

CS3304 Logic – Problem Sheet 2

September 20, 2016, Lecturer: Claas Röver

QUESTION 1. James, Kevin and Michael are suspected of income tax evasion. They testify under oath as follows.

JAMES: Kevin is guilty and Michael is innocent.

KEVIN: If James is guilty, then so is Michael.

MICHAEL: I'm innocent, but at least one of the others is guilty.

Let J, K, M be the statements, "James is innocent", "Kevin is innocent", "Michael is innocent", respectively. Express the testimony of each suspect by a proposition, and write out truth tables for these three statements in parallel columns. Now answer the following questions.

- (a) Are the testimonies of the three suspects consistent?
- (b) The testimony of one suspect follows from that of another. Which from which?
- (c) Assuming everybody is innocent, who committed perjury?
- (d) Assuming everyone's testimony is true, who is innocent and who is guilty?
- (e) Assuming that the innocent told the truth and the guilty told lies, who is innocent and who is guilty?

QUESTION 2. Decide whether the set of propositions

$$A \rightarrow C, C \vee B \vee D, (D \vee C) \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C) \text{ and } \neg C \vee \neg A$$

is (a) inconsistent, (b) satisfiable, (c) a tautology.

QUESTION 3. Using semantic tableaux, decide whether the following arguments are valid.

- (a) If Aoife is 18 years old and holds a drivers licence, then she is allowed to drive a car. Aoife is not allowed to drive a car. Therefore she is not 18 years old.
- (b) If Aoife is 18 years old, then if she holds a drivers licence, then she is allowed to drive a car. Aoife is not allowed to drive a car. Therefore she does not hold a drivers licence.
- (c) If Aoife is 18 years old, then if she holds a drivers licence, then she is allowed to drive a car. Aoife is 18 years old. Aoife is not allowed to drive a car. Therefore she does not hold a drivers licence.

QUESTION 4. True or false? In the following A is a statement and \mathcal{S} is a set of statements.

- (a) Every tautology is satisfiable.
- (b) If \mathcal{S} is inconsistent, then \mathcal{S} is satisfiable.
- (c) A is a tautology if and only if $\neg A$ is unsatisfiable.
- (d) If \mathcal{S} is inconsistent, then $\mathcal{S} \cup \{A\}$ is inconsistent.
- (e) If \mathcal{S} is satisfiable, then $\mathcal{S} \cup \{A\}$ is satisfiable.
- (f) If $\mathcal{S} \cup \{A\}$ is satisfiable, then \mathcal{S} is satisfiable.
- (g) If $\mathcal{S} \cup \{A\}$ is inconsistent, then \mathcal{S} is inconsistent.