

CS 70

Luca Manolache

January 18, 2024

CONTENTS

1	Propositional Logic	2
1.1	Propositions	2
1.2	Propositional Forms	2
1.3	Implication	2
1.4	Truth Tables	3
1.5	Quantifiers	3
1.6	DeMorgan’s Law for Quantifiers	4
2	Proofs	5
2.1	Background and Notation	5
2.2	Proof by Example (or Counterexample)	5
2.3	Direct Proof	5
2.4	Proof by Contraposition	5
2.5	Proof by Contradiction	5
2.6	Proof by Cases	6

LECTURE 1

PROPOSITIONAL LOGIC

1.1 Propositions

Definition 1.1.1 (*Propositions*)

Statements that are true or false.

Some example propositions are $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational, $2 + 2 = 4$, and $2 + 2 = 3$. Some non examples are $4 + 5$ and $x + x$.

1.2 Propositional Forms

Propositions can be put together to make another proposition. Some examples of this are conjunction ($P \wedge Q$), disjunction ($P \vee Q$), and negation ($\neg P$).

Example: Sample propositional forms:

1. $\neg(2 + 2 = 4)$ is false
2. $(2 + 2 = 3) \wedge (2 + 2 = 4)$ is false

1.3 Implication

Definition 1.3.1 (*Implication*)

$P \Rightarrow Q$ can be read as "If P , then Q ."

Implications are only false if P is true and Q is false. When P is false, the implication will be true, however this is a meaningless statement.

Additionally, an implication is equivalent to

$$P \Rightarrow Q \equiv \neg P \vee Q \quad (1.1)$$

Example: If you stand in the rain, then you'll get wet.

P = "you stand in the rain"

Q = "you get wet"

$P \Rightarrow Q$

Note. If $P \Rightarrow Q$, that does not say anything about the opposite of $Q \Rightarrow P$.

Definition 1.3.2 (Contrapositive)

The contrapositive of $P \Rightarrow Q$ is $\neg Q \Rightarrow \neg P$. They are logically equivalent to the implication.

Definition 1.3.3 (Converse)

The converse of $P \Rightarrow Q$ is $Q \Rightarrow P$. They are NOT logically equivalent to the implication.

Definition 1.3.4 (If and only if)

If $P \Rightarrow Q \wedge Q \Rightarrow P$, then P if and only if (iff) Q or $P \Leftrightarrow Q$.

1.4 Truth Tables

Truth tables can simplify doing calculations with propositions.

Truth tables are also able to be used to prove logical equivalence. If two statements have the same truth tables, they are logically equivalent.

1.5 Quantifiers

None of the below are propositions as they have a free variable.

- $\sum_{i=1}^n i = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$
- $x > 2$
- n is even and the sum of two primes

These are all called predicates. They are similar to a function which returns true or false.

To turn them into a predicate we need a quantifier.

Definition 1.5.1 (Universe)

A universe is the type of a variable. Some examples are:

- $N = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$
- $N^+ = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$

Definition 1.5.2 (There Exists)

$(\exists x \in S)(P(x))$ means $P(x)$ is true for some x in S .

Example: $(\exists x \in N)(x = x^2)$ True because $0 \times 0 = 0$ and is equivalent to $(0 = 0) \wedge (1 = 1) \wedge (2 = 4) \wedge \dots$

Definition 1.5.3 (*For all*)

$(\forall x \in S)(P(x))$ means $P(x)$ is true for all x in S .

Example: $(\forall x \in \mathbb{N})(x+1 > x)$ True because adding one to a number will always be larger.

Note. Quantifiers are not commutative.

1.6 DeMorgan's Law for Quantifiers

When negating a quantifier, you negate the inside and flip the quantifier. This means

$$\neg(\forall x \in S)(P(x)) \equiv (\exists x \in S)(\neg P(x)) \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$\neg(\exists x \in S)(P(x)) \equiv (\forall x \in S)(\neg P(x)) \quad (1.3)$$

LECTURE 2

PROOFS

2.1 Background and Notation

Definition 2.1.1 (*Integers*)

Integers are closed under addition.

$$a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \Rightarrow a + b \in \mathbb{Z}$$

Definition 2.1.2 (*Divisible*)

$a|b$ is read as "a divides b".

Formally, $a|b \Leftrightarrow \exists q \in \mathbb{Z}$ where $b = aq$.

2.2 Direct Proof

To prove $P \Rightarrow Q$ you assume P is true and use that to prove Q .

2.3 Proof by Contraposition

Remember 1.3.2, $(P \Rightarrow Q) \equiv (\neg Q \Rightarrow \neg P)$. Therefore, if we assume $\neg Q$ and can prove that it implies $\neg P$, then we have proved the original goal of $P \Rightarrow Q$.

2.4 Proof by Contradiction

Show that if we assume $\neg P$, then we use forward reasoning (direct proof) to show $\neg P \Rightarrow R$ and to show $\neg P \Rightarrow \neg R$. This is often found when trying to show a simple property should always not hold.

2.5 Proof by Cases

Prove all possible cases for something are true, therefore the thing you are proving must be true.