

International Conference on the Principles and Future Development of AACR

Toronto, Canada, October 23-25, 1997

What is a Work?

by

Martha M. Yee

Cataloguing Supervisor

UCLA Film and Television Archive

What is a work?
Martha M. Yee
July 8, 1997

Outline

- I. Users
- II. Definition implicit in AACR2
- III. Possibility of using fundamental content to help in making decisions about works, and possibly to reorganize the rules for description
 - A. Pure types of fundamental content
 - 1. text (print or handwritten words or words read aloud)
 - 2. music (musical notation in print or handwritten, or actual sound, i.e. performed music)
 - 3. still image (includes original art, slides, posters, prints, photographs)
 - 4. moving image (image, 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?)
 - 5. spatial data
 - 6. three-dimensional objects?
 - 7. numeric data?
 - 8. computer programs?
 - B. Mixed types of fundamental content
 - 1. One type of content predominant
 - 2. Fundamentally mixed with no type of content predominant
 - C. A work of any of these types (either pure or mixed) can be:
 - 1. distributed in multiple copies or unique
 - 2. issued serially, issued in continuously updatable form or issued 'monographically'
 - 3. issued as part of a larger whole or not
 - 4. controlled archivally or not in the collection that holds it
 - 5. exist on multiple carriers
 - a. be reproduced onto a number of different physical carriers
 - b. be released simultaneously on a number of different physical carriers
 - c. be reproduced and reissued on the same type of physical carrier
- IV. Problem conditions not yet adequately covered in AACR2R:
 - A. Collaborative works of mixed responsibility
 - B. Collaborative works of mixed responsibility produced in stages, with portions of the collaborative work

- existing as separable pieces
- C. Works intended for performance
- D. Preexisting works reissued with additional material
- E. Preexisting works transformed or adapted into new works in other ways
- F. Represented works
- G. Works of changing authorship (serials and revised editions)
- V. Author or title entry
- VI. Definition of work

The paper

I. Users:

The following assertions 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.¹

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 have 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.

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, in some areas, users may differ 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 entered 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).

II. 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.

The following are examples of current cataloging that illustrate this point. The main entry, identifying the work, is underlined.

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, Indiana : Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1943.

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 practising 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.

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, Indiana : 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)

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:

... 12. 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, NY : 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. xvii, 307 p. : ill. ; 24 cm.

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 authorship²
- 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 pre-existing text to music

In AACR2R, we have considered the following changes not to be substantial enough to cause the creation of a new work

² See both 21.6C1 and 21.12 in AACR2R.

(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 Section on Cataloguing Study 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:

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)³
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
1) all functions are subsidiary to performance by a group that 'goes beyond mere performance, execution, etc.' (21.1B2.e)
2) when one performer performs the work of many composers, composing is subsidiary to performance (21.23C)

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.

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

III. 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 following seven categories cannot be transformed into a work in another of the following seven 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.

A. Pure types of fundamental content:

1. 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).

2. 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.

3. 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 which 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).

4. 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)?

5. 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)?

6. 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?

7. numeric data (other than spatial data)?

8. computer programs?

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

1. One type of content predominant (judgement 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.

2. Fundamentally mixed with no type of content predominant:

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

When pre-existing 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 pre-existing work. Also, when an existing print work acquires an on-line 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

C. A work of any of these types (either pure or mixed) can be:

1. distributed in multiple copies or unique
2. 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.)
3. issued as part of a larger whole or not
4. controlled archivally or not by the collection that holds it
5. exist on multiple physical carriers:
 - a. be reproduced onto a number of different physical

carriers as follows; such reproduction creates a 'manifestation,' to use the term recommended by the IFLA Section on Cataloguing Study 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

- b. be 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 Section on Cataloguing Study 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

- c. be reproduced and reissued on the same type of physical carrier; such reproduction also creates a 'manifestation,' to use the term recommended by the IFLA Section on Cataloguing Study 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)

IV. Problem conditions not yet adequately covered in AACR2R:

A. 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 pre-existing 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 pre-existing works. The rule for new works of mixed responsibility should call for entering such works under title.⁴

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 pre-existing works. The latter category will be discussed further below.

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

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

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 pre-existing works.

On the basis of discussions of various approaches (outlined in Section 2 of the discussion paper prepared by the Task Force, which can be found at the following web site: <http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~mrwatson/ccdapage/perftfrp.html>) 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:

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.

exist and be collected) separately: sound tracks of films; choreographies; librettos;⁵ 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 pre-existing 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 outline 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:

1. 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.⁶ It is possible that such approaches could be fruitful for dealing with supplementary or related electronic and other material.

2. Finding aids:

These represent a rather special case. Finding aids could be conceived as a fuller type of metadata that mediates between a) the cataloging record metadata and b) the actual collection being cataloged in the cataloging record and described in the finding aid. Since the finding aid itself

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 Yee, Martha M. "What is a Work? Part 3: The Anglo-American Cataloging Codes," Cataloging & Classification Quarterly 20:1 (1995), p. 33-36.

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 that 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.

3. 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.

4. 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 is 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.

C. 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 acknowledgement 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?

Problems with specific rules in AACR2R:

1) 21.1B2e, in explicitly encouraging entry under performing groups for films and videorecordings, implies that all other functions that are carried out in the creation of a moving image work are subsidiary to the performance of a group, in the case of this particular type of performance. 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 pre-existing work takes place, the pre-existing 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?

2) 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 video recordings, 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.

3) 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: a) the compilation or assembly of the pieces to be performed; and b) 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.

4) 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.⁷ I

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, located at the following web site:
<http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~mrwatson/ccdapage/perftfrp.html>
) 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:

Realizations of pre-existing 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 pre-existing 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 pre-existing 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

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,

entry for the main entry of any pre-existing 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 pre-existing 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 pre-existing 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.

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 which 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.⁸
3. Performances of Macbeth.
4. Works about Macbeth.⁹
5. Other works related to Macbeth.¹⁰

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.

D. 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 lots of videodisc examples in

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.

the UCLA Film and Television Archive; another example is the interactive multimedia version of 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 republications 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 pre-existing 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 pre-existing 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 pre-existing work accompanied by or interwoven with biographical or critical material, illustrations, commentaries, and other subsidiary material is represented as an edition of the pre-existing work, enter it under the heading appropriate to that work. If it is represented as a new work, enter it according to [general rule for new works of mixed responsibility?]¹¹

¹¹ It should be noted that the CC:DA Task Force on the Cataloging of Works Intended for Performance made the

E. Preexisting works transformed or adapted into new works

Are there other problems with decision-making about adaptation other change to pre-existing 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 toward 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

following recommendation in October of 1996:

3. Develop a general rule covering pre-existing 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:
<http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~mrwatson/ccdapage/perftfrp.html>

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. At any rate, 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 useful to ask some map catalogers who were theoretically inclined to investigate whether or not a pre-existing map can be changed to such a degree that it should be considered a new work, related to the pre-existing work, and if so, whether there is a way to 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?

F. 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.¹²

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

¹² For a much fuller discussion of this problem, see: Shatford, Sara. "Describing a Picture." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly 4:4 (Summer 1984) 13-30.

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, currently being 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.¹³ 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.¹⁴

Ideally, AACR2R would contain rules for both options, 1) emphasis on the representation and 2) 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 a) 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; b) 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,

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.

that it should contain some physical description.)

G. Works of changing authorship¹⁵ (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. 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, so they could be sure of getting the latest, most current edition, and so scientific historians could more easily survey the library's holdings of earlier editions of a prominent text or other work subject to extensive revision

¹⁵ This was the phrase Seymour Lubetzky used to describe works that continue to exist and change over time, including in their authorship, such that they are most usefully entered under title.

over time.

V. Authorship

Just a note for those who may feel that in a paper on defining 'work', too much emphasis has been placed on authorship. Certainly, a work does not have to have either an author, or a primary author, in order to be considered a work. The truth is, though, that the works that tend to raise questions in our minds about when a work is a new work, and when it is merely an edition of a pre-existing work, are works that do have authors, and it is commonly a change in authorship that leads us to wonder whether the work has become a new work or not. Problems tend to crop up with works that go into multiple editions of various kinds, and such works tend to be the works of prolific authors, often in the humanities (although there are certainly prolific authors in the sciences as well, such as Darwin and Freud).

Works that do not have authors, or that have many authors, and are thus entered under title, are somewhat neglected in our current practice. We have deemed it impractical to try to establish a main entry for each monographic work entered under title. We have assumed that these types of work do not tend to have editions that need to be collocated. This assumption should perhaps be tested by research. Films, for example, commonly have editions (director's cuts, airline versions, etc.), and are frequently released under titles other than their original release titles.

Serials, as opposed to monographs, have not been ignored; that is, they are given uniform titles when it is necessary to distinguish two different works with the same title. However, their frequent corporate authorship has been ignored since the advent of AACR2, so that most of them are now entered under title. Their main entries would nearly always be unique without cataloger intervention if they were entered under corporate authors as often as they used to be; that approach could lessen the amount of work currently done on establishing and maintaining serials uniform titles.

VI. 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.¹⁶ I did

¹⁶ The CC:DA Task Force on the Cataloging of Works Intended for Performance made the following recommendation in October

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 named¹⁷) 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

of 1996

(<http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~mrwatson/ccdapage/perftfrp.html>):

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.

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.¹⁸

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

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:

Yee, Martha M. "The Concept of Work for Moving Image Materials." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly 18:2 (1993) p. 33-40.

Yee, Martha M. "What is a Work? Part 1, The User and the Objects of the Catalog." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly 19:1 (1994) p. 9-28.

Yee, Martha M. "What is a Work? Part 2, The Anglo-American Cataloging Codes." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly 19:2 (1994) p. 5-22.

Yee, Martha M. "What is a Work? Part 3, The Anglo-American Cataloging Codes." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly 20:1 (1995) p. 25-46.

Yee, Martha M. "What is a Work? Part 4, Cataloging Theorists and a Definition." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly 20:2 (1995) p. 3-24.

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.