

# Foundations of Artificial Intelligence

## E3. Propositional Logic: Resolution

Malte Helmert

University of Basel

April 22, 2026

# Propositional Logic: Overview

## Chapter overview: propositional logic

- E1. Syntax and Semantics
- E2. Equivalence, Normal Forms and Reasoning
- E3. Resolution
- E4. DPLL Algorithm
- E5. Local Search and Outlook

# Motivation

# Reasoning and (Un-) Satisfiability

- last chapter: reduce reasoning to unsatisfiability
- also: interest in (un-) satisfiability in its own right

Can we test unsatisfiability in a more efficient way than by computing the whole truth table?

- E3 & E4: complete algorithms for determining satisfiability/unsatisfiability of a formula
- E5: incomplete algorithms that find satisfying assignments

# Resolution

# Sets of Clauses

in this chapter:

- **prerequisite:** formulas in conjunctive normal form
- clause represented as a **set  $C$  of literals**
- formula represented as a **set  $\Delta$  of clauses**

## Example

Let  $\varphi = (P \vee Q) \wedge \neg P$ .

- $\varphi$  in conjunctive normal form
- $\varphi$  consists of clauses  $(P \vee Q)$  and  $\neg P$
- representation of  $\varphi$  as set of sets of literals:  $\{\{P, Q\}, \{\neg P\}\}$

## Sets of Clauses (Corner Cases)

Distinguish  $\perp$  (empty clause = empty set of literals)  
vs.  $\emptyset$  (empty set of clauses).

- $C = \perp (= \emptyset)$  represents a **disjunction over zero literals**:

$$\bigvee_{L \in \emptyset} L = \perp$$

- $\Delta_1 = \{\perp\}$  represents a **conjunction over one clause**:

$$\bigwedge_{\varphi \in \{\perp\}} \varphi = \perp$$

- $\Delta_2 = \emptyset$  represents a **conjunction over zero clauses**:

$$\bigwedge_{\varphi \in \emptyset} \varphi = \top$$

# Resolution: Idea

## Resolution

- method to test CNF formula  $\varphi$  for unsatisfiability
- **idea:** derive new clauses from  $\varphi$  that logically follow from  $\varphi$
- if empty clause  $\perp$  can be derived  $\rightsquigarrow \varphi$  unsatisfiable

German: Resolution

# The Resolution Rule

$$\frac{C_1 \cup \{l\}, C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}}{C_1 \cup C_2}$$

- “From  $C_1 \cup \{l\}$  and  $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$ , we can conclude  $C_1 \cup C_2$ .”
- $C_1 \cup C_2$  is **resolvent** of **parent clauses**  $C_1 \cup \{l\}$  and  $C_2 \cup \{\bar{l}\}$ .
- The literals  $l$  and  $\bar{l}$  are called **resolution literals**, the corresponding proposition is called **resolution variable**.
- resolvent follows logically from parent clauses (Why?)

**German:** Resolutionsregel, Resolvent, Elternklauseln, Resolutionslitterale, Resolutionsvariable

## Example

- resolvent of  $\{A, B, \neg C\}$  and  $\{A, D, C\}$ ?
- resolvents of  $\{\neg A, B, \neg C\}$  and  $\{A, D, C\}$ ?

# Resolution: Derivations

## Definition (derivation)

Notation:  $R(\Delta) = \Delta \cup \{C \mid C \text{ is resolvent of two clauses in } \Delta\}$

A clause  $D$  can be **derived** from  $\Delta$  (in symbols  $\Delta \vdash D$ ) if there is a sequence of clauses  $C_1, \dots, C_n = D$  such that for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  we have  $C_i \in R(\Delta \cup \{C_1, \dots, C_{i-1}\})$ .

**German:** Ableitung, abgeleitet

## Lemma (soundness of resolution)

*If  $\Delta \vdash D$ , then  $\Delta \models D$ .*

Does the converse direction hold as well (**completeness**)?

**German:** Korrektheit, Vollständigkeit

## Resolution: Completeness?

The converse of the lemma does not hold in general.

example:

- $\{\{A, B\}, \{\neg B, C\}\} \models \{A, B, C\}$ , but
- $\{\{A, B\}, \{\neg B, C\}\} \not\models \{A, B, C\}$

but: converse holds for special case of empty clause  $\perp$  (no proof)

Theorem (refutation-completeness of resolution)

$\Delta$  is unsatisfiable iff  $\Delta \vdash \perp$

German: Widerlegungsvollständigkeit

consequences:

- Resolution is a complete proof method for testing unsatisfiability of CNF formulas.
- Resolution can be used for general reasoning by reducing to a test for unsatisfiability of CNF formulas.

# Example

Let  $\Phi = \{P \vee Q, \neg P\}$ . Does  $\Phi \models Q$  hold?

## Solution

- test if  $((P \vee Q) \wedge \neg P) \rightarrow Q$  is tautology
- equivalently: test if  $((P \vee Q) \wedge \neg P) \wedge \neg Q$  is unsatisfiable
- resulting set of clauses:  $\Phi' = \{\{P, Q\}, \{\neg P\}, \{\neg Q\}\}$
- resolving  $\{P, Q\}$  with  $\{\neg P\}$  yields  $\{Q\}$
- resolving  $\{Q\}$  with  $\{\neg Q\}$  yields  $\perp$
- observation: empty clause can be derived, hence  $\Phi'$  unsatisfiable
- consequently  $\Phi \models Q$

# Resolution: Discussion

- Resolution is a complete proof method to test formulas for unsatisfiability.
- In the worst case, resolution proofs can take exponential time.
- In practice, a **strategy** which determines the next resolution step is needed.
- In the following chapter, we discuss the **DPLL** algorithm, which is a combination of backtracking and resolution.

# Summary

# Summary

- **resolution rule** (for clauses in set notation):  
“from  $C_1 \cup \{\ell\}$  and  $C_2 \cup \{\bar{\ell}\}$ , conclude  $C_1 \cup C_2$ .”
  - **resolution**: repeatedly apply the rule to see if a contradiction can be derived (empty clause  $\perp$ )
  - is a **refutation-complete** proof method applicable to formulas in conjunctive normal form.
- ↪ can be used to test if a set of clauses is unsatisfiable