

-NoValue-

axd.1 Examples of Derivações

fol:axd:pro:
sec

Exemplo axd.1. Suppose we want to prove $(\neg\theta \vee \alpha) \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \alpha)$. Clearly, this is not an instance of any of our axioms, so we have to use the MP rule to **deriva** it. Our only rule is MP, which given φ and $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$ allows us to justify ψ . One strategy would be to use ?? with φ being $\neg\theta$, ψ being α , and χ being $\theta \rightarrow \alpha$, O.s., the instance

$$(\neg\theta \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \alpha)) \rightarrow ((\alpha \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \alpha)) \rightarrow ((\neg\theta \vee \alpha) \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \alpha))).$$

Why? Two applications of MP yield the last part, which is what we want. And we easily see that $\neg\theta \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \alpha)$ is an instance of ??, and $\alpha \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \alpha)$ is an instance of ?. So our **derivação** is:

- | | | |
|----|---|----------|
| 1. | $\neg\theta \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \alpha)$ | ?? |
| 2. | $(\neg\theta \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \alpha)) \rightarrow$
$((\alpha \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \alpha)) \rightarrow ((\neg\theta \vee \alpha) \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \alpha)))$ | ?? |
| 3. | $(\alpha \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \alpha)) \rightarrow ((\neg\theta \vee \alpha) \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \alpha))$ | 1, 2, MP |
| 4. | $\alpha \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \alpha)$ | ?? |
| 5. | $(\neg\theta \vee \alpha) \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \alpha)$ | 3, 4, MP |

fol:axd:pro:
ex:identity

Exemplo axd.2. Let's try to find a **derivação** of $\theta \rightarrow \theta$. It is not an instance of an axiom, so we have to use MP to **deriva** it. ?? is an axiom of the form $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$ to which we could apply MP. To be useful, of course, the ψ which MP would justify as a correct step in this case would have to be $\theta \rightarrow \theta$, since this is what we want to **deriva**. That means φ would also have to be θ , O.s., we might look at this instance of ??:

$$\theta \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \theta)$$

In order to apply MP, we would also need to justify the corresponding second premise, namely φ . But in our case, that would be θ , and we won't be able to **deriva** θ by itself. So we need a different strategy.

The other axiom involving just $\rightarrow$ is ??, O.s.,

$$(\varphi \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \chi)) \rightarrow ((\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\varphi \rightarrow \chi))$$

We could get to the last nested conditional by applying MP twice. Again, that would mean that we want an instance of ?? where $\varphi \rightarrow \chi$ is $\theta \rightarrow \theta$, the **fórmula** we are aiming for. Then of course, φ and χ are both θ . How should we pick ψ so that both $\varphi \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \chi)$ and $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$, O.s., in our case $\theta \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \theta)$ and $\theta \rightarrow \psi$, are also **derivável**? Well, the first of these is already an instance of ??, whatever we decide ψ to be. And $\theta \rightarrow \psi$ would be another instance of ?? if ψ were $(\theta \rightarrow \theta)$. So, our **derivação** is:

1. $\theta \rightarrow ((\theta \rightarrow \theta) \rightarrow \theta)$??
2. $(\theta \rightarrow ((\theta \rightarrow \theta) \rightarrow \theta)) \rightarrow$
 $((\theta \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \theta)) \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \theta))$??
3. $(\theta \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \theta)) \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \theta)$ 1, 2, MP
4. $\theta \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \theta)$??
5. $\theta \rightarrow \theta$ 3, 4, MP

Exemplo axd.3. Sometimes we want to show that there is a *derivação* of some *fórmula* from some other *fórmulas* Γ . For instance, let's show that we can *deriva* $\varphi \rightarrow \chi$ from $\Gamma = \{\varphi \rightarrow \psi, \psi \rightarrow \chi\}$. fol:axd:prop:ex:chain

1. $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$ HYP
2. $\psi \rightarrow \chi$ HYP
3. $(\psi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow (\varphi \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \chi))$??
4. $\varphi \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \chi)$ 2, 3, MP
5. $(\varphi \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \chi)) \rightarrow$
 $((\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\varphi \rightarrow \chi))$??
6. $((\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\varphi \rightarrow \chi))$ 4, 5, MP
7. $\varphi \rightarrow \chi$ 1, 6, MP

The lines labelled “HYP” (for “hypothesis”) indicate that the *fórmula* on that line is *um membro* of Γ .

Proposição axd.4. If $\Gamma \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ and $\Gamma \vdash \psi \rightarrow \chi$, then $\Gamma \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \chi$ fol:axd:prop:prop:chain

Prova. Suppose $\Gamma \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ and $\Gamma \vdash \psi \rightarrow \chi$. Then there is a *derivação* of $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$ from Γ ; and a *derivação* of $\psi \rightarrow \chi$ from Γ as well. Combine these into a single *derivação* by concatenating them. Now add lines 3–7 of the *derivação* in the preceding example. This is a *derivação* of $\varphi \rightarrow \chi$ —which is the last line of the new *derivação*—from Γ . Note that the justifications of lines 4 and 7 remain valid if the reference to line number 1 is replaced by reference to the last line of the *derivação* of $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$, and reference to line number 2 by reference to the last line of the *derivação* of $\psi \rightarrow \chi$. $\square$

Problema axd.1. Show that the following hold by exhibiting *derivações* from the axioms:

1. $(\varphi \wedge \psi) \rightarrow (\psi \wedge \varphi)$
2. $((\varphi \wedge \psi) \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow (\varphi \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \chi))$
3. $\neg(\varphi \vee \psi) \rightarrow \neg\varphi$

Créditos das Imagens

Referências Bibliográficas