

## Examination 1 Solutions

### CS 313H

1. [10] Using a truth table prove that  $((p \Rightarrow q) \wedge (q \Rightarrow r)) \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow r)$  is a tautology.

$p$	$q$	$r$	$p \Rightarrow q$	$q \Rightarrow r$	$(p \Rightarrow q) \wedge (q \Rightarrow r)$	$p \Rightarrow r$	$((p \Rightarrow q) \wedge (q \Rightarrow r)) \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow r)$
F	F	F	T	T	T	T	T
F	F	T	T	T	T	T	T
F	T	F	T	F	F	T	T
F	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	T	F	F	T
T	F	T	F	T	F	T	T
T	T	F	T	F	F	F	T
T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T

2. [20] Using the predicates defined on the set of UT students:

$Exy$   $x$  is equal to  $y$ ,

$CSx$   $x$  is a CS major,

$Mx$   $x$  is a math major,

Express in the syntax of Predicate Calculus:

a. "There is exactly one CS major."

$$(\exists x)(CSx \wedge (\forall y)(\sim Exy \Rightarrow \sim CSy))$$

b. "There are at least three students who are both Math majors and CS majors."

$$(\exists x)(\exists y)(\exists z)(\sim Exy \wedge \sim Exz \wedge \sim Eyz \wedge Mx \wedge My \wedge Mz \wedge CSx \wedge CSy \wedge CSz)$$

c. "No one is both a Math major and a CS major."

$$(\forall x)(\sim CSx \vee \sim Mx)$$

d. "There are at most two Math majors."

$$\sim (\exists x)(\exists y)(\exists z)(\sim Exy \wedge \sim Exz \wedge \sim Eyz \wedge Mx \wedge My \wedge Mz)$$

**3. [15]** Using sentential calculus (with a four column format), prove  $((p \Leftrightarrow (q \vee r)) \wedge r) \Rightarrow p$  holds without premises.

{ P <sub>1</sub> }	1. $(p \Leftrightarrow (q \vee r)) \wedge r$	P (for CP)
{ P <sub>1</sub> }	2. $p \Leftrightarrow (q \vee r)$	Simp (1)
{ P <sub>1</sub> }	3. $(p \Rightarrow (q \vee r)) \wedge ((q \vee r) \Rightarrow p)$	Equiv (2)
{ P <sub>1</sub> }	4. $(q \vee r) \Rightarrow p$	Simp (3)
{ P <sub>1</sub> }	5. $r$	Simp (1)
{ P <sub>1</sub> }	6. $q \vee r$	Add (5)
{ P <sub>1</sub> }	7. $p$	MP (4), (6)
	8. $((p \Leftrightarrow (q \vee r)) \wedge r) \Rightarrow p$	C (1), (7)

**4. [15]** Prove the tautology  $(p \Rightarrow q) \vee (p \wedge \sim q)$  using resolution.

Negate the conclusion:

$$\sim ((p \Rightarrow q) \vee (p \wedge \sim q))$$

Convert to CNF:

$$\sim ((p \Rightarrow q) \vee (p \wedge \sim q))$$

$$\sim (p \Rightarrow q) \wedge \sim (p \wedge \sim q)$$

$$\sim (\sim p \vee q) \wedge (\sim p \vee \sim \sim q)$$

$$(\sim \sim p \wedge \sim q) \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$$

$$p \wedge \sim q \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$$

{ P <sub>1</sub> }	1. $p$	P
{ P <sub>2</sub> }	2. $\sim q$	P
{ P <sub>3</sub> }	3. $\sim p \vee q$	P
{ P <sub>1</sub> , P <sub>3</sub> }	4. $q$	Res (1), (3)
{ P <sub>1</sub> , P <sub>2</sub> , P <sub>3</sub> }	5. <i>false</i>	ContraPrem. (2), (4)

5. [20] Using sentential calculus (with a four column format), prove that the conclusion “Either Rachel or Sarah has no cat” follows from these premises:

If Mike has no cat then Pat has no cat and if Tom has no cat then Zack has no cat.

If either Mike has a cat or Pat has no cat then Zack has a cat.

If Tom has a cat then it is not true that both Rachel and Sarah have cats.

**Begin by giving them symbolic values to certain sentences and expressing the premises and conclusion in terms of those symbols.**

Let  $m$  = “Mike has a cat”  
 $p$  = “Pat has a cat”  
 $t$  = “Tom has a cat”  
 $z$  = “Zack has a cat”  
 $r$  = “Rachel has a cat”  
 $s$  = “Sarah has a cat”

$\{Pr_1\}$	(1.) $(\sim m \Rightarrow \sim p) \wedge (\sim t \Rightarrow \sim z)$	P
$\{Pr_2\}$	(2.) $(m \vee \sim p) \Rightarrow z$	P
$\{Pr_3\}$	(3.) $t \Rightarrow \sim (r \wedge s)$	P
$\{Pr_1\}$	(4.) $\sim m \Rightarrow \sim p$	Simp (1)
$\{Pr_1\}$	(5.) $\sim \sim m \vee \sim p$	CD (4)
$\{Pr_1\}$	(6.) $m \vee \sim p$	DN (5)
$\{Pr_1, Pr_2\}$	(7.) $z$	MP (2), (6)
$\{Pr_1, Pr_2\}$	(8.) $\sim t \Rightarrow \sim z$	Simp (1)
$\{Pr_1, Pr_2\}$	(9.) $\sim \sim t$	MT (7), (8)
$\{Pr_1, Pr_2\}$	(10.) $t$	DN (9)
$\{Pr_1, Pr_2, Pr_3\}$	(11.) $\sim (r \wedge s)$	MP (10)
$\{Pr_1, Pr_2, Pr_3\}$	(12.) $\sim r \vee \sim s$	DM (11)