

Problem Set 3

Aaron Wang

February 11 2024

1. Prove each of the following statements for any propositions φ, ψ, ξ .

(a) $(\varphi \rightarrow \psi), (\psi \rightarrow \xi) \vdash (\varphi \rightarrow \xi)$

Proof. Let φ, ψ , and ξ be arbitrary propositions, and suppose $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$ and $\psi \rightarrow \xi$. We will first show that $\varphi \vdash \xi$. Assume φ . Since we have $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$, we get ψ by modus ponens. Further, since we have $\psi \rightarrow \xi$, we get ξ by modus ponens. Thus, $\varphi \vdash \xi$. Therefore, by applying the deduction rule, we can conclude $\varphi \rightarrow \xi$.
Q.E.D.

(b) $\varphi, \psi \vdash \varphi \wedge \psi$

Proof. Let φ and ψ be arbitrary propositions. Assume φ , and also separately assume ψ . Towards a contradiction, suppose $\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)$. We can see that

$$\begin{aligned}\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi) &\equiv \neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi && \text{by De Morgan's laws} \\ &\equiv \varphi \rightarrow \neg\psi && \text{by conditional disintegration}\end{aligned}$$

So we have φ and $\varphi \rightarrow \neg\psi$, which gives us $\neg\psi$ by modus ponens. However, since we had ψ by assumption, we get a contradiction.

Therefore, we can conclude $\varphi \wedge \psi$ by Reductio ad absurdum.

Q.E.D.

2. Prove each of the following statements for any propositions φ, ψ, ξ .

(a) $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \varphi$

Proof. Let φ be an arbitrary proposition. Assume φ . Now observe that φ follows from this assumption. Therefore, $\varphi \vdash \varphi$. Now by deduction rule, we can conclude $\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$.

Q.E.D.

(b) $\vdash (\neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi) \rightarrow \varphi$

Proof. Let φ be an arbitrary proposition. Let's first show that $\varphi \equiv \neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi &\equiv \varphi \vee \varphi && \text{by idempotence} \\ &\equiv \neg(\neg\varphi) \vee \varphi && \text{by double negation} \\ &\equiv \neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi && \text{by conditional disintegration}\end{aligned}$$

Now we can substitute φ for $\neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$ which turns $(\neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi) \rightarrow \varphi$ into an equivalent expression $\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$, something we have already proved in (a). Therefore we can conclude $(\neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi) \rightarrow \varphi$.

Q.E.D.

(c) $\vdash \neg\varphi \rightarrow (\varphi \rightarrow \neg\psi)$

Proof. Let φ and ψ be arbitrary propositions. Let's first show that $\psi \rightarrow \neg\varphi \equiv \varphi \rightarrow \neg\psi$.

$$\begin{aligned}\psi \rightarrow \neg\varphi &\equiv \neg\psi \vee \neg\varphi && \text{by conditional disintegration} \\ &\equiv \neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi && \text{by commutativity} \\ &\equiv \varphi \rightarrow \neg\psi && \text{by conditional disintegration}\end{aligned}$$

Using this equivalence, we can substitute $\psi \rightarrow \neg\varphi$ for $\varphi \rightarrow \neg\psi$ in $\neg\varphi \rightarrow (\varphi \rightarrow \neg\psi)$ to create an equivalent expression $\neg\varphi \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \neg\varphi)$ which is in the form of Hilbert's first axiom. Consequently, by Hilbert's first axiom, we can conclude $\neg\varphi \rightarrow (\varphi \rightarrow \neg\psi)$.

Q.E.D.

(d) $\varphi \wedge \psi \vdash \varphi$

Proof. Let φ and ψ be arbitrary propositions. Assume $\varphi \wedge \psi$.
Assume towards a contradiction $\neg\varphi$. Using conjunction introduction,
 $\varphi \wedge \psi, \neg\varphi \vdash (\varphi \wedge \psi) \wedge (\neg\varphi)$. Observe:

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi \wedge \psi) \wedge \neg\varphi &\equiv (\psi \wedge \varphi) \wedge \neg\varphi && \text{by commutativity} \\ &\equiv \psi \wedge (\varphi \wedge \neg\varphi) && \text{by associativity} \\ &\equiv \psi \wedge (\perp) && \text{by complement} \\ &\equiv \perp && \text{by domination} \end{aligned}$$

So, we have \perp . However, we also have \top which is proven by the Truth theorem (proven by the fact that we proved (a) and (a) is a tautology). Therefore, by Reductio ad Absurdum we can conclude φ .

Q.E.D.

(e) $\vdash \top$

Proof. From (a) we concluded $\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$. Since $\varphi \rightarrow \varphi \equiv \top$ (proved in PSet 2), we can also conclude \top .

Q.E.D.

3. Prove each of the following statements for any propositions φ, ψ, ξ, χ

(a) $\varphi \vdash (\varphi \vee \psi)$

Proof. Let φ and ψ be arbitrary propositions. Assume φ . Towards a contradiction, suppose $\neg(\varphi \vee \psi)$. Using conjunction introduction, $\varphi, \neg(\varphi \vee \psi) \vdash \varphi \wedge \neg(\varphi \vee \psi)$ Observe:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi \wedge \neg(\varphi \vee \psi) &\equiv \varphi \wedge (\neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi) && \text{by De Morgan's laws} \\ &\equiv (\varphi \wedge \neg\varphi) \wedge \neg\psi && \text{by associativity} \\ &\equiv \perp \wedge \neg\psi && \text{by complement} \\ &\equiv \perp && \text{by domination} \end{aligned}$$

So, we have $\neg(\varphi \vee \psi) \vdash \perp$. However, we also have $\neg(\varphi \vee \psi) \vdash \top$ because we assumed $\neg(\varphi \vee \psi)$. Therefore, by Reductio ad Absurdum we can conclude $\neg(\neg(\varphi \vee \psi))$ or $\varphi \vee \psi$.

Q.E.D.

(b) $(\varphi \rightarrow \xi), (\psi \rightarrow \xi), (\varphi \vee \psi) \vdash \xi$

Proof. Let φ, ψ and ξ be arbitrary propositions. Assume $(\varphi \rightarrow \xi)$, $(\psi \rightarrow \xi)$, and $(\varphi \vee \psi)$. Assume towards a contradiction $\neg\xi$. Using conjunction introduction:

$$(\varphi \rightarrow \xi), (\psi \rightarrow \xi) \vdash (\varphi \rightarrow \xi) \wedge (\psi \rightarrow \xi)$$

Observe:

$$(\varphi \rightarrow \xi) \wedge (\psi \rightarrow \xi)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\equiv (\neg\varphi \vee \xi) \wedge (\neg\psi \vee \xi) && \text{by conditional disintegration} \times 2 \\ &\equiv (\neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi) \vee \xi && \text{by distributivity} \\ &\equiv \neg(\varphi \vee \psi) \vee \xi && \text{by De Morgan's laws} \\ &\equiv (\varphi \vee \psi) \rightarrow \xi && \text{by conditional disintegration} \end{aligned}$$

So, we have $\varphi \vee \psi$ and $(\varphi \vee \psi) \rightarrow \xi$. By *modus ponens* we can conclude ξ .

Q.E.D.

(c) $\varphi, \neg\varphi \vdash \psi$

Proof. Let φ and ψ be arbitrary propositions. Assume φ as a premise. By disjunction introduction, $\varphi \vdash \varphi \vee \psi$. Observe:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi \vee \psi &\equiv \neg(\neg\varphi) \vee \psi && \text{by double negation} \\ &\equiv \neg\varphi \rightarrow \psi && \text{by conditional disintegration}\end{aligned}$$

Now assume $\neg\varphi$ as another premise. By modus ponens, we conclude ψ .

Q.E.D.

(d) $(\varphi \vee \psi), \neg\varphi \vdash \psi$

Proof. Let φ and ψ be arbitrary propositions. Assume $(\varphi \vee \psi)$ and $\neg\varphi$. Observe:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi \vee \psi &\equiv \neg(\neg\varphi) \vee \psi && \text{by double negation} \\ &\equiv \neg\varphi \rightarrow \psi && \text{by conditional disintegration}\end{aligned}$$

So, we have $\neg\varphi$ and $\neg\varphi \rightarrow \psi$. By *modus ponens* we can conclude ψ .

Q.E.D.

(e) $(\varphi \rightarrow \xi), (\psi \rightarrow \chi), (\varphi \vee \psi) \vdash \xi \vee \chi$

Proof. Let φ, ψ, ξ , and χ be arbitrary propositions.

Assume $\varphi \rightarrow \xi, \psi \rightarrow \chi$, and $\varphi \vee \psi$. Assume towards a contradiction $\neg(\xi \vee \chi)$. Observe that by De Morgan's laws $\neg(\xi \vee \chi) \equiv \neg\xi \vee \neg\chi$ from which we can use conjunction elimination to conclude $\neg\xi$ and $\neg\chi$. Now, by modus tollens, we can use $\neg\xi$ and $\varphi \rightarrow \xi$ to conclude $\neg\varphi$. Similarly, by modus tollens, we can use $\neg\chi$ and $\psi \rightarrow \chi$ to conclude $\neg\psi$. Since we have $\neg\psi$ and $\neg\varphi$ we can use conjunction introduction to conclude $\neg\psi \wedge \neg\varphi$ which is equivalent to $\neg(\varphi \vee \psi)$ by De Morgan's laws. Since we proved $\neg(\varphi \vee \psi)$ and assumed $\varphi \vee \psi$, by Reductio Ad Absurdum we can conclude $\neg(\neg(\xi \vee \chi))$ or $\xi \vee \chi$.

Q.E.D.

4. Let \mathcal{L} be a binary predicate. Prove the following statement.

$$\vdash \neg \exists x \forall y (\mathcal{L}(x, y) \leftrightarrow \neg \mathcal{L}(y, y))$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{L} be a binary predicate. Towards a contradiction, assume $\exists x \forall y (\mathcal{L}(x, y) \leftrightarrow \neg \mathcal{L}(y, y))$ which by existential elimination says $\forall y (\mathcal{L}(t, y) \leftrightarrow \neg \mathcal{L}(y, y))$ for a new term t . By universal elimination, $\forall y (\mathcal{L}(t, y) \leftrightarrow \neg \mathcal{L}(y, y))$ is true for any value y so let $y = t$. In this case, $\mathcal{L}(t, t) \leftrightarrow \neg \mathcal{L}(t, t) \equiv \perp$ so $\exists x \forall y (\mathcal{L}(x, y) \leftrightarrow \neg \mathcal{L}(y, y)) \vdash \perp$ (Look at a truth table). However, we assumed $\exists x \forall y (\mathcal{L}(x, y) \leftrightarrow \neg \mathcal{L}(y, y))$ so by the truth theorem $\exists x \forall y (\mathcal{L}(x, y) \leftrightarrow \neg \mathcal{L}(y, y)) \vdash \top$. Since $\exists x \forall y (\mathcal{L}(x, y) \leftrightarrow \neg \mathcal{L}(y, y))$ leads to a contradiction, we can conclude $\neg \exists x \forall y (\mathcal{L}(x, y) \leftrightarrow \neg \mathcal{L}(y, y))$ by Reductio Ad Absurdum.

Q.E.D.

5. Consider a universe of discourse consisting of every natural number. Recall that a positive integer is *prime* when it has *exactly two* positive divisors: one and itself.

Let $\omega(x) := \text{"}x \text{ is an odd number.}"$

Let $\pi(x) := \text{"}x \text{ is a prime number.}"$

Further, suppose the following statements only contain propositions.

- (a) Prove φ , where φ is the statement $\varphi \vdash \forall x (\omega(x) \rightarrow \pi(x))$.

Proof. Let $\varphi := \text{"}\varphi \vdash \forall x (\omega(x) \rightarrow \pi(x))\text{"}$. Assume φ . Therefore we have φ which says $\varphi \vdash \forall x (\omega(x) \rightarrow \pi(x))$. Observe that $\varphi \vdash \forall x (\omega(x) \rightarrow \pi(x))$ is $\varphi \rightarrow \forall x (\omega(x) \rightarrow \pi(x))$ by deduction rule. Thus by modus ponens, we use φ and $\varphi \rightarrow \forall x (\omega(x) \rightarrow \pi(x))$ to get $\forall x (\omega(x) \rightarrow \pi(x))$. Therefore by modus ponens $\varphi \vdash \forall x (\omega(x) \rightarrow \pi(x))$

Q.E.D.

- (b) Prove $\forall x (\omega(x) \rightarrow \pi(x))$.

Proof. From (a) we found $\vdash \varphi$. Thus, we have $\varphi \vdash \forall x (\omega(x) \rightarrow \pi(x))$ from which deduction rule gives us $\varphi \rightarrow \forall x (\omega(x) \rightarrow \pi(x))$. By Modus ponens, since we have φ and $\varphi \rightarrow \forall x (\omega(x) \rightarrow \pi(x))$, we can conclude $\forall x (\omega(x) \rightarrow \pi(x))$.//
Q.E.D.