

Lib sc. 9;1972; PAPER E.

Choice of the Heading of the Main Entry : Simple Book by Single Author.

(Cataloguing problems. 17). (Comparison of CCC and AACR. 8).

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

[The rules in RDC (1904), the different editions of AACR, and in the different editions of CCC, pertaining to the Choice of the Heading of the Main Entry for a Simple Book by a Single Author, are critically evaluated and compared. Impact, if any, of one code on another is indicated. The inadequacy of Rule MD1 in CCC (1964) is detected, and the modification necessary to remove that is suggested.]

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 year of publication, as for example, AACR (1908).
- CCC** = Classified catalogue code. By S R Ranganathan. Its five editions are distinguished by adding after the abbreviation, their respective years of publication.
- RDC (1904)** = Rules for a dictionary catalogue. By Charles A Cutter. Ed 4. 1904.

1 Introduction

11 SCOPE OF THE PAPER

This paper makes a comparative study of the rules of CCC and AACR, pertaining to the Choice of the Heading of the Main Entry for a Simple Book by a Single Author.

12 DEFINITION OF 'CHOICE'

The term 'Choice' denotes

1 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

- 2 The name of the entity so determined.

13 MNEMONIC SECTION NUMBER

The subsections of this Paper are numbered mnemonically to facilitate easy reference. This has been done according to the following table:

Code	Quotation	Commentary
RDC (1904)	a	A
AACR (1908)	b	B
CCC (1934)	c	C
CCC (1945)	e	E
AACR (1949)	f	F
CCC (1951)	g	G
CCC (1958)	j	J
CCC (1964)	k	K
AACR (1967)	m	M
CCC (Ed 6)	n	N

2 Rules for the Choice of the Heading of the Main Entry

The rules in RDC, AACR, and CCC pertaining to the Choice of the Heading of the Main Entry for a Simple Book by a Single Author, are quoted in the following subsections of this Section.

2a RULE IN RDC (1904)

"1. Make the author-entry under

- (A) the name of the author whether personal or corporate, or (B) some substitute for it."

2b RULE IN AACR (1908)

"1 Author entry. Enter a work under the name of its author whether individual or corporate. (cf Definitions: Author)".

2c RULE IN CCC (1934)

"12 The Heading is to consist of one of the following according to the nature of the book.

- 1 The name of a Personal Author;
- 2 The names of two Joint Personal Authors;
- 3 The name of a Corporate Author;

- 4 The names of two Joint Corporate Authors;
- 5 A pseudonym or two pseudonyms;
- 6 The name of a person other than author;
- 7 The names of two persons other than authors; and
- 8 The first word of the Title, not an article, or an honorific word.

"121 Subject to rules 1262 and 128, if the title-page contains the name of one and only one Personal Author, that name is to be used as the Heading."

"123 Subject to rule 128, if Corporate Authorship is indicated by the book, the name of the Corporate Author is to be used as the Heading ..."

2e RULE IN CCC (1945)

The Rules 12, 121 and 123 are the pertinent rules in CCC (1945). Except for categories 6 and 7, Rule 12 is the same as Rule 12 in CCC (1934) quoted in Sec 1c above. Categories 6 and 7 read as follows:

"6. The name of a person other than author, *i.e.* of a Collaborator other than Joint Author;

7. The name of two persons other than authors, *i.e.* of two Collaborators, other than Joint Authors;"

Rule 121 in CCC (1945) is the same as Rule 121 in CCC (1934), quoted in Sec 1c of this paper.

Rule 123 in CCC (1945) is the same as Rule 123 in CCC (1934), quoted in Sec 1c of this paper.

2f RULE IN AACR (1949)

"1. General Rule. Enter a work under the name of its author whether personal or corporate.

"2. Individual author, Works by. Enter a work under the name of its author, when known, whether or not his name appears in the publication. (cf. 32) ..."

2g RULE IN CCC (1951)

"12 The Heading is to consist of the earliest of the following which the book admits of:

[The Categories 1 to 8 are the same as Categories 1 to 8 of Rule 12, in CCC (1945). (See Sec 2e of this paper)]

"121 [Same as Rule 121 in CCC (1934) quoted in Sec 2c of this paper].

2j RULE IN CCC (1958)

"5121 The Heading is to consist of the earliest of the following which the book admits and the Rules of Chap 14 prescribe as the Author:—

- 1 The name of a Personal Author;
- 2 The names of Joint Personal Authors;
- 3 The name of a Corporate Author;
- 4 The names of Joint Corporate Authors;
- 5 A pseudonym or two or more pseudonyms;
- 6 The name of a Collaborator;
- 7 The names of Joint Collaborators; and
- 8 The Title of the Document."

2k **RULE IN CCC (1964)**

"MD1 [Same as Rule 5121 in CCC (1958), quoted in Sec 2j of this paper, with the following exceptions:

- 1 The term 'Chap 14' is replaced by the term 'Part G';
- 2 The statement 'Names of a Joint Personal Author and of a Joint Corporate Author' is inserted as category 4; and
- 3 The categories 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are renumbered 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 respectively].

2m **RULE IN AACR (1967)**

"1 Works of single authorship.

A. Enter a work, a collection of works, or selections from works by one author under the person or corporate body that is the author, whether named in the work or not.

"B. If the publication attributes the authorship erroneously or fictitiously to someone who is not the author, enter it under the actual author and make an added entry under the attributed author if he is a real person."

3 Evaluation of the Rules for the Choice of the Heading of the Main Entry

The following subsections of this Section are devoted to the evaluation of the Rules quoted in the subsections of Sec 2.

3A EVALUATION OF THE RULE IN RDC (1904)

3A1 Definition of "Author" in RDC (1904)

RDC (1904) defines the term 'Author' as follows:

"*Author*, in the narrow sense, is the person who writes 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 properly to be called the collector). Bodies of men (societies, cities, legislative bodies, countries) are to be considered the authors of their memoirs, transactions, journals, debates, reports, etc."

3A2 Implication of the Definition of "Author"

In relation to the concept of "Personal Author", the

following are a few implications of the definition of the term 'Author' given by RDC (1904):

1 In the case of a Simple Book, the Writer—that is, the creator of the ideas and the expression constituting it—is the Author;

2 In the case of a Composite Book made of several contributions by the same person, the Writer—that is, the creator of the ideas and the expression constituting each of the contributions—is the Author; and

3 In the case of a Composite Book made of several contributions by different persons, the Editor—that is, the Collector of the Works created by others—is the Author.

Evidently, there is an element of self-contradiction in this definition. Further, the use of the term 'Writer' to denote the "Person Creating the Work—that is, the ideas and the expression constituting it"—has rendered the definition too inadequate to be applied widely.

3A3 *Result of the Implication*

The following are some of the results of these implications:

1 Rule 1 of RDC (1904) has been simultaneously a rule for the Choice of the Heading of the Main Entry for a simple book as well as for a composite book. This is a case of the violation of the Principle of Unity of Idea in drafting a Cataloguing Code.

2 The purport of each of the Rules 8 to 22 is as follows:

Rule N	Purport	Rule N	Purport
8	Illustrator	16	Continuation, Index
9	Designer, Painter, Cartographer, Engraver	17	Epitome
10	Photographer	18	Revision
11	Musical works	19	Excerpts
12-13	Booksellers, Auctioneers	20	Chrestomathies
14-15	Commentators	21	Concordances
		22	Reporter
			Ana, Table talk

These rules are virtually the different interpretative definitions of the term 'Author' in the sense that each of them deals with the question "Who is the author in a definite context?" This question

should have been dealt with at the level of the definitions of the cataloguing terms. But these have been given as the rules for the Choice of Heading. It is evident, that this is to make up for the inadequacy of the definition of the term 'Author' and of Rule 1 respectively. This is again a violation of the Principle of Unity of Idea. In other words, in the context of an adequate definition of the term 'Author', Rule 8 to 22 are redundant.

3A4 *The Term 'Author-Entry'*

According to RDC (1904), the term 'Author-Entry' refers to "an entry (main or added) under the name of the author (whether personal or corporate) or some substitute for it". The use of the term 'Author-Entry' in Rule 1, makes one understand that the rule is simultaneously for the choice of the Heading of the Main Entry and of Added Entries. But a careful examination of this rule shows that it is solely concerned with the Main Entry. Therefore, the term 'Author-Entry' should have been replaced by the term 'Main Entry'. Both are technical terms defined by RDC (1904).

3A5 *The Term 'Substitute'*

The term 'Substitute for the Name of the Author' in Rule 1, has got no formal definition of its own. But there is an indirect enumerative definition embedded in Rule 96 to Rule 109. There are three broad categories of Substitutes — viz part of the name of the author, pseudonym, the name of the collector. In the context of a Simple Book, only the first two categories are applicable. In this context, the phrase "the name of the author" in Rule 1, actually stands for the phrase 'the real name of the author'.

3A6 *Canon of Ascertainability*

Rule 2 in RDC (1904) is devoted to anonymous books. According to RDC (1904), a book is anonymous, "if the author's name does not appear in the title." The term 'Title' refers collectively to the author statement, title proper, and imprint. In other words, Rule 1 in RDC (1904) is concerned with books in which the name of the author is mentioned in the "Title". Therefore, this rule is quite in conformity with the Canon of Ascertainability.

3B EVALUATION OF THE RULE IN AACR (1908)

A comparison of Rule 1 in AACR (1908) with Rule 1 in RDC (1904) shows that the former is virtually the same as the latter, though verbal changes are evident. Further, the definition of the terms 'Author' and 'Author-Entry' in AACR (1908) are

adopted from RDC (1904) with verbal changes. Again, the purport of each of the Rules 4 to 22 in AACR (1908) is as follows:

Rule N	Purport	Rule N	Purport
4	Illustrator	14	Continuations
5	Engravers	15	Indexes
6	Cartographers	16	Concordances
7	Architects	17	Epitomes
8	Music	18	Excerpts, Chrestomathies
9	Libretti	19	Revision
10	Thematic catalogues	20	Table talk, Interviews
11	Heraldic visitations	21	Translation
12	Bulls	22	Manuscripts
13	Commentaries		

The above rules are mostly adapted from RDC (1904). Each of them is virtually an interpretative definition of the term 'Author' in a definite context. Further, Rule 112 to 118 in AACR (1908) are devoted to the Choice of the Heading of the Main Entry for Anonymous books. A book is deemed anonymous by AACR (1908), "if the author's name does not appear in the book itself" f'. In other words, Rule 1 in AACR (1908), is concerned with the book in which the name of the author(s) appear in the book. Therefore, the remarks on Rule 1 in AACR (1908) are analogous to those given in Sec 1A and its subdivisions, of this paper.

3C EVALUATION OF THE RULE IN CCC (1934)

3CI Definition of "Author" in CCC (1934)

CCC (1934) deems the term 'Author' to be a generic term to denote "Personal Author" and "Corporate Author". It defines the term 'Personal Author' as follows: "A composer or writer of a book, the responsibility for its contents resting solely on him in his private capacity. . . ." It defines the term 'Corporate Author' as follows: "A work is said to be of corporate author-

ship 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...."

3C2 *A Break-Through*

CCC (1934) has succeeded in distinguishing the essential criterion to recognize the authorship of a document; and it is "the responsibility for its contents". This is a break-through in the development of the concept of "authorship" with respect to cataloguing. The self-contradictory element in the definition of "Author" in RDC (1904) has been completely removed by CCC (1934).

3C3 *Effect of the Break-Through*

The developmental features of the definitions of the terms 'Personal Author' and 'Corporate Author' in CCC (1934) have been reflected in the formulation of its individual rules. For example, it has succeeded in implementing the Principle of Unity of Idea in its Rules 121 and 123. Further, it has succeeded in avoiding the need of giving any redundant rule warranted by the inadequacy of the definition of the term 'Personal Author'. Rules 121 and 123 in CCC (1934) are perfectly in conformity with the Canon of Ascertainability. But, Rule 123 has a long tail appended to it. The three dots in the quotation stand for this tail. This portion of the rule is devoted to the definition of the different kinds of Corporate Body. And thus, the Principle of Unity of Idea is violated in the formulation of this rule.

3C4 *Rule 12 in CCC (1934)*

Rule 12 in CCC (1934) gives rise to a doubt in the context of Rules 121 and 123. A careful examination of this rule shows that this rule by itself fails to guide the Choice of the Heading for a particular book; because, it states "The heading is to consist of one of the following according to the nature of the book." Each category in the rule corresponds to a particular nature of the book. But the rule does not say anything about what this nature is. Therefore, the function of this rule has been restricted to the simple enumeration of the names of the different entities that may constitute the Heading of the Main Entry for a Simple Book. And the rules, such as 121 and 123, are the ones actually guiding the Choice. In this sense, Rule 12 is redundant.

3C5 *Potentiality of Rule 12*

But Rule 12 itself could have mentioned a sequence of preference from among the different categories of Author, on the basis of the information furnished on the title-page and its

over-flow pages of the document catalogued. This would have resulted in a single simple rule for the Choice of the Heading of the Main Entry for a Simple Book quite in conformity with the Canon of Ascertainability. This has been realised by CCC (1951); and it has successfully incorporated this finding in its Rule 21 (See Sec 3F1).

3E EVALUATION OF THE RULE IN CCC (1945)

The relevant rules in CCC (1945) are the same as those in CCC (1934). Therefore, the remarks on the rules in CCC (1945) are analogous to those made in Sec 3C and its subdivisions, of this paper.

3F EVALUATION OF THE RULE IN AACR (1949)

3F1 *Definition of "Author" in AACR (1949)*

The definition of the term 'Author' in AACR (1949) does not differ substantially from that in AACR (1908) which again is virtually the same as that in RDC (1904). However, AACR (1949) adds the following sentence in tis 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) has 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 of the terms 'Personal Author' and 'Corporate Author' given in CCC (1934) shows that they are virtually the same, though a trivial 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 !

3F2 *No Effect of the Improvement*

The purport of each of the following rules in AACR (1949) is as follows:

Rule N	Purport	Rule N	Purport
3E	Narrator	19	Work of art
4B	Spoken words	20	Revision
6	Correspondence	21	Translation
7	Expedition	22	Abridgement, Adaptation Paraphrase, Selection
8A	Inscription		
9	Manuscript	23	Dramatisation
10	Map		Novelisation
11	Medium	24	Parody and imitation
12	Music	25	Supplement and Continuation
13	Catalogue	26	Sequel
14	Radio-script	27	Index
16	Ship's log	28	Concordance
17,	Thesis and Dissertation	29	Commentary
17E			
18	Heraldic visitation		

An examination of these rules shows that each of them is virtually an interpretative definition of the term 'Personal Author' in a definite context. They should have been dealt with at the level of the definitions of cataloguing terms. But, these have been given as rules for the Choice of Heading. This is, of course, a violation of the Principle of Unity of Idea in drafting a cataloguing code. Further, RDC (1904) and AACR (1908) have found such rules necessary to make up for the inadequacy of their respective definitions of the term 'Author'. But AACR (1949) has improved its definition of the term 'Author' in two ways (See Sec 3E1). In spite of that, it has failed to realise that the rules mentioned above are quite redundant as the rules for Choice of Heading.

3F3 *Unnecessary Numerousness of Rules*

Consider Rule 1, and Rule 2, of AACR (1949) along with its Rule 32 which reads as follows: "Enter works published anonymously under author when known...". It may be noted that the intention of Rule 32 is comprehended by Rule 2; and the intention of Rule 2 again is comprehended by Rule 1. Rule 1 has been designated "General Rule". By implication, Rule 2 is a "Specific Rule". Rule 32, in its own context, has been designated "General Rule"; but in the context of Rules 1 and 2, it is no doubt a "Specific Rule". Generally speaking, a "Specific

Rule" is warranted in a situation when the "General Rule" fails to guide the desired practice fully. For example, in the case of a book by joint authors, AACR (1949) prescribes the choice of the name of the author mentioned first on the title-page, for the Heading of the Main Entry. Certainly, Rule 1, the General Rule, fails to guide this practice; and therefore, this situation calls for a "Specific Rule". On the contrary, a book by an individual author does not warrant a "Specific Rule" in the context of Rule 1. So also is the case with Rule 32 in the context of Rule 1 and Rule 2. In other words, Rule 1 and the commentary to it could be so formulated that the unnecessary numerosness of rules could be safely avoided. AACR (1949) appears to have failed to realise this. There appears to be another reason behind this fault of unnecessary numerosness of rules. The classification of cataloguing problems implied in RDC (1904) distinguishes a book mentioning the name of its author from an anonymous one; and deals with them in distinct rules. AACR (1908) follows RDC (1904). AACR (1949) deviates from its older practice; and deals once in Rule 2 with both the problems and again in Rule 32 with the problem of anonymous books. As a result of this, the Principle of Unity of Idea has been violated, and the fault of unnecessary numerosness of rules has occurred.

3F4 *Canon of Ascertainability*

Rule 32 in AACR (1949) is devoted to the Choice of Heading for anonymous books. But, its Rule 2 also explicitly shares the same responsibility. Again, its Rule 1 does so impliedly. Therefore, there is no rule in AACR (1949) which is exclusively devoted to the Choice of Heading for a Simple Book by a Single Author, mentioning the name of its author. As a result, Rules 1 and 2 in AACR (1949) violate the Canon of Ascertainability.

3G EVALUATION OF THE RULES IN CCC (1951)

3G1 *Rule 12 in CCC (1951)*

Rule 12 in CCC (1951) differs from Rule 12 in CCC (1945) in prescribing a sequence of priority for the Choice of Heading depending upon the information given in the title-page and its overflow-pages of the document to be catalogued. This novel feature of Rule 12 in CCC (1951) has made it an elegant simple rule for Choice of Heading. But the phrase "which the book admits of" is rather vague. What it intends, would have been more precisely conveyed by the phrase "which the title-page and its overflow pages of the document warrants." Secondly, to make this rule fully operative, there is a need of resolving the different kinds of conflict of authorship at the level of definition of terms. This is to be done by propping up the definition of the terms 'Personal

Author', 'Corporate Author', and 'Collaborator' by a set of interpretative definitions applicable to specific contexts. The first attempt in this direction has been made by S R Ranganathan in his *Theory of library catalogue* (1938) in its Chap 54. CCC (1945) and CCC (1951) could have incorporated it. But, for the sake of economy, both of them have referred to *Theory* for the purpose of resolving the different kinds of conflict of authorship. The inadequacy of Rule 12 in CCC (1951) has been thus made up. But, it would have been more helpful if Rule 12 also in CCC (1951) would have referred to Chap 54 in *Theory* to help resolution of any conflict of authorship. This has been realised by CCC at a later stage.

3G2 Rule 121 in CCC (1951)

It may be noted that in the context of Rule 12 as modified by CCC (1951), Rule 121 is redundant. But CCC (1951) has failed to realise this. However, CCC has realised this at a later stage.

3J EVALUATION OF THE RULE IN CCC (1958)

3J1 Definition of 'Author'

CCC (1958) has defined the terms 'Author of Work', 'Personal Author' and 'Corporate Author' as follows:

"Author of Work.—1 Person creating the work, *i.e.* the thought, and the expression constituting it.

2 Corporate body owning responsibility for a work, *i.e.* for the thought and expression constituting it.

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

"Corporate Author.—Corporate body as author, the responsibility for the thought and expression constituting the work resting solely on it or any organ of it, 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."

Evidently, the above definitions are far more improved than those in earlier editions. This improvement at the level of definition has made Rule 5121 in CCC (1958) more effective for the purpose of Choice of Heading.

3J2 Further Improvement

Chapter 14 in CCC (1958) is devoted to the resolution of the different kinds of conflict of authorship by giving interpretative definition of the terms 'Personal Author' and 'Corporate Author'. Rule 5121 in CCC (1958) refers to this Chapter explicitly. Rule 121

in CCC (1951) is no more continued in CCC (1958). In this way, CCC (1958) has rectified the faults occurring in CCC (1951).

3J3 *Persisting Inadequacy*

The phrase "which the book admits of" has not yet been replaced by the phrase "which the title-page and its overflow pages of the document warrants". This is an inadequacy still persisting in CCC (1958).

3K EVALUATION OF THE RULE IN CCC (1964)

CCC (1964) continues the definitions of the terms 'Author of Work', 'Personal Author' and 'Corporate Author', as given in CCC (1958).

Rule MD1 in CCC (1964) is the same as Rule 5127 in CCC (1958). Therefore, the remarks made in Sec 3J and its subdivisions of this paper, are equally applicable to the concerned Rules and Definitions in CCC (1964).

3M EVALUATION OF RULE IN AACR (1967)

3M1 *Definition of "Author" in AACR (1967)*

AACR (1967) defines the term 'Author' 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."

RDC started the wrong tradition of deeming the Editor or Collector of a composite book as its author. And thus, it failed to determine the essential criterion to distinguish the author of a work from its collaborator — such as, editor, revisor, and translator. CCC (1934) was the first code to challenge this wrong tradition. It could do this, because it succeeded in determining the essential criterion to distinguish the author of a work from its collaborator. In the case of a Personal Author, this criterion consists of his work of creation *cum* his responsibility for the created work — that is, for the ideas and the expression constituting it. In the case of a Corporate Author, this criterion consists only of its responsibility for the created work. For, the work of creation can be conceded at the individual level only. AACR (1908) followed RDC (1904) blindly. But AACR (1949) presented some developmental feature in its dealing with the concept of authorship. Its formal definition of the term 'Author' was not much improved upon. But in its commentary to Rule 1, it incorporated the findings of CCC (1934) in regard to the definition of the

term 'Author'. AACR (1967) has now thrown off completely the wrong tradition continued by its earlier editions. It has incorporated in its formal definition of the term 'Author', most of the findings of CCC (1934) and of its later editions. As a result, this formal definition has now become, in the idea plane, a close approximation of the definition of the term 'Author' in CCC (1958) and CCC (1964).

Evidently, some verbal manipulation of the ideas contained in the definitions in CCC has been done in the definition in AACR (1967). For example, according to CCC (1958) or CCC (1964), a person creating a work — that is, the ideas and the expression constituting it — and owning the responsibility for it in his private capacity is a Personal Author. On the other hand, according to AACR (1967), a person "chiefly responsible for the creation of the intellectual or artistic content of a work" is a Personal Author. It may be noted that except for the term 'chiefly' the intention of the whole expression appears to convey the same idea as contained in the definition in CCC (1958) or CCC (1964). The intention behind the use of the term 'chiefly' appears to add some new element to the definition. In the context of distinguishing a Personal Author, let us take note of the significance of the idea denoted by the term 'chiefly'. In determining the authorship of a work by a single author, this concept is inoperative. In the case of a work by joint authors, the author who is "chiefly responsible" is indeterminable. In the case of a composite document, each work constituting it is either of single authorship or joint authorship. Therefore, the term 'chiefly' has little significance in this context. It is more confusing than clarifying.

Again, according to CCC (1958) or CCC (1964), a corporate body owning only the responsibility for a created work — that is, for the ideas and expression constituting it — is a Corporate Author. But, according to AACR (1967), a corporate body "chiefly responsible for the creation of intellectual or artistic content of a work" is a Corporate Author. In this context, the remarks relating to the term 'chiefly' are analogous to those made in relation to the definition of the term 'Personal Author'. Some additional remarks are warranted in relation to the phrase "responsible for creation". There is no difficulty in understanding the concept of a person creating a work. But it is not so in the case of a corporate body. The work of creating a work is always left to the care of one or more individuals. The responsibility of a created work may be transferred from one or more individuals to a corporate body. Therefore, the criterion expressed in the phrase 'responsible for creation' does not apply to a Corporate Author.

The use of the same criterion to define "Personal Author",

and "Corporate Author" by AACR (1967) has, therefore, reduced the effectiveness of the improvement achieved by it by incorporating the findings of CCC (1958) or CCC (1964) in this regard.

3M2 *Dealing with Conflict of Authorship*

The improvement of the definition of the term 'Author' has led to the realisation of the need of dealing separately with the problem of "Conflict of Authorship" — as CCC (1945) and its later editions have done. As a result of this, AACR (1967) has grouped its rules dealing with the resolution of the different kinds of conflict of authorship under the heading "Works with Authorship of Mixed Character". It may be noted as an aside, that the definition of the term 'Author', as given by AACR (1967), does not admit of the concept of "Authorship of Mixed Character".

However, each rule under this caption has taken the form of a rule for choice of heading. In fact, each rule deals with the question "Who is the author in a particular context?" This question is to be answered at the level of definitions of cataloguing terms and not at the level of the rules for Choice of Heading. CCC (1945) and its later editions have realised it and they have dealt with this problem accordingly. Evidently, AACR (1967) has failed to realise it.

3M3 *Avoidance of Unnecessary Numerousness of Rules*

AACR (1967) appears to have made conscious attempt to avoid the unnecessary numerousness of rules, a dominant feature of AACR (1949). This is evident from the fact that AACR (1967) has omitted Rule 1 in AACR (1949).

3M4 *Respect for the Principle of Unity of Idea*

AACR (1967) uses the term 'Anonymous' in the sense "of unknown authorship". This also is a deviation from its earlier editions. Evidently, the classification of cataloguing problems has also been different from its earlier editions. Its Rules 1A and 1B deal with books by a single author whose real name is ascertainable. From the point of view of its classification of cataloguing problems each of these rules is in conformity with the Principle of Unity of Idea. Conformity to this principle has been a rare phenomenon with its earlier editions.

Let us consider Rule 1A and 1B in AACR (1967). Both of them prescribe that the Heading of the Main Entry is to consist of the name of the author whether mentioned in the document or not. This prescription implies the following steps to work out the Heading:

1 Examine whether the name of the author is mentioned in the document.

2 If mentioned, check up with the sources outside the document whether the authorship is erroneously or fictitiously attributed.

3 If so, find out the name of the actual author and choose it as the Heading.

4 If not, choose the name of the author mentioned in the document, as the Heading.

5 If the name of the author is not mentioned in the document, try to find out the name of the author from outside sources.

6 If found, choose it as the Heading.

7 If not, deem it as a work of unknown authorship.

There is an underlying principle governing the formulation of Rule 1A and Rule 1B . AACR (1967) itself states it to be as follows: "Entry should be under author or principal author when one can be determined." In the light of the above steps, the intention of this principle can be spelt out as follows:

The information about the document to be catalogued, found in the sources mentioned below, should determine the choice of the Heading of its Main Entry, in the following sequence of preference:

1 Sources outside the document; and

2 Sources inside the document.

On the contrary, according to the Canon of Ascertainability, "The information found in the title-page of the document catalogued and its over-flow pages should determine the choice of the Heading of the Main Entry". Therefore, Rule 1A and Rule 1B directly violates the Canon of Ascertainability. The usefulness of this Canon can be upheld in this context as follows:

During his direct first acquaintance with a book, the reader tries to memorise the information necessary to refer to it at a later stage. For this purpose, he depends upon the information furnished in the title-page and its overflow pages. The reader may come to know about the book indirectly also — such as, by hearing about it or by reading about it. In such a case, his acquaintance is with a reference to the book. The items of information constituting the reference is again picked up from the same source. This is true in the majority of cases. That is why, in the case of a "known" book, the majority of readers refer to it using information furnished on the title-page and its overflow pages. A main purpose of a service library catalogue is to help a reader to find his book — to help the fulfilment of Law 2 of Library Science: Every Reader His Book. Obviously, Law 2 will be fully satisfied if the Canon of Ascertainability is respected.

Secondly, in the case of a book of the past, the outside sources may furnish the lacking information, depending upon several factors — such as, the status of the author and the popularity of the book. But in the case of a book currently published — either without mentioning the name of its author, or attributing the authorship erroneously or fictitiously — no contemporary outside sources can help. The lacking information may be available only at a later stage. In such a case, the Heading of the Main Entry once established is subjected to change. This is a violation of the Canon of Permanence.

Thirdly, a decision depending upon the information furnished by outside sources may vary from person to person and in the case of the same person, from time to time. This may happen due to several reasons — such as, difference of knowledge among the cataloguers about the appropriate source of information and uncertainty of their respective access to this appropriate source. The inevitable result is inconsistency in practice.

4 Scope for Further Development of the Rules in CCC

The developmental features of the Rules in CCC (1958) and CCC (1964) are quite significant. However, there is scope of further development, for instance, at the level of Definitions of Terms, and at the level of Rules for Choice. The latter, falling within the scope of this paper, is discussed in the succeeding sections.

41 THE PHRASE "THE HEADING IS TO CONSIST OF"

Rule MD1 in CCC (1964) is concerned with the Choice of the Heading of the Main Entry for a Simple Book. It starts as follows: "The Heading is to consist of. . . ." What a Heading consists of, can be determined only after "Rendering" and "Recording" of the Heading are completed. This Rule has nothing to do with Rendering and Recording. What it actually intends to prescribe is "The Choice for the Heading is to consist of. . . ." This intention of the Rule is not precisely expressed. Therefore, there is a scope for further improvement in this respect.

Further, in the context of the Choice of the Heading of the Main Entry, a statement, such as "The Heading is to consist of the names of the Joint Personal Authors", may give rise to some confusion in certain situations. For example, in the case of three or more joint personal authors, the Heading ultimately — that is, after Rendering and Recording — consists of the name of one of the joint personal authors only.

HC PHRASE "WHICH THE DOCUMENT ADMITS"

Rule MD1 in CCC (1964) continues the phrase "which

the document admits," first introduced by CCC (1945). Actually, what the Rule intends to prescribe is "which the title-page of the document to be catalogued and its overflow pages admit". This intention of the Rule is not precisely expressed. Therefore, there is a scope for further improvement in this respect.

43 THE CATEGORY 6

Rule MD1 in CCC (1964) mentions the following as Category 6 in the sequence of priority:

"6 A pseudonym or two or more Pseudonyms;"

What it intends to prescribe is "The pseudonym(s) of the author(s)". This category implies that the other categories — that is, Category 1 to 5 — pertaining to the different kinds of the author are concerned with their respective real names. This interpretation may give rise to a confusion in certain situations. For example, in the case of a book by a pseudonymous author, the title-page may mention the real name of the author subordinated to his pseudonym. In such a situation, according to Rule MD1, the Choice of Heading is to consist of the real name of the author. On the contrary, according to Rule MD421, the Choice of Heading is to consist of the pseudonym of the author. The root of this contradiction appears to be the decision of including this category in Rule MD1 where it does not fit in. The problem of pseudonym calls for a separate set of rules for the Choice of Heading. CCC (1964) has realised it and has already provided for it. In this circumstances Category 6 may be excluded from Rule MD1 which intended to serve as the General Rule for the Choice of Heading.

5 Suggested Modification

In the light of the findings given in Sec 4 and its subdivisions, the following modified version is suggested in respect of the prescription for the Choice Heading of (Rule MD1), for incorporation in CCC (Ed 6):

The *Choice for the Heading* is to consist of the earliest of the following which the *title-page of the document to be catalogued and its overflow pages* admit, and Part G prescribes as the Author:

- 1 The name of a Personal Author;
- 2 The names of Joint Personal Authors;
- 3 The name of a Corporate Author;
- 4 The names of a Joint Personal Author and of a Joint Corporate Author;
- 5 The names of Joint Corporate Authors;
- 6 The name of a Collaborator;
- 7 The names of Joint Collaborators; and
- 8 The Title of the Document.