

# Section 1.1: Statements, Symbolic Representations, and Tautologies

January 13, 2020

## Abstract

In Section 1.1 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!), but that causes problems for us here.

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

- **Statement/proposition:** a sentence possessing (or assigned) truth value ( $T$  or  $F$ ; sometimes represented as 1 or 0).

**Exercise #1, p. 16:** which of the following are statements?

- ⌋ a. The moon is made of green cheese.
- ⌋ b. He is certainly a tall man. *what is tall?*
- ⌋ c. Two is a prime number.
- ⌋ d. The game be over by 4:00. (What if we had said instead ~~“Will the game be over soon?”~~) *No questions are statements.*
- ⌋ e. Next year interest rates will rise.
- ⌋ f. Next year interest rates will fall.
- g.  $x^2 - 4 = 0$

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

- “Truth is relative” (requires a **context** – the universe).
- Variables come in several flavors. I mean, it’s clear that “ $x$ ” is a variable – it’s our favorite variable! And it seems clear that “He” is a variable in “He is certainly a tall man.” But is “tall” a variable? Is “moon” a variable?
- English is a troublesome language (and this is just Chapter 1, exercise 1!).

- **Logical connectives** join statements into **formulas**, or arguments, or compound statements:

- conjunction (symbolized by  $\wedge$ , “and”)
- disjunction (symbolized by  $\vee$ , “or”)
- implication (symbolized by  $\rightarrow$ , “implies”)
- equivalence (symbolized by  $\longleftrightarrow$ , “if and only if”)
- negation (symbolized by  $'$  – “not” – which is a *unary* operation, in contrast to the other four which are *binary*)

**Note:** These connectives are not independent - some of these may be derived from the others (Exercise #48 – one of your homework problems – shows that disjunction 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:

- All statements are wffs.
- The following are wffs, for any wffs  $A$  and  $B$ :
  - $(A \vee B)$ ,
  - $(A \wedge B)$ ,
  - $(A \rightarrow B)$ ,
  - $(A \longleftrightarrow B)$ ,
  - $A'$

This is a **recursive** method for defining wffs (we’ll talk more about recursion soon....).

Notice that all we are really saying is that wffs are just formed by applying the binary connectives and negation (the only unary connective). It’s another way of saying that these connectives are indeed well-defined **functions**, defined on the set of all wffs: they operate on wffs, to produce new wffs.

- **Order of precedence** in the “computation” of a wff:
  - \* parentheses
  - \*  $'$
  - \* conjunction, disjunction
  - \* implication
  - \* equivalence

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

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

So we can drop some parentheses, when they’re properly handled by order of precedence.

- The **main connective** is defined as the last to be applied.

- Truth Tables for the most common wffs:

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

Does the table for implication seem weird to you? It's by convention, but is also related to the fact that "from a falsehood anything can be proven". In the implication  $A \rightarrow B$ ,  $A$  is the **antecedent**, and  $B$  is the **consequent**.

Bertrand Russell famously thus used the "fact" that " $1=2$ " (a falsehood) to prove that he is the Pope - wouldn't the Pope be surprised!

Some English equivalents to implication are:

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

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

**Exercise #5** (p. 16) Find the antecedent and the consequent in each of the following statements:

- a. Healthy plant growth follows from sufficient water.  

$$\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_B \quad \underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_B \quad \underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_A$$
- b. Increased availability of information is a necessary condition for further technological advances.  

$$\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_A \quad \underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_A$$
- c. Errors will be introduced only if there is a modification of the program.  

$$\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_B$$
- d. Fuel savings implies good insulation or storm windows throughout.  

$$A \rightarrow (B \vee C)$$

Do you agree with the first one? Just because one makes a well-formed statement doesn't mean that it's reasonable (true)! Could it be false? Sometimes true, sometimes false?

**Exercise #11ade (p. 17) - Negating implications and other wffs:** Write the negation of each statement:

- $A$ 
 $B$
- a. If the food is good, then the service is excellent.
  - d. Neither the food is good nor the service excellent. ✓
  - e. If the price is high, then the food is good and the service is excellent.

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

  

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

Some of the negations in Table 1.6 are suspect, IMHO. Can you guess why? (It “must be done with care”....)

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

The author makes an interesting observation about how we write the truth table (p. 8, table 1.8): it can be constructed in such a way that it can be considered simply counting up using binary numbers. Our logical world is **binary**, so we should expect to see powers of two. We might also look at the trees on p. 7 for these logic tables, and relate them back to Pascal’s (Yanghui’s) triangle.

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 (always have the same truth value),  $A \iff B$ , if the wff

$$A \iff B \quad (A \rightarrow B) \wedge (B \rightarrow A)$$

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:

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



c. Therefore babies should be in an asylum.

Written as a tautology:  $(B \rightarrow C) \wedge (C \rightarrow A) \rightarrow (B \rightarrow A)$ .

Let's check. Assume that the wff is false: that is, assume that the lefthand side is true, but the righthand side is false.

But since  $B \rightarrow A$  is false, we know that  $B$  is true, while  $A$  is false.

However, since both  $B \rightarrow C$  and  $C \rightarrow A$  are true, we must have  $C$  true (since  $B$  is true); then, since  $C$  is true, we must have  $A$  true to make the second implication true. But this is a contradiction.

Hence the proposed tautology is, in fact, a tautology.