

Lib sc. 6; 1969; PAPER B.

**Conflict of Authorship : Person Vs Person.**  
(Cataloguing problems. 6). (Comparison of CCC and ALA, 4).

**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 the definition of the term 'Personal Author'. Indicates the various ways in which the conflict of authorship centring round persons vs person arises. Makes a comparative study of how CCC 1964 and ALA 1967 resolve this conflict; and for this purpose considers the following four types of work: (1) Spoken words; (2) Correspondence; (3) Map and Atlas; and (4) Dependent work. Points out that CCC 1964 resolves the conflict as a preliminary measure before formulating the rules for the choice of Heading of the Main Entry; but that ALA 1967 mixes up the two problems in the rules for the choice of Heading violating the Principle of Unity of Idea in formulating rules.]

**ABBREVIATIONS USED**

ALA 1967 = Anglo-American cataloguing rules; [Ed 3], North American text; prepared by the American Library Association, the Library of Congress, the Library Association, and the Canadian Library Association. 1967.

CCC 1964 = Classified catalogue code with additional rules of dictionary catalogue code; Ed 5;

by S R Ranganathan. Assisted by  
A Neelamegha. 1964.

#### 0 Introduction

##### 01 IMPORTANCE OF THE TERM 'PERSONAL AUTHOR'

In the case of a work with personal author, CCC as well as ALA Code prescribes the name of the Personal Author as the Heading of its Main Entry. And most of the works do have personal authors. Therefore, the definition of the term personal author is important.

##### 02 DEFINITION OF THE TERM PERSONAL AUTHOR'

In Sec FC3, CCC 1964 defines the term 'Personal Author' as "Person creating the work — that is, the thought and the expression constituting it".

In Appendix 1 giving the glossary, ALA 1967 defines the term 'Personal Author' as "The person chiefly responsible for the creation of the intellectual or artistic content of a work".

While actually applying these definitions to determine the author, they turn out to be rather naive.

##### 03 CONFLICT OF PERSONAL AUTHORSHIP

This naivety arises out of the fact that the title-page of a work often has more than one name not amounting to a joint-authorship and neither of the names is indicated to be a collaborator rather than the author. Here, the definitions do not help us to determine which person should be taken to be the author. This is how the conflict of personal authorship arises. This conflict should be resolved. Its resolution would depend upon a comparison of the role of each of the persons in the creation of the work — that is, the thought and the expression constituting it — as CCC puts it or in the creation of the intellectual and artistic content of the work, as the ALA Code puts it. This paper is concerned with such a comparison.

##### 04 KINDS OF WORK

The following are the four well known types of work demanding the resolution of conflict of personal authorship:

- |                   |                      |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1 Spoken word;    | 3 Map and Atlas; and |
| 2 Correspondence; | 4 Dependent work.    |

The succeeding sections will deal with the determination of authorship of these four types of works.

##### 05 DEPENDENT WORK

At this stage, it is helpful to define "Dependent Work". CCC 1964 defines it as follows:

**GB4 Dependent Work.**— Dependent Work is a work got by some modification of another work, (which will be called the Original Work), or by augmentation of it. The modification or augmentation, as the case may be, need not necessarily be by the author of the original work. It may be done by some other person or even by a corporate body."

Conflict of authorship arises in respect of the original author and the modifier or the augmentser.

### 1 Spoken Word

The term 'Spoken Word' implies more than one person. When the 'spoken word' is committed to writing and thereby converted into a work, its title-page will have the name of more than one person.

### 11 RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT BY CCC 1964

The following tabular statement forming Sec GB1 of CCC 1964 gives which of the persons should be taken as the author.

SN	Type of Work	Author
1	Ana, table-talk	Talker
2	Dialogue, conversation, debate	Participants
3	Interview	Person(s) interviewed
4	Lecturer	Lecturer
5	Narration (real and not fictitious)	Narrator
6	Mediumistic communication	Medium(s) and not the disembodied soul

### 12 RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT BY ALA 1967

ALA 1967 mixes up the resolution of the conflict of authorship and the prescription of the Heading of the Main Entry, in a single rule on the Choice of Heading. In fact, the authorship has to be inferred from the name prescribed as heading. The following are the relevant rules:

#### 13 Reporter or person reported

13A Enter a report of an interview, or of a discussion, conversation, or similar exchange, under the reporter, if he is a participant and the report is to a considerable extent in his own words.

- 13B If the reporter is not a participant and if the report is essentially confined to the words of the person or persons interviewed or participating in the exchange, enter the report under the principal participant, the first named participant, or the title according to the provisions of rule 3.

Besides these, the following rules also may be taken to be relevant:

- 1 Rule 13C for mediumistic communication;
- 2 Rules 3A, 3B1, and 3B2 for debate; and
- 3 Rule 16 (?) for narration.

121 *Primary Violation of the Principle of Unity*

Rules 13A and 13B are obviously on the choice of the Heading of the Main Entry. But incidentally or impliedly, they also resolve the conflict of authorship. This is a violation of the Principle of Unity of Idea. This is the primary violation.

122 *Secondary Violation of the Principle of Unity*

Apart from this primary violation, there are also secondary violations. These rules mix up the cases of

- 1 One person interviewed;
- 2 One person interviewed and the reporter making substantial contribution to the intellectual content of the work;
- 3 One person interviewed and the reporter being, to a considerable extent, responsible for the expression of the idea collected from the person interviewed;
- 4 Two or three persons interviewed;
- 5 More than three persons interviewed;
- 6 More than one person interviewed and the reporter making substantial contribution to the intellectual content of the work, and
- 7 More than one person interviewed and the reporter being, to a considerable extent, responsible for the expression of the idea collected from the persons interviewed.

123 *Proposed New Version of Rules 13A and 13B*

Before we take up a comparison of CCC and ALA Code in this respect, it is helpful to remove these secondary violations of the Principle of Unity of Idea. In the first place, there should be separate sets of rules for Interview, Discussion, Conversation, and Table-talk. We shall take "Interview" as typical. The rules bearing on "Interview" in ALA 1967 are 13A and 13B. The removal of secondary violation of the Principle of Unity of Idea is better done by splitting up these two rules into the following seven rules:

13a Enter a report of an interview under the name of the person interviewed, if only one person is interviewed and the report is essentially confined to the words of the person interviewed, and the reporter has not made any contribution to the intellectual content of the work.

13b Enter a report of an interview under the name of the reporter if the report is, to a considerable extent, in his own words and the number of persons interviewed is one.

13c Enter a report of an interview under the name of the reporter if he had also contributed substantially to the intellectual content of the report and the number of persons interviewed is one.

13d Enter a report of an interview under the name of the reporter if the report is, to a considerable extent, in his own words and the number of persons interviewed is more than one.

13e Enter a report of an interview under the name of the principal person interviewed, if it is indicated, otherwise, under the name of the person interviewed whose name is mentioned first on the title-page according to the provisions of rule 3A and 3B1, if two or three persons are interviewed and the report is essentially confined to the words of the persons interviewed and the reporter has not made any substantial contribution to the intellectual content of the work.

13f Enter a report of an interview under the principal person interviewed, if it is indicated, otherwise, under the title of the report according to the provisions of rule 3A and 3B2, if more than three persons are interviewed and the report is essentially confined to the words of the persons interviewed and the reporter has not made any substantial contribution to the intellectual content of the work.

13g Enter a report of an interview under the name of the reporter if he had also contributed substantially to the intellectual content of the report and if the number of persons interviewed is more than one.

13 COMPARISON OF CCC AND ALA CODE WHEN THE NUMBER OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED IS ONE

131 *Agreement between CCC 1964 and ALA 1967*

The revised rule 13a of ALA 1967 and the item 3 in the table of CCC 1964 agree in determining the person interviewed as the author.

132 *Disagreement between CCC 1964 and ALA 1967*

1321 *Reporter as Author*

The revised rule 13b of ALA 1967 determines the reporter as the author when he is the creator of the expression in the work,

in spite of his not being "responsible for the creation of the intellectual content of the work", as the definition given by ALA 1967 requires. The definition of the term 'Author' given by ALA Code does not at all refer to Responsibility for Expression. Thus, possession of that responsibility is neither necessary nor by itself sufficient.

### 1322 *Person Interviewed as Author*

However, let us assume that the ALA Code's definition is made to include the responsibility for expression alone as sufficient for authorship. Even then, CCC 1964 has not provided for this contingency in the table. Perhaps, it has taken this case to be determined by the items in the tables on dependent works (See Sec 4/5). Let us examine whether these tables have provided for this contingency. There is no explicit mention of this contingency in those tables. But that which comes nearest to it is item 96 of the table in Sec 5 of this paper. According to it, the author of the dependent work should be taken as the author of a "version in the same or another language which has sufficient new qualities in thought and/or expression to deem it an independent work on its own right". When the report of an interview is in the reporter's own words, can we say that it has sufficient new qualities in expression to deem it to be an independent work of the reporter? This is a moot point. The view of ALA 1967 implies that it does have sufficient new qualities in expression. But in the view of CCC 1964, it does not have. Perhaps, we shall have to decide which view is right by tossing a coin. But we should not take to this last resort before exploring other positive ways of determining the issue. For example, we may seek help from the Canons of Cataloguing (CCC 1964; Part B); and if they fail, from the Laws of Library Science (CCC 1964; Chap CA).

### 1323 *Teleological Approach*

Now that the approach from the side of semantics and definitions of the terms involved, has brought us to a deadlock we may make a teleological approach. In this approach we are guided by purpose. The purpose of catalogue is to help a reader, seeking a specific book, to locate it as quickly as possible. Experience shows that the majority of readers look for a work under the name of its author. Therefore, the name of the author should be the Heading of the Main Entry. Moving further, when there is neck competition between two persons in the claim for authorship of a book teleology would ask us to find out from experience whether the majority of readers would look up in the catalogue, the name of the person interviewed or the reporter.

Our experience shows that they would look up under the name of the person interviewed. This is the result of the teleological approach.

It must be remembered that the biographer of a person may interview him to get a real feel of his personality and for this purpose, he may put a few questions and elicit answers from him. The biography he produces should not be taken to be a report of the interview. Its author is the interviewer—that is, the biographer. The biographee interviewed is only the subject of the book.

### 133 *A Case of Joint Authorship*

The revised rule 13c of ALA 1967 makes the reporter and the person interviewed jointly responsible for the intellectual content of the work. Therefore, it is a case of joint authorship. The choice of heading should be left to the rules dealing with joint authorship.

### 14 COMPARISON OF CCC AND ALA CODE WHEN THE NUMBER OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED IS MORE THAN ONE

#### 141 *Disagreement between CCC 1964 and ALA 1967*

The revised rule 13d of ALA 1967 determines the reporter as the author when he is the creator of the expression in the work in spite of his not being "responsible for the creation of the intellectual content of the work", as the definition given by ALA 1967 requires. Regarding this rule, the comments are the same as given in Sec 132 and its subdivisions of this Paper.

#### 142 *Cases of Joint Authorship*

In the cases covered by the revised rules 13e and 13f, the persons interviewed are jointly responsible for the intellectual content of the work. Therefore, they are cases of joint authorship. The choice of heading in these cases should be left to the rules dealing with joint authorship. CCC 1964 has done so.

The revised rule 13g of ALA 1967 is concerned with the case where the reporter and the persons interviewed are jointly responsible for the intellectual content of the work. Therefore, this is also a case of joint authorship. The choice of heading, in this case also, should be left to the rules dealing with joint authorship. CCC 1964 has done so.

We shall consider these cases when we will deal with the choice of the Heading for the Main Entry of a work of joint authorship.

## 2 Correspondence

The term "Correspondence" implies more than one person.

A volume of correspondences may have on its title-page the names of more than one person.

21 RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT BY CCC 1964

The following elucidation forming Sec GB2 of CCC 1964 determines which of the person(s) should be taken as the author:

GB2 Correspondence.— In the case of mutual correspondence, the correspondents should be taken as joint authors.

If, however, the document contains the correspondence of one person only with several others, that one person alone may be taken as the author.

22 RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT BY ALA 1967

3 Works of Shared Authorship. *Preliminary note.*

The rules below apply to

1 Works produced by the joint collaboration of two or more authors,

2 Works for which different authors have prepared separate contributions (*e.g.* composite works, symposia, series of addresses, lectures, etc, written specifically for a particular occasion or for the publication in hand) providing the authors are not acting as members of corporate body, and

3 Works consisting of an exchange between different persons (*e.g.* correspondence debates).

221 *Joint Authorship*

Category 1 cited above is a case of joint authorship. Therefore, each of the persons should be taken as author.

222 *Author of a Composite Book*

Category 2 cited above is a case of composite book. Here also each of the contributors should be taken to be the author of his own contribution. The work as a whole does not have an author.

223 *Author of a Volume of Correspondence*

Category 3 cited above is again a case of joint authorship except that when the volume contains the correspondences of one person only with several others, in which case, that one person alone is the author.

23 COMPARISON OF CCC AND ALA CODE

The resolutions of the conflict of authorship in the case of correspondence, as given by CCC 1964 and ALA 1967 are



virtually in agreement. However, the resolution in ALA 1967 is intimately associated with the rules on the choice of heading.

### 3 Map and Atlas

#### 31 CCC 1964

GB3 Map and Atlas.— The cartographer should be taken as the author of a map or atlas.

#### 32 ALA 1967

210 General rule.— A map, a series or set of maps, an atlas, a relief model, or a globe is entered under the person or corporate body that is primarily responsible for its informational content. If the content has both geographic and subject aspects, the aspect that constitutes the principal feature of the work determines the rules of entry to be applied. If the subject aspect is principal feature, the rules of entry for books and book-like material are applied (Chap 1), if the geographic aspect is the principal feature, rule 211 is applied.

##### 211 Non-subject maps, atlases, etc

211A Primary responsibility explicit.— A map, series or set of maps, or an atlas, etc, the content of which is mainly confined to geographic information, is entered under the person or corporate body that is explicitly indicated as primarily responsible for its geographic content. The appearance on a map of the phrase "compiled by" or its equivalent in a foreign language is ordinarily understood to indicate primary responsibility. Likewise, the inclusion in the title of the name of part of the name of a corporate body, excluding a commercial firm other than a map publisher, is to be interpreted as indicating that body's primary responsibility.

211B Primary responsibility not explicit.— When the primary responsibility for a map, atlas, etc, is not explicit, the main entry is chosen according to the order of preference given below:

- 1 The individual whose survey provided the basis of the cartography;
- 2 The cartographer;
- 3 The engraver, if known to be also a cartographer;
- 4 The corporate body, including a map publisher, that prepared the maps; and
- 5 The title.

#### 33 COMPARISON OF CCC AND ALA CODE

CCC 1964 has asserted that the cartographer only is to be taken as the author of a map or atlas. On the other hand, Rule 210, 211A and 211B of ALA 1967 on the choice of heading

imply that the cartographer cannot necessarily be the only claimant for authorship of a map or atlas. The CCC's determination of the cartographer as the author, in all cases of map and atlas, requires to be amended in the light of the ALA rules on the choice of heading mentioned above. For, in the case of a map or atlas pertaining to a subject, such as geology, or historical geography, or economics, the person creating the work — that is, the thought constituting it — is not the cartographer, but the specialist in geology, or historical geography, or economics, as the case may be. The status of the cartographer, here, is that of a translator, who translates the ideas of the specialist into the language of cartography; in other words, the cartographer is only a collaborator and not the author.

#### 4 Dependent Work : Author of the Original

##### 41 CCC 1964

GB5 Author of the Original.— The author of the original should be taken as the author of the following kinds of dependent works:

- |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|
| 1 Abridgement | 4 Revision    |
| 2 Adaptation  | 5 Selection   |
| 3 Paraphrase  | 6 Translation |

##### 42 ALA 1967

###### 14 Reviser or original author

14A In general enter an edition that has been revised, enlarged, abridged, condensed, etc., by another person, under the original author ...

###### 7 Adapter or original author

7A Enter an adaptation or other rewriting of a work in a different literary style (e.g. paraphrase, epitome, version for children) or in a different literary form (e.g. dramatisation, novelization, versification) under the person who did the adapting or rewriting, if known; otherwise, under its title.

###### 15 Translation or author

15A Enter a translation of a work under the author of the original work.

##### 43 COMPARISON OF CCC AND ALA CODE

The following table gives a comparative view about the determination of authorship by the two codes.

SN	Kind of Dependent Work	CCC 1964	ALA 1967
1	Abridgement	Author of the original	Author of the original
2	Adaptation	„ „ „	Author of the dependent work
3	Paraphrase	„ „ „	Do.
4	Revision	„ „ „	Author of the original
5	Selection	„ „ „	[Could not be ascertained]
6	Translation	„ „ „	Author of the original

## 44 DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN CCC AND ALA CODE

441 *Adaptation*

CCC 1964 would make the author of an adaptation a collaborator — a person associated with a work and/or its author in a secondary capacity not amounting to authorship (CCC 1964, Sec FD1). Because, he is not "responsible for the creation of the intellectual content of the work".

442 *Paraphrase*

In the view of CCC 1964, the author of a paraphrase merely seeks to lay bare the intellectual and artistic content of the original. Therefore, he is to be treated only as a collaborator and not the author.

## 45 AGREEMENT BETWEEN CCC AND ALA

In all the other four cases mentioned in the table, the two codes agree.

5 **Dependent Work : Author of the Dependent Work**

## 51 CCC 1964

GB6 Author of Dependent Work.— The author of the Dependent Work should be taken as the author of the following kinds of dependent works:

1	Commentary (of greater importance than the basic work)	91	Novelisation
		92	Parody
		93	Sequel

2	Concordance	94	Supplement
3	Continuation	95	Versification
4	Dramatisation	96	Version in the same or another language, which has sufficient new qualities in thought and/or expression to deem it an independent work on its own right.
5	Imitation		
6	Index		
7	Libretto		
8	Music-setting		

## 52 ALA 1967

The rules 7A, 11A, 19, 19A, 19B, 19B1, 19B2 of ALA 1967 are relevant to the determination of authorship of the types of documents mentioned in the table in Sec 51 under CCC 1964.

No rule in ALA 1967 appears to have been turned on "Imitation" and "Parody".

## 53 COMPARISON OF CCC AND ALA CODE

531 *Agreement between CCC 1964 and ALA 1967*

Subject to Rule 19A of ALA 1967 and except for Libretto, CCC 1964 and ALA 1967 are in agreement about the authorship of the types of document mentioned in Sec 51.

532 *Disagreement between CCC 1964 and ALA 1967*5321 *Index and Manual*

The relevant portion of Rule 19A of ALA 1967 reads as follows:

19A Works with dependent titles. Enter a work that has a title that is indistinctive and dependent on the title of another work under the same author and/or title as the work to which the work is related if it falls in one of the categories given below.

1 Auxiliary works the use of which is dependent on a particular edition of the main work (e.g. certain indexes, manuals, etc) . .

The implication of this rule is that in the case of an index or a manual the author of the original work, to which it is an index or manual, is to be taken as the author provided its title is dependent on a particular edition of the original work and its use is dependent on a particular edition of the original work. This decision is contradictory to the definition of the term 'Author' as given in ALA 1967. If the author of the original himself has not created its index or manual, how can he be "responsible for the creation of their intellectual content"? After all, a specific use of a work cannot change its authorship. CCC 1964 does not determine the author of the original work as the author of the index; but it determines the indexer as the author of the index; and similarly in the case of a manual to a work.

5322 *Libretto*

The rules on "Libretto" in ALA 1967 are as follows:

19B1 Enter a libretto for a particular musical work under the composer . . .

19B2 If the work used as a libretto is published as a literary work or without reference to a particular musical setting, however, enter it under its author.

19B3 Enter a collection of librettos for musical works of a particular composer under the composer.

Rule 19B2 of ALA 1967, agrees with CCC 1964. The composer is not responsible for the creation of the intellectual content of the libretto. Therefore, 19B1 and 19B3 contradict the definition of the term 'Author' as given in ALA 1967. The correct way of connecting the libretto with the musical composition should be through an author-title added entry under the name of the composer.

6 **New Categories**

The categories causing conflict of personal authorship discussed in this paper and covered by the two codes are by no means exhaustive. New categories may arise in future. Even at present there might be a few categories, involving conflict of personal authorship, without having come to notice. The Chapter "GB Conflict of Authorship: Person vs Person" in CCC 1964 may have to be added to from time to time.