

Constructive Logic (15-317), Fall 2019

Assignment 7: Classical Logic

Instructor: Karl Crary
TAs: David M Kahn, Siva Somayyajula, Avery Cowan

Due: Friday, October 18, 11:59 pm

Submit your homework via GradeScope as a file named **hw7.pdf**.

1 A New Constructive Logic: Classical Logic

Intuitionistic logic is based on the idea that the fundamental mathematical activity is to *affirm* the truth of something using evidence. Classical logic should be understood as a different, *dialectical* model of mathematical activity, in which one party tries to affirm and the other party tries to deny. Whereas the central duality of intuitionistic natural deduction was between the *introduction* and *elimination* rules for truth $A \text{ true}$, in classical natural deduction, each proposition is explained through the interaction between rules for affirmation $A \text{ } \text{👍}$ (i.e. $A \text{ true}$) and rules for denial $A \text{ } \text{👎}$ (i.e. $A \text{ false}$), a contest governed by the nullary form of judgment $\#$ (contradiction).¹

To be precise, each connective comes equipped with introduction rules for *both* affirmation and denial; classical negation $\neg A$ implements the involutive “change of perspective” between player (affirmation) and opponent (denial).

Conjunction

$$\frac{A \text{ } \text{👍} \quad B \text{ } \text{👍}}{A \wedge B \text{ } \text{👍}} \wedge \text{ } \text{👍}_1$$

$$\frac{A \text{ } \text{👎}}{A \wedge B \text{ } \text{👎}} \wedge \text{ } \text{👎}_1$$

$$\frac{B \text{ } \text{👎}}{A \wedge B \text{ } \text{👎}} \wedge \text{ } \text{👎}_2$$

Disjunction

$$\frac{A \text{ } \text{👍}}{A \vee B \text{ } \text{👍}} \vee \text{ } \text{👍}_1$$

$$\frac{B \text{ } \text{👍}}{A \vee B \text{ } \text{👍}} \vee \text{ } \text{👍}_2$$

$$\frac{A \text{ } \text{👎} \quad B \text{ } \text{👎}}{A \vee B \text{ } \text{👎}} \vee \text{ } \text{👎}$$

¹The symbols $A \text{ } \text{👍}$ and $A \text{ } \text{👎}$ can be written using the provided macros; if you have trouble using these symbols, it is also acceptable to write $A \text{ true}$ and $A \text{ false}$, as from lecture.

Implication

$$\frac{\overline{A \text{ } \text{thumbs up}}^u \quad \vdots \quad B \text{ } \text{thumbs up}}{A \supset B \text{ } \text{thumbs up}} \supset \text{thumbs up}^u \quad \frac{A \text{ } \text{thumbs up} \quad B \text{ } \text{thumbs down}}{A \supset B \text{ } \text{thumbs down}} \supset \text{thumbs down}$$

Units

$$\overline{\top \text{ } \text{thumbs up}} \top \text{ } \text{thumbs up} \quad \overline{\perp \text{ } \text{thumbs down}} \perp \text{ } \text{thumbs down}$$

Negation

$$\frac{A \text{ } \text{thumbs down}}{\neg A \text{ } \text{thumbs up}} \neg \text{thumbs up} \quad \frac{A \text{ } \text{thumbs up}}{\neg A \text{ } \text{thumbs down}} \neg \text{thumbs down}$$

In classical natural deduction, affirmation and denial compete with each other in a *formal contradiction*, a nullary judgment written $\#$. The rules for contradictions are as follows:

Contradiction

$$\frac{A \text{ } \text{thumbs up} \quad A \text{ } \text{thumbs down}}{\#} \text{link} \quad \frac{\overline{A \text{ } \text{thumbs up}}^u \quad \vdots \quad \#}{A \text{ } \text{thumbs down}} \# \text{ } \text{thumbs down}^u \quad \frac{\overline{A \text{ } \text{thumbs down}}^u \quad \vdots \quad \#}{A \text{ } \text{thumbs up}} \# \text{ } \text{thumbs up}^u$$

Using the rules $\# \text{ } \text{thumbs up}$ and $\# \text{ } \text{thumbs down}$, all the usual “elimination rules” for truth can be *derived* in classical natural deduction.

Task 1 (14 pts). Recall the introduction and elimination rules for the universal quantifier in intuitionistic natural deduction:

$$\frac{[z : \tau] \quad \vdots \quad A(z) \text{ true}}{\forall x : \tau. A(x) \text{ true}} \forall I^z \quad \frac{t : \tau \quad \forall x : \tau. A(x) \text{ true}}{A(t) \text{ true}} \forall E$$

Now it's your turn: *invent* affirmation and denial rules $\forall \text{ } \text{thumbs up}$, $\forall \text{ } \text{thumbs down}$ for the universal quantifier, as an extension to the classical natural deduction calculus which we have seen so far.

Task 2 (14 pts). Recall the introduction and elimination rules for the existential quantifier in intuitionistic natural deduction:

$$\frac{t : \tau \quad A(t) \text{ true}}{\exists x : \tau. A(x) \text{ true}} \exists\text{I} \qquad \frac{\exists x : \tau. A(x) \text{ true} \quad \begin{array}{c} [z : \tau] \quad \overline{A(z) \text{ true}}^u \\ \vdots \\ C \text{ true} \end{array}}{C \text{ true}} \exists\text{E}^{z,u}$$

As in the previous task, invent affirmation and denial rules $\exists\text{!}\text{👍}$, $\exists\text{!}\text{👎}$ for the existential quantifier.

Task 3 (22 pts). Using the rules you invented in the previous tasks, show that the following *elimination* rules for the universal and the existential quantifier are derivable.

$$\frac{t : \tau \quad \forall x : \tau. C(x) \text{👍}}{C(t) \text{👍}} \forall\text{!}\text{👍E} \qquad \frac{\exists x : \tau. A(x) \text{👍} \quad \begin{array}{c} [z : \tau] \quad \overline{A(z) \text{👍}}^u \\ \vdots \\ C \text{👍} \end{array}}{C \text{👍}} \exists\text{!}\text{👍E}^{z,u}$$