

# Resolution



- So resolution is nice, but what is happening when we do it?
- What does a set of clauses mean?

```
1 {A, B}
2 {~A, ~B, C}
3 {~C, D}
```

This set of clauses equivalent to the single WFF (sorry if I get
 () wrong sometimes)
 (((AvB)\*(~Av(~BvC))))\*(~CvD))

So what happens when we do resolution?
1 {A, B}
2 {~A, ~B, C}
3 {~C, D}

4 {~A,~B,D} from 2,3

- This set of clauses equivalent to the single WFF ((((AvB)\*(~Av(~BvC)))\*(~CvD))\*(~Av(~BvD)))
- So we have just added the new clause to the end of the WFF



- Resolution is built on the rule (not an S/I rules but S/I can prove this) ((PvQ)\*(~PvR)) => (QvR)
- It is extended to more than one \*

```
• 1 {A, B}
  2 {~A, ~B, C}
  3 {~C, D}
  To
• 1 {A, B}
  2 {~A, ~B, C}
  3 {~C, D}
  4 {~A,~B,D} from 2,3
```



Is the same as saying

```
((((AvB)*(~Av~BvC))*(~CvD)) =>
((((AvB)*(~Av(~BvC))))*(~CvD))*(~Av(~BvD))))
```

- So every step of resolution we add another => and another term to the end
- Can't generate new terms: invalid
- Get the empty clause: valid (negation goes backwards and says we can't assume the conclusion is false so it must be true)



```
Why not do 1,2?
1 {A, B}
2 {~A, ~B, C}
3 {~C, D}
4 {~A,~B,D} from 2,3
5 {A,~A,C} from 1,2
```

 This set of clauses equivalent to the single WFF (((((AvB)\*(~Av(~BvC)))\*(~CvD))\*(~Av(~BvD)))\*((Av~A)vC))

But Pv~P=T TvP=T T\*P=P
 (((((AvB)\*(~Av(~BvC)))\*(~CvD))\*(~Av(~BvD)))\*((Av~A)vC))
 becomes
 (((((AvB)\*(~Av(~BvC)))\*(~CvD))\*(~Av(~BvD)))\*(TvC))
 (((((AvB)\*(~Av(~BvC)))\*(~CvD))\*(~Av(~BvD)))\*T)
 ((((AvB)\*(~Av(~BvC)))\*(~CvD))\*(~Av(~BvD)))

Which is what we started with, so no information is gained



 Similarly because P\*P = P we don't want to generate the same clause more than once (say we did 2,3 again)

```
(((((((AvB)*(~Av(~BvC)))*(~CvD))*(~Av(~BvD)))*(~Av(~BvD)))*
Is equivalent to what we started with
(((((AvB)*(~Av(~BvC)))*(~CvD))*(~Av(~BvD))))
```



