# Issue 554 -53rd CRM Sig meeting

The Sig went through the examples by DH for E53 Place, reformulated for E4 Period. They had been discussed again during the 51st CIDOC CRM Sig meeting but had not been accepted at the time. The examples in question can be found below:

1. The Capital of Russia (E4) [the capital of Russia in the sense of an administrative unit moved in historical times from Moscow to St Petersburg and then back to Moscow. This exemplifies an administrative unit changing place over time without temporal discontinuity]
2. The settling activity of the community of Helsinki (a.k.a. Helsingfors) (E7) [the original settlement called Helsinki was located in the area of the modern airport. The community moved later to settle on the coast. This exemplifies a continued activity changing place over time without temporal discontinuity]
3. Bronze Age (E4) [Bronze Age, in the sense of technological adoption, spread over disjoint areas including islands such as the British Isles without temporal discontinuity]
4. Japan, the state (E4) [In 2021, the Japanese state as a political unit comprised in 6852 islands extending along the Pacific coast of Asia]

**Discussion:**

The point of examples is to demonstrate how an instance of E7 Activity or E4 Period can be located in different places over time. No.3 and No.4 succeed in doing that. No.2 is easier to understand. No.1 is harder to understand.

No.4: illustrates how spatial contiguity is not necessary to define an E4 Period – the coherence of the phenomena constituting an instance of E4 Period is critical for defining it.

No.2 demonstrates the relation between an activity and a feature that it transformed and defined (qua place). If no agreement is reached on the usefulness of the examples, then a new issue should be formulated to introduce concepts in the model, by means of which to render that particular relation (f.i., a settling activity vs. the ensuing settlement).

No.1: The objections previously raised were about the phrasing of the example. RS had suggested to reformulate as “the administrative Capital of Russia”, in the sense that the continuity was about the administration, not the place as such”. We can keep it however on the grounds of some functions were specifically executed in Moscow, even though the administration had moved to St. Petersburg (coronation of the Czar). Another example would be Den Haag vs Amsterdam (where the administration is shared between the two cities) but it does not involve moving the administration.

No.3: a reference to the technological innovations relevant for the Bronze Age added to the explanation.

**Decision**:

The examples were voted in, changes were incorporated in CIDOC CRM v7.1.2 and v7.2.1.

**Issue closed.**