

Logic

Intro to Logic

- Logic provides a formal language to avoid the ambiguity of natural languages (e.g. English)

3 Components of Logic:

- **Syntax:** The grammatical rules of a language (so we know if a statement is 'valid')
- **Semantics:** The meaning of the syntax (to determine the truth or falsity of a statement)
- **Proof System:** A rigorous method for manipulating formulae to construct proofs

Desirable properties of a logical system:

- **Completeness:** Every statement that is true (according to semantics) can be proven (using the proof system)
- **Soundness:** The proof system only derives true conclusions from statements that are both valid and true

Propositions:

- A declarative 'statement of fact' that can either be true or false, but not both (Questions, Commands and gibberish are *not* propositions)
- We can use **propositional variables** to represent propositions, and they can take the **truth values** T (True) or F (False)

Truth Tables & Semantics

p	q	$\neg p$ (Not)	$p \wedge q$ (And)	$p \vee q$ (Or)	$p \implies q$ (Implies)	$p \iff q$ (Iff)
T	T	F	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	T	F	F
F	T	T	F	T	T	F
F	F	T	F	F	T	T

Syntax:

- \implies (Implies): $p \implies q$ if only False when p is **True** and q is **False** (broken promise)
- \iff (**Iff**): True only when p and q are the **same**
- ϕ (**phi**), ψ (**psi**): Represent **any** complex formula (e.g. ϕ could be $(p \wedge q) \implies r$)

- letters (like p, q, r) are used to represent **atomic** statements

Tautology:

- A statement (ϕ) that is True for **every** truth assignment (True for every possible input)

Contradiction:

- A statement (ϕ) that is False for **every** truth assignment (False for every possible input)

Satisfiable:

- A statement (ϕ) that can be satisfied (There exists an input that results in ϕ being True)
-

Logical Equivalence & Algebra

Implication Law:

- This is used to convert an implication (\Rightarrow) into standard Or/Not Logic

$$p \Rightarrow q \equiv \neg p \vee q$$

English Example:

- Think about the promise "If it rains, I will bring an umbrella." The only time I break my promise is if "It rains" ($p = T$) **AND** "No umbrella" ($q = F$). So, as long as "It doesn't rain" ($\neg p$) **OR** "I have the umbrella" (q), I am safe.

De Morgan's Laws:

- **Negating AND:** $\neg(p \wedge q) \equiv \neg p \vee \neg q$.
 - *Translation:* "Not (A and B)" is the same as "(Not A) or (Not B)"
- **Negating OR:** $\neg(p \vee q) \equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q$.
 - *Translation:* "Not (A or B)" is the same as "(Not A) and (Not B)"

Distribution Laws:

- **Distributing OR over AND:**

$$p \vee (q \wedge r) \equiv (p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$$

- *Note:* The outside operator (\vee) goes inside the new brackets. The inside operator (\wedge) moves to the middle.
- **Distributing AND over OR:**

$$p \wedge (q \vee r) \equiv (p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r)$$

Normal Forms & Completeness

Functional Completeness:

- Set of logical operators is **Functionally Complete** if *any* possible propositional formula can be written using *only* the operators in that set

Examples of Functionally Complete Sets:

- $\{\wedge, \vee, \neg\}$
- Even $\{\wedge, \neg\}$ since $A \vee B \equiv \neg(\neg A \wedge \neg B)$
- $\{\Rightarrow, \neg\}$
- NAND: False only if both are True
- NOR: True only if both are False

Disjunctive Normal Form: (DNF)

Definition:

- A formula is in **DNF** if it is a **Disjunction of Conjunctions** (an OR of ANDs)
- **Structure:** $(A \wedge B) \vee (\neg A \wedge C) \vee \dots$
- Think of it as: "A list of ways to win" (A collection of different ways to make the formula True)

How to build it (Truth Table Method):

1. Look at the Truth Table
2. Identify every row where the result is **True**
3. Write a conjunction for that row (e.g. if $p = T, q = F$, write $(p \wedge \neg q)$)
4. Join each row with \vee

Conjunctive Normal Form: (CNF)

Definition:

- A formula is in **CNF** if it is a **Conjunction of Disjunctions** (an AND of ORs)
- **Structure:** $(A \vee B) \wedge (\neg A \vee C) \wedge \dots$
- Think of it as: "A list of requirements, all of which must be met"

How to build it (Truth Table Method):

1. Identify the **False** rows
2. Negate the variables in the "False" row
3. Join then with **ORs** (\vee) to make a clause
 - *Example:* If the false row is $p = T, q = F, r = T$, write $(\neg p \vee q \vee \neg r)$

4. Then join the clauses (False rows) with **ANDs** (\wedge)

How to build it (Syntactic Method):

1. Eliminate the arrows ($\Rightarrow, \Leftrightarrow$)
 2. Push any negations inside brackets (De Morgan's)
 3. **Distribute** \vee over \wedge until you have the correct shape $(p \vee (q \wedge r) \equiv (p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r))$
-

Natural Deduction

The Sequent:

$$\phi_1, \phi_2 \vdash \psi$$

- **Left side** (ϕ_1, ϕ_2): The **Premises** (What you are given/allowed to assume is true)
- **Symbol** (\vdash): Pronounced "turnstile". It means "provably entails"
- **Right side** (ψ): The **Conclusion** (What you are trying to reach)
- **English**: "Given that ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are True, prove that ψ is also True"

Rules:

1. Lines 1 to n are the **Premises** (state what we have been given at the start)
2. Every line after that must be justified by a **Rule** applied to previous line(s)
3. The final line must be the **Conclusion** (ψ)

***Important:** Note that every line evaluates to True*

Conjunction (\wedge) and Double Negation ($\neg\neg$):

1. And-Introduction ($\wedge i$)

- **Effect:** If you have two lines $x(A)$ and $y(B)$, you can write $A \wedge B$
- **Notation:** $\wedge i \ x, y$
- Where x and y are the line numbers and A and B are previously stated propositions
- **Example:**

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \phi_1 \\ \phi_2 \end{array}}{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2} (\wedge i \ 1, 2)$$

2. And-Elimination ($\wedge e$)

- **Rule:** If you have $A \wedge B$, you can extract just A (or just B)

- **Notation:** $\wedge e 1$ (or $\wedge e 2$ for B)
- **Example:**

$$\frac{\phi \wedge \psi}{\phi} (\wedge e1) \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\phi \wedge \psi}{\psi} (\wedge e2)$$

3. **Double Negation Elimination ($\neg\neg e$)

- **Rule:** $\neg\neg A$ is the same as A , so you can remove the double negative
- **Notation:** $\neg\neg e x$

Example:

- Prove $p, \neg\neg(q \wedge r) \vdash p \wedge r$

1. p	Premise
2. $\neg\neg(q \wedge r)$	Premise
3. $q \wedge r$	$\neg\neg e 2$
4. r	$\wedge e_2 3 \leftarrow$ (Take the 2 nd part of the 3 rd line)
5. $p \wedge r \checkmark$	$\wedge i 1, 4 \leftarrow$ (AND the 1 st line and the 4 th line)

Implication & The Boxes

- To prove an "If... then..." statement (\Rightarrow), you have to build a **simulation**

1. Implication Introduction ($\Rightarrow i$)

- To prove $A \Rightarrow B$, you start a sub-proof where you **assume** A to be True, then use that to reach B

Boxes (Sub-Proof):

1. **Top of Box:** You **Assume** the left side (A) to be True
2. **Bottom of Box:** You end with B (proven from A)
3. **Exit:** Close the box and write $A \Rightarrow B$ so you can use it from now on

Important: Note that you **cannot** use **any** statements from the sub-proof outside of the box

Example:

1. ...	(some previous work)
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> 2. A assumption ⋮ 5. B (proven from A) </div>	
6. $A \Rightarrow B$	$\Rightarrow i$ 2–5

2. Implication Elimination ($\Rightarrow e$)

Also known as *Modus Ponens*

Rule:

- If you know "**If A then B**" ($A \Rightarrow B$) is true...
- And you know "**A**" is true...
- Then you can smash them together to get "**B**"

Example:

- Prove $A, A \Rightarrow B \vdash B$

1. A	Premise
2. $A \Rightarrow B$	Premise
3. B	$\Rightarrow e$ 1, 2

Disjunction

1. Disjunction Introduction ($\vee i$)

- If a statement is True, then you can **OR** any other statement to it, and the whole thing remains True

Example:

$$\frac{\phi}{\phi \vee \psi} (\vee i_1) \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\psi}{\phi \vee \psi} (\vee i_2)$$

- **Syntax:** Use $\vee i_1$ (if adding to the right) or $\vee i_2$ (if adding to the left) + line number
-

2. Disjunction Elimination ($\vee e$)

- If you know $A \vee B$ is True, but you don't know *which* one is True. So, to prove a conclusion C , you must prove it works in **both scenarios**

The Structure (Two Boxes):

1. **Box 1:** Assume A is true \rightarrow Prove C
2. **Box 2:** Assume B is true \rightarrow Prove C
3. **Conclusion:** Since you get C in *either* case, C is definitely True

Structure: (Proof by Cases)

1. $A \vee B$	Premise									
<table><tr><td>2. A</td><td>Assumption</td><td>\leftarrow (Case 1)</td></tr><tr><td>\vdots</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>4. C</td><td>(Result)</td><td></td></tr></table>	2. A	Assumption	\leftarrow (Case 1)	\vdots			4. C	(Result)		
2. A	Assumption	\leftarrow (Case 1)								
\vdots										
4. C	(Result)									
<table><tr><td>5. B</td><td>Assumption</td><td>\leftarrow (Case 2)</td></tr><tr><td>\vdots</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>7. C</td><td>(Result MUST be same)</td><td></td></tr></table>	5. B	Assumption	\leftarrow (Case 2)	\vdots			7. C	(Result MUST be same)		
5. B	Assumption	\leftarrow (Case 2)								
\vdots										
7. C	(Result MUST be same)									
8. C	$\vee e$ 1, 2–4, 5–7									

- **Syntax:** Use $\vee e$ + Line of OR + Range of Box 1 + Range of Box 2

Disjunction Example: $(p \vee q \vdash q \vee p)$

- Proof that \vee is Commutative
 - **Plan:**
 1. **Start:** You have $p \vee q$. You need to use $\vee e$ (Proof by Cases)
 2. **Case 1 (Box 1):** Assume p . Use $\vee i$ to turn it into $q \vee p$
 3. **Case 2 (Box 2):** Assume q . Use $\vee i$ to turn it into $q \vee p$
 4. **Finish:** Cite the rule $\vee e$ to conclude $q \vee p$
- Sequent:** $p \vee q \vdash q \vee p$

1. $p \vee q$	Premise				
<table><tr><td>2. p</td><td>Assume</td></tr><tr><td>3. $p \vee q$</td><td>$\vee i_2$ 2</td></tr></table>	2. p	Assume	3. $p \vee q$	$\vee i_2$ 2	
2. p	Assume				
3. $p \vee q$	$\vee i_2$ 2				
<table><tr><td>4. q</td><td>Assume</td></tr><tr><td>5. $p \vee q$</td><td>$\vee i_1$ 4</td></tr></table>	4. q	Assume	5. $p \vee q$	$\vee i_1$ 4	
4. q	Assume				
5. $p \vee q$	$\vee i_1$ 4				
6. $q \vee p$	$\vee e$ 1, 2–3, 4–5				

Negation (\neg) & Contradiction (\perp)

Notation: (\perp)

- The \perp symbol (called "Bottom") represents a **Contradiction** (False)
 - Its means that we have hit a logical dead end. We have proved that something is both True AND False at the same time (e.g. $P \wedge \neg P$)
-

1. Negation Elimination ($\neg e$) / Bottom Introduction ($\perp i$)

- **Rule:** If you have a statement (A) on one line, and its exact opposite ($\neg A$) on another, you can smash them together to create a **Contradiction** (\perp)

Example:

$$\frac{\phi \quad \neg\phi}{\perp} (\neg e \text{ or } \perp i)$$

- **Notation:** $\neg e$ (or $\perp i$) + the line number of the combined contradicting statements
-

2. Bottom Elimination

Ex Falso Quodlibet ("From falsehood, anything follows")

- Once you have a Contradiction (\perp), you can conclude **ANYTHING** you want
- Because if the rules are broken, logic goes out the window

Example:

$$\frac{\perp}{\phi} (\perp e)$$

- **Notation:** $\perp e$ + the line number of the contradiction
-

3. Negation Introduction ($\neg i$)

Also known as "Proof by Contradiction" (for negations)

Steps to prove that something is False ($\neg A$):

1. **Assume** the statement is True A
2. Show that this assumption leads to a **Contradiction** (\perp)
3. **Conclusion:** Since assuming A to be True, broke the logic, A must be False
4. $\therefore \neg A$ is True

Structure:

1. ...

2. A	Assumption
\vdots	
5. \perp	$\neg e \dots \leftarrow$ (Crash found)

6. $\neg A$

$\neg i \ 2-5$

Negation Example - Proof of Modus Tollens (MT)

$x \Rightarrow y, \neg y \vdash \neg x$

1. $x \Rightarrow y$ Premise

2. $\neg y$ Premise

3. x	Assume
4. y	$e \Rightarrow 3, 1$
5. \perp	$\neg e \ 4, 2$

6. $\neg x$

$\neg i \ 3-5$

Derived Rules (Theorems)

1. Modus Tollens (MT)

(As proved above)

- **Rule:** If $A \Rightarrow B$ is True, and B is False ($\neg B$), then A must be False ($\neg A$)
- **Notation:** MT x, y

Example:

$$\frac{A \Rightarrow B \quad \neg B}{\neg A} (MT)$$

2. Reductio Ad Absurdum (RAA)

("Proof by Contradiction" for **positive** conclusions)

- **Method:** To prove A , assume $\neg A$, find a contradiction (\perp) then conclude A
- **Difference from Negation Introduction ($\neg i$):**
 - $\neg i$: Assume $A \rightarrow$ Contradiction \rightarrow Conclude $\neg A$
 - RAA : Assume $\neg A \rightarrow$ Contradiction \rightarrow Conclude A
- **Notation:** RAA (applied to a box assuming $\neg A$ and ending in \perp)

3. Law of Excluded Middle (LEM)

- **Concept:** Everything is either True or False ($A \vee \neg A$). There is no third option
 - **Usage:** You can write $A \vee \neg A$ on any line, (without any requirements) usually used to set up a **Proof by Cases** ($\vee e$)
 - **Notation:** LEM (nothing else needed)
-

Proof of De Morgan's Law

- **Sequent:** $\neg(p \vee q) \vdash \neg p \wedge \neg q$

1. $\neg(p \vee q)$	Premise						
(Plan: Get $\neg p$)							
<table><tr><td>2. p</td><td>Assume</td></tr><tr><td>3. $p \vee q$</td><td>$\vee i_1$ 2</td></tr><tr><td>4. \perp</td><td>$\perp i$ 3, 1</td></tr></table>	2. p	Assume	3. $p \vee q$	$\vee i_1$ 2	4. \perp	$\perp i$ 3, 1	
2. p	Assume						
3. $p \vee q$	$\vee i_1$ 2						
4. \perp	$\perp i$ 3, 1						
5. $\neg p$	$\neg i$ 2–4						
(Plan: Get $\neg q$)							
<table><tr><td>6. q</td><td>Assume</td></tr><tr><td>7. $p \vee q$</td><td>$\vee i_2$ 6</td></tr><tr><td>8. \perp</td><td>$\perp i$ 7, 1</td></tr></table>	6. q	Assume	7. $p \vee q$	$\vee i_2$ 6	8. \perp	$\perp i$ 7, 1	
6. q	Assume						
7. $p \vee q$	$\vee i_2$ 6						
8. \perp	$\perp i$ 7, 1						
9. $\neg q$	$\neg i$ 6–8						
10. $\neg p \wedge \neg q$ ✓	$\wedge i$ 5, 9						
