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## Headline Level 2

### Headline Level 3

OWL provides three increasingly expressive sublanguages designed for use by specific communities of implementers and users.

OWL Lite supports those users primarily needing a classification hierarchy and simple constraints. For example, while it supports cardinality constraints, it only permits cardinality values of 0 or 1. It should be simpler to provide tool support for OWL Lite than its more expressive relatives, and OWL Lite provides a quick migration path for thesauri and other taxonomies. Owl Lite also has a lower formal complexity than OWL DL, see the section on OWL Lite in the OWL Reference for further details.

OWL DL supports those users who want the maximum expressiveness while retaining computational completeness (all conclusions are guaranteed to be computable) and decidability (all computations will finish in finite time). OWL DL includes all OWL language constructs, but they can be used only under certain restrictions (for example, while a class may be a subclass of many classes, a class cannot be an instance of another class). OWL DL is so named due to its correspondence with description logics, a field of research that has studied the logics that form the formal foundation of OWL.

OWL Full is meant for users who want maximum expressiveness and the syntactic freedom of RDF with no computational guarantees. For example, in OWL Full a class can be treated simultaneously as a collection of individuals and as an individual in its own right. OWL Full allows an ontology to augment the meaning of the pre-defined (RDF or OWL) vocabulary. It is unlikely that any reasoning software will be able to support complete reasoning for every feature of OWL Full.

Each of these sublanguages is an extension of its simpler predecessor, both in what can be legally expressed and in what can be validly concluded. The following set of relations hold. Their inverses do not.

* Every legal OWL Lite ontology is a legal OWL DL ontology.
* Every legal OWL DL ontology is a legal OWL Full ontology.
* Every valid OWL Lite conclusion is a valid OWL DL conclusion.
* Every valid OWL DL conclusion is a valid OWL Full conclusion.
	+ ABC
	+ XYZ

*[****IMPORTANT:*** *Always use bullet-points like above (dt. “Spiegelstriche”), no matter which level!]*

Ontology developers adopting OWL should consider which sublanguage best suits their needs. The choice between OWL Lite and OWL DL depends on the extent to which users require the more-expressive constructs provided by OWL DL. The choice between OWL DL and OWL Full mainly depends on the extent to which users require the meta-modeling facilities of RDF Schema (e.g. defining classes of classes, or attaching properties to classes). When using OWL Full as compared to OWL DL, reasoning support is less predictable since complete OWL Full implementations do not currently exist.



Figure 1: Example

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tabelle 1 | A | B | c |
| x | ax | bx | cx |
| y | ay | by | cy |

Table 1: Example
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