

## 1 Propositional Logic

Propositional logic is deriving a logical conclusion by combining many propositions and using formal logic to determine the truth of arguments.

An **argument** is a sequence of statements in which the conjunction of the initial statements (called the premises/hypotheses) is said to imply the final statement (the conclusion). An argument can be represented symbolically as

$$(P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge P_3 \wedge \cdots \wedge P_n) \rightarrow Q$$

A valid argument is when the truth of the hypotheses leads to the truth of the conclusion.

A **argument is valid** *if* whenever the hypotheses are all true, the conclusion must also be true. In other words,  $(P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge P_n) \rightarrow Q$  is a tautology.

### How to Arrive at a Valid Argument

a **proof sequence** is a sequence of wffs in which each wff is either a hypothesis or the result of applying one of the formal system's derivation rules to earlier wffs in the sequence.

## 2 Rules for Propositional Logic

- Equivalence Rules
  - Allow individual wffs to be rewritten
  - Truth preserving rules
- Inference Rules
  - Allow new wff to be derived
  - Work only in one direction

## Equivalence Rules

Expression	Equivalent To	Abbreviation for Rule
$R \vee S$ $R \wedge S$	$S \vee R$ $S \wedge R$	Commutative - comm
$(R \vee S) \vee Q$ $(R \wedge S) \wedge Q$	$R \vee (S \vee Q)$ $R \wedge (S \wedge Q)$	Associative - ass
$(R \vee S)'$ $(R \wedge S)'$	$R' \wedge S'$ $R' \vee S'$	De Morgan's Laws - De Morgan
$R \rightarrow S$	$R' \vee S$	Implication - imp
$R$	$(R')'$	Double negation - dn
$P \leftrightarrow Q$	$(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow P)$	Equivalence - equ

## Inference Rules

From	Can Derive	Abbreviation for Rule
$R, R \rightarrow S$	$S$	Modus ponens - mp
$R \rightarrow S, S'$	$R'$	Modus tollens - mt
$R, S$	$R \wedge S$	Conjunction - con
$R \wedge S$	$R, S$	Simplification - sim
$R$	$R \vee S$	Addition - add

From	Can Derive	Name / Abbreviation
$P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R$	$P \rightarrow R$	Hypothetical syllogism- hs
$P \vee Q, P'$	$Q$	Disjunctive syllogism- ds
$P \rightarrow Q$	$Q' \rightarrow P'$	Contraposition- cont
$Q' \rightarrow P'$	$P \rightarrow Q$	Contraposition- cont
$P$	$P \wedge P$	Self-reference - self
$P \vee P$	$P$	Self-reference - self
$(P \wedge Q) \rightarrow R$	$P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow R)$	Exportation - exp
$P, P'$	$Q$	Inconsistency - inc
$P \wedge (Q \vee R)$	$(P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge R)$	Distributive - dist
$P \vee (Q \wedge R)$	$(P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R)$	Distributive - dist

## Examples

- Simplify  $(A' \vee B') \vee C$

- |                                 |              |
|---------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. $(A' \vee B') \vee C$        | hyp          |
| 2. $(A \wedge B)' \vee C$       | 1, De Morgan |
| 3. $(A \wedge B) \rightarrow C$ | 2, imp       |

To prove an argument of the form

$$P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge P_n \rightarrow R \rightarrow Q$$

The deduction method allows for the use of R as an additional hypothesis and thus prove

$$P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge P_n \wedge R \rightarrow Q$$

### Example

Prove  $(A \rightarrow B) \wedge (B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow C)$ . We can use the deduction method to rewrite in the form  $(A \rightarrow B) \wedge (B \rightarrow C) \wedge A \rightarrow C$

- |                      |          |
|----------------------|----------|
| 1. $A \rightarrow B$ | hyp      |
| 2. $B \rightarrow C$ | hyp      |
| 3. $A$               | hyp      |
| 4. $B$               | 1, 3, mp |
| 5. $C$               | 2, 4, mp |