Jean-Louis Lassez and Gordon Plotkin (editors), Computational Logic: Essays in Honor of Alan Robinson, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, MIT Press, 1991.

Reviewed by

IRVING H. ANELLIS

Modern Logic Publishing Box 1036, Welch Avenue Station Ames, IA 50010-1036, USA

Computational Logic is a Festschrift dedicated to John Alan Robinson on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. The papers in the volume include both surveys and original research of many of the areas in computational logic to which Robinson contributed, including automated theorem proving, unification theory, term-rewriting systems, functional programming, and logic programming.

The contributions to *Computational Logic* are divided into three subject groups, under the headings "Inference," "Equality," and "Logic Programming":

INFERENCE

Subsumption, a Sometimes Under-valued Procedure

Larry Wos, Ross Overbeek, and Ewing Lusk

The Markgraf Karl Refutation Procedure

Hans Jürgen Ohlbach and Jörg H. Siekmann

Modal Logic Should Say More Than It Does

Melvin Fitting

Interactive Proof Presentation

W. W. Bledsoe

Intelligent Backtracking Revisited

Maurice Bruynooghe

A Science of Reasoning

Alan Bundy

Inductive Inference of Theories from Facts

Ehud Shapiro

EQUALITY

Solving Equations in Abstract Algebras: A Rule-Based Survey of Unification Jean-Pierre Jouannaud and Claude Kirchner

Disunification: A Survey Hubert Comon A Case Study of the Completion Procedure: Proving Ring Commutativity **Problems** Deepak Kapur and Hantao Zhang Computations in Orthogonal Rewriting Systems, I Gérard Huet and Jean-Jacques Lévy Computations in Orthogonal Rewriting Systems, II Gérard Huet and Jean-Jacques Lévy Unification and ML-Type Reconstruction Paris C. Kanellakis, Harry G. Mairson, and John C. Mitchell Automatic Dimensional Inference Mitchell Wand and Patrick M. O'Keefe LOGIC PROGRAMMING Logic-Programming Schemes and Their Implementations Keith L. Clark A Near-Horn Prolog for Compilation Donald W. Loveland and David W. Reed Unfold/Fold Transformations of Logic Programs P. A. Gardner and J. C. Shepherdson An Algebraic Representation of Logic-Program Computations Andrea Corradini and Ugo Montanari Theory of Disjunctive Logic Programs Jack Minker, Arcot Rajasekar, and Jorge Lobo **Bottom-Up Evaluation of Logic Programs** Jeffrey F. Naughton and Raghu Ramakrishnan Absys, the First Logic-Programming Language: A View of the Inevitability of Logic Programming E. W. Elcock

The historical roots of much of this work can be found in Robinson's work on the resolution method of theorem proving, and indeed to five central papers of Robinson's career. "A Machine-oriented Logic Based on the Resolution Principle" [1965], "Automatic Deduction with Hyper-resolution" [1965a], "The Generalized Resolution Principle" [1968]. "Mechanizing Higher-order Logic" [1969], and "Computational Logic: The Unification Computation" [1971], especially the first two. Robinson's work was the inspiration for all of the subjects of computational logic treated in the *Festschrift*, even for those which did not originate directly out of Robinson's work.

In their "Preface", the editors define computational logic as comprising those parts of logic which provide a foundation for computer science, and they attribute to Robinson the

majority of the credit for the conception and birth of the endeavor to explore the relationships between logic and computer science. They regard his contribution to computational logic as "fundamental" and note that his work has "exerted a profound influence in major fields of computer science, and in particular to those areas already mentioned, from automated theorem proving to logic programming.

If we go beyond the broad generalities and vague platitudes offered by the editors, we see that Robinson's influence in computational logic goes back to and centers on his work on resolution theory, which applies the tree method to *clausal sequents*, that is to Gentzen sequents that are in clausal form.

Robinson's [1979] Logic: Form and Function was written as an introduction for computer scientists, and especially for artificial intelligence researchers, in the practical use of the resolution method. It is an informal textbook, in the sense that it was meant to instruct, but had no exercises and was written in a leisurely, almost fireside chat manner, and readers are required to already know something about logic. The resolution method was first announced by Robinson in [1963], in an abstract in the Journal of Symbolic Logic. Resolution is described by Jean-Pierre Jouannaud and Claude Kirchner in their paper for the Robinson Festschrift as the "first really effective mechanization of first-order logic" (p. 257). They add the historical remark that solving equations on first-order terms emerged with Herbrand's work on proof theory" in his doctoral thesis Recherches sur la théorie de la démonstration (1930) "and was coined unification by Alan Robinson" in his first major paper, "A Machine-oriented Logic Based on the Resolution Principle" [1965].

Robinson developed the method itself in detail in a series of pioneering papers, the most important and better-known of which is the [1965] article "A Machine-oriented Logic based on the Resolution Principle." The origin of the resolution method is roughly contemporaneous with the early development in the mid-1960's by Smullyan of analytic tableaux which grew out of Beth's development of semantic tableaux from Gentzen's natural sequences, and Smullyan's analytic tableaux and Robinson's resolution method share some common features.

Literals are predictions or negations of predictions. A sequent is in *clausal form* if it is an ordinary sentence in prenex form whose quantifiers are universal and whose matrix is a disjunction of literals (in which case it is a universal clause), or if it is an ordinary sentence in prenex form whose quantifiers are existential and whose matrix is a conjunction of literals (in which case it is an existential clause). Resolutions are carried out on clauses which are sets of quantifier-free formulae in normal form.

Quantified formulae are rewritten in "quad" notation, within which quantified clauses are translated as quantifier-free sequences of formulae in disjunctive normal form, with the "quad" (\Box) replacing the quantifiers and connectives of the original quantified sequence. For a finite set S of expressions, the *resolution* of S is the pattern of inferences applicable to the finite clausal sequents. Let R be the *resolvent* of the sequence S. A resolution proof is valid if the sequent S, R is derivable from the sequent S. Thus, for the series of resolution steps, s_0 , s_1 , ..., s_n , where s_n is a terminal sequent containing a quad-clause, the series s_0 , s_1 , ..., s_n is the resolution proof of its initial sequent s_0 .

The final goal of Robinson's efforts was to provide a LISP program that gives a computer-based process of resolution proofs. Because Robinson's method uses Gentzen sequences rather than the Deduction Theorem to justify logical inference, he can use Gentzen's cut-elimination rather than the tree decomposition rules found in Jeffrey's *Formal Logic*, to obtain inference trees. He was therefore able to establish a close connection between the computer language LISP and Gentzen's LK quantification system on the one hand and to give a proof-theoretic foundation to his discussion of Resolution theorem proving. As I wrote when discussing his [(1979)] book *Logic: Form and Function*, [Anellis 1981, 192], the resolution method was "indeed his main contribution to the literature of computer logic and proof theory."

The relationships between resolution and other automatic theorem-proving methods based upon Gentzen sequences, and in particular Maslov's inverse method, was pointed out by Kuehner [1971], who introduced the English version [Maslov 1971] of Maslov's detailed [1969] comparison of resolution with his own inverse method and by Vladimir Lifschitz [1986, 18-19], who gave a detailed characterization of Maslov's method and its applications [1986, 78-97]. It was shown by Maslov that there is a one-to-one correspondence between his inverse method and Robinson's resolution. Davydov [1971], in fact, was able to obtain a synthesis of the two methods.

The application of the resolution method to computerized proof-finding was enhanced by Robinson's development in [1965a] of a type of resolution called *hyper-resolution*. This is a resolution whose search space is considerably more sparse than the search space of general resolution. Here, we have a sequence of connected search trees which which converge to a ground resolution; these converging trees connect several levels of resolutions.

None of the authors in this *Festschrift* touch on the relations of the resolution method with Maslov's inverse method, despite the wide variety of contributions in this massive volume of more than 720 pages; and few of the authors have occasion for more than the sketchiest discussion of the historical background of either Robinson's work or of the role which Robinson's work had in their own research. Despite the occasional historical remarks made in passing, there is much, however, that the historian of logic can learn if he or she already knows something about Robinson's original work. Because nearly every paper in this *Festschrift* owes something, either directly or indirectly, to Robinson's pioneering work on resolution, what can be learned is the diversity to which that work has given rise and the extent and depth of new developments in the ever-widening and ever-deepening field of computational logic which has grown in just a few years less than three brief decades from the work begun by Robinson. The questions for future historians will be "How much of the work found in the Robinson *Festschrift* has proven to have had lasting importance?", "Have the results obtained in the wake of Robinson's work proven

to be of equal importance with Robinson's original work?" and even "What role did Robinson's work play in the subsequent development of logic in general and of computational logic in particular?"

The last question is necessitated by the absence of an analysis of Robinson's work, or indeed of any detailed treatment of this question, in the Robinson *Festschrift*. That, together with the wide diversity of subjects handled by the *Festschrift*'s contributors, is why I have focused in this review on the resolution method as one central aspect of Robinson's work and on the connections of the resolution method with the related work of Maslov and his colleagues on the inverse method.

REFERENCES.

ANELLIS, I.H. 1981. Review of J.A. Robinson, Logic: Form and Function, Cognition and Brain Theory 4, (no. 2, Spring), 191-193.

DAVYDOV, G. V. 1971. Curmes memoda резолюций с обратным методом, 3HC JIOMU 20, 24-35, 282. English translation as Synthesis of the resolution method with the inverse method, Journal of Soviet Mathematics 1 (1973), n. 1, 12-18.

KUEHNER, D.G. 1971. A note on the relation between resolution and Maslov's inverse method, Machine Intelligence 6, 73-76.

LIFSCHITZ, V. 1986. Mechanical theorem proving in the USSR: The Leningrad school, Falls Church, VA, Delphic Associates.

MASLOV, S. Ju. 1969. Связъ между тактиками обратного метода и метода резолюций, ЗНС ЛОМИ 16, 137-146.

- 1971, Proof-search strategies for methods of the resolution type, Machine Intelligence 6, 77-90. ROBINSON, J_eA. 1963. A machine-oriented logic; abstract, Journal of Symbolic Logic 28, 302.

- 1965. A machine-oriented logic based on the resolution principle, Journal of the Association of Computing Machinery 12, 23-41.

= 1965a. Automatic deduction with hyper-resolution, International Journal of Computational Mathematics 1, 227-234.

- 1968. The generalized resolution principle, Machine Intelligence 3, 77-93.

=1969. Mechanizing higher-order logic, Machine Intelligence 4, 151-170.

= 1971. Computational logic: the unification computation, Machine Intelligence 6, 63-71.

- 1979. Logic: Form and Function, The Mechanization of Deductive Reasoning, New York, Elsevier North-Holland (The Computer Science Library, Artificial Intelligence Series).