

Chapter 2: Fundamentals of Logic

謝仁偉 助理教授
jenwei@mail.ntust.edu.tw
國立台灣科技大學 資訊工程系
2008 Fall

1

Outline

- **Basic Connectives and Truth Tables**
- Logical Equivalence: The Laws of Logic
- Logical Implication: Rules of Inference
- The Use of Quantifiers
- Quantifiers, Definitions, and the Proofs of Theorems

2

Statements (1/5)

- **Statements** (or **propositions**): declarative sentences that are either true or false but not both.
- Examples:
 - p : Combinatorics is a required course for sophomores.
 - q : Margaret Mitchell wrote *Gone with the Wind*.
 - r : $2 + 3 = 5$.
- Non-statements: (do not have **truth values**)
 - “What a beautiful evening!” (exclamation)
 - “Get up and do your exercises.” (command)

3

Statements (2/5)

- **Primitive statements**: there is really no way to break them down into anything simpler.
- New statements can be obtained from existing ones in two ways.
 1. **Negation**: We do not consider the negation of a primitive statement to be a primitive statement.
 $\neg p$: Combinatorics is **not** a required course for sophomores.

4

Statements (3/5)

2. Compound statement, using the following logical connectives:

a) Conjunction $\wedge$

$p \wedge q$: "Combinatorics is a required course for sophomores, **and** Margaret Mitchell wrote *Gone with the Wind*."

b) Disjunction $\vee$

$p \vee q$ (inclusive): true if one or the other of p , q is true or if **both** of the statements p , q are true.

$p \underline{\vee} q$ (exclusive): true if one or the other of p , q is true but **not both** of the statements p , q are true.

5

Statements (4/5)

c) Implication $\rightarrow$

$p \rightarrow q$: "If combinatorics is a required course for sophomores, **then** Margaret Mitchell wrote *Gone with the Wind*."

Alternatively, we can say

1. "If p , then q ."
2. " p is sufficient for q ."
3. " p is a sufficient condition for q ."
4. " q is necessary for p ."
5. " q is a necessary condition for p ."
6. " q only if p ."

6

Statements (5/5)

- The statement p is called the **hypothesis** of the implication; q is called the **conclusion**.

d) Biconditional $\leftrightarrow$

$p \leftrightarrow q$: "Combinatorics is a required course for sophomores, **if and only if** Margaret Mitchell wrote *Gone with the Wind*."

- " p if and only if q " or " p is necessary and sufficient for q ."
- Abbreviate " p if and only if q " as " p iff q ."
- **Note:** A sentence such as "The number x is an integer." is not a statement because its truth value cannot be determined until a numerical value is assigned for x .

7

Truth Table

"0" for false and "1" for true

p	$\neg p$	p	q	$p \wedge q$	$p \vee q$	$p \underline{\vee} q$	$p \rightarrow q$	$p \leftrightarrow q$
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
		1	0	0	1	1	0	0
		1	1	1	1	0	1	1

8

Example of implication (1/2)

- **Example 2.2:** It is almost the week before Christmas and Penny will be attending several parties that week. Ever conscious of her weight, she plans not to weigh herself until the day after Christmas. Considering what those parties may do to her waistline by then, she makes the following resolution for the December 26 outcome: "If I weigh more than 120 pounds, then I shall enroll in an exercise class."

9

Example of implication (2/2)

- **Example 2.2 (cont.):**
Let p and q denote the (primitive) statements
 p : I weigh more than 120 pounds.
 q : I shall enroll in an exercise class.
 Then Penny's statement (implication) is given by $p \rightarrow q$.
 ➡ We shall consider the truth values of this particular example of $p \rightarrow q$

10

Example of Compound Statement (1/2)

- **Example 2.4:** Let us examine the truth table for the compound statement "Margaret Mitchell wrote *Gone with the Wind*, and if $2 + 3 \neq 5$, then combinatorics is a required course for sophomores."
 – p : Combinatorics is a required course for sophomores.
 – q : Margaret Mitchell wrote "*Gone with the Wind*".
 – r : $2 + 3 = 5$.
 ➡ $q \wedge (\neg r \rightarrow p)$

11

Example of Compound Statement (2/2)

- **Example 2.4 (cont.):**

p	q	r	$\neg r$	$\neg r \rightarrow p$	$q \wedge (\neg r \rightarrow p)$
0	0	0			
0	0	1			
0	1	0			
0	1	1			
1	0	0			
1	0	1			
1	1	0			
1	1	1			

12

Tautology and Contradiction

- Definition 2.1:** A compound statement is called a **tautology** if it is true for all truth value assignments for its component statement. If a compound statement is false for all such assignments, then it is called a **contradiction**.

p	q	$p \vee q$	$p \rightarrow (p \vee q)$	$\neg p$	$\neg p \wedge q$	$p \wedge (\neg p \wedge q)$
0	0	0	1	1	0	0
0	1	1	1	1	1	0
1	0	1	1	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	0	0	0

Use the symbol T_0 to denote any tautology.

Use the symbol F_0 to denote any contradiction.

- EXERCISES 2.1:** 4, 6

13

Outline

- Basic Connectives and Truth Tables
- Logical Equivalence: The Laws of Logic**
- Logical Implication: Rules of Inference
- The Use of Quantifiers
- Quantifiers, Definitions, and the Proofs of Theorems

14

Logical Equivalence

- Definition 2.2:** Two statements s_1, s_2 are said to be **logically equivalent**, and we write $s_1 \Leftrightarrow s_2$, when the statement s_1 is true (respectively, false) if and only if the statement s_2 is true (respectively, false).

p	q	$\neg p$	$\neg p \vee q$	$p \rightarrow q$
0	0	1	1	1
0	1	1	1	1
1	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	1	1

We can eliminate the connective $\rightarrow$ from compound statements.

$$\therefore \neg p \vee q \Leftrightarrow p \rightarrow q$$

15

Eliminate Connectives from Compound Statements

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$	$q \rightarrow p$	$(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$	$p \leftrightarrow q$
0	0	1	1	1	1
0	1	1	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1

$$(p \leftrightarrow q) \Leftrightarrow (\neg p \vee q) \wedge (\neg q \vee p)$$

p	q	$p \vee q$	$p \wedge q$	$\neg(p \wedge q)$	$(p \vee q) \wedge \neg(p \wedge q)$
0	0	0	0	1	0
0	1	1	0	1	1
1	0	1	0	1	1
1	1	1	1	0	0

Important Properties (1/2)

• Example 2.8: (DeMorgan's Laws)

p	q	$p \wedge q$	$\neg(p \wedge q)$	$\neg p$	$\neg q$	$\neg p \vee \neg q$	$p \vee q$	$\neg(p \vee q)$	$\neg p \wedge \neg q$
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1
0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

$$\therefore \neg(p \wedge q) \Leftrightarrow \neg p \vee \neg q$$

$$\neg(p \vee q) \Leftrightarrow \neg p \wedge \neg q$$

17

Important Properties (2/2)

• Example 2.9: (Distributive Law)

p	q	r	$p \wedge (q \vee r)$	$(p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r)$	$p \vee (q \wedge r)$	$(p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	1	0	0	1	1
1	0	0	0	0	1	1
1	0	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	0	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1

18

The Laws of Logic (1/2)

- For any primitive statements p, q, r , any tautology T_0 , and any contradiction F_0 ,

- $\neg\neg p \Leftrightarrow p$ Law of Double Negation
- $\neg(p \vee q) \Leftrightarrow \neg p \wedge \neg q$ DeMorgan's Laws
 $\neg(p \wedge q) \Leftrightarrow \neg p \vee \neg q$
- $p \vee q \Leftrightarrow q \vee p$ Commutative Laws
 $p \wedge q \Leftrightarrow q \wedge p$
- $p \vee (q \vee r) \Leftrightarrow (p \vee q) \vee r$ Associative Laws
 $p \wedge (q \wedge r) \Leftrightarrow (p \wedge q) \wedge r$

19

The Laws of Logic (2/2)

- $p \vee (q \wedge r) \Leftrightarrow (p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$ Distributive Laws
 $p \wedge (q \vee r) \Leftrightarrow (p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r)$
- $p \vee p \Leftrightarrow p$ Idempotent Laws
 $p \wedge p \Leftrightarrow p$
- $p \vee F_0 \Leftrightarrow p$ Identity Laws
 $p \wedge T_0 \Leftrightarrow p$
- $p \vee \neg p \Leftrightarrow T_0$ Inverse Laws
 $p \wedge \neg p \Leftrightarrow F_0$
- $p \vee T_0 \Leftrightarrow T_0$ Domination Laws
 $p \wedge F_0 \Leftrightarrow F_0$
- $p \vee (p \wedge q) \Leftrightarrow p$ Absorption Laws
 $p \wedge (p \vee q) \Leftrightarrow p$

20

Dual of Statement (1/3)

- **Definition 2.3:** Let s be a statement. If s contains no logical connectives other than $\wedge$ and $\vee$, then the **dual** of s , denoted s^d , is the statement obtained from s by replacing each occurrence of $\wedge$ and $\vee$ by $\vee$ and $\wedge$, respectively, and each occurrence of T_0 and F_0 by F_0 and T_0 , respectively.

21

Dual of Statement (2/3)

- If p is any primitive statement, then
 - p^d is the same as p
 - $(\neg p)^d$ is the same as $\neg p$
 - $p \vee \neg p$ and $p \wedge \neg p$ are duals of each other
 - $p \vee T_0$ and $p \wedge F_0$ are duals of each other

22

Dual of Statement (3/3)

- **Theorem 2.1 (The Principle of Duality):** Let s and t be statements that contain no logical connectives other than $\wedge$ and $\vee$. If $s \Leftrightarrow t$, then $s^d \Leftrightarrow t^d$.
- ➡ **Laws 2 through 10** in our list can be established by proving one of the laws in each pair and then invoking this principle.

23

Substitution Rules

1. Suppose that the **compound statement P is a tautology**. If p is a **primitive statement** that appears in P and we replace **each** occurrence of p by the **same** statement q , then the resulting compound statement P_1 is also a tautology.
2. Let P be a compound statement where p is an arbitrary statement that appears in P , and let q be a statement such that $q \Leftrightarrow p$. Suppose that in P we replace **one or more** occurrences of p by q . Then this replacement yields the compound statement P_1 . Under these circumstances $P_1 \Leftrightarrow P$.

24

Examples of Substitution Rules (1/3)

- Example 2.10: (Substitution Rule 1)**

a) (From DeMorgan's Laws) $P: \neg(p \vee q) \leftrightarrow (\neg p \wedge \neg q)$ is a tautology.

$P_1: \neg[(r \wedge s) \vee q] \leftrightarrow [\neg(r \wedge s) \wedge \neg q]$ is a tautology.

$P_2: \neg[(r \wedge s) \vee (t \rightarrow u)] \leftrightarrow [\neg(r \wedge s) \wedge (t \rightarrow u)]$ is also a tautology.

25

Examples of Substitution Rules (2/3)

- Example 2.10 (cont.): (Substitution Rule 1)**

b)

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$	$p \wedge (p \rightarrow q)$	$[p \wedge (p \rightarrow q)] \rightarrow q$
0	0	1	0	1
0	1	1	0	1
1	0	0	0	1
1	1	1	1	1

$\therefore [p \wedge (p \rightarrow q)] \rightarrow q$ is a tautology.

➡ $(r \rightarrow s) \wedge [(r \rightarrow s) \rightarrow (\neg t \vee u)] \rightarrow (\neg t \vee u)$ is also a tautology.

26

Examples of Substitution Rules (3/3)

- Example 2.11: (Substitution Rule 2)**

$P: p \rightarrow (p \vee q)$ is a tautology.

$P_1: p \rightarrow (\neg\neg p \vee q)$ is also a tautology.
(Since $\neg\neg p \Leftrightarrow p$.)

27

Examples (1/6)

- Example 2.12:** Negate and simplify the compound statement $(p \vee q) \rightarrow r$.

1) $(p \vee q) \rightarrow r \Leftrightarrow \neg(p \vee q) \vee r$

2) $\neg[(p \vee q) \rightarrow r] \Leftrightarrow \neg[\neg(p \vee q) \vee r]$

3) $\neg[\neg(p \vee q) \vee r] \Leftrightarrow \neg\neg(p \vee q) \wedge \neg r$

4) $\neg\neg(p \vee q) \wedge \neg r \Leftrightarrow (p \vee q) \wedge \neg r$

➡ $\neg[(p \vee q) \rightarrow r] \Leftrightarrow (p \vee q) \wedge \neg r$

28

Examples (2/6)

- **Example 2.13:** Let p, q denote the primitive statements
 p : Joan goes to Lake George.
 q : Mary pays for Joan's shopping spree.
 and consider the implication
 $p \rightarrow q$: If Joan goes to Lake George, then Mary pays for Joan's shopping spree.
 How to write the negation of $p \rightarrow q$ in a way other than simply $\neg(p \rightarrow q)$?

29

Examples (3/6)

- **Example 2.13 (cont.):**
 p : Joan goes to Lake George.
 q : Mary pays for Joan's shopping spree.
 $\neg(p \rightarrow q) \Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg p \vee q) \Leftrightarrow \neg\neg p \wedge \neg q \Leftrightarrow p \wedge \neg q$
 $\neg(p \rightarrow q)$: Joan goes to Lake George, but Mary does not pay for Joan's shopping spree.
 **Note:** The negation of an if-then statement does **not** begin with the word **if**. It is **not** another **implication**.

30

Examples (4/6)

- **Example 2.15:**

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$	$\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$	$q \rightarrow p$	$\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$
0	0	1	1	1	1
0	1	1	1	0	0
1	0	0	0	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1

- The statement $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ is called the **contrapositive** of the implication $p \rightarrow q$.
- The statement $q \rightarrow p$ is called the **converse** of $p \rightarrow q$.
- The statement $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$ is called the **inverse** of $p \rightarrow q$.

31

Examples (5/6)

- **Example 2.15 (cont.):**
 Let us consider a specific example where p, q represent the statements
 p : Jeff is concerned about his cholesterol levels.
 q : Jeff walks at least 2 miles 3 times a week.
 (The implication: $p \rightarrow q$). If Jeff is concerned about his cholesterol levels, then he will walk at least 2 miles 3 times a week.
 (The contrapositive: $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$). If Jeff does not walk at least 2 miles 3 times a week, then he is not concerned about his cholesterol levels.

32

Examples (6/6)

- Example 2.15 (cont.):**

(The converse: $q \rightarrow p$). If Jeff walks at least 2 miles 3 times a week, then he is concerned about his cholesterol levels.

(The inverse: $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$). If Jeff is not concerned about his cholesterol levels, then he will not walk at least 2 miles 3 times a week.

33

Simplification of Compound Statements (1/2)

- Example 2.16:** For primitive statements p, q , is there any simpler way to express the compound statement $(p \vee q) \wedge \neg(\neg p \wedge q)$ — that is, can we find a simpler statement that is logically equivalent to the one given?

$(p \vee q) \wedge \neg(\neg p \wedge q)$	Reasons
$\Leftrightarrow (p \vee q) \wedge (\neg\neg p \vee \neg q)$	DeMorgan's Law
$\Leftrightarrow (p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee \neg q)$	Law of Double Negation
$\Leftrightarrow p \vee (q \wedge \neg q)$	Distributive Law of $\vee$ over $\wedge$
$\Leftrightarrow p \vee F_0$	Inverse Law
$\Leftrightarrow p$	Identify Law
Consequently, we see that $(p \vee q) \wedge \neg(\neg p \wedge q) \Leftrightarrow p$	

34

Simplification of Compound Statements (2/2)


- Example 2.17:** Consider the compound statement $\neg[\neg[(p \vee q) \wedge r] \vee \neg q]$, where p, q, r are primitive statements.

$\neg[\neg[(p \vee q) \wedge r] \vee \neg q]$	Reasons
$\Leftrightarrow \neg\neg[(p \vee q) \wedge r] \wedge \neg\neg q$	DeMorgan's Law
$\Leftrightarrow [(p \vee q) \wedge r] \wedge q$	Law of Double Negation
$\Leftrightarrow (p \vee q) \wedge (r \wedge q)$	Associative Law of $\wedge$
$\Leftrightarrow (p \vee q) \wedge (q \wedge r)$	Commutative Law of $\wedge$
$\Leftrightarrow [(p \vee q) \wedge q] \wedge r$	Associative Law of $\wedge$
$\Leftrightarrow q \wedge r$	Absorption Law (as well as the Commutative Laws for $\wedge$ and $\vee$)

35

Simplification of Switching Networks (1/4)


- A **switching network** is made up of wires and switches connecting two terminals T_1 and T_2 .
 - **Open** (0): No current flows through it.
 - **Closed** (1): Current does flow through it.



36

Simplification of Switching Networks (2/4)

• Example 2.18:



The switches in a network need not act independently of each other.

This network is represented by the statement $(p \vee q \vee r) \wedge (p \vee t \vee \neg q) \wedge (p \vee \neg t \vee r)$.

37

Simplification of Switching Networks (3/4)

• Example 2.18 (cont.):

$$(p \vee q \vee r) \wedge (p \vee t \vee \neg q) \wedge (p \vee \neg t \vee r)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow p \vee [(q \vee r) \wedge (t \vee \neg q) \wedge (\neg t \vee r)]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow p \vee [(q \vee r) \wedge (\neg t \vee r) \wedge (t \vee \neg q)]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow p \vee [((q \wedge \neg t) \vee r) \wedge (t \vee \neg q)]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow p \vee [((q \wedge \neg t) \vee r) \wedge (\neg \neg t \vee \neg q)]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow p \vee [((q \wedge \neg t) \vee r) \wedge \neg(\neg t \wedge q)]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow p \vee [\neg(\neg t \wedge q) \wedge ((\neg t \wedge q) \vee r)]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow p \vee [(\neg(\neg t \wedge q) \wedge (\neg t \wedge q)) \vee (\neg(\neg t \wedge q) \wedge r)]$$

Reasons

Distributive Law of $\vee$ over $\wedge$

Commutative Law of $\wedge$
Distributive Law of $\vee$ over $\wedge$

Law of Double Negation

DeMorgan's Law

Commutative Law of $\wedge$ (twice)

Distributive Law of $\wedge$ over $\vee$

38

Simplification of Switching Networks (4/4)

• Example 2.18 (cont.):

$$\Leftrightarrow p \vee [F_0 \vee (\neg(\neg t \wedge q) \wedge r)]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow p \vee [(\neg(\neg t \wedge q)) \wedge r]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow p \vee [r \wedge \neg(\neg t \wedge q)]$$


$$\Leftrightarrow p \vee [r \wedge (t \vee \neg q)]$$

$\neg s \wedge s \Leftrightarrow F_0$, for any statement s

F_0 is the identity for $\vee$

Commutative Law of $\wedge$

DeMorgan's Law and the Law of Double Negation



• EXERCISES 2.2: 4, 8, 10

39

Outline

- Basic Connectives and Truth Tables
- Logical Equivalence: The Laws of Logic
- **Logical Implication: Rules of Inference**
- The Use of Quantifiers
- Quantifiers, Definitions, and the Proofs of Theorems

40

Valid Argument (1/2)

- Let us consider the implication

$$(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge p_3 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n) \rightarrow q.$$

Here n is a positive integer.

- The statements $p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots, p_n$ are called the **premises** of the argument.
- The statement q is the **conclusion** of the argument.
- The argument is called **valid** if whenever each of the premises $p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots, p_n$ is true, then the conclusion q is likewise true.

41

Valid Argument (2/2)

- If any one of $p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots, p_n$ is false, then the hypothesis $(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge p_3 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n)$ is false and the implication $(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge p_3 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n) \rightarrow q$ is automatically true, regardless of the truth value of q .

➡ One way to establish the validity of a given argument is to show that the statement $(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge p_3 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n) \rightarrow q$ is a tautology.

42

Example (1/3)

- Example 2.19:** Let p, q, r denote the primitive statements given as

p : Roger studies.

q : Roger plays tennis.

r : Roger passes discrete mathematics.

Now let p_1, p_2, p_3 denote the premises

p_1 : If Roger studies, then he will pass discrete mathematics.

p_2 : If Roger doesn't play tennis, then he'll study.

p_3 : Roger failed discrete mathematics.

43

Example (2/3)

- Example 2.19 (cont.):**

We want to determine whether the argument

$(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge p_3) \rightarrow q$
is valid.

To do so, we rewrite p_1, p_2, p_3 as

$p_1: p \rightarrow r$

$p_2: \neg q \rightarrow p$

$p_3: \neg r$

and examine the truth table for the implication

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

44

Example (3/3)

- Example 2.19 (cont.):**

			p_1	p_2	p_3	$(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge p_3) \rightarrow q$
p	q	r	$p \rightarrow r$	$\neg q \rightarrow p$	$\neg r$	$[(p \rightarrow r) \wedge (\neg q \rightarrow p) \wedge \neg r] \rightarrow q$
0	0	0	1	0	1	1
0	0	1	1	0	0	1
0	1	0	1	1	1	1
0	1	1	1	1	0	1
1	0	0	0	1	1	1
1	0	1	1	1	0	1
1	1	0	0	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	0	1

- ➡ Since the implication is a tautology, we can say that $(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge p_3) \rightarrow q$ is a valid argument.
- ➡ The truth of the conclusion q is **deduced** or **inferred** from the truth of the premises p_1 , p_2 , and p_3 .

45

Logical Implication

- Definition 2.4:** If p , q are arbitrary statements such that $p \rightarrow q$ is a tautology, then we say that p **logically implies** q and we write $p \Rightarrow q$ to denote this situation. (We refer to $p \rightarrow q$ as a **logical implication**.)

46

Rule of Inference: Modus Ponens

- Example 2.22 (Modus Ponens or Rule of Detachment):** In symbolic form this rule is expressed by the logical implication

p	q	
0	0	
0	1	1
1	0	0
1	1	1

If (1) p is true, and (2) $p \rightarrow q$ is true (or $p \Rightarrow q$), **then** the conclusion q must also be true.

$$\frac{p \quad p \rightarrow q}{\therefore q}$$

47

Rule of Inference: Law of the Syllogism (1/2)

- Example 2.23 (Law of the Syllogism):** This rule is given by the logical implication $[(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)] \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r)$, where p , q , and r are any statements. In tabular form it is written

$$\frac{p \rightarrow q \quad q \rightarrow r}{\therefore p \rightarrow r}$$

48

Rule of Inference: Law of the Syllogism (2/2)

- Example 2.23 (cont.):**

We may use it as follows:

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| 1) If the integer 35244 is divisible by 396,
then the integer 35244 is divisible by 66. | $p \rightarrow q$ |
| 2) If the integer 35244 is divisible by 66,
then the integer 35244 is divisible by 3. | $q \rightarrow r$ |
| 3) Therefore, if the integer 35244 is divisible
by 396, then the integer 35244 is
divisible by 3. | $\therefore p \rightarrow r$ |

49

Example (1/3)

- Example 2.24:** Consider the following argument.

- 1) Rita is baking a cake.
- 2) If Rita is baking a cake, then she is not practicing her flute.
- 3) If Rita is not practicing her flute, then her father will not buy her a car.
- 4) Therefore Rita's father will not buy her a car.

We may write the argument as

$$\begin{array}{l}
 p \\
 p \rightarrow \neg q \\
 \neg q \rightarrow \neg r \\
 \hline
 \therefore \neg r
 \end{array}$$

50

Example (2/3)

- Example 2.24 (cont.):**

We establish the validity of the argument as follows:

Steps	Reasons
1) $p \rightarrow \neg q$	Premise
2) $\neg q \rightarrow \neg r$	Premise
3) $p \rightarrow \neg r$	This follows from steps (1) and (2) and the Law of the Syllogism
4) p	Premise
5) $\therefore \neg r$	This follows from steps (4) and (3) and the Rule of Detachment

51

Example (3/3)

- Example 2.24 (cont.):**

A second way to validate the argument as follows:

Steps	Reasons
1) p	Premise
2) $p \rightarrow \neg q$	Premise
3) $\neg q$	Steps (1) and (2) and the Rule of the Detachment
4) $\neg q \rightarrow \neg r$	Premise
5) $\therefore \neg r$	Steps (3) and (4) and the Rule of Detachment

52

Rule of Inference: Modus Tollens (1/4)

- **Example 2.25 (Modus Tollens):** The rule of inference called **Modus Tollens** (“method of denying”) is given by

$$\frac{p \rightarrow q \quad \neg q}{\therefore \neg p}$$

This follows from the logical implication
 $[(p \rightarrow q) \wedge \neg q] \rightarrow \neg p$.

53

Rule of Inference: Modus Tollens (2/4)

- **Example 2.25 (cont.):**

The following exemplifies the use of **Modus Tollens** in making a valid inference:

- 1) If Connie is elected president of Phi Delta sorority, then Helen will pledge that sorority. $p \rightarrow q$
- 2) Helen did not pledge Phi Delta sorority. $\neg q$
- 3) Therefore Connie was not elected president of Phi Delta sorority. $\therefore \neg p$

54

Rule of Inference: Modus Tollens (3/4)

- **Example 2.25 (cont.):**

Use **Modus Tollens** to show that the following argument is valid (for primitive statements p , r , s , t , and u).

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} p \rightarrow r \\ r \rightarrow s \\ t \vee \neg s \\ \neg t \vee u \\ \neg u \end{array}}{\therefore \neg p}$$

55

Rule of Inference: Modus Tollens (4/4)

- **Example 2.25 (cont.):**

Steps	Reasons
1) $p \rightarrow r, r \rightarrow s$	Premises
2) $p \rightarrow s$	Step (1) and the Law of the Syllogism
3) $t \vee \neg s$	Premise
4) $\neg s \vee t$	Step (3) and the Commutative Law of $\vee$
5) $s \rightarrow t$	Step (4) and the fact that $\neg s \vee t \Leftrightarrow s \rightarrow t$
6) $p \rightarrow t$	Steps (2) and (5) and the Law of the Syllogism
7) $\neg t \vee u$	Premise
8) $t \rightarrow u$	Step (7) and the fact that $\neg t \vee u \Leftrightarrow t \rightarrow u$
9) $p \rightarrow u$	Steps (6) and (8) and the Law of the Syllogism
10) $\neg u$	Premise
11) $\therefore \neg p$	Steps (9) and (10) and Modus Tollens

56

Rule of Inference: Rule of Conjunction

- **Example 2.26 (Rule of Conjunction):** If p, q are true statements, then $p \wedge q$ is a true statement. We call this rule the **Rule of Conjunction** and write it in tabular form as

$$\frac{p}{\frac{q}{\therefore p \wedge q}}$$

57

Rule of Inference: Rule of Disjunctive Syllogism (1/2)

- **Example 2.27 (Rule of Disjunctive Syllogism):** The **Rule of Disjunctive Syllogism** comes about from the logical implication

$$[(p \vee q) \wedge \neg p] \rightarrow q,$$

which we can derive from **Modus Ponens** by

observing that $p \vee q \Leftrightarrow \neg p \rightarrow q$.

In tabular form we write

$$\frac{p \vee q}{\frac{\neg p}{\therefore q}}$$

58

Rule of Inference: Rule of Disjunctive Syllogism (2/2)

- **Example 2.27 (cont.):**

1) Bart's wallet is in his back pocket or it is on his desk.

2) Bart's wallet is not in his back pocket.

3) Therefore Bart's wallet is on his desk.

$$\frac{p \vee q}{\frac{\neg p}{\therefore q}}$$

59

Rule of Inference: Rule of Contradiction (1/2)

- **Example 2.28 (Rule of Contradiction):** Let p denote an arbitrary statement, and F_0 a contradiction. Then $(\neg p \rightarrow F_0) \rightarrow p$ is a tautology.

$$\frac{\neg p \rightarrow F_0}{\therefore p}$$

p	$\neg p$	F_0	$\neg p \rightarrow F_0$	$(\neg p \rightarrow F_0) \rightarrow p$
1	0	0	1	1
0	1	0	0	1

If p is a statement and $\neg p \rightarrow F_0$ is true, then $\neg p$ must be false because F_0 is false. So then we have p true.

60

Rule of Inference: Rule of Contradiction (2/2)

- Example 2.28 (cont.):** The [Rule of Contradiction](#) is the basis of a method for establishing the validity of an argument – namely, the method of [Proof by Contradiction](#).

In general, when we want to establish the validity of the argument

$$(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge p_n) \rightarrow q,$$

We can establish the validity of the logically equivalent argument

$$(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge p_n \wedge \neg q) \rightarrow F_0$$

61

Summary of Inference Rules (1/2)

Rule of Inference	Related Logical Implication	Name of Rule
1) $\frac{p \quad p \rightarrow q}{\therefore q}$	$[p \wedge (p \rightarrow q)] \rightarrow q$	Rule of Detachment (Modus Ponens)
2) $\frac{p \rightarrow q \quad q \rightarrow r}{\therefore p \rightarrow r}$	$[(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)] \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r)$	Law of the Syllogism
3) $\frac{p \rightarrow q \quad \neg q}{\therefore \neg p}$	$[(p \rightarrow q) \wedge \neg q] \rightarrow \neg p$	Modus Tollens
4) $\frac{p \quad q}{\therefore p \wedge q}$		Rule of Conjunction
5) $\frac{p \vee q \quad \neg p}{\therefore q}$	$[(p \vee q) \wedge \neg p] \rightarrow q$	Rule of Disjunctive Syllogism

62

Summary of Inference Rules (2/2)

6) $\frac{\neg p \rightarrow F_0}{\therefore p}$	$(\neg p \rightarrow F_0) \rightarrow p$	Rule of Contradiction
7) $\frac{p \wedge q}{\therefore p}$	$(p \wedge q) \rightarrow p$	Rule of Conjunctive Simplification
8) $\frac{p}{\therefore p \vee q}$	$p \rightarrow p \vee q$	Rule of Disjunctive Amplification
9) $\frac{p \wedge q \quad p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)}{\therefore r}$	$[(p \wedge q) \wedge [p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)]] \rightarrow r$	Rule of Conditional Proof
10) $\frac{p \rightarrow r \quad q \rightarrow r}{\therefore (p \vee q) \rightarrow r}$	$[(p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)] \rightarrow [(p \vee q) \rightarrow r]$	Rule for Proof by Cases
11) $\frac{p \rightarrow q \quad r \rightarrow s \quad p \vee r}{\therefore q \vee s}$	$[(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (r \rightarrow s) \wedge (p \vee r)] \rightarrow (q \vee s)$	Rule of the Constructive Dilemma
12) $\frac{p \rightarrow q \quad r \rightarrow s \quad \neg q \vee \neg s}{\therefore \neg p \vee \neg r}$	$[(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (r \rightarrow s) \wedge (\neg q \vee \neg s)] \rightarrow (\neg p \vee \neg r)$	Rule of the Destructive Dilemma

63

Apply Rules (1/3)

- Example 2.29:** Our first example demonstrates the validity of the argument

$$\frac{p \rightarrow r \quad \neg p \rightarrow q \quad q \rightarrow s}{\therefore \neg r \rightarrow s}$$

Steps	Reasons
1) $p \rightarrow r$	Premise
2) $\neg r \rightarrow \neg p$	Step (1) and $p \rightarrow r \Leftrightarrow \neg r \rightarrow \neg p$
3) $\neg p \rightarrow q$	Premise
4) $\neg r \rightarrow q$	Steps (2) and (3) and the Law of the Syllogism
5) $q \rightarrow s$	Premise
6) $\therefore \neg r \rightarrow s$	Steps (4) and (5) and the Law of the Syllogism

64

Apply Rules (2/3)

- **Example 2.30:** Establish the validity of the argument

$$\begin{array}{l} p \rightarrow q \\ q \rightarrow (r \wedge s) \\ \neg r \vee (\neg t \vee u) \\ \hline p \wedge t \\ \hline \therefore u \end{array}$$

Steps	Reasons
1) $p \rightarrow q$	Premise
2) $q \rightarrow (r \wedge s)$	Premise
3) $p \rightarrow (r \wedge s)$	Steps (1) and (2) and the Law of the Syllogism
4) $p \wedge t$	Premise
5) p	Step (4) and the Rule of Conjunctive Simplification
6) $r \wedge s$	Step (5) and (3) and the Rule of Detachment
7) r	Step (6) and the Rule of Conjunctive Simplification

65

Apply Rules (3/3)

- **Example 2.30 (cont.):**

$$\begin{array}{l} p \rightarrow q \\ q \rightarrow (r \wedge s) \\ \neg r \vee (\neg t \vee u) \\ \hline p \wedge t \\ \hline \therefore u \end{array}$$

8) $\neg r \vee (\neg t \vee u)$	Premise
9) $\neg(r \wedge t) \vee u$	Step (8), the Associative Law of $\vee$, and DeMorgan's Laws
10) t	Step (4) and the Rule of Conjunctive Simplification
11) $r \wedge t$	Steps (7) and (10) and the Rule of Conjunction
12) $\therefore u$	Steps (9) and (11) and the Rule of Disjunctive Syllogism

66

Proof by Contradiction (1/3)

- **Example 2.32:** Consider the argument

$$\begin{array}{l} \neg p \leftrightarrow q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \neg r \\ \hline \therefore p \end{array}$$

- To establish the validity for this argument, we assume the negation $\neg p$ of the conclusion p as another premise. The objective now is to use these four premises to derive a contradiction of F_0 . Our derivation follows.

67

Proof by Contradiction (2/3)

- **Example 2.32 (cont.):**

$$\begin{array}{l} \neg p \leftrightarrow q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \neg r \\ \hline \therefore p \end{array}$$

Steps	Reasons
1) $\neg p \leftrightarrow q$	Premise
2) $(\neg p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow \neg p)$	Step (1) and $(\neg p \leftrightarrow q) \Leftrightarrow [(\neg p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow \neg p)]$
3) $\neg p \rightarrow q$	Step (2) and the Rule of Conjunctive Simplification
4) $q \rightarrow r$	Premise
5) $\neg p \rightarrow r$	Steps (3) and (4) and the Law of the Syllogism

68

Proof by Contradiction (3/3)

- **Example 2.32 (cont.):** $\neg p \leftrightarrow q$

$$\begin{array}{l} q \rightarrow r \\ \neg r \\ \hline \therefore p \end{array}$$

- 6) $\neg p$ Premise (the one assumed)
- 7) r Steps (5) and (6) and the Rule of Detachment
- 8) $\neg r$ Premise
- 9) $r \wedge \neg r (\Leftrightarrow F_0)$ Steps (7) and (8) and the Rule of Conjunction
- 10) $\therefore p$ Steps (6) and (9) and the method of Proof by Contradiction

69

Principle

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

p	q	r	$p \wedge q$	$(p \wedge q) \rightarrow r$	$q \rightarrow r$	$p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)$
0	0	0	0	1	1	1
0	0	1	0	1	1	1
0	1	0	0	1	0	1
0	1	1	0	1	1	1
1	0	0	0	1	1	1
1	0	1	0	1	1	1
1	1	0	1	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1

$$[(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n) \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)] \Leftrightarrow [(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n \wedge q) \rightarrow r]$$

70

Example (1/3)

- **Example 2.33:** In order to establish the validity of the argument

$$\begin{array}{l} u \rightarrow r \\ (r \wedge s) \rightarrow (p \vee t) \\ q \rightarrow (u \wedge s) \\ \neg t \\ \hline \therefore q \rightarrow p \end{array}$$

We consider the corresponding argument

$$\begin{array}{l} u \rightarrow r \\ (r \wedge s) \rightarrow (p \vee t) \\ q \rightarrow (u \wedge s) \\ \neg t \\ q \\ \hline \therefore p \end{array}$$

71

Example (2/3)

- **Example 2.33 (cont.):**

Steps	Reasons	$u \rightarrow r$ $(r \wedge s) \rightarrow (p \vee t)$ $q \rightarrow (u \wedge s)$ $\neg t$ q $\hline \therefore p$
1) q	Premise	
2) $q \rightarrow (u \wedge s)$	Premise	
3) $u \wedge s$	Steps (1) and (2) and the Rule of Detachment	
4) u	Step (3) and the Rule of Conjunctive Simplification	
5) $u \rightarrow r$	Premise	
6) r	Steps (4) and (5) and the Rule of Detachment	
7) s	Step (3) and the Rule of Conjunctive Simplification	

72

Example (3/3)

- **Example 2.33 (cont.):**

$$\begin{array}{l}
 u \rightarrow r \\
 (r \wedge s) \rightarrow (p \vee t) \\
 q \rightarrow (u \wedge s) \\
 \neg t \\
 \hline
 q \\
 \hline
 \therefore p
 \end{array}$$

- | | |
|--|---|
| 8) $r \wedge s$ | Steps (6) and (7) and the Rule of Conjunction |
| 9) $(r \wedge s) \rightarrow (p \vee t)$ | Premise |
| 10) $p \vee t$ | Steps (8) and (9) and the Rule of Detachment |
| 11) $\neg t$ | Premise |
| 12) $\therefore p$ | Steps (10) and (11) and the Rule of Disjunctive Syllogism |

73

Counterexample of the Argument (1/3)

- Given an argument $p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge p_3 \wedge \dots p_n \rightarrow q$ we say that the argument is invalid if it is possible for each of the premises $p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots, p_n$ to be true (with truth value 1), while the conclusion q is false (with truth value 0).

74

Counterexample of the Argument (2/3)

- **Example 2.34:** Consider the primitive statements p, q, r, s , and t and the argument

$$\begin{array}{l}
 p \\
 p \vee q \\
 q \rightarrow (r \rightarrow s) \\
 t \rightarrow r \\
 \hline
 \therefore \neg s \rightarrow \neg t
 \end{array}$$

Show that this is an invalid argument.

75

Counterexample of the Argument (3/3)

- **Example 2.35:** What can we say about the validity or invalidity of the following argument? Here p, q, r , and s denote primitive statements.

$$\begin{array}{l}
 p \rightarrow q \\
 q \rightarrow s \\
 r \rightarrow \neg s \\
 \neg p \vee r \\
 \hline
 \therefore \neg p
 \end{array}$$

- **EXERCISES 2.3:** 4, 6, 8

76

Outline

- Basic Connectives and Truth Tables
- Logical Equivalence: The Laws of Logic
- Logical Implication: Rules of Inference
- **The Use of Quantifiers**
- Quantifiers, Definitions, and the Proofs of Theorems

77

Open Statement

- **Definition 2.5:** A declarative sentence is an **open statement** if
 1. it contains **one or more variables**, and
 2. it is not a statement, but
 3. it becomes a statement when the variables in it are replaced by **certain allowable choices**.

These allowable choices constitute what is called the **universe** or **universe of discourse** for the open statement.

78

Notation of Open Statement (1/2)

- The open statement “The number $x + 2$ is an even integer” is denoted by $p(x)$ [or $q(x)$, etc.].
- Then $\neg p(x)$ may be read “The number $x + 2$ is **not** an even integer.”
- We use $q(x, y)$ to represent an open statement that **contains two variables**.

79

Notation of Open Statement (2/2)

- Two types of quantifiers
 - The **existential quantifier** $\exists$
 - The **universal quantifier** $\forall$
- **Example:** $r(x)$: “ $2x$ is an even integer” with the universe of all integers.
- $\forall x r(x)$ and $\exists x r(x)$ both are true statements.
- The variable x in each of open statements $p(x)$ is called a **free variable** (of the open statement).
- For $\exists x p(x, y)$, $\forall x p(x, y)$
 - x is a **bounded variable**
 - y is a **free variable**

80

Example (1/3)

- **Example 2.36:** Here the universe comprises all real numbers.

$$p(x): x \geq 0 \quad r(x): x^2 - 3x - 4 = 0$$

$$q(x): x^2 \geq 0 \quad s(x): x^2 - 3 > 0$$

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 1) $\exists x [p(x) \wedge r(x)]$ | TRUE |
| 2) $\forall x [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]$ | TRUE |
| 3) $\forall x [q(x) \rightarrow s(x)]$ | FALSE |
| 4) $\forall x [r(x) \vee s(x)]$ | FALSE |
| 5) $\forall x [r(x) \rightarrow p(x)]$ | FALSE |

81

Example (2/3)

- **Example 2.39:** In the following program segment, n is an integer variable and the variable A is an array $A[1], A[2], \dots, A[20]$ of 20 integer values.

```
for  $n := 1$  to 20 do
     $A[n] := n * n - n$ 
```

Represent the following statements about the array A in quantified form, where the universe consists of all integers from 1 to 20, inclusive.

82

Example (3/3)

- **Example 2.39 (cont.):**

- 1) Every entry in the array is nonnegative:
 $\forall n (A[n] \geq 0)$.
- 2) There exist two consecutive entries in A where the larger entry is twice the smaller:
 $\exists n (A[n+1] = 2A[n])$.
- 3) The entries in the array are sorted in (strictly) ascending order:
 $\forall n [(1 \leq n \leq 19) \rightarrow (A[n] < A[n+1])]$.
- 4) The entries in the array are distinct:
 $\forall m \forall n [(m \neq n) \rightarrow (A[m] \neq A[n])]$, or
 $\forall m, n [(m < n) \rightarrow (A[m] \neq A[n])]$.

83

Definitions (1/2)

- **Definition 2.6:** Let $p(x), q(x)$ be open statements defined for a given universe. The open statements $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ are called **(logically) equivalent**, and we write $\forall x [p(x) \Leftrightarrow q(x)]$ when the biconditional $p(a) \Leftrightarrow q(a)$ is true for each replacement a from the universe (that is, $p(a) \Leftrightarrow q(a)$ for each a in the universe). If the implication $p(a) \rightarrow q(a)$ is true for each a in the universe (that is, $p(a) \Rightarrow q(a)$ for each a in the universe), then we write $\forall x [p(x) \Rightarrow q(x)]$ and say that $p(x)$ **logically implies** $q(x)$.

84

Definitions (2/2)

- Definition 2.7:** For open statements $p(x)$, $q(x)$ — defined for a prescribed universe — and the universally quantified statement $\forall x [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]$ we define:

- 1) The **contrapositive** of $\forall x [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]$ to be $\forall x [\neg q(x) \rightarrow \neg p(x)]$.
- 2) The **converse** of $\forall x [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]$ to be $\forall x [q(x) \rightarrow p(x)]$.
- 3) The **inverse** of $\forall x [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]$ to be $\forall x [\neg p(x) \rightarrow \neg q(x)]$.

85

Summarization of Quantifiers

Statement	When Is It True?	When Is It False?
$\exists x p(x)$	For some (at least one) a in the universe, $p(a)$ is true.	For every a in the universe, $p(a)$ is false.
$\forall x p(x)$	For every replacement a from the universe, $p(a)$ is true.	There is at least one replacement a from the universe for which $p(a)$ is false.
$\exists x \neg p(x)$	For at least one choice a in the universe, $p(a)$ is false, so its negation $\neg p(a)$ is true.	For every replacement a in the universe, $p(a)$ is true.
$\forall x \neg p(x)$	For every replacement a from the universe, $p(a)$ is false and its negation $\neg p(a)$ is true.	There is at least one replacement a from the universe for which $\neg p(a)$ is false and $p(a)$ is true.

86

Example

- Example 2.42:** Here the universe consists of all the integers, and the open statements $r(x)$, $s(x)$ are given by

$$r(x): 2x + 1 = 5 \quad s(x): x^2 = 9.$$

$\exists x r(x) \wedge \exists x s(x)$ is true.

$\exists x [r(x) \wedge s(x)]$ is false.

$$\Rightarrow \exists x [r(x) \wedge s(x)] \not\equiv [\exists x r(x) \wedge \exists x s(x)]$$

(is not logically equivalent to)

$$[\exists x r(x) \wedge \exists x s(x)] \not\Rightarrow \exists x [r(x) \wedge s(x)]$$

(does not logically imply)

87

Logical Equivalences and Logical Implications for Quantified Statements

- For a prescribed universe and any statements $p(x)$, $q(x)$ in the variable x :

$$\exists x [p(x) \wedge q(x)] \Rightarrow [\exists x p(x) \wedge \exists x q(x)]$$

$$\exists x [p(x) \vee q(x)] \Leftrightarrow [\exists x p(x) \vee \exists x q(x)]$$

$$\forall x [p(x) \wedge q(x)] \Leftrightarrow [\forall x p(x) \wedge \forall x q(x)]$$

$$[\forall x p(x) \vee \forall x q(x)] \Rightarrow \forall x [p(x) \vee q(x)]$$

How about the other direction?

88

Rules for Negating Statements

Rules for Negating Statements with One Quantifier

- $\neg[\forall x p(x)] \Leftrightarrow \exists x \neg p(x)$
- $\neg[\exists x p(x)] \Leftrightarrow \forall x \neg p(x)$
- $\neg[\forall x \neg p(x)] \Leftrightarrow \exists x \neg\neg p(x) \Leftrightarrow \exists x p(x)$
- $\neg[\exists x \neg p(x)] \Leftrightarrow \forall x \neg\neg p(x) \Leftrightarrow \forall x p(x)$

89

Order of Quantifiers

- **Example 2.48:** We restrict ourselves here to the universe of all integers and let $p(x, y)$ denote the open statement " $x + y = 17$."

The statement $\forall x \exists y p(x, y)$ is true.

The statement $\exists y \forall x p(x, y)$ is false.

90

Negate the Definition of Limit

- **Example 2.50:** Negate the definition of limit.

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x) = L \Leftrightarrow \forall \epsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0$$

$$\forall x [(0 < |x - a| < \delta) \rightarrow (|f(x) - L| < \epsilon)]$$

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x) \neq L$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \neg[\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0 \forall x [(0 < |x - a| < \delta) \rightarrow (|f(x) - L| < \epsilon)]]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \exists \epsilon > 0 \forall \delta > 0 \exists x \neg[(0 < |x - a| < \delta) \rightarrow (|f(x) - L| < \epsilon)]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \exists \epsilon > 0 \forall \delta > 0 \exists x \neg[\neg(0 < |x - a| < \delta) \vee (|f(x) - L| < \epsilon)]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \exists \epsilon > 0 \forall \delta > 0 \exists x [\neg\neg(0 < |x - a| < \delta) \wedge \neg(|f(x) - L| < \epsilon)]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \exists \epsilon > 0 \forall \delta > 0 \exists x [(0 < |x - a| < \delta) \wedge (|f(x) - L| \geq \epsilon)]$$

- **EXERCISE 2.4:** 18

91

Outline

- Basic Connectives and Truth Tables
- Logical Equivalence: The Laws of Logic
- Logical Implication: Rules of Inference
- The Use of Quantifiers
- **Quantifiers, Definitions, and the Proofs of Theorems**

92

The Rule of Universal Specification

- If an open statements becomes true for **all** replacements by the members in a given universe, then that open statement is true for **each specific** individual member in that universe. (A bit more symbolically — if $p(x)$ is an open statement for a given universe, and if $\forall x p(x)$ is true, then $p(a)$ is true for each a in the universe.)

93

Example (1/9)

- Example 2.53:** a) For the universe of all people, consider the open statements

$m(x)$: x is a mathematics professor

$c(x)$: x has studied calculus.

Now consider the following argument.

- All mathematics professors have studied calculus.
- Leona is a mathematics professor.
- Therefore Leona has studied calculus.

94

Example (2/9)

- Example 2.53 (cont.):**

Let l represent this particular woman (in our universe) named Leona.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \forall x [m(x) \rightarrow c(x)] \\ m(l) \end{array}}{\therefore c(l)}$$

Steps

1. $\forall x [m(x) \rightarrow c(x)]$

2. $m(l)$

3. $m(l) \rightarrow c(l)$

4. $\therefore c(l)$

Reasons

Premise

Premise

Step (1) and the **Rule of Universal Specification**

Steps (2) and (3) and the Rule of Detachment

95

Example (3/9)

- Example 2.53 (cont.):** b) For an example of a more mathematical nature let us consider the universe of all triangles in the plane in conjunction with the open statements

$p(t)$: t has two sides of equal length.

$q(t)$: t is an isosceles triangle.

$r(t)$: t has two angles of equal measure.

Let triangle XYZ with no two angles of equal measure be designed by c .

96

Example (4/9)

• **Example 2.53 (cont.):**

In triangle XYZ there is no pair of angles of equal measure.

$$\neg r(c)$$

If a triangles has two sides of equal length, then it is isosceles.

$$\forall t [p(t) \rightarrow q(t)]$$

If a triangle is isosceles, then is has two angles of equal measure.

$$\forall t [q(t) \rightarrow r(t)]$$

Therefore triangle XYZ has no two sides of equal length.

$$\therefore \neg p(c)$$

is a valid one — as evidenced by the following.

97

Example (5/9)

• **Example 2.53 (cont.):**

Steps

Reasons

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. $\forall t [p(t) \rightarrow q(t)]$ | Premise |
| 2. $p(c) \rightarrow q(c)$ | Step (1) and the Rule of Universal Specification |
| 3. $\forall t [q(t) \rightarrow r(t)]$ | Premise |
| 4. $q(c) \rightarrow r(c)$ | Step (3) and the Rule of Universal Specification |
| 5. $p(c) \rightarrow r(c)$ | Steps (2) and (4) and the Law of the Syllogism |
| 6. $\neg r(c)$ | Premise |
| 7. $\therefore \neg p(c)$ | Steps (5) and (6) and Modus Tollens |

98

Example (6/9)

- **Example 2.53 (cont.):** c) Here we'll consider the universe to be made up of the entire student body at a particular college. One specific student, Mary Gusberti, will be designated by m . For this universe and the open statements.

$j(x)$: x is a junior $s(x)$: x is a senior

$p(x)$: x is enrolled in a physical education class.

99

Example (7/9)

• **Example 2.53 (cont.):**

We consider the argument :

No junior or senior is enrolled in a physical education class.

Mary Gusberti is enrolled in a physical education class.

Therefore Mary Gusberti is not a senior.

$$\frac{\forall x [(j(x) \vee s(x)) \rightarrow \neg p(x)]}{p(m)} \therefore \neg s(m)$$

100

Example (8/9)

• Example 2.53 (cont.):

Steps	Reasons
1. $\forall x [(j(x) \vee s(x)) \rightarrow \neg p(x)]$	Premise
2. $p(m)$	Premise
3. $(j(m) \vee s(m)) \rightarrow \neg p(m)$	Step(1) and the Rule of Universal Specification
4. $p(m) \rightarrow \neg(j(m) \vee s(m))$	Step(3), $(q \rightarrow t) \Leftrightarrow (\neg t \rightarrow \neg q)$, and the Law of Double Negation
5. $p(m) \rightarrow (\neg j(m) \wedge \neg s(m))$	Step (4) and DeMorgan's Law

101

Example (9/9)

• Example 2.53 (cont.):

6. $\neg j(m) \wedge \neg s(m)$	Steps (2) and (5) and the Rule of Detachment (or Modus Ponens)
7. $\therefore \neg s(m)$	Step (6) and the Rule of Conjunctive Simplification

102

Some Possible Errors (1/3)

- Within the universe of all polygons in the plane, let c denote one specific polygon – the quadrilateral $EFGH$, where the measure of angle E is 91° . For the open statements $p(x)$: x is a square $q(x)$: x has four sides, the following argument is **invalid**.
All squares have four sides.
Quadrilateral $EFGH$ has four sides.
Therefore quadrilateral $EFGH$ is a square.

103

Some Possible Errors (2/3)

- Within the universe of all polygons in the plane, let c denote one specific polygon – the quadrilateral $EFGH$, where the measure of angle E is 91° . For the open statements $p(x)$: x is a square $q(x)$: x has four sides, the following argument is **invalid**.
All squares have four sides.
Quadrilateral $EFGH$ has four sides.
Therefore quadrilateral $EFGH$ is a square.

$$\frac{\forall x [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]}{q(c)} \therefore p(c)$$

104

Some Possible Errors (3/3)

- $p(x)$: x is a square $q(x)$: x has four sides,
The following argument is **invalid**.
All squares have four sides.
Quadrilateral $EFGH$ is not a square.
Therefore quadrilateral $EFGH$ does not have four sides.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \forall x [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)] \\ \neg p(c) \end{array}}{\therefore \neg q(c)}$$

105

The Rule of Universal Generalization

- If an open statement $p(x)$ is proved to be true when x is replaced by any **arbitrarily chosen** element c from our universe, then the universally quantified statement $\forall x p(x)$ is true. Furthermore, the rule extends beyond a single variable. So if, for example, we have an open statement $q(x, y)$ that is proved to be true when x and y are replaced by **arbitrarily chosen** elements from the same universe, or their own respective universes, then the universally quantified statement $\forall x \forall y q(x, y)$ [or, $\forall x, y q(x, y)$] is true. Similar results hold for the cases of three or more variables.

106

Example (1/5)

- **Example 2.54:** Let $p(x)$, $q(x)$, and $r(x)$ be open statements that are defined for a given universe. We show that the argument

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \forall x [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)] \\ \forall x [q(x) \rightarrow r(x)] \end{array}}{\therefore \forall x [p(x) \rightarrow r(x)]}$$

is valid by considering the following.

107

Example (2/5)

- **Example 2.54 (cont.):**

Steps	Reasons
1) $\forall x [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]$	Premise
2) $p(c) \rightarrow q(c)$	Step (1) and the Rule of Universal Specification
3) $\forall x [q(x) \rightarrow r(x)]$	Premise
4) $q(c) \rightarrow r(c)$	Step (3) and the Rule of Universal Specification
5) $p(c) \rightarrow r(c)$	Steps (2) and (4) and the Law of the Syllogism
6) $\therefore \forall x [p(x) \rightarrow r(x)]$	Step (5) and the Rule of Universal Generalization

108

Example (3/5)

- **Example 2.56:** The steps and reasons needed to establish the validity of the argument

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \forall x [p(x) \vee q(x)] \\ \forall x [(\neg p(x) \wedge q(x)) \rightarrow r(x)] \end{array}}{\therefore \forall x [\neg r(x) \rightarrow p(x)]}$$

are given as follows.

Steps

- 1) $\forall x [p(x) \vee q(x)]$
- 2) $p(c) \vee q(c)$

Reasons

- Premise
Step (1) and the Rule of Universal Specification

109

Example (4/5)

- **Example 2.56 (cont.):**

- | | |
|---|---|
| 3) $\forall x [(\neg p(x) \wedge q(x)) \rightarrow r(x)]$ | Premise |
| 4) $[\neg p(c) \wedge q(c)] \rightarrow r(c)$ | Step (3) and the Rule of Universal Specification |
| 5) $\neg r(c) \rightarrow \neg[\neg p(c) \wedge q(c)]$ | Step (4) and
$s \rightarrow t \Leftrightarrow \neg t \rightarrow \neg s$ |
| 6) $\neg r(c) \rightarrow [p(c) \vee \neg q(c)]$ | Step (5), DeMorgan's Law, and the Law of Double Negation |
| 7) $\neg r(c)$ | Premise (assumed) |
| 8) $p(c) \vee \neg q(c)$ | Step (7) and (6) and Modus Ponens |

110

Example (5/5)

- **Example 2.56 (cont.):**

- | | |
|---|---|
| 9) $[p(c) \vee q(c)] \wedge [p(c) \vee \neg q(c)]$ | Steps (2) and (8) and the Rule of Conjunction |
| 10) $p(c) \vee [q(c) \wedge \neg q(c)]$ | Step (9) and the Distributive Law of $\vee$ over $\wedge$ |
| 11) $p(c)$ | Step (10),
$q(c) \wedge \neg q(c) \Leftrightarrow F_0$, and
$p(c) \vee F_0 \Leftrightarrow p(c)$ |
| 12) $\therefore \forall x [\neg r(x) \rightarrow p(x)]$ | Steps (7) and (11) and the Rule of Universal Generalization |

111

Read by Yourself

- **Definition 2.8**
- **Theorem 2.2**
- **Theorem 2.3**
- **Theorem 2.4**
- **Theorem 2.5**
- Suppose we want to prove $\forall m [p(m) \rightarrow q(m)]$, we could prove it by the **contrapositive method** or by **contradiction**.

	Assumption	Result Derived
Contraposition	$\neg q(m)$	$\neg p(m)$
Contradiction	$p(m)$ and $\neg q(m)$	F_0

112

Homework Assignment #2

- **EXERCISES 2.1**
4, 6
- **EXERCISES 2.2**
4, 8, 10
- **EXERCISES 2.3**
4, 6, 8
- **EXERCISE 2.4**
18
- **EXERCISE 2.5**
10