Automated Reasoning Systems Introduction

Temur Kutsia

RISC, Johannes Kepler University of Linz, Austria kutsia@risc.uni-linz.ac.at

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

What is Automated Reasoning

- Reasoning: The process of making inferences.
- Automated reasoning studies methods to automate the process of reasoning.
- Automated reasoning systems: Computer programs that implement automated reasoning methods to perform reasoning automatically (or semi-automatically).

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Examples of Reasoning

 All men are mortal. Socrates is a man. Therefore Socrates is mortal.

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

All fruit is tasty if it is not cooked. This apple not tasty. Therefore, it is cooked.

Are These Reasonings Correct?

- All that glistens is not gold. This pot does not glisten. Therefore, it is gold.
- All men are mortal. Socrates is not mortal. Therefore, Socrates is not a man.

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

Are These Statements True?

- There exists a person with the property that if he (or she) is a genius then everybody is a genius.
- In idempotent groups the group operation is commutative.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

General Picture

Natural language, mathematical problems, program + specification, ...

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

General Picture

Natural language, mathematical problems, program + specification, ...



< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □











◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ののの





General Picture

Modeling



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ・三 ・のへぐ



Problem formulation (Chang and Lee, 1973):

Suppose that stock prices go down if the prime interest rate goes up. Suppose also that most people are unhappy when stock prices go down. Assume that prime interest rate does go up. Are most people unhappy?

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Problem formulation (Chang and Lee, 1973):

Suppose that stock prices go down if the prime interest rate goes up. Suppose also that most people are unhappy when stock prices go down. Assume that prime interest rate does go up. Are most people unhappy?

Formalization:

- P : prime interest rate goes up.
- S : stock prices go down.
- ► *U* : most people are unhappy.
- If the prime interest rate goes up, stock prices go down: $P \Rightarrow S$.
- If stock prices go down, most people are unhappy: $S \Rightarrow U$.

We should show that if $P \Rightarrow S$, $S \Rightarrow U$, and P hold, then U holds as well.

- We should show that if P ⇒ S, S ⇒ U, and P hold, then U holds as well.
- That means, $((P \Rightarrow S) \land (S \Rightarrow U) \land P) \Rightarrow U$ is valid.

Semantically:

Р	S	U	$P \Rightarrow S$	$S \Rightarrow U$	$((P \Rightarrow S) \land (S \Rightarrow U) \land P) \Rightarrow U$
true	true	true	true	true	true
true	true	false	true	false	true
true	false	true	false	true	true
true	false	false	false	true	true
false	true	true	true	true	true
false	false	true	true	true	true
false	true	false	true	false	true
false	false	false	true	true	true

We should show that if P ⇒ S, S ⇒ U, and P hold, then U holds as well.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

To solve this problem by (automated) reasoning, we need to have a corresponding calculus.

We should show that if P ⇒ S, S ⇒ U, and P hold, then U holds as well.

To solve this problem by (automated) reasoning, we need to have a corresponding calculus.

- Assume we have such a calculus that is sound and complete.
- ► Then we should prove *U* in this calculus from the assumptions $P \Rightarrow S, S \Rightarrow U$, and *P*.

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

(Assume the calculus has the modus ponens rule:
A and A ⇒ B imply B)

We should show that if P ⇒ S, S ⇒ U, and P hold, then U holds as well.

To solve this problem by (automated) reasoning, we need to have a corresponding calculus.

- Assume we have such a calculus that is sound and complete.
- ► Then we should prove *U* in this calculus from the assumptions $P \Rightarrow S, S \Rightarrow U$, and *P*.

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

(Assume the calculus has the modus ponens rule:
A and A ⇒ B imply B)

Proof:

- 1. $P \Rightarrow S$ (Assumption)
- **2**. $S \Rightarrow U$ (Assumption)
- 3. P (Assumption)
- 4. S (From 3 and 1 by modus ponens)
- 5. U (From 4 and 2 by modus ponens)

- In the example we used propositional logic.
- Often we need more powerful logics.
- For instance, we need first-order logic to express this:

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

 All men are mortal. Socrates is a man. Therefore Socrates is mortal.

- In the example we used propositional logic.
- Often we need more powerful logics.
- For instance, we need first-order logic to express this:

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ののの

- All men are mortal. Socrates is a man. Therefore Socrates is mortal.
- ► $\forall x.man(x) \Rightarrow mortal(x)$: All men are mortal.
- man(socrates): Socrates is a man.
- mortal(socrates): Socrates is mortal.

First-Order Logic

- Syntax
- Semantics
- Inference system

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Syntax

- Alphabet
- Terms
- Formulas

◆□ > ◆□ > ◆ 三 > ◆ 三 > ● ○ ○ ○ ○

Alphabet

A first-order alphabet consists of the following sets of symbols:

- ► A countable set of variables V.
- For each n ≥ 0, a set of n-ary function symbols Fⁿ. Elements of F⁰ are called constants.
- For each $n \ge 0$, a set of *n*-ary predicate symbols \mathcal{P}^n .

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

- Logical connectives \neg , \lor , \land , \Rightarrow , \Leftrightarrow .
- ► Quantifiers ∃, ∀.

Alphabet

A first-order alphabet consists of the following sets of symbols:

- ► A countable set of variables V.
- For each n ≥ 0, a set of n-ary function symbols Fⁿ. Elements of F⁰ are called constants.
- For each $n \ge 0$, a set of *n*-ary predicate symbols \mathcal{P}^n .

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

- Logical connectives \neg , \lor , \land , \Rightarrow , \Leftrightarrow .
- ► Quantifiers ∃, ∀.

Notation:

- x, y, z for variables.
- ► *f*, *g* for function symbols.
- ▶ *a*, *b*, *c* for constants.
- *p*, *q* for predicate symbols.

Terms

Definition

- A variable is a term.
- ▶ If t_1, \ldots, t_n are terms and $f \in \mathcal{F}^n$, then $f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ is a term.

Terms

Definition

- A variable is a term.
- ▶ If t_1, \ldots, t_n are terms and $f \in \mathcal{F}^n$, then $f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ is a term.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

Notation:

► *s*, *t*, *r* for terms.

Formulas

Definition

- If t₁,..., t_n are terms and p ∈ Fⁿ, then p(t₁,..., t_n) is a formula. It is called an atomic formula or an atom.
- If A is a formula, $\neg A$ is a formula.
- ▶ If *A* and *B* are formulas, then $A \lor B$, $A \land B$, $A \Rightarrow B$, and $A \Leftrightarrow B$ are formulas.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ののの

▶ If *A* is a formula, then $\exists x.A$ and $\forall x.A$ are formulas.

Formulas

Definition

- If t₁,..., t_n are terms and p ∈ Fⁿ, then p(t₁,..., t_n) is a formula. It is called an atomic formula or an atom.
- If A is a formula, $\neg A$ is a formula.
- ▶ If *A* and *B* are formulas, then $A \lor B$, $A \land B$, $A \Rightarrow B$, and $A \Leftrightarrow B$ are formulas.

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

▶ If *A* is a formula, then $\exists x.A$ and $\forall x.A$ are formulas.

Notation:

► A, B for formulas.

Translating English sentences into first-order logic formulas:

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

1. For each natural number there exists exactly one immediate successor natural number.

- succ, pred unary function symbols.
- \doteq binary predicate symbol.

Translating English sentences into first-order logic formulas:

1. For each natural number there exists exactly one immediate successor natural number.

 $\forall x.(\exists y.(y \doteq \textit{succ}(x) \land \forall z.(z \doteq \textit{succ}(x) \Rightarrow y \doteq z)))$

- succ, pred unary function symbols.
- \doteq binary predicate symbol.

Translating English sentences into first-order logic formulas:

1. For each natural number there exists exactly one immediate successor natural number.

 $\forall x.(\exists y.(y \doteq \textit{succ}(x) \land \forall z.(z \doteq \textit{succ}(x) \Rightarrow y \doteq z)))$

There is no natural number whose immediate successor is 0.

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

- succ, pred unary function symbols.
- \doteq binary predicate symbol.

Translating English sentences into first-order logic formulas:

1. For each natural number there exists exactly one immediate successor natural number.

 $\forall x.(\exists y.(y \doteq \textit{succ}(x) \land \forall z.(z \doteq \textit{succ}(x) \Rightarrow y \doteq z)))$

There is no natural number whose immediate successor is
0.

$$\neg \exists x.0 \doteq succ(x)$$

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

- succ, pred unary function symbols.
- \doteq binary predicate symbol.
Translating English sentences into first-order logic formulas:

1. For each natural number there exists exactly one immediate successor natural number.

 $\forall x.(\exists y.(y \doteq \textit{succ}(x) \land \forall z.(z \doteq \textit{succ}(x) \Rightarrow y \doteq z)))$

There is no natural number whose immediate successor is
 0.

$$\neg \exists x.0 \doteq succ(x)$$

3. For each nonzero natural number there exists exactly one immediate predecessor natural number.

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Assume:

- succ, pred unary function symbols.
- \doteq binary predicate symbol.

Translating English sentences into first-order logic formulas:

1. For each natural number there exists exactly one immediate successor natural number.

$$\forall x.(\exists y.(y \doteq \textit{succ}(x) \land \forall z.(z \doteq \textit{succ}(x) \Rightarrow y \doteq z)))$$

There is no natural number whose immediate successor is
 0.

$$\neg \exists x.0 \doteq succ(x)$$

3. For each nonzero natural number there exists exactly one immediate predecessor natural number.

 $\forall x.(\neg(x \doteq 0) \Rightarrow \exists y.(y \doteq pred(x) \land \forall z.(z \doteq pred(x) \Rightarrow y \doteq z)))$ Assume:

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

- succ, pred unary function symbols.
- \doteq binary predicate symbol.

Semantics

- Meaning of a first-order language consists of an universe and an appropriate meaning of each symbol.
- This pair is called structure.
- Structure fixes interpretation of function and predicate symbols.

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

- Meaning of variables is determined by a variable assignment.
- Interpretation of terms and formulas.

Structure

- Structure: a pair (D, I).
- ► *D* is a nonempty universe, the domain of interpretation.
- I is an interpretation function defined on D that fixes the meaning of each symbol associating
 - ▶ to each $f \in \mathcal{F}^n$ an *n*-ary function $f_l : D^n \to D$, (in particular, $c_l \in D$ for each constant c)
 - ▶ to each $p \in P^n$ different from \doteq , an *n*-ary relation p_l on *D*.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Variable Assignment

- A structure S = (D, I) is given.
- Variable assignment σ_S maps each x ∈ V into an element of D: σ_S(x) ∈ D.
- Given a variable x, an assignment ϑ_S is called an x-variant of σ_S iff ϑ_S(y) = σ_S(y) for all y ≠ x.

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Interpretation of Terms

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- ▶ Value of a term *t* under *S* and σ_S , $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(t)$:

•
$$Val_{S,\sigma_S}(x) = \sigma_S(x).$$

 $\triangleright \quad Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(f(t_1,\ldots,t_n)) = f_l(Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(t_1),\ldots,Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(t_n)).$

Interpretation of Terms

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- ▶ Value of a term *t* under *S* and σ_S , $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(t)$:

•
$$Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}).$$

 $\blacktriangleright Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(f(t_1,\ldots,t_n)) = f_l(Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(t_1),\ldots,Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(t_n)).$

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- Value of an atomic formula under S and σ_S is one of true, false:
 - Val_{S,σs}(s = t) = true iff Val_{S,σs}(s) = Val_{S,σs}(t).
 Val_{S,σs}(p(t₁,...,t_n)) = true iff

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ののの

 $(\mathit{Val}_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathit{t}_{1}),\ldots,\mathit{Val}_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathit{t}_{n}))\in \mathit{p}_{I}.$

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- Value of an atomic formula under S and σ_S is one of true, false:
 - ► $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(s \doteq t) = true \text{ iff } Val_{S,\sigma_S}(s) = Val_{S,\sigma_S}(t).$ ► $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(p(t_1, ..., t_n)) = true \text{ iff}$ $(Val_{S,\sigma_S}(t_1), ..., Val_{S,\sigma_S}(t_n)) \in p_I.$

A D F A 同 F A E F A E F A Q A

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- Value of an atomic formula under S and σ_S is one of true, false:

•
$$Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(s \doteq t) = true \text{ iff } Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(s) = Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(t).$$

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

 $Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(p(t_{1},\ldots,t_{n})) = true \text{ iff} \\ (Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(t_{1}),\ldots,Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(t_{n})) \in p_{I}.$

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- Value of an atomic formula under S and σ_S is one of true, false:
 - $Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(s \doteq t) = true \text{ iff } Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(s) = Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(t).$

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

► $Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(p(t_1,...,t_n)) = true \text{ iff}$ $(Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(t_1),...,Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(t_n)) \in p_l.$

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- ► Values of compound formulas under *S* and σ_S are also either *true* or *false*:
 - $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(\neg A) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(A) = false$.
 - $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(A \lor B) = true$ iff
 - $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(A) = true \text{ or } Val_{S,\sigma_S}(B) = true.$
 - $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(A \wedge B) = true$ iff
 - $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(A) = true$ and $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(B) = true$.
 - $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(A \Rightarrow B) = true$ iff
 - $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(A) = false \text{ or } Val_{S,\sigma_S}(B) = true.$
 - ▶ $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(A \Leftrightarrow B) = true \text{ iff } Val_{S,\sigma_S}(A) = Val_{S,\sigma_S}(B).$
 - $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(\exists x.A) = true$ iff
 - $Val_{S,\vartheta_S}(A) = true$ for some x-variant ϑ_S of σ_S .
 - $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(\forall x.A) = true$ iff
 - $Val_{S,\vartheta_S}(A) = true$ for all x-variants ϑ_S of σ_S .

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- Values of compound formulas under S and σ_S are also either *true* or *false*:

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- Values of compound formulas under S and σ_S are also either *true* or *false*:

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- Values of compound formulas under S and σ_S are also either *true* or *false*:
 - $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(\neg A) = true \text{ iff } Val_{S,\sigma_S}(A) = false.$ • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \lor B) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\sigma_{S}}(A) = true \text{ or } Val_{S,\sigma_{S}}(B) = true.$ \blacktriangleright Val_{S σ_{c}} ($A \land B$) = true iff \blacktriangleright Val_{S σ_{c}} (A \Rightarrow B) = true iff ► $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \Leftrightarrow B) = true \text{ iff } Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A) = Val_{S,\sigma_s}(B).$ \blacktriangleright Val_{S σ_{c}} ($\exists x.A$) = true iff ► Val_{S σ_s} ($\forall x.A$) = true iff

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- Values of compound formulas under S and σ_S are also either *true* or *false*:

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- Values of compound formulas under S and σ_S are also either *true* or *false*:
 - $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(\neg A) = true \text{ iff } Val_{S,\sigma_S}(A) = false.$ • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \lor B) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\sigma_{S}}(A) = true \text{ or } Val_{S,\sigma_{S}}(B) = true.$ • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \wedge B) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A) = true$ and $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(B) = true$. • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \Rightarrow B) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A) = false$ or $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(B) = true$. ► $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \Leftrightarrow B) = true \text{ iff } Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A) = Val_{S,\sigma_s}(B).$ \blacktriangleright Val_{S σ_{c}} ($\exists x.A$) = true iff ► Val_{S σ_s} ($\forall x.A$) = true iff

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- Values of compound formulas under S and σ_S are also either *true* or *false*:
 - $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(\neg A) = true \text{ iff } Val_{S,\sigma_S}(A) = false.$ • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \lor B) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\sigma_{S}}(A) = true \text{ or } Val_{S,\sigma_{S}}(B) = true.$ • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \wedge B) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A) = true$ and $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(B) = true$. • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \Rightarrow B) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A) = false$ or $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(B) = true$. ► $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \Leftrightarrow B) = true \text{ iff } Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A) = Val_{S,\sigma_s}(B).$ \blacktriangleright Val_{S σ_{c}} ($\exists x.A$) = true iff ► Val_{S σ_s} ($\forall x.A$) = true iff

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- Values of compound formulas under S and σ_S are also either *true* or *false*:
 - $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(\neg A) = true \text{ iff } Val_{S,\sigma_S}(A) = false.$ • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \lor B) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\sigma_{S}}(A) = true \text{ or } Val_{S,\sigma_{S}}(B) = true.$ • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \wedge B) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A) = true$ and $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(B) = true$. • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \Rightarrow B) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A) = false$ or $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(B) = true$. ► $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \Leftrightarrow B) = true \text{ iff } Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A) = Val_{S,\sigma_s}(B).$ • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(\exists x.A) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\vartheta_S}(A) = true$ for some x-variant ϑ_S of σ_S . ► Val_{S σ_s} ($\forall x.A$) = true iff

- A structure S = (D, I) and a variable assignment σ_S are given.
- Values of compound formulas under S and σ_S are also either *true* or *false*:
 - $Val_{S,\sigma_S}(\neg A) = true \text{ iff } Val_{S,\sigma_S}(A) = false.$ • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \lor B) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\sigma_{S}}(A) = true \text{ or } Val_{S,\sigma_{S}}(B) = true.$ • $Val_{S,\sigma_{c}}(A \wedge B) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A) = true$ and $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(B) = true$. • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \Rightarrow B) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A) = false$ or $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(B) = true$. ► $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A \Leftrightarrow B) = true \text{ iff } Val_{S,\sigma_s}(A) = Val_{S,\sigma_s}(B).$ • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(\exists x.A) = true$ iff $Val_{S,\vartheta_S}(A) = true$ for some x-variant ϑ_S of σ_S . • $Val_{S,\sigma_s}(\forall x.A) = true$ iff $Val_{\mathcal{S},\vartheta_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathcal{A}) = true$ for all x-variants $\vartheta_{\mathcal{S}}$ of $\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}$.

• A structure S = (D, I) is given.

• The value of a formula A under S is either *true* or *false*:

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

- $Val_{\mathcal{S}}(A) = true \text{ iff } Val_{\mathcal{S}}, \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}(A) = true \text{ for all } \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}.$
- S is called a model of A iff $Val_{\mathcal{S}}(A) = true$.
- Written $\models_{\mathcal{S}} A$.

- A structure S = (D, I) is given.
- ► The value of a formula A under S is either *true* or *false*:

- $Val_{\mathcal{S}}(A) = true \text{ iff } Val_{\mathcal{S}}, \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}(A) = true \text{ for all } \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}.$
- S is called a model of A iff $Val_{\mathcal{S}}(A) = true$.
- Written $\models_S A$.

- A structure S = (D, I) is given.
- ► The value of a formula A under S is either *true* or *false*:

- $Val_{\mathcal{S}}(A) = true \text{ iff } Val_{\mathcal{S}}, \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}(A) = true \text{ for all } \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}.$
- S is called a model of A iff $Val_{\mathcal{S}}(A) = true$.
- Written $\models_S A$.

- A structure S = (D, I) is given.
- ► The value of a formula A under S is either *true* or *false*:

- $Val_{\mathcal{S}}(A) = true \text{ iff } Val_{\mathcal{S}}, \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}(A) = true \text{ for all } \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}.$
- S is called a model of A iff $Val_{\mathcal{S}}(A) = true$.
- Written $\models_{\mathcal{S}} A$.

Formula: $\forall x.(p(x) \Rightarrow q(f(x), a))$



- Formula: $\forall x.(p(x) \Rightarrow q(f(x), a))$
- Define S = (D, I) as
 - ► *D* = {1,2},
 - ► *a_l* = 1,
 - $f_l(1) = 2, f_l(2) = 1,$
 - $p_l = \{2\},\$
 - $q_l = \{(1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 2)\}.$

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

- Formula: $\forall x.(p(x) \Rightarrow q(f(x), a))$
- Define S = (D, I) as
 - $D = \{1, 2\},\$
 - ► *a_l* = 1,
 - $f_l(1) = 2, f_l(2) = 1,$
 - $p_l = \{2\},$
 - $q_l = \{(1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 2)\}.$

▶ If $\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}(x) = 1$, then $Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(\forall x.(p(x) \Rightarrow q(f(x), a))) = true$.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ● ● ● ●

- Formula: $\forall x.(p(x) \Rightarrow q(f(x), a))$
- Define S = (D, I) as
 - ► *D* = {1,2},
 - ► *a_l* = 1,
 - $f_l(1) = 2, f_l(2) = 1,$
 - $p_l = \{2\},\$
 - $q_l = \{(1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 2)\}.$
- If $\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}(x) = 1$, then $Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(\forall x.(p(x) \Rightarrow q(f(x), a))) = true$.
- If $\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}(x) = 2$, then $Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(\forall x.(p(x) \Rightarrow q(f(x), a))) = true$.

- Formula: $\forall x.(p(x) \Rightarrow q(f(x), a))$
- Define S = (D, I) as
 - $D = \{1, 2\},\$
 - ► *a_l* = 1,
 - $f_l(1) = 2, f_l(2) = 1,$
 - $p_l = \{2\},\$
 - $q_l = \{(1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 2)\}.$
- If $\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}(x) = 1$, then $Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(\forall x.(p(x) \Rightarrow q(f(x), a))) = true$.
- If $\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}(x) = 2$, then $Val_{\mathcal{S},\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}}(\forall x.(p(x) \Rightarrow q(f(x), a))) = true$.

• Hence, $\models_{\mathcal{S}} A$.

- A formula A is valid, if $\vDash_{\mathcal{S}} A$ for all \mathcal{S} .
- Written $\models A$.
- A formula A is unsatisfiable, if $\vDash_{S} A$ for no S.
- If A is valid, then $\neg A$ is unsatisfiable and vice versa.

- A formula A is valid, if $\vDash_{\mathcal{S}} A$ for all \mathcal{S} .
- Written \models A.
- A formula A is unsatisfiable, if $\vDash_{S} A$ for no S.
- If A is valid, then $\neg A$ is unsatisfiable and vice versa.

- A formula A is valid, if $\vDash_{\mathcal{S}} A$ for all \mathcal{S} .
- Written \models *A*.
- A formula A is unsatisfiable, if $\vDash_{\mathcal{S}} A$ for no \mathcal{S} .
- If A is valid, then $\neg A$ is unsatisfiable and vice versa.

- A formula A is valid, if $\vDash_{\mathcal{S}} A$ for all \mathcal{S} .
- Written $\models A$.
- A formula A is unsatisfiable, if $\vDash_{\mathcal{S}} A$ for no \mathcal{S} .
- If A is valid, then $\neg A$ is unsatisfiable and vice versa.



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ● ● ● ●

- A formula A is valid, if $\vDash_{\mathcal{S}} A$ for all \mathcal{S} .
- Written \models A.
- A formula A is unsatisfiable, if $\vDash_{\mathcal{S}} A$ for no \mathcal{S} .
- If A is valid, then $\neg A$ is unsatisfiable and vice versa.

Valid	Non-valid	

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ● ● ● ●

- A formula A is valid, if $\vDash_{\mathcal{S}} A$ for all \mathcal{S} .
- Written \models *A*.
- A formula A is unsatisfiable, if $\vDash_{\mathcal{S}} A$ for no \mathcal{S} .
- If A is valid, then $\neg A$ is unsatisfiable and vice versa.

Valid	Non-	valid
Satis	fiable	Unsat

- A formula A is valid, if $\vDash_{\mathcal{S}} A$ for all \mathcal{S} .
- Written $\models A$.
- A formula A is unsatisfiable, if $\vDash_{\mathcal{S}} A$ for no \mathcal{S} .
- If A is valid, then $\neg A$ is unsatisfiable and vice versa.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ● ● ● ●
Inference System

Several inference systems exist for first-order logic.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● のへぐ

Today: The Resolution Calculus

The Resolution Calculus

- Operates on the clausal fragment of first-order logic
- ► Clause: A formula of the form $\forall x_1..... \forall x_n.(L_1 \lor \cdots \lor L_k)$, where
 - each L_i is a literal, i.e., either an atomic formula or its negation,
 - $L_1 \vee \cdots \vee L_k$ contains no variables other than x_1, \ldots, x_n

A D F A 同 F A E F A E F A Q A

- Every first-order formula can be reduced to a set of clauses.
- The reduction preserves unsatisfiability.
- Clauses are often written without quantifier prefix: $L_1 \lor \cdots \lor L_k$.

The Resolution Calculus

Two inference rules: Binary resolution and factoring.

Binary resolution:

$$\frac{L_1 \lor A \quad \neg L_2 \lor B}{(A \lor B)\sigma}$$

where σ is a most general unifier of L_1 and L_2 .

Factoring:

$$\frac{L_1 \vee L_2 \vee A}{(L_1 \vee A)\sigma}$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

where σ is a most general unifier of L_1 and L_2 .

Unification

- Process of equation solving.
- Used in the inference rules to make two literals identical.
- Unification algorithm computes a most general unifier for solvable systems equations

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

► For unsolvable ones, it reports failure.

Unification

- Process of equation solving.
- Used in the inference rules to make two literals identical.
- Unification algorithm computes a most general unifier for solvable systems equations
- ► For unsolvable ones, it reports failure.

Example

- ► { $x \mapsto a, y \mapsto f(a)$ } is a most general unifier of p(x, f(x)) and p(a, y).
- ▶ p(x) and p(f(x)) do not have a unifier as well as p(x) and q(y).

Proving by Resolution

- Given a set of clauses S and a hypothesis H, to prove H from S by resolution one should
 - 1. Negate the hypothesis;
 - 2. Add the negated hypothesis to *S* and start derivation, trying to obtain the contradiction;
 - 3. In the derivation, use binary resolution and factoring rules to generate new clauses, add them to *S*;
 - 4. If the empty clause appears, stop: Contradiction found, *H* is proved;
 - 5. If no step can be made and the empty clause is not found, then *H* can not be proved.
- Binary resolution + factoring is a refutationally complete inference system: A set of clauses is unsatisfiable iff these rules lead to the contradiction.

Given a trapezoid, prove that the interior alternate angles obtained by the intersection of a diagonal with the bases are equal:



・ コット (雪) (小田) (コット 日)

Example. Proving by Resolution



Formalization. Notation:

- ► trap(x₁, x₂, x₃, x₄) : Trapezoid with left upper vertex x₁, right upper vertex x₂, right lower vertex x₃, left lower vertex x₄.
- ▶ $par(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2)$: The line x_1x_2 is parallel to the line y_1y_2 .
- $eq(x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3)$: The angles $x_1x_2x_3$ and $y_1y_2y_3$ are equal.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ● ● ● ●

Example. Proving by Resolution



Formalization. Assumptions and hypothesis:

- 1. $\forall x_1.\forall x_2.\forall x_3.\forall x_4.trap(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \Rightarrow par(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4).$
- 2. $\forall x_1.\forall x_2.\forall y_1.\forall y_2.par(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) \Rightarrow eq(x_1, x_2, y_2, y_1, y_2, x_2).$

・ コット (雪) (小田) (コット 日)

- 3. trap(a, b, c, d).
- 4. eq(a, b, d, c, d, b) (Hypothesis)

Example. Proving by Resolution



Formalization. Proof from clausified assumptions and the negated hypothesis:

- 1. $\neg trap(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \lor par(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$
- 2. $\neg par(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) \lor eq(x_1, x_2, y_2, y_1, y_2, x_2).$
- 3. trap(a, b, c, d).
- **4**. ¬*eq*(*a*, *b*, *d*, *c*, *d*, *b*)
- 5. $\neg par(a, b, c, d)$ (Resolvent of 2 and 4)
- 6. \neg trap(a, b, c, d) (Resolvent of 5 and 1)
- 7.
 (Resolvent of 6 and 3, contradiction found.)

Another Example. Proving by Resolution

Factoring is important!

Show that the given set of clauses (1-3) is unsatisfiable:

- 1. $\neg p(x, y) \lor q(x, y)$.
- **2**. $p(x, y) \lor q(y, x)$.
- 3. $\neg q(a, a) \lor \neg q(b, b)$
- 4. $q(x_1, y_1) \lor q(y_1, x_1)$. (Resolvent of 1 and 2)
- 5. $q(x_1, x_1)$ (Factor of 4)
- 6. $\neg q(b, b)$ (Resolvent of 5 and 3)
- 7. \Box (Resolvent of 5 and 6, contradiction found.)

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

Proving by Resolution

 Unrestricted application of the inference rules might lead to search space explosion.

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

- Most of the generated clauses are redundant.
- How to avoid generating them?
- Resolution strategies.

Ordered Resolution

- One of most efficient resolution strategies.
- Assumes a partial ordering on terms and literals.
- Ordered inference:
 - A subset of the literals is marked as maximal
 - (If the clause is ground, i.e, without variables, the order is total, and the greatest literal is marked as maximal)
 - The inference rules may be restricted in some cases so that they apply only to maximal literals.

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

Set-of-Support Strategy

- Task: Prove by resolution + factoring that the set of clauses S is unsatisfiable.
- Split S into two sets: U and SOS.
- ▶ Names: *U* for usable, *SOS* for set-of-support.
- Strategy: Do not allow resolution between clauses in U.
 Put new clauses in SOS.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ● ● ● ●

• Complete if *U* is satisfiable.

How to Deal With Equality

- Roughly: Replace equals by equals.
- Rule: Paramodulation

$$\frac{s = t \lor C_1 \qquad \mathcal{L}[r] \lor C_2}{(\mathcal{L}[t] \lor C_1 \lor C_2)\sigma}$$

where L[r] is a literal in which the term *r* occurs and σ is a most general unifier of *r* and *s*.

- Unrestricted replacement leads to search space explosion.
- Restrictions: *r* can not be a variable, sσθ ≻ tσθ for some θ where ≻ is the given ordering, etc.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ● ● ● ●

Resolution Theorem Provers

- Quite some state-of-the-art theorem provers are based on resolution.
- Among them Prover9 (the successor of Otter) and Vampire (most successful prover in the CASC competitions).

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

Next lecture: Prover9.