

Epp 2nd Ed. 1.2 2, 3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 20 - 23, 25, 26, 27
1.3 1 - 5, 36, 38

Rewrite the statements in if-then form:

(2) I am on time for work if I catch the 8:05 bus.

If I catch the 8:05 bus, then I am on time for work.

(3) Freeze or I'll shoot.

If you do not freeze, then I will shoot.

see 13a for why!

OR: If I did not shoot you, then you froze

Write truth tables for the statement forms:

(5) $\sim p \vee q \rightarrow \sim q$

Notice order of operations here: $(\sim p) \vee q \rightarrow (\sim q)$

p	q	$\sim p$	$\sim p \vee q$	$\sim q$	$(\sim p \vee q) \rightarrow (\sim q)$
T	T	F	T	F	F
T	F	F	F	T	T
F	T	T	T	F	F
F	F	T	T	T	T

(6) $p \vee (\sim p \wedge q) \rightarrow q$

Notice order of ops: $(p \vee (\sim p \wedge q)) \rightarrow (q)$

p	q	$\sim p$	$\sim p \wedge q$	$p \vee (\sim p \wedge q)$	q	$(p \vee (\sim p \wedge q)) \rightarrow q$
T	T	F	F	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	T	F	F
F	T	T	T	T	T	T
F	F	T	F	F	F	T

(12) Use the logical equivalence $p \wedge q \rightarrow r \equiv (p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)$ to rewrite the following statement:

If $x > 2$ or $x < -2$ then $x^2 > 4$. } becomes: $(p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)$
 $(p \vee q) \rightarrow r$ If $x > 2$, then $x^2 > 4$, and if $x < -2$, then $x^2 > 4$.

Use truth tables to verify that:

(13)(a) $p \rightarrow q \equiv \sim p \vee q$

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

p	q	$\sim p$	$\sim p \vee q$
T	T	F	T
T	F	F	F
F	T	T	T
F	F	T	T

so,
 $(p \rightarrow q) \equiv (\sim p \vee q)$

same values!

(13)(b) $\sim(p \rightarrow q) \equiv p \wedge \sim q$

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$	$\sim(p \rightarrow q)$
T	T	T	F
T	F	F	T
F	T	T	F
F	F	T	F

p	q	$\sim q$	$p \wedge \sim q$
T	T	F	F
T	F	T	T
F	T	F	F
F	F	T	F

same values!

Use truth tables to establish the truth of each statement

(20) A conditional statement is not logically equivalent to its converse.

conditional $p \rightarrow q$			converse $q \rightarrow p$		
p	q		p	q	
T	T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F	T
F	T	T	F	T	F
F	F	T	F	F	T

↑ NOT the same! ↑

(21) A conditional statement is not logically equivalent to its inverse.

conditional $p \rightarrow q$			inverse $\sim p \mid \sim q \mid \sim p \rightarrow \sim q$				
p	q		p	q	$\sim p$	$\sim q$	$\sim p \rightarrow \sim q$
T	T	T	T	T	F	F	T
T	F	F	T	F	F	T	T
F	T	T	F	T	T	F	F
F	F	T	F	F	T	T	T

↑ NOT the same! ↑

(22) A conditional statement and its contrapositive are logically equivalent.

conditional $p \rightarrow q$			contrapositive $\sim p \mid \sim q \mid \sim q \rightarrow \sim p$				
p	q		p	q	$\sim p$	$\sim q$	$\sim q \rightarrow \sim p$
T	T	T	T	T	F	F	T
T	F	F	T	F	F	T	F
F	T	T	F	T	T	F	T
F	F	T	F	F	T	T	T

↑ the same! ↑

(23) The converse and the inverse of a conditional statement are logically equivalent to each other.

converse $q \rightarrow p$			inverse $\sim p \mid \sim q \mid \sim p \rightarrow \sim q$				
p	q		p	q	$\sim p$	$\sim q$	$\sim p \rightarrow \sim q$
T	T	T	T	T	F	F	T
T	F	T	T	F	F	T	T
F	T	F	F	T	T	F	F
F	F	T	F	F	T	T	T

↑ the same! ↑

Use the contrapositive to rewrite the statements in if-then form in two ways. Assume that "only if" has its formal, logical meaning.

(25) The Cubs will win the pennant only if they win tomorrow's game.

$p \rightarrow q$ If the Cubs win the pennant, then they will have won tomorrow's game.

$\sim q \rightarrow \sim p$ If the Cubs don't win tomorrow's game, then they will not win the pennant

(26) Sam will be allowed on Signe's racing boat only if he is an expert sailor.

$p \rightarrow q$ If Sam is allowed on Signe's boat, then he is an expert sailor.

$\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ If Sam is not an expert sailor, then he will not be allowed on Signe's boat.

(27) Taking the long view on your education, you go to the Prestige Corporation and ask what you should do to be hired when you graduate. The Personnel Director replies that you will be hired only if you major in mathematics or computer science, get a B average or better, and take accounting. You do, in fact, become a math major, get a B+ average, and take accounting. You return to Prestige Corporation, make a formal application, and are turned down. Did the Personnel Director lie to you? Explain!

No, they did not lie to you — they said that if you were hired, then all three things would be true. That's not the same as saying that if all 3 things were true that you would get hired.

$$p \rightarrow q \neq q \rightarrow p !$$

Section 1.3:

Use modus ponens (the conditional) or modus tollens (the contrapositive) to fill in the blanks in the arguments of 1 - 5 so as to produce valid inferences.

(1) If $\sqrt{2}$ is rational, then $\sqrt{2} = \frac{a}{b}$ for some integers a and b .

It is not true that $\sqrt{2} = \frac{a}{b}$ for some integers a and b .

\therefore $\sqrt{2}$ is not rational

Contrapositive
(modus tollens)

(2) If this is a **while** loop, then the body of the loop may never be executed.

This is a while loop.

Conditional
(modus ponens)

\therefore The body of this loop may never be executed.

(3) If logic is easy, then I am a monkey's uncle.

I am not a monkey's uncle.

\therefore Logic is not easy.

Contrapositive
(modus tollens)

(4) If this polygon is a triangle, then the sum of its interior angles is 180° .

The sum of the interior angles of this polygon is not 180° .

\therefore The polygon is not a triangle.

Contrapositive
(modus tollens)

(5) If they were unsure of the address, then they would have telephoned.

They did not telephone.

Contrapositive
(modus tollens)

\therefore They were sure of the address.

(36) Put the clues in order to find the treasure (see book for the clues, fill in the step-by-step conclusions):

(c) The house is next to the lake.

(a) If the house is next to the lake, then the treasure is not in the kitchen.

\therefore The treasure is not in the kitchen.

(b) If the tree in the front yard is an elm, then the treasure is in the kitchen.

\therefore The tree in the front yard is not an elm (contrapositive!)

(d) The tree in the front yard is an elm, or the treasure is buried under the flagpole.

\therefore The treasure is buried under the flagpole!

Hint: You don't need all five clues!

(38) Put the clues in order to find the murderer (see book for the clues, fill in the step-by-step conclusions):

(a) Lord H. was killed by a blow to the head with a brass candlestick.

(b) If the cook was in the kitchen, then the butler poisoned Lord H.

\therefore The cook was not in the kitchen (contrapositive)

(e) If the cook was not in the kitchen, then Sara was not in the dining room.

\therefore Sara was not in the dining room.

(b) Either Lady H or Sara was in the dining room.

\therefore Lady H was in the dining room.

(d) If Lady H was in the dining room, then the chauffeur killed Lord H.

\therefore The chauffeur killed Lord H.

and you don't need the last clue!