

COMP30026 Models of Computation

Assignment Project Exam Help

<https://powcoder.com>

Lecture Week 2 Part 2 (Zoom)

Add WeChat powcoder

Assignment Project Exam Help

<https://powcoder.com>

Add WeChat powcoder

Knights and Knaves Puzzle

On the island of Knights and Knaves, everyone is a knight or knave.
Knights always tell the truth. Knaves always lie.

Today there is a census on the island!

You are a census taker, going from house to house. Fill in what you know about each of these three houses.

- **In house 1:** Husband: We are both knaves.

Add WeChat powcoder

Knights and Knaves Puzzle

On the island of Knights and Knaves, everyone is a knight or knave.

Knights always tell the truth. Knaves always lie.

Today there is a census on the island!

You are a census taker, going from house to house. Fill in what you know about each of these three houses.

- **In house 1:** Husband: We are both knaves.

- **In house 2:** Wife: At least one of us is a knave.

Knights and Knaves Puzzle

On the island of Knights and Knaves, everyone is a knight or knave.

Knights always tell the truth. Knaves always lie.

Today there is a census on the island!

You are a census taker, going from house to house. Fill in what you know about each of these three houses.

- **In house 1:** Husband: We are both knaves.
- **In house 2:** Wife: At least one of us is a knave.
- **In house 3:** Husband: If I am a knight then so is my wife.

Knights and Knaves Puzzle

On the island of Knights and Knaves, everyone is a knight or knave.

Knights always tell the truth. Knaves always lie.

Today there is a census on the island!

You are a census taker, going from house to house. Fill in what you know about each of these three houses.

- **In house 1:** Husband: We are both knaves.
- **In house 2:** Wife: At least one of us is a knave.
- **In house 3:** Husband: If I am a knight then so is my wife.

If you like these puzzles, Raymond Smullyan has written several books that you will like.

Assignment Project Exam Help

Before we get to more sophisticated logic and its applications, let us establish a vocabulary and some important concepts.

"The relationship between computation and mathematical logic will be as fruitful in the next century as that between analysis and physics in the last."

John McCarthy

Add WeChat powcoder

Assignment Project Exam Help

A propositional formula is **valid** if no truth assignment makes it false. Otherwise it is **non-valid**.

It is **unsatisfiable** if no truth assignment makes it true. Otherwise it is **satisfiable**.

A valid propositional formula is a **tautology**.

An unsatisfiable propositional formula is a **contradiction**.

<https://powcoder.com>
Add WeChat powcoder

Tautology Example

$(\neg P \wedge Q) \Rightarrow (P \Rightarrow R)$ is valid:

P	Q	R	$\neg P \wedge Q$	$P \Rightarrow R$	$(\neg P \wedge Q) \Rightarrow (P \Rightarrow R)$
f	f	f	f	t	t
f	f	t	f	t	t
f	t	f	t	f	f
f	t	t	t	t	t
t	f	f	f	t	t
t	f	t	f	t	t
t	t	f	f	f	f
t	t	t	f	t	t

Logically, “Valid” Means Vacuous

In ordinary discourse, we may praise somebody by saying “the point you make is valid.”

But in formal logic, a valid statement is not that laudable; in a sense it is void of information. For example, $4 \Rightarrow 4$ is a vacuous statement, and valid.

“If Trump is sane then Trump is sane” tells us nothing about whether Trump is sane—the statement is true whatever the case may be.

You don’t even have to know who Trump is, or what it means to be sane, in order to agree: The statement is inherently true.

Validity Checking in Haskell

Given a truth table for a proposition P , it is easy to check if P is valid. The conjunction of all the entries in P 's column must be true.

To check the validity of 3-place Haskell predicate:

```
valid3 :: (Bool -> Bool -> Bool -> Bool) -> Bool
valid3 f
  = and [f p q r | p <- bs, q <- bs, r <- bs]
  where
    bs = [False, True]
```

Validity Checking in Haskell

Given a truth table for a proposition P , it is easy to check if P is valid. The conjunction of all the entries in P 's column must be true.

To check the validity of 3-place Haskell predicate:

```
valid3 :: (Bool -> Bool -> Bool -> Bool) -> Bool
valid3 f
  = and [f p q r | p <- bs, q <- bs, r <- bs]
  where
    bs = [False, True]
```

Poll 2: What does a function to check satisfiability look like?

Assignment Project Exam Help

$P \wedge Q \wedge \neg(Q \Leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee Q))$ is unsatisfiable.

Again, we can just complete the truth table. However, it is often possible to apply faster reasoning.

In this case, P and Q are conjuncts of the formula, so if a truth assignment maps either to **f**, the formula evaluates to **f**.

And if P and Q are both mapped to **t**, the third conjunct becomes $(\neg \mathbf{t} \Leftrightarrow (\neg \mathbf{t} \vee \mathbf{t}))$, which again evaluates to **f**.

Substitution Preserves Validity + Unsatisfiability

Validity is preserved by **substitution** of propositional letters by formulas.

Assignment Project Exam Help

We saw that $(\neg P \wedge Q) \Rightarrow (P \Rightarrow R)$ is valid, and hence

$$(\neg(A \vee B) \wedge (B \Leftrightarrow C)) \Rightarrow ((A \vee B) \Rightarrow (B \Leftrightarrow C))$$

is valid.

(Different letters can be replaced by the same formula, but of course, all occurrences of a letter must be replaced by the same formula.)

A formula is unsatisfiable iff its negation is valid.

It follows that substitution also preserves unsatisfiability.

Does substitution preserve satisfiability?

Assignment Project Exam Help

<https://powcoder.com>

Add WeChat powcoder

Does substitution preserve satisfiability?

Assignment Project Exam Help

No — a counter-example is easy:

<https://powcoder.com>

Add WeChat powcoder

Assignment Project Exam Help

Does substitution preserve satisfiability?

No — a counter-example is easy:

Take P (which is clearly satisfiable). Then substitute P by $Q \wedge \neg Q$.

The fact that P can be made true does not mean we cannot also make it false.

In fact, the typical propositional formula can be made both true and false; it will simultaneously be satisfiable and non-valid.

Models, Logical Consequence, and Equivalence

Let θ be a truth assignment and F be a propositional formula. If θ makes F true then θ is a model of F .

G is a logical consequence of F iff every model of F is a model of G as well.

In that case we write $F \models G$

If $F \models G$ and $G \models F$ both hold, that is, F and G have exactly the same models, then F and G are (logically) equivalent.

In that case we write $F \equiv G$

Poll 4

Of the following statements, which allow us to conclude $P \Rightarrow Q$?

- $\neg P$
- Q
- $P \Rightarrow (Q \vee R)$
- $(P \vee R) \Rightarrow Q$
- $\neg P \vee Q$
- $\neg Q \Rightarrow \neg P$
- $P \Rightarrow (Q \vee R)$
- $(P \Rightarrow Q) \vee R$

Assignment Project Exam Help

<https://powcoder.com>

Add WeChat powcoder

Poll 4

Of the following statements, which allow us to conclude $P \Rightarrow Q$?

Assignment Project Exam Help

- $\neg P$
- Q
- $P \Rightarrow (Q \vee R)$
- $(P \vee R) \Rightarrow Q$
- $\neg P \vee Q$
- $\neg Q \Rightarrow \neg P$
- $P \Rightarrow (Q \vee R)$
- $(P \Rightarrow Q) \vee R$

<https://powcoder.com>

Add WeChat powcoder

Which of the statements are logical consequences of $P \Rightarrow Q$?

Assignment Project Exam Help

If $F \equiv G$ and F' and G' are the results of replacing each occurrence of letter P (in both) with formula H , then $F' \equiv G'$.

Add WeChat powcoder

Interchange of Equivalents

Replacing equals by equals yields equals. If

Assignment Project Exam Help

- 1 F is a sub-formula of H ,
- 2 $F \equiv G$, and
- 3 H' is the result of replacing F in H by G ,

<https://powcoder.com>

then $H \equiv H'$.

Interchange of equivalents preserves not only logical equivalence.

Add WeChat powcoder

It also preserves logical consequence, validity, and unsatisfiability.

Unlike substitution, it even preserves satisfiability.

Absorption:

$$P \wedge P \equiv P$$

$$P \vee P \equiv P$$

Commutativity:

$$P \wedge Q \equiv Q \wedge P$$

$$P \vee Q \equiv Q \vee P$$

Associativity:

$$P \wedge (Q \wedge R) \equiv (P \wedge Q) \wedge R$$

$$P \vee (Q \vee R) \equiv (P \vee Q) \vee R$$

Distributivity:

$$P \wedge (Q \vee R) \equiv (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge R)$$

$$P \vee (Q \wedge R) \equiv (P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R)$$

More Equivalences

\Leftrightarrow and \oplus are also commutative and associative.

Double negation: $P \equiv \neg \neg P$

Assignment Project Exam Help

De Morgan: $\neg(P \wedge Q) \equiv \neg P \vee \neg Q$

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

<https://powcoder.com>

Implication: $P \Rightarrow Q \equiv \neg P \vee Q$

Contraposition: $\neg P \Rightarrow \neg Q \equiv Q \Rightarrow P$
 $P \Rightarrow \neg Q \equiv Q \Rightarrow \neg P$
 $\neg P \Rightarrow Q \equiv \neg Q \Rightarrow P$

Add WeChat powcoder

Biimplication: $P \Leftrightarrow Q \equiv (P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$

Assignment Project Exam Help

Find an alternative way of writing bimplication—as a conjunction.

Add WeChat powcoder

Last Equivalences

Let \perp be any unsatisfiable formula and let \top be any valid formula.

Duality:

$$\neg \neg P \equiv P$$

Negation from absurdity: $P \Rightarrow \perp \equiv \neg P$

Identity:

$$P \vee \perp \equiv P$$
$$P \wedge \top \equiv P$$

Dominance:

$$P \wedge \perp \equiv \perp$$
$$P \vee \top \equiv \top$$

Contradiction:

$$P \wedge \neg P \equiv \perp$$

Excluded middle:

$$P \vee \neg P \equiv \top$$

Assignment Project Exam Help

<https://powcoder.com>

Add WeChat powcoder

Assignment Project Exam Help

Which of these claims hold?

1 $P \Rightarrow Q \equiv (Q \Rightarrow (P \vee Q))$

2 $(P \Rightarrow Q) \wedge (P \Rightarrow R) \equiv P \Rightarrow (Q \wedge R)$

3 $(P \Rightarrow R) \wedge (Q \Rightarrow R) \models (P \wedge Q) \Rightarrow R$

Add WeChat powcoder

Assignment Project Exam Help

Learn how symbolic manipulation beats truth tables.

We shall be using:

<https://powcoder.com>

Mechanising deduction based on propositional logic

Add WeChat powcoder

Exit Puzzle for People Who Like Puzzles

Long before Covid-19, Mr. Smith and his wife invited four other couples. When everyone arrived, some of the people shook hands with some of the others. Of course, nobody shook hands with their partner, or themselves, and nobody shook hands with the same person twice.

After that, Mr. Smith asked everyone how many times they shook somebody's hand. He received different answers from all nine!

How many times did Mrs. Smith shake hands?

Answers to the discussion board