



Bibliographic Standards Committee  
Midwinter Conference, January 1998  
New Orleans, Louisiana  
Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Robert Maxwell (Chair), Laurence S. Creider, Emily Epstein, Jane Gillis, Melinda Hayes, Juliet McLaren, Russell Martin, Richard Noble, Elizabeth Robinson, Sandra Sider, Bruce Tabb, Jerry Wager.

EXCUSED: Christine Clarke

VISITORS: John Attig, Deborah J. Leslie, Beth Russell, Margaret Nicholls, Elaine Shiner, Henry Raine, Eric Holzenberg, Elaine Franco, Cornelia King, Gregory Pass, Jain Fletcher, Betty Herman, Martha Lawler, Jeffrey Makala, Virginia Bartow, Laura Linard, Elizabeth Johnson, Joan Aliprand, Frances Allen

#### 1. SETTLEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved, with changes in the order of the discussion. Several people wanted to report on Sunday instead of Saturday.

#### 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes for the meetings held in San Francisco, CA, June 28-29, 1997 were approved by the Committee with a minor correction: In Rare Serials Module, this is a contribution to the "CONSER Cataloging Manual".

#### 3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Melinda Hayes will not be at the next meeting, the Annual Conference in Washington, D.C. She is going to Vienna for several months.

#### 4. COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS

##### a) Revision of Examples to Accompany DCRB

Hayes announced that the revision is done and ready to turn in. LC is thinking of moving the Catalogers' Desktop to the web and, if this happens, it is hoped that these Examples would be part of the Desktop. Hayes is handing over editorial control of the project to Noble, since she will be out of the country. Holzenberg reported on where we are now with electronic publication. He will be meeting with Hugh Thompson from ACRL to discuss electronic and/or web versions of several of the committee's publications. Sider volunteered to redo images, either photocopying or scanning.

Maxwell reported on Sunday of his meeting with Hugh Thompson regarding electronic publication. Thompson could not foresee any problem with putting up on the web a version of what we want. Question whether this would be for Committee members only.

b) BSC Home Page: <http://www.lib.byu.edu/~catalog/people/rlm/bsc/home.htm>

There was some discussion on how to keep the BSC Home Page up to date. Who should be responsible for it. Maxwell volunteered to keep track of what is there.

c) RBMS/BSC Resources for the Rare Materials  
Cataloger: <http://www.library.upenn.edu/ipc/index.html>

Creider, owner and creator of the Resources page, has verified links within the past week. There are some additions to the page and some changes to URLs.

He would like links to the following on the Resources page:

- Classical calendar with Roman additions
- List of common Latin abbreviations, contractions (something similar to the translation of Cappelli done several years ago by University of Kansas; a possible expansion of the Latin Place Names)
- Greek ligatures
- Pre-1960 calendar of major Catholic saints (on the web now is post Vatican 2 calendar of major saints; many saints' days were moved)
- Early printing alphabets
- Collation formula (Holzenberg added that an online formula for signatures, with illustrations that show how the paper is folded is needed and that perhaps Terry Belanger would help with it. It was thought that Belanger had begun something similar)
- Gregorian calendar adoptions site: what it is, how it works, what to do with it
- Law terms in English calendar

Assignments:

- Roman calendar - Creider
- Latin abbreviations - Need someone competent in Latin; Maxwell, Creider, and Sider will undertake project; Holzenberg will pass on lists of abbreviations.
- Greek abbreviations - Maxwell; Sider will talk to George Fletcher who also might help
- Early printing alphabets: Tabb
- Collation formula - Noble agreed to put together an overview
- Pre-1960 calendar of major Catholic saints - Wager and Creider will put up list of major feast days and then add others as time goes on.

d) Latin Place Names: <http://www.lib.byu.edu/~catalog/people/rIm/latin/names.htm>

Maxwell reported on the Latin Place Names site, which resides on the Brigham Young University server. From June through December 1997 this site got 250 to 350 hits per month. Every two to three weeks new names are sent to be added. There is still a small number of problem names. Maxwell will add new terms to the Glossary and cross references to national authority file.

## 5. DISCUSSION OF 9 JANUARY 1998 PUBLIC HEARING [See APPENDIX at end]

### a) DCRB "Core Standards for Rare Books"

Fletcher reported on her presentation at the hearing on Friday evening of the DCRB Core. She had cataloged items according to full DCRB and "Core Standard for Rare Books" and showed the two records for comparison. Attig observed that Core is about completeness of record, not about transcription. He said he could not think of any other place in any core record that gives a different transcription than the full. Wager remarked that a consistent approach for Core and DCRB is necessary but that, perhaps, we should rethink DCRB. Maxwell said that consensus was that we should leave out no. 5 (transcription issue) and rethink DCRB later. Fletcher will compile the changes; Maxwell will put the revised version, together with the examples, on the BSC home page.

### b) "Guide to Rare Books in Online Systems"

Noble reported on the presentation Friday evening regarding online systems and on the comments made there. Because of the hearing, there were some minor changes to the document (adding a paragraph about special characters). The question arose as to how to publicize this, how to get this out to vendors. Noble commented that, though the announcement was sent to several vendor lists, no vendors were present. Among places mentioned to publicize were: RBMS newsletter, USMARC list, RBML, Autocat, ACRL news. Noble will get the changes to Maxwell, who will incorporate them into the text at the BSC home page. Once this is done, Robinson volunteered to re-publicize the guide to listservs and Noble will target print publications.

## 6. MARBI LIAISON REPORT

### a) Redefinition of Archival Control

Attig reported that the redefinition of archival control that was proposed during format integration is still on hold. The code 't' was never removed. Archivists assume that all manuscript materials are under archival control. The status quo is good.

### b) MARBI Proposal 98.2

Attig reported on the proposal by Harvard to include in the USMARC Holdings Format additional note fields containing copy-specific information which are currently only available in the USMARC Bibliographic Format. These include field 541 (Immediate Source of Acquisition), field 561 (Provenance), and field 562 (Copy and Version Identification Note). Harvard had wanted to remove certain fields (e.g., where an item was bought) from the bibliographic format, but this has not happened yet. Fields 541, 561 and 562 were added to the MARC holdings record but have not been removed from the bibliographic record.

#### c) Corrected Date Code in 008/006 (Date Type)

Attig reported on MARBI Discussion Paper 106, that he and Leslie drafted, on adding a value "x" for "Corrected date and given date" in the USMARC Bibliographic Format. Currently, incorrect dates of publication, which occur frequently in early printed books, are corrected in square brackets in the 260 field, and the correct date is recorded as the date of publication in the 008/07-10 as a single date. This fails to allow retrieval by the date that actually appears on the item. Attig and Leslie explained that this proposal would allow retrieval of bibliographic records by given (incorrect) date as well as corrected date. In the examples sent with this proposal, Attig admitted he made a mistake by including a calendar correction, which is not included in this proposal. The basic proposal for single corrected dates will probably be accepted this summer. The MARBI Committee did not like corrected dates in a range of dates. Attig said field 046 was discussed as a possible solution. MARBI is expected to produce a proposal for annual.

## 7. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

### a) RBMS Thesauri

Leslie, the Committee's Thesaurus Editor, reported that her committee is still working through the many proposals that had been made in previous years. For some proposals, there is no indication as to who made the proposal. She presented nine proposals for additions to "Genre Terms" and one proposal for "Printing & Publishing" to the Committee for discussion.

The first Genre Term was "Armorial". The Scope Note was changed slightly, deleting "descriptions of". The Use For terms were changed to: Books of coats of arms, Books of heraldic arms, Coats of arms, Books of, Heraldic arms, Books of. The entry for Papworth was removed from the warrant. The Committee approved "Armorial" as a new term.

The Committee then discussed the next term, "Big little books". The scope note was changed slightly to "Use for small, thick, heavily-illustrated books, usually containing abridged text of popular fiction". The term was approved.

The Committee considered the third term, "Blow books". It was thought that the alternate scope note was better. This was then changed slightly to read: "Use for books with hidden nicks or tabs in the fore-edge so that different illustrations appear on different occasions of riffling." Four "Use For" terms were deleted, leaving only Enchanted albums, Flik-Flaks, Magic picture books, and Trick magic books. The term was approved by the Committee.

The fourth Genre term, "Brand books" was proposed by Scott Carlisle. The Committee accepted the proposal.

The fifth term (proposed by Manon Th,roux) was "Calaveras". The Scope Note included at the end, "in Mexico". Several members questioned whether the form was limited to Mexico, to Latin America. The Committee decided to delete "in Mexico". The only Related Term, "Catchpenny prints" was also deleted. The term was approved by the Committee.

The sixth term, "Campaign literature" was submitted by Ken Carpenter. The only change was in the Scope Note. The phrases "used by a candidate running for public office" and "in the period preceding an election" were thought to be redundant. The Scope Note reads: "Use for materials printed to win support of voters." The Committee approved the term.

The seventh term, also proposed by Ken Carpenter in 1992, was "City directories". The term was approved for use by the Committee.

The next term, submitted by Beth Russell, was "Cruise books". Several Committee members questioned whether distribution of these were limited to the crew. Some thought books given to passengers were also called "Cruisebooks". The Committee decided this proposal needed further study.

The final Genre term, "Flip books" was submitted by Sid Berger. This term was approved by the Committee.

The only Printing & Publishing term, "Two-set printing", was submitted by Karen Nipps. After some discussion, the Committee approved the term.

#### b) Rare Serials Task Force

McLaren reported that she and Gillis are working on a manual for rare serial cataloging. This will become a module in the "CONSER Cataloging Manual". Michael Gago, from Indiana University, and Maryvonne Mavroukakis, from Library of Congress, are still part of the Task Force but will be mainly reviewing what is written. McLaren stated that Jean Hirons, Acting CONSER Coordinator has accepted in principle that rare serials are transcription driven. Gillis remarked that, after a fall conference on AACR2, definition and cataloging of serials are undergoing change. McLaren stated that the task force will be looking at rare serials from several points of view: union catalog vs., a single library, and a serial rare in itself and rare as part of a special collection. McLaren and Gillis have the draft on a password protected site. Before the annual conference, the draft should be ready for review by the Committee. At that point, a message will go out with password information.

#### c) 1998 RBMS Pre-Conference

Martin reported on the program he and Manon Th,roux, from the Rare Book Team, Yale University Library, are doing at the pre-conference. In keeping with the pre-conference's theme of the 19th century, the program will evaluate cataloging of 19th century imprints. Martin will

set the table on why we should care about doing DCRB for 19th century. He will also explore different uses that can be made of catalogs. Th,roux will illustrate with cataloging examples of 19th century imprints using DCRB full, DCRB core and AACR2. Holzenberg asked whether we should build into the discussion the question of a revision of DCRB to take into account the 19th century. Is DCRB sufficient or should it be tweaked? Noble pointed out problems with 260, 300 fields. What Th,roux can do with cataloging is show what rules would make the cataloging better. Perhaps we could end up with a subset of 19th century where DCRB should be applied. Noble mentioned the program should focus curatorial attention on books, bindings. Holzenberg said the job of this committee is to gauge interest in changing DCRB

## 8. NEW BUSINESS

### a) DCRB

Maxwell talked about the state of the rare book cataloging rules. DCRB was published in 1991. It was a revision of Bibliographic Description of Rare Books, published in 1981. Is it time to think about a revision of the rules again. Some items to consider: the rare serials CONSER module; the transcription of I/J, U/V, etc.; the possibility that we should pay more attention to MARC questions in the rules; the Core Standard (as are placement for the Minimal Level Record?); 19th century imprints. All members of the Committee were assigned (and others present were invited) to thoughtfully study DCRB between Midwinter and Annual and be prepared with suggestions and comments.

### b) Liaison to Codex Manuscripts Cataloging Standards Group

Creider reported that Hope Mayo resigned as director in May. She was replaced by Consuelo Dutschke, of Columbia, who is also working on the Digital Scriptorium Project and is primarily interested in SGML. The group has come up with elements for a first level description. The Vatican Film Library has been able to hire Gregory Pass, who has begun to produce a set of guidelines for those using USMARC. Hopefully, by summer, there will be a sort of "DCRB for Manuscripts" which the Bibliographic Standards Committee can review.

### c) BSC Resource Center

Hayes proposed a BSC Resource Center. This would be a web site which would list specialists in different fields or who to contact with specific questions (e.g., recon).

### d) 1999 RBMS Pre-Conference

The 1999 Pre-Conference in Montreal has the theme "Border Crossings". McLaren proposed a rare serials workshop. The Committee asked her to make this proposal to the Pre-Conference Committee.

On Sunday, McLaren reported that the rare serials workshop idea was well received by the Pre-Conference Committee.

#### e) Relator Terms

There has been confusion about relator codes and relator terms. LC's list, "USMARC Code List for Relators, Sources, Description Conventions", considered a national standard, was taken from an RBMS list. Do we need to retain our list? If we adopted the LC list, are there changes to it that we would want to make? How easy would it be to add to the LC list? Should we use relator codes or terms? There is much confusion about codes. Systems people like codes. Joan Aliprand, from RLG, stated that in the early days of MARC, storage of information was at a premium. This is not true now. Systems can do text searches on terms as well as codes. Holzenberg said that in the ideal system, any code could be turned into a term. Noble stated that the public display should be terms not codes. Wager said we should not change now. Raine pointed out that the USMARC list is a list of codes.

The Committee decided to test the ability to make additions to the list easily. McLaren will send a term to be added to Relator List to Wager at LC. The Committee will not make any decision until we discover how easy it is to make additions to the standard list and if the official title could be changed to USMARC Code and Term List for Relators, Sources, Description Conventions.

Before the annual meeting, all Committee members should look at the RBMS list. It is in the Oct. 1987 issue of "C&RL News", p. 553-557 (with additions in the Nov. 1987 issue, p. 645). Is there anything in the two lists to be deleted, modified, added? Also look at the USMARC code list. There should be a survey of what is actually used at libraries. This could be done using the exlibris listserv.

#### f) Recon Survey

Sider proposed that the Committee undertake a survey of rare book and manuscript recon projects that have been completed in the last 12-13 years. The survey would centralize information about the projects; include basic principles (e.g., standards adhered to, not adhered to); relate how successful project was. She and Maxwell will conduct the survey and report.

Other proposals will come by mail.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Gillis  
Secretary

---

APPENDIX

HEARING FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 1998

On the Friday evening of the ALA Midwinter Conference, there was an open meeting to discuss two documents, "Core Standards for Rare Books" and "Guide to Rare Book Records in Online Systems".

## CORE STANDARDS FOR RARE BOOKS

Bob Maxwell, in his introduction to the Core Standards presentation, acknowledged the discussion on exlibris of this draft during the past month. The comments focused mainly on the transcription of data containing U/V, I/J, VV, etc. and how it differs from DCRB. No consensus had been reached.

Jain Fletcher presented the core standard for rare books. She pointed out that core is a base and one can always add to it. She had cataloged several titles using both core and full level DCRB so that the differences between the two would be apparent. Some notes are optional in core, but fields 245-300 are required. No research is required for any of these fields. If there is a fictitious imprint on the item this is what goes into the 260. Elizabeth Johnson pointed out that, for the same item, there could be a difference in the fixed fields. Richard Noble said that 'DCRB' implies research has been done. It was noted that no call number is required, a departure from the regular books core. There was a question as to whether the DCRB core should require a call number. Without the classification, the core record becomes less useful for some libraries. Lawrence Creider said that the knowledge that all headings are authorized is more important than giving a call number. Jain pointed out that we are now benefiting from all the authority works we have done over the years. Many headings already have NACO records.

There was a discussion on how the DCRB core should be presented: should it be complete in itself or could it just be annotations to the books core. There was a question as to who will be using this core. A suggestion was made that the cataloging and copies of title pages be mounted on the Bibliographic Standards web page.

It was pointed out that the transcription of data containing U/V, I/J, VV, etc. differs from DCRB. Several different suggestions were made: simply transcribe what is on the item, use the last resort option of DCRB, or follow DCRB. There was some sentiment for at least looking at DCRB and perhaps revising it.

## GUIDE TO RARE BOOK RECORDS IN ONLINE SYSTEMS

Richard Noble presented the Guide to Rare Book Records in Online Systems. This originated in an article in RBML by Henry Raine and Laura Stalker. The guide does not have the force of a standard. Richard asked : Does this cover what we want; something that should not be covered; are there enough examples; too many examples?

Deborah Leslie commented that this guide was much better than the earlier draft. John Attig reported that SACS is coming out with something on the 655. Larry Creider pointed out that this guide has been in a draft stage now for almost five years and that it is time we get it out as a document. There were comments about the individual parts of the Guide:

1. Special Access Points: It was pointed out that subfield v and the 655 field are in flux now.
2. Place of publication: Does this mean headings should be under authority control? Note: there is currently no field in the MARC authorities format corresponding to the 752 field.
3. Date of Publication: Example is confusing. Can we put in a good example.
4. Biographic Citations: It was suggested we call them "Earnestly suggested guidelines".
5. Local and Copy-Specific Information: Add 501, local bound with.
7. Relator Terms: Not part of authorized heading. Two different concepts: sorting by relator term and searching by relator term.
9. Special Characters: Should be mentioned in Part II, Discussion.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jane Gillis