Assignment #2
CIS 427/527

Group 2

January 20, 2016

1

Since two of the men are telling the truth, we have a proposition of the form $P = (A \wedge B) \vee (A \wedge C) \vee (B \wedge C)$.

- If Adams is telling the truth, then Brown is lying ($A \implies \neg B$).
- If Brown is telling the truth, then both Adams and Clark are lying ($B \implies (\neg A \wedge \neg C)$).
- If Clark is telling the truth, then Brown is lying ($C \implies \neg B$).

If Brown were telling the truth, then P could never be satisfied, therefore Brown is lying, which makes him the killer.

2

2. Show that $((\rightarrow \notin PROP$

Suppose $((\rightarrow \in X$ and X satisfies (i), (ii), (iii) of Definition 2.1.2. We claim that $Y = X \backslash \{((\rightarrow\}$ also satisfies (i), (ii), and (iii).

(i) $\bot, p_i \in Y$,
(ii) $\varphi, \psi \in Y$ and $(\varphi \square \psi) \neq ((\rightarrow$, it is clear that $(\varphi \square \psi) \in Y$
(iii) Similarly, $\varphi \in Y$ and $(\neg \varphi) \neq ((\rightarrow$, so $(\neg \varphi) \in Y$

Therefore X is not the smallest set satisfying (i), (ii), and (iii), so $((\rightarrow$ cannot belong to $PROP$.

7. (a) Determine the trees of the proposition in Exercise 1
$(\neg p_2 \rightarrow (p_3 \vee (p_1 \leftrightarrow p_2))) \wedge \neg p_3$



$(p_7 \rightarrow \neg \bot) \leftrightarrow ((p_4 \wedge \neg p_2) \rightarrow p_1$



$(((p_1 \rightarrow p_2) \rightarrow p_1) \rightarrow p_2 \rightarrow p_1$



(b) Determine the propositions with the trees given
$\neg\neg\neg\bot$

$(p_0 \to \bot) \to ((p_0 \leftrightarrow p_1) \wedge p_5)$

$\neg((\neg p_1) \to (\neg p_1))$

9. Show that a proposition with n connectives has at most $2n + 1$ subformulas

Base Case A proposition P with zero connectives has $\leq 2(0) + 1 = 1$ subforumla(s).
Inductive Case Inductive Hypothesis: A proposition φ with n connectives has at most $2n + 1$ subformulas, where $s(\varphi)$ gives the number of subformulas.
Assume propositions p, q (where $s(p) = n$ and $s(q) = m \leq n$ connectives) have the property above. If we create a new proposition r from p and q we have:

$$s(r) = s(p) + s(q) + 1$$
$$s(r) = n + m + 1$$
$$s(r) \leq 2n + 1$$

Since the desired property holds for r the inductive hypothesis holds $\forall n \in N$.

3

(a)

$(\neg\varphi \vee \psi) \iff (\psi \to \varphi)$	φ	ψ
1	0	0
0	0	1
1	1	0
1	1	1

Not a tautology.

(f)

$(\varphi \vee \neg\varphi)$	φ
1	0
1	1

Is a tautology.

(h)

$(\bot \to \varphi)$	φ
1	0
1	1

Is a tautology.

4

(a) $\varphi \models \varphi$
By definition of semantic entailment, $\varphi \models \varphi$ iff for all v : $[\![\varphi]\!]_v = 1 \implies [\![\varphi]\!]_v = 1$. Since $[\![\varphi]\!]_v = 1 \implies [\![\varphi]\!]_v = 1$ is a tautology, $\varphi \models \varphi$ holds.
(b) $\varphi \models \psi$ and $\psi \models \sigma \implies \varphi \models \sigma$
By definition of semantic entailment, we have $[\![\varphi]\!]_v = 1\ \forall v \implies [\![\psi]\!]_v = 1$ and $[\![\psi]\!]_v = 1\ \forall v \implies [\![\sigma]\!]_v = 1$, by the transitive property, $[\![\varphi]\!]_v = 1\ \forall v \implies [\![\sigma]\!]_v = 1$.
(c) $\models \varphi \to \psi \iff \varphi \models \psi$
Since $\models \varphi \to \psi$, we know that $[\![\psi]\!]_v = 1\ \forall v$ (because if $[\![\psi]\!]_v = 0$ for some v, then $\varphi \to \psi$ is not a tautology). Therefore, we can conclude that $[\![\varphi]\!]_v = 1 \to [\![\psi]\!]_v = 1$, since anytime $[\![\varphi]\!]_v = 1$, $[\![\psi]\!]_v = 1$.

5

6

$\# = \neg(\neg(\neg p \vee \neg q) \vee \neg(p \vee q))$

7

A conjunctive normal form is a tautology iff every clause is also a tautology.

8

9

$P \to Q$**:** True when P is false; false when P is true and Q is false.
$P \lor Q \to P \land Q$**:** True when $P \iff Q$; false otherwise.
$\neg(P \lor Q \lor R)$**:** True when P, Q, R are all false; false when any P, Q, R are true.
$\neg(P \land Q) \land \neg(Q \lor R) \land (P \lor R)$**:** True when P is true, Q is false, R is false; false when P is false and R is false.