

I can write.

Theorem

$$((A \wedge B) \vee (B \wedge C)) \vdash B$$

Assume ^① $(A \wedge B) \vee (B \wedge C)$

Goal: B

Case 1 Assume ^② $A \wedge B$
Goal: B
^{②a} B simp 1a

Case 2 Assume ^③ $B \wedge C$
Goal: B
^{③b} B simp 1b

^③ B proof by cases 1, 1a-2a, 1b-2b

Theorem $(A \rightarrow B) \vdash A \rightarrow (B \vee C)$

Assume ^① $A \rightarrow B$
Goal: $A \rightarrow (B \vee C)$
Assume ^② A
Goal: $B \vee C$
^③ B mp 1, 2
^④ $B \vee C$ addition 3
^⑤ $A \rightarrow (B \vee C)$ deduction 2-4

$(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C))$ deduction 1-5

Negation

$\neg P$

not P P is false

it is not the case that P

P	$\neg P$
T	F
F	T

I add in 1

this stands for a false statement

and it is read "the absurd".

using negation statements

P

$\neg P$

1

contradiction

$\neg \neg P$

P

double negation elimination
dne

proving negative statements

To prove $\neg P$

Assume $\textcircled{n} P$
Goal: \perp
:
 $\textcircled{m} \perp$

$\textcircled{m} \neg P$ introduction
negative introduction n-m

To prove P (anything at all!)

Assume $\textcircled{n} \neg P$
Goal: \perp
:
 $\textcircled{m} \perp$

[$\textcircled{m} \neg P$ neg intro n-m
 $\textcircled{m} P$ dne m+n]

$\textcircled{m} P$ reductio n-m
reductio ad absurdum

"proof by
contradiction"

$$\frac{P}{\neg\neg P}$$

double negation
introduction

To prove $\neg Q$

Assume Q

Goal \perp

① P

premise

Goal: $\neg\neg P$

Assume ② $\neg P$

Goal: \perp

③ \perp contradict 1, 2

④ $\neg\neg P$ negative introduction 2-3

Ex falso

$$\frac{\perp}{P}$$

① \perp premise

Goal: P Try to prove this by reductio

Assume ② $\neg P$

Goal: \perp

③ \perp copy ①

④ P reductio ad absurdum

① \perp premise

Goal: P

Assume ① $\neg P$

Goal: \perp

Goal: $\neg \neg P$

| Assume ① $\neg P$

| Goal: \perp

- ④ \perp c. qed line ①
 - ⑤ $\neg \neg P$ 1-4 neg intro
 - ⑥ P dne 5
-

Theorem:
 $(P \rightarrow Q) \leftrightarrow (\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P)$

Part I Assume ① $P \rightarrow Q$

Goal: $\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$

Assume ② $\neg Q$

Goal: $\neg P$

Assume ③ P

Goal: \perp

④ Q mp 1,3

⑤ \perp con 2,4

⑥ $\neg P$ neg intro 3-5

⑦ $\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$ deduction 2-6
 finishes part I

Part II: Assume $\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$

Goal: $P \rightarrow Q$

Assume P

Goal: Q

Assume $\neg Q$

Goal: \perp

(11) $\neg P$ mp 8/10

(12) \perp a, 11 contr

(13) Q reductio 10-12

(14) $P \rightarrow Q$ deduc in 9-13

(15) $(P \rightarrow Q) \leftrightarrow (\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P)$ bi, 1-8, 9-13

I NEED TO FIX LINE 11 JUSTIFICATION
IN MANUAL

To prove $P \rightarrow Q$

Assume $\textcircled{m} \neg Q$

Goal: $\neg P$

\vdots

$\textcircled{n} \neg P$

$X \leftrightarrow Y$

X

Y

$X \leftrightarrow Y$

Y

X

$A \leftrightarrow B$

$A \leftrightarrow B$

$A \rightarrow B$

$\neg A \rightarrow \neg B$

$A \rightarrow B$

$B \rightarrow A$

$\textcircled{nn} \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$ deduced m-n

$\textcircled{n+2} (P \rightarrow Q) \leftrightarrow (\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P)$ contrapositive here

$\textcircled{n+3} P \rightarrow Q$ b.m.p. n+2

$\textcircled{n+2} P \rightarrow Q$ indirect proof m-n

Modus tollens

$P \rightarrow Q$

$\neg Q$

\hline

$\neg P$

modus tollens

① $P \rightarrow Q$ premise

② $\neg Q$ premise

Goal: $\neg P$

Assume ③ P

Goal: \perp

④ Q w.p. 1, 3

⑤ \perp 2, 5 contradiction

⑥ $\neg P$ neg intro 3-5

