

# Project 1

## Using SNARK for an Ontology of Furniture

### CSE 4/563, Knowledge Representation

### Due Tuesday, October 27, 2009

Professor Stuart C. Shapiro

February 9, 2008

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Ontologies

In philosophy, “ontology” is the study of what there is. In AI, there have been many definitions of “ontology”, but simply put, an “ontology” is a taxonomy of the terms in some domain of knowledge, possibly along with other domain rules relating the terms. In this project you will create an ontology of furniture, represent the ontology in the language of SNARK [1], and use SNARK to answer some questions about the ontology.

### 1.2 SNARK

SNARK (SRI’s New Automated Reasoning Kit) [1] may be used as a KRR system by performing the following steps. (See also [2].)

1. Run Common Lisp on `nickelback.cse.buffalo.edu` or on `timberlake.cse.buffalo.edu`.
2. Load the ask/query SNARK interface and SNARK itself, by entering the Lisp command  
`:ld /projects/shapiro/CSE563/ask`
3. Change the Common Lisp listener’s package to `snark-user` by entering the Lisp command  
`:pa snark-user`
4. Load a knowledge base.
5. Ask the system questions.

The first Lisp form in the knowledge base file must be `(initialize)`. This must be followed by assertions in the format `(assert wfp)`, where *wfp* is a quoted form in the syntax required by SNARK. This is a CLIF-like syntax using the connectives `not`, `and`, `or`, `implies`, and `iff`. “Various synonyms are accepted” [1], including `=>` for `implies`. Then `prove` may be called, or, as an alternative, the `query` or `ask` function from `/projects/shapiro/CSE563/ask.cl` may be used. Note that if you use `prove` you must evaluate `(new-row-context)` between successive calls to `prove`. For an example knowledge base (KB) file, see `/projects/shapiro/CSE563/Examples/SNARK/CarPoolWorld.cl`.

An example run of a propositional CarPoolWorld system using SNARK and the query front end follows. Most of the output produced by the loading of snark has been deleted.

```
cl-user(1): :ld /projects/shapiro/CSE563/Examples/SNARK/CarPoolWorld
```

```
...
```

```
To start using SNARK, change the package to snark-user.  
Then use (initialize), (assert <wfp>), and (prove <wfp>).  
; Running SNARK from ...
```

```
Ask if ''Tom is the driver or Betty is the driver''  
    is implied by the KB. (True.)  
(ask '(or TomIsTheDriver BettyIsTheDriver)) = True
```

```
Ask if ''Betty is the driver  
    implies that Betty is not the passenger''  
    is implied. (True.)  
(ask '(=> BettyIsTheDriver (not BettyIsThePassenger))) = True
```

```
Ask if ''Tom drives Betty and Tom is the passenger'' is implied. (False.)  
(ask '(and TomDrivesBetty TomIsThePassenger)) = False
```

```
Ask if ''Betty drives Tom'' is implied by the KB. (Unknown.)  
(ask '(BettyDrivesTom)) = Unknown
```

Notice that (ask *wfp*) can return True, False, or Unknown. It returns True if *wfp* can be proved from the KB, False if (not *wfp*) can be proved from the KB, and Unknown if there are models that satisfy  $KB \wedge wfp$  as well as models that satisfy  $KB \wedge \neg wfp$ . We know that ask will terminate and return one of these answers because resolution refutation is a decision procedure for propositional logic.

If you evaluate (query *comment wfp*), the comment is printed, (ask *wfp*) is called, and then the call to ask is printed along with the value it returns. The query function is the most convenient SNARK front-end to use at the end of a KB file, because you just load the file, and see what questions were posed to SNARK and how they were answered.

## 2 The Project

### 2.1 Project Statement

You are to use SNARK to implement and demonstrate a propositional logic version of an ontology of furniture.

### 2.2 Background

#### 2.2.1 Category Hierarchies

Articles of furniture can be categorized in a taxonomy (in computer science, also called a hierarchy or tree). For example, among the kinds of furniture are desks, chairs, and tables, and among the kinds of chairs are desk chairs, rocking chairs, and armchairs.

We will treat the subcategory relation as reflexive. That means that every category is a subcategory of itself. For example, the category of chairs is a subcategory of the category of chairs. If we want to talk about a subcategory of *A* other than *A* itself, we will call it a **proper subcategory** of *A*. For example, the category of armchairs is a proper subcategory of the category of chairs. (There are chairs that are not armchairs.)

An important property of hierarchies is that the subcategory relation is **transitive**. For example, since the category of armchairs is a subcategory of the category of chairs, and the category of chairs is a subcategory of articles of furniture, then the category of armchairs is a subcategory of the category of articles of furniture.

### 2.2.2 An Issue of Semantics

You will use propositional logic for this project. But this raises an issue of semantics. What is the intensional semantics of an atom like *Armchair*? (It is traditional in KR to use the singular rather than the plural to name a category, that is *Armchair* rather than *Armchairs*.) Above, we spoke about the category of armchairs. So is  $[Armchair]$  the category of armchairs? In propositional logic, the intensional semantics of an atomic proposition is a proposition, something that can be True or False. The category of armchairs is not a proposition, and can't be True or False. So, if we're to retain the usual flavor of propositional logic, we'd have to imagine that we're talking about a particular thing, and  $[Armchair]$  would be "*It's an armchair.*" Then  $(Armchair \Rightarrow Chair)$  makes sense—"If it's an armchair then it's a chair." The transitivity of the subcategory relation is captured by the transitivity of  $\Rightarrow$ ; that is,  $[(A \Rightarrow B) \wedge (B \Rightarrow C)] \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow C)$ . Similarly, the reflexivity of the subcategory relation is captured by the reflexivity of  $\Rightarrow$ ; that is,  $A \Rightarrow A$ .

### 2.2.3 Instances

In our commonsense understanding of the world of furniture, we not only have categories of furniture, we also have particular, individual pieces of furniture. For example, we not only have the category of desk chairs, we also have my particular, individual desk chair. We say that that chair is **an instance** of the category of desk chairs. Things can work out if we are careful in our intensional semantics. For example, we can declare the intensional semantics of some atomic proposition, say *deskchair31*, to be "*It's Prof. Shapiro's desk chair.*" Then, if  $[DeskChair]$  is "*It's a desk chair*", the wfp  $(deskchair31 \Rightarrow DeskChair)$  makes sense, and accords with our understanding of the world.

Notice that an instance of some category is also an instance of all supercategories of that category. For example, *deskchair31* is an instance of desk chairs, an instance of chairs, and an instance of articles of furniture.

### 2.2.4 Partitions and Other Category Groupings

If  $B$ ,  $C$ , and  $D$  are proper subcategories of  $A$ , we say that they **exhaust**  $A$  if every proper subcategory of  $A$  must be a subcategory of  $B$ ,  $C$  or  $D$ , and every instance of  $A$  must be an instance of  $B$ ,  $C$ , or  $D$ .

We say that a set of categories are **mutually exclusive** or **mutually disjoint** if any subcategory of one is not a subcategory of the others, and every instance of one is not an instance of the others.

We say that a set of categories,  $B_1, \dots, B_n$  **partition** a category  $A$ , if:  $B_1$ , and  $\dots$ , and  $B_n$  are proper subcategories of  $A$ ;  $B_1$ , and  $\dots$ , and  $B_n$  exhaust  $A$ ; and  $B_1$ , and  $\dots$ , and  $B_n$  are mutually disjoint.

### 2.2.5 Multiple Inheritance

Although hierarchies usually form a tree (every category has at most one immediate supercategory), there may be multiple ways to categorize a domain, so that one category winds up being an immediate subcategory of several supercategories, one in each way of categorizing the domain. For example, besides categorizing furniture as desks, chairs, tables, etc., we could also categorize articles of furniture by where they will be used, such as office furniture, dining room furniture, bedroom furniture, etc., and by stores that carry furniture, such as furniture available from Fred's Furniture Store, Arnold's Office Furniture, etc. The category of dining room tables available from Fred's Furniture Store is then a subcategory of tables and of dining room furniture and of furniture available from Fred's Furniture Store, and my desk chair is an instance of both chairs and of office furniture.

Multiple inheritance is indicated when an individual can be an instance of several categories, or a category can be a subcategory of several supercategories, none of which are subcategories of any of the others.

### 2.2.6 Negative Information

It is easy to imagine asking your system questions of the form "*if it's A, is it B?*" For example, to ask "*If it's a desk chair, is it a chair?*", you might ask  $(\Rightarrow DeskChair Chair)$  and you'd expect to get the answer **True**. In fact, unless we tell the system what individual we're considering (by saying something like "*It's deskchair31.*"), all the questions will be conditionals—questions of the form  $(\Rightarrow A B)$ , where  $A$  and  $B$  are not necessarily atomic. Could we ever expect to get an answer of **False** to such a question? If we do get an answer of **False**, that means that a wfp of the form  $(\text{not } (\Rightarrow A B))$  is **True**. However,  $(\text{not } (\Rightarrow A B))$  is logically equivalent

to (and A (not B)), which we could not expect to be implied by the KB unless we've told it A (or something that implies A). An example of what this means is that to get the system to tell us that *If it's a bedroom chair, it's not available from Arnold's Office Furniture*, we should not expect to get an answer of `False` to the question (`=> BRChair ArnoldsFurniture`), but an answer of `True` to the question (`=> BRChair (not ArnoldsFurniture)`).

## 2.3 The Task

You are to create a knowledge base of an ontology of furniture. You must collect your data from actual reference sources, such as dictionaries and web sites of furniture stores and furniture manufacturers, and you must cite your sources properly in your paper. You are not to make up the data on your own, nor should you use the examples in this paper without finding additional sources for them. Your knowledge base must include:

**multiple inheritance:** at least two categories that are each subcategories of at least two supercategories neither of which is a subcategory of the other;

**disjoint categories:** at least one category with at least three subcategories that are mutually disjoint but do not exhaust their supercategory;

**partitions:** at least one category, which is partitioned by its subcategories.

**sufficient depth:** no leaf category may be an immediate subcategory of a root category.

**multiple examples:** every non-leaf category must have at least two immediate subcategories.

You are to include a demonstration of your system that uses the `query` function to ask SNARK questions that you devise. If *A*, *B*, and *C* are wfps, not necessarily atomic, your questions must include at least one of each of the following forms for which the answer is `True`:

- $A \Rightarrow B$  testing the transitivity of the subclass relation;
- $A_1 \vee \dots \vee A_n \Rightarrow B$ , with the  $A_i$  being immediate subcategories of at least two different categories, also testing the transitivity of the subclass relation;
- $A \Rightarrow \neg B$  testing the mutual disjointness of some classes;
- $A \Rightarrow B_1 \vee \dots \vee B_n$  testing the exhaustiveness of some subcategories;
- $A \wedge \neg B_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg B_n \Rightarrow C$  also testing the exhaustiveness of some subcategories.

Do not use the same categories for all of these.

In addition,

- you must ask at least one question for which the answer is `Unknown`,

and

- every derivation answered `True` must require at least two reasoning steps.

## 2.4 Deliverables

As it says on the CSE 4/563 web page, you are to

“hand in a paper, produced using a document formatting program such as LaTeX or Microsoft Word, and printed on 8.5 by 11 inch paper, stapled in the upper left-hand corner, with a title, your name(s) user name(s), and other identifying information at the top of the first page (Do not use the header page automatically produced by the printer), plus a well-documented listing and run of your program. (Do not enclose your paper in a folder or cover.) The main product of your work is the paper, not the program!”  
[3]




Figure 1: Graphical presentation of furniture as presented in this writeup.

The paper is due at the start of class, on the date specified in the title of this document.

In addition to the paper, you are to **submit** (using `submit_cse463` or `submit_cse563`) your program, so that it can be run and checked if the instructors choose. You are to submit your program by 1:30 PM on the date due, so that you can get to class by 2:00 PM to hand in the paper.

Note that “your program” is the KB file and the sequence of calls to `query`. In fact, for ease of testing and debugging, your KB file can end with the sequence of calls to `query`, as does `/projects/shapiro/CSE563/Examples/SNARK/CarPoolWorld.cl`. Name your file `proj1KB.cl`.

### 2.4.1 The Paper

Your paper should have the following parts:

1. Descriptive title
2. Author identification
3. Introduction: general description of the project
4. Domain: English description of the domain your program works in
5. Formalism
  - (a) Syntax and intensional semantics of atomic propositions, ordered alphabetically
  - (b) English and formal presentation of information in the KB
6. Discussions and demonstrations of significant aspects of your program.
7. Acknowledgments as needed
8. References as needed

In §5b of your paper you must include a graphical presentation of your ontology, as illustrated in Figure 1 and you must explicitly point out where you satisfy each of the points listed under “KB” in the following Grading Table, and in §6, you must separately demonstrate and discuss each of the required points listed under “Questions” in the Grading Table. The grader might run your submitted program to check that it really does what you claim in the paper, but **it will be assumed that you have not done anything you do not explicitly discuss in the paper**. In particular, you must accompany each query with an informal English explanation of the reasoning your system goes through to answer it, to show that at least two reasoning steps are required. For example, an explanation of the answer to the first query about CarPool World given on page 2 might be:

Tom drives Betty or Betty drives Tom. If Tom drives Betty, then Tom is the driver. If Betty drives Tom, then Betty is the driver. Therefore, either Tom is the driver or Betty is the driver.

The fact that there are two “*if...then*” statements and one “*Therefore*” conclusion in this explanation shows that there are three reasoning steps involved.

## 2.5 Grading

Project grading will be according to the following table.

|                                                                                      | CSE 463    | CSE 563    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| <b>KB</b>                                                                            |            |            |
| Multiple inheritance                                                                 | 5          | 5          |
| Disjoint categories                                                                  | 5          | 5          |
| Partitions                                                                           | 5          | 5          |
| Sufficient depth                                                                     | 5          | 5          |
| Multiple examples                                                                    | 5          | 5          |
| <b>KB Subtotal</b>                                                                   | <b>25</b>  | <b>25</b>  |
| <b>Questions</b>                                                                     |            |            |
| True question of form $A \Rightarrow B$                                              | 5          | 5          |
| True question of form $A_1 \vee \dots \vee A_n \Rightarrow B$                        | 5          | 5          |
| True question of form $A \Rightarrow \neg B$                                         | 5          | 5          |
| True question of form $A \Rightarrow B_1 \vee \dots \vee B_n$                        | 5          | 5          |
| True question of form $A \wedge \neg B_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg B_n \Rightarrow C$ | 5          | 5          |
| Not same categories                                                                  | 6          | 5          |
| At least two reasoning steps for each True question                                  | 6          | 5          |
| At least one Unknown question                                                        | 5          | 5          |
| <b>Questions Subtotal</b>                                                            | <b>42</b>  | <b>40</b>  |
| <b>Paper</b>                                                                         |            |            |
| Paper format                                                                         | 4          | 4          |
| General project description                                                          | 4          | 4          |
| English description of domain                                                        | 4          | 4          |
| Reference cited for all data                                                         | 4          | 4          |
| Syntax and semantics of atomic propositions                                          | 4          | 5          |
| Description of formalization of KB                                                   | 3          | 3          |
| Graphical presentation of ontology                                                   | 3          | 3          |
| Discussions and demonstrations                                                       | 3          | 3          |
| Acknowledgments and References                                                       | 4          | 5          |
| <b>Paper Subtotal</b>                                                                | <b>33</b>  | <b>35</b>  |
| <b>Project Total</b>                                                                 | <b>100</b> | <b>100</b> |

## Acknowledgments

Prof. Shapiro appreciates the advice of Richard Waldinger, SRI International, on the SNARK function (`new-row-context`) that flushes clauses generated after the assertions.

## References

1. Mark E. Stickel, Richard J. Waldinger, & Vinay K. Chaudhri, "A Guide to SNARK", <http://www.ai.sri.com/snark/tutorial/tutorial.html>.
2. Stuart C. Shapiro, "UB CSE2/563 System Documentation," <http://www.cse.buffalo.edu/~shapiro/Courses/CSE563/2009Fall/resources.html#snark>
3. Stuart C. Shapiro, "UB CSE4/563," <http://www.cse.buffalo.edu/~shapiro/Courses/CSE563/2009Fall/>.