MATH1090A

## Lassonde School of Engineering

Dept. of EECS Professor G. Tourlakis MATH1090 A. Problem Set No1 Posted: Sept. 19, 2020

Due: Oct. 9, 2020; by 2:00pm, in eClass, "Assignment #1".

**Q**: How do I submit?

**A**:

- (1) Submission must be ONLY ONE file
- (2) Accepted File Types: PDF, RTF, MS WORD, ZIP
- (3) Deadline is strict, electronically limited.

## (4) MAXIMUM file size = 10MB

It is worth remembering (from the course outline):

The homework must be each individual's <u>own work</u>. While consultations with the <u>instructor</u>, <u>tutor</u>, and <u>among students</u>, are part of the <u>learning</u> <u>process</u> and are encouraged, nevertheless, *at the end of all this consultation* each student will have to produce an <u>individual report</u> rather than a copy (full or partial) of somebody else's report.

The concept of "late assignments" does not exist in this course.



Page 1

G. Tourlakis

**1.** (6 MARKS)

## Use a Formula Construction to either *support* or *reject EACH* of the following statements:

- $(\mathbf{p})$  is a formula.
- () is a formula.
- $\mathbf{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{q}$  is a formula.
- 2. (4 MARKS) Prove that no wff is the empty string.

*Hint*. Use <u>induction on formulas</u> or <u>analyse</u> what is happening during a <u>formula construction</u>.

3. A <u>formula schema</u> is a tautology iff <u>all its instances</u> are tautologies.

Which of the following schemata are tautologies? Show the whole process that lead to your answers.

I note that in the six sub-questions below I am NOTalways using all the formally necessary brackets.

Be sure to insert brackets CORRECTLY <u>before</u> you try to answer each question.

- (1 MARK)  $((A \lor B) \lor C) \equiv (A \lor (B \lor C))$
- (1 MARK)  $A \to B \equiv A \lor B \equiv B$
- (1 MARK)  $\top \equiv \bot \equiv \bot$
- (1 MARK)  $\neg A \lor B \equiv A \lor B \equiv B$
- (1 MARK)  $A \lor B \equiv A \land B \equiv A$
- (1 MARK)  $A \to B \equiv A \land B \equiv A$

G. Tourlakis

4. (5 MARKS) Prove that if we have  $A, B \models_{taut} C$ , then we also have  $\models_{taut} A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$  and conversely.

Or as we usually put it: " $A, B \models_{taut} C \underline{iff} \models_{taut} A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$ ".

Here, using truth tables or truth-table shortcuts, you must prove that if you have one side of the "iff", then you must have the other. *There are two directions* in your proof!

- 5. (4 MARKS) Prove that every nonempty proper *suffix* of a wff A contains an excess of *right* brackets.
- 6. (3 MARKS) Suppose we know  $\models_{taut} A \land B$ . Prove that we can conclude that  $\models_{taut} A$  and  $\models_{taut} B$ .
- 7. (4 MARKS) Suppose we know  $\models_{taut} A \lor B$ . Prove that the conclusion  $\models_{taut} A \text{ or } \models_{taut} B$  is false. Caution. Here you need a counter *example*! So you <u>cannot</u> argue with general A and B.
- 8. (5 MARKS) By using truth tables, or using related shortcuts, *prove* or *disprove* the following tautological implication *claims*.

Show the whole process that led to each of your answers and note that *disproofs* need *SPECIFIC* counter-*EXAMPLES* not a *loose general argument* via A and B.

- $A \wedge B \models_{\text{taut}} A$
- $A \models_{\text{taut}} A \land B$
- $A \models_{\text{taut}} A \lor B$

Page 3

G. Tourlakis

Ş

- $A, A \equiv B \models_{\text{taut}} B$
- $B, A \to B \models_{\text{taut}} A$
- 9. (6 MARKS) Compute the result of the following substitutions, whenever the requested substitution makes sense.

Whenever a requested substitution does not make sense, explain exactly why it does not.



Remember the priorities of the various connectives as well as of the metaexpression " $[\mathbf{p} := ...]$ "! The following formulas <u>have not</u> been written with all the formally required brackets.

- $\bullet \ \mathbf{p} \lor \mathbf{q} \to \mathbf{p}[\mathbf{p} := \mathbf{r}]$
- $(\mathbf{p} \wedge \mathbf{q})[\mathbf{p} := \mathbf{f}]$
- $(\mathbf{p} \to \mathbf{q})[\mathbf{p} := \top]$
- $\top [\top := \mathbf{p}]$
- $(q \wedge r \rightarrow p)[r' := A]$  (where A is some wff and p, q, r, r' are actual (distinct) Boolean variables; <u>not</u> metavariables)
- $\mathbf{p} \lor (\mathbf{q} \land \mathbf{r})[A := \mathbf{r}]$  (where A is some wff)