

## Logic VI

### 1. Review

#### i. Want to say:

1. “Andrew has two siblings: Nathaniel and Elizabeth”
2. Does this work?

$$\text{Sibling}(\text{Nathaniel}, \text{Andrew}) \cap \text{Sibling}(\text{Elizabeth}, \text{Andrew})$$

3. No! Sentence is true for models where I have only one sibling
  - a. (Nathaniel & Elizabeth can be mapped to the same object)
4. Doesn't rule out models where I am assigned more than two siblings
5. Correct sentence:

$$\text{Sibling}(\text{Nathaniel}, \text{Andrew}) \cap \text{Sibling}(\text{Elizabeth}, \text{Andrew}) \cap \text{Nathaniel} \neq \text{Elizabeth} \cap \forall x \text{ Sibling}(x, \text{Andrew}) \Rightarrow (x = \text{Nathaniel} \cup x = \text{Elizabeth})$$

#### ii. Easy to make mistakes (these are database semantics)

1. Insist that every constant symbol refer to a distinct object (unique-names assumption)  $\rightarrow$  two separate variables refer to different objects
2. Atomic sentences not known to be true are false (closed-world assumption)
3. model cannot have more objects than constant symbols (domain closure)
4. With these assumptions,

$$\text{Sibling}(\text{Nathaniel}, \text{Andrew}) \cap \text{Sibling}(\text{Elizabeth}, \text{Andrew})$$

works now

#### b. FOL Semantics

- i. There is no single correct semantics for FOL
- ii. Standard FOL semantics:
  1. Infinite many models
  2. Don't need to know all symbols beforehand (entities can be given names later when we need them)
- iii. Database Semantics: (assumptions are strict)
  1. Finite number of models
  2. Need definite knowledge of what the world contains (cannot give new names in the future)

c. Using FOL in Agents

- i. Add sentences to KB with TELL routine (just like prep logic) → we can either ask or add sentences

1. Sentences called assertions (adding sentences)

$TELL(KB, Holding(Microphone, Taylor))$   
 $TELL(KB, Dating(Travis, Taylor))$   
 $TELL(KB, \forall x Driving(x, Getaway Car) \Rightarrow Person(x))$

- ii. Query the KB with ASK routine (asking questions)

1. Questions asked are called queries/goals

$ASK(KB, Holding(Microphone, Taylor))$  Returns true  
 $ASK(KB, \exists x Driving(x, Getaway Car))$  Returns true

- 2.

- iii. Sometimes want to know variable values where query is true

1. ASKVARs routine

$ASK(KB, Driving(x, Getaway Car))$  Returns  $\{x/Travis\}$   
 $ASK(KB, \exists y Dating(x, y))$  Returns  $\{x/Travis\}, \{x/Taylor\}$

- 2.

- a. If the variable x is unbound, I am asking who is the variable x → Travis in this case  
b. The second question → give me the value of x that makes the statement true

2. The Kinship Domain

- a. Lets work through this example:

- i. Add axioms about family tree

$\forall m, c \quad Mother(c) \Leftrightarrow Female(m) \cap Parent(m, c)$   
 $\forall w, h \quad Husband(h, w) \Leftrightarrow Male(h) \cap Spouse(h, w)$   
 $\forall x \quad Male(x) \Leftrightarrow \neg Female(x)$   
 $\forall p, c \quad Parent(p, c) \Leftrightarrow Child(c, p)$   
 $\forall g, c \quad Grandparent(g, c) \Leftrightarrow \exists p \quad Parent(g, p) \cap Parent(p, c)$   
 $\forall x, y \quad Sibling(x, y) \Leftrightarrow x \neq y \cap \exists p \quad Parent(p, x) \cap Parent(p, y)$

- b. Theorem (not an axiom):

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

- c. Not all axioms are definitions:

$\forall x \quad Person(x) \Leftrightarrow \dots?$  → do not need a definition of a person

- d. Good news!

- i. We don't need a complete definition of Person in order to use it!

- ii. We can write partial specifications of properties that every person has  
 $\forall x \text{ Person}(x) \Rightarrow \dots$
- iii. We can write partial specifications of properties that make something a person (can split things up  $\rightarrow$  divide and conquer)  
 $\forall x \dots \Rightarrow \text{Person}(x)$

### 3. Numbers, Sets, and Lists

- a. We can build large KBs from a tiny amount of axioms
- b. Let's talk about natural numbers (non-negative ints)
  - i. Natnum predicate (i.e. relation)
  - ii. One constant symbol 0  $\rightarrow$  Naming 0 to be a natural number
  - iii. One function symbol S ("successor" function)  
 $\rightarrow$  If n is a natural number, then so is S(n), etc  
 $\text{Natnum}(0)$   
 $\forall n \text{ Natnum}(n) \Rightarrow \text{NatNum}(S(n))$
  - iv. Need some other axioms to constrain S (0 cannot be a successor)  
 $\forall n \ 0 \neq S(n)$   
 $\forall m, n \ m \neq n \Rightarrow S(m) \neq S(n) \rightarrow$  successors of two distinct numbers are distinct

### 4. Natural Numbers

- $\text{Natnum}(0)$
- $\forall n \text{ Natnum}(n) \Rightarrow \text{NatNum}(S(n))$
- $\forall n \ 0 \neq S(n)$
- $\forall m, n \ m \neq n \Rightarrow S(m) \neq S(n)$
- a.
- b. With these axioms: Addition!
  - i. We can define operators! Adding 0 does nothing!  
 $\forall m \text{ Natnum}(m) \Rightarrow + (0, m) = m$   
 $\forall m, n \text{ Natnum}(m) \cap \text{Natnum}(n) \Rightarrow + (S(m), n) = S(+ (m, n))$   
 $(m + 1) + n = (m + n) + 1$
- c. Once we have addition:
  - i. Can do subtraction (addition in negative direction)
  - ii. Can do multiplication (repeated addition)
  - iii. Can do division (repeated subtraction)
- d. All of number theory & cryptography are built from these!