


First-Order Logic & Inference



Material from Dr. Marie desJardins. Some material adopted from notes by Andreas Geyer-Schulz and Chuck Dyer

1

Bookkeeping

- Midterms returned today
- HW4 due 11/7 @ 11:59

2

First-Order Logic

Chapter 8

4

First-Order Logic

- First-order logic (FOL) models the world in terms of
 - **Objects**, which are things with individual identities
 - **Properties** of objects that distinguish them from other objects
 - **Relations** that hold among sets of objects
 - **Functions**, which are a subset of relations where there is only one "value" for any given "input"
- Examples:
 - Objects: Students, lectures, companies, cars ...
 - Relations: Brother-of, bigger-than, outside, part-of, has-color, occurs-after, owns, visits, precedes, ...
 - Properties: blue, oval, even, large, ...
 - Functions: father-of, best-friend, second-half, one-more-than ...

5

Sentences: Terms and Atoms


- A **term** (denoting a real-world individual) is:
 - A constant symbol: *John*, or
 - A variable symbol: *x*, or
 - An n-place function of n terms
 - x and $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ are terms, where each x_i is a term
 - $is-a(John, Professor)$
 - A term with no variables is a **ground term**.
- An **atomic sentence** is an n-place predicate of n terms
 - Has a truth value (t or f)

8

Sentences: Terms and Atoms

- A **complex sentence** is formed from atomic sentences connected by the logical connectives:
 - $\neg P, P \vee Q, P \wedge Q, P \rightarrow Q, P \leftrightarrow Q$ where P and Q are sentences

$has-a(x, Bachelors) \wedge is-a(x, human)$
does NOT SAY everyone with a bachelors' is human
 $has-a(John, Bachelors) \wedge is-a(John, human)$
 $has-a(Mary, Bachelors) \wedge is-a(Mary, human)$



9

Quantifiers

- **Universal quantification**
 - $\forall x P(x)$ means that P holds for **all** values of x in its domain
 - States universal truths
 - E.g.: $\forall x \text{dolphin}(x) \rightarrow \text{mammal}(x)$
- **Existential quantification**
 - $\exists x P(x)$ means that P holds for **some** value of x in the domain associated with that variable
 - Makes a statement about some object without naming it
 - E.g., $\exists x \text{mammal}(x) \wedge \text{lays-eggs}(x)$



10

Sentences: Quantification

- **Quantified sentences** adds quantifiers \forall and \exists
 - $\forall x \text{has-a}(x, \text{Bachelors}) \rightarrow \text{is-a}(x, \text{human})$
 - $\exists x \text{has-a}(x, \text{Bachelors})$
 - $\forall x \exists y \text{Loves}(x, y)$

Everyone who has a bachelors' is human.

There exists some who has a bachelors'.

Everybody loves somebody.

11

Sentences: Well-Formedness

- A **well-formed formula (wff)** is a sentence containing no “free” variables. That is, all variables are “bound” by universal or existential quantifiers.
- $(\forall x)P(x,y)$ has x bound as a universally quantified variable, but y is free.

12

Quantifiers: Uses

- Universal quantifiers **often** used with “implies” to form “rules”:
 - $(\forall x) \text{student}(x) \rightarrow \text{smart}(x)$
 - “All students are smart”
- Universal quantification **rarely*** used to make blanket statements about every individual in the world:
 - $(\forall x)\text{student}(x)\wedge\text{smart}(x)$
 - “Everyone in the world is a student and is smart”

*Deliberately, anyway

14

Quantifiers: Uses

- Existential quantifiers are **usually** used with “and” to specify a list of properties about an individual:
 - $(\exists x) \text{student}(x) \wedge \text{smart}(x)$
 - “There is a student who is smart”
- A common mistake is to represent this English sentence as the FOL sentence:
 - $(\exists x) \text{student}(x) \rightarrow \text{smart}(x)$
 - But what happens when there is a person who is *not* a student?

15

Quantifier Scope

- Switching the order of universal quantifiers *does not* change the meaning:
 - $(\forall x)(\forall y)P(x,y) \leftrightarrow (\forall y)(\forall x) P(x,y)$
- Similarly, you can switch the order of existential quantifiers:
 - $(\exists x)(\exists y)P(x,y) \leftrightarrow (\exists y)(\exists x) P(x,y)$
- Switching the order of universals and existentials *does* change meaning:
 - Everyone likes someone: $(\forall x)(\exists y) \text{likes}(x,y)$
 - Someone is liked by everyone: $(\exists y)(\forall x) \text{likes}(x,y)$

16

Connections between All and Exists

We can relate sentences involving \forall and \exists using De Morgan's laws:

$$\begin{aligned}(\forall x) \neg P(x) &\leftrightarrow \neg(\exists x) P(x) \\ \neg(\forall x) P &\leftrightarrow (\exists x) \neg P(x) \\ (\forall x) P(x) &\leftrightarrow \neg(\exists x) \neg P(x) \\ (\exists x) P(x) &\leftrightarrow \neg(\forall x) \neg P(x)\end{aligned}$$

17

Quantified Inference Rules

- Universal instantiation
 - $\forall x P(x) \therefore P(A)$
- Universal generalization
 - $P(A) \wedge P(B) \dots \therefore \forall x P(x)$
- Existential instantiation
 - $\exists x P(x) \therefore P(F)$ ← skolem constant F
- Existential generalization
 - $P(A) \therefore \exists x P(x)$

18

Universal Instantiation (a.k.a. Universal Elimination)

- If $(\forall x) P(x)$ is true, then $P(C)$ is true, where C is *any* constant in the domain of x
- Example:
 - $(\forall x) \text{eats}(\text{Ziggy}, x) \Rightarrow \text{eats}(\text{Ziggy}, \text{IceCream})$
- The variable symbol can be replaced by any ground term, i.e., any constant symbol or function symbol applied to ground terms only

19

Existential Instantiation (a.k.a. Existential Elimination)

- Variable is replaced by a **brand-new constant**
 - I.e., not occurring in the KB
- From $(\exists x) P(x)$ infer $P(c)$
 - Example:
 - $(\exists x) \text{eats}(\text{Ziggy}, x) \rightarrow \text{eats}(\text{Ziggy}, \text{Stuff})$
 - “Skolemization”
- *Stuff* is a **skolem constant**
- Easier than manipulating the existential quantifier

20

Existential Generalization (a.k.a. Existential Introduction)

- If $P(c)$ is true, then $(\exists x) P(x)$ is inferred.
- Example
 - $\text{eats}(\text{Ziggy}, \text{IceCream}) \Rightarrow (\exists x) \text{eats}(\text{Ziggy}, x)$
- All instances of the given constant symbol are replaced by the new variable symbol
- Note that the variable symbol cannot already exist anywhere in the expression

21

Translating English to FOL

Every gardener likes the sun.
 $\forall x \text{gardener}(x) \rightarrow \text{likes}(x, \text{Sun})$

Whiteboard
time!

You can fool some of the people all of the time.
 $\exists x \forall t \text{person}(x) \wedge \text{time}(t) \rightarrow \text{can-fool}(x, t)$

You can fool all of the people some of the time.
 $\forall x \exists t (\text{person}(x) \rightarrow \text{time}(t) \wedge \text{can-fool}(x, t))$
 $\forall x (\text{person}(x) \rightarrow \exists t (\text{time}(t) \wedge \text{can-fool}(x, t)))$ ← Equivalent

All purple mushrooms are poisonous.
 $\forall x (\text{mushroom}(x) \wedge \text{purple}(x)) \rightarrow \text{poisonous}(x)$

22

Translating English to FOL

No purple mushroom is poisonous.

$\neg \exists x \text{ purple}(x) \wedge \text{mushroom}(x) \wedge \text{poisonous}(x)$
 $\forall x (\text{mushroom}(x) \wedge \text{purple}(x) \rightarrow \neg \text{poisonous}(x))$ **Equivalent**

There are exactly two purple mushrooms.

$\exists x \exists y \text{ mushroom}(x) \wedge \text{purple}(x) \wedge \text{mushroom}(y) \wedge \text{purple}(y) \wedge \neg(x=y) \wedge \forall z$
 $(\text{mushroom}(z) \wedge \text{purple}(z)) \rightarrow ((x=z) \vee (y=z))$

Clinton is not tall.

$\neg \text{tall}(\text{Clinton})$

X is above Y iff X is on directly on top of Y or there is a pile of one or more other objects directly on top of one another starting with X and ending with Y.

$\forall x \forall y \text{ above}(x,y) \leftrightarrow (\text{on}(x,y) \vee \exists z (\text{on}(x,z) \wedge \text{above}(z,y)))$

23

Semantics of FOL

- **Domain M:** the set of all objects in the world (of interest)
- **Interpretation I:** includes
 - Assign each constant to an object in M
 - Define each function of n arguments as a mapping $M^n \Rightarrow M$
 - Define each predicate of n arguments as a mapping $M^n \Rightarrow \{T, F\}$
 - Therefore, every ground predicate with any instantiation will have a truth value
 - In general there is an infinite number of interpretations because |M| is infinite
- **Define logical connectives:** $\neg, \wedge, \vee, \Rightarrow, \Leftrightarrow$ as in PL
- **Define semantics of $(\forall x)$ and $(\exists x)$**
 - $(\forall x) P(x)$ is true iff P(x) is true under all interpretations
 - $(\exists x) P(x)$ is true iff P(x) is true under some interpretation

36

- **Model:** an interpretation of a set of sentences such that every sentence is *True*

• A sentence is

- **satisfiable** if it is true under some interpretation
- **valid** if it is true under all possible interpretations
- **inconsistent** if there does not exist any interpretation under which the sentence is true

- **Logical consequence:** $S \models X$ if all models of S are also models of X

37

Axioms, Definitions and Theorems

- **Axioms** are facts and rules that attempt to capture all of the (important) facts and concepts about a domain; axioms can be used to prove **theorems**
 - Mathematicians don't want any unnecessary (dependent) axioms –ones that can be derived from other axioms
 - Dependent axioms can make reasoning faster, however
 - Choosing a good set of axioms for a domain is a kind of design problem
- A **definition** of a predicate is of the form " $p(X) \leftrightarrow \dots$ " and can be decomposed into two parts
 - **Necessary** description: " $p(x) \rightarrow \dots$ "
 - **Sufficient** description " $p(x) \leftarrow \dots$ "
 - Some concepts don't have complete definitions (e.g., person(x))

38

More on Definitions

- Examples: define $\text{father}(x, y)$ by $\text{parent}(x, y)$ and $\text{male}(x)$
 - $\text{parent}(x, y)$ is a necessary (**but not sufficient**) description of $\text{father}(x, y)$
 - $\text{father}(x, y) \rightarrow \text{parent}(x, y)$
 - $\text{parent}(x, y) \wedge \text{male}(x) \wedge \text{age}(x, 35)$ is a **sufficient (but not necessary)** description of $\text{father}(x, y)$:
 - $\text{father}(x, y) \leftarrow \text{parent}(x, y) \wedge \text{male}(x) \wedge \text{age}(x, 35)$
 - $\text{parent}(x, y) \wedge \text{male}(x)$ is a **necessary and sufficient** description of $\text{father}(x, y)$
 - $\text{parent}(x, y) \wedge \text{male}(x) \leftrightarrow \text{father}(x, y)$

39

Higher-Order Logic

- FOL only allows to quantify over variables, and variables can only range over objects.
- HOL allows us to quantify over relations
- Example: (quantify over functions)
 - "two functions are equal iff they produce the same value for all arguments"
 - $\forall f \forall g (f = g) \leftrightarrow (\forall x f(x) = g(x))$
- Example: (quantify over predicates)
 - $\forall r \text{ transitive}(r) \rightarrow (\forall xyz) r(x,y) \wedge r(y,z) \rightarrow r(x,z)$
- More expressive, but undecidable.

40

Expressing Uniqueness

- Sometimes we want to say that there is a single, unique object that satisfies a certain condition
- “There exists a unique x such that $\text{king}(x)$ is true”
 - $\exists x \text{ king}(x) \wedge \forall y (\text{king}(y) \rightarrow x=y)$
 - $\exists x \text{ king}(x) \wedge \neg \exists y (\text{king}(y) \wedge x \neq y)$
 - $\exists! x \text{ king}(x)$
- “Every country has exactly one ruler”
 - $\forall c \text{ country}(c) \rightarrow \exists! r \text{ ruler}(c,r)$
- Iota operator: “ $\iota x P(x)$ ” means “the unique x such that $p(x)$ is true”
 - “The unique ruler of Freedonia is dead”
 - $\text{dead}(\iota x \text{ ruler}(\text{freedonia},x))$