Peter Smith, Introduction to Formal Logic (CUP, 2nd edition)

Exercises 14: Tautologies

- (a) Which of the following wffs are tautologies, which are contradictions, and which are neither?
 - $(1) \neg ((\neg \neg Q \land \neg \neg P) \lor \neg (P \land Q))$
 - (2) $(P \lor ((\neg P \lor Q) \land \neg Q))$
 - $(3) \quad (\{P \lor \neg (Q \land R)\} \lor \{(\neg P \land Q) \land R\})$
 - $(4) \quad (\{P \lor (Q \land \neg R)\} \lor \neg \{(\neg P \lor R) \lor Q\})$
 - $(5) \quad (\{P \land (\neg Q \lor \neg R)\} \lor \neg \{(P \lor \neg R) \lor \neg Q\})$
 - (6) $\neg (\{\neg (P \land \neg R) \land \neg (Q \land \neg S)\} \land \neg \{\neg (P \lor Q) \lor (R \lor S)\})$
- (b*) Which of the following claims are true about PL wffs, and why?
 - (1) The conjunction of a contradiction and any another wff is still a contradiction.
 - (2) The conjunction of a tautology and any another wff is still a tautology.
 - (3) The disjunction of two tautologies is a tautology.
 - (4) All the tautologies in a PL language express the same truth function as each other.
 - (5) Every contradiction in a PL language has the same truth table as a wff of the form $(\alpha \wedge \neg \alpha)$.

If a wff is neither a tautology nor a contradiction, it is said to be *contingent*. Which of the following claims are true, and why?

- (6) The negation of a contingent wff is contingent.
- (7) The disjunction of two contingent wffs is contingent.
- (8) The conjunction of two contingent wffs is contingent.
- (9) The disjunction of two contingent wffs is never a contradiction.