



SNS COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY

(An Autonomous Institution)



Approved by AICTE, New Delhi, Affiliated to Anna University, Chennai

Accredited by NAAC-UGC with 'A++' Grade (Cycle III) &

Accredited by NBA (B.E - CSE, EEE, ECE, Mech & B.Tech.IT)

COIMBATORE-641 035, TAMIL NADU

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

Conditional Proof:

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

Set	Premises	Rule
1.	R (Assumed)	P (Assumed premise)
2.	$\neg R \vee P$	P
{1, 2}	P	T $\neg P, P \vee Q \Rightarrow Q$
4.	$P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow S)$	P
{2, 4}	$Q \rightarrow S$	T $P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$
6.	Q	P
{5, 6}	S	T $P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$
{1, 7}	$R \rightarrow S$	CP

2J. Derive the following using CP:

i) $P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow P \rightarrow (P \wedge Q)$

ii) $P, P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow (R \wedge S)) \Rightarrow Q \rightarrow S$

iii) $P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow P \rightarrow (P \wedge Q)$

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

i) $P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow P \rightarrow (P \wedge Q)$

Step	Premises	Rule
1.	P	P (Assumed premise)
2.	$P \rightarrow Q$	P
{1, 2}	Q	T $P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$
{1, 2}	$P \wedge Q$	T $P, Q \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$
5.	$P \rightarrow (P \wedge Q)$	CP



SNS COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY

(An Autonomous Institution)

Approved by AICTE, New Delhi, Affiliated to Anna University, Chennai

Accredited by NAAC-UGC with 'A++' Grade (Cycle III) &

Accredited by NBA (B.E - CSE, EEE, ECE, Mech & B.Tech.IT)

COIMBATORE-641 035, TAMIL NADU



DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

ii). $P, P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow (R \wedge S)) \Rightarrow Q \rightarrow S$

Step	Premises	Rule
		P (Assumed premise)
1.	Q	P
2.	P	P
3.	$P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow (R \wedge S))$	T
{2,3} 4.	$Q \rightarrow (R \wedge S)$	T
{1,4} 5.	$R \wedge S$	T
{5} 6.	S	T
{1,6} 7.	$Q \rightarrow S$	CP

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

Step	Premises	Rule
		P (Assumed premise)
1.	$\neg P$	P
2.	$\neg P \vee Q$	T
{2} 3.	$P \rightarrow Q$	T
{1,3} 4.	Q	T
5.	$\neg Q \vee R$	P
{5} 6.	$Q \rightarrow R$	T
{4,6} 7.	R	T
8.	$R \rightarrow S$	P
{7,8} 9.	S	T
{1,9} 10.	$P \rightarrow S$	CP



SNS COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY

(An Autonomous Institution)

Approved by AICTE, New Delhi, Affiliated to Anna University, Chennai

Accredited by NAAC-UGC with 'A++' Grade (Cycle III) &

Accredited by NBA (B.E - CSE, EEE, ECE, Mech & B.Tech.IT)

COIMBATORE-641 035, TAMIL NADU



DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

Inconsistent Proof:

A set of premises H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m is said to be inconsistent if $H_1 \wedge H_2 \wedge \dots \wedge H_m \Rightarrow F$ which stands for a contradiction.

E.g., $H_1 \wedge H_2 \wedge \dots \wedge H_m = A \wedge \neg A$, where A is any variable.

* II. Prove that the premises $P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R, R \rightarrow S, S \rightarrow \neg R$ and $P \wedge S$ are inconsistent.

Step	Premises	Rule
1.	$P \rightarrow Q$	P
2.	$Q \rightarrow R$	P
{1, 2} 3.	$P \rightarrow R$	T $P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R \Rightarrow P \rightarrow R$
4.	$S \rightarrow \neg R$	P
{A} 5.	$R \rightarrow \neg S$	T $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$
{3, 5} 6.	$P \rightarrow \neg S$	T $P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R \Rightarrow P \rightarrow R$
7.	$R \rightarrow S$	P
{6} 8.	$\neg P \vee \neg S$	T $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$
{8} 9.	$\neg(P \wedge S)$	T $\neg P \vee \neg S \Leftrightarrow \neg(P \wedge S)$
10.	$P \wedge S$	P
{9, 10} 11.	$(P \wedge S) \wedge \neg(P \wedge S)$	T $P, Q \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$
12.	F	T

✓ 2]. Show that the premises $P \rightarrow Q, P \rightarrow \neg Q, Q \rightarrow \neg P, P$ are inconsistent.

1.	P	P
2.	$P \rightarrow Q$	P
{1, 2} 3.	Q	T $P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$
4.	$Q \rightarrow \neg P$	P
{3, 4} 5.	$\neg P$	T $P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$
6.	$P \rightarrow \neg P$	P
{6} 7.	$\neg P \rightarrow \neg P$	T $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$



SNS COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY



(An Autonomous Institution)

Approved by AICTE, New Delhi, Affiliated to Anna University, Chennai

Accredited by NAAC-UGC with 'A++' Grade (Cycle III) &

Accredited by NBA (B.E - CSE, EEE, ECE, Mech & B.Tech.IT)

COIMBATORE-641 035, TAMIL NADU

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

{5,7}	8.	$\neg P$	T	$P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$
{1,8}	9.	$P \wedge \neg P$	T	$P, Q \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$
	10.	F	T	$P \wedge \neg P \Leftrightarrow F$

3]. Prove that the premises $a \rightarrow (b \rightarrow c)$, $d \rightarrow (b \wedge \neg c)$, and are inconsistent.

	1.	$a \wedge d$	P	$P \wedge Q \Rightarrow P, Q$
{1}	2.	a	T	
	3.	$a \rightarrow (b \rightarrow c)$	P	$P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow P \rightarrow Q$
{2,3}	4.	$b \rightarrow c$	T	
{1}	5.	d	T	
	6.	$d \rightarrow (b \wedge \neg c)$	P	$P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$
{5,6}	7.	$b \wedge \neg c$	T	$\neg(P \rightarrow Q) \Leftrightarrow P \wedge \neg Q$
{7}	8.	$\neg(b \rightarrow c)$	T	$P, Q \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$
{4,8}	9.	$(b \rightarrow c) \wedge \neg(b \rightarrow c)$	T	
	10.	F	T	

4]. Show that the following premises are inconsistent.

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

P : Jack misses many classes through illness
 Q : Jack fails high school.
 R : Jack reads a lot of books
 S : Jack is uneducated.



SNS COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY

(An Autonomous Institution)



Approved by AICTE, New Delhi, Affiliated to Anna University, Chennai

Accredited by NAAC-UGC with 'A++' Grade (Cycle III) &

Accredited by NBA (B.E - CSE, EEE, ECE, Mech & B.Tech.IT)

COIMBATORE-641 035, TAMIL NADU

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

The premises are

$P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R, S \rightarrow TR, PAS.$

Step	Premises	Rule
1.	$P \rightarrow Q$	P
2.	$Q \rightarrow R$	P
{1,2} 3.	$P \rightarrow R$	T $P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R \Rightarrow P \rightarrow R$
4.	$S \rightarrow TR$	P
{4} 5.	$R \rightarrow TS$	T $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow TR \rightarrow TP$
{3,5} 6.	$P \rightarrow TS$	T $P \rightarrow R, R \rightarrow TS \Rightarrow P \rightarrow TS$
{6} 7.	$TP \vee TS$	T $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow TP \vee Q$
{7} 8.	$\neg(P \wedge S)$	T $\neg(P \wedge Q) \Leftrightarrow TP \vee \neg Q$
9.	$P \wedge S$	P
{8,9} 10.	$(P \wedge S) \wedge \neg(P \wedge S)$	T $P, Q \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$
11.	F	T $P \wedge \neg P \Leftrightarrow F.$

5. i). If there is a ball game, then travelling was difficult.

ii). If they arrived on time then travelling was not difficult.

iii). They arrived on time

iv). Therefore there was no ball game.

Show that the above statements are valid statement.

Let P : There was a ball game

Q : Travelling was difficult

R : They arrived on time.

The premises are $P \rightarrow Q, R \rightarrow \neg Q, R,$

The conclusion is $\neg P.$



SNS COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY

(An Autonomous Institution)

Approved by AICTE, New Delhi, Affiliated to Anna University, Chennai

Accredited by NAAC-UGC with 'A++' Grade (Cycle III) &

Accredited by NBA (B.E - CSE, EEE, ECE, Mech & B.Tech.IT)

COIMBATORE-641 035, TAMIL NADU



DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

Step	Premises	Rule
1.	R	P
2.	$R \rightarrow \neg Q$	P
{1, 2} 3.	$\neg Q$	$T, P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$
4.	$P \rightarrow Q$	P
{3, 4} 5.	$\neg P$	$T, P \rightarrow Q, \neg Q \Rightarrow \neg P$