

Now we can get back to proofs!

Atomic Statement:

statement that cannot be broken into smaller statements

## Truth Table Proofs

Prove the following statement is true:

If you eat a raw egg everyday, then  
 you will win the lottery, or  
 if you win the lottery you  
 will lose your job.

P  
 Q  
 R

1. Identify atomic statements and label
2. Write statement symbolically

$$(P \rightarrow Q) \vee (Q \rightarrow R)$$

3. Create truth table

S.KIMMEL

start with atomic

next build up to full

P	Q	R	$P \rightarrow Q$	$Q \rightarrow R$	$(P \rightarrow Q) \vee (Q \rightarrow R)$
T	T	T	T	T	T
T	T	F	T	F	T
T	F	T	F	T	T
T	F	F	F	T	T
F	T	T	T	T	T
F	T	F	T	F	T
F	F	T	T	T	T
F	F	F	T	T	T

all possible combinations

Proof: Let P be the statement...

" Q "

" R "

Then looking at the truth table, we see

$(P \rightarrow Q) \vee (Q \rightarrow R)$  is true for any truth value of P, Q, and R.

Truth tables are only useful when you don't have too many atomic statements ( $\#$  of rows  $\sim 2^{(\# \text{ of atomic statements})}$ )

Better if can avoid

Q. Explain why  $(P \rightarrow Q) \vee (Q \rightarrow R)$  is true without a truth table

- $Q$  is true or false. If it is true,  $P \rightarrow Q$  is true. If it is false,  $Q \rightarrow R$  is true. Either way, at least one of  $P \rightarrow Q$ ,  $Q \rightarrow R$  is true, so the whole statement is true.

Useful tool: Logical Equivalences

ex:  $P \rightarrow Q$  is logically equivalent to  $\neg P \vee Q$

P	Q	$P \rightarrow Q$	$\neg P$	$\neg P \vee Q$	$(P \rightarrow Q) \leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee Q)$
T	T	T	F	T	T
T	F	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	T	T	T
F	F	T	T	T	T

Statements R and S are logically equivalent if they have the same truth value under any assignment of truth values to their atomic parts, i.e. if  $R \leftrightarrow S$ .

★ If two statements are logically equivalent, you can substitute one for the other:

$$P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q \quad \text{so}$$

$$Q \rightarrow R \Leftrightarrow \neg Q \vee R$$

$$(P \rightarrow Q) \vee (Q \rightarrow R) \Leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee Q) \vee (\neg Q \vee R).$$

Now we have a bunch of OR's ( $\vee$ 's), so the statement is true if any substatement is true. But either Q or  $\neg Q$  is true, so the whole statement is true.