

# Lecturecise 21

2013

## Example Formula in First-Order Logic

model of a formula = interpretation (structure) that makes a formula true

$$\neg \left( (\forall x. \exists y. R(x, y)) \wedge (\forall x. \forall y. (R(x, y) \Rightarrow \forall z. R(x, f(y, z)))) \wedge (\forall x. (P(x) \vee P(f(x, a)))) \Rightarrow \forall x. \exists y. (R(x, y) \wedge P(y)) \right)$$

After normal form and Skolemization we obtain these first-order clauses:

$$\begin{aligned} & R(x, g_1(x)) \\ & \neg R(x, y) \vee R(x, f(y, z)) \\ & P(x) \vee P(f(x, a)) \\ & \neg R(c_0, y) \vee \neg P(y) \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ variables are implicitly  $\forall$  quantified; there are no  $\exists$  quantifiers
- ▶ each clause is disjunction of literals (atomic formulas or their negation)
- ▶ from any model of these clauses we can obtain model for the original formula (just ignore interpretation of Skolem constants  $g_1, c_0$ )

## Applying Resolution

- 1  $R(x, g_1(x))$
- 2  $\neg R(x, y) \vee R(x, f(y, z))$
- 3  $P(x) \vee P(f(x, a))$
- 4  $\neg R(c_0, y) \vee \neg P(y)$

## Applying Resolution

- 1  $R(x, g_1(x))$
- 2  $\neg R(x, y) \vee R(x, f(y, z))$
- 3  $P(x) \vee P(f(x, a))$
- 4  $\neg R(c_0, y) \vee \neg P(y)$
- 5 (1,2):  $R(x, f(g_1(x), z))$

## Applying Resolution

- 1  $R(x, g_1(x))$
- 2  $\neg R(x, y) \vee R(x, f(y, z))$
- 3  $P(x) \vee P(f(x, a))$
- 4  $\neg R(c_0, y) \vee \neg P(y)$
- 5 (1,2):  $R(x, f(g_1(x), z))$
- 6 (1,4):  $\neg P(g_1(c_0))$

## Applying Resolution

- 1  $R(x, g_1(x))$
- 2  $\neg R(x, y) \vee R(x, f(y, z))$
- 3  $P(x) \vee P(f(x, a))$
- 4  $\neg R(c_0, y) \vee \neg P(y)$
- 5 (1,2):  $R(x, f(g_1(x), z))$
- 6 (1,4):  $\neg P(g_1(c_0))$
- 7 (3,6):  $P(f(g_1(c_0), a))$

## Applying Resolution

- 1  $R(x, g_1(x))$
- 2  $\neg R(x, y) \vee R(x, f(y, z))$
- 3  $P(x) \vee P(f(x, a))$
- 4  $\neg R(c_0, y) \vee \neg P(y)$
- 5 (1,2):  $R(x, f(g_1(x), z))$
- 6 (1,4):  $\neg P(g_1(c_0))$
- 7 (3,6):  $P(f(g_1(c_0), a))$
- 8 :  $\neg R(c_0, f(g_1(c_0), a))$

## Applying Resolution

- 1  $R(x, g_1(x))$
- 2  $\neg R(x, y) \vee R(x, f(y, z))$
- 3  $P(x) \vee P(f(x, a))$
- 4  $\neg R(c_0, y) \vee \neg P(y)$
- 5 (1,2):  $R(x, f(g_1(x), z))$
- 6 (1,4):  $\neg P(g_1(c_0))$
- 7 (3,6):  $P(f(g_1(c_0), a))$
- 8 :  $\neg R(c_0, f(g_1(c_0), a))$
- 9 :  $\emptyset$

## Applying Resolution

- 1  $R(x, g_1(x))$
- 2  $\neg R(x, y) \vee R(x, f(y, z))$
- 3  $P(x) \vee P(f(x, a))$
- 4  $\neg R(c_0, y) \vee \neg P(y)$
- 5 (1,2):  $R(x, f(g_1(x), z))$
- 6 (1,4):  $\neg P(g_1(c_0))$
- 7 (3,6):  $P(f(g_1(c_0), a))$
- 8 :  $\neg R(c_0, f(g_1(c_0), a))$
- 9 :  $\emptyset$

Proof found!