

## Math 2001 Homework 04

Exercises: LaP 5.3. 1–7

Due Friday 22 February by 2pm

**5.3.1.** Show how to derive the proof-by-contradiction rule from the law of the excluded middle, using the other rules of natural deduction. In other words, assume you have a proof of  $\perp$  from  $\neg A$ . Using  $A \vee \neg A$  as a hypothesis, but *without* using the rule RAA, show how you can go on to derive  $A$ .

**5.3.2.** Give a natural deduction proof of  $\neg(A \wedge B)$  from  $\neg A \vee \neg B$ . (You do not need to use proof by contradiction.)

**5.3.3.** Construct a natural deduction proof of  $\neg A \vee \neg B$  from  $\neg(A \wedge B)$ . You can do it as follows:

1. First, prove  $\neg B$ , and hence  $\neg A \vee \neg B$ , from  $\neg(A \wedge B)$  and  $A$ .
2. Use this to construct a proof of  $\neg A$ , and hence  $\neg A \vee \neg B$ , from  $\neg(A \wedge B)$  and  $\neg(\neg A \vee \neg B)$ .
3. Use this to construct a proof of a contradiction from  $\neg(A \wedge B)$  and  $\neg(\neg A \vee \neg B)$ .
4. Using proof by contradiction, this gives you a proof of  $\neg A \vee \neg B$  from  $\neg(A \wedge B)$ .

**5.3.4.** Give a natural deduction proof of  $\neg A \vee B$  from  $A \rightarrow B$ . You may use the *Law of the Excluded Middle* (LEM).

**5.3.5.** Put  $(A \vee B) \wedge (C \vee D) \wedge (E \vee F)$  in disjunctive normal form, that is, write it as a big “or” of multiple “and” expressions.

**5.3.6.** Prove  $\neg(A \wedge B) \rightarrow \neg A \vee \neg B$  by replacing the sorry’s below by proofs.

```
open classical
variables {A B C : Prop}

-- Prove  $\neg (A \wedge B) \rightarrow \neg A \vee \neg B$  by replacing the sorry's below
-- by proofs.

lemma step1 (h :  $\neg (A \wedge B)$ ) (h : A) :  $\neg A \vee \neg B$  :=
have  $\neg B$ , from sorry,
show  $\neg A \vee \neg B$ , from or.inr this

lemma step2 (h :  $\neg (A \wedge B)$ ) (h :  $\neg (\neg A \vee \neg B)$ ) : false :=
```

```

have ¬ A, from
  assume : A,
  have ¬ A → B, from step1 h <A>,
  show false, from h this,
show false, from sorry

theorem step3 (h : ¬ (A → B)) : ¬ A → B :=
by_contradiction
  (assume h' : ¬ (¬ A → B),
   show false, from step2 h h')

```

**5.3.7.** Also do these:

```

open classical
variables {A B C : Prop}

example (h : ¬ B → ¬ A) : A → B :=
sorry

example (h : A → B) : ¬ A → B :=
sorry

```