MASSACRUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Combridge, Massachusetts PROJECT MAC

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE PROJECT MENO 91

MEMORANDUM MAC-M-285 November, 1965

A Useful Algebraic Property of Robinson's Unification Algorithm

Timothy P. Hart

This memo presupposes some acquaintance with "A Machine Oriented Logic Based on the Resolution Principle", J.A. Robinson, JACM Jan. 65. The reader unfamiliar with this paper should be able to get a general idea of the theorem if he knows that \mathcal{O}_A is a post operator indicating a minimal set of substitutions (most general substitution) necessary to transform all elements of the set of formulae, A, into the same element (to "unify" A), so that when \mathcal{O}_A exists A \mathcal{O}_A is a set with one element (a "unit").

Example:

$$A = \{f(x), y, f(g(u)), f(g(z))\}$$

$$U_A = \{g(u)/x, f(g(u))/y, u/z\}$$

$$AU_A = \{f(g(u))\}$$

Another most general unifier of A is g(z)/x, f(g(z))/y, z/u.

Theorem:

 $\mathcal{T}_{B\mathcal{T}_A}$ exists iff $\mathcal{T}_{A\mathcal{T}_B}$ exists. Both $\mathcal{T}_{A}\mathcal{T}_{B\mathcal{T}_A}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{B}\mathcal{T}_{A\mathcal{T}_B}$ unify the set A and at the same time unify the set B.

Proof:

 ρ is a <u>most general simultaneous unifier</u> of A and B if $A\rho$ is a unit, B ρ is a unit, and if $A\theta$ and $B\theta$ are units then there is a substitution μ such that $\theta = \rho \mu_0$

Example:

$$A = \{x, f(a,y), f(u,y)\}$$

$$B = \{y, g(u)\}$$

$$C_A = \{f(a,y)/x, a/u\}$$

$$C_B = \{g(u)/y\}$$

$$A = \{x, f(a,g(u)), f(u,g(u))\}$$

$$A = \{y, g(a)\}$$

$$A = \{y, g(a)\}$$

$$A = \{f(a,g(a))/x, a/u\}$$

$$A = \{g(a)/y\}$$

$$A = \{g(a)/y\}$$

$$A = \{g(a)/y, f(a,g(a))/x, a/u\}$$

Example:

$$A = \{f(x,y), f(a,b)\}$$

$$B = \{x, y\}$$

$$G_A = \{a/x, b/y\}$$

$$G_B = \{y/x\}$$

$$AG_B = \{f(y,y), f(a,b)\}$$

$$BG_A = \{a, b\}$$

$$Neither G_AG_B \text{ nor } G_BG_A \text{ exists.}$$

Application

This theorem shows that certain proofs in Robinson's resolution system are equivalent. Thus improvements can be made to search procedures which test equivalent proofs.

Let $A = \left\{A_1, A_2\right\}$ and $B = \left\{B_1, B_2\right\}$ such that \mathbb{T}_A and \mathbb{T}_B exist, and let $\left\{A_1\right\}$, $\left\{\sim A_2, B_1\right\}$, and $\left\{\sim B_2\right\}$ be clauses (sets of literals) with no variables common between the sets so that $\left\{A_1\right\}$ $\mathbb{T}_B = \left\{A_1\right\}$ and $\left\{B_2\right\}$ $\mathbb{T}_A = \left\{B_2\right\}$. (This is the result of a preliminary step in resolution.)

Then the proof (where V indicates resolution)

$$\{A_1\}$$
 $\{A_2, B_1\}$ $\{B_1\}$ $\{G_A, G_B_2\}$ $\{G_A, G_B_B\}$

exists, i.e. TBTA exists, if and only if the proof

exists, since this proof exists only if VAVB exists.

By an extension of this reasoning it can be seen that any such rearrangement of a proof tree corresponding to a rearrangement of the order of unification leads to an equivalent proof. In particular there are $\frac{(2m-2)!}{m! (m-1)!}$ (asymptotically 4^m)

ways of developing a proof without factoring involving m-2 2-literal, terminal clauses, and 2 1-literal, terminal clauses. e.g. for m=4 there are 5 equivalent structures:

