

Two formulas F and G are (semantically) **equivalent** if $\mathcal{A}(F) = \mathcal{A}(G)$ for every assignment \mathcal{A} that is suitable for both F and G .

We write $F \equiv G$ to denote that F and G are equivalent.

Which of the following equivalences hold?

$$(A \wedge (A \vee B)) \equiv A$$

$$\neg(A \vee B) \equiv (\neg A \wedge \neg B)$$

$$(A \wedge (B \vee C)) \equiv ((A \wedge B) \vee C)$$

$$(A \wedge (B \vee C)) \equiv ((A \wedge B) \vee (A \wedge C))$$

1

Main logical questions

- **Model checking**

Let F be a formula and let \mathcal{A} be a suitable assignment.

Does $\mathcal{A}(F) = 1$ hold?

- **Satisfiability**

Let F be a formula. Is F satisfiable ?

- **Validity**

Let F be a formula. Is F valid ?

- **Consequence**

Let F and G be formulas. Does $F \models G$ hold?

- **Equivalence**

Let F and G be formulas. Does $F \equiv G$ hold?

3

2

Observation

The following connections hold:

$$(F \rightarrow G) \text{ is valid if and only if } F \models G$$

$$(F \leftrightarrow G) \text{ is valid if and only if } F \equiv G$$

4

- **Validity** to **Unsatisfiability** (and back):

$$F \text{ valid} \quad \text{iff} \quad \neg F \text{ unsatisfiable}$$

$$F \text{ unsatisfiable} \quad \text{iff} \quad \neg F \text{ valid}$$

- **Validity** to **Consequence**:

$$F \text{ valid} \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{true} \models F$$

- **Consequence** to **Validity**:

$$F \models G \quad \text{iff} \quad F \rightarrow G \text{ valid}$$

- **Validity** to **Equivalence**:

$$F \text{ valid} \quad \text{iff} \quad F \equiv \text{true}$$

- **Equivalence** to **Validity**:

$$F \equiv G \quad \text{iff} \quad F \leftrightarrow G \text{ valid}$$

5

Properties of semantic equivalence

Semantic equivalence is an **equivalence relation** between formulas.

Semantic equivalence is **closed under operators**:

If $F_1 \equiv F_2$ and $G_1 \equiv G_2$ hold, then
 $(F_1 \wedge G_1) \equiv (F_2 \wedge G_2)$, $(F_1 \vee G_1) \equiv (F_2 \vee G_2)$ and $\neg F_1 \equiv \neg F_2$
 hold too.

Equivalence relation + Closure under Operations
 =
Congruence relation

7

6

Substitution theorem

Closure under operations can also be formulated this way:

Theorem (**substitution theorem**)

Let F and G be equivalent formulas. Let H be a formula with (at least) an occurrence of F as subformula. Then H and H' are equivalent, where H' is the result of substituting an arbitrary occurrence of F in H by G .

8

Equivalence (I)

Theorem

The following equivalences hold for every formulas F and G :

$$(F \wedge F) \equiv F$$

$$(F \vee F) \equiv F \quad (\text{Idempotence})$$

$$(F \wedge G) \equiv (G \wedge F)$$

$$(F \vee G) \equiv (G \vee F) \quad (\text{Commutativity})$$

$$((F \wedge G) \wedge H) \equiv (F \wedge (G \wedge H))$$

$$((F \vee G) \vee H) \equiv (F \vee (G \vee H)) \quad (\text{Associativity})$$

$$(F \wedge (F \vee G)) \equiv F$$

$$(F \vee (F \wedge G)) \equiv F \quad (\text{Absorption})$$

Equivalences (II)

$$(F \wedge (G \vee H)) \equiv ((F \wedge G) \vee (F \wedge H))$$

$$(F \vee (G \wedge H)) \equiv ((F \vee G) \wedge (F \vee H)) \quad (\text{Distributivity})$$

$$\neg\neg F \equiv F \quad (\text{Double negation})$$

$$\neg(F \wedge G) \equiv (\neg F \vee \neg G)$$

$$\neg(F \vee G) \equiv (\neg F \wedge \neg G) \quad (\text{deMorgan's Laws})$$

$$(F \vee G) \equiv F, \text{ if } F \text{ is a tautology}$$

$$(F \wedge G) \equiv G, \text{ if } F \text{ is a tautologie} \quad (\text{Tautology Laws})$$

$$(F \vee G) \equiv G, \text{ if } F \text{ is unsatisfiable}$$

$$(F \wedge G) \equiv F, \text{ if } F \text{ is unsatisfiable} \quad (\text{Unsatisfiability Laws})$$

9

Normal forms (I)

Definition (Normal forms)

A **literal** is an atomic formula or the negation of an atomic formula. (In the former case the literal is **positive** and **negative** in the latter).

A formula F is in **conjunctive normal form (CNF)** if it is a conjunction of disjunctions of literals:

$$F = \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \left(\bigvee_{j=1}^{m_i} L_{i,j} \right) \right),$$

where $L_{i,j} \in \{A_1, A_2, \dots\} \cup \{\neg A_1, \neg A_2, \dots\}$

10

Normal forms (II)

A formula F is in **disjunctive normal form (DNF)** if it is a disjunction of conjunctions of literals:

$$F = \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n \left(\bigwedge_{j=1}^{m_i} L_{i,j} \right) \right),$$

where $L_{i,j} \in \{A_1, A_2, \dots\} \cup \{\neg A_1, \neg A_2, \dots\}$

11

12

1. Substitute every occurrence of a subformula of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \neg\neg G & \text{ by } G \\ \neg(G \wedge H) & \text{ by } (\neg G \vee \neg H) \\ \neg(G \vee H) & \text{ by } (\neg G \wedge \neg H) \end{aligned}$$

until no such formulas occur.

2. Substitute in every occurrence of a subformula of the form

$$\begin{aligned} (F \vee (G \wedge H)) & \text{ durch } ((F \vee G) \wedge (F \vee H)) \\ ((F \wedge G) \vee H) & \text{ durch } ((F \vee H) \wedge (G \vee H)) \end{aligned}$$

until no such formulas occur.

A	B	C	F
0	0	0	1
0	0	1	0
0	1	0	0
0	1	1	1
1	0	0	1
1	0	1	0
1	1	0	0
1	1	1	1

DNF: Each row of the truth table with value 1 yields a conjunction, a 0 in column A yields $\neg A$, and a 1 yields A

$$\begin{aligned} & (\neg A \wedge \neg B \wedge \neg C) \vee (\neg A \wedge B \wedge C) \\ & \vee (A \wedge \neg B \wedge \neg C) \vee (A \wedge B \wedge C) \end{aligned}$$

CNF: Each row of the truth table with value 0 yields a disjunction, a 0 in column A yields A , and a 1 yields $\neg A$

$$\begin{aligned} & (A \vee B \vee \neg C) \wedge (A \vee \neg B \vee C) \\ & \wedge (\neg A \vee B \vee \neg C) \wedge (\neg A \vee \neg B \vee C) \end{aligned}$$

Precedence

Operator precedence:

- \leftrightarrow binds weaker than
- \rightarrow which binds weaker than
- \vee which binds weaker than
- \wedge which binds weaker than
- \neg .

So we have

$$A \leftrightarrow B \vee \neg C \rightarrow D \wedge \neg E \equiv (A \leftrightarrow ((B \vee \neg C) \rightarrow (D \wedge \neg E)))$$

But: well chosen parenthesis help to visually parse formulas.