

Harvey Mudd College
 Computer Science 80
 Logic for Computer Science
 Spring Semester 2002

Homework 7 – Predicate Logic: Proof Theory
Sample Solution

1. Give Natural Deduction proofs of each of the following formulas (brackets are used in place of parentheses in some formulas to make the structure clearer):

(a) $\exists x[\forall y(p(x, y))] \Rightarrow \forall y[\exists x(p(x, y))]$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{[\forall y(p(x, y))]^2}{p(x, y)} \forall_E}{\exists x(p(x, y))} \exists_I}{[\exists x(\forall y(p(x, y)))]^1 \forall y(\exists x(p(x, y)))} \forall_I}{\forall y(\exists x(p(x, y)))} \exists_E2}{\exists x(\forall y(p(x, y))) \Rightarrow \forall y(\exists x(p(x, y)))} \Rightarrow_I 1$$

There are two crucial things to note in this proof:

First, that in order to comply with the proviso for the \exists_E , the variable x must be re-bound (by the \exists_I rule) above the use of \exists_E . (The use of \forall_I could be moved below the \exists_I rule since that rule puts no restrictions on y .)

The more important thing to note is that this is how \exists_E is used. A large number of students submitted solutions with the following non-proof:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{[\exists x(\forall y(p(x, y)))]^1}{\forall y(p(x, y))} \exists_E^*}{p(x, y)} \forall_E}{\exists x(p(x, y))} \exists_I}{\forall y(\exists x(p(x, y)))} \forall_I}{\exists x(\forall y(p(x, y))) \Rightarrow \forall y(\exists x(p(x, y)))} \Rightarrow_I 1$$

The topmost rule here is NOT \exists_E . It is basically \forall_E being misapplied to an existential. If this were the rule for eliminating existential quantifiers, all manner of invalid formulas could be proven. In particular, you would have proofs like:

$$\frac{\frac{[\exists xp(x)]^1}{p(x)} \exists_E^*}{\forall xp(x)} \forall_I}{\exists xp(x) \Rightarrow \forall xp(x)} \Rightarrow_I 1$$

(b) $\exists x[p(x) \Rightarrow q(x)] \Rightarrow [\forall x(p(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x(q(x))]$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{[\forall p(x)]^2}{p(x)} \forall_E \quad [p(x) \Rightarrow q(x)]^3}{q(x)} \Rightarrow_E}{\frac{[\exists x(p(x) \Rightarrow q(x))]^1}{\exists x(q(x))} \exists_I \quad \exists_E 3} \Rightarrow_I 2}{\frac{\exists x(q(x))}{\forall x(p(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x(q(x))} \Rightarrow_I 2} \Rightarrow_I 1$$

Again, note the rebinding of x before the \exists_E rule is reached.

(c) Prove that any boletus is poisonous. That is, from open assumptions:

- $\forall x(f(x) \Rightarrow [m(x) \vee t(x)])$
- $\forall x(b(x) \Rightarrow f(x))$
- $\forall x([t(x) \vee pp(x)] \Rightarrow p(x))$
- $\forall x(b(x) \Rightarrow \neg m(x))$

prove the conclusion $\forall x(b(x) \Rightarrow p(x))$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\forall x(b(x) \Rightarrow f(x))}{b(x) \Rightarrow f(x)} \forall_E}{f(x)} \Rightarrow_E \quad \frac{\frac{\forall x(f(x) \Rightarrow (m(x) \vee t(x)))}{f(x) \Rightarrow (m(x) \vee t(x))} \forall_E}{m(x) \vee t(x)} \Rightarrow_E}{\frac{[m(x)]^2}{t(x)} \perp}{\frac{[b(x)]^1}{b(x) \Rightarrow \neg m(x)} \forall_E \quad \frac{[t(x)]^2}{t(x) \Rightarrow p(x)} \forall_E} \Rightarrow_E} \Rightarrow_E$$

(d) (extra credit) $[\forall x(p(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x(q(x))] \Rightarrow \exists x[p(x) \Rightarrow q(x)]$

Not yet.

2. Give Gentzen Sequent Calculus proofs for each of the conclusions in the last problem, including the extra credit (which is not extra credit in this problem).

(a) $\exists x[\forall y(p(x, y))] \Rightarrow \forall y[\exists x(p(x, y))]$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\overline{p(d, c) \longrightarrow p(d, c)} \text{ id}}{\forall y(p(d, y)) \longrightarrow p(d, c)} \exists_R}{\forall y(p(d, y)) \longrightarrow \exists x(p(x, c))} \exists_R}{\exists x(\forall y(p(x, y))) \longrightarrow \exists x(p(x, c))} \exists_L}{\exists x(\forall y(p(x, y))) \longrightarrow \forall y(\exists x(p(x, y)))} \forall_R}{\longrightarrow \exists x(\forall y(p(x, y))) \Rightarrow \forall y(\exists x(p(x, y)))} \Rightarrow_R$$

(b) $\exists x[p(x) \Rightarrow q(x)] \Rightarrow [\forall x(p(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x(q(x))]$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\overline{q(c), p(c) \longrightarrow q(c)} \text{ id}}{p(c) \Rightarrow q(c), p(c) \longrightarrow q(c)} \exists_R}{p(c) \Rightarrow q(c), p(c) \longrightarrow \exists x(q(x))} \exists_R}{p(c) \Rightarrow q(c), \forall x(p(x)) \longrightarrow \exists x(q(x))} \forall_L}{p(x) \Rightarrow q(x), \forall x(p(x)) \longrightarrow \exists x(q(x))} \exists_L}{\exists x(p(x) \Rightarrow q(x)) \longrightarrow \forall x(p(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x(q(x))} \Rightarrow_R}{\longrightarrow \exists x(p(x) \Rightarrow q(x)) \Rightarrow (\forall x(p(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x(q(x)))} \Rightarrow_R$$

(c) Prove that any boletus is poisonous. That is, from open assumptions:

- $\forall x(f(x) \Rightarrow [m(x) \vee t(x)])$
- $\forall x(b(x) \Rightarrow f(x))$
- $\forall x([t(x) \vee pp(x)] \Rightarrow p(x))$
- $\forall x(b(x) \Rightarrow \neg m(x))$

prove the conclusion $\forall x(b(x) \Rightarrow p(x))$

Let Γ be the set of assumptions listed above. The proof is then as follows, where each of the uses of \forall_R is being applied to one of the clauses from Γ , instantiating it to the desired term, a :

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\overline{\Gamma, b(a), m(a) \longrightarrow m(a), t(a)} \text{ id}}{\Gamma, b(a), m(a), \neg m(a) \longrightarrow t(a)} \neg_L}{\Gamma, b(a), m(a), b(a) \Rightarrow \neg m(a) \longrightarrow t(a)} \forall_E}{\Gamma, b(a), m(a) \longrightarrow t(a)} \forall_E}{\Gamma, b(a), m(a) \vee t(a) \longrightarrow t(a)} \forall_E}{\frac{\frac{\overline{\Gamma, b(a), f(a) \longrightarrow f(a)} \text{ id}}{\Gamma, b(a), b(a) \Rightarrow f(a) \longrightarrow f(a)} \forall_E}{\Gamma, b(a) \longrightarrow f(a)} \Rightarrow_L}{\Gamma, b(a), f(a) \Rightarrow (m(a) \vee t(a)) \longrightarrow t(a)} \forall_L}{\frac{\overline{\Gamma, b(a), p(a) \longrightarrow p(a)} \text{ id}}{\Gamma, b(a), t(a) \Rightarrow p(a) \longrightarrow p(a)} \forall_L}{\frac{\Gamma, b(a) \longrightarrow p(a)}{\Gamma \longrightarrow b(a) \Rightarrow p(a)} \forall_R}{\Gamma \longrightarrow \forall x(b(x) \Rightarrow p(x))} \forall_R \Rightarrow_L$$

3. Give resolution refutation proofs of each of the formulas in the last problem (i.e. show that each is a consequence of an empty Γ by negating just the one formula, converting it to PCNF, and performing resolution on the clauses that arise from it.)

$$(a) \exists x[\forall y(p(x, y))] \Rightarrow \forall y[\exists x(p(x, y))]$$

$$\begin{aligned} \neg(\exists x[\forall y(p(x, y))] \Rightarrow \forall y[\exists x(p(x, y))]) &\longrightarrow \neg(\neg\exists x[\forall y(p(x, y))] \vee \forall y[\exists x(p(x, y))]) \\ &\longrightarrow \neg\neg\exists x[\forall y(p(x, y))] \wedge \neg\forall y[\exists x(p(x, y))] \\ &\longrightarrow \exists x[\forall y(p(x, y))] \wedge \exists y[\forall x(\neg p(x, y))] \\ &\longrightarrow \forall y(p(sk_1, y)) \wedge \forall x(\neg p(x, sk_2)) \\ &\longrightarrow p(sk_1, y) \wedge \neg p(x, sk_2) \end{aligned}$$

$$(b) \exists x[p(x) \Rightarrow q(x)] \Rightarrow [\forall x(p(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x(q(x))]$$

$$\begin{aligned} \neg(\exists x[p(x) \Rightarrow q(x)] \Rightarrow [\forall x(p(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x(q(x))]) &\longrightarrow \neg(\neg\exists x[\neg p(x) \vee q(x)] \vee [\neg\forall y(p(y)) \vee \exists z(q(z))]) \\ &\longrightarrow \neg\neg\exists x[\neg p(x) \vee q(x)] \wedge \neg[\neg\forall y(p(y)) \vee \exists z(q(z))] \\ &\longrightarrow \exists x[\neg p(x) \vee q(x)] \wedge \neg\neg\forall y(p(y)) \wedge \neg\exists z(q(z)) \\ &\longrightarrow \exists x[\neg p(x) \vee q(x)] \wedge \forall y(p(y)) \wedge \forall z(\neg q(z)) \\ &\longrightarrow [\neg p(sk_1) \vee q(sk_1)] \wedge p(y) \wedge \neg q(z) \end{aligned}$$

(c) Prove that any boletus is poisonous. That is, from open assumptions:

- $\forall x(f(x) \Rightarrow [m(x) \vee t(x)])$
- $\forall x(b(x) \Rightarrow f(x))$
- $\forall x([t(x) \vee pp(x)] \Rightarrow p(x))$
- $\forall x(b(x) \Rightarrow \neg m(x))$

prove the conclusion $\forall x(b(x) \Rightarrow p(x))$

$$\begin{aligned}
\forall x(f(x) \Rightarrow [m(x) \vee t(x)]) &\longrightarrow \neg f(x) \vee m(x) \vee t(x) \\
\forall x(b(x) \Rightarrow f(x)) &\longrightarrow \forall y(b(y) \Rightarrow f(y)) \longrightarrow \neg b(y) \vee f(y) \\
\forall x([t(x) \vee pp(x)] \Rightarrow p(x)) &\longrightarrow \forall z(\neg[t(z) \vee pp(z)] \vee p(z)) \longrightarrow [\neg t(z) \wedge \neg pp(z)] \vee p(z) \\
&\longrightarrow (\neg t(z) \vee p(z)) \wedge (\neg pp(z) \vee p(z)) \\
\forall w(b(w) \Rightarrow \neg m(w)) &\longrightarrow \neg b(w) \vee \neg m(w) \\
\neg(\forall x(b(x) \Rightarrow p(x))) &\longrightarrow \neg(\forall v(\neg b(v) \vee p(v))) \longrightarrow \exists v(\neg \neg b(v) \wedge \neg p(v)) \\
&\longrightarrow b(sk_1) \wedge \neg p(sk_1)
\end{aligned}$$

(d) $(\forall x(p(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x(q(x))) \Rightarrow \exists x(p(x) \Rightarrow q(x))$

$$\begin{aligned}
\neg[(\forall x(p(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x(q(x))) \Rightarrow \exists x(p(x) \Rightarrow q(x))] &\longrightarrow \neg[\neg(\neg \forall x(p(x)) \vee \exists y(q(y))) \vee \exists z(\neg p(z) \vee q(z))] \\
&\longrightarrow \neg \neg(\neg \forall x(p(x)) \vee \exists y(q(y))) \wedge \forall z \neg(\neg p(z) \vee q(z)) \\
&\longrightarrow (\exists x(\neg p(x)) \vee \exists y(q(y))) \wedge \forall z(\neg \neg p(z) \wedge \neg q(z)) \\
&\longrightarrow (\neg p(sk_1) \vee q(sk_2)) \wedge p(z) \wedge \neg q(z)
\end{aligned}$$