

Section 1.5

Rules of Inference

Definition: A *theorem* is a *valid* logical assertion which can be proved using

- other theorems
- *axioms* (statements which are given to be true) and
- *rules of inference* (logical rules which allow the deduction of conclusions from premises).

A *lemma* (not a “lemon”) is a 'pre-theorem' or a result which is needed to prove a theorem.

A *corollary* is a 'post-theorem' or a result which follows directly from a theorem.

Rules of Inference

Many of the tautologies in Chapter 1 are rules of inference. They have the form

$$H_1 \quad H_2 \quad \dots \quad H_n \quad C$$

where

H_i are called the *hypotheses*

and

C is the *conclusion*.

As a rule of inference they take the symbolic form:

$$\begin{array}{c} H_1 \\ H_2 \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ H_n \\ C \end{array}$$

where \implies means 'therefore' or 'it follows that.'

Examples:

The tautology $P \implies (P \implies Q) \implies Q$ becomes

$$\begin{array}{c} P \\ P \implies Q \\ Q \end{array}$$

This means that whenever P is true and $P \implies Q$ is true we can conclude logically that Q is true.

This rule of inference is the most famous and has the name

• *modus ponens*

or

- the *law of detachment*.

Other famous rules of inference:

$$\begin{array}{l} P \\ P \quad Q \end{array} \qquad \text{Addition}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} P \quad Q \\ P \end{array} \qquad \text{Simplification}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \neg Q \\ P \quad Q \\ \neg P \end{array} \qquad \text{Modus Tollens}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} P \quad Q \\ Q \quad R \\ P \quad R \end{array} \qquad \text{Hypothetical syllogism}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} P \quad Q \\ \neg P \\ Q \end{array} \qquad \text{Disjunctive syllogism}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} P \\ Q \\ P \quad Q \end{array} \qquad \text{Conjunction}$$

$$(P \quad Q) \quad (R \quad S)$$

$$P \quad R$$

Constructive dilemma

$$Q \quad S$$

Rules of Inference for Quantifiers

$$xP(x)$$

Universal Instantiation (UI)

$$P(c)$$

$$P(x)$$

Universal Generalization (UG)

$$xP(x)$$

$$P(c)$$

Existential Generalization (EG)

$$xP(x)$$

$$xP(x)$$

Existential Instantiation (EI)

$$P(c)$$

Note:

- In Universal Generalization, x must be arbitrary.
- In Universal Instantiation, c need not be arbitrary but often is assumed to be.

• In Existential Instantiation, c must be an element of the universe which makes $P(x)$ true.

Example:

*Every man has two legs. John Smith is a man.
Therefore, John Smith has two legs.*

Define the predicates:

$M(x)$: x is a man

$L(x)$: x has two legs

J : John Smith, a member of the universe

The argument becomes

1. $\forall x [M(x) \rightarrow L(x)]$

2. $M(J)$

$L(J)$

The proof is

1. $\forall x [M(x) \rightarrow L(x)]$

2. $M(J) \rightarrow L(J)$

3. $M(J)$

4. $L(J)$

Hypothesis 1
step 1 and UI

Hypothesis 2
steps 2 and 3
and *modus ponens*

Q. E. D.

Note: Using the rules of inference requires lots of practice.

Fallacies

Fallacies are incorrect inferences.

Some common fallacies:

- ***The Fallacy of Affirming the Consequent***

*If the butler did it he has blood on his hands.
The butler had blood on his hands.
Therefore, the butler did it.*

This argument has the form

$$\begin{array}{l} P \quad Q \\ Q \\ P \end{array}$$

or

$$[(P \quad Q) \quad Q] \quad P$$

which is not a tautology and therefore not a rule of inference!

- ***The Fallacy of Denying the Antecedent*** (or the *hypothesis*)

*If the butler is nervous, he did it.
The butler is really mellow.
Therefore, the butler didn't do it.*

This argument has the form

$$\begin{array}{l} P \quad Q \\ \neg P \\ \neg Q \end{array}$$

or

$$[(P \quad Q) \quad \neg P] \quad \neg Q$$

which is also not a tautology and hence not a rule of inference.

• ***Begging the question or circular reasoning***

This occurs when we use the truth of statement being proved (or something equivalent) in the proof itself.

Example:

Conjecture: *if x^2 is even then x is even.*

Proof: If x^2 is even then $x^2 = 2k$ for some k . Then $x = 2l$ for some l . Hence, x must be even.
