

---

# Rethinking the Authorship Principle

RICHARD P. SMIRAGLIA AND HUR-LI LEE

---

## ABSTRACT

The fundamental principle of order in the library catalogue is the authorship principle, which serves as the organizing node of an alphabetic-classed system, in which “texts” of “works” are organized first alphabetically by uniform title of the progenitor work and then are subarranged using titles for variant instantiations, under the heading for an “author.” We analyze case studies of entries from (1) the first documented imperial library catalogue, the *Seven Epitomes* (*Qilue* [七略]), in China; (2) Abelard’s *Works*, which featured prominently in the 1848 testimony of Antonio Panizzi; and (3) *The French Chef* and the large family of instantiated works associated with it. Our analysis shows that the catalogue typically contains many large superwork sets. A more pragmatic approach to the design of catalogues is to array descriptions of resources in relation to the superwork sets to which they might belong. In all cases, a multi-dimensional faceted arrangement incorporating ideational nodes from the universe of recorded knowledge holds promise for greatly enhanced retrieval capability.

## INTRODUCTION

The fundamental principle of order in the library catalogue at present is the authorship principle. The notion of authorship serves as the organizing node of an alphabetic-classed system, in which “texts” of “works” are organized first alphabetically by uniform title of the progenitor work and then are subarranged using titles for variant instantiations, under the heading for an “author.” Recently, the epistemic presumptions of authorship, which underlie this arrangement, have been examined from bibliographical, sociocultural, and philosophical bases, using evidence from antiquity (both Greek and Chinese), as well as from the history of the evo-

lution of cataloguing rules (Smiraglia, Lee, & Olson, 2010, 2011). Knowledge, especially knowledge expressed in the form of works, is socially constructed and culturally moderated such that “authors” facilitate discourse. The tradition of the authorship principle in the library catalogue affects discourse through its ubiquitous influence on bibliography and scholarship. Attribution is seen as a form of cultural classification, in which the label—the name of an “author”—becomes the name of a class of discourse. The tension that arises between cultural classification and simple attribution has fueled pendulum swings in the evolution of cataloguing rules.

The Western alphabetic-classed system underlying catalogues developed from the mid-nineteenth century (Panizzi, Cutter, among others). Analysis of Anglo-American cataloguing codes from the 1908 ALA Code through the 1978 *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules 2nd edition (AACR2)* revealed a deterministic, almost obsessive approach to the imposition of an “author” whenever possible, even setting up a system of presumed alternatives that could be treated as “author” (Smiraglia, Lee, & Olson, 2010). But this system of assigning attribution is not simply identification, but rather is a form of labeling, a kind of cultural classification (Smiraglia, Lee, & Olson, 2011). The Western system relies, however, on a system of intellectual property that is being challenged socioculturally at present (Johns, 2009) and that is itself likely to experience revolutionary change. We wish to suggest that principles of order for intellectual resources should take factors other than authorship into account. In particular, we wish to highlight the cultural role of discourse.

For the future evolution of the catalogue, we propose an analysis based on case studies of entries from

- the first documented imperial library catalogue, the *Seven Epitomes (Qilue [七略])*, in China;
- Abelard’s *Works*, which featured prominently in the 1848 testimony of Antonio Panizzi concerning the British Museum catalogue, a bellwether development; and,
- *The French Chef*, including moving image material from the television program hosted by Julia Child and the large family of instantiated works associated with it.

We have chosen these cases deliberately, of course, for their value as complex superworks. Each is in essence a metaclass of aggregated works, which we believe will suggest new approaches to cultural discourse surrounding and encompassing intellectual resources. Each also has been the subject of case study in prior knowledge organization research, which means each has already been demonstrated as a rich source of empirical data.

THE CHINESE TRADITION: THE *SEVEN EPITOMES*

Moral authority takes supremacy in traditional Chinese bibliography. At the heart of Chinese bibliographic endeavors, identification of authorship that includes a description of authors' moral characters is a key requirement for superior bibliographies and library catalogues. Author names, however, have no influence over the bibliographic structure. We will explain by examining several entries in a monumental library catalogue held in high esteem by the Chinese: the *Seven Epitomes*.

The consensus in Chinese bibliography accepts the *Seven Epitomes* to be China's first classified library catalogue and the progenitor of the bibliographic model applied through the end of imperial China (Liu Z, 1998). This catalogue originated in a book collation project, beginning in 26 BCE and taking a large team of scholars and specialists twenty-some years to complete, that resulted in the formation of the imperial library of the inner court in the Former Han [前漢] dynasty (202 BCE–9 CE). During collation, the project directors Liu Xiang [劉向] (79–8 BCE) and his son Liu Xin [劉歆] (53 BCE–23 CE) composed a résumé for each collated book to include a range of information such as the title of the book, the physical roll or chapter count of the book, the table of contents, the collation details, the information about the author if available, and/or an assessment of the work. All the résumés, more than 600 in total (the exact number unknown), were later collected into a book titled the *Separate Résumés* (*Bielu* [別錄]). Liu Xin shortened the entries and arranged them according to an added classification when he transformed the résumés into a catalogue for the dynastic library titled the *Seven Epitomes* right before the beginning of the Common Era. Neither the *Separate Résumés* nor the *Seven Epitomes* is extant; however, the latter is believed to have survived in an abridgement as the “Bibliographic Treatise” of the *History of the Former Han Dynasty* (*Hanshu Yiwén zhì* [漢書藝文志]; “Han Treatise” hereafter), a first-century text by Ban Gu [班固] (32–92) (Ban, 1972). The following analysis is carried out through an examination of an authoritative version of both bibliographic works reconstructed by Yao Zhenzong [姚振宗] (1842–1906), which uses the Han Treatise as the backbone, republished recently (Liu Xiang, 2008; Liu Xin, 2008).

In the field of Chinese bibliography, majority scholars believe that the classificatory structure, the included titles and their order (with a small number of noted exceptions), and partial bibliographic details in the original catalogue are retained in the reconstructed catalogue (Lai X, 1981). Still unclear is what detail in each entry had been removed by Ban Gu. Fortunately, eight of the original résumés have remained nearly intact (with four seemingly missing the table of contents and one abbreviated), which provide clues as to what might have been in the original catalogue (Liu Xiang, 2008). Among the eight, six identify an author whose name (respectful name) is used either as the entire title or part of the

title of the book. Some biographical information about each individual author is given, including variably the person's name (in one case, only the surname), hometown (where he was born and raised), the court(s) he served, accomplishments in office, meritorious or not-so-meritorious acts or past, and the origin or affiliation of his ideas. Five of the *résumés* briefly describe each author's ideas and assess their value according to the moral standard established in the Six Classics (i.e., six ancient texts titled the *Changes* [*Yi* 易], the *Documents* [*Shu* 書], the *Odes* [*Shi* 詩], the *Rites* [*Li* 禮], the *Music* [*Yue* 樂], and the *Spring and Autumn Annals* [*Chunqiu* 春秋]), the Han official literary canon.

Of the 600-plus entries in the *Seven Epitomes*, many have their authors' names in the titles in various forms. The division of the *Changes*, for example, has twenty entries, fifteen of which include author names in their titles, and another one includes names in its annotation. (There has been no consensus on how to count entries, and the number of twenty reflects the total number of titles recorded.) Credible historical documents reveal, also supported by one of the surviving *résumés*, that the collation team at times compiled new books from previously separate pieces of writing and that new titles were given to those books and possibly many other previously untitled works, including some whose given titles contain the authors' names (Shaughnessy, 2006). Quite a few entries include additional information about the authors, and eleven might have had a substantial biography similar to the ones in the aforementioned surviving *résumés* (Ban Gu removed it and gave a note under the entry pointing to the source for the biography). Given the fact that some bibliographic information known to be in the *résumés* and the catalogue is not in the Han Treatise and there are no references in the Han Treatise about such information, it may be surmised that Ban Gu deleted many such annotations from the catalogue without noting the deletion. Overall, such prominent use of authors' names in the titles and attachment of biographic information betray a significant effort by Liu Xiang and Liu Xin to identify authors with their works. On the other hand, some annotations voice doubt about authorship, sometimes for the entire work and other times just for part of the work—also testifying to a preoccupation with authorship identification.

One of the Six Classics, the *Changes*, may serve as an excellent example of a superwork for explaining the concept of authorship as conceived by Liu Xiang and Liu Xin. We will use the title *The Classic of Changes* (i.e., *Yi jing* [易經]), as in some translations and as in the catalogue itself, in the following discussion to avoid confusion with the division. In the *Seven Epitomes*, the first main class in its classification (i.e., the Epitome of the Six Arts [六藝略]) is devoted to the Six Classics, each of which occupies one division in the class with *The Changes* at the top. *The Changes* opens with an entry under *The Classic of Changes* and then lists nineteen other works.

An analysis of the twenty entries reveals three general types of authorship among them: composer of the text, transmitter, and patron. Liu Xin attributes the authorship of various parts of *The Classic of Changes* to three individuals separated in time: Fu Xi [宓戲] (legendary ruler, ca. 2900–2800 BCE), King Wen [文王] (founder and first ruler of the Zhou dynasty, ca. 1200 BCE), and Confucius [孔子] (551–479 BCE) (Liu Xin, 2008, p. 92). He also gives the surnames of three transmitters (i.e., Shi [施], Meng [孟], and Liangqiu [梁丘]) under the entry for *The Classic of Changes*, indicating three versions of the text (Liu Xin, 2008, p. 109). The last category of authorship is shown in the entry of the *Yi zhuan Huainan dao xun* [易傳淮南道訓] (Liu Xin, 2008, p. 111). “Huainan” in the title refers to Prince Huainan [淮南王] (named Liu An [劉安], 179–122 BCE) who is said in the annotation to be the patron who commissioned nine scholars to write exegeses of *The Classic of Changes* for the anthology. Except for the first entry that represents *The Classic of Changes*, the remaining nineteen works in the division are all exegeses of the classic text. Fourteen of the exegetic works have the exegete identified in their titles. Most interestingly, three of those titles include two names (Liu Xin, 2008, p. 111). Later scholars such as Yao Zhenzong conjecture that the second person named in each of those titles might have been the actual exegete who attempted to accent his scholarly pedigree by including in the title the name of a well-known scholar specializing in *The Classic of Changes*.

A further analysis of other parts of the catalogue identifies another group of authors—editors who created a collection of texts through compiling and editing separate works by one or multiple writers. One distinguished editor is Confucius, who is credited in the catalogue as the editor of *The Documents* and *The Odes* (Liu Xin, 2008, pp. 93, 94). For the *Analects* (*Lunyu* [論語]), the catalogue explains that this anthology consists of the notes taken by Confucius’s students to document his teachings and that some of his students, unnamed, compiled the anthology after his death (Liu Xin, 2008, p. 96). These few statements concerning editorship in the catalogue do not recognize the intellectual voice of the editors in the collected works. In Chinese intellectual history, the compiler of a work is in theory merely a transmitter whose duty is to pass on the intellectual contents of the work intended by the author without alteration. Confucius has famously described himself to be a faithful transmitter of classical texts, not an author (Confucius, 1983, p. 57).

The deep conviction of authorship identification demonstrated in the *Seven Epitomes* does not extend into an organizing principle. That is, Author or Title in no manner serves a function in organizing entries for retrieval. The only retrieval mechanism in the catalogue is a classification that is predominantly a ranking system of moral values (for all principles applied in the catalogue, see Lee, 2012). Classification seemed to be the only organizing method applied in early Chinese bibliographic and refer-

ence works, including dictionaries such as the *Er ya* [爾雅] (before the first century BCE) and the *Shuo wen jie zi* [說文解字] by Xu Shen [許慎] (the early second century). Indexing by title or author first appeared in the Tang [唐] dynasty (618–907), but its application to bibliography occurred much later than that (Qiao, 1992). In 136 BCE, Emperor Wu [武帝] of the Former Han instituted a policy to officially canonize the Six Classics inaugurating a 2,000-year exaltation of classicism (*rushu* [儒術]) throughout imperial China (Lewis, 1999). Han classicism is fundamentally a doctrine that upholds ethical ideals imparted in the Six Classics. As a devout classicist, Liu Xin devised the classification for the catalogue according to classicist values with an intention to influence government policy as well as to guide students pursuing the formal education required for all who aspired to office. The descriptions of an author's moral character and acts are no doubt indispensable in a classification of moral rankings.

In the *Seven Epitomes*, the classification consists of six main classes: Epitome of the Six Arts (Liuyi lue [六藝略]), Epitome of the Masters (Zhuzi lue [諸子略]), Epitome of Lyrics and Rhapsodies (Shifu lue [詩賦略]), Epitome of Military Texts (Bingshu lue [兵書略]), Epitome of Divination and Numbers (Shushu lue [術數略]), and Epitome of Formulae and Techniques (Fangji lue [方技略]). Multiple works by the same author are not collocated in one class or one division precisely because classicist moral values, rather than authorship, determine where a work belongs in the catalogue (for a more detailed discussion of its classification, see Lee & Lan, 2011). Works by Xun zi (荀子, 313–238 BCE), for example, appear in two places in the catalogue: a collection of primarily his expository works titled the *Sun qing zi* [孫卿子] in the Epitome of the Masters and an anthology of poetic writings in the Epitome of Lyrics and Rhapsodies (Liu Xin, 2008, pp. 129 and 160). In other words, an author's personal moral character does not directly translate into the moral values contained in all his works. A work is evaluated on its own merit, and then its author's biography helps illuminate the work's contents.

Based on this analysis, it is clear that the *Seven Epitomes* conveys the idea of an author as a moral voice. It is evidenced by the cataloguers' efforts in identifying authors and providing biographic information, some quite substantial. That moral voice of an author manifests in writings of various moral values that in turn are placed within the entire moral world in a hierarchical structure understood through a classicist lens.

#### PANIZZI, ABELARD'S *Works*, CEMENTING THE ANGLO-AMERICAN TRADITION

Much of what we now recognize as tradition in Anglo-American cataloguing practice comes from the mid-nineteenth-century evolution of major library catalogues at the British Museum and the Smithsonian Institution

and from Charles Cutter's late-nineteenth-century amalgamation of what was considered best-practice for the nascent dictionary catalogue (Strout, 1956). In particular, and although divergent practices emerged, it is from Panizzi's production of rules for the British Museum catalogue, and his various testimonies during the development of those rules, that the practice of organizing works, over and against the practice of organizing books, emerged. That is, it is from Panizzi that we see at this early stage an emphasis on creating useful catalogue entries that, apart from title transcription, supply sufficient information about editions, editors, translations, and intellectual content (see Smiraglia, 2001, pp. 17–18). Much of what would become the traditional alphabetico-classed structure of a file headed by a named author, and subdivided by titles of the authors' works (with each of these subdivisions populated by varying editions and translations of the works) is explained by Panizzi in his letter to the Right Honorable the Earl of Ellesmere (1985). Attempting to explain a potential bibliographical miasma to a layman, Panizzi uses as an example a sort of excursion through various libraries, in which he seeks a specific edition of the works of Abelard but is constantly frustrated by divergent practices of transcription and order.

Panizzi begins with a set of six transcriptions from these varying catalogues; these are shown here in table 1.

With this simple example we can see at once how Panizzi uses the authorship principle to form a class named ABÆLARDUS, with, in this case, a division "Opera" populated by the editions. Although Panizzi uses the example to make several points unrelated to our research, he does use the example to discuss the utility of naming the class "ABÆLARDUS." In fact, Panizzi explains how the author's name forms a class in the alphabetical catalogue (1985, p. 22):

The name of Alphabetical Catalogue is now universally applied to that kind of catalogue in which the titles of books are arranged in the al-

Table 1. Abelard's *Works*

---

I. Abælard's Works

II. ABÆLARDUS.	Opera et Epistolis ejus et Heloisæ. 4°.
III. ABÆLARDUS.	Opera ejus et Heloisæ Abbatissæ conjugis ipsius. 4°. <i>Par.</i> 1616.
IV. ABÆLARDUS.	Epistolæ ejus et Heloisæ, ed. a R. Rawlinson. <i>Lond.</i> 1718. 8°.
V. ABÆLARDUS.	Epistolæ ejus et Heloisæ, cum codd. MSS. Collat. Per Ric. Rawlinson. 8°. <i>Lond.</i> 1718.
VI. ABÆLARDUS.	Opera, et Heloisæ, Conjugis ipsius, cœnobii Paraditensis Abbatissæ; cum præfatione Apologetica pro PETRO ABÆLARDO per FRANCISCUM AMBÆSIUM ( <i>andream Quercetanium</i> ) et censura Doctorum Parisiensium, in lucem edita, studio ejusdem Andreæ Quercetani; cum indice. 4°. <i>Parisiis</i> , 1616.

---

From Panizzi (1985, pp. 19–20).

phabetical order of the surname of the author, which surname is taken as a heading; and whenever no surname of the author occurs, some other word is taken as a heading, which is arranged in its proper place with the surnames of authors, in alphabetical order.

This is preferable, for Panizzi, because of its usefulness in immediate location of a class of works under a known name, which is much more useful for its immediate alphabetical accessibility than a classified arrangement, in which Abelard might be simply a member of a larger class of "Fathers. XII. Cent." (Panizzi, 1985, p. 22).

The problem Panizzi uses this example to illustrate is the inadequate transcription of titles, which leads to confusion. In fact, in Panizzi's excursion, there are two editions, one that includes a preface by Duchesne and one that does not. However, the transcriptions are not sufficiently clear, and in one case an edition with the preface does not so indicate, and in another, the preface is indicated but not actually present (1985, p. 21, emphasis original):

A "full and accurate" catalogue informs us that there are two sorts of copies of this edition: one with the "Præfatio apologetica," without the name of Duchesne, who, *it is said*, wrote it; and another, *without* that Præfatio, but *with* Duchesne's name.

This, of course, raises for our purposes the issue of intellectual responsibility inhering in the volume under consideration, which contains not only works by Abelard but also works by his ill-fated companion, Heloise, as well as the commentary by Duchesne, an expanded commentary by François d'Amboise, all eventually edited by Rawlinson. In fact, intellectual responsibility is diverse in this case, which makes the attribution to Abelard even more distinctly one of collocating device, or class, rather than mere attribution.

To close out our case study, we gathered bibliographic descriptions of all volumes identified as Abelard's *Works* from the OCLC WorldCat. Twenty-five instantiations were identified, and descriptions of these are arrayed in table 2. Note that Panizzi's system is here fully in evidence, with all of these works gathered under the authorized heading for Abelard found in the Library of Congress Name Authority File: Abelard, Peter, 1079–1142, accompanied by the AACR2-designated uniform title "Works," the editions further subdivided by original date as well as language of presentation. After sorting the entries, we found eight author-uniform title headings organizing the instantiations, including microforms and electronic resources. Still, this impressive mixture is kept together as an alphabetical class by the common attribution "Abelard's Works."

Table 2. Abelard's *Works* in the WorldCat

<i>AACR2</i> Heading	Title Transcription	Details of Publication	Note on Instantiation
Abelard, Peter, 1079–1142. Works. 1849	Opera hactenus seorsim edita nunc primum in unum collegit, &c. / \$c Victor Cousin.	Parisiis: 1849.	Microfilm. Notre Dame, Ind: University Libraries, filmed February 1992. Electronic reproduction. [S.l.]: HathiTrust Digital Library, 2010.
Abelard, Peter, 1079–1142. Works. 1855	Petri Abælardi Abbatis Rugensis opera omnia: juxta editionem Parisiensem anni 1626, suppletis quæ in ea desiderabantur opusculis; accedunt Hilarii et Berengarii Abælardi discipulorum opuscula et epistolæ accurate J.-P. Migne.	[Paris]: Excudebatur et venit apud J.-P. Migne, 1855.	
Abelard, Peter, 1079–1142. Works. 1885	Opera omnia: Juxta editionem parisiensem anni 1626, suppletis quæ in ea desiderabantur opusculis accedunt Hilarii et Berengarii, Abaelardi discipulorum opuscula et epistolæ; accurate J. P. Migue.	Paris: Garnier, 1885.	Photoreproduc- tion. Ann Arbor, Mich: University Microfilms, 1978.
Abelard, Peter, 1079–1142. Works. 1970	Opera Petrus Abaelardus ; hactenus seorsim edita nunc primum in unum collegit textum ad fidem librorum editorum scriptorumque recensuit notas, argumenta, indices.	Hildesheim, New York: G. Olms, 1970.	“Reprografischer Nachdruck der Ausgabe Paris 1849-1859.”  Electronic reproduction. Charlottesville, Va: Intelix, 2008.
Abelard, Peter, 1079–1142. Works. 1979	Petri Abælardi Abbatis Rugensis opera omnia: juxta editionem Parisiensem anni 1626, suppletis quæ in ea desiderabantur opusculis: accedunt Hilarii et Berengarii Abælardi discipulorum opuscula et epistolæ accurate J.-P. Migne.	Turnhout: Brepols, 1979.	

*(continued)*

Table 2 (continued)

AACR2 Heading	Title Transcription	Details of Publication	Note on Instantiation
Abelard, Peter, 1079-1142. Works. Latin. 1616	Filosofi et theologi, Abbatis Ruyensis et Heloisae coniugis eius, primae paracletensis abbatissae. Opera Petri Abaelardi ... nunc primum edita ex mms. codd. V. illust. Francisci Amboesii ... cum eiusdem praefatione apologetica, & censura doctorum, Parisiensium.	Parisiis: Nicolai Buon, 1616.	
Abelard, Peter, 1079-1142. Works. Latin. 2008	Peter Abelard: Opera	Charlottesville, Va: IntelLex Corporation, 2008.	Electronic resource: reprint of the 1849-1859 ed. published by A. Durand, Paris.
Abelard, Peter, 1079-1142. Works. Russian. 1783	Sobranie pisem.	1783.	Microfilm.

## THE FRENCH CHEF

Our final case comes from the late twentieth century, and has been chosen because of its inherent diversity both in intellectual responsibility and in the variety of instantiations extant. *The French Chef* was Julia Child's iconic public television cooking show from the 1960s. Designed to demonstrate to home cooks the possibilities of cooking with fresh ingredients using traditional techniques, the program premiered on Boston's WGBH public television station in 1963. An immediate success, despite its shoestring production, the program remained on the air until 1973, with progressively more impressive production values, including music and scenery, but also was responsible for developing the now ubiquitous (on food television) overhead camera shot that could demonstrate the action of a cook's hands or in a pot. The episodes of the television series were produced by Russell Morash or Ruth Lockwood and directed by several people, including Morash. Music by John Morris was used as well. As success drove the increasingly sophisticated development of episodes, more people contributed to the intellectual responsibility of the production.

The origins of the program were demonstrations Child developed based on *Mastering the Art of French Cooking*, which she had coauthored with Simone Beck and Louisette Bertholle. The program eventually spawned a cookbook titled *The French Chef Cookbook*, with illustrations by Child's husband Paul. There is some correspondence between the two

cookbooks, which is to say the same text appears in each in a few places, so there is a direct semantic relationship as well as a clear ideational relationship. Of course, *The French Chef Cookbook* closely follows the recorded episodes of the television show, and thus a clear ideational and semantic relationship exists here as well. A check of the OCLC WorldCat shows that this book has been digitized as well as translated into several other languages. The multiplicity of instantiations of each makes up this superwork set, which is a fairly typical multimedia product of late twentieth-century origin.

Immediately apparent is the complexity of the superwork set, which has its origins in the progenitor work by Child, Beck, and Bertholle. There are three essential nodes in the set:

- *Mastering the Art of French Cooking*—by Julia Child, Louisette Bertholle, and Simone Beck and with illustrations by Sidonie Coryn
- *The French Chef with Julia Child*—the television series
- *The French Chef Cookbook*

Each node in the superwork set is itself the progenitor of associated instantiations, such as translations, new editions and digitizations of the books, various film and video instantiations of the television episodes, and even promotional booklets produced by Milwaukee's Sentry Foods, containing recipes from the series. Furthermore, Julia Child and the major components of this superwork set are also in a sense cultural catalysts for evolution of such related works as the 2009 motion picture *Julie & Julia* and even the famous *Saturday Night Live* skits by Dan Aykroyd. While all nodes in this superwork set share semantic and ideational content—including the recipes—there is no clear sense of authorship, per se. While it is clear that Julia Child is the catalyst for the creation and evolution of the superwork set, it is also clear that she is not the “author” of most of the instantiated resources. Rather, she represents a useful historical anchor, her name allowing us to tie together these diverse entities, not unlike the use of an honorific to arrange classical texts.

## CONCLUSIONS

Our analysis reveals that even across time and culture, the catalogue is continually made up of collections of instantiated resources that form superwork sets. The term “superwork” was coined by Svenonius (2000, p. 38) and is used to represent the totality of works and their instantiations that can be associated with a common intellectual origin (Smiraglia, 2007). Research has indicated that the makeup of catalogues conforms roughly to Lotka's Law, in that a significant minority of works, roughly one third, make up superwork sets, while the remaining two-thirds are single one-time publications (Smiraglia, 2001, p. 37). Superworks have typically been represented by some form of author-title heading in the

Anglo-American tradition, following a pattern derived from Cutter and Lubetzky (Smiraglia, Lee, & Olson, 2011, p. 4). The result of this practice is a set of alphabetic-classed headings such as those for Abelard displayed in table 2 earlier.

In all of the cases we have examined here, the individual authors clearly have been associated with the works under study but not as sole creator or even as deliberate source of intellectual responsibility. Rather, cultural discourse has in every case assigned an iconic role to the authors, such that they are associated with the works, rather in the manner that we might interpret the subject of a work to be associated with it. That is, the authors in our cases represent not so much sole creators as much as they represent important factual matter associated with the works. Authorship does not manifest itself in these cases as an organizing principle functioning to collocate entries for retrieval. Rather, we see the names of authors associated with the identifier for a class of semantically and ideationally related works—i.e., members of a superwork set.

This suggests a more pragmatic approach to the design of catalogues is to array descriptions of resources in relation to the superwork sets to which they might belong. Identifiers for these sets might in some instances contain names of associated creators. The obsessive application of rules of attribution should be abandoned for a more culturally oriented system of identifiers—*The French Chef*, in other words, rather than Julia Child. It is no longer necessary for catalogues to consist only of lists of brief, formalized headings. Instead, it is quite possible for the catalogue to display an informative heuristic, such as “here are gathered resources related to *The French Chef*.” The single, one-time publications that make up the bulk of the catalogue are well-served by continued indexing that uses names of persons responsible for intellectual content and formal titles.

In all cases, a faceted arrangement holds promise for greatly enhanced retrieval capability. The empirically based object-oriented version of FRBR (Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records), *FRBRoo* (International Working Group, 2010), can provide identifiers for systematic orientation of resources as ideational members of resource sets, whether those sets are singletons or superwork sets. Combined with a faceted classification such as the UDC, such multidimensional faceted capabilities would make the most powerful use of our ability to analyze and document the ideational nodes in the universe of recorded knowledge (as has been suggested by Smiraglia, Heuvel, & Dousa, 2011). It is time to move past reliance on simple authorship attribution as the ordering principle of the catalogue.

## REFERENCES

- Ban G. [班固] (1972). *Hanshu* [漢書]. Taipei shi: Hongye.  
 Confucius. (1983). *The analects (Lun yü)* (D. C. Lau, Trans.). Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.

- International Working Group on FRBR and CIDOC CRM Harmonization. (2010). *FRBR object-oriented definition and mapping to FRBR<sub>ER</sub>* (Heraklion, Greece: ICS FORTH). Retrieved March 19, 2012, from [http://www.cidoc-crm.org/frbr\\_drafts.html](http://www.cidoc-crm.org/frbr_drafts.html)
- Johns, A. (2009). *Piracy: The intellectual property wars from Gutenberg to Gates*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lai X. [来新夏] (1981). *Gudian muluxue qianshuo* [古典目录学浅说]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Lee, H.-L. (2012). Epistemic foundation of bibliographic classification in Early China: A *ru* classicist perspective. *Journal of Documentation*, 68(3), 378–401.
- Lee, H.-L., & Lan, W.-C. (2011). Proclaiming intellectual authority through classification: The case of the *Seven Epitomes*. *Knowledge Organization*, 38(1), 25–42.
- Lewis, M. E. (1999). *Writing and authority in early China*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Liu Xiang. [劉向] (2008). *Qilue bielu yiwen* [七略別錄佚文] (Yao Zhenzong [姚振宗], Comp.; Deng Junjie [鄧駿捷], Ed. & Suppl.). With: Liu Xin. *Qilue yiwen*. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe.
- Liu Xin. [劉歆] (2008). *Qilue yiwen* [七略佚文] (Yao Zhenzong [姚振宗], Comp.; Deng Junjie [鄧駿捷], Ed. & Suppl.). With: Liu Xiang. *Qilue bielu yiwen*. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe.
- Liu Z. [劉兆祐] (1998). *Zhongguo muluxue* [中國目錄學] (1st ed.). Taipei: Wunan tushu chubanshe.
- Panizzi, A. (1985). Mr. Panizzi to the Right Hon. The Earl of Ellesmere.—British Museum, January 29, 1848. In M. Carpenter & E. Svenonius (Eds.), *Foundations of cataloguing: A sourcebook* (pp. 18–47). Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited. (Original work published 1848)
- Qiao H. [乔好勤] (1992). *Zhongguo muluxue shi* [中国目录学史]. Wuchang: Wuhandaxue chubanshe.
- Shaughnessy, E. L. (2006). *Rewriting early Chinese texts*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Smiraglia, R. P. (2001). Further progress toward theory in knowledge organization. *The Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*, 26(2/3), 30–49.
- Smiraglia, R. P. (2007). Bibliographic families and superworks. In A. G. Taylor (Ed.), *Understanding FRBR: What it is and how it will affect our retrieval tools* (pp. 73–86). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- Smiraglia, R. P., Heuvel, C. van den, & Dousa, T. (2011). Interactions between elementary structures in universes of knowledge. In A. Slavic, & E. Civallero (Eds.), *Classification & ontology: Formal approaches and access to knowledge: Proceedings of the International UDC Seminar 19–20 September 2011, The Hague, Netherlands* (pp. 25–40). Würzburg: Ergon Verlag.
- Smiraglia, R. P., Lee, H.-L., & Olson, H. A. (2010). The flimsy fabric of authorship. In V. Neset, E. Ménard, & S. Mas (Eds.), *Information science: Synergy through diversity: Proceedings of the 38th Annual CAIS/ACSI conference, June 2–4, 2010, Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada*. Retrieved March 19, 2012, from [http://www.cais-acsi.ca/conf\\_proceedings\\_2010.htm](http://www.cais-acsi.ca/conf_proceedings_2010.htm). Toronto, ON: CAIS.
- Smiraglia, R. P., Lee, H.-L., & Olson, H. A. (2011). Epistemic presumptions of authorship. In *iConference 2011, Inspiration, Integrity, and Intrepidity (February 8–11, 2011)* (pp. 137–143). New York: ACM.
- Strout, R. F. (1956). The development of the catalogue and cataloguing codes. *Library Quarterly*, 26, 254–275.
- Svenonius, E. (2000). *The intellectual foundation of information organization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

---

Richard P. Smiraglia is professor and a member of the Information Organization Research Group in the School of Information Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, where he teaches in the area of information organization. He has defined the meaning of “a work” empirically and has revealed the ubiquitous phenomenon of instantiation among information objects. *The Nature of ‘A Work’* (2001) was the first monograph-length treatment of the work and was followed soon by the 2002 anthology *Works as Entities for Information Retrieval*. He is also working with knowledge theory, with the phenomenological aspect of social tagging, and with cultural heritage

ontology for data-mining. He is an associate researcher of the e-Humanities Group of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences and is editor-in-chief of the journal *Knowledge Organization*, published by Ergon-Verlag of Würzburg.

Hur-Li Lee is associate professor and a member of the Information Organization Research Group in the School of Information Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, where she teaches in the area of information organization. Her major research interests include classification theory, users' interactions with structures of information systems, and social and cultural aspects of information organization. She has published in major scholarly journals such as *Journal of Documentation*, *Journal of the American Society for Information Society*, *Knowledge Organization*, and *Library Quarterly*. In 2006, she spent five months at Peking University (Beijing, China) to study traditional Chinese bibliography as a Fulbright Scholar. That experience has since evolved into a long-term research project, "Traditional Chinese Bibliographic Classification."