

Administrivia

- Reminder: Homework 2 due Monday.
- A note about the reading: We won't cover section 1.5 at all. We'll cover section 1.6, but later.

Slide 1

More Predicate Logic Examples

- (Section 1.4 problems 20, 24, 28.)

Slide 2

Proof Techniques

Slide 3

- In chapter 1 we worked up a formal system for proving “meaningless” formulas — which can prove “meaningful” formulas as special cases.
- Most of the time, though, we want to prove something is valid in a particular context, and the procedure is less formal and makes use of context-specific additional info (e.g., definitions of terms such as “even integer”).
- *But* keep in mind that less-formal proofs could be done in the millimeter-by-millimeter style of chapter 1.
- (Why are we doing this anyway? In part because you almost surely will see theorems/proofs in CS theory classes, in part to help with that “mathematical maturity” goal, ...)

Proof Techniques, Continued

Slide 4

- Suppose you have a “conjecture” (e.g., “all odd numbers greater than 1 are prime”). How to (try to) prove it?
- Well, first must sometimes decide *whether* to prove it. Do you think it’s true?
- If it’s a statement about all integers, etc., often helpful to start with “inductive reasoning” — try some examples and see what happens.
- If one doesn’t work? “Counterexample” that shows conjecture false.
- If all succeed? Just means you didn’t find a counterexample. So, turn to “deductive reasoning” to prove — subject of first part of chapter 2.
- Lots of examples/problems will be simple stuff about integers. Why? Something where we supposedly all know the “context”.

Minute Essay

Slide 5

- Use predicate logic to prove that the following argument is valid: "All CS majors must take Discrete Structures. Some CS majors are also physics majors. Therefore, some physics majors must take Discrete Structures." Use predicates $C(x)$, $D(x)$, and $P(x)$.
- Have you been asked to do proofs in a math (or other) course before? What course? Did you find it easy/hard? fun/painful?

Minute Essay Answer

Slide 6

- Hypotheses: $(\forall x)(C(x) \rightarrow D(x))$, $(\exists x)(C(x) \wedge P(x))$

Conclusion: $(\exists x)(P(x) \wedge D(x))$

Proof:

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. | $(\forall x)(C(x) \rightarrow D(x))$ | hyp |
| 2. | $(\exists x)(C(x) \wedge P(x))$ | hyp |
| 3. | $C(a) \wedge P(a)$ | 2, ei |
| 4. | $C(a) \rightarrow D(a)$ | 1, ui |
| 5. | $C(a)$ | 3, sim |
| 6. | $P(a)$ | 3, sim |
| 7. | $D(a)$ | 4, 5, mp |
| 8. | $P(a) \wedge D(a)$ | 6, 7, con |
| 9. | $(\exists x)(P(x) \wedge D(x))$ | 8, eg |