

CS250: Discrete Math for Computer Science

L4: PropCalc: Tautologies, Satisfiability, Equivalence

Definition of Propositional Connectives

via Truth Tables:

Today just concentrate on \sim, \wedge, \vee

world	p	q	T	F	$\sim p$	$p \wedge q$	$p \vee q$	$p \oplus q$
W_3	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
W_2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
W_1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
W_0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0

Definition of Propositional Connectives

via Truth Tables:

Today just concentrate on \sim, \wedge, \vee

world	p	q	T	F	$\sim p$	$p \wedge q$	$p \vee q$	$p \oplus q$
W_3	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
W_2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
W_1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
W_0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0

via functions: $\sim : \text{bool} \rightarrow \text{bool}; \quad \wedge, \vee, \oplus : \text{bool}^2 \rightarrow \text{bool} \quad \text{bool} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{0, 1\}$

$$\mathbf{T} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$$

$$\mathbf{F} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$$

$$\sim p \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 - p$$

$$p \wedge q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min(p, q)$$

$$p \vee q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max(p, q)$$

$$p \rightarrow q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sim p \vee q$$

$$p \leftrightarrow q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$$

$$p \oplus q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (p + q) \bmod 2$$

Definition of Propositional Connectives

via Truth Tables:

Today just concentrate on \sim, \wedge, \vee

world	p	q	T	F	$\sim p$	$p \wedge q$	$p \vee q$	$p \oplus q$
W_3	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
W_2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
W_1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
W_0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0

Key Idea: $W_i : \{p_1, \dots, p_n\} \rightarrow \text{bool}$ W_0, \dots, W_{2^n-1}
lines of truth table = valuations = possible worlds

via functions: $\sim : \text{bool} \rightarrow \text{bool}; \quad \wedge, \vee, \oplus : \text{bool}^2 \rightarrow \text{bool} \quad \text{bool} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{0, 1\}$

T	$\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$	F	$\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$
$\sim p$	$\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 - p$	$p \wedge q$	$\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min(p, q)$
$p \vee q$	$\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max(p, q)$	$p \rightarrow q$	$\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sim p \vee q$
$p \leftrightarrow q$	$\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$	$p \oplus q$	$\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (p + q) \bmod 2$

possible worlds lines of truth table

W_0, \dots, W_{2^n-1}

valuations

$W_i : \{p_1, \dots, p_n\} \rightarrow \text{bool}$

world	p	q	T	F	$\sim p$	$p \wedge q$	$p \vee q$	$p \oplus q$
W_3	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
W_2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
W_1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
W_0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0

possible worlds

W_0, \dots, W_{2^n-1}

lines of truth table

valuations

$W_i : \{p_1, \dots, p_n\} \rightarrow \text{bool}$

world	p	q	T	F	$\sim p$	$p \wedge q$	$p \vee q$	$p \oplus q$
W_3	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
W_2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
W_1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
W_0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0

iClicker 4.1 $\sim p$ is true in which of the above worlds?

A: all of them

B: none of them

C: W_0 and W_1

D: W_2 and W_3

possible worlds lines of truth table

W_0, \dots, W_{2^n-1}

valuations

$W_i : \{p_1, \dots, p_n\} \rightarrow \text{bool}$

world	p	q	T	F	$\sim p$	$p \wedge q$	$p \vee q$	$p \oplus q$
W_3	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
W_2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
W_1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
W_0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0

possible worlds lines of truth table

W_0, \dots, W_{2^n-1}

valuations

$W_i : \{p_1, \dots, p_n\} \rightarrow \text{bool}$

world	p	q	T	F	$\sim p$	$p \wedge q$	$p \vee q$	$p \oplus q$
W_3	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
W_2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
W_1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
W_0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0

iClicker 4.2 $(p \vee q) \wedge \sim(p \wedge q)$ is true in which of the above worlds?

A: none of them

B: W_1 and W_2

C: just W_3

D: just W_1

Tautologies, Contradictions, and Satisfiability

- ▶ A **tautology** (**Taut**) is a PropCalc formula such that every row of its truth table is 1, i.e., it is true in **all worlds**,

world	p	q	$\sim p$	$p \vee \sim p$	$p \wedge \sim p$	$p \wedge q$
W_3	1	1	0	1	0	1
W_2	1	0	0	1	0	0
W_1	0	1	1	1	0	0
W_0	0	0	1	1	0	0

Tautologies, Contradictions, and Satisfiability

- ▶ A **tautology** (**Taut**) is a PropCalc formula such that every row of its truth table is 1, i.e., it is true in **all worlds**, e.g., $p \vee \sim p \in \mathbf{Taut}$.

world	p	q	$\sim p$	Taut $p \vee \sim p$	$p \wedge \sim p$	$p \wedge q$
W_3	1	1	0	1	0	1
W_2	1	0	0	1	0	0
W_1	0	1	1	1	0	0
W_0	0	0	1	1	0	0

Tautologies, Contradictions, and Satisfiability

- ▶ A **tautology (Taut)** is a PropCalc formula such that every row of its truth table is 1, i.e., it is true in **all worlds**, e.g., $p \vee \sim p \in \mathbf{Taut}$.
- ▶ A **contradiction (unSAT)** is a PropCalc formula whose truth table is all 0's, i.e. it is true in **no world**,

world	p	q	$\sim p$	Taut $p \vee \sim p$	$p \wedge \sim p$	$p \wedge q$
W_3	1	1	0	1	0	1
W_2	1	0	0	1	0	0
W_1	0	1	1	1	0	0
W_0	0	0	1	1	0	0

Tautologies, Contradictions, and Satisfiability

- ▶ A **tautology (Taut)** is a PropCalc formula such that every row of its truth table is 1, i.e., it is true in **all worlds**, e.g., $p \vee \sim p \in \mathbf{Taut}$.
- ▶ A **contradiction (unSAT)** is a PropCalc formula whose truth table is all 0's, i.e. it is true in **no world**, e.g., $p \wedge \sim p \in \mathbf{unSAT}$.

world	p	q	$\sim p$	Taut $p \vee \sim p$	unSAT $p \wedge \sim p$	$p \wedge q$
W_3	1	1	0	1	0	1
W_2	1	0	0	1	0	0
W_1	0	1	1	1	0	0
W_0	0	0	1	1	0	0

Tautologies, Contradictions, and Satisfiability

- ▶ A **tautology (Taut)** is a PropCalc formula such that every row of its truth table is 1, i.e., it is true in **all worlds**, e.g., $p \vee \sim p \in \mathbf{Taut}$.
- ▶ A **contradiction (unSAT)** is a PropCalc formula whose truth table is all 0's, i.e. it is true in **no world**, e.g., $p \wedge \sim p \in \mathbf{unSAT}$.
- ▶ A PropCalc formula is **satisfiable (SAT)** iff it is not a contradiction, i.e., it is true in **some world**,

world	p	q	$\sim p$	Taut $p \vee \sim p$	unSAT $p \wedge \sim p$	$p \wedge q$
W_3	1	1	0	1	0	1
W_2	1	0	0	1	0	0
W_1	0	1	1	1	0	0
W_0	0	0	1	1	0	0

Tautologies, Contradictions, and Satisfiability

- ▶ A **tautology (Taut)** is a PropCalc formula such that every row of its truth table is 1, i.e., it is true in **all worlds**, e.g., $p \vee \sim p \in \mathbf{Taut}$.
- ▶ A **contradiction (unSAT)** is a PropCalc formula whose truth table is all 0's, i.e. it is true in **no world**, e.g., $p \wedge \sim p \in \mathbf{unSAT}$.
- ▶ A PropCalc formula is **satisfiable (SAT)** iff it is not a contradiction, i.e., it is true in **some world**, e.g., $p, q, \sim p, p \vee \sim p, p \wedge q \in \mathbf{SAT}$.

	SAT	SAT	SAT	SAT Taut	unSAT	SAT
world	p	q	$\sim p$	$p \vee \sim p$	$p \wedge \sim p$	$p \wedge q$
W_3	1	1	0	1	0	1
W_2	1	0	0	1	0	0
W_1	0	1	1	1	0	0
W_0	0	0	1	1	0	0

iClicker 4.3 $p \vee (\sim p \wedge q)$ is ?

A: Taut

B: unSAT

C: neither, i.e., **SAT** but not **Taut**

world	p	q	$\sim p$	$p \vee (\sim p \wedge q)$
W_3	1	1	0	
W_2	1	0	0	
W_1	0	1	1	
W_0	0	0	1	

R4 Quiz Answers

Is the following PropForm a tautology (**Taut**), a contradiction (**unSAT**), or neither (**SAT** - **Taut**) ?

1. $\sim\sim p \vee p$ **SAT** – **Taut**

R4 Quiz Answers

Is the following PropForm a tautology (**Taut**), a contradiction (**unSAT**), or neither (**SAT** - **Taut**) ?

1. $\sim\sim p \vee p$ **SAT** – **Taut**

2. $\sim\sim p \vee \sim p$ **Taut**

R4 Quiz Answers

Is the following PropForm a tautology (**Taut**), a contradiction (**unSAT**), or neither (**SAT** - **Taut**) ?

1. $\sim\sim p \vee p$ **SAT** – **Taut**

2. $\sim\sim p \vee \sim p$ **Taut**

3. $p \oplus p$ **unSAT**

R4 Quiz Answers

Is the following PropForm a tautology (**Taut**), a contradiction (**unSAT**), or neither (**SAT** - **Taut**) ?

1. $\sim\sim p \vee p$ **SAT** – **Taut**

2. $\sim\sim p \vee \sim p$ **Taut**

3. $p \oplus p$ **unSAT**

4. $p \oplus \sim p$ **Taut**

R4 Quiz Answers

Is the following PropForm a tautology (**Taut**), a contradiction (**unSAT**), or neither (**SAT** - **Taut**) ?

1. $\sim\sim p \vee p$ **SAT** – **Taut**

2. $\sim\sim p \vee \sim p$ **Taut**

3. $p \oplus p$ **unSAT**

4. $p \oplus \sim p$ **Taut**

5. $p \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$ **SAT** – **Taut**

R4 Quiz Answers

Is the following PropForm a tautology (**Taut**), a contradiction (**unSAT**), or neither (**SAT - Taut**) ?

1. $\sim\sim p \vee p$ **SAT** – **Taut**
2. $\sim\sim p \vee \sim p$ **Taut**
3. $p \oplus p$ **unSAT**
4. $p \oplus \sim p$ **Taut**
5. $p \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$ **SAT** – **Taut**
6. $(p \wedge q) \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$ **SAT** – **Taut**

R4 Quiz Answers

Is the following PropForm a tautology (**Taut**), a contradiction (**unSAT**), or neither (**SAT - Taut**) ?

1. $\sim\sim p \vee p$ **SAT** – **Taut**
2. $\sim\sim p \vee \sim p$ **Taut**
3. $p \oplus p$ **unSAT**
4. $p \oplus \sim p$ **Taut**
5. $p \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$ **SAT** – **Taut**
6. $(p \wedge q) \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$ **SAT** – **Taut**
7. $(p \wedge q) \wedge (\sim p \vee \sim q)$ **unSAT**

R4 Quiz Answers

Is the following PropForm a tautology (**Taut**), a contradiction (**unSAT**), or neither (**SAT - Taut**) ?

1. $\sim\sim p \vee p$ **SAT** – **Taut**
2. $\sim\sim p \vee \sim p$ **Taut**
3. $p \oplus p$ **unSAT**
4. $p \oplus \sim p$ **Taut**
5. $p \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$ **SAT** – **Taut**
6. $(p \wedge q) \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$ **SAT** – **Taut**
7. $(p \wedge q) \wedge (\sim p \vee \sim q)$ **unSAT**
8. $(p \oplus q) \wedge (\mathbf{T} \wedge p) \wedge (\mathbf{F} \vee q)$ **unSAT**

R4 Quiz Answers

Is the following PropForm a tautology (**Taut**), a contradiction (**unSAT**), or neither (**SAT - Taut**) ?

1. $\sim\sim p \vee p$ **SAT** – **Taut**
2. $\sim\sim p \vee \sim p$ **Taut**
3. $p \oplus p$ **unSAT**
4. $p \oplus \sim p$ **Taut**
5. $p \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$ **SAT** – **Taut**
6. $(p \wedge q) \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$ **SAT** – **Taut**
7. $(p \wedge q) \wedge (\sim p \vee \sim q)$ **unSAT**
8. $(p \oplus q) \wedge (\mathbf{T} \wedge p) \wedge (\mathbf{F} \vee q)$ **unSAT**
9. $(p \oplus q) \vee (p \wedge q) \vee (\sim p \vee \sim q)$ **Taut**

R4 Quiz Answers

Is the following PropForm a tautology (**Taut**), a contradiction (**unSAT**), or neither (**SAT - Taut**) ?

1. $\sim\sim p \vee p$ **SAT** – **Taut**
2. $\sim\sim p \vee \sim p$ **Taut**
3. $p \oplus p$ **unSAT**
4. $p \oplus \sim p$ **Taut**
5. $p \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$ **SAT** – **Taut**
6. $(p \wedge q) \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$ **SAT** – **Taut**
7. $(p \wedge q) \wedge (\sim p \vee \sim q)$ **unSAT**
8. $(p \oplus q) \wedge (\mathbf{T} \wedge p) \wedge (\mathbf{F} \vee q)$ **unSAT**
9. $(p \oplus q) \vee (p \wedge q) \vee (\sim p \vee \sim q)$ **Taut**
10. $(p \wedge q) \vee (\sim p \vee \sim q)$ **Taut**

Knights and Knaves

[Smullyan, *What Is the Name of This Book?*]

Knights always truthful; Knaves always lie; $A, B \in \{Kt, Kv\}$

B : “ A & B opposite types”

Knights and Knaves

[Smullyan, *What Is the Name of This Book?*]

Knights always truthful; Knaves always lie; $A, B \in \{Kt, Kv\}$

A : “ B is Kt”

B : “ A & B opposite types”

Knights and Knaves

[Smullyan, *What Is the Name of This Book?*]

Knights always truthful; Knaves always lie; $A, B \in \{Kt, Kv\}$

A : “ B is Kt”

B : “ A & B opposite types”

$T_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B$ is a Kt

$T_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A$ & B opposite types

Knights and Knaves

[Smullyan, *What Is the Name of This Book?*]

Knights always truthful; Knaves always lie; $A, B \in \{Kt, Kv\}$

$S_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A : "B \text{ is Kt}"$ $S_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B : "A \& B \text{ opposite types}"$

$T_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B \text{ is a Kt}$ $T_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A \& B \text{ opposite types}$

Knights and Knaves

[Smullyan, *What Is the Name of This Book?*]

Knights always truthful; Knaves always lie; $A, B \in \{Kt, Kv\}$

$S_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A : "B \text{ is Kt}"$ $S_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B : "A \& B \text{ opposite types}"$

$T_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B \text{ is a Kt}$ $T_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A \& B \text{ opposite types}$

$S_1 = T_1 \leftrightarrow A \text{ is Kt}$ $S_2 = T_2 \leftrightarrow B \text{ is Kt}$

Knights and Knaves

[Smullyan, *What Is the Name of This Book?*]

Knights always truthful; Knaves always lie; $A, B \in \{Kt, Kv\}$

$S_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A : "B \text{ is Kt}"$ $S_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B : "A \& B \text{ opposite types}"$

$T_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B \text{ is a Kt}$ $T_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A \& B \text{ opposite types}$

$S_1 = T_1 \leftrightarrow A \text{ is Kt}$ $S_2 = T_2 \leftrightarrow B \text{ is Kt}$

w	A is Kt	B is Kt	T_1	T_2	$T_1 \leftrightarrow A \text{ is Kt}$	$T_2 \leftrightarrow B \text{ is Kt}$
W_3	1	1	1	0	1	0
W_2	1	0	0	1	0	0
W_1	0	1	1	1	0	1
W_0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Knights and Knaves

[Smullyan, *What Is the Name of This Book?*]

Knights always truthful; Knaves always lie; $A, B \in \{Kt, Kv\}$

$S_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A : "B \text{ is Kt}"$ $S_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B : "A \& B \text{ opposite types}"$

$T_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B \text{ is a Kt}$ $T_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A \& B \text{ opposite types}$

$S_1 = T_1 \leftrightarrow A \text{ is Kt}$ $S_2 = T_2 \leftrightarrow B \text{ is Kt}$

w	A is Kt	B is Kt	T_1	T_2	$T_1 \leftrightarrow A \text{ is Kt}$	$T_2 \leftrightarrow B \text{ is Kt}$
W_3	1	1	1	0	1	0
W_2	1	0	0	1	0	0
W_1	0	1	1	1	0	1
W_0	0	0	0	0	1	1

W_0 is only world satisfying $S_1 \wedge S_2$.

Knights and Knaves

[Smullyan, *What Is the Name of This Book?*]

Knights always truthful; Knaves always lie; $A, B \in \{Kt, Kv\}$

$S_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A : "B \text{ is Kt}"$ $S_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B : "A \& B \text{ opposite types}"$

$T_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B \text{ is a Kt}$ $T_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A \& B \text{ opposite types}$

$S_1 = T_1 \leftrightarrow A \text{ is Kt}$ $S_2 = T_2 \leftrightarrow B \text{ is Kt}$

w	A is Kt	B is Kt	T_1	T_2	$T_1 \leftrightarrow A \text{ is Kt}$	$T_2 \leftrightarrow B \text{ is Kt}$
W_3	1	1	1	0	1	0
W_2	1	0	0	1	0	0
W_1	0	1	1	1	0	1
W_0	0	0	0	0	1	1

W_0 is only world satisfying $S_1 \wedge S_2$.

Thus A and B are both Knaves.

R4 Quiz Answers

Do the following equivalences hold?

1. $\mathbf{T} \equiv p \oplus \sim p$

yes

R4 Quiz Answers

Do the following equivalences hold?

1. $\mathbf{T} \equiv p \oplus \sim p$

yes

2. $q \wedge p \equiv p \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$

yes

R4 Quiz Answers

Do the following equivalences hold?

1. $\mathbf{T} \equiv p \oplus \sim p$ yes

2. $q \wedge p \equiv p \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$ yes

3. $\sim p \vee q \equiv q \vee p$ no

R4 Quiz Answers

Do the following equivalences hold?

1. $\mathbf{T} \equiv p \oplus \sim p$ yes

2. $q \wedge p \equiv p \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$ yes

3. $\sim p \vee q \equiv q \vee p$ no

4. $\sim p \vee q \equiv \sim q \vee p$ no

R4 Quiz Answers

Do the following equivalences hold?

1. $\mathbf{T} \equiv p \oplus \sim p$ yes

2. $q \wedge p \equiv p \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$ yes

3. $\sim p \vee q \equiv q \vee p$ no

4. $\sim p \vee q \equiv \sim q \vee p$ no

5. $(p \wedge \sim q) \equiv \sim(\sim p \vee q)$ yes