MSc Course Unit COMP6012 Automated Reasoning

Prolog, Resolution and Logic Programming

Alan Williams Room 2.107

email: alanw@cs.man.ac.uk

School of Computer Science

October 2006

This Part of the Course

0.1 Timetable: Part I (Alan Williams)

Here is the Provisional Timetable for Part I

Mondays	Session 1 (9:00-10:30)		Session 2 (11:00-12:30)	Lunch	Session 3 (2:00-3:30)		Session 4 (4:00-5:00)
2nd Oct	(AW1) Prop log Intro; (lecture)		(AW2) Prop Res I (lecture)		(AW3) Prolog I (lab)		(AW4) Prop Res II (lect & ex)
9th Oct	(AW5) Pred Intro (lecture)		(AW6) Pred Res I (lecture)		(AW7) Prolog II (lab)		(AW8) Pred Res II (lect & ex)
16th Oct	(AW9) Log Prog (lecture)		(AW10) Prolog III (lab)		(RS1)		(RS2)
Thursday 19th Oct					(AW11) Prolog lab Marking		

Books

[1] J. Kelly. *The Essence of Logic*. Prentice Hall, 1997.

[2] Rajeev Goré and Martin Peim. Automated Reasoning: Notes for MSc Module CS612. Department of Computer Science, University of Manchester, 1997.

[3] M. Ben-Ari. *Mathematical Logic for Computer Science*. PHI, 1993.

[4] L. Sterling and E. Shapiro. *The Art of Prolog*. MIT, 1986.

[5] Clocksin and Mellish. *Programming in Prolog*. Springer-Verlag, 1994.

[6] Ulle Endriss. *An Introduction to Prolog Programming*. `http://staff.science.uva.nl/~ulle/teaching/prolog/prolog.pdf`.

[7] L.C. Paulson. *ML for the Working Programmer*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.

[8] C-L. Chang and Richard C-T. Lee. *Symbolic Logic and Mechanical Theorem Proving*. Academic Press, 1973.

[9] U. Nilsson and J. Małuszyński. *Logic, Programming and Prolog*. Wiley, 1990.

[1, chpt. 3]

Lecture 5: Prolog

The Basics

Terms:

– constants, variables

– compound: *functors*: *name*(arg_1,...,arg_k)

Ground terms: terms with no variables

Clauses:

– **Rules:** *Head* :- $Goal_1$, ..., $Goal_k$.

– **Facts:** *Head*.

i.e. a rule without any goals or body

– **Goals:** $Goal_1$, ..., $Goal_k$.

i.e. a rule without a head.

Some Examples

`parent(john,juliet).`

`parent(john,sue,juliet).` (no. of arguments)

`:- parent(john,X).`

`parent(X,juliet).`

`greater_than(succ(X),zero).`

Procedure: rules with same Head name

```
ancestor(X,Y) :- mother(X,Y).
ancester(X,Y) :- father(X,Y).
ancester(X,Y) :- aunt(X,Y).
...
```

Meaning of a Rule:

If *Goal*$_1$ and *Goal*$_2$ and ... and *Goal*$_k$ all hold, then *Head* holds.

Program: a list of clauses

The meaning of a Prolog Program P:

the set of ground goals deducible from P

Another Example

1: `ancestor(X,Y) :- father(X,Y).`

2: `father(X,Y) :- parent(X,Y), male(X).`

3: `parent(john,juliet).`

4: `male(john).`

```
    :- ancestor(john,juliet).
(1) :- father(john,juliet).
(2) :- parent(john,juliet),male(john).
(3,4) Yes
```

Now with recursion:

```
1: ancestor(X,Y) :- parent(X,Y).
2: ancestor(X,Y) :- parent(X,Z),ancestor(Z,Y).
3: parent(chaz,john).
4: parent(john,juliet).
```

```
    :- ancestor(chaz,juliet).
(2) :- parent(chaz,Z),ancestor(Z,juliet).
(3) :- parent(chaz,john),ancestor(john,juliet).
(2) :- ancestor(john,juliet).
(1) :- parent(john,juliet).
(4) Yes
```

Multiple Solutions

```
    :- ancestor(chaz,X).
(3) :- parent(chaz,john)
    X = john ;

(2) :- parent(chaz,Y),ancestor(Y,X).
(3) :- parent(chaz,john),ancestor(john,juliet).
(2) :- ancestor(john,juliet).
(1) :- parent(john,juliet).
    X = juliet
```

Search Strategy: left-to-right, top-to-bottom (but see later. . .)

Arithmetic, Equality

Built-in predicates which perform evaluation:

operators: `+`, `*`, `-`, `/`

comparison: `<`, `>`, `<=`, `>=`

equality: `=`, `\=`

```
X = 2 * 3 * 7
```

```
42 = 2 * 3 * 7
```

invoke evaluation: `42 is 2 * 3 * 7`

```
X is 2 * 3 * 7
```

Lists

Notation: `[ val`$_1$`,···,val`$_k$`]`

Empty: `[ ]`

Cons: `[1|[2,3]]` (cf. Lisp, SML)

```
length([ ],0).
length([X|Y],N) :- length(Y,N1), N is N1+1.
```

(consider: `length([X|Y],N) :- N is N1+1, length(Y,N1).`)

Fail, Cut

- `fail`: a predicate that *always* fails (what use is that?)
- **cut**: denoted by '`!`', a predicate that *always* succeeds. Its side effects alter back-tracking, and possibilities to re-try satisfying previous goals (**see later**).

Lecture 2: Propositional Resolution

Propositional Resolution: Plan

- Proof by refutation (as with semantic tableaux)
- Normal Forms
- CNF: Conjunctive Normal Form
- NNF: Negative Normal Form
- Clausal form
- Resolution Principle
- Resolution Algorithm
- Simplifications
- Soundness, Completeness, Termination
- Resolution Strategies (brief)

Aside: Prolog Tableaux Construction

```
/*
    Propositional Logic Semantic Tableaux
    From Ben-Ari: Mathematical Logic for Computer Science (Appendix B)
    ( in /home/ta5/staff/alanw/PROLOG/semtab.pl )
 */

/* Define logical operators: */
:- op(650,xfy, '#').
:- op(640,xfy, '=>').
:- op(630,yfx, '^').
:- op(620,yfx, 'v').
:- op(610, fy, '~').

/* Top-level algorithm */

semantic_tableau(F) :-  T = t(_, _, [F]),
                        extend_tableau(T),
                        write_tableau(T,0).

extend_tableau(t(closed, empty, L)) :-
        check_closed(L).
```

```
extend_tableau(t(open, empty, L)) :-
        contains_only_literals(L).
extend_tableau(t(Left, empty, L)) :-
        alpha_rule(L,L1),
        Left = t(_,_,L1),
        extend_tableau(Left).
extend_tableau(t(Left, Right, L)) :-
        beta_rule(L,L1,L2),
        Left = t(_,_,L1),
        Right = t(_,_,L2),
        extend_tableau(Left),
        extend_tableau(Right).

/* tableau extension */

check_closed(L) :-
        mymember(F,L), mymember( ~ F, L).

contains_only_literals([]).
contains_only_literals([F | Tail]) :-
        literal(F),
        contains_only_literals(Tail).
```

```
literal(F) :- atom(F).
literal(~ F) :- atom(F).

alpha_rule(L, [A1, A2 | Ltemp]) :-
        alpha_formula(A,A1,A2),
        mymember(A,L),
        delete(A,L, Ltemp).
alpha_rule(L, [A1 | Ltemp]) :-
        A = ~ ~ A1,
        mymember(A,L),
        delete(A,L, Ltemp).

beta_rule(L, [B1 | Ltemp], [B2 | Ltemp]) :-
        beta_formula(B,B1,B2),
        mymember(B,L),
        delete(B,L, Ltemp).

alpha_formula(A1 ^ A2, A1, A2).
alpha_formula(~ (A1 => A2), A1, ~ A2).
alpha_formula(~ (A1 v A2), ~ A1, ~ A2).
alpha_formula(~ (A1 # A2), ~ (A1 => A2), ~( A2 => A1) ).

beta_formula(A1 v A2, A1, A2).
```

```
beta_formula(A1 => A2, ~ A1, A2).
beta_formula(~ (A1 ^ A2), ~ A1, ~ A2).
beta_formula(A1 # A2, A1 => A2, A2 => A1).

/* printing the tableau */

write_formula_list([F]) :- write(F).
write_formula_list([F | Tail]) :-
        write(F),
        write(','),
        write_formula_list(Tail).

write_tableau(empty,_).
write_tableau(closed,_) :-
        write(' Closed').
write_tableau(open,_) :-
        write(' Open').
write_tableau(t(Left, Right, List), K) :-
        nl, tab(K), K1 is K+3,
        write_formula_list(List),
        write_tableau(Left,K1),
        write_tableau(Right,K1).
```

```
/* standard list operations */

mymember(X, [X | _]).
mymember(X, [_ | Tail]) :- mymember(X,Tail).

delete(X, [X | Tail], Tail).
delete(X, [Head | Tail], [Head | Tail1]) :- delete(X, Tail, Tail1).

/* Example: from above

semantic_tableau( ((p ^ q) ^ ~ q) ).

*/
```

Normal Forms

DNF (disjunctive normal form):

$$D_1 \vee D_2 \vee \cdots \vee D_m$$

where $D_i = L_1 \wedge L_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge L_n$

CNF (conjunctive normal form):

$$C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge C_m$$

where $C_i = L_1 \vee L_2 \vee \cdots \vee L_n$

L_j is a **literal**, either A or $\neg(A)$ for atomic propositional formula A.

For literal L, then $\overline{L}$ is the **complement** of L.
i.e. if $L = A$, then $\overline{L} = \neg(A)$

Converting to CNF

- eliminate implication ('$\rightarrow$'): $(F \rightarrow G) \mathrel{=\mid\models} (\neg(F) \vee G)$
- 'push in' negations using De Morgan's Laws:

  $\neg(F \wedge G) \mathrel{=\mid\models} (\neg(F) \vee \neg(G))$

  $\neg(F \vee G) \mathrel{=\mid\models} (\neg(F) \wedge \neg(G))$
- remove double negation ('$\neg\neg$'): $\neg(\neg(F)) \mathrel{=\mid\models} F$
- now formula is in **Negative Normal Form (NNF)**
- finally, remove conjunction within disjunction, via distributive law:
  $(F \vee (G \wedge G_2)) \mathrel{=\mid\models} ((F \vee G) \wedge (F \vee G_2))$

Theorem 11 *Every propositional formula* F *can be converted into a CNF formula F' such that* F *is logically equivalent to* F'*, i.e.:*

$$F \mathrel{=\!|\!|\!=} F'$$

$\square$

Example

$$\neg((A \wedge B) \rightarrow B)$$

$$\neg(\neg(A \wedge B) \vee B)$$

$$\neg(\neg(A \wedge B)) \wedge \neg(B)$$

$$(A \wedge B) \wedge \neg(B)$$

```
datatype SENT = Prop of string | Not of SENT |
                And of (SENT * SENT) | Or of (SENT * SENT) | True | False;

fun Imp (x,y) = Or(Not(x),y);  fun BiImp(x,y) = And(Imp(x,y),Imp(y,x));

fun nnf (Prop a) = Prop a  | nnf (Not (Prop a)) = Not (Prop a)
  | nnf (Not (Not a)) = nnf a
  | nnf (Not (And(a,b))) = nnf(Or(Not a, Not b))
  | nnf (Not (Or(a,b))) = nnf(And(Not a, Not b))
  | nnf (And(a,b)) = And(nnf a, nnf b)
  | nnf (Or(a,b)) = Or(nnf a, nnf b);

fun distrib (p, And(q,r)) = And(distrib(p,q),distrib(p,r))
  | distrib (And(q,r),p) = And(distrib(q,p),distrib(r,p))
  | distrib (p,q) = Or(p,q);

fun cnf(And(p,q)) = And(cnf(p),cnf(q))
  | cnf(Or(p,q)) = distrib(cnf(p),cnf(q)) | cnf(p) = p;

fun docnf(p) = cnf(nnf(p));
```

```
- sent1;
    (((~A/\~B)\/(~A/\B))\/((A/\~B)\/(A/\B)))

- docnf(Not(sent1));
    (((A\/B)/\(A\/~B))/\((~A\/B)/\(~A\/~B)))




- sent2
     (~(~A\/(~B\/C2))\/(~(~A\/B)\/(~A\/C2)))

     ((A -> (B -> C2)) -> ((A -> B) -> (A -> C2)))

- docnf(Not(sent2));
    ((~A\/(~B\/C2))/\((~A\/B)/\(A/\~C2)))
```

Clausal Form

Clausal Formula: Consider a (CNF) clause $L_1 \vee L_2 \vee \cdots \vee L_n$

'$\vee$' is associative, commutative, idempotent, so…

Represent clausal formula as a set of literals, or a **Clause**, C:

$$\text{Notation : } [L_1; L_2; \ldots; L_n]$$

A **Unit Clause** has a single literal: $[L]$

Write CNF as a set of clauses, N, in **Clausal Form**:

$$\{C_1, C_2, \cdots, C_m\}$$

where C_i are clauses.
Let $CF(X)$ be the clausal form of a set of formulae X

An interpretation v satisfies clause C *iff* $v(L) =$ true for some L in C.

Define v on empty clause: $v([\,]) =$ false, i.e. $[\,]$ is a contradiction.

Note: $\{[\,]\}$ is **unsatisfiable**, **BUT** $\{\ \ \}$ is **valid**

Example

$F = (A \wedge B) \wedge \neg(B)$

$CF(F) = \{[A],[B],[\neg(B)]\}$

$F = (((\neg A \wedge \neg B) \vee (\neg A \wedge B))) \vee (A \wedge \neg B)) \vee (A \wedge B))$

$CF(\neg(F)) = \{[A;B],[A;\neg B],[\neg A;B],[\neg A;\neg B]\}$

$F = ((A \rightarrow B) \wedge (B \rightarrow A))$

$CF(F) = \{[\neg(A);B],[\neg(B);A]\}$

Resolution Principle

Based on:

$$((F \vee G) \wedge (G_2 \vee \neg(G)) \models (F \vee G_2)$$

C_1 and C_2 are **Clashing Clauses** if $L \in C_1$ and $\overline{L} \in C_2$.

For **Parent Clauses** C_1, C_2, their **Resolvent** is

$$Res(C_1, C_2) = (C_1 \setminus \{L\}) \cup (C_2 \setminus \{\overline{L}\})$$

Theorem 14 ***Resolution Rule***: $C_1, C_2 \models Res(C_1, C_2)$ $\square$

The Resolution Algorithm

Start with set of clauses N_0

Given set of clauses, N_i at stage i:

- *Choose* a pair of clashing clauses, $C_1, C_2 \in N_i$
- Let $C = Res(C_1, C_2)$
- if $C = [\,]$ then terminate (N_0 is unsatisfiable)
  else $N_{i+1} = N_i \cup \{C\}$
- if $N_{i+1} = N_i$ *for all ways of choosing* C_1, C_2
  then terminate (N_0 is satisfiable)

Example

(1) Let $F = (A \wedge B) \to B$ and test for $\models (A \wedge B) \to B$

$\neg F = (A \wedge B) \wedge \neg(B)$

$CF(\neg(F)) = \{[A], [B], [\neg(B)]\}$

1	A	
2	B	
3	$\neg(B)$	
4	$Res(B, \neg(B)) = [\,]$	$2, 3$

(2) $(A \to B) \wedge (B \to C) \models (A \to C)$

(3)

1	$[A]$	
2	$[\neg(A); B]$	
3	$[\neg(A)]$	
$4a$	$[B]$	$1, 2$
$4b$	$[\,]$	$1, 3$; terminate

(4a) leaves $\{[B], [\neg(A)]\}$ with no clashing clauses.
S_0 satisfiable?? No! Need to backtrack and consider all other choices of clashing clauses (i.e. (4b)).

(4) Find clausal form for: $(A \wedge (A \rightarrow (B \vee C))) \models \neg A \rightarrow (\neg A \wedge B \wedge \neg C)$

(5) Find clausal form for: $F = ((A \rightarrow B) \wedge (B \rightarrow A))$

(6) Check satisfiability of: $F = (((\neg(A \wedge \neg(B)) \vee (\neg(A \wedge B))) \vee (A \wedge \neg(B))) \vee (A \wedge B))$

(7) Check satisfiability of: $F = ((A \rightarrow B) \wedge (B \rightarrow A))$

(8) Prove: $(A \rightarrow B) \models (B \rightarrow A)$

(9) Prove: $(A, A \rightarrow B) \models A$

Simplifications

Let $N \approx N'$ mean N is satisfiable iff N' is satisfiable.

Lemma 1 – Purity Deletion: If L appears in N but $\overline{L}$ is not in N.
Then delete all C_i containing L leaving N'.
Then $N \approx N'$.

Lemma 2 – Unit Propagation: If unit clause $[L] \in N$
Then delete all C_i containing L, and delete $\overline{L}$ from remaining clauses, to leave N'.
Then $N \approx N'$.

Lemma 3 – Tautology Deletion: If a clause C contains L and $\overline{L}$
Then $N' = N \setminus \{C\}$.
Then $N \approx N'$.

Lemma 4 – Subsumption Deletion: If $C_1 \subseteq C_2$ then C_1 **subsumes** C_2.
Then $N' = N \setminus \{C_2\}$
Then $N \approx N'$.

Example

$\{[A;B],[A_2],[A_2;B_2],[A;B;B_2],[\neg B,\neg A_2],[\neg A],[\neg A_3,A_3]\}$

Soundness, Completeness, Termination

Let $N_0 = CF(X \cup \{\neg F\})$

Refutation of N_0 *iff* the resolution procedure derives $[]$ from N_0.

Call this $X \vdash_{\mathcal{R}} F$

Soundness of $\mathcal{R}$ w.r.t. the semantics of PC: If $X \vdash_{\mathcal{R}} F$ then $X \models F$.

Use the resolution procedure to decide if $X \cup \{\neg F\}$ is satisfiable, i.e. if $X \models F$.

Completeness of $\mathcal{R}$ w.r.t. the semantics of PC: If $X \models F$ then $X \vdash_{\mathcal{R}} F$.

Termination: $\mathcal{R}$ terminates

Resolution Strategies

Start from N_0.

(1) Linear Resolution: each resolvent $R_{i+1} = Res(R_i, B_i)$, the **centre clause**, is obtained from the previous centre clause R_i and a **side clause**, B_i, which is either taken from N_0 or is a previous centre clause.

Complete.

(2) Input Resolution:

A sub-case of linear resolution: the same but *all* side clauses now taken from N_0 (each element in N_0 is an **input clause**)

Easier to implement, more efficient, but not complete.

(3) Unit Resolution:

At least one parent clause is a unit clause.

Equivalent to input resolution

(4) Set-of-Support Resolution:

Let $N_2 \subset N$ and $N \setminus N_2$ is satisfiable.

At least one parent clause must come from N_2.

Complete.

Example

Input Resolution (also Linear):

$\{[\neg A; \neg B], [\neg A_2; \neg B_2; A], [B_2; \neg A_2], [B], [A_2]\}$

1.	$[\neg A; \neg B]$		
2.	$[B_2; \neg A_2]$		
3.	$[\neg A_2; \neg B_2; A]$		
4.	$[B]$		
5.	$[A_2]$		
6.	$[\neg B; \neg B_2; \neg A_2]$	$1,3(A)$
7.	$[\neg B; \neg A_2]$	$2,6(B_2)$
8.	$[\neg A_2]$	$4,7(B)$
9.	$[\,]$	$5,8(A_2)$

Lecture 3: First Order Predicate Logic (FOPL)

Introduction

1. *The successor of each number is always greater than that number*
2. *There is a number greater than 3*

Restrict numbers to the set $\{1, \ldots, 5\}$.

1. $gt\_2\_1 \wedge gt\_3\_2 \wedge gt\_4\_3 \wedge gt\_5\_4$
2. $gt\_1\_3 \vee gt\_2\_3 \vee gt\_3\_3 \vee gt\_4\_3 \vee gt\_5\_3$

Write proposition gt_i_j as *predicate* $gt(i, j)$, where $gt : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$.

1. $gt(2,1) \wedge gt(3,2) \wedge gt(4,3) \wedge gt(5,4)$
2. $gt(1,3) \vee gt(2,3) \vee gt(3,3) \vee gt(4,3) \vee gt(5,3)$

and allow functions, e.g.

1. $gt(succ(1),1) \wedge gt(succ(2),2) \wedge gt(succ(3),3) \wedge gt(succ(4),4)$
2. $gt(1,3) \vee gt(2,3) \vee gt(3,3) \vee gt(4,3) \vee gt(5,3)$

But still cannot (easily) express *for all* or *for some* in propositional logic (and impossible for infinite sets of objects)

So introduce *quantifiers*.

The Language L of FOPL

n-ary predicate symbols (of arity n)

n-ary function symbols (of arity n)

constant symbols

variables $x \in \mathcal{X}$

terms in L:

- a constant or variable from L
- if $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ are terms in L, and f_n is an n-ary function symbol in L, then $f_n(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ is a term in L

atomic formulae in L:

- true, false are atomic formulae in L
- if $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ are terms in L, and p_n is an n-ary predicate symbol in L, then $p_n(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ is an atomic formula in L

formulae in L:

- atomic formulae from L are formulae in L
- if F, G are formulae and x is a variable in L, then the following are formulae in L:
  $(F \wedge G), (F \vee G), \neg(F), (F \rightarrow G)$,
  $\forall x\ F$ (*universal quantification*)
  $\exists x\ F$ (*existential quantification*)

Variable Binding:

- x is *bound* in $\forall x\ F$ or $\exists x\ F$.
- F is the **scope** of x
- A variable which isn't bound is **free**

Example

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
(p_1(x)\wedge & (p_1(x)\wedge \\
\quad(\forall x & \quad(\forall \mathbf{x'} \\
\qquad(p_2(a,x)\wedge q_1(y))\rightarrow & \qquad(p_2(a,\mathbf{x'})\wedge q_1(y))\rightarrow \\
\qquad\quad(\exists y & \qquad\quad(\exists \mathbf{y'} \\
\qquad\qquad(r_2(x,y)\wedge & \qquad\qquad(r_2(\mathbf{x'},\mathbf{y'})\wedge \\
\qquad\qquad\quad(\forall x & \qquad\qquad\quad(\forall \mathbf{x''} \\
\qquad\qquad\qquad\neg(q_3(x,z,b)))))) & \qquad\qquad\qquad\neg(q_3(\mathbf{x''},z,b))))))
\end{array}
$$

Semantics of FOPL

Structure $\mathcal{M} = (D, R, F, C)$:

domain D (non-empty)

R: assign k-ary relation $p^{\mathcal{M}}$ on D to each k-ary predicate symbol p of L;

F: assign k-ary function $f^{\mathcal{M}}$ on D to each k-ary function symbol f of L;

C: assign element $a^{\mathcal{M}}$ from D to each constant symbol a of L.

Assignment s over $\mathcal{M}$: $s(x) \in D$ for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Values for terms: t is given value $t^{\mathcal{M},s} \in D$:

Term in L	Value in D
constant a	$a^{\mathcal{M},s} = a^{\mathcal{M}}$
variable x	$x^{\mathcal{M},s} = s(x)$
n-ary function f	$f(t_1,t_2,\ldots,t_n)^{\mathcal{M},s} = f^{\mathcal{M}}(t_1^{\mathcal{M},s},t_2^{\mathcal{M},s},\ldots,t_n^{\mathcal{M},s})$
	($t_1,\ldots,t_n$ are terms)

Truth values for formulae: $v_{\mathcal{M},s}(A) \in \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$

Logic Symbol	Truth Value
constant **t**	$v_{\mathcal{M},s}(\mathbf{t}) = \text{true}$
constant **f**	$v_{\mathcal{M},s}(\mathbf{f}) = \text{false}$
predicate	$v_{\mathcal{M},s}(p(t_1, \ldots, t_n)) = \text{true iff } (t_1^{\mathcal{M},s}, \ldots, t_n^{\mathcal{M},s}) \in p^{\mathcal{M}}$
connective (e.g)	$v_{\mathcal{M},s}(F \wedge G) = \text{true iff } v_{\mathcal{M},s}(F) = \text{true and } v_{\mathcal{M},s}(G) = \text{true}$
quantifier $\forall$	$v_{\mathcal{M},s}(\forall x F) = \text{true iff for all } d \in D$, $v_{\mathcal{M},s[x \mapsto d]}(F) = \text{true}$
quantifier $\exists$	$v_{\mathcal{M},s}(\exists x F) = \text{true iff for some } d \in D$, $v_{\mathcal{M},s[x \mapsto d]}(F) = \text{true}$

If $v_{\mathcal{M},s}(F) = \text{true}$, write $\models_{\mathcal{M},s} F$

If F is closed, then $v_{\mathcal{M},s}(F)$ is independent of s, so write $\models_{\mathcal{M}} F$

$\mathcal{M}$ is also a **model** for F.

A closed formula is **satisfiable** if it is *true* in *some* structure

A closed formula is **valid** if it is *true* in *all* structures: write $\models F$

Example

$A = \forall x \forall y(q(x,y) \rightarrow (p(x,y) \vee \exists z(p(x,z) \wedge q(z,y))$
Structure $\mathcal{M} = (\textit{people}, \{q \mapsto \textit{ancestor}, p \mapsto \textit{parent}\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$
Any assignment s

- $v_{\mathcal{M},s}(\forall x \forall y(q(x,y) \rightarrow (p(x,y) \vee \exists z(p(x,z) \wedge q(z,y)))))) = \text{true}$ iff
- for all $d \in D$, $v_{\mathcal{M},s[x \mapsto d]}(\forall y(q(x,y) \rightarrow (p(x,y) \vee \exists z(p(x,z) \wedge q(z,y)))))) = \text{true}$ iff
- for all $d \in D$, for all $d' \in D$, $v_{\mathcal{M},s[x \mapsto d][y \mapsto d']}(q(x,y) \rightarrow (p(x,y) \vee \exists z(p(x,z) \wedge q(z,y))))) = \text{true}$ iff
- for all $d \in D$, for all $d' \in D$, if $v_{\mathcal{M},s[x \mapsto d][y \mapsto d']}(q(x,y)) = \text{true}$ then $v_{\mathcal{M},s[x \mapsto d][y \mapsto d']}(p(x,y) \vee \exists z(p(x,z) \wedge q(z,y))) = \text{true}$ iff
- for all $d \in D$, for all $d' \in D$, if $(d,d') \in$ *ancestor* then either $v_{\mathcal{M},s[x \mapsto d][y \mapsto d']}(p(x,y))$ or $v_{\mathcal{M},s[x \mapsto d][y \mapsto d']}(\exists z(p(x,z) \wedge q(z,y)))$ iff
- for all $d \in D$, for all $d' \in D$, if $(d,d') \in$ *ancestor* then either $(d,d') \in$ *parent* or there exists a $d'' \in D$, such that $v_{\mathcal{M},s[x \mapsto d][y \mapsto d'][z \mapsto d'']}(p(x,z) \wedge q(z,y)) = \text{true}$ iff
- for all $d \in D$, for all $d' \in D$, if $(d,d') \in$ *ancestor* then either $(d,d') \in$ *parent* or there exists a $d'' \in D$, such that $v_{\mathcal{M},s[x \mapsto d][y \mapsto d'][z \mapsto d'']}(p(x,z)) = \text{true}$ and $v_{\mathcal{M},s[x \mapsto d][y \mapsto d'][z \mapsto d'']}(q(z,y)) = \text{true}$ iff
- for all $d \in D$, for all $d' \in D$, if $(d,d') \in$ *ancestor* then either $(d,d') \in$ *parent* or there exists a $d'' \in D$, such that $(d,d'') \in$ *parent* and $(d'',d') \in$ *ancestor* iff
- for all people d and d', if d is an ancestor of d', then either d' is a parent of d, or there exists another person d'' such that d'' is a parent of d and d'' is an ancestor of d'.
- which is ‘clearly’ true, since *ancestor* is the transitive closure of *parent*.

Lecture 4: Resolution for Predicate Logic

Predicate Resolution: Plan

- Proof by refutation again
- Normal Forms (again!)
- CNF, NNF, Clausal form (again!)
- Prenex CNF (new)
- Preclausal Form (new)
- Existential quantifier elimination: Skolemisation
- Substitution
- Unification
- Resolution Principle (again!)
- Resolution Algorithm (again!)
- Soundness, Completeness, Termination

Normal Forms

Prenex conjunctive normal form:

$$F = Q_1 x_1 \cdots Q_k x_k M$$

where

F is closed

Q_i is a quantifier,

M is a formula in CNF (quantifier-free), the **matrix** of F

free variables $x_1, \ldots x_k$ of M

Preclausal form: prenex conjunctive normal form *and* Q_i are all *universal* quantifiers.

Just use M to represent the universal closure of M.

Clausal form: preclausal form $+$ write M as a set of clauses (it's in CNF)

Conversion to Clausal Form

- rename bound variables apart
- rewrite all logical connectives (e.g. $\rightarrow$) using $\wedge$ and $\vee$ (propositional)
- move $\neg$ inward (propositional)
- move all quantifiers out to the front (*see Kelly*)
- put the matrix into CNF using distributive laws (propositional)

Existential Quantifier Elimination

... by **Skolemisation**

Consider prenex clausal form: $Q_1 x_1 \cdots Q_k x_k M$

- Choose leftmost $\exists_{n+1} x_{n+1}$
- Create a new n-ary function symbol 'f_n'
- Replace occurences of x_{n+1} in M by '$f_n(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$' (a **Skolem function**)
- Remove $\exists_{n+1} x$

If $\exists_1 x_1$ is first, then use a new constant symbol c (a **Skolem constant**)

Theorem 18 *(**Skolem**) There is a purely syntactic procedure which, given a closed formula F, produces a formula F' which is in preclausal form such that F is satisfiable if and only if F' is satisfiable.* □

Substitution

$\sigma = \{x_1/t_1, x_2/t_2, \ldots, x_n/t_n\}$

where

variable $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$

terms $t_i (t_i \neq x_i)$

'$t\sigma$' means *simultaneously* replace each x_i in t with t_i.

Use σ, θ, μ for substitutions ...

Aside: Notation Alert!

Note: 'x/t' means x is *subistuted by* t (not t substituted by x)

Also, we have used '$x_1 \leftarrow t_1$' (e.g. in G&P)

Composing Substitutions:

Let $\theta = \{x_1/s_1, \ldots, x_n/s_n\}$, $\sigma = \{y_1/t_1, \ldots, y_m/t_m\}$

Want: $(t\theta)\sigma = t(\theta \circ \sigma)$ [2, Theorem 16]

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta \circ \sigma = \\
&\quad \{x_1/s_1\sigma, \ldots, x_n/s_n\sigma\} \\
&\qquad \setminus \{x_1/x_1, \ldots, x_n/x_n\} \\
&\qquad\quad \cup \sigma'
\end{aligned}$$

σ' is obtained from σ by removing any substitutions x_i/s'_i, where x_i appears in θ

(i.e. Using 'domain subtraction' operation '$\lhd$': $\sigma' = \{x_1, \ldots x_n\} \lhd \sigma$)

Example

Let $\theta = \{w/v, x/f(z), y/g(x), z/y\}$ and $\sigma = \{v/w, z/a, y/b, x/h(v)\}$
and let $t = f(v,w,x,y,z)$

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
t\theta & = & f(v,v,f(z),g(x),y) \\
\hline
(t\theta)\sigma & = & f(w,w,f(a),g(h(v)),b) \\
\hline
\theta' & = & \{w/v\sigma, x/f(z)\sigma, y/g(x)\sigma, z/y\sigma\} \\
 & = & \{w/w, x/f(z)\sigma, y/g(x)\sigma, z/y\sigma\} \\
 & = & \{x/f(a), y/g(h(v)), z/b\} \\
\sigma' & = & \{w,x,y,z\} \lhd \sigma \\
 & = & \{v/w\} \\
\theta \circ \sigma & = & \theta' \cup \sigma' \\
 & = & \{v/w, x/f(a), y/g(h(v)), z/b\} \\
\hline
t(\theta \circ \sigma) & = & f(w,w,f(a),g(h(v)),b)
\end{array}
$$

$A =$

$(p_1(x) \wedge$

$\quad (\forall x$

$\quad\quad (p_2(a,x) \wedge q_1(y)) \rightarrow$

$\quad\quad\quad (\exists y$

$\quad\quad\quad\quad (r_2(x,y) \wedge$

$\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad (\forall x$

$\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad \neg(q_3(x,z,b)))))))$

$A\{x/f(z), y/g(x), z/y\} =$

$(p_1(f(z)) \wedge$

$\quad (\forall \mathbf{x}'$

$\quad\quad (p_2(a,\mathbf{x}') \wedge q_1(g(x))) \rightarrow$

$\quad\quad\quad (\exists \mathbf{y}'$

$\quad\quad\quad\quad (r_2(\mathbf{x}',\mathbf{y}') \wedge$

$\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad (\forall \mathbf{x}''$

$\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad \neg(q_3(\mathbf{x}'',y,b)))))))$

Unification

Terms s, t are **unifiable** if there is a θ so that $s\theta = t\theta$.

Most General Unifier (MGU):

An MGU makes the ‘least number of changes’

A unifier θ is a MGU for terms s, t if, for all unifiers σ of s, t then $\sigma = \theta \circ \mu$ for some substitution μ.

Theorem 17 *If two terms are unifiable then they have a most general unifier.*

$\square$

Algorithm for Computing MGUs:

$unify(s,t)$:

> **if** $s = t$ **then** return $\emptyset$
>
> **let** s_1, t_1 = *disagreement pair* of s,t
>
> **if** s_1, t_1 are variables **then** $from = s_1, to = t_1$
>
> **if** s_1 is a variable **and** $s_1 \notin Vars(t_1)$ **then** $from = s_1, to = t_1$
>
> **if** t_1 is a variable **and** $t_1 \notin Vars(s_1)$ **then** $from = t_1, to = s_1$
>
> **else** return $fail$
>
> $ret = unify(s\{from/to\}, t\{from/to\})$
>
> **if** $ret = \mu$ (a MGU) **then** return $\{from/to\} \circ \mu$
>
> **if** $ret = fail$ **then** return $fail$

$Vars(t_1)$ returns the set of variables in t_1

'$s_1 \notin Vars(t_1)$' is the **Occurs Check**

Example

1. $unify(f(a,g(x)),f(x,g(y))$
2. $unify(f(x,g(x)),f(y,g(h(y)))$
3. $unify(f(a,g(x)),f(x',g(y))$
4. $unify(f(x,g(z)),f(y,g(a))$

First Order Resolution

... at last ...

Clashing Clauses C_1, C_2:

$L_1 \in C_1, L_2 \in C_2$ and $L_1, \overline{L_2}$ have a MGU θ

Assume C_1, C_2 have no variables in common (otherwise, rename variables)

Suppose clash on L_1, L_2 with MGU θ.

A **Binary Resolvent** of C_1, C_2:

$$(C_1\theta - \{L_1\theta\}) \cup (C_2\theta - \{L_2\theta)\}$$

Factoring necessary for completeness of FOR.

$\{L_1, L_2, \cdots, L_n\} \subseteq C$ such that $\{L_1, L_2, \cdots, L_n\}$ has an MGU θ:
$C\theta$ is a **factor** of C.

A **Resolvent** of C_1, C_2 is a binary resolvent of C'_1, C'_2 (where C'_i may be a factor of C_i)

Resolution Procedure

(similar to propositional case)

Given set of clauses N_i:

- *Choose* a pair of clashing clauses, $C_1, C_2 \in N_i$ (rename variables apart)
- Let $C = Res(C_1, C_2)$
- if $C = [\,]$ then terminate (N_0 is unsatisfiable)
  else $N_{i+1} = N_i \cup \{C\}$
- if $N_{i+1} = N_i$ *for all ways of choosing* C_1, C_2
  (*and* the clashing literal) then terminate (N_0 is satisfiable)

Example

$F = (\forall x(A(x) \rightarrow B(x))) \rightarrow ((\exists x A(x)) \rightarrow (\exists x B(x)))$

$CF(\neg F) = \{[\neg A(x); B(x)], [A(a)], [\neg B(x)]\}$

1.	$[\neg A(x); B(x)]$	
2.	$[A(a)]$	
3.	$[\neg B(x)]$	(standardise apart first)
4.	$[\neg A(x)]$	$1, 3(B)$
5.	$[\,]$	$2, 4(A), \{x/a\}$

Soundness, Completeness, Termination

Soundness: If $X \vdash_{\mathcal{R}} A$ (i.e. there is a refutation (with factoring) of $X \cup \{\neg A\}$) then $X \models A$.

Completeness: If $X \models A$ then $X \vdash_{\mathcal{R}} A$.
i.e. if $X \nvdash_{\mathcal{R}} A$ then $X \not\models A$.

Termination:

Resolution is a **semi-decision** procedure.

Terminates if $X \models A$, but may not terminate if $X \not\models A$.

Herbrand Models

Set of clauses: $\mathcal{S}$, contaning…

Set of constant symbols: $\mathcal{C}$; Set of function symbols: $\mathcal{F}$

The **Herbrand Universe** $H_{\mathcal{S}}$ of $\mathcal{S}$:

for $a \in \mathcal{C}$: $a \in H_{\mathcal{S}}$

for $f \in \mathcal{F}$: $f(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in H_{\mathcal{S}}$, with $t_i \in H_{\mathcal{S}}$

If there are no constants, then include an arbitrary constant symbol a.

Herbrand Base $B(\mathcal{S})$: the set of all ground atoms formed from predicate symbols in $\mathcal{S}$ and $H_{\mathcal{S}}$.

Herbrand Interpretation: a subset of the Herbrand base, containing ground atoms assumed to be satisfied.

Herbrand Model for $\mathcal{S}$ is a Herbrand interpretaion which satisfies $\mathcal{S}$.

Example

$S = \{[p(a)], [q(b)], [r(c)], [\neg q(x), p(x)], [\neg p(y), r(y)]\}$

$H(S) = \{a, b, c\}$

$B(S) = \{p(a), q(a), r(a), p(b), q(b), r(b), p(c), q(c), r(c)\}$

model $= \{p(a), p(b), q(a), q(b), r(a), r(b), r(c)\}$

interpretation $= \{p(a), p(b), q(a), q(b), r(a), r(c)\}$

(but not a model)

Q: What use is all this?

Theorem *$\mathcal{S}$ has a model iff it has a Herbrand model* $\square$

Theorem *If $\mathcal{S}$ is unsatisfiable then some finite set of ground clauses of $\mathcal{S}$ is unsatisfiable* $\square$

Example

$A = (\forall x(p(x) \rightarrow q(x))) \rightarrow ((\forall x p(x)) \rightarrow (\forall x q(x)))$

$CF(\neg A) = \{[\neg p(x), q(x)], [p(y)], [\neg q(a)]\}$

Ground Clauses with $\{x/a, y/a\}$:

$$\{[\neg p(a), q(a)], [p(a)], [\neg q(a)]\}$$

Lecture 5: Logic Programming

Logic Programming: Plan

- Horn Clauses
- Resolution with Horn Clauses
- Prolog
- Search Strategy: SLD-Resolution and SLD-Trees
- Cut, Fail, Negation-as-Failure

Horn Clauses

As usual, **some definitions**. . .

positive literal: atomic formula $p(t_1,\ldots,t_n)$

negative literal: *negated* atomic formula $\neg p(t_1,\ldots,t_n)$.

Horn clause: a clause containin *at most one* positive literal e.g.

$[H_1;\neg B_2;\ldots\neg B_n]$

Definite clause: a Horn clause with *exactly one* positive literal.

$[H_1;\neg B_2;\ldots\neg B_n]$

Fact: a definite clause with *no* negative literals. $[H_1]$

Goal clause: a Horn clause with *no positive* literals. $[\neg B_1;\ldots\neg B_n]$

Set of Horn clauses X

Goal clause $\mathcal{G}$.

Write a Horn clause as $H_1 \leftarrow B_2,\ldots,B_n$

Resolution with Horn Clauses

Apply linear input resolution: $\mathcal{G}$ as initial centre clause.

- Choose
  1. a negative literal $\neg G_i \in \mathcal{G}$
  2. a clause $C^1 \in X$ with $C^1 = [H^1; \neg B^1_1; \ldots; \neg B^1_{n_1}]$

     $\ldots$

  so that $\neg G_i$ and H^1 clash: compute $\theta_1 = unify(G_i, H^1)$.

  (first renaming apart common variables) Success? Returns MGU θ_1.
- New centre clause:

  $\mathcal{G}' = (\mathcal{G}\theta_1 - \neg G_i\theta_1) \cup [\neg B^1_1\theta_1; \ldots; \neg B^1_{n_1}\theta_1]$

- Now compute $\mathcal{G}''$ from a negative literal in $\mathcal{G}'$ and a (postive) head H^2 of some clause $C^2 \in X$.
  i.e. compute: $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}', \mathcal{G}'', \ldots$ and MGUs $\theta_1, \theta_2, \ldots$ until empty clause is reached: $X \cup \{\mathcal{G}\}$ is unsatisfiable.
- **Computed Answer Substitution:** $\theta = \theta_1 \circ \theta_2 \circ \ldots \circ \theta_n$
  (restricted to free variables in goal)
- Two possible choices at each iteration:

  negative literal $\neg G_i$ from centre clause

  clause $C \in X$, with clashing head H to resolve with $\neg G_i$
- If no clashes with one set of choices then **backtrack** and try with other choices (if available).
- If there are no choices, then fail.

Prolog

Notation

variables: begin with capital letter: `X,Y,Answer`

constants, functors, predicates: begin with lower-case letter:
`parent/2, john, chaz`

definite clauses, or rules: `H :- B_1, ... , B_n`

procedure: sequence of rules with same head

fact: single positive literals, with no body

goal: headless rule, just the body: `:- B_1, ... , B_n`

Body variables are existentially quantified; head variables are universally quantified over the rule.

Also, built-in operations,
e.g. list `[a,b,c]`, empty list `[ ]`, add element to list `[X | Xs]`

Arithmetic evaluation: `X is X+1`

Search Strategy: SLD-Resolution

SLD-Resolution: **S**elect literal, **L**inear resolution, **D**efinite clauses

(1) **breadth-first** or (2) **depth-first**.

(1) will guarantee to find a finite resolution refutation, but (2) more efficient. . .

Prolog performs a **depth-first** search, matching rules from **top-to-bottom**, and resolving goal clauses from **left-to-right**.

Example

```
(1) ancestor(X,Y) :- parent(X,Y).
(2) ancestor(X,Y) :- parent(X,Z), ancestor(Z,Y).

(3) parent(jim,roy).     (4) parent(john,juliet).
(5)  parent(roy,sue).    (6) parent(roy,alan).      (7) parent(chaz,john).
(8)  parent(sue,toby).   (9) parent(sue,juliet).

(G) :- ancestor(P,juliet).
```

1. Resolve `ancestor(P,juliet)` with rule (1): with $\theta_1 = \{P/X, Y/juliet\}$, to yield G_1 = `:- parent(X,juliet).`
2. Resolve `:- parent(X,juliet)` with fact (4), with $\theta_2 = \{X/john\}$, to yield empty clause

So... the answer substitution is $\{P/X\} \circ \{X/john\} = \{P/john\}$

i.e. `john` is an ancestor of `juliet`

Example

```
:- op(650,xfy, '#'). :- op(640,xfy, '=>'). :- op(630,yfx, '^').
:- op(620,yfx, 'v'). :- op(610, fy, '~').

semantic_tableau(F) :-  T = t(_, _, [F]), extend_tableau(T), write_tableau(T,0).

extend_tableau(t(closed, empty, L)) :- check_closed(L).
extend_tableau(t(open, empty, L)) :- contains_only_literals(L).
extend_tableau(t(Left, empty, L)) :-
      alpha_rule(L,L1), Left = t(_,_,L1), extend_tableau(Left).
extend_tableau(t(Left, Right, L)) :- beta_rule(L,L1,L2), Left = t(_,_,L1),
        Right = t(_,_,L2), extend_tableau(Left), extend_tableau(Right).

check_closed(L) :- member(F,L), member( ~ F, L).

contains_only_literals([]).
contains_only_literals([F | Tail]) :- literal(F), contains_only_literals(Tail).

literal(F) :- atom(F). literal(~ F) :- atom(F).

alpha_rule(L, [A1, A2 | Ltemp]) :-
        alpha_formula(A,A1,A2), member(A,L),    delete(A,L, Ltemp).
alpha_rule(L, [A1 | Ltemp]) :-  A = ~ ~ A1, member(A,L), delete(A,L, Ltemp).

beta_rule(L, [B1 | Ltemp], [B2 | Ltemp]) :-
        beta_formula(B,B1,B2), member(B,L), delete(B,L, Ltemp).

alpha_formula(A1 ^ A2, A1, A2). alpha_formula(~ (A1 => A2), A1, ~ A2).
alpha_formula(~ (A1 v A2), ~ A1, ~ A2).
alpha_formula(~ (A1 # A2), ~ (A1 => A2), ~( A2 => A1) ).
```

```
beta_formula(A1 v A2, A1, A2). beta_formula(A1 => A2, ~ A1, A2).
beta_formula(~ (A1 ^ A2), ~ A1, ~ A2). beta_formula(A1 # A2, A1 => A2, A2 => A1).

member(X, [X | _]).
member(X, [_ | Tail]) :- member(X,Tail).

delete(X, [X | Tail], Tail).
delete(X, [Head | Tail], [Head | Tail1]) :- delete(X, Tail, Tail1).

write_formula_list([F]) :- write(F).
write_formula_list([F | Tail]) :- write(F), write(','), write_formula_list(Tail).

write_tableau(empty,_). write_tableau(closed,_) :- write(' Closed').
write_tableau(open,_) :- write(' Open').
write_tableau(t(Left, Right, List), K) :- nl, tab(K), K1 is K+3,
        write_formula_list(List), write_tableau(Left,K1), write_tableau(Right,K1).
```

An **SLD-Tree** of goal G_0, with respect to a program P and computation rule R is a labelled tree;

- G_0 at root
- G_{i+1} is a child of G_i if it is a resolvent of G_i and some clause C_i from P, under R.
- a branch is (finitely) **failed** if there is no resolvent
- a branch is **closed** if the resolvent is empty
- a branch may be **infinite**

- **Cut**: prune SLD-Tree — don't backtrack and search alternatives after failure.

  Insert '!' goal into clause body.

  '!' succeeds and *forces* all choices since containing clause was unified with parent goal.

  It's ok to prune failed branches, but not (necessarily) ok to prune success branches: 'green' and 'red' cuts.
- **Fail**: a goal that *always* fails.

- **Negation as Failure**: if search for resolution of `G` **finitely fails** then conclude `not G`.
  ('safe' if `G` is ground, but 'floundering' if `G` is non-ground).

```
disjoint(Xs,Ys) :- not (member(X,Xs), member(X,Ys).

teacher(alan).                  student(ashley).
takes_courses(X) :- student(X).

(1) :- not takes_courses(alan).
(2) :- not takes_courses(Y).
```

```
not X :- X, !, fail.
not X.
```

Lecture 7: Course Summary

The Handout of Handouts

- Course:
  - ‘Introduction, Timetable and Work Schedule’
  - (Parts I and II distributed separately)
- Part I: Resolution/Prolog (Alan):
  - ‘*Notes on Automated Reasoning*’ (Goré + Peim)
  - Outline solutions to selected exercises
  - Lecture slides
  - Part I Laboratory Exercises
  - ‘Resolution Exercises’
- Part II: Advanced Topics (Renate)
  - Lecture Notes booklet
  - Exercise and Laboratory notes

Assessed Work and Deadlines

- **Exam (40%)**: Open-book, 2 hours. Two Parts. Attempt three out of four questions in each Part.
- **Assessed Coursework (60%)**:
  - Part I Lab Exercises ($0.3x60\%$)
  - Part I 'Resolution Exercises' ($0.2x60\%$)
  - Part II 'Advanced Topics' Laboratories and Exercises ($0.5x60\%$)

Written work to be submitted to Student Support Office

Exam: Part One

It will *not* contain questions on:

- Kripke structures
- Temporal Logic
- Predicate Logic semantic tableaux
- Binary Decision Diagrams

(i.e. which have appeared in some past papers)

The exam may contain questions on topics covered in both the Pre-Course week and the Teaching Week.

Even though the exam is 'Open Book', you need to have a good knowledge of the topics covered, and in particular be proficient and up-to-speed in applying them.

Highlights

- deductive reasoning system vs meaning of formula
- meta-language vs object-language
- $\vdash$ vs $\models$
- soundness and completeness
- termination: decision procedures
- F is satisfiable if there is *some* interpretation for which evaluates to true.
- Model: a satisfying interpretation
- Validity: true in *every* interpretation
- refutation: $X \models F$ iff $X \cup \neg F$ is unsatisfiable
- If $\neg F$ is unsatisfiable then F is valid

(Propositional Logic) Semantic tableaux:

- Prove F by refuting $\neg F$: set root node label to be $\neg F$
- if parent is satisfiable then at least one child is.
- if all branches are closed then root formula is unsatisfiable
- counter-example generated from interpretation of atoms in open branch(es)

(Propositional Logic) Resolution:

- CNF, Clausal Form (CF): translation preserves equivalence
- Empty clause $[\,]$ is invalid (but empty CF $\{\ \}$ is valid)
- CF containing empty clause $\{C_1, \ldots, [\,], \ldots, C_k\}$ is therefore invalid
- Proof by refutation: look for empty clause
- Resolution algorithm
- Choose Clashing Clauses, containing complementary pair of literals

- Always terminates (finite number of clashing clauses);
- Simplifications preserve satisfiability ($N \approx N'$), possibly using different interpretations.
- sound and complete (assuming *systematic* rule application), but possible non-termination

(Predicate Logic) Resolution:

- Consider closed formula only (in this course)
- Translate into Prenex CNF: rename bound variables (where possible); bring quantifiers to front (put existential quantifiers first if possible)
- Remove existential quantifiers using Skolem functions and constants
- Clausal Form: *Matrix* with free variables implicitly quantified
- Look for Clashing Clauses (cf propositional resolution); Unification between literals in pair of clauses (standardise variables apart first!)
- Factoring: look for unifiable subset of literals within same clause (do *not* standardise variables apart!)
- sound and complete (with factoring), but possible non-termination

Unification:

- Composition of substitution: defined to be associative ($(t\theta)\sigma = t(\theta \circ \sigma)$).
- ‘Occurs Check’ to avoid infinite iteration
- construct Most General Unifier
- Unification Algorithm

Logic Programming:

- Linear Input Resolution with Horn Clauses: only one *positive* literal in each clause, so cuts down choices.
- Answer substitution produced on successful refutation
- Correspondence between Logic Programming and Resolution

Prolog Programming:

- Syntax: constants, variables, terms, user-defined operators
- Rules, facts, goals
- program execution = resolution steps
- answer substitution
- techniques: recursion, accumulator argument
- SLD Search strategy: search rules top-to-bottom; choose left-hand literal in goal;
- depth-first search of SLD-tree;
- Cuts: prune SLD-Tree to search; negation-as-failure: return false when there's no negative result

Glossary (Partial!)

Propositional:

Prop. Language	$\mathcal{P}$
Truth symbols	$\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{f}$
Connectives	$\neg, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow$
Truth *values*	$\mathsf{true}, \mathsf{false}$
Some Literal	$L, \overline{L}$
Some atomic proposition	A or B or B_2 or A' ...
Some prop. formulae	F or G or G_2 or F' ...
Set of prop. formulae	X or X' ...
Valuation (prop. formulae)	$v(F)$
Logical consequence	$\models$
Logical equivalence	$=\mid\models$

Clauses	C or D or C_1 or D' ...
Clause	$[L_1; L_2; \ldots; L_m]$
Set of clauses	$\{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n\}$
Set of clauses	N or N_0 or N' ...
valuation (clausal form)	$v(X)$
Set difference	$N \setminus N'$

Predicate:

FOPL. Language	L
variables	x or x_1 or $y \ldots$
constant symbols	a or a_1 or $b \ldots$
function symbols	f or f_1 or $g \ldots$
(data) term	t or t_1 or $s' \ldots$
predicate symbols	p or p_1 or $q' \ldots$
substitutions	σ or $\theta \ldots$
substitution	$[x/t]$
... applied to term s	$s\sigma$ or $s[x/t]$

Note difference in 'Clause' notation between Parts I and II.