

# Natural Deduction Rules

James Pustejovsky



COSI 112

Brandeis University

Fall, 2013

## 5.1 Natural deduction rules for $\wedge, \rightarrow, \vee$

There are two rules for each connective. The rules reflect the meanings of the connectives.

The easiest is  $\wedge$  ('and').

### Rules for $\wedge$

- ( $\wedge$ -introduction, or  $\wedge I$ ) To introduce a formula of the form  $A \wedge B$ , you have to have already introduced  $A$  and  $B$ .

|   |              |                   |
|---|--------------|-------------------|
| 1 | $A$          | we proved this... |
|   | $\vdots$     | (other junk)      |
| 2 | $B$          | and this...       |
| 3 | $A \wedge B$ | $\wedge I(1, 2)$  |

The line numbers are essential for clarity.

### Rules for $\wedge$ ctd.

- ( $\wedge$ -elimination, or  $\wedge E$ ) If you have managed to write down  $A \wedge B$ , you can go on to write down  $A$  and/or  $B$ .

|   |              |                        |
|---|--------------|------------------------|
| 1 | $A \wedge B$ | we proved this somehow |
| 2 | $A$          | $\wedge E(1)$          |
| 3 | $B$          | $\wedge E(1)$          |

### Rules for $\vee$

- ( $\vee$ -introduction, or  $\vee I$ )

To prove  $A \vee B$ , prove  $A$ , or (if you prefer) prove  $B$ .

|   |            |                     |
|---|------------|---------------------|
| 1 | $A$        | proved this somehow |
| 2 | $A \vee B$ | $\vee I(1)$         |

$B$  can be any formula at all!

|   |            |                     |
|---|------------|---------------------|
| 1 | $B$        | proved this somehow |
| 2 | $A \vee B$ | $\vee I(1)$         |

$A$  can be any formula at all.

### Rules for $\vee$ , ctd.

- ( $\vee$ -elimination, or  $\vee E$ ) To prove something from  $A \vee B$ , you have to prove it by assuming  $A$ , AND prove it by assuming  $B$ . (This is arguing by cases.)

|   |            |               |                          |
|---|------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | $A \vee B$ |               | we got this somehow      |
| 2 | $A$        | ass           | 5 $B$ ass                |
| 3 | $\vdots$   | the 1st proof | 6 $\vdots$ the 2nd proof |
| 4 | $C$        | we got it     | 7 $C$ we got it again    |
| 8 | $C$        |               | $\vee E(1, 2, 4, 5, 7)$  |

The assumptions  $A, B$  are not usable later, so are put in (side-by-side) boxes. *Nothing inside the boxes can be used later.*

### Rules for $\rightarrow$

- ( $\rightarrow$ -introduction,  $\rightarrow I$ : 'arrow-introduction') To introduce a formula of the form  $A \rightarrow B$ , you *assume*  $A$  and then prove  $B$ .

During the proof, you can use  $A$  as well as anything already established. But *you can't use  $A$  or anything from the proof of  $B$  from  $A$  later on* (because it was based on an extra assumption).

So we isolate the proof of  $B$  from  $A$ , in a *box*:

|   |                               |                       |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | $A$                           | ass                   |
|   | $\langle$ the proof $\rangle$ | hard struggle         |
| 2 | $B$                           | we made it!           |
| 3 | $A \rightarrow B$             | $\rightarrow I(1, 2)$ |

*Nothing inside the box can be used later.*

In natural deduction, boxes are used when we make additional assumptions. The first line inside a box should always be labelled 'ass' (assumption) — with one exception, coming later (p. 212).

### Rules for $\rightarrow$ , ctd.

- ( $\rightarrow$ -elimination, or  $\rightarrow E$ ) If you have managed to write down  $A$  and  $A \rightarrow B$ , in either order, you can go on to write down  $B$ . (This is modus ponens.)

|   |                   |                        |
|---|-------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | $A \rightarrow B$ | we got this somehow... |
|   | $\vdots$          | other junk             |
| 2 | $A$               | and this too...        |
| 3 | $B$               | $\rightarrow E(1, 2)$  |

### 5.3 Rules for $\neg$

This is the trickiest case. Also,  $\neg$  has three rules! The first two treat  $\neg A$  like  $A \rightarrow \perp$ .

- ( $\neg$ -introduction,  $\neg I$ ) To prove  $\neg A$ , you assume  $A$  and prove  $\perp$ . As usual, you can't then use  $A$  later on, so enclose the proof of  $\perp$  from assumption  $A$  in a box:

|   |          |                       |
|---|----------|-----------------------|
| 1 | $A$      | ass                   |
| 2 | $\vdots$ | more hard work, oh no |
| 3 | $\perp$  | we got it!            |
| 4 | $\neg A$ | $\neg I(1, 3)$        |



### Rules for $\neg$ , ctd.

- ( $\neg$ -elimination,  $\neg E$ )

From  $A$  and  $\neg A$ , deduce  $\perp$ :

|   |          |                        |
|---|----------|------------------------|
| 1 | $\neg A$ | proved this somehow... |
| 2 | $\vdots$ | junk                   |
| 3 | $A$      | ... and this           |
| 4 | $\perp$  | $\neg E(1, 3)$         |

- ( $\neg\neg$ -elimination,  $\neg\neg$ ):

From  $\neg\neg A$ , deduce  $A$ . (See example 5.8.)