I'm not robot
reCAPTCHA
Continue

Ontologia definicion pdf

ISSN: 1139-8736 Legal Deposit: B-39120-2002 Copyright: © Chantal Pérez We already mentioned that t rmino ontolog t pizza dictionary a identifies it with a branch metaf sica that explores the nature of existence. The real application, however, onlog is a computing unit and should not be seen as a natural unit that has been discovered, but rather as an artificial resource that was created (Mahesh 1996). Ontolog is understood as a common and common understanding of domains that can communicate between scientists and computing systems. this important nature, the fact that they can be divided and reused in different applications, partly explains the great interest associated with the creation and integration of ltimosos in ontologist as (Steve et al. 1998a, b). Ontolog is usually a sin nimo m s is conceptualization n88. According to Gruber's definition (1993:199), the ontolog constitutes an official, clear specification of common conceptualisation. For the purposes of this definition, which has already been converted into a standard, conceptualisation refers to an abstract world model from which the relevant concepts are identified; exl cito refers to the need to deliberately clarify the various concepts that constitute the ontolog, which we impose as continuity of representation of concepts in point 5.2; formal points out that the specificity must be represented by an official and common representation language, which reflects that the intrusive case must at best insist on accepted knowledge (e.g. on the same, the group of people to whom it should be used). The definition of onlog more specific is offered by Weigand (1997): ontology is a database that describes concepts in the world or in a field, some of their characteristics and how concepts relate to each other. Therefore, although onlog a philosophy is a systemic explanation of existence, systems based on knowledge that exist in exactly what can be represented and what is represented through declarative formalism, such as those mentioned in section 5.2.3, are known, as we saw, as the discourse of the universe. Ontolog a UoD is a set of objects that are represented in it and can be talked about and can be talked about. When we talk about the ontolog as a knowledge representation system, we need to indicate what kind of system we refer to. In fact, the ontolog used in all types of information applications where it is necessary to define in concrete terms the set of units concerned in the respective scope of application, as well as the interaction between them. Some ontolog, created with the simple purpose of achieving comprensin relevant UoD, because their creation imposes a very detailed specification. Another creation journal that was created a general proposal, such as the Cyc project (Guha & Lenat 1990), which is focused on building a knowledge base with the necessary human knowledge to draw conclusions. Steve et al. (1998a: 1) distinguishes three fundamental onlog types as: Ontolog from a domain representing relevant specialized knowledge of domains or subdomains, such as medicine, military applications, cardiology or, in our particular case, oncologies. Ontolog as a rich gene that represents the general and basic concepts of knowledge, such as part/all structures, quantification, processes or types of objects. Ontolog as representations that indicate conceptualizations are based on the formalmism of representative knowledge, so they are also called meta-ontolog as (meta-level or higher level ontogys). These three types, Guarino (1998a: 9) 89 ade ontolog as being created for a specific activity or task (called task onlogies), such as selling products or diagnosing diseases and ontolog, created a specific application. This classification helps us understand the initial approach the ontolog uses in this research work: the ontolog of the Microspace Project (v ase secci n 5.3.3), which its authors called placed (Mahesh 1996:6). In doing so, they refer to the fact that the creation of this ontolog is aimed at realising a specific task in a clearly defined area and is intended to work together with certain instruments. However, the fact that it is insisted on lying does not prevent the general concept of embracing being broad (although it cannot be considered a rich gene ontologist). On the other hand, it integrates its meta-ontolog, because all the concepts included (except the parent node) start from the concepts previously defined onlog a. For example, the basic is-relationship in the structure hierarchy is the concept of ontolog, especially it is a property type ONTOLOGY-SLOT.90 In our opinion, these two functions make it very valuable and repetitive for our purposes. 88. Notes to Guarino (1998) indicate that the name conceptualization is closer to the philosophical understanding of the ontolog as a system of the cathedral as they form an insight into the world. 89 However, in the Guarino classification, so-called top-level ontogenes are also regarded as rich genes and are, consequently, independent of a particular area or task. 90 In the future, we will use versales when we refer to the meanings of anelogа. Ndice General I ndice Cap tulo 5 I Next ISSN: 1139-8736 Legal Deposit: B-39120-2002 Copyright: © Chantal Pérez Ontology means study of it. This word is created by using the Greek terms , ontos, which means to be, ente, and o, logos, meaning study, discourse, science, theory. Oftology is part or branch philosophy that explores character, existence and reality, trying to determine the basic categories and relationships is like being. This includes some abstract questions, such as the existence or absence of certain entities, what can be said about existence and what does not exist, what the meaning of existence is, etc. The philosophers of ancient Greece, Plato and Aristotle studied this concept, which is often confused with metaphysics. In fact, ontology is an aspect of metaphysics that seeks to categorize what is essential and fundamental in the unit in question. The ontological test or ontological argument is one of the classic tests or arguments for the existence of God, based on the need for existence, which he is attributed as impeccably perfect, using only for reasons. In information science and technology, ontology has classifications. They are used as a tool to categorize or group information into classes. Ontologies are also applied in Semantic Web and Artificial Intelligence to assimile and codify knowledge by defining the relationship between the concepts of a given domain (field of knowledge). See also What is reality? Update date: 23/06/2016. As quoted: Ontology. In: Significados.com. Available in Ontology (from ancient Ὄν [on] -genitive ὄντος-[ontos], ente; and science, study, theory)) or general metaphysics is a philosophy industry that explores what is there, as well as the relationship between institutions (such as the relationship between universal, such as red, and a person who is him like an apple) or the relationship between an activity (such as one Socrates drank) and its members (Socrates and hemlock). [1] Some of the ontological questions are: what is important? What is the process? What is space time? Are there new properties? Does all events comply with any law(s)? Are there natural species? What makes an object real? Are there any root causes? Is the opportunity real? [2] Many traditional questions of philosophy can be understood as ontological questions:[1] Does God exist? Are there spiritual organizations like ideas and thoughts? Are there abstract subjects, such as numbers? Is it universal? Ontological problems Philosopher Willard van Orman Quine presented what he called the ontological problem in his article About What There is:[3] A strange feature of ontological problem is its simplicity. It can be articulated in two Castilian monosiliables: What's there? It can also be answered in one word: Everything, and everyone will accept this answer as true. However, it's just to say that's what's there. Is left non-compliances in specific cases; and therefore this issue has continued over the centuries. In general, each of these specific exceptions has a different problem. [4] Since the second half of the twentieth century, prevailing naturalism has determined that the metaphysical debate is primarily about the existence or absence of everything that seems to contradict the world's description of the most successful scientific theories. [5] This is reflected in the choice of some of the following cases: Abstract subjects: It is widely recognised that ideas are conceived as formulated by each individual's cognition in one of two categories: as abstract subjects or as specific entities. [6] Numbers, sets, and concepts are some examples of units that we intuitively classify as abstract, while the planet Venus, this tree and this person are intuitive examples of specific entities. However, the criterion for deciding when an entity is abstract and when it is specific, except intuition, has not yet been adopted. Moreover, there is no agreement as to whether abstract entities exist either and, if so, for which they exist. [7] Common Sense Units: When we find a chair, should we say that what is in the world is the President? Would it be more appropriate to say that what is strictly speaking is a bunch of molecules? Or maybe a bunch of atoms? [8] This argument can also be applied to many other common sense units. Universals (also called properties, attributes or characteristics) are supposed to reference predicates such as green, rough, friend or insect. [9] Universal existence is postulate to justify our talk about individuals. For example, we have a reasonable say about a plant that is green because the plant is universal green, or because the green universal is present in the plant. In addition, we can say from several things that everyone is green because the green universal, which is something different from the things, is present in all of them. The universal problem is whether universal exists, and if so, what their essence is: whether they exist in things (in re), or whatever they are (before rem), or in our minds, mention a few lines. [10] Mind: When we open our heads what we see, there is no mind, with thoughts, ideas and memories, but a question. Is it that spiritual is an illusion, and that everything we describe today in spiritual terms can be reduced to the physical processes that science observes? Is it that the spiritual is something effectively existing, irrelevant and unperable? [5] For a little more discussion, see Mind-Body Problem. Holes: At first glance, the holes are made of nothing. As is possible, them as if they were common objects? How is it possible to perceive them? What do we perceive? [11] Universal Problems This section is an excerpt from Universal Problem[edit] This article or section requires references that appear in an accredited publication. This notification was made on 17 April 2013. The universal problem includes a variety of thematic areas that are: cognitive psychology, epistemology and ontology, among others. A universal problem relates to how we think and perceive and what reality is known. The universal problem can be illustrated by the following question: is the idea of a river (universal) more realistic than dwellings in the river's raging waters (individual) at this time? Is it less real? Or otherwise realistic? It can be portrayed as follows: Being individual and unique to all beings that exist in nature, how the knowledge we gain through our ideas can be true, which alone and always gives us universal? [12] Mind-body problem This section is an excerpt from the Mind-Body Problem [edit] Diagram of a different approach to solving the mind-body problem. In the philosophy of spirit and cognitive science, the mind-body problem is the problem of explaining the relationship between the mind (the soul of some authors) and the question: how is it that mental or subjective states (such as feelings, beliefs, decisions, memories) explain, interact with, or exceed the substances and processes of objects in the world studied in science. [13] It is therefore an ontological problem; but the problem of other minds can be understood as being epistemic counterparts. The problem was described in renée Descartes in the 17th century, and Aristotle philosophers, philosophy of Avicena, and previous Asian traditions. [16] Various developments are proposed; most of them dualists (like De cartesian) or monisti. Dualism holds the difference between the material and the spiritual sphere; can become the last thing supernatural. Monism believes that there is only one reality, substance or unifying essence, to which the terms can be explained. The problem of the mind-body is closely related to intentionality, mental causation, complex problems of consciousness, problems of free action, the importance of symbols, the identity of the individual, the problem of other minds, etc. There is no identifiable causal point of interaction between the non-physical mind and its physical expansion has proven problematic substance dualism, and many modern mind philosophers think that the psyche is not something separate from the body. [18] Non-On-Call and Non-Ideological postures are also obtained in the scientific community. This has been helped by sociobiology, computing, evolutionary psychology, cognitive revolution and neuroscience evidence that highlights the dependence of mental phenomena on body substrates. [21] However, it is believed that the mind-body problem is still open and far from buried. Indeed, materialistic philosophers such as David Chalmers and Colin McGinn warn that some of the questions asked might be an undisclosed scientific or other explanation. Others like Daniel Dennett give more optimistic predictions, but still recognizing him as a problem. Etymology Ogdoas Scholastica (1606) by Jacob Lorhard, first text with the word ontology. The first, in the philosophical sense, was the term ontology in the philosophical sense, was the German philosopher Jacob Lorhard in his work Ogdoas Šolastika (1606)[24], followed by Rodolfo Goclenio in his work Lexiop philosopher (Philosophical Lexicon in Spanish), in 1613 with Greek characters. [25] It says that ontology is ente philosophy. After various uses and its transition to Latin characters, German mathematician and philosopher Gottfried Leibniz used the expression in his book Introductio ad Encyclopaediam arcanam (1683) and defined it as a science of what is and nothing, of the body and non-ente, things and its nature and accident. Already as a technical term, it is found in Jean Le Clerc's Ontologia sive de ente genere published in 1692 and the German philosopher Christian Wolff popularizes it, defining it as the science of the body as a whole as it entes. It claims that it uses a demonstration or deductive method and analyses predicates corresponding to ente as soon as it is ente. All these feelings helped to identify it in practice with metaphysics. The aristotle disciples of ancient age history first used the term metaphysics to refer to what their teacher described as the first philosophy, later referred to as ontology. Ontology is research on how it is, or to be at all, than anything that is or exists. Some philosophers, especially from Plato School, argue that all nouns refer to existing entities. Others argue that nouns don't always name entities, but provide a reference form to a collection of objects or events. In this respect, the mind, rather than referring to a person, refers to the collection of spiritual events that a person faces. In the Middle Ages, the increasingly limited importance of ontology in the neoshostic, non-sohostic teaching was still the exploration of static property[26] and in some cases transcendental property. Modern Age From concept neo scholastics is that Kanta can confirm moving this concept to his philosophy that ontology is a priori concepts that live in understanding and their use of experience, resulting in the concept of a more immanent sense. Twentieth century According to Husserl, ontology is the science of essences that can be formal or material. The first is devoted to formal esences, that is, the characteristics of all the essenas. Material loads have significant essences and are limited according to the types of objects. They are therefore also called regional itthogens. [27] Obviously, formal ontology includes all materials and even material. Heidegger, who could learn with Husserl in his early days, raises the question of being in Aristotle metaphysics, making criticism of the ontology tradition as on-theology, and trying to approach being with a unit out there out there that could be understood as human. Thus, he develops an original ontology, called the analysis of existence, which is responsible for the existence of the constitution (existence . The ontology then refers to the condition of the possibility of stocks or to be the same in their initial opening. [28] Moreover, he insists on differentiation of metaphysics differentiation from ontology, claiming that they are radically different because the earlier ones were mixed with ente, while the second part is precisely that they are different. Based on criticism of detology as metaphysics and hesoth all scholastic, Hartmann points out that ontology is actually a criticism that makes it possible to discover the boundaries of metaphysics and what content can be considered rational or understandable. [29] See also Metaphysics Ente Ontology from actante-Rizoma Teleology Ontological Anarchism Notes and references to (b) Hofweber, Thomas. Logic and ontology. In Edward N. Zalta, ed. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2009 Edition edition). Mahner, Martin; Bunge, Mario (2000). Biophilosophy basics. Mexico: the 21st century. Isbn 9682322758. Isbn 9682322758. Quins, V.O. (September 1948). About what's there. Metaphysics review (2 (5)). (Played id. Logically, pages 1-19). pages 21-38. Basics of dialectic ontology p. 64. Metaphysics problems. Oxford's companion to philosophy. Retrieved 15 July 2009. McDuwald, A. (1987- Abstract objects. In Edward N. Zalta, ed. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2009 Edition edition). Oliver, Alexander D. abstract subjects. Oxford's companion in philosophy. Retrieved 20 July 2009. Stuart, John, 1966- Philosophical research. 47. But what are the simple components that are made of reality?—What are the simple components of a chair?—What are the parts of the tree with which it is assembled? Are molecules, or atoms? Lowe, EJ versatile. Oxford Philosophy. Retrieved 19 July 2009. Simon Blackburn (ed.). Universal. Oxford Philosophy Dictionary. Retrieved 20 July 2009. Stuart, John, 1966- Holes. Stanford Philosophy Encyclopedia (Winter 2008 edition). Myr, Jacques (1963). Chapter II Philosophy-Key Problems-Logic. Introduction to philosophy. Readers' Club. p. 135. Crane, Tim, Mind-Body Problem, p. 1 Robert M. Young (1996). Robinson, Howard (Nov. 3, 2011). Henrik Lagerlund (2010). Kim, Jebugan (1995). Suuyuuu