

# UCLA

## UCLA Previously Published Works

### Title

What is a work?

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6dm403n3>

### Journal

The Principles and Future of AACR: Proceedings of the International Conference on the Principles and Future Development of AACR, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, October 23-25, 1997, 1

### Author

Yee, Martha M

### Publication Date

1997

Peer reviewed



# 3

## What Is a Work?

---

MARTHA M. YEE

### Introduction

There are three stages to the cataloging work required to represent a given entity, such as an author, a work, or a subject, in a catalog.

1. The entity must be defined.
2. The entity must be named.
3. Variant names for the entity must be identified, and syndetic apparatus provided that leads users from variants to the chosen name.

In the first stage of representing an author in the catalog, for example, the cataloger must determine whether the John Smith who writes poetry is the same John Smith who publishes texts on physics (see figure 1).

---

FIRST STAGE:  
Poems / by John Smith  
Physics : a text / by John Smith

---

FIGURE 1

In the second stage, the cataloger must determine how John Smith is commonly known, and, if necessary, add data, such as dates or initials, to his name to distinguish him from other John Smiths (see figure 2).

---

SECOND STAGE:  
 Smith, John, 1614-1733  
 Smith, John (John Aloysius), 1947-

---

FIGURE 2

In the third stage, the cataloger must determine whether John Smith has used other names in his publications, such as Jack Smith, and if he has, provide cross-references by means of an authority record (see figure 3).

---

THIRD STAGE:  
 Smith, John (John Aloysius), 1947-  
 x Smith, Jack, 1947-

---

FIGURE 3

These same three stages are necessary for representing a work in a catalog, although catalogers may be less conscious of this fact, since so much of the effort put into naming works goes into establishing the names of their authors, and the work on titles is only partially done, if at all, in most disciplines (a notable exception being the field of music). This paper will discuss each of these three stages in detail, covering current practice in *AACR2R*, problems with current practice, and suggested solutions. In addition, the paper includes a section on the structure of the catalog and methods of demonstrating relationships, as well as a summary of all of the recommendations made for change to *AACR2R*.

## I. Defining the Work

### A. Users

The following assumptions are based on common sense, on memory of my own experience as a naive library user, and on some experience as a reference librarian. They are the assumptions behind the objects of the catalog, and therefore the assumptions behind our cataloging practice. I would challenge those who disagree with them to do research to try to disprove them; I think, if such research were tried, it would be impossible to disprove the following:

#### *Assumptions*

- Most users seek particular works, not particular editions. Yet works are published in the form of editions; the fundamental duty of descriptive cataloging is to organize the resulting chaotic bibliographic universe to facilitate user access to works, and to allow

them easily to select the edition of the work sought that best meets their needs as to language, illustration, currency, authority, nearness to original sources, availability to the user (not checked out and in the branch in which the user is located at the moment, for example), etc.

- Users assume that we display together all editions of a work held.
- Users usually don't know about editions they don't find.
- Users rarely have a way to protest or complain, and even when they do, they don't know how to analyze the problem beyond saying that they can't find what they are looking for.<sup>1</sup>

From the above, it should be apparent that in defining work, we want to aim at a definition that corresponds to most users' conceptions of work. While there are many types of work for which this is not difficult to do, there are some types of work concerning which users may differ in their conceptions depending on their subject backgrounds. It is apparent, for example, that users with a strong opera background will feel that Joseph Losey's film of Mozart's *Don Giovanni* is an edition or version of the work *Don Giovanni* by Mozart, while users with a strong film background will consider it a new work of mixed authorship to be cited and searched under title. When this kind of disagreement exists, a general set of cataloging rules like *AACR* must reach some sort of compromise, and then ensure that both sets of users can at least find the works they are looking for, even if we can't guarantee that in all cases they will be looking at the main entry for the work sought (where they would find *all* the editions of the work, as well as works about it and works related to it).

## B. Definition implicit in *AACR2*

Giving two items the same main entry implies they represent the same work. One way to define main entry is as the citation or heading form for a work. Many works are still usefully identified using both author and title.

Figure 4 contains examples of current cataloging that illustrate this point. The main entry, identifying the work, is underlined.

In *AACR2R*, we have considered the following changes to be substantial enough to cause the creation of a new (but related) work (signalled by a change in main entry):

- rewriting of a text in another form, e.g., the dramatization of a novel
- filming of a play
- adaptation of an art work from one medium to another (e.g., an engraving of a painting)
- changing of the title of a serial work
- revision of a text accompanied by a change in representation of authorship<sup>2</sup>
- addition of commentary or biographical/critical material when the commentary or biographical/critical material is emphasized in title page representation
- free transcription of the work of a composer
- merely basing a musical work on other music, e.g., variations on a theme
- setting a preexisting text to music

---

EXAMPLE 1, TWO EDITIONS (OR "EXPRESSIONS") OF THE SAME WORK, GIVEN THE SAME MAIN ENTRY

Edition 1:

Wendt, Lloyd.

Lords of the Levee : the story of Bathhouse John and Hinky Dink / by Lloyd Wendt and Herman Kogan. -- 1st ed. -- Indianapolis, Ind. : Bobbs-Merrill, 1943. 384 p. : ill. ; 23 cm.

Edition 2:

Wendt, Lloyd.

[Lords of the Levee]

Bosses in lusty Chicago : the story of Bathhouse John and Hinky Dink / by Lloyd Wendt and Herman Kogan ; with an introduction by Paul H. Douglas. -- Bloomington, Ind. : Indiana University Press, 1967, c1943.

xv, 384 p. : ill. ; 20 cm.

EXAMPLE 2, TWO EDITIONS (OR "EXPRESSIONS") OF THE SAME WORK, GIVEN THE SAME MAIN ENTRY

Edition 1:

Turgenev, Ivan Sergeevich, 1818-1883.

[Ottsy i deti. English]

Fathers and sons / by Ivan Turgenev ; translated by Barbara Makanowitzky ; with an introduction by Alexandra Tolstoy. -- Bantam classic ed. -- Toronto ; New York : Bantam Books, 1981.

x, 208 p. ; 18 cm.

Edition 2:

Turgenev, Ivan Sergeevich, 1818-1883.

[Ottsy i deti. English]

Fathers and sons / Ivan Turgenev ; translated by Rosemary Edmonds ; with The Romanes lecture, Fathers and children / by Isaiah Berlin. -- Harmondsworth, Eng. ; Baltimore : Penguin, 1975.

294 p. ; 19 cm. -- (Penguin classics ; L147)

FIGURE 4

EXAMPLE 3, TWO DIFFERENT WORKS, ONE RELATED TO THE OTHER, GIVEN DIFFERENT MAIN ENTRIES, BUT RELATED BY MEANS OF AN ADDED ENTRY ON ONE FOR THE MAIN ENTRY OF THE OTHER

Work 1:

Mitchell, Margaret, 1900-1949.

Gone with the wind / Margaret Mitchell. -- Anniversary ed., with an introd. / by James A. Michener. -- New York : Macmillan, 1975, c1936. xii, 947 p. ; 24 cm.

Work 2:

Gone with the wind [motion picture] / David O. Selznick ; director, Victor Fleming. -- Special CAV collector's edition. -- United States : MGM/UA Home Video, c1991. 5 videodiscs (222 min.) : sd., col ; 12 in.

TRACINGS:

... I. Fleming, Victor, 1883-1949.  
II. Mitchell, Margaret, 1900-1949. Gone with the wind.

EXAMPLE 4, TWO DIFFERENT WORKS, NOT RELATED TO EACH OTHER, GIVEN DIFFERENT MAIN ENTRIES

Work 1:

Krogh, David.

Smoking : the artificial passion / David Krogh. -- New York, N.Y. : W.H. Freeman, c1991. xvi, 176 p. ; 24 cm.

Work 2:

Gilbert, David G., 1947-

Smoking : individual difference, psychopathology, and emotion / David G. Gilbert ; foreword by H.J. Eysenck. -- Washington, D.C. : Taylor and Francis, c1995.

---

**FIGURE 4**—Continued

In AACR2R, we have considered the following changes not to be substantial enough to cause the creation of a new work (signalled by the retention of the same main entry as the original work); rather such changes create “expressions,” to use the term recommended by the IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records:

- translation into another language
- addition of illustrations to a text

- revision of a text by the same author(s) as the original
- abridgement of a text
- editing of a text to produce a critical edition
- addition of commentary or biographical/critical material when the original work is emphasized in title page representation
- reproduction of an art work
- arrangement, transcription, etc., of the work of a composer
- improvisation by a performer on the work of a composer
- provision of a choreography for an existing musical work, such as a ballet
- addition of an instrumental accompaniment or additional parts to a musical work
- addition of words to music
- performance of a musical work on a sound recording
- republication with a different setting of type
- republication with a different title on the title page
- republication as part of a different series

The following types of criteria are invoked to produce the above results:

1. "The nature of the work itself," to use the language of 21.9A.
  - 21.10A, Paraphrase, rewriting, adaptation for children, version in a different literary form
  - 21.11, Illustrated texts
  - 21.12, Abridgement
  - 21.14, Translation
  - 21.16B, Reproduction of art work
  - 21.18, Arrangement or transcription (of music) vs. distinct alteration, paraphrase, or work merely based on
  - 21.19, Musical work that includes words
  - 21.20, Musical setting for ballet
  - 21.21, Added accompaniment
  - 21.16, Spirit communication
  - 21.23, Sound recordings
  - 21.27, Academic disputations

If the cataloger can determine that the work being cataloged is an "abridgement" or an "illustrated text," these rules will simply mandate a particular type of entry. However, if the cataloger has a work which does not quite fall into any of these categories, there won't be a form-based rule to indicate proper entry. These rules look suspiciously like the 1949 rules, which were criticized for including large numbers of rules for forms of publication, which grew as new forms of publication appeared, and which were riddled with inconsistency.

However, implicit in these rules seem to be more principled approaches based on primary and secondary authorship.

Writing of text as primary authorship:

## 68 What Is a Work?

- illustration of a text is subsidiary to writing the text (21.11)
- translation is subsidiary to writing the original text (21.14)

Creation of art work as primary authorship:

- reproduction of an art work is subsidiary to creating the art work reproduced (21.16B)

Composition of music as primary authorship:

- arranging music is subsidiary to composing it (21.18)
- writing lyrics is subsidiary to composing music (21.19)
- writing librettos is subsidiary to composing music (21.19)<sup>3</sup>
- writing the choreography, libretto, or scenario for a ballet or pantomime is subsidiary to writing its music (21.20)
- writing instrumental accompaniments and additional parts is subsidiary to composing music (21.21)
- performance is subsidiary to composition of music (21.23), except that
  - a) all functions are subsidiary to performance by a group that “goes beyond mere performance, execution, etc.” (21.1B2.e)
  - b) when one performer performs the work of many composers, composing is subsidiary to performance (21.23C)

### 2. Change in the medium of expression (21.9A)

21.16A, Adaptation from one graphic art medium to another

### 3. “Wording of the chief source” (21.9A)

21.12, Revisions of texts

21.13, Texts published with commentary

21.15, Texts published with biographical/critical material

21.17B, Reproductions of two or more art works with text

21.14, Collaboration between artist and writer

### 4. Relative extent of content

21.25, Reports of interviews or exchanges

### 5. Outside research establishing authorship (as a back-up approach)

21.27, Academic disputations

## C. Possibility of using fundamental content to help in making decisions about works, and possibly to reorganize the rules for description

The following are suggestions for analyzing the materials we catalog into pure types of fundamental content. My hypothesis in this exercise is that a work in one of the eight categories listed in section 1 cannot be transformed into a work in another of the eight categories without becoming a new work. This hypothesis needs testing by research.



The potential utility of this approach is as follows: if we can delineate the fundamental types of content, it might help in defining the concept of "work," and it might help us determine when a previously existing work has been modified so much it has become a new work. Incidentally, this approach might also provide a better means of organizing the rules for description, preventing the current problem of cross-classification in chapters 1-13, although that is a bit peripheral to the topic of this particular paper.

1. Pure types of fundamental content:

- a. text (a work fundamentally comprised of printed, typed, or handwritten words, or words read aloud)

Within the category of text, there may be subcategories which are also "pure" in the sense that a work cannot move from one category to another without becoming a new work. Consider the following possibilities, for example:

- poetry
- fiction
- drama

Drama may be a special case. For centuries the only things libraries could collect were the texts of works intended for performance. The performances themselves could not be recorded and thus could not be collected. However, there is a possibility that dramatic works, when seen as works intended for performance, rather than as literary textual works, are essentially works of mixed responsibility that cannot exist as performed works without the participation of many different people performing many different functions. This may also be true of dramatico-musical works intended for performance as well, such as operas and ballets (see below).

- b. music (a work fundamentally comprised of music, either musical notation (typed, printed, or handwritten), or actual sound, i.e., performed music)

There is a strong convention in Western classical music to consider performed music to be the work of its composer, even when the performer has improvised on the music as written, or an arranger has modified the original composition.

- c. still image (a work fundamentally comprised of image(s) that are stationary; includes original art (painting, drawing, art prints, dioramas), slides, posters, prints, photographs, architectural drawings)

Within the category of image, there may be subcategories which are also "pure" in the sense that a work cannot move from one category to another without becoming a new work. Consider the following possibilities, for example:

- painting
- drawing
- engraving
- lithograph

Photography presents a special case. Because slide collections are created and used as surrogates for art originals, which may be located at remote sites that are expensive or impossible to visit, current practice among slide librarians, codified in *AACR2R* rule 21.16B, is to treat a reproduction of an art original as if it were the art original itself, even though it is almost always different in scale and different in

medium (for any art original other than a photograph). This treatment of photography as sometimes being a “mere recording medium” is similar to the treatment of some kinds of moving image, to be discussed below. It seems to be a peculiarity of photographic image content that it can produce such a close likeness of a photographed work that the photograph can be useful to users as a surrogate for the photographed work. When photographic works are treated as surrogates in this fashion, they probably no longer function as pure content types, but rather as a method of reproduction that creates either a “manifestation,” or, perhaps, an “expression,” rather than a “work” (see below).

- d. moving image (a work fundamentally comprised of moving images, which often (but not necessarily) has text and sound integrated to make a single work; includes dance as well as dance notation, since dance consists of movement (moving image) plus sound)

Film is a relatively new medium of expression (only one hundred years old) that is fundamentally a work of photography, in which meaning is expressed by means of the visual composition of frames, cutting, camera angles, and rhythm and timing of the action before the camera. While film draws on all previous art forms (painting, writing, sculpture, architecture, music, dance), it is fundamentally a new art form. As such, adaptation is necessary to turn any previously existing work into a work in this form.

The problem is, of course, that just as all text is not *belles lettres*, not all films are Films, i.e., cinematic works, such as those described above. Film can also be used as a “mere recording medium,” as in the case of scientific record film, anthropological film, and so forth. In truth, film can be put to as many varied uses as text.

How can catalogers tell whether they are dealing with a cinematic work, or film as a “mere recording medium”? One clue lies in the functions credited on the film; if a cinematographer, an editor, a screenwriter, and/or a director are involved, it is highly likely that the work is a cinematic work, as these are the kinds of functions that result in the expression of meaning using visual composition of frames, cutting, camera angles, and rhythm and timing of the action before the camera.

If film is held to function sometimes as a “mere recording medium,” this latter type of film would probably no longer function as a pure content type, but rather as a method of reproduction that creates either a “manifestation,” or, perhaps, an “expression,” rather than a “work” (see below).

Should choreographic works (in notation) be considered equivalent to the screenplay for a film, a kind of precursor to what is fundamentally a moving image work? Or should choreographic works form a separate category here (as a pure type)? Or are choreographic works a mixed type (see below)?

- e. spatial data (includes maps, aerial photographs, remote sensing images, atlases, globes)

How does the concept of work function in the field of spatial data? Can a flat map be made into a globe and still be the same work? Note that any two-dimensional map is trying to represent a three-dimensional reality, so it is probably artificial to forbid a two-dimensional work from having a three-dimensional version that is the same work. When are two items considered to be two different versions or editions of the same work (i.e., when are they given the same main entry, despite intellectual

or artistic differences between them that require making a separate record to express them)?

- f. three-dimensional objects (includes realia, toys, specimens, sculpture, monuments, buildings, gardens)

Can a toy or a sculpture be an edition of a work that is not a toy or a sculpture?

- g. numeric data (other than spatial data)

- h. computer programs

- 2. Mixed types of fundamental content (aggregate works in the sense that the pieces are separable (can be published separately), and can have different authorship):

- a. One type of content predominant (judgment will be required to determine primacy):

*text with illustrations, which can now include musical and audiovisual illustrations*

Traditionally, texts with illustrations have been entered under the author of the text. However, it is possible that in fields such as children's literature, this is somewhat artificial. As more and more visual and audio materials are added to electronic versions of previously existing texts, it is possible that it may become harder and harder to argue for the predominance of text.

*music with words (opera, lieder, etc.)*

As noted above, the field of Western classical music has a long tradition of considering composition primary authorship, and all other functions to be subsidiary. This has led to the practice of considering lieder with words by someone other than the composer to be the work of the composer. It has also led to considering an opera with a libretto by someone other than the composer, in a production unspecified by the composer (e.g., as to costumes, lighting, etc.), adapted into a cinematic work with frame composition, camera angles, cutting, etc., unspecified by the composer, to be the work of the composer. Operas, in fact, when performed, consist of more than just music with words, and perhaps (as suggested above) should be considered to be essentially works of mixed responsibility, along with other dramatico-musical works intended for performance.

*dance (choreography and music)*

The dance field has come to see performances of dance works as works of mixed responsibility to be entered under title, although this is not yet reflected in AACR2. Perhaps this would argue for including dance (both choreographic notation and recordings of dance performances) as moving image works, above.

- b. Fundamentally mixed with no type of content predominant:

*interactive multimedia and other electronic resources that mix text, sound, and image*

When preexisting works are reissued with interactive multimedia commentary, biographical/critical information, and so forth, and are still represented as being the original work, it may be desirable to consider them to be expressions of the preexisting work. Also, when an existing print work acquires an online multimedia version (e.g., *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and *Britannica Online*; *New York Times* and *New York Times on the Web*), it may be desirable to treat them as expressions of the same work. Such tactics would argue against considering "interactive multimedia" to be a pure category.

*kits*

3. A work of any of these types (either pure or mixed) can:
  - a. be distributed in multiple copies or unique
  - b. be issued serially, issued in continuously updatable form, or issued "monographically" (Note: It is relatively rare for a particular work to be issued as both a monograph and a serial, but perhaps has happened, as in the case of Dickens' serialized novels. It is becoming more common for a serial work to be issued both serially (in print) and in continuously updatable form (online). Thus, it would not seem wise to consider a change in seriality to create a new work.)
  - c. be issued as part of a larger whole or not
  - d. be controlled archivally or not by the collection that holds it
  - e. exist on multiple physical carriers:
    - i) reproduced onto a number of different physical carriers as follows; such reproduction creates a "manifestation," to use the term recommended by the IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records:
      - digitization: all (includes various types of digitization, including, for example: both Mac and Windows versions; both ASCII and Microsoft Word versions; scanned by optical character recognition software (thereby turned into text), vs. scanned as an image (bitmapped, jpeg, gif); CD-ROM vs. diskette vs. remotely accessed; etc.)
      - microfilming, photocopying, still and slide photography: text as print on page, musical notation, image, numeric data
      - audio reproduction (audiocassettes, sound discs, CDs, etc.): text read aloud, performed music
      - film and video reproduction (videocassettes, motion picture film, videodiscs, etc.): audiovisual works
    - ii) released simultaneously on a number of different physical carriers as follows; these simultaneous releases on multiple carriers are "manifestations," to use the term recommended by the IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records:
      - digitization: all (includes various types of digitization, including, for example: both Mac and Windows versions; both ASCII and Microsoft Word versions; scanned by optical character recognition software (thereby turned into text), vs. scanned as an image (bitmapped, jpeg, gif); CD-ROM vs. diskette vs. remotely accessed, etc.)
      - microfilming, photocopying, still and slide photography: text as print on page, musical notation, image, numeric data
      - audio reproduction (audiocassettes, sound discs, CDs, etc.): text read aloud, performed music
      - film and video reproduction (videocassettes, motion picture film, videodiscs, etc.): audiovisual works
    - iii) reproduced and reissued on the same type of physical carrier; such reproduction also creates a "manifestation," to use the term recommended by the IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records; e.g.:
      - resetting of type (text or musical notation)

reissue or republication using the same plates (text or musical notation)  
prints and negatives (still photographic and moving image material)

#### D. Problem conditions not yet adequately covered in AACR2R

##### 1. Collaborative works of mixed responsibility

There are no general rules for mixed responsibility in new works; therefore, most audiovisual materials are excluded from treatment as new works of mixed responsibility. Thus, catalogers of these classic works of mixed responsibility are thrown back to rules 21.1C1 and 21.6C2 for entry.

The rules for mixed responsibility are often based on format rather than on conditions of authorship.

The rules are not numbered logically—see indentations below.

Structure of the relevant rules in Chapter 21:

##### *WORKS OF MIXED RESPONSIBILITY*

##### 21.8 WORKS OF MIXED RESPONSIBILITY:

##### *WORKS THAT ARE MODIFICATIONS OF OTHER WORKS*

##### 21.9 GENERAL RULE

*Modifications of Texts:* 21.10-21.15

*Art Works:* 21.16-21.17

*Musical Works:* 21.18-21.22

*Sound Recordings:* 21.23

##### *MIXED RESPONSIBILITY IN NEW WORKS:* 21.24-21.27

[No general rule]

The section on “Works That Are Modifications of Other Works” includes rules that cover some new works of mixed responsibility, e.g., the rule for musical works that include words (21.19), some of which are new works.

Perhaps one of the sources of confusion in the current rules for “works of mixed responsibility” is that even though the section is defined by a condition of authorship, it is divided up based on types of modifications of work, not based on types of mixed responsibility. Note that a work could conceivably be made into a new work without introducing mixed authorship; for example, an author could dramatize his own novel. Also, of course, a new work of mixed responsibility can be created, without there being a preexisting work. To avoid such confusion in this paper, a number of categories which are currently subsumed by AACR2R into the section on works of mixed responsibility are discussed below independently of the discussion of mixed responsibility.

I would recommend that general rules for works of mixed responsibility be developed that can be applied to such works in any form or format, whether they are new works or are based on preexisting works. The rule for new works of mixed responsibility should call for entering such works under title.<sup>4</sup>

I would also recommend that the rules be restructured into two sections: rules covering new works of mixed responsibility, and rules covering various kinds of

adaptation and other change to preexisting works. The latter category will be discussed further below.

2. Collaborative works of mixed responsibility produced in stages, with portions of the collaborative work existing as separable pieces

In 21.28 when the parts of a work of mixed responsibility are published separately, they are treated as works in their own right, rather than as parts of a greater whole. For example, the following may be published (or at any rate exist and be collected) separately: sound tracks of films; choreographies; librettos;<sup>5</sup> screenplays; set and costume designs; stills and posters connected with a particular motion picture. Some might argue that these should be considered parts of the preexisting works, even though published (or existing) separately.

Change in practice in this area could also affect 21.11B, according to which illustrations published with text are entered under the writer of the text, but the same illustrations published separately are entered under the illustrator.

One of the reviewers of the original outline of this paper suggested that this section should also cover "electronic resources, finding aids, digital supplements, guidebooks and manuals that accompany, and software/data." This suggestion may, in fact, cover a number of different problems:

- a. Supplementary or related material that has a somewhat independent existence:

Past practice has sometimes been to enter materials such as supplements under the heading for the supplemented work in certain prescribed instances, for example, when they are by the author of the supplemented work, when they have dependent titles, when use of the supplement is dependent on a particular edition of the supplemented work, or when the supplement represents a clear continuation of the supplemented work.<sup>6</sup> It is possible that such approaches could be fruitful for dealing with supplementary or related electronic and other material.

- b. Finding aids:

These represent a rather special case. Finding aids could be conceived as a fuller type of metadata that mediates between (i) the cataloging record metadata and (ii) the actual collection being cataloged in the cataloging record and described in the finding aid. Since the finding aid itself stands for the same "work" as the cataloging record, and since it does not actually appear in the catalog in the same sense that the catalog record does (it does not have headings linked to the authority file, etc.), perhaps it need not be dealt with by *AACR*. (Do any institutions catalog their finding aids, such that the cataloging record, too, needs to be linked in?) However, if it is felt useful to include in *AACR* rules for making hypertext links between cataloging records and the actual documents they describe (when the latter are in digitized form), then finding aids should not be ignored in such a context.

- c. Guidebooks and manuals that accompany:

If "accompany" means physically bundled together, then I'm not aware that there are any problems with treating such accompanying material according to the existing rules in *AACR* for describing them in the physical description area. In effect, we treat them as being part of the expression being described in the bibliographic record, just as we would treat volume 2 of a multivolume work.

Could this refer, however, to guidebooks and manuals that are electronic and meant to be used in conjunction with works that are not electronic (or vice versa)? If that is the case, then the comments under section 1 above apply to these as well.

d. Software/data:

It is probably not possible to make sweeping recommendations about this type of relationship. It may be that we would want to devise different practices based on whether or not the software is meant to be used exclusively with the data, whether or not the data are meant to be used exclusively with the software, and so forth.

Changes in this area could represent a considerable shift from current practice and should probably be studied more closely before detailed recommendations are made.

3. Works intended for performance

When does performance create a new related work (akin to adaptation), rather than a version of the old (akin to translation, i.e., a type of subsidiary authorship)? (Subsidiary authorship refers to the type of authorship that can produce a new edition of a previously existing work; examples are editing, translation, illustration, and the writing of commentaries.)

Traditionally, music scholars have considered composing to be primary authorship and performance to be subsidiary authorship. Thus, musical performances are frequently given composer main entry. Traditionally, film scholars have been hesitant to assign primary authorship to any of the functions that go into the making of a film. Thus, films of performances have usually been given title main entry. Is there any way for these two fields to agree on which authorship functions involved in performance are primary (creating new related works) and which are subsidiary (creating manifestations of previously existing works)?

By the way, even within the music field, there is general acknowledgment that the primacy of composition over performance is culture-specific, and functions best when applied to Western classical music. Users are not as consistent in considering works of Western popular or folk music, or non-Western music of all kinds to be primarily the works of composers.

Works intended for performance raise general questions about the degree to which the rules should rank into primary and secondary responsibility the functions carried out in the production of a work of mixed responsibility.

Do some types of performance create new works and some not? If so, what is a principled way to differentiate between the two (or more?) kinds of performance?

Is a work intended for performance and its realization the same work, or two different works?

If both are the same work, should the work be identified primarily by title, or by a primary author and a title? If the latter, how is the primary author to be identified? To the extent that this deals with the naming issue, it will be dealt with further below in section II.

Problems with specific rules in *AACR2R*:

- a. 21.1B2e, in explicitly encouraging entry under performing groups for films and videorecordings, implies that all other functions carried out in the creation of a moving image work are subsidiary to the performance of a group. This approach is not

consistent with the treatment elsewhere in the rules of performance of music as subsidiary to composition. The phrase “beyond mere performance, execution, etc.” is ambiguous. Does this mean that if any improvisation on a preexisting work takes place, the preexisting work becomes a new work authored by the performing group? Music librarians have probably been inconsistent in practice on this point. If it does mean that improvisation creates a new work when carried out by a group, why does not improvisation create a new work when carried out by an individual performer?

- b. There is potential cross-classification if some sound recordings are considered to be musical works. In general, there seems to be confusion about the meaning of “musical works”—does the category include videorecordings of musical performances or is it limited to graphic/textual representations of music intended for performance? The glossary definition (“musical composition . . . intended for performance”) may imply that it is meant to cover only the graphic/textual representations of music. Further evidence that “musical works” might not be meant to cover sound recordings is provided by the fact that 21.23A1 refers back to rules 21.18-21.22, calling for use of the “heading appropriate to the work.” If it is true that “musical works” is intended to refer only to graphic/textual representations of music, but not to the performances of music recorded on sound and videorecordings, the cataloging world is using the term “musical works” in an oddly narrow way compared to the way the rest of the world uses the term.
- c. 21.23C1 calls for entering a sound recording compilation of works of multiple composers under performer. There are two functions carried out by the performer in the creation of such a compilation: (i) the compilation or assembly of the pieces to be performed and (ii) the performance of the pieces. Since we hold consistently elsewhere in the rules that performance is subsidiary to composition, the difference in this case seems to be the act of compilation. If that is the case, this current practice seems to be a throwback to the old rules for entering textual compilations under editor, and thus does not fit with the general principle of consistent treatment of underlying conditions of authorship regardless of format. Current practice is generally to enter under title when a subsidiary authorship function such as editing or compilation has been carried out, but there is no primary author.
- d. 21.20 calls for entering musical settings for ballets under composer, even when the choreographic notation, scenario, libretto, etc., is present. The dance field has come to see performances of dance works as works of mixed responsibility to be entered under title, although this is not yet reflected in *AACR2*.

Recommendations concerning rules for works intended for performance:

Works intended for performance present the hardest problem to solve, since there are large groups of users who perceive of them as still being the work of the author of their original text, and large groups of users who perceive of them as being new related works once they are performed. The CC:DA Task Force charged with making recommendations concerning works intended for performance failed to reach consensus in an attempt to consider most works intended for performance the work of the author of the original text.<sup>7</sup> I lean toward another approach, perhaps based on my background in film. Note that there are actually three “layers” of creative activity going on in the creation of a dramatico-musical work which is then filmed: (1) There is composition of the original text (in the case of a play) or music (in the case of an opera; we will ignore the problem of the libretto for now). (2) There are the decisions that go into actually producing the play or opera in a live performance



(lighting, sets, costume design, casting, various readings of the lines or voicings of the arias, and so forth). (3) Finally, there are the creative decisions that go into making a cinematic work: camera angles, composition of frames, cutting, etc. It is the third layer that I am convinced constitutes a kind of adaptation, such that the play or opera becomes a film, a different work—a photographic work, not a musical work (but one related to the play or opera on which it is based). I am willing to concede that when film is used as a mere recording medium, it is not a cinematic work. However, if a screenwriter, an editor, and/or a cinematographer are credited, I recommend that it be considered a new cinematic work. Note that if this approach were to be taken, it would be crucial to make an added entry for the main entry of any pre-existing work that is adapted into a new work in the course of performance.

There is a more logical (but very radical) approach that should be examined, at least. If it is desired to consider *all* performances of a particular dramatico-musical work as the same work, no matter what the medium, we could consider all dramatico-musical works to be inherently works of mixed authorship, unable to exist without the work of many different people carrying out many different functions, and therefore entered under title. Thus, all texts of *Macbeth* and all performances of *Macbeth* would be entered under title. We would then doubtless be committing ourselves to elaborate uniform titles to allow versions of versions to be linked up to each other. For example, the various versions of Orson Welles' *Macbeth* would need to be subcollocated along with its sound track, its scripts, works about it, videodisc versions with additional material, etc. It is interesting to note in this connection that these works tend to have fairly distinctive titles (*Don Giovanni* vs. *5th Symphony*), and their performances are often advertised without using the names of playwrights or composers.

If my recommended approach toward cinematic works based on previously existing dramatic works is adopted, there is a way that users of online catalogs could be helped to find these performances fairly readily. It is possible that a change in the USMARC format to specifically identify related work added entries as performance added entries could lead to online catalog displays that might prevent undue confusion for users who consider a performance and a work intended for performance to be the same work. Currently, the second indicator of an added entry for a work can be set to 2 when the work is actually contained within the work cataloged, and an added entry for a work is contained in a 6XX field. If the same second indicator were given another value for performance, it would potentially allow for the following type of display:

Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616.

1. All's well that ends well.
2. Antony and Cleopatra.
3. As you like it.
4. Comedy of errors.
5. Coriolanus.
6. Cymbeline.
7. Hamlet.
8. Henry V.

9. Henry VI.
10. Macbeth.

When the user chooses line 10, for Macbeth, the following display could result:

Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616. Macbeth.

1. Editions of Macbeth.
2. Works containing Macbeth.<sup>8</sup>
3. Performances of Macbeth.
4. Works about Macbeth.<sup>9</sup>
5. Other works related to Macbeth.<sup>10</sup>

When the user chooses line 3, for performances of Macbeth, the following display could result:

1. Classic theatre. Macbeth. 1977.
2. Hallmark hall of fame. Macbeth (1954)
3. Hallmark hall of fame. Macbeth (1960)
4. Macbeth (1948)
5. Macbeth (1971)
6. Studio one. Macbeth. 1951.
7. Throne of blood. Akira Kurosawa's throne of blood. 1957.

Of course, this still dodges the question of which films are mere recordings of a performance (same work), and which are adaptations (new works), and whether this distinction should be made visible to users in displays. In figure 5 you can see what such a distinction could look like, if we decided to make it.

---

Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616. Macbeth.  
1. Editions of Macbeth.  
2. Works containing Macbeth.  
3. Performances of Macbeth.  
4. Films based on Macbeth.  
5. Works about Macbeth.

---

FIGURE 5

“Performances of” would be for same main entry sound and videorecordings (“mere recordings”); “films based on” would be for films (i.e., motion pictures and videorecordings) with related work added entries for the preexisting works from which they were adapted.

Note that here the USMARC format calls for coding of types of relationships between works and editions of works not explicitly defined by AACR2 (but implicit in the rules). In other words, some of the work to make relationships intelligible to users is being done by USMARC, not by AACR2. This may be an area in which

better coordination between the two would be advisable, and may also point to the need to make explicit what is implicit in AACR2.

Also note the way that the encoding of relationships provides a method for helping users with unmanageably large OPAC displays.

By the way, I would like to take issue with those who might feel that it doesn't matter whether Shakespeare's *Macbeth* as a work includes all the film versions or all the performances. It does matter, because of the fact that a record can be retrieved many different ways, and the work it represents may need to be displayed with many other works. Polanski's *Macbeth* can be represented in the catalog as either an edition of Shakespeare's play (Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616. *Macbeth*) or as an adaptation of the play into a film (*Macbeth* (1971)). Whatever decision is made, that is the way the film will appear in the summary display to anyone who retrieves it along with ninety-five other hits, on say, a genre search, a subject search, a keyword-within-record search, a search for a particular actor or cinematographer, etc. The work heading must be able to stand on its own in representing the work among hundreds of other works in long displays. It is important to decide *what* is being named before naming it. One of the functions the main entry carries out in an OPAC is that of naming, defining, and differentiating the work entities of interest to users and making the relationships among them intelligible in complex displays representing hundreds of other works.

#### 4. Preexisting works reissued with additional material

Here the fact that many rules of mixed authorship are based on format rather than on conditions of authorship is leading to the result that works with the same conditions of authorship, but in newer formats, are excluded from treatment under AACR2R rules. For example:

21.13 is defined as "Texts published with commentary." There are now lots of examples of musical performances and films (and probably other types of work) being republished with audio tracks containing commentary by people involved in the production, critics, etc. Many of these are works intended for performance, but the phenomenon is probably not limited to them. There are many videodisc examples in the UCLA Film and Television Archive; e.g., the interactive multimedia version of *The Magic Flute*, which, according to a summary on a cataloging record, contains "a complete performance of Mozart's *The magic flute*, enhanced by over one hour of commentaries and other music. Includes . . . long-form analysis of Mozart's music, story of the opera . . ."

21.15 is defined as "Texts published with biographical/critical material." The republishings mentioned above can also include biographical/critical material. For example, *Microsoft Multimedia Mozart*, according to a summary on a cataloging record, contains "Multimedia information on Mozart and his Dissonant quartet, including a recording of the quartet, an examination of the historical and social context in which it was composed, a visual guide through the music."

21.11, Illustrated texts. It is now possible to publish discursive works which use fragments of preexisting performed works as illustration, e.g., musical performances or excerpts from films. *Cataloging Musical Moving Image Material*, edited by Lowell Ashley, recently published as *MLA Technical Report* no. 25, has an example (on p. 67) of a videocassette of lectures at Harvard by Leonard Bernstein that are illustrated by various musical performances.

Commentaries, biographical/critical material, and “illustrations” do not cover all of the categories of material that can be added to a preexisting work in a republication of it (or to a new work, as in the Leonard Bernstein example). For example, the multimedia version of *A Hard Day's Night* “features the complete, uncut movie, Alun Owen's original script, additional Beatles songs, an essay on the Beatles by critic Bruce Eder, the theatrical trailer and clips from Richard Lester's early work.” Many people would consider this to be a version of *A Hard Day's Night*.

Perhaps the following could serve as a first draft of a general rule to cover these new situations: If a work consisting of a preexisting work accompanied by or interwoven with biographical or critical material, illustrations, commentaries, and other subsidiary material is represented as an edition of the preexisting work, enter it under the heading appropriate to that work. If it is represented as a new work, enter it according to the general rule for new works of mixed responsibility.<sup>11</sup>

##### 5. Preexisting works transformed or adapted into new works

Are there other problems with decision-making about adaptations or other changes to preexisting works besides those discussed above?

To someone like myself who is not an expert music cataloger, it seems that it would be useful to have a more principled approach when arrangement or improvisation or other similar change to a musical work is extensive enough to justify considering it a new work (i.e., a type of adaptation). What is essential about a musical work that persists through arrangement or improvisation? Is it melody? Are there musical forms analogous to “play” and “novel” such that movement from one form to the other constitutes adaptation?

Is there adequate consensus yet about whether jazz improvisation creates editions of previously existing works, or whether, on the contrary, it constitutes a kind of composition on the fly, thereby creating new works? For example, the song “All of Me” was written by Gerald Marks (music) and Seymour Simons (lyrics). It has been performed by the following jazz artists: Billie Holiday, Erroll Garner, Frank Sinatra, Sidney Bechet, and Louis Armstrong, among others. If an analytical entry is being made for Erroll Garner's performance, should this be treated as an expression of the song by Gerald Marks (Marks, Gerald. All of me)? Or should it be treated as a new related work composed by Erroll Garner in the course of his jazz performance (Garner, Erroll. All of me)?

Is it really wise to consider musical works that include words (such as librettos or lyrics) to be primarily musical, rather than works of mixed responsibility? I recently had occasion to catalog a newsreel story about the famous Marian Anderson concert in front of the Lincoln Memorial. The newsreel includes her complete performance of “America” (“from every mountainside, let freedom ring”). I wanted to make an added entry for the song and was disconcerted to discover that the main entry for it is “God save the King,” since it uses the melody of the latter. In other words, the change in the lyrics to the song was not considered significant enough to create a new related work.

What about spatial data? Map catalogers do seem to recognize the concept of edition. For example, the U.S. Geological Survey's 1939 map of Golden, Colorado, has an edition with revisions shown in purple compiled from aerial photographs taken in 1978. These two maps are given the same main entry, which would seem to imply that they are considered to be the same work. It would be use-

ful to ask some map catalogers who were theoretically inclined to investigate whether or not a preexisting map can be changed to such a degree that it should be considered a new work related to the preexisting work and, if so, whether one can define the nature of such changes in a principled way.

And what about electronic resources? What types of "adaptation" of electronic works into new but related electronic works are likely to arise in this area? Will we be able to rely as heavily on representation to identify the relationships between two different but related electronic works as we have been able to do with current off-line publishing?

6. Represented works; for example, a series of photographs of a Frank Lloyd Wright house by an eminent photographer; the Frank Lloyd Wright house is the work represented, and the photographs are a work in which Wright's work is represented; also sometimes called a "surrogate" for Wright's work<sup>12</sup>

Image catalogers need to make a clear decision about what is being described in order to prevent the creation of a confusing record; the work that is not described must be treated as a related work of some type. *AACR2R* does not yet provide much guidance for decisions of this kind, although it does call for entering a reproduction under the heading for the original work (21.16B). Presumably a reproduction is of little interest in its own right. When a work is represented in another work that *is* of interest, such as a photographic work or the work of another artist, a decision must be made. For example, Michael Kenna's photographs of Le Notre's gardens, recently shown at the Huntington Library, should probably be considered to be primarily the work of Michael Kenna, but related to the work of Le Notre.<sup>13</sup> The current popularity of performance art is raising similar problems. When the work of a performance artist is documented by another artist, the latter a photographer or cinematographer, the problems are similar. Also, the proliferation of images of *Mona Lisa* in fine art, on T-shirts, in Wegman photos, reflected on magazine covers, on an apron, over and over by Warhol, etc., forces us to realize that reproduction of an image cannot always be held to be simply a copy ("manifestation") of the original.<sup>14</sup>

Ideally, *AACR2R* would contain rules for both options, (a) emphasis on the representation and (b) emphasis on the represented work, and leave it up to institutions to decide which was most appropriate for any given work. Possible criteria that could be applied might include (i) whether the intent was to create a surrogate for the original work, or whether the intent was to create a new work by the photographer; (ii) whether the image is presented as the represented work, or as a new work by the photographer.

It has been suggested by Sara Shatford Layne that it might be useful to explore the possibility of creating two records in one, one that describes the represented work and one that describes the representation, with the fields differentiated as to which work is being described by using USMARC linked-field techniques. Sherman Clarke suggests that another potential approach might be to create an authority record that describes the represented work and link all cataloging records for representations of it to that authority record. (Sara counters that in her view, that "authority record" should look more like a full bibliographic record; presumably she means, for example, that it should contain some physical description.)

7. Works of changing authorship<sup>15</sup> (serials and revised editions)

Currently, change of title of a serial work leads to the creation of a new main entry in *AACR2R*; in other words, change of title causes the creation of a new, related work. The various related works that make up the history of a given serial can only be assembled by a user who happens to be in a library that holds issues entered under each title the serial has held. If there are any missing links, the run cannot be assembled. Is this really the right way to conceive of a serial work? Does it really correspond to the way users conceptualize serial works?

Now that serials are beginning to be distributed electronically, their nature as works is beginning to change in rather profound ways. For example, a serial distributed as issues in text form can now exist simultaneously in electronic form as a continuously updated database consisting of all of the articles ever published in that serial, extending across title changes. In other words, such a database can easily contain articles from a serial which has changed its title several times. Users surely consider both the database and the journal they seek (under any title it has held) to be different versions of the same work.

Currently, rules 21.6C1 and 21.12 call for treating revised editions as new works whenever the representation of authorship changes, including simple transposition of the names of two authors on a title page. Such revisions are also treated as new works whenever the title changes. These practices, too, mean that a user can only be assured of finding the latest edition of a text (or other work subject to revision over time) in a library that has cataloging records for every earlier edition, so that the chained related work added entries can gradually lead the user from his or her citation to the latest edition. It seems likely that users consider all of these editions to represent the same work, and that they would find it useful to see the editions in one place. In this way they could be sure of getting the latest, most current edition, and scientific historians could more easily survey the library's holdings of earlier editions of a prominent text or other work subject to extensive revision over time. A definition of work that allowed for change in authorship, editorship, or title of a text without the text becoming a new work could help library users in a number of fields that make heavy use of texts (e.g., law and medicine).

## E. Definition of work

There seems to be a certain amount of consensus in the field that it would be useful to at least explore the possibility of adding an explicit definition of work to *AACR2R*.<sup>16</sup> I did some dissertation work on at least trying to describe what such a definition might look like.

Functions the definition should carry out:

1. It should include more than just works of single personal authorship, encompassing works of changing authorship, multiple authorship, and mixed authorship.
2. It should recognize that a work can change in either title or authorship without necessarily becoming a new work.
3. It should recognize that a work can be created by a group, whether named or unnamed and whether the group's name changes or not.

4. It should recognize that a work can be translated into a language other than its original language without becoming a new work.
5. It should recognize that a work intended for performance can be performed without becoming a new work.
6. It should recognize that a work can be reissued with subsidiary material, such as commentaries, illustrations, biographical/critical material, and other subsidiary matter, without thereby becoming a new work.
7. It should recognize that the intellectual and artistic content of a work can change without its necessarily becoming a new work, as in the case of revision, musical arrangement, and improvisation, etc.
8. It should recognize that a work can be reproduced photographically without necessarily becoming a new work.

With these functions in mind, the following definition is proposed:

Work: the product of the intellectual or artistic activity of a person or persons or of a named or unnamed group expressed in a particular way. A work has a name (or can be named<sup>17</sup>) and can stand alone as a publication; however, its name can change without its necessarily becoming a new work. The person(s) or group responsible can change without the work necessarily becoming a new work. The work can be translated into another language without necessarily becoming a new work. If two items are represented as the same work, consider them to be so, unless there is some overriding reason not to do so. As a rule of thumb, consider two items to be the same work if they would be considered interchangeable by most users, or if a user seeking one would actually find the other preferable (as in the case of a later revised edition).

Do not consider two items to be the same work if the particular way in which the intellectual or artistic activity is expressed has changed in order to adapt it to a new medium of expression. Examples would be the novelization of a film, the dramatization of a novel, an etching based on a painting, or a free transcription of a musical work.<sup>18</sup>

I feel I cannot in good conscience leave this topic without a warning, however. There are good reasons that our cataloging codes have never had a definition of work in their glossaries. Language can be treacherous. As soon as you write a rule or a definition, there is the potential for loopholes. There is the potential for practitioners to lose sight of the spirit or principle and seize on the letter of the "law" to do the exact opposite of the original intent. In some ways, it might be preferable to leave catalogers free to use their judgment in this area over time, as conditions change, rather than tying them down to the conception of work we are able to formulate in 1997. If we do attempt a definition, I would urge that we make it as principled a definition as possible to try to avoid this problem.

## II. Naming the Work

Under our current system for naming works (using the main entry), we identify a work by means of its principal author (if it has one) in conjunction with its title. When there is a principal author, this usually results in a unique heading for the work, without the need for cataloger-added parentheticals to break conflicts. However, when the title alone must be relied on, it is frequently necessary for catalogers to add qualifiers to break conflicts, to

ensure that all of the editions of one work come together independently of another work with the same title. Serials catalogers are very familiar with this phenomenon (see figure 6).

Once catalogers start tinkering with the titles in this fashion, the titles become much less predictable for users, especially in systems that are incapable of ignoring parenthetical qualifiers in the arrangement of records retrieved, as most of our OPACs are. If we are really serious about trying to implement the objectives of the catalog and helping users find the works they seek (demonstrating the relationships between works), we ought to try to find a way to roll back AACR2's move toward title main entry, so as to create stronger collocation points for the editions of a work, as well as works related to it and works about it.

Unfortunately, OPACs are at their worst when it comes to helping a user find a work of which both author and title are known, probably still the most common search done in research libraries.<sup>19</sup> Systems can't seem to handle an identifier that sometimes occurs in two fields (e.g., 100 and 245) and sometimes in one field broken into subfields (e.g., 700 with a \$t subfield) (see figure 7), and that sometimes consists of a uniform heading (that can be

---

Using the title alone for main entry:

Report (Aerojet-General Corporation. Liquid Engine Division)

Report by the Railway Board on Indian railways.

Report covering the operation and enforcement of liquor laws in Manitoba.

Report (Forest Products Laboratory (U.S.))

Report from the Select Committee on Abortion.

Report (National Severe Storms Project (U.S.))

Report of Chief Inspector of Locomotive Boilers.

Report of the Banana Board and statement of accounts.

Report of the California party boat fleet.

Report of the Millinery Stabilization Commission, Inc.

Report on freedom.

Report on sunspot observations.

Report on the Kenya Post Office Savings Bank.

Report on the macaroni and kindred products industry in Canada.

Report on tourism statistics in Tanzania.

Report to the legislature on Brown Bag Network Program.

Report (United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority. Research Group)

Report upon forestry.

527 screens of journal titles listed in ORION as of September, 1997

---

FIGURE 6



---

Work identified using two fields:  
 100 1\_ \$a Shakespeare, William, \$d 1564-1616.  
 245 00 \$a Macbeth.

Work identified using one field:  
 700 12 \$a Shakespeare, William, \$d 1564-1616. \$t Macbeth.

---

**FIGURE 7**

dynamically updated, e.g., 130) and sometimes consists of a transcribed field (that must be protected from dynamic updating, e.g., 245). They never offer users a search for a known work, and they often force the user to choose either author *or* title (see figure 8);

---

Searches offered on initial search screen on MELVYL's new web site:  
 Title  
 Author  
 Subject  
 Power

Searches offered on the initial screen of DRA's web catalog:  
 Any word or words  
 Search by subject  
 Search by author  
 Search by title

---

**FIGURE 8**

even when an author-title search is available, it tends to be treated as an expert or power search, and it tends to be done as a keyword-within-bibliographic-record search, such that the authority file is not searched for name and title variants (see figure 9),

---

Keyword-within-bibliographic-record search:  
 FNT Cummings 1  
Cummings, E. E. (Edward Estlin), 1894-1962.  
 1 x 1 / with an introduction by Lloyd Frankenberg. --  
 London : Horizon, 1947.

---

**FIGURE 9**

and the only possible display is a display of bibliographic records in main entry order. Thus, any work *added entries* that may have been retrieved will not be apparent in the display (see figure 10).

---

```

Bibliographic record that displays as:
Search done: FIND NAME TITLE Cummings 1
Hollander, John. An entertainment for Elizabeth ... 1972
... not revealing the reason for its retrieval:
Hollander, John.
  An entertainment for Elizabeth / with designs for
  costumes by Anne Hollander ; and introduction by Irving
  Cummings ... (English literary renaissance monographs ; v.
  1, no. 1) ...

```

---

**FIGURE 10**

Also, retrieved records are not summarized as to whether they are editions of the work itself, related works, or works about the work, producing the unmanageably large results sets that plague OPAC users. However, rather than letting the failures of our systems determine our cataloging practices, I would urge that we figure out a better way to force our systems to behave as catalogs. It is the business of AACR2 to cause the creation of catalogs that meet the cataloging objective of allowing the user to find a particular work of which the author and/or title is known.

It is very important to separate issues concerning the *form of name* we give an entity from issues concerning the *definition* of the entity (covered in the section above). The film *Seven Samurai* has been released under three different titles:

*Seven samurai*  
*Shichinin no samurai* (a transliteration of the Japanese script)  
*Magnificent seven*

The question of whether to use a uniform title to bring together all of the editions of a work is different from the question of what that uniform title should be (e.g., whether it should be in the language of the library users, English in most of the U.S., for example, or the language of the country of origin of the work in question, Japanese, for example, for a Japanese film). A number of commentators have pointed out the possibility of developing international authority records that identify the language of each heading contained in them, allowing libraries to designate their own language forms as the preferred forms for display in their OPACs. This could potentially free us from the tyranny of language that led commentators like Eva Verona to oppose the use of uniform titles because her users didn't like having to deal with foreign languages. Allowing an English-language-speaking population to search for works under their English-language titles, regardless of their titles in their countries of origin, would allow us to come closer to our principle of trying to enter authors and works under the names by which they are commonly known.

### III. Providing Access to Works under Their Variant Names

Provision of access to works under their variant names is haphazard and in a state of confusion at the present time. In current practice, some of the variant names for a work may be found only in the form of title added entries on bibliographic records, while others may be found only in the title subfields of name-title cross-references in authority records (see figure 11).

---

Variant names for a work may be found:

1. In title added entries and contents notes on bibliographic records:

245 1\_

246

505

740

2. In name-title cross-references found on authority records.

---

FIGURE 11

Given the yawning gap between authority records and bibliographic records maintained by most OPACs (described above), this ensures that users' searches for works using variants of author name and/or title will be highly likely to fail in most systems, or to succeed only partially (as when only editions carrying the variant forms are retrieved, not *all* editions). (See figure 12.)

This is an area in which work to clarify our concepts of "work" and "edition," and to implement cleanly defined record structures based on these concepts (authority records for "work" (chapters 21, 25, and 26) and bibliographic records for "edition" (chapters 1-13)).

---

When the title variant sought by the user exists as a name-title cross-reference, users searching for a work by title (rather than author and title) may find the work only if a keyword-within-heading search of authority record headings is included as part of the title search (not done in any existing OPACs) and only if the search results are small.

User searches on FTI Nutcracker

<00>400-7 10 \$a Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilich, \$d 1840-1893.

---

FIGURE 12

could be most fruitful in making our catalogs work better for users, although OPACs will have to be better designed to make use of these records as well.

Other problems for users stem from the fact that our OPAC software lacks hierarchical sensitivity. For example, the cross-reference from "FBI" to "United States. Federal Bureau of Investigation" needs to be applied not just to that heading, but to those hierarchically beneath it, including, for example, "United States. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Intelligence Division." (See figure 13.)

---

Two authority records:

United States. Federal Bureau of Investigation.

x FBI

United States. Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Intelligence Division.

The second authority record lacks the cross-reference from FBI.

---

FIGURE 13

A search for "FBI Intelligence Division" should not be allowed to fail, as it would in all current OPACs. Perhaps a statement of principle in chapter 26 of AACR2 might help convey the need for better searching software. For example, the principle might be stated as: "A cross-reference to a heading should also be made available to users who access any subset of that heading. For example, a cross-reference to an author should be available to any user seeking one of his works identified by means of his name and the title of the work."

#### IV. Structure of the Catalog and Methods of Demonstrating Relationships

On the AACRCONF listserv<sup>20</sup> and at the Toronto meeting in October of 1997 there was considerable discussion of whether or not we need to change our current record structures and methods of demonstrating relationships in a computerized and networked environment. This topic applies to more than just works, but much of the discussion centered on the need for a work-based record, as opposed to the current practice of creating edition- or expression-based records.

First of all, let me point out that in many ways we are *already* doing most of what some commentators have described as a radical new approach (and therefore impractical). Let me explain. We already differentiate one work from another (in making main entry decisions). (See figure 14.)

We already name works (again, by means of the main entry). (See figure 15.)

And we already create work-based records whenever we create an authority record for a work. Music catalogers, who create more of these authority records than anyone else, will

---

Two works differentiated by their main entries:  
 Health (New York, N.Y.)  
 Health (San Francisco, Calif.)

---

FIGURE 14

---

A work named using author and title:  
 Beethoven, Ludwig van, 1770-1827. Symphonies, no. 5, op.  
 67, C minor.

---

FIGURE 15

probably feel that this hardly needs to be said, but I think it does need to be said for people who work in fields in which such records are rarely made (see figure 16).

We already implement a “superwork” concept whenever we make a work (i.e., name-title or uniform title) added entry on the bibliographic record for another work. For example, when I make a name-title added entry for Margaret Mitchell’s novel on the film *Gone*

---

A work-based authority record:

```
<00>010-0 __ $a n80056438
  <00>100-0 10 $a Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilich, $d 1840-1893.
  $t Shchelkunchik
  <00>400-1 10 $a Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilich, $d 1840-1893.
  $t Casse-noisette
  <00>400-2 10 $a Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilich, $d 1840-1893.
  $t Di|bot|hor|no
  <00>400-3 10 $a Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilich, $d 1840-1893.
  $t N|hotkn|happar
  <00>400-4 10 $a Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilich, $d 1840-1893.
  $t Nussknacker
  <00>400-5 10 $a Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilich, $d 1840-1893.
  $t Schiaccianoci
  <00>400-6 10 $a Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilich, $d 1840-1893.
  $t Sp|farg|fator de nuci
  <00>400-7 10 $a Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilich, $d 1840-1893.
  $t Nutcracker
```

---

FIGURE 16

*with the Wind*, I am treating the novel as a superwork, from which new works, such as the film, have spun off over time (see figure 17).

---

```

Superwork concept:
Related work:
245 00 $a Gone with the wind $h [Motion picture] / $c
Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.
700 1_ $a Mitchell, Margaret, $d 1900-1949. $t Gone with
the wind.
Original work (Superwork):
100 1_ $a Mitchell, Margaret, $d 1900-1949.
245 00 $a Gone with the wind / $c Margaret Mitchell.

```

---

FIGURE 17

What is needed most, I think, is clarification and statement in the code of the principles behind what we are doing now, more consistent application of those principles, and an examination of how far our current practices can be extended to help library users find the multiple-edition works that are probably the most commonly sought works in our libraries.

Note that these decisions about when an item is a new work cannot be avoided. It is a fact of life that works exist in the form of editions, and as soon as there is more than one edition, there is the possibility for variation in both the author name and the title by which the work is known, cited, and sought by users. Cataloging is essentially the act of decision-making about issues like these, and all catalogers should be taught to make such decisions effectively. Those who think they are avoiding such decision-making are simply representing two items that are the same work as if they were two different works; in other words, they are not cataloging (doing professional work), they are creating the equivalent of a publisher's catalog or a web search engine (doing clerical work). The only difference is that our work costs more. It is a waste of the taxpayers' money for people who add no more value than that to be paid out of the public purse for cataloging in libraries.

On the AACRCONF listserv, and at the Toronto meeting, a number of participants suggested that we begin to move data from bibliographic records for editions ("expressions") of works to the authority record that stands for the work itself. I would have no objection to our studying the possibility of moving toward such an approach for all of the *access points* that apply to the work as a whole, with some important qualifications:

1. as long as the distinction can be made cleanly (i.e., this access point is not needed for this particular edition ("expression"), only for the work as a whole); consider, for example, what is to be done with data that applies to more than one edition, but not to all editions, e.g., some editions may be illustrated by Gustave Dore, but not all.
2. as long as descriptions of editions of a particular work are readily available to anyone who selects that work.

3. when and only when OPACs routinely integrate authority records with bibliographic records such that all searches (including keyword searches) are done on both (as far as I know, no OPAC can claim to do this now).

However, I would strongly oppose moving any of the *descriptive elements* from the bibliographic record to the authority record. Consider the following. A work exists only as the set of all of its editions (or “expressions”). If all of the copies (“manifestations” or “items”) of all of those editions were to be destroyed, the work would thereby be eliminated from our cultural record. The marks that we transcribe from an edition (or “expression”) into our bibliographic record constitute historical evidence of how the abstract work manifested itself concretely. After the main entry, all of the bibliographic description in a bibliographic record serves to identify a particular edition of a work, distinguish it from other editions of that work, and characterize it as an edition. All of this data serves to help a user select the particular edition of the work that best meets her needs.

Remember that all of the following can vary between editions of a work:

- title, as when a work changes title between editions (see figure 18);

---

Title:  
 Smollett, Tobias George, 1721-1771.  
The expedition of Humphry Clinker ...  
 Smollett, Tobias George, 1721-1771.  
Humphry Clinker ...

---

FIGURE 18

- statement of responsibility, as with translators, editors, illustrators (subsidiary authors), and as with an author who uses different pseudonyms across the various editions of one work (see figure 19);

---

Statement of responsibility:  
 The expedition of Humphry Clinker / by the author of  
Roderick Random.  
 The expedition of Humphry Clinker / by Dr. Smollett.  
 The expedition of Humphry Clinker / by Tobias Smollet,  
M.D., with 10 plates by T. Rowlandson.  
 L'expédition d'Humphry Clinker / traduction de Jean Giono  
et Catherine d'Ivernois.

---

FIGURE 19

- publisher and publication date (see figure 20);

---

Publisher and publication date:

The expedition of Humphry Clinker / by Tobias Smollett ,  
M.D. ; with 10 plates by T. Rowlandson. -- London :  
Printed for H.D. Symonds and T. Kay, 1793.

The expedition of Humphry Clinker / Tobias Smollett ;  
edited by Peter Miles. -- London : Everyman, 1993.

---

**FIGURE 20**

- illustration statement in the physical description, as when one edition of a work is illustrated and another is not (see figure 21);

---

Illustrations:

The expedition of Humphry Clinker / Tobias Smollett. --  
Ware : Wordsworth Classics, 1995.  
333 p. ; 20 cm.

The expedition of Humphry Clinker / Tobias Smollett ;  
introduction and notes by Thomas R. Preston ; the text  
edited by O.M. Brack, Jr. -- Athens, Ga. : University of  
Georgia Press, c1990.  
ix, 500 p. : ill., map ; 24 cm.

---

**FIGURE 21**

- paging, which is often the *only* indicator of a change of edition in the classic sense of a resetting of the type; in this example, these two items probably represent the *same* edition of the work (see figure 22);

---

Paging:

The expedition of Humphry Clinker / by Tobias George  
Smollett. -- New York, Century, 1902.  
372 p.

The expedition of Humphry Clinker / by Tobias George  
Smollett. -- New York, Century, 1904.  
372 p.

(Same edition of the same work (same setting of type),

---

**FIGURE 22**



- series, as when one edition of a work is in a series and others are not (see figure 23).

---

Series statement:

The expedition of Humphry Clinker / Tobias Smollett ;  
 edited by Peter Miles. -- London : Everyman, 1993.  
 xxxiii, 444 p.

Humphry Clinker : an authoritative text, contemporary  
 responses, criticism / Tobias Smollett ; edited by James  
 L. Thorson. -- 1st ed. -- New York : Norton, c1983.  
 xxi, 436 p. : ill. ; 22 cm. -- (A Norton critical  
 edition)

---

FIGURE 23

The edition entity has been dangerously neglected by major writers on the work, in three major ways.

First, there seems to be a failure to recognize that the entire bibliographic description functions to identify, describe, and characterize a particular edition of a work, not a particular work. There are many editions that do not have either edition statements or notes that specifically identify them as editions; see the examples in figures 18-23. Barbara Tillett's dissertation research on the derivative relationship, including editions, looked only at edition statements and notes, not at the rest of the description. Her "derivative relationship," which includes editions, translations, adaptations, and changes in genre, was studied using only the following USMARC fields: 041, 250, 775, 534, and the only fields in the body of the descriptive record that she characterizes as "devices to express these relationships in the catalog" are dash entries, edition statements, and notes.<sup>21</sup> What Tillett fails to recognize is that what makes explicit the fact that two items are two different editions of the same work is (1) the fact they have the same main entry (same work) and (2) the fact the description differs in some way (different editions). It is not necessary for the description to explicitly state "2nd edition" or for there to be a reference to a previous edition in the notes. The same type of error seems to have been made by the IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, which seemed to define "edition" as "expression" in the introduction, but then failed to associate all areas of the bibliographic description with the function of identifying an "expression" in the tables that make up the bulk of their work,<sup>22</sup> by Leazer, who includes date, edition, and language as attributes of work (and does not treat of editions at all),<sup>23</sup> and by Howarth (p. 154) who seems to imply that elements of the bibliographic description describe the work, rather than an edition of the work. (154) (155)

Secondly, there seems to be a failure to recognize that there is a layer between work and item, here called "edition," and that some changes in text do not necessarily create a new work, but rather create a new edition of the same work. Thus, for example, Patrick Wilson seems to consider even the most minute change to create a new work,<sup>24</sup> and, following him, Smiraglia states that "any change in either ideational or semantic content results in the creation of a new work,"<sup>25</sup> while Leazer adopts Smiraglia's definition.<sup>26</sup> See the examples in figures 18-23 for examples of change in semantic or ideational content that create new editions of a work, not new works. Note also that the changes that can occur between editions can be more complex than simple changes in the text.

And thirdly, there is a dangerous tendency to conflate the concepts of edition (same work) and adaptation (new related work) into one category. In fact, these are two quite distinct conditions, and they have been treated quite differently in Anglo-American cataloging practice. Two editions of the same work are given the same main entry. A work and its adaptation are given different main entries, with the latter given an added entry for the main entry of the first in order to demonstrate the relationship. As I have tried to argue above, there are good reasons to treat these two conditions differently; Polanski's *Macbeth* can be represented in the catalog as either an edition of Shakespeare's play (Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616. *Macbeth*) or as an adaptation of the play into a film (*Macbeth* (1971)). Whatever decision is made, that is the way the film will appear in the summary display to anyone who retrieves it along with ninety-five other hits on, say, a genre search, a subject search, a keyword-within-record search, a search for a particular actor or cinematographer, etc. It is important to aim at a representation of the work in a heading that corresponds to users' perceptions of the work, so that they can recognize and choose the heading for the work they seek. Unfortunately, Barbara Tillett lumps editions and adaptations together in the derivative category,<sup>27</sup> and then Smiraglia<sup>28</sup> and now Vellucci (p. 110) follow Tillett in lumping adaptations (new works) and translations (editions of the same work) together as "derivative relationships."

Another reason to avoid moving edition-specific information to a work-based record is that this edition-specific data represents our primary source material for determining how an author or a work (or a subject, for that matter) is commonly known. When determining the form of name for any of the three major entities (author, work, and subject), we need to know how the entity is usually named on the title pages of particular editions of works.

To lose this information descriptive of a particular edition, or to muddle it up with information applying to the work as a whole, would be a bibliographic disaster. The user may begin by seeking a particular work, but most users end their search by selecting a particular edition of it (e.g., the latest one, the illustrated one, the one from an authoritative publisher, the one with an editor known to the user). In the ideal catalog, once the user had selected an edition of the desired work, he or she could then select a physical format for that edition (e.g., electronic form, microform, or text; or electronic form, audiocassette, or CD; or electronic form, videocassette, or 35 mm. nitrate film).

Finally, consider the fact that the work develops over time by means of the accrual of editions. In a sense, the work cannot be described completely ahead of time.

A web-based world offers a new type of linking device to be used to demonstrate various types of relationships. Now we have the following potential linking devices for demonstrating relationships among our bibliographic, authority, and holdings records:

1. Hot links using web addresses
2. Standard numbers such as ISBNs and ISSNs
3. Record numbers such as an authority record number in the national Name Authority File or an LCCN
4. Uniform headings

I would like to suggest that in our current shared cataloging environment, in which we are maintaining numerous local catalogs with no linkages between catalogs, uniform headings, such as authorized forms of name for authors and works (including uniform titles), are still the most functional linking device. My reasons are as follows:

All are equally bad in terms of stability. All can change over time, and we have no reliable methods for proliferating these changes into all the catalogs which are using the linking device.

Uniform headings have the following advantages:

1. They are the only type of link that is humanly readable. Thus, they can represent an author, a work, or a subject to a user, enabling the user to recognize and select (or not select) a particular heading. Thus, they also have the effect of explaining something about the nature of the link (although various people have suggested ways in which to categorize relationships in a more detailed manner than we have done so far). Thus, a link that consists of an author name and a title carries the information that it represents the work named.
2. Since the uniform heading link is humanly readable, when it gets out of synch, that fact is more likely to be recognizable to catalog editors who can then put the link back in synch.
3. Certainly all links are prone to error, but it seems probable that humanly readable links are less likely to contain errors than meaningless strings of numbers or, at least, more likely to be spotted and corrected eventually.
4. And finally, uniform headings strike me as being more sharable. Unlike the other types of link, a uniform heading actually can sit in a catalog that does not have any other records with that heading and still function perfectly well. Once more records with that heading arrive, they should automatically link (assuming no errors and assuming adequate system design).

I think it would be helpful if we put more thought into detailing the types of linking that would be helpful in our catalogs. It seems to me that we most commonly need one-to-many links. Consider the following list:

1. Work to its editions (one-to-many, if authority record for work is linked to bibliographic records for its editions)
2. Edition to all copies of it in various physical formats (one-to-many, if bibliographic record for the edition is linked to holdings records for its near-equivalents or "manifestations" in various physical formats)
3. Author to his or her works (one-to-many, if authority record for author is linked to authority records for his or her works, and thence to bibliographic records attached to the work authority records)
4. Subject heading to the works about that subject (one-to-many, if authority record for subject is linked to bibliographic records using that subject heading)
5. Work to related work links (one-to-one, if authority records for the works were linked; many-to-many if all the editions of one work were linked to all the editions of the other work)

That latter category should perhaps give us pause. In my opinion, any link between bibliographic records should be considered to be at least potentially a link between two particular editions of two particular works, not a link between works, since the object of a bibliographic record is a particular edition of a particular work. It seems to me that linking

of works would be much more efficient and logically explicable if it could be done as much as possible on a one-to-one basis (work record-to-work record), rather than on a many-to-many basis (bibliographic records-to-bibliographic records). If we do bibliographic record-to-bibliographic record linking, we risk increasing the number of linking added entries on each bibliographic record exponentially.

Currently, when we make a related work added entry on a bibliographic record, in effect, we link that bibliographic record to two different work authority records; its main entry links it to the work of which it is an edition; its related work added entry links it to the work to which it is related. Each of those work headings then provides one-to-many links to both editions of itself, and works related to it. Chained entries, such as those made between successively entered serials records, and revised editions of texts with authorship changes lose the power of the one-to-many linking.

We also need to develop methods of creating hierarchical links between entities that could be used in smart systems to signal to the computer (1) that a cross-reference to one element in a hierarchy also applies to all elements beneath it in the hierarchy; (2) that an editing change to one element in a hierarchy should also be applied to all elements beneath it; and (3) that a search that retrieves one element in a hierarchy should display that element and all elements beneath it. One possibility might be to try defining this hierarchy to the computer using the fact that our headings are already designed to be treated this way; thus, one could define the elements beneath as being those that begin with the same heading, but have subsequent subfields attached. (This assertion is probably oversimplified and would benefit from some research! For example, one would probably not often want to exercise hierarchical power over all authors with the same surname. You might want to sometimes, though, e.g., for names beginning with "Mc". . . .)

Consider the following hierarchical relationships that are currently ignored in OPACs:

- A corporate body to all of its subdivisions
- An author to all of his or her pseudonyms
- An author to all of his or her works represented by author-title headings
- A work to all of its editions; consider, for example, works such as the Bible that are subarranged by edition information such as language, date, etc., using uniform titles that include such edition-related elements.

(If we weren't limiting discussion to descriptive cataloging rules here, we could also list the hierarchical relationships between subject headings and their subdivisions, and between class numbers and all numbers included underneath them in classification hierarchies.)

It is because OPACs ignore these hierarchical relationships that we have the problem described earlier in this paper: a search on FBI Intelligence Division would fail in all current systems because the cross-reference from FBI occurs only on the authority record for "United States. Federal Bureau of Investigation," not on the record for "United States. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Intelligence Division."

The real problem with all linking devices in a shared cataloging environment, however, lies with the shared cataloging environment itself. Because our thousands of local catalogs are not linked together, or linked upward to the national name authority file, any change in a uniform heading will be made in only three places: the national name authority file; the Library of Congress catalog; and the local catalog of the cataloger who made the change.

All other catalogs will henceforward be out of synch until that heading happens to be worked on locally for some other reason.

The real solution, and admittedly it's a radical one (but we live in radical times), is that instead of sharing cataloging records, we need to re-examine the possibility of sharing a catalog!

I have tried to make this point elsewhere,<sup>29</sup> but will try to reformulate it a bit for this context. If the development of the information superhighway eventually means cheap and ubiquitous telecommunication, could we not begin to envision a single catalog, accessible to all users, and updatable by all catalogers?

Advantages for linking:

1. Any link could be made once and would be permanent (but editable), and immediately ubiquitous, i.e., visible to all users.
2. We could demonstrate complex hierarchical relationships using both uniform headings and, when necessary, mechanical linkages, and presenting authority, bibliographic, and holdings records in seamless hierarchical integration.
3. Changes in headings to keep them in line with commonly known forms and current vocabulary could be made once and would be immediately ubiquitous.
4. System design for the OPAC interface (display of records, arrangement of headings, compression and expansion of large displays), so important for supporting the demonstration of relationships, could be done once and shared by all libraries and library users. I have long had the suspicion that the complexity of programming necessary to build an OPAC that is a true catalog is so expensive that the library market cannot support it in the current world of multiple private-sector vendors. However, I wonder if it could not be supported by tax dollars, as a public good, if it were, in fact, going to be used by *all* libraries and library users. This would have the effect of standardizing the catalog interface, as we all long to do. Perhaps we could then teach students to search The Catalog in kindergarten, along with their ABC's.

Other advantages:

1. Such an approach has got to be more cost-effective than our current approach of maintaining thousands of local catalogs. Adding an item to a collection would consist of either adding a holdings symbol to an existing record in the catalog (which requires professional judgment, in my opinion, but could be done extremely quickly by a well-educated professional) or adding new record(s) for that item when necessary.
2. We could take all the money we save on heads of technical services, copy cataloging departments, cataloger updating of multiple catalogs, OPAC vendors, planning for new OPAC software, etc., and spend it on hiring more well-educated (not just trained) professional catalogers who would, perhaps, then be able to create analytic records for the individual cuts on sound recordings, full cataloging records for series with the full panoply of added entries, etc., all of which added value would immediately be available to all users of the catalog.

Maybe when Bill Gates finally discovers the limits of "intelligent assistants," we could talk him into funding such a catalog and becoming thereby the Carnegie of the twenty-first

century. After all we have the expensive part already—the USMARC records; the software design would probably cost him about what he spends every year on shoes.

## V. What AACR2 Should Do

In Toronto there was a good deal of support for the position that AACR2 should more explicitly state the objectives and principles that already underlie our current practice, in order to make the rules more understandable, teachable, and extensible. The following are my recommendations:

1. State the objectives and principles of cataloging clearly in the introduction to the code, and direct anyone using the code to refer to these whenever a bibliographic condition not covered by a particular rule is encountered. Ensure that these principles are applied consistently, and examine how far current practice can be extended to apply the principles consistently to all kinds of materials.
2. Include in the objectives a statement that one of the major goals of the catalog is to ensure that a user who does any kind of a search leading to the selection of a particular work should be shown in an organized display all available editions of that work, as well as works that contain it, works that are based on it, and works about it.
3. Include in the objectives a statement that a work should be named using the name of its principal author (if there is one) and the title by which it is commonly known to the users of the library.

Consider also stating that two works with the same name should be given uniform headings that differentiate one from the other whenever one is represented by more than one bibliographic record.

4. Include in the objectives a statement that the user should be led to a desired work from any variant of its author's name or its title that the user might employ in his or her search.
5. Include a statement of principle concerning the degree of change to a preexisting work that causes the creation of a new edition of that work, and the degree of change that causes the creation of a new work related to the preexisting work.
6. Make explicit the types of relationships between works, and the types of relationships among the editions ("expressions") of a work that are implicit in AACR2.
7. Consider defining work as follows:

the product of the intellectual or artistic activity of a person or persons or of a named or unnamed group expressed in a particular way. A work has a name (or can be named<sup>30</sup>) and can stand alone as a publication; however, its name can change without its necessarily becoming a new work. The person(s) or group responsible can change without the work necessarily becoming a new work. The work can be translated into another language without necessarily becoming a new work. If two items are represented as the same work, consider them to be so, unless there is some overriding reason not to do so. As a rule of thumb, consider two items to be the same work if they would be considered interchangeable by most users, or if a user seeking one would actually find the other preferable (as in the case of a later revised edition).

Do not consider two items to be the same work if the particular way in which the intellectual or artistic activity is expressed has changed in order to adapt it to a new medium of expression. Examples would be the novelization of a film, the dramatization of a novel, an etching based on a painting, or a free transcription of a musical work.<sup>31</sup>

8. Clarify our concepts of work and edition (“expression”) and tie them to clean record structures, e.g., the authority record should always stand for the work, and the bibliographic record should always stand for the edition.

### Recommendations for Chapter 21

1. Develop general rules for works of mixed responsibility that can be applied to such works in any form or format, whether they are new works or are based on preexisting works. Restructure the rules into two sections: rules covering new works of mixed responsibility and rules covering various kinds of adaptation and other change to preexisting works.
2. Create a new rule for new works of mixed responsibility that calls for entering such works under title unless only two functions are carried out and a more specific rule calls for considering one function primary and the other secondary. Ensure that this rule covers choreographic works.
3. Study the problem of collaborative works of mixed responsibility produced in stages with portions of the collaborative work existing as separable pieces, and consider whether it might be possible to collocate all of the portions of a single work.
4. Reconsider 21.1B2e. If the phrase “beyond mere performance, execution, etc.” refers to improvisation on the part of a group, consider extending this approach to performance of individual performers who improvise as well; if it does not, drop this rule, or rationalize it better.
5. Use a different term than “musical works” if it is desired to refer to printed music, but not to performances of musical works recorded on sound recording or videorecording formats.
6. Clarify in 21.23C1 whether the function carried out by the performer leading to main entry is that of compilation or that of performance, and rationalize this practice in the context of the treatment of compilation/performance elsewhere in chapter 21.
7. Consider any preexisting work that is adapted to create a cinematic work as a new work related to the preexisting work.
8. Try to get rid of rules in chapter 21 that are tied to format; instead, analyze the underlying conditions of authorship. For example, consider replacing 21.11, 21.13, and 21.15 with the following more general rule: If a work consisting of a preexisting work accompanied by or interwoven with biographical or critical material, illustrations in any format, commentaries, and other subsidiary material is represented as an edition of the preexisting work, enter it under the heading appropriate to that work. If it is represented as a new work, enter it according to the rules for new works of mixed responsibility.
9. Study music, spatial data, electronic resources, and other special types of material to identify the nature of adaptation in those materials, i.e., what types of change to a preexisting work cause the creation of a new related work, and what types of change simply produce a new edition (“expression”).

10. Reexamine rule 21.16B; study represented works, and consider including rules in AACR2 that allow institutions cataloging these works to either (a) emphasize the representation or (b) emphasize the represented work in their cataloging, depending on what is most appropriate in any given case.
11. Reconsider the rules for entry of works of changing authorship such as serials and texts to see if the various expressions of these works can be better gathered together and represented as one work to users.
12. Consider rolling back AACR2's move toward title main entry, i.e., consider entering more works under corporate and personal authors in order to create unique headings to identify the work without having to resort to uniform titles.

### Recommendations for Chapter 26

State in the introduction to chapter 26 the general principle that a cross-reference to a heading should also be made available to users who access any subset of that heading. For example, a cross-reference to an author should be available to any user seeking one of his works identified by means of his name and the title of the work.

### Notes

1. An elaboration of this point may be in order for those who are puzzled about what it is doing here. I have heard catalogers make remarks such as, "Our library doesn't use uniform titles and none of our users has ever complained." One of the major reasons we call ourselves a profession is that we have a kind of expert knowledge our users do not necessarily have that allows us to help or harm them without their realizing it. Thus, we have a professional and social responsibility to do everything we can to help rather than harm, *even though* they cannot evaluate our work. I particularly want to make this point because we are a profession under attack by a society that has never grasped the nature of our expertise and thinks that Bill Gates' intelligent assistants are going to solve all the problems they are having finding things on the Internet. Unfortunately for us, the fact users don't observe when we have helped them means that our work is largely invisible to them. Now is a time when, rather than trying to make cataloging so easy that low-paid clerks can do it without training (only putting things up on the Internet can really be that easy), we need to focus our energies on practicing our special expertise, and perhaps on trying to educate the public (and other librarians!) more thoroughly in what that is, and what its value is.
2. See both 21.6C1 and 21.12 in AACR2R.
3. Actually, U.S. practice follows the alternative rule in the footnote to 21.28 which leads to the libretto being entered under the heading for the musical work.
4. It should be noted that the CC:DA Task Force on the Cataloging of Works Intended for Performance made the following recommendation in October of 1996:
  1. Develop general rules for works of mixed responsibility that can be applied to such works in any form or format, whether they are new works or are based on preexisting works.

On the basis of discussions of various approaches at the 1996 ALA Annual Meeting in New York, the Task Force roughed out the following approach for the part of recommendation 1 dealing with new works for consideration by the cataloging community (the various approaches are outlined in section 2 of the discussion paper prepared by the Task Force, which can be found at the following web site: Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, CC:DA documents, CC:DA Midwinter and Annual Conference documents, ALA Annual, San Francisco,



CA, CC:DA meetings, 6/28/97 and 6/30/97, Draft document of the Task Force on the Cataloging of Works Intended for Performance for discussion by CC:DA and the cataloging community (18 December 1997):

New works of mixed responsibility in which creation of a text is just part of the collaborative production of the work should be entered under title, unless there are only two authorship functions involved, and a more specific rule assigns primacy to one of the functions.

5. Actually, as noted above, U.S. practice follows the alternative rule in the footnote to 21.28, which leads to the libretto being entered under the heading for the musical work. If librettos are considered to be parts of the original work, why not consistently apply this treatment to screenplays, set and costume designs, etc.?
6. Martha M. Yee, "What Is a Work? Part 3: The Anglo-American Cataloging Codes," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (1995): 33-36.
7. The CC:DA Task Force on the Cataloging of Works Intended for Performance made the following recommendation in October of 1996:
  2. Develop rules for works realized through performance that can be applied to such works in any form or format.

On the basis of discussions of various approaches outlined in section 2 of the discussion paper prepared by the Task Force, at the 1996 ALA Annual Meeting in New York, the Task Force roughed out the following approach for recommendation 2 above for consideration by the cataloging community (discussion paper is located at the following web site: Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, CC:DA documents, CC:DA Midwinter and Annual Conference documents, ALA Annual, San Francisco, CA, CC:DA meetings, 6/28/97 and 6/30/97, Draft document of the Task Force on the Cataloging of Works Intended for Performance for discussion by CC:DA and the cataloging community (18 December 1997):

Realizations of preexisting texts which consist of instructions for performance should be entered as follows:

If the instructions are detailed, and if they are closely followed in the performance, the performance should be considered the same work as the preexisting text, and creation of the text should be considered the primary function in the creation of the work, with performance being subsidiary.

If, however, the original instructions are not detailed and/or are not closely followed in the performance, the performance should be considered a new work, but one related to the preexisting text; i.e., if improvisation and/or adaptation and/or creative or intellectual work beyond mere performance occur, the performance should be considered a new work. This new work should be entered under title, unless there are only two authorship functions involved, and a more specific rule assigns primacy to one of the functions.

The Task Force agreed that it should be emphasized in the rules for added entries that it is crucial to make an added entry for the main entry of any preexisting work which is adapted into a new work in the course of performance.

Some clues that might be taken to point to adaptation having occurred in the course of making a film based on a preexisting work might be a screenplay credit and/or a cinematography credit.

Subsequent to the above recommendations having been made, it became clear that the principle of "detailed instructions closely followed" was in conflict with current practice in the music field of considering works that have been either arranged (prior to the performance) or improvised (during the performance) as being still the work of the original composer (in other words, the same as the preexisting work). If the Task Force's approach is desired, a loose approach to the definition of "detailed instructions" would have to be taken, such that when improvisation was intended as part of the original instructions or is accepted as a standard method of performance of a particular kind of music, it would have to be considered to be part of the instructions. In fact, this same kind

of looseness of definition of "detailed instructions" could be used to justify considering production elements of dramatic works (costumes, lighting, etc.) to have been understood as part of the original instructions, or intended by the composer of the opera or the writer of the play. Several comments received from the field based on the CC:DA document posted on the web indicate that catalogers who are not expert in music or film feel they would have a hard time carrying out the decision-making required by the Task Force's approach.

8. In the USMARC format, work added entries with second indicator 2.
9. In the USMARC format, 6XX fields contain subject added entries for the work.
10. In the USMARC format, added entries for the work with second indicator 1 or blank.
11. It should be noted that the CC:DA Task Force on the Cataloging of Works Intended for Performance made the following recommendation in October of 1996:
  3. Develop a general rule covering preexisting works reissued in any form or format with the addition of matter of all kinds, including commentaries, and biographical/critical material, as well as non-textual matter such as posters, film trailers and new sound tracks. Usually, inclusion of such material should not be held to create a new work.

The document containing this recommendation can be found at the following web site: Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, CC:DA documents, CC:DA Midwinter and Annual Conference documents, ALA Annual, San Francisco, CA, CC:DA meetings, 6/28/97 and 6/30/97, Draft document of the Task Force on the Cataloging of Works Intended for Performance for discussion by CC:DA and the cataloging community (18 December 1997).
12. For a much fuller discussion of this problem, see: Sara Shatford, "Describing a Picture," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 4, no. 4 (summer 1984): 13-30.
13. The relationship is rather a special one, in which one work "depicts" another. Our practice has probably not been consistent between considering this a subject relationship (6XX fields in the USMARC format) or a descriptive relationship (7XX fields in the USMARC format). Perhaps it needs definition as a separate type of relationship in its own right.
14. Sherman Clarke and Jenni Rodda moderated a discussion on the Mona Lisa phenomenon at the 1997 conference of the Visual Resources Association.
15. This was the phrase Seymour Lubetzky used to describe works that continue to exist and change over time, with the change including change in authorship, such that they are most usefully entered under title.
16. The CC:DA Task Force on the Cataloging of Works Intended for Performance made the following recommendation in October of 1996 (Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, CC:DA documents, CC:DA Midwinter and Annual Conference documents, ALA Annual, San Francisco, CA, CC:DA meetings, 6/28/97 and 6/30/97, Draft document of the Task Force on the Cataloging of Works Intended for Performance for discussion by CC:DA and the cataloging community (18 December 1997)):
  4. Add a definition of "work" to the glossary.
17. Care must be taken not to exclude pictorial and other types of frequently untitled works.
18. Unfortunately, there just wasn't room in this paper to include an extensive justification for the proposed definition. Considerably more extensive examination and discussion of past Anglo-American cataloging practice, and of criteria proposed by cataloging theoreticians, as well as other justifications for the proposed definition of "work" may be found in the following series of articles:

Martha M. Yee, "The Concept of *Work* for Moving Image Materials," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 18, no. 2 (1993): 33-40.

———, "What Is a Work? Part I, The User and the Objects of the Catalog," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 19, no. 1 (1994): 9-28.

———, "What Is a Work? Part 2, The Anglo-American Cataloging Codes," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 19, no. 2 (1994): 5-22.

- , "What Is a Work? Part 3, The Anglo-American Cataloging Codes," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (1995): 25-46.
- , "What Is a Work? Part 4, Cataloging Theorists and a Definition," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 20, no. 2 (1995): 3-24.
19. User studies are very difficult to interpret in this regard, due to the propensity for users to do subject searches or include subject terms in their searches when looking for a known work, and due to the tendency of OPACs to force users to search under *either* author *or* title; probably most author searches should be counted as known-work searches for this reason.
  20. International Conference on the Principles and Future Development of AACR, Discussion list archives, July-October 1997 (9 December, 1997).
  21. Barbara B. Tillett, "Bibliographic Relationships: Toward a Conceptual Structure of Bibliographic Information Used in Cataloging" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1987), 43-56, Appendix B. In a personal communication (December 22, 1997), Barbara states "it looks to me that the identification of the significant data elements needed to identify an edition is what you are after rather than identifying a relationship to another edition or work, which makes it a different exercise from the one I conducted in my dissertation, which looked at the devices that had been used to show the relationships—recognizing full well that there are many other indicators that the human uses to distinguish."
  22. International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA), *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. Draft Report for World-wide Review* (Frankfurt: IFLA, 1996).
  23. Gregory H. Leazer, "A Conceptual Schema for the Control of Bibliographic Works," in *Navigating the Networks: Proceedings of the ASIS Mid-Year Meeting, Portland, Oregon, May 21-25*, ed. D. L. Andersen, T. J. Galvin, and M. D. Giguere (Medford, N.J.: Learned Information, 1994), 125.
  24. Patrick Wilson. *Two Kinds of Power* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1968), 6.
    - , "The Catalog as Access Mechanism: Background and Concepts," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 27, no. 1 (January 1983): 5.
    - , "The Work and the Work Record in Cataloging," *Annual Review of OCLC Research* (1986-1987): 43.
    - , "The Objectives of the Catalog and the Means to Reach Them," in *The Conceptual Foundations of Descriptive Cataloging*, ed. Elaine Svenonius (San Diego: Academic Press, 1989), 11.
    - , "Interpreting the Second Objective of the Catalog," *Library Quarterly* 59, no. 4 (October 1989): 339-53.
  25. Richard Smiraglia, "Derivative Bibliographic Relationships: Linkages in the Bibliographic Universe," in *Navigating the Networks: Proceedings of the ASIS Mid-Year Meeting, Portland, Oregon, May 21-25*, ed. D. L. Andersen, T. J. Galvin, and M. D. Giguere (Medford, N.J.: Learned Information, 1994), 169. It is confusing to find later on in this paper references to "edition" without any definition of it. His use of the term seems to conflict with the definition of work quoted here.
  26. Leazer, "A Conceptual Schema for the Control of Bibliographic Works," 116.
  27. Tillett, "Bibliographic Relationships," 43-56. In a personal communication, December 22, 1997, Barbara continues to argue that "the entities that are in derivative relationships populate a continuum from the same work to different works."
  28. Smiraglia, "Derivative Bibliographic Relationships: Linkages in the Bibliographic Universe," 177.
  29. Martha M. Yee, "Editions: Brainstorming for AACR2000," in *The Future of the Descriptive Cataloging Rules: Papers from the ALCTS Preconference. AACR2000, American Library Association Annual Conference, Chicago, June 22, 1995*, ed. Brian E. C. Schottlaender, ALCTS

Papers on Library Technical Services and Collections, no. 6 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1998), 40-65.

30. Care must be taken not to exclude pictorial and other types of frequently untitled works.
31. Unfortunately, there just wasn't room in this paper to include an extensive justification for the proposed definition. Considerably more extensive examination and discussion of past Anglo-American cataloging practice, and of criteria proposed by cataloging theoreticians, as well as other justifications for the proposed definition of "work" may be found in the following series of articles:

Yee, "The Concept of *Work* for Moving Image Materials."

———, "What Is a Work? Part 1, The User and the Objects of the Catalog."

———, "What Is a Work? Part 2, The Anglo-American Cataloging Codes."

———, "What Is a Work? Part 3, The Anglo-American Cataloging Codes."

———, "What Is a Work? Part 4, Cataloging Theorists and a Definition."