Reference for meeting on place names

Nesting of places

- **TE**: It would be helpful to add to the discussion of XML encapsulation as a method for signaling geographic containment a reference to the later discussion of **<relation>**. In the latter portion of the guidance the alternative of <relation type="partOf" ... /> is introduced; it would be helpful to have a back reference from the encapsulation discussion earlier in the section. In fact, I'd prefer guidance that privileges use of <relationship> over encapsulation to indicate containment relationships.

  LR: "<relation> vs containment. It always makes me uneasy to have too many ways of doing exactly the same thing, but it's hard to see what containment could mean for <place>s within <place>s other than what is proposed, nor to argue against allowing for relationships other than containment, so we wound up with both. Contrast this with the discussion of what <nym> within <nym> means -- something quite different."

- **DOD:** The main issues I had, however, were the inability to create structures within groups of the main elements (i.e. placeName or placeTrait) and, in the case of the river, to express parts of the place (this last is not too hard, I suspect though).

  - in the case of Lethbridge I went to Census Canada, where there were a number of newly released placeTraits. But there is no way of keeping the internal (tabular) structure Census Canada or even group them as a subsection of the placeTrait. Leaving aside the ability to introduce tables--though these are commonly used by geographers—it would be nice to be able to do something like this at least:

    ```
    <placeTrait type="population">
      <placeTrait type="singleMales20-24">20</placeTrait>
      <placeTrait type="singleFemales20-24">19</placeTrait>
    </placeTrait>
    ```

  - Finally, in the case of the Oldman river, I wanted to be able both to group locations (some places on the river are both lat-long, confluences, and towns and it would nice to indicate their relationship to each other--a similar problem to the above) and discuss the river in terms of the different geographical areas it went through—mountainous, foothills, and plains. Here I was getting my information from a study of the river and they tended to discuss the river in this way.
    One option for this would have been to divide the river into multiple places, one each for each region:

    ```
    <place>
      <placeName>Oldman river</placeName>
      <place>
        <placeName>Mountainous region</placeName>
        <location/>
      </place>
      <place>
        <placeName>Foothills region</placeName>
        <location/>
      </place>
    ```

```
<place>
  <placeName>Plains region</placeName>
  <location/>
</place>
</place>
```

The trouble with this, though, is that the same source discussed the climate in two regions--mountains and plains (which affected foothills and plains). I thought I'd then try to tie placeTraits to location ranges, but there is no corresp or targets att available.

State/Trait

To decide whether:

a) copy Trait/State/Event from person,

b) invent new generic elements instead

c) drop Trait from place

- **AC trac 307**: The ODD makes <gi>locale</gi> member of model.placeTraitLike and <gi>location</gi> member of model.placeStateLike. Now, the definition of state/trait (changeable/unchanging) as for the 'personography' section doesn't really match intuitively the concept, respectively, of location/locale. It should probably be the other way round.

  LB: "locale should be unchanging, I agree, and location can change."

  AC: see examples under 'locale' where the type of locale changes over time. "Probably, as far as places regard, the concepts of State/Trait should be treated differently compared to what's now the practice for persons. "

- **AC trac 307**: In general, we need more description for the formal sections related to <gi>placeTrait</gi> and <gi>placeState</gi> at least. Actually, I am not sure that we need two classes here. If we do, they will certainly differ from the 'personography' model. Indeed trait/state for places seem to correspond to very blurred concepts (the inconsistency in the examples confirm this e.g. size encoded as a trait and as a state).

  LB: "Yes, I tend to agree. Maybe we don't need both, but then we need to have a very clear rationale for keeping them both in person as well!"

Locale

- **AC trac 307**: Secondly, is <gi>locale</gi> necessary if we are adding already <gi>place</gi>? e.g. <place type="building" subtype="restaurant">

  LB: "<locale> provides a more detailed description of the sort of place it is. Yes, you could use type and subtype instead to categorize it more formally, and maybe we don't need locale therefore."

  AC trac 307: If there is agreement for keeping <gi>locale</gi>, this element should be enriched of other attributes (at least att.typed and att.datable I would say).

  LB: "att.typed might be useful; and att.datable seems dubious to me."

  AC: "I defend att.datable because, if we keep <gi>locale</gi>, the same place could become different things over time (e.g. a restaurant, a bar, a greengrocer shop; a library, a refectory,

a stable)."

- **TE**: "locale" is problematic
    - For an element containing a "brief informal description of the nature of a place for example a room, a restaurant, a park bench etc.". To most working at the intersection of history and geography (I would argue), "locale" connotes something like "vicinity" or "immediate environs". There's also the problematic overlap of internet/web terminology, where "locale" indicates "a set of parameters that defines the user's language, country and any special variant preferences that the user wants to see in their user interface".
    - How does using <locale> differ from a usage (also explicit in the examples) like:
        > <place type="islandGroup">
    - Perhaps consider:
        - <description> for "informal description of the place and its nature"
        - <place type="paradeGround"> for "formal classification of the nature of the place" vel sim
            - multiple iterations of something like <placeClass> or <placeType> may be required as an alternative within <place> to accommodate multiple classifications (c.f., "feature class" in the ADL Gazetteer schema)

LB: "<locale> was a pre-existing TEI element which we pressganged into service here. It does seem a bit problematic as to name, and its overlap with other ways of characterizing a place."

Latitude and Longitude

- **AC trac 307**:
    - Latitude and Longitude "<location scheme="latlong">41.687142 -74.870109</location>"
    - probably we DO need specific attributes for latitude and longitude and defined standard datatype as it has been done for date/time. Alternatively we could recommend the use of <gi>measure</gi> (as in one of the examples quoted below).

        LB: "They should certainly be made consistent!"

    - instead of using <att>scheme</att> the following examples follow other routes (should we uniform them all? if yes to what?): "<location type="lat-long">65 00 N, 18 00 W</location>" "<location type="latLong"><measure unit="latlong">40.7484° N 73.9858° W</measure></location>"

        LB: "I will make these consistent."

- **TE**: Given the option of using GML (and maybe GeoRSS!) within <location>, I would encourage deprecation of markup like the following (from one of the examples), except perhaps in the case where the TEI Places profile proves appropriate for the encoding of an existing (print) gazetteer using a Lat/Lon encoding other than that recognized by GML or GeoRSS profiles: <location type="lat-long">65 00 N, 18 00 W</location>

Sources, assertions, responsibilities, uncertainty

- **AC trac 307**: add placeName as member of att.EditLike?

LB: "I can see why you want att.editLike, but I'm wondering whether it ought not to be enough to add it to <place>. the <location> within <place> is supposed to define a <place>, so if there are two opinionms about it, maybe it's two different places?"

- **AC trac 307**: I would add att.editLike to <gi>location</gi>

  LB: " can see why you want att.editLike, but I'm wondering whether it ought not to be enough to add it to <place>. the <location> within <place> is supposed to define a <place>, so if there are two opinionms about it, maybe it's two different places?"

    AC: not necessarily. For historical/cultural reasons a place may be known and identified as such i.e. perceived culturally or historically as a place (e.g. Troy); while where the place is physically located may be another matter open to multiple interpretations.

- **TE**: How to cite/reference **source(s)** of locations or names? Maybe via resp attributes? Or some other method?

  SR: "source of assertion about locations etc; this should be catered for already with <bibl> child, I think."

  LB: "Linking assertions with responsibility statements is a recurrent thread. We have discussed a generic <assert> element, to combine an assertion with an indication of responsibility and certainty, but backed away from it as being too complex, and not adding much beyond what the existing @resp and @cert attributes provide; also there is an existing method for marking certainty (http://tei.oucs.ox.ac.uk/Guidelines/Source/Guidelines/en/guidelines-en.xml.ID=CE) which should be taken into consideration."

- **DOD**: It would be nice to be able first of all to qualify names (something I guess you can do with type), and secondly somehow group and distinguish among alternatives, commenting on mistakes if applicable. Also, almost every source I saw glossed the Native names the first time they came up. I did this by using foreign within placeName, but I can see that causing problems if you only gloss "unusual" foreign names: so I could see in the case of something like Rome using placeName xml:lang="en" for Rome, and placeName xml:lang="it" for Roma but wanting to gloss whatever the Blackfoot word for the city is.

Dates and periods

- **AC trac 159**: The example for <gi>birth</gi> doesn't use any attributes from att.datable: "These attributes can be combined in various ways to provide additional nuances. Consider, for example, the following: <birth>15 March 1857.</birth>"

- **AC trac 159**: in the formal description of att.dateTime.w3c there is a pointer to a footnote (35) that probably shouldn't be there.

- **AC trac 159**: is the following (values of <att>value</att>) correct? "<time xml:lang="en-US" type="descriptive" value="13:45:00-05:00">"

- **AC trac 159**: no reference to <att>calendar</att> is now made in this chapter, but I imagine it would be invaluable even just to say that the P5.1 will look into ways of supporting calendar systems different from the Gregorian one.

- **DOD**: "I found a couple of minor inconsistencies in the ODD: notBefore and notAfter failing to be available in places where the examples say they should be, examples that should text data in elements that the ODD requires child elements for. I also wonder if we shouldn't have someway of indicating point-in-time for all elements that have

from/to/notBefore/notAfter elements: like birthdays (where we use @date), acts of incorporation or census data are valid only for specific points in time and it felt silly using either from or from/to with the same date to indicate that Lethbridge changed its name on 1885-10-15 orhad 1850 women in common law relationships in the 2001 census."

- **TE**: How to do named time periods (possibly without fixed calendrical dates but relative relationships)?

  LB: "The treatment of dates and times has just undergone major surgery in order to support various kinds of automatic processing and validation, mappings to both ISO and W3C date formats etc. When the patient is mobile again, I agree that we need to start thinking about "named" dates. It should not be too difficult."

Outstanding issues from ticket 159 (general proofreading of ND by AC)

- geogName doesn't really need its own <att>type</att> but could be a member of att.typed
- orgName
    - still has <att>reg</reg> but in the prose has been commented out
    - should become member of att.naming and att.key (it would get <att>nymRef</att> also though)?

  LB: "I think orgName and all of its bits needs some extensive revision to make it consistent with placeName and persName. If we can do that for P5 1.0, good; if not we should consider removing discussion of organizations completely. I have made a trac ticket to that effect."

- the current reference sections for <gi>langKnowledge</gi> now refers to http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4646.txt , but I would also point to something more useful such as http://www.iana.org/assignments/language-subtag-registry and/or http://www.w3.org/International/articles/language-tags/Overview.en.php (as Lou has now done in the prose following my suggestion)

Outstanding issues from ticket 307 (comments to additions to ND on places by AC)

- I believe this material could integrate ND well (possibly as "Data about Places"? just before <div xml:id="NDNYM">?
- group together the classes model.placeStateLike, model.placeTraitLike (assumed we need both), model.placeEventLike into a new class called model.placePart [by the way, I believe in this ODD lots of even already existing elements have been added as members of model.nameLike so that they can be children of <gi>place</gi>]
- have model.placePart in the content model of <gi>place</gi>
- make <gi>listPlace</gi> member of model.placeLike (you could then have <gi>listPlace</gi> within <gi>place</gi>, but this is plausible, isn't it?)

  LB: "what would it mean though?"

  AC: "You could have a place that consists of a set of places that you need to group for some reasons (e.g. county --> list of villages; list of cities)."

- I can see some potential confusion between the use of elements such those described under the section "Geo-political Place Names" of the current ND chapter and the additional

element described here as <gi>locale</gi>. All these elements could be considered as part of the name of a place (therefore members of model.placeNamePart as the former are) as well as part of the description of the place as a real thing (members of a new class model.placePart as mentioned above?).

Take for instance the first example in this file about Lyon. The line <locale>city</locale> could equally be expressed within the placeName as <settlement type="city">. The latter refers to the name just to a certain extent; it may be argued that it refers to the physical category of the place (i.e. stating that it is a city) as well as to the name (i.e. stating that it is the name of a city).

LB: "Yes, but that would be wrong, or rather, they are two different assertions. One is an assertion about a name (that it's a city name); the other is an assertion about a place (that the ***place*** is a city there). You could imagine having a <place type="city"> which persists in referring to itself as a village, for example ("Bicester Village" springs to mind!)"

AC: "I take the point and agree, but I am just saying that it may be confusing and this needs to be made more clear in the prose."

Same is valid for <gi>offset</gi>. It can be used to encode a part of the name of a place or its real physical location (as per section "Geographical names").

The prose seems to clarify and quotes: "<p>As noted previously, <gi>country</gi>, <gi>region</gi>, <gi>settlement</gi> are all specializations of the generic <gi>placeName</gi> element, and may not therefore be used as specializations of the generic <gi>place</gi> element."

However, this is contradicted by the example for <place type="building">, where for example <settlement> is used within <location>, as it is perfectly reasonable, I think.

LB: "I don't think this contradicts it, though I agree it's confusing. The placename type things inside <location> are there to identify the location, not as alternatives to its name."

Outstanding issues: comments by TE

Rhetoric/rationale

1. "make the differences between this schema and competing approaches more explicit in the draft and, having done so, for the Council to consider carefully whether these are sufficient to warrant the extension of the TEI in this direction. The alternative is a TEI endorsement of another encoding format and namespace for this particular class of information."

2. **Rationale** for a TEI place representation, both within TEI and (totally lacking at present) vis-a-vis existing mechanisms already public, e.g.:

   - Why not just use GML for the whole thing?

   - What about the Alexandria Digital Library Gazetteer Content Format?
     - See also: http://www.alexandria.ucsb.edu/gazetteer/
   - What about SpatialML, a "markup language for representing spatial expressions in natural language documents"?

LB: "Absolutely no intention or need for TEI to re-invent detailed geographic metadata already done better by GML and similar. We could do with some real examples though, as

you note.

SpatialML is an interesting one which I have glanced at but not studied in detail: it comes from the very different world of "named entity recognition" . Certainly we ought to review it and the others you mention, before rushing ahead, if only as a fruitful source of examples."

3. Linking essential metadata to geographic coordinates (e.g., coordinate system, scale of source data, minimum mapping unit, precision of coordinates, accuracy of placement)

   - Careful selection (or construction) of the GML profile to be used within <location> should cover this, no?
       - If GML will permit this (I am not a GML lawyer), TEI should **not** roll its own for this aspect. The primary consumer of such information will be automated mapping and spatial query tools, so as non-TEI-specific as possible is best, IMO.
       - But the guidelines needs to discuss it explicitly. This is not unrelated to the "sources" bullet above.

4. What about **GeoRSS** instead of (or as an option to) GML inside <location>? ... given that GeoRSS provides a simple GML profile

   - SR: "we don't need to commit ourselves to GML at all.
     We can say "use some external namespace when you want to do precise location", be it GML, KML, GeoRSS or whatever."

   - LB: "Adding GeoRSS is definitely an option. We only specified GML because that was the one we found on the web... no intention of being exclusive."

Ethnica

- **What about ethnica**? Greek and Roman sources frequently refer to cities and other polities by the plural form of the associated ethnic noun. Personal names often incorporate these ethnica as well, but it's clear that (particularly in the plural) they are often functioning as geographic names. This fact is brought into sharper focus when one considers that, by grammar and orthography, you can't distinguish the name of a tribe/people from the name (effectively) of a city (i.e., its collective citizenry).
    - It's not inappropriate for a gazetteer-like document (either from transcription or born-digital) to include such information. Consider William Smith's Geography ...
    - Is there scope of the addition of <ethnicName>?

LB: "Ethnica sounds interesting. But I think it's a kind of placeName still, not a new kind of name, even though its location may be hard to pin down. After all whether we think of Bristol as "the place with a bridge" or "the place where the Bristolians hang out", it's still a place."