Decision Procedures

Jochen Hoenicke

Software Engineering
Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg

Summer 2012

Further route of this lecture

- Syntax and Semantics of First Order Logic (FOL)

Further route of this lecture

- Syntax and Semantics of First Order Logic (FOL)
- Semantic Tableaux for FOL

Further route of this lecture

- Syntax and Semantics of First Order Logic (FOL)
- Semantic Tableaux for FOL
- FOL is only semi-decidable

Further route of this lecture

- Syntax and Semantics of First Order Logic (FOL)
- Semantic Tableaux for FOL
- FOL is only semi-decidable

$\Longrightarrow$ Restrictions to decidable fragments of FOL

Further route of this lecture

- Syntax and Semantics of First Order Logic (FOL)
- Semantic Tableaux for FOL
- FOL is only semi-decidable

$\Longrightarrow$ Restrictions to decidable fragments of FOL

  - Quantifier Free Fragment (QFF)

Further route of this lecture

- Syntax and Semantics of First Order Logic (FOL)
- Semantic Tableaux for FOL
- FOL is only semi-decidable

$\Longrightarrow$ Restrictions to decidable fragments of FOL

  - Quantifier Free Fragment (QFF)
  - QFF of Equality

Further route of this lecture

- Syntax and Semantics of First Order Logic (FOL)
- Semantic Tableaux for FOL
- FOL is only semi-decidable

$\Longrightarrow$ Restrictions to decidable fragments of FOL

  - Quantifier Free Fragment (QFF)
  - QFF of Equality
  - Presburger arithmetic

Further route of this lecture

- Syntax and Semantics of First Order Logic (FOL)
- Semantic Tableaux for FOL
- FOL is only semi-decidable

$\Longrightarrow$ Restrictions to decidable fragments of FOL

  - Quantifier Free Fragment (QFF)
  - QFF of Equality
  - Presburger arithmetic
  - (QFF of) Linear integer arithmetic

Further route of this lecture

- Syntax and Semantics of First Order Logic (FOL)
- Semantic Tableaux for FOL
- FOL is only semi-decidable

⟹ Restrictions to decidable fragments of FOL
  - Quantifier Free Fragment (QFF)
  - QFF of Equality
  - Presburger arithmetic
  - (QFF of) Linear integer arithmetic
  - Real arithmetic

Further route of this lecture

- Syntax and Semantics of First Order Logic (FOL)
- Semantic Tableaux for FOL
- FOL is only semi-decidable

$\Longrightarrow$ Restrictions to decidable fragments of FOL

  - Quantifier Free Fragment (QFF)
  - QFF of Equality
  - Presburger arithmetic
  - (QFF of) Linear integer arithmetic
  - Real arithmetic
  - (QFF of) Linear real/rational arithmetic

Further route of this lecture

- Syntax and Semantics of First Order Logic (FOL)
- Semantic Tableaux for FOL
- FOL is only semi-decidable

$\Longrightarrow$ Restrictions to decidable fragments of FOL

  - Quantifier Free Fragment (QFF)
  - QFF of Equality
  - Presburger arithmetic
  - (QFF of) Linear integer arithmetic
  - Real arithmetic
  - (QFF of) Linear real/rational arithmetic
  - QFF of Recursive Data Structures

Further route of this lecture

- Syntax and Semantics of First Order Logic (FOL)
- Semantic Tableaux for FOL
- FOL is only semi-decidable

$\Longrightarrow$ Restrictions to decidable fragments of FOL

  - Quantifier Free Fragment (QFF)
  - QFF of Equality
  - Presburger arithmetic
  - (QFF of) Linear integer arithmetic
  - Real arithmetic
  - (QFF of) Linear real/rational arithmetic
  - QFF of Recursive Data Structures
  - QFF of Arrays

Further route of this lecture

- Syntax and Semantics of First Order Logic (FOL)
- Semantic Tableaux for FOL
- FOL is only semi-decidable

$\Longrightarrow$ Restrictions to decidable fragments of FOL

  - Quantifier Free Fragment (QFF)
  - QFF of Equality
  - Presburger arithmetic
  - (QFF of) Linear integer arithmetic
  - Real arithmetic
  - (QFF of) Linear real/rational arithmetic
  - QFF of Recursive Data Structures
  - QFF of Arrays
  - Putting it all together (Nelson-Oppen).

First-Order Logic

Syntax of First-Order Logic

Also called Predicate Logic or Predicate Calculus

FOL Syntax

variables	$x, y, z, \cdots$
constants	$a, b, c, \cdots$
functions	$f, g, h, \cdots$ with arity $n > 0$

Also called Predicate Logic or Predicate Calculus

FOL Syntax

variables	$x, y, z, \cdots$
constants	$a, b, c, \cdots$
functions	$f, g, h, \cdots$ with arity $n > 0$
terms	variables, constants or
	n-ary function applied to n terms as arguments
	$a, x, f(a), g(x, b), f(g(x, f(b)))$

Also called Predicate Logic or Predicate Calculus

FOL Syntax

variables	$x, y, z, \cdots$
constants	$a, b, c, \cdots$
functions	$f, g, h, \cdots$ with arity $n > 0$
terms	variables, constants or
	n-ary function applied to n terms as arguments
	$a, x, f(a), g(x, b), f(g(x, f(b)))$
predicates	$p, q, r, \cdots$ with arity $n \geq 0$

Syntax of First-Order Logic

Also called Predicate Logic or Predicate Calculus

FOL Syntax

variables	$x, y, z, \cdots$
constants	$a, b, c, \cdots$
functions	$f, g, h, \cdots$ with arity $n > 0$
terms	variables, constants or
	n-ary function applied to n terms as arguments
	$a, x, f(a), g(x, b), f(g(x, f(b)))$
predicates	$p, q, r, \cdots$ with arity $n \geq 0$
atom	$\top$, $\bot$, or an n-ary predicate applied to n terms
literal	atom or its negation
	$p(f(x), g(x, f(x))), \quad \neg p(f(x), g(x, f(x)))$

Note: 0-ary functions: constant

0-ary predicates: $P, Q, R, \ldots$

Syntax of First-Order Logic (2)

quantifiers

existential quantifier $\exists x.F[x]$

"there exists an x such that $F[x]$"

universal quantifier $\forall x.F[x]$

"for all x, $F[x]$"

FOL formula literal, application of logical connectives ($\neg, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow$) to formulae,
or application of a quantifier to a formula

Example

FOL formula

$$\forall x.\ \underbrace{(p(f(x),x) \rightarrow (\exists y.\ (\underbrace{p(f(g(x,y)),g(x,y))}_{G})) \wedge q(x,f(x)))}_{F}$$

The scope of $\forall x$ is F.
The scope of $\exists y$ is G.

Example

FOL formula

$$\forall x.\ \underbrace{(p(f(x),x) \rightarrow (\exists y.\ (\underbrace{p(f(g(x,y)),g(x,y))}_{G})) \wedge q(x,f(x)))}_{F}$$

The scope of $\forall x$ is F.
The scope of $\exists y$ is G.
The formula reads:
"for all x,
if $p(f(x),x)$
then there exists a y such that
$p(f(g(x,y)),g(x,y))$ and $q(x,f(x))$"

Famous theorems in FOL

- The length of one side of a triangle is less than the sum of the lengths of the other two sides

Famous theorems in FOL

- The length of one side of a triangle is less than the sum of the lengths of the other two sides

$$\forall x, y, z.\ \mathit{triangle}(x, y, z) \rightarrow \mathit{length}(x) < \mathit{length}(y) + \mathit{length}(z)$$

Famous theorems in FOL

- The length of one side of a triangle is less than the sum of the lengths of the other two sides

$$\forall x, y, z.\ \mathit{triangle}(x, y, z) \rightarrow \mathit{length}(x) < \mathit{length}(y) + \mathit{length}(z)$$

- Fermat's Last Theorem.

Famous theorems in FOL

- The length of one side of a triangle is less than the sum of the lengths of the other two sides

$$\forall x, y, z.\ triangle(x, y, z) \rightarrow length(x) < length(y) + length(z)$$

- Fermat's Last Theorem.

$$\begin{aligned}&\forall n.\ integer(n) \land n > 2\\ &\quad \rightarrow \forall x, y, z.\\ &\qquad integer(x) \land integer(y) \land integer(z)\\ &\qquad \land x > 0 \land y > 0 \land z > 0\\ &\qquad\quad \rightarrow x^n + y^n \neq z^n\end{aligned}$$

Pumping Lemma

Pumping Lemma

For every regular Language L there is some $n \geq 0$, such that for all words $z \in L$ with $|z| \geq n$ there is a decomposition $z = uvw$ with $|v| \geq 1$ and $|uv| \leq n$, such that for all $i \geq 0$: $uv^iw \in L$.

For every regular Language L there is some $n \geq 0$, such that for all words $z \in L$ with $|z| \geq n$ there is a decomposition $z = uvw$ with $|v| \geq 1$ and $|uv| \leq n$, such that for all $i \geq 0$: $uv^iw \in L$.

$$
\begin{array}{l}
\forall L.\ \mathit{regularlanguage}(L) \rightarrow \\
\quad \exists n.\ \mathit{integer}(n) \wedge n \geq 0 \wedge \\
\quad\quad \forall z.\ z \in L \wedge |z| \geq n \rightarrow \\
\quad\quad\quad \exists u, v, w.\ \mathit{word}(u) \wedge \mathit{word}(v) \wedge \mathit{word}(w) \wedge \\
\quad\quad\quad\quad z = uvw \wedge |v| \geq 1 \wedge |uv| \leq n \wedge \\
\quad\quad\quad\quad \forall i.\ \mathit{integer}(i) \wedge i \geq 0 \rightarrow uv^iw \in L
\end{array}
$$

Pumping Lemma

For every regular Language L there is some $n \geq 0$, such that for all words $z \in L$ with $|z| \geq n$ there is a decomposition $z = uvw$ with $|v| \geq 1$ and $|uv| \leq n$, such that for all $i \geq 0$: $uv^iw \in L$.

$$
\begin{array}{l}
\forall L.\ \mathit{regularlanguage}(L) \rightarrow \\
\quad \exists n.\ \mathit{integer}(n) \wedge n \geq 0 \wedge \\
\quad\quad \forall z.\ z \in L \wedge |z| \geq n \rightarrow \\
\quad\quad\quad \exists u, v, w.\ \mathit{word}(u) \wedge \mathit{word}(v) \wedge \mathit{word}(w) \wedge \\
\quad\quad\quad\quad z = uvw \wedge |v| \geq 1 \wedge |uv| \leq n \wedge \\
\quad\quad\quad\quad \forall i.\ \mathit{integer}(i) \wedge i \geq 0 \rightarrow uv^iw \in L
\end{array}
$$

Predicates: *regularlanguage*, *integer*, *word*, $\cdot \in \cdot$, $\cdot \leq \cdot$, $\cdot \geq \cdot$, $\cdot = \cdot$

For every regular Language L there is some $n \geq 0$, such that for all words $z \in L$ with $|z| \geq n$ there is a decomposition $z = uvw$ with $|v| \geq 1$ and $|uv| \leq n$, such that for all $i \geq 0$: $uv^i w \in L$.

$$
\begin{array}{l}
\forall L.\ \mathit{regularlanguage}(L) \rightarrow \\
\quad \exists n.\ \mathit{integer}(n) \wedge n \geq 0 \wedge \\
\quad\quad \forall z.\ z \in L \wedge |z| \geq n \rightarrow \\
\quad\quad\quad \exists u, v, w.\ \mathit{word}(u) \wedge \mathit{word}(v) \wedge \mathit{word}(w) \wedge \\
\quad\quad\quad\quad z = uvw \wedge |v| \geq 1 \wedge |uv| \leq n \wedge \\
\quad\quad\quad\quad \forall i.\ \mathit{integer}(i) \wedge i \geq 0 \rightarrow uv^i w \in L
\end{array}
$$

Predicates: *regularlanguage*, *integer*, *word*, $\cdot \in \cdot$, $\cdot \leq \cdot$, $\cdot \geq \cdot$, $\cdot = \cdot$
Constants: 0, 1
Functions: $|\cdot|$ (word length), concatenation, iteration

FOL Semantics

An interpretation $I : (D_I, \alpha_I)$ consists of:

- Domain D_I
  non-empty set of values or objects

FOL Semantics

An interpretation $I : (D_I, \alpha_I)$ consists of:

- Domain D_I
  non-empty set of values or objects
  for example $D_I =$ playing cards (finite),

FOL Semantics

An interpretation $I : (D_I, \alpha_I)$ consists of:

- Domain D_I
  non-empty set of values or objects
  for example $D_I =$ playing cards (finite),
  integers (countable infinite), or

FOL Semantics

An interpretation $I : (D_I, \alpha_I)$ consists of:

- Domain D_I
  non-empty set of values or objects
  for example $D_I =$ playing cards (finite),
  integers (countable infinite), or
  reals (uncountable infinite)

FOL Semantics

An interpretation $I : (D_I, \alpha_I)$ consists of:

- Domain D_I
  non-empty set of values or objects
  for example $D_I =$ playing cards (finite),
  integers (countable infinite), or
  reals (uncountable infinite)
- Assignment α_I
  - each variable x assigned value $\alpha_I[x] \in D_I$

FOL Semantics

An interpretation $I : (D_I, \alpha_I)$ consists of:

- Domain D_I

  non-empty set of values or objects

  for example $D_I =$ playing cards (finite),
  integers (countable infinite), or
  reals (uncountable infinite)

- Assignment α_I
  - each variable x assigned value $\alpha_I[x] \in D_I$
  - each n-ary function f assigned

    $$\alpha_I[f] : D_I^n \to D_I$$

    In particular, each constant a (0-ary function) assigned value $\alpha_I[a] \in D_I$

FOL Semantics

An interpretation $I : (D_I, \alpha_I)$ consists of:

- Domain D_I
  non-empty set of values or objects
  for example $D_I =$ playing cards (finite),
  integers (countable infinite), or
  reals (uncountable infinite)
- Assignment α_I
  - each variable x assigned value $\alpha_I[x] \in D_I$
  - each n-ary function f assigned

    $$\alpha_I[f] : D_I^n \to D_I$$

    In particular, each constant a (0-ary function) assigned value $\alpha_I[a] \in D_I$
  - each n-ary predicate p assigned

    $$\alpha_I[p] : D_I^n \to \{\top, \bot\}$$

    In particular, each propositional variable P (0-ary predicate) assigned truth value ($\top$, $\bot$)

Example

$$F \ : \ p(f(x,y),z) \rightarrow p(y, g(z,x))$$

Interpretation $I \ : \ (D_I, \alpha_I)$

$$D_I = \mathbb{Z} = \{\cdots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \cdots\} \quad \text{integers}$$

$$\alpha_I[f] : \ D_I^2 \rightarrow D_I \qquad\qquad \alpha_I[g] : \ D_I^2 \rightarrow D_I$$

$$(x,y) \mapsto x + y \qquad\qquad (x,y) \mapsto x - y$$

$$\alpha_I[p] : \ D_I^2 \rightarrow \{\top, \bot\}$$

$$(x,y) \mapsto \begin{cases} \top & \text{if } x < y \\ \bot & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Example

$$F : \; p(f(x,y),z) \rightarrow p(y, g(z,x))$$

Interpretation $I : (D_I, \alpha_I)$

$D_I = \mathbb{Z} = \{\cdots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \cdots\}$ integers

$\alpha_I[f] : \; D_I^2 \rightarrow D_I$, $(x,y) \mapsto x + y$ $\qquad \alpha_I[g] : \; D_I^2 \rightarrow D_I$, $(x,y) \mapsto x - y$

$$\alpha_I[p] : \; D_I^2 \rightarrow \{\top, \bot\}$$

$$(x,y) \mapsto \begin{cases} \top & \text{if } x < y \\ \bot & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Also $\alpha_I[x] = 13, \alpha_I[y] = 42, \alpha_I[z] = 1$

Compute the truth value of F under I

Example

$$F\ :\ p(f(x,y),z) \rightarrow p(y,g(z,x))$$

Interpretation $I\ :\ (D_I, \alpha_I)$

$$D_I = \mathbb{Z} = \{\cdots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \cdots\} \quad \text{integers}$$

$$\alpha_I[f] :\ D_I^2 \rightarrow D_I \qquad \alpha_I[g] :\ D_I^2 \rightarrow D_I$$

$$(x,y) \mapsto x + y \qquad (x,y) \mapsto x - y$$

$$\alpha_I[p] :\ D_I^2 \rightarrow \{\top, \bot\}$$

$$(x,y) \mapsto \begin{cases} \top & \text{if } x < y \\ \bot & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Also $\alpha_I[x] = 13, \alpha_I[y] = 42, \alpha_I[z] = 1$

Compute the truth value of F under I

1. $I \not\models p(f(x,y),z)$ since $13 + 42 \geq 1$
2. $I \not\models p(y,g(z,x))$ since $42 \geq 1 - 13$
3. $I \models F$ by 1, 2, and $\rightarrow$

F is true under I

Semantics: Quantifiers

For a variable x:

Definition (x-variant)

An x-variant of interpretation I is an interpretation $J : (D_J, \alpha_J)$ such that

- $D_I = D_J$
- $\alpha_I[y] = \alpha_J[y]$ for all symbols y, except possibly x

That is, I and J agree on everything except possibly the value of x

For a variable x:

Definition (x-variant)

An x-variant of interpretation I is an interpretation $J : (D_J, \alpha_J)$ such that

- $D_I = D_J$
- $\alpha_I[y] = \alpha_J[y]$ for all symbols y, except possibly x

That is, I and J agree on everything except possibly the value of x

Denote $J : \ I \triangleleft \{x \mapsto \mathsf{v}\}$ the x-variant of I in which $\alpha_J[x] = \mathsf{v}$ for some $\mathsf{v} \in D_I$.

Semantics: Quantifiers

For a variable x:

Definition (x-variant)

An x-variant of interpretation I is an interpretation $J : (D_J, \alpha_J)$ such that

- $D_I = D_J$
- $\alpha_I[y] = \alpha_J[y]$ for all symbols y, except possibly x

That is, I and J agree on everything except possibly the value of x

Denote $J : I \triangleleft \{x \mapsto \mathsf{v}\}$ the x-variant of I in which $\alpha_J[x] = \mathsf{v}$ for some $\mathsf{v} \in D_I$. Then

- $I \models \forall x.\ F$ iff for all $\mathsf{v} \in D_I$, $I \triangleleft \{x \mapsto \mathsf{v}\} \models F$
- $I \models \exists x.\ F$ iff there exists $\mathsf{v} \in D_I$ s.t. $I \triangleleft \{x \mapsto \mathsf{v}\} \models F$

Example

Consider

$$F : \forall x.\ \exists y.\ 2 \cdot y = x$$

Here $2 \cdot y$ is the infix notatation of the term $\cdot(2, y)$,
and $2 \cdot y = x$ is the infix notatation of the atom $= (\cdot(2, y), x)$.

- 2 is a 0-ary function symbol (a constant).
- $\cdot$ is a 2-ary function symbol.
- $=$ is a 2-ary predicate symbol.
- x, y are variables.

Example

Consider

$$F : \forall x.\ \exists y.\ 2 \cdot y = x$$

Here $2 \cdot y$ is the infix notatation of the term $\cdot(2, y)$,
and $2 \cdot y = x$ is the infix notatation of the atom $= (\cdot(2, y), x)$.

- 2 is a 0-ary function symbol (a constant).
- $\cdot$ is a 2-ary function symbol.
- $=$ is a 2-ary predicate symbol.
- x, y are variables.

What is the truth-value of F?

Example ($\mathbb{Z}$)

UNI FREIBURG

$$F : \forall x.\, \exists y.\, 2 \cdot y = x$$

Let I be the standard interpration for integers, $D_I = \mathbb{Z}$.
Compute the value of F under I:

Example ($\mathbb{Z}$)

$$F : \forall x.\, \exists y.\, 2 \cdot y = x$$

Let I be the standard interpration for integers, $D_I = \mathbb{Z}$.
Compute the value of F under I:

$$I \models \forall x.\, \exists y.\, 2 \cdot y = x$$

iff

$$\text{for all v} \in D_I,\ I \triangleleft \{x \mapsto \text{v}\} \models \exists y.\, 2 \cdot y = x$$

iff

for all v $\in D_I$, there exists $\text{v}_1 \in D_I$, $I \triangleleft \{x \mapsto \text{v}\} \triangleleft \{y \mapsto \text{v}_1\} \models 2 \cdot y = x$

The latter is false since for $1 \in D_I$ there is no number v_1 with $2 \cdot v_1 = 1$.

Example ($\mathbb{Q}$)

$$F : \forall x.\ \exists y.\ 2 \cdot y = x$$

Let I be the standard interpration for rational numbers, $D_I = \mathbb{Q}$.
Compute the value of F under I:

Example ($\mathbb{Q}$)

$$F : \forall x.\, \exists y.\, 2 \cdot y = x$$

Let I be the standard interpration for rational numbers, $D_I = \mathbb{Q}$.
Compute the value of F under I:

$$I \models \forall x.\, \exists y.\, 2 \cdot y = x$$

iff

$$\text{for all } \mathsf{v} \in D_I,\ I \triangleleft \{x \mapsto \mathsf{v}\} \models \exists y.\, 2 \cdot y = x$$

iff

for all $\mathsf{v} \in D_I$, there exists $\mathsf{v}_1 \in D_I$, $I \triangleleft \{x \mapsto \mathsf{v}\} \triangleleft \{y \mapsto \mathsf{v}_1\} \models 2 \cdot y = x$

The latter is true since for $\mathsf{v} \in D_I$ we can choose $\mathsf{v}_1 = \frac{\mathsf{v}}{2}$.

Satisfiability and Validity

Definition (Satisfiability)

F is satisfiable iff there exists an interpretation I such that $I \models F$.

Definition (Validity)

F is valid iff for all interpretations I, $I \models F$.

Satisfiability and Validity

Definition (Satisfiability)

F is satisfiable iff there exists an interpretation I such that $I \models F$.

Definition (Validity)

F is valid iff for all interpretations I, $I \models F$.

Note

F is valid iff $\neg F$ is unsatisfiable

Substitution

Suppose, we want to replace terms with other terms in formulas, e.g.

$$F \;:\; \forall y.\; (p(x, y) \rightarrow p(y, x))$$

should be transformed to

$$G \;:\; \forall y.\; (p(a, y) \rightarrow p(y, a))$$

Substitution

Suppose, we want to replace terms with other terms in formulas, e.g.

$$F\ :\ \forall y.\ (p(x,y) \rightarrow p(y,x))$$

should be transformed to

$$G\ :\ \forall y.\ (p(a,y) \rightarrow p(y,a))$$

We call the mapping from x to a a substituion denoted as $\sigma\ :\ \{x \mapsto a\}$.

Substitution

Suppose, we want to replace terms with other terms in formulas, e.g.

$$F \ : \forall y.\ (p(x,y) \rightarrow p(y,x))$$

should be transformed to

$$G \ : \forall y.\ (p(a,y) \rightarrow p(y,a))$$

We call the mapping from x to a a substituion denoted as $\sigma : \{x \mapsto a\}$.
We write $F\sigma$ for the formula G.

Substitution

Suppose, we want to replace terms with other terms in formulas, e.g.

$$F : \forall y.\ (p(x, y) \rightarrow p(y, x))$$

should be transformed to

$$G : \forall y.\ (p(a, y) \rightarrow p(y, a))$$

We call the mapping from x to a a substituion denoted as $\sigma : \{x \mapsto a\}$.
We write $F\sigma$ for the formula G.
Another convenient notation is $F[x]$ for a formula containing the variable x and $F[a]$ for $F\sigma$.

Substitution

Definition (Substitution)

A substitution is a mapping from terms to terms, e.g.

$$\sigma : \{t_1 \mapsto s_1, \dots, t_n \mapsto s_n\}$$

By $F\sigma$ we denote the application of σ to formula F, i.e., the formula F where all occurences of $t_1, \dots, t_n$ are replaced by $s_1, \dots, s_n$.

For a formula named $F[x]$ we write $F[t]$ as shorthand for $F[x]\{x \mapsto t\}$.

Safe Substitution

Care has to be taken in the presence of quantifiers:

$$F[x] \,:\, \exists y.\; y = Succ(x)$$

What is $F[y]$?

Safe Substitution

Care has to be taken in the presence of quantifiers:

$$F[x] : \exists y.\ y = Succ(x)$$

What is $F[y]$?
We need to rename bounded variables occuring in the substitution:

$$F[y] : \exists y'.\ y' = Succ(y)$$

Safe Substitution

Care has to be taken in the presence of quantifiers:

$$F[x] : \exists y.\ y = Succ(x)$$

What is $F[y]$?
We need to rename bounded variables occuring in the substitution:

$$F[y] : \exists y'.\ y' = Succ(y)$$

Bounded renaming does not change the models of a formula:

$$(\exists y.\ y = Succ(x)) \Leftrightarrow (\exists y'.\ y' = Succ(x))$$

Recursive Definition of Substitution

$$t\sigma = \begin{cases} \sigma(t) & t \in \mathrm{dom}(\sigma) \\ f(t_1\sigma, \ldots, t_n\sigma) & t \notin \mathrm{dom}(\sigma) \land t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \\ x & t \notin \mathrm{dom}(\sigma) \land t = x \end{cases}$$

$$p(t_1, \ldots, t_n)\sigma = p(t_1\sigma, \ldots, t_n\sigma)$$

$$(\neg F)\sigma = \neg(F\sigma)$$

$$(F \land G)\sigma = (F\sigma) \land (G\sigma)$$

$$\ldots$$

$$(\forall x.\ F)\sigma = \begin{cases} \forall x.\ F\sigma & x \notin \mathit{Vars}(\sigma) \\ \forall x'.\ ((F\{x \mapsto x'\})\sigma) & \text{otherwise and } x' \text{ is fresh} \end{cases}$$

$$(\exists x.\ F)\sigma = \begin{cases} \exists x.\ F\sigma & x \notin \mathit{Vars}(\sigma) \\ \exists x'.\ ((F\{x \mapsto x'\})\sigma) & \text{otherwise and } x' \text{ is fresh} \end{cases}$$

$$F\ :\ (\forall x.\ p(x, y)) \rightarrow\ q(f(y),\ x)$$

bound by $\forall x \nearrow$ $\nwarrow$ free free $\nearrow$ $\nwarrow$ free

$$\sigma\ :\ \{x \mapsto g(x),\ y \mapsto f(x),\ f(y) \mapsto h(x, y)\}$$

$F\sigma$?

Example: Safe Substitution $F\sigma$

$$F : (\forall x.\ p(x, y)) \rightarrow q(f(y), x)$$

bound by $\forall x$ ↗ ↖ free free ↗ ↖ free

$$\sigma : \{x \mapsto g(x),\ y \mapsto f(x),\ f(y) \mapsto h(x, y)\}$$

$F\sigma$?

1. Rename

$$F' : \forall x'.\ p(x', y) \rightarrow q(f(y), x)$$

↑ ↑

where x' is a fresh variable

2. $F\sigma : \forall x'.\ p(x', f(x)) \rightarrow q(h(x, y), g(x))$

Semantic Tableaux

Recall rules from propositional logic:

$$\frac{I \models \neg F}{I \not\models F} \qquad \frac{I \not\models \neg F}{I \models F}$$

$$\frac{I \models F \wedge G}{\begin{array}{l} I \models F \\ I \models G \end{array}} \leftarrow \text{and} \qquad \frac{I \not\models F \wedge G}{I \not\models F \mid I \not\models G} \ (\mid \ \nwarrow \text{or})$$

$$\frac{I \models F \vee G}{I \models F \mid I \models G} \qquad \frac{I \not\models F \vee G}{\begin{array}{l} I \not\models F \\ I \not\models G \end{array}}$$

$$\frac{I \models F \rightarrow G}{I \not\models F \mid I \models G} \qquad \frac{I \not\models F \rightarrow G}{\begin{array}{l} I \models F \\ I \not\models G \end{array}}$$

$$\frac{I \models F \leftrightarrow G}{I \models F \wedge G \mid I \not\models F \vee G} \qquad \frac{I \not\models F \leftrightarrow G}{I \models F \wedge \neg G \mid I \models \neg F \wedge G}$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} I \models F \\ I \not\models F \end{array}}{I \models \bot}$$

Semantic Tableaux for FOL

The following additional rules are used for quantifiers:

$$\frac{I \models \forall x. F[x]}{I \models F[t]} \text{ for any term } t \qquad \frac{I \not\models \forall x. F[x]}{I \not\models F[a]} \text{ for a fresh constant } a$$

$$\frac{I \models \exists x. F[x]}{I \models F[a]} \text{ for a fresh constant } a \qquad \frac{I \not\models \exists x. F[x]}{I \not\models F[t]} \text{ for any term } t$$

(We assume that there are infinitely many constant symbols.)

The formula $F[t]$ is created from the formula $F[x]$ by the substitution $\{x \mapsto t\}$ (roughly, replace every x by t).

Example

Show that $(\exists x.\ \forall y.\ p(x, y)) \to (\forall x.\ \exists y.\ p(y, x))$ is valid.

Example

Show that $(\exists x.\ \forall y.\ p(x,y)) \rightarrow (\forall x.\ \exists y.\ p(y,x))$ is valid.

Assume otherwise.

1.	$I \not\models (\exists x.\ \forall y.\ p(x,y)) \rightarrow (\forall x.\ \exists y.\ p(y,x))$	assumption
2.	$I \models \exists x.\ \forall y.\ p(x,y)$	1 and $\rightarrow$
3.	$I \not\models \forall x.\ \exists y.\ p(y,x)$	1 and $\rightarrow$
4.	$I \models \forall y.\ p(a,y)$	2, $\exists$ ($x \mapsto a$ fresh)
5.	$I \not\models \exists y.\ p(y,b)$	3, $\forall$ ($x \mapsto b$ fresh)
6.	$I \models p(a,b)$	4, $\forall$ ($y \mapsto b$)
7.	$I \not\models p(a,b)$	5, $\exists$ ($y \mapsto a$)
8.	$I \models \bot$	6,7 contradictory

Thus, the formula is valid.

Example

Is $F \; : \; (\forall x.\ p(x,x)) \rightarrow (\exists x.\ \forall y.\ p(x,y))$ valid?.

Example

Is F : $(\forall x.\ p(x,x)) \rightarrow (\exists x.\ \forall y.\ p(x,y))$ valid?.

Assume I is a falsifying interpretation for F and apply semantic argument:

1.	$I \not\models (\forall x.\ p(x,x)) \rightarrow (\exists x.\ \forall y.\ p(x,y))$	
2.	$I \models \forall x.\ p(x,x)$	1 and $\rightarrow$
3.	$I \not\models \exists x.\ \forall y.\ p(x,y)$	1 and $\rightarrow$
4.	$I \models p(a_1,a_1)$	2, $\forall$
5.	$I \not\models \forall y. p(a_1,y)$	3, $\exists$
6.	$I \not\models p(a_1,a_2)$	5, $\forall$
7.	$I \models p(a_2,a_2)$	2, $\forall$
8.	$I \not\models \forall y. p(a_2,y)$	3, $\exists$
9.	$I \not\models p(a_2,a_3)$	8, $\forall$

$\vdots$

No contradiction.

Example

Is F : $(\forall x.\ p(x,x)) \rightarrow (\exists x.\ \forall y.\ p(x,y))$ valid?.

Assume I is a falsifying interpretation for F and apply semantic argument:

1.	$I \not\models (\forall x.\ p(x,x)) \rightarrow (\exists x.\ \forall y.\ p(x,y))$	
2.	$I \models \forall x.\ p(x,x)$	1 and $\rightarrow$
3.	$I \not\models \exists x.\ \forall y.\ p(x,y)$	1 and $\rightarrow$
4.	$I \models p(a_1,a_1)$	2, $\forall$
5.	$I \not\models \forall y. p(a_1,y)$	3, $\exists$
6.	$I \not\models p(a_1,a_2)$	5, $\forall$
7.	$I \models p(a_2,a_2)$	2, $\forall$
8.	$I \not\models \forall y. p(a_2,y)$	3, $\exists$
9.	$I \not\models p(a_2,a_3)$	8, $\forall$

$\vdots$

No contradiction. Falsifying interpretation I can be "read" from proof:

$$D_I = \mathbb{N}, \quad p_I(x,y) = \begin{cases} \text{true} & y = x, \\ \text{false} & y = x+1, \\ \text{arbitrary} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Semantic Argument Proof

To show FOL formula F is valid, assume $I \not\models F$ and derive a contradiction $I \models \bot$ in all branches

Semantic Argument Proof

To show FOL formula F is valid, assume $I \not\models F$ and derive a contradiction $I \models \bot$ in all branches

- Soundness
  If every branch of a semantic argument proof reach $I \models \bot$, then F is valid

Semantic Argument Proof

To show FOL formula F is valid, assume $I \not\models F$ and derive a contradiction $I \models \bot$ in all branches

- Soundness
  If every branch of a semantic argument proof reach $I \models \bot$, then F is valid
- Completeness
  Each valid formula F has a semantic argument proof in which every branch reach $I \models \bot$

To show FOL formula F is valid, assume $I \not\models F$ and derive a contradiction $I \models \bot$ in all branches

- Soundness
  If every branch of a semantic argument proof reach $I \models \bot$, then F is valid
- Completeness
  Each valid formula F has a semantic argument proof in which every branch reach $I \models \bot$
- Non-termination
  For an invalid formula F the method is not guaranteed to terminate.
  Thus, the semantic argument is not a decision procedure for validity.

Soundness (proof sketch)

If for interpretation I the assumption of the proof hold
then there is an interpretation I' and a branch
such that all statements on that branch hold.

Soundness (proof sketch)

If for interpretation I the assumption of the proof hold
then there is an interpretation I' and a branch
such that all statements on that branch hold.

I' differs from I in the values $\alpha_I[a_i]$ of fresh constants a_i.

Soundness (proof sketch)

If for interpretation I the assumption of the proof hold
then there is an interpretation I' and a branch
such that all statements on that branch hold.

I' differs from I in the values $\alpha_I[a_i]$ of fresh constants a_i.

If all branches of the proof end with $I \models \bot$, then the assumption was wrong.

Soundness (proof sketch)

If for interpretation I the assumption of the proof hold
then there is an interpretation I' and a branch
such that all statements on that branch hold.

I' differs from I in the values $\alpha_I[a_i]$ of fresh constants a_i.

If all branches of the proof end with $I \models \bot$, then the assumption was wrong. Thus, if the assumption was $I \not\models F$, then F must be valid.

Completeness (proof sketch)

Consider (finite or infinite) proof trees starting with $I \not\models F$. We assume that

- all possible proof rules were applied in all non-closed branches.
- the $\forall$ and $\exists$ rules were applied for all terms.
  This is possible since the terms are countable.

If every branch is closed, the tree is finite (Kőnig's Lemma) and we have a finite proof for F.

Completeness (proof sketch, continued)

Otherwise, the proof tree has at least one open branch P. We show that F is not valid.

Completeness (proof sketch, continued)

Otherwise, the proof tree has at least one open branch P. We show that F is not valid.

1. The statements on that branch P form a Hintikka set:
   - $I \models F \wedge G \in P$ implies $I \models F \in P$ and $I \models G \in P$.
   - $I \not\models F \wedge G \in P$ implies $I \not\models F \in P$ or $I \not\models G \in P$.
   - $I \models \forall x.\ F[x] \in P$ implies for all terms t, $I \models F[t] \in P$.
   - $I \not\models \forall x.\ F[x] \in P$ implies for some term a, $I \not\models F[a] \in P$.
   - Similarly for $\vee, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow, \exists$.

Completeness (proof sketch, continued)

Otherwise, the proof tree has at least one open branch P. We show that F is not valid.

1. The statements on that branch P form a Hintikka set:
   - $I \models F \wedge G \in P$ implies $I \models F \in P$ and $I \models G \in P$.
   - $I \not\models F \wedge G \in P$ implies $I \not\models F \in P$ or $I \not\models G \in P$.
   - $I \models \forall x.\ F[x] \in P$ implies for all terms t, $I \models F[t] \in P$.
   - $I \not\models \forall x.\ F[x] \in P$ implies for some term a, $I \not\models F[a] \in P$.
   - Similarly for $\vee, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow, \exists$.
2. Choose $D_I := \{t \mid t \text{ is term}\}$, $\alpha_I[f](t_1, \ldots, t_n) = f(t_1, \ldots t_n)$,

$$\alpha_I[x] = x, \quad \alpha_I[p](t_1, \ldots, t_n) = \begin{cases} \text{true} & I \models p(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in P \\ \text{false} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Completeness (proof sketch, continued)

Otherwise, the proof tree has at least one open branch P. We show that F is not valid.

1. The statements on that branch P form a Hintikka set:
   - $I \models F \wedge G \in P$ implies $I \models F \in P$ and $I \models G \in P$.
   - $I \not\models F \wedge G \in P$ implies $I \not\models F \in P$ or $I \not\models G \in P$.
   - $I \models \forall x.\ F[x] \in P$ implies for all terms t, $I \models F[t] \in P$.
   - $I \not\models \forall x.\ F[x] \in P$ implies for some term a, $I \not\models F[a] \in P$.
   - Similarly for $\vee, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow, \exists$.
2. Choose $D_I := \{t \mid t \text{ is term}\}$, $\alpha_I[f](t_1, \ldots, t_n) = f(t_1, \ldots t_n)$,

$$\alpha_I[x] = x, \quad \alpha_I[p](t_1, \ldots, t_n) = \begin{cases} \text{true} & I \models p(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in P \\ \text{false} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

3. I satisfies all statements on the branch.
   In particular, I is a falsifying interpretation of F, thus F is not valid.

Normal Forms

Also in first-order logic normal forms can be used:

- Devise an algorithm to convert a formula to a normal form.
- Then devise an algorithm for satisfiability/validity that only works on the normal form.

Negation Normal Forms (NNF)

Negations appear only in literals. (only $\neg, \wedge, \vee, \exists, \forall$)

To transform F to equivalent F' in NNF use recursively the following template equivalences (left-to-right):

$$\neg\neg F_1 \Leftrightarrow F_1 \qquad \neg\top \Leftrightarrow \bot \qquad \neg\bot \Leftrightarrow \top$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\neg(F_1 \wedge F_2) \Leftrightarrow \neg F_1 \vee \neg F_2 \\ \neg(F_1 \vee F_2) \Leftrightarrow \neg F_1 \wedge \neg F_2\end{array}\right\}\text{De Morgan's Law}$$

$$F_1 \rightarrow F_2 \Leftrightarrow \neg F_1 \vee F_2$$

$$F_1 \leftrightarrow F_2 \Leftrightarrow (F_1 \rightarrow F_2) \wedge (F_2 \rightarrow F_1)$$

Negation Normal Forms (NNF)

Negations appear only in literals. (only $\neg, \wedge, \vee, \exists, \forall$)

To transform F to equivalent F' in NNF use recursively
the following template equivalences (left-to-right):

$$\neg\neg F_1 \Leftrightarrow F_1 \qquad \neg\top \Leftrightarrow \bot \qquad \neg\bot \Leftrightarrow \top$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} \neg(F_1 \wedge F_2) \Leftrightarrow \neg F_1 \vee \neg F_2 \\ \neg(F_1 \vee F_2) \Leftrightarrow \neg F_1 \wedge \neg F_2 \end{array}\right\}\text{De Morgan's Law}$$

$$F_1 \rightarrow F_2 \Leftrightarrow \neg F_1 \vee F_2$$
$$F_1 \leftrightarrow F_2 \Leftrightarrow (F_1 \rightarrow F_2) \wedge (F_2 \rightarrow F_1)$$

$$\neg\forall x.\ F[x] \Leftrightarrow \exists x.\ \neg F[x]$$
$$\neg\exists x.\ F[x] \Leftrightarrow \forall x.\ \neg F[x]$$

Example: Conversion to NNF

$$G : \forall x. \ (\exists y. \ p(x, y) \wedge p(x, z)) \rightarrow \exists w. p(x, w) \ .$$

Example: Conversion to NNF

$$G \; : \; \forall x.\ (\exists y.\ p(x,y) \wedge p(x,z)) \rightarrow \exists w. p(x,w)\ .$$

1. $\forall x.\ (\exists y.\ p(x,y) \wedge p(x,z)) \rightarrow \exists w.\ p(x,w)$
2. $\forall x.\ \neg(\exists y.\ p(x,y) \wedge p(x,z)) \vee \exists w.\ p(x,w)$

   $F_1 \rightarrow F_2 \Leftrightarrow \neg F_1 \vee F_2$

3. $\forall x.\ (\forall y.\ \neg(p(x,y) \wedge p(x,z))) \vee \exists w.\ p(x,w)$

   $\neg\exists x.\ F[x] \Leftrightarrow \forall x.\ \neg F[x]$

4. $\forall x.\ (\forall y.\ \neg p(x,y) \vee \neg p(x,z)) \vee \exists w.\ p(x,w)$

Prenex Normal Form (PNF)

All quantifiers appear at the beginning of the formula

$$Q_1 x_1 \cdots Q_n x_n.\ F[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$$

where $Q_i \in \{\forall, \exists\}$ and F is quantifier-free.

Every FOL formula F can be transformed to formula F' in PNF s.t. $F' \Leftrightarrow F$:

Prenex Normal Form (PNF)

All quantifiers appear at the beginning of the formula

$$Q_1 x_1 \cdots Q_n x_n.\ F[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$$

where $Q_i \in \{\forall, \exists\}$ and F is quantifier-free.

Every FOL formula F can be transformed to formula F' in PNF s.t. $F' \Leftrightarrow F$:

1. Write F in NNF

Prenex Normal Form (PNF)

All quantifiers appear at the beginning of the formula

$$Q_1 x_1 \cdots Q_n x_n.\ F[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$$

where $Q_i \in \{\forall, \exists\}$ and F is quantifier-free.

Every FOL formula F can be transformed to formula F' in PNF s.t. $F' \Leftrightarrow F$:

1. Write F in NNF
2. Rename quantified variables to fresh names

Prenex Normal Form (PNF)

All quantifiers appear at the beginning of the formula

$$Q_1 x_1 \cdots Q_n x_n.\ F[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$$

where $Q_i \in \{\forall, \exists\}$ and F is quantifier-free.

Every FOL formula F can be transformed to formula F' in PNF s.t. $F' \Leftrightarrow F$:

1. Write F in NNF
2. Rename quantified variables to fresh names
3. Move all quantifiers to the front

Example: PNF

Find equivalent PNF of

$$F \ : \ \forall x.\ ((\exists y.\ p(x,y) \wedge p(x,z)) \rightarrow \exists y.\ p(x,y))$$

Example: PNF

Find equivalent PNF of

$$F \ : \ \forall x.\ ((\exists y.\ p(x,y) \land p(x,z)) \rightarrow \exists y.\ p(x,y))$$

- Write F in NNF

$$F_1 \ : \ \forall x.\ (\forall y.\ \neg p(x,y) \lor \neg p(x,z)) \lor \exists y.\ p(x,y)$$

- Rename quantified variables to fresh names

$$F_2 \ : \ \forall x.\ (\forall y.\ \neg p(x,y) \lor \neg p(x,z)) \lor \exists w.\ p(x,w)$$

$\uparrow$ in the scope of $\forall x$

Example: PNF

- Move all quantifiers to the front

$$F_3 \;:\; \forall x.\, \forall y.\, \exists w.\, \neg p(x,y) \lor \neg p(x,z) \lor p(x,w)$$

Alternately,

$$F_3' \;:\; \forall x.\, \exists w.\, \forall y.\, \neg p(x,y) \lor \neg p(x,z) \lor p(x,w)$$

Note: In F_2, $\forall y$ is in the scope of $\forall x$, therefore the order of quantifiers must be $\cdots \forall x \cdots \forall y \cdots$

$$\boxed{F_4 \Leftrightarrow F \text{ and } F_4' \Leftrightarrow F}$$

Note: However $G \;\not\Leftrightarrow\; F$

$$G \;:\; \forall y.\, \exists w.\, \forall x.\, \neg p(x,y) \lor \neg p(x,z) \lor p(x,w)$$

Decidability of FOL

Decidability of FOL

- FOL is undecidable (Turing & Church)
  There does not exist an algorithm for deciding if a FOL formula F is valid, i.e. always halt and says "yes" if F is valid or say "no" if F is invalid.

Decidability of FOL

- FOL is undecidable (Turing & Church)
  There does not exist an algorithm for deciding if a FOL formula F is valid, i.e. always halt and says "yes" if F is valid or say "no" if F is invalid.
- FOL is semi-decidable
  There is a procedure that always halts and says "yes" if F is valid, but may not halt if F is invalid.

Decidability of FOL

- FOL is undecidable (Turing & Church)
  There does not exist an algorithm for deciding if a FOL formula F is valid, i.e. always halt and says "yes" if F is valid or say "no" if F is invalid.
- FOL is semi-decidable
  There is a procedure that always halts and says "yes" if F is valid, but may not halt if F is invalid.

On the other hand,

- PL is decidable
  There exists an algorithm for deciding if a PL formula F is valid, e.g., the truth-table procedure.

Similarly for satisfiability