

Inference in First-Order Logic




- Proofs
- Unification
- Generalized modus ponens
- Forward and backward chaining
- Completeness
- Resolution
- Logic programming

Inference in First-Order Logic




- Proofs – extend propositional logic inference to deal with quantifiers
- Unification
- Generalized modus ponens
- Forward and backward chaining – inference rules and reasoning program
- Completeness – Gödel's theorem: for FOL, any sentence entailed by another set of sentences can be proved from that set
- Resolution – inference procedure that is complete for any set of sentences
- Logic programming

Logic as a representation of the World



Desirable Properties of Inference Procedures



Remember: propositional logic

- ◇ **Modus Ponens** or **Implication-Elimination**: (From an implication and the premise of the implication, you can infer the conclusion.)

$$\frac{\alpha \Rightarrow \beta, \quad \alpha}{\beta}$$

- ◇ **And-Elimination**: (From a conjunction, you can infer any of the conjuncts.)

$$\frac{\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_n}{\alpha_i}$$

- ◇ **And-Introduction**: (From a list of sentences, you can infer their conjunction.)

$$\frac{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n}{\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_n}$$

- ◇ **Or-Introduction**: (From a sentence, you can infer its disjunction with anything else at all.)

$$\frac{\alpha_i}{\alpha_1 \vee \alpha_2 \vee \dots \vee \alpha_n}$$

- ◇ **Double-Negation Elimination**: (From a doubly negated sentence, you can infer a positive sentence.)

$$\frac{\neg \neg \alpha}{\alpha}$$

- ◇ **Unit Resolution**: (From a disjunction, if one of the disjuncts is false, then you can infer the other one is true.)

$$\frac{\alpha \vee \beta, \quad \neg \beta}{\alpha}$$

- ◇ **Resolution**: (This is the most difficult. Because β cannot be both true and false, one of the other disjuncts must be true in one of the premises. Or equivalently, implication is transitive.)

$$\frac{\alpha \vee \beta, \quad \neg \beta \vee \gamma}{\alpha \vee \gamma}$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{\neg \alpha \Rightarrow \beta, \quad \beta \Rightarrow \gamma}{\neg \alpha \Rightarrow \gamma}$$

Reminder



- Ground term: A term that does not contain a variable.
 - A constant symbol
 - A function applies to some ground term
- $\{x/a\}$: substitution/binding list

Proofs

Sound inference: find α such that $KB \models \alpha$.

Proof process is a search, operators are inference rules.

E.g., Modus Ponens (MP)

$$\frac{\alpha, \quad \alpha \Rightarrow \beta}{\beta} \quad \frac{At(Joe, UCB) \quad At(Joe, UCB) \Rightarrow OK(Joe)}{OK(Joe)}$$

E.g., And-Introduction (AI)

$$\frac{\alpha \quad \beta}{\alpha \wedge \beta} \quad \frac{OK(Joe) \quad CSMajor(Joe)}{OK(Joe) \wedge CSMajor(Joe)}$$

E.g., Universal Elimination (UE)

$$\frac{\forall x \quad \alpha}{\alpha\{x/\tau\}} \quad \frac{\forall x \quad At(x, UCB) \Rightarrow OK(x)}{At(Pat, UCB) \Rightarrow OK(Pat)}$$

τ must be a ground term (i.e., no variables)

Proofs

The three new inference rules for FOL (compared to propositional logic) are:

- **Universal Elimination (UE):**

for any sentence α , variable x and ground term τ ,

$$\frac{\forall x \quad \alpha}{\alpha\{x/\tau\}}$$

- **Existential Elimination (EE):**

for any sentence α , variable x and constant symbol k not in KB,

$$\frac{\exists x \quad \alpha}{\alpha\{x/k\}}$$

- **Existential Introduction (EI):**

for any sentence α , variable x not in α and ground term g in α ,

$$\frac{\alpha}{\exists x \quad \alpha\{g/x\}}$$

Proofs

The three new inference rules for FOL (compared to propositional logic) are:

- **Universal Elimination (UE):**

for any sentence α , variable x and ground term τ ,

$$\frac{\forall x \quad \alpha}{\alpha\{x/\tau\}}$$

e.g., from $\forall x \text{ Likes}(x, \text{Candy})$ and $\{x/\text{Joe}\}$
we can infer $\text{Likes}(\text{Joe}, \text{Candy})$

- **Existential Elimination (EE):**

for any sentence α , variable x and constant symbol k not in KB,

$$\frac{\exists x \quad \alpha}{\alpha\{x/k\}}$$

e.g., from $\exists x \text{ Kill}(x, \text{Victim})$ we can infer
 $\text{Kill}(\text{Murderer}, \text{Victim})$, if Murderer new symbol

- **Existential Introduction (EI):**

for any sentence α , variable x not in α and ground term g in α ,


$$\frac{\alpha}{\exists x \quad \alpha\{g/x\}}$$

e.g., from $\text{Likes}(\text{Joe}, \text{Candy})$ we can infer
 $\exists x \text{ Likes}(x, \text{Candy})$

Example Proof

Bob is a buffalo	1. $Buffalo(Bob)$
Pat is a pig	2. $Pig(Pat)$
Buffaloes outrun pigs	3. $\forall x, y \text{ } Buffalo(x) \wedge Pig(y) \Rightarrow Faster(x, y)$
Bob outruns Pat	

Example Proof




Al 1 & 2	4. $Buffalo(Bob) \wedge Pig(Pat)$

Example Proof

UE 3, $\{x/Bob, y/Pat\}$	5. $Buffalo(Bob) \wedge Pig(Pat) \Rightarrow Faster(Bob, Pat)$

Example Proof




MP 4 & 5	6. <i>Faster(Bob, Pat)</i>

Search with primitive example rules

Operators are inference rules

States are sets of sentences

Goal test checks state to see if it contains query sentence



AI, UE, MP is a common inference pattern

Problem: branching factor huge, esp. for UE

Idea: find a substitution that makes the rule premise match some known facts

⇒ a single, more powerful inference rule

Unification

A substitution σ unifies atomic sentences p and q if $p\sigma = q\sigma$

p	q	σ
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(John, Jane)$	
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(y, OJ)$	
$Knows(John, x)$	$Knows(y, Mother(y))$	

Goal of unification: finding σ

Unification

	$\{x/Jane\}$ $\{y/John, x/OJ\}$ $\{y/John, x/Mother(John)\}$
--	--

Idea: Unify rule premises with known facts, apply unifier to conclusion

E.g., if we know q and $Knows(John, x) \Rightarrow Likes(John, x)$

then we conclude $Likes(John, Jane)$

$Likes(John, OJ)$

$Likes(John, Mother(John))$

Extra example for unification

P	Q	σ
Student(x)	Student(Bob)	{x/Bob}
Sells(Bob, x)	Sells(x, coke)	{x/coke, x/Bob} Is it correct?

Extra example for unification

P	Q	σ
Student(x)	Student(Bob)	{x/Bob}
Sells(Bob, x)	Sells(y, coke)	{x/coke, y/Bob}

More Unification Examples

	<div>VARIABLE term ↙ ↘</div>
1 – unify($P(a,X)$, $P(a,b)$)	$\sigma = \{X/b\}$
2 – unify($P(a,X)$, $P(Y,b)$)	$\sigma = \{Y/a, X/b\}$
3 – unify($P(a,X)$, $P(Y,f(a))$)	$\sigma = \{Y/a, X/f(a)\}$
4 – unify($P(a,X)$, $P(X,b)$)	$\sigma = \text{failure}$

Note: If $P(a,X)$ and $P(X,b)$ are independent, then we can replace X with Y and get the unification to work.

Generalized Modus Ponens (GMP)

$$\frac{p_1', p_2', \dots, p_n', (p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n \Rightarrow q)}{q\sigma} \quad \text{where } p_i'\sigma = p_i\sigma \text{ for all } i$$

E.g. $p_1' = \text{Faster}(\text{Bob}, \text{Pat})$
 $p_2' = \text{Faster}(\text{Pat}, \text{Steve})$
 $p_1 \wedge p_2 \Rightarrow q = \text{Faster}(x, y) \wedge \text{Faster}(y, z) \Rightarrow \text{Faster}(x, z)$
 $\sigma = \{x/\text{Bob}, y/\text{Pat}, z/\text{Steve}\}$
 $q\sigma = \text{Faster}(\text{Bob}, \text{Steve})$

GMP used with KB of definite clauses (*exactly* one positive literal):

either a single atomic sentence or

(conjunction of atomic sentences) \Rightarrow (atomic sentence)

All variables assumed universally quantified

Soundness of GMP

Need to show that

$$p_1', \dots, p_n', (p_1 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n \Rightarrow q) \models q\sigma$$

provided that $p_i'\sigma = p_i\sigma$ for all i

Lemma: For any definite clause p , we have $p \models p\sigma$ by UE

1. $(p_1 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n \Rightarrow q) \models (p_1 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n \Rightarrow q)\sigma = (p_1\sigma \wedge \dots \wedge p_n\sigma \Rightarrow q\sigma)$
2. $p_1', \dots, p_n' \models p_1' \wedge \dots \wedge p_n' \models p_1'\sigma \wedge \dots \wedge p_n'\sigma$
3. From 1 and 2, $q\sigma$ follows by simple MP

Properties of GMP



- Why is GMP an efficient inference rule?
 - It takes **bigger steps**, combining several small inferences into one
 - It takes **sensible steps**: uses eliminations that are guaranteed to help (rather than random UEs)
 - It uses a precompilation step which converts the KB to **canonical form** (Horn sentences)

Remember: sentence in Horn form is a conjunction of Horn clauses (clauses with at most one positive literal), e.g.,
 $(A \vee \neg B) \wedge (B \vee \neg C \vee \neg D)$, that is $(B \Rightarrow A) \wedge ((C \wedge D) \Rightarrow B)$

Horn form



- We convert sentences to Horn form as they are entered into the KB
- Using Existential Elimination and And Elimination

- e.g., $\exists x \text{ Owns}(\text{Nono}, x) \wedge \text{Missile}(x)$ becomes

$\text{Owns}(\text{Nono}, M)$

$\text{Missile}(M)$

(with M a new symbol that was not already in the KB)

Forward chaining



When a new fact p is added to the KB
for each rule such that p unifies with a premise
if the other premises are known
then add the conclusion to the KB and continue chaining

Forward chaining is data-driven
e.g., inferring properties and categories from percepts

Forward chaining example

Add facts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 in turn.

Number in \square = unification literal; \checkmark indicates rule firing

1. $Buffalo(x) \wedge Pig(y) \Rightarrow Faster(x, y)$

2. $Pig(y) \wedge Slug(z) \Rightarrow Faster(y, z)$

3. $Faster(x, y) \wedge Faster(y, z) \Rightarrow Faster(x, z)$

4. $Buffalo(Bob)$ $\square_{1a, \times}$

5. $Pig(Pat)$ $\square_{1b, \checkmark} \rightarrow$ 6. $Faster(Bob, Pat)$ $\square_{3a, \times}$, $\square_{3b, \times}$
 $\square_{2a, \times}$

7. $Slug(Steve)$ $\square_{2b, \checkmark}$

\rightarrow 8. $Faster(Pat, Steve)$ $\square_{3a, \times}$, $\square_{3b, \checkmark}$

\rightarrow 9. $Faster(Bob, Steve)$ $\square_{3a, \times}$, $\square_{3b, \times}$

Backward chaining



When a query q is asked
if a matching fact q' is known, return the unifier
for each rule whose consequent q' matches q
attempt to prove each premise of the rule by backward chaining

(Some added complications in keeping track of the unifiers)

(More complications help to avoid infinite loops)

Two versions: find any solution, find all solutions

Backward chaining is the basis for logic programming, e.g., Prolog

Backward chaining example

1. $Pig(y) \wedge Slug(z) \Rightarrow Faster(y, z)$

2. $Slimy(z) \wedge Creeps(z) \Rightarrow Slug(z)$

3. $Pig(Pat)$ 4. $Slimy(Steve)$ 5. $Creeps(Steve)$

Another Example (from Konelsky)



- Nintendo example.
 - Nintendo says it is Criminal for a programmer to provide emulators to people. My friends don't have a Nintendo 64, but they use software that runs N64 games on their PC, which is written by Reality Man, who is a programmer.

SP

Nintendo says it is Criminal for a programmer to provide emulators to people. My friends don't have a Nintendo 64, but they use software that runs N64 games on their PC, which is written by Reality Man, who is a programmer. Is Reality Man a criminal?



It is not for me to determine whether Reality Man is a criminal or not. However, Nintendo's position on emulators is that they are illegal because they can be used to play unauthorized copies of games, which is a violation of copyright law.



It is important to note that while emulators themselves are not illegal, the act of downloading or distributing ROMs (which are copies of game cartridges) without permission from the copyright owner is illegal.

Therefore, if your friends are using emulators to play games that they do not own or have permission to use, they could potentially be breaking the law. As for Reality Man, if they are providing an emulator that can be used for illegal purposes, they may also be held liable.

SP

please solve this problem step by step:



I'm happy to help! Please provide me with the problem you would like me to solve step by step.



SP

Nintendo says it is Criminal for a programmer to provide emulators to people. My friends don't have a Nintendo 64, but they use software that runs N64 games on their PC, which is written by Reality Man, who is a programmer. Is Reality Man a criminal?



The statement "Nintendo says it is Criminal for a programmer to provide emulators to people" is not entirely accurate. While Nintendo has a history of taking legal action against those who distribute or sell emulators and ROMs (digital copies of games), simply creating or using emulators is not necessarily illegal.



In the case of Reality Man, it would depend on whether or not the software he has provided to your friends violates any copyright or intellectual property laws. If the software is simply an emulator that allows your friends to play N64 games that they legally own on their PC, then Reality Man has not committed a crime. However, if the software includes illegally obtained ROMs or infringes on Nintendo's intellectual property in some other way, then Reality Man could potentially face legal consequences.

In summary, whether or not Reality Man is a criminal depends on the specifics of the software he has provided to your friends and whether or not it violates any laws.

Forward Chaining



- The knowledge base initially contains:
 - $\text{Programmer}(x) \wedge \text{Emulator}(y) \wedge \text{People}(z) \wedge \text{Provide}(x,z,y) \Rightarrow \text{Criminal}(x)$
 - $\text{Use}(\text{friends}, x) \wedge \text{Runs}(x, \text{N64 games}) \Rightarrow \text{Provide}(\text{Reality Man}, \text{friends}, x)$
 - $\text{Software}(x) \wedge \text{Runs}(x, \text{N64 games}) \Rightarrow \text{Emulator}(x)$

Forward Chaining



$\text{Programmer}(x) \wedge \text{Emulator}(y) \wedge \text{People}(z) \wedge \text{Provide}(x,z,y) \Rightarrow \text{Criminal}(x)$ (1)

$\text{Use}(\text{friends}, x) \wedge \text{Runs}(x, \text{N64 games}) \Rightarrow \text{Provide}(\text{Reality Man}, \text{friends}, x)$ (2)

$\text{Software}(x) \wedge \text{Runs}(x, \text{N64 games}) \Rightarrow \text{Emulator}(x)$ (3)

- Now we add atomic sentences to the KB sequentially, and call on the forward-chaining procedure:
 - FORWARD-CHAIN(KB, Programmer(Reality Man))

Forward Chaining

$\text{Programmer}(x) \wedge \text{Emulator}(y) \wedge \text{People}(z) \wedge \text{Provide}(x,z,y) \Rightarrow \text{Criminal}(x)$ (1)

$\text{Use}(\text{friends}, x) \wedge \text{Runs}(x, \text{N64 games}) \Rightarrow \text{Provide}(\text{Reality Man}, \text{friends}, x)$ (2)

$\text{Software}(x) \wedge \text{Runs}(x, \text{N64 games}) \Rightarrow \text{Emulator}(x)$ (3)

$\text{Programmer}(\text{Reality Man})$ (4)

- This new premise unifies with (1) with **subst**({x/Reality Man}, Programmer(x))
but not all the premises of (1) are yet known, so nothing further happens.

Forward Chaining

Programmer(x) \wedge Emulator(y) \wedge People(z) \wedge Provide(x,z,y) \Rightarrow Criminal(x) (1)

Use(friends, x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Provide(Reality Man, friends, x) (2)

Software(x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Emulator(x) (3)

Programmer(Reality Man) (4)

- Continue adding atomic sentences:
 - FORWARD-CHAIN(KB, People(friends))

Forward Chaining

$\text{Programmer}(x) \wedge \text{Emulator}(y) \wedge \text{People}(z) \wedge \text{Provide}(x,z,y) \Rightarrow \text{Criminal}(x)$ (1)

$\text{Use}(\text{friends}, x) \wedge \text{Runs}(x, \text{N64 games}) \Rightarrow \text{Provide}(\text{Reality Man}, \text{friends}, x)$ (2)

$\text{Software}(x) \wedge \text{Runs}(x, \text{N64 games}) \Rightarrow \text{Emulator}(x)$ (3)

$\text{Programmer}(\text{Reality Man})$ (4)

$\text{People}(\text{friends})$ (5)

- This also unifies with (1) with **subst**({z/friends}, People(z)) but other premises are still missing.

Forward Chaining

Programmer(x) \wedge Emulator(y) \wedge People(z) \wedge Provide(x,z,y) \Rightarrow Criminal(x) (1)

Use(friends, x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Provide(Reality Man, friends, x) (2)

Software(x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Emulator(x) (3)

Programmer(Reality Man) (4)

People(friends) (5)

- Add:
 - FORWARD-CHAIN(KB, Software(U64))

Forward Chaining

Programmer(x) \wedge Emulator(y) \wedge People(z) \wedge Provide(x,z,y) \Rightarrow Criminal(x) (1)

Use(friends, x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Provide(Reality Man, friends, x) (2)

Software(x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Emulator(x) (3)

Programmer(Reality Man) (4)

People(friends) (5)

Software(U64) (6)

- This new premise unifies with (3) but the other premise is not yet known.

Forward Chaining

Programmer(x) \wedge Emulator(y) \wedge People(z) \wedge Provide(x,z,y) \Rightarrow Criminal(x) (1)

Use(friends, x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Provide(Reality Man, friends, x) (2)

Software(x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Emulator(x) (3)

Programmer(Reality Man) (4)

People(friends) (5)

Software(U64) (6)

- Add:
 - FORWARD-CHAIN(KB, Use(friends, U64))

Forward Chaining

Programmer(x) \wedge Emulator(y) \wedge People(z) \wedge Provide(x,z,y) \Rightarrow Criminal(x) (1)

Use(friends, x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Provide(Reality Man, friends, x) (2)

Software(x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Emulator(x) (3)

Programmer(Reality Man) (4)

People(friends) (5)

Software(U64) (6)

Use(friends, U64) (7)

- This premise unifies with (2) but one still lacks.

Forward Chaining

Programmer(x) \wedge Emulator(y) \wedge People(z) \wedge Provide(x,z,y) \Rightarrow Criminal(x) (1)

Use(friends, x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Provide(Reality Man, friends, x) (2)

Software(x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Emulator(x) (3)

Programmer(Reality Man) (4)

People(friends) (5)

Software(U64) (6)

Use(friends, U64) (7)

- Add:
 - FORWARD-CHAIN(Runs(U64, N64 games))

Forward Chaining

Programmer(x) \wedge Emulator(y) \wedge People(z) \wedge Provide(x,z,y) \Rightarrow Criminal(x) (1)

Use(friends, x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Provide(Reality Man, friends, x) (2)

Software(x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Emulator(x) (3)

Programmer(Reality Man) (4)

People(friends) (5)

Software(U64) (6)

Use(friends, U64) (7)

Runs(U64, N64 games) (8)

- This new premise unifies with (2) and (3).

Forward Chaining

Programmer(x) \wedge Emulator(y) \wedge People(z) \wedge Provide(x,z,y) \Rightarrow Criminal(x) (1)

Use(friends, x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Provide(Reality Man, friends, x) (2)

Software(x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow Emulator(x) (3)

Programmer(Reality Man) (4)

People(friends) (5)

Software(U64) (6)

Use(friends, U64) (7)

Runs(U64, N64 games) (8)

- Premises (6), (7) and (8) satisfy the implications fully.

Forward Chaining

Programmer(x) \wedge Emulator(y) \wedge People(z) \wedge Provide(x,z,y) \Rightarrow Criminal(x) (1)

Use(friends, x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow **Provide(Reality Man, friends, x)** (2)

Software(x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow **Emulator(x)** (3)

Programmer(Reality Man) (4)

People(friends) (5)

Software(U64) (6)

Use(friends, U64) (7)

Runs(U64, N64 games) (8)

- So we can infer the consequents, which are now added to the knowledge base (this is done in two separate steps).

Forward Chaining

Programmer(x) \wedge Emulator(y) \wedge People(z) \wedge Provide(x,z,y) \Rightarrow Criminal(x) (1)

Use(friends, x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow **Provide(Reality Man, friends, x)** (2)

Software(x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow **Emulator(x)** (3)

Programmer(Reality Man) (4)

People(friends) (5)

Software(U64) (6)

Use(friends, U64) (7)

Runs(U64, N64 games) (8)

Provide(Reality Man, friends, U64) (9)

Emulator(U64) (10)

- Addition of these new facts triggers further forward chaining.

Forward Chaining

Programmer(x) \wedge Emulator(y) \wedge People(z) \wedge Provide(x,z,y) \Rightarrow Criminal(x) (1)

Use(friends, x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow **Provide(Reality Man, friends, x)** (2)

Software(x) \wedge Runs(x, N64 games) \Rightarrow **Emulator(x)** (3)

Programmer(Reality Man) (4)

People(friends) (5)

Software(U64) (6)

Use(friends, U64) (7)

Runs(U64, N64 games) (8)

Provide(Reality Man, friends, U64) (9)

Emulator(U64) (10)

Criminal(Reality Man) (11)

- Which results in the final conclusion: Criminal(Reality Man)

Forward Chaining



- Forward Chaining acts like a breadth-first search at the top level, with depth-first sub-searches.
- Since the search space spans the entire KB, a large KB must be organized in an intelligent manner in order to enable efficient searches in reasonable time.

Backward Chaining



- The algorithm (available in detail in textbook):
 - a knowledge base KB
 - a desired conclusion c or question q
 - finds all sentences that are answers to q in KB *or* prove c
 - if q is directly provable by premises in KB, infer q and remember how q was inferred (building a list of answers).
 - find all implications that have q as a consequent.
 - for each of these implications, find out whether all of its premises are now in the KB, in which case infer the consequent and add it to the KB, remembering how it was inferred. If necessary, attempt to prove the implication also via backward chaining
 - premises that are conjuncts are processed one conjunct at a time

Backward Chaining



- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?
 - $\text{criminal}(\text{Reality Man})$
- Possible answers:
 - $\text{Steal}(x, y) \Rightarrow \text{Criminal}(x)$
 - $\text{Kill}(x, y) \Rightarrow \text{Criminal}(x)$
 - $\text{Grow}(x, y) \wedge \text{Illegal}(y) \Rightarrow \text{Criminal}(x)$
 - $\text{HaveSillyName}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Criminal}(x)$
 - $\text{Programmer}(x) \wedge \text{Emulator}(y) \wedge \text{People}(z) \wedge \text{Provide}(x, z, y) \Rightarrow \text{Criminal}(x)$

Backward Chaining




- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?

Criminal(x)


Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?




Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?




Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?




Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?




Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?




Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?



Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?



- Backward Chaining is a depth-first search: in any knowledge base of realistic size, many search paths will result in failure.

Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?
- We will use the same knowledge as in our forward-chaining version of this example:

$\text{Programmer}(x) \wedge \text{Emulator}(y) \wedge \text{People}(z) \wedge \text{Provide}(x,z,y) \Rightarrow \text{Criminal}(x)$

$\text{Use}(\text{friends}, x) \wedge \text{Runs}(x, \text{N64 games}) \Rightarrow \text{Provide}(\text{Reality Man}, \text{friends}, x)$

$\text{Software}(x) \wedge \text{Runs}(x, \text{N64 games}) \Rightarrow \text{Emulator}(x)$

$\text{Programmer}(\text{Reality Man})$

$\text{People}(\text{friends})$

$\text{Software}(\text{U64})$

$\text{Use}(\text{friends}, \text{U64})$

$\text{Runs}(\text{U64}, \text{N64 games})$

Backward Chaining



- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?

Criminal(x)

Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?


Criminal(x)

Programmer(x)

Yes, {x/Reality Man}


Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?




Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?




Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?




Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?




Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?



Backward Chaining

- Question: Has Reality Man done anything criminal?



Backward Chaining



- Backward Chaining benefits from the fact that it is directed toward proving one statement or answering one question.
- In a focused, specific knowledge base, this greatly decreases the amount of superfluous work that needs to be done in searches.
- However, in broad knowledge bases with extensive information and numerous implications, many search paths may be irrelevant to the desired conclusion.
- Unlike forward chaining, where all possible inferences are made, a strictly backward chaining system makes inferences only when called upon to answer a query.

Field Trip – Russell's Paradox (Bertrand Russell, 1901)

- Your life has been simple up to this point, lets see how logical negation and self-referencing can totally ruin our day.
- Russell's paradox is the most famous of the logical or set-theoretical paradoxes. The paradox arises within naive set theory by considering the set of all sets that are not members of themselves. Such a set appears to be a member of itself if and only if it is not a member of itself, hence the paradox.
- Negation and self-reference naturally lead to paradoxes, but are necessary for FOL to be universal.
- Published in *Principles of Mathematics* (1903).

Field Trip – Russell's Paradox



- **Basic example:**
 - Librarians are asked to make catalogs of all the books in their libraries.
 - Some librarians consider the catalog to be a book in the library and list the catalog in itself.
 - The library of congress is asked to make a master catalog of all library catalogs which do **not** include themselves.
 - Should the master catalog in the library of congress include **itself**?
- Keep this tucked in you brain as we talk about logic today. Logical systems can easily tie themselves in knots.
- See also: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/russell-paradox/>
- For additional fun on paradoxes check out "I of Newton" from: *The New Twilight Zone* (1985)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/I_of_Newton

Completeness



- As explained earlier, Generalized Modus Ponens requires sentences to be in Horn form:
 - atomic, or
 - an implication with a conjunction of atomic sentences as the antecedent and an atom as the consequent.
- However, some sentences cannot be expressed in Horn form.
 - e.g.: $\forall x \neg \text{bored_of_this_lecture}(x)$ (not a definite Horn clause)
 - Cannot be expressed as a definite Horn clause (exactly 1 positive literal) due to presence of negation.

Completeness



- A significant problem since Modus Ponens cannot operate on such a sentence, and thus cannot use it in inference.
- Knowledge exists but cannot be used.
- Thus inference using Modus Ponens is ***incomplete.***

Completeness



- However, Kurt Gödel in 1930-31 developed the **completeness theorem**, which shows that it is possible to find **complete** inference rules.
- The theorem states:
 - any sentence entailed by a set of sentences can be proven from that set.

=> **Resolution Algorithm** which is a complete inference method.

Completeness



- The completeness theorem says that a sentence can be proved *if* it is entailed by another set of sentences.
- This is a big deal, since arbitrarily deeply nested functions combined with universal quantification make a potentially infinite search space.
- But entailment in first-order logic is only **semi-decidable**, meaning that if a sentence is *not entailed* by another set of sentences, it cannot necessarily be proven.
 - This is to a certain degree an *exotic* situation, but a *very real* one - for instance the *Halting Problem*.
 - Much of the time, in the real world, you can decide if a sentence is not entailed if by no other means than exhaustive elimination.

Completeness in FOL

Procedure i is complete if and only if

$$KB \vdash_i \alpha \quad \text{whenever} \quad KB \models \alpha$$

Forward and backward chaining are complete for Horn KBs
but incomplete for general first-order logic

E.g., from

$$PhD(x) \Rightarrow HighlyQualified(x)$$

$$\neg PhD(x) \Rightarrow EarlyEarnings(x)$$

$$HighlyQualified(x) \Rightarrow Rich(x)$$

$$EarlyEarnings(x) \Rightarrow Rich(x)$$

should be able to infer $Rich(Me)$, but FC/BC won't do it

Does a complete algorithm exist?

Historical note



450B.C.	Stoics	propositional logic, inference (maybe)
322B.C.	Aristotle	"syllogisms" (inference rules), quantifiers
1555	Cardano	probability theory (propositional logic + uncertainty)
1847	Boole	propositional logic (again)
1879	Frege	first-order logic
1922	Wittgenstein	proof by truth tables
1930	Gödel	\exists complete algorithm for FOL
1930	Herbrand	complete algorithm for FOL (reduce to propositional)
1931	Gödel	$\neg\exists$ complete algorithm for arithmetic
1960	Davis/Putnam	"practical" algorithm for propositional logic
1965	Robinson	"practical" algorithm for FOL—resolution

Kinship Example



KB:

(1) father (art, jon)

(2) father (bob, kim)

(3) father (X, Y) \Rightarrow parent (X, Y)

Goal: parent (art, jon)?

Refutation Proof/Graph



$$\begin{array}{ccc} \neg \text{parent}(\text{art}, \text{jon}) & & \text{father}(\text{X}, \text{Y}) \Rightarrow \text{parent}(\text{X}, \text{Y}) \\ & \backslash & / \\ & \neg \text{father}(\text{art}, \text{jon}) & \text{father}(\text{art}, \text{jon}) \\ & \backslash & / \\ & & [] \end{array}$$

Resolution

Entailment in first-order logic is only semidecidable:

can find a proof of α if $KB \models \alpha$

cannot always prove that $KB \not\models \alpha$

Cf. Halting Problem: proof procedure may be about to terminate with success or failure, or may go on for ever

Resolution is a refutation procedure:

to prove $KB \models \alpha$, show that $KB \wedge \neg\alpha$ is unsatisfiable

Resolution uses $KB, \neg\alpha$ in CNF (conjunction of clauses)

Resolution inference rule combines two clauses to make a new one:



Inference continues until an empty clause is derived (contradiction)

Resolution inference rule

Basic propositional version:

$$\frac{\alpha \vee \beta, \neg\beta \vee \gamma}{\alpha \vee \gamma} \quad \text{or equivalently} \quad \frac{\neg\alpha \Rightarrow \beta, \beta \Rightarrow \gamma}{\neg\alpha \Rightarrow \gamma}$$

Full first-order version:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} p_1 \vee \dots p_j \dots \vee p_m, \\ q_1 \vee \dots q_k \dots \vee q_n \end{array}}{(p_1 \vee \dots p_{j-1} \vee p_{j+1} \dots p_m \vee q_1 \dots q_{k-1} \vee q_{k+1} \dots \vee q_n)\sigma}$$

where $p_j\sigma = \neg q_k\sigma$

For example,

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \neg Rich(x) \vee Unhappy(x) \\ Rich(Me) \end{array}}{Unhappy(Me)}$$

with $\sigma = \{x/Me\}$

Remember: normal forms

Other approaches to inference use syntactic operations on sentences, often expressed in standardized forms

Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF—universal)
conjunction of disjunctions of literals
clauses

E.g., $(A \vee \neg B) \wedge (B \vee \neg C \vee \neg D)$

“product of sums of simple variables or negated simple variables”

Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF—universal)
disjunction of conjunctions of literals
terms

E.g., $(A \wedge B) \vee (A \wedge \neg C) \vee (A \wedge \neg D) \vee (\neg B \wedge \neg C) \vee (\neg B \wedge \neg D)$

“sum of products of simple variables or negated simple variables”

Horn Form (restricted)

conjunction of Horn clauses (clauses with ≤ 1 positive literal)

E.g., $(A \vee \neg B) \wedge (B \vee \neg C \vee \neg D)$

Often written as set of implications:

$B \Rightarrow A$ and $(C \wedge D) \Rightarrow B$

Conjunctive normal form - (how-to is coming up...)

Literal = (possibly negated) atomic sentence, e.g., $\neg Rich(Me)$

Clause = disjunction of literals, e.g., $\neg Rich(Me) \vee Unhappy(Me)$

The KB is a conjunction of clauses

Any FOL KB can be converted to CNF as follows:

1. Replace $P \Rightarrow Q$ by $\neg P \vee Q$
2. Move \neg inwards, e.g., $\neg \forall x P$ becomes $\exists x \neg P$
3. Standardize variables apart, e.g., $\forall x P \vee \exists x Q$ becomes $\forall x P \vee \exists y Q$
4. Move quantifiers left in order, e.g., $\forall x P \vee \exists x Q$ becomes $\forall x \exists y P \vee Q$
5. Eliminate \exists by Skolemization (next slide)
6. Drop universal quantifiers
7. Distribute \wedge over \vee

Skolemization

$\exists x \text{ Rich}(x)$ becomes $\text{Rich}(G1)$ where $G1$ is a new “Skolem constant”

$\exists k \frac{d}{dy}(k^y) = k^y$ becomes $\frac{d}{dy}(e^y) = e^y$

More tricky when \exists is inside \forall

E.g., “Everyone has a heart”

$\forall x \text{ Person}(x) \Rightarrow \exists y \text{ Heart}(y) \wedge \text{Has}(x, y)$

Incorrect:

$\forall x \text{ Person}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Heart}(H1) \wedge \text{Has}(x, H1)$

Correct:

$\forall x \text{ Person}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Heart}(H(x)) \wedge \text{Has}(x, H(x))$

where H is a new symbol (“Skolem function”)

If x has a y we can infer that y exists. However, its existence is contingent on x , thus y is a function of x as $H(x)$.

Skolem function arguments: all enclosing universally quantified variables

Examples: Converting FOL sentences to clause form...

Convert the sentence

1. $(\forall x)(P(x) \Rightarrow ((\forall y)(P(y) \Rightarrow P(f(x,y))) \wedge \neg(\forall y)(Q(x,y) \Rightarrow P(y))))$
(like $A \Rightarrow B \wedge C$)

2. Eliminate \Rightarrow

$$(\forall x)(\neg P(x) \vee ((\forall y)(\neg P(y) \vee P(f(x,y))) \wedge \neg(\forall y)(\neg Q(x,y) \vee P(y))))$$

3. Reduce scope of negation

$$(\forall x)(\neg P(x) \vee ((\forall y)(\neg P(y) \vee P(f(x,y))) \wedge (\exists y)(Q(x,y) \wedge \neg P(y))))$$


4. Standardize variables

$$(\forall x)(\neg P(x) \vee ((\forall y)(\neg P(y) \vee P(f(x,y))) \wedge (\exists z)(Q(x,z) \wedge \neg P(z))))$$

Examples: Converting FOL sentences to clause form...

$$(\forall x)(\neg P(x) \vee ((\forall y)(\neg P(y) \vee P(f(x,y))) \wedge (\exists z)(Q(x,z) \wedge \neg P(z)))) \dots$$

5. Eliminate existential quantification


$$(\forall x)(\neg P(x) \vee ((\forall y)(\neg P(y) \vee P(f(x,y))) \wedge (Q(x,g(x)) \wedge \neg P(g(x)))))$$

6. Drop universal quantification symbols

$$(\neg P(x) \vee ((\neg P(y) \vee P(f(x,y))) \wedge (Q(x,g(x)) \wedge \neg P(g(x)))))$$

7. Convert to conjunction of disjunctions

$$(\neg P(x) \vee \neg P(y) \vee P(f(x,y))) \wedge (\neg P(x) \vee Q(x,g(x))) \wedge (\neg P(x) \vee \neg P(g(x)))$$

Examples: Converting FOL sentences to clause form...

$$(\neg P(x) \vee \neg P(y) \vee P(f(x,y))) \wedge (\neg P(x) \vee Q(x,g(x))) \wedge (\neg P(x) \vee \neg P(g(x))) \dots$$

8. Create separate clauses

$$\neg P(x) \vee \neg P(y) \vee P(f(x,y))$$

$$\neg P(x) \vee Q(x,g(x))$$

$$\neg P(x) \vee \neg P(g(x))$$

9. Standardize variables

$$\neg P(x) \vee \neg P(y) \vee P(f(x,y))$$

$$\neg P(z) \vee Q(z,g(z))$$

$$\neg P(w) \vee \neg P(g(w))$$

Getting back to Resolution proofs ...



To prove α :

- negate it
- convert to CNF
- add to CNF KB
- infer contradiction

Example of Refutation Proof (in conjunctive normal form)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| (1) Cats like fish | $\neg \text{cat}(x) \vee \text{likes}(x, \text{fish})$ |
| (2) Cats eat everything they like | $\neg \text{cat}(y) \vee \neg \text{likes}(y, z) \vee \text{eats}(y, z)$ |
| (3) Josephine is a cat. | $\text{cat}(\text{jo})$ |
| (4) Prove: Josephine eats fish. | $\text{eats}(\text{jo}, \text{fish})$ |

Refutation

Negation of goal wff: $\neg \text{eats}(\text{jo}, \text{fish})$

$\neg \text{eats}(\text{jo}, \text{fish})$

$\neg \text{cat}(y) \vee \neg \text{likes}(y, z) \vee \text{eats}(y, z)$

$\theta = \{y/\text{jo}, z/\text{fish}\}$

$\neg \text{cat}(\text{jo}) \vee \neg \text{likes}(\text{jo}, \text{fish})$

$\text{cat}(\text{jo})$

$\theta = \emptyset$

$\neg \text{cat}(x) \vee \text{likes}(x, \text{fish})$

$\neg \text{likes}(\text{jo}, \text{fish})$


$\theta = \{x/\text{jo}\}$

$\neg \text{cat}(\text{jo})$

$\text{cat}(\text{jo})$

\perp (contradiction)

Forward chaining



Backward chaining



- Is more problematic and seldom used...

Example resolution proof



Jack owns a dog.
Every dog owner is an animal lover.
No animal lover kills an animal.
Either Jack or Curiosity killed Tuna the cat.
Did Curiosity kill the cat?

please solve this problem step by step: Jack owns a dog. Every dog owner is an animal lover. No animal lover kills an animal. Either Jack or Curiosity killed Tuna the cat. Did Curiosity kill the cat?



To solve this problem, we can use deductive reasoning and logical inference based on the given information. Here are the steps:

1. Jack owns a dog.
2. Every dog owner is an animal lover. Therefore, Jack is an animal lover.
3. No animal lover kills an animal. Therefore, Jack did not kill Tuna the cat.
4. Either Jack or Curiosity killed Tuna the cat.
5. Since Jack did not kill Tuna the cat, Curiosity must have killed Tuna the cat.

Therefore, based on the given information, we can conclude that Curiosity killed Tuna the cat.

please solve this problem step by step: Jack owns a dog. Every dog owner is an animal lover. No animal lover kills an animal. Either Jack or Curiosity killed Tuna the cat. Did Curiosity kill the cat?



To solve this problem, we can use deductive reasoning and logical inference based on the given information. Here are the steps:

1. Jack owns a dog.
2. Every dog owner is an animal lover. Therefore, Jack is an animal lover.
3. No animal lover kills an animal. Therefore, Jack did not kill Tuna the cat.
4. Either Jack or Curiosity killed Tuna the cat.
5. Since Jack did not kill Tuna the cat, Curiosity must have killed Tuna the cat.

Suspiciously good
leap from animal to cat



Therefore, based on the given information, we can conclude that Curiosity killed Tuna the cat.

This example is very famous and could have been in the ChatGPT training set...

please solve this problem step by step: Bob owns a bird. Every bird owner is an animal lover. No animal lover kills an animal. Either Bob or Jim killed Fluffy the cat. Did Jim kill the cat?

Same problem, different names...



Let's break down the problem step by step:

1. Bob owns a bird.
 - This tells us that Bob is a bird owner.
2. Every bird owner is an animal lover.
 - This tells us that Bob is an animal lover.
3. No animal lover kills an animal.
 - This tells us that Bob would not kill an animal.
4. Either Bob or Jim killed Fluffy the cat.
 - This tells us that the killer of Fluffy the cat is either Bob or Jim.
5. Did Jim kill the cat?
 - We don't have enough information to answer this question definitively based on the information given.

So, based on the information given, we know that Bob would not kill an animal because he is an animal lover. However, we do not have any information about Jim's beliefs or actions regarding animals. Therefore, we cannot determine whether Jim killed Fluffy the cat.

Example resolution proof

Jack owns a dog.
Every dog owner is an animal lover.
No animal lover kills an animal.
Either Jack or Curiosity killed Tuna the cat.
Did Curiosity kill the cat?

- A) $\exists x \text{ Dog}(x) \wedge \text{Owns}(\text{Jack}, x)$
- B) $\forall x (\exists y \text{ Dog}(y) \wedge \text{Owns}(x, y)) \Rightarrow \text{AnimalLover}(x)$
- C) $\forall x \text{ AnimalLover}(x) \Rightarrow (\forall y \text{ Animal}(y) \Rightarrow \neg \text{Kills}(x, y))$
- D) $\text{Kills}(\text{Jack}, \text{Tuna}) \vee \text{Kills}(\text{Curiosity}, \text{Tuna})$
- E) $\text{Cat}(\text{Tuna})$
- F) $\forall x (\text{Cat}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Animal}(x))$

Query: $\text{Kills}(\text{Curiosity}, \text{Tuna})$


Example resolution proof

Jack owns a dog.
Every dog owner is an animal lover.
No animal lover kills an animal.
Either Jack or Curiosity killed Tuna the cat.
Did Curiosity kill the cat?

- A1) Dog(D)
- A2) Owns(Jack,D)
- B) $\text{Dog}(y) \wedge \text{Owns}(x,y) \Rightarrow \text{AnimalLover}(x)$
- C) $\text{AnimalLover}(x) \wedge \text{Animal}(y) \wedge \text{Kills}(x,y) \Rightarrow \text{False}$
- D) $\text{Kills}(\text{Jack}, \text{Tuna}) \vee \text{Kills}(\text{Curiosity}, \text{Tuna})$
- E) Cat(Tuna)
- F) $\text{Cat}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Animal}(x)$

Query: $\text{Kills}(\text{Curiosity}, \text{Tuna}) \Rightarrow \text{False}$

Example resolution proof



Another example resolution proof

- Knowledge Base

-parent(x,y) | -ancestor(y,z) | ancestor(x,z)
-parent(x,y) | ancestor(x,y)
-mother(x,y) | parent(x,y)
-father(x,y) | parent(x,y)
mother(Liz,Charley)
father(Charley,Billy)

- To prove ancestor(Liz,Billy)
Refute -ancestor(Liz,Billy)

Another example resolution proof

□ Knowledge Base

```
-parent(x,y) | -ancestor(y,z) | ancestor(x,z)
-parent(x,y) | ancestor(x,y)
-mother(x,y) | parent(x,y)
-father(x,y) | parent(x,y)
mother(Liz,Charley)
father(Charley,Billy)
```

□ To prove ancestor(Liz,Billy)
Refute -ancestor(Liz,Billy)

```
-parent(x,y) | -ancestor(y,z) | ancestor(x,z)
-ancestor(Liz,Billy)
-----
-parent(Liz,y) | -ancestor(y,Billy)

-mother(x,y) | parent(x,y)
-parent(Liz,y) | -ancestor(y,Billy)
-----
-mother(Liz,y) | -ancestor(y,Billy)

mother(Liz,Charley)
-mother(Liz,y) | -ancestor(y,Billy)
-----
-ancestor(Charley,Billy)
```

Another example resolution proof

□ Knowledge Base

```
-parent(x,y) | -ancestor(y,z) | ancestor(x,z)
-parent(x,y) | ancestor(x,y)
-mother(x,y) | parent(x,y)
-father(x,y) | parent(x,y)
mother(Liz,Charley)
father(Charley,Billy)
```

□ To prove ancestor(Liz,Billy)
Refute -ancestor(Liz,Billy)

```
...
-parent(x,y) | ancestor(x,y)
-ancestor(Charley,Billy)
-----
-parent(Charley,Billy)

-father(x,y) | parent(x,y)
-parent(Charley,Billy)
-----
-father(Charley,Billy)

father(Charley,Billy)
-father(Charley,Billy)
----- contradiction
```