

## 5. First Order Logic – Natural Deduction

---

David Pereira   José Proença

RAMDE 2021/2022

Requirements and Model-driven Engineering

CISTER – ISEP

Porto, Portugal

<https://cister-labs.github.io/ramde2122>

# Natural Deduction in First Order Logic

---

## Recalling FOL...

### FOL language

A language of FOL considers the following sets of symbols:

**logical symbols** of one of the following forms: a **set of variables**

$S = \{x, y, \dots, x_0, y_0, \dots\}$ ; **logical connectives**  $\wedge, \vee, \neg$ , and  $\rightarrow$ ;

**quantifiers**  $\forall$  (for all) and  $\exists$  (exists); parenthesis ( and ); possibly, the **equality** symbol  $=$

**Non-logical symbols** of one of the following forms: a (possibly empty) set of **functional symbols** for each  $n$ -arity, represented as  $\mathcal{F}_n$  (when referring to constants, we are actually talking about functional symbols with arity 0). Typically,  $f, g, h, \dots$ ; a (possibly empty) set of **relation symbols** for each  $n$ -arity, represented as  $\mathcal{R}_n$ . Typically,  $P, Q, R, \dots$

# First Order Logic - Syntax

## FOL Terms and Atoms

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a FOL language. A term is inductively/recursively defined as follows:

- a variable  $x \in \mathcal{V}$  is a term;
- a constant i.e., a symbol  $c \in \mathcal{F}_0$  is also a term;
- if  $t_0, \dots, t_n$  are terms and  $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$  is a functional symbol, then  $f(t_0, \dots, t_n)$  is a term.

A FOL term is said to be **closed** if no variables occur in such term.

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a FOL language. An **atom** (from the term atomic formula) is inductively/recursively defined as follows:

- if  $t_0, \dots, t_n$  are terms and  $R \in \mathcal{R}_n$  is a relational symbol, then  $R(t_0, \dots, t_n)$  is an atom;
- if  $\mathcal{L}$  include the equality symbol  $=$  and if  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are terms, then  $t_1 = t_2$  is an atom.

## FOL Formulae

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a FOL language. The set of **formulae** is inductively/recursively defined as follows:

- an atom is a formula;
- if  $\varphi$  is a formula, then so is  $\neg\varphi$ ;
- if  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are formulas, then so are  $\varphi \wedge \psi$ ,  $\varphi \vee \psi$ , and  $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$ ;
- if  $\varphi$  is a formula and  $x$  is a variable, then  $\forall x, \varphi$  and  $\exists x, \varphi$  are also formulas.

# Bound and free variables

## Bound Variable

A variable  $x$  is said to be **bound** to a formula  $\varphi$  if  $\varphi$  has a subformula  $\psi$  whose schema is  $\forall x, \theta$  or  $\exists x, \theta$  and  $x$  occurs in  $\theta$ .

## Free Variable

A variable  $x$  is said to be **free** if it is not bound.

## Proposition

A formula is said to be a proposition if it does not contain free variables.

## Substitution

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a FOL language,  $\varphi$  a formula,  $t$  a term, and  $x \in \mathcal{L}$  a variable. The substitution of the variable  $x$  by the term  $t$  in  $\varphi$  is denoted by  $\varphi[t/x]$  and corresponds to replacing all the free occurrences of  $x$  in  $\varphi$  by the term  $t$ .

# Natural Deduction Rules

---



# Which are the new rules (on top of Propositional Logic)?

## Elimination rule for $\forall$

If we know that  $\forall x, \varphi$  holds, then we can conclude that  $\varphi$  holds for a specific term  $t$

$$\frac{\forall x \varphi}{\varphi[t/x]} \forall E$$

## Introduction rule for $\forall$

If we assume some term  $t$  and we are able to prove that  $\varphi[t/x]$  then we can conclude that  $\forall x, \varphi$ .

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} [t] \\ \vdots \\ \varphi[t/x] \end{array}}{\forall x \varphi[t/x]} \forall I$$

## Examples of reasoning about "for all"

Lets prove that  $\forall x, (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)), \forall x, P(x) \vdash \forall x, Q(x)$ .

|   |  |                                      |                               |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 |  | $\forall x, (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$ |                               |
| 2 |  | $\forall x, P(x)$                    |                               |
|   |  | <hr/>                                |                               |
| 3 |  | $t$                                  |                               |
|   |  | $P(t) \rightarrow Q(t)$              | $\forall\mathbf{E}(1)$        |
| 4 |  | $P(t)$                               | $\forall\mathbf{E}(2)$        |
| 5 |  | $Q(t)$                               | $\rightarrow\mathbf{E}(3, 4)$ |
| 6 |  | $\forall x, Q(x)$                    | $\forall\mathbf{I}(3-5)$      |

## Examples of reasoning about "for all"

Lets prove that  $P(t), \forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)) \vdash \neg Q(t)$ .

|   |                                      |                               |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | $P(t)$                               |                               |
| 2 | $\forall x, (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$ |                               |
| 3 | $P(t) \rightarrow Q(t)$              | $\forall\mathbf{E}(2)$        |
| 4 | $\neg Q(t)$                          | $\rightarrow\mathbf{E}(3, 1)$ |

## Examples of reasoning about "for all"

Lets prove that  $\vdash \forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)) \rightarrow (\forall x, P(x) \rightarrow \forall x, Q(x))$ .

|   |  |                               |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 1 | $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$   |                               |
| 2 | $\forall xP(x)$  |                               |
| 3 | $t \quad P(t)$   | $\forall\mathbf{E}(2)$        |
| 4 | $P(t) \rightarrow Q(t)$  | $\forall\mathbf{E}(1)$        |
| 5 | $Q(t)$   | $\rightarrow\mathbf{E}(3, 4)$ |
| 6 | $\forall xQ(x)$  | $\forall\mathbf{I}(3-5)$      |
| 7 | $\forall xP(x) \rightarrow \forall xQ(x)$  | $\rightarrow\mathbf{I}(2-6)$  |
| 8 | $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)) \rightarrow (\forall x, P(x) \rightarrow \forall x, Q(x))$ | $\rightarrow\mathbf{I}(1-7)$  |

# Which are the new rules (on top of Propositional Logic)?

## Elimination rule for $\exists$

If we know that  $\exists x, \varphi$  holds, and if assuming term  $t$  and  $\varphi[t/x]$  we can deduce  $\psi$ , then we can prove  $\psi$  overall.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} [t \ \varphi[t/x]] \\ \vdots \\ \psi \end{array}}{\exists x \varphi} \exists E$$

## Introduction rule for $\exists$

If we assume some term  $t$  and we are able to prove that  $\varphi[t/x]$  then we can conclude that  $\exists x, \varphi$ .

$$\frac{\varphi[t/x]}{\exists x, \varphi} \exists I$$

## Examples of reasoning about "for all"

Lets prove that  $\forall x, \varphi \vdash \exists x, \varphi$ .

|   |                      |                        |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | $\forall x \varphi$  |                        |
| 2 | $\varphi[t/x]$       | $\forall\mathbf{E}(1)$ |
| 3 | $\exists x, \varphi$ | $\exists\mathbf{I}(2)$ |

## Examples of reasoning about "for all"

Lets prove that  $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)), \exists xP(x) \vdash \exists xQ(x)$ .

|   |                                  |                               |
|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | $\forall xP(x) \rightarrow Q(x)$ |                               |
| 2 | $\exists xQ(x)$                  |                               |
| 3 | $t \quad P(t)$                   |                               |
| 4 | $P(t) \rightarrow Q(t)$          | $\forall\mathbf{E}(1)$        |
| 5 | $Q(t)$                           | $\rightarrow\mathbf{E}(3, 4)$ |
| 6 | $\exists xQ(x)$                  | $\exists\mathbf{I}(5)$        |
| 7 | $\exists xQ(x)$                  | $\exists\mathbf{E}(3-6)$      |

## Examples of reasoning about "for all"

Lets prove that  $\exists xP(x), \forall x\forall y(P(x) \rightarrow Q(y)) \vdash \forall yQ(y)$ .

|       |   |        |                                     |                                |
|-------|---|--------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1     | $\exists x Q(x)$                              |        |                                     |                                |
| 2     | $\forall x \forall y (P(x) \rightarrow Q(y))$ |        |                                     |                                |
| <hr/> |   |        |                                     |                                |
| 3     | $t$   | $u$    | $P(t)$                              |                                |
| 4     |   |        | $\forall y (P(t) \rightarrow Q(y))$ | $\forall \mathbf{E}(2)$        |
| 5     |   |        | $P(t) \rightarrow Q(u)$             | $\forall \mathbf{E}(4)$        |
| 6     |   |        | $Q(u)$                              | $\rightarrow \mathbf{E}(3, 5)$ |
| 7     |   | $Q(u)$ |                                     | $\exists \mathbf{E}(1-3-6)$    |
| 8     | $\forall y Q(y)$                              |        |                                     | $\forall \mathbf{I}(3-7)$      |



## Which are the new rules (on top of Propositional Logic)?

### Elimination rule for =

If we know that two terms  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are equal and that  $\varphi[t_1/x]$  holds, then  $\varphi[t_2/x]$  must also hold.

$$\frac{t_1 = t_2 \quad \varphi[t_1/x]}{\varphi[t_2/x]} = \mathbf{E}$$

### Introduction rule for =

If we assume some term  $t$  and we are able to prove that  $\varphi[t/x]$  then we can conclude that  $\forall x, \varphi$ .

$$\frac{}{t = t} = \mathbf{I}$$

## Examples of reasoning about equality

Lets prove that if  $t_1 = t_2$  then  $t_2 = t_1$ .

|   |             |  |
|---|-------------|--|
| 1 | $t_1 = t_2$ |  |
| 2 | $t_1 = t_1$ | $=\mathbf{I}$                                    |
| 3 | $t_2 = t_1$ | $=\mathbf{E}(\varphi \text{ is } x = t_1, 1, 2)$ |

Lets prove that if  $t_1 = t_2$  and  $t_2 = t_3$ , then  $t_1 = t_3$ .

|   |             |  |
|---|-------------|--|
| 1 | $t_1 = t_2$ |  |
| 2 | $t_2 = t_3$ | $=\mathbf{I}$                                    |
| 3 | $t_1 = t_3$ | $=\mathbf{E}(\varphi \text{ is } t_1 = x, 2, 2)$ |

## Exercises on FOL Natural Deduction

---

## Proving that $\exists x \neg \varphi \vdash \neg \forall x \varphi$

|   |                             |                    |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | $\exists x \neg \varphi$    |                    |
| 2 | $\forall x \varphi$         |                    |
| 3 | $u \quad \neg \varphi[u/x]$ |                    |
| 4 | $\varphi[u/x]$              | $\forall E(2)$     |
| 5 | $\perp$                     | $\perp I(3, 4)$    |
| 6 | $\perp$                     | $\exists E(1-3-5)$ |
| 7 | $\neg \forall x \varphi$    | $\neg I(2-6)$      |

## Proving that $\forall x\varphi \wedge \psi \vdash \forall x(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ and $x$ is not free in $\psi$

|   |                                  |                    |
|---|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | $\forall x\varphi \wedge \psi$   |                    |
| 2 | $\forall x\varphi$               | $\wedge E_l(1)$    |
| 3 | $\psi$                           | $\wedge E_r(1)$    |
| 4 | $u \mid \varphi[u/x]$            |                    |
| 5 | $\varphi[u/x] \wedge \psi$       | $\wedge I(4, 3)$   |
| 6 | $(\varphi \wedge \psi)[u/x]$     | $x$ free in $\psi$ |
| 7 | $\forall x(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ | $\forall I(4-6)$   |

## Proving that $\forall x(\varphi \wedge \psi) \vdash \forall x\varphi \wedge \psi$ and $x$ is not free in $\psi$

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | $\forall x(\varphi \wedge \psi)$                            |  |
| 2 | $u$   | $(\varphi \wedge \psi)[u/x] \quad \forall\mathbf{E}(1)$      |
| 3 |   | $\varphi[u/x] \wedge \psi \quad x \text{ not free in } \psi$ |
| 4 |   | $\psi \quad \wedge\mathbf{E}_r(3)$                           |
| 5 |   | $\varphi[u/x] \quad \wedge\mathbf{E}_l(3)$                   |
| 6 | $\forall x\varphi \quad \forall\mathbf{I}(2-5)$             |  |
| 7 | $\forall x\varphi \wedge \psi \quad \wedge\mathbf{I}(6, 4)$ |  |