CITS2211 Assignment 1

Baasil Siddiqui

Question 1

a) P ∨ (Q ∨ ¬P)

P	Q	$\neg P$	$Q \vee \neg P$	$P \vee (Q \vee \neg P)$
T	T	F	T	T
T	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	T	T
F	F	T	T	T

As the truth table demonstrates, the proposition is a tautology since it's always true regardless of the truth values of Q or P

b) (P ∧ ¬P) ∨ ¬Q

P ∧ ¬P = F (by contradiction)
¬Q   (By absorption)

the proposition depends on the truth value of Q hence it's a contingent

c) Q → (P ∧ ¬Q)

P	Q	$\neg Q$	$P \wedge \neg Q$	$Q \to (P \wedge \neg Q)$
T	T	F	F	F
T	F	T	T	T
F	T	F	F	F
F	F	T	F	T

As the truth table demonstrates, the truth value of the proposition depends on the truth values of P and Q. Hence, the proposition is a contingent.

Question 2

P ∨ ¬(P ∨ ¬Q) ≡ P ∨ ¬Q

1. P ∨ ¬ (P ∨ ¬ Q)	Premise
2. P ∨ (¬ P ∧ Q)	1, Demorgan's laws
3. (P ∨ ¬P) ∧ (P ∨ Q)	2, distributivity
4. T ∧ (P ∨ Q)	3, excluded middle
5. P ∨ Q	4, absorption

5. $P \vee Q$

Q.E.D.

Question 3

$\forall x \, \exists n \, (x \leq n \leq x{+}5 \wedge (\exists a \, \exists b \, (a \neq n) \wedge (a \neq 1) \wedge (b \neq n) \wedge (b \neq 1) \wedge (a \times b = n))$

Question 4

let $N(x, y)$ be "x is a neighbour of y"

a) Anna has no neighbours

$\neg(\exists x.N(x, a))$

b) Ben has two neighbours

$\exists x \, \exists y \, (N(x, b) \wedge N(y, b) \wedge x \neq y \wedge \forall z \, (N(z, b) \rightarrow (z = x \vee z = y)))$

c) If somebody is a neighbour of Ben, Ben is also a neighbour of that person

$\forall x \, (N(x, b) \rightarrow N(b, x))$

d) Except for Anna, everyone is the neighbour of someone

$\forall x \, (x \neq a \rightarrow \exists y(N(x, y)))$

Question 5

a) $\dfrac{P}{P}$

 $P \equiv P$ by rule of identity
 hence, the inference rule is sound

b) $\dfrac{P}{P \leftrightarrow Q}$

 if Q if false, the axiom is true but the conclusion is false
 Hence, the inference rule is unsound

c) $\dfrac{P \leftrightarrow Q}{P}$

 if P and Q are false, the axiom is true but the conclusion is false
 Hence, the inference rule is unsound

d) $\dfrac{P \quad Q}{P \vee Q}$

 From the premise P we can infer $P \vee Q$ by disjunction introduction rule
 Hence, the inference rule is sound

e) $$\dfrac{P \to Q \quad \neg\neg P}{Q}$$

1. ¬¬P	Premise
2. P → Q	Premise
3. P	1, double negation
4. Q	3, 2, Demorgan's laws

Hence the rule is sound

Question 6

∀x.(¬ Q(x) ∨ P(x)) ∨ ∃ x(Q(x) ∨ (P(x) ∧ R(x))) → ∃x.R(x)

1. $\forall x(\neg Q(x) \wedge P(x))$	premise
2. $\exists x(Q(x) \vee (P(x) \wedge R(x)))$	premise
3. $Q(a) \vee (P(a) \wedge R(a))$	2, Exist elimination
4. $\neg Q(a) \wedge P(a)$	1, Forall elimination
5. $\neg Q(a)$	4, conjunction elimination
6. $\neg Q(a) \to (P(a) \wedge R(a))$	3, implication law
7. $P(a) \wedge R(a)$	5, 6, Modus ponens
8. R(a)	7, conjunction elimination
9. $\exists x.R(x)$	8, Exists introduction