

---

# INFS 289-5/291B: WORK/COPY

Winter 2010

\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\* Syllabus :: January 4, 2009

---

## Course information

Number: INFS 289-5/291B  
Title: Work/Copy  
ID: 628-548-200  
Quarter: winter 2010  
Location: Room 245, GSE&IS Building  
Time: Thursday, 9am–12:30pm

---

## Instructor information

Instructor: Jonathan Furner  
Office: Room 224, GSE&IS Building  
Email: [furner@gseis.ucla.edu](mailto:furner@gseis.ucla.edu)  
Voice: (310) 825-5210  
Fax: (310) 206-4460  
Office hours: Monday, 11am–2pm

---

## Catalog description

### For INFS 289-5

[This catalog description is the standard placeholder for INFS 289, which is the IS department’s “special topics” class. It doesn’t have anything to say about Work/Copy, and is provided here for the sake of completeness only.]

*“289. Seminar: Special Issues in Information Studies. Seminar, two to four hours. Identification, analysis, and discussion of critical intellectual, social, and technological issues facing the profession. Topics may include (but not limited to) expert systems, literacy, electronic networks, youth at risk, information literacy, historical bibliography, preservation of electronic media, etc. May be repeated with topic change. Letter grading.”*

### For INFS 291A-291B-291C

[This catalog description is the generic one for the new sequence of classes on Theory in Information Studies, which is offered for the first time in 2009–10 (with the temporary course numbers INFS 291A-289-289 for 2009–10 only). The Work/Copy class is one of the Special Topics classes in the theory of information studies.]

*“291A-291B-291C. Theory in Information Studies. (4-4-4) Seminar, four hours. Letter grading. 291A. (4) Theoretical Traditions in Information Studies. Seminar, four hours. The nature of information studies: ontological, epistemological, and ethical accounts of information and of the information arts and sciences. Conceptions, theories, and models of information; information-related artifacts, agents, contexts, institutions, practices, properties, values, and related phenomena. The interdisciplinary context: subfields of*

information studies, and cognate disciplines. Frameworks for theory construction, e.g., critical theory; discourse analysis; hermeneutics; phenomenology; semiotics; social epistemology. Letter grading. *291B-291C*. (4-4) Special Topics in the Theory of Information Studies. Seminar, four hours. Topics include: Information and evidence: record-keeping and memory-making; personal and community identity; accountability and trust. Information and design: design and implementation of information systems and services; information aesthetics. Information retrieval and knowledge organization. Information seeking, access, and use: contexts, techniques, needs, barriers. Information and power: groups, ideologies, identities, structures. Information and value: information ethics; evaluation of information services. Information policy and law: processes, institutions, players, stakes. Information institutions and professions: domains, ecologies, cultures, communities. Economics, geography, history, philosophy, politics, sociology of information. May be repeated with topic change. Letter grading.”

### **For INFS 291B**

[This catalog description is the specific one for the Work/Copy class.]

“*291B. Work/Copy*. Seminar, four hours. Conceptions, theories, and models of works and copies; of working and copying. Interdisciplinary approaches: philosophy of art; literary theory; media and cultural studies; intellectual property law; information science; etc. Implications for design and evaluation of data models and of information services. Letter grading.”

---

## **Objectives**

In this class, we will talk about a cluster (or several clusters) of questions that are related in the sense that they all have something to do with ideas about the nature of **documents** (i.e., things that instantiate works of authorship), about the ways in which documents are produced and used, and about the ways in which documents relate to one another and to things of other kinds such as works and authors.

The class might be conceived as a class on “document theory”; alternatively, as a class in “philosophy of documentation” (if such a specialism existed) or, more broadly, in “philosophy of information.” But it draws not only on ideas developed in “analytic” philosophy (e.g., in metaphysics, ontology, philosophy of art, and philosophy of literature), but also on those developed in (among other fields) “continental” philosophy and critical theory; semiotics; cultural (and media, visual, literary, and art) studies (and theory, and history); intellectual property law; “library [archival, museum] and information studies” and “cultural informatics”; and information systems design. Students will be encouraged to identify and apply the approach(es) and method(s) with which they are most comfortable, as well as to develop an appreciation of the range and diversity of the approaches and methods that are potentially applicable, and to articulate their own interests within one or more of these overlapping conceptual frameworks.

The aim of the course, then, is to provide an introduction to the multiple approaches that have historically been taken in the production of “document theory” (whether or not the product has been labeled that way). It is intended to contribute to the theoretical foundations that students construct before proceeding to the Written Qualifying Examinations in the doctoral program in the Department of Information Studies.

---

## **Outcomes**

Upon satisfactory completion of this course, you will have demonstrated:

- your knowledge of the nature of documents, of document production/use processes, and of inter-document relationships;

- your understanding of the nature and significance of the main problems and challenges faced by scholars working on document theory;
- your appreciation of the range and diversity of approaches to document theory;
- your skills in the clarification, articulation, critical analysis, and evaluation of different document theories;
- your skills in identifying opportunities for the application of document theory to the development of best practices in the design of systems for document description and discovery.

---

## Methods

Each week we shall be discussing a small set of readings. There are two reading lists (see below): a “List of required readings,” and a “Supplementary list of recommended readings.” Most of the required readings will be available from the course website, accessible through CCLE (UCLA’s Common Collaboration and Learning Environment). Copies of any required readings that aren’t available online will be put on reserve in the MIT Lab (GSE&IS Building, 1st floor).

It’s very important that everyone comes to class well prepared, ready to discuss the week’s required readings. 30% of your final grade will be awarded on the basis of your preparation for and participation in class (see “Assignments,” below).

To access the course website, go to <http://ccl.e.ucla.edu/>, click on “Winter 10” under “Education and Information Studies,” then click on page “9,” then click on “2010 Winter INF STD289 SEM5 (FURNER),” then click on “Login,” then enter your UCLA Logon ID and Password (i.e., your Bruin Online ID, *not* your GSE&IS ID), and click on “Sign In Now.”

---

## Textbooks

There is no required textbook for this course.

---

## Assignments

There are two assignments for this class:

1. a project in which you will use the PBworks collaborative workspace service to contribute to a glossary of definitions of, and annotations on, a set of terms used in document theory (counting towards **30%** of the final grade; due in week **9**—Monday, March 1, 9am); and
2. a final paper on a specific topic in document theory (**40%**; week **11**—Monday, March 15, 9am). If you obtain a grade B or higher in this class, this paper can count as the “major/specialization paper” specified on p. 35 of the IS *Student handbook 2009-2010* as a required component of the M.L.I.S. portfolio.

Please note that no extensions will be granted for either of these assignments.

For assignment #1, full details will be made available in class. The collaborative workspace for this course is accessible at <http://workcopy.pbworks.com/>.

For assignment #2, you will write a major paper on a specific topic in document theory. A list of suggestions of topics will be distributed in class. You should submit an indication of your proposed topic no later than Thursday, February 4 (Week 5). The body of the final paper (excluding the list of references to any materials used) should be no longer than 5,000 words. The paper and reference list should be formatted in accordance with a standard style guide (e.g., Chicago/Turabian, MLA). Please make sure to cite all the materials that you use; please use a standard citation and reference format; please make sure all references,

including those to electronic resources, are complete; and please double-space your text and number the pages. A letter grade will be assigned on the basis of a combination of the following criteria: originality and creativity; relevance to the subject matter of the class; level of critical insight; soundness and validity of arguments; demonstrated usage of relevant literature; accuracy of factual information; organizational structure; and readability.

The final **30%** of your final grade will be awarded on the basis of the quality (not the quantity) of your preparation for and participation in class.

---

## Syllabus

<i>Week</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Required readings</i>
1	Thursday, Jan 7	Ontology.	Smith (2003). Thomasson (2009). Wetzel (2006). Hilpinen (2004). Lowe (2003).
2	Thursday, Jan 14	Documents.	Briet (1951). Barthes (1971). DeRose et al. (1990). Buckland (1997). Pédaque (2003). Smith (2005).
3	Thursday, Jan 21	Representation.	Chandler (1994). Warner (1990). McKemmish (2005). Wilson (1968a). Kulvicki (2006). Taborsky (1990).
4	Thursday, Jan 28	Representation, cont'd.	Bazin (1958). Barthes (1961). Scruton (1981). Walton (1984). Schwartz (1995). Meskin & Cohen (2008).
5	Thursday, Feb 4  Submit subject for Assignment #2.	Instantiation.	Borges (1939). Stevenson (1957). Wolterstorff (1975). Gracia (1995). Howell (2002). Rohrbaugh (2003).

6	Thursday, Feb 11	Identity.	Hawthorne (2003). Lowe (1983). McLaverty (1984). Shillingsburg (1991). Kirschenbaum (2002). Bryant (2002). Renear & Dubin (2003). Tanselle (2005).
7	Thursday, Feb 18	Reproduction.	Benjamin (1936). Freitag (1987). Tanselle (1989). Roberts (1994). Nelson (2000). Savedoff (2000). Sassoon (2004).
8	Thursday, Feb 25  Assignment #1 due on <b>Monday, Mar 1, 9am.</b>	Reproduction, cont'd.	U.S. Copyright Office (2009). Malkan (2005). Allan (2007). Goodman (1976). Dutton (1998). Irvin (2005).
9	Thursday, Mar 4	Modeling inter-document relationships.	Wilson (1968b). IFLA (1998). Svenonius (2000). Tillett (2001). Baca et al. (2006). Baca & Clarke (2007). Renear & Dubin (2007). Riva et al. (2009).
10	Thursday, Mar 11  Assignment #2 due on <b>Monday, Mar 15, 9am.</b>	Authorship and creativity.	Barthes (1968). Foucault (1969). Jaszi (1991). Bowden (1999). Warner (2002). Farley (2004).
11	Thursday, Mar 18	Finals week: NO CLASS.	—

---

---

## List of required readings

### Week 1. Ontology.

What kinds of things are there?

Smith, Barry. 2003. Ontology. In *The Blackwell guide to the philosophy of computing and information*, ed. Luciano Floridi, 155–166 (Chapter 11). Oxford: Blackwell.

Thomasson, Amie L. 2009. Categories. In *Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta. Stanford, CA: Metaphysics Research Lab, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University. Available online at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/categories/>

Wetzel, Linda. 2006. Types and tokens. In *Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta. Stanford, CA: Metaphysics Research Lab, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University. Available online at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/types-tokens/>

Hilpinen, Risto. 2004. Artifact. In *Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta. Stanford, CA: Metaphysics Research Lab, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University. Available online at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/artifact/>

Lowe, E. Jonathan. 2003. Recent advances in metaphysics. *Facta Philosophica* 5, no. 1: 3–24. Available online at: <http://www.cs.vassar.edu/~weltyc/fois/fois-2001/keynote/>

### Week 2. Documents.

What kind of thing is a document?

Briet, Suzanne. 1951. *Qu'est-ce que la documentation?* Paris: ÉDIT. [Translated into English as: Suzanne Briet's *What is documentation?*, trans. and ed. Ronald E. Day and Laurent Martinet with Hermina G. B. Anghelescu. In *What is documentation? English translation of the classic French text*, 9–46. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2006.]

Barthes, Roland. 1971. De l'œuvre au texte. *Revue d'esthétique* 24, no. 3: 225–232. [Translated into English as: From work to text. In *Image—music—text*, trans. Stephen Heath, 155–164. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.]

DeRose, Steven J., David G. Durand, Elli Mylonas, and Allen H. Renear. 1990. What is text, really? *Journal of Computing in Higher Education* 1 (2): 3–26.

Buckland, Michael K. 1997. What is a “document”? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 48, no. 9: 804–809.

Pédaque, Roger T. 2003. *Document: Forme, signe et médium, les re-formulations du numérique*. Version 3. Paris, France: Sciences et technologies de l'information et de la communication, Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS-STIC). [Translated into English as: *Document: Form, sign and medium, as reformulated for electronic documents*. Available online at: [http://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/06/22/28/PDF/sic\\_00000594.pdf](http://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/06/22/28/PDF/sic_00000594.pdf)]

Smith, Barry. 2005. How to do things with paper: The ontology of documents and the technologies of identification. Paper presented at Ontolog Forum, October 13, 2005. PowerPoint slides available online at: [http://ontology.buffalo.edu/document\\_ontology/Ontology\\_of\\_DocumentsNov05](http://ontology.buffalo.edu/document_ontology/Ontology_of_DocumentsNov05)

### **Week 3. Representation.**

#### **(a) Documents in general.**

Under what conditions (if any) does a document represent something (e.g., a subject)?  
What kind of thing is the thing that is represented?

Chandler, Daniel. 1994. Introduction; Signs; Modality and representation. In *Semiotics for beginners* (Sections 1, 2, and 3). Aberystwyth, Wales: Aberystwyth University. Available online at: <http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/S4B/semiotic.html>

Warner, Julian. 1990. Semiotics, information science, documents and computers. *Journal of Documentation* 46, no. 1: 16–32.

McKemmish, Sue. 2005. Traces: Document, record, archive, archives. In *Archives: Recordkeeping in society*, ed. Sue McKemmish, Michael Piggott, Barbara Reed, and Frank Upward, 1–20. Wagga Wagga, Australia: Centre for Information Studies, Charles Sturt University.

Wilson, Patrick. 1968. Subjects and the sense of position. In *Two kinds of power: An essay on bibliographical control*, 69–92 (Chapter 5). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Kulvicki, John. 2006. Pictorial representation. *Philosophy Compass* 1, no. 6: 535–546.

Taborsky, Edwina. 1990. The discursive object. In *Objects of knowledge*, ed. Susan M. Pearce, 50–77 (Chapter 2). London: Athlone Press. Available online via Google Books.

### **Week 4. Representation, cont'd.**

#### **(b) Photographs in particular.**

Under what conditions (if any) does a photograph represent something (e.g., a subject)?  
What kind of thing is the thing that is represented?

Bazin, André. 1958. Ontologie de l'image photographique. In *Qu'est-ce que le cinéma? I: Ontologie et langage*, 11–19. Paris: Éditions du Cerf. [Translated into English as: The ontology of the photographic image, trans. Hugh Gray. *Film Quarterly* 13, no. 4 (1960): 4–9.]

Barthes, Roland. 1961. Le message photographique. *Communications* 1: 127–138. [Translated into English as: The photographic message. In *Image—music—text*, trans. Stephen Heath, 15–31. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.]

Scruton, Roger. 1981. Photography and representation. *Critical Inquiry* 7, no. 3: 577–603.

Walton, Kendall. 1984. Transparent pictures: On the nature of photographic realism. *Noûs* 18, no. 1: 67–72.

Schwartz, Joan M. 1995. “We make our tools and our tools make us”: Lessons from photographs for the practice, politics, and poetics of diplomatics. *Archivaria* 40: 40–74.

Meskin, Aaron, and Jonathan Cohen. 2008. Photographs as evidence. In *Photography and philosophy: New essays on the pencil of nature*, ed. Scott Walden, 70–90. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

## Week 5. Instantiation.

Under what conditions (if any) does a document instantiate something (e.g., a work)?  
What kind of thing is the thing that is instantiated?

Borges, Jorge Luis. 1939. Pierre Menard, autor del *Quijote*. *Sur*. [Translated into English as: Pierre Menard, author of the *Quixote*. In *Labyrinths: Selected stories and other writings*, ed. Donald Yates and James E. Irby, 36–44. New York: New Directions, 1964.]

Stevenson, Charles L. 1957. On “What is a poem?” *Philosophical Review* 66, no. 3: 329–362.

Wolterstorff, Nicholas. 1975. Toward an ontology of art works. *Noûs* 9, no. 2: 115–142.

Gracia, Jorge J. E. 1995. Textual identity. *Sorites* 2: 57–75. Available online at: [http://www.ifs.csic.es/sorites/Issue\\_02/item6.htm](http://www.ifs.csic.es/sorites/Issue_02/item6.htm)

Howell, Robert. 2002. Ontology and the nature of the literary work. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 60, no. 1: 67–79.

Rohrbaugh, Guy. 2003. Artworks as historical individuals. *European Journal of Philosophy* 11, no. 2: 177–205.

## Week 6. Identity.

### (a) Identity of artifacts in general.

How do we determine when  $x$  is the same as  $y$ ?

Hawthorne, John. 2003. Identity. In *Oxford handbook of metaphysics*, ed. Michael J. Loux and Dean W. Zimmerman, 99–130 (Chapter 4). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lowe, E. Jonathan. 1983. On the identity of artifacts. *Journal of Philosophy* 80, no. 4: 220–232.

### (b) Identity of documents in particular.

How do we determine when document  $x$  is the same as document  $y$ ?

McLaverly, James. 1984. The mode of existence of literary works of art: The case of the *Dunciad Variorum*. *Studies in Bibliography* 37: 82–105. Available online via: <http://etext.virginia.edu/bsuva/sb/>

Shillingsburg, Peter L. 1991. Text as matter, concept, and action. *Studies in Bibliography* 44: 31–82.

Kirschenbaum, Matthew G. 2002. Editing the interface: Textual studies and first generation electronic objects. *TEXT: An Interdisciplinary Annual of Textual Studies* 14: 15–51.

Bryant, John. 2002. Work as concept: Intentionalist historicism and the ontology of literary work. In *The fluid text: A theory of revision and editing for book and screen*, 30–42 (Chapter 2). Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan University Press.

Renear, Allen, and David Dubin. 2003. Towards identity conditions for digital documents. In *DC-2003: Proceedings of the International Conference on Dublin Core and Metadata Applications* (Seattle, WA, September 28 – October 2, 2003), ed. Stuart A. Sutton, 181–189. Singapore: Dublin Core Metadata Initiative. Available online at: <http://dcpapers.dublincore.org/ojs/pubs/article/view/746/742>

Tanselle, G. Thomas. 2005. The textual criticism of visual and aural works. *Studies in Bibliography* 57: 1–37.



## Week 7. Reproduction.

Under what conditions (if any) does a document reproduce something (e.g., an original)?  
What kind of thing is the thing that is reproduced?

### (a) Reproduction of works.

Benjamin, Walter. 1936. *Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit* (2nd version). [Translated into English as: The work of art in the age of its technological reproducibility. In *The work of art in the age of its technological reproducibility, and other writings on media*, ed. Michael W. Jennings, Brigid Doherty, and Thomas Y. Levin; trans. Edmund Jephcott, Rodney Livingstone, Howard Eiland, and others; 19–55. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2008.]

Freitag, Wolfgang. 1987. Art reproductions in the library: Notes on their history and use. In *The documented image: Visions in art history*, ed. Gabriel P. Weisberg and Laurinda S. Dixon, 349–363. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Tanselle, G. Thomas. 1989. Reproductions and scholarship. *Studies in Bibliography* 42: 25–54.

Roberts, Helene M. 1994. Second hand images: The role of surrogates in artistic and cultural exchange. *Visual Resources* 9, no. 4: 335–346.

Nelson, Robert S. 2000. The slide lecture, or The work of art *history* in the age of mechanical reproduction. *Critical Inquiry* 26, no. 3: 414–434.

Savedoff, Barbara E. 2000. Photographic reproduction. In *Transforming images: How photography complicates the picture*, 151–184 (Chapter 4). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Sassoon, Joanna. 2004. Photographic materiality in the age of digital reproduction. In *Photographs objects histories: On the materiality of images*, ed. Elizabeth Edwards and Janice Hart, 186–202. London: Routledge.

## Week 8. Reproduction, cont'd.

### (b) Unauthorized reproduction. (i) Copyright infringement.

U.S. Copyright Office. 2009. Chapter 1: Subject matter and scope of copyright: Section 101: Definitions. In *Copyright law of the United States of America and related laws contained in Title 17 of the United States Code: Circular 92*. Washington, DC: U.S. Copyright Office. Available online at: <http://www.copyright.gov/title17/92chap1.pdf>

Malkan, Jeffrey. 2005. What is a copy? *Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal* 23, no. 2: 419–463.

Allan, Robin J. 2007. After *Bridgeman*: Copyright, museums, and public domain works of art. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 155, no. 4: 961–989.

### (ii) Forgery, plagiarism, appropriation.

Goodman, Nelson. 1976. Art and authenticity. In *Languages of art: An approach to a theory of symbols*, 2nd ed., 99–123 (Part III). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

Dutton, Denis. 1998. Forgery and plagiarism. In *Encyclopedia of applied ethics*, ed. Ruth Chadwick, vol. 3, 503–510. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Irvin, Sherri. 2005. Appropriation and authorship in contemporary art. *British Journal of Aesthetics* 45, no. 2: 123–137.

### **Week 9. Modeling inter-document relationships for document discovery.**

Wilson, Patrick. 1968b. The bibliographical universe. In *Two kinds of power: An essay on bibliographical control*, 6–19 (Chapter 1). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. 1998. *Functional requirements for bibliographic records: Final report*. München, Germany: K. G. Saur. [Especially Chapter 3: Entities, 12–29.] Available online at: <http://www.ifla.org/en/publications/functional-requirements-for-bibliographic-records>

Svenonius, Elaine. 2000. Bibliographic entities. In *The intellectual foundation of information organization*, 31–51 (Chapter 3). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Tillett, Barbara B. 2001. Bibliographic relationships. In *Relationships in the organization of knowledge*, ed. Carol A. Bean and Rebecca Green, 19–35 (Chapter 2). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Baca, Murtha, Patricia Harpring, Elisa Lanzi, Linda McRae, and Ann Whiteside. 2006. General guidelines. In *Cataloging cultural objects: A guide to describing cultural works and their images*, 1–41. Chicago, IL: American Library Association

Baca, Murtha, and Sherman Clarke. 2007. FRBR and works of art, architecture, and material culture. In *Understanding FRBR: What it is and how it will affect our retrieval tools*, ed. Arlene G. Taylor, 103–110. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

Renear, Allen, and David Dubin. 2007. Three of the four FRBR Group 1 entity types are roles, not types. In *Proceedings of the 70th Annual Meeting of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (Milwaukee, WI, October 18–25), ed. Andrew Grove. Medford, NJ: Information Today. Available online at: <http://www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/9094/RenearFRBRasist07.pdf>

Riva, Pat, Martin Doerr, and Maja Žumer. 2009. FRBRoo: Enabling a common view of information from memory institutions. *International Cataloguing and Bibliographic Control* 38, no. 2: 30–34.

### **Week 10. Authorship and creativity.**

What is an author? What is the distinction between “to work” and “to copy”?
--

Barthes, Roland. 1968. La mort de l’auteur. *Mantéa* 5: 12–17. [Translated into English as: The death of the author. In *Image—music—text*, trans. Stephen Heath, 142–148. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.]

Foucault, Michel. 1969. Qu’est-ce qu’un auteur? *Bulletin de la Société française de Philosophie* 64, no. 3: 73–104. [Translated into English as: What is an author? In *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews by Michel Foucault*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, 113–138. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977.]

Jaszi, Peter. 1991. Toward a theory of copyright: The metamorphoses of “authorship.” *Duke Law Journal* 42, no. 2: 455–502.

Bowden, Ross. 1999. What is wrong with an art forgery? An anthropological perspective. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 57, no. 3: 333–343.

Warner, Julian. 2002. Forms of labour in information systems. *Information Research* 7, no. 4. Available online

at: <http://informationr.net/ir/7-4/paper135.html>

Farley, Christine Haight. 2004. The lingering effects of copyright's response to the invention of photography. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review* 65: 385–456.

---

## Supplementary list of recommended readings

### Week 1. Ontology.

What kinds of things are there?
---------------------------------

Furner, Jonathan. 2010. Philosophy and information studies. In *Annual review of information science and technology: Vol. 44*, ed. Blaise Cronin, 161–200. Medford, NJ: Information Today.

Lowe, E. Jonathan. 1995. The metaphysics of abstract objects. *Journal of Philosophy* 92, no. 10: 509–524.

Lowe, E. Jonathan. 2008. New directions in metaphysics and ontology. *Axiomathes* 18, no. 3: 273–288.

### Week 2. Documents.

#### (a) Documents in general.

What kind of thing is a document?
-----------------------------------

Buckland, Michael. 1991. Information as thing. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 42, no. 5: 351–360.

Hjørland, Birger. 2000. Documents, memory institutions and information science. *Journal of Documentation* 56, no. 1: 27–41.

Levy, David M. 2001. What are documents? In *Scrolling forward: Making sense of documents in the digital age*, 21–38 (Chapter 2). New York: Arcade.

Culler, Jonathan. 2003. The vicissitudes of text. *E-rea: Revue électronique d'études sur le monde anglophone* 1, no. 1. Available online at: <http://erea.revues.org/index150.html?file=1>

Drucker, Johanna. 2007. Excerpts and entanglements. In *A document (re)turn: Contributions from a research field in transition*, ed. Roswitha Skare, Niels Windfeld Lund, and Andreas Vårheim, 41–51. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang. [Paper presented at DOCAM '03, Berkeley, CA, August 13, 2003. Notes available online at: <http://thedocumentacademy.org/resources/2003/papers/drucker.paper.html>]

Tourney, Michele M. 2003. Caging virtual antelopes: Suzanne Briet's definition of documents in the context of the digital age. *Archival Science* 3, no. 3: 291–311.

Basden, A., and M. E. Burke. 2004. Towards a philosophical understanding of documentation: A Dooyeweerdian framework. *Journal of Documentation* 60, no. 4: 352–370.

Maack, Mary Niles. 2004. The lady and the antelope: Suzanne Briet's contribution to the French documentation movement. *Library Trends* 52, no. 4: 719–747.

Day, Ronald E. 2006. “A necessity of our time”: Documentation as “cultural technique” in *What is documentation?* In *What is documentation? English translation of the classic French text*, trans. and ed. Ronald E. Day and Laurent Martinet with Hermina G. B. Anghelescu, 47–63. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2006.

Bates, Marcia J. 2007. Defining the information disciplines in encyclopedia development. *Information Research* 12, no. 4. Available online at: <http://informationr.net/ir/12-4/colis/colis29.html>

Furner, Jonathan. 2008. [Review of:] *What is documentation? English translation of the classic French text*, by

Suzanne Briet, trans. and ed. Ronald E. Day and Laurent Martinet with Hermina G. B. Anghelescu, *Libraries and the Cultural Record* 43, no. 1: 107–109.

Andersen, Jack. 2008. The concept of genre in information studies. In *Annual review of information science and technology: Vol. 42*, ed. Blaise Cronin, 339–367. Medford, NJ: Information Today.

Lund, Niels Windfeld, and Michael Buckland. 2008 [published 2009]. Document, documentation, and the Document Academy: Introduction. *Archival Science* 8, no. 3: 161–164.

Beard, David. 2008 [published 2009]. From work to text to document. *Archival Science* 8, no. 3: 217–226.

Lund, Niels Windfeld. 2009. Document theory. In *Annual review of information science and technology: Vol. 43*, ed. Blaise Cronin, 399–432. Medford, NJ: Information Today.

Drucker, Johanna. 2009. Intimations of (im)materiality: Text as code in the electronic environment. In *SpecLab: Digital aesthetics and projects in speculative computing*, 145–164 (Chapter 3.2). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

### **Week 3. Representation.**

#### **(a) Documents in general.**

Under what conditions (if any) does a document represent something (e.g., a subject)? What kind of thing is the thing that is represented?
---

Goodman, Nelson. 1961. “About.” *Mind* 70, no. 277: 1–24.

Atkin, Albert. 2006. Peirce’s theory of signs. In *Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta. Stanford, CA: Metaphysics Research Lab, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University. Available online at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/peirce-semiotics/>

Raber, Douglas, and John M. Budd. 2003. Information as sign: Semiotics and information science. *Journal of Documentation* 59, no. 5: 507–522.

Day, Ronald E. 2005. Poststructuralism and information studies. In *Annual review of information science and technology: Vol. 39*, ed. Blaise Cronin, 575–609. Medford, NJ: Information Today.

Wollheim, Richard. 1998. On pictorial representation. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 56: 217–226.

Wells, David. 2007. What is a library OPAC? *The Electronic Library* 25, no. 4: 386–394.

Latham, Kiersten F. 2008. The lived experience of documents: An exploration with museum objects. Paper presented at DOCAM ’08, Madison, WI, March 28, 2008. Available online at: [http://bgsu.academia.edu/documents/0010/1309/DOCAM\\_paper.pdf](http://bgsu.academia.edu/documents/0010/1309/DOCAM_paper.pdf)

Wood, Elizabeth, and Kiersten F. Latham. 2009. Object knowledge: Researching objects in the museum experience. *Reconstruction* 9, no. 1. Available online at: <http://reconstruction.eserver.org/091/wood&latham.shtml>

### **Week 4. Representation, cont’d.**

#### **(b) Photographs in particular.**

Under what conditions (if any) does a photograph represent something (e.g., a subject)?
---

What kind of thing is the thing that is represented?

Barthes, Roland. 1964. Rhétorique de l'image. *Communications* 4: 40–51. [Translated into English as: Rhetoric of the image. In *Image—music—text*, trans. Stephen Heath, 32–51. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.]

Barthes, Roland. 1980. La chambre claire. [Translated into English as: *Camera lucida: Reflections on photography*, trans. Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 1981.]

Snyder, Joel. 1984. Photography and ontology. In *The worlds of art and the world*, ed. Joseph Margolis, 2134. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Iversen, Margaret. 1994. What is a photograph? *Art History* 17, no. 3: 450–464.

Schwartz, Joan M. 2000. “Records of simple truth and precision”: Photography, archives, and the illusion of control. *Archivaria* 50: 1–40.

Schwartz, Joan M. 2002. Coming to terms with photographs: Descriptive standards, linguistic “othering,” and the margins of archivy. *Archivaria* 54: 142–171.

Vestberg, Nina Lager. 2008. Archival value: On photography, materiality and indexicality. *Photographies* 1, no. 1: 49–65.

Schlak, Tim. 2008 [published 2009]. Framing photographs, denying archives: The difficulty of focusing on archival photographs. *Archival Science* 8, no. 2: 85–101.

Jackson, Helen. 2009. Knowing photographs now: The knowledge economy of photography in the twenty-first century. *Photographies* 2, no. 2: 169–183.

### **Week 5. Instantiation.**

Under what conditions (if any) does a document instantiate something (e.g., a work)?  
What kind of thing is the thing that is instantiated?

Wollheim, Richard. 1978. Are the criteria of identity that hold for a work of art in the different arts aesthetically relevant? *Ratio* 20, no. 1: 29–48.

Goodman, Nelson, and Catherine Elgin. 1986. Interpretation and identity: Can the work survive the world? *Critical Inquiry* 12: 567–574.

Thomasson, Amie L. 2004. The ontology of art. In *The Blackwell guide to aesthetics*, ed. Peter Kivy, 78–92. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rohrbaugh, Guy. 2005. Ontology of art. In *The Routledge Companion to Aesthetics*, 2nd ed., ed. Berys Gaut and Dominic McIver Lopes, 241–253 (Chapter 19). London: Routledge.

### **Week 6. Identity.**

#### **(a) Identity of artifacts in general.**

How do we determine when  $x$  is the same as  $y$ ?

Lowe, E. Jonathan. 1989. What is a criterion of identity? *Philosophical Quarterly* 39, no. 154: 1–21.

Noonan, Harold. 2006. Identity. In *Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta. Stanford, CA: Metaphysics Research Lab, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University. Available online at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/identity/>

Furner, Jonathan. 2009. Interrogating “identity”: A philosophical approach to an enduring issue in knowledge organization. *Knowledge Organization* 36, no. 1: 3–16.

**(b) Identity of documents in particular.**

How do we determine when document $x$ is the same as document $y$ ?
---

Greg, W. W. 1951. The rationale of copy-text. *Studies in Bibliography* 3: 19–36.

Bateson, F. W. 1961. Modern bibliography and the literary artifact. In *English studies today*, 2nd ed., ed. Georges A. Bonnard, 67–77. Bern: Lang.

Tanselle, G. Thomas. 1975. Greg’s theory of copy-text and the editing of American literature. *Studies in Bibliography* 28: 167–229.

Bowers, Fredson. 1978. Greg’s “Rationale of copy-text” revisited. *Studies in Bibliography* 31: 90–161.

Greetham, D. C. 1989. Textual and literary theory: Redrawing the matrix. *Studies in Bibliography* 42: 1–24.

McGann, Jerome. 1991. What is critical editing? *TEXT: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship* 5: 15–29.

Greetham, David C. 1992. Criticizing the text: Textual criticism. In *Textual scholarship: An introduction*, 195–346 (Chapter 8). New York: Garland.

Greetham, D. C. 1996. Phylum-tree-rhizome. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 58, no. 1: 99–126.

Levy, David M. 2001. A bit of digital history. In *Scrolling forward: Making sense of documents in the digital age*, 137–157 (Chapter 8). New York: Arcade.

Bornstein, George. 2001. How to read a page: Modernism and material textuality. In *Material modernism: The politics of the page*, 5–31. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paskin, Norman. 2003. On making and identifying a “copy.” *D-Lib Magazine* 9, no. 1. Available online at: <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january03/paskin/01paskin.html>

Allison, Arthur, James Currall, Michael Moss, and Susan Stuart. 2005. Digital identity matters. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 56, no. 4: 364–372.

Greetham, David. 2007. What is textual scholarship? In *A companion to the history of the book*, ed. Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose, 21–32 (Chapter 2). Oxford: Blackwell.

Kirschenbaum, Matthew G. 2008. Save As: Michael Joyce’s *Afternoons*. In *Mechanisms: New media and the forensic imagination*, 159–211 (Chapter 4). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Drucker, Johanna. 2009. Graphesis and code. In *SpecLab: Digital aesthetics and projects in speculative computing*, 133–143 (Chapter 3.1). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eggert, Paul. 2009. The book, the e-text and the “work-site.” In *Text editing, print and the digital world*, ed. Marilyn Deegan and Kathryn Sutherland, 63–82 (Chapter 4). Farnham, England: Ashgate.

Renear, Allen, and Karen M. Wickett. 2009. Documents cannot be edited. In *Proceedings of Balisage: The Markup Conference 2009* (Montréal, Canada, August 11–14, 2009), ed. B. Tommie Usdin. Available online at: <http://www.balisage.net/Proceedings/vol3/html/Renear01/BalisageVol3-Renear01.html>

## **Week 7. Reproduction.**

Under what conditions (if any) does a document reproduce something (e.g., an original)?  
What kind of thing is the thing that is reproduced?

### **(a) Reproduction of works.**

Fawcett, Trevor. 1982. On reproductions. *Art Libraries Journal* 7, no. 1: 9–16.

Thompson, Colin. 1982. Why do you need to see the original painting anyway? *Visual Resources* 2, no. 1/2/3: 21–36.

Hughes, Anthony. 1997. Authority, authenticity and aura: Walter Benjamin and the case of Michelangelo. In *Sculpture and its reproductions*, ed. Anthony Hughes and Erich Ranfft, 29–45. London: Reaktion.

Karlholm, Dan. 2001. Reading the virtual museum of general art history. *Art History* 24, no. 4: 552–577.

Smith, Donny. 2003. The surrogate vs. the thing. *Art Documentation* 22, no. 2: 11–15.

Fyfe, Gordon. 2004. Reproductions, cultural capital and museums: Aspects of the culture of copies. *Museum and Society* 2, no 1: 47–67.

Hamma, Kenneth. 2005. Public domain art in an age of easier mechanical reproducibility. *D-Lib Magazine* 11, no. 11. Available online at: <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/november05/hamma/11hamma.html>.

Caviness, Madeline H. 2006. Reproducing works of art held in museums: Who pays, who profits? *Diogenes* 211: 45–52.

Wagner, Gretchen. 2007. Sharing visual arts images for educational use: Finding a new angle of repose. *EDUCAUSE Review* 42, no. 6: 84–105.

Peim, Nick. 2007. Walter Benjamin in the age of digital reproduction: Aura in education: A rereading of “The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction.” *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 41, no. 3: 363–380.

Davis, Jonathan. 2008. Questioning “The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction”: A stroll around the Louvre after reading Benjamin. *Contemporary Aesthetics* 8. Available online at: <http://www.contempaesthetics.org/newvolume/pages/article.php?articleID=493>

Knowlton, Steven A. 2009. How the current draft of RDA addresses the cataloging of reproductions, facsimiles, and microforms. *Library Resources & Technical Services* 53, no. 3: 159–165.

## **Week 8. Reproduction, cont’d.**

### **(b) Unauthorized reproduction. (i) Copyright infringement.**

Butler, Kathleen Connolly. 1998. Keeping the world safe from naked-chicks-in-art refrigerator magnets: The plot to control art images in the public domain through copyrights in photographic and digital reproductions. *Hastings Communications and Entertainment Law Journal* 21: 55–128.



## **(ii) Forgery, plagiarism, appropriation.**

Singerman, Howard. 1994. Seeing Sherrie Levine. *October* 67: 78–107.

Margolis, Joseph. 1998. Farewell to Danto and Goodman. *British Journal of Aesthetics* 38, no. 4: 353–374.

Hirsh, Jennifer. 2004. Representing repetition: Appropriation in de Chirico and after. In *Italian modernism: Italian culture between decadentism and avant-garde*, ed. Luca Somigli and Mario Moroni, 403–449. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Stalnaker, Nan. 2005. Fakes and forgeries. In *The Routledge Companion to Aesthetics*, 2nd ed., ed. Berys Gaut and Dominic McIver Lopes, 513–525 (Chapter 40). London: Routledge.

## **Week 9. Modeling inter-document relationships for document discovery.**

Chen, Peter P. 1976. The entity–relationship model: Toward a unified view of data. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems* 1, no. 1: 9–36.

Bearman, David. 1996. Data relationships in the documentation of cultural objects. *Visual Resources* 11, no. 3/4: 289–299.

Case, Mary. 1996. Document for dialogue: *Categories for the Description of Works of Art*. *Visual Resources* 11, no. 3/4: 257–270.

Yee, Martha M. 1998. What is a work? In *The principles and future of AACR: Proceedings of the International Conference on the Principles and Future Development of AACR* (Toronto, Canada, October 23–25, 1997), ed. Jean Weihs, 62–104. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Library Association.

Smiraglia, Richard P. 2002. Works as signs, symbols, and canons: The epistemology of the work. *Knowledge Organization* 28, no. 4: 192–202.

Smiraglia, Richard P. 2003. The history of “the work” in the modern catalog. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 35, no. 3/4: 553–567.

LeBoeuf, Patrick. 2005. FRBR: Hype or cure-all? Introduction. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 39, no. 3/4: 1–13.

Carlyle, Allyson. 2006. Understanding FRBR as a conceptual model: FRBR and the bibliographic universe. *Library Resources & Technical Services* 50, no. 4: 264–273.

Baca, Murtha, and Patricia Harpring. 2006. *Categories for the Description of Works of Art*. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute. Available online at: [http://www.getty.edu/research/conducting\\_research/standards/cdwa/](http://www.getty.edu/research/conducting_research/standards/cdwa/).

Ercegovac, Zorana. 2006. Multiple-version resources in digital libraries: Towards user-centered displays. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 57, no. 8: 1023–1032.

Furner, Jonathan. 2006a. *The ontology of works*. Paper presented at the 69th Annual Meeting of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, Austin, TX, November 3–8, 2006. Available online at: <http://polaris.gseis.ucla.edu/jfurner/papers/furner-06asist-c-ppt.pdf>

Furner, Jonathan. 2006b. *The ontology of subjects of works*. Paper presented at the 69th Annual Meeting of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, Austin, TX, November 3–8, 2006. Available online at: <http://polaris.gseis.ucla.edu/jfurner/papers/furner-06asist-b-ppt.pdf>

Visual Resources Association. 2007. Welcome to the *VRA Core 4.0*. N.p.: Visual Resources Association. Available online at: <http://www.vraweb.org/projects/vracore4/index.html>.

Harpring, Patricia. 2007. CCO overview and description. *VRA Bulletin* 34, no. 1: 34–44.

Baca, Murtha. 2007. CCO and CDWA Lite: Complementary data content and data format standards for art and material culture information. *VRA Bulletin* 34, no. 1: 69–75.

Kessler, Ben. 2007. Encoding works and images: The story behind VRA Core 4.0. *VRA Bulletin* 34, no. 1: 20–33.

Eklund, Janice. 2007. Herding cats: CCO, XML, and the VRA Core. *VRA Bulletin* 34, no. 1: 45–68.

Furner, Jonathan. 2007. *Two senses of “work.”* Paper presented at the 25th Annual Conference of the Visual Resources Association, Kansas City, MO, March 27–31, 2007. Available online at: <http://polaris.gseis.ucla.edu/jfurner/papers/furner-07vra.pdf>.

Dickey, Timothy J. 2008. FRBRization of a library catalog: Better collocation of records, leading to enhanced search, retrieval, and display. *Information Technology and Libraries* 27, no. 1: 23–32.

### **Week 10. Authorship and creativity.**

What is an author? What is the distinction between “to work” and “to copy”?
--

Jaszi, Peter. 1992. On the author effect: Contemporary copyright and collective creativity. *Cardozo Arts and Entertainment Law Journal* 10, no. 2: 293–320.

Juola, Patrick. 2006. Authorship attribution. *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval* 1, no. 3: 233–334.

Warner, Julian. 2005. Labor in information systems. In *Annual review of information science and technology: Vol. 39*, ed. Blaise Cronin, 551–573. Medford, NJ: Information Today.