

## Handout 2

Next we turn to the study of deductive systems for propositional logic. A deductive system is a collection of axioms and inference rules. A “derivation” in a deductive system shows how a formula can be derived from a set of hypotheses using the postulates (axioms and inference rules) of the system.

### Deductive System **N**

In the natural deduction system **N**, the derivable objects are *sequents*—expressions of the form

$$\Gamma \Rightarrow F \quad (1)$$

(“ $F$  under assumptions  $\Gamma$ ”) where  $F$  is a formula and  $\Gamma$  is a finite set of formulas. If  $\Gamma$  is written as  $\{G_1, \dots, G_n\}$ , we will usually drop the braces and write (1) as

$$G_1, \dots, G_n \Rightarrow F. \quad (2)$$

Intuitively, a sequent (2) is understood as the formula

$$(G_1 \wedge \dots \wedge G_n) \rightarrow F \quad (3)$$

if  $n > 0$ , and as  $F$  if  $n = 0$ .

The axioms of **N** are sequents of the forms

$$\Rightarrow \top,$$

$$F \Rightarrow F$$

and

$$\Rightarrow F \vee \neg F.$$

The last one is called *the law of excluded middle*.

In the list of inference rules below,  $\Gamma$ ,  $\Delta$ ,  $\Delta_1$ ,  $\Delta_2$  are finite sets of formulas. All inference rules of **N** except for the two rules at the end are classified into *introduction rules* (the left column) and *elimination rules* (the right column); the exceptions are the *contradiction rule* ( $C$ ) and the *weakening rule* ( $W$ ):

$$\begin{array}{ll}
(\wedge I) \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow F \quad \Delta \Rightarrow G}{\Gamma, \Delta \Rightarrow F \wedge G} & (\wedge E) \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow F \wedge G}{\Gamma \Rightarrow F} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow F \wedge G}{\Gamma \Rightarrow G} \\
(\vee I) \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow F}{\Gamma \Rightarrow F \vee G} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow G}{\Gamma \Rightarrow F \vee G} & (\vee E) \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow F \vee G \quad \Delta_1, F \Rightarrow H \quad \Delta_2, G \Rightarrow H}{\Gamma, \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \Rightarrow H} \\
(\rightarrow I) \frac{\Gamma, F \Rightarrow G}{\Gamma \Rightarrow F \rightarrow G} & (\rightarrow E) \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow F \quad \Delta \Rightarrow F \rightarrow G}{\Gamma, \Delta \Rightarrow G} \\
(\neg I) \frac{\Gamma, F \Rightarrow \perp}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \neg F} & (\neg E) \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow F \quad \Delta \Rightarrow \neg F}{\Gamma, \Delta \Rightarrow \perp} \\
\\ 
(C) \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \perp}{\Gamma \Rightarrow F} & \\
(W) \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow F}{\Gamma' \Rightarrow F} \quad \text{if } \Gamma \subseteq \Gamma' & 
\end{array}$$

We regard the introduction and elimination rules for equivalence

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow F \rightarrow G \quad \Delta \Rightarrow G \rightarrow F}{\Gamma, \Delta \Rightarrow F \leftrightarrow G} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow F \leftrightarrow G}{\Gamma \Rightarrow F \rightarrow G} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow F \leftrightarrow G}{\Gamma \Rightarrow G \rightarrow F}$$

as special cases of  $(\wedge I)$  and  $(\wedge E)$ .

### System **N** is sound and complete:

**Theorem 1** *a sequent  $\Gamma \Rightarrow F$  is provable in **N** iff  $\Gamma$  entails  $F$ .*

To prove a formula  $F$  in System **N** means to prove the sequent  $\Rightarrow F$ . The theorem asserts that a formula is provable in **N** iff it is a tautology.

Figure 1 shows a proof of the formula

$$(p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)) \rightarrow ((p \wedge q) \rightarrow r)$$

with the corresponding “informal proof” to the right of the bar. Figure 2 is a proof of

$$(\neg p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$$

in **N**, again with an “English translation.”

1.	$p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r) \Rightarrow p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)$	— axiom	Assume $p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)$ . Now our goal is to prove $(p \wedge q) \rightarrow r$ . Assume $p \wedge q$ . Now our goal is to prove $r$ . From the second assumption, $p$ . Consequently, by the first assumption, $q \rightarrow r$ . On the other hand, from the second assumption, $q$ . Consequently $r$ . Thus we proved $(p \wedge q) \rightarrow r$ and consequently we are done.
2.	$p \wedge q \Rightarrow p \wedge q$	— axiom	
3.	$p \wedge q \Rightarrow p$	— by $(\wedge E)$ from 2	
4.	$p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r), p \wedge q \Rightarrow q \rightarrow r$	— by $(\rightarrow E)$ from 3, 1	
5.	$p \wedge q \Rightarrow q$	— by $(\wedge E)$ from 2	
6.	$p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r), p \wedge q \Rightarrow r$	— by $(\rightarrow E)$ from 5, 4	
7.	$p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r) \Rightarrow (p \wedge q) \rightarrow r$	— by $(\rightarrow I)$ from 6	
8.	$\Rightarrow (p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)) \rightarrow ((p \wedge q) \rightarrow r)$	— by $(\rightarrow I)$ from 7	

Figure 1: A proof of  $(p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)) \rightarrow ((p \wedge q) \rightarrow r)$

In each of the following problems, find a proof of the given formula in System **N**, and show also the corresponding informal proof.

- 2.1<sup>c</sup>**  $((p \wedge q) \rightarrow r) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r))$ .  
**2.2**  $(p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)) \rightarrow ((p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r))$ .  
**2.3<sup>c</sup>**  $((p \wedge q) \vee r) \rightarrow (p \vee r)$ .  
**2.4**  $(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow \neg p)$ .  
**2.5<sup>c</sup>**  $(p \rightarrow q) \vee (q \rightarrow p)$ .

In the following  $F$  and  $G$  are formulas. Find a proof in System **N**.

- 2.6<sup>c</sup>**  $F \wedge G \leftrightarrow G \wedge F, F \vee G \leftrightarrow G \vee F$ .  
**2.7<sup>c</sup>**  $F \wedge \top \leftrightarrow F, F \vee \perp \leftrightarrow F$ .  
**2.8<sup>c</sup>**  $\neg F \leftrightarrow (F \rightarrow \perp), \top \leftrightarrow (\perp \rightarrow \perp)$ .  
**2.9<sup>c</sup>**  $(F \rightarrow \neg G) \leftrightarrow \neg(F \wedge G)$ .

1.	$\neg p \rightarrow q \Rightarrow \neg p \rightarrow q$	— axiom	Assume $\neg p \rightarrow q$ . Now our goal is to prove $\neg q \rightarrow p$ .
2.	$\neg q \Rightarrow \neg q$	— axiom	Assume $\neg q$ . Now our goal is to prove $p$ .
3.	$\Rightarrow p \vee \neg p$	— axiom	Consider two cases.
4.	$p \Rightarrow p$	— axiom	Case 1: $p$ . This case is trivial.
5.	$\neg p \Rightarrow \neg p$	— axiom	Case 2: $\neg p$ . Then, by the first assumption, $q$ .
6.	$\neg p \rightarrow q, \neg p \Rightarrow q$	— by $(\rightarrow E)$ from 5, 1	This contradicts the second assumption, so that we can conclude $p$ also.
7.	$\neg p \rightarrow q, \neg q, \neg p \Rightarrow \perp$	— by $(\neg E)$ from 6, 2	Thus, in either case, $p$ .
8.	$\neg p \rightarrow q, \neg q, \neg p \Rightarrow p$	— by $(C)$ from 7	We have proved $\neg q \rightarrow p$ and consequently we are done.
9.	$\neg p \rightarrow q, \neg q \Rightarrow p$	— by $(\vee E)$ from 3, 4, 8	
10.	$\neg p \rightarrow q \Rightarrow \neg q \rightarrow p$	— by $(\rightarrow I)$ from 9	
11.	$\Rightarrow (\neg p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$	— by $(\rightarrow I)$ from 10	

Figure 2: A proof of  $(\neg p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$

**2.10<sup>c</sup>**  $\neg(F \vee G) \leftrightarrow \neg F \wedge \neg G.$

**2.11<sup>c</sup>**  $\neg(F \wedge G) \leftrightarrow \neg F \vee \neg G.$

**2.12<sup>c</sup>**  $\neg\neg\neg F \leftrightarrow \neg F.$