

10 m° 1.

Ex 1. Rocq

Ex 2. Rocq

Ex 3. IF $\Gamma \vdash A$ is provable in NJ, take some proof tree in NJ for it, it is a valid proof tree in NJ + R, thus $\Gamma \vdash A$ is provable in NJ + R.

Conversely, take a proof tree π of $\Gamma \vdash A$ in NJ + R, by admissibility of R, every occurrence of R in π can be replaced by part of a tree that doesn't use R. Doing this starting from the leaves yield a valid proof tree for $\Gamma \vdash A$ in NJ.

Ex 4.

1. Take a proof tree of $\Gamma, A, B \vdash C$. Replace each occurrence of

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, A, B, \Delta \vdash A} Ax$$

$$\frac{\frac{}{\Gamma, A \wedge B, \Delta \vdash A \wedge B} Ax}{\Gamma, A \wedge B, \Delta \vdash A} \wedge e$$

and

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, A, B, \Delta \vdash B} Ax$$

with

$$\frac{\frac{}{\tilde{\Delta} \vdash A \wedge B} Ax}{\tilde{\Delta} \vdash B} \wedge e,$$

also replacing every sequent $\Gamma, A, B, \Delta \vdash \gamma$ with $\Gamma, A \wedge B, \Delta \vdash \gamma$.

2. By induction on the size of Γ , we apply Q1.

3. No, derivable rules cannot remove hypotheses (with the rules in NJ).

Ex 5.

$$\begin{array}{l}
 1. \quad \frac{\Xi, \Gamma \vdash A}{\Xi, \Delta \vdash B} \text{ admissible iff } (\Xi, \Gamma \vdash A \text{ implies } \Xi, \Delta \vdash B) \\
 \text{iff } (\Xi \vdash \Lambda \Gamma \Rightarrow A \text{ implies } \Xi \vdash \Lambda \Delta \Rightarrow B) \quad \text{Ex h.} \\
 \text{iff } \Xi \vdash (\Lambda \Gamma \Rightarrow A) \Rightarrow (\Lambda \Delta \Rightarrow B) \\
 \text{iff } \Xi \vdash (\Delta \Gamma \Rightarrow A \wedge \Lambda \Delta \Rightarrow B) \quad \text{currying}
 \end{array}$$

2. Similarly to Q1, we know

$$\Xi, \Gamma \vdash (\Lambda \Delta \Rightarrow A) \Rightarrow B$$

is provable, thus, by repeated currying, writing $\Delta = F_1, \dots, F_n$, the sequent

$$\Xi, \Gamma \vdash (F_1 \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow F_n \Rightarrow A) \Rightarrow B$$

is provable; take π a proof tree for it.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \triangle \pi \\
 \hline
 \Xi, \Gamma \vdash \Phi \Rightarrow B
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{c}
 \text{assumption} \\
 \hline
 \Xi, \Gamma, \Delta \vdash A \\
 \hline
 \Xi, \Gamma \vdash F_1 \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow F_n \Rightarrow A \quad \text{repeated } \Rightarrow_I \\
 \hline
 \Xi, \Gamma \vdash B \quad \Rightarrow_E
 \end{array}$$

Ex 6.

1.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \triangle \pi_1 \quad \triangle \pi_2 \\
 \hline
 \frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash A} \text{wk} \quad \frac{\Delta \vdash B}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash B} \text{wk} \\
 \hline
 \Gamma, \Delta \vdash A \wedge B \quad \text{AI}
 \end{array}$$

2.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{\Gamma \vdash \neg A}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash \neg A} \text{wk} \quad \frac{\Delta \vdash A}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash A} \text{wk} \\
 \hline
 \Gamma, \Delta \vdash \perp \quad \neg E
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \vee B}{\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma \vdash A \vee B} \text{wk} \quad \frac{\Delta \vdash A \vee C}{\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma \vdash A \vee C} \text{wk} \quad \frac{\Sigma \vdash B \vee C}{\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma \vdash B \vee C} \text{wk} \\
 \hline
 \Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma \vdash C \quad \vee E
 \end{array}$$

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \Rightarrow B}{\Gamma, \Sigma \vdash A \Rightarrow B} \text{wh}}{\Gamma, \Sigma \vdash B} \quad \frac{\frac{\Delta \vdash B}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash B} \text{wR}}{\Rightarrow E.}$$

Ex 7.

Define $C_T := \perp \Rightarrow \perp$ and $C_{\neg A} := A \Rightarrow \perp$.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{}{\Gamma, \perp \vdash \perp} \text{Ax}}{\Gamma \vdash C_T} \Rightarrow I}{\Gamma \vdash C_T} \text{"}\neg I\text{"}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash C_{\neg A} \quad \Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash \perp} \Rightarrow E. \quad \neg E.$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash \perp}{\Gamma \vdash C_{\neg A}} \Rightarrow I \quad \neg I$$

Ex 8. Rocq

Ex 9. Rocq

$\neg_R A$ is equivalent to $\neg A$ iff $\vdash \neg R$ is provable.