# **Logic Tutorial 3 Solutions**

```
1.
            Proving P \lor Q \equiv (P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow Q:
a)
(P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow Q \equiv \neg (P \rightarrow Q) \lor Q
                                                                                   Implication rule
\equiv \neg (\neg P \lor Q) \lor Q
                                                                                    Implication rule
\equiv (\neg \neg P \land \neg Q) \lor Q
                                                                                   De Morgan
                                                                                   Double negation rule
\equiv (P \land \neg Q) \lor Q
                                                                                   Distributive rules
\equiv (P \lor Q) \land (\neg Q \lor Q)
\equiv P \lor Q
                                                                                   \neg Q \lor Q is a tautology
            Proving P \land Q \rightarrow R \equiv (P \rightarrow R) \lor (Q \rightarrow R):
b)
(P \rightarrow R) \lor (Q \rightarrow R) \equiv (\neg P \lor R) \lor (\neg Q \lor R)
                                                                                   Implication rule
\equiv \neg P \lor (R \lor (\neg Q \lor R))
                                                                                   Associative rules
\equiv \neg P \lor (R \lor (R \lor \neg Q))
                                                                                   Commutative rules
\equiv \neg P \lor ((R \lor R) \lor \neg Q)
                                                                                   Associative rules
\equiv \neg P \lor (R \lor \neg Q)
                                                                                   R \lor R \equiv R
\equiv \neg P \vee (\neg Q \vee R).
                                                                                   Commutative rules
= (¬P v A) Signment Project As Extremes F
\equiv \neg (P \land Q) \lor R
                                                                                   De Morgan
\equiv P \land Q \rightarrow R
                                                                                   Implication rule
            Proving Phttps://tutorcs.com
c)
(P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow (P \rightarrow R)
                                                                                   Implication rule
\equiv \neg (P \rightarrow Q) \lor (P \rightarrow R) \qquad \text{Implication rule} \\ \equiv \neg (\neg P \lor Q) \lor (P \rightarrow R) \qquad \text{CStutOhplication rule}
                                                                                   Implication rule and De Morgan
\equiv (\neg \neg P \land \neg Q) \lor (\neg P \lor R)
\equiv (P \land \neg Q) \lor (\neg P \lor R)
                                                                                   Double negation rule
                                                                                   Commutative rules
\equiv (\neg P \lor R) \lor (P \land \neg Q)
\equiv ((\neg P \lor R) \lor P) \land ((\neg P \lor R) \lor \neg Q)
                                                                                   Distributive rules
                                                                                   Commutative and Associative rules
\equiv ((\neg P \lor P) \lor R) \land ((\neg P \lor R) \lor \neg Q)
\equiv (\neg P \lor R) \lor \neg O
                                                                                   \neg P \lor P is a tautology
\equiv \neg P \lor (R \lor \neg Q) \equiv \neg P \lor (\neg Q \lor R)
                                                                                   Commutative and Associative rules
\equiv P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow R)
                                                                                   Implication rule
```

a. I will use the following propositional symbols:

D: to stand for "capital punishment deters capital crime"

J: to stand for "capital punishment is justified"

### Premise:

 $D\rightarrow J$ 

 $\neg D$ 

### Conclusion

 $\neg J$ 

D	J	$D\rightarrow J$	$\neg D$	Premise	$\neg J$
T	T	T	F	F	F
T	F	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	T	T	F
F	F	T	T	T	T

The third row shows that there is an interpretation in which the premise is true but the conclusion is not So the conclusion in pota semantic consequence of the plemise.

b. I will use the following propositional symbols:

W: to stand for "were trues a wartutores com S: to stand for "we solve our domestic problems"

Premise:  $\neg (W \land S)$ 

WeChat: cstutorcs

Conclusion:

 $S \rightarrow \neg W$ 

			Premise		
W	S	$W \wedge S$	$\neg (W \land S)$	$\neg W$	$S \rightarrow \neg W$
T	T	T	F	F	F
T	F	F	T	F	T
F	T	F	T	T	T
F	F	F	T	T	T

The conclusion follows from the premise.

3. I will use the following propositional symbols:

L: to stand for "lung cancer is more common among male smokers"

S: to stand for "smoking causes lung cancer"

M: to stand for "lung cancer is caused by something in the male makeup"

## Premise:

I

 $S \rightarrow \neg L$ 

 $L\rightarrow M$ 

### Conclusion

 $\neg S \land M$ 

<u>L</u>	S	M	$\neg L$	$S \rightarrow \neg L$	$L\rightarrow M$	$\neg S$	Premise	$\neg S \land M$
T	T	T	F	F	T	F	F	F
T	T	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
T	FA	c di c	rrFm	e <sup>T</sup> nt ]	Project I	<b>Tv</b> <sup>T</sup> 21	nt He	n T
T	F	3415	FILE	The	10 Jeet 1	7ACU	T <sub>F</sub> TTC	F
F	T	T	T	T	T	F	F	F
F	T	F 🔒	Ţ	$T_{II}$	T	F	F	F
F	F	Т	ittos	s://tu	itores.co	$\mathbf{m}$	F	T
F	F	F	T	T	T	T	F	F

The third row is the only interpretation in which all the wffs in the premise are true, and there the conclusion is also true. So the conclusion is semantically entailed by the premise.