$$(\sim B \supset (A \cdot C))$$

$$(A \supset \sim C)$$

$$\therefore B$$

This is our sample argument.

## Formal Proofs

From now on, formal proofs will be our main way to test arguments. We'll begin with easier proofs. Our initial strategy for constructing proofs has three steps.

LogiCola G (EV) Pages 153–157

- 1  $(\sim B \supset (A \cdot C))$
- 2  $(A \supset \sim C)$ 
  - [: B
- 3 asm: ~B

Block off conclusion

**←** Assume the opposite

### Step 1: START

Block off the conclusion and add "asm:" followed by the conclusion's simpler contradictory.

LogiCola G (EV)

- 1  $(\sim B \supset (A \cdot C))$
- 2  $(\mathbf{A} \supset \sim \mathbf{C})$ 
  - [∴B
- 3 asm: ~B

Here the complex wffs are 1 and 2, both **IF-THENs**. You can infer from these if you have the first part true or the second false.

### Step 2: S&I

Begin the S&I step by glancing at the complex wffs and noticing their forms. You can simplify **AND**, **NOR**, and **NIF** – and you can infer with **NOT-BOTH**, **OR**, and **IF-THEN** if certain other wffs are available.

LogiCola G (EV)

\* 1 ( $\sim \mathbf{B} \supset (\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{C})$ )

2 ( $\mathbf{A} \supset \sim \mathbf{C}$ )

[:: B

3 asm:  $\sim \mathbf{B}$ 4 :: ( $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{C}$ ) {from 1 and 3} 

(A · C)

### Step 2: S&I

Go through the complex wffs that aren't starred or blocked off and use these to derive new wffs using S- and I-rules. Star any wff you simplify using an S-rule, or the longer wff used in an I-rule inference.

LogiCola G (EV)

```
* 1 (\sim B \supset (A \cdot C))

2 (A \supset \sim C)

[:\therefore B

3 asm: \sim B

* 4 :\therefore (A \cdot C) \text{ from 1 and 3}

5 :\therefore A \text{ from 4}

6 :\therefore C \text{ from 4}
```

#### Step 2: S&I

Go through the complex wffs that aren't starred or blocked off and use these to derive new wffs using S- and I-rules. Star any wff you simplify using an S-rule, or the longer wff used in an I-rule inference.

LogiCola G (EV)

```
* 1 (\sim B \supset (A \cdot C))

* 2 (A \supset \sim C)

[:: B

3 asm: \sim B

* 4 :: (A \cdot C) {from 1 and 3}

5 :: A {from 4}

6 :: C {from 4}

7 :: \sim C {from 2 and 5}
```

#### Step 2: S&I

Go through the complex wffs that aren't starred or blocked off and use these to derive new wffs using S- and I-rules. Star any wff you simplify using an S-rule, or the longer wff used in an I-rule inference.

LogiCola G (EV)

#### Step 3: RAA

When some pair of not-blocked-off lines contradicts, apply RAA and derive the original conclusion. Your proof is done!

LogiCola G (EV)

S- and I-Rules

AND	$\frac{(P \cdot Q)}{P, Q}$	NOR	$\frac{\sim (P \vee Q)}{\sim P, \sim Q}$	NIF	$\frac{\sim (P \supset Q)}{P, \sim Q}$
NN	_~~P 	IFF	$\frac{(P \equiv Q)}{(P \supset Q),}$ $(Q \supset P)$	NIFF	$ \frac{\sim (P \equiv Q)}{(P \lor Q),} \\ \sim (P \cdot Q) $
NOT-BOTH		OR		IF-THEN	
$ \begin{array}{c} \sim (P \cdot Q) \\ \hline P \\ \sim Q \end{array} $	$\frac{\sim (P \cdot Q)}{Q}$ $\frac{Q}{\sim P}$	$\frac{(P \lor Q)}{\sim P}$	$\frac{(P \lor Q)}{^{\sim}Q}$	$\frac{(P \supset Q)}{\frac{P}{Q}}$	$\frac{(P \supset Q)}{\sim Q}$

*RAA*: Suppose that some pair of not-blocked-off lines has contradictory wffs. Then block off all the lines from the last not-blocked-off assumption on down and infer a line consisting in ":." followed by a contradictory of that assumption.

\* 1 (
$$\sim$$
B  $\supset$  (A  $\cdot$  C))   
\* 2 (A  $\supset$   $\sim$  C)   
[:: B]

3 asm:  $\sim$ B

3 asm:  $\sim$ B

4 [:: (A  $\cdot$  C) {from 1 and 3}

5 :: A {from 4}

6 :: C {from 4}

7 ::  $\sim$  C {from 2 and 5}

8 :: B {from 3; 6 contradicts 7}

c premises

(no "asm" or "::")

derived

lines ("::")

A *formal proof* is a vertical sequence of zero or more premises followed by one or more assumptions or derived lines, where each derived line follows from previously not-blocked-off lines by one of the S- and I-rules listed above or by RAA, and each assumption is blocked off using RAA.

Two wffs are *contradictories* if they are exactly alike except that one starts with an additional "~."

A simple wff is a letter or its negation; any other wff is complex.

```
* 1 (~B⊃(A·C))

* 2 (A⊃~C)

[∴ B

3 asm: ~B

* 4 ∴ (A·C) {from 1 and 3}

5 ∴ A {from 4}

6 ∴ C {from 4}

7 ∴ ~C {from 2 and 5}

8 ∴ B {from 3; 6 contradicts 7}
```

## Proof Strategy

- 1 START: Assume the opposite of the conclusion.
- 2 S&I: Derive whatever you can using S- and I-rules, until you get a contradiction.
- 3 RAA: Apply RAA and derive the original conclusion.

Valid

```
1 (A \supset B)

[::(B \supset A)

* 2 asm: \sim(B \supset A)

3 :: B {from 2} We can derive

4 :: \sim A {from 2} nothing further.
```

#### Proof strategy to include invalid arguments:

- 1 START: Assume the opposite of the conclusion.
- 2 S&I: Derive whatever you can using S- and I-rules.
- 3 RAA: If you get a contradiction, apply RAA and derive the original conclusion.
- 4 REFUTE: If you don't get a contradiction, construct a refutation box.

$$1 \quad (A^0 \supset B^1) = 1$$
$$[\therefore (B^1 \supset A^0) = 0$$
$$* \quad 2 \quad \text{asm: } \sim (B \supset A)$$
$$3 \quad \therefore B \quad \{\text{from 2}\}$$
$$4 \quad \therefore \sim A \quad \{\text{from 2}\}$$

#### Invalid

B, ~A

Step 4 - REFUTE: If you can't get a contradiction, then:

- draw a box containing any simple wffs (letters or their negation) that aren't blocked off;
- in the original argument, mark each letter "1" or "0" or "?" depending on whether you have the letter or its negation or neither in the box;
- if these truth conditions make the premises all true and conclusion false, then this shows the argument to be invalid.

```
1 (A^0 \supset B^1) = 1
                                                                                                          Invalid
* 1 (\sim B \supset (A \cdot C)) Valid
* 2 \quad (A \supset \sim C)
                                                                        [ : (B^1 \supset A^0) = 0
                                                                                                        B, ~A
                                                                * 2 asm: \sim (B \supset A)
       [ : B
     3 <sub>Γ</sub> asm: ~B
                                                                       3 \therefore B \{from 2\}
* 4 \mid \therefore (A \cdot C) \quad \{\text{from 1 and 3}\}
                                                                      4 \therefore \sim A \{\text{from } 2\}
     5 \mid \therefore A \mid \{\text{from 4}\}\
     6 \mid \therefore C \mid \{\text{from 4}\}\
      7 \stackrel{\mathsf{L}}{\cdot} \sim \mathbb{C} \quad \{\text{from 2 and 5}\}\
      8 : B \{from 3; 6 contradicts 7\}
```

- 1 START: Assume the opposite of the conclusion.
- 2 S&I: Derive whatever you can using S- and I-rules.
- 3 RAA: If you get a contradiction, apply RAA and derive the original conclusion.
- 4 REFUTE: If you don't get a contradiction, construct a refutation box.

- 1  $(B \vee A)$
- 2  $(B \supset A)$ 
  - $[ :: \sim (A \supset \sim A)$
- 3 asm:  $(A \supset \sim A)$



We're stuck!

# Here we get stuck using our old strategy – so we need to make another assumption.

- 1 START: Assume the opposite of the conclusion.
- 2 S&I: Derive whatever you can using S- and I-rules.
- 3 RAA: If you get a contradiction, apply RAA and derive the original conclusion.
- 4 REFUTE: If you don't get a contradiction, construct a refutation box.

LogiCola G (HV)

Pages 167-173

- $1 \quad (B \lor A)$
- 2  $(B \supset A)$ 
  - $[ :: \sim (A \supset \sim A)$
- 3 asm:  $(A \supset \sim A)$



We're stuck!

We're stuck when:

We can't apply S- or I-rules further.

And we can't prove the argument VALID (since we have no contradiction) or INVALID (since we don't have enough simple wffs for a refutation).

- 1  $(B \vee A)$
- 2  $(B \supset A)$ 
  - $[ :: \sim (A \supset \sim A)$
- 3 asm:  $(A \supset \sim A)$
- 4 asm: B {break up 1}

When you're stuck, try to make another assumption.

ASSUME: Look for a complex wff that isn't starred or blocked off or broken. This wff will have one of these forms:

NOT-BOTH 
$$\sim$$
 (A · B)  
OR (A ∨ B)  
IF-THEN (A ⊃ B)

Assume one side or its negation – and then return to step 2 (S&I).

LogiCola G (HV)

```
1 (B \lor A)

** 2 (B \supset A)

[:: \sim (A \supset \sim A)

** 3 asm: (A \supset \sim A)

4 asm: B {break up 1}

5 :: A {from 2 and 4}

6 :: \sim A {from 3 and 5}

Contradiction!
```

S&I: Go through the complex wffs that aren't starred or blocked off and use these to derive new wffs using S- and I-rules. Star (with one star for each live assumption) any wff you simplify using an S-rule, or the longer wff used in an I-rule inference.

```
    (B ∨ A)
    (B ⊃ A)
    ∴ ~(A ⊃ ~A)
    asm: (A ⊃ ~A)
    asm: B {break up 1}
    ∴ A {from 2 and 4}
    ∴ ~A {from 3 and 5}
    ∴ ~B {from 4; 5 contradicts 6}
```

RAA: If you have a contradiction, apply RAA on the last live assumption. If all assumptions are now blocked off, you've proved the argument valid. *Otherwise*, *erase star strings having more stars than the number of live assumptions* – and then return to step 2 (S&I).

LogiCola G (HV)

```
1 (B \vee A)
                                                                                   Valid
  2 (B \supset A)
    [ :: \sim (A \supset \sim A)
3 asm: (A \supset \sim A)

4 asm: B {break up 1}

\therefore A {from 2 and 4}

\therefore \sim A {from 3 and 5}
  7 \therefore ~B {from 4; 5 contradicts 6}
                                                                               We use "∼B"
  8 | ∴ A {from 1 and 7}
                                                                                   to get a
  9 \stackrel{\bot}{\cdot} \sim A \quad \{\text{from 3 and 8}\}\
                                                                    contradiction &
10 : \sim (A \supset \sim A) {from 3; 8 contradicts 9} \leftarrow
                                                                             finish the proof.
```

```
* 1 (B \lor A)
                                        Valid
    2 (B \supset A)
                                                                                Strategy:
      [ :: \sim (A \supset \sim A)
  3 _{\Gamma} asm: (A \supset \sim A)
                                                                                    Start
    4 | asm: B {break up 1}
5 | ∴ A {from 2 and 4}
∴ ~A {from 3 and 5}
                                                                                     S&I
                                                                                   RAA
    7 \therefore ~B {from 4; 5 contradicts 6}
                                                                                 Assume
    8 \mid \therefore A \quad \{\text{from 1 and 7}\}\
                                                                                  Refute
    9 \stackrel{\bot}{\cdot} : \sim A \quad \{\text{from 3 and 8}\}\
```

10 :  $\sim$  (A  $\supset \sim$  A) {from 3; 8 contradicts 9}

- $1 \sim (\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B})$ 
  - $[::(\sim A \cdot \sim B)]$
- 2 asm:  $\sim (\sim A \cdot \sim B)$



Assume opposite.

Then we're stuck!

We can't apply S- or I-rules or RAA; and we don't have enough simple wffs for a refutation.

START: Assume the opposite of the conclusion.

- $1 \sim (\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B})$ 
  - $[ : (\sim A \cdot \sim B)$
- 2 asm:  $\sim (\sim A \cdot \sim B)$
- 3 asm: A {break up 1}

When you're stuck, try to make another assumption.

ASSUME: Look for a complex wff that isn't starred or blocked off or broken. This wff will have one of these forms:

NOT-BOTH 
$$\sim$$
 (A · B)  
OR (A ∨ B)  
IF-THEN (A ⊃ B)

Assume one side or its negation – and then return to step 2 (S&I).

We're stuck again! But now all complex wffs are either starred or blocked off or broken.

S&I: Go through the complex wffs that aren't starred or blocked off and use these to derive new wffs using S- and I-rules. Star (with one star for each live assumption) any wff you simplify using an S-rule, or the longer wff used in an I-rule inference.

\*\* 1 
$$\sim (A^1 \cdot B^0) = 1$$
  
 $[::(\sim A^1 \cdot \sim B^0) = 0$   
2 asm:  $\sim (\sim A \cdot \sim B)$   
3 asm: A {break up 1}  
4 .:  $\sim B$  {from 1 and 3}

#### Invalid

A, ∼B

REFUTE: Construct a refutation box if you can't apply S- and I-rules or RAA further, and yet all complex wffs are either starred or blocked off or broken.

```
1 \qquad (\mathbf{B} \vee \mathbf{A})
                                                                    ** 1 \sim (A^1 \cdot B^0) = 1 Invalid
                                     Valid
  2 (B \supset A)
                                                                          [ : (\sim A^1 \cdot \sim B^0) = 0
  [ :: \sim (A \supset \sim A)
                                                                          2 asm: \sim (\sim A \cdot \sim B)
                                                                          3 asm: A {break up 1}
 3 \vdash asm: (A \supset \sim A)
  4 | asm: B {break up 1} 

∴ A {from 2 and 4}
                                                                          4 \therefore ~B {from 1 and 3}
  6 \mid \bot : \sim A \quad \{\text{from 3 and 5}\}\
                                                                                       A, ~B
  7 | \therefore \sim B {from 4; 5 contradicts 6}
  8 \mid \therefore A \mid \{\text{from 1 and 7}\}\
  9 \stackrel{\bot}{\sim} A \quad \{\text{from 3 and 8}\}\
 10 : \sim (A \supset \sim A) {from 3; 8 contradicts 9}
```

Start	S&I	RAA	Assume	Refute
-------	-----	-----	--------	--------

## Traditional Copi proofs use eight inference rules and ten replacement rules. Here are the inference rules:

AD Addition	$\frac{P}{(P \vee Q)}$
CJ Conjunction	$\frac{P}{Q}$ $(P \cdot Q)$
DI Dilemma	$\frac{((P \supset Q) \cdot (R \supset S))}{(P \lor R)}$ $\frac{(Q \lor S)}$
DS	$(P \lor Q)$
Disjunctive	~P
Syllogism	Q

HS	$(P \supset Q)$
Hypothetical	$(Q \supset R)$
Syllogism	$(P \supseteq R)$
MP Modus Ponens	$\frac{(P \supset Q)}{P}$
MT Modus Tollens	$\frac{(P \supset Q)}{\sim Q}$
SP Simplification	<u>(P • Q)</u> P

## Here are the ten Copi replacement rules:

AS Association	$(P \lor (Q \lor R)) = ((P \lor Q) \lor R)$ $(P \cdot (Q \cdot R)) = ((P \cdot Q) \cdot R)$
CM Commutation	$(P \lor Q) = (Q \lor P)$ $(P \cdot Q) = (Q \cdot P)$
DB Distribution	$(P \cdot (Q \lor R)) = ((P \cdot Q) \lor (P \cdot R))$ $(P \lor (Q \cdot R)) = ((P \lor Q) \cdot (P \lor R))$
DM De Morgan	$\sim (P \cdot Q) = (\sim P \vee \sim Q))$ $\sim (P \vee Q) = (\sim P \cdot \sim Q)$
DN Double Negation	P = ~~P
EQ Equivalence	$(P \equiv Q) = ((P \supset Q) \cdot (Q \supset P))$ $(P \equiv Q) = ((P \cdot Q) \lor (\sim P \cdot \sim Q))$
EX Exportation	$((P \cdot Q) \supset R) = (P \supset (Q \supset R))$
IM Implication	$(P \supset Q) = (\sim P \lor Q)$
RP Repetition	$P = (P \lor P)$ $P = (P \cdot P)$
TR Transposition	$(P \supset Q) = (\sim Q \supset \sim P)$

#### Conclusion: B

```
    T
    (T⊃(B∨M))
    (M⊃H)
    ∼H
    (B∨M) {MP 1+2}
    ∼M {MT 3+4}
    (M∨B) {CM 5}
    B {DS 6+7}
```

Many Copi proofs directly derive the conclusion from the premises. Copi also provides for conditional and indirect (RAA) proofs.

CP Conditional Proof	If you assume P and later derive Q, then you can star all the lines from P to Q [showing that you aren't to use them to derive further steps] and then derive $(P \supset Q)$ .
RA Reductio ad Absurdum	If you assume P and later derive $(Q \cdot \sim Q)$ , then you can star all the lines from P to $(Q \cdot \sim Q)$ [showing that you aren't to use them to derive further steps] and then derive $\sim P$ .

Truth trees break formulas into the cases that make them true. Here's a truth tree for " $(A \cdot \sim B)$ ,  $(B \vee C) \therefore C$ ":

An argument is valid if and only if every branch eventually *closes* (has a self-contradiction).