

Relational Data Model for Spatio – Temporal GIS Allowing for Attributes with Independent Temporal Extents

CHGIS Data Model – Phase Two

Merrick Lex Berman
Harvard Yenching Inst
8 Oct 2001

Subsequent to the International Workshop on Historical GIS, held in Shanghai, China, Aug 23-25th, 2001,¹ the draft for the Spatio-Temporal Database Design is now being revised. The new CHGIS Data Model being proposed here, is an attempt to limit the number of records populating the database while keeping track of events that include changes in name, location, administrative status, or relationships in the administrative hierarchy. The ideas presented here are greatly influenced by the work of Martina De Moor (University of Ghent),² Lawrence Crissman (Griffith University),³ and the author's previous CHGIS data model.⁴

The key departure from the earlier data model (footnote 4) is the tracking of attributes in separate tables, each with its own temporal extents. Whereas I had previously envisioned the simplicity of freezing attributes for each historical instance (or state in between two events), I am now attempting to allow for each attribute to have its own temporal instances. The objective is not so much to save tablespace, but to allow for tracking of variable attributes, such as name, feature type, administrative status, and avoid any duplication of records in the database caused by changes in parent or child units. In the phase two model, only a case of changing spatial objects (or “versions” of spatial objects, in Crissman's parlance) will **indirectly** impact parent – child relations.

In the earlier model (footnote 4), a change in any of the attributes, such as name or administrative status of a parent record, would indirectly impact all child records in the database. In the phase two model, similar attribute changes are tracked in separate “Instance Tables,” and only in the case where the spatial object, or footprint changes are child records affected. For example, a county boundary change would impact the hierarchical relations of subordinate villages and towns; causing any towns with **new** parent relationships to be updated in the the “Instance Relation Table,” which is to say that an affected town would have a new “part of” relationship, and the previous “part of” record must also have an “end date” alteration. Such changes, however, are limited to the immediately subordinate – superior levels in the hierarchy.

The second important difference in the phase two model is to explicitly accommodate the tracking of the concept of “place.” Although the earlier model attempted to capture the same transformations over time by focussing on events and attribute changes, the phase two model makes “place” the focal point of the database. Unfortunately, there exist no clearly defined guidelines as to what constitutes a place, and how to determine when a place has been changed into a new place. For now, the working definition is that a unique “place” in the database is the first (but not necessarily earliest) known named instance of a human settlement, historical administrative unit, natural feature, or spot feature at a known location in geographical space and a known point or extent in time.

This idea of place, however, can only be thought of as a level of abstraction separate from the actual objects that we need to keep track of in the database. For example, when we think of San Francisco, we may have a range of notions that come to mind, from the fuzzy area including the entire bay and surrounding cities, to the city itself, or to a special place familiar to us, such as Fisherman's Wharf, Union Square, or South of Market. All of these things are somehow, “San Francisco,” and we must first differentiate them to correspond with trackable objects in the database, and then we must also **satisfice**⁵ them, or associate an appropriate bounding box to enclose the space that represents each unique place feature. In the model being proposed, we first establish a loose concept of “San Francisco” in the Place Table and assign a Place ID, for example, San Francisco PID1. Then for each “Place Object” that we wish to track, we assign a unique “Place Object ID,” as in: San Francisco (the city) POID1, San Francisco Bay POID2, San Francisco

County POID3. We can then relate all of the Place Objects to a Place, but can also track the attribute histories of each place as unique unrelated objects.

Our Place Objects are tracked in their various transformations and movements, by means of independent “Instance” Tables. The Instance, in this case, is a definable point in time or span of time, and the proposed model separates Placename, Administrative Status, Feature, and Spatial Instances into their own timelines. One of the fundamental tasks of the CHGIS model is to keep track of the unsynchronized changes of in these four rough categories. For Placenames, we may track not only the sequence of “official” names that were used in government records, but can populate the table with as many “alternate” names as we choose, each having their own temporal sequence, overlaps, or discontinuities, as needed to fit the historical evidence. Admin Status is treated in a similar fashion, with the Administrative Hierarchy being tracked in the “Instance Relation Table,” as in Admin Instance X is “part of” Admin Instance Z.

The Feature Instance Table is proposed as a catch-all for any other Feature Types that the database shall include, and offers considerable flexibility for the user to incorporate their own specialized data into the database. Features such as temples, archaeological sites, dialect regions, fault zones, botanical specimen collection sites, photographs, and so forth can be organized as individual Feature Instances for each occurrence. Also of interest to users will be the Event Table, where CHGIS will include specific historical events that directly affected other Instance records, but where other important events may be entered as a means of performing temporal queries. For instance, a researcher may wish to include the exact dates of major events, such as earthquakes, in the Event Table, and then search for any records that began or ended within a certain time period of the event. Combinations of event records can be used as a matrix for other temporal queries of interest, such as the number and temporal distribution of name change occurrences during a dynastic period, or administrative changes that took place during the overlapping period of a certain number of years before and after a dynastic change, etc.

Quite independent of the Instance tables described above, the Spatial Objects in the database may be used to represent any record for which their Spatial Instance has been related to a particular Place Object. Although Feature Instances may be created that have no concrete spatial analog (such as Zen Buddhism), the base CHGIS datasets will include only records for which we can **at the very least** identify a point location. Also included will be polylines for coastlines, major river systems, and elevation contours. Polygon objects for prefecture (or Fu) level units and above will be included in the base database, and for some areas, county polygons as well. The Spatial Objects need not be kept in separate tables (depending on the software implementation) but they should allow for the tracking of object types on separate timelines. For example, a polygon may be related to a particular Spatial Instance. At the same time, a point object is related to the instance, in relation to the location of the administrative seat for that polygon. But let us say that the location of the seat changes. Not the name, the status, the polygon, or any other aspect of the Spatial Instance, except for the location of the seat. If we allow for tracking of the feature types with separate timelines, we can easily create a new Point Object record with the needed Begin – End dates and associate it to our Spatial Instance.

Derived Spatial Data may be extracted automatically for each spatial object, providing a point or bounding box for each item in the database. This will allow for quite simple discovery of objects in the database and their related attributes, without the use of any GIS mechanism.

Lastly, the data model provides for links to Historical Sources, Commentaries, Spatial Data Sources, Spatial Metadata and Vernacular Script texts needed for any of the information recorded in the tables described above.

Below are descriptions of the core tables for the system, which fall into three general categories: raw data tables, temporal instance tables, and linktables. The overall diagram should be consulted first.

Overall Diagram of Tables

<http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~chgis/work/design/figs/diagram-phase2.pdf>

List of Table Descriptions:

Page 4	Place Table
Page 5	Place Object Table
Page 6	Place Type Table
Page 7	Event Linktable
Page 7	Event Table
Page 8	Event Type Linktable
Page 9	Event Type Table
Page 9	Event Instance Linktable
Page 10	Placename Instance Linktable
Page 11	Placename Table
Page 11	Language Linktable
Page 12	Language Tables
Page 12	Transliteration Linktable
Page 13	Transliteration Table
Page 13	Admin Instance Table
Page 14	Instance Relation Table
Page 16	Admin Unit Table
Page 16	Admin Name Linktable
Page 17	Feature Instance Table
Page 18	Feature Type Table
Page 18	Feature Name Linktable
Page 19	Spatial Instance Table
Page 20	Point Table
Page 21	Polyline Table
Page 21	Polygon Table
Page 21	Raster Table
Page 22	Spatial Data Versions Table
Page 22	Derived Spatial Data Table
Page 23	Spatial Data Source Linktable
Page 23	Data Source Table
Page 24	Metadata Linktable
Page 24	Source Linktable
Page 25	Source Table
Page 25	Commentary Linktable
Page 26	Commentary Table
Page 26	Other Classification System Table

time span, using a “part of” relationship in the Relation Type field. The administrative hierarchy of relationships can be derived by stepping up or down the chain of parent or child units.

Definitions:

- 1) See also the explanation in Administrative Instance Table, Note 1 above.

The value in the “Part of” field is the Admin Instance ID of the immediately superior unit. For example if Prefecture X (which was part of Province Z from 1800 to 1900) had subordinate Counties A, B, and C, from 1820 to 1850, the table would look something like the following:

AID	part of	Begin	End
X	Z	1800	1900
A	X	1820	1850
B	X	1820	1850
C	X	1820	1850

Now let’s suppose evidence is found that the territory of Prefecture X (containing County B) actually was transferred to Prefecture M (also part of Province Z) in 1840. The impact of the new evidence can be captured in several changes, as follows:

AID	part of	Begin	End
M	Z	1800	1900
X	Z	1800	1900
A	X	1820	1850
B	X	1820	1840
B	M	1840	1850
C	X	1820	1850

- 2) In addition to “part of,” many other relationships can be tracked in the Instance Relation Table. For Example, “capital of,” can be used to indicate which Admin Instance Record served as Capital of another Admin Instance Record, allowing for the function of “serving as capital” to be tracked on an independent timeline from either administrative unit. Similarly, we can keep track of temples (as Feature Instances) associated with certain monasteries, or, in fact, by creating a Feature Instance for a particular religious sect, we could keep track of all the temples and monasteries associated with that sect. Similarly, a feature instance may be created for a particular architect, and a set of structures associated with that person using a “designed by” relationship. There is no reason why the list cannot be expanded as needed, or can adopt such relational elements from other standards, such as the ADL content standard.
- 3) Temporal Sequence may also be tracked in this table, using a “preceded by” relation type.

Notes:

- 1) The most difficult event to capture, in terms of changes in the admin hierarchy, are those caused by changes in the area, or spatial object, related to the jurisdiction of any given administrative division. The method of handling this is briefly explained in the Instance Relation table in Administrative Instance Table, Note 1 above.
- 2) Special attention needs to be taken when updating records to make sure that all impacted Child units have their End Dates changed and new rows added to indicate the new instance of their rank in the administrative hierarchy.

-
- ³ “Solution to the Parent-Child Multiples Problem in the Spatio-Temporal Database Design for the CHGIS Project,” Intl Workshop on Historical GIS, Shanghai, 2001
http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~chgis/meetings/papers/crissman_paper.doc
- ⁴ “China Historical GIS Database Model,” Intl Workshop on Historical GIS, Shanghai, 2001
http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~chgis/meetings/papers/dbase_0909/
- ⁵ See Linda Hill’s discussion of the concept of “place” and “satisficing,” “Core Elements of Digital Gazetteer’s: Placenames, Categories, and Footprints.” In J. Borbinha & T. Baker (Eds.), *Research and Advanced Technology for Digital Libraries : Proceedings of the 4th European Conference, ECDL 2000* Lisbon, Portugal, September 18-20, 2000 (pp. 280-290). Berlin: Springer. Draft online:
http://alexandria.sdc.ucsb.edu/~lhill/paper_drafts/ECDL2000_paperdraft7.pdf
- ⁶ “GNS Feature Designation Cross Reference” http://164.214.2.59/gns/html/fd_cross_ref.html
- ⁷ The levels of temporal uncertainty are indicated in the “Begin Date Rule” “End Date Rule” fields, according to the ideas set forth in Man Zhimin’s “Zoujin shuzihua – Zhongguo lishi dili xinxi xitong (CHGIS) 1820 nian shuju jianjie” [Going Digital – A brief introduction to the China Historical GIS 1820 database]. CHGIS Database Meeting, Harvard University, Cambridge, August 9th, 2001. See page 7 for temporal uncertainty guidelines.
http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~chgis/meetings/papers/man_chgis_demo.doc
- ⁸ “An Area Event System for Forest Management History,” ESRI, April 2001.
<http://fas.harvard.edu/~chgis/work/docs/papers/forestwp.pdf>
- ⁹ A full explanation of this usage is found in “Toponyms and Feature Classifications for the China Historical GIS,” presented at the Pacific Neighborhood Consortium and Electronic Cultural Atlas Initiative joint meeting, City University of Hong Kong, January, 2001.
http://www.dbr.nu/data/pubs/papers/lex_gazteer_pnc01.pdf
- ¹⁰ Alexandria Digital Library Gazetteer Feature Type Thesaurus.
<http://alexandria.sdc.ucsb.edu/gazetteer//FeatureTypes/index.htm>
- ¹¹ List of Spatial Elements in Chinese Mountain Gazetteers, compiled by Thomas Hahn.
<http://www.library.cornell.edu/wason/gazetteers/>
- ¹² ECAI Metadata Standard, Version 1.1 (Mar 1999)
http://www.ecai.org/documentation/ecai_metadata_standard.html
- ¹³ ADL Feature Type Terms. <http://alexandria.sdc.ucsb.edu/~lhill/adlgaz/FTTermNumbers.htm>