

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
From: Canadian Committee on Cataloguing
Subject: **Proposals to simplify AACR2 Ch. 21 special rules**

CCC appreciates the step-back overview approach of CILIP in its analysis of this task. We agree that useful implementation of many of these proposals is very much dependent on the organization and structure of the rules and of the various *RDA*-related products. Although the principle behind the “simplification” of some of the rules is based on what is considered to be primary access, the nuances may be lost in the generalization process causing more soul searching or judgement on the part of the cataloguer. Alternately, incorporating “subrules” to address some of the more specialized materials into the general rule may unnecessarily complicate the general rule. We also believe that the suggestion to provide more examples with more explanation should not be the approach and is not the solution. If the rule is clearly written, there should be no need to have examples justifying the rule. Instead, examples should merely illustrate the rule.

Specific rule proposals:

21.16 (Adaptations of art works): We agree that rule can be generalized.

21.17 (Reproductions of two or more art works): We agree that rule can be generalized.

21.18—21.22 (Musical works): With the exception of 21.19B and 21.19C, we prefer to retain the rules specific to music. We agree with ALA that that subsuming these rules by the more general rules would result in a loss of clarity, consistency and expediency.

21.18B (Arrangements, transcriptions, etc.)

ALA proposed revisions to 21.12: The AACR rule for “revisions” (21.12) does not seem to be an appropriate place for the current rules at 21.18B. To determine when the original author is considered responsible, certain conditions must be met and these are itemized under the heading for textual works. However, no such criteria is given under Musical works. As LC has pointed out the problem lies in distinguishing between minor modifications and more extensive ones. As stated in our general comments above, to extract only certain rules from the ones for Musical Works (21.18-21.22) does not seem justifiable. Although the emphasis of *RDA* is on an electronic version, the print format would certainly be unwieldy since the rules for a type of material could be scattered.

If, however, consensus is to incorporate these rules at a general rule, we offer the following specific comments to the revisions:

21.18B: We suggest that “simplified version” as mentioned in 21.18A1b should be explicitly stated:

Musical works

Enter an arrangement, transcription, simplified version, etc., of one or more works of one composer (or of parts of one composer’s works) under the heading for that composer....

21.18C: “arrangements described as “freely transcribed,” “based on...,” etc.” are categories of “arrangements incorporating new materials,” therefore, we suggest the following modification:

For *music*, apply this rule to arrangements incorporating new materials, including arrangements described as “freely transcribed,” “based on ...,” etc., and arrangements in which the harmony or musical style of the original has been changed.

21.19A: We do not support moving this rule to 21.6B1 since musical works with words are not really works of shared responsibility nor are they a “modification of anything” as LC pointed out. Setting a text to music does not modify a work to the same extent that paraphrasing, revising or translating a work does since its original form is still recognizable (provided that the text has not been translated prior to being set to music). However, this is also the case for illustrated texts or texts published with commentary or biographical material. If these categories of works are considered modifications of other works, then so should musical works with words. We, therefore, feel that the rule for musical works that use pre-existing words should remain in its current location.

On the other hand, although works that use newly created words are works with mixed responsibility and can logically be located with the rules for mixed responsibility, it would be more convenient to have all the rules for musical works with words together, especially since the treatment is identical in terms of choice of primary access point and formulation of secondary access points for the authors of texts set to music (name/title vs. name only).

21.19B-21.19C: We continue to support the deletion of 21.19B and 21.19C and the modification of 21.7 to include a provision on collections of works of mixed responsibility.

21.20 (Musical settings for ballets, etc.): Such a rule should be retained but we do not support moving it to 21.6B since these types of works are not works of shared responsibility but are collaborative works of mixed responsibility between composer, choreographer and librettist. We propose two alternatives:

- a) Add “ballet music” to the list of works that have a relationship to other works as given at 21.28A with appropriate examples at 21.28B1, or;
- b) Create a new rule for collaborative choreographic works in the section for *Mixed responsibility in new works* (21.24-21.27) to address: i) manifestations containing only music (composer as primary access point), and ii) manifestations containing both dance and music notation (choreographer as primary access point).

21.21. (Added accompaniments, etc.): If there is consensus to incorporate 21.21 in a more general rule, we support the ALA proposal to incorporate 21.21 in rule 21.12. The specific wording of rule 21.21, however, must be retained to make it clear that an added accompaniment does not constitute a modification that “has substantially changed the nature and content of the original” as per 21.9. Primary access should be given to the heading for the original work.

21.22. (Liturgical music): We support the ALA proposal to move rule 21.22 to the section for liturgical works.

21.23. (Sound recordings): 21.23 should be retained. Although not all possible types of contributions (e.g., producers) or the importance of the various contributions have been considered, the pre-eminence granted performers, particularly performers of popular music corresponds to what is intuitive for users. While this may be somewhat arbitrary, prominence by layout or typography has been used in other rules to determine primary access.

As for the placement of 21.23, neither *Works that are modifications of other works* nor *Mixed responsibility in new works* appear to be adequate. We propose locating the rule in a new category (*Performances of musical works?*) to cover the treatment of music performances. This would allow music performances whether issued as sound recordings or as videorecordings to be treated the same way.

21.24 (Collaboration between artist and writer): We agree that 21.24 can be incorporated into 21.6 as it falls into 21.6A1a. The only difference between 21.6 and 21.24 is that prominence of a name by wording or layout would no longer be a factor as choice of primary access since 21.6 only allows for entry under first named.

21.27 (Academic disputations): We agree to retain.

21.28. (Related works): We support the LC proposal to make footnote 7 the rule.

We do not agree, however, that added access points for authors of librettos and other texts set to music should be in the form of name/titles when both the text and the music are newly created. For works of mixed responsibility (21.24—21.27), the access point for the collaborator, etc., not chosen as the primary access point is in name form only. To provide a name/title secondary access point would either contradict the principle of primary access or imply that the contribution of the collaborator not chosen as primary access constitutes a distinct work. In either case, the notion of the work becomes more vague.

The CCC rep for the Canadian Association of Music Libraries (CAML) also has strong reservations about changing the current practice concerning the formulation of added access points for authors of librettos and other texts set to music when texts are pre-existing. There does not seem to be any significant gain in access to justify the additional costs and work required to establish name/title headings.

21.30F (Other related persons or bodies—Other art topics): Choice of primary access point in the case of art catalogues falling into rule 21.1B2a should not be considered as part of this task of rule simplification. Implications of such a revision would entail further rethinking of the impact on the logic of the other categories of 21.1B2.

Certain Legal Publications (21.31—21.36)

(CCC did not receive any comments from the CCC rep for the Canadian Association of Law Libraries (CALL))

21.31A (Scope): Retain concept of current rule.

21.31B1 (Laws of modern jurisdiction): Retain current rule.

21.31B2 (Laws governing more than one jurisdiction): Retain current rule.

21.31B3 (Bills and drafts of legislation): Retain current rule.

21.31C (Ancient laws, certain medieval laws, customary laws, etc.): Retain current rule.

21.32 (Administrative regulations, etc.): Retain current rule.

21.32B (Administrative regulations, etc., that are laws): In theory, the ALA proposal to place this area into the section dealing with laws may work, but since regulations in Canada are laws, we need to ensure that this is clear and that the entry (under jurisdiction) needs to reflect that.

21.33 (Constitutions, charters, and other fundamental laws): We agree with ALA comments.

21.34 (Court rules): Retain current rule.

21.35A1 (Treaties, etc., between two or three governments): Make no distinction between **21.35A1** and **21.35A2 (Treaties, etc., between four or more governments)** and enter under uniform title for the treaty, etc., in all cases. In making this proposal, however, one questions the implication of 21.1B2 for this type of material.

21.35B (Agreements contracted by international intergovernmental bodies) and **21.35C (Agreements contracted by the Holy See):** Consider incorporating these rules into proposed 21.35A.

21.35D (Other agreements involving jurisdictions): LC's proposal to retain 21.35D1 and 21.35D4 but to delete 21.35D2 and 21.35D3 does not seem principled. Although both 21.35D2 and 21.35D3 refer to 21.35, it is not consistent to separate the agreements based on choice of primary access point. Choice of primary access point should not be the focus of rule simplification in all cases. Often times, it is more logical to group the types together, e.g., "other agreements involving jurisdictions." In so doing, we agree with ALA that all of 21.35D should be retained although the choice of primary access point should be reconsidered if 21.35A is revised to entry under uniform title in all cases. Retaining 21.35D1 and 21.35D4 bears questioning why 21.6 is not also applicable to 21.35A. Additionally, many of the proposals for deletion/incorporation do not address the different secondary access points, i.e., whether the uniform title is to be added to the headings. CCC would like to examine all the issues before agreeing to the deletion/incorporation of many of the rules into the general rule at 21.35A.

21.35E (Protocols, amendments, etc.): Agree with ALA.

21.35F (Collections): Agree with LC.

21.36A (Law reports): Agree with LC.

21.36B (Citations, digests, etc.): Retain current rule.

21.36C1—21.36C3 (Proceedings in the first instance...): Agree with ALA to simplify.

21.36C4—21.36C9: Retain current rules.

21.37 (Sacred Scriptures): Prefer changing heading to "Sacred works and scriptures"

21.37A: Agree with LC.

21.37B: Retain current rule.

21.38 (Theological creeds, confessions of faith, etc.): Agree with LC.

21.39A1: Agree with LC.

21.39A2: Retain current rule.

21.39A3: Retain current rule.

21.39B (Liturgical works of the Orthodox Eastern Church): Agree with LC.

21.39C (Jewish liturgical works): Retain current rule.

Chapter 25 rules (Sacred Scriptures , Theological Creeds, Confessions of Faith, Etc.–

CCC reserves comment on the analysis of the rules in Chapter 25 until a more detailed draft of the approach of Part III of *RDA* is available.