



## Consistency and Inconsistency of premises

A set of formulae  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$  is said to be inconsistent if their conjunction implies contradiction.

$$ii) H_1 \wedge H_2 \wedge \dots \wedge H_m \Leftrightarrow F$$

A set of formulae  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$  is said to be consistent if it is not inconsistent.

① Prove that  $P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R, S \rightarrow \neg R, P \wedge S$  are inconsistent.



$\{1\}$	1) $P \rightarrow Q$	Rule P
$\{2\}$	2) $Q \rightarrow R$	Rule P
$\{1,2\}$	3) $P \rightarrow R$	Rule T ( $P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R \Rightarrow P \rightarrow R$ )
$\{4\}$	4) $S \rightarrow \neg R$	Rule P
$\{4\}$	5) $R \rightarrow \neg S$	Rule T ( $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$ )
$\{1,2,4\}$	6) $P \rightarrow \neg S$	Rule T ( $P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R \Rightarrow P \rightarrow R$ )
$\{1,2,4\}$	7) $\neg P \vee \neg S$	Rule T ( $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$ )
$\{1,2,4\}$	8) $\neg(P \wedge S)$	Rule T (Demorgan's)
$\{9\}$	9) $P \wedge S$	Rule P
$\{1,2,4,9\}$	10) $(P \wedge S) \wedge \neg(P \wedge S)$	Rule T ( $P, Q \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$ )

which is nothing but false value. Therefore given premises are inconsistent.



② Prove that  $P \rightarrow Q$ ,  $Q \rightarrow R$ ,  $R \rightarrow S$ ,  $S \rightarrow \neg R$   
and  $P \wedge S$  are inconsistent.

$\{1\}$	1) $P \rightarrow Q$	Rule P
$\{2\}$	2) $Q \rightarrow R$	Rule P
$\{1, 2\}$	3) $P \rightarrow R$	Rule T ( $P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R$ $\Rightarrow P \rightarrow R$ )
$\{4\}$	4) $R \rightarrow S$	Rule P
$\{1, 2, 4\}$	5) $P \rightarrow S$	Rule T ( $P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R$ $\Rightarrow P \rightarrow R$ )
$\{6\}$	6) $S \rightarrow \neg R$	Rule P
$\{6\}$	7) $R \rightarrow \neg S$	Rule T ( $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$ )
$\{6\}$	8) $\neg R \vee \neg S$	Rule T ( $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$ )
$\{6\}$	9) $\neg S$	Rule T ( $P \vee Q \Rightarrow Q$ )
$\{1, 2, 4, 6\}$	10) $\neg P$	Rule T ( $P \rightarrow Q, \neg Q \Rightarrow \neg P$ )
$\{1, 2, 4, 6\}$	11) $\neg P \vee \neg S$	Rule T ( $P, Q \Rightarrow P \vee Q$ )
$\{12\}$	12) $P \wedge S$	Rule P
$\{1, 2, 4, 6\}$	13) $\neg(P \wedge S)$	Rule T (Demorgan's)
$\{1, 2, 4, 6, 12\}$	14) $(P \wedge S) \wedge \neg(P \wedge S)$	Rule T ( $P, Q \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$ )

which is nothing but false value. Therefore  
given premises are inconsistent.



## Indirect Method of Proof

In order to show that a conclusion  $C$  follows logically from the premises  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$ , we assume  $C$  is FALSE and consider  $\neg C$  as an additional premises. If  $H_1 \wedge H_2 \wedge \dots \wedge H_m \wedge \neg C$  is a contradiction, then  $C$  follows logically from  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m$ .

1. Using indirect method of proof, derive  $p \rightarrow \neg s$  from the premises  $p \rightarrow (q \vee r)$ ,  $q \rightarrow \neg p$ ,  $s \rightarrow \neg r$  and  $P$ .  
we consider  $\neg (p \rightarrow \neg s)$  as an additional premises.  
 $= \neg (\neg p \vee \neg s) = p \wedge s$ .

{1}	1) $p \wedge s$	Assumed premises
{2}	2) $p \rightarrow (q \vee r)$	Rule P
{3}	3) $p$	Rule P
{2, 3}	4) $q \vee r$	Rule T ( $P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$ )
{1}	5) $s$	Rule T ( $P \wedge Q \Rightarrow Q$ )
{6}	6) $s \rightarrow \neg r$	Rule P
{1, 6}	7) $\neg r$	Rule T ( $P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$ )



$\{2,3\}$	8) $\neg q \rightarrow r$	Rule T ( $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$ )
$\{2,3\}$	9) $\neg r \rightarrow q$	Rule T (contrapositive)
$\{1,2,3,6\}$	10) $q$	Rule T ( $P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$ )
$\{11\}$	11) $q \rightarrow \neg p$	Rule P
$\{1,2,3,6,11\}$	12) $\neg p$	Rule T ( $P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$ )
$\{1,2,3,6,11\}$	13) $p \wedge \neg p$	Rule T ( $P, Q \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$ )

which is nothing but false value.

By method of contradiction,  $p \rightarrow \neg s$



2) Show that the following argument is valid.

"My father praises me only if I can be proud of myself. Either I do well in sports or I cannot be proud of <sup>my</sup>self. If study hard, then I cannot do well in sports. Therefore, if father praises me, then I do not study well".

Let A : My father praises me

B : I can be proud of myself

C : I do well in sports

D : I study hard

Then, the premises are

$A \rightarrow B$ ,  $C \vee \neg B$ ,  $D \rightarrow \neg C$

Conclusion is  $A \rightarrow \neg D$



$\{1\}$	1) $A$	Assumed premises
$\{2\}$	2) $A \rightarrow B$	Rule P
$\{1,2\}$	3) $B$	Rule T ( $P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$ )
$\{4\}$	4) $C \vee \neg B$	Rule P
$\{4\}$	5) $B \rightarrow C$	Rule T ( $P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$ )
$\{1,2,4\}$	6) $C$	Rule T ( $P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$ )
$\{7\}$	7) $D \rightarrow \neg C$	Rule P
$\{7\}$	8) $C \rightarrow \neg D$	Rule T
$\{1,2,4,7\}$	9) $\neg D$	Rule T ( $P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$ )
	10) $A \rightarrow \neg D$	Rule CP