

Propositional_{logic}

Viv Sedov — viv.sedov@hotmail.com

February 2, 2021

Contents

1	Propositional_logic	2
1.1	Simple Operations	2
2	Disjunctive Normal Form	4
2.1	DNF of mini terms for truth tables	4
3	Conjunctive Normal Form	4
4	Logical Equivalences	5

1 Propositional_logic

1.1 Simple Operations

When covering this : there are simple operations that you should know about :

Simple Operation Not:

p	$\neg p$
1	0
0	1

Such that in this case it is the opposite given value $\neg p$ would be the direct opposite of the given Value of P .

For example say that you have the following

p	q	$p \bullet q$
1	1	1
1	0	0
0	1	0
0	0	0

In this example, we are stating the following command : $\neg(14 > 6)$ is false , we create this truth table to prove if that is true or not .

$P \bullet Q$ is true \iff p and q are true

Simple \vee - OR

p	q	$p \vee q$
1	1	1
1	0	1
0	1	1
0	0	0

In this example above , for this to hold true, atleast one of teh values would have to have a one it to hold true, this is known as an *Inclusive* or as in you can say the following and it would make sense: **I will go to the shops \vee i will go to the coast**

Simple Operation \implies This is where if something is true the other must be true , or where you given an equivalent pointer to if p then q

p	q	$p \implies q$
1	1	1
1	0	0
0	1	1
1	1	1

With the above example this is not cause and effect , there is a reason for why this occurs , and that is that there is a pointer such that it acts like an if statment, with the following code shown below :

```
foo = True
if foo:
    return 1
else:
    return 0
```

The code above is rather simple , but shows that if something is true , then you would have some sort of value expression , or some pointer that would return if it is correct or not .

In the weird scenario of f and t , where if f is false it implies that q is true , that is because the q value is true , meaning that it would hold , a little trick for this one is that for what ever the second value is , if it is

true , it will hold , if both are false , then it will true , though if one is true and the other is false , it will not hold .

Logically equivalent \iff this can also be seen as if and only if or iff
Here is an example of the logical truth table behind this

p	q	$p \iff q$
1	1	1
1	0	0
0	1	0
0	0	1

With this , Where if something is true then the other must be true or if its false then the other would have to be false , in this case you are seeing if these two values are the same .

Example Exercises of how this would all work :
Given that :

$$p = \text{Logicisfunforjane} \quad q = \text{daviddoesnotlikecabbager} = \text{davideyesareblue}$$

We can then further express all of this in a notational form .

- $\neg p \bullet q$ This would imply the following truth table

$\neg p$	p	q	$\neg p \bullet q$
0	1	1	0
1	0	1	1
0	1	0	0
1	0	0	0

- $\neg R \bullet \neg P \implies$ Both are not goint to be true such that you would get only one possible answer for this .

Multiple truth table example : show the following in a truth table :

$$p \bullet (q \implies r)$$

p	q	r	$q \implies r$	$p \bullet (q \implies r)$
1	1	1	1	1
1	1	0	0	0
1	0	1	1	1
0	1	0	0	0
0	1	1	1	0
0	0	0	1	0

Here is another example to understand how these tables would all work together

$$(p \implies q) \bullet (q \implies p)$$

p	q	$q \implies p$	$p \implies q$	$(p \implies q) \bullet (q \implies p)$
1	1	1	1	1
0	1	0	1	0
1	0	1	0	0
0	0	1	1	1

Definition 1.1. Two propositions are equal if they have the same truth values, they are known as $P \implies Q$ this is known as logically equivalent

Definition 1.2. A proposition is tautology if it is always true an example of this is $P \vee \neg P$ this is always true

Definition 1.3. A proposition is a contradiction if it is always false for example $P \bullet \neg P$ this is always false

Definition 1.4. A proposition is **Contingent** if it is neither Always true or false

2 Disjunctive Normal Form

A given formula is said to be a *Disjunctive normal form* when it is an Or $\implies \vee$ this is known as **DNF** a function is conjunctive when it has an \bullet form, within their proposition logic.

$$(p \bullet \neg q \bullet r) \vee (\neg q \bullet \neg r) \vee q$$

Everytime a given formula is built, we would follow the rules of propositional calculus, and how for each conjunctive formula there should be a disjunctive formula as well.

2.1 DNF of mini terms for truth tables

- For each row whose truth value is true, write down for each of the proposition variables, of p_i in the formula of it self, either P_i is true in row or $\neg P_i$ if false.
- Repeat the first pointer, for the truth table where the formula is true and write down the disjunction of the conjunctions.

What you will see is that those two values will equal up such that the result of the formula in DNF is the equivalent to the original formula.

3 Conjunctive Normal Form

A formula is said to be **Conjunctive Normal Form** when its conjunction is \bullet of disjunctive of \vee an example of this is shown below:

$$(\neg P \vee Q \vee R \vee \neg S) \bullet (P \vee Q) \bullet \neg S \bullet (Q \vee \neg R \vee S)$$

Every expression built up according to the rules of calc, and such that for each conjunctive formula there is a similar or an equivalent formula that can be written in disjunctive form.

Conjunctive form, or in brackets, and on the outside

Disjunctive form, And in the brackets and or on the outside

4 Logical Equivalences

We can use this to obtain normal form , when we use the implication law to eliminate subprocess - when ever you have a double negation and demorgans to bring a \neg you what this value to be on the outside : here are the sub process of how this can be done :

$$\neg\neg P \iff P$$

This rule is the double negation Law

$$\begin{aligned} (P \vee Q) &\iff (Q \vee P) \\ (P \bullet Q) &\iff (Q \bullet P) \\ (P \iff Q) &\iff (Q \iff P) \end{aligned}$$

Commutative laws where both values would have to equal towards each other .

$$\begin{aligned} ((P \vee Q) \vee R) &\iff (P \vee (Q \vee R)) \\ ((P \bullet Q) \bullet R) &\iff (P \bullet (Q \bullet R)) \end{aligned}$$

This is the associative laws , where it is very similar to how they work in matrices in which they can equate towards each other .

$$\begin{aligned} ((P \vee Q) \bullet R) &\iff (P \vee (Q \bullet R)) \\ ((P \bullet Q) \vee R) &\iff (P \bullet (Q \vee R)) \end{aligned}$$

This law is the distributive law , in which the given values would be changed within a DNF and CNF representation

$$\begin{aligned} (P \vee P) &\iff P \\ (P \bullet P) &\iff P \end{aligned}$$

Idempotent laws where the values of it self would always equal to it self no matter what .

Demorgans Law :

$$\begin{aligned} \neg(P \vee Q) &\iff (\neg P \bullet \neg Q) \\ \neg(P \bullet Q) &\iff (\neg P \vee \neg Q) \\ (P \bullet Q) &\iff \neg(\neg P \vee \neg Q) \\ (P \vee Q) &\iff \neg(\neg P \bullet \neg Q) \end{aligned}$$

Most times when you look at demorgans law , you will notice that its very similar to the laws that have been stated above, but the thing that you want to note is that you will see that they are equal in some sense , where an or , is a direct link with Not and And it self.

§ Contrapositive Laws

$$(P \implies Q) \iff (\neg Q \implies \neg P)$$

implication that imply towards each other are contrapositive and hence you can switch out the given details of that information .

where If Q is an active receiver then P must be an active pointer is the same as stating if not p equates to Not q, in some sense you should understand how that would work .

§ Implication

$$\begin{aligned} (P \implies Q) &\iff (\neg P \vee Q) \\ (P \implies Q) &\iff \neg(P \bullet \neg Q) \end{aligned}$$

§ Further implication

$$\begin{aligned}(P \vee Q) &\iff (\neg P \implies Q) \\ (P \bullet Q) &\iff \neg(\neg P \implies \neg Q)\end{aligned}$$

This one is rather annoying, but the principle of how this works is very intriguing, if you do prove this via proof table you will see that they are truly equivalent: $P \vee Q$

p	q	$p \vee q$
1	1	1
1	0	1
0	1	1
0	0	0

this is the same as : $(\neg P \implies Q)$

P	Q	$p \implies Q$	$(\neg P \implies Q)$
1	1	1	1
0	1	1	1
1	0	0	1
0	0	1	0

If you look at the given tables above you will notice that indeed they are the same, a truth table may be long but they are very good at breaking down the given data that you have into something more readable.

Further Implies and equivalences

$$\begin{aligned}((P \implies R) \bullet (Q \implies R)) &\iff ((P \vee Q) \implies R) \\ ((P \implies Q) \bullet (P \implies R)) &\iff ((P \implies (Q \bullet R))\end{aligned}$$

With this law you are using the given equivalences that are shown above with the disjunctive and conjunctive views, but within an equivalence ratio

§ Exportion Law

$$((P \bullet Q) \implies R) \iff (P \implies (Q \implies R))$$

This one is a good one, Mainly because if anything that does imply to another pointer, you can show that they are all equal towards each other.

§ Side Notes Within the compound proposition $\neg(P \vee Q) \& (\neg P \bullet \neg Q)$ they are the same, hence why when you look at the proof that is shown above you will see that they are the same.

When ever you look at equivalences you will notice that connectives $\vee \bullet$ will always suggest that $P \vee Q \implies Q \vee P$