CSCI 561
Foundation for Artificial Intelligence

9-10: Knowledge, Reasoning, Propositional Logic
Discussion: Review for Midterm1

Professor Wei-Min Shen
University of Southern California

Knowledge and Reasoning

- Knowledge representation
- Logic and representation
- Propositional (Boolean) logic
- Normal forms
- Inference in propositional logic
- Wumpus world example

Agent and Environment

Knowledge-Based Agent

Domain independent algorithms

Inference engine

Knowledge Base

ASK

TELL

Domain specific content

- Agent that uses **prior** or **acquired** knowledge to achieve its goals
  - Can make more efficient decisions
  - Can make informed decisions
- Knowledge Base (KB): contains a set of representations of facts about the Agent's environment
- Each representation is called a **sentence**
- Use some **knowledge representation language (KRL)**, to TELL it what to know, e.g., (temperature 72F)
- ASK agent to query what to do
- Agent can use inference to deduce new facts from the TELLed facts

Generic Knowledge-Based Agent

```
function KB-AGENT( percept) returns an action
    static: KB, a knowledge base
            t, a counter, initially 0, indicating time

    TELL(KB, MAKE-PERCEPT-SENTENCE(percept, t))
    action ← ASK(KB, MAKE-ACTION-QUERY(t))
    TELL(KB, MAKE-ACTION-SENTENCE(action, t))
    t ← t + 1
    return action
```

1. TELL KB what was perceived
   Uses a KRL to insert new sentences, representations of facts, into KB

2. ASK KB what to do
   Uses logical reasoning to examine actions and select the best action

Wumpus World Example

Percepts Breeze, Glitter, Smell

Actions Left turn, Right turn,
Forward, Grab, Release, Shoot

Goals Get gold back to start
without entering pit or wumpus square

Environment
Squares adjacent to wumpus are smelly
Squares adjacent to pit are breezy
Glitter if and only if gold is in the same square
Shooting kills the wumpus if you are facing it
Shooting uses up the only arrow
Grabbing picks up the gold if in the same square
Releasing drops the gold in the same square

Wumpus World Characterization

- Deterministic?

- Accessible?

- Static?

- Discrete?

- Episodic?

Wumpus World Characterization

- Deterministic?   Yes – outcome exactly specified

- Accessible?   No – only local perception

- Static?   Yes – Wumpus and pits do not move

- Discrete?   Yes

- Episodic?   (No) – because static

Exploring a Wumpus World

A= Agent
B= Breeze
S= Smell
P= Pit
W= Wumpus
OK = Safe
V = Visited
G = Glitter

Exploring a Wumpus World

A= Agent
B= Breeze
S= Smell
P= Pit
W= Wumpus
OK = Safe
V = Visited
G = Glitter

Exploring a Wumpus World

A= Agent
B= Breeze
S= Smell
P= Pit
W= Wumpus
OK = Safe
V = Visited
G = Glitter

Exploring a Wumpus World

A= Agent
B= Breeze
S= Smell
P= Pit
W= Wumpus
OK = Safe
V = Visited
G = Glitter

# Exploring a Wumpus World

A= Agent
B= Breeze
S= Smell
P= Pit
W= Wumpus
OK = Safe
V = Visited
G = Glitter

Exploring a Wumpus World

A= Agent
B= Breeze
S= Smell
P= Pit
W= Wumpus
OK = Safe
V = Visited
G = Glitter

# Exploring a Wumpus World

A= Agent
B= Breeze
S= Smell
P= Pit
W= Wumpus
OK = Safe
V = Visited
G = Glitter

Exploring a Wumpus World

A= Agent
B= Breeze
S= Smell
P= Pit
W= Wumpus
OK = Safe
V = Visited
G = Glitter

Other Tight Spots

Breeze in (1,2) and (2,1)
⇒ no safe actions

Assuming pits uniformly distributed,
(2,2) is most likely to have a pit

Smell in (1,1)
⇒ cannot move
Can use a strategy of coercion:
    shoot straight ahead
    wumpus was there ⇒ dead ⇒ safe
    wumpus wasn't there ⇒ safe

Another Example Solution

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2 **OK**	2,2	3,2	4,2
1,1 **A** **OK**	2,1 **OK**	3,1	4,1

A = Agent
B = Breeze
G = Glitter, Gold
OK = Safe square
P = Pit
S = Stench
V = Visited
W = Wumpus

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2 **OK**	2,2 **P?**	3,2	4,2
1,1 **V** **OK**	2,1 **A** **B** **OK**	3,1 **P?**	4,1

No perception ⯈   1,2 and 2,1 OK

Move to 2,1

B in 2,1 ⯈   2,2 or 3,1 P?

1,1 V ⯈   no P in 1,1

Move to 1,2 (only option)

Example Solution

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3 **W!**	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2 **A** **S** **OK**	2,2 **OK**	3,2	4,2
1,1 **V** **OK**	2,1 **B** **V** **OK**	3,1 **P!**	4,1

A = Agent
B = Breeze
G = Glitter, Gold
OK = Safe square
P = Pit
S = Stench
V = Visited
W = Wumpus

1,4	2,4 **P?**	3,4	4,4
1,3 **W!**	2,3 **A** **S G** **B**	3,3 **P?**	4,3
1,2 **S** **V** **OK**	2,2 **V** **OK**	3,2	4,2
1,1 **V** **OK**	2,1 **B** **V** **OK**	3,1 **P!**	4,1

S and No S when in 2,1 ⮕ 1,3 or 1,2 has W

1,2 OK ⮕ 1,3 W

No B in 1,2 ⮕ 2,2 OK & 3,1 P

Logic in General

<u>Logics</u> are formal languages for representing information
such that conclusions can be drawn

<u>Syntax</u> defines the sentences in the language

<u>Semantics</u> define the "meaning" of sentences;
i.e., define <u>truth</u> of a sentence in a world

E.g., the language of arithmetic

$x + 2 \geq y$ is a sentence; $x2 + y >$ is not a sentence

$x + 2 \geq y$ is true iff the number $x + 2$ is no less than the number y

$x + 2 \geq y$ is true in a world where $x = 7$, $y = 1$
$x + 2 \geq y$ is false in a world where $x = 0$, $y = 6$

Types of Logic

Logics are characterized by what they commit to as "primitives"

Ontological commitment: what exists—facts? objects? time? beliefs?

Epistemological commitment: what states of knowledge?

Language	Ontological Commitment	Epistemological Commitment
Propositional logic	facts	true/false/unknown
First-order logic	facts, objects, relations	true/false/unknown
Temporal logic	facts, objects, relations, times	true/false/unknown
Probability theory	facts	degree of belief 0...1
Fuzzy logic	degree of truth	degree of belief 0...1

Key Concepts of Logic

- Syntax
- Semantics
- Entailment
- Inference
- Soundness
- Completeness
- Inference Rules
- Normal Forms
- Truth Tables
- Reasoning

Logic Representation of the Real World

Symbol Systems

The Real World

Objects:
+BLOCKA+
+BLOCKB+
+BLOCKC+
……
Relations:
P_1:(IS_ON +BLOCKA+ +BLOCKB+)
P_2:((IS_RED +BLOCKA+)
……

"Knowledge Base"
"Robot Brain"

"The semantic wall"

Truth Depends on Interpretation

Representation 1

World

A

B

ON(A,B) T
ON(B,A) F

ON(A,B) F   A

ON(B,A) T   B

The Key Logic Concepts

$$Entailment \vDash$$

$$Inference \vdash$$

Break the Semantic Wall

Symbol Systems

The Real World

Objects:
+BLOCKA+
+BLOCKB+
+BLOCKC+

……
Relations:
P_1:(IS_ON +BLOCKA+ +BLOCKB+)
P_2:((IS_RED +BLOCKA+)
……

"Knowledge Base"
"Robot Brain"

KB ("mind") and Models ("real worlds")

Mind

KB

α

Real Worlds

M(KB)

M(α)

Entailment

$$KB \models \alpha$$

Knowledge base KB <u>entails</u> sentence α
     if and only if
α is true in all worlds where KB is true

E.g., the KB containing "the Giants won" and "the Reds won"
entails "Either the Giants won or the Reds won"

"Entailment" is different from "Inference"

Logic as a Representation of the World

entails

Representation: Sentences ⟶ Sentence

Refers to
(Semantics)

World   Facts ⟶ follows ⟶ Fact

Models (the "real worlds")

Logicians typically think in terms of <u>models</u>, which are formally structured worlds with respect to which truth can be evaluated

We say m is a <u>model</u> of a sentence α if α is true in m

$M(\alpha)$ is the set of all models of α

Then $KB \models \alpha$ if and only if $M(KB) \subseteq M(\alpha)$

E.g. $KB = $ Giants won and Reds won
$\alpha = $ Giants won

α = "intelligence must have a body"
Models (possible worlds):
      Earth, Mars, …...

M(α)

M(KB)

Entailment

$$KB \models \alpha$$

Knowledge base KB <u>entails</u> sentence α
       if and only if
α is true in all worlds where KB is true $M(KB) \subseteq M(\alpha)$

E.g., the KB containing "the Giants won" and "the Reds won"
entails "Either the Giants won or the Reds won"

Entailment means it is impossible for the following case to occur:
the premise (*KB*) is true but the consequence (*a*) is false

Logic as a Representation of a World

e.g., "John has three brains."

"how many brains did Argentinosaurus had?"

Representation: Sentences $\xrightarrow{\text{entails}}$ Sentence

Refers to

- -

(Semantics)

World   Facts $\xrightarrow{\text{follows}}$ Facts

Really? Need to do a scan of John's head!

Entailment: How to Check?

- $KB \models \alpha$?

- Is $M(KB)$ a subset of $M(\alpha)$?

$$KB \models \alpha \text{ if and only if } M(KB) \subseteq M(\alpha)$$

Check Entailment in Wumpus World

M(KB) M(α1) M(KB) M(α2)

(a) (b)

$α_1 = ¬P_{1,2}$ $α_2 = ¬P_{2,2}$

$KB \models α_1$ $KB \models α_2$

? ?

Inference

$KB \vdash_i \alpha =$ sentence α can be derived from KB by procedure i

Soundness: i is sound if
      whenever $KB \vdash_i \alpha$, it is also true that $KB \models \alpha$

Completeness: i is complete if
      whenever $KB \models \alpha$, it is also true that $KB \vdash_i \alpha$

Preview: we will define a logic (first-order logic) which is expressive enough to say almost anything of interest, and for which there exists a sound and complete inference procedure.

That is, the procedure will answer any question whose answer follows from what is known by the KB.

"Entailment" =\= "Inference"

KB inference α: derived by a procedure

In robot's head (or on paper)

complete

sound

Mind

KB entails α

Real
Worlds

Model of KB is a subset of Model of α

Models of symbols: M(KB), M(α), …
are "possible worlds"

Basic Symbols

- Expressions only evaluate to either "true" or "false."

- P   "P is true"
- ¬P   "P is false"   negation
- P V Q   "either P is true or Q is true or both"   disjunction
- P ^ Q   "both P and Q are true"   conjunction
- P => Q   "if P is true, then Q is true"   implication
- P ⇔ Q   "P and Q are either both true or both false" equivalence

Propositional Logic: Syntax

Propositional logic is the simplest logic

The proposition symbols P_1, P_2 etc are sentences

If S is a sentence, $\neg S$ is a sentence

If S_1 and S_2 is a sentence, $S_1 \wedge S_2$ is a sentence

If S_1 and S_2 is a sentence, $S_1 \vee S_2$ is a sentence

If S_1 and S_2 is a sentence, $S_1 \Rightarrow S_2$ is a sentence

If S_1 and S_2 is a sentence, $S_1 \Leftrightarrow S_2$ is a sentence

Propositional Logic: Semantics   (must be checked in real worlds)

Each model specifies true/false for each proposition symbol

E.g. A B C
$\quad\quad True \;\; True \;\; False$

Rules for evaluating truth with respect to a model m:

$\neg S$ is true iff	S	is false			
$S_1 \wedge S_2$ is true iff	S_1	is true <u>and</u>	S_2	is true	
$S_1 \vee S_2$ is true iff	S_1	is true <u>or</u>	S_2	is true	
$S_1 \Rightarrow S_2$ is true iff	S_1	is false <u>or</u>	S_2	is true	
i.e., is false iff	S_1	is true <u>and</u>	S_2	is false	
$S_1 \Leftrightarrow S_2$ is true iff	$S_1 \Rightarrow S_2$ is true <u>and</u> $S_2 \Rightarrow S_1$ is true				

Truth Tables

- Truth value: whether a statement is true or false.
- Truth table: complete list of truth values for a statement given all possible values of the individual atomic expressions.

Example:

P	Q	P V Q
T	T	T
T	F	T
F	T	T
F	F	F

Truth tables for basic connectives

P	Q	¬P	¬Q	P V Q	P ^ Q	P=>Q	P⇔Q
T	T	F	F	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	T	F	F	F
F	T	T	F	T	F	T	F
F	F	T	T	F	F	T	T

Propositional logic: basic manipulation rules

- ¬(¬A) = A   Double negation

- ¬(A ^ B) = (¬A) V (¬B)   Negated "and"
- ¬(A V B) = (¬A) ^ (¬B)   Negated "or"

- A ^ (B V C) = (A ^ B) V (A ^ C)   Distributivity of ^ on V
- A V (B ^ C) = (A V B) ^ (A V C)   Distributivity of V on ^
- A => B = (¬A) V B   by definition
- ¬(A => B) = A ^ (¬B)   using negated or
- A ⇔ B = (A => B) ^ (B => A)   by definition
- ¬(A ⇔ B) = (A ^ (¬B))V(B ^ (¬A))   using negated and & or
- ...

Propositional inference: enumeration method

Let $\alpha = A \vee B$ and $KB = (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$

Is it the case that $KB \models \alpha$?
Check all possible models—α must be true wherever KB is true

A	B	C	$A \vee C$	$B \vee \neg C$	KB	α
False	False	False				
False	False	True				
False	True	False				
False	True	True				
True	False	False				
True	False	True				
True	True	False				
True	True	True				

Entailment Check by Enumeration

KB |= α?   Is M(KB) a subset of M(α)?

A	B	C	$A \lor C$	$B \lor \neg C$	KB	α
False	False	False	False	True	False	False
False	False	True	True	False	False	False
False	True	False	False	True	False	True
False	True	True	True	True	True	True
True	False	False	True	True	True	True
True	False	True	True	False	False	True
True	True	False	True	True	True	True
True	True	True	True	True	True	True

M(α)

M(KB)

Propositional Logic: Normal Forms

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

<u>Conjunctive Normal Form</u> (CNF—universal)
$\underbrace{conjunction \text{ of } \underbrace{disjunctions \text{ of } literals}_{clauses}}$

E.g., $(A \lor \neg B) \land (B \lor \neg C \lor \neg D)$

"product of sums of simple variables or negated simple variables"

<u>Disjunctive Normal Form</u> (DNF—universal)
$\underbrace{disjunction \text{ of } \underbrace{conjunctions \text{ of } literals}_{terms}}$

E.g., $(A \land B) \lor (A \land \neg C) \lor (A \land \neg D) \lor (\neg B \land \neg C) \lor (\neg B \land \neg D)$

"sum of products of simple variables or negated simple variables"

<u>Horn Form</u> (restricted)
$conjunction$ of $Horn\ clauses$ (clauses with ≤ 1 positive literal)
E.g., $(A \lor \neg B) \land (B \lor \neg C \lor \neg D)$
Often written as set of implications:
$B \Rightarrow A$ and $(C \land D) \Rightarrow B$

Deriving expressions from functions

- Given a Boolean function in truth table form, find a propositional logic expression for it that uses only V, ^ and ¬.
- **Idea:** We can easily do it by disjoining the "T" rows of the truth table.

Example: Given a truth table for a function, how to write the results in logic?

```
P  Q      RESULT
T  T      F
T  F      T
F  T      T
F  F      F
```

RESULT = ?

Deriving expressions from functions

- Given a boolean function in truth table form, find a propositional logic expression for it that uses only V, ^ and ¬.
- **Idea:** We can easily do it by disjoining the "T" rows of the truth table.

Example: XOR function

```
P   Q       RESULT
T   T       F
T   F       T                       P ^ (¬Q)
F   T       T                       (¬P) ^ Q
F   F       F
```

RESULT = (P ^ (¬Q)) V ((¬P) ^ Q)

A more formal approach

- To construct a logical expression in disjunctive normal form from a truth table:

- Build a **"minterm"** for each row of the table, where:

  - For each variable whose value is T in that row, include
    the variable in the minterm
  - For each variable whose value is F in that row, include
    the negation of the variable in the minterm
  - Link variables in minterm by conjunctions

- The expression consists of the disjunction of all minterms.

Example: adder with carry

Takes 3 variables in: x, y and ci (carry-in); yields 2 results: sum (s) and carry-out (co). To get you used to other notations, here we assume T = 1, F = 0, V = OR, ^ = AND, ¬ = NOT.

```
x     y     ci    co    s
--------------------------
0     0     0     0     0
0     0     1     0     1     s : NOT x AND NOT y AND ci
0     1     0     0     1     s : NOT x AND y AND NOT ci
0     1     1     1     0     co: NOT x AND y AND ci
1     0     0     0     1     s : x AND NOT y AND NOT ci
1     0     1     1     0     co: x AND NOT y AND ci
1     1     0     1     0     co: x AND y AND NOT ci
1     1     1     1     1     co,s: x AND y AND ci
```

The logical expression for co is:

```
(NOT x AND y AND ci)  OR  (x AND NOT y AND ci)  OR
(x AND y AND NOT ci)  OR  (x AND y AND ci)
```

The logical expression for s is:

```
(NOT x AND NOT y AND ci)  OR  (NOT x AND y AND NOT ci)
OR (x AND NOT y AND NOT ci)  OR  (x AND y AND ci)
```

49

Tautologies

- Logical expressions that are always true. Can be simplified out.

Examples:

T
T V A
A V (¬A)
¬(A ^ (¬A))
A ⇔ A
((P V Q) ⇔ P) V (¬P ^ Q)
(P ⇔ Q) => (P => Q)

Validity and Satisfiability

A sentence is <u>valid</u> if it is true in <u>all</u> models

e.g., $A \lor \neg A$, $A \Rightarrow A$, $(A \land (A \Rightarrow B)) \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{B}$

Validity is connected to inference via the <u>Deduction</u> <u>Theorem</u>

$KB \models \alpha$ if and only if $(KB \Rightarrow \alpha)$ is valid

A sentence is <u>satisfiable</u> if it is true in <u>some</u> model

e.g., $A \lor B$, C

A sentence is <u>unsatisfiable</u> if it is true in <u>no</u> models

e.g., $A \land \neg A$

Satisfiability is connected to inference via the following:

$KB \models \alpha$ if and only if $(KB \land \neg \alpha)$ is unsatisfiable

i.e., prove α by *reductio ad absurdum*

Proof methods

Proof methods divide into (roughly) two kinds:

Model checking
    truth table enumeration (sound and complete for propositional)
    heuristic search in model space (sound but incomplete)
        e.g., the GSAT algorithm (Ex. 6.15)

Application of inference rules
    Legitimate (sound) generation of new sentences from old
    Proof = a sequence of inference rule applications
        Can use inference rules as operators in a standard search alg.

Inference Rules (1-4)

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

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

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

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

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

$$\frac{\alpha_1, \quad \alpha_2, \quad \ldots, \quad \alpha_n}{\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2 \wedge \ldots \wedge \alpha_n}$$

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

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

Inference Rules (5-7)

◇ **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.)

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

◇ **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.)

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

Inference Rules (1 – 7)

◇ **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.)

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

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

$$\frac{\alpha_1, \ \alpha_2, \quad \ldots, \quad \alpha_n}{\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2 \wedge \ldots \wedge \alpha_n}$$

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

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

◇ **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.)

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

Inference Example

- Prove the rule of "Modus Tollens" $\dfrac{\alpha \rightarrow \beta, \; \neg\beta}{\neg\alpha}$

  - $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$
  - $\neg\alpha \lor \beta$
  - $\neg\neg\beta \lor \neg\alpha$
  - $\neg\beta \rightarrow \neg\alpha$
  - $\neg\beta$
  - $\neg\alpha$

Inference example

Show that the hypotheses:

- It is not sunny this afternoon and it is colder than yesterday.
- We will go swimming only if it is sunny.
- If we do not go swimming, then we will take a canoe trip.
- If we take a canoe trip, then we will be home by sunset.

lead to the conclusion:

- We will be home by the sunset.

Inference example

Show that the hypotheses:

- It is not sunny this afternoon and it is colder than yesterday. $\neg s \wedge c$
- We will go swimming only if it is sunny. $w \rightarrow s$
- If we do not go swimming, then we will take a canoe trip. $\neg w \rightarrow t$
- If we take a canoe trip, then we will be home by sunset. $t \rightarrow h$

lead to the conclusion:

- We will be home by the sunset. h

Where:
s: "it is sunny this afternoon"
c: "it is colder than yesterday"
w: "we will go swimming"
t: "we will take a canoe trip.
h: "we will be home by the sunset."

Inference example

Show that the hypotheses:

- It is not sunny this afternoon and it is colder than yesterday. $\neg s \wedge c$
- We will go swimming only if it is sunny. $w \rightarrow s$
- If we do not go swimming, then we will take a canoe trip. $\neg w \rightarrow t$
- If we take a canoe trip, then we will be home by sunset. $t \rightarrow h$

lead to the conclusion:

- We will be home by the sunset. h

Step	Reason
1. $\neg s \wedge c$	hypothesis

Where:
s: "it is sunny this afternoon"
c: "it is colder than yesterday"
w: "we will go swimming"
t: "we will take a canoe trip.
h: "we will be home by the sunset."

Inference example

Show that the hypotheses:

- It is not sunny this afternoon and it is colder than yesterday. $\neg s \wedge c$
- We will go swimming only if it is sunny. $w \rightarrow s$
- If we do not go swimming, then we will take a canoe trip. $\neg w \rightarrow t$
- If we take a canoe trip, then we will be home by sunset. $t \rightarrow h$

lead to the conclusion:

- We will be home by the sunset. h

Step	Reason
1. $\neg s \wedge c$	hypothesis
2. $\neg s$	simplification

Where:
s: "it is sunny this afternoon"
c: "it is colder than yesterday"
w: "we will go swimming"
t: "we will take a canoe trip.
h: "we will be home by the sunset."

Inference example

Show that the hypotheses:

- It is not sunny this afternoon and it is colder than yesterday. $\neg s \wedge c$
- We will go swimming only if it is sunny. $w \rightarrow s$
- If we do not go swimming, then we will take a canoe trip. $\neg w \rightarrow t$
- If we take a canoe trip, then we will be home by sunset. $t \rightarrow h$

lead to the conclusion:

- We will be home by the sunset. h

Step	Reason
1. $\neg s \wedge c$	hypothesis
2. $\neg s$	simplification
3. $w \rightarrow s$	hypothesis

Where:
s: "it is sunny this afternoon"
c: "it is colder than yesterday"
w: "we will go swimming"
t: "we will take a canoe trip.
h: "we will be home by the sunset."

Inference example

Show that the hypotheses:

- It is not sunny this afternoon and it is colder than yesterday. $\neg s \wedge c$
- We will go swimming only if it is sunny. $w \rightarrow s$
- If we do not go swimming, then we will take a canoe trip. $\neg w \rightarrow t$
- If we take a canoe trip, then we will be home by sunset. $t \rightarrow h$

lead to the conclusion:

- We will be home by the sunset. h

Step	Reason
1. $\neg s \wedge c$	hypothesis
2. $\neg s$	simplification
3. $w \rightarrow s$	hypothesis
4. $\neg w$	modus tollens of 2 and 3

Where:
s: "it is sunny this afternoon"
c: "it is colder than yesterday"
w: "we will go swimming"
t: "we will take a canoe trip.
h: "we will be home by the sunset."

Inference example

Show that the hypotheses:

- It is not sunny this afternoon and it is colder than yesterday. $\neg s \wedge c$
- We will go swimming only if it is sunny. $w \rightarrow s$
- If we do not go swimming, then we will take a canoe trip. $\neg w \rightarrow t$
- If we take a canoe trip, then we will be home by sunset. $t \rightarrow h$

lead to the conclusion:

- We will be home by the sunset. h

Step	Reason
1. $\neg s \wedge c$	hypothesis
2. $\neg s$	simplification
3. $w \rightarrow s$	hypothesis
4. $\neg w$	modus tollens of 2 and 3
5. $\neg w \rightarrow t$	hypothesis

Where:
s: "it is sunny this afternoon"
c: "it is colder than yesterday"
w: "we will go swimming"
t: "we will take a canoe trip.
h: "we will be home by the sunset."

Inference example

Show that the hypotheses:

- It is not sunny this afternoon and it is colder than yesterday. $\neg s \land c$
- We will go swimming only if it is sunny. $w \to s$
- If we do not go swimming, then we will take a canoe trip. $\neg w \to t$
- If we take a canoe trip, then we will be home by sunset. $t \to h$

lead to the conclusion:

- We will be home by the sunset. h

Step	Reason
1. $\neg s \land c$	hypothesis
2. $\neg s$	simplification
3. $w \to s$	hypothesis
4. $\neg w$	modus tollens of 2 and 3
5. $\neg w \to t$	hypothesis
6. t	modus ponens of 4 and 5

Where:
s: "it is sunny this afternoon"
c: "it is colder than yesterday"
w: "we will go swimming"
t: "we will take a canoe trip.
h: "we will be home by the sunset."

64

Inference example

Show that the hypotheses:

- It is not sunny this afternoon and it is colder than yesterday. $\neg s \wedge c$
- We will go swimming only if it is sunny. $w \rightarrow s$
- If we do not go swimming, then we will take a canoe trip. $\neg w \rightarrow t$
- If we take a canoe trip, then we will be home by sunset. $t \rightarrow h$

lead to the conclusion:

- We will be home by the sunset. h

Step	Reason
1. $\neg s \wedge c$	hypothesis
2. $\neg s$	simplification
3. $w \rightarrow s$	hypothesis
4. $\neg w$	modus tollens of 2 and 3
5. $\neg w \rightarrow t$	hypothesis
6. t	modus ponens of 4 and 5
7. $t \rightarrow h$	hypothesis

Where:
s: "it is sunny this afternoon"
c: "it is colder than yesterday"
w: "we will go swimming"
t: "we will take a canoe trip.
h: "we will be home by the sunset."

Inference example

Show that the hypotheses:

- It is not sunny this afternoon and it is colder than yesterday. $\neg s \wedge c$
- We will go swimming only if it is sunny. $w \rightarrow s$
- If we do not go swimming, then we will take a canoe trip. $\neg w \rightarrow t$
- If we take a canoe trip, then we will be home by sunset. $t \rightarrow h$

lead to the conclusion:

- We will be home by the sunset. h

Step	Reason
1. $\neg s \wedge c$	hypothesis
2. $\neg s$	simplification
3. $w \rightarrow s$	hypothesis
4. $\neg w$	modus tollens of 2 and 3
5. $\neg w \rightarrow t$	hypothesis
6. t	modus ponens of 4 and 5
7. $t \rightarrow h$	hypothesis
8. h	modus ponens of 6 and 7

Where:
s: "it is sunny this afternoon"
c: "it is colder than yesterday"
w: "we will go swimming"
t: "we will take a canoe trip.
h: "we will be home by the sunset."

66

Wumpus world: example

- **Facts:** Percepts inject (TELL) facts into the KB
  - [stench at 1,1 and 2,1] □ S1,1 ; S2,1
- **Rules:** if square has no stench then neither the square or adjacent squares contain the Wumpus

  - R1: $\neg S1,1 \Rightarrow \neg W1,1 \wedge \neg W1,2 \wedge \neg W2,1$

  - R2: $\neg S2,1 \Rightarrow \neg W1,1 \wedge \neg W2,1 \wedge \neg W2,2 \wedge \neg W3,1$

  - …

- **Inference:**
  - KB contains $\neg S1,1$ then using Modus Ponens we infer

    $\neg W1,1 \wedge \neg W1,2 \wedge \neg W2,1$
  - Using And-Elimination we get: $\neg W1,1 \quad \neg W1,2 \quad \neg W2,1$
  - …

Limitations of Propositional Logic

1. It is too weak, i.e., has very limited expressiveness:

- Each rule has to be represented for each situation:
  e.g., "don't go forward if the Wumpus is in front of you" takes 64 rules

2. It cannot keep track of changes:

- If one needs to track changes, e.g., where the agent has been before then we need a timed-version of each rule. To track 100 steps we'll then need 6400 rules for the previous example.

Its **hard to write and maintain** such a huge rule-base

Inference becomes intractable

Summary

Logical agents apply <u>inference</u> to a <u>knowledge base</u>
to derive new information and make decisions

Basic concepts of logic:
- <u>syntax</u>: formal structure of <u>sentences</u>
- <u>semantics</u>: <u>truth</u> of sentences wrt <u>models</u>
- <u>entailment</u>: necessary truth of one sentence given another
- <u>inference</u>: deriving sentences from other sentences
- <u>soundess</u>: derivations produce only entailed sentences
- <u>completeness</u>: derivations can produce all entailed sentences

Wumpus world requires the ability to represent partial and negated information, reason by cases, etc.

Propositional logic suffices for some of these tasks

Truth table method is sound and complete for propositional logic

Summary: Logic and Reasoning

- Knowledge Base (KB): contains a set of <u>sentences</u> expressed using a Knowledge Representation Language (KRL)
  - TELL: operator to add a sentence to the KB
  - ASK: to query the KB
- Logics are KRLs where conclusions can be drawn
  - Syntax
  - Semantics
- Entailment: KB |= a iff "a is true in all worlds where KB is true"
- Inference: KB |−$_i$ a = sentence a can be derived from KB using a procedure i

  - Sound: whenever KB |−$_i$ a, then KB |= a is true
  - Complete: whenever KB |= a, then KB |−$_i$ a