

Abductive Equivalential Translation
and its application to
Natural Language Database Interfacing

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm

Manny Rayner
SRI International, Cambridge

September 1993

Abstract

The thesis describes a logical formalization of natural-language database interfacing. We assume the existence of a “natural language engine” capable of mediating between surface linguistic string and their representations as “literal” logical forms: the focus of interest will be the question of relating “literal” logical forms to representations in terms of primitives meaningful to the underlying database engine. We begin by describing the nature of the problem, and show how a variety of interface functionalities can be considered as instances of a type of formal inference task which we call “Abductive Equivalential Translation” (AET); functionalities which can be reduced to this form include answering questions, responding to commands, reasoning about the completeness of answers, answering meta-questions of type “Do you know...”, and generating assertions and questions. In each case, a “linguistic domain theory” (LDT) Γ and an input formula F are given, and the goal is to construct a formula with certain properties which is equivalent to F , given Γ and a set of permitted assumptions. If the LDT is of a certain specified type, whose formulas are either conditional equivalences or Horn-clauses, we show that the AET problem can be reduced to a goal-directed inference method. We present an abstract description of this method, and sketch its realization in Prolog. The relationship between AET and several problems previously discussed in the literature is discussed. In particular, we show how AET can provide a simple and elegant solution to the so-called “Doctor on Board” problem, and in effect allows a “relativization” of the Closed World Assumption. The ideas in the thesis have all been implemented concretely within the SRI CLARE project, using a real projects and payments database. The LDT for the example database is described in detail, and examples of the types of functionality that can be achieved within the example domain are presented.

KEYWORDS: Natural language processing, natural language interfaces, databases, logic programming, equivalences, Closed World Assumption, “Doctor on Board” problem

Acknowledgements

Nearly every PhD thesis contains a lengthy acknowledgements section, and this one is no exception. I would like to start by admitting my debt to the other members of the CLARE project: Hiyan Alshawi, Dave Carter, Dick Crouch, Steve Pulman and Arnold Smith. Without the unique contributions they each made to the project, the work I report here could quite simply not have been carried out. I would particularly like to thank Hiyan Alshawi. Many of the key ideas grew out of discussions with Hiyan, and I am sure that some of them are really more his than mine. I would also like to thank the CLARE sponsors: BP Research, British Aerospace, British Telecom, SRI International, the UK Defence Research Agency, and the UK Department of Trade and Industry.

I would never have gotten around to writing the thesis if I hadn't been patiently persuaded to do so by Carl-Gustaf Jansson, my supervisor, Elisabeth Kron, my wife, and Lotta Almgren and Alison Golding, our sometime *au pairs*. I hope they consider their efforts rewarded. For similar reasons, I must also thank my own thesis students, Björn Gambäck, Barney Pell and Christer Samuelsson, for mercilessly teasing me during periods when I thought I wanted to be doing quite different things. Jerry Hobbs, Östen Dahl, Seif Haridi and Sture Hägglund agreed to act as my opponent and examiners respectively despite the heavy demands made on their time. Many people encouraged me with kind remarks about previous drafts of this work, and among them I would particularly like to mention Barbara Grosz and Karen Sparck-Jones.

Finally I would like to thank you, the reader. Please read on: there are a few good bits, I think, in the middle of all the boring stuff. And I need your discerning mind to tell me which are which.

Manny Rayner
Cambridge, September 1993

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	What this thesis is about	1
1.2	The SRI CLARE system	4
1.3	An example session with CLARE	6
2	Interfacing as Translation	23
2.1	Introduction	23
2.2	Related work	25
2.2.1	Horn-clause approaches	26
2.2.2	Non-inferential equivalential translation	27
2.2.3	“Interpretation as abduction”	27
2.2.4	Relationship of AET to earlier work	28
2.3	Ontological issues	29
2.4	LDTs and effective translations	31
2.4.1	Basic form of linguistic domain theories	31
2.4.2	Effective translation	33
2.5	Formalizing interfacing functionalities	34
2.5.1	Yes/No questions	34
2.5.2	Commands and WH-questions	36
2.5.3	Statements describing new information	38
2.5.4	Meta-questions	39
2.5.5	Generating statements and questions	40
2.6	The Closed World Assumption	41
3	AET	43
3.1	Introduction	43
3.2	Formalization of AET	44
3.2.1	“Universal” equivalences and translation schemas	45
3.2.2	“Existential” equivalences	47

3.2.3	Horn-clause readings of equivalences	48
3.2.4	The abstract AET process	49
3.3	A simple example	50
3.4	Translating higher-order formulas	54
3.5	Abductive translation	55
3.6	Simplification	56
3.6.1	Non-inferential simplification	56
3.6.2	Inferential simplification	58
3.6.3	Simplification for processing assertions	61
3.7	The “Doctor on Board” problem	62
3.8	The translation engine	67
3.9	Debugging equivalential theories	69
4	Linguistic Domain Theories	73
4.1	Introduction	73
4.2	Overview of the example LDT	75
4.2.1	Names and objects	77
4.2.2	“Conceptual” predicates	78
4.2.3	“Attribute” predicates	81
4.3	General axioms	82
4.4	Domain-specific axioms	84
4.5	Database-specific axioms	84
4.6	Specific linguistic constructs	87
4.6.1	Translating “attribute” predicates	88
4.6.2	Support verbs	89
4.6.3	Predicates referring to identifiers	90
4.6.4	Expressions that map onto code values	91
4.6.5	Transferring properties between objects	92
4.7	Assumption declarations	93
4.8	Horn clause axioms	94
4.9	A full example	96
5	The Reasoning Engine	105
5.1	Logical structure	105
5.1.1	Abductive proofs	106
5.1.2	Proving implications	107
5.1.3	Proving negated goals	108
5.2	Search strategies for inference	110
5.2.1	Avoiding infinitely recursive branches	111

5.2.2	Avoiding redundant search	112
5.2.3	Dynamic re-ordering of conjuncts	112
5.3	Finding finite proof procedures	113
6	Generation of Utterances	117
6.1	Introduction	117
6.2	Learning case-based description rules	119
6.3	Description of database entities	122
6.4	Generating questions	126
7	Conclusions	131
7.1	Summary	131
7.2	Further directions	133
7.2.1	Using AET in other domains	133
7.2.2	Making the AET process symmetrical	133
7.2.3	Goal-directed reasoning about acquisition of knowledge	134
	References	137
A	The semantics of questions	141
B	Syntax and semantics of TRL	145
B.1	Terms	145
B.2	Abstracts	146
B.3	Forms	146
C	Translating to SQL	149

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 What this thesis is about

The basic aim of this thesis is to describe a logical formalization of the topic usually described as “Natural Language Database Interfacing”, presented in a way which is consistent with the methods of present-day computational linguistics and artificial intelligence. We will interpret the phrase “Natural Language Database Interfacing” in a broad sense, to encompass any kind of use of language in connection with a database; this is of course somewhat too broad as it stands, but we want to stress that we are not limiting ourselves to the procedural goal of constructing a system that can use the database to answer questions posed in natural language. Our starting point is rather that we are building a theory which describes the relationship between a database and the natural-language utterances which in some way or another make reference it. These utterances can certainly be questions explicitly about the content of the database (“Which payments were made on May 23rd?”), but they can also be commands to supply information (“Tell me about payments made on May 23rd”), statements supplying new information for the database (“A payment to British Telecom was made on May 23rd”), or meta-questions (“Do you know whether any payment was made on May 23rd?”). We will not assume either that use of language is exclusively by human participants in the dialogue: we want the theory to support generation of language, for example statements describing facts already in the database, or questions asking for fillers of incomplete database records. Since this thesis is within the field of computer science (rather than, for example, those of linguistics or philosophy), we also make another demand, namely that the theory should be computationally tractable: that is to say, it

should in principle (and, preferably, in practice), be capable of efficient realization as a functioning program. In accordance with a now well-established paradigm, such a program will operate in a way that can be conceptualized as performing inference on the theory to obtain conclusions of a particular type.

The goals set out in the paragraph above are so vague that they could potentially encompass an almost limitless variety of approaches, (although it is also worth noting that they in fact exclude most previously published work on the subject: see section 2.2). We will now narrow them to focus more closely on the actual research that has been accomplished here. First, we will drastically simplify the problem by not dealing directly with natural language, but only with logical formulas representing natural language utterances. It is of course by no means clear that such a move is really possible (or, some would claim, even desirable); on the other hand, a great deal of work has been done during the last century on the representation of language in logic, which has recently found expression in the creation of *natural language engines*, large implemented systems practically capable of fairly robust automatic translation between utterances and their logical representations. This thesis makes extensive, often implicit, use of one such system, the SRI Core Language Engine (CLE), which is described in more detail in section 1.2. By availing oneself of this accumulated body of knowledge, it is possible to abstract away the linguistic phenomena which intuitively belong to the surface form of language (morphology, and much of the simpler aspects of syntax), and instead concentrate on what hopefully are the deeper semantic issues: how words refer to database records, and how the context in which a word is used can affect the way in which it refers. In order for there still to be a problem to solve, it is necessary to limit the scope of operation of the language engine; we demand, roughly, that the logical representations which it assigns to utterances should be in some sense “literal”, that is to say that there should exist a close correspondence between the component words of the utterance and the component symbols of its logical representation. Although this principle is not applied with complete rigidity in the CLE, it is given sufficiently full expression that we hope the results will be of fairly general relevance. In the main body of the thesis, we will later see numerous examples of these “literal” logical forms.

Informally, the key idea in our treatment of the subject is that of “translation”: we wish to translate vague natural language utterances into precisely defined expressions in a formal language that can be used to manipulate and reason about the database. By replacing natural language utterances with

their logical forms, we can make this goal more precise: given a logical form F , whose constants correspond to word-senses, we might wish to find an equivalent expression, F' , whose constants correspond to database objects and relations, perhaps together with elementary arithmetic operations and other uncontroversial relations; this, roughly, will be our characterization of the *analysis* type of task, the class of tasks where natural language has been turned into database commands. Conversely, given a logical expression F whose constants refer to the database, we might wish to find an equivalent expression F' whose constants are word-senses; this will be the form of *generation* tasks, tasks where the database is given, and natural language is to be produced.

The ideas in the last paragraph constrain the picture considerably. If we are to talk about logical forms of natural language utterances being “equivalent” with formulas directly representing database concepts, then the equivalence must be with respect to a background theory. Calling the theory Γ , we will be able to define a formula F_{db} expressed in the “database language” to be a translation of a logical form F_{ling} iff

$$\Gamma \Rightarrow (F_{ling} \equiv F_{db}) \quad (1.1)$$

Thus one of our major goals will be the construction of suitable theories Γ , and we will have a good deal to say about this in a moment. Before doing so, however, we will make an important modification to (1.1). It turns out in practice that if Γ is a fairly general theory (that is to say, if it is applicable in a wide range of situations), then it will often be the case that equivalences like those in (1.1) can only be proved to follow from it with the addition of extra assumptions A ; the reason why these assumptions have to be treated specially is that they are defeasible, that is to say that additional knowledge may force them to be retracted. So the modified form of our specification of what it means for a logical form F_{ling} and a database expression F_{db} to be equivalent is

$$\Gamma \cup A \Rightarrow (F_{ling} \equiv F_{db}) \quad (1.2)$$

where Γ is a background theory and the A belong to a set of permissible assumptions. In this case, we will say that F_{db} is an *abductive equivalential translation* of F_{ling} , the translation being from the logical vocabulary of word-senses to the logical vocabulary of database concepts. Since equivalence is a symmetric relation, it will be equally correct to say that F_{ling} is an abductive equivalential translation of F_{db} , reversing the roles of the source

and target languages. The greater part of the sequel will be concerned with exploring the ramifications of the concept of abductive equivalential translation (hereafter usually shortened to AET), and how it can be used to provide a practically useful framework within which various natural language interfacing tasks can be formalized and implemented. Illustrative examples will be taken from the SRI CLARE system, an advanced natural language and reasoning system built on top of the CLE, which makes extensive use of AET.

The rest of the thesis is organized as follows. Section 1.2 gives an overview of CLARE, focussing on the role that AET plays in the system as a whole, and Section 1.3 shows an example session with CLARE. The thesis proper starts with Chapter 2, which explains in more detail the various interface functionalities that we will consider, and how they can be realized in terms of AET; it also discusses *en route* the rough form of the “background theory” Γ and the permissible assumptions A of (1.2). Chapter 3 then considers computational mechanisms that can be used to solve the problem of finding an abductive equivalential translation of a formula given a background theory: it is shown that this can be reduced to a goal-directed inference task if Γ is constructed in a certain way. Theories of this form will be referred to as *equivalential linguistic domain theories*, and are the subject of Chapter 4. A goal-directed reasoning engine used to support the translation functionalities of chapter 3 is described in chapter 5.

Up to this point, we will mostly have considered only the functionalities which involve mapping queries and assertions into a form that can be used by the database. Chapter 6 shows how we can use the framework in the reverse direction to formalize generation of statements describing the contents of database records, and questions asking about the fillers of unfilled database fields. Finally, chapter 7 sums up and concludes. There are three appendices. Appendix A discusses and motivates the theory of question semantics used throughout the thesis; appendix B defines the syntax and semantics of TRL, the extended first-order logic used throughout the thesis; and appendix C outlines the methods used in CLARE to translate TRL logical expressions into SQL query language to connect to actual SQL databases.

1.2 The SRI CLARE system

In this section we will briefly describe the SRI CLARE system. CLARE is a sophisticated natural language and reasoning system built on top of the

SRI Core Language Engine (CLE). Although it would certainly have been impossible to carry out the research reported here without the benefit of an implemented environment like that provided by the CLE, much of the CLE's internal structure is at best of only tangential interest in this context; since the CLE is well-described elsewhere (Alshawi 1992), we will confine ourselves to providing sufficient detail that the reader will be able to see where the translation and reasoning components fit into the total scheme.

CLARE is an integrated system, intended to provide the core language processing capabilities needed for a wide range of tasks such as knowledge-based access, machine translation, text scanning and speech synthesis, which in one way or another involve manipulating human language. The design of CLARE is characterized by giving high priority to *modularity* and *declarative representation of information*: the system is composed of a dozen or so cleanly separated subsystems, which pass information, coded in well-defined intermediate representations, over well-defined interfaces. Different types of linguistic knowledge are available in various declaratively specified forms; the processing modules will usually *compile* the declarative knowledge they need into a form suitable for the uses to which they intend to put it.

At the coarse level of granularity which will suffice for our purposes, CLARE can be separated into three main pieces. The first of these is the CLE, which can be viewed as a module that converts between two levels of representation, *surface form* and *quasi logical form* (QLF). Conversion can take place in either direction; thus the CLE's *analysis* module can use the declaratively specified linguistic information to derive QLF representations from surface forms, while the *generation* module uses the same information, compiled in a different way, to derive surface forms from their QLF representations. QLF can be characterized as a logical representation which attempts to encode only the linguistic information in the utterance; this implies that QLF representations of vague expressions like pronouns and ellipsis are themselves vague (Alshawi and Crouch 1992). We will actually have little to say about QLF in this thesis, since it is a level of representation that is difficult to use directly to support inferential reasoning.

The second major piece of CLARE is the *resolution* component, which converts between QLF and logical form representations; logical forms are represented in a conservatively extended first-order logic called Target Reasoning Language (TRL), defined in appendix B. The resolution component converts QLF into TRL by "resolving" referentially vague sub-expressions; this can involve operations corresponding to finding referents for pronouns and definite noun-phrases, expanding elliptic phrases, and determining the

relative scope of quantifiers. Typically, all these operations involve inference in some way. In the reverse direction, CLARE has a limited ability to synthesize QLFs corresponding to TRL expressions. We will say a little more about the resolution component (primarily in Chapter 6), but nearly the whole of the thesis will focus on CLARE's third main subsystem, the *inference* component. This is the part that manipulates TRL expressions, and which mediates between TRL and the expressions used for direct communication with the underlying database; as we have said above, the inference component also provides an important functionality utilised by the resolution subsystem. In the annotated example session with CLARE shown in the next section, the reader will be able to see more clearly how the three top-level sub-systems in CLARE interact.

1.3 An example session with CLARE

In this section, we present an example session with CLARE to illustrate some of its capabilities; we will focus on the inference sub-system. Some of the less interesting output will be edited away. Comments will be in normal font, and input from the user prefixed by `user>>`.

In the session, CLARE is acting as an interface to a database of projects and payments. The database records are based on real ones for SRI Cambridge, but for confidentiality reasons names have been replaced by fanciful variants¹, and the larger sums of money randomly reduced in size.

We omit the start-up sequence, and jump to the first sentence, a simple question. In this first example, we present the entire CLARE output; in subsequent sentences, we will mostly focus on the inference stage.

```
user>> List all payments made during 1990.
```

```
Segmentation. Morphology. Phrases. Syntactic analysis.
```

```
Semantic analysis.
```

```
6 well-sorted semantic analyses.
```

```
Preference ranking.
```

```
Complete sentence with bracketing:
```

```
"{list {all payments {made {during {1990}}}}}. "
```

¹Credit for the more amusing entries is due to Arnold Smith.

Word senses (unordered):

```
list: enumerate
payment: paying event
make: perform (rather than "present with")
```

CLARE has analyzed the sentence as far as the QLF level of representation, and prints it out with bracketing to indicate major constituents and paraphrases of the content words. It now goes on to the resolution stage.

Initial Resolution.

```
"list all payments made during 1990 (the year)!"
```

```
Entities:  you ;
           all payments made during 1990 (the year) ;
           1990 (the year) ;
```

Scoping.

CLARE has now completed the resolution stage as well (including quantifier scoping), and produced a logical form. The only non-trivial action taken has been to resolve "1990" to a year (rather than for example to a project whose project ID is 1990). The resulting LF is now passed to inference.

Assumptions used in query translation:

```
all_transactions_referred_to_are_from_SRI
```

The command could be translated into an executable form, if it was permissible to assume that all the payments are from SRI. The result, slightly simplified, is the following formula:

```
forall([Id,Amt,Payee,Date]
  impl(sql_select([Id,Amt,Payee,Date]
    [SELECT DISTINCT t_1.trn_id,
      t_1.amount,
      t_1.payee,
      t_1.cheque_date,
    FROM TRANS t_1,
    WHERE t_1.amount > '0',
```

```

AND '1-JAN-90' <= t_1.cheque_date,
AND t_1.cheque_date <= '31-DEC-90']),
execute_in_future(display([Id,Date,Payee,Amt])))

```

This states that the command will be executed if at some point in the future each tuple describing an appropriate payment is displayed.

In order to perform the translation, CLARE has made use of a number of facts about the relationship between language and database, which are stored as logical axioms in its *linguistic domain theory* for the projects and payments domain.

1. Axioms determining the relationship between the word *payment* and the records in the TRANS relationship; these say, roughly, that payments made by SRI between August 17th, 1989 and March 31st, 1991 stand in a one-to-one relationship with records in the TRANS relationship for which the `amount` field is positive.
2. Axioms defining the meaning of the verb *make* in the case when its object is a payment: these say in effect that a payment, and the making of a payment, are one and the same thing.
3. Axioms defining how the word *during* is used; roughly, that an event is “during” an interval if the time-point associated with it follows the time-point associated with the start of the interval, and precedes the one associated with its end.
4. An axiom relating the time-point associated with a payment to the `cheque_date` field in the TRANS record corresponding to the payment.
5. Axioms defining an appropriate interpretation of the verb *show* when applied to a payment: roughly, that “showing” a payment is the same as finding the payment’s associated TRANS record, and printing a tuple consisting of its `trn_id`, `cheque_date`, `payee` and `amount` fields.

CLARE executes the command, resulting in a number of tuples being printed:

Executing command:

Answer:

```

[100321,09-JAN-90,Martian Systems plc,780]
[100322,09-JAN-90,UKU,150]

```

```
[100323,09-JAN-90,PonyRides International Ltd,24]
[100324,09-JAN-90,PonyRides International Ltd,36]
[100325,09-JAN-90,B Baggins and Sons Ltd,79.09]
...
[100755,17-DEC-90,Maxwells,492.57]
[100756,17-DEC-90,Maxwells,270.96]
[100758,21-DEC-90,Point Counterpoint,6.8]
[100849,29-NOV-90,Ziek Fender,4788.73]
[100850,29-NOV-90,Reg Donaldson,2853.84]
```

Finally, a “key” is displayed: CLARE uses its knowledge about the relationships between words and database fields to find one or more common nouns to describe each field in the tuples it has printed.

Key for answer fields:

```
[A,B,C,D]
```

```
A: payment, transaction
B: date, time
C: payee
D: amount, money
```

Command executed.

```
user>> Show payments from 12/90 to 2/91.
```

```
...
```

```
"show all payments from 12/1990 (the month) to
2/1991 (the month)!"
```

We skip the initial parts of processing, except for the paraphrase summary produced by the resolution stage: this confirms that CLARE has correctly interpreted 12/90 and 2/91 as months.

Assumptions used in query translation:

```
all_transactions_referred_to_are_from_SRI
```

Once again, CLARE has had to assume in order to carry out the translation that the payments referred to are ones made by SRI. In addition to the facts from its linguistic domain theory used in translating the previous sentence, it has had to apply knowledge concerning the use of the prepositions *to* and *from*: specifically, it has used axioms which state that these prepositions refer to relations of temporal precedence when used together with arguments that can be interpreted as time points or intervals. Further axioms state that months are objects of such a type. The final translated formula is similar to the previous one.

Executing command:

Answer:

```
[100721,04-DEC-90,Mohawk Taxi Services,172.55]
[100722,04-DEC-90,Maybe's Couriers Inc,27]
[100723,04-DEC-90,World Travel,253.35]
[100724,04-DEC-90,World Travel,226]
[100725,04-DEC-90,World Travel,226]
...
[100846,21-FEB-91,Streetside Newsagent,12.22]
[100847,21-FEB-91,Mohawk Taxi Services,151.7]
[100851,01-FEB-91,Reg Donaldson,1759.13]
[100853,27-FEB-91,Zippy Express,153.74]
[100854,28-FEB-91,Camreality,45.2]
```

Key for answer fields:

...

Command executed.

The next question involves translating into a form that involves a counting operation: we suppress most of the details.

```
user>> How many payments were made during 1990?
```

```
...
```

```
"how many payments were made during 1990 (the year)?"
```

```
...
```

Assumptions used in query translation:

```
all_transactions_referred_to_are_from_SRI
```

Using axioms already described, the final result of translation is as follows:

```
forall([Count],
  impl(sql_select([Count],
    [SELECT COUNT ( DISTINCT t_1.trn_id ),
      FROM TRANS t_1,
      WHERE t_1.cheque_date <= '31-DEC-90',
      AND '1-JAN-90' <= t_1.cheque_date,
      AND t_1.amount > '0']],
    execute_in_future(display([Count]))))
```

and the result of executing it is

Answer:

426

Key for answer fields:

A

A: number

The next example, though superficially very similar, reveals a couple of novel points.

```
user>> How much did Cow's Milk receive from SRI?
...
"how much money did Cow's Milk Dairies (the payee)
  receive from SRI (the payee)?"
...
```

Assumptions used in query translation:

```
money_is_measured_in_pounds_sterling
transactions_referred_to_made_between_1989/8/17_and_1991/4/1
```

In this question, the payee is explicitly specified as SRI, but the range of payment dates is not mentioned. CLARE consequently no longer needs to print a warning that the payee is assumed to be SRI, but instead warns the user about the range for which payment records exist. The final result of translation is

```
forall([Total],
      impl(sql_select([Total],
                    [SELECT SUM ( DISTINCT t_1.amount ),
                     FROM TRANS t_1,
                     WHERE t_1.payee = 'Cow''s Milk Dairies',
                     AND t_1.amount > '0',
                     AND t_1.cheque_date < '15-JUL-93']],
          execute_in_future(display([Total]))))
```

which when executed yields the answer

Executing command:

Answer:

454.22

Key for answer fields:

A

A: quantity

Command executed.

(Warning: the response is based on possibly incomplete information).

CLARE has been told that it is allowed to assume that the payments referred to have all been made during the period for which payment records exist. The assumption has however also been flagged as one which can potentially result in incomplete answers, so the warning on the last line is issued.

In the next example, this theme is carried a stage further.

```
user>> Which companies received cheques from SRI last
        February?
        ...
        "which companies received some cheques from SRI
        (the payee) during 2/1992 (the month)?"
        ...
```

The command could not be translated without violating the following:

```
transactions_referred_to_made_between_1989/8/17_and_1991/4/1
```

CLARE was able to complete translation of the LF into executable form with the usual assumption that all the transactions referred to were made in the period for which records exist. This time, however, it is able to prove that the assumption is contradicted by the context in which it is made, since February 1992 is after March 1991. It consequently informs the user of this and does not attempt to execute the translated query.

The next few examples illustrate CLARE's handling of the well-known "Doctor on Board" problem, which arises when database fields are filled by Boolean (yes/no) values.

```
user>> Which employees have a car?
...
(resolution does nothing interesting)
...
```

Assumptions used in query translation:

```
all_cars_referred_to_are_company_cars
all_employees_referred_to_are_at_SRI
```

CLARE needs to access a new set of axioms in order to translate this query:

1. Axioms defining the usage of the expression "SRI employee": roughly, that objects which can be referred to as "SRI employees" stand in one-to-one correspondence with records in the `EMPLOYEE` relation.
2. Axioms defining the usage of the words "have" and "company car" when applied to SRI employees: roughly, that there is an object which can be referred to as a "company car", and which a given SRI employee can be referred to as "having" if and only if the `has_car` field in the corresponding `EMPLOYEE` record is filled by a `y`.
3. "Employee" may be assumed to be equivalent to "SRI employee", and "car" to "company car".

Using these facts, CLARE is able to translate the query into the executable form

```
forall([Empl],
      impl(sql_select([Empl],
                    [SELECT DISTINCT t_1.name,
                     FROM EMPLOYEE t_1,
                     WHERE t_1.has_car = 'y']),
          execute_in_future(display([Empl]))))
```

yielding the response

Answer:

```
Peter Piper
Zorba Greek
```

Key for answer fields:

A

A: employee, person

By making use of the additional fact that the `has_car` field must be filled with either a `y` or a `n`, it is also possible to deal successfully with the following query:

```
user>> Which employees do not have a car?
```

finally producing the query

```
forall([Empl],
      impl(sql_select([Empl],
                    [SELECT DISTINCT t_1.name,
                     FROM EMPLOYEE t_1,
                     WHERE t_1.has_car = 'n']),
          execute_in_future(display([Empl]))))
```

and the answer

Answer:

```
Darth Vader
Geoff Steiner
Gordon Bennett
```



```
James Cagney
Mac the Knife
Maid Marion
Naomi Brett-Adams
Phoebe Waters
R B N Fielder
Sammy Davis Junior
```

One of the things that make “Doctor on Board” sentences difficult is that the correct response is sometimes to report that the sentence cannot be translated: the next example illustrates this.

```
user>> Which car does Peter Piper have?
...
```

CLARE succeeds in partially translating the query, producing the intermediate formula

```
forall([Event,Car],
      impl(employee_has_car(Event,employee1#'Peter Piper',Car),
          execute_in_future(display([Car]))))
```

with the accompanying informative message

Assumptions used in query translation:

```
all_cars_referred_to_are_company_cars
```

It has, however, no way to translate this further into a formula that uses an SQL call to access the `EMPLOYEE` relation; the only rules available for translating the `employee_has_car` predicate require the `Car` variable to be existentially quantified. In other words, they can only apply to formulas referring to the *existence* of cars. The response is now to print an informative failure message:

Warning:

My definitions of the following predicates may be inadequate in this context: [employee_has_car/3]

Query could not be translated further:
not attempting an answer.

The same method can be used to deal with many “figurative” or “idiomatic” constructions. For example, the original logical form for the query

```
user>> Which companies have a stake in WHIZ?
...
```

is a faithful encoding of the apparent surface form of the sentence: it asks for objects called “companies”, which are such that they “have” an object called a “stake”, which is “in” WHIZ project. To answer the query, it must be translated into a form which accesses the PROJECT_SPONSOR relation: the facts used say in effect that each record in the relation corresponds to a suitable instance of a “having” and a “stake”. The final executable query and result are

```
forall([Sponsor],
      impl(sql_select([Sponsor],
                    [SELECT DISTINCT t_1.sponsor_name,
                     FROM PROJECT_SPONSOR t_1,
                     WHERE t_1.proj_name = 'WHIZ']),
          display_tuple_in_future([Sponsor])))
```

Answer:

Triton Interstellar Electronics

Key for answer fields:

A

A: company, sponsor

The next two examples illustrate how CLARE can apply knowledge about the way in which it is embedded in its real-world “discourse situation”. The first one shows an elementary capability in this respect: to be able to translate the word *current* into meaningful database concepts, CLARE must know what the date is.

```
user>> Show all current projects.
...
```

CLARE’s definition of *current* amounts to saying that an object associated with an interval is “current” if that interval includes the present moment.

For projects, the relevant interval is the one bounded by their start and end dates, which for SRI projects are listed in two fields of the PROJECT relation. After informing the user that it is assuming that all projects referred to are SRI projects, CLARE ends up with the query

```
forall([Name,AccNum],
      impl(sql_select([Name,AccNum],
                    [SELECT DISTINCT t_1.name , t_1.proj_no,
                     FROM PROJECT t_1,
                     WHERE t_1.start_date <= '15-JUL-93',
                     AND '15-JUL-93' <= t_1.end_date]),
          execute_in_future(display([Name,AccNum])))
```

which can be executed to yield the answer

Key for answer fields:

```
[SLT,3775]
[WHIZ,1392]
```

[A,B]

```
A: project
B: account
```

The next sentence is a more interesting example of CLARE's connection to its utterance situation: it illustrates how a verb like *show* can be treated by the framework as an ordinary content word.

user>> Have you shown me the SLT project?

...

The axioms for *show*, used in translating many of the previous queries, define an equivalence between the activity referred to as “showing database objects to the user” on one hand, and successfully executed calls to the `print-tuple_in_future` on the other. By providing a log of such calls (implemented as a set of clauses for the predicate `tuple_printed_in_past`), CLARE is able to use the same mechanism to answer questions about “showing” actions which have already been carried out. In the present case, CLARE performs the translation to find out what kind of action would correspond to a “showing” of the SLT project. The translated query, which is essentially a pattern to match against the query log, is

```
tuple_printed_in_past([SLT,3775])
```

Since the previous sentence has left a record of this type, the response is

Answer:

Yes

The next sentence illustrates an interesting functionality which follows as a simple consequence of the translation method: the ability to answer meta-questions about the system's knowledge.

```
user>> Do you know what the sex of each employee is?
```

```
...
```

Questions of the above type are inherently ambiguous between the reading which treats them literally as Y-N questions, and the indirect question reading which makes them politely phrased WH-questions. CLARE's strategy is to attempt to translate the "inner" or embedded question, here "*What is the sex of each employee?*". If this can be done, it informs the user and asks whether the answer to the embedded question is also required.

In the present case, the translation could be carried out successfully, giving the following result.

Assumptions used in query translation:

```
all_employees_referred_to_are_at_SRI
```

```
kw(forall([Name,Sex,SexCode]
  impl(and(sql_select([SexCode,Name],
                    [SELECT DISTINCT t_1.sex,
                      t_1.name,
                    FROM EMPLOYEE t_1]),
        sex_code(Sex,SexCode))
  display_tuple_in_future([Name,SexCode])))
```

The outer-level `kw` operator is to be read "knows what" or "knows whether", and holds if the argument has been translated into an executable form. Note also that the final result of translation includes a call to the predicate `sex_code`, which relates the internal code used to indicate sex in the `EMPLOYEE` record, to the externally meaningful values `Male` and `Female`. The result of executing the query is

Answer:

Yes

Do you want me to to tell you? user>> y.

Answer:

Darth Vader	Male
Geoff Steiner	Male
Gordon Bennett	Male
James Cagney	Male
Mac the Knife	Male
Maid Marion	Female
Naomi Brett-Adams	Female
Peter Piper	Male
Phoebe Waters	Female
R B N Fielder	Male
Sammy Davis Junior	Male
Zorba Greek	Male

Key for answer fields:

A B

A: employee, person

B: sex

Our final examples show CLARE being used to enter information into the database by constructing new records, and then describing these records back to the user. Since it is often impossible to describe a record in a single sentence, CLARE represents the content of the sentences previously processed in an intermediate form where fields so far unfilled by specified values hold existentially bound variables. Database relations are represented as predicates, with one argument place for each column in the real relation.

We first show how a PROJECT record can be constructed from a series of sentences, each of which describes the filler of one or more field.

user>> F00 is a project.

...

Assumptions used in query translation:

```
all_projects_referred_to_are_SRI_projects
```

After the first sentence has been fully translated, the intermediate form is

```
x([X,Y,Z],
  PROJECT('FOO',X,Y,Z))
```

The field indicating the project name has been filled by the atom FOO; those for the account number and start and end dates have not been specified, and thus contain only existentially bound variables.

The second sentence specifies the project's account, and fills another field:

```
user>> FOO's account is 1234.
...
"the account of FOO (the project) is account 1234."
```

Resolution paraphrasing make it clear that "*1234*" is being interpreted as "*account 1234*". After translation (we omit the details), the intermediate form is

```
x([Y,Z],
  PROJECT('FOO',1234,Y,Z))
```

The third sentence describes the fillers of both the start and end date fields at once.

```
user>> FOO started on 1/1/91 and finished yesterday.
...
"FOO (the project) started on 1/1/1991 (the day)
and finished during 14/7/1993 (the day)."
```

The final result is the completed database record

```
PROJECT('FOO',1234,1-JAN-91,14-JUL-93))
```

It is now possible to ask the system to describe the new record it has built:

```
user>> Talk about FOO.
...
"talk about FOO (the project)!"
```

CLARE translates the logical form of the request into a call to the predicate `talk_about_in_future`, analogous to `print_template_in_future`.

```
talk_about_in_future(project1#'F00')
```

CLARE describes the record by filling in predicates in a set of QLF templates which have been acquired by generalization from training examples. It avoids unnecessary repetition by checking each new sentence before printing to make sure it does not logically follow from those previously printed. It terminates when the set of descriptive sentences printed is large enough that their conjunction is logically equivalent with the record being described.

Trying to describe a database record:

```
"F00 (the project)'s end date is 14/7/1993 (the day)."  
"F00 (the project)'s number is 1234."  
"F00 (the project)'s start date is 1/1/1991 (the day)."
```

(The record was fully described)

Note that the linguistic forms used in the description differ in almost every way from those used to enter the record.

The final example illustrates CLARE's ability to generate questions. We repeat the previous example, but this time allowing CLARE to take the initiative. The first sentence is the same.

```
clare>> F00 is a project.  
...
```

After this, control is passed to CLARE:

```
clare>> .ask
```

CLARE now attempts to use its domain theory to synthesize questions that ask for the values of the unfilled fields in the record. CLARE asks the following question, and waits for the user's reply.

```
"what is F00 (the project)'s account?"
```

```
answer_please>> user>> 1234.
```

The answer is processed in the same way as any other utterance: resolution interprets in in the context of the question just asked by the system, producing the following paraphrase:

```
...  
"account 1234 is F00 (the project)'s account."
```

Translation then uses this to fill in the “account” field in the record, following which a second question is asked. Once again, processing proceeds as normally to fill in the “start date” field.

```
"what is F00 (the project)'s start date?"
```

```
answer_please>> user>> 1/1/91.
```

```
...  
"1/1/1991 (the day) is F00 (the project)'s  
start date."
```

The final question demonstrates the flexibility of the interaction strategy: CLARE has no problems in coping with an answer which is a complete clause, rather than an elliptical fragment.

```
"what is F00 (the project)'s end date?"
```

```
answer_please>> user>> F00 ended on 14/7/93.
```

```
...  
"F00 (the project) ended on 14/7/1993 (the day)."
```

When the last answer has been processed, the record is complete: the fields have the same values as before,

```
PROJECT(F00,1234,1-JAN-91,14-JUL-93)
```


Chapter 2

Interfacing as Translation_____

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, we will describe at a high level of abstraction the basic functionalities provided by CLARE that allow it to be used as a natural-language interface to a knowledge base, and in particular to a relational database. Before going any further, we will recapitulate at greater length the arguments from Section 1.1, and establish more precisely what we mean by “natural-language interfacing”. Normally, the problem is thought of as that of producing answers to natural-language questions posed to a knowledge base (cf. Perrault and Grosz, 1988). Here, we will adopt a more general view; we will regard it as the problem of formalizing the relationship between 1) the contents of a database, and 2) the way in which people use language to talk about it. Asking questions about the contents of databases is far from being the only way in which language and database can be related; thus apart from question-answering, we wish the model to support reasoning that will allow at least the following.

- Responding to natural-language commands.
- Accepting statements describing new records for the database.
- Reasoning about whether the database contains the information necessary to answer an NL question.
- Indicating whether answers to WH-questions are complete or not, and distinguishing between “No” and “Don’t know” answers to Y-N questions.

- Describing existing records in the database using NL.
- When records are incomplete, formulating NL questions to elucidate the information needed to complete them.

We want the information needed to support these functionalities to be expressed declaratively, using some sort of predicate logic; the result will be a *linguistic domain theory* for the database, a theory of how language and database are related. Languages are normally based on vague, common-sense concepts, databases on precise, formal ones. Relating these two disparate systems raises the usual problem of common-sense reasoning: interpretation of vague NL concepts in terms of precise database concepts is often only possible if additional assumptions, not implied by the explicit linguistic content, are made. These assumptions are in general defeasible. In some cases, it may be desirable to relay them back to human users. If the scheme is to be practically useful, we also want to be able to specify a methodology for constructing linguistic domain theories. For the usual software engineering reasons, they should also, as far as possible, be modular and re-usable. These, in brief, are our top-level goals. We will now make them more specific, and relate them to the concrete architecture of the Core Language Engine.

The CLE, being a general natural language system (rather than one tailored to a specific application), constructs representations of utterances that essentially mirror their linguistic content. Normally, every content word in the utterance will correspond to an occurrence of a word-sense predicate in that utterance's TRL representation. Thus for example in the CLARE Project Resource Management domain the sentence

(S1) Show all payments made to BT during 1990.

gets a TRL representation approximately of the form

$$\forall X.((\exists E \exists A. \textit{payment}'(X) \wedge \textit{make}'(E, A, X, \textit{bt}') \wedge \textit{during}'(E, 1990)) \rightarrow \exists E'. \textit{show}'(\textit{clare}', X) \wedge \textit{in_future}(E)) \quad (2.1)$$

in which the predicates *show'*, *payment'*, *make'* and *during'* correspond directly to the words *show*, *payment*, *make* and *during*. In order to carry out the command, however, CLARE needs to construct an SQL `SELECT` statement which searches for `TRANS` tuples where the `payee` field is filled by `bt`, and the `cheque_date` field by a date constrained to be between 1st January and 31st December, 1990. The gap between the two representations can lead to several possible kinds of difficulties. Firstly, the “linguistic”

and “database” representations are quite simply very different. Obvious problems arise when we frame the task in terms of converting the original TRL representation of **(S1)** into a suitable SQL query. In particular, the rules that link specific language-related representation elements to specific SQL constructs will in general need to be context-sensitive: in **(S1)**, for example, mapping the representation of the word *during* into a restriction on the `cheque_date` field will involve taking account of the way *during* is used together with the words *make* and *payment* at least.

Alongside of this there is another, more subtle problem. It may be impossible to derive an SQL query that corresponds to the original natural-language utterance; or if it is possible, the SQL may not correspond exactly to the English. There are three particularly important ways in which this can happen, which will motivate much of the following discussion:

1. A query can be *conceptually* outside the database’s domain. For example, if “payments” in **(S1)** is replaced by “phone-calls”, the interface should be able to indicate to the user that it is unable to relate the query to the information contained in the database.
2. A query can be *contingently* outside the database’s domain. Thus if “1990” is replaced by “1985”, it may be possible to derive a query; however, if the database only contains records going back to 1989, the result will be an empty list. Presenting this to the user without explanation is seriously misleading.
3. A query may need additional implicit assumptions to be translatable into database form. Asking **(S1)** in the context of our example Project Resource Management domain, it is implicitly understood that all payments referred to have been made by SRI. If the user receives no feedback describing the assumptions that have been made to perform the translation, it is again possible for misunderstandings to arise.

Keeping in mind the problems we have just discussed, we will next consider methodologies previous used to attack these aspects of the natural language interfacing task.

2.2 Related work

This section examines previous work on the problem of converting between “literal” representations of natural-language utterances and representations

in terms of database primitives. We will in particular examine three approaches, all of which have to some extent influenced the work reported here. We list them as follows, with a brief description of each:

1. Horn-clause methods: the database is encoded as a set of unit clauses, and the truth-conditions for the word-sense predicates are defined by Horn-clauses which eventually bottom out in the database.
2. Non-inferential equivalential translation: this approach, first implemented in the PHLIQUA system, is like ours in deriving database queries equivalent to the original logical forms; unlike ours, it does so without using general inferential methods.
3. “Interpretation as abduction”: this approach, most widely known from the SRI TACITUS system, allows general inference and also assumption of unproven hypotheses under suitable circumstances. Unlike our approach, it attempts however to prove implications rather than equivalences.

In the following three sub-sections, we will now describe each approach more fully. In the final sub-section, we summarize the way in which they have contributed to the scheme described in this thesis.

2.2.1 Horn-clause approaches

The currently most popular approach is perhaps to attempt to effect the connection between LF and database query by encoding the database as a set of unit clauses, and then building an interpreter for the logical forms which captures the relations between linguistic and database predicates as “rules” or “meaning postulates” written in Horn-clause form (cf. e.g. McCord 1987, Pereira and Shieber 85). The strength of the Horn-clause method is that it allows arbitrary inferences to be used; moreover, since Horn-clause deduction can be implemented as a goal-directed backward-chaining algorithm, the inference process can be made reasonably efficient. The drawback is that Horn-clauses are “if” rules; they give conditions for the LF’s being true, but (as pointed out in Konolige 1981), they lack the “only if” half that says when they are false. This means that they can normally only be used to justify positive answers to questions; there is no easy way to distinguish between “no” and “don’t know” in a pure Horn-clause theory. It is of course possible to invoke the Closed World Assumption (CWA); in this interpretation, finite failure is regarded as equivalent to negation. Unfortunately, experience also

shows that it is extremely difficult to write meaning postulates for non-trivial domains that are valid under this strict interpretation.

For these reasons, Scha (1982) concludes that Horn-clause methods are insufficient; this is regrettable, in view of their many obvious advantages. One way of viewing the present piece of work is as an attempt to redeem the Horn-clause approach from Scha's objections.

2.2.2 Non-inferential equivalential translation

The second line of attack we will consider could be called "non-inferential equivalential translation": the basic idea is to derive a query which is logically equivalent with the original logical form, but to do so without using general inferential methods, on the grounds that these cannot be implemented in a sufficiently efficient way. The best-known systems to embody variants of this approach are PHLIQA (Bronnenberg et al 1980) and the systems developed at BBN during the mid-80's (Stallard 1986) where the method is referred to as 'recursive terminological simplification'. In both of these there is restricted inference amounting to a form of type-checking. The advantage of equivalential translation methods in general is that they justify both positive and negative answers. However, the lack of general inference results in a loss of expressiveness which can most obviously be illustrated by variants of the so-called "Doctor on Board" problems (Perrault and Grosz, 1986) caused by the presence of existential quantifiers. We will return to this point in section 3.7.

We should mention at this point a little-known paper of Konolige from 1981, which also formulates the problem in terms of equivalence between logical form and database query; particularly with regard to treatment of proper names we have borrowed from Konolige's idea to some extent. The paper, however, is written entirely at the level of denotation, and makes no mention of inference methods suitable for concretely solving the problem as posed.

2.2.3 "Interpretation as abduction"

The third strand of research we will examine attacks a problem ignored by both of the first two: as already pointed out, it is not in general possible to justify a sound inferential connection between logical form and database without making additional unproven assumptions, which later information may potentially invalidate. The most obvious way to extend an inferential

framework to account for this objection is to allow leaf-nodes in proofs to include not only axioms from the background theory but also formulas which it can be regarded as reasonable to assume; in order to prevent explosion of the search-space, it is normally necessary to place constraints on the formulas which can potentially be assumed. The best-known variant of this idea is that pioneered by Hobbs and his colleagues under the name of “Interpretation as Abduction” (Hobbs et al 1988) and embodied in the SRI TACTITUS system. (Other similar work is that of Charniak and Goldman (1988)). The basic mode of operation of TACTITUS is to attempt interpretation of the logical form by attempting to construct a proof of its correctness using the background theory and the “cheapest” possible set of additional assumptions; for the idea to make sense, a cost function is defined on the space of logical formulas which makes intuitively plausible formulas cheaper than intuitively implausible ones. We will make use of this general idea, though in a somewhat different context, since we are dealing with equivalence rather than implication.

2.2.4 Relationship of AET to earlier work

Having briefly described what we view as the main precursors of our work, we now indicate more exactly how we consider that it combines and improves on them. AET can be viewed as a version of the equivalential translation framework used in PHLIQUA and Konolige’s paper, extended to be able to employ general inference methods of the kind used in Horn-clause systems to justify equivalence between LF and database form. This depends on coding the relationship between LF and database forms not as Horn-clauses but as “definitional equivalences”, conditional if-and-only-if rules of a particular form. Our approach retains computational tractability by limiting the way in which the equivalences can take part in deductions, roughly speaking by only using them to perform directed “translation” of predicates. However we still permit nontrivial goal-directed domain reasoning in justifying query derivation, allowing, for example, the translation of an LF conjunct to be influenced by any other LF conjuncts, in contrast to the basically local translation in PHLIQA. This approach deals with the first two points described at the beginning of the chapter without recourse to the CWA, and simultaneously allows a clean integration of a version of the “abductive” reasoning used in TACTITUS. As we shall see, it also makes it possible to use substantially the same framework to achieve interfacing functionalities other than question-answering. The main technical problems to be solved are caused by

the fact that the left-hand sides of the equivalences are generally not atomic.

The rest of this chapter is structured as follows. Section 2.3 begins by laying out the basic ontology underlying linguistic domain theories of the types we will consider. After this, Section 2.4 describes the approximate formal appearance of these theories, and presents the key technical concept of *effective translation*. The central section is 2.5, where we give an overview of the interface system, concentrating on the denotational and functional aspects; taking them one at a time, we show how the interface functionalities listed at the beginning of Section 2.1 can be formalized as tasks of the form “for some formula P , find a formula P' of a specified type, such that P and P' are equivalent given the linguistic domain theory and some permitted assumptions.” We will refer to tasks of this kind as “performing abductive equivalential translation (AET) on P ”. Finally section 2.6 considers the connection between AET and the Closed World Assumption.

2.3 Ontological issues

We start by defining the basic ontology underlying the linguistic domain theory; the ideas are closely related to those proposed in (Konolige 1981). We assume as usual that there is a set of objects, \mathbf{O} , and a set of relations obtaining between them, \mathbf{R} . \mathbf{O} will contain all the things that the predicates in logical forms range over — the things, like suppliers, parts, projects, payments, deliverables, etc. that natural language refers to. This includes events. Similarly, \mathbf{R} will contain all the relations obtaining between elements of \mathbf{O} that we will wish to refer to.

There will be no particular need in what follows to be much more specific about exactly what can and cannot belong to \mathbf{O} and \mathbf{R} , though this is obviously not a trivial matter. We will however be interested in picking out certain distinguished subsets of these two sets which have direct relevance to database interfacing. We take the position that databases are also objects in the world, consisting of finite collections of rows of marks; this is not a common viewpoint at the moment, but we think it corresponds well to the naive view of “what a database is”. We consequently assume the existence of a subset \mathbf{O}_{db} of \mathbf{O} consisting of *database objects*, which will be numbers, strings, date representations, and other “marks” that can be found filling fields in database records. Similarly, we will assume the existence of a subset \mathbf{R}_{db} of \mathbf{R} , which will be the *database relations*. Database relations are defined by the database’s internal structure in terms of tuples: a database

relation D holds of a list of arguments Arg_i iff there is a tuple of type D in the database whose fields are filled by the Arg_i . Since little can be done with database objects without recourse to elementary arithmetic and an ability to display results, we assume two more distinguished subsets of \mathbf{R} . **Arith** will be the relevant arithmetic relations (like “being numerically less than”) that can obtain between members of \mathbf{O}_{db} . **Exec** will be a primitive set of relations which the interface can cause to hold by performing actions. A typical relation in **Exec** would be the one that holds between a database-object, and a time and place at which the interface displayed it.

In what follows, the distinction between database objects, the non-database objects they name, and the terms in the linguistic domain theory that refer to both of them will be central. Thus for example we distinguish between

- a transaction (a non-database object, an event in the exterior world)
- the term referring to the transaction in the linguistic domain theory
- the database object (a number) that is the transaction’s ID
- the term in the theory referring to the database object.

Although these distinctions may not immediately seem necessary, they are in fact motivated by typical properties of real databases. Database objects are often codes or non-unique names, that cannot simply be treated as names in a first-order theory; for example, the same number, occurring in different fields in a relation, can be related to distinct real-world entities, or (if used as a code value), to a property of an entity.

The linguistic domain theory relates database objects with real-world objects, allowing us to draw conclusions about the properties of the real-world objects by examining the database records. Less obviously, it can also allow us to draw conclusions about properties of real-world objects from the *lack* of records of a particular type in the database. This amounts to a principled generalization of the “closed world assumption”, and is described further in section 2.6. The linguistic domain theory can also partially model the interaction between system and user, by defining a relation between predicates holding in the “utterance situation” (the real-world situation in which the user is interacting with the interface), and the executable relations. For example there are real-world predicates which correspond to verbs like “show” and “list”, which are commonly used in commands (e.g. “Show me all payments over £500”); these are related by the linguistic domain theory

to the primitive executable relation of displaying characters on the screen. Treating the utterance situation uniformly as part of the domain adds both conceptual elegance and a real increase in the interface's scope; so it is for instance possible to deal with queries like "Which of the payments that you showed me in answer 12 were made this year?" in a principled way.

2.4 LDTs and effective translations

At a pre-theoretical level, our characterization of the NL interfacing functionalities is actually a very simple one: it is only the technical details that will prove complex. The key notion is that of "translation". Given an interfacing task, described in one vocabulary, we wish to *translate* it into an equivalent task, described in another vocabulary. Thus for example the "question-answering" task is of the form "produce an answer to the question whose logical form is P "; we wish to translate this into an equivalent task of the form "execute the database query P' , and print the results in a readable way". Here, the original task is expressed using predicates corresponding to word-senses; the problem is to translate it into a task expressed using predicates corresponding to database relations, arithmetical operations and primitive executable relations. What we want to do now is to express these ideas in formal terms, so that we can then realize them as an inference problem. In particular, we want to introduce linguistic domain theories so that translation can be regarded as logical equivalence with respect to a theory. We will start by sketching the appearance of a linguistic domain theory, and defining the formal concept of *effective translation*. Throughout most of the thesis, we will regard it as sufficient to allow the target representation (the result of performing the translation) to be a predicate calculus expression that treats database relations as predicates; in appendix C, we briefly review the module that performs the final conversion into executable SQL queries.

2.4.1 Basic form of linguistic domain theories

Since we are primarily interested in establishing equivalences (rather than implications), it makes sense to write the LDT as far as possible using formulas which themselves are equivalences. For various reasons, it turns out that it is convenient to allow these equivalences to be conditional; to limit computational complexity, we will only allow their left- and right-hand sides to be existentially quantified conjunctions of atomic formulas. Thus in summary, the greater part of an LDT will be composed of formulas of the general

appearance

$$\forall \vec{x}. (Left \equiv Right) \leftarrow Conds$$

where *Left*, *Right* and *Conds* are existentially quantified conjunctions. Linguistic domain theories typically also contain Horn-clause axioms and declarations of functional relationships between arguments of predicates (these are described in detail in section 3.6.2).

It is permitted during inference to assume goals abductively, at a cost depending both on the goal and the context in which the assumption is made. We do not attempt to define a formal semantics for the notion of abductively justified inference: we merely assume that costs are assigned according to some scheme that generally makes low-cost proofs intuitively more appealing than high-cost ones. Since abductive assumptions are in any event made explicit to the user of the system, we view the costs essentially as heuristics to control the order in which the space of possible proofs is searched. The range of goals that may be abductively assumed is controlled by declarations of the form “goal *G* may be abductively assumed with cost *C* and justification *J* in a context where *Conds* can be proved to hold”. Here, *G* is an atomic formula, *C* a number and *Conds* an arbitrary formula; *J*, the “justification”, is a tag that can be used to identify the assumption to the user. An assumption can be identified as inconsistent if a proof of the negation of the assumed goal can be found in the context in which it was assumed (cf Section 3.5). To the extent that this is possible (cf. Section 5.1.3), CLARE thus has a limited ability to handle normal defaults.

Experimentation with CLARE seems to indicate that one can profitably divide abductive assumptions into at least three distinct types; we illustrate using the example PRM domain, which covers a project and payment database for SRI Cambridge. In the PRM domain, it is reasonable to assume (lacking evidence to the contrary) that “project” is equivalent with “project at SRI Cambridge”. The content of assumptions of this kind is that the speaker means something more specific than what was actually said. We consequently refer to them as “specializations”. In contrast, it is also reasonable to assume that “payment” means “SRI payment made during the period covered by database records”. In this case, however, it seems intuitively less clear that the speaker intended to use the word in the more restricted sense, and it is more appropriate to assume that the database is limited in a way which the speaker may not be fully aware of. We will call assumptions of this kind “limitations”. Finally, it may sometimes be appropriate to make assumptions that can actually be incorrect: for example,

we assume that completion dates for future deliverables have been correctly estimated. We call these assumptions “approximations”. Distinguishing between different kinds of assumption will become important later on, when we consider issues regarding the completeness of answers to questions.

2.4.2 Effective translation

We now introduce the key formal definition. We write Γ to symbolize a linguistic domain theory, and let F_{source} be an arbitrary formula; then we define F_{target} to be an *effective translation* of F_{source} iff there exists a set of abductive assumptions A such that

$$\Gamma \cup A \Rightarrow (F_{source} \equiv F_{target}) \quad (2.2)$$

and

- Each assumption in A is acceptable in the context in which it is made.
- There is a finite proof procedure for determining the truth of F_{target} .

The question of whether or not a finite proof procedure exists for a formula, given a theory, is of course undecidable in general; CLARE only attempts to solve a simple subcase of this problem.

The first criterion that must be met is that all predicates in F_{target} must be *potentially finite*: by this, we mean that they should have the property that for at least some combinations of instantiation of their arguments there are only finitely many instantiations of the remaining arguments that make them true, and that these new instantiations can be found within bounded time. Thus the minimum requirement is that if all the arguments are ground it is possible to determine the truth of the relation within bounded time. There are in practice three kinds of potentially finite predicates in a linguistic domain theory: database predicates, arithmetic relation predicates, and primitive executable predicates. We examine each of these in turn:

Database predicates These are predicates directly corresponding to the database relations \mathbf{R}_{db} ; a database predicate holds of its arguments iff the database relation has a row with those arguments. The finiteness of database predicates follows from the finiteness of the corresponding database relations. Database predicates are consequently always finite, irrespective of their instantiation.

Arithmetic relation predicates These correspond to the arithmetic relations in **Arith**, such as addition, subtraction, and inequality. In general, arithmetic relation predicates are only finite if all or all but one of their arguments are instantiated. For example, if X is instantiated to a given number, there is an infinite set of values for Y such that $X < Y$ holds. If both X and Y are fixed, however, the truth or falsity of $X < Y$ can in practice be determined in bounded time. Similarly, if X is specified, then there is an infinite set of values for Y and Z such that $X + Y = Z$. If Y is also specified, however, there is only one such Z , which can again in practice be found in bounded time.

Primitive executable predicates In order to be able to reason about CLARE's ability to perform actions like displaying of objects, there is a set of predicates which correspond to the primitive executable relations **Exec**. We assume that these predicates are finite for *instantiated* actions. Thus for example we will assume that it is possible within a bounded time to ensure that any specified database object is displayed.

Since the finiteness of some predicates depends on their instantiation, the existence of a finite proof procedure generally depends on being able to find an evaluation order which ensures that conditionally finite predicates are sufficiently instantiated by the time they are queried; CLARE can search for suitable evaluation orders by permuting the order of evaluation of conjunctions. For example, if $TRANS/3$ is a database predicate then the strategy “find an X such that $X > 100$, then find values of Y such that $TRANS(john, X, Y)$ ” is not a finite strategy; however, reversing the order to make the strategy “find X and Y such that $TRANS(john, X, Y)$, then determine whether $X > 100$ holds” is finite. The search is carried out using a simple abstract interpretation method, which uses meta-information about finiteness of predicates with respect to different instantiation patterns to mimic the behaviour of the real execution module. This part of the system is described further in section 5.3.

2.5 Formalizing interfacing functionalities

2.5.1 Yes/No questions

We are now in a position to describe formally the various interfacing functionalities. The simplest one to begin with is that of answering a Y-N ques-

2.5. FORMALIZING INTERFACING FUNCTIONALITIES 35

tion. The formal statement of the problem is as follows. We are given a formula, F_{ling} , which is the logical form of a Y-N question to be answered. We wish to find a formula F_{eval} and a set of permissible assumptions A , such that F_{eval} is an effective translation of F_{ling} modulo A in the sense defined in Section 2.4.2. There are several possibilities.

- No such F_{eval} can be found: the answer is **Don't know**.
- A is empty and F_{eval} can be proved: the answer is **Yes**.
- A is empty and F_{eval} cannot be proved: the answer is **No**.
- A is non-empty, but some member α of A is such that the negation of α can be proved: the answer is **Cannot answer question, because this violates the assumption α** .
- A is non-empty and F_{eval} can be proved: the answer is **Yes, conditional on the validity of the assumptions**.
- A is non-empty and F_{eval} cannot be proved: the answer is **No, conditional on the validity of the assumptions**.

If assumptions have been made, the user can be told what they were. An example of each case, taken from the PRM domain, follows.

- The question is *Does Peter have a dog?*. There is no effective translation of the logical representation of this question, so the answer is **Don't know**.
- The question is *Is Peter an employee at BT?*. There is an effective translation of the logical representation of this question, but it assumes that Peter is an employee at SRI, which contradicts the requirement that he is also an employee at BT. So the answer is **Don't know, because this violates the assumption that all employees referred to are at SRI**.
- The question is *Does Peter have a car?*. Peter is an employee, and there is an effective translation to a query that accesses the **EMPLOYEE** relation. The translated query can be proved, so the answer is **Yes**.
- The question is *Does Gordon have a car?*. This is the same as the previous case, except that Gordon does not have a car according to the database, and the effective translation cannot thus be proved. The answer is **No**.

- The question is *Has Peter booked less than 200 hours to CLARE?* Peter is an employee, and CLARE is a project, so there is an effective translation to a query that accesses the `TIMESHEET` relation under the assumption that the time referred to was booked during the period for which records were kept. The database reveals that only 165 hours were booked during this period, so the answer is **Yes, conditional on the validity of the assumptions.**
- The question is *Has Peter booked less than 100 hours to CLARE?* The assumption used when translating is the same as in the last example, and the answer is **No, conditional on the validity of the assumptions.**

2.5.2 Commands and WH-questions

The functionality of responding to a natural language command can be captured by a fairly simple extension of the previous definition. We will assume that the logical form representation of a command is a formula which is true if the command will be carried out at some future time. Once again, we let F_{ling} be the logical form of the command, and the task is to find an effective translation F_{eval} modulo a set of assumptions A . F_{eval} will usually be a formula that contains primitive evaluable predicates.

Answering WH-questions can be treated as a special case of responding to commands, if we assume that the logical form of a WH-question is of the type $\lambda x.Q(x)$, where $Q(x)$ holds iff x is an object satisfying the question. Thus for example the logical form for *Which payments in June were over £1000?* will be roughly

$$\lambda x.payment'(x) \wedge in'(x, june') \wedge over'(x, 1000) \quad (2.3)$$

The *asking* of a WH-question can be regarded as a command to display all the objects that would be answers to it. (The issues involved are discussed at greater length in Appendix A; cf. also (Rayner and Janson 1987)). So if $\lambda x.Q_{ling}(x)$ is the logical form of the question and $displayed_in_future(x)$ is a predicate that holds if x is displayed at some future time, then the question can be regarded as equivalent with a command whose logical form is

$$\forall x.Q(x) \rightarrow \exists t.displayed_in_future(x)$$

The different cases that can arise in responding to a command or WH-question are fairly similar to those for responding to Y-N questions. We summarize, this time without examples:

2.5. FORMALIZING INTERFACING FUNCTIONALITIES 37

- No such F_{eval} can be found: the answer is **Don't know how to respond**.
- A is non-empty, but some member α of A is such that the negation of α can be proved: the answer is **Cannot respond, because this violates the assumption α** .
- A is empty, or only contains “specialization” assumptions, and F_{eval} can be proved: the response is to perform all the necessary actions (e.g. displaying objects) and inform the user that the response is complete.
- A is empty, or only contains “specialization” assumptions, and F_{eval} cannot be proved: the response is to inform the user that it is impossible to carry out the command. (This cannot occur with questions).
- A contains “limitation” or “approximation” assumptions, and F_{eval} can be proved: the response is to perform all the necessary actions and inform the user that the completeness and/or accuracy of the answer depends on the assumptions.
- A contains “limitation” or “approximation” assumptions, and F_{eval} cannot be proved: the response is to inform the user that it is impossible to carry out the command if the assumptions are correct.

A few words are in order to explain why different types of assumption can give rise to different responses. The intuitive justification is that “specialization” assumptions are ones where the reasonable default is to trust that the user intended them to be assumed; “limitation” and “approximation” assumptions are ones where this default is not clearly appropriate. The lack of a clear dividing line between the various types of assumptions mirrors the lack of clear criteria that can be used to decide when a set of answers to a WH-question can be regarded as potentially “incomplete”; the incompleteness is relative to the user’s intent, which can only be guessed at.

A more advanced treatment might examine the previous discourse when deciding whether or not to warn the user about potential incompleteness of information. For example, a typical “limitation” assumption is that all events of a certain type (e.g. transactions) that are referred to are within the period for which records are available. The first time this point becomes relevant to translating a query, it is reasonable to inform the user, specifying the exact period in question and warning that the answer is based on potentially incomplete information. On subsequent occasions, it may be more

helpful to assume that the user is already aware of the assumption and has taken it into account when phrasing her question.

2.5.3 Statements describing new information

At a pre-theoretical level, the intended behaviour when responding to a declarative statement is to attempt to interpret it as a description of a new tuple (or set of tuples) that are to be added to the database. However, one of the immediate problems that arises when formalizing this simple picture is that more than one sentence is normally required to describe a tuple fully; the natural unit for describing a tuple is perhaps the paragraph. This clashes to some extent with the sentence-oriented processing strategy in the rest of CLARE. The compromise position taken is to treat each sentence as a component in a tuple description that is being built up successively, as part of a small discourse. When responding to a given declarative sentence S , we will thus assume that a logical formula Λ_{in} is available, which summarizes the content of the sentences previously processed in the current tuple-description discourse. We will call Λ_{in} the *logical discourse context*. If processing of S does not result in a full tuple description being produced, a new formula Λ_{out} may be produced which summarizes the content of the current discourse after processing of S (cf also Section 3.6.3). We will also need a criterion for what it means for a formula to be a tuple description: we will say that F is a tuple description iff F is a predication whose predicate symbol refers to a database relation, and all of whose arguments are terms referring to database objects.

This brief discussion should serve to motivate the following breakdown into cases. The starting point is a declarative sentence with logical form F_{ling} , and the current contents of the logical discourse context Λ_{in} . We now attempt to find A , Δ and Λ' such that $\Delta \wedge \Lambda'$ is an equivalential translation of $F_{ling} \wedge \Lambda_{in}$ modulo A , and Δ is a conjunction of tuple descriptions. The cases are:

- $F_{ling} \wedge \Lambda_{in}$ can be proved false. The user is informed, and no other action is taken.
- $F_{ling} \wedge \Lambda_{in}$ cannot be proved false, but no such Δ and Λ' can be found: the user is informed that it was so far impossible to construct any tuple, and the logical discourse context is updated to be $F_{ling} \wedge \Lambda_{in}$.
- A suitable Δ and Λ' can be found; the tuples described by the Δ are added to the database, the user is informed that tuples have been

2.5. FORMALIZING INTERFACING FUNCTIONALITIES 39

constructed using the assumptions A , and the logical discourse context is updated to be Λ' .

The first case can normally only arise when function information can be used in effect to show that two distinct records would have the same primary key (cf Section 3.6.2 and the beginning of Section 4.2).

It is arguable that in the second case the user should be informed if it is impossible to find a translation F_{db} of $F_{ling} \wedge \Lambda_{in}$ all of whose predicates are potentially finite, on the grounds that the statements already received during the present discourse cannot be translated. The objection is that further statements may resolve the problem and allow translation to database form to occur. To take an example from the PRM domain, the first sentence in the discourse could be *Clara is a woman*; this cannot be translated into database predicates, since information about sex occurs in two distinct relations, EMPLOYEE and PAYEE. If, however, the second sentence is *Clara is an employee*, the conjunction of the two sentences can be translated. There are other conceivable reasons why the logical discourse context at an intermediate point in the discourse may be untranslatable, for instance that a statement is being made only to provide information that will allow a subsequent statement to be translated. It is in general clear that a tight characterization of the functionality of responding to declarative sentences is not straightforward. Although the user's ultimate goal can be assumed to be that of describing a tuple, there are many indirect ways in which this can be achieved, and it can be difficult to distinguish cases where communication has broken down from cases where the user's intended strategy for describing the tuple is not yet apparent.

2.5.4 Meta-questions

Both Y-N and WH questions can occur embedded in meta-questions of the form "Do you know Q ?", e.g. "Do you know how many people work on CLARE?", "Do you know who received the largest payment?", "Do you know whether there were any payments on 1/11/91?". The strategies used to respond to Y-N and WH-questions can be extended in a straightforward way to cover these cases; the intuitive idea is that the system can be said to "know Q " if it would be able to produce a complete answer to Q according to the criteria described in Sections 2.5.1 and 2.5.2. There is an important point here on which we are implicitly relying: we assume that "knowing what X is" is in the context of database-question-answering equivalent with "knowing

how to display X". In general, there are many good reasons why "knowing what X is" should be interpreted in a context where the information will be put to a specific use; in a more advanced treatment of meta-questions, it might be necessary to reason about possible ways in which the information would be used. For example, "knowing where X lives" could mean any of "knowing how to get to X's house by car", "knowing how to get to X's house on foot", "knowing how to give instructions for reaching X's house" or "knowing how to display X's postal address". It is a matter of everyday experience that these conditions need not coincide.

With the caveats just mentioned, the problem of dealing with meta-questions is simple. If F_{ling} is the logical form of Q , it follows from the discussion in 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 that a sufficient criterion for producing an affirmative answer to "Do you know Q ?" is that there is an effective translation F_{eval} of F_{ling} modulo a set of assumptions A , where A contains only "specialization" assumptions. There are also several ways in which inability to meet this criterion can be meaningful to a user. If translation can only be carried out by assuming a "limitation" or "approximation" assumption, or by making an assumption whose negation is implied by its context, then the offending assumption normally constitutes a good explanation of "why the system doesn't know".

The cases for different types of response are simple variants of those for normal questions. So for example if database records only extend back to 17/8/88 it may only be possible to translate the predicate corresponding to the word "payment" into an expression involving the transaction relation if it is assumed that the payment was made after 17/8/88. In this case the meta-question "Do you know whether there were any payments on 5/5/86?" will receive the answer **No, because this violates the assumption that all payments referred to were made after 17/8/88.**

2.5.5 Generating statements and questions

Finally, we consider the functionalities of generating statements and questions. If S_{db} is a database formula that we wish to realize in language, the problem is to find a set of NL statements S_i ($i = 1..n$) with logical forms L_i , and an acceptable set of assumptions A such that

$$\Gamma \cup A \Rightarrow (\bigwedge L_i \equiv S_{db})$$

This is fairly obvious; more interestingly, a very similar treatment works for questions. For example, if Q_{db} is a formula composed of database predicates,

and containing a free variable x , then $\lambda x.Q_{db}$ can reasonably be thought of as an abstract representation of the WH-question “What x satisfies Q_{db} ?”. Assuming as before that the logical form for a WH-question is a lambda-abstraction, the problem of finding a linguistic realization of $\lambda x.Q_{db}$ can be formalized as that of finding a single natural-language question Q with logical form $\lambda x.Q_{ling}(x)$, and an acceptable set of assumptions A such that

$$\Gamma \cup A \Rightarrow \forall x.(Q_{ling}(x) \equiv Q_{db}(x))$$

The issues involved are discussed at greater length in chapter 6.

2.6 The Closed World Assumption

This section will briefly consider the question of how the Closed World Assumption fits into the picture we have constructed. To make the discussion concrete, we will initially focus on the case of Y-N questions.

We start with a logical form, F_{ling} , for which we assume that we can find an effective translation F_{eval} , and assume further that it turns out that there is no proof of F_{eval} . Inability to prove F_{eval} will imply that it is false, since we have assumed the existence of a finite proof procedure; this in turn implies (if the abductive assumptions are granted) that F_{ling} is false, since F_{eval} and F_{ling} are equivalent. With regard to the CWA, the interesting thing to consider is the part played by the database predicates that occur in F_{eval} . Knowledge of the database predicates is complete, since they have “trivial” semantics, only referring to the existence of database tuples and not directly to the rest of the world; they are closed by construction and the Closed World Assumption may safely be used on them. However, the predicates in F_{ling} are in general not closed. We will now examine in more detail how the connection between the “closed” predicates in F_{eval} and the “open” predicates in F_{ling} is defined.

In practice, the key step in proving the equivalence between F_{ling} and F_{eval} is usually of the following form. There are two predicates $P(x, y)$ and $P_{rec}(n_x, n_y)$, whose intended semantics are, respectively, “ x and y stand in relationship P ” and “It is recorded in the database that objects named n_x and n_y stand in relationship P ”. Thus P_{rec} is closed, but P isn’t. The two predicates are related by a domain axiom of the form

$$\begin{aligned} C(y) \rightarrow (P(x, y) \equiv \exists n_x, n_y. name_1(x, n_x) \\ \wedge name_2(y, n_y) \\ \wedge P_{rec}(n_x, n_y)) \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Here, each $name_i(\alpha, n_\alpha)$ ($i = 1, 2$) is a predicate that relates an object α and the identifier n_α assigned to it according to naming convention i . (As pointed out above in section 2.3, it is important to take account of the fact that the same identifier can name different objects in different contexts). $C(y)$ defines a sufficient condition for $P(x, y)$ to have been recorded; for example, y might be a date and $C(y)$ could say that y is within the period for which records have been kept.

Now suppose that $P(x, y)$ occurs in F_{ling} conjoined with some expression $D(y)$, where $D(y)$ can be proved to imply $C(y)$. Then (2.4) can be invoked to justify replacing $P(x, y)$ in F_{ling} with $\exists n_x, n_y. name_1(x, n_x) \wedge name_2(y, n_y) \wedge P_{rec}(n_x, n_y)$ while maintaining equivalence. (This will be justified in detail in Section 3.2.1). The net effect is that the CWA with regard to the predicate P has been made conditional on the its context of use. Equivalences of type (2.4) are discussed further in section 4.5.

The above analysis of how the CWA relates to Y-N question can be extended fairly simply to WH-questions as well. We will in fact distinguish between two types of WH-question: “what” or “which” questions, which involve finding objects, and “how many” or “how much” questions, which involve counting or summing. In the first case, our treatment, as already indicated, involves recasting the question in a form where it is a command to display objects from the database to the user. Again, it will normally be the case that the predicates used in the original query are open: however, the effective translation will only refer to a closed world in which names are transferred from the database to the display screen.

With regard to “how many” questions, the original question will in general refer to counting objects in the exterior world which satisfy some property P . Here, construction of an effective translation will rely on axioms in the domain theory that place the counted objects in one-to-one correspondence with database objects P' . One way of looking at this is that these axioms constitute a local unique name axiom, which encodes the constraint that names are unique *over the set of objects being counted*. Once the problem is reduced to counting database objects, it is again possible to solve it by examining the actual database. The point is that the intended model for the theory is finite and available for inspection, so it is feasible to find and count the extension of the property P' – an option not available for a general theory.

Chapter 3

AET

3.1 Introduction

We will now consider the actual computational mechanisms used to effect the task of carrying out abductive equivalential translation. The guiding example we will have in mind here is that provided by logic programming: one of the things that has made Prolog a success is the clear procedural model that can be associated with a Horn-clause program. This chapter will attempt to do the same thing for a slightly richer kind of theory; it describes a kind of logic-programming with equivalences.

More exactly, recall that the main body of the declarative knowledge used is coded as a set of conditional equivalences, formulas of the type¹

$$Conds \rightarrow ((\exists \vec{x}. P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge P_3 \dots) \equiv P') \quad (3.1)$$

The attractive aspect of this type of equivalence stems from the fact that it can be given a sensible interpretation in terms of the procedural notion of “translation”. The intuitive idea is that (3.1) can be read as “ P_1 can be expanded to P' if it occurs in an environment where $P_2 \wedge P_3 \dots \wedge Conds$ can be inferred”. The “environment” is provided by the conjuncts occurring together with P_1 in the original logical form, other meaning postulates, and the contents of the database; we will call it the *conjunctive context*. The result is a framework in which arbitrary domain inference can play a direct role in justifying the validity of the translation of an LF into a particular database query.

¹Quantification over the \vec{x} on the left-hand side will often in practice be vacuous. In this and other formulas, we assume implicit universal quantification over free variables.

The chapter is structured as follows. Section 3.2 defines the basic formalization of AET in terms of *translation schemas*, formulas that allow translation of a complex formula to be defined in terms of translation of its components. Initially, higher order-order constructs and abductive proofs are ignored; section 3.3 gives a simple illustrative example. After this, Section 3.4 then extends the framework to cover translation of higher-order formulas, and Section 3.5 describes how translation can be made abductive. Section 3.6 describes the simplification module. Section 3.7 considers the way in which AET's handling of existential quantification allows it to deal successfully with the "Doctor on Board" problem, the standard test-case in the literature. The discussion up to this point has been at an abstract level; Section 3.8 now sketches the implementation of the AET interpreter in Prolog. Finally, Section 3.9 describes a simple AET debugger, based on the Prolog debugger.

Remark on notation. This chapter describes the central ideas of AET at an abstract and fairly implementation-independent level, and to emphasize this we will usually present logical formulas in standard notation. When referring to examples from the implemented system, however, it will sometimes be convenient to employ the concrete Prolog syntax used by CLARE, writing `and(P,Q)` instead of $P \wedge Q$, `exists(X,P)` instead of $\exists X.P$, and so on. In the next chapter, where we refer constantly to examples from the system, we will switch almost exclusively to the concrete syntax. We hope that this lack of consistency will not cause the reader undue difficulties.

3.2 Formalization of AET

This section describes the formal basis for AET; it shows how conditional equivalences of type (3.1) can be used to perform recursive goal-directed translation of formulas according to a simple and well-defined scheme. We begin with a manoeuvre that will turn out to result in a great simplification of the technical problems. Instead of allowing arbitrary formulas of type (3.1), we constrain them by demanding that one of the following two conditions holds:

1. The left-hand side is a conjunction of atomic formulas.
2. The left-hand side is an existentially quantified atomic formula, and the conditions are trivial.

The two types of permitted formulas are illustrated in (3.2) and (3.3):

$$Conds \rightarrow ((P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge P_3 \dots) \equiv P') \quad (3.2)$$

$$\exists \vec{x}.(P_1) \equiv P' \quad (3.3)$$

We will refer to equivalences of type (3.2) as *universal* equivalences, and those of type (3.3) as *existential* equivalences. Allowing only these types of equivalence actually entails no loss of generality, since an expression of the form

$$Conds \rightarrow ((\exists \vec{x}.P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge P_3 \dots) \equiv P') \quad (3.4)$$

can be rewritten, introducing a new predicate P_{123} , as the two equivalences

$$\forall \vec{x}.(Conds \rightarrow ((P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge P_3 \dots) \equiv P_{123}(\vec{x}))) \quad (3.5)$$

of type (3.2), and

$$(\exists \vec{x}.P_{123}) \equiv P' \quad (3.6)$$

of type (3.3). The considerations relevant to use of universal and existential equivalences turn out to be quite different in nature. We will consequently discuss them separately, starting with the universal ones.

3.2.1 “Universal” equivalences and translation schemas

We first present the basic motivating example, which we will quickly generalize; we will show how a “universal” equivalence – an equivalence of type (3.2) – can be used to translate a conjunction $P \wedge R$ in a way that allows R naturally to be part of the context in which P is translated. Suppose then that we are given our equivalence

$$Conds \rightarrow (P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge P_3 \dots) \equiv P' \quad (3.7)$$

and that P is a ground goal that unifies with P_1 with most general unifier θ , i.e. $\theta(P_1) = P$. Suppose also that R implies $\theta(P_2 \wedge P_3 \dots \wedge Conds)$. Then we claim that

$$R \wedge P \equiv R \wedge \theta(P') \quad (3.8)$$

The proof is simple. In the \Leftarrow direction, we have that R implies $\theta(Conds)$ by hypothesis. Also, (3.7) means that $\theta(P' \wedge Conds)$ implies $\theta(P_1)$, which by hypothesis is equal to P , from 3.2. Hence $R \wedge \theta(P')$ implies P and thus $R \wedge P$.

In the \Rightarrow direction we have by hypothesis that $P = \theta(P_1)$ and R implies $\theta(P_2 \wedge P_3 \dots \wedge Conds)$. Hence $R \wedge P$ implies $\theta(P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge P_3 \dots \wedge Conds)$ which by (3.7) implies $\theta(P')$. Hence $R \wedge P$ implies $R \wedge \theta(P')$. We can summarize (3.8), together with its associated conditions, as the inference rule

$$\begin{aligned} & (Conds \rightarrow (P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge P_3 \dots) \equiv P') \wedge \\ & R \rightarrow \theta(P_2 \wedge P_3 \dots \wedge Conds) \\ \Rightarrow & R \wedge \theta(P_1) \equiv R \wedge \theta(P') \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

The next step is to generalize (3.9) by making explicit the concept of the “conjunctive context”. We do this by splitting it into two inference rules, (3.10) and (3.11), as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & (Conds \rightarrow (P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge P_3 \dots) \equiv P') \wedge \\ & Context \rightarrow \theta(P_2 \wedge P_3 \dots \wedge Conds) \\ \Rightarrow & Context \rightarrow (\theta(P_1) \equiv \theta(P')) \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & Context \wedge Q \rightarrow (P \equiv P') \\ \Rightarrow & Context \rightarrow (P \wedge Q \equiv P' \wedge Q) \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

The proofs of (3.10) and (3.11) follow from that of (3.9). The two rules can be used recursively together to translate formulas composed using an arbitrary number of occurrences of the conjunction operator. In both rules, the formulas before the \Rightarrow are the premises, and the formula after the conclusion. (3.10) is the base case: it gives sufficient conditions for using (3.2) to translate P_1 to P' . The other formula, (3.11), is the recursive case; it expresses translation of a conjunction in terms of translation of one of its conjuncts, adding the other conjunct to the conjunctive context as it does so. The advantage of splitting (3.9) into (3.10) and (3.11) is that it is then possible to add rules for other logical operators, each of which passes around the conjunctive context; we will call rules of this kind *translation-schemas*. We now present some more translation-schemas, starting with those for quantified expressions. (3.12) and (3.13) express translation of a quantified form in terms of translation of its body. In each of them, θ substitutes a set of unique constants for the \vec{x} .

$$Context \rightarrow (\theta(P) \equiv \theta(P'))$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{Context} \rightarrow (\exists \vec{x}.P \equiv \exists \vec{x}.P') \quad (3.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Context} \rightarrow (\theta(P) \equiv \theta(P')) \\ \Rightarrow & \text{Context} \rightarrow (\forall \vec{x}.P \equiv \forall \vec{x}.P') \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Next, the schemas (3.14), (3.15), (3.16) and (3.17) express translations of disjunctions, negations and implications in terms of translations of their component sub-formulas. Note that the left-hand side is added to the context when translating the right-side side in (3.17), but not *vice versa*.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Context} \rightarrow (P \equiv P') \\ \Rightarrow & \text{Context} \rightarrow (P \vee Q \equiv P' \vee Q) \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Context} \rightarrow (P \equiv P') \\ \Rightarrow & \text{Context} \rightarrow (\neg P \equiv \neg P') \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Context} \rightarrow (P \equiv P') \\ \Rightarrow & \text{Context} \rightarrow (P \rightarrow Q \equiv P' \rightarrow Q) \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Context} \wedge P \rightarrow (Q \equiv Q') \\ \Rightarrow & \text{Context} \rightarrow (P \rightarrow Q \equiv P \rightarrow Q') \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

The proofs of (3.12)–(3.17) are straight-forward.

(3.10)–(3.17) thus define a set of schemas which can be used to express translations of complex formulas built up with the connectives \wedge , \exists , \forall , \vee , \neg and \rightarrow in terms of translations of their components. Together, they define a way in which “universal” equivalences can be used as truth-preserving conditional rewriting rules, licencing translation of one of the conjuncts on the left-hand side into the right-hand side in suitable conjunctive contexts.

3.2.2 “Existential” equivalences

We have so far only considered universal equivalences, i.e. equivalences of type (3.2). As we have seen, the information used to determine when an universal equivalence is applicable is passed through the conjunctive context. For existential equivalences (equivalences of type (3.3)), the problem is rather to make sure that they are used in contexts where the variables are

appropriately quantified. We will basically adopt a minimal solution to this problem, encoded in the easily-proved translation schema

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists \vec{x}. P_1 \equiv P' \\ \Rightarrow & \theta(\exists \vec{x}. P_1) \equiv \theta(P') \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where θ is one-to-one on \vec{x} (i.e. it does not map distinct existential variables in \vec{x} into identical ones in $\theta(\vec{x})$). At first glance, this seems terribly restrictive, since it virtually limits application of an existential equivalence E to sub-formulas that are syntactic variants of E 's left-hand side. Things are actually rather better than they look, however, since it is possible to exploit the fact that

$$\exists \vec{x}. \exists \vec{y}. (R \wedge P_1)$$

is equivalent with

$$\exists \vec{y}. (R \wedge \exists \vec{x}. P_1)$$

if the \vec{x} do not occur in R . This equivalence makes it possible to “move” existential quantifiers to the right place in the formula, so that they become associated with goals that are to be translated using existential equivalences, and in practice seems to provide all the flexibility needed. It is moreover possible to “move” the existential quantifiers “on demand” in a simple way which interacts cleanly with the rest of the AET translation process. The details are presented below in Section 3.2.4. First, however, we define a second way to use the equivalences – as normal Horn-clauses – which as we soon shall see is also essential to the translation process.

3.2.3 Horn-clause readings of equivalences

An equivalence of the form

$$\forall \vec{x}. (P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge \dots \equiv \exists \vec{y}. Q_1 \wedge Q_2 \wedge \dots) \leftarrow Conds$$

implies the validity, for any k , of all Horn-clauses either of the form

$$\forall \vec{x}. \forall \vec{y}. (P_k \leftarrow Q_1 \wedge Q_2 \wedge \dots \wedge Conds)$$

or

$$\forall \vec{x}. (\theta(Q_k) \leftarrow P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge \dots \wedge Conds)$$

where θ replaces the \vec{y} with Skolem functions of the \vec{x} . We will refer to these, respectively, as *normal* and *backward* Horn-clause readings of the equivalence. For example, the rule

$$woman'(X) \wedge employee'(X) \equiv \exists HasCar.EMPL(X, w, HasCar) \quad (3.19)$$

produces two normal Horn-clause readings,

$$woman'(X) \leftarrow EMPL(X, w, HasCar) \quad (3.20)$$

$$employee'(X) \leftarrow EMPL(X, w, HasCar) \quad (3.21)$$

and one backward Horn-clause reading,

$$EMPL(X, w, sk_1(X)) \leftarrow woman'(X) \wedge employee'(X) \quad (3.22)$$

where sk_1 is a Skolem function. In the implementation, each equivalence is compiled in three different ways, to yield the normal Horn-clause, backward Horn-clause and equivalential readings. The Horn-clause readings are used to support proofs from the conjunctive context. We have experimented with using both kinds of Horn-clause; at present, though, only the normal Horn-clauses are used in the implemented system, for reasons discussed in Chapter 5.

3.2.4 The abstract AET process

We can now sketch out the basic translation process. The actual process of translation of a complex formula F is a series of single translation steps, each of which consists of the translation of an atomic constituent of F . A translation step contains the following sub-steps, with *either* **Translate-universal**, *or* **Translate-existential** being applied.

Recurse: Descend through F using the translation-schemas, until an atomic sub-formula A is reached. During this process, a conjunctive context E has been accumulated in which conditions will be proved, and some bound variables will have been replaced by unique constants. Constants resulting from bound variables are specially marked if i) they come from existentially bound variables that occur only in A , and ii) the only connectives between A and the binding existential quantifier are conjunctions. We will refer to these as *marked existential constants*.

Translate-universal: Find a rule $(H \wedge R \equiv B) \leftarrow C$ such that H unifies with A with m.g.u. θ . If it is then possible to prove $\theta(R \wedge C)$, replace A with $\theta(B)$. The leaves of the proof may include elements of the conjunctive context E , facts from the database, Horn-clauses from the linguistic domain theory Γ , or Horn-clause readings of conditional equivalences from Γ .

Translate-existential: Find a rule $\exists \vec{x}. H \equiv B$ such that H unifies with A with m.g.u. θ . If all the elements of $\theta(\vec{x})$ are distinct marked existential constants (in the sense defined immediately above in the **Recurse** step), then replace A with $\theta(B)$.

Simplify: if possible, apply simplifications to the resulting formula.

When describing translation, we will often find it convenient, by analogy with the corresponding terminology for logic programming, to refer to A in the description above as the *selected goal*, H as the *head* of the rule used, and $R \wedge C$ (in the case of a universal rule) as its *conditions*.

3.3 A simple example

An example follows to illustrate how the AET process works. In the interests of expositional clarity we use a grossly over-simplified version of the actual CLARE domain rules. In particular, we will fail to distinguish between database objects and real-world objects, since our current focus is the AET process itself rather than the structure of the linguistic domain theory. We start with the sentence (S2),

(S2) Do any women work on CLARE?

which receives the LF

$$\exists X \exists E. woman'(X) \wedge work_on'(E, X, clare') \quad (3.23)$$

(3.23) has to be mapped to a query which accesses two database relations. The first is the employee relation

$$EMPL(Empl, Sex, HasCar)$$

where $Empl$ represents employees, Sex can be w or m , and $HasCar$ can be y or n . The second is the project-member relation

$$PROJMEM(Empl, Project)$$

where *Empl* again represents the employee and *Proj* the project. The desired result is (3.24):

$$\exists X \exists HasCar. EMPL(X, w, HasCar) \wedge PROJMEM(clare', X) \quad (3.24)$$

The most clearly non-trivial part is justifying the conversion between the linguistic relation *woman'*(*X*) and the database relation *EMPL*(*X*, *w*, *_*) Even in a very restricted context, it may well be incorrect to state that “woman” is equivalent to “employee classed as being of female sex”; in the implemented PRM domain theory, it is definitely wrong, since both employees and payees are classified by sex. It is thus more correct to say that a tuple of type *EMPL*(*X*, *w*, *_*) is equivalent to the conjunction of two pieces of information: firstly that *X* is a woman, and secondly that she is an employee. This can be captured in the rule

$$\begin{aligned} & woman'(Person) \wedge employee'(Person) \equiv \\ & \exists HasCar.DB_EMPLOYEE(Person, w, HasCar) \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

In the left-to-right direction, the rule can be read procedurally as follows:

$$woman'(X)$$

translates to

$$\exists Y. EMPL(X, w, Y)$$

in contexts where it is possible to prove

$$employee'(X)$$

For the rule to be of use in the present example, we must therefore provide a justification for *employee'*(*X*)’s holding in the context of the query. The simplest way to ensure that this is so is to provide a Horn-clause meaning postulate,

$$employee'(X) \leftarrow PROJMEM(Project, X) \quad (3.26)$$

which encodes the fact that people listed in the database as project members are employees.

Similarly, we will need an equivalence rule to convert between *work_on'* and *PROJMEM*. Here the fact we want to state is that project-members are precisely people who work on projects, which we write as follows: we split

the equivalence into two formulas for the reasons explained at the beginning of Section 3.2.1.

$$\begin{aligned} work_on'(Event, Person, Project) \wedge project'(Project) &\equiv \\ work_on_project'(Event, Person, Project) &\equiv \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \exists Event.work_on_project'(Event, Person, Project) &\equiv \\ PROJMEM(Project, Person) &\equiv \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

We will also make indirect use of a rule that states that projects are objects that can be found in the first field of a *PROJ* tuple,

$$\begin{aligned} project'(Proj) &\equiv \\ \exists ProjNum \exists Start \exists End.PROJ(Proj, ProjNum, Start, End) &\equiv \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

since this will allow us to infer (by looking in the database relation *PROJ*) that the predicate *project'* holds of *clare'*.

Three translation steps now produce the desired transformation. In each, the schema for existential quantification (3.12) and the schema for conjunction (3.11) are used in turn to reduce to the base case of expanding an atom. Remember that existential quantification schema replaces variables with unique constants; when displaying the results of such a transformation, we will consistently write X^* to symbolize the new constant associated with the variable X .

The first translation step selects the atomic subformula of (3.23)

$$work_on'(E, X, clare')$$

which after replacement of bound variables by constants becomes

$$work_on'(E^*, X^*, clare')$$

The associated conjunctive context is $\{woman'(X^*)\}$. Now the equivalence (3.27) can be used, taking the first conjunct on its LHS as the head; its conditions after unification with the selected atom are the remaining conjuncts on the LHS, i.e.

$$project'(clare')$$

The normal Horn-clause reading of (3.29) can be used to reduce the conditions to

$$\exists ProjNum \exists Start \exists End.PROJ(clare', ProjNum, Start, End)$$

which can be proved directly by a call to the database relation *PROJ*. Since the conditions have been proved to hold, $work_on'(E, X, clare')$ can be replaced by $work_on_project(E, X, clare')$ in (3.23), yielding the result

$$\exists X \exists E. woman'(X) \wedge work_on_project'(E, X, clare') \quad (3.30)$$

The second translation step now uses (3.28) to translate the second conjunct of (3.30). (3.28) is an existential equivalence, so there are no conjunctive conditions; it is on the other hand necessary to check that the variables are appropriately bound. The first variable in the LHS of (3.28) is existentially bound, so the first variable in the selected goal must also be existentially bound by a quantifier which is separated from the goal only by conjunctions. Recall that these conditions are required to be able to rewrite (3.30) into the form

$$\exists X woman'(X) \wedge (\exists E. work_on_project'(E, X, clare')) \quad (3.31)$$

As this is possible, $work_on_project(E, X, clare')$ in (3.30) can be replaced by the body of (3.28), giving

$$\exists X \exists E. woman'(X) \wedge PROJMEM(clare', X) \quad (3.32)$$

and as quantification over E has become vacuous, (3.32) can be simplified to

$$\exists X. woman'(X) \wedge PROJMEM(clare', X) \quad (3.33)$$

We are now in a position to be able to translate the first conjunct of (3.33),

$$woman'(X)$$

After replacing bound variables by constants, this becomes

$$woman'(X^*)$$

and the conjunctive context is $\{PROJMEM(clare', X^*)\}$. $woman'(X^*)$ unifies with the first conjunct on the left-hand side of the equivalence (3.25), making its conditions $employee'(X^*)$. Using the Horn-clause meaning postulate (3.26), the conditions can be reduced to $PROJMEM(Project, X^*)$. Note that X^* in this formula is a constant, while *Project* is a variable. This new goal can be proved directly from the conjunctive context, instantiating *Project* to $clare'$. So the selected goal can be replaced in (3.33) by the body of (3.25), yielding the final result

$$\exists X \exists HasCar. EMPL(X, w, HasCar) \wedge PROJMEM(clare', X) \quad (3.34)$$

3.4 Translating higher-order formulas

It is possible to extend AET without much trouble to provide an adequate coverage of the higher-order constructs that commonly occur in the context database querying: the most important are those for counting, summing and ordering. We will represent these respectively by the operators *count*, *sum* and *order*, with the following syntax and semantics:

$$\textit{count}(N, \lambda X.P(X))$$

holds if there are precisely N values of A such that $P(A)$ holds;

$$\textit{sum}(S, \lambda X.P(X))$$

holds if all the objects A of which $P(A)$ holds are summable quantities, and S is their sum; and

$$\textit{order}(\textit{Selected}, \lambda X.\lambda D.P(X, D), \textit{Ordering})$$

holds if *Ordering* is an ordering relation, D_{max} is the maximal D under the relation *Ordering* such that $P(X, D)$ holds for some X , and *Selected* is such an X .

Expressions formed using these operators can be translated by translating their bodies, replacing the bound variables by unique constants as in the schemas for universal and existential quantifiers shown earlier. For example, the schema for *count* is

$$\begin{aligned} \textit{Context} &\rightarrow (\theta(P) \equiv \theta(P')) \\ \Rightarrow \textit{Context} &\rightarrow (\textit{count}(N, \lambda X.P) \equiv \textit{count}(N, \lambda X.P')) \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

where θ replaces X with a unique constant.

As can be seen, the conjunctive context is passed into the body of the higher-order form and is available for rules used to translate it. What is more interesting to consider is the extent to which the material in the bodies of these higher-order forms can be “exported” out to add to the context of goals conjoined with higher-order forms; this is frequently desirable. The solution we have adopted is to assume that the λ -bound properties appearing in the bodies of *sum*, *count* and *order* forms always have non-empty extensions, in other words that the following hold:

$$\textit{count}(N, \lambda X.P(X)) \rightarrow \exists X_1.P(X_1) \quad (3.36)$$

$$\text{sum}(N, \lambda X.P(X)) \rightarrow \exists X_1.P(X_1) \quad (3.37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{order}(\text{Selected}, \lambda X.\lambda D.P(X, D), \text{Ordering}) \rightarrow \\ \exists D_1.P(\text{Selected}, D_1) \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

This means, for instance, that given a formula of type

$$C \wedge \text{count}(N, \lambda X.P(X))$$

it is permissible to assume $\exists Y.P(Y)$ when translating C . A special case is presented by the *order* operator; as can be seen from (3.38), it is possible to make a stronger assumption, substituting the maximal element (rather than an existentially quantified one) in the outermost lambda-binding.

3.5 Abductive translation

We now put the “A” into “AET”, and describe how the basic framework can be extended further to allow abductive translation. There are essentially two problems. Firstly, we want if necessary to be able to make abductive assumptions when performing the **Translate-universal** step of the AET process described Section 3.2.4: in other words, we want to be able to define situations where some of the information required to license a translation step is assumed rather than proved. Goals will be classed as potential abductive assumptions if they ought to be assumed true when there is no specific evidence to the contrary. This brings us to our second requirement: that we should be able to define ways in which an abductive assumption is contradicted by its context of occurrence.

These two functionalities are achieved as follows. We include declarations of the form

```
assumable(Goal, Cost, Justification, Type, Cond)
```

where *Goal* and *Cond* are atomic formulas, *Cost* is a non-negative integer, *Justification* is a unique tag that names the assumption, and *Type* is the assumption-type (cf Section 2.4.1). The intended semantics are that *Goal* may be assumed at cost *Cost* in an environment where *Cond* holds. The “justification” can be used to identify the assumption to the user. If an abductive assumption A is made while translating the goal G , it is saved together G ’s

associated conjunctive context *Context*. Assumptions are considered to be inconsistent if

$$\Gamma \cup \textit{Context} \rightarrow \neg A$$

holds, where Γ is the linguistic domain theory. The implemented system has so far only a fairly primitive ability to find proofs of negated goals (cf Sections 5.1.3 and 4.8).

Examples of how assumption declarations are used will be presented later in Sections 4.5 and 4.7.

3.6 Simplification

AET, like many systems based on the idea of rewriting, tends to suffer from the problem that expressions can rapidly grow in size as they pass through successive stages of translation. The standard solution to the problem is to include a *simplifier*, a module which takes the output from a translation stage and attempts to reduce it to a more compact form (cf e.g. (Williams 1991)). This section will describe CLARE's simplifier. Although the simplifier's primary use is in conjunction with the translator, it has turned out to provide a functionality that several other parts of the system utilise. In section 3.6.3 we describe how the simplifier is used in the processing of assertions; here, the problem is to take the conjunction of the TRL representations of several assertions, and combine them into a compact form.

The simplifier consists of two main pieces. The first, described in section 3.6.1, is a collection of standard logical rewriting techniques, none of which use inference, that have the common function of reducing expressions to a canonical form. Simplification can also be carried out by using the inference-based equivalential translation methods described earlier in this chapter, in which inference justifies the replacement of sub-expressions by other forms, the equivalence of which is implied by the context. This second type of simplification is described in section 3.6.2.

3.6.1 Non-inferential simplification

The non-inferential simplification module consists of the set of rewriting methods listed below. Most of them are fairly obvious. We present the methods in the order in which they are applied by the system.

Moving existential quantifiers outwards

This method consists of two kinds of rewriting rule. The first simplifies an expression built out of conjunction and existential quantification operators into an equivalent form with a single existential operator on the outside binding all the variables (it has proven convenient to slightly extend standard predicate calculus notation by allowing a quantifier to bind an arbitrary number of variables). Thus for example

$$\exists x.p(x) \wedge \exists y.q(y)$$

will get rewritten to

$$\exists x, y.p(x) \wedge q(y)$$

The other rewriting rule is applied when an existentially quantified form occurs on the LHS of an implication; in this case, the existentially quantified variables are moved upwards to become universally quantified with wide scope over the implication. The justification for this manoeuvre is the equivalence

$$((\exists x.P) \rightarrow Q) \equiv \forall x.(P \rightarrow Q)$$

which is easily proved. The result of recursively applying the two rules is to give existential quantifiers as wide scope as possible, if necessary turning them into universals on the way.

Simplification of equalities

The next simplification step removes equalities from the expression when this is possible. The basic equivalences that licence this type of simplification are the following:

$$(\exists x.\exists y.P \wedge (x = y)) \equiv (\exists x.P[y/x])$$

$$(\forall x.\exists y.P \wedge (x = y)) \equiv (\forall x.P[y/x])$$

and

$$(\exists y.P \wedge (y = a)) \equiv P[y/a]$$

where a is a constant. The methods are implemented by recursively descending through the expression to find equality sub-forms, and in suitable cases unifying together their two arguments, replacing the equality with an occurrence of the identically true predicate. After this, a second pass removes the occurrences of *true* and the vacuous and repeated quantifications introduced.

If the expression contains an equality whose arguments consist of two non-unifiable constants Arg_1 and Arg_2 , its value can be known to be identically false (assuming non-identity of reference of distinct constants). In this case, the simplifier replaces the equality with the form

$$mismatch(Arg_1, Arg_2)$$

Subsequent behaviour depends on the nature of the expression being manipulated. If it is a question, the *mismatch* form is later replaced with an occurrence of the identically false predicate, which will generally lead to a “No” answer being produced. If the expression however represents an assertion, the mismatch normally represents a presupposition failure. In this case, the interface handler will inform the user that the expression was translated to an identically false form due to the occurrence of the mismatch, and attempt to print the incompatible arguments in an informative way (cf. Section 2.5.3).

Simplification of ground sub-expressions

The final type of simplification involves ground sub-expressions, that is to say sub-expressions containing no variables. Since these can be assigned a truth-value irrespective of their context, the expression can be simplified by computing it and replacing by an occurrence of either *true* or *false*. At present, the method is restricted in two ways: ground sub-expressions are only replaced if their predicates are declared to be executable relations (cf. section 2.4.2); also, only *true* ground expressions are substituted.

3.6.2 Inferential simplification

We will now consider methods that use equivalential translation to carry out simplification; the notion of *conjunctive context*, defined in section 3.2.1, will play a key role. We can immediately describe one way to achieve this end. Suppose that F is a formula containing an occurrence of the subformula F' , and suppose further that F' is implied by its conjunctive context. It follows that replacing F' with *true* in F will result in a formula equivalent with F . This gives a method can remove duplicated conjuncts and the like, and also perform less obvious simplifications. To take a simple example, consider the formula

$$P \wedge Q \rightarrow P \wedge R$$

The conjunctive context of the second occurrence of P contains P , so the formula can be simplified to

$$P \wedge Q \rightarrow R$$

A slightly more complex example is provided by the formula

$$P \rightarrow Q \wedge R$$

where we are also told that Q can be derived from P . Then as we know that P is in Q 's conjunctive context, it is possible to remove Q and simplify to

$$P \rightarrow R$$

A similar, but more refined, form of simplification can also be performed, which exploits functional relationships between arguments in predicates. We start by re-examining our example **(S1)** from the beginning of chapter 2, reproduced here for convenience.

(S1) Show all payments made to BT during 1990.

In section 4.9, we will see that, when the example is processed by the implemented CLARE system, the logical form originally derived from **(S1)** is

```
forall([Trans],
  impl(x([Agnt,Ev],
    and(payment1(Trans),
      and(make2(Ev,Agnt,Trans,payee1#bt),
        during1(Ev,year1#1990))))),
    x([ShowEv],
      and(show1(ShowEv,clare,Trans),
        before1(<Now>,ShowEv))))))
```

After a few translation steps, the resulting formula contains three separate instances of the `transaction` relation, one from each of the original linguistic predicates `payment1`, `make2` and `during1`. Assuming that the arguments of the `transaction` relation are

```
transaction(Transaction,Payer,Date,Payee,Amount)
```

`payment1(Payment)` expands, roughly speaking, to

```
transaction(Payment,_,_,_,_)
```

make2(Event,Agent,Payment,Payee) expands to

```
transaction(Payment/Event,Agent,_,Payee,_)
```

(the Payment and Event arguments map into the same variable). Finally, during1(Payment,Interval) expands to

```
and(transaction(Payment,_,Date,_,_),
      time_during(Date,Interval))
```

The database query will conjoin all three instances together. It is clearly preferable, if possible, to merge them instead, yielding a composite predication

```
transaction(Payment/Event,Agent,Date,Payee,_)
```

The information that licences this step as a valid simplification is that `transaction` is a function from its first argument (the payment) to the remaining ones (the agent, the date, the payee and the amount); in other words, a given payment is made by a unique agent, on a unique date, to a unique payee, for a unique amount. The system allows the information to be entered as a “function” meaning postulate in the form

```
function(transaction(Transaction,Payer,Date,Payee,Amount),
          [Transaction] -> [Payer,Date,Payee,Amount])
```

which is treated as a concise notation for the conditional equivalence

$$\begin{aligned}
 & transaction(Trans, Payer', Date', Payee', Amount') \rightarrow \\
 & (transaction(Trans, Payer, Date, Payee, Amount) \equiv \\
 & \quad Payer = Payer' \wedge Date = Date' \wedge \\
 & \quad Payee = Payee' \wedge Amount = Amount') \quad (3.39)
 \end{aligned}$$

It is thus possible to view “merging” simplification of this kind as just another instance of equivalential translation. In the current version of the system, the transformation process operates in a cycle, alternating normal translation followed by simplification using the same basic interpreter; simplification consists of functional “merging” followed by reduction of equalities where this is applicable.

3.6.3 Simplification for processing assertions

The simplification process plays an important role in the processing of assertions (cf Section 2.5.3). Consider, for example, what would happen to the pair of sentences **(Assertion1)** and **(Assertion2)** without simplification:

(Assertion1) Clara is an employee who has a car.

(Assertion2) Clara is a woman.

Assuming a suitable extension of the axioms used in Section 3.3 above, **Assertion1** translates into the database form

$$\exists A.EMPL(clara', A, y)$$

(Recall that the second field in the *EMPL* relation indicates sex, and the third whether or not the employee has a company car). This can then be put into Horn-clause form as

$$EMPL(clara', sk_1, y)$$

(where sk_1 is a Skolem constant) to make it accessible to inferencing operations. Since Clara is now known to be an employee, **Assertion2** will eventually translate into the unit clause

$$EMPL(clara', w, sk_2)$$

with sk_2 a second Skolem constant. The two clauses produced would contain all the information entered, but they could not be entered into a relational database as they stand; a normal database has no interpretation for the Skolem constants sk_1 and sk_2 .

However, it is possible to use function information to merge the two clauses into a single record. The trick is to arrange things so that the system can when necessary recover the existentially quantified form from the Skolemized one; assertions which contain Skolem constants are kept together in a cache called the *logical discourse context*. Simplification of assertions then proceeds according to the following sequence of steps:

1. Retrieve all assertions from the logical discourse context cache.
2. Construct a formula A , which is their logical conjunction.

3. Let A_0 be A , and let $\{sk_1 \dots sk_n\}$ be the Skolem constants in A . For $i = 1 \dots n$, let x_i be a new variable, and let A_i be the formula $\exists x_i.A_{i-1}[sk_i/x_i]$, i.e. the result of replacing sk_i with x_i and quantifying existentially over it.
4. Perform normal function merging on A_n , and call the result A' .
5. Convert A' into Horn-clause form, and replace the result in the logical discourse context cache.

In the example above, this works as follows. After **(Assertion1)** and **(Assertion2)** have been processed, the logical discourse context contains the clauses

$$EMPL(clara', sk_1, y)$$

$$EMPL(clara', w, sk_2)$$

$A = A_0$ is then the formula

$$EMPL(clara', sk_1, y) \wedge EMPL(clara', w, sk_2)$$

and A_2 is

$$\exists X_1, X_2. EMPL(clara', X_1, y) \wedge EMPL(clara', w, X_2)$$

If $EMPL$ is declared functional on its first argument, the second conjunct can be reduced to two equalities, giving the formula

$$\exists X_1, X_2. EMPL(clara', X_1, y) \wedge X_1 = w \wedge y = X_2$$

which finally simplifies to A' ,

$$EMPL(clara', w, y)$$

a record without Skolem constants, which can be added to a normal relational database.

3.7 The “Doctor on Board” problem

One of the best-known problems in the area of logic-based natural-language database interfacing is posed by so-called “Doctor on Board” queries (Perreault and Grosz, 1988). These are the standard examples of the problems that arise when existentially quantified variables in the logical form fail to

correspond to any quantified variable in the final evaluable expression. The original example came from a naval information database, in which the main relation contained information about the position and other attributes of a set of ships; one field was set to y if there was a doctor on board the ship in question. Now consider the three queries **(DOB1–3)** below:

(DOB1) Is there a doctor on board ship FOO?

(DOB2) Who is the doctor on board ship FOO?

(DOB3) Is there a doctor within 500 miles of ship FOO?

It is clear that a query like **(DOB1)** should be answerable; it is equally clear that a query like **(DOB2)** should not. Most interestingly, queries like **(DOB3)** should also be answerable, since the position of a doctor can be assumed to be the same as the position of his ship.

In this section, we will sketch out a treatment of the “Doctor on board” problem within the AET framework; we will abstract away as many of the details as possible. In accordance with the ideas described in Sections 2.5.1 and 2.5.2, we begin by assigning the original logical forms (3.40)–(3.42) to **DOB1–3**:

$$\exists X.doctor'(X) \wedge on_board'(X, foo') \quad (3.40)$$

$$\forall X.(doctor'(X) \wedge on_board'(X, foo') \rightarrow displayed_in_future(X)) \quad (3.41)$$

$$\exists X.doctor'(X) \wedge within'(X, foo', 500) \quad (3.42)$$

We will assume that the basic database predicate we are mapping to is

$$SHIP(ShipId, Position, DoB)$$

where *Position* is a position expressed according to some suitable co-ordinate system, and *DoB* has the value y if there is a doctor on board the ship, n otherwise. We will require *SHIP* to be functional on its first argument (i.e. the field *ShipId* will be a primary key). There will also be two evaluable predicate

$$dist(Position_1, Position_2, Distance)$$

and

$$X < Y$$

The first of these computes the distance (as a number) between two positions, according some suitable distance metric; the second is the standard arithmetic inequality relation.

We are now in a position to write down the axioms we will need. The first three define the relationship between the word-sense predicates *ship'*, *doctor'* and *on_board'*, and the database predicate *SHIP*:

$$ship'(S) \equiv \exists Pos \exists DoB. SHIP(S, Pos, DoB) \quad (3.43)$$

$$\begin{aligned} doctor'(D) \wedge on_board'(D, S) &\equiv \\ doctor_on_board(D, S) &\quad (3.44) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \exists D. doctor_on_board(D, S) &\equiv \\ \exists Pos. SHIP(S, Pos, y) &\quad (3.45) \end{aligned}$$

Axiom (3.46) defines the semantics of the word-sense predicate *within'* in terms of positions and distances:

$$\begin{aligned} within'(X_1, X_2, Radius) &\equiv \\ pos(X_1, P_1) \wedge pos(X_2, P_2) \wedge dist(P_1, P_2, D) \wedge D < Radius &\quad (3.46) \end{aligned}$$

The last two axioms translate the intermediate predicate *pos*; two rules are provided, one for positions of ships and the other for positions of doctors.

$$\begin{aligned} ship'(S) &\rightarrow \\ (pos(S, P) \equiv \exists DoB. SHIP(S, P, DoB)) &\quad (3.47) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} doctor'(D) &\rightarrow \\ (pos(D, P) \equiv (\exists S. ship'(S) \wedge on_board(D, S) \wedge pos(S, P))) &\quad (3.48) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we will assume that the database shows *foo'* to be a ship, i.e. that there is a *SHIP* record whose first field contains an instance of *foo'*.

Let us now first consider how the axioms we have just presented can be used to translate the logical form corresponding to the query (**DOB1**). The original LF is

$$\exists X. doctor'(X) \wedge on_board'(X, foo') \quad (3.49)$$

Using the existential and conjunction translation schemas in the way described in Section 3.3, we choose as the selected goal the second conjunct: after replacement of bound variables by constants, this is

$$on_board'(X*, foo')$$

and the conjunctive context is

$$\{doctor'(X*)\}$$

We use the equivalence (3.44) to translate; the conditions can be proved directly from the conjunctive context, and the result after substitution is:

$$\exists X.doctor'(X) \wedge doctor_on_board(X, foo') \quad (3.50)$$

The first conjunct of (3.50) can be simplified away (see section 3.6.2); since one of the normal Horn-clause readings of (3.44) is

$$doctor'(X) \leftarrow doctor_on_board(X, S) \quad (3.51)$$

we have that

$$doctor'(X)$$

is implied by its conjunctive context

$$\{doctor_on_board(X, foo')\}$$

and can thus be removed. This reduces (3.50) to

$$\exists X.doctor_on_board(X, foo') \quad (3.52)$$

Since X is existentially quantified and only occurs in the atomic sub-formula

$$doctor_on_board(X, foo')$$

it is now possible to apply (3.45), to translate to the final evaluable form

$$\exists Pos.SHIP(foo', Pos, y) \quad (3.53)$$

We next examine **(DOB2)**, which receives the initial LF

$$\forall X.(doctor'(X) \wedge on_board'(X, foo') \rightarrow displayed_in_future(X)) \quad (3.54)$$

By a similar sequence of steps to those used for **(DOB1)** above, (3.54) can be translated as far as the formula

$$\exists X.doctor_on_board(X, foo') \rightarrow displayed_in_future(X) \quad (3.55)$$

In contrast to the previous case, however, it is impossible to translate (3.55) any further; (3.45) is this time not applicable, as X is bound by a universal quantifier rather than an existential, and moreover occurs on the RHS as well.

We finally turn to **(DOB3)**, with initial LF

$$\exists X.doctor'(X) \wedge within'(X, foo', 500) \quad (3.56)$$

Omitting the details, we can first use (3.46) to translate (3.56) into

$$\begin{aligned} \exists X, P_d, P_{foo}, D.doctor'(X) \wedge pos(X, P_d) \wedge pos(foo', P_{foo}) \wedge \\ dist(P_d, P_{foo}, D) \wedge D < 500 \end{aligned} \quad (3.57)$$

Since the goal $doctor'(X^*)$ is a member of the conjunctive context of the second conjunct, $pos(X, P_d)$, it is possible to translate it using (3.48), giving

$$\begin{aligned} \exists X, P_d, P_{foo}, S, D.doctor'(X) \wedge ship'(S) \wedge on_board(X, S) \wedge \\ pos(S, P_d) \wedge pos(foo', P_{foo}) \wedge dist(P_d, P_{foo}, D) \wedge D < 500 \end{aligned} \quad (3.58)$$

By the same methods as those used for **(DOB1)** above, we can then translate the conjunct $on_board(X, S)$, and simplify away the conjuncts $doctor'(X)$ and $ship'(S)$, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \exists X, P_d, P_s, P_{foo}, S, D.SHIP(S, P_s, y) \wedge pos(S, P_d) \wedge \\ pos(foo', P_{foo}) \wedge dist(P_d, P_{foo}, D) \wedge D < 500 \end{aligned} \quad (3.59)$$

We now want to translate the two pos conjuncts, using (3.47). In the first case, the selected atom is

$$pos(S^*, P_d^*)$$

The conditions deriving from (3.47) are

$$ship'(S^*)$$

which can be proved using the normal Horn-clause reading of (3.43), i.e.

$$ship'(X) \leftarrow \exists P, DoB.SHIP(X, P, DoB)$$

The atom

$$SHIP(S^*, P_s^*, y)$$

can be proved from the conjunctive context. The result is

$$\begin{aligned} \exists X, P_d, P_s, DoB, P_{foo}, S, D. SHIP(S, P_s, y) \wedge SHIP(S, P_d, DoB) \wedge \\ pos(foo', P_{foo}) \wedge dist(P_d, P_{foo}, D) \wedge D < 500 \end{aligned} \quad (3.60)$$

Since *SHIP* is functional on its first argument it is possible to use functional merging (cf. Section 3.6.2) to merge the first and second conjuncts, giving

$$\begin{aligned} \exists X, P_s, P_{foo}, S, D. \wedge SHIP(S, P_s, y) \wedge \\ pos(foo', P_{foo}) \wedge dist(P_s, P_{foo}, D) \wedge D < 500 \end{aligned} \quad (3.61)$$

Lastly, the remaining *pos* conjunct can be translated, using the equivalence (3.47), the normal Horn-clause reading of (3.43) and the database relation *SHIP*. This allows

$$pos(foo', P_{foo})$$

to be replaced with

$$\exists DoB_{foo}. SHIP(foo', P_{foo}, DoB_{foo})$$

giving the final evaluable form

$$\begin{aligned} \exists X, P_s, P_{foo}, DoB_{foo}, S, D. SHIP(S, P_s, y) \wedge \\ SHIP(foo', P_{foo}, DoB_{foo}) \wedge \\ dist(P_s, P_{foo}, D) \wedge D < 500 \end{aligned} \quad (3.62)$$

3.8 The translation engine

This section sketches the CLARE translation engine, the existing Prolog implementation of the abstract AET process described earlier in Section 3.2.4. The structure of the translation engine is fairly similar to that of a Prolog meta-interpreter. There is a main predicate,

`translate(+In, -Out, +Context, +MarkedConstants, +Ain, -Aout)`

The intended semantics are that **Out** is a translation of **In** when it occurs with conjunctive context **Context**, and the variables in the list **Marked** are constants deriving from existentially bound variables, that are “specially marked” in the sense described in Section 3.2.4; **Ain-Aout** is a difference list holding the abductive assumptions made while performing the translation. There is one or more **translation** clause for each logical operator **Op**, each of which encodes an appropriate “translation schema” for **Op** (cf. Section 3.2.1).

The clause encoding the base case is applied when the main functor of **In** is a predicate symbol, rather than a logical operator. Here, an attempt is made to find an equivalence that can be used to translate **In**. Equivalences are stored in the compiled form

```
equiv(Head,Conds,ExVars,Body,Group)
```

where

- **Head** is a potential “head” of the rule, i.e. an atomic goal on its LHS;
- for universal rules, **Conds** are the remaining LHS conjuncts;
- for existential rules, **ExVars** are the existentially quantified LHS variables;
- **Body** is the RHS, and
- **Group** is an atom that associates the rule with a named “rule-group”.

Prolog variables are used to represent both universal and existential variables in the rule. The last argument, **Group**, also demands some explanation; it is frequently useful, for modularity reasons, to be able to divide equivalences into distinct named groups. A declaration is also supplied that arranges the groups in a linear sequence $Group_1 \dots Group_n$. Translation is first carried out as far as possible using only the rules from $Group_1$; then again using only the rules from $Group_2$; and so on.

When trying to apply either a universal or an atomic rule to translate an atomic goal, the first step is to unify **Head** with **In**, which consequently instantiates **Conds**, **ExVars** and **Body** as well. Behaviour now diverges depending on whether the rule is universal or existential:

- If the rule is universal, an attempt is made to prove **Conds** in the current conjunctive context; this in effect consists of sending the formula

```
impl(Context,Conds)
```

and the current list of abductive assumptions `Ain` to the inference component (cf. Chapter 5). If a proof can be found, the call returns with a set of bindings for the free variables in `Conds` and an updated list of abductive assumptions `Aout`.

- If the rule is existential, then the instantiated list `ExVars` from the rule and the list `MarkedConstants` from the original call to `translate` are passed to the predicate `check_equiv_exvars/2`, which succeeds if the members of `ExVars` are distinct members of `MarkedConstants`.

3.9 Debugging equivalential theories

To be practically useful, a programming language normally has to support some kind of interactive debugging tool. It has proved simple to build such a tool on top of the translation engine described in the last section; the functionality it offers is similar to that provided by the standard Prolog “Byrd-box” debugger. This has been enough to make it feasible to construct and debug large equivalential linguistic domain theories, containing several hundred equivalences and Horn-clauses.

The top-level commands available to the user are similar to those in the normal Byrd-box debugger, and are summarized below:

```
aet_debug_init
```

Initializes AET debugger. It is then possible to use the other commands.

```
aet_trace
```

Switches on the AET debugger, in “trace” mode.

```
aet_debug
```

Switches on the AET debugger, in “debug” mode.

```
aet_nodebug
```

Switches off the AET debugger.

```
aet_spy(+PredSpec, +Mode)
```

Puts an AET spypoint of type `Mode` on `PredSpec`. `Mode` must be either `translation` or `inference`. `PredSpec` must be of the form `F/N`.

```
aet_nospy(+PredSpec,+Mode)
```

Removes an AET spypoint of type `Mode` on `PredSpec`. `Mode` must be either `translation` or `inference`. `PredSpec` must be of the form `F/N`.

```
aet_nospyall
```

Removes all AET spypoints.

The AET debugger is implemented on top of the normal Quintus Prolog debugger, using the Quintus Prolog “advice” package. In view of the extremely implementation-dependent nature of the debugger, we will confine our description to a very brief sketch. The basic idea is to put normal spypoints on the central predicates (in particular `translate` and `prove`) that implement the translation and reasoning engines. “Advice” is added at all four ports of these key predicates, which checks the arguments passed to the predicate, the defined AET spypoints and the current mode, and if necessary switches the associated spypoint on or off. A special “portray” predicate is employed to format the predicate calls shown by the normal Quintus debugger in an easily readable way. Thus for example a completed call to the base case of `translate` is formatted as illustrated below:

```
Translating atomic sub-formula
```

```
<InFormula>
```

```
<Result>
```

```
Assumptions made: <Assumptions>
```

where `<InFormula>`, `<Result>` and `<Assumptions>` are formatted representations of the input and output of the translation, and the abductive assumptions needed to perform it. Similarly, a completed attempt by the inference component to prove a goal is formatted as

```
Prove (<CostIn> units in, <CostOut> units out):
```

```
<Formula>
```

```
Assumptions made: <Assumptions>
```

where `<Formula>` and `<Assumptions>` are the formula that has been successfully proved and the abductive assumptions used to prove it, `<CostIn>`

was the number of cost units available before the goal was attempted (cf Section 5.2), and `<CostOut>` was the number of cost units left afterwards.

Chapter 4

Linguistic Domain Theories

4.1 Introduction

From the examples presented in the previous chapter, the reader will already have gained some impression of what a linguistic domain theory looks like. In this chapter, we will consider the subject in more detail. We first describe the various types of information that compose an LDT: equivalences, Horn-clauses, declarations of functional relationships and assumption declarations. The rest of the chapter describes the LDT for the PRM domain, which we will use as a generic example.

There are four main kinds of information in the PRM LDT. The greater part of the theory is composed of conditional equivalences, which have already been discussed at length in chapter 3. In this chapter, it will be convenient to allow equivalences to be written in the concrete TRL notation illustrated by the following example (cf also Appendix B)

```
exists([Event],
  and(work_on1(Event,Person,Project),
    project1(Project))) <->
works_on_project(Event,Project,Person)
```

Apart from the conditional equivalences, there are Horn-clause formulas, declarations of functional relationships between arguments of predicates, and declarations of what assumptions are permissible. We will first review each of these briefly; later on in the chapter, we explain more exactly how they fit into the LDT.

Horn-clauses Certain relationships in the PRM LDT are inherently ones of implication rather than equivalence; in these cases, Horn-clauses,

rather than equivalences, are appropriate. For example, it is necessary to capture the fact that everyone who books time to a project is an employee. This cannot easily be made into an equivalence, since being an employee does not directly imply that one books time to any particular project. Instead, we use the Horn-clause

```
employee_Worker(Person) <-
  booking_to_project(Event,Person,Proj,Hours,Date)
```

Functional relationships Many relations have the property of being functional on some subset of their arguments; that is to say, selecting a particular given value for that subset determines a unique value for the remaining arguments. In practice, the most important case is that of *primary key* fields in database predicates. Functional relationships are defined by declarations of the form

```
function(<Template>,<FunctionalArgs> -> <RemainingArgs>)
```

In all the examples occurring in the PRM LDT, <FunctionalArgs> is a list consisting of a single argument. For example, the first argument of the TRANS relation is an identifier that functions as a primary key: this is captured by the declaration

```
function(TRANS(TransId,ChequeNum,Date,Payee,Acct,Amount),
  [TransId] -> [ChequeNum,Date,Payee,Acct,Amount])
```

Assumption declarations Assumption declarations are used to control the abductive proof mechanism: it is only permissible to make an abductive assumption when this is explicitly licenced by an assumption declaration. An assumption declaration has the general form

```
assumable(<Goal>,<Cost>,<Justification>,<Type>,<Conds>)
```

The intended semantics are that <Goal> may be assumed at cost <Cost> in an environment where <Conds> hold. <Type> can be either *specialization*, *limitation* or *approximation*; this is explained further in section 2.4.1. <Justification> is a tag which can be used to identify instances of use of this declaration. Assumption declarations are mainly used in the PRM LDT to deal with the problem of “contingent completeness” of information. Examples can be found in Sections 4.5 and 4.7.

The rest of the chapter will explain in detail how these various kinds of information can be used to build up an LDT; we will focus on the specific PRM domain for lack of other large-scale examples, but we believe that many of the principles would carry over to other relational databases.

4.2 Overview of the example LDT

This section gives an overview of how the LDT for the PRM domain is structured. The PRM relational database is based on a real SRI projects and payments database; the LDT contains about 300 equivalences, 70 Horn clauses, 45 declarations of functional relationships, and 25 assumption declarations.

It will be easiest to start by describing the various types of predicates used in the PRM domain's LDT. At one end are the *linguistic* predicates, mostly corresponding to word-senses; the names of these will be written in the form `<LowerCaseSurfaceForm><Number>` e.g. `cheque1`, `project1`, `make2`, `on1`, etc. At the other end, we have the predicates meaningful to the database. As explained in Section 2.4.2, these are of three kinds.

Firstly, we have the *database predicates* themselves, which directly correspond to the database relations. We describe these in more detail immediately below. Secondly, we have *arithmetical relation predicates*, which define the permissible arithmetical operations that can be carried out on database objects. The LDT contains predicates corresponding to addition and subtraction, inequality between numbers, and temporal precedence between representations of dates. Thirdly, we have the single *executable predicate*, instances of which the system can cause to hold in the world. The executable predicate is

```
execute_in_future(Action)
```

which holds if `tuple` is a term representing an action which the system will perform at some future time. The type of action we will be most interested is the displaying of a list of database objects, which we write `display(List)`.

We now return to consider the database relations, the names of which will be written entirely in upper case. We will refer to the following specific predicates:

```
TRANS(TransId,ChequeId,Date,PayeeId,AccNum,Amt)
```

Non-payroll payments made by SRI Cambridge between 17/8/89 and 1/4/91. For each record, the transaction ID is `TransId` and cheque ID is `ChequeId`:

if *Amt* is positive, SRI paid the payee with name *PayeeId* the quantity *Amt* in pounds sterling on day *Date*, charging it to account *AccNum*. Records with negative *Amt* turned out to represent an abuse of the database system to record reimbursements of small debts to petty cash; this is characteristic of the sort of arbitrary condition that can easily apply in a real database.

PROJECT(*Name*,*ProjectNum*,*Start*,*End*)

Projects at SRI Cambridge. The project's name is *Name* and its account number is *ProjectNum*; the start date is *Start* and the end date is *End*.

PAYEE(*PayeeId*,*Type*)

Payees in listed transactions, classified by the field *Type* as being men (m), women (w), companies (c), universities (u) or others (o).

EMPLOYEE(*Name*,*Sex*,*HasCar*)

Employees at SRI Cambridge, classified by their sex (m or w) and whether or not they have a company car (y or).

TIMESHEET(*EmployeeId*,*Time*,*Date*,*Project*)

Timesheet entries for the periods that had been entered when the database was compiled (these periods turned out to be project-dependent). The fields give in order the employee ID for the person booking the time, the number of hours booked, the date for which time was booked, and the account number charged to.

To sum up, we have on one hand the linguistic predicates, which are directly related to language, and on the other the database, arithmetic relation and executable predicates, which are directly related to the database. Between these, it has proved convenient to define a number of other “intermediate” predicates. There are in particular two specific types of intermediate predicates, which we will shortly describe, that play a major role in the LDT; we call these *conceptual* predicates and *attribute* predicates. Translation, in the direction language to database, proceeds very roughly as follows. Linguistic predicates are translated into a mixture of conceptual and attribute predicates. The attribute predicates are then translated into conceptual predicates; finally, the conceptual predicates are translated into database predicates.

The rest of the chapter will make this thumbnail sketch more explicit. In Section 4.2.1, we begin by defining the types of terms used in the theory: in

particular, we consider the relationship between terms representing names and terms representing the objects referred to by the names. Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 describe conceptual and attribute predicates. We will then have presented enough definitions to be able to describe the structure of the LDT in detail. The LDT's axioms are stratified into three distinct groups, listed in order of increasing specificity: this reflects the basic strategy of translating the original logical form predicates into predicates which are increasingly closer to the database. We refer to the groups as *general*, *domain-specific* and *database-specific*, and describe them in turn in Sections 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5. The next three sections describe particular types of information in the LDT. Section 4.6 describes the axioms used to deal with some of the more interesting linguistic constructions; Section 4.7 discusses assumption declarations; and Section 4.8 briefly examines Horn-clause axioms. In the final section, we present an extended example showing translation of a complex query.

4.2.1 Names and objects

For reasons explained in Section 2.3, we regard the terms appearing as arguments to database predicates as referring not to entities in the exterior world, but rather to “database objects”, which in practice can be taken to mean strings of characters. Since the linguistic predicates are intended to range over real-world objects, it is necessary to provide some way of relating objects to their database identifiers. This is done through the *naming predicates*. The intuition is that database identifiers are names, but not unique names: they need to be associated with some extra information to become unique. For example, there are some numbers which are both cheque and transaction IDs; the fact that a cheque ID happens to be identical with a transaction ID does *not* imply that the cheque and transaction are identical, or even that they are related.

The LDT deals with these problems by assuming that the named objects referred to by the theory can be divided up into a set of discrete subsets called *types*, such that names are unique within each type; it is also convenient to introduce identifiers for the types, and to allow terms of the form

`<Type>#<Name>`

to be regarded as referring to “the object of type `<Type>`, with identifier `<Name>`”. If the types can be identified with the extensions of English NBAR senses, then the typed objects can be described by noun-phrases consisting of the NBAR followed by the name. Thus for example the typed object

`transaction1#123` can be referred to by the English noun-phrase *transaction 123*. In practice, all the types used in the PRM LDT are identified with NBAR senses in the way just described.

Three kinds of database objects that need to be treated specially are those explicitly referring to numbers, amounts and dates. To deal with these, there are three predicates that relate these database objects to terms in the theory that represent the objects they name; for uniformity there is also a fourth predicate, which encodes the relationship between a database ID, a type, and the resulting typed object. The fourth predicates are

`sql_number_convert(Num,DBNum)` `Num` is the number of which `DBNum` is the name. In the current implementation, `Num` is a Prolog number, and `DBNum` is a Prolog atom whose print-name is the same as that of `Num`. Surprisingly, distinguishing between these two types of object actually turns out to be very helpful in terms of simplifying the mechanics of the low-level SQL interface.

`amount_object(Amount,Unit,Num)` `AmountObject` is an object representing the quantity of size `Num`, measured in the unit `Unit`.

`sql_date_convert(Date,DBDate)` `DBDate` is the database representation of the date `Date`. In the current implementation, `Date` is a structured term whose components represent the day, month and year of the date; `DBDate` is a Prolog atom whose print-name encodes the SQL representation of the date.

`named_object(TypedObject,Type,Id)` `TypedObject` is the unique typed object (cf Section 4.2.1) with type `Type` and database ID `Id`.

4.2.2 “Conceptual” predicates

Because of the very conservative semantics we have assigned to the database predicates, they are difficult to work with directly. It is consequently useful to pair each database predicate P_{db} with an “idealized” version which we call the corresponding *conceptual* predicate, P_{conc} . The exact general relationship between the “database” and “conceptual” versions of predicate is not meant to be strictly defined, but the following guiding principles have been found to be useful:

- Each argument Arg_{db} in P_{db} should have a corresponding argument Arg_{conc} in P_{conc} . If Arg_{db} is an identifier, then Arg_{conc} is the object it

identifies; if it is a “code” (e.g. a yes/no value), then the values of the two arguments should be equal.

- An extra argument should be added to P_{conc} if P_{db} has no primary key field. This argument will often end up corresponding to the “entity” argument in verbs that translate into P_{conc} .
- In some cases, other extra arguments may need to be added to P_{conc} corresponding to objects that can be referred to in natural language in connection with P_{db} , but which are always assumed to have the same value. For example, all the transactions in the database have been made by SRI, and this is implicit in the semantics of the TRANS relation. Since SRI can however be *explicitly* referred to in English as making payments, it is helpful to have an argument in the conceptual predicate corresponding to TRANS which holds the “payer” in the transaction.
- “Contingent” restrictions relating to P_{db} should not apply to P_{conc} , for example that the record only holds of events occurring within a specified period. The contingent completeness information is added instead as part of the formulas relating P_{db} and P_{conc} .

The brief discussion above should motivate the following definitions of the conceptual predicates associated with the database predicates in the PRM LDT. We will describe the axioms that relate each database predicate to its associated conceptual predicate later, in Section 4.5. For the moment, we leave the connection between them informal.

`transaction(Trans,Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Account,Amt)`

`Trans` is a payment made by `Payer` to `Payee` on the day `Date`. The amount was `Amt` and the payment was accomplished using `Cheque`; it was charged to `Account`. Note that the new argument `Payer` has been added, and the restrictions concerning the permitted range of dates dropped. Most importantly, the arguments are all objects in the exterior world rather than strings.

`project(Project,Organisation,Account,Start,End)`

`Project` is a project at `Organisation`. It has the associated account `Account`, the start date is `Start`, and the end date is `End`. Once again, a new argument (`Organisation`) has been added.

```
payee(Payee,Type)
```

Payee is a payee of the type defined by Type. Here, the difference between the conceptual and database predicates is minimal.

```
employee(Employee,Organisation,Sex,HasCar),
```

Employees at Organisation, classified by their sex and whether or not they have a company car.

```
booking_to_project(Event,Person,Time,Date,Project)
```

Since the TIMESHEET predicate has no primary key, the argument Event is added, corresponding to the event of Person's booking the quantity of time Time to Project on Date.

Database relationships are usually functions on at least one of their arguments (those that correspond to primary keys); as just discussed, conceptual relations always have this property, if necessary by construction. The translation mechanism is able to make use of information about functional relationships in several ways (cf 3.6.2). Functional relations are defined by declarations of the form

```
function(<Template>,<From> -> <To>)
```

This is to be read as stating that in <Template>, an assignation of values to the variables making up the list <From> uniquely determines the values of the variables in the list <To>.

Function declarations of this type are consequently supplied both for database and conceptual predicates. For example, the declarations for TRANS and transaction are

```
function(TRANS(TransId,ChequeId,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt),
        ([TransId] -> [ChequeId,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt]))
function(TRANS(TransId,ChequeId,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt),
        ([ChequeId] -> [TransId,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt]))
```

```
function(transaction(Trans,Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt),
        ([Trans] -> [Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt]))
function(transaction(Trans,Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt),
        ([Cheque] -> [Payer,Trans,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt]))
```

Either the transaction ID or the cheque number could be used as a primary key, and hence there are two functional declarations for each predicate.

4.2.3 “Attribute” predicates

There is a second general class of intermediate predicates that we have found it helpful to introduce; we call these “attribute” predicates. Attribute predicate receive their name because they are used to associate an object or event with a characteristic attribute, such as time of occurrence or magnitude. There is one attribute predicate for each such attribute. Introducing the attribute predicates makes the LDT more modular. For example, most temporal prepositions translate directly or indirectly into expressions involving the time associated with an object; however, the target predicates used to express the relationship between an object and its associated time depend on the nature of the object. By introducing the attribute predicate `associated_time`, it is possible to produce a modular solution. The predicates representing the preposition senses are first translated, using domain-independent equivalences, into a representation expressed in terms of the `associated_time` predicate; then domain-dependent equivalences (one for each relevant type of object) translate `associated_time` into conceptual predicates.

In the PRM LDT, we use four attribute predicates. There are three temporal attribute predicates, `associated_time`, `associated_start_time` and `associated_end_time`, which are produced as intermediate translations of word-sense predicates for words like *when*, *during*, *after*, *start* and *end*. Each temporal attribute predicate is a three-place predicate, whose arguments are, in order

- the object (which will often be an event)
- the associated date or time
- the “granularity” of the date or time, which at present must be either `days` or `seconds`

The fourth attribute predicate `associated_size`, has two arguments. It is produced as a result of translating linguistic predicates denoting the “size” or “magnitude” of an objects, which mainly arise in constructions that compare objects with reference to their extent. Expressions of this form include comparatives (*larger*, *smaller*) superlatives (*largest*, *smallest*), and some prepositions like *over* (*over £250*).

4.3 General axioms

In the next three sections, we describe the axioms of the PRM LDT: as indicated earlier, these are divided into three groups, which we refer to as “general”, “domain-specific” and “database-specific” respectively. About 195 of the axioms fall into the first, “general” group. About 45 of them translate words used to refer to concepts in the utterance situation (*show*, *question*, *answer* etc.) into representations in terms of the primitive executable predicates. For the sort of modularity reasons already referred to, translation is in fact carried out in three stages. The linguistic word-sense predicates are first translated into an intermediate form, expressed in terms of the predicates `execute` and `display_format`. For example a typical equivalence of this type would be the following one, that translates the ditransitive verb *show* (*Show me the payments*):

```
show2(Event,Agent,X,Audience) <->
exists([Time,Format],
  and(display_format(X,Format)
    execute(Event,display(Format),Agent,Audience,Time))
```

The right-hand side of the above equivalence expresses the fact that a “showing” of an object `X` by `Agent` to `Audience` involves finding a suitable display format `Format`, and then displaying `Format`. In practice, `Agent` will be `clare` and `Audience` a term referring to the user. In the second round of translation, the predicate `display_format` is replaced by a representation in terms of “conceptual” predicates, in a way that is dependent on the nature of `X`: this is discussed later, in Section 4.6.3. Finally, goals of the form

```
execute(Event,Action,clare,<User>,Time)
```

are translated into one of the two forms

```
execute_in_future(Action)
```

or

```
executed_in_past(Action)
```

depending on whether the context makes `Time` after or before the present moment. This division mirrors the important pragmatic distinction between future actions, which can be caused to occur if the system so desires, and past actions, which can be “remembered” by consulting the action log.

Of the remaining “general” axioms, about 100 translate basic word senses, like temporal prepositions and size expressions, into the “attribute predicates” described in Section 4.2.3 above. A simple example is provided by the predicate corresponding to the the temporal preposition *during*, which is translated by the equivalence

```
during1(E1,E2) <->
exists([T1,T2,Gran1,Gran2],
  and(associated_time(E1,T1,Gran1),
  and(associated_time(E2,T2,Gran2),
  time_during([T1,Gran1],[T2,Gran2])))
```

This expresses the fact that an event **E1** can be regarded as being “during” another event **E2** if the time associated with the first event is contained in the time associated with the second one. The arguments **Gran1** and **Gran2** express the conceptual level of granularity of the events **E1** and **E2**; at present they can be either **days** (appropriate for database events) or **seconds** (appropriate for utterance situation events). Note that the definition of the `associated_time` predicate is provided by domain-specific axioms; the equivalence performs the domain-independent function of translating the linguistic predicate `during1` into a more convenient form expressed in terms of the general predicates `associated_time` and `time_during`.

The inherently vague nature of many prepositions, however, means that an extra level of indirection is often required to translate them. The predicate corresponding to the preposition is first translated by a conditional equivalence into a second predicate representing a specialized preposition-sense; the conditions reflect suitable constraints on the preposition’s arguments. The preposition sense predicate can then be translated into “attribute predicates” by equivalences like the one for `during1` shown above. For instance, the following conditional equivalence is in the PRM LDT sufficient to deal with the temporal sense of the preposition *from*, as in *from 1/3/90 to 15/5/90*:

```
(from1(X,Y) <-> from_Temporal(X,Y)) <-
  temporal_entity(Y).
```

The predicate `temporal_entity` is defined by Horn-clauses to hold of dates, times and a few other similar objects.

The final set of about 30 general rules deal with translations of predicates like `time_during`, which relate times; the complications are caused by the fact that “times” can be either points or intervals, and can also be

expressed at different levels of granularity. The temporal axioms translate all the temporal predicates into a uniform representation in terms of a single predicate, `time_point_precedes`, that compares time-points with regard to temporal precedence.

4.4 Domain-specific axioms

The axioms of the second group, which for the PRM domain are somewhat less numerous than the first, are domain-specific but not database-specific. They translate predicates representing senses of domain words (*project, transaction, deliverable* etc.) and “attribute” predicates like `associated_time`, into representations expressed in terms of the conceptual predicates of Section 4.2.2.

Translation of both domain word-sense predicates and attribute predicates is frequently dependent on the nature of their arguments, and the corresponding equivalences are thus either conditional or have complex left-hand sides. For example, the time associated with a payment is the transaction date, but that associated with a project is the interval spanned by the start- and end-dates. The equivalences that express this are

```
and(associated_time(Trans,Date,Granularity),
    transaction1(Trans)) <->
exists([Payer,Cheque,Payee,Acc,Amt],
    and(transaction(Payer,Trans,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt),
        Granularity = days))
```

```
and(associated_time(Project,Interval,Gran),
    project1(Project)) <->
exists([StartDate,EndDate],
    and(project(Org,Project,Account,StartDate,EndDate),
        Interval = interval(StartDate,EndDate))
```

Other examples of domain-specific equivalences can be found at the beginning of Section 4.6.

4.5 Database-specific axioms

The third group of axioms relate the conceptual predicates to the associated concrete database predicates. They capture specific coding peculiarities

which relate database-objects and their associated real-world counterparts, which, as explained above in section 2.6, includes contingent limitations on the availability of recorded data. The database-specific group is small, consisting of about 25 axioms; these consist of one or more equivalence linking each conceptual predicate to its concrete counterpart, together with some axioms that define the “contingent limitations” when necessary. For example, the equivalences that relate the database predicate `TIMESHEET` and its conceptual counterpart `book_time_to_project` (slightly simplified) are

```
(book_time_to_project(Ev,Emp,Amt,Date,Acc) <->
  book_time_to_project_recorded(Ev,Emp,Amt,Date,Acc)) <-
  timesheet_data_available(Date,Acc)

exists([Ev],
  book_time_to_project_recorded(Ev,Emp,Amt,Date,Acc) <->
exists([EmpId,DBDate,AccId],
  and(TIMESHEET(EmpId,Amt,DBDate,AccId),
    and(named_object(Emp,employee1,EmpId),
      and(sql_date_convert(Date,DBDate),
        named_object(Acc,account1,AccId))))))
```

The first of these is a “universal” equivalence, that encodes the contingent completeness restrictions. It consults the predicate `timesheet_data_available` to find out whether `Date` is within the range for which timesheet data on account `Acc` has been recorded. `timesheet_data_available` is defined by a set of Horn-clauses (one for each account), of the form

```
timesheet_data_available(D,<CLAREAccount>) <-
  and(time_point_precedes(nonstrict,<CLAREStartDate>,D),
    time_point_precedes(nonstrict,D,<CLARELastRecordedDate>))

timesheet_data_available(D,<SLTAccount>) <-
  and(time_point_precedes(nonstrict,<SLTStartDate>,D),
    time_point_precedes(nonstrict,D,<SLTLastRecordedDate>))
...
```

where `<CLAREAccount>` is a ground term representing the CLARE account, and so on. The second, “existential” equivalence above uses the “naming” predicates `named_object` and `sql_date_convert` to relate the real-world objects referred to by `book_time_to_project` and the database identifiers in `TIMESHEET`.

Most of the permissible assumptions that can be made are related to the database-specific axioms, and are of one of two types. The first type, a “specialization” (see section 2.4.1), permits the assumption that arguments like “employer” in the `project` conceptual relation or “payer” in the `transaction` relation are filled by `SRI` unless explicitly filled by something else. There is a predicate, `assumably_`, to deal with this situation: we illustrate with the `project` relation. The equivalence that translates it into the associated database predicate is schematically of the form

```
(project(Proj,Org,Acc,StartDate,EndDate) <->
... <Right-hand side> ...) <-
  arguably_(Org,
             organization1#sri,
             all_projects_referred_to_are_at_SRI)
```

The content of the condition on this equivalence is that `Org` should be equal to `organization1#sri`. If it is not, it may be assumed to be, with the “justification” `all_projects_referred_to_are_at_SRI`. The intended semantics of the predicate `assumably_`, as the name suggests, are that it should hold if the first two arguments are equal; otherwise, they can be assumed equal, with the third argument serving as a “justification”. This is specified by the following Horn-clause and assumption declaration:

```
assumably_(X,Y,Justification) <- X=Y

assumable(assumably_(X,Y,Justification),
          0,
          Justification,
          specialization,
          true)
```

The second main type of assumption, a “limitation”, is related to temporal incompleteness of database records: here, the declaration is to the effect that it is permissible to assume that data is within the period for which records have been kept unless the conjunctive context implies the contrary. We illustrate with the `timesheet_data_available` predicate above. There is one assumption declaration for each account. The declaration for the `CLARE` account is for example

```
assumable(
  timesheet_data_available(D,<CLAREAcc>),
```



```

15,
time_was_booked_after_<CLAREStartDate>_and_\\
                    before_<CLARELastRecordedDate>,
limitation,
true))

```

4.6 Specific linguistic constructs

In this section, we will describe the types of equivalences used to translate some specific types of linguistic constructs. We begin with the unproblematic cases, in which a linguistic predicate can directly be mapped into a relation on one more slots of a conceptual or attribute predicate. (We will use the term “conceptual slot” as a handy abbreviation for “argument of a conceptual predicate”). The simplest case is perhaps that of a common noun which describes a conceptual slot. In the following example, the rule says that an object which fills the third argument place in the conceptual transaction relation can be described by the predicate `cheque1`.

```

cheque1(Cheque) <->
exists([Payer,Trans,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt],
    transaction(Trans,Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt))

```

Slightly more complex rules are used to translate many domain-specific preposition senses. The following are the equivalences that cover “cheque for amount” (*cheques for more than £200*), “cheque to payee” (*cheque to Maxwells*) and “cheque on account” (*cheques on account 8468*):

```

and(for(Cheque,Amt),
    cheque1(Cheque)) <->
exists([Trans,Payer,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt],
    transaction(Trans,Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt))

```

```

and(to(Cheque,Payee),
    cheque1(Cheque)) <->
exists([Trans,Payer,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt],
    transaction(Trans,Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt))

```

```

and(on(Cheque,Acc),
    and(cheque1(Cheque),
        account1(Acc))) <->

```

```
exists([Trans,Payer,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt],
       transaction(Trans,Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt))
```

In all these examples, the conditions on applicability are provided by extra conjuncts on the LHS. Similar considerations apply to many verb senses: the following, for example, is the rule that covers “pay money to”, as in *SRI paid £120 to Maxwells*.

```
and(pay2(Trans,Payer,Amt,Payee),
     money1(Amt)) <->
exists([Payer,Date,Acc],
       transaction(Trans,Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt))
```

Note that the “paying event” is regarded as being the same as the transaction, and that the agent of the paying event becomes the *Payer* in the conceptual *transaction* relation.

In the remainder of this section, we consider constructions that require equivalences of a different or more complex form.

4.6.1 Translating “attribute” predicates

“Attribute” predicates can be translated in much the same way as the linguistic predicates we have seen above. Domain-dependent equivalences are provided to translate the attributes predicates in the contexts provided by the domain word-senses: the right-hand sides of these equivalences will usually contain conceptual predicates. The following rule, for example, translates the *associated_time* predicate in a context where its first argument is a transaction; it states that the fourth field of a *transaction* relation is the time (at the level of granularity of days) associated with the transaction.

```
and(associated_time(Trans,Date,Granularity),
     transaction1(Trans)) <->
exists([Cheque,Payer,Payee,Acc,Amt],
       and(transaction(Trans,Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt),
           Granularity = days))
```

Similarly, the following pair of rules state that the start and end dates of a project are encoded in the fourth and fifth fields of the *project* relationship respectively.

```
and(associated_start_time(Project,StartDate,Granularity),
```

```

    project1(Project)) <->
exists([Org,ProjNum,EndDate],
    and(project(Project,Org,ProjNum,StartDate,EndDate),
        Granularity = days))

and(associated_end_time(Project,EndDate,Granularity),
    project1(Project)) <->
exists([Org,ProjNum,StartDate],
    and(project(Project,Org,ProjNum,StartDate,EndDate),
        Granularity = days))

```

The `associated_size` primitive predicate takes two arguments: the first is the object in question, and the second is its “size”, which is represented as number. Finding a suitable number usually involves including a goal in the RHS which extracts the number from a term representing an amount. In the following example, which defines the “size” of a cheque, the extraction is performed using the `amount_object` predicate (cf Section 4.2.1).

```

and(associated_size(Cheque,N),
    cheque1(Cheque)) <->
exists([Trans,Payer,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt],
    and(transaction(Trans,Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt),
        amount_object(AM,sterling_unit,N)))

```

4.6.2 Support verbs

Support verb constructions like “make a payment” also demand a slightly different treatment. The next example shows the relevant equivalence:

```

and(make2(MakeEvent,Payer,Trans),
    payment1(Trans)) <->
exists([Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt],
    and(transaction(Trans,Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt)
        MakeEvent = Trans))

```

Here the “making” event is once again regarded as being the same as the payment. In cases like this, where two variables from the LHS (`MakeEvent` and `Trans`) are to be mapped onto a single event on the RHS, the most straightforward solution is to write the rule in the way shown, with an equality on the right. It is worth noting that the apparently plausible formula

```
and(make2(Trans,Payer,Trans),
    payment1(Trans)) <->
exists([Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt],
    transaction(Trans,Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt))
```

does not achieve the desired end, and is not in fact equivalent with the previous one. The easiest way to convince oneself of the truth of this statement (which may seem counter-intuitive to readers used to Horn-clauses) is to consider the pair of formulas

$$p(X,Y) \leftrightarrow \text{and}(q(X), X = Y)$$

and

$$p(X,X) \leftrightarrow q(X)$$

The first of them means that $p(a,b)$ implies $q(a)$, but not the second.

4.6.3 Predicates referring to identifiers

Some linguistic predicates can refer to names or numbers, which in the PRM LDT are equated with database identifiers. For example, the equivalence used to translate the relational sense of the compound noun *project number* (e.g. *CLARE's project number*) is

```
project_number_of(N,Project),
exists([Org,Start,End,Account],
    and(project(Project,Org,Account,Start,End),
        named_object(Account,account1,N)))
```

Note the use of the predicate `named_object` on the RHS. This expresses the fact that `Account` is the “typed object” (cf Section 4.2.1) of type `account1` with identifier `N`, i.e. the object referred to by the English expression *account N*.

Equivalences of this type are also used to help translate predicates corresponding to “displaying” verbs like *show* and *list*. As explained in Section 4.3 above, these are first translated into a uniform representation that uses the predicates `executable_action/6` and `display_format/2`. The second of these is a predicate which determines the appearance of the term printed to represent a database object: the intention is that

```
display_format(Object,Format)
```

should hold if `Format` is either a database object, or a list containing one or more database objects, that can be used together as a representation of `Object` suitable for displaying to the user. For example, a transaction can be conveniently displayed as a list consisting of its transaction ID, the date of the payment, the payee ID, and the amount. This is captured in the following equivalence,

```
and(display_format(Trans,Format),
     transaction1(Trans)) <->
exists([Payer,C,Date,Payee,AC,Amt,TransId,DBDate,PayeeId,AmtNum],
       and(transaction(Trans,Payer,C,Date,Payee,AC,Amt),
           and(named_object(Trans,transaction1,TransId),
               and(sql_date_convert(Date,DBDate),
                   and(named_object(Payee,payee1,PayeeId),
                       and(amount_object(Amt,pounds_sterling,AmtNum)
                           Format = [TransId,DBDate,PayeeId,AmtNum]))))))))
```

There is one `display_format` definition for each type of object. Many objects are “typed objects” whose names serve as adequate descriptions; this is for example the case for sponsors in the PRM domain. In cases like these, an equivalence like the following one for “sponsors” is sufficient:

```
(display_format(Sponsor,Format) <->
  named_object(Sponsor,sponsor1,Format)) <-
  sponsor1(Sponsor).
```

4.6.4 Expressions that map onto code values

The filler of a field in a database relationship is often a code, and an English expression can map onto a value, or set of values, for this code; thus for example it might easily be the case that a word like *man* or *woman* ultimately maps onto a field being filled by an `m` or a `w`. The problems involved have already been discussed at some length in Section 3.7. Here, we present some more examples from the PRM LDT.

The first and second equivalences below are straightforward. The first states that *man* when applied to an object known to be a payee, maps onto the first field of the `payee` relation being filled by an `m` (recall that `payee1` is a predicate corresponding to a words-sense, while `payee` is a “conceptual” predicate). The second states that an overhead payment is a transaction where the “account” field is filled by a numbered object of type “account” whose number satisfies the predicate `overhead_code`.

```
and(man1(Payee),
    payee1(Payee)) <->
payee(m,Payee)
```

```
overhead_payment1(Trans) <->
exists([Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt,Num],
    and(transaction(Trans,Payer,Cheque,Date,Payee,Acc,Amt),
    and(numbered_object(Account,account1,Num),
    overhead_code(Num))))
```

For the second equivalences, a further definition is needed to specify the range of permitted values for overhead codes: they are defined to be exactly those numbers which are members of the set {775, 675}. The equivalence used is

```
overhead_code(Num) <-> member(Num,[775,675])
```

The third example uses the `employee` relation, whose third argument is set to `y` if the employee in question has a company car. It illustrates the problems discussed earlier in Section 3.7, and involves a code which indicates existence or non-existence of an object. The following two rules provide an appropriate translation for the relevant predicates `company_car1` and `have1`:

```
and(company_car1(Car),
    and(employee1(Empl),
    have1(Event,Empl,Car))) <->
employee_has_car(Event,Empl,Car)
```

```
exists([Event,Car],
    employee_has_car(Event,Empl,Car)) <->
exists([Sex]
    employee(Empl,Sex,y))
```

4.6.5 Transferring properties between objects

There are several cases in the PRM LDT where two related objects X and X' can both have the same property P . We have already seen one example of this phenomenon earlier in our discussion of the “Doctor on Board” problem (Section 3.7), where both ships and doctors can have positions, and the position of a doctor is the same as that of his ship. In all the cases in the

PRM domain, it was possible, just as with the ships and doctors, to express the relationship between P , X and X' with a simple conditional equivalence.

We illustrate with the preposition *on*, used with regard to payments; linguistically, payments can be either on accounts (*Show me all payments on account 8468*) or on projects (*Which payments on CLARE were over £1000?*). This is of course a simple example of metonymy. The “payment on account” case can be mapped into the TRANS relation, which associates payments with account numbers. To deal with the “payment on project” case we must first find the project’s account number. This can be achieved with the following conditional equivalence:

```
(on1(X,Project) <-> on1(X,Account)) <-
  project(Project,Org,Account,Start,End) .
```

which compactly captures the metonymic relationship between the two contexts of use of `on1`.

4.7 Assumption declarations

Most of the assumption declarations in the PRM LDT are of the form described earlier in Section 4.5: they make it permissible to assume that contingently complete information really is complete for the purposes of the question. Assumption declarations are also used in two other contexts.

Firstly, there are a couple of cases where a word can be assumed to be used in a specialized sense: for example, *car* is normally assumed to mean *company car*. This is achieved by using a conditional equivalence

```
(car1(X) <-> company_car1(X)) <-
  car_is_company_car(X)
```

together with the assumption declaration

```
assumable(car_is_company_car(X),
  0,
  all_cars_referred_to_are_company_cars,
  specialization,
  true)
```

Here, `all_cars_referred_to_are_company_cars` is the “justification” tag used to describe the assumption to the user.

The second type of assumption declaration is more interesting, and is related to the “executable predicates”. Recall that these are predicates which the system can cause to become true, by executing actions in the world. If they refer to future events, ground executable predicate goals can thus be assumed to be true. This is specified by the assumption declaration (slightly simplified)

```
assumable(execute_in_future(Action),
          0,
          perform_action(Action),
          action,
          ground_action(Action)).
```

The content of the declaration is that the execution of `Action` by CLARE at some future time can be assumed to be true, if `Action` is a ground term representing an action. The assumption is of the type `action`, and the justification is the term

```
perform_action(Action)
```

The justification in the case of an assumption of type `action` is of a special kind: it is in a literal sense a promissory note that the action will be carried out by the system at some time in the future. After a proof has been completed, CLARE collects together all these action assumptions, and discharges them by executing all the actions described in the justification tags.

4.8 Horn clause axioms

A number of Horn-clause axioms are also used in the PRM LDT. We have already seen some examples of Horn-clause axioms in the preceding section, used to define conditions under which conceptual and database predicates correspond. Two other types of Horn-clause axioms found in the LDT are also worth discussing. The first results from the predicate `personal/1`, which holds of entities that can be referred to by the interrogative pronoun *who*. In a normal context like *Who works on CLARE?* or *Who booked time to project 8744 this month?*, no information is contributed by the occurrence of `personal`; it is implicit that entities who can work on projects, or book time to projects, can be referred to as “who”. This fact is captured in the Horn-clauses


```
personal(Person) <-
  works_on_project(Event,Person,Project).
```

```
personal(Person) <-
  booking_to_project(Event,Person,Time,Date,Account).
```

The translation process uses these clauses to deduce that the occurrences of `personal` are implied by their contexts, and can safely be thrown away, in the way described in Section 3.6.2.

The second type of Horn-clauses are the “negated goal” axioms used to find inconsistent uses of assumptions (cf Section 3.5). These are formulas of the type

```
neg(Goal) <- Body
```

They are not Horn-clauses according to the formal definition of the term, but are treated as such by the inference engine (cf Section 5.1.3).

In the current PRM LDT, negated goal clauses are mainly used in connection with conditions on “limitation” assumptions. For example, we saw in Section 4.5 above that the “open” predicate `book_time_to_project` and its “closed” counterpart `book_time_to_project_recorded` are linked by the equivalence

```
(book_time_to_project(Ev,Emp,Amt,Date,Acc) <->
  book_time_to_project_recorded(Ev,Emp,Amt,Date,Acc)) <-
  timesheet_data_available(Date,Acc)
```

where `timesheet_data_available` is a predicate, defined by normal Horn-clauses, that gives sufficient conditions for timesheet data having been recorded. A typical clause, giving sufficient conditions for timesheet data on CLARE to have been recorded, was

```
timesheet_data_available(D,<CLAREAccount>) <-
  and(time_point_precedes(nonstrict,<CLAREStartDate>,D),
      time_point_precedes(nonstrict,D,<CLARELastRecordedDate>))
```

Now we can make these conditions necessary as well, by adding the corresponding negated clauses

```
neg(timesheet_data_available(D,<CLAREAcc>)) <-
  time_point_precedes(strict,D,<CLAREStartDate>)
```

```
neg(timesheet_data_available(D,<CLAREAcc>)) <-
  time_point_precedes(strict,<CLARELastRecordedDate>,D)
```

As can be seen, these state that timesheet data is explicitly *not* recorded for dates outside the specified period.

The following negated goal clause is provided for the predicate `assumably_` described in Section 4.5:

```
neg(assumably_(X,Y,Justification)) <-
  different_ground_terms(X,Y)
```

This makes it inconsistent to assume that distinct ground terms are equal. The predicate `different_ground_terms` is defined in a way that treats specially the unique constants introduced by translation schemas for constructions that bind variables (cf Sections 3.2.1 and 3.4). These unique constants are not considered to be ground terms for the purposes of the `different_ground_terms` predicate.

4.9 A full example

In this final section, we present a detailed example showing how CLARE uses the PRM linguistic domain theory to find an effective translation of the TRL representation of sentence **(S1)** (repeated here for convenience).

(S1) Show all payments made to BT during 1990.

We will take a few liberties with the exact representation of the domain axioms in the interests of increased readability. In particular we have suppressed the complications caused by the treatment of granularity of time, and removed some arguments from predicates when they were irrelevant to the example. To make the formulas more compact, we also introduce the minor notational abbreviation of writing `E` instead of `exists` to represent existential quantification, and `A` instead of `forall` to represent universal quantification.

The original TRL representation of **(S1)** is

```
A([Trans],
  impl(E([Agnt,Ev],
    and(payment1(Trans),
      and(make2(Ev,Agnt,Trans,payee1#bt),
        during1(Ev,year1#1990))))),
  E([ShowEv],
    and(show1(ShowEv,clare,Trans),
      before1(<Now>,ShowEv))))))
```

(We write `<Now>` to stand for the TRL representation of the present moment). The formula can be glossed as “For all `Trans` such that `Trans` is a payment made by some `Agent` during the year 1990, it is the case that CLARE will show `Trans` at some time after the present time”.

The desired effective translation will be expressed in terms of three evaluable predicates. The database information is accessed by the predicate `TRANS(TransId,DBDate,PayeeName,Amount)`. We have omitted the `ChequeId` and `Account` arguments, since they play no part in the derivation; we have also removed the corresponding arguments from the associated conceptual predicate, `transaction`. Dates are manipulated by the arithmetic predicate `time_point_precedes` (shortened to `t_precedes`), which holds if its arguments are two representations of calendar dates such that the first is temporally before the second. Execution of actions is represented as usual by the predicate

```
execute_in_future(Action)
```

(cf Section 4.3). The actions we are interested in here are displaying actions carried out by CLARE: these will be represented as terms of the form `display(FormatList)` where `FormatList` is a list of objects to be displayed.

The first step is to use equivalences which translate the linguistic predicates `payment1`, `make2`, `during1`, `show1` and `before1` into conceptual predicates. Replacing bound variables with unique constants marked with asterisks,

```
payment1(Trans*)
```

is first translated to

```
E([Payer,Date,Payee,Amt],
   transaction(Trans*,Payer,Date,Payee,Amt))
```

using the domain-specific equivalence

```
transaction1(Trans) <->
E([Payer,Date,Payee,Amt],
   transaction(Trans,Payer,Date,Payee,Amt)).
```

Then

```
make2(Ev*,Agnt*,Trans*,payee1#bt)
```

is translated into

```
E([Date1,Amt1],
  and(transaction(Ev*,Agnt*,Date1,payee1#bt,Amt1),
    Ev*=Trans*))
```

using the rule

```
and(make2(Payer,Event,Payment,Payee),
  transaction1(Payment)) <->
E([Date,Amt],
  and(transaction(Event,Payer,Date,Payee,Amt),
    (Event = Payment)))
```

The next rule to be applied is the one that translates `during1`. The intended semantics of `during1(E1,E2)` are “E1 and E2 are events, and the time associated with E1 is inside that associated with E2”. The relevant equivalence is

```
during1(E1,E2) <->
E([Date1,Date2],
  and(associated_time(E1,Date1),
    and(associated_time(E2,Date2),
      time_during(Date1,Date2))))
```

This translates

```
during1(Ev*,year1#1990)
```

into

```
E([Date1,Date2],
  and(associated_time(Ev*,Date1),
    and(associated_time(year#1990,Date2),
      time_during(Date1,Date2))))
```

This can now be translated further by using equivalences for `associated_time`. For the first conjunct, the appropriate one is

```
and(associated_time(Trans,Date),
  transaction1(Trans)) <->
E([Payer,Payee,Amt],
  transaction(Trans,Payer,Date,Payee,Amt))
```

which says that the `associated_time` of a transaction is its third argument; for the second conjunct, we have

```
associated_time(year1#YearNum,Time) <->
Time = interval(date(YearNum,1,1),date(YearNum,12,31))
```

which says that the time associated with a year is the interval starting on the first of January and ending on the 31st of December. Applying these in turn, we get a representation of

```
during1(Ev*,year1#1990)
```

in terms of conceptual predicates, namely

```
E([Payer2,Date2,Payee2,Amt2],
  and(transaction(Ev*,Payer2,Date2,Payee2,Amt2),
    time_during(Date2,interval(date([1990,1,1]),
      date([1990,12,31])))))
```

Next

```
show1(ShowEv*,clare,Trans*)
```

is translated by the following two equivalences. The first, a “general” axiom,

```
show1(E,Agent,X) <->
E([DisplayT,Format],
  and(execute(E,display(Format),Agent,DisplayT),
    display_format(X,Format)))
```

can be glossed “A showing of *X* by *Agent* is the execution of a displaying of *Format*, where *Format* is the display-format of *X*”. The second,

```
and(display_format(Trans,Format),
  transaction1(Trans)) <->
E([TransId,Payer,Date,DBDate,Payee,PayeeId,Amt,AmtNum],
  and(transaction(Trans,Payer,Date,Payee,Amt),
    and(named_object(Trans,TransId,transaction),
    and(sql_date_convert(Date,DBDate),
    and(named_object(Payee,PayeeId,payee1),
    and(amount_object(Amt,pounds,AmtNum),
    Format = [TransId,DBDate,PayeeId,AmtNum]))))
```

(see section 4.6.3) is a context-sensitive domain-dependent equivalence which defines the display-format for a transaction to be a four-element list consisting of the transaction ID, the transaction date, the payee’s name, and the amount. The result of applying both of these is

```

E([TransId,Date3,DBDate,Payee3,PayeeId,Amt3,AmtNum,DisplayT],
  and(execute(ShowEv*,display([TransId,DBDate,PayeeId,AmtNum]),
    clare,DisplayT),
    and(transaction(Trans*,Payer3,Date3,Payee3,Amt3),
      and(Trans*=transaction1#Id,
        and(sql_date_convert(Date,DBDate)
          and(Payee3=payee1#PayeeId,
            Amt3=amount(AmtNum,pounds)))))))))

```

Finally,

```
before1(<Now>,ShowEv*)
```

is translated into

```

E([Format1,DisplayAgent,DisplayT]
  and(execute(ShowEv*,Format1,DisplayAgent,DisplayT),
    time_before(<Now>,DisplayT)))

```

using rules similar to those used above to translate `during1`. When all the rules mentioned so far have been applied, the translated form is

```

A([Payer,Trans,Date,Payee,Amt,Payer1,Date1,Amt1,Payer2,
  Date2,Payee2,Amt2],
  impl(and(transaction(Trans,Payer,Date,Payee,Amt),
    and(transaction(Trans,Payer1,Date1,payee1#bt,Amt1)
      and(transaction(Trans,Payer2,Date2,Payee2,Amt2)
        time_during(Date2,
          interval(date([1990,1,1]),
            date([1990,12,31]))))))),
    E([TransId,Date3,DBDate,Payee3,PayeeId,Amt3,AmtNum,
      DisplayEv,Format1,DisplayAg,DisplayT3,DisplayT],
      and(execute(DisplayEv,
        display([Id,DBDate,PayeeId,Amt3]),
          clare,
          DisplayT1),
        and(execute(DisplayEv,Format1,DisplayAg,DisplayT),
          and(time_before(<Now>,DisplayT),
            and(transaction(Trans,Payer3,Date3,Payee3,Amt3),
              and(Trans=transaction1#Id,
                and(sql_date_convert(Date,DBDate),

```

```
and(Payee3=payee1#PayeeId,
    Amt=amount(AmtNum,pounds)))))))))
```

Exploiting the fact that `transaction` and `execute` are both functional on their first argument, this reduces after simplification involving functional merging (see section 3.6.2) to

```
A([Payer,Trans,Date,Payee,Amt],
  impl(and(transaction(Trans,Payer,Date,payee1#bt,Amt),
    time_during(Date,
      interval(date([1990,1,1]),
        date([1990,12,31])))),
    E([TransId,DBDate,AmtNum,DisplayT],
      and(Trans=transaction1#TransId,
        and(sql_date_convert(Date,DBDate),
          and(Amt=amount(AmtNum,pounds),
            and(execute(DisplayEv,
              display([TransId,DBDate,bt,AmtNum]),
                clare,
                DisplayT),
              time_before(<Now>,DisplayT)))))))))
```

Applying “general” equivalences to translate `time_before` and `time_during` into `t_precedes`, we get

```
A([Payer,Trans,Date,Payee,Amt],
  impl(and(transaction(Trans,Payer,Date,payee1#bt,Amt),
    and(t_precedes(date([1990,1,1]),Date),
      t_precedes(Date,date([1990,12,31])))),
    E([TransId,DBDate,AmtNum,DisplayT],
      and(Trans=transaction1#TransId,
        and(sql_date_convert(Date,DBDate),
          and(Amt=amount(AmtNum,pounds),
            and(execute(DisplayEv,
              display([TransId,DBDate,bt,AmtNum]),
                clare,
                DisplayT),
              t_precedes(<Now>,DisplayT)))))))))
```

We then apply more “general” equivalences to translate `execute` into `execute_in_future`, reducing the previous form to

```

A([Payer,Trans,Date,Payee,Amt],
  impl(and(transaction(Trans,Payer,Date,payee1#bt,Amt),
    and(t_precedes(date([1990,1,1]),Date),
      t_precedes(Date,date([1990,12,31])))),
    E([TransId,DBDate,AmtNum],
      and(Trans=transaction1#TransId,
        and(sql_date_convert(Date,DBDate),
          and(Amt=amount(AmtNum,pounds),
            and(execute_in_future(
              display([TransId,DBDate,bt,AmtNum])))))))))))

```

Now we apply the equivalence that translates the conceptual predicate `transaction` into the database predicate `TRANS`:

```

(and(transaction(Trans,Payer,Date,Payee,Amount),
  transaction_data_available(Date)) <->
  E([TransId,AMNum,PayeeName,DBDate],
    and(TRANS(TransId,DBDate,PayeeName,AMNum),
      and(named_object(Trans,TransId,transaction1),
        and(named_object(Payee,PayeeName,payee1),
          and(sql_date_convert(Date,DBDate),
            amount_object(Amount,pounds,AMNum)))))) <-
  assumably_=(Payer,
    organization#sri,
    payments_referred_to_are_from_SRI)

```

When the equivalence is applied to the goal

```
transaction(Trans*,Payer*,Date*,payee1#bt,Amt*)
```

its conjunctive context is the set

```
{t_precedes(date(1990,1,1),Date*),
 t_precedes(Date*,date(1990,12,31))}
```

There are two conditions that must be proved from the context for the rule to be applicable,

```
assumably_=(Payer*,
  organization1#sri,
  payments_referred_to_are_from_SRI)
```

and


```
transaction_data_available(Date*)
```

The first of these cannot be proved, but the assumption declaration

```
assumable(assumably_=(X,Y,Justification)
          0,
          Justification,
          specialization,
          true)
```

(cf Section 4.5) makes it permissible to assume it with justification `payments_referred_to_are_from_SRI`. The validity of the other condition can be inferred from the context. The axioms needed to do this are two Horn-clauses: one defines the period for which transaction records exist, viz.

```
transaction_data_available(Date) <-
  and(t_precedes(date(1,8,89),Date2),
       t_precedes(Date,date(1,4,91)))
```

and the other encodes the fact that `t_precedes` is transitive,

```
t_precedes(Date1,Date3) <-
  and(t_precedes(Date1,Date2),
       t_precedes(Date2,Date3))
```

By chaining backwards through these to the context, it is then possible to prove that `transaction_data_available(Date*)` holds, and translate to the final form

```
A([TransId,Date,DBDate,AmtNum],
  impl(and(TRANS(TransId,DBDate,bt,AmtNum)
           and(sql_date_convert(Date,DBDate),
              and(t_precedes(date([1990,1,1]),Date),
                    t_precedes(Date,date([1990,12,31]))))))
       execute_in_future(display([TransId,DBDate,bt,AmtNum]))))
```

The final formula admits a finite proof procedure, (cf sections 2.4.2 and 5.3), since its truth can be ascertained by an algorithm that can be summarized as

1. Search for all tuples from the finite `TRANS` relation.

2. Check each to find the ones where the `Payee` field is equal to `bt` and the `Date` field is suitably constrained by the arithmetic predicates `sql_date_convert` and `t_precedes`
3. Assume that appropriate lists will in each such case be displayed by the interface's causing the corresponding instantiated instance of the `execute_in_future` predicate to hold.

The system has also managed to prove, under an abductive assumption whose justification is `payments_referred_to_are_from_SRI`, that the final formula is equivalent to the original query. Granted this assumption, the user can be informed that the response is complete (cf section 2.5.2).

Chapter 5

The Reasoning Engine

CLARE's inference engine is used by several other components. It supports proofs from conjunctive contexts when performing translation (cf. section 3.2.1), and evaluates translated queries; it is also employed to compile the lemmas used when generating facts and questions (Chapter 6), and for various other tasks during reference resolution which will not concern us here. In each case, the basic functionality is some version of the following. We are provided with a Horn-clause theory Γ , a formula F (which may contain free variables \vec{x}), and a criterion which determines permissible abductive assumptions. The task is to find a substitution θ on \vec{x} and a set of permissible assumptions A such that

$$\Gamma \Rightarrow (A \rightarrow \theta(F)) \tag{5.1}$$

or terminate with the information that no such θ and A exist. This chapter describes how the inference functionalities are realized in CLARE as a type of Prolog meta-interpreter. Since these have been described many times in the literature (e.g. (Sterling and Shapiro, 1986)), we will concentrate on the unusual features of the CLARE inference engine. The expositional strategy used will be to describe a simplified version of the inference engine, beginning with a the basic meta-interpreter for pure Horn-clause theories shown in figure 5.1 and adding features as we go along to cover new functionalities.

5.1 Logical structure

The basic form of the inference engine is that of a slightly extended Prolog meta-interpreter. Superimposed on top of it, there is an iterated-deepening

```
prove(and(L,R)) :-  
    prove(L),  
    prove(R).  
  
prove(G) :-  
    horn_clause_in_theory(G <- Body),  
    prove(B).  
  
prove(G) :-  
    unit_clause_in_theory(G).
```

Figure 5.1: Basic Horn-clause interpreter

A* search strategy. We will only consider the logical aspects of the inference engine in this section, postponing discussion of the search strategy until section 5.2. There are two important extensions over the standard Prolog meta-interpreter: these are to cover abductive proofs and proofs of universally quantified implications. We discuss these in Sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2. In Section 5.1.3 we briefly consider the treatment of negation.

5.1.1 Abductive proofs

We will use the term “abductive proof” in this section to mean construction of a proof-tree in which some leaves are undischarged assumptions. CLARE performs abductive proofs for two essentially distinct reasons. The first has been referred to many times already in chapters 2, 3 and 4; when using logic to reason about common-sense concepts, such as those expressed in natural language, it is frequently necessary to assume background knowledge which is not part of the explicit content of the utterance’s logical representation. In this case, the abductively assumed conditions are normally shown to the user in order to check their appropriateness. Abductive proofs are also used in order to compile “implicational lemmas”, which are utilized by the generation component (see Chapter 6) and several other parts of the system not described in the thesis. In this mode of operation, the reasoning engine is given a goal F containing free variables \vec{x} and a set of criteria for making abductive assumptions; the assumptions may also contain free variables. If an abductive proof can be found with assumptions A and a substitution

θ for the \vec{x} , this can be regarded as a strict (non-abductive) proof for the Horn-clause

$$\forall \vec{y}. (A \rightarrow \theta(F))$$

where \vec{y} are the free variables in $\theta(\vec{x})$. As part of the process of compiling a linguistic domain theory, all implicational lemmas of a particular type are generated. At present, the criterion used for limiting abductive assumptions restricts A to being a set of which all but at most one member are *arithmetic relation goals* (cf section 2.4.2). The remaining member of A must be an atomic predication whose predicate is a conceptual predicate. The net result is to prove an implication of the form

$$Arith \rightarrow (Conceptual \rightarrow G)$$

where G is an atomic goal, *Conceptual* is a conceptual goal, and *Arith* is a conjunction of arithmetical relation goals. These lemmas can be used to find quickly the “consequences” of a goal that matches *Conceptual* (cf 6.3).

Two minor changes are needed to extend a Prolog meta-interpreter to allow abductive proofs: another argument is added to the main predicate, which passes around a difference-list holding the assumptions, and an extra clause is added which allows “proof” of an atomic goal by adding it to the assumption-list, if the abductive assumability criteria permit this. The basic interpreter, modified in the way described, is shown in figure 5.2.

5.1.2 Proving implications

We now consider the task of extending the inference engine to be able to prove formulas of type

$$\text{forall}(\text{Vars}, \text{impl}(\text{LHS}, \text{RHS}))$$

where the variables in **Vars** occur free in **LHS** and **RHS**. Two well-known strategies exist for attempting to prove such expressions; they can be proved either *intensionally* or *extensionally*. Intensional proofs are carried out by substituting unique constants for the **Vars**, assuming **LHS**, and attempting to prove **RHS**; extensional proofs by listing all values of **Vars** for which a proof of **LHS** can be found, and for each one ascertaining that a proof of **RHS** exists. The CLARE inference engine can use either strategy.

To implement the intensional proof strategy it is necessary to add yet another argument to the **prove** predicate in the interpreter, to hold the set of assumptions derived from the **LHS**; it is tempting to try and include them

```

prove(and(L,R),AssumptionsIn-AssumptionsOut) :-
    prove(L,AssumptionsIn-AssumptionsNext),
    prove(R,AssumptionsNext-AssumptionsOut).

prove(G,AssumptionsIn-AssumptionsOut) :-
    horn_clause_in_theory(G <- Body),
    prove(Body,AssumptionsIn-AssumptionsOut).

prove(G,AssumptionsIn-AssumptionsIn) :-
    unit_clause_in_theory(G).

prove(G,AssumptionsIn-[G|AssumptionsIn]) :-
    abductively_assumable(G).

```

Figure 5.2: Abductive Horn-clause interpreter

in the abductive assumption list, but in practice this manoeuvre does not seem to simplify matters. The need to take account of possible abductive assumptions also introduces some complications in the extensional strategy, since it is necessary to collect the assumptions used for each separate proof of RHS. The skeleton interpreter, modified to allow proof of universally quantified implications by the intensional and extensional strategies, is presented in figure 5.3. Here the first clause of form `prove(forall...)` is for the intensional strategy; `replace_by_unique_constants` is assumed to be a predicate which replaces all the variables in its argument by unique ground terms. The following clause is for the extensional strategy. Here `safe_bagof(X,G,Xs)` is like `bagof(X,G,Xs)`, with the difference that it first binds any free variables in G, and succeeds with `Xs=[]` if there is no proof of G; `union_n_1(List,Union)` takes a list of lists as its first argument and returns their union as the second one.

5.1.3 Proving negated goals

The inference engine contains no general treatment of negation, but in order to deal with cases where `Goal` is explicitly contradicted by its context it is possible to define rules of the form

```
neg(Goal) <- Body
```

(All clauses from the interpreter in figure 5.2)

```

prove(G,AssumptionsIn-AssumptionsIn,ImplAssumptions) :-
  member(G,ImplAssumptions).

prove(forall(Vars,impl(LHS,RHS)),AssIn-AssOut,ImplAss) :-
  replace_by_unique_constants(Vars),
  add_implicational_assumptions(LHS,ImplAss,ImplAss1),
  prove(R,AssIn-AssOut,ImplAss1).

prove(forall(Vars,impl(LHS,RHS)),AssIn-AssOut,ImplAss)
  safe_bagof(environment(Vars,AssOutLeft),
             prove(LHS,AssIn-AssOutLeft,ImplAss)
             LeftEnvironmentList),
  prove_forall_cases(LeftEnvironmentList,Vars^RHS,
                    ImplAss,AssOutList),
  union_n_1(AssOutList,AssOut).

prove_forall_cases([],_Vars^_RHS,_ImplAss,[]).
prove_forall_cases([EnvFirst|EnvRest],Right,ImplAss,
                  [AssOutFirst|AssOutRest]) :-
  prove_forall_case(EnvFirst,Right,ImplAss,AssOutFirst),
  prove_forall_cases(EnvRest,Right,ImplAss,AssOutRest).

prove_forall_case(environment(VarsLeft,AssOutLeft),
                 Vars^RHS,ImplAss,AssOut) :-
  copy_term([Vars^RHS,ImplAss],[Vars1^RHS1,ImplAss1]),
  VarsLeft = Vars1,
  prove(RHS1,AssOutLeft-AssOut,ImplAss1).

add_implicational_assumptions(and(P,Q),ImplAssIn,ImplAssOut) :- !,
  add_implicational_assumptions(P,ImplAssIn,ImplAssNext),
  add_implicational_assumptions(Q,ImplAssNext,ImplAssOut).
add_implicational_assumptions(G,ImplAss,[G|ImplAss]) :-
  atomic_goal(G), !.
add_implicational_assumptions(_Other,ImplAss,ImplAss).

```

Figure 5.3: Abductive interpreter for Horn-clauses and implications

where **Goal** is an atomic formula and **Body** is an arbitrary formula. A rule of this type has the content “the negation of **Goal** is implied by **Body**”, and is formally a normal Horn-clause; note that there is no connection, as far as the inference engine is concerned, between the goals **G** and **not(G)**. Rules with negated heads are only invoked to attempt to identify inconsistent uses of assumptions (cf. Section 3.5).

5.2 Search strategies for inference

In this section we consider the search strategy used in the inference engine, which as already stated is an iterated-deepening A* (IDA*) search strategy (Korf, 1986, Stickel, 1986); that is, search proceeds by first defining a cost limit D , and then performing a depth-first search where each branch is cut off when the sum of the cost of goals already processed, together with an estimate of the cost of solving pending goals, exceeds D . The cost function used at present charges one unit for each rule application, and conservatively estimates one unit for each pending goal; as explained in section 3.5, it is possible to define extra costs for abductively assumed goals. The motivation for using IDA*, rather than simple depth-first search, is that it avoids getting stuck in infinite recursions; it essentially performs the function of simulating breadth-first search, and is thus theoretically complete. However, experiment quickly shows that infinite recursion still causes severe practical difficulties without further elaboration of the method.

There are basically three problems, which to some extent are related. Firstly, it is easy to spend excessive amounts of time in infinite branches of the search tree, especially ones resulting from “transitivity” axioms (cf (Appelt and Hobbs 90)), and Horn-clause readings of axioms of the form

$$(p(X, Y) \equiv p(X, Z)) \leftarrow q(Y, Z)$$

(cf Section 4.6.5). The problem becomes even more acute when both “normal” and “backward” Horn-clause readings of equivalences are used (cf Section 3.2.3); it is then easy for the inference engine to get into situations where it wanders aimlessly around in the search-space, alternately using “normal” and “backward” Horn-clause versions of equivalences. Secondly, even when infinite branches as such are not a problem, it may be the case that there are multiple redundant proofs of a goal. The third problem arises from inefficient ordering of conjunctions. When trying to prove a conjunction, it can sometimes be the case that there are many proofs of the first conjunct

(which take a correspondingly long time to generate), but that the second conjunct can quickly be discovered to have either one or no proofs; in this case attempting to prove the conjuncts in a different order can pay dividends. The non-obvious aspects of the search strategy, which we will now describe, stem from attempts to counteract these problems. We describe them one at a time.

5.2.1 Avoiding infinitely recursive branches

The approach we currently use to help minimize time spent in infinitely recursive branches of the search-tree is based on a standard loop-avoidance method. It can be proved that it is sound to cut off search if a goal is *identical* to one of its ancestors. The inference engine uses this criterion, both in its simple form and in a “look-ahead” mode: when expanding a goal G to a conjunction $B_1 \wedge B_2 \dots$, it checks before adding the B_i to the stack of pending goals, to make sure that none of them are identical to an ancestor. Perhaps surprisingly (since this is a fairly expensive operation), it turns out that performing the “look-ahead” check increases efficiency quite substantially.

It would be pleasant if the “identity” condition could be relaxed a little, for example by replacing it with a test of unification or subsumption with one of the ancestor goals. Unfortunately, it is easy to prove that weakening the condition is in general not correct. However, a strong syntactic similarity between a goal and an ancestor is often a good heuristic indicator that a loop has arisen, and can be taken as a justification for exacting a “penalty”, causing the cost limit to be reached more quickly. In the current version, the penalty is applied if the goal is subsumed by an ancestor, a strategy which we have found to work well in practice. The method is sound, since its only effect is to devote less effort to search of the affected branches without cutting them off completely, and appears rather more general than the approach advocated in (Appelt and Hobbs 90), which involves recoding of the meaning postulates.

The loop avoidance method described above is strong enough that it is at any rate possible to consider using both forward and backward versions of equivalences. Use of the backward versions still slows down the inference engine by more than a factor of ten, when it is used to support translation with the PRM LDT. For this reason, we decided to remove backward Horn clauses. It turned out in practice that the potential inferences lost due to this step were fairly unimportant, and that the “inference holes” which appeared

could easily be filled by adding a few appropriate hand-coded clauses.

5.2.2 Avoiding redundant search

The second problem, that of avoiding redundant recomputation, is currently only applied to ground goals, that is goals which contain no uninstantiated variables. We have observed in many cases that, without some kind of restrictions, a great deal of effort is wasted in producing multiple proofs for goals of this kind. Since a proof of a ground goal is basically just a “yes” or “no”, it is tempting to adjust the backtracking mechanism so as to block attempts to find new proofs of ground goals that have already been successfully proved. However, this is not quite right; the problem is that the ordering of the search-space may mean that the first proof produced is an expensive one, which leaves the search process on the verge of exceeding the cost limit, and prevents further progress. The correct realization of the idea seems rather to be to block retrying of ground goals only if the cost of the existing proof falls under a given bound, which we have at present arbitrarily fixed as a third of the total cost limit.

5.2.3 Dynamic re-ordering of conjuncts

The time taken to find a proof for a conjunctive goal (or to ascertain that there is no proof) can often be strongly dependent on the order in which the conjuncts are attempted. We have made no attempt to solve this problem in its general form, but two special cases are sufficiently important that the inference engine needs to take account of them. Suppose first that the interpreter is about to attempt to prove the conjunction $L \wedge R$. If it is the case that there is no proof of R , then time lost establishing this can be recovered by omitting the attempt to prove L . Thus it can pay to perform “look-ahead” and search for goals which can quickly be shown to be unachievable. Similarly, if L contains free variables which also occur in R then the time needed to find a proof can be reduced if the number of proofs for R is substantially less than the number of proofs for L , since instantiating free variables nearly always has the function of reducing the number of possible proofs. In particular, if it can quickly be shown that there is only *one* proof of R then it is very likely that it will be correct to attempt it first.

It is possible to include declarations of the form

```
quick_failure_test(<Goal>) :- <Conds>
```

or

```
quick_determinism_test(<Goal>) :- <Conds>
```

where `<Goal>` is an atomic goal and `<Conds>` an arbitrary Prolog form; the intended semantics are that there should be, respectively, no proofs or exactly one proof of `<Goal>` if `<Conds>` hold. For declarations of this kind to be useful, `<Conds>` should be quickly evaluable. In the present version of CLARE, instances of `<Conds>` never do more than check instantiations of variables, or attempt to unify them with other terms. Tests for both cases are applied when a Horn-clause is used to expand a goal `G`; after the head of the clause has been unified with `G`, the goals in the body are examined. If a `quick_failure_test` succeeds then proof of the whole conjunction fails; if a `quick_determinism_test` succeeds on a subgoal, then that subgoal is evaluated first. There are currently about 30 “quick failure and determinism” declarations, all of them for the “naming” predicates described in section 4.2.1.

5.3 Finding finite proof procedures

In the final section of this chapter we describe the module responsible for searching for finite proof procedures (see also section 2.4.2). Since the inference engine is basically a Prolog meta-interpreter, it is sensitive to the ordering of conjuncts: it attempts to prove a goal of the form `and(P,Q)` by first proving `P` and then proving `Q`. If `P` and `Q` share a free variable `X`, the order can be important. To repeat the example from 2.4.2, if `TRANS/3` is a database predicate then the strategy “find an `X` such that `X > 100`, then find values of `Y` such that `TRANS(john, X, Y)`” is not a finite strategy; however, reversing the order to make the strategy “find `X` and `Y` such that `TRANS(john, X, Y)`, then determine whether `X > 100` holds” is finite.

The search for finite proof strategies is carried out by another extended Prolog meta-interpreter, using an abstract interpretation method. The information needed to deal with the base case of attempting to prove an atomic goal is provided by declarations of the form

```
call_pattern(<Pred>(Arg1,Arg2,...Argn),InArgs,OutArgs)
```

where `<Pred>` is a predicate and `InArgs` and `OutArgs` are subsets of the set `{Arg1, ..., Argn}`. The intended semantics are that there are finitely many proofs of the goal

`<Pred>(Arg1,Arg2,...Argn)`

if the variables in `InArgs` are already instantiated, and that each of them will result in the arguments `OutArgs` becoming instantiated. The basic structure of the interpreter is shown in figure 5.4; only the clauses for conjunctive and atomic goals are displayed. In the implemented interpreter, there is a clause for each logical operator of the TRL language. The central idea is to rearrange the expression by using an abstract version of the Prolog “freeze” or delayed-goal primitive. The arguments of the main predicates `rearrange0` and `rearrange1` are

`rearrange0/1(Original,Rearranged,Eval,Frozen,Done)`

where

`Original` is the original expression.

`Rearranged` is the rearranged expression.

`Eval` is a copy of `Original` used to keep track of the variables currently instantiated in the abstract interpretation.

`Frozen` is a difference-list of delayed goals, i.e. goals which were insufficiently instantiated to be executed when first called.

`Done` is a difference-list that keeps track of progress made in evaluating goals, to prevent infinite postponement of goal execution.

The two predicates call each other recursively, with `rearrange0` calling `rearrange1` and then trying to “thaw” any frozen goals that may have been created. Note the special treatment of equality goals: if `Eval` is an equality, its arguments are unified if possible.

```

rearrange(OldForm,NewForm) :-
  copy_term(OldForm,EvalForm),
  rearrange0(OldForm,NewForm,EvalForm, []-[], []-_), !.

rearrange0(Old,New,Eval,FrozenI-FrozenO,DoneI-DoneO) :-
  rearrange1(Old,NewO,Eval,FrozenI-FrozenN,DoneI-DoneN),
  thaw(NewO,New,FrozenN-FrozenO,DoneN-DoneO).

rearrange1(and(LOld,ROld),and(LNew,RNew),and(L,R),
           FrozenIn-FrozenOut,DoneIn-DoneOut) :- !,
  rearrange0(LOld,LNew,L,FrozenIn-FrozenNext,DoneI-DoneN),
  rearrange0(ROld,RNew,R,FrozenNext-FrozenOut,DoneN-DoneO).
rearrange1(OldG,OldG,G,Frozen-Frozen,Done-[goal_done|Done]) :-
  abstract_call(G),!.
rearrange1(OldG,true,G,Frozen-[frozen(G,OldG)|Frozen],D-D).

thaw(Form,Form,[]-[],Done-Done) :- !.
thaw(Form,OutForm,
      [frozen(FrozenEval,FrozenOld)|FrozenNext]-FrozenOut,
      DoneI-DoneO) :-
  rearrange1(FrozenOld,FrozenNew,FrozenEval,[]-[],[]-[_|_]),!,
  thaw(and(Form,FrozenNew),OutForm,FrozenNext-FrozenOut,
       [goal_done|DoneI]-DoneO).
thaw(Form,OutForm,
      [FrozenFirst|FrozenNext]-[FrozenFirst|FrozenOutRest],
      DoneI-DoneO) :-
  thaw(Form,OutForm,FrozenNext-FrozenOutRest,DoneI-DoneO).

abstract_call(X=Y) :-
  X = Y, !.
abstract_call(_X=_Y) :- !.
abstract_call(G) :-
  call_pattern(G,InArgs,OutArgs),
  is_instantiated(InArgs),
  make_instantiated(OutArgs).

```

Figure 5.4: Interpreter for finding finite proof strategies

Chapter 6

Generation of Utterances_____

6.1 Introduction

So far, we have concentrated on interfacing functionalities which involve translating from natural language primitives into database primitives. This chapter describes a simple method that has been implemented in CLARE to handle translation in the reverse direction; the input is expressed in terms meaningful to the database, and the output is in the form of natural language utterances. We will as usual mainly be concerned with the part of the translation process that involves inferences, but to put the work in its proper context we first briefly discuss CLARE's overall strategy with regard to generation.

Recall that CLARE has two main abstract levels of representation: Quasi Logical Form (QLF) and TRL. QLF is the representation that is output by the first, compositional, phase of semantic analysis. The rules used to relate QLFs to surface strings are coded entirely in terms of unification, and are both in theory and in practice fully reversible. Generation of surface form from QLF is performed by the Semantic Head-Driven generation algorithm (Shieber *et al* 1990), and will not be discussed further here; we will instead concentrate on the problem of producing suitable QLF representations from database input, expressed in terms of TRL formulas. We will consider generation of both assertions and questions, as described in Section 2.5.5. Assertions will be generated to describe complete database records; questions to ask for values of unfilled fields in incomplete records.

To understand the problems involved in synthesizing an appropriate QLF representation for a TRL formula, it will be helpful to begin by considering it as the inverse of the analysis process, which has QLF as input and database

TRL as output. As described in Section 1.2, the analysis process has two main phases: the resolution phase, in which referentially vague expressions are replaced by concrete values; and the translation phase, in which linguistic predicates are translated into database predicates. Both of these phases need to be inverted. The reason why this task is non-trivial is that a good deal of information pertaining to surface linguistic form is lost in the transition from QLF to TRL. There are two main problems.

The first is that the resolution phase can in general be arbitrarily non-deterministic in the reverse direction. For example, a given definite NP will normally only be able to refer to a small number of possible domain objects; conversely, however, there are a potentially infinite number of definite noun-phrases that can be used to refer to a given domain object. The generation of definite descriptions is a major research topic in its own right, and in order to keep the focus on our primary area of concern, the translation problem, we restrict ourselves by only considering resolution rules that are deterministic in the reverse direction. Typical examples of such rules are those which resolve proper name expressions, numbers and date expressions. In the reverse (TRL to QLF) direction, these take as input a TRL term representing a typed object, number, or date, and return a QLF `term` construct which encodes the surface semantic structure of an appropriate noun-phrase. We will see examples of use of these rules later in the chapter.

The second problem is caused by the loss of hierarchical structure involved in the transition from QLF to TRL. For example, an NP modified by a relative clause will at QLF level contain the contribution of the relative as a distinct sub-form. After conversion to TRL, however, the structure is “flattened”; the head-noun and all its modifiers, including the relative, will be at the same level. Our initial implementation solves the second problem by tightly limiting the range of possible QLFs that can be produced; the process of producing QLF from TRL is not free, but is rather constrained to follow one of a set of “template” rules. These templates are automatically produced by generalizing specific training examples, using a variant of the so-called “case-based learning” method. The learning procedure is described in Section 6.2. It produces rules of the approximate form

```
qlf_for_trl(<QLF>) :- <Body>
```

where `<Body>` is a set of TRL goals. (We refer to these as TRL description generation rules, or simply TRL generation rules.) The goals in `<Body>` can be of several different types: they include the component conjuncts in the TRL form that is being generating from, and conditions constraining `terms`

in <QLF> to refer to TRL constants. Examples of learned TRL description rules are given in the next section.

The set of TRL description rules is not complete; a QLF can be produced only if it is of the same form as one of the training examples. They are not necessarily guaranteed to be sound either, though we have not in practice observed any unsound rules to have been inferred by the process. The status of the rules is thus that of *generation heuristics*, induced by analysis of specific examples. To check the soundness of a rule, it necessary to make sure that the original TRL can be recovered from the proposed QLF.

Loss of completeness is not necessarily important, since there is no need to be able to produce *every* way of expressing something. Indeed, everyday experience suggests that people generally make use of an array of stock phrases when expressing themselves; there is no obvious reason to believe that one has to have a general mechanism for generation at this level. The unsoundness of the method is more significant, since checking correctness is moderately expensive. One way to attack this problem might be to attempt to infer rules using the Explanation-Based Learning method (Hirsh 1987, Rayner 1988); the application of reference resolution methods would be conditions on the inferred rules. In the rest of this chapter we describe in more detail TRL generation as implemented in CLARE.

6.2 Learning case-based description rules

The learning method used for acquiring TRL description rules is extremely simple, and is perhaps best introduced by an example. Suppose that the training example is the sentence

John is a dog.

uttered in a context in which “John” can be used to refer to the entity `john1`. This produces the QLF

```
[dcl,
  form(verb(pres,no,no,no,y),
    A,
    B^
    [B,
      [be,
        A,
        term(proper_name(tpc),C,D^[name_of,D,John],E,F),
```

$$G^{\wedge}[\text{eq}, G, \text{term}(q(H, a, \text{sing}), I, J^{\wedge}[\text{dog1}, J], K, L)]], \\ M)]$$

(the details of the QLF representation are not interesting). After resolution and simplification, this produces the TRL form

$$\text{dog1}(\text{john1})$$

The idea is to generalize the training sentence by looking for correspondences between the QLF and the TRL representations, and hypothesizing that they are instances of a general rule. In our example, there are two such correspondences.

1. The predicate symbol `dog1` occurs in both QLF and TRL.
2. The QLF representation contains the QLF term

$$\text{term}(\text{proper_name}(\text{tpc}), C, D^{\wedge}[\text{name_of}, D, \text{John}], E, F)$$

and the TRL representation contains the TRL term `john1`, and there is a deterministically reversible resolution rule which makes the TRL term the referent of the QLF term.

In order to generalize the example, we hypothesize that the connection between the QLF and TRL representations depends on the linguistic properties associated with the predicate `dog1`, and the referential connection between the two terms. We make the first of these precise by using the predicate `genpred`, which links a predicate symbol to the lexicon entries in which it appears. Here, the relevant clause of `genpred` is

$$\text{genpred}(\text{dog1}, ([\text{dog1}, _], \text{nbar}(_, _)))$$

– that is, `dog1` is a one-place predicate and a common noun (`nbar`) sense. Our precise hypothesis with regard to replacing `dog1` is then that the information about it `genpred` constitutes a sufficiently detailed description of its properties that any other predicate with a similar entry would be processed in the same way. So we are guessing, for example, that in a context where “Mary” can be used to refer to the entity `mary1`, the TRL

$$\text{cat1}(\text{mary1})$$

could have been produced from the QLF

```
[dcl,
  form(verb(pres,no,no,no,y),
    A,
    B^
    [B,
      [be,
        A,
        term(proper_name(tpc),C,D^[name_of,D,Mary],E,F),
        G^[eq,G,term(q(H,a,sing),I,J^[cat1,J],K,L)]]],
    M)]
```

our justification being that `cat1` has a similar `genpred` entry, i.e.

```
genpred(cat1, ([cat1,_],nbar(_,_)))
```

and that there is a reversible resolution rule which given the atom `mary1` can find out that the QLF expression

```
term(proper_name(tpc),C,D^[name_of,D,Mary],E,F)
```

would refer to it. In the general case, our heuristic rule will be to guess that

```
[dcl,
  form(verb(pres,no,no,no,y),
    A,
    B^
    [B,
      [be,
        A,
        <Term>,
        G^[eq,G,term(q(H,a,sing),I,J^[<PredAtom>,J],K,L)]]],
    M)]
```

is a QLF from which it would be possible to derive the TRL form

```
<PredAtom>(<Ref>)
```

under the assumptions that `<PredAtom>` is a atom, `<Term>` is a term, the `genpred` entry for `<PredAtom>` is

```
genpred(<PredAtom>, ([<PredAtom>,_],nbar(_,_)))
```

and `<Ref>` is the referent of `<Term>`. This information is what is encoded in the induced rule,

```

trl_gen([dcl,
        form(verb(pres,no,no,no,y),A,
              B^[B,[be,
                  A,
                  Term,
                  C^[eq,C,term(q(_,a,sing),_,
                              D^[Pred,D],_,_)]]],
              _)],
        [Pred,Ref],
        [entity_ref_term(Ref,Term),
         trlgoal([Pred,Ref],
                  genpred(Pred,(E^[Pred,E],nbar(_,_))))])

```

The three arguments to the rule are, in turn, the generalized QLF; the associated generalized TRL representation; and the conditions of applicability. The rule is capable of producing QLFs for sentences of the form

$\langle NP \rangle$ is a/an $\langle Noun \rangle$.

where $\langle NP \rangle$ is any referring expression for which there is a reversible resolution method. This includes NPs like “John”, “Mary (the employee)”, “1990 (the year)” and “1/1/89 (the day)”.

6.3 Description of database entities

We now show how CLARE can use the TRL description rules to produce sentences describing database objects. This functionality is in the implemented system linked to the semantics of English verbs like “talk about (something)” and “tell (someone) about (something)”. Thus for example processing of a sentence such as

Talk about Peter Piper.

will produce a call to describe the conceptual object referred to by the expression *Peter Piper*, namely

employee1#’Peter Piper’

The description module is passed the conceptual object X that is to be described, and begins by finding all conceptual goals C_i (see section 4.2) which have the property that at least one argument position is filled by

an occurrence of X . This provides an abstract “conceptual-level” summary of “what the database knows about X ”. The main part of the processing is then carried out by two sub-modules, the *utterance synthesizer* and the *utterance filter*, which are called in alternation. The synthesizer uses the TRL description rules to attempt to find new utterances whose truth-conditions are implied by some C_i . After each such utterance is found, but before it is displayed, the utterance filter is called into play to determine whether or not the new utterance should be shown to the user, and if so whether any more utterances need be searched for. We illustrate the behaviour of the description module by sketching the course of processing for the example given immediately above. The first C_i found is the predication (C1)

```
employee(organization1#sri,employee1#'Peter Piper',m,y)    (C1)
```

which conveys the information that the employee Peter Piper is a employee at the organization SRI, is of sex m (for “Man”), and has a car (y as opposed to n).

The utterance synthesizer is called first. When passed a conceptual goal C_i , the synthesizer begins by computing the set of goals logically implied by the union of C_i with the current linguistic domain theory *excluding* the database: the result is then used as input to the learned TRL description rules. The efficiency of the process is increased by pre-compiling the set of consequences of a generic representative of each class of tuple, and caching the results in the form of “implicational lemmas”. The relevant lemmas are of the form

Conditions -> (<C> -> <L>)

where <C> is a conceptual goal matching C_i , **Conditions** is a conjunction of evaluable predicates, and <L> is an atomic goal whose predicate is a linguistic predicate (cf. section 5.1.1). Continuing with the example, synthesis from the goal (C1) proceeds as follows. First the TRL lemmas are used to find the set of consequences of (C1). When the concrete values for the relevant instances have been instantiated, the result is a list which includes the goals

```
car1(sk12(employee1#'Peter Piper'))
have1(sk13(employee1#'Peter Piper'),
      employee1#'Peter Piper',
      sk12(employee1#'Peter Piper')),
male1(employee1#'Peter Piper'),
man1(employee1#'Peter Piper'),
```

```

name_of1('Peter Piper',employee1#'Peter Piper')),
sex_of1(Male,employee1#'Peter Piper'),
person1(employee1#'Peter Piper'),
at1(employee1#'Peter Piper',organization1#sri),
employee1(employee1#'Peter Piper'),

```

Here, $sk12(X)$ and $sk13(X)$ are Skolem functions representing, respectively, the car employee X has (if such an object exists), and the event of his or her having it. It is now possible to attempt to apply learned description rules, some of which succeed. For example, the first two “consequence” goals,

```

car1(sk12(employee1#'Peter Piper'))
have1(sk13(employee1#'Peter Piper'),
      employee1#'Peter Piper',
      sk12(employee1#'Peter Piper')),

```

licence an application of the rule generalized from

John loves a cat.

with `employee1#Peter Piper` substituting `john1`, `have1` substituting `love1` and `car1` substituting `cat1` in the conditions. Now the noun phrase *Peter Piper (the employee)* can be produced as an NP whose referent is `employee1#Peter Piper`; the relevant resolution rule is reversible, as there is sufficient structure in the typed variable. Synthesis proceeds from the QLF produced, yielding the sentence

Peter Piper (the employee) has a car.

Before the sentence is displayed, the utterance filter is called. The filter keeps track of the combined propositional content of the sentences so far uttered when describing the current tuple, which is stored as a global variable P_{old} . (Initially, the value of P_{old} is *true*). When the filter is passed a new candidate utterance with propositional content P , it first ascertains whether or not P is implied by P_{old} . If this is the case, it returns the information that the new utterance is redundant and need not be displayed. If not, it displays the new utterance, and updates the combined propositional content to $P_{old} \wedge P$. It then checks again to find out whether $P_{old} \wedge P$ is equivalent to the current tuple. If so, no more utterances need to be generated.

The expression representing the content is first transformed if necessary by replacing Skolem functions with existentially quantified variables and then translated into conceptual form. Thus the propositional content of the first utterance is originally

```
and(car1(sk12(employee1#'Peter Piper')),
    have1(sk13(employee1#'Peter Piper'),
          employee1#'Peter Piper',
          sk12(employee1#'Peter Piper'))))
```

After replacement of Skolem functions by existentially quantified variables, this becomes

```
exists([X,Y],
       and(car1(X),
           have1(Y,employee1#'Peter Piper',X))) (C2)
```

and after translation,

```
exists([X],
       employee(organization1#sri,employee1#'Peter Piper',X,y) (C3)
```

Translating (C2) into the canonical form (C3) makes it simple to ascertain that the tuple has so far not been completely described, by comparing (C3) and the original tuple (C1). On the next cycle, the compiled consequence goal

```
man1(employee1#'Peter Piper')
```

is used to generate the sentence

Peter Piper (the employee) is a man.

The conjunction of (C3) and the propositional content of the second sentence now however translates to (C1), so the filter can return with the information that the tuple has been completely described.

For tuples whose structure is more complex, the filter leads to a very substantial reduction in the verbosity of the output produced by the description module. For example, when generating from a `project` tuple the output produced is something like the following

```
CLARE (the project)'s end date is 19/11/1992 (the day).
CLARE (the project)'s number is 8468.
CLARE (the project)'s start date is 20/11/1989 (the day).
```

With the utterance filter disabled, the output becomes

```

CLARE (the project)'s end date is 19/11/1992 (the day).
CLARE (the project)'s number is 8468.
CLARE (the project)'s start date is 20/11/1989 (the day).
CLARE (the project)'s account is account 8468.
CLARE (the project)'s project number is 8468.
CLARE (the project)'s account number is 8468.
19/11/1992 (the day) is an end date.
8468 is a number.
20/11/1989 (the day) is a start date.
account 8468 is an account.
CLARE (the project) is a project.
8468 is a project number.
8468 is an account number.
CLARE (the project) began on 20/11/1989 (the day).
CLARE (the project) ended on 19/11/1992 (the day).
CLARE (the project) finished on 19/11/1992 (the day).
CLARE (the project) started on 20/11/1989 (the day).
CLARE (the project) began.
CLARE (the project) ended.
CLARE (the project) finished.
CLARE (the project) started.

```

As can be seen, the filter's simple uniform mechanism manages to eliminate several different kinds of excess verbosity, some of which are not obviously redundant and require non-trivial inference to detect.

6.4 Generating questions

It is also possible, using the methods we have just described, to generate questions. The module in CLARE responsible for doing this is invoked by the top-level CLARE command `.ask`: if some incomplete tuples have been created by processing assertions (see sections 2.5.3 and 3.6.3), CLARE will respond to `.ask` by entering a loop where it poses questions to the user intended to elucidate the information necessary to fill the unknown argument positions. This can involve generation of both Y-N and WH- questions. We begin by giving an example dialogue: utterances by CLARE and the user are prefixed by `clare>` and `user>` respectively, and comments are in normal font.

```

user> ARLA is a project.

```


The user inputs a declarative statement. After processing it, CLARE has an incomplete project record.

```
user> .ask
```

The user invokes the question-asking module to fill the unspecified fields in the record.

```
clare> what is ARLA (the project)'s account?
```

CLARE asks a question to find out the filler of the “account” field in the record, and hands control back to the user to get the answer.

```
user> 1234.
```

The user answers. The utterance is processed by CLARE in the normal way, which involves syntactic and semantic analysis, followed by ellipsis resolution in the context of the previous question.

```
clare> account 1234 is ARLA (the project)'s account.
```

CLARE prints out a paraphrase showing the result of performing resolution, to keep the user informed. It then translates the result in the usual way, merging it with the previous one as described in section 3.6.3.

```
clare> what is ARLA (the project)'s start date?
```

CLARE asks another question, this time to find out the project’s start date. Processing is as before.

```
user> 1/4/93.
```

```
clare> 1/4/1993 (the day) is ARLA (the project)'s start date.
```

```
clare> what is ARLA (the project)'s end date?
```

Another question from CLARE; this time, the user replies with a sentence. Processing is still the same as usual.

```
user> ARLA will end on 1/4/96.
```

When this sentence has been processed, CLARE has successfully filled all the fields in the tuple.

The range of questions currently handled is limited to Y-N questions whose propositional content is an existentially quantified conjunction, and WH-questions whose propositional content is a lambda-bound existentially

quantified conjunction. For questions of these types, we can acquire case-based rules by a slight extension of the methods described in section 6.2; the only extra point is that it is necessary to store the lambda-bound variable for a WH-question. Thus for example the rule induced from the training sentence

Who loves Mary?

is

```

trl_gen([whq,
        form(verb(pres,no,no,no,y),
            A,
            B^[B,[C,A,term(q(tpc,wh,_),_,
                        D^[personal,D],_,-),E]],_)]),
        F^exists([G],
            and([personal,F],
                [C,G,F,H]))),
        [entity_ref_term(H,E),
         personal(I),
         trlgoal([C,_ ,I,H],
                 genpred(C,(form(_ ,verb(_ ,_ ,_ ,_ ,_ ),
                                J,K^[K,[C,J,_ ,_ ]],_ ),
                                v(_ ,_ ))))]),
        [I])

```

where the fourth argument [I] to `trl_gen` is the list of lambda-bound variables in the conditions; note that the second argument, the propositional content, is already a lambda-bound form. We now describe how rules of this kind can be used.

Let us begin by supposing that we have a conceptual goal C , in which some argument X is so far uninstantiated. There are two obvious strategies to use when trying to find a filler for X . The first is to attempt to frame a WH-question whose propositional content is equivalent to $\lambda X.C$; the second is to substitute some plausible value a for X in C , and then try to find a Y-N question whose content is equivalent to $C[X/a]$. CLARE can use either strategy, choosing according to the nature of the argument position. If it is an argument that has to be filled by one of a known finite set of possible code values, it tries the second strategy; otherwise, it uses the first one.

For both strategies, the major difference compared to generating assertions is that what is required is an utterance whose propositional content is

equivalent to that of the question, not *implied* by it. We will refer to the initial expression, either $\lambda X.C$ or $C[X/a]$ as the case may be, as the *abstract question*; we can reduce the two cases to one by considering abstract questions as forms bound by a set of lambdas, where the set is empty for Y-N questions and non-empty for WH-questions.

Suppose then that the abstract question is $\lambda \vec{X}.C$ where \vec{X} is a vector of variables. Generation proceeds as follows. We try to find a description rule R , generalized from a question, for which the set of lambda-bound variables is \vec{Y} , the conditions are $Conds$, the propositional content is $\lambda \vec{Y}.P_R$, and the following hold:

1. The cardinalities of \vec{X} and \vec{Y} are equal.
2. If \vec{a} is a set of unique constants with the same cardinality as \vec{X} and \vec{Y} , then $Conds[\vec{Y}/\vec{a}]$ is implied by $C[\vec{X}/\vec{a}]$.
3. $P_R[\vec{Y}/\vec{a}]$ implies $C[\vec{X}/\vec{a}]$

If these conditions are met, then the propositional content of R is equivalent to that of $\lambda \vec{X}.C$. The conditions are phrased the way they are so as to allow use of the techniques presented in section 6.3; thus the second condition is satisfied using the compiled TRL lemmas, and the third one with essentially the same mechanism as that used by the “utterance filter” described at the end of the last section.

Chapter 7

Conclusions

7.1 Summary

We will now pull the threads together and summarize the main arguments of the thesis. The fundamental idea has been to provide a formal account of how natural language utterances can be related to the contents of databases. We have reduced this to a logical problem by assuming that both databases and natural language utterances can be expressed in logical terms. The databases present no problem; to deal with the language, we have assumed the existence of a “natural language engine”, which can mediate between surface linguistic expressions and their representations as “literal logical forms”. The problem now became one of converting between two types of logical formulas, one relating to language and one relating to databases. In Chapter 2, we showed that several different types of interface functionality can be reduced to the same common form: we are given a formula F_{source} , a background theory Γ , and criteria which permit the making of certain assumptions. We are asked to find a formula F_{target} , fulfilling certain restrictions, and permissible assumptions A , such that

$$\Gamma \cup A \Rightarrow (F_{ling} \equiv F_{db}) \tag{7.1}$$

One important technical device used was to give the database predicates a “trivial” semantics, referring only to the existence of database tuples and not to objects in the exterior world. In Section 2.6, we showed how this makes it possible to side-step in a simple way the difficulties associated with use of the Closed World Assumption, in effect allowing the CWA to be “relativized” by the domain theory Γ .

The next two chapters addressed two interlinked questions:

1. Can we construct suitable theories Γ , that make it possible to solve inference problems of type (7.1) with reasonable efficiency?
2. If so, how are these inference problems solved?

Answering the two questions just posed in reverse order, we first described in Chapter 3 an inference process, Abductive Equivalential Translation (AET), which can be used in conjunction with a domain theory consisting of directed conditional equivalences and Horn-clauses. AET is sound but not complete; its strength is that it has an efficient and easily comprehensible procedural model, which allows equivalential theories to be constructed and debugged in much the same way as Prolog programs. A few initial examples were presented, showing in particular how AET is powerful enough to provide an elegant and natural solution to the well-known “Doctor on Board” problem. The AET process relies on having an extended Horn-clause inference engine, which was described in Chapter 5.

In Chapter 4, we then went on to show how equivalential theories of the type described in the previous chapter could be constructed to solve the original problem of relating linguistic and database predicates. We described an example theory, which relates a fairly wide range of linguistic constructs to the database relations of a real projects and payments database. The key idea was to structure the theory in a modular way that allows the linguistic predicates to be translated into forms successively “nearer” to the database relations. In particular, we argued that it is useful to funnel translation through so-called “conceptual” predicates; each database predicate D corresponds to one conceptual predicate, which roughly contains the union of the information in D and the linguistic predicates that translate into it. We also show how introduction of conceptual predicates makes it possible for translation to deal with contingent completeness of database information, in particular the common constraint that records are only available for a limited period.

Nearly all the previous discussion focussed on translation of linguistic predicates into database predicates. Chapter 6 considered the reverse problem of deriving language from database. A simple method was introduced, that extracted “templates” from typical examples and could use them to generate both descriptions of complete database records and questions asking for values of unfilled fields in incomplete ones. The method used AET to provide a “filter” which limits the verbosity of descriptions of complete tuples, and checks the validity of proposed questions.

7.2 Further directions

7.2.1 Using AET in other domains

This thesis has reported in detail how a non-trivial natural-language interface was successfully implemented using AET. Every effort was made to employ methods that would be as general as possible, but the fact remains that one swallow does not make a summer: AET needs to be used more before its merits can be properly evaluated. It is thus pleasant to be able to say that a second AET application, a CLARE interface to the AUTOROUTE route-finding package, has now been constructed. This is being reported elsewhere (Lewin *et al* 1993). It is particularly gratifying that nearly all the work was carried out by project personnel (primarily Ian Lewin) who had not participated in the development of the PRM application. Two swallows do not make a summer either, but one can at any rate say that the swallow population seems to be increasing.

7.2.2 Making the AET process symmetrical

One unfortunate shortcoming of the work reported here is the lack of symmetry between the roles played by equivalences in the analysis and generation processes. Since equivalences are by their nature symmetrical, it seems quite reasonable to expect that the part of the generation process which is concerned with inference could be formulated more directly in terms of AET.

In this context, I would like to make it clear that the treatment of generation described in Chapter 6 should not be regarded as more than a stopgap; in this section, I will sketch how a more satisfying solution could be achieved. Recall from Section 2.4 the key notion of “effective translation”, which was used to formalize the analysis tasks. Here, we were given a linguistic formula F_{source} : then the condition for F_{target} to be an *effective translation* of F_{source} was that there existed a set of abductive assumptions A such that

$$\Gamma \cup A \Rightarrow (F_{source} \equiv F_{target}) \quad (7.2)$$

and

- Each assumption in A is acceptable in the context in which it is made.
- There is a finite proof procedure for determining the truth of F_{target} .

The symmetrical concept in the generation direction could be called a “linguistically realizable translation”. So this time we are given an F_{source} which

is a formula expressed in terms of database predicates: then F_{target} is a *linguistically realizable translation* of F_{source} if there is a set of abductive assumptions A such that

$$\Gamma \cup A \Rightarrow (F_{source} \equiv F_{target}) \quad (7.3)$$

and

- Each assumption in A is acceptable in the context in which it is made.
- There is a linguistic utterance whose “literal” logical denotation is F_{target} .

The AET process would be used in the database to language direction to derive possible candidates for F_{target} ; these would be analyzed further to discover if they could be realized as denotations of utterances.

It has been possible, using AET in the language to database direction, to make the translation process deterministic: this is justifiable on the grounds that database representation is a canonical form. The main technical problem involved in implementing the proposed scheme is that the AET process in the database to language direction would have to be non-deterministic, since linguistic representations are not canonical. For this reason, we did not attempt to implement reverse AET in the CLARE project. It seems to me, however, that the obstacles posed are by no means insuperable, and that it would be extremely interesting to investigate the “reverse translation” idea more thoroughly.

7.2.3 Goal-directed reasoning about acquisition of knowledge

It is worth noting that the formalization of “knowing wh...” described in Section 2.5.4 can easily be extended into a formalization of “finding out wh...”. This can be done in several ways: the simplest is to allow the conditions on certain equivalences to be contingent on executable assumptions, assumptions which will be true if appropriate perceptual actions are carried out. We illustrate with a sketch of the standard example, “finding out someone’s telephone number” (cf e.g. (McCarthy 1977), (Moore 1985)).

Simplifying as much as possible (and side-stepping some of the temporal reasoning issues without comment), we start by letting Γ be the background theory as usual. We assume we have an “open” predicate

$$phone_no(Name, Number, T)$$

with the intended semantics “the phone number of the person called *Name* is *Number* at time *T*”. We also have a “closed” predicate,

$$REC_PHONE_NO(Name, Number, T)$$

whose semantics are “the phone number of the person called *Name* is *Number* at time *T*, and this is recorded in my database at time *T*”. Now suppose we want to reason about how we might find out Mary’s phone number, in other words arrange for it to be present in the database. We formalize this as requiring a formula F_{db} expressed in terms of the database predicate REC_PHONE_NO , a time T_{done} , and a set of assumptions A corresponding to actions that I can carry out, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma \cup \{A, finish_time(T_{done})\} \Rightarrow \\ ((\exists N.phone_no(mary', N, T_{done})) \equiv F_{db}) \end{aligned} \quad (7.4)$$

where T_{done} represents a time at which the information has been added to the database. Including the goal $finish_time(T_{done})$ on the left-hand side is convenient for reasons that will shortly become apparent.

The following formula expresses the fact that the phone number of the person called *Name* is recorded in my database after I have executed the action of looking up *Name* in the telephone directory

$$\begin{aligned} execute(directory_look_up(Name), T_1) \wedge before'(T_1, T_2) \rightarrow \\ (phone_no(Name, N, T_2) \equiv REC_PHONE_NO(Name, N, T_2)) \end{aligned} \quad (7.5)$$

Lastly, we have to specify assumability conditions. We allow goals of the form

$$execute(Action, Time)$$

to be assumed if *Time* is in the future and *Action* is a ground action term. We also allow goals of the form

$$before'(T_1, T_2)$$

to be assumed if T_1 is the time of an executed action, and

$$finish_time(T_2)$$

holds, on the grounds that we are at liberty to choose a finish time that occurs after all the necessary actions have been completed.

By performing normal AET, it follows (we omit the details) that a solution to 7.4 exists, where F_{db} is

$$\exists N_1.REC_PHONE_NO(mary', N_1, T_{done})$$

and A (the set of assumptions) is, for some T_{lookup}

$$\{execute(look_up_no(mary'), T_{lookup}), before'(T_{lookup}, T_{done})\}$$

In other words, I will know what Mary's number is at any moment after the time when I perform the operation of looking it up. The significant thing about this example, compared e.g. to the account in (Moore 1985), is that the process of reasoning about knowledge acquisition is carried out in a goal-directed way that is compatible with normal AI planning methods. I think that this is an interesting idea to explore further.

References

- Alshawi, H. 1990. "Resolving Quasi Logical Forms". *Computational Linguistics* 16:133–144.
- Alshawi, H., ed. 1992. *The Core Language Engine*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Alshawi, H., D.M. Carter, M. Rayner and B. Gambäck. 1991. "Translation by Quasi Logical Form Transfer", in *Proc. 29th ACL*, Berkeley, California.
- Alshawi, H. and R. Crouch. 1992. "Monotonic Semantic Interpretation", *Proc. 30th ACL*, Newark, Delaware.
- Alshawi, H., Rayner, M., and Smith, A.G. 1991. "Declarative Derivation of Database Queries from Meaning Representations", in Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunications S.C. (ed.) *Proceedings of the 1991 BANKAI Workshop on Intelligent Information Access*, Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Appelt, D. and J.R. Hobbs. 1990. "Making Abduction more Efficient", in *Proc. DARPA Workshop on Speech and Natural Language*, Morgan Kaufmann, San Mateo.
- Bennett, M. 1979. *Questions in Montague Grammar*. University of Indiana Linguistics Club.
- Bronneberg, W.J.H.J., H.C. Bunt, S.P.J. Landsbergen, R.J.H. Scha, W.J. Schoenmakers and E.P.C. van Utteren. 1980. "The Question Answering System PHLIQA1". In L. Bolc (ed.), *Natural Language Question Answering Systems*. Macmillan.

- Charniak, E. and Goldman, R. 1988. “A Logic for Semantic Interpretation”. *Proceedings of the 26th Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 87–94.
- Clark, K.L. 1978. “Negation as Failure”. In H. Gallaire and J. Minker (editors), *Logic and Data Bases*, Plenum, New York.
- Dalrymple, M., S. M. Shieber, and F. C. N. Pereira. 1991. “Ellipsis and Higher-Order Unification”. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 14:399–452.
- Davidson, D. 1967. “The Logical Form of Action Sentences”. Reprinted in Davidson, 1980, *Essays on Actions and Events*, Oxford University Press.
- Grosz, B. J., D. E. Appelt, P. Martin, and F. Pereira. 1987. “TEAM: An Experiment in the Design of Transportable Natural-Language Interfaces”. *Artificial Intelligence* 32: 173–243.
- Hobbs, J.R., M. Stickel, P. Martin and D. Edwards. 1988. “Interpretation as Abduction”, in *Proceedings of the 26th ACL*, Buffalo, New York.
- Hobbs, J. R., and S. M. Shieber. 1987. “An Algorithm for Generating Quantifier Scopings”. *Computational Linguistics* 13:47–63.
- Karttunen, L. 1977. “Syntax and Semantics of Questions”. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1:3–44.
- Konolige, K. 1981. *The Database as Model: A Metatheoretic Approach*, SRI technical note 255.
- Korf, R. 1986. “Search: A Survey of Recent Results” in *Exploring Artificial Intelligence: Survey Talks from the National Conferences on Artificial Intelligence*, Morgan Kaufmann, San Mateo.
- Lewin, I., M. Russell, D.M. Carter, S. Browning, K. Ponting and S.G. Pulman. 1993. “A speech-based route enquiry system built from general-purpose components”. *Proceedings of EUROSPEECH '93*.
- McCarthy, J. 1977. “Epistemological Problems of Artificial Intelligence”. *Proceedings of the 4th IJCAI*, Cambridge, MA.
- McCord, M.C. 1987. “Natural Language Processing in Prolog”, in A. Walker (ed.) *Knowledge Systems and Prolog*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.

- Moore, R.C. 1985. "A Logic of Knowledge and Action". In Hobbs, J.R. and Moore, R.C., *Formal Theories of the Common-Sense World*, Ablex.
- Moran, D. B. 1988. "Quantifier Scoping in the SRI Core Language Engine". Proceedings of the 26th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York, 33–40.
- Pereira, F. C. N. 1990. "Categorial Semantics and Scoping", *Computational Linguistics* 16:1 1–10.
- Pereira, F.C.N. and M.E. Pollack. 1991. "Incremental Interpretation", *Artificial Intelligence* 50 37-82.
- Pereira, F.C.N. and S.M. Shieber. 1985. *Prolog and Natural-Language Understanding*, CLSI Lecture Notes.
- Perrault, C. Raymond and Barbara J. Grosz. 1988. "Natural Language Interfaces" in *Exploring Artificial Intelligence: Survey Talks from the National Conferences on Artificial Intelligence*, Morgan Kaufmann, San Mateo.
- Rayner, M. and S. Janson. 1989. "Finding Out = Achieving Decidability", in *Working notes: IJCAI workshop on Knowledge, Planning and Perception*, Detroit, Michigan. Also available as Research Report R89015, Swedish Institute of Computer Science, Kista, Sweden.
- Scha, R.J.H. 1983. *Logical Foundations for Question Answering*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Groningen, the Netherlands.
- Shieber, S. M., G. van Noord, F. C. N. Pereira, and R. C. Moore. 1990. "Semantic-Head-Driven Generation". *Computational Linguistics* 16:30–43.
- Stallard, D.G. 1986. "A Terminological Simplification Transformation for Natural Language Question-Answering Systems". *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, ACL, 241–246.
- Stickel, M. E. 1986. "A Prolog technology theorem prover: implementation by an extended Prolog compiler.", *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 4, 353-380.

Sterling, L. and S. Shapiro. 1985. *The Art of Prolog*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.

Williams, B.C.. 1991. “A Theory of Interactions: Unifying Qualitative and Quantitative Algebraic Reasoning”. *Artificial Intelligence* 51: 39–94.

Appendix A

The semantics of questions_____

This appendix summarizes the theory of question semantics used throughout the thesis. There are two main points. First, we distinguish between *questions* and *question utterances*; this is not an idea that most linguists will find controversial, though non-linguists will perhaps feel it needs some explanation. Briefly, then, *questions* are a type of linguistic construction that can occur either alone or *embedded* in other constructions. The only question-embedding construction that is considered in any detail in the main body of the thesis is “know *Q*”, with *Q* a question (see Section 2.5.4); typical examples, with the embedded questions italicized, might be

(Q1) Do you know *which employees work on each project?*

(Q2) Do you know *whether any payments were made after 1/1/92?*

The embedded question in (Q1) is considered to be *Which employees work on each project?*, and in (Q2) *Was any payment made after 1/1/92?*.

When questions stand on their own, we call them *question utterances*. A question utterance is considered to be a command to answer the question in some appropriate way. Now when assigning semantics to questions, we will require that embedded questions and question utterances be treated uniformly. A given question, *Q*, will have some semantic value, *Q'*. We thus require that the semantic value of *Q* used as a question-utterance be a function of *Q'*, and also that the semantic value of a construction embedding *Q* be a function of *Q'*. For our present purposes, we can be even more specific: we demand that

1. The semantics of constructions of type “X knows Q ” should be schematically

$$know'(x', Q')$$

In practice, we will only be interested in what the system knows, and we will abbreviate

$$know'(system', Q')$$

to

$$kw(Q')$$

2. The semantics of Q used as a question utterance should be schematically

$$question_answered(Q')$$

This is interpreted as a goal that will be true if an action is carried out appropriate for answering Q .

We discuss appropriate semantics for the operators *question_answered* and *kw* in Sections 2.5.1, 2.5.2 and 2.5.4.

The remaining point to consider is how to assign appropriate semantics to the questions themselves. Here, we will adopt a minimal proposal, which as far as we know was originally suggested by Bennett (1979); we try to abstract away as much as possible from the details of any specific semantic theory. The proposal is as follows:

1. If Q is a Y-N question corresponding to a declarative sentence D (i.e. Q is the question that asks whether or not D is true), then we take its semantic value to be that same as that of D .
2. If Q is a WH-question, which can be read as asking which objects stand in a given relationship R , then the semantic value of Q is R .

The Y-N question case should be clear, but the WH-question case needs some further explanation. Usually, there will be only one WH-element, and the question can be read as asking for objects with a certain property. Thus for example consider the questions **(Q3)**–**(Q5)**:

(Q3) Who worked on the CLARE project?

(Q4) When did the CLARE project finish?

(Q5) Which projects started during 1990?

Here, the semantic value of **(Q3)** is a property that holds of people who worked on the CLARE project; the semantic value of **(Q4)** is a property that holds of dates when the CLARE project finished; and the semantic value of **(Q5)** is a property holding of projects which started during 1990. The semantic value of a property can most simply be represented as a λ -abstraction: if we allow this, the semantic values of **(Q3)**–**(Q5)** are roughly those shown in (A.1)–(A.3):

$$\lambda X.person'(X) \wedge work_on'(X, clare) \quad (A.1)$$

$$\lambda D.\exists E.date(D) \wedge finish'(E, clare) \wedge date_of(E, D) \quad (A.2)$$

$$\lambda P.\exists E.project(P) \wedge start'(E, P) \wedge during'(E, 1990) \quad (A.3)$$

If there are (either explicitly or implicitly) several question-elements, then the semantic value of the question becomes a relation, as in **(Q6)** and **(Q7)**:

(Q6) Who works on which project?

(Q7) When did each project start?

which receive the semantic values shown in (A.4) and (A.5):

$$\lambda X\lambda Y.person'(X) \wedge project'(Y) \wedge work_on'(X, Y) \quad (A.4)$$

$$\lambda P\lambda D.\exists E.project(P) \wedge start'(E, P) \wedge date_of(E, D) \quad (A.5)$$

It should be noted that the theory we have outlined here is not the most popular one in theoretical linguistic circles. Currently, the “standard” approach is that described in (Karttunen 1977), which makes the denotation of a question the set of true answers. We feel that there are good reasons to query the appropriateness of this idea, but a discussion of the issues lies too far outside the scope of the thesis; the interested reader is referred to (Rayner and Janson 1987) for our objections to Karttunen’s approach.

Appendix B

Syntax and semantics of TRL

This appendix briefly defines the syntax and semantics of the TRL language. TRL is a conservatively extended first-order logic, which is used as the level of representation in CLARE that supports inference operations. When discussing AET at an abstract level, we consequently often find it convenient to use normal logical notation. We indicate for each construct the “normal” logical equivalent.

There are three basic types of construct: terms, abstracts and forms. We list each one separately.

NB: The version of TRL described here is that used in the body of the thesis, and represents a slightly rationalized form of the implemented version. The most important differences concern the concrete syntax for typed terms (here, `Type#Id`), and higher-order constructs for counting, summing and ordering.

B.1 Terms

A TRL term can be any of the following:

1. A variable, represented as a Prolog variable.
2. A constant, represented as a Prolog atom.
3. The result of applying a function symbol to a list of terms, represented as a complex Prolog term.

When using standard logical notation, we do not enforce any syntactic convention to distinguish between variables and constants, relying on this being clear from context.

We will distinguish terms of the $\text{Type}\#\text{Id}$, where Type is a TRL constant and Id is a TRL term. These will have the conventional meaning “the object of type Type , whose database identifier is Id ”. In normal logical syntax we will write these as $\text{Type} : \text{Id}$.

B.2 Abstracts

If P is a TRL form or a TRL abstract, and $X_1 \dots X_n$ are TRL variables, then

$$X_1 \wedge X_2 \dots X_n \wedge P$$

is a TRL abstract. It denotes a n -ary relation R between objects, such that R holds between the objects denoted by $A_1 \dots A_n$ iff the formula resulting from substituting A_i for X_i in P holds. In normal logical notation, we write $\lambda X_1 \dots \lambda X_n. P$.

B.3 Forms

A TRL form can be any of the following:

Conjunction If P and Q are TRL forms, then

$$\text{and}(P, Q)$$

is a TRL form, which holds iff both P and Q hold. Conjunctions are as usual written $P \wedge Q$ in normal logical notation.

Disjunction If P and Q are TRL forms, then

$$\text{or}(P, Q)$$

is a TRL form, which holds iff either P or Q holds. Disjunctions are as usual written $P \vee Q$ in normal logical notation.

Negation If P is a TRL form, then

$$\text{not}(P)$$

is a TRL form, which holds iff P does not hold. Negations are written $\neg P$ in normal logical notation.

Implication If P and Q are TRL forms, then

$$\text{impl}(P, Q)$$

$$Q \leftarrow P$$

are alternate ways of writing the same TRL form, which holds iff either Q holds or P does not hold. In normal notation, we will permit both $P \rightarrow Q$ and $Q \leftarrow P$.

Equivalence If P and Q are TRL forms, then

$$P \leftrightarrow Q$$

is a TRL form, which holds iff P and Q either both hold or both fail to hold. In normal notation, we write $P \equiv Q$.

Existential quantification If P is a TRL form, and $[X_1, X_2, \dots]$ is a list of TRL variables, then

$$\text{exists}([X_1, X_2, \dots], P)$$

is a TRL form, which holds iff P hold for some instantiation of the variables $[X_1, X_2, \dots]$. In normal notation, we write $\exists X_1, X_2, \dots P$.

Universal quantification If P is a TRL form, and $[X_1, X_2, \dots]$ is a list of TRL variables, then

$$\text{forall}([X_1, X_2, \dots], P)$$

is a TRL form, which holds iff P hold for all instantiations of the variables $[X_1, X_2, \dots]$. In normal notation, we write $\forall X_1, X_2, \dots P$.

Counting If $X \wedge P$ is a TRL abstract, and N is a TRL term, then

$$\text{cardinality}(N, X \wedge P)$$

is a TRL form, which holds iff there are precisely N instantiations of X such that P holds. In normal notation, we write $\text{count}(N, \lambda X. P)$.

Summing If $X \wedge P$ is a TRL abstract, and N is a TRL term, then

$$\text{sum}(\text{Sum}, X \wedge P)$$

is a TRL form, which holds iff

1. all objects A such P holds when A is substituted for X are summable quantities
2. Sum is their sum.

In normal notation, we write $sum(Sum, \lambda X.P)$.

Ordering If $X \hat{D} P$ is a TRL abstract, and N and $Ordering$ are TRL terms, then

$$order(Selected, X \hat{D} P, Ordering)$$

is a TRL form, which holds iff

1. $Ordering$ is a term representing an ordering relation
2. $DMax$ is the maximal $D1$ under the relation represented by $Ordering$ such that P when $D1$ is substituted for D and some $X1$ is substituted for X , and
3. $Selected$ is such an $X1$

In normal notation, we write $order(Selected, \lambda X \lambda D.P(X, D), Ordering)$.

Meta-knowledge If P is a TRL form, then

$$kw(P)$$

(read “knows-whether” P) is a TRL form, which holds iff there is an effective translation of P (cf. Section 2.4.2). In normal notation we write $kw(P)$.

Necessity If P is a TRL form, then

$$def(P)$$

(read “ P is true by definition”) is a TRL form, which holds iff P is implied by the background theory *without* the database.

Appendix C

Translating to SQL_____

This section briefly describes the module responsible for synthesis of actual SQL queries. The conversion module takes as input a TRL form P , assumed to represent a question; it outputs a form P' , such that P and P' are equivalent and as much as possible of P has been replaced by calls to the SQL interface. The interface is mediated through the predicate

`sql_select(Vars,SQLQuery)`

where `SQLQuery` is a term representing an SQL `SELECT` statement, and `Vars` is a list whose length is equal to the number of selected variables in `SQLQuery`. The intended semantics are that

`sql_select(Vars,SQLQuery)`

holds iff `Vars` are a row selected by `SQLQuery`. `SQLQuery` is a logical term representing the abstract SQL syntax; conversion to concrete SQL syntax is handled by the low-level SQL interface, and is straightforward. We now describe how the conversion process is carried out; we will illustrate by continuing the extended example from section 4.9. We use the same abbreviated notation, shortening `exists` to `E` and `forall` to `A`. Recall that the original query was

(S1) Show all payments made to BT during 1990.

This receives the final translated TRL representation (slightly simplified in the interests of readability),

```
A([TransId,Date,DBDate,AmtNum],
  impl(and(TRANS(TransId,DBDate,bt,AmtNum)
```

```

and(sql_date_convert(Date,DBDate),
and(t_precedes(date([1990,1,1]),Date),
t_precedes(Date,date([1990,12,31])))
execute_in_future(display([TransId,DBDate,bt,AmtNum])))

```

which can be glossed as

“Find all TRANS tuples with `trn_id` field `TransId`, `cheque_date` field `DBDate`, `payee` field `bt` and amount field `AmtNum`, such that `DBDate` represents a date after 1/1/90 and before 31/12/90; and for each one display the list `[TransId, DBDate, bt, AmtNum]`.”

Taking the conclusion first, the translation to SQL form produced is

```

A([TransId,DBDate,AmtNum],
impl(sql_select([TransId,DBDate,AmtNum],
SELECT([t_1.trn_id,t_1.amount,t_1.cheque_date],
FROM([alias(TRANS,t_1)]),
WHERE([t_1.payee=bt,
sql_date_=<(1-JAN-90,
t_1.cheque_date)),
sql_date_=<(t_1.cheque_date,
31-DEC-90)])),
execute_in_future(display([TransId,DBDate,bt,AmtNum])))

```

Here, the abstract SQL syntax is a hopefully transparent representation of the SQL query whose concrete syntax will be

```

"SELECT DISTINCT t_1.trn_id , t_1.cheque_date , t_1.amount
FROM TRANS t_1
WHERE t_1.payee = 'bt'
AND '1-JAN-90' <= t_1.cheque_date
AND t_1.cheque_date <= '31-DEC-90"

```

We now explain in more detail how this result can be produced. Processing traces the following series of top-level steps:

1. Translate representation-independent evaluable predicates such as `t_precedes` into database access language dependent primitives using AET.
2. Insert database column names into database predicates.

3. Make column names unique by associating a “relation alias” with each occurrence of a database predicate.
4. Group together conjunctions of goals suitable for turning into `SELECT` statements. Goals suitable for inclusion are goals representing database lookups and goals that map onto conditions in `WHEN` clauses. For each such conjunction, do the following:
 - (a) Extract the variables that are to be selected.
 - (b) Replace variables by column descriptions.
 - (c) Extract the variables that are constrained to have fixed values, and add these as suitable equalities to the `WHEN` clause.
 - (d) If more than one relation instance is referenced, add equalities to the `WHEN` clause to represent the join.
5. Simplify the result.

We use the example to illustrate. The first step is to use AET to translate the occurrences of `t_precedes`. The relevant equivalence is

```
t_precedes(Date1,Date2) <->
exists([DBDate1,DBDate2],
  and(sql_date_convert(Date1,DBDate1),
    and(sql_date_convert(Date2,DBDate2),
      sql_date_=<(DBDate1,DBDate2))))
```

applied twice; after some simplification (exploiting the fact that `db_date_convert` is a function from each of its arguments to the other one, see section 3.6.2), the result is

```
A([TransId,Date,DBDate,AmtNum],
  impl(and(TRANS(TransId,DBDate,bt,AmtNum)
    and(sql_date_convert(Date,DBDate),
      and(sql_date_=<(1-JAN-90,DBDate)
        sql_date_=<(DBDate,31-DEC-90))))),
    execute_in_future(display([TransId,DBDate,bt,AmtNum])))
```

Note that `1-JAN-90` and `31-DEC-90` are atomic SQL date representations. The next two steps are fairly trivial in nature, and involve substituting SQL column names in the `TRANS` relation and creating a unique relation alias `t_1` for it. (Since there is only one relation here, this step is not actually necessary, but we show it for completeness). The result is

```
A([TransId,Date,DBDate,AmtNum],
  impl(and(tuple(t_1,TRANS([trn_id=TransId,
                           cheque_date=DBDate,
                           payee=bt,
                           amount=AmtNum])),
        and(sql_date_convert(Date,DBDate),
            and(sql_date_=<(1-JAN-90,DBDate)
                sql_date_=<(DBDate,31-DEC-90))))),
  execute_in_future(display([TransId,DBDate,bt,AmtNum])))
```

Conjunctions are now when possible turned into `sql_select` goals; the only suitable conjunction is

```
and(tuple(t_1,TRANS([trn_id=TransId,
                    cheque_date=DBDate,
                    payee=bt,
                    amount=AmtNum])),
  and(sql_date_=<(1-JAN-90,DBDate)
      sql_date_=<(DBDate,31-DEC-90)))
```

Here, the database look-up goals are the singleton

```
{tuple(t_1,TRANS([trn_id=TransId,
                  cheque_date=DBDate,
                  payee=bt,
                  amount=AmtNum]))}
```

and the initial `WHEN` clause goals are

```
{sql_date_=<(1-JAN-90,DBDate)
  sql_date_=<(DBDate,31-DEC-90))}
```

Consulting the database look-up goals, the variables to be selected are `TransId`, `DBDate` and `AmtNum`, so they end up being the list of variables in the `sql_select` goal's first argument; then replacing the variables inside the `SELECT` with column descriptions, we replace `TransId` with `t_1.trn_id`, `DBDate` with `t_1.cheque_date` and `AmtNum` with `t_1.amount`. The `WHEN` clause goals now become

```
{sql_date_=<(1-JAN-90,t_1.cheque_date)
  sql_date_=<(t_1.cheque_date,31-DEC-90))}
```

There is a single column, `payee`, constrained to have a fixed value, `bt`, so it adds another goal

```
t_1.payee=bt
```

to the `WHEN` clause. The final result is the `sql_select` goal

```
sql_select([TransId,DBDate,AmtNum],
           SELECT([t_1.trn_id,t_1.amount,t_1.cheque_date],
                 FROM([alias(TRANS,t_1)]),
                 WHERE([t_1.payee=bt,
                       sql_date_=<(1-JAN-90,
                                   t_1.cheque_date)),
                       sql_date_=<(t_1.cheque_date,
                                   31-DEC-90))]))))
```

Replacing the conjunction with the `sql_select` goal, we reach the final form,

```
A([TransId,DBDate,AmtNum],
   impl(sql_select([TransId,DBDate,AmtNum],
                  SELECT([t_1.trn_id,t_1.amount,t_1.cheque_date],
                        FROM([alias(TRANS,t_1)]),
                        WHERE([t_1.payee=bt,
                              sql_date_=<(1-JAN-90,
                                          t_1.cheque_date)),
                              sql_date_=<(t_1.cheque_date,
                                          31-DEC-90))]))),
   execute_in_future(display([TransId,DBDate,bt,AmtNum])))
```