

## Harry Potter Tableaux Problem

Given knowledge base K:

### TBox:

Human  $\sqsubseteq$   $\exists$ hasParent.Human

Orphan  $\sqsubseteq$  Human  $\sqcap$   $\forall$ hasParent. $\neg$ Alive

Converting TBox Concept Inclusions into single concept form, we get

$\neg$ Human  $\sqcup$   $\exists$ hasParent.Human

$\neg$ Orphan  $\sqcup$  (Human  $\sqcap$   $\forall$ hasParent. $\neg$ Alive)

### ABox:

Orphan(harrypotter), hasParent(harrypotter,jamespotter)

Using the tableaux method show that  $\neg$ Alive(jamespotter) is a logical consequence of K.

Let us include Alive(jamespotter) to the Abox and try to show K is unsatisfiable.

Also, let us abbreviate terms as follows:

term	abbreviation
Human	h
hasParent	hp
Orphan	o
Alive	a
harrypotter	h
jamespotter	j

INITIAL ABOX:

A0
o(h)
hp(h,j)
a(j)
$(\neg h \sqcup \exists hp.h)(h)$
$(\neg h \sqcup \exists hp.h)(j)$
$(\neg o \sqcup (h \sqcap \forall hp.\neg a))(h)$
$(\neg o \sqcup (h \sqcap \forall hp.\neg a))(j)$

Applying  $\sqcup$ -rule to  $(\neg o \sqcup (h \sqcap \forall hp.\neg a))(h)$  gives:

---

---

A11 (INCONSISTENT)

---

**o(h)**  
hp(h,j)  
a(j)  
(¬h ⊔ ∃hp.h)(h)  
(¬h ⊔ ∃hp.h)(j)  
(¬o ⊔ (h ⊓ ∀hp.¬a))(h)  
(¬o ⊔ (h ⊓ ∀hp.¬a))(j)  
**¬o(h)**

---

---

---

A12

---

o(h)  
hp(h,j)  
a(j)  
(¬h ⊔ ∃hp.h)(h)  
(¬h ⊔ ∃hp.h)(j)  
(¬o ⊔ (h ⊓ ∀hp.¬a))(h)  
(¬o ⊔ (h ⊓ ∀hp.¬a))(j)  
**(h ⊓ ∀hp.¬a)(h)**

---

A11 contains a clash and is inconsistent; So, A11 can be discarded and not expanded further.

Applying  $\sqcap$ -rule to **(h ⊓ ∀hp.¬a)(h)** gives:

---

---

A2

---

o(h)  
hp(h,j)  
a(j)  
(¬h ⊔ ∃hp.h)(h)  
(¬h ⊔ ∃hp.h)(j)  
(¬o ⊔ (h ⊓ ∀hp.¬a))(h)  
(¬o ⊔ (h ⊓ ∀hp.¬a))(j)  
(h ⊓ ∀hp.¬a)(h)  
**h(h)**  
**(∀hp.¬a)(h)**

---

Applying  $\sqcup$ -rule to **(¬h ⊔ ∃hp.h)(h)** gives:

---

---

A31 (INCONSISTENT)

---

o(h)

---

A31 (INCONSISTENT)

---

hp(h,j)  
a(j)  
( $\neg h \sqcup \exists hp.h$ )(h)  
( $\neg h \sqcup \exists hp.h$ )(j)  
( $\neg o \sqcup (h \sqcap \forall hp.\neg a)$ )(h)  
( $\neg o \sqcup (h \sqcap \forall hp.\neg a)$ )(j)  
( $h \sqcap \forall hp.\neg a$ )(h)  
**h(h)**  
( $\forall hp.\neg a$ )(h)  
 **$\neg h(h)$**

---

---

A32

---

o(h)  
hp(h,j)  
a(j)  
( $\neg h \sqcup \exists hp.h$ )(h)  
( $\neg h \sqcup \exists hp.h$ )(j)  
( $\neg o \sqcup (h \sqcap \forall hp.\neg a)$ )(h)  
( $\neg o \sqcup (h \sqcap \forall hp.\neg a)$ )(j)  
( $h \sqcap \forall hp.\neg a$ )(h)  
h(h)  
( $\forall hp.\neg a$ )(h)  
**( $\exists hp.h$ )(h)**

---

A31 contains a clash and is inconsistent; So, A31 can be discarded and not expanded further.

Applying  $\forall$ -rule to ( $\forall hp.\neg a$ )(h) gives:

---

A4 (INCONSISTENT)

---

o(h)  
hp(h,j)  
**a(j)**  
( $\neg h \sqcup \exists hp.h$ )(h)  
( $\neg h \sqcup \exists hp.h$ )(j)  
( $\neg o \sqcup (h \sqcap \forall hp.\neg a)$ )(h)  
( $\neg o \sqcup (h \sqcap \forall hp.\neg a)$ )(j)  
( $h \sqcap \forall hp.\neg a$ )(h)  
h(h)  
( $\forall hp.\neg a$ )(h)  
( $\exists hp.h$ )(h)

A4 (INCONSISTENT)  
 $\neg a(j)$

All Aboxes have ended up with clashes! So, KB with  $a(j)$  is unsatisfiable; Hence  $\neg a(j)$  is a logical consequence of K.