

### **Key Points**

- logical deduction is applying rules to a set of premises to generate conclusions
  - a mechanical process logical deduction is a form of computation
- propositional logic deals with statements that have truth values (true/false)
- this is foundational

CPSC 229: Foundations of Computation • Spring 2024

- computers are built of circuits that implement operations on on/off (true/false) values
- logical deduction provides a way to generate new knowledge without having to explicitly store every fact

Logic and Proof

### Objectives

### objectives

- learn the rules of logic and understand why they are valid
- be able to apply the rules of logic in both symbolic form and English to generate new conclusions and to prove or disprove particular statements

CPSC 229: Foundations of Computation • Spring 2024

### Key Points – Propositional Logic

- definitions proposition, propositional variable, mathematical generality
- logical operators
  - symbols and meaning
  - precedence rules
  - meaning of associativity
- truth tables
- terms and concepts contrapositive, converse, tautology, logical equivalence, contradiction
- applying propositional logic to English statements

### Propositional Logic

- a proposition is a statement that has a truth value (true or false)
- a *propositional variable* is a name that stands in for a specific proposition
  - conventionally a lowercase letter p, q, r
  - allows for mathematical generality a statement about p holds for every possible proposition to p could represent
- a compound proposition combines simpler propositions and logical operators
  - conventionally represented by a capital letter P(Q, R)

# Logical Operators

CPSC 229: Foundations of Computation . Spring 2024

q and q or not implies,	~	AND OR NOT	both $p$ and $q$ true only when both $p$ and $q$ are true, otherwise false either $p$ or $q$ , or both true only when at least one of $p$ and $q$ are true false only when both $p$ and $q$ are false the opposite of $p$
not implies,	~		true only when at least one of $p$ and $q$ are true false only when both $p$ and $q$ are false the opposite of $p$
implies,	~	NOT	
			true when p is false, false when p is true
q or if p then q		IMPLIES	both $p$ and $q$ are true, or $p$ is false false only when $p$ is true and $q$ is false, otherwise true
q if and only if	≡, ⇔	IFF	p implies $q$ , and $q$ implies $ptrue only when p and q have the same value(either both true or both false), false when pand q have different values$
q xor		XOR	either $p$ or $q$ , but not both true only when $p$ and $q$ have different values (one is true and the other false), false when $p$ and $q$ have the same value (both true or both false)
	q if and only if	q if and ≡, ⇔	q if and ≡, ⇔ IFF

### **Truth Tables**

CPSC 229: Foundations of Computation • Spring 2024

- a truth table expresses the value of a compound proposition for each combination of values for its propositional variables
- can be used to define operators or show logical equivalence

$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	
false     true     false     true     false     false <t< th=""><th><math>r \mid p \land (q \land r)</math></th></t<>	$r \mid p \land (q \land r)$
true false false false true true true true true true true tru	false
true true true true false true false true false true false false true false fa	false
true false f	false
true false true false false false	false
	false
	false
true true false true false	false
true true true true true true	true
CPSC 229: Foundations of Computation   Spring 2024	

### Precedence

- need an unambiguous interpretation of a compound proposition involving multiple operators
- from highest to lowest:  $\neg$ ,  $\land$ ,  $\lor$  and  $\oplus$ ,  $\rightarrow$ ,  $\leftrightarrow$
- priority is left to right in a series of operators of equal precedence
- use parentheses to override precedence or add clarity

in which the op	erators are evaluated:			
a) $\neg p \lor q$	a) $\neg p \lor q$ b) $p \land q \lor \neg p$		d) $p \land \neg q \lor q$	
a) $\psi \lor q$	b) $p \land q \lor p$	c) $p \lor q \land r$	u) p / · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

## Terms and Concepts

- *P* is a *tautology* if and only if it is true for all possible combinations of truth values for its propositional variables
- *P* is a *contradiction* if and only if it is false for all possible combinations of truth values for its propositional variables

4. Some of the following compound propositions are tautologies, some are contradictions, and some are neither. In each case, use a truth table to decide to which of these categories the proposition belongs:
a) (p ∧ (p → q)) → q
b) ((p → q) ∧ (q → r)) → (p → r)
c) x ∧ (-x)
d) (p ∧ (p ∧ q)) → (p → c)

e) 
$$p \land (\neg p)$$
  
e)  $p \lor (\neg p)$ 

d)  $(p \lor q) \to (p \land q)$ f)  $(p \land q) \to (p \lor q)$ 

CPSC 229: Foundations of Computation • Spring 2024

**Terms and Concepts** •  $p \rightarrow q$  is an implication

(¬q) → (¬p) is the contrapositive of p → q
 an implication is logically equivalent to its contrapositive

If this is Tuesday, then we are in Belgium. If we aren't in Belgium, then this isn't Tuesday.

- $q \rightarrow p$  is the *converse* of  $p \rightarrow q$ 
  - an implication is *not* logically equivalent to its converse

If this is Tuesday, then we are in Belgium. If we are in Belgium, then this is Tuesday. maybe we spend both Tuesday and Wednesday in Belgium

 $\bigcirc$ 

CPSC 229: Foundations of Computation • Spring 2024

P and Q are logically equivitautology - written $P \equiv Q$	valent if and only if $P \leftrightarrow Q$ is a
<b>5.</b> Use truth tables to show that each equivalent to $p \leftrightarrow q$ .	of the following propositions is logically
	of the following propositions is logically <b>b</b> ) $(\neg p) \leftrightarrow (\neg q)$ <b>d</b> ) $\neg (p \oplus q)$

### Reasoning with Propositional Logic

- a proposition is expressed in English as a sentence which says something (the *predicate*) about the sentence's subject
- a caution

CPSC 229: Foundations of Computation . Spring 2024

 English can express more and is more ambiguous than propositional logic

But English is a little too rich for mathematical logic. When you read the sentence "I wanted to leave and I left," you probably see a connotation of causality: 1 left *because* I wanted to leave. This implication does not follow from the logical combination of the truth values of the two propositions "I wanted to leave" and "I left." Or consider the proposition "I wanted to leave but I did not leave." Here, the word "but" has the same *logical* meaning as the word "and," but the connotation is very different. So, in

### Implication and Deduction

• $p \rightarrow q$ is true only if both $p$ and $q$ are true, or if $p$ is false					
I say – If the party is on Tuesday, then I'll be there.	$p \rightarrow q$ is true				
The party is on Tuesday. Will I be there?	p is true, is q?				
yes, because when $p$ is true, $p \rightarrow q$ is only true if $q$ also is					
I say – If the party is on Tuesday, then I'll be there.	$p \rightarrow q$ is true				
The party is on Friday. Will I be there?	<i>p</i> is not true, is <i>q</i> ?				
who knows? $p \rightarrow q$ is only true if $p$ is false, regardless of whether $q$ is true					

# <text><text><text><text><text><text>

7. Let *p* represent the proposition "You leave" and let *q* represent the proposition "I leave." Express the following sentences as compound propositions using pand q, and show that they are logically equivalent: a) Either you leave or I do. (Or both!) b) If you don't leave, I will. 8. Suppose that *m* represents the proposition "The Earth moves," *c* represents "The Earth is the center of the universe," and q represents "Galileo was railroaded." Translate each of the following compound propositions into English: a)  $\neg g \wedge c$ b)  $m \rightarrow \neg c$ c)  $m \leftrightarrow \neg c$ d)  $(m \to g) \land (c \to \neg g)$ 9. Give the converse and the contrapositive of each of the following English sentences: a) If you are good, Santa brings you toys. b) If the package weighs more than one ounce, then you need extra postage. c) If I have a choice, I don't eat eggplant. CPSC 229: Foundations of Computation • Spring 2024

## Writing Up Solutions

- "writing up a solution" is a thing
  - a separate step from figuring out the solution
  - not necessarily or only a dump of the process you went through to find the solution
- give the solution *and* provide support for the solution
  - "support" provides evidence for the correctness of the solution
  - unsupported answers will receive little or no credit
- writeup should be organized, neat, and readable
  - write English in sentences, use paragraphs, etc
  - don't waste time recopying if there's a small mistake, but it should be more polished than an evolving draft
- typing is encouraged
  - encourages revision
  - OK to handwrite e.g. if typing isn't time-efficient for particular content

-

.7