

The importance of resolution

The inference rule

$$\begin{array}{l} A \vee B \vee C \vee \dots \vee Z \\ D \vee E \vee F \vee \dots \vee \neg Z \\ \hline A \vee B \vee C \vee D \vee E \vee F \vee \dots \end{array}$$

Part of the original Prolog example:

```
eats(X, Y) :- cat(X), mouse(Y).
chases(X, Y) :- eats(X, Y).
chases(X, Y) :- dog(X), cat(Y).
cat(tom).
mouse(jerry).
```

Those are all reversed implications, e.g.

if `cat(X)` and `mouse(Y)` then `eats(X, Y)`

So what we've got is five things that are all true

```
(cat(X) ^ mouse(Y) => eats(X, Y)) ^
(eats(X, Y) => chases(X, Y)) ^
(dog(X) ^ cat(Y) => chases(X, Y)) ^
(cat(tom)) ^
(mouse(jerry))
```

Propositional logic can't handle those sorts of formulae, so simplify:

```
(cx ^ my => exy) ^
(exy => chxy) ^
(dx ^ cy => chxy) ^
(cx) ^
(my)
```

And recall these equivalences:

$$A \Rightarrow Z \equiv Z \vee \neg A$$

so

$$A \wedge B \wedge C \Rightarrow Z \equiv Z \vee \neg(A \wedge B \wedge C) \equiv Z \vee \neg A \vee \neg B \vee \neg C$$

Our rule base is therefore

```
(exy v ¬cx v ¬my) ^
(chxy v ¬exy) ^
(chxy v ¬dx v ¬cy) ^
(cx) ^
(my)
```

All nicely in Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF)

$$\begin{aligned}
& (exy \vee \neg cx \vee \neg my) \wedge \\
& (chxy \vee \neg exy) \wedge \\
& (chxy \vee \neg dx \vee \neg cy) \wedge \\
& (cx) \wedge \\
& (my)
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose we want to know whether $chxy$ or not.

Resolve cx with $exy \vee \neg cx \vee \neg my$ giving $exy \vee \neg my$

Resolve that with $chxy \vee \neg exy$ giving $\neg my \vee chxy$

Resolve that with my giving $chxy$

Q.E.D.

The absolute technical truth.

Logic programming actually works through proof by contradiction, attempt to prove the negation of what you want, and hope to fail.

We wanted to prove $chxy$, so we add $\neg chxy$ with our rule base:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (exy \vee \neg cx \vee \neg my) \wedge \\
& (chxy \vee \neg exy) \wedge \\
& (chxy \vee \neg dx \vee \neg cy) \wedge \\
& (cx) \wedge \\
& (my) \wedge \\
& (\neg chxy)
\end{aligned}$$

and let resolution proceed exactly as above.

At the end, when we were left with $chxy$, there is now one more step.

Resolve that with $\neg chxy$, resulting in nothing at all, which is failure.

That means that (our knowledge base) \wedge ($\neg chxy$) is false.

Our knowledge base is the definition of truth in this program, so it must be $\neg chxy$ that is false, so according to our knowledge base, $chxy$ is true.

The only trick is knowing which two facts to apply resolution to at each step.