

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning

Propositional Logic

Bernhard Nebel, Malte Helmert and Stefan Wöfl

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg

April 22 & 25, 2008

Why Logic?

- Logic is one of the best developed systems for **representing knowledge**.
- Can be used for analysis, design and specification.
- Understanding formal logic is a prerequisite for understanding most research papers in KRR.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

The Right Logic. . .

- Logics of different **orders** (1st, 2nd, ...)
- **Modal** logics
 - epistemic
 - temporal
 - dynamic (program)
 - multi-modal logics
 - ...
- **Many-valued** logics
- **Conditional** logics
- **Nonmonotonic** logics
- **Linear** logics
- ...

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

The Right Logic. . .

- Logics of different **orders** (1st, 2nd, ...)
- **Modal** logics
 - epistemic
 - temporal
 - dynamic (program)
 - multi-modal logics
 - ...
- **Many-valued** logics
- **Conditional** logics
- **Nonmonotonic** logics
- **Linear** logics
- ...

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

The Right Logic...

- Logics of different **orders** (1st, 2nd, ...)
- **Modal** logics
 - epistemic
 - temporal
 - dynamic (program)
 - multi-modal logics
 - ...
- **Many-valued** logics
- **Conditional** logics
- **Nonmonotonic** logics
- **Linear** logics
- ...

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

The Right Logic...

- Logics of different **orders** (1st, 2nd, ...)
- **Modal** logics
 - epistemic
 - temporal
 - dynamic (program)
 - multi-modal logics
 - ...
- **Many-valued** logics
- **Conditional** logics
- **Nonmonotonic** logics
- **Linear** logics
- ...

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

The Right Logic...

- Logics of different **orders** (1st, 2nd, ...)
- **Modal** logics
 - epistemic
 - temporal
 - dynamic (program)
 - multi-modal logics
 - ...
- **Many-valued** logics
- **Conditional** logics
- **Nonmonotonic** logics
- **Linear** logics
- ...

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

The Right Logic...

- Logics of different **orders** (1st, 2nd, ...)
- **Modal** logics
 - epistemic
 - temporal
 - dynamic (program)
 - multi-modal logics
 - ...
- **Many-valued** logics
- **Conditional** logics
- **Nonmonotonic** logics
- **Linear** logics
- ...

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

The Right Logic...

- Logics of different **orders** (1st, 2nd, ...)
- **Modal** logics
 - epistemic
 - temporal
 - dynamic (program)
 - multi-modal logics
 - ...
- **Many-valued** logics
- **Conditional** logics
- **Nonmonotonic** logics
- **Linear** logics
- ...

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

The Right Logic...

- Logics of different **orders** (1st, 2nd, ...)
- **Modal** logics
 - epistemic
 - temporal
 - dynamic (program)
 - multi-modal logics
 - ...
- **Many-valued** logics
- **Conditional** logics
- **Nonmonotonic** logics
- **Linear** logics
- ...

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

The Logical Approach

- Define a **formal language**: logical & non-logical symbols, syntax rules
- Provide language with **compositional semantics**
 - Fix **universe** of discourse
 - Specify how the non-logical symbols can be **interpreted**: **interpretation**
 - Rules how to **combine** interpretation of single symbols
 - **Satisfying interpretation** = **model**
 - Semantics often entails concept of **logical implication/entailment**
- Specify a **calculus** that allows to **derive** new formulae from old ones – according to the entailment relation

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

The Logical Approach

- Define a **formal language**: logical & non-logical symbols, syntax rules
- Provide language with **compositional semantics**
 - Fix **universe** of discourse
 - Specify how the non-logical symbols can be **interpreted**: **interpretation**
 - Rules how to **combine** interpretation of single symbols
 - **Satisfying interpretation** = **model**
 - Semantics often entails concept of **logical implication/entailment**
- Specify a **calculus** that allows to **derive** new formulae from old ones – according to the entailment relation

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

The Logical Approach

- Define a **formal language**: logical & non-logical symbols, syntax rules
- Provide language with **compositional semantics**
 - Fix **universe** of discourse
 - Specify how the non-logical symbols can be **interpreted**: **interpretation**
 - Rules how to **combine** interpretation of single symbols
 - **Satisfying interpretation** = **model**
 - Semantics often entails concept of **logical implication/entailment**
- Specify a **calculus** that allows to **derive** new formulae from old ones – according to the entailment relation

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

The Logical Approach

- Define a **formal language**: logical & non-logical symbols, syntax rules
- Provide language with **compositional semantics**
 - Fix **universe** of discourse
 - Specify how the non-logical symbols can be **interpreted**: **interpretation**
 - Rules how to **combine** interpretation of single symbols
 - **Satisfying interpretation** = **model**
 - Semantics often entails concept of **logical implication/entailment**
- Specify a **calculus** that allows to **derive** new formulae from old ones – according to the entailment relation

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Propositional Logic: Main Ideas

- **Non-logical symbols:** propositional **variables** or **atoms**
 - representing **propositions** which cannot be decomposed
 - which can be **true** or **false** (for example: “Snow is white”, “It rains”)
- **Logical symbols:** propositional connectives such as:
and (\wedge), **or** (\vee), and **not** (\neg)
- **Formulae:** built out of atoms and connectives
- **Universe of discourse:** truth values

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Propositional Logic: Main Ideas

- **Non-logical symbols:** propositional **variables** or **atoms**
 - representing **propositions** which cannot be decomposed
 - which can be **true** or **false** (for example: “Snow is white”, “It rains”)
- **Logical symbols:** propositional connectives such as:
and (\wedge), **or** (\vee), and **not** (\neg)
- **Formulae:** built out of atoms and connectives
- **Universe of discourse:** truth values

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Propositional Logic: Main Ideas

- **Non-logical symbols:** propositional **variables** or **atoms**
 - representing **propositions** which cannot be decomposed
 - which can be **true** or **false** (for example: “Snow is white”, “It rains”)
- **Logical symbols:** propositional connectives such as:
and (\wedge), **or** (\vee), and **not** (\neg)
- **Formulae:** built out of atoms and connectives
- **Universe of discourse:** truth values

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Syntax

Countable alphabet Σ of **atomic propositions**: a, b, c, \dots

Propositional formulae are built according to the following **rule**:

φ	\longrightarrow	a	<i>atomic formula</i>
		\perp	<i>falsity</i>
		\top	<i>truth</i>
		$(\neg\varphi')$	<i>negation</i>
		$(\varphi' \wedge \varphi'')$	<i>conjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \vee \varphi'')$	<i>disjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \rightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>implication</i>
		$(\varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>equivalence</i>

Parentheses can be omitted if no ambiguity arises.

Operator precedence: $\neg > \wedge > \vee > \rightarrow = \leftrightarrow$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Syntax

Countable alphabet Σ of **atomic propositions**: a, b, c, \dots

Propositional formulae are built according to the following rule:

φ	\longrightarrow	a	<i>atomic formula</i>
		\perp	<i>falsity</i>
		\top	<i>truth</i>
		$(\neg\varphi')$	<i>negation</i>
		$(\varphi' \wedge \varphi'')$	<i>conjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \vee \varphi'')$	<i>disjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \rightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>implication</i>
		$(\varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>equivalence</i>

Parentheses can be omitted if no ambiguity arises.

Operator precedence: $\neg > \wedge > \vee > \rightarrow = \leftrightarrow$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Syntax

Countable alphabet Σ of **atomic propositions**: a, b, c, \dots

Propositional formulae are built according to the following rule:

φ	\longrightarrow	a	<i>atomic formula</i>
		\perp	<i>falsity</i>
		\top	<i>truth</i>
		$(\neg\varphi')$	<i>negation</i>
		$(\varphi' \wedge \varphi'')$	<i>conjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \vee \varphi'')$	<i>disjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \rightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>implication</i>
		$(\varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>equivalence</i>

Parentheses can be omitted if no ambiguity arises.

Operator precedence: $\neg > \wedge > \vee > \rightarrow = \leftrightarrow$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Syntax

Countable alphabet Σ of **atomic propositions**: a, b, c, \dots

Propositional formulae are built according to the following **rule**:

φ	\longrightarrow	a	<i>atomic formula</i>
		\perp	<i>falsity</i>
		\top	<i>truth</i>
		$(\neg\varphi')$	<i>negation</i>
		$(\varphi' \wedge \varphi'')$	<i>conjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \vee \varphi'')$	<i>disjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \rightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>implication</i>
		$(\varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>equivalence</i>

Parentheses can be omitted if no ambiguity arises.

Operator precedence: $\neg > \wedge > \vee > \rightarrow = \leftrightarrow$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Syntax

Countable alphabet Σ of **atomic propositions**: a, b, c, \dots

Propositional formulae are built according to the following **rule**:

φ	\longrightarrow	a	<i>atomic formula</i>
		\perp	<i>falsity</i>
		\top	<i>truth</i>
		$(\neg\varphi')$	<i>negation</i>
		$(\varphi' \wedge \varphi'')$	<i>conjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \vee \varphi'')$	<i>disjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \rightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>implication</i>
		$(\varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>equivalence</i>

Parentheses can be omitted if no ambiguity arises.

Operator precedence: $\neg > \wedge > \vee > \rightarrow = \leftrightarrow$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Syntax

Countable alphabet Σ of **atomic propositions**: a, b, c, \dots

Propositional formulae are built according to the following **rule**:

φ	\longrightarrow	a	<i>atomic formula</i>
		\perp	<i>falsity</i>
		\top	<i>truth</i>
		$(\neg\varphi')$	<i>negation</i>
		$(\varphi' \wedge \varphi'')$	<i>conjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \vee \varphi'')$	<i>disjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \rightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>implication</i>
		$(\varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>equivalence</i>

Parentheses can be omitted if no ambiguity arises.

Operator precedence: $\neg > \wedge > \vee > \rightarrow = \leftrightarrow$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Syntax

Countable alphabet Σ of **atomic propositions**: a, b, c, \dots

Propositional formulae are built according to the following **rule**:

φ	\longrightarrow	a	<i>atomic formula</i>
		\perp	<i>falsity</i>
		\top	<i>truth</i>
		$(\neg\varphi')$	<i>negation</i>
		$(\varphi' \wedge \varphi'')$	<i>conjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \vee \varphi'')$	<i>disjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \rightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>implication</i>
		$(\varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>equivalence</i>

Parentheses can be omitted if no ambiguity arises.

Operator precedence: $\neg > \wedge > \vee > \rightarrow = \leftrightarrow$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Syntax

Countable alphabet Σ of **atomic propositions**: a, b, c, \dots

Propositional formulae are built according to the following **rule**:

φ	\longrightarrow	a	<i>atomic formula</i>
		\perp	<i>falsity</i>
		\top	<i>truth</i>
		$(\neg\varphi')$	<i>negation</i>
		$(\varphi' \wedge \varphi'')$	<i>conjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \vee \varphi'')$	<i>disjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \rightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>implication</i>
		$(\varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>equivalence</i>

Parentheses can be omitted if no ambiguity arises.

Operator precedence: $\neg > \wedge > \vee > \rightarrow = \leftrightarrow$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Syntax

Countable alphabet Σ of **atomic propositions**: a, b, c, \dots

Propositional formulae are built according to the following **rule**:

φ	\longrightarrow	a	<i>atomic formula</i>
		\perp	<i>falsity</i>
		\top	<i>truth</i>
		$(\neg\varphi')$	<i>negation</i>
		$(\varphi' \wedge \varphi'')$	<i>conjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \vee \varphi'')$	<i>disjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \rightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>implication</i>
		$(\varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>equivalence</i>

Parentheses can be omitted if no ambiguity arises.

Operator precedence: $\neg > \wedge > \vee > \rightarrow = \leftrightarrow$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Syntax

Countable alphabet Σ of **atomic propositions**: a, b, c, \dots

Propositional formulae are built according to the following **rule**:

φ	\longrightarrow	a	<i>atomic formula</i>
		\perp	<i>falsity</i>
		\top	<i>truth</i>
		$(\neg\varphi')$	<i>negation</i>
		$(\varphi' \wedge \varphi'')$	<i>conjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \vee \varphi'')$	<i>disjunction</i>
		$(\varphi' \rightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>implication</i>
		$(\varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'')$	<i>equivalence</i>

Parentheses can be omitted if no ambiguity arises.

Operator precedence: $\neg > \wedge > \vee > \rightarrow = \leftrightarrow$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Semantics: Idea

- Atomic propositions can be **true** ($1, T$) or **false** ($0, F$).
- Provided the truth values of the atoms have been fixed (**truth assignment** or **interpretation**), the truth value of a formula can be computed from the truth values of the atoms and the connectives.
- **Example:**

$$(a \vee b) \wedge c$$

is true *iff* c is true and, additionally, a or b is true.

Logical implication can then be defined as follows:

- φ is **implied** by a set of formulae Θ iff φ is true for all truth assignments (world states) that make all formulae in Θ true.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Semantics: Idea

- Atomic propositions can be **true** ($1, T$) or **false** ($0, F$).
- Provided the truth values of the atoms have been fixed (**truth assignment** or **interpretation**), the truth value of a formula can be computed from the truth values of the atoms and the connectives.
- **Example:**

$$(a \vee b) \wedge c$$

is true *iff* c is true and, additionally, a or b is true.

Logical implication can then be defined as follows:

- φ is **implied** by a set of formulae Θ iff φ is true for all truth assignments (world states) that make all formulae in Θ true.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Semantics: Idea

- Atomic propositions can be **true** ($1, T$) or **false** ($0, F$).
- Provided the truth values of the atoms have been fixed (**truth assignment** or **interpretation**), the truth value of a formula can be computed from the truth values of the atoms and the connectives.
- **Example:**

$$(a \vee b) \wedge c$$

is true *iff* c is true and, additionally, a or b is true.

Logical implication can then be defined as follows:

- φ is **implied** by a set of formulae Θ iff φ is true for all truth assignments (world states) that make all formulae in Θ true.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Semantics: Idea

- Atomic propositions can be **true** ($1, T$) or **false** ($0, F$).
- Provided the truth values of the atoms have been fixed (**truth assignment** or **interpretation**), the truth value of a formula can be computed from the truth values of the atoms and the connectives.
- **Example:**

$$(a \vee b) \wedge c$$

is true *iff* c is true and, additionally, a or b is true.

Logical implication can then be defined as follows:

- φ is **implied** by a set of formulae Θ iff φ is true for all truth assignments (world states) that make all formulae in Θ true.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Formal Semantics

An **interpretation** or **truth assignment** over Σ is a function:

$$\mathcal{I}: \Sigma \rightarrow \{T, F\}.$$

A formula ψ is **true under** \mathcal{I} or is **satisfied by** \mathcal{I} (symb. $\mathcal{I} \models \psi$):

$$\mathcal{I} \models a \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{I}(a) = T$$

$$\mathcal{I} \models \top$$

$$\mathcal{I} \not\models \perp$$

$$\mathcal{I} \models \neg\varphi \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{I} \not\models \varphi$$

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi \wedge \varphi' \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ and } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi'$$

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi \vee \varphi' \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ or } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi'$$

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi \rightarrow \varphi' \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{if } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi, \text{ then } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi'$$

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi' \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ if and only if } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi'$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Formal Semantics

An **interpretation** or **truth assignment** over Σ is a function:

$$\mathcal{I}: \Sigma \rightarrow \{T, F\}.$$

A formula ψ is **true under** \mathcal{I} or is **satisfied by** \mathcal{I} (symb. $\mathcal{I} \models \psi$):

$$\mathcal{I} \models a \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{I}(a) = T$$

$$\mathcal{I} \models \top$$

$$\mathcal{I} \not\models \perp$$

$$\mathcal{I} \models \neg\varphi \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{I} \not\models \varphi$$

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi \wedge \varphi' \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ and } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi'$$

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi \vee \varphi' \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ or } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi'$$

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi \rightarrow \varphi' \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{if } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi, \text{ then } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi'$$

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi' \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ if and only if } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi'$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Example

Given

$$\mathcal{I} : a \mapsto T, b \mapsto F, c \mapsto F, d \mapsto T,$$

Is $((a \vee b) \leftrightarrow (c \vee d)) \wedge (\neg(a \wedge c) \vee (c \wedge \neg d))$ true or false?

$$((a \vee b) \leftrightarrow (c \vee d)) \wedge (\neg(a \wedge c) \vee (c \wedge \neg d))$$

$$((a \vee b) \leftrightarrow (c \vee d)) \wedge (\neg(a \wedge c) \vee (c \wedge \neg d))$$

$$((a \vee b) \leftrightarrow (c \vee d)) \wedge (\neg(a \wedge c) \vee (c \wedge \neg d))$$

$$((a \vee b) \leftrightarrow (c \vee d)) \wedge (\neg(a \wedge c) \vee (c \wedge \neg d))$$

$$((a \vee b) \leftrightarrow (c \vee d)) \wedge (\neg(a \wedge c) \vee (c \wedge \neg d))$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Example

Given

$$\mathcal{I} : a \mapsto T, b \mapsto F, c \mapsto F, d \mapsto T,$$

Is $((a \vee b) \leftrightarrow (c \vee d)) \wedge (\neg(a \wedge c) \vee (c \wedge \neg d))$ true or false?

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Example

Given

$$\mathcal{I} : a \mapsto T, b \mapsto F, c \mapsto F, d \mapsto T,$$

Is $((a \vee b) \leftrightarrow (c \vee d)) \wedge (\neg(a \wedge c) \vee (c \wedge \neg d))$ true or false?

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Example

Given

$$\mathcal{I} : a \mapsto T, b \mapsto F, c \mapsto F, d \mapsto T,$$

Is $((a \vee b) \leftrightarrow (c \vee d)) \wedge (\neg(a \wedge c) \vee (c \wedge \neg d))$ true or false?

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Example

Given

$$\mathcal{I} : a \mapsto T, b \mapsto F, c \mapsto F, d \mapsto T,$$

Is $((a \vee b) \leftrightarrow (c \vee d)) \wedge (\neg(a \wedge c) \vee (c \wedge \neg d))$ true or false?

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Example

Given

$$\mathcal{I} : a \mapsto T, b \mapsto F, c \mapsto F, d \mapsto T,$$

Is $((a \vee b) \leftrightarrow (c \vee d)) \wedge (\neg(a \wedge c) \vee (c \wedge \neg d))$ true or false?

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

$$((\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b}) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{d})) \wedge (\neg(\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{c}) \vee (\mathbf{c} \wedge \neg \mathbf{d}))$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Terminology

An interpretation \mathcal{I} is a **model** of φ iff

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$$

A formula φ is

- **satisfiable** if there is an \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$;
- **unsatisfiable**, otherwise; and
- **valid** if $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$ for each \mathcal{I} ;
- **falsifiable**, otherwise.

Two formulae φ and ψ are **logically equivalent** (symb. $\varphi \equiv \psi$) if for all interpretations \mathcal{I} ,

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \psi.$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Terminology

An interpretation \mathcal{I} is a **model** of φ iff

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$$

A formula φ is

- **satisfiable** if there is an \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$;
- **unsatisfiable**, otherwise; and
- **valid** if $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$ for each \mathcal{I} ;
- **falsifiable**, otherwise.

Two formulae φ and ψ are **logically equivalent** (symb. $\varphi \equiv \psi$) if for all interpretations \mathcal{I} ,

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \psi.$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Terminology

An interpretation \mathcal{I} is a **model** of φ iff

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$$

A formula φ is

- **satisfiable** if there is an \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$;
- **unsatisfiable**, otherwise; and
- **valid** if $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$ for each \mathcal{I} ;
- **falsifiable**, otherwise.

Two formulae φ and ψ are **logically equivalent** (symb. $\varphi \equiv \psi$) if for all interpretations \mathcal{I} ,

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \psi.$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Terminology

An interpretation \mathcal{I} is a **model** of φ iff

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$$

A formula φ is

- **satisfiable** if there is an \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$;
- **unsatisfiable**, otherwise; and
- **valid** if $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$ for each \mathcal{I} ;
- **falsifiable**, otherwise.

Two formulae φ and ψ are **logically equivalent** (symb. $\varphi \equiv \psi$) if for all interpretations \mathcal{I} ,

$$\mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \psi.$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Examples

Satisfiable, unsatisfiable, falsifiable, valid?

$$(a \vee b \vee \neg c) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b \vee d) \wedge (\neg a \vee b \vee \neg d)$$

↪ satisfiable: $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto F, d \mapsto F, \dots$

↪ falsifiable: $a \mapsto F, b \mapsto F, c \mapsto T, \dots$

$$((\neg a \rightarrow \neg b) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow a))$$

↪ satisfiable: $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto T$

↪ valid: Consider all interpretations or argue about falsifying ones.

Equivalence? $\neg(a \vee b) \equiv \neg a \wedge \neg b$

↪ Of course, equivalent (de Morgan).

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Examples

Satisfiable, unsatisfiable, falsifiable, valid?

$$(a \vee b \vee \neg c) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b \vee d) \wedge (\neg a \vee b \vee \neg d)$$

\rightsquigarrow **satisfiable:** $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto F, d \mapsto F, \dots$

\rightsquigarrow **falsifiable:** $a \mapsto F, b \mapsto F, c \mapsto T, \dots$

$$((\neg a \rightarrow \neg b) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow a))$$

\rightsquigarrow **satisfiable:** $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto T$

\rightsquigarrow **valid:** Consider all interpretations or argue about falsifying ones.

Equivalence? $\neg(a \vee b) \equiv \neg a \wedge \neg b$

\rightsquigarrow Of course, equivalent (de Morgan).

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Examples

Satisfiable, unsatisfiable, falsifiable, valid?

$$(a \vee b \vee \neg c) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b \vee d) \wedge (\neg a \vee b \vee \neg d)$$

↪ satisfiable: $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto F, d \mapsto F, \dots$

↪ falsifiable: $a \mapsto F, b \mapsto F, c \mapsto T, \dots$

$$((\neg a \rightarrow \neg b) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow a))$$

↪ satisfiable: $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto T$

↪ valid: Consider all interpretations or argue about falsifying ones.

Equivalence? $\neg(a \vee b) \equiv \neg a \wedge \neg b$

↪ Of course, equivalent (de Morgan).

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Examples

Satisfiable, unsatisfiable, falsifiable, valid?

$$(a \vee b \vee \neg c) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b \vee d) \wedge (\neg a \vee b \vee \neg d)$$

↪ satisfiable: $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto F, d \mapsto F, \dots$

↪ falsifiable: $a \mapsto F, b \mapsto F, c \mapsto T, \dots$

$$((\neg a \rightarrow \neg b) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow a))$$

↪ satisfiable: $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto T$

↪ valid: Consider all interpretations or argue about falsifying ones.

Equivalence? $\neg(a \vee b) \equiv \neg a \wedge \neg b$

↪ Of course, equivalent (de Morgan).

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Examples

Satisfiable, unsatisfiable, falsifiable, valid?

$$(a \vee b \vee \neg c) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b \vee d) \wedge (\neg a \vee b \vee \neg d)$$

↪ satisfiable: $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto F, d \mapsto F, \dots$

↪ falsifiable: $a \mapsto F, b \mapsto F, c \mapsto T, \dots$

$$((\neg a \rightarrow \neg b) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow a))$$

↪ satisfiable: $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto T$

↪ valid: Consider all interpretations or argue about falsifying ones.

Equivalence? $\neg(a \vee b) \equiv \neg a \wedge \neg b$

↪ Of course, equivalent (de Morgan).

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Examples

Satisfiable, unsatisfiable, falsifiable, valid?

$$(a \vee b \vee \neg c) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b \vee d) \wedge (\neg a \vee b \vee \neg d)$$

↪ satisfiable: $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto F, d \mapsto F, \dots$

↪ falsifiable: $a \mapsto F, b \mapsto F, c \mapsto T, \dots$

$$((\neg a \rightarrow \neg b) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow a))$$

↪ satisfiable: $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto T$

↪ valid: Consider all interpretations or argue about falsifying ones.

Equivalence? $\neg(a \vee b) \equiv \neg a \wedge \neg b$

↪ Of course, equivalent (de Morgan).

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Examples

Satisfiable, unsatisfiable, falsifiable, valid?

$$(a \vee b \vee \neg c) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b \vee d) \wedge (\neg a \vee b \vee \neg d)$$

\rightsquigarrow satisfiable: $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto F, d \mapsto F, \dots$

\rightsquigarrow falsifiable: $a \mapsto F, b \mapsto F, c \mapsto T, \dots$

$$((\neg a \rightarrow \neg b) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow a))$$

\rightsquigarrow satisfiable: $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto T$

\rightsquigarrow valid: Consider all interpretations or argue about falsifying ones.

Equivalence? $\neg(a \vee b) \equiv \neg a \wedge \neg b$

\rightsquigarrow Of course, equivalent (de Morgan).

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Examples

Satisfiable, unsatisfiable, falsifiable, valid?

$$(a \vee b \vee \neg c) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b \vee d) \wedge (\neg a \vee b \vee \neg d)$$

\rightsquigarrow satisfiable: $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto F, d \mapsto F, \dots$

\rightsquigarrow falsifiable: $a \mapsto F, b \mapsto F, c \mapsto T, \dots$

$$((\neg a \rightarrow \neg b) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow a))$$

\rightsquigarrow satisfiable: $a \mapsto T, b \mapsto T$

\rightsquigarrow valid: Consider all interpretations or argue about falsifying ones.

Equivalence? $\neg(a \vee b) \equiv \neg a \wedge \neg b$

\rightsquigarrow Of course, equivalent (de Morgan).

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Some Obvious Consequences

Proposition

φ is valid iff $\neg\varphi$ is unsatisfiable and φ is satisfiable iff $\neg\varphi$ is falsifiable.

Proposition

$\varphi \equiv \psi$ iff $\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$ is valid.

Theorem

If $\varphi \equiv \psi$ and χ' results from substituting φ by ψ in χ , then $\chi' \equiv \chi$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Some Obvious Consequences

Proposition

φ is valid iff $\neg\varphi$ is unsatisfiable and φ is satisfiable iff $\neg\varphi$ is falsifiable.

Proposition

$\varphi \equiv \psi$ iff $\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$ is valid.

Theorem

If $\varphi \equiv \psi$ and χ' results from substituting φ by ψ in χ , then $\chi' \equiv \chi$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Some Obvious Consequences

Proposition

φ is valid iff $\neg\varphi$ is unsatisfiable and φ is satisfiable iff $\neg\varphi$ is falsifiable.

Proposition

$\varphi \equiv \psi$ iff $\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$ is valid.

Theorem

If $\varphi \equiv \psi$ and χ' results from substituting φ by ψ in χ , then $\chi' \equiv \chi$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Some Equivalences

simplifications	$\varphi \rightarrow \psi \equiv \neg\varphi \vee \psi$	$\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi \equiv (\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \wedge (\psi \rightarrow \varphi)$
idempotency	$\varphi \vee \varphi \equiv \varphi$	$\varphi \wedge \varphi \equiv \varphi$
commutativity	$\varphi \vee \psi \equiv \psi \vee \varphi$	$\varphi \wedge \psi \equiv \psi \wedge \varphi$
associativity	$(\varphi \vee \psi) \vee \chi \equiv \varphi \vee (\psi \vee \chi)$	$(\varphi \wedge \psi) \wedge \chi \equiv \varphi \wedge (\psi \wedge \chi)$
absorption	$\varphi \vee (\varphi \wedge \psi) \equiv \varphi$	$\varphi \wedge (\varphi \vee \psi) \equiv \varphi$
distributivity	$\varphi \wedge (\psi \vee \chi) \equiv (\varphi \wedge \psi) \vee (\varphi \wedge \chi)$	$\varphi \vee (\psi \wedge \chi) \equiv (\varphi \vee \psi) \wedge (\varphi \vee \chi)$
double negation	$\neg\neg\varphi \equiv \varphi$	
constants	$\neg\perp \equiv \top$	$\neg\top \equiv \perp$
De Morgan	$\neg(\varphi \vee \psi) \equiv \neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi$	$\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi) \equiv \neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi$
truth	$\varphi \vee \top \equiv \top$	$\varphi \wedge \top \equiv \varphi$
falsity	$\varphi \vee \perp \equiv \varphi$	$\varphi \wedge \perp \equiv \perp$
taut./contrad.	$\varphi \vee \neg\varphi \equiv \top$	$\varphi \wedge \neg\varphi \equiv \perp$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

How Many Different Formulae Are There ...

... for a given *finite* alphabet Σ ?

- Infinitely many: $a, a \vee a, a \wedge a, a \vee a \vee a, \dots$
- How many different logically distinguishable (not equivalent) formulae?
 - For Σ with $n = |\Sigma|$, there are 2^n different interpretations.
 - A formula can be characterized by its set of models (if two formulae are not logically equivalent, then their sets of models differ).
 - There are $2^{(2^n)}$ different sets of interpretations.
 - There are $2^{(2^n)}$ (logical) equivalence classes of formulae.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

How Many Different Formulae Are There ...

... for a given *finite* alphabet Σ ?

- Infinitely many: $a, a \vee a, a \wedge a, a \vee a \vee a, \dots$
- How many different logically distinguishable (not equivalent) formulae?
 - For Σ with $n = |\Sigma|$, there are 2^n different interpretations.
 - A formula can be characterized by its set of models (if two formulae are not logically equivalent, then their sets of models differ).
 - There are $2^{(2^n)}$ different sets of interpretations.
 - There are $2^{(2^n)}$ (logical) equivalence classes of formulae.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

How Many Different Formulae Are There ...

... for a given *finite* alphabet Σ ?

- Infinitely many: $a, a \vee a, a \wedge a, a \vee a \vee a, \dots$
- How many different logically distinguishable (not equivalent) formulae?
 - For Σ with $n = |\Sigma|$, there are 2^n different interpretations.
 - A formula can be characterized by its set of models (if two formulae are not logically equivalent, then their sets of models differ).
 - There are $2^{(2^n)}$ different sets of interpretations.
 - There are $2^{(2^n)}$ (logical) equivalence classes of formulae.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

How Many Different Formulae Are There ...

... for a given *finite* alphabet Σ ?

- Infinitely many: $a, a \vee a, a \wedge a, a \vee a \vee a, \dots$
- How many different logically distinguishable (not equivalent) formulae?
 - For Σ with $n = |\Sigma|$, there are 2^n different interpretations.
 - A formula can be characterized by its set of models (if two formulae are not logically equivalent, then their sets of models differ).
 - There are $2^{(2^n)}$ different sets of interpretations.
 - There are $2^{(2^n)}$ (logical) equivalence classes of formulae.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

How Many Different Formulae Are There ...

... for a given *finite* alphabet Σ ?

- Infinitely many: $a, a \vee a, a \wedge a, a \vee a \vee a, \dots$
- How many different logically distinguishable (not equivalent) formulae?
 - For Σ with $n = |\Sigma|$, there are 2^n different interpretations.
 - A formula can be characterized by its set of models (if two formulae are not logically equivalent, then their sets of models differ).
 - There are $2^{(2^n)}$ different sets of interpretations.
 - There are $2^{(2^n)}$ (logical) equivalence classes of formulae.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

How Many Different Formulae Are There ...

... for a given *finite* alphabet Σ ?

- Infinitely many: $a, a \vee a, a \wedge a, a \vee a \vee a, \dots$
- How many different logically distinguishable (not equivalent) formulae?
 - For Σ with $n = |\Sigma|$, there are 2^n different interpretations.
 - A formula can be characterized by its set of models (if two formulae are not logically equivalent, then their sets of models differ).
 - There are $2^{(2^n)}$ different sets of interpretations.
 - There are $2^{(2^n)}$ (logical) equivalence classes of formulae.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

How Many Different Formulae Are There ...

... for a given *finite* alphabet Σ ?

- Infinitely many: $a, a \vee a, a \wedge a, a \vee a \vee a, \dots$
- How many different logically distinguishable (not equivalent) formulae?
 - For Σ with $n = |\Sigma|$, there are 2^n different interpretations.
 - A formula can be characterized by its set of models (if two formulae are not logically equivalent, then their sets of models differ).
 - There are $2^{(2^n)}$ different sets of interpretations.
 - There are $2^{(2^n)}$ (logical) equivalence classes of formulae.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Logical Implication

- Extension of the relation \models to sets Θ of formulae:

$$\mathcal{I} \models \Theta \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ for all } \varphi \in \Theta.$$

- φ is **logically implied** by Θ (symbolically $\Theta \models \varphi$) iff φ is true in all models of Θ :

$$\Theta \models \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ for all } \mathcal{I} \text{ such that } \mathcal{I} \models \Theta$$

- Some consequences:
 - **Deduction theorem:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\} \models \psi$ iff $\Theta \models \varphi \rightarrow \psi$
 - **Contraposition:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\} \models \neg\psi$ iff $\Theta \cup \{\psi\} \models \neg\varphi$
 - **Contradiction:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\}$ is unsatisfiable iff $\Theta \models \neg\varphi$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Logical Implication

- Extension of the relation \models to sets Θ of formulae:

$$\mathcal{I} \models \Theta \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ for all } \varphi \in \Theta.$$

- φ is **logically implied** by Θ (symbolically $\Theta \models \varphi$) iff φ is true in all models of Θ :

$$\Theta \models \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ for all } \mathcal{I} \text{ such that } \mathcal{I} \models \Theta$$

- Some consequences:

- **Deduction theorem:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\} \models \psi$ iff $\Theta \models \varphi \rightarrow \psi$
- **Contraposition:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\} \models \neg\psi$ iff $\Theta \cup \{\psi\} \models \neg\varphi$
- **Contradiction:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\}$ is unsatisfiable iff $\Theta \models \neg\varphi$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Logical Implication

- Extension of the relation \models to sets Θ of formulae:

$$\mathcal{I} \models \Theta \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ for all } \varphi \in \Theta.$$

- φ is **logically implied** by Θ (symbolically $\Theta \models \varphi$) iff φ is true in all models of Θ :

$$\Theta \models \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ for all } \mathcal{I} \text{ such that } \mathcal{I} \models \Theta$$

- Some consequences:

- **Deduction theorem:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\} \models \psi$ iff $\Theta \models \varphi \rightarrow \psi$
- **Contraposition:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\} \models \neg\psi$ iff $\Theta \cup \{\psi\} \models \neg\varphi$
- **Contradiction:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\}$ is unsatisfiable iff $\Theta \models \neg\varphi$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Logical Implication

- Extension of the relation \models to sets Θ of formulae:

$$\mathcal{I} \models \Theta \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ for all } \varphi \in \Theta.$$

- φ is **logically implied** by Θ (symbolically $\Theta \models \varphi$) iff φ is true in all models of Θ :

$$\Theta \models \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ for all } \mathcal{I} \text{ such that } \mathcal{I} \models \Theta$$

- Some consequences:

- **Deduction theorem:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\} \models \psi$ iff $\Theta \models \varphi \rightarrow \psi$
- **Contraposition:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\} \models \neg\psi$ iff $\Theta \cup \{\psi\} \models \neg\varphi$
- **Contradiction:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\}$ is unsatisfiable iff $\Theta \models \neg\varphi$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Logical Implication

- Extension of the relation \models to sets Θ of formulae:

$$\mathcal{I} \models \Theta \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ for all } \varphi \in \Theta.$$

- φ is **logically implied** by Θ (symbolically $\Theta \models \varphi$) iff φ is true in all models of Θ :

$$\Theta \models \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ for all } \mathcal{I} \text{ such that } \mathcal{I} \models \Theta$$

- Some consequences:

- **Deduction theorem:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\} \models \psi$ iff $\Theta \models \varphi \rightarrow \psi$
- **Contraposition:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\} \models \neg\psi$ iff $\Theta \cup \{\psi\} \models \neg\varphi$
- **Contradiction:** $\Theta \cup \{\varphi\}$ is unsatisfiable iff $\Theta \models \neg\varphi$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Normal Forms

Terminology:

- Atomic formulae a , negated atomic formulae $\neg a$, truth \top and falsity \perp are **literals**.
- A disjunction of literals is a **clause**.
- If \neg only occurs in front of an atom and there are no occurrences of \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow , the formula is in **negation normal form (NNF)**.
Example: $(\neg a \vee \neg b) \wedge c$, but not: $\neg(a \wedge b) \wedge c$
- A conjunction of clauses is in **conjunctive normal form (CNF)**.
Example: $(a \vee b) \wedge (\neg a \vee c)$
- The dual form (disjunction of conjunctions of literals) is in **disjunctive normal form (DNF)**.
Example: $(a \wedge b) \vee (\neg a \wedge c)$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Normal Forms

Terminology:

- Atomic formulae a , negated atomic formulae $\neg a$, truth \top and falsity \perp are **literals**.
- A disjunction of literals is a **clause**.
- If \neg only occurs in front of an atom and there are no occurrences of \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow , the formula is in **negation normal form (NNF)**.

Example: $(\neg a \vee \neg b) \wedge c$, **but not:** $\neg(a \wedge b) \wedge c$

- A conjunction of clauses is in **conjunctive normal form (CNF)**.

Example: $(a \vee b) \wedge (\neg a \vee c)$

- The dual form (disjunction of conjunctions of literals) is in **disjunctive normal form (DNF)**.

Example: $(a \wedge b) \vee (\neg a \wedge c)$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Normal Forms

Terminology:

- Atomic formulae a , negated atomic formulae $\neg a$, truth \top and falsity \perp are **literals**.
- A disjunction of literals is a **clause**.
- If \neg only occurs in front of an atom and there are no occurrences of \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow , the formula is in **negation normal form (NNF)**.

Example: $(\neg a \vee \neg b) \wedge c$, **but not:** $\neg(a \wedge b) \wedge c$

- A conjunction of clauses is in **conjunctive normal form (CNF)**.

Example: $(a \vee b) \wedge (\neg a \vee c)$

- The dual form (disjunction of conjunctions of literals) is in **disjunctive normal form (DNF)**.

Example: $(a \wedge b) \vee (\neg a \wedge c)$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Normal Forms

Terminology:

- Atomic formulae a , negated atomic formulae $\neg a$, truth \top and falsity \perp are **literals**.
- A disjunction of literals is a **clause**.
- If \neg only occurs in front of an atom and there are no occurrences of \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow , the formula is in **negation normal form (NNF)**.
Example: $(\neg a \vee \neg b) \wedge c$, **but not:** $\neg(a \wedge b) \wedge c$
- A conjunction of clauses is in **conjunctive normal form (CNF)**.
Example: $(a \vee b) \wedge (\neg a \vee c)$
- The dual form (disjunction of conjunctions of literals) is in **disjunctive normal form (DNF)**.
Example: $(a \wedge b) \vee (\neg a \wedge c)$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Negation Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there is a logically equivalent formula in NNF.

Proof.

First eliminate \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow by the appropriate equivalences. The rest of the proof is by structural induction.

Base case: Claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Inductive case: Assume claim is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its NNF $\text{nnf}(\varphi)$.

- $\text{nnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \text{nnf}(\varphi) \wedge \text{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) = \text{nnf}(\varphi) \vee \text{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) = \text{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \vee \text{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \vee \psi)) = \text{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \wedge \text{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\neg(\neg\varphi)) = \text{nnf}(\varphi)$



KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Negation Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there is a logically equivalent formula in NNF.

Proof.

First eliminate \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow by the appropriate equivalences. The rest of the proof is by structural induction.

Base case: Claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Inductive case: Assume claim is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its NNF $\text{nnf}(\varphi)$.

- $\text{nnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \text{nnf}(\varphi) \wedge \text{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) = \text{nnf}(\varphi) \vee \text{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) = \text{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \vee \text{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \vee \psi)) = \text{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \wedge \text{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\neg(\neg\varphi)) = \text{nnf}(\varphi)$



KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Negation Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there is a logically equivalent formula in NNF.

Proof.

First eliminate \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow by the appropriate equivalences. The rest of the proof is by structural induction.

Base case: Claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Inductive case: Assume claim is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its NNF $\text{nnf}(\varphi)$.

- $\text{nnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \text{nnf}(\varphi) \wedge \text{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) = \text{nnf}(\varphi) \vee \text{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) = \text{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \vee \text{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \vee \psi)) = \text{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \wedge \text{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\neg(\neg\varphi)) = \text{nnf}(\varphi)$



KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Negation Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there is a logically equivalent formula in NNF.

Proof.

First eliminate \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow by the appropriate equivalences. The rest of the proof is by structural induction.

Base case: Claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Inductive case: Assume claim is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its NNF $\text{nnf}(\varphi)$.

- $\text{nnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \text{nnf}(\varphi) \wedge \text{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) = \text{nnf}(\varphi) \vee \text{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) = \text{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \vee \text{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \vee \psi)) = \text{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \wedge \text{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\text{nnf}(\neg(\neg\varphi)) = \text{nnf}(\varphi)$



KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Negation Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there is a logically equivalent formula in NNF.

Proof.

First eliminate \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow by the appropriate equivalences. The rest of the proof is by structural induction.

Base case: Claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Inductive case: Assume claim is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its NNF $\mathit{nnf}(\varphi)$.

- $\mathit{nnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \mathit{nnf}(\varphi) \wedge \mathit{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\mathit{nnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) = \mathit{nnf}(\varphi) \vee \mathit{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\mathit{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) = \mathit{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \vee \mathit{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\mathit{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \vee \psi)) = \mathit{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \wedge \mathit{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\mathit{nnf}(\neg(\neg\varphi)) = \mathit{nnf}(\varphi)$



KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Negation Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there is a logically equivalent formula in NNF.

Proof.

First eliminate \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow by the appropriate equivalences. The rest of the proof is by structural induction.

Base case: Claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Inductive case: Assume claim is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its NNF $\mathit{nnf}(\varphi)$.

- $\mathit{nnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \mathit{nnf}(\varphi) \wedge \mathit{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\mathit{nnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) = \mathit{nnf}(\varphi) \vee \mathit{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\mathit{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) = \mathit{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \vee \mathit{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\mathit{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \vee \psi)) = \mathit{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \wedge \mathit{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\mathit{nnf}(\neg(\neg\varphi)) = \mathit{nnf}(\varphi)$



KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Negation Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there is a logically equivalent formula in NNF.

Proof.

First eliminate \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow by the appropriate equivalences. The rest of the proof is by structural induction.

Base case: Claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Inductive case: Assume claim is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its NNF $\mathbf{nnf}(\varphi)$.

- $\mathbf{nnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \mathbf{nnf}(\varphi) \wedge \mathbf{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\mathbf{nnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) = \mathbf{nnf}(\varphi) \vee \mathbf{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\mathbf{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) = \mathbf{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \vee \mathbf{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\mathbf{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \vee \psi)) = \mathbf{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \wedge \mathbf{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\mathbf{nnf}(\neg(\neg\varphi)) = \mathbf{nnf}(\varphi)$



KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Negation Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there is a logically equivalent formula in NNF.

Proof.

First eliminate \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow by the appropriate equivalences. The rest of the proof is by structural induction.

Base case: Claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Inductive case: Assume claim is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its NNF $\mathit{nnf}(\varphi)$.

- $\mathit{nnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \mathit{nnf}(\varphi) \wedge \mathit{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\mathit{nnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) = \mathit{nnf}(\varphi) \vee \mathit{nnf}(\psi)$
- $\mathit{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) = \mathit{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \vee \mathit{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\mathit{nnf}(\neg(\varphi \vee \psi)) = \mathit{nnf}(\neg\varphi) \wedge \mathit{nnf}(\neg\psi)$
- $\mathit{nnf}(\neg(\neg\varphi)) = \mathit{nnf}(\varphi)$



KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Conjunctive Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there are logically equivalent formulae in CNF and DNF, respectively.

Proof.

The claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Let us assume it is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its CNF $\text{cnf}(\varphi)$ (and its DNF $\text{dnf}(\varphi)$).

- $\text{cnf}(\neg\varphi) = \text{nnf}(\neg \text{dnf}(\varphi))$ and $\text{cnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \text{cnf}(\varphi) \wedge \text{cnf}(\psi)$.
- Assume $\text{cnf}(\varphi) = \bigwedge_i \chi_i$ and $\text{cnf}(\psi) = \bigwedge_j \rho_j$ with χ_i, ρ_j being clauses. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\text{cnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) &= \text{cnf}\left(\left(\bigwedge_i \chi_i\right) \vee \left(\bigwedge_j \rho_j\right)\right) \\ &= \bigwedge_i \bigwedge_j (\chi_i \vee \rho_j) \quad (\text{by distributivity})\end{aligned}$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Conjunctive Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there are logically equivalent formulae in CNF and DNF, respectively.

Proof.

The claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Let us assume it is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its CNF $\text{cnf}(\varphi)$ (and its DNF $\text{dnf}(\varphi)$).

- $\text{cnf}(\neg\varphi) = \text{nnf}(\neg \text{dnf}(\varphi))$ and $\text{cnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \text{cnf}(\varphi) \wedge \text{cnf}(\psi)$.
- Assume $\text{cnf}(\varphi) = \bigwedge_i \chi_i$ and $\text{cnf}(\psi) = \bigwedge_j \rho_j$ with χ_i, ρ_j being clauses. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\text{cnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) &= \text{cnf}\left(\left(\bigwedge_i \chi_i\right) \vee \left(\bigwedge_j \rho_j\right)\right) \\ &= \bigwedge_i \bigwedge_j (\chi_i \vee \rho_j) \quad (\text{by distributivity})\end{aligned}$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Conjunctive Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there are logically equivalent formulae in CNF and DNF, respectively.

Proof.

The claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Let us assume it is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its CNF $\text{cnf}(\varphi)$ (and its DNF $\text{dnf}(\varphi)$).

- $\text{cnf}(\neg\varphi) = \text{nnf}(\neg \text{dnf}(\varphi))$ and $\text{cnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \text{cnf}(\varphi) \wedge \text{cnf}(\psi)$.
- Assume $\text{cnf}(\varphi) = \bigwedge_i \chi_i$ and $\text{cnf}(\psi) = \bigwedge_j \rho_j$ with χ_i, ρ_j being clauses. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\text{cnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) &= \text{cnf}\left(\left(\bigwedge_i \chi_i\right) \vee \left(\bigwedge_j \rho_j\right)\right) \\ &= \bigwedge_i \bigwedge_j (\chi_i \vee \rho_j) \quad (\text{by distributivity})\end{aligned}$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Conjunctive Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there are logically equivalent formulae in CNF and DNF, respectively.

Proof.

The claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Let us assume it is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its CNF $\text{cnf}(\varphi)$ (and its DNF $\text{dnf}(\varphi)$).

- $\text{cnf}(\neg\varphi) = \text{dnf}(\neg\text{dnf}(\varphi))$ and $\text{cnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \text{cnf}(\varphi) \wedge \text{cnf}(\psi)$.
- Assume $\text{cnf}(\varphi) = \bigwedge_i \chi_i$ and $\text{cnf}(\psi) = \bigwedge_j \rho_j$ with χ_i, ρ_j being clauses. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\text{cnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) &= \text{cnf}\left(\left(\bigwedge_i \chi_i\right) \vee \left(\bigwedge_j \rho_j\right)\right) \\ &= \bigwedge_i \bigwedge_j (\chi_i \vee \rho_j) \quad (\text{by distributivity})\end{aligned}$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Conjunctive Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there are logically equivalent formulae in CNF and DNF, respectively.

Proof.

The claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Let us assume it is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its CNF $\text{cnf}(\varphi)$ (and its DNF $\text{dnf}(\varphi)$).

- $\text{cnf}(\neg\varphi) = \text{dnf}(\neg\text{cnf}(\varphi))$ and $\text{cnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \text{cnf}(\varphi) \wedge \text{cnf}(\psi)$.
- Assume $\text{cnf}(\varphi) = \bigwedge_i \chi_i$ and $\text{cnf}(\psi) = \bigwedge_j \rho_j$ with χ_i, ρ_j being clauses. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\text{cnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) &= \text{cnf}\left(\left(\bigwedge_i \chi_i\right) \vee \left(\bigwedge_j \rho_j\right)\right) \\ &= \bigwedge_i \bigwedge_j (\chi_i \vee \rho_j) \quad (\text{by distributivity})\end{aligned}$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Conjunctive Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there are logically equivalent formulae in CNF and DNF, respectively.

Proof.

The claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Let us assume it is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its CNF $\text{cnf}(\varphi)$ (and its DNF $\text{dnf}(\varphi)$).

- $\text{cnf}(\neg\varphi) = \text{dnf}(\neg\text{dnf}(\varphi))$ and $\text{cnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \text{cnf}(\varphi) \wedge \text{cnf}(\psi)$.
- Assume $\text{cnf}(\varphi) = \bigwedge_i \chi_i$ and $\text{cnf}(\psi) = \bigwedge_j \rho_j$ with χ_i, ρ_j being clauses. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\text{cnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) &= \text{cnf}\left(\left(\bigwedge_i \chi_i\right) \vee \left(\bigwedge_j \rho_j\right)\right) \\ &= \bigwedge_i \bigwedge_j (\chi_i \vee \rho_j) \quad (\text{by distributivity})\end{aligned}$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Conjunctive Normal Form

Theorem

For each propositional formula there are logically equivalent formulae in CNF and DNF, respectively.

Proof.

The claim is true for a , $\neg a$, \top , \perp .

Let us assume it is true for all formulae φ (up to a certain number of connectives) and call its CNF $\text{cnf}(\varphi)$ (and its DNF $\text{dnf}(\varphi)$).

- $\text{cnf}(\neg\varphi) = \text{dnf}(\neg\text{dnf}(\varphi))$ and $\text{cnf}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \text{cnf}(\varphi) \wedge \text{cnf}(\psi)$.
- Assume $\text{cnf}(\varphi) = \bigwedge_i \chi_i$ and $\text{cnf}(\psi) = \bigwedge_j \rho_j$ with χ_i, ρ_j being clauses. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\text{cnf}(\varphi \vee \psi) &= \text{cnf}\left(\left(\bigwedge_i \chi_i\right) \vee \left(\bigwedge_j \rho_j\right)\right) \\ &= \bigwedge_i \bigwedge_j (\chi_i \vee \rho_j) \quad (\text{by distributivity})\end{aligned}$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

How to Decide Properties of Formulae

How do we decide whether a formula is satisfiable, unsatisfiable, valid, or falsifiable?

Note: Satisfiability and falsifiability are **NP-complete**. Validity and unsatisfiability are **co-NP-complete**.

- A CNF formula is valid iff all clauses contain two complementary literals or \top .
- A DNF formula is satisfiable iff one disjunct does not contain \perp or two complementary literals.
- However, transformation to CNF or DNF may take exponential time (and space!).
- One can try out all truth assignments.
- One can test systematically for satisfying truth assignments (backtracking search)
↪ **Davis-Putnam-Logemann-Loveland procedure (DPLL)**.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

How to Decide Properties of Formulae

How do we decide whether a formula is satisfiable, unsatisfiable, valid, or falsifiable?

Note: Satisfiability and falsifiability are **NP-complete**. Validity and unsatisfiability are **co-NP-complete**.

- A CNF formula is valid iff all clauses contain two complementary literals or \top .
- A DNF formula is satisfiable iff one disjunct does not contain \perp or two complementary literals.
- However, transformation to CNF or DNF may take exponential time (and space!).
- One can try out all truth assignments.
- One can test systematically for satisfying truth assignments (backtracking search)
↪ **Davis-Putnam-Logemann-Loveland procedure (DPLL)**.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

How to Decide Properties of Formulae

How do we decide whether a formula is satisfiable, unsatisfiable, valid, or falsifiable?

Note: Satisfiability and falsifiability are **NP-complete**. Validity and unsatisfiability are **co-NP-complete**.

- A CNF formula is valid iff all clauses contain two complementary literals or \top .
- A DNF formula is satisfiable iff one disjunct does not contain \perp or two complementary literals.
- However, transformation to CNF or DNF may take exponential time (and space!).
- One can try out all truth assignments.
- One can test systematically for satisfying truth assignments (backtracking search)
↪ **Davis-Putnam-Logemann-Loveland procedure (DPLL)**.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

How to Decide Properties of Formulae

How do we decide whether a formula is satisfiable, unsatisfiable, valid, or falsifiable?

Note: Satisfiability and falsifiability are **NP-complete**. Validity and unsatisfiability are **co-NP-complete**.

- A CNF formula is valid iff all clauses contain two complementary literals or \top .
- A DNF formula is satisfiable iff one disjunct does not contain \perp or two complementary literals.
- However, transformation to CNF or DNF may take exponential time (and space!).
- One can try out all truth assignments.
- One can test systematically for satisfying truth assignments (backtracking search)
 \rightsquigarrow **Davis-Putnam-Logemann-Loveland procedure (DPLL).**

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

How to Decide Properties of Formulae

How do we decide whether a formula is satisfiable, unsatisfiable, valid, or falsifiable?

Note: Satisfiability and falsifiability are **NP-complete**. Validity and unsatisfiability are **co-NP-complete**.

- A CNF formula is valid iff all clauses contain two complementary literals or \top .
- A DNF formula is satisfiable iff one disjunct does not contain \perp or two complementary literals.
- However, transformation to CNF or DNF may take exponential time (and space!).
- One can try out all truth assignments.
- One can test systematically for satisfying truth assignments (backtracking search)
 \rightsquigarrow **Davis-Putnam-Logemann-Loveland procedure (DPLL)**.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

How to Decide Properties of Formulae

How do we decide whether a formula is satisfiable, unsatisfiable, valid, or falsifiable?

Note: Satisfiability and falsifiability are **NP-complete**. Validity and unsatisfiability are **co-NP-complete**.

- A CNF formula is valid iff all clauses contain two complementary literals or \top .
- A DNF formula is satisfiable iff one disjunct does not contain \perp or two complementary literals.
- However, transformation to CNF or DNF may take exponential time (and space!).
- One can try out all truth assignments.
- One can test systematically for satisfying truth assignments (backtracking search)
 \rightsquigarrow **Davis-Putnam-Logemann-Loveland procedure (DPLL)**.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Deciding Entailment

- We want to decide $\Theta \models \varphi$.
- Use deduction theorem and reduce to validity:

$$\Theta \models \varphi \text{ iff } \bigwedge \Theta \rightarrow \varphi \text{ is valid.}$$

- Now negate and test for unsatisfiability using DPLL.
- Different approach: Try to **derive** φ from Θ – find a **proof** of φ from Θ .
- Use **inference rules** to **derive** new formulae from Θ .
Continue to deduce new formulae until φ can be deduced.
- One particular calculus: **resolution**.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Deciding Entailment

- We want to decide $\Theta \models \varphi$.
- Use deduction theorem and reduce to validity:

$$\Theta \models \varphi \text{ iff } \bigwedge \Theta \rightarrow \varphi \text{ is valid.}$$

- Now negate and test for unsatisfiability using DPLL.
- Different approach: Try to **derive** φ from Θ – find a **proof** of φ from Θ .
- Use **inference rules** to **derive** new formulae from Θ .
Continue to deduce new formulae until φ can be deduced.
- One particular calculus: **resolution**.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Deciding Entailment

- We want to decide $\Theta \models \varphi$.
- Use deduction theorem and reduce to validity:

$$\Theta \models \varphi \text{ iff } \bigwedge \Theta \rightarrow \varphi \text{ is valid.}$$

- Now negate and test for unsatisfiability using DPLL.
- Different approach: Try to **derive** φ from Θ – find a **proof** of φ from Θ .
- Use **inference rules** to **derive** new formulae from Θ .
Continue to deduce new formulae until φ can be deduced.
- One particular calculus: **resolution**.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Deciding Entailment

- We want to decide $\Theta \models \varphi$.
- Use deduction theorem and reduce to validity:

$$\Theta \models \varphi \text{ iff } \bigwedge \Theta \rightarrow \varphi \text{ is valid.}$$

- Now negate and test for unsatisfiability using DPLL.
- Different approach: Try to **derive** φ from Θ – find a **proof** of φ from Θ .
- Use **inference rules** to **derive** new formulae from Θ .
Continue to deduce new formulae until φ can be deduced.
- One particular calculus: **resolution**.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Deciding Entailment

- We want to decide $\Theta \models \varphi$.
- Use deduction theorem and reduce to validity:

$$\Theta \models \varphi \text{ iff } \bigwedge \Theta \rightarrow \varphi \text{ is valid.}$$

- Now negate and test for unsatisfiability using DPLL.
- Different approach: Try to **derive** φ from Θ – find a **proof** of φ from Θ .
- Use **inference rules** to **derive** new formulae from Θ .
Continue to deduce new formulae until φ can be deduced.
- One particular calculus: **resolution**.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Resolution: Representation

- We assume that all formulae are in CNF.
 - Can be generated using the described method.
 - Often formulae are already close to CNF.
 - There is a “cheap” conversion from arbitrary formulae to CNF that **preserves satisfiability** – which is enough as we will see.
- More convenient representation:
 - CNF formula is represented as a set.
 - Each clause is a set of literals.
 - $(a \vee \neg b) \wedge (\neg a \vee c) \rightsquigarrow \{\{a, \neg b\}, \{\neg a, c\}\}$
- Empty clause (symbolically \square) and empty set of clauses (symbolically \emptyset) are different!

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: Representation

- We assume that all formulae are in CNF.
 - Can be generated using the described method.
 - Often formulae are already close to CNF.
 - There is a “cheap” conversion from arbitrary formulae to CNF that **preserves satisfiability** – which is enough as we will see.
- More convenient representation:
 - CNF formula is represented as a set.
 - Each clause is a set of literals.
 - $(a \vee \neg b) \wedge (\neg a \vee c) \rightsquigarrow \{\{a, \neg b\}, \{\neg a, c\}\}$
- Empty clause (symbolically \square) and empty set of clauses (symbolically \emptyset) are different!

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: Representation

- We assume that all formulae are in CNF.
 - Can be generated using the described method.
 - Often formulae are already close to CNF.
 - There is a “cheap” conversion from arbitrary formulae to CNF that **preserves satisfiability** – which is enough as we will see.
- More convenient representation:
 - CNF formula is represented as a set.
 - Each clause is a set of literals.
 - $(a \vee \neg b) \wedge (\neg a \vee c) \rightsquigarrow \{\{a, \neg b\}, \{\neg a, c\}\}$
- Empty clause (symbolically \square) and empty set of clauses (symbolically \emptyset) are different!

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: The Inference Rule

Let l be a literal and \bar{l} its complement.

The resolution rule

$$\frac{C_1 \cup \{l\}, C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}}{C_1 \cup C_2}$$

$C_1 \cup C_2$ is the **resolvent** of the **parent clauses** $C_1 \cup \{l\}$ and $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$. l and \bar{l} are the **resolution literals**.

Example: $\{a, b, \neg c\}$ resolves with $\{a, d, c\}$ to $\{a, b, d\}$.

Note: The resolvent is not logically equivalent to the set of parent clauses!

Notation:

$$R(\Delta) = \{C \mid C \text{ is resolvent of two clauses in } \Delta\}$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: The Inference Rule

Let l be a literal and \bar{l} its complement.

The resolution rule

$$\frac{C_1 \cup \{l\}, C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}}{C_1 \cup C_2}$$

$C_1 \cup C_2$ is the **resolvent** of the **parent clauses** $C_1 \cup \{l\}$ and $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$. l and \bar{l} are the **resolution literals**.

Example: $\{a, b, \neg c\}$ resolves with $\{a, d, c\}$ to $\{a, b, d\}$.

Note: The resolvent is not logically equivalent to the set of parent clauses!

Notation:

$$R(\Delta) = \{C \mid C \text{ is resolvent of two clauses in } \Delta\}$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: The Inference Rule

Let l be a literal and \bar{l} its complement.

The resolution rule

$$\frac{C_1 \dot{\cup} \{l\}, C_2 \dot{\cup} \{\bar{l}\}}{C_1 \cup C_2}$$

$C_1 \cup C_2$ is the **resolvent** of the **parent clauses** $C_1 \cup \{l\}$ and $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$. l and \bar{l} are the **resolution literals**.

Example: $\{a, b, \neg c\}$ resolves with $\{a, d, c\}$ to $\{a, b, d\}$.

Note: The resolvent is not logically equivalent to the set of parent clauses!

Notation:

$$R(\Delta) = \{C \mid C \text{ is resolvent of two clauses in } \Delta\}$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: The Inference Rule

Let l be a literal and \bar{l} its complement.

The resolution rule

$$\frac{C_1 \cup \{l\}, C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}}{C_1 \cup C_2}$$

$C_1 \cup C_2$ is the **resolvent** of the **parent clauses** $C_1 \cup \{l\}$ and $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$. l and \bar{l} are the **resolution literals**.

Example: $\{a, b, \neg c\}$ resolves with $\{a, d, c\}$ to $\{a, b, d\}$.

Note: The resolvent is not logically equivalent to the set of parent clauses!

Notation:

$$R(\Delta) = \{C \mid C \text{ is resolvent of two clauses in } \Delta\}$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: The Inference Rule

Let l be a literal and \bar{l} its complement.

The resolution rule

$$\frac{C_1 \cup \{l\}, C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}}{C_1 \cup C_2}$$

$C_1 \cup C_2$ is the **resolvent** of the **parent clauses** $C_1 \cup \{l\}$ and $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$. l and \bar{l} are the **resolution literals**.

Example: $\{a, b, \neg c\}$ resolves with $\{a, d, c\}$ to $\{a, b, d\}$.

Note: The resolvent is not logically equivalent to the set of parent clauses!

Notation:

$$R(\Delta) = \{C \mid C \text{ is resolvent of two clauses in } \Delta\}$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: Derivations

D can be **derived** from Δ by resolution (symbolically $\Delta \vdash D$) if there is a sequence C_1, \dots, C_n of clauses such that

- 1 $C_n = D$ and
- 2 $C_i \in R(\Delta \cup \{C_1, \dots, C_{i-1}\})$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Define $R^*(\Delta) = \{D \mid \Delta \vdash D\}$.

Theorem (Soundness of resolution)

Let D be a clause. If $\Delta \vdash D$ then $\Delta \models D$.

Proof idea.

Show $\Delta \models D$ if $D \in R(\Delta)$ and use induction on proof length.

Let $C_1 \cup \{l\}$ and $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$ be the parent clauses of $D = C_1 \cup C_2$.

Assume $\mathcal{I} \models \Delta$, we have to show $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 1: $\mathcal{I} \models l$ then there must be a literal $m \in C_2$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$. This implies $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 2: $\mathcal{I} \models \bar{l}$ similarly, there is $m \in C_1$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$.

This means that each model \mathcal{I} of Δ also satisfies D , i.e., $\Delta \models D$. □

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: Derivations

D can be **derived** from Δ by resolution (symbolically $\Delta \vdash D$) if there is a sequence C_1, \dots, C_n of clauses such that

- 1 $C_n = D$ and
- 2 $C_i \in R(\Delta \cup \{C_1, \dots, C_{i-1}\})$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Define $R^*(\Delta) = \{D \mid \Delta \vdash D\}$.

Theorem (Soundness of resolution)

Let D be a clause. If $\Delta \vdash D$ then $\Delta \models D$.

Proof idea.

Show $\Delta \models D$ if $D \in R(\Delta)$ and use induction on proof length.

Let $C_1 \cup \{l\}$ and $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$ be the parent clauses of $D = C_1 \cup C_2$.

Assume $\mathcal{I} \models \Delta$, we have to show $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 1: $\mathcal{I} \models l$ then there must be a literal $m \in C_2$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$. This implies $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 2: $\mathcal{I} \models \bar{l}$ similarly, there is $m \in C_1$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$.

This means that each model \mathcal{I} of Δ also satisfies D , i.e., $\Delta \models D$. □

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: Derivations

D can be **derived** from Δ by resolution (symbolically $\Delta \vdash D$) if there is a sequence C_1, \dots, C_n of clauses such that

- 1 $C_n = D$ and
- 2 $C_i \in R(\Delta \cup \{C_1, \dots, C_{i-1}\})$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Define $R^*(\Delta) = \{D \mid \Delta \vdash D\}$.

Theorem (Soundness of resolution)

Let D be a clause. If $\Delta \vdash D$ then $\Delta \models D$.

Proof idea.

Show $\Delta \models D$ if $D \in R(\Delta)$ and use induction on proof length.

Let $C_1 \cup \{l\}$ and $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$ be the parent clauses of $D = C_1 \cup C_2$.

Assume $\mathcal{I} \models \Delta$, we have to show $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 1: $\mathcal{I} \models l$ then there must be a literal $m \in C_2$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$. This implies $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 2: $\mathcal{I} \models \bar{l}$ similarly, there is $m \in C_1$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$.

This means that each model \mathcal{I} of Δ also satisfies D , i.e., $\Delta \models D$. □

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: Derivations

D can be **derived** from Δ by resolution (symbolically $\Delta \vdash D$) if there is a sequence C_1, \dots, C_n of clauses such that

- 1 $C_n = D$ and
- 2 $C_i \in R(\Delta \cup \{C_1, \dots, C_{i-1}\})$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Define $R^*(\Delta) = \{D \mid \Delta \vdash D\}$.

Theorem (Soundness of resolution)

Let D be a clause. If $\Delta \vdash D$ then $\Delta \models D$.

Proof idea.

Show $\Delta \models D$ if $D \in R(\Delta)$ and use induction on proof length.

Let $C_1 \cup \{l\}$ and $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$ be the parent clauses of $D = C_1 \cup C_2$.

Assume $\mathcal{I} \models \Delta$, we have to show $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 1: $\mathcal{I} \models l$ then there must be a literal $m \in C_2$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$. This implies $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 2: $\mathcal{I} \models \bar{l}$ similarly, there is $m \in C_1$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$.

This means that each model \mathcal{I} of Δ also satisfies D , i.e., $\Delta \models D$. □

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: Derivations

D can be **derived** from Δ by resolution (symbolically $\Delta \vdash D$) if there is a sequence C_1, \dots, C_n of clauses such that

- 1 $C_n = D$ and
- 2 $C_i \in R(\Delta \cup \{C_1, \dots, C_{i-1}\})$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Define $R^*(\Delta) = \{D \mid \Delta \vdash D\}$.

Theorem (Soundness of resolution)

Let D be a clause. If $\Delta \vdash D$ then $\Delta \models D$.

Proof idea.

Show $\Delta \models D$ if $D \in R(\Delta)$ and use induction on proof length.

Let $C_1 \cup \{l\}$ and $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$ be the parent clauses of $D = C_1 \cup C_2$.

Assume $\mathcal{I} \models \Delta$, we have to show $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 1: $\mathcal{I} \models l$ then there must be a literal $m \in C_2$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$. This implies $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 2: $\mathcal{I} \models \bar{l}$ similarly, there is $m \in C_1$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$.

This means that each model \mathcal{I} of Δ also satisfies D , i.e., $\Delta \models D$. □

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: Derivations

D can be **derived** from Δ by resolution (symbolically $\Delta \vdash D$) if there is a sequence C_1, \dots, C_n of clauses such that

- 1 $C_n = D$ and
- 2 $C_i \in R(\Delta \cup \{C_1, \dots, C_{i-1}\})$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Define $R^*(\Delta) = \{D \mid \Delta \vdash D\}$.

Theorem (Soundness of resolution)

Let D be a clause. If $\Delta \vdash D$ then $\Delta \models D$.

Proof idea.

Show $\Delta \models D$ if $D \in R(\Delta)$ and use induction on proof length.

Let $C_1 \cup \{l\}$ and $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$ be the parent clauses of $D = C_1 \cup C_2$.

Assume $\mathcal{I} \models \Delta$, we have to show $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 1: $\mathcal{I} \models l$ then there must be a literal $m \in C_2$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$. This implies $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 2: $\mathcal{I} \models \bar{l}$ similarly, there is $m \in C_1$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$.

This means that each model \mathcal{I} of Δ also satisfies D , i.e., $\Delta \models D$. □

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: Derivations

D can be **derived** from Δ by resolution (symbolically $\Delta \vdash D$) if there is a sequence C_1, \dots, C_n of clauses such that

- 1 $C_n = D$ and
- 2 $C_i \in R(\Delta \cup \{C_1, \dots, C_{i-1}\})$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Define $R^*(\Delta) = \{D \mid \Delta \vdash D\}$.

Theorem (Soundness of resolution)

Let D be a clause. If $\Delta \vdash D$ then $\Delta \models D$.

Proof idea.

Show $\Delta \models D$ if $D \in R(\Delta)$ and use induction on proof length.

Let $C_1 \cup \{l\}$ and $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$ be the parent clauses of $D = C_1 \cup C_2$.

Assume $\mathcal{I} \models \Delta$, we have to show $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 1: $\mathcal{I} \models l$ then there must be a literal $m \in C_2$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$. This implies $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 2: $\mathcal{I} \models \bar{l}$ similarly, there is $m \in C_1$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$.

This means that each model \mathcal{I} of Δ also satisfies D , i.e., $\Delta \models D$. □

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: Derivations

D can be **derived** from Δ by resolution (symbolically $\Delta \vdash D$) if there is a sequence C_1, \dots, C_n of clauses such that

- 1 $C_n = D$ and
- 2 $C_i \in R(\Delta \cup \{C_1, \dots, C_{i-1}\})$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Define $R^*(\Delta) = \{D \mid \Delta \vdash D\}$.

Theorem (Soundness of resolution)

Let D be a clause. If $\Delta \vdash D$ then $\Delta \models D$.

Proof idea.

Show $\Delta \models D$ if $D \in R(\Delta)$ and use induction on proof length.

Let $C_1 \cup \{l\}$ and $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$ be the parent clauses of $D = C_1 \cup C_2$.

Assume $\mathcal{I} \models \Delta$, we have to show $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 1: $\mathcal{I} \models l$ then there must be a literal $m \in C_2$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$. This implies $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 2: $\mathcal{I} \models \bar{l}$ similarly, there is $m \in C_1$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$.

This means that each model \mathcal{I} of Δ also satisfies D , i.e., $\Delta \models D$. □

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: Derivations

D can be **derived** from Δ by resolution (symbolically $\Delta \vdash D$) if there is a sequence C_1, \dots, C_n of clauses such that

- 1 $C_n = D$ and
- 2 $C_i \in R(\Delta \cup \{C_1, \dots, C_{i-1}\})$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Define $R^*(\Delta) = \{D \mid \Delta \vdash D\}$.

Theorem (Soundness of resolution)

Let D be a clause. If $\Delta \vdash D$ then $\Delta \models D$.

Proof idea.

Show $\Delta \models D$ if $D \in R(\Delta)$ and use induction on proof length.

Let $C_1 \cup \{l\}$ and $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$ be the parent clauses of $D = C_1 \cup C_2$.

Assume $\mathcal{I} \models \Delta$, we have to show $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 1: $\mathcal{I} \models l$ then there must be a literal $m \in C_2$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$. This implies $\mathcal{I} \models D$.

Case 2: $\mathcal{I} \models \bar{l}$ similarly, there is $m \in C_1$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models m$.

This means that each model \mathcal{I} of Δ also satisfies D , i.e., $\Delta \models D$. □

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Resolution: Completeness?

Do we have

$$\Delta \models \varphi \text{ implies } \Delta \vdash \varphi?$$

Of course, could only hold for CNF. However:

$$\left\{ \{a, b\}, \{\neg b, c\} \right\} \models \{a, b, c\}$$
$$\left\{ \{a, b\}, \{\neg b, c\} \right\} \not\models \{a, b, c\}$$

However, one can show that resolution is **refutation-complete**:

$$\Delta \text{ is unsatisfiable iff } \Delta \vdash \square.$$

Entailment: Reduce to unsatisfiability testing and decide by resolution.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations

Completeness

Resolution

Strategies

Horn Clauses

Resolution: Completeness?

Do we have

$$\Delta \models \varphi \text{ implies } \Delta \vdash \varphi?$$

Of course, could only hold for CNF. However:

$$\left\{ \{a, b\}, \{\neg b, c\} \right\} \models \{a, b, c\}$$
$$\not\models \{a, b, c\}$$

However, one can show that resolution is **refutation-complete**:

$$\Delta \text{ is unsatisfiable iff } \Delta \vdash \square.$$

Entailment: Reduce to unsatisfiability testing and decide by resolution.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations

Completeness

Resolution

Strategies

Horn Clauses

Resolution: Completeness?

Do we have

$$\Delta \models \varphi \text{ implies } \Delta \vdash \varphi?$$

Of course, could only hold for CNF. However:

$$\left\{ \{a, b\}, \{\neg b, c\} \right\} \models \{a, b, c\}$$
$$\left\{ \{a, b\}, \{\neg b, c\} \right\} \not\models \{a, b, c\}$$

However, one can show that resolution is **refutation-complete**:

$$\Delta \text{ is unsatisfiable iff } \Delta \vdash \square.$$

Entailment: Reduce to unsatisfiability testing and decide by resolution.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations

Completeness

Resolution

Strategies

Horn Clauses

Resolution: Completeness?

Do we have

$$\Delta \models \varphi \text{ implies } \Delta \vdash \varphi?$$

Of course, could only hold for CNF. However:

$$\left\{ \{a, b\}, \{\neg b, c\} \right\} \models \{a, b, c\}$$
$$\left\{ \{a, b\}, \{\neg b, c\} \right\} \not\vdash \{a, b, c\}$$

However, one can show that resolution is **refutation-complete**:

$$\Delta \text{ is unsatisfiable iff } \Delta \vdash \square.$$

Entailment: Reduce to unsatisfiability testing and decide by resolution.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations

Completeness

Resolution

Strategies

Horn Clauses

Resolution: Completeness?

Do we have

$$\Delta \models \varphi \text{ implies } \Delta \vdash \varphi?$$

Of course, could only hold for CNF. However:

$$\left\{ \{a, b\}, \{\neg b, c\} \right\} \models \{a, b, c\}$$
$$\left\{ \{a, b\}, \{\neg b, c\} \right\} \not\models \{a, b, c\}$$

However, one can show that resolution is **refutation-complete**:

$$\Delta \text{ is unsatisfiable iff } \Delta \vdash \square.$$

Entailment: Reduce to unsatisfiability testing and decide by resolution.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations

Completeness

Resolution

Strategies

Horn Clauses

Resolution Strategies

- Trying out all different resolutions can be very costly,
- and might not be necessary.
- There are different **resolution strategies**.
- Examples:
 - **Input resolution** ($R_I(\cdot)$): In each resolution step, one of the parent clauses must be a clause of the input set.
 - **Unit resolution** ($R_U(\cdot)$): In each resolution step, one of the parent clauses must be a unit clause.
 - Not all strategies are (refutation) completeness preserving. Neither input nor unit resolution is. However, there are others.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness

Resolution
Strategies

Horn Clauses

Resolution Strategies

- Trying out all different resolutions can be very costly,
- and might not be necessary.
- There are different **resolution strategies**.
- Examples:
 - **Input resolution** ($R_I(\cdot)$): In each resolution step, one of the parent clauses must be a clause of the input set.
 - **Unit resolution** ($R_U(\cdot)$): In each resolution step, one of the parent clauses must be a unit clause.
 - Not all strategies are (refutation) completeness preserving. Neither input nor unit resolution is. However, there are others.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness

Resolution
Strategies

Horn Clauses

Resolution Strategies

- Trying out all different resolutions can be very costly,
- and might not be necessary.
- There are different **resolution strategies**.
- Examples:
 - **Input resolution** ($R_I(\cdot)$): In each resolution step, one of the parent clauses must be a clause of the input set.
 - **Unit resolution** ($R_U(\cdot)$): In each resolution step, one of the parent clauses must be a unit clause.
 - Not all strategies are (refutation) completeness preserving. Neither input nor unit resolution is. However, there are others.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness

Resolution
Strategies

Horn Clauses

Resolution Strategies

- Trying out all different resolutions can be very costly,
- and might not be necessary.
- There are different **resolution strategies**.
- Examples:
 - **Input resolution** ($R_I(\cdot)$): In each resolution step, one of the parent clauses must be a clause of the input set.
 - **Unit resolution** ($R_U(\cdot)$): In each resolution step, one of the parent clauses must be a unit clause.
 - Not all strategies are (refutation) completeness preserving. Neither input nor unit resolution is. However, there are others.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness

Resolution
Strategies

Horn Clauses

Horn Clauses & Resolution

Horn clauses: Clauses with at most one positive literal

Example: $(a \vee \neg b \vee \neg c), (\neg b \vee \neg c)$

Proposition

Unit resolution is refutation-complete for Horn clauses.

Proof idea.

Consider $R_U^*(\Delta)$ of Horn clause set Δ . We have to show that if $\square \notin R_U^*(\Delta)$, then $\Delta (\equiv R_U^*(\Delta))$ is satisfiable.

- Assign *true* to all unit clauses in $R_U^*(\Delta)$.
- Those clauses that do not contain a literal l such that $\{l\}$ is one of the unit clauses have at least one negative literal.
- Assign true to these literals.
- Results in satisfying truth assignment for $R_U^*(\Delta)$ (and $\Delta \subseteq R_U^*(\Delta)$).

□

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies

Horn Clauses

Horn Clauses & Resolution

Horn clauses: Clauses with at most one positive literal

Example: $(a \vee \neg b \vee \neg c), (\neg b \vee \neg c)$

Proposition

Unit resolution is refutation-complete for Horn clauses.

Proof idea.

Consider $R_U^*(\Delta)$ of Horn clause set Δ . We have to show that if $\square \notin R_U^*(\Delta)$, then $\Delta (\equiv R_U^*(\Delta))$ is satisfiable.

- Assign *true* to all unit clauses in $R_U^*(\Delta)$.
- Those clauses that do not contain a literal l such that $\{l\}$ is one of the unit clauses have at least one negative literal.
- Assign true to these literals.
- Results in satisfying truth assignment for $R_U^*(\Delta)$ (and $\Delta \subseteq R_U^*(\Delta)$).



KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Horn Clauses & Resolution

Horn clauses: Clauses with at most one positive literal

Example: $(a \vee \neg b \vee \neg c), (\neg b \vee \neg c)$

Proposition

Unit resolution is refutation-complete for Horn clauses.

Proof idea.

Consider $R_U^*(\Delta)$ of Horn clause set Δ . We have to show that if $\square \notin R_U^*(\Delta)$, then $\Delta (\equiv R_U^*(\Delta))$ is satisfiable.

- Assign *true* to all unit clauses in $R_U^*(\Delta)$.
- Those clauses that do not contain a literal l such that $\{l\}$ is one of the unit clauses have at least one negative literal.
- Assign true to these literals.
- Results in satisfying truth assignment for $R_U^*(\Delta)$ (and $\Delta \subseteq R_U^*(\Delta)$).



KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Horn Clauses & Resolution

Horn clauses: Clauses with at most one positive literal

Example: $(a \vee \neg b \vee \neg c), (\neg b \vee \neg c)$

Proposition

Unit resolution is refutation-complete for Horn clauses.

Proof idea.

Consider $R_U^*(\Delta)$ of Horn clause set Δ . We have to show that if $\square \notin R_U^*(\Delta)$, then $\Delta (\equiv R_U^*(\Delta))$ is satisfiable.

- Assign *true* to all unit clauses in $R_U^*(\Delta)$.
- Those clauses that do not contain a literal l such that $\{l\}$ is one of the unit clauses have at least one negative literal.
- Assign true to these literals.
- Results in satisfying truth assignment for $R_U^*(\Delta)$ (and $\Delta \subseteq R_U^*(\Delta)$).



KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Horn Clauses & Resolution

Horn clauses: Clauses with at most one positive literal

Example: $(a \vee \neg b \vee \neg c), (\neg b \vee \neg c)$

Proposition

Unit resolution is refutation-complete for Horn clauses.

Proof idea.

Consider $R_U^*(\Delta)$ of Horn clause set Δ . We have to show that if $\square \notin R_U^*(\Delta)$, then $\Delta (\equiv R_U^*(\Delta))$ is satisfiable.

- Assign *true* to all unit clauses in $R_U^*(\Delta)$.
- Those clauses that do not contain a literal l such that $\{l\}$ is one of the unit clauses have at least one negative literal.
- Assign true to these literals.
- Results in satisfying truth assignment for $R_U^*(\Delta)$ (and $\Delta \subseteq R_U^*(\Delta)$).



KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses

Horn Clauses & Resolution

Horn clauses: Clauses with at most one positive literal

Example: $(a \vee \neg b \vee \neg c), (\neg b \vee \neg c)$

Proposition

Unit resolution is refutation-complete for Horn clauses.

Proof idea.

Consider $R_U^*(\Delta)$ of Horn clause set Δ . We have to show that if $\square \notin R_U^*(\Delta)$, then $\Delta (\equiv R_U^*(\Delta))$ is satisfiable.

- Assign *true* to all unit clauses in $R_U^*(\Delta)$.
- Those clauses that do not contain a literal l such that $\{l\}$ is one of the unit clauses have at least one negative literal.
- Assign true to these literals.
- Results in satisfying truth assignment for $R_U^*(\Delta)$ (and $\Delta \subseteq R_U^*(\Delta)$).



KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Why Logic?

Propositional
Logic

Syntax

Semantics

Terminology

Normal Forms

Decision
Problems

Resolution

Derivations
Completeness
Resolution
Strategies
Horn Clauses