

A Logic Similar to Propositional Logic

Consider the following logic:

Syntax: A wff can be defined using following BNF rules.

- $\Phi ::= p \mid (\Phi + \Phi) \mid (\neg \Phi)$
- p is propositional symbol representing a proposition from the set of propositions $\{p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots\}$

Semantics:

- A proposition can map to “true” or “false”
- “ \neg ” is interpreted as “negation” ($\neg \text{true} = \text{false}$; $\neg \text{false} = \text{true}$)
- “ $+$ ” is interpreted as “exclusive or”
 - $\text{true} + \text{true} = \text{false}$
 - $\text{false} + \text{false} = \text{false}$
 - $\text{true} + \text{false} = \text{true}$
 - $\text{false} + \text{true} = \text{true}$

Questions-1: Which strings are wffs in this logic?

1. p_1
2. $(p_1 + (\neg p_2))$
3. $+p_1$
4. $(\neg \Phi)$
5. $p_1 + p_2$
6. $\neg (p_1)$
7. $(\neg p_1)$
8. $(p_1 + (p_2 + p_3))$

Questions-2: Let us assume that unary operator \neg has higher precedence than $+$ operator, and $+$ is a left associative operator. What are the fully parenthesized versions of the following wffs?

1. $\neg p_1 + \neg p_2$
2. $\neg \neg p_1 + \neg p_2 + p_3$
3. $\neg p_1 + p_2 + \neg p_3$

Questions-3: Axioms are the formulas that are regarded to be true in the logic. Can you give three axioms in this logic? (using schemas - generic versions of formulas)

Questions-4: Can you give some inference rules in this logic? (using schemas generic versions of formulas)

Rule 1	Rule 2	Rule 3
$\frac{\Phi + \Psi \quad \Phi}{?}$	$\frac{\Phi + \Psi \quad \Psi}{?}$	$\frac{\Phi + \Psi \quad \neg \Phi}{?}$
Rule 4	Rule 5	Rule 6
$\frac{\Phi \quad \neg \Psi}{?}$	$\frac{\neg \Phi \quad \Psi}{?}$	$\frac{\Phi + \Psi \quad \neg \Psi}{?}$
Rule 7		
$\frac{\neg \neg \Phi}{?}$		

Questions-5: Can you give a proof p_3 from p_1, p_1+p_2, p_2+p_3 using the inference rules from question 4?

$p_1, p_1+p_2, p_2+p_3 \vdash p_3$

Questions-6: Is $\neg p_2$ a logical consequence of p_1 and p_1+p_2 ?

$p_1, p_1+p_2 \models \neg p_2$?