

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

(c) find a prop C such that $C \rightarrow X$

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

$$p = T$$

$$q = T$$

$$r = F$$

$$p \wedge X \rightarrow X$$

Let C be the prop $p \wedge \neg q \wedge r$

$$(p \wedge \neg q \wedge r) \rightarrow X$$

$$(r \wedge p) \rightarrow X$$

$$(p \wedge \neg q) \rightarrow X$$

~~(p ∧ q)~~

$x \rightarrow ?$

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

$$x \rightarrow (p \wedge q)$$

$$x \rightarrow p$$

$$f \rightarrow x$$

$$A \rightarrow B$$

if $A=1$ then $B=1$

p	q	r	$p \wedge q$	$\neg p \wedge q$	x
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	0
0	1	1	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	0	1
1	0	1	1	0	1
1	1	0	1	0	1
1	1	1	1	0	1

≡
≡
≡
≡

—

A
B
C

D

If A, B & C are all true, then D is true.

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

Different notation:

$$A, B, C \Rightarrow D$$

Prove: ~~$p \rightarrow r$~~ , $q \rightarrow \neg r$, $p \rightarrow q$, $r \Rightarrow \neg p$

$q \rightarrow \neg r$

$p \rightarrow q$

$\frac{r}{\neg p}$

Proof:

1. $p \rightarrow q$ Hypothesis
2. $q \rightarrow \neg r$ Hypothesis
3. $p \rightarrow \neg r$ Chain rule, 1. & 2.

4. r Hypothesis
5. $\neg p$ Indirect Reasoning, 3 & 4

QED

-
- 4. r Hypothesis
 5. $r \rightarrow \neg p$ Contrapositive 3.
 6. $\neg p$ Direct Reasoning, 4 & 5
- QED

proof: $p \rightarrow q$

$q \rightarrow r$

$p \wedge t$

 t

proof:

1. $p \rightarrow q$

Hypothesis

2. $q \rightarrow r$

Hypothesis

3. $p \rightarrow r$

Chain rule, 1. 2.

4. $p \wedge t$

Hypothesis

5. p

Conjunctive Simplification, 4.

6. t

Detachment, 3. & 5.

Q.E.D

↑

or Direct Reasoning

or Modus Ponens

proof: $p \rightarrow q$

$q \rightarrow r$

$p \wedge t$

 t

proof:

1. $p \rightarrow q$

Hypothesis

2. $q \rightarrow r$

Hypothesis

3. $p \rightarrow r$

Chain rule, 1. 2.

4. $p \wedge t$

Hypothesis

5. p

Conjunctive Simplification, 4.

6. t

Detachment, 3. & 5.

↑

or Direct Reasoning

or Modus Ponens

Q.E.D

If you send me an email, then I'll finish my HW.

If you don't send me an email, then I'll go to sleep early.

If I go to sleep early, then I'll wake up happy.

Therefore, if I don't finish my HW, I'll wake up happy.

Is this a valid theorem?

Let E be the prop "you send me an email"

Let W be the prop "I'll finish my homework"

Let S be the prop "I go to sleep early"

Let H be the prop "I wake up happy"

Prove: $E \rightarrow W$

$\neg E \rightarrow S$

$S \rightarrow H$

$\neg W \rightarrow H$

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{Prove: } E \rightarrow W \\
 \neg E \rightarrow S \\
 S \rightarrow H \\
 \hline
 \neg W \rightarrow H
 \end{array}$$

Proof:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. $\neg E \rightarrow S$ | Hyp. |
| 2. $S \rightarrow H$ | Hyp. |
| 3. $\neg E \rightarrow H$ | Chain rule, 1 & 2 |
| 4. $E \rightarrow W$ | Hyp |
| 5. $\neg W \rightarrow \neg E$ | Contrapositive, 4. |
| 6. $\neg W \rightarrow H$ | Chain rule, 5. 3 |
| QED | |

Indirect Proof

Want to prove $A \wedge B \wedge C \Rightarrow D$

Assume $\neg D$ and show that this leads to a contradiction.

Then we can say "therefore, D"

ex: prove $a \rightarrow b$

$$\frac{\neg(b \vee c)}{\neg a}$$

proof:

- | | | |
|----|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. | a | Negation of conclusion |
| 2. | $a \rightarrow b$ | Hypothesis |
| 3. | b | Direct Reasoning, 1. 2. |
| 4. | $\neg(b \vee c)$ | Hyp. |
| 5. | $(\neg b) \wedge (\neg c)$ | DeMorgan's DeMorgan's, 4. |
| 6. | $\neg b$ | Conj. Simpl. 5. |

~~///~~
← "contradiction"

3. 6.

Then we can say "therefore, D"

ex: prove $a \rightarrow b$
 $\frac{\neg(b \vee c)}{\neg a}$

proof:

- | | | |
|----|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. | a | Negation of conclusion |
| 2. | $a \rightarrow b$ | Hypothesis |
| 3. | b | Direct Reasoning, 1. 2. |
| 4. | $\neg(b \vee c)$ | Hyp. |
| 5. | $(\neg b) \wedge (\neg c)$ | DeMorgan's DeMorgan's, 4. |
| 6. | $\neg b$ | Conj. Simpl. 5. |
- #
← "contradiction"

Therefore, $\neg a$
QED

$\therefore \neg a$
↑
"therefore"

A
B
C
—
D

$\neg D$

A

B

C

—
—
—

F

$\neg D \rightarrow F$
 $T \rightarrow D$

Therefore, $\neg a$ \dots $\neg a$
QED \uparrow
"therefore"

~~$P \rightarrow Q$~~

$$\begin{array}{l} P \rightarrow Q \\ P \\ \hline Q \end{array}$$

Direct Reasoning

$$\begin{array}{l} P \rightarrow Q \\ \neg Q \\ \hline \neg P \end{array}$$

Indirect Reasoning

$$\begin{array}{l} P \rightarrow Q \\ Q \\ \hline P \end{array}$$

fallacy of affirming
the conclusion.

$$\begin{array}{l} P \rightarrow Q \\ \neg P \\ \hline \neg Q \end{array}$$

fallacy of denying
the hypothesis

NOTE: This is not an inductive proof:

prove

A
B
<hr/> C
D

proof:

$\neg D$
A
B
C

D

///

Def: an int n is even if $n=2k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$

n is odd if $n=2k+1$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$

Prove: If n is even, so is $3n+6$

- Proof: 1. n is even Hypothesis
2. $n=2k, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ Definition of "even"
3. $3n+6=3(2k)+6$ Subs, 2.
4. $3n+6=6k+6$
 $=2(3k+3)$ Algebra 3.
5. $3k+3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ Closure of integers, 2.
6. $3n+6$ is even 4, 5, Def. of "even"
- QED