



Part II (using Sequent Calculus):  $(\exists x R(x)) \rightarrow S(a) \vdash (\forall y \neg R(y)) \vee (\exists z S(z))$

One of several possible proofs:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{R(y_0) \vdash R(y_0), (\exists z S(z))} \text{Axiom} \\
 \frac{R(y_0) \vdash (\exists x R(x)), (\exists z S(z))}{\vdash (\exists x R(x)), \neg R(y_0), (\exists z S(z))} \vdash \exists \\
 \frac{\vdash (\exists x R(x)), \neg R(y_0), (\exists z S(z)) \quad \vdash \neg \quad S(a) \vdash (\forall y \neg R(y)), S(a)}{\vdash (\exists x R(x)), (\forall y \neg R(y)), (\exists z S(z)) \vdash \forall} \text{Axiom} \\
 \frac{\vdash (\exists x R(x)), (\forall y \neg R(y)), (\exists z S(z)) \vdash \forall \quad S(a) \vdash (\forall y \neg R(y)), (\exists z S(z)) \vdash \exists}{(\exists x R(x)) \rightarrow S(a) \vdash (\forall y \neg R(y)), (\exists z S(z))} \rightarrow \vdash \\
 \frac{(\exists x R(x)) \rightarrow S(a) \vdash (\forall y \neg R(y)), (\exists z S(z))}{(\exists x R(x)) \rightarrow S(a) \vdash (\forall y \neg R(y)) \vee (\exists z S(z))} \vdash \vee
 \end{array}$$

2. [10 points] Prove or disprove each sequent, using any method you wish.

Part I:

$$\exists x P(x), \exists x (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)) \vdash \exists x Q(x)$$

**This sequent is not valid.**

Counterexample interpretation I:  $\Delta = \{1, 2\}$ ,  $\mu(P) = \{(1)\}$ ,  $\mu(Q) = \emptyset$ .

Here  $I(\exists x P(x)) = T$ , since  $\mu(P)(1)$ . Also  $I(\exists x (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))) = T$ , since  $I(P(2) \rightarrow Q(2)) = T$ . However,  $I(\exists x Q(x)) = F$ .

Part II:

$$\forall x \exists y P(x, y), \forall y \exists x P(x, y) \vdash \exists x P(x, x)$$

**This sequent is not valid.**

Counterexample interpretation I:  $\Delta = \{1, 2\}$ ,  $\mu(P) = \{(1, 2), (2, 1)\}$ .

Here  $I(\forall x \exists y P(x, y)) = T$ ,  $I(\forall y \exists x P(x, y)) = T$ , but  $I(\exists x P(x, x)) = F$ .

3. [20 points] Prove formula d. below, using natural deduction and the Peano axioms (a, b, c). Recall that  $\varphi[t/x]$ , where  $t$  is a term, means  $\varphi$  with  $t$  replacing each free occurrence of  $x$ .
- $\forall x \neg(s(x) = 0)$
  - $\forall x \forall y (s(x) = s(y) \rightarrow x = y)$
  - [Induction axioms] For any formula  $\varphi$ :  $(\varphi[0/x] \wedge \forall x (\varphi \rightarrow \varphi[s(x)/x])) \rightarrow \forall x \varphi$
- d. To be proved:  $\forall x \neg(s(x) = x)$ .

Proof by induction, where  $\varphi$  is  $\neg(s(x) = x)$ .

1.	$\forall x \neg(s(x) = 0)$	a.
2.	$\neg(s(0) = 0)$	1, $\forall E$
3.	$x_0$	Fresh variable
4.	$\neg(s(x_0) = x_0)$	Assumption
5.	$s(s(x_0)) = s(x_0)$	Assumption
6.	$\forall y (s(s(x_0)) = s(y) \rightarrow s(x_0) = y)$	b, $\forall E$ (sub $s(x)$ for $x$ )
7.	$s(s(x_0)) = s(x_0) \rightarrow s(x_0) = x_0$	6, $\forall E$ (sub $x$ for $y$ )
8.	$s(x_0) = x_0$	5, 7, $\rightarrow E$
9.	$\perp$	4, 8, $\neg E$
10.	$\neg(s(s(x_0)) = s(x_0))$	5-9, $\neg I$
11.	$\neg(s(x_0) = x_0) \rightarrow \neg(s(s(x_0)) = s(x_0))$	4-10, $\rightarrow I$
12.	$\forall x (\neg(s(x) = x) \rightarrow \neg(s(s(x)) = s(x)))$	3-11, $\forall I$
13.	$\neg(s(0) = 0) \wedge \forall x (\neg(s(x) = x) \rightarrow \neg(s(s(x)) = s(x)))$	2, 12, $\wedge I$
14.	$(\neg(s(0) = 0) \wedge \forall x (\neg(s(x) = x) \rightarrow \neg(s(s(x)) = s(x)))) \rightarrow \forall x \neg(s(x) = x)$	c, with $\varphi$ as $\neg(s(x) = x)$
15.	$\forall x \neg(s(x) = x)$	13, 14, $\rightarrow E$

Note that the induction step, line 11, is an instance of the contraposition of the body of b.

4. [15 points]

Carefully prove using natural deduction:

$$\exists x P(x) \wedge \exists x Q(x) \vdash \exists x \exists y (P(x) \wedge Q(y))$$

Proof:

1.	$\exists x P(x) \wedge \exists x Q(x)$	Premise
2.	$\exists x P(x)$	1, $\wedge E$
3.	$\exists x Q(x)$	1, $\wedge E$
4.	$P(x_0)$	Assumption
5.	$Q(y_0)$	Assumption
6.	$P(x_0) \wedge Q(y_0)$	4, 5, $\wedge I$
7.	$\exists y (P(x_0) \wedge Q(y))$	6, $\exists I$
8.	$\exists x \exists y (P(x) \wedge Q(y))$	7, $\exists I$
9.	$\exists x \exists y (P(x) \wedge Q(y))$	3, 5-8, $\exists E$
10.	$\exists x \exists y (P(x) \wedge Q(y))$	2, 4-9, $\exists E$

1. [15 points]

Translate each of Parts I and II below into one or more formulas, then prove or disprove each part, using any method (the premises of both parts are the same, so you only have to provide one translation of them). Provide any insightful comments that connect the two parts.

Part I:

- a. John loves a person iff that person does not love him or herself.
- b. John is a person and Mary is a person
- c. Mary loves herself.

Therefore d. John does not love Mary.

Translation (For simplicity, everything mentioned is a person.):

- a1.  $\forall x (\text{loves}(\text{John}, x) \rightarrow \neg \text{loves}(x, x))$
- a2.  $\forall x (\neg \text{loves}(x, x) \rightarrow \text{loves}(\text{John}, x))$
- d.  $\neg \text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{Mary})$

Part II:

- a. John loves a person iff that person does not love him or herself.
- b. John is a person and Mary is a person.
- c. Mary loves herself.

Therefore e. John loves Mary.

**Comment:** Premise a. is inconsistent ( $\perp$  can be derived from it), as shown below.

Therefore every formula follows from that premise, even mutually contradictory ones, such as d and e above.

**A natural deduction proof:**

1.	$\text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{John}) \vee \neg \text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{John})$	LEM
2.	$\text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{John})$	Assumption
3.	$\text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{John}) \rightarrow \neg \text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{John})$	a1, $\forall E$
4.	$\neg \text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{John})$	2, 3, $\rightarrow E$
5.	$\perp$	2, 4, $\neg E$
6.	$\neg \text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{John})$	Assumption
7.	$\neg \text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{John}) \rightarrow \text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{John})$	a2, $\forall E$
8.	$\text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{John})$	6, 7, $\rightarrow E$
9.	$\perp$	6, 8, $\neg E$
10.	$\perp$	1, 2-5, 6-9, $\vee E$
11.	$\text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{Mary})$	10, $\perp E$
12.	$\neg \text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{Mary})$	10, $\perp E$

**A resolution proof that just a. is unsatisfiable, starting with clausal forms:**

a1.  $\neg \text{loves}(\text{John}, x) \vee \neg \text{loves}(x, x)$

a2.  $\text{loves}(x, x) \vee \text{loves}(\text{John}, x)$

These unify, using  $x = \text{John}$  in the first clause. After substitution, we have  $\neg \text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{John})$  with  $\text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{John})$ , which gives  $\perp$ .

6. [20 points]

Using Hoare Logic, and any relevant algebraic identities (which need not be proved), prove the partial correctness of the following triple:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \{n \geq 0\} \\
 \text{-----} \{n \geq 0 \wedge 1 = 2^0\} \\
 x := 0; \\
 \text{-----} \{n \geq x \wedge 1 = 2^x\} \\
 y := 1; \\
 \text{-----} \{n \geq x \wedge y = 2^x\} \\
 \text{while } x < n \text{ do} \\
 \quad \text{-----} \{x < n \wedge n \geq x \wedge y = 2^x\} \\
 \quad \text{-----} \{n \geq x+1 \wedge y+y = 2^{x+1}\} \\
 \quad y := y + y; \\
 \quad \text{-----} \{n \geq x+1 \wedge y = 2^{x+1}\} \\
 \quad x := x + 1 \\
 \quad \text{-----} \{n \geq x \wedge y = 2^x\} \\
 \text{od} \\
 \text{-----} \{\neg(x < n) \wedge n \geq x \wedge y = 2^x\} \\
 \{y = 2^n\}
 \end{array}$$

Suggestion: Show the assertions between each line off to the right (where the lines are), then establish the relevant triples.

**The invariant for the while loop is:**  $\{n \geq x \wedge y = 2^x\}$

**The Hoare triples are:**

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \{n \geq 0 \wedge 1 = 2^0\} x := 0 \{n \geq x \wedge 1 = 2^x\} \quad \textit{assignment} \\
 \{n \geq x \wedge 1 = 2^x\} y := 1 \{n \geq x \wedge y = 2^x\} \quad \textit{assignment} \\
 \{n \geq x+1 \wedge y+y = 2^{x+1}\} y := y + y \{n \geq x+1 \wedge y = 2^{x+1}\} \quad \textit{assignment} \\
 \{n \geq x+1 \wedge y = 2^{x+1}\} x := x + 1 \{n \geq x \wedge y = 2^x\} \quad \textit{assignment} \\
 \\
 \{n \geq 0 \wedge 1 = 2^0\} x := 0; y := 1 \{n \geq x \wedge y = 2^x\} \quad \textit{composition} \\
 \{x < n \wedge n \geq x \wedge y = 2^x\} y:=y+y; x:=x+1 \{n \geq x \wedge y = 2^x\} \quad \textit{composition} \\
 \{n \geq x \wedge y = 2^x\} \text{ while ... od } \{\neg(x < n) \wedge n \geq x \wedge y = 2^x\} \quad \textit{while} \\
 \\
 \{n \geq 0 \wedge 1 = 2^0\} \textit{ entire program } \{y = 2^n\} \quad \textit{composition}
 \end{array}$$

**The identities used are:**

$$\begin{array}{l}
 1 = 2^0 \\
 y = 2^x \rightarrow y+y = 2^{x+1} \\
 x < n \rightarrow n \geq x+1 \\
 \neg(x < n) \wedge n \geq x \rightarrow x = n \\
 (y = 2^x \wedge n = x) \rightarrow y = 2^n
 \end{array}$$

## 7. [10 points]

Using the clauses below and resolution, prove that  $2+2 = 4$  and  $2 \times 2 = 4$ , where number 2 is represented as  $s(s(0))$ , and the number 4 is represented as  $s(s(s(s(0))))$ , where  $s$  is the successor function.

$a(x, y, z)$  means that  $z$  is the sum of  $x$  and  $y$ , and  $m(x, y, z)$  means that  $z$  is the product of  $x$  and  $y$ . The following clauses derive directly from the number theory axioms.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. $a(0, x, x)$ .   | 1. $a(0, x, x)$  |
| 2. $a(x, y, z) \rightarrow a(s(x), y, s(z))$ .                  | 2. $\neg a(x, y, z) \vee a(s(x), y, s(z))$                   |
| 3. $m(0, x, 0)$ .   | 3. $m(0, x, 0)$  |
| 4. $(m(x, y, z) \wedge a(y, z, w)) \rightarrow m(s(x), y, w)$ . | 4. $\neg m(x, y, z) \vee \neg a(y, z, w) \vee m(s(x), y, w)$ |

**2+2=4: Conclusion:  $a(s(s(0)), s(s(0)), s(s(s(s(0))))$ )**

- |   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
| 5. $\neg a(s(s(0)), s(s(0)), s(s(s(s(0))))$ . | $\neg$ conclusion |
| 6. $\neg a(s(0), s(s(0)), s(s(s(0))))$ .      | 2, 5 resolution   |
| 7. $\neg a(0, s(s(0)), s(s(0)))$ .            | 2, 6, resolution  |
| 8. $\perp$                                    | 1, 7, resolution  |

**2×2 = 4: Conclusion:  $m(s(s(0)), s(s(0)), s(s(s(s(0))))$ )**

Starting anew from 1-4:

- |  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| 9. $\neg m(s(s(0)), s(s(0)), s(s(s(s(0))))$ .  | $\neg$ conclusion |
| 10. $\neg m(s(0), s(s(0)), z) \vee \neg a(s(s(0)), z, s(s(s(s(0))))$ .                           | 4, 9 resolution   |
| 11. $\neg m(0, s(s(0)), zz) \vee \neg a(s(s(0)), zz, z) \vee \neg a(s(s(0)), z, s(s(s(s(0))))$ . | 4, 10 resolution  |
| 12. $\neg a(s(s(0)), 0, z) \vee \neg a(s(s(0)), z, s(s(s(s(0))))$ .                              | 3, 11 resolution  |
| 13. $\neg a(s(0), 0, z) \vee \neg a(s(s(0)), s(z), s(s(s(s(0))))$ .                              | 2, 12 resolution  |
| 14. $a(0, 0, z) \vee \neg a(s(s(0)), s(s(z)), s(s(s(s(0))))$ .                                   | 2, 13 resolution  |
| 15. $\neg a(s(s(0)), s(s(0)), s(s(s(s(0))))$ .   | 1, 14 resolution  |
| 16. $\neg a(s(0), s(s(0)), s(s(s(0))))$ .  | 2, 15 resolution  |
| 17. $\neg a(0, s(s(0)), s(s(0)))$ .  | 2, 16 resolution  |
| 18. $\perp$  | 1, 17 resolution  |

Note the linearity of the resolution steps.