

# Chapter 5

## Lists

DECISION PROCEDURES

LAST UPDATE OF LECTURE NOTES: TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2006

LAST UPDATE OF THIS CHAPTER: WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 2006.

### 5.1 Constructors

#### 5.1.1 Definition

The SIGNATURE OF CONSTRUCTORS  $\Sigma_{\text{cons}}$  contains the following symbols:

- A sort `elem` for elements and a sort `list` for lists of elements.
- the constant symbol `nil`, of sort `list`;
- the function symbol `cons`, of arity `elem × list → list`.

#### 5.1.2 Definition

A STANDARD `cons`-STRUCTURE  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $\Sigma_{\text{cons}}$ -structure satisfying the following conditions:

- $A_{\text{list}} = (A_{\text{elem}})^*$ ;
- $\text{nil}^{\mathcal{A}} = \langle \rangle$ ;
- $\text{cons}^{\mathcal{A}}(e, \langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle) = \langle e, e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle$ , for each  $n \geq 0$  and  $e, e_1, \dots, e_n \in A_{\text{elem}}$ .

#### 5.1.3 Definition

The MODELCLASS OF CONSTRUCTORS is the pair  $M_{\text{cons}} = (\Sigma_{\text{cons}}, \mathbf{A})$ , where  $\mathbf{A}$  is the class of all  $\Sigma_{\text{cons}}$ -structures that are isomorphic to standard `cons`-structures.

## 5.2 Lists

### 5.2.1 Definition

The SIGNATURE OF LISTS  $\Sigma_{\text{list}}$  extends the signature of constructors  $\Sigma_{\text{cons}}$  with the function symbols:

- $\text{car}$ , of arity  $\text{list} \rightarrow \text{elem}$ ;
- $\text{cdr}$ , of arity  $\text{list} \rightarrow \text{list}$ .

### 5.2.2 Definition

A STANDARD list-STRUCTURE  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $\Sigma_{\text{list}}$ -structure satisfying the following conditions:

- $\mathcal{A}^{\Sigma_{\text{cons}}}$  is a standard cons-structure;
- $\text{car}^{\mathcal{A}}(\langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle) = e_1$ , for each  $n > 0$  and  $e_1, \dots, e_n \in A_{\text{elem}}$ ;
- $\text{cdr}^{\mathcal{A}}(\langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle) = \langle e_2, \dots, e_n \rangle$ , for each  $n > 0$  and  $e_1, \dots, e_n \in A_{\text{elem}}$ .

### 5.2.3 Definition

The MODELCLASS OF LISTS is the pair  $M_{\text{list}} = (\Sigma_{\text{list}}, \mathbf{A})$ , where  $\mathbf{A}$  is the class of all  $\Sigma_{\text{list}}$ -structures that are isomorphic to standard list-structures.

## 5.3 From constructors to equality with acyclicity test

### 5.3.1 Algorithm (IS-SATISFIABLE-CONSTRUCTORS)

**Input:** A finite set  $\Gamma$  of flat  $\Sigma_{\text{cons}}$ -literals

**Output:** **satisfiable** if  $\Gamma$  is satisfiable; **unsatisfiable** otherwise

```

1: function IS-SATISFIABLE-CONSTRUCTORS( $\Gamma$ )
2:    $X \leftarrow \text{vars}(\Gamma)$ 
3:   For each literal of the form  $x \approx \text{cons}(e, y)$  in  $\Gamma$ , add to  $\Gamma$  the literals
            $e \approx \text{car}(x), \quad y \approx \text{cdr}(x)$ 
4:    $T \leftarrow$  the set of terms occurring in  $\Gamma$ 
5:    $R \leftarrow \{(s, t) \in T \times T \mid \text{the literal } s \approx t \text{ is in } \Gamma\}$ 
6:    $C \leftarrow$  the congruence closure of  $R$  with respect to  $T$ 
7:   Let  $\preceq$  be the binary relation of  $X_{\text{list}}$  defined by letting  $x \preceq y$  iff there
           is a literal  $y' \approx \text{cons}(e, x')$  in  $\Gamma$  such that  $(x, x') \in C$  and  $(y, y') \in C$ 
8:   if  $x \not\approx y$  is in  $\Gamma$  and  $(x, y) \in C$  then
9:     return unsatisfiable
10:  else if  $x \approx \text{nil}$  and  $y \approx \text{cons}(e, z)$  are in  $\Gamma$ , and  $(x, y) \in C$  then
11:    return unsatisfiable
12:  else if  $\preceq$  is not acyclic then
13:    return unsatisfiable
14:  else
```

```

15:     return satisfiable
16:   end if
17: end function

```

### 5.3.2 Proposition

If Algorithm IS-SATISFIABLE-CONSTRUCTORS returns `satisfiable` then  $\Gamma$  is  $M_{\text{cons}}$ -satisfiable.

PROOF. Assume without loss of generality that  $X_{\text{elem}} \neq \emptyset$ .  $\Gamma$  is clearly satisfied by the  $M_{\text{cons}}$ -interpretation  $\mathcal{A}$  over  $X$  defined as follows. First, we let

$$A_{\text{elem}} = (X_{\text{elem}}/C) \cup \{\nu_0\}.$$

where  $\nu_0 \notin X_{\text{elem}}/C$ . Then, we let

$$e^{\mathcal{A}} = [e]_C, \quad \text{for all elem-variables } e \in X_{\text{elem}}.$$

We also let

$$x^{\mathcal{A}} = \langle \rangle, \quad \text{if the literal } x \approx \text{nil} \text{ is in } \Gamma,$$

and

$$x^{\mathcal{A}} = \langle e^{\mathcal{A}} \rangle \circ y^{\mathcal{A}}, \quad \text{if the literal } x \approx \text{cons}(e, y) \text{ is in } \Gamma.$$

For all the other list-variables, we let

$$x^{\mathcal{A}} = \underbrace{\langle \nu_0 \rangle \circ \cdots \circ \langle \nu_0 \rangle}_{h(x) \text{ times}}$$

where  $h : X_{\text{list}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+$  is an arbitrarily fixed injective function.

### 5.3.3 Proposition

If Algorithm IS-SATISFIABLE-CONSTRUCTORS returns `unsatisfiable` then  $\Gamma$  is  $M_{\text{cons}}$ -unsatisfiable.

PROOF. We prove the stronger fact that  $\Gamma$  is  $M_{\text{list}}$ -unsatisfiable.

By contradiction, assume that  $\Gamma$  is  $M_{\text{list}}$ -satisfiable. Then there exists an  $M_{\text{list}}$ -interpretation  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{A} \models \Gamma$ . Let  $R'$  be the binary relation of  $T$  defined by letting  $(s, t) \in R'$  iff  $s^{\mathcal{A}} = t^{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then  $C \subseteq R'$ .

If the algorithm ended at line 9, then  $(x, y) \in C$ , which implies  $x^{\mathcal{A}} = y^{\mathcal{A}}$  contradicting the fact that the literal  $x \approx y$  is in  $\Gamma$ .

If the algorithm ended at line 11, then  $(x, y) \in C$ , which implies  $\text{nil}^{\mathcal{A}} = [\text{cons}(e, z)]^{\mathcal{A}}$ , a contradiction.

If the algorithm ended at line 13, then there is a cycle  $x_1 \preceq x_2 \preceq \cdots \preceq x_n \preceq x_1$ , implying that  $x_1^{\mathcal{A}} = [\text{cons}(e_1, x_2)]^{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $x_2^{\mathcal{A}} = [\text{cons}(e_2, x_3)]^{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $x_n^{\mathcal{A}} = [\text{cons}(e_n, x_1)]^{\mathcal{A}}$ , a contradiction.

### 5.3.4 Proposition

Algorithm IS-SATISFIABLE-CONSTRUCTORS is correct.

PROOF. Termination is obvious. Partial correctness follows by Propositions 5.3.2 and 5.3.3.

## 5.4 From lists to constructors

### 5.4.1 Algorithm (IS-SATISFIABLE-LISTS)

**Input:** A finite set  $\Gamma$  of flat  $\Sigma_{\text{list}}$ -lists

**Output:** **satisfiable** if  $\Gamma$  is satisfiable; **unsatisfiable** otherwise

```

1: function IS-SATISFIABLE-LISTS( $\Gamma$ )
2:    $\Delta \leftarrow$  LISTS-TO-CONSTRUCTORS( $\Gamma$ )
3:   return IS-SATISFIABLE-CONSTRUCTORS( $\Delta$ )
4: end function

5: function LISTS-TO-CONSTRUCTORS( $\Gamma$ )
6:    $X \leftarrow$  vars( $\Gamma$ )
7:   Replace each literal of the form  $e \approx \text{car}(x)$  in  $\Gamma$  with the formula

```

$$x \not\approx \text{nil} \rightarrow x \approx \text{cons}(e, y'),$$

where  $y'$  is a fresh free constant symbol of sort `list`.

```

8:   Replace each literal of the form  $x \approx \text{cdr}(y)$  in  $\Gamma$  with the formula

```

$$y \not\approx \text{nil} \rightarrow y \approx \text{cons}(e', x),$$

where  $e'$  is a fresh free constant symbol of sort `elem`.

```

9:   return  $\Gamma$ 
10: end function

```

### 5.4.2 Proposition

In algorithm IS-SATISFIABLE-LISTS, let  $\Delta$  be the output returned by the call to LISTS-TO-CONSTRUCTORS( $\Gamma$ ). Then the following are equivalent:

1.  $\Gamma$  is  $M_{\text{list}}$ -satisfiable.
2.  $\Delta$  is  $M_{\text{cons}}$ -satisfiable.

PROOF. (1  $\implies$  2). Immediate.

(2  $\implies$  1). Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be an  $M_{\text{cons}}$ -interpretation over  $\text{vars}(\Delta)$  satisfying  $\Delta$ . Then it is easy to check that  $\Gamma$  is satisfied by the  $M_{\text{list}}$ -interpretation  $\mathcal{A}$  over  $X$  constructed by letting

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\text{elem}} &= B_{\text{elem}}, \\ A_{\text{list}} &= B_{\text{list}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\mathcal{A}} &= e^{\mathcal{B}}, & \text{for each } e \in X_{\text{elem}}, \\ x^{\mathcal{A}} &= x^{\mathcal{B}}, & \text{for each } x \in X_{\text{list}}. \end{aligned}$$

### 5.4.3 Proposition

Algorithm IS-SATISFIABLE-LISTS is correct.

PROOF. Termination is obvious. Partial correctness follows by Proposition 5.4.2.