Chapter 4
OWL

Based on slides from Grigoris Antoniou and Frank van Harmelen
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The OWL Family Tree

A Brief History of OWL: SHOE

- Simple HTML Ontology Extensions
SHOE allows World-Wide Web authors to annotate their pages with ontology-based knowledge about page contents. We present examples showing how the use of SHOE can support a new generation of knowledge-based search and knowledge discovery tools that operate on the World-Wide Web.
- Supported adding “semantic” tags defined in an ontology plus prolog-like rules to web pages.
### A Brief History of OWL: SHOE

- Developed by group of (largely) European researchers (several from EU OntoKnowledge project)
- Based on frame-based language
- Strong emphasis on formal rigour
- Semantics in terms of Description Logics
- RDFS based syntax

### A Brief History of OWL: OIL

- Developed by group of (largely) European researchers (several from EU OntoKnowledge project)
- Based on frame-based language
- Strong emphasis on formal rigour
- Semantics in terms of Description Logics
- RDFS based syntax

### A Brief History of OWL: DAML-ONT

- Developed by DARPA DAML Program
  - Largely US based researchers
- Extended RDFS with constructors from OO and frame-based languages
- Rather weak semantic specification
  - Problems with machine interpretation
  - Problems with human interpretation

### A Brief History of OWL: DAML+OIL

- Merging of DAML-ONT and OIL
- Basically a DL with an RDFS-based syntax
- Development was carried out by "Joint EU/US Committee on Agent Markup Languages"
- Extends ("DL subset" of) RDF
- Submitted to W3C as basis for standardisation
  - Web-Ontology (WebOnt)
    - Working Group formed
A Brief History of OWL: OWL

- W3C Recommendation (February 2004)
- Based largely on the March 2001 DAML+OIL specification
- Well defined RDF/XML serializations
- Formal semantics
  - First Order
  - Relationship with RDF
- Comprehensive test cases for tools/implementations
- Growing industrial take up.
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OWL 2

- Is an extension of OWL
  - Addresses deficiencies identified by users and developers (at OWLED workshop)
- Is based on more expressive DL: SROIQ
  - OWL is based on SHOIN
- W3C working group chartered
  - Became a W3C recommendation October 2009
- Supported by popular OWL tools
  - Protégé, TopBraid, FaCT++, Pellet

Requirements for Ontology Languages

- Ontology languages allow users to write explicit, formal conceptualizations of domain models
- The main requirements are:
  - a well-defined syntax
  - efficient reasoning support
  - a formal semantics
  - sufficient expressive power
  - convenience of expression
Expressive Power vs Efficient Reasoning

- There is always a tradeoff between expressive power and efficient reasoning support.
- The richer the language is, the more inefficient the reasoning support becomes.
- Sometimes it crosses the noncomputability border.
- We need a compromise:
  - A language supported by reasonably efficient reasoners.
  - A language that can express large classes of ontologies and knowledge.

Kinds of Reasoning about Knowledge

- **Class membership**
  - If x is an instance of a class C, and C is a subclass of D, then we can infer that x is an instance of D.
- **Equivalence of classes**
  - If class A is equivalent to class B, and class B is equivalent to class C, then A is equivalent to C too.
- **Consistency**
  - X instance of classes A and B, but A and B are disjoint.
  - This is an indication of an error in the ontology.
- **Classification**
  - Certain property-value pairs are a sufficient condition for membership in a class A; if an individual x satisfies such conditions, we can conclude that x must be an instance of A.

Uses for Reasoning

- **Reasoning support is important for**
  - Checking the consistency of the ontology and the knowledge.
  - Checking for unintended relationships between classes.
  - Automatically classifying instances in classes.
- **Checks like these are valuable for**
  - Designing large ontologies, where multiple authors are involved.
  - Integrating and sharing ontologies from various sources.

Reasoning Support for OWL

- Semantics is a prerequisite for reasoning support.
- Formal semantics and reasoning support are usually provided by
  - Mapping an ontology language to a known logical formalism.
  - Using automated reasoners that already exist for those formalisms.
- OWL is (partially) mapped on a description logic, and makes use of reasoners such as FaCT, RACER and Pellet.
- Description logics are a subset of predicate logic for which efficient reasoning support is possible.
RDFS’s Expressive Power Limitations

- **Local scope of properties**
  - `rdfs:range` defines the range of a property (e.g. eats) for all classes
  - In RDF Schema we cannot declare range restrictions that apply to some classes only
  - E.g. we cannot say that cows eat only plants, while other animals may eat meat, too

- **Disjointness of classes**
  - Sometimes we wish to say that classes are disjoint (e.g. male and female)

- **Boolean combinations of classes**
  - Sometimes we wish to build new classes by combining other classes using union, intersection, and complement
  - E.g. person is the disjoint union of the classes male and female

- **Cardinality restrictions**
  - E.g. a person has exactly two parents, a course is taught by at least one lecturer

- **Special characteristics of properties**
  - Transitive property (like “greater than”)
  - Unique property (like “is mother of”)
  - A property is the inverse of another property (like “eats” and “is eaten by”)

Combining OWL with RDF Schema

- Ideally, OWL would extend RDF Schema
  - Consistent with the layered architecture of the Semantic Web

- But simply extending RDF Schema would work against obtaining expressive power and efficient reasoning
  - Combining RDF Schema with logic leads to uncontrollable computational properties
Three Species of OWL

- W3C's Web Ontology Working Group defined OWL as three different sublanguages:
  - OWL Full
  - OWL DL
  - OWL Lite
- Each sublanguage geared toward fulfilling different aspects of requirements

Soundness and completeness

- A sound reasoner only makes conclusions that logically follow from the input, i.e., all of its conclusions are correct
  - We almost always require our reasoners to be sound
- A complete reasoner can make all of the conclusions that logically follow from the input
  - We can not guarantee complete reasoners for full FOL and many subsets

OWL Full

- It uses all the OWL languages primitives
- It allows the combination of these primitives in arbitrary ways with RDF and RDF Schema
- OWL Full is fully upward-compatible with RDF, both syntactically and semantically
- OWL Full is so powerful that it’s undecidable
  - No complete (or efficient) reasoning support

OWL DL

- OWL DL (Description Logic) is a sublanguage of OWL Full that restricts application of the constructors from OWL and RDF
  - Application of OWL’s constructors’ to each other is disallowed
  - Therefore it corresponds to a well studied description logic
- OWL DL permits efficient reasoning support
- But we lose full compatibility with RDF:
  - Not every RDF document is a legal OWL DL document.
  - Every legal OWL DL document is a legal RDF document.
OWL Lite

- An even further restriction limits OWL DL to a subset of the language constructors
  - E.g., OWL Lite excludes enumerated classes, disjointness statements, and arbitrary cardinality.
- The advantage of this is a language that is easier to
  - grasp, for users
  - implement, for tool builders
- The disadvantage is restricted expressivity

Upward Compatibility for OWL Species

- Every legal OWL Lite ontology is a legal OWL DL ontology
- Every legal OWL DL ontology is a legal OWL Full ontology
- Every valid OWL Lite conclusion is a valid OWL DL conclusion
- Every valid OWL DL conclusion is a valid OWL Full conclusion

OWL Compatibility with RDF Schema

- All varieties of OWL use RDF for their syntax
- Instances are declared as in RDF, using RDF descriptions
- and typing information
- OWL constructors are specialisations of their RDF counterparts

OWL Compatibility with RDF Schema

- Semantic Web design aims at downward compatibility with corresponding reuse of software across the various layers
- The advantage of full downward compatibility for OWL is only achieved for OWL Full, at the cost of computational intractability
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OWL Syntactic Varieties

- OWL builds on RDF and uses RDF's XML-based syntax
- Other syntactic forms for OWL have also been defined:
  - An alternative, more readable XML-based syntax
  - An abstract syntax, that is much more compact and readable than the XML languages
  - A graphic syntax based on the conventions of UML

OWL XML/RDF Syntax: Header

```xml
<rdf:RDF
  xmlns:owl ="http://www.w3.org/2002/07/owl#"
  xmlns:rdf ="http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#"
  xmlns:rdfs ="http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#"
  xmlns:xsd ="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#">

  <owl:Ontology rdf:about="">
    <rdfs:comment>Example OWL ontology</rdfs:comment>
    <owl:priorVersion rdf:resource="http://www.-mydomain.org/uni-ns-old"/>
    <owl:imports rdf:resource="http://www.-mydomain.org/-persons"/>
    <rdfs:label>University Ontology</rdfs:label>
  </owl:Ontology>

  <owl:imports>, a transitive property, indicates that the document commits to all of the terms as defined in its target
  <owl:priorVersion points to an earlier version of this document

• OWL documents are RDF documents
• and start with a typical declaration of namespaces
• The W3C recommendation for owl has the namespace http://www.w3.org/2002/07/owl#"
### OWL Classes

```xml
<owl:Class rdf:about="#associateProfessor"/>
<owl:disjointWith rdf:resource="#professor"/>
<owl:disjointWith rdf:resource="#assistantProfessor"/>
</owl:Class>

- Classes are defined using `owl:Class`
  - `owl:Class` is a subclass of `rdfs:Class`
- Disjointness is defined using `owl:disjointWith`
  - Two disjoint classes can share no instances
```

### Separate Objects & Datatypes?

- **Philosophical reasons:**
  - Datatypes structured by built-in predicates
  - Not appropriate to form new datatypes using ontology language
- **Practical reasons:**
  - Note: Java does this, distinguishing classes from primitive datatypes
  - Ontology language remains simple and compact
  - Semantic integrity of ontology language not compromised
  - Implementability not compromised — can use hybrid reasoner
    - Only need sound and complete decision procedure for:
      \[ d_1^{i_1} \land \cdots \land d_n^{i_n}, \quad \text{where } i \text{ is a (possibly negated) datatype} \]

### OWL Classes

```xml
<owl:Class rdf:ID="faculty">
  <owl:equivalentClass rdf:resource="#academicStaffMember"/>
</owl:Class>
```

- `owl:equivalentClass` defines equivalence of classes
- `owl:Thing` is the most general class, which contains everything
  - i.e., every owl class is `rdfs:subClassOf owl:Thing`
- `owl:Nothing` is the empty class
  - i.e., `owl:Nothing` is `rdfs:subClassOf` every owl class

### OWL Properties

- In OWL there are two kinds of properties
  - **Object properties** relate objects to other objects
    - `owl:DatatypeProperty`
    - E.g. `is-TaughtBy`, `supervises`
  - **Data type properties** relate objects to datatype values
    - `owl:ObjectProperty`
    - E.g. phone, title, age, etc.
- These were made separate to make it easier to create sound and complete reasoners
**Datatype Properties**

- OWL uses XML Schema data types, exploiting the layered architecture of the Semantic Web

```xml
<owl:DatatypeProperty rdf:ID="age">
    <rdfs:range rdf:resource="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#nonNegativeInteger"/>
    <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="foaf:Person"/>
</owl:DatatypeProperty>
```

**OWL Object Properties**

- Typically user-defined data types

```xml
<owl:ObjectProperty rdf:ID="isTaughtBy">
    <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="#course"/>
    <rdfs:range rdf:resource="#academicStaffMember"/>
    <rdfs:subPropertyOf rdf:resource="#involves"/>
</owl:ObjectProperty>
```

**Inverse Properties**

```xml
<owl:ObjectProperty rdf:ID="teaches">
    <rdfs:range rdf:resource="#course"/>
    <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="#academicStaffMember"/>
    <owl:inverseOf rdf:resource="#isTaughtBy"/>
</owl:ObjectProperty>
```

A partial list of axioms:

- `{?P owl:inverseOf ?Q. ?P @has rdfs:domain ?C} => {?Q rdfs:range ?C}.` (Reflexivity)

**Equivalent Properties**

```xml
<owl:equivalentProperty
    <owl:ObjectProperty rdf:ID="lecturesIn">
        <owl:equivalentProperty rdf:resource="#teaches"/>
    </owl:ObjectProperty>
```

- Two properties have the same property *extension*

- Axioms

### Property Restrictions

- In OWL we can declare that the class $C$ satisfies certain conditions
  - All instances of $C$ satisfy the conditions
- This is equivalent to saying that $C$ is subclass of a class $C'$, where $C$ collects all objects that satisfy the conditions
  - $C'$ can remain anonymous
- Example:
  - People whose sex is male and have at least one child whose sex is female and whose age is six
  - Things with exactly two arms and two legs

### owl:allValuesFrom

- Describe a class where all of the values of a property match some requirement
- E.g., Math courses taught by professors.

```xml
<!-- First year courses that are taught by professors -->
<owl:Class rdf:about="#firstYearCourse">
    <rdfs:subClassOf>
        <owl:Restriction>
            <owl:onProperty rdf:resource="#isTaughtBy"/>
            <owl:allValuesFrom rdf:resource="#Professor"/>
        </owl:Restriction>
    </rdfs:subClassOf>
</owl:Class>
```

**Literally:**

Person is a sub-class of things all of whose offspring are necessarily of type Person

\{?X a foaf:Person. ?X bio:offspring ?O\} => {?O a Person}
Offspring of people are people

```xml
<rdf:RDF
 xmlns:="http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#"
 xmlns:rdfs="http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#"
 xmlns:owl="http://www.w3.org/2002/07/owl#"
 xmlns:foaf="http://xmlns.com/foaf/0.1/
 xmlns:bio="http://example.com/bio/"
 >
 <Description about="foaf:Person">
   <rdfs:subClassOf>
     <owl:Restriction>
       <owl:onProperty resource="bio:offspring" />
       <owl:allValuesFrom resource="foaf:Person" />
     </owl:Restriction>
   </rdfs:subClassOf>
 </Description>
</rdf:RDF>
```

And in N3

```n3
n3> cwm --rdf restriction.xml --n3
...
@prefix : <http://www.w3.org/2002/07/owl#> .
@prefix rdfs: <http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#> .

<foaf:Person> a :Class;
  rdfs:subClassOf [ 
    a :Restriction;
    :allValuesFrom <foaf:Person>;

#ENDS
```

owl:hasValue

- Describe a class with a particular value for a property
- E.g., Math courses taught by Professor Longhair

```xml
<!-- Math courses taught by #949352  
<owl:Class>
  <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#mathCourse"/>
  <rdfs:subClassOf>
    <owl:Restriction>
      <owl:onProperty rdf:resource="#isTaughtBy"/>
      <owl:hasValue rdf:resource="#949352"/>
    </owl:Restriction>
  </rdfs:subClassOf>
</owl:Class>
```

owl:someValuesFrom

- Describe a class based on a requirement that it must have at least one value for a property matching a description.
- E.g., Academic staff members who teach an undergraduate course.

```xml
<owl:Class rdf:about="#academicStaffMember">
  <rdfs:subClassOf>
    <owl:Restriction>
      <owl:onProperty rdf:resource="#teaches"/>
      <owl:someValuesFrom rdf:resource="#undergraduateCourse"/>
    </owl:Restriction>
  </rdfs:subClassOf>
</owl:Class>
```
Cardinality Restrictions

- We can specify minimum and maximum number using `owl:minCardinality` & `owl:maxCardinality`
  - Courses with fewer than 10 students
  - Courses with between 10 and 100 students
  - Courses with more than 100 students
- It is possible to specify a precise number by using the same minimum and maximum number
  - Courses with exactly seven students
- For convenience, OWL offers also `owl:cardinality`
  - E.g., exactly N

What does this say?

```xml
<owl:Class rdf:ID="Parent">
  <owl:equivalentClass>
    <owl:Restriction>
      <owl:onProperty rdf:resource="#hasChild" />
      <owl:minCardinality rdf:datatype="&xsd;nonNegativeInteger">1</owl:minCardinality>
    </owl:Restriction>
  </owl:equivalentClass>
</owl:Class>
```

Cardinality Restrictions

- E.g. courses taught be at least two people.

```xml
<owl:Class rdf:about="#course">
  <rdfs:subClassOf>
    <owl:Restriction>
      <owl:onProperty rdf:resource="#isTaughtBy"/>
      <owl:minCardinality rdf:datatype="&xsd;nonNegativeInteger">2</owl:minCardinality>
    </owl:Restriction>
  </rdfs:subClassOf>
</owl:Class>
```

Definition of a parent

The parent class is equivalent to the class of things that have at least one child

\[
\text{All}(x): \text{Parent}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Exists}(y) \text{ hasChild}(x, y)
\]

If hasChild is defined as having Person as it’s domain, then Parents are also people.
Special Properties

- **owl:TransitiveProperty** (transitive property)
  - E.g. "has better grade than", "is ancestor of"
- **owl:SymmetricProperty** (symmetry)
  - E.g. "has same grade as", "is sibling of"
- **owl:FunctionalProperty** defines a property that has at most one value for each object
  - E.g. "age", "height", "directSupervisor"
- **owl:InverseFunctionalProperty** defines a property for which two different objects cannot have the same value

Boolean Combinations

- We can combine classes using Boolean operations (union, intersection, complement)
- Negation is introduced by the complementOf
- E.g., courses not taught by staffMembers
  ```xml
  <owl:Class rdf:about="#course">
    <rdfs:subClassOf>
      <owl:Restriction>
        <owl:onProperty rdf:resource="#teaches"/>
        <owl:allValuesFrom>
          <owl:complementOf rdf:resource="#staffMember"/>
        </owl:allValuesFrom>
        <owl:allValuesFrom>
        </owl:Restriction>
    </rdfs:subClassOf>
  </owl:Class>
  ```

The new class is not a subclass of the union, but rather equal to the union
- We have stated an equivalence of classes
- E.g., university people is the union of staffMembers and Students
  ```xml
  <owl:Class rdf:ID="peopleAtUni">
    <owl:unionOf rdf:parseType="Collection">
      <owl:Class rdf:about="#staffMember"/>
      <owl:Class rdf:about="#student"/>
    </owl:unionOf>
  </owl:Class>
  ```
Boolean Combinations

- E.g., CS faculty is the intersection of faculty and things that belongTo the CS Department.

```xml
<owl:Class rdf:id="facultyInCS">
  <owl:intersectionOf rdf:parseType="Collection">
    <owl:Class rdf:about="#faculty"/>
    <owl:Restriction>
      <owl:onProperty rdf:resource="#belongsTo"/>
      <owl:hasValue rdf:resource="#CSDepartment"/>
    </owl:Restriction>
  </owl:intersectionOf>
</owl:Class>
```

Nesting of Boolean Operators

- E.g., administrative staff are staff members who are not faculty or technical staff members

```xml
<owl:Class rdf:id="adminStaff">
  <owl:intersectionOf rdf:parseType="Collection">
    <owl:Class rdf:about="#staffMember"/>
    <owl:complementOf>
      <owl:unionOf rdf:parseType="Collection">
        <owl:Class rdf:about="#faculty"/>
        <owl:Class rdf:about="#techSupportStaff"/>
      </owl:unionOf>
    </owl:complementOf>
  </owl:intersectionOf>
</owl:Class>
```

Enumerations with owl:oneOf

- E.g., a thing that is either Monday, Tuesday, ...

```xml
<owl:oneOf rdf:parseType="Collection">
  <owl:Thing rdf:about="#Monday"/>
  <owl:Thing rdf:about="#Tuesday"/>
  <owl:Thing rdf:about="#Wednesday"/>
  <owl:Thing rdf:about="#Thursday"/>
  <owl:Thing rdf:about="#Friday"/>
  <owl:Thing rdf:about="#Saturday"/>
  <owl:Thing rdf:about="#Sunday"/>
</owl:oneOf>
```

Declaring Instances

- Instances of classes are declared as in RDF, as in these examples

```xml
<rdf:Description rdf:id="949352">
  <rdf:type rdf:resource="#academicStaffMember"/>
</rdf:Description>
<academicStaffMember rdf:id="949352">
  <uni:age rdf:datatype="&xsd;integer">39</uni:age>
</academicStaffMember>
```
No Unique-Names Assumption

- OWL does not adopt the unique-names assumption of database systems
  - That two instances have a different name or ID does not imply that they are different individuals
- Suppose we state that each course is taught by at most one staff member, and that a given course is taught by #949318 and is taught by #949352
  - An OWL reasoner does not flag an error
  - Instead it infers that the two resources are equal

Distinct Objects

To ensure that different individuals are indeed recognized as such, we must explicitly assert their inequality:

```xml
<lecturer rdf:about="949318">
  <owl:_differentFrom rdf:resource="949352"/>
</lecturer>
```

Distinct Objects

- OWL provides a shorthand notation to assert the pairwise inequality of all individuals in a given list

```xml
<owl:allDifferent>
  <owl:distinctMembers rdf:parseType="Collection">
    <lecturer rdf:about="949318"/>
    <lecturer rdf:about="949352"/>
    <lecturer rdf:about="949111"/>
  </owl:distinctMembers>
</owl:allDifferent>
```

Data Types in OWL

- XML Schema provides a mechanism to construct user-defined data types
  - E.g., the data type of `adultAge` includes all integers greater than 18
- Such derived data types cannot be used in OWL
  - The OWL reference document lists all the XML Schema data types that can be used
  - These include the most frequently used types such as `string`, `integer`, `Boolean`, `time`, and `date`. 
**Versioning Information**

- **owl:priorVersion** indicates earlier versions of the current ontology
  - No formal meaning, can be exploited for ontology management
- **owl:versionInfo** generally contains a string giving information about the current version, e.g. keywords

**Versioning Information**

- **owl:backwardCompatibleWith** contains a reference to another ontology
  - All identifiers from the previous version have the same intended interpretations in the new version
  - Thus documents can be safely changed to commit to the new version
- **owl:incompatibleWith** says that the containing ontology is a later version of the referenced ontology but is not backward compatible with it

**Combination of Features**

- In different OWL languages there are different sets of restrictions regarding the application of features
- In **OWL Full**, all the language constructors may be used in any combination as long as the result is legal RDF
- **OWL DL** removes or restricts some features to ensure that complete reasoning is **tractable** or to make reasoning implementations easier

**Restriction of Features in OWL DL**

- **Vocabulary partitioning**
  - Any resource is allowed to be only a class, a data type, a data type property, an object property, an individual, a data value, or part of the built-in vocabulary, and not more than one of these
- **Explicit typing**
  - The partitioning of all resources must be stated explicitly (e.g. a class must be declared if used in conjunction with **rdfs:subClassOf**).
Restriction of Features in OWL DL

- **Property Separation**
  - The set of object properties and data type properties are disjoint
  - Therefore the following can never be specified for data type properties:
    - `owl:inverseOf`
    - `owl:FunctionalProperty`
    - `owl:InverseFunctionalProperty`
    - `owl:SymmetricProperty`

Restriction of Features in OWL DL

- **No transitive cardinality restrictions**
  - No cardinality restrictions may be placed on transitive properties
  - e.g., people with more than 5 ancestors
- **Restricted anonymous classes**
  Anonymous classes are only allowed to occur as:
  - the domain and range of either `owl:equivalentClass` or `owl:disjointWith`
  - the range (but not the domain) of `rdfs:subClassOf`

Restriction of Features in OWL Lite

- Restrictions of OWL DL and more
  - `owl:oneOf`, `owl:disjointWith`, `owl:unionOf`, `owl:complementOf` and `owl:hasValue` are not allowed
- Cardinality statements (minimal, maximal, and exact cardinality) can only be made on the values 0 or 1
- `owl:equivalentClass` statements can no longer be made between anonymous classes but only between class identifiers
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African Wildlife Ontology: Classes

African Wildlife: Properties

African Wildlife: Plants and Trees
An African Wildlife: Branches

<owl:Class rdf:ID="branch">
  <rdfs:comment>Branches are parts of trees. </rdfs:comment>
  <rdfs:subClassOf>
    <owl:Restriction>
      <owl:onProperty rdf:resource="#is-part-of"/>
      <owl:allValuesFrom rdf:resource="#tree"/>
    </owl:Restriction>
  </rdfs:subClassOf>
</owl:Class>

African Wildlife: Leaves

<owl:Class rdf:ID="leaf">
  <rdfs:comment>Leaves are parts of branches. </rdfs:comment>
  <rdfs:subClassOf>
    <owl:Restriction>
      <owl:onProperty rdf:resource="#is-part-of"/>
      <owl:allValuesFrom rdf:resource="#branch"/>
    </owl:Restriction>
  </rdfs:subClassOf>
</owl:Class>

African Wildlife: Carnivores

<owl:Class rdf:ID="carnivore">
  <rdfs:comment>Carnivores are exactly those animals that eat also animals. </rdfs:comment>
  <owl:intersectionOf rdf:parsetype="Collection">
    <owl:Class rdf:about="#animal"/>
    <owl:Restriction>
      <owl:onProperty rdf:resource="#eats"/>
      <owl:someValuesFrom rdf:resource="#animal"/>
    </owl:Restriction>
  </owl:intersectionOf>
</owl:Class>

African Wildlife: Herbivores

How can we define Herbivores?
African Wildlife: Herbivores

Here is one approach

<owl:Class rdf:ID="herbivore">
  <rdfs:comment>
Herbivores are exactly those animals that eat only plants or parts of plants.
  </rdfs:comment>
</owl:Class>

African Wildlife: Giraffes

<owl:Class rdf:ID="giraffe">
  <rdfs:comment>Giraffes are herbivores, and they eat only leaves.</rdfs:comment>
  <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:type="#herbivore"/>
  <owl:Restriction>
    <owl:onProperty rdf:resource="#eats"/>
    <owl:allValuesFrom rdf:resource="#leaf"/>
  </owl:Restriction>
</owl:Class>

African Wildlife: Lions

<owl:Class rdf:ID="lion">
  <rdfs:comment>Lions are animals that eat only herbivores.</rdfs:comment>
  <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:type="#carnivore"/>
  <rdfs:subClassOf>
    <owl:Restriction>
      <owl:onProperty rdf:resource="#eats"/>
      <owl:allValuesFrom rdf:resource="#herbivore"/>
    </owl:Restriction>
  </rdfs:subClassOf>
</owl:Class>
African Wildlife: Tasty Plants

<owl:Class rdf:ID="tasty-plant">
  <rdfs:comment>Plants eaten both by herbivores and carnivores</rdfs:comment>
  <rdfs:comment>??????????????</rdfs:comment>
</owl:Class>

Printer Ontology – Class Hierarchy

<owl:Class rdf:ID="product">
  <rdfs:comment>Products form a class.</rdfs:comment>
</owl:Class>

<owl:Class rdf:ID="padid">
  <rdfs:comment>Printing and digital imaging devices form a subclass of products.</rdfs:comment>
</owl:Class>
Printer Ontology – HP Products

<owl:Class rdf:ID="hpProduct">
  <owl:intersectionOf>
    <owl:Class rdf:about="#product"/>
    <owl:Restriction>
      <owl:onProperty rdf:resource="#manufactured-by"/>
      <owl:hasValue>
        <xsd:string rdf:value="Hewlett Packard"/>
      </owl:hasValue>
    </owl:Restriction>
  </owl:intersectionOf>
</owl:Class>

Printer Ontology – Printers & Personal Printers

<owl:Class rdf:ID="printer">
  <rdfs:comment>Printers are printing and digital imaging devices.</rdfs:comment>
  <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#padid"/>
</owl:Class>

<owl:Class rdf:ID="personalPrinter">
  <rdfs:comment>Printers for personal use form a subclass of printers.</rdfs:comment>
  <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#printer"/>
</owl:Class>

HP LaserJet 1100se Printers

<owl:Class rdf:ID="1100se">
  <rdfs:comment>1100se printers belong to the 1100 series and cost $450.</rdfs:comment>
  <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#1100series"/>
  <rdfs:subClassOf>
    <owl:Restriction>
      <owl:onProperty rdf:resource="#price"/>
      <owl:hasValue><xsd:integer rdf:value="450"/></owl:hasValue>
    </owl:Restriction>
  </rdfs:subClassOf>
</owl:Class>

A Printer Ontology – Properties

<owl:DatatypeProperty rdf:ID="manufactured-by">
  <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="#product"/>
  <rdfs:range rdf:resource="&xsd:string"/>
</owl:DatatypeProperty>

<owl:DatatypeProperty rdf:ID="printingTechnology">
  <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="#printer"/>
  <rdfs:range rdf:resource="&xsd:string"/>
</owl:DatatypeProperty>
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OWL in OWL

- We present a part of the definition of OWL in terms of itself
- The following captures some of OWL’s meaning in OWL
  - It does not capture the entire semantics
  - A separate semantic specification is necessary
- The URI of the OWL definition is defined as the default namespace

Classes of Classes (Metaclasses)

The class of all OWL classes is itself a subclass of the class of all RDF Schema classes:

```xml
<rdfs:Class rdf:ID="Class">
  <rdfs:label>Class</rdfs:label>
  <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="&rdfs;Class"/>
</rdfs:Class>
```

Metaclasses – Thing and Nothing

- **Thing** is most general object class in OWL
- **Nothing** is most specific class: the empty object class
- The following relationships hold:

```
Thing = Nothing ∪ Nothing
Nothing = Thing = Nothing ∪ Nothing = Nothing \ Nothing = ∅
```
Class and Property Equivalences

<rdf:Property rdf:ID="EquivalentClass">
   <rdfs:label>EquivalentClass</rdfs:label>
   <rdfs:subPropertyOf rdf:resource="&rdfs;subClassOf"/>
   <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="#Class"/>
   <rdfs:range rdf:resource="#Class"/>
</rdf:Property>

<rdf:Property rdf:ID="EquivalentProperty">
   <rdfs:label>EquivalentProperty</rdfs:label>
   <rdfs:subPropertyOf rdf:resource="&rdfs;subPropertyOf"/>
</rdf:Property>

Class Disjointness

<rdf:Property rdf:ID="disjointWith">
   <rdfs:label>disjointWith</rdfs:label>
   <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="#Class" />  
   <rdfs:range rdf:resource="#Class" />
</rdf:Property>

Equality and Inequality

- Equality and inequality can be stated between arbitrary things
  - In OWL Full this statement can also be applied to classes
- Properties sameIndividualAs, sameAs and differentFrom
Equality and Inequality

<rdf:Property rdf:ID="sameIndividualAs">
    <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="#Thing"/>
    <rdfs:range rdf:resource="#Thing"/>
</rdf:Property>

<rdf:Property rdf:ID="sameAs">
    <EquivalentProperty rdf:resource="#sameIndividualAs"/>
</rdf:Property>

Union and Intersection of Classes

- Build a class from a list, assumed to be a list of other class expressions

<rdf:Property rdf:ID="unionOf">
    <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="#Class"/>
    <rdfs:range rdf:resource="&rdf;List"/>
</rdf:Property>

Restriction Classes

Restrictions in OWL define the class of those objects that satisfy some attached conditions

<rdfs:Class rdf:ID="Restriction">
    <rdfs:label>Restriction</rdfs:label>
    <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#Class"/>
</rdfs:Class>

Restriction Properties

- All the following properties (onProperty, allValuesFrom, minCardinality, etc.) are only allowed to occur within a restriction definition
  - Their domain is owl:Restriction, but they differ with respect to their range
**Restriction Properties**

```xml
<rdf:Property rdf:ID="onProperty">
    <rdfs:label>onProperty</rdfs:label>
    <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="#Restriction"/>
    <rdfs:range rdf:resource="&rdf:Property;"/>
</rdf:Property>

<rdf:Property rdf:ID="allValuesFrom">
    <rdfs:label>allValuesFrom</rdfs:label>
    <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="#Restriction"/>
    <rdfs:range rdf:resource="&rdfs;Class;"/>
</rdf:Property>
```

**Properties**

- `owl:ObjectProperty` and `owl:DatatypeProperty` are special cases of `rdf:Property`

```xml
<rdfs:Class rdf:ID="ObjectProperty">
    <rdfs:label>ObjectProperty</rdfs:label>
    <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="&rdf:Property;"/>
</rdfs:Class>
```

**Restriction Properties**

```xml
<rdf:Property rdf:ID="hasValue">
    <rdfs:label>hasValue</rdfs:label>
    <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="#Restriction"/>
</rdf:Property>

<rdf:Property rdf:ID="minCardinality">
    <rdfs:label>minCardinality</rdfs:label>
    <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="#Restriction"/>
    <rdfs:range rdf:resource="&xsd;nonNegativeInteger;"/>
</rdf:Property>
```

**Properties**

Symmetric, functional and inverse functional properties can only be applied to object properties.

```xml
<rdfs:Class rdf:ID="TransitiveProperty">
    <rdfs:label>TransitiveProperty</rdfs:label>
    <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#ObjectProperty;"/>
</rdfs:Class>
```
Properties

**owl:inverseOf** relates two object properties

```
<rdf:Property rdf:ID="inverseOf">
  <rdfs:label>inverseOf</rdfs:label>
  <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="#ObjectProperty"/>
  <rdfs:range rdf:resource="#ObjectProperty"/>
</rdf:Property>
```

Future Extensions of OWL

- Modules and Imports
- Defaults
- Closed World Assumption
- Unique Names Assumption
- Procedural Attachments
- Rules for Property Chaining

Modules and Imports

- The importing facility of OWL is very trivial:
  - It only allows importing of an entire ontology, not parts of it
- Modules in programming languages based on **information hiding**: state functionality, hide implementation details
  - Open question how to define appropriate module mechanism for Web ontology languages
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Defaults

- Many practical knowledge representation systems allow inherited values to be overridden by more specific classes in the hierarchy
  - treat inherited values as defaults
- No consensus has been reached on the right formalization for the nonmonotonic behaviour of default values

Closed World Assumption

- OWL currently adopts the open-world assumption:
  - A statement cannot be assumed true on the basis of a failure to prove it
  - On the huge and only partially knowable WWW, this is a correct assumption
- Closed-world assumption: a statement is true when its negation cannot be proved
  - tied to the notion of defaults, leads to nonmonotonic behaviour

Unique Names Assumption

- Typical database applications assume that individuals with different names are indeed different individuals
- OWL follows the usual logical paradigm where this is not the case
  - Plausible on the WWW
- One may want to indicate portions of the ontology for which the assumption does or does not hold

Procedural Attachments

- A common concept in knowledge representation is to define the meaning of a term by attaching a piece of code to be executed for computing the meaning of the term
  - Not through explicit definitions in the language
- Although widely used, this concept does not lend itself very well to integration in a system with a formal semantics, and it has not been included in OWL
**Rules for Property Chaining**

- OWL does not allow the composition of properties for reasons of decidability
- In many applications this is a useful operation
- One may want to define properties as general rules (Horn or otherwise) over other properties
- Integration of rule-based knowledge representation and DL-style knowledge representation is currently an active area of research

**OWL 2 adds**

- Qualified cardinality
  - A hand has five digits, one of which is a thumb and four of which are fingers
- Stronger datatype/range support
- Additional property characteristics
  - E.g., reflexivity
- Role chains
  - E.g., hasParent.hasSibling.hasChild
- A better defined model for punning within DL
  - Allows a term to name both a concept and an individual
- More powerful annotations

**Conclusions**

- OWL is the proposed standard for Web ontologies
- OWL builds upon RDF and RDF Schema:
  - (XML-based) RDF syntax is used
  - Instances are defined using RDF descriptions
  - Most RDFS modeling primitives are used
- Formal semantics and reasoning support is provided through the mapping of OWL on logics
  - Predicate logic and description logics have been used for this purpose
- While OWL is sufficiently rich to be used in practice, extensions are in the making
  - They will provide further logical features, including rules