

Simplifying the axiomatization for the ordered affine geometry via a theorem prover

Dafa Li

Dept of mathematical sciences

Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

Abstract

Based on an ordering with directed lines and using constructions instead of existential axioms, von Plato proposed a constructive axiomatization of the ordered affine geometry. There are 22 axioms for the ordered affine geometry, of which the axiom I.7 is about the convergence of three lines (ignoring their directions). In this paper, we indicate that the axiom I.7 includes much redundancy, and demonstrate that the complicated axiom I.7 can be replaced equivalently with a simpler and more intuitive new axiom via a theorem prover.

Keywords: the ordered affine geometry, axiomatization, natural deduction, automated theorem proving, the first order logic.

1 Introduction

Heyting proposed the constructive axiomatization for elementary geometry [1]. He adopted the concepts of distinct points and distinct lines rather than the concepts of equal points and lines. von Plato proposed the axioms of constructive geometry for which he introduced the concepts of convergent lines instead of parallel lines and of apartness of a point from a line instead of incidence of a point with a line [2, 3]. Then, he presented a constructive theory of the ordered affine geometry [4].

In about 1927, Tarski improved Hilbert's 1899 axioms and proposed his axiomatization for geometry [5]. Contrast to Hilbert's axioms, the axioms in Tarskian geometry are shorter and more elegant and the number of the axioms is less. Then, he also improved his axiomatization in [6, 7].

There are some achievements in automated theorem proving [8, 9, 10, 11]. McCune proved that Robbins algebras are Boolean with the theorem prover EQP [11]. Since the problem was posed by Herbert Robbins in the 1930s, it was conjectured that all Robbins algebras are Boolean algebras. Beeson and Wos found OTTER proofs of 212 theorems in Tarskian geometry [5]. Some open lattice theory problems were solved with the help of automated theorem provers [12].

The natural deduction system is adapted from G. Gentzen system in the 1930s [17, 18]. The natural deduction system is popular in elementary textbooks. Proofs in a natural deduction system are derived from assumptions by applying many inference rules, for example MP (modus ponens). The inference rules resemble patterns of reasoning from natural language discourse. So, the inference rules are natural and intuitive. It is also known that proofs in a natural deduction systems are shorter and easier to construct than in axiomatic and tableau systems. Therefore, natural deduction systems are more suited to practical theorem-proving. By using the automated natural deduction prover (ANDP) [13, 14], we simplified von Plato's axiomatization of constructive apart-

ness geometry and orthogonality [15, 16].

In this paper, we simplify von Plato's axiomatization for the ordered affine geometry via the theorem prover ANDP. We indicate that von Plato's axiom I.7 includes some redundancy and show that the complicated axiom I.7 can be replaced equivalently with a simpler and more intuitive new axiom. One can see that so far, it is the first time to improve von Plato's axiomatization for the ordered affine geometry.

2 Automated natural deduction prover (ANDP)

The natural deduction system is adapted from Gentzen system. Natural deduction systems are more suited to practical theorem-proving.

2.1 The rules of inference used in ANDP

There are many rules in natural deduction system.

A. Rules of inference for propositional logic

The axiom and basic rules

(a) Premise or assumption

$$\Gamma, A \vdash A$$

(b)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma, A \vdash B}$$

Rules for connectives

(a) MP (Modus Ponens)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B}{\Gamma \vdash B}$$

MT (Modus Tollens)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \sim B \quad \Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B}{\Gamma \vdash \sim A}$$

(b) LDS (Left Disjunctive Syllogism)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \vee B \quad \Gamma \vdash \sim A}{\Gamma \vdash B}$$

RDS (Right Disjunctive Syllogism)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \vee B \quad \Gamma \vdash \sim B}{\Gamma \vdash A}$$

(c) CP (Conditional Proof)

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B}$$

(d) SIMP (Simplication)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash A}$$
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash B}$$

(e) IP (Indirect Proof)

$$\frac{\Gamma, \sim A \vdash B \quad \Gamma, \sim A \vdash \sim B}{\Gamma \vdash A}$$

\sim Elimination

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Gamma \vdash \sim A}{\Gamma \vdash B}$$

(f) DILEMMA (or Cases)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \vee B \quad \Gamma, A \vdash C \quad \Gamma, B \vdash C}{\Gamma \vdash C}$$

(g) IMP (Implication)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \vee B \quad \Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B}{\Gamma \vdash \sim A \rightarrow B} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B}{\Gamma \vdash \sim A \vee B}$$

(h) Double Negation

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \sim \sim A}{\Gamma \vdash A} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash \sim \sim A}$$

Rules for quantifiers

(a) UG (Universal Generalization)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A(x)}{\Gamma \vdash \forall x A(x)}$$

where x is not free in any member of Γ .

(b) US (Universal Specialization)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \forall x A(x)}{\Gamma \vdash A(t)}$$

where t is free for x in $A(x)$.

(c) EG (Existential Generalization)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A(t)}{\Gamma \vdash \exists x A(x)}$$

where t is free for x in $A(x)$.

(d) ES(or EE, Eliminating Existential quantifier)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \exists x A(x) \quad \Gamma, A(a) \vdash C}{\Gamma \vdash C}$$

where a is an individual constant not occurring in any member of Γ , in $\exists x A(x)$ or in C .

Substitution rule

SUB (Substitution)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A(x)}{\Gamma \vdash A(t)}$$

where variable x is not free in any member of Γ and t is free for x in $A(x)$.

De Morgan rules

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \sim [A \vee B] \quad \Gamma \vdash \sim [A \wedge B] \quad \Gamma \vdash \sim [A \rightarrow B]}{\Gamma \vdash \sim A \wedge \sim B \quad \Gamma \vdash \sim A \vee \sim B \quad \Gamma \vdash A \wedge \sim B}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \sim \forall x A(x) \quad \Gamma \vdash \sim \exists x A(x)}{\Gamma \vdash \exists x \sim A(x) \quad \Gamma \vdash \forall x \sim A(x)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \exists x \sim A(x) \quad \Gamma \vdash \forall x \sim A(x)}{\Gamma \vdash \sim \forall x A(x) \quad \Gamma \vdash \sim \exists x A(x)}$$

In ANDP system, the quantifiers $(\forall x)$ and $(\exists x)$ are written as (Ax) and (Ex) , respectively. The connectives \rightarrow , \vee , and \wedge are written as $- >$, $|$, and $\&$, respectively. “ \sim ” stands for “not”.

2.2 Two unification algorithms

The rules UG (Universal Generalization) and EG (Existential Generalization) are used to introduce quantifiers. The rules US (Universal Specialization) and ES (Existential Specialization) are used to eliminate quantifiers.

We have two unification algorithms for quantifiers, one is for introducing quantifiers, the other is for eliminating quantifiers [13]. Given two formulas, our algorithm can determine if they match by applying the rules UG and EG . For “yes” case, our algorithm can give the series of operations UG and EG and decide which occurrences of terms should be existentially generalized upon. Similarly, given two formulas, our algorithm can determine if they match by applying the rules US and ES . For “yes” case, our algorithm can find the series of operations US and ES and decide what terms are used to replace the bound variables by matching without using Skolem functions.

2.3 Search strategies and Heuristics

(1). Minimal scopes of quantifiers

Push quantifiers inside as possible as we can to minimize scopes of quantifiers. For example, for $\forall x \sim (\sim P(x) \vee \sim Q(x))$, pushing the quantifier

inside, obtain $\sim \exists x(\sim P(x) \vee \sim Q(x))$. Pushing the quantifier inside again, obtain $\sim (\exists x \sim P(x) \vee \exists x \sim Q(x))$. Pushing the quantifier inside again, $\sim (\sim \forall x P(x) \vee \sim \forall x Q(x))$. By using De Morgan rule, obtain $\forall x P(x) \wedge \forall x Q(x)$.

Minimal scopes of quantifiers can make more chances to apply the rules for propositional logic. For example, after pushing quantifiers inside, we obtain $\forall x P(x) \wedge \forall x Q(x)$. Then, simplification rule can be applied to $\forall x P(x) \wedge \forall x Q(x)$, and obtain $\forall x P(x)$ and $\sim \forall x Q(x)$.

(2). It is known that deducing theorems from top to bottom may produce many redundant formulas. People manage to block to produce them. We always deduce theorems first from bottom to top then from top to bottom. For example, if a present goal is of the form $A \rightarrow B$, $A \wedge B$ or $A \vee B$, then first apply the rules CP, CONJUNCTION or IMPLICATION to the goal, respectively, to deduce it from bottom to top.

(3). The order in which the rules are applied is important. We prefer to apply the rules for propositional logic to the ones for quantifiers. When deducing from top to bottom, we use MP, MT, LDS, RDS, SIMPLIFICATION in order and use DILEMMA (or CASES) as the last one.

(4). Subsumption in natural deduction

When determining if a formula should be produced, we check if it can be derived from a formula in preceding line by renaming bound variables. For "yes" case, we ignore it. For example, assume that $\forall y P(y)$ is derived by the rules. If $\forall x P(x)$ has been derived in preceding line, then we ignore $\forall y P(y)$ because $\forall y P(y)$ can be obtained from $\forall x P(x)$ by renaming the bound variable x .

(5). For tautology

A wff is called tautologous if it can be obtained from a tautology substituting formulas for propositional variables in the tautology and renaming bound variables. If a formula is tautologous, then the formula will not be produced. For example, $\exists x P x \rightarrow \exists y P y$ can be obtained from the tautology $q \rightarrow q$ by substituting $\exists x P x$ for the propositional variable q and renaming the bound variable x in $\exists x P x \rightarrow \exists x P x$. Therefore, $\exists x P x \rightarrow \exists y P y$ is tautologous.

(6). When applying the rule CASES to a disjunction, then two disjuncts will be used as new hypotheses. Thus, the free individual variables in the disjunction will appear in the new hypotheses and therefore become new constants. It produces many new Herbrand terms and irrelevant and redundant formulas. Now we use the following strategies.

1: The rule CASES is first applied to premises.

2: The rule CASES is then applied to the disjunctions in which no free individual variables appear.

3: The rule CASES is then applied to short formulas.

3 Simplifying the axiomatization for von Plato's ordered affine geometry

The five basic relations DiPt, DiLn, Umdir, L-Apt, and L-Con and four constructions $\ln(a, b)$, $\text{pt}(a, b)$, $\text{par}(l, m)$, and $\text{rev}(l)$ are used to describe the axiomatization for the ordered affine geometry [4]. In total, von Plato's axiomatization has 22 axioms [4].

In this paper, we want to replace the axiom I.7 with a simpler and more intuitive new axiom equivalently. Only three axioms I.5, I.6, and I.7 are of concern to the presented work. Only a basic relation $\text{Umdir}(l, m)$ and only a construction $\text{rev}(l)$ appear in the axioms I.5 I.6, and I.7.

$\text{Umdir}(l, m)$ means l and m are unequally directed lines.

$\text{rev}(l)$ stands for the reverse of line l .

3.1 The three axioms

The axiom I.5,

$$(\forall l) \sim \text{Umdir}(l, l). \quad (1)$$

The axiom I.6:

$$(\forall l)(\forall m)[\text{Umdir}(l, m) \rightarrow \text{Umdir}(l, n) \vee \text{Umdir}(m, n)] \quad (2)$$

The axiom I.7:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\forall l)(\forall m)(\forall n)[\text{Umdir}(l, m) \& \text{Umdir}(l, \text{rev}(m)) \\ \rightarrow & \text{Umdir}(l, n) \& \text{Umdir}(l, \text{rev}(n)) \vee \text{Umdir}(m, n) \& \text{Umdir}(m, \text{rev}(n))]. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The convergence $\text{Con}(l, m)$ is defined by means of the basic relation Umdir as $\text{Umdir}(l, m) \& \text{Umdir}(l, \text{rev}(m))$ [4]. Thus, $\text{Con}(l, m)$ means that l and m are convergent lines. Note that directions of lines l and m are ignored for $\text{Con}(l, m)$. And then by means of the definition of $\text{Con}(l, m)$, the axiom I.7 becomes

$$(\forall l)(\forall m)(\forall n)[\text{Con}(l, m) \rightarrow \text{Con}(l, n) \vee \text{Con}(m, n)]. \quad (4)$$

Eq.(4) describes the convergence of three lines (the direction is ignored)

3.2 Much redundancy in the axiom I.7

The axiom I.7 can be rewritten equivalently as $w1 \& w2 \& w3 \& w4$, where

$$\begin{aligned} w1 &= \sim \text{Umdir}(l, m) \vee \sim \text{Umdir}(l, \text{rev}(m)) \\ & \vee \text{Umdir}(l, n) \vee \text{Umdir}(m, n), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} w2 &= \sim \text{Umdir}(l, m) \vee \sim \text{Umdir}(l, \text{rev}(m)) \\ & \vee \text{Umdir}(l, n) \vee \text{Umdir}(m, \text{rev}(n)), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$w3 = \sim Undir(l, m) \vee \sim Undir(l, rev(m)) \quad (7)$$

$$\vee Undir(l, rev(n)) \vee Undir(m, n),$$

$$w4 = \sim Undir(l, m) \vee \sim Undir(l, rev(m)) \quad (8)$$

$$\vee Undir(l, rev(n)) \vee Undir(m, rev(n)),$$

where the prefix $(\forall l)(\forall m)(\forall n)$ for w1, w2, w3, and w4 was omitted.

The classical concepts Opp and Dir are defined by means of the basic relation Undir [4]. $Opp(x, y)$ is defined as $\sim Undir(x, rev(y))$. Thus, $Opp(x, y)$ means that the lines x and y are oppositely directed lines. $Dir(x, y)$ is defined as $\sim Undir(x, y)$. Thus, $Dir(x, y)$ means that x and y are equally directed lines.

By means of the definitions of Dir and Opp, w1, w2, w3, and w4 can be rewritten as

$$w1 = Dir(l, n) \& Dir(m, n) \rightarrow Dir(l, m) \vee Opp(l, m), \quad (9)$$

$$w2 = Dir(l, n) \& Opp(m, n) \rightarrow Dir(l, m) \vee Opp(l, m), \quad (10)$$

$$w3 = Opp(l, n) \& Dir(m, n) \rightarrow Dir(l, m) \vee Opp(l, m), \quad (11)$$

$$w4 = Opp(l, n) \& Opp(m, n) \rightarrow Dir(l, m) \vee Opp(l, m), \quad (12)$$

where the prefix $(\forall l)(\forall m)(\forall n)$ for w1, w2, w3, and w4 was omitted.

w1 in Eq.(9) means that if l and n are equally directed line and m and n are equally directed lines, then lines l and m are equally directed lines or oppositely directed lines. One can know that it is impossible for both $Dir(l, m)$ and $Opp(l, m)$ happen. In fact, lines l and m are equally directed lines. Thus, w1 includes the redundancy. Even, we show that the axiom I.6 implies w1 below. It means w1 is redundant.

w2 in Eq.(10) means that if l and n are equally directed line and m and n are oppositely directed lines, then lines l and m are equally directed lines or oppositely directed lines. One can know that it is impossible for both $Dir(l, m)$ and $Opp(l, m)$ happen. Factually, lines l and m should be oppositely directed lines. It means that w2 includes the redundancy.

w3 in Eq.(11) means that if l and n are oppositely directed line and m and n are equally directed lines, then lines l and m are equally directed lines or oppositely directed lines. It is impossible for both $Dir(l, m)$ and $Opp(l, m)$ happen. Factually, lines l and m should be oppositely directed lines. It means that w3 includes the redundancy.

w4 in Eq.(12) means that if l and n are oppositely directed line and m and n are oppositely directed lines, then lines l and m are equally directed lines or oppositely directed lines. It is impossible for both $Dir(l, m)$ and $Opp(l, m)$ happen. Factually, lines l and m should be equally directed lines. It means that w4 includes the redundancy. Even, we show that the axiom I.6 implies w4 below. It means w4 is redundant.

4 Replacing the axiom I.7 with a shorter formula equivalently

By means of the automated reasoning prover ANDP, after lots of trials, we choose the following the wff (well-formed formula) to replace the axiom I.7 equivalently.

Let SYM :

$$(\forall l)(\forall m)[Undir(l, rev(m)) \rightarrow Undir(m, rev(l))]. \quad (13)$$

SYM reads that for any lines l and m , if l and the reverse of m are unequally directed lines, then m and the reverse of l are unequally directed lines. SYM is referred as to the symmetry of the reverse line.

Clearly, SYM is shorter and more intuitive than the axiom I.7. One can know that the predicate *Undir* in the formula SYM and the axiom I.7 have two and six occurrences, respectively.

In this section, we show that the axiom I.7 can be replaced with SYM equivalently. To the end, after lots of trials by using ANDP, we choose the set of the axioms I.5, I.6, and I.7 (the set is the smallest) such that it is equivalent to the set of the axioms I.5 and I.6, and SYM. Clearly, we need only to show that the axioms I.5, I.6, and I.7 imply SYM and the axioms I.5 and I.6, and SYM imply the axiom I.7. The ANDP proofs are put in Supplementary.

4.1 The axioms I.5, I.6, and SYM imply the axiom I.7

One can know that the axiom I.7 is complicated. To reduce the difficulty to derive the axiom I.7, we consider w1, w2, w3, and w4 in Eqs. (5, 6, 7, 8). In stead of deriving the axiom I.7 from the axioms I.5, I.6, and SYM, we can try to derive w1, w2, w3, and w4, respectively, via ANDP.

4.1.1 The axiom I.6 implies w1

After lots of computer experiments, the ANDP proof of w1 is derived from only the axiom I.6 without using other axioms. It means that w1 is redundant. Via the ANDP proof, we find the following corresponding hand proof and a resolution proof for w1.

Lemma 1. w1 can be derived from only the axiom I.6.

(i). Transfer the mechanical ANDP proof into a hand proof.

Proof. We can rewrite w1 as

$$w1 = Undir(l, m) \wedge Undir(l, rev(m)) \wedge \sim Undir(l, n) \rightarrow Undir(m, n).$$

Assume that $Undir(l, m)$ and $Undir(l, rev(m))$ and $\sim Undir(l, n)$. Then, let us derive $Undir(m, n)$. Applying the axiom I.6, obtain

$$Undir(l, m) \rightarrow Undir(l, n) \vee Undir(m, n) \quad (14)$$

Via $Undir(l, m)$ and from the above, obtain

$$Undir(l, n) \vee Undir(m, n) \quad (15)$$

Via $\sim Undir(l, n)$ and Eq. (15), we obtain $Undir(m, n)$.

We finish the proof.

(ii). Transfer the mechanical ANDP proof into a resolution proof.

We next show that the axiom I.6 implies w1 by resolution.

From the negation of w1, we obtain the following clauses (1) to (4). From the axiom I.6, obtain the clause (5).

We have input clauses:

- (1). $Undir(a, b)$,
- (2). $Undir(a, rev(b))$,
- (3). $\sim Undir(a, c)$,
- (4). $\sim Undir(b, c)$,
- (5). $\sim Undir(x, y) \vee Undir(x, z) \vee Undir(y, z)$.

From the above five input clauses, we obtain a unit refutation of the empty clause. The refutation includes three resolvents. Clearly, the clause (2) is redundant. “mgu” in Table 1 is short for “most general unifier”. ϕ stands for the empty clause. The literals resolved upon for each resolvent are the first literals of the parent clauses. For example, for the second row of Table 1, ((1),(5)) means that the parent clauses are the clauses (1) and (5), and the first literal of the clause (1) and the first literal of the clause (5) are the literals resolved upon.

Table 1. Resolution proof for w1

#	resolvents	parent clauses	mgu
(6)	$Undir(a, z) \vee Undir(b, z)$,	(1,5)	$\{a/x, b/y\}$
(7)	$Undir(b, c)$	(6,3)	$\{c/z\}$
(8)	ϕ	(4,7)	

4.1.2 The axioms I.5, I.6 and SYM imply w2

The ANDP proof of w2 is derived from the axioms I.5, I.6, and SYM without using other axioms. Via the ANDP proof, we find a resolution proof in Appendix A and the following corresponding hand proof.

Lemma 2. w2 can be derived from the axioms I.5, I.6 and SYM.

Proof. We can rewrite w2 as follows.

$$w2 = Undir(l, m) \wedge Undir(l, rev(m)) \wedge \sim Undir(l, n) \rightarrow Undir(m, rev(n)).$$

Assume $Undir(l, m)$, $Undir(l, rev(m))$, and $\sim Undir(l, n)$. Let us derive $Undir(m, rev(n))$.

Applying the axiom I.6, obtain

$$Undir(l, rev(m)) \rightarrow Undir(l, n) \vee Undir(rev(m), n) \quad (16)$$

Via $Undir(l, rev(m)), \sim Undir(l, n)$, and the above, obtain

$$Undir(rev(m), n) \tag{17}$$

Applying the axiom I.6 again, obtain

$$Undir(rev(m), n) \rightarrow Undir(rev(m), rev(m)) \vee Undir(n, rev(m)). \tag{18}$$

From Eqs. (17, 18) and the axiom I.5, obtain

$$Undir(n, rev(m)). \tag{19}$$

Applying SYM, obtain

$$Undir(n, rev(m)) \rightarrow Undir(m, rev(n)) \tag{20}$$

From Eqs. (19, 20), obtain

$$Undir(m, rev(n)) \tag{21}$$

We finish the proof.

4.1.3 The axioms I.5, I.6, and SYM imply w3.

The ANDP proof of w3 is derived from the axioms I.5, I.6, SYM without using other axioms. Via the ANDP proof, we find a resolution proof in Appendix B and the following corresponding hand proof.

Lemma 3. w3 can be derived from the axioms I.5, I.6 and SYM.

Proof. We can rewrite w3 as follows.

$$w3 = Undir(l, m) \wedge Undir(l, rev(m)) \wedge \sim Undir(m, n) \rightarrow Undir(l, rev(n)). \tag{22}$$

Assume $Undir(l, m)$, $Undir(l, rev(m))$, and $\sim Undir(m, n)$. Let us derive $Undir(l, rev(n))$. Applying SYM, we obtain

$$Undir(l, rev(m)) \rightarrow Undir(m, rev(l)) \tag{23}$$

Then, via $Undir(l, rev(m))$ and the above, obtain

$$Undir(m, rev(l)). \tag{24}$$

Applying the axiom I.6, obtain

$$Undir(m, rev(l)) \rightarrow Undir(m, n) \vee Undir(rev(l), n) \tag{25}$$

Then, from Eqs. (24, 25), Via $\sim Undir(m, n)$, obtain

$$Undir(rev(l), n). \tag{26}$$

Applying the axiom I.6 again, obtain

$$Undir(rev(l), n) \rightarrow Undir(rev(l), rev(l)) \vee Undir(n, rev(l)). \quad (27)$$

From Eqs. (26, 27) and the axiom I.5, obtain

$$Undir(n, rev(l)). \quad (28)$$

Applying SYM again, obtain

$$Undir(n, rev(l)) \rightarrow Undir(l, rev(n)). \quad (29)$$

From Eqs. (28, 29), obtain

$$Undir(l, rev(n)). \quad (30)$$

We finish the proof.

4.1.4 The axiom I.6 implies w4.

The ANDP proof of w4 is derived from only the axiom I.6 without using other axioms. It means that w4 is redundant. Via the ANDP proof, we find the following corresponding hand proof and a resolution proof.

Lemma 4. w4 can be derived from only the axiom I.6.

(i). Transfer the mechanical ANDP proof into a hand proof
Proof. We can rewrite w4 as follows.

$$w4 = Undir(l, m) \wedge Undir(l, rev(m)) \wedge \sim Undir(l, rev(n)) \rightarrow Undir(m, rev(n)).$$

Assume $Undir(l, m)$, $Undir(l, rev(m))$, and $\sim Undir(l, rev(n))$. Let us derive $Undir(m, rev(n))$. Applying the axiom I.6, obtain

$$Undir(l, m) \rightarrow Undir(l, rev(n)) \vee Undir(m, rev(n)). \quad (31)$$

Via $Undir(l, m)$ and Eq. (31), we obtain

$$Undir(l, rev(n)) \vee Undir(m, rev(n)). \quad (32)$$

Via $\sim Undir(l, rev(n))$ and the above, we obtain

$$Undir(m, rev(n)). \quad (33)$$

We finish the proof.

(ii). Transfer the mechanical ANDP proof into a resolution proof

We next show that the axiom I.6 implies w4 by resolution. From the negation of w4, we obtain the following clauses (1) to (4). From the axiom I.6, obtain the clause (5).

We have input clauses:

- (1). $Undir(a, b)$,
- (2). $Undir(a, rev(b))$,

- (3). $\sim \text{Undir}(a, \text{rev}(c))$,
- (4). $\sim \text{Undir}(b, \text{rev}(c))$.
- (5). $\sim \text{Undir}(x, y) \vee \text{Undir}(x, z) \vee \text{Undir}(y, z)$,

From the above five input clauses, we obtain a unit refutation of the empty clause. The refutation includes three resolvents. Clearly, the clause (2) is redundant. The literals resolved upon for each resolvent are the first literals of the parent clauses.

Table 4. Resolution proof for w4

#	resolvents	parent clauses	mgu
(6)	$\text{Undir}(a, z) \vee \text{Undir}(b, z)$,	(1,5)	$\{a/x, b/y\}$
(7)	$\text{Undir}(b, \text{rev}(c))$	(6,3)	$\{\text{rev}(c)/z\}$
(8)	ϕ	(4,7)	

In lights of Lemmas 1-4, we can conclude the following.

Theorem 1. The axioms I.5, I.6, and SYM imply the axiom I.7.

4.2 The axioms I.5, I.6, and I.7 imply SYM

To reduce the difficulty to derive SYM from the set of the axioms I.5, I.6, and I.7, we try to derive SYM from the set of the axioms I.5, I.6, and w1 (resp. w2, w3, w4) by using ANDP. Finally, we obtain the ANDP proof of SYM from the set of the axioms I.5, I.6, and w2. Via the ANDP proof, we find the following corresponding hand proof and a resolution proof in Appendix C.

Lemma 5. SYM can be derived from the axioms I.5, I.6, and w2.

Proof (which is an Indirect Proof.). Assume that SYM does not hold. That is, assume

$$\text{Undir}(l, \text{rev}(m)) \tag{34}$$

$$\sim \text{Undir}(m, \text{rev}(l)) \tag{35}$$

Applying w2, obtain

$$\sim \text{Undir}(l, m) \vee \sim \text{Undir}(l, \text{rev}(m)) \vee \text{Undir}(l, l) \vee \text{Undir}(m, \text{rev}(l)) \tag{36}$$

Via Eqs. (34, 35) and the axiom I.5, from the above equation, obtain

$$\sim \text{Undir}(l, m). \tag{37}$$

Applying w2, obtain

$$\sim \text{Undir}(l, \text{rev}(m)) \vee \sim \text{Undir}(l, \text{rev}(\text{rev}(m))) \vee \text{Undir}(l, m) \vee \text{Undir}(\text{rev}(m), \text{rev}(m)). \tag{38}$$

Via Eqs. (34, 37), and the axiom I.5, obtain

$$\sim \text{Undir}(l, \text{rev}(\text{rev}(m))). \tag{39}$$

Applying the axiom I.6, obtain

$$\text{Undir}(l, \text{rev}(m)) \rightarrow \text{Undir}(l, m) \vee \text{Undir}(\text{rev}(m), m). \tag{40}$$

Via Eqs. (34, 37), obtain

$$U\text{ndir}(\text{rev}(m), m). \quad (41)$$

Applying the axiom I.6, obtain

$$U\text{ndir}(\text{rev}(m), m) \rightarrow U\text{ndir}(\text{rev}(m), \text{rev}(l)) \vee U\text{ndir}(m, \text{rev}(l)). \quad (42)$$

Via Eqs. (35, 41), obtain

$$U\text{ndir}(\text{rev}(m), \text{rev}(l)). \quad (43)$$

Applying w2, obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sim U\text{ndir}(\text{rev}(m), l) \vee \sim U\text{ndir}(\text{rev}(m), \text{rev}(l)) \\ & \vee U\text{ndir}(\text{rev}(m), \text{rev}(m)) \vee U\text{ndir}(l, \text{rev}(\text{rev}(m))). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Via Eq. (43, 39), and the axiom I.5, from the above obtain

$$\sim U\text{ndir}(\text{rev}(m), l). \quad (45)$$

Applying the axiom I.6, obtain

$$U\text{ndir}(l, \text{rev}(m)) \rightarrow U\text{ndir}(l, l) \vee U\text{ndir}(\text{rev}(m), l). \quad (46)$$

Via Eq. (34) and the axiom I.5, obtain

$$U\text{ndir}(\text{rev}(m), l). \quad (47)$$

Thus, Eqs. (45, 47) make a contradiction. We finish the proof.

Thus, from Lemma 5 we can conclude the following.

Theorem 2. The axioms I.5, I.6, and I.7 imply SYM.

From Theorems 1 and 2, we obtain the following.

Theorem 3. The set of the axioms I.5, I.6, and SYM is equivalent to the set of the axioms I.5, I.6, and I.7. In other words, the axiom I.7 is equivalent to SYM, by using the axioms I.5, I.6. Thus, the axiom I.7 can be replaced with SYM equivalently.

5 Replacing the axiom I.7 with von Plato's Theorem 3.5 equivalently

von Plato's Theorem 3.5 is [4]

$$(\forall l)(\forall m)(\forall n)[\sim U\text{ndir}(l, \text{rev}(m)) \& \sim U\text{ndir}(l, n) \rightarrow \sim U\text{ndir}(m, \text{rev}(n))]. \quad (48)$$

By means of the definitions of Opp and Dir, von Plato's Theorem 3.5 becomes

$$(\forall l)(\forall m)(\forall n)[Opp(l, m) \& Dir(l, n) \rightarrow Opp(m, n)], \quad (49)$$

Thus, Eq. (49) reads that if l and m are oppositely directed lines and l and n are equally directed lines, then m and n are oppositely directed lines.

One can see that von Plato's Theorem 3.5 is also simpler and more intuitive than the axiom I.7. Note that the predicate *Undir* in von Plato's Theorem 3.5 has three occurrences. Next, we show that the axiom I.7 can also be replaced with Von Plato's Theorem 3.5 equivalently.

Lemma 6. von Plato's Theorem 3.5 and the axiom I.5 imply SYM.

Proof. Applying von Plato's Theorem 3.5, obtain

$$\sim Undir(m, rev(l)) \& \sim Undir(m, m) \rightarrow \sim Undir(l, rev(m)). \quad (50)$$

Eq. (50) can be rewritten as

$$Undir(m, rev(l)) \vee Undir(m, m) \vee \sim Undir(l, rev(m)). \quad (51)$$

Via the axiom I.5, from the above obtain SYM

$$Undir(l, rev(m)) \rightarrow Undir(m, rev(l)). \quad (52)$$

We finish the proof.

Theorem 4. The axioms I.5, I.6, and von Plato's Theorem 3.5 imply the axiom I.7.

Proof. In light of Lemma 6, von Plato's Theorem 3.5 and the axiom I.5 imply SYM. In light of Theorem 1, the axioms I.5, I.6, and SYM imply the axiom I.7. Therefore, the axioms I.5, I.6, and von Plato's Theorem 3.5 imply the axiom I.7. We finish the proof.

Therefore, in light of Theorem 4, the axiom I.7 can also be replaced equivalently with von Plato's Theorem 3.5. One can also see that SYM is shorter than von Plato's Theorem 3.5.

6 Summary

Via the automated theorem prover ANDP, we Simplify the axiomatization for the ordered affine geometry proposed by von Plato. From 22 axioms of the ordered affine geometry, we choose three axioms I.5, I.6, and I.7 and show the set of the axioms I.5, I.6, and I.7 is equivalent to the set of the formula SYM and the axioms I.5 and I.6. Thus, the complicated axiom I.7 can be replaced equivalently with SYM which is shorter and more intuitive than the axiom I.7.

We also show that the set of the axioms I.5, I.6, and I.7 is equivalent to the set of von Plato's Theorem 3.5 and the axioms I.5 and I.6. Thus, the axiom I.7 can also be replaced equivalently with von Plato's Theorem 3.5 which is also shorter and more intuitive than the axiom I.7

It is obvious to see that the predicate *Undir* in the formula SYM, von Plato's Theorem 3.5, and the axiom I.7 have two, three, and six occurrences, respectively.

7 Appendix A. Resolution proof of w2

We next show that the axioms I.5 and I.6, and SYM imply w2 by resolution. Via the ANDP proof of w2, it is easy to find a resolution proof of w2 below.

From the negation of w2, we obtain the following clauses (1) to (4). From the axiom I.5 (resp. I.6, SYM), obtain the clause (5) (resp. (6), (7)).

We have input clauses:

- (1). $\text{Undir}(a,b)$,
- (2). $\text{Undir}(a, \text{rev}(b))$,
- (3). $\sim\text{Undir}(a,c)$,
- (4). $\sim\text{Undir}(b,\text{rev}(c))$.
- (5). $\sim\text{Undir}(x,x)$,
- (6). $\sim\text{Undir}(x,y) \vee \text{Undir}(x,z) \vee \text{Undir}(y,z)$,
- (7). $\sim\text{Undir}(x,\text{rev}(y)) \vee \text{Undir}(y,\text{rev}(x))$.

From the above seven input clauses, we obtain a unit refutation of the empty clause. The refutation includes six resolvents. Clearly, the clause (1) is redundant. The literals resolved upon for each resolvent are the first literals of the parent clauses.

Table 1. Resolution proof for w2

#	resolvents	parent clauses	mgu
(8)	$\text{Undir}(a,z) \vee \text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),z)$,	(2,6)	$\{a/x, \text{rev}(b)/y\}$
(9)	$\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),c)$	(8,3)	$\{c/z\}$
(10)	$\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),z) \vee \text{Undir}(c,z)$,	(6,9)	$\{\text{rev}(b)/x, c/y\}$
(11)	$\text{Undir}(c,\text{rev}(b))$	(10,5)	$\{\text{rev}(b)/x, \text{rev}(b)/z\}$
(12)	$\text{Undir}(b,\text{rev}(c))$	(7,11)	$\{c/x, b/y\}$
(13)	ϕ	(12,4)	

8 Append B. Resolution proof of w3

We next show that the axioms I.5 and I.6, and SYM imply w3 by resolution. Via the ANDP proof of w3, it is easy to find a resolution proof of w3 below.

From the negation of w3 we obtain the following clauses (1) to (4). From the axiom I.5 (resp. I.6, SYM), obtain the clause (5) (resp. (6), (7)).

Then, we have input clauses:

- (1). $\text{Undir}(a,b)$,
- (2). $\text{Undir}(a, \text{rev}(b))$,
- (3). $\sim\text{Undir}(a,\text{rev}(c))$,
- (4). $\sim\text{Undir}(b,c)$,
- (5). $\sim\text{Undir}(x,x)$,
- (6). $\sim\text{Undir}(x,y) \vee \text{Undir}(x,z) \vee \text{Undir}(y,z)$,
- (7). $\sim\text{Undir}(x,\text{rev}(y)) \vee \text{Undir}(y,\text{rev}(x))$.

From the above seven input clauses, we obtain a unit refutation of the empty clause. The refutation includes seven resolvents. The literals resolved upon for

each resolvent are the first literals of the parent clauses. Note that the clause (1) is redundant.

Table 2. Resolution proof for w3

#	resolvents	parent clauses	mgu
(8)	$\text{Undir}(b, \text{rev}(a))$	(2,7)	$\{a/x, b/y\}$
(9)	$\text{Undir}(b, z) \vee \text{Undir}(\text{rev}(a), z)$	(8,6)	$\{b/x, \text{rev}(a)/y\}$
(10)	$\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(a), c)$	(4,9)	$\{c/z\}$
(11)	$\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(a), z) \vee \text{Undir}(c, z)$	(10,6)	$\{\text{rev}(a)/x, c/y\}$
(12)	$\text{Undir}(c, \text{rev}(a))$	(5,11)	$\{\text{rev}(a)/z, \text{rev}(a)/x\}$
(13)	$\text{Undir}(a, \text{rev}(c))$	(12,7)	$\{c/x, a/y\}$
(14)	ϕ	(13,3)	

9 Appendix C The resolution proof of SYM.

We next show that the axioms I.5 and I.6, and W2 imply SYM by resolution. Via the ANDP proof of SYM, it is easy to find a resolution proof of SYM below.

From the negation of SYM, we obtain the following clauses (1) and (2). From the axioms I.5, I.6, and W2, obtain clauses (3), (4), and (5), respectively.

We have input clauses:

- (1). $\text{Undir}(a, \text{rev}(b))$,
- (2). $\sim \text{Undir}(b, \text{rev}(a))$,
- (3). $\sim \text{Undir}(x, x)$,
- (4). $\sim \text{Undir}(x, y) \vee \text{Undir}(x, z) \vee \text{Undir}(y, z)$,
- (5). $\sim \text{Undir}(x, y) \vee \sim \text{Undir}(x, \text{rev}(y)) \vee \text{Undir}(x, z) \vee \text{Undir}(y, \text{rev}(z))$.

From the above five input clauses, we obtain a unit refutation of the empty clause. The refutation includes 16 resolvents.

Table 5. The resolution proof for SYM.

#	Resolvents	parent clauses	mgu
(6)	$\sim\text{Undir}(a,b)\vee\text{Undir}(a,z)\vee\text{Undir}(b,\text{rev}(z))$	(1,5)	$\{a/x,b/y\}$
(7)	$\sim\text{Undir}(a,b)\vee\text{Undir}(b,\text{rev}(a))$	(3,6)	$\{a/x, a/z\}$
(8)	$\sim\text{Undir}(a,b)$	(2,7)	
(9)	$\sim\text{Undir}(a,\text{rev}(\text{rev}(b)))\vee\text{Undir}(a,z)\vee\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),\text{rev}(z))$	(1,5)	$\{a/x,\text{rev}(b)/y\}$
(10)	$\sim\text{Undir}(a,\text{rev}(\text{rev}(b)))\vee\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),\text{rev}(b))$	(8,9)	$\{b/z\}$
(11)	$\sim\text{Undir}(a,\text{rev}(\text{rev}(b)))$	(3,10)	$\{b/x\}$
(12)	$\text{Undir}(a,z)\vee\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),z)$	(1,4)	$\{a/x,\text{rev}(b)/y\}$
(13)	$\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),b)$	(8,12)	$\{b/z\}$
(14)	$\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),z)\vee\text{Undir}(b,z)$	(4,13)	$\{\text{rev}(b)/x,b/y\}$
(15)	$\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),\text{rev}(a))$	(2,14)	$\{\text{rev}(a)/z\}$
(16)	$\sim\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),a)\vee\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),z)\vee\text{Undir}(a,\text{rev}(z))$	(5,15)	$\{\text{rev}(b)/x,a/y\}$
(17)	$\sim\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),a)\vee\text{Undir}(a,\text{rev}(\text{rev}(b)))$	(3,16)	$\{\text{rev}(b)/z\}$
(18)	$\sim\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),a)$	(11,17)	
(19)	$\text{Undir}(a,z)\vee\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),z)$	(1,4)	$\{a/x,\text{rev}(b)/y\}$
(20)	$\text{Undir}(\text{rev}(b),a)$	(3,19)	$\{a/z\}$
(21)	ϕ	(18,20)	

References

- [1] Heyting, A.: Axioms for intuitionistic plane affine geometry In L. Henkin et al., eds.. The Axiomatic Method, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 160-173 (1959).
- [2] von Plato, J.: The axioms of constructive geometry. Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, vol. 76, 169-200 (1995).
- [3] van Dalen, D.: ‘Outside’ as a primitive notion in constructive projective geometry. Geometriae Dedicata 60, 107- 111 (1996).
- [4] von Plato, J.: A constructive theory of ordered affine geometry. Indag. Mathem., N.S. 9 (4), 549-562 (1998).
- [5] Michael Beeson and Larry Wos, Finding Proofs in Tarskian Geometry, Journal of Automated Reasoning, 58(1): 181-207 (2017).
- [6] Alfred Tarski. A decision method for elementary algebra and geometry. Technical report, The RAND Corporation, 1957. First published August 1948.
- [7] Alfred Tarski. What is elementary geometry? In Leon Henkin, Patrick Suppes, and Alfred Tarski, editors, The Axiomatic Method: with Special Reference to Geometry and Physics, pages 16–29. North-Holland Publishing Company, 1959.
- [8] McCune, W., Wos, L.: Application of automated deduction to the search for single axioms for exponent groups. Proc. of LPAR-92, St. Petersburg, Russia, July 15–20, 1992, pp. 131–136.

- [9] Padmanabhan, R., McCune, W.: Single identities for ternary Boolean algebra. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 29 (2), 13-16 (1993).
- [10] McCune, W., Padmanabhan, R.: Single identities for lattice theory and weakly associative lattices. *Algebra Universalis*, 36 (4), 436-449(1996).
- [11] McCune, W.: Solution of the Robbins Problem. *J. of automated reasoning* 19(3), 263–276 (1997).
- [12] Adam Grabowski, *J. of automated reasoning* 55, 211-221 (2015).
- [13] Li, D.: Unification Algorithms for Eliminating and Introducing Quantifiers in Natural Deduction Automated Theorem Proving. *J. of Automated Reasoning* 18(1), 105-134(1997).
- [14] Li, D.: Natural Deduction Prover and Experiments, *Tableaux 97*, Nancy, France, pp153-157, May 13-16, (1997).
- [15] Li, D., Jia, P., Li, X.: Simplifying von Plato’s axiomatization of constructive apartness geometry. *Annals of pure and applied logic*, vol. 102, No1-2, (2000).
- [16] Li, D.: Using Prover ANDP to simplify orthogonality. *Annals of pure and applied logic*, 124, 49-70 (2003).
- [17] Pelletier, F.J.: a brief history of natural deduction. *History and philosophy of logic* 20, p. 1-31 (1999).
- [18] Hazen, Allen P. and Pelletier, F. J., Gentzen and Jaśkowski natural deduction: Fundamentally similar but importantly different. *Studia logica* 102, 1103-1142 (2014).

Supplementary

The axiom I.6 implies W1

Solution

1. $(Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x \ y \ \rightarrow \ (Az)[\text{UNDIR } x \ z \ | \ \text{UNDIR } y \ z]]$ ASSUMED-PREMISE
2. $\text{UNDIR } v1 \ v2$ ASSUMED-PREMISE
3. $\sim \text{UNDIR } v1 \ v3$ ASSUMED-PREMISE
4. $(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } v1 \ y \ \rightarrow \ (Az)[\text{UNDIR } v1 \ z \ | \ \text{UNDIR } y \ z]]$ US (v1 x) 1
5. $\text{UNDIR } v1 \ v2 \ \rightarrow \ (Az)[\text{UNDIR } v1 \ z \ | \ \text{UNDIR } v2 \ z]$ US (v2 y) 4
6. $(Az)[\text{UNDIR } v1 \ z \ | \ \text{UNDIR } v2 \ z]$ MP 5 2
7. $\text{UNDIR } v1 \ v3 \ | \ \text{UNDIR } v2 \ v3$ US (v3 z) 6
8. $\text{UNDIR } v2 \ v3$ LDS 7 3
9. $\text{UNDIR } v2 \ v3$ SAME 8
10. $\sim \text{UNDIR } v1 \ v3 \ \rightarrow \ \text{UNDIR } v2 \ v3$ CP 9
11. $\text{UNDIR } v1 \ v3 \ | \ \text{UNDIR } v2 \ v3$ IMP 10
12. $\text{UNDIR } v1 \ [\text{rev } v2] \ \rightarrow \ \text{UNDIR } v1 \ v3 \ | \ \text{UNDIR } v2 \ v3$ CP 11

13. $\sim\text{UNDIR } v1 [rev v2] \mid \text{UNDIR } v1 v3 \mid \text{UNDIR } v2 v3$	IMP 12
14. $\text{UNDIR } v1 v2$	
$\rightarrow [\sim\text{UNDIR } v1 [rev v2] \mid \text{UNDIR } v1 v3 \mid \text{UNDIR } v2 v3$	CP 13
15. $[[\sim\text{UNDIR } v1 v2 \mid \sim\text{UNDIR } v1 [rev v2]] \mid \text{UNDIR } v1 v3$	
$\mid \text{UNDIR } v2 v3$	IMP 14
16. $(Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[\sim\text{UNDIR } x y \mid \sim\text{UNDIR } x [rev y]]$	
$\mid \text{UNDIR } x z \mid \text{UNDIR } y z]$	UG 15
17. $(Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x y \rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } x z \mid \text{UNDIR } y z]]$	
$\rightarrow (Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[\sim\text{UNDIR } x y \mid \sim\text{UNDIR } x [rev y]]$	
$\mid \text{UNDIR } x z \mid \text{UNDIR } y z]$	CP 16

10 The axioms I.5, I.6, and SYM imply w2

Solution

1. $(Ax)\sim\text{UNDIR } x x$	
& $(Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x [rev y] \rightarrow \text{UNDIR } y [rev x]]$	
& $(Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x y \rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } x z \mid \text{UNDIR } y z]]$	ASSUMED-
PREMISE	
2. $\sim(Ex)\text{UNDIR } x x$	SIMP 1
3. $(Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x [rev y] \rightarrow \text{UNDIR } y [rev x]]$	SIMP 1
4. $(Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x y \rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } x z \mid \text{UNDIR } y z]]$	SIMP 1
5. $\text{UNDIR } v1 [rev v2]$	ASSUMED-PREMISE
6. $\sim\text{UNDIR } v1 v3$	ASSUMED-PREMISE
8. $\text{UNDIR } v1 [rev v2] \rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } v1 z \mid \text{UNDIR } [rev v2] z]$	
	US $([rev v2]/y, v1/x)$ 4
9. $(Az)[\text{UNDIR } v1 z \mid \text{UNDIR } [rev v2] z]$	MP 8 5
10. $\text{UNDIR } v1 v3 \mid \text{UNDIR } [rev v2] v3$	US $(v3 z)$ 9
11. $\text{UNDIR } [rev v2] v3$	LDS 10 6
13. $\text{UNDIR } [rev v2] v3 \rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } [rev v2] z \mid \text{UNDIR } v3 z]$	
	US $(v3/y, [rev v2]/x)$ 4
14. $(Az)[\text{UNDIR } [rev v2] z \mid \text{UNDIR } v3 z]$	MP 13 11
15. $\text{UNDIR } [rev v2] [rev v2] \mid \text{UNDIR } v3 [rev v2]$	US $(rev v2 z)$ 14
16. $(Ev11)\text{UNDIR } v11 v11 \mid \text{UNDIR } v3 [rev v2]$	EG 15
17. $\text{UNDIR } v3 [rev v2]$	LDS 2 16
19. $\text{UNDIR } v3 [rev v2] \rightarrow \text{UNDIR } v2 [rev v3]$	US $(v2/y, v3/x)$ 3
20. $\text{UNDIR } v2 [rev v3]$	MP 19 17
21. $\text{UNDIR } v2 [rev v3]$	SAME 20
22. $\sim\text{UNDIR } v1 v3 \rightarrow \text{UNDIR } v2 [rev v3]$	CP 21
23. $\text{UNDIR } v1 v3 \mid \text{UNDIR } v2 [rev v3]$	IMP 22
24. $\text{UNDIR } v1 [rev v2] \rightarrow \text{UNDIR } v1 v3 \mid \text{UNDIR } v2 [rev v3]$	CP 23
25. $[\sim\text{UNDIR } v1 [rev v2] \mid \text{UNDIR } v1 v3] \mid \text{UNDIR } v2 [rev v3]$	IMP 24
26. $\text{UNDIR } v1 v2 \rightarrow [\sim\text{UNDIR } v1 [rev v2] \mid \text{UNDIR } v1 v3] \mid \text{UNDIR } v2 [rev$	
$v3]$	CP 25
27. $[[\sim\text{UNDIR } v1 v2 \mid \sim\text{UNDIR } v1 [rev v2]] \mid \text{UNDIR } v1 v3] \mid \text{UNDIR } v2$	
$[rev v3]$	IMP 26

28. $(Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[\sim \text{UNDIR } x y \mid \sim \text{UNDIR } x [\text{rev } y]] \mid \text{UNDIR } x z \mid \text{UNDIR } y [\text{rev } z]]$ UG 27
29. $[(Ax)\sim \text{UNDIR } x x$
 $\& (Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x [\text{rev } y] \rightarrow \text{UNDIR } y [\text{rev } x]]$
 $\& (Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x y \rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } x z \mid \text{UNDIR } y z]]$
 $\rightarrow (Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[\sim \text{UNDIR } x y \mid \sim \text{UNDIR } x [\text{rev } y]] \mid \text{UNDIR } x z \mid \text{UNDIR } y [\text{rev } z]]$ CP 28

11 The axioms I.5 and I.6, and SYM imply w3

Solution

1. $\sim[(Ax)\sim \text{UNDIR } x x$
 $\& (Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x y \rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } x z \mid \text{UNDIR } y z]]$
 $\& (Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x [\text{rev } y] \rightarrow \text{UNDIR } y [\text{rev } x]]$
 $\rightarrow (Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[\sim \text{UNDIR } x y \mid \sim \text{UNDIR } x [\text{rev } y]]$
 $\mid \text{UNDIR } x [\text{rev } z] \mid \text{UNDIR } y z]$ ASSUME-NEG
2. $[[\sim(Ax)\sim \text{UNDIR } x x$
 $\& (Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x y \rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } x z \mid \text{UNDIR } y z]]$
 $\& (Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x [\text{rev } y] \rightarrow \text{UNDIR } y [\text{rev } x]]$
 $\& \sim(Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[\sim \text{UNDIR } x y \mid \sim \text{UNDIR } x [\text{rev } y]]$
 $\mid \text{UNDIR } x [\text{rev } z] \mid \text{UNDIR } y z]$ DE.MORGAN 1
3. $\sim(\text{Ex})\text{UNDIR } x x$ SIMP 2
4. $(Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x y \rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } x z \mid \text{UNDIR } y z]]$ SIMP 2
5. $(Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x [\text{rev } y] \rightarrow \text{UNDIR } y [\text{rev } x]]$ SIMP 2
6. $\sim(Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[\sim \text{UNDIR } x y \mid \sim \text{UNDIR } x [\text{rev } y]]$
 $\mid \text{UNDIR } x [\text{rev } z] \mid \text{UNDIR } y z]$ SIMP 2
7. $\sim(Ay)(Az)[[\sim \text{UNDIR } a1 y \mid \sim \text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } y]]$
 $\mid \text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } z] \mid \text{UNDIR } y z]$ HYPO 6
8. $\sim(Az)[[\sim \text{UNDIR } a1 a2 \mid \sim \text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } a2]]$
 $\mid \text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } z] \mid \text{UNDIR } a2 z]$ HYPO 7
9. $\sim[\sim \text{UNDIR } a1 a2 \mid \sim \text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } a2]]$
 $\& \sim(Az)[\text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } z] \mid \text{UNDIR } a2 z]$ DE.MORGAN 8
10. $\sim[\sim \text{UNDIR } a1 a2 \mid \sim \text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } a2]]$ SIMP 9
11. $\sim(Az)[\text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } z] \mid \text{UNDIR } a2 z]$ SIMP 9
12. $\text{UNDIR } a1 a2 \& \text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } a2]$ DE.MORGAN 10
13. $\text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } a2]$ SIMP 12
14. $\sim[\text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } a3] \mid \text{UNDIR } a2 a3]$ HYPO 11
15. $\sim \text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } a3] \& \sim \text{UNDIR } a2 a3$ DE.MORGAN 14
16. $\sim \text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } a3]$ SIMP 15
17. $\sim \text{UNDIR } a2 a3$ SIMP 15
18. $(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } y] \rightarrow \text{UNDIR } y [\text{rev } a1]]$ US (a1 x) 5
19. $\text{UNDIR } a1 [\text{rev } a2] \rightarrow \text{UNDIR } a2 [\text{rev } a1]$ US (a2 y) 18
20. $\text{UNDIR } a2 [\text{rev } a1]$ MP 19 13
21. $(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } a2 y \rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } a2 z \mid \text{UNDIR } y z]]$ US (a2 x) 4
22. $\text{UNDIR } a2 [\text{rev } a1] \rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } a2 z \mid \text{UNDIR } [\text{rev } a1] z]$

23. $(Az)[\text{UNDIR } a2 \ z \mid \text{UNDIR } [\text{rev } a1] \ z]$	US (rev a1 y) 21 MP 22 20
24. $\sim \text{UNDIR } [\text{rev } a1] \ [\text{rev } a1]$	US (rev a1 v10) 3
25. $(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } a3 \ [\text{rev } y] \ \rightarrow \ \text{UNDIR } y \ [\text{rev } a3]]$	US (a3 x) 5
26. $\text{UNDIR } a2 \ a3 \mid \text{UNDIR } [\text{rev } a1] \ a3$	US (a3 z) 23
27. $\text{UNDIR } [\text{rev } a1] \ a3$	LDS 26 17
28. $(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } [\text{rev } a1] \ y]$	
$\rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } [\text{rev } a1] \ z \mid \text{UNDIR } y \ z]$	US (rev a1 x) 4
29. $\text{UNDIR } [\text{rev } a1] \ a3$	
$\rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } [\text{rev } a1] \ z \mid \text{UNDIR } a3 \ z]$	US (a3 y) 28
30. $(Az)[\text{UNDIR } [\text{rev } a1] \ z \mid \text{UNDIR } a3 \ z]$	MP 29 27
31. $\text{UNDIR } [\text{rev } a1] \ [\text{rev } a1] \mid \text{UNDIR } a3 \ [\text{rev } a1]$	US (rev a1 z) 30
32. $\text{UNDIR } a3 \ [\text{rev } a1]$	LDS 31 24
33. $\text{UNDIR } a3 \ [\text{rev } a1] \ \rightarrow \ \text{UNDIR } a1 \ [\text{rev } a3]$	US (a1 y) 25
34. $\text{UNDIR } a1 \ [\text{rev } a3]$	MP 33 32
35. FALSE	\sim -ELIMINATION 34 16
36. FALSE	EE 11 35
37. FALSE	EE 7 36
38. FALSE	EE 6 37
39. $[(Ax)\sim \text{UNDIR } x \ x]$ $\& (Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x \ y \ \rightarrow \ (Az)[\text{UNDIR } x \ z \mid \text{UNDIR } y \ z]]]$ $\& (Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x \ [\text{rev } y] \ \rightarrow \ \text{UNDIR } y \ [\text{rev } x]]]$ $\rightarrow (Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[\sim \text{UNDIR } x \ y \mid \sim \text{UNDIR } x \ [\text{rev } y]]]$ $[\text{UNDIR } x \ [\text{rev } z]] \mid \text{UNDIR } y \ z]$	IP 38

12 The axiom I.6 implies W4

Show that

$(Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x \ y \ \rightarrow \ (Az)[\text{UNDIR } x \ z \mid \text{UNDIR } y \ z]]$
 $\rightarrow (Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[\sim \text{UNDIR } x \ y \mid \sim \text{UNDIR } x \ [\text{rev } y]]]$
 $[\text{UNDIR } x \ [\text{rev } z]] \mid \text{UNDIR } y \ [\text{rev } z]]]$

Solution

1. $(Ax)(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } x \ y]$	
$\rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } x \ z \mid \text{UNDIR } y \ z]$	ASSUMED-PREMISE
2. $\text{UNDIR } v1 \ v2$	ASSUMED-PREMISE
3. $\sim \text{UNDIR } v1 \ [\text{rev } v3]$	ASSUMED-PREMISE
4. $(Ay)[\text{UNDIR } v1 \ y \ \rightarrow \ (Az)[\text{UNDIR } v1 \ z \mid \text{UNDIR } y \ z]]$	US (v1 x)
1	
5. $\text{UNDIR } v1 \ v2$	
$\rightarrow (Az)[\text{UNDIR } v1 \ z \mid \text{UNDIR } v2 \ z]$	US (v2 y) 4
6. $(Az)[\text{UNDIR } v1 \ z \mid \text{UNDIR } v2 \ z]$	MP 5 2
7. $\text{UNDIR } v1 \ [\text{rev } v3] \mid \text{UNDIR } v2 \ [\text{rev } v3]$	US (rev(v3) z) 6
8. $\text{UNDIR } v2 \ [\text{rev } v3]$	LDS 7 3
9. $\text{UNDIR } v2 \ [\text{rev } v3]$	SAME 8
10. $\sim \text{UNDIR } v1 \ [\text{rev } v3] \ \rightarrow \ \text{UNDIR } v2 \ [\text{rev } v3]$	CP 9

11. UNDIR v1 [rev v3] UNDIR v2 [rev v3]	IMP 10
12. UNDIR v1 [rev v2]	
-> UNDIR v1 [rev v3] UNDIR v2 [rev v3]	CP 11
13. [~UNDIR v1 [rev v2] UNDIR v1 [rev v3]] UNDIR v2 [rev v3]	IMP 12
14. UNDIR v1 v2	
-> [~UNDIR v1 [rev v2] UNDIR v1 [rev v3]] UNDIR v2 [rev v3]	CP 13
15. [[~UNDIR v1 v2 ~UNDIR v1 [rev v2]] UNDIR v1 [rev v3]] UNDIR v2 [rev v3]	IMP 14
16. (Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[~UNDIR x y ~UNDIR x [rev y]] UNDIR x [rev z] UNDIR y [rev z]]	UG 15
17. (Ax)(Ay)[UNDIR x y -> (Az)[UNDIR x z UNDIR y z]] -> (Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[~UNDIR x y ~UNDIR x [rev y]] UNDIR x [rev z] UNDIR y [rev z]]	CP 16

13 The axioms I.5 and I.6, and w2 imply SYM

Solution

1. ~[[(Ax) ~UNDIR x x & (Ax)(Ay)[UNDIR x y -> (Az)[UNDIR x z UNDIR y z]] & (Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[~UNDIR x y ~UNDIR x [rev y]] UNDIR x z] UNDIR y[rev z]]	
-> (Ax)(Ay)[UNDIR x [rev y] -> UNDIR y [rev x]]	ASSUME-NEG
2. [[(Ax) ~UNDIR x x & (Ax)(Ay)[UNDIR x y -> (Az)[UNDIR x z UNDIR y z]] & (Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[~UNDIR x y ~UNDIR x [rev y]] UNDIR x z] UNDIR y[rev z]]	
& ~ (Ax)(Ay)[UNDIR x [rev y] -> UNDIR y [rev x]]	DE.MORGAN 1
3. ~(Ex)UNDIR x x	SIMP 2
4. (Ax)(Ay)[UNDIR x y -> (Az)[UNDIR x z UNDIR y z]]	SIMP 2
5. (Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[~UNDIR x y ~UNDIR x [rev y]] UNDIR x z] UNDIR y [rev z]]	SIMP 2
6. ~ (Ax)(Ay)[UNDIR x [rev y] -> UNDIR y [rev x]]	SIMP 2
7. ~(Ay)[UNDIR a1 [rev y] -> UNDIR y [rev a1]]	HYPO 6
8. ~[UNDIR a1 [rev a2] -> UNDIR a2 [rev a1]]	HYPO 7
9. UNDIR a1 [rev a2] & ~UNDIR a2 [rev a1]	DE.MORGAN 8
10. UNDIR a1 [rev a2]	SIMP 9
11. ~UNDIR a2 [rev a1]	SIMP 9
15. [[~UNDIR a1 a2 ~UNDIR a1 [rev a2]] UNDIR a1 a1] UNDIR a2 [rev a1]	US (a1/x, a2/y, a1/z) 5
16. [~UNDIR a1 a2 ~UNDIR a1 [rev a2]] UNDIR a1 a1	RDS 11 15
17. [~UNDIR a1 a2 ~UNDIR a1 [rev a2]] (Ev4)UNDIR v4 v4	EG 16
18. ~UNDIR a1 a2 ~UNDIR a1 [rev a2]	RDS 3 17
19. ~UNDIR a1 a2	RDS 18 10

21. UNDIR a1 [rev a2] -> (Az)[UNDIR a1 z | UNDIR [rev a2] z]
US (a1/x,[rev a2]/y) 4
22. (Az)[UNDIR a1 z | UNDIR [rev a2] z] MP 21 10
25. [[~UNDIR a1 [rev a2] | ~UNDIR a1 [rev
[rev a2]]] | UNDIR a1 v12] | UNDIR [rev a2] [rev v12]
US (a1/x, [rev a2]/ y, v12 /z) 5
26. [[~UNDIR a1 [rev a2] | ~UNDIR a1 [rev
[rev a2]]] | UNDIR a1 a2] | (Ev13)UNDIR v13 v13 EG&SUB 25
27. [~UNDIR a1 [rev a2] | ~UNDIR a1 [rev[rev a2]]] | UNDIR a1 a2
RDS 3 26
28. ~UNDIR a1 [rev a2] | ~UNDIR a1 [rev[rev a2]] RDS 27 19
29. ~UNDIR a1 [rev [rev a2]] LDS 28 10
33. UNDIR a1 a2 | UNDIR [rev a2] a2 US (a2 z) 22
34. UNDIR [rev a2] a2 LDS 33 19
35. UNDIR [rev a2] a2 -> UNDIR [rev a2] [rev a1] | UNDIR a2 [rev a1]
US ((rev a2)/x, a2/y,[rev a1]/ z) 4
36. UNDIR [rev a2] [rev a1] | UNDIR a2[rev a1] MP 34 35
37. UNDIR [rev a2] [rev a1] RDS 36 11
41. [[~UNDIR [rev a2] a1 | ~UNDIR [rev a2]
[rev a1]] | UNDIR [rev a2] [rev a2]] | UNDIR a1 [rev[rev a2]]
US ((rev a2)/x,a1/y,[rev a2]/z) 5
42. [~UNDIR [rev a2] a1 | ~UNDIR [rev a2]
[rev a1]] | UNDIR [rev a2] [rev a2] RDS 29 41
43. [~UNDIR [rev a2] a1 | ~UNDIR [rev a2][rev a1]] | (Ev23)UNDIR v23
v23
- EG 42
44. ~UNDIR [rev a2] a1 | ~UNDIR [rev a2][rev a1] RDS 3 43
45. ~UNDIR [rev a2] a1 RDS 44 37
49. UNDIR a1 [rev a2] -> UNDIR a1 a1 | UNDIR [rev a2] a1
US (a1/x,[rev a2]/y,a1/z) 4
50. UNDIR a1 a1 | UNDIR [rev a2] a1 MP 10 49
51. UNDIR a1 a1 RDS 50 45
52. ~UNDIR a1 a1 SUB 3
53. FALSE ~ -ELIMINATION 51 52
54. FALSE EE 7 53
55. FALSE EE 6 54
56. [(Ax)~UNDIR x x
& (Ax)(Ay)[UNDIR x y-> (Az)[UNDIR x z | UNDIR y z]]]
& (Ax)(Ay)(Az)[[~UNDIR x y | ~UNDIR x [rev y]] | UNDIR x z] | UNDIR
y[rev z]]
-> (Ax)(Ay)[UNDIR x [rev y] -> UNDIR y [rev x]] IP 55