

CS113 LAB 4 - Truth Table

SML

```
| fun ttgen_ex((a:'a,b:'a),[ ]) = [ ] |  
|   ttgen_ex((a:'a,b:'a), q::qs : 'a list list) =  
|     [q @ [a]] @ [q @ [b]] @ ttgen_ex((a,b), qs) : 'a list list;  
| fun ttgen(0, (_, _)) = [[ ]] : 'a list list |  
|   ttgen(1, (a:'a,b:'a)) = [[a],[b]] |  
|   ttgen(d, (a:'a,b:'a)) = ttgen_ex((a,b), ttgen(d-1, (a,b)));
```

CS113 LAB 4 - SML Functions

SML

```
fun conditional [false, false] = true | conditional [false, true] = true
  | conditional [true, false] = false | conditional [true, true] = true;
fun disjunction [false, false] = false | disjunction [false, true] = true
  | disjunction [true, false] = true | disjunction [true, true] = true;
fun isValid([ ], c, p, q) = c[p, q]
  | isValid(pr::ps, c, p, q) = if pr[p, q]
    then isValid(ps, c, p, q) else true;
fun isTautology([ ]) = true
  | isTautology(x::xs) = x andalso isTautology(xs);
```

```
val conditional = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val disjunction = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val isValid = fn: ('a list -> bool) list * ('a list -> bool) * 'a * 'a -> bool
```

```
val isTautology = fn: bool list -> bool
```

Algorithm to determine if an argument is valid

- Identify the premises and the conclusion of the argument
- Construct a truth table including premises and conclusion
- Find all rows in which premises are true
- If in each of the true rows, the conclusion is true then argument is valid
 - i.e. a tautology

CS113 LAB 4 - Proof Power Rules

ProofPower rules of inference

SML

```
val premise = asm_rule;  
val modus_ponens =  $\Rightarrow$ _elim;  
val modus_tollens = modus_tollens_rule;  
val disjunctive_addition =  $\vee$ _right_intro;  
val conjunctive_addition =  $\wedge$ _intro;  
val conjunctive_simplification =  $\wedge$ _right_elim;  
val disjunctive_syllogism =  $\vee$ _cancel_rule;  
val hypothetical_syllogism =  $\Rightarrow$ _trans_rule;  
val double_negation =  $\neg$ _ $\neg$ _elim;
```

```
val premise = fn: TERM -> THM  
:) val modus_ponens = fn: THM -> THM -> THM  
:) val modus_tollens = fn: THM -> THM -> THM  
:) val disjunctive_addition = fn: TERM -> THM -> THM  
:) val conjunctive_addition = fn: THM -> THM -> THM  
:) val conjunctive_simplification = fn: THM -> THM  
:) val disjunctive_syllogism = fn: THM -> THM -> THM  
:) val hypothetical_syllogism = fn: THM -> THM -> THM  
:) val double_negation = fn: THM -> THM
```

CS113 LAB 4 - Example 4.3

p	q	$(p \rightarrow q)$	$(q \rightarrow p)$	$((p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p))$	$(p \vee q)$	$((p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)) \rightarrow (p \vee q)$
T	T	T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F	T	T
F	T	T	F	F	T	T
F	F	T	T	T	F	F

$$\frac{p \rightarrow q \quad q \rightarrow p}{\therefore p \vee q}$$

SML

```
fun premise1[p, q] = conditional[p, q];  
fun premise2[p, q] = conditional[q, p];  
fun conclusion[p, q] = disjunction[p, q];  
fun v[p, q] = isValid([premise1, premise2], conclusion, p, q);  
isTautology(map v (ttgen(2, (true, false))));
```

```
val premise1 = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val premise2 = fn: 'a list -> 'a
```

```
val conclusion = fn: 'a list -> 'a
```

```
val v = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val it = false: bool
```

CS113 LAB 4 - Example 4.4

p	q	$(p \rightarrow q)$	$((p \rightarrow q) \wedge p)$	$((p \rightarrow q) \wedge p) \rightarrow q$
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	F	T
F	F	T	F	T

$$p \rightarrow q$$
$$\frac{q}{\therefore q}$$

```
val premise1 = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val premise2 = fn: 'a list -> 'a
```

```
val conclusion = fn: 'a list -> 'a
```

```
val v = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
:) val it = true: bool
```

SML

```
fun premise1[p, q] = conditional[p, q];
```

```
fun premise2[p, q] = p;
```

```
fun conclusion[p, q] = q;
```

```
fun v[p, q] = isValid([premise1, premise2], conclusion, p, q);
```

```
isTautology(map v (ttgen(2, (true, false))));
```

```
"Proof Power"
```

```
val premise = asm_rule;
```

```
val modus_ponens =  $\Rightarrow$ _elim;
```

```
val p1 = premise  $\lceil p \Rightarrow q \rceil$ ;
```

```
val p2 = premise  $\lceil p:\text{BOOL} \rceil$ ;
```

```
modus_ponens p1 p2;
```

This argument is **valid**

(This is Modus Ponens)

Proof Power

```
val premise = fn: TERM -> THM
```

```
:) val modus_ponens = fn: THM -> THM -> THM
```

```
:) val p1 = p  $\Rightarrow$  q  $\vdash$  p  $\Rightarrow$  q: THM
```

```
:) val p2 = p  $\vdash$  p: THM
```

```
:) val it = p  $\Rightarrow$  q, p  $\vdash$  q: THM
```

CS113 LAB 4 - Example 4.5

p	q	$(p \rightarrow q)$	$\sim q$	$((p \rightarrow q) \wedge \sim q)$	$\sim p$	$((p \rightarrow q) \wedge \sim q) \rightarrow \sim p$
T	T	T	F	F	F	T
T	F	F	T	F	F	T
F	T	T	F	F	T	T
F	F	T	T	T	T	T

SML

```
fun premise1[p, q] = conditional[p, q];  
fun premise2[p, q] = not q;  
fun conclusion[p, q] = not p;  
fun v[p, q] = isValid([premise1, premise2], conclusion, p, q);  
isTautology(map v (ttgen(2, (true, false))));
```

This argument is **valid** (This is Modus Tollens)

$$\frac{p \rightarrow q \quad \sim q}{\therefore \sim p}$$

```
val premise1 = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val premise2 = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val conclusion = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val v = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val it = true: bool
```

CS113 LAB 4 - Problem 4.3

Problem 4.3

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

SML

```
val premise = asm_rule;
val modus_ponens =  $\Rightarrow$ _elim;
val p1 = premise  $\lceil \neg p \vee q \Rightarrow r \rceil$ ;
val p2 = premise  $\lceil \neg p \vee q \rceil$ ;
modus_ponens p1 p2;
```

$$\frac{\sim p \vee q \rightarrow r \quad \sim p \vee q}{\therefore r}$$

This argument is **valid**
(This is Modus Ponens)

```
val premise = fn: TERM -> THM
:) val modus_ponens = fn: THM -> THM -> THM
:) val p1 =  $\neg p \vee q \Rightarrow r \vdash \neg p \vee q \Rightarrow r$ : THM
:) val p2 =  $\neg p \vee q \vdash \neg p \vee q$ : THM
:) val it =  $\neg p \vee q \Rightarrow r, \neg p \vee q \vdash r$ : THM
```

CS113 LAB 4 - Problem 4.4

p	q	$(p \rightarrow q)$	$((p \rightarrow q) \wedge q)$	$((p \rightarrow q) \wedge q) \rightarrow p$
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	T	F
F	F	T	F	T

$$\frac{p \rightarrow q}{q} \therefore p$$

SML

```
fun premise1[p, q] = conditional[p, q];  
fun premise2[p, q] = q;  
fun conclusion[p, q] = p;  
fun v[p, q] = isValid([premise1, premise2], conclusion, p, q);  
isTautology(map v (ttgen(2, (true, false))));
```

This argument is **invalid**

```
val premise1 = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val premise2 = fn: 'a list -> 'a
```

```
val conclusion = fn: 'a list -> 'a
```

```
val v = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val it = false: bool
```


CS113 LAB 4 - Problem 4.8

p	q	$(p \vee q)$	$\sim p$	$((p \vee q) \wedge \sim p)$	$((p \vee q) \wedge \sim p) \rightarrow q$
T	T	T	F	F	T
T	F	T	F	F	T
F	T	T	T	T	T
F	F	F	T	F	T

$$\frac{p \vee q \quad \sim p}{\therefore q}$$

SML

```
fun premise1[p, q] = disjunction[p, q];  
fun premise2[p, q] = not p;  
fun conclusion[p, q] = q;  
fun v[p, q] = isValid([premise1, premise2], conclusion, p, q);  
isTautology(map v (ttgen(2, (true, false))));
```

This argument is **valid**

```
val premise1 = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val premise2 = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val conclusion = fn: 'a list -> 'a
```

```
val v = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val it = true: bool
```

CS113 LAB 4 - Problem 4.13

p	q	$\sim p$	$(\sim p \rightarrow q)$	$\sim q$	$(\sim q \rightarrow p)$	$((\sim p \rightarrow q) \wedge (\sim q \rightarrow p))$	$(\sim p \vee \sim q)$	$((\sim p \rightarrow q) \wedge (\sim q \rightarrow p)) \rightarrow (\sim p \vee \sim q)$
T	T	F	T	F	T	T	F	F
T	F	F	T	T	T	T	T	T
F	T	T	T	F	T	T	T	T
F	F	T	F	T	F	F	T	T

Premise 1: If Tom is not on team A, then Hua is on team B.

Premise 2: If Hua is not on team B, then Tom is on team A.

Therefore: Tom is not on team A or Hua is not on team B.

SML

```
val p = "Tom is on team A";
val q = "Hua is on team B";
fun premise1[p, q] = conditional[not p, q];
fun premise2[p, q] = conditional[not q, p];
fun conclusion[p, q] = disjunction[not p, not q];
fun v[p, q] = isValid([premise1, premise2], conclusion, p, q);
isTautology(map v (ttgen(2, (true, false))));
```

$$\frac{p \vee q}{\sim p} \therefore q$$

```
val premise1 = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val premise2 = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val conclusion = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val v = fn: bool list -> bool
```

```
val it = false: bool
```

This argument is **invalid**

CS113 LAB 4 - Problem 4.16

Use Proofpower rules of inference to derive the conclusion.

SML

```
val L1 = premise "¬p ∨ q ⇒ r";  
val L2 = premise "s ∨ ¬q";  
val L3 = premise "¬t";  
val L4 = premise "p ⇒ t";  
val L5 = premise "¬p ∧ r ⇒ ¬s";  
val L6 = modus_tollens L4 L3;  
val L7 = disjunctive_addition "q:BOOL" L6;  
val L8 = modus_ponens L1 L7;  
val L9 = conjunctive_addition L6 L8;  
val L10 = modus_ponens L5 L9;  
val L11 = disjunctive_syllogism L2 L10;
```

1.	$\sim p \vee q \rightarrow r$	premise
2.	$s \vee \sim q$	premise
3.	$\sim t$	premise
4.	$p \rightarrow t$	premise
5.	$\sim p \wedge r \rightarrow \sim s$	premise
<hr/>		
6.	$\sim p$	modus tollens
7.	$\sim p \vee q$	disjunctive addition 6
8.	r	modus ponens 1 7
9.	$\sim p \wedge r$	conjunctive addition 6 8
10.	$\sim s$	modus ponens 5 9
11.	$\sim q$	disjunctive syllogism 2 10
<hr/>		
	$\therefore \sim q$	conclusion

```

val L1 =  $\neg p \vee q \Rightarrow r \vdash \neg p \vee q \Rightarrow r$ : THM
:) val L2 =  $s \vee \neg q \vdash s \vee \neg q$ : THM
:) val L3 =  $\neg t \vdash \neg t$ : THM
:) val L4 =  $p \Rightarrow t \vdash p \Rightarrow t$ : THM
:) val L5 =  $\neg p \wedge r \Rightarrow \neg s \vdash \neg p \wedge r \Rightarrow \neg s$ : THM
:) val L6 =  $p \Rightarrow t, \neg t \vdash \neg p$ : THM
:) val L7 =  $p \Rightarrow t, \neg t \vdash \neg p \vee q$ : THM
:) val L8 =  $\neg p \vee q \Rightarrow r, p \Rightarrow t, \neg t \vdash r$ : THM
:) val L9 =  $\neg p \vee q \Rightarrow r, p \Rightarrow t, \neg t \vdash \neg p \wedge r$ : THM
:) val L10 =  $\neg p \wedge r \Rightarrow \neg s, \neg p \vee q \Rightarrow r, p \Rightarrow t, \neg t \vdash \neg s$ : THM
:) val L11 =  $s \vee \neg q, \neg p \wedge r \Rightarrow \neg s, \neg p \vee q \Rightarrow r, p \Rightarrow t, \neg t \vdash \neg q$ : THM

```

CS113 LAB 4 - Problem 4.17

Use the valid argument forms of this section to deduce the conclusion from the premises.

SML

```
val L1 = premise "¬p ⇒ r ∧ ¬s";
val L2 = premise "t ⇒ s";
val L3 = premise "u ⇒ ¬p";
val L4 = premise "¬w";
val L5 = premise "u ∨ w";
val L6 = disjunctive_syllogism L5 L4;
val L7 = modus_ponens L3 L6;
val L8 = modus_ponens L1 L7;
val L9 = conjunctive_simplification L8;
val L10 = modus_tollens L2 L9;
val L11 = disjunctive_addition "w:BOOL" L10;
```

1.	$\sim p \rightarrow r \wedge \sim s$	premise
2.	$t \rightarrow s$	premise
3.	$u \rightarrow \sim p$	premise
4.	$\sim w$	premise
5.	$u \vee w$	premise
<hr/>		
6.	u	disjunctive syllogism
7.	$\sim p$	modus ponens 3 6
8.	$r \wedge \sim s$	modus ponens 1 7
9.	$\sim s$	conjunctive simplification L8
10.	$\sim t$	modus tollens L2 L9
11.	$\sim t \vee w$	disjunctive addition L10
<hr/>		
	$\therefore \sim t \vee w$	conclusion

```

:) val L1 =  $\neg p \Rightarrow r \wedge \neg s \vdash \neg p \Rightarrow r \wedge \neg s$ : THM
:) val L2 =  $t \Rightarrow s \vdash t \Rightarrow s$ : THM
:) val L3 =  $u \Rightarrow \neg p \vdash u \Rightarrow \neg p$ : THM
:) val L4 =  $\neg w \vdash \neg w$ : THM
:) val L5 =  $u \vee w \vdash u \vee w$ : THM
:) val L6 =  $u \vee w, \neg w \vdash u$ : THM
:) val L7 =  $u \Rightarrow \neg p, u \vee w, \neg w \vdash \neg p$ : THM
:) val L8 =  $\neg p \Rightarrow r \wedge \neg s, u \Rightarrow \neg p, u \vee w, \neg w \vdash r \wedge \neg s$ : THM
:) val L9 =  $\neg p \Rightarrow r \wedge \neg s, u \Rightarrow \neg p, u \vee w, \neg w \vdash \neg s$ : THM
:) val L10 =  $t \Rightarrow s, \neg p \Rightarrow r \wedge \neg s, u \Rightarrow \neg p, u \vee w, \neg w \vdash \neg t$ : THM
:) val L11 =  $t \Rightarrow s, \neg p \Rightarrow r \wedge \neg s, u \Rightarrow \neg p, u \vee w, \neg w \vdash \neg t \vee w$ : THM

```

CS113 LAB 4 - Problem 4.18

Use the valid argument forms of this section to deduce the conclusion from the premises.

SML

```
val L1 = premise "¬(p ∨ q) ⇒ r";  
val L2 = premise "¬p";  
val L3 = premise "¬r";  
val L4 = modus_tollens L1 L3;  
val L5 = double_negation L4;  
val L6 = disjunctive_syllogism L5 L2;
```

1.	$\sim p \vee q \rightarrow r$	premise
2.	$\sim p$	premise
3.	$\sim r$	premise
4.	$\sim\sim(p \vee q)$	modus tollens 1 3
5.	$p \vee q$	double-negation 4
6.	q	disjunctive syllogism 2 5
$\therefore \sim s$		conclusion

Notice that ProofPower doesn't apply double-negation automatically, so inserted double-negation manually. (L5)

```
: ) val L1 =  $\neg (p \vee q) \Rightarrow r \vdash \neg (p \vee q) \Rightarrow r$ : THM  
: ) val L2 =  $\neg p \vdash \neg p$ : THM  
: ) val L3 =  $\neg r \vdash \neg r$ : THM  
: ) val L4 =  $\neg (p \vee q) \Rightarrow r, \neg r \vdash \neg \neg (p \vee q)$ : THM  
: ) val L5 =  $\neg (p \vee q) \Rightarrow r, \neg r \vdash p \vee q$ : THM  
: ) val L6 =  $\neg (p \vee q) \Rightarrow r, \neg r, \neg p \vdash q$ : THM
```