THE CALCULUS OF COMPUTATION

HIDENORI SHINOHARA

1. Chapter 1

Exercise (1.1).

(a) Assume that there is a falsifying interpretation I.
  1. $I \not\models P \wedge Q \rightarrow P \rightarrow Q$ (assumption)
  2. $I \models P \wedge Q$ (by 1 and semantics of $\rightarrow$)
  3. $I \not\models P \rightarrow Q$ (by 1 and semantics of $\rightarrow$)
  4. $I \models Q$ (by 2 and semantics of $\wedge$)
  5. $I \not\models Q$ (by 3 and semantics of $\rightarrow$)
  6. $I \models \bot$ (4 and 5 are contradictory)

  There is only one branch and it is closed. Thus F is valid.

(b) By constructing a truth table which has $2^2 = 4$ rows, it is easy to see that the interpretation $I : \{P \mapsto \mathsf{false}, Q \mapsto \mathsf{true}\}$ is a falsifying interpretation.

(c) By constructing a truth table which has $2^3 = 8$ rows, it is easy to see that the interpretation $I : \{P \mapsto \mathsf{true}, Q \mapsto \mathsf{false}, R \mapsto \mathsf{false}\}$ is a falsifying interpretation.

Exercise (1.2).

(a) To prove that $\top \Leftrightarrow \neg\bot$, we prove that $\top \leftrightarrow \neg\bot$ is valid. Assume that there is a falsifying interpretation I such that $I \not\models \top \leftrightarrow \neg\bot$. We apply the semantics of $\leftrightarrow$.

  The first branch is:

  1a. $I \models \top \wedge \neg(\neg\bot)$
  2a. $I \models \neg(\neg\bot)$ (by 1a and semantics of $\wedge$)
  3a. $I \not\models \neg\bot$ (by 2a and semantics of $\neg$)
  4a. $I \models \bot$ (by 3a and semantics of $\neg$)

  The second branch is:

  1b. $I \models \neg\top \wedge \neg\bot$
  2b. $I \models \neg\top$ (by 1b and semantics of $\wedge$)
  3b. $I \not\models \top$ (by 2b and semantics of $\neg$)
  4b. $I \models \top$ (Under any interpretation, $\top$ has value true)
  5b. $I \models \bot$ (3b and 4b are contradictory)

  Thus both branches are closed, and thus $\top \leftrightarrow \neg\bot$ is valid.

(b) We will apply a strategy similar to that of Example 1.13. To prove $\bot \Leftrightarrow \neg\top$, we prove that $F : \bot \leftrightarrow \neg\top$ is valid. Suppose F is not valid; there exists an interpretation I such that $I \not\models F$. There are exactly two branches.

  The first branch is:

  1a. $I \models \bot \wedge \neg(\neg\top)$ (by semantics of $\leftrightarrow$)
  2a. $I \models \bot$ (by 1a and semantics of $\wedge$)

  The second branch is:

1b. $I \models (\neg\bot) \land \neg(\neg\top)$ (by semantics of $\leftrightarrow$)
2b. $I \models \neg\top$ (by 1b and semantics of $\land$)
3b. $I \not\models \top$ (by 2b and semantics of $\neg$)
4b. $I \models \top$ (by definition, P.7)
5b. $I \models \bot$ (by 3b and 4b)
Both of these two branches are closed; F is valid.

Exercise (1.3).

- $\bot$ is equivalent to $\neg\top$. In other words, $\bot \Leftrightarrow \neg\top$ and that is proved in Exercise 1.2(b).

Exercise (1.4).

- We claim that $\neg F \Leftrightarrow F \barwedge F$. To prove that, we prove $\neg F \leftrightarrow F \barwedge F$ is valid.

F	$\neg F$	$F \barwedge F$	$\neg F \leftrightarrow F \barwedge F$
0	1	1	1
1	0	0	1

- $F_1 \lor F_2 \Leftrightarrow (F_1 \barwedge F_1) \barwedge (F_2 \barwedge F_2)$. This can be shown easily using the truth table with $2^2 = 4$ rows.

Exercise (1.5).

(a) By using the list of template equivalences on P.19, we can obtain the negation normal form of the original formula as following:
- $F : \neg(P \to Q)$.
- $F' : \neg(\neg P \lor Q)$.
- $F'' : \neg(\neg P) \land \neg Q$.
- $F''' : P \land \neg Q$.

The only connectives in F''' are $\neg, \land$, and $\lor$ and the negations appear only in literals. Thus F''' is in NNF. Furthermore, F''' is actually in CNF and DNF since it is the disjunction of one conjunction, and it is the conjunction of two clauses.

(b) $F' : (\neg P \lor \neg Q) \land R$ is the NNF of F that can be obtained using the same strategy as above. F' is already in CNF. $F'' : (\neg P \land R) \lor (\neg Q \land R)$ is an equivalent formula in DNF.

(c) $F : (Q \land R \to (P \lor \neg Q)) \land (P \lor R)$.
- $F_1 : (\neg(Q \land R) \lor (P \lor \neg Q)) \land (P \lor R)$.
- $F_2 : (\neg Q \lor \neg R \lor P \lor \neg Q) \land (P \lor R)$.
- $F_3 : (\neg Q \land (P \lor R)) \lor (\neg R \land (P \lor R)) \lor (P \land (P \lor R)) \lor (\neg Q \land (P \lor R))$.
- $F_4 : (\neg Q \land P) \lor (\neg Q \land R) \lor (\neg R \land P) \lor (\neg R \land R) \lor (P \land P) \lor (P \land R) \lor (\neg Q \land P) \lor (\neg Q \land R)$.

F_2 is in NNF and CNF, and F_4 is in DNF.

Exercise (1.6).

(a) $\bigwedge_{v \in V} \bigvee_{c \in C} P_v^c$.

(b) $\bigwedge_{(v,w) \in E} \bigvee_{c_1 \neq c_2 \in C} (\neg P_v^{c_1} \lor \neg P_w^{c_2})$.

(c) $\bigwedge_{(v,w) \in E} \bigvee_{c \in C} (\neg P_v^c \lor \neg P_w^c)$.

(d) No clue. The problem statement seems too ambiguous.

(e) They are already in CNF. We have $N \cdot M$ variables and $N \cdot M + K \cdot M \cdot (M-1) + K \cdot M$ clauses in the encoding above.

Exercise (1.7).

(a) $P_{(F)}$ contains 1 term. Each $\mathsf{En}(G)$ contains $1, 1, 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 3, 1, 1, 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 3, 3 \cdot 2 \cdot 2$ clauses. Thus the expansion would contain 1728 clauses, which is the product of the numbers of clauses.

(b)

(i) 2^n clauses.

(ii) $\mathsf{Rep}(F_n) = P_{F_n}$, so it is just one clause. We have the subformula set $S_{F_n} = \{Q_1, \cdots, Q_n\} \cup \{R_1, \cdots, R_n\} \cup \{Q_i \wedge R_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. We will consider how many clauses $\mathsf{En}(G)$ has for each $G \in S_{F_n}$.

- For each Q_i and R_i, we have $\mathsf{En}(Q_i) = \mathsf{En}(R_i) = \top$. This adds $2n$ clauses to F'.
- $\mathsf{En}(Q_i \wedge R_i)$ contains 3 clauses as defined on P.25. This adds $3n$ clauses to F'.

Therefore, in total, F' contains $1 + 2n + 3n = 5n + 1$ clauses. Note that $5n + 1 < 30n + 2$ where $30n + 2$ is the upper bound described on P.26.

I am not sure if a subformula can be bigger. In other words, for instance, should $(Q_1 \wedge R_1) \vee (Q_2 \wedge R_2)$ be a subformula of F_3? It seems unnecessary to include such cases for the purpose of CNF conversion, but it seems to be more consistent with the definition of a subformula.

(iii) When $n \leq 4$, 2^n is smaller than $5n + 1$. For $n \geq 5$, 2^n is bigger than $5n + 1$.

Exercise (1.8).

(a) We will follow the format described in Example 1.30. Branching on Q or R will result in unit clauses; choose Q. Then $F\{Q \mapsto \top\} : (P \vee \neg R) \wedge (R)$. P appear only positively, so we consider $F\{Q \mapsto \top, P \mapsto \top\} : R$. Then R appears only positively, so the formula is satisfiable. In particular, F is satisfied by interpretation

$$I : \{P \mapsto \mathsf{true}, Q \mapsto \mathsf{true}, R \mapsto \mathsf{true}\}.$$

(b) Branching on Q or R will result in unit clauses. Choose Q.

$$F\{Q \mapsto \top\} : (\neg P \vee \neg R) \wedge (R).$$

P appears only negatively.

$$F\{P \mapsto \bot, Q \mapsto \top\} : R.$$

R appears only positively. Thus the interpretation $I : \{P \mapsto \mathsf{false}, Q \mapsto \mathsf{true}, R \mapsto \mathsf{true}\}$ satisfies F.

2. Chapter 2

Exercise (2.1).

(a) $\exists x, y.\, \text{day}(x) \wedge \text{day}(y) \wedge \text{length}(x) < \text{length}(y)$.
(b) $\exists x.\, \text{place}(x) \wedge \text{home}(x) \wedge (\forall y.\, \text{place}(y) \wedge \text{home}(y) \rightarrow x = y)$.
(c) $\forall x, y.\, \text{mother}(\text{me}, x) \wedge \text{mother}(x, y) \rightarrow \text{grandmother}(\text{me}, y)$.
(d) $\forall x, y, z.\, \text{convex}(x) \wedge \text{convex}(y) \wedge \text{intersect}(x, y, z) \rightarrow \text{convex}(z)$.

Exercise (2.2).

(a) This exercise is similar to Example 2.13. To show that the given formula is invalid, we find an interpretation I such that

$$I \models (\forall x, y.\, p(x,y) \to p(y,x)) \land \exists z.\, \neg p(z,z).$$

Choose $D_I = \{0,1\}$ and $p_I = \{(0,1),(1,0)\}$. Both $\forall x, y.\, p(x,y) \to p(y,x)$ and $\exists z.\, \neg p(z,z)$ evaluate to true under I because

- $I \models \forall x, y.\, p(x,y) \to p(y,x)$ since $I \lhd \{x \mapsto \mathsf{v}, y \mapsto \mathsf{w}\} \models p(x,y) \to p(y,x)$ for any $\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{w} \in \{0,1\}$.
- $I \models \exists z.\, \neg p(z,z)$ since $I \lhd \{z \mapsto 0\} \models \neg p(z,z)$.

(b) To show that the given formula is invalid, we need to find an interpretation I such that

$$I \models \exists x, y.\, p(x,y) \land p(y,x) \land \exists z.\, \neg p(z,z).$$

Choose $D_I = \{0,1\}$ and $p_I = \{(0,1),(1,0)\}$.

1. $I \models \exists x, y.\, p(x,y) \land p(y,x) \land \exists z.\, \neg p(z,z)$.
2. $I \lhd \{x \mapsto 0, y \mapsto 1\} \models p(x,y) \land p(y,x) \land \exists z.\, \neg p(z,z)$ by 1 and the semantics of $\exists$.
3. $I \lhd \{x \mapsto 0, y \mapsto 1\} \models p(x,y)$ by 2 and the semantics of $\land$.
4. $I \lhd \{x \mapsto 0, y \mapsto 1\} \models p(y,x)$ by 2 and the semantics of $\land$.
5. $I \lhd \{x \mapsto 0, y \mapsto 1\} \models \exists z.\, \neg p(z,z)$ by 2 and the semantics of $\land$.
6. $I \lhd \{x \mapsto 0, y \mapsto 1, z \mapsto 0\} \models \neg p(z,z)$ by 5 and the semantics of $\exists$.

(c) To show that the given formula is invalid, we need to find an interpretation I such that

$$I \models \neg((\exists x.\, p(x)) \to (\forall y.\, p(y))).$$

It suffices to show that its negation normal form is satisfied by I.

- $\neg((\exists x.\, p(x)) \to (\forall y.\, p(y)))$.
- $\neg(\neg(\exists x.\, p(x)) \lor (\forall y.\, p(y)))$.
- $(\exists x.\, p(x)) \land \neg(\forall y.\, p(y))$.
- $(\exists x.\, p(x)) \land (\exists y.\, \neg p(y))$.

In other words, it suffices to show

$$I \models (\exists x. p(x)) \land (\exists y. \neg p(y)).$$

By P.40, this is equivalent to $I \models (\exists x. p(x))$ and $I \models (\exists y. \neg p(y))$. Let $D_I = \{0,1\}$ and $p_I = \{0\}$. By P.41, $I \lhd \{x \mapsto 0\} \models p(x)$ and $I \lhd \{y \mapsto 1\} \models \neg p(y)$.

Exercise (2.3).

(a) To show $\neg(\forall x.\, F) \Leftrightarrow \exists x.\, \neg F$, we will show the validity of $\neg(\forall x.\, F) \leftrightarrow \exists x.\, \neg F$. Suppose that it is not valid. Then there exists an interpretation I such that $I \not\models \neg(\forall x.\, F) \leftrightarrow \exists x.\, \neg F$. By the semantiocs of $\leftrightarrow$, there are two branches. The semantics of $\land, \neg$ appear on P.10, and that of $\forall, \exists$ appear on P.42.

The first branch is:

1a. $I \models \neg(\forall x.\, F) \land \neg(\exists x.\, \neg F)$.
2a. $I \models \neg(\forall x.\, F)$ by 1a and semantics of $\land$.
3a. $I \models \neg(\exists x.\, \neg F)$ by 1a and semantics of $\land$.
4a. $I \not\models \forall x.\, F$ by 2a and semantics of $\neg$.

5a. $I \lhd \{x \mapsto \mathsf{v}\} \not\models F$ by 4a and semantics of $\forall$ for some fresh v.
6a. $I \not\models \exists x.\, \neg F$ by 3a and semantics of $\neg$.
7a. $I \lhd \{x \mapsto \mathsf{v}\} \not\models \neg F$ by 6a and semantics of $\exists$ for the same v.
8a. $I \lhd \{x \mapsto \mathsf{v}\} \models F$ by 7a and semantics of $\neg$.
9a. $I \models \bot$ by 5a and 8a.

The second branch is:

1b. $I \models \neg(\neg(\forall x.\, F)) \wedge \exists x.\, \neg F$.
2b. $I \models \exists x.\, \neg F$ by 1b and semantics of $\wedge$.
3b. $I \lhd \{x \mapsto \mathsf{v}\} \models \neg F$ by 2b and semantics of $\exists$ for some fresh $\mathsf{v} \in D_I$.
4b. $I \lhd \{x \mapsto \mathsf{v}\} \not\models F$ by 3b and semantics of $\neg$.
5b. $I \models \neg(\neg(\forall x.\, F))$ by 1b and semantics of $\wedge$.
6b. $I \not\models \neg(\forall x.\, F)$ by 5b and semantics of $\neg$.
7b. $I \models \forall x.\, F$ by 6b and semantics of $\neg$.
8b. $I \lhd \{x \mapsto \mathsf{v}\} \models F$ by 7b and semantics of $\forall$ for the same v.
9b. $I \models \bot$ by 4b and 8b.

Every branch of a semantic argument proof of $I \not\models F$ closes, so F is valid by Theorem 2.30.

Exercise (2.4).

(a)
- $(\forall x.\, \exists y.\, p(x, y)) \to \forall x.\, p(x, x)$.
- $\neg(\forall x.\, \exists y.\, p(x, y)) \vee \forall x.\, p(x, x)$.
- $(\exists x.\, \neg(\exists y.\, p(x, y))) \vee \forall x.\, p(x, x)$.
- $(\exists x.\, \forall y.\, \neg p(x, y)) \vee \forall x.\, p(x, x)$.
- $(\exists x.\, \forall y.\, \neg p(x, y)) \vee \forall w.\, p(w, w)$.
- $\neg p(x, y)) \vee p(w, w)$.
- $\exists x.\, \forall y.\, \forall w.\, \neg p(x, y)) \vee p(w, w)$.