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Previously on “Semantic Web Technologies”

- Is RDF more powerful than XML?
- XML is a markup language for information
- In XML, arbitrary elements and attributes can be defined
- XML tag names are meaningless for a computer
- RDF is a markup language for information
- In RDF, arbitrary classes and predicates can be defined
- RDF class and predicate names are meaningless for a computer
Today: Schemas and Ontologies

• They bring the Semantics to the Semantic Web (finally!)
  – Building simple ontologies with RDF Schema
  – Elements of RDF Schema
  – Automatic deduction with RDF Schema
Berners-Lee (2009): Semantic Web and Linked Data
What is Missing up to Now?

• Our mission: make computers understand information on the Web

• But what does *understand* actually mean?

"Madrid is the capital of Spain."
Semantics

• Let's look at that sentence:
  – "Madrid is the capital of Spain."

• Published on the Semantic Web (i.e., using RDF):

• How many pieces of information can we (i.e., humans) derive from that sentence?
  – (1 piece of information = 1 statement <S,P,O>)
  – Estimations? Opinions?
Semantics

• Let's look at that sentence:
  – "Madrid is the capital of Spain."

• We can get the following information:
  – "Madrid is the capital of Spain."
  – "Spain is a state."
  – "Madrid is a city."
  – "Madrid is located in Spain."
  – "Barcelona is not the capital of Spain."
  – "Madrid is not the capital of France."
  – "Madrid is not a state."
  – ...
How do Semantics Work?

Cities are capitals of states.
Each state has exactly one capital.

A city cannot be the capital of more than one state.

"Madrid is the capital of Spain."
An Excursion to Linguistics

- Saussure's idea of a *linguistic sign*
- Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913):
  - Signifier (signifiant) and signified (signifié) cannot be separated from each other

"tree"
An Excursion to Linguistics

- The triangle of reference

So, how do Semantics Work?

- **Lexical semantics**
  - Meaning of a word is defined by relations to other words
- **Extensional semantics**
  - Meaning of a word is defined by the set of its instances
- **Intensional semantics, e.g., feature-based semantics**
  - Meaning of a word is defined by features of the instances
- **Prototype semantics**
  - Meaning of a word is defined by proximity to a prototypical instance
- ...
Lexical Semantics

- Defining semantics by establishing relations between words
Extensional Semantics

• Listing instances
  – EU members are Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, ..., Sweden, UK.

• *Angela Merkel == Chancellor of Germany*
  – both terms have the same extension
## Intensional Semantics

- Describes features of things, i.e., *semes*
- A seme is a feature that distinguishes the meaning of two words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>has wings</th>
<th>can swim</th>
<th>has fur</th>
<th>can fly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duck</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolphin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intensional vs. Extensional Semantics

- Intensionally different things can have the same extension
- Classic example: morning star and evening star

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Celestial body</th>
<th>bright</th>
<th>visible in the morning</th>
<th>visible in the evening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning star</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening star</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- both have the same extension (i.e., Venus)
Intensional vs. Extensional Semantics

• The extension can change over time without the intension changing
  – e.g., “student”
  – does that change the semantics?

• Intension may also change over time
  – technological achievements (e.g., intension of ship)
  – changes in moral values (e.g., intension of marriage)

• Extension may also be empty, e.g.
  – Unicorn
  – Martian
  – Yeti (?)
Intensional vs. Extension Semantics

- ...explained by two well-known experts in the field :-)
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Prototype Semantics

• A small experiment:
  – Close your eyes, and imagine a bird!
Prototype Semantics

- So far, intensional and extensional semantics are based on boolean logics (i.e., there's only “true” and “false”)
- Prototype Semantics: a more fuzzy variant

Jean Aitchison: Words in the Mind (1987)
How do Semantics Work?

• We have learned: Semantics define the meaning of words
• That is what we do in the Semantic Web
  – using methods from lexical, intensional, and extensional semantics

http://walkinthewords.blogspot.com/2008/05/linguistic-cartoon-favorites-semantics.html
How do Semantics Work?

Cities are capitals of states.

Each state has exactly one capital.

A city cannot be the capital of more than one state.

"Madrid is the capital of Spain."
Semantics in the Semantic Web

\[
\text{City}(x) \iff \exists y: \text{capitalOf}(x,y) \\
\text{State}(y) \iff \exists x: \text{capitalOf}(x,y) \\
\text{locatedIn}(x,y) \iff \text{capitalOf}(x,y) \\
\ldots
\]

Ontologies

• "An ontology is an explicit specification of a conceptualization."¹

• Ontologies encode the knowledge about a domain

• They form a common vocabulary
  – and describe the semantics of its terms

What is an Ontology?

• Ontology (without a or the) is the philosophical study of being
  – greek: ὄντος (things that are), λόγος (the study)
  – A sub discipline of philosophy

• In computer science (with a or the)
  – a formalized description of a domain
  – a shared vocabulary
  – a logical theory
Ontologies – Further Definitions

• Guarino und Giaretta (1995):
  "a logical theory which gives an explicit, partial account of a conceptualization"

• Uschold und Gruninger (1996):
  "shared understanding of some domain of interest"
  "an explicit account or representation of some part of a conceptualisation"

• Guarino (1998):
  "a set of logical axioms designed to account for the intended meaning of a vocabulary"
Essential Properties of Ontologies

• Explicit
  – Meaning is not “hidden” between the lines

• Formal
  – e.g., using logic or rule languages

• Shared
  – Martin Hepp: "Autists don't build ontologies"
  – An ontology just for one person does not make much sense

• Partial
  – There will (probably) never be a full ontology of everything in the world
Classifications of Ontologies

Degree of Formality

- Catalog
- Glossary
- Thesaurus
- Informal Taxonomy
- Formal Taxonomy
- Formal Instances
- Frames
- Value Restrictions
- Logic Constraints

informal ontologies

light-weight ontologies

heavy-weight ontologies

formal ontologies

The Oldest Ontology

Porphyry, Greek philosopher, ca. 234-305

Figure 1.1 Tree of Porphyry, translated from a version by Peter of Spain (1239)
Encoding Simple Ontologies: RDFS

- A W3C Standard since 2004

- Most important element: classes

  :State a rdfs:Class .

- Classes form hierarchies

  :EuropeanState rdfs:subClassOf :State .
Class Hierarchies in RDF Schema

- Multiple inheritance is possible

Convention for this course: unlabeled arrows = rdfs:subClassOf
Properties in RDF Schema

- Properties are the other important element
- resemble two-valued predicates in predicate logic

:capitalOf a rdf:Property .

- Properties also form hierarchies

:capitalOf rdfs:subPropertyOf :locatedIn .
Domains and Ranges of Properties

• In general, properties exist independently from classes
  – i.e., they are *first class citizens*
  – this is different than OOP or ERM

• Defining the domain and range of a property:

  :capitalOf rdfs:domain :City .
  :capitalOf rdfs:range :Country .

• Domain and range are inherited by sub properties
  – They can also be further restricted
Predefined Properties

- We have already seen
  - rdf:type
  - rdfs:subClassOf
  - rdfs:subPropertyOf
  - rdfs:domain
  - rdfs:range
Further Predefined Properties

- **Labels:**
  
  :Germany rdfs:label "Deutschland"@de .
  
  :Germany rdfs:label "Germany"@en .

- **Comments:**
  
  :Germany rdfs:comment "Germany as a political entity."@en .

- **Links to other resources:**
  
  :Germany rdfs:seeAlso <http://www.deutschland.de/> .

- **Link to defining schema:**
  
  :Country rdfs:isDefinedBy
  <http://foo.bar/countries.rdfs> .
URIs vs. Labels

- A URI is only a unique identifier
  - it does not need to be interpretable
    http://www.countries.org/4327893

- Labels are made for human interpretation
- ...and can come in different languages:

  countries:4327893 rdfs:label "Deutschland"@de .
countries:4327893 rdfs:label "Germany"@en .
countries:4327893 rdfs:label "Tyskland"@sv .
...
URIs vs. Labels

- Labels and comments can also be assigned to RDFS elements:

```reason
Country a rdfs:Class .
Country rdfs:label "Land"@de .

locatedIn a rdf:Property .
locatedIn rdfs:label "liegt in"@de .
locatedIn rdfs:label "is located in"@en .
locatedIn rdfs:comment "refers to geography"@en .
```
RDF Schema and RDF

- Every RDF Schema document is also an RDF document
- This means: all properties of RDF also hold for RDFS!

- Non-unique Naming Assumption
  
  schema1:Country a rdfs:Class .
  schema2:State a rdfs:Class .

- Open World Assumption
  
  :Country rdfs:subClassOf :GeographicObject .
  :City rdfs:subClassOf :GeographicObject .
Our First Ontology

- States, cities, and capitals

:State a rdfs:Class .
:City a rdfs:Class .
:locatedIn a rdf:Property .
:capitalOf rdfs:subPropertyOf :locatedIn .
:capitalOf rdfs:domain :City .
:capitalOf rdfs:range :State .


Definition of the Terminology (T-Box)

Definition of theAssertions (A-box)
What do We Gain Now?

```turtle
:Country a rdfs:Class .
:City a rdfs:Class .
:locatedIn a rdfs:Property .
:capitalOf rdfs:subPropertyOf :locatedIn .
:capitalOf rdfs:domain :City .
:capitalOf rdfs:range :Country .

```
What do We Gain Now?

+ :capitalOf rdfs:domain :City
→ :Madrid a :City .

+ :capitalOf rdfs:range :Country
→ :Spain a :Country .

+ :capitalOf rdfs:subPropertyOf :locatedIn .
→ :Madrid :locatedIn :Spain .
Reasoning with RDF

• RDF Schema allows for *deductive* reasoning on RDF

• This means:
  – given facts and rules,
  – we can derive new facts

• The corresponding tools are called *reasoner*

• Opposite of deduction: *induction*
  – deriving models from facts
  – see, e.g., lectures on data mining and machine learning
A Bit of History

• Aristotle (384 – 322 BC)
• Syllogisms
  – Deriving facts using rules

• Example:
  All men are mortal.
  Socrates is a man.
  → Socrates is mortal.
A Bit of History

Penguins are black and white. Some old TV shows are black and white. Therefore, some penguins are old TV shows.

Logic: another thing that penguins aren’t very good at.

Cartoon Copyright: Randy Glasbergen, http://www.glasbergen.com/
Interpretation and Entailment

• Entailment
  – The set of all consequences of a graph

• Mapping a graph to an entailment is called interpretation

• Simplest Interpretation:
  – \(<s,p,o> \in G \rightarrow <s,p,o> \in \text{Entailment}\)

• This interpretation creates all statements explicitly contained in the graph.
• But the *implicit* statements are the interesting ones!
Interpretation using Deduction Rules

• RDF interpretation can be done using RDFS deduction rules
• Those create an entailment
  – using existing resources, literals, and properties
  – creating additional triples like <s,p,o>
  – e.g.,
    • <Madrid, rdf:type, City>
    • <Madrid, located_in, Spain>
• Note:
  – no new resources, literals, or properties are created!
Reasoning with Deduction Rules

- Deduction rules are an interpretation function
- Simple reasoning algorithm (a.k.a. forward chaining):

Given: an RDF Graph G
a set of deduction rules R
Entailment E = G
Repeat
  M := { }
  For all rules in R
    For each statement S in E
      Apply R to S
      If E does not contain consequence
        Add consequence to M
  Add all elements in M to E
until M = { }
### Deduction Rules for RDF Schema (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rdf1</td>
<td>s p o .</td>
<td>p rdf:type rdf:Property .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rdfs1</td>
<td>s p l .</td>
<td>l rdf:type rdfs:Literal .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l is a Literal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rdfs2</td>
<td>s p o .</td>
<td>s rdf:type c .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p rdfs:domain c .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rdfs3</td>
<td>s p o .</td>
<td>o rdf:type c .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p rdfs:range c .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rdfs4a</td>
<td>s p o .</td>
<td>s rdf:type rdfs:Resource .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rdfs4b</td>
<td>s p o .</td>
<td>o rdf:type rdfs:Resource .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o is a URI or blank node</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rdfs5</td>
<td>p1 rdfs:subPropertyOf p2 .</td>
<td>p1 rdfs:subPropertyOf p3 .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p2 rdfs:subPropertyOf P3 .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deduction Rules for RDF Schema (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rdfs7</td>
<td>p1 rdfs:subPropertyOf p2 . s p1 o .</td>
<td>s p2 o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rdfs8</td>
<td>c rdf:type rdfs:Class .</td>
<td>c rdfs:subClassOf rdfs:Resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rdfs9</td>
<td>s rdf:type c1 . c1 rdfs:subClassOf c2 .</td>
<td>s rdf:type c2 .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rdfs10</td>
<td>c rdf:type rdfs:Class .</td>
<td>c rdfs:subClassOf c .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rdfs11</td>
<td>c1 rdfs:subClassOf c2 . c2 rdfs:subClassOf c3 .</td>
<td>c1 rdfs:subClassOf c3 .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applying Deduction Rules

• Another Example

:Employee a rdfs:Class .
:Employee rdfs:subClassOf :Human .
:Room a rdfs:Class .
:worksIn rdfs:subPropertyOf :hasOffice .
:hasOffice rdfs:domain :Employee .
:hasOffice rdfs:range :Room .

:Tim :worksIn :D0815 .
Applying Deduction Rules

- Example:

```
:Tim :worksIn :D0815 .
:worksIn rdfs:subPropertyOf :hasOffice .
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rdfs7</td>
<td>p1 rdfs:subPropertyOf p2 . s p1 o .</td>
<td>s p2 o .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ :Tim :hasOffice :D0815 .
Applying Deduction Rules

- Example:

\[ :\text{Tim} :\text{hasOffice} :\text{D0815} . \]
\[ :\text{hasOffice rdfs:domain} :\text{Employee} . \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rdfs2</td>
<td>s p o . p rdfs:domain c .</td>
<td>s rdf:type c .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \rightarrow :\text{Tim rdf:type} :\text{Employee} . \]
Applying Deduction Rules

- Example:

:Tim rdf:type :Employee.
:Employee rdfs:subClassOf :Human .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rdfs9</td>
<td>s rdf:type c1 .</td>
<td>s rdf:type c2 .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c1 rdfs:subClassOf c2 .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ :Tim rdf:type :Human .
What if there are Multiple Domains/Ranges?

• Example for social networks:

  :knows rdfs:domain :Person .
  :knows rdfs:domain :MemberOfSocialNetwork .

• What should be the semantics here?
  – Everybody who knows someone is a person and a member of a social network
  – Everybody who knows someone is a person or a member of a social network
The Rules will Tell Us

:knows rdfs:domain :Person. \hspace{1cm} (a0)
:knows rdfs:domain :MemberOfSocialNetwork . \hspace{1cm} (a1)
:Peter :knows :Stephen . \hspace{1cm} (a2)
(rdfs2+a0+a2) :Peter rdf:type :Person . \hspace{1cm} (a3)
(rdfs2+a1+a2) :Peter rdf:type :MemberOfSocialNetwork . \hspace{1cm} (a4)
...

• This chain works for each object
  – it is always contained in both classes
    → i.e., the intersection semantics hold
What have We Gained?

• Let's look at that sentence:
  – "Madrid is the capital of Spain."

• We can get the following information:
  – "Madrid is the capital of Spain." ✔
  – "Spain is a state." ✔
  – "Madrid is a city." ✔
  – "Madrid is located in Spain." ✔
  – "Barcelona is not the capital of Spain." ✗
  – "Madrid is not the capital of France." ✗
  – "Madrid is not a state." ✗
  – ...
What we Cannot Express (up to Now)

• "Every state has exactly one capital"
  – Property cardinalities
• "Every city can only be the capital of one state."
  – Functional properties
• "A city cannot be a state at the same time."
  – Class disjointness
• ...

• For those, we need more expressive languages than RDFS!
What we Cannot Express (up to Now)

• "Every state has exactly one capital"
  – i.e., "A state cannot have more than one capital."

• "Every city can only be the capital of one state."
  – i.e., "A city cannot be the capital of two different states."

• "A city cannot be a state at the same time."
What we Cannot Express (up to Now)

• Note: there is no negation in RDF and RDFS

• This means, we cannot produce any contradictions
  – This makes reasoning easy
  – But it also restricts the utility
  – Example:
    Mammals do not lay eggs
    Penguins lay eggs
    → Penguins are not mammals

• We will get to know formalisms that support negation
  – and learn how to do reasoning with them
What we Cannot Express (up to Now)

• The missing negation perfectly fits the AAA principle
  – Anybody can say anything about anything
• ...and the Open World Assumption

• Any new knowledge will always fit to the knowledge that is already there
  – This principle is called “monotonicity”
What we Cannot Express (up to Now)

- Kurt Gödel (1906-1978)
- Logic systems are either
  - not very powerful or
  - not free of contradictions
- RDF Schema belongs to the first class
What we Cannot Express (up to Now)

- Jim Hendler (*1957)
- "A little semantics goes a long way."
Just a moment

• "We cannot produce any contradictions"
• so what about
  :Peter a :Baby .
  :Peter a :Adult .

• That is a contradiction!

• Well, it is – for us human beings
• But a computer will not know
  – Non-unique name assumption!
here be dragons...

Semantic Web Technologies (This lecture)

Technical Foundations

Berners-Lee (2009): Semantic Web and Linked Data
Questions?