

CS 245

Lemma: Let $A \models A'$,

$B \models B'$ and $C(u) \models C'(u)$ then

$$[1] \neg A \models \neg A'$$

$$[2] A \wedge B \models A' \wedge B'$$

$$[3] A \vee B \models A' \vee B'$$

$$[4] A \rightarrow B \models A' \rightarrow B'$$

$$[5] A \leftrightarrow B \models A' \leftrightarrow B'$$

$$[6] \forall x C(x) \models \forall x C'(x)$$

$$[7] \exists x C(x) \models \exists x C'(x)$$

Fact: Suppose $B \equiv C$ and A' results from A by replacing some but not necessarily all occurrences of B in A by C . Then $A \equiv A'$.

Proof: By induction on the structure of A .

Fact: Suppose $A \in \text{Form}(L)$ and A is composed of atoms, the connectives \wedge, \vee and \neg , and the quantifiers \forall and \exists .

Then if A' , the dual of A , results from A by exchanging \wedge for \vee , \vee for \wedge , \forall for \exists , \exists for \forall , and each atom for its negation, then $A \# A'$.

Natural Deduction for first-order logic.

To the ND rules for propositional logic add introduction and elimination rules for the universal quantifier \forall , the existential quantifier \exists , and for equality \approx .

$(\forall -)$ If $\Sigma \vdash \forall x A(x)$
then $\Sigma \vdash A(t)$

Notice that t is some term, in $\text{Term}(L)$, and t replaces all occurrences of x in $A(x)$.

(\forall_+) If $\Sigma \vdash A(u)$

where u does not occur
in Σ ,

then $\Sigma \vdash \forall x A(x)$.

Here, x must also not occur
in $A(u)$.

$(\exists -)$ If $\Sigma, A(u) \vdash B$

and u does not occur in Σ
or B , then

$\Sigma, \exists x A(x) \vdash B$

$(\exists +)$ If $\Sigma \vdash A(t)$

then $\Sigma \vdash \exists x A(x)$

where $A(x)$ results by
replacing some not necessarily
all occurrences of t in $A(t)$
by x .

$(\approx -)$ IF $\Sigma \vdash A(t_1)$
and $t_1 \approx t_2$

then $\Sigma \vdash A(t_2)$

where $A(t_2)$ results from
 $A(t_1)$ by replacing some but
not necessarily all occurrences
of t_1 in $A(t_1)$ by t_2 .

$$(\approx +) \quad \vdash \quad u \approx u$$

Def. (Formal deducibility)

Let $\Sigma \subseteq \text{Form}(L)$ and

$A \in \text{Form}(L)$. Then A is

formally deducible from Σ
in first order logic if

$$\Sigma \vdash A$$

can be generated from
the ND proof rules.

Suppose x_1, \dots, x_n are
variables then

$\forall x_1 \dots \forall x_n$

can be abbreviated as $\forall x_1 \dots x_n$.

Similarly

$\exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n$

can be abbreviated as $\exists x_1 \dots x_n$.

We can then extend the
rules

$(\forall -)$

$(\forall +)$

$(\exists -)$

$(\exists +)$

as follows

(\forall -) If $\Sigma \vdash \forall x_1, \dots, x_n A(x_1, \dots, x_n)$
then $\Sigma \vdash A(t_1, \dots, t_n)$.

$$(\forall+) \text{ IF } \Sigma \vdash A(u_1, \dots, u_n)$$

where u_1, \dots, u_n do not
occur in Σ then

$$\Sigma \vdash \forall x_1, \dots, x_n A(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

$(\exists-)$ If $\Sigma, A(u_1, \dots, u_n) \vdash B$

where u_1, \dots, u_n do not occur
in B or Σ , then

$\Sigma, \exists x_1 \dots x_n A(x_1, \dots, x_n) \vdash B$

$(\exists+)$ IF $\Sigma \vdash A(t_1, \dots, t_n)$

then $\Sigma \vdash \exists x_1 \dots x_n A(x_1, \dots, x_n)$

where $A(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ results

from simultaneously replacing
some, not necessarily all,

occurrences of t_i in

$A(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ by x_i ,

for $i \in [1..n]$.

Notice that in

$$x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$$

the x_i should be distinct.

For instance

$$\forall x x F(x, x)$$

is not a well formed
formula.

Neither is $\forall x \forall x F(x, x)$.

In the rules $(\forall+)$ and $(\exists-)$ the u_i should also be distinct.

However in $(\forall-)$ and $(\exists+)$ the t_i need not be distinct.