

ULLER: A Unified Language for Learning and Reasoning

Emile van Krieken^{1,7}[0000–0001–5502–4817], Samy
Badreddine^{2,3,4,7}[0000–0003–1624–9188], Robin Manhaeve⁵[0000–0001–9907–7486],
and Eleonora Giunchiglia⁶[0000–0001–9313–753X]

¹ University of Edinburgh

² Sony AI

³ Fondazione Bruno Kessler

⁴ University of Trento

⁵ KU Leuven

⁶ TU Vienna

⁷ Equal contribution

Abstract The field of neuro-symbolic artificial intelligence (NeSy), which combines learning and reasoning, has recently experienced significant growth. There now are a wide variety of NeSy frameworks, each with its own specific language for expressing background knowledge and how to relate it to neural networks. This heterogeneity hinders accessibility for newcomers and makes comparing different NeSy frameworks challenging. We propose a unified language for NeSy, which we call ULLER, a Unified Language for LEarning and Reasoning. ULLER encompasses a wide variety of settings, while ensuring that knowledge described in it can be used in existing NeSy systems. We define a neuro-symbolic first-order syntax, along with example semantics including classical, fuzzy, and probabilistic logics. Finally, we believe ULLER is a first step towards making NeSy research more accessible and comparable, paving the way for libraries that streamline training and evaluation across a multitude of semantics, knowledge bases, and NeSy systems.

1 Introduction

Deep learning has driven innovation in many fields for almost a decade. Among the many reasons behind its central role is how easy it is to apply it to a multitude of problems. Recently, neuro-symbolic (NeSy) methods (see, e.g., [25,4,44,17,30,51,20]), which belong to the NeSy subfield *informed machine learning*, [16,47] have overcome some well-known problems affecting deep learning models by exploiting the *background knowledge* available for the problem at hand. For example, they showed how knowledge can help in (i) training models with fewer data points and/or incomplete supervisions, (ii) creating models that are compliant by-design with a set of requirements, and (iii) being more robust when making predictions for out-of-distribution datapoints. However, the presence of background knowledge makes it more challenging to obtain the “frictionless reproducibility” [13] which characterises machine learning (ML). Indeed,

in the ML field, shared datasets and clear evaluation metrics allow ML practitioners to quickly get started with evaluating new methods and comparing it to existing work. To achieve this goal for NeSy research, we also need frictionless sharing of knowledge. Current NeSy frameworks all have different approaches to encode the background knowledge: some use logical languages, like first-order [4,30], propositional [2,50,17], logic programming [25] or answer set programming [51] - with a wide array of different syntaxes - while other methods use plain Python programs [11]. See Section 5 for an overview. Therefore, to compare the performance of different NeSy systems, a researcher needs to specify the same knowledge in many languages. This is a significant barrier for researchers new to the field, and even for experts, it is a time-consuming and error-prone task.

ULLER, a Unified Language for LEarning and Reasoning In this paper, we take a first step towards frictionless sharing of knowledge in the NeSy field by proposing a *Unified Language for Learning and Reasoning* (ULLER - pronounced “OOH-ler” like the god of the Norse mythology). ULLER allows us to express the knowledge used in informed machine learning and then choose and compare different NeSy systems on that knowledge. The long-term goal is to create a Python library implementing ULLER that is shared among the significant NeSy systems. First, the user would express the knowledge in ULLER. Then, they would load the data, after which the different NeSy systems are called to train and/or use the knowledge at inference time with a single line of code. This allows the NeSy community *(i)* to define benchmarks that include both data and knowledge, *(ii)* to easily compare the available NeSy systems on such benchmarks, and *(iii)* to lower the entry barrier to the NeSy frameworks for the broader machine learning community.

To achieve the above, we have to decouple the *syntax* of the knowledge representation from the *semantics* given by the NeSy system. The syntax of ULLER, defined in Section 2, acts as syntactic sugar around first-order logic (FOL), with specifically designed *statement blocks*. Statements simplify the process of writing down function application and composition - and hence dealing with data sampling and processing pipelines. We opt for a FOL-like syntax as it generalises propositional logic, while being a natural language for declaring general constraints: It is familiar to ML researchers used to writing Python while having a well-defined semantics for logicians. Furthermore, it is highly expressive: We believe it can express all knowledge currently used in NeSy methods.

The semantics of ULLER, defined in Section 3, depends on *(i)* an *interpretation*: often referred to as a “symbol grounding” [19], which maps symbols to meanings, and *(ii)* a “NeSy system”, which takes the knowledge and its interpretation, and computes loss functions and outputs accordingly. We will formalise the differences between NeSy systems by what they compute given a program in ULLER and an interpretation. We will also provide examples for several common systems, such as classical logic, fuzzy logic (such as Logic Tensor Networks [4]), probabilistic logic (such as Semantic Loss [50] and Deep-

ProbLog [25]). This will highlight the flexibility of our language, as it can be used to express knowledge in many formalisms.

2 Syntax of ULLER

Let \mathcal{V} be a set of variable symbols, \mathcal{C} be a set of constant symbols, \mathcal{D} be a set of a set of domain symbols, \mathcal{P} be a set of predicate symbols, \mathcal{T} be a set of property symbols, and \mathcal{F} be a set of function symbols, which might represent both deterministic and non-deterministic functions. We then define the syntax of ULLER $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ULLER}}$ as a context-free grammar:

$$\begin{aligned}
 F &::= \forall x \in D (F) \mid \exists x \in D (F) \\
 F &::= x := f(T, \dots, T)(F) \\
 F &::= F \wedge F \mid F \vee F \mid F \Rightarrow F \mid \neg F \mid A \mid (F) \\
 A &::= P(T, \dots, T) \\
 T &::= x \mid c \mid T.\text{prop} \mid -T \mid T + T \mid T \times T \mid T/T
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $D \in \mathcal{D}$, $x \in \mathcal{V}$, $c \in \mathcal{C}$, $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\text{prop} \in \mathcal{T}$. We also allow inline predicates such as $T \leq T$. The non-terminal symbols represent the following: F is a *formula*, A is an *atom* and T is a *term*. We call $x := f(T, \dots, T)(F)$ a statement binding, or just *statement*, which we discuss in Section 2.1. Notice that the only functions allowed in T are arithmetic operations (and property getters?). All other functions must be specified via statements.

The syntax of ULLER does not include any special construct for neural networks. Instead, we see neural networks as function approximators: They receive an input and return an output. When writing knowledge, the nuance that neural networks compute a distribution over outputs is irrelevant: We assume the user specifies what properties the output of the neural network should satisfy. How a NeSy system then uses this neural network is irrelevant to the user. This also allows users to swap both deterministic and non-deterministic functions (like neural networks) in-and-out, which is very useful for debugging a program, or figuring out different configurations of a problem.

Syntactic Sugar We allow $\forall x_1 \in D_1, x_2 \in D_2(F)$ as syntactic sugar for $\forall x_1 \in D_2(\forall x_1 \in D_2(F))$ for the quantifiers. We also allow $x_1 := f_1(T, \dots, T), x_2 := f_2(T, \dots, T)(F)$ as syntactic sugar for $x_1 := f_1(T, \dots, T)(x_2 := f_2(T, \dots, T)(F))$.

Typing We note that this is a dynamically typed language. We do not guarantee syntactically that functions and predicates can only take arguments from the domain defined in their interpretations.

2.1 Statements

A key design choice of ULLER is the use of special statement bindings $x := f(T, \dots, T)(F)$ to declare (possibly random) variables obtained by the application of (possibly non-deterministic) functions. Note that function symbols f only

appear in statements, and not in the definition of terms T , like in standard FOL.

Statements simplify the composition of functions. This gives a syntax that is both familiar to ML researchers who are used to writing Python, and gives a clear separation between the machine learning pipeline that processes data and the constraints on the data given by the logic.

Example 1 (Procedural composition of functions). Consider the MNISTAdd example from A. To further emphasise the ease of composing functions in ULLER, let us consider an unusual scenario where (i) the two MNIST digits are always different, and (ii) the object classifier f expects greyscale images with pixel values normalised in the $[0, 1]$ interval whereas the data points in the dataset T are RGB images with pixel values in $[0, 256]$. We can succinctly apply the transformations and formulate the new condition using ULLER statements:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \in T(\\ & x'_1 := \text{greyscale}(x.\text{im1}), x''_1 := \text{normalise}(x'_1), \\ & x'_2 := \text{greyscale}(x.\text{im2}), \quad x''_2 := \text{normalise}(x'_2), \\ & n_1 := f(x''_1), n_2 := f(x''_2), \\ & ((n_1 + n_2 = x.\text{sum}) \wedge n_1 \neq n_2) \\ &) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

◁

Secondly, statements explicitly delimit the scopes of such variables, which gives control over the memoisation and independence between said variables.

Example 2 (Scoping independence). Consider a non-deterministic function `dice()` which associates a probability to each outcome of a six-sided dice throw. Consider the following program written in ULLER:

$$x := \text{dice()} \ (x = 6 \wedge \text{even}(x)). \tag{3}$$

The formula asks if a dice throw outcome is a six and is even. For a fair dice, under probabilistic semantics, the probability of the formula being true is $\frac{1}{6}$.

Now consider the alternative ULLER program:

$$(x := \text{dice()} \ (x = 6)) \wedge (x := \text{dice()} \ (\text{even}(x))). \tag{4}$$

Here, we throw two independent dice, and check if the first lands on six and the other one is even. For a fair die, the probability of this formula is $\frac{1}{6} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{12}$.

Consider a similar program in regular FOL (which is not allowed in our language):

$$(\text{dice}() = 6) \wedge \text{even}(\text{dice}()) \tag{5}$$

It is ambiguous whether results of the non-deterministic function are shared (as in the ULLER program of (3)) or not (as in the ULLER program of (4)).

Many probabilistic NeSy frameworks memorise the outcome of the function and interpret it as shared, like in the ULLER interpretation of (3). We argue this behaviour should not be a default assumption from the NeSy system. Instead, dependence and memoisation scopes should be explicitly defined by the program. ULLER statements give researchers control over these scopes. \triangleleft

3 Semantics of ULLER

In this section, we define the semantics of ULLER. In Section 3.1 we discuss how ULLER interprets the symbols in the language, such as the function symbols and domain symbols. Then, in Section 3.2, we discuss how different NeSy systems interpret the formulas in ULLER.

3.1 Interpretation of the Symbols

Before we can hope to do anything with ULLER, we need to *interpret* the undefined symbols in $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ULLER}}$, that is, \mathcal{D} , \mathcal{P} , \mathcal{F} , and \mathcal{C} . An interpretation function I assigns a meaning to these symbols. We will first give an intuitive description and motivation of our definition before we give a formal definition.

An interpretation function assigns a domain to a set. This is enough to define domains that have a finite number of elements. However, we will frequently want to compute the truth value of statements on continuous values. This is challenging: How do we compute a \forall statement over a continuous domain on a computer? For finite domains, ML practitioners take several random examples using minibatching. Similarly, we define a distribution over the elements of the domain to allow NeSy systems to estimate the truth value of \forall statements over large domains.

Definition 1. *An interpretation I is a function that assigns a meaning to each symbol in $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ULLER}}$ according to the following rules:*

1. *The interpretation of a domain $D \in \mathcal{D}$ is a set Ω .*

In the following, let $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_n, \Omega_{n+1}$ be sets.

3. *The interpretation of a predicate P of arity n is a function of n domains to $\{0, 1\}$. That is, $I(P) : \Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. The interpretation of the predicate truth is predefined as the identity function on the booleans, that is, $I(\text{truth}) : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that $I(\text{truth})(x) = x$.*
4. *The interpretation of a constant c is an element of a domain, that is, $c \in \Omega_i$.*
5. *The interpretation of a function f of arity n is a conditional probability distribution⁸ $I(f) : \Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_n \rightarrow (\Omega_{n+1} \rightarrow [0, 1])$. That is, for any set of inputs $x_1 \in \Omega_1, \dots, x_n \in \Omega_n$, $I(f)(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a probability distribution*

⁸ To be precise, our definition is equivalent to a *probability kernel* or *Markov kernel*, which is a formalisation of the concept of a conditional probability distributions in measure theory.

on the domain Ω_{n+1} . If for all $x_1 \in \Omega_1, \dots, x_n \in \Omega_n$ the probability distribution $I(f)(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a deterministic distribution, we say that $I(f)$ is a deterministic function.

We give a probabilistic interpretation to both domains and functions. In particular, we treat functions, such as neural networks, as a *conditional distribution* given assignments $x_1 \in \Omega_1, \dots, x_n \in \Omega_n$ to input variables. This allows us to represent the uncertainty of the neural networks, which NeSy systems using, for example, probabilistic and fuzzy semantics can use to compute probabilities and fuzzy truth values. We will also frequently want to use regular (deterministic) functions $f : \Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_n \rightarrow \Omega_{n+1}$. A regular function is a special case of a conditional distribution that we refer to as a deterministic function. We define deterministic functions with a conditional distribution using the Dirac delta distribution at $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for continuous distributions, and a distribution that assigns 1 to the output value $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for finite domains, and 0 to the other values.

$\text{truth}(x)$ is a predicate reserved for emulating the concept of a non-deterministic predicate, common in NeSy systems, using ULLER. Consider a statement $x := f_{\text{smokes}}(\text{John})$ that assigns to x the output of f_{smokes} that predicts the probability that a person smokes. That is, $I(f_{\text{smokes}}) : \text{People} \rightarrow (\{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1])$ is a conditional probability distribution over the booleans $\{0, 1\}$. However, we cannot directly use x in formulas: $\neg x$ is not syntactically valid, as x is a term (a variable), and not a formula. This is where $\text{truth}(x)$ comes in: We use $\text{truth}(x)$ to write a program such as $x := f_{\text{smokes}}(\text{John})(\neg \text{truth}(x))$. This means f_{smokes} acts as a non-deterministic predicate (often called a *neural predicate* [25]).

3.2 Semantics of neuro-symbolic systems


We next define the meaning of a formula in $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ULLER}}$. Such a meaning is defined using both an interpretation I and a NeSy system $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$. Here, $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is a function that interprets the semantics of the logical operations of the language. We will also need a variable assignment $\eta : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ that maps variables $v \in \mathcal{V}$ to an element of a domain $\mathcal{O} = \cup_i \Omega_i$, where Ω_i is the sample space associated to the domain $D_i \in \mathcal{D}$.

Definition 2. A NeSy structure is a tuple $(I, \eta, \mathcal{B}, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{I, \eta})$ where I is an interpretation, $\eta : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ is a variable assignment, \mathcal{B} is a set of outputs and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{I, \eta} : \mathcal{L}_{\text{ULLER}} \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{O}$ is a neuro-symbolic system which is a function that assigns an output in \mathcal{B} to each formula in $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ULLER}}$ and a domain element in \mathcal{O} for terms T . If the interpretation and the variable assignment are clear from the context, we will simply write $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ for $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{I, \eta}$.


We will be discussing several NeSy systems and their semantics for the NeSy language in the following sections. Each NeSy system is defined over some output \mathcal{B} . For example, classical logic is defined over the output $\{0, 1\}$, while fuzzy logics are defined over the interval $[0, 1]$. A neuro-symbolic system $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{I, \eta}$ defines the semantics of a language expression. When the language expression is a term T ,

$$\forall x \in X(y := f_{\text{cat}}(x), z := f_{\text{bool}}(y)[p(y_1) \wedge \text{id}(z)])$$

Single-Choice



Probabilistic



Fuzzy




Figure 1. Interpretation of the same formula under classical, probabilistic and fuzzy semantics, where $f_{\text{cat}} : X \rightarrow (Y \rightarrow [0, 1])$, $f_{\text{bool}} : Y \rightarrow (\mathbb{B} \rightarrow [0, 1])$, $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, $Y = \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$, $\mathbb{B} = \{0, 1\}$. We loosely ignore the semantics functions $I()$ and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ for ease of notation.

this returns an element of the universe \mathcal{O} . When the language expression is a formula F , this returns an element in \mathcal{B} instead.

ULLER is a dynamically typed language. The variable assignment is defined over the union of all the domains, but we do not guarantee syntactically that functions and predicates can only take arguments from the domain defined in the interpretation.

Notation. In this section, we denote with $\eta[x \mapsto a]$ an updated variable assignment obtained from η as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\eta[x \mapsto a](x) &= a \\ \eta[x \mapsto a](x') &= \eta(x') \quad \text{for } x' \neq x\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

Finally, we define $p_f(a|T_1, \dots, T_n) = I(f)(\llbracket T_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket T_n \rrbracket)(a)$. $p_f(a|T_1, \dots, T_n)$ computes the probability of the element $a \in \Omega_{n+1}$ under the distribution $I(f)$ when conditioned on the interpretation of the terms T_1 to T_n , that is, under $\llbracket T_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket T_n \rrbracket$. In the coming sections we will frequently use this shorthand to talk about the semantics of the different NeSy systems.

3.3 Single-choice semantics

We first define the semantics of the NeSy language if we “choose” an option deterministically from a conditional distribution. Then, our semantics reduces to a regular first-order logic. A common way to make a deterministic choice from a distribution is to take its mode, that is, the most likely output according to the neural network.

Definition 3. *The classical structure $(I, \eta, \{0, 1\}, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{I, \eta}^C)$ is defined on boolean outputs $\{0, 1\}$ as:*

$$\llbracket \forall x \in D(F) \rrbracket^C = \min_{a \in I(D)} \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I, \eta[x \mapsto a]}^C \tag{7}$$

$$\llbracket \exists x \in D(F) \rrbracket^C = \llbracket \neg \forall x \in D(\neg F) \rrbracket^C \tag{8}$$

$$\llbracket F_1 \wedge F_2 \rrbracket^C = \min(\llbracket F_1 \rrbracket^C, \llbracket F_2 \rrbracket^C), \llbracket F_1 \vee F_2 \rrbracket^C = \llbracket \neg(\neg F_1 \wedge \neg F_2) \rrbracket^C \tag{9}$$

$$\llbracket \neg F \rrbracket^C = 1 - \llbracket F \rrbracket^C, \llbracket F_1 \Rightarrow F_2 \rrbracket^C = \llbracket \neg F_1 \vee F_2 \rrbracket^C \tag{10}$$

$$\llbracket P(T_1, \dots, T_n) \rrbracket^C = I(P)(\llbracket T_1 \rrbracket^C, \dots, \llbracket T_n \rrbracket^C) \tag{11}$$

$$\llbracket (F) \rrbracket^C = \llbracket F \rrbracket^C, \llbracket [F] \rrbracket^C = \llbracket F \rrbracket^C \tag{12}$$

$$\llbracket x_i \rrbracket^C = \eta(x_i), \llbracket c \rrbracket^C = I(c) \tag{13}$$

$$\llbracket T_1 + T_2 \rrbracket^C = \llbracket T_1 \rrbracket^C + \llbracket T_2 \rrbracket^C \tag{14}$$

$$\llbracket T.\text{prop} \rrbracket^C = \text{get}(\llbracket T \rrbracket^C, \text{prop}) \tag{15}$$

$$\llbracket x := f(T_1, \dots, T_n)(F) \rrbracket^C = \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I, \eta[x \mapsto \arg\max_{a \in \Omega_{n+1}} p_f(a|T_1, \dots, T_n)]}^C \tag{16}$$

In Equation 15, $\text{get}(\llbracket T \rrbracket^C, \text{prop})$ is a deterministic function that retrieves the value of an object property.

Equation 16 demands some explanation. The $\arg \max$ takes the probability distribution given by the interpretation of the function f and chooses a value from

the codomain Ω_{n+1} . In the classical structure, this choice is made deterministically by picking the mode of the distribution, that is, the most likely element a . Then we assign this element to the variable x through the variable assignment $\eta[x \mapsto a]$, and evaluate the rest of the formula F with this new assignment.

Importantly, the classic semantics allows us to prove whether a neuro-symbolic system “is faithful” to classical logic when all functions are deterministic. We formally introduce this notion by noting we can transform any program into a deterministic program by choosing the mode of the distribution like in Equation 16.

Definition 4. *For some interpretation I , the mode interpretation \hat{I} , is another interpretation such that for all function symbols $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $\hat{I}(f)$ returns the mode of p_f . That is, $\hat{p}_f(a|T_1, \dots, T_n) = \delta(a - \arg \max_{a'} p_f(a'|T_1, \dots, T_n))$, where δ is the Dirac delta distribution. Then a neuro-symbolic system $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is classical in the limit if for all language statements $L \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{ULLER}}$, $\llbracket L \rrbracket_{\hat{I}, \eta} = \llbracket L \rrbracket_{I, \eta}^C$.*

3.4 Probabilistic Semantics

Probabilistic semantics, also known as weighted model counting or possible world semantics in the literature, computes the probability that a formula is true. This is done by iterating over all possible assignments to the variables.

In the next sections, we will not redefine semantics whenever it is equal to the classical semantics, up to domain differences. For instance, we will not repeat constants and variable semantics.

Definition 5. *The probabilistic structure $(I, \eta, [0, 1], \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^P)$ is defined on probabilities $[0, 1]$ as:*

$$\llbracket \forall x \in D(F) \rrbracket^P = \prod_{a \in I(D)} \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I, \eta[x \mapsto a]}^P \quad (17)$$

$$\llbracket F_1 \wedge F_2 \rrbracket^P = \llbracket F_1 \rrbracket^P \cdot \llbracket F_2 \rrbracket^P \quad (18)$$

$$\llbracket x := f(T_1, \dots, T_n)(F) \rrbracket^P = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim p_f(\cdot | T_1, \dots, T_n)} \left[\llbracket F \rrbracket_{I, \eta[x \mapsto a]}^P \right] \quad (19)$$

In probabilistic semantics, a function $f(x)$ is interpreted as a conditional distribution conditioned on x . In this case, we require computing the *expectation* of the formulas being true under the interpreted functions. This happens in Equation 19. How one actually computes this expectation will depend on whether the output domain Ω_{n+1} is discrete or continuous. In particular, for discrete domains, Equation 19 equals

$$\llbracket x := f(T_1, \dots, T_n)(F) \rrbracket^P = \sum_{a \in \Omega_{n+1}} p_f(a | T_1, \dots, T_n) \cdot \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I, \eta[x \mapsto a]}^P, \quad (20)$$

while for continuous domains it equals

$$\llbracket x := f(T_1, \dots, T_n)(F) \rrbracket^P = \int_{a \in \Omega_{n+1}} p_f(a | T_1, \dots, T_n) \cdot \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I, \eta[x \mapsto a]}^P da. \quad (21)$$

We should note that probabilistic semantics in most practical cases will be intractable because of the exponential recursion introduced in Equation 20, not to mention the usually intractable integral in Equation 21. This can be sped up with probabilistic inference techniques that first compile the formula into a more efficient representation, and then use inference algorithms to compute the probability of the formula being true.

In addition, this semantics can be extended to algebraic model counting, which generalises the probabilistic semantics by considering semirings \mathcal{B} together with a product and a sum operation. This, for example, allows us to compute the most likely assignment to the variables in a formula, or to compute the gradient of the probabilistic semantics using dual numbers.

3.5 Fuzzy Semantics

The setup for fuzzy semantics is very similar to that of the probabilistic semantics. The two differences are using t-norms and t-conorms to connect fuzzy truth values, and the interpretation of sampling from boolean distributions.

Definition 6. *The fuzzy structure $(I_F, \eta, [0, 1], \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^F)$, where I_F is an interpretation I except that the predicate symbol `truth` is interpreted as the identity function on $[0, 1]$, is defined on fuzzy truth values $[0, 1]$ as:*

$$\llbracket \forall x \in D(F) \rrbracket^F = \bigotimes_{a \in I(D)} \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I_F, \eta[x \mapsto a]}^F \quad (22)$$

$$\llbracket \exists x \in D(F) \rrbracket^F = \bigoplus_{a \in I(D)} \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I_F, \eta[x \mapsto a]}^F \quad (23)$$

$$\llbracket F_1 \wedge F_2 \rrbracket^F = \llbracket F_1 \rrbracket^F \otimes \llbracket F_2 \rrbracket^F, \quad \llbracket F_1 \vee F_2 \rrbracket^F = \llbracket F_1 \rrbracket^F \oplus \llbracket F_2 \rrbracket^F \quad (24)$$

$$\llbracket x := f(T_1, \dots, T_n)(F) \rrbracket^F = \begin{cases} \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I_F, \eta[x \mapsto p_f(a=1|T_1, \dots, T_n)]}^F & \text{if } \Omega_{n+1} = \{0, 1\} \\ \bigoplus_{a \in \Omega_{n+1}} p_f(a|T_1, \dots, T_n) \otimes \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I_F, \eta[x \mapsto a]}^F & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

where $\otimes : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \mapsto [0, 1]$ is a fuzzy t-norm and $\oplus : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \mapsto [0, 1]$ is a fuzzy t-conorm [4, 43]. We will not give a semantics to continuous random variables for fuzzy semantics, as the aggregation of truth values is not defined in any standard way in the neuro-symbolic literature.

Fuzzy semantics do not manipulate the outcome of a function $f(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ as a random variable. Instead, Equation 25 reasons disjointly over all possible outcomes $a \in \Omega_{n+1}$ by interpreting the probability $p_f(a|T_1, \dots, T_n) \in [0, 1]$ as truth degrees. This truth degree is then conjoined with the interpretation of the rest of the formula F . Intuitively, they ask if there “exists a such that $f(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ maps to a and that a verifies the rest of the formula F ”.

In addition to Fuzzy Logics with t-norms and t-conorms for conjunction and disjunction, other NeSy frameworks such as DL2 [14] and STL [46] can also be

implemented with this semantics. While fuzzy logic acts on truth values in $[0, 1]$, DL2 acts on truth values in $[-\infty, 0]$ and STL in $[-\infty, \infty]$. They choose appropriate differentiable operators to implement the conjunction and disjunction. We refer the reader to [37] for details.

3.6 Sampling semantics

The sampling semantics $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^S$ is a simple modification to the classical semantics. It samples a value from each conditional distribution and uses that value to evaluate the formula. Therefore, the only difference in $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^S$ with classical semantics in Definition 3 is in Equation 16:

$$\llbracket x := f(T_1, \dots, T_n)(F) \rrbracket^S = \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I, \eta[x \mapsto \text{sample}(p_f(\cdot | T_1, \dots, T_n))]}^S \quad (26)$$

Here, `sample` is a function that takes a probability distribution and samples a value from the codomain Ω_{n+1} . The sampling semantics $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^S$ can be repeated multiple times to reduce the variance, like in standard Monte Carlo methods. This semantics can be combined with gradient estimation methods to learn the parameters of the neural networks [34, 45]. A recent implementation of this in the context of NeSy is the CatLog derivative trick [11], but any type of estimator based on the score function (commonly known as REINFORCE) can be used [21].

The sampling semantics in Equation 26 is a simple way to estimate the truth value of a formula. However, since sampling is not a differentiable operation, it is not possible to use this semantics to train the neural networks. Instead, we can use the score function gradient estimation method [34] to estimate the gradient of the truth value of a formula with respect to the parameters of the neural networks. However, this requires adapting the evaluation of the formula to incorporate score function terms. We give a brief description of how one might go about doing that in Appendix B.

4 Learning and Reasoning

In this section, we describe how we can use ULLER to perform neuro-symbolic learning and reasoning. We start with the learning setting. For this, we extend the definition of an interpretation (Definition 1) to a *parameterised interpretation*. A parameterised implementation allows us to implement neural networks with learnable parameters. For instance, a function model can be interpreted as a neural network $I_\theta(\text{model}) = NN_\theta$.

Definition 7. A parameterised interpretation is an interpretation $I_\theta(I)$ that is uniquely defined by a parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Let $F \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{ULLER}}$ denote a ULLER formula that has a quantifier ranging over a dataset T (for instance Example 1). Learning a parameterised interpretation typically involves searching for an optimal set of parameters $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ maximising

the neuro-symbolic system on F over a dataset Ω_T . In most machine learning settings, we are interested in minimising a loss function over a random minibatch $x_1, \dots, x_n \sim \Omega_T$. We can define such a loss function and corresponding search problem with

$$L(\theta) = -\llbracket F \rrbracket_{I_\theta \cup \{T \mapsto \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}\}, \{\}} \quad \theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{L}(\theta). \quad (27)$$

To allow for minibatching, we interpret the domain symbol T as the minibatch x_1, \dots, x_n . We can easily implement variations of this loss. For instance, we can combine multiple formulas and give each different weights. Furthermore, for probabilistic and fuzzy semantics, $L(\theta)$ will be differentiable, allowing us to use common optimisers. However, not all NeSy structures can be optimised over: This loss only makes sense when a semantics returns a value in an ordered set \mathcal{B} , but we also allow NeSy structures to return other kinds of values.

A different pattern, more related to reasoning, is to find the input x that maximises or minimises the neuro-symbolic system:

$$x^* = \arg \max_{x' \in X} \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I_\theta \cup \{T \mapsto \{x\}\}, \{\}} \quad (28)$$

This strategy can be combined with adversarial learning to first find the input that most violates the background knowledge, and then corrects that input [29].

5 Related Work

The last decades have seen the rise of neuro-symbolic frameworks that allow for specifying knowledge about the behaviour of neural networks symbolically [26]. However, unlike ULLER they are restricted to a single semantics, usually variations of probabilistic (Section 3.4) or fuzzy semantics (Section 3.5). The majority of current frameworks use the syntactic *neural predicate* construct as discussed in Section 3.1. DeepProbLog [25] is a probabilistic logic programming language [9] with neural predicates. Variations of its syntax are used in multiple follow-up works [10, 48, 23]. Scallop [20] chooses to restrict its language to Datalog to improve scalability, among others [24]. For ULLER, we choose to use an expressive first-order language, leaving scalable inference to the implementation of the NeSy system. Other NeSy frameworks are based on Answer Set Programming [51, 36, 3], relational languages [31, 28, 7], temporal logics [40] and description logics [49, 38, 39], while Logic Tensor Networks [4] is also based on first-order logic, among others [27, 12]. Finally, many commonly used NeSy frameworks are restricted to propositional logic [50, 2, 22, 8, 17, 14].

Logic of Differentiable Logics (LDL) [37] defines a first-order language to compare formal properties of several NeSy frameworks. Compared to ULLER, LDL is strongly typed, while ULLER is weakly typed, and LDL does not model probabilistic semantics. In LDL, uncertainty comes from predicates, rather than functions, and does not have a syntactic construct like ULLER's statement blocks. Pylon [1] is a Python library similar in goal to ULLER. It also allows

for expressing propositional logic (CNF) formulas, which can then get compiled into a Semantic Loss or fuzzy loss functions. However, by being restricted to a propositional language, Pylon is limited in expressiveness, and requires the user to manually ground out formulas.

ULLER is also heavily inspired by probabilistic programming languages [18] such as Stan [6] that specify probabilistic models in a high-level language. In particular, ULLER can be considered a first-order probabilistic programming language (FOPPL) [41] defined on boolean outputs. These boolean outputs represent the conditioning (observations) of the probabilistic model. By being first-order, the language is restricted to having a finite number of random variables. Other FOPPL languages centred on neural networks include Pyro [5] and ProbTorch [35]. These languages enforce a probabilistic semantics corresponding to that of ULLER defined in Section 3.4. However, ULLER does not enforce this semantics and also supports, for instance, fuzzy semantics. We leave an in-depth analysis of the relations between ULLER and aforementioned probabilistic programming languages for future work.

Other related work attempts to define building blocks for neuro-symbolic AI [42] or to categorise existing approaches [33]. We instead focus on a particular set of informed machine learning approaches, and develop a unifying language to allow communicating with them.

6 Conclusion

- We introduced ULLER
- We defined the syntax and semantics of ULLER
- We showed how to use ULLER to express knowledge about neural networks
- Future work: Implement in Python library. Extensions to higher-order logics [41]. More NeSy systems.

Acknowledgements

References

1. Ahmed, K., Li, T., Ton, T., Guo, Q., Chang, K., Kordjamshidi, P., Srikumar, V., den Broeck, G.V., Singh, S.: PYLON: A pytorch framework for learning with constraints. In: Thirty-Sixth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2022, Thirty-Fourth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2022, The Twelveth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2022 Virtual Event, February 22 - March 1, 2022. pp. 13152–13154. AAAI Press (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1609/AAAI.V36I11.21711>, <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v36i11.21711>
2. Ahmed, K., Teso, S., Chang, K., den Broeck, G.V., Vergari, A.: Semantic probabilistic layers for neuro-symbolic learning. In: Koyejo, S., Mohamed, S., Agarwal, A., Belgrave, D., Cho, K., Oh, A. (eds.) Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Process-

- ing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022 (2022), http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/c182ec594f38926b7fcb827635b9a8f4-Abstract-Conference.html
3. Aspis, Y., Broda, K., Lobo, J., Russo, A.: Embed2Sym - Scalable Neuro-Symbolic Reasoning via Clustered Embeddings. In: Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning. pp. 421–431. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, Haifa, Israel (Jul 2022). <https://doi.org/10.24963/kr.2022/44>
 4. Badreddine, S., d’Avila Garcez, A., Serafini, L., Spranger, M.: Logic Tensor Networks. *Artificial Intelligence* **303**, 103649 (Feb 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2021.103649>
 5. Bingham, E., Chen, J.P., Jankowiak, M., Obermeyer, F., Pradhan, N., Karaletsos, T., Singh, R., Szerlip, P.A., Horsfall, P., Goodman, N.D.: Pyro: Deep universal probabilistic programming. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **20**, 28:1–28:6 (2019)
 6. Carpenter, B., Gelman, A., Hoffman, M.D., Lee, D., Goodrich, B., Betancourt, M., Brubaker, M.A., Guo, J., Li, P., Riddell, A.: Stan: A probabilistic programming language. *Journal of statistical software* **76** (2017)
 7. Cohen, W.W.: TensorLog: A Differentiable Deductive Database. arXiv:1605.06523 [cs] (Jul 2016)
 8. Daniele, A., van Krieken, E., Serafini, L., van Harmelen, F.: Refining neural network predictions using background knowledge. *Mach. Learn.* **112**(9), 3293–3331 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10994-023-06310-3>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-023-06310-3>
 9. De Raedt, L., Kimmig, A.: Probabilistic (logic) programming concepts. *Machine Learning* **100**(1), 5–47 (Jul 2015). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-015-5494-z>
 10. De Smet, L., Martires, P.Z.D., Manhaeve, R., Marra, G., Kimmig, A., De Raedt, L.: Neural Probabilistic Logic Programming in Discrete-Continuous Domains (Mar 2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.04660>
 11. De Smet, L., Sansone, E., Zuidberg Dos Martires, P.: Differentiable sampling of categorical distributions using the catlog-derivative trick. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36** (2024)
 12. Diligenti, M., Gori, M., Sacca, C.: Semantic-based regularization for learning and inference. *Artificial Intelligence* **244**, 143–165 (2017)
 13. Donoho, D.: Data science at the singularity. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00865 (2023)
 14. Fischer, M., Balunovic, M., Drachsler-Cohen, D., Gehr, T., Zhang, C., Vechev, M.: DL2: training and querying neural networks with logic. In: International Conference on Machine Learning. pp. 1931–1941. PMLR (2019)
 15. Foerster, J., Farquhar, G., Al-Shedivat, M., Rocktäschel, T., Xing, E., Whiteson, S.: DiCE: The infinitely differentiable monte carlo estimator. In: International Conference on Machine Learning. pp. 1529–1538 (2018)
 16. Giunchiglia, E., Stoian, M.C., Lukasiewicz, T.: Deep Learning with Logical Constraints. In: Raedt, L.D. (ed.) Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2022, Vienna, Austria, 23–29 July 2022. pp. 5478–5485. *ijcai.org* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2022/767>
 17. Giunchiglia, E., Tatomir, A., Stoian, M.C., Lukasiewicz, T.: CCN+: A neuro-symbolic framework for deep learning with requirements. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* p. 109124 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2024.109124>

18. Gordon, A.D., Henzinger, T.A., Nori, A.V., Rajamani, S.K.: Probabilistic programming. In: Future of software engineering proceedings, pp. 167–181 (2014)
19. Harnad, S.: The symbol grounding problem. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **42**(1-3), 335–346 (1990)
20. Huang, J., Li, Z., Chen, B., Samel, K., Naik, M., Song, L., Si, X.: Scallop: From Probabilistic Deductive Databases to Scalable Differentiable Reasoning. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (May 2021)
21. Kool, W., van Hoof, H., Welling, M.: Buy 4 REINFORCE samples, get a baseline for free! p. 14 (2019)
22. van Krieken, E., Thanapalasingam, T., Tomczak, J.M., van Harmelen, F., ten Teije, A.: A-nesi: A scalable approximate method for probabilistic neurosymbolic inference. In: Oh, A., Naumann, T., Globerson, A., Saenko, K., Hardt, M., Levine, S. (eds.) Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023 (2023), http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/4d9944ab3330fe6af8efb9260aa9f307-Abstract-Conference.html
23. Maene, J., Raedt, L.D.: Soft-Unification in Deep Probabilistic Logic. In: Thirty-Seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (Nov 2023)
24. Magnini, M., Ciatto, G., Omicini, A.: On the Design of PSyKI: A Platform for Symbolic Knowledge Injection into Sub-symbolic Predictors. In: Calvaresi, D., Nijjar, A., Winikoff, M., Främling, K. (eds.) Explainable and Transparent AI and Multi-Agent Systems, vol. 13283, pp. 90–108. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15565-9_6
25. Manhaeve, R., Dumancic, S., Kimmig, A., Demeester, T., De Raedt, L.: Deep-ProbLog: Neural probabilistic logic programming. In: Proceedings of NeurIPS (2018)
26. Marra, G., Dumančić, S., Manhaeve, R., De Raedt, L.: From Statistical Relational to Neural Symbolic Artificial Intelligence: A Survey. arXiv:2108.11451 [cs] (Aug 2021)
27. Marra, G., Giannini, F., Diligenti, M., Gori, M.: Lyrics: A general interface layer to integrate logic inference and deep learning. In: Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases. pp. 283–298. Springer (2019)
28. Marra, G., Kuželka, O.: Neural markov logic networks. In: Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence. pp. 908–917. PMLR (2021)
29. Minervini, P., Riedel, S.: Adversarially regularising neural NLI models to integrate logical background knowledge. In: Korhonen, A., Titov, I. (eds.) Proceedings of the 22nd Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning. pp. 65–74. Association for Computational Linguistics, Brussels, Belgium (Oct 2018). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/K18-1007>, <https://aclanthology.org/K18-1007>
30. Pryor, C., Dickens, C., Augustine, E., Albalak, A., Wang, W.Y., Getoor, L.: NeuPSL: Neural Probabilistic Soft Logic. In: Proceedings of the Thirty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence. pp. 4145–4153. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, Macau, SAR China (Aug 2023). <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2023/461>
31. Pryor, C., Dickens, C., Augustine, E., Albalak, A., Wang, W.Y., Getoor, L.: Neupsl: Neural probabilistic soft logic. In: Proceedings of the Thirty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2023, 19th-25th August 2023, Macao, SAR, China. pp. 4145–4153. ijcai.org (2023). <https://doi.org/10.24963/IJCAI.2023/461>, <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2023/461>

32. Richardson, M., Domingos, P.: Markov logic networks. *Machine Learning* **62**(1–2), 107–136 (Jan 2006). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-006-5833-1>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10994-006-5833-1>
33. Sarker, M.K., Zhou, L., Eberhart, A., Hitzler, P.: Neuro-symbolic artificial intelligence. *AI Communications* **34**(3), 197–209 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3233/AIC-210084>
34. Schulman, J., Heess, N., Weber, T., Abbeel, P.: Gradient estimation using stochastic computation graphs. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2015)
35. Siddharth, N., Paige, B., van de Meent, J.W., Desmaison, A., Goodman, N.D., Kohli, P., Wood, F., Torr, P.: Learning disentangled representations with semi-supervised deep generative models. In: Guyon, I., Luxburg, U.V., Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S., Garnett, R. (eds.) *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30. pp. 5927–5937. Curran Associates, Inc. (2017)
36. Skryagin, A., Stammer, W., Ochs, D., Dhami, D.S., Kersting, K.: SLASH: Embracing Probabilistic Circuits into Neural Answer Set Programming. *arXiv:2110.03395 [cs]* (Oct 2021)
37. Slusarz, N., Komendantskaya, E., Daggitt, M.L., Stewart, R., Stark, K.: Logic of differentiable logics: Towards a uniform semantics of dl. In: *Proceedings of 24th International Conference on Logic*. vol. 94, pp. 473–493 (2023)
38. Tang, Z., Hinnerichs, T., Peng, X., Zhang, X., Hoehndorf, R.: Falcon: faithful neural semantic entailment over alc ontologies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.07628* (2022)
39. Tang, Z., Pei, S., Peng, X., Zhuang, F., Zhang, X., Hoehndorf, R.: TAR: Neural Logical Reasoning across TBox and ABox (Aug 2022)
40. Umili, E., Capobianco, R., De Giacomo, G.: Grounding ltl specifications in image sequences. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*. vol. 19, pp. 668–678 (2023)
41. van de Meent, J.W., Paige, B., Yang, H., Wood, F.: An Introduction to Probabilistic Programming (Oct 2021). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1809.10756>
42. van Harmelen, F., ten Teije, A.: A Boxology of Design Patterns for Hybrid Learning and Reasoning Systems. *Journal of Web Engineering* **18**(1), 97–124 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.13052/jwe1540-9589.18133>
43. van Krieken, E., Acar, E., van Harmelen, F.: Analyzing differentiable fuzzy logic operators. *Artificial Intelligence* **302**, 103602 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2021.103602>
44. van Krieken, E., Thanapalasingam, T., Tomczak, J., van Harmelen, F., Ten Teije, A.: A-NeSI: A scalable approximate method for probabilistic neurosymbolic inference. In: Oh, A., Neumann, T., Globerson, A., Saenko, K., Hardt, M., Levine, S. (eds.) *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. vol. 36, pp. 24586–24609. Curran Associates, Inc. (2023)
45. van Krieken, E., Tomczak, J., Ten Teije, A.: Stochastic: A framework for general stochastic automatic differentiation. In: Ranzato, M., Beygelzimer, A., Dauphin, Y., Liang, P., Vaughan, J.W. (eds.) *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. vol. 34, pp. 7574–7587. Curran Associates, Inc. (2021)
46. Varnai, P., Dimarogonas, D.V.: On robustness metrics for learning stl tasks. In: *2020 American Control Conference (ACC)*. pp. 5394–5399. IEEE (2020)
47. von Rueden, L., Mayer, S., Beckh, K., Georgiev, B., Giesselbach, S., Heese, R., Kirsch, B., Pfrommer, J., Pick, A., Ramamurthy, R., Walczak, M., Garcke, J., Bauckhage, C., Schuecker, J.: Informed Machine Learning – A Taxonomy and

- Survey of Integrating Prior Knowledge into Learning Systems. IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering **35**(1), 614–633 (Jan 2023). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2021.3079836>
48. Winters, T., Marra, G., Manhaeve, R., De Raedt, L.: Deepstochlog: Neural stochastic logic programming. In: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. vol. 36, pp. 10090–10100 (2022)
 49. Wu, X., Zhu, X., Zhao, Y., Dai, X.: Differentiable Fuzzy \mathcal{ALC} : A Neural-Symbolic Representation Language for Symbol Grounding (Dec 2022)
 50. Xu, J., Zhang, Z., Friedman, T., Liang, Y., den Broeck, G.V.: A semantic loss function for deep learning with symbolic knowledge. In: Dy, J.G., Krause, A. (eds.) Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10–15, 2018. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 80, pp. 5498–5507. PMLR (2018), <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/xu18h.html>
 51. Yang, Z., Ishay, A., Lee, J.: NeurASP: Embracing neural networks into answer set programming. In: Bessiere, C. (ed.) Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-20. pp. 1755–1762. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization (Jul 2020). <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2020/243>

A Practical Examples

Example 3 (MNIST Addition). Suppose we want to express the standard (single-digit) MNIST addition program using ULLER. In this setting, we have a domain T that represents a training dataset $I(T)$. In Section 4, we discuss how this training dataset can also be a minibatch of examples.

Each data point x consists of a pair of images (which we access with the properties `im1` and `im2`) associated to a label representing the value of their sum (which we can intuitively access via the property `sum`). Finally, we have a function f that we interpret as a neural network classifying MNIST images. Then, if we want to write that for every input the outputs of the neural network should be equal to the sum of the inputs, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \in T \\ (n1 := f(x.\text{im1}), n2 := f(x.\text{im2})) \\ (n1 + n2 = x.\text{sum}) \end{aligned}$$

Example 4 (Smokes Friends Cancer).

In this classical example of Statistical Relational Learning introduced by [32], uncertain facts in a population group are modeled using the neural predicates $\text{Friends}(x, y)$ for friendship, $\text{Smokes}(x)$ for smoking, and $\text{Cancer}(x)$ for cancer. As ULLER relies on functions rather than predicates to model uncertainty, we must use $\text{truth}(a)$ to formalise the problem in our language as explained in Section 3.1.

For simplicity, we use $(A \Rightarrow B) \equiv (\neg(A \wedge \neg B))$ and $(A \Leftrightarrow B) \equiv ((A \Rightarrow B) \wedge (B \Rightarrow A))$ to denote logical implications and equivalences. The operations can be simplified to fit with the syntax in (1).

Here is an example of a knowledge base for this problem. Friends of friends are friends:

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall x \in \text{People}, y \in \text{People}, z \in \text{People} \\ &\quad (a_1 := \text{Friends}(x, y), a_2 := \text{Friends}(y, z), a_3 := \text{Friends}(x, z) \\ &\quad ((\text{truth}(a_1) \wedge \text{truth}(a_2)) \Rightarrow \text{truth}(a_3))) \end{aligned}$$

If two people are friends, either both smoke or neither does:

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall x \in \text{People}, y \in \text{People} \\ &\quad (a_1 := \text{Friends}(x, y), a_2 := \text{Smokes}(x), a_3 := \text{Smokes}(y) \\ &\quad (\text{truth}(a_1) \Rightarrow (\text{truth}(a_2) \Leftrightarrow \text{truth}(a_3)))) \end{aligned}$$

Friendless people smoke:

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall x \in \text{People} \\ &\quad (\neg \exists y \in \text{People} (a_1 := \text{Friends}(x, y)(\text{truth}(a_1))) \\ &\quad \Rightarrow a_2 := \text{Smokes}(x)(\text{truth}(a_2))) \end{aligned}$$

Smoking causes cancer:

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall x \in \text{People} \\ &\quad (a_1 := \text{Smokes}(x), a_2 := \text{Cancer}(x) \\ &\quad (\text{truth}(a_1) \Rightarrow \text{truth}(a_2))) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that, according to the definitions of Section 3.1, the probabilistic interpretation of the above formula will assume conditional independence between $a_1 \sim p_{\text{Smokes}}(\cdot|x)$ and $a_2 \sim p_{\text{Cancer}}(\cdot|x)$. To model a dependence of cancer on smoking, i.e. $a_2 \sim p_{\text{Cancer}}(\cdot|x, a_1)$, we can make the probability explicitly depend on the previous variable:

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall x \in \text{People} \\ &\quad (a_1 := \text{Smokes}(x), a_2 := \text{Cancer}(x, a_1) \\ &\quad (\text{truth}(a_1) \Rightarrow \text{truth}(a_2))) \end{aligned}$$

Next, we have labelled examples for each relationship. For example, for $\text{Friends}()$, drawing examples from a dataset T_{Friends} :

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall t \in T_{\text{Friends}} \\ &\quad (l := \text{Friends}(t.x, t.y) \\ &\quad (l = t.\text{label})) \end{aligned}$$

B Gradient estimation

One way to implement gradient estimation methods of this is using the DiCE estimator [15] which introduces the *MagicBox* operator $\boxdot(x) = \exp(x - \perp(x))$,

where \perp is the **StopGradient** operator used in deep learning frameworks. This operator allows us to add a term that only appears when we differentiate it, and equals 1 during the forward pass. To incorporate DiCE for Unified Language for LEarning and Reasoning, we have to modify both Equation ?? as before, and Equation 16

$$\llbracket x := f(T_1, \dots, T_n)(F) \rrbracket^S = \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I, \mathcal{A}(\eta, S)}^C \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \square(\log p_{f_i}(\mathcal{A}(\eta, S)[x_i])) \quad (29)$$

Extensions of the DiCE estimator can be used to implement a wide variety of gradient estimation methods [45].

C Classical in the limit

C.1 Probabilistic semantics

The probabilistic semantics is *classical in the limit*. To show this, we note that we require that the domain becomes $\{0, 1\}$ instead of probabilities $[0, 1]$. Under this domain, the product is equal to the min function. We can use this to rewrite all but the interpretation of statements into the classical semantics.

Next, take for a statement $x := f(T_1, \dots, T_n)(F)$ the induction assumption that $\llbracket F \rrbracket_{\hat{I}, \eta}^P = \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I, \eta}^C$, where \hat{I} is defined as in Definition 4. Then the interpretation of a statement is:

$$\mathbb{E}_{a \sim p_{\hat{f}}(\cdot | T_1, \dots, T_n)}[\llbracket F \rrbracket_{\hat{I}, \eta[x \mapsto a]}^P] = \llbracket F \rrbracket_{\hat{I}, \eta[x \mapsto \arg \max_{a \in \Omega_{n+1}} p_f(a | T_1, \dots, T_n)]}^P$$

Here, we reduce the expectation by noting that since $p_{\hat{f}}(a | T_1, \dots, T_n) = \delta(a - \arg \max_{a'} p_f(a' | T_1, \dots, T_n))$, exactly one element gets 1 probability (or a single element with non-zero probability, in the case of continuous distributions). This single element is chosen on the right side. Then, we use the induction assumption to find that this is equal to the classical semantics of statements given in Equation 16.

C.2 Fuzzy semantics

Using the axioms of t-norms, we find that the fuzzy semantics is also classical in the limit. This again can be proven by induction. For Equations 22 and 24, we use the boundary conditions of t-norms, which states that $x \otimes 1 = x$ for $x \in [0, 1]$. Therefore, if $x = 0$, $0 \otimes 1 = 0$ and if $x = 1$, $1 \otimes 1 = 1$, meaning t-norms act as the min operator under the domain $\{0, 1\}$.

Next, consider the program fragment $x := f(T_1, \dots, T_n)(F)$ and take the induction assumption $\llbracket F \rrbracket_{\hat{I}, \eta}^F = \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I, \eta}^C$. First, assume the domain $\Omega_{n+1} = \{0, 1\}$ and assume $\arg \max_{a \in \{0, 1\}} p_f(a | T_1, \dots, T_n) = 1$. Then, the interpretation of the statement is $\llbracket F \rrbracket_{\hat{I}, \eta[x \mapsto p_{\hat{f}}(a=1 | T_1, \dots, T_n)]}^F = \llbracket F \rrbracket_{\hat{I}, \eta[x \mapsto 1]}^F$, since the Dirac distribution will put all its mass on the output 1. Similarly, if $\arg \max_{a \in \{0, 1\}} p_f(a | T_1, \dots, T_n) =$

0, then the interpretation is $\llbracket F \rrbracket_{\hat{I}, \eta[x \mapsto 0]}^F$. Then we can simply use the induction assumption.

Finally, if $\Omega_{n+1} \neq \{0, 1\}$, then we know there is a unique output $a \in \Omega_{n+1}$ such that $p_{\hat{f}}(a|T_1, \dots, T_n) = 1$, while for the other outputs $p_{\hat{f}}(a'|T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0$. Then, using associativity and commutativity of the t-conorm \oplus , the interpretation of the statement is

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket F \rrbracket_{\hat{I}, \eta[x \mapsto a]}^F \otimes p_{\hat{f}}(a|T_1, \dots, T_n) \oplus \bigoplus_{a' \in \Omega_{n+1} \setminus \{a\}} \llbracket F \rrbracket_{\hat{I}, \eta[x \mapsto a']}^F \otimes p_{\hat{f}}(a'|T_1, \dots, T_n) \\ & \llbracket F \rrbracket_{\hat{I}, \eta[x \mapsto a]}^F \otimes 1 \oplus \bigoplus_{a' \in \Omega_{n+1} \setminus \{a\}} \llbracket F \rrbracket_{\hat{I}, \eta[x \mapsto a']}^F \otimes 0 \\ & \llbracket F \rrbracket_{\hat{I}, \eta[x \mapsto a]}^F \oplus \bigoplus_{a' \in \Omega_{n+1} \setminus \{a\}} 0 = \llbracket F \rrbracket_{\hat{I}, \eta[x \mapsto a]}^F \end{aligned}$$

where we again use the boundary conditions of the t-norm \otimes ($1 \otimes x = x$) and t-conorm ($0 \oplus x = x$).

D Relation of Probabilistic semantics to the Semantic Loss

Here, we show why the probabilistic semantics is equivalent to the weighted model counting semantics used in, for instance, the Semantic Loss. Let F be a closed formula without any statements $x := f(T_1, \dots, T_n)(F')$ that only involves variables x_1, \dots, x_n over finite domains. The *weighted model count* (WMC) is the evaluation of the classical semantics weighted by probabilities of the assignments to variables. These probabilities are often assumed to be independent, although our framework also allows for the probabilities to depend on previous variables. This is illustrated in Example 4. The definition of the WMC is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{WMC} &= \sum_{a_1 \in \Omega_1} \dots \sum_{a_n \in \Omega_n} \prod_{i=1}^n p_{f_i}(a_i) \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I, \{x_1 \mapsto a_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto a_n\}}^C \\ &= \sum_{a_1 \in \Omega_1} p_{f_1}(a_1) \dots \sum_{a_n \in \Omega_n} p_{f_n}(a_n) \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I, \{x_1 \mapsto a_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto a_n\}}^C. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Next, we rewrite this into a program $x_1 := f_1(), \dots, x_n := f_n()(F)$ such that the probabilistic semantics in Definition 5 is equal to the weighted model count. For ease of notation, let us denote S_i each statement $x_i := f_i()$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then, we find the probabilistic semantics of the program by sequentially expanding the

interpretation of the statements:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket S_1, \dots, S_n(F) \rrbracket_{I, \{\cdot\}}^P &= \sum_{a_1 \in \Omega_1} p_{f_1}(a_1) \cdot \llbracket S_2, \dots, S_n(F) \rrbracket_{I, \{x_1 \mapsto a_1\}}^P \\
 &\dots \\
 &= \sum_{a_1 \in \Omega_1} p_{f_1}(a_1) \dots \sum_{a_n \in \Omega_n} p_{f_n}(a_n) \llbracket F \rrbracket_{I, \{x_1 \mapsto a_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto a_n\}}^C \\
 &= \text{WMC}
 \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where in the last step we use that since the domains are finite and F does not contain statements, the probabilistic semantics of F is equal to the classic one.

E Relation of Fuzzy Semantics to Differentiable Fuzzy Logics

Fuzzy logics are actively used in NeSy [4,43,8,17]. We show how existing NeSy systems using fuzzy logics arise from the fuzzy semantics of ULLER. Existing fuzzy logics systems align with our interpretations of terms and logical operators, but differ in their use of fuzzy predicates, which are interpreted as functions to $[0, 1]$, that is, $I_{\text{NeSy}}(P) : \Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_n \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Then, the truth value of a formula is computed by evaluating the formula with the fuzzy semantics.

We can emulate this in our fuzzy semantics with the $\text{truth}()$ predicate and proof by induction. For each neural predicate $I_{\text{NeSy}}(P_i) : \Omega_1^i \times \dots \times \Omega_{n_i}^i \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we define a ULLER function $I(f_i) : \Omega_1^i \times \dots \times \Omega_{n_i}^i \rightarrow (\{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1])$ such that:

$$I_{\text{NeSy}}(P_i)(T_1^i, \dots, T_{n_i}^i) = I(f_i)(T_1^i, \dots, T_{n_i}^i)(1) \tag{32}$$

Let F be a first-order logic formula with no statements nor functions, and $\llbracket F \rrbracket^{\text{NeSy}}$ be its interpretation in a fuzzy NeSy system. Let F contain k neural atoms $P_i(T_1^i, \dots, T_{n_i}^i)$, $i = 1 \dots k$. Let $S_1, \dots, S_k(F')$ be a ULLER program with k statements where S_i defines $x_i := f_i(T_1^i, \dots, T_{n_i}^i)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, and F' is F where we replace every mention of $P_i(T_1^i, \dots, T_{n_i}^i)$ by $\text{truth}(x_i)$. We have:

$$\llbracket S_1, \dots, S_k(F') \rrbracket^F = \llbracket F' \rrbracket_{I, \eta[x_1 \mapsto p_{f_1}(1|T_1^1, \dots, T_{n_1}^1), \dots, x_k \mapsto p_{f_k}(1|T_1^k, \dots, T_{n_k}^k)]}^F \tag{33}$$

$$= \llbracket F' \rrbracket_{I, \eta[x_1 \mapsto I_{\text{NeSy}}(P_1)(T_1^1, \dots, T_{n_1}^1), \dots, x_k \mapsto I_{\text{NeSy}}(P_k)(T_1^k, \dots, T_{n_k}^k)]}^F \tag{34}$$

$$= \llbracket F \rrbracket^{\text{NeSy}} \tag{35}$$

Equality (34) stems from definition (32). We derive equality (35) by induction. First, note that according to the definition of $I(\text{truth})$ and the assignment in (34), we have:

$$\llbracket \text{truth}(x_i) \rrbracket^F = I_{\text{NeSy}}(P_i)(T_1^i, \dots, T_{n_i}^i) = \llbracket P(T_1^i, \dots, T_{n_i}^i) \rrbracket^{\text{NeSy}} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, k \tag{36}$$

If our semantics use the same t-norm operator \otimes as the NeSy system, then:

$$\llbracket F_1 \wedge F_2 \rrbracket^F = \llbracket F_1 \rrbracket^F \otimes \llbracket F_2 \rrbracket^F = \llbracket F'_1 \rrbracket^{\text{NeSy}} \otimes \llbracket F'_2 \rrbracket^{\text{NeSy}} = \llbracket F'_1 \wedge F'_2 \rrbracket^{\text{NeSy}} \quad (37)$$

where in the second equality we use the induction hypothesis $\llbracket F_1 \rrbracket^F = \llbracket F'_1 \rrbracket^{\text{NeSy}}$ and $\llbracket F_2 \rrbracket^F = \llbracket F'_2 \rrbracket^{\text{NeSy}}$. The same can naturally be derived for other logical connectives. It follows that we can emulate any formula F built with the neural predicates $P(T_1^i, \dots, T_{n_i}^i)$, by building formula F' with the equivalently interpreted $\text{truth}(x_i)$ (see Equation (34)) and the same logical constructs, such that $\llbracket F \rrbracket^{\text{NeSy}} = \llbracket S_1, \dots, S_k(F') \rrbracket^F$.