OR (∨) (disjunction): these statements are false only when both p and q are false.

OR ∨ (Disjunction)		
p	q	p ∨ q
T	**T**	**T**
T	**F**	**T**
F	**T**	**T**
F	**F**	**F**

Exclusive (⊻) one of p or q (read p or else q)

⊻ (Exclusive)		
p	q	p ⊻ q
T	**T**	**F**
T	**F**	**T**
F	**T**	**T**
F	**F**	**F**

If ⟶ Then Statements – These statements are false only when p is true and q is false (because anything can follow from a false premise).

If ⟶ Then		
p	q	p → q
T	**T**	**T**
T	**F**	**F**
F	**T**	**T**
F	**F**	**T**

Here, p called **hypothesis (antecedent)** and q called **consequent (conclusion)**.

- Equivalent Forms of (**p → q)** read as:

1- If p then q":
2- p implies q
3- p is a sufficient condition for q

(Existence of H_2O is sufficient to exist of Oxygen(O))
4- p only if q= if not **q** then not **p**.
5- q if p.
6- q whenever p
7- q is a necessary condition for p.
(Existence of O is necessary to exist of H_2O)
8- q follows from p.

9- q, provided that p.

To understand why the conational statements is false only in the case when p is true but q is false considering the following example:

- Suppose your dad promises you:

"If you get an A in Foundation1, then I will buy you a laptop computer".

Here, p is "you get an **A** in Foundation1",
q is "I will buy you a notebook computer".

Then the only situation you can accuse your dad of breaking his promise is when

you get an A in Foundation1
but (and)
your dad does not buy you a notebook computer.

If you do not get an **A** in Foundtation1, then whether you dad buys you a notebook computer or not, you can't say that he breaks his promise.

- The statement $q \rightarrow p$ is called the **converse** of the statement $p \rightarrow q$ and the statement $\sim p \rightarrow \sim q$ is called the **inverse**.

For instance "**if Ali is from Baghdad then Ali is from Iraq"** is true, but the converse **"if Ali is from Iraq then Ali is from Baghdad"** may be false. The inverse "**if Ali is not from Baghdad then Ali is not from Iraq"** may be false.

- **Note** that the statements **p** → **q** and **q** → **p** are different.

If and only If Statements – These statements are true only when both p and q have the same truth (logical) values.

If ↔ Then		
p	q	p ↔ q
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	F
F	F	T

NOT ~ (negation) The "not" is simply the opposite or complement of its original value.

NOT ~ (negation)	
P	~p
T	F
F	T

- Note that, the negation is meaningful when used with only one logical proposition. This is not true of the other connectives.

Examples 1.2.4. Write the following statements symbolically, and then make a truth table for the statements.

(i) If I go to the mall or go to the stadium, then I will not go to the gym.

(ii) If the fish is cooked, then dinner is ready and I am hungry.

Solution.

(i) Suppose we set

p = I go to the mall

q = I go to the stadium

r = I will go to the gym

The proposition can then be expressed as "If p or q, then not r," or (p ∨ q) → ~ r.

p	q	r	p ∨ q	~r	(p ∨ q) →~r
T	T	T	T	F	F
T	T	F	T	T	T
T	F	T	T	F	F
T	F	F	T	T	T
F	T	T	T	F	F
F	T	F	T	T	T
F	F	T	F	F	T
F	F	F	F	T	T

(ii) Suppose we set

f = the fish is cooked.
r = dinner is ready.
h = I am hungry.

(a) f → (r ∧ h)

(b) (f → r) ∧ h

f	r	h	r ∧ h	f→(r ∧ h)	f → r	(f→r) ∧ h
T	T	T	T	T	T	T
T	T	F	F	F	T	F
T	F	T	F	F	F	F
T	F	F	F	F	F	F
F	T	T	T	T	T	T
F	T	F	F	T	T	F
F	F	T	F	T	T	T
F	F	F	F	T	T	F

Exercise 1.2,5.
Build a truth table for p → (q → r) and (p ∧ q) → r.

1.3. Tautology /Contradiction / Contingency

Definition 1.3.1. (Tautology)

A tautology (theorem or lemma) is a logical proposition that is always true.

Remark 1.3.2. One informal way to check whether or not a certain logical formula is a theorem is to construct its truth table.

Example 1.3.3. $p \vee \sim p$.

Definition 1.3.4. (Contradiction)

A contradiction is a logical proposition that is always false.

Example 1.3.5. $p \wedge \sim p$.

Definition 1.3.6. (Contingency)

A contingency is a logical proposition that is neither a tautology nor a contradiction.

Example 1.3.7.

(i) The logical proposition $p \vee q \rightarrow \sim r$ is a contingency. See Example 1.2.4(i).

(ii) The logical proposition $p \vee \sim (p \wedge q)$ is a tautology.

p	q	$p \wedge q$	$\sim (p \wedge q)$	$p \vee \sim (p \wedge q)$
T	T	T	F	T
T	F	F	T	T
F	T	F	T	T
F	F	F	T	T

Exercise 1. 1.3.8

(i) Build a truth table to verify that the logical proposition

$$(p \leftrightarrow q) \wedge (\sim p \wedge q)$$

is a contradiction.

(ii) (Low of Syllogism) Show that the logical proposition

$$[(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)] \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r)$$

is a tautology.

Definition 1.3.9. (Logically equivalent)

Propositions **r** and **s** are logically equivalents if the truth tables of **r** and **s** are the same and denoted by **r ≡ s**.

Example 1.3.10. Show that

$$\sim(p \rightarrow q) \equiv p \wedge \sim q.$$

Solution. Show the truth values of both propositions are identical.

p	q	~q	p → q	~(p → q)	p ∧ ~q
T	T	F	T	F	F
T	F	T	F	T	T
F	T	F	T	F	F
F	F	T	T	F	F

Remark 1.3.11. (Relation Between Logical Equivalent and Tautology)

$$(r \equiv s) \equiv (r \leftrightarrow s) \text{ is a tautology.}$$

Solution.

r	s		r	s	r ↔ s	
T	T	**r ≡ s**	T	T	T	←
T	F		T	F	F	
F	T		F	T	F	
F	F	**r ≡ s**	F	F	T	←

From the above table of the propositions r ≡ s and (r ↔ s is a tautology) we get that they have the same truth table.