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Abstract
The popularity of OWL for knowledge representation in the Semantic Web applications makes it an attractive platform. Although OWL supports some form of object-oriented features for knowledge structuring and maintenance, it is significantly weak in capturing most essential object-oriented features such as single and multiple inheritance, default class values, methods, overriding and encapsulation in their true spirits. It is also weak in extending reasoning support for intelligent knowledge processing. Such features are becoming increasingly essential in applications such as social networks, e-commerce and knowledge rich ontology for Life Sciences. In this paper, we propose an extension of OWL toward a more powerful knowledge structuring language, called OWL++, by supporting multiple different types of inheritance with overriding, and non-monotonic reasoning capabilities within OWL. We demonstrate OWL++’s computability and implementability by presenting a translational semantics of OWL++ to OWL, for which we have robust execution engines while for the reasoning component of OWL++ we rely on Jena to support rules in OWL.

Introduction
Since W3C accepted OWL Web Ontology Language as a standard for knowledge representation in the Semantic Web several years ago, OWL has become the leading ontology language in industry and academia as evidenced by the significant number of applications and development tools reported in the literature. Despite OWL’s immense popularity, its inherent limitation in handling exceptions and conflicts in multiple inheritance hierarchies poses significant hurdles in naturally capturing modern application semantics that demand advanced constructs to structure knowledge. This limitation may be attributed to OWL’s semantic foundations rooted in Description Logic (DL). From a software engineering and knowledge representation standpoint, the importance of class and inheritance hierarchies has been well documented in the literature and in OWL’s own adoption of these concepts to a limited extent. The insistence on inheritance with overriding in class hierarchies also demands attention to the concomitant issue of conflict resolution due to multiple inheritance and exceptions. The absence of a satisfactory semantic along these lines in OWL has been a major bottleneck for its wider use in modern applications requiring serious knowledge representation tools.

Conflicts and exceptions are natural in common sense knowledge. To appreciate the breadth and scope of exceptions in the context of the Semantic Web, we summarize below the various different ways it can manifest itself in such applications. For example,

- **Rules with Exception**: In e-commerce it is common to have conflicting business rules. In (Antoniou and Arief 2002), the authors present several such rules with exceptions. One of the simple ones says that ‘If a customer is loyal then grant discounts’, which is in contradiction with the general business rule that states ‘No discount may be allowed to customers’.

- **Reasoning with Incomplete Information**: (Antoniou and Arief 2002) also describes a scenario where business rules have to cope with incomplete information, i.e. in the absence of certain information some assumptions have to be made that lead to conclusions not supported by OWL. For example, conventional wisdom dictates that the packaging for tax free food is also tax free. However, in the absence of the knowledge that any packaging that is more exotic than usual is not tax free.

- **Ontology Merging**: When ontologies from different sources are merged, contradictions arise naturally and OWL cannot cope with such inconsistencies.

- **Default Inheritance in Ontologies**: The need for default value inheritance in ontologies has been discussed in (Bernstein and Grosos 2003) in the context of modeling the MIT Process Handbook. As pointed out in this example, and numerous others (Jamil 1997), default values and overriding inheritance of such values in inheritance hierarchies are one of the most effective, efficient and elegant ways of factoring information and streamlining their maintenance.

- **Non-monotonic Reasoning**: Once exceptions are allowed, and reasoning is supported, the natural demand is the
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support for non-monotonic reasoning as advocated in RuleML.

To exemplify the need for representing default values and their inheritance in OWL class hierarchies, let us discuss a simple scenario. In OWL, all properties are defined outside of class descriptions and are thus decoupled from all classes making them global in nature, exposed and available to all classes. The mapping constructs domain and range externally tie properties to OWL classes. Since a property is global, default value assignment is not feasible or meaningful for OWL classes. Essentially, values are thus assigned at the instance level. For example, if class GradStudent has a monthlySalary property with a default value $1,500, then in OWL we need to assign this value to every GradStudent instance explicitly through textual assignment. In essence, the inheritance of the default value and its possible overriding is decided statically at compile time, leaving no option for updating the default value. This leaves the issue of maintenance on shaky ground because if we are to change this default value to another value, say $1,700, we will be required to update the knowledge base entirely and replace all occurrences of $1,500 to $1,700. As opposed to OWL, object-oriented (OO) systems handle default values quite elegantly. In OO systems, default class values are assigned inside a class template to an attribute or class variable (Meditskos and Bassiliades 2008) which is local to the class, and thus, shielded from outside use. The mechanism of inheritance is used to share this value at run time at the instance or subclass level, giving the opportunity to update the class value when needed without the need to update all instance objects locally. This dynamic resolution of overriding and default value inheritance facilitates maintenance and improved knowledge structuring as we will witness in the following sections. OO systems also are better equipped to handle conflicts in the case of multiple inheritance (Jamil 1997) but OWL simply does not support this feature.

**Contributions of OWL++**

In this paper, we present an extension of OWL called OWL++ to support default value inheritance, overriding, conflict resolution and non-monotonic reasoning in a spirit similar to OO systems. So, the main contributions of our proposal can be summarized as follows:

- We introduce the notion of default property values in OWL classes and their inheritance with overriding in the class hierarchies.
- We address the issue of multiple inheritance and conflict resolution through the introduction of the concept of property locality and inheritability in OWL class hierarchies.
- We also introduce the concept of null inheritance\(^1\) in OWL to model withdrawal of properties in subclasses to aid conflict resolution and to support complex inheritance needs.

\(^1\)A superclass in OWL++ may inhibit a subclass from inheriting its properties by declaring them null, such as AverageSalary in employee class, which has no meaning at the instance level.

- As a demonstration of its implementability and the soundness of its semantics, we present a translation procedure of OWL++ to OWL. OWL++ is implemented as a Java based front-end through which the users interact on top of Jena (jena.sourceforge.net). We chose to use a translational semantics to leverage existing robust OWL engines such as Jena for our implementation to avoid effort duplication, ease of implementation and efficiency, and for the reasoning support it offers for OWL.

**A Motivating Example**

We now discuss modeling a social network type of application similar to Facebook and LinkedIn using OWL++ for expository purposes to highlight its salient features on intuitive grounds. In this example application, we model a non-profit humanitarian group that aims to promote education in the less fortunate parts of the world. Every member of this social network is classified as a Donor, Student, Mentor or Associate. Donors offer financial resources or funds to students for their education. Mentors are professional teachers who act as surrogates to administer the funds donated by donors and guide students, while Associates offer support in the form of coordination and program organization. The associates in this social network are usually members of the Mentor class who are teachers.

Figure 1 shows a partial ontology of this application in which classes are shown in ovals (i.e., Donor), solid arrows represent properties and the annotations on the arrows represent their names (i.e., monthlyFee), solid rectangles represent default class values (i.e., $100), and dashed rectangles depict default class values (also known as virtual attributes) that are computed (i.e., Gold if (monthlyFee*12 + donation) \(\geq 5,000\)). Computed property values are essentially a set of rules that assigns a value to the property when executed. A bar above any rectangle indicates an inhibition of the associated property in the class for which the property is defined (i.e., property profession in Student class is withdrawn although it is a subclass of Member). It is important to note here that in OWL++, a property can only be associated with

![Figure 1: Classes showing inheritance modes and types](image-url)
one class giving the property a specific locality that we exploit in overriding and conflict resolution decisions during inheritance in OWL++. Finally, a dashed arrow captures the notion of subclasses in OO systems (i.e., Donor inherits all the properties of Member being one of its subclasses and additionally defines three new properties: monthlyFee, donation, and category). Inhibited property annotations can be further prefixed with class names to indicate the choice of inhibition (i.e., Donor:profession in class Associate). This feature is useful for the purpose of inheritance conflict resolution as we will discuss shortly.

Preliminaries

To stay consistent with OWL and one of its extensions called SWRL, we adapt the syntax and semantics of OWL (Patel-Schneider, Hayes, and Horrocks 2004) and SWRL (Horrocks et al. 2004) as adapted in OWL++.

OWL Web Ontology Language

Definition 1 (OWL Vocabulary) The OWL vocabulary consists of a set of literals \( V \) and seven sets of URI references, \( V_C, V_D, V_I, V_{DP}, V_{IP}, V_{AP}, \) and \( V_D \). The components of \( V \), i.e., \( V_C, V_D, V_I, V_{DP}, V_{IP}, V_{AP}, \) and \( V_D \), are pairwise disjoint. \( V_C \) consists of class names \( \text{owl:Thing} \) and \( \text{owl:Nothing} \). \( V_D \) consists of OWL URI reference for built-in datatype name \( \text{rdfs:Literal}. \) \( V_{AP} \) is the set of annotations containing \( \text{owl:versionInfo}, \text{rdfs:label}, \text{rdfs:comment}, \text{rdfs:seeAlso}, \) and \( \text{rdfs:isDefinedBy} \). Finally, the individual-valued property names \( V_{IP} \), the data-valued property names \( V_{DP} \), the individual names \( V_I \), and the ontology names \( V_O \) do not have any required members.

Definition 2 (OWL Interpretation) An OWL Interpretation is a tuple of the form \( \mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{R}, EC, ER, I, S, LV) \), where \( \mathcal{R} \) is a set of resources, \( LV \subseteq \mathcal{R} \) is a set of literal values, \( EC \) is a mapping of URI references to OWL classes and datatypes. Also, \( ER \) is a mapping of URI references for OWL properties, \( L \) maps typed literals to \( LV \) and \( S \) maps individual names to elements of \( EC \) (owl:Thing).

Definition 3 (OWL Classes) An OWL class \( oc \) is a structure of the form \( < \alpha, \kappa > \), where \( \alpha \) is the class axiom\(^2\) and \( \kappa \) is a set of OWL constructs\(^3\).

Example 1 The following example captures the Associate class of Figure 1 in OWL.

\[
\langle \text{owl:Class rdf:ID="Associate"} >
\langle \text{rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#Donor"} 
\langle \text{rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#Mentor"} 
\langle /\text{owl:Class} >
\]

Definition 4 (OWL Instances) An OWL instance \( oi \) is a structure of the form \( < \alpha_i, pv > \), where \( \alpha_i \) is the instance axiom and \( pv \) is a set of name value pairs.

Example 2 Let D1 be an instance of Donor in which the properties name and profession have values “Sam” and “Teacher” respectively. The OWL representation for Donor is shown below.

\[
\langle \text{Donor rdf:ID="D1"} >
\langle \text{name rdf:datatype="&xsd;string">Sam</name>
\langle \text{profession rdf:datatype="&xsd;string">Engineer</profession>
\langle /\text{Donor} >
\]

The Semantic Web Rule Language (SWRL)

SWRL (Horrocks et al. 2004) extends OWL with simple Horn rules. The syntax of a rule is \( \mathcal{A} \leftarrow B_1, \ldots, B_m \), where \( \mathcal{A} \) is the head and \( B_i \) are body atoms. The atoms can be of the following forms: \( C(x), D(z), P(x, y), Q(x, z), \text{sameAs}(x, y), \text{differentFrom}(x, y) \) and \( \text{builtIn}(B, z_1, \ldots, z_n) \), where \( C \) is an OWL DL description, \( D \) is an OWL DL data range, \( P \) is an OWL DL individual-valued property, \( Q \) is an OWL DL data-valued property, \( B \) is a built in predicate, \( x \) and \( y \) are variables or OWL individuals, and \( z, z_1, \ldots, z_n \) are variables or OWL data values. Usually the body atoms are binary predicates but using built-ins SWRL also allows some predefined n-ary predicates in body atoms. We adapt the XML version of rule syntax directly from (Horrocks et al. 2004). However, since the XML version is fairly verbose we will use short hand notation as follows:

\[
\text{head} \leftarrow \text{body}
\]

OWL++ Overview

We now briefly introduce the syntax and semantics of OWL++ with an overview of its salient features. An OWL++ program basically is a set of classes, instances, object and data type properties and rule definitions. In contrast to OWL class definitions, an OWL++ definition has properties with default value or rules through its signature construct. An instance object is similar to a class object except that instances do not define the structural aspects of class objects and can not have instances or subclasses of their own.

Syntax

Definition 5 (OWL++ Programs) An OWL++ program \( P \) is a tuple of the form \( \langle \Sigma, \Upsilon, \Omega \rangle \), where \( \Sigma \) is a set of class structures, containing \( \text{owl:Thing} \) and \( \text{owl:Nothing} \), \( \Upsilon \) is the set of Horn like rules, and \( \Omega = \{ V_D, V_I, V_{DP}, V_{IP}, V_{AP}, V_O \} \) is the set of OWL elements as defined in Definition 1.

Definition 6 (OWL++ Class Structure) An OWL++ class structure \( c \) is of the form \( < \alpha, \psi, \kappa > \), where \( \alpha \) is the class axiom, \( \psi \) is the signature of the class and \( \kappa \) is a set of OWL constructs.

Definition 7 (Class Signature) A class signature \( \psi \) of class \( c \) is of the form \( \langle \rho, \delta \rangle \), where \( \rho \) is a set of inhibited properties from its super classes and \( \delta \) is the set of properties that have either default values or a rule corresponding to a virtual property. The set of inhibited properties in \( c \) is denoted by \( \rho(c) \).
Example 3  The following XML code fragment defines the structure of Donor and Associate class in OWL++. Within the signature construct Donor takes a default value on monthlyFee and a default rule for type property\(^4\).

```xml
<owl:Class rdf:ID="Donor">  
  <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#Member" />  
  <owlp:Signature>  
    <monthlyFee rdf:datatype="#xsd:int">100</monthlyFee>  
    <donation object, amount>, 12*fee+amount >= $5,000  
  </owlp:Signature>  
</owl:Class>

Similarly, the class Associate inhibits the property profession from Donor in an attempt to avoid conflict due to multiple inheritance, and thus allows the inheritance of the property along with its default value from the Mentor class, if any. In the absence of this inhibitory declaration, Associate will inherit neither based on OWL++’s cautious semantics.

```xml
<owl:Class rdf:ID="Associate">  
  <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#Donor" />  
  <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#Mentor" />  
  <owlp:Signature>  
    <monthlyFee rdf:datatype="#xsd:int">100</monthlyFee>  
  </owlp:Signature>  
  <owlp:reject rdf:resource="#Donor::profession"/>  
</owl:Class>

To be able to capture an intuitive semantics of inheritance with overriding and conflict resolution, (Jamil 1997) introduced the concept of property locality, and inheritability of properties based on the locality of their definitions. The idea of inheritability states that a class can inherit a property from another class if there is a unique path of subclass relationships between these classes, and there is no intermediate class that redefines the same property (and thus overrides it), thereby guaranteeing the inheretance of most specific and conflict free class properties. The concept of locality and inheritability are captured in the following set of definitions.

- **Code or virtual property**: A property \( p \) in \( Y \subset V_C \) is said to be virtual if it is defined using a OWL++ rule.
- **Global property**: Any property \( p \in P = \{V_{IP}, V_{DP}, V_{CP}\} \) is said to be global since it is defined outside of a class.
- **Locality of property**: Let \( p \) be a property and \( o \) be an object then \( o : p \) represents the fact that \( p \) is locally defined at \( o \). Intuitively, \( o \) is called the concept or the descriptor of the local property \( p \), i.e. \( context(p) = o \). In example 3 the property monthlyFee is defined locally within the signature construct i.e. \( context(monthlyFee) = Donor \).
- **Is-a**: Let \( o_a \), \( o_i \) and \( o_s \) be class names. Then \( o_i \in o_a \) and \( o_s : o_a \) are respectively instance and subclass descriptions in OWL++. Intuitively, they say that \( o_i \) and \( o_s \) are instance and subclass of \( o_a \) respectively. We will use the notation \( o_i p \) throughout when the difference between the two is unimportant.

### Definition 8 (Locality)
Let \( P = \{\Sigma, \Gamma, \Omega\} \) be a program, \( o_i \) be a class object, \( o \) be any object, \( \varphi \) be any signature expression for \( o_i \in \Sigma \), and \( p \in P \) be any property such that \( context(p) = o \), or \( context(\varphi) = o \). Then \( p \) and \( \varphi \) are local to objects \( o_i \) and \( o \) respectively in \( P \).

### Definition 9 (Property Inheritability)
Let \( S \) be a set of is-a descriptions, \( p \) be a property symbol and \( o \) be an object. Then the inheritability of the property \( p \) in the object \( o \) is defined by the property inheritability function \( \nabla_p \) as follows:

\[
\nabla_p(S, p, o) = \begin{cases} 
  o_s & \text{if property context}(p) = o \text{ and } [\exists q \text{ such that } q \in S, \nabla_p(S, p, q) = o_s, \text{ context}(p) = o_s, \nabla_p(S, p, o) = \nabla_p(S, p, o_s) \text{ and } (\forall p, q, r \text{ such that } q \neq r \in S, \text{ one of the following holds).}} \\
  r & \text{if } \nabla_p(S, p, r) = r, \text{ and context}(p) \neq r \text{, and } o \text{, or } p \in \rho(o).} \\
  o & \text{in all other cases}
\end{cases}
\]

The algorithm to compute the inheritability function \( \nabla_p(S, p, o) \) is given bellow:

#### Algorithm 1 computeInheritableFunction(class, lcc)

Require: initially lcc = \( \emptyset \) {lcc = list of computed classes}

if class \( \in lcc \) then
  continue
end if

ldp = list of default properties of class
for each \( dp \in ldp \) do
  put inheritable(class, class, dp). into rule base
end for

lp = list of inhibited properties of class
lip = list of immediate parents of class
for each \( pClass \in lip \) do
  if lcc \( \neq \emptyset \) and \( pClass \notin lcc \) then
    computeInheritableFunction(pClass, lcc)
  end if
  lp = list of all properties of \( pClass \)
  for each \( p \in lp \) do
    if \( p \in ldp \) or \( p \in lp \) then
      continue
    end if
    if \( p \) already inherited from another class then
      throw Exception("Inheritance Conflict")
    end if
    add fact inheritable(class, pClass, p). to rule base
  end for
end for

#### Definition 10 (Inherited Property)
Let \( P \) be a program, \( o_i \) be a class object, \( o \) be an instance object, \( o \) be any object i.e. \( o \in o_i \cup o \cup p \in P \) be a property, and \( context(p) = o \). Then \( p \) is inherited in \( o \) if \( \nabla_p(S, p, o_i) = o \). We say \( o \) code inherits \( p \) if \( p \in V_{CP} \), otherwise it value inherits \( p \) if \( p \in V_{IP} \cup V_{DP} \).

---

\(^4\)For lack of space, instead of using the customary XML based SWRL syntax, we directly use a Horn like rule notation for this virtual property type within the class structure below with the understanding that in a real OWL++ program this rule will be replaced by a SWRL like syntax.
Semantics Based on Rewriting

The semantics of an OWL++ program $P = (\Sigma, \mathcal{Y}, \Omega)$ are obtained by translating it to an equivalent OWL program $P' = (\Sigma', \mathcal{Y}', \Omega')$ such that $\Sigma'$ is a set of OWL classes in $V_C$, $\mathcal{Y}'$ is a set of SWRL rules and $\Omega'$ has a set of instances $V_I = V_I \cup V_{SI}$ where $V_{SI}$ is a set of system instances for every OWL++ class that has default values. The algorithm below describes how to translate $P$ to $P'$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm 2 Rewriting class structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>if signature $\psi \in c_s(\alpha_c, \psi, \kappa) = \emptyset$ then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWL class expression $oc(\alpha_c, \kappa) = c_s(\alpha_c, \psi, \kappa)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add $oc(\alpha_c, \kappa) \in \Sigma'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remove $\psi$ from $c_s(\alpha_c, \psi, \kappa)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add $oc(\alpha_c, \kappa) \in \Sigma'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if $\delta = \emptyset$ then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if $\delta \in V_{IP} \cup V_{DP}$ then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>create $oi^\perp$, a system instance of OWL class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for every $p \in V_{IP} \cup V_{DP}$ do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add $p \in \alpha_\delta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add $oi^\perp \in V_{SI}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if $\delta \in V_{CP}$ then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for every $p \in V_{CP}$ do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>replace object variable with the class object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end if</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 4 The Donor class in OWL++ shown above will be disassembled to an equivalent OWL class with the same name, a system instance named Sys-Donor with monthlyFee of value $100 and a rule for the type property as shown below.

```xml
<owl:Class rdf:ID="Donor">
  <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#Member"/>
</owl:Class>

<Donor rdf:ID="Sys-Donor">
  <monthlyFee rdf:datatype="&xsd;int">100</monthlyFee>
</Donor>

type(Donor, "Gold") <- monthlyFee(Donor, fee),
donation(Donor, amount), 12*fee+amount <= $5,000
```

For the class Associate, we just remove the signature and add the following OWL class.

```xml
<owl:Class rdf:ID="Associate">
  <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#Donor"/>
  <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#Mentor"/>
</owl:Class>
```

Recall that we have used signatures to override values and rules locally within a class. To be able to simulate non-monotonic inheritance with overriding and conflict resolution, we create a system instance of a class if that class contains any default value for a property $p \in V_{IP} \cup V_{DP}$ and assign the value to this system instance. However, if $p \in V_{CP}$ then we replace the class object with the object returned by the inheritable function.

The translation into an OWL then completes by adding all the facts computed by $\nabla$ function to $P'$, a process we call inheritance closure, and by adding the following completion rules to it. The completion rules properly deduce which object $c$ can inherit a property $p$ from a class $c$ and bind those inherited properties to the relevant objects. For our example, inheritance closure will add the following facts to the translated OWL program $P'$.

- inheritable (Donor, monthlyFee, Donor).
- inheritable (Donor, type, Donor).
- inheritable (Mentor, profession, Mentor).
- inheritable (Associate, profession, Mentor).
- inheritable (Associate, monthlyFee, Donor).
- inheritable (Associate, type, Donor).

Query Translation

We query an OWL++ program with the SPARQL query language (Prud’hommeaux and Seaborne). The general syntax of SPARQL is of the form (subject predicate object), where subject, predicate and object are either variables or URIs and have usual meanings as in SPARQL.

Any query to a class instance in OWL++ does not need to be translated, since the instance structure in both languages are identical. However, a query involving class structures, e.g. default values, needs to be translated to equivalent OWL query. Since the default value of a class property is tied with the object sys-instance, a query that asks for a class property value is translated with respect to that sys-instance. The sys-instance is actually the system instance of the class from which the property is inherited or returned by the inheritable function. For example, the query (Donor monthlyFee ?value) is translated to (Sys-Donor monthlyFee ?value), since the value of monthlyFee is stored in Sys-Donor instance. Several other examples of translated queries are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Query Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Query</th>
<th>Translated Query</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Donor monthlyFee ?value)</td>
<td>(Sys-Donor monthlyFee ?value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Associate profession ?value)</td>
<td>(Sys-Mentor profession ?value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D1 monthlyFee ?value)</td>
<td>(Sys-Donor monthlyFee ?value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D1 name ?value)</td>
<td>(D1 name ?value)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

property(source, value) ← inheritable(source, prop, object), property (object, value).

5System instance is not part of OWL++ program individuals and users are not aware of it. It is used to simulate the default behavior of OWL++ class.

6Variables start with the symbol '?'.
property(source, value) ← inheritable(source, prop, object), sysInstanceOf(object, sys_object), property(sys_object, value).

Related Research

To the best of our knowledge, we believe that OWL++ is the first language that extends OWL with support for overriding inheritance, conflict resolution and non-monotonic reasoning in a single platform. However, the development proposed in this paper has been largely motivated by the work in (Jamil 1997). We now discuss other research that are similar in spirit to this development, but they do not quite address the issues raised. (Yang, Kifer, and Zhao 2003) propose a model for semantic web, and (Kifer 2005; Katz and Parsia 2005) introduce the concept of non-monotonic inheritance into non OWL based Semantic Web rule languages. On the other hand, (Bernstein and Grosos 2003) proposed a new approach called Courteous inheritance, using Courteous Logic Programs (CLP), a subset of Rule Markup Language, RuleML (Boley, Tabet, and Wagner 2001), to represent non-monotonic inheritance reasoning in process ontologies. In this approach, the PH ontology knowledge e.g. subclass relationship and property values, are represented as CLP rules. The CLP rules have labels (optional) to identify prioritized conflicts using a special predicate "overrides". For example, overrides([l1, l2]) means that (any rule labeled) "l1" has strictly higher priority than "l2". Similar kind of non-monotonic extensions of Description Logic have been proposed in (Antoniou 2002). This work shows how non-monotonic rule systems in the form of defeasible reasoning can be built on top of the Description Logic. In both cases, exceptions are not modeled as part of the semantics. Instead it needs to specify every exception rule explicitly, making knowledge representation clumsy and compromising the naturalness of knowledge representation.

Summary

Non-monotonic inheritance and overriding has always been a complex subject to address satisfactorily because it involves the notion of theory or belief revision. In the context of the Semantic Web, the problem is more acute because complete enumeration of all exceptions are not possible ahead of time due to its sheer size, and the constant changes in the universe of discourse. So, there is a serious need for a language in which the semantics of the language is capable of handling such exceptions naturally without user intervention or prior knowledge. In this paper, we have proposed one such language to tackle these issues in an elegant fashion within the semantics of the language. This extension empowers OWL with the requisite set of constructs needed to support modern applications. We have presented a brief but formal syntax for our language OWL++ and demonstrated its usefulness and salient features using several real life examples. To comply with standards and recent developments, we have adapted to OWL and SWRL syntax, and implemented our system on top of the Jena reasoner for OWL. In our implementation, the user always uses OWL++ to represent an ontology, and is unaware of the use of the back-end systems. Thus, the main strength of this proposal is its tight integration with the existing OWL and SWRL languages and the rewriting based approach that we take to construct a semantics of OWL++, allowing us to use existing technologies to build the OWL++ reasoner.
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