

IN4060 - Oblig 4

1 Entailment

1.1

Yes, with the following derivation:

1. `sim:Marge fam:hasSpouse sim:Homer` – P
2. `fam:hasSpouse rdfs:domain foaf:Person` – P
3. `sim:Marge rdf:type foaf:Person` – `rdfs2`, 1,2

1.2

Yes, this is true because it is specified in the `family.ttl` in Exercise 1.7.

1.3

No, this cannot be proven.

We can derive using `rdfs2` that `sim:Marge` is a `foaf:Person`, but we cannot say that `sim:Marge` is a `fam:Woman` because she is a `foaf:Person`.

1.4

Yes, with the derivation:

1. `fam:hasBrother rdfs:range fam:Man` – P
2. `_:2 fam:hasBrother sim:Herb` – P
3. `sim:Herb rdf:type fam:Man` – `rdfs3`, 1,2

1.5

Yes, with the derivation:

1. fam:hasFather rdfs:subPropertyOf fam:isRelativeOf – P
2. sim:Lisa fam:hasFather sim:homer – P
3. sim:Lisa fam:isRelativeOf sim:Homer – rdfs7, 1,2

1.6

No, this cannot be proven.

This is because there is no rule that can be applied where a conclusion of Lisa having Marge as mother can be met.

It can be believed that blank node 1 represents Marge and Lisa has Parent blank node 1, but this never specifies either if it is Lisa's mother or if it is actually Marge.

1.7

Yes, with the derivation:

1. fam:hasSister rdf:range fam:Woman – P
2. _:1 fam:hasSister sim:Patty – P
3. sim:Patty rdf:type fam:Woman – rdfs3, 1,2
4. fam:Woman rdfs:subClassOf foaf:Person – P
5. sim:Patty rdf:type foaf:Person – rdfs9, 4,3

1.8

Yes, with the derivation:

1. `sim:Lisa fam:hasParent _:1 - P`
2. `_:1 fam:hasSister sim:Patty - P`
3. `_:a fam:hasParent _:1 - se2 on 1, _:a for sim:Lisa`
4. `_:a fam:hasParent _:b - se1 on 3, _:b for _:1`
5. `_:b fam:hasSister sim:Patty - se2 on 2, _:b for _:1`

1.9

No, this cannot be proven.

It states that there exists a person (`_:d`) who has two different brothers, (`_:e`) and (`_:f`).

We only know one person with a brother (`_:2`), but (`_:2`) has only one brother (`sim:Herb`), and therefore it cannot be proven.