Deutsches
Forschungszentrum
für Künstliche
Intelligenz GmbH

Technical
Memo
TM-90-04

Terminological Knowledge Representation:

A Proposal for a Terminological Logic

F. Baader, H.-J. Bürckert,
J. Heinsohn, B. Hollunder,
J. Müller, B. Nebel,
W. Nutt, H.-J. Profitlich

December 1990

Deutsches Forschungszentrum für Künstliche Intelligenz GmbH

Postfach 20 80
D-6750 Kaiserslautern
Tel.: (+49 631) 205-3211/13
Fax: (+49 631) 205-3210

Stuhlsatzenhausweg 3
D-6600 Saarbrücken 11
Tel.: (+49 681) 302-5252
Fax: (+49 681) 302-5341

Deutsches Forschungszentrum für Künstliche Intelligenz

The German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence (Deutsches Forschungszentrum für Künstliche Intelligenz, DFKI) with sites in Kaiserslautern und Saarbrücken is a non-profit organization which was founded in 1988 by the shareholder companies ADV/Orga, AEG, IBM, Insiders, Fraunhofer Gesellschaft, GMD, Krupp-Atlas, Mannesmann-Kienzle, Philips, Siemens and Siemens-Nixdorf. Research projects conducted at the DFKI are funded by the German Ministry for Research and Technology, by the shareholder companies, or by other industrial contracts.

The DFKI conducts application-oriented basic research in the field of artificial intelligence and other related subfields of computer science. The overall goal is to construct *systems with technical knowledge and common sense* which - by using AI methods - implement a problem solution for a selected application area. Currently, there are the following research areas at the DFKI:

- ❑ Intelligent Engineering Systems
- ❑ Intelligent User Interfaces
- ❑ Intelligent Communication Networks
- ❑ Intelligent Cooperative Systems.

The DFKI strives at making its research results available to the scientific community. There exist many contacts to domestic and foreign research institutions, both in academy and industry. The DFKI hosts technology transfer workshops for shareholders and other interested groups in order to inform about the current state of research.

From its beginning, the DFKI has provided an attractive working environment for AI researchers from Germany and from all over the world. The goal is to have a staff of about 100 researchers at the end of the building-up phase.

Prof. Dr. Gerhard Barth
Director

Terminological Knowledge Representation: A Proposal for a Terminological Logic

Franz Baader, Hans-Jürgen Bürckert, Jochen Heinsohn, Bernhard Hollunder, Jürgen Müller, Bernhard Nebel, Werner Nutt, Hans-Jürgen Profitlich

DFKI-TM-90-04

Terminological Knowledge Representation: A Proposal for a Terminological Logic

Franz Baader, Hans-Jürgen Bürckert, Jochen Heinsohn,
Bernhard Hollunder, Jürgen Müller, Bernhard Nebel,
Werner Nutt, Hans-Jürgen Profitlich
Deutsches Forschungszentrum für Künstliche Intelligenz (DFKI)
Postfach 2080, D-6750 Kaiserslautern
Stuhlsatzenhausweg 3, D-6600 Saarbrücken 11
West Germany

Abstract

This paper contains a proposal for a terminological logic. The formalisms for representing knowledge as well as the needed inferences are described.

1 Introduction

An important aspect of intelligence is the use of existing knowledge. In order to realize this in AI-Systems we need both adequate methods to represent knowledge and effective procedures to retrieve and reuse the needed knowledge. One of the basic mechanisms of human knowledge representation and processing is the division of the world into classes or concepts ("find the right pigeonhole") which usually are given with a hierarchical structure.

Let us consider some knowledge base about families and relationships. We have to deal with persons which are of sex male or female. We have parents, mothers, fathers etc. A verbal description of this knowledge might be as follows:

- *Persons* are of *sex Male* or *Female.*
- *Woman* is defined as *Person* with *sex Female.*
- *Man* is defined as *Person* with *sex Male.*
- Nobody can be both *Man* and *Woman.*
- *Parents* are defined as *Persons* which have some *child* (which is also a *Person*).
- *Mothers* are defined to be *Parents* with *sex Female.*
- *Fathers* are defined to be *Parents* with *sex Male.*
- *Mother_with_many_children* is defined as *Mother* with at least three *children.*

We also have individuals (or objects) which are instances of concepts. For example,

- *John* is a *Father.*
- *Tom* is a *child* of *John.*
- *Mary* is a *Woman.*

Now every knowledge representation system should offer a couple of services that allow to arrange, manage, modify or retrieve information of the above kind. It should be able to answer the following questions:

- Is an introduced concept defined in a meaningful way at all (or does it denote the empty concept in all worlds) ? (*satisfiability*)
- Is a concept more general than another one ? (*subsumption*)
- Where exactly is the concept situated in a concept hierarchy ? (*classification*)
- Is the represented knowledge consistent ? (*consistency*)
- What facts are deducible from the knowledge ? (*instantiation*)
- Which are the concepts an object is instance of ? (*realization*)
- Which are the instances of a given concept ? (*retrieval*)

Building such a system we are confronted with the following questions:

1. How can the above properties found out at all ?
   And then if we know procedures that might do this:

2. How can we find out, if the procedures really do what they should do ?

3. How efficient are these procedures ?

Terminological logics based on concept description languages like KL-ONE [BS85] are such formalisms that make classification, description of relations among the classes and especially their hierarchical structure possible. However, concept description languages are not only one among a lot of possibilities, but meanwhile they offer compared to other KR-formalisms some fundamental advantages:

- There is a well understood *declarative* semantics.
  This means that the meaning of the constructs is not given operationally, e.g. by the implementation ("John is a father", because my system answers to the question "What is John?" just "father"), but the meaning is given by its description and its models ("John is a father", because he is a father in all models—in all worlds—where the description suits to.)

- There is a characterization of the tasks of the KR-systems by the declarative semantics.

- There is a number of procedures and algorithms that realize these tasks and whose properties are well investigated now:

  1. Correctness
     (If the system answers "John is a father", then John is a father within the meaning of the semantics—that is in all suitable worlds.)
  2. Completeness
     (The system answers "John is a father", if John is a father within the meaning of the semantics.)
  3. Complexity, Decidability
     (Are the services decidable and fast executable, respectively, at all ?)

If we want to design a knowledge base, we first need a formal language that we can use. In the following we will present a proposal for a terminological language in both abstract form and machine readable form (LISP notation). As a kernel, our language contains all the constructs provided by $\mathcal{ALC}$ [SS88] and some additional operators which (sometimes?) can be translated into $\mathcal{ALCFNR}$ [HN90].

2 Symbols

The terminological language is based on the following primitives, the symbols of the alphabet:

- Concept names: *CN*

- Role names: *RN*

- Attribute names: *AN*
- Individual names: *IN*
- Object names: *ON*

Examples with respect to our introductory example are: `Person`, `Woman`, `Man`, `Parent` are concept names, `child` is a role name, `sex` is an attribute name, `Male` and `Female` are individual names, and `John` and `Mary` are objects names.

With this primitives we are allowed to form more complex expressions as specified in the next two sections:

- Concept expressions: C
- Role expressions: R
- Attribute expressions: A

The meaning of these is given by models or interpretations $\mathcal{I}$. Those consist of a set $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$—the domain—and an interpretation function $\cdot^{\mathcal{I}}$, that assigns a set

$$CN^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$$

to each concept name CN, a set-valued function (or equivalently a binary relation)

$$RN^{\mathcal{I}} : \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \longrightarrow 2^{\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}} \qquad (RN^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}})$$

to each role name RN, a single-valued partial function

$$AN^{\mathcal{I}} : dom\, AN^{\mathcal{I}} \longrightarrow \Delta^{\mathcal{I}},$$

where $dom\, AN^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$, to each attribute name AN, and an element

$$I^{\mathcal{I}} \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$$

to each individual name IN and object name ON. We assume that different individuals and objects denote different elements in every interpretation. This property is called *unique name assumption* and is usually assumed in the database world.

3 Concept Forming Operators

Besides the concept, role, and attribute names our alphabet includes a number of operators, that permit to compose more complex concepts, roles, and attributes. We allow for the following concept forming operators:

Concrete Form	**Abstract Form**	**Semantics**
(and $C_1 \ldots C_n$)	$C_1 \sqcap \ldots \sqcap C_n$	$C_1^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \ldots \cap C_n^{\mathcal{I}}$
(or $C_1 \ldots C_n$)	$C_1 \sqcup \ldots \sqcup C_n$	$C_1^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \ldots \cup C_n^{\mathcal{I}}$
(not C)	$\neg C$	$\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \setminus C^{\mathcal{I}}$
(all R C)	$\forall R.C$	$\{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid R^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \subseteq C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$
(some R)	$\exists R$	$\{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid R^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \neq \emptyset\}$
(some R C)	$\exists R.C$	$\{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid R^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \cap C^{\mathcal{I}} \neq \emptyset\}$

(atleast n R)	$\exists_{\geq n} R$	$\{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid \lvert R^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \geq n \rvert\}$
(atmost n R)	$\exists_{\leq n} R$	$\{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid \lvert R^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \leq n \rvert\}$
(exact n R)	$\exists_{= n} R$	$\{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid \lvert R^{\mathcal{I}}(d) = n \rvert\}$
(atleast n R C)	$\exists_{\geq n} R.C$	$\{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid \lvert R^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \cap C^{\mathcal{I}} \geq n \rvert\}$
(atmost n R C)	$\exists_{\leq n} R.C$	$\{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid \lvert R^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \cap C^{\mathcal{I}} \leq n \rvert\}$
(exact n R C)	$\exists_{= n} R.C$	$\{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid \lvert R^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \cap C^{\mathcal{I}} = n \rvert\}$
(eq R_1 R_2)	$R_1 \downarrow R_2$	$\{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid R_1^{\mathcal{I}}(d) = R_2^{\mathcal{I}}(d)\}$
(neq R_1 R_2)	$R_1 \uparrow R_2$	$\{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid R_1^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \neq R_2^{\mathcal{I}}(d)\}$
(subset R_1 R_2)	$R_1 \rightarrow R_2$	$\{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid R_1^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \subseteq R_2^{\mathcal{I}}(d)\}$
(supset R_1 R_2)	$R_1 \leftarrow R_2$	$\{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid R_1^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \supseteq R_2^{\mathcal{I}}(d)\}$
(in A C)	$A : C$	$\{d \in dom\, A^{\mathcal{I}} \mid A^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$
(is A IN)	$A : IN$	$\{d \in dom\, A^{\mathcal{I}} \mid A^{\mathcal{I}}(d) = IN^{\mathcal{I}}\}$
(eq A_1 A_2)	$A_1 \downarrow A_2$	$\{d \in dom\, A_1^{\mathcal{I}} \cap dom\, A_2^{\mathcal{I}} \mid A_1^{\mathcal{I}}(d) = A_2^{\mathcal{I}}(d)\}$
(neq A_1 A_2)	$A_1 \uparrow A_2$	$\{d \in dom\, A_1^{\mathcal{I}} \cap dom\, A_2^{\mathcal{I}} \mid A_1^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \neq A_2^{\mathcal{I}}(d)\}$
(oneof $IN_1 \ldots IN_n$)	$\{IN_1, \ldots, IN_n\}$	$\{IN_1^{\mathcal{I}}, \ldots, IN_n^{\mathcal{I}}\}$

Examples: The concept *mother* can be described as

$$\texttt{Person} \sqcap \texttt{sex} : \texttt{Female};$$

Mother_with_many_children can be described as

$$\texttt{Mother} \sqcap \exists_{\geq 3}\texttt{child.Person};$$

Father_with_sons_only can be described as

$$\texttt{Parent} \sqcap \texttt{sex} : \texttt{Male} \sqcap \texttt{child} \downarrow \texttt{son}.$$

4 Role Forming and Attribute Forming Operators

Similar as for concepts our terminological logic provides a couple of role forming and attribute forming operators:

Concrete Form	Abstract Form	Semantics
(and $R_1 \ldots R_n$)	$R_1 \sqcap \ldots \sqcap R_n$	$R_1^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \ldots \cap R_n^{\mathcal{I}}$
(inverse R)	R^{-1}	$\{(d, d') \mid (d', d) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}\}$
(restrict R C)	$R\,\|_C$	$\{(d, d') \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \mid d' \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$
(domrange C_1 C_2)	$C_1 \times C_2$	$C_1^{\mathcal{I}} \times C_2^{\mathcal{I}}$
(trans R)	R^*	$\{(d, d') \mid \exists d_1, \ldots, d_n (d, d_1) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}, \ldots, (d_n, d') \in R^{\mathcal{I}}\}$???
(inverse A)	A^{-1}	$\{(A^{\mathcal{I}}(d), d) \mid d \in dom\, A^{\mathcal{I}}\}$
(restrict A C)	$A\,\|_C$	$A^{\mathcal{I}}\,\|_{C^{\mathcal{I}}}$
(compose $A_1 \ldots A_n$)	$A_1 \circ \ldots \circ A_n$	$A_1^{\mathcal{I}} \circ \ldots \circ A_n^{\mathcal{I}}$

Notice that the inverse of an attribute is a role, but in general not an attribute.

Examples: The role *daughter* can be defined as

$$\texttt{female\_relative} \sqcap \texttt{child};$$

the role *successor* can be defined as

(inverse `predecessor`).

5 Terminological Axioms

The terminological axioms (definitions, specializations, and restrictions) are used to specify the knowledge about the world or a part of the world. A set of terminological axioms specifies a terminology $\mathcal{T}$. It selects from all possible interpretations of the language those models that satisfy the given axioms as described below.

Concrete Form	**Abstract Form**	**Semantics**
(defconcept CN C)	$CN = C$	$CN^{\mathcal{I}} = C^{\mathcal{I}}$
(defrole RN R)	$RN = R$	$RN^{\mathcal{I}} = R^{\mathcal{I}}$
(defattribute AN A)	$AN = A$	$AN^{\mathcal{I}} = A^{\mathcal{I}}$
(defprimconcept CN C)	$CN \sqsubseteq C$	$CN^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq C^{\mathcal{I}}$
(defprimrole RN R)	$RN \sqsubseteq R$	$RN^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq R^{\mathcal{I}}$
(defprimattribute AN A)	$AN \sqsubseteq A$	$AN^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq A^{\mathcal{I}}$
(defdisjoint $CN_1 \ldots CN_n$)	$CN_1 \parallel \ldots \parallel CN_n$	$CN_i^{\mathcal{I}} \cap CN_j^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset, i \neq j$
(definvpair $AN_1 AN_2$)	$AN_1 = AN_2^{-1}$	$AN_1^{\mathcal{I}} = (AN_2^{\mathcal{I}})^{-1}$

Example (our introductory example in formal notation):

Person $\sqsubseteq$ sex : {Male, Female}
Woman = Person $\sqcap$ sex : Female
Man = Person $\sqcap$ sex : Male
Woman $\parallel$ Man
Parent = Person $\sqcap$ $\exists$child.Person $\sqcap$ $\forall$child.Person
Mother = Parent $\sqcap$ sex : Female
Father = Parent $\sqcap$ sex : Male
Mother_with_many_children = Mother $\sqcap$ $\exists_{\geq 3}$child.Person
Father_with_sons_only = Father $\sqcap$ child $\downarrow$ son.

6 Assertional Axioms

In order to fill our world with objects we allow for assertional axioms which have the following forms.

Concrete Form	**Abstract Form**	**Semantics**
(C ON)	($ON : C$)	$ON^{\mathcal{I}} \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$
(R ON ON')	(ON R ON')	$(ON^{\mathcal{I}}, ON'^{\mathcal{I}}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}$
(A ON ON')	(ON A ON')	$ON^{\mathcal{I}} \in dom\, A^{\mathcal{I}}, (ON^{\mathcal{I}}, ON'^{\mathcal{I}}) \in A^{\mathcal{I}}$

Examples:
(John Father)
(John child Tom)
(Mary Woman).

7 Services

Now we are able to give a formal specification of the services mentioned in the introduction.

1. Satisfiability of a concept C in a terminology $\mathcal{T}$:
   Does there exist a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ with $C^{\mathcal{I}} \neq \emptyset$?
   (`Man` $\sqcap$ `Woman` is not satisfiable.)

2. Subsumption within a terminology $\mathcal{T}$:
   $C \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{T}} D$ iff in all models $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$: $C^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq D^{\mathcal{I}}$
   (e.g. `Mother` $\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{T}}$ `Woman`).

3. Equivalence of concepts within a terminology $\mathcal{T}$:
   $C \approx_{\mathcal{T}} D$ iff in all models $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$: $C^{\mathcal{I}} = D^{\mathcal{I}}$

4. Classification in $\mathcal{T}$:
   Find all minimal concepts D w.r.t. the subsumption relation with $D \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{T}} C$.

5. Find the smallest relation on the concepts in $\mathcal{T}$ such that their transitive closure is the subsumption relation (modulo $\approx_{\mathcal{T}}$).

6. Consistency of the represented knowledge.
   Does there exist a model $\mathcal{I}$ for the terminological and assertional axioms ?

7. What facts are deducible from the knowledge ?
   (e.g. a fact α is deducible from the knowledge iff all models for the terminological and assertional axioms satisfy α.)

8. Realization.
   Given an object *ON* occurring in an assertional axiom. Which are most specific concepts of $\mathcal{T}$ w.r.t. the subsumption relation *ON* is instance of?

9. Retrieval.
   Given an concept C. Which objects occurring in the assertional axioms are instances of C ?

Thus with this formalization of our services we can develop procedures or algorithms for the services and prove their correctness, completeness, complexity, decidability.

References

[BS85] R. J. Brachman, J. G. Schmolze. "An Overview of the KL-ONE knowledge representation system." *Cognitive Science*, 9(2):171-216, April 1985.

[HN90] B. Hollunder, W. Nutt. *Subsumption Algorithms for Concept Languages.* DFKI Research Report RR-90-04, DFKI, Postfach 2080, D-6750 Kaiserslautern, West Germany.

[SS88] M. Schmidt-Schauß, G. Smolka. *Attributive Concept Descriptions with Unions and Complements.* SEKI Report SR-88-21, FB Informatik, Universität Kaiserslautern, D-6750, Kaiserslautern, West Germany,1988. To appear in Artificial Intelligence, 47, 1991.

Deutsches
Forschungszentrum
für Künstliche
Intelligenz GmbH

DFKI
-Bibliothek-
Stuhlsatzenhausweg 3
6600 Saarbrücken 11
FRG

DFKI Publikationen

Die folgenden DFKI Veröffentlichungen oder die aktuelle Liste von erhältlichen Publikationen können bezogen werden von der oben angegebenen Adresse.

DFKI Publications

The following DFKI publications or the list of currently available publications can be ordered from the above address.

DFKI Research Reports

RR-90-01
Franz Baader
Terminological Cycles in KL-ONE-based Knowledge Representation Languages
33 pages

RR-90-02
Hans-Jürgen Bürckert
A Resolution Principle for Clauses with Constraints
25 pages

RR-90-03
Andreas Dengel & Nelson M. Mattos
Integration of Document Representation, Processing and Management
18 pages

RR-90-04
Bernhard Hollunder & Werner Nutt
Subsumption Algorithms for Concept Languages
34 pages

RR-90-05
Franz Baader
A Formal Definition for the Expressive Power of Knowledge Representation Languages
22 pages

RR-90-06
Bernhard Hollunder
Hybrid Inferences in KL-ONE-based Knowledge Representation Systems
21 pages

RR-90-07
Elisabeth André, Thomas Rist
Wissensbasierte Informationspräsentation: Zwei Beiträge zum Fachgespräch Graphik und KI:

1. Ein planbasierter Ansatz zur Synthese illustrierter Dokumente
2. Wissensbasierte Perspektivenwahl für die automatische Erzeugung von 3D-Objektdarstellungen

24 pages

RR-90-08
Andreas Dengel
A Step Towards Understanding Paper Documents
25 pages

RR-90-09
Susanne Biundo
Plan Generation Using a Method of Deductive Program Synthesis
17 pages

RR-90-10
Franz Baader, Hans-Jürgen Bürckert, Bernhard Hollunder, Werner Nutt, Jörg H. Siekmann
Concept Logics
26 pages

RR-90-11
Elisabeth André, Thomas Rist
Towards a Plan-Based Synthesis of Illustrated Documents
14 pages

RR-90-12
Harold Boley
Declarative Operations on Nets
43 pages

RR-90-13
Franz Baader
Augmenting Concept Languages by Transitive Closure of Roles: An Alternative to Terminological Cycles
40 pages

RR-90-14
Franz Schmalhofer, Otto Kühn, Gabriele Schmidt
Integrated Knowledge Acquisition from Text, Previously Solved Cases, and Expert Memories
20 pages

RR-90-15
Harald Trost
The Application of Two-level Morphology to Non-concatenative German Morphology
13 pages

DFKI Technical Memos

TM-89-01
Susan Holbach-Weber
Connectionist Models and Figurative Speech
27 pages

TM-90-01
Som Bandyopadhyay
Towards an Understanding of Coherence in Multimodal Discourse
18 pages

TM-90-02
Jay C. Weber
The Myth of Domain-Independent Persistence
18 pages

TM-90-03
Franz Baader, Bernhard Hollunder
KRIS: Knowledge Representation and Inference System
-System Description-
15 pages

TM-90-04
Franz Baader, Hans-Jürgen Bürckert, Jochen Heinsohn, Bernhard Hollunder, Jürgen Müller, Bernhard Nebel, Werner Nutt, Hans-Jürgen Profitlich
Terminological Knowledge Representation: A Proposal for a Terminological Logic
7 pages

DFKI Documents

D-89-01
Michael H. Malburg & Rainer Bleisinger
HYPERBIS: ein betriebliches Hypermedia-Informationssystem
43 Seiten

D-90-01
DFKI Wissenschaftlich-Technischer Jahresbericht 1989
45 pages

D-90-02
Georg Seul
Logisches Programmieren mit Feature - Typen
107 Seiten

D-90-03
Ansgar Bernardi, Christoph Klauck, Ralf Legleitner
Abschlußbericht des Arbeitspaketes PROD
36 Seiten

D-90-04
Ansgar Bernardi, Christoph Klauck, Ralf Legleitner
STEP: Überblick über eine zukünftige Schnittstelle zum Produktdatenaustausch
69 Seiten

D-90-05
Ansgar Bernardi, Christoph Klauck, Ralf Legleitner
Formalismus zur Repräsentation von Geometrie- und Technologieinformationen als Teil eines Wissensbasierten Produktmodells
66 Seiten

Terminological Knowledge Representation:
A Proposal for a Terminological Logic

F. Baader, H.-J. Bürckert, J. Heinsohn, B. Hollunder,
J. Müller, B. Nebel, W. Nutt, H.-J. Profitlich

TM-90-04
Technical Memo