

## UB LIS 571 Soergel Lecture 7.2a, Reading 1

### The Author Approach: Conditions and Cases

Lubetzky after Needham, *Organizing knowledge in libraries*. No place: Seminar Press; 1971, reformatted and edited by D. Soergel; “I” refers to Needham.

Note: Lubetzky is the foremost thinker on descriptive cataloging of documents in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. He worked at the Library of Congress and had a big influence on the development of AACR2.

The conditions he considers are

1. Documents having more than one author
2. Authors having more than one name
3. Dependent documents [should be last in a logical arrangement, DS]
4. Corporate authors

**Lubetzky’s conditions to be considered in thinking about document authorship**

Each condition has several cases with possible solutions, one of which must be chosen in making cataloging rules. Under *Possible solution*, Lubetzky’s solution (often, but not always adopted by AACR2) is bolded; if there is no bolded solution, Lubetzky suggests different solutions depending on the circumstances.

The cases are presented in two columns, depending on which of two issues they deal with:

Issue A: What entries to make

Here the issue is whether a author relationship between the document and a person or organization should be established at all

Issue B: What form the entry should take

Here the issue by what name (entity identifier) the person or organization should be given (entered in the catalog record, available for search)

Condition	Issue A: What entries to make	Issue B: What form the entry should take
<p><b>1. Documents having more than one Author</b></p>	<p><b>1.1 Document prepared by an author with the aid of collaborators or contributors.</b></p> <p><i>Possible solutions:</i>            Entry under            (i) author first-named on the title page, or            (ii) title, or  <b>(iii) author chiefly responsible.</b></p> <p><i>Lubetzky's solution:</i>            The document will be cited by the author chiefly responsible; therefore enter under his name, with possible added entries for collaborators or contributors.</p>	
	<p><b>1.2 Document composed by an editor or compiler from the writings of <u>several</u> other people.</b>  <b>Not</b> collected editions or selections of a single author, which are entered under the original author</p> <p><i>Possible solutions:</i>            These will differ according to whether the document is a monograph or a periodical (journal, year-book, annual review of, etc.).  <i>Monograph:</i> <b>(i) editor</b>, or (ii) title.  <i>Periodicals:</i> (i) editor, or <b>(ii) title</b>, or possibly            (iii) the organization, society, etc. responsible.</p> <p><i>Lubetzky's solution:</i>  <i>Monographs:</i> entry under editor or compiler will result in the sought heading; if no editor is named enter under title.  <i>Periodicals:</i> there are bound to be successive editors; therefore entry under title will result in sought heading and will collocate the work (except, perhaps, where several titles are possible).</p>	

Condition	Issue A: What entries to make	Issue B: What form the entry should take
<p><b>1. Documents having more than one Author,</b> continued</p>	<p><b>1.3 Document by several authors with no one author more responsible for it than any of the others.</b></p> <p><i>Possible solutions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) First-mentioned author (or where two only, first and second in one heading), or</li> <li><b>(ii) title</b> (not widely adopted).</li> </ul> <p><i>Lubetzky's solution:</i></p> <p>Lubetzky advocates title entry. Though he argues the case for title entry at some length, few catalogers have been convinced of the efficacy of this solution. Traditionally such documents have been entered under the first-mentioned author and there is little doubt that in many cases this is the sought heading. A factor which seems to influence this is the number of authors - the more authors the greater the prominence of the title. The problem is to discover how many authors have to be named before title takes precedence over author.</p>	
	<p><b>1.4 Document in which the writer reports the communication of another person (real or fictitious).</b></p> <p><i>Possible solution:</i></p> <p>Entry under</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>(i) the original person</b> (if real), or</li> <li>(ii) the writer.</li> </ul> <p><i>Lubetzky's solution:</i></p> <p>If the person is real, enter under his name, with added entry under writer.</p>	

Condition	Issue A: What entries to make	Issue B: What form the entry should take
<p><b>2. Authors having more than one name</b></p> <p>Lubetzky distinguishes between authors who have several names and elect to use one consistently, and those who use different names in successive documents (Conditions 2.3/4)</p>		<p><b>2.1 The author has changed his or her name in consequence of marriage, adoption of new citizenship, joining a religious order, or for any other reason.</b></p> <p>Note that here, in contrast to the conditions listed below, the change of name is not primarily a matter of authorship: the new name has a validity beyond the author's writings.</p> <p><i>Possible solutions:</i></p> <p>Entry under</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) earliest name,</li> <li><b>(ii) latest</b> (but not AACR2),</li> <li>(iii) best known.</li> </ul> <p><i>Lubetzky's solution:</i></p> <p>Enter under latest name if used in the author's books, on the grounds that this will be the sought heading (even if he has used the earlier one at some stage in his career), because he will be known by his later name and all re-issues of his works will bear the later name. Such a solution satisfies the reader wanting a particular document and also leads to collocation of an author's works.</p>
		<p><b>2.2 The author always writes under an assumed name different from his real name, or under his title of nobility, or under part of his name.</b></p> <p><i>Possible solutions:</i></p> <p>Entry under</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) real name,</li> <li><b>(ii) assumed name, etc.</b></li> </ul> <p><i>Lubetzky's solution:</i></p> <p>Use the assumed name, etc. because readers will identify an author by the name he uses in his writings. Here again direct entry results in both a sought heading and collocation of an author's works, thus satisfying both objectives of an author catalogue.</p>

Condition	Issue A: What entries to make	Issue B: What form the entry should take
<p>2. <b>Authors having more than one name,</b> continued</p>		<p><b>2.3/4 Author uses more than one name in successive documents</b> This forces the cataloguer to choose between the two objectives of the author catalogue [(1) finding a specific work and (2) finding all works by the same author].</p> <p><i>Possible solutions:</i> Entry under</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) real name,</li> <li>(ii) earliest name used, real or assumed,</li> <li>(iii) latest name used,</li> <li><b>(iv) name used on the title page of the document</b></li> </ul> <p><i>Lubetzky's solution:</i> Enter under the name found on the title page unless an author uses pseudonyms 'indiscriminately', in which case the real name should always be used - so long as the author has used it in some of his writings.</p> <p>Writers often use different names when they write in a number of different genres or styles (e.g. C. Day Lewis - Nicholas Blake). In such cases particularly readers will inquire after their works by the names used on the title pages - few even know of the relationships between pseudonyms. Thus direct entry according to the title page is certainly the most generally useful mode of entry and the qualification Lubetzky makes about 'indiscriminate' use of pseudonyms should be warily applied. One can see its point however when there is little significance in the different names used, e.g. entry under the name found on the title page would be of little value in the case of a nobleman who sometimes used family name, sometimes title of nobility, more or less by accident, or a married woman variously identified. In such cases a uniform heading is essential for both objectives of the author catalogue.</p> <p>Thus generally speaking Lubetzky - here as elsewhere - prefers the direct catalogue. References would be used to reveal related names.</p>

Condition	Issue A: What entries to make	Issue B: What form the entry should take
<p><b>2. Authors having more than one name,</b> continued</p>		<p><b>2.3/4 Author uses more than one name in successive documents</b></p> <p>Note from DS: When the same person writes in different genres under different names, one could argue that there are several authors “living in the same person”. If a user reads <i>Alice in wonderland</i> and asks for more books by the same author, she wants books with <i>Lewis Carroll</i> as author and not books with <i>Charles Dodgson</i> as author (books on mathematics), even though all these books were written by the same person. In this view, Solution (iv), name used on the title page of the document, does satisfy both objectives of the catalog: (1) Finding a specific book, such as <i>Alice in wonderland</i>, of which the author (<i>Lewis Carroll</i>) is known and (2) Finding all books by a given author, such as <i>Lewis Carroll</i></p>
		<p><b>2.5 Authors whose names appear in translation in varying forms.</b></p> <p><i>Possible solutions:</i> Entry under (i) English form, <b>(ii) vernacular form.</b></p> <p><i>Lubetzky's solution:</i> Vernacular form - thus collocating original works and translations. However, well-known foreign authors whose names are generally read in translation should be entered under the name which appears in the translations, e.g. Rabindranath nTagore.</p>
<p><b>3. Dependent Documents</b> See below</p>	<p>Lengthy discussion, text follows table.</p>	

Condition	Issue A: What entries to make	Issue B: What form the entry should take
<p><b>4. Corporate authors</b></p>	<p><b>4.1 The reports and statements of a corporate body are usually prepared by one of its officers or by another person engaged to prepare the statement for it.</b></p> <p><i>Possible solutions:</i> Entry under     (i) person     (ii) corporate body.</p> <p><i>Lubetzky's solution:</i> Publications issued in the name of a corporate body, that is, communications purporting to be those of the corporate body and bearing the authority of that body: Enter under the name of the corporate body with an added entry for the personal author; in case of committee reports added entry under chairman is essential.. Other publications: enter under the person who prepares the work.</p> <p>Individual cases may still be difficult to decide. The basic question is: in what circumstances can a corporate body be considered as author? Answer requires more study of the nature of the relationships that exist between organizations and the documents bearing their names. (Michael Gorman)</p>	<p><b>4.2 Many corporate bodies have no proper identifying names of their own but only generic names describing their type and common to most bodies of that type e.g. public library, historical society, dramatic club, etc.</b></p> <p><i>Possible solutions:</i> Entry under     (i) name followed by place to distinguish between them,     (ii) place followed by the name of the body.</p> <p><i>Lubetzky's solution:</i> Those which need the name of place (e.g. country, city, county, etc.) for their identification should be entered under such place names, e.g. Taunton. Public Library. All other organizations should be entered under name. This rule refers especially to non-governmental authors.</p> <p>It could be argued that this condition arises from a misunderstanding - and that, in fact, place is an essential part of the <i>name</i>: thus corporate body in the above example is Taunton Public Library (see the British rule in AACR).</p>

Condition	Issue A: What entries to make	Issue B: What form the entry should take
<p>4. Corporate authors, continued</p>		<p><b>4.3 Change of name in corporate bodies.</b></p> <p><i>Possible solutions:</i>  Entry under  (i) earliest name,  (ii) latest  <b>(iii) successive names as they arise.</b></p> <p><i>Lubetzky's solution:</i>  Lubetzky points out that the problem is different in kind from the problem of change of name in personal authors. Here change of name often reflects a change in structure or constitution. Having regard to this and to the fact that works are often sought under the names in which they were issued, Lubetzky prefers to consider change of name as the end of one organization and the beginning of another, and therefore suggests entry under each successive name, except where the change is slight or of such short duration as to be of little significance to the enquirer. A direct form of entry leaving collocation to cross references.</p> <p>A further advantage of this solution is that it presents the cataloguer with little extra work. A disadvantage is that particular editions of a work may be scattered according to whether they were issued under one name or another. Again cross references would relate them.</p>



Condition	Issue A: What entries to make	Issue B: What form the entry should take
<p>4. Corporate authors, continued</p>		<p><b>4.4 An organization may act or speak as a whole or through one of its branches, divisions, offices, etc.</b></p> <p><i>Possible solutions:</i>  Entry under  (i) main body alone,  (ii) main body with subheading for subordinate body,  (iii) subordinate body.</p> <p>For example, the Association of Assistant Librarians (a division of the Library Association) may be entered as:  Library Association.  Library Association. Association of Assistant Librarians.  Association of Assistant Librarians.</p> <p>Each has its advantages and disadvantages, discussed by Lubetzky in his <i>Report</i>.</p> <p><i>Lubetzky's solution:</i>  If the subdivision has a proper and self-sufficient name of its own (as the AAL has), it should be entered under its own name directly. Cross references should be made to show relationships. This solution aims at the sought heading rather than collocation of all branches of an organization, for the latter will occur only when the branches have no proper and self-sufficient names (e.g. Statistics Division). It should be remembered when considering this problem that affiliations change and too much subordination in the catalogue must lead to frequent change of entries, or of cross references if entered successively by the different names - not to mention the problems facing the reader when searching for information.</p> <p>Note from DS: This is more than just a question of the name. It is a question to what entity the author relationship should be made, the parent body or the division.</p>

### 3. Dependent Documents

I have extended Lubetzky's conception of dependent documents to cover the following categories:

- (i) Modified documents: e.g. revisions, epitomes, selections
- (ii) Dependent documents proper: works which are separate but which depend for their interest and existence on other documents. Two groups:
  - (a) those which depend on a single document, e.g. librettos, continuations, scenarios, indexes of single documents, and
  - (b) those which depend on the total output of an author, e.g. thematic catalogues, concordances.

*Lubetzky's solution:*

(i) and (iia) give rise to the same problem: is the new document to be placed under author of the original, or entered as a separate document in its own right (with the necessary references in either case)? Lubetzky considers (iia) only and states that they should be entered under the author and title of the document to which they belong, unless they have an interest and value of their own, in which case they should be entered as independent documents.

This could be extended to include category (i): where the revision, etc., is virtually a new work, entry should be made under reviser. This would meet the requirements of a direct catalogue, and, in the case of entry under the original, will also result in collocation of dependent documents with the originals. However, it should be noted that it is by no means always easy to decide whether a document has an interest and value of its own. Its treatment in reviews and the layout of the title page might help in practice.

For (iib) entry should be under the author of the new document; entry under the author whose output is treated constitutes subject (form) entry, e.g. Shakespeare, William - Concordances.