

## 2.4 Goal-driven Instantiation

Instantiation is used to refute the current model discovered by the ground solver.

Rather than a fast but loosely guided instantiation technique, we can search for the most suitable instance if it exists.

Scenario:

$M$ : a model of the ground formula returned by the ground SMT solver.

$\mathcal{Q}$ : the set of universally quantified clauses contained in the original input.

Problem:

Find a clause  $\forall x C \in \mathcal{Q}$  and a grounding substitution  $\sigma$  such that  $M \cup C\sigma$  is unsatisfiable, if it exists.

### E-ground (Dis)unification Problem

Given

$E$ : a set of ground equality literals,

$N$ : a set of equality literals,

find  $\sigma$  such that  $E \models N\sigma$ .

The E-ground (dis)unification problem can be used to encode the goal-driven instantiation problem:

For  $M$  and each  $\forall x C \in \mathcal{Q}$ , try to solve the E-ground (dis)unification problem  $M \models (\neg C)\sigma$ .

### Congruence Closure with Free Variables

CCFV (Barbosa et al, 2017) decomposes  $N$  into sets of smaller constraints by replacing terms with equivalent smaller ones until either

1. a variable assignment is possible, and the decomposition restarts afterwards,
2. a contradiction occurs, and the corresponding search branch is closed,
3. a substitution satisfying the problem is found.

CCFV is sound, complete and terminating for the E-ground (dis)unification problem.

Modern implementations: CVC4, VeriT.

## Literature

Haniel Barbosa, Pascal Fontaine, Andrew Reynolds: Congruence Closure with Free Variables. *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, TACAS 2017*, LNCS 10206, pp. 214-230, Springer, 2017.

David Detlefs, Greg Nelson, James B. Saxe: Simplify: A Theorem Prover for Program Checking. *Journal of the ACM*, 52(3):365–473, 2005.

Yeting Ge, Leonardo de Moura: Complete instantiation for quantified formulas in Satisfiability Modulo Theories. *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification, CAV 2009 LNCS 5643*, pp. 306–320, Springer, 2009.

Leonardo de Moura, Nikolaj Bjørner: Efficient E-Matching for SMT solvers. *Automated Deduction, CADE-21, LNAI 4603*, pp. 183–198, Springer, 2007.

Robert Nieuwenhuis, Albert Oliveras, Cesare Tinelli: Solving SAT and SAT Modulo Theories: From an Abstract Davis-Putnam-Logemann-Loveland Procedure to DPLL(T). *Journal of the ACM*, 53(6):937–977, 2006.

Viorica Sofronie-Stokkermans: Hierarchic reasoning in local theory extensions. *Automated Deduction, CADE-20, LNAI 3632*, pp. 219–234, Springer, 2005.

## 3 Superposition

First-order calculi considered so far:

Resolution: for first-order clauses without equality.

(Unfailing) Knuth-Bendix Completion: for unit equations.

Goal:

Combine the ideas of ordered resolution (overlap maximal literals in a clause) and Knuth-Bendix completion (overlap maximal sides of equations) to get a calculus for equational clauses.

### 3.1 Recapitulation

First-order logic:

Atom: either  $P(s_1, \dots, s_m)$  with  $P \in \Pi$  or  $s \approx t$ .

Literal: Atom or negated atom.

Clause: (possibly empty) disjunction of literals (all variables implicitly universally quantified).

Refutational theorem proving:

For refutational theorem proving, it is sufficient to consider sets of clauses: every first-order formula  $F$  can be translated into a set of clauses  $N$  such that  $F$  is unsatisfiable if and only if  $N$  is unsatisfiable.

In the non-equational case, unsatisfiability can for instance be checked using the (ordered) resolution calculus.

(Ordered) resolution: inference rules:

	Ground case:	Non-ground case:
<i>Resolution:</i>	$\frac{D' \vee A \quad C' \vee \neg A}{D' \vee C'}$	$\frac{D' \vee A \quad C' \vee \neg A'}{(D' \vee C')\sigma}$ where $\sigma = \text{mgu}(A, A')$ .
<i>Factoring:</i>	$\frac{C' \vee A \vee A}{C' \vee A}$	$\frac{C' \vee A \vee A'}{(C' \vee A)\sigma}$ where $\sigma = \text{mgu}(A, A')$ .

Ordering restrictions:

Let  $\succ$  be a well-founded and total ordering on ground atoms.

Literal ordering  $\succ_L$ : compares literals by comparing lexicographically first the respective atoms using  $\succ$  and then their polarities (negative  $>$  positive).

Clause ordering  $\succ_C$ : compares clauses by comparing their multisets of literals using the multiset extension of  $\succ_L$ .

Ordering restrictions (ground case):

Inference are necessary only if the following conditions are satisfied:

- The left premise of a Resolution inference is not larger than or equal to the right premise.
- The literals that are involved in the inferences ( $[\neg] A$ ) are maximal in the respective clauses (strictly maximal for the left premise of Resolution).

Ordering restrictions (non-ground case):

Define the atom ordering  $\succ$  also for non-ground atoms.

Need stability under substitutions:  $A \succ B$  implies  $A\sigma \succ B\sigma$ .

Note:  $\succ$  cannot be total on non-ground atoms.

For literals involved in inferences we have the same maximality requirements as in the ground case.

Resolution is (even with ordering restrictions) refutationally complete:

Dynamic view of refutational completeness:

If  $N$  is unsatisfiable ( $N \models \perp$ ) then *fair* derivations from  $N$  produce  $\perp$ .

Static view of refutational completeness:

If  $N$  is *saturated*, then  $N$  is unsatisfiable if and only if  $\perp \in N$ .

Proving refutational completeness for the ground case:

We have to show:

If  $N$  is saturated (i. e., if sufficiently many inferences have been computed), and  $\perp \notin N$ , then  $N$  is satisfiable (i. e., has a model).

Constructing a candidate interpretation:

Suppose that  $N$  be saturated and  $\perp \notin N$ . We inspect all clauses in  $N$  in ascending order and construct a sequence of Herbrand interpretations (starting with the empty interpretation: all atoms are false).

If a clause  $C$  is false in the current interpretation, and has a positive and strictly maximal literal  $A$ , then extend the current interpretation such that  $C$  becomes true: add  $A$  to the current interpretation. (Then  $C$  is called *productive*.)

Otherwise, leave the current interpretation unchanged.

The sequence of interpretations has the following properties:

- (1) If an atom is true in some interpretation, then it remains true in all future interpretations.
- (2) If a clause is true at the time where it is inspected, then it remains true in all future interpretations.
- (3) If a clause  $C = C' \vee A$  is productive, then  $C$  remains true and  $C'$  remains false in all future interpretations.

Show by induction: if  $N$  is saturated and  $\perp \notin N$ , then every clause in  $N$  is either true at the time where it is inspected or productive.

Note:

For the induction proof, it is not necessary that the conclusion of an inference is contained in  $N$ . It is sufficient that it is redundant w. r. t.  $N$ .

$N$  is called *saturated up to redundancy* if the conclusion of every inference from clauses in  $N \setminus Red(N)$  is contained in  $N \cup Red(N)$ .

Proving refutational completeness for the non-ground case:

If  $C_i\theta$  is a ground instance of the clause  $C_i$  for  $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$  and

$$\frac{C_n, \dots, C_1}{C_0}$$

and

$$\frac{C_n\theta, \dots, C_1\theta}{C_0\theta}$$

are inferences, then the latter inference is called a *ground instance* of the former.

For a set  $N$  of clauses, let  $G_\Sigma(N)$  be the set of all ground instances of clauses in  $N$ .

Construct the interpretation from the set  $G_\Sigma(N)$  of all ground instances of clauses in  $N$ :

- $N$  is saturated and does not contain  $\perp$
- $\Rightarrow G_\Sigma(N)$  is saturated and does not contain  $\perp$
- $\Rightarrow G_\Sigma(N)$  has a Herbrand model  $I$
- $\Rightarrow I$  is a model of  $N$ .

It is possible to encode an arbitrary predicate  $P$  using a function  $f_P$  and a new constant *true*:

$$\begin{aligned} P(t_1, \dots, t_n) &\rightsquigarrow f_P(t_1, \dots, t_n) \approx \text{true} \\ \neg P(t_1, \dots, t_n) &\rightsquigarrow \neg f_P(t_1, \dots, t_n) \approx \text{true} \end{aligned}$$

In equational logic it is therefore sufficient to consider the case that  $\Pi = \emptyset$ , i. e., equality is the only predicate symbol.

Abbreviation:  $s \not\approx t$  instead of  $\neg s \approx t$ .

## 3.2 The Superposition Calculus – Informally

Conventions:

From now on:  $\Pi = \emptyset$  (equality is the only predicate).

Inference rules are to be read modulo symmetry of the equality symbol.

We will first explain the ideas and motivations behind the superposition calculus and its completeness proof. Precise definitions will be given later.

Ground inference rules:

$$\text{Pos. Superposition: } \frac{D' \vee t \approx t' \quad C' \vee s[t] \approx s'}{D' \vee C' \vee s[t'] \approx s'}$$

$$\text{Neg. Superposition: } \frac{D' \vee t \approx t' \quad C' \vee s[t] \not\approx s'}{D' \vee C' \vee s[t'] \not\approx s'}$$

$$\text{Equality Resolution: } \frac{C' \vee s \not\approx s}{C'}$$

(Note: We will need one further inference rule.)

Ordering wishlist:

Like in resolution, we want to perform only inferences between (strictly) maximal literals.

Like in completion, we want to perform only inferences between (strictly) maximal sides of literals.

Like in resolution, in inferences with two premises, the left premise should not be larger than the right one.

Like in resolution and completion, the conclusion should then be smaller than the larger premise.

The ordering should be total on ground literals.

Consequences:

The literal ordering must depend primarily on the larger term of an equation.

As in the resolution case, negative literals must be a bit larger than the corresponding positive literals.

Additionally, we need the following property: If  $s \succ t \succ u$ , then  $s \not\approx u$  must be larger than  $s \approx t$ . In other words, we must compare first the larger term, then the polarity, and finally the smaller term.

The following construction has the required properties:

Let  $\succ$  be a *reduction ordering that is total on ground terms*.

To a positive literal  $s \approx t$ , we assign the multiset  $\{s, t\}$ , to a negative literal  $s \not\approx t$  the multiset  $\{s, s, t, t\}$ . The *literal ordering*  $\succ_L$  compares these multisets using the multiset extension of  $\succ$ .

The *clause ordering*  $\succ_C$  compares clauses by comparing their multisets of literals using the multiset extension of  $\succ_L$ .

Constructing a candidate interpretation:

We want to use roughly the same ideas as in the completeness proof for resolution.

But: a Herbrand interpretation does not work for equality: The equality symbol  $\approx$  must be interpreted by equality in the interpretation.

Solution: Productive clauses contribute ground rewrite rules to a TRS  $R$ .

The interpretation has the universe  $T_\Sigma(\emptyset)/R = T_\Sigma(\emptyset)/\approx_R$ ; a ground atom  $s \approx t$  holds in the interpretation, if and only if  $s \approx_R t$  if and only if  $s \leftrightarrow_R^* t$ .

We will construct  $R$  in such a way that it is terminating and confluent. In this case,  $s \approx_R t$  if and only if  $s \downarrow_R t$ .

One problem:

The completeness proof for the resolution calculus depends on the following property:

If  $C = C' \vee A$  with a strictly maximal and positive literal  $A$  is false in the current interpretation, then adding  $A$  to the current interpretation cannot make any literal of  $C'$  true.

This property does not hold for superposition:

Let  $b \succ c \succ d$ . Assume that the current rewrite system (representing the current interpretation) contains the rule  $c \rightarrow d$ . Now consider the clause  $b \approx d \vee b \approx c$ .

We need a further inference rule to deal with clauses of this kind, either the ‘‘Merging Paramodulation’’ rule of Bachmair and Ganzinger or the following ‘‘Equality Factoring’’ rule due to Nieuwenhuis:

$$\text{Equality Factoring: } \frac{C' \vee s \approx t' \vee s \approx t}{C' \vee t \not\approx t' \vee s \approx t'}$$

Note: This inference rule subsumes the usual factoring rule.

How do the non-ground versions of the inference rules for superposition look like?

Main idea as in the resolution calculus:

Replace identity by unifiability. Apply the mgu to the resulting clause. In the ordering restrictions, use  $\not\prec$  instead of  $\succ$ .

However:

As in Knuth-Bendix completion, we do not want to consider overlaps at or below a variable position.

Consequence: there are inferences between ground instances  $D\theta$  and  $C\theta$  of clauses  $D$  and  $C$  which are *not* ground instances of inferences between  $D$  and  $C$ .

Such inferences have to be treated in a special way in the completeness proof.



### 3.3 The Superposition Calculus – Formally

Until now, we have seen most of the ideas behind the superposition calculus and its completeness proof.

We will now start again from the beginning giving precise definitions and proofs.

Inference rules:

$$\text{Pos. Superposition: } \frac{D' \vee t \approx t' \quad C' \vee s[u] \approx s'}{(D' \vee C' \vee s[t'] \approx s')\sigma}$$

where  $\sigma = \text{mgu}(t, u)$  and  
 $u$  is not a variable.

$$\text{Neg. Superposition: } \frac{D' \vee t \approx t' \quad C' \vee s[u] \not\approx s'}{(D' \vee C' \vee s[t'] \not\approx s')\sigma}$$

where  $\sigma = \text{mgu}(t, u)$  and  
 $u$  is not a variable.

$$\text{Equality Resolution: } \frac{C' \vee s \not\approx s'}{C'\sigma}$$

where  $\sigma = \text{mgu}(s, s')$ .

$$\text{Equality Factoring: } \frac{C' \vee s' \approx t' \vee s \approx t}{(C' \vee t \not\approx t' \vee s \approx t')\sigma}$$

where  $\sigma = \text{mgu}(s, s')$ .

**Theorem 3.1** *All inference rules of the superposition calculus are correct, i. e., for every rule*

$$\frac{C_n, \dots, C_1}{C_0}$$

we have  $\{C_1, \dots, C_n\} \models C_0$ .

**Proof.** Exercise. □

Orderings:

Let  $\succ$  be a *reduction ordering that is total on ground terms*.

To a positive literal  $s \approx t$ , we assign the multiset  $\{s, t\}$ , to a negative literal  $s \not\approx t$  the multiset  $\{s, s, t, t\}$ . The *literal ordering*  $\succ_L$  compares these multisets using the multiset extension of  $\succ$ .

The *clause ordering*  $\succ_C$  compares clauses by comparing their multisets of literals using the multiset extension of  $\succ_L$ .

Inferences have to be computed only if the following ordering restrictions are satisfied (after applying the unifier to the premises):

- In superposition inferences, the left premise is not greater than or equal to the right one.
- The last literal in each premise is maximal in the respective premise, i. e., there exists no greater literal (strictly maximal for positive literals in superposition inferences, i. e., there exists no greater or equal literal).
- In these literals, the lhs is neither smaller nor equal than the rhs (except in equality resolution inferences).

A ground clause  $C$  is called *redundant w. r. t. a set of ground clauses  $N$* , if it follows from clauses in  $N$  that are smaller than  $C$ .

A clause is *redundant w. r. t. a set of clauses  $N$* , if all its ground instances are redundant w. r. t.  $G_\Sigma(N)$ .

The set of all clauses that are redundant w. r. t.  $N$  is denoted by  $Red(N)$ .

$N$  is called *saturated up to redundancy*, if the conclusion of every inference from clauses in  $N \setminus Red(N)$  is contained in  $N \cup Red(N)$ .

### 3.4 Superposition: Refutational Completeness

For a set  $E$  of ground equations,  $T_\Sigma(\emptyset)/E$  is an  $E$ -interpretation (or  $E$ -algebra) with universe  $\{[t] \mid t \in T_\Sigma(\emptyset)\}$ .

One can show (similar to the proof of Birkhoff's Theorem) that for every *ground equation*  $s \approx t$  we have  $T_\Sigma(\emptyset)/E \models s \approx t$  if and only if  $s \leftrightarrow_E^* t$ .

In particular, if  $E$  is a convergent set of rewrite rules  $R$  and  $s \approx t$  is a ground equation, then  $T_\Sigma(\emptyset)/R \models s \approx t$  if and only if  $s \downarrow_R t$ . By abuse of terminology, we say that an equation or clause is valid (or true) in  $R$  if and only if it is true in  $T_\Sigma(\emptyset)/R$ .

*Construction of candidate interpretations* (Bachmair & Ganzinger 1990):

Let  $N$  be a set of clauses not containing  $\perp$ . Using induction on the clause ordering we define sets of rewrite rules  $E_C$  and  $R_C$  for all  $C \in G_\Sigma(N)$  as follows:

Assume that  $E_D$  has already been defined for all  $D \in G_\Sigma(N)$  with  $D \prec_C C$ . Then  $R_C = \bigcup_{D \prec_C C} E_D$ .

The set  $E_C$  contains the rewrite rule  $s \rightarrow t$ , if

- (a)  $C = C' \vee s \approx t$ .
- (b)  $s \approx t$  is strictly maximal in  $C$ .
- (c)  $s \succ t$ .
- (d)  $C$  is false in  $R_C$ .
- (e)  $C'$  is false in  $R_C \cup \{s \rightarrow t\}$ .
- (f)  $s$  is irreducible w. r. t.  $R_C$ .

In this case,  $C$  is called *productive*. Otherwise  $E_C = \emptyset$ .

Finally,  $R_\infty = \bigcup_{D \in G_\Sigma(N)} E_D$ .

**Lemma 3.2** *If  $E_C = \{s \rightarrow t\}$  and  $E_D = \{u \rightarrow v\}$ , then  $s \succ u$  if and only if  $C \succ_C D$ .*

**Proof.** ( $\Rightarrow$ ): By condition (b),  $s \approx t$  is strictly maximal in  $C$  and  $u \approx v$  is strictly maximal in  $D$ , and since the literal ordering is total on ground literals, this implies that all other literals in  $C$  or in  $D$  are actually smaller than  $s \approx t$  or  $u \approx v$ , respectively.

Moreover,  $s \succ t$  and  $u \succ v$  by condition (c). Therefore  $s \succ u$  implies  $\{s, t\} \succ_{\text{mul}} \{u, v\}$ . Hence  $s \approx t \succ_L u \approx v \succeq_L L$  for every literal  $L$  of  $D$ , and thus  $C \succ_C D$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ): Let  $C \succ_C D$ , then  $E_D \subseteq R_C$ . By condition (f),  $s$  must be irreducible w. r. t.  $R_C$ , so  $s \neq u$ .

Assume that  $s \not\succeq u$ . By totality, this implies  $s \preceq u$ , and since  $s \neq u$ , we obtain  $s \prec u$ . But then  $C \prec_C D$  can be shown in the same way as in the ( $\Rightarrow$ )-part, contradicting the assumption.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.3** *The rewrite systems  $R_C$  and  $R_\infty$  are convergent (i. e., terminating and confluent).*

**Proof.** By condition (c),  $s \succ t$  for all rules  $s \rightarrow t$  in  $R_C$  and  $R_\infty$ , so  $R_C$  and  $R_\infty$  are terminating.

Furthermore, it is easy to check that there are no critical pairs between any two rules: Assume that there are rules  $u \rightarrow v$  in  $E_D$  and  $s \rightarrow t$  in  $E_C$  such that  $u$  is a subterm of  $s$ . As  $\succ$  is a reduction ordering that is total on ground terms, we get  $u \prec s$  and therefore  $D \prec_C C$  and  $E_D \subseteq R_C$ . But then  $s$  would be reducible by  $R_C$ , contradicting condition (f).

Now the absence of critical pairs implies local confluence, and termination and local confluence imply confluence.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4** *If  $D \preceq_C C$  and  $E_C = \{s \rightarrow t\}$ , then  $s \succ u$  for every term  $u$  occurring in a negative literal in  $D$  and  $s \succeq u$  for every term  $u$  occurring in a positive literal in  $D$ .*

**Proof.** If  $s \preceq u$  for some term  $u$  occurring in a negative literal  $u \not\approx v$  in  $D$ , then  $\{u, u, v, v\} \succ_{\text{mul}} \{s, t\}$ . So  $u \not\approx v \succ_L s \approx t \succeq_L L$  for every literal  $L$  of  $C$ , and therefore  $D \succ_C C$ .

Similarly, if  $s \prec u$  for some term  $u$  occurring in a positive literal  $u \approx v$  in  $D$ , then  $\{u, v\} \succ_{\text{mul}} \{s, t\}$ . So  $u \approx v \succ_L s \approx t \succeq_L L$  for every literal  $L$  of  $C$ , and therefore  $D \succ_C C$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.5** *If  $D \in G_\Sigma(N)$  is true in  $R_D$ , then  $D$  is true in  $R_\infty$  and  $R_C$  for all  $C \succ_C D$ .*

**Proof.** If a positive literal of  $D$  is true in  $R_D$ , then this is obvious.

Otherwise, some negative literal  $s \not\approx t$  of  $D$  must be true in  $R_D$ , hence  $s \not\downarrow_{R_D} t$ . As the rules in  $R_\infty \setminus R_D$  have left-hand sides that are larger than  $s$  and  $t$ , they cannot be used in a rewrite proof of  $s \downarrow t$ , hence  $s \not\downarrow_{R_C} t$  and  $s \not\downarrow_{R_\infty} t$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.6** *If  $D = D' \vee u \approx v$  is productive, then  $D'$  is false and  $D$  is true in  $R_\infty$  and  $R_C$  for all  $C \succ_C D$ .*

**Proof.** Obviously,  $D$  is true in  $R_\infty$  and  $R_C$  for all  $C \succ_C D$ .

Since all negative literals of  $D'$  are false in  $R_D$ , it is clear that they are false in  $R_\infty$  and  $R_C$ . For the positive literals  $u' \approx v'$  of  $D'$ , condition (e) ensures that they are false in  $R_D \cup \{u \rightarrow v\}$ . Since  $u' \preceq u$  and  $v' \preceq u$  and all rules in  $R_\infty \setminus R_D$  have left-hand sides that are larger than  $u$ , these rules cannot be used in a rewrite proof of  $u' \downarrow v'$ , hence  $u' \not\downarrow_{R_C} v'$  and  $u' \not\downarrow_{R_\infty} v'$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7 (“Lifting Lemma”)** *Let  $C$  be a clause and let  $\theta$  be a substitution such that  $C\theta$  is ground. Then every equality resolution or equality factoring inference from  $C\theta$  is a ground instance of an inference from  $C$ .*

**Proof.** Exercise. □

**Lemma 3.8 (“Lifting Lemma”)** *Let  $D = D' \vee u \approx v$  and  $C = C' \vee [\neg] s \approx t$  be two clauses (without common variables) and let  $\theta$  be a substitution such that  $D\theta$  and  $C\theta$  are ground.*

*If there is a superposition inference between  $D\theta$  and  $C\theta$  where  $u\theta$  and some subterm of  $s\theta$  are overlapped, and  $u\theta$  does not occur in  $s\theta$  at or below a variable position of  $s$ , then the inference is a ground instance of a superposition inference from  $D$  and  $C$ .*

**Proof.** Exercise. □

**Theorem 3.9 (“Model Construction”)** *Let  $N$  be a set of clauses that is saturated up to redundancy and does not contain the empty clause. Then we have for every ground clause  $C\theta \in G_\Sigma(N)$ :*

- (i)  $E_{C\theta} = \emptyset$  if and only if  $C\theta$  is true in  $R_{C\theta}$ .
- (ii) If  $C\theta$  is redundant w. r. t.  $G_\Sigma(N)$ , then it is true in  $R_{C\theta}$ .
- (iii)  $C\theta$  is true in  $R_\infty$  and in  $R_D$  for every  $D \in G_\Sigma(N)$  with  $D \succ_C C\theta$ .

**Proof.** We use induction on the clause ordering  $\succ_c$  and assume that (i)–(iii) are already satisfied for all clauses in  $G_\Sigma(N)$  that are smaller than  $C\theta$ . Note that the “if” part of (i) is obvious from the construction and that condition (iii) follows immediately from (i) and Corollaries 3.5 and 3.6. So it remains to show (ii) and the “only if” part of (i).

*Case 1:  $C\theta$  is redundant w. r. t.  $G_\Sigma(N)$ .*

If  $C\theta$  is redundant w. r. t.  $G_\Sigma(N)$ , then it follows from clauses in  $G_\Sigma(N)$  that are smaller than  $C\theta$ . By part (iii) of the induction hypothesis, these clauses are true in  $R_{C\theta}$ . Hence  $C\theta$  is true in  $R_{C\theta}$ .

*Case 2:  $x\theta$  is reducible by  $R_{C\theta}$ .*

Suppose there is a variable  $x$  occurring in  $C$  such that  $x\theta$  is reducible by  $R_{C\theta}$ , say  $x\theta \rightarrow_{R_{C\theta}} w$ . Let the substitution  $\theta'$  be defined by  $x\theta' = w$  and  $y\theta' = y\theta$  for every variable  $y \neq x$ . The clause  $C\theta'$  is smaller than  $C\theta$ . By part (iii) of the induction hypothesis, it is true in  $R_{C\theta}$ . By congruence, every literal of  $C\theta$  is true in  $R_{C\theta}$  if and only if the corresponding literal of  $C\theta'$  is true in  $R_{C\theta}$ ; hence  $C\theta$  is true in  $R_{C\theta}$ .

Case 3:  $C\theta$  contains a maximal negative literal.

Suppose that  $C\theta$  does not fall into Case 1 or 2 and that  $C\theta = C'\theta \vee s\theta \not\approx s'\theta$ , where  $s\theta \not\approx s'\theta$  is maximal in  $C\theta$ . If  $s\theta \approx s'\theta$  is false in  $R_{C\theta}$ , then  $C\theta$  is clearly true in  $R_{C\theta}$  and we are done. So assume that  $s\theta \approx s'\theta$  is true in  $R_{C\theta}$ , that is,  $s\theta \downarrow_{R_{C\theta}} s'\theta$ . Without loss of generality,  $s\theta \succeq s'\theta$ .

Case 3.1:  $s\theta = s'\theta$ .

If  $s\theta = s'\theta$ , then there is an *equality resolution* inference

$$\frac{C'\theta \vee s\theta \not\approx s'\theta}{C'\theta}.$$

As shown in the Lifting Lemma, this is an instance of an *equality resolution* inference

$$\frac{C' \vee s \not\approx s'}{C'\sigma}$$

where  $C = C' \vee s \not\approx s'$  is contained in  $N$  and  $\theta = \rho \circ \sigma$ . (Without loss of generality,  $\sigma$  is idempotent, therefore  $C'\theta = C'\sigma\rho = C'\sigma\sigma\rho = C'\sigma\theta$ , so  $C'\theta$  is a ground instance of  $C'\sigma$ .) Since  $C\theta$  is not redundant w.r.t.  $G_\Sigma(N)$ ,  $C$  is not redundant w.r.t.  $N$ . As  $N$  is saturated up to redundancy, the conclusion  $C'\sigma$  of the inference from  $C$  is contained in  $N \cup \text{Red}(N)$ . Therefore,  $C'\theta$  is either contained in  $G_\Sigma(N)$  and smaller than  $C\theta$ , or it follows from clauses in  $G_\Sigma(N)$  that are smaller than itself (and therefore smaller than  $C\theta$ ). By the induction hypothesis, clauses in  $G_\Sigma(N)$  that are smaller than  $C\theta$  are true in  $R_{C\theta}$ , thus  $C'\theta$  and  $C\theta$  are true in  $R_{C\theta}$ .

Case 3.2:  $s\theta \succ s'\theta$ .

If  $s\theta \downarrow_{R_{C\theta}} s'\theta$  and  $s\theta \succ s'\theta$ , then  $s\theta$  must be reducible by some rule in some  $E_{D\theta} \subseteq R_{C\theta}$ . (Without loss of generality we assume that  $C$  and  $D$  are variable disjoint; so we can use the same substitution  $\theta$ .) Let  $D\theta = D'\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta$  with  $E_{D\theta} = \{t\theta \rightarrow t'\theta\}$ . Since  $D\theta$  is productive,  $D'\theta$  is false in  $R_{C\theta}$ . Besides, by part (ii) of the induction hypothesis,  $D\theta$  is not redundant w.r.t.  $G_\Sigma(N)$ , so  $D$  is not redundant w.r.t.  $N$ . Note that  $t\theta$  cannot occur in  $s\theta$  at or below a variable position of  $s$ , say  $x\theta = w[t\theta]$ , since otherwise  $C\theta$  would be subject to Case 2 above. Consequently, the *negative superposition* inference

$$\frac{D'\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta \quad C'\theta \vee s\theta[t\theta] \not\approx s'\theta}{D'\theta \vee C'\theta \vee s\theta[t'\theta] \not\approx s'\theta}$$

is a ground instance of a *negative superposition* inference from  $D$  and  $C$ . By saturation up to redundancy, its conclusion is either contained in  $G_\Sigma(N)$  and smaller than  $C\theta$ , or it follows from clauses in  $G_\Sigma(N)$  that are smaller than itself (and therefore smaller than  $C\theta$ ). By the induction hypothesis, these clauses are true in  $R_{C\theta}$ , thus  $D'\theta \vee C'\theta \vee s\theta[t'\theta] \not\approx s'\theta$  is true in  $R_{C\theta}$ . Since  $D'\theta$  and  $s\theta[t'\theta] \not\approx s'\theta$  are false in  $R_{C\theta}$ , both  $C'\theta$  and  $C\theta$  must be true.

Case 4:  $C\theta$  does not contain a maximal negative literal.

Suppose that  $C\theta$  does not fall into Cases 1 to 3. Then  $C\theta$  can be written as  $C'\theta \vee s\theta \approx s'\theta$ , where  $s\theta \approx s'\theta$  is a maximal literal of  $C\theta$ . If  $E_{C\theta} = \{s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta\}$  or  $C'\theta$  is true in  $R_{C\theta}$  or  $s\theta = s'\theta$ , then there is nothing to show, so assume that  $E_{C\theta} = \emptyset$  and that  $C'\theta$  is false in  $R_{C\theta}$ . Without loss of generality,  $s\theta \succ s'\theta$ .

Case 4.1:  $s\theta \approx s'\theta$  is maximal in  $C\theta$ , but not strictly maximal.

If  $s\theta \approx s'\theta$  is maximal in  $C\theta$ , but not strictly maximal, then  $C\theta$  can be written as  $C''\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta \vee s\theta \approx s'\theta$ , where  $t\theta = s\theta$  and  $t'\theta = s'\theta$ . In this case, there is a *equality factoring* inference

$$\frac{C''\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta \vee s\theta \approx s'\theta}{C''\theta \vee t'\theta \not\approx s'\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta}$$

This inference is a ground instance of an inference from  $C$ . By saturation, its conclusion is true in  $R_{C\theta}$ . Trivially,  $t'\theta = s'\theta$  implies  $t'\theta \downarrow_{R_{C\theta}} s'\theta$ , so  $t'\theta \not\approx s'\theta$  must be false and  $C\theta$  must be true in  $R_{C\theta}$ .

Case 4.2:  $s\theta \approx s'\theta$  is strictly maximal in  $C\theta$  and  $s\theta$  is reducible.

Suppose that  $s\theta \approx s'\theta$  is strictly maximal in  $C\theta$  and  $s\theta$  is reducible by some rule in  $E_{D\theta} \subseteq R_{C\theta}$ . Let  $D\theta = D'\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta$  and  $E_{D\theta} = \{t\theta \rightarrow t'\theta\}$ . Since  $D\theta$  is productive,  $D\theta$  is not redundant and  $D'\theta$  is false in  $R_{C\theta}$ . We can now proceed in essentially the same way as in Case 3.2: If  $t\theta$  occurred in  $s\theta$  at or below a variable position of  $s$ , say  $x\theta = w[t\theta]$ , then  $C\theta$  would be subject to Case 2 above. Otherwise, the *positive superposition* inference

$$\frac{D'\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta \quad C'\theta \vee s\theta[t\theta] \approx s'\theta}{D'\theta \vee C'\theta \vee s\theta[t'\theta] \approx s'\theta}$$

is a ground instance of a *positive superposition* inference from  $D$  and  $C$ . By saturation up to redundancy, its conclusion is true in  $R_{C\theta}$ . Since  $D'\theta$  and  $C'\theta$  are false in  $R_{C\theta}$ ,  $s\theta[t'\theta] \approx s'\theta$  must be true in  $R_{C\theta}$ . On the other hand,  $t\theta \approx t'\theta$  is true in  $R_{C\theta}$ , so by congruence,  $s\theta[t\theta] \approx s'\theta$  and  $C\theta$  are true in  $R_{C\theta}$ .

Case 4.3:  $s\theta \approx s'\theta$  is strictly maximal in  $C\theta$  and  $s\theta$  is irreducible.

Suppose that  $s\theta \approx s'\theta$  is strictly maximal in  $C\theta$  and  $s\theta$  is irreducible by  $R_{C\theta}$ . Then there are three possibilities:  $C\theta$  can be true in  $R_{C\theta}$ , or  $C'\theta$  can be true in  $R_{C\theta} \cup \{s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta\}$ , or  $E_{C\theta} = \{s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta\}$ . In the first and the third case, there is nothing to show. Let us therefore assume that  $C\theta$  is false in  $R_{C\theta}$  and  $C'\theta$  is true in  $R_{C\theta} \cup \{s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta\}$ . Then  $C'\theta = C''\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta$ , where the literal  $t\theta \approx t'\theta$  is true in  $R_{C\theta} \cup \{s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta\}$  and false in  $R_{C\theta}$ . In other words,  $t\theta \downarrow_{R_{C\theta} \cup \{s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta\}} t'\theta$ , but not  $t\theta \downarrow_{R_{C\theta}} t'\theta$ . Consequently, there is a rewrite proof of  $t\theta \rightarrow^* u \leftarrow^* t'\theta$  by  $R_{C\theta} \cup \{s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta\}$  in which the rule  $s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta$  is used at least once. Without loss of generality we assume that  $t\theta \succeq t'\theta$ . Since  $s\theta \approx s'\theta \succ_L t\theta \approx t'\theta$  and  $s\theta \succ s'\theta$  we can conclude that  $s\theta \succeq t\theta \succ t'\theta$ . But then there is only one possibility how the rule  $s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta$  can be used in the rewrite proof: We must have  $s\theta = t\theta$  and the rewrite proof must have the form  $t\theta \rightarrow s'\theta \rightarrow^* u \leftarrow^* t'\theta$ , where the first step uses  $s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta$  and all other steps use rules from  $R_{C\theta}$ . Consequently,  $s'\theta \approx t'\theta$  is true in  $R_{C\theta}$ . Now observe that there is an *equality factoring* inference

$$\frac{C''\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta \vee s\theta \approx s'\theta}{C''\theta \vee t'\theta \not\approx s'\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta}$$

whose conclusion is true in  $R_{C\theta}$  by saturation. Since the literal  $t'\theta \not\approx s'\theta$  must be false in  $R_{C\theta}$ , the rest of the clause must be true in  $R_{C\theta}$ , and therefore  $C\theta$  must be true in  $R_{C\theta}$ , contradicting our assumption. This concludes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

A  $\Sigma$ -interpretation  $\mathcal{A}$  is called *term-generated*, if for every  $b \in U_{\mathcal{A}}$  there is a ground term  $t \in T_{\Sigma}(\emptyset)$  such that  $b = \mathcal{A}(\beta)(t)$ .

**Lemma 3.10** *Let  $N$  be a set of (universally quantified)  $\Sigma$ -clauses and let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a term-generated  $\Sigma$ -interpretation. Then  $\mathcal{A}$  is a model of  $G_{\Sigma}(N)$  if and only if it is a model of  $N$ .*

**Proof.** ( $\Rightarrow$ ): Let  $\mathcal{A} \models G_{\Sigma}(N)$ ; let  $(\forall \vec{x} C) \in N$ . Then  $\mathcal{A} \models \forall \vec{x} C$  iff  $\mathcal{A}(\gamma[x_i \mapsto a_i])(C) = 1$  for all  $\gamma$  and  $a_i$ . Choose ground terms  $t_i$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(\gamma)(t_i) = a_i$ ; define  $\theta$  such that  $x_i\theta = t_i$ , then  $\mathcal{A}(\gamma[x_i \mapsto a_i])(C) = \mathcal{A}(\gamma \circ \theta)(C) = \mathcal{A}(\gamma)(C\theta) = 1$  since  $C\theta \in G_{\Sigma}(N)$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ): Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a model of  $N$ ; let  $\forall \vec{x} C \in N$  and  $C\theta \in G_{\Sigma}(N)$ . Then  $\mathcal{A} \models \forall \vec{x} C$  and therefore  $\mathcal{A} \models C$ . Consequently  $\mathcal{A}(\gamma)(C\theta) = \mathcal{A}(\gamma \circ \theta)(C) = 1$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.11 (Refutational Completeness: Static View)** *Let  $N$  be a set of clauses that is saturated up to redundancy. Then  $N$  has a model if and only if  $N$  does not contain the empty clause.*

**Proof.** If  $\perp \in N$ , then obviously  $N$  does not have a model. If  $\perp \notin N$ , then the interpretation  $R_{\infty}$  (that is,  $T_{\Sigma}(\emptyset)/R_{\infty}$ ) is a model of all ground instances in  $G_{\Sigma}(N)$  according to part (iii) of the model construction theorem. As  $T_{\Sigma}(\emptyset)/R_{\infty}$  is term-generated, it is a model of  $N$ .  $\square$



So far, we have considered only inference rules that add new clauses to the current set of clauses (corresponding to the *Deduce* rule of Knuth-Bendix Completion).

In other words, we have derivations of the form  $N_0 \vdash N_1 \vdash N_2 \vdash \dots$ , where each  $N_{i+1}$  is obtained from  $N_i$  by adding the consequence of some inference from clauses in  $N_i$ .

Under which circumstances are we allowed to delete (or simplify) a clause during the derivation?

A *run* of the superposition calculus is a sequence  $N_0 \vdash N_1 \vdash N_2 \vdash \dots$ , such that

- (i)  $N_i \models N_{i+1}$ , and
- (ii) all clauses in  $N_i \setminus N_{i+1}$  are redundant w. r. t.  $N_{i+1}$ .

In other words, during a run we may add a new clause if it follows from the old ones, and we may delete a clause, if it is redundant w. r. t. the remaining ones.

For a run,  $N_\infty = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} N_i$  and  $N_* = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} \bigcap_{j \geq i} N_j$ . The set  $N_*$  of all *persistent* clauses is called the *limit* of the run.

**Lemma 3.12** *If  $N \subseteq N'$ , then  $Red(N) \subseteq Red(N')$ .*

**Proof.** Obvious. □

**Lemma 3.13** *If  $N' \subseteq Red(N)$ , then  $Red(N) \subseteq Red(N \setminus N')$ .*

**Proof.** Follows from the compactness of first-order logic and the well-foundedness of the multiset extension of the clause ordering. □

**Lemma 3.14** *Let  $N_0 \vdash N_1 \vdash N_2 \vdash \dots$  be a run. Then  $Red(N_i) \subseteq Red(N_\infty)$  and  $Red(N_i) \subseteq Red(N_*)$  for every  $i$ .*

**Proof.** Exercise. □

**Corollary 3.15**  *$N_i \subseteq N_* \cup Red(N_*)$  for every  $i$ .*

**Proof.** If  $C \in N_i \setminus N_*$ , then there is a  $k \geq i$  such that  $C \in N_k \setminus N_{k+1}$ , so  $C$  must be redundant w. r. t.  $N_{k+1}$ . Consequently,  $C$  is redundant w. r. t.  $N_*$ . □

A run is called *fair*, if the conclusion of every inference from clauses in  $N_* \setminus \text{Red}(N_*)$  is contained in some  $N_i \cup \text{Red}(N_i)$ .

**Lemma 3.16** *If a run is fair, then its limit is saturated up to redundancy.*

**Proof.** If the run is fair, then the conclusion of every inference from non-redundant clauses in  $N_*$  is contained in some  $N_i \cup \text{Red}(N_i)$ , and therefore contained in  $N_* \cup \text{Red}(N_*)$ . Hence  $N_*$  is saturated up to redundancy.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.17 (Refutational Completeness: Dynamic View)** *Let  $N_0 \vdash N_1 \vdash N_2 \vdash \dots$  be a fair run, let  $N_*$  be its limit. Then  $N_0$  has a model if and only if  $\perp \notin N_*$ .*

**Proof.** ( $\Leftarrow$ ): By fairness,  $N_*$  is saturated up to redundancy. If  $\perp \notin N_*$ , then it has a term-generated model. Since every clause in  $N_0$  is contained in  $N_*$  or redundant w.r.t.  $N_*$ , this model is also a model of  $G_\Sigma(N_0)$  and therefore a model of  $N_0$ .

( $\Rightarrow$ ): Obvious, since  $N_0 \models N_*$ .  $\square$

### 3.5 Improvements and Refinements

The superposition calculus as described so far can be improved and refined in several ways.

#### Concrete Redundancy and Simplification Criteria

Redundancy is undecidable.

Even decidable approximations are often expensive (experimental evaluations are needed to see what pays off in practice).

Often a clause can be *made* redundant by adding another clause that is entailed by the existing ones.

This process is called *simplification*.

Examples:

Subsumption:

If  $N$  contains clauses  $D$  and  $C = C' \vee D\sigma$ , where  $C'$  is non-empty, then  $D$  subsumes  $C$  and  $C$  is redundant.

Example:  $f(x) \approx g(x)$  subsumes  $f(y) \approx a \vee f(h(y)) \approx g(h(y))$ .

Trivial literal elimination:

Duplicated literals and trivially false literals can be deleted: A clause  $C' \vee L \vee L$  can be simplified to  $C' \vee L$ ; a clause  $C' \vee s \not\approx s$  can be simplified to  $C'$ .

Condensation:

If we obtain a clause  $D$  from  $C$  by applying a substitution, followed by deletion of duplicated literals, and if  $D$  subsumes  $C$ , then  $C$  can be simplified to  $D$ .

Example: By applying  $\{y \rightarrow g(x)\}$  to  $C = f(g(x)) \approx a \vee f(y) \approx a$  and deleting the duplicated literal, we obtain  $f(g(x)) \approx a$ , which subsumes  $C$ .

Semantic tautology deletion:

Every clause that is a tautology is redundant. Note that in the non-equational case, a clause is a tautology if and only if it contains two complementary literals, whereas in the equational case we need a congruence closure algorithm to detect that a clause like  $x \not\approx y \vee f(x) \approx f(y)$  is tautological.

Rewriting:

If  $N$  contains a unit clause  $D = s \approx t$  and a clause  $C[s\sigma]$ , such that  $s\sigma \succ t\sigma$  and  $C \succ_C D\sigma$ , then  $C$  can be simplified to  $C[t\sigma]$ .

Example: If  $D = f(x, x) \approx g(x)$  and  $C = h(f(g(y), g(y))) \approx h(y)$ , and  $\succ$  is an LPO with  $h > f > g$ , then  $C$  can be simplified to  $h(g(g(y))) \approx h(y)$ .

## Selection Functions

Like the ordered resolution calculus, superposition can be used with a selection function that overrides the ordering restrictions for negative literals.

A *selection function* is a mapping

$$S : C \mapsto \text{set of occurrences of negative literals in } C$$

We indicate selected literals by a box:

$$\boxed{\neg f(x) \approx a} \vee g(x, y) \approx g(x, z)$$

The second ordering condition for inferences is replaced by

- The last literal in each premise is either selected, or there is no selected literal in the premise and the literal is maximal in the premise (strictly maximal for positive literals in superposition inferences).

In particular, clauses with selected literals can only be used in equality resolution inferences and as the second premise in negative superposition inferences.

Refutational completeness is proved essentially as before:

We assume that each ground clause in  $G_\Sigma(N)$  inherits the selection of one of the clauses in  $N$  of which it is a ground instance (there may be several ones!).

In the proof of the model construction theorem, we replace case 3 by “ $C\theta$  contains a selected or maximal negative literal” and case 4 by “ $C\theta$  contains neither a selected nor a maximal negative literal”.

In addition, for the induction proof of this theorem we need one more property, namely:  
(iv) If  $C\theta$  has selected literals then  $E_{C\theta} = \emptyset$ .

## Redundant Inferences

So far, we have defined saturation in terms of redundant clauses:

$N$  is *saturated up to redundancy*, if the conclusion of every inference from clauses in  $N \setminus Red(N)$  is contained in  $N \cup Red(N)$ .

This definition ensures that in the proof of the model construction theorem, the conclusion  $C_0\theta$  of a ground inference follows from clauses in  $G_\Sigma(N)$  that are smaller than or equal to itself, hence they are smaller than the premise  $C\theta$  of the inference, hence they are true in  $R_{C\theta}$  by induction.

However, a closer inspection of the proof shows that it is actually sufficient that the clauses from which  $C_0\theta$  follows are smaller than  $C\theta$  – it is *not* necessary that they are smaller than  $C_0\theta$  itself. This motivates the following definition of redundant *inferences*:

A ground inference with conclusion  $C_0$  and right (or only) premise  $C$  is called *redundant w.r.t. a set of ground clauses  $N$* , if one of its premises is redundant w.r.t.  $N$ , or if  $C_0$  follows from clauses in  $N$  that are smaller than  $C$ .

An inference is *redundant w.r.t. a set of clauses  $N$* , if all its ground instances are redundant w.r.t.  $G_\Sigma(N)$ .

Recall that a clause can be redundant w.r.t.  $N$  without being contained in  $N$ . Analogously, an inference can be redundant w.r.t.  $N$  without being an inference from clauses in  $N$ .

The set of all inferences that are redundant w.r.t.  $N$  is denoted by  $RedInf(N)$ .

Saturation is then redefined in the following way:

$N$  is *saturated up to redundancy*, if every inference from clauses in  $N$  is redundant w.r.t.  $N$ .

Using this definition, the model construction theorem can be proved essentially as before.

The connection between redundant inferences and clauses is given by the following lemmas. They are proved in the same way as the corresponding lemmas for redundant clauses:

**Lemma 3.18** *If  $N \subseteq N'$ , then  $RedInf(N) \subseteq RedInf(N')$ .*

**Lemma 3.19** *If  $N' \subseteq Red(N)$ , then  $RedInf(N) \subseteq RedInf(N \setminus N')$ .*

## Literature

Leo Bachmair, Harald Ganzinger: Completion of First-Order Clauses with Equality by Strict Superposition (Extended Abstract). Conditional and Typed Rewriting Systems, 2nd International Workshop, LNCS 516, pp. 162–180, Springer, 1990.

Leo Bachmair, Harald Ganzinger: Rewrite-based Equational Theorem Proving with Selection and Simplification. Journal of Logic and Computation, 4(3):217–247, 1994.

Leo Bachmair, Harald Ganzinger: Resolution Theorem Proving. Handbook of Automated Reasoning, Vol. 1, Ch. 2, pp. 19–99, Elsevier Science B.V., 2001.

Christoph Weidenbach: Combining Superposition, Sorts and Splitting. Handbook of Automated Reasoning, Vol. 2, Ch. 27, pp. 1965–2013, Elsevier Science B.V., 2001.

## 3.6 Splitting

Motivation:

A clause like  $f(x) \approx a \vee g(y) \approx b$  has rather undesirable properties in the superposition calculus: It does not have negative literals that one could select; it does not have a unique maximal literal; moreover, after performing a superposition inference with this clause, the conclusion often does not have a unique maximal literal either.

On the other hand, the two unit clauses  $f(x) \approx a$  and  $g(y) \approx b$  have much nicer properties.

### Splitting with Backtracking

If a clause  $\forall \vec{x}, \vec{y} C_1(\vec{x}) \vee C_2(\vec{y})$  consists of two non-empty variable-disjoint subclauses, then it is equivalent to the disjunction  $(\forall \vec{x} C_1(\vec{x})) \vee (\forall \vec{y} C_2(\vec{y}))$ .

In this case, superposition derivations can branch in a tableau-like manner:

$$\text{Splitting: } \frac{N \cup \{C_1 \vee C_2\}}{N \cup \{C_1\} \quad | \quad N \cup \{C_2\}}$$

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  do not have common variables.

If  $\perp$  is found on the left branch, backtrack to the right one.

If  $C_1$  is ground, the general rule can be improved:

$$\text{Splitting: } \frac{N \cup \{C_1 \vee C_2\}}{N \cup \{C_1\} \quad | \quad N \cup \{C_2\} \cup \{\neg C_1\}}$$

where  $C_1$  is ground.

Note:  $\neg C_1$  denotes the conjunction of all negations of literals in  $C_1$ .

In practice: most useful if both subclauses contain at least one positive literal.

### Implementing Splitting

Most clauses that are derived after a splitting step do *not* depend on the split clause.

It is unpractical to delete them as soon as one branch is closed and to recompute them in the other branch afterwards.

Solution: Associate a label set  $\mathcal{L}$  to every clause  $C$  that indicates on which splits it depends.

$$\text{Inferences: } \frac{C_2 \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_2 \quad C_1 \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_1}{C_0 \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_2 \cup \mathcal{L}_1}$$

If we derive  $\perp \leftarrow \mathcal{L}$  in one branch:

Determine the last split in  $\mathcal{L}$ .

Backtrack to the corresponding right branch.

Keep those clauses that are still valid on the right branch.

Restore clauses that have been simplified if the simplifying clause is no longer valid on the right branch.

Additionally: Delete splittings that did not contribute to the contradiction (branch condensation).

## AVATAR

Superposition with splitting has some similarity with CDCL.

Can we actually use CDCL?

Encoding splitting components:

Use propositional literals as labels for splitting components:

non-ground component  $C \rightarrow$  propositional variable  $P_C$

positive ground component  $C \rightarrow$  propositional variable  $P_C$

negative ground component  $C \rightarrow$  negated propositional variable  $\neg P_C$

Therefore: splittable clauses  $\rightarrow$  propositional clauses.

Implementation:

Combine a CDCL solver and a superposition prover.

The superposition prover passes splittable clauses and labelled empty clauses to the CDCL solver.

If the CDCL solver finds contradiction: input contradictory.

Otherwise the CDCL solver extracts a boolean model and passes the associated labelled clauses to the superposition prover.

## Literature

Andrei Voronkov: AVATAR: The Architecture for First-Order Theorem Provers. Int. Conf. on Computer-Aided Verification, CAV, LNCS 8559, pp. 696–710, Springer, 2014.

Christoph Weidenbach: Combining Superposition, Sorts and Splitting. Handbook of Automated Reasoning, Vol. 2, Ch. 27, pp. 1965–2013, Elsevier Science B.V., 2001.

### 3.7 Constraint Superposition

So far:

Refutational completeness proof for superposition is based on the analysis of inferences between ground instances of clauses.

Inferences between ground instances must be covered by inferences between original clauses.

Non-ground clauses represent the set of all their ground instances.

Do we really need *all* ground instances?

#### Constrained Clauses

A *constrained clause* is a pair  $(C, K)$ , usually written as  $C \llbracket K \rrbracket$ , where  $C$  is a  $\Sigma$ -clause and  $K$  is a formula (called *constraint*).

Often:  $K$  is a boolean combination of *ordering literals*  $s \succ t$  with  $\Sigma$ -terms  $s, t$ .  
(also possible: comparisons between literals or clauses).

Intuition:  $C \llbracket K \rrbracket$  represents the set of all ground clauses  $C\theta$  for which  $K\theta$  evaluates to true for some fixed term ordering. Such a  $C\theta$  is called a ground instance of  $C \llbracket K \rrbracket$ .

A clause  $C$  without constraint is identified with  $C \llbracket \top \rrbracket$ .

A constrained clause  $C \llbracket \perp \rrbracket$  with an unsatisfiable constraint represents no ground instances; it can be discarded.

#### Constraint Superposition

Inference rules for constrained clauses:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{Pos. Superposition:} \quad \frac{D' \vee t \approx t' \llbracket K_2 \rrbracket \quad C' \vee s[u] \approx s' \llbracket K_1 \rrbracket}{(D' \vee C' \vee s[t'] \approx s')\sigma \llbracket (K_2 \wedge K_1 \wedge K)\sigma \rrbracket} \\
 \text{where } \sigma = \text{mgu}(t, u) \text{ and} \\
 u \text{ is not a variable and} \\
 K = (t \succ t' \wedge s[u] \succ s' \\
 \quad \wedge (t \approx t') \succ_C D' \\
 \quad \wedge (s[u] \approx s') \succ_C C' \\
 \quad \wedge (s[u] \approx s') \succ_L (t \approx t'))
 \end{array}$$

The other inference rules are modified analogously.