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## from informal/common reasoning to formal reasoning:

- IF the train arrives late AND there are NO taxis

THEN John is late for the meeting

- John is NOT late for the meeting
- the train did arrive late
- THEREFORE there were taxis
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## from informal/common reasoning to formal reasoning:

- IF the train arrives late AND there are NO taxis THEN John is late for the meeting
- John is NOT late for the meeting
- the train did arrive late
- THEREFORE there were taxis
again symbolically:
$>\left(\begin{array}{cc}P & \neg Q) \rightarrow R\end{array}\right.$
- $\quad \neg R$
- $\quad P$
- $\vdash \quad Q$
more succintly:
$P \wedge \neg Q \rightarrow R, \neg R, P \vdash Q$
- a sequent (also called a judgment) is an expression of the form:

$$
\varphi_{1}, \ldots, \varphi_{n} \vdash \psi
$$

where:

1. $\varphi_{1}, \ldots, \varphi_{n}, \psi$ are well-formed formulas (also called wff's)
2. the symbol " $\vdash$ " is pronounced turnstile
3. the wff's $\varphi_{1}, \ldots, \varphi_{n}$ to the left of " $\mid$ " are called the premises (also called antecedents or hypotheses)
4. the wff $\psi$ to the right of " $\vdash$ " is called the conclusion (also called succedent)

- a sequent is said to be valid (also deducible or derivable) if there is a formal proof for it
- a formal proof (also called deduction or derivation) is a sequence of wff's which starts with the premises of the sequent and finishes with the conclusion of the sequent:
$\varphi_{1} \quad$ premise
$\varphi_{2} \quad$ premise
$\vdots$
$\varphi_{n} \quad$ premise
$\vdots$
$\psi \quad$ conclusion
where every wff in the deduction is obtained from the wff's preceding it using a proof rule


## Examples of Proof Rules

$$
\begin{array}{lll} 
& \frac{\varphi}{\varphi \wedge \psi} & \wedge \mathrm{i} \\
> & \frac{\varphi \wedge \psi}{\varphi} & \wedge \mathrm{e}_{1} \\
> & \frac{\varphi \wedge \psi}{\psi} & \wedge \mathrm{e}_{2} \\
& \frac{\varphi}{\neg \neg \varphi} & \neg \neg \mathrm{i} \\
& \frac{\neg \neg \varphi}{\varphi} & \neg \neg \mathrm{e}
\end{array} \quad \text { (cannot be used in intuitionistic logic) }
$$
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$$
\rightarrow \mathrm{i}
$$

open a box when you introduce an assumption (wff $\varphi$ in rule $\rightarrow \mathrm{i}$ ) close the box when you discharge the assumption you must close every box and discharge every assumption in order to complete a formal proof

## Proof Rules Associated with Only One " $\neg$ " and with " $\perp$ "

So far, we have an elimination rule and an introduction rule for double negation " $\neg \neg$ ", namely $\neg \neg$ e and $\neg \neg$ i, but not for single negation " $\neg$ ". We now compensate for this lack:

$$
\frac{\varphi \quad \neg \varphi}{\perp} \neg \mathrm{e} \quad \text { ( or LNC for Law of Non-Contradiction) }
$$

where " $\perp$ " (a single symbol) stands for "contradiction"

## Proof Rules Associated with Only One " $\neg$ " and with " $\perp$ "

So far, we have an elimination rule and an introduction rule for double negation " $\neg \neg$ ", namely $\neg \neg$ e and $\neg \neg$ i, but not for single negation " $\neg$ ". We now compensate for this lack:

where " $\perp$ " (a single symbol) stands for "contradiction"


## Two Derived Proof Rules

## The two following rules are derived rules -

the first from rules $\rightarrow i, \neg i, \rightarrow e$, and $\neg \neg e$ (see [LCS, pp 24-25]); the second from rules $\vee \mathrm{i}$, $\neg \mathrm{i}, \neg \mathrm{e}$, and $\neg \neg \mathrm{e}$ (see [LCS, pp 25-26]):


## PBC (for Proof by Contradiction)

LEM (for Law of Excluded Middle)

Because $\neg \neg$ e is rejected in intuitionistic logic, so are PBC and LEM
(a summary of all proof rules and some derived rules in [LCS, p. 27])
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formal proof of the sequent $\quad P \vdash Q \rightarrow(P \wedge Q)$
${ }_{1} \quad P$
${ }^{2} \quad Q$
$3 \quad P \wedge Q$
$\wedge \mathrm{i} 1,2$
$4 \quad Q \rightarrow(P \wedge Q)$
$\rightarrow i$
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## Examples of Natural Deductions

formal proof of the sequent $P \rightarrow(Q \rightarrow R) \vdash P \wedge Q \rightarrow R$

| ${ }_{1}$ | $P \rightarrow(Q \rightarrow R)$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ${ }_{2}$ | $P \wedge Q$ |  |
| 3 | $P$ | $\wedge \mathrm{e}_{1} 2$ |
| 4 | $Q \rightarrow R$ | $\rightarrow \mathrm{e} 1,3$ |
| 5 | $Q$ |  |
| 6 | $R$ | $\wedge \mathrm{e}_{2} 2$ |
| 7 | $P \wedge Q \rightarrow R$ | $\rightarrow \mathrm{e} 4,5$ |
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formal proof of the sequent $P \wedge Q \rightarrow R \vdash P \rightarrow(Q \rightarrow R)$
${ }_{1} \quad P \wedge Q \rightarrow R$
$2 P$
3 Q
$4 \quad P \wedge Q$
$\wedge i 2,3$
${ }_{5} R$
$\rightarrow$ e 1, 4
$6 \quad Q \rightarrow R$
$\rightarrow i$
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## Examples of Natural Deductions

formal proof of the sequent $\quad P \rightarrow(Q \rightarrow R) \vdash(P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow(P \rightarrow R)$

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
1 & P \rightarrow(Q \rightarrow R) & \\
\hline 2 & P \rightarrow Q & \\
\hline 3 & P & \rightarrow \mathrm{e} 2,3 \\
4 & Q & \rightarrow \mathrm{e} 1,3 \\
5 & Q \rightarrow R & \rightarrow \mathrm{e} 5,4 \\
6 & R & \rightarrow \mathrm{i} \\
\hline 7 & P \rightarrow R & \rightarrow \mathrm{i}
\end{array}
$$

Formal Proof of the Initial Sequent:

| 1 | $P \wedge \neg Q \rightarrow R$ | premise |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\neg R$ | premise |
| 3 | $P$ | premise |
| 4 | $\neg Q$ | assume |
| 5 | $P \wedge \neg Q$ | $\wedge$ i 3,4 |
| 6 | $R$ | $\rightarrow$ e 1,5 |
| 7 | $\perp$ | $\neg \mathrm{e} 6,2$ |
| 8 | $\neg \neg Q$ | $\neg \mathrm{i}$ |
| 9 | $Q$ | $\neg \neg \mathrm{e} 8$ |
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