

TO: Mary Lynette Larsgaard, Chair, CC:DA

FROM: Mary Lynette Larsgaard and Alexander C. Thurman, Co-Chairs,
CC:DA Task Force for the Review of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)* [DCRM(B)]

RE: Final report of the CC:DA Task Force for the Review of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)* [DCRM(B)]

Following is the final report of the CC:DA Task Force for the Review of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)* [DCRM(B)].

The charge of the task force is to prepare a review of this draft document, for transmittal to CC:DA by August 22, 2005. Particular attention should be given to areas, if any, in which AACR2R and this document are not in conformance.

General Comments

Content/Arrangement

- ✓ The TF's charge includes paying particular attention to areas where DCRM(B) is not "in conformance" with AACR2R. The TF has identified numerous places where DCRM(B) rules differ from their counterparts in AACR2R in the direction of enabling "more faithful transcriptions and more accurate physical descriptions" (e.g., in 0F2, 0J, 1E5, 4B2, 6D, etc.). However, as this principle is understood to be the rationale for the existence of DCRM(B), this report does not attempt to list such variances, unless they are viewed by the TF as otherwise problematic.
- ✓ DCRM(B)'s Appendix G, and in particular its table of early letter forms and symbols, is an extremely helpful and welcome addition to DCRB. The TF passes on its compliments.
- ✓ Why is the "List of Works Cited or Consulted" at the front of DCRM(B)? The TF notes that this positioning is held over from DCRB, and that DCRB's preface describes this section as a resource for rare book catalogers. If that aspect is important maybe the title should be changed, e.g., "Works Cited and Other Resources for Rare Book Catalogers." Whatever the section is titled, it seems counter-intuitive to list Works Cited before citing them, and the TF recommends this section be placed among the final appendices so that users will not have to flip through it every time they consult the rules.
- ✓ DCRM(B) is one of several anticipated publications that will address rare book/special collections according to format, e.g., DCRM(B) for monographs,

- DCRM(S) for serials, etc. No explanation for the draft's title construction and its relation to the other planned volumes is given. Is this contextual information reserved for the Preface? If so, would it be better to include this with the related discussion of DCRM(B)'s context in the opening of the Objectives and Principles section?
- ✓ The TF believes that a concise statement of the relation of DCRM(B) to AACR2R should appear sooner than p. 12 (Principle 5), preferably in the opening paragraph of the Objectives and Principles section. Are FRBR or Svenonius's work really more significant precursors/complements to DCRM(B) than are AACR2R or DCRB? If so, their presence could be more explicit in the rules section, as there are no direct references in the rules to either these precursors or to the enumerated objectives and principles—while there are references made to AACR2R throughout the rules.
 - ✓ The distinction made in the Objectives section between rare and general materials is sufficiently clear. But the repeatedly used corollary phrases, “general cataloging rules” and “general cataloging codes,” are harder to grasp. Are these phrases simply a substitute for ‘AACR2R’ or for ‘AACR2R’s cataloging rules for general materials?’ Or do they also allude to other English language-community “general cataloging codes” now in use that catalogers and administrators might set aside in order to adopt DCRM(B)? If the latter, a footnote citing this set of codes would be useful. If the former, why not address AACR2R directly? Either way, what is intended by “general cataloging rules” needs clarification.
 - ✓ The TF appreciates the theoretical effort embodied by DCRM(B)'s statement of objectives and principles, but feels this material would resonate more deeply if it were made more concise and better integrated into everything that follows. For example, the first paragraph of the Principles section alludes to six DCRM(B) principles, then enumerates four principles and three sub-principles from Svenonius. The seven Svenonius concepts receive no further elaboration. The TF suggests that this paragraph and the subsequent DCRM(B) six principle statements would be more reader-friendly if at least all mention of the Svenonius sub-principles were removed. This paragraph could then end more forcefully: “influenced by the general principles ... offered by Svenonius: user convenience; representation; sufficiency and necessity; standardization; and integration.”
 - ✓ Within each of the Principles (p. 11-13), a tieback to a specific “user objective” is made. Earlier (p. 9), these objectives were identified as “DCRM(B) objectives”—for consistency and clarity could that term be maintained here rather than the ambiguous phrase “user objective?”
 - ✓ The “Pre-Cataloging Decisions” section makes no specific reference to any of the preceding Principles and Objectives. The TF notes that frequent reference back to the Principles and/or Objectives within the rules section would likely make the rules wordier and less user-friendly. However, if the Principles and Objectives are

to “pay their way” as an integral part of DCRM(B) perhaps they should be incorporated into the Pre-Cataloging Decisions.

For example, choosing to catalog a collection with item-level cataloging presumably fulfills Principles 1-4 much more fully than would relying solely on a single collection-level record. However, the ensuing discussion of “collection-level vs. item-level description” (p. 15) omits mention of the Principles and seems to presume that the meaning and benefits of item-level description are self-evident, focusing instead on collection-level description.

Finding aids are the only example of “item-level” description cited; however, the term “finding aid” is inescapably associated with archival description, and the TF advises strongly against its use in DCRM(B). Archival finding aids are notable for their wealth of collection-level contextual information about a collection’s creators, provenance, etc., not for item-level description. A single item in a collection may be cited in a finding aid’s folder or box list, but this is not comparable to the description a bibliographic record would provide.

The TF recommends reversing the section heading such that “item-level” description appears first, and adding a short paragraph outlining the benefits and demands of item-level description (ideally with reference to the relevant Principles) before moving into the discussion of collection-level description. Choosing to rely on collection-level records effectively means cataloging using Appendix B instead of the DCRM(B) rules—this section does not make this important fact sufficiently clear.

- ✓ The TF believes that DCRM(B)’s frequent use of the phrase “if desired” to identify optional provisions is less clear and less user-friendly than the italicized “*Optionally*” found in AACR2R. The italicized “*Optionally*” also appears sporadically in DCRM(B) (e.g., p. 27, 82, 88), as well as “if it is considered important,” and “alternatively,” raising the issue of consistency. Is there a distinct principle governing these different wordings? If so, providing it in a note would be helpful. The TF applauds the fact that examples illustrating optional practices in DCRM(B) are usually labeled as such, and prefers consistent use of “*Optionally*” over “if desired” et al. AACR2R (0.7) and DACS (p. 4) have valuable preliminary rules describing the difference between “options” and “alternatives”; a similar section in DRCM(B) would be welcome.
- ✓ The coexistence in DCRM(B) of the terms “mandatory” and “required” is confusing. The TF recommends the consistent use of one of the terms. “Required” is preferable, but the repeated use of the phrase “mandatory if applicable” in the PCC/BIBCO documentation alluded to in Appendix C likely means that for consistency’s sake “mandatory” is unavoidable. AACR2R, by comparison, rarely uses either term, relying instead on prominently labeled optional rules, with the default assumption that if an instruction isn’t so labeled then it is to be followed whenever applicable.

- ✓ The TF recognizes that Appendix A exists to provide guidance for coding records that vary “in some aspect from that of a full-level, standard AACR 2/DCRM(B) record.” But the effect of the numbered and bolded subheads is to suggest a comprehensive guide to the use of the dcrmb code, and the absence of a section labeled “Full-level DCRM(B)” is notable. The TF recommends simply providing such a comprehensive guide—cutting out the 3rd and 4th sentences of the 1st paragraph and the 1st and 2nd sentences of the 2nd paragraph, and adding a brief blurb on DCRM(B) full level.

Further, the numeration accompanying the subheads in Appendix A is not meaningful, and is potentially confusing in the context of the fixed field values being discussed—perhaps the numbers should go. (If such a change is made to subhead presentation, though, it should be done in the context of rationalizing the style across all appendices.)

- ✓ Appendix B’s extensive use of the language of archival arrangement and description (particularly the heavy reliance on the term “finding aid”) for avowedly non-archival practices is quite confusing. TF believes that if such a guide to collection-level cataloging is to be included, it should limit itself to cataloging; arrangement of materials and their description by finding aids as discussed in subsections B and C are archival matters best left to the sources named on p. 122. The TF strongly feels that the term “finding aid” refers unavoidably to the central tool of archival description; using this term to describe an “item-level” supplement to a collection-level bibliographic record for ‘non-archival’ materials is not advisable.
- ✓ The Glossary is not marked as one of the appendices, though the glossaries are so marked in DCRB and AACR2R. For consistency, the Glossary should be a lettered as an Appendix as well.
- ✓ In DCRB, Appendix F provides a “Concordance Between Rules in DCRB and AACR2.” The TF would like to see the correspondences between rules in DCRM(B) and AACR2R included in this draft—either by way of an appendix, or in parenthetical or marginal notes within the rules themselves.

Style

- ✓ AACR2 rule 0.2 cites *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary* as its authority for choosing between British/American spelling and vocabulary variations. DCRM(B) evidently uses “American” spelling and vocabulary but does not say this explicitly.
- ✓ DCRM(B) consistently refers to “AACR 2.” AACR2 refers to itself without a space before the 2 (in its footer, for example). Further, since DCRM(B) describes

itself as based on the 2002 Revision of AACR2 (p. 20), it might be preferable to use the acronym AACR2R.

- ✓ DCRM(B) consistently abbreviates centimeters as “cm,” and millimeters as “mm,” without a period at the end. AACR2R always includes a period with these abbreviations.
- ✓ Subheads in the “Objectives and Principles” and “Pre-Cataloging Decisions” sections are in title case (p. 11, “Principles for Construction of DCRM(B)”), while subheads in the rules section are in sentence case (p. 20, “Scope and purpose”). Is there any reason not to make them consistent?
- ✓ The inconsistent treatment of internal structure and layout among the different appendices makes them more difficult to scan, understand, and use. Here is a brief indication of the current inconsistency:

Appendix A has numbered subheads in sentence case

1. Collection-level DCRM(B)

Appendix B has lettered subheads in all capitals

A. INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

Appendix C has subheads based on MARC record areas/tags in title case

Variable Control Fields:001, 003, 005

1XX (Main Entry)

Appendix D and E have no subheads

Appendix F has subheads based on rule numbers with topical descriptions in sentence case

0F1. Romanized title

Also, the presentation of lists among and within the appendices varies greatly: some lists label elements with letters, others with numbers or hyphens; some lists add punctuation after each element, others don't.

The TF recommends rationalizing the internal style and layout of the appendices, and ideally doing the same for the draft as a whole (across Objectives, etc., Rules, and Appendices). The clash of layout styles across DCRM(B) suggests a combination of separately developed parts—more visual order will increase the draft's cohesiveness for users.

Specific Comments

- p. 8: There is a typo in the citation for *Type Evidence*, a reversed open parenthesis before “and updates.”
- p. 9, 2nd paragraph: The TF has several comments about this paragraph, so the following passage presents it with all suggested changes (with comments below):

The primary objectives of cataloging rare materials are no different than those of cataloging other materials. These objectives focus on meeting user needs to find, identify, select, and obtain materials. However, users of rare materials will often bring specialized requirements to these tasks that cannot be met by general cataloging rules. The following DCRM(B) objectives are designed to accommodate these important differences.

- p. 9, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence: Shorten.
- p. 9, 2nd paragraph, 2nd & 3rd sentences: FRBR reference seems decorative — these objectives long predate FRBR. Switch “needs” and “requirements” in sentences 2 and 3 to tighten the important sentence 2.
- p. 9, 2nd paragraph, 4th sentence: “Intended to account for” should be replaced with “designed to accommodate.” “Account for” has unintended sense of ‘explain.’
- p. 10, Objective 4, subhead, re: “materials whose production or presentation characteristics deviate from modern conventions.”: “Deviate” suggests that the modern conventions predated the materials, which is often not the case — “differ” would be better.
- p. 11, Principle 1, 2nd & 3rd sentences: Suggest changing “It enables distinguishing among items as well as manifestations. The principle relates to user objective 1 stated above” to “It enables the user to distinguish among items as well as manifestations, in support of DCRM(B) objective 1 stated above.” See comment on “user objectives” vs. “DCRM(B) objectives” in the general comments above.
- p. 12, Principle 5, 2nd & 3rd sentences: TF recommends trimming and combining these two sentences, changing them to “DCRM(B) is designed to guide the description of rare materials in a context in which AACR2R (often as interpreted and applied by the Library of Congress) is accepted as the common standard for the cataloging of general materials. Therefore, DCRM(B) uses ...”
- p. 12, Principle 5, 4th sentence, re: “in DCRM(B) rules, appendices, and glossaries.”: Change to: “in DCRM(B) rules, appendices, and glossary entries.”
- p. 12, Principle 5, 6th sentence: re: “Numbering of areas within DCRM(B) conforms to the structure of *ISBD* as implemented in AACR 2.”: The TF suggests inserting an example of a numbered area after “DCRM(B),” such as “(e.g., Area 1, Title and Statement of Responsibility Area).” Also, why are “*ISBD*” and one mention of “AACR 2” in the following sentence italicized, in a paragraph where DCRM(B), AACR2, and ISBD(A) appear often without italics? And shouldn’t this first reference to the source of AACR2’s area numbering and naming actually be to “ISBD(G)”?

- p. 13, Principle 5, final sentence: The distinction here between a “standard” and a “cataloging code” is potentially confusing. AACR2R, ISBD(A), and DCRM(B) are all content standards. Introducing the ad hoc term “cataloging code” here is unnecessary — the TF recommends simply omitting this final sentence.
- p. 13, Principle 6, 2nd sentence: A clear statement of the relationship of DCRM(B) to DCRB would be helpful. Recommend adding a sentence on that before a revised version of the current second sentence, e.g., “DCRM(B) is a revision of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books* (DCRB). DCRM(B) will introduce changes to DCRB cataloging practices only after careful consideration.”
- p. 14, Pre-Cataloging, 1st paragraph, 1st sentence: Suggest shortening to: “Catalogers of special collections materials have several decisions to make before beginning to create a bibliographic record.”
- p. 14, Pre-Cataloging, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence: re: “and determining the extent to which various options in the rules will be exercised.”: Suggest change to: “and identifying which optional instructions in the chosen rule code will be adopted.” More specific, avoids repetition of “determining.”
- p. 14, Pre-Cataloging, 3rd paragraph, 1st sentence: Remove both commas.
- p. 14, Pre-Cataloging, 4th paragraph, 5th sentence, re: “A mechanism for easily making exceptions to cataloging policy is desirable as well.”: Suggest change to: “Standard cataloging policy should be sufficiently flexible to allow for outstanding features to be highlighted in particular situations.”
- p. 15-17, Decisions subheads: Suggest replacing “vs.” with “or” in all 4 subheads, moving “DCRM(B)” to the front of subhead 3, and forming all subheads consistently. Resulting subheads would be:
- 1) *Description: Item-Level or Collection-Level*
 - 2) *Cataloging Code: AACR2R or DCRM(B)*
 - 3) *DCRM(B) Encoding Level: Minimal, Core, or Full*
 - 4) *Bibliographic Variants: Single Record or Multiple Records*
- p. 15, Decision 1, 2nd paragraph, re: “The lack of specificity can be ameliorated through provision of some sort of item-level specific control, such as a finding aid, and is highly recommended.” Replace “ameliorated” with “addressed” and replace “and” with “which.” Reconsider whether “finding aid” is an appropriate example here, per the discussion of this section in the “General” comments above.
- p. 15, Decision 1, 3rd paragraph: Combine sentences 1 and 2 for greater concision: “A combination approach for a collection of items might entail individual cataloging of all or selected items in addition to the creation of a collection-level record for the whole.”

- p. 15, Decision 2, 1st paragraph, re: “Both codes contain an array of optional rules ...”:
Change to: “Both codes contain optional rules ...”
- p. 15, Decision 2, 2nd paragraph, re: “AACR 2 is generally considered to be easier and quicker to apply than DCRM(B).”: This is vague, and premature — DCRM(B) hasn’t yet been released for general use and comparison against AACR2R. Moreover, sometimes the converse is true. Suggest replacing this sentence with: “Due to its less comprehensive transcription of some details, AACR2R may be easier and quicker to apply than DCRM(B). The converse can also be true; DCRM(B)’s direct transcription can be easier and faster than identifying and applying the abbreviations and omissions required by AACR2R.”
- p. 16, Decision 3, italicized opening words of each paragraph: Delete the hyphens from the noun phrases naming specific encoding levels that open the 3 main paragraphs in this section. Also remove hyphen in 1st paragraph, “DCRM(B) minimal-level may be suitable...” When “minimal-level” or “core-level” or “full-level” appear as adjectival phrases modifying a noun (e.g., “record” or “description”) they need hyphens; but “*DCRM(B) minimal level*,” “*DCRM(B) core level*,” and “*DCRM(B) full level*” as used here are noun phrases and thus shouldn’t have hyphens.
- p. 16, Decision 3, 2nd paragraph, 4th sentence, re: “...or when particular language expertise among current cataloging staff is insufficient for proper subject analysis.”: Suggest change to: “or when the language expertise required for adequate subject analysis is not available.”
- p. 16, Decision 3, 4th paragraph, re: “DCRM(B) full-level represents the normative application of these rules, yet encompasses a range of potential levels of detail.”: Suggest change to: “DCRM(B) full level represents the normative application of these rules, yet also allows for varying levels of detail.” “Normative” is vague, however.
- p. 16, Decision 3, 4th paragraph, re: “Aside from mandatory notes ..., the bulk of the notes are optional”: Change to: “Though there are some mandatory notes ..., most notes are optional.”
- p. 17, Decision 3, top sentence, re: “or the peculiar attributes of the item in hand.”:
Change “peculiar” to “particular.”
- p. 17, Decision 3, 1st full paragraph, last sentence, re: “access by literary genre ... or physical characteristics.”: Change to: “access by literary genre ... or by physical characteristics.”
- p. 17, Decision 4, 2nd paragraph, 3rd sentence, re: “The cataloger must be consistent in applying these alternative rules to all areas of the description once the decision has been made to apply them.”: Suggest change to: “Once the decision has been

made to apply the alternative rules, the cataloger must then be consistent in applying them to all areas of the description.”

- p. 17, Factors subhead, re: “Factors To Consider In Making These Decisions.”: Suggest change to: “Factors To Consider In Making Pre-Cataloging Decisions.”
- p. 17, Factor 1, 1st sentence, re: “to the institution’s mission and user group needs.”: Change to: “to the institution’s mission and the needs of its users.”
- p. 18, Factor 4, 2nd sentence, re: “Is current staff able ...”: Change to: “Are staff able.” “Current” already appears in previous sentence.
- p. 18, Factor 4, 4th sentence, re: “Is current staff expertise in languages, subject areas, descriptive standards, or encoding standards adequate for implementing and/or completing proposed work plans?”: Change to: “Is current staff expertise in languages, subject areas, descriptive standards, and/or encoding standards adequate for ongoing or proposed work plans?”
- p. 20, 0A, end of 1st paragraph, re: “and other materials produced in the modern era.”: “Modern era” is not ideal for describing period in question — the TF suggests “and other contemporary materials” instead.
- p. 20, 0A, top of 2nd paragraph, re: “the cataloging of the usual modern book.”: Suggest change to: “the cataloging of typical modern books” or “the cataloging of typical machine-press books.”
- p. 20, 0A, 2nd sentence of 2nd paragraph, re: “These details are important”: Suggest change to: “Such details may be important.” Also suggest combining last two sentences of ¶ by adding colon after “reasons” and semi-colon after “issues”).
- p. 21, 0A, 4th paragraph, re: “Consult the relevant sections of AACR 2 for rules ...”: The TF notes that DCRM(B) in Appendix F goes into detail about added title access. Since the primary source in “general cataloging” for rules about title added access seems to be the LCRI for AACR2R rule 21.30J, should the LCRI be cited in this paragraph and/or in Appendix F? Further, Appendix F describes situations where added title access is mandatory; there needs to be a pointer early in the “general rules” and again in the Area 1 rules, telling users that Appendix F contains “mandatory” instructions about title access.
- p. 21, 0B2, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence, re: “make a note indicating the description is based on an imperfect copy.”: Add “that” after “indicating.”
- p. 23, 0D: “Area 3. Material (or type of publication) specific details” should be included in the Area column of the list of prescribed sources of information, along with a bracketed explanation in the Prescribed Sources column such as: “[Not used for

- printed monographs].” Alternatively, a sentence or note should follow the list explaining the absence of Area 3 — but Area 3 shouldn’t be omitted silently.
- p. 26, 0F, list after 1st paragraph, re: “Publication, Distribution, etc.”: Change to “Publication, distribution, etc.”
- p. 27, 0F3, footnote 4, re: “Transcribe virgules as commas.”: Add virgule symbol, resulting in: “Transcribe a virgule (/) as a comma.”
- p. 28, 0F3, 3rd paragraph, re: “replace them by a dash.”: Change to: “replace them with a dash.”
- p. 29, 0F4, 2nd paragraph, re: “the form of title with the words closed up.” Suggest change to: “the form of title as it appears on the item, without the spaces.”
- p. 38, 1B7, 1st paragraph: The rule instructs, “Never abridge the title proper before the sixth word except in certain cases involving an alternative title.” One such case follows, but it’s not clear how many other cases there are and where one would look to find them enumerated.
- p. 45, 1F1, 2nd paragraph: “If the individual works are by different persons or bodies ... unless a linking word or phrase is already present.” An example with a linking word or phrase would be helpful.
- p. 47, 1G5, 2nd sentence, re: “title proper, other title information, or statement of responsibility.”: Change “or” to “and/or.”
- p. 59, 4A4, 1st sentence, re: “nonetheless transcribe it.”: Change to: “transcribe it nonetheless.”
- p. 62, 4B4, 1st sentence, re: “Supply the name of the country, state, province, etc. ... ”: Change to: “Supply in square brackets the name of the country, state, province, etc. ...”
- p. 63, 4B5, re: “... supply the full form or complete the name.”: Change to: “supply in square brackets the full form or complete the name.”
- p. 64, 4B10, 1st paragraph: Add comma after “body.”
- p. 64, 4B10, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence, re: “If considered necessary for identification, also supply the modern place name and the name of the larger jurisdiction.”: Add “in square brackets” after “supply.”
- p. 65, 4B13: Examples would be helpful.
- p. 65, 4C1, 1st sentence, re: “Transcribe the names of publishers, distributors, and booksellers, together with associated information concerning their places of activity, as part of this element.”: Would not place only be transcribed as part of

- this element if grammatically inseparable? If so, then if place is to be mentioned here it should include that qualifier, even though place is the explicit subject of 4C3. Suggest change to: “Transcribe the names of publishers, distributors, and booksellers, together with grammatically inseparable information concerning their places of activity ...”
- p. 69, 4D2, Roman numerals: The TF had mixed responses to the rule change requiring the transcription of dates in roman numerals as they appear. The majority agreed with the change, while a minority preferred keeping roman numeral transcription optional as in DCRB, particularly for cases with date ranges such as the second example in 4D7.
- p. 72-73, 4D4: Given DCRM(B)’s stated rationale of allowing for more complete transcriptions, the TF doesn’t understand why 4D4 limits the transcription of copyright dates in Area 4 to cases where a date of publication, distribution, etc. is not present in the source. If the cataloger wishes to include both the publication date and the copyright date in Area 4, why not have an option allowing this choice, rather than limiting the transcription of the copyright date to a note?
- p. 74, 4D7, re: “and connect them by a hyphen.”: Change to: “and connect them with a hyphen.”
- p. 77 & 86, subheads: The subheads “PUBLICATIONS IN ONE PHYSICAL UNIT” and “PUBLICATIONS IN MORE THAN ONE PHYSICAL UNIT” are in all caps and appear to be in the same font as the general Area Header (5. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION AREA). This use of all caps subheads does not appear elsewhere in the rules; change subheads to sentence case in a font smaller than the Area Header.
- p. 83, 5B8: The TF supports DCRM(B)’s priority of allowing detailed physical description. It does seem excessive to force the cataloger to always “count all blank pages or leaves” in the case of lengthy unpaginated/unfoliated volumes. The TF feels there should be an option to use an estimated page count followed by a question mark for these situations (“[1080?] p.”), perhaps kicking in after a designated number of pages. Requiring catalogers to manually count hundreds of pages hardly guarantees an accurate result, and increases wear and tear on fragile items.
- p. 84, 5B9, re: “Treat title pages that are not integral to letterpress gatherings ... as leaves or pages of plates.”: Does this also apply to frontispieces that are not integral to letterpress? If so, can “and frontispieces” be added after “title pages?”
- p. 85, 5B13, re: “If adding a statement of pagination or foliation, place it in parentheses following the designation.”: Why isn’t the distinction between numbered and unnumbered pagination/foliation mentioned here or in the given example? Pages

- in a portfolio could be numbered or unnumbered. Suggest adding an example with unnumbered pagination or foliation.
- p. 91, 5D4, 1st & 2nd sentences: Combine first two sentences to avoid repetition. Change to: “For a single-sheet publication issued unfolded, give the height followed by the width, separated by a multiplication sign.”
- p. 96, 6F, re: “If the ... ISSN of a series appears in the publication and is considered important by the cataloging agency, transcribe it in the series area.” TF believes the ISSN is always important and should be transcribed if present. Change to: “If the ... ISSN of a series appears in the publication, transcribe it in the series area.”
- p. 98, 7A1, 4th paragraph, re: “to justify added entries intended for special files of personal names, titles, genres/forms, physical characteristics, provenance, etc.”: Add “or corporate” after “personal.” Some publisher added entries are for corporate bodies, for example.
- p. 99, 7A1, 5th paragraph & footnote 16, re: “In general, notes are not mandatory, but some notes are required in particular situations ...”: Contrasting “mandatory” and “required” in the same sentence is confusing. Change to: “Some notes are mandatory in particular situations ...”
- p. 100, 7A4, formal notes, re: “or when their use gives economy of space without loss of clarity.” 7A4 is taken verbatim from AACR2R 1.7A3 except that DCRM(B) substitutes “gives” for AACR2R’s “provides.” “Provides” is better.
- p. 100, 7B, 1st sentence, re: “A general outline of types of notes follows; other notes than those provided for may be made if desired.”: Replace with: “Here are some of the most common types of notes.”
- p. 100, 7B, 4th sentence, re: “regardless of the order it is listed here.”: Change to: “regardless of its order in this list.”
- p. 102, 7B6, source of statement of responsibility, 1st sentence, re: “If the statement of responsibility ... appears in a source other than the title page.”: Change to: “If the statement of responsibility ... is taken from a source other than the title page.”
- p. 102, 7B6, source of statement of responsibility, 2nd sentence, re: “If a statement of responsibility appears in the item but outside the sources for the statement of responsibility.”: Add “prescribed” before “sources.”
- p. 106, 7B9, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence, re: “Give these details generally according to Gaskell’s formula.” Why “generally?” Suggest omitting “generally.”
- p. 107, 7B9, 5th paragraph: Including an example using chi would be helpful here. Also, having an example with an incomplete gathering somewhere in 7B9 would be good.

- p. 110, 7B13, 1st paragraph, re: “give the designation of the thesis.”: Change to: “give in parentheses the designation of the thesis.”
- p. 111, 7B14: Add examples showing that citations of volume and page numeration should be preceded by commas, e.g., “Lowndes, p. 809” and “BM 15th cent., VI, p. 53.”
- p. 113, 7B19, elements list: The continuous punctuation of this list (and the one on p. 141) is odd. Delete semicolons after list entries a) and b), delete “; and” after c) and delete period after d). Replace semi-colons within entries a) and b) with em dashes.
- p. 119, Appendix A, special collections cataloging, re: “DCRM(B) rules 5B1-5D5 or AACR2 rules 2.5B-2.5D.”: This draft of DCRM(B) does not contain a rule 5D5.
- p. 134, Appendix C: The circumstances described in the second paragraph for when the use of DCRM(B) core level would be appropriate — “when faithful and accurate descriptions are desirable, and the provision of subject and other access points is important, but abbreviated transcriptions and fewer notes are acceptable” — are hard to pinpoint. When and where is the balance between “faithful and accurate” and “abbreviated” to be drawn? The third paragraph then seems to reiterate the benefits of DCRM(B) full level, before changing direction and recommending note omission and descriptive abbreviation for “an effective DCRM(B) core-level record.” The TF requests the addition of one or two examples of situations where DCRM(B) core level would be preferable to following either DCRM(B) full level or AACR2R core level, with reference to specific information to be omitted and why.
- p. 140, Appendix D, section 1, re: “abridge the description wherever possible as allowed by the rules.” If a principal benefit of minimal-level records is to save time and effort, then ideally this appendix would provide a list of possible abridgements.
- p. 140, Appendix D, section 2: Again, the continuous punctuation of the list of elements is odd. Also, note that the similarly punctuated list on p. 113 labels each elements with a letter, while here hyphens are used.
- p. 142, Appendix E: This appendix has two lists without punctuation between elements and one list with punctuation between elements.
- p. 142, Appendix E, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence: The TF is unsure of the value of passing references to FRBR in DCRM(B), but if working FRBR into the draft when possible is an objective, this sentence alluding to what AACR2R calls an “edition” and bibliographic scholarship calls an “issue” would seem a pertinent place for a FRBR reference. The glossary entry for the FRBR term “manifestation” points toward Appendix E. Perhaps Appendix E should address the relationship of the concepts “edition,” “issue,” and “manifestation” directly.

- p. 145, Appendix F, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence, re: “Providing additional title access in varying forms will assist users to successfully identify and locate desired resources ...”: Change to: “Providing additional title access to varying forms will assist users to identify and locate resources ...”
- p. 145, Appendix F, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence, re: “These differences in description may occur for a variety of reasons, including ...”: Add “common to rare book cataloging” after “reasons.”
- p. 145, Appendix F, 3rd paragraph, re: “The guidelines below provide explicitly for some of the specific situations that commonly arise from these rare book phenomena.”: Change to: “The guidelines below list some specific situations common to rare book cataloging wherein added title access is mandatory, followed by other situations where added title access is optional.”
- p. 149, Appendix G, tables: The TF looks forward to using both the tables in this appendix. If either or both of these tables (p. 149-150, 153-154) are going to be split over two pages in the published version of DCRM(B), can the table headers be carried over into the part of the table on the second page(s)?
- p. 151, Appendix G, Inverted roman numeral C: Since the situation described here is also known as an “apostrophus,” can this term be included in the text and/or example given?
- p. 152, Appendix G, Letters I/J and U/V, re: “a naïve observer could not tell you in abstract.”: Add “the” before “abstract.”
- p. 154, Appendix G, Letter W, 1st paragraph, 1st sentence, re: “Not to be confused with the developments of the u/v graphs is the representation of the letter w.”: Suggest change to: “The representation of the letter w is not to be confused with the developments of the u/v graphs.”
- p. 154, Appendix G, Letter W, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence, re: “The w graph was part of the alphabet for Germanic, but not for Romance languages.”: Change to: “The w graph was part of the alphabet of Germanic, but not Romance, languages.”
- p. 154, Appendix G, Letter W, 1st paragraph, 3rd sentence, re: “The bulk of the earliest printing was in Latin.”: Change to: “Most early printing was in Latin.”
- p. 156-160, Glossary: The TF would like to see the Glossary become more robust, possibly importing more terms relevant to rare materials from Carter’s *ABC for Book Collectors* or other sources. Even if limited to terms not included in AACR2R’s glossary, more could be done here. The TF had mixed feelings about including the four FRBR terms in the glossary. The majority felt it was acceptable, while a minority preferred omitting all mention of FRBR in DCRM(B) until and unless FRBR is truly integrated into the rules themselves.

Task Force Members

John Kloswick, *Michigan State University*

Mary Lynette Larsgaard, co-chair, *University of California, Santa Barbara*

Elizabeth Mangan, *retired*

Carol E. Pardo, *Columbia University*

Alexander C. Thurman, co-chair, *Columbia University*

Penny Welbourne, *Yale University*