Diskrete Mathematik

Solution 2

2.1 Interpreting Propositional Formulas in Natural Language

- a) The formulas can be stated in the English language in the following way:
 - i) F_1 : "The monkey has a banana and does not sit on the palm tree."
 - ii) F₂: "The monkey sits on the palm tree and has a banana, or it does not sit on the palm tree and it does not have a banana."Equivalently, we could say "The monkey sits on the palm tree if and only if it has a banana."
- **b)** The sentences can be written formally in the following way:
 - i) $F_3 = \neg A \land \neg B$
 - ii) $F_4 = (\neg A \land B) \lor (A \land \neg B)$
- c) i) $\neg F_3$: The monkey sits on the palm tree or it has a banana.

$$\neg F_3 \equiv \neg (\neg A \land \neg B) \equiv A \lor B$$

ii) $\neg F_4$: The monkey sits on the palm tree if and only if it has a banana.

$$\neg F_4 \equiv (A \land B) \lor (\neg A \land \neg B) \equiv F_2$$

2.2 Logical Equivalence via Function Tables

a)

A	B	C	$B \to C$	$ \neg(A \to C) \land \neg(A \lor B) $	$(B \to C) \to \left(\neg(A \to C) \land \neg(A \lor B)\right)$
0	0	0	1	0	0
0	0	1	1	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	1
0	1	1	1	0	0
1	0	0	1	0	0
1	0	1	1	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	1
1	1	1	1	0	0

b) With the above function table, it becomes clear that the formula in a) is true if and only if $B \land \neg C$ is true. Therefore, the simple equivalent formula is $B \land \neg C$.

2.3 Proving Logical Equivalence using Equivalence Transformations We have:

$$\begin{array}{ll} (C \wedge A) \lor ((B \to A) \wedge \neg C) \\ \equiv (C \wedge A) \lor (\neg C \wedge (B \to A)) & (\text{commutativity of } \wedge) \\ \equiv (C \wedge A) \lor (\neg C \wedge (\neg B \lor A)) & (\text{definition of } \rightarrow) \\ \equiv (C \wedge A) \lor ((\neg C \wedge \neg B) \lor (\neg C \wedge A)) & (\text{distributive law (5)}) \\ \equiv (C \wedge A) \lor ((\neg C \wedge A) \lor (\neg C \wedge \neg B)) & (\text{commutativity of } \vee) \\ \equiv ((C \wedge A) \lor (\neg C \wedge A)) \lor (\neg C \wedge \neg B)) & (\text{associativity of } \vee) \\ \equiv ((A \wedge C) \lor (\neg C \wedge A)) \lor (\neg C \wedge \neg B) & (\text{commutativity of } \wedge) \\ \equiv ((A \wedge C) \lor (A \wedge \neg C)) \lor (\neg C \wedge \neg B) & (\text{commutativity of } \wedge) \\ \equiv (A \wedge (C \lor \neg C)) \lor (\neg C \wedge \neg B) & (\text{distributive law (5)}) \\ \equiv (A \wedge (T) \lor (\neg C \wedge \neg B) & (F \lor \neg F \equiv T) \\ \equiv A \lor (\neg C \wedge \neg B) & (F \wedge T \equiv F) \\ \equiv A \lor (\neg B \wedge \neg C) & (\text{de Morgan, } \neg (F \lor G) \equiv \neg F \wedge \neg G) \end{array}$$

2.4 Logical Consequence

a) We first construct the function table for the formula $A \land (A \rightarrow B)$.

$$\begin{array}{c|ccc} A & B & A \land (A \to B) \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array}$$

The above table shows that the truth value of $A \wedge (A \rightarrow B)$ is 1 only for the truth assignment in the last row. Clearly, *B* is also true for that assignment. Thus, *B* is the logical consequence of $A \wedge (A \rightarrow B)$ and the statement holds.

b) The statement is false. There exists a truth assignment, namely one in which *A* is false and *B* is true, for which $A \rightarrow B$ is true, but $\neg A \rightarrow \neg B$ is false. Thus, $\neg A \rightarrow \neg B$ is not a logical consequence of $A \rightarrow B$.

A	B	C	$A \to B$	$B \to C$	$(A \to B) \land (B \to C)$	$A \to C$
0	0	0	1	1	1	1
0	0	1	1	1	1	1
0	1	0	1	0	0	1
0	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	0	0	0	1	0	0
1	0	1	0	1	0	1
1	1	0	1	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1

c) We construct the function table for both formulas: $(A \rightarrow B) \land (B \rightarrow C)$ and $A \rightarrow C$.

Analogously to Subtask a), we can show that the statement holds.

2.5 Satisfiability and Tautologies

- a) This formula is satisfiable, since it is true for the assignment A = 0, B = 1. It is, however, not a tautology, since it is false for the assignment A = 0, B = 0.
- **b)** This formula is unsatisfiable (hence, it is not a tautology). In order to prove this, let $F = ((A \rightarrow B) \land (B \rightarrow C)) \land \neg (A \rightarrow C)$. We notice that

$$\neg F \equiv \neg ((A \to B) \land (B \to C)) \lor (A \to C)$$
 (de Morgan's rules)
$$\equiv (A \to B) \land (B \to C) \to (A \to C)$$
 (def. \rightarrow)

From Task 2.4 c), we know that $(A \to B) \land (B \to C) \models (A \to C)$ is true. From this fact, together with Lemma 2.3, it follows that $\neg F$ is a tautology. Hence, by Lemma 2.2, *F* is unsatisfiable.

2.6 Knights and Knaves

Let *A* be the proposition "The left road leads to the village." and let *B* be the proposition "The islander is a knight.". We want to ask the islander about the truth value of a formula F in *A* and *B* in order to determine whether *A* is true.

In order to be guaranteed to learn whether *A* is true or not, we have to receive a fixed answer (say, "Yes") from the islander in case *A* is true, and the opposite (say, "No") in case *A* is false. This has to hold *independently* of whether the islander is a knight or a knave (since we have no information about that).

If the islander is a knight (*B* is true) the answer will be the truth value of *F* (since knights always tell the truth). However, if the islander is a knave (*B* is false) the answer will be the truth value of $\neg F$ (since knaves always lie).

Hence, we derive the following partial function table:

A	B	F	$\neg F$
0	0		0
0	1	0	
1	0		1
1	1	1	

This partial function table can be completed (uniquely) to the following function table:

A	B	F	$\neg F$
0	0	1	0
0	1	0	1
1	0	0	1
1	1	1	0

From the function table we obtain a possible formula $F = (\neg A \land \neg B) \lor (A \land B)$. Formulated as a question: "Does the left road lead to the jungle and you are a knave, or is it the case that the left road leads to the village and you are a knight?".