Boolean Connectives

Torben Amtoft
Kansas State University

Motivation

Negation

Conjunction

Disjunction

Sentences

Ambiguity

The Game in Tarski's World

Agenda

- Chapter 1 introduced basic FOL
  (one main aim of book)
- Chapter 2 introduced notion of logical consequence
  (other main aim of book)
- Chapter 3 introduces more features of FOL

Boolean Connectives

Recall that an atomic sentence is a predicate applied to one or more terms:

`Older(father(max),max)`

We now extend FOL with the boolean connectives:

- and, to be written $\wedge$
- or, to be written $\vee$
- not, to be written $\neg$.

Negation ("not")

Truth table:

P	$\neg P$
true	false
false	true

- Symbol $\neg$ is not standard (cf. p. 91);
  in emails and on the web I'll write ~.
- $\neg\neg P$ is equivalent to P
  unlike English, where double negation emphasizes:
  it doesn't make no difference; *there will be no nothing*
- $\neg$`LeftOf(a, b)` is not equivalent to `RightOf(a, b)`

Conjunction ("and")

P	Q	$P \wedge Q$
true	true	true
true	false	false
false	true	false
false	false	false

- in emails and on the web I may write /\ or ^
- English sentences translated using $\wedge$ may
  - not use "and"

    Max is a tall man   `Tall(max)` $\wedge$ `Man(max)`
  - carry temporal implications

    Max went home and went to sleep
  - be expressed using other connectives

    Max was home but Claire was not

Disjunction ("or")

P	Q	$P \lor Q$
true	true	true
true	false	true
false	true	true
false	false	false

- in emails and on the web I may write \/ or `v`.
- the interpretation is "inclusive", not "exclusive": true $\lor$ true $=$ true.
- In English, the default is often "exclusive", as when a waiter offers *soup or salad*
- We can express exclusive or (p. 75):

Disjunction ("or")

P	Q	$P \vee Q$
true	true	true
true	false	true
false	true	true
false	false	false

- in emails and on the web I may write `\/` or `v`.
- the interpretation is "inclusive", not "exclusive": true $\vee$ true $=$ true.
- In English, the default is often "exclusive", as when a waiter offers *soup or salad*
- We can express exclusive or (p. 75): $(P \vee Q) \wedge \neg(P \wedge Q)$
- We can also encode "neither nor": $\neg(P \vee Q)$

Sentences

A sentence P is thus given by

- if P is an atomic sentence then P is also a sentence;
- if P_1 and P_2 are sentences then $P_1 \wedge P_2$ is a sentence;
- if P_1 and P_2 are sentences then $P_1 \vee P_2$ is a sentence;
- if P is a sentence then $\neg P$ is a sentence.

This can be written in "Backus-Naur" notation:

$$\begin{array}{lcl} P & ::= & \text{atomic sentence} \\ & \mid & P \wedge P \\ & \mid & P \vee P \\ & \mid & \neg P \end{array}$$

Resolving Ambiquity

	expression	how to read it	how not to read it
Algebra	$3 + 4 \times 5$	$3 + (4 \times 5) = 23$	$(3 + 4) \times 5 = 35$
	$3 \times 4 + 5$	$(3 \times 4) + 5$	$3 \times (4 + 5)$

Resolving Ambiquity

	expression	how to read it	how not to read it
Algebra	$3 + 4 \times 5$	$3 + (4 \times 5) = 23$	$(3 + 4) \times 5 = 35$
	$3 \times 4 + 5$	$(3 \times 4) + 5$	$3 \times (4 + 5)$

Boolean Algebra	interpretation I	interpretation II
true $\vee$ false $\wedge$ false	true $\vee$ (false $\wedge$ false) evaluates to true	(true $\vee$ false) $\wedge$ false evaluates to false

Resolving Ambiquity

	expression	how to read it	how not to read it
Algebra	$3 + 4 \times 5$	$3 + (4 \times 5) = 23$	$(3 + 4) \times 5 = 35$
	$3 \times 4 + 5$	$(3 \times 4) + 5$	$3 \times (4 + 5)$

Boolean Algebra	interpretation I	interpretation II
true $\vee$ false $\wedge$ false	true $\vee$ (false $\wedge$ false) evaluates to true	(true $\vee$ false) $\wedge$ false evaluates to false

- In the literature, I is often chosen (as $\wedge$ is considered "multiplication" and $\vee$ is considered "addition").

Resolving Ambiquity

	expression	how to read it	how not to read it
Algebra	$3 + 4 \times 5$	$3 + (4 \times 5) = 23$	$(3 + 4) \times 5 = 35$
	$3 \times 4 + 5$	$(3 \times 4) + 5$	$3 \times (4 + 5)$

Boolean Algebra	interpretation I	interpretation II
true $\vee$ false $\wedge$ false	true $\vee$ (false $\wedge$ false) evaluates to true	(true $\vee$ false) $\wedge$ false evaluates to false

- In the literature, I is often chosen (as $\wedge$ is considered "multiplication" and $\vee$ is considered "addition").
- In the textbook, neither I or II is chosen, instead (p. 80):

  Parentheses must be used whenever ambiguity would result from their omission

Resolving Ambiguity

	expression	how to read it	how **not** to read it
Algebra	$3 + 4 \times 5$	$3 + (4 \times 5) = 23$	$(3 + 4) \times 5 = 35$
	$3 \times 4 + 5$	$(3 \times 4) + 5$	$3 \times (4 + 5)$

Boolean Algebra	interpretation I	interpretation II
true $\vee$ false $\wedge$ false	true $\vee$ (false $\wedge$ false) evaluates to true	(true $\vee$ false) $\wedge$ false evaluates to false

- In the literature, I is often chosen (as $\wedge$ is considered "multiplication" and $\vee$ is considered "addition").
- In the textbook, neither I or II is chosen, instead (p. 80):

  Parentheses must be used whenever ambiguity would result from their omission

Negation binds tightly: $\neg P \wedge Q$ is not equivalent to $\neg(P \wedge Q)$.

Ambiguity in English

Consider the phrase

you can have soup or salad and pasta.

If the intended meaning is "soup or (salad and pasta)":

Ambiguity in English

Consider the phrase

you can have soup or salad and pasta.

If the intended meaning is "soup or (salad and pasta)":

you can have soup or both salad and pasta

If the intended meaning is "(soup or salad) and pasta":

Ambiguity in English

Consider the phrase

> *you can have soup or salad and pasta.*

If the intended meaning is "soup or (salad and pasta)":

> *you can have soup or both salad and pasta*

If the intended meaning is "(soup or salad) and pasta":

> *you can have soup or salad, and pasta*

or

Ambiguity in English

Consider the phrase

you can have soup or salad and pasta.

If the intended meaning is "soup or (salad and pasta)":

you can have soup or both salad and pasta

If the intended meaning is "(soup or salad) and pasta":

you can have soup or salad, and pasta

or

you can have pasta and either soup or salad

The Game in Tarski's World

- Given sentence $P = \texttt{Cube(c)} \lor \texttt{Cube(d)}$.
- Given world where c is a cube but d is not.

We	Opponent
P is false in this world	
	So c is not a cube?
Eh... I admit defeat	

The Game in Tarski's World

- Given sentence $P = \texttt{Cube}(\texttt{c}) \lor \texttt{Cube}(\texttt{d})$.
- Given world where c is a cube but d is not.

We	Opponent
P is false in this world	
	So c is not a cube?
Eh... I admit defeat	
OK, P is true in this world	
	Because c is a cube or because d is?
Because d is a cube	
	You lost but could have won

The Game in Tarski's World

- Given sentence $P = \texttt{Cube}(\texttt{c}) \vee \texttt{Cube}(\texttt{d})$.
- Given world where c is a cube but d is not.

We	Opponent
P is false in this world	
	So c is not a cube?
Eh... I admit defeat	
OK, P is true in this world	
	Because c is a cube or because d is?
Because d is a cube	
	You lost but could have won
OK, because c is a cube	
	You won (finally!)

More about the Game

- Given sentence $P = \texttt{Cube(a)} \vee \neg\texttt{Cube(a)}$.

We	Opponent
P is true in this world	
	Because a is a cube or because a is not a cube?
Eh... I don't know but P will always be true!	
	Please answer my question!

- Who won the game???