

2nd Exercise sheet Proof Theory

14 Feb 2018

Exercise 1 Give natural deduction proofs of the following statements, using only those rules that are intuitionistically valid:

- (a) $(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\neg\psi \rightarrow \neg\varphi)$.
- (b) $\varphi \rightarrow \neg\neg\varphi$.
- (c) $\neg\neg\neg\varphi \rightarrow \neg\varphi$.
- (d) $(\varphi \rightarrow \neg\neg\psi) \leftrightarrow (\neg\neg\varphi \rightarrow \neg\neg\psi)$.
- (e) $\neg\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi \wedge \neg\neg\psi$.

Exercise 2 Consider the following De Morgan laws:

$$\begin{aligned}\neg(\varphi \vee \psi) &\rightarrow \neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi \\ \neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi &\rightarrow \neg(\varphi \vee \psi) \\ \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi) &\rightarrow \neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi \\ \neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi &\rightarrow \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)\end{aligned}$$

Give natural deduction proofs of these laws, using the Reductio ad Absurdum rule instead of the Ex Falso rule only when this is unavoidable.

Exercise 3 Give proofs of the following formulas in classical natural deduction.

- (a) $(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\neg\varphi \vee \psi)$.
- (b) $((\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow \varphi) \rightarrow \varphi$.

Exercise 4 (a) Give natural deduction-style proofs in intuitionistic logic of

$$\begin{array}{l} \neg\neg(\varphi \vee \neg\varphi) \\ (\varphi \vee \neg\varphi) \rightarrow (\neg\neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi) \end{array}$$

- (b) Suppose that in the natural deduction system for classical logic we would replace the reductio ad absurdum rule with a rule saying that for any φ the statement $\varphi \vee \neg\varphi$ is an axiom (so for any formula φ we have a proof tree

$$\frac{}{\varphi \vee \neg\varphi}$$

with conclusion $\varphi \vee \neg\varphi$ and no uncanceled assumptions). Deduce from (a) that this new system for natural deduction proves the same statements $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ as the old one.

- (c) Give a Kripke model refuting the intuitionistic validity of

$$(\neg\neg p \rightarrow p) \rightarrow (p \vee \neg p),$$

thus showing that the law of excluded middle and the law of double negation elimination $\neg\neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$ are not “instancewise” equivalent.