

Section 1.1: Statements, Symbolic Representations, and Tautologies

August 29, 2010

Abstract

We encounter the elements of logic: statements, connectives, tautologies, contradictions, etc., and create well-formed formulas (wffs - “whiffs”) from these basic elements.

We discover the problems of transforming phrases in our language into the realm of logic: our language is ambiguous (perhaps we like that!), and that causes problems for us.

An algorithm for detecting tautologies in the form of implications is described.

- **Statement/proposition:** a sentence possessing truth value (T or F).

Exercise #1

- The moon is made of green cheese.
- He is certainly a tall man.
- Two is a prime number.
- Will the game be over soon?
- Next year interest rates will rise.
- Next year interest rates will fall.
- $x^2 - 4 = 0$

A couple of things we should observe in examining these examples:

- “Truth is relative” (requires a **context**).
- Variables come in several flavors.
- English is a troublesome language!

- **Logical connectives** join statements into **formulas**, or arguments, or compound statements:
 - conjunction (symbolized by \wedge , “and”)

- disjunction (symbolized by \vee , “or”)
- implication (symbolized by \longrightarrow)
- equivalence (symbolized by \longleftrightarrow , “if and only if”)
- negation (symbolized by $'$ – “not” – which is a *unary* operation)

Note: These connectives are not independent - some of these may be derived from the others (Exercise #33 shows that conjunction and negation suffice to write the others, for example).

- **Well-formed formula** (wff - “whiff”) is a compound statement made up of statements, logical connectives, and other wffs

What makes one well-formed? There are just a few rules for creating wffs:

- a. All statements are wffs, as are the following for any wffs A and B :
- b. $(A \vee B)$,
- c. $(A \wedge B)$,
- d. A' ,
- e. $(A \longrightarrow B)$,
- f. $(A \longleftrightarrow B)$,

- **Order of precedence:**

- * parentheses
- * $'$
- * conjunction, disjunction
- * implication
- * equivalence

Order of precedence helps us to simplify our lives: hence,

$$A \wedge B \longrightarrow C \text{ means } (A \wedge B) \longrightarrow C$$

- **main connective** (last to be applied)

- Truth Table for the most common wffs:

A	B	$A \wedge B$	$A \vee B$	$A \longrightarrow B$	A'	B'	$A \leftrightarrow B$
T	T						
T	F						
F	T						
F	F						

Does the table for implication seem weird to you? It's by convention!

In the implication $A \longrightarrow B$, A is the **antecedent**, and B is the **consequent**.

Some English equivalents to implication are:

- If A , then B .
- A implies B .
- A , therefore B .
- A only if B .
- B follows from A .
- A is a sufficient condition for B .
- B is a necessary condition for A .

Implication plays an especially important role among connectives, so learn it well!

Exercise #4

- a. Healthy plant growth follows from sufficient water.
- b. Increased availability of information is a necessary condition for further technological advances.
- c. Errors will be introduced only if there is a modification of the program.
- d. Fuel savings implies good insulation or storm windows throughout.

Exercise #7ade: Negating implications

- **Truth table** for a wff with n statement letters: 2^n rows

Example: the table for implication above, which is a binary (2 statement letter) logical connective. Hence there are $2^2 = 4$ rows.

- **tautology**: wff which is always true (represented by 1).
- **contradiction**: wff which is always false (represented by 0).
- **equivalent wffs**: wffs A and B are equivalent, $A \iff B$, if the wff

$$A \iff B$$

is a tautology. (*How can we prove that?*)

Some tautological equivalences:

1a. $A \vee B \iff B \vee A$	1b. $A \wedge B \iff B \wedge A$	Commutative
2a. $(A \vee B) \vee C \iff A \vee (B \vee C)$	2b. $(A \wedge B) \wedge C \iff A \wedge (B \wedge C)$	Associative
3a. $A \vee (B \wedge C) \iff (A \vee B) \wedge (A \vee C)$	3b. $A \wedge (B \vee C) \iff (A \wedge B) \vee (A \wedge C)$	Distributive
4a. $A \vee 0 \iff A$	4b. $A \wedge 1 \iff A$	Identity
5a. $A \vee A' \iff 1$	5b. $A \wedge A' \iff 0$	Complement

Equivalent wffs will be useful when we are proving arguments, and want to replace complex wffs with simpler ones.

- **De Morgan's Laws** are two specific examples of equivalent wffs:

- $(A \vee B)' \iff A' \wedge B'$
- $(A \wedge B)' \iff A' \vee B'$

Hence we claim that $(A \vee B)' \iff (A' \wedge B')$ is a tautology.

Notice that the two formulas of De Morgan's Laws appear analogous ("dual"). In fact, one is the negation of the other.

Question: How so?

A	B	$A \vee B$	$(A \vee B)'$	A'	B'	$A' \wedge B'$
T	T					
T	F					
F	T					
F	F					

Table 1: Exercise #20e: Verify by constructing a truth table that this De Morgan's law is a tautology: $(A \vee B)' \longleftrightarrow A' \wedge B'$.

Exercise #27

- **Algorithm:** a set of instructions that can be mechanically executed in a finite amount of time in order to solve some problem.

^{p12} Often written out in **pseudocode**, the author provides us an example of an algorithm: TautologyTest, which is useful for determining whether or not an implication (that is, a wff where the main connective is implication) is, in fact, always true (a tautology). She proceeds by contradiction (one proof technique we'll study further in Chapter 2): assume that the implication $P \rightarrow Q$ is false. Then P must be true, and Q false (the only scenario which makes an implication false).

Exercise 29: c, p 18

$$\underbrace{(A \vee B) \wedge A'}_P \rightarrow B$$

$$\rightarrow Q$$

1. P
2. $(A \vee B) \wedge A'$
3. Q'
4. B'
5. $A \vee B$
6. A'

7. A

Contradiction

$A \wedge A'$

\therefore We have a tautology

Building a truth table for the implication also constitutes an algorithm to test to see if it is true, but, although the truth table algorithm may be more powerful (as more general, working for all would-be tautologies), an algorithm like `TautologyTest` may be faster when applied to a particular implication.