

Introduction to Propositional Logic

Logic

The Trev Tutor

Propositional Logic

A statement is a declarative sentence that can be True (1) or False (0).

Boolean logic ↗ in computer science

Examples of statements

- Milk is white T
- $|d| = 0$ F
- Humans are just fish with legs F

The point is not whether whether or not these statements are True or False but rather that they are statements, which means in propositional logic we can express them.

- We can't express things like

• Questions, imperatives

Syntax

Propositions are denoted with capital letters P, Q, R, ...

P = 1 Checked

Q = 1 Wrote an exam

Lowercase letters p, q, r... are used for general propositions that have no meanings.

→ Used for general proofs

Connectives (some notations) to change meaning

- P is a well-formed formula (wff)
- $\neg P$ is a wff $\text{not } P$
- $P \wedge q$ is a wff $P \text{ and } q$
- $P \vee q$ is a wff $P \text{ or } q$
- $P \rightarrow q$ is a wff $\text{if } P \text{ then } q$
- Implication \rightarrow "If, then" $P \rightarrow q$

Notations
★

Example

Translate the following into English

$P = I \text{ cheat}$ $R = I \text{ write on Exam}$

$Q = I \text{ will get caught}$ $S = I \text{ will fail}$

$\cdot (R \wedge P) \rightarrow (Q \wedge S)$

if I write on exam and I cheat

then I will get caught and I will fail

Example:

Translate into Propositional Logic:

If James does not die then Mary will not get any money and James family will be happy.

$(\neg P) \rightarrow (\neg Q \wedge R)$

define our keys

not is a connective

$P = \text{James dies}$

$Q = \text{Mary will get money}$

$R = \text{James family will be happy}$

PR.3: IMPLICATIONS

Give the converse, inverse and contrapositive of the conditional statement:

Prof. B is happy when you get your homework done on time.

Converse $q \rightarrow p$

Inverse $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$

Contrapositive $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$

KEY

- ① First write in "If p , then q " form.
- so it's clear what is p and what is q



Which property implies
the other property.

Prof. B is happy when you get your homework done on time.
Rewrite: If you get your homework done on time, then Prof. B is happy

p

q

* "You have to get your HW done on time" ~ Happens 1st

p is called the hypothesis
 q is called the conclusion

Converse $q \rightarrow p$

If Prof. B is happy, then you get your homework done on time.

Inverse $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$

If you did not get your homework done on time, Prof. B is not happy

Contrapositive $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$

If Prof. B is not happy, then you did not get your homework done on time.

More Notes

Implication $p \rightarrow q$ "If p, then q"

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

MORE ON IMPLICATIONS

In $p \rightarrow q$ there does not need to be any connection between the antecedent or the consequent. The "meaning" of $p \rightarrow q$ depends only on the truth values of p and q .

These implications are perfectly fine, but would not be used in ordinary English.

- "If the moon is made of green cheese, then I have more money than Bill Gates." $\stackrel{?}{q}$
- "If $1 + 1 = 3$, then your grandma wears combat boots." $\stackrel{?}{q}$

~ "Are related"

One way to view the logical conditional is to think of an obligation or contract.

- "If I am elected, then I will lower taxes."
- "If you get 100% on the final, then you will get an A."

If the politician is elected and does not lower taxes, then the voters can say that he or she has broken the campaign pledge. Something similar holds for the professor. This corresponds to the case where p is true and q is false.

Looking just at truth values.

IMPLICATIONS: CONVERSE, INVERSE, CONTRA-POSITIVE

From $p \rightarrow q$ we can form new conditional statements.

- $q \rightarrow p$ is the converse of $p \rightarrow q$ ~ Switch Order
- $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$ is the inverse of $p \rightarrow q$ analog
- $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ is the contrapositive of $p \rightarrow q$ ~ neg + switch

Example: Find the converse, inverse, and contrapositive of "It is raining is a sufficient condition for my not going to town."

✗ converse: If I do not go to town, then it is raining.

inverse: If it is not raining, then I will go to town. ✓

contrapositive: If I go to town, then it is not raining.

If it is raining, then I will not go to town
 $\stackrel{?}{P} \qquad \qquad \qquad \stackrel{?}{q}$

* Note that only the contrapositive has the same truth values as the original conditional statement. We call these equivalent. The converse and inverse are equivalent to one another, as well.

Applications of Propositional Logic

TRANSLATING ENGLISH SENTENCES

Steps to convert an English sentence to a statement in propositional logic using:

* "If I go to Harry's or to the country, I will not go shopping."

Step 1: Identify atomic propositions and represent using propositional variables.

- p: I go to Harry's
- q: I go to the country.
- r: I will go shopping

Step 2: Determine appropriate logical connectives

- If p or q, then not r
- $(p \vee q) \rightarrow \neg r$

If p or q

PR.1: TRANSLATING ENGLISH SENTENCES

Convert each sentence into propositional logic.

a. You can access the Internet from campus only if you are a computer science major or you are not a freshman.

b. The automated reply cannot be sent when the file system is full.

a. You can access the Internet from campus only if you are a computer science major or you are not a freshman.

p: Computer internet access
q: Computer science major
r: freshman

"if p, then q or not r"

$$P \rightarrow (q \vee \neg r)$$

b. The automated reply cannot be sent when the file system is full.

p: automated reply can be sent
q: file system is full

$$q \rightarrow \neg P$$

"If q, then p"

CONSISTENT SYSTEM SPECIFICATIONS

Definition: A list of propositions is **consistent** if it is possible to assign truth values to the proposition variables so that each proposition is true.

Exercise: Are these specifications consistent?

- ① • "The diagnostic message is stored in the buffer ~~or~~ it is retransmitted."
- ② • "The diagnostic message is ~~not~~ stored in the buffer." a
- ③ • "If the diagnostic message is stored in the buffer, then it is retransmitted."

Solution: Let p denote "The diagnostic message is stored in the buffer." Let q denote "The diagnostic message is retransmitted" The specification can be written as:

$$\textcircled{1} \ p \vee q, \textcircled{2} \ \neg p, \textcircled{3} \ p \rightarrow q$$

When p is false and q is true all three statements are true. So the specification is consistent.

$F \quad T$ $p \vee q,$ \downarrow look & Truth Value T	$T F = T$ $\neg p,$ \downarrow look & Truth Value T	$F \rightarrow T$ $p \rightarrow q$ \downarrow look & Truth Value T
---	---	---

PR.2: LOGIC PUZZLES (P.23 #18)

When planning a party, you want to know whom to invite. Among the people you would like to invite are three touchy friends. You know that if Jasmine attends, she will become unhappy if Samir is there. Samir will attend only if Kanti will be there, and Kanti will not attend unless Jasmine also does. Which combinations of these three friends can you invite so as not to make someone unhappy?

Yo

PR.3: LOGIC PUZZLES (P.23 #32A)

The police have three suspects for the murder of Mr. Cooper: Mr. Smith, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Williams. Smith, Jones, and Williams each declare that they did not kill Cooper. Smith also states that Cooper was a friend of Jones and that Williams disliked him. Jones also states that he did not know Cooper and that he was out of town the day Cooper was killed. Williams also states that he saw both Smith and Jones with Cooper the day of the killing and that either Smith or Jones must have killed him. Can you determine who the murderer was? There is only one murderer, and the two innocent men are telling the truth but the guilty man may be lying?

LOGIC PUZZLES

An island has two kinds of inhabitants, **knaves**, who always tell the truth, and **knives**, who always lie. You go to the island and meet A and B. A says "B is a knight.". B says "The two of us are of opposite types." What are A and B? Let p represent that A is a knight and q represent that B is a knight.

- Suppose A is a knight. Then p is true. Since a knight tells the truth, then q is also true. But this violates B's statement that A and B are different types. Since B would have to tell the truth, this scenario doesn't work.



- If A is a knave. He tells us that B is a knight, but he must be lying because he is a knave. Therefore B is also a knave. B tells us that he and A are of a different type, but he must be lying since he is a knave. Therefore, both A and B are knaves. This is the only logical conclusion.

LOGIC PUZZLES

Can we represent this with a truth table? Yes, but it may be easier without using p and q. In order to find the truth, the values after each statement must match the possibilities on the left. Try this with me. (Note, I have filled in the A column for the first statement and B for the second statement, as those values wouldn't change.)

Our Four Possibilities		A says "B is a knight"		B says "The two of us are of opposite type"	
A	B	A	B	A	B
Knight	Knight	Knight			Knight
Knight	Knave	Knight			Knave
Knave	Knight	Knave			Knight
Knave	Knave	Knave			Knave

Statement and Translation Examples

Logic

Translate the following sentences, given the following statements:

P: I finish writing my computer program before lunch

q: I shall play tennis in the afternoon

r: The sun is shining

s: The humidity is low

some of
sayings } P is necessary for q
 q → P

usually most
difficult

Problems:

1) If the sun is shining, I shall play tennis this afternoon.

P → q

if statement

$$P \rightarrow q$$

- 2 statements

2) Finishing the writing of my computer program before lunch is necessary for my playing tennis this afternoon.

is necessary for

2 connectives

P is necessary for q

$$q \rightarrow P$$

$$q \rightarrow P$$

- 2 statements

Some as sayings

3) Low Humidity and sunshine are sufficient for me to play tennis this afternoon.

are sufficient for me to play tennis

2 q

$$(S \wedge r) \rightarrow q$$

P is sufficient for q

$$P \rightarrow q$$

Sufficient for
playing tennis this
afternoon? (q)

Question 2

Determine which is a statement.

1) In 1999, Barack Obama released a K-pop album.

Yes, it's a statement b/c it has a truth value, it is either True or False.

2.) $17y + 20x$ is an integer $P(x, y)$

No, not a statement b/c y and x are variables

it's not a statement if it has a variable in it.

~ tricky

3.) Tell me the time.

No, this is a command

4.) I can't live without you.

Yes, a statement

~ Can be True or False

Truth Tables

Logic

Recall: Each statement is True or False

- ~ Truth Table will tell us all possible outcomes of statements and connectives !
- 32 is even T/F
- $A \leq B$ iff $x \in B$ implies $x \in A$ F/O

* All connection connectives take a truth value and output a truth value.

Taking a look at each Connective:

Negation (\neg , \sim)

Truth Table

P	$\neg P$
1	0
0	1

Truth Table shows all possible combinations of truth conditions

What does Negation do?

if P is True then the negation

of P is going to be false (Vice-Versa)

Shows all possible combination of truth conditions (P can either be True or False)

$$\text{Neg } P = 1 - P \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{Nice way to} \\ \text{find the value} \end{array}$$

example: $P = 1 \quad \neg P = 1 - P = 0$ of the negation.

(Mathematical way of looking at the problem)

Conjunction (\wedge , $\&$, $-$)

and

P	q	$P \wedge q$
1	1	1
1	0	0
0	1	0
0	0	0

mostly
use the
carrot (\wedge)
Symbol

p and q

If at row = 2 # of statements

Conjunction: compound statement formed by joining two statements with the connector "and"

$$P \wedge q = \min(P, q)$$

The min of P, q
← lowest value in row is 1

↓
lowest value in row is 0

↓
lowest value in row is 0

Mathematical
Way of looking
at this.

What does p and q do to the truth value?

- ~ only true when both p and q are true
- ~ in every other scenario it's false

All possible combinations

Inclusive
or
Disjunction ~ "or"

Disjunction ($\vee, +$)

P	q	$P \vee q$
1	1	1
1	0	1
0	1	1
0	0	0

Mathematically \exists

$$P \vee q = \max(P, q)$$

P and q are true if at least one of P, q are true.

← neither P or q are true so $P \vee q$ is false.

Conditional (\rightarrow, \Rightarrow)

if p then q

P	q	$P \rightarrow q$
1	1	1
1	0	0
0	1	1
0	0	1

It's not sunny out

Mathematically

$$P \rightarrow q = 1$$

iff $p \leq q$

2nd Scenario: $1 \not\leq 0 = 0$

it is only false if P is true and Q is false, the rest of the times it will be true

Practice statement

if its sunny

I will wear

Sunscreen

KEY

When am I lying to you?

I am lying to you if it is sunny out (which would be P is true) and I'm not wearing sunscreen.

This is like my promise to you. I'm saying look it's sunny out I promise

I will wear sunscreen and it is sunny and I'm not wearing sunscreen

I lied to you therefore the conditional is false. But if it's not sunny outside

so I am not lying to you am I

It doesn't matter if I'm wearing sunscreen or not it's not sunny outside therefore I'm not violating any truth condition therefore it is true in the bottom two cases.

2 more connectives

Biconditional (\leftrightarrow, \equiv) iff \curvearrowright if and only if

P	q	$P \leftrightarrow q$	$p = q$ then $P \leftrightarrow q = 1$
1	1	1	if they (p and q) are the same
1	0	0	value then it's <u>True</u> .
0	1	0	
0	0	1	

Exclusive Or (\oplus, \vee)

- opposite of the biconditional

$p \neq q$

then $P \oplus q = 1$

P	q	$P \oplus q$
1	1	0
1	0	1
0	1	1
0	0	0

Proofs with Truth Tables

Logic

Formulas p and q are logically equivalent iff the truth conditions of p are the same as the truth conditions of q .

$p \Leftrightarrow q$ iff

P	q
X	X
Y	Y

↙

↙ the same so p and q are logically equivalent.

Example:

↙ logically equivalent

Is $(p \wedge q) \Leftrightarrow \neg(p \vee q)$? NO! Why?

P	q	$p \wedge q$	$p \vee q$	$\neg(p \vee q)$
1	1	1	1	0
1	0	0	1	0
0	1	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	1

"or" ~ The truth conditions for p and q ($p \wedge q$) and the truth conditions for $\neg(p \vee q)$ are not identical, therefore they are not logically equivalent.

Steps to solve logically Equivalent Problems:

1st: Build truth table for p and q

- Then solve each column

NOT
THE
SAME

For $\neg(p \vee q)$ we take the negation of the previous column ($p \vee q$)

2nd: Check statement

\neg : not
~reverse value

example 2:

Is $\neg(p \wedge q) \leftrightarrow (\neg p \vee \neg q)$? Yes, they're logically equivalent

P	q	$p \wedge q$	$\neg(p \wedge q)$	$\neg p$	$\neg q$	$\neg p \vee \neg q$
1	1	1	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	0	1	1
0	1	0	1	1	0	1
0	0	0	1	1	1	1

After doing the truth table, you can look at the truth conditions for the two formulas we want to compare.

- By being logically equivalent if I ever have not P and q in a proof somewhere I can substitute that in with not P or not q b/c they're exactly the same thing.

Exercise:

Show that $(p \vee \neg p)$ is always true.

a tautology.

P	$\neg p$	$p \vee \neg p$
1	0	1
0	1	1

Every single output is a 1

~ every single value in our truth table is going to be 1.

P or not p could be more elaborate

$$\underbrace{(a \wedge b)}_P \vee \underbrace{\neg(a \wedge b)}_{\neg p}$$

] combination of composition

Exercise:

Show that $(p \vee \neg p)$ is always False. (otherwise known as a contradiction)

P	$\neg p$	$p \wedge \neg p$
1	0	0
0	1	0

a contradiction

Every single output is a 0

Proofs using Truth Tables

Truth Table Examples

Logic

Example 1:

Draw the Truth Table for $\neg(p \vee \neg q) \rightarrow \neg p$

P	q	$\neg P$	$\neg q$	$P \vee \neg q$	$\neg(P \vee \neg q)$	$\neg(P \vee \neg q) \rightarrow \neg P$
1	1	0	0	1	0	1
1	0	0	1	1	0	1
0	1	1	0	0	1	1
0	0	1	1	1	0	1

Tautology ~ all outcomes in truth table is True (1). $(\top P \wedge q) \rightarrow \top P$

Example 2:

$$\overline{[p \wedge (p \rightarrow q)]} \rightarrow q$$

P	q	$P \rightarrow q$	$P \wedge (P \rightarrow q)$	$(P \wedge (P \rightarrow q)) \rightarrow q$
1	1	1	1	1
1	0	0	0	1
0	1	1	0	1
0	0	1	0	1

Exclusive Or Example.

Example 1:

Write the Truth table for Exclusive or, ($P \oplus q$), then state whether $(P \oplus P) \oplus P$ is a tautology, contradiction or neither.

XOR

P	q	$P \oplus q$
1	1	0
1	0	1
0	1	1
0	0	0

P	$P \oplus P$	$(P \oplus P) \oplus P$
1	0	1
0	0	0

not different

- We can say $(P \oplus P) \oplus P = P$, logically equivalent, neither a tautology nor a contradiction.

Example 2:

Give the Truth table for $(P \oplus q) \vee (P \oplus \neg q)$

P	q	$\neg q$	x	y	$x \vee y$
1	1	0	0	1	1
1	0	1	1	0	1
0	1	0	1	0	1
0	0	1	0	1	1

- Tautology

$$(P \oplus q) \vee (P \oplus \neg q) = 1$$

Sheffer Stroke Examples

~ Another logical operator

$P \uparrow q$ is to be read as "p monand q", and is equivalent to $\neg(p \wedge q)$. \neg

Provide the truth table for $(p \uparrow q)$ and $(P \uparrow P)$.

P	q	$p \uparrow q$
1	1	0
1	0	1
0	1	1
0	0	1

P	$P \uparrow P \Leftrightarrow \neg P$	$\neg P$ or $\neg q$
1	0	
0	1	

$$\neg \ell \Leftrightarrow \ell \uparrow \ell$$

Sheffer stroke

at least one of them in the column
are false, so $p \uparrow q$
is true

Questions

1) Using the Sheffer stroke, provide the a definition for $(p \wedge q)$

$$P \uparrow q \Leftrightarrow \neg(p \wedge q)$$

$$(p \wedge q) \Leftrightarrow \neg \neg(p \wedge q)$$

$$\neg \ell \Leftrightarrow \ell \uparrow \ell$$

$$\ell = p \uparrow q$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \neg(p \uparrow q)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (p \uparrow q) \uparrow (p \uparrow q)$$

2) find definition for $P \vee q$

$$(P \vee q)$$

$$\neg \neg \neg p \vee \neg \neg q$$

$$\neg (\neg (\neg p) \vee (\neg q))$$

$$\sim \sim \sim \neg (p \wedge q)$$

similar to the Sheffer stroke

Something as
↓ need to define those in terms of the Sheffer stroke

$$(p \uparrow p) \uparrow (q \uparrow q)$$

This "not", "and" is
the Sheffer stroke itself
so our definition of
 $(P \vee q)$ is just

Logical Equivalent

Logic Laws

- We can use logical equivalences to reduce complex formulas into simpler ones
- Two new symbols \Leftrightarrow or \equiv

* logical equivalence is denoted \Leftrightarrow

Truth table (always look like)

T	F
1	0
1	0

T : Tautology (always 1)

F : Contradiction (always 0)

first laws

Identity

$$P \wedge T \Leftrightarrow P$$

~ logically equivalent to P

$$P \vee F \Leftrightarrow P$$

"or"

Domination

$$P \vee T \Leftrightarrow T$$

~ True is always True

$$P \wedge F \Leftrightarrow F$$

~ False is always False

The Tautology is always true

Let's reduce this Problem:

$$(P \vee F) \wedge (q \vee T)$$

$$P \wedge (q \vee T) \quad \text{Identity Law}$$

$$P \wedge T \quad \text{Domination Law}$$

$$P \quad \text{Identity Law}$$

~ in domination P, doesn't matter

~ We can see how the Truth and False are dominating over the formula

Double Negation

$$\neg\neg P \Leftrightarrow P$$

~ crosses out *

* DeMorgan's Law ~ Used everywhere!

$$\neg(P \wedge q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee \neg q$$

distributed

$$\neg(P \vee q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \wedge \neg q$$

Example:

$$\neg(\neg P \wedge \neg q)$$

$$\neg\neg P \vee \neg\neg q \quad \text{DeMorgan Law}$$

$$P \vee q$$

Double Negation

$$3 \times (1+2) \rightarrow \\ (3 \times 1) + (3 \times 2)$$

Another way to look

Distributive law

$$P \wedge (q \vee r) \Leftrightarrow (P \wedge q) \vee (P \wedge r)$$

$$P \vee (q \wedge r) \Leftrightarrow (P \vee q) \wedge (P \vee r)$$

Absorption Law

$$P \wedge (P \vee q) \Leftrightarrow P$$

$$P \vee (P \wedge q) \Leftrightarrow P$$

example:

$$\neg\neg p \vee ((p \vee F) \wedge \neg\neg q)$$

$$p \vee (\underline{(p \vee F) \wedge q}) \quad \text{Double Negation} \times 2$$

$$p \vee (p \wedge q) \quad \text{Identity}$$

P

Absorption

Commutativity (V, A)

$$P \wedge q \Leftrightarrow q \wedge P$$

$$P \vee q \Leftrightarrow q \vee P$$

~ We can flip the order

Inverse Laws

$$P \wedge \neg P \Leftrightarrow F$$

$$P \vee \neg P \Leftrightarrow T$$

Associativity (V, A)

$$P \wedge (q \wedge r) \Leftrightarrow (P \wedge q) \wedge r$$

✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓

~ can do "ors" as well

~ make sure the signs stay the same.

Conditional Law

$$P \rightarrow q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee q$$

* Truth Tables *

P	q	$P \rightarrow q$	$\neg P$	$\neg P \vee q$
1	1	1	0	1
1	0	0	0	0
0	1	1	1	1
0	0	1	1	1

∴ logically Equivalent

Exercise:

Show $(\neg(p \wedge q) \wedge q)$ is logically equivalent to $(\neg p \wedge q)$.

$$\underline{\neg(p \wedge q)} \wedge q$$

$$(\neg p \vee \neg q) \wedge q \quad \text{DeMorgan's Law}$$

$$(q \wedge \neg p) \vee (\neg q \wedge q)$$

$$(q \wedge \neg p) \vee F$$

Inverse

What happens if I have anything or False?
~ that's left with anything it had before

Identity Law: $(P \vee F \Leftrightarrow P)$

$$\neg p \wedge q$$

Commutativity Law

~ can flip anything around

Proofs

example $P \wedge T \Leftrightarrow P$

Identity Laws

Truth Table

P	T	$P \wedge T$
T	T	T
F	T	F

We see that
 P and $P \wedge T$ are
logically Equivalent

example $P \vee F \Leftrightarrow P$

Truth Table

P	F	$P \vee F$
T	F	T
F	F	F

logically Equivalent

Absorption Law

example: $P \wedge (P \vee q) \Leftrightarrow P$

Truth Table:

P	q	$P \vee q$	$P \wedge (P \vee q)$
1	1	1	1
1	0	1	1
0	1	1	0
0	0	0	0

P and $P \wedge (P \vee q)$ are
logically equivalent.

Domination Law Proof

$$p \vee T \Leftrightarrow T$$

Truth Table

P	T	$p \vee T$
1	1	1
0	0	1

$$p \wedge F \Leftrightarrow F$$

P	F	$p \wedge F$
1	0	0
0	0	0

Inversion Law Proof

$$p \wedge \neg p \Leftrightarrow F$$

P	$\neg p$	$p \wedge \neg p$	F
1	0	0	0
0	1	0	0

$$p \vee \neg p \Leftrightarrow T$$

P	$\neg p$	$p \vee \neg p$	T
1	0	1	1
0	1	1	1

DeMorgan Law Proof

$$\neg(p \wedge q) \Leftrightarrow \neg p \vee \neg q$$

P	q	$(p \wedge q)$	$\neg(p \wedge q)$	$\neg p$	$\neg q$	$\neg p \vee \neg q$
1	1	1	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	0	1	1
0	1	0	1	1	0	1
0	0	0	1	1	1	1

$$\neg(p \vee q) \Leftrightarrow \neg p \wedge \neg q$$

P	q	$(p \vee q)$	$\neg(p \vee q)$	$\neg p$	$\neg q$	$\neg p \wedge \neg q$
1	1	1	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	0	0	1	0
0	1	1	0	1	0	0
0	0	0	1	1	1	1

Logic Laws Example 1.

1.)

Use Laws to reduce: $\neg[(p \wedge q) \rightarrow r]$

$$1.) \neg(\neg(p \wedge q) \vee r) \quad \text{~Conditional Law ~perform this law 1st}$$

$$2.) \neg\neg(p \wedge q) \wedge \neg r \quad \text{DeMorgan's Law}$$

$$3.) p \wedge q \wedge \neg r \quad \text{Double Negation}$$

2.) Prove that $(\neg p \vee q) \wedge (p \wedge (\neg p \wedge q)) \Leftrightarrow (p \wedge q)$

$$1.) (\neg p \vee q) \wedge \underline{(p \wedge (\neg p \wedge q))}^P \quad \text{identity law}$$

$$2.) ((p \wedge q) \wedge q) \vee ((p \wedge q) \wedge \neg p) \quad \text{Distribution Law}$$

$$3.) (p \wedge q) \vee (\underline{(p \wedge q)} \wedge \neg p) \quad \text{identity law}$$

$$4.) (p \wedge q) \vee F \quad \text{~all conjunctions}$$

Negation

$$5.) p \wedge q$$

~ if we have something that could be true or something that's always false its always going to take the upper value.

Want this to reduce to True

3.) Show that $(p \vee q) \rightarrow (q \rightarrow q)$ is a tautology $\Leftrightarrow T$

1) $\neg(p \vee q) \vee (q \rightarrow q)$ definition of \rightarrow

2) $\neg(p \vee q) \vee (\neg q \vee q)$ do the \rightarrow again

3) $\neg(p \vee q) \vee T$ - b/c this is the law of t.

4) T - if we have something \neg always be True

or True, it's always going to take

the upper value with the or, and True is always True

If we have this $\neg(p \rightarrow q) \Leftrightarrow ((\neg p) \wedge q) \vee (\neg q) \wedge T$

statement: $\neg(p \rightarrow q)$

\uparrow_1 this is always True, then that means the conditional will always be a 1.

$\neg(p \rightarrow q)$ - We know it's a 1 b/c if we have

$q \rightarrow q$ this is always True

- always a Tautology

Logic Laws Examples 2

Show that $p \rightarrow q$ and $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ are logically equivalent without using truth tables or the contraposition law.

1. $p \rightarrow q$
2. $\neg p \vee q$
3. $\neg(\neg q) \vee \neg p$ definition of \rightarrow (conditional law)
commutivity law
4. $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ def of \rightarrow

Show that $(p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)$ and $(p \vee q) \rightarrow r$ are logically equivalent

1. $(p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)$
2. $(\neg p \vee r) \wedge (\neg q \vee r) \rightarrow$ def
3. $r \vee (\neg q \wedge \neg p)$ distributed law
4. $(\neg q \wedge \neg p) \vee r$ communitivity law
5. $\neg(\neg q \wedge \neg p) \rightarrow r \rightarrow$ def
6. $(\neg\neg q \vee \neg\neg p) \rightarrow r$ DeMorgan's
7. $(q \vee p) \rightarrow r$ Double Negation

Conditionals

~ Challenging ~

Conditionals

* True Conditional is equivalent to the
nothing else *

Contrapositive

Converse

$$P \rightarrow q$$

$$\neg P \vee q$$

logically equivalent

$$q \rightarrow P$$

~ flipping the order

$$\neg q \vee P$$

logically equivalent

~ logically equivalent

~ logically Equivalent

Inverse

$$\neg P \rightarrow \neg q$$

Just adding the
negations
to P and
q

$$\neg \neg P \vee \neg q$$

$$P \vee \neg q$$

Double
Negation
logically
Equivalent

Contrapositive

$$\neg q \rightarrow \neg P$$

$$\neg \neg q \vee \neg P$$

$$q \vee \neg P$$

uses double negation

logically equivalent

Biconditional

- conjunction of two conditionals

not a standard
operator

$$P \leftrightarrow q \iff (P \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow P)$$

p only if q

p if q

if and only if

Truth Table
Proof →

P	q	$P \leftrightarrow q$	$(P \rightarrow q)$	$q \rightarrow P$	$(P \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow P)$
1	1	1	1	1	1
1	0	0	0	1	0
0	1	0	1	0	0
0	0	1	1	1	1

logically equivalent

"if p, then q"

"p implies q"

"if p, q"

"p only if q"

"p is sufficient for q"

"a sufficient condition for q is p"

"q if p"

"q whenever p"

"q when p"

"q is necessary for p"

"a necessary condition for p is q"

"q follows from p"

"q unless $\neg p$ "

Extra Notes on Conditionals

If I study hard, then I will pass.
p q

If p then q
 $p \rightarrow q$ (" p implies q)

Either I don't study hard, or I pass
 $\neg p \vee q$

Vasconly True statements

When the hypothesis is false, the statement is **Vasconly true**.

Ex: if Trofor is a unicorn, then everyone gets an A.
if p then q
 $p \rightarrow q$

Translation Examples

"I will pass if I get a good exam mark." if p then q

P

G → P

"I will pass only if I get a good exam mark."

P → G

"I will pass if and only if I get a good exam score."

P ↔ G

These two statements are closely related in terms of the biconditional.

→ This means if you get a good exam mark and you don't pass then it's false, because it's a lie.

(true) → (true) \wedge (false) \rightarrow (false)

If I pass the course $P \rightarrow G$ if P is 1 then I better be getting a good exam mark, so I^1 will pass only if I get a good exam mark.

$P \rightarrow G$ is FALSE

- if I pass and don't get a good exam mark then this is going to be false, I will only pass if I get a good exam mark. This says I passed, even though I didn't get a good exam mark, which is a lie.

~ Think of it when someone is lying.

Example

Mark is writing an exam on propositional logic. During the Exam, Dr. Cheetmaster notices that Mark is acting up rather suspicious. Suspecting Mark of cheating, Dr. Cheetmaster walks up behind Mark and notices a cheat sheet. Dr. Cheetmaster says

"If you don't give me your cheat sheet, then you will fail the course."

Because Mark doesn't want to fail, he gives Dr. Cheetmaster his cheatsheet. After reviewing the Cheatsheet, Dr. Cheetmaster fails Mark.

NO

Did Dr. Cheetmaster lie to Mark? Explain your answer using the truth conditions of the conditional and its logical equivalencies.

Answer:

$$T \leftarrow C \rightarrow F \Leftrightarrow \neg F \rightarrow C$$

But Mark gave Dr. Cheetmaster the cheatsheet

C

I doesn't matter if he gave him his cheatsheet, he was probably going to fail

Conditional Examples

Determine whether the conditionals are True or False.

(i) If $\underbrace{2 \times 4 = 6}$, then $\underbrace{3 + 6 = 7}$

FALSE

FAKE

? + ?

$0 \rightarrow 0$ is not True? \therefore False

(ii) If $\underbrace{1+1=2}$, then $\underbrace{3 \times 6 = 18}$

TRUE

TRUE

? + ?

$1 \rightarrow 1$

True?

(iii) $\underbrace{2 \times 7 = 14}$ only if $\underbrace{6 \times 2 = 18}$

TRUE

FAKE

False? + ?

When we have only if
if p then Q is equivalent to know I + I
P only if Q

Question #2:

"If it snows I will cry"

Converse

$$Q \rightarrow P$$

If I will cry then it snows

Inverse

$$\neg P \rightarrow \neg Q$$

if it doesn't snow, then I will not cry

Contra positive

$$\neg Q \rightarrow \neg \neg P$$

If I won't cry, then it doesn't snow

~ This is logically equivalent to the 1st conditional.

Rules of Inference

- Deducing logical outcomes

ITM

if it rains, I will get wet.

It's raining

if I will get wet.

- We take one or two premises from them

- A set of premises P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n prove some conclusion q in an argument.

$$(P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge \dots \wedge P_n) \rightarrow q$$

- An argument is valid if the premises logically entail the conclusion

If all our rules of inference take us from the premises to the conclusion then it's Valid. If there are improper steps or steps that aren't logically equivalent in there, then it's invalid.

Laws ★ Rules of Inferences ★

1. Modus Ponens

① Modus Ponens

MPP

↳ so action refers to confirming the antecedent

$$\begin{array}{c} P \rightarrow q \\ \text{if } P \text{ is true} \\ \therefore q \end{array}$$

Illustrating the
thing into the
arrow and
getting an
output

② Modus Tollens

MTT

-opposite way

$$\begin{array}{c} P \rightarrow q \\ \neg q \\ \hline \therefore \neg P \end{array}$$

$\neg P \rightarrow \neg P$

logically Equivalent

③ Hypothetical Syllogism

like transitivity

HS

$$\begin{array}{c} P \rightarrow q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \hline \therefore P \rightarrow r \end{array}$$

$$P \leftarrow (q \wedge q \rightarrow r)$$

④ Disjunctive Syllogism

DS

$$\begin{array}{c} P \vee q \\ \neg P \\ \hline \therefore q \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Take short cut} \\ P \rightarrow q \rightarrow r \\ \text{Hence } P \rightarrow r \end{array}$$

⑤ Addition VI

Addition rule if p is true then p or q is true.

$$\begin{array}{c} P \\ \text{then } P \text{ or } q \text{ is} \\ \text{True.} \end{array}$$

$\therefore P \vee q$ is not a tautology.

⑦ Conjunction $\wedge I$

Conjunction rule if p and q are

both true, then $P \wedge q$ is also true.

$\frac{P \quad q}{\therefore P \wedge q}$ $P \wedge q$ are going to be true

⑥ Simplification $\wedge E$

$$\begin{array}{c} P \wedge q \\ \hline \therefore P \\ \therefore q \end{array}$$

and elimination
bc you're removing
the and from it.

① Exercise

1. R Premise
2. $R \rightarrow D$ Premise
3. $D \rightarrow \neg J$ Premise

4. ~~R~~ $\neg D$ - using 1, 2, MPP
- stuck R in and got D
5. $\neg J$ - using 3, 4, MPP

Another way to do things (Hypothetical Syllogism)

4. $R \rightarrow \neg J$ - using 2, 3, HS
5. $\neg J$ - 1, 4 MPP

Task:

- Prove that (1) - (3) entail $\neg J$.
- Justify each step

② Exercise

1. $(\neg R \vee \neg F) \rightarrow (S \wedge L)$ Premise
2. $S \rightarrow T$ Premise
3. $\neg T$ Premise

4. $\neg S$ 2, 3, MTT
5. $\neg(S \wedge L) \rightarrow \neg(\neg R \vee \neg F)$ 1, Contrapositive
6. $(\neg S \vee \neg L) \rightarrow (\neg \neg R \wedge \neg \neg F)$ 5, De Morgan's
7. $(\neg S \vee \neg L) \rightarrow (R \wedge F)$ 6, 8 Double Negation
8. $\neg S \vee \neg L$ 4, Addition

9. $R \wedge F$ 7, 8 MPP

10. R 9, Simplification

Task:

- Show that (1) - (3) entail R

Predicate Logic and Negating Quantifiers

Logic

Predicate Logic and Quantifiers ↳ Can have terms?

We want to talk about variables

e.g. $\Sigma(x) = x \text{ is even}$

two-place predicate

open

$G(x, y) = x \text{ is greater than } y$

NOT A STATEMENT!

Can stick in constants
in

$G(2, 1) = 2 \text{ is greater than } 1$ True? ~ has a truth value

$G(3, 6) = 3 \text{ is greater than } 6$ False?

What's the difference b/w closed and open formulae; well closed formulae have truth values and open do not have truth values.

so $G(x, y)$ is not a statement. Which means we can't even have it in propositional logic at all, we need predicate logic in order to say something like $G(x, y)$ is greater than y . and assigned truth values to constants plugged into those variables and that's one thing predicate logic lets us do. But the more important thing it does is gives us quantifiers.

We want to introduce quantifiers

Universal Quantifier

$\forall x P(x)$: "For all x , x is P "

(for all x) $\forall P$ $\ldots \wedge Q \vee R \vee \ldots$ is valid

Existential Quantifier

$\exists x P(x)$: "For some x , x is P "

There exists
 x

We use this notation everywhere in mathematics

① For every real number n , there's a real number m such that $m^2 = n$.

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{R} \quad \exists m \in \mathbb{R} : m^2 \leq n \text{ or } P(m, n) \equiv m^2 = n$$

For all real numbers n

Exist an m in the

② Given two rationals, x and y , \sqrt{xy} will also be rational.

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{Q}, \sqrt{xy} \in \mathbb{Q}$$

or

Look $\forall x \in \mathbb{Q} \forall y \in \mathbb{Q}$ it says for both x and y there exist a rational

such that product of x and y is also rational. That is our result

• Translating some mathematical statements into predicate logic

Negating Quantifiers

• Define $\forall x, \exists x$ for a universe with elements, $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$

$$\forall x P(x) \Leftrightarrow P(1) \wedge P(2) \wedge \dots \wedge P(n)$$

• This is true if every x in the universe is P

$$\exists x P(x) \Leftrightarrow P(1) \vee \neg P(2) \vee \dots \vee \neg P(n)$$

↑
Definition of existential \exists

Show that $\neg \forall x [P(x)] \Leftrightarrow \exists x [\neg P(x)]$

$$\neg \forall x P(x) = \neg (P(1) \wedge P(2) \wedge \dots \wedge P(n))$$

$$= \neg P(1) \vee \neg P(2) \vee \dots \vee \neg P(n)$$

$$\exists x P(x) = P(1) \vee P(2) \vee \dots \vee P(n)$$

$$\neg \forall x P(x) \Leftrightarrow \exists x [\neg P(x)]$$

~ There exists an x except instead of just having $P(x)$ we have not $P(x)$ ($\neg P(x)$) because remember the definition of existent x

- Look very similar except there is negation in front of each term

$$[(\forall x P(x)) \wedge (\forall x Q(x))] \Leftrightarrow \forall x P(x) \wedge \forall x Q(x)$$

All Equivalencies

$$[(\exists x P(x)) \wedge (\exists x Q(x))] \Leftrightarrow \exists x P(x) \wedge \exists x Q(x)$$

$$\forall x P(x) \Leftrightarrow \neg \exists x [\neg P(x)]$$

$$\exists x P(x) \Leftrightarrow \neg \forall x [\neg P(x)]$$

$$\neg \forall x P(x) \Leftrightarrow \exists x [\neg P(x)]$$

$$\neg \exists x P(x) \Leftrightarrow \forall x [\neg P(x)]$$

Checking logically Equivalent

no negation as a plus (+)

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{no negation} \\ \text{as a plus (+)} \\ \text{minus (-)} \\ \text{csc} \\ \text{minor (-)} \\ \neg \forall x P(x) \\ \parallel \quad \parallel \text{unreduced} \\ -\forall +P \\ +\exists -P \\ \exists x \neg P(x) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \exists \quad \exists x P(x) \\ + \exists + P \\ -\forall - P \\ \neg \forall x [\neg P(x)] \end{array}$$

Negate the Following:

$$\forall x \exists y [P(x, y) \wedge Q(y)]$$

$$\neg [\forall x \exists y [P(x, y) \wedge Q(y)]]$$

\sim Brackets
 \sim 1st negate $\forall x$

$$\exists x \neg [\exists y [P(x, y) \wedge Q(y)]]$$

$$\exists x \forall y \neg [P(x, y) \wedge Q(y)]$$

\sim now we need to negate

$$\exists x \forall y [\neg P(x, y) \vee \neg Q(y)]$$

\sim now we do DeMorgan's Law

Negating Quantifiers and Translation Examples

Translate the following:

- Every student is majoring in math or computer science

$$\forall x [S(x) \rightarrow (M(x) \vee C(x))]$$

- For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $x > y$ if $x^2 > y^2$

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \forall y \in \mathbb{R} [(x^2 > y^2) \rightarrow (x > y)]$$

- For all $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an $\delta > 0$ such that $|f(x) - L| < \varepsilon$ when $|x - q| < \delta$.

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \delta > 0 [(|x - c| < \delta) \rightarrow (|f(x) - L| < \varepsilon)]$$

Negate:

$$\exists x (P_x \wedge Q_x)$$

$$\neg (\exists x (P_x \wedge Q_x))$$

$$\forall x (\neg (\exists x) (P_x \wedge Q_x)) \equiv \forall x [\neg P_x \vee \neg Q_x]$$

Negate: $\forall x (P_x \rightarrow Q_x)$

$$\neg (\forall x (P_x \rightarrow Q_x))$$

$$[\neg (\forall x) \exists x [\neg (P_x \rightarrow Q_x)]] \text{ or } \exists x [\neg (P_x \rightarrow Q_x)]$$

$$\exists x [\neg (\neg P_x \vee Q_x)]$$

$$\exists x [P_x \wedge \neg Q_x]$$

Unique Quantifier Examples

Determine the Truth Values.

(i) $n \in \mathbb{Z} \ \exists \exists n (n^2 = 2)$

We know $n = \pm \sqrt{2}$

FALSE

(ii) $x \in \mathbb{R} \quad \forall x (x^2 + 2 \geq 1)$

$x^2 \geq 0$

$0 + 2 \geq 1$

TRUE

(iii) $x \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \forall x ((-x)^2 = x^2)$

$0^2 = 0^2$

$(-3)^2 = 3^2$

$3^2 = (-3)^2$

TRUE

$\exists ! x$ means unique

If $\exists ! x P(x)$ means "there exists a unique x such that $P(x)$ ", determine the truth values of the following:

(i) $\exists ! x (x+1 = 2x) \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{Z}$

(ii) $\exists ! x (x > 1) \text{ for } x \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$

Which of the following are always True?

$$\exists ! x P(x) \rightarrow \exists x P(x)$$

$$\exists ! x \neg P(x) \rightarrow \neg \forall x P(x)$$

$$\exists x P(x) \rightarrow \exists ! x P(x)$$

Conditionals ★ Extra Notes ★

extra logic

Conditional

$$P \rightarrow Q$$

if P , "the hypothesis" then Q ~ "the conclusion"

Converse

$$Q \rightarrow P$$

if Q ~ "the conclusion" then P ~ "the hypothesis"

converse not

Inverse

$$\neg P \rightarrow \neg Q$$

if $\neg P$ ~ "the hypothesis" then $\neg Q$ ~ "the conclusion"

inverse not

Contra-positive

$$\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$$

if $\neg Q$ ~ "the conclusion" then $\neg P$ ~ "the hypothesis"

contra-positive not

Biconditional

$$P \Leftrightarrow Q$$

if P ~ "the hypothesis" then Q ~ "the conclusion"

Examples

① If you study then you will get a good grade

Whatever comes after the "If", will be the hypothesis

Whatever comes after the "then", that's your conclusion.

What would the Converse be?

-in reverse

If you got a good grade then you studied.

~ But that's not necessary true, you could've gotten a good grade b/c the teacher made the test really easy, or you're just naturally good at math.

What about the Inverse?

- Add word not in there (negated)
if you do not study, then you will not get a good grade.

What about the Contrapositive?

~ Combination of the converse and inverse and negating them:
if you do not get a good grade, then you did not study

2 Angles



- form lines, they are supplementary, add up to 180°

extra logic

② If 2 Angles ~~are~~ form a linear pair then they are supplementary

What would be the converse of the statement?

"If 2 Angles are supplementary, then they form a linear pair."

Is this True?

That's not necessarily true. ~~it has to be~~ What could have two angles here

Example of the converse: - Notice they're not adjacent error. Just b/c you say something in reverse doesn't mean its true you know forward or a conditional statement.

to each other, they're not sharing a vertex or end a ray.

- Not a linear pair

What about the Inverse of the statement?

"If 2 Angles do not form a linear pair then they are not supplementary."

True or False?

FALSE, b/c just b/c they don't form a linear pair doesn't mean they're not supplementary, they could still add up to 180° .

What about the Contra positive?

- Sketch the hypothesis and conclusion and we're going to negate them both.

"If 2 angles are not supplementary then they do not form a linear pair."

True or False?

TRUE, b/c if they're not supplementary, that means they don't add up to 180° there's no way that they could be forming a straight line, a linear pair.

~ Plus we know if the Conditional is True, then the contrapositive will automatically be true, they have the same truth value.



P

- ③ If 2 lines form right angles then they are Perpendicular.
~ That makes sense, it's True

What about a converse statement? What about if we say
"If two lines are perpendicular then they form right angles"

~ The conditional statement and the converse statement are both true, we can write this as a biconditional statement.

Biconditional means two conditional statements, meaning that it's a conditional statement forward and reverse. $P \leftrightarrow Q$

How do we rewrite this as a Biconditional?

~ replace with "If and Only if"

2 lines form right angles if and only if they are perpendicular.

Conditional statements

Dcf: $p \rightarrow q$ means:

"If p is TRUE then q is TRUE"

Practice Problems

Section 1.1

8. Let p and q be the propositions

p : I bought a lottery ticket this week.

q : I won the million dollar jackpot.

Express each of these propositions as an English sentence.

- a) $\neg p$ b) $p \vee q$ c) $p \rightarrow q$
d) $p \wedge q$ e) $p \leftrightarrow q$ f) $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$
g) $\neg p \wedge \neg q$ h) $\neg p \vee (p \wedge q)$

a) $\neg p$ I did not buy a lottery ticket this week

b) $p \vee q$ I bought a lottery ticket this week. or I won the million dollar jackpot.

c) $p \rightarrow q$ If I bought a lottery ticket this week. then I won the million dollar jackpot.

d) $p \wedge q$ I bought a lottery ticket this week. and I won the million dollar jackpot.

e) $p \leftrightarrow q$ I bought a lottery ticket this week. if and only if I won the million dollar jackpot.

f) $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$ If I did not buy a lottery ticket this week then I did not win the million dollar jackpot

g) $\neg p \wedge \neg q$ I did not buy a lottery ticket this week and I did not win the million dollar jackpot

h) $\neg p \vee (p \wedge q)$ I did not buy a lottery ticket this week or

10. Let p and q be the propositions "The election is decided" and "The votes have been counted," respectively. Express each of these compound propositions as an English sentence.

a) $\neg p$ \sim and

b) $p \vee q$
d) $q \rightarrow p$

c) $\neg p \wedge q$

e) $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$

g) $p \leftrightarrow q$

h) $\neg q \vee (\neg p \wedge q)$

p : The election is decided

q : The voter have been counted

a) $\neg p$ The election is not decided

b) $p \vee q$ The election is decided, or the voter have been counted.

c) $\neg p \wedge \neg q$ The election is not decided and the voter have been counted.

d) $q \rightarrow p$ if the voter have been counted, then the election is decided.

e) $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ if the voter have not been counted then the election is not decided.

f) $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$ If the election is not decided then the voter have not been counted.

g) $p \leftrightarrow q$ The election is decided if and only if the voter have been counted.

h) $\neg q \vee (\neg p \wedge q)$

15. Let p , q , and r be the propositions

p : Grizzly bears have been seen in the area.
 q : Hiking is safe on the trail.
 r : Berries are ripe along the trail.

Write these propositions using p , q , and r and logical connectives (including negations).

- a) Berries are ripe along the trail, but grizzly bears have not been seen in the area.
- b) Grizzly bears have not been seen in the area and hiking on the trail is safe, but berries are ripe along the trail.
- c) If berries are ripe along the trail, hiking is safe if and only if grizzly bears have not been seen in the area.
- d) It is not safe to hike on the trail, but grizzly bears have not been seen in the area and the berries along the trail are ripe.
- e) For hiking on the trail to be safe, it is necessary but not sufficient that berries not be ripe along the trail and for grizzly bears not to have been seen in the area.
- f) Hiking is not safe on the trail whenever grizzly bears have been seen in the area and berries are ripe along the trail.

$\wedge \sim$ and

$\vee \sim$ or

- a) Berries are ripe along the trail, but grizzly bears have not been seen in the area.

$$r \wedge \neg p$$

- b) Grizzly bears have not been seen in the area and hiking on the trail is safe, but berries are ripe along the trail.

$$\neg p \wedge q \wedge r$$

- c) If berries are ripe along the trail, hiking is safe if and only if grizzly bears have not been seen in the area.

$$\text{if } r^{\rightarrow} \quad r \rightarrow (q \leftrightarrow \neg p)$$

- d) It is not safe to hike on the trail, but grizzly bears have not been seen in the area and the berries along the trail are ripe.

$$\neg q \wedge \neg p \wedge r$$

- e) For hiking on the trail to be safe, it is necessary but not sufficient that berries not be ripe along the trail and for grizzly bears not to have been seen in the area.

$$q \rightarrow (\neg r \wedge \neg p)$$

- f) Hiking is not safe on the trail whenever grizzly bears have been seen in the area and berries are ripe along the trail.

$$(p \wedge r) \rightarrow \neg q$$

"if p , then q "

"if p , q "

" p is sufficient for q "

" q if p "

" q when p "

"a necessary condition for p is q "

" q unless $\neg p$ "

" p implies q "

" p only if q "

"a sufficient condition for q is p "

" q whenever p "

" q is necessary for p "

" q follows from p "

11. Let p and q be the propositions

p : It is below freezing.
 q : It is snowing.

Write these propositions using p and q and logical connectives (including negations).

- a) It is below freezing and snowing.
- b) It is below freezing but not snowing.
- c) It is not below freezing and it is not snowing.
- d) It is either snowing or below freezing (or both).
- e) If it is below freezing, it is also snowing.
- f) Either it is below freezing or it is snowing, but it is not snowing if it is below freezing.
- g) That it is below freezing is necessary and sufficient for it to be snowing.

- a) It is below freezing and snowing.

$$p \wedge q$$

- b) It is below freezing but not snowing.

$$p \wedge \neg q$$

- c) It is not below freezing and it is not snowing.

$$\neg p \wedge \neg q$$

- d) It is either snowing or below freezing (or both).

$$q \vee p$$

- e) If it is below freezing, it is also snowing.

$$p \rightarrow q$$

- f) Either it is below freezing or it is snowing, but it is not snowing if it is below freezing.

$$(p \vee q) \wedge (p \rightarrow \neg q)$$

- g) That it is below freezing is necessary and sufficient for it to be snowing.

$$p \leftrightarrow q$$

$\wedge \sim$ and

$\vee \sim$ or

"if p , then q "	" p implies q "
"if p, q "	" p only if q "
" p is sufficient for q "	"a sufficient condition for q is p "
" q if p "	" q whenever p "
" q when p "	" q is necessary for p "
"a necessary condition for p is q "	" q follows from p "
" q unless $\neg p$ "	

p : It is below freezing
 q : It is snowing

12. Let p , q , and r be the propositions

p : You have the flu.

q : You miss the final examination.

r : You pass the course.

Express each of these propositions as an English sentence.

- a) $p \rightarrow q$
- b) $\neg q \leftrightarrow r$
- c) $q \rightarrow \neg r$
- d) $p \vee q \vee r$
- e) $(p \rightarrow \neg r) \vee (q \rightarrow \neg r)$
- f) $(p \wedge q) \vee (\neg q \wedge r)$

a) $p \rightarrow q$

If you have the flu, then you miss the final examination.

b) $\neg q \leftrightarrow r$

You don't miss the final exam if and only if you pass the course.

c) $q \rightarrow \neg r$

If you miss the final examination, then you do not pass the course.

d) $p \vee q \vee r$

e) $(p \rightarrow \neg r) \vee (q \rightarrow \neg r)$

f) $(p \wedge q) \vee (\neg q \wedge r)$

14. Let p , q , and r be the propositions

p : You get an A on the final exam.
 q : You do every exercise in this book.
 r : You get an A in this class.

Write these propositions using p , q , and r and logical connectives (including negations).

- a) You get an A in this class, but you do not do every exercise in this book.
- b) You get an A on the final, you do every exercise in this book, and you get an A in this class.
- c) To get an A in this class, it is necessary for you to get an A on the final.
- d) You get an A on the final, but you don't do every exercise in this book; nevertheless, you get an A in this class.
- e) Getting an A on the final and doing every exercise in this book is sufficient for getting an A in this class.
- f) You will get an A in this class if and only if you either do every exercise in this book or you get an A on the final.

- a) You get an A in this class, but you do not do every exercise in this book.

$$r \wedge \neg q$$

- b) You get an A on the final, you do every exercise in this book, and you get an A in this class.

$$p \wedge q \wedge r$$

- c) To get an A in this class, it is necessary for you to get an A on the final.

$$r \rightarrow p$$

- d) You get an A on the final, but you don't do every exercise in this book; nevertheless, you get an A in this class.

$$p \wedge \neg q \wedge r$$

- e) Getting an A on the final and doing every exercise in this book is sufficient for getting an A in this class.

$$p \wedge q \rightarrow r$$

- f) You will get an A in this class if and only if you either do every exercise in this book or you get an A on the final.

$$r \leftrightarrow q \vee p$$

rown usually most difficult
 some of p is necessary for q
 $q \rightarrow p$
 p is sufficient for q
 , this afternoon. $P \rightarrow q$

22. Write each of these statements in the form "if p , then q " in English. [Hint: Refer to the list of common ways to express conditional statements provided in this section.]
- a) It is necessary to wash the boss's car to get promoted.
 - b) Winds from the south imply a spring thaw.
 - c) A sufficient condition for the warranty to be good is that you bought the computer less than a year ago.
 - d) Willy gets caught whenever he cheats.
 - e) You can access the website only if you pay a subscription fee.
 - f) Getting elected follows from knowing the right people.
 - g) Carol gets seasick whenever she is on a boat.

Analyze the sentence
- find the cause and effect

cause ~ if
effect ~ then

- a) It is necessary to wash the boss's car to get promoted.

1) Rewrite in "if p , then q " form.

If you wash your boss's car, then you will get promoted.

- b) Winds from the south imply a spring thaw.

cause: Wind from the south
effect: Spring thaw

- c) A sufficient condition for the warranty to be good is that you bought the computer less than a year ago.

cause: bought less than a year ago
effect: Warranty is good

If you bought the computer less than a year ago, then the warranty is good.

- d) Willy gets caught whenever he cheats.

cause: Cheats
effect: Caught

If Willy cheats, then he will get caught.

- e) You can access the website only if you pay a subscription fee.

cause: Pay for Subscription
effect: Access to Website

- f) Getting elected follows from knowing the right people.

cause: Knowing the right people
effect: Gets elected

- g) Carol gets seasick whenever she is on a boat.

cause: On a boat
effect: Gets seasick