E91 Co-Reference Assignment

Subclass of: E13 Attribute Assignment

Scope note: This class comprises actions of making the assertion whether two or more particular instances of E89 Propositional Object refer to the same instance of E1 CRM Entity. The assertion is based on the assumption that this was an implicit fact being made explicit by this assignment. Use of this class allows for the full description of the context of this assignment.

The Actor making the assertion may have different degrees of confidence in the truth of the asserted fact of co-reference, because it may imply an interpretation of the (past) knowledge behind the propositional objects assumed to be co-referring. This degree of confidence, also known as “propositional attitude”, can be described by using the property *P2 has type (is type of)* for the whole of the co-reference activity. No such degree of confidence can be connected to each of the co-referring propositional objects. In the case one E39 Actor creates a E91 Co-Reference Assignment between two or more E89 Propositional Objects and wants to express two or more different propositional attitudes for one E89 Propositional Object, ~~In case different propositional attitudes should be expressed per asserted propositional object,~~ the assertion has accordingly to be divided into one instance of E91 Co-Reference Assignment for each propositional attitude.

The use of *P155 has co-reference target* is limited to entities within the knowledge base in which the E91 Co-Reference Assignment is found. This is because the E91 Co-Reference Assignment is making explicit the world view of the E39 Actor carrying out the assignment and this world view is expressed as such only within that specific knowledge base. For a further discussion of the relationship from E91 Co-Reference Assignment via P155 has co-reference target to E1 CRM Entity, see the technical paper … .

~~This class aims mainly at the problem of interpreting in historical texts to what particular entity a name, pronoun or equivalent kind of expression was intended to refer to within a particular passage of the text by its author. In other words, it expresses the uncertainty of the creator of the assertion about the meaning of information provided by another person. Such an interpretation can only be documented with respect to another reference – either found in another text by the same or another author, and/ or by referring to the world known to the creator of the co-reference assertion himself. To do the latter, the property~~ *~~P155 has co-reference target (is co-reference target of)~~* ~~allows for referring to an instance of CRM Entity of the creator’s world. In a sense, the respective instance of E91 Co-Reference Assignment using the property~~ *~~P155 has co-reference target (is co-reference target of)~~* ~~in a knowledge base forms propositional object referring to the creator’s target entity, since a knowledge base as a whole can be seen as a propositional object. Consequently, if in a Semantic Web implementation the target entity is instantiated by a URI, the meaning of this identifier must be unambiguous to the creator of the co-reference assignment. Similarly, a URI of another authority, such as an author catalogue of a library, can be interpreted as a referring proposition of this catalogue, and be referred to by the property~~ *~~P153 assigned co-reference to (was regarded to co-refer by)~~* ~~or~~ *~~P154 assigned non co-reference to (was regarded not to co-refer by): E89 Propositional Object~~* ~~in order to express that it does not immediately represent the creator’s known world. In this case, the authority that knows the meaning of this URI must be unambiguous by the form of the URI itself.~~

~~In contrast, the meaning of the property ‘owl:same\_as’ of the OWL knowledge representation language cannot specify who’s knowledge it represents and cannot express propositional attitudes. Therefore it is not adequate to model the progress of scholarly co-reference research.~~

Examples:

§ the assertion that the author name “Hans Jæger” on the title page of the novel “Fra Christiania-Bohêmen” refers to the same historical person as the motive of the painting “Forfatteren Hans Jæger” by Edvard Munch.

§ the assertion that the author name “Hans Jæger” on the title page of the novel “Fra Christiania-Bohêmen” does not refer to the same historical person as the author of the collection of drawings “Til Julebordet : ti Pennetegninger / af H.J.” incorrectly attributed to Hans Jæger in the Bibsys database.

§ *Insert example of the use of P2 has type as describe in the scope notes.*

Properties:

P153 assigned co-reference to (was regarded to co-refer by): E89 Propositional Object

P154 assigned non co-reference to (was regarded not to co-refer by): E89 Propositional Object

P155 has co-reference target (is co-reference target of): E1 CRM Entity