Technische Universität München von der Eine WS 2008/09 Institut für Informatik 19. 12. 2008 Prof. Tobias Nipkow, Ph.D. Alexander Krauss, Sascha Böhme

# Logic

## Exercise Sheet 9

Exercise 9.1 Resolution

Prove the following formula by resolution:

$$
(\forall y \cdot Q(f(a), f(y))) \land (\forall x \, y \cdot Q(y, f(y)) \Rightarrow P(f(x), g(y, b))) \Rightarrow (\exists x \cdot \exists y \cdot \exists z \cdot P(x, y) \land P(f(a), g(x, b)) \land Q(x, z))
$$

#### Solution

After skolemization and transformation into CNF, we get the following set of clauses, where variables are made unique:

$$
\{Q(f(a), f(y_1))\}\tag{1}
$$

$$
\{\neg Q(y_2, f(y_2)), P(f(x_2), g(y_2, b))\}\tag{2}
$$

$$
\{\neg P(x_3, y_3), \neg P(f(a), g(x_3, b)), \neg Q(x_3, z_3)\}\tag{3}
$$

Resolving (2) and (3) with the unifier  $\{x_2 \mapsto a, y_2 \mapsto x_3\}$  yields the resolvent

$$
\{\neg Q(x_3, f(x_3)), \neg P(x_3, y_3), \neg Q(x_3, z_3)\}\tag{4}
$$

Resolving (1) and (4) with the unifier  $\{x_3 \mapsto f(a), y_1 \mapsto f(a)\}$  yields the resolvent

$$
\{\neg P(f(a), y_3), \neg Q(f(a), z_3)\}\tag{5}
$$

Resolving (2) and (5) with the unifier  $\{x_2 \mapsto a, y_3 \mapsto g(y_2, b)\}\$  yields the resolvent

$$
\{\neg Q(y_2, f(y_2)), \neg Q(f(a), z_3)\}\tag{6}
$$

Resolving (1) and (6) with the unifier  $\{y_2 \mapsto f(a), y_1 \mapsto f(a)\}$  yields the resolvent

$$
\{\neg Q(f(a), z_3)\}\tag{7}
$$

Finally, resolving (1) and (7) with the unifier  $\{z_3 \mapsto f(y_1)\}$  yields the empty clause.

#### Exercise 9.2 Resolution clauses

For a set C of clauses, the set  $Res(C)$  is defined as the set of all clauses which can be derived from C by resolution. Find a finite clause set C such that  $Res(C)$  is infinite.

# Solution

One set of clauses is the following one:

$$
\{P(c)\}, \{\neg P(x), P(f(x))\}
$$

Resolution then produces the infinite list of resolvents  $P(f(c))$ ,  $P(f(f(c)))$ , ...

Exercise 9.3 First-order Sequent Calculus

Use the sequent calculus of first-order logic to prove the following formulas:

a) 
$$
(\forall x.P \lor Q(x)) \Rightarrow (P \lor \forall x.Q(x))
$$
  
b)  $\neg(\forall x.\exists y.\forall z.\neg P(x,z) \land P(z,y))$ 

## Solution

a)

$$
\frac{\frac{\overline{(\forall x.P \lor Q(x)), P \vdash P, Q(x)} \land x \qquad (\forall x.P \lor Q(x)), P \vdash P, Q(x)}{\forall x.P \lor Q(x)), (P \lor Q(x)) \vdash P, Q(x)} \lor L}{\forall x.P \lor Q(x) \vdash P, Q(x)}}{\forall x.P \lor Q(x) \vdash P, \forall x.Q(x)} \lor R}{\forall x.P \lor Q(x) \vdash P, \forall x.Q(x)} \lor R}{\forall x.P \lor Q(x) \vdash P \lor \forall x.Q(x)} \lor R}{\forall x.P \lor Q(x) \vdash P \lor \forall x.Q(x)} \rightarrow R
$$

b)

$$
\frac{\Gamma, \Delta, \neg P(c, c), P(c, y), P(y, y) \vdash P(c, y)}{\Gamma, \Delta, \neg P(c, c), P(c, y), \neg P(c, y), P(y, y) \vdash \bot} \neg L
$$
\n
$$
\frac{\Gamma, \Delta, \neg P(c, c), P(c, y), \neg P(c, y) \land P(y, y) \vdash \bot}{\Gamma, \Delta, \neg P(c, c), P(c, y) \vdash P(c, y) \land P(y, y) \vdash \bot} \lor L
$$
\n
$$
\frac{\Gamma, \Delta, \neg P(c, c), P(c, y) \vdash \bot}{\Gamma, \Delta, \neg P(c, c) \land P(c, y) \vdash \bot} \land L
$$
\n
$$
\frac{\Gamma, \forall z. \neg P(c, z) \land P(z, y) \vdash \bot}{\Gamma, \exists y. \forall z. \neg P(c, z) \land P(z, y) \vdash \bot} \neg L
$$
\n
$$
\frac{\forall L}{\forall x. \exists y. \forall z. \neg P(x, z) \land P(z, y) \vdash \bot} \neg R
$$

where

$$
\Gamma = \forall x. \exists y. \forall z. \neg P(x, z) \land P(z, y)
$$

$$
\Delta = \forall z. \neg P(c, z) \land P(z, y)
$$

(\*): This step works on the quantifier hidden in  $\Delta$ .

#### Exercise 9.4 Resolution and Equality

a) A monoid is an algebraic structure consisting of a set together with a binary, associative operation + and a distinguished neutral element 0. These properties can be described by the following axioms:

$$
\forall x. 0 + x = x
$$
  

$$
\forall x. x + 0 = x
$$
  

$$
\forall x. \forall y. \forall z. x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z
$$

Prove by resolution that these axioms imply  $\forall x \cdot 0 + (x + 0) = x$  in all normal models.

b) A group is a monoid with inverse elements, i.e., additional to the monoid axioms, we have the following properties:

$$
\forall x. \exists y. \, x + y = 0
$$

$$
\forall x. \exists y. \, y + x = 0
$$

Prove by resolution that every element of a group has exactly one inverse.

#### Solution

a) An algebraic proof for this proposition is the chain of equalities  $0 + (a + 0) = a + 0 = a$ where the first and second axiom. We reuse this idea in the resolution proof.

The equality and monoid laws can be translated straightforwardly into clauses:

$$
\{x = x\} \tag{1}
$$

$$
\{\neg(x=y), y=x\}
$$
 (2)

$$
\{\neg(x = y), \neg(y = z), x = z\}
$$
 (3)

$$
\{\neg (x_1 = y_1), \neg (x_2 = y_2), x_1 + x_2 = y_1 + y_2\}
$$
\n
$$
(4)
$$

$$
\{0+x=x\}\tag{5}
$$

$$
\{x+0=x\}\tag{6}
$$

$$
\{x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z\}
$$
 (7)

The conjecture corresponds to the clause  $\{0+(a+0)=a\}$ . Applying transitivity of equality (3) twice yields

$$
\{\neg(0 + (a + 0) = x), \neg(x = y), \neg(y = a)\}\
$$

Application of (5) reduces this to

$$
\{\neg (a+0=y), \neg (y=a)\}\
$$

Application of (6) then yields

$$
\{\neg(a=a)\}
$$

which, with  $(1)$ , results in the empty clause.

b) We want to show that  $\forall x.\forall y.\forall z.x + y = 0 \land x + z = 0 \Rightarrow y = z$ . The algebraic proof can be given as chain of equalities, for fixed  $a, b$  and  $c$ :

$$
b = b + 0 = b + (a + c) = (b + a) + c = 0 + c = c
$$

The resolution proof proceeds in a similar fashion as in the previous solution. Additionally to the group laws, we have two clauses representing the assumptions of the conjecture, i.e.  ${a + b = 0}$  and  ${a + c = 0}$ . The goal clause  ${\neg (b = c)}$  is expanded by transitivity of equality (3) into

$$
\{\neg (b = w), \neg (w = x), \neg (x = y), \neg (y = z), \neg (z = c)\}\
$$

Applying symmetry (2) to (6) yields  $\{x = x + 0\}$ . Using this and (5) reduces the above clause to

$$
\{\neg (b+0=x), \neg (x=y), \neg (y=0+c)\}\
$$

Application of the congruence rule (4) then yields

$$
\{\neg (b = y_1), \neg (0 = y_2), \neg (y_1 + y_2 = y), \neg (y = 0 + c)\}\
$$

Reflexivity (1) gives

$$
\{\neg(0 = y_2), \neg(b + y_2 = y), \neg(y = 0 + c)\}\
$$

With symmetry, we get  $\{0 = a + c\}$  from the second assumption. Then, we yield

$$
\{\neg(b + (a + c) = y), \neg(y = 0 + c)\}\
$$

Using congruence (4) and the first assumption on the second formula reduces this clause to

$$
\{\neg(b + (a + c) = (b + a) + c)\}\
$$

which yields the empty clause when resolving with (7).

#### Proof Rules of the Sequent Calculus:

Axioms

$$
\frac{}{\Gamma, p \vdash \Delta, p} Ax \qquad \qquad \frac{}{\Gamma, \bot \vdash \Delta} \bot L \qquad \qquad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \top} \top R
$$

Rules

$$
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, p}{\Gamma, \neg p \vdash \Delta} \neg L\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma, p \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \neg p} \neg R\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma, p, q \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \neg p} \wedge L\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, p \quad \Gamma \vdash \Delta, q}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, p \land q} \wedge R\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma, p \vdash \Delta \quad \Gamma, q \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma, p \lor q \vdash \Delta} \vee L\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, p, q}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, p \lor q} \vee R\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, p}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, p \lor q} \vee R\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, p \vdash \Delta, q}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, p \Rightarrow q} \Rightarrow R\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma, \forall x. p, p[t/x] \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma, \forall x. p \vdash \Delta} \forall L\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, p[y/x]}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \forall x. p} \forall R\n\qquad\ny \notin FV(\Gamma \cup \Delta \cup (\forall x. p))\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma, p[y/x] \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists x. p, p[t/x]} \exists R\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists x. p, p[t/x]}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists x. p. p[t/x]} \exists R\n\qquad\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists x. p, p[t/x]}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists x. p. p[t/x]} \exists R\n\qquad\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists x. p. p[t/x]}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists x. p. p[t/x]} \exists R\n\qquad\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists x. p. p[t/x]}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists x. p. p[t/x]} \exists R\n\qquad\n\qquad\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists x. p. p[t/x]}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists x. p. p[t/x]} \exists R\n\qquad\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists x. p. p[t/x]}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists x. p. p[t/x]} \exists R\n\qquad\n\qquad\n\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists
$$

 $\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \exists x . p$ 

Γ,  $\exists x.p \vdash \Delta$ 

 $y \notin FV(\Gamma \cup \Delta \cup (\exists x . p))$