

Statistical relational learning and neuro-symbolic AI: what does first-order logic offer?

Vaishak Belle*

University of Edinburgh, UK

vaishak@ed.ac.uk

In this paper, our aim is to briefly survey and articulate the logical and philosophical foundations of using (first-order) logic to represent (probabilistic) knowledge in a non-technical fashion. Our motivation is three fold. First, for machine learning researchers unaware of why the research community cares about relational representations, this article can serve as a gentle introduction. Second, for logical experts who are newcomers to the learning area, such an article can help in navigating the differences between finite vs infinite, and subjective probabilities vs random-world semantics. Finally, for researchers from statistical relational learning and neuro-symbolic AI, who are usually embedded in finite worlds with subjective probabilities, appreciating what infinite domains and random-world semantics brings to the table is of utmost theoretical import.

1 Introduction

Statistical relational learning and neuro-symbolic AI are having a growing impact on recent discussions regarding the connection between (deep) learning and logical syntax [24, 32, 17, 6]. These fields are motivated by the use of relations and logical reasoning, specifically entailment and satisfaction, in learning paradigms. They recognize that the world is inherently relational; objects have properties and attributes, employees have employers that are part of organisations, individuals are part of social networks. More elaborately, in biological networks, genes are the fundamental units of heredity that determine the traits of an organism. The process by which genes are expressed in proteins involves several steps, including transcription and translation, that are critical for the proper functioning of cells and organisms. If we need to reason about biological data, then algorithms that harness these relationships and processes are fundamental.

Logical reasoning is crucial to deduce properties about these relationships. For example, if we know that a dog is a mammal and a cat is a mammal, we should be able to deduce that they both give birth to live young, except unless those mammals that are monotremes. On the other hand, if we know that insects cannot be mammals, then we can also deduce that a dog cannot be an insect.

In the insular world of (deep) machine learning, where we assume that objects are atomic and independent, the incorporation of logical artifacts provides a much richer understanding of the world and its objects, leading to a more nuanced and accurate interpretation of the data.

A second important area where the impact of symbols extends to is the notion of explainability in artificial intelligence. While traditionally this area has been about interpreting decision boundaries, it now includes attempts to use logical and programmatic objects to characterize the prediction model. See, for example, recent celebrated successes on deep concept induction [28, 18]. There is the more complex area of constructing mental models of the users and providing explanations relative to that putative user [25]. This area is also governed by symbolic and formal principles. Symbolic principles such as sufficiency and necessity are also being used to explore causal dimensions for explanations [15].

Despite this success and the many syntactic flavors explored in the research community, the underlying logical language is essentially propositional. Almost always, the outputs of the learning model (such as a neural network) are either interpreted probabilistically over a finite set of propositional variables, or as the numeric truth value accorded to a finite set of propositions (in fuzzy logical approaches). Even in a (probabilistic) logic programming setting such as ProbLog, cycle breaking strategies are considered to reduce query-driven reasoning to probabilistic labels over finitely many propositions via weighted model counting [39, 19].

*The material below is adapts discussions from a recent book by the author [7], but has been extended to incorporate details and discussions about neuro-symbolic AI.

In this paper, *our aim is to briefly survey and articulate the logical and philosophical foundations of using (first-order) logic to represent (probabilistic) knowledge in a non-technical fashion.* Our motivation is three fold. First, for machine learning researchers unaware of why the research community cares about relational representations, this article can serve as a gentle introduction. Second, for logical experts who are newcomers to the learning area, such an article can help in navigating the differences between finite vs infinite, and subjective probabilities vs random-world semantics. Finally, for researchers from statistical relational learning (StarAI) and neuro-symbolic AI (NeSyAI), who are usually embedded in finite worlds with subjective probabilities, appreciating what infinite domains and random-world semantics brings to the table is of utmost theoretical import: in fact, one may even argue it is needed to make the area well-defined! StarAI and NeSyAI wishes to generalize to unforeseen examples, and deal with statistical properties, and yet their prove properties for finite models and degrees of belief.

Of course, the use of a relational language (with a finite domain notwithstanding), that only serves as syntactic sugar for the specification for probabilistic models, is not without its advantages. It can greatly simplify the specification of relations and hierarchies over random variables, and can also speed up probabilistic inference in some cases by appealing to first-order resolution [40]. *But by incorporating probabilistic reasoning into first-order logic, we might be able to better deal with infinite domains and incomplete knowledge in a more principled way, and allowing for the specification of random properties (and not simply subjective probabilities, as assumed by current mainstream languages) in an open-world setting.* However, there will still challenges to be addressed, such as the computational complexity of reasoning with large knowledge bases and the need for effective methods of learning from data.

2 Why representation matters

It is worth reflecting on the nature of knowledge representation and how it affects modeling and learning. Regardless of whether we use a logical representation (such as a logic program), a probabilistic one (such as a Bayesian network), or a connectionist one (such as a neural network), our goal is to represent information and capture the knowledge of a robot or vision system. We want to understand how this representation produces interesting conclusions that determine what the robot knows and understands about the world.

While acquisition is undoubtedly important, for now, we are focusing on the language used for representing information. It is crucial to equip this language with tools for modeling and reasoning about the world. In a statement remarkably similar in spirit, Pearl writes [37]:

This is why you will find me emphasizing and reemphasizing notation, language, vocabulary and grammar. For example, I obsess over whether we can express a certain claim in a given language and whether one claim follows from others. My emphasis on language also comes from a deep conviction that language shapes our thoughts. You cannot answer a question that you cannot ask, and cannot ask a question that you have no words for.

Which language should we choose, and what should we represent? Turing machines are foundational structures for investigating the computable universe. They offer minimal, yet powerful read and write operations. However, being a computational abstraction means we have no means to concretely talk about what the robot knows about the environment it operates in. Likewise, binary system code runs robotic software, but is too coarse and opaque to explain a purposeful agent. Vectorized representations and non-linear decision boundaries as obtained by sigmoid neural units over many interconnected layers are also too coarse to explain the functioning of a deep network. Although these models seem capable of capturing a potentially infinite hypothesis space and high-dimensional data, including high-resolution images such as mammograms, an operational description is too opaque for humans to decipher.

Therefore, we require a modeling framework that is understandable to domain experts and allows for the updating and provision of new information, while also being suitable for computational processes. In particular, by a representation, we mean a mapping from one entity to another. The former is concrete and computationally processable. For example, “rain” might stand for the assertion that it is raining today. Reasoning is the computational processing of representations to produce new knowledge. We focus on formal (symbolic) logic, where all information is stored explicitly or implicitly using symbols.

The distinction between explicit and implicit knowledge is important: explicit knowledge is often the information that is directly modelled or provided by the domain expert. This could come in the form of rules, databases, knowledge bases, graphs, or any other structured data. Implicit knowledge is what is obtained from the explicit knowledge through one or more reasoning steps.

Reasoning can be understood in two ways. First, it can define the mathematical framework for obtaining explicit knowledge from implicit knowledge. In logic, we often provide a semantics and/or proof theory that determines when sentences are “entailed” from a knowledge base (a set of sentences). Second, reasoning can provide an implementation strategy for computing entailments: an algorithm that takes a knowledge base and a query as input and outputs whether the query is entailed. Standard platforms for designing such algorithms include theorem provers, model checkers, and satisfiability solvers.

3 Logic and probability: how did we get here?

Leibniz perhaps first suggested that thinking could be understood as symbol manipulation, but it was only with the results of Boole and Frege that an algebraic view of logic became possible. Symbolic logic was primarily used for studying the foundations of mathematics until the 19th century. David Hilbert’s program, Kurt Gödel’s seminal incompleteness theorem, and other such inquiries studied the arithmetic of natural numbers and what logically follows from that arithmetic. John McCarthy, among others, began to see first-order logic as a formalism for capturing commonsense and language only since the 1960s [33, 34, 36]. He suggested that the system’s knowledge could be represented in a formal language, and a general-purpose algorithm could then determine the necessary actions to solve the problem at hand. A major advantage of this approach is that the representation can be scrutinized and understood by external observers, allowing them to improve the system’s behavior by making statements to it.

Numerous such languages emerged in the years to follow, but first-order logic remained at the forefront as a general and powerful option. Unfortunately, one of the main arguments against a logical approach is the pervasive uncertainty present in almost every domain of interest. This uncertainty can manifest in various forms, such as measurement errors (e.g. readings from a thermometer), the absence of categorical assertions (e.g. smoking may be a factor for cancer, but cancer is not an absolute consequence for smokers), and the presence of numerous “latent” factors. These factors include causes that the modeler may not have taken into account, which question the legitimacy of the model.

Modeling uncertain worlds required a rigorous formulation, which has been achieved through probabilistic models, of course. Probabilistic models, obtained either by explicit specification or implicitly induced by modern machine learning methods such as deep learning, have supercharged the application of statistical methods in language understanding, vision, and data analysis more generally.

Despite the success of probabilistic models, we observe that they are essentially propositional, yet are deployed in an inherently relational world. That is, they easily make sense of “flat” data, where atomic events are treated as independent and identically distributed random variables. This realization has led to the design of probabilistic concept languages, culminating in the area of statistical relational learning, neuro-symbolic AI, and other hybrid languages.

Note that there is a considerable history on the unification of logic and probability, including early work by Carnap and Gaifman [13, 20]. Interested readers can refer to [6] for a discussion on the historical development.

4 First-order logic

First-order logic is, as discussed above, a widely studied formalism. To contrast it with popular proposals in statistical learning, let us start with an example often used in that community, which involves smoking within social networks. We will then discuss variations allowed by propositional and first-order logic, while also briefly demonstrating their features. As will become clear, virtually every formalism from that community does not support arbitrary first-order logic. There is one good reason for this: first-order logic is only semi-decidable, and computing entailments is not tractable [11]. (Although first-order logic with reals as its domain is decidable, it is best used to reason about arithmetic properties, as seen in satisfiability modulo solvers.)

Let us imagine two individuals a (for Alice) and b (for Bob) such that a is a smoker and the two are friends. Using $S(x)$ as a predicate to mean x is a smoker and $F(x, y)$ to mean x is a friend of y , we have: $S(a) \wedge F(a, b)$. There are two propositional assertions here, connected using a conjunction, to say both are true in the knowledge base (KB).

Suppose we found that smokers influence those in their social networks to also smoke, in which case, we would wish to add $S(b)$ to the KB. However, rather than working this out by hand, we might wish to express this observation using an implication rule: $S(a) \wedge F(a, b) \supset S(b)$. Such rules involve only constants, and so, with quantifiers, we will be able to

say that the smokers rule applies to every individual: $\forall x,y. S(x) \wedge F(x,y) \supset S(y)$. The quantification is over a “domain of discourse”, which defines the constants to which the expression following the quantification applies.

Naturally, the knowledge base (KB) contains “facts”, i.e., ground atoms, such as $S(a)$ and $F(a,b)$, in addition to quantified formulas. These facts constitute explicit knowledge. By applying these facts to the rules, we can derive $S(b)$, which is implicit in the sense of the terminology used earlier. In this way, the truth value for every instance of $S(x)$ can be determined from explicit or implicit knowledge, similar to a database. This denotes the case of “complete knowledge.”

Incompleteness is usually expressed using disjunctions and existential quantifiers. For example, assuming a third constant c for Carol: $(S(a) \vee S(c)) \wedge \neg(S(a) \wedge S(c))$ says that either Alice or Carol is a smoker but not both.

The use of an existential statement can declare the existence of an individual with a certain property, but not specify who that individual might be. For example, the following sentence states that there is a friend of Alice who is not Carol: $(\exists x. F(x,b)) \wedge \neg F(c,b)$. Suppose we further stipulate that no one can be their own friend: $\forall x. \neg F(x,x)$. Of course, if our domain were finite and consisted only of the individuals discussed so far - $\{a,b,c\}$ - then $F(a,b)$ would follow from the above two sentences. However, if the domain is infinite, then infinitely many candidates are possible friends of Bob, but we are not certain of any one of them.

4.1 Infinite domains

In addition to incomplete information about domains, other types of incomplete knowledge can also be expressed with infinite domains. For instance, when quantifiers range over an infinite set, the sentence $\forall x. x \neq a \supset S(x)$ states that there are infinitely many individuals who are smokers, except for Alice who might or might not be a smoker. Therefore, it models unknown atoms. To represent unknown values, we can use the following sentence: $\forall x(S(x) \supset \text{eyecolor}(x) \neq \text{green})$, which declares that among smokers in our population, of whom there may be infinitely many, none has green eyes.

Although there are a wide range of formalisms in statistical relational learning, constants are typically fixed in advance and are finite. Functions are rarely allowed, and often the interpretation of predicates is fixed as well: that is, the set of ground atoms is fixed, as well as their truth values. When these formalisms allow atoms to be decorated with probabilities, there is some flexibility in terms of the interpretation of predicates, in the sense that a positive instance is more likely than a negative instance, or vice versa.

As noted, the full first-order language, especially over a possibly infinite domain, can allow for unknown sets of atoms, their possible values, and varying sets of objects (e.g., when the set of humans is left open). This makes standard first-order logic a powerful and general-purpose language for representing knowledge, and we believe it can be a promising candidate for the next generation of probabilistic relational models.

In fact, keeping the domain undefined is often referred to as “open-world” modelling. Note that closeness is not difficult to implement in open-world models, should we so wish. For example, the sentence below says that Alice and Bob are both smokers, and everyone else is not: $\forall x[(x = a \vee x = b) \supset S(x)] \wedge ((x \neq a \wedge x \neq b) \supset \neg S(x))$.

4.2 Probabilities on formulas

The standard way to represent incomplete knowledge in symbolic logic is through the use of disjunctions and existential quantifiers. A logical disjunction expresses qualitative uncertainty, but does not commit to which of the disjuncts is more likely than the other.

For example, suppose we toss a coin and find that it lands on heads nine out of ten times. We might believe it is a loaded coin and ascribe a probability of 0.9 to observing heads on the next toss. Suppose we read three plausible reports, two of which suggest that Alice is not a smoker, but the third asserts that she is. We might ascribe a probability of 2/3 to $S(a)$. However, given that a report about Alice being a smoker might have been more recent or that Alice accidentally admitted she occasionally smokes, we might treat it as a true but lesser-known fact and ignore the other reports. Whichever the case may be, we need a language to reason about the *degrees of belief* – i.e., subjective probabilities – of the agent.

One of the simplest and most widely studied approaches to dealing with degrees of belief in logic involves the concept of *possible worlds*, where each world represents a distinct interpretation of the underlying knowledge base. We ascribe a probability (or more generally, a weight) to each world. To determine the probability of a statement $S(a)$, we

sum the probabilities of all worlds where $S(a)$ is true. We may also use weights and consider the ratio of that sum to a *normalization factor*, which is simply the sum of the probabilities of all worlds.

4.3 Probabilities on atoms

Suppose $S(a)$ is believed with a probability of 1. What is the probability that Bob is also a smoker? Given that $S(a)$ is entailed by KB, meaning it holds in every possible model of the KB, we cannot infer anything about $S(b)$ without further information. The probability of $S(b)$ depends on the possible worlds. If $S(b)$ is also entailed by the KB, it would be accorded a probability of 1 as well. However, if some models of the KB did not satisfy $S(b)$, then the probability of $\neg S(b)$ can be obtained by summing the probabilities of all such worlds, say this is r . The probability of $S(b)$ would then be $(1 - r)$. If the worlds all have equal weights, and $S(b)$ is false in r out of n worlds, then the probability of $S(b)$ would be $(n - r)/n$. From a logical viewpoint, the extension of the predicate S is different in every world, and it so happens that a is in every such extension while b is only in some.

Suppose we were able to assign a probability of $4/5$ to Alice and Bob being smokers based on the deterministic rule mentioned above. This rule can be represented in the KB as $4/5: (S(a) \wedge F(a, b)) \supset S(b)$, indicating that in 4 out of 5 worlds, Alice influences her friend to smoke. If all worlds had equal weights, this would mean that Alice influences her friend to smoke in $4/5$ of those worlds.

To further understand the rule, let's consider two scenarios with different probabilities for Alice being a smoker. Assume $\{S(a), F(a, b)\}$ is believed with probability 1. The noisy rule states that $S(b)$ is true in four-fifths of the worlds, giving us a probability of $4/5$ for $S(b)$.

Now, let's assume $F(a, b)$ is believed with probability 1, but $S(a)$ only with a probability of $2/3$. Assuming equal weights to worlds for ease of explanation, $S(a)$ holds in two-thirds of the worlds, and in four-fifths of those worlds, the noisy rule requires that $S(b)$ holds. Therefore, the probability of $S(b)$ is $2/3 \times 4/5 = 8/15$.

Let's consider a simple example where a unique distribution would not arise. Suppose $\forall x, y (F(x, y))$ is believed with probability 1. This means that every individual is a friend of everybody else (including themselves). Now suppose $S(a) \vee S(c)$ is believed with probability 1. In this case, no specification is provided for the individual probabilities of $S(a)$ and $S(c)$. It is not acceptable to assign a probability of 0 to both $S(a)$ and $S(c)$. However, provided that this requirement is satisfied, there are many possibilities. Most statistical relational languages will either disallow such specifications or make assumptions about how the distribution should be defined for such disjunctions. Notable exceptions allowing for imprecise probabilities do exist, but they are often not in a first-order formalism. See [4, 9] for examples that involve first-order logic and multiple distributions.

Suppose we are interested in the probability of $S(b)$ given the noisy smokers rule above and a similar instance resulting from $S(c)$: $4/5: (S(c) \wedge F(c, b)) \supset S(b)$. It is not hard to see that the probability of $S(b)$ should be $4/5$. This is because every world should satisfy $S(a)$ or $S(c)$ or both. Due to the universal rule about everyone being friends, $F(a, c)$ and $F(b, c)$ both hold. Consequently, in four-fifths of the worlds (assuming equal weights for simplicity), the smokers rule would imply that $S(b)$ must hold. Therefore, its probability is also $4/5$.

Suppose we instead said $S(a) \vee S(c)$ with a probability of $1/5$. In one-fifth of the possible worlds, $S(a)$ or $S(c)$ or both would be true. In four-fifths of those worlds, the smokers rule would mean that $S(b)$ must be true as well. Therefore, the probability of $S(b)$ would be $4/5 \times 1/5 = 4/25$ assuming equal weights.

4.4 Probabilities on quantified formulas

The examples from the previous section could be expressed more succinctly with the following noisy quantified rule: $4/5: \forall x, y (S(x) \wedge F(x, y) \supset S(y))$. This rule states that in four-fifths of the worlds (assuming equal weights to worlds), friends of smokers are smokers too.

Suppose we know for certain that Alice and Bob are friends, and we ascribe a probability of $2/3$ to the atom $S(a)$. Then, in two-thirds of the worlds, $S(a)$ holds. In four-fifths of these worlds, the universal rule, together with the certain knowledge that $F(a, b)$, means that $S(b)$ holds. The probability of $S(b)$ is then $2/3 \times 4/5 = 8/15$.

However, one might find it striking how the reading of this rule contrasts with the statistical observation that motivates it. Presumably, we would like to say that in 80% of the population, friends of smokers are also smokers. This is statistical information, of course, but the way the rule is written requires that the rule must hold in four-fifths of the worlds. In

other words, if in every world there is some smoker whose friend is not a smoker, then the rule clearly holds in no world, and so its probability should be 0.

This is an early observation in the field of probabilistic logics [1, 2, 3, 23, ?]. The possible-worlds model with probabilities over worlds is used to define degrees of belief, but it is not appropriate for statistical information. To represent statistical information, a different formal setup is required. This setup, called the *random-worlds* semantics, allows probabilities to be ascribed to domain elements. With this approach, we can reason about the probability of a randomly chosen person being a smoker, or the probability of two randomly chosen individuals being friends, and so on. This would be useful in cases where the smokers universal is known to not be true in the real world.

In most statistical relational and neuro-symbolic languages, the intended statistical interpretation is often ignored, resulting in noisy quantified rules. These rules are commonly interpreted using the possible-worlds model.

Likewise, probabilities on existentially quantified formulas are to be understood the same way. For example: $1/5: \exists x(S(x))$ says that in one-fifth of the worlds (assuming equal weights on worlds), there is someone who is a smoker. It is *not* saying that one out of five individuals is a smoker or that there is a 20% chance that a randomly chosen individual is a smoker.

Both of these topics require a random-worlds semantics, and integrating that with a possible-worlds semantics could be an exciting area of research for mainstream statistical relational and neuro-symbolic AI.

4.5 What lies beneath

ProbLog, probabilistic databases, Markov logic networks, Bayesian networks, factor graphs [38], and their neuro-symbolic extensions can be understood either in terms of a computational framework called *weighted model counting* [?, 39], or via a fuzzy semantics that accords non-binary truth values to atoms. Let us discuss them in turn.

Given a logical language with n propositions, and therefore, 2^n possible truth assignments (or worlds) $\mathcal{M} = \{M_1, \dots, M_{2^n}\}$, consider a weight function μ mapping literals to non-negative reals. By extension, let the weight of a world $\mu(M)$ be defined as the product of the weights of the literals that hold at M . Then the weighted model count of a propositional formula ϕ is defined as:

$$WMC(\phi) \doteq \sum_{\{M \in \mathcal{M}, M \models \phi\}} \mu(M) / \sum_{\{M \in \mathcal{M}\}} \mu(M).$$

A Bayesian network can be encoded as a propositional knowledge base, with the conditional dependences expressed as implications [?, 39]. In Markov logic networks, propositions appearing in a clause correspond to the dependent random variables in an undirected graphical model. The probability function of the nodes can be further expressed in terms of a weight function of the above sort. In this case, the probability of some query q (a propositional formula) is obtained using:

$$WMC(KB \wedge q) / WMC(KB).$$

In other words, relative to the models of KB, we compute the weights of those worlds additionally satisfying q .

There are a few notable exceptions to picture in the statistical relational learning community; see [5] for more discussions. For example, in BLOG [35], function symbols are allowed in the language over an infinite domain, thus supporting open-world modeling. However, for computational reasons, various restrictions are placed both for the language and its implementation. Well-defined programs, for example, restrict the use of logical connectives. When computing probabilities, it avoids instantiating infinitely many terms by sampling values for function symbols. When it comes to termination, moreover, a number of structural conditions need to hold, including one that the quantifiers over formulas can only range over finite sets.

In a second approach to the semantics of neural learning in logic, binary truth is relaxed. In particular, because the outputs of neural networks are real-valued and need to be interpreted logically, there has been a recent revival of fuzzy logic in neuro-symbolic AI [10, 21, 29]. Fuzzy logic allows for degrees of truth, unlike classical logic which assumes a proposition is either true or false. In fuzzy logic, logical connectives are interpreted as maximum and product operators, where the maximum operator corresponds to disjunction and the product operator corresponds to conjunction.

When the inputs to these operators are either 0 or 1, it can be seen that maximum and product collapses to the classical interpretation. However, when the inputs are reals between 0 and 1, formulas are evaluated to values that do not correspond to being strictly true or false. This makes the semantics of complex formulas hard to interpret. Although

there is some research on first-order fuzzy logic over non-finite domains, much of the work on neuro-symbolic AI is limited to finite domains [21].

A common argument in favor of fuzzy logic is that it may be more feasible computationally [41, 42], although this comes at the cost of a hard-to-interpret semantics. However, recent discussions have raised the point that neural networks are trained for conditional probabilities, making it reasonable to interpret the output in a probabilistic manner [41, 42]. As a result, it may be more appropriate to consider using probabilistic (logical) languages. Striking a balance between ease of computation and interpretability of semantics is crucial, and perhaps the final decision may depend on the specific application.

5 Outlook and conclusions

In the above sections, we discussed the importance of reasoning using the friends-smokers example. We also explored the advantages of first-order logic in terms of the expressiveness it offers for open-world scenarios. However, we did not delve into the strategies that allow us to reason in a decidable way with fragments of first-order logic. Fortunately, there are numerous methods available to tackle this issue, and we shall mention them in brief.

As is well known, areas such as descriptive complexity and finite model theory demonstrate that logic could serve as an abstraction for understanding computation vis-à-vis representation. It is also well-known that there is a trade-off between the expressiveness of the language and the tractability of the reasoning task.

On the one hand it is widely acknowledged that relations and more generally, the expressiveness of first-order logic is extremely useful for capturing language and concepts required for common-sense reasoning. This explains the use of first-order logic in database theory, statistical relational learning, automated planning, knowledge representation (e.g., description logics, and reasoning about actions) and verification. But at the same time the entailment problem is only semi-decidable.

Since Goedel's celebrated results on the intractability of logic, there has been a wide range of approaches to deal with this trade-off especially in the knowledge representation, symbolic computation and the statistical relational learning communities. They can be broadly classified into three categories. The easiest approach is to simply restrict the language to propositional logic. Popular frameworks in statistical relational learning such as Markov logic networks and relational Bayesian networks as well as relational probabilistic planning languages take this approach [16, 26, 31, 43].

A second approach is to limit the expressiveness of the language in terms of the size of the predicates (but not necessarily in terms of the size of the domain). Description logics are popular concept representation languages in knowledge representation that only allow predicates with utmost two arguments. When the domain is further assumed to be finite, certain other computational tasks beyond entailment turn out to be tractable [12, 27].

A third approach, stemming from the knowledge representation community but less popular in other communities, is to limit reasoning. Here, the entailment relation itself is weakened by way of introducing non-traditional semantics [30]. However, because the semantical apparatus is often complicated, they have understandably not been pursued by or used in other communities.

Somewhere in between the three approaches, there is also the well-known Horn clause restriction, seen most prominently in logic programming and its derivatives. It potentially allows for an infinite Herbrand universe, but the grounding of the program is only performed against a ground query, which permits a propositional encoding sometimes [19]. This enables the use of logic programming in a wide variety of applications, including statistical relational learning by decorating clauses further with probabilities. But most common flavors are limited in only allowing one positive literal in a clause, and is non-monotonic.

A fourth approach is to exploit symmetries in first-order representations. For example, the area of lifted reasoning avoids grounding a probabilistic relational model by appealing to first-order resolution [40]. In somewhat a similar spirit, a recent result shows that there is an intuitive fragment of first-order disjunctive knowledge, for which reasoning is decidable and can be reduced to propositional satisfiability [8]. Knowledge bases in this fragment essentially amounts to universally quantified first-order clauses, but without arity restrictions and without restrictions on the appearance of negation. Queries, however, are expected to be ground formulas. They achieve this result is by showing how the entailment over infinitely many infinite-sized structures can be reduced to a search over finitely many finite-size structures. The crux of the argument lies in showing that names not mentioned in the knowledge base and the query behave identically (in a suitable formal sense).

Overall, if we extend the statistical relational and neuro-symbolic formalisms to full first-order expressiveness, some of these strategies need to be combined and extended carefully, and this is an exciting area for future research.

References

- [1] M. Abadi and J. Halpern. Decidability and expressiveness for first-order logics of probability. *Information and Computation*, 112(1):1 – 36, 1994.
- [2] F. Bacchus, A. Grove, J. Y. Halpern, and D. Koller. Forming beliefs about a changing world. In *Proc. AAAI*, pages 222–229, 1994.
- [3] F. Bacchus, A. J. Grove, J. Y. Halpern, and D. Koller. From statistical knowledge bases to degrees of belief. *Artificial intelligence*, 87(1-2):75–143, 1996.
- [4] F. Bacchus, J. Y. Halpern, and H. J. Levesque. Reasoning about noisy sensors and effectors in the situation calculus. *Artificial Intelligence*, 111(1-2):171 – 208, 1999.
- [5] V. Belle. Open-universe weighted model counting. In *AAAI*, 2017.
- [6] V. Belle. Logic meets learning: From aristotle to neural networks. In *Neuro-Symbolic Artificial Intelligence: The State of the Art*, pages 78–102. IOS Press, 2021.
- [7] V. Belle. Toward robots that reason: Logic, probability & causal laws. 2023.
- [8] V. Belle and B. Juba. Implicitly learning to reason in first-order logic. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [9] V. Belle and G. Lakemeyer. Reasoning about probabilities in unbounded first-order dynamical domains. In *IJCAI*, 2017.
- [10] T. R. Besold, A. d. Garcez, S. Bader, H. Bowman, P. Domingos, P. Hitzler, K.-U. Kühnberger, L. C. Lamb, D. Lowd, P. M. V. Lima, et al. Neural-symbolic learning and reasoning: A survey and interpretation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.03902*, 2017.
- [11] E. Boerger, E. Grädel, and Y. Gurevich. *The classical decision problem*. Springer Verlag, 1997.
- [12] D. Calvanese, G. De Giacomo, D. Lembo, M. Lenzerini, and R. Rosati. Data complexity of query answering in description logics. *Artificial Intelligence*, 195:335–360, 2013.
- [13] R. Carnap. *Logical foundations of probability*. Routledge and Kegan Paul London, 1951.
- [14] M. Chavira and A. Darwiche. On probabilistic inference by weighted model counting. *Artif. Intell.*, 172(6-7):772–799, 2008.
- [15] H. Chockler, D. Kroening, and Y. Sun. Explanations for occluded images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1234–1243, 2021.
- [16] J. Corander, T. Janhunen, J. Rintanen, H. J. Nyman, and J. Pensar. Learning chordal markov networks by constraint satisfaction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26: 27th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2013. Proceedings of a meeting held December 5-8, 2013, Lake Tahoe, Nevada, United States.*, pages 1349–1357, 2013.
- [17] A. d’Avila Garcez and L. C. Lamb. Neurosymbolic ai: The 3rd wave. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2012, 2020.
- [18] K. Ellis, A. Solar-Lezama, and J. Tenenbaum. Sampling for bayesian program learning. In *NIPS*, pages 1289–1297, 2016.
- [19] D. Fierens, G. V. den Broeck, I. Thon, B. Gutmann, and L. D. Raedt. Inference in probabilistic logic programs using weighted CNF’s. In *UAI*, pages 211–220, 2011.
- [20] H. Gaifman. Concerning measures in first order calculi. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 2(1):1–18, 1964.
- [21] A. S. d. Garcez, K. Broda, D. M. Gabbay, et al. *Neural-symbolic learning systems: foundations and applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2002.
- [22] J. Halpern. An analysis of first-order logics of probability. *Artificial Intelligence*, 46(3):311–350, 1990.
- [23] J. Y. Halpern. *Reasoning about Uncertainty*. MIT Press, 2003.
- [24] P. Hitzler. Neuro-symbolic artificial intelligence: The state of the art. 2022.
- [25] S. Kambhampati. Challenges of human-aware ai systems. *AI Magazine*, 41(3), 2020.
- [26] S. Kok and P. Domingos. Learning markov logic networks using structural motifs. In *ICML*, pages 551–558, 2010.
- [27] D. Koller, A. Levy, and A. Pfeffer. P-classic: a tractable probabilistic description logic. In *Proc. AAAI / IAAI*, pages 390–397, 1997.
- [28] B. M. Lake, R. Salakhutdinov, and J. B. Tenenbaum. Human-level concept learning through probabilistic program induction. *Science*, 350(6266):1332–1338, 2015.
- [29] L. C. Lamb, A. Garcez, M. Gori, M. Prates, P. Avelar, and M. Vardi. Graph neural networks meet neural-symbolic computing: A survey and perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.00330*, 2020.

- [30] Y. Liu and H. J. Levesque. Tractable reasoning in first-order knowledge bases with disjunctive information. In *Proc. AAAI*, pages 639–644, 2005.
- [31] D. Lowd and A. Rooshenas. Learning markov networks with arithmetic circuits. In *AISTATS*, 2013.
- [32] R. Manhaeve, S. Dumancic, A. Kimmig, T. Demeester, and L. De Raedt. Deepproblog: Neural probabilistic logic programming. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- [33] J. McCarthy. Programs with common sense. In *Semantic Information Processing*, pages 403–418. MIT Press, 1968.
- [34] J. McCarthy. Situations, Actions and Causal Laws. Technical report, Stanford University, 1963. Also in M. Minsky (ed.), *Semantic Information Processing*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1968.
- [35] B. Milch, B. Marthi, S. J. Russell, D. Sontag, D. L. Ong, and A. Kolobov. BLOG: Probabilistic models with unknown objects. In *Proc. IJCAI*, pages 1352–1359, 2005.
- [36] L. Morgenstern and S. A. McIlraith. John McCarthy’s legacy. *Artificial Intelligence*, 175(1):1 – 24, 2011.
- [37] J. Pearl and D. Mackenzie. *The book of why*.
- [38] L. D. Raedt, K. Kersting, S. Natarajan, and D. Poole. Statistical relational artificial intelligence: Logic, probability, and computation. *Synthesis Lectures on Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning*, 10(2):1–189, 2016.
- [39] T. Sang, P. Beame, and H. A. Kautz. Performing bayesian inference by weighted model counting. In *AAAI*, pages 475–482, 2005.
- [40] G. Van den Broeck. *Lifted Inference and Learning in Statistical Relational Models*. PhD thesis, KU Leuven, 2013.
- [41] E. van Krieken, E. Acar, and F. van Harmelen. Analyzing differentiable fuzzy implications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03472*, 2020.
- [42] E. van Krieken, E. Acar, and F. van Harmelen. Analyzing differentiable fuzzy logic operators. *Artificial Intelligence*, 302:103602, 2022.
- [43] H. Younes and M. Littman. PPDDL 1. 0: An extension to pddl for expressing planning domains with probabilistic effects. Technical report, Carnegie Mellon University, 2004.