

## COMPLETENESS OF COPI'S METHOD OF DEDUCTION

JOHN THOMAS CANTY

Massey has pointed out in [2] that it is an open question as to whether Copi's method of deduction for propositional logic (**CMD**), as described in Chapter Three of [1], is complete in the sense of being able to validate every argument which can be proved valid by the use of truth-tables. It is here shown that **CMD** is complete in this sense, for its completeness follows from Theorem I below and the deductive completeness of the logistic system **R.S.** of Chapter Seven of [1].

The following lemma is required for the proof of Theorem I:

*There is a formal proof by **CMD** of the validity of  $q \vee (p \cdot \sim p) \cdot r \therefore q$ .*

Proof of the lemma:<sup>1</sup>

- |   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| 1. $q \vee (p \cdot \sim p) \cdot r$            | / $\therefore q$ |
| 2. $(q \vee (p \cdot \sim p)) \cdot (q \vee r)$ | 1, Dist.         |
| 3. $q \vee (p \cdot \sim p)$                    | 2, Simp.         |
| 4. $(q \vee p) \cdot (q \vee \sim p)$           | 3, Dist.         |
| 5. $q \vee p$                                   | 4, Simp.         |
| 6. $\sim \sim q \vee p$                         | 5, D.N.          |
| 7. $\sim q \supset p$                           | 6, Impl.         |
| 8. $(q \vee \sim p) \cdot (q \vee p)$           | 4, Comm.         |
| 9. $q \vee \sim p$                              | 8, Simp.         |
| 10. $\sim \sim q \vee \sim p$                   | 9, D.N.          |

\*This paper was written while the author was a fellow under the National Defense Education Act.

1. The elementary valid argument forms of **CMD** used in constructing this formal proof are referred to by their abbreviations given by Copi on pages 42-43 of [1]. Note that because of Comm. for both disjunction and conjunction, formal proofs of the validity of  $((p \cdot \sim p) \cdot r) \vee q \therefore q$ ,  $(r \cdot (p \cdot \sim p)) \vee q \therefore q$ , and  $q \vee (r \cdot (p \cdot \sim p)) \therefore q$  can also be given. Thus any reference to the formal proof given for this lemma should be taken as referring to any one of these four formal proofs.