

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative

Subject: **Proposals to simplify AACR2 Ch. 21 special rules**

General Comments

In revising Part I ACOC enthusiastically supported the process of generalisation and simplification. We also supported the elimination of any rules that were based neither on principles nor on significant differences in the type of resource, but which grew, in part, out of the class of materials based arrangement of the rules themselves. ACOC considers that the process of generalisation and simplification of the Ch. 21 special rules may be a qualitatively different process from Part I, especially for those special rules which are supplementary to the general rules, rather than exceptions, and which are based on the content of the resources or the disciplines from which they derive.

Rules that determine the choice of entry based purely on the layout or wording of the chief source are easy to apply, cost efficient, and meet the principle of representation. Rules which say that the choice of entry should always be given to, for e.g., the composer or performer are also easy to apply and are more likely to have a consistent result than those which rely on catalogue's judgement. However, they also may go against the principle of assigning the primary access point to the person with chief responsibility for the intellectual or artistic content. ACOC believes that JSC needs to resolve this issue; i.e. decide which objective takes precedence before the special rules on choice of entry can be successfully generalised.

Many of the Ch. 21 rules would benefit from a statement saying the principle that is behind them, followed by information on what should be taken into consideration when making a choice. For example, a rule might start "Primary access should be given to the original author if they can still be considered responsible for the intellectual or artistic content of the work. Consider the original author to still be responsible if In the case of textual works consider ... to indicate that the original author is still responsible."

Wherever complex rules are retained, we would support the use of tables or charts to clarify the rules (for example as suggested for legal publications in *5JSC/Chair/5/ALA follow-up*).

The comments below are preliminary in nature, as ACOC is in the process of consulting with Australian specialists, particularly in relation to Certain Legal Publications [21.31–21.36] and Certain Religious Publications [21.37–21.39] and to a limited extent on Musical Works [21.18–21.22].

Art Works

[21.16–21.17] General comments

ACOC agrees with ALA, CCC and LC that these rules can be deleted, and art works covered by the general rules, providing that the flexibility in creating access points is retained (as per ALA's comment).

21.11B. Illustrations published separately

ACOC agrees with LC's comment that these can be included in the general rule.

21.16. Adaptations of art works.

ACOC agrees with LC's comments.

21.17. Reproductions of two or more art works

Although we agree with CCC that the presence or absence of the author's name on the chief source should not determine the primary access point, ACOC does not support the rationale given for always giving the artist as the primary access point. Our preliminary thoughts are that, as with texts with commentary, the aim should be to assign the primary access point to the person with chief responsibility for the intellectual or artistic content, and believe that some guidelines on how to achieve this (perhaps along the lines of 21.13D) might be appropriate.

21.24. Collaboration between artist and writer.

ACOC notes that works produced by the combined efforts of artists and writers present a similar choice to the cataloguer as those produced by the combined efforts of composers and writers, and ideally should be treated similarly in the rules. (Comment repeated at 21.19. Musical works that include words).

21.30F. Other related persons or bodies.

ACOC agrees with LC's comments.

Other art topics:

ACOC agrees that this anomaly needs to be resolved.

Musical Works**[21.18–21.22] general comments**

In principle ACOC supports both ALA's suggestion regarding re-arranging the rules "to better reflect the function of the responsible body (bodies)", and LC's suggestion that "the situations can be covered by general rules". We would hope that both objectives could be met, and note that the inclusion of music examples in the general rules will assist. To the extent that separate rules are still required, ACOC would like to see the principle behind the exception to be stated in the rules.

21.18A. Scope

ACOC agrees with LC's comments.

21.18B. Arrangements, transcriptions, etc.

ACOC supports ALA's suggestions in principle. Placing the rules for musical works in the context of the general rules and under the headings for author considered responsible/no longer responsible help to elucidate the principle being applied. However we note that further work could be done to state both the rules for textual works, and those for musical works, in a more principles based way.

ACOC agrees with LC's comments.

21.18C. Adaptations

ACOC supports ALA's suggestions in principle, but notes that further improvements are possible. For example is the paragraph commencing "For music, if the work is related ..." only applicable to music and is it appropriate here? Is the final 'if in doubt' sentence for music any different than the general rule?

ACOC notes that LC has suggested placement under 21.9.

21.19. Musical works that include words

ACOC agrees with LC's comments.

ACOC notes that works produced by the combined efforts of artists and writers present a similar choice to the cataloguer as those produced by the combined efforts of composers and writers, and ideally should be treated similarly in the rules. (Comment repeated from 21.24. Collaboration between artist and writer.).

21.19A. General rule

ACOC agrees with LC's comments, and would welcome the incorporation of this rule into the general rules. It seems unlikely that the problem of not being able to tell if one part of a work is pre-existing is limited to music with words. Is there a general principle that could be applied here?

ACOC would consider a proposal to always choose the composer as the primary access point for example in cases of shared responsibility with the principle responsibility not indicated.

21.19B. Pasticcios, ballad operas, etc.

ACOC would welcome a proposal that addresses ALA, CCC and LC's suggestions.

21.19C. Writer's works set by several composers

ACOC agrees with ALA and CCC's comments.

21.20. Musical settings for ballets, etc.

ALA has suggested moving this rule to the general rule on shared responsibility, while LC considers it a case of mixed responsibility. ACOC would prefer that the cataloguer not have to determine whether those involved have collaborated or prepared separate contributions.

21.21. Added accompaniments, etc.

ACOC agrees that this rule can be included in an appropriate general rule.

21.22. Liturgical Music

ACOC agrees with ALA that this can be moved to the rules on liturgical works.

21.28. Related works

ACOC agrees with LC's comments on cadenzas and incidental music. ACOC also generally agrees with their comments on librettos, but would like to discuss further their suggestion regarding the alternative rule.

Sound Recordings [21.23]

ACOC notes that ALA intends to submit a further follow-up to this response.

ACOC notes and generally agrees with LC's general comments. We also note that folk music can present similar problems.

ACOC further notes that not all sound recordings relate to music or literary texts, but may include interviews or sounds of nature or even collections of sound effects.

21.23A. One work

ACOC agrees with LC that this rule is out of place, and also notes that there is an instance of the Rule of three in this rule.

21.23B. Two or more works by the same person(s) or body(ies)

21.23C. Works by different persons or bodies. Collective title

21.23D. Works by different persons or bodies. No collective title

ACOC generally agrees with LC's comments that the situations covered by these rules can be covered under the general rules.

Academic Disputations [21.27]

ACOC lacks the expertise to comment specifically on this rule except to note that it is a fairly succinct rule for a unique situation and could be retained.

Certain Legal Publications [21.31–21.36]

Certain Religious Publications [21.37–21.39]

The individual members of ACOC lack the expertise to comment on these rules. However, we are in the process of consulting our Australian colleagues on the issues raised.