

## Reading Quiz Section 2.1

1. A *tautology* is a proposition which \_\_\_\_\_
  - (a) is false no matter what the truth value of its component propositions.
  - (b) is only true when all of its component propositions are true.
  - (c) is never false, no matter what the truth value of its component propositions.
  - (d) is built only using the connectives  $\wedge, \vee$ .
2. A *contradiction* is a proposition which \_\_\_\_\_
  - (a) is false no matter what the truth value of its component propositions.
  - (b) is only true when all of its component propositions are false.
  - (c) is never false, no matter what the truth value of its component propositions.
  - (d) is built only using the connective  $\neg$ .
3. The *contrapositive* of the conditional  $P \implies Q$  is the conditional \_\_\_\_\_
  - (a)  $\neg P \implies Q$
  - (b)  $\neg Q \implies \neg P$
  - (c)  $Q \implies P$
  - (d)  $P \implies \neg Q$
4. True or False: The *converse* of  $P \implies Q$  is logically equivalent to  $P \implies Q$ .
5. The *negation* of the conditional “if I study at least 25 hours per week, then I will be successful” is the proposition \_\_\_\_\_
  - (a) “I study at least 25 hours per week, but I am not successful.”
  - (b) “Either I study less than 25 hours per week, or I am successful.”
  - (c) “Either I study at least 25 hours per week, or I am not successful.”
  - (d) “If I am successful, then I will study at least 25 hours per week.”
6. De Morgan’s laws state that:  
 $\neg(P \vee Q)$  is logically equivalent to (1) \_\_\_\_\_  
 $\neg(P \wedge Q)$  is logically equivalent to (2) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (a) (1)  $\neg(P \implies Q)$ , (2)  $(\neg P \vee \neg Q)$
  - (b) (1)  $(\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$ , (2)  $(P \vee Q)$
  - (c) (1)  $(\neg P \wedge Q)$ , (2)  $(P \vee \neg Q)$
  - (d) (1)  $(\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$ , (2)  $(\neg P \vee \neg Q)$

## Practice Problems Section 2.1

1. Suppose that “If Colin was early, then no-one was playing pool” is a true statement.
  - (a) What is its contrapositive of this statement? Is it true?
  - (b) What is the converse? Is it true?
  - (c) What can we conclude (if anything?) if we discover each of the following? *Treat the two scenarios separately.*
    - (i) Someone was playing pool.
    - (ii) Colin was late.

Video Solution

2. Prove that  $P \vee \neg Q$  is logically equivalent to  $\neg P \implies (\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$ .

Video Solution

3. Define the connective  $\uparrow$  (called the *Sheffer stroke*, or *NAND*) by the following truth table:

$P$	$Q$	$P \uparrow Q$
$T$	$T$	$F$
$T$	$F$	$T$
$F$	$T$	$T$
$F$	$F$	$T$

- (a) Prove  $P \uparrow Q$  is logically equivalent to  $\neg(P \wedge Q)$ .
- (b) Find an expression built using only  $P$  and the connective  $\uparrow$  which is logically equivalent to  $\neg P$ .
- (c) Find an expression built using only  $P, Q$ , and the connective  $\uparrow$  which is logically equivalent to  $P \wedge Q$ .

Video Solution