

Solutions for exercises in chapter 1

E1.1 Verify that

$$S_0 \rightarrow \neg S_1 = \langle 2, 3, 1, 4 \rangle$$

and

$$(S_0 \rightarrow S_1) \rightarrow (\neg S_1 \rightarrow \neg S_0) = \langle 2, 2, 3, 4, 2, 1, 4, 1, 3 \rangle.$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 \rightarrow \neg S_1 &= \langle 2 \rangle \frown S_0 \frown \neg S_1 \\ &= \langle 2 \rangle \frown \langle 3 \rangle \frown \langle 1 \rangle \frown S_1 \\ &= \langle 2, 3, 1, 4 \rangle; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (S_0 \rightarrow S_1) \rightarrow (\neg S_1 \rightarrow \neg S_0) &= \langle 2 \rangle \frown (S_0 \rightarrow S_1) \frown (\neg S_1 \rightarrow \neg S_0) \\ &= \langle 2 \rangle \frown \langle 2 \rangle \frown S_0 \frown S_1 \frown \langle 2 \rangle \frown \neg S_1 \frown \neg S_0 \\ &= \langle 2, 2, 3, 4, 2 \rangle \frown \langle 1 \rangle \frown S_1 \frown \langle 1 \rangle \frown S_0 \\ &= \langle 2, 2, 3, 4, 2, 1, 4, 1, 3 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

E1.3 Prove that there is a sentential formula of each positive integer length.

If m is a positive integer, then

$$\overbrace{\langle 1, 1, \dots, 1, S_0 \rangle}^{m-1 \text{ times}}$$

is a formula of length m , it is

$$\overbrace{\neg \neg \dots \neg}^{m-1 \text{ times}} S_0.$$

E1.5 Prove Proposition 1.3 as follows. Let f be a sentential assignment. For each positive integer m , let A_m be the set of all sentential formulas of length at most m . An m -approximation is a function G assigning to each member of A_m a value 0 or 1 so that the following conditions hold:

- (1) If $S_i \in A_m$, then $G(S_i) = f(i)$.
- (2) If $\neg\varphi \in A_m$, then $G(\neg\varphi) = 1 - G(\varphi)$.
- (3) If $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$ is in A_m , then $G(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) = 0$ iff $G(\varphi) = 1$ and $G(\psi) = 0$.

Prove:

- (4) If G and G' are m -approximations, then $G = G'$.
- (5) For each positive integer m there is an m -approximation.

Then one can define the desired function F by setting $F(\varphi) = G(\varphi)$ where G is an m -approximation with φ of length m .

Following the outline, to prove (4), suppose that G and G' are m -approximations. We prove by induction on $i \leq m$ that if φ is a formula of length i , then $G(\varphi) = G'(\varphi)$.

Suppose that we know the result for formulas φ of length less than i , and ψ has length i , where $1 \leq i \leq m$. By Proposition 1.2(ii) we have three cases.

Case 1. ψ is S_j for some j . Then $G(\psi) = G(S_j) = f(j) = G'(S_j) = G'(\psi)$.

Case 2. ψ is $\langle 0 \rangle \wedge \chi$ for some formula χ . Thus the length of χ is $i - 1 < i$, so $G(\chi) = G'(\chi)$ by the inductive assumption. Hence $G(\psi) = 1 - G(\chi) = 1 - G'(\chi) = G'(\psi)$.

Case 3. ψ is $\langle 1 \rangle \wedge \chi \wedge \theta$ for some formulas χ, θ . Then the lengths of χ and θ are less than i , and so $G(\chi) = G'(\chi)$ and $G(\theta) = G'(\theta)$ by the inductive assumption. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} G(\psi) = 0 & \text{ iff } G(\chi \rightarrow \theta) = 0 \\ & \text{ iff } G(\chi) = 1 \text{ and } G(\theta) = 0 \\ & \text{ iff } G'(\chi) = 1 \text{ and } G'(\theta) = 0 \\ & \text{ iff } G'(\chi \rightarrow \theta) = 0 \\ & \text{ iff } G'(\psi) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

and it follows that $G(\psi) = G'(\psi)$.

This finishes the inductive proof.

We prove (5) by induction. For $m = 1$, define $G(S_i) = f(i)$ for all $i \in \omega$. Clearly G is a 1-approximation. Now assume that we know that there is an n -approximation for every $n < m$, where $m > 1$. For each $n < m$ let G_n be an n -approximation. Let $\varphi \in A_m$. If φ has length $n < m$, let $H(\varphi) = G_n(\varphi)$. Now suppose that φ has length m . By Proposition 1.2(ii) we have the following cases:

Case 1. $\varphi = S_i$ for some i . But S_i has length 1 and $m > 1$, contradiction.

Case 2. $\varphi = \neg\psi$ for some formula ψ . Then ψ has length $m - 1$. We define $H(\varphi) = 1 - G_{m-1}(\psi)$.

Case 3. $\varphi = \psi \rightarrow \chi$ for some formulas ψ, χ . Say ψ has length $n < m$ and χ has length $p < m$. We define $H(\varphi) = 0$ iff $G_n(\psi) = 1$ and $G_p(\chi) = 0$.

Clearly H is an m -approximation.

E1.7 Use the truth table method to show that the formula

$$(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \leftrightarrow (\neg\varphi \vee \psi)$$

is a tautology.

φ	ψ	$\varphi \rightarrow \psi$	$\neg\varphi$	$\neg\varphi \vee \psi$	$(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \leftrightarrow (\neg\varphi \vee \psi)$
1	1	1	0	1	1
1	0	0	0	0	1
0	1	1	1	1	1
0	0	1	1	1	1

E1.10 Use the informal method described in the notes to determine whether or not the following is a tautology:

$$S_0 \rightarrow (S_1 \rightarrow (S_2 \rightarrow (S_3 \rightarrow S_1))).$$

2	1	3	2	4	3	5	4	5
$S_0 \rightarrow (S_1 \rightarrow (S_2 \rightarrow (S_3 \rightarrow S_0)))$								
1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0

Values 0 and 1 have been tentatively assigned to S_0 , a contradiction, so the formula is a tautology.