

# PROOF THEORY

## TUTORIAL SESSION 2

Jeroen Goudsmit

Wednesday February 9th 2011

### Axioms

$$\frac{}{p \rightarrow p} \text{AXIOM}$$

### Structural Rules

$$\frac{\Gamma, A, B, \Pi \rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma, B, A, \Pi \rightarrow \Delta} \text{EXCHANGEL}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A, B, \Lambda}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, B, A, \Lambda} \text{EXCHANGER}$$

$$\frac{A, A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta} \text{CONTRACTIONL}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A, A}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A} \text{CONTRACTIONR}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta} \text{WEAKENINGL}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A} \text{WEAKENINGR}$$

### Propositional Rules

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \quad B, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{A \supset B, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta} \supset L$$

$$\frac{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, B}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \supset B} \supset R$$

$$\frac{A, B, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{A \wedge B, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta} \wedge L$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \quad \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, B}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \wedge B} \wedge R$$

$$\frac{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta \quad B, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{A \vee B, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta} \vee L$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A, B}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \vee B} \vee R$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A}{\neg A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta} \neg L$$

$$\frac{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, \neg A} \neg R$$

### Cut Rule

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \quad A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta} \text{CUT}$$

Figure 1: Sequent Calculus for Propositional Classical Logic

## EXERCISE I — Sequent Calculus

---

In the lecture we discussed Gentzen's sequent calculus as depicted in [Figure 1](#).

### EXERCISE I.A — Elementary Formulae

Prove the following statements in this system.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| (i) $\phi \supset \psi \supset (\phi \wedge \psi)$ ;  | (viii) $\phi \supset \neg\neg\phi$ ;                            |
| (ii) $(\chi \supset \phi) \supset (\chi \supset \psi) \supset (\chi \supset \phi \wedge \psi)$ ;                      | (ix) $\neg(\phi \wedge \psi) \supset \neg\phi \vee \neg\psi$ ;  |
| (iii) $(\phi \supset \alpha) \supset (\psi \supset \beta) \supset (\phi \wedge \psi) \supset (\alpha \wedge \beta)$ ; | (x) $\neg(\phi \vee \psi) \supset \neg\phi \wedge \neg\psi$ ;   |
| (iv) $(\phi \supset \chi) \supset (\psi \supset \chi) \supset (\phi \vee \psi) \supset \chi$ ;                        | (xi) $\neg\neg\phi \supset \phi$ ;                              |
| (v) $(\phi \supset \alpha) \supset (\psi \supset \beta) \supset (\phi \vee \psi) \supset (\alpha \vee \beta)$ ;       | (xii) $(\neg\psi \supset \neg\phi) \supset \phi \supset \psi$ ; |
| (vi) $(\phi \supset \psi \supset \chi) \supset (\phi \wedge \psi) \supset \chi$ ;                                     | (xiii) $\phi \vee \neg\phi$ ;                                   |
| (vii) $\chi \vee (\phi \wedge \psi) \supset (\chi \wedge \phi) \vee (\chi \wedge \psi)$ ;                             | (xiv) $\phi \wedge \neg\phi \supset \psi$ .                     |

A proof of (xiii) can be found in Gentzen (1935, p. 13).

### EXERCISE I.B — Cut Elimination

In the proof of cut elimination we treated the case of  $\neg$  and  $\wedge$ , but neglected  $\vee$  and  $\supset$ . Also, we only treated the easier left-hand side for conjunction. Prove all cases.

**Example 1** (The Left-Hand Case of  $\supset$ ). Suppose that  $A \supset B$  is contained in  $\Gamma$ , and that the amount of connectives in the sequent  $\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$  is  $m$ . Let  $\Gamma'$  be  $\Gamma$  without occurrences of this formula. Realize that from the sequent  $A \supset B, \Gamma' \rightarrow \Delta$  one can derive  $\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$  using only weak inferences. Moreover, from the sequents  $\Gamma' \rightarrow \Delta, A$  and  $B, \Gamma' \rightarrow \Delta$  one can prove  $A \supset B, \Gamma' \rightarrow \Delta$  using the right-hand implication rule. Hence we know, by the inversion theorem and the assumption that  $\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$  is provable, that both these sequents are provable as well. It is clear that the amount of connectives in these sequents is at most  $m - 1$ .

By induction we now know of proofs L and R of  $\Gamma' \rightarrow \Delta, A$  and  $B, \Gamma' \rightarrow \Delta$  respectively, both without any use of CUT and containing fewer than  $2^{m-1}$  strong inferences. Now consider the following derivation.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{L}{\Gamma' \rightarrow \Delta, A} \quad \frac{R}{B, \Gamma' \rightarrow \Delta}}{A \supset B, \Gamma' \rightarrow \Delta} \supset L}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta} \supset L \quad (1)$$

It is clear that (1) is a proof. Moreover, as L and R contain at most  $2^{m-1} - 1$  strong inferences, we know that this entire proof contains at most  $2 \cdot (2^{m-1} - 1) + 1 = 2^m - 1$  strong inferences.

## EXERCISE 1.C — Sharing

Consider the rule  $\wedge R$  and see that the *context*  $\Gamma$  is ‘duplicated’ to both premisses. The rules  $\wedge R$ ,  $\vee L$  and  $\supset L$  all have this same structure. Troelstra and Schwichtenberg (1996) say that these types of rules are *context-sharing*. A *context-independent* (or *non-sharing*) version of the former rule would be the following.

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \quad \Pi \rightarrow \Delta, B}{\Gamma, \Pi \rightarrow \Delta, \Delta, A \wedge B} \wedge R_P \quad (2)$$

Construct context-independent variants of the other context-dependent rules in the system. Also prove that the system obtained by replacing the context-dependent rules with their context-independent counterparts is equivalent in power to the system of Figure 1. A way to do this is by showing how the new and old rules can be derived from one another. By example, the ‘old’ right-conjunction rule is proven using the new conjunction rule of (2) as follows.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \quad \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, B}{\Gamma, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, \Delta, A \wedge B} \wedge R_P}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, \Delta, A \wedge B} \text{CONTRACTIONL}}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \wedge B} \text{CONTRACTIONR}$$

More details are given by Troelstra and Schwichtenberg (1996, p. 55).

## References

---

- Gentzen, Gerhard (1935). “Untersuchungen über das logische Schließen.” In: *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 39 (1). 10.1007/BF01201353, pages 176–210. ISSN: 0025-5874. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01201353>.
- Troelstra, Anne Sjerp and Helmut Schwichtenberg (1996). *Basic Proof Theory*. Volume 43. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science. Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 0-521-77911-1.