0E. Consider making the option of original punctuation more explicitly to exclude adding punctuation not present in the source, with the exception of prescribed punctuation at the ends of subfields (per NLS).

0H-0J. Revisit the transcription rules for early letter forms, including i/j u/v. Give instruction for transcribing hyphens and dashes. Broaden the instructions for representing conjectural transcriptions instead of limiting it to abbreviations. [To be considered by Group 2: Transcription issues]. Give instruction on transcribing abbreviations in early modern format (e.g., S.’). Come up with a general policy toward transcription throughout. That is, when something is to be transcribed, make sure the DCRM language uses the word ‘transcribe’.

NLS: transcribe “AE” in ligature in upper case at the beginning of a word as “Ae”; transcribe “q;” as “q[ue]”.

1A2. Reconsider silent omission of transcription of dedications, patronage, and privilege statements from t.p. These data are or can be bibliographically significant regarding the work, expression, or manifestation, not to mention their occasional prominence and grammatical linking with t.p. content. In addition, silent omission of these data prevents adequate representation of title page content.

1B1. Consider changing to NLS policy of not transposing separable statements of responsibility. Consider making it a general rule to not transpose elements with an area.

1F. Reconsider separation of rules for single-sheet publications.

1G9. Consider eliminating this rule.

Area 2

2B1. Reconsider instruction to transcribe exactly edition statements only if taken from the t.p.


2C3. Ditto.

Area 4. Consider adding rule requiring transpositions to be noted.

4A4. Need MARC tagging for example.

4B3. Lack of modern names for places appearing in Latin is a serious obstacle to readers. Recommend making this rule explicitly cover those cases as well.

4C2. Reconsider instruction to generally omit addresses and qualifications. Specifically, encourage transcription of addresses, with an optional omission for lengthy imprints.

4C3. Place name is supplied, not recorded, as the first element of the area.

4C6. Tighten up the rule on omitting names from lengthy imprints.

2nd par. Contradicts 4A2 for not combining in an element data taken from different sources; the need for this exception is not clear.

4D2. Instruction to silently convert transcription of roman dates to arabic. Clarify use of square brackets for adjustments. That is, when is ‘[i.e.]’ to be used?

Reconsider restrictions on copyright dates.

4E. Instruction to supply printing date to the publication, etc. area. This assumes a policy of creating a new record for an issue or impression, which DCRB does not do elsewhere. This issue may be considered by working groups 3 (machine-press) or 6 (editions). Likewise with 4A5.

5B6. 1st par. Most actual cases would be publication numbered [i]-xii, [1], 1-176. Make a decision on and give example for that situation instead.

Last example—1v. (various pagings). Consider disallowing this option.

5B7 2nd par. Consider only permitting the last number correction in cases of final misnumbering, not in cases of internal non-self-correcting misnumbering. That is, disallow the situation covered by example 2.

5B9. Consider making allowance for giving plate numbering when all but frontis. is numbered.

Reconsider instruction to treat letterpress singletons as leaves of plates if they’re plates.

Reconsider treatment of engraved title pages in statement of extent.

Both of the two preceding evince a fuzzy understanding of what we’re trying to describe in the statement of extent. A differing treatment of letterpress insertions (but only tables) and engraved plates (but only t.p.’s) based on their content is highly suspect.

Need guidance for physical description of books consisting chiefly or entirely of plates, as in calligraphy manuals.
5B15. Folder. My Rare Book School students have a lot of trouble understanding folders and how to represent them. Remedy may not be possible. Also, a more common occurrence is for, say, one side to have four printed pages, and the verso to be a single large page, such as a map. Consider treating folders as any other single sheet, or give better understanding of how we count “pages” printed on a single sheet.

5B17. Consider whether the examples should be “3 v. in 5” and “8 v. in 5.” Give guidance on treatment of copy-specific binding not according with bibliographical volumes, such as splitting large works or combining volumes in one.


5C1. Replace “(metal cuts)” with “(engravings)”. Add example for more precise intaglio process, such as mezzotints?

5C2. “Diagrams” is no longer mentioned in AACR2. Discontinue here? Rule permits use of more terms than given here (“one or more such terms as the following”). Is this what we want?

Area 7. Promote use of standardized terminology (from thesauri) and other conventions of transcriptions (especially for illegible text, expansions) in note area.


2nd example group. Give example for “Variously attributed to” + 3 or more names.

7C9. Lack of guidance for pagination and signature statements in non-roman alphabets.

Use of π and ζ when the standard character set does not include these symbols. Give example of a gathering in 8/4 with current typographical capabilities.

7C18. Consider clarifying the definition of “imperfect”, and instruct that notes indicating imperfections be prefaced with “Imperfect:”

7C19. Rework this rule entirely. Confusion between items issued together and those bound together after publication. For the former, consider prefacing note with “Issued with:”, and for the latter, “Bound with:”

Appendix B. Need guidance for the character that is similar to an ß, but is formed by a long s and a script z very close together, sometimes touching, sometimes with a perceptible space between: ß. Is it ‘ss’ or ‘sz’.

Glossary: Title page definition confusion between ‘leaf’ and ‘page’. Add definition for ‘frontispiece’? For ‘integral’?