CS 433 Automated Reasoning 2025

Lecture 4: Logical theories

Instructor: Ashutosh Gupta

IITB India

Compile date: 2025-01-15

What is theory?

Theory

"Theory is a contemplative and rational type abstract ... thinking, or .... ."

- Wikipedia

Example 4.1
Scientific and economic theories
- ▶ *Newton's theory of gravity*
- ▶ *Theory of evolution*
- ▶ *Theory of marginal utility*

Conspiracy theories

Example 4.2

- ▶ *9/11 is an inside job*
- ▶ *Trump is a Russian mole*
- ▶ *$R + L = J$ (confirmed)*

They may sound silly.

However, they are still theories.

FOL has no knowledge

First-order logic(FOL) provides a grammar for rational abstract thinking.

However, FOL carries no knowledge of any subject matter.

It was not obvious. 16th century philosopher René Descartes tried to prove

$$\text{Inherent model of logic} \Rightarrow \text{God exists.}$$

$$\text{Theory} = \text{Subject knowledge} + \text{FOL}$$

Now we will formally define theories in logic.

Defining theories

The subject knowledge can be expressed in the following two ways

1. the set of acceptable models
2. the set of valid sentences in the subject

Example 4.3

Model m with $D_m = \mathbb{N}$ is the only model we consider for the theory of natural numbers.

We can also define the theory using the set of valid sentences over natural numbers. e.g.
$\forall x.\ x + 1 \neq 0.$

Now let us define this formally.

Theories

Definition 4.1
A *theory* $\mathcal{T}$ is a set of sentences closed under implication, i.e.,

$$\text{if } \mathcal{T} \models F \text{ then } F \in \mathcal{T}.$$

Abuse of notation, $\models$ is also used for implication

$\mathcal{T}$ $\models$ •$F \in \mathcal{T}$

Sentences

$\mathcal{T}$-satisfiability and $\mathcal{T}$-validity

Definition 4.2
A formula F is $\mathcal{T}$-satisfiable if there is model m such that $m \models \mathcal{T} \cup \{F\}$. We write $\mathcal{T}$-satisfiability as $m \models_{\mathcal{T}} F$.

Definition 4.3
A formula F is $\mathcal{T}$-valid if $\mathcal{T} \models F$. We write $\mathcal{T}$-validity as $\models_{\mathcal{T}} F$.

Example 4.4
Let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}$ be the set of true sentences in arithmetic over natural numbers.

$\exists x.\, x > 0$ is not a valid sentence in FOL. However, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}} \models \exists x.\, x > 0$. Therefore, $\models_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}} \exists x.\, x > 0$.

$\exists x.\, x < 0$ is a satisfiable sentence in FOL. However, $\not\models \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}} \cup \{\exists x.\, x < 0\}$. Therefore, $\not\models_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}} \exists x.\, x < 0$.

Theory of Models

Definition 4.4

For a set $\mathcal{M}$ of models for signature **S**, *let* $Th(\mathcal{M})$ *be the set of* **S***-sentences that are true in every model in* $\mathcal{M}$,*i.e.,*

$$Th(\mathcal{M}) = \{F \mid \text{ for all } m \in \mathcal{M}.\ m \models F\}$$

Models   Sentences

Theory and models

Theorem 4.1
$Th(\mathcal{M})$ is a theory

Proof.
Consider F such that $Th(\mathcal{M}) \models F$.

Therefore, F is true in every model in $\mathcal{M}$.

Therefore, $F \in Th(\mathcal{M})$.

$Th(\mathcal{M})$ is closed under implication. $\qquad\square$

Topic 4.1

Axioms

Being a closed set is not a useful definition.

The definition via a set of models is also not convenient, since we use formulas in our calculations.

How do we handle a theory? Can we do better for deciding $\mathcal{T}$-validity/satisfiability?

Define theories using axioms

Definability of a class of models

Definition 4.5

*For a set Σ of sentences in signature **S**, let $Mod(\Sigma)$ be a class of models such that*

$$Mod(\Sigma) = \{m \mid \text{for all } F \in \Sigma.\ m \models F\}.$$

Models   Sentences

Consequences

Definition 4.6

For a set Σ of sentences, let $Cn(\Sigma)$ be the set of consequences of Σ, i.e.,

$$Cn(\Sigma) = Th(Mod(\Sigma)).$$

Models   Sentences

Exercise 4.1

Show for a theory $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{T} = Cn(\mathcal{T})$.

Example: theory of lists

Example 4.5

Let us suppose our subject of interest is lists. First we need to fix our signature.

We should be interested in the following functions and predicates

- ▶ :: - constructor for extending a list
- ▶ head - function to pick head of a list
- ▶ tail - function to pick tail of a list
- ▶ atom - predicate that checks if something is constructed using :: or not

The signature is

$$\mathbf{S} = (\{:: /2, head/1, tail/1\}, \{atom/1\})$$

Example: theory of lists

Let Σ consists of

1. $\forall x, y.\ head(x :: y) = x$
2. $\forall x, y.\ tail(x :: y) = y$
3. $\forall x.\ atom(x) \vee head(x) :: tail(x) = x$
4. $\forall x, y.\ \neg atom(x :: y)$

$\mathcal{T}_{list} = Th(Mod(\Sigma))$ is the set of valid sentences over lists.

The sentences in $\mathcal{T}_{list}$ may not be true on the non-list models.

Exercise 4.2
Can we derive that empty list exists from the above axioms?

Axiomatizable

> A set is decidable if there is an algorithm to check membership

Definition 4.7
A theory $\mathcal{T}$ is *axiomatizable* if there is a <u>decidable set</u> Σ such that $\mathcal{T} = Cn(\Sigma)$.

Definition 4.8
A theory $\mathcal{T}$ is *finitely axiomatizable* if there is a finite set Σ such that $\mathcal{T} = Cn(\Sigma)$.

Exercise 4.3
Show that if $Cn(\Sigma)$ is finitely axiomatizable, there is a finite $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma$ such that $Cn(\Sigma') = Cn(\Sigma)$.

Commentary: Solution of the above exercise: Let Σ'' be a finite axiomatization of $Cn(\Sigma)$. Therefore, $\Sigma \models \Sigma''$. Due to the compactness of FOL, there is a finite $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma$ such that $\Sigma' \models \Sigma''$. Therefore, $Cn(\Sigma'') \subseteq Cn(\Sigma') \subseteq Cn(\Sigma)$. Therefore, $Cn(\Sigma') = Cn(\Sigma)$.

Axiomatizable implies enumerable

We assume that theories consists of countably many symbols.

Theorem 4.2
An axiomatizable theory $\mathcal{T}$ is effectively enumerable.

Proof.
Let decidable set Σ' be such that $Cn(\Sigma') = \mathcal{T}$.
Therefore for each $F \in \mathcal{T}$, there is a finite $\Sigma_0 \subseteq \Sigma'$ such that $\Sigma_0 \models F$.(Why?)

We enumerate triples (F, Σ_0, Pr), where

1. $F \in \mathbf{S}$-sentences,
2. finite $\Sigma_0 \subseteq \Sigma'$, and
3. Pr is a FO-proof (sequence of formulas with consequence relation).

Since the three sets are effectively enumerable, the set of triples is also effectively enumerable.
In the enumeration of triples, if Pr is proof of $\Sigma_0 \models F$, we report F. □

Commentary: In the above, method we can not ever say that a formula is not in $\mathcal{T}$. Therefore, even if Σ' is decidable, $\mathcal{T}$ is not decidable. We need more from the axioms to make $\mathcal{T}$ decidable.

Enumerable to decidable

A theory may have axioms that can be organized some way

and we can exploit the organization

to avoid the last mindless search of validity proofs and search them efficiently.

The dedicated search procedures are called decision procedures.

We often show decidability of a theory by providing a decision procedure.

Decidable theories

Definition 4.9
Let $\mathcal{T} = Th(Mod(\Sigma))$. $\mathcal{T}$ is decidable if there is an algorithm that, for each sentence F, can decide whether $F \in \mathcal{T}$ or not.

Definition 4.10 (Equivalent to 4.9)
There is an algorithm that, for each sentence F, can decide whether $\Sigma \Rightarrow F$ or not.

Topic 4.2

Theory Examples

Example decidable and undecidable theories

Example 4.6

Two arithmetics over natural numbers.

$$\text{Decidable} \quad \text{Presburger [3EXPTIME]} \begin{cases} \forall x \neg (x + 1 = 0) \\ \forall x \forall y (x + 1 = y + 1 \Rightarrow x = y) \\ F(0) \wedge (\forall x (F(x) \Rightarrow F(x + 1)) \Rightarrow \forall x F(x)) \\ \forall x (x + 0 = x) \\ \forall x \forall y (x + (y + 1) = (x + y) + 1) \\ \forall x, y (x \cdot 0 = 0) \\ \forall (x \cdot (y + 1) = x \cdot y + x) \end{cases} \quad \text{Undecidable Peano}$$

The third axiom is a schema (a pattern of axioms).

Exercise 4.4

Give an algorithm to check if a sentence belongs to the schema or not.

Commentary: A schema is unacceptable if we can not have an algorithm to match the pattern of schema. The story goes that Presburger's PhD advisor was not too pleased by the above decidability result in 1929. The advisor did not know that there will be an area of science, where decidability will be a cornerstone of thinking.

Defining theory

A theory may be expressed in two ways.

1. By giving a set Σ of axioms
2. By giving a set $\mathcal{M}$ of acceptable models

There are theories that can not be expressed by one of the above two ways.

For example,

▶ Number theory can only be defined using the model. There is no axiomatization. (Due to Gödel's incompleteness theorem)

▶ Set theory has no "natural" model. We understand set theory via its axioms.

Example: theory of equality $\mathcal{T}_E$

We have treated equality as part of FOL syntax and added special proof rules for it.

We can also treat equality as yet another predicate.

We can encode the behavior of equality as the set of following axioms.

1. $\forall x.\ x = x$
2. $\forall x, y.\ x = y \Rightarrow y = x$
3. $\forall x, y, z.\ x = y \wedge y = z \Rightarrow x = z$
4. for each $f/n \in \mathbf{F}$, $\forall x_1, .., x_n, y_1, .., y_n.\ x_1 = y_1 \wedge .. \wedge x_n = y_n \Rightarrow f(x_1, .., x_n) = f(y_1, .., y_n)$
5. for each $P/n \in \mathbf{R}$, $\forall x_1, .., x_n, y_1, .., y_n.\ x_1 = y_1 \wedge .. \wedge x_n = y_n \wedge P(x_1, .., x_n) \Rightarrow P(y_1, .., y_n)$

The last two axioms are also schema, because they define a set of axioms using a pattern.

Topic 4.3

Fragments/Logics

Decidablity and Complexity

▶ FOL validity is undecidable

▶ We restrict the problem in two ways

    1. Theories : limits on the space of models
        ▶ We may get decidable theories

    2. Logics/Fragments : syntactic restrictions on formulas
        ▶ Further reduction in complexity of the decision problem

Fragments

We may restrict $\mathcal{T}$ syntactically to achieve decidablity or low complexity.

Definition 4.11

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a theory and $\mathcal{L}$ be a set of **S**-sentences. $\mathcal{L}$ wrt $\mathcal{T}$ is decidable if there is an algorithm that takes $F \in \mathcal{L}$ as input and returns if $F \in \mathcal{T}$ or not.

Sentences

Example 4.7 (Horn clauses)

$\mathcal{L} = \{\forall x.\ A_1(x) \wedge \cdots \wedge A_n(x) \Rightarrow B(x) | A_i \text{ and } B \text{ are atomic}\}$

Quantifier-free fragments

Quantifier-free(QF) fragment has free variables that are assumed to be existentially quantified. (unlike FOL clauses!!)

Often, the quantifier-free fragments of theories have efficient decision procedures.

Example 4.8
The following is a QF formula in the theory of equality

$$f(x) = y \wedge (x = g(a, z) \vee h(x) = g(b))$$

QF of $\mathcal{T}$ of equality has an efficient decision procedure.
Otherwise, the theory is undecidable.

Examples of quantifier-free fragments

Some times the fragments are also referred as logics.

The following important fragments are usually referred using abbreviated names

▶ quantifier-free theory of equality and uninterpreted function symbols (QF_EUF)

▶ quantifier-free theory of linear rational arithmetic (QF_LRA)

▶ quantifier-free theory of uninterpreted function and linear integer arithmetic (QF_UFLIA)

In the following website, find the benchmarks in the above fragments/logics

Visit SMTLIB
http://smtlib.cs.uiowa.edu/

Topic 4.4

Problems

Exercise

Exercise 4.5
Prove commutativity of $+$ in Presburger arithmetic.

Topic 4.5

Extra slides : complete theories

Complete theory

Definition 4.12
A theory $\mathcal{T}$ is *complete* if for every sentence F, either $F \in \mathcal{T}$ or $\neg F \in \mathcal{T}$.

Exercise 4.6
When a theory is not complete?

Exercise 4.7
Can a theory have both F and $\neg F$ for some sentence F?

Exercise 4.8
Prove: if $Mod(\mathcal{T})$ is singleton then $\mathcal{T}$ is complete.

A condition for complete theory

Theorem 4.3
If for each $m_1, m_2 \in Mod(\mathcal{T})$ and sentence F,

$$m_1 \models F \text{ iff } m_2 \models F$$

then $\mathcal{T}$ is complete.

Proof.
If F is true in one model in $Mod(\mathcal{T})$ then F is true in all. Therefore, F is complete. □

No sentence can distinguish models of $\mathcal{T}$.

Complete axiomatizable == Decidable

Theorem 4.4
A complete axiomatizable theory is decidable.

Proof.
Since for each **S**-formula F, either F or $\neg F$ is in Σ.

The enumeration in theorem 4.2 will eventually generate proof for F or $\neg F$.

Therefore, complete axiomatizable theory is decidable. □

Decidability via completeness

We can show decidability of a theory via completeness.

We may show completeness as follows.
- ▶ there are no finite models
- ▶ all countable models are isomorphic (No sentence can distinguish them)

In the previous proof, we enumerate all proofs to look for the members of $\mathcal{T}$.

The method does not tell us about the hardness of the decision problem.

End of Lecture 4