

# **Session : Basic Logic**

## **1: Propositional Logic**

---

Dr. Shatrughan Modi



# Logic

---

- Study of valid reasoning.
- Allows us to represent knowledge in precise, mathematical way.
- Allows us to make valid inferences using a set of precise rules.
- **Many applications in CS:**
  - AI, programming languages, databases, computer architecture, automated testing and program analysis etc.

# Propositional Logic

---

- Simplest logic is propositional logic.
- Building blocks of propositional logic are propositions.
- A proposition is a statement that is either true or false.
- Examples:
  1. ITC301 is a course in discrete structures in IIITU :- True
  2. Una is located in Haryana :- False
  3. Pay attention :- Not a proposition
  4.  $x + y > 4$  :- Not a proposition

# Propositional Variables

---

- Each proposition will be represented by a propositional variable.
- Propositional variables are usually represented as lower-case letters, such as  $p$ ,  $p_1$ ,  $p_2$ ,  $q$ , etc.
- Each variable can take one of two values: true or false.
- What is truth value of “India hosted 2019 ICC Cricket World Cup”?  
False
- A truth table is a table showing the truth value of a propositional logic formula as a function of its inputs.

# Logical Connectives

---

□ Three basic logical connectives:

1. **Logical NOT:**  $\neg p$  (not p)

Also called logical negation.

2. **Logical AND:**  $p \wedge q$  (p and q)

Also called logical conjunction.

3. **Logical OR:**  $p \vee q$  (p or q)

Also called logical disjunction

□ Propositions formed using logical connectives are called **compound propositions**

# Truth Table

---

p	q	$\neg p$	$p \wedge q$	$p \vee q$
T	T	F	T	T
T	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	F	T
F	F	T	F	F

**Example:** Construct a truth table for  $(p \vee q) \vee (\neg r)$

# Summary

---

- Propositional Logic
- Propositional Variables
- Basic Logical Connectives
- Truth Table



# **Session : Basic Logic**

## **2: Conditional and Biconditional Statements**

---

# Conditional Statements

---

- The conditional statement  $p \rightarrow q$  is the proposition “if  $p$ , then  $q$ .”
- The conditional statement  $p \rightarrow q$  is false when  $p$  is true and  $q$  is false, and true otherwise.
- The statement  $p \rightarrow q$  is called a conditional statement because it asserts that  $q$  is true on the condition that  $p$  holds.
- A conditional statement has two parts, a **hypothesis** and a **conclusion**.
- The part after the “if” is the hypothesis, and the part after the “then” is the conclusion
- A conditional statement is also called an **implication**.

# Expressing Conditional Statements

---

“if  $p$ , then  $q$ ”

“ $p$  implies  $q$ ”

“if  $p$ ,  $q$ ”

“ $p$  only if  $q$ ”

“ $p$  is sufficient for  $q$ ”

“a sufficient condition for  $q$  is  $p$ ”

“ $q$  if  $p$ ”

“ $q$  whenever  $p$ ”

“ $q$  when  $p$ ”

“ $q$  is necessary for  $p$ ”

“a necessary condition for  $p$  is  $q$ ”

“ $q$  follows from  $p$ ”

“ $q$  unless  $\neg p$ ”

# Converse, Inverse and Contrapositive

---

## □ Converse

- The converse of a conditional is formed by switching the hypothesis and the conclusion.
- The converse of  $p \rightarrow q$  is  $q \rightarrow p$

## □ Contrapositive

- Negate the hypothesis and the conclusion of the converse
- The contrapositive of  $p \rightarrow q$ , is  $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ .

## □ Inverse

- Negate the hypothesis and the conclusion
- The inverse of  $p \rightarrow q$ , is  $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$

# Example

---

- Conditional statement is “If it rained last night, then the sidewalk is wet.”
- The converse of the conditional statement is  
“If the sidewalk is wet, then it rained last night.”
- The contrapositive of the conditional statement is  
“If the sidewalk is not wet, then it did not rain last night.”
- The inverse of the conditional statement is  
“If it did not rain last night, then the sidewalk is not wet.”

# Biconditional Statement

---

- The biconditional statement  $p \leftrightarrow q$  is the proposition “p if and only if q.”
- The biconditional statement  $p \leftrightarrow q$  is true when p and q have the same truth values, and is false otherwise.
- Biconditional statements are also called bi-implications.

# Truth Table

---

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$	$p \leftrightarrow q$
T	T	T	T
T	F	F	F
F	T	T	F
F	F	T	T

Example: Construct a truth table for the formula  $\neg p \wedge (p \rightarrow q)$



# Summary

---

- Conditional Statement
- Converse, Inverse and Contrapositive
- Biconditional Statement

# Session : Basic Logic

## 3: Practice on Propositional Logic

---

# Operator Precedence

---

□ How do we parse this statement?

$$\neg x \rightarrow y \vee z \rightarrow x \vee y \wedge z$$

□ Operator precedence for propositional logic:

$\neg$

$\wedge$

$\vee$

$\rightarrow$

$\leftrightarrow$

**Above expression is same as:**

$$(\neg x) \rightarrow ((y \vee z) \rightarrow (x \vee (y \wedge z)))$$

# Example 1

---

□ Construct Truth Table of  $(p \vee \neg q) \rightarrow (p \wedge q)$ .

# Translating into Propositional Logic

---

General rule for translation:

- Step 1 find logical connectives
- Step 2 break the sentence into elementary propositions
- Step 3 rewrite the sentence in propositional logic

# Example 2

---

- If you are older than 18 or you are with your parents then you can drive a two-wheeler.
- Atomic (elementary) propositions:
  - a= you are older than 18
  - b= you are with your parents
  - c=you can drive a two-wheeler
- Translation:  $a \vee b \rightarrow c$

# Example 3

---

- You can have free coffee if you are senior citizen and it is a Tuesday
- Atomic (elementary) propositions:
  - a= You can have free coffee
  - b= you are senior citizen
  - c= it is a Tuesday
- Translation:  $b \wedge c \rightarrow a$

# Example 4

---

□ Consider following propositional variables:

a: I will get up early this morning

b: There is a lunar eclipse this morning

c: There are no clouds in the sky this morning

d: I will see the lunar eclipse

□ Convert the following sentence in to propositional form:

“I won’t see the lunar eclipse if I don’t get up early this morning”

**Translation:  $\neg a \rightarrow \neg d$**



# Example 5

---

□ Consider following propositional variables:

a: I will get up early this morning

b: There is a lunar eclipse this morning

c: There are no clouds in the sky this morning

d: I will see the lunar eclipse

□ Convert the following sentence in to propositional form:

“If I get up early this morning, but it's cloudy outside, I won't see the lunar eclipse.

**Translation:**  $a \wedge \neg c \rightarrow \neg d$

# Example 6

---

Let us use the following propositions:

a: It is raining.

b: I will go to college.

c: The computers are broken.

d: I have a headache.

Expression	English meaning
$a \wedge d$	It is raining and I have a headache.
$c \rightarrow \neg b$	If the computers are broken then I will not go to college.
$a \vee d \rightarrow \neg b$	If it is raining or I have a headache then I will not go to college.

# Session : Basic Logic

## 4:Propositional Equivalences

---

# Tautology and Contradiction

---

- Some propositions are interesting since their values in the truth table are always the same
- A compound proposition that is always true for all possible truth values of the propositions is called a **tautology**.
- A compound proposition that is always false is called a **contradiction**.
- A proposition that is neither a tautology nor contradiction is called a **contingency**.
- Example:  $p \vee \neg p$  is a tautology

# Example

---

Show that the statement  $(p \vee q) \wedge [(\neg p) \wedge (\neg q)]$  is contradiction

# Logical equivalence

---

- Two propositions  $p$  and  $q$  are logically equivalent if their truth tables are the same.
- Also,  $p$  and  $q$  are logically equivalent if  $p \leftrightarrow q$  is a tautology.
- If  $p$  and  $q$  are logically equivalent, we write  $p \equiv q$ .

# Example

---

Look at the these two compound propositions:  $p \rightarrow q$  and  $q \vee \neg p$

Equivalence	Name
$p \wedge T \equiv p, \quad p \vee F \equiv p$	Identity laws
$p \vee T \equiv T, \quad p \wedge F \equiv F$	Domination laws
$p \vee p \equiv p, \quad p \wedge p \equiv p$	Idempotent laws
$\neg(\neg p) \equiv p$	Double negation law
$p \vee q \equiv q \vee p$ $p \wedge q \equiv q \wedge p$	Commutative laws
$(p \vee q) \vee r \equiv p \vee (q \vee r)$ $(p \wedge q) \wedge r \equiv p \wedge (q \wedge r)$	Associative laws
$p \vee (q \wedge r) \equiv (p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$ $p \wedge (q \vee r) \equiv (p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r)$	Distributive laws
$\neg(p \vee q) \equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q$ $\neg(p \wedge q) \equiv \neg p \vee \neg q$	De Morgan's laws
$p \vee (p \wedge q) \equiv p$ $p \wedge (p \vee q) \equiv p$	Absorption laws
$p \vee \neg p \equiv T, \quad p \wedge \neg p \equiv F$	Negation laws



# Example

---

□ Prove  $\neg(p \vee (\neg p \wedge q)) \equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q$

$$\neg(p \vee (\neg p \wedge q)) \equiv \neg p \wedge \neg(\neg p \wedge q) \quad \text{DeMorgan}$$

$$\equiv \neg p \wedge (p \vee \neg q) \quad \text{DeMorgan}$$

$$\equiv (\neg p \wedge p) \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q) \quad \text{Distributivity}$$

$$\equiv F \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q) \quad \text{Because } \neg p \wedge p \equiv F$$

$$\equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q \quad \text{Because } F \vee r \equiv r \text{ for any } r$$

# Example

---

Use the logical equivalences to show that  $\neg(p \vee \neg(p \wedge q))$  is a contradiction.

$$\neg(p \vee \neg(p \wedge q))$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \neg p \wedge \neg(\neg(p \wedge q)) \quad \text{De Morgan's Law}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \neg p \wedge (p \wedge q) \quad \text{Double Negation Law}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\neg p \wedge p) \wedge q \quad \text{Associative Law}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow F \wedge q \quad \text{Contradiction}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow q \wedge F \quad \text{Commutative Law}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow F \quad \text{Domination Law}$$

# **Session : Basic Logic**

## **5:Normal Forms**

---

# Normal Forms

---

- We can convert any proposition into two normal forms –
  1. Disjunctive normal form
  2. Conjunctive normal form

# Disjunctive normal form(DNF)

---

- Every compound proposition in the propositional variables  $p, q, r, \dots$ , is uniquely equivalent to a proposition that is formed by taking the disjunction of conjunctions of some combination of that variables or their negations.
- This is called the disjunctive normal form of a proposition.

## □ Example

$$(A \wedge B) \vee (A \wedge C) \vee (B \wedge C \wedge D)$$

- The individual conjunctions that make up the disjunctive normal form are called minterms.

# Method to construct DNF

---

- Construct a truth table for the proposition.
- Use the rows of the truth table where the proposition is True to construct minterms
  - If the variable is true, use the propositional variable in the minterm
  - If a variable is false, use the negation of the variable in the minterm
- Connect the minterms with  $\vee$ 's(OR's).

# Example

---

Find the disjunctive normal form for the proposition  $p \rightarrow q$

<b>p</b>	<b>q</b>	<b><math>p \rightarrow q</math></b>
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

- $p \rightarrow q$  is true when either
1.  $p$  is true and  $q$  is true,
  2. or  $p$  is false and  $q$  is true,
  3. or  $p$  is false and  $q$  is false.

The disjunctive normal form is then  $(p \wedge q) \vee (\neg p \wedge q) \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q)$

# Conjunctive normal form(CNF)

---

□ Conjunctive normal form of a proposition is the equivalent form that consists of a “conjunction of disjunctions.”

□ Example

$$(A \vee B) \wedge (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee C \vee D)$$

□ If we want to get the conjunctive normal form of a proposition, construct the disjunctive normal form of its negation and then negate again and apply De Morgan's Laws.



**Example:** Find the conjunctive normal form of the proposition  $(p \wedge \neg q) \vee r$ .

**Solution:**

(1) Negate:  $\neg[(p \wedge \neg q) \vee r] \Leftrightarrow (\neg p \vee q) \wedge \neg r$ .

(2) Find the disjunctive normal form of  $(\neg p \vee q) \wedge \neg r$ :

p	q	r	$\neg p$	$\neg r$	$(\neg p \vee q)$	$(\neg p \vee q) \wedge \neg r$
T	T	T	F	F	T	F
T	T	F	F	T	T	T
T	F	T	F	F	F	F
T	F	F	F	T	F	F
F	T	T	T	F	T	F
F	T	F	T	T	T	T
F	F	T	T	F	T	F
F	F	F	T	T	T	T

The disjunctive normal form for  $(\neg p \vee q) \wedge \neg r$  is

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

The conjunctive normal form for  $(p \wedge \neg q) \vee r$  is then the negation of this last expression, which, by De Morgan's Laws, is

$$(\neg p \vee \neg q \vee r) \wedge (p \vee \neg q \vee r) \wedge (p \vee q \vee r).$$

# Well Formed Formula

---

- Any expression that obeys the syntactic rules of propositional logic is called a *well-formed formula*, or *WFF*
- The well-formed formulas of propositional logic are obtained by using the construction rules below:
  - An atomic proposition  $p$  is a well-formed formula.
  - If  $p$  is a well-formed formula, then so is  $\neg p$ .
  - If  $p$  and  $q$  are well-formed formulas, then so are  $p \vee q$ ,  $p \wedge q$ , and  $p \rightarrow q$ .

# **Session : Basic Logic**

## **6:Propositional Inference Rules**

---

# Argument

---

- In mathematics, an argument is a sequence of propositions (called premises) followed by a proposition (called conclusion)
- A valid argument is one that, if all its premises are true, then the conclusion is true
- Ex: “If it rains, I drive to school.”  
    “it rains.”  
     $\therefore$  “I drive to school.”
- Rules of inference are templates for building valid arguments

# Valid Argument Form

---

□ In the previous example, the argument belongs to the following form:

$p \rightarrow q$

$p$

$\therefore q$

□ Indeed, the above form is valid no matter what propositions are substituted to the variables

□ This is called a valid argument form

□ By definition, if a valid argument form consists

– premises:  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k$

– conclusion:  $q$

then  $(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_k) \rightarrow q$  is a tautology

# Rules of Inference

---

1. Modus Ponens (method of affirming) or law of detachment

premises:  $p, p \rightarrow q$

conclusion:  $q$

**Corresponding Tautology:**  $(p \wedge (p \rightarrow q)) \rightarrow q$

2. Modus Tollens (method of denying)

premises:  $\neg q, p \rightarrow q$

conclusion:  $\neg p$

**Corresponding Tautology:**  $(\neg q \wedge (p \rightarrow q)) \rightarrow \neg p$

# Rules of Inference

---

## 3. Hypothetical Syllogism

premises:  $p \rightarrow q, q \rightarrow r$

conclusion:  $p \rightarrow r$

**Corresponding Tautology:**  $((p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r)$

## 4. Disjunctive Syllogism

premises:  $\neg p, p \vee q$

conclusion:  $q$

**Corresponding Tautology:**  $((p \vee q) \wedge \neg p) \rightarrow q$

# Rules of Inference

---

## 5. Addition

premise:  $p$

conclusion:  $p \vee q$

**Corresponding Tautology:**  $p \rightarrow (p \vee q)$

## 6. Simplification

premise:  $p \wedge q$

conclusion:  $p$

**Corresponding Tautology:**  $(p \wedge q) \rightarrow p$



# Rules of Inference

---

## 7. Conjunction

premises:  $p, q$

conclusion:  $p \wedge q$

**Corresponding Tautology:**  $((p) \wedge (q)) \rightarrow (p \wedge q)$

## 8. Resolution

premises:  $p \vee q, \neg p \vee r$

conclusion:  $q \vee r$

**Corresponding Tautology:**  $((p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p \vee r)) \rightarrow (q \vee r)$

# Rules of Inference

---

## 9. Constructive Dilemma

premises:  $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (r \rightarrow s)$   
 $(p \vee r)$

conclusion:  $(q \vee s)$

**Corresponding Tautology:**  $((p \rightarrow q) \wedge (r \rightarrow s)) \wedge (p \vee r) \rightarrow (q \vee s)$

## 10. Destructive Dilemma

premises:  $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (r \rightarrow s)$   
 $(\neg q \vee \neg s)$

conclusion:  $(\neg p \vee \neg r)$

**Corresponding Tautology:**  $((p \rightarrow q) \wedge (r \rightarrow s)) \wedge (\neg q \vee \neg s) \rightarrow (\neg p \vee \neg r)$

# Example 1

---

□ State which rule of inference is the basis of the following argument.

**“It is below freezing now Therefore, it is either below freezing or raining now.”**

**Solution:**

Let P: It is below freezing now.

Q: It is raining now.

premise: p

conclusion:  $p \vee q$

This is an argument that uses the addition rule.

# Example 2

---

□ State which rule of inference is the basis of the following argument.

**“It is below freezing and raining now. Therefore, it is raining now.”**

**Solution:**

Let P: It is below freezing now.

Q: It is raining now.

premise:  $p \wedge q$

conclusion:  $p$

This is an argument that uses the Simplification rule.

# Example 3

---

□ State which rule of inference is the basis of the following argument.

**“if it rains today, then we will not have a barbecue today.**

**If we do not have a barbecue today, then we will have a barbecue tomorrow.**

**Therefore if it rains today, then we will have a barbecue tomorrow.”**

**Solution:**

Let P: It is raining today.

Q: we will not have a barbecue today.

R: we will have a barbecue tomorrow.

premises:  $p \rightarrow q, q \rightarrow r$

conclusion:  $p \rightarrow r$

This is an argument that uses the Hypothetical Syllogism rule.

# Example 4

---

□ It is known that

1. It is not sunny this afternoon, and it is colder than yesterday.
2. We will go swimming only if it is sunny.
3. If we do not go swimming, we will play basketball.
4. If we play basketball, we will go home early.

□ Can you conclude “we will go home early”?

# Solution

□ To simplify the discussion, let  
p := It is sunny this afternoon  
q := It is colder than yesterday  
r := We will go swimming  
s := We will play basketball  
t := We will go home early

□ We will give a valid argument with  
premises:  $\neg p \wedge q$ ,  $r \rightarrow p$ ,  $\neg r \rightarrow s$ ,  $s \rightarrow t$   
conclusion: t

Premises:

- A. It is not sunny this afternoon, and it is colder than yesterday.
- B. We will go swimming only if it is sunny.
- C. If we do not go swimming, we will play basketball.
- D. If we play basketball, we will go home early.

Step	Reason
1. $\neg p \wedge q$	Premise A
2. $\neg p$	Simplification using (1)
3. $r \rightarrow p$	Premise B
4. $\neg r$	Modus Tollens using (2) and (3)
5. $\neg r \rightarrow s$	Premise C
6. s	Modus Ponens using (4) and (5)
7. $s \rightarrow t$	Premise D
8. t	Modus Ponens using (6) and (7)

# Example 5

---

□ Show that the premises

1. If you send me an email message, then I will finish writing the program.
2. If you do not send me an email message, then I will go to sleep early.
3. If I go to sleep early, then I will wake up feeling refreshed.

Leads to the conclusion

I do not finish writing the program, then I will wake up feeling refreshed.



Step	Reason
1. $p \rightarrow q$	Premise
2. $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$	Contrapositive
3. $\neg p \rightarrow r$	Premise
4. $\neg q \rightarrow r$	Hypothetical Syllogism
5. $r \rightarrow s$	Premise
6. $\neg q \rightarrow s$	Hypothetical Syllogism

# Session : Basic Logic

## 7: Predicate Logic

---

# Limitation of Propositional Logic

---

- Every COE student must study discrete mathematics
- Deepak is a COE student
  - So Deepak must study discrete mathematics

This idea can't be expressed with propositional logic
- What propositional logic allows to express:
  - If Deepak is a COE student he must study discrete mathematics
  - Deepak is a COE student
- So Deepak must study discrete mathematics

# Predicate

---

- A predicate is a statement that contains variables (predicate variables) and that may be true or false depending on the values of these variables.

Example:  $P(x) = "x^2 \text{ is greater than } x"$  is a predicate

- The domain of a predicate variable is the collection of all possible values that the variable may take.

e.g. the domain of  $x$  in  $P(x)$ : integer

- Predicate logic is an extension of Propositional logic.
- It adds the concept of predicates and quantifiers to better capture the meaning of statements that cannot be adequately expressed by propositional logic.

# Example

---

□ Let  $P(x, y) = "x > y"$ .

Domain: integers, i.e. both  $x$  and  $y$  are integers.

□  $P(4, 3)$  means " $4 > 3$ ", so  $P(4, 3)$  is TRUE;

□  $P(1, 2)$  means " $1 > 2$ ", so  $P(1, 2)$  is FALSE;

□  $P(3, 4)$  is false (in general,  $P(x, y)$  and  $P(y, x)$  not equal).

# Quantifiers

---

- The variable of predicates is quantified by quantifiers.
- There are two types of quantifier in predicate logic –
  1. Universal Quantifier
  2. Existential Quantifier.

# Universal Quantifiers

---

- Universal quantifier states that the statement within its scope is true for every value of the specific variable.
- It is denoted by the symbol  $\forall$ .
- $\forall x P(x)$  is read as for every value of  $x$ ,  $P(x)$  is true.
- Example: Let  $P(x)$  denote  $x > x - 1$ .

What is the truth value of  $\forall x P(x)$  ?

Assume the universe of discourse of  $x$  is all real numbers.

Answer: Since every number  $x$  is greater than itself minus 1.

Therefore,  $\forall x P(x)$  is true

# Existential quantifier

---

- Existential quantifier states that the statement within its scope is true for some values of the specific variable.
- It is denoted by the symbol  $\exists$ .
- $\exists x P(x)$  is read as for some values of  $x$ ,  $P(x)$  is true.
- Example Let  $T(x)$  denote  $x > 5$  and  $x$  is from Real numbers.
- What is the truth value of  $\exists x T(x)$ ?
  - Answer: Since  $10 > 5$  is true.
  - Therefore, it is true that  $\exists x T(x)$ .



# Nested Quantification

---

- A proposition can have multiple quantifier
  - “All rabbits are faster than all tortoises.”
  - Domains:  $R=\{\text{rabbits}\}$ ,  $T=\{\text{tortoises}\}$
  - Predicate  $C(x, y)$ : Rabbit  $x$  is faster than tortoise  $y$
- In symbols
$$\forall x \in R, \forall y \in T, C(x,y)$$
- In words
  - For any rabbit  $x$ , and for any tortoise  $y$ ,  $x$  is faster than  $y$ .

# Truth Value of Quantified Statements

---

Statement	When True	When False
$\forall x \in D, P(x)$	$P(x)$ is true for every $x$ .	There is one $x$ for which $P(x)$ is false.
$\exists x \in D, P(x)$	There is at least one $x$ for which $P(x)$ is true.	$P(x)$ is false for every $x$ .

# Negation of Quantification

---

□ Negation of a universal quantification becomes an existential quantification.

$$\neg (\forall x \in D, P(x)) \equiv \exists x \in D, \neg P(x)$$

□ Example:

Not all students study hard  $\equiv$  There is at least one student who do not study hard

□ Negation of an existential quantification becomes an universal quantification.

$$\neg (\exists x \in D, P(x)) \equiv \forall x \in D, \neg P(x)$$

□ Example:

It is not the case that some students in this class are from Jaipur  $\equiv$  All students in this class are not from Jaipur

# Contd..

---

$$\square \neg (\forall x \in D, P(x) \wedge Q(x))$$

$$\equiv \exists x \in D, \neg(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \quad (\text{Negation of Quantification})$$

$$\equiv \exists x \in D, (\neg P(x) \vee \neg Q(x)) \quad (\text{DeMorgan Law})$$

$\square$  Example: Not all students in this class are using Facebook and (also) Google+

There is some (at least one) student in this class who is not using Facebook or not using Google+ (or may be using neither)

# Summary of Session

---

- Propositional Logic
- Logical Connectives
- Truth tables
- Logical Equivalences
- Normal Forms
- Propositional inference rules
- Predicate Logic