

Rules of Inference-

Consider a set of propositions p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n and a proposition q . Then a compound proposition of the form $(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n) \rightarrow q$ is called an argument. Here p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n are called the premises of the argument and q is called a conclusion of the argument. It is a practice to write the above argument in the following tabular form:

$$\begin{array}{c} p_1 \\ p_2 \\ \vdots \\ p_n \\ \hline \therefore q \end{array}$$

The preceding argument is said to be valid if whenever each of the premises p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n is true, then the conclusion q is likewise true.

In other words, the argument $(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n) \rightarrow q$ is valid when $(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n) \Rightarrow q$

It is to be emphasized that in an argument, the premises are always taken to be true whereas the conclusion may be true or false. The conclusion is true only in the case of a valid argument.

There exists rule of logic which can be employed for establishing the validity of arguments.

These rules are called the Rules of inference.

1. Rule of Conjunctive Simplification

This rule states that, for any two propositions p and q , if $p \wedge q$ is true, then p is true.

$$\text{i.e. } (p \wedge q) \Rightarrow p$$

2. Rule of Disjunctive Amplification

This rule states that, for any two propositions p and q , if p is true then $p \vee q$ is true.
i.e., $p \Rightarrow p \vee q$

3. Rule of Syllogism

This rule states that, for any three propositions p, q, r , if $p \rightarrow q$ is true and $q \rightarrow r$ is true, then $p \rightarrow r$ is true.

$$\text{i.e., } [(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)] \Rightarrow (p \rightarrow r)$$

and is expressed in the following tabular form

$$\begin{array}{c} p \rightarrow q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \therefore p \rightarrow r \end{array}$$

4. Modus Ponens (Rule of Detachment) (^{Method of affirming})

This rule states that if p is true and $p \rightarrow q$ is true, then q is true.

$$\text{i.e., } (p \wedge (p \rightarrow q)) \Rightarrow q$$

In tabular form,

$$\begin{array}{c} p \\ p \rightarrow q \\ q \end{array}$$

5. Modus Tollens (Method of denying)

This rule states that if $p \rightarrow q$ is true and q is false, then p is false.

$$\text{i.e., } [(p \rightarrow q) \wedge \neg q] \Rightarrow (\neg p)$$

In tabular form,

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

6. Rule of Disjunctive Syllogism

This rule states that if $p \vee q$ is true and p is false, then q is true.

$$\text{i.e., } [(p \vee q) \wedge \neg p] \Rightarrow q$$

In tabular form,	$p \vee q$
	$\neg p$
	$\therefore q$

7. Rule of Contradiction

This rule states that if $\neg p \rightarrow F_0$ is true, then p is true.

$$\text{i.e., } (\neg p \rightarrow F_0) \Rightarrow p$$

* Using the Rules of Inference, test whether the following are a valid argument.

(i) If Sachin hits a century, then he gets a free car.
Sachin hits a century.

\therefore Sachin gets a free car.

Let p : Sachin hits a century.

q : Sachin gets a free car.

Then the given argument reads:

$$p \rightarrow q$$

$$\underline{p}$$

$$\therefore q$$

In view of Modus Ponens rule, this is a valid argument.

(ii) If Sachin hits a century, he gets a free car.
Sachin does not get a free car.

\therefore Sachin has not hit a century.

Let p : Sachin hits a century. Then, $p \rightarrow q$ } By Modus
 q : Sachin gets a free car. $\neg q$ } Ponens
 $\therefore \neg p$ } rule of it is a valid argument

(iii) I will become famous or I will not become a musician
 I will become a musician

\therefore I will become famous

sol! Let p : I will become famous

q : I will become a musician.

Then, we have

$$p \vee q$$

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

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

\therefore the argument is: $\frac{q}{q \rightarrow p}$

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

In view of the Modus Ponens rule, the argument is valid.

(iv) If I study, then I do not fail in the examination.

If I do not fail in the examination, my father gifts a two-wheeler to me.

\therefore If I study then my father gifts a two-wheeler to me.

sol! Let p : I study.

q : I do not fail in the examination

r : My father gift a two-wheeler to me.

Then, the argument is

$$p \rightarrow q$$

$$q \rightarrow r$$

$$\frac{p}{p \rightarrow r}$$

\therefore In view of the Rule of Syllogism,
 this is a valid argument.

Topic _____

Date _____

(v)

If it snows, then I will stay home.
 If I stay home, I will watch a movie.
If it is snowing
 \therefore I will watch a movie.

soln

let p : It snows. q : I will stay home. r : I will watch a movie.

∴ The argument is

$$\begin{array}{c} p \rightarrow q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} p \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} r \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} p \rightarrow q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \hline \end{array}$$

 $\therefore p \rightarrow r$ (by Rule of Syllogism)

$$\begin{array}{c} p \\ \hline \end{array}$$

 $\therefore r$ (by Modus Ponens)

∴ The argument is valid.

(vi)

If the meeting is cancelled, then I will go to the gym.
 If I go to the gym, I will feel tired.

I do not feel tired.

∴ The meeting was not cancelled.

soln

let p : The meeting is cancelled q : I will go to the gym. r : I feel tired.

∴ The argument is

$$\begin{array}{c} p \rightarrow q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} r \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} p \rightarrow q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \hline \end{array}$$

 $\therefore p \rightarrow r$ (by Rule of Syllogism)

$$\begin{array}{c} p \rightarrow q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \hline \end{array}$$

 $\therefore \neg p$ (by Modus Tollens)
 ∴ The argument is valid.

(vii)

If Sachin hits a century, he gets a free car.
Sachin gets a free car.

\therefore Sachin has hit a century.

Sol.

Let p : Sachin hits a century,

q : Sachin gets a free car

Then, the argument is: $p \rightarrow q$

q

$\therefore p$

We note that if $p \rightarrow q$ and q are true,
 there is no rule which asserts that
 p must be true.

Therefore The given argument is not valid.

(viii)

I will get grade A in this course or I will
not graduate.

If I do not graduate, I will join the army

\therefore I got grade A

\therefore I will not join the army.

Sol.

Let p : I will get grade A in this course

q : I do not graduate

\therefore I join the army.

Then the argument is:

$p \vee q$

$q \rightarrow \neg p$

$\neg p$

$\therefore \neg q$

$p \vee q \Leftrightarrow q \vee p \Leftrightarrow \neg q \rightarrow p$ (conditional)

$q \rightarrow \neg p \Leftrightarrow \neg q \rightarrow \neg \neg p$ (contrapositive)

The argument is $\neg q \rightarrow p$

$\neg q \rightarrow \neg \neg p$

$\therefore \neg q \rightarrow p$ (by Rule of Syllogism)

$\neg q \rightarrow p$

There is no rule which asserts that

$\neg q \rightarrow p$

$\neg q$ must be true. \therefore The given argument is not valid.

(ix)

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

Sol

$$\begin{array}{l} p \wedge (p \rightarrow \neg q) \wedge (\neg q \rightarrow \neg r) \\ \Leftrightarrow p \wedge (p \rightarrow \neg r) \text{ (Rule of Syllogism)} \\ \Leftrightarrow \neg r \text{ (Modus Ponens)} \end{array}$$

\therefore The given argument is valid.

(x)

$$\begin{array}{c} p \wedge q \\ p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r) \\ \therefore r \end{array}$$

Sol

$$\begin{array}{l} (p \wedge q) \wedge (p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)) \\ \Leftrightarrow p \wedge (p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)) \text{ (Rule of Conjunctive Simplification)} \\ \Leftrightarrow p \rightarrow r \text{ (Modus Ponens)} \\ \Leftrightarrow q \vdash (q \rightarrow r) \quad [\because p \wedge q \Rightarrow q] \\ \Leftrightarrow r \quad [\text{Modus Ponens}] \end{array}$$

\therefore The given argument is valid.

(xi)

$$\begin{array}{c} p \rightarrow r \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Sol

$$\begin{array}{l} \therefore (p \vee q) \rightarrow r \\ (p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r) \\ \Leftrightarrow (\neg p \vee r) \wedge (\neg q \vee r) \text{ (Conditional)} \\ \Leftrightarrow (r \vee \neg p) \wedge (r \vee \neg q) \text{ (Commutative)} \\ \Leftrightarrow r \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q) \text{ (Distributive)} \\ \Leftrightarrow (\neg p \wedge \neg q) \vee r \text{ (Commutative)} \\ \Leftrightarrow \neg (p \vee q) \vee r \text{ (De Morgan's)} \\ \Leftrightarrow (p \vee q) \rightarrow r \text{ (Conditional)} \end{array}$$

By logical equivalence, the given argument is valid.

(xii)

$$p \vee q$$

$$\neg p$$

$$q \rightarrow r$$

$$r \rightarrow s$$

$$s$$

$$sol^n (p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p) \wedge (q \rightarrow r) \wedge (r \rightarrow s)$$

$\Leftrightarrow q \wedge (q \rightarrow r) \wedge (r \rightarrow s)$ (Disjunctive Syllogism)

$\Leftrightarrow q \wedge (r \rightarrow s)$ (Modus Ponens)

$\Leftrightarrow s$ (Modus Ponens)

∴ the given argument is valid

(xiii)

$$p \rightarrow q$$

$$\neg r \rightarrow s$$

$$p \vee r$$

$$\therefore q \vee s$$

$$sol^n (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (r \rightarrow s) \wedge (p \vee r)$$

$\Leftrightarrow (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (r \rightarrow s) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow r)$ (Conditional)

$\Leftrightarrow (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow r) \wedge (r \rightarrow s)$ (Commutative)

$\Leftrightarrow (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow s)$ (Rule of Syllogism)

$\Leftrightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow \neg p) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow s)$ (Contrapositive)

$\Leftrightarrow (q \rightarrow s)$ (Rule of Syllogism)

$\Leftrightarrow q \vee s$ (Conditional)

∴ the given argument is valid

(xiv)

$\neg q$ follows logically from the premises:

$$p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r), \neg r, p$$

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

$\Leftrightarrow (p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)) \wedge p \wedge (\neg r)$ (Commutative)

$\Leftrightarrow (q \rightarrow r) \wedge (\neg r)$ (Modus Ponens)

$\Leftrightarrow \neg q$ (Modus Tollens)

∴ the given argument is valid.

(xv)

r follows from $(\neg p \vee \neg q) \rightarrow (r \wedge s), r \rightarrow t, \neg t$

$$sol^n [(\neg p \vee \neg q) \rightarrow (r \wedge s)] \wedge (r \rightarrow t) \wedge (\neg t)$$

$\Leftrightarrow [(\neg p \vee \neg q) \rightarrow (r \wedge s)] \wedge (\neg r)$ (Modus Tollens)

$\Leftrightarrow [(\neg p \vee \neg q) \rightarrow (r \wedge s)] \wedge (\neg r \vee \neg s)$ (Disjunctive Amplification)

$\Leftrightarrow [(\neg p \vee \neg q) \rightarrow (r \wedge s)] \wedge \neg (r \wedge s)$ (De Morgan's)

$\Leftrightarrow \neg (\neg p \vee \neg q)$ (Modus Tollens)

$\Leftrightarrow p \wedge q$ (De Morgan's)

$\Leftrightarrow p$ (Conjunctive Simplification)

∴ the given argument is valid.

Topic

Date

xvi) $(\neg p \vee q) \rightarrow r$ Sol: $[(\neg p \vee q) \rightarrow r] \wedge [r \rightarrow (s \vee t)] \wedge (\neg s \wedge \neg u) \wedge (\neg u \rightarrow t)$
 $s \rightarrow (s \vee t)$ $\rightarrow (\neg p \vee q) \rightarrow (s \vee t) \wedge (\neg s \wedge \neg u) \wedge (\neg u \rightarrow t)$
 $\neg s \wedge \neg u$ (Syllogism)
 $\neg u \rightarrow \neg t$ $\Leftrightarrow (\neg p \vee q) \rightarrow (s \vee t) \wedge (\neg s) \wedge (\neg u \wedge (\neg u \rightarrow \neg t))$
 $\therefore p$ (associative)
 $\Rightarrow [(\neg p \vee q) \rightarrow (s \vee t)] \wedge (\neg s) \wedge (\neg t)$ (Modus Ponens)
 $\Leftrightarrow [(\neg p \vee q) \rightarrow (s \vee t)] \wedge (\neg(s \vee t))$ (De Morgan's)
 $\Rightarrow \neg(\neg p \vee q)$ (Modus Tollens)
 $\Leftrightarrow p \wedge \neg q$ (De Morgan's)
 $\Rightarrow p$ (conjunctive Simplification)
 \therefore The argument is valid.

xvii) $\{ p \wedge (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (\text{SVR}) \wedge (s \rightarrow \neg q) \} \rightarrow (\text{SVT})$

Given $p \quad \text{so } p \wedge (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (\text{SVR}) \wedge (s \rightarrow \neg q)$
 $p \rightarrow q \quad \Leftrightarrow p \wedge (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (\neg s \rightarrow s) \wedge (s \rightarrow \neg q)$
 $\text{SVR} \quad \text{(conditional)}$

$s \rightarrow \neg q \quad \Rightarrow p \wedge (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (\neg s \rightarrow \neg q) \quad \text{(Syllogism)}$
 $\therefore \text{SVT} \Leftrightarrow p \wedge (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow s) \quad \text{(Contrapositive)}$
 $\Rightarrow p \wedge (p \rightarrow s) \quad \text{(Syllogism)}$
 $\Rightarrow s \quad \text{(Modus Ponens)}$
 $\Rightarrow \text{SVT} \quad \text{(Disjunctive Amplification)}$

\therefore The argument is valid

xviii

* Either I will go to the party or I will stay home
If I go to the party, I will have fun.
If I stay home, I will study.

∴ Either I will have fun or I will study

$$\text{st} \quad p \vee q \quad ((p \vee q) \wedge (p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow s))$$

$$p \rightarrow r \Leftrightarrow (\neg p \rightarrow q) \wedge (p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow s) \text{ (conditional)}$$

$$q \rightarrow s \Leftrightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow s) \wedge (r \rightarrow s) \text{ (Commutative)}$$

$$\therefore r \vee s \Rightarrow (\neg r \rightarrow s) \wedge (r \rightarrow s) \text{ (Syllogism)}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\neg s \rightarrow p) \wedge (p \rightarrow r) \text{ (Contrapositive)}$$

$$\Rightarrow \neg s \rightarrow r \text{ (Syllogism)}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow s \vee r \text{ (Conditional)}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow r \vee s \text{ (Commutative)}$$

∴ The argument is valid.

Open Statements

Consider the declarative sentences such as

- (i) $x+3=6$, (ii) $x^2 < 10$, (iii) x divides 4, (iv) $x = \sqrt{2}$

These sentences are not propositions unless the symbol x is specified. Sentences of this kind are called open statements or open sentences, and the unspecified symbols, such as x in the sentences given above, are called free variables.

The sentence (i) becomes a proposition if x is replaced by any element of \mathbb{R} (the set of real numbers). This sentence becomes a true proposition if x is replaced by 3, and becomes a false proposition, if x is replaced by any other real number (other than 3). Here, we say \mathbb{R} is a universe (or universe of discourse) for the variable x in the sentence (i). Similarly, \mathbb{R} is a universe for x in sentences (ii), (iii) and (iv).

Open statements containing a variable x are denoted by $p(x)$, $q(x)$ etc. If U is the universe for the variable x in an open statement $p(x)$ and if $a \in U$, then the proposition got by replacing x by a in $p(x)$ is denoted by $p(a)$.

In the open statement : $p(x) : x+3=6$, $p(3)$ is true, whereas $p(2)$ is false.

Hence an open statement $p(x)$ becomes a proposition only when x is replaced by a chosen element of the universe. The truth or falsity of the proposition $p(a)$ depends upon the element a of the universe that is chosen to replace x .

Compound open statements can be formed using the logical connectives. (i) $\neg p(x)$ is the negation of $p(x)$, (ii) $p(x) \wedge q(x)$ is conjunction, (iii) $p(x) \vee q(x)$ is disjunction, (iv) $p(x) \rightarrow q(x)$ is conditional, (v) $p(x) \leftrightarrow q(x)$ is biconditional of $p(x)$ and $q(x)$.

* Suppose the universe consists of all integers
Consider the following open statements:

$p(x)$: $x \leq 3$, $q(x)$: $x+1$ is odd, $r(x)$: $x > 0$.

Write the truth values of the following:

- (i) $p(2)$
- (ii) $\neg q(4)$
- (iii) $p(-1) \wedge q(1)$
- (iv) $\neg p(3) \vee r(0)$
- (v) $p(0) \rightarrow q(0)$
- (vi) $p(1) \rightarrow \neg q(2)$
- (vii) $p(4) \vee (q(1) \wedge r(2))$
- (viii) $p(2) \wedge (q(0) \vee \neg r(2))$

soln

(i) $p(2)$: $2 \leq 3$ is true.

(ii) $\neg q(4)$: $4+1$ is odd $\therefore \neg q(4)$ is false.

(iii) $p(-1)$: $-1 \leq 3$ is true, $q(1)$: $1+1$ is odd is false
 $\therefore p(-1) \wedge q(1)$ is false.

(iv) $p(3)$: $3 \leq 3$ is true $\therefore \neg p(3)$ is false

$r(0)$: $0 > 0$ is false

$\therefore \neg p(3) \vee r(0)$ is false

(v) $p(0)$: $0 \leq 3$ is true, $q(0)$: $0+1$ is odd is true
 $\therefore p(0) \rightarrow q(0)$ is true

(vi) $p(1)$: $1 \leq 3$ is true,

$q(2)$: $2+1$ is odd is true, $\therefore \neg q(2)$ is false

$r(1) \leftrightarrow \neg q(2)$ is false

(vii) $p(4)$: $4 \leq 3$ is false, $q(1)$: $1+1$ is odd is false

$r(2)$: $2 > 0$ is true.

$\therefore q(1) \wedge r(2)$ is false.

$\therefore p(4) \vee (q(1) \wedge r(2))$ is false

(viii) $p(2)$: $2 \leq 3$ is true, $q(0)$: $0+1$ is odd is true

$r(2)$: $2 > 0$ is true, $\neg r(2)$ is false

$q(0) \vee \neg r(2)$ is true.

$\therefore p(2) \wedge (q(0) \vee \neg r(2))$ is true.

Quantifiers

Consider the following proposition:

- ① All squares are rectangles.
- ② For every integer x , x^2 is a non-negative integer.
- ③ Some determinants are equal to zero.
- ④ There exists a real number whose square is equal to itself.

In these propositions, the words "all", "every", "some", "there exists" are associated with the idea of a quantity. Such words are called quantifiers.

The above propositions can be rewritten in alternative form as:

- (1) For all $x \in S$, x is a rectangle.
or $\forall x \in S$, $p(x)$, where \forall denotes the phrase "for all" and $p(x)$ stands for the open statement " x is a rectangle".

Similarly

- (2) $\forall x \in Z$, $q(x)$

where \forall is "for every"

$q(x)$ is x^2 is a non-negative integer

- (3) Here the symbol \forall is called a universal quantifier.
- (4) can be rewritten as for some D , x is equal to zero or symbolically $\exists x \in D$, $p(x)$, where \exists denotes "for some" and $p(x)$ is " x is equal to zero".

Similarly (4) is $\exists x \in R$, $q(x)$, where \exists denotes "There exists" and $q(x)$ is " x is a real number whose square is equal to itself".

Here the symbol \exists is called the existence quantifier. A proposition involving the universal or the existential quantifier is called a quantified statement and the variable present in the quantified statement is called a bounded variable.

* For the universe of all integers, let
 $p(x): x > 0$, $q(x): x \text{ is even}$, $r(x): x \text{ is a perfect square}$,
 $s(x): x \text{ is divisible by 3}$, $t(x): x \text{ is divisible by 7}$.
 write down the following quantified statements in symbolic form.

- (i) At least one integer is even.
- (ii) There exists a positive integer that is even.
- (iii) Some even integers are divisible by 3.
- (iv) Every integer is either even or odd.
- (v) If x is even and a perfect square, then x is not divisible by 3.
- (vi) If x is odd or is not divisible by 7, then x is divisible by 3.

Sol:

- (i) $\exists x, q(x)$
- (ii) $\exists x, [p(x) \wedge q(x)]$
- (iii) $\exists x, [q(x) \wedge s(x)]$
- (iv) $\forall x, [q(x) \vee \neg q(x)]$
- (v) $\forall x, [(q(x) \wedge r(x)) \rightarrow \neg s(x)]$
- (vi) $\forall x, [\neg q(x) \vee \neg r(x) \rightarrow s(x)]$

Truth value of a quantified statement

Rule 1: The statement " $\forall x \in S, p(x)$ " is true only when $p(x)$ is true for each $x \in S$.

Accordingly, to infer that a proposition of the form " $\forall x \in S, p(x)$ " is false, it is enough to exhibit one element a of S such that $p(a)$ is false.

Rule 2: The statement " $\exists x \in S, p(x)$ " is false only when $p(x)$ is false for every $x \in S$.

Accordingly, to infer that a " $\exists x \in S, p(x)$ " is true it is enough to exhibit one element $a \in S$ such that $p(a)$ is true.

Topic _____

Date _____

Two Rules of Inference

Rule 3: If an open statement $p(x)$ is known to be true for all x in a universe S and if $a \in S$, then $p(a)$ is true. (This is known as the Rule of Universal Specification).

Rule 4: If an open statement $p(x)$ is proved to be true for any (arbitrary) x chosen from a set S , then the quantified statement, $\forall x \in S, p(x)$ is true. (This is known as the Rule of Universal Generalization)

Logical Equivalence

Two quantified statements are said to be logically equivalent whenever they have the same truth values in all possible situations.

- (i) $\forall x, [p(x) \wedge q(x)] \Leftrightarrow (\forall x, p(x)) \wedge (\forall x, q(x))$
- (ii) $\exists x, [p(x) \vee q(x)] \Leftrightarrow (\exists x, p(x)) \vee (\exists x, q(x))$
- (iii) $\exists x, [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)] \Leftrightarrow \forall x, [\neg p(x) \vee q(x)]$

Rule for Negation of a Quantified Statement

Rule 5: To construct the negation of a quantified statement, change the quantifier from universal to existential and vice-versa, and also replace the open statement by its negation.

$$\text{i.e., } \neg (\forall x, p(x)) \equiv \exists x, \neg p(x)$$

$$\neg (\exists x, p(x)) \equiv \forall x, (\neg p(x))$$



examples

1. "All equilateral triangles are isosceles" can be read as " $\forall x \in T, p(x)$ " where T is the set of triangles, $p(x)$ is " x is isosceles".
The negation is " $\exists x \in T, \neg p(x)$ ".
In words it reads "For some equilateral triangle, x is not isosceles" OR, equivalently
"Some equilateral triangles are not isosceles".
2. "Some integers are even", can be read as " $\exists x \in Z, p(x)$ ", where Z is the set of integers, $p(x)$ is " x is even".
The negation is " $\forall x \in Z, \neg p(x)$ ".
In words it reads "For every integer x , x is not even", or equivalently
"For no integer x , x is even" OR
"All integers are not even".
3. "No even integer is divisible by 7"
which can be read as: "For any even integer x , x is not divisible by 7".
Symbolically, $\forall x \in E, \neg p(x)$,
where E is set of all even integers
 $p(x)$ is " x is divisible by 7".
The negation is $\exists x \in E, p(x)$,
In words it is "There exists an even integer divisible by 7" OR
"Some even integer is divisible by 7".

- * Consider the open statements $p(x)$, $q(x)$, $r_1(x)$, $s(x)$, $t(x)$ given by $p(x) : x > 0$, $q(x) : x \text{ is even}$, $r_1(x) : x \text{ is a perfect square}$, $s(x) : x \text{ is divisible by } 3$, $t(x) : x \text{ is divisible by } 7$. Express each of the following symbolic statements in words and indicate its truth value.
- (i) $\forall x, [r_1(x) \rightarrow p(x)]$
 - (ii) $\exists x, [s(x) \wedge \neg q(x)]$
 - (iii) $\forall x, [\neg r_1(x)]$
 - (iv) $\forall x, [q(x) \vee t(x)]$.
- ~~Q~~ (i) For ~~some~~ ^{any} integer x , if x is a perfect square, then $x > 0$. - false, (for $x=0$).
- (ii) For some integer x , x is divisible by 3 and x is not even. - true. (for $x=9$).
- (iii) For any integer x , x is not a perfect square. - false. (for $x=25$)
- (iv) For any integer x , x is a perfect square or x is divisible by 7 - false (for $x=8$)

- * Consider the following open statements with the set of all real numbers as the universe.

$$p(x) : x \geq 0, q(x) : x^2 \geq 0, r(x) : x^2 - 3x - 4 = 0, s(x) : x^2 - 3 > 0.$$

- ~~Q~~ Determine the truth values of the following statements
- (i) $\exists x, p(x) \wedge q(x)$
 - (ii) $\forall x, r(x) \vee s(x)$,
 - (iii) $\forall x, q(x) \rightarrow s(x)$, $\neg (\forall x, r(x) \rightarrow p(x))$

- ~~Q~~ (i) There exists a real number x for which both x is positive and the square of x is positive. (eg $x=1$) - true truth value is 1
- (ii) For every real number x , $x^2 - 3x - 4 = 0$ or $x^2 - 3 > 0$. ($x^2 - 3x - 4 = 0 \Rightarrow x = 4, -1$, & $x^2 \geq 0$) - false (not true for $x = -1$), truth value is 0
- (iii) For every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $q(x)$ is true, $s(x)$ is false. $\therefore \forall x, q(x) \rightarrow s(x)$ is false. the truth value is 0

* Negate and simplify each of the following:

$$(i) \forall x, [p(x) \vee q(x)] \quad (ii) \forall x, [p(x) \wedge \neg q(x)]$$

$$(iii) \forall x, [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)], \quad (iv) \exists x, [(p(x) \vee q(x)) \rightarrow r(x)]$$

soln

$$(i) \neg \{\forall x, [p(x) \vee q(x)]\} \equiv \exists x, \neg [p(x) \vee q(x)]$$

$$= \exists x, [\neg p(x) \wedge \neg q(x)]$$

$$(ii) \neg \{\forall x, [p(x) \wedge \neg q(x)]\} \equiv \exists x, [\neg p(x) \vee q(x)]$$

$$(iii) \neg \{\forall x, [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]\} \equiv \neg \{\forall x, [\neg p(x) \vee q(x)]\}$$

$$= \exists x, [\neg \neg p(x) \wedge \neg q(x)]$$

$$(iv) \neg \{\exists x, [(p(x) \vee q(x)) \rightarrow r(x)]\} \equiv \neg \{\exists x, [\neg(p(x) \vee q(x)) \vee r(x)]\}$$

$$= \forall x, [(p(x) \vee q(x)) \wedge \neg r(x)]$$

* Let the set Z of all integers be the universe.

Obtain the negation of the quantified statement

$\exists x \in Z, [p(x) \wedge q(x)]$ for $p(x): 2x+1=5$ and $q(x): x^2=9$, and express it in words.

$$\text{soln } \neg \{\exists x \in Z, [p(x) \wedge q(x)]\} \equiv \forall x \in Z, [\neg p(x) \vee \neg q(x)]$$

In words: For all integers, $2x+1 \neq 5$ or $x^2 \neq 9$.

* Let Z be the universe. Given $p(x): x$ is odd and $q(x): x^2-1$ is even, express the conditional "For any x , if x is odd, then x^2-1 is even", in symbolic form and negate it.

$$\text{soln In symbolic form: } \forall x \in Z, [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]$$

$$\text{Negation is } \neg \{\forall x \in Z, [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]\} = \neg \{\forall x, [\neg p(x) \vee q(x)]\}$$

$$= \exists x, [p(x) \wedge \neg q(x)]$$

In words: For some integer x , x is odd and x^2-1 is not even.

- * Write the following propositions in symbolic form and find its negation: "All integers are rational numbers and some rational numbers are not integers".
- sol let $p(x)$: x is a rational number.
 $q(x)$: x is an integer.

Z = set of all integer, Ω = set of all rational numbers
 Then in symbolic form: $[\forall x \in Z, p(x)] \wedge [\exists x \in \Omega, \neg q(x)]$
 Negation is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \neg [\forall x \in Z, p(x)] \wedge [\exists x \in \Omega, \neg q(x)] \\ & \equiv [\exists x \in Z, \neg p(x)] \vee [\forall x \in \Omega, q(x)] \end{aligned}$$

In words:

"Some integers are not rational numbers or every rational number is an integer".

- * Write the following proposition in symbolic form, and find its negation: "If all triangles are right-angled, then no triangle is equiangular".
- sol Let T = set of all triangles.
 $p(x)$: x is right angled, $q(x)$: x is equiangular.

In symbolic form: $[\forall x \in T, p(x)] \rightarrow [\forall x \in T, \neg q(x)]$

Negation is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \neg [\forall x \in T, p(x)] \rightarrow [\forall x \in T, \neg q(x)] \\ & \equiv [\exists x \in T, p(x)] \vee [\exists x \in T, q(x)] \end{aligned}$$

In words:

"All triangles are right-angled and some triangles are equiangular".

* Consider the following open statements with the set of all real numbers as the universe.
 $p(x): |x| > 3$, $q(x): x > 3$. Find the truth value of the statement, $\forall x, [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]$.

Also write the converse, inverse and the contrapositive of this statement and find their truth values.

(a) Given $p(x): |x| > 3$, $q(x): x > 3$

$$p(-4) = |-4| = 4 > 3 \text{ is true.}$$

$$q(-4) = -4 > 3 \text{ is false.}$$

$\therefore p(x) \rightarrow q(x)$ is false for $x = -4$.

$\therefore \forall x [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]$ is false (for $x = -4$ it is false).

i) Converse is: $\forall x, [q(x) \rightarrow p(x)]$.

In words: "For every real number x , if $x > 3$ then $|x| > 3$ ".

This is a true statement.

ii) Inverse is: $\forall x, [\neg p(x) \rightarrow \neg q(x)]$

In words: "For every real number x , if $|x| \leq 3$, then $x \leq 3$ ".

This is a true statement.

iii) Contrapositive is: $\forall x, [\neg q(x) \rightarrow \neg p(x)]$

In words: "For every real number x , if $x < 3$, then $|x| \leq 3$ ".

This is a false statement.

Logical implication involving Quantifiers

A quantified statement P is said to logically imply a quantified statement Q if Q is true whenever P is true. Then we write $P \Rightarrow Q$.

Given a set of quantified statements

P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n and Q , we say that Q is a valid conclusion from the premises

$P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n \text{ or } P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge \dots \wedge P_n \Rightarrow Q$ is a valid argument if Q is true whenever each of P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n is true, or equivalently if $P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge P_3 \wedge \dots \wedge P_n \Rightarrow Q$.

The validity of an argument involving quantified statements be analysed on the basis of the laws of logic and the rules of inference.

* Prove the following:

$$(i) \forall x, p(x) \Rightarrow \exists x, p(x), (ii) \forall x, [p(x) \vee q(x)]$$

$$\Rightarrow \forall x, p(x) \vee \exists x, q(x)$$

Soln (i) $\forall x, p(x) \Rightarrow p(x)$ is true for every $x \in U$
 $\Rightarrow p(a)$ is true for $x = a \in U$
 $\Rightarrow p(x)$ is true for some $x \in U$
 $\Rightarrow \exists x, p(x)$.

$$(ii) \forall x, [p(x) \vee q(x)] \rightarrow p(x) \vee q(x) \text{ is true for every } x \in U.$$

$\rightarrow [p(x) \text{ is true for every } x \in U],$
 $\text{or } [q(x) \text{ is true for every } x \in U]$
 $\rightarrow \forall x, p(x) \vee q(x) \text{ is true for } x \in U$
 $\Rightarrow \forall x, p(x) \vee \exists x, q(x)$

- * Prove that the statement $\exists x, q(x)$ follows logically from the premises $\forall x, p(x) \rightarrow q(x)$ and $\forall x, p(x)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Soln} \quad & [\forall x, p(x)] \wedge [\forall x, p(x) \rightarrow q(x)] \\ & \Rightarrow p(a) \wedge [p(a) \rightarrow q(a)] \\ & \Rightarrow q(a) \quad (\text{Modus Ponens}) \\ & \Rightarrow \exists x, q(x). \end{aligned}$$

- * Prove that the following argument is valid:

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall x, [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)] \\ & \forall x, [q(x) \rightarrow r(x)] \\ & \therefore \forall x, [p(x) \rightarrow r(x)]. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Soln} \quad & [\forall x, [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]] \wedge [\forall x, [q(x) \rightarrow r(x)]] \\ & \Rightarrow [p(a) \rightarrow q(a)] \wedge [q(a) \rightarrow r(a)] \\ & \Rightarrow p(a) \rightarrow r(a) \quad (\text{Syllogism}) \\ & \Rightarrow \forall x, [p(x) \rightarrow r(x)], \text{ by the Rule of Universal Generalization} \end{aligned}$$

- * Establish the validity of the following argument:

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

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

$$\therefore \forall x, [\neg r(x) \rightarrow p(x)]$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\forall x, [p(x) \vee q(x)]\} \wedge \{\forall x, [(\neg p(x) \wedge q(x)) \rightarrow r(x)]\} \\ & \Leftrightarrow \{\forall x, [p(x) \vee q(x)]\} \wedge \{\forall x, [\neg r(x) \rightarrow \neg(\neg p(x) \wedge q(x))] \} \end{aligned}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \{\forall x, [p(x) \vee q(x)]\} \wedge \{\forall x[\neg r(x) \rightarrow (\neg p(x) \vee \neg q(x))] \} \quad (\text{Contrapositive})$$

$$\Rightarrow \{\forall x, [p(x) \vee q(x)]\} \wedge \{\forall x [p(x) \vee \neg q(x)]\} \quad (\text{De Morgan's})$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \forall x, [p(x) \vee (\neg q(x) \wedge \neg \neg q(x))] \quad (\text{Modus Ponens})$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \forall x, [p(x) \vee (\neg q(x) \wedge q(x))] \quad (\text{assuming } \neg \neg q(x) \text{ is true})$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \forall x, [p(x) \vee F_0] \quad (\text{Inverse})$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \forall x, p(x) \quad (\text{Identity})$$

Thus when $\neg r(x)$ is true, the given premises implies $p(x)$

$$\therefore \neg r(x) \rightarrow p(x) \text{ is true}$$

- * Establish the validity of the following argument:
- $$\forall x, [p(x) \rightarrow [q(x) \wedge r(x)]]$$
- $$\forall x, [p(x) \wedge s(x)]$$
- $$\therefore \forall x, [q(x) \wedge s(x)].$$

Sol: Take any a from the universe.

Then $[p(a) \rightarrow [q(a) \wedge r(a)]] \wedge [p(a) \wedge s(a)]$

$$\Leftrightarrow p(a) \wedge [p(a) \rightarrow [q(a) \wedge r(a)]] \wedge s(a) \quad (\text{Associative})$$

$$\Rightarrow [q(a) \wedge r(a)] \wedge s(a) \quad (\text{Modus Ponens})$$

$$\Rightarrow [q(a) \wedge [r(a) \wedge s(a)]] \quad (\text{Associative})$$

$$\Rightarrow r(a) \wedge s(a) \quad (\text{Conjunctive simplification})$$

$$\Rightarrow \forall x, [q(x) \wedge s(x)] \quad (\text{Universal Generalization})$$

This proves that the given argument is valid.

- * Find whether the following argument is valid:
No engineering student of First or Second semester studies Logic.

Anil is an engineering student who studies Logic.

\therefore Anil is not in Second Semester.

$p(x)$: x is in First semester, $q(x)$: x is in Second Semester
 $r(x)$: x studies logic, a : Anil.

The given argument reads:

$$\forall x, [(p(x) \vee q(x)) \rightarrow \neg r(x)]$$

$$\qquad\qquad\qquad \nexists (a)$$

$$\therefore \neg q(a)$$

$$\forall x, [(p(x) \vee q(x)) \rightarrow \neg r(x)] \Leftrightarrow \neg q(a)$$

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

$$\Rightarrow \neg q(a) \wedge [(p(a) \vee q(a)) \rightarrow \neg r(a)] \quad (\text{Commutative})$$

$$\Rightarrow \neg q(a) \wedge [r(a) \rightarrow \neg(p(a) \vee q(a))] \quad (\text{Contrapositive})$$

$$\Rightarrow \neg(p(a) \vee q(a)) \quad (\text{Modus Ponens})$$

$$\Rightarrow \neg p(a) \wedge \neg q(a) \quad (\text{De Morgan's})$$

$$\Rightarrow \neg q(a) \quad (\text{Conjunctive simplification})$$

\therefore The given argument is valid.

* Prove the following argument is valid:

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

$$\exists x, \neg p(x)$$

$$\forall x, [\neg q(x) \vee r(x)]$$

$$\forall x, [s(x) \rightarrow \neg r(x)]$$

$$\therefore \exists x, \neg s(x)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{M1} \quad & [\forall x, [p(x) \vee q(x)]] \wedge [\exists x, \neg p(x)] \wedge [\forall x, [\neg q(x) \vee r(x)]] \wedge [\forall x, [s(x) \rightarrow \neg r(x)]] \\ & \rightarrow [p(a) \vee q(a)] \wedge [\neg p(a)] \wedge [\neg q(a) \vee r(a)] \wedge [s(a) \rightarrow \neg r(a)] \\ & \Rightarrow q(a) \wedge [\neg q(a) \vee r(a)] \wedge [s(a) \rightarrow \neg r(a)] \quad (\text{Disjunctive Syllogism}) \\ & \Rightarrow r(a) \wedge [s(a) \rightarrow \neg r(a)] \quad (\text{Disjunctive Syllogism}) \\ & \Rightarrow \neg s(a) \quad (\text{Modus Tollens}) \\ & \Rightarrow \exists x, \neg s(x) \end{aligned}$$

This proves that the given argument is valid.

* Find whether the following argument is valid:

If a triangle has two equal sides, then it is isosceles.

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

A certain triangle ABC does not have two equal angles.

The triangle ABC does not have two equal sides.

M2 Let the universe be the set of all triangles,

let $p(x)$: x has equal sides, $q(x)$: x is isosceles,

$r(x)$: x has two equal angles. C: triangle ABC

The given argument is: $\forall x, [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]$

$$\forall x, [q(x) \rightarrow r(x)]$$

$$\neg r(C)$$

$$\therefore \neg p(C)$$

$$[\forall x, [p(x) \rightarrow q(x)]] \wedge [\forall x, [q(x) \rightarrow r(x)]] \wedge [\neg r(C)]$$

$$\rightarrow [p(C) \rightarrow q(C)] \wedge [q(C) \rightarrow r(C)] \wedge [\neg r(C)] \quad (\text{Universal Specification})$$

$$\rightarrow [p(C) \rightarrow r(C)] \wedge [\neg r(C)] \quad (\text{Modus Ponens})$$

$$\rightarrow \neg p(C) \quad (\text{Modus Tollens})$$

This proves that the given argument is valid.

Topic _____ Date _____

- * Find whether the following is a valid argument for which the universe is the set of all students.

No Engineering student is bad in studies
Anil is not bad in studies

: Anil is an engineering student.

Sol. Let $p(x)$: x is an engineering student,
 $q(x)$: x is bad in studies

Then the argument is $\frac{\forall x [p(x) \rightarrow \neg q(x)]}{\neg q(a) \therefore p(a)}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall x [p(x) \rightarrow \neg q(x)] \quad | \neg q(a) \\ \Rightarrow & [p(a) \rightarrow \neg q(a)] \quad | \neg q(a) \\ \not\Rightarrow & p(a) \end{aligned}$$

because $p(a)$ can be false when both $p(a) \rightarrow \neg q(a)$
and $\neg q(a)$ are true.

As such the given argument is not valid.

- * Prove that $\exists x, [p(x) \wedge q(x)] \Rightarrow \exists x, p(x) \wedge \exists x, q(x)$.
Is the converse true?

Sol. Let S denote the universe.

$$\begin{aligned} \exists x, [p(x) \wedge q(x)] & \Rightarrow p(a) \wedge q(a), \text{ for some } a \in S, \\ & \Rightarrow p(a) \text{ for some } a \in S \text{ and } q(a) \text{ for some } a \in S, \\ & \Rightarrow \exists x, p(x) \wedge \exists x, q(x) \end{aligned}$$

Now consider : the required implication follows

$$\exists x, p(x) \wedge \exists x, q(x)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \exists x, p(x) & \Rightarrow p(a) \text{ for some } a \in S \\ \text{and } \exists x, q(x) & \Rightarrow q(b) \text{ for some } b \in S \\ \therefore \exists x, p(x) \wedge \exists x, q(x) & \Rightarrow p(a) \wedge q(b) \\ & \not\Rightarrow p(a) \wedge q(a) \quad (\because b \text{ need not be same as } a) \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\exists x, [p(x) \wedge q(x)]$ need not be true when $\exists x, p(x) \wedge \exists x, q(x)$ is true.

$$\text{i.e., } \exists x, p(x) \wedge \exists x, q(x) \not\Rightarrow \exists x, [p(x) \wedge q(x)]$$

Methods of Proof and Methods of Disproof

The propositions that commonly appear in mathematical discussions are conditionals of the form $p \rightarrow q$, where p and q are simple or compound propositions which may involve quantifiers as well. Given such a conditional, the process of establishing that the conditional is true by using the rules/laws of logic and other known facts constitutes a proof of the conditional.

The process of establishing that a proposition is false constitutes a disproof.

Direct Proof:

The direct method of proving a conditional $p \rightarrow q$ has the following lines of argument:

1. Hypothesis: First assume that p is true.
2. Analysis: Starting with the hypothesis and employing the rules/laws of logic and other known facts, infer that q is true.
3. Conclusion: $p \rightarrow q$ is true.

* Give a direct proof of the statement: "The square of an odd integer is an odd integer."

∴ The conditional to be proved is:

"If n is an odd integer, then n^2 is an odd integer."

Assume that n is an odd integer (Hypothesis)

Then $n = 2k+1$ for some integer k .

Consequently $n^2 = (2k+1)^2 = 4k^2 + 4k + 1$

Observe that RHS is not divisible by 2.

Therefore, n^2 is not divisible by 2.

i.e., n^2 is an odd integer (Conclusion)

The given statement is thus proved by direct proof.

* Prove that for all integers k and l , if k and l are both odd, then $k+l$ is even and kl is odd.

Sol) Take any two integers k and l , and assume that both of these are odd (hypothesis)

Then $k = 2m+1$, $l = 2n+1$ for some integers m and n .

$$\therefore k+l = (2m+1)+(2n+1) = 2(m+n+1)$$

$$\text{and } kl = (2m+1)(2n+1) = 4mn + 2(m+n)+1$$

Observe that $k+l$ is divisible by 2

and kl is not divisible by 2

$\therefore k+l$ is an even integer, and kl is an odd integer.

Indirect Proof

We know that the conditional $p \rightarrow q$ and its contrapositive $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ are logically equivalent. In some situations, given a conditional $p \rightarrow q$, a direct proof of the contrapositive $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ is easier. On the basis of this proof, we infer that the conditional $p \rightarrow q$ is true. This method of proving a conditional is called an indirect method of proof.

* Let n be an integer. Prove that if n^2 is odd, then n is odd.

Sol) Here, the conditional to be proved is $p \rightarrow q$, where p : n^2 is odd, q : n is odd.

Consider: $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$: If n is even then n^2 is even. Assume $\neg q$ is true, i.e., n is even,

then $n = 2k$, where k is an integer.

Consequently $n^2 = (2k)^2 = 4k^2$ which is divisible by 2.

$\therefore n^2$ is even, i.e., $\neg p$ is true. This prove $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ is true. $\therefore \neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ is true serves as an indirect proof of $p \rightarrow q$.

- * Give an indirect proof of the statement:
 "The product of two even integers is an even integer."
 Sol) The given statement is equivalent to
 "If a and b are even integers, then ab is an even integer."
 i.e. $p \rightarrow q$, where p : a and b are even integers.
 q : ab is an even integer.

The contrapositive $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ is:

If ab is an odd integer, then a and b are odd integers.

assume that $\neg q$ is true,

i.e. ab is an odd integer.

$\Rightarrow ab$ is not divisible by 2

$\Rightarrow a$ is not divisible by 2 and b is not divisible by 2

$\Rightarrow a$ and b are odd integers.

$\Rightarrow \neg p$ is true.

$\therefore \neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ is true $\Rightarrow p \rightarrow q$ is true.

- * Provide an indirect proof of the following statement:
 "For all positive real numbers x and y , if the product xy exceeds 25, then $x > 5$ or $y > 5$.
 Sol) The given statement reads: $p \rightarrow (q \vee r)$,

where p : $xy > 25$ q : $x > 5$, r : $y > 5$

The contrapositive is: $(\neg q \wedge \neg r) \rightarrow \neg p$.

Let $(\neg q \wedge \neg r)$ be true, i.e., $x \leq 5$ and $y \leq 5$.

then this implies $xy \leq 25$.

$\therefore \neg p$ is true.

$\therefore (\neg q \wedge \neg r) \rightarrow \neg p$ is true.

$\Rightarrow p \rightarrow (q \vee r)$ is true.

Proof by contradiction

The indirect method of proof is equivalent to what is known as the Proof by contradiction. The lines of argument in this method of proof of the statement $p \rightarrow q$ are as follows:

1. Hypothesis: Assume that $p \rightarrow q$ is false.
i.e., assume that p is true and q is false.
2. Analysis: Starting with the hypothesis that q is false and employing the rules of logic and other known facts, infer that p is false. This contradicts the assumption that p is true.
3. Conclusion: Because of the contradiction arrived in the analysis, we infer that $p \rightarrow q$ is true.

- * Provide a proof by contradiction of the following statement: For every integer n , if n^2 is odd, then n is odd.
- Given let n be an integer. Then the given statement reads $p \rightarrow q$, where p : n^2 is odd, and q : n is odd.
- Assume that $p \rightarrow q$ is false, that is, assume that p is true and q is false.
- Now, q is false means: n is even, so that $n = 2k$ for some integer k . This yields $n^2 = (2k)^2 = 4k^2$, from which it is evident that n^2 is even; i.e., p is false. This contradicts the assumption that p is true.
- In view of this contradiction, we infer that the given conditional $p \rightarrow q$ is true.

- * Prove that if m is even integer, then $m+7$ is an odd integer.
- Given $p \rightarrow q$, where p : m is even, q : $m+7$ is odd.
- Assume $p \rightarrow q$ is false, i.e., p is true and q is false.
- q is false $\rightarrow m+7 = 2k \rightarrow m = 2k-7 \rightarrow m = 2k-8+1 \rightarrow m = 2(k-4)+1$.
This contradicts m is even, i.e., contradicts p is true. which is odd.
The assumption $p \rightarrow q$ is false is wrong, hence $p \rightarrow q$ is true.

* Prove that there is no rational number whose square is 2.

Sol) Let Q denote the set of all rational numbers.

Then we need to prove: $\forall x \in Q, p \rightarrow q$,

where $p: x$ is rational number and $q: x^2 \neq 2$.

Assume $p \rightarrow q$ is false; i.e., p is true and q is false
 $\Rightarrow x$ is a rational number and $x^2 = 2$.
 since x is rational, $x = \frac{a}{b}$ where a, b are integers,
 which have no common factors.

Since $x^2 = 2 \Rightarrow x = \frac{a^2}{b^2} \Rightarrow a^2 = 2b^2 \Rightarrow a$ is even
 $\Rightarrow a = 2n$ for some integer n .

$\Rightarrow 2b^2 = (2n)^2 \Rightarrow b^2 = 2n^2 \Rightarrow b^2$ is even $\Rightarrow b$ is even

Since a and b are both even, hence have common factor 2.
 This is a contradiction to the assumption that
 $a \& b$ have no common factors.

Hence our assumption is wrong $\therefore p \rightarrow q$ is true.

* Give a proof by contradiction for the following statement: "If n is an odd integer, then $n+9$ is an even integer".

Sol) $p \rightarrow q$: $p: n$ is an odd integer

$q: n+9$ is an even integer.

assume $p \rightarrow q$ is false if p is true and q is false
 q is false $\rightarrow n+9$ is an odd integer

$\therefore n+9 = 2k+1 \Rightarrow n = 2k-8 \Rightarrow n=2(k-4)$

which shows n is even, This contradicts that
 n is odd. Hence the assumption $p \rightarrow q$ is false
 is wrong. Hence the given statement is true.

Proof by Exhaustion

The quantified statement " $\forall x \in S, p(x)$ " is true if $p(x)$ is true for every (each) x in S . If S consists of only a limited number of elements, we can prove that the statement " $\forall x \in S, p(x)$ " is true by considering $p(a)$ for each a in S and verifying that $p(a)$ is true (in each case). Such a method of proof is called the method of exhaustion.

- * Prove that every even integer n with $2 \leq n \leq 26$ can be written as a sum of at most three perfect squares.

* Let $S = \{2, 4, 6, \dots, 24, 26\}$.

We observe that $2 = 1^2 + 1^2$, $4 = 2^2$, $6 = 2^2 + 1^2 + 1^2$, $8 = 2^2 + 2^2$, $10 = 3^2 + 1^2$, $12 = 2^2 + 2^2 + 2^2$, $14 = 3^2 + 2^2 + 1^2$, $16 = 4^2$, $18 = 4^2 + 1^2 + 1^2$, $20 = 4^2 + 2^2$, $22 = 3^2 + 3^2 + 2^2$, $24 = 4^2 + 2^2 + 2^2$, $26 = 5^2 + 1^2$.

The above facts verify that each x in S is a sum of at most three perfect squares.

Proof by Existence

The quantified statement " $\exists x \in S, p(x)$ " is true if any one element $a \in S$ such that $p(a)$ is true is exhibited. Hence the best way of providing a proposition of the form " $\exists x \in S, p(x)$ " is to exhibit the existence of one $a \in S$ such that $p(a)$ is true. This method of proof is called Proof of existence.

- * Prove that there exists a real number x such that $x^3 + 2x^2 - 5x - 6 = 0$

For $x = -1$, $x^3 + 2x^2 - 5x - 6 = -1 + 2 + 5 - 6 = 0$.
Hence the proof.

Disproof by Contradiction

Suppose we wish to disprove a conditional $p \rightarrow q$. For this purpose, we start with the hypothesis that p is true and q is true, and end up with a contradiction. In view of the contradiction, we conclude that the conditional $p \rightarrow q$ is false. This method of disproving $p \rightarrow q$ is called Disproof by Contradiction.

* Disprove the statement: "The sum of two odd integers is an odd integer".

sol Here the proposition to be disproved is $p \rightarrow q$, where $p: a$ and b are odd integers and $q: a+b$ is odd integer. Assume that p is true and q is true. Then $a = 2k_1 + 1$, $b = 2k_2 + 1$ - (1) and $a+b = 2k_1+1 + 2k_2+1 = 2(k_1+k_2+1)$ - (2)
From (1) $a+b = 2k_1+1 + 2k_2+1 = 2(k_1+k_2+1)$
 $\Rightarrow a+b$ is even integer.

This contradicts the assumption (2).

In view of this contradiction, we infer that $p \rightarrow q$ is false. This disproves the given statement.

Disproof by Counterexample

The proposition of the form " $\forall x \in S, p(x)$ " is false if any one element $a \in S$ such that $p(a)$ is false is exhibited. Hence the best way to disproving a proposition involving the universal quantifier is to exhibit just one case where the proposition is false. This method of disproof is called Disproof by counterexample.

Topic _____ Date _____

* Disprove the proposition: The product of any odd integers is a perfect square.

Soln: Note that $m=3$ and $n=5$ are odd integers, but $mn=15$ is not a perfect square.

Thus the given proposition is disproved, with $m=3, n=5$ serving as counterexamples.

* Disprove the proposition: If m and n are positive integers which are perfect squares, then mn is a perfect square.

Soln: Note that $m=9$ and $n=4$ are perfect squares, but $mn=14$ is not a perfect square.

Therefore the given statement is not true. It is disproved through the counterexample $m=9, n=4$.

* Disprove that the sum of squares of any four non-zero integers is an even integer.

Soln: Here, the proposition is!

For any four non-zero integers a, b, c, d , $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + d^2$ is an even integer.

Note that for $a=1, b=1, c=1, d=2$, the proposition is false.

Thus the given proposition is not a true proposition. The proposition is disproved through the counter example $a=1, b=1, c=1$ and $d=2$.

Topic _____

Date _____