

CS304 – CS310  
Mathematical and Logical Aspects of Computing

## Lecture 6: Logical consequence

Friday, 20<sup>th</sup> September 2013

### Today's topics

- 1 Decision Procedure
- 2 Simultaneously satisfiable
- 3 Logical consequence
- 4 Exercises

[These slides we revised after the lecture, to remove several of the ones not used in class]

Last week we introduced some new ideas:

We say a proposition  $A$  is satisfiable if there is some interpretation  $v$  such that  $v(A) = T$ . We call  $v$  a model for  $A$ .

If a proposition is *not* satisfiable, it is a *contradiction*.

We say a proposition  $A$  is valid if, for all interpretations  $v$ ,  $v(A) = T$ . Equivalently, we say  $A$  is “*tautology*”. We can write this as:  $\models A$ .

However, if there is some  $v$  such that  $v(A) = F$ , then we say that  $A$  is *not valid* (or “falsifiable”), and we write  $\not\models A$ .

**Examples (CS304, Summer 11/12, Q2(c))** For each of the following propositions, determine if it is satisfiable or not satisfiable, and if it is valid or not valid.

(iii)  $(a \wedge \neg b) \rightarrow (a \vee \neg b)$

(iv)  $(a \uparrow b) \rightarrow (a \downarrow b)$ .

## Decision procedure

Given an set of formulas,  $\mathcal{V}$ , an algorithm is a *decision procedure* for  $\mathcal{V}$  if given any  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ , it terminates and reports if  $A \in \mathcal{V}$  or  $A \notin \mathcal{V}$ .

Probably the most useful example for us is the decision procedure that determines if  $A$  is in the set of satisfiable propositions.

- We know such an algorithm exists because for any  $A$  because we simply (but tediously) inspect its truth table.
- We can use this procedure to determine if a proposition is *valid*.

Some times it is more efficient to use a *refutation procedure*... (take notes)

A set of formulas  $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$  is *simultaneously satisfiable* if there is some (particular) assignment  $v$  such that

$$v(A_1) = v(A_2) = \dots = v(A_n) = T.$$

We say  $v$  is a model for the set.

Equivalently, we say that  $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$  is *consistent (as a collection)*.

Examples:

Suppose that

$$\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n, B\}$$

is unsatisfiable. Then...

**Definition (Logical Consequence)**

Let  $\mathcal{V} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$  be a set of propositions, and  $C$  be a proposition.  $C$  is a *logical consequence* of  $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$  iff every model of  $\mathcal{V}$  is a model of  $C$ .

We write  $\mathcal{V} \models C$ .

*Examples:*

Q1. For each of the following collections of propositions, use a truth table to show that it is consistent, and find an interpretation that satisfies all the propositions in the collection.

- (i)  $\{a \oplus \neg b, \quad a \vee b, \quad a \uparrow b\}.$
- (ii)  $\{a \rightarrow \neg b, \quad a \vee b, \quad \neg a \rightarrow b\}.$
- (iii)  $\{\neg(a \rightarrow b), \quad b \vee c, \quad a \rightarrow c\},$