

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

FROM: Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative

SUBJECT: Proposals to simplify AACR2 Ch. 21 special rules

General observations

CILIP notes the potential ambiguity in the original call recorded by ALA in its response. We have not been aware of any similar uncertainties during our own considerations, but would clearly not wish to miss out on potentially valuable responses from other constituencies and would support any proposal for a further call in this area, if any constituency felt this was needed.

We think the 2nd para. of ALA's follow-up is vitally important. JSC needs to be clear what the intended effect of any amalgamation or consolidation of rules is, otherwise users will impose their own interpretations.

Art works

We agree with the general consensus that rules 21.16 and 21.17 are, with only minimal change elsewhere, effectively redundant. 21.17A1 in particular is stating the obvious, whilst 21.16 may actually be oversimplifying the case: when is a print a reproduction and when an adaptation? The general rule gives more flexibility (21.9).

Many in the UK art library community have, over the years, thought 21.17B as odd, but the rules were supposed to have been introduced at the request of the art community. Now it seems that community may have no use for this and other special rules. Curious. Doubtless the reasons have lost their way in the mists of time.

21.11B. Agree.

21.16. Agree.

21.17 Disagree with CCC. Main entry should depend on whether it is essentially text with illustrations or illustrations with accompanying text, as the current rule implies. It is also what it is implied by current rule 21.24A on "collaboration between artist and writer", which makes 21.17 even more redundant. Whilst this may, in many cases, be stretching the concept of "collaboration", you also have to stretch the concept of "modification" of a work of art if you have to use 21.17 (bearing in mind that this rule is in a section headed *Works that are modifications of other works*, embracing rules 21.9-21.23).

21.24 Agree.

21.30F Agree

Other LC(1) Entry under gallery etc. is given for one of two reasons, represented by 21.1B2(a) and 21.1B2(d). It would require changes to both rules to exclude catalogues, exhibitions, etc., devoted to a single artist, and could raise as many problems (by introducing yet further complexity to the rules currently at 21.1B2) as it solves.

Other LC(2) Agree.

Musical works

Gen ALA We agree with the MLA view. But this again raises questions about what it's appropriate to include in the rules themselves, as well as to the best means of organising those rules so that they not only benefit those who need to use them but don't hinder use of the remaining rules for those with no interest in (or need to use, at any rate) special rules for music. Ease of use for everyone is a key consideration. (Of course, this is a more general point, and one we've aired already, but...)

Gen LC We agree with LC that the organisation is illogical. But that doesn't mean that the rules don't work as self-contained entities as/when needed. Again (cf CILIP's original "general" comments), where to place any rules that are needed is in an important issue and one that needs to be tackled properly once decisions have been made as to what to discard and what to retain.

21.18A Agree.

21.18B, ALA Agree.

21.18B, LC Agree. Presumably this implies a need to deal with the extent of any modification (cf. minor/major title changes)?

21.18C, ALA Is it clear what is meant by "version in a different graphic arts medium"? Could the two final paragraphs of the proposed revision be generalised?

21.18C, LC Agree re omission of b) and c), but will need to be explicit in the text or through provision of example(s).

21.19A, ALA Agree for individual works.

21.19A, LC We feel this is an insoluble conundrum. Since the rules talk in terms of "works", it seems to make most sense to treat each new setting as a new/separate work and not to attempt such fine distinctions, unless the work is clearly "mixed" (e.g. some ballad operas).

21.19B, ALA Move to 21.6 *or* 21.7, depending (cf CCC).

21.19B, CCC Agree.

21.19B, LC Agree.

21.19C, ALA Agree.

21.19C, CCC Agree.

21.19C, LC Disagree. Such publications are in no respect "adaptations".

21.20 Agree in general. But again we feel there's a conflict between ALA and LC in the way they respectively understand shared vs mixed responsibility. Do rules 21.6 and 21.8 need looking at too?

- 21.21 ALA (see proposed revision of 21.18B) regards as “revision”; LC considers “adaptation”. We agree that they seem to be closer to the latter, but fear you could end up with some pretty strange results, so are inclined to side with ALA and to regard them as insufficient to count as a “distinct alteration”.
- 21.22 Agree.
- 21.28 Librettos: We agree footnote 7 should be the *only* rule, but disagree that distinctions are necessary (or practical). We also disagree that name/title should always be used for added entries
Cadenzas: Agree.
Incidental music: Agree.

Sound recordings

- Gen LC CILIP agrees with paras. 1 and 3, and with the first two bullets at the foot of p. 15. We disagree with the third bullet – giving credit, in a catalogue entry, for someone on the basis of their reputation in a given field, seems a curious concept. And one that would be difficult to put into practice.
- 21.23A Agree.
- 21.23B Agree. We especially liked the bullets. But how does this fit with the issues raised earlier on?
- 21.23C We are unsure about the idea of treating these as a subset of adaptations. But we agree about offering general guidance.
- 21.23D We think we agree.

Academic disputations

CILIP agrees with the ALA proposal, and appreciates the work ALA put into providing background information on what, to most, is a fairly obscure area.

Legal publications

CILIP hasn't reviewed associated chapter 25 rules at this time.

- Gen ALA Single set of rules: whilst ALA's argument is undoubtedly a strong one, we feel this raises more general issues too.
Simplification: we would welcome development of ALA's ideas for presenting these rules in a chart or table.
- 21.31 Agree.
- 21.31A Agree.
- 21.31A1 Agree that the distinction needs to be clarified.
- 21.31B Agree both ALA and LC.
- 21.31B1, ALA We don't usually do this, do we? Would there be implications elsewhere?

- 21.31B1, LC We think we agree (but don't have sufficient legal experience to hand to be totally sure what "fundamental law" is!)
- 21.31B2 Agree all.
- 21.31B3 Agree all.
- 21.31C Agree all.
- 21.32 We agree that some simplification is needed, but have no specific ideas to offer.
- 21.32B CILIP agrees moving this to 21.31, but would ask constituencies to note that we had no legal expertise to call upon, so hope that the British Library and/or CCC might be able to offer a more authoritative response on this matter.
- 21.33 Agree with ALA re the basic problem, and with LC re the solution.
- 21.34 Agree all.
- 21.35A, ALA We basically agree, but would prefer that the first-named be used as the entry point, rather than the first in English alphabetical order.
- 21.35A, CCC We cannot agree that this would be appropriate for bilateral treaties.
- 21.35A, LC We cannot agree that this would be appropriate for bilateral treaties. WE agree the incorporation of other rules, if this turns out to be possible.
- 21.35B We agree with LC (and disagree with ALA, therefore).
- 21.35C We agree with LC (and disagree with ALA, therefore).
- 21.35D We agree with ALA (and disagree with LC re 21.35D2-D3, therefore).
- 21.35E At the risk of exposing our lack of legal knowledge, is there some similarity here with the administrative regulations (21.32), both in what they are (in terms of relationships) and how they might be treated? We think we agree with LC, and possibly disagree with ALA, but would willingly yield to anyone who can bring better knowledge of the issues to the table than we can muster.
- 21.35F We agree with ALA (and disagree with LC, therefore).
- 21.35F3 Agree.
- 21.36A Agree. We can't see why the "issuing body" matters, especially with so much government publishing (in the UK and elsewhere) being privatised.
- 21.36A1 Agree.
- 21.36A2 If there are two, then why not enter under the first-named (cf other situations involving "two")? Otherwise agree.
- 21.36B Agree all.
- 21.36C1-C3 Agree ALA.
- 21.36C4-C9 Agree ALA.

Religious publications

CILIP hasn't reviewed associated chapter 25 rules at this time.

- 21.37, ALA Aren't all scriptures "sacred works"? There seems an element of tautology here. Is it really "or" that's meant? In addition, we note many kinds of works which might be termed loosely "sacred works", e.g. sacred music,

which would not in any way fall under this rule. We agree the need for a definition, though, in order to remove any ambiguity!

- 21.37, LC Agree.
- 21.37A , ALA Agree that it duplicates 21.1C(d). But perhaps this is one of those places where it needs to be retained in order to make sense of a package of rules dealing with religious publications?
- 21.37A, LC (a) Agree. (b) We would prefer entry under corporate body with an added entry for (or reference from) a personal author, if this is possible.
- 21.37B We agree moving to 21.9-21.10, retaining usage and glossary definitions.
- 21.38, ALA This is eminently practical, but is it entirely logical?
- 21.38, LC (b) This doesn't overcome the problem identified in the ALA response. (c) We prefer the ALA proposal; determining the level of official acceptance is an unnecessary burden.
- 21.39A1 We prefer ALA to LC. The ALA definition may need revisiting, though. Will it be clear what's meant by "programmes of religious services"?
- 21.39A2 We agree with ALA (and disagree with LC, therefore).
- 21.39A3 We agree with ALA (and disagree with LC, therefore).
- 21.39B, ALA Agree.
- 21.39B, LC Whilst we prefer the ALA proposal, we could agree with LC if the proposed revision of 21.39A1 were accepted.
- 21.39C We agree with ALA (and disagree with LC, therefore).