

1, 2, 3, 4, 5

1 [20 points] Give box-style proofs for each of the following:

A. [4 points] $F \rightarrow G \vdash ((F \wedge G) \rightarrow F) \wedge (F \rightarrow (F \wedge G))$.

B. [4 points] $(F \rightarrow G) \wedge (F \rightarrow H) \vdash F \rightarrow (G \wedge H)$.

C. [4 points] $F \vee G, \neg F \vdash G$.

D. [4 points] $\neg(F \rightarrow G) \vdash G \rightarrow F$.

E. [4 points] $\neg(F \wedge G) \vdash \neg F \vee \neg G$.

■

2 [6 points] Pierce's Law is the formula $((F \rightarrow G) \rightarrow F) \rightarrow F$.

A. [2 points] By using truth tables, show that Pierce's law is a tautology (i.e., that $\models ((F \rightarrow G) \rightarrow F) \rightarrow F$), or equivalently that this formula is true under every valuation.

B. [4 points] Prove Pierce's Law using natural deduction.

Hint: As mentioned in class, *constructive* logic rejects the use of indirect arguments. Consequently, in constructive logic one cannot use the excluded middle axiom ($\vdash \phi \vee \neg\phi$), double-negation elimination rule ($\neg\neg\phi \vdash \phi$), or the proof by contradiction rule (if $\neg\phi \vdash \perp$, then $\vdash \phi$). In constructive logic, Pierce's Law is not provable! Therefore, your proof has to involve at least one use of at least one of these three classical rules.

■

3 [24 points] **Proof or No Proof?** For each of the following, either show there is no proof (by finding a valuation/model that makes the assumptions true and the conclusion false), or provide a natural deduction (box) proof.

- A. [4 points] $\neg F \vee (G \rightarrow F) \vdash \neg F \wedge G$.
- B. [4 points] $F \rightarrow G, \neg F \rightarrow G \vdash G$.
- C. [4 points] $F \rightarrow G \rightarrow H \vdash G \rightarrow F \rightarrow H$.
- D. [4 points] $F \rightarrow G \rightarrow H \vdash F \rightarrow H \rightarrow G$.
- E. [4 points] $(F \rightarrow G) \rightarrow H \vdash F \rightarrow G \rightarrow H$.
- F. [4 points] $F \rightarrow G, C \rightarrow D \vdash F \vee C \rightarrow G \wedge D$.

■

4 [9 points] **OS Wars:** Consider the following argument:

- Premise 1: If my computer runs Windows, then Microsoft got my money.
- Premise 2: If my computer runs Mac OS X, then Apple got my money.
- Conclusion: At least one of the following statements is true:
 - If my computer runs Mac OS X, then Microsoft got my money.
 - If my computer runs Windows, then Apple got my money.

- A. Define propositions (e.g., F , G , etc.) to stand for relevant statements in this proof, and show how to symbolically represent the premises and conclusion using these propositions.
- B. Either provide a formal proof that this argument holds, or find a valuation where the assumptions are true but the conclusion is false.

■

5 [1 easy point] Please wait until you're done with the rest of the assignment to answer this quick survey:

- A. How long (in hours) did you spend working on this assignment?
- B. What was the most interesting thing you learned while answering these problems?
(We're sure there was *something* you learned.)

■