

Proof Theory and Automated Theorem Proving  
2013  
Exercises  
Week 4

Lecturer: Joost J. Joosten

March 14, 2013

## 1 Structural rule

We have already proven the admissibility of the structural rule: If  $\vdash_{\top}^m \Gamma$  then  $\vdash_{\top}^m \Gamma, \Delta$  (we were actually allowed to increase the  $m$  too).

1. Sometimes the structure of a proof witnessing  $\vdash_{\top}^m \Gamma, \Delta$  is different from the structure of  $\vdash_{\top}^m \Gamma$ . Illustrate this using the example  $\vdash_{\top} A \vee \sim A, A$ .
2. Under certain conditions though, we do have that the structure of the proof remains the same after weakening. Formulate and prove a statement to the effect that from  $\vdash_{\top}^m \Gamma$  we can conclude  $\vdash_{\top}^m \Gamma, \Delta$  by a proof that shares the same structure as the original proof of  $\vdash_{\top}^m \Gamma$ . What is a sufficient condition on  $\Delta$ ?

## 2 Traces

Throughout all this exercise suppose that we split a provable sequent in two disjunct parts  $\Gamma$  and  $\Delta$ ; Thus,  $\vdash_{\top}^m \Gamma, \Delta$  for some  $m \in \omega$ .

A proof  $\Pi$  of  $\Gamma, \Delta$  is a well-founded labeled binary tree such that  $\langle \rangle \in \Pi$  with label  $\delta(\Delta)$  and so that each  $s$  is a finite sequence of 0 and 1's so that if  $s \in \Pi$  then,

1. if  $s \hat{\ } \langle n \rangle$  implies  $n = 0$ , then  $\frac{\delta(s \hat{\ } \langle 0 \rangle)}{\delta(s)}$  is an application of one of the rules  $(\exists), (\forall), \vee$ ,
2. if  $s$  is a leaf, then  $\delta(s)$  is an axiom,
3. if both  $s \hat{\ } \langle 0 \rangle$  and  $s \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle$  are in  $\Pi$ , then  $\frac{\delta(s \hat{\ } \langle 0 \rangle) \quad \delta(s \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle)}{\delta(s)}$  is an application of the  $(\wedge)$  rule.

Given a proof  $\Pi$ , we wish to give a sensible definition of  $\text{Trace}(\Gamma)$ . Basically,  $\text{Trace}(\Gamma)$  should tell us which formulas “in”  $\Pi$  originate in  $\Gamma$ . We define  $\text{Trace}(\Gamma) = \Pi$  but now with a different labeling function  $\tau$ . We inductively define  $\tau(\langle \ \rangle) = \Gamma$ , and if  $s \in \Pi$ , then

1. if  $s \hat{\langle} n \rangle$  implies  $n = 0$ , and  $\frac{\delta(s \hat{\langle} 0 \rangle)}{\delta(s)}$  is an application of the rule  $(\vee)$ , with  $\tau(s) = A_0 \vee A_1, \Gamma'$  where  $A_0 \vee A_1$  is the newly introduced formula, and  $A_i$  is the premiss for this newly introduced formula then  $\tau(s \hat{\langle} 0 \rangle) := \Gamma' \cup (\{A_i, A_0 \vee A_1\} \cap \delta(s \hat{\langle} 0 \rangle))$
2. etc.

**Actual exercise:**

1. Write down the other cases of the definition of  $\text{Trace}(\Gamma)$ .
2. We call an axiom  $\Delta', A, \sim A$  *mixed* in case  $A \in \text{Trace}(\Gamma)$  and  $\sim A \in \text{Trace}(\Delta)$  for some atomic formula  $A$ . Show that if  $\Pi$  does not contain mixed axioms, but only axioms of the form  $\Gamma', A, \sim A$  with  $\{\sim A, A\} \subseteq \text{Trace}(\Gamma)$ , then  $\vdash_{\Gamma}^m \Gamma$ .