



Discuss and record decisions on remaining MODS questions

Details

Type:	Documentation	Status:	CLOSED (View Workflow)
Priority:	Normal	Resolution:	Fixed
Labels:	None		

Description

Questions I have about creating the MODS records.

Attachments

FinalInstitutions.xlsx	19 kB	5 days ago
Institutions.xlsx	11 kB	1 week ago
Institutions-Masterlist.xlsx	17 kB	4 days ago
liv_013477_MODS-illustrative-sample.xml	1 kB	5 days ago
Manuscript Abbreviations_adrian_2015_03_04.xlsx	23 kB	5 days ago
Manuscript Abbreviations_Adrian_2015_03_05.xlsx	24 kB	4 days ago
Manuscript Abbreviations_claudia_2015_03_04.xlsx	24 kB	5 days ago
Manuscript Abbreviations_claudia_2015_03_05.xlsx	25 kB	4 days ago
Manuscript Abbreviations_lisa_2015_03_04.xlsx	23 kB	5 days ago
Manuscript Abbreviations.xlsx	22 kB	1 week ago
MODS-test.xml	7 kB	02/Mar/15 11:44 AM
MODS to DC Crosswalk_Claudia.xlsx	10 kB	Yesterday
MODS to DC Crosswalk - Updated.xlsx	9 kB	3 days ago
Rev3Institutions.xlsx	19 kB	5 days ago
Rev4Institutions.xlsx	18 kB	5 days ago
RevInstitutions.xlsx	14 kB	1 week ago
RevInstitutions2.xlsx	14 kB	6 days ago
Sample Illustrative MODS.xml	2 kB	4 days ago

Issue Links

mentioned in

[Daily StandUps 2015-03-02 to 2015-03-06](#)

Activity

- All
- Comments
- Work Log
- History
- Activity

[Adrian Wisnicki](#) added a comment - 27/Feb/15 12:42 PM

When we have two creators, would it be:

```
<mods:name type="personal" authorityURI="http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names" valueURI="http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n9210908">
<mods:namePart>Livingstone, David, 1813-1873</mods:namePart>
<mods:namePart>Wolf, Joseph, 1820-1899</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type="text">creator</mods:roleTerm>
</mods:role>
</mods:name>
```

Or:

```

<mods:name type="personal" authorityURI="http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names" valueURI="http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n9210908">
<mods:namePart>Livingstone, David, 1813-1873</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type="text">creator</mods:roleTerm>
</mods:role>
<mods:namePart>Wolf, Joseph, 1820-1899</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type="text">creator</mods:roleTerm>
</mods:role>
</mods:name>

```

Also, note that that current valueURI is broken. What should the correct one be?

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 27/Feb/15 12:49 PM

Note the following, that for the creator (which is almost always Livingstone) we have surname, forename, dates, whereas for addressee we have forename surname. There's no scope for converting addressee to the format of creator.

So, should we leave these as is, in two different ways, or should I change creator (which would be easy to do) to forename surname also and then this could be linked with some kind of authority name?

My preference is for the latter. Also, if so for the latter, then the tag would become simply <mods:name>, no?

```

<mods:name type="personal" authorityURI="http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names" valueURI="http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n9210908">
<mods:namePart>Livingstone, David, 1813-1873</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type="text">creator</mods:roleTerm>
</mods:role>
</mods:name>
<mods:name>
<mods:namePart>David G. Watt</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type="text">addressee</mods:roleTerm>
</mods:role>
</mods:name>


```

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 27/Feb/15 12:56 PM

Here's an example note of the sort we discussed:

```
<mods:physicalDescription><note>1 folio, folded to create 4 pages, with writing on 2 pages</note></mods:physicalDescription>
```

Should the note be given a specific attribute and value? If so, what?

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 27/Feb/15 1:05 PM

If two repositories hold parts of an item, is the following correct:

```

<mods:name type="corporate">
<mods:namePart>NLS</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type="text" authority="marcrelator">repository</mods:roleTerm>
</mods:role>
</mods:name>
<mods:location>
<mods:shelfLocator>MS.10707</mods:shelfLocator>
</mods:location>
<accessCondition>Some text</accessCondition>
<mods:name type="corporate">
<mods:namePart>DLC</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type="text" authority="marcrelator">repository</mods:roleTerm>
</mods:role>
</mods:name>
<mods:location>
<mods:shelfLocator>Cat. 297</mods:shelfLocator>
</mods:location>
<accessCondition>Some text</accessCondition>

```

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 27/Feb/15 1:09 PM


If an original item has two otherVersions, is the following correct:

```
<mods:relatedItem type="otherVersion">
<mods:note>Seaver, DLLL, pp. 55-56, 58, ex.</mods:note>
<mods:note>Sotheby's Cat., 13 Mar. 1979, lot 122.</note>
</mods:relatedItem>
```

Or would it be:

```
<mods:relatedItem type="otherVersion">
<mods:note>Seaver, DLLL, pp. 55-56, 58, ex.</mods:note>
</mods:relatedItem>
<mods:relatedItem type="otherVersion">
<mods:note>Sotheby's Cat., 13 Mar. 1979, lot 122.</note>
</mods:relatedItem>
```

And that's the last question, I think! Sorry for the deluge!

 Claudia Horning added a comment - 27/Feb/15 5:21 PM

Where there are two creators:

```
<mods:name type="personal" authorityURI="http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names" valueURI="http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n79018579">
<mods:namePart>Livingstone, David, 1813-1873</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type="text">creator</mods:roleTerm>
</mods:role>
</mods:name>
```

```
<mods:name type="personal" authorityURI="http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names" valueURI="http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n80006277">
<mods:namePart>Wolf, Joseph, 1820-1899</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type="text">creator</mods:roleTerm>
</mods:role>
</mods:name>
```

They are always entered in separate <mods:name> elements, even if they have some elements (like role) in common.

I'm not sure I'm understanding your question about the contrast between the handling of the creator and the addressees, so I hope you'll be patient with me if I'm not. 😊

If you're talking about the value of the name we're actually storing within the <mods:namePart>, the best practice is always to follow the standard authority file practice of using the order of Surname/Family Name, First Name/Given Name, dates (if known). So we should explore the possibility of making the addressee names look more like the creators, e.g.


```
<mods:name type="personal" authorityURI="http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names" valueURI="http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n79018579">
<mods:namePart>Livingstone, David, 1813-1873</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type="text">creator</mods:roleTerm>
</mods:role>
</mods:name>
```

```
<mods:name>
<mods:namePart type="personal">Watt, David G.</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type="text">addressee</mods:roleTerm>
</mods:role>
</mods:name>
```

Even if we can't change the names to the Last Name, First Name order, we would still include in <mods:namePart> and with type="personal",

On to <mods:physicalDescription><note>, I don't think we need any attributes.

I will be back to look at your other questions.

 Elizabeth McAulay added a comment - 27/Feb/15 5:34 PM


I just went to id.loc.gov and found this as the URI:

<http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n79018579.html>

The error is that we need the ".html" on it. At least I think that's correct. Claudia, can you confirm?

Thanks,


Lisa

 Elizabeth McAulay added a comment - 27/Feb/15 5:42 PM - **edited**

Regarding the order of Forename Surname,

I would prefer that we keep Livingstone in the correct format, and we can figure out how to change the names here at UCLA to match the authority file. We planned to do this once we had the MODS in our system, I think. Although I suppose we could start on that now, I would generate a list of addressees and ask students to find the authority names if existing.

In MODS, the element <name> cannot take text children, only element children. Therefore, the name has to be recorded in the <namePart> element. I think you might have been asking about that, but I'm not sure.

 Claudia Horning added a comment - 27/Feb/15 5:50 PM

It seems to work for me whether or not there's .html at the end, and the record lists the URI without it:

[1]<http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n79018579>

From: Elizabeth McAulay (JIRA) helpdesk@library.ucla.edu 

Sent: Friday, February 27, 2015 3:36 PM

To: Horning, Claudia

Subject: [JIRA] ([LO-262](#)) Random MODS questions

[2]Elizabeth McAulay commented on [3]LO-262

[4]Re: Random MODS questions

I just went to id.loc.gov and found this as the URI:

[5]<http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n79018579.html>

The error is that we need the ".html" on it. At least I think that's correct. Claudia, can you confirm?

Thanks,


Lisa

[6]

[7]Add Comment


This message was sent by Atlassian JIRA (v6.3.7#6337-sha1:2ed701e)

-
- [1] <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n79018579>
 - [2] <https://jira.library.ucla.edu/secure/ViewProfile.jspx?name=emcaulay>
 - [3] <https://jira.library.ucla.edu/browse/LO-262>
 - [4] <https://jira.library.ucla.edu/browse/LO-262>
 - [5] <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n79018579.html>
 - [6] <https://jira.library.ucla.edu/browse/LO-262#add-comment>
 - [7] <https://jira.library.ucla.edu/browse/LO-262#add-comment>


 Elizabeth McAulay added a comment - 27/Feb/15 6:10 PM

Ah, okay, I missed it, but somewhere in the middle of these comments we switched which URI was being used for Livingstone. The one in the very first comment is incorrect (as Adrian noted), but the other comments are using the correct one.


So, yes, no need to use the ".html" after all.

 Elizabeth McAulay added a comment - 27/Feb/15 6:13 PM

For the use of <accessCondition>some text</accessCondition>, I don't understand the meaning. We should flesh that out a little more.

 Elizabeth McAulay added a comment - 27/Feb/15 6:14 PM

I'm not sure of the answer on the relatedItem. I'll punt that over to Claudia.

 Claudia Horning added a comment - 27/Feb/15 6:24 PM


If an original item has two otherVersions, this would be correct:

<mods:relatedItem type="otherVersion">


<mods:note>Seaver, DLLL, pp. 55-56, 58, ex.</mods:note>
</mods:relatedItem>

<mods:relatedItem type="otherVersion">
<mods:note>Sotheby's Cat., 13 Mar. 1979, lot 122.</note>
</mods:relatedItem>

Although I am wondering if it should be <mods:relatedItem><mods:identifier> instead of <mods:note>. Is the value contained in the subelement a citation to a work that also contains the letter?

 Elizabeth McAulay added a comment - 27/Feb/15 6:31 PM

About the two repositories, I think we might want to include a note that describes that the item is split between two repositories. (Unless I misunderstood the reason there are two repositories.)

 Adrian Wisnicki added a comment - 27/Feb/15 8:32 PM

For the use of <accessCondition>some text</accessCondition>, I don't understand the meaning. We should flesh that out a little more.


++Some text would go in the spot marked. That's just a place marker for our discussion. When this bit of the record was completed it would be, depending on the access conditions, something like:

<accessCondition>(c) National Library of Scotland. Images licensed for use under Creative Commons etc.</accessCondition>

or

<accessCondition>(c) Royal Geographical Society. Images used by permission.</accessCondition>

etc.

 Adrian Wisnicki added a comment - 27/Feb/15 8:41 PM

I think most of my questions have been answered (more or less) except the one about proper format for two repositories holding one item. Please let me know on that one.

Also, Lisa, how would you record in the MODS the give item being split between the two archives? Please give me the exact use of tags and text, etc. ideally in the correct context of how to record correctly two separate repositories in the MODS.

Now two more questions (these really are the last ones):

1. In the actual MODS file, should ampersand be:

&


or

&


2. The <mods:relatedItem type="otherVersion"> sometimes refers to a URL. Currently such a reference looks like this:

<mods:relatedItem type="otherVersion">
<mods:note><http://www.invaluable.com/auction-lot/david-livingston-explorer-a-signed-letter-of-t-507-c-wvvrqided> [accessed 6 March 2014]</mods:note>
</mods:relatedItem>

Is this OK?

 Adrian Wisnicki added a comment - 27/Feb/15 8:45 PM

P.S. Once all questions are resolved, I'm hoping on Monday or so to generate a sample record that we can review before I generate the whole batch.

 Adrian Wisnicki added a comment - 01/Mar/15 9:50 PM

It looks like I didn't address this:

If an original item has two otherVersions, this would be correct:

<mods:relatedItem type="otherVersion">
<mods:note>Seaver, DLLL, pp. 55-56, 58, ex.</mods:note>
</mods:relatedItem>


<mods:relatedItem type="otherVersion">
<mods:note>Sotheby's Cat., 13 Mar. 1979, lot 122.</note>
</mods:relatedItem>

Although I am wondering if it should be <mods:relatedItem><mods:identifier> instead of <mods:note>. Is the value contained in the subelement a citation to a work that also contains the letter?

++The subelement is indeed a publication that includes all or part of the given item. So should we then go with mods:identifier. No problem if so, just let me know.

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 02/Mar/15 10:56 AM - **edited**

Fyi, I'm in the process of mocking up a sample MODS record in XML and Oxygen is telling me that @unit on mods:extent is not allowed. Is this still OK or how should I change?

 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 02/Mar/15 11:03 AM

I wanted to make sure it actually included the item, rather than just being **about** the item. Since it does, <mods:relatedItem type="otherVersion"> looks right.

On the dual repository question, I like Lisa's idea of including a note if possible, but if it would be difficult it's perhaps not necessary.

If two repositories hold parts of an item, is the following correct:


```
<mods:name type="corporate">
<mods:namePart>NLS</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type="text" authority="marcrelator">repository</mods:roleTerm>
</mods:role>
</mods:name>

<mods:location>
<mods:shelfLocator>MS.10707</mods:shelfLocator>
</mods:location>
<accessCondition>Some text</accessCondition>

<mods:name type="corporate">
<mods:namePart>DLC</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type="text" authority="marcrelator">repository</mods:roleTerm>
</mods:role>
</mods:name>

<mods:location>
<mods:shelfLocator>Cat. 297</mods:shelfLocator>
</mods:location>
<accessCondition>Some text</accessCondition>
```


This is all correct, but doesn't solve the problem of connecting a particular shelf location to its repository. One possibility would be to add a displayLabel="NLS" (or "DLC") to the appropriate <mods:location>, or prefixing the locator with that as text, e.g. DLC: Cat. 297.

 **Elizabeth McAulay** added a comment - 02/Mar/15 11:08 AM

Yes, I should have mentioned in an earlier comments. @unit is an addition in the 3.5 schema. Just change 3-4 to 3-5 in the schema declaration for the MODS at the top of the file

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 02/Mar/15 11:42 AM

I've created a MODS test file and am attaching it to this thread. This is for you to review that I'm doing everything right and also sets out the remaining questions. So, henceforth, please just turn your attention there and don't worry about the questions I've raised above any more as anything still not resolved is in the file.

 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 02/Mar/15 2:09 PM

We have two versions of the title, one with date, one without. Both could be useful depending on the context. What kind of attribute could we include (and where) for one or the other or both to distinguish them?

Perhaps the one without the date could be given the attribute type="alternative"

Since we have multiple authors (and addressees for that matter), in the way I'm creating the MODS, it's not going to be possible to include specific @valueURI. I'm therefore going to assume UCLA will do this. Is this OK?

If we're not sure all of these people are in the LC authority file, we shouldn't include the authorityURI either. Lisa, I'll defer to you on whether UCLA can add specific URIs for people after the fact; we certainly have authority experts down here who could identify the appropriate URIs if desired.

Two more things on names: If creator is unknown and we need to record that, it would be better to do so in a note rather than adding Unknown as a name value. And for the McRobert example, if dates are unknown, we normally just omit them rather than posting question marks. So I would recommend just using McRobert, Catherine.

Let's pretend that the following item is split over two collections. See what I've done below. Is this correct? Also, how would we note that the

item is between the two collections?

There's no great way to do this, nor is there a great way to indicate that one specific <mods:location> or <mods:accessCondition> applies to a particular <mods:name>. The best way I can think of to do this is to use the attribute displayLabel in <mods:location> and <mods:accessCondition> to indicate which institution is relevant. And possibly a note further explaining the situation.


Note that for acronyms such as DLC, we have a spreadsheet that identifies the actual repositories.

Would it be possible to use the full names of the repositories in the records?

We could have up to three mods:accessCondition for a given work as above. Also, note that the conditions include a URL. Is it OK to do this this way?

I see multiple examples like this in the MODS Guidelines, so it should be fine.

I have a meeting now, but will take a look at your <mods:relatedItem> question when I return.

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 1 week ago - **edited**

Thanks very much for this, Claudia. I really appreciate your help! Here are a few follow up questions/points based on what you've written. We're almost there, I think!

Since we have multiple authors (and addressees for that matter), in the way I'm creating the MODS, it's not going to be possible to include specific @valueURI. I'm therefore going to assume UCLA will do this. Is this OK?

If we're not sure all of these people are in the LC authority file, we shouldn't include the authorityURI either. Lisa, I'll defer to you on whether UCLA can add specific URIs for people after the fact; we certainly have authority experts down here who could identify the appropriate URIs if desired.

+++ Ok, I've removed authorityURI.

Two more things on names: If creator is unknown and we need to record that, it would be better to do so in a note rather than adding Unknown as a name value.

+++Can you give me an example of this?

Let's pretend that the following item is split over two collections. See what I've done below. Is this correct? Also, how would we note that the item is between the two collections?

There's no great way to do this, nor is there a great way to indicate that one specific <mods:location> or <mods:accessCondition> applies to a particular <mods:name>. The best way I can think of to do this is to use the attribute displayLabel in <mods:location> and <mods:accessCondition> to indicate which institution is relevant. And possibly a note further explaining the situation.

+++Would the following be OK?

<mods:location displayLabel="Institution 1"> and <mods:accessCondition displayLabel="Institution 2">


I can't do custom names in displayLabel the way that I'm doing this.

By "note," do you mean that after, for instance, <mods:accessCondition displayLabel="Institution 2">, I would simply put something like <note displayLabel="Institution 2">This institution only holds a part of this item.</note>. The displayLabel then, in this way, would link everything together.

Note that for acronyms such as DLC, we have a spreadsheet that identifies the actual repositories.

Would it be possible to use the full names of the repositories in the records?

+++Let me see how feasible this is. It may be a bit of work.

 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 1 week ago

+++Can you give me an example of this?

Sure. You wouldn't use the <mods:name> element at all for the unknown creator, but instead add a <mods:note> saying something like. **One of the authors is unidentified.** The note isn't necessary, but might help if you think users would be confused where there are clearly multiple creators but only some are known quantities.

Linking Name/accessCondition

Actually, backing up for a second, could we add the attribute type="use and reproduction" to all the accessCondition elements?

I talked to Lisa about this, and we came up with an alternative way of handling this, which is to put the repository name/accessCondition into <mods:relatedItem type="original">, since all of the other MODS elements are subelements to that. In other words...

<mods:relatedItem type="original">

```


<mods:name type="corporate">
<mods:namePart>DLC</mods:namePart>
etc.etc.etc.
</mods:name>
<mods:accessCondition type="use and reproduction">
[DLC access conditions]
</mods:accessCondition>
<mods:location>
[DLC location]
</mods:location>
</mods:relatedItem>

```

If that won't work, Lisa and I think we could do some processing on our end to preface the related location/accessCondition with the name of the relevant institution.

Similarly, Lisa says we can do a find & replace to get the full names of the repositories into the records, so you do not need to worry about that.

Elizabeth McAulay Please check to make sure I am not misstating our conversation! 😊

 Adrian Wisnicki added a comment - 1 week ago

Brilliant. This all makes sense and is easy to work in.

So that leave my question re: <mods:relatedItem type="otherVersion">

<!-- For the last one of these, it's not letting me put in the following: <http://historical.ha.com/c/item.zx?saleNo=6093&lotIdNo=88014#97189718550> [accessed 6 March 2014] -->

Also, regarding expanding the institutional repository acronym, I've got an easy way to do this, so I'll do it. Moreover, say the initials are "NLS," in my spreadsheet I already have the data to give you:

National Library of Scotland

or


National Library of Scotland (Edinburgh, Scotland)

or

National Library of Scotland (Edinburgh, Scotland) <http://www.nls.uk/>

or any variant in any order of the above.

What's your preference?

 Adrian Wisnicki added a comment - 1 week ago

Given the grouping of the repository info, it also makes sense to put in the physical details of the item as they apply to that repository, so I've done the following:

```

<mods:relatedItem type="original">
<mods:name type="corporate">
<mods:namePart>DLC</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type="text" authority="marcrelator">repository</mods:roleTerm>
</mods:role>
</mods:name>
<mods:location>
<mods:shelfLocator>Cat. 1123</mods:shelfLocator>
</mods:location>
<mods:physicalDescription>
<mods:note type="physical details">MS aut</mods:note>
<mods:extent unit="pages">106</mods:extent>
<mods:note>53 folia, folded to create 106 pages, with writing on 106 pages</mods:note>
<mods:extent unit="mm">151 x 90</mods:extent>
</mods:physicalDescription>
<mods:accessCondition type="use and reproduction">© University of Glasgow Photographic Unit.
Images of the Livingstone manuscripts from the David Livingstone Centre made by the University
of Glasgow Photographic Unit licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0
Unported license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/).</mods:accessCondition>
<mods:accessCondition type="use and reproduction">© David Livingstone Centre, Blantyre.
Manuscript text licensed for use under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0
Unported license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/).</mods:accessCondition>
<mods:accessCondition type="use and reproduction">© Dr. Neil Imray Livingstone Wilson. As

```


relevant, all original Livingstone works licensed for use under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported license
 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/).</mods:accessCondition>
 </mods:relatedItem>
 <mods:relatedItem type="original">


Sound good?

 Elizabeth McAulay added a comment - 1 week ago

I was just writing a comment when I realized I should find out how frequently there are MODS records with more than one holding repository. If it is 20 or less, we might want to hand adjust those MODS if that will ease some of the problems. (not sure if it will!)

Anyway, Claudia and I discussed different solutions earlier today and she represented those well above (thanks, Claudia!) We actually were breaking our usual practice to include information about the original in the relatedItem field. We almost always represent that as relevant information about the digital asset. So, I'd prefer to have the physicalDescription fields still in the main MODS record and not encapsulated in the relatedItem. That will keep the Livingstone records more conformant with our standard practice. And that means that we will have an easier time manipulating the metadata for display on the web. The most important element above is the note with the value "MS aut", which we could use as a facet if desirable.

By the way, that inspires me to mention that it might be worthwhile to expand the shorthand for those values into full words, and / or use a controlled vocabulary.

 Elizabeth McAulay added a comment - 1 week ago - edited

The Library of Congress name authority file (LCNAF) has:


National Library of Scotland.

I'd vote for using that value, but look for confirmation from Claudia.

 Elizabeth McAulay added a comment - 1 week ago

And the LCNAF for our DLC is:

David Livingstone Centre.

 Adrian Wisnicki added a comment - 1 week ago

I was just writing a comment when I realized I should find out how frequently there are MODS records with more than one holding repository. If it is 20 or less, we might want to hand adjust those MODS if that will ease some of the problems. (not sure if it will!)


+++There are three of them :->

So, I'd prefer to have the physicalDescription fields still in the main MODS record and not encapsulated in the relatedItem.

+++No problem.

By the way, that inspires me to mention that it might be worthwhile to expand the shorthand for those values into full words, and / or use a controlled vocabulary.

+++I'll generate a list in a moment.

 Adrian Wisnicki added a comment - 1 week ago

The Library of Congress name authority file (LCNAF) has:


National Library of Scotland.

I'd vote for using that value, but look for confirmation from Claudia.

And the LCNAF for our DLC is:

David Livingstone Centre.

+++I'm attaching a spreadsheet of all the institutions involved here. In column A, I have the names as I currently have them. If you'd could have a student get the canonical versions of these names in column B by, say, tomorrow :-> that would be fabulous. It's a tedious task, but should be a fast and easy one. Thanks!

 Adrian Wisnicki added a comment - 1 week ago


I've attached the manuscript abbreviations currently used in the MODS. There are only a handful to these and can easily be changed. Let me know what you'd like to use in substitution. Please feel free to put the substitutes directly in the spreadsheet and I'll make the changes.

 Adrian Wisnicki added a comment - 1 week ago

I was just writing a comment when I realized I should find out how frequently there are MODS records with more than one holding repository. If


it is 20 or less, we might want to hand adjust those MODS if that will ease some of the problems. (not sure if it will!)

+++I've now managed to resolve this further so that there are only two such records. For these two items, the physical details are the same, so there's now not even a need to identify physical details of the part of the item held at one repository over the other.


 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 1 week ago

Adrian Wisnicki & Elizabeth McAulay I've attached a partially complete list of Institutions--you'll see we're having a hard time identifying some with very general names (see Notes column), and there are others we're not sure about. I'm waiting to see if we can quickly establish name authority records for some of those that are currently just local (also in Notes column).

See RevInstitutions.xlsx

 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 1 week ago

And a p.s. is that if we want this perfect, we probably can't complete by tomorrow, more like end of Thursday. So please let me know if you'd rather have something perfect that takes longer, or something less than perfect (but pretty good!) by tomorrow.


 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 6 days ago

Hi Claudia,

Thanks so much for taking this forward so quickly. I'll review the revised list and if there's any info I can provide to help, I'll send it on a little later.

And, yes, why not go for perfection! Let's aim for end of Thursday and take it from there. I really appreciate your help on this!


Adrian

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 6 days ago

Hi Claudia,

See the attached, revised spreadsheet 2. I've added locations to all the archives, which should answer a lot of your questions, although I also answered them as well (see green cells). Hope this helps!

Adrian

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 6 days ago


Just a reminder that I need an answer for the following question:

<!-- For the last one of these, it's not letting me put in the following: <http://historical.ha.com/c/item.zx?saleNo=6093&lotIdNo=88014#97189718550> [accessed 6 March 2014] -->

The good news is that I've now otherwise been able to use my spreadsheet and a groovy script (and I do mean that both ways) to batch generate all the MODS files as a test. All looks good, so once we finalize the remaining bits. We'll be in good shape to close out this aspect of the project.

Also, as a rule, MODS accepts URL in the fields. The above seems to be an anomaly because of the specific text in the URL. It's possible that other URLs also have this issue.

Lisa, is there a way to check via Oxygen, at one go, if all the files I've generated are valid. It won't do to check these 2000+ records one by one.

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 6 days ago

Also, Lisa, if you could please give me the preferred versions of the manuscript abbreviations (attached to this thread) as soon as you can, I can also work them into the MODS. As noted, there are only a handful of these, so keeping my fingers crossed this should be straightforward.

 **Elizabeth McAulay** added a comment - 5 days ago

Yes, there is a way to check if all are valid in oXygen. I have to remind myself of the steps. It involves creating a project in oXygen, which I don't do very often, but is very convenient for this sort of thing. Do you use that feature usually?

 **Elizabeth McAulay** added a comment - 5 days ago


For the URL question above, the problem is the "&". Ampersand is a reserved character and so it cannot be used in XML. You can encode it as an entity "&" which is okay.

When I open the URL you have above it resolves to a URL without the ampersand, so maybe that is better? I am not sure:

<http://historical.ha.com/itm/autographs/non-american/david-livingstone-autograph-with-henry-stanley-autograph-letter/a/6093-34644.s#97189718550>

 **Elizabeth McAulay** added a comment - 5 days ago

I have attached "Manuscript Abbreviations_lisa_2015_03_04.xlsx" – which has my first wave of controlled vocabulary based on searching the Art and Architecture Thesaurus (AAT). I'd like **Claudia Horning** to review and revise.

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 5 days ago


Yes, there is a way to check if all are valid in oXygen. I have to remind myself of the steps. It involves creating a project in oXygen, which I don't do very often, but is very convenient for this sort of thing. Do you use that feature usually?

+++I've used it a few times, but am not well versed in it at all, so any guidance appreciated.

When I open the URL you have above it resolves to a URL without the ampersand, so maybe that is better? I am not sure:

<http://historical.ha.com/itm/autographs/non-american/david-livingstone-autograph-with-henry-stanley-autograph-letter/a/6093-34644.s#97189718550>

+++Let me check. Also, I've figured out a way to isolate the files that have URLs like this, there aren't many, so I'll go through those as least one by one to see if there are any other problematic URLs. In terms of encoding entities, do you prefer decimal or hexadecimal or does it matter?

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 5 days ago

I have attached "Manuscript Abbreviations_lisa_2015_03_04.xlsx" – which has my first wave of controlled vocabulary based on searching the Art and Architecture Thesaurus (AAT). I'd like Claudia Horning to review and revise.

++Thank you! One quick thing to note: remember we also have a genre namespace, which also draws on AAT and **kind of** does what this section of the MODS does, but not quite.

Another way to think of this, having just peeked at your sheet, is that we could add additional genre categories and do away with the Manuscript abbreviation part of the MODS all together.

The only issue is where there would be overlap in terms, i.e., where in the genre category an item was categorized in a particular way, it might be duplicated by what we're adding now. The good news is that, with respect to the terms you've used, I've only used one of these in the genre category so that significantly minimizes – so far, at least, before Claudia looks at this – the potential for duplication.

Hope that make sense?


 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 5 days ago

Sorry, I've been in the weeds all day, just surfacing now.

The mods:physical location note does not need to use a controlled vocabulary, though those can be helpful. So I think we just need to translate the existing abbreviations into something useful/understandable by users.


We could also use the AAT terms and add them as additional Mods:genre terms though!

I've added some suggestions to the spreadsheet, look for the filename with my name in it.

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 5 days ago


Weeds!!?? I thought California was all sunny beaches and what not....

Claudia, Lisa, thanks for your suggestions on this. I've added answers to your questions and comments. So perhaps one more round of review from each of you should do it on this?

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 5 days ago - **edited**

Separately, we also need to review the MODS for illustrative images as the terms used there are somewhat different manuscript MODS. The good news is that there are only four fields in the illustrative because we don't have much info about the illustrative images. The bad news is well, amazingly for once there is no bad news.

I'm attaching a sample record with some comments. Could you both take a look at this when you get a chance. I think, hope, this one should be pretty easy.


 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 5 days ago - **edited**

I've uploaded rev3Institutions, nearly final I think. Please take a look.


 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 5 days ago

re:manuscript abbreviations

Adrian Wisnicki what is the difference between MS aut in and MS aut fr? Is the fragment just smaller?

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 5 days ago

I can't tell you 100% for certain because I didn't make this up (it comes from our original source), but it's something like if you have a full letter (MS aut), a page of a full letter (MS aut in), and a piece cut out of a page of a full letter (MS aut fr). Does that help?

 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 5 days ago

MODS for images:

identifier: We could use `<mods:identifier type="local" displayLabel="master_id">` for both if they're roughly equivalent.


title: agree to leave as is

note: Why not move to `mods:accessCondition`?

Are these all photos? All black & white? I'm wondering if we could batch add an appropriate genre term.


Could we batch add `<mods:physicalDescription>` 1 photograph to all?

Also, is there a date or date range we could apply (earliest possible, latest possible)?

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 5 days ago

I've uploaded rev3Institutions, nearly final I think. Please take a look.

++Claudia, the list looks fabulous! Thank you for your work on this and with a day to spare! I've added some comments for the remaining unresolved entries. Perhaps these help?

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 5 days ago

MODS for images:

identifier: We could use `<mods:identifier type="local" displayLabel="master_id">` for both if they're roughly equivalent.

++OK will do.

title: agree to leave as is

note: Why not move to `mods:accessCondition`?

++OK will do.

Are these all photos? All black & white? I'm wondering if we could batch add an appropriate genre term.

++A combination of color and B&W photos and images. For convenience, I currently have them divided up into the following folders:

Historical artifacts, historical illustrations, historical photographs, institutions-grounds-statues, manuscripts-books-maps-texts, museum information displays, project team


It's a total grab bag.

Could we batch add `<mods:physicalDescription>` 1 photograph to all?

++Sure 1 image would be more appropriate, however.

Also, is there a date or date range we could apply (earliest possible, latest possible)?

++In some cases, yes, in some, no. It would definitely take some work.


 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 5 days ago

I've (optimistically) uploaded a "Final" institution list, which we can of course edit if need be.

On the illustrations:


We could batch add `<mods:genre authority="aat">images</mods:genre>` to all safely, as well as `<mods:physicalDescription><mods:extent>1 image`

I hate to leave resources without any date at all. Can we narrow down the earliest/latest dates for the whole collection, or even the bulk of the collection, to even a century or two? I don't want you to individually examine/investigate each image, though!

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 5 days ago

I hate to leave resources without any date at all. Can we narrow down the earliest/latest dates for the whole collection, or even the bulk of the collection, to even a century or two? I don't want you to individually examine/investigate each image, though!

++OK, let me see what I can do re: dates. Let's say I'm able to come up with specific dates or date ranges, how do you want this to appear in the MODS?

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 5 days ago

Re: the archives list, looks good!

So a question, let's hypothetically say that I figured out how to get the appropriate LCCN URL into the `@valueURI` for each repository as per the following example:


```
<mods:name type='corporate' authorityURI='http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names' valueURI='http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n79092591'>
<mods:namePart>University of London. School of Oriental and African Studies</mods:namePart>
<mods:role>
<mods:roleTerm type='text' authority='marcclerator'>repository</mods:roleTerm>
```

</mods:role>
</mods:name>

For those repositories you've labeled as local, would it be valueURI="local" or would we cut out the authorityURI and valueURI all together?
And how would I give the local with the french URL?

Also one follow question re your spreadsheet:

For Argyll Muniments (Argyllshire, Scotland) – here are the full details: Argyll Muniments, Inverary Castle, Inverary, Argyllshire, Scotland. Does this help?

 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 5 days ago - **edited**

For the local ones, we would omit the attributes of authorityURI and valueURI and instead just use the attribute authority="local"

You can ignore the french URL, that was just thrown in as an explanation.

The Argyll Muniments is still a bit of a mystery, because it doesn't seem to refer to either a personal or corporate name but rather a document or set of documents. I could create a local name value for the castle (Inveraray Castle (Argyllshire, Scotland). Additionally (or alternatively), we could add <mods:titleInfo type="uniform"> <mods:title> Argyll Muniments to record that. I've been Googling "Argyll Muniments" in Google prime and Google Scholar, but no one seems to actually explain what they are so I'm kind of flying blind here. 😊

 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 4 days ago

OK, let me see what I can do re: dates. Let's say I'm able to come up with specific dates or date ranges, how do you want this to appear in the MODS?

In <mods:originInfo> it would be something like this:

<mods:dateCreated>[20th century?]</mods:dateCreated>

<mods:dateCreated encoding="iso8601">1901/2000</mods:dateCreated>

or

<mods:dateCreated>[late 19th-early 20th century?]</mods:dateCreated>

<mods:dateCreated encoding="iso8601">1870/1930</mods:dateCreated>

or


<mods:dateCreated>[between 1853 and 1929]</mods:dateCreated>

<mods:dateCreated encoding="iso8601">1853/1929</mods:dateCreated>

In the "plain" <mods:dateCreated> you have some leeway to explain the range, using brackets and question marks to express uncertainty.

In the iso8601 you have to convert that to [earliest possible date]/[latest possible date]

Does that make sense?

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 4 days ago

Hi Claudia

Thanks for your answers. I'll follow up on them soon. In the meantime two additional questions:


What if the repository is "private owner"? Is that just local?

For some items we have dates ranges. 15 June-23 August 1866 etc. for these the iso8601 is just the start date. Is that ok?

 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 4 days ago

If the repository is just private owner, that would definitely be local. I personally would lean towards putting that in a note rather than making it a name access point, but if you want to be able to browse the collection by repository *including* private owner, then make it a local value.

This is how a range like 15 June-23 August 1866 would be represented in iso8601: 1866-06-15/1866-08-23.

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 4 days ago

Thanks again for all your answers. From looking into this myself, Argyll Muniments is the same as Argyll Monuments, which indeed appears to be a collection at Inverary Castle (<http://www.inveraray-castle.com/>). So please just give me an authority name and URL for that and I think we can call that done. Indeed, there's only one letter (out of 2000+) there. Otherwise, I'm happy to report that I was successful able to get the valueURI coordinated with the repositories, so that's that.

In any case, I'll see if I can sort out the date ranges, so thanks very much for that info.

And that leaves just finalizing the manuscript abbreviations. I attached the most recent version here with comments from me yesterday. I think we've agreed that we'll just put this information into the genre category. So, in short, what's needed next is for you, Claudia, to please review my comments and see if you can come up with terms for the few items that are still outstanding. Would you mind doing that when you get a chance?


Thanks again

 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 4 days ago

Okay for Argyll let's go with:
Inveraray Castle (Argyllshire, Scotland). Argyll Monuments
type="local"


I'm running out the door so don't have time to update the spreadsheet.

Also attached a semi-final list of terms for the manuscript abbreviations. Still one or two questions in there--just need to know what sounds best to you guys in terms of wording.

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 4 days ago

Thanks for help with the final bits!.


I'm attaching the institutions masterlist for future reference.

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 4 days ago - **edited**

I just reviewed your changes to the manuscript abbreviations and had an idea on how to handle this, so I've made some changes/additions highlighted in green. Here's an explanation of what I've done:

1. These originally were specific only to Livingstone manuscripts. I expanded them to other items in our digital collection, but there's really no need to do so, especially as the other items already have AAT genres attached to them as well.
2. So I'll remove these from the other items and leave them only with the Livingstone items.
3. Effectively, these originally split Livingstone items into two categories 1) original autographs and 2) copies of some sort, so I've used genre (column D) to reiterate those categories, as we don't want to lose the distinction.
4. Within each of the two broad categories, a number of subcategories were original created to distinguish among different types of autographs and copies. So, I've also chosen descriptions (column C) to correlate to the original descriptions, with the idea in mind that we want to retain the distinctions among the different kinds of autographs and among the different kinds of copies. I've also chosen genres (column E) to reflect these distinctions.


See what you think, but I think this lines up neatly and makes sense this way.

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 4 days ago

Claudia,

Please find attached a sample illustrative MODS for your review. Two questions in there for you, but I think finalizing this should be straightforward.

Adrian

 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - 4 days ago

Sample illustrative MODS:

Is this how to do the name?

Livingstone Online should be mods:name type="corporate"

Note: not every item will be associated with a repository, particularly those images that belong to Livingstone Online itself. Should we count Livingstone Online as a "local" repository, or just leave it as creator above, or both? Maybe something like: UCLA Digital Library Program. Livingstone Online for repository?

I'd like [Elizabeth McAulay](#) to weigh in on this one.

Also, it looks like there's no closing `</relatedItem>`?

Manuscript Abbreviations

Looks good to me! [Elizabeth McAulay](#)?

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - 3 days ago - **edited**


Hi Claudia,

As always thanks for your help on this! In terms of Sample Illustrative MODS and Manuscript Abbreviations, it sounds like we'll be able to close these out once Lisa chimes in, so let's wait on her. What a marathon it's been wrapping these up, so I appreciate you (and Lisa) hanging in there!

The last thing I need to ask of you, prior to the images going off to UNL for addition of metadata to the headers, is to finalize the MODS to DC crosswalk. We've already worked on this, so I've done an updated version which I'm attaching. This takes account of all our revisions to the MODS and, I think, covers all possibilities. Could you please take a look at this when you get a chance?

Thanks again.

Adrian

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - Yesterday

Here's a quick run down of where we are with the MODS. This supercedes all open questions above.


1. Using the magic of spreadsheets, I was again able to get all the bibliographic otherVesion information into the MODS, so it's no longer needed for UCLA to write a script for this.
2. Lisa needs to review and confirm the manuscript abbreviations schema we've put together (see attached). Claudia has already OK'd this (see previous comments).
3. Lisa needs to review the illustraive MODS sample I've created (attached). Claudia has already reviewed this, I fixed things based on her feedback, so only one point still needs resolution:

Adrian: Note: not every item will be associated with a repository, particularly those images that belong to Livingstone Online itself. Should we count Livingstone Online as a "local" repository, or just leave it as creator above, or both? Maybe something like: UCLA Digital Library Program. Livingstone Online for repository?

Claudia: I'd like Elizabeth McAulay to weigh in on this one.

4. Claudia and Lisa need to finalize the MODS to DC crosswalk (also attached). This builds on feedback previously provided from one of our advisory board members and Claudia and Lisa. Claudia is currently working on this.


And that's it. Once #2, 3, 4 are done, the MODS can go off to UNL!

 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - Yesterday

I'm not sure if UNL wants simple or qualified/refined DC. My initial take includes refinements, but can be made simple by removing all the types.

One of our uses of <mods:relatedItem>, though correct in MODS, is very confusing when mapped to <dc:relation> so I've tentatively mapped to <dc:publisher> It could also go to <dc:contributor>

Thoughts?


 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - Yesterday

Claudia, this looks great! Thank you. In terms of your question, that's correct that that is the repository that holds the given item.

I must admit, looking at your spreadsheet, that I like the idea of using:

<dc:contributor type="provenance">

as in a lot of cases the images haven't been "published" and that could be a bit misleading/confusing. Lisa?

 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - Yesterday

Unfortunately, you can't refine contributor with type="provenance" in DC, only publisher. There's no really good, simple way to record the repository. I've seen DC "extended" like this:

```
<descriptionSet xmlns:marcrel="http://www.loc.gov/loc.terms/relators/"
xmlns:dc="http://purl.org/dc/elements/1.1/">
```

```
<description>
```

```
...
```

```
<dc:publisher>John Smith</dc:publisher>
```

```
<marcrel:OWN>John Smith</marcrel:OWN>
```

```
...
```

```
</description>
```

```
<descriptionSet>
```

 **Elizabeth McAulay** added a comment - Yesterday

Answering on the manuscript_abbreviations.

I think "autograph" means "written in one's own hand" so we should have values like this:

Complete autograph

Incomplete autograph

Fragmentary autograph

Manuscript copy also in creator's hand

Manuscript copy, unknown hand


Photocopy of autograph

Microfilm of autograph

Is that too esoteric? If so, then we might want to phrase it like this:

Complete manuscript in creator's hand


Let me know – I am open to suggestions!

 **Elizabeth McAulay** added a comment - Yesterday

About Illustrative Images:

For Images created for or by the Livingstone Online projects. E.g., images of project staff engaged in work for the project.

My leaning would be not to provide information about a repository for those images. However, if you both think we should note that, then we might want to have a note along these lines: "Digital image created as part of the Livingstone Online project. Master digital image managed by the UCLA Digital Library Program."

 **Elizabeth McAulay** added a comment - Yesterday


Comments on the role of the repository vis a vis DC.

I think the only good place for the repository would be in a description tag. In which case, you might want to expand the value from just the name of the repository to something like. "Original item held by \$VALUE"


What do you two think?

Commentary that is of only esoteric and philosophical importance:

One of the reasons I find Dublin Core really hard to work with is that it does not like to describe the analog object from which a digital object was created. Instead, DC likes to be completely about the digital asset. On the one hand, that's very pure of them and you avoid having a "hybrid" record (Claudia will know I'm referencing a topic often discussed by Metadata instructor at UCLA and Vocabularies Maven Murtha Baca). However, there is no digital asset that was digitized from an analog for which you don't want to know where the analog object comes from!

 **Elizabeth McAulay** added a comment - Yesterday

I approve of the MODS to DC crosswalk, excepting the discussion of the repository name. I am happy to be guided by both of you on that issue now that I had my two cents. 😊

 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - Yesterday

I like Lisa's versions of the abbreviations, and I am okay with moving the repository to <dc:description> with a prefatory note. What do you think, Adrian?

And yes, DC can be frustrating in its purity!

 **Adrian Wisnicki** added a comment - Yesterday

Re: Repository in DC:

<dc:description>Original item held by Arquivo Histórico Ultramarino (Portugal).</dc:description>

Correct? If so, looks good to me!

Re: Manuscript abbreviations


I like Lisa's slightly longer versions, so let's go with those:

Complete manuscript in creator's hand

Re: Images created for or by the Livingstone Online projects.

Let's just skip having a repository

And I think that resolves all questions. We are done and good to go, no?

 **Claudia Horning** added a comment - Yesterday

And I think that resolves all questions. We are done and good to go, no?

I think so. Yay!

 **Elizabeth McAulay** added a comment - Yesterday

This is great news! Closing this ticket. Good job, all!

People

Assignee:

 Adrian Wisnicki

Reporter:

 Adrian Wisnicki

Votes:

0

Watchers:

3 [Stop watching this issue](#)

Dates

Due:

02/Mar/15

Created:

27/Feb/15 12:39 PM

Updated:

Yesterday

Resolved:

Yesterday
