

Semantic Wikipedia

Max Völkel, Markus Krötzsch, Denny Vrandečić, Heiko Haller, Rudi Studer
Institute AIFB, University of Karlsruhe (TH)
76128 Karlsruhe, Germany

{voelkel,kroetzsch,vrandecic,haller,studer}@aifb.uni-karlsruhe.de

ABSTRACT

Wikipedia is the world's largest collaboratively edited source of encyclopaedic knowledge. But in spite of its utility, its contents are barely machine-interpretable. Structural knowledge, e. g. about how concepts are interrelated, can neither be formally stated nor automatically processed. Also the wealth of numerical data is only available as plain text and thus can not be processed by its actual meaning.

We provide an extension to be integrated in Wikipedia, that allows the typing of links between articles and the specification of typed data inside the articles in an easy-to-use manner.

Enabling even casual users to participate in the creation of an open semantic knowledge base, Wikipedia has the chance to become a resource of semantic statements, hitherto unknown regarding size, scope, openness, and internationalisation. These semantic enhancements bring to Wikipedia benefits of today's semantic technologies: more specific ways of searching and browsing. Also, the RDF export, that gives direct access to the formalised knowledge, opens Wikipedia up to a wide range of external applications, that will be able to use it as a background knowledge base.

In this paper, we present the design, implementation, and possible uses of this extension.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

H.3.5 [Information Storage and Retrieval]: Online Information Systems; H.5.3 [Information Interfaces]: Group and Organization Interfaces—*Web-based interactions*; I.2.4 [Artificial Intelligence]: Knowledge Representation; K.4.3 [Computers and Society]: Organizational Impacts—*Computer-supported collaborative work*

General Terms

Human Factors, Documentation, Languages

Keywords

Semantic Web, Wikipedia, RDF, Wiki

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper describes an extension to be integrated in Wikipedia, that enhances it with Semantic Web [6] technologies. Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia, is well-established as the world's largest

Copyright is held by the International World Wide Web Conference Committee (IW3C2). Distribution of these papers is limited to classroom use, and personal use by others.

WWW 2006, May 23–26, 2006, Edinburgh, Scotland.
ACM 1-59593-323-9/06/0005.

online collection of encyclopaedic knowledge, and it is also an example of global collaboration within an open community of volunteers.

The information contained in Wikipedia is still unusable in many fields of application. *Using* Wikipedia currently means *reading* articles—There is no way to automatically gather information scattered across multiple articles, like “Give me a table of all movies from the 1960s with Italian directors.” Although the data is quite structured (each movie on its own article, links to actors and directors), its meaning is unclear to the computer, because it is not represented in a machine-processable, i. e. formalised way.

To let the huge and highly motivated community of Wikipedians render the shared factual knowledge of Wikipedia machine-processable, we face several challenges: In addition to technical aspects of this endeavour, the main challenge is to introduce semantic technologies into the established usage patterns of Wikipedia. We propose small extensions to the wiki link syntax and an enhanced article view to show the interpreted semantic data to the user.

We expose Wikipedia's fine-grained human edited information in a standardised and machine-readable way by using the W3C standards on RDF [15], XSD [10], RDFS [7], and OWL [21]. This opens new ways to improve Wikipedia's capabilities for querying, aggregating, or exporting knowledge, based on well-established Semantic Web technologies. We hope that Semantic Wikipedia can help to demonstrate the promised value of semantic technologies to the general public, e. g. serving as a base for powerful question answering interfaces.

The primary goal of this project is to supply an implemented extension to be actually introduced into Wikipedia in the near future. The implementation is rapidly developing, and the software can be tested online at <http://wiki.ontoworld.org>.

In this article, we review major achievements and shortcomings of today's Wikipedia (Section 2), and discuss our basic ideas and their effect on practical usage (Section 3). We describe the underlying architecture of our system (Section 4) and give an overview of the concrete implementation (Section 5). In Section 6, we point out various potential knowledge-based applications (both local and web-based), that could be realised based on our semantic extension of Wikipedia. After a brief review of related approaches to semantic wikis (Section 7), we conclude with a summary and point to open research issues in Section 8.

2. TODAY'S WIKIPEDIA

Wikipedia is a collaboratively edited encyclopaedia, available under a free licence on the web.¹ It was created by Jimbo Wales and Larry Sanger in January 2001, and has attracted some ten thousand

¹<http://www.wikipedia.org>

editors from all over the world. As of 2005, Wikipedia consists of more than 2.5 million articles in over two hundred languages, with the English, German, French and Japanese editions being the biggest ones [25].

It is based on a wiki software. The idea of wikis was first introduced by Ward Cunningham [9] within the programming language patterns group. A wiki is a simple content management system, that is especially geared towards enabling the reader to change and enhance the content of the website easily. Wikipedia is based on the MediaWiki² software, which was developed by the Wikipedia community especially for the Wikipedia, but is now used in several other websites as well. The idea of Wikipedia is to allow everyone to edit and extend the encyclopaedic content (or simply correct typos).

Besides the encyclopaedic articles on many subjects, Wikipedia also holds numerous articles that are meant to enhance the browsing of Wikipedia: rock'n'roll albums in the sixties; lists of the countries of the world, sorted by area, population, or the index of free speech; the list of popes sorted by length of papacy, their name or the year of inauguration. There is even a list of persons with asteroids named after them. As it is now, all these lists have to be written manually, introducing several sources of inconsistency, only maintainable through the sheer size of the community. Smaller Wikipedia communities, like the Latin Wikipedia or the Asturian Wikipedia will hardly be able to afford the luxury of maintaining several redundant lists.

These lists may be regarded as queries with manually created answers. Whereas queries about the biggest countries may be anticipated, rather seldom asked queries like the search for “all the movies from the 1960s with Italian directors” will hardly be created, or else badly maintained, often being dependant on a single editor. Changes in the articles do not reflect in all the appropriate lists, but have to be updated manually.

Besides those hand-crafted lists, Wikipedia provides a full-text search of its content and a categorisation of articles (where categories can be organised hierarchically). There is no other way to access the huge data included in Wikipedia right now. In particular, Wikipedia's content is only accessible for human reading. The automatic gathering of information for agents and other programs is hardly possible right now: only complete articles may be read as blobs of text, which is hard to process, understand and put to further usage by computers.

3. GENERAL IDEA

Our primary goal is to provide an extension to MediaWiki which allows to make important parts of Wikipedia's knowledge machine-processable with as little effort as possible. The prospect of making the world's largest collaboratively edited source of factual knowledge accessible in a fully automatic fashion is certainly appealing, but the specific setting also creates a number of challenges that one has to be aware of.

When compared to other content management systems, wikis are primarily characterized by the specific usage patterns they suggest [9]. Most importantly, users are enabled to add and modify content easily, restricted only by the requirement to agree with other members of the community. In Wikipedia, processes have been established to identify possible problems and to resolve disputes, but decisions are still made and put into practice by community members. The wiki system provides an adequate environment, but does not directly enforce any restrictions. Since our system is conceived as an extension of MediaWiki it adheres to these core wiki

principles—often referred to as the “wiki way”—with all the advantages and disadvantages that this brings.

In addition to the “wiki way,” various other requirements were vital for our design choices:

Usability. First and foremost, any extension of Wikipedia must satisfy highest requirements on usability, since the large community of volunteers is a primary strength of any wiki. Users must be able to use the extended features without any technical background knowledge or prior training. Furthermore, it should be possible to simply ignore the additional possibilities without major restrictions on the normal usage and editing of Wikipedia.

Expressiveness. It is desirable to have as much knowledge as possible in a machine processable format, but it is well-known that this often conflicts with usability and performance. This particularly affects advanced features, such as reasoning with time and space, for which practical solutions are still sought. Still, on an informal level, Wikipedia provides various means of structuring its content, and such existing structures are a natural choice for formalization. Difficulties, such as the creation of logical inconsistencies, should be avoided.

Flexibility. Wikis can be employed for a great variety of tasks, and users can adjust the form and content of the collected information in almost unrestricted ways. A semantic extension should adhere to these principles.

Scalability. Wikipedia's sheer size, and the fact that the knowledge base is growing continuously, is a major challenge for current semantic technologies. Performance and scalability are thus highly relevant.

Interchange and compatibility. Making Wikipedia accessible to machines also requires concrete interfaces and export functions. The latter involves the task of selecting appropriate semantic description languages for exchanging information. Compatibility with current tools, but also with future developments, is an important criterium in this respect.

In the rest of this section, we review the main features of the system from a Wikipedia editor's viewpoint, with a particular focus on usability, expressiveness, and flexibility. We start with an overview of the kind of semantic information that is supported, and proceed by discussing *typed links* and *attributes* individually. Technical aspects considering scalability, interchange and compatibility are detailed later on in Section 4.

3.1 The Big Picture

As explained above, respecting existing usage patterns is highly important for integrating extensions into a wiki. Our guideline for doing so is to consider current wiki usage, and to identify structural features that suggest themselves for machine processing. In some cases, Wikipedia already provides concise structure, while in other cases slight extensions are needed to enable users to make information more explicit. We arrive at the following key elements for our annotations:

- *categories*, which classify articles according to their content,
- *typed links*, which classify links between articles according to their meaning, and
- *attributes*, which specify simple properties related to the content of an article.

²<http://www.mediawiki.org>




Figure 1: Currently there are pages and links (above), we feature concepts and data connected by relations (below).

Categories already exist in Wikipedia, though they are mainly used to assist browsing. Typed links and attributes are novel features that are explained below and detailed in subsequent sections. An important characteristic of the above means of annotation is that they always refer to the topic of a specific article, and only in this article can these annotations be given. This notion of locality is adopted in our system since it simplifies usage and maintenance.

Typed links are obtained from normal links by slightly extending the way of creating a hyperlink between articles, as illustrated in Figure 1. As for the Web in general, links are arguably the most basic and also most relevant markup within a wiki, and their syntactic representation is ubiquitous in the source of any Wikipedia article. The introduction of typed links thus is a natural consequence of our goal of exploiting existing structural information. Through a minor, optional syntax extension, we allow wiki users to create (*freely*) typed links, which express a *relation* between two pages (or rather between their respective subjects). As an example, one could type a link from the article “London” to “England” with the relation “is capital of.” Even very simple search algorithms would then suffice to provide a precise answer to the question “What is the capital of England?” In contrast, the current text-driven search returns only a list of articles for the user to read through. Details on how the additional type information can be added in an unobtrusive and user-friendly way are given in the next section.

It is of course important to clarify what a “type” of a link actually is in this setting, and which types are available to the user. In accordance to the wiki way, we impose no restrictions in this respect, and allow users to create new types on the fly by just employing them for annotations. It is understood that this bears both advantages and disadvantages, but it is also a basic principle of wiki usage to which we try to adhere with all our extensions as far as possible.

Wikipedia’s current category system takes a similar approach, and demonstrates that this choice is feasible in practice. This is due to a number of control mechanisms that have been developed in the community, ranging from detailed usage guidelines to technical means for enforcing community decisions for or against a certain use of categories (detailed in Section 4.1).

Attributes provide another interesting source of machine readable data, which incorporates the great number of data values in the encyclopedia. Typically, such values are provided in the form of numbers, dates, coordinates, and the like. For example, one would like to obtain access to the population number of London. It should be clear that it is not desirable to solve this problem by creating a typed link to an article entitled “7421328” because this would create a unbearable amount of mostly useless number-pages whereas the textual title does not even capture the intended numeric meaning faithfully (e.g. the natural lexicographic order of titles does not correspond with the natural order of numbers). Therefore, we introduce an alternative markup for describing attribute values in various datatypes. The Wikipedia project “WikiData”³ pursues a similar objective, but is targeted at different use-cases where fixed forms can be used to input data. Moreover, we address the problem of handling units of measurement that are often given for data values.

In order for such extensions to be used by editors, there must be new features that provide some form of *instant gratification*. Semantically enhanced search functions improve the possibilities of finding information within Wikipedia and would be of high utility to the community. But one also has to assure that changes made by editors are immediately reflected when conducting such searches. Additionally, Wikipedia’s machine-readable knowledge is made available for external use by providing RDF dumps. This enables the creation of additional tools to leverage Wikipedia contents and re-use it in other contexts. Thus, in addition to the traditional usage of Wikipedia, a new range of services is enabled inside and outside the encyclopaedia. Experience with earlier extensions, such as Wikipedia’s category system, assures us that the benefits of said services will lead to a rapid introduction of typed links into Wikipedia.

The core features of our system are illustrated by Figure 2, which shows a screenshot of a short article on London. The markup contained in the article source allows to extract key facts from this text, which are displayed below the article. Quick links to search functions are provided there as well (see Section 3.5). In the following sections, we explain in detail how this is achieved by an editor.

3.2 Usage of Typed Links

A regular hyperlink already states that there is some relation between two pages. Search engines like Google successfully use this kind of information to rank pages in a keyword search scenario. Typed links in Wikipedia can even go beyond that, since they are interpreted as *semantic relations* between two concepts described within articles. We associate with each wiki page a URI to unambiguously represent the concept described on that page. We do not claim that every link should be turned into a typed link. Many links serve merely navigational purposes, and it would not make sense to attribute them any further meaning.

The suggested typing mechanism can be understood as a kind of categorisation of links. As with categories and articles, wiki authors are free to employ arbitrary descriptive labels for typing links. To do so, one has to extend the syntactical description of a hyperlink. Without semantic extensions, the source of the article

³<http://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Wikidata>



Figure 2: A semantic view of London.

in Figure 2 looks as in Figure 3. In Wikipedia, links to other articles are created by simply enclosing the article names in double brackets. Classification in categories is achieved in a similar fashion by providing a link to the category. However, category links are always displayed in a special format at the bottom of an article, without regard to the placement of the link inside the text.

In order to explicitly state that London is the capital of England, in the “London” article one just extends the link to `[[England]]` by writing `[[is capital of::England]]`. This states that a relation called “is capital of” holds between “London” and “England.” Typed links stay true to the wiki-nature of Wikipedia: Every user can add an arbitrary type to a link or change it. Of course existing link types should be used wherever applicable, but a new type can also be created simply by using it in a link. To make improved searching and similar features most efficient, the community will have to settle down to re-use existing link types. As in the case of categories, we allow the creation of descriptive articles on link types to aid this process—for details see Section 4.

In the rare cases where links should have multiple types, users can write `[[type1::type2::...::typen::target article]]`.

Sometimes it is desirable that the displayed text of a hyperlink is different from the title of the article it links to. In Wikipedia, this is achieved by writing `[[target article|link text in article]]`. This option is not affected by our syntactical extension, the textual label also of a typed link can still be freely chosen by the user e.g. by using `[[is capital of::United Kingdom|UK]]`.

Note how typed links integrate seamlessly into current wiki usage. In contrast to all other semantic wikis we are aware of (see Section 7), Semantic MediaWiki places semantic markup directly within the text to ensure that machine-readable data agrees with the human-readable data of the article. The notation we have chosen makes the extended link syntax largely self-explicatory provided that labels are chosen carefully.

Typed links already enable some convenient applications. Besides the direct query for the capital of England, the above information can also be used in more advanced ways: If we know that “is capital of” is a special case of being “is located in” (ways for stating this are discussed in Section 4), we can *infer* that London is located in England—even if this fact is not stated anywhere in Wikipedia. Semantic MediaWiki also permits *aggregated queries* that combine several search criteria to return a list of articles. For example, considering membership in the category “City,” and knowing that England is located in Europe, we can derive that “London” should indeed be included when searching for all European cities. In con-

```
'''London''' is the capital city of [[England]]
and of the [[United Kingdom]]. As of [[2005]],
the total resident population of London was
estimated 7,421,328. Greater London covers an
area of 609 square miles. [[Category:City]]
```

Figure 3: Source of an article on London using Wikipedia’s current markup.

```
'''London''' is the capital city of [[capital
of::England]] and of the [[is capital of::United
Kingdom]]. As of [[2005]], the total resident
population of London was estimated
[[population:=7,421,328]]. Greater London
covers an area of [[area:=609 square miles]].
[[Category:City]]
```

Figure 4: Source of an article on London with semantic extensions.

trast to simple keyword queries, no rivers, routes, or mountains will be returned merely because they mention the terms “Europe” and “City.” These examples illustrate various levels of reasoning with semantic information, and it is clear that there is a trade-off between added strength and required effort for computation and implementation.

3.3 Attributes and Types

Data values play a crucial role within an encyclopaedia, and machine access to this data yields numerous additional applications. In contrast to the case of links, attribute values are usually given as plain text, so that there is no such straightforward syntactical extension for marking this information. Yet we settled down to introduce a syntax that is very similar to the above markup for typed links. Namely, in order to make, e.g., the value for the population of London explicit, one writes `[[population:=7,421,328]]`. Using `:=` instead of `::` allows an easy distinction between attributes and typed links, while also reflecting the proximity of these concepts.

We are aware that introducing link syntax for parts of text that do not create hyperlinks might be a possible source of confusion for users. But the fact that most special characters are allowed to be used as text inside MediaWiki articles severely restricts the syntactical options. Therefore, MediaWiki uses link syntax also for denoting category membership, to relate articles across languages, and for including images, each of which does not create a normal hyperlink at the place of the markup. We thus believe that our choice is tenable, but we also allow to syntactically encapsulate annotations into Wikipedia’s *template* mechanism, as described in Section 3.4.

Besides this, attributes behave similarly to typed links from a user perspective: like with links, we enable users to freely create new attributes simply by using a new name, and to provide alternative texts with the markup. The latter feature is often helpful, e.g. in order to write “London has a population of `[[population:=7,421,328|around 7.5 million]]`.”

Combining this information with the semantic data discussed above, the system should be able to build a list of all European cities ordered by their population on the fly. To enable this, we also need a powerful query language and tools that support it. Fortunately, such languages have been developed for various explicit representations of knowledge, SPARQL⁴ being the most recent out-

⁴<http://www.w3.org/TR/rdf-sparql-query/>

come of these developments. Including these achievements to our system requires us to describe semantic data in RDF and to provide an appropriate storage architecture, as discussed in Section 4. Another challenge is to develop user interfaces that provide access to such powerful query mechanisms without requiring knowledge of SPARQL syntax. Luckily, we can address this problem gradually, starting with intuitive special-purpose interfaces that restrict expressivity. Section 5 sketches how our system supports the creation of such tools in a way that is mostly independent from our implementation.

So far, attributes appear to be quite similar to typed links, but there are a number of further issues to be taken into account. For example, a statement like “Greater London has a total area of 609” does not mean anything. What is missing here is the *unit of measurement*. To solve this problem, our current implementation provides generic support for such units in a fully intuitive way. In the present example, the user would just write “[`area:=609 square miles`],” though the unit could also be denoted as “mi²,” “sq mile,” and much more. Observe that there are often multiple identifiers to denote the same unit, but that there are also different units to measure the same quantity. Therefore, the system offers support for multiple unit identifiers. In a growing number of cases, the system provides automatic conversion of a value to various other units as well, such that searches can be conducted over many values irrespective of their unit. This allows users to state their values either in square miles or square kilometers.

For the user, these features are completely transparent: she just enters the unit of her choice. Of course, the degree of support varies among units. Users also receive the immediate benefit of having converted values displayed within the article. Thus the markup given in Figure 4 actually produces the output of Figure 2. Finally, if a unit is unknown, the (numerical) value is just processed together with its (textual) unit identifier. Note that the value displayed within the text part of a wiki page is never a computed one and is always displayed as entered.

Due to the fact that units can have ambiguous identifiers (e.g. “ml” for “miles” and for “millilitres”), users must be able to state which kind of units are supported for an attribute. Many features, such as sorting results according to some attribute, also require knowledge about its basic datatype (integer, float, string, calendar date, ...). Details on how unit support is implemented, and on how users can supply the required type information are given in Section 4.2 below. Here, we only remark that users will usually find a sufficient set of existing attributes, so that they do not have to bother with their declaration.

3.4 Semantic Templates

With the above features, the system is also able to implement a technology sometimes referred to as *semantic templates*. Wikipedia already offers a template mechanism that allows users to include predefined parts of text into articles. Space does not permit us to provide details on this mechanism, but extensive documentation is available online⁵. Templates can also include placeholders which are instantiated with user-supplied text when the template is included into an article. This feature allows to have a fixed format for varying content, and was mainly introduced to ensure a consistent layout among articles.

By simply adding typed links or attributes to the template text, our implementation allows the use of templates for encapsulating semantic annotation. In some cases, one could even modify existing templates to obtain a large amount of semantic data without

changing any article. Yet, many existing uses of templates disallow such semi-automatic annotation. Indeed, placeholders in templates are often instantiated with short descriptive texts, possibly containing multiple links to other articles, such that no single entity can be annotated. Yet, semantic templates are a valuable addition to our approach, since they can simplify annotation in many cases.

3.5 User Experience

We already saw that editors experience only small changes in form of some easy to grasp syntax, appearing at various places within articles. Here, we discuss some other changes that users will encounter in a Semantic Wikipedia.

Most prominently, users now find an infobox for semantic information at the bottom of each page. It helps editors to understand the markup, since it immediately shows how the system interprets the input. But the infobox also provides extended features for normal users. As shown in Figure 2, typed links are augmented with quick-links to “inverse searches.” For example, consider an article about *Hyde Park* stating that it is located in London. A single click in the infobox then suffices to trigger a search for other things located in London.

Additionally, data values can be connected with special features based on their datatype. For instance, articles that specify geographic coordinates can be furnished with links to external map services⁶. In the case of calendar dates, links could refer to specialised searches that visualise a timeline of other events around the given date. At the time of the writing of this article, the system does not include such custom functions yet, but support for geographic coordinates is scheduled for the near future.

Of course it is also possible to conduct searches directly. New special pages for “*Semantic Search*” can be conceived to allow users to pose advanced queries. Providing user interfaces for this task is not at the core of our current work, but the system already includes a simple search for articles that have certain relations to certain other articles. We provide means for developers to add their own search interfaces in an easy way, and we expect that many customised searches will appear (both experimental and stable, both within Wikipedia and on external sites).

Finally, tools for collecting RDF data during browsing, like *Piggybank*⁷, will find machine readable RDF specifications for each article when visiting the article page. Piggybank can integrate this data into the local RDF repository, and offer advanced functions such as showing the gathered geographic locations in online maps.

4. DESIGN

In this section, we devise an architecture for a concrete implementation. We start by introducing the overall format and architecture for data storage, and continue with discussing the workflow for evaluating typed links and attributes given in articles. For attributes, this includes declaration, error handling, and unit conversion.

Seeking a suitable formal data model, we notice the close resemblance of our given input data to RDF and RDFS. Typed links basically describe RDF properties between RDF resources that denote articles, attributes correspond to properties between articles and RDF data literals, and Wikipedia’s current classification scheme can be modelled with RDFS classes. Note that Wikipedia already restricts the use of categories to the classification of articles—there are no categories of categories. In other words, we are dealing with

⁵<http://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Help:Template>

⁶Experimental versions of such services are already provided in English Wikipedia, but the focus there is not on further usage of the data.

⁷<http://simile.mit.edu/piggy-bank/>

a fragment of RDFS that is largely compatible with the semantics of OWL DL, and we might choose a representation in either formalism without major semantic obstacles.⁸

These considerations enable us to view our system as a convenient tool to author RDF specifications, removing technical barriers to allow cooperative editing by a large number of users. Though this viewpoint neglects the specific scenario of a semantic Wikipedia, it is helpful for the more technical parts of the architecture. In particular, the consistent and well-understood data model of RDF simplifies design choices and allows us to reuse existing software.

The availability of mature *free*⁹ software for processing and storing RDF is indeed very important. First of all, it helps us to tackle the huge scalability challenges linked to our usage scenario: Wikipedia has to cope with a large number of simultaneous read and write requests over a steadily growing database. Specialised RDF databases (“triplestores”) available today should be able to deal with the expected loads¹⁰, and do even provide basic reasoning support for RDFS constructs. Furthermore, recent RDF tools provide simplified data access via query languages like SPARQL which can be used to implement search interfaces. Free RDF software libraries like Redland¹¹ facilitate the task for external developers who want to reuse semantic data exported from Wikipedia in an RDF/XML serialisation. The overall architecture we envision is pictured in Figure 5, which we will consider in more detail in Section 5.

4.1 Typed Links

In the following, we describe how the above ideas can be instantiated in a concrete architecture that allows input, processing, and export of typed links in MediaWiki. This encompasses the treatment of categories, attributes, and schema information as well, though some additional measures are required for some of these cases.

Section 3 explained how users can include type information in existing links. According to our above discussion on the relationship to RDF, the type that a user gives to a link is just a string that is used to generate an appropriate URI for an RDF property. Thus, proper encoding in RDF can be achieved without requiring users to declare types of links in advance, and arbitrary names can be introduced by users. Yet, it is clear that the complete lack of such schema information complicates the task of annotation which requires consistent usage of type identifiers. Many names might be introduced for the same relationship, and, possibly more problematic, the same name might be used with different meanings.

These problems are already being encountered in the current usage of Wikipedia’s categories, and experience shows that they are not critical. However, to address the problem, it is possible to create special articles (distinguished by their Wikipedia *namespace* “Category:”) that provide a human readable description for most categories. Similarly, we introduce a namespace “Relation:” that allows to add descriptions of possible relations between articles.¹²

⁸One must be aware that Wikipedia’s categories describe collections of articles, as opposed to categories of article subjects. E.g., the category “Europe” denotes a class of articles *related to* Europe, not the class of all “europes.”

⁹Being free (as in speech) is indispensable in our setting, since only free software is used to run Wikipedia.

¹⁰English Wikipedia *currently* counts more than 989,000 articles, but it is hard to estimate how many RDF triples one has to expect. High numbers of parallel requests yield another invariant often ignored in benchmarks of current stores.

¹¹<http://librdf.org>

¹²We deviate from the label “type” here, since its meaning is ambiguous unless additional technical terms are juxtaposed.




Figure 5: Basic architecture of the semantic extensions to MediaWiki. On the left, Wikipedia users edit articles to enter semantic information (see Section 4). Further extensions to MediaWiki use this data and export it to external applications (see Section 5).

In spite of these additions, the processing of typed links entered by a user does not involve articles on relations. Hence only local data sources need to be accessed for transforming typed links into RDF triples that are sent to the triplestore which serves as the storage backend. To assure that the triplestore contains no information that is not contained in the text of the article, we must delete outdated triples prior to saving new information. Luckily, every article affects exactly those triples that involve this article as the subject, so that we just have to delete these triples on update. Note how crucial this *locality* of our approach is for obtaining a scalable system. Summing up, any user-triggered update of an article leads to the following three steps:

1. Extraction of link types from the article source (parsing).
2. Transformation of this semantic information into RDF triples.
3. Updating the triplestore by deleting old triples and storing new ones.

Each of these operations can be performed with a minimum of additional resources (computation time, bandwidth), and the update of the triple store could even be achieved asynchronously after the article text was saved. Edit conflicts by concurring changes are detected and resolved by the MediaWiki software.

Our architecture also ensures that the current semantic information is always accessible by querying the triple store. This is very convenient, since applications that work on the semantic data, including any search and export functions, can be implemented with reference to the storage interface independently from the rest of the system. In Section 5, we give some more details on how this is achieved. Here we just note the single exception to this general scheme of accessing semantic data: the infobox at the bottom of each article is generated during parsing and does not require read access to the triplestore. This is necessary since infoboxes must be generated when previewing articles, and this *before* they are saved.

4.2 Attributes

Attributes are similar to typed links, but describe relationships between an article and a (possibly complex) data value, instead of

between two articles. With respect to the general architecture of storage and retrieval, they thus behave similarly to typed links. But additional challenges for processing attribute values have already been encountered in Section 3. In this section, we formally relate the lexical representation of attribute data to the data representation of XML Schema. This leads us to consider the declaration of datatypes for semantic attributes, before focussing on error handling and the complex problem of unit support.

4.2.1 Value Processing and Datatypes

A primary difficulty with attributes is the proper recognition of the given value. Since attribute values currently are just given as plain text, they do not adhere to any fixed format. On the other hand, proper formatting can be much more complicated for a data value than for a typed link. A link is valid as soon as its target exists, but a data value (e.g. a number) must be *parsed* to find out its meaning. Formally, we distinguish the *value space* (e.g. the set of integer numbers) from the *lexical space* (e.g. the set of all acceptable string representations of integers). A similar conceptualisation is encountered for the representation of datatypes in RDF, which is based on XML Schema (XSD).

Now it is tempting to build support for attributes in Wikipedia based on the original XSD datatypes. We certainly want to use XSD representations for storing data values in RDF triples. Unfortunately, we cannot adopt the lexical space from XSD, since it usually does not allow for the data representation that is most common to users, especially if their language is not English. Thus we allow users to provide input values from a defined lexical space of Wikipedia, which is usually not equal to a lexical space of XSD. Formally, we combine two conversions between data representations: (1) the conversion between Wikipedia's lexical space and the (XSD) value space, and (2) the conversion between the value space and the corresponding lexical space of XSD.

Thus the lexical space within Wikipedia must be localised to adapt to the writing customs of other languages, while the XML Schema representation is universal, allowing for machine processing of arbitrary language Wikipedias. Parsing user provided data values ensures that the stored RDF triples conform to the XML specification, and allows us to perform further operations on the data, as described below.

Clearly, we must have prior knowledge of the lexical and value spaces involved in the conversion, since these can in general not be derived from the input. In other words, we need a predefined datatype for any attribute for which values are given. The supported datatypes themselves are provided by the system, and cannot be changed by editing the wiki. Yet, in contrast to the case of typed links, it is in general not possible to introduce new attributes without specifying the desired datatype. In Section 4.2.2 below, we discuss how the system still can minimise the formal constraints that might hinder intuitive usage.

We arrive at a system that consists of three major components: *data values* (e.g. “3,391,407”) are assigned to *attributes* (e.g. “population”) which are associated with a given *datatype* (e.g. “integer”). The types themselves are built-in, and their articles only serve to give a description of proper usage and admissible input values. It is important to understand that a type in Wikipedia always implies some XML Schema datatype, but is generally more specific than this. For example, one can have many types that support XSD “date” while mapping its values to different (language specific) lexical spaces in Wikipedia.

To allow users to declare the datatype of an attribute, we introduce a new Wikipedia namespace “Attribute:” that contains articles on attributes. Within these articles, one can provide human-

readable descriptions as in the case of relations and categories, but one can also add semantic information that specifies the datatype. To minimise the amount of new syntactic constructs, we propose to use the concept of typed links as introduced in this paper. Therefore we reserve a third (and last) namespace for types: “Type:.” Then, using a relation with built-in semantic we can simply write

```
[[hasType::Type:integer]]
```

to denote that an attribute has this type. The declaration of datatypes can also be facilitated by templates as introduced in Section 3.4. For instance, one can easily create a template that provides the semantic information that an attribute is of type integer, but that also includes human-readable hints and descriptions.

The general workflow of processing attribute input is slightly more complex than in the case of typed links. Before extracting the attribute values from the article source, we need to find out about the datatype of an attribute. This requires an additional read request to the storage backend and thus has some impact on performance. Since other features, such as template inclusion, have similar requirements, we are optimistic that this impact is tenable.

4.2.2 Error Handling

In contrast to typed links, the handling of attributes involves cases where the system is not able to process an input properly, although the article is syntactically correct. Such a case occurs whenever users refer to attributes for which no datatype was declared, but also if the provided input values do not belong to the lexical space of the datatype.

A usual way to deal with this is to output an error that specifies the problem to the user. However, in a wiki-environment, it is vital to tolerate as many errors as possible. Reasons are that technical error messages might repel contributors, that users may lack the knowledge to understand and handle error messages, and, last but not least, that tolerating errors and inconsistencies (temporally) is crucial for the success of collaborative editing. Thus our system aims at catching errors and merely issuing warning messages wherever possible.

In case of missing datatype declarations, this can be achieved by presuming some feasible datatype based on the structure of the input. Basically, when encountering a numerical value, the input is treated as floating point number. Otherwise, it is processed as a string. A warning inside the infobox at the article bottom informs the user about the possible problem. Here we exploit that RDF includes a datatype declaration for each value of a property. A property can thus have values of multiple datatypes within one knowledge base. This is also required if an existing datatype declaration is changed later on (recall that anyone can edit declarations). The new type only affects future edits of articles while existing data is still valid.

If the datatype is specified but the input does not belong to the supported lexical space, we do not store any semantic information and only issue a warning message within the infobox.

4.2.3 Units of Measurement

The above framework provides a feasible architecture for treating plain values, like the number of inhabitants of some city. However, many realistic quantities are characterised not only by a numerical value, but also by an associated unit. This is a major concern in an open community where users may have individual preferences regarding physical units. Units might be given in different systems (kilometres vs. miles) or on different scales (nanometres vs. kilometres). In any case, reducing such input to a mere number severely restricts comparability and thwarts the intended universal

exchange of data between communities and languages. Using different attributes for different units is formally correct, but part of the problem remains (values of “length (miles)” and “length (kilometres)” remain incomparable to RDF tools).

Our solution to this problem is twofold. On the one hand, we provide automatic unit conversion to ensure that large parts of the data are stored in the same unit. On the other hand, we recognise even those units for which no conversion support is implemented yet, so that we can export them in a way that prevents confusion between values of different units. To this end, note that it is fairly easy to separate a (postfixed) unit string from a numerical value. Given both the numerical value and the unit string, one can unambiguously store the information by including unit information into attribute (property) names. For example, the input `[[length:=3km]]` is exported as value 3 of a property identified as “length#km.” The symbol “#” cannot occur in article names, so that no confusion with existing attributes is possible. Users can freely use new units, and exported data remains machine-processable.

Since the power of semantic annotation stems from comparing attributes across the database, it is desirable to employ only a small number of different units. Users can achieve this manually by converting values to some standard unit and giving other units as optional alternative texts only. We automate this process by providing built-in unit conversion for common units. From the RDF output it is not possible to tell whether a unit conversion has taken place automatically, or whether the user has provided the value in the given unit right away. This has the further advantage that one can safely add unit support gradually, without affecting applications that already work with the exported data. Built-in unit support also allows us to provide automatic conversions inside the article text or infoboxes, providing immediate gratification for using attributes.

Formally, the added unit support extends the lexical space of Wikipedia’s datatypes, requiring more complex parsing functions. Consequently, unit information is also provided by the datatype. We do not restrict to primitive types such as “integer” or “decimal,” but may also have more complex types like “temperature” or “astronomic distance.” Note that unit-enabled types also have to account for differences in scale: it is not feasible to convert any length, be it in nanometres or in light years, to metres, unless one intends to support arbitrary precision numbers. The meaning of all types is hard-coded within the system, while their user documentation is provided on the respective wiki pages.

5. CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION

Important parts of the architecture from Section 4 have already been implemented. Readers who want to touch the running system are pointed to our online demo at wiki.ontoworld.org and to the freely available source code.¹³ We would like to encourage researchers and developers to make use of the fascinating amount of real world data that can be gathered through Semantic MediaWiki and to combine it with their own tools.

At the moment, Semantic MediaWiki is still under heavy development, and many features are just about to be implemented. Like MediaWiki itself, the system is written in PHP and uses a MySQL database. Instead of directly modifying the source code of the wiki, we make use of MediaWiki’s *extension* mechanism that allows developers to register functions for certain internal events. For this reason, the Semantic MediaWiki extension is largely independent from the rest of the code and can be easily introduced into a running system.

¹³See <http://sourceforge.net/projects/semmediawiki>.

Moreover, interested readers can easily implement their own extensions to the semantic extension. The general architecture for adding extensions is depicted in Figure 5. The box on the left represents the core functions of editing and reading, implemented according to the description in Section 4. As shown in the centre of Figure 5, the obtained (semantic) information can be exploited by other extensions of MediaWiki by simply accessing the triplestore. Functions for conveniently doing so are provided with our implementation. Our current effort comprises some such extensions, specifically a basic semantic search interface and a module for exporting RDF in an XML serialisation. Additional extensions, such as improved search engines, can be added easily and in a way that is largely independent of our source code. MediaWiki provides means of adding “Special:” pages to the running system in a modular way, so that a broad range of semantic tools and interfaces could be registered and evaluated without problems.

Finally, the data export can be utilised by independent external applications. Programmers thus obtain convenient access to the worlds largest encyclopaedic knowledge base, and to the results of any other MediaWiki-based cooperative online project. The possibilities this technology offers to enhance desktop applications and online services are immense—we discuss some immediate application scenarios in the next section.

6. APPLICATIONS

A wide range of applications becomes possible on the basis of a semantically enhanced Wikipedia. Here, we briefly outline the diversity of different usage areas, ranging from the integration of Wikipedia’s knowledge into desktop applications, over enhanced *folksonomies*, to the creation of multilingual dictionaries. Moreover, automated access to Wikipedia’s knowledge yields new research opportunities, such as the investigation of consensus finding processes.

Many desktop applications could be enhanced by providing users with relevant information from Wikipedia, and it should not come as a surprise that corresponding efforts are already underway.¹⁴ For instance, the *amaroK* media player¹⁵ seamlessly integrates Wikipedia articles on artists, albums, and titles into its user interface, whenever these are available. With additional semantic knowledge from Wikipedia, many further services could be provided, e.g. by retrieving the complete discography of some artist, or by searching the personal collection for Gold and Platinum albums. Similarly, media management systems could answer domain-specific queries, e.g. for “music influenced by the Beatles” or “movies that got an Academy Award and have a James Bond actor in a main role.” But the latter kind of question answering is not restricted to media players: educational applications can gather factual data on any subject, desktop calendars can provide information on the current date, scientific programs can visualise Wikipedia content (genealogical trees, historical timelines, topic maps, . . .), imaging tools can search for pictures on certain topics—just to name a few.

These usage scenarios are not restricted to the desktop. A web-based interface also makes sense for any of the above services. Since Wikipedia data can be accessed freely and without major legal restrictions, it can be included in many web pages. Cooperations with search engines immediately come to mind, but also special-purpose services can be envisaged, that may augment their own content with Wikipedia data. A movie reviewer could, instead of adding the whole data about the movie herself, just use a template and integrate it on her website, pulling the data live from

¹⁴http://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/KDE_and_Wikipedia

¹⁵<http://www.amarok.org>

Wikipedia. Finally, portals that aggregate data from various data sources (newsfeeds, blogs, online services) clearly benefit from the availability of encyclopaedic information too.

On the other hand, Wikipedia can also contribute to the exchange of other information on the web. Folksonomies [16] are collaborative tagging or classification systems that freely use on-the-fly labels to tag certain web resources like websites (del.icio.us¹⁶), pictures ([flickr](http://www.flickr.com)¹⁷), or even blog entries [11]. In these applications, tagging simply means assigning a keyword to a resource, in order to allow browsing by those labels. These keywords distinguish neither language nor context. For example, the tag “reading” could either mean the city, *Reading, MA*, or the act of reading a book; the tag “gift” could either mean the German word for poison or the English synonym for present. On the other hand, different tags may mean mostly the same thing, as in the case of “country,” “state,” and “nation.” Searching for either one of them does not yield results tagged with the other, although they would be as relevant. A semantic tagging system, however, could offer labels based on meaning rather than on potentially ambiguous text strings. This task is simplified when using concept names and synonyms retrieved from a semantically enhanced Wikipedia in the user’s chosen language. Similarly, Wikipedia’s URIs can serve as a universal namespace for concepts in other knowledge bases and ontologies, providing a common base for URI mapping and integration approaches.

Semantic Wikipedia could also act as an incubator for creating domain ontologies, by suggesting domains and ranges for roles, or applicable roles for a certain concept (if the majority of countries seem to have a head of state, a system could suggest to add such a role to the ontology). Semantic Wikipedia also could be queried in order to populate learned ontologies quickly [14] (one could, for example, retrieve all soccer players to populate a soccer ontology).

Another significant advantage is the internationality of such a semantic tagging approach, based on the fact that Wikipedia relates concepts across languages. For example, a user in Bahrain could ask for pictures tagged with an Arabic term, and would also receive pictures originally tagged with corresponding Chinese terms. To some extent, semantically interlinking articles across different languages would even allow to retrieve translations of single words—especially when including Wiktionary¹⁸, a MediaWiki-based dictionary that already exists for various languages.

The wealth of data provided by Semantic Wikipedia can also be used in research and development. A resource of test data for semantically enabled applications immediately comes to mind, but social research and related areas may also profit. For example, comparing the semantic data, one can highlight differing conceptualisations in communities of different languages. Also ontology engineering methodologies begin to consider consensus finding processes as a crucial part of ontology creation [24]. Researchers could observe how knowledge bases are collaboratively built by the Wikipedia community and how such communities reach consensus. Wikipedia records all changes as well as discussions associated to articles. Combined with the evolving semantic annotation, this might allow insights on discussion and collaboration processes as well.

7. RELATED APPROACHES

The general concept of using a wiki for collaboratively editing semantic knowledge bases is appealing, and it should not come as

¹⁶<http://del.icio.us>

¹⁷<http://www.flickr.com>

¹⁸<http://wiktionary.org>

a surprise that many approaches towards this goal exist. Most of them are subject to ongoing development.

Platypus Wiki was introduced in 2004 as one of the first semantic wikis [19, 8]. It allows users to add semantic information to a dedicated input field, which is separated from the field for editing standard wiki text. Users provide semantic data by writing RDF statements in N3 notation [5]. This approach influenced later systems, such as the Rhizome wiki [22, 23] that provided very similar functionality. Both approaches are very RDF centric and probably hard to understand for ordinary users, as they require a good understanding of RDF and a some skill in writing N3.

One year later, the prototype WikSAR [3, 2] was presented, winning the *Best Demo Award* at the European Semantic Web Conference. The system uses a different, more tightly integrated syntax. Users can now simply make semantic statements within the text by writing lines of the form `PredicateLabel:ObjectLabel`. As in our work, statements in this notation are interpreted as RDF triples with the page title being the subject. A similar approach was taken by [17]. Both approaches improve usability by having the semantic content together with the wiki text. These approaches still lacked the tight integration of explicit machine-readable data and human-readable editable text that we are introducing.

There were approaches that put a stronger emphasis on formal structure, and hence are more geared towards editing ontologies instead of text. For instance, [1] resembles more an ontology editor than a wiki. Although it could be used as a wiki, it lacks an easy way to create links, which is a central issue of common wikis. The unpublished *KendraBase* [12] is similar in scope but provides a more wiki-like interface.

Recently, some personal semantic wikis were proposed [4, 18]. They are designed to be used as desktop applications, and thus do not emphasise the community process that is typical for classical wikis. However, with respect to the way in which they integrate human- and machine-readable content, these systems are comparable to [2] and [17].

With regards to attributes, WikSAR [2] also introduced this idea. However, we are not aware of any approach that supports data types and unit conversion to the extent of our present work. This feature allows for world-wide integration, spanning different unit systems.

Finally, some other systems offer domain-free machine-readable knowledge bases. OpenCyc¹⁹ collected more than 300,000 assertions (comparable to the typed links in our setting). In spite of its name, OpenCyc is not fully open: it is free for usage, but it does not allow free contributions. A former online project called MindPixel²⁰ allowed users to provide statements and evaluate them as either true or false. Currently, the project is down for maintenance, but it had already collected 1.4 million statements as of January 2004. A similar system is described in [20].

8. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

We have shown how Wikipedia can be modified to make part of its knowledge machine-processable using semantic technologies. On the user side, our primary change is the introduction of *typed links* and *attributes*, by means of a slight syntactic extension of the wiki source. By also incorporating Wikipedia’s existing category system, an impressive amount of semantic data can be gathered. For further processing, this knowledge is conveniently represented in an RDF-based format.

We presented the system architecture underlying our actual implementation of these ideas, and discussed how it is able to meet

¹⁹<http://www.opencyc.org>

²⁰<http://mindpixel.org>

the high requirements for usability and scalability we are faced with. The outcome of these considerations is a working implementation which hides complicated technical details behind a mostly self-explaining user interface.

Our work is based on a thorough review of related approaches, and we are continuously discussing our proposals with users and editors of Wikipedia. Recent presentations of parts of this work have been received very positively by the community [13], and still lead to a further constructive exchange of ideas. Considering how quickly earlier extensions, such as the category system, have been introduced into Wikipedia, we thus have strong reasons to believe that our implementation will be used in English Wikipedia by the end of 2006.

Various issues remain topics for future research. For example, the addition of more expressive schema information (inverse and symmetric relations, meta-modelling, consistency checks, etc.) as supported by OWL or RDFS (but not always by both) requires additional discussions. Moreover, in order to get knowledge bases small enough to fit existing tools, the RDF graph might need to be pruned and relevant subgraphs have to be identified. For specific uses it might be required to map Semantic Wikipedia to existing knowledge bases, e. g. aligning concepts with another ontology. In addition to general ontology alignment issues, there will be an extra challenge, because Wikipedia is neither complete nor consistent nor particularly homogeneous.

We have demonstrated that the system provides many immediate benefits to Wikipedia's users, such that an extensive knowledge base might be built up very quickly. The emerging pool of machine accessible data presents great opportunities for developers of semantic technologies who seek to evaluate and employ their tools in a practical setting. In this way, Semantic Wikipedia can become a platform for technology transfer that is beneficial both to researchers and a large number of users worldwide, and that really makes semantic technologies part of the daily usage of the World Wide Web.

Acknowledgements. We wish to thank the community of Wikipedians for their comments. This research was partially supported by the European Commission under IST-2003-506826 "SEKT," and FP6-507482 "Knowledge Web Network of Excellence," and by the German BMBF project "SmartWeb." The expressed content is the view of the authors but not necessarily the view of any of the mentioned projects as a whole.

9. REFERENCES

- [1] S. Auer. Powl – a web based platform for collaborative semantic web development. In *Proc. of 1st WS Scripting for the Semantic Web, Hersonissos, Greece*, May 2005.
- [2] D. Aumüller. Semantic authoring and retrieval in a wiki (WikSAR). In *Demo Session at the ESWC 2005*, May 2005.
- [3] D. Aumüller. SHAWN: Structure helps a wiki navigate. In W. Mueller and R. Schenkel, editors, *Proceedings of the BTW-Workshop WebDB Meets IR*, March 2005.
- [4] D. Aumüller and S. Auer. Towards a semantic wiki experience – desktop integration and interactivity in WikSAR. In *Proceedings of 1st Workshop on The Semantic Desktop, Galway, Ireland*, 2005.
- [5] T. Berners-Lee. Primer: Getting into RDF & Semantic Web using N3, 2005. Available at <http://www.w3.org/2000/10/swap/Primer.html>.
- [6] T. Berners-Lee, J. Hendler, and O. Lassila. The Semantic Web. *Scientific American*, (5), 2001.
- [7] D. Brickley and R. V. Guha. RDF Vocabulary Description Language 1.0: RDF Schema. W3C Recommendation, 10 February 2004. Available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/rdf-schema/>.
- [8] S. E. Campanini, P. Castagna, and R. Tazzoli. Platypus wiki: a semantic wiki wiki web. In *Semantic Web Applications and Perspectives, Proceedings of 1st Italian Semantic Web Workshop*, Dec 2004.
- [9] W. Cunningham and B. Leuf. *The Wiki Way. Quick Collaboration on the Web*. Addison-Wesley, 2001.
- [10] D. C. Fallside and P. Walmsley. Xml schema part 0: Primer second edition, Oct 2004. Available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema-0/>.
- [11] S. Golder and B. A. Huberman. The structure of collaborative tagging systems. *Journal of Information Science*, 2006. to appear.
- [12] D. Harris and N. Harris. Kendrabase. Available at <http://kendra.org.uk/wiki/wiki.pl?KendraBase>.
- [13] M. Krötzsch, D. Vrandečić, and M. Völkel. Wikipedia and the Semantic Web – the missing links. In *Proc. of the 1st Int. Wikimedia Conf., Wikimania*, Aug 2005.
- [14] A. Maedche and S. Staab. Discovering conceptual relations from text. In *ECAI 2000, Proceedings of the 14th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 2000*. IOS Press, Amsterdam, 2000.
- [15] F. Manola and E. Miller. Resource Description Framework (RDF) primer. W3C Recommendation, 10 February 2004. Available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/rdf-primer/>.
- [16] A. Mathes. Folksonomies – cooperative classification and communication through shared metadata. *Computer Mediated Communication*, Dec 2004.
- [17] H. Muljadi and T. Hideaki. Semantic wiki as an integrated content and metadata management system. In *Poster Session at the ISWC 2005*, Nov 2005.
- [18] E. Oren. Semperwiki: a semantic personal wiki. In *Proc. of 1st WS on The Semantic Desktop, Galway, Ireland*, 2005.
- [19] S. E. Roberto Tazzoli, Paolo Castagna. Towards a semantic wiki wiki web. In *Demo Session at ISWC2004*.
- [20] P. Singh, T. Lin, E. T. Mueller, G. Lim, T. Perkins, and W. L. Zhu. Open mind common sense: Knowledge acquisition from the general public. In *On the Move to Meaningful Internet Systems, 2002 – Confederated International Conferences DOA, CoopIS, and ODBASE 2002*, pages 1223–1237, London, UK, 2002. Springer-Verlag.
- [21] M. K. Smith, C. Welty, and D. McGuinness. OWL Web Ontology Language Guide, 2004. W3C Recommendation.
- [22] A. Souzis. Rhizome position paper. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Friend of a Friend, Social Networking and the Semantic Web*, Sept 2004.
- [23] A. Souzis. Building a semantic wiki. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 20:87–91, 2005.
- [24] D. Vrandečić, H. S. Pinto, Y. Sure, and C. Tempich. The diligent knowledge processes. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 9(5):85–96, Oct 2005.
- [25] J. Wales. Wikipedia and the free culture revolution. OOPSLA/WikiSym Invited Talk, Oct 2005.