Technische Universität München
Institut für Informatik
Prof. Tobias Nipkow, Ph.D.
Lukas Stevens

Lambda Calculus
Winter Term 2022/23
Exercise Sheet 11

Exercise 1 (Peirce's Law in Intuitionistic Logic)

Prove the following variant of Peirce's Law in inuitionistic logic:

$$((((P \to Q) \to P) \to P) \to Q) \to Q$$

Exercise 2 (Intuitionistic Proof Search in Haskell)

The goal of this exercise is to implement the procedure to decide $\Gamma \vdash A$ in Haskell, i.e. the algorithm from the proof of Theorem 4.1.2.

- Have a look at the template provided on the website. It provides definitions of formulae and proof terms of intuitionistic propositional logic.
- Try to fill in the implementation of *solve*.
- Implement the three proof rules seen in the lecture: *assumption*, *intro*, and *elim*. Use the examples at the end of the template to test your implementation as you go. For *elim*, use the criterion from the proof to guess suitable instantiations.

The algorithm can be streamlined further:

a) When trying to prove $\Gamma \vdash A \to B$, it suffices to try ($\to$Intro). Explain why.

b) The attempt to prove $\Gamma \vdash A$ by assumption can be dropped if we use the following generalised $\to$Elim rule:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A_1 \to \ldots \to A_n \to B \qquad \forall i \leq n.\ \Gamma \vdash A_i}{\Gamma \vdash B} \to\textsc{Elim}$$

However, the proof obtained can be different. Explain the difference and why the outright proof by assumption is subsumed.

Homework 3 (Constructive Logic)

a) Prove the following statement using the calculus for intuitionistic propositional logic:

$$((c \to b) \to b) \to (c \to a) \to ((a \to b) \to b)$$

Hint: To make your proof tree more compact, you may remove unneeded assumptions to the left of the $\vdash$ during the proof as you see fit. For example, the following step is valid:

$$\frac{p \vdash p}{p, q \vdash p}$$

b) Give a well-typed expression in $\lambda^{\to}$ with the type

$$((\gamma \to \beta) \to \beta) \to (\gamma \to \alpha) \to ((\alpha \to \beta) \to \beta)$$

(You don't need to give the derivation tree.)

Homework 4 (The Negative Fragment)

We say that a formula A is negative if atomic formulas P only occur *negated* in A, i.e. in the form $P \to \bot$ ($\neg P$ for short). The symbol $\bot$ for *falsehood* plays the role of an unprovable propositional constant: we do not have any special proof rules or axioms for it.

Show that if A is negative, then:

$$\vdash \neg\neg A \to A$$

Hint: First show:

a) $\vdash \neg\neg\neg A \to \neg A$

b) $\vdash \neg\neg(A \to B) \to (\neg\neg A \to \neg\neg B)$

c) $\vdash (\neg\neg A \to \neg\neg B) \to (A \to \neg\neg B)$