



The meeting was called to order at 8:30 am

1. Introductions of members and visitors

Members Present: Randal Brandt, University of California, Berkeley; Ann Copeland, Pennsylvania State University; Laurence Creider, New Mexico State University; Sarah Schmidt Fisher, University of Delaware; Deborah J. Leslie, Folger Shakespeare Library (chair); R. Arvid Nelsen, University of California, San Diego (intern); Jennifer O'Brien Roper, University of Maryland (secretary); Beth M. Russell, Ohio State University (thesaurus editor); Nina Schneider, New York Public Library (intern); Stephen Skuce, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Joe Springer, Mennonite Historical Library, Goshen College; Manon Th  roux, Yale University.

Liaisons Present: Jain Fletcher, University of California, Los Angeles (rare music); Jane Gillis, Yale University (rare serials); Robert Maxwell, Brigham Young University (CC:DA); Juliet McLaren, ESTC/University of California, Riverside (rare serials)

Visitors: Christopher D. Cook, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Charles Croissant, Saint Louis University; Vernica Downey, Harvard Law School; Emily Epstein, University of Colorado, Health Sciences Center; David Faulds, Emory University; Eileen Heeran, University of Michigan; Christopher Jones, University of Illinois; Nancy Kandoian, New York Public Library; James Larrabee, UC Berkeley Law Library; Windy Lundy, University of Colorado, Boulder; Jennifer MacDonald, Saint Louis University; Kate Moriarty, Saint Louis University; Margaret Nichols, Cornell University; John Overholt, Harvard University; Phyllis Payne, Boston University; Elizabeth Robinson, Library of Congress; E.C. Schroeder, Yale University; Christopher Smith, Yale University; Alex Thurman, Columbia University

2. Settlement of the agenda

The CC:DA report, agenda item 9, was moved up to item 5, to allow Maxwell to leave for another meeting.

3. Approval of Midwinter 2005 minutes

Skuce moved to approve the minutes as written. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Announcements

Brian Hillyard of the National Library of Scotland, and a participant in the 2003 DCRM(B) Conference at Yale, announced the founding of the UK Bibliographic Standards Committee, a committee of the Rare Books Group of the Chartered Institute of Library Information

Professionals (CILIP--successor to Britain's Library Association). The UK BSC has been asked to read and comment on ISBD(A) and DCRM(B).

Confusion has arisen about the process of appointing formal liaisons between the BSC and our counterpart in the Society of American Archivists (SAA). The BSC instead hopes to maintain communication with the SAA by exchanging minutes and other documents in lieu of liaison reports during meetings.

After polling interested institutions, the ARL Task Force on Exposing Hidden Collections will submit a grant proposal for funding to do inventories on like materials in a number of libraries. The subject matter has not been determined.

The MARC for Special Collections Discussion Group will hold a joint meeting with the Public Services Discussion Group. Hidden collections, the challenges of local or in-house databases, and collaboration and communication between cataloging and public services staff are among the topics on the agenda.

5. CC:DA report.

Maxwell reported that the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) has had a full agenda since Midwinter, mainly dealing with the revision of AACR2. The ALCTS/ACRL Task Force on Cataloging Rules for Early Printed Monographs commented in March on the proposed draft of part one of AACR3, and its call for continuation of rare materials rules in the code, as well as its other comments, were included in ALA's lengthy response to the Joint Steering Committee. Worldwide comment on the draft was not generally positive, and the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* (AACR) decided to adopt a radically different approach. Rather than revise the current text into AACR3, an entirely new code will be written, tentatively titled *RDA: Resource Description and Access*. The current plan is for RDA to be a content, not a display, standard, which has implications for use of ISBD punctuation: RDA as envisioned will be compatible with ISBD punctuation but will not require it. Therefore, the structure of RDA will not be tied to ISBD area; rather, it will be tied to the *Functional Requirements of Bibliographic Records* user tasks. RDA is also conceived as a web product, although the JSC promises that a print edition will also be issued. A prospectus will appear at the end of July, including an outline of the entire document and a couple of sample chapters. Tom Delsey continues as editor. A final publication is scheduled for 2008.

The general structure of RDA, as that of the defunct AACR3, is in three parts: a first part covering description; a second part covering provision of access points for persons, families (this is new), corporate bodies, and citations for related works, expressions, manifestations, and items; and a third part on authority control, including formulation of access points for persons, families, corporate bodies, and works.

BSC was interested in the addition of rules for access to family names and asked Maxwell to find out who would develop these rules. He was able to speak with ALA's JSC representative, Jennifer Bowen, later on at the conference, and she responded that Tom Delsey would draft the rules and then they would be available for comment.

For those interested in following current developments with the Joint Steering Committee, a useful web page exists with lots of materials about RDA and related matters:

<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/current.html>.

Maxwell also reported on the proposed joint BSC/CC:DA program on DCRM(B) (for Annual 2006). Mary Larsgaard, chair of CC:DA, continues to be willing to have CC:DA act as a co-sponsor in name, but because of the heavy workload on CC:DA due to RDA, she thinks that if the program is to happen BSC will need to do most of the work.

Maxwell announced that he has been appointed as a voting member of CC:DA, and that he will be replaced as ACRL liaison to CC:DA by Manon Th  roux.

#### 6. DCRM(B) discussion

Leslie announced that the epsilon draft has gone out for public review. The Cataloging Policy and Support Office (CPSO) of LC has formed a working group to respond to the draft. Leslie reminded those present of the historical development of rare book cataloging rules: the first iteration, *Bibliographic Description of Rare Books* (BDRB), had been written and published by the Library of Congress alone. The successor to BDRB, *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books*, was a collaborative effort between LC and this committee, with the final product published by LC. The latest version of these rules, DCRM(B), was initiated by this committee, and LC has agreed to act as publisher if they approve the text.

The public hearing for DCRM(B) will take place at this conference, and the editorial board hopes to hear from a variety of communities. The DCRM(B) editorial board is comprised of John Attig, Deborah J. Leslie, Bob Maxwell, Joe Springer, and Manon Th  roux as convener.

Springer and Th  roux led the DCRM(B) discussion. They invited anyone wishing to help with wordsmithing to do so via email and the listserv. For this meeting, Springer and Th  roux wanted to focus on polling the group regarding issues that have come up through the editorial process.

##### a. Digraphs/Ligatures

Digraphs were discussed in-depth on the DCRM-L. A digraph, which DCRB and LCRI 1.0E call "ligature," properly defined for our purposes is two letters representing a single speech sound printed as a single letter. The current DCRB provision on digraphs follows LCRI 1.0E, which is to separate all ligatures and all digraphs except for *  * in Anglo-Saxon, *  * in French, and *  * and *  * in Scandinavian languages. At the 2003 Beinecke DCRM(B) conference, the decision was made to transcribe such characters into their separate a, o, and e components. Since this is a controversial provision, the editors would like to re-open the question. Agreeing that all ligatured letters should be separated, should digraphs (properly defined) be 1) transcribed as separate letters; 2) transcribed as digraphs; 3) transcribed as separate letters except in the case of Anglo-Saxon, French, and modern Scandinavian (as in DCRB and the LCRI); or 4) transcribed as a digraph only in languages where a printed digraph has a different value or alphabetization than the same letters separated (specifically *  * in Danish and

Norwegian). Thérout noted that the objectives and principles for DCRM(B) state that changes to the rules would not be made unless there was a clear and compelling reason.

Several issues were broached. Although the possibility of different indexing of digraphs vis-à-vis separate letters was raised, it was largely dismissed as a problem since all or nearly all library systems index digraphs as separate characters. The French œ was discussed at length. In French, these letters are usually written as a digraph, although there is no difference of value or of alphabetization between œ and oe. This is in contrast to the æ digraph in Norwegian and Danish, which is considered a single letter and is alphabetized differently than æ. One argument for maintaining the current rule is that it follows an LCRI, so the transcription of materials cataloged using DCRM(B) would be consistent with materials represented in the catalog that did not receive DCRM(B) treatment. The results of an informal poll revealed that two votes were in favor keeping of separating all ligatures and digraphs, regardless of language; two were in favor of transcribing digraphs as digraphs; around 20 were in favor of keeping the DCRB/LCRI approach; and seven were in favor of transcribing digraphs only when the digraph is a separate letter of its own. The overriding opinion was that even though the current DCRB treatment of digraphs might not be the best one, the arguments for change are not clear and compelling.

b. Collection-level cataloging

In reviewing the collection-level guidelines in Appendix B, the editors questioned whether it would be appropriate for a cataloger to use the 040 ꝥ dcrmb in records for collections cataloged following these guidelines. Thérout noted that there are four differences between collection-level records created according to LC's Cataloging Service Bulletin no. 78 (Fall 1997) and those created according to DCRM(B). The order of notes is different; DCRM(B) explicitly requires a note stating "Collection title devised by cataloger" when appropriate; when a collection-level record must be put on separate bibliographic records due to system limitations, LC simply repeats the 260 information, whereas DCRM(B) instructs the cataloger to divide the records chronologically and reflect this in the 260; and DCRM(B) suggests using the collector's name as main entry. There are LCRI's that instruct the cataloger to supply notes in the same order that DCRM(B) has outlined, note the source of the title, and create a main entry under collector's name. The only substantive difference, then, is the information in the 260. Several questioned the guidelines for collection-level records in DCRM(B) if the use of the 040 ꝥ dcrmb would not be allowed for collection-level records created using those guidelines. Gillis noted someone working with a collection of rare materials may turn to DCRM(B) for guidance, and Fletcher added that catalogers in such cases might be making choices for access points that are more in line with DCRM(B). Russell reminded the group that collection level records are addressed in DCRM(B) in response to a need expressed from the cataloging community. A poll showed that the vast majority preferred to allow catalogers to apply the 040 ꝥ dcrmb to collection-level records created using the instructions in DCRM(B).

c. Labelling of notes in examples

The current draft precedes each example of a note in the rules using one of these four captions: *note*, *local note*, *optional note* and *optional local note*. Leslie asked the group if the rules should state, also or instead, when notes are mandatory. In a poll, fourteen people agreed with the statement that all notes in the examples should be explicitly labeled *optional* or *mandatory*; one person thought that only mandatory notes should be labeled, and eleven voted to leave the labeling of notes as it currently appears. As for preferring the terminology *mandatory* or *required*, Russell noted that in the larger metadata world, *mandatory* tends to refer to information that must be present for a record to be valid, while *required* implies that it should be included, but will not affect validity if left empty. McLaren clarified that by these definitions, *required* has the same meaning as DCRM(B)'s current usage of *mandatory if applicable*. In a poll, four preferred *mandatory*, while 15 preferred *required*.

d. 4B1

In reading the rules, the editors noticed that this rule directs the cataloger to transcribe the most prominent place as the place of publication. They found this issue to be problematic, especially in conjunction with the wording of 4B6, which instructs the cataloger to transcribe places in the order in which they appear on the source. Th  roux and Springer preferred not to discuss this issue at the meeting, but rather welcome written comments and suggestions on reconciling this issue.

e. 4D4

DCRM(B) has rationalized transcription in rare book cataloging to a greater degree, and the editorial board is looking for advice with regard to copyright statements. Currently, DCRB instructs the cataloger to type "c" followed by the year presented in the copyright statement. Often, however, early copyright statements contain more information than just the date. Currently all of this information is being silently omitted, which conflicts with the principle of transcription in this transcription field. Larrabee voiced concerns that inserting a mark of omission for omitted copyright data will render the date information unintelligible to users, suggesting that it makes more sense to bracket the date if the whole statement is not to be transcribed: the bracket will indicate that the information is not as it appears on the piece, but indicates this concept in a clearer fashion than using the mark of omission. Schneider favored transcribing the whole statement. Th  roux noted that transcription is good, unless it doesn't make sense to the user or is extremely complicated. The group engaged in a discussion of the pros and cons of transcribing versus using the mark of omission versus making no change to the rules. The majority favored extending the transcription principle to copyright statements, which would result in transcribed data with any omissions indicated by the mark of omission, while others preferred to keep the current practice. There were suggestions for steps in the middle, such as *c[opyright]* as a replacement for the copyright symbol, which is currently not part of the cataloging, typeset. Th  roux noted that there was no cohesive opinion in the group, but that the editors would carefully consider all arguments when making a decision.

f. Objectives and Principles

The editorial team has noticed that the terminology of Functional Rules for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) is used extensively in the objectives and principles to DCRM(B), but not elsewhere in the text. They would like to experiment and try to add FRBR terminology to the rules to see how that reads, and likewise try removing FRBR terminology from the objectives and principles to match the rules as currently written and see how that reads. Many felt strongly that FRBR terminology and philosophy should be used in DCRM(B). All agree the terminology should not be shoehorned in where it doesn't fit, but where appropriate bring DCRM(B) in line with current theory. Thérout and Springer asked those who are in favor of using FRBR terms to look at the rules and note places where they might be seamlessly added.

g. 0F1, Romanization

AACR2 assumes that nonroman source material was romanized by the cataloger when transcribing, thus requiring a note only when the text of source material of languages traditionally expressed in nonroman scripts is already present in romanized form. Should DCRM(B) make such an assumption? Leslie made the argument that DCRM(B) requires notes when exact transcription has been breached, such as in re-arranging the order of elements. Romanizing nonroman text is a radical manipulation by the cataloger, and therefore a note should be required whenever the cataloger has romanized any text. All but one person were in favor of requiring such a note.

h. Areas 2,4,7

If a cataloging agency would like to track printings, it would be helpful to provide the string of numbers often found on the title page verso that indicates printing number. If anyone knows the term used to denote this number string, please share it with the editors. Brandt has heard it referred to as the "number line", and will find a source for this terminology.

i. Feedback on updates in Epsilon

a. 2B1

Are the instructions on varying edition statements in a made-up set acceptable? Several questioned how a made-up set could have a common edition statement, while others argued that notes explaining that an edition statement is from the first volume could be confusing to users. There was a discussion of the use of local and universal notes for this situation. Springer suggested that the conversation continue on dcrmb-l, using the epsilon draft as a springboard to suggest changes.

b. 2B9/2C4

Instructs catalogers to transcribe parallel edition statements, rather than putting the information in a note. The group agreed with this change.

c. 5B1 Extent

The editors feel that this rule was written too much from the early book perspective. Those interested in playing with the wording should submit suggestions to dcrm-l.

- d. 5C1  
Should significant illustrations on title pages be considered illustrations in the 300 ¶b? In principle, the group was in favor of removing denial of title page illustrations, allowing for cataloger judgment, perhaps with the use of notes. Fletcher noted that this issue is important to sheet music catalogers.
- e. 5C3  
No objections to the changes in this rule.
- f. Appendix G – Early letter forms and symbols  
The group discussed the transcription of the Tironian sign as an ampersand. Leslie consulted Paul Needham, a well-known incunabulist, who recommended transcribing all “and” sigla as ampersands. One or two visitors from the manuscript tradition strongly objected to equating the Tironian ‘et’ sign with the ampersand. Springer noted that other traditions can be instructive, but should not be prescriptive when dealing with rules for print materials. In a poll, three opposed transcribing the Tironian ‘et’ sign as an ampersand, and 20 were in favor of transcribing it as an ampersand. Those who were opposed to the transcription are encouraged to address their concerns on dcrn-l, noting that any examples and arguments should be based in printed materials. Also, anyone with thoughts on transcribing the curved r-v used to create a w in early German printing is invited to send them to the list.
- g. 7B9 Treatment of nonroman signatures  
This section has been revised substantially. The main change is that nonroman characters in an alphabetic sequence will be romanized using the ALA romanization tables rather than providing English translations of the character in brackets. The editors intend to provide standard signing sequences as a basis for making compressed signature statements. However, preliminary research shows that some nonroman alphabets (especially Cyrillic languages) varied according to time period, location, and printer. The editors will continue to scrutinize these issues, and continue investigating the use of nonroman Greek, Hebrew, Russian, and Church Slavic alphabets in early printing. The group was satisfied with the general approach.
- h. Glossary  
Several people have noted that there is a problem with the definition for *wrapper*. The editorial board would appreciate suggestions to fix the perceived problem. *Integral* and *plate* now have two-part definitions, and Leslie noted that there is precedent in AACR2 for two-part definitions. Some felt that the second definition of *plate*, specifically allowing for dimensions larger or smaller than the text block, is too misleading and allows consideration of wrappers as plates. The suggestion was made to change this to “...significantly larger than the text block, i.e. folded...”

i. Pre-cataloging decisions

There are now four questions to consider, rather than six. The deleted considerations are issues of MARC versus another encoding standard, and analysis of multipart items and items issued in monographic series. The group agreed that these two questions, although part of a general pyramid of cataloging decisions, were part of larger cataloging policy decisions and not of particular relevance to rare book cataloging.

j. Appendix C

Creider questioned whether or not core-level records can be created on OCLC without labeling them as core, and several people responded that cataloging agencies can add core records to OCLC without being PCC contributors.

7. Thesaurus

Russell announced that prior to this meeting, committee members had the opportunity to test the online version of the thesauri in order to evaluate the software. Nelsen input all the data from the thesauri into the software for this test. Some proofreading and display issues still need to be worked out. The group discussed the current limitations of the hierarchical display. Nelsen tried to create some workarounds in this implementation. Russell informed the group that three software packages had been evaluated by the sub-committee, and that MultiTes offered affordability in addition to functionality. Other systems did offer collapsible hierarchy views, but they cost a great deal more. Additionally, Nelsen evaluated open source products, and found that those products were not developed enough to be fully functional. Russell and Nelsen found MultiTes to be very responsive to questions and saw some upgrades made while the product was being tested. Leslie agreed that given the money constraints, there were no competitors. Russell offered a motion to pursue the acquisition of MultiTes for the thesauri. The software will be ₺295 to purchase, with an annual maintenance fee of ₺125, which includes telephone support. The motion was seconded, and passed unanimously.

Terms:

Form terms

**Spes panel bindings**

This term has been tabled pending more discussion and research

**Rebinding**

The term passed unanimously. Final version:

Thesaurus Binding Terms

Term      Rebinding

Hierarchy [Subsequent treatment]

SN              Use for books that have had their original boards or covers removed and replaced with others, usually after resewing.

BT      [Subsequent treatment]

Warrant Roberts, M. and D. Etherington. Bookbinding and the conservation of books, a dictionary of descriptive terminology. Washington, DC : Library of Congress (1982), p. 213: "Rebinding: The more-or-less complete rehabilitation of a worn and/or damaged book, the minimum amount of work involving resewing and the attachment of new covers. ..."

### **Machine-made headbands**

Leslie questioned the use of "in imitation" in the scope note, and Russell responded that this clarifies that these headbands are often made to look like worked headbands. The term passed unanimously. Final version:

Thesaurus Binding Terms

Term Machine-made headbands

Hierarchy [Ancillary structures]

SN Use for headbands woven by machine on cloth or other type of support, often in imitation of worked headbands.

BT Stuck-on headbands

Warrant Cockerell, D. Bookbinding and the care of books, a handbook for amateurs, bookbinders & librarians... New York : D. Appleton and Co. (1902), p. 151: "Machine-made headbands can be bought by the yard."

### **Tacketed bindings**

The term passed unanimously with no discussion or changes. Final version:

Thesaurus Binding terms

Term Tacketed bindings

Hierarchy [Types of binding structures]

SN Use for bindings in which the case is attached to the text block by means of tackets, such as strips of parchment or leather thongs.

UF Tacket bindings

BT [Types of binding structures]

Warrant Hand Bookbindings: From Special Collections in the Princeton University Library (Online exhibit) : "Italian, sixteenth century tacketed binding" (and example)  
[http://libweb5.princeton.edu/visual\\_materials/hb/cases/temporary/index.html](http://libweb5.princeton.edu/visual_materials/hb/cases/temporary/index.html)

### **Unlettered bindings**

Russell noted that the scope note is trying to indicate bindings that do not contain the author or title, but may have other identifying information, such as a coat of arms. Leslie suggested not specifying the "title or author's name", but Brandt noted that this wording was based on Carter's definition. Creider suggested adding Carter to the warrant. The term passed unanimously. Final version:

Thesaurus Binding Terms

Term Unlettered bindings

Hierarchy	[Materials and treatment]
SN	Use for bindings with no title or author's name on the spine or cover.
BT	[Materials and treatment]
Warrant	John Carter, <i>ABC for book collectors</i> (1992), p. 211 "Unlettered: without any title or author's name on the spine of the binding." Matt T. Roberts and Don Etherington, <i>Bookbinding and the conservation of books</i> (1982), p. 273 : "unlettered. A book which has not been blocked or otherwise marked with identifying information on the spine or cover.

The remaining binding terms were deferred, as the committee would like to research them further before presenting them to the committee at large.

### **Zines**

This is a new term. The BT of periodical has been removed since discussion of this term in Boston, and it will now live under the conditions of publication hierarchy. Thérout questioned this move, and Russell noted that the relation to periodical cannot be kept since some zines are monographs. The scope note also leaves out mention of zines being alternative or underground publications, since an item might not self-identify as such. This will be left up to cataloger's judgment. This term will be at the same level as Alternative publications, Ephemera etc. in the hierarchy. It was approved in principle at midwinter 2005, and now the structure needs approval. The term passed unanimously. Final version:

#### Thesaurus Genre Terms

Term Zines

Hierarchy [Conditions of publication]

SN Use for independent self-publications, periodical or monographic, usually inexpensively produced and with small circulation, covering any of a wide range of topics.

NT Fanzines

BT [Conditions of publication]

Warrant Gunderloy, Mike. "Zines: where the action is: the very small press in America." *Whole Earth Review*, fall 1990, no. 38: p. 58. "I'm excited about the very small press, whether you call it the underground press, the alternative press, or simply "zines.""

### **Fanzines**

The scope note was adjusted to make this term a narrower form of zines. Thérout noted that the scope note does not mention self-publication, which she felt was a defining characteristic. Nelsen responded that the Subcommittee wanted to keep the term expanded to include glossy published works aimed at enthusiasts. The research showed that the community refers to fanzines as self-published, though. Robinson noted that the warrant states that "fanzine" is a contraction of fan magazine, and suggested that a UF be added. The term was deferred pending further research and editing.

b. Relator terms

## Subscriber

The term passed unanimously. Final version:

Term	Subscriber
SN	Use for a person who purchases or pledges to purchase an item in advance of its publication.
Warrant	Carter, ABC, 8th ed. "...expensive books, privately printed books, special copies ... or even the whole edition would sometimes be issued on subscription. Subscribers who responded to the preliminary proposal might be asked to pay part of the price in advance ... And in many cases their names would be printed, in a list of subscribers ..."

8. The preconference seminars discussion/work will be accomplished via email.

### 9. ISBD(A) Revision

Robinson reported that the ISBD(A) revision group has come across problems similar to those encountered by this committee. Such issues include retention or elimination of punctuation, usage of FRBR, and limitations of transposition. They hope to finish their work by the end of the calendar year, at which time there will be formal requests for review.

### 10. MARBI

- Proposal no. 2005-04/R: Hierarchical Geographic Names in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-04R.html>

- Proposal no. 2005-06: Addition of Subfields for Relator Terms/Codes for Subject Access to Images <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-06.html>

Leslie asked for opinions on both MARBI proposals. C. Smith had some objections to the proposal for a relator term "depicted" in 2005-06. Grammatically, it seems strange to put a relator term at the end of a verb phrase subject, when other relator terms are attached to nouns and noun phrases. He also felt that this proposal is a quick workaround to the problem. Creider questioned why the "pictorial works" subdivision cannot be used in such cases. There was no clear consensus from the group on alternate suggestions to the proposed relator term.

### 11. DCRM(M)

Fletcher reported that the group working on the rare music rules held an open meeting at the February MLA meeting, hoping to get review and comment on their draft. The manuscript aspect of the rules seems to be of most interest. They are currently working towards a public review at ALA Midwinter in San Antonio. Fletcher will notify Leslie by the fall if the group is on target to meet this goal, so that a room can be requested.

### 12. DCRM(S)

Gillis reported that she and McLaren have been waiting for DCRM(B) to reach its final form, more or less, so that the serials rules could be adjusted accordingly. Since the book rules seem to be close to final form, they will work on having a draft ready by Midwinter. Leslie

will schedule a public hearing on DCRM(S) for a year from now, at ALA Annual in New Orleans.

### 13. Closing notes

Copeland moderated a preconference seminar on the impact of digital initiatives on cataloging departments, and it was well attended.

Changes to the committee

New members: Nelsen, Schneider, Eileen Heeran, David Faulds, and Windy Lundy.  
Alex Thurman will be an intern.

Outgoing members: Sarah Fisher, Jennifer Roper, Joe Springer.

### Appendix: Directory of Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger Submitted by Laurence Creider

In addition to the regular maintenance of the site, I have added a number of links, mostly concerning early title pages and images of early manuscripts.

New Links

<http://germa83.uni-trier.de/DWB> Grimm Deutsches Woerterbuch

<http://www.pribramska.cz/knih/ruzne/Graesse/contents.html>

Graesse

<http://www.british-fiction.cf.ac.uk/> British Fiction 1800-1829 : a Database of Production, Circulation & Reception

<http://www.historicaldirectories.org/> Historical Directories—19<sup>th</sup> century commercial, trade and municipal directories

<http://emblems.let.uu.nl/emblems/html/index.html> Emblem Project Utrecht

<http://www.buchwiss.uni-erlangen.de/Projekte/Titelblatt/Vortrag/Vortrag.htm>  
Ursula Rautenberg, follow the links to the project publications.

<http://inkunabeln.ub.uni-koeln.de/titelblatt/> Das fruehe deutsche Buchtitelblatt—  
database of images of incunables with descriptions.

<http://corsair.morganlibrary.org/ICAIntro/ICAintroshortdesc.htm>

Images from the Pierpont Morgan Library's Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts

[http://digitalgallery.nypl.org/nypldigital/explore/dgexplore.cfm?topic=arts&collection=MedievalandRenaissan&col\\_id=173](http://digitalgallery.nypl.org/nypldigital/explore/dgexplore.cfm?topic=arts&collection=MedievalandRenaissan&col_id=173)

New York Public Library Digital Gallery Medieval and Renaissance Illuminated Manuscripts from Western Europe

<http://www.ceec.uni-koeln.de/> Codices Electronici Ecclesiae Coloniensis (CEEC)

<http://dig.vkol.cz/> Digital MS collection of the Research Library in Olomouc

<http://www.nls.uk/auchinleck> Auchinleck MS National Library of Scotland

Changed Links:

Princeton University Library Cataloging Documentation--  
<http://infoshare1.princeton.edu/katmandu/catman.html>

[http://www.getty.edu/research/conducting\\_research/vocabularies/ulan/index.html](http://www.getty.edu/research/conducting_research/vocabularies/ulan/index.html) --The Union List of Artist Names Browser via the Getty Research Institute

Getty Research Institute Thesaurus of Geographic Names

[http://www.getty.edu/research/conducting\\_research/vocabularies/tgn/index.html](http://www.getty.edu/research/conducting_research/vocabularies/tgn/index.html)

<http://www.landesarchiv-bw.de/piccard/start.php?id=piccard&archiv=hstas-->  
Piccard Collection of Watermarks in the Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart

<http://sdr.lib.uiowa.edu/lucile/>--Home Page for the Lucille Project by Sid Huttner

Removed Links:

Cynthia Bertelsen's Cataloging Foreign Language Materials

<http://www.vt.edu:10021/admin/international/resdev/catalog.html> Haven't been able to access since last summer.

Greek Transliteration table

<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/iasweb/catsweb/rarebook/greek.htm> Moved and can't find it.

<http://www.sil.si.edu/DigitalCollections/>--Early books digitized by the Smithsonian Institution—No longer a separate site for early books.