THE ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES, WITH EMPHASIS ON RULE 3 (WORKS ON SHARED AUTHORSHIP)

The rules relating to the choice of headings for works of multiple authorship in the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 1967 are discussed. The concept of shared authorship and the emphasis on title entry of this revised code are brought out. The rules 3, 4 and 5 are also considered in the light of the four General Principles underlying the rules for choice of heading. A schematic diagram showing the different ways of sharing the authorial responsibility and their corresponding rules for entry is presented.

INTRODUCTION

With the events leading to the release of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 1967, the 'golden age of cataloguing' has, perhaps, dawned again. Difficulties and discussions in cataloguing are once again furnishing the same 'innocent pleasure and interest' to many of us as they did to Cutter's contemporaries. Initial comments on the new code, which have appeared in print so far, are, as can be anticipated, of very general nature. However, it has been pointed out in a number of comments [6,11] that Rule 3 (works of shared authorship) is one of the most significant developments in the new code. We propose to discuss in this paper the development and the implications of this new rule in some detail.

IN SEARCH OF PRINCIPLES

Rule 3, we believe, provides us with a very convenient angle to get a close view of some of the principles that underly the rules in the new code. If the previous edition, i.e. the 'A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries, 2nd edn, Chicago, 1949, was an alarming maze of rules, exceptions to rules and repetition of rules, it was also this code which triggered off, in a way, the forces leading to a penetrating analysis, rationalization and complete revision of cataloguing rules accumulated since the days of Cutter. In 1953, Seymour Lubetzky asked, and undoubtedly he voiced the feelings of many, "are all these rules necessary? Are all the complexities inevitable? Is there an underlying design which gives our code unity and purpose?"[9]. Lubetzky showed clearly that the 'continuous proliferation and growing complexity' of the rules were due mainly to the fact that the ALA rules were not based on clearly-defined principles, hence they had become a loose collection of rules developed to fit specific cases rather than the conditions which the cases illustrated. This, we believe, is the cardinal point which has guided equally the practising cataloguers in their demands and code makers in their revision work. Surely, Bernice Field had this in mind when she claimed that, "the new rules for entry and heading aim to make cataloging more logical than it is presently by focusing on types of authorship rather than types of works..."[6].

RULE 3 OF THE CODE

With this introduction let us now turn to Rule 3 proper in the new code. The preliminary note attached to this rule shows clearly the scope of it. It would be expedient to quote it verbatim: "The rules below apply to i) works produced by the joint collaboration of two or more authors, ii) 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 a corporate body, and iii) works consisting of an exchange between different persons (e.g. correspondence, debates). They apply equally to cases of shared responsibility among compilers, editors, translators, adapters, etc., when the applicable rule requires main entry under such a person".
More Comprehensive than the Previous Rule

The above note makes it clear that the Rules 3A and 3B are to be applied to at least three distinct types of publications: 1) works by joint authors, 2) composite works, and 3) works consisting of an exchange between different persons (e.g., correspondences, debates, conversations, etc.). Lubetzky has pointed out that there were as many as sixteen rules — 3A-3E, 4(1)-4B(3), and 5A(1)-5B — to provide for the entry of works by more than one author. The important point to be considered here is how this convenient reduction in the number and complexity of rules could be achieved. The answer is basically what is contained in Miss Bernice Field’s statement quoted earlier. For too long our code makers had focused their attention on types of works, hence separate rules were necessary to deal with each type of works mentioned above. Now, our code makers have found out a very fundamental and significant similarity underlying at a deeper level between these types of works. This is perceptible only when we focus our attention on the question of authorship. The commonness between these works is that in each case authorship is shared by two or more persons. We believe, the expression 'works of shared authorship' is very profound and most appropriate.

Commenting on the Rule 2 (Work of Avowed authorship) in the 'Code of Cataloging Rules' (CCR), Paul Dunkin also held a similar view. He said, "This sweeping reduction in the number and complexity of ALA rules in this and other areas results from the fact that CCR considers works only with regard to authorship while ALA considers works with regard to their type or form and requires a rule or set of rules for each type or form. Yet the rules for one type may easily involve the same principle as that applicable to another type"[10].

First Author vs Principal Author

Now let us come back to a consideration of Rule 3. It will be evident from what have been said about the scope of the rule that works by joint authors and composite works are to be treated alike. This may sound too drastic. In fact all codes had very carefully preserved the distinction between works of joint authorship and composite works. The ALA Rules was no exception to that. It had maintained the distinction by Rule 3 and Rule 4. Bibliographically the distinction may be of some significance but if we ask why should there be any distinction made in their cataloguing practices, then, the answer may not be very convincing. If we accept Jolley's criterion of authorship, i.e., to the cataloguer authorship does not connote the intellectual responsibility alone but also the name most permanently and consistently associated with a particular work, then one has to accept also, as Jolley would put it, that "twenty-one equal authors [i.e., when no one is represented as principal author] will not provide a name to attach to a work whether their contributions are merged into one whole or are separate and labelled"[8]. It may be reminded here that the ALA Rules had preserved the distinction in a most arbitrary way. The general rule for works by joint authors recommended entry 'under the first author mentioned on the title page' (Rule 3) and the rule for composite works recommended entry 'under the author chiefly responsible for the work, first mentioned on the title page, or under title...' (Rule 4). It may be mentioned here that the British Museum Rules recommended the entry of a composite work under the 'name of the first author' only (Rule 15(ii))[3]. This shifting emphasis and hesitancy would make one suspect that neither of these two rules is based on any sound principle. However, three important points need to be taken note of in this connection. Firstly, in the treatment of works by joint authors the emphasis was on the first-mentioned author exclusively whereas in the treatment of composite works the main emphasis was on the chief author. One can easily think of cases where even for works by joint authors the responsibility may not be equally shared or there may be an author or authors chiefly responsible. Secondly, this concept of principal authorship was germane in the ALA Rules but it was applied only in the treatment of composite works. It would be shown in the latter paragraphs of this paper that in the new code this concept has been applied very consistently for the treatment of all works where the authorship responsibility is shared. We believe this is an important development in the new code. Thirdly, in the ALA Rules (Rule 4) there was no indication as to how the chief responsibility or the principal author is to be determined. Here also the new code has introduced some refinements.
No Specific Rule for Festschriften

Before we go on to consider the above points, which involves a consideration of the underlying principles, let us examine the implications and effects of the comprehensive new Rule 3 from another angle. The old specific rule 5A(1c) for a very important type of publications, i.e., Festschriften has been eliminated. We find a very interesting picture in the treatment of Festschriften in the various codes. Although there is diversity of practice so far as the choice of heading is concerned but all codes have one common aspect in that all of them give equal emphasis on the importance of this type of work by providing specific rules for the choice of heading and added entries. Hence, non-provision of any specific rule in the new code surely demands closer examination and we need to know how exactly such works are to be treated.

Who is the 'Author' of a Festschrift

If we keep in mind Jolley's very pragmatic criteria of authorship, i.e., the term implies the concept of both intellectual responsibility and of the name most permanently and consistently associated with a work, then it can be easily seen that in deciding the authorship of a Festschrift we have difficulty. Undoubtedly, the name of the person honoured will be most permanently and consistently associated with such a work but no stretch of imagination can confer the right of authorship on this name from the point of view of intellectual responsibility. It is quite natural that Cutter, in his anxiety to supply a 'natural heading' for every entry would prefer the name of the person honoured, in the heading. That is exactly the recommendation of his rule 108. The British Museum rule (15 iii, exception) also suggests similar treatment. But this rule introduces a highly arbitrary distinction as it (exception) is not to be applied to memorial volumes and centenary publications, it is meant for Festschriften presented to living persons only. Surely, life and death are important facts but from cataloguing point of view completely irrelevant. The Joint Code of 1908 (rule 126:2) had recommended entry under the society or institutions (when published by a society or an institution) or under title, with added entries under the editor and the person in whose honour the collection is published. According to the ALA Rules (Rule 5A(1c)) the entry was to be under the society or institution (when published by a society or an institution) or under editor if the editor's name appears prominently in the publication, otherwise under title. Subject entry under the person in whose honour the collection is published is to be given. Thus it would be evident that even the previous edition of the code was able to get over the temptation of Cutter's 'natural heading', and also it recognised the importance of editorial responsibility of such publications. In the new edition of the Code, as has been said, there is no specific rule for Festschriften. They are to be treated like any other works of shared authorship (Rule 3) or any other 'works produced under editorial direction' (Rule 4). We shall presently discuss and demonstrate how such works are to be treated by applying the basic rules of 3 and 4.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

In the foregoing paragraphs we have considered the significance of Rule 3 from the point of view of its area of application and have seen that it is a very comprehensive rule, taking care of at least three major types of works and uniting them all through the common characteristics of shared authorship. In the subsequent paragraphs we propose to discuss its significance from another angle. It is known that the rules in the new code are based on some accepted principles. In the entire code, we feel, Rule 3 in association with Rules 4 and 5 carve out an area where we can see the most conscious application of these principles, or the logic behind the rules. This is an important development in the new code and which, all cataloguers will welcome. Incidentally, in the subsequent paragraphs, we will also attempt to gather the loose ends of our thoughts, kept-hanging in earlier paragraphs, and weave them on along the general pattern of discussion.

Chapter I (Entry) introduces the general principles as:

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.

The First Principle and Rule 3

Taking the first principle into consideration, surely the concept of 'principal author' is a significant development. As has been pointed out earlier this concept was germane and applied only to composite works in the previous edition of the code. Now this is to be applied to all cases of multiple authorship. A very pertinent question here would be how this is to be determined. While discussing this point at the Paris Conference Dr. Ranganathan had commented that "the onerous task of judging who was the principal author should not be left to the cataloguer, instead it should be made clear that he was to be guided by the information found in the book", and he suggested the addition of the phrase, 'as indicated on the title-page or in any other part of the book' [7]. This was not, however, accepted by the Conference. In the circumstances, we are particularly happy to note that the new code, has accepted this useful suggestion, as would be clear from the wording of its Rule 3A. It reads, "Enter a work of shared authorship under the person or corporate body, if any, to whom principal responsibility is attributed, e.g. by wording or typography." Lubetzky had maintained that "... the most important characteristic of the book, for the purpose of cataloging, is the fact that it is provided with a prominent identification tag in the form of a title page. The cataloguer can thus anticipate how a particular book will normally be cited and looked for and provide for it accordingly" [9]. But this simple direction was made obscure at times by pretentious cries like, 'it is the book and not the title-page which is to be described'. Hence, with this clear direction to rely solely on the title-page to decide an important issue like the principal author, we can definitely say that we have come back to the 'relates of the title-page'. In fact this has been made very explicit in Chapter 1 (page 9) of the Code, where it is mentioned, 'the entry for a work is normally based on the statements that appear on the title page, or any part of the work that is used as its substitute' (denoted by the term 'title-page'). This stand has been maintained very consistently by Dr. Ranganathan and the principle itself was given by him earlier by what he calls the Canon of Ascertainability.

From what have been said above it follows that in the choice of heading for a work of multiple authorship the first deciding factor would be the indication or not of a principal author (by wording or typography).

The Second Principle and Rule 4

When the first principle alone cannot decide the issue, we have to apply the second principle. Here also we find a very significant difference in the approach of the new code. For, in the previous edition, in all the rules for the types of works we are considering, viz. works of joint authorship, composite works and works consisting of an exchange between different persons, editorial responsibility in general was not considered to be important enough to enter such works under the names of editors. Only in one instance, in Rule 5A(1C), a festschrift was prescribed to be entered under editor if it was not published by a society or an institution. Now, in all types of works of multiple authorship (when no one is represented as principal author and there are more than three authors) if the editor appears to be primarily responsible for the existence of the work, the entry can be under the name of the editor, provided two more conditions are satisfied i.e., he is named on the title page of the work and the publisher is not named in the title. The present rule 4A reads, "enter a work produced under editorial direction under its editor provided: 1) he is named on the title page of the work, 2) the publisher is not named in the title, and 3) the editor appears to be primarily responsible for the existence of the work."

So, here again is an instance where the new code has focussed attention on types of authorship, in this case editorial responsibility, rather than types of works, like works of joint authorship, composite works or works consisting of an exchange between different persons.

About the practical application of this rule we have to make two comments. Firstly, the preliminary note to this rule makes it clear that this rule applies only to such of these works (multiple authorship) as are not
serials and do not involve questions of corporate authorship, other than the responsibility of the publisher. This means that if a corporate body is entirely responsible for the editorial direction and is also named, the entry cannot be under the name of the body, if we have in mind this rule alone. To make this point clear let us consider the following example. The title-page of the publication is reproduced below:

The Communication Research Centre
University College London

Aspects of TRANSLATION
STUDIES IN COMMUNICATION 2

A. D. Booth
Leonard Forster
D. J. Furley
R. Glemet
Joseph Needham
C. Rabin
L. W. Tancock
with a Preface by
A. H. Smith

London 1958 | SECKER AND WARBURG

The work is a composite book having seven contributions from as many authors and their names are arranged alphabetically. The actual order of the contributions is different. It would be evident that there is no indication of any principal author either by typography or by wording. Application of rule 3 will indicate entry under the title. But there is something more in the title-page to be taken note of. The name of a corporate body, the Communication Research Centre, appears very prominently. On examination we find that the preface has been signed by A. H. Smith in his capacity as the secretary of this Centre. The preface also makes it clear that the Centre was responsible for planning the 'symposium' and for the existence of the work. Hence, it is possible to consider the Centre to be chiefly responsible for the work. Applying rule 4A(1) of the previous edition of the code the entry can be under the name of the corporate body. It may be added that the B.N.B. had entered the work under this heading (rendered as: London. University. University College. Communication Research Centre). But Rule 4 of the new code cannot be applied in this case, even if the primary responsibility for the existence of the work has been established, as this rule is not to be applied to cases involving questions of corporate authorship. It can be mentioned straightaway, as otherwise we shall be going outside the scope of this paper, that Rule 17 is to be applied in such cases. Well, all this was to show the implications and the exact scope of Rule 4.

The second comment we want to make is that this rule does not provide any hint as to when an editor is to be considered primarily responsible as has been given in the case of principal author. We just want to say that some guidance in this direction could have been easily given, and this will be apparent in the next section when we consider the third principle along with the next rule.

The Third Principle and Rule 5

The third principle which is about collections, is fairly simple and the Rule 5 completely takes care of this. The Rule 5A is only for such collections as have collective titles. The rule reads as follows: "If a collection of independent works by different authors, not written specifically for the same occasion or for the publication in hand, or of extracts from such works, has a collective title, enter it under the person who compiled it when he is named on the title page as compiler or editor...". In the wordings of this rule, the qualifying clause 'not written specifically for the same occasion or for the publication in...".
hand' is very significant in one respect. The main distinction between Rule 4 and Rule 5 and the types of work they are to cover respectively is that Rule 4 treats of works of multiple authorship where individual contributions are written specifically for the same occasion or for the publication in hand, naturally the editor playing a more important role, whereas under Rule 5 are treated works the contributions of which are not written in a similar way. So, by this comparison, we feel, it would have been better if Rule 4 had brought out this distinguishing feature, by appropriate wording, as that would have given some guidance also as to how and when an editor is to be considered primarily responsible for the existence of a work. The Rule 5B takes care of collections without a collective title.

The Fourth Principle and Rules 3, 4 and 5

If the most prominent identification tag of a book is its title-page then surely two most reliable and important items in it are the name of the author and the title of the book. But which one to prefer for entry — the name of the author or the title? All modern codes have given the preference to the name of the author for a number of reasons. Whatever may be the relative merits and demerits of these two items from the point of view of ascertainability, permanency, etc. there is one great social implication at the root of this preference. This has been most succinctly brought out by Jolley in these few words — "We enter a book primarily under its author because in our present stage of civilization individual intellectual responsibility for a book is considered to possess a special importance. We think of books first as the works of individual authors"[8]. It follows naturally that when the name of the author is not mentioned or unknown, the title would be the only remaining clue to identify a book. Since the days of Panizzi, all cataloguing rules had accepted this stand and Cutter saw in it the 'two great principles' of cataloguing. As we consider the present Fourth Principle in relation to the other three principles, we hear an echo of Cutter's 'two great principles'. But what is more important is that mingled with this echo we hear something more, some voice not heard before. We intend to focus here this new development.

Author vs. Title Re-examined

Out of the two most dependable and valid clues for the identification of a book, viz. the author and the title, the 'two great principles' had given the preference to the former but never denied the importance of the latter. But, an analysis of our rules for the choice of heading can easily reveal that, in fact, we have been giving disproportionate importance and emphasis to the former. Only in a few instances our rules recommend entry under title, and that too as a last resort. This is evident if we just consider for a moment headings consisting of a name followed by such subdivisions as, 'Spurious and doubtful work', or 'Supposed author'. This tendency is much more evident in corporate headings like 'Geneva. Citizens', 'Baltimore. Merchants' or 'London. Women'. Our rules had recommended the entry of works even under such made-up and uncertain headings in preference to titles. This discussion prompts us to say that all books may be grouped, from this point of view, under three broad categories, viz.
1) works whose authorship is known and certain
2) works whose authorship is uncertain or that is by a group that lacks a specific name; and
3) works whose authorship is unknown. The made-up headings that we have quoted above show that our rules have been harbouring a distinct preference for entry under author, not only for the first category but also for the second category. This is clearly reflected in the relevant rules of the ALA code. Thus the general rule 32 recommended, "Enter works published anonymously under author when known. Rule 140 recommended, "Enter reports of meetings or committees of citizens not belonging to any named body or class and having no definite name, under the name of the place with subheading CITIZENS". Again rule 141 advised, "Enter anonymous publications of any class of citizens (not organized) under the name of the place with the name of the class as subheading..." The new code, by a single rule (2A), has completely reversed the position. It reads, "Enter under title a work that is of unknown or uncertain authorship, or that is by a group that lacks a name*. Hence we find here a distinct preference for entry under title, for the works belonging to the second category mentioned above. We believe, this is a true rehabilitation of the 'two great principles'.
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Authorship Diffuse

In the wording of the Fourth Principle we also find that title entry is to be preferred even for those works whose authorship is 'diffuse'. Within the purview of the rules and the type of works we are considering in this paper, the best example of the application of this part of the Principle is supplied by rule 3B2. It reads, "if no one is represented as principal author and there are more than three authors, enter the work under its title..." So, here are cases where authorship is known and certain, yet title entry is preferred because authorship responsibility is diffused. It means title entry has claimed a part of the first category also.

Law of Impartiality Satisfied!

In principle each one of the several authors of a work of multiple authorship (specially in the case of joint authorship) has equal claim to be considered for heading. This is the message of the Law of Impartiality. At the same time, for very practical reasons of economy in time, labour and cost, we want to draw a clear line of demarcation between 'few authors' and 'many authors'. This has necessarily to be arbitrary to some extent. In view of the common team work habit amongst scientists and the resultant works usually being of multiple authorship, it would be expedient to include as many authors as possible under the category 'few authors'. The ALA Code had drawn this line of demarcation between three and four authors. But the treatment of works on either side of the demarcation line was almost same, as both the categories were to be entered under the first mentioned author. For a work with more than three authors, the author statement could omit the names of all authors, except the first, and consequently avoid giving added entries. Of course this practice was whetted by Rule 3:6C of the Rules for Descriptive Cataloging (Library of Congress). Now, the revised code recommends completely different entries for these two categories. For the first category, the entry is under the first named author, and for the second category, when there are 'many' authors (defined as more than three), the entry is to be under title. This means that when there are many authors, even the first author loses his claim to the heading of the main entry. This is a point which will be hotly debated. But, we can see the rationale behind this rule in Jolley's observations. He said, "...universal convention recognizes two names in permanent association as having the same function as a single name. This is not a cataloguer's invention but extends to legal firms, fashion shops, publishers, etc. "To how many names does this principle extend? To three at least but beyond that it is more doubtful. It is certain that if twenty-one names appear on the title page with equal prominence their names cannot cohere to form a joint name" [8]. So, in such cases where it is difficult to find a name which will be closely and permanently associated with a book, it is surely advisable to depend on the other equally reliable identification mark of a book, which is the title. It may also be pointed out that to ignore the claims of all authors, when there are many authors, to the heading of the main entry is only another way to satisfy the Law of Impartiality.

Schematic Diagram

In this last section we are giving the summary of rules for the treatment of works by multiple authors in a schematic diagram (see page 151). It would be evident that now the deciding factor in determining the choice of main entry heading would be the nature of sharing of the authorship responsibility. We are to focus our attention on this point, instead of trying to find out, for the publication in hand, whether it is a work of joint authorship or a composite work, a festschrift honouring a living person or a memorial volume, an exchange of letters between different persons or collection of letters, etc. Let us take the case of festschriften again, because, as we have pointed out before, the revised code has not provided any specific rule for this type of works. If we now look at a festschrift from this new point of view of authorship responsibility surely a festschrift too will fall under one of the categories represented in the schematic diagram - it may have three or more than three authors or contributors, one of them may be indicated as the principal author, it may be produced under editorial direction and the contributions written for the particular occasion, or it may be a collection of already published works only collected for the occasion by a compiler and so on, and the choice of heading will be determined accordingly. The fact that a particular publication is in the form of a festschrift need no longer by itself determine
the choice of heading. Surely, this is simplification and rationalization of cataloguing rules at its best.

Let us conclude with these words of Paul Dunkin: "... The new code is not a conglomeration of little rules to deal with special little questions. Rather it is a statement of broad rules resting on basic principles. This does not mean that the new code will not answer special little question. 'Love God; love your neighbour' does not tell you every time and every circumstance — or even what kind of God or what kind of a neighbour. But anyone with any imagination at all will find that the rule answers more questions than a code maker could think of in a lifetime" [10].
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MULTIPLE AUTHORSHIP
Rules 3, 4, 5

- If there is a Principal Author
  - Entry under principal author (person or corporate body) (Rule 3A)
  - [Added entries under other authors if not more than two; under first mentioned author if other than the principal author]
  - If the order of names is different in different volumes or editions, entry under the first author in the first volume or first edition (Rule 3Bia & 3Bib)

- If there are not more than 3 authors, entry under the first mentioned author (Rule 3Bl)
- [Added entries under other authors]

- If there are more than 3 authors, entry under the first mentioned author (Rule 3B2)
- [Added entry under the first mentioned author]

- If produced under editorial direction
  - If the editor is named, the publisher is named in the title, and the editor is primarily responsible, entry under the editor (person only) (Rule 4A)
  - [Added entry under the editor if named, under first mentioned author]
  - If the editor is not named, the publisher is also named in the title, or editor is not primarily responsible, entry under title (Rule 4A)
  - [Added entry under editor if named, under first mentioned author]

Collections

- With Collective title
  - Entry under compiler if named (Rule 5A)
  - [Added entries under author, if named, for works included if there are not more than three]

- Without Collective title
  - Entry under title if the compiler is not named (Rule 5A)
  - [Author-title added entries for works included if there are not more than three]

Entry under heading appropriate to the work listed first on the title page or the first work in the collection (Rule 5h)
[Added entries under compiler or editor, if named, and under the works or authors included, if appropriate]