Formale Systeme Week 8

Reasoning

http://cs.uni-salzburg.at/~anas/teaching/FormaleSysteme/

Advantages:

- well-structured
- arguments present
- small steps
- both ways

Disadvantages:

- successive
- "standard" equivalences
- little guidance

Advantages:

- well-structured
- arguments present
- small steps
- both ways

Disadvantages:

- successive
- "standard" equivalences
- little guidance

 $(P \Rightarrow Q) \land P \Rightarrow Q$

 \underline{val} {Implication twice} $\neg((\neg P \lor Q) \land P) \lor Q$ $\stackrel{val}{=}$ {De Morgan} $\neg(\neg P \lor Q) \lor \neg P \lor Q$ $\stackrel{val}{=}$ {De Morgan} $(\neg \neg P \land \neg Q) \lor \neg P \lor Q$ $\stackrel{val}{=}$ {Double negation} $(P \land \neg Q) \lor \neg P \lor Q$ $\stackrel{val}{=}$ {Distributivity} $(P \lor \neg P \lor Q) \land (\neg Q \lor \neg P \lor Q)$ \underline{val} {Excludded middle twice} $T \wedge T$ {T/F-elimination} T

Hence: val $(P \Rightarrow Q) \land P \models Q$

Advantages:

- well-structured
- arguments present
- small steps
- both ways

Disadvantages:

- successive
- "standard" equivalences
- little guidance

 $(P \Rightarrow Q) \land P \Rightarrow Q$ \underline{val} {Implication twice} $\neg((\neg P \lor Q) \land P) \lor Q$ $\stackrel{val}{=}$ {De Morgan} $\neg(\neg P \lor Q) \lor \neg P \lor Q$ $\overset{val}{=}$ {De Morgan} $(\neg \neg P \land \neg Q) \lor \neg P \lor Q$ \underline{val} {Double negation} $(P \land \neg Q) \lor \neg P \lor Q$ $\stackrel{val}{=}$ {Distributivity} $(P \lor \neg P \lor Q) \land (\neg Q \lor \neg P \lor Q)$ $\overset{val}{=}$ {Excludded middle twice} $T \wedge T$ $\{T/F\text{-elimination}\}$ T

Advantages:

- easier
- more natural
- no longer successive
- single pattern
 (few useful instantiations)

(1) Assume: P(2) Assume: $P \Rightarrow Q$ (3) From (1) and (2) deduce Q

Advantages:

Natural deduction

- easier
- more natural
- no longer successive
- single pattern
 (few useful instantiations)

(1) Assume: P(2) Assume: $P \Rightarrow Q$ (3) From (1) and (2) deduce Q

Reasoning

A proof by reasoning (natural deduction) is a sequence of statements which are either assumptions or conclusions (inferences) inferred from any of the previous (!) statements (premises)



Example:

- From zero premises, any tautology is a correct conclusion

- From one premise any standard equivalence/weakening leads to a correct conclusion, e.g., from $\neg P \land \neg Q$ we can correctly conclude $\neg (P \lor Q)$

Types of assumptions/ hypotheses

• Pure hypotheses

• Generating hypotheses

• Identifying hypotheses / definitions

Types of assumptions/ hypotheses



• Generating hypotheses

Identifying hypotheses / definitions





Example: Let n be a natural number greater than 10

• Identifying hypotheses / definitions





Generating hypotheses

Example: Let n be a natural number greater than 10

Identifying hypotheses / definitions

Example: Let x be the square root of 222, i.e., define $x = \sqrt{222}$



• To set up the scenery







Sunday, November 27, 2011



• For a specific goal









