Propositions and dogical Connectives

Proposition: It is a dodarative senstence that is either True or False but not both.

Symbols: P. B., R symbolizes Propositional Statements and are called Propositional Components

1, V, 7, ->, are Logical Connectives

eg

PAB => Pand B: Conjunction

PVB => Por B: Disjunction.

 $\neg P \Rightarrow not P : negation.$

P -> B => if P then B: Conditional

P => Pifand only if 9: Biconditional.

ex. of a Compound sentence which is more complex can be: $(P \land \neg 9) \lor (\neg 5 \rightarrow R)$

Truck Tables:

He can evaluate teult tables from the teult values of it & components.

det us see the basic Truth Tables,

Let us constant a trulk table for a more complex sentence say $\neg P \rightarrow (81P)$

Tautology: A Compound sentence is a tautology when its trulk value is true regardless of the trulk value of its components.

Contradiction: A compound sentence is a Contradiction when its truth value is fatse regardless of the truth value of its components.

eg: (PA-P) is a Contradiction.

Logical Equivalence:

Let Y and y be proportional sentences.

Y=> Y, whenever the following holds:

For every truth assignment applied to the components of Y and Y are identical.

Propositional logic laws:

1. <u>De Morganis Law</u>:

2. Commutative Laws

3 Associative laws
$$\Psi \vee (\Psi \vee \chi) \iff (\Psi \vee \Psi) \vee \chi$$

$$\Psi \wedge (\Psi \wedge \chi) \iff (\Psi \wedge \Psi) \wedge \chi$$

$$\Psi \wedge \Psi \iff \Psi$$

$$\Psi \vee \Psi \iff \Psi$$

$$\Psi \wedge (\Psi \vee \chi) \iff (\Psi \wedge \Psi) \vee (\Psi \wedge \chi)$$

$$\Psi \vee (\Psi \wedge \chi) \iff (\Psi \vee \Psi) \wedge (\Psi \vee \chi)$$

$$(\Psi \vee \chi) \wedge \Psi \iff (\Psi \wedge \Psi) \vee (\chi \wedge \Psi)$$

$$(\Psi \wedge \chi) \vee \Psi \iff (\Psi \vee \Psi) \wedge (\chi \vee \Psi)$$

- 6. Double Negation law: 774 > 4
- 7. Tantology Law 4 1 (a tantology) (=> 4
- 8. Contradiction law: YV (a contradiction) (=> Y
- 9. Conditional laws:

- 10. Contrapositive Law: Y > Y <=> 74 -> 74
- 11. Bi Conditional Law . 4 -> 4 > (4 -> 4) 1 (4 -> 4)

Non, we will no longer use trult tables to prove dojical equivalence but use lang instead.

exercise: Prove:
$$(P \rightarrow R) \land (Q \rightarrow R) \Longleftrightarrow (P \lor Q) \rightarrow R$$

 $(P \rightarrow R) \land (Q \rightarrow R) \Longleftrightarrow (\neg P \lor R) \land (\neg Q \lor R)$
(Conditional Law)
 $\iff (\neg P \land \neg Q) \lor R$
(distributive Law)
 $\iff \neg (P \lor Q) \lor R (Do Morgan)$
 $\iff (P \lor Q) \rightarrow R (Conditional Law)$

hence proved!

Let up now prove:
$$X \notin A \setminus B \rightleftharpoons X \notin A \text{ or } X \notin B$$

$$\chi \notin A \setminus B \rightleftharpoons \neg \chi \in A \setminus B \rightleftharpoons \neg (\chi \in A \land \chi \notin B)$$
(by def: of \emptyset)

det us prove another result, $P \longrightarrow (Q \longrightarrow R) \iff (P \land Q) \longrightarrow R.$

$$P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow R) \iff \neg P \lor (Q \rightarrow R) \iff \neg P \lor (\neg Q \lor R)$$

(conditional Laws)

 $\iff (\neg P \lor \neg Q) \lor R (Associative)$
 $\iff \neg (P \land Q) \lor R (De Morgan)$
 $\iff (P \land Q) \rightarrow R (Londitional law)$