

CS590U

# **Access Control: Theory and Practice**

Lecture 14 (February 24)

Basics of Logic and Logic Programming



# What is Logic?

---

- Formulas
- Syntactical approach
  - define how to derive new formulas from existing ones
  - $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$
- Semantic approach
  - define when a formula is a logical implication of other formulas
  - $\Gamma \models \varphi$



# Example Logic Formulas

---

- From
  - $\forall X \forall Y (\text{mother}(X) \wedge \text{child\_of}(Y, X) \Rightarrow \text{loves}(X, Y))$
  - $\text{mother}(\text{mary})$
  - $\text{child\_of}(\text{tom}, \text{mary})$
- Conclude
  - $\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{tom})$



# Kinds of Logic

---

- Propositional logic
  - classical, intuitionistic
- First order logic (predicate logic)
  - classical, intuitionistic
- Second order logic
- Modal logic



# Propositional Logic

---

- $\wedge$             AND
- $\vee$             OR     $p \vee q$  equivalent with  $\neg(\neg p \wedge \neg q)$
- $\neg$             NOT
- $\Rightarrow$          $p \Rightarrow q$  equivalent with  $\neg p \vee q$
- $\Leftrightarrow$        $p \Leftrightarrow q$  means  $p \Rightarrow q \wedge q \Rightarrow p$
  
- Well formed formulas
  - a variable is a wff
  - $(\phi \wedge \psi)$ ,  $(\phi \vee \psi)$ ,  $(\neg \phi)$ ,  $(\phi \Rightarrow \psi)$ ,  $(\phi \Leftrightarrow \psi)$  are wff's

# Semantics of Propositional Logic



- A valuation of a formula  $\varphi$  is a truth assignment for every variable in  $\varphi$ 
  - one can then evaluate  $\varphi$
- A valuation of a formula  $\varphi$  is a model of  $\varphi$  if  $\varphi$  evaluates to true
- $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \models \psi$  iff  $\psi$  is true in every model of  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$
- A formula  $\varphi$  is satisfiable iff it has one model
- A formula  $\varphi$  is valid iff every valuation of it is a model for it



# Conjunctive Normal Form

---

- Conjunctive Normal Form
- A formula is represented as conjunctions of disjunctions
- Checking validity of formulas in CNF is easy, but checking satisfiability is NP-complete



# Horn Clauses

---

- A formula in CNF where each conjunct has 0 or 1 positive literal
  - $p_1$  a fact
  - $p_1 \vee \neg p_2 \vee \dots \vee \neg p_n$ 
    - i.e.,  $p_1 \Leftarrow p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n$  a rule
  - $\neg p_1 \vee \neg p_2 \vee \dots \vee \neg p_n$ 
    - i.e.,  $\Leftarrow p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n$  a query
- Satisfiability of a formula in horn clauses can be decided in linear time





# Predicate Logic

---

- An alphabet consists of predicates, constants, and variables
  - in  $\forall X \forall Y (\text{mother}(X) \wedge \text{child\_of}(Y, X) \Rightarrow \text{loves}(X, Y)) \wedge \text{mother}(\text{mary}) \wedge \text{child\_of}(\text{tom}, \text{mary})$
  - mother, child\_of, loves are predicates
  - mary and tom are constants
  - X and Y are variables
  - $\forall$  and  $\exists$  are quantifiers
- We ignore function symbols for this lecture



# Closed Formulas (Sentences)

---

- Given a formula  $\varphi$ , the occurrence of a variable  $X$  is **bound** if it is inside the scope of a quantifier  $\forall X$  or  $\exists X$ . Otherwise, the occurrence is **free**.
- A formula with no free occurrences of variables is said to be **closed**.
  - a closed formula is also known as a **sentence**.
- A formula with no variable is said to be **ground**.



# Semantics of Predicate Logic

---

- A formula is just a string that can be parsed to a syntax tree
- A structure is a domain together with a set of relations (ignoring functions)
- An interpretation  $I$  of an alphabet maps
  - each constant to an element in the domain
  - each  $n$ -ary predicate to a relation



# Semantics of Predicate Logic

---

- Given an interpretation  $I$ ,
  - $\forall X \varphi$  evaluates to true iff for every element in  $I$ ,  $\varphi$  with every free occurrence of  $X$  replaced by evaluates to true
  - $\exists X \varphi$  evaluates to true iff there exists an element in  $I$ ,  $\varphi$  with every free occurrence of  $X$  replaced by evaluates to true
  - $p(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)$  evaluates to true iff  $(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)$  is in the relation that  $p$  maps to



# Models and Logical Consequence

---

- Given a set  $P$  of closed formulas, an interpretation  $I$ ,  $I$  is a model of  $P$  iff every formula in  $P$  is true in  $I$ .
- A formula is unsatisfiable if it doesn't have a model
- Logical consequence:  $\varphi$  is a logical consequence of  $P$  iff  $\varphi$  is true in every model of  $P$ , written as  $P \models \varphi$ .
- Proving  $P \models \varphi$  may be difficult, one way is to prove that  $P \cup \neg\varphi$  is unsatisfiable





# Logical Inference

---

- Using rules to manipulate formulas to determine whether  $\varphi$  follows from  $P$ .
- Soundness and completeness



# Logic Programming

---

- Rooted in Automated Theorem Proving
  - see an example
- The program consists of clauses
  - how to express grandchild in terms of child





# Definite Clauses

---

- A definite clause has the form
  - $A_0 \leftarrow A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_n$  where  $n \geq 0$
  - When  $n=0$ , it is a fact
  - Otherwise, it is a rule
- Logical atoms, literals, clauses
- A definite program is a finite set of definite clauses
- A definite goal has the form  $\leftarrow A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_n$
- The programmer has an intended model; the program describes features of the model. The programmer wants to know properties of the intended model
- The evaluation engine must be sound



# The Least Herbrand Model

---

- Given an alphabet  $A$ , the Herbrand universe consists of all ground terms that can be constructed using symbols from  $A$ 
  - when  $A$  doesn't contain any function symbols, the Herbrand universe is simply the set of all constants in  $A$
- The Herbrand base consists of all ground atoms over  $A$



# Herbrand Model

---

- Herbrand interpretation
  - essentially a subset of the Herbrand base, saying which ground atoms are true
- A Herbrand model of a program is a Herbrand interpretation such that every clause is true in it



# Why Herbrand Model?

---

- Theorem: Let  $P$  be a definite program and  $G$  a definite goal, if  $P \cup \{G\}$  has a model, then  $P \cup \{G\}$  has a Herbrand model
- Corollary: if  $P \cup \{G\}$  does not have a Herbrand model, then  $P \models \neg G$ .
- Thus, one only need to check whether  $G$  is false in all Herbrand models of  $P$  to determine whether  $\neg G$  is true
- Theorem: Given two Herbrand model of a definite program, their intersection is also a Herbrand model



# The Least Herbrand Model

---

- Theorem: There exists a unique least Herbrand model.
- Theorem: The least Herbrand model is the set of all ground atomic logical consequences of the program.



# Construction of the Least Herbrand Model

---

- Using the immediate consequence operator
- The least fixpoint of the immediate consequence operator is the least Herbrand Model.



# Next Lecture

---

- Overview of Trust Management