

RIF: A Standard Rules Language for the Semantic Web

Jos de Bruijn

Faculty of Computer Science
Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy
debruijn AT inf.unibz.it

Ontolog Conference Call – 26 June 2008

(Semantic) Web Languages (I)

Data Language

- ▶ Resource Description Framework (RDF)
 - ▶ *subject – predicate – object*
 - ▶ a rdf:type c, a p b

Ontology Languages

- ▶ RDF Schema
 - ▶ Semantically extends RDF, defining semantics for `subClassOf`, `subPropertyOf`, `domain`, `range`
- ▶ OWL Full
 - ▶ Semantically extends RDFS, defining semantics for `intersectionOf`, `unionOf`, etc.
- ▶ OWL Lite/DL
 - ▶ Syntactical subsets of RDF, different semantics
 - ▶ Semantics defined in terms of *abstract syntax*

(Semantic) Web Languages (II)

Web Rule Language

- ▶ Rule Interchange Format (RIF) BLD (Basic Logic Dialect)
 - ▶ Horn rules with equality for the Web
 - ▶ *Not* based on RDF or OWL

Rules, Ontologies, and Data

- ▶ RDF graphs as data sets for rules
- ▶ RDFS/OWL ontologies as data models for rules
- ▶ Rules as extension to RDFS or OWL ontologies
- ▶ Solution: define interoperation between RIF, RDF, and OWL by connecting their semantics

Contents

Syntax

Semantics

Embedding

Importing RDF/OWL

A RIF document (ruleset) R may reference (*Import*) RDF/OWL documents S_i :

`Import(graphLocation profile)`

- ▶ *graphLocation*: location of the RDF graph
- ▶ *profile*: how to interpret RDF graph (cf. entailment regime)
 - ▶ e.g., simple entailment, RDFS, OWL DL
 - ▶ Determines semantic notions to be used, model, satisfiability, entailment

A *RIF-RDF combination* is a tuple $C = \langle R, \{S_1, \dots, S_n\} \rangle$

A *RIF-OWL DL combination* is a tuple $C = \langle R, \{O_1, \dots, O_n\} \rangle$,

where O_1, \dots, O_n are OWL ontologies in abstract syntax form; R does not have variables in class/property positions.

Statements in RIF versus Statements in RDF/OWL

RDF/OWL symbol		RIF symbol	
IRI	<http:/...>	IRI	"http:/..." ^{^^rif:iri}
Literal w/o language tag	"abcde"	String	"abcde" ^{^^xs:string}
Literal w language tag	"abcde"@en	rif:text constant	"abcde@en" ^{^^rif:text}
Typed literal	"1" ^{^^xs:int}	Constant	"1" ^{^^xs:int}
Blank node	_:x	Existential variable (in rule body)	?x

RDF/OWL statement		RIF statement	
RDF Triple	s p o	Frame formula	s[p -> o]
OWL class membership	a type(C)	Frame	a[rdftype -> C]
OWL property value	a value(p b)	Frame	a[p -> b]

Example

Consider the RDF graph S :

```
ex:john    ex:brotherOf    _:x .
_:x        ex:parentOf     ex:mary .
```

And the ruleset R :

```
forall ?x, ?y, ?z (?x[ex:uncleOf -> ?z] :-
  And(?x[ex:brotherOf -> ?y] ?y[ex:parentOf -> ?z]))
```

From the combination $\langle R, \{S\} \rangle$ we can derive the frame formula

```
ex:john[ex:uncleOf -> ex:mary]
```

But also the triple

```
ex:john ex:uncleOf ex:mary
```

Semantics of Combinations (I)

- ▶ Three model theories: RIF, RDF, and OWL DL
 - ▶ RDF model theory has several notions of *interpretation* (and satisfiability, entailment): simple, RDF, RDFS, D, OWL Full
 - ▶ Semantics of combination accommodates all these notions; selection of notion based on *profile*
- ▶ Semantics of combination based on *connection* of model theories
 - ▶ RIF interpretations interpret rule sets
 - ▶ RDF interpretations interpret RDF graphs
 - ▶ OWL interpretations interpret OWL ontologies
 - ▶ Connection of model theories through *conditions* on interpretations

Semantics of Combinations (II)

- ▶ A common-rif-rdf-interpretation is a pair (\mathbf{I}, I) , where \mathbf{I} is an RIF interpretation, I is an RDF interpretation, such that a number of conditions hold, e.g.:
 - ▶ Domains of interpretation are the same
 - ▶ Interpretation of IRIs and well-typed literals is the same
 - ▶ Interpretation of triples corresponds with interpretation of frame formulas
- ▶ (\mathbf{I}, I) satisfies a combination $C = \langle R, \{S_1, \dots, S_n\} \rangle$ if \mathbf{I} satisfies R and I satisfies all S_1, \dots, S_n
 - ▶ (\mathbf{I}, I) rdfs-satisfies C if I is an rdfs-interpretation
 - ▶ (\mathbf{I}, I) D-satisfies C if I is a D-interpretation
 - ▶ (\mathbf{I}, I) OWL-Full-satisfies C if I is an OWL-Full-interpretation
- ▶ C entails a graph T if for every (\mathbf{I}, I) that satisfies C , I satisfies T
- ▶ C entails a RIF condition formula ϕ if for every (\mathbf{I}, I) that satisfies C , \mathbf{I} satisfies ϕ

Embedding RIF-RDF combinations

- ▶ Simple, RDF, and RDFS entailment for combinations may be embedded into RIF
- ▶ Given a combination $C = \langle R, \{S_1, \dots, S_n\} \rangle$, RIF condition ϕ , and graph T
 - ▶ Embed S_i as sets of facts, Skolemizing blank nodes ($tr_R(S_i)$)
 - ▶ Embed R as R
 - ▶ Axiomatize profile ($R^{simple}, R^{RDF}, R^{RDFS}$)
 - ▶ Embed ϕ as ϕ
 - ▶ Embed T as conjunction of frame formulas, with blank nodes as existentially quantified variables ($tr_Q(t)$)
- ▶ Then,
 - ▶ C rdfs-entails ϕ iff $R \cup R^{RDFS} \cup tr_R(S_1) \cup \dots \cup tr_R(S_n)$ entails ϕ and
 - ▶ C rdfs-entails T iff $R \cup R^{RDFS} \cup tr_R(S_1) \cup \dots \cup tr_R(S_n)$ entails $tr_Q(T)$

Example

Consider the combination $C = \langle R, \{S\} \rangle$, with S :

```
ex:john      ex:memberOf      ex:studentCouncil .  
ex:Student  rdfs:subClassOf  ex:Person .
```

and R :

```
Forall ?x (?x[rdf:type -> ex:Student] :-  
  ?x[ex:memberOf -> ex:studentCouncil])
```

and the graph T :

```
_:x rdf:type ex:Person
```

Example (cont'd)

$tr_R(S)$:

```
ex:john[ex:memberOf -> ex:studentCouncil]
ex:Student[rdfs:subClassOf -> ex:Person]
```

R^{RDFS} includes:

```
forall ?x ?y ?z (?z[rdf:type -> ?y] :-
  And (?x[rdfs:subClassOf -> ?y] ?z[rdf:type -> ?x])),
```

$tr_Q(T)$:

```
Exists ?x (?x[rdf:type -> ex:Person])
```

As expected, $R \cup R^{RDFS} \cup tr_R(S)$ entails $tr_Q(T)$

Bibliography

- ▶ RIF Basic Logic Dialect, H. Boley, M. Kifer, eds. Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/rif-bld/>.
- ▶ RIF RDF and OWL compatibility, J. de Bruijn, ed. Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/rif-rdf-owl/>.
- ▶ RDF Semantics, P. Hayes, Editor. Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/rdf-mt/>.
- ▶ OWL Web Ontology Language Semantics and Abstract Syntax, P. F. Patel-Schneider, P. Hayes, I. Horrocks, Editors. Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/owl-semantics/>.