

EXERCISE 1.

$$\Delta = \{ B \Leftrightarrow [A \Leftrightarrow (\neg B \wedge A \wedge \neg C)], C \Leftrightarrow (A \vee B) \}.$$

(i) Truth table:

(i) Truth table:

			$B \Leftrightarrow [A \Leftrightarrow (\neg B \wedge A \wedge \neg C)], \quad C \Leftrightarrow (A \vee B)$						$\Delta$		
A	B	C	[3]		[2]		[1]	[5]		[4]	
I <sub>1</sub> : 1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	-
I <sub>2</sub> : 1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	-
I <sub>3</sub> : 1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	Model
I <sub>4</sub> : 1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	-
I <sub>5</sub> : 0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	Model
I <sub>6</sub> : 0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	-
I <sub>7</sub> : 0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	-
I <sub>8</sub> : 0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	-

(ii) The knowledge base is (SAT) satisfiable, but not a tautology, because there are two interpretations which are models (I<sub>3</sub> and I<sub>5</sub> have truth value "TRUE" for both WFF that form the knowledge base.)

A WFF is a logical consequence of a knowledge base when the models of said knowledge base are also models of the WFF.

Therefore, (iii) A is not a logical consequence of  $\Delta$ : truth values of A for models of

$\Delta$ : I<sub>3</sub> "1", I<sub>5</sub> "0";  $\Delta \not\models A$ .

(iv)  $\Delta \not\models \neg A$ , truth values of  $\neg A$  for the models of  $\Delta$ : I<sub>3</sub>: "0", I<sub>5</sub>: "1".

(v)  $\Delta \not\models B$ , truth values of B for the models of  $\Delta$ : I<sub>3</sub>: "0", I<sub>5</sub>: "1".

(vi)  $\Delta \not\models \neg B$ , truth values of  $\neg B$  for the models of  $\Delta$ : I<sub>3</sub>: "1", I<sub>5</sub>: "0".

(vii)  $\Delta \models C$ , truth values of C for the models of  $\Delta$ : I<sub>3</sub>: "1", I<sub>5</sub>: "1".

(viii)  $\Delta \not\models \neg C$ , truth values of  $\neg C$  for the models of  $\Delta$ : I<sub>3</sub>: "0", I<sub>5</sub>: "0".

## EXERCISE 2

(i)  $w_1, w_2$  and  $w$  are WFF which simultaneously fulfill:

$\{w_1, w_2, \neg w\}$  is UNSAT,  $\{w_1, w_2, w\}$  is SAT.

This is an example very similar to proof by contradiction, where we have the knowledge base  $\Delta = \{w_1, w_2\}^*$  and, to know if  $w$  is a logical consequence of  $\Delta$ , we prove that  $\alpha = \{w_1, w_2, \neg w\}$  is UNSAT.

Therefore it is true that  $\Delta \models w$ , so  $\{w_1, w_2\} \models w$ .

\*NOTE: we know that  $\Delta$  is SAT because if  $\{w_1, w_2, w\}$  is SAT, then  $\{w_1, w_2\}$  must be also SAT.

(a)  $\{w_1, w_2\} \not\models w$  is incorrect, because  $w$  is, in fact, a logical consequence of  $\{w_1, w_2\}$ .

(b)  $\{w_1, w_2\} \not\models \neg w$  is correct, because  $\{w_1, w_2\} \models w$ , so, for all models of  $\{w_1, w_2\}$  the truth value of  $\neg w$  is "FALSE".

(c) " $w$  is SAT" is correct, because if  $\{w_1, w_2, w\}$  is SAT, then  $w_1, w_2$  and  $w$  have truth value "TRUE" all in the same interpretation at least once, and that means that  $w$  is "TRUE" for at least one interpretation and is, therefore SAT.

(d) " $w_1 \wedge w_2$  is SAT" is also correct, just like in (c), there must be at least one interpretation where  $w_1, w_2, w$  are all three "TRUE", so there is at least one interpretation where  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are both true, so there are models of  $(w_1 \wedge w_2)$  and it is SAT.

(e) It is not possible to determine whether  $w_1 \wedge w_2 \wedge w$  is a tautology, because there may be interpretations that are not models, but it is still SAT. There is not information enough to know.



(EXERCISE 2) (ii)  $\Delta = \{A \vee B, (A \Rightarrow B) \vee (A \Leftrightarrow \neg C), \neg C \Leftrightarrow (\neg A \vee \neg B)\}$ .

Transformation to CNF:

[1]  $(A \vee B)$

[2]  $(A \Rightarrow B) \vee (A \Leftrightarrow \neg C) \equiv (\neg A \vee B) \vee [(\neg A \wedge \neg C) \vee (A \wedge \neg C)] \equiv [\neg \neg \text{Elim}],$   
 $\quad \quad \quad \uparrow$   
 $\quad \quad \quad (\text{def } \Rightarrow, \Leftrightarrow)$   
 $\quad \quad \quad \equiv \neg A \vee B \vee (\neg A \wedge \neg C) \vee (A \wedge \neg C)$  [Distributive laws]

$\equiv (\neg A \vee B \vee \neg A \vee A) \wedge (\neg A \vee B \vee \neg A \vee \neg C) \wedge (\neg A \vee B \vee C \vee A) \wedge (\neg A \vee B \vee C \vee \neg C)$

[Idempotency, excluded middle laws,]

$\equiv T \wedge (\neg A \vee B \vee \neg C) \wedge T \wedge T$  [Neutral element]

$\equiv (\neg A \vee B \vee \neg C)$  [2]

[3]  $\neg C \Leftrightarrow (\neg A \vee \neg B) \equiv (\neg \neg C \vee (\neg A \vee \neg B)) \wedge (\neg(\neg A \vee \neg B) \vee \neg C)$  [DM]  
 $\quad \quad \quad \uparrow$   
 $\quad \quad \quad (\text{def } \Leftrightarrow, \text{def } \Rightarrow)$   
 $\quad \quad \quad \equiv (C \vee (\neg A \vee \neg B)) \wedge ((A \wedge B) \vee \neg C)$  [Associative and Distributive laws]

$\equiv (C \vee \neg A \vee \neg B) \wedge (A \vee \neg C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$  [3], [1], [2], [3]  $\vdash_{\text{intro}}$

$\Delta: \{ \underbrace{(A \vee B)}_{[1]} \wedge \underbrace{(\neg A \vee B \vee \neg C)}_{[2]} \wedge \underbrace{(C \vee \neg A \vee \neg B)}_{[3.1]} \wedge \underbrace{(A \vee \neg C)}_{[3.2]} \wedge \underbrace{(B \vee \neg C)}_{[3.3]} \}$

$\vdash_{\text{resoln}}$  [1]  $A \vee B$  |  $\vdash_{\text{RES}_A} B \vee B \vee \neg C \xrightarrow{\text{(Idempotency)}} B \vee \neg C$   
 [2]  $\neg A \vee B \vee \neg C$  |  $\vdash_{\text{RES}_A} B \vee \neg C$  (excluded middle law)  
 [3.1]  $C \vee \neg A \vee \neg B$  |  $\vdash_{\text{RES}_C} A \vee \neg A \vee \neg B \xrightarrow{\text{(Idempotency)}} \neg B$   
 [3.2]  $A \vee \neg C$  |  $\vdash_{\text{RES}_C} \neg C$   
 [3.3]  $B \vee \neg C$  |  $\vdash_{\text{INTRO}} (B \vee \neg C) \wedge T \wedge (B \vee \neg C) \equiv$   
 $\quad \quad \quad$  [Neutral element, Idempotency]

$\equiv (B \vee \neg C)$  is already part of  $\Delta$ , while neither  $C$  nor  $\neg C$  can be inferred by Resolution with the clauses from  $\Delta$ , so we can say that:

Neither  $C$  nor  $\neg C$  is a logical consequence of  $\Delta$ .

### EXERCISE 3

When two individuals of the same species speak to each other, they always tell the truth.  
When two individuals of different species speak to each other, they always lie.

Atoms: A: "A is Akinian". ( $\neg A$ : "A is Denobulan")  
B: "B is Akinian". ( $\neg B$ : "B is Denobulan")  
C: "C is Akinian". ( $\neg C$ : "C is Denobulan").

Denotation.

(i) Formalize the knowledge base as WFFs in propositional logic.

A to B: You are Akinian if and only if C is Akinian

$B \Leftrightarrow C$  is true if and only if A and B

are of the same species:  $A \Leftrightarrow B \equiv (A \wedge B) \vee (\neg A \wedge \neg B)$   
The same goes for the two others, so:

Sentence in natural language	WFFs
• A and B are of the same species if and only if B and C are of the same species	[1] $(A \Leftrightarrow B) \Leftrightarrow (B \Leftrightarrow C)$
• B and C are of the same species if and only if either C is Denobulan or A is Akinian (or both)	[2] $(B \Leftrightarrow C) \Leftrightarrow (A \vee \neg C)$
• A and C are of the same species if and only if B and A are Akinians	[3] $(A \Leftrightarrow C) \Leftrightarrow (A \wedge B)$

(ii)  $\Delta: \{ (A \Leftrightarrow B) \Leftrightarrow (B \Leftrightarrow C), (B \Leftrightarrow C) \Leftrightarrow (A \vee \neg C), (A \Leftrightarrow C) \Leftrightarrow (A \wedge B) \}$

[1]  $(A \Leftrightarrow B) \Leftrightarrow (B \Leftrightarrow C)$  [def  $\Leftrightarrow$ ]

$\equiv ((A \Leftrightarrow B) \wedge (B \Leftrightarrow C)) \vee (\neg (A \Leftrightarrow B) \wedge \neg (B \Leftrightarrow C))$  [def  $\Leftrightarrow$ ], [Associative]

$\equiv [(\neg A \vee B) \wedge (\neg B \vee A) \wedge (\neg B \vee C) \wedge (\neg C \vee B)] \vee [\neg ((A \wedge B) \vee (\neg A \wedge \neg B)) \wedge \neg ((B \wedge C) \vee (\neg B \wedge \neg C))]$

[DM,  $\neg \neg$  Elim, Associative laws]

$\equiv [(\neg A \vee B) \wedge (\neg B \vee A) \wedge (\neg B \vee C) \wedge (\neg C \vee B)] \vee [(\neg A \wedge \neg B) \wedge (A \vee B) \wedge (\neg B \vee \neg C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)]$

[Distributive laws, Idempotency, excluded middle laws -  $(\neg A \vee A) \equiv T$ ]

$\equiv T \wedge T \wedge T \wedge (\neg A \vee B \vee C) \wedge T \wedge T \wedge (A \vee \neg B \vee \neg C) \wedge T \wedge (\neg A \vee \neg B \vee C) \wedge T \wedge T \wedge T \wedge$

$\wedge T \wedge (A \vee B \vee \neg C) \wedge T \wedge T$ . [Neutral element.]

$\equiv (\neg A \vee B \vee C) \wedge (A \vee \neg B \vee \neg C) \wedge (\neg A \vee \neg B \vee C) \wedge (A \vee B \vee \neg C)$  [1].



$$[2] (B \Leftrightarrow C) \Leftrightarrow (A \vee \neg C) \quad [def \Leftrightarrow]$$

$$\equiv ((B \Leftrightarrow C) \wedge (A \vee \neg C)) \vee (\neg(B \Leftrightarrow C) \wedge \neg(A \vee \neg C)) \quad [def \Leftrightarrow, \neg \rightarrow \text{dimin}, DM]$$

$$\equiv [(\neg B \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C) \wedge (A \vee \neg C)] \vee [\neg((B \wedge C) \vee (\neg B \wedge \neg C)) \wedge (\neg A \wedge C)] \quad [Associative law, DM, \neg \rightarrow \text{Elimin}]$$

$$\equiv [(\neg B \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C) \wedge (A \vee \neg C)] \vee [(\neg B \vee \neg C) \wedge (B \vee C) \wedge \neg A \wedge C] \quad [Absorption, Commutative law: (B \vee C) \wedge C \equiv C.]$$

$$\equiv [(\neg B \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C) \wedge (A \vee \neg C)] \vee [(\neg B \vee \neg C) \wedge \neg A \wedge C] \quad [Distributive laws, Idempotency, excluded middle laws]$$

$$\equiv T \wedge (\neg A \vee \neg B \vee C) \wedge (\neg B \vee C) \wedge T \wedge (\neg A \vee B \vee \neg C) \wedge T \wedge (A \vee \neg B \vee \neg C) \wedge T \wedge T \quad [Neutral element]$$

$$\equiv (\neg A \vee \neg B \vee C) \wedge (\neg B \vee C) \wedge (\neg A \vee B \vee \neg C) \wedge (A \vee \neg B \vee \neg C) \quad [2]$$

$$[3] (A \Leftrightarrow C) \Leftrightarrow (A \wedge B) \quad [def \Leftrightarrow], [Associative laws]$$

$$\equiv [(A \Leftrightarrow C) \wedge A \wedge B] \vee [\neg(A \Leftrightarrow C) \wedge \neg(A \wedge B)] \quad [DM, def \Leftrightarrow]$$

$$\equiv [(\neg A \vee C) \wedge (\neg C \vee A) \wedge A \wedge B] \vee [\neg((A \wedge C) \vee (A \wedge \neg C)) \wedge (\neg A \vee \neg B)] \quad [Associative + Commutative laws, DM, \neg \rightarrow \text{dimin}, Absorption: (\neg C \vee A) \wedge A \equiv A]$$

$$\equiv [(\neg A \vee C) \wedge A \wedge B] \vee [(A \vee C) \wedge (\neg A \vee \neg C) \wedge (\neg A \vee \neg B)]$$

$$[Distributive laws, Idempotency, excluded middle laws]$$

$$\equiv T \wedge T \wedge (\neg A \vee \neg B \vee C) \wedge (A \vee C) \wedge T \wedge T \wedge (A \vee B \vee C) \wedge (\neg A \vee B \vee \neg C) \wedge T \quad [Neutral element]$$

$$\equiv (\neg A \vee \neg B \vee C) \wedge (A \vee C) \wedge (A \vee B \vee C) \wedge (\neg A \vee B \vee \neg C) \quad [3]$$

$$[1], [2], [3] \vdash_{\text{INTRO}} [Associative laws, Idempotency, Commutative laws]$$

$$\Delta: \{ (A \vee B \vee C) \wedge (A \vee B \vee \neg C) \wedge (A \vee \neg B \vee \neg C) \wedge (\neg A \vee B \vee \neg C) \wedge (\neg A \vee \neg B \vee C) \wedge (A \vee C) \wedge (\neg B \vee C) \}. \quad (CNF).$$

$\vdash_{\text{Elimin}}$	$[a] A \wedge B \vee C$ $[b] A \vee B \vee \neg C$	$\vdash_{\text{RES}_A} A \vee B$	$\vdash_{\text{RES}_B} A$	
	$[c] A \vee \neg B \vee \neg C$ $[g] A \vee C$	$\vdash_{\text{RES}_C} [cg] A \vee \neg B$		
	$[a] A \vee B \vee C$ $[h] \neg B \vee C$	$\vdash_{\text{RES}_B} [ah] A \vee C$		
	$\vdash_{\text{RES}_A} C$	$[d] \neg A \vee B \vee C$ $[h] \neg B \vee C$	$\vdash_{\text{RES}_B} [dh] \neg A \vee C$	
		$[d] \neg A \vee B \vee C$ $[e] \neg A \vee B \vee \neg C$	$\vdash_{\text{RES}_C} [de] \neg A \vee B$	$\vdash_{\text{RES}_A} B$
		$[f] \neg A \vee B \vee C$ $[e] \neg A \vee B \vee \neg C$	$\vdash_{\text{RES}_C} [ef] A \vee B$	
	$[f] \neg A \vee B \vee C, [e] A \vee B \vee \neg C \vdash_{\text{RES}_C} A \vee A \vee B \vee \neg C \equiv T$			

A, B and C are all  
Arbitrary.

$$\vdash_{\text{INTRO}} (A \wedge B \wedge C)$$

[Neutral element]

$$\Delta \models A \wedge B \wedge C$$

# EXERCISE 4

1) The lobster, The Gryphon or the Mock Turtle are sane, their beliefs are always true, otherwise they are false.

- (a) Atoms      Denotation
- L : "The Lobster is sane"
- G : "The Gryphon is sane"
- M : "The Mock Turtle is sane"

Δ:

(b)	WFF	Meaning
[1] L	$L \Leftrightarrow (G \Leftrightarrow (G \wedge \neg L \wedge \neg M))$	The lobster believes that the gryphon believes that he (the gryphon) is the only one of the three that is sane.
[2] M	$M \Leftrightarrow (L \vee G)$	The mock turtle believes that either the lobster or the gryphon (or both) is sane

(c) Transform the WFFs in Δ to CNF.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & [1] \quad L \Leftrightarrow (G \Leftrightarrow (G \wedge \neg L \wedge \neg M)) \quad [dy \Leftrightarrow] \\
 & \equiv (L \wedge (G \Leftrightarrow (G \wedge \neg L \wedge \neg M))) \vee (\neg L \wedge \neg (G \Leftrightarrow (G \wedge \neg L \wedge \neg M))) \\
 & \quad [dy \Leftrightarrow] \\
 & \equiv (L \wedge ((\neg G \vee (G \wedge \neg L \wedge \neg M)) \wedge (G \vee \neg (G \wedge \neg L \wedge \neg M)))) \vee \\
 & \quad \vee (\neg L \wedge \neg [(G \wedge (G \wedge \neg L \wedge \neg M)) \vee (\neg G \wedge \neg (G \wedge \neg L \wedge \neg M))]) \quad [\text{Associative laws, DM,} \\
 & \quad \neg \text{Elimin., Distributive law}] \\
 & \equiv (L \wedge (\neg G \vee G) \wedge (\neg G \vee \neg L) \wedge (G \vee M) \wedge (G \vee \neg G \vee L \vee M)) \vee \\
 & \quad \vee (\neg L \wedge \neg [(G \wedge \neg L \wedge \neg M) \vee (\neg G \wedge (\neg G \vee L \vee M))]) \quad [\text{Excluded middle laws, DM} \\
 & \quad \neg \text{Elimin., Associative laws,} \\
 & \quad \text{neutral element, Absorption}] \\
 & \equiv (L \wedge (\neg G \vee \neg L) \wedge (\neg G \vee M)) \vee \\
 & \quad \vee (\neg L \wedge (\neg G \vee L \vee M) \wedge G) \quad [\text{Distributive laws, Commutative laws}] \\
 & \equiv ((L \wedge G) \vee (L \vee \neg L) \wedge (\neg G \vee M)) \vee ((\neg L \wedge L) \vee (\neg L \wedge (\neg G \vee M))) \wedge G \quad [\text{Excluded} \\
 & \quad \text{middle laws, neutral} \\
 & \quad \text{element, Associative law}] \\
 & \equiv (L \wedge G \wedge (\neg G \vee M)) \vee (\neg L \wedge (\neg G \vee M) \wedge G) \quad [\text{Distributive laws}] \\
 & \equiv (L \wedge G \wedge (\neg G \vee M)) \vee (\neg L \wedge ((\neg G \wedge G) \vee (G \wedge M))) \quad [\text{excluded middle laws}]
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\equiv (L \wedge \neg G \wedge (\neg G \vee \neg M)) \vee (\neg L \wedge G \wedge M) \quad [\text{Absorption}]$$

$$\equiv (L \wedge \neg G) \vee (\neg L \wedge G \wedge M) \quad [\text{Distributive laws, excluded middle law}]$$

$$\equiv T \wedge (L \vee G) \wedge (L \vee M) \wedge (\neg G \vee \neg L) \wedge T \wedge (\neg G \vee M) \quad [\text{neutral element}]$$

$$[1] \equiv \underline{(L \vee G) \wedge (L \vee M) \wedge (\neg G \vee \neg L) \wedge (\neg G \vee M)}$$

$$[2] \quad M \Leftrightarrow L \vee G \quad [\text{def} \Leftrightarrow]$$

$$\equiv (M \wedge (L \vee G)) \vee (\neg M \wedge \neg (L \vee G)) \quad [\text{D.M., Associative law}]$$

$$\equiv (M \wedge (L \vee G)) \vee (\neg M \wedge \neg L \wedge \neg G) \quad [\text{Distributive law, excluded middle law}]$$

$$\equiv T \wedge (M \vee \neg L) \wedge (M \vee \neg G) \wedge (L \vee G \vee \neg M) \wedge T \wedge T. \quad [\text{neutral element}]$$

$$\equiv \underline{(M \vee \neg L) \wedge (M \vee \neg G) \wedge (L \vee G \vee \neg M)}$$

$$\Delta: [1], [2] \vdash_{\text{intro}} [\text{Associative law, idempotency}]$$

$$\Delta = \{(L \vee G) \wedge (L \vee M) \wedge (\neg L \vee \neg G) \wedge (M \vee \neg G) \wedge (M \vee \neg L) \wedge (L \vee G \vee \neg M)\}$$

(d)  $\vdash_{\text{elim}} \frac{L \vee M}{M \vee \neg L} \vdash_{\text{RES}_L} M \rightarrow \Delta \models M$   $M$  is a logical consequence of  $\Delta$ .  
The Mock turtle is sane.

$$\frac{L \vee G}{M \vee \neg G} \vdash_{\text{RES}_G} L \vee M \rightarrow \text{either for M. Turtle or the Lobster is sane, or both; but we already have this clause.}$$

(e) If we also know that either the lobster, ~~not~~ or the M. Turtle is sane, but not both.  
 then we know:  $M \Leftrightarrow \neg L \equiv (\neg M \vee \neg L) \wedge (M \vee L)$   
 [def  $\Leftrightarrow$ ,  $\neg$ -Elimin]

Our knowledge base becomes:

$$\Delta = \{(L \vee G) \wedge (L \vee M) \wedge (\neg L \vee \neg G) \wedge (M \vee \neg G) \wedge (M \vee \neg L) \wedge (L \vee G \vee \neg M) \wedge (\neg M \vee \neg L) \wedge (M \vee L)\}$$

$$\vdash_{\text{elim}} \frac{L \vee M}{M \vee \neg L} \vdash_{\text{RES}_L} M \vdash_{\text{RES}_M} \neg L \vdash_{\text{RES}_L} G \left\{ \begin{array}{l} M \\ \neg L \\ G \end{array} \right. \vdash_{\text{intro}} M \wedge \neg L \wedge G$$

$$[\text{Now } \Delta \models M, \Delta \models \neg L, \Delta \models G.]$$

If we know  $M \Leftrightarrow \neg L$ , then  $(M \wedge \neg L \wedge G)$  is a logical consequence of  $\Delta$ ,  
 so the Mock Turtle and the Gryphon are sane, and the Lobster is not.