MAS114: Lecture 5

James Cranch

http://cranch.staff.shef.ac.uk/mas114/

2018–2019

Implication

We were discussing the concept of implication: writing $A \Rightarrow B$ to mean "if A, then B".

More caveats

Remark

More caveats

Remark

The implication $A \Rightarrow B$ only says something interesting about B if A happens to be true!

More caveats

Remark

The implication $A \Rightarrow B$ only says something interesting about B if A happens to be true! If A is false, then we have $A \Rightarrow B$ no matter whether B is true or false.

More caveats

Remark

The implication $A \Rightarrow B$ only says something interesting about B if A happens to be true! If A is false, then we have $A \Rightarrow B$ no matter whether B is true or false.

For example, it's correct to say

> *"If $2 + 2 = 337$, then this course is lectured by Dr Cranch".*

or indeed

> *"If $2 + 2 = 337$, then this course is lectured by Robert de Niro".*

More caveats

Remark

The implication $A \Rightarrow B$ only says something interesting about B if A happens to be true! If A is false, then we have $A \Rightarrow B$ no matter whether B is true or false.

For example, it's correct to say

> *"If $2+2=337$, then this course is lectured by Dr Cranch".*

or indeed

> *"If $2+2=337$, then this course is lectured by Robert de Niro".*

This may be a surprise if you're basing your intuition on ordinary English, where people use the words "if. . . then" in several different ways, sometimes slightly ambiguously.

Yet more caveats

Yet more caveats

Remark

Another important point is that if $A \Rightarrow B$ does not say that B is true *only* if A is true

Yet more caveats

Remark

Another important point is that if $A \Rightarrow B$ does not say that B is true *only* if A is true (that would be $B \Rightarrow A$, in fact).

Yet more caveats

Remark

Another important point is that if $A \Rightarrow B$ does not say that B is true *only* if A is true (that would be $B \Rightarrow A$, in fact).
So it's correct to say

> *If it rains next Wednesday, then* $2 + 2 = 4$*.*

Yet more caveats

Remark

Another important point is that if $A \Rightarrow B$ does not say that B is true *only* if A is true (that would be $B \Rightarrow A$, in fact).
So it's correct to say

> *If it rains next Wednesday, then* $2 + 2 = 4$*.*

In fact, it's true that $2 + 2 = 4$ no matter whether it rains next Wednesday, but that's not a problem.

Yet more caveats

Remark

Another important point is that if $A \Rightarrow B$ does not say that B is true *only* if A is true (that would be $B \Rightarrow A$, in fact).
So it's correct to say

> *If it rains next Wednesday, then* $2 + 2 = 4$*.*

In fact, it's true that $2 + 2 = 4$ no matter whether it rains next Wednesday, but that's not a problem. Whether or not it's *helpful* to say that is another question!

A truth table for implication

A truth table for implication

We can sum up the comments above by giving a *truth table* for implication. We write 0 for false and 1 for true.

A truth table for implication

We can sum up the comments above by giving a *truth table* for implication. We write 0 for false and 1 for true.

P	Q	$P \Rightarrow Q$
0	0	
0	1	
1	0	
1	1	

A truth table for implication

We can sum up the comments above by giving a *truth table* for implication. We write 0 for false and 1 for true.
First off, note that if Q is true, then $P \Rightarrow Q$ is definitely true no matter whether P is true.

P	Q	$P \Rightarrow Q$
0	0	
0	1	
1	0	
1	1	

A truth table for implication

We can sum up the comments above by giving a *truth table* for implication. We write 0 for false and 1 for true.
First off, note that if Q is true, then $P \Rightarrow Q$ is definitely true no matter whether P is true.

P	Q	$P \Rightarrow Q$
0	0	
0	1	1
1	0	
1	1	1

A truth table for implication

We can sum up the comments above by giving a *truth table* for implication. We write 0 for false and 1 for true.
First off, note that if Q is true, then $P \Rightarrow Q$ is definitely true no matter whether P is true.
Also, if P is false, then $P \Rightarrow Q$ is true no matter whether Q is true.

P	Q	$P \Rightarrow Q$
0	0	
0	1	1
1	0	
1	1	1

A truth table for implication

We can sum up the comments above by giving a *truth table* for implication. We write 0 for false and 1 for true.
First off, note that if Q is true, then $P \Rightarrow Q$ is definitely true no matter whether P is true.
Also, if P is false, then $P \Rightarrow Q$ is true no matter whether Q is true.

P	Q	$P \Rightarrow Q$
0	0	1
0	1	1
1	0	
1	1	1

A truth table for implication

We can sum up the comments above by giving a *truth table* for implication. We write 0 for false and 1 for true.
First off, note that if Q is true, then $P \Rightarrow Q$ is definitely true no matter whether P is true.
Also, if P is false, then $P \Rightarrow Q$ is true no matter whether Q is true.
In fact, it's only if P is true and Q is false that $P \Rightarrow Q$ is false.

P	Q	$P \Rightarrow Q$
0	0	1
0	1	1
1	0	
1	1	1

A truth table for implication

We can sum up the comments above by giving a *truth table* for implication. We write 0 for false and 1 for true.

First off, note that if Q is true, then $P \Rightarrow Q$ is definitely true no matter whether P is true.

Also, if P is false, then $P \Rightarrow Q$ is true no matter whether Q is true.

In fact, it's only if P is true and Q is false that $P \Rightarrow Q$ is false.

P	Q	$P \Rightarrow Q$
0	0	1
0	1	1
1	0	0
1	1	1

Converses

Converses

We've seen in the above, that $A \Rightarrow B$ and $B \Rightarrow A$ are different statements.

Converses

We've seen in the above, that $A \Rightarrow B$ and $B \Rightarrow A$ are different statements. It's helpful to have a word relating them:

Converses

We've seen in the above, that $A \Rightarrow B$ and $B \Rightarrow A$ are different statements. It's helpful to have a word relating them:

Definition

Consider a statement of the form $A \Rightarrow B$. Then the *converse* of that statement is the statement $B \Rightarrow A$.

Statements and their converses

Statements and their converses

The truth of an implication has very little to do with the truth of its converse, as we'll see.

Statements and their converses

The truth of an implication has very little to do with the truth of its converse, as we'll see.

Example

Let P be the statement "X lives in England" and Q be the statement "X lives in Sheffield".

Statements and their converses

The truth of an implication has very little to do with the truth of its converse, as we'll see.

Example

Let P be the statement “X lives in England” and Q be the statement “X lives in Sheffield”.
Is the statement $P \Rightarrow Q$ always true?

Statements and their converses

The truth of an implication has very little to do with the truth of its converse, as we'll see.

Example

Let P be the statement "X lives in England" and Q be the statement "X lives in Sheffield".
Is the statement $P \Rightarrow Q$ always true?

?

Statements and their converses

The truth of an implication has very little to do with the truth of its converse, as we'll see.

Example

Let P be the statement "X lives in England" and Q be the statement "X lives in Sheffield".
Is the statement $P \Rightarrow Q$ always true?

?

Is its converse always true?

Statements and their converses

The truth of an implication has very little to do with the truth of its converse, as we'll see.

Example

Let P be the statement "X lives in England" and Q be the statement "X lives in Sheffield".
Is the statement $P \Rightarrow Q$ always true?

?

Is its converse always true?

?

Statements and their converses again

Statements and their converses again

Example

Let C be the statement "Y is English", and let D be the statement "Y lives in Sheffield".

Statements and their converses again

Example

Let C be the statement "Y is English", and let D be the statement "Y lives in Sheffield".

Is the statement $C \Rightarrow D$ always true?

Statements and their converses again

Example

Let C be the statement "Y is English", and let D be the statement "Y lives in Sheffield".

Is the statement $C \Rightarrow D$ always true?

?

Statements and their converses again

Example

Let C be the statement "Y is English", and let D be the statement "Y lives in Sheffield".
Is the statement $C \Rightarrow D$ always true?

?

Is the converse always true?

Statements and their converses again

Example

Let C be the statement “Y is English”, and let D be the statement “Y lives in Sheffield”.

Is the statement $C \Rightarrow D$ always true?

?

Is the converse always true?

?

Equivalence

Equivalence

Equivalence is the relationship between two statements of being both true, or both false.

Equivalence

Equivalence is the relationship between two statements of being both true, or both false.

Definition

Let P and Q be statements. We write $P \Leftrightarrow Q$, pronounced "P is equivalent to Q" for the statement that P is true if and only if Q is true.

Equivalence

Equivalence is the relationship between two statements of being both true, or both false.

Definition

Let P and Q be statements. We write $P \Leftrightarrow Q$, pronounced "P is equivalent to Q" for the statement that P is true if and only if Q is true.

Sometimes people shorten "if and only if" to "iff".

Negation

Negation

Negation is a type of opposite:

Negation

Negation is a type of opposite:

Definition

Let P be a statement. The *negation* of P, written $\neg P$ and often pronounced "not P", is the statement "P is false".

Negation

Negation is a type of opposite:

Definition

Let P be a statement. The *negation* of P, written $\neg P$ and often pronounced "not P", is the statement "P is false".

Remark

We must be careful in thinking of negation as an opposite. For example, the negation of "Richard is happy" is "Richard is not happy".

Negation

Negation is a type of opposite:

Definition

Let P be a statement. The *negation* of P, written $\neg P$ and often pronounced "not P", is the statement "P is false".

Remark

We must be careful in thinking of negation as an opposite. For example, the negation of "Richard is happy" is "Richard is not happy".

Most people would say that the "opposite" is "Richard is sad".

That's not quite the same thing!

Negation

Negation is a type of opposite:

Definition

Let P be a statement. The *negation* of P, written $\neg P$ and often pronounced "not P", is the statement "P is false".

Remark

We must be careful in thinking of negation as an opposite. For example, the negation of "Richard is happy" is "Richard is not happy".
Most people would say that the "opposite" is "Richard is sad".
That's not quite the same thing!
Similarly, the negation of "Alice is in front of Bob" is not "Alice is behind Bob", but:

Negation

Negation is a type of opposite:

Definition

Let P be a statement. The *negation* of P, written $\neg P$ and often pronounced "not P", is the statement "P is false".

Remark

We must be careful in thinking of negation as an opposite. For example, the negation of "Richard is happy" is "Richard is not happy".
Most people would say that the "opposite" is "Richard is sad".
That's not quite the same thing!
Similarly, the negation of "Alice is in front of Bob" is not "Alice is behind Bob", but:

?

Negation

Negation is a type of opposite:

Definition

Let P be a statement. The *negation* of P, written $\neg P$ and often pronounced "not P", is the statement "P is false".

Remark

We must be careful in thinking of negation as an opposite. For example, the negation of "Richard is happy" is "Richard is not happy".
Most people would say that the "opposite" is "Richard is sad".
That's not quite the same thing!
Similarly, the negation of "Alice is in front of Bob" is not "Alice is behind Bob", but:

?

Note that double negation doesn't do anything: the statement $\neg(\neg P)$ is equivalent to P.

Negation

Negation is a type of opposite:

Definition

Let P be a statement. The *negation* of P, written $\neg P$ and often pronounced "not P", is the statement "P is false".

Remark

We must be careful in thinking of negation as an opposite. For example, the negation of "Richard is happy" is "Richard is not happy".
Most people would say that the "opposite" is "Richard is sad".
That's not quite the same thing!
Similarly, the negation of "Alice is in front of Bob" is not "Alice is behind Bob", but:

?

Note that double negation doesn't do anything: the statement $\neg(\neg P)$ is equivalent to P. Since statements are either true or false, if it's not "not true", it's true.

Contrapositives

Contrapositives

The negation allows us to make sense of something very important about implication:

Contrapositives

The negation allows us to make sense of something very important about implication:

Definition

Consider a statement of the form $P \Rightarrow Q$. Its *contrapositive* is the statement $(\neg Q) \Rightarrow (\neg P)$.

About contrapositives

About contrapositives

The main useful fact about the contrapositive is that it's equivalent to the original implication. This is something very familiar from everyday life. If my friend Mel says

About contrapositives

The main useful fact about the contrapositive is that it's equivalent to the original implication. This is something very familiar from everyday life. If my friend Mel says

> *"If I can come visit you this evening, then I'll text you at lunchtime,"*

About contrapositives

The main useful fact about the contrapositive is that it's equivalent to the original implication. This is something very familiar from everyday life. If my friend Mel says

> *"If I can come visit you this evening, then I'll text you at lunchtime,"*

then I might rephrase it to myself as:

About contrapositives

The main useful fact about the contrapositive is that it's equivalent to the original implication. This is something very familiar from everyday life. If my friend Mel says

> *"If I can come visit you this evening, then I'll text you at lunchtime,"*

then I might rephrase it to myself as:

> *"I don't get a text at lunchtime, then Mel won't visit this evening."*

About contrapositives

The main useful fact about the contrapositive is that it's equivalent to the original implication. This is something very familiar from everyday life. If my friend Mel says

> *"If I can come visit you this evening, then I'll text you at lunchtime,"*

then I might rephrase it to myself as:

> *"I don't get a text at lunchtime, then Mel won't visit this evening."*

But here's a formal statement and proof, anyway:

About contrapositives

The main useful fact about the contrapositive is that it's equivalent to the original implication. This is something very familiar from everyday life. If my friend Mel says

> *"If I can come visit you this evening, then I'll text you at lunchtime,"*

then I might rephrase it to myself as:

> *"I don't get a text at lunchtime, then Mel won't visit this evening."*

But here's a formal statement and proof, anyway:

Proposition

Let P and Q be statements. The statement $P \Rightarrow Q$ is equivalent to its contrapositive $(\neg Q) \Rightarrow (\neg P)$.

About contrapositives

The main useful fact about the contrapositive is that it's equivalent to the original implication. This is something very familiar from everyday life. If my friend Mel says

> *"If I can come visit you this evening, then I'll text you at lunchtime,"*

then I might rephrase it to myself as:

> *"I don't get a text at lunchtime, then Mel won't visit this evening."*

But here's a formal statement and proof, anyway:

Proposition

Let P and Q be statements. The statement $P \Rightarrow Q$ is equivalent to its contrapositive $(\neg Q) \Rightarrow (\neg P)$.

Proof.

?

“And” and “Or”

"And" and "Or"

There are other ways to combine statements, other than implication:

“And” and “Or”

There are other ways to combine statements, other than implication:

Definition

Let P and Q be statements. The statement $P \wedge Q$, pronounced “P and Q”, is the statement that both P and Q are true.

“And” and “Or”

There are other ways to combine statements, other than implication:

Definition

Let P and Q be statements. The statement $P \wedge Q$, pronounced “P and Q”, is the statement that both P and Q are true.
The statement $P \vee Q$, pronounced “P or Q”, is the statement that at least one of P or Q (and possibly both) is true.

Truth tables

Truth tables

We can make truth tables for both of them:

Truth tables

We can make truth tables for both of them:

P	Q	$P \wedge Q$
0	0	0
0	1	0
1	0	0
1	1	1

Truth tables

We can make truth tables for both of them:

P	Q	$P \wedge Q$
0	0	0
0	1	0
1	0	0
1	1	1

P	Q	$P \vee Q$
0	0	0
0	1	1
1	0	1
1	1	1

“Or” in English

"Or" in English

Remark

While you're all used to these words from everyday life, there can be vagueness about how "or" is used in English.

“Or” in English

Remark

While you’re all used to these words from everyday life, there can be vagueness about how “or” is used in English.
For example,

you can have your pie with chips or with mashed potatoes

is probably intended to mean “but not both”.

“Or” in English

Remark

While you’re all used to these words from everyday life, there can be vagueness about how “or” is used in English.
For example,

> *you can have your pie with chips or with mashed potatoes*

is probably intended to mean “but not both”. In mathematical argument when we use “or” and mean “but not both”, we have to say so explicitly.

Implication and "Or"

Implication and "Or"

It is sometimes worth knowing that implication can be defined in terms of "or":

Implication and "Or"

It is sometimes worth knowing that implication can be defined in terms of "or":

Proposition

The statement $P \Rightarrow Q$ *is equivalent to* $(\neg P) \vee Q$.

Implication and "Or"

It is sometimes worth knowing that implication can be defined in terms of "or":

Proposition

The statement $P \Rightarrow Q$ is equivalent to $(\neg P) \vee Q$.

Proof.

The only way that the first statement can be false is if P is true and Q is false. But that's also the only way that the second statement can be false, so they're equivalent. □

Implication and "Or"

It is sometimes worth knowing that implication can be defined in terms of "or":

Proposition

The statement $P \Rightarrow Q$ is equivalent to $(\neg P) \vee Q$.

Proof.

The only way that the first statement can be false is if P is true and Q is false. But that's also the only way that the second statement can be false, so they're equivalent. □

Note that that shows another style of proof of logical statements: by analysis rather than the "case bash" used in truth tables.

Quantifiers

Quantifiers

Lastly, we need to discuss how to make statements about *general* situations and *particular* examples.

Quantifiers

Lastly, we need to discuss how to make statements about *general* situations and *particular* examples. The phrases we use again and again are "for all" and "there exists": these are called *quantifiers*.

Quantifiers

Lastly, we need to discuss how to make statements about *general* situations and *particular* examples. The phrases we use again and again are "for all" and "there exists": these are called *quantifiers*. The following symbols are in common use:

Quantifiers

Lastly, we need to discuss how to make statements about *general* situations and *particular* examples. The phrases we use again and again are "for all" and "there exists": these are called *quantifiers*. The following symbols are in common use:

$\forall$ for "for all";

Quantifiers

Lastly, we need to discuss how to make statements about *general* situations and *particular* examples. The phrases we use again and again are "for all" and "there exists": these are called *quantifiers*. The following symbols are in common use:

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall \quad \text{for "for all"};\\ &\exists \quad \text{for "there exists"}; \end{aligned}$$

Quantifiers

Lastly, we need to discuss how to make statements about *general* situations and *particular* examples. The phrases we use again and again are "for all" and "there exists": these are called *quantifiers*. The following symbols are in common use:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \quad & \text{for "for all"}; \\ \exists \quad & \text{for "there exists"}; \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \text{for "such that"}. \end{aligned}$$

Examples of quantifiers

Examples of quantifiers

So, for example,

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad n^2 - 1 = (n+1)(n-1)$$

Examples of quantifiers

So, for example,

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad n^2 - 1 = (n+1)(n-1)$$

is to be read as

"For all integers n, we have $n^2 - 1 = (n+1)(n-1)$."

Examples of quantifiers

So, for example,

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad n^2 - 1 = (n+1)(n-1)$$

is to be read as

"For all integers n, we have $n^2 - 1 = (n+1)(n-1)$*."*

And

$$\exists x \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x^2 - 3x - 12 = 0$$

Examples of quantifiers

So, for example,

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad n^2 - 1 = (n+1)(n-1)$$

is to be read as

"For all integers n, we have $n^2 - 1 = (n+1)(n-1)$."

And

$$\exists x \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x^2 - 3x - 12 = 0$$

is to be read as

"There exists a real number x such that $x^2 - 3x - 12 = 0$."