Chapter 0

Expressions and Equations

Text before the first section.

0.1 Section Title

Text of section.

0.2 Section Title

Text of section.

0.3 Section Title

Text of section.

0.4 Section Title

Text of section.

0.5 Section Title

Text of section.

0.6 Section Title

Text of section.

0.7 Section Title

Text of section.

0.8 Section Title

Text of section.

0.9 Section Title

Text of section.

0.10 Sample code

Objectives

After completing this section, you should be able to do the following.

1. Explain the conditions under which an implication is true.
2. Identify statements as equivalent to a given implication or its converse.
3. Explain the relationship between the truth values of an implication, its converse, and its contrapositive.

0.10.1 Section Preview

Investigate!

While walking through a fictional forest, you encounter three trolls guarding a bridge. Each is either a *knight*, who always tells the truth, or a *knave*, who always lies. The trolls will not let you pass until you correctly identify each as either a knight or a knave. Each troll makes a single statement:

Troll 1: If I am a knave, then there are exactly two knights here.

Troll 2: Troll 1 is lying.

Troll 3: Either we are all knaves, or at least one of us is a knight.

Which troll is which?

Try it 0.10.1

Spend a few minutes thinking about the Investigate problem above. What could you conclude if you knew Troll 1 really was a knave (i.e., their statement was false)? Share your initial thoughts on this.

Definition 0.10.2 Argument.

An **argument** is a sequence of statements, the last of which is called the **conclusion** and the rest of which are called **premises**.

An argument is said to be **valid** provided the conclusion must be true whenever the premises are all true. An argument is **invalid** if it is not valid; that is, all the premises can be true, and the conclusion could still be false.

An argument is **sound** provided it is valid and all the premises are true. A

proof of a statement is a sound argument whose conclusion is the statement.

By the way... Our definitions of **argument**, **valid argument**, and **sound argument** are the same ones used in philosophy, the other primary academic discipline concerned with logic and reasoning.

Example 0.10.3

Consider the following two arguments:

$$\begin{array}{ll} & \text{If Edith eats her vegetables, then she can have a cookie.} \\ & \text{Edith eats her vegetables.} \\ \hline \therefore & \text{Edith gets a cookie.} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} & \text{Florence must eat her vegetables to get a cookie.} \\ & \text{Florence eats her vegetables.} \\ \hline \therefore & \text{Florence gets a cookie.} \end{array}$$

(The symbol "$\therefore$" means "therefore")

Are these arguments valid?

Solution. Do you agree that the first argument is valid but the second argument is not? We will soon develop a better understanding of the logic involved in this analysis, but if your intuition agrees with this assessment, then you are in good shape.

Notice the two arguments look almost identical. Edith and Florence both eat their vegetables. In both cases, there is a connection between the eating of vegetables and cookies. Yet we claim that it is valid to conclude that Edith gets a cookie, but not that Florence does. The difference must be in the connection between eating vegetables and getting cookies. We need to be skilled at reading and comprehending these sentences. Do the two sentences mean the same thing?

Unfortunately, in everyday language we are often sloppy, and you might be tempted to say they are equivalent. But notice that just because Florence *must* eat her vegetables, we have not claimed that doing so would be *enough* (she might also need to clean her room, for example). In everyday (non-mathematical) practice, you might be tempted to say this "other direction" is implied. In mathematics, we never get that luxury.

Remark 0.10.4 The arguments in the example above illustrate another important point: Even if you don't care about the advancement of human knowledge in the field of mathematics, becoming skilled at analyzing arguments is useful. And even if you don't want to give your grandmother a cookie. If you are *using* mathematics to solve problems in some other discipline, it is still necessary to demonstrate that your solution is correct. You better have a good argument that it is!