

## Worksheet: Tableau Proofs

---

1. Suppose you are trying to prove some formula  $C$ . What is something you could “safely” do right away (i.e., might not help, but definitely won’t hurt), if you have the assumption

- $A \wedge B$ ?

- $A \vee B$ ?

2. We say that a formula is a *stacking* formula if it is equivalent to a conjunction, and a *splitting* formula if it is equivalent to a disjunction.<sup>1</sup> Which of the following formulas are splitting and which are stacking?

- $A \rightarrow B$

- $\neg(A \wedge B)$

- $\neg(A \vee B)$

- $\neg(A \rightarrow B)$

- $\neg\neg A$ . (This is neither. But how could we simplify it?)

---

<sup>1</sup>Equivalent in a nontrivial way, of course, since any formula  $A$  satisfies  $A \equiv A \wedge \top \equiv A \vee \perp$ .

3. A (classical logic) *tableau proof* is arranged as follows:

- We start with the premises and the *negation* of the conclusion, and try to prove  $\perp$ . So, **it's always a proof by contradiction.**
- We build a tree (creating and extending paths) by splitting or stacking; once a formula is split or stacked we can “check it off” and ignore it thereafter.
- A path from the root is *closed* if it contains a contradiction (i.e., both  $r$  and  $\neg r$ ); we stop extending this path.
- The process stops with success if all paths are closed. (If we get stuck before all paths close, we can use the open path(s) to derive a counterexample.)

Give tableau proofs for:

- $p \rightarrow q \rightarrow p$

- $(p \vee q) \wedge \neg q \rightarrow p$

- $(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow \neg p)$

- $((p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow p) \rightarrow p$

- $((p \rightarrow q) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow q)) \rightarrow q$

- $((p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow r) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r))$

- $((w \rightarrow m) \wedge (x \rightarrow a)) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow m) \vee (w \rightarrow a))$

4. What splitting/stacking/simplifying can we do in a tableau proof with:

- $\exists x. P(x)$

- $\forall x. P(x)$

- $\neg \exists x. P(x)$

- $\neg \forall x. P(x)$

5. Give a tableau proof for:

- $\forall x. P(x) \vdash \neg \exists x. \neg P(x).$

- $\exists z. \forall w. Q(z, w) \vdash \forall y. \exists x. Q(x, y)$