
George Konidaris gdk@cs.brown.edu

Spring 2017

Knowledge






Representation and Reasoning

Represent knowledge about the world.

- Representation language.
- Knowledge base.
- Declarative facts and rules.

Reason using that represented knowledge.

- Often asking questions.
- Inference procedure.
- Heavily dependent on representation language.




Propositional Logic

A proposition is:

- A possible fact about the world.
- Either true or false.
- We may not know which.
- Can be combined with logical connectives.







More sophisticated representation language.



World can be described by:



objects

 $Color(\cdot)$ functions

 $Adjacent(\cdot, \cdot)$ $IsApple(\cdot)$ predicates

Objects:

- A "thing in the world"
 - Apples
 - Red
 - The Internet
 - Team Edward
 - Reddit
- · A name that references something.
- · Cf. a noun.

 $MyApple 271 \ The Internet \ Ennui$

Functions:

- Operator that maps object(s) to single object.
 - $ColorOf(\cdot)$
 - $ObjectNextTo(\cdot)$
 - $SocialSecurityNumber(\cdot)$
 - $DateOfBirth(\cdot)$
 - $Spouse(\cdot)$

Color Of(MyApple 271) = Red



Predicates - replaces proposition



- $IsApple(\cdot)$
- $ParentOf(\cdot, \cdot)$
- $BiggerThan(\cdot, \cdot)$
- $HasA(\cdot, \cdot)$

We can build up complex sentences using logical connectives, as in propositional logic:

- $Fruit(X) \implies Sweet(X)$
- $Food(X) \implies (Savory(X) \lor Sweet(X))$
- $ParentOf(Bob, Alice) \land ParentOf(Alice, Humphrey)$
- $Fruit(X) \implies Tasty(X) \lor (IsTomato(X) \land \neg Tasty(X))$

Predicates can appear where a propositions appear in propositional logic, but *functions cannot*.

Models for First-Order Logic

Recall from Propositional Logic!



- · Set the value of every variable in the KB to True or False.
- 2^n models possible for n propositions.

Proposition	Value
Cold	False
Raining	False
Cloudy	False
Hot	False

Proposition	Value
Cold	True
Raining	False
Cloudy	False
Hot	False

Proposition	Value
Cold	True
Raining	True
Cloudy	True
Hot	True

Models for First-Order Logic

The situation is much more complex for FOL.

A model in FOL consists of:

- A set of objects.
- A set of functions + values for all inputs.
- A set of predicates + values for all inputs.



Models for First-Order Logic

Consider:

Objects

 $Orange \\ Apple$

Predicates

 $IsRed(\cdot)$

 $HasVitaminC(\cdot)$

Functions

 $OppositeOf(\cdot)$

Example model:

Predicate	Argument	Value
IsRed	Orange	False
IsRed	Apple	$\mid True \mid$
$\mid HasVitaminC$	Orange	$\mid True \mid$
Has Vitamin C	Apple	$oxed{True}$

Function	Argument	Return
OppositeOf	Orange	Apple
Opposite	Apple	Orange

Knowledge Bases in FOL

A KB is now:

- A set of objects.
- A set of predicates.
- A set of functions.
- A set of sentences using the predicates, functions, and objects, and asserted to be true.

Objects

 $Orange \\ Apple$

Predicates

 $IsRed(\cdot)$

 $HasVitaminC(\cdot)$

Functions

 $OppositeOf(\cdot)$

IsRed(Apple)

HasVitaminC(Orange)

vocabulary



Knowledge Bases in FOL


Listing everything is tedious ...

Especially when general relationships hold.











We would like a way to say more general things about the world than explicitly listing truth values for each object.

Quantifiers

New weapon:

Quantifiers.



Make generic statements about properties that hold for the entire collection of objects in our KB.

Natural way to say things like:


- All fish have fins.
- All books have pages.
- There is a textbook about Al.

Key idea: variable + binding rule.

Existential Quantifiers

There exists object(s) such that a sentence holds.





Existential Quantifiers

Examples:


- $\exists x, Person(x) \land Name(x, George)$
- $\exists x, Car(x) \land ParkedIn(x, E23)$
- $\exists x, Course(x) \land Prerequisite(x, CS270)$



Universal Quantifiers

A sentence holds for all object(s).





Universal Quantifiers

Examples

- $\forall x, Fruit(x) \implies Tasty(x)$
- $\forall x, Bird(x) \implies Feathered(x)$
- $\forall x, Book(x) \rightarrow HasAuthor(x)$



Quantifiers

Difference in strength:

- Universal quantifier is very strong.
 - So use weak sentence.

$$\forall x, Bird(x) \implies Feathered(x)$$

- Existential quantifier is very weak.
 - So use strong sentence.

$$\exists x, Car(x) \land ParkedIn(x, E23)$$



Compound Quantifiers



$$\forall x, \exists y, Person(x) \implies Name(x, y)$$

"every person has a name"

Common Pitfalls



 $\forall x, Bird(x) \land Feathered(x)$

Common Pitfalls



$$\exists x, Car(x) \implies ParkedIn(x, E23)$$

Examples

. . .



Inference in First-Order Logic

Ground term, or literal - an actual object:

MyApple12



vs. a variable:

 \mathcal{X}

If you have only ground terms, you can convert to a propositional representation and proceed from there.

IsTasty(Apple): IsTastyApple

Instantiation

Getting rid of variables: instantiate a variable to a literal.

Universally quantified:

$$\forall x, Fruit(x) \implies Tasty(x)$$

$$Fruit(Apple) \implies Tasty(Apple)$$

$$Fruit(Orange) \implies Tasty(Orange)$$

$$Fruit(MyCar) \implies Tasty(MyCar)$$

$$Fruit(TheSky) \implies Tasty(TheSky)$$

For every object in the KB, just write out the rule with the variables substituted.

Instantiation

Existentially quantified:

Invent a new name (Skolem constant)



$$\exists x, Car(x) \land ParkedIn(x, E23)$$

$$Car(C) \wedge ParkedIn(C, E23)$$

- Name cannot be one you've already used.
- Rule can then be discarded.

PROLOG

PROgramming in LOGic (Colmerauer, 1970s)

- General-purpose Al programming language
- Based on First-Order Logic
- Declarative
- Use centered in Europe and Japan
- Fifth-Generation Computer Project
- Some parts of Watson (pattern matching over NLP)
- Often used as component of a system.

