Literals and "non-literals"

- The world of resources is further divided into
 - Literals ("Strings")
 - "self-contained"
 - appear directly in DC metadata
 - "terminals" in DC metadata
 - can not be further "described"
 - Other "non-literal" resources ("Things")
 - referred to in DC metadata
 - can be further described
 - in your metadata or in someone else's metadata elsewhere
- "Things" can be described, "strings" can't



Literals and "non-literals"

- So, the designer of a DC application has to
 - Construct (or adopt) a model of the part of the world of interest
 - Types of resource, types of relationship between resources
- And they have to decide
 - Do I model this as a "Thing" because
 - I need to describe it?
 - Or allow others to describe it?
 - Or take advantage of fact that others have described it?
 - Do I model this as a "String" (literal) because
 - it is "self describing"?
 - I don't need to describe it?
 - Or allow others to describe it?
 - Or make use of others' descriptions of it?
- Choice depends on requirements of application



e.g. http://purl.org/dc/terms/LCSH

DCAM Description Set Model

- a literal value surrogate is made up of
 - exactly one value string
 - encodes value
- a non-literal value surrogate is made up of
 - zero or one value URIs
 - identifies value
 - zero or one vocabulary encoding scheme URI
 - identifies a set of which the value is a member
 - zero or more value strings
 - represents value

e.g. "metadata"

e.g. "métadonnées"

e.g. http://www.w3.org/TR/2004/

REC-rdf-concepts-20040210/

- a value string is either a plain value string or a typed value string
 - a plain value string may have an associated value string language
 - a typed value string is associated with a syntax encoding scheme URI
- Vocabulary Encoding Scheme
 - A named set to which a "Thing" belongs
- Syntax Encoding Scheme
 - A named set of rules for the "interpretation" of a set of "Strings"

e.g. "DCMI Abstract Model"

