

## Webinar Module 2

### Rules for writing programs of

- 1. Don't use new syntax
- 2. In the program, we should always expect the user follows instructions
  - Makes it easier for us to learn
  - Once basics are done, we could worry
- 3. Stick with format of the output

### PROGRAM

Given the weight of two items.

For each item, give its weight in lbs. and oz separated by a space

Item 1: 3 12  
 Item 2: 5 7  
 9 3  
 (19)

Method  
 # 1

$$\begin{aligned} 19 \div 16 &= 1 \text{ R } 3 \\ 19 \div 16 &= 1 \\ 19 \bmod 16 &= 3 \end{aligned}$$

The combined weight is 9lbs and 3 ounces

\* Always think of strategy you want to implement Method #2

1. Convert weight from lbs. + oz. to just oz.
2. Add oz. together
3. Then convert weight back

$p \vee q$   
 $\neg p \vee r$   
 $\therefore q \vee r$

↳ Applied  
 when both  
 Assumptions  
 are 1 so  
 our argument  
 is 1

p	q	r	$p \vee q$	$\neg p \vee r$	$q \vee r$	$\neg q \vee \neg r$
T	T	T	T	F	T	F
T	T	F	T	T	T	T
T	F	T	T	F	F	F
T	F	F	T	T	F	T
F	T	T	T	F	T	T
F	T	F	T	T	T	T
F	F	T	F	T	F	F
F	F	F	F	T	F	T

$p \vee q$   
 $\neg p \vee r$   
 $\therefore q \vee r$   
 Not Valid

Use rules of inference and laws of propositional logic to prove

h1  $(p \wedge q) \rightarrow r$   
h2  $\neg r$   
h3  $q$

$\therefore \neg p$

What is a Valid Justification?

- Quote a hypothesis as a statement
- Use rule of inference
- Use Logical Equivalences

Basically we write series of statements to be true until we reach a true conclusion

#	Statement	Justification
1	$(p \wedge q) \rightarrow r$	h1
2	$\neg r$	h2
3	$\neg(p \wedge q)$	Modus tollens on lines 2 & 1
4	$\neg p \vee \neg q$	Identity 9b (DeMorgan) on line 3
5	$\neg q \vee \neg p$	Identity 3a (Commutative) on line 4
6	$q$	h3
7	$\neg \neg q$	Identity 7 (Double Negation) on line 6
8	$\neg p$	Disjunctive Syllogism on lines 5 and lines 7

Universal generalization: Most useful

- We need to conclude it Always works
- We take an arbitrary item, show  $P(u)$  is true, therefore it's always true

$u$  is arbitrary element  
 $P(u)$

$\therefore \forall x P(x)$

What is valid?

- Quote Hypothesis
- Rules of inference
- Logical Equivalences

And

- Arbitrary Elemental Variable from Domain

$U$  = Set of People who live in a city

Linda lives in the city

Linda owns a Ferrari

Everyone who owns a Ferrari has gotten a speeding ticket

$\therefore$  Linda has gotten a speeding ticket

$F(x)$  = "x owns a Ferrari"

$S(x)$  = "x got a speeding ticket"

Linda is in  $U$

$F(\text{Linda})$

$\forall x F(x) \rightarrow S(x)$

$\therefore F(\text{Linda})$

#	Statement	Justification
1	$\forall x F(x) \rightarrow S(x)$	h3
2	Linda is in $U$	h1
3	$F(\text{Linda}) \rightarrow S(\text{Linda})$	Universal Instantiation on 2 and 1
4	$F(\text{Linda})$	h2
5	$S(\text{Linda})$	Modus Ponens on lines 4 and 3

- You won't state " $E(x)$ " for lives in city because the universe the argument implies is that.



$V$  = the set of students in a class

Every student on the honor roll recieved an A  
No student who got a detention recieved an A

$\therefore$  No Student who got a detention is on the honor roll

$H(x)$  = "x is on honor roll"

$A(x)$  = "x got an A"

$D(x)$  = "x got a detention"

If we don't want a

$$\forall x [H(x) \rightarrow A(x)]$$

$$\neg \exists x [D(x) \wedge A(x)] \equiv \forall x \neg [D(x) \wedge A(x)] \equiv \forall x [\neg D(x) \vee \neg A(x)]$$

$$\therefore \neg \exists x [D(x) \wedge H(x)] \equiv \sim \equiv \forall x [H(x) \rightarrow \neg D(x)]$$

#	Statement	Justification
1	$c$ is an Arbitrary Element	Element Introduction
2	$\forall x (H(x) \rightarrow A(x))$	h1
3	$H(c) \rightarrow A(c)$	universal Instatution on lines 1&2
4	$\neg \exists x [D(x) \wedge A(x)]$	h2
5	$\forall x \neg [D(x) \wedge A(x)]$	DeMorgan on line 4
6	$\neg [D(c) \wedge A(c)]$	universal Instilization 1&5
7	$\neg D(c) \vee \neg A(c)$	DeMorgan on line 6
8	$\neg H(c) \vee \neg D(c)$	3rd Conditional Commemo on line 7
9	$A(c) \rightarrow \neg D(c)$	conditional on line 8
10	$H(c) \rightarrow D(c)$	1st hypothetical Syllogism

11	$\neg H(c) \vee \neg D(c)$	11a Line 10 Conditional
12	$\neg D(c) \vee \neg H(c)$	Commutative on 11
13	$\neg (D(c) \wedge H(c))$	DeMorgan line 12
14	$\forall x \neg (D(x) \wedge H(x))$	Universal Generalization line 1 & 13
15	$\neg \exists x [D(x) \wedge H(x)]$	DeMorgan on Line 14