

Restrictions of resolution

Restrictions allow to perform a resolution step only when the clauses involved satisfy certain syntactic conditions.

A restriction is **complete** if the calculus with the restriction is still complete.

We consider some restrictions of propositional resolution.
Extending them to predicate logic is easy.

Positive and negative resolution

P-resolution: one of the two clauses to be resolved is positive, i.e., contains only positive literals.

N-resolution: one of the two clauses to be resolved is negative, i.e., contains only negative literals.

Theorem: P- and N-resolution are complete.

Completeness proof

Theorem: P- and N-resolution are complete.

Proof: Only for P-resolution (N-resolution similar).

Let F be an unsatisfiable formula. We show that the empty clause can be derived using P-resolution.

By induction on the number n of atomic formulas occurring in F .

Case $n = 0$ is trivial. Let $n > 0$ and let A be an atomic formula of F .

Example:

$$F = \{A, \neg D\} \quad \{A, B, D\} \quad \{\neg A, \neg B, \neg D\} \quad \{\neg A, B\} \quad \{\neg B, D\} \quad \}$$

We know that $F[A/0]$ and $F[A/1]$ are unsatisfiable.

$$F[A/0] = \{\neg D\} \quad \{B, D\} \quad \{\neg B, D\}$$

$$F[A/1] = \{\neg B, \neg D\} \quad \{B\} \quad \{\neg B, D\}$$

Completeness proof

- (1) Construct using P-Resolution a derivation of the empty clause from $F[A/0]$ (exists by induction hypothesis).

$$F[A/0] : \quad \{\neg D\} \quad \{B, D\} \quad \{\neg B, D\}$$

Completeness proof

- (2) Transform the derivation from step (1) into a derivation of $\{A\}$ from F (or of the empty clause if this is possible).
- (3) Add resolution steps that resolve $\{A\}$ with every clause of F containing $\neg A$.

F : $\{A, \neg D\}$ $\{A, B, D\}$ $\{\neg A, \neg B, \neg D\}$ $\{\neg A, B\}$ $\{\neg B, D\}$

This produces the clauses in $F[A/1]$.

Completeness proof

Add a derivation of the empty clause from $F[A/1]$.

$$F[A/1] : \quad \{\neg B, \neg D\} \quad \{B\} \quad \{\neg B, D\}$$

Linear resolution

Linear resolution: one of the two clauses must be the resolvent produced in the previous step (no restriction for the first step).

Theorem: Linear resolution is complete.

Completeness proof

Theorem: Linear resolution is complete.

Proof: Let F be unsatisfiable.

$$F = \{A\} \quad \{A, B, D\} \quad \{\neg A, \neg B, \neg D\} \quad \{\neg A, B\} \quad \{\neg B, D\}$$

Let $F' \subseteq F$ be a minimal unsatisfiable subset (unsatisfiable core)

$$F' = \{A\} \quad \{\neg A, \neg B, \neg D\} \quad \{\neg A, B\} \quad \{\neg B, D\}$$

We show: for **every** clause C of F' there is a linear derivation of the empty clause starting with C .

Proof by induction on the number n of atomic formulas.

Case $n = 0$ is trivial. Let $n > 0$ and let A be an atomic formula of F .

We consider two cases: $|C| = 1$ and $|C| > 1$.

Case $|C| = 1$

Let $C = \{L\}$.

$$C = \{A\}$$

We know that $F'[A/0]$ and $F'[A/1]$ are unsatisfiable.

Step 1: Choose an unsatisfiable core F'' of $F'[L/1]$.

$$F'' = F'[A/1] = \{\neg B, \neg D\} \quad \{B\} \quad \{\neg B, D\}$$

Pick $C' \in F''$ such that $C' \cup \{\bar{L}\} \in F'$.

(C' exists, otherwise $F'' \subseteq F' - \{C\}$ and so by minimality of F' the core F'' is satisfiable.)

$$C' = \{\neg B, \neg D\}$$

Case $|C| = 1$ (con.)

Step 2: Construct a linear derivation of the empty clause from F'' starting with C' (exists by induction hypothesis).

$$F'' : \quad \{\neg B, \neg D\} \quad \{B\} \quad \{D\}$$

Case $|C| = 1$ (con.)

Step 3: Resolve $\{L\}$ with $C' \cup \{\bar{L}\}$, add the derivation from Step 2 to get a derivation of $\{\bar{L}\}$ from F' , and resolve $\{L\}$ and $\{\bar{L}\}$.

$$F' : \quad \{A\} \quad \{\neg A \neg B, \neg D\} \quad \{\neg A, B\} \quad \{\neg B, D\}$$

Case $|C| > 1$

$$F = \{A\} \quad \{A, B, D\} \quad \{\neg A, \neg B, \neg D\} \quad \{\neg A, B\} \quad \{\neg B, D\}$$

$$F' = \{A\} \quad \{\neg A, \neg B, \neg D\} \quad \{\neg A, B\} \quad \{\neg B, D\}$$

$$C = \{\neg A, \neg B, \neg D\}$$

Step 1: Pick any $L \in C$ and set $C' = C - \{L\}$.

$$L = \neg B \quad C' = \{\neg A, \neg D\}$$

Choose an unsatisfiable core F'' of $F'[L/0]$ containing C' .
(Why must it exist?)

$$F'' = F'[\neg B/0] = F'[B/1] = \{A\} \quad \{\neg A, \neg D\} \quad \{D\}$$

Case $|C| > 1$ (con.)

Step 2: Construct a linear derivation of the empty clause from F'' starting with C' (exists by induction hypothesis). Transform it into a derivation of $\{L\}$ from F' .

$$F' : \quad \{A\} \quad \{\neg A, \neg B, \neg D\} \quad \{\neg A, B\} \quad \{\neg B, D\}$$

Case $|C| > 1$ (con.)

Step 3: Apply the previous case (singleton clause case) to

$(F' - \{C\}) \cup \{\{L\}\}$.

(Allowed, because $(F' - \{C\}) \cup \{\{L\}\}$ unsatisfiable and $(F' - \{C\})$ satisfiable.)

$$(F' - \{C\}) \cup \{\{L\}\} : \{A\} \quad \{\neg A, B\} \quad \{\neg B, D\} \quad \{\neg B\}$$

Case $|C| > 1$ (con.)

Step 4: Concatenate the derivations from steps 2 and 3.

$$F' : \quad \{A\} \quad \{\neg A, \neg B, \neg D\} \quad \{\neg A, B\} \quad \{\neg B, D\}$$

SLD-Resolution

The satisfiability problem for Horn-formulas can be solved in linear time.

The satisfiability problem for Horn-formulas of predicate logic is, however, **undecidable**.

SLD-resolution is defined only for Horn-formulas.

SLD-resolution: linear resolution +

- start at a negative clause (the **goal clause**);
- at each resolution step one of the parent clauses is an input non-negative clause (a **procedure clause**).

Completeness

Theorem: SLD-resolution is complete (for Horn-formulas).

Proof: Let F be an unsatisfiable Horn-formula.

(1) F contains a negative clause C .

Proof: exercise.

(2) There is a linear derivation of the empty clause starting with C .
Already proved (Why?).

(3) At each step of this derivation one of the two clauses to be resolved is an input procedure clause.

Proof: by the Horn condition all resolvents of the derivation are negative. Since negative clauses can only be resolved with non-negative clauses, the other clause must be a procedure clause, which must come from the input.