### 624-55th; minutes

The SIG reviewed the proposal by GB & RS to introduce class Exxx Name into the CIDOC CRM specification, as the equivalent of the E33\_E41\_Linguistic\_Appellation that has been minted for the rdfs implementation. Proposed class declaration below:

**Exxx Name**

Subclass of:

E33 Linguistic Object,

E41 Appellation

Superclass of:

E35 Title

Scope note:

This class comprises textual strings that within a cultural linguistic context are identified as names belonging to one or more languages. Being a subclass of E41 Appellation and E33 Linguistic Object, Exxx Name should be used when there is a need to document both a name and the language or languages in which it is identifiable.

Instances of Name can be given to anything by anyone who is a sentient user of language or a group which is attributed as having such powers.

**Discussion points:** The proposal spurred a lively debate concerning the utility of such a class – two lines of argumentation formed:

* Held by GB, EC, (RS through the mailing list)
	+ Treating (people’s/places’/…) names on a par with E35 Title in the sense that despite their typical lack of a propositional meaning, names do stand in a similar relation to language as titles do, namely single out individuals from a similar set of things, identify unique individuals, are arbitrarily assigned (for the most part).
	+ Since P72 has language connects all instances of E33 Linguistic Object to the E56 Language they are expressed in, and this works well with instances of E33 Title (for which it holds IsA E41 Appellation), the same could hold for the instances of Exxx Name –names should also get attributed a language.
	+ The guideline in the scope note of E41 Appellation instructs to document the language of the appellation through P72 (for NPs, which <proper> Names are, by default). The practice is also applied in the rdfs through E33\_E41\_Linguistic\_Appellation, it needs to make its way to the official documentation.
* Held by MD, PR, FB
	+ It is not the Appellation that has a language but the association of a name/appellation with an individual object. This is captured through the semantics of F12 Nomen in LRM, and F12 Nomen is explicitly NOT an instance of E41 Appellation.
	+ It is not clear what a name being expressed in a given language signifies: what does “being expressed in a given language” mean? Is it the writing system that determines the appropriate language/linguistic group? Spelling variations? Phonetic rendering/indications? The proposed scope note does not specify it. Also, when it comes to spelling variations, they could represent dialectal variation within one and the same language.
	+ Alternatives have been proposed, i.e., instead of using P72 opting for a more explicit statement like “uses language”/”is expressed in language”

The ordering by which contradictory principles (should) apply was also contested –namely,

1. **it was argued that** the class should not be admitted since it does not come with a set of properties connecting it to other classes –which seems to indicate that it is a form of classification, not ontology (principle 3.1 violation), **but also**
2. that properties should not be repeated, and as such one can connect all subclasses through the superproperty –i.e., there is no need to implement yet another property that IsA P72 has language (which would yield a principle 2.3 violation).

**Way to move forward:** Since there is no way to resolve this issue if all principles rank the same,
**HW** assigned to MD to formally make a counter-argument, cast in terms of a strict example showcasing logical problems that ensue from admitting class Exxx Name into CIDOC CRM. This way, the SIG will make an informed decision, either dispensing with it or altering the proposal seeing that it does not create the type of logical problems that were alluded to.