

Resolution and Unification in Logic Programming

Michael McThrow

San Jose State University
Computer Science Department
CS 152 – Programming Paradigms

October 26, 2020



Table of Contents

- 1 Basic Concepts
- 2 Resolving Ground Queries
- 3 Unification
- 4 Resolving Queries with Unification
- 5 Preview of Wednesday's Lecture

Table of Contents

- 1 Basic Concepts
- 2 Resolving Ground Queries
- 3 Unification
- 4 Resolving Queries with Unification
- 5 Preview of Wednesday's Lecture

Ground and Non-ground Terms

- Terms that lack variables are **ground**.
- Terms that contain variables are **non-ground**.

Examples of Ground and Non-ground Terms

■ Ground Terms:

- `evolution(bulbasaur, ivysaur).`
- `fire(charmander).`
- `plus(s(s(0)), s(s(s(0))), s(s(s(s(s(0)))))).`

■ Non-ground Terms:

- `evolution(ivysaur, X)?`
- `plus(0, X, 0).`

Table of Contents

- 1 Basic Concepts
- 2 Resolving Ground Queries**
- 3 Unification
- 4 Resolving Queries with Unification
- 5 Preview of Wednesday's Lecture

Definition of Resolution

Definition (Resolution)

“**Resolution** is the process of matching facts and rules to perform *inferencing*, the derivation of logical conclusions from the rules”
[from Professor Tom Austin's Spring 2019 CS 152 slides].

When we issue a query, the interpreter *resolves* it.

The simple case is when we are issuing ground queries; i.e., queries with no variables such as `evolution(bulbasaur, ivysaur)?`.

How do we resolve ground queries?

Resolution Algorithm for Ground Queries and Terms

Input: A ground goal G and a program P

Output: *yes* if G is a logical consequence of P ,
no otherwise

Algorithm: Initialize the resolvent to G .
while the resolvent is not empty *do*
 choose a goal A from the resolvent
 choose a ground instance of a clause $A' \leftarrow B_1, \dots, B_n$ from P
 such that A and A' are identical
 (if no such goal and clause exist, exit the while loop)
 replace A by B_1, \dots, B_n in the resolvent
If the resolvent is empty, *then* output *yes*, *else* output *no*.

Figure 1.1 An abstract interpreter to answer ground queries with respect to logic programs

Figure: Resolution algorithm for ground queries and terms [Sterling and Shapiro 1994, p. 22]

Let's go to the whiteboard for an example.

Each iteration of the while loop in the resolution algorithm is called a *reduction*.

Definition of a Reduction

Definition (Reduction)

“A **reduction** of a goal G by a program P is the replacement of G by the body of an instance of a clause in P , whose head is identical to the chosen goal” [Sterling and Shapiro, p. 23].

This resolution algorithm works for ground queries given a program consisting of ground rules. But how do we deal with non-ground queries and rules?

Table of Contents

- 1 Basic Concepts
- 2 Resolving Ground Queries
- 3 Unification**
- 4 Resolving Queries with Unification
- 5 Preview of Wednesday's Lecture

Common Instance

Definition (Common Instance)

“A term t is a **common instance** of two terms t_1 and t_2 , if there exist substitutions θ_1 and θ_2 such that t equals $t_1\theta_1$ and $t_2\theta_2$ ”
[Sterling and Shapiro, p. 88].

Definition of “More General”

Definition

“A term s is **more general** than a term t is t is an instance of s but s is not an instance of t ” [Sterling and Shapiro, p. 88].

Definition of “More General”

Definition

“A term s is **more general** than a term t is t is an instance of s but s is not an instance of t ” [Sterling and Shapiro, p. 88].

For example, `fire(X)` is more general than `fire(charizard)`, since `fire(charizard)` is an instance of `fire(X)`, but `fire(X)` is not an instance of `fire(charizard)`.

Alphabetic Variants

Definition (Alphabetic Variant)

“A term s is an **alphabetic variant** of a term t if both s is an instance of t and t is an instance of s ” [Sterling and Shapiro, p. 88].

Alphabetic Variants

Definition (Alphabetic Variant)

“A term s is an **alphabetic variant** of a term t if both s is an instance of t and t is an instance of s ” [Sterling and Shapiro, p. 88].

For example, these terms are alphabetic variants of each other:

- `member(X, tree(Left, X, Right))`
- `member(Y, tree(Left, Y, Z))`

Unification

- “A **unifier** of two terms is a substitution making the terms identical. If two terms have a unifier, we say they **unify**” [Sterling and Shapiro, p. 88].
- “Any unifier determines a common instance, and conversely, any common instance determines a unifier” [p. 88].

Unification

- “A **unifier** of two terms is a substitution making the terms identical. If two terms have a unifier, we say they **unify**” [Sterling and Shapiro, p. 88].
- “Any unifier determines a common instance, and conversely, any common instance determines a unifier” [p. 88].

Example: Given the terms $\text{append}([1,2,3], [3,4], \text{List})$ and $\text{append}([X|Xs], Ys, [X|Zs])$, the unifying substitution is $X=1$, $Xs=[2,3]$, $Ys=[3,4]$, $\text{List}=[1,Zs]$ and the common instance is $\text{append}([1,2,3], [3,4], [1|Zs])$.

Most General Unifier (MGU)

Definition (Most General Unifier)

“A **most general unifier**, or MGU, of two terms is a unifier such that the associated common instance is most general” [p. 88].

Most General Unifier (MGU)

Definition (Most General Unifier)

“A **most general unifier**, or MGU, of two terms is a unifier such that the associated common instance is most general” [p. 88].

The goal of unification is to identify the MGU of two terms. The resolution algorithm will use the MGU when resolving queries.

Unification Algorithm [Sterling and Shapiro 1994, p. 90]

Algorithm: Initialize the substitution θ to be empty,
the stack to contain the equation $T_1 = T_2$,
and failure to *false*.

while stack not empty and no failure do

 pop $X = Y$ from the stack

 case

X is a variable that does not occur in Y :
 substitute Y for X in the stack and in θ
 add $X = Y$ to θ

Y is a variable that does not occur in X :
 substitute X for Y in the stack and in θ
 add $Y = X$ to θ

X and Y are identical constants or variables:
 continue

X is $f(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and Y is $f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$
 for some functor f and $n > 0$:
 push $X_i = Y_i, i = 1 \dots n$, on the stack

 otherwise:
 failure is *true*

If failure, then output failure else output θ .

Let's go to the whiteboard for an example.

Table of Contents

- 1 Basic Concepts
- 2 Resolving Ground Queries
- 3 Unification
- 4 Resolving Queries with Unification**
- 5 Preview of Wednesday's Lecture

Resolution with Unification

Input: A goal G and a program P

Output: An instance of G that is a logical consequence of P , or *no* otherwise

Algorithm: Initialize the resolvent to G .
while the resolvent is not empty *do*
 choose a goal A from the resolvent
 choose a (renamed) clause $A' \leftarrow B_1, \dots, B_n$ from P
 such that A and A' unify with mgu θ
 (if no such goal and clause exist, exit the *while* loop)
 replace A by B_1, \dots, B_n in the resolvent
 apply θ to the resolvent and to G
If the resolvent is empty, *then* output G , *else* output *no*.

Figure 4.2 An abstract interpreter for logic programs

Figure: Resolution algorithm with unification [Sterling and Shapiro 1994, p. 93]

Table of Contents

- 1 Basic Concepts
- 2 Resolving Ground Queries
- 3 Unification
- 4 Resolving Queries with Unification
- 5 Preview of Wednesday's Lecture**

In the past few lectures, we've been going over pure logic programming with Prolog syntax. Beginning Wednesday, we will begin covering some more concrete elements of Prolog, including arithmetic and its execution model.

Reading Assignment

Please read chapters 6, 7, and 8 of *The Art of Prolog*.