

SS1:

Database point of view

- start with $\mathcal{D} = \text{db state} \hat{=} T_P^1(\emptyset)$
- set of true rules $H \leftarrow B_1, \dots, B_n$

+ Def Slide SS1:
but is equivalent

SS1 = Prolog-style definition:

start with \emptyset

Program P :
 • ground facts $p(a,b,c)$
 • rules $q(x) :- p(x,-,-)$

$$I_0 = \emptyset = T_P^0(\emptyset)$$

$$I_1 = T_P(\emptyset)$$

- rules: don't do anything

- facts: \exists rules $p(a,b,c) :-$

DB state $\mathcal{D} \hat{=} T_P^1(\emptyset) = T_P(\emptyset)$ "from work, we can derive $p(a,b,c)$ "
 \Leftarrow all these ground facts

$$\dots T_P^2(\emptyset)$$

$$T_P^3(\emptyset) = T(T_P^2(\emptyset))$$

$$\dots T_P^{\infty}(\emptyset)$$

\rightsquigarrow take the union ^{infinite(?)}

$$\downarrow T_P^\omega(\emptyset)$$

Consider (Prolog!) there is a rule
 (using a fct. symbol f)

$$P = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{person}(\text{father}(x)) \leftarrow \text{person}(x) \cdot \\ \text{person}(\text{john}) \cdot \end{array} \right\}$$

$$T_P^0(\emptyset) = \emptyset$$

$$T_P^1(\emptyset) = T_P(\emptyset) = \{ \text{person}(\text{john}) \}$$

$$T_P^2(\emptyset) = \{ \text{person}(\text{john}), \text{person}(\text{father}(\text{john})) \}$$

$$T_P^3(\emptyset) = \{ \text{person}(\text{john}), \text{person}(\text{father}(\text{john})), p(\text{father}(\text{father}(\text{john}))) \}$$

⋮ by induction

$$T_P^i(\emptyset) = \{ \text{person}(f^j(\text{john})) \mid j = 0 \dots (i-1) \}$$

$\Rightarrow \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} T_P^i(\emptyset)$ is infinite! $\Rightarrow \{ p(f^i(\text{john})) \mid i = 0 \dots \infty \}$

$M :=$

\Rightarrow this is an infinite FOL interpretation / infinite Herbrand structure, which can be finitely described

Prolog: bottom-up characterization infinite / finitely Herbrand

- top-down use

?- p(f(f(f(f(j))))))

YES.

• uses the proof-theoretic semantics

?- person(father(mary))

No. cannot prove it.

M is a Herbrand interpretation
 $=$ set of ground atoms.

$M \models P$?

- $M \models \text{person}(\text{john})$ yes: $\text{person}(\text{john}) \in M$
- $M \models \forall x: \text{person}(x) \rightarrow \text{person}(\text{father}(x))$
 whenever $\text{person}(t) \in M$
 $\quad \quad \quad \uparrow$
 $\quad \quad \quad$ ground term
 \Rightarrow yes, $M \models P$ then also $\text{person}(\text{father}(t)) \in M$

- M is the smallest model of P
 for each $M' \neq M$ then $M' \not\models P$
- there are many $M'' \neq M$ such that $M'' \models P$
 eg. take $M'' := M \cup \{ \text{person}(\text{mary}), \text{person}(\text{father}(\text{mary})), \dots, \text{person}(f^i(\text{mary})) \mid i = 0 \dots \infty \}$
- $M''' := M \cup \{ \text{count}(\text{ger}), \text{op}(\text{ger}, \text{ben}), \text{pres}(\text{ger}, \text{fu} \text{steinmeier}) \}$
- $M^S := M''' \cup \{ \text{person}(\text{fu} \text{steinmeier}), \text{person}(\text{father}^i(\text{fu} \text{steinmeier})) \mid i = 0 \dots \infty \}$

SESS basic knowledge K_1
 basic knowledge $K_2 \supseteq K_1$
 derivable conclusions: $K_i \models_{\text{calc}} \varphi$?
 Holds whenever $K_1 \models_{\text{calc}} \varphi$, then also $K_2 \models \varphi$
 if yes: "calc is monotonic"
 FOL is monotonic.

Consider:

tweets is a bird. usually birds fly. penguins are birds. penguins do not fly.	}	$K_1 \vdash$	human calc tweets flies
--	---	--------------	----------------------------

$K_2 = K_1 + \{ \text{tweets is a penguin} \}$
 $K_2 \vdash$ tweets does definitely not fly!
 \Rightarrow human reasoning is nonmonotonic
 \Rightarrow to do belief revision if necessary

SQL queries:
 select name from countries
 where not exists (select * from ismember i where i.cnty = c.ccode and i.org = 'EU')

$\alpha_1 = \begin{matrix} \text{name} \\ \text{USA} \\ \text{R} \\ \text{UA} \\ \text{KOS} \\ \vdots \end{matrix}$

update $\alpha_2 = \alpha_1 \cup \{ \text{ismember}('UA', 'EU', 'member') \}$
 $\alpha_2 \neq \alpha_1$, but
 answer to same query:

name	USA
	R
	UA
	KOS

answer $\alpha_2 \neq$ answer (α_1)
 \Rightarrow SQL is nonmonotonic.