

# Unit – I

## Mathematical Logic

### INTRODUCTION

**Proposition:** A **proposition** or **statement** is a declarative sentence which is either true or false but not both. The truth or falsity of a proposition is called its **truth-value**.

These two values ‘true’ and ‘false’ are denoted by the symbols  $T$  and  $F$  respectively. Sometimes these are also denoted by the symbols 1 and 0 respectively.

**Example 1:** Consider the following sentences:

1. Delhi is the capital of India.
2. Kolkata is a country.
3. 5 is a prime number.
4.  $2 + 3 = 4$ .

These are propositions (or statements) because they are either true or false.

Next consider the following sentences:

5. How beautiful are you?
6. Wish you a happy new year
7.  $x + y = z$
8. Take one book.

These are not propositions as they are not declarative in nature, that is, they do not declare a definite truth value  $T$  or  $F$ .

**Propositional Calculus** is also known as **statement calculus**. It is the branch of mathematics that is used to describe a logical system or structure. A logical system consists of (1) a universe of propositions, (2) truth tables (as axioms) for the logical operators and (3) definitions that explain equivalence and implication of propositions.

### Connectives

The words or phrases or symbols which are used to make a proposition by two or more propositions are called **logical connectives** or **simply connectives**. There are five basic connectives called negation, conjunction, disjunction, conditional and biconditional.

### Negation

The **negation** of a statement is generally formed by writing the word ‘not’ at a proper place in the statement (proposition) or by prefixing the statement with the phrase ‘It is not the case that’. If  $p$  denotes a statement then the negation of  $p$  is written as  $\neg p$  and read as ‘not  $p$ ’. If the truth value of  $p$  is  $T$  then the truth value of  $\neg p$  is  $F$ . Also if the truth value of  $p$  is  $F$  then the truth value of  $\neg p$  is  $T$ .

**Table 1.** Truth table for negation

$p$	$\neg p$
T	F
F	T

**Example 2:** Consider the statement  $p$ : Kolkata is a city. Then  $\neg p$ : Kolkata is not a city.

Although the two statements ‘Kolkata is not a city’ and ‘It is not the case that Kolkata is a city’ are not identical, we have translated both of them by  $p$ . The reason is that both these statements have the same meaning.

### Conjunction

The **conjunction** of two statements (or propositions)  $p$  and  $q$  is the statement  $p \wedge q$  which is read as ‘ $p$  and  $q$ ’. The statement  $p \wedge q$  has the truth value  $T$  whenever both  $p$  and  $q$  have the truth value  $T$ . Otherwise it has truth value  $F$ .

**Table 2.** Truth table for conjunction

$p$	$q$	$p \wedge q$
$T$	$T$	$T$
$T$	$F$	$F$
$F$	$T$	$F$
$F$	$F$	$F$

**Example 3:** Consider the following statements  $p$  : It is raining today.

$q$  : There are 10 chairs in the room.

Then  $p \wedge q$  : It is raining today and there are 10 chairs in the room.

**Note:** Usually, in our everyday language the conjunction ‘and’ is used between two statements which have some kind of relation. Thus a statement ‘It is raining today and  $1 + 1 = 2$ ’ sounds odd, but in logic it is a perfectly acceptable statement formed from the statements ‘It is raining today’ and ‘ $1 + 1 = 2$ ’.

**Example 4:** Translate the following statement:

‘Jack and Jill went up the hill’ into symbolic form using conjunction.

**Solution:** Let  $p$  : Jack went up the hill,  $q$  : Jill went up the hill.

Then the given statement can be written in symbolic form as  $p \wedge q$ .

### Disjunction

The **disjunction** of two statements  $p$  and  $q$  is the statement  $p \vee q$  which is read as ‘ $p$  or  $q$ ’. The statement  $p \vee q$  has the truth value  $F$  only when both  $p$  and  $q$  have the truth value  $F$ . Otherwise it has truth value  $T$ .

**Table 3:** Truth table for disjunction

$p$	$q$	$p \vee q$
$T$	$T$	$T$
$T$	$F$	$T$
$F$	$T$	$T$
$F$	$F$	$F$

**Example 5:** Consider the following statements  $p$  : I shall go to the game.

$q$  : I shall watch the game on television.

Then  $p \vee q$  : I shall go to the game or watch the game on television.

### Conditional proposition

If  $p$  and  $q$  are any two statements (or propositions) then the statement  $p \rightarrow q$  which is read as, 'If  $p$ , then  $q$ ' is called a **conditional statement** (or **proposition**) or **implication** and the connective is the **conditional connective**.

The conditional is defined by the following table:

**Table 4.** Truth table for conditional

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

In this conditional statement,  $p$  is called the **hypothesis** or **premise** or **antecedent** and  $q$  is called the **consequence** or **conclusion**.

To understand better, this connective can be looked as a conditional promise. If the promise is violated (broken), the conditional (implication) is false. Otherwise it is true. For this reason, the only circumstances under which the conditional  $p \rightarrow q$  is false is when  $p$  is true and  $q$  is false.

**Example 6:** Translate the following statement:

*'The crop will be destroyed if there is a flood' into symbolic form using conditional connective.*

**Solution:** Let  $c$  : the crop will be destroyed;  $f$  : there is a flood.

Let us rewrite the given statement as

'If there is a flood, then the crop will be destroyed'. So, the symbolic form of the given statement is  $f \rightarrow c$ .

**Example 7:** Let  $p$  and  $q$  denote the statements:

$p$  : You drive over 70 km per hour.

$q$  : You get a speeding ticket.

Write the following statements into symbolic forms.

(i) You will get a speeding ticket if you drive over 70 km per hour.

(ii) Driving over 70 km per hour is sufficient for getting a speeding ticket.

(iii) If you do not drive over 70 km per hour then you will not get a speeding ticket.

(iv) Whenever you get a speeding ticket, you drive over 70 km per hour.

**Solution:** (i)  $p \rightarrow q$  (ii)  $p \rightarrow q$  (iii)  $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$  (iv)  $q \rightarrow p$ .

**Notes:** 1. In ordinary language, it is customary to assume some kind of relationship between the antecedent and the consequent in using the conditional. But in logic, the antecedent and the

consequent in a conditional statement are not required to refer to the same subject matter. For example, the statement ‘If I get sufficient money then I shall purchase a high-speed computer’ sounds reasonable. On the other hand, a statement such as ‘If I purchase a computer then this pen is red’ does not make sense in our conventional language. But according to the definition of conditional, this proposition is perfectly acceptable and has a truth-value which depends on the truth-values of the component statements.

2. Some of the alternative terminologies used to express  $p \rightarrow q$  (if  $p$ , then  $q$ ) are the following: (i)  $p$  implies  $q$

(ii)  $p$  only if  $q$  (‘If  $p$ , then  $q$ ’ formulation emphasizes the antecedent, whereas ‘ $p$  only if  $q$ ’ formulation emphasizes the consequent. The difference is only stylistic.)

(iii)  $q$  if  $p$ , or  $q$  when  $p$ .

(iv)  $q$  follows from  $p$ , or  $q$  whenever  $p$ .

(v)  $p$  is sufficient for  $q$ , or a sufficient condition for  $q$  is  $p$ . (vi)  $q$  is necessary for  $p$ , or a necessary condition for  $p$  is  $q$ . (vii)  $q$  is consequence of  $p$ .

### Converse, Inverse and Contrapositive

If  $P \rightarrow Q$  is a conditional statement, then

- (1).  $Q \rightarrow P$  is called its *converse*
- (2).  $\neg P \rightarrow \neg Q$  is called its *inverse*
- (3).  $\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$  is called its *contrapositive*.

Truth table for  $Q \rightarrow P$  (converse of  $P \rightarrow Q$ )

$P$	$Q$	$Q \rightarrow P$
T	T	T
T	F	T
F	T	F
F	F	T

Truth table for  $\neg P \rightarrow \neg Q$  (inverse of  $P \rightarrow Q$ )

$P$	$Q$	$\neg P$	$\neg Q$	$\neg P \rightarrow \neg Q$
T	T	F	F	T
T	F	F	T	T
F	T	T	F	F
F	F	T	T	T

Truth table for  $\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$  (contrapositive of  $P \rightarrow Q$ )

$P$	$Q$	$\neg Q$	$\neg P$	$\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$
T	T	F	F	T
T	F	T	F	F
F	T	F	T	T
F	F	T	T	T

**Example:** Consider the statement

$P$  : It rains.

$Q$ : The crop will grow.

The implication  $P \rightarrow Q$  states that

$R$ : If it rains then the crop will grow.

The converse of the implication  $P \rightarrow Q$ , namely  $Q \rightarrow P$  states that  $S$ : If the crop will grow then there has been rain.

The inverse of the implication  $P \rightarrow Q$ , namely  $\neg P \rightarrow \neg Q$  states that

$U$ : If it does not rain then the crop will not grow.

The contraposition of the implication  $P \rightarrow Q$ , namely  $\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$  states that  $T$  : If the crop do not grow then there has been no rain.

**Example 9:** Construct the truth table for  $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$

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

### Biconditional proposition

If  $p$  and  $q$  are any two statements (propositions), then the statement  $p \leftrightarrow q$  which is read as ‘ $p$  if and only if  $q$ ’ and abbreviated as ‘ $p$  iff  $q$ ’ is called a **biconditional statement** and the connective is the **biconditional connective**.

The truth table of  $p \leftrightarrow q$  is given by the following table:

**Table 6.** Truth table for biconditional

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

It may be noted that  $p \leftrightarrow q$  is true only when both  $p$  and  $q$  are true or when both  $p$  and  $q$  are false. Observe that  $p \leftrightarrow q$  is true when both the conditionals  $p \rightarrow q$  and  $q \rightarrow p$  are true, *i.e.*, the truth-values of  $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$ , given in Ex. 9, are identical to the truth-values of  $p \leftrightarrow q$  defined here.

**Note:** The notation  $p \leftrightarrow q$  is also used instead of  $p \leftrightarrow q$ .

## TAUTOLOGY AND CONTRADICTION

**Tautology:** A statement formula which is true regardless of the truth values of the statements which replace the variables in it is called a **universally valid formula** or a **logical truth** or a **tautology**.

**Contradiction:** A statement formula which is false regardless of the truth values of the statements which replace the variables in it is said to be a **contradiction**.

**Contingency:** A statement formula which is neither a tautology nor a contradiction is known as a **contingency**.

## Substitution Instance

A formula  $A$  is called a substitution instance of another formula  $B$  if  $A$  can be obtained from  $B$  by substituting formulas for some variables of  $B$ , with the condition that the same formula is substituted for the same variable each time it occurs.

Example: Let  $B : P \rightarrow (J \wedge P)$ .

Substitute  $R \leftrightarrow S$  for  $P$  in  $B$ , we get

$$(i): (R \leftrightarrow S) \rightarrow (J \wedge (R \leftrightarrow S))$$

Then  $A$  is a substitution instance of  $B$ .

Note that  $(R \leftrightarrow S) \rightarrow (J \wedge P)$  is not a substitution instance of  $B$  because the variables

$P$  in  $J \wedge P$  was not replaced by  $R \leftrightarrow S$ .

## Equivalence of Formulas

Two formulas  $A$  and  $B$  are said to be equivalent to each other if and only if  $A \leftrightarrow B$  is a tautology.

If  $A \leftrightarrow B$  is a tautology, we write  $A \Leftrightarrow B$  which is read as  $A$  is equivalent to  $B$ .

Note : 1.  $\Leftrightarrow$  is only a symbol, but not a connective.

2.  $A \leftrightarrow B$  is a tautology if and only if the truth tables of  $A$  and  $B$  are the same.

3. Equivalence relation is symmetric and transitive.

Method I. Truth Table Method: One method to determine whether any two statement formulas are equivalent is to construct their truth tables.

Example: Prove  $P \vee Q \Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$ .

Solution:

$P$	$Q$	$P \vee Q$	$\neg P$	$\neg Q$	$\neg P \wedge \neg Q$	$\neg(\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$	$(P \vee Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$
T	T	T	F	F	F	T	T
T	F	T	F	T	F	T	T
F	T	T	T	F	F	T	T
F	F	F	T	T	T	F	T

As  $P \vee Q \Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$  is a tautology, then  $P \vee Q \Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$ .

Example: Prove  $(P \rightarrow Q) \Leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee Q)$ .

Solution:

$P$	$Q$	$P \rightarrow Q$	$\neg P$	$\neg P \vee Q$	$(P \rightarrow Q) \Leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee Q)$
T	T	T	F	T	T
T	F	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	T	T	T
F	F	T	T	T	T

As  $(P \rightarrow Q) \Leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee Q)$  is a tautology, then  $(P \rightarrow Q) \Leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee Q)$ .

Equivalence Formulas:

1. Idempotent laws:

$$(a) P \vee P \Leftrightarrow P$$

$$(b) P \wedge P \Leftrightarrow P$$

2. Associative laws:

$$(a) (P \vee Q) \vee R \Leftrightarrow P \vee (Q \vee R)$$

$$(b) (P \wedge Q) \wedge R \Leftrightarrow P \wedge (Q \wedge R)$$

3. Commutative laws:

$$(a) P \vee Q \Leftrightarrow Q \vee P$$

$$(b) P \wedge Q \Leftrightarrow Q \wedge P$$

4. Distributive laws:

$$P \vee (Q \wedge R) \Leftrightarrow (P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R)$$

$$P \wedge (Q \vee R) \Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge R)$$

5. Identity laws:

$$(a) (i) P \vee F \Leftrightarrow P$$

$$(ii) P \vee T \Leftrightarrow T$$

$$(b) (i) P \wedge T \Leftrightarrow P$$

$$(ii) P \wedge F \Leftrightarrow F$$

6. Component laws:

$$(a) (i) P \vee \neg P \Leftrightarrow T$$

$$(ii) P \wedge \neg P \Leftrightarrow F$$

$$(b) (i) \neg \neg P \Leftrightarrow P$$

$$(ii) \neg T \Leftrightarrow F, \neg F \Leftrightarrow T$$

7. Absorption laws:

$$(a) P \vee (P \wedge Q) \Leftrightarrow P$$

$$(b) P \wedge (P \vee Q) \Leftrightarrow P$$

8. Demorgan's laws:

$$(a) \neg(P \vee Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \wedge \neg Q$$

$$(b) \neg(P \wedge Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee \neg Q$$

**Method II. Replacement Process:** Consider a formula  $A : P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow R)$ . The formula  $Q \rightarrow R$  is a part of the formula  $A$ . If we replace  $Q \rightarrow R$  by an equivalent formula  $\neg Q \vee R$  in  $A$ , we get another formula  $B : P \rightarrow (\neg Q \vee R)$ . One can easily verify that the formulas  $A$  and  $B$  are equivalent to each other. This process of obtaining  $B$  from  $A$  as the replacement process.

Example: Prove that  $P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow R) \Leftrightarrow P \rightarrow (\neg Q \vee R) \Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) \rightarrow R$ . (May. 2010)

Solution:  $P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow R) \Leftrightarrow P \rightarrow (\neg Q \vee R)$  [ $\because Q \rightarrow R \Leftrightarrow \neg Q \vee R$ ]

$$\Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee (\neg Q \vee R) \quad [ \because P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q ]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee \neg Q) \vee R \quad [\text{by Associative laws}]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \neg(P \wedge Q) \vee R \quad [\text{by De Morgan's laws}]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) \rightarrow R [ \because P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q ].$$

Example: Prove that  $(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (R \rightarrow Q) \Leftrightarrow (P \vee R) \rightarrow Q$ .

Solution:  $(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (R \rightarrow Q) \Leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge (\neg R \vee Q)$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\neg P \wedge \neg R) \vee Q \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\neg(P \vee R) \vee Q \Leftrightarrow P \vee$$

$$R \rightarrow Q$$

Example: Prove that  $P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow P) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \rightarrow (P \rightarrow Q)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Solution: } P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow P) &\Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee (Q \rightarrow P) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee (\neg Q \vee P) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee P) \vee \neg Q \\ &\Leftrightarrow T \vee \neg Q \\ &\Leftrightarrow T \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \neg P \rightarrow (P \rightarrow Q) &\Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg P) \vee (P \rightarrow Q) \\ &\Leftrightarrow P \vee (\neg P \vee Q) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (P \vee \neg P) \vee Q \\ &\Leftrightarrow T \vee Q \\ &\Leftrightarrow T \end{aligned}$$

So,  $P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow P) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \rightarrow (P \rightarrow Q)$ .

\*\*\*Example: Prove that  $(\neg P \wedge (\neg Q \wedge R)) \vee (Q \wedge R) \vee (P \wedge R) \Leftrightarrow R$ . (Nov. 2009)

Solution:

$$\begin{aligned} &(\neg P \wedge (\neg Q \wedge R)) \vee (Q \wedge R) \vee (P \wedge R) \\ &\Leftrightarrow ((\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \wedge R) \vee ((Q \vee P) \wedge R) \quad [\text{Associative and Distributive laws}] \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\neg(P \vee Q) \wedge R) \vee ((Q \vee P) \wedge R) \quad [\text{De Morgan's laws}] \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\neg(P \vee Q) \vee (P \vee Q)) \wedge R \quad [\text{Distributive laws}] \\ &\Leftrightarrow T \wedge R \quad [:\neg P \vee P \Leftrightarrow T] \\ &\Leftrightarrow R \end{aligned}$$

\*\*Example: Show  $((P \vee Q) \wedge \neg(\neg P \wedge (\neg Q \vee \neg R))) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg R)$  is tautology.

Solution: By De Morgan's laws, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \neg P \wedge \neg Q &\Leftrightarrow \neg(P \vee Q) \\ \neg P \vee \neg R &\Leftrightarrow \neg(P \wedge R) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg R) &\Leftrightarrow \neg(P \vee Q) \vee \neg(P \wedge R) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg((P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R)) \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} \neg(\neg P \wedge (\neg Q \vee \neg R)) &\Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg P \wedge \neg(Q \wedge R)) \\ &\Leftrightarrow P \vee (Q \wedge R) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hence } ((P \vee Q) \wedge \neg(\neg P \wedge (\neg Q \vee \neg R))) &\Leftrightarrow (P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Thus } ((P \vee Q) \wedge \neg(\neg P \wedge (\neg Q \vee \neg R))) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg R)$$



$$\Leftrightarrow [(P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R)] \vee \neg[(P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R)]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow T$$

Hence the given formula is a tautology.

Example: Show that  $(P \wedge Q) \rightarrow (P \vee Q)$  is a tautology. (Nov. 2009)

Solution:  $(P \wedge Q) \rightarrow (P \vee Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg(P \wedge Q) \vee (P \vee Q) [\because P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q]$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee \neg Q) \vee (P \vee Q) \quad [\text{by De Morgan's laws}]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee P) \vee (\neg Q \vee Q) \quad [\text{by Associative laws and commutative laws}]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (T \vee T) [\text{by negation laws}]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow T$$

Hence, the result.

Example: Write the negation of the following statements.

- Jan will take a job in industry or go to graduate school.
- James will bicycle or run tomorrow.
- If the processor is fast then the printer is slow.

Solution: (a). Let  $P$  : Jan will take a job in industry.

$Q$ : Jan will go to graduate school.

The given statement can be written in the symbolic as  $P \vee Q$ .

The negation of  $P \vee Q$  is given by  $\neg(P \vee Q)$ .

$$\neg(P \vee Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \wedge \neg Q.$$

$\neg P \wedge \neg Q$ : Jan will not take a job in industry and he will not go to graduate school.

(b). Let  $P$  : James will bicycle.

$Q$ : James will run tomorrow.

The given statement can be written in the symbolic as  $P \vee Q$ .

The negation of  $P \vee Q$  is given by  $\neg(P \vee Q)$ .

$$\neg(P \vee Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \wedge \neg Q.$$

$\neg P \wedge \neg Q$ : James will not bicycle and he will not run tomorrow.

(c). Let  $P$  : The processor is fast.

$Q$ : The printer is slow.

The given statement can be written in the symbolic as  $P \rightarrow Q$ .

The negation of  $P \rightarrow Q$  is given by  $\neg(P \rightarrow Q)$ .

$$\neg(P \rightarrow Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg P \vee Q) \Leftrightarrow P \wedge \neg Q.$$

$P \wedge \neg Q$ : The processor is fast and the printer is fast.

Example: Use Demorgans laws to write the negation of each statement.

- I want a car and worth a cycle.
- My cat stays outside or it makes a mess.
- I've fallen and I can't get up.
- You study or you don't get a good grade.

Solution: (a). I don't want a car or not worth a cycle.

(b). My cat not stays outside and it does not make a mess.

- (c). I have not fallen or I can get up.
- (d). You can not study and you get a good grade.

Exercises: 1. Write the negation of the following statements.

- (a). If it is raining, then the game is canceled.
- (b). If he studies then he will pass the examination.

Are  $(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow r$  and  $p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)$  logically equivalent? Justify your answer by using the rules of logic to simplify both expressions and also by using truth tables. Solution:  $(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow r$  and  $p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)$  are not logically equivalent because

Method I: Consider

$$\begin{aligned} (p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow r &\Leftrightarrow (\neg p \vee q) \rightarrow r \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg p \vee q) \vee r \Leftrightarrow \\ &(p \wedge \neg q) \vee r \\ &\Leftrightarrow (p \wedge r) \vee (\neg q \wedge r) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r) &\Leftrightarrow p \rightarrow (\neg q \vee r) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg p \vee (\neg q \vee r) \Leftrightarrow \\ &\neg p \vee \neg q \vee r. \end{aligned}$$

Method II: (Truth Table Method)

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

Here the truth values (columns) of  $(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow r$  and  $p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)$  are not identical.

Consider the statement: "If you study hard, then you will excel". Write its converse, contra positive and logical negation in logic.

## Duality Law

Two formulas  $A$  and  $A^*$  are said to be *duals* of each other if either one can be obtained from the other by replacing  $\wedge$  by  $\vee$  and  $\vee$  by  $\wedge$ . The connectives  $\vee$  and  $\wedge$  are called *duals* of each other. If the formula  $A$  contains the special variable  $T$  or  $F$ , then  $A^*$ , its dual is obtained by replacing  $T$  by  $F$  and  $F$  by  $T$  in addition to the above mentioned interchanges.

Example: Write the dual of the following formulas:

$$(i). (P \vee Q) \wedge R \quad (ii). (P \wedge Q) \vee T \quad (iii). (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \vee \neg(Q \wedge \neg S))$$

Solution: The duals of the formulas may be written as

$$(i). (P \wedge Q) \vee R \quad (ii). (P \vee Q) \wedge F \quad (iii). (P \vee Q) \wedge (P \wedge \neg(Q \vee \neg S))$$

Result 1: The negation of the formula is equivalent to its dual in which every variable is replaced by its negation.

We can prove

$$\neg A(P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n) \Leftrightarrow A^*(\neg P_1, \neg P_2, \dots, \neg P_n)$$

Example: Prove that (a).  $\neg(P \wedge Q) \rightarrow (\neg P \vee (\neg P \vee Q)) \Leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee Q)$

$$(b). (P \vee Q) \wedge (\neg P \wedge (\neg P \wedge Q)) \Leftrightarrow (\neg P \wedge Q)$$

Solution: (a).  $\neg(P \wedge Q) \rightarrow (\neg P \vee (\neg P \vee Q)) \Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \vee (\neg P \vee Q))$  [ $\because P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$ ]

$$\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \vee Q)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) \vee \neg P \vee Q$$

$$\Leftrightarrow ((P \wedge Q) \vee \neg P) \vee Q$$

$$\Leftrightarrow ((P \vee \neg P) \wedge (Q \vee \neg P)) \vee Q$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (T \wedge (Q \vee \neg P)) \vee Q$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (Q \vee \neg P) \vee Q$$

$$\Leftrightarrow Q \vee \neg P$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$$

(b). From (a)

$$(P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \vee (\neg P \vee Q)) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$$

Writing the dual

$$(P \vee Q) \wedge (\neg P \wedge (\neg P \wedge Q)) \Leftrightarrow (\neg P \wedge Q)$$

## Tautological Implications

A statement formula  $A$  is said to *tautologically imply* a statement  $B$  if and only if  $A \rightarrow B$  is a tautology.

In this case we write  $A \Rightarrow B$ , which is read as 'A implies B'.

Note:  $\Rightarrow$  is not a connective,  $A \Rightarrow B$  is not a statement formula.

$A \Rightarrow B$  states that  $A \rightarrow B$  is tautology.

Clearly  $A \Rightarrow B$  guarantees that  $B$  has a truth value  $T$  whenever  $A$  has the truth value  $T$ .

One can determine whether  $A \Rightarrow B$  by constructing the truth tables of  $A$  and  $B$  in the same manner as was done in the determination of  $A \Leftrightarrow B$ . Example: Prove that  $(P \rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow (\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P)$ .

Solution:

$P$	$Q$	$\neg P$	$\neg Q$	$P \rightarrow Q$	$\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$	$(P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow (\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P)$
T	T	F	F	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F	F	T
F	T	T	F	T	T	T
F	F	T	T	T	T	T

Since all the entries in the last column are true,  $(P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow (\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P)$  is a tautology.

Hence  $(P \rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow (\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P)$ .

In order to show any of the given implications, it is sufficient to show that an assignment of the truth value  $T$  to the antecedent of the corresponding condi-

tional leads to the truth value  $T$  for the consequent. This procedure guarantees that the conditional becomes tautology, thereby proving the implication.

Example: Prove that  $\neg Q \wedge (P \rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow \neg P$ .

Solution: Assume that the antecedent  $\neg Q \wedge (P \rightarrow Q)$  has the truth value  $T$ , then both  $\neg Q$  and  $P \rightarrow Q$  have the truth value  $T$ , which means that  $Q$  has the truth value  $F$ ,  $P \rightarrow Q$  has the truth value  $T$ . Hence  $P$  must have the truth value  $F$ .

Therefore the consequent  $\neg P$  must have the truth value  $T$ .

$$\neg Q \wedge (P \rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow \neg P.$$

Another method to show  $A \Rightarrow B$  is to assume that the consequent  $B$  has the truth value  $F$  and then show that this assumption leads to  $A$  having the truth value  $F$ . Then  $A \rightarrow B$  must have the truth value  $T$ .

Example: Show that  $\neg(P \rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow P$ .

Solution: Assume that  $P$  has the truth value  $F$ . When  $P$  has  $F$ ,  $P \rightarrow Q$  has  $T$ , then  $\neg(P \rightarrow Q)$  has  $F$ . Hence  $\neg(P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow P$  has  $T$ .

$$\neg(P \rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow P$$

## Other Connectives

We introduce the connectives NAND, NOR which have useful applications in the design of computers.

**NAND:** The word NAND is a combination of 'NOT' and 'AND' where 'NOT' stands for negation and 'AND' for the conjunction. It is denoted by the symbol  $\uparrow$ .

If  $P$  and  $Q$  are two formulas then

$$P \uparrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg(P \wedge Q)$$

The connective  $\uparrow$  has the following equivalence:

$$P \uparrow P \Leftrightarrow \neg(P \wedge P) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee \neg P \Leftrightarrow \neg P.$$

$$(P \uparrow Q) \uparrow (P \uparrow Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg(P \uparrow Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg(P \wedge Q)) \Leftrightarrow P \wedge Q.$$

$$(P \uparrow P) \uparrow (Q \uparrow Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \uparrow \neg Q \Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \Leftrightarrow P \vee Q.$$

NAND is Commutative: Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be any two statement formulas.

$$\begin{aligned} (P \uparrow Q) &\Leftrightarrow \neg(P \wedge Q) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg(Q \wedge P) \Leftrightarrow \\ &(Q \uparrow P) \end{aligned}$$

$\therefore$  NAND is commutative.

NAND is not Associative: Let  $P$ ,  $Q$  and  $R$  be any three statement formulas.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Consider } \uparrow(Q \uparrow R) &\Leftrightarrow \neg(P \wedge (Q \uparrow R)) \Leftrightarrow \neg(P \wedge (\neg(Q \wedge R))) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee (Q \wedge R) \\ (P \uparrow Q) \uparrow R &\Leftrightarrow \neg(P \wedge Q) \uparrow R \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg(P \wedge Q) \wedge R) \Leftrightarrow \\ &(P \wedge Q) \vee \neg R \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the connective  $\uparrow$  is not associative.

**NOR:** The word NOR is a combination of 'NOT' and 'OR' where 'NOT' stands for negation and 'OR' for the disjunction. It is denoted by the symbol  $\downarrow$ .

If  $P$  and  $Q$  are two formulas then

$$P \downarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg(P \vee Q)$$

The connective  $\downarrow$  has the following equivalence:

$$P \downarrow P \Leftrightarrow \neg(P \vee P) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \wedge \neg P \Leftrightarrow \neg P.$$

$$(P \downarrow Q) \downarrow (P \downarrow Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg(P \downarrow Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg(P \vee Q)) \Leftrightarrow P \vee Q.$$

$$(P \downarrow P) \downarrow (Q \downarrow Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \downarrow \neg Q \Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg P \vee \neg Q) \Leftrightarrow P \wedge Q.$$

NOR is Commutative: Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be any two statement formulas.

$$\begin{aligned} (P \downarrow Q) &\Leftrightarrow \neg(P \vee Q) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg(Q \vee P) \Leftrightarrow \\ &(Q \downarrow P) \end{aligned}$$

$\therefore$  NOR is commutative.

NOR is not Associative: Let  $P$ ,  $Q$  and  $R$  be any three statement formulas. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} P \downarrow (Q \downarrow R) &\Leftrightarrow \neg(P \vee (Q \downarrow R)) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg(P \vee (\neg(Q \vee R))) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg P \wedge (Q \vee R) \\ (P \downarrow Q) \downarrow R &\Leftrightarrow \neg(P \vee Q) \downarrow R \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg(P \vee Q) \vee R) \Leftrightarrow \\ &(P \vee Q) \wedge \neg R \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the connective  $\downarrow$  is not associative.

Evidently,  $P \uparrow Q$  and  $P \downarrow Q$  are duals of each other.  
Since

$$\neg(P \wedge Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee \neg Q$$

$$\neg(P \vee Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \wedge \neg Q.$$

Example: Express  $P \downarrow Q$  in terms of  $\uparrow$  only.

Solution:

$$\downarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg(P \vee Q)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (P \vee Q) \uparrow (P \vee Q)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow [(P \uparrow P) \uparrow (Q \uparrow Q)] \uparrow [(P \uparrow P) \uparrow (Q \uparrow Q)]$$

Example: Express  $P \uparrow Q$  in terms of  $\downarrow$  only. (May-2012)

Solution:

$$\uparrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg(P \wedge Q)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) \downarrow (P \wedge Q)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow [(P \downarrow P) \downarrow (Q \downarrow Q)] \downarrow [(P \downarrow P) \downarrow (Q \downarrow Q)]$$

## Truth Tables

Example: Show that  $(A \oplus B) \vee (A \downarrow B) \Leftrightarrow (A \uparrow B)$ . (May-2012)

Solution: We prove this by constructing truth table.

$A$	$B$	$A \oplus B$	$A \downarrow B$	$(A \oplus B) \vee (A \downarrow B)$	$A \uparrow B$
T	T	F	F	F	F
T	F	T	F	T	T
F	T	T	F	T	T
F	F	F	T	T	T

As columns  $(A \oplus B) \vee (A \downarrow B)$  and  $(A \uparrow B)$  are identical.

$$\therefore (A \oplus B) \vee (A \downarrow B) \Leftrightarrow (A \uparrow B).$$

## Normal Forms

If a given statement formula  $A(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$  involves  $n$  atomic variables, we have  $2^n$  possible combinations of truth values of statements replacing the variables.

The formula  $A$  is a tautology if  $A$  has the truth value  $T$  for all possible assignments of the truth values to the variables  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n$  and  $A$  is called a contradiction if  $A$  has the truth value  $F$  for all possible assignments of the truth values of the  $n$  variables.  $A$  is said to be *satisfiable* if  $A$  has the truth value  $T$  for atleast one combination of truth values assigned to  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n$ .

The problem of determining whether a given statement formula is a Tautology, or a Contradiction is called a decision problem.

The construction of truth table involves a finite number of steps, but the construction may not be practical. We therefore reduce the given statement formula to normal form and find whether a given statement formula is a Tautology or Contradiction or atleast satisfiable.

It will be convenient to use the word "product" in place of "conjunction" and "sum" in place of "disjunction" in our current discussion.

A product of the variables and their negations in a formula is called an *elementary product*. Similarly, a sum of the variables and their negations in a formula is called an *elementary sum*.

Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be any atomic variables. Then  $P$ ,  $\neg P \wedge Q$ ,  $\neg Q \wedge P$ ,  $\neg P$ ,  $P \wedge \neg P$ , and  $Q \wedge \neg P$  are some examples of elementary products. On the other hand,  $P$ ,  $\neg P \vee Q$ ,  $\neg Q \vee P$ ,  $\neg P$ ,  $P \vee \neg P$ , and  $Q \vee \neg P$  are some examples of elementary sums.

Any part of an elementary sum or product which is itself an elementary sum or product is called a *factor* of the original elementary sum or product. Thus  $\neg Q$ ,  $\neg P$ , and  $\neg Q \wedge P$  are some of the factors of  $\neg Q \wedge P \wedge \neg P$ .

## Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF)

A formula which is equivalent to a given formula and which consists of a sum of elementary products is called a *disjunctive normal form* of the given formula.

Example: Obtain disjunctive normal forms of

$$(a) P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q); \quad (b) \neg(P \vee Q) \leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q).$$

Solution: (a) We have

$$\begin{aligned} P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q) &\Leftrightarrow P \wedge (\neg P \vee Q) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge \neg P) \vee (P \wedge Q) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (b) \quad \neg(P \vee Q) \leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) &\Leftrightarrow ((\neg(P \vee Q) \wedge (P \wedge Q)) \vee ((P \vee Q) \wedge \neg(P \wedge Q))) \text{ [using} \\ &\quad R \leftrightarrow S \Leftrightarrow (R \wedge S) \vee (\neg R \wedge \neg S)] \\ &\Leftrightarrow ((\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \wedge (P \wedge Q)) \vee ((P \vee Q) \wedge (\neg P \vee \neg Q)) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\neg P \wedge \neg Q \wedge P \wedge Q) \vee ((P \vee Q) \wedge \neg P) \vee ((P \vee Q) \wedge \neg Q) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\neg P \wedge \neg Q \wedge P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge \neg P) \vee (Q \wedge \neg P) \vee (P \wedge \neg Q) \vee (Q \wedge \neg Q) \end{aligned}$$

which is the required disjunctive normal form.

Note: The DNF of a given formula is not unique.

## Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF)

A formula which is equivalent to a given formula and which consists of a product of elementary sums is called a *conjunctive normal form* of the given formula.

The method for obtaining conjunctive normal form of a given formula is similar to the one given for disjunctive normal form. Again, the conjunctive normal form is not unique.

Example: Obtain conjunctive normal forms of

$$(a) P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q); \quad (b) \neg(P \vee Q) \leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q).$$

Solution: (a).  $P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q) \Leftrightarrow P \wedge (\neg P \vee Q)$

$$(b). \neg(P \vee Q) \leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\neg(P \vee Q) \rightarrow (P \wedge Q)) \wedge ((P \wedge Q) \rightarrow \neg(P \vee Q))$$

$$\Leftrightarrow ((P \vee Q) \vee (P \wedge Q)) \wedge (\neg(P \wedge Q) \vee \neg(P \vee Q))$$

$$\Leftrightarrow [(P \vee Q \vee P) \wedge (P \vee Q \vee Q)] \wedge [(\neg P \vee \neg Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q)]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (P \vee Q \vee P) \wedge (P \vee Q \vee Q) \wedge (\neg P \vee \neg Q \vee \neg P) \wedge (\neg P \vee \neg Q \vee \neg Q)$$

Note: A given formula is tautology if every elementary sum in CNF is tautology.

Example: Show that the formula  $Q \vee (P \wedge \neg Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$  is a tautology.

Solution: First we obtain a CNF of the given formula.

$$Q \vee (P \wedge \neg Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \Leftrightarrow Q \vee ((P \vee \neg P) \wedge \neg Q)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (Q \vee (P \vee \neg P)) \wedge (Q \vee \neg Q)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (Q \vee P \vee \neg P) \wedge (Q \vee \neg Q)$$

Since each of the elementary sum is a tautology, hence the given formula is tautology.

## Principal Disjunctive Normal Form

In this section, we will discuss the concept of principal disjunctive normal form (PDNF).

Minterm: For a given number of variables, the minterm consists of conjunctions in which each statement variable or its negation, but not both, appears only once.

Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be the two statement variables. Then there are  $2^2$  minterms given by  $P \wedge Q$ ,  $P \wedge \neg Q$ ,  $\neg P \wedge Q$ , and  $\neg P \wedge \neg Q$ .

Minterms for three variables  $P$ ,  $Q$  and  $R$  are  $P \wedge Q \wedge R$ ,  $P \wedge Q \wedge \neg R$ ,  $P \wedge \neg Q \wedge R$ ,  $P \wedge \neg Q \wedge \neg R$ ,  $\neg P \wedge Q \wedge R$ ,  $\neg P \wedge Q \wedge \neg R$ ,  $\neg P \wedge \neg Q \wedge R$  and  $\neg P \wedge \neg Q \wedge \neg R$ . From the truth tables of these minterms of  $P$  and  $Q$ , it is clear that

$P$	$Q$	$P \wedge Q$	$P \wedge \neg Q$	$\neg P \wedge Q$	$\neg P \wedge \neg Q$
T	T	T	F	F	F
T	F	F	T	F	F
F	T	F	F	T	F
F	F	F	F	F	T

(i). no two minterms are equivalent

(ii). Each minterm has the truth value  $T$  for exactly one combination of the truth values of the variables  $P$  and  $Q$ .

**Definition:** For a given formula, an equivalent formula consisting of disjunctions of minterms only is called the Principal disjunctive normal form of the formula.

The principle disjunctive normal formula is also called the sum-of-products canonical form.



## Methods to obtain PDNF of a given formula

### (a). By Truth table:

- (i). Construct a truth table of the given formula.
- (ii). For every truth value  $T$  in the truth table of the given formula, select the minterm which also has the value  $T$  for the same combination of the truth values of  $P$  and  $Q$ .
- (iii). The disjunction of these minterms will then be equivalent to the given formula.

Example: Obtain the PDNF of  $P \rightarrow Q$ .

Solution: From the truth table of  $P \rightarrow Q$

$P$	$Q$	$P \rightarrow Q$	Minterm
T	T	T	$P \wedge Q$
T	F	F	$P \wedge \neg Q$
F	T	T	$\neg P \wedge Q$
F	F	T	$\neg P \wedge \neg Q$

The PDNF of  $P \rightarrow Q$  is  $(P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$ .

$$\therefore P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q).$$

Example: Obtain the PDNF for  $(P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge R) \vee (Q \wedge R)$ .

Solution:

$P$	$Q$	$R$	Minterm	$P \wedge Q$	$\neg P \wedge R$	$Q \wedge R$	$(P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge R) \vee (Q \wedge R)$
T	T	T	$P \wedge Q \wedge R$	T	F	T	T
T	T	F	$P \wedge Q \wedge \neg R$	T	F	F	T
T	F	T	$P \wedge \neg Q \wedge R$	F	F	F	F
T	F	F	$P \wedge \neg Q \wedge \neg R$	F	F	F	F
F	T	T	$\neg P \wedge Q \wedge R$	F	T	T	T
F	T	F	$\neg P \wedge Q \wedge \neg R$	F	F	F	F
F	F	T	$\neg P \wedge \neg Q \wedge R$	F	T	F	T
F	F	F	$\neg P \wedge \neg Q \wedge \neg R$	F	F	F	F

The PDNF of  $(P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge R) \vee (Q \wedge R)$  is

$$(P \wedge Q \wedge R) \vee (P \wedge Q \wedge \neg R) \vee (\neg P \wedge Q \wedge R) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q \wedge R).$$

### (b). Without constructing the truth table:

In order to obtain the principal disjunctive normal form of a given formula is constructed as follows:

- (1). First replace  $\rightarrow$ , by their equivalent formula containing only  $\wedge$ ,  $\vee$  and  $\neg$ .
- (2). Next, negations are applied to the variables by De Morgan's laws followed by the application of distributive laws.
- (3). Any elementarily product which is a contradiction is dropped. Minterms are obtained in the disjunctions by introducing the missing factors. Identical minterms appearing in the disjunctions are deleted.

Example: Obtain the principal disjunctive normal form of

$$(a) \neg P \vee Q; (b) (P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge R) \vee (Q \wedge R).$$

Solution:

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad \neg P \vee Q &\Leftrightarrow (\neg P \wedge T) \vee (Q \wedge T) && [\because A \wedge T \Leftrightarrow A] \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\neg P \wedge (Q \vee \neg Q)) \vee (Q \wedge (P \vee \neg P)) && [\because P \vee \neg P \Leftrightarrow T] \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\neg P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \vee (Q \wedge P) \vee (Q \wedge \neg P) \\ &&& [\because P \wedge (Q \vee R) \Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge R)] \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\neg P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \vee (P \wedge Q) && [\because P \vee P \Leftrightarrow P] \end{aligned}$$

$$(b) (P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge R) \vee (Q \wedge R)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q \wedge T) \vee (\neg P \wedge R \wedge T) \vee (Q \wedge R \wedge T) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q \wedge (R \vee \neg R)) \vee (\neg P \wedge R \wedge (Q \vee \neg Q)) \vee (Q \wedge R \wedge (P \vee \neg P)) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q \wedge R) \vee (P \wedge Q \wedge \neg R) \vee (\neg P \wedge R \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge R \wedge \neg Q) \\ &\quad \vee (Q \wedge R \wedge P) \vee (Q \wedge R \wedge \neg P) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q \wedge R) \vee (P \wedge Q \wedge \neg R) \vee (\neg P \wedge Q \wedge R) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q \wedge R) \end{aligned}$$

$$P \vee (P \wedge Q) \Leftrightarrow P$$

$$P \vee (\neg P \wedge Q) \Leftrightarrow P \vee Q$$

Solution: We write the principal disjunctive normal form of each formula and compare these normal forms.

$$\begin{aligned} (a) P \vee (P \wedge Q) &\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge T) \vee (P \wedge Q) && [\because P \wedge Q \Leftrightarrow P] \\ &\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge (Q \vee \neg Q)) \vee (P \wedge Q) && [\because P \vee \neg P \Leftrightarrow T] \\ &\Leftrightarrow ((P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge \neg Q)) \vee (P \wedge Q) && [\text{by distributive laws}] \\ &\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge \neg Q) && [\because P \vee P \Leftrightarrow P] \end{aligned}$$

which is the required PDNF.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Now,} \quad &\Leftrightarrow P \wedge T \\ &\Leftrightarrow P \wedge (Q \vee \neg Q) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge \neg Q) \end{aligned}$$

which is the required PDNF.

$$\text{Hence,} \quad P \vee (P \wedge Q) \Leftrightarrow P.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(b) P \vee (\neg P \wedge Q) &\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge T) \vee (\neg P \wedge Q) \\
&\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge (Q \vee \neg Q)) \vee (\neg P \wedge Q) \\
&\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge \neg Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge Q)
\end{aligned}$$

which is the required PDNF.

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
P \vee Q &\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge T) \vee (Q \wedge T) \\
&\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge (Q \vee \neg Q)) \vee (Q \wedge (P \vee \neg P)) \\
&\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge \neg Q) \vee (Q \wedge P) \vee (Q \wedge \neg P) \\
&\Leftrightarrow (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge \neg Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge Q)
\end{aligned}$$

which is the required PDNF.

Hence,  $P \vee (\neg P \wedge Q) \Leftrightarrow P \vee Q$ .

**Example:** Obtain the principal disjunctive normal form of

$$P \rightarrow ((P \rightarrow Q) \wedge \neg(\neg Q \vee \neg P)). \quad (\text{Nov. 2011})$$

Solution: Using  $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$  and De Morgan's law, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rightarrow ((P \rightarrow Q) \wedge \neg(\neg Q \vee \neg P)) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \\
&\vee ((\neg P \vee Q) \wedge (Q \wedge P)) \\
&\Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee ((\neg P \wedge Q \wedge P) \vee (Q \wedge Q \wedge P)) \Leftrightarrow \\
&\neg P \vee F \vee (P \wedge Q) \\
&\Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee (P \wedge Q) \\
&\Leftrightarrow (\neg P \wedge T) \vee (P \wedge Q) \\
&\Leftrightarrow (\neg P \wedge (Q \vee \neg Q)) \vee (P \wedge Q) \\
&\Leftrightarrow (\neg P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \vee (P \wedge Q)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence  $(P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$  is the required PDNF.

## Principal Conjunctive Normal Form

The dual of a minterm is called a Maxterm. For a given number of variables, the *maxterm* consists of disjunctions in which each variable or its negation, but not both, appears only once. Each of the maxterm has the truth value  $F$  for exactly one combination of the truth values of the variables. Now we define the principal conjunctive normal form.

For a given formula, an equivalent formula consisting of conjunctions of the max-terms only is known as its *principle conjunctive normal form*. This normal form is also called the *product-of-sums canonical form*. The method for obtaining the PCNF for a given formula is similar to the one described previously for PDNF.

Example: Obtain the principal conjunctive normal form of the formula  $(\neg P \rightarrow R) \wedge (Q \leftrightarrow P)$

Solution:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\neg P \rightarrow R) \wedge (Q \leftrightarrow P) \\
 & \Leftrightarrow [\neg(\neg P) \vee R] \wedge [(Q \rightarrow P) \wedge (P \rightarrow Q)] \\
 & \Leftrightarrow (P \vee R) \wedge [(\neg Q \vee P) \wedge (\neg P \vee Q)] \\
 & \Leftrightarrow (P \vee R \vee F) \wedge [(\neg Q \vee P \vee F) \wedge (\neg P \vee Q \vee F)] \\
 & \Leftrightarrow [(P \vee R) \vee (Q \wedge \neg Q)] \wedge [(\neg Q \vee P) \vee (R \wedge \neg R)] \wedge [(\neg P \vee Q) \vee (R \wedge \neg R)] \\
 & \Leftrightarrow (P \vee R \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R \vee \neg Q) \wedge (P \vee \neg Q \vee R) \wedge (P \vee \neg Q \vee \neg R) \\
 & \quad \wedge (\neg P \vee Q \vee R) \wedge (\neg P \vee Q \vee \neg R) \\
 & \Leftrightarrow (P \vee Q \vee R) \wedge (P \vee \neg Q \vee R) \wedge (P \vee \neg Q \vee \neg R) \wedge (\neg P \vee Q \vee R) \wedge (\neg P \vee Q \vee \neg R)
 \end{aligned}$$

which is required principal conjunctive normal form.

Note: If the principal disjunctive (conjunctive) normal form of a given formula  $A$  containing  $n$  variables is known, then the principal disjunctive (conjunctive) normal form of  $\neg A$  will consist of the disjunction (conjunction) of the remaining minterms (maxterms) which do not appear in the principal disjunctive (conjunctive) normal form of  $A$ . From  $A \Leftrightarrow \neg \neg A$  one can obtain the principal conjunctive (disjunctive) normal form of  $A$  by repeated applications of De Morgan's laws to the principal disjunctive (conjunctive) normal form of  $\neg A$ .

Example: Find the PDNF form PCNF of  $S : P \vee (\neg P \rightarrow (Q \vee (\neg Q \rightarrow R)))$ .

Solution:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \Leftrightarrow P \vee (\neg P \rightarrow (Q \vee (\neg Q \rightarrow R))) \\
 & \Leftrightarrow P \vee (\neg(\neg P) \vee (Q \vee (\neg(\neg Q) \vee R))) \\
 & \Leftrightarrow P \vee (P \vee Q \vee (Q \vee R)) \\
 & \Leftrightarrow P \vee (P \vee Q \vee R) \\
 & \Leftrightarrow P \vee Q \vee R
 \end{aligned}$$

which is the PCNF.

Now PCNF of  $\neg S$  is the conjunction of remaining maxterms, so

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{PCNF of } \neg S : & (P \vee Q \vee \neg R) \wedge (P \vee \neg Q \vee R) \wedge (P \vee \neg Q \vee \neg R) \wedge (\neg P \vee Q \vee R) \\
 & \wedge (\neg P \vee Q \vee \neg R) \wedge (\neg P \vee \neg Q \vee R) \wedge (\neg P \vee \neg Q \vee \neg R)
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence the PDNF of  $S$  is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \neg(\text{PCNF of } \neg S) : & (\neg P \wedge \neg Q \wedge R) \vee (\neg P \wedge Q \wedge \neg R) \vee (\neg P \wedge Q \wedge R) \vee (P \wedge \neg Q \wedge \neg R) \\
 & \vee (P \wedge \neg Q \wedge R) \vee (P \wedge Q \wedge \neg R) \vee (P \wedge Q \wedge R)
 \end{aligned}$$

## Theory of Inference for Statement Calculus

Definition: The main aim of logic is to provide rules of inference to infer a conclusion from certain premises. The theory associated with rules of inference is known as inference theory .

Definition: If a conclusion is derived from a set of premises by using the accepted rules of reasoning, then such a process of derivation is called a deduction or a formal proof and the argument is called a *valid argument* or conclusion is called a *valid conclusion*.

Note: Premises means set of assumptions, axioms, hypothesis.

Definition: Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two statement formulas. We say that " $B$  logically follows from  $A$ " or " $B$  is a *valid conclusion (consequence)* of the premise  $A$ " iff  $A \rightarrow B$  is a tautology, that is  $A \Rightarrow B$ . We say that from a set of premises  $\{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m\}$ , a conclusion  $C$  follows logically iff

$$H_1 \wedge H_2 \wedge \dots \wedge H_m \Rightarrow C$$

(1)

Note: To determine whether the conclusion logically follows from the given premises, we use the following methods:

- Truth table method
- Without constructing truth table method.

## Validity Using Truth Tables

Given a set of premises and a conclusion, it is possible to determine whether the conclusion logically follows from the given premises by constructing truth tables as follows.

Let  $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n$  be all the atomic variables appearing in the premises  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$  and in the conclusion  $C$ . If all possible combinations of truth values are assigned to  $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n$  and if the truth values of  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$  and  $C$  are entered in a table. We look for the rows in which all  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$  have the value T. If, for every such row,  $C$  also has the value T, then (1) holds. That is, the conclusion follows logically.

Alternatively, we look for the rows on which  $C$  has the value F. If, in every such row, at least one of the values of  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$  is F, then (1) also holds. We call such a method a ‘truth table technique’ for the determination of the validity of a conclusion.

Example: Determine whether the conclusion  $C$  follows logically from the premises

$H_1$  and  $H_2$ .

- (a)  $H_1 : P \rightarrow Q$        $H_2 : P$      $C : Q$   
 (b)  $H_1 : P \rightarrow Q$        $H_2 : \neg P$      $C : Q$   
 (c)  $H_1 : P \rightarrow Q$        $H_2 : \neg(P \wedge Q)$      $C : \neg P$   
 (d)  $H_1 : \neg P$                $H_2 : P$      $Q$      $C : \neg(P \wedge Q)$   
 (e)  $H_1 : P \rightarrow Q$        $H_2 : Q$      $C : P$

Solution: We first construct the appropriate truth table, as shown in table.

$P$	$Q$	$P \rightarrow Q$	$\neg P$	$\neg(P \wedge Q)$	$P \quad Q$
T	T	T	F	F	T
T	F	F	F	T	F
F	T	T	T	T	F
F	F	T	T	T	T

(a) We observe that the first row is the only row in which both the premises have the value  $T$ . The conclusion also has the value  $T$  in that row. Hence it is valid.

In (b) the third and fourth rows, the conclusion  $Q$  is true only in the third row, but not in the fourth, and hence the conclusion is not valid.

Similarly, we can show that the conclusions are valid in (c) and (d) but not in (e).

## Rules of Inference

The following are two important rules of inferences.

Rule P: A premise may be introduced at any point in the derivation.

Rule T: A formula  $S$  may be introduced in a derivation if  $S$  is tautologically implied by one or more of the preceding formulas in the derivation.

Implication Formulas

$$I_1 : P \wedge Q \Rightarrow P \quad (\text{simplification})$$

$$I_2 : P \wedge Q \Rightarrow Q$$

$$I_3 : P \Rightarrow P \vee Q$$

$$I_4 : Q \Rightarrow P \vee Q$$

$$I_5 : \neg P \Rightarrow P \rightarrow Q$$

$$I_6 : Q \Rightarrow P \rightarrow Q$$

$$I_7 : \neg(P \rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow P$$

$$I_8 : \neg(P \rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow \neg Q$$

$$I_9 : P, Q \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$$

$$I_{10} : \neg P, P \vee Q \Rightarrow Q \quad (\text{disjunctive syllogism})$$

$$I_{11} : P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q \quad (\text{modus ponens})$$

$$I_{12} : \neg Q, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow \neg P \quad (\text{modus tollens})$$

$$I_{13} : P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R \Rightarrow P \rightarrow R \quad (\text{hypothetical syllogism})$$

$$I_{14} : P \vee Q, P \rightarrow R, Q \rightarrow R \Rightarrow R \quad (\text{dilemma})$$

Example: Demonstrate that  $R$  is a valid inference from the premises  $P \rightarrow Q$ ,  $Q \rightarrow R$ , and  $P$ .

Solution:

{1}	(1) $P \rightarrow Q$	Rule P
{2}	(2) $P$	Rule P,
{1, 2}	(3) $Q$	Rule T, (1), (2), and $I_{13}$
{4}	(4) $Q \rightarrow R$	Rule P
{1, 2, 4}	(5) $R$	Rule T, (3), (4), and $I_{13}$

Hence the result.

Example: Show that  $R \vee S$  follows logically from the premises  $C \vee D$ ,  $(C \vee D) \rightarrow \neg H$ ,  $\neg H \rightarrow (A \wedge \neg B)$ , and  $(A \wedge \neg B) \rightarrow (R \vee S)$ .

Solution:

{1}	(1) $(C \vee D) \rightarrow \neg H$	Rule P
{2}	(2) $\neg H \rightarrow (A \wedge \neg B)$	Rule P
{1, 2}	(3) $(C \vee D) \rightarrow (A \wedge \neg B)$	Rule T, (1), (2), and $I_{13}$
{4}	(4) $(A \wedge \neg B) \rightarrow (R \vee S)$	Rule P
{1, 2, 4}	(5) $(C \vee D) \rightarrow (R \vee S)$	Rule T, (3), (4), and $I_{13}$
{6}	(6) $C \vee D$	Rule P
{1, 2, 4, 6}	(7) $R \vee S$	Rule T, (5), (6), and $I_{11}$

Hence the result.

Example: Show that  $S \vee R$  is tautologically implied by  $(P \vee Q) \wedge (P \rightarrow R) \wedge (Q \rightarrow S)$ .

Solution:

{1}	(1) $P \vee Q$	Rule P
{1}	(2) $\neg P \rightarrow Q$	Rule T, (1) $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$
{3}	(3) $Q \rightarrow S$	Rule P
{1, 3}	(4) $\neg P \rightarrow S$	Rule T, (2), (3), and $I_{13}$
{1, 3}	(5) $\neg S \rightarrow P$	Rule T, (4), $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$
{6}	(6) $P \rightarrow R$	Rule P
{1, 3, 6}	(7) $\neg S \rightarrow R$	Rule T, (5), (6), and $I_{13}$
{1, 3, 6}	(8) $S \vee R$	Rule T, (7) and $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$

Hence the result.

Example: Show that  $R \wedge (P \vee Q)$  is a valid conclusion from the premises  $P \vee Q$ ,

$Q \rightarrow R$ ,  $P \rightarrow M$ , and  $\neg M$ .

Solution:

{1}	(1) $P \rightarrow M$	Rule P
{2}	(2) $\neg M$	Rule P
{1, 2}	(3) $\neg P$	Rule T, (1), (2), and $I_{12}$
{4}	(4) $P \vee Q$	Rule P
{1, 2, 4}	(5) $Q$	Rule T, (3), (4), and $I_{10}$
{6}	(6) $Q \rightarrow R$	Rule P



{1, 2, 4, 6} (7)  $R$  Rule T, (5), (6), and  $I_{11}$

{1, 2, 4, 6} (8)  $R \wedge (P \vee Q)$  Rule T, (4), (7) and  $I_9$

Hence the result.

Example: Show  $I_{12} : \neg Q, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow \neg P$ .

Solution:

{1} (1)  $P \rightarrow Q$  Rule P

{1} (2)  $\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$  Rule T, (1), and  $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$

{3} (3)  $\neg Q$  Rule P

{1, 3} (4)  $\neg P$  Rule T, (2), (3), and  $I_{11}$

Hence the result.

Example: Test the validity of the following argument:

"If you work hard, you will pass the exam. You did not pass. Therefore, you did not work hard".

Example: Test the validity of the following statements:

"If Sachin hits a century, then he gets a free car. Sachin does not get a free car.

Therefore, Sachin has not hit a century".

## Rules of Conditional Proof or Deduction Theorem

We shall now introduce a third inference rule, known as CP or rule of conditional proof.

Rule CP: If we can derive  $S$  from  $R$  and a set of premises, then we can derive  $R \rightarrow S$  from the set of premises alone.

Rule CP is not new for our purpose here because it follows from the equivalence

$$(P \wedge R) \rightarrow S \Leftrightarrow P \rightarrow (R \rightarrow S)$$

Let  $P$  denote the conjunction of the set of premises and let  $R$  be any formula. The above equivalence states that if  $R$  is included as an additional premise and  $S$  is derived from  $P \wedge R$ , then  $R \rightarrow S$  can be derived from the premises  $P$  alone.

Rule CP is also called the *deduction theorem* and is generally used if the conclusion of the form  $R \rightarrow S$ . In such cases,  $R$  is taken as an additional premise and  $S$  is derived from the given premises and  $R$ .

Example: Show that  $R \rightarrow S$  can be derived from the premises  $P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow S)$ ,  $\neg R \vee P$ , and  $Q$ .

(Nov. 2011)

Solution: Instead of deriving  $R \rightarrow S$ , we shall include  $R$  as an additional premise and show  $S$  first.

{1}	(1) $\neg R \vee P$	Rule P
{2}	(2) $R$	Rule P (assumed premise)
{1, 2}	(3) $P$	Rule T, (1), (2), and $I_{10}$
{4}	(4) $P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow S)$	Rule P
{1, 2, 4}	(5) $Q \rightarrow S$	Rule T, (3), (4), and $I_{11}$
{6}	(6) $Q$	Rule P
{1, 2, 4, 6}	(7) $S$	Rule T, (5), (6), and $I_{11}$
{1, 2, 4, 6}	(8) $R \rightarrow S$	Rule CP

Example: Show that  $P \rightarrow S$  can be derived from the premises  $\neg P \vee Q$ ,  $\neg Q \vee R$ , and  $R \rightarrow S$ .

Solution: We include  $P$  as an additional premise and derive  $S$ .

{1}	(1) $\neg P \vee Q$	Rule P
{2}	(2) $P$	Rule P (assumed premise)
{1, 2}	(3) $Q$	Rule T, (1), (2), and $I_{10}$
{4}	(4) $\neg Q \vee R$	Rule P
{1, 2, 4}	(5) $R$	Rule T, (3), (4), and $I_{10}$
{6}	(6) $R \rightarrow S$	Rule P
{1, 2, 4, 6}	(7) $S$	Rule T, (5), (6), and $I_{11}$
{1, 2, 4, 6}	(8) $P \rightarrow S$	Rule CP

Example: 'If there was a ball game, then traveling was difficult. If they arrived on time, then traveling was not difficult. They arrived on time. Therefore, there was no ball game'. Show that these statements constitute a valid argument. Solution: Let us indicate the statements as follows:

$P$ : There was a ball game.

$Q$ : Traveling was difficult.

$R$ : They arrived on time.

Hence, the given premises are  $P \rightarrow Q$ ,  $R \rightarrow \neg Q$ , and  $R$ . The conclusion is  $\neg P$ .

{1}	(1) $R \rightarrow \neg Q$	Rule P
{2}	(2) $R$	Rule P
{1, 2}	(3) $\neg Q$	Rule T, (1), (2), and $I_{11}$
{4}	(4) $P \rightarrow Q$	Rule P
{4}	(5) $\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$	Rule T, (4), and $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$
{1, 2, 4}	(6) $\neg P$	Rule T, (3), (5), and $I_{11}$

Example: By using the method of derivation, show that following statements constitute a valid argument: "If  $A$  works hard, then either  $B$  or  $C$  will enjoy. If  $B$  enjoys, then  $A$  will not work hard. If  $D$  enjoys, then  $C$  will not. Therefore, if  $A$  works hard,  $D$  will not enjoy.

Solution: Let us indicate statements as follows:

Given premises are  $P \rightarrow (Q \vee R)$ ,  $Q \rightarrow \neg P$ , and  $S \rightarrow \neg R$ . The conclusion is  $P \rightarrow \neg S$ .  
We include  $P$  as an additional premise and derive  $\neg S$ .

{1}	(1) $P$	Rule P (additional premise)
{2}	(2) $P \rightarrow (Q \vee R)$	Rule P
{1, 2}	(3) $Q \vee R$	Rule T, (1), (2), and $I_{11}$
{1, 2}	(4) $\neg Q \rightarrow R$	Rule T, (3) and $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow P \vee Q$
{1, 2}	(5) $\neg R \rightarrow Q$	Rule T, (4), and $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$
{6}	(6) $Q \rightarrow \neg P$	Rule P
{1, 2, 6}	(7) $\neg R \rightarrow \neg P$	Rule T, (5), (6), and $I_{13}$
{1, 2, 6}	(8) $P \rightarrow R$	Rule T, (7) and $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$
{9}	(9) $S \rightarrow \neg R$	Rule P
{9}	(10) $R \rightarrow \neg S$	Rule T, (9) and $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$
{1, 2, 6, 9}	(11) $P \rightarrow \neg S$	Rule T, (8), (10) and $I_{13}$
{1, 2, 6, 9}	(12) $\neg S$	Rule T, (1), (11) and $I_{11}$

Example: Determine the validity of the following arguments using propositional logic:

"Smoking is healthy. If smoking is healthy, then cigarettes are prescribed by physicians. Therefore, cigarettes are prescribed by physicians". (May-2012)

Solution: Let us indicate the statements as follows:

$P$ : Smoking is healthy.

$Q$ : Cigarettes are prescribed by physicians.

Hence, the given premises are  $P$ ,  $P \rightarrow Q$ . The conclusion is  $Q$ .

{1}	(1) $P \rightarrow Q$	Rule P
{2}	(2) $P$	Rule P

{1, 2}                    (3)  $Q$                     Rule T, (1), (2), and  $I_{11}$   
Hence, the given statements constitute a valid argument.

### Consistency of Premises

A set of formulas  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$  is said to be *consistent* if their conjunction has the truth value  $T$  for some assignment of the truth values to the atomic variables appearing in  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$ .

If, for every assignment of the truth values to the atomic variables, at least one of the formulas  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$  is false, so that their conjunction is identically false, then the formulas  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$  are called *inconsistent*.

Alternatively, a set of formulas  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$  is inconsistent if their conjunction implies a contradiction, that is,

$$H_1 \wedge H_2 \wedge \dots \wedge H_m \Rightarrow R \wedge \neg R$$

where  $R$  is any formula.

Example: Show that the following premises are inconsistent:

- (1). If Jack misses many classes through illness, then he fails high school.
- (2). If Jack fails high school, then he is uneducated.
- (3). If Jack reads a lot of books, then he is not uneducated.
- (4). Jack misses many classes through illness and reads a lot of books.

Solution: Let us indicate the statements as follows:

$E$ : Jack misses many classes through illness.

$S$ : Jack fails high school.

$A$ : Jack reads a lot of books.

$H$ : Jack is uneducated.

The premises are  $E \rightarrow S, S \rightarrow H, A \rightarrow \neg H$ , and  $E \wedge A$ .

{1}	(1) $E \rightarrow S$	Rule P
{2}	(2) $S \rightarrow H$	Rule P
{1, 2}	(3) $E \rightarrow H$	Rule T, (1), (2), and $I_{13}$
{4}	(4) $A \rightarrow \neg H$	Rule P
{4}	(5) $H \rightarrow \neg A$	Rule T, (4), and $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$
{1, 2, 4}	(6) $E \rightarrow \neg A$	Rule T, (3), (5), and $I_{13}$
{1, 2, 4}	(7) $\neg E \vee \neg A$	Rule T, (6) and $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$
{1, 2, 4}	(8) $\neg(E \wedge A)$	Rule T, (7), and $\neg(P \wedge Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee \neg Q$
{9}	(9) $E \wedge A$	Rule P
{1, 2, 4, 9}	(10) $\neg(E \wedge A) \wedge (E \wedge A)$	Rule T, (8), (9) and $I_9$

Thus, the given set of premises leads to a contradiction and hence it is inconsistent.

Example: Show that the following set of premises is inconsistent: "If the contract is valid, then John is liable for penalty. If John is liable for penalty, he will go bankrupt. If the bank will loan him money, he will not go bankrupt. As a matter of fact, the contract is valid, and the bank will loan him money."

Solution: Let us indicate the statements as follows:

$V$ : The contract is valid.

$L$ : John is liable for penalty.

$M$ : Bank will loan him money.

$B$ : John will go bankrupt.

{1}	(1) $V \rightarrow L$	Rule P
{2}	(2) $L \rightarrow B$	Rule P
{1, 2}	(3) $V \rightarrow B$	Rule T, (1), (2), and $I_{13}$
{4}	(4) $M \rightarrow \neg B$	Rule P
{4}	(5) $M \rightarrow \neg M$	Rule T, (4), and $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$
{1, 2, 4}	(6) $V \rightarrow \neg M$	Rule T, (3), (5), and $I_{13}$
{1, 2, 4}	(7) $\neg V \vee \neg M$	Rule T, (6) and $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$
{1, 2, 4}	(8) $\neg(V \wedge M)$	Rule T, (7), and $\neg(P \wedge Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee \neg Q$
{9}	(9) $V \wedge M$	Rule P
{1, 2, 4, 9}	(10) $\neg(V \wedge M) \wedge (V \wedge M)$	Rule T, (8), (9) and $I_9$

Thus, the given set of premises leads to a contradiction and hence it is inconsistent.

## Indirect Method of Proof

The method of using the rule of conditional proof and the notion of an inconsistent set of premises is called the *indirect method of proof* or *proof by contradiction*.

In order to show that a conclusion  $C$  follows logically from the premises  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$ , we assume that  $C$  is false and consider  $\neg C$  as an additional premise. If the new set of premises is inconsistent, so that they imply a contradiction. Therefore, the assumption that  $\neg C$  is true does not hold.

Hence,  $C$  is true whenever  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$  are true. Thus,  $C$  follows logically from the premises  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$ .

Example: Show that  $\neg(P \wedge Q)$  follows from  $\neg P \wedge \neg Q$ .

Solution: We introduce  $\neg\neg(P \wedge Q)$  as additional premise and show that this additional premise leads to a contradiction.

{1}	(1) $\neg\neg(P \wedge Q)$	Rule P (assumed)
{1}	(2) $P \wedge Q$	Rule T, (1), and $\neg\neg P \Leftrightarrow P$
{1}	(3) $P$	Rule T, (2), and $I_1$
{4}	(4) $\neg P \wedge \neg Q$	Rule P
{4}	(5) $\neg P$	Rule T, (4), and $I_1$
{1, 4}	(6) $P \wedge \neg P$	Rule T, (3), (5), and $I_9$

Hence, our assumption is wrong.

Thus,  $\neg(P \wedge Q)$  follows from  $\neg P \wedge \neg Q$ .

Example: Using the indirect method of proof, show that

$$P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R, \neg(P \wedge R), P \vee R \Rightarrow R.$$

Solution: We include  $\neg R$  as an additional premise. Then we show that this leads to a contradiction.

{1}	(1) $P \rightarrow Q$	Rule P
{2}	(2) $Q \rightarrow R$	Rule P
{1, 2}	(3) $P \rightarrow R$	Rule T, (1), (2), and $I_{13}$
{4}	(4) $\neg R$	Rule P (assumed)
{1, 2, 4}	(5) $\neg P$	Rule T, (4), and $I_{12}$
{6}	(6) $P \vee R$	Rule P
{1, 2, 4, 6}	(7) $R$	Rule T, (5), (6) and $I_{10}$
{1, 2, 4, 6}	(8) $R \wedge \neg R$	Rule T, (4), (7), and $I_9$

Hence, our assumption is wrong.

Example: Show that the following set of premises are inconsistent, using proof by contradiction

$$P \rightarrow (Q \vee R), Q \rightarrow \neg P, S \rightarrow \neg R, P \Rightarrow P \rightarrow \neg S.$$

Solution: We include  $\neg(P \rightarrow \neg S)$  as an additional premise. Then we show that this leads to a contradiction.

$$\therefore \neg(P \rightarrow \neg S) \Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg P \vee \neg S) \Leftrightarrow P \wedge S.$$

{1}	(1) $P \rightarrow (Q \vee R)$	Rule P
{2}	(2) $P$	Rule P
{1, 2}	(3) $Q \vee R$	Rule T, (1), (2), and Modus Ponens
{4}	(4) $P \wedge S$	Rule P (assumed)
{1, 2, 4}	(5) $S$	Rule T, (4), and $P \wedge Q \Rightarrow P$

{6}	(6) $S \rightarrow \neg R$	Rule P
{1, 2, 4, 6}	(7) $\neg R$	Rule T, (5), (6) and Modus Ponens
{1, 2, 4, 6}	(8) $Q$	Rule T, (3), (7), and $P \wedge Q, \neg Q \Rightarrow P$
{9}	(9) $Q \rightarrow \neg P$	Rule P
{1, 2, 4, 6}	(10) $\neg P$	Rule T, (8), (9), and $P \wedge Q, \neg Q \Rightarrow P$
{1, 2, 4, 6}	(11) $P \wedge \neg P$	Rule T, (2), (10), and $P, Q \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$
{1, 2, 4, 6}	(12) $F$	Rule T, (11), and $P \wedge \neg P \Leftrightarrow F$

Hence, it is proved that the given premises are inconsistent.

## The Predicate Calculus

### Predicate

A part of a declarative sentence describing the properties of an object is called a predicate. The logic based upon the analysis of predicate in any statement is called predicate logic.

Consider two statements:

John is a bachelor

Smith is a bachelor.

In each statement "is a bachelor" is a predicate. Both John and Smith have the same property of being a bachelor. In the statement logic, we require two different symbols to express them and these symbols do not reveal the common property of these statements. In predicate calculus these statements can be replaced by a single statement "x is a bachelor". A predicate is symbolized by a capital letters which is followed by the list of variables. The list of variables is enclosed in parenthesis. If  $P$  stands for the predicate "is a bachelor", then  $P(x)$  stands for "x is a bachelor", where  $x$  is a predicate variable.

The domain for  $P(x) : x$  is a bachelor, can be taken as the set of all human names. Note that  $P(x)$  is not a statement, but just an expression. Once a value is assigned to  $x$ ,  $P(x)$  becomes a statement and has the truth value. If  $x$  is Ram, then  $P(x)$  is a statement and its truth value is true.

### Quantifiers

**Quantifiers:** Quantifiers are words that refer to quantities such as 'some' or 'all'.

Universal Quantifier: The phrase 'forall' (denoted by  $\forall$ ) is called the universal quantifier.

For example, consider the sentence "All human beings are mortal".

Let  $P(x)$  denote 'x is a mortal'.

Then, the above sentence can be written as

$$(\forall x \in S)P(x) \text{ or } \forall xP(x)$$

where  $S$  denote the set of all human beings.

$\forall x$  represents each of the following phrases, since they have essentially the same for all  $x$

For every  $x$

For each  $x$ .

**Existential Quantifier:** The phrase 'there exists' (denoted by  $\exists$ ) is called the existential quantifier.

For example, consider the sentence

”There exists  $x$  such that  $x^2 = 5$ .”

This sentence can be written as

$$(\exists x \in R)P(x) \text{ or } (\exists x)P(x),$$

where  $P(x) : x^2 = 5$ .

$\exists x$  represents each of the following phrases

- There exists an  $x$
- There is an  $x$
- For some  $x$
- There is at least one  $x$ .

Example: Write the following statements in symbolic form:

- (i). Something is good
- (ii). Everything is good
- (iii). Nothing is good
- (iv). Something is not good.

Solution: Statement (i) means ”There is atleast one  $x$  such that,  $x$  is good”.

Statement (ii) means ”Forall  $x$ ,  $x$  is good”.

Statement (iii) means, ”Forall  $x$ ,  $x$  is not good”.

Statement (iv) means, ”There is atleast one  $x$  such that,  $x$  is not good.

Thus, if  $G(x) : x$  is good, then

statement (i) can be denoted by  $(\exists x)G(x)$

statement (ii) can be denoted by  $(\forall x)G(x)$

statement (iii) can be denoted by  $(\forall x)\neg G(x)$

statement (iv) can be denoted by  $(\exists x)\neg G(x)$ .

Example: Let  $K(x) : x$  is a man

$L(x) : x$  is mortal

$M(x) : x$  is an integer

$N(x) : x$  either positive or negative

Express the following using quantifiers:

- All men are mortal
- Any integer is either positive or negative.

Solution: (a) The given statement can be written as

for all  $x$ , if  $x$  is a man, then  $x$  is mortal and this can be expressed as

$$(\forall x)(K(x) \rightarrow L(x)).$$

(b) The given statement can be written as

for all  $x$ , if  $x$  is an integer, then  $x$  is either positive or negative and this can be expressed

as  $(\forall x)(M(x) \rightarrow N(x))$ .



## Free and Bound Variables

Given a formula containing a part of the form  $(x)P(x)$  or  $(\exists x)P(x)$ , such a part is called an  $x$ -bound part of the formula. Any occurrence of  $x$  in an  $x$ -bound part of the formula is called a bound occurrence of  $x$ , while any occurrence of  $x$  or of any variable that is not a bound occurrence is called a free occurrence. The smallest formula immediately following  $(\forall x)$  or  $(\exists x)$  is called the scope of the quantifier.

Consider the following formulas:

- $(x)P(x, y)$
- $(x)(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$
- $(x)(P(x) \rightarrow (\exists y)R(x, y))$
- $(x)(P(x) \rightarrow R(x)) \vee (x)(R(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$
- $(\exists x)(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$
- $(\exists x)P(x) \wedge Q(x)$ .

In (1),  $P(x, y)$  is the scope of the quantifier, and occurrence of  $x$  is bound occurrence, while the occurrence of  $y$  is free occurrence.

In (2), the scope of the universal quantifier is  $P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)$ , and all occurrences of  $x$  are bound.

In (3), the scope of  $(x)$  is  $P(x) \rightarrow (\exists y)R(x, y)$ , while the scope of  $(\exists y)$  is  $R(x, y)$ . All occurrences of both  $x$  and  $y$  are bound occurrences.

In (4), the scope of the first quantifier is  $P(x) \rightarrow R(x)$  and the scope of the second is  $R(x) \rightarrow Q(x)$ . All occurrences of  $x$  are bound occurrences.

In (5), the scope  $(\exists x)$  is  $P(x) \wedge Q(x)$ .

In (6), the scope of  $(\exists x)$  is  $P(x)$  and the last occurrence of  $x$  in  $Q(x)$  is free.

## Negations of Quantified Statements

$$(i). \neg(x)P(x) \Leftrightarrow (\exists x)\neg P(x)$$

$$(ii). \neg(\exists x)P(x) \Leftrightarrow (x)(\neg P(x)).$$

Example: Let  $P(x)$  denote the statement "x is a professional athlete" and let  $Q(x)$  denote the statement "x plays soccer". The domain is the set of all people.

(a). Write each of the following proposition in English.

- $(x)(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$
- $(\exists x)(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$
- $(x)(P(x) \vee Q(x))$

(b). Write the negation of each of the above propositions, both in symbols and in words.

Solution:

(a). (i). For all  $x$ , if  $x$  is an professional athlete then  $x$  plays soccer.

"All professional athletes plays soccer" or "Every professional athlete plays soccer".

(ii). There exists an  $x$  such that  $x$  is a professional athlete and  $x$  plays soccer.

- ”Some professional athletes paly soccer”.
- (iii). For all  $x$ ,  $x$  is a professional athlete or  $x$  plays soccer.  
 ”Every person is either professional athlete or plays soccer”.

(b). (i). In symbol: We know that

$$\neg(x)(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)) \Leftrightarrow (\exists x)\neg(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)) \Leftrightarrow (\exists x)\neg(\neg(P(x)) \vee Q(x)) \\ \Leftrightarrow (\exists x)(P(x) \wedge \neg Q(x))$$

There exists an  $x$  such that,  $x$  is a professional athlete and  $x$  does not paly soccer.  
 In words: ”Some professional athlete do not play soccer”.

$$(ii). \neg(\exists x)(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \Leftrightarrow (x)(\neg P(x) \vee \neg Q(x))$$

In words: ”Every people is neither a professional athlete nor plays soccer” or All people either not a professional athlete or do not play soccer”.

$$(iii). \neg(x)(P(x) \vee Q(x)) \Leftrightarrow (\exists x)(\neg P(x) \wedge \neg Q(x)).$$

In words: ”Some people are not professional athlete or do not paly soccer”.

## Inference Theory of the Predicate Calculus

To understand the inference theory of predicate calculus, it is important to be famil-iar with the following rules:

Rule US: Universal specification or instaniation

$$(x)A(x) \Rightarrow A(y)$$

From  $(x)A(x)$ , one can conclude  $A(y)$ .

Rule ES: Existential specification

$$(\exists x)A(x) \Rightarrow A(y)$$

From  $(\exists x)A(x)$ , one can conclude  $A(y)$ .

Rule EG: Existential generalization

$$A(x) \Rightarrow (\exists y)A(y)$$

From  $A(x)$ , one can conclude  $(\exists y)A(y)$ .

Rule UG: Universal generalization

$$A(x) \Rightarrow (y)A(y)$$

From  $A(x)$ , one can conclude  $(y)A(y)$ .

### Equivalence formulas:

$$E_{31} : (\exists x)[A(x) \vee B(x)] \Leftrightarrow (\exists x)A(x) \vee (\exists x)B(x)$$

$$E_{32} : (x)[A(x) \wedge B(x)] \Leftrightarrow (x)A(x) \wedge (x)B(x)$$

$$E_{33} : \neg(\exists x)A(x) \Leftrightarrow (x)\neg A(x)$$

$$E_{34} : \neg(x)A(x) \Leftrightarrow (\exists x)\neg A(x)$$

$$E_{35} : (x)(A \vee B(x)) \Leftrightarrow A \vee (x)B(x)$$

$$E_{36} : (\exists x)(A \wedge B(x)) \Leftrightarrow A \wedge (\exists x)B(x)$$

$$E_{37} : (x)A(x) \rightarrow B \Leftrightarrow (x)(A(x) \rightarrow B)$$

$$E_{38} : (\exists x)A(x) \rightarrow B \Leftrightarrow (x)(A(x) \rightarrow B)$$

$$E_{39} : A \rightarrow (x)B(x) \Leftrightarrow (x)(A \rightarrow B(x))$$

$$E_{40} : A \rightarrow (\exists x)B(x) \Leftrightarrow (\exists x)(A \rightarrow B(x))$$

$$E_{41} : (\exists x)(A(x) \rightarrow B(x)) \Leftrightarrow (x)A(x) \rightarrow (\exists x)B(x)$$

$$E_{42} : (\exists x)A(x) \rightarrow (x)B(X) \Leftrightarrow (x)(A(x) \rightarrow B(X)).$$

Example: Verify the validity of the following arguments:

”All men are mortal. Socrates is a man. Therefore, Socrates is mortal”.

or

Show that  $(x)[H(x) \rightarrow M(x)] \wedge H(s) \Rightarrow M(s)$ .

Solution: Let us represent the statements as follows:

$H(x)$  :  $x$  is a man

$M(x)$  :  $x$  is a mortal

$s$  : Socrates

Thus, we have to show that  $(x)[H(x) \rightarrow M(x)] \wedge H(s) \Rightarrow M(s)$ .

{1}	(1)	$(x)[H(x) \rightarrow M(x)]$	Rule P
{1}	(2)	$H(s) \rightarrow M(s)$	Rule US, (1)
{3}	(3)	$H(s)$	Rule P
{1, 3}	(4)	$M(s)$	Rule T, (2), (3), and $I_{11}$

Example: Establish the validity of the following argument:”All integers are rational numbers. Some integers are powers of 2. Therefore, some rational numbers are powers of 2”.

Solution: Let  $P(x)$  :  $x$  is an integer

$R(x)$  :  $x$  is rational number

$S(x)$  :  $x$  is a power of 2

Hence, the given statements becomes

$$(x)(P(x) \rightarrow R(x)), (\exists x)(P(x) \wedge S(x)) \Rightarrow (\exists x)(R(x) \wedge S(x))$$

Solution:

{1}	(1)	$(\exists x)(P(x) \wedge S(x))$	Rule P
{1}	(2)	$P(y) \wedge S(y)$	Rule ES, (1)
{1}	(3)	$P(y)$	Rule T, (2) and $P \wedge Q \Rightarrow P$
{1}	(4)	$S(y)$	Rule T, (2) and $P \wedge Q \Rightarrow Q$
{5}	(5)	$(x)(P(x) \rightarrow R(x))$	Rule P
{5}	(6)	$P(y) \rightarrow R(y)$	Rule US, (5)
{1, 5}	(7)	$R(y)$	Rule T, (3), (6) and $P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$
{1, 5}	(8)	$R(y) \wedge S(y)$	Rule T, (4), (7) and $P, Q \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$
{1, 5}	(9)	$(\exists x)(R(x) \wedge S(x))$	Rule EG, (8)

Hence, the given statement is valid.

Example: Show that  $(x)(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)) \wedge (x)(Q(x) \rightarrow R(x)) \Rightarrow (x)(P(x) \rightarrow R(x))$ .

Solution:

{1}	(1) $(x)(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$	Rule P
{1}	(2) $P(y) \rightarrow Q(y)$	Rule US, (1)
{3}	(3) $(x)(Q(x) \rightarrow R(x))$	Rule P
{3}	(4) $Q(y) \rightarrow R(y)$	Rule US, (3)
{1, 3}	(5) $P(y) \rightarrow R(y)$	Rule T, (2), (4), and $I_{13}$
{1, 3}	(6) $(x)(P(x) \rightarrow R(x))$	Rule UG, (5)

Example: Show that  $(\exists x)M(x)$  follows logically from the premises

$(x)(H(x) \rightarrow M(x))$  and  $(\exists x)H(x)$ .

Solution:

{1}	(1) $(\exists x)H(x)$	Rule P
{1}	(2) $H(y)$	Rule ES, (1)
{3}	(3) $(x)(H(x) \rightarrow M(x))$	Rule P
{3}	(4) $H(y) \rightarrow M(y)$	Rule US, (3)
{1, 3}	(5) $M(y)$	Rule T, (2), (4), and $I_{11}$
{1, 3}	(6) $(\exists x)M(x)$	Rule EG, (5)

Hence, the result.

Example: Show that  $(\exists x)[P(x) \wedge Q(x)] \Rightarrow (\exists x)P(x) \wedge (\exists x)Q(x)$ .

Solution:

{1}	(1) $(\exists x)(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$	Rule P
{1}	(2) $P(y) \wedge Q(y)$	Rule ES, (1)
{1}	(3) $P(y)$	Rule T, (2), and $I_1$
{1}	(4) $(\exists x)P(x)$	Rule EG, (3)
{1}	(5) $Q(y)$	Rule T, (2), and $I_2$
{1}	(6) $(\exists x)Q(x)$	Rule EG, (5)
{1}	(7) $(\exists x)P(x) \wedge (\exists x)Q(x)$	Rule T, (4), (5) and $I_9$

Hence, the result.

Note: Is the converse true?

{1}	(1) $(\exists x)P(x) \wedge (\exists x)Q(x)$	Rule P
{1}	(2) $(\exists x)P(x)$	Rule T, (1) and $I_1$
{1}	(3) $(\exists x)Q(x)$	Rule T, (1), and $I_1$
{1}	(4) $P(y)$	Rule ES, (2)
{1}	(5) $Q(s)$	Rule ES, (3)

Here in step (4),  $y$  is fixed, and it is not possible to use that variable again in step (5).  
Hence, the *converse is not true*.

Example: Show that from  $(\exists x)[F(x) \wedge S(x)] \rightarrow (y)[M(y) \rightarrow W(y)]$  and  $(\exists y)[M(y) \wedge \neg W(y)]$  the conclusion  $(x)[F(x) \rightarrow \neg S(x)]$  follows.

{1}	(1)	$(\exists y)[M(y) \wedge \neg W(y)]$	Rule P
{1}	(2)	$[M(z) \wedge \neg W(z)]$	Rule ES, (1)
{1}	(3)	$\neg[M(z) \rightarrow W(z)]$	Rule T, (2), and $\neg(P \rightarrow Q) \Leftrightarrow P \wedge \neg Q$
{1}	(4)	$(\exists y)\neg[M(y) \rightarrow W(y)]$	Rule EG, (3)
{1}	(5)	$\neg(y)[M(y) \rightarrow W(y)]$	Rule T, (4), and $\neg(x)A(x) \Leftrightarrow (\exists x)\neg A(x)$
{1}	(6)	$(\exists x)[F(x) \wedge S(x)] \rightarrow (y)[M(y) \rightarrow W(y)]$	Rule P
{1, 6}	(7)	$\neg(\exists x)[F(x) \wedge S(x)]$	Rule T, (5), (6) and $I_{12}$
{1, 6}	(8)	$(x)\neg[F(x) \wedge S(x)]$	Rule T, (7), and $\neg(x)A(x) \Leftrightarrow (\exists x)\neg A(x)$
{1, 6}	(9)	$\neg[F(z) \wedge S(z)]$	Rule US, (8)
{1, 6}	(10)	$\neg F(z) \vee \neg S(z)$	Rule T, (9), and De Morgan's laws
{1, 6}	(11)	$F(z) \rightarrow \neg S(z)$	Rule T, (10), and $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$
{1, 6}	(12)	$(x)(F(x) \rightarrow \neg S(x))$	Rule UG, (11)

Hence, the result.

Example: Show that  $(x)(P(x) \vee Q(x)) \Rightarrow (x)P(x) \vee (\exists x)Q(x)$ . (May. 2012)

Solution: We shall use the indirect method of proof by assuming  $\neg((x)P(x) \vee (\exists x)Q(x))$  as an additional premise.

{1}	(1)	$\neg((x)P(x) \vee (\exists x)Q(x))$	Rule P (assumed)
{1}	(2)	$\neg(x)P(x) \wedge \neg(\exists x)Q(x)$	Rule T, (1) $\neg(P \vee Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \wedge \neg Q$
{1}	(3)	$\neg(x)P(x)$	Rule T, (2), and $I_1$
{1}	(4)	$(\exists x)\neg P(x)$	Rule T, (3), and $\neg(x)A(x) \Leftrightarrow (\exists x)\neg A(x)$
{1}	(5)	$\neg(\exists x)Q(x)$	Rule T, (2), and $I_2$
{1}	(6)	$(x)\neg Q(x)$	Rule T, (5), and $\neg(\exists x)A(x) \Leftrightarrow (x)\neg A(x)$
{1}	(7)	$\neg P(y)$	Rule ES, (5), (6) and $I_{12}$
{1}	(8)	$\neg Q(y)$	Rule US, (6)
{1}	(9)	$\neg P(y) \wedge \neg Q(y)$	Rule T, (7), (8) and $I_9$
{1}	(10)	$\neg(P(y) \vee Q(y))$	Rule T, (9), and $\neg(P \vee Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \wedge \neg Q$
{11}	(11)	$(x)(P(x) \vee Q(x))$	Rule P
{11}	(12)	$(P(y) \vee Q(y))$	Rule US
{1, 11}	(13)	$\neg(P(y) \vee Q(y)) \wedge (P(y) \vee Q(y))$	Rule T, (10), (11), and $I_9$
{1, 11}	(14)	$F$	Rule T, and (13)

which is a contradiction. Hence, the statement is valid.

Example: Using predicate logic, prove the validity of the following argument: "Every husband argues with his wife.  $x$  is a husband. Therefore,  $x$  argues with his wife".

Solution: Let  $P(x)$ :  $x$  is a husband.

$Q(x)$ :  $x$  argues with his wife.

Thus, we have to show that  $(x)[P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)] \wedge P(x) \Rightarrow Q(y)$ .

{1}	(1) $(x)(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$	Rule P
{1}	(2) $P(y) \rightarrow Q(y)$	Rule US, (1)
{1}	(3) $P(y)$	Rule P
{1}	(4) $Q(y)$	Rule T, (2), (3), and $I_{11}$

Example: Prove using rules of inference

Duke is a Labrador retriever.  
All Labrador retriever like to swim.  
Therefore Duke likes to swim.

Solution: We denote

$L(x)$ :  $x$  is a Labrador retriever.

$S(x)$ :  $x$  likes to swim.

$d$ : Duke.

We need to show that  $L(d) \wedge (x)(L(x) \rightarrow S(x)) \Rightarrow S(d)$ .

{1}	(1) $(x)(L(x) \rightarrow S(x))$	Rule P
{1}	(2) $L(d) \rightarrow S(d)$	Rule US, (1)
{2}	(3) $L(d)$	Rule P
{1, 2}	(4) $S(d)$	Rule T, (2), (3), and $I_{11}$ .

### JNTUK Previous questions

1. Test the Validity of the Following argument: "All dogs are barking. Some animals are dogs. Therefore, some animals are barking".
2. Test the Validity of the Following argument: "Some cats are animals. Some dogs are animals. Therefore, some cats are dogs".
3. Symbolizes and prove the validity of the following arguments :
  - (i) Himalaya is large. Therefore every thing is large.
  - (ii) Not every thing is edible. Therefore nothing is edible.
4. a) Find the PCNF of  $(\sim p \leftrightarrow r) \wedge (q \leftrightarrow p)$  ?  
b) Explain in brief about duality Law?  
  
c) Construct the Truth table for  $\sim(\sim p \wedge \sim q)$ ?  
d) Find the disjunctive Normal form of  $\sim(p \rightarrow (q \wedge r))$  ?
5. Define Well Formed Formula? Explain about Tautology with example?
6. Explain in detail about the Logical Connectives with Examples?

7. Obtain the principal conjunctive normal form of the formula  $(\neg P \rightarrow R) \wedge (Q \leftrightarrow P)$
8. Prove that  $(\exists x)P(x) \wedge Q(x) \rightarrow (\exists x)P(x) \wedge (\exists x)Q(x)$ . Does the converse hold?
9. Show that from i)  $(\exists x)(F(x) \wedge S(x)) \rightarrow (y)(M(y) \rightarrow W(y))$   
ii)  $(\exists y)(M(y) \wedge \neg W(y))$  the conclusion  $(x)(F(x) \rightarrow \neg S(x))$  follows.
10. Obtain the principal disjunctive and conjunctive normal forms of  $(P \rightarrow (Q \wedge R)) \wedge (\neg P \rightarrow (\neg Q \wedge \neg R))$ . Is this formula a tautology?
11. Prove that the following argument is valid: No Mathematicians are fools. No one who is not a fool is an administrator. Sitha is a mathematician. Therefore Sitha is not an administrator.
12. Test the Validity of the Following argument: If you work hard, you will pass the exam. You did not pass. Therefore you did not work hard.
13. Without constructing the Truth Table prove that  $(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow q = p \vee q$ ?
14. Using normal forms, show that the formula  $Q \vee (P \wedge \neg Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$  is a tautology.
15. Show that  $(x)(P(x) \vee Q(x)) \rightarrow (x)P(x) \vee (\exists x)Q(x)$
16. Show that  $\neg(P \wedge Q) \rightarrow (\neg P \vee (\neg P \vee Q)) \Leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee Q)$   
 $(P \vee Q) \wedge (\neg P \wedge (\neg P \wedge Q)) \Leftrightarrow (\neg P \wedge Q)$
17. Prove that  $(\exists x)(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \rightarrow (\exists x)P(x) \wedge (\exists x)Q(x)$
18. Example: Prove or disprove the validity of the following arguments using the rules of inference. (i) All men are fallible (ii) All kings are men (iii) Therefore, all kings are fallible.
19. Test the Validity of the Following argument:  
“Lions are dangerous animals, there are lions, and therefore there are dangerous animals.”

### MULTIPLE CHOICE QUESTIONS

- 1: Which of the following propositions is tautology?  
A.  $(p \vee q) \rightarrow q$  B.  $p \vee (q \rightarrow p)$  C.  $p \vee (p \rightarrow q)$  D. Both (b) & (c)  
Option: C
- 2: Which of the proposition is  $p \wedge (\sim p \vee q)$  is  
A. A tautology B. A contradiction C. Logically equivalent to  $p \wedge q$  D. All of above  
Option: C
- 3: Which of the following is/are tautology?  
A.  $a \vee b \rightarrow b \wedge c$  B.  $a \wedge b \rightarrow b \vee c$  C.  $a \vee b \rightarrow (b \rightarrow c)$  D. None of these  
Option: B
- 4: Logical expression  $(A \wedge B) \rightarrow (C \wedge A) \rightarrow (A \equiv 1)$  is  
A. Contradiction B. Valid C. Well-formed formula D. None of these  
Option: D
- 5: Identify the valid conclusion from the premises  $P \vee Q, Q \rightarrow R, P \rightarrow M, \neg M$   
A.  $P \wedge (R \vee R)$  B.  $P \wedge (P \wedge R)$  C.  $R \wedge (P \vee Q)$  D.  $Q \wedge (P \vee R)$   
Option: D
- 6: Let a, b, c, d be propositions. Assume that the equivalence  $a \leftrightarrow (b \vee \neg b)$  and  $b \leftrightarrow c$  hold. Then truth value of the formula  $(a \wedge b) \rightarrow ((a \wedge c) \vee d)$  is always  
A. True B. False C. Same as the truth value of a D. Same as the truth value of b  
Option: A
- 7: Which of the following is a declarative statement?  
A. It's right B. He says C. Two may not be an even integer D. I love you  
Option: B
- 8:  $\neg P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow R)$  is equivalent to  
A.  $(P \wedge Q) \rightarrow R$  B.  $(P \vee Q) \rightarrow R$  C.  $(P \vee Q) \rightarrow \neg R$  D. None of these  
Option: A
- 9: Which of the following are tautologies?  
A.  $((P \vee Q) \wedge Q) \leftrightarrow Q$  B.  $((P \vee Q) \wedge \neg P) \rightarrow Q$  C.  $((P \vee Q) \wedge P) \rightarrow P$  D. Both (a) & (b)  
Option: D
- 10: If F1, F2 and F3 are propositional formulae such that  $F1 \wedge F2 \rightarrow F3$  and  $F1 \wedge F2 \rightarrow \neg F3$  are both tautologies, then which of the following is TRUE?  
A. Both F1 and F2 are tautologies B. The conjunction  $F1 \wedge F2$  is not satisfiable  
C. Neither is tautologies D. None of these

- Option: B
11. Consider two well-formed formulas in propositional logic  
 $F1 : P \rightarrow \neg P$   $F2 : (P \rightarrow \neg P) \vee (\neg P \rightarrow P)$  Which of the following statement is correct?  
 A.F1 is satisfiable, F2 is unsatisfiable B.F1 is unsatisfiable, F2 is satisfiable  
 C.F1 is unsatisfiable, F2 is valid D.F1 & F2 are both satisfiable  
 Option: C
- 12: What can we correctly say about proposition  $P1 : (p \vee \neg q) \wedge (q \rightarrow r) \vee (r \vee p)$   
 A.P1 is tautology B.P1 is satisfiable  
 C.If p is true and q is false and r is false, the P1 is true  
 D.If p as true and q is true and r is false, then P1 is true  
 Option: C
- 13:  $(P \vee Q) \wedge (P \rightarrow R) \wedge (Q \rightarrow S)$  is equivalent to  
 A. $S \wedge R$  B. $S \rightarrow R$  C. $S \vee R$  D.All of above  
 Option: C
- 14: The functionally complete set is  
 A. $\{\neg, \wedge, \vee\}$  B. $\{\neg, \wedge\}$  C. $\{\neg\}$  D.None of these  
 Option: C
- 15:  $(P \vee Q) \wedge (P \rightarrow R) \wedge (Q \rightarrow R)$  is equivalent to  
 A.P B.Q C.R D.True = T  
 Option: C
- 16:  $\neg(P \rightarrow Q)$  is equivalent to  
 A. $P \wedge \neg Q$  B. $P \wedge Q$  C. $\neg P \vee Q$  D.None of these  
 Option: A
- 17: In propositional logic , which of the following is equivalent to  $p \rightarrow q$ ?  
 A. $\neg p \rightarrow q$  B. $\neg p \vee q$  C. $\neg p \vee \neg q$  D. $p \rightarrow q$   
 Option: B
- 18: Which of the following is FALSE? Read  $\wedge$  as And,  $\vee$  as OR,  $\sim$  as NOT,  $\rightarrow$  as one way implication and  $\leftrightarrow$  as two way implication?  
 A. $((x \rightarrow y) \wedge x) \rightarrow y$  B. $((\sim x \rightarrow y) \wedge (\sim x \wedge \sim y)) \rightarrow y$  C. $(x \rightarrow (x \vee y))$  D. $((x \vee y) \leftrightarrow (\sim x \vee \sim y))$   
 Option: D
- 19: Which of the following well-formed formula(s) are valid?  
 A. $((P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow R)) \rightarrow (P \rightarrow R)$  B. $(P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow (\neg P \rightarrow \neg Q)$   
 C. $(P \vee (\neg P \vee \neg Q)) \rightarrow P$  D. $((P \rightarrow R) \vee (Q \rightarrow R)) \rightarrow (P \vee Q) \rightarrow R$   
 Option: A
- 20: Let p and q be propositions. Using only the truth table decide whether  $p \leftrightarrow q$  does not imply  $p \rightarrow \neg q$  is  
 A.True B.False C.None D.Both A and B  
 Option: A