Missionary Travels Coding Issues

Overwriting Issues

1) The kind where Livingstone deletes one word in his own hand by writing over it with another. This is dealt with in 11.11 of the manual:

<subst><del>gave</del><add place="over-text">handed</add></subst>

So no changes to manual needed? Please confirm.

No change to the manual required

2) The kind where Livingstone writes over an editorial suggestion (ie another hand) with the same word in order to confirm it. This is dealt with by your last suggestion: See ‘dug’, two thirds of the way down in the margin of 0044. See also ‘still they’ on line 7 of 0049.

<w><add place="marginleft" hand="#U2" rend="gray">dug</add><add place="over-text">dug</add></w>

I think we may add a new element for this: <retrace>. I'll ask James how this works exactly, but take a look here:<http://www.tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/html/ref-retrace.html> Also read the "note" all the way at the bottom.

This looks perfect to me. From the note at the bottom, it looks like this is precisely what I’m looking for!

We will use the following: <retrace>, as in this example:

<retrace hand=”#DL”><add place="marginleft" hand="#U2" rend="gray">dug</add></retrace>

A new section needs to be added to the manual.

Excellent

3) Livingstone occasionally writes over a symbol added by an editor in order to confirm it (ie a caret or another metamark). We need a way of doing this. The same as above, except without <w> seems feasible.

Same as #2, I think, would do.

Agreed

Exactly as #2.

Excellent

4) Livingstone sometimes writes over a suggestion by the editor with a different word or symbol, in order to delete/change it. The problem here is showing that we have both an editorial addition, and that it’s substituted by Livingstone using overwriting. How about the following:

<add place="marginleft" hand="#U2" rend="gray">editor’s word</add><add place="over-text">Livingstone’s correction</add>

So no change to manual? Please confirm.

The manual currently only contains the sort of overwriting identified in #1, where Livingstone’s self-overwriting is also marked as a kind of substitution/deletion. My attempt above doesn’t show that when Livingstone writes over an editorial suggestion/addition with a different word that he is also making such a ‘deletion’ or ’ substitution'. But perhaps this isn’t necessary and indicating that his new word is “over-text” is enough. Either way, it would be great to have a reference to this in the manual. Or I can just include whatever we decide on in our additional MT coding notes.

I think the following does the trick:

<subst><del><add place="marginleft" hand="#U2" rend="gray">editor’s word</add></del><add place="over-text">Livingstone’s correction</add></subst>

This is just a variant of something we’re already doing, but we can add a supplemental note about this to the manual.

Quick question - does the order of the first <add> and <del> matter here?

Let’s go with: <add place="marginleft" hand="#U2" rend="gray"><subst><del>editor’s word</del><add place="over-text" hand=”#DL”>Livingstone’s correction</add></subst></add>

5) Occasionally a word is deleted by the editor and then DL scribbles over it too to indicate he confirms the deletion. See, for example, the first few lines of 0082 which have been first deleted by the editor and then by DL. See third line on 0048

Something like:

<del type="cancelled" rend="gray" hand="#U2">You</del><del type="cancelled" place=“over-text”>You</del> (this currently shows up as an error)

Same as #2, I think, would do.

Yes, I think retrace could work here too. But I’d need guidance on how to show that DL is retracing the deletion or scribble, rather than the initial word.

This is what we’ll use:

<retrace hand=”#DL”><del type="cancelled" rend="gray" hand="#U2">You</del></retrace>

A note needs to be added to the <retrace> section.

Does this make it clear that the word ‘you’ isn’t retraced as well. Does it capture the fact that it’s only the scribbled deletion that is retraced?

If Livingstone rewrites the deleted word:

<retrace hand=”#DL”><del type="cancelled" rend="gray" hand="#U2">You</del></retrace>

If Livingstone confirms the deletion:

<del hand=”#DL”><del type="cancelled" rend="gray" hand="#U2">You</del></del>

A note needs to be added to the <retrace> section.

6) Sometimes the opposite to #4 happens: the editor writes over a word of Livingstone’s in order to delete/change it. I think encoding it as below. Please confirm.

<subst><del hand="#U2">no</del><add place="over-text" rend="gray" hand="#U2">any</add></subst>

I think the above looks fine, except I’ve removed the color from the <del> as it’s also captured in the <add> so no need to do it twice.

Great

Other issues

1) The editor occasionally underlines one of DL’s words in pencil (or engages in some other small act of formatting). This could be dealt with if hand="#U2" rend="gray" could be added to <hi>. rend would need to show both colour and underlining – something like “gray underline”. See ‘(turn over)’ on 0057.

So: <hi hand="#U2" rend="underline gray">Livingstone’s word</hi>

This looks fine to me. Does Oxygen not accept it?

<hi> doesn’t seem to accept hand

Let’s ask James

2) As you know, when coding metamarks we’ve been adding functions when they have a clear purpose (insertion, deletion, transposition, new paragraph). But sometimes the editor draws a circle around a word or one of his own symbols. Is just leaving that as an empty metamark (with a comment) enough? See the circle around the deleted words two thirds of the way down 0076.

We could do <metamark type=”circle”/> if you like. Just let me know. You could also come up with a list of things that would go under type: circle, box, square, whatever suits.

Creating a list sounds like a good idea. If text is included in a circle can we do as you suggest in point 6 and indicate this by opening and closing the metamark? ie <metamark type=”circle”>DL’s words</metamark>

We’ve been using “function” with metamark for deletion, insertion, transposition. I wonder if we can use both “function” and “type” in metamark to add specificity where possible ie: <metamark type="dotted line" function="deletion">and</metamark>

We are going to avoid using type, other than putting it in a comment <!-- type=”dotted-line”-->

3) When there is a long line marking a section (often to signal a query), we’re just using an empty metamark (with a comment). But it would be good to have a way of marking the length of the line, where it runs for quite a few lines or even over a page. See 0059-0060.

We could do <metamark dim=”vertical” extent=”5” unit=”lines”/> or <metamark dim=”vertical” extent=”1” unit=”pages”/>. Would that suit?

That would work well. Would it be possible to combine that with the sorts of values you’ve mentioned above? ie in this case, “long line”. And would it be advisable to open and close the metamark as you suggest in point 6, or is that unnecessary?

We’ll just open and close the metamark and note its extent in a comment.

4) We use <add place="below"><metamark function="transposition"/></add> when an arrow or other mark indicates that Livingstone or the editor wants to move some words or part of the body of text from one place to another. Looking at Stephen’s transcriptions, what he’s been doing is moving the material intended to be transposed at the same time. Look for instance at 0501. About two thirds of the way down, DL clearly moves the sentence ‘Spoons not being generally in fashion’ up before the sentence beginning ‘The milk. Following the use of the transposition metamark, Stephen has been transcribing the moved material within the add tag. In other words, he has moved the sentence since this is what Livingstone’s arrows indicate. This seems right to me, but wanted to check. See also the transposition of the word ‘which’ in the margin of 0086.

This one is tricky. Our broadest policy is that we transcribe the physical document not the intended object, in which case text should be left where it is and movement only be indicated via <metamark/>. That said, I for one have certainly not followed this and moved text when Livingsotne wanted it moved, as in what you describe. So we could formally take this as the exception to the rule and would then only need to do it consistently. In other words, everytime DL says move a word, we do it. Is that what you would like? If so, fine by me. We just need to add a section to the manual.

That would be my preference, I must admit…

Let’s go with the following to indicate moved text.

<lb/>some <anchor xml:id="01"/> text

<lb/>

<lb/><metamark corresp="#01" function="reorder">nice</metamark>

5) This one is a major issue. In Sect 13 (beginning 0304) we first encounter something that will occur quite a bit in vol 3.

Here, Livingstone starts writing on the back of the page. Where it’s clearly a standalone addition intended to be inserted into another page (as in 0306), we deal with this using the anchor tag. Or if the text flows on from the previous page, we just transcribe as normal.

But it gets tricky when DL starts writing continuous text on the backs of pages, which don’t necessarily flow simply from one page to another. So in Sect 13, due to DL’s later addition, the actual reading order of the pages is 0311,0312,0314, 0313. Stephen tried to code these as additions following on from the end of previous using the anchor tag pages (ie anchored to where Livingstone says ‘see back of next page’), but could only get the code to validate when he altered the order of the transcribed pages. Ie he had to transcribe them in the order 0311, 0312, 0314, 0313. I think using the anchor tag might be unnecessary here, and that we can just transcribe them without this. What do you think?

It does raise the general question though of what we should do when the reading order of pages is jumbled like this, due to DL adding material later by writing on the verso of the page. In volume three, in some places this gets really confusing, and would be very hard to follow without reordering the pages.

See my note for #4 above. In this case, I think we should default to our rule of favoring physical document. In other words, each back of page should be treated as a separate page and transcribed as such. If this means that you’d have to close a paragraph prematurely at the end of the preceding page, then open it again on the following, that’s what you’d have to do:

…preceding page text in</p>

<pb/>

<p>back of page text</p>

<pb/>

<p>middle of sentence….

Happy to follow this. It will mean that the text will be a bit tricky for the reader to follow, but as you say we’re transcribing the text as it appears.

Start with <add>, if schema doesn’t accept, then go to <addSpan> per normal use. Both <add> and <addSpan> take @corresp and work in conjunction with <anchor>

text…<anchor xml:id=”01”/>text. ..text

<pb/><!--back→

<add corresp=”#01”> <anchor xml:id=”02”></add>

<pb/>

text text

<pb/>

<add corresp=”#02”></add>

6) Proof correction marks. Some of these are dealt with using metamark plus a function. But there are others that aren’t. For instance, Livingstone underlines the deleted word ‘right’ on 0082 using a dotted line. This is the proof correction mark for ‘let stand’. Currently, we’ve transcribed this as over-writing – ie as though DL has rewritten the word ‘right’.

In this case, I would treat it as a metamark and use type=”dotted-line”. This type would need to be added to the manual. Also, you could try to use metamark as a regular tag to see if you could record where something began and ended, so:

<metamark type=”dotted-line”/>word

or

<metamark type=”dotted-line”>word</metamark>

Would one of the above suit?

I prefer the second option, using metamark as a regular tag. I’ve tried this and it works. This could also be used for “circle” etc discussed in point two

We’re going to put a metamark around the text, opening and closing it to demonstrate its extent. This could apply to a circle, square, long line etc. A note should be added to describe the metamark. In cases of the dotted line, use function=”let-stand”

<metamark hand="#DL" function="let-stand"><del hand="#U1">right<del></metamark>

7) Page number query. When there are two (or more) sets of page numbers in the top right hand corner, we code like this:

<lb/><fw><add place="margintop" hand="#U1" rend="gray right">58</add> <add place="margintop below" hand="#U1" rend="gray right">80</add></fw>

But in this example, on 0083, the number 80 is below 56. It’s actually really inline with the line above, but we should probably keep all added page numbers in the header <fw> to be consistent.

I would do this slightly differently and treat the 80 as an addition below the 58:

<lb/><fw><add place="margintop" hand="#U1" rend="gray right">58 <add place="below" hand="#U1" rend="gray right">80</add></add></fw>

So, in other words, one <add> nestled within another. Does that sound OK to you?

Perfect.

8) Can animals and insects be combined with foodstuff?

Usually, of course, it should be <term type=”animal”> or <term type=”insect”> so that should be retained. But if it’s also a foodstuff in context you could do:

<term type=”animal”><term type=”foodstuff”>goat</term></term>

The order of the two terms doesn’t matter. We can add this case to the manual.

That sounds good to me.