

# Student Information

Full Name : Deniz KOLUAÇIK

Id Number : 2310274

## Answer 1

a)

| $p$ | $q$ | $\neg p$ | $q \rightarrow \neg p$ | $p \leftrightarrow q$ | $(q \rightarrow \neg p) \leftrightarrow (p \leftrightarrow q)$ |
|-----|-----|----------|------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| T   | T   | F        | F                      | T                     | F  |
| T   | F   | F        | T                      | F                     | F  |
| F   | T   | T        | T                      | F                     | F  |
| F   | F   | T        | T                      | T                     | T  |

Table 1: The truth table of the given compound proposition.

b)

| $p$ | $q$ | $r$ | $p \vee q$ | $p \rightarrow r$ | $q \rightarrow r$ | $(p \vee q) \wedge (p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)$ | $((p \vee q) \wedge (p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r) \rightarrow r)$ |
|-----|-----|-----|------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| T   | T   | T   | T          | T                 | T                 | T  | T  |
| T   | T   | F   | T          | F                 | F                 | F  | T  |
| T   | F   | T   | T          | T                 | T                 | T  | T  |
| T   | F   | F   | T          | F                 | T                 | F  | T  |
| F   | T   | T   | T          | T                 | T                 | F  | T  |
| F   | T   | F   | T          | T                 | F                 | F  | T  |
| F   | F   | T   | F          | T                 | T                 | F  | T  |
| F   | F   | F   | F          | T                 | T                 | F  | T  |

Table 2: The truth table for the given formula, where the expression on the last column holds true for any value of  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$ , showing us that the formula is a **tautology**.

## Answer 2

|   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| $\neg p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r) \equiv \neg(\neg p) \vee (q \rightarrow r)$ | <i>Table 7, Line 1</i>     |
| $\equiv p \vee (q \rightarrow r)$   | <i>Double negation law</i> |
| $\equiv p \vee (\neg q \vee r)$   | <i>Table 7, Line 1</i>     |
| $\equiv (p \vee \neg q) \vee r$   | <i>Associative law</i>     |
| $\equiv (\neg q \vee p) \vee r$   | <i>Commutative law</i>     |
| $\equiv \neg q \vee (p \vee r)$   | <i>Associative law</i>     |
| $\equiv \neg(\neg q) \rightarrow (p \vee r)$                                      | <i>Table 7, Line 3</i>     |
| $\equiv q \rightarrow (p \vee r)$   | <i>Double negation law</i> |

Hence;  $\neg p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)$  is logically equivalent to  $q \rightarrow (p \vee r)$ .

## Answer 3

- a)  $\forall x L(x, Burak)$
- b)  $\forall x L(Hazal, x)$
- c)  $\forall x \exists y L(x, y)$
- d)  $\neg \exists x \forall y (L(x, y))$
- e)  $\forall x \exists y L(y, x)$
- f)  $\forall x (\neg L(x, Mustafa) \wedge \neg L(x, Burak))$
- g)  $\exists x \exists y \forall z (L(Ceren, x) \wedge (L(Ceren, y) \wedge x \neq y) \wedge (L(Ceren, z) \rightarrow (z = x \vee z = y)))$
- h)  $\forall x \exists y \forall z (L(x, y) \wedge (L(x, z) \rightarrow y = z))$
- i)  $\forall x \forall y (L(x, y) \rightarrow x \neq y)$
- j)  $\exists x \exists y \forall z (L(x, x) \wedge L(x, y) \wedge x \neq y) \wedge (L(x, z) \rightarrow (z = x \vee z = y))$

## Answer 4

Table 3: Proof of  $p \rightarrow q, \neg q \vdash \neg p$ . This proof will be referred as *Modus Tollens* or *M.T.* for short.

|   |                   |                       |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | $p \rightarrow q$ | <i>premise</i>        |
| 2 | $\neg q$          | <i>premise</i>        |
| 3 | $p$               | <i>assumption</i>     |
| 4 | $q$               | $\rightarrow_e, 1, 3$ |
| 5 | $\perp$           | $\neg_e, 2, 4$        |
| 6 | $\neg p$          | $\neg_i, 3 - 5$       |

Table 4: Proving that  $p, p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q), q \rightarrow s \vdash \neg q \rightarrow (s \vee \neg r)$

|   |                                      |                        |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | $p$                                  | <i>premise</i>         |
| 2 | $p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$    | <i>premise</i>         |
| 3 | $q \rightarrow s$                    | <i>premise</i>         |
| 4 | $r \rightarrow q$                    | $\rightarrow_e, 1, 2$  |
| 5 | $\neg q$                             | <i>assumption</i>      |
| 6 | $\neg r$                             | <i>M.T., 4, 5</i>      |
| 7 | $s \vee \neg r$                      | $\vee_i, 6$            |
| 8 | $\neg q \rightarrow (s \vee \neg r)$ | $\rightarrow_i, 5 - 7$ |

## Answer 5

In this question, we are going to use several theorems that will be proven first, like in the previous question.

|    |                        |                        |
|----|------------------------|------------------------|
| 1  | $\neg p \wedge \neg q$ | <i>premise</i>         |
| 2  | $\neg p$               | $\wedge_e, 1$          |
| 3  | $\neg q$               | $\wedge_e, 1$          |
| 4  | $p \vee q$             | <i>assumption</i>      |
| 5  | $p$                    | <i>assumption</i>      |
| 6  | $\perp$                | $\neg_e, 2, 5$         |
| 7  | $p \rightarrow \perp$  | $\rightarrow_i, 5 - 6$ |
| 8  | $q$                    | <i>assumption</i>      |
| 9  | $\perp$                | $\neg_e, 3, 8$         |
| 10 | $q \rightarrow \perp$  | $\rightarrow_i, 8 - 9$ |
| 11 | $\perp$                | $\vee_e, 4, 7, 10$     |
| 12 | $\neg(p \vee q)$       | $\neg_i, 4 - 11$       |

Table 5: De Morgan's Law:  $\neg p \wedge \neg q \vdash \neg(p \vee q)$ . Note that we have used  $\perp$  to represent the Boolean value *False* in line 7 and 10 to be able to use conjunction elimination in line 11.. This theorem will be referred as  $DeM_{\vee}$ .

|   |                        |                   |
|---|------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | $p \vee q$             | <i>premise</i>    |
| 2 | $\neg q$               | <i>premise</i>    |
| 3 | $\neg p$               | <i>assumption</i> |
| 4 | $\neg p \wedge \neg q$ | $\wedge_i, 2, 3$  |
| 5 | $\neg(p \vee q)$       | $DeM_{\vee}, 4$   |
| 6 | $\perp$                | $\neg_e, 1, 5$    |
| 7 | $\neg\neg p$           | $\neg_i, 3 - 6$   |
| 8 | $p$                    | $\neg\neg_e, 7$   |

Table 6: Lemma:  $p \vee q, \neg q \vdash p$ . This lemma will be referred as Koluacik's rule.

|   |                       |                    |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | $\neg\exists x p(x)$  |                    |
| 2 | $x_0$                 | <i>constant</i>    |
| 3 | $p(x_0)$              | <i>assumption</i>  |
| 4 | $\exists x p(x)$      | $\exists_i, 3$     |
| 5 | $\perp$               | $\neg_e, 1, 4$     |
| 6 | $\neg p(x_0)$         | $\neg_i, 3 - 5$    |
| 7 | $\forall x \neg p(x)$ | $\forall_i, 2 - 6$ |

Table 7: De Morgan's Law for quantifiers. This law will be referred as  $DeM_{\exists}$ .

Table 8: Proof of  $\forall x(p(x) \rightarrow q(x)), \neg\exists zr(z), \exists yp(y) \vee r(a) \vdash \exists zq(z)$ .

|    |                                    |                                |
|----|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1  | $\forall x(p(x) \rightarrow q(x))$ | <i>premise</i>                 |
| 2  | $\neg\exists zr(z)$                | <i>premise</i>                 |
| 3  | $\exists yp(y) \vee r(a)$          | <i>premise</i>                 |
| 4  | $\forall z\neg r(z)$               | <i>DeM.</i> $\exists z, 2$     |
| 5  | $\neg r(a)$                        | $\forall_{e,z\leftarrow a}, 4$ |
| 6  | $\exists yp(y)$                    | <i>Kolucak's rule, 3, 5</i>    |
| 7  | $b \quad p(b)$                     | <i>assumption</i>              |
| 8  | $p(b) \rightarrow q(b)$            | $\forall_{e,x\leftarrow b}, 1$ |
| 9  | $q(b)$                             | $\rightarrow_e, 7, 8$          |
| 10 | $\exists zq(z)$                    | $\exists_i, 9$                 |
| 11 | $\exists zq(z)$                    | $\exists_e, 6, 7 - 10$         |