

101100001000 101100001000 101100001000 101100001000 101100001000

CSCI 2824: Discrete Structures

Lecture 8: Rules of Inference (part 1)

101100001000 101100001000 101100001000 101100001000 101100001000

Rachel Cox

Department of Computer Science

Announcements and reminders

- Homework 2 (written) due **today at noon**.
 - **Read the instructions** at the top of the homework assignment.
 - You will be graded partially on **style** and **neatness**. (just like in life)
 - Multiple pages must be **stapled**. Do the problems **in order**.
 - **No torn-out-of-notebook fringe crap.**
 - Do **not** try to cram too much into a small space. When in doubt, start a new page.
 - **Write your full name at the top of the back page.**

Rules of Inference

“Valid Arguments”

valid: the conclusion must follow from the truth of the preceding statements (premises)

argument: a sequence of statements that end with a conclusion

- Rules of Inference are the basic tools for establishing the truth of statements.

The Distinction between truth and validity	
TRUTH	VALIDITY
Concerned with what is the case	Concerned with whether conclusions follows from premises
	The validity of an argument is independent of the truth or falsity of the premises it contains.

Rules of Inference

An **argument** in propositional logic is a sequence of propositions. All but the final proposition in the argument are called premises and the final proposition is called the conclusion. An argument is valid if the truth of all its premises implies that the conclusion is true.

An **argument form** in propositional logic is a sequence of compound propositions involving propositional variables. An argument form is valid no matter which particular propositions are substituted for the propositional variables in its premises, the conclusion is true if the premises are true.

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

Rules of Inference

Example: “If you have a current password, then you can log onto the network.”

“You have the current password.”

“Therefore, you can log onto the network.”

Example: “If you have access to the network, then you can change your grade.”

“You have access to the network.”

“You can change your grade.”

Rules of Inference

Rules of Inference – Relatively simple argument forms

Question: What about Truth Tables to prove an argument form is valid?

Answer: You can always use a truth table to verify the validity of an argument form.
But what if there are 10 different propositional variables?

$$2^{10} = 1024 \text{ rows}$$

Rules of Inference

For our argument to be valid, it must be the case that there is no situation (i.e., truth values for p and q) in which the premises of the argument are true but the conclusion false.

We joined the premises with the conclusion in a conditional (as *premises* \rightarrow *conclusion*)

- So for the argument to be valid, the conditional describing it must be **always true** (i.e., it needs to be a tautology)

Check with a truth table:

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$	$(p \rightarrow q) \wedge p$	$((p \rightarrow q) \wedge p) \rightarrow q$
T	T			
T	F			
F	T			
F	F			

Rules of Inference

Modus Ponens – Law of Detachment

➤ Latin for *mode that affirms*

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

- If a conditional statement and the hypothesis of the conditional statement are both true, then the conclusion must also be true.



Rules of Inference

Modus Tollens – Law of Detachment

➤ Latin for *mode that denies*

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

E.g. If it is day, then it is not night.
But it is night.
Therefore, it is not day.

- If a conditional statement is true, then so is its contrapositive.

Rules of Inference

Derivation of Modus Tollens:


	Step	Justification
1.	$p \rightarrow q$	premise
2.	$\neg q$	premise
3.		
4.		

Rules of Inference

Hypothetical Syllogism

- Greek : Συλλογισμος – *conclusion or inference*

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



Θεοφραστος

- sometimes called chain rule or transitivity of implication

Rules of Inference

Disjunctive Syllogism

- aka *modus tollendo ponens* – mode that affirms by denying

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

E.g. Jacob is having either spaghetti or chicken soup for dinner.
He doesn't have spaghetti.
Therefore, he must be having chicken soup.

- also sometimes called disjunction elimination or elimination

Rules of Inference

Derivation of Disjunctive Syllogism:

	Step	Justification
1.	$p \vee q$	premise
2.	$\neg p$	premise
3.		
4.		

Rules of Inference

Addition

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

Simplification

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

Conjunction

$$\frac{\begin{matrix} p \\ q \end{matrix}}{\therefore p \wedge q}$$

Resolution

$$\frac{\begin{matrix} p \vee q \\ \neg p \vee r \end{matrix}}{\therefore q \vee r}$$

➤ These rule of inference can also be found in Table 1 on page 72 of our textbook.

Rules of Inference

Derivation of Resolution:

	Step	Justification
1.	$p \vee q$	premise
2.	$\neg p \vee r$	premise
6.		

Rules of Inference

Example: Use rules of inference to show that the following argument is valid.

$$(p \vee q) \rightarrow \neg r$$

$$\neg r \rightarrow s$$

$$p$$

$$\therefore s$$