

To: Mary Larsgaard, Chair  
ALA/ALCTS/CCS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

From: Judy Knop, Chair, Taskforce on Review of RDA,  
Technical Services Interest Group, American Theological Library Association

Re: Reconciliation of Special Rules for Religious Materials in AACR2 Chapter 21  
[21.37–21.39]

Below is a summary of positions indicating agreement and disagreement on the part of the three organizations asked to reconcile differences of opinion. Due to the absence of the representative from the Association of Jewish Libraries, all that can be done is to state the AJL position when there is disagreement. ATLA and CLA have had a continuing discussion which has brought about some agreement, but leaves areas of disagreement. Because of the time constraints, no final consensus could be reached in some areas.

**21.37A:**

- ✓ ATLA and CLA agree to delete this rule in favor of 21.1C1 (d).
- ✓ AJL and CLA are in favor of changing “sacred scripture” to “sacred works and scripture” in all relevant places.
- ✓ ATLA is not in favor because it feels that this makes the phrase a great deal “fuzzier”. ATLA takes the word “scripture” to mean: “any writing that is regarded as sacred by a religious group.” ATLA does not see the reference to consistency with the Subject Cataloging Manual, H1188, as relevant. ATLA strongly recommends including a definition for “sacred scripture” in the RDA glossary.

**21.37B:**

- ✓ AJL does not comment on this rule.
- ✓ ATLA strongly believes that harmonies of the Bible fit under rule 21.9, which produces the exact result we wish to achieve:

Enter a work that is a modification of another under the heading appropriate to the new work if the modification has substantially changed the nature and content of the original [I would see this as applying to case 2 of the definition: An interweaving of such passages into a continuous text], thus calling for entry under the person who interwove the passages. If, however, the modification is a . . . rearrangement, etc. enter under the heading appropriate to the original [thus entry under Bible].

- ✓ CLA disagrees that harmonies can be cataloged under 21.9, and wishes the current rule, 21.37B, to stand.
- ✓ Both ATLA and CLA wish the current definition in the glossary to stand.

**21.38:**

- ✓ CLA and ATLA agree that this rule can be eliminated, with the addition to 21.1C1 of:

e) it is a theological creed, confession of faith, etc.

- ✓ AJL not only wants this rule retained, but suggests the need for a provision for personal authorship for some Jewish creeds. One possible reconciliation of these positions is:

**21.1B2**

c) those that record the collective thought of the body (e.g. reports of commissions, committees, etc.; official statements of position on external policies), however always enter theological creeds, confessions of faith, etc. emanating from one or more corporate bodies under title

**21.1C1**

e) it is a theological creed, confession of faith, etc. and is not of personal authorship

ATLA would support this possibility.

**21.39A1:**

- ✓ CLA and ATLA have agreed to eliminate this rule, moving the definition of a liturgical work to the glossary or to a footnote to 21.1B2 (b). CLA has withdrawn the addition to the definition. ATLA has proposed adding the list of non-liturgical works to the definition. CLA has agreed to add the list with a few emendations. ATLA is also proposing one addition to the definition, which would support the elimination of 21.39A2. The final definition would read (changes underlined):

*Liturgical work* includes officially sanctioned or traditionally accepted texts of religious observance, books of obligatory prayers to be offered at stated times [including the Liturgy of the hours, Divine office, etc.], calendars and manuals of performance of religious observances, readings from sacred scripture intended for use in a religious service, and prayer books known or formerly known as "books of hours." Do not consider as liturgical works books intended for private devotions, hymnals for congregations and choirs, proposals for orders of worship not officially approved, unofficial manuals, programmes of religious services, worship aids, lectionaries without scriptural text, or Bible vigils.

- ✓ AJL does not suggest the elimination of this rule, but suggests changing “church or denominational body” to “body.”
- ✓ If the rule is retained, ATLA and CLA agrees with AJL on the wording change.

**21.39A2:**

- ✓ CLA does not agree with the elimination of this rule. In the event that 21.39A is eliminated, CLA suggests changing the wording to the following:

Enter an item consisting of readings from sacred scriptures intended for use in a religious service as a liturgical work.

- ✓ ATLA suggests adding “readings from sacred scripture” to the definition of liturgical work, which would obviate the need for this rule.
- ✓ AJL and CLA suggest changing “sacred scripture” to “sacred works and scriptures.” ATLA does not support this change, as noted above under 21.37A, but does support a definition of sacred scripture to be added to the glossary.

**21.39C:**

- ✓ CLA does not agree with elimination of this rule for the following reasons:
  - a) AJL does not favor elimination.
  - b) Since there is no intention to change the substance of the rule, why engage in amending 21.1C1 just to preserve that substance? I view this as a special exception which should be dignified by a freestanding rule.
- ✓ AJL actually suggests eliminating this rule, but keeping their current practice of entering under title.
- ✓ ATLA has suggested eliminating this rule and adding title entry as a new point under 21.1C1, which seems in concert with AJL:

f) it is a Jewish liturgical work. When appropriate, use a uniform title as instructed in 25.21-25.22.

**Overall rationale for eliminating the special rules in Ch. 21** (suggested by an ATLA cataloger):

I think that as a matter of organization in print material, it is easier to find exceptions to rules in a special section, such as the “certain religious publications” of chapter 21. If the RDA is envisioned as primarily an e-text, I don’t think the organization matters as much for finding exceptions. And with e-texts it might actually be easier to find the exceptions

listed with the rule where you would expect them to otherwise be located if they were not exceptions.

Generally I think that consolidating exceptions in one place will make the rules easier to use, and that we should prefer the elimination of 21.37-39 for this reason.