

# LOGICS EXERCISE

TU MÜNCHEN  
INSTITUT FÜR INFORMATIK

PROF. TOBIAS NIPKOW  
LARS HUPEL

SS 2018

EXERCISE SHEET 1

10.04.2018

**Submission of homework:** Before tutorial on 17.04.2018. Until further notice, homework has to be submitted in groups of two students.

You have to achieve a minimum combined score of 50% on your homeworks to be granted a grade bonus on the final exam, provided that the exam is passed.

## Exercise 1.1. [Short Questions]

Let  $M$  be a set of formulas, and let  $F$  and  $G$  be formulas. Which of the following assertions hold?

1. If  $F$  satisfiable then  $M \models F$
2.  $F$  is valid iff  $\top \models F$
3. If  $\models F$  then  $M \models F$
4. If  $M \models F$  then  $M \cup \{G\} \models F$
5.  $M \models F$  and  $M \models \neg F$  cannot hold simultaneously
6. If  $M \models G \rightarrow F$  and  $M \models G$  then  $M \models F$

## Solution:

The assertions 2, 3, 4, and 6 hold.

Counterexample for 1:  $F = A_1, M = \{A_2\}$

Counterexample for 5:  $M = \{\perp\}$  (*ex falso quodlibet*)

**Exercise 1.2. [Coincidence Lemma]**

Assume that for all atomic formulas  $A_i$  in  $F$ ,  $\mathcal{A}(A_i) = \mathcal{A}'(A_i)$ . Show that

$$\mathcal{A} \models F \text{ iff } \mathcal{A}' \models F$$

**Solution:**

Proof by induction over the structure of  $F$ . Let  $atoms(F)$  denote the set of all atomic formulas  $A_i$  in a formula  $F$ .

- Base case  $F = A_i$  for some  $i$ :  
 Observation:  $atoms(A_i) = \{A_i\}$ , hence  $\mathcal{A}(A_i) = \mathcal{A}'(A_i)$   
 $\mathcal{A} \models A_i$  iff  $\mathcal{A}(A_i) = 1$  iff  $\mathcal{A}'(A_i) = 1$  iff  $\mathcal{A}' \models A_i$
- Base case  $F = \top$ : trivial
- Base case  $F = \perp$ : trivial
- Case  $F = \neg G$  for some  $G$ :  
 Observation:  $atoms(\neg G) = atoms(G)$   
 IH:  $\mathcal{A} \models G$  iff  $\mathcal{A}' \models G$   
 $\mathcal{A} \models \neg G$  iff  $\mathcal{A} \not\models G$  iff  $\mathcal{A}' \not\models G$  iff  $\mathcal{A}' \models \neg G$
- Case  $F = G \vee H$  for some  $G, H$ :  
 Observation:  $atoms(F) = atoms(G) \cup atoms(H)$   
 Hence,  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}'$  coincide on  $G$  and  $H$  too.  
 IH 1:  $\mathcal{A} \models G$  iff  $\mathcal{A}' \models G$   
 IH 2:  $\mathcal{A} \models H$  iff  $\mathcal{A}' \models H$   
 Remaining proof trivial.
- Case  $F = G \wedge H$  and remaining cases: similar

**Exercise 1.3. [Semantic Proof]**

Let  $\models F \rightarrow G$  where  $F$  and  $G$  do not share any atoms. Show that then  $F$  is unsatisfiable or  $G$  is a tautology (or both). *Hint:* you may want to use the previous result.

**Solution:**

Proof by contradiction. Assume that  $F$  is satisfiable and  $G$  is not a tautology. Obtain assignments  $\mathcal{A}_F$  and  $\mathcal{A}_G$  such that  $\mathcal{A}_F \models F$  and  $\mathcal{A}_G \not\models G$ . Construct a new assignment  $\mathcal{A}$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}(A_i) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{A}_F(A_i) & \text{if } A_i \in atoms(F) \\ \mathcal{A}_G(A_i) & \text{if } A_i \in atoms(G) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This is well-defined, because  $atoms(F) \cap atoms(G) = \emptyset$ .  $\mathcal{A}$  coincides with  $\mathcal{A}_F$  on  $F$  and with  $\mathcal{A}_G$  on  $G$ . By coincidence lemma,  $\mathcal{A} \models F$  and  $\mathcal{A} \not\models G$ . But  $\mathcal{A} \not\models (F \rightarrow G)$ , which is a contradiction to  $\models F \rightarrow G$ .

**Homework 1.1.** [CNF and DNF] (6 points)

Use the rewriting-based procedure from the lecture to convert the following formulas  $F$  and  $G$  first to NNF, and then to CNF and DNF. Document each rewriting step.

$$F = \neg\neg(\neg A_1 \wedge \neg\neg(A_2 \vee A_3)) \qquad G = (A_1 \vee A_2 \vee A_3) \wedge (\neg A_1 \vee \neg A_2)$$

**Homework 1.2.** [Basic equivalences] (8 points)

Let  $F$  and  $G$  be formulas. Are the following statements equivalent? Proof or counterexample!

1.  $\models F \leftrightarrow G$
2.  $F \equiv G$

How about these two statements?

1.  $F$  is valid
2.  $F \equiv \top$

**Homework 1.3.** [Efficient CNF satisfiability check] (6 points)

In general, solving satisfiability for CNF formula is a hard problem. Consider the special case where clauses may only contain up to two literals. Give an efficient algorithm to check satisfiability.