

Solutions

1 Below, a stands for append, c for cons and e for empty.

```

unify(a(c(1, e), c(2, (c(3, e))), L), a(c(X, Xs), Ys, c(X, Zs)))
  unify(c(1, e), c(X, Xs))
    unify(1, X)
      unify(X, 1)      X ↦ 1
    unify(e, Xs)
      unify(Xs, e)     Xs ↦ e
  unify(c(2, (c(3, e))), Ys)
    unify(Ys, c(2, (c(3, e))))   Ys ↦ c(2, (c(3, e)))
  unify(L, c(X, Zs))      L ↦ c(1, Zs)
  
```

2

```

male(oskar)
  unify(male(oskar), male(gustav))   fails
  father(oskar, Y)
    unify(father(oskar, Y), father(gustav, eva))   fails
    unify(father(oskar, Y), father(gustav, lena))   fails
    unify(father(oskar, Y), father(oskar, gustav))   success
  
```

3 $\mathcal{S}_{cs}[\text{halt}]c\sigma = \sigma$.

4 Assume that $\mathcal{S}'_{cs}[\mathcal{S}_i]c\sigma = c(\mathcal{S}_{ds}[\mathcal{S}_i]\sigma)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathcal{S}'_{cs}[\text{if } b \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else } S_2]c\sigma = \\
 & (\mathcal{B}[b]\sigma ? \mathcal{S}'_{cs}[\mathcal{S}_1]c\sigma : \mathcal{S}'_{cs}[\mathcal{S}_2]c\sigma) = \\
 & (\mathcal{B}[b]\sigma ? c(\mathcal{S}_{ds}[\mathcal{S}_1]\sigma) : c(\mathcal{S}_{ds}[\mathcal{S}_2]\sigma)) = \\
 & c(\mathcal{B}[b]\sigma ? \mathcal{S}_{ds}[\mathcal{S}_1]\sigma : \mathcal{S}_{ds}[\mathcal{S}_2]\sigma) = \\
 & c(\mathcal{S}_{ds}[\text{if } b \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else } S_2]\sigma)
 \end{aligned}$$

5 By the assignment axiom

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \{s + (x - 1) * y = p\} \mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x} - 1 \{s + x * y = p\} \text{ and} \\
 & \{s + y + (x - 1) * y = p\} \mathbf{s} := \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{y} \{s + (x - 1) * y = p\}
 \end{aligned}$$

By the rule for composition and the consequence rule it follows that

$$\{\neg(x = 0) \wedge s + x * y = p\} \mathbf{s} := \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x} - 1 \{s + x * y = p\}$$

6 The statement should be equivalent to

$$S; \text{ while } \neg b \text{ do } S$$

Consider the following proof tree

$$\frac{\frac{\{P\}S; \{Q\} \quad \frac{\{Q \wedge \neg b\}S\{Q\}}{\{Q\} \text{ while } \neg b \text{ do } S \{Q \wedge b\}}}{\{P\}S; \text{ while } \neg b \text{ do } S \{Q \wedge b\}}}$$

to justify the following proof rule

$$\frac{\{P\}S\{Q\} \quad \{Q \wedge \neg b\}S\{Q\}}{\{P\} \text{ repeat } S \text{ until } b \{Q \wedge b\}}$$

7 $x * 2^y = 2^n$.

8 Assume that $P \Rightarrow Q$. Base cases:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[\text{skip}]P &= P \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[\text{skip}]Q &= Q \text{ implies that} \\ \mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[\text{skip}]P &\Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[\text{skip}]Q \end{aligned}$$

The definition of substitution implies that $(P[x \mapsto a]) \Rightarrow (Q[x \mapsto a])$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[x:=a]P &= P[x \mapsto a] \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[x:=a]Q &= Q[x \mapsto a] \text{ implies that} \\ \mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[x:=a]P &\Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[x:=a]Q \end{aligned}$$

Inductive cases: Assume that the statement in the problem is true for S_1 and S_2 and all P and Q . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[S_2]P &\Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[S_2]Q \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[S_1](\mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[S_2]P) &\Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[S_1](\mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[S_2]Q) \end{aligned}$$

We omit the case for the if statement.

For the **while** statement, assume that $P \Rightarrow Q$ implies that $\mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[S]P \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\text{wp}}[S]Q$ for all P and Q . It follows that $W_0(P) \Rightarrow W_0(Q)$ and that $W_i(P) \Rightarrow W_i(Q)$ implies $W_{i+1}(P) \Rightarrow W_{i+1}(Q)$ for all i and finally that $\exists n \in \mathbb{N} . W_n(P) \Rightarrow \exists n \in \mathbb{N} . W_n(Q)$.