## G53KRR: unification, resolution with equality

A unifier of two literals  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  is a substitution  $\theta$  such that  $\rho_1 \theta = \rho_2 \theta$ .

There are many possible unifiers, and some of them are too specific. For example, P(x, y) and P(a, z) can be unified by  $\theta_1 = x/a, y/z$  and by  $\theta_2 = x/a, y/b, z/b$  (the second one is too specific).

A most general unifier (mgu) for  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  is a unifier  $\theta$  such that for any other unifier  $\theta'$ , there is a further substitution  $\theta$ \* such that  $\theta' = \theta\theta$ \*. Basically,  $\theta'$  is obtained from  $\theta$  by doing some extra substitutions.

An mgu for  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  (assuming  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  do not have common variables to start with) can be computed as follows:

- 1. start with  $\theta = \{ \}$
- 2. exit if  $\rho_1 \theta = \rho_2 \theta$
- 3. set DS to be the pair of terms at the first place where  $\rho_1 \theta$  and  $\rho_2 \theta$  disagree
- 4. find a variable v in DS and a term t in DS not containing v; if none exist, fail
- 5. otherwise set  $\theta$  to  $\theta\{v/t\}$  and go to step 2.

If we have to deal with a set of clauses containing equality, we need to add to KB the following axioms:

reflexivity  $\forall x(x=x)$ 

symmetry  $\forall x \forall y (x = y \supset y = x)$ 

**transitivity**  $\forall x \forall y \forall z (x = y \land y = z \supset x = z)$ 

substitution for functions for every function f of arity n in the set of clauses,  $\forall x_1 \forall y_1 \dots \forall x_n \forall y_n (x_1 = y_1 \land \dots \land x_n = y_n \supset f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f(y_1, \dots, y_n))$ 

substitution for predicates for every predicate P of arity n in the set of clauses,

$$\forall x_1 \forall y_1 \dots \forall x_n \forall y_n (x_1 = y_1 \land \dots \land x_n = y_n \supset P(x_1, \dots, x_n) \supset P(y_1, \dots, y_n))$$

With these axioms, resolution is sound and complete for refutation for firstorder logic with equality.

Example:  $\forall x(x = a \lor x = b), \exists x P(x), \neg P(a), \neg P(b)$  should be inconsistent. Clauses:

**C1** [x = a, x = b]

**C2** [P(c)]

C3  $[\neg P(a)]$ 

C4  $[\neg P(b)]$ 

We will also use the following instance of substitution for predicates:

**C5**  $[\neg(x_1 = y_1), \neg P(x_1), P(y_1)]$ 

Proof:

- (1)  $[\neg(c = y_1), P(y_1)]$  from C5 and C2,  $x_1/c$
- (2)  $[\neg(c=a)]$  from C3 and (1),  $y_1/a$
- (3) [c = b] from (2) and C1, x/c
- (4) [P(b)] from (3) and (1),  $y_1/b$
- (5) [] from (4) and C4.