

## Natural Deduction for Predicate Calculus

Reading: Huth and Ryan Section 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.3

**Definition:** A term  $t$  is *free for*  $X$  in  $\phi$  if no variable in  $t$  becomes bound when  $t$  is substituted for  $X$  in  $\phi$ .

Examples:

$Z$  is free for  $X$  in  $p(X, Y)$

$Z$  is free for  $X$  in  $\exists Y(p(X, Y))$

$Z$  is *not* free for  $X$  in  $\exists Z(p(X, Z))$

More examples:

$f(U, V)$  is free for  $X$  in  $p(X, Y)$

$f(U, V)$  is free for  $X$  in  $\forall U(q(U)) \longrightarrow \forall Y(p(X, Y))$

$f(U, V)$  is not free for  $X$  in  $p(X, Y) \longrightarrow \forall U(q(X, U))$

Eliminating Universal Quantification:

$$\frac{\forall X(\phi(X))}{\phi(t)} \forall X - e$$

where  $t$  is a term that is *free for*  $X$  in  $\phi$ .

An example of what goes wrong if we don't check that  $t$  is free for  $X$  in  $\phi$ .

Note  $Y$  is not free for  $X$  in  $\exists Y(\text{father}(X, Y))$

- |     |  |                                      |
|-----|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1 : | $\forall X \exists Y(\text{father}(X, Y))$ | Premise                              |
| 2 : | $\exists Y(\text{father}(Y, Y))$           | 1, $\forall X - e(\text{incorrect})$ |

Remark: It is always possible to make  $t$  free for  $X$  in  $\phi$  by renaming variables.

Example:

$f(U, V)$  is not free for  $X$  in  $\phi = \exists U(q(X, U))$

If we rename  $U$  to  $W$  in  $\phi$ , we get the formula  $\exists W(q(X, W))$  .... this is logically equivalent to  $\phi$ .

$f(U, V)$  is free for  $X$  in  $\exists W(q(X, W))$

The rule  $\forall X - e$  “explained” ....

Recall that if the universe is a finite set of objects  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  then

$$\forall X(\phi(X)) \equiv (\phi(a_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \phi(a_n))$$

Compare:

$\frac{\forall X(\phi(X))}{\phi(a_i)}$	$\frac{(\phi(a_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \phi(a_n))}{\phi(a_i)}$
--	---

A variant of a problem by Bertrand Russell:

1. The barber shaves all and only those men in this town who do not shave themselves.
2. Thus, the barber is not a man.

Introducing universal quantification

$$\frac{\boxed{\begin{array}{c} X_0 \\ \vdots \\ \phi[X \mapsto X_0] \end{array}} \quad \forall X - i}{\forall X \phi}$$

Here  $X_0$  is a variable that does not occur anywhere outside the box.

Intuitively, the first line of the box says “let  $X_0$  be an arbitrary object”. The fact that it appears nowhere else means that we make no assumptions about  $X_0$  whatsoever.

We then do some reasoning (the “ $\vdots$ ”) and conclude  $\phi[X \mapsto X_0]$ . Since we assumed nothing about  $X_0$ , we can run the same argument for *any* particular value for  $X$  instead of  $X_0$ .

1. All Microsoft product has bugs.
2. Thus, if all our software is Microsoft product then all our software has bugs.

$$\neg \forall X (\phi(X)) \quad \vdash \quad \exists X (\neg \phi(X))$$

Introducing existential quantification

$$\frac{\phi[X \mapsto t]}{\exists X(\phi)} \quad \exists X - i$$

where  $t$  is a term that is free for  $X$  in  $\phi$

Eliminating existential quantification

$$\frac{\exists X(\phi(X)) \quad \boxed{\begin{array}{c} X_0 \quad \phi(X_0) \quad \text{Asmptn} \\ \vdots \\ \chi \end{array}}}{\chi} \quad \exists X - e$$

Here  $X_0$  is a variable that does not occur anywhere outside the box.

Intuitively,  $\exists X(\phi(X))$  tells us that some value of  $X$  satisfies  $\phi(X)$ , but we don't know which value.

The box says: "let's temporarily use  $X_0$  a name for the value of  $X$  satisfying  $\phi(X)$ , and see what we can conclude from  $\phi(X_0)$ "

We need to make sure that the name  $X_0$  is not already being used as a name for something else, for there is no guarantee that other object satisfies  $\phi(X)$ .

$$\neg \forall X(\phi(X)) \quad \vdash \quad \exists X(\neg \phi(X))$$

Some problems, by Lewis Carroll:

1. Babies are illogical.
2. Nobody is despised who can manage a crocodile.
3. Illogical persons are despised.
4. Thus, babies cannot manage crocodiles.

1. Everyone who is sane can do logic.
2. No lunatics are fit to serve on a jury.
3. None of your sons can do logic.
4. Thus, none of your sons is fit to serve on a jury.