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Abstract

Annotating – understood here as the process in which the segments of a text are marked as belonging to a defined category [Reiter, Willand, and Gius 2020] – can be seen as a key technique in many disciplines [Macmullen 2005], especially for working with text in the Humanities [e.g. Unsworth 2000], the Computational Sciences (e.g. [Sivasothy et al. 2021]; [Doleschal et al. 2022]) and the Digital Humanities [Caria and Mathiak 2019]. In the field of Digital Humanities, annotations of text are utilized, among other purposes, for the enrichment of a corpus or digital edition with (linguistic) information (e.g. [Lu 2014]; [Nantke, and Schlupkothen 2020]), for close and distant reading methods (e.g. [Jänicke et al. 2015]), or for machine learning techniques (e.g. [Fiorucci et al. 2020]). Defining categories to shape data has been used in different text analysis contexts, including the study of toponyms (e.g. [Kyriacopoulou 2019]) and biographical data (e.g. [Aprosio and Tonelli 2015]). The paper at hand showcases the use of annotations within the Vienna Time Machine project (2020-2022, PI: Claudia Resch) which aims to connect different knowledge resources about historical Vienna via Named Entity Recognition (NER) and Linking (NEL). More specifically, it discusses the challenges and potentials of annotating 18th century death lists found in the Wien[n]eresches Diarium or Wiener Zeitung, an early modern newspaper which was first published in 1703 and has already been (partly) digitized in form of the so-called DIGITARIUM [Resch and Kampkaspar 2019]: Here, users can access over 330 high-quality full text issues of the newspaper which contain a number of different text types, including articles, advertisements and more structured texts, such as arrival or death lists. The focus of this article lies on the semi-structured death lists, which do not only appear in almost every issue of the historical Wiener Zeitung, but are also relatively consistent in their structure and display a high semantic density: Each entry contains detailed information about a deceased person, such as their name, occupation, place of death, and age (e.g. David Clauß, Burgerl. Gold=spin., beyn 3. Brüd. bey St. Ulrich, alt 61. J.). Annotating these semi-structured list items opens up multiple possibilities: The resulting classified data can be used for efficient distant or scalable reading, quantitative analyses [Nanni, Kümper, and Ponzetto 2016], and as a gold standard for both rule-based and machine learning NER approaches (e.g. [Jiang, Banchs, and Li 2016]). To reach this goal and as a first step of the annotation process, the project team conducted a close reading of various death lists from multiple decades to identify recurrent linguistic patterns and, based hereon, to develop a first expandable set of categories. This bottom-up approach resulted in five preliminary categories, namely PERSON, OCCUPATION, PLACE, AGE and CAUSE-OF-DEATH, which were color-coded [Jänicke et al. 2015] and, accompanied by annotated examples, documented in the form of annotation guidelines as intersubjectively applicable and concise as possible. These guidelines were then used by two researchers familiar with the historic material to annotate a randomly drawn and temporally distributed sample of 500 death list entries in the browser-based environment Prodigy (https://prodi.gy). Hereby, the emphasis was put especially on emerging “challenging” cases, i.e. items where annotators were in doubt about their choice of category, the exact positioning of annotations or the necessity to annotate certain entities at all. Whenever annotators encountered ambiguous items, these were collected, grouped and – as a third step in the annotation process – discussed with an interdisciplinary group of linguists, historians and prosopographers. Within this collective, a solution for each group of issues was agreed on and incorporated into the annotation guidelines. Also, existing categories were revised where necessary (eg. PERSON > PERSON-DECEASED, PERSON-RELATED). The
new, more stable category system was then again used for a new sequence of annotation and discussion of ambiguities, resulting in an iterative process where annotation and category development became intertwined. This approach, explained in the article in more detail, demonstrates that tagsets are never entirely final, but always depend on particular knowledge interests and data material and that even the annotation of inherently semi-structured lists requires continuous critical reflection and considerable historical and linguistic knowledge. At the same time, it can be exemplified by this work that it is precisely these “challenging” cases which carry a great potential for gaining knowledge and can be considered central to the development of a valid annotation system (cf. [Franken, Koch, and Zinsmeister 2020]).

Introduction

Digital processes and research practices have given new relevance to the formation of categories for textual analysis, as evidenced by the presence and complexity of the term annotation. The annotation of data can be seen as a key technique in many disciplines [Macmullen 2005], especially for working with text in the Humanities (e.g. Unsworth, 2000), the Computational Sciences (e.g. [Sivasothy et al. 2021]; [Doleschal et al. 2022]) and subsequently, the Digital Humanities [Caria and Mathiak 2019]. Rehm [Rehm 2020, p. 299] also reaffirms this, stating that the “annotation of textual information is one of the most fundamental activities in Linguistics and Computational Linguistics including neighbouring fields such as, among others, Literary Studies, Library Science and Digital Humanities”.

In the broad field of Digital Humanities, annotations of text are used in multifaceted ways, as they pose a crucial methodological step for the further analytical processing of text sources within different analytical procedures [Franken, Koch, and Zinsmeister 2020]. For example, they allow for the enrichment of a corpus or digital edition with (linguistic) information (e.g. [Lu 2014]; [Nantke, and Schlupkothen 2020]), for the use of close and distant reading methods (e.g. [Jänicke et al. 2015]), or for machine learning techniques (e.g. [Fiorucci et al. 2020]).

Annotation can broadly be defined as the “addition of metadata, comments, markup, or other information that supplements the original data and renders it richer or more usable”[Flanders and Jannidis 2019, p. 313]. It potentially includes the assignment of (e.g. descriptive, technical or bibliographical) metadata, text-structural information, mark-up on the lexical or grammatical level as well as semantic annotations of varying depth or complexity – depending on the objects and project goals or research questions (Lordick et al., 2016, p. 188).

The paper at hand defines annotating as the process in which the segments of a text are marked as belonging to a defined category [Reiter, Willand, and Gius 2020, p. 329], which will be applied for the analysis of death lists in the 18th century newspaper Wien[n]erisches Diarium. In the course of this paper, we will demonstrate, based on concrete examples, how defining categories can also be beneficial for the study of toponyms (e.g. [Kyriacopoulou 2019]; [Palladino 2021]) and biographical data (e.g. [Aprosio and Tonelli 2015]). Especially texts with a high information-density, such as the lists investigated here, allow for a fruitful application of annotations, making them a valuable contribution for digital textual scholarship. However, there is a variety of different obstacles and hurdles to overcome when annotating (historical) text, which will be described in detail.

What’s in the news? Historical newspapers as rich knowledge (re)sources

The paper at hand showcases the use of annotations within the Vienna Time Machine project (2020–2022, PI: Claudia Resch), which aims to connect different knowledge resources about historical Vienna via Named Entity Recognition (NER) and Linking (NEL). More specifically, it discusses the challenges and potentials of annotating 18th century death lists found in the Wien[n]erisches Diarium, an early modern newspaper which was first published in 1703 and renamed Wiener Zeitung in 1780. For a considerable time period during the 18th century, it held the undisputed position of being the most important newspaper within the Habsburg Monarchy. The Diarium was published twice a week in its first century, was printed in quarto format and contained between 8 and 40 pages, with a considerable increase in volume towards the end of the century. The fact that the entire collection as an intact body of issues published since its
The historical *Wiener Zeitung* has already been (partly) digitized in form of the so-called *DIGITARIUM* [Resch and Kampkaspar 2019]: here, users can access over 330 high-quality full-text issues of the newspaper provided as XML/TEI files. As results in recognizing the German blackletter typeface with traditional OCR software are usually far from satisfactory, the layout and text recognition relied on the HTR technology provided by Transkribus. To train an initial model [2], selected issues were transcribed completely by hand. In order to create a scientifically sound basis for a wide range of philologial research interests, we preferably avoided normalising interventions and the historical language was reproduced as close to the printed original as possible. Those resulting reliable transcriptions then served as a training and test data (ground truth) set for a new model that was applied to further issues, whereby the recognition greatly improved over time [Resch and Kampkaspar 2019, pp. 56–59].

**Death lists in the *DIGITARIUM***

The historical *Wiener Zeitung* contains a number of different text types, including articles, official announcements and advertisements, but also more structured texts, such as arrival or death lists. The focus of this article lies on the semi-structured death lists, which do not only appear in almost every issue of the newspaper, but are also relatively consistent in their structure and display a high semantic density: sorted by date of death and frequently also by location (inside vs. outside the city), the persons who died in Vienna since the last issue of the newspaper are listed:

![List of the Deceased in and around the City](image)

*Figure 1. Fig. 1: Exemplary death list (WD 19.11.1703: 8)*

Within the *DIGITARIUM*, each newspaper issue of the *Diarium* was edited using the TEI/P5 guidelines. This includes the TEI header and several other elements, as for example divisions (<div>), paragraphs (<p>), words (<w>) and highlighted text, to distinguish passages or words printed in Antiqua font from its surroundings (<hi>). For the structural annotation of the lists, the <list> element was used to encode any sequence of items organized as a list. Each distinct item in the list was then encoded as a distinct <item> element (see TEI Guidelines, Section 3.8). Additionally, (sub-)headings which, in case of the death lists, were used to group list entries according to time and/or space were encoded through the <head>-element:
Each of these entries or <item>-elements contains detailed information about a specific deceased person, for instance their name, occupation, place of death, and age. Generally speaking, the process of annotating such entities can be analogue or digital, whereas the latter can again be subdivided in manual, semi-automatic and fully automatic practices.

While analogue annotations serve to organize, structure, acquire and pass on knowledge, the digital paradigm exceeds these functions, e.g. allowing for the observation of patterns, further processing of the annotations, as well as the usage of large amounts of data [Rapp 2017, pp. 254–255]. At the same time, especially when processing larger (historical) amounts of data, it is of central importance that the category formation and annotation process is well-regulated and adheres to clear guidelines. In the special case of death lists in historical newspapers such guidelines as well as a category system itself are first to be developed, as such texts have so far only been considered for individual studies focusing on selected aspects and/or time spans where no systematic annotation of the material was carried out (e.g. [Peller 1920]).

Annotation process

To reach this goal and as a first step of the annotation process, the project team[3] conducted a close reading of various death lists from multiple decades to identify recurrent linguistic patterns and, based hereon, to develop a first expandable set of categories. This bottom-up approach resulted in five preliminary categories, namely PERSON, OCCUPATION, PLACE, CAUSE-OF-DEATH and AGE, as annotated in the exemplary item below:

(1) Der Johann Rendt / ein Zuckerbacher in Berdronischen Hauß in Offenloch ist an der Lungelsucht
The categories derived from the text were color-coded (cf. legend above; [Jänicke et al. 2015]) and, in combination with annotated examples, documented in the form of annotation guidelines as intersubjectively applicable and concise as possible. These guidelines were then used as concrete aids for decision-making by two researchers familiar with the historic material to annotate a randomly drawn and temporally distributed sample of 500 death list entries in the browser-based environment Prodigy (https://prodi.gy). The software provides annotators with a graphic user interface, where they are shown one item at a time accompanied by the pre-defined tagset:

![Prodigy Screenshot]

**Figure 3.** Screenshot of the annotation of an exemplary item in Prodigy

Annotations are made by first choosing a tag through clicking on it and then marking one or multiple words to which the tag should be assigned. In case of errors or re-decisions, markings can be easily deleted and redone. Furthermore, Prodigy allows for unclear items to be omitted and for multiple users to (re-)annotate the same dataset.

During this annotation process, the emphasis was put especially on emerging “challenging” cases, i.e. items where annotators were in doubt about their choice of category, the exact positioning of annotations or the necessity to annotate certain entities at all. Whenever annotators encountered ambiguous items, these were collected, grouped and – as a third step in the annotation process – discussed within the interdisciplinary team of philologists, historians and prosopographers. Within this collective, a solution for each group of issues was agreed on and incorporated into the annotation guidelines. As a consequence, existing categories were revised where necessary. The new, more stable and mature category system was then again used for a new sequence of annotation and discussion of ambiguities, resulting in an iterative process where annotation and category development became intertwined. This approach roughly corresponds to Rapp’s [Rapp 2017, pp. 256–257] basic notion of an annotation process, which she breaks down into the following five steps: it involves an initial exploratory data analysis, an initial definition of categories and formulation of
guidelines, the annotation itself, an evaluation, and the repetition of these steps. Concrete findings that emerged through this process are discussed in the following sections on the basis of sample items.

PERSON

Since each death list item documents one person that died in- or outside the City of Vienna, the tag PERSON can be considered fundamental for the annotation task. It refers to information identifying the individual whose death is detailed, specifically, their first and/or last name, as given in (2):

(2) Carl Richter / Burgerl. Schuh=maecher / bey dem golden Lammel / auf der Wieden / alt 44. J. (WD 21.06.1730: 8)

However, not every death list entry follows the prototypical pattern of [first name] + [last name] given in (2) which provides annotators with a clear conception of where the PERSON tag should start and end. Instead, items can also, among other things, involve maternal names (cf. 3), additional titles (cf. 4), and even unnamed persons (cf. 5). In order to facilitate later disambiguation and to distinguish items with unknown persons from items missing an annotation tag, we decided to also subsume such (as well as similar) cases of additional identity information under the PERSON tag:

(3) Dem Hern Augustin von Damian, Käyserl. Wasser=Ambts Gegenhandler / beym rothen Thurn in sein Hauß aussers rothen Hoff / sein Frau Anna gebohrne von Hoffmann; ist am Schlag=Flüss beschaut / alt 46. Jahr. (WD 08.08.1703: 8)

(4) Die (Titl) Fräulein Maria Sibilla Stögerin / von und zu Ladendorff / im Graff Herbersteinischen Hauß am alten Kühn=Marckt / alt 82. Jahr. (WD 06.02.1706: 9)

(5) Eine unbek. Weibspers. alt b. 56 J. ist in d. Donau ertrunken gefunden worden. (WZ 04.06.1796: 13)

However, not all issues encountered when annotating could be solved solely by widening (or narrowing) the scope of the PERSON category. For instance, as example (3) has already depicted, one death list entry might contain references to more than one (named) person: As women (e.g. Walburga in 6) and children (e.g. Joseph in 7) were considered less autonomous than men, no separate entry is recorded under their name; rather, they are identifiable by the mention of their husband (cf. Karl Wesselly in 6) or father (e.g. Friedrich Eysenhut in 7):


It might be argued that one could simply use the sequence of person entities in each item to discriminate the related (first named) from the deceased person (second named). However, not all items that include two or more persons necessarily express a kinship or partnership relation. The entry shown in (8), for example, accumulates three deceased persons whose only (known) connection is their same place of death, namely the city hospital:


Due to such cases as well as the high frequency of items involving more than one person, an adjustment of the initial tagset was deemed necessary: instead of assigning the overarching tag PERSON to all (un-)named persons, the category was split into two separate tags, namely PERSON-DECEASED and PERSON-RELATED. Although this conceptualisation is currently sufficient for our research interests, further sub-categories are certainly possible. For instance, depending on the respective purpose, one could additionally distinguish between first, second and last name, or between maternal and married name.
Another type of personal information included in (almost) all death list entries is occupational information. Here, in contrast to the previous category, no additional distinction between the occupation of a deceased person and the occupation of a relative/spouse needs to be made since given occupation titles generally refer to male persons:[6]


In (9) the deceased himself is an innkeeper (Wirth), while in (10) it is the father of the deceased child whose profession (burgerl. Fleisch=hackern “civic butcher”) is mentioned by name. The same principle applies to death list entries for married women and partly even widows (e.g. Glasermeister. Witw. “master glazier’s widow”). In this respect, the assignment of OCCUPATION entities to PERSON entities does not pose an issue. Rather, the difficulty lies in defining the start and the end point of an OCCUPATION tag since, as it can already be seen from the examples above, occupational information frequently includes additional attributive adjectives (e.g. burgerl., gew. [gewester]). Depending on the semantics of these adjectives, they can either be considered central occupational distinctions (e.g. Kayserlicher Schneider “imperial tailor” vs. Burgerlicher Schneider “civic tailor”) or negligible supplements (e.g. gewester “been”).

As another challenge, various textual elements were discovered that cannot be classified as an occupation, but still reveal essential information about a person and his or her role in society (e.g. hne Condit. [Condition] “without occupation”, Wittwe “widow”, verh. [verheiratet] “married”, Kind “child”, armes Mensch “poor person”, Töchterl “daughter”, Weib “wife”). To account for this valuable information as well, a new category and tag was introduced, namely SOCIAL-ROLE, as annotated in the exemplary items below:

(11) Der Anna N. ledigem Menschen / in der Roßau / ihr Kind Leopold / alt 9. Wochen. (WD 07.02.1711: 9)


PLACE

While information belonging to the categories OCCUPATION and SOCIAL-ROLE is frequently, but not always present in a death list entry, the place of residence and/or death is consistently specified. According to our category system, such toponyms – understood as names for identifiable and thus namable parts of the earth’s surface (cf. [Dräger, Heuser, and Prinz 2021, p. V]) – are to be annotated with the tag PLACE. However, it turned out that an even more precise working definition of place names must be available for this purpose. For instance, the prototypical item given in (13), where the life and/or death of the guardsman Gregori Korber is located near (bey) the house grüne[r] Jäger in the urban area of Lerchenfeld, already raises several questions:


The first thing to ask is which words are specifically part of the toponym to be annotated, i.e. whether to include or exclude preceding definite articles from annotation (dem grünen Jäger vs. grünen Jäger). Here, it helps both to compare different texts of the source material with each other and to include further knowledge resources: additional list items showcase a frequent merging of preposition and article (e.g. bey dem > beym) which makes it impossible to mark only the latter as part of the place name, and historical city maps (e.g. Steinhausen 1710) refer to houses without articles when listing them in their legend (e.g. gulden Löw, Neue Welt). Thus, both approaches provide arguments for not regarding articles as part of toponyms.

Secondly, it must be decided whether one (grünen Jäger im Lerchenfeld) or two PLACE tags (grünen Jäger, Lerchenfeld) should be placed in item (13). As we based the annotation category on the idea of identifying not places but place names, we chose to go with the latter variant. This approach also has the advantages that the extracted
spatial entities can both be directly compared and/or linked to other resources and possible spatial relations are made visible through the presence of multiple PLACE tags within a single item.

Hence, of the four possible ways to allocate the PLACE tag(s) in (13) which are shown in (14), version (14b) is considered the “correct” way according to our annotation guidelines:

(14)

a) Gregori Korber / Guardi=Soldat / bey dem grünen Jäger im Lerchenfeld / alt 41. J.
b) Gregori Korber / Guardi=Soldat / bey dem grünen Jäger im Lerchenfeld / alt 41. J.
c) Gregori Korber / Guardi=Soldat / bey dem grünen Jäger im Lerchenfeld / alt 41. J.
d) Gregori Korber / Guardi=Soldat / bey dem grünen Jäger im Lerchenfeld / alt 41. J.

In addition to this guidance for assigning PLACE tags, further aspects must be accounted for when annotating toponyms. On the one hand, within the death lists, toponyms may appear not only in the form of proper names but also as appellatives (e.g. Kranken=Haus “hospital”) and, on the other hand, it may be difficult to distinguish between place names and place descriptions, as the following item demonstrates:

(15) Dem Lud. Schieber, Maur. s. W. Anna Ma. wo die Jgfer zum Fenst. aussch. am Alsterb. alt 22. J. (WD 05.03.1768: 6)

Although the phrase wo die Jgfer [Jungfer] zum Fenst. [Fenster] aussch. [ausschaut] “where the spinster looks out the window” gives the impression of a place merely being vaguely described instead of precisely located, it is in fact a toponym, namely the name of a concrete house. As the Wien Geschichte Wiki (2022), a historical knowledge platform for Vienna, documents, this house sign stems from a legend: a girl, who had been looking out for her beloved from the window for many weeks during the plague in 1410 and 1411, saw his body in the swollen Alsbach stream flowing past, whereupon she threw herself into the stream and drowned.

Besides such peculiarities of the historical material, the structure of location information also tends to change over time, as Fischer [Fischer 2019, pp. 143–144] notes: while early death list items usually contained a house, street and/or area name, later entries were often more precise and additionally also included a house number. Accordingly, this can be seen as another starting point for potentially refining the annotation system for specific research interests in the future: for instance, one might want to distinguish between names for different localities (e.g. street, square, district, house) or provide a specific tag for house numbers.

CAUSE OF DEATH

Besides the aspects already discussed, some (esp. early) death lists also contained the cause of death for certain persons, which could, among other things, be a disease (cf. 16), an accident (cf. 17) or a crime (cf. 18):

(16) Der Anton Huebauer / in Burger=Spital / an innerlicher Faulung / alt 12. Jahr. (WD 03.01.1722: 8)

As indicated by these examples, textual elements that are to be tagged with CAUSE-OF-DEATH can be given in various grammatical forms; for instance, both nouns and noun phrases (e.g. innerliche Faulung “internal rot”, Hectica=Fieber “Hectica fever”) as well as adjectives, verbs and verbal phrases (e.g. erstochen “stabbed”, vom Fenster herunter gefallen “fallen down from the window”) may occur. Furthermore, a new agent is introduced in this context, namely an inspecting and/or attesting authority who examines the deceased and officially determines the cause of death, like the Royal City Court (Königl. Stadt=Gericht) in (17). Depending on one’s research interests, such institutional entities
could potentially also be assigned a specific annotation tag in the future. But even if this is not the case, the list-internal distinction between official and unofficial causes of death still very much informs the annotation process, as it has proven relevant for list items which include both a description of the death situation (cf. underlinings) and the result of the pathological examination:

(20) Jos. Kayser, Schuhkn. welcher auf eine Schuhale gefallen und sich verwundet, ist in das Bäckenh. überbracht, und gestorb. ist v. k. k. Stadt= und Landger. an Brand besch. word. alt 22. J. (WD 16.05.1772: 7)

For the sake of clarity and with the prospect of automatic analysis of the annotations, officially authorised causes of death were given precedence over unofficial observations and thus annotated solely when present. Only if no official statement concerning the cause of death was provided in a list entry, other (descriptive) information about it was marked.

AGE

Last but not least, each death list item found in the Diarium includes the age of the deceased person which is to be marked with the tag AGE. An advantage here is that no separation in the sense of PERSON-DECEASED and PERSON-RELATED is necessary, as age statements exclusively refer to deceased and never to related persons. Nevertheless, challenges still arise in regard to tagging death lists according to the AGE category. One is the reappearing question about the limits of what should be annotated; here concretely, whether the recurrent measurement Jahr “year” (abbreviated as J.) should be considered as part of the age information and thus be annotated (cf. 21a) or whether it should be excluded as redundant (cf. 21b):


An answer to this question can be found through further engagement with the textual material: Although first glances into the death lists give readers the impression that the age of deceased persons was exclusively counted in years, closer looks into the historical texts show that a multitude of age measurements can be attested. Besides cases of half years (e.g. 2. und ein halb Jahr), third years (e.g. 3. und ein drittel Jahr) and quarter years (e.g. 6. Viertl. J.), also months (e.g. 4. Monat), weeks (e.g. 4 Wochen), days (e.g. 9. Tag) and even hours (e.g. 2. Stund) were used to quantify the life span of a person.

For the annotation process, this means that it is of central importance not only to annotate the respective numerical age specification, but also to include its verbal unit of measurement. In general, it has proven useful to take into account verbal supplementary information when annotating age(s). For instance, another special case that needs to be considered are entries where the age of the deceased person seems to have been estimated and is thus preceded by bey, bei or b. “close to, around, approximately”, as in (22) and (23):

(22) Eine unbekannte Manns=Person / bey der Schlag=Brucken in der Leopold=Stadt / alt bey 60. J. (WD 11.04.1731: 7)

As demonstrated in the two examples above, we decided to also annotate this lexical marker of age estimation as it makes a viable difference for interpreting a person’s age. This decision was confirmed by further quantitative and qualitative analyses of the death lists’ age statements (cf. [Kirchmair and Rastinger 2021]; [Rastinger, Kirchmair, and Resch 2022]), which showed that the small word bei is associated with the socio-demographic characteristics of the
Possibilities and an exemplary application scenario

The preceding considerations and reflections on each category document that a reliable annotation of our research data is complex and labor-intensive. However, it should be emphasized that the annotation of precisely these semi-structured list entries is also a rewarding task: ultimately, the annotations make the inherent structure of the texts computer-readable, which in turn can become the starting point for further research.

An essential function of categorising this data is its deeper classification, which could then be integrated into the existing prototype DIGITARIUM and in this way enrich the edition. The TEI offers extensive coding recommendations that would be applicable in the case of persons and places. Another advantage would be the retrievability of already annotated entities, which could then be searched for specifically, as frequently wished for by users [Fischer 2019, pp. 149].

Also, especially important seems to be the fact that reliably annotated data sets (like the one described) can be used as a training set for machine analysis methods. To use the dataset “as a gold standard for both rule-based and machine learning NER approaches” [Jiang, Banchs, and Li 2016], was at the same time one of the primary intentions of the annotation project described (cf. [Resch, Rastinger, and Kirchmair 2022]). If such approaches prove successful, they can potentially also be applied to other similar texts, e.g. the arrival lists of the Wien[n]erisches Diarium (cf. Rastinger, 2022) or lists in other early modern periodicals.[6]

Another important application area that should not be underestimated opens up when thinking about the future of annotation: if it is the case that annotation decisions will increasingly also be made by artificial intelligence, the definition of sound categories determined and approved by experts takes on a special significance as such category systems can increase the probability of valid and consistent annotations. For instance, when using Large Language Models (LLMs) like GPT-4 (https://openai.com/gpt-4) for NER, users are given the possibility to state the labels they would like to use for tagging their texts which then, in turn, heavily influences the quality of the output.

That annotations also enable quantitative analyses [Nanni, Kümper, and Ponzetto 2016], and make them more transparent, will finally be shown by an exemplary application scenario. From the multitude of categories (name, occupation, cause of death etc.), it is the age specifications that are visualized here as they allow for automatic extraction over the whole dataset. Before being analyzed on a quantitative level, however, these age specifications had to be translated from verbal age expressions to numerical values. Hereby, varying measurements of age (e.g. years, quarter years, days), as well as graphematic variation (e.g. “quarter years” as Viertel Jahr versus Viertel=Jahr versus Viertl J.), needed to be taken into account. Also, the age expressions could be given in a half-verbal manner which requires high historical knowledge, as their conversion to numbers diverges from contemporary expectations multiple times. For example, dritthalb Jahr “three half years” must be translated to 2.5 (i.e. 3 minus 0.5) years instead of being interpreted as 3.5 (i.e. 3 plus 0.5) years. Through such extensive data preparation, the verbal age expressions of 13.084 list items were converted to a numerical form and visualized in the graph below, where the age span of the deceased in the death lists ranges from two hours to 109 years.
As shown in the plot, the child mortality in the 18th century can be considered to be very high and, in reality, might have been even higher, as, according to Peller [Peller 1920, p. 229], stillborn children and children in the first year of life are often not included in the death lists. While child deaths seem to be very common during this time period, cases of centenarians can be considered to be relatively rare, since only 20 of them could be observed in our data. What seems to be striking are the spikes at round numbers such as 30, 40 or 50. This phenomenon is already discussed by an academic in the 18th century, namely by Süßmilch [Süßmilch 1761, p. 362–363], who clarifies that those spikes must not be interpreted as more people dying at a round age, but rather as an artefact of a preference for round ages divisible by ten. Stolberg [Stolberg 2007, p. 50] also links these spikes to socio-cultural circumstances and infers that the division of life into decades seems to have determined the subjective experience of the course of life. As this exemplary use case highlights, annotations of the death lists can be deployed very fruitfully for the investigation of mortality in the 18th century. However, contextual knowledge is very much needed for interpreting the results.

Findings and Conclusion

Based on the examples and the application scenario discussed, it has become clear that the annotation of seemingly simple and short list entries can by no means be considered a trivial task. Annotating these texts requires specific knowledge and great familiarity with the source, including an overview of the time period and knowledge of the early modern newspaper landscape. A hurdle that should not be underestimated arises from the fact that we are dealing with a level of language that is remote in time today, and therefore we cannot always rely on our natural sense of language and judgment. In addition to the graphematic variation, which was not at all uncommon at the time, there are abbreviations that have become increasingly frequent over the course of the century, which make text comprehension more difficult and (as in the next example) must be correctly resolved.


In order to understand these abbreviations, not only linguistic-historical knowledge is needed, but also topographical knowledge of Vienna in the 18th century – the letter M, for example, can stand for Markt “market”, “Mühle” “mill” or more meanings. In all cases of doubt, it is advisable to compare the respective entry with others or to search for similar (complete) forms that have already occurred and from which the abbreviations can be derived. For the recognition of professions that no longer exist today, the annotators will also need profound historical-cultural knowledge, otherwise it can happen that an occupation (such as Viehmayr in the following example) is misinterpreted as a personal name.
In the course of the annotation process and the intensive effort to form tangible categories, it has become apparent that our understanding of the death lists and their entities has deepened increasingly. The initial five categories soon became insufficient to adequately describe the lists. The expansion of the original five to seven descriptive categories, namely PERSON-DECEASED, PERSON-RELATED, OCCUPATION, SOCIAL-ROLE, PLACE, CAUSE-OF-DEATH, and AGE, can therefore also be seen as a consequence of a growing comprehension and our competence to make increasingly accurate discernments about the texts analysed. If the annotation process is compared to a spiral cycle (schematically illustrated in [Lemnitzer and Zinsmeister 2015, p. 103]) or to an extended hermeneutic circle (cf. [Bögel et al. 2015, p. 124]), this annotation cycle can theoretically be understood as open-ended.\[8\]

With this in mind, it is even more important that tools are developed that support undogmatic annotation and provide users with the possibility to modify existing as well as "create" new tags even during the annotation process (such as CATMA (https://catma.de), MAXQDA (https://maxqda.com) or Annotation Studio (https://www.annotationstudio.org), so that researchers can dynamically adapt their tagset when they identify limitations and/or contradictions in their initial assumptions.

In practice, these open and flexible annotation cycles, where tagsets are never entirely final, are not seldom confronted with a project reality whose reporting does not tolerate any postponement or provisionality, but often requires quick decisions. It is therefore all the more important to allow sufficient time for annotation processes and also to plan for iterative phases of analysis, discussion and evaluation. The experience shows that it is worth investing more effort and time in this phase of the investigation, since it is often precisely through this continuous critical reflection that new insights into the data material are gained. Last but not least, a reliable system of categories with well-considered annotations can spark off a whole new range of questions and ideally has the potential to become a springboard for further research.

Tools and Websites mentioned


Notes

[1] The collection was created within the project “Das Wien[n]erische Diarium: Digitaler Datenschatz für die geisteswissenschaftlichen Disziplinen” (PI: Claudia Resch), which was funded by the “go!digital2.0” program of the Austrian Academy of Sciences and carried out at the Austrian Centre for Digital Humanities and Cultural Heritage (ACDH-CH).

[2] The current model specifically trained on 829 400 words from the Diarium is already publicly available as “German Fraktur 18th century”, see readcoop.eu/model/german-fraktur-18th-century/.

[3] The annotation was essentially done by the authors of this paper, who come from the field of digital philology and have (in some cases many years of) experience with digital methods on the one hand and on the other hand have already worked intensively with older language stages, annotations problems associated with non-standard historical varieties of German and with these newspaper texts in particular. Georg Vogeler and Matthias Schögl contributed to our discussions in an advisory capacity as experts in history and prosopography.

[4] Here and in the following sections, text passages from the Wien[n]erisches Diarium (WD) or from the Wiener Zeitung (WZ) will be quoted with their date of publication and page number.

[5] In very rare cases, an occupation is also attributed to women, but in this case no male person is part of the respective item.

[6] Currently, various NER models that are already available for (historical) German are being evaluated in the course of the City of Vienna funded project “Visiting Vienna – digital approaches to the (semi-)automatic analysis of the arrival lists found in the Wien[n]erisches Diarium” (2022–2023, PI: Nina C. Rastinger).

[7] What has also proven helpful in decoding historical abbreviations so far, has been the creation of an (open-ended) register of abbreviations used in the Wien[n]erisches Diarium. This is currently especially done by Thomas Kirchmair as part of his master thesis in the field of Digital Humanities.

[8] In the course of our paper, we have already discussed several ways in which one could potentially further optimize the presented annotation system for one’s own research needs. One last example for such future adaptions could also be to distinguish between the social role(s) of a deceased vs. a related person.
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