

Overview of Inference in First-Order Logic

Chapter 9

Outline

- Reducing first-order inference to propositional inference
- Lifting inference in propositional logic to first-order logic.
 - Unification
 - Resolution

Two Approaches for Inference in FOL

Propositionalisation:

- Treat a first-order sentences as a template.
- Instantiating all variables with all possible constants gives a set of ground propositional clauses.
- Apply efficient propositional solver, e.g. SAT.

Two Approaches for Inference in FOL

Propositionalisation:

- Treat a first-order sentences as a template.
- Instantiating all variables with all possible constants gives a set of ground propositional clauses.
- Apply efficient propositional solver, e.g. SAT.

Lifted Inference:

- Generalize propositional methods to 1st-order methods.
- Issue: dealing with variables and quantifiers
- Rule of inference: resolution
- Unification: instantiate variables where necessary.

Propositionalisation

- **Easy case:** A finite world in which all individuals have names
 - E.g. the wumpus world
 - But also many planning, scheduling, etc. problems

Propositionalisation

- **Easy case:** A finite world in which all individuals have names
 - E.g. the wumpus world
 - But also many planning, scheduling, etc. problems
- **Idea:**
 - Replace a universally-quantified sentence with all of its instances
 - Replace an existentially-quantified sentence with a disjunction of its instances

Propositionalisation

- **Easy case:** A finite world in which all individuals have names
 - E.g. the wumpus world
 - But also many planning, scheduling, etc. problems
- **Idea:**
 - Replace a universally-quantified sentence with all of its instances
 - Replace an existentially-quantified sentence with a disjunction of its instances
- A formula (KB, etc.) with no variables is called *ground*
- *Inference procedure:*
 - Ground the KB and the query, and
 - run an inference procedure for propositional logic.

Universals

- E.g., $\forall x \text{ King}(x) \wedge \text{Greedy}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Evil}(x)$

yields

$$\text{King}(\text{John}) \wedge \text{Greedy}(\text{John}) \Rightarrow \text{Evil}(\text{John})$$

$$\text{King}(\text{Richard}) \wedge \text{Greedy}(\text{Richard}) \Rightarrow \text{Evil}(\text{Richard})$$

$$\text{King}(\text{car}_{54}) \wedge \text{Greedy}(\text{car}_{54}) \Rightarrow \text{Evil}(\text{car}_{54})$$

...

Existentials

- E.g., $\exists x \text{ Likes}(\text{John}, x)$

yields

$$\text{Likes}(\text{John}, \text{John}) \vee \text{Likes}(\text{John}, \text{Richard}) \vee \dots \vee \\ \text{Likes}(\text{John}, \text{car}_{54}) \vee \dots$$

Existentials

- E.g., $\exists x \text{ Likes}(\text{John}, x)$

yields

$$\text{Likes}(\text{John}, \text{John}) \vee \text{Likes}(\text{John}, \text{Richard}) \vee \dots \vee \\ \text{Likes}(\text{John}, \text{car}_{54}) \vee \dots$$

Q: What does “Everyone likes someone” look like?

Reduction to propositional inference

- Suppose the KB contains just the following:
 $\forall x \text{ King}(x) \wedge \text{Greedy}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Evil}(x)$
 $\text{King}(\text{John}), \text{Greedy}(\text{John}), \text{Brother}(\text{Richard}, \text{John})$
- Instantiating the universal sentence in *all possible* ways, we get
 $\text{King}(\text{John}) \wedge \text{Greedy}(\text{John}) \Rightarrow \text{Evil}(\text{John})$
 $\text{King}(\text{Richard}) \wedge \text{Greedy}(\text{Richard}) \Rightarrow \text{Evil}(\text{Richard})$
 $\text{King}(\text{John}), \text{Greedy}(\text{John}), \text{Brother}(\text{Richard}, \text{John})$
- The new KB is *propositionalized*.
- Proposition symbols are
 $\text{King}(\text{John}),$
 $\text{Greedy}(\text{John}),$
 $\text{Brother}(\text{John}, \text{Richard}),$
 $\text{Brother}(\text{John}, \text{John}),$ etc.

Problems with propositionalization

- Usually generates lots of irrelevant sentences.
- E.g., consider:
 $\forall x \text{ King}(x) \wedge \text{Greedy}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Evil}(x),$
 $\forall y \text{ Greedy}(y),$
 $\text{King}(\text{John}), \text{ Brother}(\text{Richard}, \text{John})$
 - For query $\text{Evil}(\text{John})$, propositionalization produces lots of facts (like $\text{Greedy}(\text{Richard})$) that are irrelevant
- k -ary predicate and n constants $\Rightarrow n^k$ instances

Problems with propositionalization

- Usually generates lots of irrelevant sentences.
- E.g., consider:
$$\forall x \text{ King}(x) \wedge \text{Greedy}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Evil}(x),$$
$$\forall y \text{ Greedy}(y),$$
$$\text{King}(\text{John}), \quad \text{Brother}(\text{Richard}, \text{John})$$
 - For query $\text{Evil}(\text{John})$, propositionalization produces lots of facts (like $\text{Greedy}(\text{Richard})$) that are irrelevant
- k -ary predicate and n constants $\Rightarrow n^k$ instances
- However, many recent AI applications use propositionalization for FO KBs over a finite domain.
 - Has led to work in *intelligent grounding*.
- Can make propositionalization work for *arbitrary* FO theories
 - 👉 See text for more

General FOL: Dealing with Variables

Consider the KB:

$$\{ \forall x (Grad(x) \Rightarrow Student(x)), \\ \forall y (Student(y) \Rightarrow Happy(y)), \\ Grad(ZeNian), \\ UGrad(Andrei) \}$$

- Intuitively $Happy(ZeNian)$ is inferrable.
 - This requires *instantiating* x and y to $ZeNian$.
- For such a deduction $Andrei$ is irrelevant.

Idea: Try to limit instantiation of variables to *useful* instances.

Unification

- If two formulas can be made the same by substitutions of variables, they are said to be *unified*
- Unification is the process of making 2 formulas (terms, etc) the same by finding an appropriate substitution for variables.

Unification

- If two formulas can be made the same by substitutions of variables, they are said to be *unified*
- Unification is the process of making 2 formulas (terms, etc) the same by finding an appropriate substitution for variables.
- Consider:

$$\forall x(Grad(x) \Rightarrow Student(x)), \quad Grad(ZeNian)$$

Unification

- If two formulas can be made the same by substitutions of variables, they are said to be *unified*
- Unification is the process of making 2 formulas (terms, etc) the same by finding an appropriate substitution for variables.
- Consider:
$$\forall x(Grad(x) \Rightarrow Student(x)), \quad Grad(ZeNian)$$
- To obtain $Student(ZeNian)$ we have the following steps:

Unification

- If two formulas can be made the same by substitutions of variables, they are said to be *unified*
- Unification is the process of making 2 formulas (terms, etc) the same by finding an appropriate substitution for variables.
- Consider:
$$\forall x(Grad(x) \Rightarrow Student(x)), \quad Grad(ZeNian)$$
- To obtain $Student(ZeNian)$ we have the following steps:
 - Figure out how to make $Grad(x)$ and $Grad(ZeNian)$ the same.
 - This is easy: Bind x to $ZeNian$.

Unification

- If two formulas can be made the same by substitutions of variables, they are said to be *unified*
- Unification is the process of making 2 formulas (terms, etc) the same by finding an appropriate substitution for variables.
- Consider:
$$\forall x(Grad(x) \Rightarrow Student(x)), \quad Grad(ZeNian)$$
- To obtain $Student(ZeNian)$ we have the following steps:
 - Figure out how to make $Grad(x)$ and $Grad(ZeNian)$ the same.
 - This is easy: Bind x to $ZeNian$.
 - Substituting, we get the rule instance:
$$Grad(ZeNian) \Rightarrow Student(ZeNian).$$

Unification

- If two formulas can be made the same by substitutions of variables, they are said to be *unified*
- Unification is the process of making 2 formulas (terms, etc) the same by finding an appropriate substitution for variables.
- Consider:
$$\forall x(Grad(x) \Rightarrow Student(x)), \quad Grad(ZeNian)$$
- To obtain $Student(ZeNian)$ we have the following steps:
 - Figure out how to make $Grad(x)$ and $Grad(ZeNian)$ the same.
 - This is easy: Bind x to $ZeNian$.
 - Substituting, we get the rule instance:
$$Grad(ZeNian) \Rightarrow Student(ZeNian).$$
 - Can now derive $Student(ZeNian)$.

Unification Examples

Look for substitution θ such that $\alpha\theta = \beta\theta$

α	β	θ
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(John, Jane)$	
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(y, OJ)$	
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(y, Mother(y))$	
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(x, OJ)$	

Unification Examples

Look for substitution θ such that $\alpha\theta = \beta\theta$

α	β	θ
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(John, Jane)$	$\{x/Jane\}$
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(y, OJ)$	
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(y, Mother(y))$	
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(x, OJ)$	

Unification Examples

Look for substitution θ such that $\alpha\theta = \beta\theta$

α	β	θ
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(John, Jane)$	$\{x/Jane\}$
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(y, OJ)$	$\{x/OJ, y/John\}$
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(y, Mother(y))$	
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(x, OJ)$	

Unification Examples

Look for substitution θ such that $\alpha\theta = \beta\theta$

α	β	θ
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(John, Jane)$	$\{x/Jane\}$
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(y, OJ)$	$\{x/OJ, y/John\}$
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(y, Mother(y))$	$\{y/John, x/Mother(John)\}$
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(x, OJ)$	

Unification Examples

Look for substitution θ such that $\alpha\theta = \beta\theta$

α	β	θ
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(John, Jane)$	$\{x/Jane\}$
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(y, OJ)$	$\{x/OJ, y/John\}$
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(y, Mother(y))$	$\{y/John, x/Mother(John)\}$
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(x, OJ)$	<i>fail</i>

Problem: Can't substitute both *John* and *OJ* for *x* at the same time.

Solution: Standardize variables apart:

- Replace $Knows(x, OJ)$ with $Knows(y, OJ)$

Reasoning and Unification

- Unification lets us work with both universally quantified variables and arbitrary terms.

- We can use unification in rules such as:

$$Parent(x, y) \wedge Parent(y, z) \Rightarrow GrandParent(x, z)$$

where the variables are taken as being universally quantified.

- Then forward chaining and backward chaining with unification can be defined for such rules.

- 👉 For backward chaining, following one line of development, one ends up with the programming language Prolog.

Resolution: Brief summary

- Resolution can be used in the first-order case (where it forms the basis for much of theorem proving)
- Full first-order version:

$$\frac{\ell_1 \vee C_1, \quad \ell_2 \vee C_2}{(C_1 \vee C_2)\theta} \quad \text{where } \ell_1\theta = \neg\ell_2\theta.$$

- For example,

$$\frac{\neg Rich(x) \vee Unhappy(x) \quad Rich(Ken)}{Unhappy(Ken)} \quad \text{with } \theta = \{x/Ken\}$$

- For details see the text or CMPT 411.

Inference in FOL

For KB and query α :

- Convert $KB \wedge \neg\alpha$ to CNF.
 - This is trickier than in propositional logic, since we have to deal with variables and quantifiers.
- Apply resolution steps to $CNF(KB \wedge \neg\alpha)$
 - No longer guaranteed to terminate if satisfiable
 - FOL is *undecidable*



Complete for FOL

Summary

- Propositionalization
 - Grounding approach: reduce all sentences to PL and apply propositional inference techniques.
- FOL/Lifted inference techniques
 - Propositional techniques + Unification.
 - Generalized Modus Ponens
 - Resolution-based inference.
- Many other aspects of FOL inference not discussed in class