FOL -- Formal Proofs

HE Mingxin, Max
CS104: program07 @ yeah.net CS108:
mxhe1 @ yeah.net

I2ML(H) Spring 2023 (CS104|CS108)

Exercises 11 : Reading and More

Record your time spent (in 0.1 hours) with brief tasks and durations in your learning log by hand writing!

1) Read textB-ch02-2.1+2.2-basics-fol.pdf (cont.)
2) Read textI-ch02-2.1+2.2-basics-fol.pdf (cont.)
3) Read textI-ch03-3.1-FormalProofs.pdf (in 2 weeks)
4) Read textB-ch02-2.3-Proofs-fol.pdf (in 2 weeks)

Topic 11B.1

Formal Proofs

Consequence to Derivation

We also need the formal proof system for FOL.

Let us suppose for a (in)finite set of formulas Σ and a formula F, we have $\Sigma \models F$.

Similar to propositional logic, we will now again develop a system of “derivations”. We derive the following statements.

$$\Sigma \vdash F$$

Formal Rules for FOL

- The old rules will continue to work
- We need new rules for..... quantifiers and equality
- Let us see how do we develop those!

Rules for propositional logic stays!

$$\textsc{Assumption}\,\frac{}{\Sigma \vdash F}\,F \in \Sigma \quad \textsc{Monotonic}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash F}{\Sigma' \vdash F}\,\Sigma \subseteq \Sigma' \quad \textsc{DoubleNeg}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash F}{\Sigma \vdash \neg\neg F}$$

$$\wedge - \textsc{intro}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash F \quad \Sigma \vdash G}{\Sigma \vdash F \wedge G} \quad \wedge - \textsc{Elim}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash F \wedge G}{\Sigma \vdash F} \quad \wedge - \textsc{Symm}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash F \wedge G}{\Sigma \vdash G \wedge F}$$

$$\vee - \textsc{intro}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash F}{\Sigma \vdash F \vee G} \quad \vee - \textsc{Symm}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash F \vee G}{\Sigma \vdash G \vee F} \quad \vee - \textsc{def}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash F \vee G}{\Sigma \vdash \neg(\neg F \wedge \neg G)}*$$

$$\vee - \textsc{Elim}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash F \vee G \qquad \Sigma \cup \{F\} \vdash H \qquad \Sigma \cup \{G\} \vdash H}{\Sigma \vdash H}$$

$$\Rightarrow - \textsc{Intro}\,\frac{\Sigma \cup \{F\} \vdash G}{\Sigma \vdash F \Rightarrow G} \quad \Rightarrow - \textsc{Elim}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash F \Rightarrow G \quad \Sigma \vdash F}{\Sigma \vdash G} \quad \Rightarrow - \textsc{def}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash F \Rightarrow G}{\Sigma \vdash \neg F \vee G}*$$

* Works in both directions
We are not showing the rules for $\Leftrightarrow$, $\oplus$, and punctuation.

Rules for quantifiers and equality

We will introduce the following four rules.

- $\forall$-Intro
- $\exists$-Intro
- $\forall$-Elim
- $\exists$-Elim

We will also introduce rules for equality

- Reflex
- Eqsub

Note

We will not show all steps due to propositional rules.

We will write ‘propositional rules applied to …’

Provably Equivalent

Definition 11B.1

If statements $\{F\} \vdash G$ and $\{G\} \vdash F$ hold, then we say F and G are provably equivalent.

Topic 11B.2

Introduction Rules for $\forall$ and $\exists$

$\exists$-Intro quantifiers

The condition is often not explicitly written. By writing $F(y)$ and $F(t)$, people may imply that the substitutions are defined.

If a fact is true about a term, we can introduce $\exists$

$$\exists - \textsc{Intro}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash F(t)}{\Sigma \vdash \exists y.\ F(y)}\, y \notin FV(F(z)), F(z)\{z \mapsto t\} \text{ and } F(z)\{z \mapsto y\} \text{ are defined}$$

for some variable z.

Example 11B.1

1. $\{H(x)\} \vdash H(x)$ *Assumption*
2. $\{H(x)\} \vdash \exists y.\ H(y)$ *$\exists$-Intro applied to 1*

Bad derivations that violate the side condition $y \notin FV(F(z))$

Example 11B.2

1. $\{1 \neq 2, x = 1, y = 2\} \vdash x \neq y$ — *Premise*
2. $\{1 \neq 2, x = 1, y = 2\} \vdash \exists y.\ y \neq y$ — *$\exists$-Intro applied to 1*✗

because $y \in FV(z \neq y)$.

Thinking Exercise 11B.1

1. $\Sigma \vdash F(f(x), y)$ — *Premise*
2. $\Sigma \vdash \exists y.F(y, y)$ — *$\exists$-Intro applied to 1*✗

Give $F(z)$ that shows $y \in FV(F(z))$.

Bad derivation that violate the side condition '$F(z)\{z \mapsto y\}$ is defined'

Example 11B.3

1. $\{\exists y.\ c \neq y\} \vdash \exists y.\ c \neq y$ *Assumption*
2. $\{\exists y.\ c \neq y\} \vdash \exists y.\ \exists y.\ y \neq y$ *$\exists$-Intro applied to 1*✗

because $(\exists y.\ z \neq y)\{z \mapsto y\}$ *is not defined.*

The following derivation is correct even if y is quantified somewhere in the formula.

Thinking Exercise 11B.2

1. $\Sigma \vdash \exists w.\ (c \neq w \land \forall y.P(y))$ *Assumption*
2. $\Sigma \vdash \exists y.\ \exists w.\ (y \neq w \land \forall y.P(y))$ *$\exists$-Intro applied to 1*✓

Give $F(z)$ that shows all conditions are satisfied.

Commentary: In the first example, y being quantified is not solely responsible. The problem is that z is occurring in a scope where where y is quantified.

Bad derivations that violate the side condition '$F(z)\{z \mapsto t\}$ is defined'

Example 11B.4

1. $\Sigma \vdash \forall x.\ f(x) = x$ *Premise*
2. $\Sigma \vdash \exists y \forall x.\ y = x$ *$\exists$-Intro applied to 1*✗

Statement 2 says that the domain is singleton, which is not implied by 1

because $(\forall x.\ z = x)\{z \mapsto f(x)\}$ *is not defined.*

We get $F(t)$, we need to identify $F(z)$.

Commentary: z is a placeholder. $F(z)$ neither occurs in antecedents nor in consequent of the proof rule. Therefore, it is our choice (the person who is writing the proof) to choose z and $F(z)$. If we choose a z that is already around, then we may potentially run into a situation where some actions are not allowed. Therefore, it is cleaner to assume z is not being used for any other purpose in the context. Therefore, we should always choose such that z is not quantified in $F(z)$. If we choose $F(z)$ poorly, we may not be able to apply the rule.

Good derivations that may look bad

Not all occurrences of t are replaced.

One may complain that not all copies of $g(c)$ were replaced.

Example 11B.5

1. $\emptyset \vdash \exists x_2.\ f(g(c), x_2) = f(g(c), c)$ *Premise*
2. $\emptyset \vdash \exists x_1, x_2.\ f(x_1, x_2) = f(g(c), c)$ *$\exists$-Intro applied to 1✓*

$F(z) = \exists x_2.\ f(z, x_2) = f(g(c), c)$ *satisfies all the side conditions.*

How to intro $\forall$?

We have seen the following proof in our life.

- Consider a fresh name x to represent a number.
- We prove $Fact(x)$
- We conclude $\forall x.Fact(x)$.

$\forall$-Intro for variables

If something is true about a variable that is not referred elsewhere.

Then it must be true for any value in the universe.

No reference condition

$$\forall-\textsc{Intro}\frac{\Sigma \vdash F(x)}{\Sigma \vdash \forall y.\ F(y)} y \notin FV(F(z)),\ x, z \in \text{Vars},\ \text{and } x \notin FV(\Sigma \cup \{F(z)\}).$$

Example 11B.6

1. $\{H(x)\} \vdash H(x)$ *Assumption*
2. $\{H(x)\} \vdash \forall y.\ H(y)$ *$\forall$-Intro applied to 1* ✗

Since x is referred in left hand side, the above derivation is wrong.

Thinking Exercise 11B.3

Why $FV(F(z))$ must not contain x?

Commentary: The rule has implicit side condition that $F(z)\{z \mapsto x\}$ and $F(z)\{z \mapsto y\}$ are defined.

$\forall$-Intro (for constants)

Constants may play the similar role

$$\forall - \textsc{Intro}\frac{\Sigma \vdash F(c)}{\Sigma \vdash \forall y.\ F(y)} y \notin FV(F(z)), c \text{ is not referred in } \Sigma \cup \{F(z)\},\ \text{and } c/0 \in \mathbf{F},$$

for some variable z.

Example 11B.7

1. $\Sigma \vdash H(c)$ *Premise and c is not referred in Σ*
2. $\Sigma \vdash \forall y.\ H(y)$ *$\forall$-Intro applied to 1*

Commentary: The rule has implicit side condition that $F(z)\{z \mapsto x\}$ and $F(z)\{z \mapsto y\}$ are defined.

Example: Bad ∀-Intro

Example 11B.8

Consider the following derivation where we used a term for ∀-INTRO.

1. $\emptyset \vdash \exists y.\ f(y) \neq y \vee f(c) = c$ *Premise*
2. $\emptyset \vdash \forall x.\ (\exists y.\ f(y) \neq y \vee x = c)$ ∀-INTRO *applied to 1* ✗

Our $F(z) = \exists y.\ f(y) \neq y \vee z = c$.

$f(c)$ *does not occur in* $F(z)$.

The formula in 1 is a valid formula and the formula in 2 is not a valid formula.

Topic 11B.3

Elimination Rules for $\forall$ and $\exists$

Universal instantiation

If some thing is always true, we should be able to make it true on any value.

$$\forall - \textsc{Elim}\frac{\Sigma \vdash \forall x.F(x)}{\Sigma \vdash F(t)}$$

Commentary: The above rule has an implicit side condition that $F\{x \mapsto t\}$ is defined.

Our first FOL proof : $\forall$ implies $\exists$

the proof does not work in the reverse direction

Theorem 11B.1

If we have $\Sigma \vdash \forall x.F(x)$, we can derive $\Sigma \vdash \exists x.F(x)$.

Proof.

1. $\Sigma \vdash \forall x.F(x)$ — Premise
2. $\Sigma \vdash F(x)$ — $\forall$-Elim applied to 1
3. $\Sigma \vdash \exists x.F(x)$ — $\exists$-Intro applied to 2 $\square$

Thinking Exercise 11B.4

Show $\Sigma \vdash \forall x.(F(x) \land G(x))$ and $\Sigma \vdash \forall x.F(x) \land \forall x.G(x)$ are provably equivalent.

One more example: working with quantifiers

Example 11B.9

A derivation for $\emptyset \vdash (\forall x.\ (P(x) \vee Q(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x.P(x) \vee \forall x.Q(x))$.

1. $\{\forall x.\ (P(x) \vee Q(x)), \neg\exists x.P(x)\} \vdash \forall x.\ (P(x) \vee Q(x))$ — *Assumption*
2. $\{\forall x.\ (P(x) \vee Q(x)), \neg\exists x.P(x)\} \vdash P(y) \vee Q(y)$ — *$\forall$-Elim applied to 1*
3. $\{\forall x.\ (P(x) \vee Q(x)), \neg\exists x.P(x)\} \vdash \neg\exists x.P(x)$ — *Assumption*
4. $\{\forall x.\ (P(x) \vee Q(x)), \neg\exists x.P(x), P(y)\} \vdash P(y)$ — *Assumption*
5. $\{\forall x.\ (P(x) \vee Q(x)), \neg\exists x.P(x), P(y)\} \vdash \exists x.P(x)$ — *$\exists$-Intro applied to 4*
6. $\{\forall x.\ (P(x) \vee Q(x)), \neg\exists x.P(x)\} \vdash Q(y)$ — *propositional rules applied to 2, 3, and 5*
7. $\{\forall x.\ (P(x) \vee Q(x)), \neg\exists x.P(x)\} \vdash \forall x.Q(x)$ — *$\forall$-Intro applied to 6*

..... rest is propositional reasoning

Thinking Exercise 11B.5

Fill the gaps in the step 6 and the tail of the proof.

Commentary: To understand the interplay of propositional reasoning and quantifiers, please solve the above exercise.

How to understand substitutions in the proof rules?

In the proof rules, there is a leaving term t and an arriving term s, and there is $F(z)$. Antecedents have $F(t)$ and consequences have $F(s)$.

For example,

$$F(z) = \underbrace{P(z) \wedge \forall z.Q(z) \wedge (\forall w.R(w,u)}_{\text{No worry occurrences of z}} \vee \exists y.R(z,y))$$

There are four cases of occurrences of z.

- z may occur free under no scope
- z is quantified in a scope
- free z does not occur in scope of a quantifier w
- free z occurs in scope of a quantifier y (troubling case)

Only the last case causes a restriction that t and s cannot have y.

Commentary: A good way to think is that the name of a quantified variable is not important to the outside world, except when we try to substitute a free variable in its scope by a term, which may have a variable with the same name.

The name conflict issue is a mute point. As long as we follow some naming discipline, which ensures that free variables in a system and quantified variables do not 'clash'. We need not worry. This is often done in programming languages. For example, import in python prefixes every imported name.

Where is $\exists$ instantiation?

$\exists$ can not behave like $\forall$.

If there is something, should we not be able to choose it? Not an arbitrary choice.

Example 11B.10

Let us suppose we want to prove, "If there is a door in the building, I can steal diamonds."

Intuitively, we do...

1. *Assume door x is there*
2. $\vdots$
3. *details of robbery*
4. $\vdots$
5. *I steal diamonds.*
6. *We say, therefore the theorem holds.*

Formally, we need to do the following.

1. $\Sigma \cup \{D(x)\} \vdash D(x)$ *Assumption*
2. $\vdots$
3. *symbolic details of robbery*
4. $\vdots$
5. $\Sigma \cup \{D(x)\} \vdash \mathit{Stolen}$ ...
6. $\Sigma \vdash D(x) \Rightarrow \mathit{Stolen}$ *$\Rightarrow$-Intro applied to 5*
7. $\Sigma \vdash \exists x.D(x) \Rightarrow \mathit{Stolen}$ *What rule?*

Commentary: We expect the *Stolen* formula does not have x free. Therefore, the above reasoning may work as $\exists$ instantiation.

Instantiation rule for exists

The following rule plays the role of $\exists$ instantiation.

$$\exists - \textsc{Elim}\frac{\Sigma \vdash F(x) \Rightarrow G}{\Sigma \vdash \exists y.F(y) \Rightarrow G}x \notin FV(\Sigma \cup \{G, F(z)\}), y \notin FV(F(z))$$

Commentary: Note that y and x can be same variables. Whenever we apply the rule, we need to make a distinction between incoming variable x and outgoing variable y.

Example: using $\exists$-Elim

Example 11B.11

The following derivation proves $\emptyset \vdash \exists x.(A(x) \wedge B(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x.A(x)$

1. $\{A(x) \wedge B(x)\} \vdash A(x) \wedge B(x)$ — Assumption
2. $\{A(x) \wedge B(x)\} \vdash A(x)$ — $\wedge$-Elim applied to 1
3. $\{A(x) \wedge B(x)\} \vdash \exists x.\ A(x)$ — $\exists$-Intro applied to 2
4. $\emptyset \vdash A(x) \wedge B(x) \Rightarrow \exists x.\ A(x)$ — $\Rightarrow$-Intro applied to 3
5. $\emptyset \vdash \exists x.(A(x) \wedge B(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x.\ A(x)$ — $\exists$-Elim applied to 4

We cannot instantiate $\exists$ out of the blue. We assume instantiated formula (step 1), prove the goal (step 3), and produce an implication (step 4), which is followed by $\exists$-Elim.

Thinking Exercise 11B.6

Show $\Sigma \vdash \exists x.(F(x) \vee G(x))$, *and* $\Sigma \vdash \exists x.F(x) \vee \exists x.G(x)$ *are provably equivalent.*

Example: Disastrous derivations

Example 11B.12

Here are two derivations that apply proof rules incorrectly and derive a bad statement.

1. $\{A(x)\} \vdash A(x)$ — *Assumption*
2. $\{A(x)\} \vdash \forall x.\ A(x)$ — *$\forall$-Intro applied to 1*✗
3. $\emptyset \vdash A(x) \Rightarrow \forall x.\ A(x)$ — *$\Rightarrow$-Intro applied to 2*
4. $\emptyset \vdash \exists x.A(x) \Rightarrow \forall x.\ A(x)$ — *$\exists$-Elim applied to 3*

1. $\{\exists x.A(x)\} \vdash \exists x.A(x)$ — *Assumption*
2. $\{\exists x.A(x)\} \vdash A(x)$ — *$\exists$-Elim applied to 1*✗
3. $\{\exists x.A(x)\} \vdash \forall x.\ A(x)$ — *$\forall$-Intro applied to 2*
4. $\emptyset \vdash \exists x.A(x) \Rightarrow \forall x.\ A(x)$ — *$\Rightarrow$-Intro applied to 3*

Topic 11B.4

Rules for Equality

Equality Rules

For equality

$$\textsc{Reflex}\,\frac{}{\Sigma \vdash t = t} \qquad \textsc{EqSub}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash F(t) \quad \Sigma \vdash t = t'}{\Sigma \vdash F(t')}$$

Thinking Exercise 11B.7

Do we need a side condition for rule EQSUB*?*

Commentary: Again applying EQSUB gets tricky. You need to identify $F(z)$ for some fresh z like other rules.

Example : example for equality

Example 11B.13

Let us prove $\emptyset \vdash \forall x, y.\ (x \neq y \vee f(x) = f(y))$

1. $\{x = y\} \vdash x = y$ — *Assumption*
2. $\{x = y\} \vdash f(x) = f(x)$ — *Reflex*
3. $\{x = y\} \vdash f(x) = f(y)$ — *EqSub applied to 1 and 2*
4. $\{\} \vdash \neg(x = y) \vee f(x) = f(y)$ — *propositional rules applied to 3*
5. $\{\} \vdash \forall x, y.\ (\neg(x = y) \vee f(x) = f(y))$ — *$\forall$-Intro applied twice to 4*

Thinking Exercise 11B.8

Write $F(z)$s in the application of $\forall$-Intro.

Deriving symmetry for equality

Theorem 11B.2

If we have $\Sigma \vdash s = t$, we can derive $\Sigma \vdash t = s$

Proof.

1. $\Sigma \vdash s = t$ — Premise
2. $\Sigma \vdash s = s$ — Reflex
3. $\Sigma \vdash t = s$ — EqSub applied to 2 and 1 where $F(z) = (z = s)$

□

Therefore, we declare the following as a derived proof rule.

$$\textsc{EqSymm}\frac{\Sigma \vdash s = t}{\Sigma \vdash t = s}$$

Example : finding evidence of $\exists$ is hard

There are magic terms that can provide evidence of $\exists$. Here is an extreme example.

Example 11B.14

Consider $\emptyset \vdash \exists x_4, x_3, x_2, x_1.\ f(x_1, x_3, x_2) = f(g(x_2), j(x_4), h(x_3, a))$
Let us construct a proof for the above as follows

1. $\emptyset \vdash f(g(h(j(c), a)), j(c), h(j(c), a)) = f(g(h(j(c), a)), j(c), h(j(c), a))$ *Reflex*
2. $\emptyset \vdash \exists x_1.f(x_1, j(c), h(j(c), a)) = f(g(h(j(c), a)), j(c), h(j(c), a))$ *$\exists$-Intro applied to 1*
3. $\emptyset \vdash \exists x_2.\exists x_1.f(x_1, j(c), x_2) = f(g(x_2), j(c), h(j(c), a))$ *$\exists$-Intro applied to 2*
4. $\emptyset \vdash \exists x_3.\exists x_2.\exists x_1.f(x_1, x_3, x_2) = f(g(x_2), j(c), h(x_3, a))$ *$\exists$-Intro applied to 3*
5. $\emptyset \vdash \exists x_4.\exists x_3.\exists x_2.\exists x_1.f(x_1, x_3, x_2) = f(g(x_2), j(x_4), h(x_3, a))$ *$\exists$-Intro applied to 4*

Topic 11B.5

Problems

Exercise: extended $\forall$-elim rule

Thinking Exercise 11B.9

Show that the following derived rule is sound

$$\forall - \textsc{Elim}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash \forall x_1 \ldots x_n . F}{\Sigma \vdash F\sigma}\,F \text{ is quantifier-free}$$

Thinking Exercise 11B.10

Show that the following derived rule is sound

$$\forall - \textsc{Subst}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash \forall x_1 \ldots x_n . F}{\Sigma \vdash \forall Vars(F\sigma).\ F\sigma}\,F \text{ is quantifier-free and } FV(\Sigma) = \emptyset$$

Exercise : derived rules for equality

Thinking Exercise 11B.11

Prove the following derived rules

$$\textsc{EqTrans}\frac{\Sigma \vdash s = t \qquad \Sigma \vdash t = r}{\Sigma \vdash s = r} \qquad \textsc{Paramodulation}\frac{\Sigma \vdash s = t}{\Sigma \vdash r(s) = r(t)}$$

Practice formal proofs

Thinking Exercise 11B.12

Prove the following statements

1. $\emptyset \vdash \forall x.\exists y.\forall z.\exists w.(R(x,y) \vee \neg R(w,z))$
2. $\emptyset \vdash \forall x.\exists y.x = y$
3. $\emptyset \vdash \forall x.\forall y.((x = y \wedge f(y) = g(y)) \Rightarrow (h(f(x)) = h(g(y))))$
4. $\emptyset \vdash \exists x_1, x_2, x_3.f(g(x_1), x_2) = f(x_3, x_1)$

Proofs on set theory**

Thinking Exercise 11B.13

Consider the following axioms of set theory

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma = \{\, & \forall x, y, z.\ ((z \in x \Leftrightarrow z \in y) \Rightarrow x = y), \\ & \forall x, y.\ (x \subseteq y \Leftrightarrow \forall z.\ (z \in x \Rightarrow z \in y)), \\ & \forall x, y, z.\ (z \in x - y \Leftrightarrow (z \in x \wedge z \notin y))\}.\end{aligned}$$

Prove the following

$$\Sigma \vdash \forall x, y.\ x \subseteq y \Rightarrow \exists z.(y - z = x)$$

Exercise: bad orders

Thinking Exercise 11B.14

Prove that the following formulas are mutually unsatisfiable.

- $\forall x. \neg E(x, x)$
- $\forall x, y. (E(x, y) \wedge E(y, x) \Rightarrow x = y)$
- $\forall x, y, z. (E(x, y) \wedge E(y, z) \Rightarrow \neg E(x, z))$
- $\forall x, y, z. (E(x, y) \wedge E(x, z) \Rightarrow E(y, x) \vee E(z, y))$
- $\exists x, y. E(x, y)$

Exercise: modeling equality using a predicate and axioms

Thinking Exercise 11B.15

1. Give a formal proof that shows that following formulas are mutually unsatisfiable.

- $\forall x, y.\ x = y$
- $\forall x.\ \neg R(x, x)$
- $\exists x, y.\ R(x, y)$

2. Give a model that satisfies the following set of formulas.

- $\forall x.\ E(x, x)$
- $\forall x, y.\ E(x, y)$
- $\forall x, y.\ (E(x, y) \Rightarrow E(y, x))$
- $\forall x.\ \neg R(x, x)$
- $\forall x, y, z.\ (E(x, y) \wedge E(y, z) \Rightarrow E(x, z))$
- $\exists x, y.\ R(x, y)$

3. Give a formal proof that shows that the following formulas are mutually unsatisfiable.

- $\forall x.\ E(x, x)$
- $\forall x, y.\ E(x, y)$
- $\forall x, y.\ (E(x, y) \Rightarrow E(y, x))$
- $\forall x.\ \neg R(x, x)$
- $\forall x, y, z.\ (E(x, y) \wedge E(y, z) \Rightarrow E(x, z))$
- $\exists x, y.\ R(x, y)$
- $\forall x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2.\ (E(x_1, x_2) \wedge E(y_1, y_2) \wedge R(x_1, y_1) \Rightarrow R(x_2, y_2))$

Exercise: different proof systems

Thinking Exercise 11B.16

Let us suppose we remove $\forall - \textsc{Elim}$ *from our FOL proof system and we add the following proof rule in our proof system.*

$$\exists - \textsc{Def}\,\frac{\Sigma \vdash \forall x.F(x)}{\Sigma \vdash \neg\exists x.\,\neg F(x)}$$

Show that we can drive $\forall - \textsc{Elim}$ *from the modified proof system. Give detailed derivation without skipping any step. Only formal derivations will be accepted.*

Commentary: **Solution:**

1. $\Sigma \vdash \forall x.F(x)$ — Premise
2. $\Sigma \cup \{\neg F(t)\} \vdash \forall x.F(x)$ — Monotonic applied to 1
3. $\Sigma \cup \{\neg F(t)\} \vdash \neg\exists x.\neg F(x)$ — $\exists$-Def applied to 1
4. $\Sigma \cup \{\neg F(t)\} \vdash \neg F(t)$ — Assumption
5. $\Sigma \cup \{\neg F(t)\} \vdash \exists x.\neg F(x)$ — $\exists$-Intro applied to 4
6. $\Sigma \vdash \neg\neg F(t)$ — ByContra applied to 3 and 5
7. $\Sigma \vdash F(t)$ — RevDoubleNeg applied to 6

Proofs on Arrays

Thinking Exercise 11B.17

Let Σ contain the following FOL sentences (all free symbols are functions or constants)

1. $\forall z, i, x.\ read(store(z, i, x), i) = x$
2. $\forall z, i, j, v.\ (\ i = j \vee read(store(z, i, v), j) = read(z, j)\ )$
3. $store(a, n, read(b, n)) = store(b, n, read(a, n))$
4. $read(b, m) \neq read(a, m)$

Using the formal proof system, show that Σ can derive contradiction.

Commentary: **Solution:** The following proof is repetitive. Key observation is what to substitute for v and x and aim to derive $m = n$.

1. $\Sigma \vdash store(a, n, read(b, n)) = store(b, n, read(a, n))$ — Assumption
2. $\Sigma \vdash \forall z, i, j, v.\ (\ i = j \vee read(store(z, i, v), j) = read(z, j)\ )$ — Assumption
3. $\Sigma \vdash (\ n = m \vee read(store(a, n, read(b, n)), m) = read(a, m)\ )$ — $\forall$-Elim applied to 1 with substitutions $\{z \mapsto a, i \mapsto n, j \mapsto m, v \mapsto read(b, n)\}$
4. $\Sigma \vdash (\ n = m \vee read(store(b, n, read(a, n)), m) = read(b, m)\ )$ — $\forall$-Elim applied to 1 with substitutions $\{z \mapsto b, i \mapsto n, j \mapsto m, v \mapsto read(a, n)\}$
5. $\Sigma \vdash (\ n = m \vee read(store(b, n, read(a, n)), m) = read(a, m)\ )$ — EqSub applied to 3 and 1
6. $\Sigma \vdash (\ n = m \vee read(b, m) = read(a, m)\ )$ — EqSub applied to 3 and 5, and some propositional reasoning
7. $\Sigma \vdash read(b, m) \neq read(a, m)$ — Assumption
8. $\Sigma \vdash n = m$ — Resolution applied to 6 and 7
9. $\Sigma \vdash \forall z, i, x.\ read(store(z, i, x), i) = x$ — Assumption
10. $\Sigma \vdash read(store(a, n, read(b, n)), n) = read(b, n)$ — $\forall$-Elim applied to 9 with substitutions $\{z \mapsto a, i \mapsto n, x \mapsto read(b, n)\}$
11. $\Sigma \vdash read(store(b, n, read(a, n)), n) = read(a, n)$ — $\forall$-Elim applied to 9 with substitutions $\{z \mapsto b, i \mapsto n, x \mapsto read(a, n)\}$
12. $\Sigma \vdash read(store(b, n, read(a, n)), n) = read(b, n)$ — Eqsub applied to 10 and 1
13. $\Sigma \vdash read(b, n) = read(a, n)$ — Eqsub applied to 11 and 12
14. $\Sigma \vdash read(b, m) = read(a, m)$ — Eqsub applied to 13 and 8

Topic 11B.6

Extra slides: Soundness

Soundness of the Proof System

We need to show that the proof rules derive only valid statements.

We only need to prove the soundness of the new proof rules in addition to the propositional rule.

Substitution

Theorem 11B.3

For a variable z, a term t, and a formula $F(z)$, if $m^{\nu}(z) = m^{\nu}(t)$ and $F(t)$ is defined, then

$$m, \nu \models F(z) \qquad \textit{iff} \qquad m, \nu \models F(t).$$

Proof.

Not so trivial proof by structural induction. $\square$

Thinking Exercise 11B.18

Write down the above proof. *Hint: You need to case split when we quantify over z or some other variable.*

Soundness: $\exists - \textsc{Intro}$ is sound

Theorem 11B.4

The following rule is sound.

$$\exists - \textsc{Intro}\frac{\Sigma \vdash F(t)}{\Sigma \vdash \exists y.\ F(y)}\ y \notin FV(F(z)), F(z)\{z \mapsto t\} \textit{ and } F(z)\{z \mapsto y\} \textit{ are defined}$$

for some variable z.

Commentary: All soundness proofs are repeated applications of similar arguments. However, in each rule the side conditions play their role differently. To understand the side conditions, please look into all the soundness arguments in the extra slides of this lecture.

Proof.

1. Let us assume $m, \nu \models \Sigma$.
2. Due to the antecedent, $m, \nu \models F(t)$. Let $m^{\nu}(t) = v$.
3. Since $z \notin FV(F(t))$, $m, \nu[z \mapsto v] \models F(t)$.
4. Since $F(z)\{z \mapsto t\}$ is defined, $m, \nu[z \mapsto v] \models F(z)$. (why?) (Theorem 11B.3)
5. Since $y \notin FV(F(z))$, $m, \nu[z \mapsto v, y \mapsto v] \models F(z)$.
6. Since $F(z)\{z \mapsto y\}$ is defined, $m, \nu[z \mapsto v, y \mapsto v] \models F(y)$. (Theorem 11B.3)
7. Therefore, $m, \nu[z \mapsto v] \models \exists y.\ F(y)$.
8. Since $z \notin FV(F(y))$, $m, \nu \models \exists y.\ F(y)$ $\square$

Soundness: $\forall - \textsc{Intro}$ is sound

Theorem 11B.5

The following rule is sound.

$$\forall - \textsc{Intro}\frac{\Sigma \vdash F(x)}{\Sigma \vdash \forall y.\ F(y)} y \notin FV(F(z)),\ x, z \in \mathrm{Vars},\ \textit{and } x \notin FV(\Sigma \cup \{F(z)\}).$$

Proof.

- Let us assume $m, \nu \models \Sigma$. Let v be some value in the domain of model m.
- Since $x \notin FV(\Sigma)$, $m, \nu[x \mapsto v] \models \Sigma$. Due to the antecedent, $m, \nu[x \mapsto v] \models F(x)$.
- Since $z \notin FV(F(x))$, $m, \nu[x \mapsto v, z \mapsto v] \models F(x)$.
- Since $F(z)\{z \mapsto x\}$ is defined, $m, \nu[x \mapsto v, z \mapsto v] \models F(z)$(why?).
- Since $x \notin FV(F(z))$, $m, \nu[z \mapsto v] \models F(z)$.
- Since $y \notin FV(F(z))$, $m, \nu[z \mapsto v, y \mapsto v] \models F(z)$.
- Since $F(z)\{z \mapsto y\}$ is defined, $m, \nu[x \mapsto v, z \mapsto v] \models F(y)$(why?).
- Since $z \notin FV(F(y))$(why?), $m, \nu[y \mapsto v] \models F(y)$.
- Since v is an arbitrary value, we have $m, \nu \models \forall y.\ F(y)$. $\square$

Soundness: $\forall - \textsc{Elim}$ is sound

Theorem 11B.6

The following rule is sound.

$$\forall - \textsc{Elim}\frac{\Sigma \vdash \forall x.F(x)}{\Sigma \vdash F(t)}$$

Proof.

1. Let $t' = t\{x \mapsto z\}$, where z is a fresh variable.
2. Since $F\{x \mapsto t\}$ is defined, $F\{x \mapsto t'\}$ is defined and $F(t')\{z \mapsto x\}$ is defined.
3. Let us assume $m, \nu \models \Sigma$. Let $\nu' \triangleq \nu[z \mapsto \nu(x)]$. Since $z \notin FV(\Sigma)$, $m, \nu' \models \Sigma$.
4. Due to the antecedent, $m, \nu' \models \forall x.\ F(x)$.
5. Let $v \triangleq m^{\nu'}(t')$. Since $x \notin Vars(t')$, $v = m^{\nu'[x \mapsto v]}(t')$.
6. Due to $\forall$ semantics, $m, \nu'[x \mapsto v] \models F(x)$.
7. Since $F\{x \mapsto t'\}$ is defined , $m, \nu'[x \mapsto v] \models F(t')$.
8. Since $x \notin FV(F(t'))$, $m, \nu' \models F(t')$.
9. Therefore, $m, \nu \models F(t)$.(why?) $\square$

Commentary: If x does not occur in t, the proof is simpler. However, it occurs very often in practice.

Soundness: $\exists - \textsc{Elim}$ is sound

Theorem 11B.7

The following rule is sound.

$$\exists - \textsc{Elim}\frac{\Sigma \vdash F(x) \Rightarrow G}{\Sigma \vdash \exists y.F(y) \Rightarrow G} x \notin FV(\Sigma \cup \{G, F(z)\}), y \notin FV(F(z))$$

Proof.

- Let us assume $m, \nu \models \Sigma$ and $m, \nu \models \exists y.F(y)$.
- There is v in domain of m such that $m, \nu[y \mapsto v] \models F(y)$.
- Since $x, y \notin FV(F(z))$, and $F(x)$ and $F(y)$ substitutions are defined, $m, \nu[x \mapsto v] \models F(x)$.
- Since $x \notin FV(\Sigma)$, $m, \nu[x \mapsto v] \models \Sigma$.
- Due to the antecedent, $m, \nu[x \mapsto v] \models F(x) \Rightarrow G$.
- Therefore, $m, \nu[x \mapsto v] \models G$.
- Since $x \notin FV(G)$, $m, \nu \models G$.

$\square$

End of Lecture 11B