

A

$A \rightarrow B$

B

modus ponens

$$(A \rightarrow B \wedge C) \leftrightarrow (A \rightarrow B) \wedge (A \rightarrow C)$$

Part I Assume  $\textcircled{1} A \rightarrow (B \wedge C)$

Goal:  $A \rightarrow B \wedge A \rightarrow C$

Goal:  $A \rightarrow B$

Assume  $\textcircled{2} A$

Goal B

$\textcircled{1} A \rightarrow B$  (you get  $B \wedge C$  by modus ponens, and you can extract C by simp)

Goal:  $A \rightarrow C$

Similarly

$\textcircled{3?}$

$A \rightarrow C$

$\textcircled{7} (A \rightarrow B) \wedge (A \rightarrow C)$  conj ? , ??

$\textcircled{2} A$

Part II Ass<sup>9</sup>:  $(A \rightarrow B) \wedge (A \rightarrow C)$

Goal:  $A \rightarrow (B \wedge C)$

Ass<sup>10</sup>:  $A$

Goal:  $B \wedge C$

①  $A \rightarrow B$  simp 9

②  $A \rightarrow C$  simp 9

③  $B$  m.p. 10, 11

⊙  $A \rightarrow (B \wedge C)$

The theorem: biconditional introduction 1-4, 9-11

$\frac{A \wedge B}{A}$        $\frac{A \wedge B}{B}$

rule of simplification

# Contrapositive Theorem

$$\text{Prove } (P \rightarrow Q) \leftrightarrow (\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P)$$

Part I: Assume ①  $P \rightarrow Q$

Goal:  $\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$

Assume ②  $\neg Q$

Goal:  $\neg P$

Assume ③  $P$

Goal:  $\perp$

④  $Q$  m.p. 3, 1

⑤  $\perp$  contradiction 2, 4


⑥  $\neg P$  negation introduced on 3-5

1.  $P \rightarrow Q$

②  $\neg Q$

3  $P$

4  $Q$

⑥  $\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$  ded 2-6 finished Part I! 

Part II: Assume  $\textcircled{8} \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$

Goal:  $P \rightarrow Q$

Assume  $\textcircled{9} P$

Goal:  $Q$

Assume  $\textcircled{10} \neg Q$  for reductio

Goal:  $\perp$

$\textcircled{11} \neg P$  m.p. 10, 8

$\textcircled{12} \perp$  contra 9, 11

$\textcircled{13} Q$  reductio ad absurdum 10-12

$\textcircled{14} P \rightarrow Q$  ded. 9-13

$\textcircled{15} (P \rightarrow Q) \leftrightarrow (\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P)$  biconditional introduction  
1-7, 8-14

8.  $\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$

9.  $P$

10.  $\neg Q$

11.  $\neg P$

The contrapositive theorem justifies new rules!

Modus Tollens

$P \rightarrow Q$

$\neg Q$

$\neg P$

~~$P \rightarrow Q$   
 $Q \rightarrow \perp$   
 $P \rightarrow \perp$~~

$\textcircled{1} P \rightarrow Q$  premise

$\textcircled{2} \neg Q$  premise

Goal:  $\neg P$

$\textcircled{3} (P \rightarrow Q) \leftrightarrow (\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P)$  contrapositive theorem

$\textcircled{4} \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$  b.i.m.p. 1, 3

$\textcircled{1} P \rightarrow Q$

$\textcircled{2} \neg Q$

$\textcircled{3} \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$

$\textcircled{4} \neg P$

⑤  $\neg P$  m.p. 2,4

$$\begin{array}{l} P \rightarrow Q \\ \neg Q \\ \hline \neg P \end{array}$$

The strategy of indirect proof

Goal:  $P \rightarrow Q$

Assume  $\textcircled{?} \neg Q$

Goal:  $\neg P$

$\textcircled{?1} \neg P$

$P \rightarrow Q$  indirect proof ~~??~~ ? - ??

Assume  $\textcircled{m} \neg Q$   
Goal:  $\neg P$   
:  
:  
:  
 $\textcircled{n} \neg P$

$\textcircled{n+1} \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$  ded. ~~??~~ m-n

$\textcircled{n+2} \neg Q \rightarrow (P \rightarrow Q) \leftrightarrow (\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P)$  contrapositive theorem

$\textcircled{n+1} \textcircled{n+3} P \rightarrow Q$  bwp n+1, n+2 indirect proof m-n

# Rules combining Disjunction[or] and Negation[not]

$$\frac{P \vee Q \quad \neg P}{Q}$$

$$\frac{P \vee Q \quad \neg Q}{P}$$

disjunctive  
syllogism.

$$\frac{\neg P \vee Q \quad P}{Q}$$

$$\frac{P \vee \neg Q \quad Q}{P}$$

①  $P \vee Q$

premise

②  $\neg Q$

premise

Goal:  $P$

Prove by cases on ①

Case I Assume 1a  $P$

Goal:  $P$

③  $P$  copy line 1a

Case II Assume 1b  $Q$

Goal:  $P$

2b  $\perp$  2, 1b contradiction

$P \vee Q$

$\neg Q$

$Q$

3b P ex falso 2b  
④ P |  
proof by cases 1, 1a-2a, 1b-3b

---

Strategy for Proving a Disjunction

$A \vee B$  is equivalent to  $(\neg A) \rightarrow B$

it is also equivalent to  $(\neg B) \rightarrow A$

Goal:  $A \vee B$

| Assume <sup>①</sup>  $\neg A$

| Goal:  $B$

| ...

| <sup>②</sup>  $B$

<sup>③</sup>  $A \vee B$  alternate elimination 1-n

Goal:  $A \vee B$

Assume  $\neg B$

Goal:  $A$

$\vdots$

$A$

$A \vee B$

---

Example:

Factor Theorem If  $ab=0$  then  $a=0$  or  $b=0$ .

Suppose  $ab=0$

Suppose  $a \neq 0$ .

Then  $a \cdot a^{-1} = 1$ .

So  $b = 1b = a \cdot a^{-1} \cdot b = a \cdot b \cdot a^{-1} = 0$ .

Pne  $ab=0 \rightarrow (a=0 \vee b=0)$

Assume  $ab=0$

Goal:  $a=0 \vee b=0$

Assume  $a \neq 0$ .

Goal:  $b=0$

$b = 1b = a^{-1}ab = a^{-1}0 = 0 \checkmark$

$a=0$  or  $b=0$  a.e. by the block above.



Excluded Middle

$$A \vee \neg A$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Goal: } \textcircled{A} \vee \neg A \\ \quad \text{Assume } \textcircled{1} \neg A \\ \quad \quad \text{Goal: } \neg A \\ \quad \quad \textcircled{2} \neg A \text{ any } 1 \end{array}$$

$$A \vee \neg A \text{ a.e. 1-2}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Goal: } A \vee \neg A \\ \quad \text{Assume } \textcircled{1} \neg \neg A \\ \quad \quad \text{Goal: } A \\ \quad \quad \textcircled{2} A \text{ d.n.e. } \textcircled{1} \end{array}$$

$$A \vee \neg A \text{ a.e. 1-2}$$

Try to prove Excluded Middle directly.

Goal:  $A \vee \neg A$

Assume  $\neg(A \vee \neg A)$  Goal:

Goal:  $\perp$

~~Try to prove  $A \vee \neg A$  in order to get  $\perp$~~

Try to prove  $A$  (from  $A$ ,  $A \vee \neg A$  follows and I get  $\perp$ )

Assume  $\neg A$

Goal:  $\perp$

③  $A \vee \neg A$  add line 2

④  $\perp$  1,3 contradiction

⑤  $A$  by reductio 2-4

⑥  $A \vee \neg A$  add line 5

⑦  $\perp$  1,6 contradiction

⑧  $A \vee \neg A$  reductio 1-7





















