

Ch 1. The Foundations: Logic and Proofs

Predicate Logic-2

Natural Deduction

Sungwon Kang

Acknowledgement

- [Rosen 19] Kenneth H. Rosen, for Discrete Mathematics & Its Applications (8th Edition), Lecture slides
- [Hunter 11] David J. Hunter, Essentials of Discrete Mathematics, 2nd Edition, Jones & Bartlett Publishers, 2011, Lecture Slides

Well-Formed Formulas of Propositional Logic

- Well-Formed Formulas(wffs): Grammatically (or syntactically) correct expressions of a language.

Well-Formed Formulas of Propositional Logic

- 1) Every proposition symbols such as p, q, r, \dots and P, Q, R, \dots are wffs.
 - 2) If α and β are wffs, then so are $(\neg\alpha)$, $(\alpha \wedge \beta)$, $(\alpha \vee \beta)$ and $(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$.
- Note that we do now consider \leftrightarrow here because
$$\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta \equiv (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \wedge (\beta \rightarrow \alpha)$$
and thus it is redundant.

Well-Formed Formulas of Predicate Logic

Term: A variable or an expressions that is built by prefixing a function symbol to a sequence of terms.

Examples $f, f(t), f(t1, t2), \dots, g, g(t), g(t1, t2), \dots$ where $t, t1, t2, \dots$ are terms.

Atomic Formula: A proposition symbol or an expression that is built by prefixing a predicate symbol to a sequence of terms.

Examples $p, q, r, \dots, P, Q, R, \dots, P(t), P(t1, t2), \dots, Q(t), Q(t1, t2), \dots$ where $t, t1, t2, \dots$ are terms.

Well-Formed Formulas of Predicate Logic

- 1) Atomic formulas are wffs.
- 2) If α and β are wffs, then so are $(\neg\alpha)$, $(\alpha \wedge \beta)$, $(\alpha \vee \beta)$ and $(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$.
- 3) If x is a variable and α is a wff, then $(\forall x)\alpha$ and $(\exists x)\alpha$ are wffs.

Gentzen's Natural Deduction

Rules for Propositional Logic

\wedge -intro

A, B

$A \wedge B$

\vee -intro

A

$A \vee B$

\rightarrow -intro

$\Sigma, A \vdash B$

$\Sigma \vdash A \rightarrow B$

\neg -intro (proof by contradiction)

$\Sigma, A \vdash B, \quad \Sigma, A \vdash \neg B$

$\Sigma \vdash \neg A$

\wedge -elim

$A \wedge B$

A

\wedge -elim

$A \wedge B$

B

\vee -elim (proof by cases)

$\Sigma, A \vdash C \quad \Sigma, B \vdash C$

$\Sigma, A \vee B \vdash C$

\rightarrow -elim (modus ponens)

$A, A \rightarrow B$

B

\neg -elim

$\neg\neg A$

A

“ \vdash ” is read
“yield”.

$D_1, \dots, D_i \vdash E$

means

“E is provable from D_1, \dots, D_i ”,

i.e.

“There is a formal proof
(using only the given rules of inference) of E
from D_1, \dots, D_i .”

D_1, \dots, D_i are called *assumptions*.
E is called the *conclusion*.

Σ is used to represent a set of assumptions.

The name for the symbol “ \vdash ” is
“turnstile”.



Gentzen's Natural Deduction

Rules for Propositional Logic

\wedge -intro

A, B

$A \wedge B$

\wedge -elim

$A \wedge B$

A

\wedge -elim

$A \wedge B$

B

\vee -intro

A

$A \vee B$

\vee -intro

B

$A \vee B$

\vee -elim (proof by cases)

$\Sigma, A \vdash C \quad \Sigma, B \vdash C$

$\Sigma, A \vee B \vdash C$

\rightarrow -intro (Deduction Theorem)

$\Sigma, A \vdash B$

$\Sigma \vdash A \rightarrow B$

\rightarrow -elim (modus ponens)

$A, A \rightarrow B$

B

\neg -intro (proof by contradiction)

$\Sigma, A \vdash B, \neg B$

$\Sigma \vdash \neg A$

\neg -elim

$\neg\neg A$

A

\wedge -intro rule and \wedge -elim rule

\wedge -intro

A, B

$A \wedge B$

\wedge -elim

$A \wedge B$

A

\wedge -elim

$A \wedge B$

B

\wedge -intro rule introduces \wedge in the conclusion.

\wedge -elim rule eliminates \wedge in the premise.

\vee -intro rule and \vee -elim rule

\vee -intro

A

$A \vee B$

\vee -intro

B

$A \vee B$

\vee -elim (proof by cases)

$\Sigma, A \vdash C \quad \Sigma, B \vdash C$

$\Sigma, A \vee B \vdash C$

\vee -intro rule introduces \vee in the conclusion.

\vee -elim rule eliminates \vee in the premise $A \vee B$ so that it does not appear in the premises of the two subproofs.

Example (Proof by cases):

Let $\Sigma : \{r, s\}$

A: p

B: q

C: $(p \wedge r) \vee (q \wedge r)$

Show $\{r, s\}, p \vee q \vdash (p \wedge r) \vee (q \wedge r)$

\vee -elim (proof by cases)

$\Sigma, A \vdash C \quad \Sigma, B \vdash C$

$\Sigma, A \vee B \vdash C$

Example (Proof by cases):

Let $\Sigma : \{r, s\}$

A: p

B: q

C: $(p \wedge r) \vee (q \wedge r)$

Show $\{r, s\}, p \vee q \vdash (p \wedge r) \vee (q \wedge r)$

$\Sigma, A \vee B \vdash C$ (1)

Proof Need to prove the following two cases

(2) $\frac{\Sigma \left\{ \begin{array}{c} r \\ s \\ p \end{array} \right.}{C} \frac{A}{(p \wedge r) \vee (q \wedge r)}$

(3) $\frac{\Sigma \left\{ \begin{array}{c} r \\ s \\ q \end{array} \right.}{C} \frac{B}{(p \wedge r) \vee (q \wedge r)}$

Then by \vee -elim Q.E.D.

\rightarrow -intro rule and \rightarrow -elim rule

\rightarrow -intro (Deduction Theorem)

$\Sigma, A \vdash B$

$\Sigma \vdash A \rightarrow B$

\rightarrow -elim (modus ponens)

$A, A \rightarrow B$

B

\rightarrow -intro rule introduces \rightarrow in the conclusion.

\rightarrow -elim rule eliminates \rightarrow in the premise $A \rightarrow B$.

\neg -intro rule and \neg -elim rule

\neg -intro (proof by contradiction)

$\Sigma, A \vdash B, \neg B$

$\Sigma \vdash \neg A$

\neg -elim

$\neg\neg A$

A

\neg -intro rule introduces \neg in the conclusion.

\neg -elim rule eliminates \neg in the premise $\neg\neg A$.

Quiz 06-1

[1] State whether the following statement is true or false.

“Any expression (for propositional logic) with more left parentheses than right parentheses is not a well-formed formula.”

[2] Which of the following is NOT a well-formed formula of predicate logic?

- (a) $((p \vee q) \rightarrow r)$
- (b) $(\exists x) (P(f(x), x) \wedge q)$
- (c) $(\exists x) P(f(x), x) \wedge q$
- (d) $(\exists x) P(f(x), x) \wedge q$