Mathematical and Logical Foundations of Computer Science

Lecture 4 - Propositional Logic (Natural Deduction)

Vincent Rahli

(some slides were adapted from Rajesh Chitnis' slides)

University of Birmingham

Where are we?

- Symbolic logic
- ► Propositional logic
- Predicate logic
- ► Constructive vs. Classical logic
- Type theory

Today

Natural Deduction proofs

Recap: Connectives & Special Atomic Propositions

Syntax

$$P ::= a \mid P \land P \mid P \lor P \mid P \rightarrow P \mid \neg P$$

Two special atoms:

- ▶ T which stands for True
- ▶ ⊥ which stands for False

Recap: Connectives & Special Atomic Propositions

Syntax

$$P ::= a \mid P \land P \mid P \lor P \mid P \to P \mid \neg P$$

Two special atoms:

- ▶ T which stands for True
- ▶ ⊥ which stands for False

We also introduced four connectives:

- $P \wedge Q$: we have a proof of both P and Q
- $P \vee Q$: we have a proof of at least one of P and Q
- ▶ $P \rightarrow Q$: if we have a proof of P then we have a proof of Q
- ▶ $\neg P$: stands for $P \rightarrow \bot$

Recap: Proofs in Propositional Logic

For **formal proofs**, we need two things

Recap: Proofs in Propositional Logic

For **formal proofs**, we need two things

- 1. A formal language
 - for representing propositions, arguments
 - here we are using propositional logic

Recap: Proofs in Propositional Logic

For formal proofs, we need two things

- 1. A formal language
 - for representing propositions, arguments
 - here we are using propositional logic
- 2. A **proof** theory
 - to prove ("infer", "deduce") whether an argument is valid
 - inference rules, which are the building blocks of proofs

Inference rules are the tools we are allowed to use

Inference rules are the tools we are allowed to use

Careful with the rules you assume otherwise you might be able to prove false statements!

Inference rules are the tools we are allowed to use

Careful with the rules you assume otherwise you might be able to prove false statements!

Example of an inference rule (and-introduction rule):

$$\frac{A}{A \wedge B} [\wedge I]$$

Inference rules are the tools we are allowed to use

Careful with the rules you assume otherwise you might be able to prove false statements!

Example of an inference rule (and-introduction rule):

$$\frac{A}{A \wedge B} [\wedge I]$$

These are rule schemata, where here A and B are metavariables ranging over all possible propositions.

Inference rules are the tools we are allowed to use

Careful with the rules you assume otherwise you might be able to prove false statements!

Example of an inference rule (and-introduction rule):

$$\frac{A}{A \wedge B} [\wedge I]$$

These are rule schemata, where here A and B are metavariables ranging over all possible propositions.

Notation

- Premise(s) at the top
- Conclusion at the bottom
- Name of the inference rule on the right

And-introduction

$$\frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B} \ [\wedge I]$$

And-introduction

$$\frac{A}{A \wedge B} [\wedge I]$$

implication-elimination

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

And-introduction

$$\frac{A}{A \wedge B} [\wedge I]$$

implication-elimination

$$A \to B \qquad A \\ B \qquad [\to E]$$

False-elimination

$$\frac{\perp}{A}$$
 [$\perp E$]

And-introduction

$$\frac{A}{A \wedge B} [\wedge I]$$

implication-elimination

$$A \to B \qquad A \\ B \qquad [\to E]$$

False-elimination

$$\frac{\perp}{A}$$
 [$\perp E$]

True-introduction

Negation-elimination, i.e., both A and $\neg A$ cannot be true at same time

Negation-elimination, i.e., both A and $\neg A$ cannot be true at same time

Formally, want to prove $A, \neg A \vdash \bot$

Negation-elimination, i.e., both A and $\neg A$ cannot be true at same time

Formally, want to prove $A, \neg A \vdash \bot$

A **proof** is a tree of instances of inference rules.

Negation-elimination, i.e., both A and $\neg A$ cannot be true at same time

Formally, want to prove $A, \neg A \vdash \bot$

A **proof** is a tree of instances of inference rules.

Assuming that $\neg A$ is defined as $A \rightarrow \bot$, a proof of the above sequent (or argument) is:

$$\frac{A \quad \neg A}{\bot} \quad [\to E]$$

Recap: Another simple proof

Given three hypotheses A,B,C, how can we prove $(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)$?

Recap: Another simple proof

Given three hypotheses A,B,C, how can we prove $(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)$?

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B} \quad [\wedge I] \quad \frac{A \quad C}{A \wedge C} \quad [\wedge I]$$
$$(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C) \quad [\wedge I]$$

Recap: Another simple proof

Given three hypotheses A, B, C, how can we prove $(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)$?

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B} \quad [\wedge I] \quad \frac{A \quad C}{A \wedge C} \quad [\wedge I]$$
$$(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C) \quad [\wedge I]$$

The rule used at each step is and-introduction, i.e., $[\land I]$

Natural Deduction

Framework

- "natural" style of constructing a proof
- start with the given premises
- repeatedly apply the given inference rules
- until you obtain the conclusion

Natural Deduction

Framework

- "natural" style of constructing a proof
- start with the given premises
- repeatedly apply the given inference rules
- until you obtain the conclusion

Two key points:

- Can work both forwards and backwards
- Natural doesn't mean there is unique proof

Natural Deduction

Framework

- "natural" style of constructing a proof
- start with the given premises
- repeatedly apply the given inference rules
- until you obtain the conclusion

Two key points:

- Can work both forwards and backwards
- Natural doesn't mean there is unique proof

Introduced by **Gentzen** in 1934 and further studied by **Prawitz** in 1965.





$$\frac{A}{A}^{1}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$B$$

$$A \to B \quad 1 \ [\to I]$$

Discharging/cancellation of hypothesis

$$\begin{array}{c} -1 \\ A \\ \vdots \\ B \\ \hline A \to B \end{array} 1 [\to I]$$

This is the "implication-introduction" rule.

Discharging/cancellation of hypothesis

$$\begin{array}{c} -1 \\ \vdots \\ B \\ \overline{A \to B} \end{array} 1 [\to I]$$

This is the "implication-introduction" rule.

We don't have to make use of A in which case we can just omit it:

Discharging/cancellation of hypothesis

$$\begin{array}{c} -1 \\ A \\ \vdots \\ B \\ A \to B \end{array} 1 [\to I]$$

This is the "implication-introduction" rule.

We don't have to make use of A in which case we can just omit it:

$$\frac{B}{A \to B}$$

Cancelling hypothesis continued

Given the hypothesis A, C how can we prove $B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))$?

Cancelling hypothesis continued

Given the hypothesis A, C how can we prove $B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))$?

Here is a proof:

 $\overline{B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))}$

Given the hypothesis A, C how can we prove $B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))$?

$$\overline{B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))}$$

Given the hypothesis A, C how can we prove $B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))$?

$$\frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B} \quad [\wedge I] \quad ----$$

$$\overline{B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))}$$

Given the hypothesis A, C how can we prove $B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))$?

$$\frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B} \quad [\land I] \quad \frac{A \quad C}{}$$

$$\overline{B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))}$$

Given the hypothesis A, C how can we prove $B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))$?

$$\frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B} \quad [\land I] \quad \frac{A \quad C}{A \wedge C} \quad [\land I]$$

$$\overline{B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))}$$

Given the hypothesis A, C how can we prove $B \rightarrow ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))$?

$$\frac{\frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B} \quad [\land I] \quad \frac{A \quad C}{A \wedge C} \quad [\land I]}{(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)} \quad [\land I]}$$

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

Given the hypothesis A, C how can we prove $B \rightarrow ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))$?

$$\frac{\frac{A \quad \overline{B}}{A \wedge B}^{1} \quad \Lambda I}{\frac{A \quad C}{(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)}} \quad \Lambda I} \quad \Lambda I$$

$$\frac{(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)}{(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)} \quad \Lambda I \rightarrow I$$

Given the hypothesis A, C how can we prove $B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))$?

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{\frac{A \quad \overline{B}}{A \wedge B}^{1} \quad \Lambda I}{\frac{A \quad C}{(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)}} \quad \Lambda I} \quad \Lambda I$$

$$\frac{(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)}{(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)} \quad \Lambda I \rightarrow I$$

At this point, we can also cancel another hypothesis, say A

Given the hypothesis A, C how can we prove $B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))$?

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{A \overline{B}^{1}}{A \wedge B} [\wedge I] \frac{A C}{A \wedge C} [\wedge I]$$

$$\frac{(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)}{(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)} [1]$$

$$1 [\rightarrow I]$$

At this point, we can also cancel another hypothesis, say A

This gives a proof of

$$A \to (B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C)))$$

using the hypothesis C only

$$B \to ((A \land B) \land (A \land C))$$

$$\frac{\overline{B}^{1}}{(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)}$$

$$\overline{B \rightarrow ((A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C))} \quad 1 \ [\rightarrow I]$$

$$\frac{\frac{\overline{B}}{A \wedge B}^{1}}{\frac{A \wedge B}{(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)}} \xrightarrow{[\wedge I]} \frac{A \wedge C}{B \to ((A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C))} \xrightarrow{[\wedge I]}$$

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{B}}{A \wedge B}^{1} [\wedge I] \quad \frac{A \quad C}{A \wedge C} [\wedge I]$$

$$\frac{(A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C)}{(B \rightarrow ((A \wedge B) \wedge (A \wedge C))} 1 [\rightarrow I]$$

Rules for → (implication)

Rules for → (implication)

▶ implication-introduction

$$\begin{array}{c}
\overline{A}^{1} \\
\vdots \\
\overline{B} \\
\overline{A \to B}^{1} \ [\to I]
\end{array}$$

Rules for → (implication)

▶ implication-introduction

$$\frac{A}{A}^{1}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$B$$

$$A \to B^{1} [\to I]$$

implication-elimination

$$A \to B \qquad A \qquad [\to E]$$

Rules for ¬ (not)

Rules for ¬ (not)

► Negation-introduction

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
 \overline{A} & 1 \\
 \vdots & \\
 \underline{\bot} & 1 & [\neg I]
\end{array}$$

Rules for ¬ (not)

Negation-introduction

$$\begin{array}{c} \overline{A} & 1 \\ \vdots & \\ \underline{\bot} & 1 & [\neg I] \end{array}$$

Negation-elimination

$$A \qquad \neg A \qquad [\neg E]$$

Rules for \vee (or)

Rules for \vee (or)

or-introduction (for any formula B)

$$\frac{A}{A \vee B} \quad [\vee I_L] \qquad \frac{A}{B \vee A} \quad [\vee I_R]$$

Rules for \vee (or)

or-introduction (for any formula B)

$$\frac{A}{A \vee B} \quad [\vee I_L] \qquad \qquad \frac{A}{B \vee A} \quad [\vee I_R]$$

or-elimination

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

Rules for \(\lambda \) (and)

Rules for \(\lambda \) (and)

and-introduction

$$\frac{A}{A \wedge B} [\wedge I]$$

Rules for \(\lambda \) (and)

and-introduction

$$\frac{A}{A \wedge B} [\wedge I]$$

and-elimination

$$\frac{A \wedge B}{B} \quad [\wedge E_R] \qquad \qquad \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \quad [\wedge E_L]$$

Given $A \to B$ and $B \to C$, give a proof of $A \to C$

Given $A \to B$ and $B \to C$, give a proof of $A \to C$

Here is a proof:

 $\overline{A \to C}$

Given
$$A \to B$$
 and $B \to C$, give a proof of $A \to C$

$$\begin{array}{c}
A \to B \\
\hline
 \overline{A \to C}
\end{array}$$

Given
$$A \to B$$
 and $B \to C$, give a proof of $A \to C$

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

$$\overline{A \to C}$$

Given
$$A \to B$$
 and $B \to C$, give a proof of $A \to C$

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

Given $A \to B$ and $B \to C$, give a proof of $A \to C$

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{1} \quad A \to B}{B} \quad [\to E] \quad B \to C$$

$$\frac{C}{A \to C} \quad 1 \quad [\to E]$$

Given $A \to B$ and $B \to C$, give a proof of $A \to C$

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{1} \quad A \to B}{B} \quad [\to E] \quad B \to C$$

$$\frac{C}{A \to C} \quad 1 \quad [\to E]$$

$$A \to C$$

Given
$$A \to B$$
 and $B \to C$, give a proof of $A \to C$

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{1} \quad A \to B}{B} \quad [\to E] \quad B \to C$$

$$\frac{C}{A \to C} \quad 1 \quad [\to E]$$

$$\frac{A}{C} \xrightarrow{C} 1 [\rightarrow I]$$

Given $A \to B$ and $B \to C$, give a proof of $A \to C$

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{1} \quad A \to B}{B} \quad [\to E] \quad B \to C$$

$$\frac{C}{A \to C} \quad 1 \quad [\to E]$$

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{1} \quad A \to B}{\underline{B}} \quad [\to E]$$

$$\frac{C}{A \to C} \quad 1 \ [\to I]$$

Given $A \to B$ and $B \to C$, give a proof of $A \to C$

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{1} \quad A \to B}{B \quad [\to E]} \quad B \to C$$

$$\frac{C}{A \to C} \quad 1 \quad [\to E]$$

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{1} \quad A \to B}{B} \quad [\to E] \quad B \to C$$

$$\frac{C}{A \to C} \quad 1 \quad [\to E]$$

Given $A \to B$ and $B \to C$, give a proof of $A \to C$

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{1} \quad A \to B}{\underline{B} \qquad [\to E]} \quad B \to C$$

$$\frac{C}{A \to C} \quad 1 \quad [\to E]$$

And backward?

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{1} \quad A \to B}{B} \quad [\to E] \quad B \to C$$

$$\frac{C}{A \to C} \quad 1 \quad [\to E]$$

We also need to go forward to prove C

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

001.		
	$A \neg A$	
$\neg A \lor B$		
	B	

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{A}}{A} \quad [\neg E]$$

$$\frac{A}{B} \quad [\bot E]$$

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

$$\frac{A \quad \neg A}{\frac{\bot}{B} \quad [\neg E]} \\
 \frac{\bot}{B} \quad [\bot E] \\
 \neg A \lor B \quad \neg A \to B$$

$$B$$

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{A} \quad [\neg E]}{\frac{\bot}{B} \quad [\bot E]} \quad \frac{B}{B} \quad [\bot E] \quad \frac{B}{B} \quad [\bot E] \quad B}$$

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{A} \quad [\neg E]}{B} \quad [\bot E] \quad B}{B \quad A \quad B} \quad [\bot E] \quad B$$

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{A} \quad 1}{[-E]}$$

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{A} \quad [-E]}{[-E]}$$

$$\frac{A \quad B \quad [-E]}{[-A \lor B \quad A \to B} \quad [-A \lor B] \quad \overline{B} \quad 2 \quad [-A \lor B]$$

$$\frac{A \quad A \quad B \quad [-E]}{[-E]}$$

$$\frac{B}{[-E]}$$

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{A} \quad 1}{[-E]}$$

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{A} \quad [-E]}{[-E]}$$

$$\frac{A \quad B \quad [-E]}{[-A \lor B \quad A \to B} \quad [-A \lor B] \quad \overline{B} \quad 2 \quad [-A \lor B]$$

$$\frac{A \quad A \quad B \quad [-E]}{[-E]}$$

$$\frac{B}{[-E]}$$

Backward?

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{A} \quad [\neg E]}{\frac{\bot}{B} \quad [\bot E]} \quad \frac{B}{B} \quad [\bot E] \quad \frac{B}{B} \quad [\bot E]$$

$$\frac{\neg A \lor B \quad \overline{A \to B} \quad [\to I] \quad \overline{B} \quad 2 \quad [\to I]}{B} \quad [\lor E]$$

Backward?

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{-A}}{B} \stackrel{1}{[\neg E]} \\
\frac{\bot}{B} \quad [\bot E] \qquad \overline{B} \stackrel{2}{B} \\
\underline{-A \lor B} \quad \overline{-A \to B} \quad 1 \quad [\to I] \quad \overline{B} \stackrel{2}{B \to B} \quad 2 \quad [\to I] \\
B \qquad B \qquad \qquad [\lor E]$$

$$\frac{\neg A \lor B \quad \neg A \to B}{B} \qquad \overline{B \to B} \quad [\lor E]$$

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{-A} \quad ^{1}}{\frac{\bot}{B} \quad [\neg E]} \\
\frac{\bot}{B} \quad [\bot E] \qquad \overline{B} \quad ^{2} \quad [\neg A \lor B \quad \overline{A \to B} \quad ^{1} \quad [\to I] \quad \overline{B \to B} \quad ^{2} \quad [\lor E]$$

$$\frac{A \quad \neg A}{B} \xrightarrow{I}$$

$$\frac{-A \lor B}{A} \xrightarrow{A \to B}$$

$$\frac{A \quad \neg A}{B} \xrightarrow{I}$$

$$\frac{B}{B} \xrightarrow{I}$$

$$\frac{B} \xrightarrow{I}$$

$$\frac{B}{B} \xrightarrow$$

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{-A}}{B} \stackrel{1}{[\neg E]} \\
\frac{\bot}{B} \quad [\bot E] \qquad \overline{B} \stackrel{2}{B} \\
\underline{-A \lor B} \quad \overline{-A \to B} \quad 1 \quad [\to I] \quad \overline{B} \stackrel{2}{B \to B} \quad 2 \quad [\to I] \\
B \qquad B \qquad \qquad [\lor E]$$

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{A}}{\frac{\bot}{B}} \stackrel{[\bot E]}{}_{1} = \frac{A \lor B}{A \to B} \stackrel{[\bot E]}{}_{1} = \frac{A \lor B}{B} \qquad [\lor E]$$

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{-A} \quad ^{1}}{\frac{\bot}{B} \quad [\neg E]} \\
\frac{\bot}{B} \quad [\bot E] \qquad \overline{B} \quad ^{2} \quad [\to I]$$

$$\underline{-A \lor B} \quad \overline{-A \to B} \quad ^{1} \quad [\to I] \quad \overline{B \to B} \quad ^{2} \quad [\lor E]$$

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{A}}{\bot \quad [\neg E]}$$

$$\frac{A}{\bot \quad [\neg E]}$$

$$\frac{B}{\bot \quad [\bot E]}$$

$$\frac{A}{B} \quad [\bot E]$$

$$\frac{A}{B} \quad [\bot E]$$

$$\frac{B}{B} \quad [\lor E]$$

Given $\neg A \lor B$ and A, how do we derive B?

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{-A}}{B} \stackrel{1}{[\neg E]} \\
\frac{\bot}{B} \quad [\bot E] \qquad \overline{B} \stackrel{2}{B} \\
\underline{-A \lor B} \quad \overline{-A \to B} \quad 1 \quad [\to I] \quad \overline{B} \stackrel{2}{B \to B} \quad 2 \quad [\to I] \\
B \qquad B \qquad \qquad [\lor E]$$

$$\frac{A \quad \overline{A} \quad 1}{\underline{L} \quad [\neg E]}$$

$$\frac{A}{B} \quad [\bot E] \quad \overline{B} \quad 2 \quad [\to I]$$

$$\frac{A}{B} \quad [\bot E] \quad \overline{B} \quad 2 \quad [\to I]$$

$$B \quad B \quad E \quad [\to E]$$

We typically go both forward and backward in proofs

We typically go both forward and backward in proofs

Show $(B \land A)$ given the hypothesis $(A \land B)$

We typically go both forward and backward in proofs

Show $(B \wedge A)$ given the hypothesis $(A \wedge B)$

Here is a proof:

 $B \wedge A$

We typically go both forward and backward in proofs

Show
$$(B \wedge A)$$
 given the hypothesis $(A \wedge B)$

$$\frac{B}{B \wedge A} \quad A \quad [\wedge I]$$

We typically go both forward and backward in proofs

Show
$$(B \wedge A)$$
 given the hypothesis $(A \wedge B)$

$$\frac{A \wedge B}{B} \ \ [\wedge I] \ \ \underline{\qquad \qquad } \\ B \wedge A \ \ [\wedge I]$$

We typically go both forward and backward in proofs

Show
$$(B \wedge A)$$
 given the hypothesis $(A \wedge B)$

$$\frac{A \wedge B}{B} \quad [\wedge I] \quad \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \quad [\wedge I]$$

$$B \wedge A \quad [\wedge I]$$

Complicated looking question

Prove the following:

$$R\ , (P \to Q) \land (Q \to P)\ , Q \to Z\ , R \to P \vdash Z$$

Complicated looking question

Prove the following:

$$R, (P \to Q) \land (Q \to P), Q \to Z, R \to P \vdash Z$$

$$\frac{R \quad R \to P}{P} \quad [\to E] \quad \frac{P \to Q \land Q \to P}{P \to Q} \quad [\land E]$$

$$Q \to Z \qquad \qquad Q$$

$$Z \qquad \qquad [\to E]$$

Conclusion

What did we cover today?

- Natural Deduction rules for propositional logic
- Natural Deduction proofs
- Forward & backward reasoning

Conclusion

What did we cover today?

- Natural Deduction rules for propositional logic
- Natural Deduction proofs
- Forward & backward reasoning

Next time?

Sequent calculus