

# Intermediary Truth Values

# TRUE is 1, FALSE is 0

We have dealt with **math** where statements really are **true** or **false** (with some rare exceptions).

The **Real World** is messier!

# We want to Truth Values between 0 and 1

**So far** If  $x$  is a boolean var then  $x \in \{0, 1\}$ .

# We want to Truth Values between 0 and 1

**So far** If  $x$  is a boolean var then  $x \in \{0, 1\}$ .

**Today** We want to allow  $x \in [0, 1]$ .

# We want to Truth Values between 0 and 1

**So far** If  $x$  is a boolean var then  $x \in \{0, 1\}$ .

**Today** We want to allow  $x \in [0, 1]$ .

This makes sense in English.

# We want to Truth Values between 0 and 1

**So far** If  $x$  is a boolean var then  $x \in \{0, 1\}$ .

**Today** We want to allow  $x \in [0, 1]$ .

This makes sense in English.

- ▶ Leo knows a lot of discrete math: I would give that a 0.9.

# We want to Truth Values between 0 and 1

**So far** If  $x$  is a boolean var then  $x \in \{0, 1\}$ .

**Today** We want to allow  $x \in [0, 1]$ .

This makes sense in English.

- ▶ Leo knows a lot of discrete math: I would give that a 0.9.
- ▶ Joe Biden was a good president. I won't even try to give this one a number because it's too ill defined. (Also I should not share my politics with the class.)

# We want to Truth Values between 0 and 1

**So far** If  $x$  is a boolean var then  $x \in \{0, 1\}$ .

**Today** We want to allow  $x \in [0, 1]$ .

This makes sense in English.

- ▶ Leo knows a lot of discrete math: I would give that a 0.9.
- ▶ Joe Biden was a good president. I won't even try to give this one a number because it's too ill defined. (Also I should not share my politics with the class.)
- ▶ It's going to rain tomorrow. Forecasts give probabilities.

# Interpretation

What does it mean to say that statement  $X$  gets an 0.8?

# Interpretation

What does it mean to say that statement  $X$  gets an 0.8?  
Can interpret several ways.

# Interpretation

What does it mean to say that statement  $X$  gets an 0.8?

Can interpret several ways.

- ▶ The probability that  $X$  is true is 0.8. Works for weather, does not work for Leo's knowledge of DM or Biden's presidency.

# Interpretation

What does it mean to say that statement  $X$  gets an 0.8?

Can interpret several ways.

- ▶ The probability that  $X$  is true is 0.8. Works for weather, does not work for Leo's knowledge of DM or Biden's presidency.
- ▶ Confidence in the statement.

# Interpretation

What does it mean to say that statement  $X$  gets an 0.8?

Can interpret several ways.

- ▶ The probability that  $X$  is true is 0.8. Works for weather, does not work for Leo's knowledge of DM or Biden's presidency.
- ▶ Confidence in the statement.

We will **not** dwell on this. We will ponder a well defined math question about intermediary truth values.

# How to define $\wedge$ , $\vee$ , $\neg$ ?

Criteria:

# How to define $\wedge$ , $\vee$ , $\neg$ ?

Criteria:

1. When  $x, y \in \{0, 1\}$  should give the same answer as usual case.

# How to define $\wedge$ , $\vee$ , $\neg$ ?

Criteria:

1. When  $x, y \in \{0, 1\}$  should give the same answer as usual case.
2. Want the definitions to satisfy De Morgan' Law.

# How to define $\wedge$ , $\vee$ , $\neg$ ?

Criteria:

1. When  $x, y \in \{0, 1\}$  should give the same answer as usual case.
2. Want the definitions to satisfy De Morgan' Law.
3. Want the definitions to make sense intuitively. For example,  
 $x \wedge y \leq x$  (harder for  $x \wedge y$  to be true then for  $x$  to be true)  
 $x \vee y \geq x$  (easier for  $x \vee y$  to be true then for  $x$  to be true)

Work on in groups!

# Answer One

# Answer One

$$x \wedge y = xy$$

# Answer One

$$x \wedge y = xy$$

$$x \vee y = x + y - xy.$$

# Answer One

$$x \wedge y = xy$$

$$x \vee y = x + y - xy.$$

$$\neg x = 1 - x.$$

## Answer Two

## Answer Two

$$x \wedge y = \min\{x, y\}$$

## Answer Two

$$x \wedge y = \min\{x, y\}$$

$$x \vee y = \max\{x, y\}$$

## Answer Two

$$x \wedge y = \min\{x, y\}$$

$$x \vee y = \max\{x, y\}$$

$$\neg x = 1 - x.$$

# Is Their Another Answer?

Is there another way to define  $\wedge$ ,  $\vee$ ,  $\neg$  that satisfies DeMorgan's law and some other intuitions?

VOTE

# Is Their Another Answer?

Is there another way to define  $\wedge$ ,  $\vee$ ,  $\neg$  that satisfies DeMorgan's law and some other intuitions?

VOTE

- 1) YES and this is known.

# Is Their Another Answer?

Is there another way to define  $\wedge$ ,  $\vee$ ,  $\neg$  that satisfies DeMorgan's law and some other intuitions?

VOTE

- 1) YES and this is known.
- 2) NO. The question has been made rigorous and shown to be NO $\downarrow$

# Is Their Another Answer?

Is there another way to define  $\wedge$ ,  $\vee$ ,  $\neg$  that satisfies DeMorgan's law and some other intuitions?

VOTE

- 1) YES and this is known.
- 2) NO. The question has been made rigorous and shown to be NO<sub>i</sub>
- 3) This question has not been made rigorous.

# Is Their Another Answer?

Is there another way to define  $\wedge$ ,  $\vee$ ,  $\neg$  that satisfies DeMorgan's law and some other intuitions?

VOTE

- 1) YES and this is known.
- 2) NO. The question has been made rigorous and shown to be NO<sub>i</sub>
- 3) This question has not been made rigorous.
- 4) This question has been made rigorous and is UNKNOWN TO SCIENCE.

# Is Their Another Answer?

Is there another way to define  $\wedge$ ,  $\vee$ ,  $\neg$  that satisfies DeMorgan's law and some other intuitions?

VOTE

- 1) YES and this is known.
- 2) NO. The question has been made rigorous and shown to be NO<sub>i</sub>
- 3) This question has not been made rigorous.
- 4) This question has been made rigorous and is UNKNOWN TO SCIENCE.

Answer on the next page.

# And the Answer Is

## And the Answer Is

2) NO. The question has been made rigorous and shown to be NO*i*