

A Million Pictures.

*Magic Lantern Slide Heritage as Artefacts
in the Common European History of
Learning*



Minutes of Workshop 2: Defining Guidelines for Description and Cataloguing – Discussing First Results 14 – 16 April 2016 – Girona, ES

THURSDAY 14 April 2016

Jordi Pons, Museu del Cinema, welcomed the guests in the museum's premises. Together with Àngel Quintana and Daniel Pitarch from University of Girona, they plan an exhibition on magic lantern slides with three aims: introduce visitors to the object, discover its uses in shows and discover types and characteristics of lantern slides in the collection. Àngel Quintana, Universitat de Girona and Francisco Javier Frutos, Universidad de Salamanca welcomed the guests on behalf of the Research team Girona & Salamanca and presented the program for the coming days.

16:00 PANEL I. Magic Lantern Public Collections.

Chair: Àngel Quintana (UdG)

In the first panel, archivists, cataloguers and curators presented current activities and practices in the cataloguing and digitising of lantern slides in four major Spanish museums.

“Magic lantern slides collection at Filmoteca Española”

Elena Cervera de la Torre (Filmoteca Española)

The Filmoteca Española has a collection of objects destined for a future Museum of Cinema. Among these objects there is an important collection of lanterns and slides. In her presentation, Elena Cervera de la Torre first presented the scope and content of the collection and explained the criteria for cataloguing and digitising. Most lantern slides in the museum's collections come from the collection of Sagarmínaga, a Spanish film pioneer and lanternist who gave his collection to the museum. The collection holds slides of various types (see <http://www.mecd.gob.es/cultura-mecd/areas-cultura/cine/mc/fe/ccr/colecciones/sagarminaga.html>).

For preservation: slides are cleaned and then put in neutral paper and envelopes in cardboard box. Cataloguing: lantern slides are catalogued as individual objects with respect to technology of image production (chromolithography, photograph b/w, photograph hand-coloured, hand-coloured, mixed), material, genre, and image composition.

For digitization, the object is photographed as a whole piece, using back light and frontal light from a camera with two lights. Slides are photographed on front side and back side. Animated slides are not documented in a video but single photographs of the slide in various positions are taken. The relation of slides to each other can be indirectly reconstructed from searching images of the same metadata, e.g. of the same producer or by collection / provenance.

Cataloguing is done with aim to inventory museum collection of a film archive, so database of film archive was not specifically designed to accommodate lantern slides. Right now, the museum is in transition from old catalogue system to the shared catalogue and database of Spanish museums, DOMUS.

“Magic lantern slides collection at Museo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología”

Marian del Egidio Rodríguez (Director MUNCYT)

The National Museum of Science and Technology of Spain (MUNCYT) is a museum owned by the State under the Secretary of State for Research, Development and Innovation of the Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness. It is managed by the Spanish Foundation for Science and Technology (FECYT). The MUNCYT preserves more than 15,000 objects that are as diverse as scientific instruments, technological equipment, vehicles, sketches of machines and industrial tools; from the sixteenth century to the present. Most of the pieces come from schools, high schools, universities, scientific institutions, private collections and donations. Among the scientific objects related to physics preserved at the museum –which come mostly from old cabinets and laboratories of the nineteenth century– highlights the collection of magic lantern slides. MUNCYT is thus a museum that holds very different types of objects, and in most cases, there is not an expert on every kind of object among permanent staff.

All slides in the collection have been used in educative settings, mostly by the in the IES San Isidro. The slides are organized in groups by discipline and topic of slides (e.g. on History and Agricultural Chemistry). MUNCYT uses the database DOMUS, a shared catalogue of Spanish heritage institutions. DOMUS is rather rigid but some classifications of lantern slides could be added. For the cataloguing of lantern slides, MUNCYT follows the typology of magic lantern slides that was developed by the research team of Salamanca.

The museum opens up its collections to public with guided tours. A lantern with slides is on permanent exhibition in the section on optical instruments and this section is very positively received by groups of schools and teachers.

“Precinema in the museum collection of the Filmoteca de Catalunya. The magic lantern slides collection case”

Noemí Maya (Curator of the Graphic Arts Archive of Filmoteca de Catalunya)

As in the previous cases, lantern slides are not the exclusive objects of most relevant object in the collection of Filmoteca de Catalunya. They form part of the “film-related” collection. However, the lantern slides are part of the archive and became part of the institution’s history. Most items come from a donation by Delmiro de Caralt, a private collector, which was given to the museum in 1988. The collection is well-conserved and objects are easy to scan. This collection contains circa 1,000 pieces and is pretty random; it contains various optical toys, 10 projectors and lantern slides. A question raised by curators was how to raise awareness about this collection. With very limited staff, and lantern slides not being considered the core collection of the institution, some lantern slides have been scanned and catalogued, but not all. Cataloguing is done according to DublinCore record. As a filmoteca, the needs of users and the tools that are available are centred around film.

“Cataloguing lantern slides: the CCPB experience”

Manuela Carmona García (Catálogo Colectivo del Patrimonio Bibliográfico)

Cataloguing lantern slides held in educational collections of Historical High Schools of Spain and catalogued is the project of Manuela Carmona García. Currently, she is in charge of inventorying the collections of Spanish High schools libraries for the Union Catalogue of Bibliographic Heritage

of Spain using MARC 21 as a cataloguing format.

These libraries also hold lantern slides that were, at that time, used for teaching. Some slides have been removed and some remain in boxes. In most libraries, hardly any librarian knew of the existence of lantern slides, and there is no knowledge in house about the material. However, the material has been looked after by librarians. Every collection holds circa 400 lantern slides. Her finding is that non-specialised libraries whose collections include lantern slides, tend to incorporate lantern slides as the last item into their catalogues. This is caused, on the one hand, by the lack of familiarity with the material – since lantern slides are little known and rarely used – and due to the difficulties in their description on the other. Consequently, the cataloguing poses a double challenge: first, lantern slides must be managed like any other material from the library collection; second, the most detailed description possible must be filed and made available to the users. This poses several issues like authorship and dating, that must be resolved with reference books and other contemporaneous materials in order to place the lantern slides within a concrete time frame. In this lecture, Manuela Carmona García described the difficulties to achieve the project's aim: due to lack of specialized knowledge, classification and identification of slides needed to start from information on the material object itself (labels, images). From used techniques and similar labels, the producer could sometimes be identified. Series numbers and order numbers were highly relevant and could, in some cases, be linked and identified in relation to collections of other Historical High School Libraries or linked to distribution catalogues. Such catalogues contain information that does not appear in slides and help dating. In some cases, dating could be done via an image that was taken from an illustrated journal. One big question was how to order the slides: by number? By type? By topic of image? Manuela Carmona García decided to prepare the cataloguing with the help of several Excel sheets that present the information as a first step before entering the data into the catalogue.

Comparing collections of high schools showed the distribution of educative material. High schools had standardized program in Spain from the second half of the 19th century onwards, governments bought the collections.

In the discussion, Richard Crangle asked if the slides were of Spanish producers. Manuela Carmona García answers that there were only a few Spanish publishers, but most slides were imported from Germany. Frank Kessler asked if there were catalogues.

Discussion

In the discussion, the relation of Lucerna to other databases was addressed in several questions. The problem showed that accommodating a collection of lantern slides into rigid cataloguing systems poses problems for a detailed description of the material.

→ this point will be discussed further.

Also, the question of how to express the relations between slides in cataloguing software that is designed to treat every object individually came up. In many cases, the relations can only be expressed by filtering according to item type, producers etc.

Should slides be catalogued in the same order as they are found in the box? Manuela Carmona García considered the order of slides in a box not relevant for documentation because in many cases the slides have been arranged and rearranged. Preserving the order, in her view, does not contain relevant information because they had been re-organized already. Elena Cervera de la Torre advocated cataloguing according to the order in which the material is found in the box.

In conclusion, everyone agreed that in the current situation, users will need the skill to interpret metadata from databases in order to understand the object. The exchange was highly valued and the need for additional metadata in already existing cataloguing software for the accommodation and identification of lantern slides was broadly shared.

PANEL II. The Lucerna Database

As Lucerna is the database we work with and modify, we reflect in this workshop on the implementation of the formulated demands in the previous workshop.

“Internationalising Lucerna - a progress report and workshop”

Richard Crangle (Exeter University)

Richard Crangle started his presentation with the initial idea of Lucerna: this web resource is intended as a way into research on lantern slides; it should raise curiosity and offer a starting point for exploring magic lantern heritage.

In the beginning of the construction of Lucerna, most data were taken of reseller’s catalogues; the data on Lucerna on slide sets thus reflects commercially distributed slide sets of commercial producers. What becomes apparent in the course of the *A Million Pictures* project is that there is another type of slide set, namely the ones found in a collection. These may be a “mix and match” of single lantern slides that were originally produced as a (commercially distributed) set and now are integrated into a set for performance. A new function in Lucerna makes it possible to catalogue the slide sets in a collection as “privately assembled”. The first set with which this case was examined, is a lecture on Colonial South Africa (see <http://slides.uni-trier.de/set/index.php?id=3008928>).

The challenge in programming was to assign the conceptual field of a single slide to several sets while assuring that the uploaded images are related to the “right” collection, but this is now solved. Richard Crangle also explained the “Lightbox” function in Lucerna. Registered users can use it to create their own collection from slides that are uploaded in Lucerna.

Another task on the programmer’s to-do-list is the organisation of import and export of datasets. The test case will be the export of data about the lantern slide collections at RAMM that are now in Lucerna and that will be imported to the museum’s proper database <http://slides.uni-trier.de/collection/index.php?id=2500355>. A report on this is expected for the next workshop in Antwerp.

Tagging: suggested is to use the “subject keyword” function for *conceptual* indexing of *slide sets* and tagging for the *content description* of the images on *single slides*. The problem arises, however, how this can be achieved in a best way: tagging via controlled vocabularies? Free tagging? Does tagging need moderation (e.g. if people just tag nonsense or use offensive words)? Once these questions are answered, we can advance to the next one, namely how to invite people to tag digital copies of lantern slides.

Questions raised in the discussion about tagging per slide are whether this should be a priority for this project and if newly developed software in semantic web for cultural heritage might be useful to integrate at this point. Such software maps lexical terms onto concepts and links the lexical expressions to each other e.g. relate similar words to each other (e.g. “courgette” and “zucchini” but also “shouting” with “calling”).

Concerning internationalizing the interface of Lucerna, Richard Crangle programmed a way in which users of Lucerna could translate English descriptions into languages other than English, e.g. Spanish. Some issues concern the layout of the interface because terms that are short in English might be longer in other languages.

Decisions need to be made on the exact term that stands in as conceptual unit in Lucerna.

Sometimes there are several terms that can be used for one concept, e.g. what is now a “slide” has in English also been called “transparency” or “view for projection”. Who decides which term to use? Sabine Lenk raised the question whether or not such a glossary should be created about different historical terms around the magic lantern and where this work-in-progress-document should be stored.

Ine van Dooren suggested that the focal point must be the lantern, related to its history, images, etc. in order to structure such a document, which is not yet available elsewhere.

After the discussion it was agreed that such a glossary and list of translated terms should be available within the Lucerna database, not on a separate website. Placing this resource within

Lucerna makes the findings traceable. If a discussion about terms is needed, a comment field can be inserted, too.

19:30 “A taste of nature“ public video performance at Caixaforum Girona by Björt Rúnarsdóttir and Alba G. Corral.

In this free public event, Alba G. Corral created a live video performance to Björt Rúnarsdóttir musical composition. They also used some digital images of magic lantern in their show and thus has, among others, a sequence of a phantasmagoria show, using the extra affordances of the digital video software to create stunning effects that a lantern show in a phantasmagoria could not produce. About 60 people attended the show. Video documentation is available at Youtube, see <https://youtu.be/w7ENTRAa1R8>

FRIDAY, 15 April 2016

10:00 PANEL III. Digitization: hands on and experiences.

Chair: Daniel Pitarch (UdG)

The morning session was dedicated to an exchange of experience about digitizing, cataloguing and metadata in various projects with different aims.

“Towards Best Practices for Digitisation of Lantern Slides”

Ludwig Vogl-Bienek (Universität Trier)

In a “hands-on presentation” Ludwig Vogl-Bienek presented his experiences in photographing lantern slides with the aim to generate study editions of slide sets. He shared the expertise that was accumulated in the project “Media-historical, methodological, and media-technological Principles of the Digitisation of Works in the Historical Art of Projection” currently running at the university of Trier. The demonstration included a set up and ways for light measuring that ensures comparability of colours across various slides, as automatic exposure might destroy the comparability of colour within a slide set or between slide sets. For colour measurement, (transparent) grey scales and colour charts proved indispensable. Experiences show that the best way for colour management is to do a good white balance; unwanted reflection from surrounding is best avoided by “building a tent” of black fabric around the installation. Slides are photographed with both back light and front light.

Next to frontal view, the lantern slide is photographed against a background in “studio grey”, from a 30° angle. Although this creates some problems with depth of field, results are good enough to study the object.

Questions for discussion were what would be defined as front and back of a lantern slide and what would be up / and down. Ludwig’s suggestions were that the front side is where the painting or emulsion is applied to and that “up” means how the slide is put into the projector (thus with the images appearing “upside down” to the viewer without the apparatus).

Exact measuring and the use of raw data in a professional program of Adobe Photoshop Lightroom form the basis for files that meet the quality standards for such editions.

A detailed report about set-up will be published in 2017 by the Trier project in a Companion.

“First experiences with digitizing lantern slides: implications for the understanding of the archival object”

Sarah Dellmann (Utrecht University)

Sarah Dellmann digitized a sample of lantern slides in the collection of EYE Film Institute Netherlands by taking photographs. Circumstances caused that the digitization had to take place on location in the storage facility with a lot of surrounding light. The collection under investigation was not catalogued and the inventory was incomplete. The objective of Sarah Dellmann’s digitisation effort was to document a large number of lantern slides in a short amount of time and

produce digital copies that a) serve as reference copies for cataloguing b) can be used for online presentation (300 dpi jpg) and are of good enough quality for reproduction in print (600 dpi tiff). The selection of items was made according to the relevance of her academic research project. Because of limited time, only one side of objects was photographed unless something was written on the back (which was not often the case). The resulting images are good enough for publication and re-use but make serious compromises in documenting the condition of the object, the exact shape of the object, or truth to colouring, as received specifications asked for cropping white borders. Suggestion for future digitization project is to not crop the borders in order to preserve this object-related information about exact shape and condition of the edges / binding, which can also be of value for conservation.

“Best Practice Model for Digitizing Slides”

Sabine Lenk (Universiteit Antwerpen)

One important deliverable of *A Million Pictures* will be the guidelines with best practices. Sabine Lenk assembled the information and experiences so far. The draft version with the long working title “Suggestions for a best practice model for digitizing slides and lantern equipment – Guidelines based on experience by members of the research group and external advices” was circulated beforehand. Because of multiple aims of digitisation and preservation, this document should show “how it can be done rather than how to do it”. It will concentrate on the following points: 1. Equipment, 2. The digitisation act – working with a scanner, 3. The digitisation act – working with a digital camera, 4. Literature. It should contain information on a) decision making b) tips for working and c) link to resources for further information and to deepen knowledge. The guidelines will cover technical and practical aspects of the digitisation work. A question for the discussion that was delegated to the Research Team Assembly was whether or not this document should also include information about preservation and restoration or data management.

Discussion

In the discussion, the newly gained insights from the presentations were used to discuss the draft version of the manual.

Ine van Dooren asked how to produce master copies that can be useful for many aims: every display of lantern slides, old and digitized, displays the images differently.

Richard Crangle’s answer to this question was that different requirements are needed for different digitisations, which leads to the question: what is the audience of the digitized slides and the manual: private collectors? Institutions? In any case, the manual needs to be accessible for the institution that has no specialities knowledge and limited resources.

How detailed should technical explanations be? Frank Kessler proposed to limit the number of specifications of images. Starting point is the ambition that the digitised objects are intended to also be of use for others.

Ine van Dooren called for not too technically specific descriptions, as apparatus, formats and programs change quickly. She proposed to use the manual to point staff to what to look out for. Ludwig Vogl-Bienek was in favour of a documentation of technical specifications as not all new equipment is completely new. He stresses the specific needs of high quality reproduction that has the aim to make the materiality visible in virtual research environment that brings researchers “closer to the thing” that might be inaccessible in some private collections. Such a digitisation project does not aim at an *audience* but aims at *users* who need to be advised in how to use the resource; reproducing high-end lantern slides needs practical training in addition to a manual. Sabine Lenk concluded that there are three levels of reproduction: “quick & dirty” [on location shooting in limited time], “studio” [professional working surrounding, enough time to adhere to some standards] and “high-end” [for the production of critical digital editions].

With respect to users and their eventually needed access to the original material, we can learn from film archives (and other archives as well): for most types of research, simple digital copies are sufficient; if access to material object is needed, that could still be provided.

Philip Robert raised the question how an archive should decide which of the slides should be chosen for digitization into “high-end” editions?

Ludwig Vogl-Bienek replied that to date, this happens by chance, and this chance will unavoidably create a canon. Probably the best way to go about is to do it “on demand”: if a researcher says they need a better quality reproduction, the archive can decide which of the slides to digitise in higher quality.

Richard Crangle seconded this option: The problem in documenting lantern slide heritage is that there is “so much material”. Scale is a problem as it can be intimidating. The manual must address this question to encourage archivists to start somewhere and present that people have a chance of “dealing with it”.

Sabine Lenk said that over 10 years, technological standards will probably have changed and digitization needs to be redone anyway. The “Quick and dirty” should be used to inventory collections. Digital tools and technical apparatus that were used in project (back then) should be documented, too; not just the results. *A Million Pictures* should understand itself as an initiative that prepares the field for next production.

Jenny Durrant disagreed: it is not realistically to think that archives re-scan their material every 10 years. Right now, she and RAMM have some time to deal with the lantern collection and then that will be it for a long time. Curators will then have to move to other sub-collections.

Ine van Dooren called to remember that digitisation should not forget preservation. We do not know how to best deal with the object, yet; still, we want to give access. Preservation is still very important as without good preservation, no access can be given to object.

Joe Kember shared his optimism about the project: once a sufficient scale is there, more users of a range of disciplines will make use of the material which may alter our understanding of the object, too.

Sabine Lenk called for keeping big data in mind and work together with Digital Humanities initiatives for e.g. search tools. She suggests to keep various formats, especially the raw-files to be able to make access copies in .jpeg and .tiff or other file formats in the future.

Jenny Durrant brought to attention that storing data always comes with costs that need to be covered from the budget of the archive. It might not always be possible to store everything in all resolutions.

In the discussion it became clear that the work flow in the various institutions varies:

- MUNCYT starts with cataloguing and from the catalogued objects makes selections on the catalogues objects that will be also documented digitally.
- At Filmoteca di Catalunya, work-flow is often the other way around: a digitizing project is mostly a good chance to catalogue a sub-collection.
- At Filmoteca Española, digitising is done together with cataloguing: the desired way of working is cataloguing to take pictures of the items just at same time as they are catalogued in order to complete the database record. Digital pictures of lantern slides consider each slide as one piece in the museum and photograph it as a whole, e.g. the slide with the frame, if it has one, both sides, front and back, and in a way that you can see the edges, without cutting them even if they are deteriorated. This procedure allows us to keep a precise register of the state of the slide and its conservation, which is helpful when deciding whether it is adequate for an exhibition or a loan. In the case of animated slides, when the image offers different views, we take pictures of the image in different positions. She explained that in her experience, high quality digitisations need to begin with a “quick and dirty” way to then evaluate subsequently what else is possible.
- At the Union Catalogue of Bibliographic Heritage of Spain, Manuela Carmona García reported that digitisation is not done in-house but with an external company; in this case, a “check-list” for things to look out for and clear agreements with the external company needs to be made. When digitization is not done by the same team that is doing the cataloguing, demands must be made very explicit.

The best practice manual should take these scenarios as well as the following conditions into account:

- how to go about if resources are limited and you do it little by little, but consistently
 - how to go about if the staff that digitizes images changes all the time, e.g. if it is delegated to internships
- the further discussion on this topic is delegated to the Research Team Assembly and the working group “best practices”

11:30 Coffee & tea break

12:00 Panel IV: Cataloguing: content analysis and metadata

Chair: Lluïsa Faxedas (UdG)

This panel was dedicated to various ways of systematic description of lantern slides using standardised metadata.

“Content analysis and the organisation of cultural repertories: a typology of magic lantern slides according to the format.”

Carmen López, Francisco Javier Frutos & Beatriz González de Garay (Universidad de Salamanca)

One deliverable of the project is a Codebook for content analysis. The codebook on format should lead to a classification of all lantern slides. Content analysis is thus meant as a first step / part of cataloguing by providing the vocabulary and system of terms, also for programming (for similar project with similar aims: see “Every Noise at Once” (www.everynoise.com), which is a classification tool to classify all pieces of music.

In content analysis, the conceptual definition of a variable is a kind of declaration of what you want to measure in the messages. A variable is a dimension or characteristic of a study object that can have different values. The act of defining implies that values can be established, and that is no other thing than measuring them, although always in a reference theoretical frame.

In collaboration with the Museum Girona, the Salamanca team presented various types of slides and their description according to the format.

Format could be identified as a enough-relevant variable so it could be the organizational criterion, that is, a standard able to offer a typology of magic lantern slides according to the principles of mutual exclusion, uniformity, completeness, relevance, clarity and productivity.

The codebook section on format is one of three, the other two will contain “genre” (with three variables allowed) and “production” (with two variables allowed).

With a “hands-on” presentation, Javier Frutos exemplified the draft version of the codebook’s categories with slides from the collection of the Museo del Cinema. Feedback on the codebook is requested by May 20th.

The draft version and video of the presentation is available for the researchers on BeeHub.

“Metadata for Managing the CRDI Photographic Archive”

David Iglésias Franch (Archival Technician at CRDI)

David Iglésias Franch reported on the involvement of CRDI in project for Photographs on Europeana. The aims of CRDI are to know, protect, offer, disseminate the image heritage of Girona. The management of the information resources have experimented a significant change since digital image technology. It is indispensable to know which are the metadata that take part in the digital object and the way in which they are encoded and structured. This fact requires a good knowledge of the metadata standards and the graphic formats on which we are working on.

David Iglésias Franch explained the principles and encoding for using embedded metadata at CRDI: The solution was to embed the metadata in the image itself (thus not externally, as is done in Lucerna and most databases); rather metadata of the DublinCore standard are embedded within the digital object (jpeg or tiff).

One problem of this approach is that metadata are needed that can be both a) embedded in image (thus applied to already digitized objects) and b) items that appear in catalogue but are not digitized

yet. David Iglésias Franch presentation of technical and programming infrastructure as well as the software and agreed workflow that allowed CRDI to carry out its task in the Europeana project. The management of metadata in the framework of Europeana consists in mapping the original metadata with the metadata of LIDO standard. This action is done in MINT server. After this manual mapping, there is an automatic mapping from LIDO to EDM, the standard used by Europeana which is based in RDF language. After this process metadata are ready to be harvest and publishes on Europeana.

Concerning multilingual vocabularies, there is an addition mapping with keywords in order to be skosified. The mapping was done to EuropeanaPhotography vocabulary for technical terms and to GAAT (Getty Art and Architecture Thesaurus) for subject keywords.

“Metadata: mapping a landscape”

Ine Van Doren (SASE Brighton)

SASE is a regional archive with some slides but slides not being the most exclusive items in collection. Usually, slides were part of other collections / part of donations. Starting point for working with slides needs to consider this. Metadata need to start from physical object. This can be conflict with Lucerna, as Lucerna focusses on lantern slides, rather independent of the rest of the collection in which they are part of. Because Lucerna has a different focal point than a local or regional museum, the required metadata are different. Question is then: how to map the metadata so that people can find the material?

There is more and more data in the digital world of the web and people want things linked up and accessible. Archives, museums and libraries (for a large part the custodians of the physical objects) need networks and standards for description and indexing. Increasingly the mapping of metadata enabling for example the easy transference of data between databases/resources is important. How does the Lucerna web resource fit into this?

Museums give part of their collection accessible for online access of digital copies in order to promote museum's holdings but also the place where the digital images are made accessible. How to museums choose where to place digital copies of selections of their holdings?

How to deal with the situation that Lucerna is a subject-specific / medium-specific resource whereas Lantern slide collections are usually not held in medium-specific / lantern-focused institutions?

What follows from that?

Situation: So far, data are entered manually into Lucerna, using cataloguing terms

→ how are they relevant for small institutions?

→ private collections?

Ine van Dooren called for a using metadata and controlled vocabularies that are already developed, For metadata, e.g. CDWA: Catalogue descriptions for works of art; or MARC standards for or texts should be reflected in the entry fields of Lucerna. Also, controlled vocabularies e.g. the GETTY list of Geographical names, Dbpedia and the GAAT (Getty Art & architecture) should be used as “keywords”, and eventual the thesaurus from ICONCLASS.

In order to express the medium-specific aspects of lantern slides, the description of single slides should build on the taxonomy developed by the team in Salamanca.

Using standardised metadata systems and controlled vocabularies that are already widely used will make it easier to map existing collections to Lucerna and Lucerna to other cataloguing projects.

Lucerna should develop a system for uploading data: museums have and need their own systems and thus need to catalogue lantern slides in their systems. We need to create a way in which we can upload / migrate data from external research projects to Lucerna and vice versa.

Ine van Dooren's last suggestion to make Lucerna more appealing for more users was to create a webinterface that offers “themes” as an entry point. Lucerna is too dense and specified to be of interest for people who do not click twice and/or do not have to patience or knowledge to merge the information of the various entry fields to something meaningful. An entrance via a theme could be

of help. Ine van Dooren suggested to use the themes of the research project as exemplary entry points
→ the question of what is practically possible to implement is delegated to the Research Team Assembly.

13:30 Lunch

15:00 Panel V. Other subjects

Chair: Anna Bayó (UdG)

In this session, presentations show various ways in which the technology, the material, the disposition and affordances inspire contemporary scholars and artists to engage with museum collections.

• “Lantern (research) Lessons: An Early Report on the Curation, Digitisation, and Creative Re-use of Magic Lantern Slides at the RAMM, Exeter”

Joe Kember (Exeter University), Jenny Durrant (RAMM) and Richard Crangle (Exeter University)

Until April 2016, about eight months into the project, the process of digitisation of lantern slides at the Royal Albert Memorial Museum in Exeter is almost complete, and several public engagement events have already taken place. Richard Crangle, Joe Kember and Jenny Durrant gave a brief account of the work undertaken and of the ramifications of this on both the RAMM and other UK collections. The lantern slides in the collection of RAMM were not in all cases well-documented. An earlier inventory project in the 1970s only added some lantern slides to the RAMM catalogue. RAMM is a regional museum, with the curator having lantern slides in their custody as only one of several objects. The aim of the museum is to reach out to the local population which reflects in the slogan “home of a million thoughts”. Exhibitions are curated explicitly with an address to the public to share their knowledge with the museum. Very often, the indexing in RAMM’s internal catalogue only inventoried a box and/or collection which means that not all objects were catalogued. By now, all 4,599 slides were catalogued; more than 3,000 are already published on Lucerna and some 1,500 still need to go through post-production. The slides came in various donations and give a cross-over of (often high-quality) amateur slide production of local photographers and slides from commercially produced sets. Most slides are balanced between amusement and education. Because slides are part of several departments in the museum, cataloguing in e.g. social history or natural history is done differently.

RAMM would like to share lantern slides on online portals like Europeana but before this project this was not possible because Europeana requires cataloguing of individual objects and before *A Million Pictures*, this was not the case for most of the slides in the collection.

As part of *A Million Pictures*, some decisions still need to be made concerning the digital collection and the physical collection:

Digital collection: images are available for download via Lucerna in low resolution. Image-files still need to be renamed according to museum’s accession number – question is how to best do that.

Also, information that is in Lucerna needs to be exported and then imported into RAMM’s cataloguing software (filemaker). IT solutions will be tested once all material is in Lucerna.

Physical collection: should material be organized in donor groups or collection groups? How should accession numbers be given that related the digital accession number with the single slides in each box? Put stickers on each slide?

How to incorporate physical collection into museum system? E.g. putting slides on display, as educational material, as part of the museum’s history? How to create thematic links between slides and local organisations, thematic exhibitions?

In the time ahead, the collaboration will focus on questions of

- connecting the magic lantern collection to other collections , e.g. connecting the magic lantern to a peep-show,

- what re-using the material in a meaningful way can look like

- investigate how diversity of collection and scale can be best documented
 - document archive stories, both institutional history
 - open ways to place the slides in local stories around the private slides, eventually use digital newspapers for identification of yet unidentified slides.
- paying particular attention to issues of cataloguing and digitisation work in the archive. In doing so, they hope to provide a methodological case study that can inform and contribute to best practice on these processes.
- reflect on the differences between cataloguing in Lucerna and cataloguing in the museum's cataloguing system.

“Artistic Reuse of an Old Apparatus.”

Sarah Vanagt (artist) and Nele Wynants (Universiteit Antwerpen)

Sarah Vanagt and Nele Wynants continues the thread “re-use of collection in a meaningful way”. What forms of creative re-use are possible? In museums, lantern slides (just like other historical objects) can be presented either “classically”, e.g. as a “display” of the object in its historical context. This can take the form of exhibiting objects or as re-enactment of the historical use or in educational activities like workshops.

Creative re-use considers the object slightly different: not just as a document of the past but also as a source of inspiration for contemporary art, a starting point for new work creates a dialogue between past and present. In this way, creative re-use can be seen as a way to reflect history or archaeology of the media. On the occasion of the 3rd workshop organized by the University of Antwerp on “creative reuse of the magic lantern” (27-30 October 2016), film artist Sarah Vanagt was invited to develop a project inspired by the magic lantern slides and projectors in the Vrielynck collection. The Vrielynck collection is part of the Museum for Contemporary Art Antwerp and is a collection on the history of moving image apparatus; it contains circa 250 slides and circa 250 apparatuses. As a museum for contemporary art, the M HKA is not primarily interested in history of media or the historical aspects of the slides or the but in their meanings for contemporary artists. As such, M HKA has a tradition of inviting artists to work with material held in their collections. Sarah Vanagt will set up an exhibition at the Antwerp Museum for Contemporary Art (M HKA), displaying original lanterns and slides next to her own contemporary lantern film, developed for the occasion. She thus proposes a media archaeological perspective on magic lantern shows that understands the object less as a discovery of a forgotten past but a means to establish an active relationship between past and present. Sarah Vanagt presented her investigation into microscopic images that were projected and her experiments with seeing images through a (reconstruction of) the lenses that were made by Leeuwenhoek in the 17th century.

“The Magic Lantern, some connections with digital culture”

Bernardo Riego (Universidad de Cantabria)

In this presentation, Bernardo Riego pointed out several ways in which the study of contemporary, digital media benefits from knowledge about historical media and practices, such as the magic lantern. He emphasized the relevance of turning to the history of media. The magic lantern and magic lantern slides should be acknowledged also by scholars of New Media Studies as an important means of communication, not just as a footnote to cinema history. Even though plates of coloured glass and projection machines may appear very simple if compared with the cinematographic images or digital animation, there are still similarities. Lantern slides were an important source of all our contemporary practices around the projected images, but above all, they are in themselves very sophisticated forms and also very different from other *media* and other *ways of exhibiting images* (for instance, etchings and paintings).

Magic lantern slides, their visual effects, kinds of projection and narrative transitions are connected with the recent practices of digital technologies: visual effects like morphing, rediscovered in the early days of digital images, was already available in the lantern slides; moving scenes with image replacement reminds of animated gifs; the projection techniques from Robertson are clearly

connected with the construction of the scene in layers —a central technique on today’s digital images, not to forget the dissolving views that cinematography reused under the denomination of cross-fade. This connection between magic lantern and current digital technologies, so Riego, can help us today to explain the importance and influences that the culture of the magic lantern had in the past, with references to our ways of seeing and understanding today’s images.

“Beyond the magic lantern. Creation process of a magic lantern show today”

Sergi Buka (magician)

Sergi Buka presented his work for a show that will premiere in March 2017. In this show, the use of light and shadows to create magic is central. Buka also starts from the poetics of slides, mostly painted ones, and “translates” the fascination into a part of his show. Buka explained his relationship with the luminous image, how he related to the illusionists, to magic and magic lantern in history and his show today and gave insights into the process of creation of a show.

Discussion

Javier Frutos asked Bernado Riego if he also meant to compare the effect of the media, the spectacularity in past and present audiences? Bernado Riego replied that this is not the case: today, these effects do not surprise spectators anymore; his talk was meant to point to similarities in technical effects, not to similarities in media experience.

Sabine Lenk asked if there were any museum journals we should contact. Joe Kember replied that the Exeter Team plans an initiative to reach out to museum professionals with the aim to inventory what is out there in collections. The Exeter Team plans an article for a British museum journal. Sabine Lenk pointed to the need for training and sharing knowledge about dealing with lantern slides so that museum professionals can handle material better. The idea of offering workshops is appreciated and delegated to future discussions.

18:00 Visit and presentation

“Magic Lantern at Museu del Cinema-Col·lecció Tomàs Mallol: Permanent Exhibition and New Discoveries (Fantascope, 1850)”

Jordi Pons and Montse Puigdevall (Museu del Cinema-Col·lecció Tomàs Mallol)

Jordi Pons and Montse Puigdevall presented the educational activities of the Museu del Cinema related to magic lantern: the museum offers 20 different educational workshops for school classes and other groups, several address the lantern. Every year, c. 20,000 students come with their teachers to the workshops. In the workshop “From magic to Show” students create their own magic lantern show. The museum has further produced 144 videos for its own Youtube-channel, seven of which are related to the magic lantern. The objective of the educational activities is to explain how a slide works and how an image is produced.

Jordi Pons explained the adventurous history on the extraordinary item recently acquired in the museum: a magic lantern for phantasmagoria (c. 1850). This device was originally purchased in the mid-nineteenth century by a high school in Girona in order to use it at their cabinet of physical scientific instruments and to conduct experiments with projection. It is an improved magic lantern, that could perform all projection techniques used in a Phantasmagoria show (projection, projection opaque, moving the projector, focus and blur the image, regulation of intensity light, etc.). Around 1845, the Spanish government had made a list of items that high schools needed to acquire in order to teach in labs. Such a complex phantasmagoric magic lantern is not on the government's list, but less complex magic lanterns were. In any case, this magic lantern could be used to conduct all the educational experiments suggested in text books of experimental physics that teach about the magic lantern. Only a few original copies are known of this kind of lantern, of this size and good condition. The lantern is now on permanent display in the Museo del Cinema. The workshop participants got a special guided tour by Jordi Pons to the rooms of the permanent exhibition dedicated to magic lantern and optical toys.

SATURDAY 16 April 2016

10:30 -14:30 Research Team Assembly

Chair: Sarah Dellmann (Universiteit Utrecht)

Practical and Organizational Matters were discussed. See separate minutes.

At 14:15, de Research Team Assembly was finished.

All participants thank Daniel Pitarch for the great organization of a varied and inspiring programme and Montse Puigdevall and Jordi Pons for inviting the workshop to the premises of the Museu del Cinema.

All participant thank the Girona staff for being really wonderful hosts.

The next workshop will take place from 27-29 October 2016 in Antwerp, Belgium.

At 14:30, the workshop was closed.

For the notes: Sarah Dellmann, Utrecht, 6 June 2016.

Attached:

- Program of the workshop
- List of Participants



A Million Pictures: Magic Lantern Slide Heritage as Artefacts in the Common European History of Learning is a Joint Programming Initiative on Cultural Heritage – Heritage Plus project which is funded by NWO, Belspo, AHRC and MINECO and Co-Funded by the European Commission.



This document is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Attachment 1: WORKSHOP - SCHEDULE

THURSDAY 14 April 2016

15:30 Welcome words and short introduction (Àngel Quintana, Universitat de Girona, and Jordi Pons, Museu del Cinema)

16:00 Magic Lantern Public Collections - Chair: Àngel Quintana (UdG)

- “Magic lantern slides collection at Filmoteca Española”

Elena Cervera de la Torre (Filmoteca Española)

- “Magic lantern slides collection at Museo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología”

Marian del Egado Rodríguez (Director MUNCYT)

- “Precinema in the museum collection of the Filmoteca de Catalunya. The magic lantern slides collection case”

Noemí Maya (curator of the Graphic Arts Archive of Filmoteca de Catalunya)

- “Cataloguing lantern slides: the CCPB experience”

Manuela Carmona García (Catálogo Colectivo del Patrimonio Bibliográfico)

17:30 “Internationalising Lucerna - a progress report and workshop ” Richard Crangle (Exeter University)

19:30 *A taste of nature* Björt Rúnarsdóttir i Alba G. Corral , public performance at Caixafòrum Girona

Dinner

FRIDAY 15 April 2016

10:00 Digitization: hands on and experiences - Chair: Daniel Pitarch (UdG)

- “Towards Best Practices for Digitisation of Lantern Slides”

Ludwig Vogl-Bienek (Universität Trier)

- “First experiences with digitizing lantern slides: implications for understanding of the archival object”

Sarah Dellman (Universiteit Utrecht)

- “Best Practice Model for Digitizing Slides”

Sabine Lenk (Universiteit Antwerpen)

11:30 Coffee & tea break

12:00 Cataloguing: context analysis and metadata Chair: Lluïsa Faxedas (UdG)

- “Content analysis and the organisation of cultural repertoires: a typology of magic lantern slides according to the format.”

Carmen López, Francisco Javier Frutos & Beatriz González de Garay (Universidad de Salamanca)

- “Metadata for Managing the CRDI Photographic Archive”

David Iglésias Franch (Archival Technician at CRDI)

- “Metadata: mapping a landscape”

Ine Van Doren (SASE Brighton)

13:30 Lunch

15:00 Other subjects - Chair: Anna Bayó (UdG)

• “Lantern (research) Lessons: An Early Report on the Curation, Digitisation, and Creative Re-use of Magic Lantern Slides at the RAMM, Exeter”

Joe Kember (Exeter University), Jenny Durrant (RAMM) and Richard Crangle (Exeter University)

• “Artistic Reuse of an Old Apparatus.”

Sarah Vanagt (artist) and Nele Wynants (Universiteit Antwerpen)

• “The Magic Lantern, some connections with digital culture”

Bernardo Riego (Universidad de Cantabria)

• “Beyond the magic lantern. Creation process of a magic lantern show today”

Sergi Buka (magician)

16:30 Group discussion

18:00 Museu del Cinema–Col·lecció Tomàs Mallol: Visit and presentation

“Magic Lantern at Museu del Cinema-Col·lecció Tomàs Mallol: Permanent Exhibition and New Discoveries (Fantascope, 1850)”

Jordi Pons and Montse Puigdevall (Museu del Cinema-Col·lecció Tomàs Mallol)

Dinner

SATURDAY 16 April 2016

10:30 Research Team Assembly: Practical and Organizational Matters

Chair: Sarah Dellmann (Universiteit Utrecht)

Attachment 2: List of participants:

1. Frank Kessler (Universiteit Utrecht)
2. Sarah Dellman (Universiteit Utrecht)
3. Sabine Lenk (Universiteit Antwerpen)
4. Sarah Vanagt (Artist –Antwerpen)
5. Nele Wynants (Universiteit Antwerpen)
6. Phillip Roberts (York University)
7. Ine Van Dooren (SASE Brighton)
8. Joe Kember (Exeter University)
9. Richard Crangle (Exeter University)
10. Jenny Durrant (RAMM Museum)
11. Ludwig Vogl-Bienek (Universität Trier)
12. Daniela Müller-Kolb (Universität Trier)
13. Martin Loiperdinger (Universität Trier)
14. Elena Cervera de la Torre (Filmoteca Española)
15. Marian del Egido Rodríguez (Museo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología)
16. Noemí Maya (Filmoteca de Catalunya)
17. Manuela Carmona García (Catálogo Colectivo del Patrimonio Bibliográfico)
18. David Iglésias Franch (Centre de Recerca i Difusió de la Imatge, Girona City Council)
19. Bernardo Riego (Universidad de Cantabria)
20. Sergi Buka (Magician)
21. Francisco Javier Frutos (Universidad de Salamanca)
22. Jordi Pons (Museu del Cinema Girona)
23. Montse Puigdevall (Museu del Cinema)
24. Lluïsa Faxedas (Universitat de Girona)
25. Anna Bayó (Universitat de Girona)
26. Dolors Vidal (Universitat de Girona)
27. Ramon Girona (Universitat de Girona)
28. Àngel Quintana (Universitat de Girona)
29. Daniel Pitarch (Universitat de Girona)