Logik für Informatiker
Logic for computer scientists

First-order resolution

Till Mossakowski

WiSe 2007/08

First-order resolution

- generalises propositional resolution to first-order logic
- is a proof system that is well-suited for efficient implementation
- many automated first-order provers are based on resolution: SPASS, Prover9, Vampire
- also interactive provers for higher-order logic are based on resolution: Isabelle, HOL, HOL-light

Skolemization

The sentence

$$\forall x \exists y Neighbor(x, y)$$

is logically equivalent to the second-order sentence

$$\exists f \forall x Neighbor(x, f(x))$$

In first-order logic, we have the Skolem normal form

$$\forall x Neighbor(x, f(x))$$

Theorem about Skolem normal form

Theorem

A sentence $S \equiv \forall x \exists y P(x, y)$ is satisfiable iff its Skolem normal form $\forall x P(x, f(x))$ is.
Every structure satisfying the Skolem normal form also satisfies S. Moreover, every structure satisfying S can be turned into one satisfying the Skolem normal form. This is done by interpreting f by a function which picks out, for any object b in the domain, some object c such that they satisfy $P(x, y)$.

Unification of terms

$$\{P(f(a)), \forall x\ \neg P(f(g(x)))\}$$

is satisfiable, but

$$\{P(f(g(a))), \forall x\ \neg P(f(x))\}$$

is not. This can be seen with unification.

Terms $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ are unifiable, if there is a substitution of terms for some or all the variables in $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ such that the terms that result from the substitution are syntactically identical terms.

Example

$$f(g(z), x), \quad f(y, x), \quad f(y, h(a))$$

are unifiable by substituting $h(a)$ for x and $g(z)$ for y.

Prenex Normal Form

Goal: shift all quantifiers to the top-level

$(\forall x P) \wedge Q \rightsquigarrow \forall x(P \wedge Q)$	$(\exists x P) \wedge Q \rightsquigarrow \exists x(P \wedge Q)$
$P \wedge (\forall x Q) \rightsquigarrow \forall x(P \wedge Q)$	$P \wedge (\exists x Q) \rightsquigarrow \exists x(P \wedge Q)$
$(\forall x P) \vee Q \rightsquigarrow \forall x(P \vee Q)$	$(\exists x P) \vee Q \rightsquigarrow \exists x(P \vee Q)$
$P \vee (\forall x Q) \rightsquigarrow \forall x(P \vee Q)$	$P \vee (\exists x Q) \rightsquigarrow \exists x(P \vee Q)$
$\neg \forall x P \rightsquigarrow \exists x(\neg P)$	$\neg \exists x P \rightsquigarrow \forall x(\neg P)$
$(\forall x P) \longrightarrow Q \rightsquigarrow \exists x(P \longrightarrow Q)$	$(\exists x P) \longrightarrow Q \rightsquigarrow \forall x(P \longrightarrow Q)$
$P \longrightarrow (\forall x Q) \rightsquigarrow \forall x(P \longrightarrow Q)$	$P \longrightarrow (\exists x Q) \rightsquigarrow \exists x(P \longrightarrow Q)$

$$P \leftrightarrow Q \rightsquigarrow (P \longrightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \longrightarrow P)$$

Alpha-renaming (change of bound variables)

The Prenex normal form algorithm assumes that all variables in a formula are distinct. This can be achieved by α-renaming:

$\forall x P(x) \leadsto \forall y P(y)$

$\exists x P(x) \leadsto \exists y P(y)$

Resolution for FOL

Suppose that we have a set $\mathcal{T}$ of sentences an want to show that they are not simultaneously first-order satisfiable.

1. Put each sentence in $\mathcal{T}$ into prenex form, say

$$\forall x_1 \exists y_1 \forall x_2 \exists y_2 \dots P(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \dots)$$

2. Skolemize each of the resulting sentences, say

$$\forall x_1 \forall x_2 \dots P(x_1, f_1(x_1), x_2, f_2(x_1, x_2), \dots)$$

using different Skolem functions for different sentences.

3. Put each quantifier free matrix P into conjunctive normal form, say
$$P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge \ldots \wedge P_n$$
where each P_i is a disjunction of literals.
4. Distribute the universal quantifiers in each sentence across the conjunctions and drop the conjunction signs, ending with a set of sentences of the form
$$\forall x_1 \forall x_2 \ldots P_i$$

5. Change the bound variables in each of the resulting sentences so that no variable appears in two of them.

6. Turn each of the resulting sentences into a set of literals by dropping the universal quantifiers and disjunction signs. In this way we end up with a set of resolution clauses.

7. Use resolution and unification to resolve this set of clauses

$$\frac{\{C_1, \ldots, C_m\},\ \{\neg D_1, \ldots, D_n\}}{\{C_2\theta, \ldots C_m\theta, D_2\theta, \ldots, D_n\theta\}}$$

if $C_1\theta = D_1\theta$ (θ is a unifier of C_1 and D_1)

Example I

Is the following argument valid?

$$\begin{array}{|l}
\forall x(P(x,b) \lor Q(x)) \\
\forall y(\ \neg P(f(y),b) \lor Q(y)) \\
\hline
\forall y(Q(y) \lor Q(f(y)))
\end{array}$$

Reformulated: is the following set unsatisfiable?

$$\begin{array}{l}
\forall x(P(x,b) \lor Q(x)) \\
\forall y(\ \neg P(f(y),b) \lor Q(y)) \\
\neg\forall y(Q(y) \lor Q(f(y)))
\end{array}$$

Step 1: Prenex normal form

$$\forall x(P(x,b) \lor Q(x))$$
$$\forall y(\ \neg P(f(y),b) \lor Q(y))$$
$$\exists y \neg(Q(y) \lor Q(f(y))$$

Step 2: Skolemization

$$\forall x(P(x,b) \vee Q(x))$$
$$\forall y(\ \neg P(f(y),b) \vee Q(y))$$
$$\neg(Q(c) \vee Q(f(c)))$$

Since the existential quantifier was not preceeded by any universal quantifier, we need a 0-ary function symbol, that is, an individual constant c.

Step 3: Conjunctive normal form

$$\forall x(P(x,b) \lor Q(x))$$
$$\forall y(\ \neg P(f(y),b) \lor Q(y))$$
$$\neg Q(c) \land \neg Q(f(c))$$

Step 4: Drop conjunctions

$$\forall x(P(x,b) \lor Q(x))$$
$$\forall y(\ \neg P(f(y),b) \lor Q(y))$$
$$\neg Q(c)$$
$$\neg Q(f(c))$$

Step 5: change bound variables: nothing to do.

Step 6: Drop universal quantifiers and disjunctions, and step 7: do resolution

1. $\{P(x,b),\ Q(x)\}$
2. $\{\neg P(f(y),b),\ Q(y)\}$
3. $\{\neg Q(c)\}$
4. $\{\neg Q(f(c))\}$

5. $\{Q(y), Q(f(y))\}$ 1,2 with $f(y)$ for x
6. $\{Q(f(c))\}$ 3,5 with c for y
7. $\Box$ 4,6

Example II

Is the following argument valid?

From

“Everyone admires someone who admires them unless they admire Quaid.”

we can infer

“There are people who admire each other, at least one of whom admires Quaid.”

The formalization

$$\begin{array}{|l} \forall x[\neg A(x,q) \rightarrow \exists y(A(x,y) \wedge A(y,x))] \\ \hline \exists x \exists y[A(x,q) \wedge A(x,y) \wedge A(y,x)] \end{array}$$

Reformulated: is the following set unsatisfiable?

$$\begin{array}{l} \forall x[\neg A(x,q) \rightarrow \exists y(A(x,y) \wedge A(y,x))] \\ \neg\exists x \exists y[A(x,q) \wedge A(x,y) \wedge A(y,x)] \end{array}$$

Step 1: Prenex normal form

$$\forall x \exists y [\neg A(x,q) \rightarrow (A(x,y) \wedge A(y,x))]$$
$$\forall x \forall y \neg [A(x,q) \wedge A(x,y) \wedge A(y,x)]$$

Step 2: Skolemization

$$\forall x [\neg A(x,q) \rightarrow (A(x,f(x)) \wedge A(f(x),x))]$$
$$\forall x \forall y \neg [A(x,q) \wedge A(x,y) \wedge A(y,x)]$$

Step 3: Conjunctive normal form

$$\forall x [(A(x,q) \vee A(x,f(x))) \wedge (A(x,q) \vee A(f(x),x))]$$
$$\forall x \forall y [\neg A(x,q) \vee \neg A(x,y) \vee \neg A(y,x)]$$

Step 4: Drop conjunctions

$$\forall x(A(x,q) \vee A(x,f(x)))$$
$$\forall x(A(x,q) \vee A(f(x),x))$$
$$\forall x \forall y[\neg A(x,q) \vee \neg A(x,y) \vee \neg A(y,x)]$$

Step 5: change bound variables.

$$\forall x(A(x,q) \vee A(x,f(x)))$$
$$\forall y(A(y,q) \vee A(f(y),y))$$
$$\forall z \forall w[\neg A(z,q) \vee \neg A(z,w) \vee \neg A(w,z)]$$

Step 6: Drop universal quantifiers and disjunctions, and step 7: do resolution

1. $\{A(x,q), A(x,f(x))\}$
2. $\{A(y,q), A(f(y),y)\}$
3. $\{\neg A(z,q), \neg A(z,w), \neg A(w,z)\}$

Step 6: Drop universal quantifiers and disjunctions, and step 7: do resolution

1. $\{A(x,q), A(x,f(x))\}$
2. $\{A(y,q), A(f(y),y)\}$
3. $\{\neg A(z,q), \neg A(z,w), \neg A(w,z)\}$
4. $\{A(q,f(q))\}$ 1,3 with q for w, x, z

Step 6: Drop universal quantifiers and disjunctions, and step 7: do resolution

1. $\{A(x,q), A(x,f(x))\}$
2. $\{A(y,q), A(f(y),y)\}$
3. $\{\neg A(z,q), \neg A(z,w), \neg A(w,z)\}$
4. $\{A(q,f(q))\}$ 1,3 with q for w,x,z
5. $\{A(f(q),q)\}$ 2,3 with q for w,y,z

Step 6: Drop universal quantifiers and disjunctions, and step 7: do resolution

1. $\{A(x, q), A(x, f(x))\}$
2. $\{A(y, q), A(f(y), y)\}$
3. $\{\neg A(z, q), \neg A(z, w), \neg A(w, z)\}$
4. $\{A(q, f(q))\}$ 1,3 with q for w, x, z
5. $\{A(f(q), q)\}$ 2,3 with q for w, y, z
6. $\{\neg A(q, f(q))\}$ 3,5 with $f(q)$ for z, q for w

Step 6: Drop universal quantifiers and disjunctions, and step 7: do resolution

1. $\{A(x,q), A(x,f(x))\}$
2. $\{A(y,q), A(f(y),y)\}$
3. $\{\neg A(z,q), \neg A(z,w), \neg A(w,z)\}$
4. $\{A(q,f(q))\}$ 1,3 with q for w, x, z
5. $\{A(f(q),q)\}$ 2,3 with q for w, y, z
6. $\{\neg A(q,f(q))\}$ 3,5 with $f(q)$ for z, q for w
7. $\square$ 4,6

The FO Con routine of Fitch . . .

. . . is based on automated deduction similar to resolution.

However, note: first-order consequence is undecidable (Church).

Hence, the FO Con routine at some inputs does not give a result.

Prolog: Programming in logic

Prolog is based on definite Horn clauses (i.e. exactly one positive literal in each clause)

$$ancestorOf(X, Y) : -motherOf(X, Y).$$
$$ancestorOf(X, Y) : -fatherOf(X, Y).$$
$$ancestorOf(X, Z) : -ancestorOf(X, Y), ancestorOf(Y, Z).$$
$$motherOf(a, b).$$
$$fatherOf(b, c).$$
$$fatherOf(b, d).$$

SLD resolution

All subgoals are of form $\leftarrow P_1, \ldots, P_n$ (i.e. $\neg P_1 \vee \ldots \vee \neg P_n$).

Resolution always with the leftmost disjunct:

$\leftarrow P_1, \ldots, P_n$

$R \leftarrow Q_1, \ldots, Q_m \qquad R\theta = P_1\theta$

$(\leftarrow Q_1, \ldots, Q_m, P_2, \ldots, P_n)\theta$

In disjunctive form:

$\neg P_1 \vee \ldots \vee \neg P_n$

$R \vee \neg Q_1 \vee \ldots \vee \neg Q_m \qquad R\theta = P_1\theta$

$(\neg Q_1 \vee \ldots \vee \neg Q_m \vee \neg P_2 \vee \ldots \neg P_n)\theta$

Example

$\leftarrow ancestor(X, Y)$

Example

$\leftarrow ancestor(X, Y)$

Answers:

```
X = a  Y = b
X = b  Y = c
X = b  Y = d
X = a  Y = c
X = a  Y = d
```

SWI-Prolog

In the local net: just call pl.

Documentation:

`http://`
`www.swi.psy.uva.nl/projects/SWI-Prolog/Manual`

Exercises

chapter 18, 18.20-18.30