

## Rules of Inference:

### Valid argument or valid conclusion:

If a conclusion is derived from a set of premises by using the accepted rules of reasoning, then the conclusion is called valid argument or valid conclusion.

### Defn:

We say that from a set of premises  $\{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m\}$  a conclusion 'C' follows if  $H_1 \wedge H_2 \wedge \dots \wedge H_m \Rightarrow C$

### I) Truth table technique:

$(H_1 \wedge H_2 \wedge \dots \wedge H_m) \rightarrow C$  is a tautology

1) Determine whether the conclusion  $c$  follows logically from the premises  $H_1$  and  $H_2$

a)  $H_1: P \rightarrow Q$      $H_2: P$      $c: Q$     T.P  $(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge P \rightarrow Q$  is tautology

$P$	$Q$	$P \rightarrow Q$	$(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge P$	$((P \rightarrow Q) \wedge P) \rightarrow Q$
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	F	T
F	F	T	F	T

valid conclusion

b)  $H_1: P \rightarrow Q$      $H_2: \neg P$      $C: Q$

To verify,  $[(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge \neg P] \rightarrow Q$  is tautology or not

P	Q	$(P \rightarrow Q)$	$\neg P$	$(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge \neg P$	$(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge \neg P \rightarrow Q$
T	T	T	F	F	T
T	F	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	T	T	T
F	F	T	T	T	F
					Not tautology Not valid conclusion

## Validity (of Verbal arguments)

2) Determine the validity of the following argument.

*Premise* { If two sides of a triangle are equal then  
opposite angles are equal. Two sides of a  
triangle are not equal,  
conclusion  
therefore the opposite angles are not equal

Soln P: Two sides of a triangle are equal  
Q: Opposite angles are equal

$$H_1: P \rightarrow Q \quad H_2: \neg P \quad C: \neg Q$$

To verify that  $((P \rightarrow Q) \wedge \neg P) \rightarrow \neg Q$  is a tautology.

P	Q	$P \rightarrow Q$	$\neg P$	$(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge \neg P$	$\neg Q$	$(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge \neg P \rightarrow \neg Q$
T	T	T	F	F	F	T
T	F	F	F	F	T	T
F	T	T	T	T	F	F
F	F	T	T	T	T	T
						Not tautology Not valid argument.

3) *Premises* { If you invest in stock market, then you will get rich. If you get rich then you will be happy

---

*Conclusion* Therefore, If you invest in stock market then you will be happy.

P : Invest in stock market      Q : you will get rich

R : you will be happy

$H_1: P \rightarrow Q$        $H_2: Q \rightarrow R$        $C: P \rightarrow R$

$((P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow R)) \rightarrow (P \rightarrow R)$  is a tautology (verify)

hence given argument is valid.

## II) Without using Truth table

### Implications

Simplification :  $I_1: P \wedge Q \Rightarrow P$   
 $I_2: P \wedge Q \Rightarrow Q$

Addition  $I_3: P \Rightarrow P \vee Q$   
 $I_4: Q \Rightarrow P \vee Q$

$$I_5: \neg P \Rightarrow P \rightarrow Q$$

$$I_6: Q \Rightarrow P \rightarrow Q$$

$$I_7: \neg(P \rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow P$$

$$I_8: \neg(P \rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow \neg Q$$

$$I_9 \quad (P) \wedge (Q) \Rightarrow (P \wedge Q)$$

$$I_{10} \quad \neg P, P \vee Q \Rightarrow Q \quad \text{disjunctive syllogism}$$

$$I_{11} \quad P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q \quad \text{modus ponens}$$

$$I_{12} \quad \neg Q, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow \neg P \quad \text{modus tollens}$$

$$I_{13} \quad P \rightarrow Q \rightarrow R \Rightarrow P \rightarrow R \quad \text{hypothetical syllogism}$$

$$I_{14} \quad P \vee Q, P \rightarrow R, Q \rightarrow R \Rightarrow R \quad \text{dilemma.}$$

### Rules of Inference

Name	Tautology	Rule of Inference
Modus ponens	$[P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q)] \rightarrow Q$	$\begin{array}{c} P \\ P \rightarrow Q \\ \hline \therefore Q \end{array}$



Name	Tautology	Rule of Inference
Modus tollens	$[\neg Q \wedge (P \rightarrow Q)] \rightarrow \neg P$	$\begin{array}{l} \neg Q \\ P \rightarrow Q \\ \hline \therefore \neg P \end{array}$
Hypothetical Syllogism	$[(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow R)] \rightarrow (P \rightarrow R)$	$\begin{array}{l} P \rightarrow Q \\ Q \rightarrow R \\ \hline \therefore P \rightarrow R \end{array}$
Disjunctive Syllogism	$[(P \vee Q) \wedge \neg P] \rightarrow Q$	$\begin{array}{l} P \vee Q \\ \neg P \\ \hline \therefore Q \end{array}$

Name	Tautology	Rule of Inference
Addition	$P \rightarrow (P \vee Q)$	$\frac{P}{P \vee Q}$
Simplification	$(P \wedge Q) \rightarrow P$	$\frac{P \wedge Q}{P}$
Conjunction	$[(P) \wedge (Q)] \rightarrow (P \wedge Q)$	$\frac{P}{Q}$ $\frac{Q}{P \wedge Q}$
Resolution	$((P \vee Q) \wedge [\neg P \vee R])$ $\rightarrow (Q \vee R)$	$\frac{P \vee Q}{\neg P \vee R}$ $\frac{\neg P \vee R}{Q \vee R}$

1) State which rule is the basis of the following argument

i) It is below freezing now.

Therefore, it is either below freezing or raining now

Soln P: It is below freezing now

Q: It is raining now

$$\frac{P}{\therefore P \vee Q}$$

Addition Rule is used.

ii) It is below freezing and raining now  
therefore, it is below freezing now.

$$\frac{P \wedge Q}{\therefore P}$$

Simplification rule is used.