

**Week1:** A set of propositional formulas is **satisfiable** if some interpretation satisfies all formulas in the set.

A propositional formula is a **tautology** if every interpretation satisfies

F is **equivalent** to G (symbolically,  $F \leftrightarrow G$ ) if, for every interpretation I  $F_i = G_i$  In other words,  $F \leftrightarrow G$  is a tautology

A set of formulas **entails** a formula (symbolically,  $\Gamma \models G$ ) if, every interpretation that satisfies all formulas in  $\Gamma$  satisfies G also.

F is a tautology iff  $\neg F$  is unsatisfiable. F is **equivalent** to G iff  $F \leftrightarrow G$  is a **tautology**. F is equivalent to G iff F entails G and G entails F!

A **literal** is either an atom or its negation A **clause** is of the form  $L_1 \vee \dots \vee L_n (n \geq 1)$  where each  $L_i$  is a literal

A formula is in **conjunctive normal form (CNF)** if it is of the form  $F_1 \wedge \dots \wedge F_m (m \geq 1)$  where each  $F_i$  is a clause

**Reasoning** is a form of calculation over symbols standing for propositions rather than numbers. While **propositions** are abstract objects, their representations are concrete objects and can be easily manipulated

**Deductive Reasoning:** Usually, we are interested in deriving implicit, entailed facts from a given collection of explicitly represented facts that are logically 1. Sound (the derived proposition must be true, given that the premises are true), and 2. Complete (all true consequences can be derived).

**Abductive Reasoning:** Given a background theory, a set of explanations and an observation, find the most likely explanation

**Default Reasoning:** In the absence of evidence to the contrary, we jump to a conclusion

In **propositional logic**, an atom represents a proposition, which is either true or false. A **propositional signature** is a set of symbols called atoms.

A set  $T$  of formulas **Entails** a formula  $F$   
For each int  $I$   
For each formula  $G$  in  $T$  in  
check if  $I$  satis  $G$   
If no, continue to next  
interpretation  
If yes: check if Satisfies  
If yes: continue to next  
interpretation  
If no: exit and report "Not  
Entailed"

**CLAUSIFY** (  $F$  ) eliminate  
from  $F$  all connectives  
other than  $\neg, \wedge, \vee$   
and distribute  $\neg$  over  $\wedge$   
and  $\vee$  until It applies to  
atoms only; distribute  $\vee$   
over  $\wedge$  until it applies to  
literals only; return the  
set of conjunctive terms  
of the

**Unit Propagation 1,**  
For any CNF  $F$  and atom  $A$ ,  
 $F|A$  is obtained from  $F$  by  
replacing all occurrences of  
 $A$  by  $T$  and simplifying the  
result by removing  
-all clauses containing the  
disjunctive term  $T$ , and  
- the disjunctive terms  $\neg T$   
in all remaining clauses

**Unit propagation 2.**  
Similarly,  $F|\neg A$  is the result  
of replacing all occurrences  
of  $A$  by  $\perp$  and simplifying  
the result by removing  
-all clauses containing the  
disjunctive term  $\neg \perp$ , and  
-the disjunctive terms  $\perp$  in  
all remaining clauses.

A **propositional formula** of is  
defined recursively as follows:  
- Every atom is a formula  
- Both 0 place connectives are  
formulas  
- If  $F$  is a formula then  $\neg F$  is a  
formula  
- For any binary connective  $\odot$ , if  
 $F$  and  $G$  are formulas then  $(F \odot G)$  is  
a formula

**Week 2: FOL: F** is logically valid iff  $\neg F$  is unsatisfiable. Individuals are expressed by **object/function constants**: andy, paul, father (andy). Properties are expressed by **predicates**.  $S, I, Y$  are predicates.  $S(\text{andy})$ ,  $\text{Andy}$  is a student.  $I(\text{paul})$  Paul is an instructor.  $Y(\text{andy}, \text{paul})$ .  $\text{Andy}$  is younger than Paul. A **Herbrand** interpretation is a special case of first-order interpretation [ A Herbrand interpretation of signature  $\sigma$  (containing at least one object constant) is an interpretation of  $\sigma$  such that - its universe (Herbrand Universe) is the set of all ground (i.e., variable-free) terms of  $\sigma$  - every ground term is interpreted as itself ( $t_i = t$ )

**Signature:** 2 types symbols  
-function constants (with  
arity  $n$ ):  $+/2, a/0, \text{father}/1$   
•function constants of arity 0  
are called object constants  
- predicate constants (with  
arity  $n$ ):  $\text{even}/1, >/2$   
• predicate constants of arity  
0 are called propositional  
constants

**Other symbols-non sign**  
(object) variables:  $x, y, z$ ,  
-the propositional  
connectives:  $\perp, T, \neg, \wedge$   
 $, \vee, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow$   
- the universal quantifier  
 $\forall$  and the existential  
quantifier  $\exists$   
- the parentheses and the  
comma

A **term** is meant to denote an  
individual. It is defined  
recursively:  
- an object constant is a  
term  
- an object variable is a term  
- for every function constant  
 $f$  of arity  $n$  ( $n > 0$ ), if  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  are  
terms then so is  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$

**FOL(propos+below)**  
-every atomic formula of  $\sigma$  is a  
formula  
-if  $F$  is a formula then  
 $\forall x F$  and  $\exists x F$  are formulas.  
Whereas propositional logic  
assumes world contains facts,  
**First order logic** (like natural  
language) assumes the world  
contains Objects, Functions,  
Relations

N queens puzzle:  
 $1 \{ \text{queen}(R, 1..n) \} 1 :- R=1..n.$   
 $:- \text{queen}(R1, C), \text{queen}(R2, C),$   
 $R1 \neq R2.$   
 $:- \text{queen}(R1, C1),$   
 $\text{queen}(R2, C2), R1 \neq R2, |R1 -$   
 $R2| = |C1 - C2|.$   
No two queens share the  
same row, column, or  
diagonal

**Week 3:** If two formulas are equivalent under propositional logic, then they have the **same minimal models.**, converse is not true?. A propositional rule is **definite** if  
a) its head is an atom, and b) its body (if it has one) does not contain negation. A **definite** program has a **unique minimal model**. A **stable model** of a definite  
program  $\Pi$  is **the minimal model** of  $\Pi$ . A **stable model** of a **positive** program  $\Pi$  is a **minimal model** of  $\Pi$ . A **critical part** of a propositional rule is a subformula of its  
head or body that begins with negation but is not part of another subformula that begins with negation. The **reduct**  $\Pi_x$  of  $\Pi$  relative to an interpretation  $X$  is the positive  
propositional program obtained from  $\Pi$  by replacing each critical part  $\neg H$  of each of its rules - by  $T$  if  $X$  satisfies  $\neg H$ ; - by  $\perp$  otherwise. **Equivalent propositional**  
programs (i.e., having the same models) may have different stable models.

**Fibonacci Numbers**

$\text{Fib}(0) = 0$   $\text{Fib}(1) = 1$   
 $\text{Fib}(n+2) = \text{Fib}(n) +$   
 $\text{Fib}(n+1)$  for  $n \geq 0$   
 $\text{fib}(i, m)$ :  $i$ -th Fibonacci number is  
 $m$   
 $\text{fib}(0, 0).$   $\text{fib}(1, 1).$   
 $\text{fib}(N+2, F1+F2)$   
 $:- \text{fib}(N, F1), \text{fib}(N+1, F2), N=0..(n-$   
 $2).$

**Factorials**

$\text{Fac}(0) = 1$   $\text{Fac}(n+1) =$   
 $(n+1) \times \text{Fac}(n)$   
 $\% \text{fac}(i, m)$ :  $i$ -th factorial is  
 $m$   $\text{fac}(0, 1).$   $\text{fac}(N+1,$   
 $(N+1) \times F$   $:- \text{fac}(N, F),$   
 $N=1..n.$   $\text{fac}(F) :- \text{fac}(N, F).$

**Stable model of a clingo  
program**

1. Construct the propositional  
image  
2. Find the reduct relative to  
 $\{p(a), q(a)\}$   
3. Check if  $\{p(a), q(a)\}$  is a  
minimal model of the reduct

Stable model of a propositional program  $\Pi$

1. Guess an interpretation  $X$   
2. Find the reduct of  $\Pi$  relative to  $X$  (i.e.,  $\Pi^X$ )  
3. Check if  $X$  satisfies  $\Pi^X$  a. If yes, continue  
b. If no, conclude  $X$  is not a stable model of  $\Pi$   
4. Check if no other interpretation that is smaller than  $X$  satisfies  
 $\Pi^X$ . I.e., for each interpretation  $Y$  that is smaller than  $X$ ,  
a. If  $Y$  satisfies  $\Pi^X$ , conclude  $X$  is not a stable model of  $\Pi$   
B. Else continue 5. Conclude  $X$  is a stable model of  $\Pi$

1:1 function  
domain(1;2;3)  
.  
codomain(  
 $a; b; c; d; e$ ).  
{f(X,Y):  
codomain(Y)}  
=1  
:- domain(X).  
 $X=X1$   
f(X,Y),  
f(X1,Y).

% onto  
domain(1;2;3).  
codomain(a;b).  
{f(X,Y):  
codomain(Y)} =  
1 :- domain(X).  
:- {f(X,Y):  
domain(X)} = 0,  
codomain(Y).

$X$  equals 8 (soln 1)  
 $\exists y [Q(x,y) \wedge Q(y,a)] \wedge \neg \exists y, z$   
 $[Q(x,y) \wedge Q(y,a) \wedge Q(x,z) \wedge Q(z,a)$   
 $\wedge y \neq z] \exists y [Q(x,y) \wedge Q(y,a)]$   
means that there is a number  
 $y$  between  $x$  and  $a$ , thus  $x$  can  
only be  $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, 7, 8\}$ .  $\neg \exists y, z$   
 $[Q(x,y) \wedge Q(y,a) \wedge Q(x,z) \wedge Q(z,a)$   
 $\wedge y \neq z]$  means that we cannot  
find 2 different numbers  $y$   
and  $z$  between  $x$  and  $a$ . Thus  
 $x$  now can only be 8.

$X$  equals 8 (soln 2)  
 $\forall y [P(y) \wedge Q(y,a) \rightarrow Q(y,x)] \wedge \exists y$   
 $[Q(x,y) \wedge Q(y,a)] \exists y [Q(x,y) \wedge$   
 $Q(y,a)]$  means that there is a  
number  $y$  between  $x$  and  $a$ ,  
thus  $x$  can only be  
 $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, 7, 8\}$ .  $\forall y [P(y) \wedge$   
 $Q(y,a) \rightarrow Q(y,x)]$  means that for  
all prime number  $y$  that is  
smaller than  $a$ ,  $y$  must be  
smaller than  $x$ . The possible  
values of  $y$  are  $\{2, 3, 5, 7\}$ , and

Student taking CSE 579 2 solutions:  
1.  $\exists x \exists y (P(x) \wedge P(y) \wedge x \neq y \wedge \forall z (P(z) \rightarrow (z = x \vee z = y)))$   
2.  $\exists x \exists y \forall z [P(x) \wedge P(y) \wedge x \neq y \wedge ((x \neq z \wedge y \neq z) \rightarrow \neg P(z))]$   
**DPLL (F,U):** Unit-propagate (F,U);  
If  $F$  contains the empty clause then return;  
If  $F = T$  then exit with a model of  $U$ ;  
 $L \leftarrow$  a literal containing an atom from  $F$ ;  
 $DPLL(F|L, UU\{L\})$ ;  
 $DPLL(F|\neg L, UU\{\neg L\})$

			since they are all smaller than x, x can only be 8.	To solve satisfiability of F, call DPLL(F, $\emptyset$ )
--	--	--	--	--