

Term-Indexing for the Beagle Theorem Prover

Timothy Clarence Richard Cosgrove

A subthesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the degree of
Bachelor of Science (Honours) at
The Department of Computer Science
Australian National University

July 2013

© Timothy Clarence Richard Cosgrove

Typeset in Palatino by \TeX and $\text{\LaTeX} 2_{\epsilon}$.

Except where otherwise indicated, this thesis is my own original work.

Timothy Clarence Richard Cosgrove
14 July 2013

For Dana.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my Supervisor and all...

Abstract

This should be the abstract to your thesis. . .

x

Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| Acknowledgements | vii |
| Abstract | ix |
| 1 An Introduction to My Thesis | 1 |
| 1.1 The Basis for this Work | 1 |
| 1.1.1 A Theoretical Framework | 1 |
| 2 Background | 3 |
| 2.1 First-Order Logic Terms and Notation | 3 |
| 2.1.1 FOL basics | 3 |
| 2.1.2 Calculi and FOL problems | 3 |
| 2.2 Automated Reasoning and Theorem Proving | 3 |
| 2.3 Term Indexing | 4 |
| 2.4 Fingerprint Indexing | 4 |
| 2.5 The Beagle Theorem Prover | 4 |
| 2.5.1 The Weak Abstraction with Heirachic Superposition Calculus . . | 4 |
| 2.5.2 Beagle's Shortcomings | 4 |
| 2.6 Scala | 4 |
| 3 Implementing Fingerprint Indexing | 5 |
| 3.1 Initial Implementation | 5 |
| 3.1.1 Refactoring Current Implementation | 5 |
| 3.1.2 Initial Problems | 5 |
| 3.2 Tailoring to Beagle | 5 |
| 4 Results | 7 |
| 4.1 Why I Did It | 7 |
| 4.2 What I Did | 7 |
| 5 Conclusion | 9 |
| 5.1 Why this is a Very Clever Thesis | 9 |
| A Some Other Stuff | 11 |
| A.1 Why I Did It | 11 |
| B More Stuff | 13 |

| | |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Bibliography | 15 |
| Index | 16 |

An Introduction to My Thesis

1.1 The Basis for this Work

1.1.1 A Theoretical Framework

Background

2.1 First-Order Logic Terms and Notation

This thesis focuses around the extension of *beagle*, a *first-order logic* (FOL) theorem prover. In order to understand *beagle*'s purpose and functions a basic understanding of the FOL logical system is required. This section provides a rudimentary overview of FOL syntax and uses; but also includes an explanation of any specialised terms and notation used throughout the paper.

2.1.1 FOL basics

2.1.2 Calculi and FOL problems

Should contain

- Variables
- Symbols
- Predicates
- Quantifiers
- Notion of soundness and completeness
- Description of a 'calculus'
- Positions

2.2 Automated Reasoning and Theorem Proving

Automated Reasoning is a rapidly growing field of research where computer programs are used to solve problems stated in first order logic statments or other formal logics.

[Weidenbach et al. 1999], [Riazanov and Voronkov 1999], [Schulz 2002]

Should contain

- Theorem prover examples

2.3 Term Indexing

Term indexing is a technique used to

2.4 Fingerprint Indexing

Fingerprint Indexing is a recent technique developed by Schulz [2012].

2.5 The Beagle Theorem Prover

The core implementation of Beagle was developed by Peter Baumgartner et al. of NICTA. Its purpose was to demonstrate the capabilities of the *Weak Abstraction with Heirachic Superposition Calculus*; which allows the incorporation of prior knowledge via a ‘background reasoning’ modules.

2.5.1 The Weak Abstraction with Heirachic Superposition Calculus

2.5.2 Beagle’s Shortcomings

2.6 Scala

As mentioned above *beagle* is written in *Scala*, the Scalable Language. Scala is a functional language and may be confusing to those who are not familiar with the functional programming paradigm. This thesis will contain occasional snippets of Scala code; but note that any snippets used will be accompanied by an explanation and in general an understanding of Scala is not required.

We add a few blank pages here to illustrate section headings on odd pages (other than the first page in a new chapter).

Also, here is an example of a citation, and another . If in the context, it makes sense to talk about the work of an author in a more integrated way, like, that can be done too. Because the information on this page is *so* important, it has been indexed too (see the index at the back of this thesis).¹

¹However, it is *strongly* advisable to leave indexing until the thesis is complete. Donald Knuth says to allow about a day for the task of indexing. In my experience he was spot-on.

Implementing Fingerprint Indexing

3.1 Initial Implementation

```

/** Check two Fingerprint features for compatibility based
 * on the unification table (See page 6 of [Schulz 2012]).
 * This table is reduced to 4 cases:
 *   True if Features are equal,
 *   True if at least one Feature is B,
 *   True if at least one Feature is A; but no Ns,
 *   False otherwise */
def compareFeaturesForUnification
    (a:FPFeature, b:FPFeature) : Boolean =
(a==b) ||
(Set(a,b) match {
    case x if (x contains FPB) => true
    case x if (x contains FPA) => !(x contains FPN)
    case _ => false})

```

Listing 1: Scala implementation of the Fingerprint unification table. [Schulz 2012, p6]

3.1.1 Refactoring Current Implementation

3.1.2 Initial Problems

3.2 Tailoring to Beagle

Results

4.1 Why I Did It

4.2 What I Did

Conclusion

5.1 Why this is a Very Clever Thesis

Some Other Stuff

A.1 Why I Did It

More Stuff

Bibliography

- RIAZANOV, A. AND VORONKOV, A. 1999. Vampire. In *Automated Deduction – CADE-16*, Volume 1632 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 292–296. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. (p.3)
- SCHULZ, S. 2002. E – A Brainiac Theorem Prover. *Journal of AI Communications* 15, 2/3, 111–126. (p.3)
- SCHULZ, S. 2012. Fingerprint indexing for paramodulation and rewriting. In B. GRAMLICH, D. MILLER, AND U. SATTLER Eds., *Automated Reasoning*, Volume 7364 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 477–483. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. (pp.4, 5)
- WEIDENBACH, C., AFSHORDEL, B., BRAHM, U., COHRS, C., ENGEL, T., KEEN, E., THEOBALT, C., AND TOPIĆ, D. 1999. System description: Spass version 1.0.0. In *Automated Deduction – CADE-16*, Volume 1632 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 378–382. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. (p.3)

Index

Books to read, 4

Section headings, 4