

Lib Sc. 8; 1971; PAPER H.

**Conflict of Authorship: Name of Original Author Merged in Title** (Cataloguing problems. 13). (Comparison of CCC and AACR. 7).

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

**G Bhattacharyya**, *Senior Lecturer, Documentation Research and Training Centre, Bangalore* 3.

[If the name of the original author is merged in the title, it may give rise to a conflict of authorship. Ordinarily, such a conflict falls in the category "Person vs Person." As regards resolution of conflict of authorship, the implication of the Principle of Unity of Idea is that a cataloguing code should (1) recognise resolution of conflict of authorship as a problem quite distinct from those of choice, rendering, and recording the name of the author, and (2) give an independent set of rules for the resolution of conflict of authorship. A conflict of authorship arising out of the merger of the name of the original author in the title, should ordinarily be resolved at the level of definition of terms — that is, with reference to

the formal definitions of the terms 'Personal Author' and 'Personal Collaborator.' If they do not prove sufficient for the purpose, the definition of the term 'Personal Author' is to be propped up by an interpretative definition. In the light of the above criteria, a comparative study of the respective approaches of the different editions of CCC and AACR to resolve the conflict, is made. The following interpretative definition of the term 'Author' is proposed to resolve the conflict: In case the name of the author of the original work is merged in the title of the revised work, the author of the original work is the author of the revised work if the reviser himself definitely indicates, in the Collaborator Statement on the title-page, that he himself is only a collaborator of the work concerned].

#### ABBREVIATIONS USED:

- AACR = Anglo-American cataloguing rules. By American Library Association and others. Its three editions are distinguished by adding after the abbreviation their respective years of publication.
- CCC = Classified Catalogue Code. By S R Ranganathan. Its five editions are distinguished by adding after the abbreviation their respective years of publication.
- RD $\square$ (1904) = Rules for a dictionary catalogue. By Charles A Cutter. Ed 4. 1904.

### 1 Introduction

#### 1.1 CLASSIC

A Classic is a work usually having embodiments in several versions, adaptations, and translations, attracting other works on itself, and getting copied out and/or brought out in print even long after its origin. A classic is almost immortal; it has elements of permanent value. Therefore, a classic may be a source for Dependent Works. Since a classic outlives its author the title page of any of its Dependent Work other than an Evaluation, has, often necessarily, to contain the name of a collaborator. The author's name may be found merged in the title of such a work. Such a situation gives rise to the question "Who is the author of the Dependent Work?" This is a case of conflict of authorship centring round Person vs Person. A comparison of the respective approaches of CCC and AACR to resolve such a conflict has already been made by Ranganathan and Bhattacharyya (2).

## 12 WORK OTHER THAN A CLASSIC

Occasionally we have a work, consisting mainly of current ideas, revised by a person other than the author of the original. While the frame-work of the original is maintained, the extent of the revision may vary from being slight and negligible to being very considerable. When it is considerable, and the revision is made by a person other than the author of the original, conflict of authorship arises. For, it is the reviser, and not the original author, that is responsible for most of the content of the revised work. In such a case, the name of the original author may be found, on the title-page of the revision, merged in the title of the work.

An intensive study of this problem by Ranganathan and Neelamegham (1, 3) has revealed the following varieties of practices:

Original author's name	Collaborator's name
1 Merged in the title and also retained in the place of the author's name.	11 (No collaborator). 12 Omitted altogether.
2 Merged in the title, but not retained in the place of the author's name.	21 Given in the author statement on the title-page. 22 Given in the title-page and described as Editor and/or Reviser.
3 Merged in the title, not retained in the place of author's name, and yet mentioned as a collaborator with the reviser and the editor.	31 Given in the title page and described as Editor and/or Reviser.
4 Merged in the title along with collaborator's name.	41 Given in the author-statement on the title-page
5 Merged in the title but inserted after the name of the publisher.	51 Given in the title page and described as Editor and/or Reviser.

**13 CAUSES FOR MERGER**

The merging of the name of the original author in the title may be due to one of three causes:

1 It may be in recognition that the framework designed by the original author continues to be valid though the details need change from time to time;

2 It may be out of deference to the memory of the original author; and

3 It may be as a means of having the benefit of the good-will established for the work by the original author.

**14 CONFLICT OF AUTHORSHIP**

The situation mentioned in Sec 12 above, gives rise to the question, "Whose name are we to use as the Heading of the Main Entry in such a case?" This is the conflict. At a deeper level, this question implies another, namely, "Who is the author of such a revised work?" In this sense, it is a case of conflict of authorship. In most of the cases, it centres round Person vs Person.

**15 SCOPE OF THE PAPER**

This paper makes a comparative study of how the different editions of CCC and AACR make their respective approaches to resolve the conflict of authorship centring round the merger of the name of the original author in the title.

**2 Criterion for Evaluation****21 UNIT OPERATION**

The work of preparing an entry may consist of the following unit operations:

1 Resolution of conflict of authorship;

2 Choice;

3 Uniformisation of variant forms;

4 Rendering; and

5 Recording.

The Principle of Unity of Idea suggests that a rule in a cataloguing code should be concerned with one and only one unit operation. As regards resolution of conflict of authorship, its implication is that a cataloguing code should

1 Recognise "resolution of conflict of authorship" as a problem quite distinct from those of choice, rendering, and recording the name of the author; and

2 Give an independent set of rules for the resolution of conflict of authorship.

**22 LEVEL OF RESOLUTION**

The different levels of prescription at which the various problems of cataloguing get resolved in a cataloguing code may be categorised as follows:

- 1 The level of normative principles of cataloguing;
- 2 The level of definition of terms;
- 3 The level of rules for choice;
- 4 The level of rules for uniformisation;
- 5 The level of rules for rendering;
- 6 The level of rules for recording; and
- 7 The level of commentaries.

A conflict of authorship centres round the question, "Who is the author?" It is the responsibility of the definition of the term 'Author' to answer this question. Therefore, the level of prescription at which the resolution of a conflict of authorship is to be found in a cataloguing code is the level of definition of the term 'Author'.

**23 INTERPRETATIVE DEFINITION**

A formal definition of each of the terms 'Author', 'Personal Author', 'Corporate Author', and 'Collaborator', goes a long way in resolving the different kinds of conflict of authorship. But this is not sufficient. In many a case, each of the initial formal definitions requires to be propped up by one or more appropriate interpretative definitions as a sequel to it. When the original author's name is found to be merged in the title, it generally gives rise to a conflict centering round Person vs Person. Such a conflict has to be resolved with reference to the definitions of the terms 'Personal Author' and 'Personal Collaborator'. If these two formal definitions do not prove sufficient, they are to be propped up by one or more interpretative definitions suitable for the purpose.

**24 AUTHORITY**

A person bringing out a later edition may be too sentimental; and he may give the name of the original author as the Author in the title-page, and his own name only as a Collaborator, or he may even omit his own name altogether from the title-page even when more than half of the work embodied in the new edition is different from the work of the original edition. At the other extreme, an egoistic reviser may omit the name of the original author and insert his own name as the author even though the change in the work embodied in the revised edition is much less

than half of the original work. It is very difficult for a cataloguer to sit in judgment to determine the extent of contribution of each person. For practical purposes, he has to depend upon some authority, in the resolution of the conflict. In spite of all the possibilities mentioned above, the person that has to be assumed to have the knowledge to resolve the conflict, is the one who brings out the later edition. Therefore, an objective method of resolving such a conflict is to depend upon the statement which discloses the role of the reviser on the title-page of the document concerned.

### 25 UNIFORMITY OF PRACTICE

If the name of one of two claimants for the heading section of the Main Entry is preferred for some reason or other, the name of the other claimant should generally be given an Added Entry. On the basis of this formula, it is possible to prescribe a uniform practice for the choice of the heading of the main entry in all cases of conflict of authorship arising out of the merger of the name of the original author in the title. But in such a choice, there remains the risk of the violation of the definition of the term 'Author'.

### 3 Pertinent Rule

*Note.*— The subsections in this section are numbered mnemonically to facilitate easy reference. This has been done according to the scheme given in Sec A4 of the article *Conflict of authorship: Corporate body vs corporate body* (*Library science*. 7;1970, Paper G).

#### 3a PERTINENT RULE IN RDC (1904)

"18. A revision should be entered under the name of the original author unless it becomes substantially a new work".

#### 3b PERTINENT RULE IN AACR (1908)

"19. Revision. Enter a revision under the name of the original author unless it has become substantially a new work in which case it is to be entered under the reviser, with a reference (Cutter 18)".

#### 3c PERTINENT RULE IN CCC (1934)

"1298 If the name of the personal author be merged in the title, it is to be separated out and used as the Heading, unless the edition or revision in question deviates so much from the original as to admit of its being regarded as a different work, in which case the name of the reviser or the editor is to be used as the Heading in accordance with Rule 126 and its subdivisions and Rule 127, as the case may be, and the name of the original author

is not to be separated from the title".

3e PERTINENT RULE IN CCC (1945)

Same as in CCC (1934) quoted in Sec 3c of this paper.

3f PERTINENT RULE IN AACR (1949)

"2 . . . . Enter revisions and other modifications under the original author whenever the work remains substantially his, especially if the book purports to be an edition of the original work (cf 20).

"20 Revision. Enter a revision under the name of the original author with added entry for the reviser (cf 2)".

3g PERTINENT RULE IN CCC (1951)

Same as in CCC (1934) quoted in Sec 3c of this paper.

3j PERTINENT RULE IN CCC (1958)

"1417 In the later editions of a book, edited, or revised, or continued by a person different from the author, the name of the original author may be found merged in the title of the book. Then the question arises as to who should be taken as its author — the original author or the person whose name occurs in the author statement on the title-page. The answer should naturally depend upon the extent to which the new edition differs from the original. It appears to be difficult to lay down any objective criterion in this matter. There are cases where even after half a century after the original author's death, the person bringing out successive posthumous editions continues to insert in the author statement on the title-page the name of the original author as well as his own name. He may present the two names either as if they were joint authors, or as if the later one is a collaborator only. This difference in practice also makes the problem more complicated and makes it difficult to have a rule which will produce consistent results."

3k PERTINENT RULE IN CCC (1964)

"GE Name of Original Author merged in Title

"GE5 The safest course to determine the choice of the heading is to rely on the Canon of Ascertainability — that is, by what is indicated in the title-page, rather than sit in judgement over what is given in the title-page."

3m PERTINENT RULE IN AACR (1967)

"14 Reviser or Original author.

"A In general, enter an edition that has been revised, enlarged abridged, condensed, etc., by another person, under the original author, with added entry under the other person."

"B If the new edition clearly indicates that the work is no longer that of the original author, however, enter it under the new author, Make an author title added entry under, or an explanatory reference from, the heading of the earlier work."

### 30 Evaluation

#### 3A EVALUATION OF RULE IN RDC (1904)

The case of the name of the original author merged in the title is not recognised by RDC (1904) as a specific problem warranting a specific prescription. The Rule quoted in Sec 3a of this paper, though pertinent in this context, is very broad in scope. Of course, it can be applied to resolve the conflict of authorship arising out of the merger of the name of the original author in the title. But in that case, it violates the Principle of Unity of Idea. This is because, it mixes up two different levels of prescriptions — namely, the level of definition of terms and the level of rules for choice. Again, the rule does not provide either explicitly or impliedly any objective method of resolving the conflict; it is all left to the judgement of the individual cataloguer.

#### 3B EVALUATION OF RULE IN AACR (1908)

It may be noted that the pertinent rule in AACR (1908) is the same as that in RDC (1904). It is a case of acknowledged adoption. Therefore, all the remarks made in connection with the evaluation of the pertinent rule in RDC (See Sec 3A of this paper) are equally applicable to the pertinent rule in AACR (1908).

#### 3C EVALUATION OF RULE IN CCC (1934)

CCC (1934) has recognised the merging of the original author in the title as a specific cataloguing problem warranting a specific prescription. But, it has failed to recognise the level for the prescription to be that of the definition of the term 'Author.' On the other hand, it has attempted to resolve it at the level of rules for choice of heading. Thus it has violated the Principle of Unity of Idea. In content, the rule in CCC (1934) echoes the pertinent rule in RDC (1904). Thus, it fails to provide either explicitly or impliedly, any objective method of resolving the conflict: it is all left to the judgement of the individual cataloguer.

#### 3E EVALUATION OF RULE IN CCC (1945)

The pertinent rule in CCC (1934) occurs as-it-is in CCC



(1945). Therefore, the remarks here are analogous to those made in Sec 3C of this paper.

### 3F EVALUATION OF RULE IN AACR (1949)

There are two pertinent rules in AACR (1949). The contents of the two rules hardly differ from that of the pertinent rule in RDC (1904), though verbal changes are evident. Therefore, the remarks made in relation to the pertinent rule in RDC (1904) in Sec 3A are equally applicable to these rules. But, Rule 2 appears to be an improved version due to its reference to the term 'Edition'. This reference apparently leads to believe that it has provided some objective method to resolve the conflict. But it is not really so. For, the term 'Edition' is defined as "one of the successive forms in which a literary text is issued either by the author or by a subsequent editor". And it leaves us to the same place where we had been without the statement "especially if the book purports to be an edition of the original work".

### 3G EVALUATION OF RULE IN CCC (1951)

The pertinent rule in CCC (1934) occurs as-it-is in CCC (1951). Therefore, the remarks here are analogous to those made in Sec 3C of this paper.

### 3J EVALUATION OF RULE IN CCC (1958)

CCC (1958) is the first code to have recognised the problem of the name of original author merged in the title, as a case of conflict of authorship. And it has dealt with the problem at the appropriate level of prescription — namely, the level of the definition of the term 'Author'. But in the content of its prescription it has failed to add anything more than what its earlier editions have done. Its speciality lies only in the fact that it has mentioned explicitly about the need for an objective criterion to resolve this conflict. On the other hand, as if in despair, it concludes by saying "It appears to be difficult to lay down any objective criterion in this matter ... This difference in practice also makes the problem more complicated and makes it difficult to have a rule which will produce consistent results."

### 3K EVALUATION OF RULE IN CCC (1964)

CCC (1964) has followed CCC (1958) in recognising the case of the name of the original author merged in the title, as a specific problem of conflict of authorship warranting a specific prescription at the level of the definition of the term 'Author' for its resolution. It has further gone ahead, by providing a definite rule to resolve the conflict of authorship. The rule prescribes reliance on the Canon of Ascertainability for the purpose.

In this sense, CCC (1964) has succeeded in providing an objective method to resolve this conflict, which is absent in any one of the earlier codes. But, the prescription has taken the form of a rule for choice of heading. At the level of definition of terms, it should have taken the form of an interpretative definition of the term 'Personal Author'.

#### 4 Inadequacy of Formal Definition

CCC (1964) has defined the terms 'Personal Author' and 'Personal Collaborator' as follows:

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

"Personal Collaborator.— Person associated with a work and/or its author(s) in a secondary capacity not amounting to authorship — for example, director, guide, assistant, commentator, illustrator, engraver, translator, reviser, editor, reporter, writer of introduction or foreword, epitomiser, adapter, librettist, writer of the words in a musical composition, writer of the words in a pictorial book."

If the name of the original author is merged in the title, it may give rise to a conflict of authorship. Ordinarily, such a conflict falls in the category 'Person vs Person'. The formal definitions of the terms 'Personal Author' and 'Personal Collaborator' quoted above should ordinarily be sufficient to resolve such a conflict. But, there are cases where they may not prove sufficient; and the situation may call for an interpretative definition of the term 'Personal Author'.

#### 5 Interpretative Definition of 'Personal Author'

To take care of a situation where the formal definitions of the terms 'Personal Author' and 'Personal Collaborator' prove insufficient, it is necessary to introduce in a cataloguing code an interpretative definition of the term 'Personal Author' to resolve a conflict of authorship arising out of the merger of the name of the original author in the title. Such an interpretative definition may take the following form:

In case the name of the author of the original work is merged in the title of the revised work, the author of the original work is the author of the revised work if the reviser himself definitely indicates, in the Collaborator Statement on the title-page of the document, that he himself is only a collaborator of the work concerned.

**It has already been pointed out that the person that has to be**

assumed to have the knowledge to resolve the conflict is the one who brings out the later edition. Therefore, the statement made by him about his role on the title-page will furnish sufficient authority, on the basis of which right decision can be reached. The interpretative definition proposed above has taken this "factor of authority" into consideration. Finally, it is in conformity with the definitions of the terms 'Personal Author' and 'Personal Collaborator'.

#### 6 Bibliographical References

- 1 Sec 12 RANGANATHAN (S R). Classified catalogue code with additional rules for dictionary catalogue code. Ed 5. 1964. Chap GE.
- 2 Sec 11 RANGANATHAN (S R) and BHATTACHARYYA (G). Conflict of authorship: Person vs Person. Sec 4. and 5. (Lib sc. 6;1969;Paper B).
- 3 Sec 12 RANGANATHAN (S R) and NEELAMEGHAN (A). Name of original author merged in title. (An lib sc. 10;1963; Paper E).