

Martha M. Yee

April 1994 draft

WHAT IS A WORK?: PART 2, THE ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING CODES

ABSTRACT

Anglo-American codes are examined to determine the implicit or acting concept of work in each, in order to trace the development of our current implicit concept of work, as embodied in AACR2R. The following conditions are examined, using comparison tables: 1) contraction of a work (abridgements, condensations, digests, epitomes, outlines, chrestomathies, excerpts, extracts, selections); and 2) change in substance of a work (adaptations, dramatizations, free translations, novelizations, paraphrases, versifications, films or filmstrips of a text, musical arrangements, musical amplifications, musical settings, musical simplifications, musical transcriptions, musical versions, parodies, imitations, performances, reproductions of art works, revisions, editing, enlargements, expansion, updating, translation.)

WHAT IS A WORK?: PART 2, THE ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING CODES

No Anglo-American code has ever formally defined work. However, the implicit or acting concept of work in a code can be extrapolated from rules that relate the editions of a work. In order to extrapolate the acting concept of work from any particular code, an operational definition of the situation in which a particular code treats two items as the same work is needed, as opposed to the situation in which the code treats two items as two different works. The operational definition proposed is the following: a code treats two items as the same work when it calls for assigning the same main entry to both items; a code treats two items as different works when it calls for assigning two different main entries to the two items. Such an operational definition requires that we go on to define main entry operationally. Here we run into difficulties with works entered under author, due to the fact that in Anglo-American practice, except in those cases where a uniform title is assigned, main entry has referred only to the author heading assigned to a work entered under author. This means that the treatment of two manifestations of the same work with different titles, entered under author, is the same as the treatment of two different works by the same author; in both these cases the two items are given the same main entry, i.e. the same author heading. For example, if one wants to ask whether Anglo-American codes treat a translation as the same work as the original work, and one looks at the rules for choice of main entry for translations, one will find that the rules call for entry of the translation under the author of the original work; it is clear that the translation is not being treated as a different work by the translator; however, if a uniform title is not assigned to the translated work, in fact the translated work is treated exactly the same as is another work by the author of the original work. In the development of our definition, we will apply the proposed

operational definition, tempered by a knowledge of the intent of the code-makers, which surely was, for example, to consider a translation as a manifestation of the original work rather than as a different work by the author of the original work.

The various Anglo-American codes have been examined to determine how various conditions of change in works have been handled in the past, that is whether the changed items have been treated as manifestations of the same work or as different works. The findings are summarized in the following tables; an 'x' under 'SAME WORK' means that the code calls for assigning the same main entry to the item as was assigned to the original work. An 'x' under 'DIFF. WORK' means that the code in question calls for assigning a different main entry to the item from the one assigned to the original work. An 'x' under 'DECISION' means that sometimes the code prescribes treating the item as the same work and sometimes as a different work. The 'CRITERIA' section of the table describes how the decision is made. Full bibliographic citations for each of the codes' abbreviations in the tables may be found near the end of this article, prior to the summary. (The absence of a particular code in a given table signifies the code did not address the bibliographic situation covered in that table.)

a. Contraction of a work: abridgement, condensation, digest,
 epitome, outline

As can be seen from the following table, a simple abridgement, without rewriting, has been considered the same work as the original by all Anglo-American codes except the 1939 Bodleian rules. AACR1 and AACR2 treat an abridgement as a kind of revised edition, and therefore if an abridgement is attributed to the abridger rather than the original author, it is treated as a new work.

CONDITION: Contraction of a work

___TYPE: Abridgement, condensation, digest, epitome, outline

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
Cutter 1-4	x			
Linderfelt	x			
1908 rules	x			
Fellows (1922)	x			
Vatican (1938)	x			
Bodleian 1939		x		
1941 rules	x			
1949 rules	x			
CCR 1960	x			
CCR 1961			x	Same work if issued with omissions of parts of the text; different work if adapted, recast or rewritten in a new form, such as a condensation, epitome or outline.

AACR1	x	Same work unless new edition clearly indicates the work is no longer that of the original author.
AACR2	x	Same as AACR1.
AACR2R	x	Original author's name as part of the title no longer considered indication that the work is that of the original author.

b. Contraction of work: chrestomathies, excerpts, extracts, selections

As can be seen from the following table, without exception, the Anglo-American codes regard excerpts or selections from a work to be a manifestation of that work.

CONDITION: Contraction of work

TYPE: Chrestomathies, excerpts, extracts, selections

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
Panizzi	x			
Jewett	x			
Cutter 2-4	x			
Linderfelt			x	Same work if given without annotations in order to show the beauties and characteristics of an author's style.
1908 rules	x			
Prussian Inst.	x			

(1908)	
Fellows	x
(1922)	
Vatican	x
(1938)	
1941 rules	x
1949 rules	x
CCR 1956	x
CCR 1958	x
CCR 1960	x
CCR 1961	x
AACR1	x
AACR2	x
AACR2R	x

c. Change in the substance of a work: adaptation, dramatization,
free translation, novelization, paraphrase, versification,
film or filmstrip of text

As can be seen from the following tables, early Anglo-American codes considered adaptations to be manifestations of the original work. With the 1941 rules, this began to change, as catalogers were asked to determine the degree of kinship between an adaptation and the original work. Lubetzky toyed with the idea of letting the decision rest on representation, and then decided that the rewriting or reconstruction involved in adaptation resulted in a new work. This has been the approach taken in both AACR's. It is interesting

to note that this relatively recent approach to textual adaptation goes back to the 1908 rules when concerning musical adaptation. (See second table below.)

CONDITION: Change in the substance of a work

TYPE: Adaptation, dramatization, free translation, novelization, paraphrase,
versification

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
Cutter 1-4	x			
Linderfelt	x			
1908 rules	x			
Vatican (1938)		x		
Bodleian 1939		x		
1941 rules			x	Same work unless bears slight kinship with the original work or has become a classic in its own right. Dramatization is new work.
1949 rules			x	Same as 1941 rules. In addition, novelization is new work.
<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
CCR 1956			x	Same work if intended as a representation of original work; new work if intended as one based on or otherwise related to original work.
CCR 1958		x		
CCR 1960		x		

CCR 1961	x	Translation of poetry into prose is excepted. A free translation is the same work if represented as the work of the original author, a new work if represented as the work of the translator.
AACR1	x	
AACR1, Chap. 12	x	
AACR2	x	
AACR2R	x	

CONDITION: Change in substance of the work

TYPE: Adaptation (Music), free transcription, paraphrase, variations

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
Jewett (1852)	x			
1908 rules		x		
Bodleian 1939		x		
1941 rules		x		
1949 rules		x		
AACR1		x		
AACR2		x		
AACR2R		x		

d. Change in the substance of a work: (music) arrangement
amplification, setting, simplification, trans-
cription, version

It can be seen from the following table that prior to the 1940's arrangement of music was not considered sufficient to create a new work. From the 1940's on, various criteria were developed to determine when differences between arrangement and original were so marked as to create a new work.

CONDITION: Change in substance of work

TYPE: Arrangement (Music), amplification, setting, simplification, transcription, version

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
Jewett 1852	x			
1908 rules	x			
Vatican (1938)	x			
Bodleian 1939			x	Arrangement is same work; transcription is different work.
1941 rules			x	New work if marked difference in length, changes in key, marked differences in harmonization. Same work if change is mere addition of embellishments (trills, runs, and passage work).
1949 rules			x	Same as 1941 with ad-

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
AACR1			x	dition of criterion of introduction of new thematic material for new work. New work if described as "freely transcribed," "based on," etc., if it is known that extensive new material has been introduced, or that the harmony or musical style of the original has been substantially altered.
AACR2			x	New work if distinct alteration, paraphrase or merely based on other music.
AACR2R			x	Same as AACR2

e. Change in the substance of a work: Parodies, imitations

It can be seen from the following table that Anglo-American codes have never considered parodies or imitations to be manifestations of the work parodied or imitated. Only during the 1940's was it considered necessary to have a specific rule to cover these types of works.

CONDITION: Change in substance of work

TYPE: Parodies, imitations

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
Vatican (1938)			x	

Bodleian 1939 1941 rules	x	
1949 rules	x	
CCR 1956	x	Not specifically mentioned
CCR 1958	x	"
CCR 1960	x	"
CCR 1961	x	"
AACR1	x	"
AACR2	x	"
AACR2R	x	"

f. Change in the substance of a work: performance

It wasn't until the 1950's that the rules began to deal with performances on films and sound recordings. From the beginning, a performance on a sound recording was considered to be the same work as the musical or textual work performed, while a performance on film or video usually was not; in the latter case, across-the-board title entry gave way gradually to the use of the same rules for choice of entry as were applied to monographs, but usually the result was still title entry, since the production functions and performance functions combined usually constituted the condition of diffuse authorship calling for entry under title. Lubetzky was the first to suggest that performers be considered the authors of

collections of works by a number of different authors with a single performer. AACR2 introduced the entry under performer of works produced by means of a combination of performance and improvisation. This is somewhat akin to the entry under adapter of an adaptation.

CONDITION: Change in substance of work

TYPE: Performance

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
RDC. Motion pictures, 1953		x		
RDC. Phonorecords, 1964	x			
CCR 1960			x	Performer as author of sound recording collections.
AACR1 Mot. pict. Sd. rec.	x	x		
AACR2			x	Performer as author of sound recording collections. Performer/improviser as author.
Mot. pict. Sd. rec.	x	x		
AACR2R				Same as AACR2.

g. Change in the substance of a work: Reproduction of art works

It can be seen from the following table that until special rules for pictorial materials were developed at the Library of Congress in the 1950's, reproductions of art works, whether in the same or a different medium, were treated as the same work as the work reproduced.

Since the development of special rules, change in medium, such as the change from painting to etching or lithograph, with a different artist responsible for the etching or lithograph, has been considered to cause the creation of a new work. Photography has not been considered a `medium' in this sense, since a photograph or photomechanical reproduction is still considered the same work as the work reproduced.

CONDITION: Change in substance of work

TYPE: Reproduction of art works

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
Cutter 1-4	x			
Linderfelt	x			
1908 rules	x			
Prussian Inst. (1908)	x			
Fellows (1922)	x			
Vatican (1938)	x			
1941 rules	x			
1949 rules	x			
RDC. Pictures, etc. 1959		x		Photographic, photo- mechanical or mecha- nical reproduction or copy in the same medium is same work. Adaptation in diff. medium is diff. work. Option: all are same work.

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
AACR1			x	Adaptation from one medium of the graphic arts to another is a new work. Reproduction of the work of an artist is the same work (e.g. photograph or photomechanical reproduction).
AACR2			x	Same as AACR1
AACR2R			x	Same as AACR1

h. Change in the substance of a work: revision, editing,
enlargement, expansion, updating

From the time of Cutter, it has been considered that some types of revision can create "substantially a new work." It is interesting to compare the relatively early development of these rules with the relatively late development of rules for treating adaptations as different works. The constant change from code to code of the criteria to be applied in determining whether or not a revision constitutes a new work would seem to indicate that catalogers had difficulty with decision-making about this condition. It can be seen that the application of the criterion of representation to this condition goes back to Cutter. The introduction by Linderfelt, based on Dziatzko, of the concept of change in title of a revision entered under title constituting change of work may be a foreshadowing of successive entry for serials, although in a sense it needed no introduction, since the Anglo-American rules did not call for uniform titles for any works entered under title other than anonymous classics and sacred books.

CONDITION: Change in substance of work

TYPE: Revision, editing, enlargement, expansion, updating

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
Jewett	x			
Cutter 2-4			x	Criteria for judging whether or not it has become "substantially a new work": whether or not the revision is counted as one of the editions of the original work; whether it is described on the title page as the work of the original author or the reviser; how it is described in the preface.
Linderfelt			x	Author named first on t.p.; whether counted in number of editions. If entered under title, and title changes, different works.
1908 rules			x	Cataloger to judge whether "substantially a new work;" no explicit criteria given. If entered under title and title changes, different work.
Prussian Inst. (1908)			x	New work if varies so strongly from orig. work it is to be regarded as independent work. Composition of

				the title is taken into account. New work if entered under title and title changes. If entered under same author, but title changes, editions are not filed together under author.
Vatican (1938)			x	Cataloger to judge if "substantially a new and original work." If entered under title and title changes, new work.
1941 rules			x	Cataloger to judge if "substantially a new work." If entered under title and title changes, new work.
<u>CODE:</u> 1949 rules	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u> x	<u>CRITERIA</u> Same work if "work remains substantially that of the original author, especially if it purports to be an edition of his work." If entered under title and title changes, new work.
CCR 1956			x	Same work if "intended as a representation of" the original work; diff. work if "intended as one based on or otherwise related to" the original work. Works which may be prepared successively by different people to be entered under uniform title (i.e., same work).

CCR 1958			x	Same work if edited and issued with or without additions or omissions; different work if rewritten or reconstructed. Works which may be prepared successively by different people to be entered under uniform title (i.e. same work).
CCR 1960			x	Same work if issued under the name of the original author; different work if issued under the name of the reviser. Works of changing authorship entered under uniform title unless original author's name is included in the title (i.e., same work).
CCR 1961			x	Same work if represented as the work of the original author; different work if represented as the work of the reviser.
AACR1			x	New work if new edition clearly indicates it is no longer the work of the original author. Uniform titles (optional anyway) specifically not used for editions purporting to be revised or updated (i.e., different work if title changes).

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
AACR2			x	Same work if original author named in a statement of responsibility or in the

			title or if the chief source indicates the original author is still considered to be responsible for the work. New work if not as above, or if title changes, other than by translation.
AACR2R	x		Revision to remove the criterion of the original author's name in the title as evidence that it is the same work.

i. Change in the substance of a work: translation

The following table may be somewhat deceptive in its implication that, from the 1908 rules on, some decision-making was required to determine if a translation were a new work. In fact, the treatment of a translation as a manifestation of the work translated is solidly entrenched in Anglo-American tradition. The reason not all translations were in fact treated as the same work was that the codes did not have rules for uniform titles for works entered under title (so-called anonymous works), unless the works were sacred books or classics. Thus translations entered under author were given the same main entry as the originals, according to our operational definition, but translations entered under title were not.

CONDITION: Change in substance of work

TYPE: Translation

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
Panizzi	x			
Jewett	x			

Cutter 1-4 x

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
Lib. Assoc. 1883	x			
ALA condensed 1889	x			
Bodleian 1889	x			Full entry under both author and translator
Linderfelt			x	Same work unless it is a revised edition entered under title, with title change, which is diff. work.
Dewey 1890	x			Bibles are entered under editor or translator so as not to duplicate the grouping under 'Bible' in the subject catalog.
1908 rules			x	Same work unless entered under title with title change. Exception: Sacred books and anonymous classics (epics, national folk tales) given uniform titles, i.e. same work.
Prussian Inst. (1908)			x	Translations which have independent significance, e.g. as linguistic landmarks are different works. Translations of works entered under title which have been revised are different works.
Fellows 1922			x	Same as 1908 rules.
Vatican			x	Same as 1908 rules.

(1938)				
Bodleian			x	Same as 1908 rules.
1939				
1941 rules			x	Same as 1908 rules.
1949 rules			x	Same as 1908 rules.
CCR 1956	x			
CCR 1958	x			
CCR 1960	x			
CCR 1961	x			Optionally works entered under title are different works (i.e. if uniform title option is not followed).

<u>CODE:</u>	<u>SAME WORK</u>	<u>DIFF. WORK</u>	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
AACR1			x	Revised translations entered under title are not the same work; optionally works entered under title are different works (i.e. if uniform title option is not followed).
AACR2			x	Optionally works entered under title are different works (i.e. if uniform title option is not followed).
AACR2R				Same as AACR2.
KEY:				
Panizzi	Panizzi's 91 Rules. In: Brault, Nancy. <u>The Great Debate on Panizzi's Rules in 1847-1849</u> . Los Angeles: The School of Library Service and the University Library, 1972.			
Jewett	Jewett, Charles Coffin. "On the Construction of Catalogs." 2nd ed. 1853. In: <u>Charles Coffin Jewett and American Librarianship, 1841-1868</u> . Ed. by Michael H. Harris. Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1975. 131-155.			

- Cutter1 Cutter, Charles A. "Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue." In: Public Libraries in the United States of America: Their History, Condition and Management: Special Report, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education. Part II. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1876. 3-89.
- Cutter2 Cutter, Charles A. Rules for a Dictionary Catalog. 2nd ed. with corrections and additions. Special Report on
on Public Libraries (U.S. Bureau of Education) 2. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1889.
- Cutter3 Cutter, Charles A. Rules for a Dictionary Catalog. 3rd ed. with corrections and additions and an
alphabetical index. Special Report on Public Libraries (U.S. Bureau of Education) 2. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1891.
- Cutter4 Cutter, Charles A. Rules for a Dictionary Catalog. 4th ed., rewritten. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off.,
1904.
- LA 1883 Library Association of the United Kingdom. "Cataloguing Rules of the Library Association of the United Kingdom (as revised at Liverpool, 1883)." Library Chronicle 2 (1885): 25-28.
- Bodleian 1889 Appendix I in: Cutter, Charles A. Rules for a Dictionary Catalog. 2nd ed. with corrections and additions. Special Report on Public Libraries (U.S. Bureau of Education) 2. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1889.
- ALA 1889 Appendix I in: Cutter, Charles A. Rules for a Dictionary Catalog. 2nd ed. with corrections and additions. Special Report on Public Libraries (U.S. Bureau of Education) 2. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1889.
- Wheatley Wheatley, H.B. How to catalogue a library. London: Stock, 1889.
- Linderfelt Linderfelt, Klas August. Eclectic Card Catalog Rules. Boston: Charles A. Cutter, 1890.
- Dewey 1890 Dewey, Melvil. Library School Card Catalog Rules. 3rd ed. rev. Boston: Library Bureau, 1890.
- ALA 1902 American Library Association. Advisory Catalog Committee. Condensed Rules for an Author and Title Catalog. Rev. ed. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1902.
- ALA 1904 American Library Association. Advisory Catalog Committee. Condensed Rules for an Author and Title Catalog. Rev. ed. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1904.
- 1908 rules American Library Association. Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries. American ed. Boston, Mass.: American Library Association, Publishing Board, 1908.
- Prussian Inst. The Prussian Instructions: Rules for the Alphabetical Catalogs of the Prussian Libraries. Transl. from the
2nd ed. with an introd. and notes by Andrew D. Osborn. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press,
(1908) 1938.
- Fellows (1922) Fellows, Dorcas. Cataloging Rules with Explanations and Illustrations. 2nd ed., rev. and enl. New York:
H.W. Wilson, 1922.
- Vatican (1938) Vatican Library. Rules for the Catalog of Printed Books. Transl. from the 2nd Italian ed. by Thomas J. Shanahan et al., ed., Wyllys E. Wright. Chicago: American Library Association, 1948.
- Bodleian 1939 Bodleian Library. Cataloguing Rules. Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1939.
- 1941 rules American Library Association. Catalog Code Revision Committee. A.L.A. Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries. Prelim. American 2nd ed. Chicago: American Library Association, 1941.
- 1949 rules American Library Association. Division of Cataloging and Classification. A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for
Author
and Title Entries. 2nd ed. ed. by Clara Beetle. Chicago: American Library Association, 1949.
- RDC, motion Library of Congress. Descriptive Cataloging Division. Rules
pictures,
1953
for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress. Motion
Pictures and Filmstrips. 2nd prelim. ed. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Descriptive Cataloging Division, 1953.
- RDC, phono- Library of Congress. Descriptive Cataloging Division. Rules
records,
1964
for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress. Phono-
records. 2nd prelim. ed. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Descriptive Cataloging Division, 1964.
- RDC, pic- Library of Congress. Descriptive Cataloging Division. Rules
tures,
for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress. Pic-

- 1959 tures, Designs and Other Two-dimensional Representations.
Prelim. ed. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Descriptive Cataloging Division, 1959.
- CCR 1956 Lubetzky, Seymour. Code for Cataloging: Authors and Titles. Rev. ed., partial draft. American Library Association, Code Revision Committee, Dec. 1956.
- CCR 1958 Lubetzky, Seymour. Code of Cataloging Rules: Bibliographic Entry and Description: a Partial and Tentative Draft for a New Edition of Bibliographic Cataloging Rules Prepared for the Catalog Code Revision Committee. Chicago: American Library Association, Catalog Code Revision Committee, June, 1958.
- CCR 1960 Lubetzky, Seymour. Code of Cataloging Rules: Author and Title Entry. an unfinished draft. Chicago: American Library Association, 1960.
- CCR 1961 Lubetzky, Seymour. Code of Cataloging Rules: Author and Title Entry: Additions, Revisions and Changes Prepared in Light of Discussions of the March 1960 Draft for Consideration of the Catalog Code Revision Committee. Chicago: American Library Association, Sept. 1961.
- AACR1 Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. North American text. Chicago: American Library Association, 1967.
- AACR1, Chap. 12 Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. North American text. Chapter 12. Chicago: American Library Association, 1975.
- AACR2 Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. 2nd ed. Chicago: American Library Association, 1978.
- AACR2R Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. 2nd ed., 1988 Revision. Chicago: American Library Association, 1988.

SUMMARY

In this article (Part 2), we have considered the conditions of contraction of a work, and change in the substance of a work. In Part 3, we will continue to look at Anglo-American cataloging codes to see how they have treated the following conditions: 1) same work with different appendages; 2) separately published parts of a work produced by the exercise of several different functions; 3) appendages to a work published separately; 4) change in title of a work.