

# Logic for Computer Science

Summer Semester  
2019-2020

## LECTURE 10:

Decidable theories  
&  
quantifier elimination

Lectures : LORENZO CLEMENTE

Tutorials : DARIA WALUKIEWICZ, JACEK CHRZASZCZ,  
JĘDRZEJ KOŁODZIEJSKI

Labs : DARIA, JACEK + PIOTR WOJTAN

# SUMMARY

- logical theories (axiomatic theories, theory of a structure).
- The decision problem of a Theory.
- Undecidability (next time).
- Decidable theories.
- Finite model property.
- Elimination of quantifiers.
  - Examples of theories with quantifier elimination.
  - Quantifier elimination for  $(\mathbb{Q}, \leq)$ .
  - Consequences of quantifier elimination.

# THEORIES

A **Theory** is a set of sentences  $\Gamma$  closed w.r.t. logical consequence:  
 $\Gamma \models \varphi$  implies  $\varphi \in \Gamma$ .

A Theory  $\Gamma$  is **complete** if for every  $\varphi$ ,  $\varphi \in \Gamma$  or  $\neg\varphi \in \Gamma$ .

How to define a Theory?

1) From syntax (formulas):

Axiomatic Theory of a set of axioms  $\Delta$ :  $\text{Th}(\Delta) := \{\varphi \mid \Delta \models \varphi\}$ .

Sometimes complete, sometimes incomplete.

2) From semantics (structures):

Theory of a structure  $\mathcal{A}$ :  $\text{Th}(\mathcal{A}) = \{\varphi \mid \mathcal{A} \models \varphi\}$ .

Always complete!

## EXAMPLES : THEORIES from SYNTAX (AXIOMATIC TH.)

Theory of dense total orders with no endpoints (DLO).  $\Sigma = \{\leq\}$ .  
linear

$\Delta_{\text{DLO}} = \{\text{reflexivity, transitivity, density, no max/min}\}.$

Sometimes infinitely many axioms are required :

$\Delta_\infty = \{\text{size} >_1, \text{size} >_2, \dots\}, \Sigma = \{=\}$ : Theory of infinite structures.

$\Delta_{\text{RCF}} = \{\text{ordered fields, } \forall x >_0 \exists y \cdot y^2 = x\} \cup \{\varphi_1, \varphi_3, \varphi_5, \dots\},$

$\Sigma = \{0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq\}$ ,  $\varphi_m = \text{every polynomial of degree } m \text{ has a root}$ : Theory of real closed fields.

$\Delta_{\text{FO}} = \{\varphi \mid \vdash \varphi\}$ : sentences provable in Hilbert's proof system.

By soundness & completeness,  $\text{Th}(\Delta_{\text{FO}}) = \Delta_{\text{FO}} = \{\varphi \mid \models \varphi\}$  valid sentences  
(True in every structure).

# EXAMPLES: THEORIES from SEMANTICS (STRUCTURES)

$\text{Th}(\mathbb{A}, =)$  : first order theory of an infinite set with equality.  $= \text{Th}(\Delta_\infty)$

$\text{Th}(\mathbb{Q}, \leq)$  : first-order theory of the rationals with order.  $= \text{Th}(\Delta_{\text{DLO}})$

$\text{Th}(\mathbb{Q}, +)$  : additive theory of the rationals.

$\text{Th}(\mathbb{Q}, \cdot)$  : Skolem arithmetic.

$\text{Th}(\mathbb{N}, +)$  : Presburger arithmetic.

$\text{Th}(\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot)$  : Tarski algebra.  $= \text{Th}(\Delta_{\text{RCF}})$

$\text{Th}(\Sigma^*, \cdot)$  : Theory of the free monoid (finite words).

:

(The theory of a structure is complete by definition.)

# THE DECISION PROBLEM

for a Theory  $\Gamma$  over  $\Sigma$ .

(ENTScheidungsproblem)

INPUT: a sentence  $\varphi$  over vocabulary  $\Sigma$ .

OUTPUT: YES iff  $\varphi \in \Gamma$ .

$\Rightarrow$  The central problem in Mathematical logic (Hilbert/Ackermann '28)

THEOREM (Church '36, Turing '37)

The validity problem for first-order logic is undecidable.

(but recursively enumerable thanks to Gödel's completeness theorem)

THEOREM (Trakhtenbrot '50)

The finite satisfiability problem is undecidable.

(but obviously recursively enumerable)

# DECIDABLE THEORIES

( $\varphi$  valid  $\Leftrightarrow$  unsatisfiable  $\neg\varphi$ )

Two Techniques to obtain decidability :

1) Finite model property (Satisfiable  $\Rightarrow$  finitely satisfiable).

Algorithm to decide validity of  $\varphi$  :

Semiprocedure 1 : enumerate proofs. } Terminates thanks  
Semiprocedure 2 : enumerate models. } to completeness + FMP.

2) Effective elimination of quantifiers.

Idea : Convert  $\varphi$  to an equivalent quantifier-free  $\psi$ .

If  $\varphi$  is a sentence (no free variables),

then  $\psi$  is even variable free and can often be checked directly.

# DECIDABLE FRAGMENTS ZOO (with equality)

- Monadic first-order logic (döwenheim'15)  
(Only unary predicates; no equality, no functions).
- $\exists^* \forall^*$  fragment (Brouwer, Schönfinkel '28; Ramsey '30 with eq.)
- $\exists^* \forall \exists^*$  fragment (no eq. Ackermann '28; '54 with eq.)
- $\exists^* \forall^2 \exists^*$  fragment, no equality (Gödel '32)

Tight: SAT for  $\forall \exists \forall$  and  $\forall \exists$  is undecidable

without eq. (Sváeny '50; Kohn, Moon, Wang '62),

and  $\exists^* \forall^2 \exists^*$  with eq. (Golomb '84).

- $\text{FO}^2$ : 2 variable fragment (Scott '62, Mortimer '75)

Tight:  $\text{FO}^3$  undecidable

- Guarded fragment, guarded negation fragment, ...

FINITE  
MODEL  
PROPERTY

# QUANTIFIER ELIMINATION

$$\varphi(a, b, c) \equiv \exists x. \ ax^2 + bx + c = 0 \quad (\text{over } \mathbb{R})$$

Can we find a quantifier-free formula  $\psi(a, b, c)$  equivalent to  $\varphi$ ?

$$\psi(a, b, c) = (a = 0 \wedge (c = 0 \vee b \neq 0)) \vee (a \neq 0 \wedge b^2 - 4ac \geq 0)$$

Tarski-Seidenberg

$\text{Th}(\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot, 0, 1, \leq)$  has effective elimination of quantifiers.

⇒ There are q.f. equivalents of (!)

$$\exists x. \ ax^5 + bx^4 + cx^3 + dx^2 + ex + f = 0$$

# EXAMPLES of THEORIES with QUANTIFIER ELIMINATION

(caveat: need to extend the signature sometimes)

- $\text{Th}(\mathbb{A}, =)$ ,  $\mathbb{A}$  infinite
  - $\text{Th}(\mathbb{Q}, \leq)$ : dense total order.
  - Theory of the Erdős-Rényi random graph.
- :
- $\text{Th}(\mathbb{Z}, (\overset{\leftarrow}{+1}), \leq)$ : discrete total order .
  - $\text{Th}(\mathbb{Q}, +, \leq)$ : additive theory of rational numbers.
  - $\text{Th}(\mathbb{Z}, +, \leq)$ : Presburger logic .
  - $\text{Th}(\mathbb{N}, \cdot)$ : Skolem arithmetic .
  - $\text{Th}(\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot)$ : Tarski algebra .
- :
- homogeneous  
structures*

# TOWARDS QUANTIFIER ELIMINATION

Claim: It suffices to consider formulas

~~conjunctional quant.~~

$$\exists x \cdot \underbrace{\varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_m}$$

Or negation of atomic

atomic & quantifier-free & contains x

$$qe(\neg \varphi) = \neg qe(\varphi)$$

$$qe(\varphi \vee \psi) = qe(\varphi) \vee qe(\psi)$$

$$qe(\varphi \wedge \psi) = qe(\varphi) \wedge qe(\psi)$$

$$qe(\forall x \cdot \varphi) = qe(\neg \exists x \cdot \neg \varphi)$$

$$qe(\exists x \cdot \varphi) = qe(\varphi) \text{ if } x \notin fv(\varphi)$$

$$qe(\exists x \cdot \varphi) = qe(\exists x \cdot \varphi_1) \vee \dots \vee qe(\exists x \cdot \varphi_m), \text{ where}$$

$$DNF(qe(\varphi)) \equiv \varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_m \xleftarrow{\text{conjunctional}}$$

# EXAMPLE : QUANTIFIER ELIMINATION for $(\mathbb{Q}, \leq)$

How does  $\varphi \equiv \exists x . \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \psi_m$  look like over  $\Sigma = \{\leq\}$ ?

Case 1 : Some  $\psi_i \equiv x < x$ . Then  $\psi \equiv \perp$

Case 2 : Some  $\psi_i \equiv x = y$ . Replace  $x$  with  $y$  everywhere.

Case 3 :  $\psi \equiv \exists x . \underbrace{y_1 < x \wedge \dots \wedge y_m < x}_{\text{lower bounds}} \wedge \underbrace{x < z_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x < z_m}_{\text{upper bounds}}$

Take  $\psi \equiv \bigwedge_{i,j} y_i < z_j$ .

Correctness by density.

# CONSEQUENCES of QUANTIFIER ELIMINATION

- If effective and the q.f. fragment is decidable  $\Rightarrow$  decidability.

Ex.:  $\exists x \cdot ax^2 + bx + c = 0 \rightsquigarrow (a=0 \wedge (c=0 \vee b \neq 0)) \vee (a \neq 0 \wedge b^2 - 4ac \geq 0)$ .

- No constants + q.e.  $\Rightarrow$  completeness.

Proof: let  $\Gamma$  be a theory and  $\psi$  a sentence (no free variables)

By q.e. there is  $\varphi$  q.f. s.t.  $\Gamma \models \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$ .

Since no constants,  $\psi$  is equivalent to either  
 $T$  (and thus  $\varphi \in \Gamma$ ) or  $\perp$  (and thus  $\neg\varphi \in \Gamma$ ).