

Recall: Definition 1.1.6 Two statements (involving the same statement letters) are **logically equivalent** if they have the “same” truth table.

Proposition 1.1.7 (DeMorgan’s Laws). Let P and Q be statements.

(1) $\neg(P \wedge Q)$ is logically equivalent to $\neg P \vee \neg Q$.

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

Note: The truth tables you constructed on Group Assignment #1 prove the first part of this proposition.

1. Construct truth tables in order to prove that $\neg(P \vee Q)$ is logically equivalent to $\neg P \wedge \neg Q$.

Negating Statements: It is often important to be able to understand the meaning of the **negation** of a logical statement. Formally, we can just apply the negation connective to a statement. Although this gives us a logical representation that is technically correct, having a ‘positively phrased’ form of such a statement is generally more useful. Your textbook calls this a *useful denial* of the logical statement.

Example: Our goal is to find a useful negation of the statement $1 < x < 2$. To accomplish this, we first notice that this is a compound statement in disguise. This is really stating: $x > 1$ and $x < 2$. The formal negation of this is: $\neg[(x > 1) \wedge (x < 2)]$. Using DeMorgan’s Law, we see this is equivalent to: $\neg(x > 1) \vee \neg(x < 2)$. Applying the “Trichotomy Property” of inequalities, we can rewrite this as: $(x \leq 1) \vee (x \geq 2)$. Thus, a useful denial of the original statement is the statement: $x \leq 1$ or $x \geq 2$.

2. Find a useful denial of the statement n is even or $n < 10$.

More logical connectives: Suppose P and Q represent statements. We define the **conditional** and **bi-conditional** logical connectives as follows:

- The *implication* or *conditional* statement $P \Rightarrow Q$ is the statement “If P then Q ”. We often call P the *hypothesis* or *antecedent* and Q the **conclusion** or *consequent*.
- The *bi-conditional* statement $P \Leftrightarrow Q$ is the statement “ P if and only if Q ”. We can think of this statement as an abbreviated form of the statement $(P \Rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \Rightarrow P)$.

3. **Note:** In order to create a truth table for the conditional, it is useful to think of $P \Rightarrow Q$ as a sort of “contract” or promise statement and to ask which case(s) would lead to a broken promise of contract. Consider the example statement: “If you mow the lawn then I will pay you \$20”. Complete the truth table for the conditional in the table provided below.

P	Q	$P \Rightarrow Q$
T	T	
T	F	
F	T	
F	F	

P	Q	$P \Leftrightarrow Q$
T	T	
T	F	
F	T	
F	F	

4. Use the fact that the bi-conditional is the conjunction of two conditional statements to write out its truth table in the table provided above.

Note: Several English phrases that are used to represent conditional and bi-conditional statements are given below. In each of these, P and Q play the same role as in the base symbolic statements $P \Rightarrow Q$ and $P \Leftrightarrow Q$

Alternate Forms of the Conditional

- If P then Q
- P only if Q
- P is sufficient for Q
- Q when P
- Q if P
- Q is necessary for P

Alternate Forms of the Bi-conditional

- P if and only if Q
- P iff Q
- P is equivalent to Q
- P exactly when Q
- P is necessary and sufficient for Q

5. Determine whether or not the following statements are true or false.

- (a) If $2 + 2 = 5$ then $2^3 = 8$ (b) If $2^3 = 8$ then $2 + 2 = 5$ (c) $2 + 2 = 5$ iff $\neg(2^3 = 8)$

Proposition 1.1.11 Let P and Q be statements.

(1) $P \Rightarrow Q$ is logically equivalent to $\neg P \vee Q$ (2) $\neg(P \Rightarrow Q)$ is logically equivalent to $P \wedge (\neg Q)$ (3) $P \Leftrightarrow Q$ is true exactly when P and Q have the same truth value.

6. Use truth tables to prove either part (1) or (2) in this theorem (your choice).

7. Find a useful denial of the statement “If you mow the lawn then I will pay you \$20”.

8. Create a truth tables for the logical expressions: $\neg P \vee \neg Q$, and $\neg(P \vee Q)$

Note: There are several important statements related to the conditional $P \Rightarrow Q$. The textbook only gives two of these, but we will define all three.

Definition 1.1.13(plus addendum) Let P and Q be statements.

- (1) The *converse* of $P \Rightarrow Q$ is the statement $Q \Rightarrow P$.
 - (2) The *contrapositive* of $P \Rightarrow Q$ is the statement $(\neg Q) \Rightarrow (\neg P)$.
 - (3) The *inverse* of $P \Rightarrow Q$ is the statement $(\neg P) \Rightarrow (\neg Q)$.
9. Use truth tables to determine which of these three statements are logically equivalent to the original conditional statement $P \Rightarrow Q$.

10. Write the converse and contrapositive statements (in plain English) for the conditional statement “If you mow the lawn then I will pay you \$20”.

Quantifiers

Note: Recall that on Group Work #1, we determined that $x + 1 = 5$ is not a proposition because it is not possible to assign it a truth value as written. We consider this to be a **predicate** because it only becomes a proposition when the “free variable” x is assigned a specific value from the “universe” under consideration (think of this as the “domain” for the free variable).

If we think of the real numbers as the “universe” for free variable x , then we can define $P(x)$, the predicate statement $x + 1 = 5$. From this, the proposition $P(4)$ is True, since it represents $4 + 1 = 5$, while $P(5)$ is False, as it represents $5 + 1 = 5$.

Another way to change a predicate statement into a statement which has a truth value is to add a *quantifier*.

Definition 1.1.16: Let \mathcal{U} be a universe under consideration and $P(x)$ be a predicate whose only free variable is x . Then the statements:

- “for all x , $P(x)$ ” [denoted $(\forall x)P(x)$]
 - “there exists x such that $P(x)$ ” [denoted $(\exists x)P(x)$]
- are statements that have truth values.

- The symbol \forall is called the **universal quantifier**. The statement $(\forall x)P(x)$ is true exactly when each individual element a in the universe \mathcal{U} has the property that $P(a)$ is true.
- The symbol \exists is called the **existential quantifier**. The statement $(\exists x)P(x)$ is true exactly when the universe \mathcal{U} contains at least one element a for which $P(a)$ is true.

11. Determine the truth value for each of the following statements:

- (a) For all real numbers r , $r \cdot 5 = 1$
- (b) There exists a real number r such that $r \cdot 5 = 1$
- (c) There exists a natural number n such that $n \cdot 5 = 1$
- (d) There exists a real number x such that for any real number y , $x \cdot y = y$.

Note: Familiarize yourself with following notation for some frequently used “universes” of numbers.

The **natural numbers** \mathbb{N} : $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$.

The **integers** \mathbb{Z} : $\mathbb{Z} = \{\dots - 3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$.

The **rational numbers** \mathbb{Q} : $\mathbb{Q} = \{x : \text{there exist } a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, b \neq 0 \text{ such that } x = \frac{a}{b}\}$.

The **real numbers** \mathbb{R} : (informally) $\mathbb{R} = \{x : x \text{ has a decimal expansion}\}$.

Negating Quantified Statements

Proposition 1.1.18 Let $P(x)$ be a predicate and let \mathcal{U} be the intended universe. Then:

- (1) $\neg(\forall x)P(x)$ is logically equivalent to $(\exists x)(\neg P(x))$; i.e., $\neg(\forall x \in \mathcal{U})P(x)$ is logically equivalent to $(\exists x \in \mathcal{U})(\neg P(x))$.
- (2) $\neg(\exists x)P(x)$ is logically equivalent to $(\forall x)(\neg P(x))$; i.e., $\neg(\exists x \in \mathcal{U})P(x)$ is logically equivalent to $(\forall x \in \mathcal{U})(\neg P(x))$.

Note: The notation $(\forall x \in \mathcal{U})P(x)$ is an abbreviation for the statement $(\forall x)(x \in \mathcal{U} \Rightarrow P(x))$. Similarly, the notation $(\exists x \in \mathcal{U})P(x)$ is an abbreviation for the statement $(\exists x)(x \in \mathcal{U} \wedge P(x))$.

12. Find a “useful denial” for each of the following statements.

- (a) There exists a real number r such that $\sqrt{r} = -1$.

- (b) For all real numbers, if $x < 4$, then $x^2 < 16$.