1 Unification

A drawback of the ground resolution procedure is that it requires predicting which ground instances of clauses will be needed in a proof. In this lecture we introduce a version of resolution that allows us to perform substitution “by need”. This relies on the notion of unification.

Substitutions. A substitution is a selfmap $\theta$ on the set of $\sigma$-terms such that (writing function application on the right) $c\theta = c$ for each constant symbol $c$ and $f(t_1, \ldots, t_k)\theta = f(t_1\theta, \ldots, t_k\theta)$ for each $k$-ary function symbol $f$. A substitution is thus determined by its action on variables. We denote by $[t/x]$ the substitution that maps the variable $x$ to the term $t$ and leaves all other variables unchanged. It is clear that the composition of two substitutions is a substitution. We write $\sigma \cdot \tau$ for each application on the right (i.e., $\sigma\tau$ denotes the substitution obtained by sequentially applying $\sigma$ and $\tau$).

Term Equations. A term equation is an ordered pair of terms $s \overset{?}{=} t$. A substitution $\theta$ is a unifier of a system of term equations $\{s_1 \overset{?}{=} t_1, \ldots, s_n \overset{?}{=} t_n\}$ if $s_i\theta = t_i\theta$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. We further say that $\theta$ is a most general unifier (mgu) if any other unifier $\theta'$ factors through $\theta$, i.e., we have $\theta' = \theta\theta''$ for some substitution $\theta''$. For example, the substitution $\theta = [f(a)/x][b/y]$ unifies $x \overset{?}{=} f(y)$, as does the substitution $\theta' = [f(y)/x]$. Here $\theta'$ is an mgu and $\theta = \theta'(a/b)$, that is, $\theta$ factors through $\theta'$. Note that both the substitutions $[x/y]$ and $[y/x]$ are both mgus of the equation $x \overset{?}{=} y$. In fact, mgus are only unique up to renaming variables. The term equation $f(x) \overset{?}{=} g(a)$, where $f$ and $g$ are different unary function symbols, has no unifier. Likewise the equation $x \overset{?}{=} f(x)$ has no unifier. A system $S$ is solved if it is in the form $S = \{x_1 \overset{?}{=} t_1, \ldots, x_n \overset{?}{=} t_n\}$ where the $x_i$ are distinct variables that do not appear in any term $t_j$. For such a solved form $S$ the substitution $\theta_S := [t_1/x_1] \cdots [t_n/x_n]$ is well-defined and is an mgu; indeed, for any unifier $\theta$ of $S$ we have $\theta = \theta_S\theta$.

Unification. We present an abstract form of the unification algorithm as a family of rewrite rules that can be applied non-deterministically to transform systems of equations into solved form or $\perp$, representing an unsatisifiable system. By convention we allow $f$ and $g$ in the rules Decompose and Conflict to be constant symbols (considered as nullary function symbols); e.g., an instance Conflict with $m = n = 0$ would be $\{a \overset{?}{=} b\} \rightarrow \perp$ for distinct constant symbols $a$ and $b$.

- **Simplify:** $\{x \overset{?}{=} x\} \cup S \rightarrow S$ for any variable $x$
- **Swap:** $\{t \overset{?}{=} x\} \cup S \rightarrow \{x \overset{?}{=} t\} \cup S$ if $t$ is not a variable
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Unifying Sets of Literals. The notion of an mgu can be lifted from terms to literals. For a literal $L$ and substitution $\theta$, we write $L \theta$ for the literal obtained by applying $\theta$ to each term appearing in $L$. Given a set of literals $D = \{L_1, \ldots, L_k\}$ we say that $\theta$ unifies $D$ if $L_1 \theta = \cdots = L_k \theta$. We say moreover that $\theta$ is a most general unifier if any other unifier factors through $\theta$.

An mgu of $D$ can be obtained by solving an appropriate set of term equations. Consider the set of literals $D := \{P(f(x), u), P(y, y), P(y, u)\}$. An mgu of $D$ is an mgu of the system of equations $S := \{f(x) \equiv y, y \equiv y, u \equiv y\}$. To solve, we first apply the rule Simplify to remove $y \equiv y$ and then the rule Elim w.r.t. to the equation $f(x) \equiv t$ to get a system in solved form $\{f(x) \equiv y, u \equiv f(x)\}$. We conclude that $D$ unifies to $\{P(f(x), f(x))\}$ under the substitution $[f(x)/y][f(x)/u]$. Examples of sets of literals that cannot be unified are $\{P(f(x)), P(g(x))\}$ and $\{P(f(x)), P(x)\}$. The problem in the second case is that we cannot unify a variable $x$ and term $t$ if $x$ occurs in $t$.

From Proposition 1, we get:

**Theorem 2** (Unification Theorem). A unifiable set of literals $D$ has a most general unifier.
For doing examples by hand, the following presentation of the unification algorithm will be useful. This can be seen as an implementation of the abstract rewriting procedure described above, but without explicitly representing sets of equations.

**Unification Algorithm**

**Input:** Set of literals \( D \)

**Output:** Either a most general unifier of \( D \) or “fail”

\[ \theta := \text{identity substitution} \]

while \( D \) is not a singleton do

begin

pick two distinct literals in \( D \) and find the left-most positions at which they differ

if one of the corresponding sub-terms is a variable \( x \) and the other a term \( t \) not containing \( x \)

then \( D := D[t/x], \theta := \theta[t/x] \) else output “fail” and halt

end

**Example 3.** Consider an execution of the unification algorithm on input \( D = \{P(x, y), P(f(z), x)\} \).

Scanning left-to-right, the leftmost discrepancy is underlined in \( \{P(x, y), P(f(z), x)\} \).

Applying the substitution \([f(z)/x]\) to \( D \) yields the set \( D' = \{P(f(z), y), P(f(z), f(z))\} \), where the underlined positions again indicate the leftmost discrepancy. Applying the substitution \([f(z)/y]\) to \( D' \) yields the singleton set \( \{P(f(z), f(z))\} \). Thus \([f(z)/x][f(z)/y]\) is a most general unifier of the set \( D \).

### 2 Resolution

First-order resolution operates on sets of clauses, that is, sets of sets of literals. Given a formula \( \forall x_1 \ldots \forall x_n F \) in Skolem form we perform resolution on the clauses in the matrix \( F \) with the goal of deriving the empty clause. Although quantifiers do not explicitly appear in resolution proofs, we can see the variables in such a proof as being implicitly universally quantified. This is made more formal when we formulate the Resolution Lemma in the next section.

For any set of literals \( D \), let \( \overline{D} \) denote the set of complementary literals. For example, if \( D = \{-P(x), R(x, y)\} \) then \( \overline{D} = \{P(x), \overline{R(x, y)}\} \).

**Definition 4 (Resolution).** Let \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) be clauses with no variable in common. We say that a clause \( R \) is a **resolvent** of \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) if there are sets of literals \( D_1 \subseteq C_1 \) and \( D_2 \subseteq C_2 \) such that \( D_1 \cup \overline{D_2} \) has a most general unifier \( \theta \), and

\[
R = (C_1 \theta \setminus \{L\}) \cup (C_2 \theta \setminus \{\overline{L}\}),
\]

where \( L = D_1 \theta \) and \( \overline{L} = D_2 \theta \). More generally, if \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are arbitrary clauses, we say that \( R \) is a resolvent of \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) if there are variable renamings \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \) such that \( C_1 \theta_1 \) and \( C_2 \theta_2 \) have no variable in common, and \( R \) is a resolvent of \( C_1 \theta_1 \) and \( C_2 \theta_2 \) according to the definition above.

**Example 5.** Consider a signature with constant symbol \( e \), unary function symbols \( f \) and \( g \), and a ternary predicate symbol \( P \). We compute a resolvent of the clauses \( C_1 = \{\neg P(f(e), x, f(g(e)))\} \) and \( C_2 = \{\neg P(x, y, z), P(f(x), y, f(z))\} \) as follows (see Figure 1). First apply the substitution \([u/x]\) to \( C_1 \), obtaining a clause \( C'_1 \) that has no variable in common in \( C_2 \). Now unify complementary literals under the substitution \([e/x][u/y][g(e)/z]\), obtaining the clause \( \{\neg P(e, u, g(e))\} \).

A **predicate-logic resolution derivation** of a clause \( C \) from a set of clauses \( F \) is a sequence of clauses \( C_1, \ldots, C_m \), with \( C_m = C \) such that each \( C_i \) is either a clause of \( F \) (possibly with the
variables renamed) or follows by a resolution step from two preceding clauses $C_j, C_k$, with $j, k < i$. We write $\text{Res}^*(F)$ for the set of clauses $C$ such that there is a derivation of $C$ from $F$.

**Example 6.** Consider the following sentences over a signature with ternary predicate symbol $A$, constant symbol $e$, and unary function symbol $s$. The idea is that $A$ represents the ternary addition relation, $e$ the zero element, and $s$ the successor function.

$$F_1 : \forall x A(e, x, x)$$
$$F_2 : \forall x \forall y \forall z (-A(x, y, z) \lor A(s(x), y, s(z)))$$
$$F_3 : \forall x \exists y A(s(s(e)), x, y)$$

We use first-order resolution to show that $F_1 \land F_2 \models F_3$, that is, we show that $F_1 \land F_2 \land \neg F_3$ is unsatisfiable. We proceed in two steps.

**Step (i): separately Skolemise each formula.** Formula $\neg F_3$ is equivalent to $\exists y \forall z \neg A(s(s(e)), y, z)$. Skolemising, we obtain the formula $G_3 := \forall z \neg A(s(s(e)), c, z)$, where $c$ is a new constant symbol. Now $F_1 \land F_2 \land G_3$ is equisatisfiable with $F_1 \land F_2 \land \neg F_3$ and so it suffices to give a resolution refutation of $F_1 \land F_2 \land G_3$.\(^1\)

**Step (ii). derive the empty clause using resolution.** The proof is as follows. Note that in order to always ensure that we resolve clauses with disjoint variables, we arrange it so that the variables in line $k$ of the proof are subscripted with $k$. In particular, we add a variable renaming at the end of each unifying substitution so that the variables in the output formula have the right subscript for the next line of the proof.

\[
\begin{align*}
1. \{-\forall e A(s(e), c, z_1)\} & \quad \text{clause of } G_3 \\
2. \{-\forall e A(s(x_2), y_2, z_2)\} & \quad \text{clause of } F_2 \\
3. \{-\forall e A(s(e), c, z_3)\} & \quad 1,2 \text{ Res. Sub } [s(e)/x_2][c/y_2][s(z_2)/z_1][z_3/z_2] \\
4. \{-\forall e A(c, z_4)\} & \quad 2,3 \text{ Res. Sub } [c/x_2][c/y_2][s(z_2)/z_3][z_4/z_3] \\
5. \{-\forall e A(e, y_5, y_6)\} & \quad \text{clause of } F_1 \\
6. \square & \quad 4,5 \text{ Res. Sub } [e/y_3][c/z_4]
\end{align*}
\]

\(^1\)Formally the notion of a resolution proof assumes a single Skolem-form formula. So strictly speaking the proof below is a resolution refutation of the formula $\forall x \forall y \forall z (A(e, x, x) \land ((\neg A(x, y, z) \lor A(s(x), y, s(z))) \land A(s(s(e)), x, y)))$, which is logically equivalent to $F_1 \land F_2 \land G_3$.
Given a formula $H$ with free variables $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$, its universal closure $\forall^*H$ is the sentence $\forall x_1 \forall x_2 \ldots \forall x_n H$. The following lemma is key to the soundness of resolution.

**Lemma 7** (Resolution Lemma). Let $F = \forall x_1 \ldots \forall x_n G$ be a closed formula in Skolem form, with $G$ quantifier-free. Let $R$ be a resolvent of two clauses in $G$. Then $F \equiv \forall^*(G \cup \{R\})$.

**Proof.** Clearly $\forall^*(G \cup \{R\}) \models F$. The non-trivial direction is to show that $F \models \forall^*R$. For this, since $F$ is closed, it suffices to show that $F \models R$. (Check that you understand why this is so!)

To this end, suppose that $R$ is a resolvent of clauses $C_1, C_2 \in G$, with $R = (C_1 \theta \setminus \{L\}) \cup (C_2 \theta' \setminus \{\overline{L}\})$ for some substitutions $\theta, \theta'$ and complementary literals $L \in C_1 \theta$ and $\overline{L} \in C_2 \theta'$.

Let $A$ be an assignment that satisfies $F = \forall^*G$. Since $C_1, C_2 \in G$, by the Translation Lemma $A \models C_1 \theta$ and $A \models C_2 \theta'$. Moreover, since $A'$ satisfies at most one of the complementary literals $L$ and $\overline{L}$, it follows that $A$ satisfies at least one of $C_1 \theta \setminus \{L\}$ and $C_2 \theta' \setminus \{\overline{L}\}$. We conclude that $A$ satisfies $R$, as required.

**Corollary 8** (Soundness). Let $F = \forall x_1 \ldots \forall x_n G$ be a closed formula in Skolem form. Let clause $C$ be obtained from $G$ by a resolution derivation. Then $F \equiv \forall^*(G \cup C)$.

**Proof.** Induction on the length of the resolution derivation, using the Resolution Lemma for the induction step.

### A Refutation Completeness

In this appendix we prove the refutation completeness of predicate-logic resolution proofs by showing that ground resolution proofs lift to predicate-logic resolution proofs. The proofs here are more technical and can be regarded as optional.

**Lemma 9** (Lifting Lemma). Let $C_1$ and $C_2$ be variable-disjoint clauses with respective ground instances $G_1$ and $G_2$. Suppose that $R$ is a propositional resolvent of $G_1$ and $G_2$. Then $C_1$ and $C_2$ have a predicate-logic resolvent $R'$ such that $R$ is a ground instance of $R'$.

**Proof.** The situation of the lemma is shown in Figure 3. We can write the ground resolvent $R$ in the form $R = (G_1 \setminus \{L\}) \cup (G_2 \setminus \{\overline{L}\})$, for complementary literals $L \in G_1$ and $\overline{L} \in G_2$. Since $C_1$ and $C_2$ have no variable in common we can write $G_1 = C_1 \theta'$ and $G_2 = C_2 \theta'$ for a single ground substitution $\theta'$. Let $D_1 \subseteq C_1$ be the set of literals mapped to $L$ by $\theta'$ and let $D_2 \subseteq C_2$ be the set of literals mapped to $\overline{L}$ by $\theta'$. Then $\theta'$ is a unifier of $D_1 \cup \overline{D_2}$. Writing $\theta$ for the most general unifier of $D_1 \cup \overline{D_2}$, we have that

$$R' := (C_1 \theta \setminus D_1 \theta) \cup (C_2 \theta \setminus D_2 \theta)$$

(2)

is a predicate-logic resolvent of $C_1$ and $C_2$.

Recall from the proof of the Unification Lemma that $\theta' = \theta \theta'$. By (2) we now have that

$$R' \theta' = (C_1 \theta' \setminus D_1 \theta' \theta) \cup (C_2 \theta' \setminus D_2 \theta' \theta)$$

$$= (C_1 \theta' \setminus D_1 \theta) \cup (C_2 \theta' \setminus D_2 \theta')$$

$$= (G_1 \setminus \{L\}) \cup (G_2 \setminus \{\overline{L}\}) .$$

(The first equality uses the fact that $D_1 \theta$ and $C_1 \theta$ have disjoint images under $\theta'$ and likewise $D_2 \theta$ and $C_2 \theta$ have disjoint images under $\theta'$, which follows from $\theta' = \theta \theta'$.) We conclude that $R$ is a ground instance of $R'$ under the substitution $\theta'$.
Corollary 10 (Completeness). Let $F$ be a closed formula in Skolem form with its matrix $F'$ in CNF. If $F$ is unsatisfiable then there is a predicate-logic resolution proof of $\Box$ from $F'$.

Proof. Suppose $F$ is unsatisfiable. By the completeness of ground resolution there is a proof $C'_1, C'_2, \ldots, C'_n$, where $C'_n = \Box$ and each $C'_i$ is either a ground instance of a clause in $F'$ or is a resolvent of two clauses $C'_j, C'_k$ for $j, k < i$. We inductively define a corresponding predicate-logic resolution proof $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n$, such that $C'_i$ is a ground instance of $C_i$. For each $i$, if $C'_i$ is a ground instance of a clause $C \in F'$ then define $C_i = C$. On the other hand, suppose that $C'_i$ is a resolvent of two ground clauses $C'_j, C'_k$, with $j, k < i$. By induction we have constructed clauses $C_j$ and $C_k$ such that $C'_j$ is a ground instance of $C_j$ and $C'_k$ is a ground instance of $C_k$. By the Lifting Lemma we can find a clause $C_i$ which is a resolvent of $C_j$ and $C_k$ such that $C'_i$ is a ground instance of $C_i$. \qed