

1. Solve the exercise on p. 24, items 1, 4, 5, and 8.

(1)

- (1) F  $q \supset (p \supset q)$
- (2) T  $q$  (1)
- (3) F  $p \supset q$  (1)
- (4) T  $p$  (3)
- (5) F  $q$  (3)
- X(2)

(4)

- (1) F  $[(p \supset r) \wedge (q \supset r)] \wedge (p \vee q) \supset r$
- (2) T  $((p \supset r) \wedge (q \supset r)) \wedge (p \vee q)$  (1)
- (3) F  $r$  (1)
- (4) T  $(p \supset r) \wedge (q \supset r)$  (2)
- (5) F  $p \vee q$  (2)
- (6) T  $p \supset r$  (4)
- (7) T  $q \supset r$  (4)
- (8) T  $p$  (5) | (9) T  $q$  (5) | (13) T  $r$  (7)
- (10) F  $p$  (6) | (11) T  $r$  (6) | (12) F  $q$  (7) | (13) T  $r$  (7)
- X(8) | X(3) | X(9) | X(3)

(5)

- (1) F  $\neg(p \wedge q) \supset (\neg p \vee \neg q)$
- (2) T  $\neg(p \wedge q)$  (1)
- (3) F  $\neg p \vee \neg q$  (1)
- (4) F  $p \wedge q$  (2)
- (5) F  $\neg p$  (3)
- (6) F  $\neg q$  (3)
- (7) F  $p$  (4) | (8) F  $q$  (4)
- (9) T  $p$  (5) | (10) T  $q$  (6)
- X(7) | X(8)

(8)

- (1) F  $(p \vee (q \wedge r)) \supset ((p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r))$
- (2) T  $p \vee (q \wedge r)$  (1)
- (3) F  $(p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$  (1)
- (4) T  $p$  (2) | (5) T  $q \wedge r$  (2)
- (6) F  $p \vee q$  (4) | (7) F  $p \vee r$  (4)
- (8) F  $p$  (6) | (9) F  $p$  (7)
- X(4) | X(4)
- \*
- (10) T  $q$  (5)
- (11) T  $r$  (5)
- (12) F  $p \vee q$  (4) | (13) F  $p \vee r$  (4)
- (14) F  $p$  (12) | (16) F  $p$  (13)
- (15) F  $q$  (12) | (17) F  $r$  (13)
- X(10) | X(11)

2. Recall that a tableaux  $\mathcal{T}$  is complete if all its branches are either closed or complete, where a branch  $\theta$  of a tableaux  $\mathcal{T}$  is complete if for every  $\alpha$  on  $\theta$  both  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  occur on  $\theta$  and if for every  $\beta$  on  $\theta$  at least one of  $\beta_1, \beta_2$  occur on  $\theta$ .

We prove that the tableaux method terminates.

We generate an analytic tableaux for the unsigned formula  $X$  in the following manner. At each stage, we have an ordered dyadic tree  $\mathcal{T}_i$ . In the first stage, we construct the tree  $\mathcal{T}_1$ , a one-point tree whose origin is  $F X$ . In the  $n^{\text{th}}$  stage, we select from  $\mathcal{T}_{n-1}$  the left-most branch  $\theta$  that is unclosed and incomplete. From this branch, we consider all  $\alpha$  on  $\theta$  such that either  $\alpha_1$  or  $\alpha_2$  does not occur on  $\theta$  and all  $\beta$  on  $\theta$  such that neither  $\beta_1$  nor  $\beta_2$  occur on  $\theta$ . We select the  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$  node that dominates all others. If we select an  $\alpha$  node such that  $\alpha_1$  does not occur on  $\theta$ , then extend  $\theta$  by  $\alpha_1$  to form  $\mathcal{T}_n$ . If we select an  $\alpha$  node such that  $\alpha_2$  does not occur on  $\theta$ , then extend  $\theta$  by  $\alpha_2$  to form  $\mathcal{T}_n$ . If we select a  $\beta$  node, then extend  $\theta$  by  $\beta_1, \beta_2$  to form  $\mathcal{T}_n$ .

We show that the above method either closes or completes any branch  $\theta$  by induction on the “size” of the branch. Define  $size(\theta)$  as follows:

$$size(\theta) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \theta \text{ closed or completed} \\ \sum_{x \text{ dominates } y} deg(x) & \text{where } x \text{ is the node selected} \end{cases}$$

Note that an incomplete branch necessarily has an  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$  node selected by the above procedure; furthermore, the degree of an  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$  node is greater than zero. Hence  $size(\theta) > 0$  for any unclosed, incomplete branch.

Suppose  $size(\theta) = 0$ . Then  $\theta$  is closed or complete.

Suppose  $size(\theta) > 0$ . Suppose an  $\alpha$  node is selected. In either one or two steps, we must close or complete  $\theta : \alpha_1 : \alpha_2$ . Note  $size(\theta : \alpha_1 : \alpha_2) < size(\theta)$  because  $deg(\alpha_1) + deg(\alpha_2) < deg(\alpha)$ . Hence, by the induction hypothesis, the method closes or completes the branch. Suppose a  $\beta$  node is selected. Then we must close or complete  $\theta : \beta_1$  and  $\theta : \beta_2$ . Note  $size(\theta : \beta_1) < size(\theta)$  because  $deg(\beta_1) < deg(\beta)$ ; likewise,  $size(\theta : \beta_2) < size(\theta)$  because  $deg(\beta_2) < deg(\beta)$ . Hence, by the induction hypothesis, the method closes or completes both branches.

Hence, the method closes or completes any branch. In particular, the method closes or completes the one-point tree whose origin is  $F X$ . Thus, the tableaux method terminates.

3. We prove that any downward closed set  $S$  satisfying for all signed formulas  $X$ ,  $X \in S$  iff  $\bar{X} \notin S$  is a truth set.

Let  $S$  be a downward closed set satisfying for all signed formulas  $X$ ,  $X \in S$  iff  $\bar{X} \notin S$ . We show that  $S$  satisfies the laws of a truth set:

- (0) Show that for any  $X$ , exactly one of  $X, \bar{X}$  belongs to  $S$ .

Let  $X$  be a signed formula. If  $X \in S$ , then  $\bar{X} \notin S$ , by the definition of  $S$ . If  $X \notin S$ , then  $\bar{X} \in S$ , by the definition of  $S$ . Hence, exactly one of  $X, \bar{X}$  belongs to  $S$ .

- (a) Show  $\alpha \in S$  iff  $\alpha_1 \in S$  and  $\alpha_2 \in S$ .

Consider  $\alpha$ . If  $\alpha \in S$ , then  $\alpha_1 \in S$  and  $\alpha_2 \in S$ , by the definition of downward closed. Suppose  $\alpha_1 \in S$  and  $\alpha_2 \in S$ . By way of contradiction, assume  $\alpha \notin S$ . By the definition of  $S$ ,  $\bar{\alpha} \in S$ . By  $(J_1(a))$ ,  $\bar{\alpha}$  is some  $\beta$ . Hence  $\beta_1 \in S$  or  $\beta_2 \in S$ , by the definition of downward closed. Furthermore, by  $(J_2(b))$ ,  $\bar{\alpha}_1$  is  $\beta_1$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_2$  is  $\beta_2$ . Thus,  $\bar{\alpha}_1 \in S$  or  $\bar{\alpha}_2 \in S$ . If  $\bar{\alpha}_1 \in S$ , then  $\alpha_1 \notin S$ , by definition of  $S$ , but contrary to the assumption. If  $\bar{\alpha}_2 \in S$ , then  $\alpha_2 \notin S$ , by the definition of  $S$ , but contrary to the assumption. Hence  $\alpha \in S$ .

- (b) Show  $\beta \in S$  iff  $\beta_1 \in S$  or  $\beta_2 \in S$ .

Consider  $\beta$ . If  $\beta \in S$ , then  $\beta_1 \in S$  or  $\beta_2 \in S$ , by the definition of downward closed. Suppose  $\beta_1 \in S$  or  $\beta_2 \in S$ . By way of contradiction, assume  $\beta \notin S$ . By the definition of  $S$ ,  $\bar{\beta} \in S$ . By  $(J_1(b))$ ,  $\bar{\beta}$  is some  $\alpha$ . Hence  $\alpha_1 \in S$  and  $\alpha_2 \in S$ , by the definition of downward closed. Furthermore, by  $(J_2(a))$ ,  $\bar{\beta}_1$  is  $\alpha_1$  and  $\bar{\beta}_2$  is  $\alpha_2$ . Thus,  $\bar{\beta}_1 \in S$  and  $\bar{\beta}_2 \in S$ . Hence  $\beta_1 \notin S$  and  $\beta_2 \notin S$ , by the definition of  $S$ , but contrary to the assumption. Hence,  $\beta \in S$ .

4. We give a recursive datatype definition for an analytic tableau.

```
Form = var: Var +
      neg: Form +
      and: Form * Form +
      or: Form * Form +
      imp: Form * Form
Sign = t: Unit + f: Unit
Tableaux = index: Nat *
          sign: Sign *
          form: Form *
          next: (closed: Int +
                complete: Unit +
                alpha: Int * Tableaux +
                beta: Int * Tableaux * Tableaux)
```