Mathematical and Logical Foundations of Computer Science Logic Tips

University of Birmingham

Propositional Logic 1

Natural Deduction Proofs

1. When working backwards, most of the time:

Start with introducing the \rightarrow , \wedge , Pause, think, and start using And finally cancel all your leaves: and \neg symbols, i.e., with $[\rightarrow I]$, the elimination rules, i.e. $[\rightarrow E]$,

$$\frac{\frac{B}{B \wedge A}}{A \wedge B \to B \wedge A} \stackrel{[\wedge I]}{}_{1} \xrightarrow{}_{1} [\to I]$$

 $[\neg E], [\land E_L], [\land E_R]$:

$$\frac{A \wedge B}{B} \stackrel{[\wedge E_R]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge E_L]}{=} \frac{B \wedge A}{A \wedge B \to B \wedge A} \stackrel{[\wedge I]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A}$$

$$\frac{\frac{B}{B} \cdot A}{A \wedge B \to B \wedge A} \stackrel{[\wedge I]}{=} 1 \stackrel{[\to I]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{B} \stackrel{[\wedge E_R]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge E_L]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge E_L]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge E_L]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge E_R]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge E_R]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge I]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge I]}{=} \frac{B \wedge A}{A \wedge B \to B \wedge A} \stackrel{[\wedge I]}{=} \frac{B \wedge A}{A \wedge B \to B \wedge A} \stackrel{[\wedge I]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge I]}{=} \stackrel{[\wedge I]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge I]}$$

2. With \vee s, the pattern is typically different:

Start with your eliminations:

$$\frac{A \vee B \quad A \to B \vee A \quad B \to B \vee A}{B \vee A \quad B \to B \vee A \quad [\vee E]}$$

$$\frac{A \vee B \quad A \to B \vee A \quad A \quad [\to I]}{A \vee B \to B \vee A \quad A}$$

Start with your eliminations: and then do your introductions:
$$\frac{\overline{A} \quad {}^{2}}{\overline{B} \vee A} \stackrel{[\vee I_{R}]}{\overline{B} \vee A} \stackrel{\overline{B} \quad 3}{\overline{B} \vee A} \stackrel{[\vee I_{L}]}{\overline{B} \vee A} \stackrel$$

3. Typical pattern to prove $A \to A$:

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{-1}}{A \to A} \ _1 \ [\to I]$$

4. Typical classical pattern using [LEM]:

$$\frac{\overline{A \vee \neg A} \quad \stackrel{[LEM]}{\longrightarrow} \quad A \to C \quad \neg A \to C}{C} \quad [\vee E]$$

5. Typical classical pattern using [DNE]:

$$\frac{\perp}{\neg \neg A} \, {}_{[DNE]}^{1 \, [\neg I]}$$

6. Typical pattern given an hypothesis of the form $A \to B \vee C$. When proving some formula D with an hypothesis of the form $A \to B \lor C$, see if you can prove A, in which case consider eliminating $B \lor C$ right away since you know you can get it from the implication:

$$\begin{array}{c|cccc} A \to B \lor C & A & [\to E] & B \to D & C \to D \\ \hline B \lor C & D & [\lor E] \end{array}$$

1

Semantics

1. Lay out your truth tables as follows, i.e., A's column has 4 **T**s followed by 4 **F**s, then B's column has 2 **T**s followed by 2 **F**s followed by 2 **F**s followed by 2 **F**s, etc.:

			i
A	$\mid B \mid$	C	
T	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{T}	
${f T}$	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{F}	
${f T}$	\mathbf{F}	${f T}$	
${f T}$	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	
\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{T}	${f T}$	
\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{F}	
\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	${f T}$	
\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	

2. If you know that a formula is provable using a Natural Deduction proof, then by soundness you know that it is semantically valid, and therefore satisfiable and not falsifiable.