02156 - Logical Systems and Logic Programming
Fall 2021

DTU - Technical University of Denmark

Date of submission: September 22, 2021

Assignment 1

Daniel F. Hauge (s201186)

Problem 1

Question 1.1

Truth table is constructed using semantics written in the assignment description.

A	B	$\neg A$	$A \wedge B$	$A \vee B$	$A \rightarrow B$	$A \leftrightarrow B$
T	T	F	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	T	F	F
T	X	F	X	T	X	X
F	T	T	F	T	T	F
F	F	T	F	F	T	T
F	X	T	F	X	T	¬ X
X	T	¬ X	X	T	T	X
X	F	¬ X	F	X	¬ X	¬ X
X	X	¬ X	X	X	T	T

The lack of semantics for X will make some cases just terminate with $\neg X$. An interesting observation from comparison is that some logical operations disregard or will work just fine without classical truth values. Like implication $X \rightarrow X$ will give True, as with implication it does not matter what value it is operating with.

Question 1.2

When p is T:

$$\neg T \wedge T = F \wedge T = \underline{\underline{F}}$$

When p is F:

$$\neg F \wedge F = T \wedge F = \underline{\underline{F}}$$

When p is X:

$$\neg X \wedge X = \underline{\underline{F}}$$

As there is no semantics for the negation of X, there is no better evaluation of ¬X. Hence we conclude the X case to be false, as the values is not equal and neither of them is T.

Problem 2

Question 2.1

Refuting the validity of the expression, we negate it and try to find counter example:

$$\neg(((s \to p) \land ((\neg s \to t) \land (\neg p \to \neg t))) \to p)$$

$$((s \to p) \land ((\neg s \to t) \land (\neg p \to \neg t))), \neg p$$

$$s \to p, (\neg s \to t) \land (\neg p \to \neg t), \neg p$$

$$p, (\neg s \to t) \land (\neg p \to \neg t), \neg p \qquad \neg s, (\neg s \to t) \land (\neg p \to \neg t), \neg p$$

$$\times \qquad \neg s, (\neg s \to t), (\neg p \to \neg t), \neg p$$

$$\neg s, s, (\neg p \to \neg t), \neg p \qquad \neg s, t, (\neg p \to \neg t), \neg p$$

$$\times \qquad \neg s, t, p, \neg p \qquad \neg s, t, \neg t, \neg p$$

$$\times \qquad \times$$

Concluding a complete closed tableau, thus we can say that the formula is valid hence we can say it's a tautology.

Question 2.2

Considering the logical equivalence, we observe that it can be used to argument for the following:

$$s \to p \equiv \neg p \to \neg s$$

and

$$\neg p \to \neg t \equiv t \to p$$

Therefor we can "swap" the parts marked with underline below to show equivalence with the formular:

$$((\underline{s \to p}) \land ((\neg s \to t) \land (\underline{\neg p \to \neg t}))) \to p$$