

BRANCH - _____

SEMESTER - _____

NAME _____

NAME OF PAPER _____ PAPER CODE _____

COLLEGE ROLL No. _____ DATE _____

MARKS OBTAINED _____

Signature of the Invigilator _____

Signature of Examiner _____

They are.

Axiom 1 $\Rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow \alpha)$

Axiom 2 $\Rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow \gamma)) \rightarrow ((\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \gamma))$

Axiom 3 $\Rightarrow (\neg \alpha \rightarrow \neg \beta) \rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow \alpha)$

6. The rule of inference for axiomatic system called modus ponens - is defined as follows:

β is a direct consequence of $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ and α

This can be re-written as,

for: ' $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ ', and ' α '

logical consequence: ' β '

Deduction in axiomatic system

A deduction of a formula in AxIomatic system is a sequence of fff's $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$ such that for each i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) either α_i is an axiom or hypothesis or is derived from α_j, α_k where $j, k < i$ using modus ponens inference rule.

Deductive consequence

If Σ is a set of hypothesis (formula assumed to be proved) involved in the deduction of α , then α is called a deductive consequence of Σ or α is deducible from Σ . Written as $\Sigma \vdash \alpha$.

Theorem

If a formula α is deduced from axioms only and no hypothesis are used then α is called a theorem. Written as $\vdash \alpha$, we assume that here ' Σ ' is empty.

Eg: $\{\phi\} \vdash (p \rightarrow \phi)$ i.e. ' $p \rightarrow \phi$ ' is logical consequence of $\{\phi\}$, \rightarrow proof it.

Ans: Hypothesis given. ϕ ①
Axiom 1 $\phi \rightarrow (p \rightarrow \phi)$ ②
From 1, 2, Modus ponens $(p \rightarrow \phi)$ ③

Hence we can conclude that $\{\phi\} \vdash (p \rightarrow \phi)$.

Eg: $\{p \rightarrow \phi, \phi \rightarrow R\} \vdash (p \rightarrow R)$ proof that.
Called chain rule

Ans: Hypothesis given $(p \rightarrow \phi)$ ①
Hypothesis given $(\phi \rightarrow R)$ ②
From axiom 1. $(\phi \rightarrow R) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow (\phi \rightarrow R))$ ③

[Let α is $\phi \rightarrow R$ and β is p]

From Modus ponens ②, ③ $p \rightarrow (\phi \rightarrow R)$ ④

From axiom 2 $(p \rightarrow (\phi \rightarrow R)) \rightarrow ((p \rightarrow \phi) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow R))$ ⑤

(4) From 4, 5, modus ponens $(P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow (P \rightarrow R)$ (6)

From 1, 6, modus ponens $(P \rightarrow R)$ (7)

Hence we can conclude $\{P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R\} \vdash (P \rightarrow R)$

Eg: Proof that $\{P \rightarrow Q\} \vdash ((R \rightarrow P) \rightarrow (R \rightarrow Q))$

Proof: hypothesis given $(P \rightarrow Q)$ (1)

from Axiom 1. $(P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow ((R \rightarrow (P \rightarrow Q)) \rightarrow (R \rightarrow Q))$ (2)

From 1, 2, modus ponens $R \rightarrow (P \rightarrow Q)$ (3)

From Axiom 2. $(R \rightarrow (P \rightarrow Q)) \rightarrow ((R \rightarrow P) \rightarrow (R \rightarrow Q))$ (4)

From 3, 4, modus ponens $(R \rightarrow P) \rightarrow (R \rightarrow Q)$ (5)

Hence we can conclude that

$\{P \rightarrow Q\} \vdash ((R \rightarrow P) \rightarrow (R \rightarrow Q))$

Eg: Prove that $\vdash (P \rightarrow P)$

Ans: theorem $\vdash (P \rightarrow P)$ (a)

From Axiom 1 $P \rightarrow ((Q \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P)$ (1)

From Axiom 2 $(P \rightarrow ((Q \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P)) \rightarrow ((P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow P)) \rightarrow (P \rightarrow P))$ (2)

From (1) (2), modus ponens $(P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow P)) \rightarrow (P \rightarrow P)$ (3)

From (a), Axiom 1 $P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow P)$ (4)

From 3, 4, modus ponens $(P \rightarrow P)$.

Therefore we can conclude that $\vdash (P \rightarrow P)$

So, $\vdash (P \rightarrow P)$ is a theorem.

Eg: Prove that $\vdash (\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg\neg P)$.

It's same as previous example.

Eg: Prove that $\vdash (\neg\neg P \rightarrow P)$ is a theorem

Ans: Theorem $\vdash (\neg\neg P \rightarrow P)$

By Axiom 1, $\neg\neg P \rightarrow (\neg\neg\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg\neg P) \dots ①$

By Axiom 3, $(\neg(\neg\neg\neg P) \rightarrow \neg(\neg\neg P)) \rightarrow (\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg\neg\neg\neg P) \dots ②$

By Transitivity 1,2, $\neg\neg P \rightarrow (\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg\neg\neg\neg P) \dots ③$

By Axiom 3

~~$\neg\neg P \rightarrow (\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg(\neg\neg P)) \dots ④$~~

By Axiom 3

~~$(\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg(\neg\neg P)) \rightarrow (\neg\neg P \rightarrow P) \dots ⑤$~~

By Axiom 3

$(\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg(\neg\neg P)) \rightarrow (\neg\neg P \rightarrow P) \dots ④$

By Transitivity 3,4; $\neg\neg P \rightarrow (\neg\neg P \rightarrow P) \dots ⑤$

By Axiom 2 $(\neg\neg P \rightarrow (\neg\neg P \rightarrow P)) \rightarrow ((\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg\neg P) \rightarrow (\neg\neg P \rightarrow P)) \dots ⑥$

By 5,6, Modus Ponens.

$(\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg\neg P) \rightarrow (\neg\neg P \rightarrow P) \dots ⑦$

$\neg\neg P \rightarrow ((\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg\neg P) \rightarrow \neg\neg P) \dots ⑧$

By Axiom 1

By Axiom 2, $(\neg\neg P \rightarrow ((\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg\neg P) \rightarrow \neg\neg P)) \rightarrow ((\neg\neg P \rightarrow (\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg\neg P)) \rightarrow (\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg\neg P)) \dots ⑨$

By 8,9, Modus Ponens. $(\neg\neg P \rightarrow (\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg\neg P)) \rightarrow (\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg\neg P)$

By Axiom 1 $\neg\neg P \rightarrow (\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg\neg P) \dots ⑩$

By 10, 11, M.P. $\neg\neg P \rightarrow \neg\neg P$
By 7, 12, M.P. $\vdash (\neg\neg P \rightarrow P)$ proved