

Advancing Manuscript Metadata: Work in Progress at the Jagiellonian University

Luiz do Valle Miranda^[0000-0003-1838-5693], Krzysztof Kutt^[0000-0001-5453-9763], and Grzegorz J. Nalepa^[0000-0002-8182-4225]

Jagiellonian Human-Centered AI Lab, Mark Kac Center for Complex Systems Research, Institute of Applied Computer Science, Faculty of Physics, Astronomy and Applied Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, prof. Stanisława Łojasiewicza 11, 30-348 Kraków, Poland
luiz.dovallemiranda@doctoral.uj.edu.pl, krzysztof.kutt@uj.edu.pl, gjn@gjn.re

Abstract. As part of ongoing research projects, three Jagiellonian University units—the Jagiellonian University Museum, the Jagiellonian University Archives, and the Jagiellonian Library—are collaborating to digitize cultural heritage documents, describe them in detail, and then integrate these descriptions into a linked data cloud. Achieving this goal requires, as a first step, the development of a metadata model that, on the one hand, complies with existing standards, on the other hand, allows interoperability with other systems, and on the third, captures all the elements of description established by the curators of the collections. In this paper, we present a report on the current status of the work, in which we outline the most important requirements for the data model under development and then make a detailed comparison with the two standards that are the most relevant from the point of view of collections: Europeana Data Model used in Europeana and Encoded Archival Description used in Kalliope.

Keywords: Cultural heritage · Metadata · Knowledge graphs · Europeana Data Model · Encoded Archival Description

1 Introduction

The history of libraries organizing (meta)data about their items is—perhaps—as old as the concept of libraries. The appearance of different media for the storage and transfer of human knowledge is correlated with the evolution of techniques and artifacts for encoding library metadata. A significant recent iteration of such an interplay is visible with the advent of information and communications technology and the accompanying attempt to implement cataloging techniques that draw upon the potentialities of such systems. Linked Data (LD) is the technology that embodies the current trends in metadata organization [2]. Linked Data is essential for the Semantic Web paradigm.

LD is based on the endeavor to represent data using shared vocabularies for both individuals, their characteristics, and the relation between individuals. Such a metadata vocabulary references unique web identifiers (URI) in a

machine-readable way that allows linkage to semantically related resources from other datasets. Modeling a certain dataset using linked data facilitates data integration between institutions and certain operations with the dataset, including knowledge discovery, enrichment, and visualization. The basic standards for such data models are RDF, OWL, SKOS, and SWRL [4].

There are two main reasons for libraries' move towards linked data technologies. First, library resources are usually of different kinds, such as books, manuscripts, journals, drawings, etc. The meaning of such artifacts is intrinsically connected to the spatial and temporal contexts in which they are inserted, as well as other individuals to which they are linked, including author information, and other referred publications. Second, there is a trend of making institutional resources available and accessible for expanded collaboration possibilities. The advantages of linked data can be levered proportionally to the richness and interoperability of a given resource's metadata.

Commitment of Jagiellonian University (JU) and especially Jagiellonian Library (JL) to linked data is visible from its integration with the Europeana portal (<https://europeana.eu/>). Europeana—Europe's digital cultural heritage platform integrating more than 3000 institutions—already offers access to more than 600.000 documents from the JL. The search and access of such documents depends on the metadata provided by the partner institution. Among the metadata elements currently provided by the JL, there is information about the type of item, subject, creation date, and language of the document.

On the one hand, the current metadata integrated into the Europeana portal can provide a powerful representation of the given document. On the other hand, there is a set of elements that, if present, would significantly enrich the given representation, and thus enhance the advantages of linked data. Such enrichment possibilities are especially present in the case of subtypes of manuscripts, e.g., in letters with information about the sender and receiver, or in historical documents with descriptive information about their history (Regest).

Given the prospects of a richer representation of manuscript metadata, the Jagiellonian Library supports the development of a standard for such a task. The main pillars of this endeavor are the inclusion of the detailed description format developed at the JL, the preservation of the possibility of integrating with Europeana, and the ability to integrate with the Kalliope system (catalog managed by German libraries). This paper describes the work in progress towards developing such a standard. In Sect. 2, we present the description format developed at JL (The Knowledge Matrix), and two related data models: Europeana's EDM and Kalliope's EAD. Sect. 3 then compares them, highlighting their points of compatibility and incompatibility. Sect. 4 concludes the paper.

2 Metadata schemes

2.1 The Knowledge Matrix (TKM)

As part of the ongoing DiHeLib and CHExRISH projects, three Jagiellonian University units—namely the Jagiellonian University Museum, the Jagiellonian

University Archives and the Jagiellonian Library—are digitizing, describing, and interlinking collections of manuscripts from the Sammlung Autographa collection from the so-called Berlin Collection [9] (DiHeLib project) and collections of archival documents related to the university’s history (CHEXRISH project). In the course of this work, the librarians and curators of the collections prepared a new standard for the description of historical documents, for which a set of Microsoft 365 cloud-based tools was then developed (for a detailed description of the entire workflow and toolset, see [6]), in particular Microsoft Excel spreadsheets serving as data entry interfaces, which were named The Knowledge Matrix (TKM). The core elements of this description schema with actual values for sample document can be found in Tab. 1.

Table 1. Actual description of sample manuscript from JL with TKM data model (Note: some fields are by design empty for specific document types, e.g., “Publisher” for manuscripts).

Property	Value
Title	Letter from [Karl] Heinrich Aster to [Johann David Erdmann] Preuss
Description	—
Subject	—
Type of document	Letter / edm:Type = TEXT
Identifier	SA, Aster, Karl Heinrich_2.2
Physical extent	4 pages
Interaction with a person	Sender: Aster, Karl Heinrich; Receiver: Preuss, Johann David Erdmann
Place of origin	Dresden
Creation Date	28.12.1852
Language	German
Custody history	Radowitz 5262
Other editions	Not found
Person graphically represented	—
Material information	Red seal and postage stamp: “Sachsen. Neu 3 Grosch” (card 5v)
Publisher	—
Current location	Kraków

2.2 Europeana Data Model (EDM)

With the goal of offering interoperability and accessibility of data on a massive scale, Europeana developed a schema for structuring data called the Europeana Data Model (EDM). One of the tenets of EDM is being “an open, cross-domain Semantic Web-based framework that can accommodate the range and richness of particular community standards such as LIDO for museums, EAD for archives

or METS for digital libraries” [5]. At the same time that EDM offers a certain structure for representing metadata, it also allows for enrichment given third-party sources. EDM is based on the principles of linked data and is built around a knowledge graph.

Three fundamental distinctive classes in EDM are the provided cultural heritage object (represented as `edm:ProvidedCHO`), the digital representation of the object (`edm:WebResource`), and the aggregation as a representation of the link between the former and the latter (`ore:Aggregation`). An example of an EDM representation of the Mona Lisa painting is present in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1. Mona Lisa – an object-centric description in EDM [5].

There are 35 core properties for `edm:ProvidedCHO`, they are divided into mandatory, recommended, and optional properties. One way to guide a providing institution on the adequate subset of properties to take into consideration while developing a representation for a document’s metadata is the A-C tier requirements. Fulfilling Tier A requirements is equivalent to treating the Europeana website as a basic search platform, while Tier B integration amounts to using Europeana as an exploration platform. Finally, achieving Tier C is equal to treating Europeana as a knowledge platform. The project reported in this paper aims to achieve Tier C integration with Europeana.

There are three categories of requirements for reaching a given tier: language, enabling elements, and contextual classes. Language refers to the presence of language tags in metadata elements that have text string values. Enabling elements are metadata elements about the document that help its search and fit in one of the following “Discovery Scenarios”: browse by date or time span, by subjects and types, by agents or by place. Finally, contextual classes—such as `edm:Agent`, `skos:Concept`, `edm:Place`, `edm:TimeSpan`—give context to the provided cultural

heritage objects aiding their retrieval. The relation between different tiers and the requirements can be accessed in [1].

In the comparison table (see Tab. 2), we take into account the mandatory and recommended properties and the tier classification. The comparison table presents a comprehensive (but not exhaustive) list of EDM properties that are significant for manuscripts and that meet the requirements for Tier C.

2.3 Kalliope (EAD)

Kalliope (<https://kalliope-verbund.info/en/>) is an online catalog for personal papers, manuscripts, and publishers' archives. Kalliope was originally founded by the Berlin State Library, but has grown to integrate metadata from institutions all around the German-speaking countries, including German language archives in other countries, such as Poland or the United States. Standardized data from partner institutions can be made available for retrieval in Kalliope, given compliance with the Encoded Archival Description (EAD) format.

The EAD is an international XML-based standard for the description and exchange of archival data. EAD possesses a hierarchical structure and makes it possible to describe the relation between wholes and parts in a collection¹. EAD contains elements for persons, families, places and corporate bodies; these elements allow references to unique identifiers for such individuals. Kalliope utilizes links to the Integrated Authority File (Gemeinsame Normdatei, GND) of the German National Library to identify individuals.

One of the main differences between EDM and EAD is that EDM is structured as a knowledge graph, while EAD is based on XML tags. The former represents the aggregation of a certain digital version of an object, focusing on the graph of characteristics of the physical object. The latter is a representation of a finding aid document hierarchically related to a collection and the present items. The primary goal of a finding aid is to provide information about the history of a collection and how the materials within it are organized, helping users navigate the collection and locate relevant material for their research [7].

3 Comparison of metadata schemes

Despite the differences between EAD and EDM, propositions exist on how to map elements from one standard to the other. Hennicke et al. [3], for example, demonstrate how an archival finding aid encoded in EAD-XML format can be represented using an RDF-based model such as EDM. Furthermore, the extensive report by Rockenbauer et al. [8] summarizes the requirements and procedures for mapping mandatory EDM fields with the EAD standard. Drawing on the advancements presented by such works, Tab. 2 compares TKM, EDM, and Kalliope's EAD as a guideline for the development of a standard for representing manuscripts' metadata by the JL.

¹ <http://webdoc.sub.gwdg.de/edoc/aw/d-lib/dlib/november03/lieder/11lieder.html>.

Table 2. Comparison of TKM, EDM and Kalliope's EAD. Obligatory EDM properties are marked with *, while recommended ones with ^.

TKM	EDM	Kalliope EAD
Title	*dc:title	<unittitle>Brief von Ludwig van Beethoven</unittitle>
Description	*dc:description	<scopecontent><head>Inhaltsangabe</head><p>Angaben zum Inhalt des Bestandes.</p></scopecontent>
Subject	*dc:subject	<controlaccess><subject>part>Alien and Seditio n laws, 1798</part></subject></controlaccess>
Type of document	*dc:type or edm:hasType or *edm:type	<controlaccess><head>Gattungen</head><genreform source="GND" authfilenumber="4008240-4">Brief</genreform></controlaccess>
Identifier	^dc:identifier	<unittid label="Signatur" repositorycode="DE-1a" identifier="XYZ9494">Bestandsnummer</unittid>
Physical extent	dcterms:extent	<physdesc><extent>14 letters</extent></physdesc>
Interaction with a person	^dc:contributor or ^edm:creator or ^edm:hasMet	<controlaccess><head>Personen</head><persname role="Verfasser" source="GND" authfilenumber="118508288" normal="Beethoven, Ludwig_van">Beethoven, Ludwig van (1770-1827)</persname></controlaccess>
Place of origin	^edm:hasMet	<geogname role="Entstehungsort" source="GND" authfilenumber="4029702-0" normal="Chemnitz">Karl-Marx-Stadt </geogname>
Creation date	^dcterms:created	<unittdate label="Entstehungsdatum" normal="18940502/1896">02.05.1894 [?]-1896 [?]</unittdate>
Language	*dc:language	<langmaterial><language langcode="ger">Deutsch</language></langmaterial>
Custody history	his-dcterms:provenance	<custodhist><head>Angaben zur Herkunft</head><p>Text zur Geschichte</p><p><corpname role="Eigentumer" source="GND" authfilenumber="5058957-X" normal="Aufbau-Verlag_Berlin">Aufbau-Verlag <Berlin></corpname></p></custodhist>
Other editions	dcterms:hasVersion or dcterms:isVersionOf	<bibliography><head>Editionshinweise</head><p>Hinweise auf Editionen</p></bibliography>
Person graphically represented	edm:isRepresentationOf	<persname role="Erwahnte_Person" source="GND" authfilenumber="118584596" normal="Mozart, Wolfgang_Amadeus">Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus (1756-1791)</persname>
Material information	infor-dcterms:medium	<physdesc label="Angaben_zum_Material"><dimensions label="Format">Formatangabe</dimensions><physfacet label="Erhaltungszustand">Erhaltungszustand</physfacet></physdesc>
Publisher	^dc:publisher	<bibref><persname role="Herausgeber" source="GND" authfilenumber="118507591">Baumgart, Reinhard</persname></bibref>
Current location	loc-edm:currentLocation	<physloc label="Standort">

The first column of Tab. 2 presents the concept from the current TKM model, while two others present the respective EAD and EDM elements. Some elements are represented in the same way in both standards, for example, “Title”, “Description”, “Physical Extent”, “Subject”, “Identifier”, “Creation date”, “Language”, and “Current location”. Another case of mapping is when the representations are slightly different, but can be unproblematically mapped, such as (1) “Place of origin”, (2) “Custody history”. (3) “Other editions” and (4) “Person graphically represented”. In the case of (1), EDM has no element for encoding the place of origin, the place is connected with the object by the affirmation that the object has merely been in this place. Regarding (2), EAD allows for the representation of provenance linking a text explaining the history with a link to the given institutions (URI) holding the document, while EDM only allows for texts. In the case of (3), in EDM editions are separate objects reciprocally linked with the version properties, while in EAD information about editions are encoded in text format. Finally, for (4), EAD encodes it as a reference to a person, while EDM as a representation (that is not necessarily graphical).

The last set of concepts is those whose mapping cannot be made one to one, but need multiple elements from one standard to be mapped to multiple elements from the other. The most important of those concepts is “Interaction with a person”. This concept includes subconcepts such as “Creator”, “Sender”, “Receiver”, “Issuer”, etc. While the specification of the interaction with a person can be easily made in EAD by changing the role attribute, it is more difficult in EDM, which is limited by the three above-mentioned options. One clear example of such a difficulty is the pair “Sender” and “Receiver”. While the sender of a letter can be approximated to the creator of the letter, it is not necessarily the same as referring to the creator of an academic work. The receiver, on the other hand, can be considered as a mere person to whom the letter has come in contact (`edm:hasMet`), without acknowledging the intentionality of the letter. Another option for the “Receiver” would be mapping it as a contributor, which can be to some extent accurate, but is a different concept of, e.g., a co-author. Thus, in the case of “Interaction with a Person” the decision of how to map it has to be made based on the given dataset and the institution’s expectations.

Another concept in this subset is “Type of document”. Examples of possible types of documents are “Letters”, “Historical documents” or “Diary entries”. For EAD the representation of such types is clear, even allowing for a controlled id for each kind of type. EDM, on the other hand, offers three properties that are related to type. One of them is `edm:type`, which is an obligatory field for EDM with possible values “TEXT”, “VIDEO”, “SOUND”, “IMAGE” and “3D”. For manuscripts, the standard values would be “TEXT”. Another property is `dc:type`, which refers to a term from a controlled vocabulary that describes the nature or genre of the item, e.g., a book or a letter. Finally, `edm:hasType` is supposed to be a super-property of the former, encapsulating also material information about the object. In most cases `edm:type` and `dc:type` will have to be used, although on a case by case basis `edm:hasType` can also be implemented.

“Material information” is another problematic concept to map. In EAD it is possible to describe different aspects of the material, such as its preservation state, works of restoration visible in the object, its state of preparation (e.g., if it is a draft), etc. EDM offers `dcterms:medium` as a description for the material carrier of a document, e.g., paper. A thorough manuscript standard should build upon the possibilities of EAD for representing material information.

Finally, it is worth highlighting that the set of elements present in the comparison table is not exhaustive. The rationale for constructing such a table is to make it agnostic to the content of the manuscripts, to avoid the need for a thorough study of the object before collecting metadata. However, the table still fulfills the minimum requirements for the highest level of integration to both Kalliope and Europeana and provides rich metadata for computationally aided research in the field of cultural heritage.

4 Conclusion and further works

In this work, we compared the Kalliope’s EAD and the Europeana’s EDM standard to extract a list of concepts for a manuscript metadata standard that can be interoperable with these platforms and that can advance the goal of metadata enrichment and availability at Jagiellonian University. The work-in-progress character of this study allows for highlighting and applying necessary changes in the standard under development. Two important aspects are delineating uniquely identifiable sub-properties for interaction between people and manuscripts and for the material state of the manuscript.

Besides these mentioned future modifications, there are other pressing issues for future research on developing a manuscript standard and taking advantage of manuscript metadata as linked data. One of the threads for future research is the representation of dates. The specification of dates in manuscripts is not always precise, or certain, or can involve timespans of different magnitude. These difficulties call for the development of best practice guidelines for dealing with temporal information. Another thread is the development of a recommendation system for manuscripts, drawing on a prospective knowledge graph including linked manuscript metadata. The next step in the solution to these challenges is the development of an ontology to formalize the concepts present in the comparison table.

Acknowledgments. This publication was funded by a flagship project “CHExRISH: Cultural Heritage Exploration and Retrieval with Intelligent Systems at Jagiellonian University” under the Strategic Programme Excellence Initiative at Jagiellonian University. The research for this publication has been supported by a grant from the Priority Research Area DigiWorld under the Strategic Programme Excellence Initiative at Jagiellonian University.

Disclosure of Interests. The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

References

1. Europeana: Europeana publishing guide, <https://europeana.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/EF/pages/2059763713/Publishing+guide>, accessed: 10.05.2024.
2. Haslhofer, B., Isaac, A., Simon, R.: Knowledge graphs in the libraries and digital humanities domain. In: Sakr, S., Zomaya, A. (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Big Data Technologies*, pp. 1–8. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63962-8_291-1, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63962-8_291-1
3. Henricke, S., Olensky, M., Boer, V., Isaac, A., Wielemaker, J.: Conversion of ead into edm linked data. In: *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Semantic Digital Archives (SDA 2011)* (2011)
4. Hyvönen, E., Rantala, H.: Knowledge-based relation discovery in cultural heritage knowledge graphs. In: *Proceedings of the Digital Humanities in the Nordic Countries 4th Conference (DHN 2019)* (2019)
5. Isaac, A.: Europeana data model primer. Tech. rep., Europeana (Jul 2013), <https://pro.europeana.eu/page/edm-documentation>
6. Kutt, K., Gomułka, J., do Valle Miranda, L., Nalepa, G.J.: Microsoft cloud-based digitization workflow with rich metadata acquisition for cultural heritage objects. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* (2024), submitted, in review
7. Light, M., Hyry, T.: Colophons and annotations: New directions for the finding aid. *The American Archivist* **65**(2), 216–230 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.65.2.34328544g8w58637>, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40294207>
8. Rockenbauer, E., Pichler, A., Urzúa, J., Thoden, K., Wintergrün, D., Müller, G., Dröge, E., Iwanowa, J., Henricke, S., Morbidoni, C., Guggenheim, E., Knepper, M., Waxman, J., Leone, L., Winer, D., Stanley-Clamp, L., LaCalle, M., D’Iorio, P., Schmidtner, K.: D1.1 – requirements report (for the project “digitised manuscripts to europeana”). Tech. rep., Europeana (2012), <https://pro.europeana.eu/project/dm2e>
9. Sosnowski, R., Tylus, P.: European treasure in the jagiellonian library. a flagship project. *Polish Libraries* **11**, 235–244 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.36155/PLib.11.00008>