Lib sc. 10; 1973; PAPER W

A Critique of the "General Principles" in A A C R.
(Cataloguing problems. 19).

G Bhattacharyya, *Senior Lecturer, Documentation Research and Training Centre, Indian Statistical Institute, Bangalore* 560003.

[The four "General Principles", incorporated in AACR (1967), as the normative principles governing the formulation of the individual rules for the choice of the headings of the main entries for different varieties of document, are evaluated from the following points of view: (1) Categorisation of cataloguing problems; (2) Final authority for the choice of the heading of the main entry; and (3) Empirical facts of experience governing the formulation of the principles. An evaluative classification of the technical terms and ideas involved in the formulation of the principles is presented. The realisation of the need of incorporating a set of normative principles into the code is appreciated. The "General Principles" form a first step only, and there is considerable scope for improvement. A conscious attempt (1) to arrive at an effective mutually exclusive categorisation of cataloguing problems, on the basis of the empirical facts of experience pertaining to the pattern of formulation of the sought headings for different varieties of "known document" in the majority of cases, (2); to determine the final authority governing the choice of the heading of the main entry on the basis of the above findings; and (3) to distinguish between a normative principle and a rule, would be helpful]

0 Introduction
01 STATEMENT OF "UNDERLYING PRINCIPLES"
The *Anglo-American cataloguing rules*, 1967 (=AACR), in its *Introductory notes* to Chapter 1: Entry, states as follows:
"*General Principles*. The following general principles underlie the rules for entry:
(1) Entry should be under author or principal author when one can be determined.
(2) Entry should be under editor when there is no author or principal author and when the editor is primarily responsible for the existence of the work.

(3) Entry should be under a compiler named on the title-page in the case of collections of works by various authors.

(4) Entry should be under title in the case of other works whose authorship is diffuse, indeterminate, or· unknown."

02 SCOPE OF THE PAPER

This set of General Principles appears to be primarily concerned with the choice of the heading of the main entry for a Multiple-Entry Alphabetical Catalogue. This paper attempts to evaluate these "General Principles". In this connection, it is necessary to take note of the following statements occurring in the Introduction to AACR:

"The difference in the character of the present rules lies first in the fact that they are based on a set of principles that have been followed as consistently as possible, allowing for the necessity of reaching common agreement and, in certain cases, of coming to terms with economic imperatives."

"Second, choice of entry and construction of heading have been treated as separate problems, except when form subheadings are involved."

Technically, the expression 'Construction of Heading' is denoted by the term 'Rendering'. For the purpose of this paper, it is necessary to take note of the technical denotation of the terms 'Choice' and 'Rendering'. The term 'Choice' denotes the determination of that entity, from among the entities associated with the document to be catalogued, the name of which is to be used in a specified section of an entry; as well as the name of the entity so determined. The term 'Rendering' denotes the determination of the word(s) or word-group(s) to be retained in and/or added to a choice, and the determination, if warranted, of the sequence of the words or word-groups so determined; as well as the entity resulting thereafter. While any one of these terms is used to denote either an operation, or the result of an operation, the context helps to specify the sense in which the term is used. The evaluation of the "General Principles" will be confined to their relation to the choice of the heading of the main entry. In other words, no attempt is made here to evaluate their relation to the rendering of the heading of the main entry.

The evaluation of the set of "General Principles" calls for some background preparation relating to the following:

1   Clarification of the technical terms associated with the set of principles;

2   Taking note of the specific purview of AACR as a cataloguing code; and

3   Taking note of the empirical facts cf experience in regard to the pattern of formulation of sought headings for the different varieties cf "known documents"; and of the compatible rule corresponding to each set of empirical principles.

1   Clarification of Technical Terms
     To gain a clarification of the significant technical terms used in the statement of the set of "General Principles", it is necessary to take note of the definition, wherever possible, of such a term. Further, it will be helpful to interpret such a term, wherever necessary, in the right context. For this purpose, the following may be considered:

(a) Principle	(h) Primary responsibility for the
(b) Rule	existence of a work
(c) Work	(j) Work of determinate authorship
(d) Collection	(k) Work of indeterminate authorship
(e) Author	(m) Work of diffuse authorship
(f) Principal author	(n) Main entry
(g) Compiler	(p) Heading

1a 'PRINCIPLE'
     The term 'Principle' has not been defined by AACR. Naturally, it has been taken to be an assumed term. Generally, the meaning in which the term 'Principle' may be used in the context of a Cataloguing Code is as follows:
     A proposition or other formulation, usually generalised, and with one or more of the following attributes:
     1   It may be a statement of fact; or
     2   It may be accepted as true or helpful; or
     3   It may form the basis for deriving another proposition, with one or more of the attributes of the basic proposition; or
     4   It may provide a basis for reasoning; or
     5   It may guide the formulation of a proposition prescribing a procedure for fulfilling a particular purpose.

1a1   *Example*
     Consider the following propositions:
     1   Books are for use.
     2   A catalogue promotes the use of books.
     3   The heading of an entry in a catalogue is to be a sought heading.
     4   The items of information given in the title-page and in its overflow pages, in the majority of cases, form the basis for the formulation of the sought headings for it,

5   In the case of a simple document, the choice of the heading of its main entry is to consist of the name(s) of its author(s) if given on the title-page and its overflow pages.

6   The rendering of a name-of-person, in the heading of the main entry is to consist successively of the following:

(a) Entry Element;

(b) Secondary Elements, if any; and

(c) Individualising Element, if necessary.

7   In the case of a name-of-person belonging to the European cultural group:

(a) The Entry Element is to consist of the word or word-group forming the surname;

(b) The Secondary Element is to consist of the rest of the word or word-group in the name; and

(c) The Individualising Element is to consist generally of the year of birth of the person concerned.

8   The recording in Roman script of a name-of-person in the heading of the main entry is to consist successively of the following:

(a) The Entry Element written all in capital letters;

(b) The Secondary Element written in small letters with the initial letter in each substantive word capitalised, and enclosed in parenthesis;

(c) The Individualising Element — that is, year of birth — written in Indo-Arabic numerals, and enclosed in parenthesis; and

(d) A full stop.

1a2   *Annotation*

1   It may be noted that in the context of Library Service, Proposition 1 has been accepted as true and helpful. Secondly, it has formed the basis for deriving Proposition 2, which again is a statement of fact forming the basis for deriving Proposition 3. Thirdly, Proposition 1 provides, directly or indirectly, the basis for reasoning in the evaluation of any library technique. Therefore, Proposition 1 is a Principle. In relation to Proposition 2 it is the Basic Principle; and in relation to it, Proposition 2 is a Derived Principle.

2   Similarly, it may be argued that each of the Propositions 2 to 4 also is a Principle.

3   In relation to each other, each of the Propositions 1 to 4 belong to a distinct relative level.

4   None of the Principles 1 to 4, prescribes a procedure for cataloguing practice.

5 Proposition 5 is the first to prescribe a procedure for cataloguing practice. The formulation of this Proposition has been guided by Proposition 3 and Proposition 4 simultaneously.

6 Similarly, each ·of the Propositions 6 to 8 prescribes a procedure for cataloguing practice.

7 According to the definition of the term 'Principle', therefore, it is not helpful to deem any one of the Propositions 5 to 8, a Principle.

1b RULE

It is helpful to distinguish between a Principle and a Proposition prescribing a procedure for cataloguing practice. It is possible by defining the term 'Rule'. But AACR has not defined it. Naturally, it has been taken to be an assumed term. In the context of a Cataloguing Code, the term 'Rule' may be defined as follows:

A proposition with the following attributes:

1 Its formulation has been guided by a Principle; and

2 It directly prescribes a procedure for cataloguing practice.

1b1 *Example*

Each of the Propositions 5 to 8 given in Sec 1a1, is a Rule.

1b2 *Annotation*

1 It may be noted that Proposition 6 prescribes the rendering procedure of a name-of-person in general terms; and Proposition 7 prescribes the same procedure in specific terms. Therefore, as in the case of Principles, it is possible to distinguish Rules belonging to various levels.

2 It may further be noted that the definition of the term 'Principle' does not admit of a "Rule in General Terms" to be called a Principle.

1c WORK

The term 'Work' has not been defined by AACR. If it is taken to be an assumed term, in the context of cataloguing, it is to mean "Something produced by the exercise of creative talent or expenditure of creative effort". Such an entity may be recognised to be consisted of a set of ideas, their systematization, and their expression. In other words, the term 'Work' denotes any set of "expressed systematized ideas". It may be noted here that recording of a set of expressed ideas is not at all an essential attribute of a "Work". That is to say, for example, that a "Document" is not equal to a "Work". While the term 'Work' denotes only a set of expressed systematised ideas, the term 'Document' denotes a record of expressed systematised ideas.

The Classified Catalogue Code (=CCC) of S R Ranganathan has recognised the terms ' Work ' and 'Document' as technical terms; and it has defined them as follows:

"Work.— Expressed thought".

"Document.— Record of work on paper or other material, fit for physical handling, transport across space, and preservation through time."

It may be noted that the definitions in CCC are quite in conformity with the findings of our analysis mentioned above.

Further, for the purpose of the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (Paris) (1961), the terms 'Work' and 'Document' were defined as follows:

"Work.— Any expression of thought in language or symbol or other medium for record and communication."

"Document.— A work recorded in language or symbols, or by other means."

It may be noted that these definitions are virtually the same as those given by Ranganathan.

1d COLLECTION

1d1 *Definition of "Collection"*

The term 'Collection' has been defined by AACR as follows: "Collection. If by one author: Three or more independent works or parts of works published together; if by more than one author: two or more independent works or parts of works published together, and not written for the same occasion, or for the publication in hand."

1d2 *Annotation*

The term 'Work' has been defined to be "a set of expressed systematised ideas". In this sense, a sentence may be regarded as one of the shortest manifestations of "Work". Such a manifestation may be deemed to be a manifestation of lowest remove. A body of systematised works of lowest remove gives rise to works of different higher removes. Depending upon the context, a work of any remove may be deemed to be a "Whole Work". When such a "Whole Work" is not a manifestation of the lowest remove, each of the works of different lower removes constituting it, may be deemed to be a "Part Work". Obviously, a "Part Work" cannot be independent of its "Whole Work". Associated with each "Whole Work", there is a continuous exposition. This continuous exposition links up its "Part Works".

At the document-level, corresponding to a work of any remove, a document of that remove can be distinguished. A document embodying a work intended to be deemed to be a "Whole Work" for its having a distinct single title comprehending all its

"Part Works" is a Contribution at the document-level. "Contribution" is an idea which is helpful to be recognised at the document-level only.

An assemblage of several contributions gives rise to a collection. "Collection" is, therefore, another idea recognisable at the document-level, and not at the work-level. This finding is essential for the understanding of the idea "Collection". In its absence, faults may occur in the formulation of its definition. This becomes evident in the definition of the term 'Collection', quoted above. The term 'Work' has been used here in place of the term 'Contribution'.

Evidently, the term 'Collection' has been deemed by AACR to be the generic term to denote "Collection of Contributions of One and the Same Author" and "Collection of Contributions of Two or More Different Authors".

The expression "Collection of Contributions of One and the Same Author" refers to a document made up of three or more contributions each of which is by one and the same author. A contribution forming part of such a collection may be a reprint of the full text of a contribution published earlier; or it may be of a part of a contribution published earlier. The contributions forming the different parts of a collection may be written for the "publication in hand", also; as it generally happens in the case of many documents made up of several short stories by one and the same author. In such a case, the contributions in many cases are found to be published for the first time as the different parts of the collection concerned. The conditions mentioned above give rise to several questions — such as,

1 What is the rationale behind not recognising a document made up of two contributions by one and the same author, as a collection ? and

2 What is the status of a document made up of two or more contributions, each of the same joint authorship ?

AACR fails to answer these questions convincingly.

The expression "Collection of Contributions of Two or More Different Authors" refers to a document made up of two or more contributions, with the following attributes:

1 At least two of which are by two different authors;
2 A single occasion did not initiate their writings; and
3 None of them were written for the publication in hand.

The conditions mentioned above give rise to several questions — such us,

1 Why the attributes to be possessed by a collection of contributions of two or more different authors are to such a great

extent different from those of a collection of contributions of one and the same author?

2 What useful purpose does this difference of attributes serve in cataloguing?

AACR fails to answer these questions convincingly. However, it is evident th~t AACR has made a conscious attempt to distinguish a collection of contributions of two or more authors from a "Composite Work". The term 'Composite Work' is defined as "An original work consisting of separate and distinct parts, by different authors, which constitute together an integral whole". Obviously, the definition refers to "Composite Document" and not to "Composite Work"; for, the "Composite nature" in this context cannot be recognised at the level of "work"; it can be recognised at the level of "Document" only. It may be noted here that according to a general dictionary, the term 'Collection' refers to a whole made up of distinct parts; and the term 'Composite' refers to the state of being made up of distinct parts. In this sense, "Collection" is synonymous with "Composite Entity". This finding suggests that any one of these two terms should have been accepted as the standard term; and a system of terms to denote the different varieties of it could have been developed on the basis of the different characteristics pertinent to the purpose of cataloguing. CCC has made such an approach in its following system of terms:

1 Composite Book.— Book with two or more contributions, each with its own title, not forming a continuous exposition, and often, though not necessarily, by different authors.

2 Ordinary Composite Book.— Composite book provided with a single generic title to denote all the contributions collectively.

3 Artificial Composite Book.— Composite Book without a generic title to denote all the contributions collectively.

1e   AUTHOR
1e1   *Definition of "Author"*
       The term "Author" has been defined by AACR as follows:
       "Author.— The person or corporate body chiefly responsible for the creation of the intellectual or artistic content of a work, e.g., the writer of a book, the compiler of a bibliography, the composer of a musical work, the artist who paints a picture, the photographer who takes a photograph."

1e2   *Annotation*
       It is helpful to introduce the following equations of work and of document as the fundamental basis in considering "Authorship":

Work = Information — that is, systematised body of ideas
+ Expression

Document = Information — that is, systematised body of ideas
+ Exposition + Embodiment

"Authorship" is recognisable at the level of "Work" itself. The "Information" and "Exposition" constituting a "Work" may perhaps be thought of separately; but they can never exist separately. In this context only, let us consider the definition.

Evidently, the term 'Author' has been deemed to be a generic term to denote "Personal Author" and "Corporate Author". These two terms have been frequently used in the text of AACR; but none of them with its separate definition occurs in the list of technical terms. Of course, it is not at all difficult to derive the appropriate definition of each of these terms from the definition of the term ' Author '. An attempt in that direction will result in the following:

Personal Author.— The person chiefly responsible for the creation of the intellectual or artistic content of a work.

Corporate Author.— The corporate body chiefly responsible for the creation of the intellectual or artistic content of a work.

Consider a work of science. The systematised body of ideas, contained in it, is its intellectual content. It may be thought of separately as distinguished from the exposition of the work. This implies that in such a case, the intellectual content is not equal to the work.

Now, consider a work of literature. It has "claim to consideration on the ground of beauty of form or emotional effect". Naturally, the creation of such a work is pre-eminently guided by emotion and some sort of experience as distinguished from pure intellect. So far as the beauty of form is concerned, it lies entirely at the level of exposition. Therefore, the term 'Intellectual Content' does not apply here; and its contents can be aptly described by the term 'Artistic Content'. This implies that in the case of a work of literature, the artistic content is equal to the work.

Now, let us consider the idea "Creation" — that is, the act of bringing into existence — of a work. Obviously, a work owes its origin to the brain of a human being. For every work, there is a creator; and the creator is always an individual. This implies that a corporate body cannot be a creator. Of course, at the level of "Document " it is possible to merge two or more works, each created by a different individual, into one integral whole without indicating what is created by whom. This artificial measure results in a work of joint authorship.

Evidently, the act of creation is not equal to the result of creation — that is, work. There may be an agent making the provision of the necessary environment for the act of creation. But this agent is never creditable or chargeable for the act of creation — that is, this agent cannot be responsible for the act of creation. The entire responsibility for the act of creation rests with the creator himself. As it rests with one and only one individual, is it impossible to distinguish any chief responsibility for the act of creation ?

An individual enjoys the privilege of retaining or transferring the responsibility for the work. A corporate body enjoys the privilege of owning the responsibility of a work created by an individual. A corporate body is also obliged to own the responsibility of a work created for it by an individual. In all such cases, the corporate body owning the responsibility for the work is creditable or chargeable for it.

In the light of the above analysis, it is possible to detect the falacies in the idea plane and the faults in the verbal plane that have been committed by AACR in its definition of the term 'Author.' Firstly, the use of the term 'Chiefly' in the definition of the term 'Personal Author' is faulty. Secondly, the use of the expression 'Chiefly responsible for the creation' in the definition of the term 'Corporate Author' is faulty. Both these faults have been committed due to falacies in the idea plane.

The line of thinking manifested in the analysis suggests a rectification of these faults by developing a system of terms as follows:

Author.— Generic term to denote "Personal Author" and "Corporate Author".

Personal Author.— Person creating a work and the responsibility for the ideas and the expression constituting it resting solely on his private capacity, and not on the capacity of any office held by him within a corporate body, nor on that corporate body.

Corporate Author.— Corporate Body owning the responsibility for a work — that is, the responsibility for the ideas and the expression constituting it resting solely on the corporate body, and not on the private capacity of any person or persons forming part of or holding office in, or in any other way connected with that body.

This is exactly the approach made by CCC. CCC approach has made a significant impact at the international level, in the development of the idea of "Authorship". This will be evident from the findings furnished in the following section.

1e3   *Development of the Idea of Authorship*

The development of the idea of authorship is briefly summarised below:

In his *Rules for dictionary catalogue* (=RDC) (1904), C A Cutter defined the term 'Author' as follows:

"Author, in the narrow sense, is the person who wiites a book, in a wider sense it may be applied to him who is the cause of the book's existence by putting together the writings of several authors (usually called the *editor*, more appropriately to be called the *collector*). Bodies of men (societies, cities, legislative bodies, countries) are to be consideied the authors of their memoirs, transactions, journals, debates, repoits, etc." In relation to the idea of "Personal Author" the following are a few implications of the definition:

1   In the case of a simple book, the "writer' is the author;

2   In the case of a composite book made up of several contributions by one and the same person, the "writer" is the author;

3   In the case of a composite book made up of several contributions, at least two of which are by two different persons, the editor — that is, the collector of the contributions — is the author.

Evidently, there is an element of self-contradiction in this definition. This appears to be due to the failure in recognising the "writer" as the creator of the ideas and the expression constituting the work concerned and simultaneously as the bearer of its responsibility in his private capacity. This happens to be the essential criterion to recognise personal authorship. The part of the definition devoted to the idea of "Corporate Author" is purely enumerative. A purely enumerative definition of an entity is generally attempted when there is a failure in recognising the essential criterion to distinguish it. In the case of corporate authorship, the essential criterion is its owning the responsibility for the work concerned.

AACR of 1908 adopted the RDC definition of the term 'Author' with verbal changes.

CCC in its Ed 1 in 1934 explicitly deemed the term 'Author' to be the generic term to denote "Personal Author" and "Corporate Author". It defined each of them as follows:

1   Personal Author.— A composer or writer of a book, the responsibility for its contents resting solely on him in his private capacity . . .

2   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 . . .

CCC (1934) was the first code to distinguish the essential criterion to recognise the authorship of a work; and it was "the responsibility for its contents". This was a breakthrough in the development of the idea of "authorship". The self-contradictory element in the definition of "Author" in RDC was completely removed. The definitions in CCC (1934) were continued in CCC (1945) and CCC (1951).

The definition of the term 'Author in AACR of 1949 did not differ substantially from that in its earlier edition, which again was virtually the same as that in RDC. However, AACR (1949) added the following sentence in its definition: "By extension, an artist, composer, photographer, cartographer, etc." Further, the following commentary to its Rule 1, is also relevant to be taken note of: "The author is considered to be the person or body chiefly responsible for the intellectual content of the book, literary, artistic or musical ... Governments, Societies, institutions and other organisations are to be regarded as the authors of the publications for which they as corporate bodies are responsible ..." AACR (1949) succeeded in improving its definition of the term 'Author' (Personal Author) to some extent, by adding the new sentence. But, it may be noted that a thorough improvement in this regard, lies in the two "definitions" — one for the term 'Personal Author' and the other for the term 'Corporate Author' embedded in the commentary to Rule 1. A comparison of these two definitions with the definitions given in CCC (1934) would show that they are virtually the same, though verbal difference is evident. This is a clear evidence of the impact of CCC (1934) on AACR (1949). However, these two "embedded definitions" could have been adopted by AACR (1949) as an improved substitute for its formal definition of the term 'Author'. But it is difficult to guess why it was not done !

It may be noted here that in 1937, when the press copy of the *Theory of library catalogue* was ready, Ranganathan received a mimeographed copy of the draft of the preliminary second edition of the Anglo-American Code of 1908. Along with it came also a letter from Rudolph Gjelsness, the Chairman and Editor-in-Chief of the Catalogue Code Revision Committee of the American Library Association. He requested for comments on the draft rules. Ranganathan detected many inconsistencies and faults in the draft rules; traced their origin; and suggested means of rectifying those. An evidence of the direct impact of Ranganathan's suggestion is that, in relation to the rendering of Indic names, ALA Code of 1949 preferred to quote Rule 1212 of CCC (1934) along with the whole discussion accompanying it, as an aid to the understanding and treatment of Indic names. One of the suggestions given by Ranganathan was to improve

the definition of the term 'Author' along line followed by CCC (1934). The contents of Ranganathan's definitions of the terms 'Author', 'Personal Author' and 'Corporate Author' could not replace fully the contents of the definition of the term 'Author' given in the Anglo-American Code of 1908. But the addition of the sentence "By extension, an artist, composer, photographer, cartographer, etc." to the definition may be deemed to be an evidence of the impact of Ranganathan's suggestion. However, the contents of the definitions suggested by Ranganathan could find a place in the ALA Code of 1949; and that was in the discussion accompanying its Rule 1 on page 3. Here also, of course, the ALA Code of 1949 could not throw off the wrong tradition introduced by Cutter. It becomes evident from the following statement occurring in the discussion accompanying its Rule 1: "if there are many contributors, the collector or editor of the material may be considered the author."

CCC (1958) improved the definition of the term 'Author' considerably in the idea plane as well as in the verbal plane. CCC (1964) has incorporated those improved definitions. For incorporation in Ed 6 of CCC those improved definitions have now been formulated in the style shown in Sec 1e2 of this paper.

AACR (1967) has now thrown off completely the wrong tradition continued by its earlier editions. It has now incorporated in its formal definition most of the contents of CCC definitions. It is quite evident that it is primarily based on the definition embedded in the discussion accompanying Rule 1 of ALA Code of 1949. It is certain that AACR (1967) has followed the line of thinking initiated by CCC. It is evident that it intends to make its definition as precise as practicable, following this line of thinking. But it appears that some falacy in the idea plane is still persisting; nad the faults in the verbal plane appear to be only due to that. This aspect of the definition has been adequately discussed in Sec 1e2 of this paper.

1f PRINCIPAL AUTHOR

The term 'Principal Author', though used in the text, is not defined by AACR. Naturally, it has been taken to be an assumed term.

The idea of 'Principal Author' has been conceded in the context of the idea "Shared Authorship". The term 'Shared Authorship' is also an undefined term. The scope of the rules specified under the heading "Works of shared authorship" does not offer a clear-cut idea about its denotation. For, the rules have been said to be specifically applicable to (1) a document of joint authorship; (2) a composite document; and (3) a docu-

ment embodying exchange of ideas between persons. They are
said to be not applicable to (1) a document made up of con-
tributions of an artist and of an author of the text, (2) a document
embodying a report of an interview, or of a discussion, conver-
sation, or similar exchange; (3) a document embodying a work
written by one person for another person; (4) a composite docu-
ment produced under the direction of a supervisory editor; and
(5) a collection of previously existing contributions, at least two
of which are by two different authors. In the context of the
heading "Works of Shared Authorship", it appears that the
term 'Shared Authorship' refers only to the authorship of the
works embodied in the varieties of documents included within
the purview of the rules given under it; and not to the authorship
of the works embodied in the varieties of documents excluded
from the purview of the rules given under it. If it is really so,
then that is a totally arbitrary decision. Assuming that such an
arbitrariness cannot be committed in a work based on a rational
foundation, let us accept that the term 'Shared Authorship'
refers to the authorship of the works embodied in the kinds of
documents specified both as included within and excluded from
the purview of the rules concerned. Then comes the question
of the validity of such an idea. According to its definition,
'Author' is always recognisable at the level of "Work" — that is,
"Author" is always of a "Work". But, when a document
consists of a single contribution, the author of the work embodied
in it may be said to be the author of the contribution or of the
document. This is because, such a situation does not give rise
to any conflict; and therefore, the validity of the idea "Author
of Document" remains unchallenged. Due to the same reason,
it may remain unchallenged in the case of the idea "Joint Author
of Document". But, when it is a case of composite document,
the idea "Author of Composite Document" is invalid. Because,
in the production of a composite document, two or more con-
tributions, each embodying a work of single or joint authorship,
are assembled together. No authorship is involved in assembling
work; therefore, "Authorship" of a composite document as a
whole cannot be conceded at all, unless all the contributions are
by one and the same author. Evidently, the term 'Work' has
been used by AACR as a synonym for 'Document'. Except
for a document embodying a work of joint authorship, all the
other varieties of documents specified to be comprehended by
the term "Works (document) of Shared Authorship" are com-
posite documents in the true sense of the term. Therefore, the
idea "Shared Authorship" is equal to "Joint Authorship" alone.
Because, in all other cases, specified by AACR, the idea "Shared
Authorship" is invalid.

In the light of the findings mentioned above, the idea "Principal Author" can be conceded only in the context of "Joint Author". A contribution is of joint authorship when the embodied work of each participating author is not distinguishable. But, on the title-page of such a document, the predominance of one of the authors may be indicated by wording or by typography, for some reason or other. The author whose predominance has been so indicated on the title-page of the document concerned, is to be deemed to be the Principal Author of the work embodied in it. The examples used by AACR to demonstrate the idea "Principal Author" support this definition of the term.

1g COMPILER

1g1 *Definition*

The term 'Compiler' has been defined by AACR as follows: "One who produces a work by collecting and putting together written or printed matter from the works of various authors. Also one who chooses and combines into one work selections or quotations from one author."

1g2 *Annotation*

There are contributions of specific interest already existing. They may be either in printed form or in non-printed form. Some agency either collects all of them, or selects some of them to make up another document by putting them together. This is published as a new document; it involves printing of the existing contributions. This new document may either consist of contributions of one and the same author, or it may consist of contributions at least two of which are of two different authors. A contribution in the new document may either be in its original form; or it may be a portion of the original. The agency responsible for the production of this new document may be either a person or a corporate body. Is there any technical terms in AACR to denote this agency ? If the answer is "No ', there will be a suggestion or demand for having one. On the contrary, if the answer is "Yes", it will be followed by another question: "What is that term ?" Naturally, it is the term 'Compiler'. But, does the definition of the term 'Compiler' convey adequately the meaning that it should ? Certainly not; it is inadequate due to faults in the verbal plane arising out of falacies in the idea plane.

It may be noted that the "new document ' referred to above satisfies the necessary conditions of being denoted, by the technica term 'Collection' as defined by AACR. In this circumstance, a precise definition of the term 'Compiler' would be "The agency,

personal or corporate, making up a collection". In this connec-
tion it may be furnished that an attempt in establishing a technical
terminology may adopt helpfully the strategy of setting up a
system of terms. In this strategy, some terms are recognised
as "Assumed Terms". Terms are categorised on the basis of
pertinent characteristics. Whenever warranted, an assumed term
becomes the starting point. In defining each term, as far as
applicable, other defined pertinent terms are made use of. This
principle becomes one of the determinants of sequence among
the categories as well as among the terms in each category. This
has been the approach of CCC. AACR is yet to make this
approach.

However, in this connection, it is necessary to take note of
the definition of the term 'Editor'. AACR has defined the term
as follows:

"Editor. One who prepares for publication a work or
collection of works or articles not his own. The editorial labour
may be limited to the preparation of the matter for the printer,
or it may include supervision of the printing, revision (restitution)
or elucidation of the text, and the addition of introduction, notes,
and other critical matter. For certain works it may involve the
technical direction of a staff of persons engaged in writing or
compiling the text."

Obviously, according to the above definition a compiler is cer-
tainly an editor in all situations. And therefore, the term
'Compiler' is synonymous with the term 'Editor'. The primary
objective of establishing technical terminology is to avoid synonyms
and homonyms. AACR has failed to achieve it in its technical
terminology. In this connection, it may also be noted that the
term 'Compiler' is also used in cataloguing to denote the
"Creators" of bibliographies, indexes, directories, etc. In such
a case the role of the compiler is equal to that of an author. This
has already been recognised by AACR in its definition of the
term 'Author'. In this circumstance, the right course would
have been to prescribe the term 'Editor' as the standard term to
include a compiler in the sense in which it has been defined. And
the term 'Compiler' could be defined to refer to an author, per-
sonal or corporate, making up a work by collecting information
from various sources and arranging them in a particular way.
It may be noted that CCC has done this.

1h PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE EXISTENCE OF A WORK
1h1 *Case of a Simple Document*

Consider a simple document — that is, a document em-
bodying a single contribution of single or of joint authorship.

The work — that is, the expressed systematised body of ideas — embodied in it is the creation of its author or authors. Anything created does exist, till it becomes, or is made non-existent. Therefore, the work starts existing immediately after its creation. Now the question is, "With whom rests the primary responsibility for the existence of the work?" There can be one and only one answer to this question: "The primary responsibility for the existence of the work rests with its author." After this question is settled, let us follow the career of the work. It gets recorded on paper or other material and becomes fit for physical handling, transportation across space, and preservation through time. At this stage, it is embodied in a document — that is, embodied expressed systematised body of ideas. To ensure simultaneous access to a number of users, it becomes necessary to produce multiple copies of the document. A publisher takes the responsibility of producing multiple copies of the document. He contracts a printer who does it according to the specification given by him. Now, can we say that the primary responsibility for the existence of the work shifts successively from its author to its recorder, publisher, and printer — in any circumstances ? That will be an invalid proposition. Similarly, the collaborators — such as, editor, and translator — who may be associated with the document at later stages can never claim the primary responsibility for the existence of the work. Their responsibility can only be of secondary nature.

1h2 *Case of a Composite Document*

Consider a composite document — that is, a document embodying two or more contributions. On the basis of the arguments furnished in Sec 1h1 it may be said that the primary responsibility for the existence of each work embodied in each contribution (document) rests only with its author and nobody else. In what circumstances, then, the primary responsibility for the existence of the "Works" can rest with the editor ? Certainly, in no circumstances. Obviously, therefore, the term 'Work' in the expression 'Primary Responsibility for the Existence of a Work' has been used in the sense of "Document". In relation to a composite document, the editor collects and edits the different contributions to make up for a new embodiment of those contributions. The editorial responsibility in relation to the new embodiment may be of any order. What amount of editorial responsibility would establish the claim of primary responsibility for the existence of the new embodiment ? Is it ascertainable at all ? Insistence on this point will surely result in arbitrary decisions leading to inconsistency in practice. This becomes evident in the decisions taken in regard to the examples furnished

by AACR under its Rule 4 dealing with "Works Produced under Editorial Direction". If the editor of a composite document, for some arbitrary reason, is taken to be primarily responsible for the existence of the new embodiment of the different works making it up, for the sake of uniformity and consistency, the editor of any composite book, irrespective of the extent of his editorial responsibility, has to be regarded similarly. Such a decision may at least serve as a helpful convention. The state of uncertainty or arbitrary decision can be avoided, if the responsibility of the editor(s) is regarded to be only secondary, in all cases; and the occurrence of his or their name(s) is regarded to be the deciding factor for the choice of the heading of the main entry.

1j WORK OF DETERMINATE AUTHORSHIP

Based on the examples furnished by AACR under its Rules 1 and 2, it may be concluded that a work, the name of whose author(s) is/are definitely determinable either from the document embodying it or from outside sources, is to be deemed to be a work of determinate authorship. If a single work of determinate authorship is embodied in a document, it is a simple document. If, several contributions (works), each of which is of determinate authorship, are embodied in a document, it is a composite document.

1k WORK OF INDETERMINATE AUTHORSHIP

Similarly, based on the examples furnished by AACR under its Rules 1 and 2 again, a work, the name of whose author(s) is/are not definitely determinable either from the document embodying it or from outside sources, is to be deemed to be a work of indeterminate authorship. Apparently, it is a very simple definition; but in reality, a very high order of complexity is associated with it. If a document is published without mentioning the name of its author in it, there is a probability of knowing it from outside sources. In this connection it is necessary to take note of the following empirical facts of experience:

1 If the document does not mention the name of the author, it may be known from some other source which has to be published at a later date.

2 There is no definiteness as to the varieties of sources, in which this information will be available.

3 There is no definiteness as to the time when this information will be available.

4 There is no definiteness as to the extent of search that will ensure the validity of a decision in this regard.

5 There is no guarantee as to the availability of the pertinent sources in a particular library.

6 No professional background of the cataloguer can definitely ensure the validity of a decision in this regard.

In the context of these empirical facts of experience, any decision about a work of indeterminate authorship has the probability of being proved invalid at any later point of time.

The cases of indeterminate authorship according to AACR may be categorised in the following three groups:

1 Work of unknown authorship.— A work, the name(s) of whose author(s) has/have been declared to be unknown by the cataloguer at a particular point of time, because of the non-availability of any such name in the sources deemed to be pertinent by him.

2 Work of uncertain authorship.— A work, the name(s) of whose author(s) has/have been declared to be uncertain by the cataloguer at a particular point of time, because of the availability of either (1) several names to which the authorship of the work is variously attributed by the sources deemed to be pertinent in this context; or (2) initials, some other alphabetical device, a characterizing word or phrase preceded by the indefinite article or a phrase naming another work that the author wrote, as the only clue to its authorship.

3 Work by unnamed groups.— A work by a number of persons coming together informally in a common cause, but not having a conventional corporate name to denote them together.

1m WORK OF DIFFUSE AUTHORSHIP

According to the definition of the terms "Work" and 'Author' the idea "Diffuse Authorship" is invalid. Then, in what sense the term 'Diffuse' has been used by AACR in the expression 'Work of Diffuse Authorship' ? AACR has mentioned "Serials" as examples of documents of diffuse authorship. According to AACR the term 'Serial' is a generic term to denote "periodicals, newspapers, annuals — (reports, yearbooks, etc)", the journals, memoirs, proceedings, transactions, etc, of societies, and numbered monographic series. A periodical is made up of contributions not by one and the same author(s). In this sense, it is analogous to a composite document. In the case of a composite document as a whole, there cannot be any authorship; there can only be authorship of each of the contributions forming part of it. So also is the case with journals etc, of societies. If the term 'Diffuse Authorship' does not apply to a contribution in a composite document or to the composite document as a

whole, it is not equally applicable to serials and similar varieties of document. The question of diffuse authorship does not arise at all in the case of newspapers, annuals, and numbered monographic series.

1n MAIN ENTRY
1n1 *Definition*
AACR has defined the term 'Main Entry' as follows: Main entry. 1. The complete catalogue record of a bibliographical entity, presented in the form by which the entity is to be uniformly identified and cited. The main entry normally includes the tracing of all other headings under which the record is to be represented in the catalogue. 2 The heading under which such a record is represented in the catalogue or, if there is no heading, the title."

1n2 *Annotation*
The definition of a concrete entity, as far as practicable, is expected to be formulated with reference to its structure and function. It may be often supplemented by examples, if necessary. A main entry is a concrete entity. The definition of "Main Entry" quoted in Sec 1n1 has been formulated primarily with reference to its structure. The reference to its function is inadequate. In a particular kind of catalogue, the main entry is presumed to have a primary function to perform; this is to respond to the majority of queries for the document. There can be no other worthwhile justification for calling an entry "Main Entry" in a catalogue. It is due to this presumption that so much of controversy exists on the choice of the heading of the main entry. Till today, there has been hardly any conscious recognition of this presumption by the cataloguing profession. Failure in this respect has been responsible for many arbitrary decisions about the choice of the heading of the main entry for a particular kind of catalogue.

Besides this, according to the definition given by AACR, the term 'Main Entry' is a homonym. It denotes simultaneously the record as a whole as well as a part (section) of it — *viz.* the heading. In the context of 'Heading' being accepted as a technical term, the homonymous status of the term 'Main Entry' has acutely violated the essential requirement of a technical terminology.

1p HEADING
1p1 *Definition*
AACR has defined the term 'Heading' as follows: "Heading. 1. A name, word, or phrase placed at the head of a catalogue record to provide a point of access in the

catalogue. Headings function as entries in the cataloguing of particular bibliographical entities (*See* Entry 2). 2. Sometimes used in descriptive cataloguing to denote the aspect concerned with uniform modes of ·representing the names of persons and corporate bodies and the titles of works in heading."

1p2 *Annotation*

The term ·Heading· again has been given the status of a homonym violating the essential requirements of a technical terminology.

2 Purview of AACR

AACR is a code meant for guiding the designing of a document finding system, taking the form of a catalogue. It is necessary to determine the functional characteristics of the document finding system envisaged by AACR. The functions of a structurally and functionally complete document finding system may be summarised as follows:

1 To respond to a query about documents using specific sought headings; and

2 To assist the choice of a particular document.

A sought heading for a particular document usually consists of the name of an attribute — such as, author, collaborator, title, series, and subject — of the document concerned. The ability to specify a document using the name of its author or collaborator, or series, or its title implies that the reader had prior acquaintance in some form or other, with the document concerned; and that he is still in a position to recall the name of one or more of these attributes. In relation to a reader, such a document may be said to be a "Known Document". On the contrary, the specification of a document by using the name of its subject — specific or general — implies, either that the reader had no prior acquaintance with the document concerned, or that, even if he had it, he is no more in a position to recall the name of any one of its attributes other than that of its subject. In relation to a reader, such a document may be said to be an "Unknown Document". Obviously, a structurally and functionally complete document finding system has to treat every document covered by it, simultaneously as "Unknown" and "Known". Corresponding to the treatment of a document as an "Unknown" one is the Subject-Cataloguing; and corresponding to the treatment of a document as a "Known" one is the Author-Collaborator-Title-Series Cataloguing (ACTS-cataloguing).

The arrangement-strategy of the entries in the catalogue corresponding to each kind of treatment is also quite distinct.

Two strategies may be distinguished in this regard: (1) Notational Grouping; and (2) Alphabetical Scattering.

The strategy of "Notational Grouping" is comparatively more compatible with subject-cataloguing corresponding to the treatment of documents as "Unknown" ones. It aims at "Grouping by Juxtaposition". But no strategy of "Notational Grouping" of names of subject(s) can work efficiently in isolation; for, the notations are unknown to its potential users. Therefore, to provide access to these unknown entities it becomes necessary to make approach through what is known about the subjects. Only the names of subjects in natural language are known to the potential users. Hence, the strategy of "Notational Grouping" has to be supplemented by the strategy of "Alphabetical Scattering" for the entries under names of subjects in an artificial language using terms of a natural language, which are "Known" to the potential users. Subject cataloguing may adopt the strategy of "Alphabetical Scattering" by using an artificial verbal language for the names of subjects. But, normally, in such an approach as such, the strategy of "Grouping" will be absent. Obviously, such an approach by itself is largely incompatible with the treatment of documents as "Unknown" ones. This is because, in response to a specific subject query, a document finding system has to provide information about the

1 Documents exclusively devoted to the specific subject;

2 Documents embodying subjects of extension greater than that of the specific subject, but having substantial portions devoted to it; and

3 Documents embodying subjects of extension smaller than that of the specific subject, but dealing with some facet of it.

The documents on subjects collateral to the specific subject may contain some information, though indirectly, relevant to the purpose in hand. The document finding system therefore, is to provide further the information about these documents. For this reason, to minimise the effect of the incompatibility of the initial strategy of "Alphabetical Scattering" it has to be supplemented by another strategy of "Alphabetical Scattering" of See also cross reference index entries. The latter aims at "Grouping" in an indirect way: "Grouping by Referencing". This succeeds in minimising the effect of incompatibility to some extent, but hardly improves the efficiency and effectiveness of the document finding system. Recently, of course, an effective means of subject cataloguing in an artificial verbal language which automatically results in a systematic arrangement of the subject headings even when the strategy of "Alphabetical Scattering" is adopted, has been demonstrated (*See* Postulate-based subject heading for dictionary catalogue system, by

G Bhattacharrya and A Neelameghan, in DRTC Annual Seminar. 7; 1969; Paper CA).

The strategy of "Alphabetical Scattering" alone is definitely most compatible with ACTS-Cataloguing corresponding to the treatment of documents as "Known" ones.

The arrangement of entries is the essence of any document finding system. The empirical facts of experience relating to arrangement of entries, as mentioned above, may be generalised into two empirical principles as follows:

1 The arrangement-strategy of "Notational Grouping" or of "Alphabetical Systematisation" is most compatible with Sub-ject-Cataloguing corresponding to the treatment of documents as "Unknown" ones; and

2 The arrangement-strategy of "Alphabetical Scattering" is most compatible with ACTS-cataloguing corresponding to the treatment of documents as "Known" ones.

On the basis of the above discussion, it is possible to specify the functional characteristics of the document finding system, envisaged by AACR, as follows:

1 AACR envisages a document finding system in which every document covered by it is to be treated as a "Known Document".

2 The document finding system envisaged by AACR is to take the form of an ACTS-Catalogue.

3 Naturally, the arrangement-strategy in this ACTS-Cata-loguing is to be "Alphabetical Scattering".

The purview of AACR, therefore, is ACTS-Cataloguing.

3 Empirical Facts of Experience and Corresponding Deduced Principles and Rules

31 ACTS-CATALOGUING

An ACTS-Catalogue is to respond to sought headings which may consist of

1 The name of a single author or of joint authors; or
2 The name of a single collaborator or of joint collaborators; or
3 The title of a document; or
4 The name of a series; or
5 Any combination of the above-mentioned names.

Therefore, ACTS-Cataloguing consists of the preparation of entries under all sought headings warranted by a document deemed to be a "Known Document". A convention has been established by the cataloguing profession to mark out one of these entries as the main entry, and the others as the added entries for the

document concerned. This is certainly not for the sake of professional pleasure. The only possible rationale behind it is the consideration of satisfying the majority-approach and the minority-approach respectively. This point has been made clear in Sec in of this paper. Therefore, the choice of the heading of the main entry in an ACTS-Catalogue for a "Known Document" has to be governed by the consideration of the majority-approach for it. The determination of the majority-approach is to be based on pertinent empirical facts of experience about the factors governing the formulation of the sought headings for a "Known Document". A few important ones are furnished in the following sub-sections.

32 DOCUMENT TO BE CATALOGUED *Vs* OUTSIDE SOURCES

A reader comes to know about a document either by consulting it, or by reading a reference to it; or by hearing a reference to it from somebody else. When he consults it by himself, the items of information furnished in the document govern the formulation of the sought heading for it. When he reads a reference to it, it contains the items of information gathered from the document itself; for, the person giving the reference is expected to have consulted it. The situation is analogous when the reader comes to know about a book by hearing a reference to it. These empirical facts of experience lead to the following empirical principle: In the majority of cases, the probability of a "Known Document" being sought under headings formulated on the basis of the items of information furnished in the document itself is high. This empirical principle is suggestive of the following deduced principle: The items of information furnished in the document itself should determine the choice of the heading of its main entry.

The empirical principle mentioned above has for its symmetrical counterpart the following: In the minority of cases, there is a probability of a "Known Document" being sought under headings formulated on the basis of the items of information about it, furnished in sources other than the document concerned, published generally at a later date. This empirical principle is suggestive of the following deduced principle: The items of information about the document furnished in sources other than the document concerned, should, if warranted, determine the choice of the headings of some of its added entries.

33 PRELIMINARY PAGES *Vs* TEXT

The usual sought headings for a "Known Document" in the majority of cases, as far as applicable, are: (1) the name(s)

of its author(s) (real names or pseudonyms, wherever applicable); (2) the name(s) of its collaborator(s) (real names or pseudonyms wherever applicable); (3) the name of its series, thesis series, report series, etc. These · items of information, whenever furnished in the document itself, almost always occur in the preliminary pages — that is, mostly in the title-page or its substitute and its overflow pages. Sometimes, the cover of a document may be used as a substitute for its title-page. These empirical facts of experience lead to the following empirical principle: In the majority of cases, the probability of a "Known Document" being sought under headings formulated on the basis of the items of information furnished in the title-page and its overflow pages is high. This empirical principle is suggestive of the following deduced principle: The items of information furnished in the title-page of the document to be catalogued and in its overflow pages should determine the choice of the heading of its main entry.

34 SIMPLE DOCUMENT

In the case of a "Known Simple Document", if the name(s) of its author(s) is/are mentioned in the title-page and its overflow pages, in the majority of cases, the probability of its being sought under the name of its author(s) is high. It may so happen that the name(s) of the author(s) is/are not mentioned in the title-page and its overflow pages; but the name of the collaborator(s) — that is, a person or corporate body associated with the work in a secondary capacity not amounting to authorship, *e g*, translator, reviser, editor etc — is/are mentioned. In this situation, in the majority of cases, the probability of its being sought under the name(s) of its collaborator(s) is high. Again, it may so happen that neither the name(s) of its author(s) nor the name(s) of any collaborator(s) is/are mentioned in the title-page and its overflow pages. In this situation in the majority of cases, the probability of its being sought under its title is high. These empirical principles lead to the following consolidation: In the case of a simple document, there is a distinct pattern in regard to the formulation of sought headings for it by the majority of readers, depending upon the items of information furnished in the title-page and its overflow pages. This principle is suggestive of the following deduced rule:

The choice of the heading of the main entry for a simple document is to consist of the earliest of the following which the title-page of the document to be catalogued and its overflow pages admit of: (a) the name(s) of the author(s); (b) the name(s) of the collaborator(s); and (c) the title.

35 ORDINARY COMPOSITE DOCUMENT

1 Empirical Principle: In the case of a "Known Ordinary Composite Document", made up of contributions of one and the same author, in the majority of cases, the probability of its being sought only under the name of its author is high.

This empirical principle is suggestive of the following deduced rule: The choice of the heading of the main entry for an ordinary composite document made up of contributions of one and the same author is to consist of the name of the author.

2 Empirical Principle: In the case of a "Known Ordinary Composite Document" made up of contributions, at least two of which are by two different authors, mentioning the name of the collaborator(s) (editor, translator etc) common to all the contributions, in the title-page and its overflow pages, in the majority of cases, the probability of its being sought under the name(s) of the common collaborator(s) is high. If the name(s) of the common collaborator(s) is/are not mentioned, in the majority of cases, the probability of its being sought only under its common generic title is high. Here again, a distinct pattern in regard to the formulation of sought headings is distinguishable.

These empirical principles are suggestive of the following deduced rule: The choice of the heading of the main entry for an ordinary composite book, made up of contributions, at least two of which are by two different authors, is to consist of the earliest of the following which the title-page of the document to be catalogued and its overflow pages admit of: (a) the name(s) of the collaborator(s); and (b) the common generic title.

36 ARTIFICIAL COMPOSITE DOCUMENT

1 Empirical Principle: In the case of a "Known Artificial Composite Document", made up of contributions by one and the same author, in the majority of cases, the probability of its being sought only under the name of its author is high.

This empirical principle is suggestive of the following deduced rule: The choice of the heading of the main entry for an artificial composite document made up of contributions of one and the same author is to consist of the name of the author.

2 Empirical Principle: In the case of a "Known Artificial Composite Document", made up of contributions, at least two of which are by two different authors, mentioning the name of the collaborator(s) (editor, translator, etc) common to all the contributions, in the title-page and its overflow pages, in the majority of cases, the probability of its being sought under the

name(s) of the common collaborator(s) is high. If the name(s) of the common collaborator(s) is/are not mentioned, in the majority of cases, the probability of its being sought under the heading appropriate to the contribution occurring first in the document is high. Here again, a distinct pattern in regard to the formulation of sought headings is distinguishable.

These empirical principles are suggestive of the following deduced rule: The choice of the heading of the main entry for an artificial composite document made up of contributions, at least two of which are by two different authors, is to consist of the earliest of the following which the title-page of the document to be catalogued and its overflow pages admit of: (a) the name(s) of the collaborator(s); and (b) the name appropriate for the heading of the main entry for the document occurring first, if treated as if it were a simple document.

37 PERIODICAL PUBLICATION

Empirical Principle: In the case of a "Known Periodical Publication", in the majority of cases, the probability of its being sought under its title is high.

This empirical principle is suggestive of the following deduced rule: The choice of the heading of the main entry for a periodical publication is to consist of its title.

4 Final Authority

In the context of designing a cataloguing code, based on the realization of the need of distinguishing between the main entry and the added entries for the documents covered by it, it is essential to recognise the final authority to govern the formulation of the individual rules for the choice of the heading of the main entries for documents. The empirical facts of experience in regard to the formulation of sought headings for "Known Documents" suggest the entity having the necessary qualities of and claim for this authority. By generalising all these facts of experience, we arrive at the following principle about the final authority:

The final authority to govern the choice of the heading of the main entry for a document in a particular library is the document to be catalogued, unless an earlier edition of the same document possessed by the library had already decided the issue for the library at some earlier point of time.

The principle of final authority in this context must satisfy the Law of Parsimony: "Between two or more possible alternative principles or rules bearing on a particular phenomenon, the one leading to overall economy of manpower, material, money, and time considered together with proper weightage, is to be

preferred." The claim of outside sources as the final authority
may be entertained in this context as the possible alternative.
The problems associated with it are mentioned in Sec 1k dealing
with "Work of Indeterminate Authorship". The consideration
of those problems shows that the recognition of outside sources
as the final authority would fail to satisfy the Law of Parsimony;
and it would result in inconsistency in practice. On the contrary,
the recognition of the document to be catalogued as the final
authority would satisfy the Law of Parsimony; and it would
ensure consistency in practice. Further, in the context of the
policy of supplementing the main entry by added entries, it would
not violate any fundamental req irements of cataloguing.

5 Categorisation of Cataloguing Problems

Again, in the context of designing a cataloguing code
based on the realisation of the need of distinguishing between
the main entry and the added entries for the documents covered
by it, it is essential to categorise the cataloguing problems in such
a way that would ensure the most effective and economic pre-
sentation of its individual rules. Each category in each array
of this categorisation must be mutually exclusive. On the basis
of the empirical facts of experience furnished in Sec 4 and its
subdivisions, we may conclude as follows:

It is helpful to recognise the different categories of cataloguing
problems corresponding to the different varieties of documents,
on the basis of the distinct patterns in regard to the formulation
of the sought headings for the kind concerned.

Following the suggestions of the pertinent empirical facts
of experience ,we may arrive at one such broad scheme of categories
as follows:

1	Books
11	Simple Books
12	Composite Books
121	Ordinary Composite Books
122	Artificial Composite Books
2	Periodical Publications

6 Evaluation of the Principles

The evaluation of the different technical terms denoting
the different ideas used in the formulation of the "General
Principles" is already furnished in Sec 1 of this paper. The back-
ground information furnished in the earlier sections suggest that
the "General Principles" governing the formulation of the indivi-
dual rules for the choice of the headings of main entries, may be
evaluated from the following points of view also:

1 Categorisation of cataloguing problems;

2 Final authority to govern the choice of the heading of the main entry; and

3 Empirical facts of experience governing the formulation of the principles.

60 ARE THEY PRINCIPLES ?

Before entering into the details of evaluation, let us raise the following question: "In the context of cataloguing, do these "General Principles" satisfy the necessary criteria of being deemed to be principles in the true sense of the term ?" The definition of the term 'Principle' given in Sec 1a and the discussion on it would definitely suggest "No" as the answer to this question. In fact, the whole set of principles is a generalised, or more appropriately, a consolidated version of the rules given in Sec 1 to 6 of AACR. A comparison of these rules with the set of "General Principles" would show that even as a generalised or consolidated version it is inadequate in its coverage; for example, it does not cover the rules given in Sec 4 of AACR under the heading "Works Produced under Editorial Direction".

However, a generalised or consolidated version of several rules may be deemed to be a principle in a narrow sense of the term. But such a tradition, if established, would not be helpful for the development of the subject. Establishment of clearly and accurately defined technical terms and their consistent proper use are essential conditions for the development of any science. Cataloguing science is not an exception to it.

Attention may now be paid to each of the "General Principles".

61 PRINCIPLE 1

Principle 1 reads as follows: "Entry should be under author or principal author when one can be determined."

The intention of this principle appears to be as follows: The heading of the main entry is to consist of the name of the author or of the principal author when one can be determined, either from the document itself or from outside sources. Evidently, the cataloguing problem covered by it may be described as "documents embodying works of determinate authorship". Obviously, such a document may be either a simple document or a composite document; when it is a simple document, it may be of single authorship or of joint authorship; its authorship may be determined either from the document itself or from outside sources. It may be noted that the categorisation of "Documents Embodying Works of Determinate Authorship" in the array of order 1 of the scheme of categories of cataloguing problems is not conducive with the pertinent empirical facts of experi-

ence furnished in Sec 3 of this paper. This is one of the reasons
for its failure in covering the Rules 3B1 and 3B2 both dealing with
the problem described as "Principal Author not indicated".
Secondly, there are composite documents made up of contri-
butions, at least two of which are by two different authors — and
each contribution is of determinate authorship. But in such a
case, the main entry for the whole document is not to be made
under the name of the author of any one of the contributions
embodied in it. In this sense, the style of consolidation has
failed to express the intention. This is, again, due to the fact
that the categorisation of the cataloguing problems has not been
in conformity with the pattern of the formulation of the sought
headings by the majority of readers.

Examination of the different specific versions of this "principle",
given in Sec 1 and 3 of AACR, shows that the final authority to
govern the choice has been recognised to be the document itself
if and only if it mentions the name(s) of the author(s); otherwise,
outside sources serve as the final authority. On the basis of the
discussion on "Final Authority" furnished in Sec 4 of this paper,
it may be remarked that such a principle of final authority is not
helpful in cataloguing.

In respect of a simple document of single authorship, men-
tioning the name of the author of the work embodied in it, the
empirical fact of experience governing the formulation of this
principle, is quite in agreement with that mentioned in Sec 34
of this paper. But, in respect of one not mentioning the name
of the author of the work embodied in it, the assumption appears
to be as follows: In the case of a "Known Simple Document"
of single authorship, not mentioning the name of the work em-
bodied in it, in the majority of cases, the probability of its being
sought under the name of its author is high. The validity of this
assumption is questionable. Either this invalid assumption or
failure to recognise the valid principle appears to have, to a large
extent, been responsible for the formulation of Principle 1. This
remark holds good in regard to the other categories of simple
documents not mentioning the name of the work embodied in
it. One important point arises out of this discussion: The main
entry is always prepared for the document as a whole, and not
for the work embodied in it, or for the contributions making it up.

62 PRINCIPLE 2

Principle 2 reads as follows: "Entry should be under
editor when there is no author or principal author, and when
the editor is primarily responsible for the existence of the work."

There cannot be a work without author(s). It may so
happen that the name(s) of the author(s) is/are not mentioned

in the document embodying the work; or, it may be that the work is of indeterminate authorship. The expression "when there is no author or principal author" appears to have been used incorrectly to refer to the situations mentioned above.

A composite document made up of contributions, each of which is of indeterminate authorship, is perhaps, still unknown to the cataloguing profession. Theoretically also, it is an unusual situation. For, if each of the works is of indeterminate authorship, it is difficult for the cataloguer to ascertain whether it is made up of contributions of one and the same author(s), or of contributions of two or more authors. In this circumstance, we can conclude that Principle 2 is concerned only with simple documents; and it has nothing to do with composite document.

On the basis of the discussion on "Primary Responsibility for the Existence of a Work", furnished in Sec 1b of this paper, it may be argued that in no circumstances, the primary responsibility for the existence of the work embodied in a simple document can rest with the editor, if any.

All the points raised above lead to the question: "What is then the cataloguing problem covered by Principle 2 ?" To find an answer to this question, the intention of Principle 2 may be favourably interpreted as follows: In the case of a simple document embodying a work of indeterminate authorship, the heading of the main entry is to consist of the name of the editor, if it is mentioned in its title-page or in its overflow pages. Such an interpretation would be acceptable, provided there is a rule for the choice of the heading of the main entry in AACR, incorporating the above prescription. Search for it does not produce any positive result. But unfortunately such cases do exist.

A forced favourable interpretation of Principle 2 is also possible. In this interpretation, the first thing to be accepted is that the expression "when there is no author or principal author" has been used to denote "when it is not a case of simple document". The use of the former expression as a substitute for the latter is somewhat unusual. If this second interpretation is insisted to be the right interpretation, many unwelcome questions may be raised. Whatever may be the state of affairs, from the side of the individual rules for the choice of the heading of the main entry, much evidence is found in favour of the second interpretation. Because, while for the first interpretation no individual rule is found; for the second there are many. If the second interpretation is not acceptable, there will be no explicitly stated "Principle" for the latter set of rules. This latter set of rules is given in Sec 4 of AACR under the heading "Works produced under editorial direction".

If Principle 2 is taken to be confined to simple documents only, then the final authority to govern the choice of the heading of the main entry would consist of outside sources only. On the basis of the discussion on "Final Authority" furnished in Sec 4 of this paper, it may be remarked that such a principle is not helpful in cataloguing.

If Principle 2 is taken to be applicable to composite documents made up of contributions of two or more different authors, then the final authority to govern the choice of the heading of the main entry would primarily consist of the document to be catalogued. This is quite helpful in cataloguing. But, the prescription "the editor is primarily responsible for the existence of the work" will reduce its helpfulness to a considerable degree; because it contains the seed of inconsistent decisions.

In both the interpretations, the empirical facts of experience governing the formulation of the principle is, to a large extent, in agreement with those mentioned in Sec 34 and 35 of this paper.

63 PRINCIPLE 3

Principle 3 reads as follows: "Entry should be under a compiler named on the title page in the case of collections of works by various authors."

The category of cataloguing problem covered by this principle is "Collection of Works by Various Authors". Evaluation of the definition of the term 'Collection' is given in Sec 1d of this paper. Technically, "Collection", as defined by AACR, is a specific category of Composite Document. The empirical fact of experience in regard to the formulation of sought headings for a "Known Composite Document" varies with the following factors: Whether it is made up of contributions of one and the same author or of two or more different authors. In this sense, "Collection of Works by Various Authors" is a distinct category. But, as a category of cataloguing problem it can hardly claim any distinction on the basis of its being made up of contributions published earlier or of contributions written for the document in hand. Therefore, separation of these two categories appears to be more due to submission to tradition, and not due to substantial rethinking.

The final authority governing the choice of the heading of the main entry consists of the document to be catalogued. And the "principle" does not contain any seed of inconsistent decision. This principle of final authority is helpful in cataloguing.

The empirical fact of experience governing the formulation of this principle is in agreement with that furnished in category 2 of Sec 35 of this paper.

64 PRINCIPLE 4

Principle 4 reads as follows:

"Entry should be under title in the case of other works whose authorship is diffuse, indeterminate, or unknown."

The discussion on the denotation of each of the terms (1) 'Work of Indeterminate Authorship', (2) 'Work of Unknown Authorship', (3) 'Work of Uncertain Authorship', (4) 'Work by Unnamed Group', and (5) 'Work of Diffuse Authorship', furnished in Sec 1k and 1m of this paper, shows the falacies inherent in these ideas and also the unhelpfulness of recognising them as categories of cataloguing problems.

The final authority governing the choice of the heading of the main entry consists, in the majority of cases, of outside sources. The unhelpfulness of this principle has been discussed in Sec 4.

The assumption governing the choice of the heading of the main entry in all such cases has again been the same invalid one mentioned in Sec 61 in relation to Principle 1. Therefore, the remarks here are analogous to those made in the same section.

7 Conclusion

No cataloguing code is complete for being used for cataloguing practice in a particular library unless it consists successively of the following three distinct codes linked up hierarchically, in which each lower link supplements its immediately higher link:

1 Universal Cataloguing Code;
2 Linguistic Cataloguing Code; and
3 Local Cataloguing Code.

A universal cataloguing code is to consist of the following:

1 The technical terminology of cataloguing;
2 The fundamental laws of library science;
3 The specific version of each of the pertinent general laws of thinking; and
4 The normative principles of cataloguing — that is, the principles governing (a) the formulation of the individual rules for each of the unit operations pertaining to the preparation of entries — *viz*, resolution of conflict of authorship, choice, uniformisation, rendering, individualisation, and recording (language, script, and style); and (b) the interpretation of the rules to meet new situations brought up by a particular document or by changes in the practice of document production; and
5 The general rules, for each of the unit operations pertaining to the preparation of entries, having application to the different categories of cataloguing problems irrespective of the language of the documents to be catalogued;

The significance of the term 'Universal' is that this code is applicable to the whole universe of documents irrespective of the

specific cataloguing problems associated with their different varieties. A universal cataloguing code, by itself, cannot provide direct guidance for day-to-day cataloguing practice nor it is meant for that.

A linguistic cataloguing code is to consist of the following:

1 The universal cataloguing code;

2 The specific rules pertaining to language, script, style of writing, unit operations, arrangement, and guiding, formulated in conformity with the pertinent principles of the universal cataloguing code; and

3 The rules prescribing the formulation of specific rules wherever warranted to meet the local requirements.

The specific linguistic rules together constitute supplement to the universal cataloguing code; and in most of the cases, provide suitable guidance for day-to-day cataloguing practice.

The significance of the term 'Linguistic' is that each of the specific rules at this level, wherever warranted, is formulated in such a way that it satisfies the requirements of the languages of the documents as well as of the language adopted for cataloguing.

A local cataloguing code is to consist of the following:

1 The universal cataloguing code;

2 The specific rules of the linguistic cataloguing code; and

3 The specific rules formulated or adopted by the library according to the prescriptions for local rules, being guided by the principles of cataloguing.

The specific local rules together constitute a supplement to the linguistic cataloguing code; and all the three codes together provide complete guidance for day-to-day cataloguing practice in the library concerned.

The significance of the term 'Local' is that the rules at this level are intended to invest the catalogue with the "intimacy" inherent in the document service at the local-level.

CCC is the example *par excellence* of a cataloguing code having all the features mentioned above.

AACR in its earlier editions had been almost a code made up of specific rules intended to satisfy the requirements of the languages of the documents and of the language adopted for cataloguing. No set of explicitly stated normative principles governing the formulation of the individual rules of the linguistic level formed part of it — that is, there was no universal cataloguing code in it. Nor were there any explicitly stated rules prescribing the formulation of specific rules for the local cataloguing code.

AACR (1967) is found to have realised the need of incorporating the universal cataloguing code in it, in the form of a set of normative principles governing the formulation of the individual

rules. This is commendable. Its first attempt in this direction consists of (1) its explicitly stated principles relating to "Sources of Determining Entry", and of (2) its "General Principles". This set of principles offers considerable scope of being improved upon. A conscious attempt (1) to arrive at an effective mutually exclusive categorisation of cataloguing problems, on the basis of the empirical facts of experience pertaining to the pattern of formulation of the sought headings for different kinds of "Known Document", (2) to recognise the final authority governing the choice of the heading of the main entry on the basis of the above findings; and (3) to distinguish between a normative principle and a rule would produce good result.

AACR (1967) has not explicitly stated rules prescribing the formulation of specific rules by the library using the code, whenever warranted, to meet the local requirements in conformity with the normative principles. But it appears to have realised the need. This becomes evident from the following statements:

1 "It is assumed, so far as rules of description are concerned, that libraries preferring less detail will modify the rules as required to suit their needs" (*Introduction*).

2 "It is recognised, however, that some libraries may wish to provide additional entries for such purposes as bringing out the contents of certain publications or displaying bibliographical activities of persons and corporate bodies other than authorship" (*Introductory Notes* to Chap 1).

This is again another commendable feature.

Another commendable feature of AACR is its endeavour to separate the rules for choice from those for rendering. This is evident from the statement from AACR quoted in Sec 02 of this paper. This feature is highly developed in CCC. The result of the first conscious attempt of AACR in this direction offers considerable scope of being improved upon. For example, AACR states immediately after stating the "General Principles": "The rules contain some exceptions to these principles, however. Notable exceptions are entry in certain cases under special headings usually denoting type or form of work (for example, 20, 22–25, 29), and entry of serial works of diffuse authorship under corporate body when the body is named in the title." The purview of the "General Principles" has been explicitly stated to be the choice of the heading of the main entry. But what has been stated to be exceptions to these "General Principles" falls within the purview of rendering (*See* the discussion on choice and rendering in Sec 02 of this paper). Further attempt to distinguish between rules for choice and rules for rendering would produce good result.