## 549-55th SIG; minutes

PF presented the updated model (following decisions in the 54th CIDOC CRM SIG meeting in Rome and harmonization with CRMbase v7.1.2)

Subtopics discussed:

### TXP16 employs script –approve scope note and examples

Details of the proposal [below](#_TXP16_employs_script):

**Discussion points**:

* The examples were edited to temporally and semantically restrict what is meant by “the Latin script” –seeing as it has evolved over the centuries. The examples were valid despite what version of the Latin script was referred to, but the participants felt it to be clearer in this form.

The SIG voted to approve the definition (and examples).   
**Outcome of the vote.**  
In favor: 10 (6 in person, 4 online)  
Against: None  
(8 participants abstained)

#### TXP16 employs script -approve scope note and examples

**TXP16 employs script (is employed in)**

Domain: TX3 Writing System

Range: TX13 Script

Subproperty of E89 Propositional Object. P148 has component (is component of): E89 Propositional Object.

Quantification: many to many (0,n:0,n)

Scope note: This property associates an instance of TX3 Writing system with one of the instances of the TX13 Script it employs

Examples: (post editing)

* + The Latin writing system used in the inscription of the Arch of Constantine (TX3) *employs script* the Latin script (TX13)
  + The Oscan writing system used in the inscription of the Tabula Bantina (TX3) *employs script* the Latin script (TX13)
  + The Oscan writing system used in the inscription of the Arch of Constantine (TX3) *employs script* the Greek script (TX13)

In First Order Logic:

TXP16(x,y) ⇒ TX3(x)

TXP16(x,y) ⇒ TX13(y)

TXP16 (x,y) ⇒ P148(x,y)

### TXP7 has item (is item of) –proposed property definition

**Proposal**: Following the change of its domain class, the scope note needed to be amended. For details of the proposal see [below](#_TXP7_has_item):

**Discussion points**:

* The scope note defines the inverse property
* The phrase “the instance of TX13 Script in which it is ***referred***” is cryptic and its meaning is disputed.

An effort was made to redraft the scope note in the right direction and using another verb but it was unsuccessful.

**HW**: AF, FM to revisit this.

#### TXP7 has item (is item of) -scope note redefinition

**TXP7 has item (is item of)**

Domain: TX13 Script

Range: TX8 Grapheme

Subproperty of:

Quantification: many to many (0,n:0,n)

Scope note: This property associates an instance of TX8 Grapheme with the instance of TX13 Script in which it is referred, distinct from other graphemes in it, for the purpose of using it conforming to the script. Different instances of TX13 Script may have some graphemes in common, but not all.

Examples:

* + The Latin script (TX13) has item the ideal capital letter “S”

In First Order Logic:

TXP7(x,y) ⇒ TX3(x)

TXP7(xy,) ⇒ TX8(y)

### TXP17 has part (forms part of) – proposed property definition

**Proposal**: approve property definition TXP17. Details of the proposal [below](#_TXP17_has_part).

**Discussion points**:

It is understood that the “Note” clause in the scope-note is intended to illustrate how the property is inherited to its subclass (namely TXP11 Grapheme Occurrence), but it needs to be stated more explicitly.

I.e., the scope note should explain what it means for an instance of grapheme sequence to form part of a broader sequence, and after having determined the TX11 IsA TX12 relation, then mention the specific case of an instance of TX11 Grapheme Occurrence to form part of another instance of TX11 Grapheme Occurrence (exemplified by the composite symbol formerly used for “ü” in German).

For the missing example: copy off any randomly picked subpart of an inscription example to showcase the typical use of the property (‘Caesari’ has part ‘aesari’ sort of thing). As it stands now, it only exemplifies the marginal case.

**HW**: AF, FM to revisit this and then call for an e-vote

#### TXP17 has part (forms part of) –proposed property definition

**TXP17 has part (forms part of)**

Domain: TX12 Grapheme Sequence

Range: TX12 Grapheme Sequence

Subproperty of P106 is composed of (forms part of)

Quantification: one to many (0,n:0,1)

Scope note: This property associates an instance of TX12 Grapheme Sequence with another instance of TX12 Grapheme Sequence appearing at a particular position of the sequence.

Note that a grapheme occurrence may be a symbolic composite containing another grapheme occurrence, such as the minute character “e” on top of the character “u” in former German writing systems denoting the symbol for “ü”.

Examples:

In First Order Logic:

TXP16(x,y) ⇒ [TX](#_heading=h.2pta16n)12(x)

TXP16 (x,y) ⇒ TX11(y)

TXP16 (x,y) ⇒ P148(x,y)

### TXP18 read (was read by) –proposed shortcut property definition

**Proposal**: approve property definition TXP18. Details of the proposal [below](#_TXP18_read_(was):

**Discussion points**:

* “complete linguistic meaning” imposes a complete-world assumption. Might be the case for the Derveni papyrus, but needn’t always be the case.
* “read and interpreted” in the example: the name of the property is read. Not interpreted. Best add that as a comment at the end of the example.
* “interpreted” did not resonate well with participants. Why not “understood”? EC and PF to further communicate about this.
* Scope note needs editing to reflect that it is the linguistic meaning of the linguistic object that is carried by the physical thing that the TX1 Written Text (IsA E25) is.

**HW**: AF, FM to revise this and then send out an e-vote

#### TXP18 read (was read by) –proposed shortcut property definition

**TXP18 read (was read by)**

Domain: TX14 Reading

Range: TX1 Written Text

Subproperty of: Jxx10 interpreted meaning of (was interpreted by)

Quantification: one to many (0,n:0,1)

Scope note: This property associates an instance of TX14 Reading with an instance of TX1 Written Text, the linguistic meaning of which was interpreted through the reading process. It is a shortcut of the fully developed path P9 consists of: TX5 Text Recognition. TXP10 deciphered text: TX1 Written Text

Examples:

* The reading of the Greek text present on the Derveni papyrus (TX14) *read* the papyrus (TX1) [interpreted the linguistic meaning that was carried by it].

In First Order Logic:

TXP16(x,y) ⇒ [TX](#_heading=h.2pta16n)12(x)

TXP16 (x,y) ⇒ TX11(y)

TXP16 (x,y) ⇒ P148(x,y)

### Deprecate TXP3 rendered

The property has become obsolete, it has been substituted by the path via TX12 Grapheme Sequence

The SIG voted to approve the full definition and examples.   
**Outcome of the vote.**  
In favor: 7 (5 in person, 2 online)  
Against: None  
(11 participants abstained)

### Review proposed examples for TXP14, TXP15, TX12

#### TXP14 used copy or representation of (was deciphered via copy or representation)

The non-autoptic recognition of the inscription text on the Arch of Constantine (TX5) *used a copy or representation* of the written text (TX11) om the Arch of Constantine [performed using a photo of the arch].

The SIG voted to approve the.   
**Outcome of the vote.**  
In favor: 8 (6 in person, 2 online)  
Against: None  
(10 participants abstained)

#### TXP15 recorded correspondence (was recorded by)

The autoptic investigation carried out by Rodolfo Lanciani (TX5) recorded correspondence the grapheme sequence ‘INSITICTV DIVINITATIS’ on the Arch of Constantine (TX12).

The SIG voted to approve the example.   
**Outcome of the vote.**  
In favor: 9 (7 in person, 2 online)  
Against: None  
(9 participants abstained)

#### TX12 Grapheme Sequence

the grapheme sequence ‘INSTINCTV DIVINITATIS’ (TX12) [as recognized by the autoptic investigation of the Arch of Constantine, carried out by Rodolfo Lanciani]

The SIG voted to approve the example.   
**Outcome of the vote.**  
In favor: 8 (6 in person, 2 online)  
Against: None  
(10 participants abstained)

### FOL proposals for TXP10/TXP14 and TXP13

A proposal to add FOL statements to properties TXP10/TXP13/TXP14 restricting the conditions under which they should be deployed.

1. Proposed axiom for TXP10 deciphered text: **TXP10(x, z1) ∧ TPX14(x, z2) ⇒ P130(z1, z2)** (and in prose: If the text recognition process deciphered a text (TXP10) making use of a copy or representation of an original written text instance (TXP14), then the copy used in the deciphering process shows features of the original written text.)
2. Proposed axiom for TXO14 used copy or representation of: **TPX14(x, z2) ∧ TXP10(x, z1) ⇒ P130(z2, z1)** (and in prose: If the text recognition process deciphered a text (TXP10) making use of a copy or representation of an original written text instance (TXP14), then the copy used in the deciphering process shows features of the original written text).

**Discussion points**: not easy to grasp why the statement about the replica (that it bears features of the original written text) is dependent on the replica having been used in a text recognition scenario and not the other way round. In the sense, that for a replica to show features of the original is a presupposition for it to be used for text recognition purposes.

It is a stretch to make assumptions on the quality of a replica based on the fact that it was used, but the material implication it is valid, just complex.

The SIG voted to approve the FOL statement, and also introduce it in prose to make it easier to understand.   
**Outcome of the vote.**  
In favor: 7 (5 in person, 2 online)  
Against: None  
(11 participants abstained)

1. Proposed axiom for TXP13 deciphered via representation: **TXP13(x, y) ⇒ (∃z) [TXP14(x, z) ∧ P138(y, z) ^ ¬TXP10(x, z)]** (and in prose: If the text recognition process deciphered via a representation of the original text (a visual item), then there is a written text ‘z’ whose copy or representation was used in the text recognition process (TXP14), and the visual item represents the written text (P138), and the text recognition process did not decipher the written text through an autoptic investigation.)

**Discussion points:** the axiom serves to distinguish cases of autoptic vs non-autoptic investigation of an object. It is valid, and also reflects common practices: if one is not working using the original source for something, then it is considered good practice to declare it. It’s a well-intended closed world assumption.

There are instructions against using a particular property in n CRMbase that are not combined with a similar FOL statement (f.i., P199 vs P138, and P67 vs P128). If this is a practice we’re considering to adopt, then we risk infinitely multiplying the FOL statements across all models with instances of where to not use such and such property.

Postpone reaching a decision. The only point of controversy is the negation part. Everything else seems fine.

**HW**: CRMtex editors to revise and send out on an e-vote.

### Overall editorial comment for CRMtex editors

Decide on the spelling –it can’t be both ‘autoptic’ and ‘auto-optic’. Preferably opt for the former.