

# LOGICS EXERCISE

TU MÜNCHEN  
INSTITUT FÜR INFORMATIK

PROF. TOBIAS NIPKOW  
LARS HUPEL

SS 2017

EXERCISE SHEET 10

04.07.2017

**Submission of homework:** Before tutorial on 11.07.2017. You have to do the homework yourself; no teamwork allowed.

**Exercise 10.1. [Sequent Calculus]**

Prove the following formulas in sequent calculus, or give a countermodel that falsifies the formula.

1.  $\neg\exists xP(x) \rightarrow \forall x\neg P(x)$
2.  $(\forall x(P \vee Q(x))) \rightarrow (P \vee \forall xQ(x))$
3.  $\forall x\exists yP(x, y) \rightarrow \exists y\forall xP(x, y)$

**Exercise 10.2. [Counterexamples from Sequent Calculus]**

Consider the following invalid statement:  $\exists xP(x) \rightarrow \forall xP(x)$ . Try to prove this statement in sequent calculus and derive a countermodel from the (incomplete) proof tree.

**Exercise 10.3. [Substitution in Sequent Calculus]**

Prove that  $\vdash_G \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  implies  $\vdash_G \Gamma[t/x] \Rightarrow \Delta[t/x]$ , where, for a set of formulas  $\Gamma$ , we define  $\Gamma[t/x]$  to be  $\{F[t/x] \mid F \in \Gamma\}$ , i.e. free occurrences of  $x$  are replaced by  $t$ . Give two different proofs:

1. A syntactic proof, transforming the proof tree of  $\vdash_G \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ .
2. A semantic proof, using correctness and completeness of  $\vdash_G$ .

**Exercise 10.4. [Natural Deduction]**

Prove the following formula using natural deduction.

$$\neg(\forall x(\exists y(\neg P(x) \wedge P(y))))$$

**Homework 10.1.** [Counterexamples from Sequent Calculus] (4 points)

Recall Exercise 10.2. We derived a countermodel from an incomplete proof tree. Now consider the statement  $\forall xP(x) \rightarrow \neg P(x)$ .

1. What happens when trying to prove the validity of this formula in sequent calculus?
2. How can we derive a countermodel from the proof tree?
3. Is there a smaller countermodel?

**Homework 10.2.** [Proofs] (16 points)

Prove the following statements using both natural deduction and sequent calculus if they are valid, or give a countermodel otherwise.

1.  $\neg\forall x\exists y\forall z(\neg P(x, z) \wedge P(z, y))$
2.  $\forall x\forall y\forall z(P(x, x) \wedge (P(x, y) \wedge P(y, z) \rightarrow P(x, z)))$
3.  $\exists x(P(x) \rightarrow \forall xP(x))$

*Caution:* While you are free to carry out the sequent calculus proofs in Logitext, note that application of  $\forall L$  and  $\exists R$  delete the principal formula. You have to select “Contract” first before instantiating the principal formula.