

## G53KRR 2018 answer to the second assessed exercise ex2

Derive by resolution an empty clause from the clauses C1-C5 below. Note that  $a$  is a constant,  $f$  a functional symbol, and  $x, y, x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2$  are variables.

**C1**  $[\neg S(x_1), T(f(x_1), x_1)]$

**C2**  $[\neg S(x), \neg T(y, x), \neg L(x), \neg H(y)]$

**C3**  $[S(a)]$

**C4**  $[L(a)]$

**C5**  $[\neg T(x_2, y_2), \neg S(y_2), H(x_2)]$

Several derivations are possible. The simplest although not the shortest one is to keep using unit clauses (clauses with only one literal):

**C6**  $[T(f(a), a)]$  from C1, C3,  $x_1/a$

**C7**  $[\neg T(x_2, a), H(x_2)]$  from C3, C5,  $y_2/a$

**C8**  $[H(f(a))]$  from C6, C7,  $x_2/f(a)$

**C9**  $[\neg T(y, a), \neg L(a), \neg H(y)]$  from C2, C3

**C10**  $[\neg T(y, a), \neg H(y)]$  from C4, C9

**C11**  $[\neg H(f(a))]$  from C6, C10,  $y/f(a)$

**C12**  $[]$  from C8, C11.

A shorter one but easier to get confused uses removal of duplicates/refactoring (since we have a disjunction inside the clause, we can rewrite  $\alpha(x) \vee \alpha(x)$  to  $\alpha(x)$ , or even  $\alpha(x) \vee \alpha(y)$  to  $\alpha(x)$ , because  $x$  and  $y$  are universally quantified and we can unify them in both directions).

**C6**  $[\neg S(x), \neg T(y, x), \neg L(x), \neg T(y, y_2), \neg S(y_2)]$  from C2, C5,  $x_2/y$

**C6r**  $[\neg S(x), \neg T(y, x), \neg L(x)]$  from C6 by refactoring ( $\neg S(x), \neg S(y_2)$  can be unified both ways, and the same for  $\neg T(y, x), \neg T(y, y_2)$ )

**C7**  $[\neg T(y, a), \neg L(a)]$  from C3, C6r,  $x/a$

**C8**  $[\neg T(y, a)]$  from C4, C7

**C9**  $[\neg S(a)]$  from C1, C8,  $y/f(a), x_1/a$

**C10**  $[]$

Common mistakes were:

substituting for terms that are not variables: as in,  $f(x)/y$ , or  $a/x$

applying resolution to three clauses in one go

I don't think it happened this time, but in previous years there was a mistake when two pairs of matching literals were eliminated in one go, for example  $[P(x), Q(x)]$  and  $[\neg P(x), \neg Q(x)]$  resolving to  $[\ ]$ . This is wrong because there is no contradiction between  $\forall x(P(x) \vee Q(x))$  and  $\forall x(\neg P(x) \vee \neg Q(x))$ : for example,  $P(x)$  could be even and  $Q(x)$  could be odd.