

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

From: Barbara Tillett, LC representative

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

The Library of Congress has carefully reviewed our original comments in light of proposals from the other constituents. In some cases we have been persuaded by the arguments and in others we retain our position or provide further clarification as shown below. Portions of the “compilation” are omitted where we have no change or further comment.

---

## **Art Works [21.16–21.17]**

### **General comments**

LC response to the ALA follow-up:

ALA and LC are in general agreement that special art rules can be eliminated, as long as rules for access points are flexible.

LC response to the CCC follow-up:

CCC and LC agree that (in CCC’s words) “The rules for art works are fundamentally the same as those for texts....”

CCC and LC agree that better coverage of works by multiple artists is needed.

**21.17:** LC has a mixed view on CCC’s proposal to collapse “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 proposal would treat works now covered under both 21.17A and 21.17B like works covered by 21.4A1 (works of single personal authorship) rather than treating the 21.17B works like 21.13B-C (texts with commentary). If we understand the proposal correctly, all collections of works by an artist would thus enter under the artist, regardless of presentation of “authorship” on the chief source. (The recommendation does not appear to be consistent with CCC’s own statement that “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)”). However, others on our staff very much like for any work that has reproductions of an artist’s works always being under the artist’s name. It is pointed out that this would simplify the cataloger’s decisions when dealing with resources “with or without commentary” and would aid the end user who would not probably have a clue whether there was commentary or not, but most likely expect to find all works under the artist’s name.

We also note that although this proposal has some advantage by providing consistency of primary access point for users, it would put art-with-commentary out of

step with other work-with-commentary situations and thus again require special treatment for art materials. (It would also be a major change from current practice requiring broad input from the art cataloging community.)

## **Musical Works [21.18–21.22]**

### **General comments**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We have taken a quite different approach to this assignment from ALA, and have tried to look for the common principles in chapter 21 that apply also to notated music and musical sound recordings. In doing that, we have endeavored to overcome the “outsider” position of music in descriptive cataloging, which has its origin in the historically text-based approach of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, and instead to incorporate music along with other media that are not text-based in general rules. To support this approach in the interest of access to musical works in chapter 21, we have indicated where music examples should not only be added, but reviewed by the Examples Working Group so that they unmistakably exemplify for musical works the rule in question. We have also pointed out places where biases toward Western music ought to be eliminated, where principles governing modified works, works of shared responsibility, and works of mixed responsibility need to be clarified in their application to creative works, and have commented that rules covering performed works need greater scrutiny so as to be better incorporated into the code.

LC response to CCC follow-up:

We agree.

### **Specific rules**

#### **➤ 21.18B. Arrangements, transcriptions, etc.**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We disagree. The ALA proposed revision of 21.12, by adding musical works, now combines two concepts: 1) For textual works, the rule instructs that the choice of principal creator be based on what is given on the manifestation. 2) For musical works, the principal creator is always chosen according to the facts (following 21.4A1).

We note further the addition to this rule of the concept regarding music, “if the original composer is unknown.” This condition can apply to works of any type and is already addressed in 21.5.

LC response to CCC follow-up:

We agree.

#### **➤ 21.18C. Adaptations**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

**21.18C [21.10]**

We disagree with introducing separate paragraphs for music and suggest that music could be incorporated by revising the first paragraph of the proposed rule as follows:

### **ADAPTATIONS**

Enter a paraphrase, rewriting, textual adaptation for children, version in a different literary form (e.g., novelization, dramatization), version in a different graphic arts medium (e.g., painting, sculpture), or a distinct alteration of a musical work (e.g., a free transcription) under the heading for the adaptor.

We also feel that in the proposed revision of 21.10, by interspersing the original sentences with the “For music” paragraphs, makes it unclear that music is also covered by some of the general statements as well as by the specific paragraphs for music. In the first pair of paragraphs, the general statement evidently does not apply to music. However, the other general paragraphs do apply to musical works: “If the name of the adaptor is known, enter under title,” “Make a name-title added entry for the original work,” and “In case of doubt about whether a work is an adaptation, enter under the heading for the original work.”

Finally, we note that the way AACR2 is organized, instructions about name-titled added entries do not belong in this rule.

LC response to CCC follow-up:

We agree.

➤ **21.19. Musical works that include words**

➤ **21.19A. General rule**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We disagree. We feel that musical works that include words are not necessarily works of shared responsibility, which is the condition 21.6B1 covers.

LC response to CCC follow-up:

We agree.

➤ **21.19B. Pasticcios, ballad operas, etc.**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We disagree. We feel that the types of works 21.19B refers to are, whatever their authorship, single works. As such, we do not feel they belong under 21.7, a rule for collections. One does not experience pasticcios, ballad operas, etc., as one would a collection of texts, where one text in the collection can be selected for reading and the others ignored.

LC response to CCC follow up:

We do not agree that individual pasticcios, ballad operas, etc., are collections.

➤ **21.19C. Writer's works set by several composers**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We disagree. We prefer to see the situation it covers folded into the general rules about *collections* [i.e., not “adaptations,” as we originally wrote], 21.7. Delete rule 21.19C and modify 21.7. [See under 21.19B.]

LC response to CCC follow-up:

We agree.

➤ **21.20. Musical settings for ballets, etc.**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We agree that the music for choreographed dances should continue to be entered under composer.

We disagree that such works should be moved to 21.6B1, which instructs that the choice of principal creator be based on what is found on the manifestation. That choice for musical works is always based on the facts (following 21.4A1).

LC response to CCC follow-up:

We agree.

➤ **21.21. Added accompaniments, etc.**

LC Comment to CCC follow-up:

We agree that we wish to retain the present choice of primary access point, the composer of the original work.

➤ **21.22. Liturgical Music**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We agree to move this rule to the appropriate section for liturgical works and include musical examples.

Addition to LC's original response (5JSC/Chair/5/LC follow-up)

➤ **21.30J2. Variant title**

From the point of view of music, all this rule needs to do is to assure it is not required to provide direct title access to variants of transcribed titles when the cataloger doesn't consider it to be useful. Toward that objective, we suggest the following revision:

**Variant title.** If considered necessary for access, make an added entry for any version of the title... that is significantly different from the title proper or other transcribed title. Do not provide an additional access point directly under title if the creator's name must be attached to the title in order for it to be meaningful.

➤ **25.27.A1. Selection of title**

In order to make a judgement as to whether a title in itself is a useful access point you need to make a judgement as to whether it stands for a type of composition. The

critical concept “type of composition” is defined only in footnote 10 of this rule, a rule that is actually about formulation of uniform titles. In fact, the term first appears in chapter 5 (5.1B1 refers to “a title that consists of the name(s) of one or more type(s) of composition”). An understanding of “type of composition” is central to both the formulation of uniform titles and the selection of title access points. We hope RDA will rectify the scattered references to the concept and introduce a definition of it when it is first used. Even if the term ends up not being used, the necessary distinction still needs to be made between the two types of titles composers use, which the cataloging code distinguishes as either “descriptive” (unique or nearly so) or “generic” (catchwords that merely characterize the work and that are used over and over by many composers). As a practical matter, the two types are justifiably treated differently both when formulating uniform titles for musical works and when deciding whether access points directly under title are desirable.

➤ **25.33. Two works issued together**

25.33 says in its entirety, “Follow the instructions in 25.7.” Thus, the rule is already generalized out of the section on music rules. However, the rule belongs in chapter 21, where choosing access points for two works issued together is now merely inferred. It should be addressed directly. Possibly, it is assumed that since this situation doesn’t fall under the definition of a collection, that works of this type are covered by 21.4 and 21.29-21.30 (21.29A-B leads you to 21.30 and then to 21.30J). The only place the situation is addressed directly is in LCRI 21.30J. 21.30M, analytical entries section, might also apply.

➤ **25.34. Collective titles**

This rule contains numerous examples of titles that, although presented in the context of uniform titles, may also appear as transcribed titles (in various languages) that represent musical works (complete works, 25.34.A; selections, 24.34B; works of various types in one broad or specific medium... , 25.35C; also sketches, drafts, etc.). Such titles include generic titles for types of compositions, as discussed above in our comments on 25.27A1, that are not useful as direct access points for musical works.

## **Certain Legal Publications [21.31–21.36]**

The Library of Congress is continuing to work on developing principle-based rules for legal materials, working with our cataloging Law Team and our Law Library of Congress. We hope to be able to suggest further approaches in those areas shown below.

### **Specific rules**

➤ **21.31. Laws, etc.**

➤ **21.31A1.**

LC response to CCC follow-up:

We agree with CCC that annotated editions of laws and law commentaries need simplification and clarification. The rules in 21.13 and 21.31 should be brought together.

**21.31C. Ancient laws, certain medieval laws, customary laws, etc.**

LC response to ALA follow-up and CCC follow-up:

We agree with ALA but still would like to revise the rule to apply only to laws for which there is no jurisdiction that the laws govern. Perhaps an improved scope note would help.

**➤ Laws – Chapter 25 rules****➤ 21.32. Administrative regulations, etc.**

Our LC response remains as in our follow-up, but we are also exploring with the Law Library of Congress (they agree with the ALA follow-up) the development of more principle-based rules to guide catalogers when dealing with administrative regulations.

**➤ 21.33. Constitutions, charters, and other fundamental laws**

LC response:

If this section is removed, there would need to be clear examples, statements, and reference notes added to 21.31B1.

**➤ 21.35A. International treaties**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We continue to disagree with ALA, but have a dissenting opinion at our Law Library of Congress that we hope to discuss over the next few weeks before the JSC meetings.

**➤ 21.35B. Agreements contracted by international intergovernmental bodies**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We disagree and continue to feel the rule should be deleted (see proposal at 21.35A.).

**➤ 21.35C. Agreements contracted by the Holy See**

LC response:

We still feel this should be deleted as it is covered by the proposal at 21.35A.

**➤ 21.35D. Other agreements involving jurisdictions**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We disagree with ALA and continue to recommend:

**21.35D1:** Retain the current rule.

**21.35D2:** Consider deleting the rule; covered by proposed rule 21.35A.

**21.35D3:** Consider deleting the rule; covered by proposed rule 21.35A.

**21.35D4:** Retain the current rule.

**➤ 21.35E. Protocols, amendments, etc.**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We disagree and would prefer to enter ancillary documents under their own title with related access to their original treaty.

**➤ 21.35F. Collections**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We disagree and continue to recommend entering all collections of treaties, etc., under title.

➤ **21.36A1. Reports of one court**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We agree.

➤ **21.36A2. Reports of more than one court**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We would prefer to avoid the rule of three dichotomy and treat court reports as other works, i.e., when there are two or more consider them as compilations (title entry) and when only one, enter them under the court per 21.1B2 b).

➤ **21.36C3. Appeal proceedings.**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We agree.

➤ **21.36C4-C9**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We agree with ALA position on the court report section.

## **Certain Religious Publications [21.37–21.39]**

### **General comments**

The definition of liturgical work as proposed by ATLA and CLA should be more closely examined. The language should be more universally applicable across religions and not seem so restricted to Christian liturgy.

### **Specific Rules**

➤ **21.37. Sacred Scriptures**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We maintain our original proposal, but we agree that a definition should be provided for "sacred scripture or sacred works".

➤ **21.37A.**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We disagree and maintain our original proposal. General rule 21.1C (d) should be deleted because of the changes we proposed in 21.37A. We wish to reiterate that the term "scripture" in "sacred scriptures" does not apply in all cases and should be broadened to sacred works or "sacred works or scriptures." Note also that the term "sacred scripture" would need to be modified in 25.17 and 25.18.

We also note the need to add a provision for entering under a personal name heading a sacred work that is identified as a work of personal authorship in reference sources dealing with the religious group to which the sacred work belongs, i.e., works of the

Bahai Faith which are entered under their prophets (Baha u llah; Abdul-Baha, etc.); works on Scientology are entered under L. Ron Hubbard.

➤ **21.37B.**

LC response to ALA follow-up and adjustment of LC follow-up proposal:

We withdraw the proposal to consider treating harmonies of different scriptural passages under the general rules for modifications of a text. Upon further consideration, we do not wish them treated as modification of texts and feel the wording of 21.9 is OK.

➤ **Sacred Scriptures - Chapter 25 rules**

**25.17A:**

Further LC clarification:

We continue to support retaining the list of specific sacred works to be entered under title that are given in current rule 25.17A but consider expanding the list to include other texts (e.g., Sikhism works, additional Hindu texts, Book of Mormon).

However, upon reconsideration with the Hebraica Team, we are advocating (as we have elsewhere) that the library community reconsider the form of the heading "Bible. O.T." If RDA is to take a more global approach, then the time is right to raise this issue, and would like the JSC to re-examine this heading and related rules.

As further clarification on our request to change "English-language reference sources" to "reference sources in the language of the cataloguing agency," we would like to be sure to retain the phrase "reference sources dealing with the religious group(s) to which the scripture belongs." The Hebrew Bible is not referred to as the Old Testament in Jewish reference sources (except perhaps as a cross reference and/or in referring to the Christian Bible). Retaining the concept of using reference sources of the "religious group(s) to which the scripture belongs" strengthens the argument that "Bible. O.T." should be re-examined. See further information on this issue below.

➤ **25.18. Parts of sacred scriptures and additions**

**25.18A. Bible**

**25.18A1**

LC response on our LC follow-up:

We endorse the current practice of entering individual books under the "appropriate Testament." Note that the approach taken with regard to the headings for individual books is dependent upon the approach taken with regard to the heading "Bible. O.T." The notion of "Bible. Genesis," whereby Bible signifies the Christian Bible, is as problematic from a Jewish cultural/theological perspective as is the term "Bible. O.T."

**25.18A2**

The Hebraica Team at the Library of Congress advocates an even stronger statement of the rationale for reconsidering the form of this heading in light of RDA's global outlook. We wish to further re-examine the mandatory "Enter the Old Testament



as Bible. O.T.” since the Hebrew scriptures are not universally known as the “Old Testament.”

The goal of incorporating a global perspective within the new code argues for taking a more culturally sensitive approach. Members of the Judaica library and scholarly community have expressed dissatisfaction with “Bible. O.T.” for many years, considering the heading problematic from a Jewish cultural and theological perspective. In some cases, Judaica libraries have created alternative forms of this heading for use in their catalogs. As noted above, the current 25.17A, which refers to “reference sources dealing with the religious group(s) to which the scripture belongs” also supports reconsidering the title “Bible. O.T.” The dilemma, of course is determining an appropriate replacement that would be acceptable to all parties and would not impact collocation (daunting file maintenance issues, aside). The ideal from a Jewish cultural/theological perspective would be to enter the heading directly, as in “Hebrew Bible,” “Hebrew Scriptures,” or the Hebrew term “Tanakh,” (which is increasingly being used in English language sources, including LC’s revised BM and KBM classification schedules). We realize that entering “Tanakh” directly might not be acceptable for all, but a compromise approach like “Bible. Hebrew Bible,” “Bible. Hebrew scriptures,” or “Bible. Tanakh,” would mislead the user, because the order of the books in the Tanakh are not the same as in the Christian Old Testament. LC acknowledges the challenge of determining an appropriate replacement that would be acceptable to all parties and would not impact collocation, but is willing to engage in discussions with stakeholders through the library community to do so.

**25.18A3-25.18A8:**

We recognize that our original proposal to retain the current rules would need to be modified to reflect any decision regarding 25.18A2 on “Bible. O.T.”

**25.18A13:**

To be clear, we recommend retaining the of adding the year, which aids in sorting of lengthy files.

**25.18A14:**

Again to clarify, we endorse retention of this rule, although the phrase, “(i.e., one included neither in the Catholic canon nor in the Protestant Apocrypha),” should be deleted. The existing explanatory references are helpful in identifying to which tradition the given apocryphal book belongs.

**25.18B. Talmud**

We reaffirm that the rule should be retained, and we confirm that the Encyclopaedia Judaica is still the most authoritative reference source for Judaica. Most, if not all, of the headings in this category have already been established anyway, and there is no advantage to changing or rethinking them. There is some question, however, as to whether specific authoritative sources should continue to be cited within the body of the rules themselves. If it is not the general practice to cite specific reference sources, perhaps a list of sources could appear separately in some type of appendix, so that

modifications, additions, etc., can be more easily made in the future. This also holds for retaining the current rules: **25.18C. *Mishnah and Tosefta* and 25.18E. *Midrashim*.**

➤ **21.38. Theological Creeds, Confessions of Faith, Etc.**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We maintain our original proposal, but recognize there needs to be acknowledgment that an individual creed may be entered under personal author, which is appropriate in the Jewish context where creeds have been attributed to various thinkers, but are not necessarily officially accepted by any particular religious body.

➤ **21.39. Liturgical works**

➤ **21.39A. General rule**

➤ **21.39A1.**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We endorse rewording from “under the heading for the church or denominational body to which it pertains” to “under the heading for the body to which it pertains.” See comments at 21.39C1 below. Otherwise, we stand by our original proposal, adding also information from 21.39A2 to the scope note.

➤ **21.39A2.**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We maintain our proposal, except to change “sacred scriptures” to “sacred works and scriptures.”

➤ **21.39A3.**

LC response to LA follow-up:

We maintain our proposal.

➤ **21.39B. Liturgical works of the Orthodox Eastern Church**

LC response to ALA follow-up”

We agree to delete the rule, but feel it is covered by proposed rule 21.39A1.

➤ **21.39C. Jewish liturgical works**

LC response to ALA follow-up:

We considered the possibility of eliminating this exceptional practice for Jewish liturgical works in the name of simplification. Nevertheless, we could not see any benefits to changing our current practice of entering under the title, particularly the uniform title as described 25.21-25.22, qualifying the heading as needed, and providing an added entry for the related body. This practice serves to both collocate and differentiate in a useful manner.

➤ **Liturgical Works - Chapter 25 rules**

Further comment from LC:

The general rule would benefit from examples from various religious traditions.

➤ **25.22. Variant and special texts:**

Further LC comment:

Although provisions for breaking conflicts in uniform titles may be covered in the general provisions for uniform titles, there is some value in retaining this rule, at least in some modified form. We frequently need to qualify liturgical works by rite (and/or other elements), so retaining the example “Haggadah (Sephardic)” may be useful, since we recommend retaining 21.39C1. However, modification of the rule should be considered to end the current practice of not qualifying Ashkenazic rite works, which, in effect, identifies Ashkenazic rite as the norm and may be considered to reflect a cultural bias.