

1

(a)

Proof

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-------------------------|
| (1) | $A \rightarrow B$ | premise |
| (2) | A | premise |
| (3) | B | Modus Ponens of 1 and 2 |
| (4) | $B \rightarrow C$ | premise |
| (5) | C | Modus Ponens of 3 and 4 |

(b)

By deduction lemma, we transform $(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow ((B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow C))$ to $(A \rightarrow B), (B \rightarrow C), A \vdash C$:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow ((B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow C))}{(A \rightarrow B) \vdash ((B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow C))}}{(A \rightarrow B), (B \rightarrow C) \vdash (A \rightarrow C)}}{(A \rightarrow B), (B \rightarrow C), A \vdash C}$$

Then we prove C :

Proof

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-------------------------|
| (1) | $A \rightarrow B$ | premise |
| (2) | A | premise |
| (3) | B | Modus Ponens of 1 and 2 |
| (4) | $B \rightarrow C$ | premise |
| (5) | C | Modus Ponens of 3 and 4 |

2

We know that Γ_1 can prove A and Γ_2, A can prove B . In order to show that $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2, A \vdash B$, we would construct Γ_3 by pick either a formulas from Γ_1 or Γ_2 (with respect in wich they appear in the sequence) until both are empty. Clearly, Γ_3 is $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$. Then, A will appear in the sequence and A is provable by Γ_1 . Then, B is provable because Γ_2 and A appears in Γ_3 .

3

(a)

By deduction lemma, we transform $((A \wedge B) \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C))$ to $((A \wedge B) \rightarrow C), A, B \vdash C$:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{((A \wedge B) \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C))}{((A \wedge B) \rightarrow C) \vdash (A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C))}}{((A \wedge B) \rightarrow C), A \vdash (B \rightarrow C)}}{((A \wedge B) \rightarrow C), A, B \vdash C}$$

Then we prove C :

Proof

- | | | |
|-----|--|-------------------------|
| (1) | A | premise |
| (2) | B | premise |
| (3) | $(A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow (A \wedge B)))$ | Axiom 4 |
| (4) | $(B \rightarrow (A \wedge B))$ | Modus Ponens of 1 and 3 |
| (5) | $(A \wedge B)$ | Modus Ponens of 1 and 4 |
| (6) | $((A \wedge B) \rightarrow C)$ | premise |
| (7) | C | Modus Ponens of 5 and 6 |

(b)

By deduction lemma, we transform $(A \wedge B) \rightarrow (B \wedge A)$ to $(A \wedge B) \vdash (B \wedge A)$:

$$\frac{(A \wedge B) \rightarrow (B \wedge A)}{(A \wedge B) \vdash (B \wedge A)}$$

Proof

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| (1) | $(A \wedge B)$ | premise |
| (2) | $(A \wedge B) \rightarrow A$ | Axiom 3a |
| (3) | A | Modus Ponens of 1 and 2 |
| (4) | $(A \wedge B) \rightarrow B$ | Axiom 3b |
| (5) | B | Modus Ponens of 2 and 4 |

- | | | |
|-----|--|-------------------------|
| (6) | $(B \rightarrow (A \rightarrow (B \wedge A)))$ | Axiom 4 |
| (7) | $(A \rightarrow (B \wedge A))$ | Modus Ponens of 6 and 5 |
| (8) | $(B \wedge A)$ | Modus Ponens of 7 and 3 |

4

In order to show that

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

is provable in our proof system, we will use the case distinction lemma :

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

By using the deduction lemma, we transform $((A \wedge C) \vee (B \wedge C)) \rightarrow ((A \vee B) \wedge C)$ into $((A \wedge C) \vee (B \wedge C)) \vdash ((A \vee B) \wedge C)$:

$$\frac{((A \wedge C) \vee (B \wedge C)) \rightarrow ((A \vee B) \wedge C)}{((A \wedge C) \vee (B \wedge C)) \vdash ((A \vee B) \wedge C)}$$

Then, if we show that $\Gamma, (A \wedge C) \vdash ((A \vee B) \wedge C)$ and $\Gamma, (B \wedge C) \vdash ((A \vee B) \wedge C)$, we could conclude by the case distinction lemma that

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

Proof of $\Gamma, (A \wedge C) \vdash ((A \wedge B) \vee C)$

- | | | |
|------|--|-------------------------|
| (1) | $A \wedge C$ | premise |
| (2) | $(A \wedge C) \rightarrow A$ | Axiom 3a |
| (3) | $(A \wedge C) \rightarrow C$ | Axiom 3b |
| (4) | A | Modus Ponens of 1 and 3 |
| (5) | C | Modus Ponens of 1 and 2 |
| (6) | $A \rightarrow (A \vee B)$ | Axiom 5a |
| (7) | $A \vee B$ | Modus Ponens of 4 and 6 |
| (8) | $(A \vee B) \rightarrow (C \rightarrow ((A \vee B) \wedge C))$ | Axiom 4 |
| (9) | $C \rightarrow ((A \vee B) \wedge C)$ | Modus Ponens of 7 and 8 |
| (10) | $(A \vee B) \wedge C$ | Modus Ponens of 5 and 9 |

Proof of $\Gamma, (B \wedge C) \vdash ((A \wedge B) \vee C)$

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|----------|
| (1) | $B \wedge C$ | premise |
| (2) | $(B \wedge C) \rightarrow B$ | Axiom 3a |
| (3) | $(B \wedge C) \rightarrow C$ | Axiom 3b |

(4)	B	Modus Ponens of 1 and 2
(5)	C	Modus Ponens of 1 and 3
(6)	$B \rightarrow (A \vee B)$	Axiom 5b
(7)	$A \vee B$	Modus Ponens of 4 and 6
(8)	$(A \vee B) \rightarrow (C \rightarrow ((A \vee B) \wedge C))$	Axiom 4
(9)	$C \rightarrow ((A \vee B) \wedge C)$	Modus Ponens of 7 and 8
(10)	$(A \vee B) \wedge C$	Modus Ponens of 5 and 9

Finally, by case distinction lemma, we have

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

5

We use the following lemma (Lemma 1) in order to prove $\Gamma \vdash \neg\neg A \rightarrow A$:

$$\frac{A \quad A}{A}$$

By deduction lemma, $\vdash A \rightarrow A$ is provable if and only if $\Gamma, A \vdash A$. Because A is a premise, A holds.

Then, we prove $\vdash \neg\neg A \rightarrow A$:

Proof

(1)	$(\neg\neg A \rightarrow (A \rightarrow A)) \rightarrow ((\neg\neg A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow (\neg\neg A \rightarrow A))$	Axiom 2
(2)	$(\neg\neg A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow ((\neg\neg A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow (\neg\neg A \rightarrow A))$	By Lemma 1
(3)	$(\neg\neg A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow (\neg\neg A \rightarrow A)$	By Lemma 1
(4)	$\neg\neg A \rightarrow A$	By Lemma 1

So we have that $\Gamma \vdash \neg\neg A \rightarrow A$ holds in our proof system. Then, we have to show that the axiom set without the axiom 9 ($A \vee \neg A$) and with the axiom 9' ($\neg\neg A \rightarrow A$) can prove $A \vee \neg A$. So we prove $\Gamma \setminus \{A \vee \neg A\} \cup \{\neg\neg A \rightarrow A\} \vdash A \vee \neg A$.

Proof

(1)	$\neg(A \vee \neg A)$	Assumption
(2)	A	Assumption
(3)	$A \rightarrow (A \vee \neg A)$	Axiom 5a
(4)	$A \vee \neg A$	Modus Ponens of 2 and 3
(5)	\perp	Because 1 and 2 are in contrary, one is false
(6)	$\neg A$	Proof by contradiction

- | | | |
|------|--------------------------------------|---|
| (7) | $\neg A \rightarrow (A \vee \neg A)$ | Axiom 5b |
| (8) | $A \vee \neg A$ | Modus Ponens of 6 and 7 |
| (9) | \perp | Because 1 and 8 are in contrary, one is false |
| (10) | $\neg\neg(A \vee \neg A)$ | Proof by contradiction |
| (11) | $A \vee \neg A$ | Double Negation elimination (see before) |