

CPS 570: Artificial Intelligence

First-Order Logic

Instructor: Vincent Conitzer

Limitations of propositional logic

- So far we studied propositional logic
- Some English statements are hard to model in propositional logic:
- “If your roommate is wet because of rain, your roommate must not be carrying **any** umbrella”
- Pathetic attempt at modeling this:
- RoommateWetBecauseOfRain =>
(NOT(RoommateCarryingUmbrella0) AND
NOT(RoommateCarryingUmbrella1) AND
NOT(RoommateCarryingUmbrella2) AND ...)

Problems with propositional logic

- No notion of **objects**
- No notion of **relations among objects**
- RoommateCarryingUmbrella0 is instructive **to us**, suggesting
 - there is an object we call Roommate,
 - there is an object we call Umbrella0,
 - there is a relationship Carrying between these two objects
- Formally, none of this meaning is there
 - Might as well have replaced RoommateCarryingUmbrella0 by P

Elements of first-order logic

- **Objects:** can give these names such as Umbrella0, Person0, John, Earth, ...
- **Relations:** Carrying(., .), IsAnUmbrella(.)
 - Carrying(Person0, Umbrella0),
IsUmbrella(Umbrella0)
 - Relations with one object = **unary relations** = **properties**
- **Functions:** Roommate(.)
 - Roommate(Person0)
- **Equality:** Roommate(Person0) = Person1

Things to note about functions

- It could be that we have a separate name for `Roommate(Person0)`
- E.g., `Roommate(Person0) = Person1`
- ... but we do not **need** to have such a name

- A function can be applied to any object
- E.g., `Roommate(Umbrella0)`

Reasoning about many objects at once

- **Variables:** x, y, z, \dots can refer to multiple objects
- New operators “for all” and “there exists”
 - **Universal quantifier** and **existential quantifier**
- for all x : $\text{CompletelyWhite}(x) \Rightarrow$
 $\text{NOT}(\text{PartiallyBlack}(x))$
 - Completely white objects are never partially black
- there exists x : $\text{PartiallyWhite}(x) \text{ AND}$
 $\text{PartiallyBlack}(x)$
 - There exists some object in the world that is partially white and partially black

Practice converting English to first-order logic

- “John has an umbrella”
- there exists y : $(\text{Has}(\text{John}, y) \text{ AND } \text{IsUmbrella}(y))$
- “Anything that has an umbrella is not wet”
- for all x : $((\text{there exists } y: (\text{Has}(x, y) \text{ AND } \text{IsUmbrella}(y))) \Rightarrow \text{NOT}(\text{IsWet}(x)))$
- “Any person who has an umbrella is not wet”
- for all x : $(\text{IsPerson}(x) \Rightarrow ((\text{there exists } y: (\text{Has}(x, y) \text{ AND } \text{IsUmbrella}(y))) \Rightarrow \text{NOT}(\text{IsWet}(x))))$

More practice converting English to first-order logic

- “John has at least two umbrellas”
- there exists x : (there exists y : (Has(John, x) AND IsUmbrella(x) AND Has(John, y) AND IsUmbrella(y) AND NOT($x=y$)))
- “John has at most two umbrellas”
- for all x, y, z : ((Has(John, x) AND IsUmbrella(x) AND Has(John, y) AND IsUmbrella(y) AND Has(John, z) AND IsUmbrella(z)) \Rightarrow ($x=y$ OR $x=z$ OR $y=z$))

Even more practice converting English to first-order logic...

- “Duke’s basketball team defeats any other basketball team”
- for all x : $((\text{IsBasketballTeam}(x) \text{ AND } \text{NOT}(x=\text{BasketballTeamOf}(\text{Duke}))) \Rightarrow \text{Defeats}(\text{BasketballTeamOf}(\text{Duke}), x))$
- “Every team defeats some other team”
- for all x : $(\text{IsTeam}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{there exists } y: (\text{IsTeam}(y) \text{ AND } \text{NOT}(x=y) \text{ AND } \text{Defeats}(x,y))))$

Is this a tautology?

- “Property P implies property Q, or property Q implies property P (or both)”
- for all x: $((P(x) \Rightarrow Q(x)) \text{ OR } (Q(x) \Rightarrow P(x)))$
- $(\text{for all } x: (P(x) \Rightarrow Q(x))) \text{ OR } (\text{for all } x: (Q(x) \Rightarrow P(x)))$

Relationship between universal and existential

- for all x : a
- is equivalent to
- $\text{NOT}(\text{there exists } x: \text{NOT}(a))$

Something we cannot do in first-order logic

- We are **not** allowed to reason in general about relations and functions
- The following would correspond to **higher-order logic** (which is more powerful):
- “If John is Jack’s roommate, then any property of John is also a property of Jack’s roommate”
- $(\text{John}=\text{Roommate}(\text{Jack})) \Rightarrow \text{for all } p: (p(\text{John}) \Rightarrow p(\text{Roommate}(\text{Jack})))$
- “If a property is inherited by children, then for any thing, if that property is true of it, it must also be true for any child of it”
- $\text{for all } p: (\text{IsInheritedByChildren}(p) \Rightarrow (\text{for all } x, y: ((\text{IsChildOf}(x,y) \text{ AND } p(y)) \Rightarrow p(x))))$

Axioms and theorems

- **Axioms**: basic facts about the domain, our “initial” knowledge base
- **Theorems**: statements that are logically derived from axioms

SUBST

- SUBST replaces one or more variables with something else
- For example:
 - $\text{SUBST}(\{x/\text{John}\}, \text{IsHealthy}(x) \Rightarrow \text{NOT}(\text{HasACold}(x)))$
gives us
 - $\text{IsHealthy}(\text{John}) \Rightarrow \text{NOT}(\text{HasACold}(\text{John}))$

Instantiating quantifiers

- From
- for all x : a
- we can obtain
- $\text{SUBST}(\{x/g\}, a)$

- From
- there exists x : a
- we can obtain
- $\text{SUBST}(\{x/k\}, a)$
- where k is a constant that does not appear elsewhere in the knowledge base (**Skolem constant**)
- Don't need original sentence anymore

Instantiating existentials after universals

- for all x : there exists y : $\text{IsParentOf}(y,x)$
- WRONG: for all x : $\text{IsParentOf}(k, x)$
- RIGHT: for all x : $\text{IsParentOf}(k(x), x)$
- Introduces a new function (**Skolem function**)
- ... again, assuming k has not been used previously

Generalized modus ponens

- for all x : Loves(John, x)
 - John loves every thing
- for all y : (Loves(y , Jane) \Rightarrow FeelsAppreciatedBy(Jane, y))
 - Jane feels appreciated by every thing that loves her
- Can infer from this:
- FeelsAppreciatedBy(Jane, John)

- Here, we used the substitution $\{x/\text{Jane}, y/\text{John}\}$
 - Note we used different variables for the different sentences
- General UNIFY algorithms for finding a good substitution

Keeping things as general as possible in unification

- Consider EdibleByWith
 - e.g., EdibleByWith(Soup, John, Spoon) – John can eat soup with a spoon
- for all x: for all y: EdibleByWith(Bread, x, y)
 - Anything can eat bread with anything
- for all u: for all v: (EdibleByWith(u, v, Spoon) => CanBeServedInBowlTo(u,v))
 - Anything that is edible with a spoon by something can be served in a bowl to that something
- Substitution: {x/z, y/Spoon, u/Bread, v/z}
- Gives: for all z: CanBeServedInBowlTo(Bread, z)
- Alternative substitution {x/John, y/Spoon, u/Bread, v/John} would only have given CanBeServedInBowlTo(Bread, John), which is not as general

Resolution for first-order logic

- for all x : ($\text{NOT}(\text{Knows}(\text{John}, x)) \text{ OR } \text{IsMean}(x) \text{ OR } \text{Loves}(\text{John}, x)$)
 - John loves everything he knows, with the possible exception of mean things
- for all y : ($\text{Loves}(\text{Jane}, y) \text{ OR } \text{Knows}(y, \text{Jane})$)
 - Jane loves everything that does not know her
- What can we unify? What can we conclude?
- Use the substitution: $\{x/\text{Jane}, y/\text{John}\}$
- Get: $\text{IsMean}(\text{Jane}) \text{ OR } \text{Loves}(\text{John}, \text{Jane}) \text{ OR } \text{Loves}(\text{Jane}, \text{John})$
- Complete (i.e., if not satisfiable, will find a proof of this), **if** we can remove literals that are duplicates after unification
 - Also need to put everything in **canonical form** first

Notes on inference in first-order logic

- Deciding whether a sentence is entailed is **semidecidable**: there are algorithms that will eventually produce a proof of any entailed sentence
- It is not **decidable**: we cannot always conclude that a sentence is not entailed

(Extremely informal statement of) Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem

- First-order logic is not rich enough to model basic arithmetic
- For any consistent system of axioms that is rich enough to capture basic arithmetic (in particular, mathematical induction), there exist true sentences that cannot be proved from those axioms

A more challenging exercise

- Suppose:
 - There are exactly 3 objects in the world,
 - If x is the spouse of y , then y is the spouse of x (spouse is a function, i.e., everything has a spouse)
- Prove:
 - Something is its own spouse

More challenging exercise

- there exist x, y, z : $(\text{NOT}(x=y) \text{ AND } \text{NOT}(x=z) \text{ AND } \text{NOT}(y=z))$
- for all w, x, y, z : $(w=x \text{ OR } w=y \text{ OR } w=z \text{ OR } x=y \text{ OR } x=z \text{ OR } y=z)$
- for all x, y : $((\text{Spouse}(x)=y) \Rightarrow (\text{Spouse}(y)=x))$
- for all x, y : $((\text{Spouse}(x)=y) \Rightarrow \text{NOT}(x=y))$ (*for the sake of contradiction*)
- *Try to do this on the board...*

Umbrellas in first-order logic

- You know the following things:
 - You have exactly one other person living in your house, who is wet
 - If a person is wet, it is because of the rain, the sprinklers, or both
 - If a person is wet because of the sprinklers, the sprinklers must be on
 - If a person is wet because of rain, that person must not be carrying any umbrella
 - There is an umbrella that “lives in” your house, which is not in its house
 - An umbrella that is not in its house must be carried by some person who lives in that house
 - You are not carrying any umbrella
- Can you conclude that the sprinklers are on?

Theorem prover on the web

- <https://webspass.spass-prover.org/>
- `begin_problem(TinyProblem).`
- `list_of_descriptions.`
- `name({*TinyProblem*}).`
- `author({*CPS570*}).`
- `status(unknown).`
- `description({*Just a test*}).`
- `end_of_list.`
- `list_of_symbols.`
- `predicates[(F,1),(G,1)].`
- `end_of_list.`
- `list_of_formulae(axioms).`
- **`formula(exists([U],F(U))).`**
- **`formula(forall([V],implies(F(V),G(V)))).`**
- `end_of_list.`
- `list_of_formulae(conjectures).`
- **`formula(exists([W],G(W))).`**
- `end_of_list.`
- `end_problem.`

Theorem prover on the web...

- `begin_problem(ThreeSpouses).`
- `list_of_descriptions.`
- `name({*ThreeSpouses*}).`
- `author({*CPS570*}).`
- `status(unknown).`
- `description({*Three Spouses*}).`
- `end_of_list.`
- `list_of_symbols.`
- `functions[spouse].`
- `end_of_list.`
- `list_of_formulae(axioms).`
- **`formula(exists([X],exists([Y],exists([Z],and(not(equal(X,Y)),and(not(equal(X,Z)),not(equal(Y,Z)))))))).`**
- **`formula(forall([W],forall([X],forall([Y],forall([Z],or(equal(W,X),or(equal(W,Y),or(equal(W,Z),or(equal(X,Y),or(equal(X,Z),equal(Y,Z)))))))))).`**
- **`formula(forall([X],forall([Y],implies(equal(spouse(X),Y),equal(spouse(Y),X)))).`**
- `end_of_list.`
- `list_of_formulae(conjectures).`
- **`formula(exists([X],equal(spouse(X),X))).`**
- `end_of_list.`
- `end_problem.`

Theorem prover on the web...

- begin_problem(TwoOrThreeSpouses).
- list_of_descriptions.
- name({*TwoOrThreeSpouses*}).
- author({*CPS570*}).
- status(unknown).
- description({*TwoOrThreeSpouses*}).
- end_of_list.
- list_of_symbols.
- functions[spouse].
- end_of_list.
- list_of_formulae(axioms).
- **formula(exists([X],exists([Y],not(equal(X,Y))))).**
- **formula(forall([W],forall([X],forall([Y],forall([Z],or(equal(W,X),or(equal(W,Y),or(equal(W,Z),or(equal(X,Y),or(equal(X,Z),equal(Y,Z)))))))))).**
- **formula(forall([X],forall([Y],implies(equal(spouse(X),Y),equal(spouse(Y),X)))).**
- end_of_list.
- list_of_formulae(conjectures).
- **formula(exists([X],equal(spouse(X),X))).**
- end_of_list.
- end_problem.

Theorem prover on the web...

- `begin_problem(FiveSpouses).`
- `list_of_descriptions.`
- `name({*FiveSpouses*}).`
- `author({*CPS570*}).`
- `status(unknown).`
- `description({*Five Spouses*}).`
- `end_of_list.`
- `list_of_symbols.`
- `functions[spouse].`
- `end_of_list.`
- `list_of_formulae(axioms).`
- **`formula(exists([X],exists([Y],exists([Z],exists([V],exists([W],and(not(equal(X,Y)),and(not(equal(X,Z)),and(not(equal(Y,Z)),and(not(equal(X,V)),and(not(equal(Y,V)),and(not(equal(Z,V)),and(not(equal(X,W)),and(not(equal(Y,W)),and(not(equal(Z,W)),not(equal(V,W)))))))))))))))).`**
- **`formula(forall([W],forall([X],forall([Y],forall([Z],forall([U],forall([V],or(equal(W,X),or(equal(W,Y),or(equal(W,Z),or(equal(X,Y),or(equal(X,Z),or(equal(Y,Z),or(equal(X,U),or(equal(Y,U),or(equal(Z,U),or(equal(W,U),or(equal(X,V),or(equal(Y,V),or(equal(Z,V),or(equal(W,V),or(equal(U,V)))))))))))))))))))).`**
- `formula(forall([X],forall([Y],implies(equal(spouse(X),Y),equal(spouse(Y),X))))).`
- `end_of_list.`
- `list_of_formulae(conjectures).`
- `formula(exists([X],equal(spouse(X),X))).`
- `end_of_list.`
- `end_problem.`

Theorem prover on the web...

- `begin_problem(Umbrellas).`
- `list_of_descriptions.`
- `name({*Umbrellas*}).`
- `author({*CPS570*}).`
- `status(unknown).`
- `description({*Umbrellas*}).`
- `end_of_list.`
- `list_of_symbols.`
- `functions[(House,1),(You,0)].`
- `predicates[(Person,1),(Wet,1),(WetDueToR,1),(WetDueToS,1),(SprinklersOn,0),(Umbrella,1),(Carrying,2),(NotAtHome,1)].`
- `end_of_list.`
- `list_of_formulae(axioms).`
- `formula(forall([X],forall([Y],implies(and(Person(X),and(Person(Y),and(not(equal(X,You)),and(not(equal(Y,You)),and(equal(House(X),House(You))),equal(House(Y),House(You))))))),equal(X,Y))))).`
- `formula(exists([X],and(Person(X),and(equal(House(You),House(X)),and(not(equal(X,You)),Wet(X)))))).`
- `formula(forall([X],implies(and(Person(X),Wet(X)),or(WetDueToR(X),WetDueToS(X))))).`
- `formula(forall([X],implies(and(Person(X),WetDueToS(X)),SprinklersOn))).`
- `formula(forall([X],implies(and(Person(X),WetDueToR(X)),forall([Y],implies(Umbrella(Y),not(Carrying(X,Y)))))).`
- `formula(exists([X],and(Umbrella(X),and(equal(House(X),House(You)),NotAtHome(X))))).`
- `formula(forall([X],implies(and(Umbrella(X),NotAtHome(X)),exists([Y],and(Person(Y),and(equal(House(X),House(Y)),Carrying(Y,X)))))).`
- `formula(forall([X],implies(Umbrella(X),not(Carrying(You,X))))).`
- `end_of_list.`
- `list_of_formulae(conjectures).`
- `formula(SprinklersOn).`
- `end_of_list.`
- `end_problem.`

Applications

- Some serious novel mathematical results proved
- Verification of hardware and software
 - Prove outputs satisfy required properties for all inputs
- Synthesis of hardware and software
 - Try to prove that there exists a program satisfying such and such properties, **in a constructive way**
- Also: contributions to planning (up next)