

1

(a)

The formula

$$\phi = (\forall x.(P(x) \wedge (\exists y.(\forall z.(Q(y, z))))) \rightarrow (\forall x.(P(x) \vee (\exists y.(\forall z.(Q(y, z)))))$$

is a special case of the formula $(q \wedge p) \rightarrow (q \vee p)$, so if $(q \wedge p) \rightarrow (q \vee p)$ is valid in our proof system, then ϕ is valid too.

So we have to prove $\vdash (q \wedge p) \rightarrow (q \vee p)$, by deduction lemma, we are going to prove $q \wedge p \vdash q \vee p$.

Proof

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| (1) | $q \wedge p$ | premise |
| (2) | $(q \wedge p) \rightarrow q$ | Axiom 3a |
| (3) | q | Modus Ponens of 1 and 2 |
| (4) | $q \rightarrow (q \vee p)$ | Axiom 5b |
| (5) | $q \vee p$ | Modus Ponens of 3 and 4 |

(b)

The formula

$$\phi = Q(x, y) \rightarrow (\forall z.(P(z)) \rightarrow (Q(x, y) \rightarrow \forall z.(P(z))))$$

is a special case of the formula $p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow (p \wedge q))$ and $p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow (p \wedge q))$ is an axiom in our proof system, then ϕ is a valid formula.

2

(a)

$$\phi = (\forall x.(\exists y.(P(x, y)))) \vee (\forall x.(\exists y.(\neg P(x, y))))$$

$$P(x, y) = \{(x, y) | x = y\}$$

$$U = \{0, 1\}$$

In order to falsify ϕ , we have to falsify both side of the \vee connective.

To falsify $\forall x.(\exists y.(P(x, y)))$, for any x , we can found an y that is not equal to x , and then falsify the formula. For $x = 1$, we pick $y = 0$ and for $x = 0$ we pick $y = 1$.

To falsify $\forall x.(\exists y.(\neg P(x, y)))$, for any x , we can found an y that is equal to x , and then falsify the formula. For $x = 1$, we pick $y = 1$ and for $x = 0$, we pick $y = 0$.

We can't make U smaller because :

- $|U| = 0$ is not possible, because $U \neq \emptyset$
- $|U| = 1$ is not possible, because the predicate have to "return" *false* or *true*, and it is not possible to construct a predicate that is non-deterministic. For example, $P(1, 1)$ can't "return" *true* one time and *false* on another time.

(b)

$$\phi = \forall x.(\exists y.(P(x, y))) \rightarrow \exists x.(\forall y.(P(x, y)))$$

$$P(x, y) = \{(x, y) | x = y\}$$

$$U = \{0, 1\}$$

In order to falsify ϕ , we have to satisfy the left hand side and falsify the right hand side of the \rightarrow connective.

To satisfy $\forall x.(\exists y.(P(x, y)))$, we have to find, for any x , and y which ois equal to x . For $x = 1$, we pick $y = 1$ and for $x = 0$, we pick $y = 0$.

To falsify $\exists x.(\forall y.(P(x, y)))$, we have to find an x , that for all y , x is not always equal to y . We pick $x = 1$, then if $y = 1$, the formula is satisfy, but for $y = 0$, the formula is not.

We can't make U smaller because :

- $|U| = 0$ is not possible, because $U \neq \emptyset$
- $|U| = 1$ is not possible, we use the same argument as before. The predicate $P(x, y)$ is deterministic. So if we have only one choice to fill P , with only one single value, then $P(\lambda, \lambda)$ would always "return" the same value, either *true* or *false*. Then both left and right hand side of the \rightarrow connective have the same value and *true* \rightarrow *true* and *false* \rightarrow *false* are valid.

3

(a)

We will prove $\vdash \neg \forall x.(\neg \phi) \rightarrow \exists x.(\phi)$, by proving the contrapositive : $\vdash \neg \exists x.(\phi) \rightarrow \forall x.(\neg \phi)$ and by deduction lemma, $\neg \exists x.(\phi) \vdash \forall x.(\neg \phi)$.

Proof

- | | | |
|-----|--|-------------------------|
| (1) | $\neg \exists x.(\phi)$ | Premise |
| (2) | $\phi \rightarrow \exists x.(\phi)$ | Axiom 11 |
| (3) | $\neg \exists x.(\phi) \rightarrow (\phi \rightarrow \neg \exists x.(\phi))$ | Axiom 1 |
| (4) | $\phi \rightarrow \neg \exists x.(\phi)$ | Modus Ponens of 1 and 3 |

(5)	$(\phi \rightarrow \exists x.(\phi)) \rightarrow ((\phi \rightarrow \neg \exists x.(\phi)) \rightarrow \neg \phi)$	Axiom 8
(6)	$(\phi \rightarrow \neg \exists x.(\phi)) \rightarrow \neg \phi$	Modus Ponens of 2 and 5
(7)	$\neg \phi$	Modus Ponens of 5 and 6
(8)	$\neg \phi \rightarrow \forall x.(\neg \phi)$	Generalisation rule
(9)	$\forall x.(\neg \phi)$	Modus Ponens of 7 and 8

(b)

We will prove $\vdash \neg \exists x.(\neg \phi) \rightarrow \forall x.(\phi)$, and by deduction lemma, we prove $\neg \exists x.(\neg \phi) \vdash \forall x.(\phi)$

Proof

(1)	$\neg \exists x.(\neg \phi)$	Premise
(2)	$\neg \phi \rightarrow \exists x.(\neg \phi)$	Axiom 11
(3)	$\neg \exists x.(\neg \phi) \rightarrow (\neg \phi \rightarrow \neg \exists x.(\neg \phi))$	Axiom 1
(4)	$\neg \phi \rightarrow \neg \exists x.(\neg \phi)$	Modus Ponens of 1 and 3
(5)	$\neg \phi \rightarrow \exists x.(\neg \phi) \rightarrow ((\neg \phi \rightarrow \neg \exists x.(\neg \phi)) \rightarrow \neg \neg \phi)$	Axiom 8
(6)	$(\neg \phi \rightarrow \neg \exists x.(\neg \phi)) \rightarrow \neg \neg \phi$	Modus Ponens of 2 and 5
(7)	$\neg \neg \phi$	Modus Ponens of 4 and 5
(8)	ϕ	Double negation elimination
(9)	$\phi \rightarrow \forall x.(\phi)$	Generalisation rule
(10)	$\forall x.(\phi)$	Modus Ponens of 8 and 9

4, 5

Due to exam preparation, I didn't have that much time to do the rest.
Thanks anyway for correcting exercises 1,2 and 3 !