Introduction to Artificial Intelligence

First-order logic

Chapter 7

Dieter Fox

Outline

◇ Syntax and semantics of FOL

◇ Fun with sentences

◇ Wumpus world in FOL

Syntax of FOL: Basic elements

Constants	$KingJohn,\ 2,\ UCB, \ldots$
Predicates	$Brother,\ >, \ldots$
Functions	$Sqrt,\ LeftLegOf, \ldots$
Variables	$x,\ y,\ a,\ b, \ldots$
Connectives	$\land\ \lor\ \neg\ \Rightarrow\ \Leftrightarrow$
Equality	$=$
Quantifiers	$\forall\ \exists$

Atomic sentences

Atomic sentence = $predicate(term_1, \ldots, term_n)$
or $term_1 = term_2$

Term = $function(term_1, \ldots, term_n)$
or $constant$ or $variable$

E.g., $Brother(KingJohn, RichardTheLionheart)$
$> (Length(LeftLegOf(Richard)), Length(LeftLegOf(KingJohn)))$

Complex sentences

Complex sentences are made from atomic sentences using connectives

$$\neg S, \quad S_1 \wedge S_2, \quad S_1 \vee S_2, \quad S_1 \Rightarrow S_2, \quad S_1 \Leftrightarrow S_2$$

E.g. $Sibling(KingJohn, Richard) \Rightarrow Sibling(Richard, KingJohn)$

$>(1,2) \quad \vee \quad \leq(1,2)$

$>(1,2) \quad \wedge \quad \neg{>}(1,2)$

Truth in first-order logic

Sentences are true with respect to a **model** and an **interpretation**

Model contains objects and relations among them

Interpretation specifies referents for
constant symbols → **objects**
predicate symbols → **relations**
function symbols → **functional relations**

An atomic sentence $predicate(term_1, \ldots, term_n)$ is true
iff the **objects** referred to by $term_1, \ldots, term_n$
are in the **relation** referred to by $predicate$

Models for FOL: Example



Universal quantification

$\forall \langle variables \rangle \; \langle sentence \rangle$

Everyone at UW is smart:
$\forall x \;\; At(x, UW) \Rightarrow Smart(x)$

$\forall x \;\; P$ is equivalent to the **conjunction** of **instantiations** of P

$$\begin{aligned} & At(KingJohn, UW) \Rightarrow Smart(KingJohn) \\ \wedge\; & At(Richard, UW) \Rightarrow Smart(Richard) \\ \wedge\; & At(UW, UW) \Rightarrow Smart(UW) \\ \wedge\; & \ldots \end{aligned}$$

Typically, $\Rightarrow$ is the main connective with $\forall$.
Common mistake: using $\wedge$ as the main connective with $\forall$:

$$\forall x \;\; At(x, UW) \wedge Smart(x)$$

Universal quantification

$\forall \langle variables \rangle \; \langle sentence \rangle$

Everyone at UW is smart:
$\forall x \;\; At(x, UW) \Rightarrow Smart(x)$

$\forall x \;\; P$ is equivalent to the **conjunction** of **instantiations** of P

$$\begin{array}{ll} & At(KingJohn, UW) \Rightarrow Smart(KingJohn) \\ \wedge & At(Richard, UW) \Rightarrow Smart(Richard) \\ \wedge & At(UW, UW) \Rightarrow Smart(UW) \\ \wedge & \ldots \end{array}$$

Typically, $\Rightarrow$ is the main connective with $\forall$.
Common mistake: using $\wedge$ as the main connective with $\forall$:

$$\forall x \;\; At(x, UW) \wedge Smart(x)$$

means "Everyone is at UW and everyone is smart"

Existential quantification

$\exists \langle variables \rangle \;\; \langle sentence \rangle$

Someone at Berkeley is smart:
$\exists\, x \;\; At(x, Berkeley) \land Smart(x)$

$\exists\, x \;\; P$ is equivalent to the **disjunction** of **instantiations** of P

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
 & At(KingJohn, Berkeley) \land Smart(KingJohn) \\
\lor & At(Richard, Berkeley) \land Smart(Richard) \\
\lor & At(Berkeley, Berkeley) \land Smart(Berkeley) \\
\lor & \ldots
\end{array}
$$

Typically, $\land$ is the main connective with $\exists$.
Common mistake: using $\Rightarrow$ as the main connective with $\exists$:

$$\exists\, x \;\; At(x, Berkeley) \;\Rightarrow\; Smart(x)$$

Existential quantification

$\exists \langle variables \rangle \; \langle sentence \rangle$

Someone at Berkeley is smart:
$\exists x \;\; At(x, Berkeley) \land Smart(x)$

$\exists x \;\; P$ is equivalent to the **disjunction** of **instantiations** of P

$$\begin{array}{ll} & At(KingJohn, Berkeley) \land Smart(KingJohn) \\ \lor & At(Richard, Berkeley) \land Smart(Richard) \\ \lor & At(Berkeley, Berkeley) \land Smart(Berkeley) \\ \lor & \ldots \end{array}$$

Typically, $\land$ is the main connective with $\exists$.
Common mistake: using $\Rightarrow$ as the main connective with $\exists$:

$$\exists x \;\; At(x, Berkeley) \;\Rightarrow\; Smart(x)$$

is true if there is anyone who is not at Berkeley!

Properties of quantifiers

$\forall x\ \forall y$ is the same as $\forall y\ \forall x$ (**why**??)

$\exists x\ \exists y$ is the same as $\exists y\ \exists x$ (**why**??)

$\exists x\ \forall y$ is **not** the same as $\forall y\ \exists x$

$\exists x\ \forall y\ Loves(x, y)$
"There is a person who loves everyone in the world"

$\forall y\ \exists x\ Loves(x, y)$
"Everyone in the world is loved by at least one person"

Quantifier duality: each can be expressed using the other

$\forall x\ Likes(x, IceCream)$??

$\exists x\ Likes(x, Broccoli)$??

Properties of quantifiers

$\forall x\ \forall y$ is the same as $\forall y\ \forall x$ (**why**??)

$\exists x\ \exists y$ is the same as $\exists y\ \exists x$ (**why**??)

$\exists x\ \forall y$ is **not** the same as $\forall y\ \exists x$

$\exists x\ \forall y\ Loves(x, y)$
"There is a person who loves everyone in the world"

$\forall y\ \exists x\ Loves(x, y)$
"Everyone in the world is loved by at least one person"

Quantifier duality: each can be expressed using the other

$\forall x\ Likes(x, IceCream)$: $\neg \exists x\ \neg Likes(x, IceCream)$

$\exists x\ Likes(x, Broccoli)$: $\neg \forall x\ \neg Likes(x, Broccoli)$

Fun with sentences

Brothers are siblings

$\forall\, x, y \;\; Brother(x, y) \;\Rightarrow\; Sibling(x, y)$.

“Sibling” is reflexive

$\forall\, x, y \;\; Sibling(x, y) \;\Leftrightarrow\; Sibling(y, x)$

One’s mother is one’s female parent

$\forall\, x, y \;\; Mother(x, y) \;\Leftrightarrow\; (Female(x) and Parent(x, y))$

A first cousin is a child of a parent’s sibling

$\forall\, x, y \;\; FirstCousin(x, y) \;\Leftrightarrow\; \exists\, p, ps \;\; Parent(p, x) \land Sibling(ps, p) \land Parent(ps, y)$

Equality

$term_1 = term_2$ is true under a given interpretation
if and only if $term_1$ and $term_2$ refer to the same object

E.g., $1 = 2$ and $\forall\, x \;\; \times(Sqrt(x), Sqrt(x)) = x$ are satisfiable
$2 = 2$ is valid

E.g., definition of (full) $Sibling$ in terms of $Parent$:

$$\forall\, x, y \;\; Sibling(x, y) \;\Leftrightarrow\; [\neg(x = y) \land \exists\, m, f \;\; \neg(m = f) \land Parent(m, x) \land Parent(f, x) \land Parent(m, y) \land Parent(f, y)]$$

Interacting with FOL KBs

Suppose a wumpus-world agent is using an FOL KB
and perceives a smell and a breeze (but no glitter) at $t = 5$:

$Tell(KB, Percept([Smell, Breeze, None], 5))$
$Ask(KB, \exists\, a \;\; Action(a, 5))$

I.e., does the KB entail any particular actions at $t = 5$?

Answer: $Yes,\ \{a/Shoot\}$ $\leftarrow$ **substitution** (binding list)

Given a sentence S and a substitution σ,
$S\sigma$ denotes the result of plugging σ into S; e.g.,
$S = Smarter(x, y)$
$\sigma = \{x/Hillary, y/Bill\}$
$S\sigma = Smarter(Hillary, Bill)$

$Ask(KB, S)$ returns some/all σ such that $KB \models S\sigma$

Knowledge base for the wumpus world

"Perception"

$\forall\, b, g, t \;\; Percept([Smell, b, g], t) \;\Rightarrow\; Smelt(t)$

$\forall\, s, b, t \;\; Percept([s, b, Glitter], t) \;\Rightarrow\; AtGold(t)$

Reflex: $\forall\, t \;\; AtGold(t) \;\Rightarrow\; Action(Grab, t)$

Reflex with internal state: do we have the gold already?

$\forall\, t \;\; AtGold(t) \wedge \neg Holding(Gold, t) \;\Rightarrow\; Action(Grab, t)$

$Holding(Gold, t)$ cannot be observed

$\Rightarrow$ keeping track of change is essential

Deducing hidden properties

Properties of locations:
$\forall\, l,t \;\; At(Agent,l,t) \land Smelt(t) \;\Rightarrow\; Smelly(l)$
$\forall\, l,t \;\; At(Agent,l,t) \land Breeze(t) \;\Rightarrow\; Breezy(l)$

Squares are breezy near a pit:

Diagnostic rule—infer cause from effect

$$\forall\, y \;\; Breezy(y) \;\Rightarrow\; \exists\, x \;\; Pit(x) \land Adjacent(x,y)$$

Causal rule—infer effect from cause

$$\forall\, x,y \;\; Pit(x) \land Adjacent(x,y) \;\Rightarrow\; Breezy(y)$$

Neither of these is complete—e.g., the causal rule doesn't say whether squares far away from pits can be breezy

Definition for the $Breezy$ predicate:

$$\forall\, y \;\; Breezy(y) \;\Leftrightarrow\; [\exists\, x \;\; Pit(x) \land Adjacent(x,y)]$$

Keeping track of change

Facts hold in **situations**, rather than eternally
E.g., $Holding(Gold, Now)$ rather than just $Holding(Gold)$

Situation calculus is one way to represent change in FOL:
Adds a situation argument to each non-eternal predicate
E.g., Now in $Holding(Gold, Now)$ denotes a situation

Situations are connected by the $Result$ function
$Result(a, s)$ is the situation that results from doing a is s



Describing actions I

"Effect" axiom—describe changes due to action
$\forall\, s \;\; AtGold(s) \;\Rightarrow\; Holding(Gold, Result(Grab, s))$

"Frame" axiom—describe **non-changes** due to action
$\forall\, s \;\; HaveArrow(s) \;\Rightarrow\; HaveArrow(Result(Grab, s))$

Frame problem: find an elegant way to handle non-change
(a) representation—avoid frame axioms
(b) inference—avoid repeated "copy-overs" to keep track of state

Qualification problem: true descriptions of real actions require endless caveats—
what if gold is slippery or nailed down or . . .

Ramification problem: real actions have many secondary consequences—
what about the dust on the gold, wear and tear on gloves, . . .

Describing actions II

Successor-state axioms solve the representational frame problem

Each axiom is "about" a **predicate** (not an action per se):

$$\text{P true afterwards} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad [\text{an action made P true}$$
$$\lor \quad \text{P true already and no action made P false}]$$

For holding the gold:

$$\forall\, a, s \;\; Holding(Gold, Result(a, s)) \;\Leftrightarrow$$
$$[(a = Grab \land AtGold(s))$$
$$\lor\, (Holding(Gold, s) \land a \neq Release)]$$

Making plans

Initial condition in KB:

$$At(Agent, [1, 1], S_0)$$
$$At(Gold, [1, 2], S_0)$$

Query: $Ask(KB, \exists\, s\;\; Holding(Gold, s))$
i.e., in what situation will I be holding the gold?

Answer: $\{s/Result(Grab, Result(Forward, S_0))\}$
i.e., go forward and then grab the gold

This assumes that the agent is interested in plans starting at S_0 and that S_0 is the only situation described in the KB

Making plans: A better way

Represent **plans** as action sequences $[a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n]$

$PlanResult(p, s)$ is the result of executing p in s

Then the query $Ask(KB, \exists\, p\;\; Holding(Gold, PlanResult(p, S_0)))$
has the solution $\{p/[Forward, Grab]\}$

Definition of $PlanResult$ in terms of $Result$:

$$\forall\, s\;\; PlanResult([\,], s) = s$$
$$\forall\, a, p, s\;\; PlanResult([a|p], s) = PlanResult(p, Result(a, s))$$

Planning systems are special-purpose reasoners designed to do this type of inference more efficiently than a general-purpose reasoner

Summary

First-order logic:
- objects and relations are semantic primitives
- syntax: constants, functions, predicates, equality, quantifiers

Increased expressive power: sufficient to define wumpus world

Situation calculus:
- conventions for describing actions and change in FOL
- can formulate planning as inference on a situation calculus KB