Closed comments from [494-Scope Note Writing Examples](#)

No.	Text	Comment
1	I prefer this method in order to show that the Guideline does not aim at demanding a structured verbose text, but rather that the author of a scope note has thought about the respective principles and decided that these aspects are either self-evident, non-applicable or sufficiently clear from the created text.	WS: Okay, but would it be possible to make an additional structured version, comparable to the first-order logic representations of properties? Especially when fragments of Scope notes may belong to more than one category. CE-O: Issue 570 will take care of this. The prose version of FOL i can follow a standardized format and need to be defined. MD: I have tried together with Gerald Hiebel to do make structured versions, but in practice aspects overlap very much. I prefer to keep the application as simple as possible. Of course, I said "not demanding". So, if someone wants to make a structured version, why not. WS: Just to add, I don't think this would be part of issue 570.
2	Indeed, many scope notes have not yet been revised thoroughly with respect to the guideline.	WS: Is / should this be an issue? CE-O: Ideally, yes. It is a big task and we can live well without.
3	Substance:	WS: Would it make sense to create a hierarchy of the substance types that are used in the CIDOC CRM classes? CE-O: such stuff as dreams are made on? I find it difficult to describe what conceptual objects are made of. May be it is sufficient to delete the first sentence. MD: I think a hierarchy of substances would be interesting, but that goes deeply into philosophy. I am not pessimistic about conceptual objects. They have not created ambiguity in the past. A clear cut identity, as communicated between people. Dreams do not belong to them, except if written down. Temporal Entity is more contentious, but both are abstract classes. Not to be instantiated directly.

		NOTE: EC has edited the first sentence in response to this and other comments since this comment thread took place.
4	The scope note may however refer to some characteristic kinds of things as examples in order to illustrate traits and contexts.	EC: Pointing directly to the examples that best illustrate each criteria listed within the scope notes would bring additional clarity to both the description and examples. For example, the description could state a criteria and then say "see example 1" or elucidate how example 1 is a good example of that criteria. CE-O: +1
5	I use the following colour codes: Substance | Traits and Potential | Identity | Unity | Existence | Further Clarifications	WS: Can we compile a list of key terms that give a hint as to the function, such as "comprises" for Substance; "instances are/have" for Traits and Potential; "identify" for Identity? MD: Nice idea indeed!
6	(E41 Appellation) This class comprises signs, either meaningful or not, or arrangements of signs following a specific syntax…	WS: This seems to be the only example for Unity. And I don't understand how "signs" / "arrangements of signs" answers the question "What makes some extent of substance be part of an instance of class A" MD: Yes, not very clear. It is the ability to refer: In different contexts, I can identify you by Wolfgang, Schmidle, or Wolfgang Schmidle, but not by Wol, olfga, gang Schmi, etc. WS:Which reminds me: If I ever get around to making a list of examples I think are not self-explaining and should have an added comment, it would start with the example "Doerr P139 has alternative form / alternative spelling Dörr". After decades of living in Greece and writing in English, do you consider "Doerr" the main form? Or are both alternative forms of each other? Is it meant as an antithesis of the P139.1 has type "transliteration from Latin 1 to ASCII" in the last sentence of the scope note? In other words, is this intended to be a normal example, or is it intended to grate and make me have an epiphany / be educational / pedagogical?