Chapter 11. Knowledge Representation and Reasoning


Lecture Notes on Artificial Intelligence, Spring 2012

Summarized by Ha, Jung-Woo and Lee, Beom-Jin

Biointelligence Laboratory
School of Computer Science and Engineering
Seoul National University

http://bi.snu.ac.kr
Contents

11.1 Deductions in Symbolic Logic
  ■ Deductions in Symbolic Logic

11.2 The Situation Calculus
  ■ The Situation Calculus

11.3 Logic Programming
  ■ Logic Programming

11.4 Semantic Networks
  ■ Semantic Networks

11.5 Scripts and Frames
  ■ Scripts and Frames

Appendix
Overview

- Methods for knowledge representation and reasoning from Mid-1960s and Mid-1970s
  - Symbolic logic and its deductions
    - Predicate calculus
    - For proving theories
  - Situation calculus
  - Logic programming: PROLOG
  - Semantic networks: HAM, MEMS, MENTAL
  - Script and Frames
Introduction

- Knowledge
  - For intelligent system
  - The mean to draw conclusion from or act on

- Knowledge representation
  - Procedural
    - Coordinate and control the specific action (ex. hitting a tennis ball)
    - Programs using the knowledge
    - Specific task program
  - Declarative
    - Declarative sentence (I am a 25 years old)
    - Symbolic structures
    - General task program
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11.1 Deductions in Symbolic Logic
Deductions in Symbolic Logic

- The predicate calculus
  - From Aristotle to G. Boole and McCarthy
  - Ex. Aristotle syllogism
    - 1. \((\forall x)[\text{Man}(x) \supset \text{Mortal}(x)]\)
      (The expression \((\forall x)\) is a way of writing “for all x”; and the expression \(\supset\) is a way of writing "implies that." “\text{Man}(x)\)” is a way of writing “x is a man”; and “\text{Mortal}(x)\)” is a way of writing “x is mortal.” Thus, the entire expression is a way of writing “for all x, x is a man implies that x is mortal” or, equivalently, “all men are mortal.”)
    - 2. \text{Man}(\text{Socrates}) (Socrates is a man.)
    - 3. Therefore, \text{Mortal}(\text{Socrates}) (Socrates is mortal.)
  - “Therefore,” is an example of a deduction
  - Rules of inference (ex. Modus ponens)
Deductions in Symbolic Logic

- **Early works on deduction in symbolic logic**
  - Programs using inference rule (1960s) for proving theorems in the predicate calculus
    - P. Gilmore, H. Wang, and D. Prawitz (IBM)
    - F. Black (Harvard)
  - QA3 (Question Answering)
    - C. C. Green implemented a new deduction method developed by J. A. Robinson
      - From two other statements, a new statement is generated by rules (ex. \( P \lor \neg Q \) and \( P \) produces \( Q \))
      - Key contribution: how resolution could be applied to general expressions in the predicate calculus

- **Example**

- So just as with programs for playing games, LT, and proving geometry theorems, deduction programs need to try many possibilities in their search for a solution
11.2 The Situation Calculus
The Situation Calculus

- **Situation calculus**
  - Where one could write logical statements that explicitly named the situation in which something or other was true
  - Ex. “What is a program for rearranging a list of numbers so that they are in increasing numerical order?”

- **Block case**
  - block A is on top of block B in some situation S
    \[ \rightarrow \text{On}(A, B, S) \]
  - block A is blue in all situations
    \[ \rightarrow (\forall s)\text{Blue}(A, s) \]
  - there exists some situation in which block A is on block B
    \[ \rightarrow (\exists s)\text{On}(A, B, s) \]
  - QA3 can deduce situation calculus \( \rightarrow \) robot plan
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11.3 Logic Programming
Logic Programming

- Green’s automatic programming
  - QA3 can construct simple computer programs
  - The first attempt to write programs using logical statements
- SL-resolution: A. Kowalski and D. Kuehner
- PROLOG (1972)
  - A. Comerauer, P. Roussel, and A. Kowalski
  - An ordered sequence of logical statements
  - The exact order in which these statements are written, along with some other constructs, is the key to efficient program execution

Figure 11.1: Robert Kowalski (top) and Alain Colmerauer (bottom)
11.4 Semantic Networks
Semantic Networks

- **Semantic networks**
  - Another format for representing declarative knowledge

- **Human Associative Memory (HAM)**
  - G. Bower and J. Anderson (1970s)
  - Network-based human memory
  - Parse simple propositional sentences and store them in the semantic network structure
  - With accumulated memory, HAM can answer simple questions

- **MEMS and MENTAL: S. C. Shapiro (1971)**
  - MEMS: a network structure for storing semantic information
  - MENTAL: aided MEMS in deducing new information from that already stored

- **SNePS: S. C. Shapiro**
  - Combination of logical representation with those of network representations used for natural language understanding
Semantic Networks

- Conceptual dependency representations for natural language sentences
  - R. C. Schank
  - People transform natural language sentences into “conceptual structures independent of the particular language where the sentences were expressed.

Figure 11.2: Roger Schank.
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11.5 Scripts and Frames
Scripts and Frames

- **Graphical knowledge representations**
  - Semantic networks and conceptual structures
  - Efficient computationally due to participating in the same chain of reasoning

- **Scripts**
  - Proposed by R. Schank and R. Abelson
  - A script is a way of representing what they call “specific knowledge – detailed knowledge about a situation or event that “we have been through many times.”

- **Example**

- **Frames**
  - Proposed by M. Minsky
  - a data-structure for representing a stereotyped situation, like being in a certain kind of living room, or going to a child's birthday party.
  - Implementation: FRL and KRL
Appendix
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Deductions in Symbolic Logic

- QA3
  - Resolution-based deduction system
  - The advantage of resolution
    - Implemented in programs to make deductions from a set of logical statements consisting of "clauses"
  - Ex.
    - 1. ROBOT(Rob) (Rob is a robot.)
    - 2. $(\forall x)[\text{MACHINE}(x) \supset \neg \text{ANIMAL}(x)]$
      (x is a machine implies that it is not an animal.)
      The system is then asked "Is everything an animal?" by having it attempt to deduce the statement
    - 3. $(\forall x)\text{ANIMAL}(x)$
      QA3 answers "NO" and gives a "counterexample"
    - 4. $x = \text{Rob}$
      (This indicates that $\neg \text{ANIMAL}(\text{Rob})$ contradicts what was to be deduced.)
An example of scripts

Figure 11.4: A scene in the restaurant script. (From Roger C. Schank and Robert P. Abelson, Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding: An Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structures, p. 43, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977.)