

CS 70 Su23: Lecture 1

Propositional logic

Propositions

- A proposition is a statement that is either **true** or **false**
- Examples of propositions
 - $2 + 2 = 4$
 - $2 + 2 = 5$
 - Victor took BART to get to class
- Examples that are **not** propositions
 - $2 + 2$
 - $x + 2 = 5$
 - This statement is false
 - Victor is the best thing that has ever happened to CS 70

P, Q, R, and friends

- We bind propositions to variables to make them easier to work with
- Some common operations on propositions:
 - **Conjunction:** $P \wedge Q$
 - "P and Q"
 - True only when both P and Q are true
 - **Disjunction:** $P \vee Q$
 - "P or Q"
 - True when at least one of P and Q is true
 - **Negation:** $\neg P$
 - "not P"
 - True when P is false
 - These are called *propositional forms* (the result is itself a proposition)
- If this sounds similar to booleans, that's no coincidence
 - They're not exactly the same, but we won't go into details in this class

Truth tables

Enumeration of all possible values for propositions

P	Q	$P \wedge Q$	$P \vee Q$	$\neg P$	$\neg P \wedge \neg Q$	$\neg P \vee Q$
T	T	T	T	F	F	T
T	F	F	T	F	F	F
F	T	F	T	T	F	T
F	F	F	F	T	T	T

A quick detour

Consider the following code snippet:

```
1  def some_func(x):  
2      if x == 5:  
3          return 3  
4      ...
```

Take note of the ellipses! More can happen afterwards

Now consider the following input/output:

```
>>> some_func(5)
```

```
3
```

```
>>> some_func(5)
```

```
12
```

```
>>> some_func(1)
```

```
3
```

```
>>> some_func(1)
```

```
14
```

Which of these would convince us there was an error executing this code?

A quick detour

Let's write this test up:

```
def test(x):  
    """returns True if we pass, False if not"""  
    if x == 5 and some_func(x) != 3:  
        return False  
    return True
```

Simplifying:

```
def test(x):  
    return not (x == 5 and some_func(x) != 3)
```

A quick detour

Now let's draw out the truth table for this:

- Let **P** = `x == 5`
- **Q** = `some_func(x) == 3`
- **R** = `test(x)`

P	Q	R	$\neg P \vee Q$
T	T	T	T
T	F	F	F
F	T	T	T
F	F	T	T

Implication

This logical construction is so useful that it has its own name (and notation):

- **Implication: $P \Rightarrow Q$** (read as “P implies Q” or “if P, then Q”)
 - $P \Rightarrow Q$ itself is either **true** or **false**, meaning that **it is also a proposition!**

Some terminology:

- P is the *antecedent* (or hypothesis/premise)
- Q is the *consequent* (or conclusion/outcome)
- Two propositional forms are **logically equivalent** if their truth tables are identical (for example, $P \Rightarrow Q \equiv \neg P \vee Q$)

Implication

Some example implications:

- If you stand in the rain, you will get wet
- If your total score is around 50%, you will receive some flavor of B
- If pigs can fly, cats can talk
 - implications for which P is always false are called “vacuously true”
- If you ask Victor if he likes boba, he will say yes

Implication is the basis for much of mathematics

Implication

We can define some other terms from an implication:

- The **converse** of $P \Rightarrow Q$ is $Q \Rightarrow P$
- The **contrapositive** of $P \Rightarrow Q$ is $\neg Q \Rightarrow \neg P$
 - sanity check: implication and contrapositive are logically equivalent

If an implication and its converse are both true, we write this as $P \Leftrightarrow Q$

- read as “**P if and only if Q**” (iff)

Question: $(P \Rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow (Q \Rightarrow P)$? This is true iff $P \Leftrightarrow Q$ (does your head hurt yet?)

Quantifiers

Let's revisit our “not a proposition” from earlier: $x + 2 = 5$

- How do we turn this into a proposition?
 - Let $P(x) = “x + 2 = 5”$ (this is still not a proposition)
 - We need to **quantify** it over some “universe”
- Some examples:
 - $P(3)$: For $x = 3$, $x + 2 = 5$
 - $P(1)$: For $x = 1$, $x + 2 = 5$
 - $P(1) \vee P(3)$: For $x = 1$ or $x = 3$, $x + 2 = 5$
 - For all integers x , $x + 2 = 5$ (universal quantifier)
 - There exists an integer x such that $x + 2 = 5$ (existential quantifier)

Quantifiers

Translating from english to math

- For every integer x , $x + 2 = 5$
 - $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}, x + 2 = 5$
- There exists some integer x such that $x + 2 = 5$
 - $\exists x \in \mathbb{Z}, x + 2 = 5$
- For any integer x , there is some larger integer y
 - $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}, \exists y \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ st } y > x$
 - $(\forall x \in \mathbb{Z})(\exists y \in \mathbb{Z})(y > x)$
- There is a largest integer
 - $\exists y \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ st } \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}, y > x$
 - $(\exists y \in \mathbb{Z})(\forall x \in \mathbb{Z})(y > x)$

DeMorgan's Laws

Naming something after yourself is the old way of commenting “first!”

- $\neg(P \wedge Q) \equiv \neg P \vee \neg Q$
- $\neg(P \vee Q) \equiv \neg P \wedge \neg Q$

A similar property holds for quantifiers:

- $\neg(\forall x P(x)) \equiv \exists x \neg P(x)$
- $\neg(\exists x P(x)) \equiv \forall x \neg P(x)$

Example from earlier: *not* ($x == 5$ and $\text{some_func}(x) != 3$)

- $\neg(x == 5 \wedge \text{some_func}(x) != 3) \equiv x != 5 \vee \text{some_func}(x) == 3$
- Or, with P and Q, $\neg(P \wedge \neg Q) \equiv \neg P \vee Q$

Next class: proofs

Let's put all of this together so we can start **proving** things are true or false!