



**Bibliographic Standards Committee  
Annual Conference, 25-26 June 2004  
Orlando, Florida  
Official Minutes**

The meeting was called to order at 8:30

### **1. Introduction of members and visitors**

**Members present:** Ann Copeland, Pennsylvania State University; Laurence Creider, New Mexico State University; Sarah Schmidt Fisher, University of Delaware; James Larrabee, University of California, Berkeley Law Library; Deborah J. Leslie, Folger Shakespeare Library (chair); Megan Lewis, Duke University (intern); Gregory Pass, Saint Louis University; Jennifer O'Brien Roper, Wake Forest University (secretary); Beth Russell, Ohio State University (thesaurus editor); Stephen Skuce, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Eileen Smith, Yale University; Manon Th  roux, Yale University;

**Members excused:** Joe Springer

**Liaisons present:** Jane Gillis, Yale University (rare serials); Robert Maxwell, Brigham Young University (CC:DA)

**Visitors:** Frances Ott Allen, University of Cincinnati; Randal Brandt, University of California, Berkeley; Erin Davis, Washington University; Christine DeZelar-Tiedman, University of Minnesota; Emily Epstein, University of Colorado Health Sciences Center; Christy Hicks, California State University, Fresno; Ryan Hildebrand University of California, Irvine; Kris Kiesling, University of Texas; Windy Lundy, University of Colorado, Boulder; Kate Moriarty, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; R. Arvid Nelsen, University of California, San Diego; Maria Oldal, Pierpont Morgan Library; John Overholt, University of Texas; Lenore Rouse, Walpole Library/Yale University; Rizio Bruno Santana, Biblioteca Mario de Andrade, Brazil; E.C. Schroeder, Yale University; Elaine Shiner, William Andrews Memorial Clark Library; Jim Stephenson, Getty Research Institute; Bruce Tabb, University of Oregon

### **2. Settlement of the agenda**

### **3. Approval of Midwinter 2004 minutes**

The minutes were approved with no changes.

#### 4. Announcements

- a. Committee membership.** Randy Brandt will become a regular member of the committee, while Arvid Nelsen and Nina Schneider will start terms as interns. All terms begin at the end of this Annual conference. Leslie mentioned that there are a couple of ways to express interest in serving on the committee. Those interested in joining can either email Leslie with an expression of interest as well as a brief justification of how you would contribute. There is also a form on the ACRL website that can be filled out. Leslie reminded all interested parties that there is always more interest than openings.
- b. Describing archives: a content standard.** Brandt announced that the Society of American Archivists will soon be publishing *Describing Archives: a Content Standard (DACS)*. Kris Kiesling is developing DACS, which is intended to replace *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts (APPM)*. This endeavor grew out of the CUSTARD project (*Canadian-U.S. Task Force on ARchival Description*), now abandoned. The preface to DACS states that it enhances APPM without cutting down the original standard, and that one of the main goals of this new standard is to combine rules for cataloging and encoded archival description in one document. The archivists at the Bancroft who evaluated DACS believe that DACS needs more examination and public scrutiny before publication, and while it does fill in some gaps found in APPM, it is not yet in a position to replace APPM. They will continue to use APPM until DACS enjoys the authority of an accepted standard, a course of action which is commended by this committee to other archival repositories. Kris Kiesling was not present for the public discussion, but did mention later that any suggestions or comments would be incorporated into the next edition.

The circumstances surrounding the publication of DACS prompted Leslie to appoint an SAA liaison from Bib Standards. Anyone actively involved in SAA as well as Bib Standards is eligible. Please email Leslie with expressions of interest.

- c. Job opportunities.** Pass distributed a job announcement for a rare books cataloger at Saint Louis University. Schroeder announced that a job announcement would be posted soon for a rare book cataloger at the British Art Center at Yale University.

#### 5. ALCTS/ACRL Task Force on Cataloging Rules for Early Printed Monographs.

Final report of the Task Force is Appendix A of these minutes

Maxwell brought up that although the "final" task force report was due in July 2004, the task force would need to remain convened so that a group would be available to receive any response from the ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee, as well as to plan an ALA program for 2006. Leslie gave her approval, with the understanding that Mary Larsgaard has also approved.

## 6. MARBI

[Submitted by John Attig 22 July 2004]. MARBI had a short agenda. The main item of interest to special collections catalogers was a proposal regarding hierarchical place access (field 752). It was decided that 752 would be limited to access based on place of publication or coverage (the newspaper/special collections use of the field) and that a new 6XX field (probably 662) would be defined for topical access through a hierarchical place name. There was some inconclusive discussion of the subfields required for these fields, particularly for places larger than a country, and the proposal will be revised to deal more thoroughly with this question. The new proposal will be discussed at Midwinter 2005.

Other proposals or announcements dealt with display control of field 017 (Copyright Clearance); a new field to encode musical incipits; recording of standard numbers and their use for record matching; issues concerning Unicode implementation; and implementation of the 13-digit ISBN (LC will begin to include these numbers in October 2004; OCLC will map the 13-digit ISBN to field 024 for searching as a standard number). For more information, please contact John Attig <jxa16@psulias.psu.edu>

## 7. CC:DA

Maxwell reported on the progress of AACR3. The Joint Steering Committee is planning a 2007 or 2008 publication; the proposed title is: *AACR3: Resource Description and Access*. A preliminary chapter in Part I will contain general rules applied universally; subsequent chapters will contain supplemental rules to bring out at least three aspects of materials: content, carrier, and mode of issuance. In Part II, Chapter 21 will be completely revised, as has been under consideration for some time. Included in the revision of this chapter will be an examination of the concept of "entry," a review of the concept of "collection," and resolution of issues surrounding the so-called "rule of three." Chapter 25 will also be rewritten to reform the uniform title concept and develop headings for works and expressions. A new Part III will be composed on authority work. Finally, a general introduction will be prepared laying out the principles on which the rules are based.

Leslie commented that the organization of the text sounds confusing. Maxwell replied that in looking at cataloging, the JSC sees *content*, *carrier*, and *mode of issuance* as the aspects that best define an item. Leslie asked if rare materials would have a separate chapter in the rules as newly envisioned, and Maxwell affirmed that they would not, given that the carrier and content for books is the same, whether they are considered rare or not. However, it is expected that rules for rare materials will continue to exist in some form in AACR3 (see above, section 5, on the ALCTS/ACRL Task Force on Cataloging Rules for Early Printed Monographs).

The JSC plans to hire an editor this summer; he or she will be expected to produce a draft of revised Part I by the end of the year for comment by the JSC, and then by the constituent bodies. It was announced that CC:DA members and liaisons would be able to share this document with their communities, so Maxwell will forward it on to BSC when it becomes available. It is critical that BSC members examine this document and following AACR3 documents so that their comments and opinions can be heard and make their way back to the JSC.

In other CC:DA news, the 2004 revision package will be published this summer; there will also be a 2005 revision package. It is expected that this will be the last revision package before the publication of AACR3.

### **8. Thesauri.**

Russell announced that there were no new terms to be discussed, although some are being worked on for Midwinter 2005. Nelsen has investigated three software products for use in creating an online version of the RBMS thesauri. When asked if ACRL had given permission for electronic publication of these thesauri, Leslie responded that Hugh Thompson had verbally agreed. Tabb confirmed that he has an email from Thompson in which permission is granted, which he will send to Russell.

### **9. Early music cataloging rules.**

Fletcher was not present to report. Maxwell reported that work is progressing, and that a new draft is available.

### **10. Preconference seminars.**

**2004, New Haven.** "Cataloging Manuscript Music," Karen Spicher, Yale University, organizer and moderator. The seminar given in New Haven on music manuscripts went very well, and received good feedback that will be incorporated into the rules currently in development.

**2005, St. Louis.** "Digital reproductions: authenticity, cataloging and the impact of initiatives on cataloging departments," Ann Copeland, Pennsylvania State University, organizer and moderator. Copeland reported that the proposal has been accepted. The topic is the impact of digital projects on cataloging departments, both in terms of workflow and standards. Two speakers, Nicole Bouché of Yale University will give an overview, and Genie Guerard of UCLA has agreed to speak. The group is currently working to identify a third speaker. Anyone with suggestions should email Copeland.

**2005, St. Louis,** "*Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern Manuscripts: A Workshop,*" Gregory Pass, St Louis University, instructor.

Pass distributed a proposal for a workshop at the 2005 preconference for teaching AMREMM. It would be similar to the workshop Pass led in Chicago, except the rules have been published in the meantime. He asked if the BSC would sponsor this workshop and the proposal passed unanimously. The workshop fee will be \$100 as it had been in Chicago, to cover the expenses of reproduction, including color photocopying.

2006, Fisher reported that the group working on a seminar proposal for the 2006 (Austin) preconference would be drafting a formal proposal for review at Midwinter.

Leslie asked for suggestions for future BSC sponsored workshops and seminars. A workshop on each of the various DCRM modules as they become available was suggested, as well as a repeat of the Latin-cataloging workshop. Leslie mentioned that a seminar proposal that never made it out of the idea phase was a seminar on the administrative and physical placement of catalogers in special collections. She feels that there is still interest in this topic, and would like anyone interested in working on a proposal to contact her via email.

#### **11. DCRM(B) gamma discussion.**

[www.folger.edu/bsc/dcrb/dcrmbgamma20040607cleancopy.pdf](http://www.folger.edu/bsc/dcrb/dcrmbgamma20040607cleancopy.pdf)

[www.folger.edu/bsc/dcrb/DCRMBGammaDiscussionQuestions2004.2.doc](http://www.folger.edu/bsc/dcrb/DCRMBGammaDiscussionQuestions2004.2.doc)

Manon Th  roux, DCRM(B) editorial group leader, prepared the discussion notes.

#### **General Questions**

**MARC.** Do we need to state that we have intentionally written the rules to be independent of MARC? Area 7 is especially problematic; the rules instruct us to preface notes with labels such as "References" or "Contents" but MARC is designed to automatically generate the labels through use of specific numeric tags. Comments on DCRB-L have indicated some discomfort with current instructions. If we do need to acknowledge the MARC problem, where would be most appropriate? In the Preface? Do we need another Principle? Should we make a distinction between the rules proper and the appendices (noting that the appendices may reference MARC)? Would it be better to simply insert footnotes in Area 7 as appropriate and remind the cataloger that the label is not needed if using MARC? (This and following paragraphs formatted thus are copied from the discussion questions.)

Leslie noted that originally these rules were going to be formatted in MARC, but the group had been persuaded away from this at the DCRM conference. She asked if the reasoning for this decision needs to be explicitly stated anywhere in the rules. There was no consensus as to whether this decision should be noted, or if so, whether the preliminaries or footnotes would be preferable. Th  roux asked if anyone had a problem with the fact that examples in the appendices use MARC, particularly the collection-level cataloging appendix. There was no objection to these examples, as the appendices are separate from the text and are not considered rules per se.

**Formatting.** The Editorial Team are tentatively planning to change formatting to make all paragraphs left-justified rather than indented and to use hanging indents for all examples. Reactions?

Thérroux asked the group several questions regarding the format of the document. For instance, whether to make the paragraphs left-justified rather than indented. There is some difficulty in smoothly relating examples to the paragraphs they are associated with. Leslie advocates a re-numbering scheme so that each paragraph would have its own number, for ease of reference ; Thérroux would like feedback on that as well. Anyone with comments or opinions on formatting should send them to DCRM-L.

**Organization.** Appendices A and B could be combined to form a new Pre-Cataloging Decisions section that would come between the Objectives & Principles section and Area O. Would this be preferable or do people like having the two sections in separate appendices?

The majority opinion was in favor of having these discussions in the prefatory material. Leslie suggested that perhaps some of it could be rewritten to lay out issues and give default advice. The main argument in favor of moving this information to the prefatory materials is that it might be more useful for the novice or occasional rare book cataloger to open the rules and find this information more easily. One argument against moving it to the front was that long prefatory sections could just as easily be daunting to the novice or occasional rare book cataloger.

**Terminology.** The Objectives & Principles section relies on FRBR concepts and terminology much more heavily than the remainder of the rules, which tend to use traditional bibliographic language (edition, issue, impression, state) and AACR2 language (edition). Are there ways to better integrate these sometimes overlapping concepts and terms? Do we need to better incorporate FRBR terminology throughout the rules?

Copeland mentioned that better integration might make the rules clearer to administrators and non-catalogers. Leslie asked for comments, specifically comments on the terminology used in the principles and objectives, to be emailed to DCRM-L.

**Headings.** Do we need to explicitly state that DCRM(B) rules do not include rules for headings (with the exception of some mention in Appendix E)? If so, where? Preface? Principles?

Some suggested providing an appendix on headings, but most agreed that the purpose of these rules does not extend to access points. Thérroux would like to see this specifically mentioned somewhere in the text, and the group agreed that the scope and purpose was the best place to put this statement.

## **Objectives & Principles**

**Monographic Focus.** Is the section too monograph-specific? Do we want one statement of principles that will apply equally to all DCRM modules or is it okay for the statement of principles to vary somewhat from module to module?

Smith noted that the terms “rare materials” and “rare monographs” are used interchangeably and suggested that one term be chosen to avoid confusion. Overall the group agreed that these rules were being written specifically for rare, printed books and that the terminology should unequivocally reflect this. Also, some liked the idea of format-specific objectives in each module of DCRM.

**Principle 5.** Can we really claim that the rules follow AACR2 text verbatim when existing AACR2 rules are adequate for cataloging rare materials? Not sure this is always true and AACR2 is dynamic rather than static. Should we soften this principle?

Leslie noted that currently the rules claim to follow AACR2 text verbatim, but she questioned keeping this statement since it is not strictly true; moreover, AACR is dynamic. Creider suggested that rules are meant to “conform” to AACR rather than be “verbatim”. Brandt suggested referring to “AACR” instead of “AACR2,” since the AACR Joint Steering Committee is now talking about publishing AACR3.

## Area 0

**OH. 3rd par.** David Woodruff suggested that LCRI 25.1 might be a better reference than LCRI 1.0E. I have added both LCRIs for now, pending closer review. Any thoughts?

Leslie suggested preferring 25.1, which refers specifically to title access. Maxwell argued that 25.1 is dealing with uniform title access, which is not the topic of OH. The editorial group will consider this question further.

**OJ2.** Restored phrase "in continuance of the manuscript tradition" because didn't want the cataloger to think that apostrophes in modern contractions and periods in abbreviations should be replaced with missing letters supplied in square brackets. Comments? Is there a better way to express this?

The group agreed to reinstate that phrase as is.

## Area 1

**1F2. example.** David Woodruff has questioned whether "dilantino" and "lamorte" have been transcribed correctly without internal spaces. Do we need instructions in area 0 on whether to insert spaces not present in the source?

Instructions elsewhere have catalogers separate words that are separate. The group discussed the various issues this example brings up, such as spacing irregularities and cataloger language expertise. These are only two examples of issues that affect the cataloger’s decision in transcribing. Leslie stated that the rules should not get into hand-holding, but noted that perhaps the examples could make a distinction between an ambiguous case and a case where two words are clearly being represented as one. Creider suggested that the editorial board spend 15 minutes trying to construct the examples to meet most needs, and if it cannot be done in that time to give up. This is an issue that has come up before and the group has never

reached a consensus in how to satisfy all levels of catalogers. Leslie will scan and send out examples of words with ambiguous spacing she would like people to look at the examples and decide what the appropriate transcription would be.

## Area 2

**2C1 and 2C3.** Instructs not to treat a statement that doesn't name a person or body as a statement of responsibility. Does not follow same approach as 1E12. Is this a problem or is it okay to have two different models for two different areas (note: the instructions follow AACR2).

Currently, the cataloger should consider a statement a statement of responsibility for the edition area if it shows some kind of action, even if particular responsibility is not identified. This is in line with AACR2. For instance "translated out of Latin into English" is considered a statement of responsibility for the edition area. Anytime there is a verb, it implies a responsible party. Some suggested deviating from AACR2 on this issue, but there is not solid rare book reason for doing so. Leslie suggested adding another example that includes a statement of responsibility in which no one is named.

**2D.** Larry Creider has pointed out that the distinction between the second example in 2C1 and the example in 2D1 is not clear (nor is the AACR2/DCRB phrase "Named Revision of an Edition"). Note that 2C1 refers to revisions from the previous edition but 2D1 refers to revisions from previous versions of the same edition. Deleted the word "named" from "Named Revision of an Edition" as it seemed to be a source of some of the confusion, though this does represent a deviation from AACR2/DCRB. Also added an editorial comment to the example in 2D1. Are the instructions in 2C1 and 2D1 any better distinguished? If not, any recommendations? Is the distinction worthwhile?

Wording change approved.

## Area 5

**5B3.** Brian Hillyard has questioned the instruction not to indicate unnumbered pages at the beginning of a sequence if the pages fall logically within the sequence (counting back to 1). He would prefer [4], 3-40 p. over [2], 40 p. especially in cases of doubt. Comments?

Leslie stated that she disagrees with this provision in cases where the numbering is not ambiguous. If you count back to one and it is in the middle of the prefatory material, it is obviously not logically in the sequence. Gillis suggested adding a second example for ambiguous paging. Most of the group has never had a problem with this rule, and there is no need to change the rules if it is not a big issue for catalogers.

**5B9.** In this draft, letterpress tables and illustrated title pages are both treated as plates if not integral; the treatment of tables does not depart from DCRB; the treatment of illustrated title pages is a departure from DCRB. Regarding the latter issue, Brian Hillyard has said: "I have re-read Bowers on all this, but I would comment (1) as influenced the change of name from BDRB to DCRB, we are not engaged in bibliographical description, and (2) even Bowers says (p.200) "On practical grounds, however, there is some reason to

differentiate engraved title-leaves, as well as frontispiece portraits or vignettes, from the ordinary plate in the body of the book" and "Nevertheless, it must be admitted that there is a certain convenience in associating an engraved title or prefixed portrait more directly with the printed sheets and in the collational formula". Bowers is concerned with collational formulae and I'm not citing him directly in support of not treating engraved title pages as plates: the point is rather that he does provide evidence for a view of engraved title leaves as standing slightly apart from "normal" leaves of plates."

Reactions? Whatever is eventually decided, the glossary definition of plate may need substantial revision; the definition should probably address both content (not necessarily illustrative?) and mechanics of construction.

The counting of letterpress tables and illustrated title pages as plates or not continues to be an issue. Leslie noted that the physical description area is accounting for the physical structure of the book, and as such there is a sense of format-ness. A folded letterpress table is not in the same format as the rest of the text, and should be considered a plate. Leslie will work on wording this rule to clarify the principle of counting text in format as text and out-of-format-ness as plates.

Leslie will repost the questions to DCRM-L and give people a chance to respond in that forum. The delta version will be out soon for comment.

Leslie announced that she would be requesting time for a public hearing a year from now.

Leslie thanked the outgoing committee members: James Larrabee, Gregory Pass, Eileen Smith, and Megan Lewis.

Meeting adjourned at 12:33

---

## Appendix A

**To:** Mary Larsgaard, chair  
Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access;  
Deborah Leslie, chair  
ACRL/RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee

**From:** Robert L. Maxwell, chair  
ALCTS/ACRL Task Force on Cataloging Rules for Early Printed Monographs

**Re:** Final Report of Task Force

At ALA Midwinter 2004, CC:DA initiated a task force to examine the cataloging rules concerning early printed monographs, AACR2 2.12–2.18. The task force was set up as a joint task force with the ACRL Rare Books and Manuscripts Section Bibliographic Standards Committee, and was given the following charge:

The Task Force on Cataloging Rules for Early Printed Monographs is charged to investigate the use of the rules for early printed monographs in chapter 2 of AACR2 and to present in its final report answers to the four major questions posed in [CC:DA/Attig/2003/4](http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/attig4.pdf) (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/attig4.pdf>):

- a. Are the special rules needed in AACR?
- b. If so, what should be the scope of the rules?
- c. Should such rules conform to either DCRM(B) or ISBD(A)?
- d. What principles should inform such rules?

This document constitutes the final report for consideration by CC:DA and BSC.

The Task Force was constituted in mid-February 2004 with the following members:

Robert L. Maxwell, Brigham Young University, chair  
Laurence S. Creider, New Mexico State University  
Robert C. W. Hall, Jr., Concord Free Public Library  
Eileen M. Heeran, University of Michigan  
M. Winslow Lundy, University of Colorado at Boulder  
Lucy Marks, Drew University Library  
Janice E. Matthiesen, University of California, Los Angeles  
R. Arvid Nelsen, University of California, San Diego  
Maria Oldal, The Pierpont Morgan Library  
Lenore Rouse, Yale University  
Brian Hillyard, National Library of Scotland, consultant

### **Preliminary Survey**

The Task Force decided that it should first undertake to try to find out who, if anyone, was using AACR2 2.12–2.18, and therefore in late March/early April 2004 sent the following query to a number of cataloging-related listservs, including ARLIS-L, ATLANTIS-L, AUTOCAT, EXLIBRIS, LIS-RAREBOOKS (UK Rare books e-mail list), MAPS-L, and PUBLIB:

A task force of ALA's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access has been asked to examine the rules in AACR2 for cataloging of early printed materials (AACR2 2.12–2.18) and make recommendations, which will be forwarded to the Joint Steering Committee. Recommendations might include revising the rules to bring them more in line with other rare cataloging standards, or elimination of the rules altogether. The task force would therefore like to hear from those in the cataloging community who use AACR2 2.12–2.18. Please contact me at (e-mail address) by (date) if you use these rules, even if only occasionally, and would be willing to respond to some brief questions about your cataloging practices regarding rare materials.

Twenty-one of the 32 respondents to the query said they use 2.12–2.18. The geographic distribution of those libraries that apply 2.12–2.18 includes 11 libraries from the United

Kingdom, eight from the United States, and one each from Ireland and Israel. Some of these use AACR2 in addition to DCRB; others use AACR2 exclusively. The main category of U.S. catalogers who used AACR2 rather than DCRB seemed to be those at libraries with few rare or pre-1801 materials, but who found the need for some “extra” descriptive conventions and perhaps did not have the expertise or staff to warrant learning the ins and outs of DCRB; there are perhaps also some U.S. libraries that are not aware of DCRB as a descriptive standard, though there was no evidence of this from the small number of responses to the survey.

## **More Detailed Survey**

During May 2004 a more detailed questionnaire was prepared for the 21 librarians who indicated that they apply 2.12–2.18 and who responded in the first survey that they would be willing to answer more questions. The full survey instrument is included in this report in an appendix.

This second survey was distributed at the end of May. Responses came from eleven libraries (4 American, 7 British) ranging in size from 13,000 to 6,000,000 volumes and cataloging from 5 to 2500 early printed monographs annually. All eleven respondents use 2.12–2.18 and eight of them also apply 2.0–2.11. Some of the libraries use a combination of other cataloging rules: DCRB (6), the CILIP Rare Books Group rules (5), or their own local rules (5). Only one library reported using 2.12–2.18 exclusively. The date of imprint was cited by ten libraries as the criterion for deciding to apply 2.12–2.18, but several libraries also noted other reasons. Nine of the respondents found that the rules in 2.12–2.18 do not fully meet their needs in the cataloging of early printed monographs. Several commented that because of that inadequacy they supplement with other rules: DCRB, the CILIP rules, or their own local rules.

When asked to identify specific rules that are insufficient and to suggest revisions, respondents mentioned eight rules by number. Perhaps the most important comments concerned rules 2.14B (alternative titles should be recorded and not omitted), 2.14C (mottoes, dedications, etc., sometimes should be recorded), 2.14E (need for examples of ‘usage of the text’ re: I/J and U/V/VV), and 2.18D (need for guidance in giving details of signatures including the description and name of special characters that are often used to sign signatures).

Respondents frequently requested more information in 2.12–2.18 on incunabula, transcription (particularly of early printed abbreviations), diacritics, and copy-specific information. More examples were also requested. Some respondents also indicated a desire for guidance on additional access points for printers or former owners, identification of thesauri for terms used in 2.17B, 2.18E, and 2.18F, and “something on genre.”

The Task Force members have concluded that they probably were unsuccessful in finding the best avenue to reach other catalogers who use rules 2.12–2.18. However, those catalogers whom the surveys did reach provided thoughtful comments concerning the relevance of the rules for early printed materials in AACR and supported retention of those rules.

## Discussion of the Questions Posed in the Charge

### A. Are special rules needed in AACR?

The Task Force believes that special rules for rare materials remain necessary in AACR for the following reasons:

1. Rare materials are for the most part cataloged following the same principles as other materials of the same format/content/mode of issuance, etc. However, because of their nature they often require somewhat more in depth treatment, which can be fairly easily summarized in the code, as currently. Non-specialist catalogers also need help interpreting the complex title pages and physical make-up that frequently characterize early materials.

2. The main specialized rare materials rules, *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials* (DCRM) (formerly *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books*), are a specifically American set of rules, authored by the ACRL Rare Books and Manuscripts Section's Bibliographic Standards Committee and published by the Library of Congress. While they are widely used outside of the United States in no way can they be said to be "official" rules elsewhere, particularly since non-U.S. constituents have little or no voice in their creation and revision.

3. The Task Force has discovered that there are catalogers within the United States who do use the AACR rare materials rules rather than DCRB, so there is a need even in the U.S. community.

### B. If so, what should be the scope of the rules?

*Level of Detail.* The Task Force recommends that the scope, defined as level of detail of the rules in AACR, remain about the same as it is currently.

*Types of Materials Covered.* However, just as DCRB is expanding its scope, as DCRM, to include all sorts of rare materials besides rare books, we recommend that the scope of the rules in AACR also be expanded to include other types of rare materials, including rare maps, music, and serials.

*Chronological Scope.* DCRM is also expanding the rare materials rules to include rules for materials produced in the post-handpress period, i.e., for materials produced throughout the 19th century and to a certain extent right up to the present. The Joint Steering Committee might want to consider expanding the chronological scope of the rare materials rules in AACR. The Task Force does not make a specific recommendation on this aspect of the scope of the rules. One consideration might be the difficulty of defining when the rare materials rules should and should not be applied, which will be fairly extensively discussed in DCRM. Such a discussion would probably not be appropriate for the level of detail of these rules in AACR, and so it might be more appropriate simply to make an arbitrary chronological cutoff, e.g., 1801, or perhaps slightly later, such as 1825.

C. Should such rules conform to either DCRM(B) or ISBD(A)?

The Task Force recommends that these rules should conform to DCRM (not necessarily only to the “B” [Books] section of DCRM), since DCRM, though not official outside the United States, is the most fully worked out and most widely used standard for rare materials cataloging. Most fully cataloged records for rare materials in shared databases conform to DCRM standards, and so it would be peculiar for records cataloged under AACR to differ substantially from DCRM records (e.g., in matters of transcription or physical description). One of the principles of the DCRM revision has been that DCRM will only depart from AACR if there is a valid rare materials reason. Therefore in making this recommendation the Task Force is not setting DCRM above AACR, but it does believe that the two standards should conform to each other as much as possible.

The Task Force does not feel the same concern about conformity to ISBD(A).

D. What principles should inform such rules?

AACR2 rules for rare and early materials should provide descriptions that are detailed enough to allow users to identify different manifestations of materials and to make a decision as to whether or not they wish to consult them. The fact that rare materials are usually kept in closed stacks makes it particularly important that the catalog record for such materials be detailed enough to act as a reliable surrogate for the item itself.

The Task Force believes that these rules should be consistent with DCRM without attempting to duplicate the latter in its entirety. It is understood that the rules should remain primarily a resource for the non-specialist cataloger who must deal with rare materials, providing sufficient guidance in those areas where additional or more precise information is mandatory (e.g., details about the physical make-up of incunabula and later printed materials). The rules should contain a caveat directing the user to the more comprehensive rules in DCRM if additional guidance is needed.

### **AACR3**

Rapid developments with respect to the third edition of AACR, particularly the possibility that a first draft of Part I might be prepared by this Fall, is of concern to the Task Force. It is important that revision of the rules for early printed monographs be included in this first draft. We would like to make the following points:

1. The rules for rare materials, including early printed monographs, should not be separated into a special section as they are now. They should, instead, be arranged as appropriate with the other rules, e.g., rules about the title and statement of responsibility area with the other rules for this area, those about the publication, distribution, etc., area with other rules for this area, etc. Most of these rules should be in the first, general,

chapter, not in a chapter about printed books, wherever that will appear in the new edition.

2. Rules applying to specific carriers (e.g., printed books, maps, scores, etc.) should be in the chapter appropriate to that carrier, e.g., rules for the physical description of early printed books should be found in the chapter that contains other rules for the physical description of printed books.
3. Similarly, rules applying to specific modes of issuance (e.g., rules for treatment of rare serials) should be in the chapter appropriate to that mode of issuance.
4. Because the Task Force has recommended that the rules for early printed monographs be revised to bring them in line with *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials*, more is needed than simple rearrangement of the current rules. (Note: The rules are in need of at least some revision even if the Joint Steering Committee does not agree that they should conform to DCRM.) Some body needs to be charged with suggesting revised language since it seems possible that the general editor of AACR3 will not be conversant with the needs of rare materials or be familiar with *DCRM*. The members of the Task Force are willing to undertake this task if the Joint Steering Committee requests.

### **The Future of the Task Force**

Although in its original charge it was anticipated that the Task Force would complete its work by Midwinter 2005 and be disbanded, it looks as though there may be more work beyond that time. At the JSC's request, the Task Force might be asked to submit suggested language to the editor of AACR3; and there is discussion of a joint CC:DA / BSC program at Annual 2006 about the relationship between DCRM and the AACR rules. Members of the Task Force have expressed their willingness to continue working, therefore, beyond the original completion date of Midwinter 2005 if CC:DA and BSC desire.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Maxwell, Chair

ALCTS/ACRL Task Force on Cataloging Rules for Early Printed Monographs

## APPENDIX

### Second (More Detailed) Survey Instrument

1. What rules do you use in the descriptive part of bibliographic records for early printed monographs? (answer all that apply)
  - 1a. AACR2 2.0-11?
  - 1b. AACR2 2.12-18?
  - 1c. Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books (DCRB)?
  - 1d. International Standard Bibliographic Description of Older Monographic Publications (Antiquarian) (ISBD(A))?
  - 1e. CILIP Rare Books Group rules (Guidelines for the Cataloguing of Rare Books)?
  - 1f. Local rules?
  - 1g. Other? (Please specify)

If you responded "b" to question 1, please answer questions 2-8. If "b" was not one of your answers to question 1, please skip to question 9.

2. Do you use AACR2 2.12-18 exclusively when you create the descriptive portion of original bibliographic records for early printed monographs?
3. If you use 2.12-18 exclusively, why did you make the decision to use those rules? (Answer all that apply)
  - 3a. Convenience of information located in AACR2?
  - 3b. Lack of availability of DCRB?
  - 3c. DCRB appears more complex than required?
  - 3d. AACR2 rules preferred to those offered by DCRB on the same topic? (specify rules)
  - 3e. Didn't know about DCRB or don't have access to it?
  - 3f. Formal decision never made, just followed AACR2?
  - 3g. Other reasons?
4. What criteria do you use to decide which materials to describe using 2.12-18?
  - 4a. Date of the imprint?
  - 4b. Subject matter?
  - 4c. Format?
  - 4d. Language?
  - 4e. Other?
5. How do your copy catalogers approach records for early printed monographs found in the bibliographic utilities?
  - 5a. Accept them as they are regardless of the code under which they were created?
  - 5b. Edit them to reflect application of 2.12-18?

5c. Accept them if they are created according to DCRB, but otherwise edit if 2.12-18 needs to be applied?

6. If you use 2.12-18, do those rules meet all of your needs in the cataloging of early printed monographs?

7. If the paragraphs in 2.12-18 do not meet your needs, what revisions or additions to those paragraphs would you find helpful?

8. If you use 2.12-18 in conjunction with DCRB, in what cases do you do so?

If you responded "a" to question 1, please answer questions 9-10.

9. Do you use the main part of AACR2 Chapter 2 (2.0-11) exclusively for the descriptive part of the bibliographic record when you originally catalog early printed monographs?

10. If you use 2.0-11, do you find the need to supplement with other rules that are more specific to early printed monographs? Which rules?

11. What type of library do you work in? academic, governmental, public, research, special, or some other type (please specify)?

12. What is the size of your library? Small, medium, or large (or give an approximate number of volumes held)?

13. How large is your collection of early printed monographic materials? (Give approximate number of volumes if possible)

14. How many early printed monographs do you catalog per year?

15. To which bibliographic utilities does your library contribute cataloging records?

16. Which online system does your library use?

17. What materials and formats do you catalog?

17a. Rare materials only?

17b. All materials and formats received by the library?

17c. Early books and non-book formats?

17d. Maps, Music, Archives, Manuscripts, Serials, Microformats, Moving image materials (videos, DVDs), electronic resources? (indicate all that are appropriate)

18. Do you have any other comments?

## Appendix B

Report on the BSC Directory of Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger submitted by  
Larry Creider, 2004.07.21

There were a number of additions and one significant deletion from the site.

I've added links to Information Resources for Early Books and Manuscripts from the Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbuettel (<http://www.hab.de/bibliothek/fachinfo/druckehss/index.htm>) (thanks to Lee Piepho), Free Online Resources for Rare Books and FORRB in and around Astronomy from the Library of the Observatory of the University of Palermo ([http://www.astropa.unipa.it/biblioteca/Rare%20books/rare\\_books.html](http://www.astropa.unipa.it/biblioteca/Rare%20books/rare_books.html)) (thanks to Deborah Leslie),

19th Century American Children's Book Trade Directory, from the American Antiquarian Society (<http://www.americanantiquarian.org/btdirectory.htm>), COPAC, a Union Catalogue of 24 British research libraries plus the British Library and the National Library of Scotland (<http://copac.ac.uk/>) (thanks again to Deborah), Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke (<http://www.gesamtkatalogderwiegendrucke.de/>), VD-16 -- Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachbereich erschienenen Drucke des 16. Jahrhunderts (<http://www.vd16.de/>), Catalogs of the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbuettel (<http://www.hab.de/bibliothek/kataloge/index-e.htm>),

the British Library Digital Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts (<http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/welcome.htm>), a digitized version of Kristeller's Latin Manuscript Books before 1600 (<http://www.mgh-bibliothek.de/kristeller/>)

Unfortunately, the Universitaetsbibliothek of the Technische Universitaet Braunschweig has removed the Saur's Biographical Indices at the Universitaetsbibliothek Braunschweig at the request of Saur. See <http://www.biblio.tu-bs.de/wbi/> Lee Piepho alerted me to the problem.