

An Introduction to Symbolic Artificial Intelligence Applied to Multimedia

Guilherme Lima, Rodrigo Costa, Marcio Ferreira Moreno
Guilherme.Lima@ibm.com, Rodrigo.Costa@ibm.com, mmoreno@br.ibm.com

IBM Research, Brazil

2019-11-08

Abstract

In this chapter, we give an introduction to symbolic artificial intelligence (AI) and discuss its relation and application to multimedia. We begin by defining what symbolic AI is, what distinguishes it from non-symbolic approaches, such as machine learning, and how it can be used in the construction of advanced multimedia applications. We then introduce description logic (DL) and use it to discuss symbolic representation and reasoning. DL is the logical underpinning of OWL, the most successful family of ontology languages. After discussing DL, we present OWL and related Semantic Web technologies, such as RDF and SPARQL. We conclude the chapter by discussing a hybrid model for multimedia representation, called Hyperknowledge. Throughout the text, we make references to technologies and extensions specifically designed to solve the kinds of problems that arise in multimedia representation.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Description Logic(s)	4
2.1	Syntax	5
2.2	Semantics	11
2.3	Reasoning tasks	18
2.4	Rules	20
2.5	Other DLs	20
3	Semantic Web Technologies	22
3.1	RDF	23
3.2	SPARQL	26
3.3	OWL	29
4	A Hybrid Approach: Hyperknowledge	36
4.1	Hyperknowledge in a nutshell	37
4.2	HSL and HyQL	38
4.3	Hyperknowledge tools	43
5	Further Reading	45

1 Introduction

A classic problem in multimedia representation and understanding is the *semantic gap* problem. It states that there is a big representational gap between the audiovisual signals that compose multimedia objects and the concepts represented by these signals. For instance, the dominant color and movement trajectory of a given set of pixels in a video clip, which are low-level characteristics of the clip, do not provide much information about the *meaning* of the set of pixels—at least not to computers. But recent developments in artificial intelligence (AI) are changing that.

Backed by large training datasets, current machine learning methods are able to extrapolate complex patterns from low-level multimedia data. These patterns are embodied in trained models which can be used to classify or identify persons and objects with reasonable speed and accuracy in images, audio clips, and video clips. But being able to identify persons and objects in multimedia data only solves half of the problem. To emulate human cognition and truly understand a scene—for instance, to determine who is doing what and the consequences of these actions—computers need additional information: they need common sense knowledge and domain knowledge, and also the capacity to infer new knowledge from preexisting knowledge. This is where symbolic AI comes in.

The basic idea of symbolic AI is to describe the world, its entities, and their relationships using a formal language—a language that can be conveniently manipulated by computers—and to develop efficient algorithms to query and deduce things from these formal descriptions. To illustrate the kind of applications enabled by the combination of symbolic AI and multimedia consider Figure 1.




Figure 1: *The Death of Marat* (detail), by Jacques-Louis David, 1793. (WikiMedia)

Suppose we are given this picture and suppose the only thing we know about it is what we can infer from the image. We can see it depicts Jean-Paul Marat (assuming we can identify him), a stab wound, a blood-tainted knife, and a letter addressed to him and signed by Charlotte Corday (assuming we can read the contents of the letter). The analogy here is that we have extracted these information—or *facts*—using pattern matching. Although such basic facts allow us to perform simple computational tasks, such as keyword-based image classification and search, they are not enough to understand the image.

To truly *understand* what is being depicted in Figure 1 we need more than basic facts. We need (1) general knowledge about the world, (2) specific knowledge about the persons named, and (3) the capacity to combine general and specific knowledge with the facts extracted from the image in order to infer new facts.

Now suppose we are given (1), (2), and (3). From our general knowledge of the world, and possibly by further analyzing the image, we can assert with high confidence that Marat is holding the letter and that he has a stab wound on the chest. From this and from the blood-tainted knife depicted below him, we might infer that the depicted knife is the object that caused the wound. Since knives are not autonomous beings, we might also conclude that someone (possibly himself) stabbed Marat in the chest. But who and why?

To answer these questions we will need more information. Suppose we are told that Marat was a journalist and political agitator, and one of the leaders of a radical political faction in the Reign of Terror period of the French Revolution (c. 1793). Suppose we are also told that Charlotte Corday, who signed the letter, was a declared political enemy of Marat—she blamed him for a number of killings in Paris and other cities and believed that he was a grave threat to the French Republic. Under the light of these new facts, we can conclude that Figure 1 looks like the scene of a political murder.

By combining this conclusion with the additional fact that Charlotte Corday is known to have murdered Jean-Paul Marat with a knife while he was in his bathtub, holding a letter from her, we can infer that Figure 1 must be a graphical representation of this incident, that is, of the politically motivated assassination of Jean-Paul Marat by Charlotte Corday.

The derivation of this last fact from the visual patterns of Figure 1 has only been possible because we have had access not only to basic facts extracted from the image, but also to facts about the world (common sense knowledge) and about the depicted objects and persons (domain knowledge), and because we could combine all of these facts and make inferences.

One of the main goals of symbolic AI is to enable the representation and manipulation of pieces of knowledge by computers in ways that resemble or emulate the kind of manipulations performed by humans—manipulations similar to the considerations that enabled us to determine the true meaning of Figure 1. The combination of this capacity with multimedia opens up many possibilities. For instance, the Marat’s murder example is an application of automated image understanding. Two related applications are video understanding and audio understanding, which are

often more complex as they involve the extraction of temporal information.

Other applications of symbolic AI to multimedia include the semantic retrieval, classification, recommendation, and inspection of multimedia data—for example, to automatically identify suspicious activity in surveillance videos, generate age ratings for music and movies, and identify risk factors for diseases in medical images and videos. Although we could list many other interesting applications, and we will discuss some of these as we go along, here our focus is not on the applications themselves. Our focus is on the principles and technologies that enabled their conception in the first place.

In this chapter, we give an introduction to symbolic AI from the perspective of multimedia. We begin, in Section 2, with description logic (DL). One reason for doing so is that DL allows us to introduce symbolic representation in an abstract setting, without the complications and biases of a particular technology. Another reason is that DL is itself a practical technology: it is the logical underpinning of the most expressive family of ontology languages, the OWL family.

After introducing DL, in the next section (Section 3) we discuss the incarnation of symbolic AI on the Web, the so-called *Semantic Web*. We lay out the Semantic Web vision, its main enabling technologies (RDF, OWL, SPARQL, SWRL, etc.), and the relation of these technologies with the notions discussed in Section 2. Throughout both sections, whenever possible we motivate the discussion with examples from the multimedia domain. We also strive to present or mention methodologies and extensions specifically designed to solve the kinds of problems that arise in multimedia representation.

We conclude the chapter with the discussion of a hybrid model for multimedia representation (Section 4). This model, called *Hyperknowledge* (HK), generalizes a classic hypermedia model with the notions of concept nodes and semantic links. By doing so, the Hyperknowledge model allows for the integrated representation and processing of multimedia content together with their semantic description.

Suggestions for further reading are listed at the end of the chapter (Section 5).

2 Description Logic(s)

The word logic has many meanings and no completely satisfying definition. We can understand logic as a system for deducing new statements from previously asserted statements. There are many kinds of logics. One of the simplest is propositional logic, which deals with statements constructed by means of the propositional connectives $\neg$ (not), $\wedge$ (and), $\vee$ (or), $\rightarrow$ (if-then), and $\leftrightarrow$ (if and only if). First-order logic (FOL), often used to formalize mathematical statements, extends propositional logic with the notions of variables, constants, functions, predicates, and quantifiers. There are still further extensions, such as second order logic, and logics which adopt slightly different approaches, such as modal and fuzzy logics.

The term “description logic” (DL) refers not to a single logic but to a *family* of logics. That is why we sometimes write description logics (plural). The logics in

this family come in many flavors, but most of them share the same core modeling features—they speak of individuals, concepts, and roles. Here we will focus on the description logic *SROIQ* [16]. Most of today’s mainstream DLs are sublanguages of *SROIQ*, which is also the basis of the ontology language OWL 2 DL [35]. We will follow the usual approach for presenting a formal language. We begin by giving the form (syntax) of *SROIQ* statements together with their intuitive meaning. We will define their exact meaning (semantics) later.

2.1 Syntax

We assume we are given three sets of names, N_I , N_C , and N_R , containing names for individuals, concepts, and roles, respectively. The idea is that individuals will represent real-world entities, concepts will represent characteristics of these entities, and roles will represent relations between (two) entities.¹ We assume further that the sets N_I , N_C , and N_R are pairwise disjoint, that is, that no name occurs at the same time in more than one of the sets. The three sets of names constitute the *vocabulary* of *SROIQ*—the basic building blocks which we will use to construct statements of the language.

We distinguish three kinds of statements, which in DL are also called *axioms*. These are grouped into *boxes*: ABox, TBox, and RBox. The latter, RBox, is available only in very expressive description logics, such as *SROIQ*, but all DL-based ontologies have a TBox and most of them an ABox. Together the three boxes comprise a *knowledge base*.

The ABox contains the *assertional knowledge*: statements that assert facts about specific individuals. For example, the concept assertion

Director(kubrick)

states that the individual named `kubrick` is a director. Similarly, the role assertion

directs(kubrick, space-odyssey)

states that the individual named `kubrick` directs the individual (that is, the movie) named `space-odyssey`.

The TBox and RBox contain the *terminological knowledge*: statements that assert facts concerning all individuals. The TBox contains statements about concepts and the RBox contains statements about roles. For example, the TBox axiom

Director $\sqsubseteq$ Person

states that the concept named `Director` is subsumed by the concept named `Person`, that is, that every individual who is a director is also a person. And the RBox axiom

directs $\sqsubseteq$ likes

¹For those versed in first-order logic, names of individuals are constants, names of concepts are unary predicates, and names of roles are binary predicates.

states that the role named `directs` is subsumed by the role named `likes`, that is, that directing a movie implies liking it.²

This last statement is, of course, questionable. Maybe some director out there in the world does not like some movie which he or she directed. But the point here is that the statements in a knowledge base, especially those in the TBox and RBox, formalize a particular *conceptualization* of a domain. The conceptualization reflects the world-view of its designer and may contain simplifications which make sense in its context of use.

Another property of a conceptualization is that it is language-independent—it is just a conceptual model which can be created in a modeling language such as UML. The term *ontology* is sometimes used to mean the instantiation of a conceptualization in a specific knowledge representation language. For our purposes, the term ontology will mean the same as knowledge base, that is, a set of axioms partitioned into ABox, TBox, and RBox.

Back to *SROIQ*, we will now define the precise syntax of the statements in each of the boxes.

RBox The *SROIQ* RBox contains statements that describe characteristics of roles and interdependencies between roles. A *role* is one of the following expressions:

1. A role name r , for some r in N_R .
2. An inverted role name r^- , for some r in N_R .
3. The universal role u .

A *role inclusion axiom* (RIA) is a statement of the form

$$r_1 \circ \dots \circ r_n \sqsubseteq r,$$

where $r_1, \dots, r_n$, and r are roles.

Here is an example RIA:

$$\text{fatherOf} \sqsubseteq \text{childOf}^-.$$

This RIA states that the role named `fatherOf` is subsumed by the inverse of the role named `childOf`, that is, that if a is a father of b then b is a child of a , for any individuals a and b . Similarly, the RIAs

$$\text{owns} \sqsubseteq \text{caresFor} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{owns} \circ \text{partOf} \sqsubseteq \text{owns}$$

²We can rewrite the last two statements in first-order logic as

$$\forall x(\text{Director}(x) \rightarrow \text{Person}(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad \forall x \forall y(\text{directs}(x, y) \rightarrow \text{likes}(x, y)).$$

The notation of DL is inspired by set theory and does not use variables.

state, respectively, that if a owns b then a cares for b (ownership implies care) and that if a owns b and b is part of c then a owns c (ownership of a part implies ownership of the whole).³ A finite set of RIAs is called a *role hierarchy*.

A *role characteristic* is a statement of one of the forms:

$$\text{Sym}(r), \quad \text{Asy}(r), \quad \text{Tra}(r), \quad \text{Ref}(r), \quad \text{Irr}(r), \quad \text{Dis}(r, s),$$

where r and s are any roles different from the universal role u . As we will see in Section 2.2, we interpret roles as binary relations and we use role characteristic statements to assert properties of these relations—namely, *symmetry*, *asymmetry*, *transitivity*, *reflexivity*, *irreflexivity*, and *disjointness*. We will give the precise meaning of these terms later.

A *SROIQ RBox* consists of a role hierarchy together with a finite set of role characteristics. The RBox is said to be *regular* if its role hierarchy is regular.

Regularity is desirable property because it guarantees the decidability of the resulting logic. In practice, this means that any reasoning task will terminate in a finite time (not loop indefinitely). We will not define what a regular RBox is, as that would take us a little too far afield, but we remark that regularity is a purely syntactical property: it can be obtained by restricting the form of the RIAs that occur in a given role hierarchy. See [16] for details.

TBox The *SROIQ TBox* contains statements relating concepts, or more precisely, concept expressions. A *concept (expression)* is one of the following:

1. A concept name C , for some C in N_C .
2. The *top* concept $\top$.
3. The *bottom* concept $\perp$.
4. The *nominal* concept $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ where $a_1, \dots, a_n$ are names in N_I .
5. The *negation* $\neg C$ where C is a concept expression.
6. The *intersection* $C \sqcap D$ where C and D are concept expressions.
7. The *union* $C \sqcup D$ where C and D are concept expressions.
8. The *existential* $\exists r.C$ where r is a role and C is a concept expression.
9. The *universal* $\forall r.C$ where r is a role and C is a concept expression.

³These three RIAs can be formalized in first-order logic as

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall x \forall y (\text{fatherOf}(x, y) \rightarrow \text{childOf}(y, x)) \\ &\forall x \forall y (\text{owns}(x, y) \rightarrow \text{caresFor}(x, y)) \\ &\forall x \forall y \forall z (\text{owns}(x, y) \wedge \text{partOf}(y, z) \rightarrow \text{owns}(x, z)). \end{aligned}$$

10. The *self-restriction* $\exists r.\text{Self}$ where r is a (simple) role.
11. The *at-least restriction* $\geq nr.C$ where n is a nonnegative integer, r is a (simple) role, and C is a concept expression.
12. The *at-most restriction* $\leq nr.C$ where n is a nonnegative integer, r is a (simple) role, and C is a concept expression.

Note that a concept expression, as defined above, is *not* a statement—it does not assert something which is either true or false. Instead, a concept expression constructs a new concept from the given expressions, which may be other concept expressions, individual names, or roles. This construction starts with the atomic concepts, that is, the concept names and the top $\top$ and bottom $\perp$ concepts (rules 1, 2, and 3 above).

Recall that a concept stands for a given characteristic of certain individuals. We can understand a concept C as the collection (or *set*) of all individuals possessing that given characteristic. So, the concept name `Actor` can be understood as the set of all individuals who are actors. Similarly, the top concept $\top$ can be understood as the set of all individuals whatsoever and the bottom concept $\perp$ as the empty set—the set containing no individuals at all.

A nominal concept $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ (rule 4) stands for the set containing precisely the individuals named by $a_1, \dots, a_n$. For instance, $\{\text{kubrick}, \text{scorsese}\}$ stands for the set whose only members are the individuals named `kubrick` and `scorsese`.

The negation, intersection, and union operations (rules 5, 6, and 7) allows us to construct new concepts from other concepts. For instance, the concept $\neg\text{Actor}$ stands for the set of all individuals who are not actors. Similarly, the concepts

$$\text{Actor} \sqcap \text{Female} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Actor} \sqcup \text{Director}$$

stand, respectively, for the set of individuals who are female actors and the set of individuals who are actors or directors (or both). Note that these operations apply to any concept expressions, not just names. So, for example, the complex concept

$$\text{Director} \sqcap \neg(\text{Female} \sqcup \{\text{kubrick}, \text{scorsese}\})$$

stands for directors who are neither female nor the individuals named `kubrick` or `scorsese`.

The existential and universal quantifiers (rules 8 and 9) take a role and a concept and construct a new concept. For instance, the concepts

$$\exists \text{knows}.\text{Actor} \quad \text{and} \quad \forall \text{directs}.\{\text{a-bronx-tale}, \text{good-shepherd}\}$$

stand, respectively, for the set individuals who know *some* actor, and for the set individuals who either haven't directed any film or directed exactly the films named `a-bronx-tale` and `good-shepherd`. As we will see in the next section, by the way

the $\forall$ operator is defined, if we want to exclude the “haven’t directed any film part” we must write

$$(\exists \text{directs}.\top) \sqcap (\forall \text{directs}.\{\text{a-bronx-tale}, \text{good-shepherd}\}),$$

which incidentally specifies the set $\{\text{de-niro}\}$.

The self-restriction operator (rule 10) takes a (simple) role r and constructs the concept containing all individuals which are related to themselves via r . For example, the concept $\exists \text{loves}.\text{Self}$ stands for the set of all individuals who love themselves. Clearly, this operator only makes sense when applied to roles which connect the same kind of entity, for example, persons to persons, movies to movies, etc.

The requirement of r being *simple* in the definition of the self-restriction operator is related to the problem of regularity mentioned earlier. The roles that appear in an *SROIQ* RBox are classified into simple and non-simple depending on the form of the RIAs in which they occur. Informally, the non-simple roles are those which are “created” by role chains of length greater than one; the remaining roles are considered simple. We assume that the r and s occurring in role characteristics of the form $\text{lrr}(r)$, $\text{Asy}(r)$, and $\text{Dis}(r, s)$ are always simple roles. See [16] for details.

The two remaining concept constructors of *SROIQ* are the cardinality restriction operators $\geq$ and $\leq$ (rules 11 and 12). Both take a nonnegative integer n , a simple role r , and concept C , and construct a new concept containing all individuals which are r -connected to at-least or at-most n individuals in C . For example, the concepts

$$\geq 2 \text{knows}.\text{Actor} \quad \text{and} \quad \leq 5 \text{directs}.\top$$

stand, respectively, for the set of individuals who know two or more actors, and the set of individuals who directed five or less movies.

We are finally in a position to define what a *SROIQ* TBox is. The *SROIQ* TBox is a finite set of *general concept inclusion axioms* (GCIs) where each GCI is a statement of the form

$$C \sqsubseteq D,$$

for arbitrary concepts C and D . As in RIAs, the symbol $\sqsubseteq$ in GCIs stands for subsumption. So, for instance,

$$\text{Actor} \sqsubseteq \text{Person} \quad \text{and} \quad \exists \text{directs}.\top \sqsubseteq \exists \text{knows}.\text{Actor}$$

state, respectively, that the every individual who is an actor is also a person, and that every individual who directs some film knows some actor.⁴

⁴To translate a GCI to first-order logic we first translate the concepts on each side of the $\sqsubseteq$ as formulas with a single free variable, say x . The $\sqsubseteq$ becomes an implication and the whole formula is then enclosed in a $\forall x$. For example, the last two GCIs are translated as:

$$\forall x(\text{Actor}(x) \rightarrow \text{Person}(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad \forall x(\exists y(\text{directs}(x, y) \wedge \top(y)) \rightarrow \exists z(\text{knows}(x, z) \wedge \text{Actor}(z))).$$

ABox The *SROIQ* ABox contains the *assertional statements*: statements that assert facts about specific individuals. These statements have one of the forms:

$$C(a), \quad r(a, b), \quad \neg r(a, b), \quad a \approx b, \quad a \neq b,$$

where C is a concept, r is a role, and a and b are names of individuals.

The *concept assertion* $\text{Actor} \sqcap \text{Director}(\text{de-niro})$ states that the individual named *de-niro* is an *instance* of the concept named $\text{Actor} \sqcap \text{Director}$, that is, that this individual is both an actor and a director.

The *role assertion* $\text{directs}(\text{kubrick}, \text{dr-strangelove})$ states that the individual named *kubrick* is *directs*-connected to the individual *dr-strangelove*. Similarly, the *negated role assertion* $\neg \text{directs}(\text{kubrick}, \text{taxi-driver})$ states that *kubrick* is not *directs*-connected to *taxi-driver*.

The *equality assertion* $\text{kubrick} \approx \text{stanley}$ and the *inequality assertion* $\text{kubrick} \neq \text{taxi-driver}$ state, respectively, that *kubrick* and *stanley* name the same individual, and that *kubrick* and *taxi-driver* do not name the same individual.

Knowledge base (KB) A *SROIQ* knowledge base is the union of the three boxes: RBox, TBox, and ABox. A knowledge base is said to be regular if its RBox is regular.

The movie facts KB We conclude this section on the syntax of *SROIQ* with an example. The knowledge base below collects some of the *movie facts* we have been discussing. Note that the usual interpretation of these statements—the interpretation in which *kubrick* names the famous director—is just one of many possible interpretations. We will have more to say about interpretations next.

<i>ABox</i>	
$\text{Director}(\text{kubrick})$	“kubrick is a director”
$\text{Actor} \sqcap \text{Director}(\text{de-niro})$	“de-niro is an actor and a director”
$\geq 2\text{knows}.\text{Actor}(\text{stanley})$	“stanley knows at least two actors”
$\text{directs}(\text{kubrick}, \text{space-odyssey})$	“kubrick directed space-odyssey”
$\neg \text{directs}(\text{kubrick}, \text{taxi-driver})$	“kubrick did not direct taxi-driver”
$\text{kubrick} \approx \text{stanley}$	“kubrick and stanley are the same individual”
$\text{kubrick} \neq \text{de-niro}$	“kubrick and de-niro are not the same individual”
<i>TBox</i>	
$\text{Director} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{directs}.\top$	“a director directs something”
$\exists \text{directs}.\top \sqsubseteq \text{Director}$	“anything which directs is a director”
$\text{Director} \sqsubseteq \text{Person}$	“a director is a person”
$\text{Director} \sqsubseteq \geq 1\text{knows}.\text{Actor}$	“a director knows at least one actor”
$(\exists \text{directs}.\top) \sqcap (\forall \text{directs}.\{\text{a-bronx-tale}, \text{good-shepherd}\}) \sqsubseteq \{\text{de-niro}\}$	“anything which directs exactly {a-bronx-tale, good-shepherd} must be a {de-niro}”

<i>RBox</i>	
$\text{directs} \sqsubseteq \text{likes}$	“directing implies liking”
$\text{directs} \circ \text{actsIn}^- \sqsubseteq \text{knows}$	“if x directs y in which z acts, then x knows z ”

2.2 Semantics

A knowledge base, as defined previously, is basically a set well-formed strings, called statements or axioms. The meaning of each of these strings depends ultimately on the meaning of the names which occur in them. To see this, consider the axiom $\text{Director}(\text{kubrick})$. This axiom will be true if we interpret the names Director and kubrick as “the property of being a movie director” and “Stanley Kubrick”, respectively. If however we interpret Director as “the property of being an even number” and kubrick as “the number 37”, then the assertion $\text{Director}(\text{kubrick})$ ceases to be true. This example is artificial but serves to illustrate our point that the meaning is derived from the interpretation of the names. We will now define this notion of interpretation precisely.

Interpretation An *interpretation* $\mathcal{I}$ consists of two things:

1. A nonempty set $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ called the *domain* or *universe* of discourse.
2. A function $\square^{\mathcal{I}}$ from the vocabulary sets N_I , N_C , and N_R such that:⁵
 - (a) If $a \in N_I$ then $a^{\mathcal{I}} \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$.
 - (b) If $C \in N_C$ then $C^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$.
 - (c) If $r \in N_R$ then $r^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$.

In other words, an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ fixes a domain of discourse $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$, which can be any nonempty set, and maps the names of individuals into elements of the domain, the names of concepts into subsets of the domain, and the names of roles into binary relations on the domain.

We reserve the term *individual* to refer to the semantic counterpart of an individual name, that is, to an element of the domain. And we reserve the terms *concept extension* and *role extension* to refer, respectively, to the semantic counterparts of concepts and roles, that is, to unary and binary relations on the domain.

We now lift the interpretation function $\square^{\mathcal{I}}$ so that it can be applied to arbitrary roles and concepts:

$$u^{\mathcal{I}} = \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \tag{1}$$

$$(r^-)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{\langle \delta', \delta \rangle \mid \langle \delta, \delta' \rangle \in r^{\mathcal{I}}\} \tag{2}$$

$$\top^{\mathcal{I}} = \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \tag{3}$$

⁵Note that $x^{\mathcal{I}}$ is just a more compact way to write $\mathcal{I}(x)$ which is the usual syntax for function application.

$$\perp^I = \emptyset \quad (4)$$

$$\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}^I = \{a_1^I, \dots, a_n^I\} \quad (5)$$

$$(\neg C)^I = \Delta^I \setminus C^I \quad (6)$$

$$(C \sqcap D)^I = C^I \cap D^I \quad (7)$$

$$(C \sqcup D)^I = C^I \cup D^I \quad (8)$$

$$(\exists r.C)^I = \{\delta \in \Delta^I \mid \langle \delta, \delta' \rangle \in r^I \text{ and } \delta' \in C^I, \text{ for some } \delta' \in \Delta^I\} \quad (9)$$

$$(\forall r.C)^I = \{\delta \in \Delta^I \mid \text{if } \langle \delta, \delta' \rangle \in r^I \text{ then } \delta' \in C^I, \text{ for all } \delta' \in \Delta^I\} \quad (10)$$

$$(\exists r.\text{Self})^I = \{\delta \in \Delta^I \mid \langle \delta, \delta \rangle \in r^I\} \quad (11)$$

$$(\geq nr.C)^I = \{\delta \in \Delta^I \mid \#\{\delta' \in \Delta^I \mid \langle \delta, \delta' \rangle \in r^I \text{ and } \delta' \in C\} \geq n\} \quad (12)$$

$$(\leq nr.C)^I = \{\delta \in \Delta^I \mid \#\{\delta' \in \Delta^I \mid \langle \delta, \delta' \rangle \in r^I \text{ and } \delta' \in C\} \leq n\} \quad (13)$$

These equations can be read as follows:

1. The *universal role* u stands for (denotes) the relation which connects every two individuals in the domain.
2. The *inverted role* r^- denotes the same relation as r but with the first and second coordinates swapped.
3. The *top concept* $\top$ denotes the whole domain.
4. The *bottom concept* $\perp$ denotes the empty set.
5. The *nominal* $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ denotes the set containing precisely the individuals denoted by the names $a_1, \dots, a_n$.
6. The *negation* $\neg C$ denotes the difference between the domain and the set denoted by C , that is, the set of all individuals in Δ^I which are not in C^I .
7. The *intersection* $C \sqcap D$ denotes the intersection of the sets denoted by C and D , that is, the set of all individuals which belong to both C^I and D^I .
8. The *union* $C \sqcup D$ denotes the union of the sets denoted by C and D , that is, the set of all individuals which belong to at least one of C^I or D^I .
9. The *existential* $\exists r.C$ denotes the set of all individuals which are connected via relation r^I to some individual in C^I .
10. The *universal* $\forall r.C$ denotes the set of all individuals a such that if a is connected to some individual b via r^I then b is in C^I . A consequence of this conditional form is that any individual which is not connected to another via r^I will be in the resulting set (as the implication is vacuously true).⁶
11. The *self restriction* $\exists r.\text{Self}$ denotes the set of all individuals which are connected to themselves via relation r^I .

12. The *at-least restriction* $\geq n.rC$ denotes the set of all individuals which are connected via relation r^I to at least n individuals in C^I .
13. The *at-most restriction* $\leq n.rC$ denotes the set of all individuals which are connected via relation r^I to at most n individuals in C^I .

We now turn to the problem of defining the truth-value (truth or falsity) of an axiom under a given interpretation.

Satisfiability An interpretation I *satisfies* (or *is a model of*) an axiom α , in symbols $I \models \alpha$, under the following conditions:

1. (RIA) $I \models r_1 \circ \dots \circ r_n \sqsubseteq r$ iff⁷ for every sequence $\delta_0, \delta_1, \dots, \delta_n$ in Δ^I :
 $\langle \delta_0, \delta_1 \rangle \in r_1^I, \langle \delta_1, \delta_2 \rangle \in r_2^I, \dots, \text{ and } \langle \delta_{n-1}, \delta_n \rangle \in r_n^I \text{ implies } \langle \delta_0, \delta_n \rangle \in r^I,$
that is, iff every path in Δ^I that traverses $r_1^I, \dots, r_n^I$ (in this order) has a direct r^I -shortcut.
2. (Role symmetry) $I \models \text{Sym}(r)$ iff r^I is a symmetric relation, that is, iff $\langle \delta_1, \delta_2 \rangle \in r^I$ implies $\langle \delta_2, \delta_1 \rangle \in r^I$ and vice versa, for any δ_1, δ_2 in Δ^I .
3. (Role asymmetry) $I \models \text{Asy}(r)$ iff r^I is an asymmetric relation, that is, iff $\langle \delta_1, \delta_2 \rangle \in r^I$ implies $\langle \delta_2, \delta_1 \rangle \notin r^I$, for any δ_1, δ_2 in Δ^I .
4. (Role transitivity) $I \models \text{Tra}(r)$ iff r^I is a transitive relation, that is, iff $\langle \delta_1, \delta_2 \rangle \in r^I$ and $\langle \delta_2, \delta_3 \rangle \in r^I$ implies $\langle \delta_1, \delta_3 \rangle \in r^I$, for any $\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3$ in Δ^I .
5. (Role reflexivity) $I \models \text{Ref}(r)$ iff r^I is a reflexive relation, that is, iff $\langle \delta, \delta \rangle \in r^I$, for any δ in Δ^I .
6. (Role irreflexivity) $I \models \text{Irr}(r)$ iff r^I is an irreflexive relation, that is, iff $\langle \delta, \delta \rangle \notin r^I$, for any δ in Δ^I .
7. (Role disjointness) $I \models \text{Dis}(r, s)$ iff $r^I \cap s^I = \emptyset$, that is, iff no two individuals are simultaneously r^I -connected and s^I -connected.
8. (GCI) $I \models C \sqsubseteq D$ iff $C^I \subseteq D^I$, that is, iff every individual of C^I is also an individual of D^I .
9. (Concept assertion) $I \models C(a)$ iff $a^I \in C^I$, that is, if the individual denoted by a belongs to the extension of concept C .

⁶Recall that in classical logic $A \rightarrow B$ is equivalent to $(\neg A) \vee B$. So, we can restate equation (10) as follows:

$$(\forall r.C)^I = \{\delta \in \Delta^I \mid \langle \delta, \delta' \rangle \notin r^I \text{ or } \delta' \in C^I, \text{ for all } \delta' \in \Delta^I\}.$$


Clearly, any δ which is not r -connected to some δ' satisfies the above condition.

⁷We will write “iff” as an abbreviation for “if and only if”.

10. (Role assertion) $\mathcal{I} \models r(a, b)$ iff $\langle a^{\mathcal{I}}, b^{\mathcal{I}} \rangle \in r^{\mathcal{I}}$, that is, iff $a^{\mathcal{I}}$ is $r^{\mathcal{I}}$ -connected to $b^{\mathcal{I}}$.
11. (Negated role assertion) $\mathcal{I} \models \neg r(a, b)$ iff $\langle a^{\mathcal{I}}, b^{\mathcal{I}} \rangle \notin r^{\mathcal{I}}$.
12. (Equality assertion) $\mathcal{I} \models a \approx b$ iff $a^{\mathcal{I}} = b^{\mathcal{I}}$, that is, iff $a^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $b^{\mathcal{I}}$ are the same element of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$.
13. (Inequality assertion) $\mathcal{I} \models a \not\approx b$ iff $a^{\mathcal{I}} \neq b^{\mathcal{I}}$.

Now that we have defined when an interpretation satisfies an axiom, we can extend this notion to apply to a knowledge base (set of axioms). An interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ *satisfies* (or *is a model of*) a knowledge base $\mathcal{KB}$, in symbols $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{KB}$, iff $\mathcal{I} \models \alpha$, for every axiom α in $\mathcal{KB}$. A knowledge base is said to be *satisfiable* or *consistent* if it has a model, that is, if there is some interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ which satisfies it; otherwise, the knowledge base is said to be *unsatisfiable* or *inconsistent*.

To make the discussion of interpretations more concrete, consider the following interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ for the movie facts KB presented at the end of the last section:



The domain $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ in this case consists of seven distinct individuals, $i_1, \dots, i_7$, and the names that occur in the movie facts KB are mapped as shown above. The following remarks are in order:

- Some individuals in the domain $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ might not have corresponding names: i_7 is not named by any name in the movie facts KB.

- Two distinct names might denote the same thing: `kubrick` and `stanley` denote the individual i_1 .
- Concept names are mapped into subsets of the domain Δ^I : `Director`, `Actor`, and `Person` denote sets of individuals.
- Role names are mapped into binary relations on the domain Δ^I : `knows`, `directs`, `likes`, and `actsIn` denote sets of ordered pairs of individuals. The individuals i_2 and i_5 stand in relation `directs` ^{I} to each other (in this other) because the pair $\langle i_2, i_5 \rangle$ is in `directs` ^{I} . Binary relations can be conveniently depicted as directed graphs. The graphs corresponding to the relations `knows` ^{I} , `directs` ^{I} , `likes` ^{I} , and `actsIn` ^{I} are shown in the boxes above.

Let $\mathcal{KB}$ stands for the movie facts KB and let $\mathcal{I}$ stands for the previous interpretation. The natural question to ask is whether $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{KB}$, that is, whether the previous interpretation satisfies the movie facts KB. This will be the case only if $\mathcal{I} \models \alpha$ for every axiom α in the movie facts KB. Let us check that.

We begin by checking the movie facts ABox. Clearly,

$$\mathcal{I} \models \text{Director}(\text{kubrick})$$

because $\text{kubrick}^I \in \text{Director}^I$, that is, because $i_1 \in \{i_1, i_2\}$, as required by the definition of satisfiability of concept assertions. Similarly,

$$\mathcal{I} \models \neg \text{directs}(\text{kubrick}, \text{taxi-driver})$$

because $\langle \text{kubrick}^I, \text{taxi-driver}^I \rangle \notin \text{directs}^I$. The remaining axioms in the ABox are also satisfied by $\mathcal{I}$, as the reader can easily check.

We will now check the movie facts TBox. We have that

$$\mathcal{I} \models \text{Director} \sqsubseteq \text{Person}$$

since every individual in the set Director^I is also in the set Person^I . It is also the case that

$$\mathcal{I} \models (\exists \text{directs}.\top) \sqcap (\forall \text{directs}.\{\text{a-bronx-tale}, \text{good-shepherd}\}) \sqsubseteq \{\text{de-niro}\}$$

because:

1. de-niro^I is connected via relation `directs` ^{I} to some member of $\top^I$ (that is, the whole domain).
2. Everything to which de-niro^I is `directs` ^{I} -connected is an element of the set $\{\text{a-bronx-tale}^I, \text{good-shepherd}^I\}$.
3. The previous assertions (1) and (2) hold for no other individual besides de-niro^I .

The rest of the axioms in the movie facts TBox are also satisfied by $\mathcal{I}$. (Again, we leave these checks to the reader.)

The last thing to check are the axioms in the movie facts RBox. We have that

$$\mathcal{I} \models \text{directs} \sqsubseteq \text{likes}$$

holds because every pair in relation $\text{directs}^{\mathcal{I}}$ is also in relation $\text{likes}^{\mathcal{I}}$. One way to determine whether or not

$$\mathcal{I} \models \text{directs} \circ \text{actsIn}^- \sqsubseteq \text{knows}$$

holds is to search for three (not necessarily distinct) individuals x, y, z such that $\langle x, y \rangle \in \text{directs}^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $\langle z, y \rangle \in \text{actsIn}^{\mathcal{I}}$ but $\langle x, z \rangle \notin \text{knows}^{\mathcal{I}}$. If we can find such three individuals then the assertion is false (as we just found a counterexample). Otherwise, if we cannot find such three individuals, the assertion is true. In the case of the interpretation $\mathcal{I}$, there is only one possible choice of individuals that satisfies the first two requirements, namely, $x = i_2$, $y = i_5$, and $z = i_7$. Under this choice the third requirement is also satisfied since $\langle i_2, i_7 \rangle \in \text{knows}^{\mathcal{I}}$. Hence the assertion is true, that is, the axiom $\text{directs} \circ \text{actsIn}^- \sqsubseteq \text{knows}$ is satisfied by the interpretation $\mathcal{I}$.

Since $\mathcal{I}$ satisfies all axioms in each of the boxes of the movie facts KB, we conclude that answer to our original question (namely, whether or not $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{KB}$) is positive. That is, it is indeed the case that the interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ satisfies the movie facts KB, and consequently, the movie facts KB is consistent (satisfiable).

Two related questions concerning the movie facts KB are the following: Can we find an interpretation $\mathcal{J}$ that does not satisfies the movie facts KB? And how can we modify the movie facts KB so that it becomes inconsistent (unsatisfiable)?

A simple answer to the first question is to take an interpretation $\mathcal{J}$ which is identical to the previous interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ but in which we map $\text{kubrick}^{\mathcal{J}}$ and $\text{stanley}^{\mathcal{J}}$ to distinct individuals in the domain $\Delta^{\mathcal{J}}$. Clearly, under such interpretation the ABox axiom $\text{kubrick} \approx \text{stanley}$ does not hold, and so $\mathcal{J} \not\models \mathcal{KB}$.

Concerning the second question, in order to make the movie facts KB inconsistent we need to modify it in a way that prevents the construction of any satisfying interpretation. A trivial way to accomplish this is to add the inequality assertion $\text{kubrick} \neq \text{kubrick}$ to the KB. This axiom will be false under any interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ because whatever the choice of denotation for kubrick we will always have $\text{kubrick}^{\mathcal{I}} = \text{kubrick}^{\mathcal{I}}$. Of course, there are less trivial ways to obtain an inconsistent KB. (Can the reader find one involving a TBox axiom?)

This concludes our discussion of satisfiability. The whole point of a formal semantics is to define a *consequence relation* which allows us to determine when a knowledge base entails a given axiom. We will now define this consequence relation in terms of the satisfiability relation.

Logical consequence An axiom α is a *logical consequence* of (or *is entailed by*) a knowledge base $\mathcal{KB}$, in symbols $\mathcal{KB} \models \alpha$, iff $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{KB}$ implies $\mathcal{I} \models \alpha$, for every

interpretation $\mathcal{I}$. That is, iff every interpretation which is a model of the knowledge base $\mathcal{KB}$ is also a model of the axiom α .⁸

Using this definition of logical consequence we can determine precisely when an axiom α follows from a given set of axioms. As we discussed previously, some KBs are inconsistent in the sense that there is no interpretation satisfying all their axioms. The problem with having an inconsistent knowledge base is that, by definition, it entails any axiom. That is, if $\mathcal{KB}$ is inconsistent then the assertion “ $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{KB}$ implies $\mathcal{I} \models \alpha$ for any $\mathcal{I}$ ” is vacuously true because the antecedent of the implication, namely, $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{KB}$, is false. This amounts to the saying that states that anything follows from a contradiction. In practice, inconsistency is an indicator of modeling errors.

An important task in DL theory is thus to determine whether or not a given KB is consistent. We will discuss this and other so-called *reasoning tasks* in detail in the next section. Before that, however, let us end this section with an example of logical consequence.

Consider the following assertion about the movie facts $\mathcal{KB}$:

$$\mathcal{KB} \models \text{Actor} \sqsubseteq \text{Person}.$$

This assertion states that the axiom $\text{Actor} \sqsubseteq \text{Person}$ is logical consequence of the set of axioms which comprise the $\mathcal{KB}$. Is this assertion true? How can we prove it or disprove it?

Let us try to disprove it. What we need to do in this case is find an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ which satisfies all axioms in $\mathcal{KB}$ but which fails to satisfy $\text{Actor} \sqsubseteq \text{Person}$. For instance, take the previously discussed interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ for $\mathcal{KB}$ whose domain consists of the individuals $i_1, \dots, i_7$. As we have checked a few paragraphs ago, $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{KB}$. But it is not the case that every actor is a person under $\mathcal{I}$. For instance, $i_7 \in \text{Actor}^{\mathcal{I}}$ but $i_7 \notin \text{Person}^{\mathcal{I}}$. Hence $\mathcal{KB} \not\models \text{Actor} \sqsubseteq \text{Person}$, that is, the movie facts $\mathcal{KB}$ does not entail the axiom $\text{Actor} \sqsubseteq \text{Person}$.

It is usually harder to prove the opposite, that is, that a knowledge base entails a given axiom α . This amounts to showing that any attempt to find an interpretation which satisfies the knowledge base but falsifies α is doomed to failure. For instance, let us prove that the movie facts $\mathcal{KB}$ entails the axiom

$$\exists \text{likes}.\top(\text{de-niro}).$$

In other words, let us prove that that once we assume the axioms in the movie facts $\mathcal{KB}$ are true we must conclude, necessarily, that *de-niro* likes something.

Suppose there is an interpretation $\mathcal{J}$ which satisfies the movie facts $\mathcal{KB}$ but which does not satisfy the above axiom. From the assumption that $\mathcal{J} \models \mathcal{KB}$, we

⁸Note that the symbol $\models$ has different meanings depending on the kind of the object that occurs on its left-hand side. When this object is interpretation, like in $\mathcal{I} \models \alpha$, the symbol $\models$ stands for the satisfiability relation. When this object is a set of axioms, like in $\mathcal{KB} \models \alpha$, the symbol $\models$ denotes the logical consequence relation.

can infer that

$$\mathcal{I} \models \text{Actor} \sqcap \text{Director}(\text{de-niro}) \quad (14)$$

$$\mathcal{I} \models \text{Director} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{directs}.\top \quad (15)$$

$$\mathcal{I} \models \text{directs} \sqsubseteq \text{likes} \quad (16)$$

By (14), we know that the individual denoted by `de-niro` must be in the set $\text{Director}^{\mathcal{I}}$. And so, by (15), we know that this individual must be $\text{directs}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -connected to someone, that is, $\langle \text{de-niro}^{\mathcal{I}}, a \rangle \in \text{directs}^{\mathcal{I}}$, for some individual a . Finally, by (16), it must be the case that $\langle \text{de-niro}^{\mathcal{I}}, a \rangle \in \text{likes}^{\mathcal{I}}$, which contradicts our original assumption that $\mathcal{I} \not\models \exists \text{likes}.\top(\text{de-niro})$. Hence, we must conclude that no such $\mathcal{I}$ can exist. That is, any interpretation which satisfies the movie facts $\mathcal{KB}$ will also satisfy $\exists \text{likes}.\top(\text{de-niro})$, and so $\mathcal{KB} \models \exists \text{likes}.\top(\text{de-niro})$.

2.3 Reasoning tasks

One of the advantages of formalizing a body of knowledge in logic is the possibility of treating it as a tangible object to which certain operations can be applied. In DL, the object is the KB (set of axioms) and the operations are *reasoning tasks* which attempt to extract new knowledge from it.

An important characteristic of the reasoning tasks of DL, which make them at same time powerful and complex, is that they follow the *open-world assumption* (OWA). Under this assumption, facts which cannot be deduced from a KB are assumed to be *unknown* but not necessarily false. This contrasts with the *closed-world assumption* (CWA) often adopted in database systems where facts that are not in the database are assumed to be false. That said, when needed the CWA can be emulated to some extent in DL via nominals, and there specialized (autoepistemic, circumscriptive) DLs with support for the CWA.

We will now describe briefly the principal kinds of reasoning tasks for DL. For a more detailed description (with references) see [30, 2]. A thorough discussion of the computational complexities associated with these tasks for specific DLs can be found in [40], and a list of software implementing some of the tasks can be found in [26].

Knowledge base satisfiability The most fundamental of the DL reasoning tasks is knowledge base satisfiability. The goal of this task is to decide whether or not a given KB is satisfiable, that is, whether there is an interpretation that satisfies all of its axioms. Some important reasoning tasks, such as axiom entailment, which we discuss next, can be reduced to KB satisfiability.

There are basically two kinds of approaches for checking KB satisfiability. The *model-theoretic* approaches try to construct a model for the KB or to show that such construction must necessarily fail. The *proof-theoretic approaches* manipulate the KB syntactically until a contradiction is derived or until a point is reached where it is guaranteed that no contradiction can be derived. Examples of methods of the

first kind are the (tree) automata-based methods and the method of the tableaux. As examples of methods of the second kind we can cite the consequence-driven methods and those based on resolution.

Axiom entailment The goal of axiom entailment is to decide whether a given axiom α is a logical consequence of a given KB. This problem can be reduced to the KB satisfiability problem in DLs which support negation (such as *SROIQ*). In DLs without such support this reduction is still possible but requires the emulation of negation through some notion of opposition between axioms.

Concept satisfiability and classification The goal of the concept satisfiability (consistency) is to decide whether a concept C is satisfiable with respect to a knowledge base $\mathcal{KB}$. That is, whether there is an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ which satisfies $\mathcal{KB}$ and in which $C^{\mathcal{I}}$ is populated (not empty). Note that some concepts, such as $C \sqcap \neg C$, by definition cannot be satisfied.

A related task is concept classification. Its goal is to decide whether the concept names occurring in a KB can be put into a hierarchy according to their subsumption ($\sqsubseteq$) relationships. This hierarchical ordering is often a preliminary step executed before other reasoning tasks and also helps in the visualization of KBs with a large number of GCIs.

Named instance retrieval The named instance retrieval task takes a knowledge base $\mathcal{KB}$ and a concept C and returns all individual names a such that $\mathcal{KB} \models C(a)$. That is, it determines all names of individuals which are instances of the concept C in every model of $\mathcal{KB}$. This task can be extended to roles in which case we search for pairs of individual names $\langle a, b \rangle$ such that $\mathcal{KB} \models r(a, b)$.

Query answering The goal of query answering is to find an answer to a query q in a given knowledge base $\mathcal{KB}$. The query q is specified as a partial statement whose missing parts (or blanks—actually, free variables) must be filled with individual names. An answer to q is a particular filling which makes $\mathcal{KB}$ entail q , that is, a sequence of individual names which when replaced for the blanks in q makes $\mathcal{KB} \models q$. A natural extension of the problem of finding an answer to a query is the problem of finding all possible answers to a query.

Induction and abduction The goal of induction is to analyze the assertional axioms (those in the ABox) and generalize them by generating corresponding terminological axioms (GCIs and RIAs). The goal of abduction, on the other hand, is to determine, given a knowledge base $\mathcal{KB}$ and an axiom α not entailed by $\mathcal{KB}$, which axioms (satisfying some basic requirements) need to be added into $\mathcal{KB}$ so that $\mathcal{KB} \models \alpha$. Differently from the previous tasks, both induction and abduction are non-truth preserving tasks: the axioms they generate may be falsified.

2.4 Rules

Sometimes the reasoning tasks discussed above are not powerful enough. Some applications might need to represent relations and allow derivations which go beyond what can be expressed and achieved with pure DL. For instance, relations and derivations involving arbitrary computations, such as those involving arithmetic, or the derivation of facts exactly when some other facts cannot be derived (non-monotonic inferences).

A common approach to improve the expressivity of a DL is to combine the axioms in the KB with *rules* expressed in some rule language. A popular choice of rule language are Horn clauses—a fragment of first-order logic which is also the basis of the Prolog and Datalog programming languages. For example, the Semantic Web Rule Language (SWRL), pronounced “swirl”, is essentially a combination of Datalog and the ontology language OWL. Other combinations of DL with rules which improve the expressivity of the language (but in this case preserve decidability) are the Description Logic Programs (DLP) [11] and Description Logic Rules (DLR) [18]. For more details on rules, we refer the reader to [15].

2.5 Other DLs

The DL family follows a convention which allows us to determine the features of a specific DL from its name. This convention is given by the scheme

$$((\mathcal{ALC} \mid S)[\mathcal{H}] \mid SR)[O][I][\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{N} \mid Q],$$

where parentheses denote grouping, the vertical bar stands for choice, and the square brackets delimit optional components. The meaning of the letters in the above scheme is summarized in Table 2 (adapted from [32]).

Besides *SROIQ* other popular description logics are the logics *ALC* and *SHOIQ*. *ALC* [31] is the smallest DL which is boolean-closed, that is, in which boolean operators can be applied to concepts without restrictions. *SHOIQ* [2] is closely related to the ontology language OWL DL (version 1). Note that both *ALC* and *SHOIQ* are sublanguages of *SROIQ*.

Spatial and temporal extensions of DL In multimedia representation, we often need to describe spatial and temporal relations between objects. For instance, when annotating a particular scene of a film we may need to specify the relative position of the characters in the scene or the temporal sequence of their actions and dialogs.

A simple but expressive formalism for the specification of 2D spatial relations is the *region connection calculus* (RCC8). The RCC8 [28] describes eight basic relations which can take place between two regions: disconnected (DC), externally connected (EC), equal (EQ), partially overlapping (PO), tangential proper part (TPP), tangential proper part inverse (TPPi), nontangential proper part (NTPP), and nontangential proper part inverse (NTPPi). These eight relations are depicted in Figure 2. The $\mathcal{ALCI}_{\text{RCC}}$ [38] is a family of spatial description logics specifically

Table 2: Features corresponding to the letters in a DL name.

Symbol	Available/missing features	Example
$\mathcal{ALC}$	Missing: RBox axioms, universal role, role inverses, cardinality constraints, nominal concepts, and self concepts.	$\neg(\text{LiveAction} \sqcup \text{Animation})$
$\mathcal{S}$	$\mathcal{ALC}$ plus role chain axioms of the form $r \circ r \sqsubseteq r$ for r in N_R .	$\text{partOf} \circ \text{partOf} \sqsubseteq \text{partOf}$
$\mathcal{H}$	$\mathcal{ALC}$ plus role chain axioms of the form $r \sqsubseteq s$.	$\text{remakeOf} \sqsubseteq \text{basedOn}$
$\mathcal{SR}$	$\mathcal{ALC}$ plus self concepts and all kinds of RBox axioms.	$\text{hasParent} \circ \text{hasBrother} \sqsubseteq \text{hasUncle}$
$\mathcal{O}$	Available: nominal concepts.	$\{\text{universal}, \text{disney}\} \sqsubseteq \text{Studio}$
$\mathcal{I}$	Available: role inverses.	$\text{childOf} \sqsubseteq \text{parentOf}^{-}$
$\mathcal{F}$	Available: role functionality statements (expressible as $\top \sqsubseteq \leq 1r.\top$).	$\top \sqsubseteq \leq 1\text{officialWebsite}.\top$
$\mathcal{N}$	Available: cardinality constraints of the form $\geq nr.\top$ and $\leq nr.\top$.	$\text{Series} \sqsubseteq \geq 2.\text{hasEpisode}.\top$
$\mathcal{Q}$	Available: all kinds of cardinality constraints.	$\text{Series} \sqsubseteq \geq 2.\text{hasEpisode}.\text{Episode}$

designed to implement the RCC8 relations. Other DLs which can be used for spatial reasoning are the logics $\mathcal{ALC}(\mathcal{F})$ [17] and $\mathcal{ALC}(\text{CDC})$ [7]. These two are more recent proposals which are not based on the RCC.

To describe facts in time we can use one of the temporal DLs. Most of these are DL extensions with support for the usual operators of temporal logic, such as the operators $\diamond$ (possibly in the future) and $\Box$ (always in the future). The description logic $\mathcal{ALC}\text{-LTL}$ [3] combines $\mathcal{ALC}$ and Linear Temporal Logic (LTL), which adopts a linear (non-branching) notion of time and is usually employed in the specification of dynamic systems. Another temporal DL is DL-CTL [37]; this combines DL with Computational Tree Logic (CTL) which supports branching time. There is also an extension of the description logic $\mathcal{SHIN}$ that when implemented in OWL is called tOWL [19]. tOWL supports the representation of time points and relations between time points and intervals.

Fuzzy extensions of DL Information extracted from multimedia data is often ambiguous and imprecise. But traditional DLs, which are fragments of classic first-order logic, have no room for ambiguity or imprecision—the logic is boolean: either some fact is true or it is false. This means that when we use traditional DLs to represent multimedia data we may lose some important information about




Figure 2: The RCC8 relations [32].

uncertainty. Or worse, we may create some misleading sense of certainty where no such certainty really exists. One way to tackle this problem is to represent uncertainty in the logic.

The fuzzy logics are particular kind of many-valued (non-boolean) logics whose semantics involve a notion of *truth degrees*. These degrees function as additional shades of gray between the boolean true and false, which can be used to formalize vagueness and imprecision. There are many fuzzy extensions of DL. We will not describe the here but we refer the reader to [5].

3 Semantic Web Technologies

The term *Semantic Web* refers to an effort initiated in the early 2000s to extend the traditional Web, then a global library of interlinked HTML documents, to enable the semantic description and processing of these documents. Two decades later, the Web has become a much more diverse and complex environment, and the success and feasibility of the Semantic Web vision is somewhat debatable. What is not debatable, though, is the success of the standards and technologies developed in this period. Nowadays, it has become common to associate the term Semantic Web with these standards and technologies.

In this section, we will describe the core technologies of the Semantic Web. These can be organized as a stack, as depicted in Figure 3, where the technologies appearing on the top layers build on those which appear on the bottom layers. Although we will touch upon most of these technologies, we will focus on the ones depicted in bold font in the figure, namely, RDF, SPARQL, and OWL, with a special emphasis on the latter.




Figure 3: The Semantic Web stack.

3.1 RDF


One of the principal standards of the Semantic Web is the *Resource Description Framework* (RDF) [39]. RDF is a graph-based representation language. It provides a vocabulary and constructors for describing *sets of triples* denoting directed graphs. These triples are called *s-p-o triples* and have the form

$$\langle \text{subject}, \text{predicate}, \text{object} \rangle.$$

Here are three s-p-o triples describing, respectively, the type, size in bytes, and title associated with an audio file:

$\langle \text{song.mp3}, \text{type}, \text{Music} \rangle$, $\langle \text{song.mp3}, \text{size}, 10240 \rangle$, $\langle \text{song.mp3}, \text{title}, \text{"9th Symphony"} \rangle$.

And here is the graph corresponding to these three s-p-o triples:



Each triple stands for a directed edge in the graph. The subject of the triple becomes the source of the edge, the object becomes its target, and the predicate becomes the edge label.

Of course, this is just an abstract example. In an actual RDF graph the components of the triples, that is, the labels of nodes and edges in the graph, must obey a specific format (or *syntax*). A popular textual syntax for RDF is Turtle (Terse RDF Triple Language) [6]. Turtle is an alternative to the widely supported but cumbersome RDF/XML syntax. All of our RDF examples will be written in Turtle.

There are three kinds of nodes in an RDF graph: IRI nodes, literal nodes, and blank nodes. An *IRI node* is a node labeled by an IRI (Internationalized Resource Identifier); an IRI is a generalization of URI to support Unicode characters. Here is an example IRI:

<https://pt.wiktionary.org/wiki/maçã>

Note the non-ASCII characters “ç” and “ã” above. In an RDF graph, IRIs are used to denote arbitrary *resources*, such as physical objects, documents, images, abstract concepts, numbers, strings, etc.

The second kind of node which can appear in an RDF graph is the literal node. A *literal node* is any node labeled by a literal, that is, a quoted string denoting a value in-place. In the Turtle syntax, literals are written enclosed in double quotes optionally accompanied with language tags and type tags. Here are three RDF literals (written in Turtle):

```
"Rock", "maçã"@pt, "10240"^^xsd:integer.
```

The first is a plain literal, the second is a literal with a language tag (Portuguese in this case), and the third is a literal with a type tag, also called typed literal. The prefix `xsd:`, which occurs in the third literal above, stands for the namespace where the type tag `integer` is defined. We will have more to say about namespaces in a moment.

The third kind of node that can occur in an RDF graph is the blank node. A *blank node* has no specific denotation; it is an unlabeled node which is neither an IRI nor literal node. Blank nodes are often used as dummy nodes whose only purpose is to ease the encoding of complex structures in graphs.

In an RDF triple $\langle s, p, o \rangle$ the subject s must be an IRI or blank node, the predicate p must be an IRI, and the object o must be an IRI, literal, or blank node. When we assert an RDF triple we are saying informally that “the relationship indicated by the predicate holds between the resource denoted by the subject and the resource or value denoted by the object”.

Figure 4 presents a possible Turtle encoding for the graph describing the audio file “song.mp3” depicted a few paragraphs ago.⁹ Each edge in the graph (that is, triple in the set) becomes a corresponding triple in the Turtle document (lines 5–7). The subject, predicate, and object parts are separated by spaces and each triple is terminated with a dot (.). Note that IRIs are written between angle brackets $\langle \dots \rangle$.

```
1 @base <http://example.org/data/> .
2 @prefix ex: <http://example.org/#> .
3 @prefix xsd: <http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#> .
4 <song.mp3> ex:type ex:Music .
5 <song.mp3> ex:size "10240"^^xsd:integer .
6 <song.mp3> ex:title "9th Symphony" .
```

Figure 4: Turtle encoding of the RDF triples describing “song.mp3”.

The directives in lines 1–3 of Figure 4 define the namespaces of the document. That is, they specify how relative and prefixed IRIs are to be interpreted. The

⁹Sometimes literals are represented as rectangles when depicting an RDF graph. Incidentally, we did not follow this convention when depicting the graph describing “song.mp3”.

directive `@base` defines the base IRI of the whole Turtle document. Any relative IRI occurring in the document is to be interpreted as relative to this base IRI. So, for instance, the occurrences of `<song.mp3>` in lines 4–6 of Figure 4 are to be interpreted as the absolute IRI:

`http://example.org/data/song.mp3`

The directive `@prefix` introduces prefix labels which can be used to abbreviate IRIs. So, in Figure 4, the labels `ex:` and `xsd:` stand for the following IRI prefixes:

`http://example.org/#`
`http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#`

Note that prefixed IRIs are *not* written between angle brackets.

Turtle has a number of other features. Some of these are useful for avoiding tedious repetitions within the document. For instance, Figure 5 uses some of these features to define in fewer lines the same graph as Figure 4. Note the semicolons “;” in lines 3 and 4 of Figure 5. These are used to separate predicate-object pairs referring to the same subject; in this case, the IRI `http://example.org/data/song.mp3`. This type of construction is called a *predicate list*. Note also the typed literal `10240` in line 4. Some common types of literals, such as integers and floating-point numbers, can be written in Turtle in their usual syntaxes.

```
1 @prefix ex: <http://example.org/#> .  
2 <http://example.org/data/song.mp3>  
3   ex:type ex:Music ;  
4   ex:size 10240 ;  
5   ex:title "9th Symphony" .
```

Figure 5: Example of Figure 4 rewritten using predicate lists.

It is important to realize that an RDF graph is just a data structure, and that Turtle, RDF/XML, and the other syntaxes for RDF are just ways to encode this data structure in a string. More importantly, the meanings of the labels which occur in an RDF graph are not defined in the RDF standard. These labels might indicate something to the person reading them, but to a computer that understands only RDF these labels are meaningless strings—they serve only to identify and distinguish specific components of the graph.

There is another standard, called *RDF Schema* (RDFS) [13], defined on top of RDF, which specifies a basic vocabulary (set predefined terms) and associated meanings. This vocabulary can be found in the namespace:

`http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#`

It provides a set of basic terms which can be used to define more specialized terms whose meaning is given by describing their interrelations with other terms. (Note

that we used a similar approach in Section 2 when we introduced strings representing concepts and roles, such as `Director` and `directs`, and then defined their meaning via GCI and RIA relations relating them with other terms.)

RDFS is sometimes called a *lightweight ontology language* because it allows us to specify ontologies (machine-processable specifications of conceptualizations with a formally defined meaning) using a relatively small vocabulary with a simple semantics. This might be sufficient for certain applications but, in general, sophisticated applications require more powerful ontology languages. The natural choice in this case is OWL, also a Semantic Web technology. We will describe OWL in Section 3.3. Before that, however, let us present SPARQL, a language for querying RDF graphs.

3.2 SPARQL

In the previous section, we showed an RDF graph consisting of four nodes and three edges. When working with such small graphs one hardly needs to worry about efficiency. But, in practice, RDF graphs are rarely small. It is not uncommon to find applications that deal with graphs containing millions of nodes and edges. For such applications simple tools will not do. They need specialized tools, in particular, specialized databases, called *graph databases* and *triple stores*, designed to efficiently keep and process large amounts of RDF data.

SPARQL (SPARQL Protocol and RDF Query Language) is to graph databases and triple stores what SQL is to relational databases. It is a declarative interface for querying and manipulating the contents of the database/graph [12]. There are two main kinds of SPARQL queries: graph pattern matching and graph navigation. We will discuss each of these next.

Graph pattern matching A graph pattern matching query is a query that searches for a given (bounded) structural pattern in the graph. In SPARQL, these structural patterns are expressed as *triple patterns*, which are RDF triples in which the subject, predicate, or object may be a variable (name starting with “?”). A *basic graph pattern* (BGP) is the combination of one or more triple patterns.

Consider the RDF graph depicted in Figure 6, which describes the film *Taxi Driver*. Suppose we want to list all pairs of distinct persons who acted in this film. We can specify this query in SPARQL as follows:

```
1 PREFIX: <http://example.org/#>
2 SELECT ?x1 ?x2
3 WHERE {
4   ?x1 :actsIn ?x3 . ?x1 :type :Person .
5   ?x2 :actsIn ?x3 . ?x2 :type :Person .
6   ?x3 :title "Taxi Driver" . ?x3 :type :Movie .
7   FILTER (?x1 != ?x2)
8 }
```




Figure 6: RDF graph describing *Taxi Driver*.

This query expresses a BGP consisting of six triple patterns. It select all pairs of labels x_1 and x_2 (line 2) with $x_1 \neq x_2$ (line 7) such that, for some label x_3 , each of the following triples occur in the graph:

$\langle x_1, :actsIn, x_3 \rangle$ and $\langle x_1, :type, :Person \rangle$ (line 4)

$\langle x_2, :actsIn, x_3 \rangle$ and $\langle x_2, :type, :Person \rangle$ (line 5)

$\langle x_3, :title, "Taxi Driver" \rangle$ and $\langle x_3, :type, :Movie \rangle$ (line 6)

If we apply this query to the graph of Figure 6 we get the following result:

```

1  ?x1          ?x2
2  -----
3  :scorsese    :de-niro
4  :de-niro     :scorsese

```

That is, our *answer set* consists exactly of two pairs of labels: one where x_1 is :scorsese and x_2 is :de-niro (line 3 in the result), and another where x_1 is :de-niro and x_2 is :scorsese (line 4 in the result).

Graph navigation The other common kind of query supported by SPARQL are graph navigation queries. These are queries that navigate the topology of the graph through paths of potentially arbitrary lengths. A *path query* is a basic navigation query of the form $x \xrightarrow{\alpha} y$ that retrieves all pairs $\langle x, y \rangle$ such that there is a path in the graph from x to y which satisfies a given condition α .

For instance, the path queries

$$x \xrightarrow{:directs} y \quad \text{and} \quad x \xrightarrow{:actsIn \circ :type} y$$

search, respectively, for all nodes x and y such that there is an edge labeled :directs from x to y , and for all nodes x and y such that there is path of size two from x to y where the first edge in the path is labeled :actsIn and the second edge is labeled :type. (Recall that a *path* in a graph is a sequence of edges joining a sequence of nodes.).

We can specify the latter query in SPARQL as follows:

```
SELECT ?x ?y
WHERE ?x (:actsIn/:type) ?y
```

Here the symbol “/” stands for chaining and corresponds to the “o” we used in the abstract notation. If we apply this SPARQL query to the graph of Figure 6 we get answer:

?x	?y
:scorsese	:Movie
:de-niro	:Movie

For a more interesting example, consider the path query

$$x \xrightarrow{(:actsIn \circ :actsIn^-)^+} y.$$

This query searches for all actors who have a finite collaboration distance¹⁰, that is, actors x and y such that x and y are co-stars in the same movie (distance 0), or x and y are co-stars of the same z in some movie (distance 1), or x is co-star of some z_1 in some movie and y is co-star of some z_2 in some movie and z_1 and z_2 are co-stars in the same movie (distance 2), and so on. The following SPARQL code implements this query:

```
SELECT ?x ?y
WHERE ?x (:actsIn/^:actsIn)+ ?y
```

Here the symbol “^” denotes the inverse of an edge label (the symbol “-” we used in the abstract notation) and “+” stands for one or more repetitions of the pattern immediately preceding it.

Suppose we add the following triples to the graph of Figure 6:

$\langle :de-niro, :actsIn, :cassino \rangle$ and $\langle :sharon-stone, :actsIn, :cassino \rangle$.

If we run the above SPARQL query over this updated graph we get the answer:

?x	?y
:scorsese	:de-niro
:de-niro	:scorsese
:de-niro	:sharon-stone
:sharon-stone	:de-niro
:scorsese	:sharon-stone
:sharon-stone	:scorsese

¹⁰When x is the actor Kevin Bacon this distance is known as the *Bacon distance* or *Bacon degree*. See: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Six_Degrees_of_Kevin_Bacon

SPARQL has many more features, such as groups, options, alternatives, filters, etc., which can be combined with basic graph patterns and navigation operators in order to build complex queries. Our goal here was to provide a glimpse of SPARQL queries. For a detailed introduction to SPARQL, see [15]. Besides SPARQL, there are many other languages for querying graphs. See [1] for a general discussion of these. For a practical introduction to graph databases and triple stores, we recommend [29].

3.3 OWL

Web Ontology Language (OWL) is a family of ontology languages whose syntax and (formal) semantics is standardized [35]. Recall that an *ontology* is a set of precise descriptive statements about some part of the world—statements like those of description logic. OWL is based on description logic but also has many features which go beyond pure DL, such as datatypes and features for versioning and annotating ontologies. Here we will focus on version 2 of OWL (called OWL 2). This is the most recent version and it is fully compatible with the previous version.

There are three sublanguages of OWL, also called *species*: OWL Full, OWL DL, and OWL Lite. OWL Full contains both OWL DL and OWL Lite, and OWL DL contains OWL Lite. What distinguishes these three sublanguages is their degree of expressivity and, consequently, the computational cost of their associated reasoning tasks.

As with any language, in order to present OWL we will need to pick a particular syntax. Here we will use the RDF/Turtle syntax. Any OWL document written in this syntax is also a valid RDF document. Besides RDF, other common syntaxes for OWL are the functional-style syntax and the Manchester syntax. However, the only syntax that is mandatory to be supported by all OWL 2 tools is the RDF/XML syntax [14].

Next, we will present the specific terms and semantics of OWL via translations from DL. (An OWL 2 DL ontology is essentially an *SROIQ* knowledge base.) Before doing that, however, we must clear up some terminological conflicts. For historical reasons, OWL and DL sometimes use different terms to refer to the same objects. These terminological differences are summarized in Table 3.

From *SROIQ* to OWL 2 DL The translation of an *SROIQ* knowledge base into an OWL document consists of three steps.¹¹ First, we need to prefix to the document the following namespace declarations:

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

The prefixes `rdfs:`, `rdf:`, and `xsd:` are necessary because OWL reuses terms from

Table 3: Terminological differences between OWL and DL.

OWL	DL
class name	concept name
class	concept
object property name	role name
object property	role
ontology	knowledge base
axiom	axiom
vocabulary	vocabulary/signature

these namespaces.

The second thing we need to do is add to the OWL document typing statements for the concept names and role names that occur in the KB. That is, for each concept name C occurring in the KB, we add to the document the triple:

C `rdf:type owl:Class` .

And for each role name r occurring in the KB, we add the triple:

r `rdf:type owl:ObjectProperty` .

Figure 7 shows the OWL document corresponding to the *SROIQ* movie facts KB presented at the end of Section 2.1. The typing statements in lines 7–13 were generated by the above translations. Note that due to the `@prefix` directive in line 5, IRIs with an empty prefix label such as `:Actor` are to be interpreted as prefixed by the IRI `http://example.org/movie-facts#`.

The third step to translate an *SROIQ* knowledge base to OWL is the most complicated of the three: we need to translate the axioms that occur in each of the boxes. The complexity in this case stems from the rich syntactical structure of GCIs and RIAs, which cannot be directly encoded in RDF. To rewrite GCIs and RIAs in RDF we will need to use blank nodes and techniques for encoding lists in graphs.

The precise translation of arbitrary *SROIQ* axioms into OWL is given by function $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket r_1 \circ \dots \circ r_n \sqsubseteq r \rrbracket &= \llbracket r \rrbracket_{\mathbf{R}} \text{ owl:propertyChainAxiom } (\llbracket r_1 \rrbracket_{\mathbf{R}} \dots \llbracket r_n \rrbracket_{\mathbf{R}}) . \\
\llbracket \text{Sym}(r) \rrbracket &= \llbracket r \rrbracket_{\mathbf{R}} \text{ owl:type owl:SymmetricProperty} . \\
\llbracket \text{Asy}(r) \rrbracket &= \llbracket r \rrbracket_{\mathbf{R}} \text{ owl:type owl:AsymmetricProperty} . \\
\llbracket \text{Tra}(r) \rrbracket &= \llbracket r \rrbracket_{\mathbf{R}} \text{ owl:type owl:TransitiveProperty} . \\
\llbracket \text{Ref}(r) \rrbracket &= \llbracket r \rrbracket_{\mathbf{R}} \text{ owl:type owl:ReflexiveProperty} . \\
\llbracket \text{Irr}(r) \rrbracket &= \llbracket r \rrbracket_{\mathbf{R}} \text{ owl:type owl:IrreflexiveProperty} . \\
\llbracket \text{Dis}(r, s) \rrbracket &= \llbracket r \rrbracket_{\mathbf{R}} \text{ owl:propertyDisjointWith } \llbracket s \rrbracket_{\mathbf{R}} .
\end{aligned}$$

¹¹The translations we present here were adapted from Sebastian Rudolph’s excellent text [30].


$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket C \sqsubseteq D \rrbracket &= \llbracket C \rrbracket_c \text{ rdfs:subClassOf } \llbracket D \rrbracket_c . \\
\llbracket C(a) \rrbracket &= a \text{ rdf:type } \llbracket C \rrbracket_c . \\
\llbracket r(a, b) \rrbracket &= a \text{ r } b . \\
\llbracket r^-(a, b) \rrbracket &= b \text{ r } a . \\
\llbracket \neg r(a, b) \rrbracket &= [] \text{ rdf:type owl:NegativePropertyAssertion ;} \\
&\quad \text{owl:assertionProperty } \llbracket r \rrbracket_R ; \\
&\quad \text{owl:sourceIndividual } a ; \\
&\quad \text{owl:targetIndividual } b . \\
\llbracket a \approx b \rrbracket &= a \text{ owl:sameAs } b . \\
\llbracket a \not\approx b \rrbracket &= a \text{ owl:differentFrom } b .
\end{aligned}$$

where the auxiliary functions $\llbracket \Box \rrbracket_R$ and $\llbracket \Box \rrbracket_c$ are used to translate *SROIQ* roles and concept expression. These auxiliary functions are defined as follows:


$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket u \rrbracket_R &= \text{owl:topObjectProperty} \\
\llbracket r \rrbracket_R &= r \\
\llbracket r^- \rrbracket_R &= [\text{owl:inverseOf } :r] \\
\llbracket C \rrbracket_c &= C \\
\llbracket \top \rrbracket_c &= \text{owl:Thing} \\
\llbracket \perp \rrbracket_c &= \text{owl:Nothing} \\
\llbracket \{a_1, \dots, a_n\} \rrbracket_c &= [\text{rdf:type owl:Class ; owl:oneOf(:a}_1 \dots :a_n)] \\
\llbracket \neg C \rrbracket_c &= [\text{rdf:type owl:Class ; owl:complementnOf } \llbracket C \rrbracket_c] \\
\llbracket C_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap C_n \rrbracket_c &= [\text{rdf:type owl:Class ; owl:intersectionOf (} \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket_c \dots \llbracket C_n \rrbracket_c)] \\
\llbracket C_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup C_n \rrbracket_c &= [\text{rdf:type owl:Class ; owl:unionOf (} \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket_c \dots \llbracket C_n \rrbracket_c)] \\
\llbracket \exists r.C \rrbracket_c &= [\text{rdf:type owl:Restriction ;} \\
&\quad \text{owl:onProperty } \llbracket r \rrbracket_R ; \text{ owl:someValuesFrom } \llbracket C \rrbracket_c] \\
\llbracket \forall r.C \rrbracket_c &= [\text{rdf:type owl:Restriction ;} \\
&\quad \text{owl:onProperty } \llbracket r \rrbracket_R ; \text{ owl:allValuesFrom } \llbracket C \rrbracket_c] \\
\llbracket \exists r.\text{Self} \rrbracket_c &= [\text{rdf:type owl:Restriction ;} \\
&\quad \text{owl:onProperty } \llbracket r \rrbracket_R ; \text{ owl:hasSelf true }] \\
\llbracket \geq nr.C \rrbracket_c &= [\text{rdf:type owl:Restriction ;} \\
&\quad \text{owl:minQualifiedCardinality } n ; \\
&\quad \text{owl:onProperty } \llbracket r \rrbracket_R ; \text{ owl:onClass } \llbracket C \rrbracket_c] \\
\llbracket \leq nr.C \rrbracket_c &= [\text{rdf:type owl:Restriction ;} \\
&\quad \text{owl:maxQualifiedCardinality } n ; \\
&\quad \text{owl:onProperty } \llbracket r \rrbracket_R ; \text{ owl:onClass } \llbracket C \rrbracket_c]
\end{aligned}$$

Two remarks on the above translation are in order. First, note that individual names, concept names, and role names are kept as is by $\llbracket \square \rrbracket$, $\llbracket \square \rrbracket_R$, and $\llbracket \square \rrbracket_C$. For simplicity, we assume that these names are defined in the namespace of the empty prefix.

Second, note that complex role and concept expressions are translated by $\llbracket \square \rrbracket_R$ and $\llbracket \square \rrbracket_C$ as subgraphs identified by a blank node. In Turtle, these blank nodes are introduced by the square brackets. So, for instance, the role r^- becomes the subgraph



in which the blank node on the left-hand side stands for the inverse of r . Similarly, the complex concept $\geq 2 \text{ knows. Actor}$ is translated as the subgraph



Again, the blank node above stands for the complex concept as a whole.

The result of using function $\llbracket \square \rrbracket$ to translate the axioms in the movie facts KB is depicted in Figure 7. The translated ABox axioms are listed in lines 16–28, the TBox axioms in lines 31–53, and the RBox axioms in lines 55–56.

Emulating the additional axiom types of OWL in *SROIQ* The features of OWL used by the previous translation algorithm are sufficient for representing any *SROIQ* axiom in OWL. But OWL has many more features, including further types of logical axioms which have no direct counterpart in *SROIQ*. The extra types of logical axioms of OWL are useful in practice, but they do not add new capabilities from the point of view of the logic. That is, they are just a syntactic sugar that can always be rewritten in terms of the types of axioms available in *SROIQ*. See [30] for details.


Tools for manipulating ontologies If we load the Turtle file of Figure 7 on Protégé¹² and ask for a graph of the ontology, we get the following:

```

1 @prefix owl: <http://www.w3.org/2002/07/owl#> .
2 @prefix rdfs: <http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#> .
3 @prefix rdf: <http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#> .
4 @prefix xsd: <http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#> .
5 @prefix : <http://example.org/movie-facts#> .
6
7 :Actor      rdf:type    owl:Class .
8 :Director   rdf:type    owl:Class .
9 :Person     rdf:type    owl:Class .
10 :actsIn     rdf:type    owl:ObjectProperty .
11 :directs    rdf:type    owl:ObjectProperty .
12 :knows      rdf:type    owl:ObjectProperty .
13 :likes      rdf:type    owl:ObjectProperty .
14
15 # ABox
16 :kubrick    rdf:type    :Director .
17 :de-niro    rdf:type    [rdf:type owl:Class ;
18                          owl:intersectionOf (:Actor :Director)] .
19 :stanley    rdf:type    [rdf:type owl:Restriction ;
20                          owl:minQualifiedCardinality 2 ;
21                          owl:onProperty :knows ; owl:onClass :Actor ] .
22 :kubrick    :directs    :space-odyssey .
23 []          rdf:type    owl:NegativePropertyAssertion ;
24              owl:assertionProperty :directs ;
25              owl:sourceIndividual :kubrick ;
26              owl:targetIndividual :taxi-driver .
27 :kubrick    owl:sameAs :stanely .
28 :kubrick    owl:differentFrom :de-niro .
29
30 # TBox
31 :Director   rdfs:subClassOf [rdf:type owl:Restriction ;
32                              owl:onProperty :directs ;
33                              owl:someValuesFrom owl:Thing] .
34 [rdf:type owl:Restriction ;
35  owl:onProperty :directs ;
36  owl:someValuesFrom owl:Thing]
37   rdfs:subClassOf :Director .
38 :Director   rdfs:subClassOf :Person .
39 :Director   rdfs:subClassOf [rdf:type owl:Restriction ;
40                              owl:minQualifiedCardinality 1 ;
41                              owl:onProperty :knows ;
42                              owl:onClass :Actor] .
43 [rdf:type owl:Class ;
44  owl:intersectionOf ([rdf:type owl:Restriction ;
45                          owl:onProperty :directs ;
46                          owl:someValuesFrom owl:Thing]
47                        [rdf:type owl:Restriction ;
48                          owl:onProperty :directs ;
49                          owl:allValuesFrom [rdf:type owl:Class ;
50                                                  owl:oneOf (:a-bronx-tale
51                                                         :good-shepherd)]]))]
52   rdfs:subClassOf [rdf:type owl:Class ;
53                   owl:oneOf (:de-niro)] .
54 # RBox
55 :likes owl:propertyChainAxiom (:directs) .
56 :knows owl:propertyChainAxiom (:directs [owl:inverseOf :actsIn]) .

```

Figure 7: OWL corresponding to the movie facts KB of Section 2.1.



Here the nodes with a yellow circle stand for the concepts (classes), the nodes with purple diamonds stand for individuals, and the colored arrows denote specific relationships between them. For instance, the blue arrow from **Person** to **Director** represents the “has subclass” relationship. The yellow box above, with additional information about **kubrick**, is the tool-tip displayed by Protégé when we hover the mouse cursor over a particular node or edge of the graph.

Protégé is the most widely used ontology editor. It supports many plugins for ontology visualization, debugging, and reasoning. Besides Protégé, there are many other tools for designing and implementing ontologies. For a comprehensive list, see [15] and [36].

Linked data and knowledge graphs Over the years the Semantic Web vision has changed its focus from the description of linked documents to the description of linked data in general. The term *linked open data* (LOD) has been used to refer to *open* datasets of linked data, such as DBpedia¹³ (derived from Wikipedia), Wikidata¹⁴ (curated by the Wikimedia Foundation), etc. Most of these datasets adopt the technologies we have been discussing, but they are usually not ontologies in the strict sense.

Another term often associated with linked data is *knowledge graph*. This is a general term which alludes to the fact that the system or database to which the term is applied uses a graph to represent knowledge. In this sense, an OWL document encoded in RDF is a knowledge graph. Being a knowledge graph does not imply being an ontology. For instance, the graph depicted in Figure 6 is a knowledge graph, but it is certainly not an ontology.

¹²<https://protege.stanford.edu/>

¹³<https://wiki.dbpedia.org/>

¹⁴<https://www.wikidata.org/>

	Vocabulary/Ontology	Language
Descriptor-derived	Content Ontology for the TV-Anytime Content	OWL
	Content Ontology for the TV-Anytime Format	OWL
	Core Ontology for Multimedia (COMM)	OWL
	Visual Descriptor Ontology (VDO)	OWL
General purpose	Dublin Core	RDFS
	FOAF	OWL
	Schema.org	OWL
	SUMO	SUO-KIF
	WordNet 3.x	OWL
Specialized	3D Modeling Language (3DMO)	OWL 2
	Audio Effects Ontology (AUFX-O)	OWL
	Linked Movie Database (LMD)	RDFS
	Multimedia Metadata Ontology (M3O)	OWL
	Ontology for Media Resources	OWL
	Video Ontology (VidOnt)	OWL

Table 4: Some vocabularies and ontologies for multimedia.

Ontologies for multimedia There are numerous ontologies for describing multimedia. We can classify these broadly into three groups: descriptor-derived, general purpose, and specialized ontologies. The ontologies in the first group are those derived from classic metadata descriptors standards, such as MPEG-7, MPEG-21, and TV-Anytime. These ontologies are complex, limited in terms of expressivity, and have design issues (they often do not follow good practices of ontology engineering). The ontologies on the second group tend to be more mature and well-defined. On the other hand, as those in the first group, the ontologies in the third group are also problematic. They often have conceptualization problems, for instance, their scope is unclear, and usually do not reuse terms from more general (upper-level) ontologies, which is considered bad practice.

Table 4 lists some of the ontologies in the three groups. For more details on these, such as references, a discussion of their pros and cons, etc., see [32].

The point of using one of these open ontologies is, of course, to reuse their terms and definitions instead constructing everything from scratch. For instance, using Schema.org and Dublin Core we can rewrite the RDF describing the audio file “song.mp3” (Figure 5) as follows:

```
@prefix dc: <http://purl.org/dc/elements/1.1/> .
@prefix rdf: <http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#> .
@prefix schema: <http://schema.org/> .
<http://example.org/data/song.mp3> rdf:type schema:AudioObject ;
                                   schema:contentSize "10240" ;
                                   dc:title "9th Symphony" .
```

Note that we can use URI fragments [27] to refer to specific parts of the resource

being described. For instance, if we want to indicate that the key of some particular segment, say from 10s to 20s, of “song.mp3” is C Major, we can write:

```
@prefix keys: <http://purl.org/NET/c4dm/keys.owl#>
@prefix mo:   <http://purl.org/ontology/mo/>
<http://example.org/data/song.mp3#t=10,20> mo:key keys:CMajor .
```

where `mo:key` and `keys:CMajor` are terms from the Music Ontology¹⁵. Similarly, we can refer to spatial fragments of resources using URI fragments of the form `#xywh=x,y,w,h`. We will have more to say about the description of media objects and their parts in next section.

4 A Hybrid Approach: Hyperknowledge

IBM Hyperlinked Knowledge Graph [25], or Hyperknowledge for short, is a hybrid model for knowledge representation that permits the specification and interlinking of data objects and concepts. It extends the Nested Context Model (NCM) [33], a classic hypermedia model, with constructs that combine features from the domains of *hypermedia* and *knowledge* representation. To better understand why the Hyperknowledge model was proposed, let us briefly discuss the main concerns of these two communities.

The hypermedia community has been concerned with the definition of models and languages for expressing relationships among media objects (texts, images, videos, etc.). In languages such as HTML, NCL, SMIL, and SVG we can specify how different objects interact with each other and with users but we cannot link these objects to the concepts they represent—at least not directly. Also, we cannot describe in these languages ontologies like those discussed in Section 2. Metadata standards (such as MPEG-7, MPEG-21, SMPTE, EXIF, etc.) have been proposed as a solution to combine the media content and semantics, but these standards usually focus on low-level features, such as codecs, bit-rates, color spaces, etc.

The knowledge representation community, on the other hand, has focused on the development of models for representing facts about the world and on methods for querying and inferring things from these models. Applications in the knowledge engineering domain tend to assume that knowledge bases are composed purely of facts and often disregard any (multimedia) data that might be related to these facts. For instance, we can use RDF or OWL for encoding facts in a knowledge base, but the multimedia content described by these facts is usually kept in separated bases, which are handled by different tools and systems.

The goal of the Hyperknowledge model is to unify hypermedia and knowledge representation, and with this to enable the development of both semantic-aware multimedia applications and multimedia-aware knowledge bases.

¹⁵<http://musicontology.com/>




Figure 8: A Hyperknowledge base corresponding to the movie facts KB.

4.1 Hyperknowledge in a nutshell

The entities of the Hyperknowledge model are inherited from the NCM [33]. These entities comprise anchors, (atomic) nodes, compositions, links, and connectors. We will introduce each of these entities through an example. Figure 8 shows a possible representation in Hyperknowledge of a part of the movie facts KB, presented at the end of Section 2. For simplicity, here we adopt the closed world assumption, that is, we assume that facts not represented in the figure are false. (We discussed this assumption and the more general open world assumption in Section 2.3.)

A Hyperknowledge *context* is a container element that groups related elements and relationships. The characterization of related entities and the decision of grouping them into contexts is a modeling decision which depends on the application. In Figure 8, the contexts are depicted as the bounding boxes enclosing the other elements. There are two contexts in this figure. Context TBox-Context contains the elements and relationships that correspond to the TBox of the movie facts KB. The other context, ABox-Context, contains the elements and relationships corresponding to the ABox.

The ellipses and smaller rectangles in Figure 8 stand for atomic nodes. These can represent either concepts (ellipses) or data (rectangles). Here we use the word concept in the same sense in which it is used in DL. That is, a *concept* (or class in OWL terminology) represents an abstract characteristic of certain individuals. In Figure 8, all nodes in TBox-Context, namely, Person, Director, Actor, Movie,

and `Directable`, are concept nodes.

The other kind of atomic nodes which occur in Figure 8 are data nodes. A *data node* is a node containing some data content. In the figure, the data nodes are the rectangles labeled `de-niro`, `kubrick`, and `space-odyssey`, which occur in the `ABox-Context`. The idea in this example is that data nodes stand for multimedia content. For instance, `de-niro` and `kubrick` might refer to a JPEG picture of the corresponding movie directors, and `space-odyssey` might refer to an Ogg video of the corresponding film.

The dashed nodes in Figure 8 are neither concept nodes nor data nodes; they stand for *references*. That is, they are nodes that refer to other nodes, allowing that the latter be reused in other situations (contexts). So, for instance, the concept nodes `Actor` and `Director`, which are defined in the `TBox` context, are reused in the `ABox` context. Similarly, node `stanley` of the `ABox` context is a reference to the node `kubrick` in the same context. The idea here is that anything which operates over `stanley` is actually operating over `kubrick`.

This type of indirection is useful in cases where the same entity is associated with different names in possibly different contexts. For instance, the singer and song-writer Bob Dylan has recorded some folk songs under the pseudonym of Blind Boy Grunt. Any references to Blind Boy Grunt are essentially references to Bob Dylan. But the distinction between them might be important for some applications.

Back to Figure 8, the arrows in the figure stand for links representing relationships between nodes. Each link is associated with a connector (not represented in the figure) which defines the link type. A connector defines an abstract relation and associates with it a label and zero or more restrictions. A link can be seen as an instance of its connector, that is, as an actual realization of the abstract relation defined by the connectors.

In the figure, the link in the `TBox` context between `Actor` and `Person` labeled “subclass” expresses the fact that every instance of `Actor` is also an instance of a `Person`. In other words, it encodes the `TBox` axiom $\text{Actor} \sqsubseteq \text{Person}$. Similarly, the link “directs” between `Director` and `Directable` encodes the `TBox` axiom $\text{Director} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{directs}.\top$.

Unlike the edges of RDF graphs, which are necessarily binary, Hyperknowledge links can connect more than two entities. For instance, in Figure 8 the link “is-a- $\sqcap$ ” in the `ABox` context connects `de-niro` to both `Actor` and `Director`, and serves to encode the `ABox` axiom $\text{Actor} \sqcap \text{Director}(\text{de-niro})$.

4.2 HSL and HyQL

The Hyperknowledge model is accompanied by a specification language, called HSL, and a declarative query language, called HyQL. We will now present both of these technologies.

HSL HSL (Hyperknowledge Specification Language) is a language for the specification of hyperknowledge representations, which can be stored in hyperknowledge

bases, or HK bases. Figure 9 depicts the HSL document in JSON syntax corresponding to the HK base of Figure 8.

An HSL document consists of a tree of elements. In the JSON syntax, each element is an array of the form:

```
[tag, id, {attrs}, [children]]
```

where *tag* is the element tag (“hsl”, “connector”, “context”, “node”, etc.), *id* is the element id, *attrs* is a key-value map of element attributes, and *children* is a list of child elements. Depending on the *tag*, any of the last three components, *id*, *attrs*, or *children*, are optional. The meaning and allowed values for each of these components also varies from tag to tag. Instead of giving the full syntax of HSL, we will introduce its main elements using Figure 9 as a guide.

The root element of an HSL document is element “hsl” (line 1 of Figure 9). Three kinds of elements may appear inside the root: connectors, contexts, and atomic nodes. A connector specifies the format of the links of the document. For each distinct link (arrow) label in Figure 8 there is a connector in the HSL document. For instance, the connectors with ids “subclass”, “is-a”, and “is-a-cap” (lines 2–11) define the homonymous relations and are referenced by the links on lines 21–25 and 45–49.

Each context (bounding box) in Figure 8 becomes a “context” element in the HSL document (lines 14–29 and 31–54) and the concepts (ellipses) and data objects (rectangles) of Figure 8 become “node” elements inside the corresponding contexts. For instance, the concept *Director* in the TBox context becomes the node with id “Director” and type attribute “Concept” (line 17). The data object *kubrick* in the ABox context becomes the node with id “kubrick”, type “Data”, and content URI “http://example.org/kubrick.jpg” (lines 32–33). Note that node references—dashed ellipses and dashed rectangles in Figure 8—become nodes of type “Reference” (lines 34–39) with the “refer” attribute defining the id of the target node.

The links (arrows) of Figure 8 become “link” elements in the HSL document. Each link must reference one of the connectors defined just below the root element of the document. For instance, the link (arrow) from *Director* to *Person* with label *subclass* in Figure 8 becomes the link element defined on lines 21–23 whose attribute “connector” has value “subclass”, which is the id of the connector that defines the subclass relation (lines 2–4). Each element “role” in the connector, in this case the roles “subject” and “object” (lines 3 and 4) of connector “subclass”, must be matched by a corresponding bind in the link, in this case the “bind” elements on lines 22–23, which establish that in this particular instantiation of connector “subclass” node “Director” is the subject and node “Person” is the object. The omitted connectors and links in the HSL document of Figure 9 (lines 12, 28, and 53) all follow a similar pattern.

HyQL From a graph-theoretic point of view, the Hyperknowledge model supports advanced features, such as nested nodes (contexts) and hyperedges (*n*-ary links),

```

1  ["hsl", [
2    ["connector", "subclass", {"type": "fact"}, [
3      ["role", "subject"],
4      ["role", "object"]]],
5    ["connector", "is-a", {"type": "fact"}, [
6      ["role", "subject"],
7      ["role", "object"]]],
8    ["connector", "is-a-cap", {"type": "fact"}, [
9      ["role", "subject"],
10     ["role", "object1"],
11     ["role", "object2"]]],
12    ...
13
14    ["context", "TBox-Context", [
15      ["node", "Actor", {"type": "Concept"}],
16      ["node", "Directable", {"type": "Concept"}],
17      ["node", "Director", {"type": "Concept"}],
18      ["node", "Person", {"type": "Concept"}],
19      ["node", "Movie", {"type": "Movie"}],
20
21      ["link", {"connector": "subclass"}, [
22        ["bind", {"subject": "Director"}],
23        ["bind", {"object": "Person"}]]],
24
25      ["link", {"connector": "subclass"}, [
26        ["bind", {"subject": "Actor"}],
27        ["bind", {"object": "Person"}]]],
28      ...
29    ]],
30
31    ["context", "ABox-Context", null, [
32      ["node", "kubrick", {"type": "Data",
33        "uri": "http://example.org/kubrick.jpg"}],
34      ["node", "stanley", {"type": "Reference",
35        "refer": "kubrick"}],
36      ["node", "Director", {"type": "Reference",
37        "refer": "TBox-Context/Director"}],
38      ["node", "Actor", {"type": "Reference",
39        "refer": "TBox-Context/Actor"}],
40      ["node", "space-odyssey", {"type": "Data",
41        "uri": "http://example.org/odyssey.ogv"}],
42      ["node", "de-niro", {"type": "Data",
43        "uri": "http://example.org/de-niro.jpg"}],
44
45      ["link", {"connector": "is-a"}, [
46        ["bind", {"subject": "kubrick"}],
47        ["bind", {"object": "Director"}]]],
48
49      ["link", {"connector": "is-a-cap"}, [
50        ["bind", {"subject": "de-niro"}],
51        ["bind", {"object1": "Director"}],
52        ["bind", {"object2": "Actor"}]]],
53      ...
54    ]],
55  ]]

```

Figure 9: Partial HSL corresponding to the HK base of Figure 8.

which are not present in traditional knowledge graphs. A language for querying Hyperknowledge graphs, thus, has to cope with these features and with the peculiarities of the data which is stored in a Hyperknowledge base. For instance, queries involving multimedia objects often need to refer to temporal or spatial fragments of these objects and to correlate objects and fragments in time and space.

HyQL (Hyperknowledge Query Language) is a declarative language for querying hyperknowledge graphs. A HyQL query specifies a complex Hyperknowledge-graph pattern, possibly involving path navigation, level shifts, aggregation, filters, and specific features or fragments of the underlying data. The complete syntax of HyQL is presented in Figure 10. We will not discuss this syntax and its accompanying semantics in detail, though. Instead, we will introduce HyQL gradually, through example queries over the HK base of Figure 8.

Here is a HyQL query that lists all instances of concept “Director” in the HK base of Figure 8:

```
select Director
```

The results in this case are “kubrick”, “stanely”, and “de-niro”. And here is a query that counts the number of actors in the HK base:

```
select count Actor
```

The answer in this case is 1, as just “de-niro” is an instance of the concept “Actor”.

HyQL queries can also contain filters. For instance, the query

```
select Director
where Director directs space-odyssey
```

contains a filter (**where**-clause) that filters out only the directors who have directed (link “directs”) the node “space-odyssey”. The answer in this case is “kubrick” and “stanley”. Filters can be combined with other filters and also test node attributes. For instance, the query

```
select Director
where Director.uri == "http://example.org/kubrick.jpg"
and Director.type != "Reference"
```

selects all nodes which are instances of “Director” such that their “uri” attribute is equal to “http://example.org/kubrick.jpg” and their type is not “Reference”. The answer in this case is only “kubrick”.

We conclude the discussion of HyQL with a query that compares the spatial position of objects in a picture. For this query, we will need to introduce the notion of anchor [9]. An anchor specifies a part of a data node. Anchors can be the source and target of links and can also be independently designated via node references.

Consider the following HSL snippet:

```

    query ::= varlist 'select' [modifier] targetlist ['where' clause]
    varlist ::= vardecl {',' vardecl}
    vardecl ::= 'let' var
               var ::= name 'as' name | name ':' name | name
    modifier ::= 'distinct' | 'count' | 'max' | 'min' | 'sum' | 'avg'
    targetlist ::= target {',' target}
    target ::= node | nodeattr | nodeanchor | funcall
    node ::= var
    nodeattr ::= var '.' var
    nodeanchor ::= var '#' var
    funcall ::= name '(' explist )'
    explist ::= exp {',' exp}
    exp ::= boolean | number | string | node | nodeattr
    clause ::= linkclause | timeclause | spaceclause | contextclause
              | spoclass | attrclause | funcclause | anchorclause
              | clause 'and' clause
    linkclause ::= var '[' {name ':' var} ']'
    timeclause ::= var timeop var
    spaceclause ::= var spaceop var
    contextclause ::= var 'from' var
    spoclass ::= var var var
    attrclause ::= nodeattr binop exp
    funcclause ::= funcall binop exp
    anchorclause ::= nodeanchor timeop nodeanchor
                   | nodeanchor timeop var
                   | nodeanchor spaceop nodeanchor
                   | nodeanchor spaceop var
                   | nodeanchor var var
    timeop ::= 'before' | 'after' | 'meets' | 'overlaps' | 'start'
              | 'during' | 'finishes' | 'equals'
    spaceop ::= 'side' | 'above' | 'bellow' | 'collides' | 'contains'
    binop ::= '<' | '<=' | '>' | '>=' | '==' | '!='

```

Figure 10: The complete syntax of HyQL. {A} means zero or more As, and [A] means an optional A.

```

1  ["node", "picture", {"type": "Data", "uri": "marat.jpg"}, [
2      ["anchor", "knife",
3          {"x": "58px", "y": "766px", "w": "160px", "h": "37px"}],
4      ["anchor", "marat",
5          {"x": "39px", "y": "334px", "w": "146px", "h": "111px"}]]],
6  ["node", "Knife", {"type": "Concept"}],
7  ["node", "Person", {"type": "Concept"}],
8  ["link", {"connector": "is-a"}, [
9      ["bind", {"subject": "picture#knife"}],
10     ["bind", {"object": "Knife"}]]],
11 ["link", {"connector": "is-a"}, [
12     ["bind", {"subject": "picture#marat"}],
13     ["bind", {"object": "Person"}]]],

```

This HSL snippet declares three nodes: “picture” (lines 1–5), which is a data node whose URI points to the picture of Figure 1, and “Knife” (line 6) and “Person” (line 7) which are concept nodes. The anchor elements (lines 2–3 and 4–5) of the “picture” node specify rectangular regions in the picture, which correspond roughly to the regions labeled “Jean-Paul Marat” and “Knife” in Figure 1. The idea here is that we can use anchors to describe parts of nodes, in this case regions of picture, and then use links to connect regions to their semantic descriptions. In the above snippet, the links connect the region which depicts a knife with the concept “Knife” (lines 8–10) and the region which depicts a person with the concept “Person” (lines 11–13).

Now suppose that our HK base contains many more pictures whose regions are semantically described as above. We can then use HyQL to find precisely those images in which a certain spatial relationship between the concepts represented in the image hold. For instance, the HyQL query

```
select Picture where Person above Knife
```

lists all pictures in which a region described as a person appears above a region described as a knife. Clearly, the previous data node “picture” (line 1) matches this query.

HyQL has many more features, such as temporal operators (for comparing temporal fragments of nodes), arithmetic operators, path and navigation operators, etc. The description of these operators is beyond the scope of this chapter. We refer the reader to [20, 22] for additional examples of HyQL queries involving spatial and temporal anchors.

We now shift the discussion the tools which allow us to use the Hyperknowledge model in practice.

4.3 Hyperknowledge tools

There are two main tools for developing applications based on Hyperknowledge, namely, the Hyperknowledge Base (HKBase) and the Knowledge Explorer System

(KES).

HKBase The *HKBase* is a hybrid database system based on Hyperknowledge. By hybrid we mean that it stores multimedia objects besides statements about a given domain. Additionally, it has been designed from scratch to use Hyperknowledge as both internal data model and external API. For compatibility reasons, the HKBase also has features for importing and exporting RDF and OWL. In the case of importation, these statements are converted to Hyperknowledge entities before being stored in the underlying database. Figure 11 depicts the overall architecture of the HKBase.




Figure 11: HKBase architecture.

The HKBase architecture consists of three layers. The first one is the external API which exposes a REST API to applications. The next layer is the services layer which implements the core functionalities of the HKBase. Within this layer, the RDF/OWL service handles the conversion among those formats and Hyperknowledge. The query engine is the component that processes queries written in HyQL. The entities service is responsible for creating, retrieving, updating and deleting Hyperknowledge entities. And the transaction service manages requests that should be executed within a transaction.

The third and last layer of the HKBase is the data layer which handles low level access to storage back-ends. Its data source component is responsible for persisting in a given database the structured statements represented in Hyperknowledge. And




Figure 12: Screenshot of the user interface of KES. (Soccer image by Abdul Rahman, CC BY-NC-ND 4.0.)

its object manager component deals with the storage of multimedia objects.

KES *KES* (Knowledge Explorer System) [21] is an application built on top of the HKBase. Using KES, users can visualize the content stored in a Hyperknowledge base as well as curate it by adding, updating, or deleting entities and relationships. The system is collaborative, that is, it supports multiple users working simultaneously on the same repository through different devices. KES also has facilities for importing and manipulating OWL and RDF files.

Figure 12 shows a screenshot of KES. The main canvas shows a graph-based representation of the contents of a Hyperknowledge base. Besides Hyperknowledge entities, KES permits the direct manipulation of multimedia content. For instance, the screenshot of Figure 12 shows that the user has run the query: “Select Goal where Goal by Neymar”. (The Hyperknowledge base, in this case, contains facts about the soccer domain [23].) This query returns all goals scored by the player called “Neymar”. Note that the answer set display by KES contains all Hyperknowledge entities that satisfy the query, that is, all media nodes which are instances of Goal and which have at least one link stating that the goal was scored by Neymar. The content of these media nodes is displayed on the right-hand side of the screen.

5 Further Reading

In this chapter, we presented an overview of symbolic AI and discussed its application to multimedia. Like any introduction, this one was necessarily incomplete,

especially given the breadth of the topics covered. Here are some suggestions for further reading which complement those given along the text:

Logic A classic introduction to mathematical logic is [8]. The primary reference for description logic is [2]. A good introduction to DL through *SRITQ* is given in [30]. For modal logics, especially temporal logic, a good starting-point is [10]. For a discussion of DL and multimedia, see [32].

Semantic Web For a seminal discussion of the Semantic Web vision, see [4]. An overview of the principles and technologies of the Semantic Web is given in [15]. Specifically for OWL, a good place to start is [14]. For a comprehensive treatment of ontologies, see [34].

Hyperknowledge The primary reference for Hyperknowledge is [25]. Some further references describing particular applications of Hyperknowledge to document understanding and temporal reasoning are [24] and [22].

References

- [1] ANGLES, R. A comparison of current graph database models. In *2012 IEEE 28th International Conference on Data Engineering Workshops* (April 2012), IEEE, pp. 171–177.
- [2] BAADER, F., CALVANESE, D., MCGUINNESS, D. L., NARDI, D., AND PATEL-SCHNEIDER, P. F., Eds. *The Description Logic Handbook: Theory, Implementation and Applications*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [3] BAADER, F., AND LIPPMANN, M. Runtime verification using the temporal description logic $\mathcal{ALC}$ -LTL revisited. *J. Appl. Log.* 12, 4 (2014), 584–613.
- [4] BERNERS-LEE, T., HENDLER, J., AND LASSILA, O. The semantic web. *Scientific American* (May 2001), 96–101.
- [5] BORGWARDT, S., AND PEÑALOZA, R. Fuzzy description logics – a survey. In *Scalable Uncertainty Management* (2017), Springer, pp. 31–45.
- [6] CAROTHERS, G., AND PRUDHOMMEAUX, E. RDF 1.1 Turtle. Recommendation, W3C, February 2014. <http://www.w3.org/TR/2014/REC-turtle-20140225/>.
- [7] CRISTIANI, M., AND GABRIELLI, N. Practical issues of description logics for spatial reasoning. In *AAAI Spring Symposium, Stanford University, Stanford, 21–23 March, 2011* (2011).
- [8] ENDERTON, H. B. *A Mathematical Introduction to Logic*, 2nd ed. Academic Press, 2001.

- [9] FIORINI, S. R., DOS SANTOS, W. S., MESQUITA, R. C., LIMA, G. F., AND MORENO, M. F. General fragment model for information artifacts, 2019.
- [10] GOLDBLATT, R. *Logics of Time and Computation*, 2nd ed. CSLI, 1992.
- [11] GROSOFF, B. N., HORROCKS, I., VOLZ, R., AND DECKER, S. Description logic programs: Combining logic programs with description logic. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on World Wide Web* (2003), WWW '03, ACM, pp. 48–57.
- [12] HARRIS, S., AND SEABORNE, A. SPARQL 1.1 query language. Recommendation, W3C, March 2013. <http://www.w3.org/TR/2013/REC-sparql11-query-20130321/>.
- [13] HAYES, P., AND PATEL-SCHNEIDER, P. RDF 1.1 semantics. Recommendation, W3C, February 2014. <http://www.w3.org/TR/2014/REC-rdf11-mt-20140225/>.
- [14] HITZLER, P., KRÖTZSCH, M., AND PETER F. PATEL-SCHNEIDER, B. P., AND RUDOLPH, S. OWL 2 Web Ontology Language primer (second edition). Recommendation, W3C, December 2014. <http://www.w3.org/TR/2012/REC-owl2-primer-20121211/>.
- [15] HITZLER, P., KRÖTZSCH, M., AND RUDOLPH, S. *Foundations of Semantic Web Technologies*. Chapman & Hall, 2010.
- [16] HORROCKS, I., KUTZ, O., AND SATTLER, U. The even more irresistible *SROIQ*. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning* (2006), KR'06, AAAI Press, pp. 57–67.
- [17] HUDELOT, C., , ATIF, J., AND BLOCH, I. $\mathcal{ALC}(F)$: A new description logic for spatial reasoning in images. In *Computer Vision - ECCV 2014 Workshops* (2015), L. Agapito, M. M. Bronstein, and C. Rother, Eds., Springer, pp. 370–384.
- [18] KRÖTZSCH, M., RUDOLPH, S., AND HITZLER, P. Description logic rules. In *Proceedings of the 18th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Patras, February 2008* (2008), IOS Press, pp. 80–84.
- [19] MILEA, V., FRASINCAR, F., AND KAYMAK, U. tOWL: A temporal web ontology language. *IEEE Trans. Syst; Man, and Cybern., Part B (Cybernetics)* 42, 1 (February 2012), 268–281.
- [20] MORENO, M., SANTOS, R., MOZART, R., SANTOS, W., AND CERQUEIRA, R. Assisting seismic image interpretations with hyperknowledge. In *2018 First International Conference on Artificial Intelligence for Industries (AI4I)* (September 2018), pp. 48–51.

- [21] MORENO, M., SANTOS, R., SANTOS, W., BRANDÃO, R., CARRION, P., AND CERQUEIRA, R. Handling hyperknowledge representations through an interactive visual approach. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Information Reuse and Integration (IRI)* (July 2018), pp. 139–146.
- [22] MORENO, M., SANTOS, R., SANTOS, W., SILVA, R., AND CERQUEIRA, R. Knowledge bases enrichment with temporal reasoning using hyperknowledge. In *2018 IEEE First International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Knowledge Engineering (AIKE)* (September 2018), pp. 125–128.
- [23] MORENO, M., SANTOS, W. H. S. D., SANTOS, R. C. M., RAMOS, I., AND CERQUEIRA, R. Supporting soccer analytics through hyperknowledge specifications. In *2019 Second International Conference on Artificial Intelligence for Industries (AI4I)* (September 2019).
- [24] MORENO, M., SCHIRMER, L., BAYSER, M., BRANDÃO, R., AND CERQUEIRA, R. Understanding documents with hyperknowledge specifications. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Document Engineering 2018* (2018), DocEng '18, ACM, pp. 41:1–41:4.
- [25] MORENO, M. F., BRANDAO, R., AND CERQUEIRA, R. Extending hypermedia conceptual models to support hyperknowledge specifications. *Int. J. Semant. Comput.* 11, 1 (2017), 43–64.
- [26] OWL@MANCHESTER. List of reasoners. <http://owl.cs.manchester.ac.uk/tools/list-of-reasoners/>, 2019.
- [27] PFEIFFER, S., MANNENS, E., TRONCY, R., AND DEURSEN, D. V. Media Fragments URI 1.0 (basic). W3C recommendation, W3C, September 2012. <http://www.w3.org/TR/2012/REC-media-frags-20120925/>.
- [28] RANDELL, D. A., CUI, Z., AND COHN, A. G. A spatial logic based on regions and connection. In *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning* (1992), KR '92, Morgan Kaufmann, pp. 165–176.
- [29] ROBINSON, I., WEBBER, J., AND EIFREM, E. *Graph Databases*. O'Reilly, 2013.
- [30] RUDOLPH, S. Foundations of description logics. In *Reasoning Web. Semantic Technologies for the Web of Data: 7th International Summer School 2011, Galway, Ireland, August 23-27, 2011, Tutorial Lectures*. Springer, 2011, pp. 76–136.
- [31] SCHMIDT-SCHAUS, M., AND SMOLKA, G. Attributive concept descriptions with complements. *Artif. Intell.* 48, 1 (1991), 1–26.
- [32] SIKOS, L. F. *Description Logics in Multimedia Reasoning*. Springer, 2017.

- [33] SOARES, L. F. G., AND RODRIGUES, R. F. Nested Context Model 3.0 part 1: NCM core. Monographs in computer science, Informatics Department, PUC-Rio, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 2005.
- [34] STAAB, S., AND STUDER, R., Eds. *Handbook on Ontologies*, 2nd ed. Springer-Verlag, 2009.
- [35] W3C OWL WG. OWL 2 Web Ontology Language document overview (second edition). Recommendation, W3C, December 2012. <http://www.w3.org/TR/2012/REC-owl2-overview-20121211/>.
- [36] W3C SEMANTIC WEB WIKI. Semantic web development tools. <https://www.w3.org/2001/sw/wiki/Tools>, 2019.
- [37] WANG, Y., CHANG, L., LI, F., AND GU, T. Verification of branch-time property based on dynamic description logic. In *Intelligent Information Processing VII* (2014), Springer, pp. 161–170.
- [38] WESSEL, M. Qualitative spatial reasoning with the $\mathcal{ALCI}_{RCC}$ family: First results and unanswered questions. Memo 324/03, University of Hamburg, 2003. <https://kogs-www.informatik.uni-hamburg.de/publikationen/pub-wessel/report7.pdf>.
- [39] WOOD, D., LANTHALER, M., AND CYGANIAK, R. RDF 1.1 concepts and abstract syntax. Recommendation, W3C, February 2014. <http://www.w3.org/TR/2014/REC-rdf11-concepts-20140225/>.
- [40] ZOLIN, E. Complexity of reasoning in description logics. <http://www.cs.man.ac.uk/~ezolin/dl/>, 2019.