together in one list, in separate thesauri and in hierarchy.

The first genre term discussed was 'Academic addresses'. The scope note was changed to "Use for addresses delivered at educational institutions." Tabb explained that the committee decided to leave the scope note somewhat vague. They did not want to specifically include or exclude lectures in a classroom. The term was approved.

The next term was 'Book prospectuses'. The question was raised as to whether this term would cover prospectuses for periodicals. Gillis will search for warrant for 'serial prospectuses' or 'Periodical prospectuses'. In order to limit this term to books, the words 'or periodicals' were deleted and the last word, 'publications' was changed to 'books' in the scope note. A UF, 'Prospectuses, Book' was added. The term was approved.

The next term was 'Company prospectuses'. Several UFs were added: 'Prospectuses, Company', 'Commercial prospectuses', 'Prospectuses, Commercial' and 'Prospectuses, Business'. The term was approved.

A binding term was proposed: 'Corrugated board bindings'. This was accepted after a short discussion.

The next term discussed was 'Leaf books'. The term was deleted from the genre thesaurus between the first and second editions of Genre terms. The intention was to put it in the Printing and Publishing Terms thesaurus but this never happened. The discussion centered on where this term belonged. Decision was to reinstate the term into the Genre terms, changing the scope note to read: 'Use for a book containing an account of an earlier printed book or manuscript and including an original leaf (or leaves) from that book.'

The next term was 'Prospectuses'. Two narrower terms were added: 'Book prospectuses' and 'Company prospectuses'.

The next proposed term was 'Relievo leather bindings', from the Binding Terms thesaurus. The question was raised as to whether the term should actually be 'Leak's patent relievo leather bindings' (the first of the UF terms) since both warrants use 'Leak's patent relievo leather bindings' as the term. The committee approved the term contingent on Tabb searching for clearer warrants.

The last Binding term proposed was 'Ribbon-embossed cloth bindings'. The question was raised as to where we needed 'cloth' in the term. The consensus was that we do and the term was approved.

There was one new relator term proposed: 'Witness' and it was approved.

Tabb then reported on the lack of success in having LC add a code for 'Contributor', a new relator term that was previously approved. LC already has a code for the term 'Collaborator' ('clb') and has proposed adding 'Contributor' as a UF to it. The consensus of the committee is that the BSC is responsible for relator terms and that the Library of Congress as the one responsible for the relator list, should supply a code for 'Contributor'. Maxwell and Tabb will write a letter to Sally McCallum at LC asking that LC add a code for 'Contributor'.

b. Maxwell reported that the proposal to have the thesaurus editor be a separate appointment to the Bibliographic Standards Committee would be made to the RBMS Executive Committee on Monday. This was postponed from the Midwinter meeting. [The RBMS Executive Committee has sent the proposal back to the Bibliographic Standards Committee. The revised proposal should be sent to the Executive Committee before the Midwinter meeting.]

## 9. MARBI, CC:DA Report

Maxwell reported that three chapters of AACR2 are undergoing major rewrites: chapter 3 (maps), chapter 9 (computer files) and chapter 12 (serials). A prototype of rearranging AACR2 by areas has been completed. It is much more complicated than anyone thought and people are dubious about the rearrangement but are going ahead with a fuller version. The 1999 changes to AACR2 are not yet printed but are part of the latest Cataloger's Desktop.

There are several rule changes under consideration:

1. The British Library has proposed that titles of nobility not be retained in the 245 to make it the same as other fields. The Library of Congress likes them and does not want to leave them out. LC makes a distinction between titles of nobility and titles of honor. The BSC thought is that it is good to have all titles in the 245, for identification.
2. The Library Association has proposed deleting rule 1.4D4, which states that when the name of the publisher, etc. appears in a recognizable form in the 245, then in the 260 the shortest possible form (e.g., The Library, The Museum,) can be given.
3. PCC asked to have 'vol.' abbreviated to 'v.' in appendix. LC took this a step farther and wants to use the abbreviations in the appendix for any word on the list. This would make CA on item abbreviate to Calif. This does not affect DCRB so BSC will not comment on the proposal.
4. There is a proposal before the Joint Steering Committee of AACR2 for rewriting Chapter 12, changing the name from Serials to Continuing Resources. Continuing Resources would then be divided into Serials and Integrating Resources. Many of the rules for serials are not changed. There are major changes in the way integrating resources are handled. The move is towards identification and away from transcription. Integrating resources will be cataloged under latest entry. Some serials catalogers would like to see latest entry revived for serials. Gillis and McLaren will comment for the committee.

10. Rare recon survey: <http://www.library.yale.edu/bibstand/survey98.htm>

The retrospective conversion survey of rare materials was done in 1998 by Maxwell and Sider. Schroeder organized the responses and mounted them on the web. Overall there was a low response. Since many libraries are further along in recon than they were two years ago, Schroeder will make an announcement on exlibris-l and write the original respondees for more information/feedback. He will also ask about cleanup and if major recon is still being done. In the future, recon information will be added about every two years.

12. Rare Book and Manuscript Catalogers' Resource Page:  
<http://www.library.yale.edu/bibstand/resource.html>

Schroeder has mounted the Resource page and added a couple of people. Question was raised as to who makes decision to add people to this page. BSC Chair will make decision. A form will be added at bottom of page to be sent to the Chair for people to volunteer and for new places to be added.

13. Preconference reports

a. Chicago 2000

The BSC sponsored two full day workshops, held at the Newberry Library on Wednesday, July 5. Pass gave a workshop in manuscript cataloging using the newly approved Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance and Early-Modern Manuscripts for 12 people. There were a range of issues: history and typology, subject and genre form access. There was more material than time. Gillis and McLaren gave a workshop on cataloging rare serials (DCRS) for 8 people. It was a hands-on workshop with the attendees doing 4 exercises, a quick overview

of the rules and the differences between AACR2 and DCRS. McLaren will be giving the workshop in Scotland and twice in England over the summer.

b. Discussion: San Francisco 2001

There is a proposal for a seminar, Processing Twentieth Century Literary Manuscripts. A possible workshop would be cataloging Latin materials, similar to the one one several years ago by Eric Holzenburg and Steve Tabor.

14. New Business

The BSC maintains two web pages on resources for catalogers. These pages have similar names. Maxwell proposed that we rename either one or both of these. After discussion the committee decided to change the name of the collection of aids available on the web for cataloging rare materials from RBMS/BSC Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger to RBMS/BSC Directory of Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger. The page, The Rare Book and Manuscript Catalogers Resource Page, with links to catalogers with experience cataloging rare materials who have volunteered to respond to queries in their areas of expertise has been changed to The Rare Materials Catalogers HelpNet.

Maxwell and others brought up problems of indexing in online catalogs. SIRSI is unable to put the 1XX/240 combination under authority control. SIRSI and Voyager (and possibly others?) can validate a 700\$t but not the 1XX/240. The Chair will send a letter to vendors addressing this problem. There was also concern about how Uniform Titles display and index in different online systems. It was suggested that we update the BSC Guide to Rare Book Records in Online Systems. As most libraries have either gone to a second generation system or are in the process of migrating to a newer system, a discussion of systems might be a good topic for a preconference.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Gillis  
Secretary