Definition of Aggregates as Works  
Tillett Proposal

**Aggregate**: a work of individual works.

The *FRBR* conceptual model gives us a way to view the bibliographic universe. It is just one view, but one that resonates with the library community and others (such as Dublin Core and Semantic Web).

We have resources that we describe, and we find it helpful to designate the entities that make up those resources or that are related to those resources, so that we can meet certain objectives of finding and collocating information. Being able to group all the works of a creator, all the expressions of a work (e.g., to show the translations or editions available), or all the manifestations of a particular expression of a work help us fulfill specific user tasks (also laid out in *FRBR*).

When a cataloger begins the work of describing a resource, the first decision is “what am I cataloging?” – is it a single logical unit, an aggregate, or a component?

Our Working Group is asked to focus on aggregates. *FRBR* section 3.3 (p. 28) explains: “…from a logical perspective the entity work, for example, may represent an aggregate of individual works brought together” [gives some examples] “…entities at the aggregate or component level operate in the same way as entities at the integral unit level; they are defined in the same terms, they share the same characteristics, and they are related to one another in the same way as entities at the integral unit level. Sections 5.3.1.1, 5.3.2.1, 5.3.4.1, and 5.3.6.1 provide additional information on aggregate and component entities in the context of whole/part relationships.”
The entity *work* is recursive in *FRBR*. *This is a very important aspect that is buried.* Recursive means we can have a work of works – one work that is made of multiple works. Those are related in *FRBR* through whole/part relationships, as shown above. **Recommendation:** The recursive symbol was omitted from the final text, but since this is causing confusion, I feel it should be re-introduced and that we need to recommend that to the FRBR Review Group.

Recursive symbol

One work, through whole/part relationships, can consist of one or more works – it also is a one-to-many relationship – the one “whole” to its one or many “parts”.

The *FRBR* model requires then that the “whole” (in this case the aggregate) be a “one” that can have one to many expressions (Figure 3.1 in *FRBR*, p. 13). However, the *work*
may be related, through whole/part relationships, to other works (FRBR’s whole/part relationships 5.3.1.1).

In FRBR (p. 69) **5.3.1.1 Whole/Part Relationships at the Work Level**, a distinction is made between relationships involving dependent parts, and those involving independent parts.

“Dependent parts are component parts of a work that are intended to be used in the context of the larger work and as such depend on the context provided by the larger work for much of their meaning. Dependent components are often difficult to identify without reference to the larger work as they generally do not have distinctive names/titles.”

(I prefer this term, “dependent parts,” to “augmentations” used by O’Neill and Žumer. In fact, the forwards, introductions, illustrations, notes, etc. are in FRBR as “segmental parts.” – see below)

“Independent parts are those that do not depend to any significant extent on the context provided by the larger work for their meaning. Typically, independent components have distinctive names/titles. It is assumed that in both cases, the work that represents the whole is an independent work.” (p. 69)

“The dependent category can itself be divided into two subcategories: Segmental parts; and systemic parts of the work’s content. Segmental parts are discrete components of a work whose content exists as a distinct identifiable segment within a whole. Among discrete components of works would be included prefaces, chapters, sections, parts, and so on.” (p. 69)

“A systemic part of a work, on the other hand, cannot be viewed as a bounded segment of the content of the work. Rather, as systemic part is an integral aspect that extends across and is interwoven with the rest of the content of the work. Illustrations for a text or the cinematography of a film are examples of the integral aspect; they cannot be identified and discussed as intellectual or artistic parts of the whole, but do not represent separate sequential segments of the content as segmental components do.

“There often will be no reason for a dependent part of a work to be separately identified or described in a bibliographic record. In certain instances, however, such as when a preface or introduction has been written by a well-known author who is not the author of the main text, it may be considered useful to identify and describe the component in its own right. Because dependent parts by definition need to be placed in the context of the larger work, the relationship, if formally articulated, is typically done by appending an added entry for the component to the record describing the larger work; alternatively, the relationship can be reflected less formally through a contents note.

“Independent parts of a work are much more apt to be identified and described in their own right. The category includes monographs in a monographic series (where the series represents the whole); articles in a journal or issues of a journal (where the journal represents the whole); or independent intellectual components of a multipart work or kit, where that component can have value outside the
context provided by the other components of the kit. The independent category also includes commonly recognized parts of larger works such as books of the Bible, etc.” (p. 70)

When a work is “augmented” (with illustrations, a preface, introductory remarks, etc.), the result may be considered in the FRBR model as a new expression of that work (usually when the augmenting piece is dependent). When the components that augment a main work are independent (and, as FRBR notes, are more apt to be described in their own right), the combined aggregation is another work that can have its own expression(s), manifestation(s), and item(s). This aggregate work is related (whole/part) to the independent component works.

As for the comment made by O’Neill and Žumer about the 2007 addition to the expression description in FRBR:

“When an expression is accompanied by augmentations, such as illustrations, notes, glosses, etc. that are not integral to the intellectual or artistic realization of the work, such augmentations are considered to be separate expressions of their own separate work(s).”

that change to FRBR dealt with those augmentations that were not considered integral to the intellectual or artistic realization of the work. That is, those augmentations could be viewed independently, so the combination with another work would result in an aggregate work with its own expression(s), manifestation(s), and item(s).

I personally do not feel this is necessary to discussions of aggregates.
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