Lecture 6: Hypothetical Reasoning 2-AIN-144/2-IKV-131 Knowledge Reperesentation & Reasoning

Martin Baláž, Martin Homola

Department of Applied Informatics Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics Comenius University in Bratislava



21 Mar 2013

Definition (Inference Rule)

An inference rule r is an expression

$$\frac{\phi_1,\ldots,\phi_m}{\phi_0}$$

where $0 \leq m$ and ϕ_0, \ldots, ϕ_m are well-formed formulas.

The formulas $pre(r) = \{\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_m\}$ are called the *prerequisites* and the formula $cons(r) = \phi_0$ is called the *consequent* of r.

Definition (Deductive System)

A *deductive system* is a set of inference rules.

Definition (Provability)

Let *R* be a deductive system and *T* be a theory. A formula ϕ is *provable* from *T* in *R* (denoted $T \vdash_R \phi$) if there exists a sequence of inference rules r_1, \ldots, r_n , $0 \le n$, in *R* such that

- $pre(r_i) \subseteq T \cup \{cons(r_1), \ldots, cons(r_{i-1})\}$ for each $0 < i \le n$
- $\phi \in T \cup \{cons(r_1), \ldots, cons(r_n)\}$

Definition (Deductive Closure)

Let R be a deductive system and T be a theory. By $Cn_R(T)$ we denote the smallest theory T' which

- contains T, i.e. $T \subseteq T'$
- is closed under R, i.e. for each inference rule r ∈ R, if pre(r) ⊆ T' then cons(r) ∈ T'.

Theorem

Let R be a deductive system and T be a theory in a language \mathcal{L} . Then $Cn_R(T) = \{\phi \in \mathcal{L} \mid T \vdash_R \phi\}.$ Birds usually fly (except penguins, ostriches, birds with boken wings, \dots). Tweety is a bird.

Birds usually fly (except penguins, ostriches, birds with boken wings, \dots). Tweety is a bird.

Classical Logic:

$$\forall X(bird(X) \land \neg penguin(X) \land \neg ostrich(X) \land \land \neg broken_wing(X) \land \cdots \supset fly(X))$$

bird(tweety) \land \neg penguin(tweety) \land \neg ostrich(tweety) \land \land \neg broken_wing(tweety) \land \ldots

Definition (Default)

A *default* is an expression d of the form

$$\frac{\phi_1,\ldots,\phi_m:\phi_{m+1},\ldots,\phi_n}{\phi_0}$$

where $0 \le m < n$ and ϕ_0, \ldots, ϕ_n are well-formed formulas.

The formulas $pre(d) = \{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m\}$ are called the *prerequisites*, the formulas $just(d) = \{\phi_{m+1}, \dots, \phi_n\}$ are called the *justifications*, and the formula $cons(d) = \phi_0$ is called the *consequence* of *d*.

The intuitive meaning of a default is the following:

If ϕ_1, \ldots, ϕ_m are true, and we can assume $\phi_{m+1}, \ldots, \phi_n$, then ϕ_0 is true.

Exceptions in Default Logic

Birds usually fly (except penguins, ostriches, birds with boken wings, \dots). Tweety is a bird.

Default Logic:

$$\frac{bird(X):fly(X)}{fly(X)}$$

$$\forall X(penguin(X) \supset \neg fly(X))$$

 $\forall X(ostrich(X) \supset \neg fly(X))$
 $\forall X(bird(X) \land broken_wing(X) \supset \neg fly(X))$

... bird(tweety)

(*) *) *) *)

If $R(\overline{x})$ is not derived $(\neg R(\overline{x}) \text{ can be assumed})$, we conclude $\neg R(\overline{x})$.

: $\neg employee(X)$ \neg *employee*(X)

employee(peter)
employee(bob)

 \neg *employee*(*alice*)?

< ∃ >

Frame Problem (Yale Shooting Problem)

In dynamic worlds, what is not affected by actions, is unchanged.

$$\frac{holds(F, S), action(A) : holds(F, do(A, S))}{holds(F, do(A, S))}$$
$$\frac{\neg holds(F, S), action(A) : \neg holds(F, do(A, S))}{\neg holds(F, do(A, S))}$$

 $\forall S \ holds(loaded, do(load, S)) \\ \forall S \neg holds(loaded, do(shoot, S)) \\ \forall S \neg holds(alive, do(shoot, S)) \\ action(load), action(wait), action(shoot) \\ holds(alive, s_0) \end{cases}$

Richard Nixon is a Republican and at the same time a Quaker. Republicans are usually not Pacifists, but Quakers are.

$$\frac{republican(X): \neg pacifist(X)}{\neg pacifist(X)}$$
$$\frac{quaker(X): pacifist(X)}{pacifist(X)}$$

republican(nixon) quaker(nixon) Classical Logic is monotonic:

```
If T \vdash \phi then T' \vdash \phi for all T \subseteq T'.
```

Default Logic is nonmonotonic:

Consider a simple theory consisting of the single default $\frac{a}{b}$. Thus *b* may be believed. If subsequently $\neg a$ is observed we then have the new theory in which *b* cannot be believed.

In nonmonotonic logics, beliefs can be revised in the presence of new information.

Definition (Default Theory)

A default theory is a pair $\Delta = (D, W)$ where

- D is a set of defaults
- W is a classical theory

We assume a sound and complete deductive system R.

We assume that all formulas in D and W are closed, i.e. they do not contain free variables. If they do, we substitute all ground terms for each free variable.

Definition (Contextual Provability)

Let $\Delta = (D, W)$ be a default theory and E be a theory. A formula ϕ is *provable* from Δ in the *context* E (denoted $W \vdash_{D(E)} \phi$) iff there exists a sequence of defaults d_1, \ldots, d_n , $0 \le n$, such that

- $W \cup \{cons(d_1), \dots, cons(d_{i-1})\} \vdash cons(d_i) \text{ for each } 0 < i \leq n$
- $\overline{just(d_i)} \cap E = \emptyset$ for each $0 < i \le n$
- $W \cup \{cons(d_1), \ldots, cons(d_n)\} \vdash \phi$

By D(E) we denote the set of inference rules $\{pre(d)/cons(d) \mid d \in D, \overline{just(d)} \cap E = \emptyset\}.$

Definition (Operator Γ_{Δ})

Let $\Delta = (D, W)$ be a default theory and E be a theory. By $\Gamma_{\Delta}(E)$ we denote the smallest theory E' which

- contains W, i.e. $W \subseteq E'$
- is closed under R, i.e. $Cn_R(E') = E'$
- is closed under D(E), i.e. $Cn_{D(E)}(E') = E'$

Theorem

Let $\Delta = (D, W)$ be a default theory and E be a theory in a language \mathcal{L} . Then $\Gamma_{\Delta}(E) = \{\phi \in \mathcal{L} \mid W \vdash_{D(E)} \phi\}.$

Definition (Default Extension)

Let Δ be a default theory. A theory *E* is a *default extension* of Δ iff $\Gamma_{\Delta}(E) = E$.

Example (No Extension)

Neither $E_1 = Cn_R(\emptyset)$ nor $E_2 = Cn_R(\{p\})$ is a default extension of $\Delta = (\{\frac{:\neg p}{p}\}, \emptyset).$

Example (Many Extensions)

Both $E_1 = Cn_R(\{p\})$ and $E_2 = Cn_R(\{q\})$ are default extensions of $\Delta = (\{\frac{:\neg p}{q}, \frac{:\neg q}{p}\}, \emptyset).$

Iterative Characterization of Extensions

Theorem

Let $\Delta = (D, W)$ be a default theory and E be a theory. Define

$$E_0 = W$$

$$E_{i+1} = Cn_R(E_i) \cup \{cons(d) \mid d \in D(E), pre(d) \subseteq E_i\}$$

Then E is an extension of Δ iff $E = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i$.

Proof.

We can observe that

(D1)
$$W \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i$$

(D2)
$$Cn_R(\bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i) = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i$$

(D3)
$$Cn_{D(E)}(\bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i) = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i$$

By the minimality of $\Gamma_{\Delta}(E)$, we have $\Gamma_{\Delta}(E) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i$.

Proof (Continued).

 (\Rightarrow) Let E be a default extension of Δ , i.e. $\Gamma_{\Lambda}(E) = E$. We show that $E = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i$. (a) $E = \Gamma_{\Delta}(E) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i$ (b) We inductively show that $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i \subseteq \Gamma_{\Delta}(E) = E$. (1) $E_0 = W \subseteq E$ (2) Let $E_i \subseteq E$. We show that $E_{i+1} \subseteq E$. Consider $\phi \in E_{i+1}$. (i) If $\phi \in Cn_R(E_i)$ then $\phi \in E$ since $Cn_R(E) = E$. (ii) Let $d \in D(E)$ be a rule with $cons(d) = \phi$ and $pre(d) \subseteq E_i$. Since $E_i \subseteq E$, $pre(d) \subseteq E$. Then $\phi \in E$ since $Cn_{D(E)}(E) = E.$

Proof (Continued).

(\Leftarrow) Let $E = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i$. We show that E is a default extension of Δ , i.e. $\Gamma_{\Lambda}(E) = E$. (a) $\Gamma_{\Lambda}(E) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i = E$ (b) We inductively show that $E = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i \subseteq \Gamma_{\Delta}(E)$. (1) $E_0 = W \subset \Gamma_{\Lambda}(E)$ (2) Let $E_i \subseteq \Gamma_{\Delta}(E)$. We show that $E_{i+1} \subseteq \Gamma_{\Delta}(E)$. Consider $\phi \in E_{i+1}$. (i) If $\phi \in Cn_R(E_i)$ then $\phi \in Cn_R(\Gamma_{\Delta}(E)) = \Gamma_{\Delta}(E)$ since $E_i \subset \Gamma_{\Lambda}(E).$ (ii) Let $d \in D(E)$ be a rule with $cons(d) = \phi$ and $pre(d) \subseteq E_i$. Since $E_i \subseteq \Gamma_{\Delta}(E)$, $pre(d) \subseteq \Gamma_{\Delta}(E)$. Then $\phi \in \Gamma_{\Delta}(E)$ since $Cn_{D(E)}(\Gamma_{\Delta}(E)) = \Gamma_{\Delta}(E).$

▶ < ∃ ▶</p>

Consistency of Extensions

Theorem

A default theory $\Delta = (D, W)$ has an inconsistent extension iff W is inconsistent.

Proof.

$$Cn_R(W) \subseteq Cn_R(E) \subseteq \mathcal{L}$$
, i.e. *E* is inconsistent.

Corollary

If a default theory has an inconsistent extension then this is its only extension.

Theorem

Default extensions are minimal, i.e. if $E \subseteq F$ are default extensions then E = F.

Proof.

By the iterative characterization, $E = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty}$, $F = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty}$. We inductively prove that $F_i \subseteq E_i$ for all $0 \le i$, i.e. $F \subseteq E$.

Exceptions in Default Logic:

$$\frac{bird(X):fly(X)}{fly(X)}$$

Closed World Assumption:

 $\frac{: \neg employee(X)}{\neg employee(X)}$

Frame Problem:

$$\frac{holds(F,S), action(A) : holds(F, do(A, S))}{holds(F, do(A, S))}$$

Definition (Normal Default Theory)

A default *d* is normal iff $just(d) = \{cons(d)\}$. A default theory $\Delta = (D, W)$ is normal iff every default in *D* is normal.

Theorem

Every normal default theory has an extension.

Proof.

Let $\Delta = (D, W)$ be a normal default theory. If W is inconsistent, then \mathcal{L} is an extension of Δ . Let W be consistent and $E = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i$ where

$$E_0 = W$$
$$E_{i+1} = Cn_R(E_i) \cup T_i$$

We choose maximal T_i such that

- $E_i \cup T_i$ is consistent, and
- $T_i \subseteq \{cons(d) \mid d \in D, pre(d) \subseteq E_i\}.$

Proof (Continued).

Let $T'_i = \{cons(d) \mid d \in D(E), pre(d) \subseteq E_i\}$. We show that $T_i = T'_i$, i.e. $E = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i$ is a default extension of Δ .

- (a) We prove that $T_i \subseteq T'_i$. Let $\phi \in T_i$ and $d \in D$ be a default with $cons(d) = \phi$ and $pre(d) \subseteq E_i$. Since $E_i \cup T_i$ is consistent, $\overline{\phi} \notin E$ and $\phi \in T'_i$.
- (b) We prove by contradiction that T'_i ⊆ T_i. Let φ ∈ T'_i \ T_i and d ∈ D(E) be a rule with cons(d) = φ and pre(d) ⊆ E_i. Then φ ∉ E. By the maximality of T_i, we have that E_i ∪ T_i ∪ {φ} is inconsistent, i.e. Cn_R(E_i) ∪ T_i ∪ {φ} is inconsistent, i.e. E ∪ {φ} is inconsistent, i.e. E ∪ {φ} is inconsistent since E_{i+1} ⊆ E. Then φ ∈ Cn_R(E) = E and we have a contradiction.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト