List of Tables

2.1 Levels of interpretation according to Panofsky (1955) 17
2.2 Example of description of an artwork (Tityus, by Michelangelo) interpretation through three levels 18

3.1 Classes and properties related to the recognition of artworks (sculptures and paintings if available) in selected knowledge graphs 40
3.2 Overview of the artwork subject presence in the selected graphs (as of 01/12/2022) 41
3.3 Evaluation metrics, the first five criteria are adapted from (Färber et al. 2018), the last criterion is newly developed 43
3.4 Inter-annotator agreement scores as measured by quadratically weighted Cohen's Kappa for semantic validity of iconographical and iconological triples and column completeness per knowledge graph 44
3.5 Properties identifying iconographical and iconological content for each selected knowledge graph 46
3.6 Results for each metric over the selected Knowledge Graphs (as of 01/12/2022) 52

5.1 Definition of the entities involved in the pre-iconographical description according to Panofsky's theory (integrated with Imdahl [2012]) . . . 79
5.2 Definition of the entities involved in the iconographical description according to Panofsky's theory 80
5.3 Definition of the entities involved in the iconological synthesis according to Panofsky's theory 81
5.4 Overview of research questions extracted from the literature and the source 83
5.5 SEEMP Reference Ontology Requirements Specification Document (requirements 1–5) 92
5.6 SEEMP Reference Ontology Requirements Specification Document (requirements 6–7) 93
5.7 Direct Reuse of Classes and Properties in ICON 105

Published in: Sofia Baroncini, Diving into artworks interpretations through the lenses of semantic data. An Application on Panofsky's Iconological Studies, Heidelberg: arthistoricum.net 2026, https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1462

5.8 Indirect Reuse of Classes and Properties in ICON: icon element – type – external element . . . 106
5.9 Distinction between subjects and visual subjects depending on Panofsky's levels of interpretation . . . 110

6.1 Fields described in the table for cultural objects description . . . 116
6.2 Fields described in the table for pre-iconographical recognitions . . . 118
6.3 Fields described in the table for iconographical recognitions . . . 120
6.4 Entities for which the type is indicated in the URI . . . 136
6.5 Identifiers creation rules . . . 137
6.6 Identifiers creation rules (Manifested subjects and recognitions) . . . 138
6.7 Cultural object relations aligned with CONA associative relations . . . 140
6.8 Overview of the alignments made and matching strategy . . . 141
6.9 Cultural object Table filled with the case studies metadata . . . 145
6.10 Expression of the recognized first-level objects in tabular format . . . 147
6.11 Expression of the visual citation performed by the Medieval relief of the Roman one . . . 148
6.12 Second-level subjects recognitions expressed in a tabular format . . . 149
6.13 Third-level subjects recognitions expressed in a tabular format . . . 149

7.1 Overview of research questions extracted from the literature, their specification in sub-questions performed in SPARQL queries. . . . 161
7.2 Subject types having a support score greater than 0.20 . . . 168
7.3 Overview of the recognitions giving support to the recognition of a cultural phenomenon . . . 169
7.4 Results of SQ11 showing the number of third-level concept recognition citing as evidence a textual source . . . 179
7.5 Example of results obtained by performing SQ12 . . . 181
7.6 Overview of the iconographies having a description at the first level and appearing more than once (SQ12) . . . 182
7.7 Frequency of recognizing attributes of Cupid (SQ15) . . . 187
7.8 Example of copying and copied artworks . . . 195
7.9 The most connected cultural phenomena in the iconological network 202
7.10 Total of artworks having at least a cultural phenomenon, distinguished for the degree of description (multiple levels or only the third one) . . . 203

8.1 Performed evaluation metrics . . . 221
8.2 Percentage of addressed and partially addressed sub-questions expressing the RQs of the domain . . . 224
8.3 Quantitative overview of the test dataset (number of triples, subjects, and interpretations) . . . 225
8.4 Information about artworks cited in the queries . . . 225
8.5 CQ 1.2.1 results . . . 226
8.6 CQ 1.3.1 results . . . 227

8.7 CQ 2.6.1 results 228
8.8 CQ 0.2.1 results 229
8.9 Description of the artwork ‘Time the destroyer’ according to the three levels of interpretation 231
8.10 Comparison between Wikidata, VIR, and ICON 236

10.1 Knowledge bases included in the case study. 256