

Lib sc. 5; 1969; PAPER H.

Conflict of Authorship : Person vs Corporate Body.
(Cataloguing problems. 7). (Comparison of CCC and ALA Code. 5).

S R Ranganathan, *National Research Professor in Library Science, and Honorary Professor, Documentation Research and Training Centre, Bangalore 3*, and
G Bhattacharyya, *Lecturer, Documentation Research and Training Centre, Bangalore 3*.

[Refers to the importance of stating the Normative Principles of Cataloguing in a Catalogue Code and shows how ALA 1967 has made its first attempt in this direction. Enumerates the essential elements that a Catalogue Code should deal with. Refers to the Principle of Unity of Idea in a catalogue code and shows how ALA 1967 has followed the lead of CCC in the matter of respecting the principle by separating out the rules for the choice of heading from those for rendering it; but it still continues to mix up in one and the same rule the resolution of the conflict of authorship, and the choice of Heading for the Main Entry and for the Added Entries. Makes a comparative study of how the different editions of CCC and ALA code resolve the conflict of authorship centring round Person vs Corporate body. And in this, considers the following cases: (1) Documents to be deemed to be of corporate authorship; (2) Documents to be deemed to be of personal authorship; (3) Non-governmental edition of an act; and (4) Conference documents. Indicates the impact, if any, received by any code from the earlier codes].

ABBREVIATIONS USED

ALA = Cataloguing rules: Author and title entries; compiled by the Committees of the Library Association and the American Library Association.

Its three editions are distinguished by adding after the abbreviation their respective years of publication — e g ALA 1908;

ALA 1949; and ALA 1967.

CCC = Classified catalogue code; by S R Ranganathan.

Its five editions are distinguished by adding after the abbreviation their respective years of publication — e.g. CCC 1934; CCC 1945; CCC 1951; CCC 1958; and CCC 1964.

1 Introduction

11 GUIDING PRINCIPLE

A Catalogue Code should state or refer to the Normative Principles of Cataloguing. Except for CCC 1958 and CCC 1964, practically no other Code explicitly states the Normative Principles of Cataloguing used for guidance in the drafting of Rules. For the first time, ALA 1967 has made an attempt in this direction by incorporating four "General Principles" said to underlie its Rules for Entry. But this is far from sufficient. It would have been better if it had followed CCC in full measure in this respect.

12 PRINCIPLE OF UNITY OF IDEA

A Catalogue Code should deal with the following essential elements:

- 1 Definitions of cataloguing terms;
- 2 Interpretation of cataloguing terms in different contexts;
- 3 Choice of information for a Section of an Entry;
- 4 Rendering of it; and
- 5 Style of recording it.

The Principle of Unity of Idea demands that no rule in a Catalogue Code should deal with more than one of the elements mentioned above, in respect of any problem.

The earlier two editions of ALA Code sometimes mix up all the five elements in one and the same rule. This issue has already been dealt with in the article *Principle of unity of idea in a catalogue code* (2). However, ALA 1967 has openly declared the following as its new features:

- 1 "Choice of entry and construction of heading have been treated as separate problems ..."; and
- 2 "Choice of entry has been treated as a problem of determination of authorship responsibility." (1).

ALA 1967 has rightly followed the lead of CCC in respect of its first new feature. But it has failed in its second so called new feature. It is not easy to see what prevented it from giving up its old habit and separating out the set of rules on the determination of the author on the one side and the choice of Heading for the Main Entry and for the Added Entries on the other as CCC 1958 and CCC 1964 have done.

13 RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT OF AUTHORSHIP

Authorship is to be determined with reference to the definitions of the terms 'Author', 'Personal Author' and 'Corporate Author'; and a conflict of authorship is to be resolved by proper interpretation of these terms in the context concerned. Therefore, the responsibility of resolving a conflict of authorship rests with the element "Interpretation of the term 'Author' in different contexts"; and not with the rules for the choice of Heading of the Main Entry.

Understanding and bringing out the full implication of the definitions of the terms 'Personal Author' and 'Corporate Author' becomes essential in applying these definitions to the rule prescribing the name of the author of a document to be chosen as the Heading of its Main Entry.

Till 1958, practically all the codes mixed up in one and the same rule — namely, the rule for the choice of Heading — two or more of the following elements:

- 1 Definition
- 2 Its full implication in a particular context; and
- 3 Choice of Heading.

This implied violating the Principle of Unity of Idea in the drafting of cataloguing rules. The successive editions of ALA Code, and CCC have been evidently uneasy about this wrong practice. This problem was fully discussed and a solution suggested in the *Theory of library catalogue* (1938) (3). But this suggestion was not fully implemented by CCC 1945. For, it wanted time to make some experiments.

However, CCC 1958 implemented these suggestions in a Chapter entitled "Conflict of Authorship". This chapter is reproduced as Part G in CCC 1964. In CCC 1964, the sections in Part G amount, in effect, to annotations and commentaries on the rules in Part F giving the definitions of different kinds of author, to fit in with different contexts.

14 NORMALISATION OF ALA RULE

This paper makes a comparative study of CCC and ALA Code in regard to their respective resolutions of conflict of authorship centring round Person vs Corporate Body.

To make the comparative study less cumbersome, more meaningful, and more fair, wherever necessary, the mixture of the determination of Author and of the choice of Heading in a Rule in ALA 1949 and ALA 1967 has been removed. The result is the reduction of such an ALA rule to a standard form. The

essential method used to remove the mixture in a rule and to reduce the rule to the standard form is

1 Replacement of the term "Enter under", occurring in the original rule, by the term "[The ... is to be taken to be the author of]." (In each rule, the three dots have been replaced by the designation of the right entity to be taken as the author. This retains the substance of the rule intact insofar as the determination of authorship is concerned. This method of removal of mixture from ALA rules should be followed up by the necessary rules prescribing the choice of Heading of the Main Entry. It is presumed that it will not be a great task. On the other hand, it will add to clarity); and

2 Deletion of directions such as "with added entry under ..." (This is not relevant to the determination of the right authorship). The finally resulting form of the ALA rule may be referred to as the "Normalised ALA Rule".

15 RESTRICTION IN CITATION OF RULES

It is not equally easy to normalise the rules of ALA 1908 on this subject without breaking up and rewriting many rules and adding annotations and commentaries explaining the reasons therefor. Therefore, the normalised forms of the rules of ALA 1908 are not cited in this paper.

CCC 1951 and CCC 1958 are also not cited for comparison. Because, the relevant sections of CCC 1951 and CCC 1958 are the same as those of CCC 1945 and CCC 1958 respectively. But, exception has been made in one case where the prescription of CCC 1958 differs from that of CCC 1964.

2 Corporate Body as Author

Note.— The mnemonic numbering of the citations and of the commentaries on them have been explained in the article *Cataloguing terminology* (Library science. 5; 1968; Paper L).

2b CCC 1945

Corporate author.— A work is said to be of corporate authorship if the responsibility for its contents does not rest solely on a personal author or authors in their private capacity but rests essentially on a corporate body. The mere fact that a work is published or aided financially or approved or authorised by a corporate body is not sufficient reason to deem it to be of corporate authorship. If the title-page of a work mentions the name of an official of a corporate body in the place in which the author's name is usually mentioned, it is to be deemed to be of ... Corporate Authorship if it is limited by the administrative purpose, function and outlook of the Corporate Body.

[For resolving conflict of authorship centring round *Person Vs Corporate Body*, refer further to the *Theory of library catalogue*. (3)].

2c ALA 1949

Rule 71. [The corporate body is to be taken to be the author of] such material as official publications of governments; proceedings and reports of societies; official catalogues of libraries, museums; reports of institutions, firms, conferences, and other bodies even though the name of the individual preparing it is given.

Note.— Besides this general rule, ALA 1949 repeats the idea in the following rules also in respect of certain particular instances:

- 1 Rule 73A;
- 2 Rule 73B; and
- 3 Rule 73C(1).

These rules are not cited here. Because, in the context of Rule 71, they are redundant. Redundancy is a fault in a Code. If deemed necessary, the substance of the redundant rules may be given as commentaries or illustrations under the basic rule.

2f CCC 1964

GC 2 If the title-page does not mention the name(s) of person(s) in the author statement, but mentions or indicates somewhere in itself or in the overflow of the title-page, the name of a corporate body(ies) other than a body belonging to the publishing trade mentioned in the imprint, and if there is also internal evidence of corporate authorship, the author in the document is of corporate authorship; provided that, even in the case of the name(s) of corporate body(ies) mentioned in the imprint being only that of a body belonging to the publishing trade, if it is a work by the corporate body itself—such as its catalogue, administrative report, history—the work in the document is of corporate authorship.

GC 3 If the title-page mentions or indicates the name(s) of corporate body(ies) other than a body belonging to a publishing trade mentioned in the imprint, and also the name(s) of person(s) in the place usually giving the name of the author,

GC31 The work in the document is of corporate authorship, if it is of deliberative, legislative, directive, judicial, administrative or routine character limited by the purpose or function or outlook of the corporate body. The mere fact that a document is published, financed, aided, approved, sponsored, or authorised by a corporate body is not sufficient reason to deem the work in

it to be of corporate authorship and not to be of personal authorship.

2g ALA 1967

Rule 17A1 ... The corporate body [is to be taken to be the author of] a work that is by its nature necessarily the expression of the corporate thought or activity of the body. Such works include official records and reports, and statements, studies and other communications dealing with the policies, operations, or management of the body made by officers or other employees of the body.

Rule 17A2 ... The corporate body [is to be taken to be the author of] a work, other than a formal history, describing the body, its functions, procedures, facilities, resources, etc. or an inventory, catalog, directory of personnel, list of members, etc.

Note.— Besides these general rules, ALA 1967 repeats the idea in the following rules also in respect of certain instances:

1 Rule 17C1a; and

2 Rule 17C1c.

These rules are not cited here. Because, in the context of Rule 17A, they are redundant. Redundancy is a fault in a Code. If deemed necessary, the substance of the redundant rules may be given as commentaries or illustrations under the basic rule.

22 CCC 1945

Ed 1(1934) of CCC recognises the conflict of authorship centring round Person vs Corporate Body. It rightly realises that the appropriate level for resolving this conflict is the level of definitions of the terms 'Personal Author' and 'Corporate Author'. But it fails to realise the helpfulness of resolving this conflict at the level of the interpretation of the definitions of these terms in different contexts; and of separating these interpretations from the definitions themselves. Because of this failure, CCC 1934 formulates its definitions of these two terms in such a way that each of them results in a mixture of the definition of the term and the interpretation of the definition in different contexts. This implies violation of the Principle of Unity of Idea in drafting rules giving definitions of terms. Then comes the *Theory of library catalogue* (= *Theory*) (3). It points out categorically that "many ambiguous cases can still lurk between the two definitions". It indicates the need for resolving the conflict of authorship at the level of the interpretation of the definitions of the terms 'Personal Author' and 'Corporate Author' in different contexts; and not to mix up the issue with the definitions proper or with the rule for the choice of Heading. It is not known why the suggestion given by the *Theory* is not taken advantage of by CCC

1945. Instead, it takes out the essential conclusions of the *Theory* and adds it to the existing definitions of 'Personal Author' and "Corporate Author". Of course, it refers to the pertinent chapter in the *Theory* for resolving conflict of authorship. All the same, CCC 1945 continues the faults of CCC 1934. This is because, need was felt for further thinking and experiment on the subject.

23 ALA 1949

The approach of ALA 1949 is a definite improvement over that of ALA 1908. It brings together all the scattered interpretations of the definition of the term 'Author'; and presents them in the form of a general rule — Rule 71. This rule is made the first rule in its part on "Corporate Bodies as Authors"; though the chapter is devoted mainly to the rendering of corporate headings. This approach shows that perhaps ALA 1949 has to some extent realised the advantage of bringing together in one place the interpretations necessary to resolve this conflict. The content of Rule 71 is also far more improved than that of the basic materials in ALA 1908 from which it has been developed. In its normalised form it resembles very much the interpretation incorporated in the definition of the term 'Corporate Author' in CCC 1945.

26 CCC 1964

As the correct formulation was made by CCC 1958, CCC 1964 simply reproduces it. It implements the suggestions of the *Theory* very neatly. Firstly, at the level of the definitions of cataloguing terms, it defines the terms 'Author', 'Personal Author' and 'Corporate Author' each separately conforming to the Canons of Technical Terminology. Secondly, at the level of interpretation of terms in different contexts, it provides a separate chapter — Chapter GC — on the interpretation of these terms in different context. In the context of these definitions and their interpretations, the general rule for the choice of the Heading of the Main Entry — Rule MD1 — has become very simple and resilient and it has acquired unity of idea.

The interpretation given in Sec GC2, GC3, and GC31 of CCC 1964 is far more thorough than that given in CCC 1945. It brings out the fact that the title-page and its overflow pages play a vital role in the resolution of conflict of authorship. This is in exact conformity to the Canon of Ascertainability defined and explained in Chap BB of CCC 1964.

27 ALA 1967

The approach of ALA 1967 towards the problems of conflict of authorship differs considerably from that of ALA 1949.

Firstly, the rules dealing with the problem have been shifted from the part on "Rendering of Heading" to the part on "Choice of Heading". Secondly, they have been grouped mostly under the heading "Works with Authorship of Mixed Character". Thirdly, the purpose of this grouping has been explicitly stated in an *Introductory note* to this section. Fourthly, drafting of the rules has been improved considerably.

The problem of deciding the author of a work in case of conflict of authorship is no longer mixed up in the rules for "Rendering the Heading". In so doing, ALA 1967 has followed CCC 1958 and CCC 1964. But while CCC 1958 and CCC 1964 separate the problem of conflict of authorship from the choice of heading also, ALA 1967 has abstained from following the path of CCC. It continues to mix up the determination of authorship in the rules for choice of heading. Why this difference in ALA 1967 following CCC in respect of the rules for rendering, but not in respect of the rules for choice? In reply, to this question, the following statement occurs in the Editor's *Introduction to ALA 1967*: "Choice of entry has been treated as a problem of determination of authorship responsibility." This shows that the difference in the treatment of the rules for rendering conforming to CCC and the rules for choice not conforming to CCC is conscious. What could have been the philosophy behind this persistence of mixing up different ideas in one and the same rule, ignoring the example of CCC?

The grouping of the rules under the heading "Works with Authorship of Mixed Character" is an approximation of the practice of CCC 1958 and CCC 1964.

The resolution of the conflict of authorship has to be sought through the definitions of the terms 'Author', 'Personal Author', and 'Corporate Author'; and through the interpretation of these terms in relation to different contexts. ALA 1967 defines the term 'Author' only. This is a considerably improved definition. A comparison of the definition of the term 'Author' found in ALA 1949, CCC 1958 and CCC 1964 and ALA 1967 shows the influence of CCC on ALA Code in this improvement of the definition of the term. However, ALA 1967 appears to have missed the essence. The creation of a work has always to be by a person only, even if it is done on behalf of a corporate body. The corporate body has the right to get it changed by the draftsman before it takes up responsibility for the work. The person who drafts the work may even deny his own responsibility for such changes. It is here that the distinction between "Personal Authorship" and "Corporate Authorship" arises. This is one of the ways in which the conflict of authorship arises. This is

not laid bare by ALA 1967 because it uses the term 'Responsibility' for both kinds of authorship.

The grouping of rules under the heading "Works with Authorship of Mixed Character" itself discloses a flaw and a confusion in thinking, unless it is taken to connote "Joint Authorship".

The normalised Rule 17A1 of ALA 1967, as cited in Sec 2g, appears to have been based on Rule 71 of ALA 1949 — which itself had been influenced by CCC 1945 (See Sec 23 of this paper). The ideas in Rule 17A1 of ALA 1967 appears to be virtually copies of the ideas contained in Sec GC3 and GC31 of CCC 1964, though ALA 1967 makes changes in the verbal plane.

Rule 17A2 of ALA 1967 denies corporate authorship to certain categories of works, such as "a formal history, describing the body ...". This question cannot be decided ex cathedra in this simple way. The authorship will have to be decided in accordance with the basic rules on the resolution of conflict between corporate authorship and personal authorship. That is why, CCC 1964 does not make exception of these types of work.

3 Person as Author

3b CCC 1945

Personal author.— A composer or writer of a book, the responsibility for its contents resting solely on him in his private capacity and not essentially on a corporate body or on his official capacity.

Corporate author.— ... If the title-page of a work mentions the personal name of an official of a corporate body in the place in which the author's name is usually mentioned, it is to be deemed to be of Personal Authorship, if its primary function is extension of the sphere of knowledge ...

[For resolving conflict of authorship centring round Person vs Corporate Body, refers further to the *Theory*](3).

3c ALA 1949

Rule 71 [The person is to be taken to be the author of the] ... monographic works [created by him as an] official, officer, member, or employee of a corporate body when these works are not clearly administrative or routine in character, even though issued by the corporate body.

Note.— Besides this general rule, ALA 1949 repeats the idea in the following rules also in respect of certain particular instances:

- 1 Rule 73C;
- 2 Rule 75C(2); and
- 3 Rule 75D.

These rules are not cited here. Because, in the context of Rule 71, they are redundant. Redundancy is a fault in a Code. If deemed necessary, the substance of the redundant rules may be given as commentaries or illustrations under the basic rule.

3f CCC 1964

GC1 If the title-page mentions the name(s) of Person(s) only in the author-statement and does not mention or indicate the name of any corporate body(ies) other than the one(s) belonging to the publishing trade mentioned in the imprint, the work in the document is of personal authorship.

GC3 If the title-page mentions or indicates the name(s) of corporate body(ies) other than a body belonging to a publishing trade mentioned in the imprint, and also the name(s) of person(s) in the place usually giving the name of the author.

GC32 The work in the document is of personal authorship, if its primary function is the extension of the boundary of a field of knowledge or its intensification, and the responsibility for the thought and expression of it rests on the person and not on the office held by him in the corporate body, in spite of his being a paid or an honorary employee or a member of the corporate body. The mere mention of the personal name of an official of the corporate body in the place in which author's name is usually mentioned in a book, is not sufficient reason to deem the work in it to be of personal authorship and not to be of corporate authorship.

3g ALA 1967

Rule 17A1 [The person is to be taken to be the author of] single reports ... that are made by [him as an] officer or other employee [of a corporate body] and that embody the results of scholarly investigation or scientific research. [The consultant is to be taken to be the author of] all reports and studies prepared by [him as one] engaged [by a corporate body] for the particular purpose.

Rule 17B [The person creating it is to be taken to be the author of a work that is not of corporate authorship] under the provisions of 17A1 and 17A2 above, or if there is doubt as to whether it is.

Note.— Besides these general rules, ALA 1967 repeats the idea in the following rules also in respect of certain particular instances:

- 1 Rule 17C2a;
- 2 Rule 17C2b; and
- 3 Rule 17C2c.

These rules are not cited here. Because, in the context of Rule 17A they are redundant. Redundancy is a fault in a Code. If deemed necessary, the substance of the redundant rules may be given as commentaries or illustrations under the basic rule.

32 CCC 1945

All the remarks made in Sec 22 of this paper are equally applicable here.

33 ALA 1949

All the remarks made in Sec 23 of this paper are equally applicable here. The impact of CCC 1945 on the formulation of Rule 71 of ALA 1949 is specially notable here.

36 CCC 1964

All the remarks made in Sec 26 of this paper are equally applicable here.

37 ALA 1967

All the remarks made in Sec 27 of this paper are equally applicable here. The impact of CCC 1958 and CCC 1964 on the formulation of Rule 17A1 of ALA 1967 is specially notable here.

4 Non-Governmental Edition of an Act**4b CCC 1945**

[Same as cited in Sec 3b of this paper].

4c ALA 1949

Rule 84C. Annotated laws. [The annotator is to be taken to be the author of the] annotated editions or compilations of acts ... only when the text of the acts is obviously subordinated to the annotations ...

Rule 84D. Digests of laws. [The digester is to be taken to be the author of the digests of laws] when the original text of the laws digested or annotated is quoted only in part, or in a fragmentary manner or when the contribution of the digester or annotator forms the main feature of the book.

4e CCC 1958

An edition of an Act, brought out by a private author with introduction, notes, commentaries, case laws, and overall observations, should be treated as a composite book, as if the government is the author of the text alone and the private author is the author of the introduction, notes, etc.

4f CCC 1964

GC42 An edition of an Act, brought out by a private author with introduction, notes, commentaries, case laws, and overall observations should be treated as provided in GB6 [that is, the author of the dependent work is to be taken to be the author].

4g ALA 1967

Rule 11 Commentator or author

Rule 11A Commentary emphasised. [The commentator is to be taken to be the author of the commentary] if the title-page presents the publication as a commentary on the work, — unless there is strong reason to treat it as an edition of the work . . .

Rule 11B Edition of the work emphasised. [The author of the original is to be taken to be the author of an edition of it with commentary] if the title-page presents the publication as an edition of the work with accompanying commentary or annotations.

42 CCC 1945

CCC 1945 does not provide any separate treatment of an edition of an act brought out by a private author with introduction, notes, commentaries, case laws, and overall observations. Evidently, it fails to recognise it as a specific case giving rise to a conflict of authorship centring round person vs corporate body, the resolution of which demands a specific interpretation of the term 'Personal Author'.

43 ALA 1949

ALA 1949 recognises an annotated act as a specific case giving rise to a conflict of authorship centring round person vs corporate body; and it rightly gives a separate treatment to it.

45 CCC 1958

CCC 1958 recognises that an edition of an act brought out by a private author with introduction, notes, commentaries, case laws, and overall observations is a case of conflict of authorship centring round person vs corporate body. But, in determining the authorship of such an edition of an act, CCC 1958 prescribes the treatment of it as a Composite Book. In this case, Rule 621 on artificial composite book will apply. The implication of this is that the book contains two different works — viz.

1 The Act itself with its corporate authorship; and

2 The introduction, etc with its own personal authorship. This amounts to absolving the cataloguer from the responsibility to determine the relative weightage of the above two works. In fact, the Rule itself presumes equal weightage.

46 CCC 1964

On the other hand, CCC 1964 recognises the need for the cataloguer to exercise his judgment as to which has greater weightage and to choose the author—the person or the corporate body—in accordance with his judgment on weightage. CCC 1964 was helped to come to this decision by the fact that in the classified part of the catalogue, the original act and its different editions with commentaries etc would come in succession. Therefore, there would be no need to treat the book as a composite book in order to provide an entry under the corporate body in case the commentary etc by the private author is more dominant.

47 ALA 1967

The substance of the Rules 11A and 11B also amounts to leaving to the cataloguer the judgment about the relative weightage given in the book to the act itself and to the commentaries etc on it.

5 Conference Documents

5f CCC 1964

GC 5 Person vs Conference.— A conference is deemed author only of its agenda, minutes, resolutions, report of proceedings, and similar collectively created thought.

But a collection of learned papers or memoranda presented by person(s) or corporate body(ies) at the conference is deemed to have the respective person(s) or body(ies) as author(s).

5g ALA 1967

[No specific rule in ALA 1967 is devoted to the resolution of the conflict of authorship centring round person vs conference. The general rules 17A1, 17A2 and 17B (cited in Sec 2g and 3g of this paper) are to be applied, to the extent they are applicable, to resolve this conflict].

56 CCC 1964

The documents with which a conference may be associated may be

- 1 Its agenda, minutes, resolutions, report of proceedings and similar collectively created ideas; and
- 2 Collection of learned papers or memoranda presented by their respective authors to the conference. This association of these two different categories of documents with a conference, gives rise to a conflict of authorship centring round person vs corporate body. The definitions of the terms 'Personal Author' and 'Corporate Author' and the general interpretation of them

applicable to all contexts are not sufficient to resolve this conflict. Conference documents call for a separate specific interpretation of these definitions. But, till 1958, CCC does not recognise the conference documents as a case calling for a special interpretation. CCC 1958 realises the unhelpfulness of leaving this resolution to the care of the definitions of these terms and the general interpretation of them; and it provides a separate section on the subject. CCC 1964 continues the practice of CCC 1958. But, both of them fail, however, in dealing with the case where both the categories appear together as a single book. This must be attended to by CCC in its next edition.

57 ALA 1967

ALA 1967, like its earlier editions, does not recognise conference documents as a specific case calling for a special interpretation. Evidently, it leaves this resolution to the care of the general rules 17A1, 17A2, and 17B. It will be helpful to the cataloguer, if it follows the example of CCC 1964 and provide a special rule on the subject.

6 Bibliographical References

- 1 Sec 12 AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION and others. Anglo-American catalogue rule. [Ed 3]. North American text. 1967. P5.
- 2 Sec 12 BHATTACHARYYA (G.) Principle of unity of idea in a catalogue code. (Lib sc. 5; 1968; Paper F.)
- 3 Sec 13 RANGANATHAN (S R). Theory of library catalogue. 1938.