

Fact (clear)

1. if $\mu \vdash \gamma$ then $\mu \cup \mu' \vdash \gamma$

2. if $\mu \vdash \gamma$ for all $\gamma \in \mu'$ and $\mu' \vdash \emptyset$, then $\mu \vdash \emptyset$

Ex 1

$$\text{Ax 1. } (\varphi \rightarrow (\neg \rightarrow \varphi))$$

Let δ be arbitrary truth-assignment. Then by def.

$$\begin{aligned} \delta[\varphi \rightarrow (\neg \rightarrow \varphi)] &= 1 + \delta[\varphi] + \delta[\varphi] \cdot \delta[\neg \rightarrow \varphi] \\ &= 1 + \delta[\varphi] + \delta[\varphi] \cdot (1 + \delta[\neg] + \delta[\neg] \delta[\varphi]) \\ &= 1 + \delta[\varphi] + \delta[\varphi] + \delta[\varphi] \delta[\neg] + \delta[\varphi]^2 \delta[\neg] \\ &= 1 + \delta[\varphi] \delta[\neg] + \delta[\varphi] \delta[\neg] \\ &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Ax 3. } ((\neg \varphi \rightarrow \neg \neg) \rightarrow (\neg \rightarrow \varphi))$$

For any δ , $\delta[(\neg \varphi \rightarrow \neg \neg) \rightarrow (\neg \rightarrow \varphi)]$

$$\begin{aligned} &= 1 + \delta[\neg \varphi \rightarrow \neg \neg] + \delta[\neg \varphi \rightarrow \neg \neg] \delta[\neg \rightarrow \varphi] \\ &= 1 + (1 + \delta[\neg \varphi] + \delta[\neg \varphi] \delta[\neg \neg]) + (1 + \delta[\neg \varphi] + \delta[\neg \varphi] \delta[\neg \neg]) (1 + \delta[\neg] + \delta[\neg] \delta[\varphi]) \\ &= (1 + \delta[\varphi]) + (1 + \delta[\varphi]) (1 + \delta[\neg]) + (\delta[\varphi] + 1 + \delta[\varphi] + \delta[\neg] + \delta[\varphi] \delta[\neg]) \\ &\quad \cdot (1 + \delta[\neg] + \delta[\neg] \delta[\varphi]) \\ &= \cancel{1 + \delta[\varphi]} + \cancel{1 + \delta[\varphi]} + \delta[\neg] + \delta[\varphi] \delta[\neg] + \cancel{1 + \delta[\neg]} + \delta[\neg] \delta[\varphi] \\ &\quad + \delta[\neg] + \delta[\neg]^2 + \delta[\neg]^2 \delta[\varphi] \\ &\quad + \delta[\varphi] \delta[\neg] + \delta[\varphi] \delta[\neg]^2 + \delta[\varphi]^2 \delta[\neg]^2 \\ &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

Ax 2.

lazy to typeset.

Ex. 2.

1) (\rightarrow) Trivial.

(\leftarrow) prove by Contrapositive. For any δ , if $\delta[\phi] \neq \delta[\psi]$,
Then either

① $\delta[\phi] = 1$ and $\delta[\psi] = 0$, Concluding $\phi \neq \psi$, or

② $\delta[\phi] = 0$ and $\delta[\psi] = 1$, Concluding $\psi \neq \phi$

2) (\rightarrow) For any δ , Assume δ satisfies M . Then

$\delta[\phi \rightarrow \psi] = 1 + \delta[\phi] + \delta[\phi] \delta[\psi]$. Either

① $\delta[\phi] = 0$, Concluding $\delta[\phi \rightarrow \psi] = 1 + 0 + 0 = 1$, or

② $\delta[\phi] = 1$, Concluding δ satisfies $M \cup \{\phi\}$, and by

hypothesis $\delta[\psi] = 1$. it follows $\delta[\phi \rightarrow \psi] = 1 + 1 + 1 = 1$

(\leftarrow) For any δ , Assume δ satisfies $M \cup \{\phi\}$, Then δ satisfies
also M . By hypothesis $\delta[\phi \rightarrow \psi] = 1$. Observe

$$\delta[\phi \rightarrow \psi] = 1 + \delta[\phi] + \delta[\phi] \delta[\psi]$$

$$1 = 1 + 1 + \delta[\psi]$$

$$= \delta[\psi]$$

Ex. 3.

1) let δ be arbitrary.

Case ①. $\delta[\phi] = 0$, Then $\delta[\phi \rightarrow \psi] = 1 + 0 + 0 = 1$

Case ②. $\delta[\phi] = 1$, Then $\delta[\phi \rightarrow \psi] = 1 + 1 + 1 = 1$

2) Since $\vdash T$, $\{\phi\} \vdash T$ by Fact 1.

By the deduction theorem, $\vdash (\phi \rightarrow T)$

Ex. 4

By the deduction theorem $\mathcal{M} \cup \{\varphi\} \vdash \tau$ implies $\mathcal{M} \vdash (\varphi \rightarrow \tau)$.

Clearly $\Delta \cup \mathcal{M} \vdash \varphi$

$\Delta \cup \mathcal{M} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \tau$ by fact 1

But $\{\varphi, \varphi \rightarrow \tau\} \vdash \tau$ using MP

it follows $\Delta \cup \mathcal{M} \vdash \tau$ by fact 2

Ex. 5

1) $\{\varphi\} \cup \{\varphi \rightarrow \tau\} \vdash \tau$ MP

Deduction
Contrad I.
Contrad II.

$\{\varphi\} \vdash (\varphi \rightarrow \tau) \rightarrow \tau$ Deduction

$\vdash (\varphi \rightarrow ((\varphi \rightarrow \tau) \rightarrow \tau))$ Deduction

2) $\{(\varphi \rightarrow \tau), (\tau \rightarrow \emptyset)\} \cup \{\varphi\} \vdash \emptyset$ MP

$\{(\varphi \rightarrow \tau), (\tau \rightarrow \emptyset)\} \vdash (\varphi \rightarrow \emptyset)$ Deduction

3) That's exactly the first example in page 39 of the notes.

4) $\{(\neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi)\} \cup \{\neg\varphi\} \vdash \varphi$ MP

$\{(\neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi)\} \cup \{\neg\varphi\} \vdash \neg\varphi$

$\{(\neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi)\} \vdash \varphi$ Contradiction

$\vdash ((\neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi) \rightarrow \varphi)$ Deduction

lemma . if $M \cup \{T\} \vdash \psi$ and $\vdash T$, Then $M \vdash \psi$

let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$ be the derivation of $M \cup \{T\} \vdash \psi$, and

$\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_n$ be the derivation of $\vdash T$

Consider $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_n, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$. Then T in $\{\alpha_i\}$ shall no longer be an assumption. in other words, it's a derivation from M .

Since $\beta_n = \psi$, clearly $M \vdash \psi$.

Fact 2 Proof

Let $M' = \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \dots$

We're given $M \vdash \gamma_i$. Denote its derivation

$\varphi_{i,1}$

$\varphi_{i,2}$

$\varphi_{i,3}$

\vdots

$\varphi_{i,n_i} = \gamma_i$

We're given also from M'

β_1

β_2

\vdots

$\beta_n = \emptyset$

Construct a sequence

$\varphi_{i,j}$

β_1

β_2

\vdots

$\beta_n = \emptyset$

Clearly, this sequence relies on assumptions only from M , as $\beta_i \in M'$ are now deduced from M .

Thus $M \vdash \emptyset$