

**To:** Nina Schneider, Chair  
ALA/ACRL/RBMS/Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC)  
Todd Fell, Chair  
*Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)* Editorial Team

**From:** Robert Rendall, Chair  
ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

**Subject:** CC:DA Review of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)*

---

CC:DA appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)* (hereafter DCRM(C)), in response to the invitation extended by the RBMS liaison to CC:DA on January 31, 2015. In keeping with CC:DA's actions on *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)*<sup>1</sup> and *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)*<sup>2</sup>, a Task Force was charged to undertake a thorough review of DCRM(C) and to submit a report for discussion and approval by the CC:DA membership.

#### **General comments:**

After a careful review, the Task Force approves of DCRM(C) as a useful and important resource for catalogers of rare cartographic materials. The task force identified a number of general and specific comments for the DCRM(C) editors to consider.

#### **DCRM(C) and RDA:**

The Task Force is glad to see that the description conventions code dcrmc has been established in advance. Since PCC BIBCO records can no longer be coded AACR2 as of January 1, 2015, we are also glad to learn that the PCC BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) profile will be updated to include rare cartographic provisions, so that PCC-authenticated records can be coded both RDA and DCRM(C), as is now the case with the other published DCRM modules. While the relationships among standards are complex and shifting, we believe it benefits catalogers to include the most current available information about this option and the status of these developments in the appropriate sections of the DCRM(C) text. This might include the Introduction (specifically II.1; X.1.3; X.1.4 footnote) and Appendix A.

#### **Specific comments:**

##### ***Preface:***

---

<sup>1</sup> CC:DA/Chair/2008-2009/1: Comments on *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)*  
<<http://downloads.alcts.ala.org/ccda/docs/chair44.pdf>>

<sup>2</sup> CC:DA/Chair/2005-2006/1: Comments on *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)*  
<<http://downloads.alcts.ala.org/ccda/docs/chair28.pdf>>

The summary of differences between standards on p. 8–9 is useful.

The differences with CM includes mention of additional appendices; we suggest adding a similar statement to the differences from DCRM(B). There are some important new appendices in DCRM(C).

***Introduction:***

I.2 and I.4:

We are glad to see that the scope of DCRM(C) is not limited to published material, and that it includes appropriate rules for manuscript materials.

II.1:

It appears that the mention of the RBMS vocabularies at the end of the 2nd paragraph is the first mention of them. We suggest adding a footnote reference to the official site.

***0. General Rules:***

0B2.2:

We suggest referring in the second and third paragraphs to the entirety of 0G6 rather than only 0G6.3. Doing so would give options to interpolate or conjecture text for lacunae in imperfect copies in addition to the mark of omission. Alternatively, a revision to 0G6.3 such as that suggested below could expand the scope of treatment of lacunae to include these options.

0G6.3:

This is related to the above comment (0B2.2). The example showing “Brad[shaw]” doesn’t actually follow the rule it illustrates, which says to “use the mark of omission enclosed in square brackets to show lacunae”. The rule as written does not instruct the cataloger to supply the missing information rather than simply using a mark of omission.

We suggest following DCRM(G) in adding the underlined phrase:

“If the description is based on an [imperfect](#) example (see [0B2.2](#)) and the missing portion cannot be reconstructed with some certainty, use the mark of omission enclosed in square brackets ([...]) to show lacunae in the resource.”

0G3.5:

Since manuscript cartographic materials are in scope, a virgule could be found in Gothic script, in addition to Gothic typeface.

0G8.2:

Similarly, we suggest adjusting this rule to apply to traditional marks of contraction in manuscript cartographic materials as well as those printed in continuation of the manuscript tradition.

0G10:

Single-sheet publications and single-sheet graphics pose some similar issues, but this entire section is unique to DCRM(C). We suggest that the scope of 0G10.1 be limited to cartographic images on sheets, and limited to order of transcription within a single element. Otherwise, 0G10.2 seems to contradict the general principle in 0G10.1. This section might also be seen as an exception to the general DCRM practice of noting transposition of data. The reason it is not is that it only applies within a single element; transposition between elements would still be noted.

### **1. Title and Statement of Responsibility Area:**

1C3:

We suggest that “electronic resource” be added to the other two possibilities for reproductions.

1G3:

This is a particularly important rule for maps, so we suggest giving it earlier in the text so that it is more likely to be taken into account when choosing the title proper.

### **2. Edition Area:**

2B3:

We wonder whether the distinction between hand-press and machine-press era applies to all types of cartographic resources here. It seems that the examples (certainly those that refer to “t.p. verso”) are for atlases. We note that there is no comparable rule in DCRM(G) which also deals with plate-pressing rather than letter-pressing. If this doesn't really apply to printing from plates, then perhaps the scope of the rule should be narrowed.

### **3. Mathematical Details Area:**

3D2.2:

2nd paragraph on page 97, says “Supply zeros where necessary to ensure consistency.” Maps catalogers interpret this as ensuring consistency across the entire coordinate statement. Therefore, the 2nd and 3rd examples at the top of page 97 should read:

(E 15°00'00”--E 17°30'45”/N 1°30'12”--S 2°30'35”)

(W 74°50'--W 74°40'/N 45°05'--N 45°00')

The example following the 2nd paragraph should read:

(W 133°15'--W 54°00'/N 54°0'--N 14°00')

and the 2nd example under 3D2.8 (page 99) should read:

(E 6°06'--E 8°57'/N 47°50'--N 45°48')

#### **4. Publication, Distribution, Production, Etc., Area:**

We believe these rules successfully incorporate manuscript resources, either by an explicit instruction or by including "production" in the name of the area when applicable. These techniques make it clear what to do for manuscripts.

4B7, 4C7, 4D7:

We find the applicability of "multipart monographs" unclear. Is this limited to atlases issued in multiple parts? Or would this be applied to a map set or map series? If map sets or map series are "multipart monographs", that should be stated explicitly (perhaps with a reference to appendix P). (See also comments on 7B3.2, 7B3.3, and glossary.)

#### **5. Physical Description Area:**

5A2:

The source of information for physical description (aside from atlases) is "any source"—but we wonder if "the resource itself" is more appropriate. Alternatively, the instruction might follow DCRM(G) 5A2 in giving additional guidance on sources of information besides the resource itself. The rule in DCRM(G) also requires a note when this information is taken from reference sources, etc.

5C5–5C8:

Is there a significant difference in treatment of color between atlases and other cartographic materials? Could the parallel sections be combined? If there are differences, it might be better to state a general rule on each point and then give exceptions rather than splitting it out into a section about atlases and then a section about other materials.

We note that the atlas rules are given first (5C5-5C7) and then rules for other maps, while elsewhere in the rules this is reversed (e.g. 5D gives maps on sheets rules first, and then atlas). We suggest keeping a consistent sequence of rules in this regard.

5C5.2 etc.:

The stated default here is to treat hand-colored maps as issued that way unless there is evidence to the contrary. Given some recent discussion on the DCRM list, it might be

preferable to reverse the default: Treat hand coloring as copy-specific unless there is clear evidence that copies were issued that way.

5C5.5:

This rule is parallel to 5C8.5. We suggest using the same wording.

5C8:

The editorial convention seems to be to mention manuscripts first, and then non-manuscripts. The sequence for atlases; maps, etc., on sheets; and other cartographic formats is less consistent. It might be a good idea to make a general policy. This is a particular problem here because there is nothing at 5C8 to indicate that the rules no longer apply to "Maps and other illustrations in an atlas (5C4–5C7)"; it might be good to add a similar heading to indicate that 5C8–5C11 apply to maps, etc., on sheets (if that is true). Furthermore, we note the amount of repetition between 5C5 and 5C8; most of the rules are the same, but are recorded using slightly different wording.

5C10:

Material. The “e.g.” phrase implies that “paper” should not be recorded but if that is the case, we think the instruction should state so more clearly. On the other hand, if it is acceptable to record paper, then omit the entire parenthetical and let the examples serve to clarify the instruction. If we cannot record “paper,” then revise the instruction as follows: “*Optionally*, give the material of which a map, etc. is made, if it is a substance other than paper.” If the fact that a resource is made of paper is unexpected or notable (e.g. if a map was issued on both paper and cloth), we do think it the cataloger should have this option.

5E1.1:

Appendix B indicates that using the separate physical descriptions technique (more than one 300 field) is permitted, but 5E1.1 implies that the only way to record accompanying material is to use the “+” technique in a single physical description (300 field). Perhaps the examples should illustrate both valid options.

## **7. Note Area:**

7B3.1 (and other similar rules, e.g. 7B9.1):

“Title from Wheat”. We realize this is traditional procedure in the DCRM manuals, but we question the usefulness of this practice. The note might well find itself divorced from the citation (e.g. in a catalog configuration that does not display the 510) leaving the catalog user to wonder what “Wheat” is. In the current and future environment, which wasn’t envisaged in the card environment that this sort of note was invented for, a fuller citation to what (e.g.) Wheat is should be given in any note—ideally, consistent with the fuller forms in the current edition of Standard Citation Forms.

7B3.2 and 7B3.3:

Here is it clear that map series and map sets are not included in the scope of "multipart monographs". That seems to mean that the latter category is limited to atlases or multisheet single maps. It would be helpful if that were stated explicitly in all appropriate rules. (see also comment on 4B7, 4C7, 4D7, and on the Glossary)

7B7.5 (and other rules covering local notes, e.g. 7B11.6, 7B19.3, 7B19.4), examples:  
We note that 7A4.5 covers recommended best practices for local notes, and gives examples there reflecting a range of practices. We suggest that the other examples of local notes throughout Area 7 reflect the best practice (i.e. giving the library's name), referring back to 7A4.5 if necessary.

7B10:

It seems likely that recording of signatures would be limited to atlases. If this is the case, it would be helpful to state this explicitly.

7B11.3, 7B11.4, 7B11.5, 7B11.6, etc.:

We note that DCRM(B) 7B19 (local notes) has been broken up, and local notes are dealt with under rules for appropriate general notes—and that this follows DCRM(G).  
As a result, we suggest that a clearer distinction be made both in the rules and the examples in each case between local and universal notes (as was done in 7B7.5) in these cases and elsewhere in Area 7.

7B15.1–2 (p. 188):

*Standard Citations for Rare Materials Cataloging* is now published, superseding previous versions. We suggest updating the rule and examples accordingly, and providing a link to the website in a footnote etc. (See also comment above on 7B3.1 and following.)

7B20.1, 7B20.3:

We suggest that these rules begin "Make a local note..."

## **8. Standard Number and terms of Availability Area:**

8B2 and 8E:

These instructions have some redundancy and might be combined or simplified.

### ***Appendices:***

#### **General comments:**

The order of appendices J–T seems a bit random. We suggest that the more comprehensive ones (those that deal generally with the description of a type of cartographic material) should come first, followed by those that deal with particular elements or parts of the description. This would look something like this (using the current designations):

- N. Composite atlases
- P. Identification of map series and sets
- Q. Treatment of map series and sets
- T. Maps as component parts of larger works
- J. Scale
- K. Coordinates
- S. Signatures
- L. Date of situation
- M. Notes on source of map
- R. Relief

We note that while scale and coordinates are well covered, additional guidance might be useful on the identification and implications of different projections, given that there is an option to supply a projection statement (3C1.2).

#### **Appendix B:**

008/07–10:

The rule gives instructions on bulk dates taken from the 260 field, but there are no rules at 4D relating to bulk dates.

045 field: Date of situation:

A reference to Appendix L might be helpful here.

#### **Appendix P:**

P2:

According to the definitions, multisheet single maps fall under "multipart monograph", while map series and map sets apparently do not. (See also comments on the glossary definition).

#### **Glossary:**

Index map:

The definition does not require that the map sheets indexed be part of a larger work. We have a hard time imagining an index map to unrelated maps of an area. Most often, the index map is to a particular map series or map set—and the term might also be applied to an index to a multisheet single map. Something along these lines seems to be an integral part of the definition.

Multipart monographs:

Multipart monograph seems to be the broadest term; its scope can include any type of cartographic resource consisting of more than one piece: a 3-volume atlas, a set of planetary globes issued together. It can include multisheet single maps, and probably map series, map

sets, and monographic series. Given this, any rule for "multipart monographs" needs to be very clear whether it is intended to be applied to **all** these, or only to some; this is particularly important when the rule for "multipart monographs" is immediately followed by a different rule for "map series and sets" (7B3.2 and 7B3.3).

Remote-sensing image:

Although this is not specifically an issue about rare cartographic resources, we note that sometimes a distinction is made between a remote-sensing image (which consists only of the sensing data) and a remote-sensing map (which includes an overlay of cartographic notation). This distinction is not always made, however; it is made in LCSH, but not in the AACR2 SMDs. If this distinction is not made here, perhaps this definition should note that this term also covers remote-sensing maps (with a see-from reference).

### **Task Force Members:**

Matthew Haugen, chair  
Rare Book Cataloger  
Columbia University Libraries  
102 Butler Library  
535 West 114th St.  
New York, NY 10027  
work: (212) 851-2451  
E-mail: [matthew.haugen@columbia.edu](mailto:matthew.haugen@columbia.edu)

John C. Attig  
Pennsylvania State University  
126J Paterno Library  
University Park, PA 16802-1805  
work: (814) 867-1038  
fax: (814) 863-7293  
E-mail: [JXA16@PSU.EDU](mailto:JXA16@PSU.EDU)

Robert Maxwell  
Brigham Young University  
6728 Harold B. Lee Library  
Provo, UT 84602  
work: (801) 422-5568  
fax: (801) 422-3221  
E-mail: [robert\\_maxwell@byu.edu](mailto:robert_maxwell@byu.edu)

**With additional input from:**



Paige Andrew, Pennsylvania State University  
Carol Pardo, Columbia University Libraries