

Relationship between statements

Selim Kaan Ozsoy, Middle East Technical University

Logical Implication

Given two statements p and q , we say that p implies q and write $p \Rightarrow q$ in the case that q is true in all cases that p is true; equivalently the statement $p \rightarrow q$ is a tautology.

Theorem

Let P, Q, R, S be statements, then:

1. $((p \rightarrow q) \wedge p) \Rightarrow q$ (Modus Ponens)
2. $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge \neg q \Rightarrow \neg p$ (Modus Tollens)
3. $p \wedge q \Rightarrow p$
4. $p \wedge q \Rightarrow q$
5. $p \leftrightarrow q \Rightarrow q \rightarrow p$
6. $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p) \Rightarrow p \leftrightarrow q$
7. $q \Rightarrow p \vee q$
8. $(p \vee q) \wedge \neg p \Rightarrow q$
9. $(p \vee q) \wedge \neg q \Rightarrow p$
10. $p \leftrightarrow q \Rightarrow p \rightarrow q$
11. $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (R \rightarrow S) \wedge (p \vee R) \Rightarrow (q \vee S)$
12. $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow R) \Rightarrow p \rightarrow R$ (Hypothetical Syllogism)

Proof of $(p \vee q) \wedge \neg p \Rightarrow q$

We construct the truth table of the following statement: $(p \vee q) \wedge \neg p \rightarrow q$

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

(We use truth tables to prove a tautology)

Logical Equivalence

Given two statements P and Q , we say that P is equivalent to Q and we write $P \Leftrightarrow Q$ in the case that $P \leftrightarrow Q$ is a tautology.

Theorem

Let P, Q, R be statements, Then:

- a) $\neg(\neg p) \Leftrightarrow p$ (Double Negation)
- b) $p \vee q \Leftrightarrow q \vee p$ (Commutative Law)
- c) $p \wedge q \Leftrightarrow q \wedge p$ (Commutative Law)
- d) $(p \vee q) \vee R \Leftrightarrow p \vee (q \vee R)$ (Associative Law)
- e) $(p \wedge q) \wedge R \Leftrightarrow p \wedge (q \wedge R)$ (Associative Law)
- f) $p \wedge (q \vee R) \Leftrightarrow (p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge R)$ (Distributive Law)
- g) $p \vee (q \wedge R) \Leftrightarrow (p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee R)$ (Distributive Law)
- h) $p \rightarrow q \Leftrightarrow \neg p \vee q$ (Implication Law)
- i) $p \rightarrow q \Leftrightarrow \neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ (Contrapositive)
- j) $p \Leftrightarrow q \Leftrightarrow q \Leftrightarrow p$
- k) $p \Leftrightarrow q \Leftrightarrow (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$
- l) $\neg(p \wedge q) \Leftrightarrow \neg p \vee \neg q$ (De Morgan's Law)
- m) $\neg(p \vee q) \Leftrightarrow \neg p \wedge \neg q$ (De Morgan's Law)
- n) $\neg(p \rightarrow q) \Leftrightarrow p \wedge \neg q$
- o) $\neg(p \leftrightarrow q) \Leftrightarrow (p \wedge \neg q) \vee (q \wedge \neg p)$

Proof of (p → q) ⇔ ¬p ∨ q

We have to construct a truth table to prove that it is a tautology. The statement is: $(p \rightarrow q) \Leftrightarrow (\neg p \vee q)$

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$	$\neg p \vee q$	$(p \rightarrow q) \Leftrightarrow (\neg p \vee q)$
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	T	T
F	F	T	T	T

Hence, $(p \rightarrow q) \Leftrightarrow \neg p \vee q$ is a tautology.

Proof of part (n) without truth tables

We want to show: $\neg(p \rightarrow q) \Leftrightarrow p \wedge \neg q$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \neg(p \rightarrow q) &\Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg p \vee q) && \text{(by h: } p \rightarrow q \Leftrightarrow \neg p \vee q\text{)} \\
 &\Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg p) \wedge \neg q && \text{(by m: De Morgan's)} \\
 &\Leftrightarrow p \wedge \neg q && \text{(by a: Double Negation)}
 \end{aligned}$$

Variations of Conditional Statement

Given a statement of the form $p \rightarrow q$, the statement:

- $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ is called the **contrapositive** of $p \rightarrow q$.
- $q \rightarrow p$ is called the **converse** of $p \rightarrow q$.
- $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$ is called the **inverse** of $p \rightarrow q$.

Example

Show that: $(A \wedge B) \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow Q)$

1st Method

By definition, we show that $((A \wedge B) \rightarrow Q) \Leftrightarrow (A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow Q))$ is a tautology by constructing the truth table.

2nd Method

We can use the known equivalences between various statements to get the wanted equivalence.

$$\begin{aligned} (A \wedge B) \rightarrow Q &\Leftrightarrow \neg(A \wedge B) \vee Q && (\text{because } p \rightarrow q \Leftrightarrow \neg p \vee q) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\neg A \vee \neg B) \vee Q && (\text{because } \neg(p \wedge q) \Leftrightarrow \neg p \vee \neg q) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg A \vee (\neg B \vee Q) && (\text{because } (p \vee q) \vee R \Leftrightarrow p \vee (q \vee R)) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg A \vee (B \rightarrow Q) && (\text{because } \neg p \vee q \Leftrightarrow p \rightarrow q) \\ &\Leftrightarrow A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow Q) && (\text{because } \neg p \vee q \Leftrightarrow p \rightarrow q) \end{aligned}$$