BIE-DML - Discrete Mathematics and Logic

Tutorial 1

Formulas, truth valuation, logical laws

Francesco Dolce, Eva Pernecká and Jitka Rybníčková

Faculty of Information Technology
Czech Technical University in Prague

Winter semester 2025/2026

updated: 07/10/2025, 17:14

1.1 Introduction

Definition 1.1 (Formulas of PL)**. Formulas of propositional logic** are:

1. All elementary formulas $A, B, C, \ldots$.
2. If A, B are propositional formulas, then so are $(\neg A), (A \wedge B), (A \vee B), (A \Rightarrow B), (A \Leftrightarrow B)$.
3. Only formulas obtained by **final** usage of rules 1 and 2 are propositional formulas.

Remark 1.2. We usually omit unnecessary brackets, i.e., we simply write

$$A \wedge B, \quad \neg A \Rightarrow B, \quad (A \Rightarrow B) \vee \neg((A \wedge B) \vee B)$$

instead of

$$(A \wedge B),\ ((\neg A) \Rightarrow B)\,,\ ((A \Rightarrow B) \vee (\neg((A \wedge B) \vee B)))$$

Definition 1.3 (Logical connectives)**.**

Name	**Notation**	**Formal Usage**	**How to read it**
negation	$\neg$	$\neg A$	not A
conjunction	$\wedge$	$A \wedge B$	A and B
disjunction	$\vee$	$A \vee B$	A or B
implication	$\Rightarrow$	$A \Rightarrow B$	A implies B, if A (then) B
equivalence	$\Leftrightarrow$	$A \Leftrightarrow B$	A if and only if (iff) B, A when and only when B

1.1.1 Truth valuation

Truth valuation of a propositional formula can be determined from the truth values of all elementary formulas using the rules for logical connectives (summed up below):

A	B	$\neg A$	$A \wedge B$	$A \vee B$	$A \Rightarrow B$	$A \Leftrightarrow B$
1	1	0	1	1	1	1
1	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	1	1	0	1	1	0
0	0	1	0	0	1	1

Definition 1.4. We say that:

- Formula F is **true** in truth valuation v if $v(F) = 1$.
- Formula F is **false** in truth valuation v if $v(F) = 0$.
- Formula F is **satisfiable** if there is truth valuation v where $v(F) = 1$.
- Formula F is **unsatisfiable** if there is no truth valuation v where $v(F) = 1$.
- Formula F is a **tautology** (denoted by $\top$) if $v(F) = 1$ for every valuation v (i.e., it is always true).
- Formula F is a **contradiction** (denoted by $\bot$) if $v(F) = 0$ for every valuation v (i.e., it is always false).

Definition 1.5 ($A \Dashv\vDash B$)**.**
Formulas A, B are **logically equivalent** ($A \Dashv\vDash B$) if and only if $v(A) = v(B)$ for every valuation v.

Remark 1.6. $A \Dashv\vDash B$ iff $A \Leftrightarrow B$ is a tautology.

Theorem 1.7 (Properties of tautology and contradiction)**.**

1. $\neg\top \Dashv\vDash \bot$ ...*(The negation of a tautology is a contradiction.)*
2. $\neg\bot \Dashv\vDash \top$ ...*(The negation of a contradiction is a tautology.)*
3. *A tautology is satisfiable.*
4. *A contradiction is unsatisfiable.*

Moreover, for any formula of PL A holds:

1. $A \wedge \top \Dashv\vDash A$ ...*identity law for* $\wedge$
2. $A \vee \top \Dashv\vDash \top$ ...*identity law for* $\vee$
3. $A \wedge \bot \Dashv\vDash \bot$ ...*universal bound law for* $\wedge$
4. $A \vee \bot \Dashv\vDash A$ ...*universal bound law for* $\vee$

1.1.2 Logical Laws

Theorem 1.8. *Let A, B, C be formulas of PL. Then*

1. $A \vee \neg A \Dashv\vDash \top$ ...*law of excluded middle*
2. $\neg(A \wedge \neg A) \Dashv\vDash \top$ ...*law of non-contradiction*
3. $\neg\neg A \Leftrightarrow A \Dashv\vDash \top$ ...*law of double negation*
4. $A \wedge A \Dashv\vDash A$ ...*idempotent law for* $\wedge$
5. $A \vee A \Dashv\vDash A$ ...*idempotent law for* $\vee$
6. $A \wedge B \Dashv\vDash B \wedge A$ ...*commutative law for* $\wedge$
7. $A \vee B \Dashv\vDash B \vee A$ ...*commutative law for* $\vee$
8. $(A \wedge B) \wedge C \Dashv\vDash A \wedge (B \wedge C)$ ...*associative law for* $\wedge$
9. $(A \vee B) \vee C \Dashv\vDash A \vee (B \vee C)$ ...*associative law for* $\vee$
10. $(A \wedge B) \vee C \Dashv\vDash (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee C)$ ...*distributive law*
11. $(A \vee B) \wedge C \Dashv\vDash (A \wedge C) \vee (B \wedge C)$ ...*distributive law*
12. $A \wedge (A \vee B) \Dashv\vDash A$ ...*absorption law for* $\vee$
13. $A \vee (A \wedge B) \Dashv\vDash A$ ...*absorption law for* $\wedge$
14. $\neg(A \wedge B) \Dashv\vDash \neg A \vee \neg B$ ...*de Morgan law*
15. $\neg(A \vee B) \Dashv\vDash \neg A \wedge \neg B$ ...*de Morgan law*

16. $A \Rightarrow B \boxminus \neg B \Rightarrow \neg A$ *...law of contraposition*

17. $A \Rightarrow B \boxminus \neg A \vee B$ *..."golden rule"*

18. $\neg(A \Rightarrow B) \boxminus A \wedge \neg B$ *..."silver rule"*

19. $A \Leftrightarrow B \boxminus (A \Rightarrow B) \wedge (B \Rightarrow A)$ *...meaning of the equivalence*

Theorem 1.9. *Given any formula A, B, C, tautology $\top$ and contradiction $\perp$, the following logical equivalences hold:*

1. Commutative laws:	$A \wedge B \boxminus B \wedge A$	$A \vee B \boxminus B \vee A$
2. Associative laws:	$(A \wedge B) \wedge C \boxminus A \wedge (B \wedge C)$	$(A \vee B) \vee C \boxminus A \vee (B \vee C)$
3. Distributive laws:	$A \wedge (B \vee C) \boxminus (A \wedge B) \vee (A \wedge C)$	$A \vee (B \wedge C) \boxminus (A \vee B) \wedge (A \vee C)$
4. Identity laws:	$A \wedge \top \boxminus A$	$A \vee \perp \boxminus A$
5. Law of excluded middle:	$A \vee \neg A \boxminus \top$	
6. Law of non-contradiction:	$A \wedge \neg A \boxminus \perp$	$\neg(A \wedge \neg A) \boxminus \top$
7. Law of double negation:	$\neg\neg A \boxminus A$	
8. Idempotent laws:	$A \wedge A \boxminus A$	$A \vee A \boxminus A$
9. Universal bound laws:	$A \wedge \perp \boxminus \perp$	$A \vee \top \boxminus \top$
10. Negation of $\top$ and $\perp$:	$\neg\top \boxminus \perp$	$\neg\perp \boxminus \top$
11. De Morgan laws:	$\neg(A \wedge B) \boxminus \neg A \vee \neg B$	$\neg(A \vee B) \boxminus \neg A \wedge \neg B$
12. Absorption laws:	$A \vee (A \wedge B) \boxminus A$	$A \wedge (A \vee B) \boxminus A$
13. "Golden rule"/"Silver rule":	$A \Rightarrow B \boxminus \neg A \vee B$	$\neg(A \Rightarrow B) \boxminus A \wedge \neg B$

Remark 1.10. Given any formula A, B, tautology $\top$ and contradiction $\perp$, the table below presents the list of the most used logically equivalent formulas to tautology, contradiction, implication and equivalence:

1. $\top$	$A \vee \neg A$
	$A \Leftrightarrow A$
	$\neg(A \wedge \neg A)$
2. $\bot$	$A \wedge \neg A$
	$A \Leftrightarrow \neg A$
	$\neg(A \vee \neg A)$
3. $A \implies B$	$\neg A \vee B$
	$\neg(A \wedge \neg B)$
	$\neg B \Rightarrow \neg A$
4. $A \Leftrightarrow B$	$(A \Rightarrow B) \wedge (B \Rightarrow A)$
	$(A \Rightarrow B) \wedge (\neg A \Rightarrow \neg B)$
	$(A \vee \neg B) \wedge (\neg A \vee B)$
	$(A \wedge B) \vee (\neg A \wedge \neg B)$
	$\neg A \Leftrightarrow \neg B$

Lemma 1.11 (Properties of Implication)**.**

- $A \Rightarrow B \quad \not\models\!\dashv \quad B \Rightarrow A$
- $A \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow C) \quad \not\models\!\dashv \quad (A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow C$

Lemma 1.12 (Properties of Equivalence)**.**

- $A \Leftrightarrow B \models\!\dashv B \Leftrightarrow A$ ...*commutative law*
- $A \Leftrightarrow (B \Leftrightarrow C) \models\!\dashv (A \Leftrightarrow B) \Leftrightarrow C$ ...*associative law*
- $\neg(A \Leftrightarrow B) \models\!\dashv \neg A \Leftrightarrow B$ ...*negation*
- $A \Leftrightarrow A \models\!\dashv \top$
- $A \Leftrightarrow \neg A \models\!\dashv \bot$
- $A \Leftrightarrow \top \models\!\dashv A$
- $A \Leftrightarrow \bot \models\!\dashv \neg A$

1.1.3 Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

Assume we have an implication $A \Rightarrow B$. If A is false then the implication is automatically true – this case is of no interest to us. If the implication should be true and so is A, then B must be also true. So we can say that it **suffices** for A to be true for B to be also true, i.e., A is a sufficient condition for B. On the other hand, if A is true then, **necessarily**, B has to be true – B is a necessary condition for A.

In an implication $A \Rightarrow B$, A is a **sufficient condition** for B and B is a **necessary condition** for A.

If we have an equivalence $A \Leftrightarrow B$, then B is a sufficient and necessary condition for A, as well as A being a necessary and sufficient condition for B (there is a symmetry in an equivalence).

Example 1.13. Without oxygen, there would be no human life; hence oxygen is a **necessary** condition for the existence of human beings. We can rephrase it as "If there is human life then there must be oxygen" and formalize $H \Rightarrow O$ with H denoting "There is human life" and O denoting "There is oxygen".
(Alternatively, we can say ""If there was no oxygen then there would be no human life", $\neg O \Rightarrow \neg H$. This is an equivalent formulation which demonstrates the law of contraposition.)

Example 1.14. Some scientists think that if there is oxygen then there must be (some kind of) life; so oxygen might also be a **sufficient** condition for (some kind of) life to exist. We would say "If there is oxygen then there must be (some kind of) life", and write $O \Rightarrow L$, with O meaning "There is oxygen" and L meaning "There is (some kind of) life".

1.1.4 Functionally Complete Systems of Logical Connectives

Definition 1.15 (Complete Systems)**.**
A set of logical connectives is (functionally) **complete** iff for any formula there is a logically equivalent formula containing connectives only from this set.

Definition 1.16 (Sheffer symbol and Peirce arrow)**.**
We define the **Sheffer symbol** $\uparrow$ (or NAND) as

$$A \uparrow B \dashv\vDash \neg(A \wedge B)$$

We define the **Peirce arrow** $\downarrow$ (or NOR) as

$$A \downarrow B \dashv\vDash \neg(A \vee B).$$

Theorem 1.17. *The following sets of connectives are functionally complete.*

1. $\{\neg, \vee\}$;
2. $\{\neg, \wedge\}$;
3. $\{\neg, \Rightarrow\}$;
4. *all sets containing the sets above;*
5. $\{\uparrow\}$;
6. $\{\downarrow\}$.

1.1.5 Disjunctive Normal Form and Conjunctive Normal Form of Formulas of PL

Definition 1.18 (Literals, Implicants, DNF)**.**

- A **literal** is an elementary formula or its negation.
- An **implicant** is a literal or a conjunction of literals.
- A formula is in **disjunctive normal form** (DNF) if it is an implicant or a disjuction of implicants.

Definition 1.19 (Clauses, CNF)**.**

- A **clause** is a literal or a disjunction of literals.
- A formula is in **conjunctive normal form** (CNF) if it is a clause or a conjunction of clauses.

Example 1.20.

- A; $\neg A$; B ...literals
- $A \wedge \neg B$; $\neg A \wedge C \wedge B$; $\neg C$ ...implicants
- $(A \wedge B \wedge C) \vee (\neg A \wedge \neg C)$ ...DNF
- $(A \wedge \neg B) \vee (\neg A \wedge C \wedge B) \vee \neg C$ ...DNF
- A; $\neg A$; $A \vee B$; $A \wedge \neg B$ (!!!) ...DNF
- $A \vee \neg B$; $\neg A \vee C \vee B$; $\neg C$ ...clauses
- $(A \vee \neg B) \wedge C$ ...CNF
- $(A \vee \neg B) \wedge (\neg A \vee C) \wedge \neg C$ ...CNF
- A; $\neg A$; $A \wedge \neg B$; $A \vee \neg B$ (!!!) ...both DNF and CNF!

Theorem 1.21. *For every formula there is a logically equivalent formula which is in DNF and a logically equivalent formula which is in CNF.*

Remark 1.22. DNF and CNF are constructed by application of logical laws, mostly these ones:

- We use distributive laws (in both directions!) for transition between CNF and DNF.
  - $(G \wedge \neg H) \vee (\neg I \wedge J \wedge K) \models\!\!\!\dashv (G \vee \neg I) \wedge (G \vee J) \wedge (G \vee K) \wedge (\neg H \vee \neg I) \wedge (\neg H \vee J) \wedge (\neg H \vee K)$.
- We omit contradictions ($\perp$) in DNF and tautologies ($\top$) in CNF.
  - $(A \vee B) \wedge \neg B \models\!\!\!\dashv (A \wedge \neg B) \vee \underbrace{(B \wedge \neg B)}_{\perp} \models\!\!\!\dashv A \wedge \neg B$.
  - $A \wedge \underbrace{(B \vee \neg B)}_{\top} \models\!\!\!\dashv A$.

Observation 1.23. *By negation of a DNF (and the negation of every its implicant), we get a formula in CNF. However, this formula is a* ***negation*** *of the original formula (i.e., not a CNF of the original formula!), and vice versa.*

Example 1.24. Consider the formula in DNF F:

$$(G \wedge \neg H) \vee (\neg I \wedge J \wedge K).$$

Then $\neg F$ is a formula in CNF which looks like:

$$\begin{aligned}\neg((G \wedge \neg H) \vee (\neg I \wedge J \wedge K)) &\models\!\!\!\dashv \neg(G \wedge \neg H) \wedge \neg(\neg I \wedge J \wedge K) \models\!\!\!\dashv \\ &\models\!\!\!\dashv (\neg G \vee H) \wedge (I \vee \neg J \vee \neg K).\end{aligned}$$

However, the CNF of F is obtained by distributing the two implicants, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}(G \wedge \neg H) \vee (\neg I \wedge J \wedge K) &\models\!\!\!\dashv (G \vee (\neg I \wedge J \wedge K) \wedge (\neg H \vee (\neg I \wedge J \wedge K)) \\ &\models\!\!\!\dashv ((G \vee \neg I) \wedge (G \vee J) \wedge (G \vee K)) \wedge ((\neg H \vee \neg I) \wedge (\neg H \vee J) \wedge (\neg H \vee K)) \\ &\models\!\!\!\dashv (G \vee \neg I) \wedge (G \vee J) \wedge (G \vee K) \wedge (\neg H \vee \neg I) \wedge (\neg H \vee J) \wedge (\neg H \vee K) \\ &\not\models\!\!\!\dashv (\neg G \vee H) \wedge (I \vee \neg J \vee \neg K).\end{aligned}$$

The CNF of F is $(G \vee \neg I) \wedge (G \vee J) \wedge (G \vee K) \wedge (\neg H \vee \neg I) \wedge (\neg H \vee J) \wedge (\neg H \vee K)$ but not $(\neg G \vee H) \wedge (I \vee \neg J \vee \neg K)$ which is **only** a $\neg$ DNF of F.

!!! Remember: $\neg$ DNF **is** CNF, but of a different formula!

1.1.6 Full DNF and CNF

Definition 1.25 (Full DNF and CNF)**.**

- A **minterm** is an implicant which contains all elementary formulas.
- A **maxterm** is a clause which contains all elementary formulas.
- A formula is in **full DNF** if it is a disjunction of minterms.
- A formula is in **full CNF** if it is a conjunction of maxterms.

Theorem 1.26. *For every formula there is a logically equivalent formula which is in full DNF and a logically equivalent formula which is in full CNF.*

Idea for finding full DNF and full CNF:

- Full DNF: complete implicants in DNF to minterms (one by one, adding the missing literals)

$$A \mathrel{\models\!\!\!\!\dashv} A \wedge \top \mathrel{\models\!\!\!\!\dashv} A \wedge (B \vee \neg B) \mathrel{\models\!\!\!\!\dashv} (A \wedge B) \vee (A \wedge \neg B).$$

- Full CNF: complete clauses in CNF to maxterms (one by one, adding the missing literals)

$$A \mathrel{\models\!\!\!\!\dashv} A \vee \bot \mathrel{\models\!\!\!\!\dashv} A \vee (B \wedge \neg B) \mathrel{\models\!\!\!\!\dashv} (A \vee B) \wedge (A \vee \neg B).$$

1.1.7 Logical Consequence

Definition 1.27. A formula B is a **logical consequence** of a formula A – or A logically implies B – if for each valuation v, if $v(A) = 1$ then $v(B) = 1$. We denote it by $A \models B$.

Proposition 1.28. *For every two formulas of propositional logic A, B:*

1. $A \mathrel{\models\!\!\!\!\dashv} B$ *if and only if* $A \models B$ *and* $B \models A$.
2. $A \models B$ *if and only if* $A \Rightarrow B$ *is a tautology.*
3. $A \mathrel{\models\!\!\!\!\dashv} B$ *if and only if* $A \Leftrightarrow B$ *is a tautology.*
4. $A \models B$ *if and only if* $A \wedge \neg B$ *is a contradiction.*

1.2 Exercises

Exercise 1.1. Use these elementary propositions and the proposed letters

a) Today it's Wednesday. (W)

b) Today it's Monday. (M)

c) We have a class today. (C)

d) Jane has a cat. (A)

e) Jane has a dog. (O)

f) An animal barks. (B)

g) An animal is a dog. (D)

to formalize these sentences:

i) Today it's not Wednesday.

ii) We don't have a class today.

iii) Today it's Wednesday and we have a class.

iv) Jane has a cat and a dog.

v) Jane has a cat but she doesn't have a dog.

vi) Jane has a cat or a dog. - not exclusive or!!!

vii) Today it's Monday or we have a class.

viii) If an animal barks then it's a dog.

ix) An animal barks only if it's a dog.

x) An animal is a dog only if it barks.

xi) * We have a class today unless it's Monday. (= If it's **not** Monday today then we have a class.)

xii) Today it's Wednesday if and only if we have a class.

Remark 1.29. There are several ways of expressing implication. Some are quite straightforward: *if* A *then* B, B *if* A, B *whenever* A all mean *If* A *is true then* B *is true.* Others are more confusing: A *only if* B means *if* A *then* B (for example "Nick will eat his lunch only if he is very hungry." means "If Nick will eat his lunch then he is very hungry."), and A *unless* B actually means *if not* B *then* A (for example "You cannot drive unless you are 18." means "If you are not 18 then you cannot drive.").

Exercise 1.2. The sentences below contain negation(s). Try to simplify them and formulate them as positive declarations, where possible.
Example: Negative: It's not true that 2 is less than 1. Positive: 2 is greater than or equal to 1.

a) A number x is not even.

b) A number x is not greater than 3.

c) I do not have two children.

d) It's not the case that Mars is the closest planet to the Sun.

e) It's not true that Bob is not a good student.

f) * It's not true that I haven't decided not to go to the party.

Exercise 1.3. Formalize the sentences below using these two elementary propositions and the given letters:

- T: "I take the tram."
- S: "I take the subway."

a) I take the tram and the subway.

b) I take the tram or the subway.

c) If I take the tram then I take the subway too.

d) If I take the tram then I don't take the subway.

e) I take the tram if and only if I don't take the subway.

f) I take neither the tram nor the subway.

g) I take the tram or the subway but not both.

h) * Unless I take the subway, I don't take the tram.

Exercise 1.4. Identify the elementary propositions and formalize the following sentences using the letters proposed.
Example: "Cats don't bark." (B)
Denote the statement "Cats bark" by B. Then "Cats don't bark" can be represented by $\neg B$.

a) Jane likes cats (C) and dogs (D).

b) Tonight I will read a book (B) or watch TV (T).

c) If Mr. Jones is happy (R), Mrs. Jones is happy (S), and if Mr. Jones is unhappy, Mrs. Jones is unhappy.

d) The bribe will be paid (B) if and only if the goods are delivered (G).

e) John goes to the movies (M) only if a comedy is playing (C).

f) It's not the case that students don't like logic. (L)

g) Max (M) and Charles (C) will go to the party but neither Tamara (T) nor Lucy (L) will come.

h) Charles (C) will not come without Lucy. (L)

i) You can either have soup (P) or salad (S) but not both. (exclusive disjunction)

j) * If you don't like to fly (F) then you can visit some countries (V) only if you go by ship (S).

k) ** You can't live in the Czech Republic (L) unless you are a Czech citizen (C) or you have a visa (V).

Exercise 1.5. List all subformulas and construct truth tables for the following formulas. Decide whether they are satisfiable, contradictions or tautologies.

a) $(\neg A \Rightarrow B) \vee A$

b) $(A \wedge B) \Rightarrow \neg(A \Leftrightarrow \neg B)$

c) $(A \vee \neg C) \Rightarrow B$

d) $((A \Rightarrow B) \wedge A) \Rightarrow B$

e) $(\neg(A \wedge B) \Rightarrow C) \Leftrightarrow \neg C$

f) $(A \Rightarrow (B \wedge C)) \Rightarrow ((A \Rightarrow B) \wedge (A \Rightarrow C))$

g) * $((A \Rightarrow B) \vee \neg(C \wedge D)) \iff (\neg(D \Rightarrow B) \wedge (A \vee C))$

Exercise 1.6. Prove the validity of logical laws in Theorem 1.7.

a) The negation of a tautology is a contradiction. $(\neg\top \mathrel{\text{⫤⊨}} \bot)$

b) The negation of a contradiction is a tautology. $(\neg\bot \mathrel{\text{⫤⊨}} \top)$

c) A tautology is satisfiable. (There is truth value $v(\top) = 1$.)

d) A contradiction is unsatisfiable. ($v(\bot) = 0$ for every truth value v.)

Exercise 1.7. Prove the validity of the following for any formula of PL A (see Theorem 1.7).

a) $A \wedge \top \mathrel{\text{⫤⊨}} A$

b) $A \vee \top \mathrel{\text{⫤⊨}} \top$

c) $A \wedge \bot \mathrel{\text{⫤⊨}} \bot$

d) $A \vee \bot \mathrel{\text{⫤⊨}} A$

Exercise 1.8. Determine whether the formulas listed below are satisfiable, tautologies, or contradictions. (Try to find the answer using your knowledge of logical connectives first, then prove it formally.)

a) $(P \wedge Q) \Rightarrow P$

b) $P \wedge \neg P$

c) $\neg(P \wedge \neg P)$

d) $(P \Rightarrow R) \wedge (P \wedge \neg R)$

e) $P \Leftrightarrow \neg P$

f) $\neg R \vee R$

g) $(P \wedge R) \Leftrightarrow (P \Leftrightarrow R)$

h) $P \Rightarrow \neg P$

i) $P \Rightarrow (Q \Rightarrow (R \Rightarrow P))$

Exercise 1.9. Proposition. A number is divisible by 6 if and only if it is a multiple of 2 and 3. Express the property *A number is a multiple of 2 and 3.* as

1. a necessary condition for divisibility by 6,
2. a sufficient condition for divisibility by 6.

Identify elementary propositions within the original proposition and formalize it using letters of your choice.
Which of the below are true?

a) divisibility by 2 is a necessary condition for divisibility by 6,

b) divisibility by 2 is a sufficient condition for divisibility by 6,

c) divisibility by 6 is a necessary condition for divisibility by 3,

d) divisibility by 6 is a sufficient condition for divisibility by 3,

e) if a number is not divisible by 6 then it is not divisible by 2 and 3,

f) if a number is not divisible by 6 then it is not divisible by 2 or 3,

g) if a number is not divisible by 6 then it is not divisible by 2,

h) if a number is divisible by 2 then it is divisible by 2 or 3,

i) if a number is divisible by 2 or 3 then it is divisible by 2,

j) if a number is divisible by 2 and 3 then it is divisible by 2

Exercise 1.10 (Necessary / sufficient conditions)**.** Formalize the statements below.

a) "To get to university it is necessary to finish high school."

b) "To get to university it is sufficient to finish high school."

c) "To get to university it is necessary and sufficient to finish high school."

Exercise 1.11 (Necessary / sufficient conditions)**.** Formalize the statements below.

a) "To be able to drive a car it is necessary to be at least 18 years old."

b) "To be able to drive a car it is sufficient to be at least 18 years old."

c) "To be able to drive a car it is necessary and sufficient to be at least 18 years old."

Exercise 1.12. Select some of the laws in Theorem 1.9 and prove their correctness.
Find a formula with at least two elementary formulas which is a tautology. Do the same for a contradiction.

Exercise 1.13. Find logically equivalent formulas which have negation only in front of elementary formulas A, B, C, D.

a) $\neg(A \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow C))$,

b) $\neg(A \Leftrightarrow (B \wedge (C \Rightarrow D)))$,

c) $\neg(A \vee (B \Rightarrow (C \wedge D)))$,

d) $\neg((A \Rightarrow B) \wedge (C \Leftrightarrow D))$.

Exercise 1.14. Translate the following statements into formulas of PL. Negate the formulas and then use the known laws to "push" the negations in front of elementary formulas. Convert the resulting formulas back into natural language.

a) "If the sun is shining I'll go on a trip or swimming."

b) "Number x is divisible by 6 if and only if it is divisible by 3 and 2."

c) "Bolzano-Cauchy criterion is a necessary condition for a sequence to converge."

Exercise 1.15. Using logical laws simplify the following formulas. Identify all rules you use.

a) $A \Rightarrow (B \vee A)$,

b) $A \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow A))$,

c) $(A \wedge B) \Rightarrow (A \vee C)$,

d) $(A \Rightarrow B) \vee (B \Rightarrow A)$,

e) $\neg(A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow A$,

f) * $\neg((A \Leftrightarrow \neg(B \wedge C)) \wedge A)$.

Exercise 1.16. Pick from the sentences listed below those with the same meaning as "It's not the case that I live in Peru or in Brazil".

a) "I don't live in Peru and I don't live in Brazil."

b) "I don't live in Peru or I don't live in Brazil."

c) "It's not the case that I live in Peru and it's not the case that I live in Brazil."

d) "I don't live in Peru and I live in Brazil."

Exercise 1.17. Pick from the sentences listed below those with the same meaning as "It's not the case that I live in Peru and in Brazil".

a) "I don't live in Peru and I don't live in Brazil."

b) "I don't live in Peru or I don't live in Brazil."

c) "It's not the case that I live in Peru or it's not the case that I live in Brazil."

d) "I live in Peru and in Brazil."

Exercise 1.18. Convert the following formulas to DNF and to CNF.

a) $A \Rightarrow (B \vee A)$,

b) * $(A \Rightarrow B) \Leftrightarrow (B \Rightarrow A)$,

c) * $\neg((A \Leftrightarrow \neg(B \wedge C)) \wedge A)$,

d) $\neg A \Leftrightarrow (B \vee A)$,

e) $(\neg A \wedge B) \Rightarrow (\neg B \vee C)$,

f) $\neg(A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow (\neg A \vee C)$.

Exercise 1.19. Find full DNF and full CNF of the formulas from Exercise 1.18.

Exercise 1.20. Find DNF, CNF, full DNF and full CNF of the following formulas and determine in how many valuations they are true.

a) $(A \Rightarrow B) \wedge B$,

b) $A \Rightarrow (A \wedge B)$,

c) $(A \Rightarrow B) \vee \neg(C \Rightarrow D)$,

d) $\neg((P \wedge \neg Q) \Rightarrow \neg(R \vee S))$,

e) $(A \wedge \neg(C \Rightarrow D)) \Rightarrow (B \wedge E)$,

f) * $(A \wedge B) \Leftrightarrow (A \Rightarrow C)$.

Exercise 1.21. Which of the following formulas are logical consequences of $C \wedge D$?

a) C,

b) $C \Rightarrow D$,

c) $D \Rightarrow \neg C$,

d) $\neg C \Rightarrow D$,

e) $C \Leftrightarrow D$,

f) $C \vee \neg D$,

g) $C \wedge \neg D$,

h) $C \vee \neg C$.

Exercise 1.22. Which of the sentences below logically follow from the statement:
”I will take the tram but I will not take the subway.” $(T \wedge \neg S)$

1. ”If I take the subway then I will take the tram.”
2. ”I will not take the tram if and only if I will take the subway.”
3. ”If I take the tram then I will take the subway.”
4. ”I will not take the tram or I will not take the subway.”
5. ”I will take the tram or I will not take the tram.”

Exercise 1.23. Find and justify logical consequences between pairs of formulas:

a) $\bot,\ \top,\ A,\ B,\ \neg A,\ \neg B,\ A \wedge B,\ A \vee B,\ A \Rightarrow B,\ A \Leftrightarrow B$;

b) $A \Leftrightarrow B,\ A \Rightarrow B,\ B \Rightarrow A,\ A \wedge B,\ \neg A \wedge \neg B,\ A \vee \neg A,\ B \wedge \neg B.$

Exercise 1.24. Convert the formulas below into (full) DNF/CNF and use these forms to decide logical consequence

$$E : \neg(A \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow C)), \qquad F : \neg((A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow C).$$

Exercise 1.25. Convert the formulas below into (full) DNF/CNF and use these forms to decide logical consequence.

$$G : (A \vee B) \Rightarrow C, \qquad H : (A \wedge B) \Rightarrow C, \qquad I : \neg((B \vee C) \Rightarrow (A \wedge B)).$$

1.3 More exercises

Exercise 1.26. List all subformulas and construct truth tables for the following formulas. Decide whether they are satisfiable, contradictions or tautologies.

a) $(A \Rightarrow B) \Leftrightarrow (B \Rightarrow A)$ (! common mistake!)

b) $(\neg A \Rightarrow \neg B) \Leftrightarrow (A \Rightarrow B)$ (! common mistake!)

c) $(A \wedge B) \Rightarrow \neg(A \Leftrightarrow \neg B)$

d) $(\neg A \Rightarrow B) \vee \neg(A \Leftrightarrow \neg B)$

e) $(\neg A \Rightarrow B) \vee (C \wedge \neg B)$

f) $(\neg A \wedge B) \wedge (C \wedge \neg B)$

g) $\neg(A \vee B) \Rightarrow (A \wedge \neg B)$

h) $(A \Rightarrow B) \Leftrightarrow ((\neg A \wedge C) \vee \neg B)$

i) $((A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow C) \Leftrightarrow (A \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow C))$

Exercise 1.27. Prove the validity of the logical laws in Theorem 1.8 (i.e., prove every single logical equivalence there to be a tautology)

Exercise 1.28. * The formula

$$((A \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow C)) \Rightarrow ((A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow C)))$$

contains only implications. Is it a tautology?

Exercise 1.29. Let's have two elementary propositions:

- A number x is divisible by 4 (denote by A), and
- A number x is divisible by 2 (denote by B).

Formulate which is a necessary condition for which and express as a formula of PL.

Exercise 1.30. * In the Island of Knights and Knaves, knights always make true statements and knaves always make false ones. Determine of which type are the natives.

a) We meet two natives, A and B, and A says: "At least one of us is a knave."

b) We meet two natives, A and B and A says: "Either I am a knave or B is a knight."

c) We meet two natives, A and B, and A says: "I am a knave but B isn't."

d) We meet three of them, A, B and C, and A and B make the following statements:

  - A: "All of us are knaves.".
  - B: "Exactly one of us is a knight."

e) * Once when I visited the island of knights and knaves, I came across two of the inhabitants resting under a tree. I asked one of them, “Is either of you a knight? ”He responded, and I knew the answer to my question. To which type of person I addressed the question? Is he a knight or a knave? And what is the other one? I can assure you, I have given you enough information to solve this problem.

Exercise 1.31. Use distributive laws on these formulas.

a) $(A \vee B) \wedge C \wedge D$,

b) $(A \wedge B \wedge C) \vee D$,

c) $A \wedge \neg B \wedge (A \vee B)$.

Exercise 1.32. Use logical laws to show that:

a) $(A \vee B) \wedge (A \vee \neg B) \mathrel{\text{⫤}\!\!\text{⊨}} A$;

b) $A \wedge (\neg A \vee B) \mathrel{\text{⫤}\!\!\text{⊨}} A \wedge B$;

c) $A \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow (\neg A \Rightarrow \neg B)) \mathrel{\text{⫤}\!\!\text{⊨}} \top$;

d) $(A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow (\neg A \Rightarrow \neg B) \mathrel{\text{⫤}\!\!\text{⊨}} A \vee \neg B$;

e) $(A \vee B) \Rightarrow (A \wedge B) \mathrel{\text{⫤}\!\!\text{⊨}} A \Leftrightarrow B$;

f) $(A \wedge B) \Rightarrow (A \vee B) \mathrel{\text{⫤}\!\!\text{⊨}} \top$;

g) $(A \vee B) \wedge (C \vee D) \mathrel{\text{⫤}\!\!\text{⊨}} (A \wedge C) \vee (A \wedge D) \vee (B \wedge C) \vee (B \wedge D)$.

Exercise 1.33. Convert the following formulas to logically equivalent ones containing only the given set of connectives.

a) $(A \Rightarrow B) \wedge C$, negation and disjunction;

b) $(A \vee B) \wedge C$, negation and implication;

c) $A \Rightarrow (B \vee C)$, negation and conjunction;

d) $(B \vee C) \Rightarrow A$, negation and conjunction.

Exercise 1.34. Pick from the sentences listed below those with the same meaning as ”It’s not the case that if I live in Peru then I live in Brazil”.

a) ”It’s not the case that I live in Peru or it’s not the case that I live in Brazil.”

b) ”I live in Peru and I don’t live in Brazil.”

c) ”I live in Peru and in Brazil.”

d) ”I live in Peru or I don’t live in Brazil.”

Exercise 1.35. Pick from the sentences listed below those with the same meaning as ”It’s not the case that I am hungry or it’s not the case that I am thirsty”.

a) ”It’s not the case that I am hungry or thirsty”.

b) ”It’s not the case that I am hungry and thirsty”.

c) ”It’s not the case that if I am hungry then I am thirsty”.

Exercise 1.36. Pick from the sentences listed below those with the same meaning as ”It’s not the case that I am hungry and it’s not the case that I am thirsty”.

a) ”It’s not the case that I am hungry or thirsty”.

b) ”It’s not the case that I am hungry and thirsty”.

c) ”It’s not the case that if I am hungry then I am thirsty”.

Exercise 1.37. * Pick from the sentences listed below those with the same meaning as ”I am hungry but it’s not the case that I am thirsty”.

a) ”It’s not the case that I am hungry or thirsty”.

b) ”It’s not the case that I am hungry and thirsty”.

c) ”It’s not the case that if I am hungry then I am thirsty”.

d) ”It’s not the case that if I am hungry then I am not thirsty”.

Exercise 1.38. Decide which of the following sets are functionally complete.

a) $\{\neg, \land\}$,

b) $\{\neg, \Rightarrow\}$,

c) $\{\neg, \Leftrightarrow\}$,

d) $\{\land, \lor, \Rightarrow\}$,

e) Peirce symbol NOR: $(A \downarrow B) \Dashv\vDash \neg(A \lor B)$.

Exercise 1.39. Is $\downarrow$ (resp., $\uparrow$) commutative / associative / idempotent?

Exercise 1.40 (Peirce simbol)**.**

1. Express $A \land \neg A$ using only $\downarrow$.
2. Express $A \lor \neg A$ using $\downarrow$.

Exercise 1.41. What are the formulas below logically equivalent to (choose from $A, \neg A, \top, \bot$)?

a) $A \downarrow \top$,

b) $A \downarrow \bot$,

c) $A \uparrow \top$,

d) $A \uparrow \bot$.

Exercise 1.42. Convert the formulas below into (full) DNF/CNF and use these forms to decide logical consequence.

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &: \quad \neg(A \Rightarrow (C \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow D))), \\ F_2 &: \quad \neg((A \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow D)), \\ F_3 &: \quad \neg(A \Rightarrow (C \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow (D \Rightarrow A)))). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1.30. The formula F_3 above is a contradiction. That is the only formula for which no full DNF exists. We can reason this out as follows: each minterm in full DNF of a formula A corresponds precisely to one truth valuation v for which $v(A) = 1$ and vice versa, each truth valuation v such that $v(A) = 1$ corresponds to precisely one minterm in full DNF of A. Since $\bot$ is true for no truth valuation there can be no minterm corresponding to it. We just write $\bot$.

Exercise 1.43. Convert the formulas below into (full) DNF/CNF and use these forms to decide logical consequence.

$$E : (A \wedge B) \Rightarrow (C \wedge D), \qquad F : A \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow (C \Rightarrow D)).$$

Exercise 1.44. ** Verify that $A \Rightarrow \bot \models\!\!\!\!\dashv \neg A$. Use this fact to prove that $\{\bot, \Rightarrow\}$ represents a functionally complete system.