

# Knowledge engineering

---

KR is first and foremost about knowledge

meaning and entailment

find individuals and properties, then encode facts  
sufficient for entailments

Before implementing, need to understand clearly

- what is t
- why and <https://eduassistpro.github.io/>

Add WeChat edu\_assist\_pro

Example domain: soap-opera world

people, places, companies, marriages, divorces,  
hanky-panky, deaths, crimes, ...

Task: KB with appropriate entailments

- what vocabulary?
- what facts to represent?

# Vocabulary

---

## Domain-dependent predicates and functions

main question:

what are the individuals?

here: people, places, companies, ...

## named individuals

John, sleepy Town, faulty Insurance Corp, fe  
johnQsmith, ...

## basic types <https://powcoder.com>

Person, Place, Man, Woman, ...

Add WeChat powcoder

## attributes

Rich, Beautiful, Unscrupulous, ...

## relationships

LivesAt, MarriedTo, DaughterOf, HairDresserOf,  
HadAnAffairWith, Blackmails, ...

## functions

fatherOf, ceoOf, bestFriendOf, ...

# Basic facts

---

Usually atomic sentences and negations

type facts

Man(john),

Woman(jane),

Company(faultyInsuranceCorp)

property facts

Rich(john),

$\neg$ H

WorksFor(jim,fic)

equality facts

john = ceoOf(fic),

fic = faultyInsuranceCorp,

bestFriendOf(jim) = john

Like a simple database

could store these facts in relational tables

# Complex facts

---

## Universal abbreviations

$$\forall y[\text{Woman}(y) \wedge y \neq \text{jane} \supset \text{Loves}(y, \text{john})]$$

$$\forall y[\text{Rich}(y) \wedge \text{Man}(y) \supset \text{Loves}(y, \text{jane})]$$

$$\forall x \forall y[\text{Loves}(x, y) \supset \neg \text{Blackmails}(x, y)]$$

possible to express without quantifiers

## Incomplete knowledge

$$\text{Loves}(\text{jane}, \text{john}) \vee \text{Loves}(\text{jane}, \text{jim})$$

$$\exists x[$$

<https://eduassistpro.github.io/>

who?

Add WeChat edu\_assist\_pro

cannot write down more comp

## Closure axioms

$$\forall x[\text{Person}(x) \supset x = \text{jane} \vee x = \text{john} \vee x = \text{jim} \dots]$$

$$\forall x \forall y[\text{MarriedTo}(x, y) \supset \dots]$$

$$\forall x[x = \text{fic} \vee x = \text{jane} \vee x = \text{john} \vee x = \text{jim} \dots]$$

limits domain of discourse

also useful to have  $\text{jane} \neq \text{john} \dots$

# Terminological facts

---

General relationships among predicates.  
For example:

disjoint

$$\forall x [\text{Man}(x) \supset \neg \text{Woman}(x)]$$

subtype

$$\forall x [\text{Senator}(x) \supset \text{Legislator}(x)]$$

exhaustive

$$\forall x [$$

symmet

$$\forall x \forall y [\text{MarriedTo}(x,y) \supset$$

inverse

$$\forall x \forall y [\text{ChildOf}(x,y) \supset \text{ParentOf}(y,x)]$$

type restriction

$$\forall x \forall y [\text{MarriedTo}(x,y) \supset \\ \text{Person}(x) \wedge \text{Person}(y)]$$

full definition

$$\forall x [\text{RichMan}(x) \equiv \text{Rich}(x) \wedge \text{Man}(x)]$$

Usually universally quantified conditionals or biconditionals

# Entailments: 1

---

Is there a company whose CEO loves Jane?

$\exists x [\text{Company}(x) \wedge \text{Loves}(\text{ceoOf}(x), \text{jane})]$  ??

Suppose  $I \models \text{KB}$ .

Then  $I \models \text{Rich}(\text{john}), \text{Man}(\text{john}),$

and  $I \models \forall y [\text{Rich}(y) \wedge \text{Man}(y) \supset \text{Loves}(y, \text{jane})]$

so  $I \models \text{Loves}(\text{john}, \text{jane})$ .

Also  $I \models$

so

<https://eduassistpro.github.io/>

Finally  $I \models \text{Company}(\text{fic})$

and  $I \models \text{fic} = \text{faultyInsu}$

so  $I \models \text{Company}(\text{fic})$ .

Thus,  $I \models \text{Company}(\text{fic}) \wedge \text{Loves}(\text{ceoOf}(\text{fic}), \text{jane}),$

and so

$I \models \exists x [\text{Company}(x) \wedge \text{Loves}(\text{ceoOf}(x), \text{jane})]$ .

Can extract identity of company from this proof

## Entailments: 2

---

If no man is blackmailing John, then is he being blackmailed by somebody he loves?

$\forall x[\text{Man}(x) \supset \neg \text{Blackmails}(x, \text{john})] \supset$   
 $\exists y[\text{Loves}(\text{john}, y) \wedge \text{Blackmails}(y, \text{john})] \quad ??$

Note:  $\text{KB} \models (\alpha \supset \beta) \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{KB} \cup \{\alpha\} \models \beta$

Assume:  $I \models \text{KB} \cup \{\forall x[\text{Man}(x) \supset \neg \text{Blackmails}(x, \text{john})]\}$   
Show:  $I \models \exists y[\text{Loves}(\text{john}, y) \wedge \text{Blackmails}(y, \text{john})]$

Have:  $\exists x[\text{Adult}(x) \wedge \text{Blackmails}(x, \text{john})]$   
and  $\forall x[\text{Adult}(x) \supset \text{Man}(x) \vee \text{Woman}(x)]$   
so  $\exists x[\text{Woman}(x) \wedge \text{Blackmails}(x, \text{john})]$ .  
Then:  $\forall y[\text{Rich}(y) \wedge \text{Man}(y) \supset \text{Loves}(y, \text{jane})]$   
and  $\text{Rich}(\text{john}) \wedge \text{Man}(\text{john})$   
so  $\text{Loves}(\text{john}, \text{jane})!$

But:  $\forall y[\text{Woman}(y) \wedge y \neq \text{jane} \supset \text{Loves}(y, \text{john})]$   
and  $\forall x \forall y[\text{Loves}(x, y) \supset \neg \text{Blackmails}(x, y)]$   
so  $\forall y[\text{Woman}(y) \wedge y \neq \text{jane} \supset \neg \text{Blackmails}(y, \text{john})]$   
and...  $\text{Blackmails}(\text{jane}, \text{john})!!$

Finally:  $\text{Loves}(\text{john}, \text{jane}) \wedge \text{Blackmails}(\text{jane}, \text{john})$   
so:  $\exists y[\text{Loves}(\text{john}, y) \wedge \text{Blackmails}(y, \text{john})]$

Proof as sequence of sentences

# What individuals?

---

Sometimes useful to reduce n-ary predicates to 1-place predicates and 1-place functions

- involves reifying properties: new individuals
- typical of description logics / frame languages (later)

Flexibility in terms of arity:

Purchases(john,sears,bike) or  
Purchases(john,sears,bike,feb14) or  
Purchases(john,sears,bike,feb14,\$100)

Assignment Project Exam Help

Instea

<https://eduassistpro.github.io/>

amount( $p$ )=...  $\wedge$  ...  
allows purchase to be descr levels of detail

Add WeChat edu\_assist\_pro

Complex relationships:

MarriedTo( $x,y$ ) vs.

PreviouslyMarriedTo( $x,y$ ) vs.

ReMarriedTo( $x,y$ )

Define marital status in terms of existence of marriages and divorces.

Marriage( $m$ )  $\wedge$  husband( $m$ )= $x$   $\wedge$   
wife( $m$ )= $y$   $\wedge$  date( $m$ )=...  $\wedge$   
witness( $m$ )=...  $\wedge$  ...



# Abstract individuals

---

Also need individuals for numbers, dates, times, addresses, etc.

objects about which we ask wh-questions

## Quantities as individuals

$\text{age}(\text{suzy}) = 14$

$\text{age-in-years}(\text{suzy}) = 14$   
 $\text{age-in-months}(\text{suzy}) = 168$

perhaps better to have an object for the age of Suzy,  
whose value in years is 14

$\text{years}(\text{age}(\text{suzy})) = 14$

$\text{months}(x) = 12 * \text{years}(x)$

$\text{centimeters}(x) = 100 * \text{meters}(x)$

## Similarly with locations and times

instead of

$\text{time}(m) = \text{"Jan 5 1992 4:47:03EST"}$

can use

$\text{time}(m) = t \wedge \text{year}(t) = 1992 \wedge \dots$

# Other sorts of facts

---

## Statistical / probabilistic facts

- Half of the companies are located on the East Side.
- Most of the employees are restless.
- Almost none of the employees are completely trustworthy,

## Default / prototypical facts

- Company presidents typically have secretaries intercepting their ph
- Cars have <https://eduassistpro.github.io/>
- Companies generally do not a that work together to be married

## Intentional facts

- John believes that Henry is trying to blackmail him.
- Jane does not want Jim to think that she loves John.

## Others ...