Basis for automated proof: First-Order Resolution

Stéphane Devismes Pascal Lafourcade Michel Lévy
Jean-François Monin (jean-francois.monin@imag.fr)

Université Joseph Fourier, Grenoble I

March 20, 2015

Plan

Plan

Idea

Skolemization yields formulae without quantifier.

This course presents a generalization of resolution to first-order logic :

- clausal form of skolemized formulae.
- generalization of resolution.
- Correctness and completeness of the method.

Plan

Litteral, clause

Definition 5.2.19

A positive litteral is an atomic formula. Ex : $P(x, y)$

A negative litteral is the negation of an atomic formula. Ex : $\neg Q(a)$

Every litteral is positive or negative.

A clause is a disjunction of litterals. Ex : $P(x, y) \vee \neg Q(a)$

Clausal form of a formula

Definition 5.2.20

Let A be a closed formula. The clausal form of A, $F(A)$ is a set of clauses obtained from A in two steps :

1. Skolemize A into B
2. Replace B with an equivalent set Γ of clauses using distributivity of disjunction over conjunction.

Clausal form of a formula

property 1

5.2.21

- The universal closure of the clausal form of a closed formula A has a model if and only if A is a consequence of $\forall(F(A))$.
- If A has a model, then $\forall(F(A))$ has a model.

Proof

Proof.

Let A be a closed formula, B its Skolem form and Γ its clausal form.
From the properties of skolemization :

- A is a consequence of $\forall(B)$.
- If A has a model then $\forall(B)$ has a model.

Since Γ is obtained using distributivity, B and Γ are equivalent, hence $\forall(B)$ and $\forall(\Gamma)$ are equivalent as well. Therefore, in the two properties above, $\forall(B)$ can be replaced with $\forall(\Gamma)$. $\square$

Clausal form of a set of formulae

Definition 5.2.22

Let Γ be a set of closed formulae. We define the clausal form of Γ as the union of clausal forms of all formulae of Γ, paying attention, in the course of skolemization, to use a new symbol for each eliminated existential quantifier.

Clausal form of a set of formulae

Corollary 5.2.23

Let Γ be a set of closed formulae and Δ the clausal form of Γ. We have :

- Γ is a consequence of $\forall(\Delta)$
- if Γ has a model then $\forall(\Delta)$ has a model.

Adapting Herbrand's theorem to clausal forms

Theorem 5.2.24

Let Γ be a set of closed formulae and Δ the clausal form of Γ. Γ is unsatisfiable if and only if there exists a finite unsatisfiable subset of instances of clauses of Δ on the signature of Δ.

Proof.

From Corollary 5.2.23, skolemization preserves satisfiability, then : Γ is unsatisfiable if and only if $\forall(\Delta)$ is unsatisfiable.
From Corollary 5.1.18 of Herbrand's theorem, $\forall(\Delta)$ is unsatisfiable if and only if there exists a finite unsatisfiable subset of instances of clauses of Δ on the signature of Δ. $\square$

Example 5.2.25 (1/2)

Let $A = \exists y \forall z (P(z,y) \Leftrightarrow \neg \exists x (P(z,x) \wedge P(x,z)))$. Let's compute the clausal form of A.

Example 5.2.25 (1/2)

Let $A = \exists y \forall z (P(z,y) \Leftrightarrow \neg \exists x (P(z,x) \wedge P(x,z)))$. Let's compute the clausal form of A.

1. We put A under normal form :
   $\exists y \forall z ((\neg P(z,y) \vee \forall x (\neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z))) \wedge \exists x (P(z,x) \wedge P(x,z)) \vee P(z,y))$

Example 5.2.25 (1/2)

Let $A = \exists y \forall z (P(z,y) \Leftrightarrow \neg \exists x (P(z,x) \wedge P(x,z)))$. Let's compute the clausal form of A.

1. We put A under normal form :
   $\exists y \forall z ((\neg P(z,y) \vee \forall x (\neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z))) \wedge \exists x (P(z,x) \wedge P(x,z)) \vee P(z,y))$
2. Cleaning the result :
   $\exists y \forall z ((\neg P(z,y) \vee \forall x (\neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z))) \wedge \exists u (P(z,u) \wedge P(u,z)) \vee P(z,y))$

Example 5.2.25 (1/2)

Let $A = \exists y \forall z (P(z,y) \Leftrightarrow \neg \exists x (P(z,x) \wedge P(x,z)))$. Let's compute the clausal form of A.

1. We put A under normal form :
   $\exists y \forall z((\neg P(z,y) \vee \forall x(\neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z))) \wedge \exists x(P(z,x) \wedge P(x,z)) \vee P(z,y))$
2. Cleaning the result :
   $\exists y \forall z((\neg P(z,y) \vee \forall x(\neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z))) \wedge \exists u(P(z,u) \wedge P(u,z)) \vee P(z,y))$
3. Eliminating existential quantifiers :
   $\forall z((\neg P(z,a) \vee \forall x(\neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z))) \wedge (P(z,f(z)) \wedge P(f(z),z)) \vee P(z,a))$

Example 5.2.25 (1/2)

Let $A = \exists y \forall z (P(z,y) \Leftrightarrow \neg \exists x (P(z,x) \wedge P(x,z)))$. Let's compute the clausal form of A.

1. We put A under normal form :
   $\exists y \forall z ((\neg P(z,y) \vee \forall x (\neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z))) \wedge \exists x (P(z,x) \wedge P(x,z)) \vee P(z,y))$
2. Cleaning the result :
   $\exists y \forall z ((\neg P(z,y) \vee \forall x (\neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z))) \wedge \exists u (P(z,u) \wedge P(u,z)) \vee P(z,y))$
3. Eliminating existential quantifiers :
   $\forall z ((\neg P(z,a) \vee \forall x (\neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z))) \wedge (P(z,f(z)) \wedge P(f(z),z)) \vee P(z,a))$
4. Removing universal quantifiers, we obtain the Skolem form of A :
   $((\neg P(z,a) \vee (\neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z))) \wedge (P(z,f(z)) \wedge P(f(z),z)) \vee P(z,a))$

Example 5.2.25 (1/2)

Let $A = \exists y \forall z (P(z,y) \Leftrightarrow \neg \exists x (P(z,x) \wedge P(x,z)))$. Let's compute the clausal form of A.

1. We put A under normal form :
   $\exists y \forall z ((\neg P(z,y) \vee \forall x (\neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z))) \wedge \exists x (P(z,x) \wedge P(x,z)) \vee P(z,y))$
2. Cleaning the result :
   $\exists y \forall z ((\neg P(z,y) \vee \forall x (\neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z))) \wedge \exists u (P(z,u) \wedge P(u,z)) \vee P(z,y))$
3. Eliminating existential quantifiers :
   $\forall z ((\neg P(z,a) \vee \forall x (\neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z))) \wedge (P(z,f(z)) \wedge P(f(z),z)) \vee P(z,a))$
4. Removing universal quantifiers, we obtain the Skolem form of A :
   $((\neg P(z,a) \vee (\neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z))) \wedge (P(z,f(z)) \wedge P(f(z),z)) \vee P(z,a))$
5. Transforming the latter into a product of sums of litterals, we get the clausal form of A, which is the following set of clauses :
   - $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
   - $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
   - $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

Example 5.2.25 (2/2)

- $C_1 = \neg P(z, a) \vee \neg P(z, x) \vee \neg P(x, z)$
- $C_2 = P(z, f(z)) \vee P(z, a)$
- $C_3 = P(f(z), z) \vee P(z, a)$

A has no model if and only if there is a finite unsatisfiable set of instances of C_1, C_2, C_3 on the signature of these clauses.
Looking for these instances :

Example 5.2.25 (2/2)

- $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
- $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
- $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

A has no model if and only if there is a finite unsatisfiable set of instances of C_1, C_2, C_3 on the signature of these clauses.
Looking for these instances :

- Let C_1' obtained with $x := a, z := a$ in C_1 : $C_1' = \neg P(a,a)$

Example 5.2.25 (2/2)

- $C_1 = \neg P(z, a) \vee \neg P(z, x) \vee \neg P(x, z)$
- $C_2 = P(z, f(z)) \vee P(z, a)$
- $C_3 = P(f(z), z) \vee P(z, a)$

A has no model if and only if there is a finite unsatisfiable set of instances of C_1, C_2, C_3 on the signature of these clauses.
Looking for these instances :

- Let C_1' obtained with $x := a, z := a$ in C_1 : $C_1' = \neg P(a, a)$
- Let C_1'' obtained with $x := a, z := f(a)$ in C_1 :
  $C_1'' = \neg P(f(a), a) \vee \neg P(a, f(a))$

Example 5.2.25 (2/2)

- $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
- $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
- $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

A has no model if and only if there is a finite unsatisfiable set of instances of C_1, C_2, C_3 on the signature of these clauses.
Looking for these instances :

- Let C_1' obtained with $x := a, z := a$ in C_1 : $C_1' = \neg P(a,a)$
- Let C_1'' obtained with $x := a, z := f(a)$ in C_1 : $C_1'' = \neg P(f(a),a) \vee \neg P(a,f(a))$
- Let C_2' obtained with $z := a$ in C_2 : $C_2' = P(a,f(a)) \vee P(a,a)$

Example 5.2.25 (2/2)

- $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
- $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
- $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

A has no model if and only if there is a finite unsatisfiable set of instances of C_1, C_2, C_3 on the signature of these clauses.
Looking for these instances :

- Let C'_1 obtained with $x := a, z := a$ in C_1 : $C'_1 = \neg P(a,a)$
- Let C''_1 obtained with $x := a, z := f(a)$ in C_1 :
  $C''_1 = \neg P(f(a),a) \vee \neg P(a,f(a))$
- Let C'_2 obtained with $z := a$ in C_2 : $C'_2 = P(a,f(a)) \vee P(a,a)$
- Let C'_3 obtained with $z := a$ in C_3 : $C'_3 = P(f(a),a) \vee P(a,a)$

Example 5.2.25 (2/2)

- $C_1 = \neg P(z, a) \vee \neg P(z, x) \vee \neg P(x, z)$
- $C_2 = P(z, f(z)) \vee P(z, a)$
- $C_3 = P(f(z), z) \vee P(z, a)$

A has no model if and only if there is a finite unsatisfiable set of instances of C_1, C_2, C_3 on the signature of these clauses.
Looking for these instances :

- Let C_1' obtained with $x := a, z := a$ in C_1 : $C_1' = \neg P(a, a)$
- Let C_1'' obtained with $x := a, z := f(a)$ in C_1 :
  $C_1'' = \neg P(f(a), a) \vee \neg P(a, f(a))$
- Let C_2' obtained with $z := a$ in C_2 : $C_2' = P(a, f(a)) \vee P(a, a)$
- Let C_3' obtained with $z := a$ in C_3 : $C_3' = P(f(a), a) \vee P(a, a)$

The set of these instances is unsatisfiable, then A is unsatisfiable !

Plan

Unification : expression, solution

Definition 5.3.1

- A term or a litteral is an **expression**.
- A substitution σ (see definition 5.1.3) is a **solution** of equation $e_1 = e_2$, if the two expressions $e_1\sigma$ and $e_2\sigma$ are syntactically identical.
- A substitution is a solution of a set of equations if it is a solution of each equation of the set.

Unification : carrier of substitution

Definition 5.3.3

The carrier of a substitution σ is the set of variables x such that $x\sigma \neq x$.

We only consider substitutions with a finite carrier (a finite number of variables).

Definition 5.3.3

A substitution σ with finite carrier is denoted by $< x_1 := t_1, \ldots, x_n := t_n >$ or just $x_1 := t_1, \ldots, x_n := t_n$ when there is no ambiguity.
Variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are distinct and the substitution satisfies :

- for i from 1 to n, $x_i\sigma = t_i$
- for all variables y such that $y \notin \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$, we have : $y\sigma = y$

Unification : example 5.3.4

The equation $P(x, f(y)) = P(g(z), z)$ has the solution :

The set of equations $x = g(z), f(y) = z$ has the solution :

Unification : example 5.3.4

The equation $P(x, f(y)) = P(g(z), z)$ has the solution :

$\boxed{x := g(f(y)), z := f(y).}$

The set of equations $x = g(z), f(y) = z$ has the solution :

$\boxed{x := g(f(y)), z := f(y).}$

Unification : composition of substitution

Definition 5.3.5

- Let σ and τ be 2 substitutions, we note $\sigma\tau$ the substitution such that for all variable x, $x\sigma\tau = (x\sigma)\tau$.
- The substitution $\sigma\tau$ is an instance of σ.
- Two substitutions are equivalent if each of them is an instance of the other.

Unification : example 5.3.6

Consider substitutions

- $\sigma_1 = < x := g(z), y := z >$
- $\sigma_2 = < x := g(y), z := y >$
- $\sigma_3 = < x := g(a), y := a, z := a >$

We have the following relations between these substitutions :

Unification : example 5.3.6

Consider substitutions

- $\sigma_1 =< x := g(z), y := z >$
- $\sigma_2 =< x := g(y), z := y >$
- $\sigma_3 =< x := g(a), y := a, z := a >$

We have the following relations between these substitutions :

- $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 < y := z >$
- $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1 < z := y >$
- $\sigma_3 = \sigma_1 < z := a >$
- $\sigma_3 = \sigma_2 < y := a >$

The substitutions σ_1 and σ_2 are equivalent.
The substitution σ_3 is an instance of σ_1 as well as of σ_2, but they are not equivalent.

Unification : definition of the most general solution

Definition 5.3.7 (mgu)

A solution of a set of equations is said to be the most general if any solution is an instance of it. Note that two « most general » solutions are equivalent.

Unification : definition of the most general solution

Definition 5.3.7 (mgu)

A solution of a set of equations is said to be the most general if any solution is an instance of it. Note that two « most general » solutions are equivalent.

Example 5.3.8

Consider equation $f(x, g(z)) = f(g(y), x)$.

- $\sigma_1 =< x := g(z), y := z >$,
- $\sigma_2 =< x := g(y), z := y >$,
- $\sigma_3 =< x := g(a), y := a, z := a >$

are 3 solutions.

σ_1 and σ_2 are its most general solutions.

Unifier

Definition 5.3.2

Let σ be a substitution and E a set of expressions. $E\sigma = \{t\sigma \mid t \in E\}$. The substitution σ is a unifier of E if and only if the set $E\sigma$ has only one element.

Let $\{e_i|1 \leq i \leq n\}$ a finite set of expressions. The substitution σ is a unifier of this set if and only if it is a solution of the set of equations $\{e_i = e_{i+1}|1 \leq i < n\}$.

Most General Unifier

Definition 5.3.9

Let E be a set of expressions. Recall that an expression is a term or a litteral. A unifier of E is said to be a most general (or principal) unifier if any unifier is an instance of it.

Most General Unifier and most general solution

Remark 5.3.10

Let $E = \{e_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ a set of expressions.
In the definition of a unifier, we mentioned that σ is a unifier of E if and only if σ is a solution of the set $S = \{e_i = e_{i+1} \mid 1 \leq i < n\}$.
Therefore, the Most General Unifier of E is the most general solution of S.

Unification : algorithm (sketch)

The algorithm separates equations into :

- equations to be solved, denoted by an equation
- solved equations, denoted by $:=$

Initially, there is no solved equations.

The algorithm stops when :

- No equations are still to be solved : the list of solved equations is the most general solution of the initial set of equations.
- or when it claims that there is no solution.

Unification : algorithm (rules)

- **Remove the equation.** If the 2 sides of an equation are identical.
- **Decompose.** If the 2 sides of an equation are distincts :
  - $\neg A = \neg B$ becomes $A = B$.
  - $f(s_1, \ldots, s_n) = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, becomes $s_1 = t_1, \ldots, s_n = t_n$.
    For $n = 0$ this decomposition removes the equation.
- **Failure of decomposition** If an equation to be solved is of the form $f(s_1, \ldots, s_n) = g(t_1, \ldots, t_p)$ with $f \neq g$ then the algorithm claims that there is no solution.
  In particular a failure is detected if we look for a solution to an equation between a positive litteral and a negative litteral.

Unification : algorithm (rules)

- **Orient.** If an equation is of the form $t = x$ where t is a term which is not a variable and x is a variable, then we replace the equation with $x = t$.
- **Elimination of a variable.** If an equation to be solved is of the form $x = t$ where x is a variable and t is a term without occurrence of x
    1. remove it from equations to be solved
    2. replace x by t in all equations (unsolved and solved)
    3. add $x := t$ to the solved part
- **Failure of elimination.** If an equation to be solved is of the form $x = t$ where x is a variable and t a term distinct from x and containing x then the algorithm claims that there is no solution.

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x, g(z)) = f(g(y), x)$.

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x, g(z)) = f(g(y), x)$.

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x, g(z)) = f(g(y), x)$.

By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), g(z) = x$

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x, g(z)) = f(g(y), x)$.

By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), g(z) = x$
By elimination of x, we get : $x := g(y), g(z) = g(y)$

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x, g(z)) = f(g(y), x)$.

By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), g(z) = x$
By elimination of x, we get : $x := g(y), g(z) = g(y)$
By decomposition, we get : $x := g(y), z = y$

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x, g(z)) = f(g(y), x)$.

By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), g(z) = x$
By elimination of x, we get : $x := g(y), g(z) = g(y)$
By decomposition, we get : $x := g(y), z = y$
By elimination of z, we get the solution : $x := g(y), z := y$

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x, g(z)) = f(g(y), x)$.

   By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), g(z) = x$
   By elimination of x, we get : $x := g(y), g(z) = g(y)$
   By decomposition, we get : $x := g(y), z = y$
   By elimination of z, we get the solution : $x := g(y), z := y$

2. Solve $f(x, x, a) = f(g(y), g(a), y)$.

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x, g(z)) = f(g(y), x)$.

By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), g(z) = x$
By elimination of x, we get : $x := g(y), g(z) = g(y)$
By decomposition, we get : $x := g(y), z = y$
By elimination of z, we get the solution : $x := g(y), z := y$

2. Solve $f(x, x, a) = f(g(y), g(a), y)$.

By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), x = g(a), a = y$

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x, g(z)) = f(g(y), x)$.

By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), g(z) = x$
By elimination of x, we get : $x := g(y), g(z) = g(y)$
By decomposition, we get : $x := g(y), z = y$
By elimination of z, we get the solution : $x := g(y), z := y$

2. Solve $f(x, x, a) = f(g(y), g(a), y)$.

By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), x = g(a), a = y$
By elimination of x, using the first equation, we get :
$x := g(y), g(y) = g(a), a = y$

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x, g(z)) = f(g(y), x)$.

   By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), g(z) = x$
   By elimination of x, we get : $x := g(y), g(z) = g(y)$
   By decomposition, we get : $x := g(y), z = y$
   By elimination of z, we get the solution : $x := g(y), z := y$

2. Solve $f(x, x, a) = f(g(y), g(a), y)$.

   By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), x = g(a), a = y$
   By elimination of x, using the first equation, we get :
   $x := g(y), g(y) = g(a), a = y$
   By decomposition, we get : $x := g(y), y = a, a = y$

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x, g(z)) = f(g(y), x)$.

   By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), g(z) = x$
   By elimination of x, we get : $x := g(y), g(z) = g(y)$
   By decomposition, we get : $x := g(y), z = y$
   By elimination of z, we get the solution : $x := g(y), z := y$

2. Solve $f(x, x, a) = f(g(y), g(a), y)$.

   By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), x = g(a), a = y$
   By elimination of x, using the first equation, we get :
   $x := g(y), g(y) = g(a), a = y$
   By decomposition, we get : $x := g(y), y = a, a = y$
   By elimination of y, we get : $x := g(a), y := a, a = a$

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x, g(z)) = f(g(y), x)$.

   By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), g(z) = x$
   By elimination of x, we get : $x := g(y), g(z) = g(y)$
   By decomposition, we get : $x := g(y), z = y$
   By elimination of z, we get the solution : $x := g(y), z := y$

2. Solve $f(x, x, a) = f(g(y), g(a), y)$.

   By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), x = g(a), a = y$
   By elimination of x, using the first equation, we get :
   $x := g(y), g(y) = g(a), a = y$
   By decomposition, we get : $x := g(y), y = a, a = y$
   By elimination of y, we get : $x := g(a), y := a, a = a$
   By cancellation of identity, we get : $x := g(a), y := a$

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x, x, x) = f(g(y), g(a), y)$.

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x,x,x) = f(g(y),g(a),y)$.

By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), x = g(a), x = y$

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x, x, x) = f(g(y), g(a), y)$.

By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), x = g(a), x = y$
By elimination of x, we get : $x := g(y), g(y) = g(a), g(y) = y$

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x,x,x) = f(g(y),g(a),y)$.

By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), x = g(a), x = y$
By elimination of x, we get : $x := g(y), g(y) = g(a), g(y) = y$
Orienting equations, we get : $x := g(y), g(y) = g(a), y = g(y)$

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x,x,x) = f(g(y),g(a),y)$.

By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), x = g(a), x = y$
By elimination of x, we get : $x := g(y), g(y) = g(a), g(y) = y$
Orienting equations, we get : $x := g(y), g(y) = g(a), y = g(y)$
Equation $y = g(y)$ generates a failure. Then equation $f(x,x,x) = f(g(y),g(a),y)$ has no solution.

Unification : algorithm (example 5.3.11)

1. Solve $f(x,x,x) = f(g(y),g(a),y)$.

By decomposition, we get : $x = g(y), x = g(a), x = y$
By elimination of x, we get : $x := g(y), g(y) = g(a), g(y) = y$
Orienting equations, we get : $x := g(y), g(y) = g(a), y = g(y)$
Equation $y = g(y)$ generates a failure. Then equation $f(x,x,x) = f(g(y),g(a),y)$ has no solution.

Remark : correctness and termination proofs for unification algorithm are in handout course notes.

Plan

Idea

Let Γ be a set of clauses. Suppose that $\forall(\Gamma)$ has no model. What can be done ?

Idea

Let Γ be a set of clauses. Suppose that $\forall(\Gamma)$ has no model. What can be done ?

Rules of « factorization, copy, binary resolution » allow us to infer $\perp$ from Γ.

Idea

Let Γ be a set of clauses. Suppose that $\forall(\Gamma)$ has no model. What can be done ?

Rules of « factorization, copy, binary resolution » allow us to infer $\perp$ from Γ.

Completeness of these rules is based on Herbrand's Theorem. The unification algorithm is used to find suitable instances of these clauses.

Three rules

1. Factorization : from $P(x, f(y)) \vee P(g(z), z) \vee Q(z, x)$ infer $P(g(f(y)), f(y)) \vee Q(f(y), g(f(y)))$. The inferred clause is obtained by computing the most general solution $x := g(f(y)), z := f(y)$ of $P(x, f(y)) = P(g(z), z)$.
2. The copy rule which renames the variables of a clause.
3. Binary resolution (BR) : from two premises without common variable $P(x, a) \vee Q(x)$ and $\neg P(b, y) \vee R(f(y))$ infer the resolvant $Q(b) \vee R(f(a))$, by computing the most general solution $x := b, y := a$ of $P(x, a) = P(b, y)$.

Resolution : 3 Rules

1. factorization,
2. copy,
3. resolvant

Resolution : 3 Rules

1. factorization,
2. copy,
3. resolvant

A clause, (a disjunction of litterals), is identified with the set of its litterals.

Factorization

Definition 5.4.2

The clause C' is a factor of clause C if $C' = C$ or if there exists a subset E of C such that E has two elements at least, E is unifiable and $C' = C\sigma$ where σ is the most general unifier of E.

Factorization

Definition 5.4.2

The clause C' is a factor of clause C if $C' = C$ or if there exists a subset E of C such that E has two elements at least, E is unifiable and $C' = C\sigma$ where σ is the most general unifier of E.

Example 5.4.3

The clause $\underline{P(x)} \vee Q(g(x,y)) \vee \underline{P(f(a))}$ has two factors :

Factorization

Definition 5.4.2

The clause C' is a factor of clause C if $C' = C$ or if there exists a subset E of C such that E has two elements at least, E is unifiable and $C' = C\sigma$ where σ is the most general unifier of E.

Example 5.4.3

The clause $\underline{P(x)} \vee Q(g(x,y)) \vee \underline{P(f(a))}$ has two factors :

itself and the factor $P(f(a)) \vee Q(g(f(a),y))$ obtained by applying to the clause, the most general unifier $x := f(a)$ of the two underlined litterals.

Factorization

property 1

5.4.1 Let A be a formula without quantifier and B an instance of A.
$\forall(A) \models \forall(B)$

Proof.

See handout course notes. $\square$

Factorization

property 1

5.4.1 Let A be a formula without quantifier and B an instance of A.
$\forall(A) \models \forall(B)$

Proof.

See handout course notes. $\square$

property 1

5.4.4 Let C' be a factor of the clause C.
$\forall(C) \models \forall(C')$

Proof.

Since C' is an instance of C, it is a consequence of the property 5.4.1. $\square$

Copy

Definition 5.4.5

Let C be a clause and σ a substitution, which changes only the variables of C and whose restriction ot variables of C is a bijection between thoses variables and variables of clause $C\sigma$.

The clause $C\sigma$ is a copy of the clause C.

We also say that the substitution σ is a renaming of C.

Copy

Definition 5.4.6

Let C be a clause and σ be a renaming of C. Let f the restriction of σ to variables of C and f^{-1} the inverse of f. Let σ_C^{-1} be the substitution defined for all variable x as follows :

- If x is a variable of $C\sigma$ then $x\sigma_C^{-1} = xf^{-1}$
- Otherwise $x\sigma_C^{-1} = x$.

This substitution is called the inverse of the renaming σ of C.

Copy

Example 5.4.7

Let $\sigma = < x := u, y := v >$.

σ is a renaming of $P(x,y)$.

The litteral $P(u,v)$, where $P(u,v) = P(x,y)\sigma$, is a copy of $P(x,y)$.

Let $\tau = < u := x, v := y >$. τ is the inverse of the renaming σ of $P(x,y)$.

Note that $P(u,v)\tau = P(x,y)$: the litteral $P(x,y)$ is a copy of $P(u,v)$ by the renaming τ.

Copy

property 1

5.4.8 Let C be a clause and σ a renaming of C.

1. σ_C^{-1} is a renaming of $C\sigma$.
2. for all expressions or clauses E, whose variables are the ones of C, $E\sigma\sigma_C^{-1} = E$.

Then $C\sigma\sigma_C^{-1} = C$ and therefore C is a copy of $C\sigma$.

Proof.

Let f be the restriction of σ to variables of C. By the definition of renaming, f is a bijection between the variables of C and the variables of $C\sigma$.

1. By definition of σ_C^{-1}, this substitution changes only variables of $C\sigma$ and its restriction to variables of $C\sigma$ is the bijection f^{-1}. Therefore, σ_C^{-1} is a renaming of $C\sigma$.
2. Let x a variable of C. By definition of f, $x\sigma\sigma_C^{-1} = xff^{-1} = x$. Therefore, by induction on terms, litterals and clauses, for all expressions or clauses E, whose variables are variables of C, we have $E\sigma\sigma_C^{-1} = E$.

□

Copy

property 1

5.4.9 Given two clauses which are a copy of each other, their universal closures are equivalent.

Proof.

Let C' be a copy of C. By definition, C' is an instance of C and by the previous property, C is a copy of C', hence an instance of C.

Therefore by Property 5.4.1, the universal closure of C is a consequence of the universal closure of C' and conversely. Therefore, these two universal closures are equivalent. $\square$

Binary resolvant

Definition 5.4.10

Let C and D be two clauses without common variables. The clause E is a binary resolvant of C and D if there is a litteral $L \in C$ and a litteral $M \in D$ such that L and M^c are unifiable and if $E = ((C - \{L\}) \cup (D - \{M\}))\sigma$ where σ is the most general solution of equation $L = M^c$.

Binary resolvant

Definition 5.4.10

Let C and D be two clauses without common variables. The clause E is a binary resolvant of C and D if there is a litteral $L \in C$ and a litteral $M \in D$ such that L and M^c are unifiable and if $E = ((C - \{L\}) \cup (D - \{M\}))\sigma$ where σ is the most general solution of equation $L = M^c$.

Example 5.4.11

Let $C = P(x, y) \vee P(y, k(z))$ and $D = \neg P(a, f(a, y_1))$.

Binary resolvant

Definition 5.4.10

Let C and D be two clauses without common variables. The clause E is a binary resolvant of C and D if there is a litteral $L \in C$ and a litteral $M \in D$ such that L and M^c are unifiable and if $E = ((C - \{L\}) \cup (D - \{M\}))\sigma$ where σ is the most general solution of equation $L = M^c$.

Example 5.4.11

Let $C = P(x,y) \vee P(y,k(z))$ and $D = \neg P(a,f(a,y_1))$.

$< x := a, y := f(a,y_1) >$ is the most general solution of $P(x,y) = P(a,f(a,y_1))$, then $P(f(a,y_1),k(z))$ is a binary resolvant of clauses C and D.

Binary resolvant

property 1

5.4.12 Let E be a resolvant binary of clauses C and D : $\forall(C), \forall(D) \models \forall(E)$.

Proof.

See handout course notes. $\square$

Resolution :

Definition 5.4.13

Let Γ be a set of clauses and C be a clause.

A proof of C from Γ is a sequence of clauses terminated by C, where each clause is

- a member of Γ,
- a factor of a previous clause in the proof,
- a copy of a previous clause in the proof or
- a binary resolvant of 2 previous clauses in the proof.

C is first-order inferred from Γ, denoted by $\Gamma \vdash_{1fcb} C$, if there is a proof of C from Γ.

When there is no ambiguity, we remplace $\vdash_{1fcb}$ by $\vdash$.

Resolution : Consistency

property 1

5.4.14 Let Γ be a set of clauses and C be a clause.

If $\Gamma \vdash_{1fcb} C$ then $\forall(\Gamma) \models \forall(C)$

This property is an immediate consequence of consistency of factorization, copy and binary resolution, using induction. See exercise 91.

Resolution : Example 5.4.15

Given the two clauses

1. $C_1 = P(x, y) \vee P(y, x)$
2. $C_2 = \neg P(u, z) \vee \neg P(z, u)$

Show by resolution that $\forall(C_1, C_2)$ has no model.

Resolution : Example 5.4.15

Given the two clauses

1. $C_1 = P(x, y) \vee P(y, x)$
2. $C_2 = \neg P(u, z) \vee \neg P(z, u)$

Show by resolution that $\forall(C_1, C_2)$ has no model.

1. $P(x, y) \vee P(y, x)$ Hyp C_1

Resolution : Example 5.4.15

Given the two clauses

1. $C_1 = P(x, y) \vee P(y, x)$
2. $C_2 = \neg P(u, z) \vee \neg P(z, u)$

Show by resolution that $\forall(C_1, C_2)$ has no model.

1. $P(x, y) \vee P(y, x)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(y, y)$ Factor of 1 by $< x := y >$

Resolution : Example 5.4.15

Given the two clauses

1. $C_1 = P(x,y) \vee P(y,x)$
2. $C_2 = \neg P(u,z) \vee \neg P(z,u)$

Show by resolution that $\forall(C_1, C_2)$ has no model.

1. $P(x,y) \vee P(y,x)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(y,y)$ Factor of 1 by $< x := y >$
3. $\neg P(u,z) \vee \neg P(z,u)$ Hyp C_2

Resolution : Example 5.4.15

Given the two clauses

1. $C_1 = P(x, y) \vee P(y, x)$
2. $C_2 = \neg P(u, z) \vee \neg P(z, u)$

Show by resolution that $\forall(C_1, C_2)$ has no model.

1. $P(x, y) \vee P(y, x)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(y, y)$ Factor of 1 by $< x := y >$
3. $\neg P(u, z) \vee \neg P(z, u)$ Hyp C_2
4. $\neg P(z, z)$ Factor of 3 by $< u := z >$

Resolution : Example 5.4.15

Given the two clauses

1. $C_1 = P(x,y) \vee P(y,x)$
2. $C_2 = \neg P(u,z) \vee \neg P(z,u)$

Show by resolution that $\forall(C_1, C_2)$ has no model.

1. $P(x,y) \vee P(y,x)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(y,y)$ Factor of 1 by $< x := y >$
3. $\neg P(u,z) \vee \neg P(z,u)$ Hyp C_2
4. $\neg P(z,z)$ Factor of 3 by $< u := z >$
5. $\perp$ BR 2, 4 by $< y := z >$

Resolution : Example 5.4.15

Given the two clauses

1. $C_1 = P(x, y) \vee P(y, x)$
2. $C_2 = \neg P(u, z) \vee \neg P(z, u)$

Show by resolution that $\forall(C_1, C_2)$ has no model.

1. $P(x, y) \vee P(y, x)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(y, y)$ Factor of 1 by $< x := y >$
3. $\neg P(u, z) \vee \neg P(z, u)$ Hyp C_2
4. $\neg P(z, z)$ Factor of 3 by $< u := z >$
5. $\perp$ BR 2, 4 by $< y := z >$

This example shows, a contrario, that binary resolution alone is incomplete : without factorization, the empty clauses cannot be inferred.

Resolution : Example 5.4.16

1. $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
2. $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
3. $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

We give a proof that $\forall(C_1, C_2, C_3)$ has no model.

Resolution : Example 5.4.16

1. $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
2. $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
3. $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

We give a proof that $\forall(C_1, C_2, C_3)$ has no model.

1. $\neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$ Hyp C_1

Resolution : Example 5.4.16

1. $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
2. $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
3. $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

We give a proof that $\forall(C_1, C_2, C_3)$ has no model.

1. $\neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_2

Resolution : Example 5.4.16

1. $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
2. $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
3. $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

We give a proof that $\forall(C_1, C_2, C_3)$ has no model.

1. $\neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_2
3. $P(v_0,f(v_0)) \vee P(v_0,a)$ Copy 2 by $< z := v_0 >$

Resolution : Example 5.4.16

1. $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
2. $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
3. $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

We give a proof that $\forall(C_1, C_2, C_3)$ has no model.

1. $\neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_2
3. $P(v_0,f(v_0)) \vee P(v_0,a)$ Copy 2 by $< z := v_0 >$
4. $\neg P(f(v_0),a) \vee \neg P(f(v_0),v_0) \vee P(v_0,a)$ BR 1(3), 3(1) by $<z{:=}f(v_0);x{:=}v_0>$

Resolution : Example 5.4.16

1. $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
2. $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
3. $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

We give a proof that $\forall(C_1, C_2, C_3)$ has no model.

1. $\neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_2
3. $P(v_0,f(v_0)) \vee P(v_0,a)$ Copy 2 by $< z := v_0 >$
4. $\neg P(f(v_0),a) \vee \neg P(f(v_0),v_0) \vee P(v_0,a)$ BR 1(3), 3(1) by $<z{:=}f(v_0);x{:=}v_0>$
5. $\neg P(f(a),a) \vee P(a,a)$ Fact 4 by $< v_0 := a >$

Resolution : Example 5.4.16

1. $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
2. $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
3. $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

We give a proof that $\forall(C_1, C_2, C_3)$ has no model.

1. $\neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_2
3. $P(v_0,f(v_0)) \vee P(v_0,a)$ Copy 2 by $< z := v_0 >$
4. $\neg P(f(v_0),a) \vee \neg P(f(v_0),v_0) \vee P(v_0,a)$ BR 1(3), 3(1) by $<z{:=}f(v_0);x{:=}v_0>$
5. $\neg P(f(a),a) \vee P(a,a)$ Fact 4 by $< v_0 := a >$
6. $\neg P(a,a)$ Fact 1 by $< x := a; z := a >$

Resolution : Example 5.4.16

1. $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
2. $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
3. $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

We give a proof that $\forall(C_1, C_2, C_3)$ has no model.

1. $\neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_2
3. $P(v_0,f(v_0)) \vee P(v_0,a)$ Copy 2 by $< z := v_0 >$
4. $\neg P(f(v_0),a) \vee \neg P(f(v_0),v_0) \vee P(v_0,a)$ BR 1(3), 3(1) by $<z{:=}f(v_0);x{:=}v_0>$
5. $\neg P(f(a),a) \vee P(a,a)$ Fact 4 by $< v_0 := a >$
6. $\neg P(a,a)$ Fact 1 by $< x := a; z := a >$
7. $P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_3

Resolution : Example 5.4.16

1. $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
2. $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
3. $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

We give a proof that $\forall(C_1, C_2, C_3)$ has no model.

1. $\neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_2
3. $P(v_0,f(v_0)) \vee P(v_0,a)$ Copy 2 by $< z := v_0 >$
4. $\neg P(f(v_0),a) \vee \neg P(f(v_0),v_0) \vee P(v_0,a)$ BR 1(3), 3(1) by $<z{:=}f(v_0);x{:=}v_0>$
5. $\neg P(f(a),a) \vee P(a,a)$ Fact 4 by $< v_0 := a >$
6. $\neg P(a,a)$ Fact 1 by $< x := a; z := a >$
7. $P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_3
8. $P(f(a),a)$ BR 6(1), 7(2) by $< z := a >$

Resolution : Example 5.4.16

1. $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
2. $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
3. $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

We give a proof that $\forall(C_1, C_2, C_3)$ has no model.

1. $\neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_2
3. $P(v_0,f(v_0)) \vee P(v_0,a)$ Copy 2 by $< z := v_0 >$
4. $\neg P(f(v_0),a) \vee \neg P(f(v_0),v_0) \vee P(v_0,a)$ BR 1(3), 3(1) by $<z{:=}f(v_0);x{:=}v_0>$
5. $\neg P(f(a),a) \vee P(a,a)$ Fact 4 by $< v_0 := a >$
6. $\neg P(a,a)$ Fact 1 by $< x := a; z := a >$
7. $P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_3
8. $P(f(a),a)$ BR 6(1), 7(2) by $< z := a >$

Resolution : Example 5.4.16

1. $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
2. $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
3. $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

We give a proof that $\forall(C_1, C_2, C_3)$ has no model.

1. $\neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_2
3. $P(v_0,f(v_0)) \vee P(v_0,a)$ Copy 2 by $< z := v_0 >$
4. $\neg P(f(v_0),a) \vee \neg P(f(v_0),v_0) \vee P(v_0,a)$ BR 1(3), 3(1) by $<z{:=}f(v_0);x{:=}v_0>$
5. $\neg P(f(a),a) \vee P(a,a)$ Fact 4 by $< v_0 := a >$
6. $\neg P(a,a)$ Fact 1 by $< x := a; z := a >$
7. $P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_3
8. $P(f(a),a)$ BR 6(1), 7(2) by $< z := a >$
9. $P(a,a)$ BR 5(1), 8(1)

Resolution : Example 5.4.16

1. $C_1 = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$
2. $C_2 = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$
3. $C_3 = P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$

We give a proof that $\forall(C_1, C_2, C_3)$ has no model.

1. $\neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$ Hyp C_1
2. $P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_2
3. $P(v_0,f(v_0)) \vee P(v_0,a)$ Copy 2 by $< z := v_0 >$
4. $\neg P(f(v_0),a) \vee \neg P(f(v_0),v_0) \vee P(v_0,a)$ BR 1(3), 3(1) by $<z{:=}f(v_0);x{:=}v_0>$
5. $\neg P(f(a),a) \vee P(a,a)$ Fact 4 by $< v_0 := a >$
6. $\neg P(a,a)$ Fact 1 by $< x := a; z := a >$
7. $P(f(z),z) \vee P(z,a)$ Hyp C_3
8. $P(f(a),a)$ BR 6(1), 7(2) by $< z := a >$
9. $P(a,a)$ BR 5(1), 8(1)
10. $\perp$ BR 6(1), 9(1)

Plan

First-Order resolution

We define a new rule, first-order resolution, which is a combination of factorization, copy and binary resolution.

Definition 5.4.17

The clause E is a first-order resolvant of clauses C and D if E is a binary resolvant of C' and D' where C' is a factor of C and D' is a copy of a factor of D without common variable with C',

The rule which infers E from C and D is called first-order resolution.

Example 5.4.18

Let $C = \neg P(z,a) \vee \neg P(z,x) \vee \neg P(x,z)$ and $D = P(z,f(z)) \vee P(z,a)$.

Example 5.4.18

Let $C = \neg P(z, a) \vee \neg P(z, x) \vee \neg P(x, z)$ and $D = P(z, f(z)) \vee P(z, a)$.
$C' = \neg P(a, a)$ is a factor of C.
The clause $P(a, f(a))$ is a binary resolvant of C' and of D (which is factor of itself) then it is a first-order resolvant of C and D.

Three notions of proof by resolution

Let Γ be a set of clauses and C a clause.

Notations

Three notions of proof by resolution

Let Γ be a set of clauses and C a clause.

Notations

1. $\Gamma \vdash_p C$: proof of C from Γ by propositional resolution (without substitution).

Three notions of proof by resolution

Let Γ be a set of clauses and C a clause.

Notations

1. $\Gamma \vdash_p C$: proof of C from Γ by propositional resolution (without substitution).
2. $\Gamma \vdash_{1fcb} C$: proof of C from Γ by factorization, copy and binary resolution.

Three notions of proof by resolution

Let Γ be a set of clauses and C a clause.

Notations

1. $\Gamma \vdash_p C$: proof of C from Γ by propositional resolution (without substitution).
2. $\Gamma \vdash_{1fcb} C$: proof of C from Γ by factorization, copy and binary resolution.
3. $\Gamma \vdash_{1r} C$: proof of C from Γ obtained by first-order resolution.

Three notions of proof by resolution

Let Γ be a set of clauses and C a clause.

Notations

1. $\Gamma \vdash_p C$: proof of C from Γ by propositional resolution (without substitution).
2. $\Gamma \vdash_{1fcb} C$: proof of C from Γ by factorization, copy and binary resolution.
3. $\Gamma \vdash_{1r} C$: proof of C from Γ obtained by first-order resolution.

By definition we have : $\Gamma \vdash_{1r} C$ implies $\Gamma \vdash_{1fcb} C$

Lifting theorem (1/3)

Theorem 5.4.19

Let C and D be two clauses. Let C' be an instance of C and D' be an instance of D. Let E' be a propositional resolvant of C' and D', there exists E a first-order resolvant of C and D having E' an an instance.

Proof.

See handout course notes. $\square$

Lifting theorem (1/3)

Theorem 5.4.19

Let C and D be two clauses. Let C' be an instance of C and D' be an instance of D. Let E' be a propositional resolvant of C' and D', there exists E a first-order resolvant of C and D having E' an an instance.

Proof.

See handout course notes. □

Example 5.4.20

Let $C = P(x) \vee P(y) \vee R(y)$ and $D = \neg Q(x) \vee P(x) \vee \neg R(x) \vee P(y)$.

Lifting theorem (1/3)

Theorem 5.4.19

Let C and D be two clauses. Let C' be an instance of C and D' be an instance of D. Let E' be a propositional resolvant of C' and D', there exists E a first-order resolvant of C and D having E' an an instance.

Proof.

See handout course notes. $\square$

Example 5.4.20

Let $C = P(x) \vee P(y) \vee R(y)$ and $D = \neg Q(x) \vee P(x) \vee \neg R(x) \vee P(y)$.

- The clauses $C' = P(a) \vee R(a)$ and $D' = \neg Q(a) \vee P(a) \vee \neg R(a)$ are respectively instances of C and D.

Lifting theorem (1/3)

Theorem 5.4.19

Let C and D be two clauses. Let C' be an instance of C and D' be an instance of D. Let E' be a propositional resolvant of C' and D', there exists E a first-order resolvant of C and D having E' an an instance.

Proof.

See handout course notes. $\square$

Example 5.4.20

Let $C = P(x) \vee P(y) \vee R(y)$ and $D = \neg Q(x) \vee P(x) \vee \neg R(x) \vee P(y)$.

- The clauses $C' = P(a) \vee R(a)$ and $D' = \neg Q(a) \vee P(a) \vee \neg R(a)$ are respectively instances of C and D.
- The clause $E' = P(a) \vee \neg Q(a)$ is a propositional resolvant of C' and D'.

Lifting theorem (1/3)

Theorem 5.4.19

Let C and D be two clauses. Let C' be an instance of C and D' be an instance of D. Let E' be a propositional resolvant of C' and D', there exists E a first-order resolvant of C and D having E' an an instance.

Proof.

See handout course notes. □

Example 5.4.20

Let $C = P(x) \vee P(y) \vee R(y)$ and $D = \neg Q(x) \vee P(x) \vee \neg R(x) \vee P(y)$.

- The clauses $C' = P(a) \vee R(a)$ and $D' = \neg Q(a) \vee P(a) \vee \neg R(a)$ are respectively instances of C and D.
- The clause $E' = P(a) \vee \neg Q(a)$ is a propositional resolvant of C' and D'.
- The clause $E = P(x) \vee \neg Q(x)$ is a first-order resolvant of C and D having E' as an instance.

Lifting theorem (2/3)

Theorem 5.4.21

Let Γ be a set of clauses and Δ a set of instances of clauses from Γ, and $C_1, \ldots, C_n$ a proof by propositional resolution from Δ.

There exists a proof $D_1, \ldots, D_n$ by first-order resolution from Γ such that for i between 1 and n, the clause C_i is a instance of D_i.

Lifting theorem (2/3)

Theorem 5.4.21

Let Γ be a set of clauses and Δ a set of instances of clauses from Γ, and $C_1, \ldots, C_n$ a proof by propositional resolution from Δ.

There exists a proof $D_1, \ldots, D_n$ by first-order resolution from Γ such that for i between 1 and n, the clause C_i is a instance of D_i.

Proof.

By induction on n. Let $C_1, \ldots, C_n, C_{n+1}$ a proof by propositional resolution starting with Δ. By induction, there exists a proof $D_1, \ldots, D_n$ by first-order resolution starting from Γ such that, for i between 1 and n, the clause C_i is an instance of D_i.

1. Suppose that $C_{n+1} \in \Delta$. There exists $E \in \Gamma$ where C_{n+1} is an instance then we take $D_{n+1} = E$.
2. Suppose that C_{n+1} is a propositional resolvant of C_j and C_k where $j, k \leq n$. From the previous slide, there exists E, first-order resolvant of D_j and D_k : we take $D_{n+1} = E$.

Lifting theorem (3/3)

Corollary 5.4.22

Let Γ be a set of clauses and Δ a set of instances of clauses of Γ.

Suppose that $\Delta \vdash_p C$.

There exists D such that $\Gamma \vdash_{1r} D$ and C is an instance of D.

Example 5.4.23

Consider the set of clauses
$P(f(x)) \vee P(u), \neg P(x) \vee Q(z), \neg Q(x) \vee \neg Q(y)$.
The universal closure of this set of clauses is unsatisfiable and we show it in three ways

1. By instanciation on the Herbrand's domain $a, f(a), f(f(a)), \ldots$:

Example 5.4.23

Consider the set of clauses
$P(f(x)) \vee P(u), \neg P(x) \vee Q(z), \neg Q(x) \vee \neg Q(y)$.
The universal closure of this set of clauses is unsatisfiable and we show it in three ways

1. By instanciation on the Herbrand's domain $a, f(a), f(f(a)), \ldots$:
   $P(f(x)) \vee P(u)$ is instanciated by $x := a, u := f(a)$ to $P(f(a))$
   $\neg P(x) \vee Q(z)$ is instanciated by $x := f(a), z := a$ to $\neg P(f(a)) \vee Q(a)$
   $\neg Q(x) \vee \neg Q(y)$ is instanciated by $x := a, y := a$ to $\neg Q(a)$
   These these 3 instances together are unsatisfiable, as shown in the following proof by propositional resolution :

Example 5.4.23

Consider the set of clauses
$P(f(x)) \vee P(u), \neg P(x) \vee Q(z), \neg Q(x) \vee \neg Q(y)$.
The universal closure of this set of clauses is unsatisfiable and we show it in three ways

1. By instanciation on the Herbrand's domain $a, f(a), f(f(a)), \ldots$:
   $P(f(x)) \vee P(u)$ is instanciated by $x := a, u := f(a)$ to $P(f(a))$
   $\neg P(x) \vee Q(z)$ is instanciated by $x := f(a), z := a$ to $\neg P(f(a)) \vee Q(a)$
   $\neg Q(x) \vee \neg Q(y)$ is instanciated by $x := a, y := a$ to $\neg Q(a)$
   These these 3 instances together are unsatisfiable, as shown in the following proof by propositional resolution :

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{P(f(a)) \qquad \neg P(f(a)) \vee Q(a)}{Q(a)} \qquad \neg Q(a)}{\perp}$$

Example 5.4.23

$P(f(x)) \vee P(u),\ \neg P(x) \vee Q(z),\ \neg Q(x) \vee \neg Q(y).$

Example 5.4.23

$P(f(x)) \vee P(u),\ \neg P(x) \vee Q(z),\ \neg Q(x) \vee \neg Q(y).$

2. This proof by propositional resolution is lifted to a proof by first-order resolution :

Example 5.4.23

$P(f(x)) \vee P(u),\ \neg P(x) \vee Q(z),\ \neg Q(x) \vee \neg Q(y).$

2. This proof by propositional resolution is lifted to a proof by first-order resolution :

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{P(f(x)) \vee P(u) \qquad \neg P(x) \vee Q(z)}{Q(z)} \qquad \neg Q(x) \vee \neg Q(y)}{\perp}$$

Example 5.4.23

$P(f(x)) \vee P(u),\ \neg P(x) \vee Q(z),\ \neg Q(x) \vee \neg Q(y).$

2. This proof by propositional resolution is lifted to a proof by first-order resolution :

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{P(f(x)) \vee P(u) \qquad \neg P(x) \vee Q(z)}{Q(z)} \qquad \neg Q(x) \vee \neg Q(y)}{\perp}$$

3. Each first-order resolution rule is decomposed into factorization, copy and binary resolution :

Example 5.4.23

$P(f(x)) \vee P(u),\ \neg P(x) \vee Q(z),\ \neg Q(x) \vee \neg Q(y).$

2. This proof by propositional resolution is lifted to a proof by first-order resolution :

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{P(f(x)) \vee P(u) \qquad \neg P(x) \vee Q(z)}{Q(z)} \qquad \neg Q(x) \vee \neg Q(y)}{\perp}$$

3. Each first-order resolution rule is decomposed into factorization, copy and binary resolution :

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{P(f(x)) \vee P(u)}{P(f(x))}\,fact \quad \dfrac{\neg P(x) \vee Q(z)}{\neg P(y) \vee Q(z)}\,copy}{Q(z)}\,rb \qquad \dfrac{\neg Q(x) \vee \neg Q(y)}{\neg Q(x)}\,fact}{\perp}\,rb$$

Refutational completeness of first-order resolution

Theorem 5.4.24

Let Γ be a set of clauses. Propositions : (1) $\Gamma \vdash_{1r} \bot$, (2) $\Gamma \vdash_{1fcb} \bot$, and (3) $\forall(\Gamma) \models \bot$ are equivalent.

Refutational completeness of first-order resolution

Theorem 5.4.24

Let Γ be a set of clauses. Propositions : (1) $\Gamma \vdash_{1r} \perp$, (2) $\Gamma \vdash_{1fcb} \perp$, and (3) $\forall(\Gamma) \models \perp$ are equivalent.

Proof.

- (1) implies (2) because first-order resolution is a combinaison of factorization, copy and binary resolution.

$\square$

Refutational completeness of first-order resolution

Theorem 5.4.24

Let Γ be a set of clauses. Propositions : (1) $\Gamma \vdash_{1r} \bot$, (2) $\Gamma \vdash_{1fcb} \bot$, and (3) $\forall(\Gamma) \models \bot$ are equivalent.

Proof.

- (1) implies (2) because first-order resolution is a combinaison of factorization, copy and binary resolution.
- (2) implies (3) because factorization, copy and binary resolution are consistent.

□

Refutational completeness of first-order resolution

Theorem 5.4.24

Let Γ be a set of clauses. Propositions : (1) $\Gamma \vdash_{1r} \perp$, (2) $\Gamma \vdash_{1fcb} \perp$, and (3) $\forall(\Gamma) \models \perp$ are equivalent.

Proof.

- (1) implies (2) because first-order resolution is a combinaison of factorization, copy and binary resolution.
- (2) implies (3) because factorization, copy and binary resolution are consistent.
- (3) implies (1). Suppose that $\forall(\Gamma) \models \perp$, that is, $\forall(\Gamma)$ is unsatisfiable. By Herbrand's theorem, there is a finite set Δ of instances without variable of clauses of Γ which has no propositional model. By completeness of propositional resolution, we have : $\Delta \vdash_p \perp$. From the lifting corollary 5.4.22, there exists D such that $\Gamma \vdash_{1r} D$ and $\perp$ is an instance of D. But in this case, we have $D = \perp$.

□

Conclusion

Thanks of your attention.

Questions ?