

# LOGICS EXERCISE

TU MÜNCHEN  
INSTITUT FÜR INFORMATIK

PROF. TOBIAS NIPKOW  
LARS HUPEL

SS 2018

EXERCISE SHEET 9

05.06.2018

**Submission of homework:** Before tutorial on 12.06.2018. Until further notice, homework has to be submitted in groups of two students.

## Exercise 9.1. [Decidability]

1. Resolution for first-order logic is sound and complete.
2. Satisfiability and validity for first-order logic are undecidable.

How do you reconcile these two facts?

### Solution:

Resolution gives us a semi-decision procedure for unsatisfiability. That is, if a given formula is not unsatisfiable, it might not terminate. For it to be a decision procedure, it would need to always terminate.

## Exercise 9.2. [Ground Resolution]

Use ground resolution to prove that the following formula is valid:

$$(\forall x P(x, f(x))) \longrightarrow \exists y P(c, y)$$

### Solution:

$$\begin{aligned} & \neg((\forall x P(x, f(x))) \longrightarrow \exists y P(c, y)) \\ & (\forall x P(x, f(x))) \wedge \neg \exists y P(c, y) \\ & (\forall x P(x, f(x))) \wedge \forall y \neg P(c, y) \\ & \forall x \forall y (P(x, f(x)) \wedge \neg P(c, y)) \qquad \text{(Skolem-Form)} \end{aligned}$$

Now enumerate the Herbrand expansion:

$$CE(F) = \{P(c, f(c)), \neg P(c, f(c)), \dots\}$$

With resolution, we immediately get  $\square$  from the first item in the enumeration.

**Exercise 9.3.** [Equality]

We consider how to model equality in predicate logic. In the lecture slides, the following axiom schema for congruence is used:

$$\frac{Eq(x_i, y)}{Eq(f(x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_n), f(x_1, \dots, y, \dots, x_n))}$$

Assume that this schema is replaced by:

$$\frac{Eq(x_1, y_1) \quad \dots \quad Eq(x_n, y_n)}{Eq(f(x_1, \dots, x_n), f(y_1, \dots, y_n))}$$

Reflexivity, symmetry and transitivity stay unchanged. Show that the above modified schemas is equivalent to the schemas from the lecture.

*Hint:* Simulate the modified schema with the original one and vice versa.

**Solution:**

We first simulate the modified schema with the original one. Because the original schema only allows us to replace one term at a time, an induction is necessary. We want to prove  $Eq(f(x_1, \dots, x_n), f(y_1, \dots, y_m, x_{m+1}, \dots, x_n))$  for  $1 \leq m \leq n$ . With  $m = n$  we obtain the desired schema, hence the induction must proceed on  $m$ .

- Base case:  $m = 1$

$$\frac{Eq(x_1, y_1)}{Eq(f(x_1, \dots, x_n), f(y_1, x_2, \dots, x_n))}$$

- Induction step:  $m \rightsquigarrow m + 1$

$$\text{IH} \frac{\frac{Eq(x_{m+1}, y_{m+1})}{Eq(f(y_1, \dots, y_m, x_{m+1}, \dots, x_n), f(y_1, \dots, y_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots, x_n))}}{Eq(f(x_1, \dots, x_n), f(y_1, \dots, y_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots, x_n))}}{\text{TRANS} \frac{Eq(f(x_1, \dots, x_n), f(y_1, \dots, y_m, x_{m+1}, \dots, x_n))}{Eq(f(x_1, \dots, x_n), f(y_1, \dots, y_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots, x_n))}}$$

Now, the opposite direction.

$$\frac{\overline{Eq(x_1, x_1)} \quad \dots \quad Eq(x_i, y) \quad \dots \quad \overline{Eq(x_n, x_n)}}{Eq(f(x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_n), f(x_1, \dots, y, \dots, x_n))}$$

**Homework 9.1. [Restricted Resolution]** (8 points)

In the resolution procedure as defined in the lecture slides, we can unify arbitrarily many literals from two clauses. Consider a modified resolution procedure, where exactly one literal is picked. We add another rule (“collapsing rule”): For a clause  $C = \{L_1, \dots, L_n\}$ , where  $\{L_i, L_j\}$  can be unified using a mgu  $\delta$ , add another clause  $C' = (C - L_i)\delta$ .

For example, given the clause

$$C = \{\neg W(x), \neg W(f(y)), T(x, y), \neg W(f(c))\}$$

we can apply the collapsing rule as follows:

$$L_1 = \neg W(x), L_2 = \neg W(f(y)), \delta = \{x \mapsto f(y)\}, C' = \{\neg W(f(y)), T(f(y), y), \neg W(f(c))\}$$

(Note that there are multiple possible ways to apply the collapsing rule to  $C$ .)

Prove that our modified resolution calculus, including collapsing rule, can be simulated by the original resolution calculus, and vice versa.

**Homework 9.2. [Resolution]** (6 points)

Show with resolution that:

$$f(f(f(a))) = a \longrightarrow f(f(a)) = a \longrightarrow f(a) = a$$

is valid. First, remove equality based on the procedure from the lecture. Then perform resolution.