

# 8th Exercise sheet Proof Theory

## 7 Mar 2018

**Exercise 1** Consider the following De Morgan laws:

$$\begin{aligned}\neg\exists x \varphi &\rightarrow \forall x \neg\varphi \\ \forall x \neg\varphi &\rightarrow \neg\exists x \varphi \\ \neg\forall x \varphi &\rightarrow \exists x \neg\varphi \\ \exists x \neg\varphi &\rightarrow \neg\forall x \varphi\end{aligned}$$

Which ones of those are also intuitionistically valid? Give an intuitionistic natural deduction-style proof, if possible; if this is not possible, give a classical proof and a Kripke model refuting the statement.

**Exercise 2** Consider the following classical tautologies:

$$\begin{aligned}(\forall x \varphi \rightarrow \psi) &\rightarrow \exists x (\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \\ (\exists x \varphi \rightarrow \psi) &\rightarrow \forall x (\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \\ (\psi \rightarrow \forall x \varphi) &\rightarrow \forall x (\psi \rightarrow \varphi) \\ (\psi \rightarrow \exists x \varphi) &\rightarrow \exists x (\psi \rightarrow \varphi)\end{aligned}$$

(Here  $\psi$  is a formula in which  $x$  does not occur freely.) Which ones of those are also intuitionistically valid? Give an intuitionistic natural deduction-style proof, if possible; if this is not possible, give a classical proof and a Kripke model refuting the statement.

**Exercise 3** Construct a Kripke model refuting the intuitionistic validity of the sentence

$$\neg\neg\forall x (A(x) \vee \neg A(x)).$$

This shows that there are formulas  $\varphi$  in predicate logic such that  $\varphi$  is a classical tautology, while not even  $\neg\neg\varphi$  is an intuitionistic tautology.

**Exercise 4** We extend the theory of nuclei to predicate logic. So now a nucleus is a function  $\nabla$  sending formulas in predicate logic to formulas in predicate logic, in such a way that the following statements are provable in intuitionistic logic:

$$\begin{aligned} \vdash_{\text{IL}} \varphi &\rightarrow \nabla\varphi \\ \vdash_{\text{IL}} \nabla(\varphi \wedge \psi) &\leftrightarrow (\nabla\varphi \wedge \nabla\psi) \\ \vdash_{\text{IL}} (\varphi \rightarrow \nabla\psi) &\rightarrow (\nabla\varphi \rightarrow \nabla\psi) \end{aligned}$$

In addition, define  $\varphi^\nabla$  by induction on the structure of  $\varphi$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^\nabla &:= \nabla\varphi && \text{if } \varphi \text{ is a propositional variable or } \perp, \\ (\varphi \wedge \psi)^\nabla &:= \varphi^\nabla \wedge \psi^\nabla, \\ (\varphi \vee \psi)^\nabla &:= \nabla(\varphi^\nabla \vee \psi^\nabla), \\ (\varphi \rightarrow \psi)^\nabla &:= \varphi^\nabla \rightarrow \psi^\nabla, \\ (\forall x \varphi(x))^\nabla &:= \forall x (\varphi(x))^\nabla, \\ (\exists x \varphi(x))^\nabla &:= \nabla\exists x (\varphi(x))^\nabla. \end{aligned}$$

- (a) Show  $\vdash_{\text{IL}} \nabla\exists x \nabla\varphi \leftrightarrow \nabla\exists x \varphi$  and  $\vdash_{\text{IL}} \nabla\forall x \nabla\varphi \leftrightarrow \forall x \nabla\varphi$
- (b) Show that for any formula  $\varphi$  we have  $\vdash_{\text{IL}} \nabla\varphi^\nabla \leftrightarrow \varphi^\nabla$ .
- (c) Show that  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \vdash_{\text{IL}} \psi$  implies  $\varphi_1^\nabla, \dots, \varphi_n^\nabla \vdash_{\text{IL}} \psi^\nabla$ .