Review

- ~p v q
- Contrapositive:
- ~q→~p
- Inverse:
- ~p→~q
- Converse:
- q→p
- p⊕q ≡

•
$$(p \lor q) \land \sim (p \land q)$$

- $\sim (p \wedge q) \equiv$
- ~p ∨ ~q
- $\sim (p \vee q) \equiv$
- ~p ∧ ~q
- p is sufficient for q
- p→q
- p is necessary for q
- ~p→~q

Valid and Invalid Arguments

CS 231 Dianna Xu

Review

Associative Law:

$$-(p \land q) \land r \equiv p \land (q \land r)$$

$$-(p\lor q)\lor r \equiv p\lor (q\lor r)$$

Distributive Law:

$$-p \wedge (q \vee r) \equiv (p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r)$$

$$-p\vee(q\wedge r)\equiv(p\vee q)\wedge(p\vee r)$$

Absorption Law:

$$-p \lor (p \land q) \equiv p$$

$$-p \wedge (p \vee q) \equiv p$$

Definitions

- An argument is a sequence of statements (statement forms).
- All statements in an argument except for the last one, are called premises. (assumptions, hypotheses)
- The final statement is the conclusion.
- A valid argument means the conclusion is true if the premises are all true, with all combinations of variable truth values.

Examples

 All Greeks are human and all humans are mortal; therefore, all Greeks are mortal.

 Some men are athletes and some athletes are rich; therefore, some men are rich.

 Some men are swimmers and some swimmers are fish; therefore, some men are fish.

Modus Ponens

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

Modus Ponens example

- Assume you are given the following two statements:
 - "you are in this class" p- "If you are in this class, you are a student" $p \rightarrow a$

∴ q

- Let *p* = "you are in this class"
- Let q = "you are a student"
- By Modus Ponens, you can conclude that you are a student.

Modus Ponens

• Consider $(p \land (p \rightarrow q)) \rightarrow q$

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$	$p \land (p \rightarrow q)$	$(p \land (p \rightarrow q)) \rightarrow q$
Т	Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	H	П	F	Т
F	Т	Т	F	Т
F	F	Т	F	Т

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

Modus Tollens

- Assume that we know: $\sim q$ and $p \rightarrow q$
 - Recall that $p \rightarrow q \equiv \neg q \rightarrow \neg p$
- Thus, we know $\sim q$ and $\sim q \rightarrow \sim p$
- We can conclude ~p

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

Modus Tollens example

- Assume you are given the following two statements:
 - "you are not a student" $\sim q$ "if you are in this class, you are a student" $p \rightarrow q$

∴~ *p*

- Let *p* = "you are in this class"
- Let q = "you are a student"
- By Modus Tollens, you can conclude that you are not in this class

Generalization & Specialization

 Generalization: If you know that p is true, then p v q will ALWAYS be true

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{p} & \underline{q} \\ \therefore p \vee q & \therefore p \vee q \end{array}$$

Specialization: If p \(\)
 q is true, then p will
 ALWAYS be true

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{p \wedge q} & \underline{p \wedge q} \\ \vdots & \underline{p} & \vdots \end{array}$$

Example of proof

- We have the hypotheses:
- p "It is not sunny this afternoon and it is colder than yesterday"
- "We will go swimming only if it is sunny"
 - "If we do not go swimming, then we will take a canoe trip"
- t "If we take a canoe trip, then we will be home by sunset"
- Does this imply that "we will be home by sunset"?

```
~p ∧ q
r \rightarrow p
```

Example of proof

- 2. ~p
- 3. $r \rightarrow p$
- 4. ~r
- 5. $\sim r \rightarrow s$
- 6. s
- 7. $s \rightarrow t$
- 8. t

$$p \wedge q$$

$$\therefore p$$

Specialization using step 1

2nd hypothesis

Modus tollens using steps 2 & 3

3rd hypothesis

Modus ponens using steps 4 & 5

4th hypothesis

Modus ponens using steps 6 & 7

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

$$p \rightarrow q$$

$$\therefore q$$

More rules of inference

 Conjunction: if p and q are true separately, then p∧q is true

$$p$$

$$q$$

$$\therefore p \land q$$

 Elimination: If p∨q is true, and p is false, then q must be true

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
p \lor q & p \lor q \\
 & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} p & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} q \\
 & \therefore q & \therefore p
\end{array}$$

• Transitivity: If $p \rightarrow q$ is true, and $q \rightarrow r$ is true, then $p \rightarrow r$ must be true

$$p \to q$$

$$q \to r$$

$$\therefore p \to r$$

Even more rules of inference

Proof by division into cases:
 if at least one of p or q is
 true, then r must be true

$$p \lor q$$

$$p \to r$$

$$q \to r$$

:. r

 Contradiction rule: If ~p→c is true, we can conclude p (via the contra-positive)

$$\frac{\sim p \to c}{\therefore p}$$

 Resolution: If pvq is true, and ~pvr is true, then qvr must be true

$$p \vee q$$

$$\sim p \vee r$$

$$\therefore q \vee r$$

Not in the textbook

Example of proof

- Given the hypotheses:
 - "If it does not rain or if it is not foggy, then the sailing race will be held and the lifesaving demonstration will go on"
 - "If the sailing race is held, then the trophy will be awarded"
 - "The trophy was not awarded"
- Can you conclude: "It rained"?

$$(\sim r \lor \sim f) \rightarrow (s \land l)$$

$$s \rightarrow t$$

r

Example of proof

2.
$$s \rightarrow t$$
 2nd hypothesis

4.
$$(\sim r \lor \sim f) \rightarrow (s \land l)$$
 1st hypothesis

5.
$$\sim (s \wedge l) \rightarrow \sim (\sim r \vee \sim r)$$
 Contrapositive of step 4

6.
$$(\sim s \lor \sim l) \rightarrow (r \land f)$$
 DeMorgan's law and double negation law

8.
$$r \land f$$
 Modus ponens using steps 6 & 7

Fallacy of the converse

Modus Badus

Fallacy of affirming the conclusion

Consider the following:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
q & q \\
\underline{p \rightarrow q} & \sim q \rightarrow \sim p \\
\therefore p & \therefore p
\end{array}$$

Is this true?

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$	$q \land (p \rightarrow q)$	$(q \land (p \rightarrow q)) \rightarrow p$
Т	Т	Т	Τ	Т
Т	F	H	F	Т
F	Т	Т	Т	F
F	F	Т	F	Т

Not a valid rule!

Modus Badus example

 Assume you are given the following two statements:

```
- "you are a student" q
- "If you are in this class, you are a student" p \rightarrow q
∴ p
```

- Let p = "you are in this class"
- Let q = "you are a student"

 It is clearly wrong to conclude that if you are a student, you must be in this class

Fallacy of the inverse

Modus Badus

Fallacy of denying the hypothesis

• Consider the following: ~p

$$p \rightarrow q$$

• Is this true?

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$	$\sim p \land (p \rightarrow q))$	$(\sim p \land (p \rightarrow q)) \rightarrow \sim q$
Т	Η	T	F	Т
Т	H	F	H	Т
F	Т	Т	Т	F
F	F	Т	Т	Т

Not a valid rule!

Modus Badus example

- Assume you are given the following two statements:
 - "you are not in this class" $\sim p$ "if you are in this class, you are a student" $p \rightarrow q$

- Let p = "you are in this class"
- Let q = "you are a student"
- You CANNOT conclude that you are not a student just because you are not taking Discrete Math