

High-order

Boolean Logic

8-1 G. Smolka

June 8, 2005

BA Semantically Incomplete

Not viable with
1st-order equations

• $\exists \rho = \epsilon. \mathcal{J} \models \rho = \epsilon \not\vdash \text{BA} \models \rho = \epsilon$

$f_0 \wedge f_1 \rightarrow f_2 \wedge \neg$ invalid in many-valued B. algebras

• Deduction Theorem fails:

$\exists \rho = \epsilon. \rho = 1 \stackrel{\text{BA}}{\vdash} \epsilon = 1 \not\vdash \text{BA} \models \rho \rightarrow \epsilon = \neg$

$\rho = x \wedge x, \epsilon = f_2$

$\text{BA} \not\vdash x \wedge x \rightarrow f_2 = \neg$ if $f_2 = 0$ and $f_2 = b$
for 3rd value b

Syntax and Standard Interpretation

• Same constants as for first-order β . Logic

$\mathcal{C}_1: \beta; \neg: \beta \rightarrow \beta; \wedge, \vee: \beta \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta$

• no restrictions on variables, terms, equations; (e.g.)
we have the equation $f_0 \wedge f_1 \rightarrow f_2 = \neg$ where f_i, x are variables

• Same standard interpretation as first-order β . Logic: \mathcal{J}

• $\mathcal{J} \models \rho = \epsilon$ **decidable** since all ϵ -types

denote finite sets (e.g., $\beta, \beta \rightarrow \beta, (\beta \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta, \dots$)

Additional Axiom Regains Semantic Completeness

Boolean Replacement

(BR_{rep}) $x \leftrightarrow y \wedge f x = x \leftrightarrow y \wedge f y$

Operator precedence:
 $\leftrightarrow, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow$

$\text{HB} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{BA} \cup \{\text{BR}_{\text{rep}}\}$

$\mathcal{J} \models \text{HB}$

Duality Theorems Remain Valid

$$\boxed{HB \vdash \widehat{B} \Leftrightarrow B} \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \boxed{HB \models e \Leftrightarrow HB \models \bar{e}} \\ HB \vdash \bar{e} \Leftrightarrow HB \models e$$

Proof. Since $BA \vdash \widehat{x \leftrightarrow y} = \overline{x \leftrightarrow y}$ it suffices to show:

$$BA \vdash \overline{x \leftrightarrow y} + \overline{f x} = \overline{x \leftrightarrow y + f x} \quad \text{BA}_1, \beta \\ = \overline{x \leftrightarrow y \wedge (\overline{f x})} \quad \text{BA}_1, \beta \\ = \overline{x \leftrightarrow y \wedge (\overline{f x})} \quad \text{BA}_1, \beta \\ = \overline{x \leftrightarrow y} + \overline{f x} \quad \text{BA}_1, \beta \quad \square$$

Boolean Instantiation

$$\text{(BI)} \quad \boxed{HB \vdash f_0 \wedge f_1 \rightarrow f x = \top} \quad \text{follows with Expansion, Resolution and Absorption}$$

$$\mathcal{D} \models HB \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}B = \{0_0, \omega_0\}$$

Semantic Completeness

$$\boxed{\forall x. \top \models e \Leftrightarrow HB \models e} \quad \text{follows from the above and Dn Theorem}$$

Expansion

$$\text{(Exp)} \quad \boxed{HB \vdash f x = \bar{x} \wedge f_0 + x \wedge f_1} \quad \text{follows from}$$

follows from

$$\boxed{HB \vdash x \wedge f x = x \wedge f_1} \quad x = x \Leftrightarrow \top$$

$$\boxed{HB \vdash \bar{x} \wedge f x = \bar{x} \wedge f_0} \quad \bar{x} = x \Leftrightarrow \perp$$

Conjecture: HB Deductively Incomplete

$$\exists e. \top \models e \wedge HB \not\vdash e$$

$$\text{Candidate: } f(f(f x)) = f x$$

Boolean Case Analysis (BCA)

8

$$HB \leq A: A \vdash e \Leftrightarrow A \vdash \neg(x_i=0) \wedge A \vdash \neg(x_i=\neg)$$

Proof. \Rightarrow by substitution rule

\Leftarrow Let $e = (p=t)$ and ...

$$\text{Then } A \vdash (p \Leftrightarrow t) \wedge (x_i=0) = \neg$$

$$\wedge A \vdash (p \Leftrightarrow t) \wedge (x_i=\neg) = \neg$$

Hence $A \vdash p \Leftrightarrow t = \neg$ by (S) with $f = \lambda x. p \Leftrightarrow t$

Hence $A \vdash e$ \square

Lemma

needed for Dead Theo 10

$$(1) \quad t_1 \Leftrightarrow^A t_2 \Rightarrow (p \rightarrow t_1) \Leftrightarrow^A (p \rightarrow t_2)$$

$$(2) \quad t_1 \Leftrightarrow^B t_2 \Rightarrow (p \rightarrow t_1) \Leftrightarrow^{HB^*} (p \rightarrow t_2)$$

Proof. (1) is obvious.

(2). Let $t_1 \Leftrightarrow^B t_2$. Then $\exists t, x$ such that

$$t_1 = t[x:=\neg] \text{ and } t_2 = t[x:=1] \quad (\text{wlog})$$

$$\text{Hence } p \rightarrow t_1 = \overline{p \wedge \overline{t_1}} = \overline{p \wedge \overline{t}} \wedge (x.\overline{E}) \wedge BA$$

$$= \overline{p \wedge \overline{t}} \wedge (x.\overline{E}) \wedge BA$$

$$= p \rightarrow t_2 \quad BA$$

Hence $(p \rightarrow t_1) \Leftrightarrow^{HB^*} (p \rightarrow t_2)$ \square

Deduction Theorem (\rightarrow Agree)

9

$$HB \leq A: p \wedge \overline{t} \vdash_0 t = \neg \Leftrightarrow A \vdash p \rightarrow t = \neg$$

Proof \Leftarrow easy, \square .

\Rightarrow Let $p \wedge \overline{t} \vdash_0 t = \neg$.

$$t (\Leftrightarrow^A \vee \Leftrightarrow^B) \wedge$$

$$(p \rightarrow t) \Leftrightarrow^A \neg (p \rightarrow \neg)$$

$$A \vdash p \rightarrow t = p \rightarrow \neg$$

$$A \vdash p \rightarrow t = \neg$$

Resolving Theorem

Combina next page

Resolving Theorem

$BA \vdash p \rightarrow \neg = \neg$ \square

11

$$HB \leq A: A \vdash p = t \Leftrightarrow p = \neg (\overline{t}) \vdash_0 t = \neg$$

Proof \Leftarrow obvious.

\Rightarrow Let $p = \neg (\overline{t}) \vdash_0 t = \neg$

Then $A \vdash p \rightarrow t = \neg$ and $A \vdash t \rightarrow p = \neg$ \square

Hence $A \vdash p \Leftrightarrow t = \neg$ BA

Hence $A \vdash p = t$ BA \square

Def Theo is equivalent to BRep

12

$$\text{BRep } A: (\forall \alpha = t, \alpha = \neg \text{A} \circ t = \neg \Rightarrow \text{A} \text{ t} \circ \neg t = \neg)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \text{A t BRep}$$

Proof. \Leftarrow : Already shown.

\Rightarrow : By assumption and (ii) it suffices to show:

$$x \Leftrightarrow y \wedge \neg x = \neg \quad \text{A} \circ \neg \quad x \Leftrightarrow y \wedge \neg y = \neg$$

$\text{I} \text{A}_0$

$\text{I} \text{A}_0$

$$x = y, \neg x = \neg$$

$$x = y, \neg y = \neg \quad \square$$