

Re: text to bibliography?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Word/microsoft.public.word.docmanagement/2008-08/msg02212.html>

- *From:* p0 <yves.dhondt@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 17 Aug 2008 05:49:26 -0700 (PDT)
-

I'm stripping parts from the original message as it has become too large to process decently.

On a side note, the beauty of custom xml in ooxml is that you can define your own way of storing data. And you don't even have to stick to xml: you can store binary data in an xml file. So if you really are unhappy with the format, you can easily extend Word with your own set of bibliographic tools.

I don't know what any of that means.

Well, if you are concerned with size (little tags rather than big ones), you are in for a surprise, your Word document actually contains all bibliographic data twice (talking about overkill).

What you see as a docx file is nothing more than a zip-file. So if you change the extension from docx to zip (make sure you have a backup), you can use the compressed folders utility from Windows or an external program such as WinRAR or WinZip to extract the contents of your document. In it, you will normally find a file item1.xml in the customXml directory. That is actually an xml notation of all the bibliographic data in your source. You will also find a document.xml file in the word directory. That file contains your entire text including your well-formatted bibliography (no longer in xml format). It is nice separation between the data and the view on the data.

So what I meant was, if you aren't happy with the current internal data layout, you can very well define your own layout and then format the data in the document.xml according to your layout (stored in your version of item1.xml) and preferences.

What would "ed" be? editor? edition?

Re: text to bibliography?

<ed> vs. <edn>

And then I would think about "editorial notes". Really, shortcutting data entries to save space is, in my personal opinion, about the worst thing you can do. EndNote allows importing data based on shortcut codes. But once imported, the data is once again stored in 'understandable' xml as it should be done. And luckily for that, because nobody without a decent manual would be able to figure out that %I is actually the field representing the publisher.

The entire point of using full descriptive names in tags rather than crafty shortcuts is to make things clear for the people who have to add them.

But the people shouldn't ever need to see them! They should see a form to fill in, with each slot labeled with the category that goes in it. "Author" would have a drop-down list of all Names, since most subject bibliographies involve several works by the same person. (Likewise for "Place" and "Publisher.")

Yes you will have to type more, but at least elements will be defined in such a way that there is no confusion for the user. And for non-english speaking people, full words are a lot easier to understand than shady abbreviations.

Not at all problem if you have an internationalized, or whatever they call it, interface.

That's what the source form (insert new citation) is for in Word 2007. Check your computer for a bibform.xml, if you are using an en-us version of word, it should be in <word directory>\1033\bibliography\bibform.xml. For other languages, you will have to replace 1033 with your local culture id (lcid). The file contains a mapping of localized strings (Label element) to xml tags (DataTag element). On a side note, the bibform.xml claims to follow the bibliography xml schema (default namespace) but it is not doing so since the schema does not define anything about the mapping.

Have a look at the, alas, defunct Mac program Papyrus (it wasn't worth the effort for the creator to adapt it for OS X, so he just offers it as freeware to anyone with a "legacy system," but its discussion list was still active back when I had to abandon the Mac, two+ years ago).

Re: text to bibliography?

The setup of this tool is totally different, this is a tool for storing and searching bibliographic information, even entire libraries. As a side product, it also allows you to format the output a bit. Microsoft's tool is intended only for providing formatted output. They don't care about maintaining a library where you can find stuff by keywords or authors or ...

But all this is besides the point, the original topic was about adding textual sources to your document in an automated way. I have seen some tools for converting BibTeX or EndNote files into Word 2007 sources. And you can always create a converter which translates your home-made format into Microsoft's format, but you can't expect Microsoft to support your format by default. They have a format, and you either stick to it, or you design something else (which is pretty easy using custom xml). The choice is up to you.

.