

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

From: Canadian Committee on Cataloguing

Subject: **Call for proposals to simplify AACR 2 Ch. 21 special rules**

CCC appreciates the opportunity to comment on simplification of AACR2 Ch. 21 special rules. Following are our proposals:

Art works (21.16—21.17)

The rules for art works are fundamentally the same as those for texts; only the different medium separates the two sets of rules. For example, the adaptation of a text (21.10A) is basically the same as the adaptation of an art work (21.16A). Similarly, the criterion used to determine whether it is a new work or a new expression is the same for text with commentary (21.13B-C), text with biographical/critical material (21.15), and reproductions of art works with text (21.17B). A collection of art reproductions by the same artist (21.17A) can also be encompassed by 21.4A1. We, therefore, suggest that it is possible to eliminate the specific rules and generalize the basic rules to include art works.

Further to that, we also suggest collapsing rules 21.17A and 21.17B so that the artist is the primary access point for a work consisting of reproductions for the works of an artist *with* or *without* accompanying text. The rationale: 1) focus for searching for art works is usually the artist; 2) consistent for works with or without accompanying text, and; 3) primary access point is not arbitrarily based on the presence/absence of the author of the text in the chief source (as opposed to the amount or importance of the text). We note that these rules address only a work of a single artist and do not address a work of multiple artists.

Musical works (21.18—21.22)

Simplification of choice of primary access point is desirable but, in some situations, it is also important to make clear relationships between different “contributors” so that users can identify the correct item. Title as the primary access point for works of mixed responsibility in all cases would not meet this requirement although some rules or examples can be incorporated into the more general rules for works of mixed responsibility.

We prefer that the following rules retain the existing choice of main entry as the primary access point: 21.18 (difference between arranger and adapter), 21.19A (composer of music for musical works that include words), 21.20 (composer of music for musical settings for ballets, etc.), and 21.21 (composer of music for added accompaniments, etc.).

On the other hand, rules 21.19B and 21.19C are somewhat redundant and are useful only in so far as they give instructions on added entries specific for those situations. Rule 21.19C is already covered by 21.19A (works including words) and 21.7 (collections); no special rule is necessary.

Pasticcios, ballad operas, etc., represent particular cases of works including words that can be either collections of works by different persons or bodies (21.19B1) or works of shared responsibility (21.19B2). Such cases are already covered by other rules, i.e., 21.19A, 21.6, and 21.7.

The only possible reason for retaining rule 21.19B is its provisions about excerpts, which are not principle-based and therefore need a special rule. Indeed, while it is reasonable to enter a single excerpt under its own composer, it seems inconsistent to enter a collection of excerpts under the title of the “work” and not of the collection and to require an added entry under the title of the larger work for single excerpts. Collections are not considered distinct works in other parts of AACR..

We, therefore, propose deleting rules 21.19B and 21.19C and modifying rule 21.7 to include a provision on collections of works of mixed responsibility similar to the provision at rule 21.6A1, 2nd paragraph:

Apply it also to cases of shared responsibility among adapters, arrangers, commentators, reporters, etc., when rules 21.-8—21.27 prescribe main entry under the headings for such persons.

Legal works (21.31—21.36)

At the general rule, 21.31A1, one is directed to 21.13 for annotated editions of laws and commentaries. However, the 6th example at 21.31B1 appears to be an annotation even though the rule for annotated editions, etc., is 21.13. This has always caused some confusion. Additionally, the examples do not make it clear the difference between annotations and commentary, e.g., 21.13B1, last example and 21.13C1, 3rd example. Simplifying the rule(s) for designating the primary access point for annotated editions would be helpful.

The distinction between 21.35A1 Treaties, etc., between two or three governments and 21.35A2 Treaties, etc., between four or more governments should be eliminated. The primary access point in all cases should be the uniform title for the treaty, etc., since the selection of the government first in alphabetical order is artificial as well as not language neutral for a code intended to be international.

Comments were supportive of a review of the “rule of three” concept, e.g., 21.31B2, 21.31C1, 21.34A.