## 1.4 Arguments and Rules of Inference 论证和推理规则

Consider the following sequence of propositions.

- The bug is either in module 17 or in module 81.
- The bug is a numerical error.
- Module 81 has no numerical error.

# 1.4 Arguments and Rules of Inference 论证和推理规则

Consider the following sequence of propositions.

- The bug is either in module 17 or in module 81.
- The bug is a numerical error.
- Module 81 has no numerical error.

# "The bug is in module 17"

This process of drawing a conclusion from a sequence of propositions is called **deductive reasoning** (演绎推理).

# Argument 论证

Definition 1.4.1 An argument is a sequence of propositions written

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

$$\therefore q$$

or

$$p_1,p_2,...,p_n/:q$$

# Argument 论证

Definition 1.4.1 An argument is a sequence of propositions written

$$p_1$$
  $p_2$  hypotheses (假设) or premises (前提)  $p_n$  conclusion (结论)

or

$$p_1,p_2,...,p_n/:q$$

: means therefore

# Argument 论证

Definition 1.4.1 An argument is a sequence of propositions written

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

or

$$p_1,p_2,...,p_n/:q$$

Argument is said to be **valid** (有效的) if the conclusion follows from the hypotheses; that is, if  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  and ... and  $p_n$  are true, then q must also be true. otherwise, the argument is invalid (or a fallacy).

1. Modus ponens rule of inference or law of detachment (假言推理或分离定律)

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

#### 2. Modus tollens

(拒取)

$$\begin{array}{c}
p \longrightarrow q \\
\neg q \\
\vdots \neg p
\end{array}$$

3. Addtion (附加)

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

4. Simplification (化简)

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

## 5. Conjunction

(合取)

$$\begin{array}{c}
p\\q\\
\therefore p \land q
\end{array}$$

### 6. Hypothetical syllogism

(假言三段论)

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

### 7. Disjunctive syllogism

(析取三段论)

**Example 1.4.5.** Represent the argument

The bug is either in module 17 or in module 81.

The bug is a numerical error.

Module 81 has no numerical error.

∴ The bug is in module 17.

given at the beginning of this section symbolically and show that it is valid.

p: The bug is in module 17.

*q*: The bug is in module 81.

r: The bug is a numerical error.

**Example 1.4.5.** Represent the argument

The bug is either in module 17 or in module 81.

The bug is a numerical error.

Module 81 has no numerical error.

∴ The bug is in module 17.

given at the beginning of this section symbolically and show that it is valid.

p: The bug is in module 17.

*q*: The bug is in module 81.

r: The bug is a numerical error.

#### **Example 1.4.5.** Represent the argument

The bug is either in module 17 or in module 81.

The bug is a numerical error.

Module 81 has no numerical error.

... The bug is in module 17.

given at the beginning of this section symbolically and show that it is valid.

p: The bug is in module 17.

q: The bug is in module 81.

r: The bug is a numerical error.

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

$$\therefore p$$

Exercise. It is known that

- 1. It is not sunny this afternoon, and it is colder than yesterday.
- 2. We will go swimming only if it is sunny this afternoon.
- 3. If we do not go swimming, we will play basketball.
- 4. If we play basketball, we will go home early.

Can you conclude "we will go home early"?

Exercise. It is known that

- 1. It is not sunny this afternoon, and it is colder than yesterday.
- 2. We will go swimming only if it is sunny this afternoon.
- 3. If we do not go swimming, we will play basketball.
- 4. If we play basketball, we will go home early.

Can you conclude "we will go home early"?

p :=It is sunny this afternoon

q :=It is colder than yesterday

r :=We will go swimming

s :=We will play basketball

t :=We will go home early

Exercise. A student is trying to prove that propositions p, q, and r are all true. She proceeds as follows.

First, she proves three facts:

- p implies q
- q implies r
- r implies p.

Then she concludes,

``Thus p, q, and r are all true."

What does its form of argument is like?

Exercise. A student is trying to prove that propositions p, q, and r are all true. She proceeds as follows.

First, she proves three facts:

- p implies q
- q implies r
- r implies p.

Then she concludes,

``Thus p, q, and r are all true."

$$p \to q$$

$$q \to r$$

$$r \to p$$

$$\therefore p \land q \land r$$

What does its form of argument is like?

p	q	r	p ightarrow q	$m{q}  ightarrow m{r}$	r  o p	$p \wedge q \wedge r$

 $p \to q$   $q \to r$   $r \to p$   $\therefore p \land q \land r$ 

To prove an argument is not valid, we just need to find a counterexample.

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

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

If you are a fish, then you drink water. You drink water.

You are a fish.

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

If you are a fish, then you drink water. You drink water.

You are a fish.

$$p \to q$$

$$\neg p$$

$$\cdot \neg a$$

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

If you are a fish, then you drink water. You drink water.

You are a fish.

$$\begin{array}{c}
p \to q \\
\neg p
\end{array}$$

If you are a fish, then you drink water. You are not a fish.

You do not drink water.

#### **Exercises**

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

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

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

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

### **Exercises**

(A) 
$$\neg p \rightarrow q$$
  $\neg q$   $\vdots p$ 

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

$$\frac{\text{(c)} \quad \neg p \rightarrow \neg q}{\therefore \quad q \rightarrow p}$$

#### **Honest man and Liar**

Honest man always tell the truth.

Liar always lie.

A says: "B is an honest man."

B says: "A and I are of opposite type."

What are the identities of A and B?

#### **Honest man and Liar**

Honest man always tell the truth.

Liar always lie.

A says: "B is a liar."

B says: "A is an honest man."

What are the identities of A and B?

## A game

Imagine there are 3 coins on the table. Gold, silver and copper.

If you say a truthful sentence, you will get one coin. If you say a false sentence, you get nothing.

Which sentence can guarantee gaining the gold coin?

## A game

Imagine there are 3 coins on the table. Gold, silver and copper.

If you say a truthful sentence, you will get one coin. If you say a false sentence, you get nothing.

Which sentence can guarantee gaining the gold coin?

- (A) You will give me the gold coin.
- (B) You will give me all the coins.
- (C) You will not give me any of the coins.
- (D) You will give me either silver or copper coin.
- (E) You will give me neither silver nor copper coin.

# **Problem-Solving Tips**

The validity of a very short argument or proof might be verified using a truth table. In practice, arguments and proofs use rules of inference.

# **Problem-Solving Tips**

**TABLE 1.4.1** ■ Rules of Inference for Propositions

Rule of Inference	Name	Rule of Inference	Name
$ \begin{array}{c} p \to q \\ \hline p \\ \therefore q \end{array} $	Modus ponens	$\frac{p}{q}$ $\therefore p \wedge q$	Conjunction
$\begin{array}{c} p \to q \\ \neg q \\ \hline \therefore \neg p \end{array}$	Modus tollens	$p \to q$ $q \to r$ $\therefore p \to r$	Hypothetical syllogism
$\frac{p}{\therefore p \vee q}$	Addition	$ \begin{array}{c} p \lor q \\  \hline  \neg p \\     \vdots q \end{array} $	Disjunctive syllogism
$\frac{p \wedge q}{\therefore p}$	Simplification		