



A Compositional Typed Higher-Order Logic with Definitions

Ingmar Dasseville - Matthias Van Der Hallen -
Bart Bogaerts - Gerda Janssens - Marc Denecker

International Conference on Logic Programming, 2016



Goal in KR:

- build expressive logics
- by integrating useful and expressive language constructs
- in a **meaning preserving** way

To add aggregate expressions to logic programming and ASP: many effort years, several PhD's and many papers.

To add a nested cardinality aggregate *Card* to classical logic:

- New **syntactical rule** in definition of **term**:
 - $Card(\{x : \varphi\})$ is a term if φ is a formula
- New **semantical rule** in definition of **term evaluation**:
 - $(Card(\{x : \varphi\}))^{\mathcal{I}} = \#(\{d \mid \mathcal{I}[x : d] \models \varphi\})$

To add a nested cardinality aggregate *Card* to classical logic:

- New **syntactical rule** in definition of **term**:
 - $Card(\{x : \varphi\})$ is a term if φ is a formula
- New **semantical rule** in definition of **term evaluation**:
 - $(Card(\{x : \varphi\}))^{\mathcal{I}} = \#(\{d \mid \mathcal{I}[x : d] \models \varphi\})$

We are ready.

Developing a compositional method to extend rule sets under well-founded and stable semantics with new language constructs.

Last Year: Adding templates to KR languages

Result: Framework for adding language constructs and building logics

This Year: Building a general logic including compositionality principles

Definition (Compositionality according to Frege)

The meaning of a complex expression is determined by the meanings of its constituent expressions and the rules used to combine them

The semantics for a logic L and a language constructs C must satisfy:

$$\text{Sem}_L(C(e_1, \dots, e_n)) = \text{Sem}_C(\text{Sem}_L(e_1), \dots, \text{Sem}_L(e_n))$$

What is $Sem_L(C(e_1, \dots, e_n))$ mathematically?

- Logic expressions express “information”
- Infon : mathematical semantical object to express information
 - Function from structures to values
 - = A quantum of information
 - Confer intensional objects (e.g., Montague)

What is $Sem_L(C(e_1, \dots, e_n))$ mathematically?

- Logic expressions express “information”
- Infon : mathematical semantical object to express information
 - Function from structures to values
 - = A quantum of information
 - Confer intensional objects (e.g., Montague)

Infon of $p \vee q$

Maps $\{p\}$ to *True*

Maps $\{\}$ to *False*

What is $Sem_L(C(e_1, \dots, e_n))$ mathematically?

- Logic expressions express “information”
- Infon : mathematical semantical object to express information
 - Function from structures to values
 - = A quantum of information
 - Confer intensional objects (e.g., Montague)

Infon of $p \vee q$

Maps $\{p\}$ to *True*

Maps $\{\}$ to *False*

Infon of $c + 3$

Maps $\{c = 5\}$ to 8

Syntax: Extend the set of valid expressions

Syntax: Extend the set of valid expressions

Typing: Not all expressions within the grammar are sensible
(e.g. $1 + \text{"hello"}$)

Syntax: Extend the set of valid expressions

Typing: Not all expressions within the grammar are sensible
(e.g. $1 + \text{“hello”}$)

Semantics: What info corresponds to the expression?

A language expression C is:

- Abstract syntax $C(e_1, \dots, e_n)$

A language expression C is:

- Abstract syntax $C(e_1, \dots, e_n)$
- Typing function on types: $Typ_C(type_1, \dots, type_n)$ such that

$$Typ_L(C(e_1, \dots, e_n)) = Typ_C(Typ_L(e_1), \dots, Typ_L(e_n))$$

A language expression C is:

- Abstract syntax $C(e_1, \dots, e_n)$
- Typing function on types: $Typ_C(type_1, \dots, type_n)$ such that

$$Typ_L(C(e_1, \dots, e_n)) = Typ_C(Typ_L(e_1), \dots, Typ_L(e_n))$$

- Semantic function on infons: $Sem_C(Infon_1, \dots, Infon_n)$ such that

$$Sem_L(C(e_1, \dots, e_n)) = Sem_C(Sem_L(e_1), \dots, Sem_L(e_n))$$

Simply typed lambda calculus

- Higher order types
- Lambda Abstractions

Definitions

- Higher order Rules
- Well-founded/stable semantics, lifted

Higher Order Definitions

```
{  
   $\forall cur \ \forall Move \ \forall IsWon:$   
   $win(cur, Move, IsWon) \leftarrow IsWon(cur) \vee$   
     $\exists nxt : Move(cur, nxt) \wedge lose(nxt, Move, IsWon).$   
  
   $\forall cur \ \forall Move \ \forall IsWon:$   
   $lose(cur, Move, IsWon) \leftarrow \neg IsWon(cur) \wedge$   
     $\forall nxt : Move(cur, nxt) \Rightarrow win(nxt, Move, IsWon).$   
}
```

- Meaning of a logical expression is an **infun**.
- Compositionality obtained using **Frege's** principle.
- **Integration** of common logical and functional language constructs.
- Simplifying current and enabling new **applications**.
- But we need solvers!