

HW 4

Section 1.5

A. Prove using the rules of propositional and predicate equivalence from Rosen that the following equivalences hold. Be sure to do a precise formal proof, with lines justified by equivalence rule names.

1. $\text{Forall } x. P(x) \vee \text{Exists } x. \sim P(x) == \text{True}$
 1. $P(x)$ Universal Instantiation
 2. $\sim P(x)$ Existential Instantiation
 3. True Inverse 1,2 ($P \vee \sim P == \text{True}$)
2. $\text{Exists } x. P(x) == \sim \text{Forall } x. \sim P(x)$
 1. $\sim \text{Exists}(x) P(x)$ Given
 2. $\sim \text{Forall}(x) P(x)$ Quantifier de Morgan 1
 3. $\sim \sim \text{Forall}(x) P(x)$ 2-negation 2
 4. $\sim \text{Forall}(x) \sim P(x)$ Quantifier de Morgan

B. Express the negation of each of the following formulas so that all negation symbols appear only immediately before predicates:

1. $\text{Exist } x. \text{Exist } y. P(x,y) \vee \text{Forall } x. \text{Forall } z. Q(x,z)$
 $\sim \text{Exist } x. \sim \text{Exist } y. P(x,y) \vee \sim \text{Forall } x. \sim \text{Forall } z. Q(x,z)$
2. $\text{Exist } x. \text{Exist } y. (Q(x,y) \leftrightarrow Q(y,x))$
 $\sim \text{Exist } x. \sim \text{Exist } y. (Q(x,y))$

Section 1.6

B. For each of the following claims

- Either prove they are true using rules of inference of the predicate calculus: you may use either Rosen or NatDedn propositional reasoning rules, and the Rosen quantifiers rules in Table 6, augmented with my restrictions on constant symbols (see handout on inference rules).
- Or provide a counter-example, by defining appropriate predicate atoms (e.g., $(\text{likes}(\text{bob}, \text{eve}), \dots)$ in my updated lecture notes); for full credit, use the smallest possible universe for the quantifiers.

[Hint: think first about what the statements say intuitively, maybe using something familiar instead of predicates P and Q.]

- a. $\text{Exists } y. (P(y) \wedge Q(y)) \vdash \text{Exists } x. P(x) \wedge \text{Exists } y. Q(y)$

- | | | |
|----|--|----------------------------|
| 1. | $\exists y.(P(y) \wedge Q(y))$ | Given |
| 2. | $P(x) \wedge Q(x)$ | Existential Initialization |
| 3. | $Q(x) \wedge P(x)$ | Commutative |
| 4. | $P(x)$ | Simplification |
| 5. | $\exists x.P(x)$ | Existential Generalization |
| 6. | $\exists x.P(x) \wedge \exists y.Q(y)$ | And Introduction |
- b. $\exists y.(P(y) \vee Q(y)) \vdash \exists x.P(x) \wedge \exists x.Q(x)$
- | | | |
|----|--|----------------------------|
| 1. | $P(y) \vee Q(y)$ | Existential Initialization |
| 2. | $[\sim P(y)]$ | Assume |
| 3. | $Q(y)$ | Disjunctive syllogism |
| 4. | $\exists x.Q(x)$ | Existential Generalization |
| 5. | $\exists x.Q(x) \wedge \exists x.P(x)$ | And Introduction |

- c. $\forall x.P(x) \wedge \forall y.Q(y) \vdash \forall z.(P(z) \vee Q(z))$

Let x = all humans, $P(x)$ = "x can inhale", $Q(x)$ = "x can exhale", y = all children, z = all babies.

It is the case that all humans can inhale, and all children can exhale, but it is not the case that all babies can either exhale or inhale.