Erlangen OWL and CRM RDF

Steps towards CRM OWL

CIDOC SIG, Lux 2022
December 07, 2022
Motivation

• The CIDOC CRM document is now very well structured
• Automatic processing on RDF layer proofs to be good
• No „electorial process“ is necessary anymore for most of the things
• The RDF and the ECRM OWL are now much closer than ever before
Aim
• (Semi-)automatically create an CIDOC CRM OWL
• Have this CIDOC CRM OWL with CIDOC and Erlangen namespaces for the classes for backward compatibility (owl:sameAs or owl:equivalentClass)
• At best: Have one ruleset for RDF and OWL and only do different things where it is really necessary
• However there are currently some differences between RDF and OWL that are more or less cosmetic -> We need to decide which way to go
• Multilingual Labels:
  • ECRM has only English labels, RDF has multiple languages
• Structure of Labels:
  - ECRM includes E/P-Number, rdf does not
• SKOS Notation:
  • ECRM has additionally a skos:notation element, rdf does not have that

```xml
<skos:notation rdf:datatype="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#string">
  E1
</skos:notation>
```
• Structure of comments:
  • RDF just has the scope note, ECRM has scope note, examples and FOL

```xml
<rdfs:comment>This class comprises all things in the universe of discourse of the CIDOC Conceptual Reference Model. It is an abstract concept providing for three general properties:
Identification by name or appellation, and in particular by a preferred identifier
Classification by type, allowing further refinement of the specific subclass an instance belongs to
Attachment of free text and other unstructured data for the expression of anything not captured by formal properties
All other classes within the CIDOC CRM are directly or indirectly specialisations of E1 CRM Entity.</rdfs:comment>
```

```xml
<rdfs:comment xml:lang="en">This class comprises all things in the universe of discourse of the CIDOC Conceptual Reference Model.

It is an abstract concept providing for three general properties:
1. Identification by name or appellation, and in particular by a preferred identifier
2. Classification by type, allowing further refinement of the specific subclass an instance belongs to
3. Attachment of free text and other unstructured data for the expression of anything not captured by formal properties

All other classes within the CIDOC CRM are directly or indirectly specialisations of E1 CRM Entity.

Examples:
- the earthquake in Lisbon 1755 (E5) (Chester, 2001)

In First Order Logic:
\[E1(x)\]</rdfs:comment>
```
• Comments and where to place them:
  • ECRM and RDF place the comments only on Classes and forward-Properties with only some exceptions.
  • Decision: Keep it like that or also put it on inverses?
• Support for .1 properties
  • RDF has a “special” support for .1 properties. This approach would also be possible for OWL.

• Transitive/SymmetricProperty where it fits
  • RDF does not have that, so it is not implemented. OWL should implement it

• Reflexive/Non-Reflexive
  • won’t be implemented by both as it is not really possible yet.

• Multiple Inheritance for „primitives“ like P1
  • No multiple inheritance -> ObjectProperty in OWL

• Restrictions?
• OWL 1 vs. OWL 2?
Thank you!