

# Knowledge Representation and Reasoning Logics for Artificial Intelligence

Stuart C. Shapiro

Department of Computer Science and Engineering  
and Center for Cognitive Science

University at Buffalo, The State University of New York  
Buffalo, NY 14260-2000

`shapiro@cse.buffalo.edu`

copyright ©1995, 2004–2010 by Stuart C. Shapiro

# Contents

## Part I

1. Introduction .....	4
2. Propositional Logic .....	19
3. Predicate Logic Over Finite Models .....	173
4. Full First-Order Predicate Logic .....	224
5. Summary of Part I .....	362

## Part II

6. Prolog .....	375
7. A Potpourri of Subdomains .....	411
8. SNePS .....	429
9. Belief Revision/Truth Maintenance .....	516
10. The Situation Calculus .....	570
11. Summary .....	589

## Part III

12. Production Systems.....	602
13. Description Logic .....	611
14. Abduction .....	628

# 10 The Situation Calculus

# Motivation (McCarthy)

I'm in my study at home. My car is in the garage. I want to get to the airport. How do I decide that I should walk to the garage and drive to the airport, rather than vice versa?

A commonsense planning problem.

# Solution Sketch

My study and garage are in my home.

To get from one place to another in my home, I should walk.

My garage and the airport are in the county.

To get from one place to another in the county, I should drive.

# Situations

When an agent acts, some propositions change as a result of acting, and some are independent of acting.

E.g. the fact that the airport is in the county is independent of my acting, but whether I'm in my study, in the garage, or at the airport, changes when I act.

We say that an act takes us from one situation to another.

Propositions that are dependent on situations are called propositional fluents. E.g. *At(study, S0)*, *At(garage, S1)* vs. *In(study, home)*, *In(airport, county)*

# Situational Fluents

We can view an act as something that's done in some situation, and takes us to another situation.

Let  $do(a, s)$  be a two-argument functional term.

$\llbracket do(a, s) \rrbracket =$  the situation that results from doing the act  $\llbracket a \rrbracket$  in the situation  $\llbracket s \rrbracket$ .

So,  $At(study, S0), At(garage, do(walk(study, garage), S0))$

# Planning in the Situational Calculus

Describe the situation  $S_0$ .

Give domain rules describing the effects of actions.

Find a solution for  $At(airport, ?s)$

# Formalization in SNARK

## Non-Fluent Propositions

```
(assert '(Walkable home))  
(assert '(Drivable county))  
(assert '(In study home))  
(assert '(In garage home))  
(assert '(In garage county))  
(assert '(In airport county))
```

# Effect Axioms

```
(assert '(all (x y z s)
              (=> (and (At x s) (In x z) (In y z)
                       (Walkable z))
                  (At y (do (walk x y) s))))))
```

```
(assert '(all (x y z s)
              (=> (and (At x s) (In x z) (In y z)
                       (Drivable z))
                  (At y (do (drive x y) s))))))
```

## Initial Situation

```
(assert '(At study S0))
```

# SNARK Solves the Problem

```
(query "How do you go to the airport?"  
      '(At airport ?s)  
      :answer '(By doing ?s))
```

How do you go to the airport?

```
(ask '(At airport ?s))  
= (At airport (do (drive garage airport)  
                 (do (walk study garage) S0)))
```

# Example 2: BlocksWorld

## Domain Axioms

```
(assert '(all s (Clear Table s)))
```

```
(assert '(all (x y s) (=> (and (Block y) (On x y s))  
                            (not (Clear y s)))))
```

```
(assert '(all (x s) (=> (Held x s)  
                        (not (Clear x s)))))
```

# BlocksWorld Effect Axioms

```
(assert
  '(all (x y s) (=> (and (On x y s) (Clear x s))
                    (and (Held x (do (pickUp x) s))
                        (Clear y (do (pickUp x) s))))))
```

```
(assert
  '(all (x y s) (=> (and (Held x s) (Clear y s))
                    (and (On x y (do (putOn x y) s))
                        (not (Held x (do (putOn x y) s)))
                        (Clear x (do (putOn x y) s))))))
```

# Initial Situation

```
(assert '(Block A))  
(assert '(Block B))  
(assert '(Block C))  
(assert '(On A B S0))  
(assert '(On B Table S0))  
(assert '(On C Table S0))  
(assert '(Clear A S0))  
(assert '(Clear C S0))
```

# Solving A Simple Problem

```
(query "How do you achieve holding Block A?"  
      '(Held A ?s)  
      :answer '(By doing ?s))
```

How do you achieve holding Block A?

```
(ask '(Held A ?s)) = (By doing (do (pickUp A) S0))
```

# A Harder Problem

```
(query "How do you put Block A on Block C"  
      '(On A C ?s)  
      :answer '(By doing ?s))
```

Just loops!

# The Frame Problem

We want

```
(On A C (do (putOn A C) (do (pickUp A) S0)))
```

but this requires C to be clear in situation

```
(do (pickUp A) S0)
```

That can't be decided.

We need to specify what propositional fluents **don't change** when an action is performed.

# A Frame Axiom

```
(assert
  '(all (x y s) (=> (and (Clear x s) (not (= x y)))
                    (Clear x (do (pickUp y) s)))))
```

# Another Problem

Still doesn't work, because we don't know that  
(not (= C A))

# Unique Names Axioms

```
(assert '(not (= A B)))  
(assert '(not (= A C)))  
(assert '(not (= B C)))
```

Also need

```
(use-paramodulation)
```

after (initialize)

This includes the theory of equality with resolution.

# Success!

```
(query "How do you put Block A on Block C" '(On A C ?s)
      :answer '(By doing ?s))
```

How do you put Block A on Block C

```
(ask '(On A C ?s))
= (By doing (do (putOn A C) (do (pickUp A) S0)))
```