

lem $\nVdash_{\lambda} t : b$ with $b \in BT$
 $\nVdash_{\lambda} e : b \rightarrow 0$

Proof Otherwise, we would get

$\nVdash_{\lambda} t \{^0/b\} : b \{^0/b\} = 0 \rightsquigarrow$ contradiction

$\nVdash_{\lambda} e \{^1/b\} : (b \rightarrow 0) \{^1/b\} = 1 \rightarrow 0$

$\hookrightarrow \nVdash_{\lambda} e \{^1/b\} \bullet : 0 \rightsquigarrow$ contradiction

Coroll: $\nVdash_{IPC} a$, $\nVdash_{IPC} \neg a$
 with a atomic

lem (Disjunction property)

$\nVdash_{IPC} p \vee q \iff (\nVdash_{IPC} p) \text{ or } (\nVdash_{IPC} q)$

Proof (\Leftarrow) is trivial ($\forall I1, \forall I2$)

(\Rightarrow) assume $\exists t. \nVdash_{\lambda} t : \tau \vee \sigma$

with $\Vdash_{\lambda} \tau = p$, $\Vdash_{\lambda} \sigma = q$

Wlog we assume that t is a normal form

By normal form lemma,

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} t = \text{in}_1(e) \text{ with } \nVdash_{\lambda} e : \tau \rightsquigarrow \nVdash_{IPC} \tau^T = p \\ \text{or} \\ t = \text{in}_2(f) \text{ with } \nVdash_{\lambda} f : \sigma \rightsquigarrow \nVdash_{IPC} \sigma^T = q \end{array} \right.$

Coroll If a atomic, $\nVdash_{IPC} a \vee \neg a$

Hence, IPC is not the "classical" logic we are used to

Def: $\nVdash_{CPC} = \nVdash_{IPC}$ augmented with
 \overline{LEM} (law of excluded middle) $\nVdash_{CPC} p \vee \neg p$

Coroll. $\text{IPC} \not\equiv \text{tIPC}$

Th tIPC is equivalent to IPC augmented with any one of:

1) LEP $\text{tIPC} \vdash \neg\neg p \quad (\forall p)$

2) DNE double negation elimination

$$\text{tIPC} \vdash \neg\neg p \rightarrow p \quad (\forall p)$$

3) Peirce's law

$$\text{tIPC} \vdash ((p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow p) \rightarrow p \quad (\forall p, q)$$

Ex: prove it.

Ex: prove $\text{IPC} \vdash p \rightarrow \neg\neg p$

$$\text{IPC} \vdash \neg\neg\neg p \leftrightarrow \neg p$$

Note: IPC does not prove the De Morgan's laws

$$p \vee q \leftrightarrow \neg(\neg p \wedge \neg q)$$

$$p \wedge q \leftrightarrow \neg(\neg p \vee \neg q)$$

(only \rightarrow holds, \leftarrow does not)

Th (Glyvenko) $\text{tIPC} \vdash p \Leftrightarrow \text{IPC} \vdash \neg\neg p$
(where p is a propositional formula)

Proof (\Leftarrow) trivial

$$\text{IPC} \vdash \neg\neg p \Rightarrow \text{tIPC} \vdash \neg\neg p \Leftrightarrow \text{tIPC} \vdash p$$

(\Rightarrow) By induction on tIPC we can prove $\Gamma \text{tIPC} \vdash p \Rightarrow \Gamma \text{IPC} \vdash \neg\neg p$

A few cases:

$$\text{(cpc)} \frac{\Gamma \vdash p \quad \Gamma \vdash q}{\Gamma \vdash p \wedge q} \wedge I \rightsquigarrow \exists f \Gamma \vdash_{\Gamma} \neg \neg p$$
$$\Gamma \vdash_{\Gamma} \neg \neg q$$
$$\text{then } \Gamma \vdash_{\Gamma} \neg \neg (p \wedge q)$$

We can assume (with some abuse
of notation)

$$\Gamma \vdash_{\lambda} t : \neg \neg p$$

$$\Gamma \vdash_{\lambda} e : \neg \neg q$$

and define f s.t. $\Gamma \vdash f : \neg \neg (p \wedge q)$

$$f = \lambda h_1 : \neg (p \wedge q).$$
$$t (\lambda h_2 : p.$$
$$e (\lambda h_3 : q.$$
$$h_1 \langle h_2, h_3 \rangle))$$

- - - - -

Another case

$$\text{cpc } p \vee \neg p \rightsquigarrow \text{cpc } \neg \neg (p \vee \neg p)$$

(fun H1: $\sim(p \vee \sim p) \Rightarrow$

H1 (@or_intror p ($\sim p$)

(fun H2: $p \Rightarrow$

H1 (@or_introl p ($\sim p$) H2))))

: $\neg \neg (p \vee \neg p)$

Simple Types in real - word programming languages

C : X (no real \rightarrow , no arrays)

C++ : \rightarrow , X

C# : \rightarrow , X

Java : \rightarrow , X

Scala, Swift, }

Haskell, Ocaml } : \rightarrow , X, +