

Response to Ontology and Thesaurus Review

[Ontology Review](#)

[Thesaurus Review](#)

This is a response to the Critique of Ontology and Thesaurus V4.

Ontology Review

Issues & Gaps:

- **Dangling reference:** `vad:DrawingForm` is used as a parent class in `vad:PencilDrawing`, `vad:CharcoalDrawing`, etc., but the class URI `vad:DrawingForm` is never declared — the declared class is `vad:Drawing`. This is a subtle naming inconsistency that would cause inference errors in an OWL reasoner.

Fixed by parenting the various forms of drawing to `vad:Drawing`

- **Commented-out `vad:hasMaterial`:** The property linking `vad:CreativeWork` to `vad:ArtMaterial` is commented out with no replacement, leaving a gap. Works can be described with `vad:hasPaint`, `vad:hasPaper`, and `vad:hasTool`, but there's no general material property, which limits breadth.

Added `vad:hasMaterial` property back into the ontology.

- **`vad:ArtistProfile` under `vad:Process`** is semantically misplaced — a profile is not a process step. A better home would be under `vad:ArtsPersonRole` or a standalone class.

Moved under `vad:ArtsPersonRole`.

- **`vad:Rendition` and `vad:ComputerRendition` under `vad:Process`** — similarly awkward. A rendition is more of a work artifact than a process.

`vad:Rendition` now subclassed from `vad:CreativeWork`. A new `vad:renditionOf` property has been added to `cwva` with `rdfs:domain` `vad:Rendition` and `rdfs:range` `vad:CreativeWork` ;

- **`vad:entity.ttl`** defines a parallel `the:Entity` class hierarchy (Artist, Work, Collection, etc.) in the thesaurus namespace. These overlap with the ontology's

`vad:Artist`, `vad:CreativeWork`, and `vad:ArtworkCollection`. The relationship between them is not formally declared (e.g. no `owl:equivalentClass` or `rdfs:subClassOf` bridge).

The two ontologies CWVA and the Entity ontology under the thesaurus namespace have evolved separately. The CWVA ontology serves the primary content, the art data, and Entity provides operational support for connecting concepts to these art data. Over time they may merge eliminating the perceived conflict. Declaring relationships between them is a reasonable interim solution but I'm hesitant to place an operational burden on CWVA perhaps reducing its universality.

Thesaurus Review

Issues & Gaps:

- **Inconsistent scheme references:** Some concepts point to `the:paintingTerms` while others point to `the:paintingTerm` (singular). Similarly `the:watercolorPainting` vs. `the:watercolorPainting` seems consistent, but `the:visualArtTerms` appears in concepts without a declared scheme resource. These mismatches can break SKOS navigation.

The concept schemes are under review. Currently they support graphing of discrete sections of the thesaurus at a time.

- **`skos:altLabel` typo** in `the:stainingColors` — should be `skos:altLabel`. This would silently fail in any SKOS processor.

Fixed.

- **`pigments.ttl` has commented-out scheme declaration** (`the:HistoricalPigmentsScheme`) but concepts still reference it via `skos:inScheme`. The scheme exists in practice but has no formal `skos:ConceptScheme` declaration, which breaks SKOS conformance.

The concept schemes are under review. Currently they support graphing of discrete sections of the thesaurus at a time.

- **tensegrityVocab.ttl** — tensegrity is a structural engineering/sculpture concept that seems domain-appropriate for kinetic/spatial sculpture, but its relationship to the broader thesaurus hierarchy isn't established via **skos:broader**.

This is not a valid issue. `the:tensegritTerm` has a `skos:broader` relationship to `the:visualArtTerm`

- Some definitions quote source text quite extensively (e.g. **the:spattering**) with embedded quotes that include escaped characters — worth reviewing for cleanliness and copyright implications.

All definitions have been reviewed to eliminate copyright issues. The embedded quotes concern is not an issue.