

To: Nina Schneider, Chair
ALA/ACRL/RBMS/Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC)
Margaret F. Nichols, Chair
DCRM(MSS) Editorial Team

From: Dominique Bourassa, Chair
ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

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

CC:DA appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts)* (hereafter DCRM(MSS)), as invited by the RBMS liaison to CC:DA on July 28, 2015. In keeping with actions on *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)*¹, *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)*², *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)*³, and *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music)*⁴, CC:DA has charged a Task Force to undertake a thorough review of DCRM(MSS) and to submit a report for discussion and approval by the CC:DA membership. A roster of the Task Force is included at the end of this report.

General Comments:

The distribution of examples in the document seems uneven; some sections have a large number of examples, while other sections that might benefit from examples have none.

We recommend that the editors review an outline of the hierarchical arrangement of the rules (numbering and sub-numbering) to ensure that they have been logically organized. It is also unclear what principle determines which rules have headings (if the intent is that all rules at the same hierarchical level within a given section either should or should not have headings, this principle has been applied inconsistently).

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

² CC:DA/Chair/2008--2009/1: Comments on *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)*.
<<http://downloads.alcts.ala.org/ccda/docs/chair44.pdf>>.

³ CC:DA/Chair/2014-2015/3: Comments on *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)*.
<<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/CCDAChair2014-201503.pdf>>.

⁴ CC:DA/Chair/2014-2015/4: Comments on *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music)*.
<<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/CCDAChair2014-201504.pdf>>

Specific Comments:

Background section

The first and third paragraphs are redundant and need to be combined.

Introduction

III. Objectives and principles, 2nd paragraph

A lower case “c” should be used in “Anglo-American Cataloguing tradition”, since this is not referencing AACR2.

Consider adding footnotes for links to FRBR documentation and the work by Svenonius. Svenonius should also be added to the Lists of Works Cited.

III.2.5. Rules provide for the description of an individual manuscript within different discovery environments (e.g., finding aids or bibliographic records in a catalog)

We recommend adding: “or to create data elements to be used in compiling a catalog display.”

III.2.6. Rules are adapted from DCRM(B) and DACS

We recommend ending this paragraph with the statement, “This principle is related to all of the objectives stated above.” This would be consistent with the other principle/objective statements.

V. Language preferences

In response to the editorial comment in “counterparts in their preferred language (see ??? – DCRM(G) refers reader to 4B3-4, 4B8-12, 4E and Areas 5 and 7. Do we refer to same?)”: we feel that such references are not particularly necessary and might create headaches for future editors.

IX. Precataloging decisions, paragraphs 1-4

This whole introductory section seems to be redundant with the enumerated parts of section IX that follow. Why introduce pre-cataloging decisions at length when they are listed and described immediately below? We suggest retaining the 2nd paragraph and shortening or removing the remainder.

IX. Precataloging decisions, paragraph 3

Change “will be MARC 21 or EAD” to “will be MARC 21, EAD, or another metadata schema.”

IX.2.2. Institutional and departmental resources

Change “subject heading system recognized by the MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data” to “subject heading system listed in the MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data.”

0C. Source of information

We recommend including an example of “appropriate external source(s).”

0D. Prescribed punctuation

Delete the second closing parenthesis in the footnote.

0F. Language and writing system of the description

The examples provided in 7B8.2 and 7B8.3 seem to illustrate that catalogers are not expected to make the distinction between “writing system” and “script” described in footnote 5 when they are entering public notes in the record; should this footnote mention that?

1B1.1 Form and order of information

In the second bulleted item under “The following are required components” the reference for formulation of creator name should be to 1B1.2, not 1B1.1.

1B2. Correspondence (including petitions)

Dates here appear to be “normalized” as in 4C1: year month day; should this rule prescribe that?

1C2.3.2. Part information not present

An example would be helpful here--perhaps an adaption of the example given in 7B4.5.

1C2.5. Title proper from title page, colophon, or caption

Would this information be more logically placed at the beginning of 1C2 or in 1C1? Are these rules (1C2.5-1C2.7) really specific to the “title proper”?

1C2.6. Title proper from elsewhere in the manuscript or from accompanying material

This belongs with the preceding and should be moved. On the other hand, some confusion on the part of catalogers could be avoided if the instruction were to make a devised title when there is no clear title proper for the manuscript.

1D. Physical, creative, and intellectual status of the manuscript

According to the contents on page 34, the section heading here should be 1D. Material type (physical, creative, and intellectual status of manuscript). In the current text the term “material type” is introduced in the first sentence without explanation.

There is no example with other title information between the title proper and the supplied material type before Swinburne’s poems & ballads in 1D1.5, two pages later. It might be good to have a similar example earlier on to illustrate the ordering described in 1D1 right away.

1D1.5. Indication of the state of completeness or intactness

The first period should be removed to make this 1D1.5.

2. Edition Area

If no rules are provided for this area of description even for exceptional situations, should “no general use is made” be changed to “no use is made”?

4B1.

Rules 4B3-4B6 have titles, so should rules 4B1 and 4B2 have titles as well (or maybe be combined as General rule, like 4C1?

4B4. Place of production different from place of intellectual creation

Is the note “NEED EXAMPLE OF A COPY OF A DOCUMENT (i.e., a forgery)” in the wrong place? An example is needed for this rule, but different places of intellectual and physical creation do not necessarily indicate a forgery, nor are all forgeries examples of this rule. The forgery might be better placed as an example in the following rule, 4B5. Fictitious or incorrect places of production.

4B6.1.

Adding an example with a place name like “Rome?” or “Moscow?” would illustrate use of the English name rather than the local name (and, potentially, rather than the name in the language of the manuscript itself). Technically, the example showing English “Tokyo?” rather than Romanized Japanese “Tōkyō?” may already illustrate this, but another example would be clearer for most readers.

4C2.5.2. Calendars with start dates other than January 1

Why was the decision made to record both years on the item? If the date is not transcribed but normalized, why record both dates? One could put the older version of the year in a note. However, what is proposed here may be the least confusing compromise in a messy situation.

4C5. Patterns for supplying a date

Should 4C5 and 4C6 be renumbered as sections within 4C4? This whole sequence of rules is about manuscripts not containing dates of production.

4C6.

We recommend removing “undated” and always using “date unknown” if an estimated date cannot be determined.

5A1. Prescribed punctuation

Delete the second closing parenthesis in the footnote.

7A1.1.

Should there be a statement that by definition there are no copy-specific notes in a manuscript description since the item being described is unique?

7A2. Punctuation

Delete the second closing parenthesis in the footnote.

7B5.1

The Charlotte Bronte (should that be Brontë?) example was already used for 1E2.2. While the point being illustrated here is different, it might be better to use the broadest possible array of examples rather than repeating them. This same example is also used in Appendix C.2.6.

7B5.2. Creator(s) unknown

The consecutive “if”s in this sentence make it hard to read. A comma would help clarify: Make a note if the creator of the manuscript is unknown, if considered important.

7B7.

The number of examples given in this area seems excessive.

The statement “Unpublished” in a note on bibliographic record for a manuscript looks inappropriate. It might better be expanded to something like “Manuscript of an unpublished work by the author.”

7B8.2. Writing systems

As written, this rule would require catalogers always to specify that a manuscript in Greek is in Greek script or that a manuscript in Russian is in Cyrillic script, which seems unnecessary.

7B17.2.

Instructions should be added for the situation when the formal contents presented on the title page are inaccurate.

APPENDIX A2. Full-level DCRM(MSS)

The Leader/17 value of blank is for PCC/BIBCO participants only. Others use capital I.

APPENDIX B. COLLECTION- LEVEL RECORDS

“No general use of this appendix is made for individual manuscripts” is not the most direct way of saying “this appendix has no content.” It might be better to omit that sentence and keep the following one.

APPENDIX C2.2. Formal titles preceded by grammatically inseparable statements of responsibility

The same “William Shakespeare’s a midsummer night’s dream” example appears in 1C2.1 with A capitalized as we’re told not to do here. Which is correct?

APPENDIX D3.2

Should the initial “Optionally” be italicized here as it is everywhere else? (See the explanation of how options will be presented on page 13).

APPENDIX F. TITLE ACCESS POINTS

Should this be called *uncontrolled* title access points? However, we see this is the heading used in other DCRMs.

APPENDIX F 0G7. Title proper with corrected misspellings, variant spellings, archaic spellings, etc.

We recommend removing “corrected” from this heading so that it reads “Title proper with misspellings, variant spellings, archaic spellings, etc.”

In order to make the examples clearer in this area, either remove “Source” from the first example or clearly articulate “Source” and “Transcription” for the next two examples. Add a colon at the end of “Additional access point (with modernized spelling).”

List of Works Cited

Add citation for Elaine Svenonius’s *The Intellectual Foundation for Information Organization*. (mentioned in Introduction.III)

Task Force Roster:

Jessica Hayden, Chair
Technical Services Manager
University of Northern Colorado
Campus Box 48
Greeley, CO 80639
(970) 351-2183
jessica.hayden@unco.edu

Laurence S. Creider
Head, Archives and Special Collections Dept.
University Library
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003
(575) 646-4756
lcreider@lib.nmsu.edu

Patricia M. Dragon
Head, Special Collections Cataloging
East Carolina University

Mail Stop 516
1204 Joyner Library
Greenville, NC 27858
(252) 328-0296
dragonp@ecu.edu
Faye Leibowitz
General Languages Catalog Librarian
University Library System
University of Pittsburgh
Room 326
7500 Thomas Boulevard
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
(412) 648-8113
frleibo@pitt.edu

Robert Rendall
Principal Serials Cataloger
Columbia University Libraries
102 Butler Library
535 West 114th St
New York, NY 10027
(212) 851-2449
rr2205@columbia.edu

Elizabeth Shoemaker
Catalog and Resource Access Librarian
St. Ambrose University Library
518 W Locust St
Davenport, IA 52803-2829
(563) 333-6469
shoemakerelizabetha@sau.edu