

Notation3 as an Existential Rule Language

Dörthe Arndt¹ and Stephan Mennicke²

¹ Computational Logic Group, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden, Germany

² Knowledge-Based Systems Group, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden, Germany
{firstname.lastname}@tu-dresden.de

Abstract. Notation3 Logic (N_3) is an extension of RDF which allows the user to write rules introducing new blank nodes to RDF graphs. Many applications (e.g., ontology mapping) rely on this feature as blank nodes – used directly or in auxiliary constructs – are omnipresent on the Web. However, the number of fast N_3 reasoners covering this very important feature of the logic is rather limited. On the other hand, there are engines like VLog or Nemo which do not directly support Semantic Web rule formats but which are developed and optimized for very similar constructs: existential rules. In this paper we investigate the relation between N_3 rules with blank nodes in their heads and existential rules. We identify a subset of N_3 which can be mapped directly to existential rules and define such a mapping preserving the equivalence of N_3 formulae. In order to also illustrate that in some cases N_3 reasoning could benefit from our translation, we then employ this mapping in an implementation to compare the performance of the N_3 reasoners EYE and cwm to VLog and Nemo on N_3 rules and their mapped counterparts. Our tests show that the existential rule reasoners perform particularly well for use cases containing many facts while especially the EYE reasoner is very fast when dealing with a high number of dependent rules. We thus provide a tool enabling the Semantic Web community to directly use existing and future existential rule reasoners and benefit from the findings of this active community.

Keywords: Notation3 · RDF · Blank Nodes · Existential rules.

1 Introduction

Notation3 Logic (N_3) [26,8] is an extension of the Resource Description Framework (RDF) which allows the user to quote graphs, to express rules, and to apply built-in functions on the components of RDF triples. Facilitated by different reasoners like cwm [6], Data-Fu [19], or EYE [25], N_3 rules directly consume and produce RDF graphs. This makes N_3 a well-suited format for rule exchange on the Web. N_3 supports the introduction of new blank nodes through rules, that is, if a blank node appears in the head³ of a rule, each new match for the rule body produces a new instance of the rule’s head containing *fresh* blank nodes. This feature is interesting for many use cases – mappings between different vocabularies need to take blank nodes in RDF graphs into

³ To stay consistent across frameworks, we choose to use the terms *head* and *body* throughout the whole paper. The head is the part of the rule occurring at the end of the implication arrow, the body the part at its beginning (backward rules: “head \leftarrow body”, forward rules: “body \rightarrow head”).

account, workflow composition needs to deal with unknown existing instances [24] – but it also impedes reasoning tasks: from a logical point of view these rules contain existentially quantified variables in their heads. Reasoning with such rules is known to be undecidable in general, and also the decidable cases can be very complex [4,23].

Even though recent projects like `jen3`⁴ or `RoXi`⁵ aim at improving this situation, the number of fast N_3 reasoners fully supporting blank node introduction is low. This is different for reasoners acting on existential rules, a concept very similar to blank-node-producing rules in N_3 , but developed for databases. Sometimes it is necessary to uniquely identify data by a value that is not already part of the target database. One tool to achieve that is *labeled nulls* which – just as blank nodes – indicate *the existence* of a value. This problem from databases and the observation that rules may provide a powerful, yet declarative, means of computing has led to more extensive studies of existential rules [4,12]. Many reasoners like for example `VLog` [13] or `Nemo` [21] apply dedicated strategies to optimize reasoning with existential rules.

The aim of this paper is to make existing and future optimizations on existential rules usable in the Semantic Web. We introduce a subset of N_3 supporting existential quantification but ignoring other features of the language which are not covered in existential rules, like for example built-in functions or lists. We provide a mapping between this logic and existential rules: The mapping and its inverse both preserve equivalences of formulae, enabling N_3 reasoning via existential rule technologies. We implement this mapping in python and compare the reasoning performance of the existential rule reasoners `Vlog` and `Nemo`, and the N_3 reasoners `EYE` and `cwm` for two benchmarks: one which applies a fixed set of rules on a varying size of facts, and one in which the number of facts is fixed but the number of highly dependent rules varies. Our tests show that `VLog` and `Nemo` together with our mapping outperform the traditional N_3 reasoners `EYE` and `cwm` when dealing with a high number of facts while `EYE` is the fastest on large dependent rule sets. We see that as a strong indication that our implementation will be of practical use when extended by further features.

We motivate our approach by providing examples of N_3 and existential rule formulae, and discuss how these are connected, in Sect. 2. In Sect. 3 we provide a more formal definition of Existential N_3 (N_3^{\exists}), introduce its semantics and discuss its properties. We then formally introduce existential rules, provide the mapping from N_3^{\exists} into this logic, and prove its truth-preserving properties in Sect. 4. Sect. 5 discusses our implementation and provides an evaluation of the different reasoners. In Sect. 6 we discuss the related work to then conclude our paper with Sect. 7. Furthermore, the code needed for reproducing our experiments is available on GitHub (<https://github.com/smennicke/n3rules>).

2 Motivation

N_3 has been introduced as a rule-based extension of RDF. As in RDF, N_3 knowledge is stated in triples consisting of *subject*, *predicate*, and *object*. In ground triples these can either be Internationalized Resource Identifiers (IRIs) or literals. The expression

$$\text{ :lucy :knows :tom. } \quad (1)$$

⁴ <https://github.com/william-vw/jen3>

⁵ <https://github.com/pbonte/roxi>

means⁶ that “*lucy knows tom*”. Sets of triples are interpreted as their conjunction. Like RDF, N₃ supports blank nodes, usually starting with `_:`, which stand for (implicitly) existentially quantified variables. The statement

$$:lucy :knows _ :x. \quad (2)$$

means “*there exists someone who is known by lucy*”. N₃ furthermore supports implicitly universally quantified variables, indicated by a leading question mark (?), and implications which are stated using graphs, i.e., sets of triples, surrounded by curly braces ({}) as body and head connected via an arrow (=>). The formula

$$\{ :lucy :knows ?x \} => \{ ?x :knows :lucy \}. \quad (3)$$

means that “*everyone known by Lucy also knows her*”. Furthermore, N₃ allows the use of blank nodes in rules. These blank nodes are not quantified outside the rule like the universal variables, but in the rule part they occur in, that is either in its body or its head.

$$\{ ?x :knows :tom \} => \{ ?x :knows _ :y. _ :y :name "Tom" \}. \quad (4)$$

means “*everyone knowing Tom knows someone whose name is Tom*”.

This last example shows, that N₃ supports rules concluding the *existence* of certain terms which makes it easy to express them as *existential rules*. An existential rule is a first-order sentence of the form

$$\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}. \varphi[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] \rightarrow \exists \mathbf{z}. \psi[\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}] \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$ are mutually disjoint lists of variables, φ and ψ are conjunctions of atoms using only variables from the given lists, and φ is referred to as the *body* of the rule while ψ is called the *head*. Using the basic syntactic shape of (5) we go through all the example N₃ formulae (1)–(4) again and represent them as existential rules. To allow for the full flexibility of N₃ and RDF triples, we translate each RDF triple, just like the one in (1) into a first-order atom $tr(:lucy, :knows, :tom)$. Here, tr is a ternary predicate holding subject, predicate, and object of a given RDF triple. This standard translation makes triple predicates (e.g., `:knows`) accessible as terms. First-order atoms are also known as *facts*, finite sets of facts are called *databases*, and (possibly infinite) sets of facts are called *instances*. Existential rules are evaluated over instances (cf. Sect. 4).

Compared to other rule languages, the distinguishing feature of existential rules is the use of existentially quantified variables in the head of rules (cf. \mathbf{z} in (5)). The N₃ formula in (2) uses an existentially quantified variable as well and can, thus, be encoded by the existential rule

$$\rightarrow \exists x. tr(:lucy, :knows, x) \quad (6)$$

Rule (6) has an empty body, which means the head is unconditionally true. Rule (6) is satisfied on instances containing any fact $tr(:lucy, :knows, _)$ (e.g., $tr(:lucy, :knows, :tim)$) so that variable x can be bound to `:tim`.

⁶ Here and for the remainder of this paper, the empty prefix denotes the example namespace `<http://www.example.org#>`.

The implication of (3) has

$$\forall x. tr(:lucy, :knows, x) \rightarrow tr(x, :knows, :lucy) \quad (7)$$

as its (existential) rule counterpart, which does not contain any existentially quantified variables. Rule (7) is satisfied in the instance

$$\mathcal{I}_1 = \{tr(:lucy, :knows, :tom), tr(:tom, :knows, :lucy)\}$$

but not in

$$\mathcal{K}_1 = \{tr(:lucy, :knows, :tom)\}$$

since the only fact in \mathcal{K}_1 matches the body of the rule, but there is no fact reflecting on its (instantiated) head (i.e., the required fact $tr(:tom, :knows, :lucy)$ is missing). Ultimately, the implication (4) with blank nodes in its head may be transferred to a rule with an existential quantifier in the head:

$$\forall x. tr(x, :knows, :tom) \rightarrow \exists y. tr(x, :knows, y) \wedge tr(y, :name, "Tom"). \quad (8)$$

It is clear that rule (8) is satisfied in instance

$$\mathcal{I}_2 = \{tr(:lucy, :knows, :tom), tr(:tom, :name, "Tom")\}.$$

However, instance \mathcal{K}_1 does not satisfy rule (8) because although the only fact satisfies the rule's body, there are no facts jointly satisfying the rule's head.

Note, for query answering over databases and rules, it is usually not required to decide for a concrete value of y (in rule (8)). Many implementations, therefore, use some form of abstraction: for instance, Skolem terms. VLog and Nemo implement the *standard chase* which uses another set of terms, so-called *labeled nulls*. Instead of injecting arbitrary constants for existentially quantified variables, (globally) fresh nulls are inserted in the positions existentially quantified variables occur. Such a labeled null embodies the existence of a constant on the level of instances (just like blank nodes in RDF graphs). Let n be such a labeled null. Then \mathcal{I}_2 can be generalized to

$$\mathcal{I}_3 = \{tr(:lucy, :knows, :tom), tr(:lucy, :knows, n), tr(n, :name, "Tom")\},$$

on which rule (8) is satisfied, binding null n to variable y . \mathcal{I}_3 is, in fact, more general than \mathcal{I}_2 by the following observation: There is a mapping from \mathcal{I}_3 to \mathcal{I}_2 that is a homomorphism (see Sect. 4.1 for a formal introduction of homomorphisms) but not vice versa. The homomorphism here maps the null n (from \mathcal{I}_3) to the constant $:tom$ (in \mathcal{I}_2). Intuitively, the existence of a query answer (for a conjunctive query) on \mathcal{I}_3 implies the existence of a query answer on \mathcal{I}_2 . More generally, existential rule reasoners implementing some form of *the chase* aim at finding the most general instances in this respect (also known as *universal models*) [16].

In the remainder of this paper, we further analyze the relation between N_3 and existential rules. First, we give a brief formal account of the two languages and then provide a correct translation function from N_3 to existential rules.

$f ::=$	formulae:	$t ::=$	terms:
$t \ t \ t.$	atomic formula	ex	existential variables
$\{e\}=>\{e\}.$	implication	c	constants
$f \ f$	conjunction		
$n ::=$	N3 terms:	$e ::=$	expressions:
uv	universal variables	$n \ n \ n.$	triple expression
t	terms	$e \ e$	conjunction expression

Fig. 1. Syntax of N_3^{\exists}

3 Existential N_3

In the previous section we introduced essential elements of N_3 , namely triples and rules. N_3 also supports more complex constructs like lists, nesting of rules, and quotation. As these features are not covered by existential rules, we define a subset of N_3 excluding them, called *existential N_3* (N_3^{\exists}). We base our definitions on so-called *simple N_3 formulae* [2, Chapter 7], these are N_3 formulae which do not allow for nesting.

3.1 Syntax

N_3^{\exists} relies on the RDF alphabet. As the distinction is not relevant in our context, we consider IRIs and literals together as constants. Let C be a set of such constants, U a set of universal variables (these are the variables starting with ?), and E a set of existential variables (i.e., blank nodes). If the sets C , U , E , and $\{\{, \}, =>, .\}$ are mutually disjoint, we call $\mathfrak{A} := C \cup U \cup E \cup \{\{, \}, =>, .\}$ an *N_3 alphabet*. Fig. 1 provides the syntax of N_3^{\exists} over \mathfrak{A} .

N_3^{\exists} fully covers RDF – RDF formulae are conjunctions of atomic formulae – but allows literals and blank nodes to occur in subject, predicate, and object position. On top of the triples, it supports rules containing existential and universal variables. Note, that the syntax allows rules having new universal variables in their head like for example

$$\{ :lucy :knows :tom \} => \{ ?x :is :happy \}. \quad (9)$$

which results in a rule expressing "if lucy knows tom, everyone is happy". This implication is problematic: Applied on triple (1), it yields $?x :is :happy$. which is a triple containing a universal variable. Such triples are not covered by our syntax, the rule thus introduces a fact we cannot express. Therefore, we restrict N_3^{\exists} rules to *well-formed implications* which rely on *components*. A *component* of a formula or an expression is an N_3 term which does not occur nested in a rule. More formally, let f be a formula or an expression over an alphabet \mathfrak{A} . The set $comp(f)$ of *components* of f is defined as:

- If f is an atomic formula or a triple expression of the form $t_1 \ t_2 \ t_3.$, $comp(f) = \{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$.
- If f is an implication of the form $\{e_1\}=>\{e_2\}.$, then $comp(f) = \{\{e_1\}, \{e_2\}\}$.
- If f is a conjunction of the form $f_1 f_2$, then $comp(f) = comp(f_1) \cup comp(f_2)$.

A rule $\{e_1\}=>\{e_2\}.$ is called *well-formed* if $(comp(e_2) \setminus comp(e_1)) \cap U = \emptyset$. For the remainder of this paper we assume all implications to be well-formed.

3.2 Semantics

In order to define the semantics of N_3^{\exists} we first note, that in our fragment of N_3 all quantification of variables is only defined implicitly. The blank node in triple (2) is understood as an existentially quantified variable, the universal in formula (3) as universally quantified. Universal quantification spans over the whole formula – variable $?x$ occurring in body and head of rule (3) is universally quantified for the whole implication – while existential quantification is local – the conjuncts in the head of rule (4) is existentially quantified there. Adding new triples as conjuncts to formula (4) like

$$:lucy :knows _ :y. _ :y :likes :cake. \quad (10)$$

leads to the new statement that “*lucy knows someone who likes cake*” but even though we are using the same blank node identifier $_ :y$ in both formulae, the quantification of the variables in this formula is totally separated and the person named “Tom” is not necessarily related to the cake-liker. With the goal to deal with this locality of blank node scoping, we define substitutions which are only applied on components of formulae and leave nested elements like for example the body and head of rule (3) untouched.

A *substitution* σ is a mapping from a set of variables $X \subset U \cup E$ to the set of N_3 terms. We *apply* σ to a term, formula or expression x as follows:

- $x\sigma = \sigma(x)$ if $x \in X$,
- $(s p o)\sigma = (s\sigma)(p\sigma)(o\sigma)$ if $x = s p o$ is an atomic formula or a triple expression,
- $(f_1 f_2)\sigma = (f_1\sigma)(f_2\sigma)$ if $x = f_1 f_2$ is a conjunction,
- $x\sigma = x$ else.

For formula $f = _ :x :p :o. \{ _ :x :b :c \} \Rightarrow \{ _ :x :d :e \}$, substitution σ and $_ :x \in \text{dom}(\sigma)$, we get: $f\sigma = \sigma(_ :x) :p :o. \{ _ :x :b :c \} \Rightarrow \{ _ :x :d :e \}$.⁷ We use the substitution to define the semantics of N_3^{\exists} which additionally makes use of N_3 *interpretations* $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{D}, \alpha, p)$ consisting of (1) the domain of \mathcal{I} , \mathcal{D} ; (2) $\alpha : C \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ called the object function; (3) $p : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}}$ called the predicate function.

Just as the function IEXT in RDF’s simple interpretations [20], N_3 ’s predicate function maps elements from the domain of discourse to a set of pairs of domain elements and is not applied on relation symbols directly. This makes quantification over predicates possible while not exceeding first-order logic in terms of complexity. To introduce the *semantics of N_3^{\exists}* , let $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{D}, \alpha, p)$ be an N_3 interpretation. For an N_3^{\exists} formula f :

1. If $W = \text{comp}(f) \cap E \neq \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{I} \models f$ iff $\mathcal{I} \models f\mu$ for some substitution $\mu : W \rightarrow C$.
2. If $\text{comp}(f) \cap E = \emptyset$:
 - (a) If f is an atomic formula $t_1 t_2 t_3$, then $\mathcal{I} \models t_1 t_2 t_3$. iff $(\alpha(t_1), \alpha(t_3)) \in p(\alpha(t_2))$.
 - (b) If f is a conjunction $f_1 f_2$, then $\mathcal{I} \models f_1 f_2$ iff $\mathcal{I} \models f_1$ and $\mathcal{I} \models f_2$.
 - (c) If f is an implication, then $\mathcal{I} \models \{e_1\} \Rightarrow \{e_2\}$ iff $\mathcal{I} \models e_2\sigma$ if $\mathcal{I} \models e_1\sigma$ for all substitutions σ on the universal variables $(\text{comp}(e_1) \cup \text{comp}(e_2)) \cap U$ by constants.

⁷ Note that the semantics of *simple formulae* on which N_3^{\exists} ’s semantics is based, relies on two ways to apply a substitution which is necessary to handle nested rules, since such constructs are excluded in N_3^{\exists} , we simplified here.

The semantics as defined above uses a substitution into the set of constants instead of a direct assignment to the domain of discourse to interpret quantified variables. This design choice inherited from N_3 ensures referential opacity of quoted graphs and means, in essence, that quantification always refers to named domain elements.

With that semantics, we call an interpretation \mathfrak{M} *model* of a dataset Φ , written as $\mathfrak{M} \models \Phi$, if $\mathfrak{M} \models f$ for each formula $f \in \Phi$. We say that two sets of N_3^{\exists} formulae Φ and Ψ are *equivalent*, written as $\Phi \equiv \Psi$, if for all interpretations \mathfrak{M} : $\mathfrak{M} \models \Phi$ iff $\mathfrak{M} \models \Psi$. If $\Phi = \{\phi\}$ and $\Psi = \{\psi\}$ are singleton sets, we write $\phi \equiv \psi$ omitting the brackets.

Piece Normal Form N_3^{\exists} formulae consist of conjunctions of triples and implications. For our goal of translating such formulae to existential rules, it is convenient to consider sub-formulae separately. Below, we therefore define the so-called *Piece Normal Form* (PNF) for N_3^{\exists} formulae and show that each such formula f is equivalent to a set of sub-formulae Φ (i.e., $\Phi \equiv f$) in PNF. We proceed in two steps.

First, we separate formulae based on their blank node components. If two parts of a conjunction share a blank node component, as in formula (10), we cannot split the formula into two since the information about the co-reference would get lost. However, if conjuncts either do not contain blank nodes or only contain disjoint sets of these, we can split them into so-called *pieces*: Two formulae f_1 and f_2 are called *pieces* of a formula f if $f = f_1 f_2$ and $\text{comp}(f_1) \cap \text{comp}(f_2) \cap E = \emptyset$. For such formulae we know:

Lemma 1 (Pieces). *Let $f = f_1 f_2$ be an N_3^{\exists} conjunction and let $\text{comp}(f_1) \cap \text{comp}(f_2) \cap E = \emptyset$, then for each interpretation \mathfrak{I} , $\mathfrak{I} \models f$ iff $\mathfrak{I} \models f_1$ and $\mathfrak{I} \models f_2$.*

Proof. 1. If $\text{comp}(f) \cap E = \emptyset$ the claim follows immediately by point 2b in the semantics definition.

2. If $W = \text{comp}(f) \cap E \neq \emptyset$:

(\Rightarrow) If $\mathfrak{I} \models f$ then there exists a substitution $\mu : \text{comp}(f) \cap E \rightarrow C$ such that $\mathfrak{I} \models f\mu$, that is $\mathfrak{I} \models (f_1\mu) (f_2\mu)$. According to the previous point that implies $\mathfrak{I} \models f_1\mu$ and $\mathfrak{I} \models f_2\mu$ and thus $\mathfrak{I} \models f_1$ and $\mathfrak{I} \models f_2$.

(\Leftarrow) If $\mathfrak{I} \models f_1$ and $\mathfrak{I} \models f_2$, then there exist two substitutions $\mu_1 : \text{comp}(f_1) \cap E \rightarrow C$ and $\mu_2 : \text{comp}(f_2) \cap E \rightarrow C$ such that $\mathfrak{I} \models f_1\mu_1$ and $\mathfrak{I} \models f_2\mu_2$. As the domains of the two substitutions are disjoint (by assumption), we can define the substitution $\mu : \text{comp}(f) \cap E \rightarrow C$ as follows:

$$\mu(v) = \begin{cases} \mu_1(v) & \text{if } v \in \text{comp}(f_1) \\ \mu_2(v) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Then $\mathfrak{I} \models f\mu$ and therefore $\mathfrak{I} \models f$. □

If we recursively divide all pieces into sub-pieces, we get a maximal set $F = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n\}$ for each formula f such that $F \equiv \{f\}$ and for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, $\text{comp}(f_i) \cap \text{comp}(f_j) \cap E \neq \emptyset$ implies $i = j$.

Second, we replace all blank nodes occurring in rule bodies by *fresh* universals. The rule $\{_:x : \text{likes} : \text{cake}\} \Rightarrow \{ : \text{cake} : \text{is} : \text{good}\}$. becomes $\{?y : \text{likes} : \text{cake}\} \Rightarrow \{ : \text{cake} : \text{is} : \text{good}\}$. Note that both rules have the same meaning, namely "*if someone likes cake, then cake is good.*". We generalize that:

Lemma 2 (Eliminating Existentials). *Let $f = \{e_1\} \Rightarrow \{e_2\}$ and $g = \{e'_1\} \Rightarrow \{e_2\}$ be N_3^{\exists} implications such that $e'_1 = e_1 \sigma$ for some injective substitution $\sigma : \text{comp}(e_1) \cap E \rightarrow U \setminus \text{comp}(e_1)$ of the existential variables of e_1 by universals. Then: $f \equiv g$*

Proof. We first note that $\text{comp}(f) \cap E = \emptyset$ and $\text{comp}(g) \cap E = \emptyset$ since both formulae are implications.

(\Rightarrow) We assume that $\mathfrak{M} \not\models g$ for some model \mathfrak{M} . That is, there exists a substitution $v : (\text{comp}(e'_1) \cup \text{comp}(e_2)) \cap U \rightarrow C$ such that $\mathfrak{M} \models e'_1 v$ and $\mathfrak{M} \not\models e_2 v$. We show that $\mathfrak{M} \models e_1 v$: As $((\text{comp}(e_1) \cup \text{comp}(e_2)) \cap U) \subset ((\text{comp}(e'_1) \cup \text{comp}(e_2)) \cap U)$, we know that $\text{comp}(e_1 v) \cap U = \emptyset$. With the substitution $\mu := v \circ \sigma$ for the existential variables in $e_1 v$ we get $\mathfrak{M} \models (e_1 v) \sigma$ and thus $\mathfrak{M} \models (e_1 v)$, but as $\mathfrak{M} \not\models (e_2 v)$ we can conclude that $\mathfrak{M} \not\models f$.

(\Leftarrow) We assume that $\mathfrak{M} \not\models f$. That is, there exists a substitution $v : (\text{comp}(e_1) \cup \text{comp}(e_2)) \cap U \rightarrow C$ such that $\mathfrak{M} \models e_1 v$ and $\mathfrak{M} \not\models e_2 v$. As $\mathfrak{M} \models e_1 v$, there exists a substitution $\mu : \text{comp}(e_1 v) \cap E \rightarrow C$ such that $\mathfrak{M} \models (e_1 v) \mu$. With that we define a substitution $v' : (\text{comp}(e_1) \cup \text{comp}(e_2)) \cap U \rightarrow C$ as follows: $v' : U \rightarrow C$ as follows:

$$v'(v) = \begin{cases} \mu(\sigma^{-1}(v)) & \text{if } v \in \text{range}(\sigma) \\ v(v) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

With that substitution we get $\mathfrak{M} \models e'_1 v'$ but $\mathfrak{M} \not\models e_2 v'$ and thus $\mathfrak{M} \not\models g$. □

For a rule f we call the formula f' in which all existentials occurring in its body are replaced by universals following Lemma 2 the *normalized* version of the rule. We call an N_3^{\exists} formula f *normalized*, if all rules occurring in it as conjuncts are normalized. This allows us to introduce the *Piece Normal Form*:

Theorem 1 (Piece Normal Form). *For every well-formed N_3^{\exists} formula f , there exists a set $F = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k\}$ of N_3^{\exists} formulae such that $F \equiv \{f\}$ and F is in piece normal form (PNF). That is, all $f_i \in F$ are normalized formulae and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is the maximal number such that for $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, $\text{comp}(f_i) \cap \text{comp}(f_j) \cap E \neq \emptyset$ implies $i = j$. If f_i ($1 \leq i \leq k$) is a conjunction of atomic formulae, we call f_i an atomic piece.*

Proof. The claim follows immediately from Lemma 1 and Lemma 2. □

Since the piece normal form F of N_3^{\exists} formula f is obtained by only replacing variables and separating conjuncts of f into the set form, the overall size of F is linear in f .

4 From N3 to Existential Rules

Without loss of generality, we translate sets F of N_3^{\exists} formulae in PNF (cf. Theorem 1) to sets of existential rules $\mathcal{T}(F)$. As a preliminary step, we introduce the language of existential rules formally. Later on, we explain and define the translation function that has already been sketched in Sect. 2. The section closes with a correctness argument, establishing a strong relationship between existential rules and N_3^{\exists} .

4.1 Foundations of Existential Rule Reasoning

For existential rules, we also consider a first-order vocabulary, consisting of constants (\mathbf{C}) and variables (\mathbf{V}), and additionally so-called (labeled) nulls (\mathbf{N})⁸. As already mentioned in Sect. 2, we use the same set of constants as \mathbf{N}_3 formulae, meaning $\mathbf{C} = C$. Furthermore, let \mathbf{P} be a set of *relation names*, where each $p \in \mathbf{P}$ comes with an arity $ar(p) \in \mathbb{N}$. \mathbf{C} , \mathbf{V} , \mathbf{N} , and \mathbf{P} are countably infinite and pair-wise disjoint. We use the ternary relation name $tr \in \mathbf{P}$ to encode \mathbf{N}_3 triples in Sect. 2. If $p \in \mathbf{P}$ and $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{ar(p)}$ is a list of terms (i.e., $t_i \in \mathbf{C} \cup \mathbf{N} \cup \mathbf{V}$), $p(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{ar(p)})$ is called an *atom*. We often use \mathbf{t} to summarize a term list like t_1, \dots, t_n ($n \in \mathbb{N}$), and treat it as a set whenever order is irrelevant. An atom $p(\mathbf{t})$ is *ground* if $\mathbf{t} \subseteq \mathbf{C}$. An *instance* is a (possibly infinite) set \mathcal{I} of variable-free atoms and a finite set of ground atoms \mathcal{D} is called a *database*.

For a set of atoms \mathcal{A} and an instance \mathcal{I} , we call a function h from the terms occurring in \mathcal{A} to the terms in \mathcal{I} a *homomorphism from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{I}* , denoted by $h : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}$, if (1) $h(c) = c$ for all $c \in \mathbf{C}$ (occurring in \mathcal{A}), and (2) $p(\mathbf{t}) \in \mathcal{A}$ implies $p(h(\mathbf{t})) \in \mathcal{I}$. If any homomorphism from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{I} exists, write $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}$. Please note that if n is a null occurring in \mathcal{A} , then $h(n)$ may be a constant or null.

For an (*existential*) rule $r : \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}. \varphi[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] \rightarrow \exists \mathbf{z}. \psi[\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}]$ (cf. (5)), rule bodies ($\text{body}(r)$) and heads ($\text{head}(r)$) will also be considered as sets of atoms for a more compact representation of the semantics. Let r be a rule and \mathcal{I} an instance. We call a homomorphism $h : \text{body}(r) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}$ a *match for r in \mathcal{I}* . A match h is *satisfied for r in \mathcal{I}* if there is an extension h^* of h (i.e., $h \subseteq h^*$) such that $h^*(\text{head}(r)) \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. If all matches of r are satisfied in \mathcal{I} , we say that r is *satisfied in \mathcal{I}* , denoted by $\mathcal{I} \models r$. For a rule set Σ and database \mathcal{D} , we call an instance \mathcal{I} a *model of Σ and \mathcal{D}* , denoted by $\mathcal{I} \models \Sigma, \mathcal{D}$, if $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{I} \models r$ for each $r \in \Sigma$. We say that two rule sets Σ_1 and Σ_2 are *equivalent*, denoted $\Sigma_1 \simeq \Sigma_2$, iff for all instances \mathcal{I} , $\mathcal{I} \models \Sigma_1$ iff $\mathcal{I} \models \Sigma_2$.

Labeled nulls play the role of fresh constants without further specification, just like blank nodes in RDF or \mathbf{N}_3 . The chase is a family of algorithms that soundly produces models of rule sets by continuously applying rules for unsatisfied matches. If some rule head is instantiated, existential variables are replaced by fresh nulls in order to facilitate for arbitrary constants. Although the chase is not guaranteed to terminate, it always produces a (possibly infinite) model⁹ [16].

4.2 The Translation Function from \mathbf{N}_3 to Existential Rules

The translation function \mathcal{T} maps sets $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_k\}$ of \mathbf{N}_3^{\exists} formulae in PNF to sets of rules Σ . Before we go into the details of the translation for every type of piece, we consider an auxiliary function $\mathbb{T} : C \cup E \cup U \rightarrow C \cup V$ mapping \mathbf{N}_3 terms to terms in our rule language (cf. previous subsection):

⁸ We choose here different symbols to disambiguate between existential rules and \mathbf{N}_3 , although vocabularies partially overlap.

⁹ Not just any model, but a universal model, which is a model that has a homomorphism to any other model of the database and rule set. Up to homomorphisms, universal models are the smallest among all models.

$$\mathbb{T}(t) := \begin{cases} v_x^\forall & \text{if } t = ?x \in U \\ v_y^\exists & \text{if } t = _ : y \in E \\ t & \text{if } t \in C, \end{cases}$$

where $v_x^\forall, v_y^\exists \in \mathbf{V}$ and $t \in \mathbf{C}$ (i.e., we assume $C \subseteq \mathbf{C}$). While variables in N_3 belong to either E or U , this separation is lost under function \mathbb{T} . For enhancing readability of subsequent examples, the identity of the variable preserves this information by using superscripts \exists and \forall . We provide the translation for every piece $f_i \in F$ ($1 \leq i \leq k$) and later collect the full translation of F as the union of its translated pieces.

Translating Atomic Pieces. If f_i is an atomic piece, it has the form $f_i = g_1 \ g_2 \ \dots \ g_l$ for some $l \geq 1$ and each g_j ($1 \leq j \leq l$) is an atomic formula. The translation of f_i is the singleton set $\mathcal{T}(f_i) = \{\rightarrow \exists \mathbf{z}. \text{tr}(\mathbb{T}(g_1)) \wedge \text{tr}(\mathbb{T}(g_2)) \wedge \dots \wedge \text{tr}(\mathbb{T}(g_l))\}$, where $\mathbb{T}(g_j) = \mathbb{T}(t_j^1), \mathbb{T}(t_j^2), \mathbb{T}(t_j^3)$ if $g_j = t_j^1 \ t_j^2 \ t_j^3$ and \mathbf{z} is the list of translated existential variables (via \mathbb{T}) from existentials occurring in f . For example, the formula in (10) constitutes a single piece $f_{(10)}$ which translates to a set containing the rule

$$\rightarrow \exists v_y^\exists. \text{tr}(:\text{lucy}, :\text{knows}, v_y^\exists) \wedge \text{tr}(v_y^\exists, :\text{likes}, :\text{cake}).$$

Translating Rules. For f_i being a rule $\{e_1\} \Rightarrow \{e_2\}$ we also obtain a single rule. Recall that the PNF ensures all variables of e_1 to be universals and all universal variables of e_2 to also occur in e_1 . If $e_1 = g_1^1 \ g_1^2 \ \dots \ g_1^m$ and $e_2 = g_2^1 \ g_2^2 \ \dots \ g_2^n$, $\mathcal{T}(f_i) = \{\forall \mathbf{x}. \bigwedge_{j=1}^m \text{tr}(\mathbb{T}(g_1^j)) \rightarrow \exists \mathbf{z}. \bigwedge_{j=1}^n \text{tr}(\mathbb{T}(g_2^j))\}$ where \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{z} are the lists of translated universals and existentials, respectively. Applying the translation to the N_3 formula in (4), which is a piece according to our definitions, we obtain again a singleton set, now containing the rule

$$\forall v_x^\forall. \text{tr}(v_x^\forall, :\text{knows}, :\text{tom}) \rightarrow \exists v_y^\exists. \text{tr}(v_x^\forall, :\text{knows}, v_y^\exists) \wedge \text{tr}(v_y^\exists, :\text{name}, \text{"Tom"}),$$

which is the same rule as the one given in (8) up to a renaming of (bound) variables (also known as α -conversion [17]).

Translating Sets. For the set $F = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k\}$ of N_3^\exists formulae in PNF, $\mathcal{T}(F)$ is the union of all translated constituents (i.e., $\mathcal{T}(F) = \bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{T}(f_i)$). Please note that \mathcal{T} does not exceed a polynomial overhead of its input.

The correctness argument for \mathcal{T} splits into *soundness* – whenever we translate two equivalent N_3^\exists formulae, their translated rules turn out to be equivalent as well – and *completeness* – formulae that are not equivalent are translated to rule sets that are not equivalent. Although the different formalisms have quite different notions of models, models of a translated rule sets \mathcal{M} can be converted into models of the original N_3 formula by using a Herbrand argument. Our correctness proof also considers completeness since, otherwise, a more trivial translation function would have sufficed: Let \mathcal{T}_0 be a function mapping all N_3^\exists formulae to the empty rule set: All equivalent N_3^\exists formulae are mapped to equivalent rule sets (always \emptyset), but also formulae that are not equivalent yield equivalent rule sets under \mathcal{T}_0 . Having such a strong relationship between N_3 and existential rules allows us to soundly use the translation function \mathcal{T} in practice.

Theorem 2. For PNFs F and G of N_3^\exists formulae, $F \equiv G$ iff $\mathcal{T}(F) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{T}(G)$.

Beyond the correctness of \mathcal{T} , we have no further guarantees. Especially termination of the chase over translated rule sets is not a requirement for our translation, because the original N_3^{\exists} formulae are also not required to yield finite models only. Due to the obtained similarity between N_3^{\exists} and existential rules, we envision an adoption of sufficient conditions for finite models (e.g., by means of acyclicity [15]).

5 Evaluation

The considerations provided above allow us to use existential rule reasoners to perform N_3^{\exists} reasoning. We would like to find out whether our finding is of practical relevance, that is whether we can identify datasets on which existential rule reasoners, running on the rule translations, outperform classical N_3 reasoners provided with the original data.

In order to do this we have implemented \mathcal{T} as a python script that takes an arbitrary N_3^{\exists} formula f , constructs its set representation F in PNF, and produces the set of rules $\mathcal{T}(F)$. This script and some additional scripts to translate existential rules (with at most binary predicates) to N_3^{\exists} formulae are available on GitHub. Our implementation allows us to compare N_3 reasoners with existential rule reasoners, performance-wise. As existential rule reasoners we chose VLog [13], a state-of-the-art reasoning engine designed for working with large piles of input data, and Nemo [21], a recently released rust-based reasoning engine. As N_3 reasoners we chose cwm [6] and EYE [25] which – due to their good coverage of N_3 features – are most commonly used. All experiments have been performed on a laptop with 11th Gen Intel Core i7-1165G7 CPU, 32GB of RAM, and 1TB disk capacity, running a Ubuntu 22.04 LTS.

5.1 Datasets

We performed our experiments on two datasets which are very different in nature: LUBM from the *Chasebench* [5] provides a fixed set of 136 rules and varies in the number of facts these rules are applied on while the DEEP TAXONOMY (DT) benchmark developed for the *WellnessRules* project [10] consists of one single fact and a varying number of mutually dependent rules.

The *Chasebench* is a benchmarking suite for existential rule reasoning. Among the different scenaria in Chasebench we picked LUBM for its direct compatibility with N_3 : all predicates in LUBM have at most arity 2. Furthermore, LUBM allows for a glimpse on scalability since LUBM comes in different database sizes. We have worked with LUBM 001, 010, and 100, roughly referring to dataset sizes of a hundred thousand, one million and ten million facts. We translated LUBM data and rules into a canonical N_3 format. Predicate names and constants within the dataset become IRIs using the example prefix. An atom like $src_advisor(Student441, Professor8)$ becomes the triple $:Student441 :src_advisor :Professor8$. For atoms using unary predicates, like $TeachingAssistant(Student498)$, we treat $:TeachingAssistant$ as a class and relate $:Student498$ via $rdf:type$ to the class. For any atom A , we denote its canonical translation into triple format by $t(A)$. Note this canonical translation only applies to atoms of unary and binary predicates. For the existential rule

$$\forall \mathbf{x}. B_1 \wedge \dots \wedge B_m \rightarrow \exists \mathbf{z}. H_1 \wedge \dots \wedge H_n$$




Fig. 2. Structure of the DEEP TAXONOMY benchmark.

we obtain the canonical translation by applying t to all atoms, respecting universally and existentially quantified variables (i.e., universally quantified variables are translated to universal N_3 variables and existentially quantified variables become blank nodes):

$$\{t(B_1) \dots t(B_m)\} \Rightarrow \{t(H_1) \dots t(H_n)\}.$$

This canonical translation was necessary since there has not been an N_3 version of LUBM so far. All N_3 reasoners have reasoned over this canonical translation of data and rules. Since we are evaluating VLog's and Nemo's performance on our translation \mathcal{T} , we converted the translated LUBM by \mathcal{T} back to existential rules before reasoning. Thereby, former unary and binary atoms were turned into triples and then uniformly translated to tr -atoms via \mathcal{T} .

The *Deep Taxonomy benchmark* simulates deeply nested RDFS-subclass reasoning¹⁰. More concretely, it contains one individual which is member of a class. This class is then subclass of three other classes of which one again is subclass of three more classes and so on. We illustrate this idea in Fig. 2. The benchmark provides different depths for this kind of subclass chain and we chose a depth of 1,000 and 100,000 for our tests. The reasoning always tests for the membership of the individual in the last class of the chain. For our tests, the subclass declarations were translated to rules, the triple `:N0 rdfs:subClassOf :N1.` became

$$\{ ?x \ a \ :N0. \} \Rightarrow \{ ?x \ a \ :N1. \}.$$

This translation also illustrates why this rather simple reasoning case is interesting: we have a use case in which we depend on long chains of rules executed after each other. The reasoner EYE allows the user to decide per rule whether it is applied using forward- or backward-reasoning, at least if the head of the rule does not contain blank nodes. For this dataset, we evaluated full backward- and full forward-reasoning, separately.

5.2 Results

Table 1 presents the running times of the four reasoners and additionally gives statistics about the sizes of the given knowledge base (# facts) and the rule set (# rules). For DT we display two reasoning times for EYE, one produced by only forward reasoning (EYE-fw), one for only backward-reasoning (EYE-bw). Note, that for the latter, the reasoner does not produce the full deductive closure of the dataset, but answers a query instead. As LUBM contains rules with blank nodes in their bodies, full backward reasoning was not possible in that case, the table is left blank. EYE performs much better than

¹⁰ N_3 available at: <http://eulerssharp.sourceforge.net/2009/12dtb/>.

Table 1. Experimental Results

Dataset	# facts	# rules	cwm	EYE-fw	EYE-bw	VLog	Nemo
DT 1000	1	3001	180 s	0.1 s	0.001 s	1.6 s	1.7 s
DT 100000	1	30,001	—	0.3 s	0.003 s	—	—
LUBM 001	100,543	136	117.4 s	3.4 s	—	0.2 s	2.4 s
LUBM 010	1,272,575	136	—	44.8 s	—	4.3 s	31.2 s
LUBM 100	13,405,381	136	—	—	—	47.3 s	362 s

VLog and Nemo for the experiments with DT. Its reasoning time is off by one order of magnitude. Conversely, VLog and Nemo could reason over all the LUBM datasets while EYE has thrown an exception after having read the input facts. The reasoning times of VLog are additionally significantly lower than the times for EYE. While Nemo shows a similar runtime on DT as VLog, it is slower on LUBM. However, we may be quite optimistic regarding its progress in runtime behavior, as Nemo already shows better running times on the original LUBM datasets. The reasoner cwm is consistently slower than the other three and from LUBM 010 on, we had to stop the runs of cwm after several hours without results. All reasoners tried to find the query answers/deductive closures for at least ten minutes (i.e., — in Table 1 indicates a time-out).

5.3 Discussion

In all our tests we observe a very poor performance of cwm which is not surprising, given that this reasoner is a prototype which has not been updated for some time. The results for EYE, VLog and Nemo are more interesting as they illustrate the different strengths of the reasoners.

For very high numbers of rules compared to the amount of data, EYE performs much better than VLog and Nemo. The good results of 0.1 and 0.3 seconds can even be improved by using backward reasoning. This makes EYE very well-suited for use cases where we need to apply complex rules on datasets of low or medium size. This could be interesting in decentralized set-ups such as policy-based access control for the Solidproject.¹¹ On the other hand we see that VLog and Nemo perform best when provided with large datasets and lower numbers of rules. This could be useful use cases involving bigger datasets in the Web like Wikidata¹² or DBpedia¹³.

From the perspective of this paper, these two findings together show the relevance of our work: we could observe big differences between the reasoning times of the tools we chose for our tests and these differences depended on the use cases. In other words, there are indeed use cases which could benefit from the translation we provide and we thus do not only make the first steps towards having more N₃ reasoners available but also broaden the scope of possible N₃ applications.

¹¹ <https://solidproject.org/>.

¹² <https://www.wikidata.org/>

¹³ <https://www.dbpedia.org/>

6 Related work

When originally proposed as a W3C member submission [7], the formal semantics of N_3 was only introduced in an informal way. As a consequence, different systems, using N_3 , interpreted concepts like nested formulae differently [3]. Since then, the relation of N_3 to other Web standards has been studied from a use-case perspective [2] and a W3C Community group has been formed [26], which recently published the semantics of N_3 without functions [1]. But even with these definitions, the semantic relation of the logic to other standards, especially outside the Semantics Web, has not been studied thoroughly.

For RDF, a subset of N_3 , de Bruijn and Heymans [11] provide a translation to first-order logic and F-Logic which uses very similar embeddings (e.g., a ternary predicate to represent triples) as we do in this paper, but do not cover rules. Boley [9] covers N_3 in his RuleML Knowledge-Interoperation Hub by providing a translation of N_3 to PSOA RuleML. This can be used to translate to other Web-logics. However, this work focuses on the representations of rules and does not cover their semantics.

In the realm of Description Logics (DL), rewritings in rule-based languages has its own tradition, especially when it comes to handling large amounts of data (see, e.g., [14] for a good overview of existing rewritings and their complexity, as well as more references). The goal there is to (1) make state-of-the-art rule reasoners available for DLs and, thereby, (2) use a fragment of a rule language that reflects on the data complexity of the given DL fragment. Also practical tools have been designed to capture certain profiles of the Web Ontology Language (OWL), like the Orel system [22] and, more recently, DaRLing [18]. To the best of our knowledge, a rewriting for N_3 as presented in this paper did not exist before. Also, existential rule reasoning engines have not been compared to the existing N_3 reasoners.

7 Conclusion

In this paper we studied the close relationship between N_3 rules supporting blank node production and existential rules. N_3 without special features like built-in functions, nesting of rules, or quotation can be directly mapped to existential rules with unary and binary predicates. In order to show that, we defined a mapping between N_3^{\exists} , N_3 without the aforementioned features, and existential rules. We argued that this mapping and its inverse preserve the equivalence and non-equivalence between datasets. This result allows us to trust the reasoning results when applying the mapping in practice, that is, when (1) translating N_3^{\exists} to existential rules, (2) reasoning within that framework, and (3) using the inverse mapping to transfer the result back into N_3 .

We applied that strategy and compared the reasoning times of the N_3 reasoners *cwm* and *EYE* with the existential rule reasoners *VLog* and *Nemo*. The goal of that comparison was to find out whether there are use cases for which N_3 reasoning can benefit from the findings on existential rules. We tested the reasoners on two datasets: *DT* consisting of one single fact and a varying number of mutually dependent rules and *LUBM* consisting of a fixed number of rules and a varying number of facts. *EYE* performs better on *DT* while *VLog* and *Nemo* showed their strength on *LUBM*. We

see that as an indication that for use cases of similar nature, that is, reasoning on large numbers of facts, our approach could be used to improve reasoning times. As a more general finding we see that reasoners differ in their strengths and that by providing the revertible translation between N_3^{\exists} and existential rules we increase the number of reasoners (partly) supporting N_3 and the range of use cases the logic can support in practice. We see our work as an important step towards fully establishing rule-based reasoning in the Semantic Web.

As many N_3 use cases rely on powerful built-in functions the logic provides as well as on its logical features such as support for graph terms, lists and nested rules, future work should include the extension of our translation towards full coverage of N_3 . Another direction of future work could be to investigate the differences and similarities we found in our evaluation in more detail: while showing differences in their performance, the reasoners produced the exact same result sets (modulo isomorphism) when acting on rules introducing blank nodes. That is, the different reasoning times do not stem from the handling of existentially quantified rule heads but from other optimization techniques. Fully understanding these differences will help the N_3 and the existential rule community to further improve their tools. In that context, it would also be interesting to learn if EYE's capability to combine forward and backward reasoning could improve the reasoning times when dealing with existentially quantified rule heads which are commonly dealt with in a forward manner.

We thus hope that our research on existential N_3 will spawn further investigations of powerful data-centric features in data-intensive rule reasoning as well as significant progress in tool support towards these features. Ultimately, we envision a Web of data and rule exchange, fully supported by the best tools available as converging efforts of the N_3 community, the existential rule reasoning community, and possibly many others.

Acknowledgements. Stephan Mennicke is partly supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) in project number 389792660 (TRR 248, Center for Perspicuous Computing) and by Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF, Federal Ministry of Education and Research) and DAAD (German Academic Exchange Service) in project 57616814 (SECAI, School of Embedded and Composite AI). Both authors are partly supported by the BMBF under project 13GW0552B (KIMEDS, KI-assistierte Zertifizierung medizintechnischer Software) in the Center for Scalable Data Analytics and Artificial Intelligence (ScaDS.AI),

References

1. Arndt, D., Champin, P.A.: Notation3 semantics. W3C community group report, W3C (Jul 2023), <https://w3c.github.io/N3/reports/20230703/semantics.html>
2. Arndt, Dörthe: Notation3 as the unifying logic for the semantic web. Ph.D. thesis, Ghent University (2019)
3. Arndt, Dörthe and Schrijvers, Tom and De Roo, Jos and Verborgh, Ruben: Implicit quantification made explicit : how to interpret blank nodes and universal variables in Notation3 Logic. JOURNAL OF WEB SEMANTICS **58**, 100501:1–100501:25 (2019), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.websem.2019.04.001>

4. Baget, J.F., Leclère, M., Mugnier, M.L., Salvat, E.: On rules with existential variables: Walking the decidability line. *Artificial Intelligence* **175**(9-10), 1620–1654 (2011)
5. Benedikt, M., Konstantinidis, G., Mecca, G., Motik, B., Papotti, P., Santoro, D., Tsamoura, E.: Benchmarking the chase. In: Sallinger, E., den Bussche, J.V., Geerts, F. (eds.) *Proc. 36th Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS'17)*. pp. 37–52. ACM (2017)
6. Berners-Lee, T.: *cwm (2000–2009)*, <http://www.w3.org/2000/10/swap/doc/cwm.html>
7. Berners-Lee, T., Connolly, D.: Notation3 (N3): A readable RDF syntax. W3C Team Submission (Mar 2011), <http://www.w3.org/TeamSubmission/n3/>
8. Berners-Lee, T., Connolly, D., Kagal, L., Scharf, Y., Hendler, J.: N3Logic: A logical framework for the World Wide Web. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* (3), 249–269 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068407003213>
9. Boley, H.: The ruleml knowledge-interoperation hub. In: Alferes, J.J., Bertossi, L., Governatori, G., Fodor, P., Roman, D. (eds.) *Rule Technologies. Research, Tools, and Applications*. pp. 19–33. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2016)
10. Boley, H., Osmun, T.M., Craig, B.L.: Wellnessrules: A web 3.0 case study in ruleml-based prolog-n3 profile interoperation. In: Governatori, G., Hall, J., Paschke, A. (eds.) *Rule Interchange and Applications*. pp. 43–52. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2009)
11. de Bruijn, J., Heymans, S.: Logical foundations of (e)rdf(s): Complexity and reasoning. In: Aberer, K., Choi, K.S., Noy, N., Allemang, D., Lee, K.I., Nixon, L., Golbeck, J., Mika, P., Maynard, D., Mizoguchi, R., Schreiber, G., Cudré-Mauroux, P. (eds.) *The Semantic Web*. pp. 86–99. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2007)
12. Cali, A., Gottlob, G., Pieris, A.: Query answering under non-guarded rules in Datalog+/- . In: Hitzler, P., Lukasiewicz, T. (eds.) *Proc. 4th Int. Conf. on Web Reasoning and Rule Systems (RR 2010)*. LNCS, vol. 6333, pp. 1–17. Springer (2010)
13. Carral, D., Dragoste, I., González, L., Jacobs, C., Krötzsch, M., Urbani, J.: Vlog: A rule engine for knowledge graphs. In: *International Semantic Web Conference*. pp. 19–35. Springer (2019)
14. Carral, D., Krötzsch, M.: Rewriting the description logic ALCHIQ to disjunctive existential rules. In: Bessiere, C. (ed.) *Proceedings of the 29th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2020*. pp. 1777–1783. ijcai.org (2020)
15. Cuenca Grau, B., Horrocks, I., Krötzsch, M., Kupke, C., Magka, D., Motik, B., Wang, Z.: Acyclicity notions for existential rules and their application to query answering in ontologies. *J. of Artificial Intelligence Research* **47**, 741–808 (2013)
16. Deutsch, A., Nash, A., Remmel, J.B.: The chase revisited. In: Lenzerini, M., Lembo, D. (eds.) *Proc. 27th Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS'08)*. pp. 149–158. ACM (2008)
17. Ebbinghaus, H.D., Flum, J., Thomas, W.: *Semantics of First-Order Languages*, pp. 27–57. Springer New York, New York, NY (1994)
18. Fiorentino, A., Zangari, J., Manna, M.: DaRLing: A Datalog rewriter for OWL 2 RL ontological reasoning under SPARQL queries. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* **20**(6), 958–973 (2020)
19. Harth, A., Käfer, T.: Rule-based programming of user agents for linked data. In: *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Linked Data on the Web at the Web Conference (27th WWW)*. CEUR-WS (April 2018)
20. Hayes, P. (ed.): *RDF Semantics*. W3C Recommendation (10 February 2004), available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/rdf-mt/>
21. Ivliev, A., Ellmauthaler, S., Gerlach, L., Marx, M., Meißner, M., Meusel, S., Krötzsch, M.: Nemo: First glimpse of a new rule engine. In: *39th on Logic Programming, ICLP 2023 Technical Communications*. EPTCS (to appear)

22. Krötzsch, M., Mehdi, A., Rudolph, S.: Orel: Database-driven reasoning for OWL 2 profiles. In: Haarslev, V., Toman, D., Weddell, G. (eds.) Proc. 23rd Int. Workshop on Description Logics (DL'10). CEUR Workshop Proceedings, vol. 573, pp. 114–124. CEUR-WS.org (2010)
23. Krötzsch, M., Marx, M., Rudolph, S.: The power of the terminating chase. In: Barceló, P., Calautti, M. (eds.) Proc. 22nd Int. Conf. on Database Theory (ICDT'19). LIPIcs, vol. 127, pp. 3:1–3:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik (2019)
24. Verborgh, R., Arndt, D., Van Hoecke, S., De Roo, J., Mels, G., Steiner, T., Gabarró, J.: The Pragmatic Proof: Hypermedia API Composition and Execution. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* (1), 1–48 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068416000016>
25. Verborgh, R., De Roo, J.: Drawing Conclusions from Linked Data on the Web: The EYE Reasoner. *IEEE Software* (5), 23–27 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1109/MS.2015.63>
26. Woensel, W.V., Arndt, D., Champin, P.A., Tomaszuk, D., Kellogg, G.: Notation3 language (Jul 2023), <https://w3c.github.io/N3/reports/20230703/>