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Slide 6: Are aggregating works really works?

- LRM considers an aggregating work a Work -- see LRM-E2 Work (IFLA LRM, p. 21).
- RDA considers an aggregating work a Work -- see the section Describing aggregating works and works that are aggregated under Guidance > Resource description > Describing a work.

All of the RDA guidance re Works applies to aggregating works, unless otherwise noted, e.g.:
- the special options for authorized access points for when “A work is an aggregating work” -- see the section under authorized access point for work
- some additional special guidance, e.g., Representative expressions of an aggregating work
  - it might be useful for EURIG to propose that a cross reference be added from the Aggregating works section under Aggregate Guidance to the Representative expressions of an aggregating work in the Representative Expression section.

- We describe an aggregating work based on evidence that we find in its embodying manifestation and other sources.
We describe an aggregating work by examining the results of the plan (just as we do for any other work).

We use the usual elements for works, with some special guidance for aggregating works, e.g.:

- **preferred title of work**: See the option to “Record a value of Manifestation: title proper of a manifestation that embodies a work”, but follow the special instruction under Titles proper of aggregates and record a title that is a collective title or one of the other options.

- Creators:
  - The creator agent of work of an aggregating work is an aggregator agent; if this responsibility is not known then do not record this relationship.

- Nature of content: Use Work: content type of representative expression.
If neither aggregating work has an aggregator,
  • and there is no difference in the selection and arrangement of the aggregated expressions that are embodied by the two manifestations (nothing added, or removed, or changed in any way, e.g., an added introduction or new chapter, or different illustrations, or a revised chapter),
  • then we can relate a new manifestation to an already described aggregating work.

But if there is a stated difference in actual aggregator responsibility,
  • then even if there is no apparent difference in the selection and arrangement of the aggregated expressions that are embodied by the two manifestations
  • there might be a difference that you cannot see
  • and, the Entity boundary condition re. a related agent of work applies, with its option to “record a new instance of Work (even if you choose not to apply that option).
RDA’s definition of an aggregating expression as a realization of a plan (under Aggregating expressions) fits LRM’s wording about an expression being a realization of a work.

The wording of the explanation of an aggregating expression does seem to me to be confusing.

It might be useful for EURIG to recommend that the RSC either remove or amend the content explanation under that guidance section:

The content of an aggregating expression is what is embodied by an aggregate that excludes the content of the expressions that are aggregated. For example, a title page and page headings and numbering in a printed volume aggregate may be treated as the content of the aggregating expression.
All we really need to record in a description of an aggregating expression is an appellation (a title, an access point, or an identifier) and the shortcut relationship Expression: **aggregates**. For other elements, e.g.:

**preferred title of expression:**

- See the option to “Record a value of Manifestation: title proper of a manifestation that embodies an expression”, but follow the special instruction under **Titles proper of aggregates** and record a title that is a collective title or one of the other options.

**Creators:**

- The creator of work is creator of all expressions of that work, but we can let the semantics of the elements take care of that. None of the specific agent relationships apply to aggregating expressions, but we can use the Manifestation: **contributor agent to aggregate** relationships to pick up translators, etc., of the aggregated expressions.

**Content type, Language and Script:**

- Record the values of the elements for the aggregated expressions as values for the representative expression elements for an aggregating work. (see **Representative expressions of an aggregating work**
A “revised edition” statement in MARC 250

Answer
• A MARC 250 field is used to record a transcribed Manifestation: edition statement.
• For a single-part or multi-part work, a revision statement might indicate a new expression, but for an aggregating work, it indicates a new aggregating work.

Adding the level of “work group” for collocation

Answer
• An authorized access point for work group can be recorded for collocation purposes instead of a differentiated AAP. Using the same AAP for multiple works, groups them under one heading even though they are separate works, e.g.:
  • a collection of aggregated expressions and works that have revised
  • a source aggregating work and a transformation of it, e.g., a language version
Slide 19: The LRM and RDA model doesn’t capture that sometimes works only get created to be a part of an aggregating work

**Answer**

Most supplementary content (e.g., an introduction or illustrations) has been created specifically for a new aggregate manifestation, and chapters or poems or short stories can all be new or old or a mixture of new and old works and expressions.

And both the LRM and RDA refer to supplementary content in their model of aggregates; so, aggregated works and expressions that are created specifically to be embodied in an aggregate manifestation are definitely included in the model.
Responses to Mélanie Roche’s presentation

We are unable to give full responses to Melanie’s excellent presentation because we only saw a draft of it on Monday, which did not give us enough time to prepare responses.
Responses to Paul Frank’s presentation

We did not see Paul’s presentation before today, so we had no time to prepare detailed responses, but fortunately, we think we have already covered many of the issues that Paul raised.
Thank you for your attention.
I hope we have time for your questions.