The Center for
Literary Computing

http://clc. wvu.edu

CELL: On the Consortium for Electronic Literature

(NEH WHITE PAPER DRAFT)

Sandy Baldwin, CELL Project Leader | National Endowment for the Humanities| Digital Humanities Start Up Grant, HD-51866-14, “A Vocabulary for Electronic Literature”

The Consortium for Electronic Literature

Contact: Sandy Baldwin, CELL Project Leader
Director, The Center for Literary Computing, West Virginia University
charles.baldwin@mail.wvu.edu

In early 2015, the Consortium for Electronic Literature (CELL) will launch the CELL toolset, including the first search engine for electronic literature (e-lit).[1] The project is an initiative of the Electronic Literature Organization (ELO).[2] To date, the consortium includes ten research centers that are developing online database projects dedicated to research in e-lit. Our team includes humanities scholars, along with experts in database design, information/library science, and in digital humanities projects. The project receives support from its partners as well as from the National Endowment for the Humanities. All CELL project management is coordinated by the Center for Literary Computing at West Virginia University. Technical development takes place at the NT2 lab in Montreal.

The first stage of the project is built around the search engine, which harvests and aggregates records from across the partner databases, and presents the data on the CELL website. The website includes tools allowing scholars from within the field and in the general public to search for and retrieve richly connected research on e-lit. While e-lit databases exist—*indeed, the consortium represents all the significant projects*—no consistent standard exists for the terms and notations used for encoding and retrieving research in these databases. Some partners use highly controlled data, others use more open, folksonomic approaches. Some are focused on specific corpora of e-lit, while others attempt to encompass the entire field. All the partners are committed to open access resources. By standardizing, aggregating, and making searchable data across the partner projects, we allow researchers to build on, implement, and extend our inter-site searching. Our goal is to go beyond merely creating an "e-lit Google." We provide the first shared tool for curated, international research in the field. In the long run, CELL will be the go-to point for new scholars, as well as students and the general public.

---

[1] See http://cellproject.net/.
[2] See http://eliterature.org/cell/ for a description of the consortium and its members.

Over the next three years, CELL will continue to develop and expand its toolset and its ongoing outreach in order to establish cooperative communication among databases devoted to electronic literature. Goals of the second stage include: improving our existing web-based tools for e-lit research; standardizing a field-wide taxonomy for works of e-lit; designing and prototyping visualization tools; creating a unified e-lit name authority; and maintaining ongoing creation and curation of edited content. This white paper describes the CELL project; its challenges, outcomes, and future directions; and its importance to the digital humanities.

What is E-Lit?

The ELO is the leading organization devoted to the writing, publishing, and reading of literature in electronic media. The umbrella organization for the CELL partners, the ELO includes its own database project, the Electronic Literature Directory (ELD), in the consortium. The ELO website offers the most succinct and widely-accepted definition of e-lit:

> Electronic literature, or e-lit, refers to born-digital works with recognized literary aspects that take advantage of the capabilities and contexts provided by the stand-alone or networked computer. Within the broad category of electronic literature are several forms and threads of practice, some of which are:
>
> - hypertext fiction and poetry, on and off the Web;
> - kinetic poetry presented in Flash and using other platforms;
> - computer art installations which ask viewers to read them or otherwise have literary aspects;
> - conversational characters, also known as chatterbots;
> - interactive fiction;
> - novels that take the form of emails, SMS messages, or blogs;
> - poems and stories that are generated by computers, either interactively or based on parameters given at the beginning;
> - collaborative writing projects that allow readers to contribute to the text of a work;

- literary performances online that develop new ways of writing.[3]

This definition and partial list is valuable in highlighting the flexibility and range of e-lit as it refers to digital texts. E-lit is not an "emerging field": it has arrived. The U.S. Library of Congress recently held a showcase of e-lit and is engaged in cataloging the field. Similar initiatives are underway in other countries. E-lit appears in anthologies and university courses. **However, no comprehensive tools exist for e-lit research**. No standard bibliographical protocol can describe or catalog e-lit and previous protocols of print-based literature do not apply. Existing tools are unable to keep up with the innovative forms and rapid pace of publication that stem from the creation of e-lit. The lack of appropriate research tools is partly because of the unique aspects of born-digital literary objects: they are inherently dynamic and less "fixed" than print artifacts, rendering e-lit difficult to document and study. E-lit research groups have come up with variety of terms and approaches; CELL is striving for the creation of shared protocols and tools.

E-lit is *the* site for contemporary literary innovation and creativity in digital media. Scholarship on e-lit reflexively explores the humanities' place in technology-rich environments. Moreover, e-lit is a barometer of the overall trajectory of texts in digital environments and deals with concerns shared by all digital humanities projects. The CELL project's innovations in handling these complex artifacts—not only in a single database but across an international consortium of databases—provides lessons and insights for a wide range of projects. CELL codifies the overall trajectory of literature in digital environments, leading to insights into the emerging condition of texts today.

History and Background

The major scholarly publications in the e-lit field, such as N. Katherine Hayles' *Electronic Literature: New Horizons for the Literary* (Notre Dame 2008) or Christopher T. Funkhouser's *Prehistoric Digital Poetry* (Alabama 2007), deal with authors, works, and thematics. They do not deal with the metadata and information architecture involved in works of e-lit. Looking beyond scholarly publications and toward existing research, one finds advanced consideration of digital records and archiving, as one would expect of a field of born-digital works. The ELO was a pioneer in discussion of born-digital records. Projects

[3] See http://eliterature.org/what-is-e-lit.

developed by the ELO community—such as "The Agrippa Files"—are among the paradigmatic digital humanities explorations of complex textual artifacts.

There are other projects that overlap with CELL's goals, though none deal specifically with works of e-lit or work across such an array of projects in multiple countries. These projects include 1) resources on e-lit; 2) projects in other disciplines focused on data discovery; and finally 3) projects focused on annotation and peer review.

1. Resources on e-lit. The ten partner organizations that are a part of the CELL project represent the primary e-lit research resources. The largest of these, the ELMCIP Electronic Literature Knowledge Base from the University of Bergen, Norway, is the most robust but still covers only a fraction of all published works. A possible future partner is a project at Cornell's Rose Goldsen Archive developing scalable preservation strategies for born-digital media artworks. Our project brings collections such as these together to maximize research in the field of e-lit.

2. Data discovery. The NEH-funded "DM Environment: From Annotation to Dissemination," based on the Shared Canvas model, is testing the publishing capabilities of an online tool, Digital Mappaemundi (DM), that would allow users to gather texts and visuals for humanities research. Our project can benefit from DM's lessons in data gathering. CELL differs, however, by focusing features that will provide a deeper semantic organization of our project's content, on taxonomies and name authority—on discovering a vocabulary for the field—rather than on the gathering of texts and visuals. The name authority for e-lit—one of the major deliverables of our project—looks to established projects such as Virtual International Authority File (VIAF), an international service "providing convenient access to the world's name authority files."[4] Name authorities organize, match, and merge names and other bibliographic data to provide a single reference source. VIAF provides a "super" record, allowing reference across multiple organizations. Our project will create a similar authority across the CELL databases.

3. Annotation and Peer Review. A previously funded NEH Digital Implementation grant, "Annotation Studio: Multimedia Annotation for Students," dealt with searching across humanities research on diverse resources. We hope to adopt a similar type of editorial work in the later

[4] See http://viaf.org.

stages of the CELL project: peer-reviewed annotations for each bibliographic entry.

Many robust archives and directories of e-lit currently exist; CELL is instead a meta-archive, one that encompasses the field of e-lit. It searches across archives and directories, and search results are a presentation of the research and collaboration at the source of CELL. It is nothing more or less than a framework for the field itself as it appears on the Web.

The CELL project began in 2011 at a symposium at the University of Western Sydney (Australia). In 2012, representatives from each group signed a letter of commitment to the project. This agreement set unified goals for the major international e-lit research teams, including: 1) to foster critical practice around e-lit through scholarly materials for research and reference; and 2) to advocate for the importance of online e-lit resources for scholarly research, including the development of such resources as a legitimate component of academic credentialing. Since that agreement, regular meetings continue to take place through Skype and international conferences. The following teams, all with research projects involving databases of e-lit, committed to the consortium and its objectives with signed letters of agreement:

- The ELO's Electronic Literature Directory (ELD);
- *electronic book review* (ebr), one of the oldest all-online peer-reviewed journals;
- Digital Language Arts Collection, Brown University Digital Repository;
- ADELTA (Australian Directory for Electronic Literature and Text-based Art), University of Western Sydney (Australia);
- Hypermedia, Art, and Literature Directory, Laboratoire NT2, Université du Québec à Montréal (Canada);
- The ELMCIP Electronic Literature Knowledge Base, University of Bergen (Norway);
- ADEL - Archive of German Electronic Literature, University of Siegen (Germany);
- PO.EX - Digital Archive of Portuguese Experimental Poetry, University Fernando Pessoa (Portugal);
- Hermeneia, Literary Studies and Digital Technologies Research Group, Universitat de Barcelona (Spain);

- and I ♥ E-Poetry, University of Puerto Rico: Mayagüez (Puerto Rico).

In addition, agreements are in progress with the Laboratoire Paragraphe at the University of Paris VIII and Ciberia: Biblioteca de Literatura Digital en Español at the Complutense University of Madrid. A signed agreement is also in place between CELL and Archiveit.org, and through this the US Library of Congress (LOC), for an ongoing initiative to archive electronic literature in the LOC. This collaboration is a major indicator of the leading role played by the ELO in the institutional reception and understanding of born-digital literary works.

In June 2012, the CELL partners committed to interoperability between projects as an immediate goal. This is now achieved. The CELL Element Set, a standard for bibliographical data on creative works of electronic literature, was created through comparison of existing metadata used by the members of the consortium, followed by careful discussion of which elements to retain as essential. It is *descriptive* but not *prescriptive*. Individual projects are not required to implement all the fields and are free to add their own. It is publicly available and provides the first *consensual model for the object of this field*—for creative works of e-lit. We recommend that archive and database projects, present and future, which wish to join CELL, should make records available in this format.[5]

CELL is part of the maturation of the field. No longer "emerging," no longer in need of definition and justification for its existence, e-lit now needs institutions and structures to enable research, teaching, advocacy, and creativity. These institutions are built in a constantly changing technological environment, where texts appear and disappear in the blink of an eye. CELL is an initiative to connect projects to create the most comprehensive research tool available—to connect authors with authors, students with works of e-lit, and researchers with material. Our hope in drawing from the entries of ten projects in seven countries is to seek out and invite more databases to CELL as they arise.[6]

The specific nature of born digital works poses a number of challenges for the creation of bibliographical information. These are familiar to anyone working in the field. Works of e-lit do not fit print models of knowledge/documentation; their structures are often variable; their publication is often informal or at the least does not fit the model of a publishing house; and authorship is often

[5] See the ELO CELL webpage, referenced above, for a copy of the element set.
[6] Databases are in development in Russia and Argentina, and will also be invited to join CELL.

collaborative, distributed, shared with the computer, or in other ways difficult to effectively survey.

CELL evolved in response to a number of challenges and needed to find unique solutions, which—in turn—provide barometers for large-scale consideration of text in digital environments.

Globalizing E-Lit / E-Lit as Global Lit

The CELL projects represent multiple languages and national traditions. CELL is not based solely in the context of American academia and not all the partner projects are exclusively concerned with e-lit. For example, PO.EX concerns post-1960 Portuguese experimental poetry, some but not all of which is e-lit. The consortium brings these disparate projects together for the first time. CELL is the first true cross-disciplinary attempt at formalizing the metadata and database practices in the field. A guiding question is how to represent and handle cross-linguistic search results. Our decisions in designing the search will allow scholars to pose research questions at the intersection of ubiquitous and networked born-digital objects, on the one hand, and the specificity of individual languages and cultures, on the other.

The multi-national and multi-linguistic nature of CELL also operates against a certain imaginary USA that is implied in and necessary to the constitution of the academic study of electronic literature as it exists today. This imaginary acts as a paradigm that in turn determines conditions of recognition and evaluation of all electronic literature, a paradigm projected back onto all previous works and ahead towards the future. If we are to believe Hayles in *Electronic Literature: New Horizons for the Literary*, a 2008 work that remains the only English-language scholarly monograph specifically on electronic literature, the field is recognizable by works and genres appearing in the 1980s. Moreover, these works are characterized by "linking structures." The examples she gives, both of works such as Michael Joyce's *Afternoon* and tools such as Storyspace, clearly set out the paradigm. Of course, Hayles knows better than simply to reduce electronic literature in this way, and she carefully states that the varieties of electronic literature are diverse, but the paradigm remains in force: the forms, technologies, and historical moments—linking structures, hypertext, the 1980s—are the exemplars against which all else are understood. The spatial, performative, and rhetorical claims for hypertext links remain the default definition of electronic literature. A glance at the Electronic Literature Organization's admirable collections, especially volume 1, shows the dominance of linking structures and hypertext-like works.

By contrast, CELL's global expanse illuminates other practices concerned not only with the jumps of linking but also with text as computation and procedure. Intermedial practices, especially as archaeologically set out in the commerce between Brazilian and Portuguese concrete poetry, activates the semiotics of character and image rather than the structures of juxtaposition implicit in hypertext. The point is not simply a new or alternative set of references but an open horizon where all forms of literary practice become material for electronic literature. With this break away from 1980s American hypertext, a broad vista becomes visible, including a different and more heterogeneous view of American electronic literature (the vista of a "new yet unapproachable America," in Stanley Cavell's words). The result is no longer a paradigm but a discontinuous textual relation across histories and forms, creating productive and poetic apparatuses from combinations such as the Baroque and the postmodern or the South American and the European. Once again, the polemic is meant as an act of generosity: "against America" means against an imperialism of electronic literature and for a cosmopolitan view. Electronic literature is the forum where subjects in the global network act out and struggle over their location and situation. Electronic literature must be global or it will not be.

Taxonomies: A Vocabulary for E-Lit

During the 2012-13 academic year, the consortium established a metadata standard for creative works of e-lit, the first of its kind ("The CELL Element Set"). The document emerged from discussion of the existing standards of member projects, identifying a canonical minimum metadata description for a creative work of e-lit. All CELL members signed agreements to re-configure their databases and to make records available in accordance with the standard and subsequently agreed to create a shared server to harvest records from across the partner databases. Searches using the CELL search engine retrieve records formatted by this historic standard. The results are deepened and faceted by the implementation of taxonomies, providing the first global representation of the semantic features of works of e-lit.

The critically and editorially chosen taxonomies create a semantic layer on top of the raw index entries.[7] The NT2 team, based on previous experience creating search engines operating across multiple databases, carried out the initial taxonomical analysis. NT2 analyzed the existing tagging and taxonomies of CELL partners and proposed a range of semantics for the search engine. In turn, the analysis was expanded into an initial set of taxonomies by the CELL editorial

[7] See the CELL Taxonomy table at the end of this white paper.

team. The CELL technical development team created custom Drupal modules to allow partners to implement the taxonomies, as well as a development path for non-Drupal systems. As of early 2015, the CELL partners are implementing the taxonomies.

What do the taxonomies do? They specify significant structuring for bibliographical records, such as year of publication and technical platform for creative works of e-lit. They also venture into more challenging areas, such as descriptions of modes of interactivity. Beyond the initial semanticization of the search engine, the next stage of the project is expanding taxonomies to consider critical distinctions and aesthetic qualities of the work. In short, the semantics applied by the taxonomies to the index lead to a rich vocabulary of electronic literature. Clearly, this development requires curatorial and editorial attention. CELL calls on a diverse and distributed editorial team, but the taxonomy project also brings in subject matter experts from beyond the consortium.

During the start-up phase of the project, the team created Drupal modules, which—once installed—allowed partners to tag records with the CELL-specific taxonomies.[8] The index harvests records from these sites with the added semantic layer; however, the startup phase limited this to Drupal-only modules. This choice was dictated by budget constraints, but also by the pragmatic need to test the taxonomies and indexing. The longer-term implementation of the project is creating open frameworks for non-Drupal sites to integrate with CELL. Rather than develop modules for every possible CMS, our goal is to allow any future partner to adapt their project to CELL. The semantic structuring provided by CELL is the definitive representation of the semantics of works of e-lit. The project is also making the CELL taxonomies publicly available in a canonical form, providing standardized lists for future projects and descriptions of works.

Reverse Tagging and Visualizing "the Literary"

One of the more difficult challenges for the CELL project is the semanticization of works of e-lit, as they relate to categories and taxonomies. No common vocabulary exists for e-lit. Our goal is to create a research tool that consolidates literary analyses with affordances of the digital methods and tools at hand. Taxonomizing aesthetic and critical distinctions is controversial. Moreover, the varied understandings of "literariness" across the CELL partners pose challenges for defined categories.

[8] Drupal is an open source content management system or CMS. See http://drupal.org/.

Instead of attempting to resolve these challenges, the project employs two solutions. The first is the CELL taxonomies described above, emerging from the analysis of records in the partner databases, all of which used varying definitions for terms and systems to create tags. As noted, the taxonomies are being implemented by the partners and provide a powerful semantic overlay for the CELL project. The second strategy is complementary and works from the opposite direction: we are creating an emergent taxonomy directly on the CELL website using "reverse tagging." Instead of defining the works at the point of entry with set terms, we freely categorize works by how they might be searched and used for academic research. This is a form of "free tagging." Semantically, the entries will be linked together like "regular" taxonomies, but the tagging is done manually.

Additionally, our innovation is to mine the resulting data—combining fixed taxonomies and manually tagged free categories—and to create visualizations of the results. The visualization tools are built using existing modules available through the Drupal community. These visualizations show the network of concepts surrounding the works in the field of e-lit—they attempt to picture the "literary."

Name Authority

No name authority system exists for the e-lit field, a state of affairs that causes confusion and redundancy in the scholarship. While e-lit author names obviously intersect with existing name authorities, such as VIAF, there is a clear need for a name authority serving the needs of e-lit. The field uses terms and names in a vague and contested manner, with no clear agreement. For example, Marjorie C. Luesebrink is the author of many well-known works of e-lit. Some are published under her own name, but many are published under the pen name M. D. Coverley. As a result, e-lit databases include entries for both names. The matter is even more complex: there may be a separate entry for Marjorie Luesebrink (without the middle initial) or for MD Coverley (without the periods and spaces around the initials), often as a result of different catalogers. A name authority provides a thesaurus, mapping all the instances of authors' names, and allows catalogers to ensure a reliable and agreed-upon name. It also allows the server to provide a complex and faceted search, taking users from records listing M. D. Coverley as author to other records listing Marjorie C. Luesebrink as author.

Many authors in the field do not publish in the modes familiar from the codex and printed book, and thus do not appear in existing name authorities. Additional challenges arise from the born-digital nature of the work, in which

project authors may be crowd sourced and works may exist in multiple variants by many authors, though built on common code, as in the case of Nick Montfort's *Taroko Gorge*, where dozens of authors have built on Montfort's original javascript poem to create new iterations. The result is a conundrum for scholars assessing the authorship of the code and the resulting poems. Existing models of bibliography and cataloging, drawing on print/codex traditions, are simply not up to the task. The CELL project addresses these gaps and limitations. We create a shared interpretive framework that is vital to the proliferation of research. Scholars and students of e-lit are be able to ask previously unanswerable research questions about history, context, and reception.

Technical and Institutional Challenges

Another set of considerations facing CELL is the very nature of the consortium. It is a wonderful achievement to bring together so many partners, but multiple databases—ten currently, with more to be added—pose both institutional and technical challenges. The immediate issue is technical: most but not all the databases use the Drupal open-source content management system, but each database has its own internal record formats for describing creative works of e-lit. As recounted above, this required a considerable process of determining a shared standard, followed by the implementation of the standard at each partner site, to make the data available for indexing.

But there are larger, institutional challenges posed by the nature of the consortium. One is simply the definition of the project. Individual partner databases largely define themselves through their cultural, linguistic, or geographic specificity, which acts as a kind of anchor or ground for their project. For example, Po.Ex is clearly about Portuguese experimental poetry, some of which is electronic. The ELO's directory is focused solely on electronic literature. *But what, then, is CELL?* It is necessarily trans-regional, trans-linguistic, and trans-corpus, and therefore must rely on both the collaboration of partners and on the consensual emergence of agreements on the object of study. This consensuality means CELL is an operation on the entire field. In short, CELL is a dialogic process of locating and describing electronic literature, as such.

The linguistic and geographical challenges involved—including seemingly straightforward problems of arranging Skype meetings times between Los Angeles, Australia, West Virginia, Norway, and so on—should not be minimized and are not all resolved. Furthermore, the search interface will provide results as they are in the partner databases, and thus may include languages other than

English, but the CELL toolset itself, as well as the metadata fields, *are* in English, making the entries themselves sites of cultural encounter and suggesting possible translation issues as we continue with the project.

Of course, another level of institutional challenges is simply due to local demands. Partner projects must answer to their own administration and funding bodies prior to and above any responsibility toward CELL. As a result, participation in the consortium is purely a matter of dedication to the field and an interest in seeing it evolve, rather than a result of budgeting and institutional strategy. This is a good thing: we are a consortium because of dedication and interest rather than money in our pockets. The future may be different: CELL may set the agenda. To do so will require CELL to grow and continue to validate its project before we can work at this level, or at least such validation must occur before we can collaborate with our partners' institutions and administrations in setting priorities.

We propose that these challenges are all in fact key aspects typical for a transnational project that attempts to cross and define a discipline. In short, our innovations and solutions offer possibilities to model the kind of large-scale digital humanities projects that will become increasingly typical in the future.

Once again, CELL is a meta-project describing the field. The search engine is built on top of an Apache SOLR index of entries for creative works of e-lit from all the participating partner databases. As such, the usability of the raw data will be limited by the number and variety of the records: the NT2 database has over 4,000 records, ELMCIP over 7,000, and I Love E-Poetry more than 500; and so on.

CELL is a site of knowledge production. As the challenges described above demonstrate, the toolset is not simply a window looking into existing data but will actively shape, semanticize, and construct the field. CELL is an opportunity for the most productive sort of collaborative, creative, and critical discussion and debate. Moreover, our goal is to open the project to input from the wider public, whether teachers or creators or researchers, or simply those whose interest is sparked by e-lit. As CELL becomes the go-to portal for encountering e-lit, we will continue to collect feedback from users on their understanding and insights, as well as tips towards works and other contributions that may be missing from the site. Ideally, users will easily move between the contents in the partner projects and the value added by the CELL framework. We are also developing how-to videos and FAQs for future partners, with the goal of streamlining the process for any project to easily and rapidly contribute its data to the shared index and search engine.

In all, CELL provides the core toolset for technical interoperability between e-lit databases. CELL is also the sign of a larger interoperability: between communities of scholars, creators, students, and lovers of literature.

The following is an FAQ or "cheat sheet" for catalogers creating records in the CELL partner databases. It shows the core taxonomical fields and faceted search fields for the first version of the CELL toolset; it does not show the specific terms in the taxonomical fields.

SELECTED FIELDS

FIELD NAME		NOTES
Source Database		The database where the original entry is located. Ex: ELMCIP
Title		The title of the work that the entry is about.
Creator(s)		The main creator(s) to whom the work is associated.
Creator(s) Role		The role of the creator. Ex: artist / creative team / programmer
Creator(s) URI		The URL of the creator's entry on the database.
Year of Original Publication		The year the work was originally made public. If the work has multiple versions, there should be an entry per version, so it refers to the version the entry is about.
Work Language(s)		The language the work was written in. If the work has multiple versions, there should be an entry per version, so it refers to the version the entry is about.
Creator(s)		The secondary creator(s) to whom the work is associated.
Creator(s) Role		The role of the secondary creator. Ex: translator / graphic designer
Creator(s) URI		The URL of the creator's entry on the database.
Publisher(s)		The publisher of the work.
Publisher(s)' URI		The URL of the publisher's entry on the database.
Work URL		The work's URL.
Source Entry URL		The source entry's URL.
Author(s) of the Source Entry		The author of the source entry.

Source Entry Language(s)		The language of the source entry.
Technology Used / Platform(s)-Software(s)		The technologies, software or platforms that are involved in the production or distribution of the work.
Publication Type(s)		The publication type, channel or distribution format that the work was made public.
Complementary Publication Type(s)		If the publication type required is not listed in the taxonomy, please select OTHER and write here the correct publication type.
Procedural Modality(ies)		The procedural modality is the action that occurs between the work and the user. Ex: generation / alteration
Complementary Procedural Modality(ies)		If the procedural modality required is not listed in the taxonomy, please select OTHER and write here the correct procedural modality.
Mechanism(s)		The mechanism is any device that provides input or output to a computer and which is needed to experience the work. Ex: keyboard / camera
Complementary Mechanism(s)		If the mechanism required is not listed in the taxonomy, please select OTHER and write here the correct mechanism.
Format(s)		The Format foregrounds the material and intermedial nature of e-lit, listing the formal incorporation of media and materiality into the work, as well as into the work's relations to other works and contexts. Ex: picture / database

Complementary Format(s)		If the format required is not listed in the taxonomy, please select OTHER and write here the correct format.
Description(s)		A description or analysis of the work.
Literary Quality(ies)		Other tags related to the work that would enhance its literariness.

FACETED SEARCH		
FIELD NAME	GENERAL COMMENTS	SEARCH OPTION
Source		and/or
Creator(s)	Do we need to filter by any other creators than the main(s)?	and/or
Year of Original Publication		and/or
Language(s)		and/or
Publication Type(s)		and/or
Procedural Modality(ies)		and/or
Mechanism(s)		and/or
Formal Aspect(s)		and/or