

CSE 3402: Intro to Artificial Intelligence Inference in First-Order Logic

- Required Readings: 9.1, 9.2, and 9.5
- Resolution Proofs.
 - **Part I: Convert to clausal form**
 - **Part II: Dealing with variables (unification).**
 - **Part III: Constructing Resolution Proofs.**

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

1

Computing logical consequences

- We want procedures for computing logical consequences that can be implemented in our programs.
- This would allow us to reason with our knowledge
 - Represent the knowledge as logical formulas
 - Apply procedures for generating logical consequences
- These procedures are called proof procedures.

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

2

Proof Procedures

- Interesting, proof procedures work by simply manipulating formulas. They do not know or care anything about interpretations.
- Nevertheless they respect the semantics of interpretations!
- We will develop a proof procedure for first-order logic called resolution.
 - Resolution is the mechanism used by PROLOG

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

3

Properties of Proof Procedures

- Before presenting the details of resolution, we want to look at properties we would like to have in a (any) proof procedure.
- We write $KB \vdash f$ to indicate that f can be proved from KB (the proof procedure used is implicit).

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

4

Properties of Proof Procedures

- Soundness
 - $KB \vdash f \rightarrow KB \models f$
i.e all conclusions arrived at via the proof procedure are correct: they are logical consequences.
- Completeness
 - $KB \models f \rightarrow KB \vdash f$
i.e. every logical consequence can be generated by the proof procedure.
- Note proof procedures are computable, but they might have very high complexity in the worst case. So completeness is not necessarily achievable in practice.

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

5

Resolution

- Clausal form.
 - Resolution works with formulas expressed in clausal form.
 - A literal is an atomic formula or the negation of an atomic formula. $\text{dog}(\text{fido}), \neg\text{cat}(\text{fido})$
 - A clause is a disjunction of literals:
 - $\neg\text{owns}(\text{fido},\text{fred}) \vee \neg\text{dog}(\text{fido}) \vee \text{person}(\text{fred})$
 - We write $(\neg\text{owns}(\text{fido},\text{fred}), \neg\text{dog}(\text{fido}), \text{person}(\text{fred}))$
 - A clausal theory is a conjunction of clauses.

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

6

Resolution

- Prolog Programs
 - Prolog programs are clausal theories.
 - However, each clause in a Prolog program is Horn.
 - A horn clause contains at most one positive literal.
 - The horn clause $\neg q_1 \vee \neg q_2 \vee \dots \vee \neg q_n \vee p$
is equivalent to $q_1 \wedge q_2 \wedge \dots \wedge q_n \Rightarrow p$
and is written as the following rule in Prolog:
 $p \text{ :- } q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

7

Resolution Rule for Ground Clauses

- The resolution proof procedure consists of only one simple rule:
 - From the two clauses
 - $(P, Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_k)$
 - $(\neg P, R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n)$
 - We infer the new clause
 - $(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_k, R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n)$
 - Example:
 - $(\neg\text{largerThan}(\text{clyde},\text{cup}), \neg\text{fitsIn}(\text{clyde},\text{cup}))$
 - $(\text{fitsIn}(\text{clyde},\text{cup}))$
 - $\Rightarrow \neg\text{largerThan}(\text{clyde},\text{cup})$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

8

Resolution Proof: Forward chaining

- Logical consequences can be generated from the resolution rule in two ways:
 1. Forward Chaining inference.
 - If we have a sequence of clauses C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k
 - Such that each C_i is either in KB or is the result of a resolution step involving two prior clauses in the sequence.
 - We then have that $KB \vdash C_k$.Forward chaining is sound so we also have $KB \models C_k$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

9

Resolution Proof: Refutation proofs

2. Refutation proofs.
 - We determine if $KB \vdash f$ by showing that a contradiction can be generated from $KB \wedge \neg f$.
 - In this case a contradiction is an empty clause $()$.
 - We employ resolution to construct a sequence of clauses C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m such that
 - C_i is in $KB \wedge \neg f$, or is the result of resolving two previous clauses in the sequence.
 - $C_m = ()$ i.e. its the empty clause.

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

10

Resolution Proof: Refutation proofs

- If we can find such a sequence $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m = ()$, we have that
 - $KB \vdash f$.
 - Furthermore, this procedure is sound so
 - $KB \models f$
- And the procedure is also complete so it is capable of finding a proof of any f that is a logical consequence of KB. I.e.
 - If $KB \models f$ then we can generate a refutation from $KB \wedge \neg f$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

11

Resolution Proofs Example

Want to prove $\text{likes}(\text{clyde}, \text{peanuts})$ from:

- 1. $\text{elephant}(\text{clyde}), \text{giraffe}(\text{clyde})$
- 2. $\neg \text{elephant}(\text{clyde}), \text{likes}(\text{clyde}, \text{peanuts})$
- 3. $\neg \text{giraffe}(\text{clyde}), \text{likes}(\text{clyde}, \text{leaves})$
- 4. $\text{likes}(\text{clyde}, \text{leaves})$

Forward Chaining Proof:

- 3&4 $\rightarrow \neg \text{giraffe}(\text{clyde})$ [5.]
- 5&1 $\rightarrow \text{elephant}(\text{clyde})$ [6.]
- 6&2 $\rightarrow \text{likes}(\text{clyde}, \text{peanuts})$ [7.] ✓

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

12

Resolution Proofs Example

$\neg f(\text{elephant}(\text{clyde}), \text{giraffe}(\text{clyde}))$
 $\neg f(\neg \text{elephant}(\text{clyde}), \text{likes}(\text{clyde}, \text{peanuts}))$
 $\neg f(\neg \text{giraffe}(\text{clyde}), \text{likes}(\text{clyde}, \text{leaves}))$
 $\neg \neg \text{likes}(\text{clyde}, \text{leaves})$

Refutation Proof:

- $\neg \text{likes}(\text{clyde}, \text{peanuts})$ [5.]
- $5 \& 2 \rightarrow \neg \text{elephant}(\text{clyde})$ [6.]
- $6 \& 1 \rightarrow \text{giraffe}(\text{clyde})$ [7.]
- $7 \& 3 \rightarrow \text{likes}(\text{clyde}, \text{leaves})$ [8.]
- $8 \& 4 \rightarrow ()$ ✓

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

13

Resolution Proofs

- Proofs by refutation have the advantage that they are easier to find.
 - They are more focused to the particular conclusion we are trying to reach.
- To develop a complete resolution proof procedure for First-Order logic we need :
 1. A way of converting KB and f (the query) into clausal form. [we focus on this in the rest of this lecture]
 2. A way of doing resolution even when we have variables (unification). [this will be covered in the next lecture]

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

14

Conversion to Clausal Form

To convert the KB into Clausal form we perform the following 8-step procedure:

1. Eliminate Implications.
2. Move Negations inwards (and simplify $\neg\neg$).
3. Standardize Variables.
4. Skolemize.
5. Convert to Prenex Form.
6. Distribute conjunctions over disjunctions.
7. Flatten nested conjunctions and disjunctions.
8. Convert to Clauses.

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

15

C-T-C-F: Eliminate implications

We use this example to show each step:

$$\forall X. p(X) \rightarrow (\forall Y. p(Y) \rightarrow p(f(X, Y)) \wedge \neg(\forall Y. \neg q(X, Y) \wedge p(Y)))$$

Eliminate implications: $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow \neg A \vee B$

$$\forall X. \neg p(X) \vee (\forall Y. \neg p(Y) \vee p(f(X, Y)) \wedge \neg(\forall Y. \neg q(X, Y) \wedge p(Y)))$$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

16

C-T-C-F: Move \neg Inwards

$$\forall X. \neg p(X) \\ \vee \left(\forall Y. \neg p(Y) \vee p(f(X,Y)) \right. \\ \left. \wedge \neg(\forall Y. \neg q(X,Y) \wedge p(Y)) \right)$$

2. Move Negations Inwards (and simplify $\neg\neg$)

$$\forall X. \neg p(X) \\ \vee \left(\forall Y. \neg p(Y) \vee p(f(X,Y)) \right. \\ \left. \wedge \exists Y. q(X,Y) \vee \neg p(Y) \right)$$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

17

C-T-C-F: : \neg continue...

Rules for moving negations inwards

- $\neg(A \wedge B) \rightarrow \neg A \vee \neg B$
- $\neg(A \vee B) \rightarrow \neg A \wedge \neg B$
- $\neg\forall X. f \rightarrow \exists X. \neg f$
- $\neg\exists X. f \rightarrow \forall X. \neg f$
- $\neg\neg A \rightarrow A$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

18

C-T-C-F: Standardize Variables

$$\forall X. \neg p(X) \\ \vee \left(\forall Y. \neg p(Y) \vee p(f(X,Y)) \right. \\ \left. \wedge \exists Y. q(X,Y) \vee \neg p(Y) \right)$$

3. Standardize Variables (Rename variables so that each quantified variable is unique)

$$\forall X. \neg p(X) \\ \vee \left(\forall Y. (\neg p(Y) \vee p(f(X,Y))) \right. \\ \left. \wedge \exists Z. q(X,Z) \vee \neg p(Z) \right)$$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

19

C-T-C-F: Skolemize

$$\forall X. \neg p(X) \\ \vee \left(\forall Y. \neg p(Y) \vee p(f(X,Y)) \right. \\ \left. \wedge \exists Z. q(X,Z) \vee \neg p(Z) \right)$$

4. Skolemize (Remove existential quantifiers by introducing new function symbols).

$$\forall X. \neg p(X) \\ \vee \left(\forall Y. \neg p(Y) \vee p(f(X,Y)) \right. \\ \left. \wedge q(X,g(X)) \vee \neg p(g(X)) \right)$$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

20

C-T-C-F: Skolemization continue...

Consider $\exists Y. \text{elephant}(Y) \wedge \text{friendly}(Y)$

- This asserts that there is some individual (binding for Y) that is both an elephant and friendly.
- To remove the existential, we **invent** a name for this individual, say **a**. This is a new constant symbol not equal to any previous constant symbols to obtain:
 $\text{elephant}(\mathbf{a}) \wedge \text{friendly}(\mathbf{a})$
- This is saying the same thing, since we do not know anything about the new constant **a**.

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

21

C-T-C-F: Skolemization continue

- It is essential that the introduced symbol “a” is **new**. Else we might know something else about “a” in KB.
- If we did know something else about “a” we would be asserting more than the existential.
- In original quantified formula we know nothing about the variable “Y”. Just what was being asserted by the existential formula.

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

22

C-T-C-F: Skolemization continue

Now consider $\forall X \exists Y. \text{loves}(X, Y)$.

- This formula claims that for every X there is some Y that X loves (perhaps a different Y for each X).
- Replacing the existential by a new constant won't work
 $\forall X. \text{loves}(X, \mathbf{a})$.

Because this asserts that there is a **particular** individual “a” loved by every X.

- To properly convert existential quantifiers scoped by universal quantifiers we must use **functions** not just constants.

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

23

C-T-C-F: Skolemization continue

- We must use a function that mentions every universally quantified variable that scopes the existential.
- In this case X scopes Y so we must replace the existential Y by a function of X
 $\forall X. \text{loves}(X, g(X))$.
where g is a **new** function symbol.
- This formula asserts that for every X there is some individual (given by g(X)) that X loves. g(X) can be different for each different binding of X.

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

24

C-T-C-F: Skolemization Examples

- $\forall XYZ \exists W. r(X, Y, Z, W) \rightarrow \forall XYZ. r(X, Y, Z, h1(X, Y, Z))$
- $\forall XY \exists W. r(X, Y, g(W)) \rightarrow \forall XY. r(X, Y, Z, g(h2(X, Y)))$
- $\forall XY \exists W \forall Z. r(X, Y, W) \wedge q(Z, W)$
 $\rightarrow \forall XYZ. r(X, Y, h3(X, Y)) \wedge q(Z, h3(X, Y))$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

25

C-T-C-F: Convert to prenex

- $\forall X. \neg p(X)$
 $\vee (\forall Y. \neg p(Y) \vee p(f(X, Y))$
 $\wedge q(X, g(X)) \vee \neg p(g(X)))$
5. Convert to prenex form. (Bring all quantifiers to the front—only universals, each with different name).

$$\forall X \forall Y. \neg p(X) \vee (\neg p(Y) \vee p(f(X, Y)) \wedge q(X, g(X)) \vee \neg p(g(X)))$$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

26

C-T-C-F: Conjunctions over disjunctions

- $\forall X \forall Y. \neg p(X)$
 $\vee (\neg p(Y) \vee p(f(X, Y))$
 $\wedge q(X, g(X)) \vee \neg p(g(X)))$
6. Conjunctions over disjunctions
 $A \vee (B \wedge C) \rightarrow (A \vee B) \wedge (A \vee C)$
- $\forall XY. \neg p(X) \vee \neg p(Y) \vee p(f(X, Y))$
 $\wedge \neg p(X) \vee q(X, g(X)) \vee \neg p(g(X))$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

27

C-T-C-F: flatten & convert to clauses

7. Flatten nested conjunctions and disjunctions.
 $(A \vee (B \vee C)) \rightarrow (A \vee B \vee C)$
8. Convert to Clauses (remove quantifiers and break apart conjunctions).
 $\forall XY. \neg p(X) \vee \neg p(Y) \vee p(f(X, Y))$
 $\wedge \neg p(X) \vee q(X, g(X)) \vee \neg p(g(X))$
- $\exists \mathcal{D} \neg p(X) \vee \neg p(Y) \vee p(f(X, Y))$
 $\exists \mathcal{D} \neg p(X) \vee q(X, g(X)) \vee \neg p(g(X))$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

28

Unification

- Ground clauses are clauses with no variables in them. For ground clauses we can use syntactic identity to detect when we have a P and $\neg P$ pair.
- What about variables can the clauses
 - $(P(\text{john}), Q(\text{fred}), R(X))$
 - $(\neg P(Y), R(\text{susan}), R(Y))$Be resolved?

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

29

Unification.

- Intuitively, once reduced to clausal form, all remaining variables are universally quantified. So, implicitly $(\neg P(Y), R(\text{susan}), R(Y))$ represents clauses like
 - $(\neg P(\text{fred}), R(\text{susan}), R(\text{fred}))$
 - $(\neg P(\text{john}), R(\text{susan}), R(\text{john}))$
 - ...
- So there is a “specialization” of this clause that can be resolved with $(P(\text{john}), Q(\text{fred}), R(X))$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

30

Unification.

- We want to be able to match conflicting literals, even when they have variables. This matching process automatically determines whether or not there is a “specialization” that matches.
- We don't want to over specialize!

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

31

Unification.

- $(\neg p(X), s(X), q(\text{fred}))$
- $(p(Y), r(Y))$
- Possible resolvents
 - $(s(\text{john}), q(\text{fred}), r(\text{john})) \{Y=X, X=\text{john}\}$
 - $(s(\text{sally}), q(\text{fred}), r(\text{sally})) \{Y=X, X=\text{sally}\}$
 - $(s(X), q(\text{fred}), r(X)) \quad \{Y=X\}$
- The last resolvent is “most-general”, the other two are specializations of it.
- We want to keep the most general clause so that we can use it future resolution steps.

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

32

Unification.

- unification is a mechanism for finding a “most general” matching.
- First we consider substitutions.
 - A substitution is a finite set of equations of the form

$$(V = t)$$

where V is a variable and t is a term not containing V . (t might contain other variables).

Substitutions.

- We can apply a substitution σ to a formula f to obtain a new formula $f\sigma$ by simultaneously replacing every variable mentioned in the left hand side of the substitution by the right hand side.

$$p(X,g(Y,Z))[X=Y, Y=f(a)] \rightarrow p(Y,g(f(a),Z))$$

- Note that the substitutions are not applied sequentially, i.e., the first Y is not subsequently replaced by $f(a)$.

Substitutions.

- We can compose two substitutions. θ and σ to obtain a new substitution $\theta\sigma$.

$$\text{Let } \theta = \{X_1=s_1, X_2=s_2, \dots, X_m=s_m\}$$

$$\sigma = \{Y_1=t_1, Y_2=t_2, \dots, Y_k=s_k\}$$

To compute $\theta\sigma$

$$\theta\sigma = \{X_1=s_1\sigma, X_2=s_2\sigma, \dots, X_m=s_m\sigma, Y_1=t_1, Y_2=t_2, \dots, Y_k=s_k\}$$

we apply σ to each RHS of θ and then add all of the equations of σ .

Substitutions.

$$S = \{X_1=s_1\sigma, X_2=s_2\sigma, \dots, X_m=s_m\sigma, Y_1=t_1, Y_2=t_2, \dots, Y_k=s_k\}$$

Delete any identities, i.e., equations of the form $V=V$.

Delete any equation $Y_i=s_i$ where Y_i is equal to one of the X_j in θ .

The final set S is the composition $\theta\sigma$.

Composition Example.

$$\theta = \{X=f(Y), Y=Z\}, \sigma = \{X=a, Y=b, Z=Y\}$$

$\theta\sigma$

Substitutions.

- The empty substitution $\varepsilon = \{\}$ is also a substitution, and it acts as an identity under composition.
- More importantly substitutions when applied to formulas are associative:

$$(f\theta)\sigma = f(\theta\sigma)$$

- Composition is simply a way of converting the sequential application of a series of substitutions to a single simultaneous substitution.

Unifiers.


- A unifier of two formulas f and g is a substitution σ that makes f and g syntactically identical.
- Not all formulas can be unified—substitutions only affect variables.


$$p(f(X),a) \quad p(Y,f(w))$$

- This pair cannot be unified as there is no way of making $a = f(w)$ with a substitution.

MGU.

- A substitution σ of two formulas f and g is a Most General Unifier (MGU) if

 σ is a unifier.

 For every other unifier θ of f and g there must exist a third substitution λ such that

$$\theta = \sigma\lambda$$

- This says that every other unifier is “more specialized than σ ”. The MGU of a pair of formulas f and g is unique up to renaming.

MGU.

$$p(f(X),Z) \quad p(Y,a)$$

☞ $\sigma = \{Y = f(a), X=a, Z=a\}$ is a unifier.

$$\begin{aligned} p(f(X),Z)\sigma &= \\ p(Y,a)\sigma &= \end{aligned}$$

But it is not an MGU.

☞ $\theta = \{Y=f(X), Z=a\}$ is an MGU.

$$\begin{aligned} p(f(X),Z)\theta &= \\ p(Y,a)\theta &= \end{aligned}$$

MGU.

$$p(f(X),Z) \quad p(Y,a)$$

3. $\sigma = \theta\lambda$, where $\lambda = \{X=a\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= \{Y = f(a), X=a, Z=a\} \\ \lambda &= \{X=a\} \\ \theta\lambda &= \end{aligned}$$

MGU.

- The MGU is the “least specialized” way of making clauses with universal variables match.
- We can compute MGUs.
- Intuitively we line up the two formulas and find the first sub-expression where they disagree. The pair of subexpressions where they first disagree is called the disagreement set.
- The algorithm works by successively fixing disagreement sets until the two formulas become syntactically identical.

MGU.

To find the MGU of two formulas f and g .

☞ $k = 0$; $\sigma_0 = \{\}$; $S_0 = \{f, g\}$

☞ If S_k contains an identical pair of formulas stop, and return σ_k as the MGU of f and g .

☞ Else find the disagreement set $D_k = \{e_1, e_2\}$ of S_k

☞ If $e_1 = V$ a variable, and $e_2 = t$ a term not containing V (or vice-versa) then let

$$\sigma_{k+1} = \sigma_k \{V=t\} \quad (\text{Compose the additional substitution})$$

$$S_{k+1} = S_k \{V=t\} \quad (\text{Apply the additional substitution})$$

$$k = k+1$$

GOTO 2

☞ Else stop, f and g cannot be unified.

MGU Example 1.

$$S_0 = \{p(f(a), g(X)) ; p(Y, Y)\}$$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

45

MGU Example 2.

$$S_0 = \{p(a, X, h(g(Z))) ; p(Z, h(Y), h(Y))\}$$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

46

MGU Example 3.

$$S_0 = \{p(X, X) ; p(Y, f(Y))\}$$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

47

Non-Ground Resolution

- Resolution of non-ground clauses. From the two clauses

(L, Q1, Q2, ..., Qk)

(¬M, R1, R2, ..., Rn)

Where there exists σ a MGU for L and M.

We infer the new clause

(Q1 σ , ..., Qk σ , R1 σ , ..., Rn σ)

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

48

Non-Ground Resolution E.G.

$(p(X), q(g(X)))$
 $(r(a), q(Z), \neg p(a))$

$L=p(X); M=p(a)$
 $\sigma = \{X=a\}$

$R[1a,2c]\{X=a\} (q(g(a)), r(a), q(Z))$

The notation is important.

- “R” means resolution step.
- “1a” means the first (a-th) literal in the first clause i.e. $p(X)$.
- “2c” means the third (c-th) literal in the second clause, $\neg p(a)$.
 - 1a and 2c are the “clashing” literals.
- $\{X=a\}$ is the substitution applied to make the clashing literals identical.

Resolution Proof Example

“Some patients like all doctors. No patient likes any quack. Therefore no doctor is a quack.”

Resolution Proof Step 1.
Pick symbols to represent these assertions.

$p(X)$: X is a patient
 $d(x)$: X is a doctor
 $q(X)$: X is a quack
 $l(X, Y)$: X likes Y

Resolution Proof Example

Resolution Proof Step 2.
Convert each assertion to a first-order formula.

1. Some patients like all doctors.

F1.

Resolution Proof Example

2. No patient likes any quack

F2.

3. Therefore no doctor is a quack.
Query.

Resolution Proof Example

Resolution Proof Step 3.
Convert to Clausal form.

F1.

F2.

Negation of Query.

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

53

Resolution Proof Example

Resolution Proof Step 4.
Resolution Proof from the Clauses.

$p(a)$

$\neg d(Y), l(a, Y)$

$\neg p(Z), \neg q(R), \neg l(Z, R)$

$d(b)$

$q(b)$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

54

Resolution Proof Example

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

55

Answer Extraction.

- The previous example shows how we can answer true-false questions. With a bit more effort we can also answer “fill-in-the-blanks” questions (e.g., what is wrong with the car?).
- As in Prolog we use free variables in the query where we want the fill in the blanks. We simply need to keep track of the binding that these variables received in proving the query.
 - $\text{parent}(\text{art}, \text{jon})$ -is art one of jon's parents?
 - $\text{parent}(X, \text{jon})$ -who is one of jon's parents?

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

56

Answer Extraction.

- A simple bookkeeping device is to use an predicate symbol $\text{answer}(X, Y, \dots)$ to keep track of the bindings automatically.
- To answer the query $\text{parent}(X, \text{jon})$, we construct the clause
 $(\neg \text{parent}(X, \text{jon}), \text{answer}(X))$
- Now we perform resolution until we obtain a clause consisting of only answer literals (previously we stopped at empty clauses).

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

57

Answer Extraction: Example 1

$\text{father}(\text{art}, \text{jon})$
 $\text{father}(\text{bob}, \text{kim})$
 $(\neg \text{father}(Y, Z), \text{parent}(Y, Z))$
i.e. all fathers are parents
 $(\neg \text{parent}(X, \text{jon}), \text{answer}(X))$
i.e. the query is: who is parent of jon?
 Here is a resolution proof:
 $R[4, 3b]\{Y=X, Z=\text{jon}\}$
 $(\neg \text{father}(X, \text{jon}), \text{answer}(X))$
 $R[5, 1]\{X=\text{art}\} \text{answer}(\text{art})$
 so art is parent of jon

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

58

Answer Extraction: Example 2

$(\text{father}(\text{art}, \text{jon}), \text{father}(\text{bob}, \text{jon}))$ //either bob or art is parent of jon
 $\text{father}(\text{bob}, \text{kim})$
 $(\neg \text{father}(Y, Z), \text{parent}(Y, Z))$ //i.e. all fathers are parents
 $(\neg \text{parent}(X, \text{jon}), \text{answer}(X))$ //i.e. query is parent(X,jon)

Here is a resolution proof:

$R[4, 3b]\{Y=X, Z=\text{jon}\} (\neg \text{father}(X, \text{jon}), \text{answer}(X))$
 $R[5, 1a]\{X=\text{art}\} (\text{father}(\text{bob}, \text{jon}), \text{answer}(\text{art}))$
 $R[6, 3b]\{Y=\text{bob}, Z=\text{jon}\}$
 $(\text{parent}(\text{bob}, \text{jon}), \text{answer}(\text{art}))$
 $R[7, 4]\{X=\text{bob}\} (\text{answer}(\text{bob}), \text{answer}(\text{art}))$

A disjunctive answer: either bob or art is parent of jon.

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

59

Factoring (optional)

1. $(p(X), p(Y))$ // $\forall X. \forall Y. \neg p(X) \rightarrow p(Y)$
2. $(\neg p(V), \neg p(W))$ // $\forall V. \forall W. p(V) \rightarrow \neg p(W)$

- These clauses are intuitively contradictory, but following the strict rules of resolution only we obtain:
3. $R[1a, 2a]\{X=V\} (p(Y), \neg p(W))$
Renaming variables: $(p(Q), \neg p(Z))$
 4. $R[3b, 1a]\{X=Z\} (p(Y), p(Q))$

No way of generating empty clause!

Factoring is needed to make resolution complete, without it resolution is incomplete!

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

60

Factoring (optional).

- If two or more literals of a clause C have an mgu θ , then $C\theta$ with all duplicate literals removed is called a **factor** of C .
- $C = (p(X), p(f(Y)), \neg q(X))$
 $\theta = \{X=f(Y)\}$
 $C\theta = (p(f(Y)), p(f(Y)), \neg q(f(Y))) \rightarrow (p(f(Y)), \neg q(f(Y)))$ is a factor

Adding a factor of a clause can be a step of proof:

- $(p(X), p(Y))$
- $(\neg p(V), \neg p(W))$
- $f[1ab]\{X=Y\} p(Y)$
- $f[2ab]\{V=W\} \neg p(W)$
- $R[3,4]\{Y=W\} ()$.

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

61

Prolog

- Prolog search mechanism (*without not and cut*) is simply an instance of resolution, except
 1. Clauses are Horn (only one positive literal)
 2. Prolog uses a specific depth first strategy when searching for a proof. (Rules are used first mentioned first used, literals are resolved away left to right).

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

62

Prolog

- Append:

- $append([], Z, Z)$
- $append([E1|R1], Y, [E1|Rest]) :- append(R1, Y, Rest)$

Note:

- The second is actually the clause $(append([E1|R1], Y, [E1|Rest]), \neg append(R1, Y, Rest))$
- $[]$ is a constant (the empty list)
- $[X|Y]$ is $cons(X, Y)$.
- So $[a, b, c]$ is short hand for $cons(a, cons(b, cons(c, [])))$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

63

Prolog: Example of proof

- Try to prove : $append([a, b], [c, d], [a, b, c, d])$:

1. $append([], Z, Z)$
- $(append([E1|R1], Y, [E1|Rest]), \neg append(R1, Y, Rest))$
 - $\neg append([a, b], [c, d], [a, b, c, d])$
- $R[3, 2a]\{E1=a, R1=[b], Y=[c, d], Rest=[b, c, d]\}$
 $\neg append([b], [c, d], [b, c, d])$
 - $R[4, 2a]\{E1=b, R1=[], Y=[c, d], Rest=[c, d]\}$
 $\neg append([], [c, d], [c, d])$
 - $R[5, 1]\{Z=[c, d]\} ()$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

64

Review: One Last Example!

Consider the following English description

- Whoever can read is literate.
- Dolphins are not literate.
- Flipper is an intelligent dolphin.

- Who is intelligent but cannot read.

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

65

Example: pick symbols & convert to first-order formula

- Whoever can read is literate.
 $\forall X. \text{read}(X) \rightarrow \text{lit}(X)$
- Dolphins are not literate.
 $\forall X. \text{dolp}(X) \rightarrow \neg \text{lit}(X)$
- Flipper is an intelligent dolphin
 $\text{dolp}(\text{flipper}) \wedge \text{intell}(\text{flipper})$

- Who is intelligent but cannot read?
 $\exists X. \text{intell}(X) \wedge \neg \text{read}(X).$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

66

Example: convert to clausal form

- $\forall X. \text{read}(X) \rightarrow \text{lit}(X)$
 $(\neg \text{read}(X), \text{lit}(X))$
- Dolphins are not literate.
 $\forall X. \text{dolp}(X) \rightarrow \neg \text{lit}(X)$
 $(\neg \text{dolp}(X), \neg \text{lit}(X))$
- Flipper is an intelligent dolphin.
 $\text{dolp}(\text{flipper})$
 $\text{intell}(\text{flipper})$
- who are intelligent but cannot read?
 $\exists X. \text{intell}(X) \wedge \neg \text{read}(X).$
 $\rightarrow \forall X. \neg \text{intell}(X) \vee \text{read}(X)$
 $\rightarrow (\neg \text{intell}(X), \text{read}(X), \text{answer}(X))$

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

67

Example: do the resolution proof

- $(\neg \text{read}(X), \text{lit}(X))$
 - $(\neg \text{dolp}(X), \neg \text{lit}(X))$
 - $\text{dolp}(\text{flip})$
 - $\text{intell}(\text{flip})$
 - $(\neg \text{intell}(X), \text{read}(X), \text{answer}(X))$

 - $R[5a,4] X=\text{flip}. (\text{read}(\text{flip}), \text{answer}(\text{flip}))$
 - $R[6,1a] X=\text{flip}. (\text{lit}(\text{flip}), \text{answer}(\text{flip}))$
 - $R[7,2b] X=\text{flip}. (\neg \text{dolp}(\text{flip}), \text{answer}(\text{flip}))$
 - $R[8,3] \text{answer}(\text{flip})$
- so flip is intelligent but cannot read!

Fahiem Bacchus & Yves Lesperance

68