

Chapter 1.6: Predicates and quantifiers

- Propositions often pertain to a *set* of objects, and not just a single thing. Use words like “every”, “all”, “no”, “there is”

Chapter 1.6: Predicates and quantifiers

- Propositions often pertain to a *set* of objects, and not just a single thing. Use words like “every”, “all”, “no”, “there is”
- A predicate $P(x)$ is a function which takes an input x and produces a true/false output. In other words, for a specific x , $P(x)$ is a proposition. The set from which x is drawn from might be given, or implied from context.

Chapter 1.6: Predicates and quantifiers

- Propositions often pertain to a *set* of objects, and not just a single thing. Use words like “every”, “all”, “no”, “there is”
- A predicate $P(x)$ is a function which takes an input x and produces a true/false output. In other words, for a specific x , $P(x)$ is a proposition. The set from which x is drawn from might be given, or implied from context.
- Example: There are three dogs, Rex, Bruno, and Fifi, and Bruno is the only black dog. If $P(x) = \text{dog } x \text{ is black}$, then $P(\text{Rex}) = F$, $P(\text{Bruno}) = T$ and $P(\text{Fifi}) = F$.

Chapter 1.6: Predicates and quantifiers

- Propositions often pertain to a *set* of objects, and not just a single thing. Use words like “every”, “all”, “no”, “there is”
- A predicate $P(x)$ is a function which takes an input x and produces a true/false output. In other words, for a specific x , $P(x)$ is a proposition. The set from which x is drawn from might be given, or implied from context.
- Example: There are three dogs, Rex, Bruno, and Fifi, and Bruno is the only black dog. If $P(x) = \text{dog } x \text{ is black}$, then $P(\text{Rex}) = F$, $P(\text{Bruno}) = T$ and $P(\text{Fifi}) = F$.
- Example: To test if x is between 3 and 5, $P(x) = (x > 3) \wedge (x < 5)$.

Chapter 1.6: Predicates and quantifiers

- Propositions often pertain to a *set* of objects, and not just a single thing. Use words like “every”, “all”, “no”, “there is”
- A predicate $P(x)$ is a function which takes an input x and produces a true/false output. In other words, for a specific x , $P(x)$ is a proposition. The set from which x is drawn from might be given, or implied from context.
- Example: There are three dogs, Rex, Bruno, and Fifi, and Bruno is the only black dog. If $P(x) = \text{dog } x \text{ is black}$, then $P(\text{Rex}) = F$, $P(\text{Bruno}) = T$ and $P(\text{Fifi}) = F$.
- Example: To test if x is between 3 and 5,
 $P(x) = (x > 3) \wedge (x < 5)$.
- Note: a predicate is not a proposition!

Chapter 1.6: Predicates and quantifiers

- Propositions often pertain to a *set* of objects, and not just a single thing. Use words like “every”, “all”, “no”, “there is”
- A predicate $P(x)$ is a function which takes an input x and produces a true/false output. In other words, for a specific x , $P(x)$ is a proposition. The set from which x is drawn from might be given, or implied from context.
- Example: There are three dogs, Rex, Bruno, and Fifi, and Bruno is the only black dog. If $P(x) = \text{dog } x \text{ is black}$, then $P(\text{Rex}) = F$, $P(\text{Bruno}) = T$ and $P(\text{Fifi}) = F$.
- Example: To test if x is between 3 and 5,
 $P(x) = (x > 3) \wedge (x < 5)$.
- Note: a predicate is not a proposition!
- Quantifiers turn predicates into propositions:
Existential (“there exists”): $\exists x P(x)$ is true if there is at least one x so $P(x)$ is true.
Universal (“for all”): $\forall x P(x)$ is true when $P(x)$ is true for every x .

Chapter 1.6: Predicates and quantifiers

- Propositions often pertain to a *set* of objects, and not just a single thing. Use words like “every”, “all”, “no”, “there is”
- A predicate $P(x)$ is a function which takes an input x and produces a true/false output. In other words, for a specific x , $P(x)$ is a proposition. The set from which x is drawn from might be given, or implied from context.
- Example: There are three dogs, Rex, Bruno, and Fifi, and Bruno is the only black dog. If $P(x) = \text{dog } x \text{ is black}$, then $P(\text{Rex}) = F$, $P(\text{Bruno}) = T$ and $P(\text{Fifi}) = F$.
- Example: To test if x is between 3 and 5,
 $P(x) = (x > 3) \wedge (x < 5)$.
- Note: a predicate is not a proposition!
- Quantifiers turn predicates into propositions:
Existential (“there exists”): $\exists xP(x)$ is true if there is at least one x so $P(x)$ is true.
Universal (“for all”): $\forall xP(x)$ is true when $P(x)$ is true for every x .

- Let $P(x) = \text{dog } x \text{ is black}$. Which are true quantified statements?

“There is a dog which is black.” $\exists xP(x)$.

“All dogs are black.” $\forall xP(x)$.

What does $\exists x\neg P(x)$ say?

- Let $P(x) = \text{dog } x \text{ is black}$. Which are true quantified statements?
 - “There is a dog which is black.” $\exists xP(x)$.
 - “All dogs are black.” $\forall xP(x)$.
 - What does $\exists x\neg P(x)$ say?
- “For all real numbers x , $x^2 > 0$ ”. In this case, the predicate $P(x):x^2 > 0$, and the statement is $\forall xP(x)$. Is it true?

- Let $P(x) = \text{dog } x \text{ is black}$. Which are true quantified statements?
 - “There is a dog which is black.” $\exists xP(x)$.
 - “All dogs are black.” $\forall xP(x)$.
 - What does $\exists x\neg P(x)$ say?
- “For all real numbers x , $x^2 > 0$ ”. In this case, the predicate $P(x):x^2 > 0$, and the statement is $\forall xP(x)$. Is it true?
- “There is a day of the week when I’m not working.” Predicate is $W(x)$: I’m working on day x . In symbols $\exists x\neg W(x)$.

To check the truth of quantified statements:

- $\exists xP(x)$ is true if you can find one specific x so that $P(x) = T$.
- $\forall xP(x)$ is true if $P(x) = T$ for an *arbitrary* x .
- $\exists xP(x)$ is false if $P(x) = F$ for an *arbitrary* x .
- $\forall xP(x)$ is false $P(x) = F$ for some x (“counterexample”).

To check the truth of quantified statements:

- $\exists xP(x)$ is true if you can find one specific x so that $P(x) = T$.
- $\forall xP(x)$ is true if $P(x) = T$ for an *arbitrary* x .
- $\exists xP(x)$ is false if $P(x) = F$ for an *arbitrary* x .
- $\forall xP(x)$ is false $P(x) = F$ for some x (“counterexample”).

Identify the quantifier and show how to prove or disprove:

- “There is a mammal that can fly.”

To check the truth of quantified statements:

- $\exists xP(x)$ is true if you can find one specific x so that $P(x) = T$.
- $\forall xP(x)$ is true if $P(x) = T$ for an *arbitrary* x .
- $\exists xP(x)$ is false if $P(x) = F$ for an *arbitrary* x .
- $\forall xP(x)$ is false $P(x) = F$ for some x (“counterexample”).

Identify the quantifier and show how to prove or disprove:

- “There is a mammal that can fly.”
- I can find a real number x so that $x^2 + 1 = 0$.

To check the truth of quantified statements:

- $\exists xP(x)$ is true if you can find one specific x so that $P(x) = T$.
- $\forall xP(x)$ is true if $P(x) = T$ for an *arbitrary* x .
- $\exists xP(x)$ is false if $P(x) = F$ for an *arbitrary* x .
- $\forall xP(x)$ is false $P(x) = F$ for some x (“counterexample”).

Identify the quantifier and show how to prove or disprove:

- “There is a mammal that can fly.”
- I can find a real number x so that $x^2 + 1 = 0$.
- “Every month has more than 28 days.”

To check the truth of quantified statements:

- $\exists xP(x)$ is true if you can find one specific x so that $P(x) = T$.
- $\forall xP(x)$ is true if $P(x) = T$ for an *arbitrary* x .
- $\exists xP(x)$ is false if $P(x) = F$ for an *arbitrary* x .
- $\forall xP(x)$ is false $P(x) = F$ for some x (“counterexample”).

Identify the quantifier and show how to prove or disprove:

- “There is a mammal that can fly.”
- I can find a real number x so that $x^2 + 1 = 0$.
- “Every month has more than 28 days.”
- Every even integer can be written as the sum of an odd integer plus one.

Suppose x is drawn from a set x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n . Then

$$\exists x P(x) = P(x_1) \vee P(x_2) \vee \dots \vee P(x_n)$$

and

$$\forall P(x) = P(x_1) \wedge P(x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge P(x_n).$$

If n is small enough, can verify truth/falsehood by exhaustion of cases $P(x_1), P(x_2), \dots$

Chapter 1.7: Quantified statements

Recall predicate $P(x)$ is not a proposition, but applying quantifiers $\exists x, \forall x$ makes it so.

Recall predicate $P(x)$ is not a proposition, but applying quantifiers $\exists x, \forall x$ makes it so.

- Can use quantifiers on compound propositions, e.g.
 $\exists x(p(x) \rightarrow q(x))$.

Recall predicate $P(x)$ is not a proposition, but applying quantifiers $\exists x, \forall x$ makes it so.

- Can use quantifiers on compound propositions, e.g. $\exists x(p(x) \rightarrow q(x))$.
- Order of precedence : \exists, \forall are evaluated before other operations.

Recall predicate $P(x)$ is not a proposition, but applying quantifiers $\exists x, \forall x$ makes it so.

- Can use quantifiers on compound propositions, e.g. $\exists x(p(x) \rightarrow q(x))$.
- Order of precedence : \exists, \forall are evaluated before other operations.
- If a variable has no quantifier it is free, e.g. $P(x)$, otherwise it is bound as in $\exists x(A(x) \wedge B(x))$.

Recall predicate $P(x)$ is not a proposition, but applying quantifiers $\exists x, \forall x$ makes it so.

- Can use quantifiers on compound propositions, e.g. $\exists x(p(x) \rightarrow q(x))$.
- Order of precedence : \exists, \forall are evaluated before other operations.
- If a variable has no quantifier it is free, e.g. $P(x)$, otherwise it is bound as in $\exists x(A(x) \wedge B(x))$.
- Careful! variable must either be free or bound.
Example: $B(x) \vee \exists xA(x)$ makes no sense.

Translate from English:

"All students who get an A on the final will pass the course."

"All students will get an A on the final or not pass the course."

"All students got an A on the final and passed the course."

Translate from English:

"All students who get an A on the final will pass the course."

"All students will get an A on the final or not pass the course."

"All students got an A on the final and passed the course."

Answers: $A(x)$ = x got an A, $P(x)$ = x passed,

Translate from English:

"All students who get an A on the final will pass the course."

"All students will get an A on the final or not pass the course."

"All students got an A on the final and passed the course."

Answers: $A(x)$ = x got an A, $P(x)$ = x passed,

$$\forall x(A(x) \rightarrow P(x)), \quad \forall x(A(x) \vee \neg P(x)), \quad \forall x(A(x) \wedge P(x))$$

Translate from English:

"All students who get an A on the final will pass the course."

"All students will get an A on the final or not pass the course."

"All students got an A on the final and passed the course."

Answers: $A(x)$ = x got an A, $P(x)$ = x passed,

$$\forall x(A(x) \rightarrow P(x)), \quad \forall x(A(x) \vee \neg P(x)), \quad \forall x(A(x) \wedge P(x))$$

What does $\exists x(P(x) \wedge \neg A(x))$ say?

Translate from English:

"All students who get an A on the final will pass the course."

"All students will get an A on the final or not pass the course."

"All students got an A on the final and passed the course."

Answers: $A(x)$ = x got an A, $P(x)$ = x passed,

$$\forall x(A(x) \rightarrow P(x)), \quad \forall x(A(x) \vee \neg P(x)), \quad \forall x(A(x) \wedge P(x))$$

What does $\exists x(P(x) \wedge \neg A(x))$ say?

"There is a student who passed but did not get A on the final."

Chapter 1.7: Quantified statements, examples

Check if the following statements are true. Give an example to show existential statement is true, or counterexample to show universal statement is false.

x P Q R

a T T F

b T F F

c F T F

d T T F

e T T T

(A) $\forall x(R(x) \vee Q(x)) \rightarrow P(x)$.

Chapter 1.7: Quantified statements, examples

Check if the following statements are true. Give an example to show existential statement is true, or counterexample to show universal statement is false.

x P Q R

a T T F

b T F F

c F T F

d T T F

e T T T

(A) $\forall x(R(x) \vee Q(x)) \rightarrow P(x)$. False; $x=c$ is counterexample.

(B) $\exists x((x = c) \rightarrow P(x))$.

Chapter 1.7: Quantified statements, examples

Check if the following statements are true. Give an example to show existential statement is true, or counterexample to show universal statement is false.

x P Q R

a T T F

b T F F

c F T F

d T T F

e T T T

(A) $\forall x(R(x) \vee Q(x)) \rightarrow P(x)$. False; $x=c$ is counterexample.

(B) $\exists x((x = c) \rightarrow P(x))$. True; $x = a, b, d, e$ are examples where

true (C) $\forall x(\neg R(x) \leftrightarrow P(x))$.

Chapter 1.7: Quantified statements, examples

Check if the following statements are true. Give an example to show existential statement is true, or counterexample to show universal statement is false.

x P Q R

a T T F

b T F F

c F T F

d T T F

e T T T

(A) $\forall x(R(x) \vee Q(x)) \rightarrow P(x)$. False; $x=c$ is counterexample.

(B) $\exists x((x = c) \rightarrow P(x))$. True; $x = a, b, d, e$ are examples where

true (C) $\forall x(\neg R(x) \leftrightarrow P(x))$. False; $x=e$ or c are counterexamples

Recall

$$\exists x P(x) = P(x_1) \vee P(x_2) \vee \dots \vee P(x_n),$$

$$\forall x P(x) = P(x_1) \wedge P(x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge P(x_n).$$

Recall

$$\exists xP(x) = P(x_1) \vee P(x_2) \vee \dots \vee P(x_n),$$

$$\forall xP(x) = P(x_1) \wedge P(x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge P(x_n).$$

Negations of these use extended form of DeMorgan's laws

$$\neg(P(x_1) \vee P(x_2) \vee \dots \vee P(x_n)) = \neg P(x_1) \wedge \neg P(x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \neg P(x_n),$$

and

$$\neg(P(x_1) \wedge P(x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge P(x_n)) = \neg P(x_1) \vee \neg P(x_2) \vee \dots \vee \neg P(x_n).$$

Chapter 1.8 DeMorgans laws for quantifiers

Recall

$$\exists xP(x) = P(x_1) \vee P(x_2) \vee \dots \vee P(x_n),$$

$$\forall xP(x) = P(x_1) \wedge P(x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge P(x_n).$$

Negations of these use extended form of DeMorgan's laws

$$\neg(P(x_1) \vee P(x_2) \vee \dots \vee P(x_n)) = \neg P(x_1) \wedge \neg P(x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \neg P(x_n),$$

and

$$\neg(P(x_1) \wedge P(x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge P(x_n)) = \neg P(x_1) \vee \neg P(x_2) \vee \dots \vee \neg P(x_n).$$

Therefore the negation of qualified statements is

$$\neg\exists xP(x) = \forall x\neg P(x), \quad \neg\forall xP(x) = \exists x\neg P(x).$$

Chapter 1.8 DeMorgans laws for quantifiers

Recall

$$\exists xP(x) = P(x_1) \vee P(x_2) \vee \dots \vee P(x_n),$$

$$\forall xP(x) = P(x_1) \wedge P(x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge P(x_n).$$

Negations of these use extended form of DeMorgan's laws

$$\neg(P(x_1) \vee P(x_2) \vee \dots \vee P(x_n)) = \neg P(x_1) \wedge \neg P(x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \neg P(x_n),$$

and

$$\neg(P(x_1) \wedge P(x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge P(x_n)) = \neg P(x_1) \vee \neg P(x_2) \vee \dots \vee \neg P(x_n).$$

Therefore the negation of qualified statements is

$$\neg\exists xP(x) = \forall x\neg P(x), \quad \neg\forall xP(x) = \exists x\neg P(x).$$

- Find negation of “All students hate this class.”

- Find negation of “All students hate this class.”

$H(x)$ = student x hates this class, $\neg\forall xH(x) = \exists x\neg H(x)$.

- Find negation of “All students hate this class.”
 $H(x)$ = student x hates this class, $\neg\forall xH(x) = \exists x\neg H(x)$.
- Negate “If it is Friday and it is raining, I go to the movies”.

- Find negation of "All students hate this class."
 $H(x)$ = student x hates this class, $\neg\forall xH(x) = \exists x\neg H(x)$.
- Negate "If it is Friday and it is raining, I go to the movies".
 $F(x)$ = day x is a Friday, $R(x)$ = raining on day x , $M(x)$ = go to movies on day x .

- Find negation of "All students hate this class."
 $H(x)$ = student x hates this class, $\neg\forall xH(x) = \exists x\neg H(x)$.
- Negate "If it is Friday and it is raining, I go to the movies".
 $F(x)$ = day x is a Friday, $R(x)$ = raining on day x , $M(x)$ = go to movies on day x .
In symbols: $\forall x(F(x) \wedge R(x)) \rightarrow M(x)$.

- Find negation of "All students hate this class."
 $H(x)$ = student x hates this class, $\neg\forall xH(x) = \exists x\neg H(x)$.
- Negate "If it is Friday and it is raining, I go to the movies".
 $F(x)$ = day x is a Friday, $R(x)$ = raining on day x , $M(x)$ = go to movies on day x .
In symbols: $\forall x(F(x) \wedge R(x)) \rightarrow M(x)$.
Negation: $\exists x\neg((F(x) \wedge R(x)) \rightarrow M(x))$

- Find negation of "All students hate this class."
 $H(x)$ = student x hates this class, $\neg\forall xH(x) = \exists x\neg H(x)$.
- Negate "If it is Friday and it is raining, I go to the movies".
 $F(x)$ = day x is a Friday, $R(x)$ = raining on day x , $M(x)$ = go to movies on day x .
In symbols: $\forall x(F(x) \wedge R(x)) \rightarrow M(x)$.
Negation: $\exists x\neg((F(x) \wedge R(x)) \rightarrow M(x))$
Now simplify: $\equiv \exists x\neg(\neg(F(x) \wedge R(x)) \vee M(x))$

- Find negation of "All students hate this class."

$H(x)$ = student x hates this class, $\neg\forall xH(x) = \exists x\neg H(x)$.

- Negate "If it is Friday and it is raining, I go to the movies".

$F(x)$ = day x is a Friday, $R(x)$ = raining on day x , $M(x)$ = go to movies on day x .

In symbols: $\forall x(F(x) \wedge R(x)) \rightarrow M(x)$.

Negation: $\exists x\neg((F(x) \wedge R(x)) \rightarrow M(x))$

Now simplify: $\equiv \exists x\neg(\neg(F(x) \wedge R(x)) \vee M(x))$

$\equiv \exists x\neg\neg(F(x) \wedge R(x)) \wedge \neg M(x)$

$\equiv \exists x F(x) \wedge R(x) \wedge \neg M(x)$

- Find negation of $\forall x(P(x) \leftrightarrow Q(x))$

- Find negation of $\forall x(P(x) \leftrightarrow Q(x))$

Ans: $\exists x(P(x) \wedge \neg Q(x)) \vee (Q(x) \wedge \neg P(x))$.

Can be further expanded and simplified to

$\exists x(P(x) \vee Q(x)) \wedge (\neg P(x) \vee \neg Q(x))$.

- Find negation of $\forall x(P(x) \leftrightarrow Q(x))$
Ans: $\exists x(P(x) \wedge \neg Q(x)) \vee (Q(x) \wedge \neg P(x))$.
Can be further expanded and simplified to
 $\exists x(P(x) \vee Q(x)) \wedge (\neg P(x) \vee \neg Q(x))$.
- Negate $\neg \exists x[\neg P(x) \vee (Q(x) \wedge \neg R(x))]$.

- Find negation of $\forall x(P(x) \leftrightarrow Q(x))$
Ans: $\exists x(P(x) \wedge \neg Q(x)) \vee (Q(x) \wedge \neg P(x))$.
Can be further expanded and simplified to
 $\exists x(P(x) \vee Q(x)) \wedge (\neg P(x) \vee \neg Q(x))$.
- Negate $\neg \exists x[\neg P(x) \vee (Q(x) \wedge \neg R(x))]$.
Ans: $\forall x[P(x) \wedge (\neg Q(x) \vee R(x))]$.

- Find negation of $\forall x(P(x) \leftrightarrow Q(x))$
Ans: $\exists x(P(x) \wedge \neg Q(x)) \vee (Q(x) \wedge \neg P(x))$.
Can be further expanded and simplified to
 $\exists x(P(x) \vee Q(x)) \wedge (\neg P(x) \vee \neg Q(x))$.
- Negate $\neg \exists x[\neg P(x) \vee (Q(x) \wedge \neg R(x))]$.
Ans: $\forall x[P(x) \wedge (\neg Q(x) \vee R(x))]$.
- Let $P(x)$: person x codes in python, $C(x)$: x codes in C++.
Write the following in symbols, find the negation, and translate back to English:
 - (a) "There is an employee that codes in python but not C++."
 - (b) "Every employee that codes in python codes in C++".

- Can have predicates with 2 or more variables, e.g. $P(x, y)$ where x and y are drawn from possibly different sets.

Chapter 1.9 Nested quantifiers

- Can have predicates with 2 or more variables, e.g. $P(x, y)$ where x and y are drawn from possibly different sets.
- Quantifiers apply to each variable separately, e.g. $\forall x$ is different from $\forall y$

Chapter 1.9 Nested quantifiers

- Can have predicates with 2 or more variables, e.g. $P(x, y)$ where x and y are drawn from possibly different sets.
- Quantifiers apply to each variable separately, e.g. $\forall x$ is different from $\forall y$
- Example: Let $P(x, y)$: person x misses work on day y .

Chapter 1.9 Nested quantifiers

- Can have predicates with 2 or more variables, e.g. $P(x, y)$ where x and y are drawn from possibly different sets.
- Quantifiers apply to each variable separately, e.g. $\forall x$ is different from $\forall y$
- Example: Let $P(x, y)$: person x misses work on day y . Then
 $\forall y \exists x P(x, y)$ means "Every day, someone misses work"
 $\exists x \forall y \neg P(x, y)$ means "There is a person who does not ever miss work."
 $\forall y \exists x \neg P(x, y)$ means "Every day there is a person who does not miss work."
NOTICE - Order of qualifiers can matter!

Chapter 1.9 Nested quantifiers

- Can have predicates with 2 or more variables, e.g. $P(x, y)$ where x and y are drawn from possibly different sets.
 - Quantifiers apply to each variable separately, e.g. $\forall x$ is different from $\forall y$
 - Example: Let $P(x, y)$: person x misses work on day y . Then
 $\forall y \exists x P(x, y)$ means "Every day, someone misses work"
 $\exists x \forall y \neg P(x, y)$ means "There is a person who does not ever miss work."
 $\forall y \exists x \neg P(x, y)$ means "Every day there is a person who does not miss work."
- NOTICE - Order of qualifiers can matter!
- Different variables can be bound or unbound, for example in $\forall y Q(x, y, z)$, y is bound and x, z are free.

Chapter 1.9 Nested quantifiers

- Can have predicates with 2 or more variables, e.g. $P(x, y)$ where x and y are drawn from possibly different sets.
- Quantifiers apply to each variable separately, e.g. $\forall x$ is different from $\forall y$
- Example: Let $P(x, y)$: person x misses work on day y . Then
 $\forall y \exists x P(x, y)$ means "Every day, someone misses work"
 $\exists x \forall y \neg P(x, y)$ means "There is a person who does not ever miss work."
 $\forall y \exists x \neg P(x, y)$ means "Every day there is a person who does not miss work."
NOTICE - Order of qualifiers can matter!
- Different variables can be bound or unbound, for example in $\forall y Q(x, y, z)$, y is bound and x, z are free.

(A) Let $D(x, y)$: person x dislikes class y . Write in symbols:

"Each student has at least one class they dislike."

"There is a class that every student dislikes."

Chapter 1.9 Nested quantifiers, problems

(A) Let $D(x, y)$: person x dislikes class y . Write in symbols:

"Each student has at least one class they dislike."

"There is a class that every student dislikes."

(B) Given the table of values for $P(x, y)$

P		a	b	c
---	--	---	---	---

d		T	F	T
---	--	---	---	---

e		F	T	F
---	--	---	---	---

f		F	F	T
---	--	---	---	---

determine the truth for $\exists x \exists y P(x, y)$, $\forall x \exists y P(x, y)$, $\exists y \forall x P(x, y)$.

Chapter 1.9 Nested quantifiers, problems

(A) Let $D(x, y)$: person x dislikes class y . Write in symbols:

"Each student has at least one class they dislike."

"There is a class that every student dislikes."

(B) Given the table of values for $P(x, y)$

P		a	b	c
---	--	---	---	---

d		T	F	T
---	--	---	---	---

e		F	T	F
---	--	---	---	---

f		F	F	T
---	--	---	---	---

determine the truth for $\exists x \exists y P(x, y)$, $\forall x \exists y P(x, y)$, $\exists y \forall x P(x, y)$.

(C) Write in symbols, and find the truth value:

"For any integer $x \geq 2$, there exists a prime number $y \leq x$ so that x is divisible by y ."

Chapter 1.9 Nested quantifiers, problems

(A) Let $D(x, y)$: person x dislikes class y . Write in symbols:

"Each student has at least one class they dislike."

"There is a class that every student dislikes."

(B) Given the table of values for $P(x, y)$

P | a b c

d | T F T

e | F T F

f | F F T

determine the truth for $\exists x \exists y P(x, y)$, $\forall x \exists y P(x, y)$, $\exists y \forall x P(x, y)$.

(C) Write in symbols, and find the truth value:

"For any integer $x \geq 2$, there exists a prime number $y \leq x$ so that x is divisible by y ."

Chapter 1.9 Negations of nested quantifiers

- Negations are applied using DeMorgans as before, but must be done multiple times.

Chapter 1.9 Negations of nested quantifiers

- Negations are applied using DeMorgans as before, but must be done multiple times.
- Example: $\neg\exists x\forall y(P(x, y)\rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 $\equiv \forall x\neg\forall y(P(x, y)\rightarrow Q(x, y))$

- Negations are applied using DeMorgans as before, but must be done multiple times.
- Example: $\neg\exists x\forall y(P(x, y)\rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 $\equiv \forall x\neg\forall y(P(x, y)\rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 $\equiv \forall x\exists y\neg(P(x, y)\rightarrow Q(x, y))$

- Negations are applied using DeMorgans as before, but must be done multiple times.
- Example: $\neg\exists x\forall y(P(x, y)\rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 - $\equiv \forall x\neg\forall y(P(x, y)\rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 - $\equiv \forall x\exists y\neg(P(x, y)\rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 - $\equiv \forall x\exists y(P(x, y) \wedge \neg Q(x, y)).$

- Negations are applied using DeMorgans as before, but must be done multiple times.
- Example: $\neg \exists x \forall y (P(x, y) \rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 $\equiv \forall x \neg \forall y (P(x, y) \rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 $\equiv \forall x \exists y \neg (P(x, y) \rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 $\equiv \forall x \exists y (P(x, y) \wedge \neg Q(x, y)).$
- Problem: Let $P(x, y)$: employee x emails employee y . Write in symbols and compute the negation for:
"All employees email the manager 'Bob' "
"There is an employee who gets email from no one."

Chapter 1.9 Negations of nested quantifiers

- Negations are applied using DeMorgans as before, but must be done multiple times.
- Example: $\neg \exists x \forall y (P(x, y) \rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 $\equiv \forall x \neg \forall y (P(x, y) \rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 $\equiv \forall x \exists y \neg (P(x, y) \rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 $\equiv \forall x \exists y (P(x, y) \wedge \neg Q(x, y)).$
- Problem: Let $P(x, y)$: employee x emails employee y . Write in symbols and compute the negation for:
"All employees email the manager 'Bob' "
"There is an employee who gets email from no one."
- Problem: Let $H(x, t)$: person x is happy at time t . Write in symbols: "No one is happy all the time."
Now simplify this using DeMorgans laws for quantifiers, and rephrase.

Chapter 1.9 Negations of nested quantifiers

- Negations are applied using DeMorgans as before, but must be done multiple times.
- Example: $\neg \exists x \forall y (P(x, y) \rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 $\equiv \forall x \neg \forall y (P(x, y) \rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 $\equiv \forall x \exists y \neg (P(x, y) \rightarrow Q(x, y))$
 $\equiv \forall x \exists y (P(x, y) \wedge \neg Q(x, y)).$
- Problem: Let $P(x, y)$: employee x emails employee y . Write in symbols and compute the negation for:
"All employees email the manager 'Bob' "
"There is an employee who gets email from no one."
- Problem: Let $H(x, t)$: person x is happy at time t . Write in symbols: "No one is happy all the time."
Now simplify this using DeMorgans laws for quantifiers, and rephrase.
Ans: "Everyone is unhappy sometimes."

- Some quantified statements imply two or more things at once, for example “At least two” really means “there exists one, and also exists a different one” .

- Some quantified statements imply two or more things at once, for example “At least two” really means “there exists one, and also exists a different one”.
- Phrases: “all but one”, “except”, “there is only one...” etc.

Chapter 1.10 More (difficult) quantified statements

- Some quantified statements imply two or more things at once, for example “At least two” really means “there exists one, and also exists a different one” .
- Phrases: “all but one”, “except”, “there is only one...” etc.
- Need multiple quantifiers and DIFFERENT variable names, even if predicate takes a single input.

- “There are at least two students who will get an A”.
 $A(x)$: student x gets an A.

- “There are at least two students who will get an A”.

$A(x)$: student x gets an A.

$$\exists x \exists y A(x) \wedge A(y) \wedge (x \neq y)$$

- “There are at least two students who will get an A”.
 $A(x)$: student x gets an A.
 $\exists x \exists y A(x) \wedge A(y) \wedge (x \neq y)$
- “There is only one flavor of ice cream that I like”

- “There are at least two students who will get an A”.
 $A(x)$: student x gets an A.
 $\exists x \exists y A(x) \wedge A(y) \wedge (x \neq y)$
- “There is only one flavor of ice cream that I like”
 $L(x)$: I like flavor x

- “There are at least two students who will get an A”.

$A(x)$: student x gets an A.

$$\exists x \exists y A(x) \wedge A(y) \wedge (x \neq y)$$

- “There is only one flavor of ice cream that I like”

$L(x)$: I like flavor x

$$\exists x \forall y L(x) \wedge [(x \neq y) \rightarrow \neg L(y)]$$

- "There are at least two students who will get an A".
 $A(x)$: student x gets an A.
 $\exists x \exists y A(x) \wedge A(y) \wedge (x \neq y)$
- "There is only one flavor of ice cream that I like"
 $L(x)$: I like flavor x
 $\exists x \forall y L(x) \wedge [(x \neq y) \rightarrow \neg L(y)]$
- "Alexa will turn off lights every night except Friday."

- "There are at least two students who will get an A".
 $A(x)$: student x gets an A.
 $\exists x \exists y A(x) \wedge A(y) \wedge (x \neq y)$
- "There is only one flavor of ice cream that I like"
 $L(x)$: I like flavor x
 $\exists x \forall y L(x) \wedge [(x \neq y) \rightarrow \neg L(y)]$
- "Alexa will turn off lights every night except Friday."
 $T(x)$: lights will be turned off on day x .

- "There are at least two students who will get an A".

$A(x)$: student x gets an A.

$$\exists x \exists y A(x) \wedge A(y) \wedge (x \neq y)$$

- "There is only one flavor of ice cream that I like"

$L(x)$: I like flavor x

$$\exists x \forall y L(x) \wedge [(x \neq y) \rightarrow \neg L(y)]$$

- "Alexa will turn off lights every night except Friday."

$T(x)$: lights will be turned off on day x .

$$\forall x ([x \neq \textit{Friday}] \rightarrow T(x)) \wedge ([x = \textit{Friday}] \rightarrow \neg T(x))$$

- “There are at least two students who will get an A”.
 $A(x)$: student x gets an A.
 $\exists x \exists y A(x) \wedge A(y) \wedge (x \neq y)$
- “There is only one flavor of ice cream that I like”
 $L(x)$: I like flavor x
 $\exists x \forall y L(x) \wedge [(x \neq y) \rightarrow \neg L(y)]$
- “Alexa will turn off lights every night except Friday.”
 $T(x)$: lights will be turned off on day x .
 $\forall x ([x \neq \textit{Friday}] \rightarrow T(x)) \wedge ([x = \textit{Friday}] \rightarrow \neg T(x))$
- “There is a student who helps all the others”

- “There are at least two students who will get an A”.
 $A(x)$: student x gets an A.
 $\exists x \exists y A(x) \wedge A(y) \wedge (x \neq y)$
- “There is only one flavor of ice cream that I like”
 $L(x)$: I like flavor x
 $\exists x \forall y L(x) \wedge [(x \neq y) \rightarrow \neg L(y)]$
- “Alexa will turn off lights every night except Friday.”
 $T(x)$: lights will be turned off on day x .
 $\forall x ([x \neq \textit{Friday}] \rightarrow T(x)) \wedge ([x = \textit{Friday}] \rightarrow \neg T(x))$
- “There is a student who helps all the others”
 $H(x, y)$: student x helps student y .

- “There are at least two students who will get an A”.
 $A(x)$: student x gets an A.
 $\exists x \exists y A(x) \wedge A(y) \wedge (x \neq y)$
- “There is only one flavor of ice cream that I like”
 $L(x)$: I like flavor x
 $\exists x \forall y L(x) \wedge [(x \neq y) \rightarrow \neg L(y)]$
- “Alexa will turn off lights every night except Friday.”
 $T(x)$: lights will be turned off on day x .
 $\forall x ([x \neq \textit{Friday}] \rightarrow T(x)) \wedge ([x = \textit{Friday}] \rightarrow \neg T(x))$
- “There is a student who helps all the others”
 $H(x, y)$: student x helps student y .
 $\exists x \forall y ([x \neq y] \rightarrow H(x, y))$

Chapter 1.10 More quantified statements, problems

(A) Let $L(x)$: I like candy x . Write in symbols:

“I like some candy”

“I like all candy except chocolate.”

Chapter 1.10 More quantified statements, problems

(A) Let $L(x)$: I like candy x . Write in symbols:

“I like some candy”

“I like all candy except chocolate.”

(B) Let $T(x, y)$: student x has taken math course y . Write in symbols:

“Every student has taken at least one math course”

“Every student has taken at least one math course other than 243”

“There is a student who has taken exactly one math course”

Chapter 1.10 More quantified statements, problems

(A) Let $L(x)$: I like candy x . Write in symbols:

“I like some candy”

“I like all candy except chocolate.”

(B) Let $T(x, y)$: student x has taken math course y . Write in symbols:

“Every student has taken at least one math course”

“Every student has taken at least one math course other than 243”

“There is a student who has taken exactly one math course”

Answer to last one: $\exists x \exists y \forall z (T(x, y) \wedge ((z \neq y) \rightarrow \neg T(x, z)))$.

Chapter 1.10 More quantified statements, problems

(A) Let $L(x)$: I like candy x . Write in symbols:

“I like some candy”

“I like all candy except chocolate.”

(B) Let $T(x, y)$: student x has taken math course y . Write in symbols:

“Every student has taken at least one math course”

“Every student has taken at least one math course other than 243”

“There is a student who has taken exactly one math course”

Answer to last one: $\exists x \exists y \forall z (T(x, y) \wedge ((z \neq y) \rightarrow \neg T(x, z)))$.

(C) Consider a group of employees at a company. Let

$P(x, y)$: x knows y 's phone number.

$D(x)$: x missed the deadline.

$N(x)$: x is a new employee.

“There is a new employee who knows everyone's phone number.”

“Exactly one new employee missed the deadline.”

“Except for two employees, if someone is new they missed the deadline.”

- An argument is a sequence of propositions (“hypotheses”) p_1, p_2, \dots and a concluding proposition q . For example: $p_1 =$ “Night is dark”, $p_2 =$ “Night is cold”, $q =$ “Night is dark and cold”.

- An argument is a sequence of propositions (“hypotheses”) p_1, p_2, \dots and a concluding proposition q . For example: $p_1 =$ “Night is dark”, $p_2 =$ “Night is cold”, $q =$ “Night is dark and cold”.
- Argument is invalid if q is false when all p_i are true, otherwise it is valid.

Chapter 1.11 Logical reasoning

- An argument is a sequence of propositions (“hypotheses”) p_1, p_2, \dots and a concluding proposition q . For example: $p_1 =$ “Night is dark”, $p_2 =$ “Night is cold”, $q =$ “Night is dark and cold”.
- Argument is invalid if q is false when all p_i are true, otherwise it is valid.
- Usually write arguments in tabular form, for example:

p

$\underline{p \rightarrow q}$

$\therefore q$

Can check this is valid using truth table.

Chapter 1.11 Logical reasoning

- An argument is a sequence of propositions (“hypotheses”) p_1, p_2, \dots and a concluding proposition q . For example: $p_1 =$ “Night is dark”, $p_2 =$ “Night is cold”, $q =$ “Night is dark and cold”.
- Argument is invalid if q is false when all p_i are true, otherwise it is valid.
- Usually write arguments in tabular form, for example:

p

$p \rightarrow q$

$\therefore q$

Can check this is valid using truth table.

- Example:

p

q

$\therefore \neg p \vee \neg q$

Can check this is invalid using truth table.

Chapter 1.11 Logical reasoning

- An argument is a sequence of propositions (“hypotheses”) p_1, p_2, \dots and a concluding proposition q . For example: $p_1 =$ “Night is dark”, $p_2 =$ “Night is cold”, $q =$ “Night is dark and cold”.
- Argument is invalid if q is false when all p_i are true, otherwise it is valid.
- Usually write arguments in tabular form, for example:

p

$p \rightarrow q$

$\therefore q$

Can check this is valid using truth table.

- Example:

p

q

$\therefore \neg p \vee \neg q$

Can check this is invalid using truth table.

Write as a symbolic argument, and check its validity.

(A) "If it is raining, I will take an umbrella. It is not raining.
Therefore I did not take an umbrella."

(B) "It is not true that cats sleep when it is night. If cats sleep it is night. Therefore cats don't sleep."
(interpret "when" as biconditional)

(C) "A number x is rational or irrational. x is an integer or irrational. Therefore x is either rational or an integer."

- Some valid arguments are encountered frequently, and are given specific names.

- Some valid arguments are encountered frequently, and are given specific names.
- These can be used together with rules of logic to verify that an argument is valid.

Chapter 1.12 Standard rules of inference

- Some valid arguments are encountered frequently, and are given specific names.
- These can be used together with rules of logic to verify that an argument is valid.
- Example: "It is raining. If it is raining I will take an umbrella. Therefore I will take an umbrella." (MP)

Rule of inference	Name
$\frac{p \quad p \rightarrow q}{\therefore q}$	Modus ponens
$\frac{\neg q \quad p \rightarrow q}{\therefore \neg p}$	Modus tollens
$\frac{p}{\therefore p \vee q}$	Addition
$\frac{p \wedge q}{\therefore p}$	Simplification
$\frac{p \quad q}{\therefore p \wedge q}$	Conjunction
$\frac{p \rightarrow q \quad q \rightarrow r}{\therefore p \rightarrow r}$	Hypothetical syllogism
$\frac{p \vee q \quad \neg p}{\therefore q}$	Disjunctive syllogism
$\frac{p \vee q \quad \neg p \vee r}{\therefore q \vee r}$	Resolution

Chapter 1.12 Proving validity using rules of inference

Example: “If I get a job then I will buy a car and a house. I won't buy a house. Therefore I will not get a job.”

J: Get a job, *C*: get a car, *H*: get a house.

Chapter 1.12 Proving validity using rules of inference

Example: “If I get a job then I will buy a car and a house. I won't buy a house. Therefore I will not get a job.”

J : Get a job, C : get a car, H : get a house.

Symbolically,

$$J \rightarrow C \wedge H$$

$$\frac{\neg H}{\therefore \neg J}$$

Chapter 1.12 Proving validity using rules of inference

Example: “If I get a job then I will buy a car and a house. I won't buy a house. Therefore I will not get a job.”

J : Get a job, C : get a car, H : get a house.

Symbolically,

$$J \rightarrow C \wedge H$$

$$\frac{\neg H}{\therefore \neg J}$$

Validity can be checked by truth tables, or using laws by creating a string of valid arguments. Do this by justifying each step:

$\neg H$ (hypothesis)

Chapter 1.12 Proving validity using rules of inference

Example: “If I get a job then I will buy a car and a house. I won't buy a house. Therefore I will not get a job.”

J : Get a job, C : get a car, H : get a house.

Symbolically,

$$J \rightarrow C \wedge H$$

$$\frac{\neg H}{\therefore \neg J}$$

Validity can be checked by truth tables, or using laws by creating a string of valid arguments. Do this by justifying each step:

$\neg H$ (hypothesis)

$\neg H \vee \neg C$ (addition)

Chapter 1.12 Proving validity using rules of inference

Example: "If I get a job then I will buy a car and a house. I won't buy a house. Therefore I will not get a job."

J : Get a job, C : get a car, H : get a house.

Symbolically,

$$J \rightarrow C \wedge H$$

$$\frac{\neg H}{\therefore \neg J}$$

Validity can be checked by truth tables, or using laws by creating a string of valid arguments. Do this by justifying each step:

$\neg H$ (hypothesis)

$\neg H \vee \neg C$ (addition)

$\neg(C \wedge H)$ (DeMorgan)

Chapter 1.12 Proving validity using rules of inference

Example: "If I get a job then I will buy a car and a house. I won't buy a house. Therefore I will not get a job."

J : Get a job, C : get a car, H : get a house.

Symbolically,

$$J \rightarrow C \wedge H$$

$$\frac{\neg H}{\therefore \neg J}$$

Validity can be checked by truth tables, or using laws by creating a string of valid arguments. Do this by justifying each step:

$\neg H$ (hypothesis)

$\neg H \vee \neg C$ (addition)

$\neg(C \wedge H)$ (DeMorgan)

$J \rightarrow C \wedge H$ (Hypothesis)

Chapter 1.12 Proving validity using rules of inference

Example: "If I get a job then I will buy a car and a house. I won't buy a house. Therefore I will not get a job."

J : Get a job, C : get a car, H : get a house.

Symbolically,

$$J \rightarrow C \wedge H$$

$$\frac{\neg H}{\therefore \neg J}$$

Validity can be checked by truth tables, or using laws by creating a string of valid arguments. Do this by justifying each step:

$\neg H$ (hypothesis)

$\neg H \vee \neg C$ (addition)

$\neg(C \wedge H)$ (DeMorgan)

$J \rightarrow C \wedge H$ (Hypothesis)

$\neg J$ (modus tollens)

Chapter 1.12 Proving validity using rules of inference

Ex: "I will buy a car and a house only if I get a job. I am not going to get a job. I will buy a house. Therefore I will not buy a car."

$$(C \wedge H) \rightarrow J$$
$$\neg J$$
$$\underline{H}$$
$$\therefore \neg C$$

Proof of validity:

$$(C \wedge H) \rightarrow J \text{ (Hyp)}$$
$$\neg J \text{ (Hyp)}$$

Chapter 1.12 Proving validity using rules of inference

Ex: "I will buy a car and a house only if I get a job. I am not going to get a job. I will buy a house. Therefore I will not buy a car."

$(C \wedge H) \rightarrow J$

$\neg J$

H

$\therefore \neg C$

Proof of validity:

$(C \wedge H) \rightarrow J$ (Hyp)

$\neg J$ (Hyp)

$\neg(C \wedge H)$ (MT)

Chapter 1.12 Proving validity using rules of inference

Ex: "I will buy a car and a house only if I get a job. I am not going to get a job. I will buy a house. Therefore I will not buy a car."

$(C \wedge H) \rightarrow J$

$\neg J$

H

$\therefore \neg C$

Proof of validity:

$(C \wedge H) \rightarrow J$ (Hyp)

$\neg J$ (Hyp)

$\neg(C \wedge H)$ (MT)

$\neg C \vee \neg H$ (DeM)

Chapter 1.12 Proving validity using rules of inference

Ex: "I will buy a car and a house only if I get a job. I am not going to get a job. I will buy a house. Therefore I will not buy a car."

$$(C \wedge H) \rightarrow J$$
$$\neg J$$
$$\underline{H}$$
$$\therefore \neg C$$

Proof of validity:

$$(C \wedge H) \rightarrow J \text{ (Hyp)}$$
$$\neg J \text{ (Hyp)}$$
$$\neg(C \wedge H) \text{ (MT)}$$
$$\neg C \vee \neg H \text{ (DeM)}$$
$$H \rightarrow \neg C \text{ (Cond)}$$

Chapter 1.12 Proving validity using rules of inference

Ex: "I will buy a car and a house only if I get a job. I am not going to get a job. I will buy a house. Therefore I will not buy a car."

$$(C \wedge H) \rightarrow J$$
$$\neg J$$
$$\underline{H}$$
$$\therefore \neg C$$

Proof of validity:

$$(C \wedge H) \rightarrow J \text{ (Hyp)}$$
$$\neg J \text{ (Hyp)}$$
$$\neg(C \wedge H) \text{ (MT)}$$
$$\neg C \vee \neg H \text{ (DeM)}$$
$$H \rightarrow \neg C \text{ (Cond)}$$
$$H \text{ (Hyp)}$$

Chapter 1.12 Proving validity using rules of inference

Ex: "I will buy a car and a house only if I get a job. I am not going to get a job. I will buy a house. Therefore I will not buy a car."

$(C \wedge H) \rightarrow J$

$\neg J$

H

$\therefore \neg C$

Proof of validity:

$(C \wedge H) \rightarrow J$ (Hyp)

$\neg J$ (Hyp)

$\neg(C \wedge H)$ (MT)

$\neg C \vee \neg H$ (DeM)

$H \rightarrow \neg C$ (Cond)

H (Hyp)

$\neg C$ (MP)

Alternative: use disjunctive syllogism after the DeMorgan step.

(A)

$$p \rightarrow q$$

$$\frac{\neg(q \wedge r)}{p \rightarrow \neg r}$$

(B) Write in symbols, and prove validity:

“Today it will rain or be cool. Either it will not rain or be windy. It is not cool, therefore it will be windy.”

(A)

$$p \rightarrow q$$

$$\frac{\neg(q \wedge r)}{p \rightarrow \neg r}$$

(B) Write in symbols, and prove validity:

“Today it will rain or be cool. Either it will not rain or be windy. It is not cool, therefore it will be windy.”

$$r \vee c$$

$$\neg r \vee w$$

$$\frac{\neg c}{\therefore w}$$

Inference with quantifiers

Need a way of moving between quantified statements and propositions about individual elements:

Rule of Inference	Name	Example
c is an element (arbitrary or particular) $\forall x.P(x)$ ----- $\therefore P(c)$	Universal instantiation	Izar is a student in the class. Every student in the class completed the assignment. Therefore, Izar completed the assignment.
c is an arbitrary element $P(c)$ ----- $\therefore \forall x.P(x)$	Universal generalization	Let c be an arbitrary integer. $c \leq c^2$ Therefore, every integer is less than or equal to its square.
$\exists x.P(x)$ ----- $\therefore (c \text{ is a particular element}) \wedge P(c)$	Existential instantiation*	There is an integer that is equal to its square. Therefore, $c^2 = c$, for some integer c .
c is an element (arbitrary or particular) $P(c)$ ----- $\therefore \exists x.P(x)$	Existential generalization	Sam is a particular student in the class. Sam completed the assignment. Therefore, there is a student in the class who completed the assignment.

Examples:

- UI: “Every day in Tucson is warm. So tomorrow will be warm.” or “So a random day in February will be warm.”

Inference with quantifiers

Need a way of moving between quantified statements and propositions about individual elements:

Rule of Inference	Name	Example
c is an element (arbitrary or particular) $\forall x.P(x)$ ----- $\therefore P(c)$	Universal instantiation	Izar is a student in the class. Every student in the class completed the assignment. Therefore, Izar completed the assignment.
c is an arbitrary element $P(c)$ ----- $\therefore \forall x.P(x)$	Universal generalization	Let c be an arbitrary integer. $c \leq c^2$ Therefore, every integer is less than or equal to its square.
$\exists x.P(x)$ ----- $\therefore (c \text{ is a particular element}) \wedge P(c)$	Existential instantiation*	There is an integer that is equal to its square. Therefore, $c^2 = c$, for some integer c .
c is an element (arbitrary or particular) $P(c)$ ----- $\therefore \exists x.P(x)$	Existential generalization	Sam is a particular student in the class. Sam completed the assignment. Therefore, there is a student in the class who completed the assignment.

Examples:

- UI: “Every day in Tucson is warm. So tomorrow will be warm.” or “So a random day in February will be warm.”
- EI: “There are cold days in January. So January x is cold” (where x is some number between 1 and 31).

Inference with quantifiers

Need a way of moving between quantified statements and propositions about individual elements:

Rule of Inference	Name	Example
c is an element (arbitrary or particular) $\forall x.P(x)$ ----- $\therefore P(c)$	Universal instantiation	Izar is a student in the class. Every student in the class completed the assignment. Therefore, Izar completed the assignment.
c is an arbitrary element $P(c)$ ----- $\therefore \forall x.P(x)$	Universal generalization	Let c be an arbitrary integer. $c \leq c^2$ Therefore, every integer is less than or equal to its square.
$\exists x.P(x)$ ----- $\therefore (c \text{ is a particular element}) \wedge P(c)$	Existential instantiation*	There is an integer that is equal to its square. Therefore, $c^2 = c$, for some integer c .
c is an element (arbitrary or particular) $P(c)$ ----- $\therefore \exists x.P(x)$	Existential generalization	Sam is a particular student in the class. Sam completed the assignment. Therefore, there is a student in the class who completed the assignment.

Examples:

- UI: “Every day in Tucson is warm. So tomorrow will be warm.” or “So a random day in February will be warm.”
- EI: “There are cold days in January. So January x is cold” (where x is some number between 1 and 31).
- EG: “Bob passed the test. Therefore there exists a student who passed the test.”

Inference with quantifiers

Need a way of moving between quantified statements and propositions about individual elements:

Rule of Inference	Name	Example
c is an element (arbitrary or particular) $\forall x P(x)$ ----- $\therefore P(c)$	Universal instantiation	Izar is a student in the class. Every student in the class completed the assignment. Therefore, Izar completed the assignment.
c is an arbitrary element $P(c)$ ----- $\therefore \forall x P(x)$	Universal generalization	Let c be an arbitrary integer. $c \leq c^2$ Therefore, every integer is less than or equal to its square.
$\exists x P(x)$ ----- $\therefore (c \text{ is a particular element}) \wedge P(c)$	Existential instantiation*	There is an integer that is equal to its square. Therefore, $c^2 = c$, for some integer c .
c is an element (arbitrary or particular) $P(c)$ ----- $\therefore \exists x P(x)$	Existential generalization	Sam is a particular student in the class. Sam completed the assignment. Therefore, there is a student in the class who completed the assignment.

Examples:

- UI: “Every day in Tucson is warm. So tomorrow will be warm.” or “So a random day in February will be warm.”
- EI: “There are cold days in January. So January x is cold” (where x is some number between 1 and 31).
- EG: “Bob passed the test. Therefore there exists a student who passed the test.”
- UG: “If x is an arbitrary student, they passed the test. Therefore all students passed the test.”

Show $\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \therefore \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ is valid.

Show $\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \therefore \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ is valid.

Proof:

$\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ (Hypothesis)

$P(c) \wedge Q(c)$ for an arbitrary element c (UI)

Show $\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \therefore \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ is valid.

Proof:

$\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ (Hypothesis)

$P(c) \wedge Q(c)$ for an arbitrary element c (UI)

$P(c)$ (Simplification)

$Q(c)$ (Simplification)

Show $\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \therefore \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ is valid.

Proof:

$\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ (Hypothesis)

$P(c) \wedge Q(c)$ for an arbitrary element c (UI)

$P(c)$ (Simplification)

$Q(c)$ (Simplification)

$\forall xP(x)$ (UG)

$\forall xQ(x)$ (UG)

Inference with quantifiers, examples

Show $\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \therefore \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ is valid.

Proof:

$\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ (Hypothesis)

$P(c) \wedge Q(c)$ for an arbitrary element c (UI)

$P(c)$ (Simplification)

$Q(c)$ (Simplification)

$\forall xP(x)$ (UG)

$\forall xQ(x)$ (UG)

$\forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ (conjunction).

Inference with quantifiers, examples

Show $\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \therefore \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ is valid.

Proof:

$\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ (Hypothesis)

$P(c) \wedge Q(c)$ for an arbitrary element c (UI)

$P(c)$ (Simplification)

$Q(c)$ (Simplification)

$\forall xP(x)$ (UG)

$\forall xQ(x)$ (UG)

$\forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ (conjunction).

Careful! $\exists xP(x) \wedge \exists xQ(x) \therefore \exists x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ is not valid.

Inference with quantifiers, examples

Show $\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \therefore \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ is valid.

Proof:

$\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ (Hypothesis)

$P(c) \wedge Q(c)$ for an arbitrary element c (UI)

$P(c)$ (Simplification)

$Q(c)$ (Simplification)

$\forall xP(x)$ (UG)

$\forall xQ(x)$ (UG)

$\forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ (conjunction).

Careful! $\exists xP(x) \wedge \exists xQ(x) \therefore \exists x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ is not valid.

"Everyone in class is either a CS or engineering major. There is a person who is not a CS major. Therefore there is a person who is an engineering major."

"Everyone in class is either a CS or engineering major. There is a person who is not a CS major. Therefore there is a person who is an engineering major."

Symbolically: $C(x)$: x is a CS major, $E(x)$: x is a engineering major.

$\forall x(C(x) \vee E(x)), \exists x\neg C(x), \therefore \exists xE(x)$.

"Everyone in class is either a CS or engineering major. There is a person who is not a CS major. Therefore there is a person who is an engineering major."

Symbolically: $C(x)$: x is a CS major, $E(x)$: x is a engineering major.

$\forall x(C(x) \vee E(x)), \exists x\neg C(x), \therefore \exists xE(x)$.

Proof of validity:

$\exists x\neg C(x)$ (Hyp.)

$\neg C(s)$ for a particular s (EI)

"Everyone in class is either a CS or engineering major. There is a person who is not a CS major. Therefore there is a person who is an engineering major."

Symbolically: $C(x)$: x is a CS major, $E(x)$: x is a engineering major.

$\forall x(C(x) \vee E(x)), \exists x\neg C(x), \therefore \exists xE(x)$.

Proof of validity:

$\exists x\neg C(x)$ (Hyp.)

$\neg C(s)$ for a particular s (EI)

$\forall x(C(x) \vee E(x))$ (Hyp.)

$C(s) \vee E(s)$ for the particular element s (UI)

"Everyone in class is either a CS or engineering major. There is a person who is not a CS major. Therefore there is a person who is an engineering major."

Symbolically: $C(x)$: x is a CS major, $E(x)$: x is a engineering major.

$\forall x(C(x) \vee E(x)), \exists x\neg C(x), \therefore \exists xE(x)$.

Proof of validity:

$\exists x\neg C(x)$ (Hyp.)

$\neg C(s)$ for a particular s (EI)

$\forall x(C(x) \vee E(x))$ (Hyp.)

$C(s) \vee E(s)$ for the particular element s (UI)

$E(s)$ (Disjunctive Syll.)

Inference with quantifiers, examples

"Everyone in class is either a CS or engineering major. There is a person who is not a CS major. Therefore there is a person who is an engineering major."

Symbolically: $C(x)$: x is a CS major, $E(x)$: x is a engineering major.

$\forall x(C(x) \vee E(x)), \exists x\neg C(x), \therefore \exists xE(x)$.

Proof of validity:

$\exists x\neg C(x)$ (Hyp.)

$\neg C(s)$ for a particular s (EI)

$\forall x(C(x) \vee E(x))$ (Hyp.)

$C(s) \vee E(s)$ for the particular element s (UI)

$E(s)$ (Disjunctive Syll.)

$\exists xE(x)$ (EG)

Inference with quantifiers, examples

"Everyone in class is either a CS or engineering major. There is a person who is not a CS major. Therefore there is a person who is an engineering major."

Symbolically: $C(x)$: x is a CS major, $E(x)$: x is a engineering major.

$\forall x(C(x) \vee E(x)), \exists x\neg C(x), \therefore \exists xE(x)$.

Proof of validity:

$\exists x\neg C(x)$ (Hyp.)

$\neg C(s)$ for a particular s (EI)

$\forall x(C(x) \vee E(x))$ (Hyp.)

$C(s) \vee E(s)$ for the particular element s (UI)

$E(s)$ (Disjunctive Syll.)

$\exists xE(x)$ (EG)

Inference with quantifiers, examples

“All math courses are difficult. The university offers a discrete math course. Therefore the university has a difficult course.”

Inference with quantifiers, examples

“All math courses are difficult. The university offers a discrete math course. Therefore the university has a difficult course.” $U(x)$: course x is offered by the university, $D(x)$: course x is difficult, $M(x)$: course x is math.

“All math courses are difficult. The university offers a discrete math course. Therefore the university has a difficult course.” $U(x)$: course x is offered by the university, $D(x)$: course x is difficult, $M(x)$: course x is math. Symbolically,

$$\forall x(M(x) \rightarrow D(x)), \exists x(U(x) \wedge M(x)), \therefore \exists x(U(x) \wedge D(x))$$

Inference with quantifiers, examples

“All math courses are difficult. The university offers a discrete math course. Therefore the university has a difficult course.” $U(x)$: course x is offered by the university, $D(x)$: course x is difficult, $M(x)$: course x is math. Symbolically,
 $\forall x(M(x) \rightarrow D(x)), \exists x(U(x) \wedge M(x)), \therefore \exists x(U(x) \wedge D(x))$

Proof of validity:

$\exists x(U(x) \wedge M(x))$ (Hyp.)

$U(c) \wedge M(c)$ for a particular c (EI)

Inference with quantifiers, examples

“All math courses are difficult. The university offers a discrete math course. Therefore the university has a difficult course.” $U(x)$: course x is offered by the university, $D(x)$: course x is difficult, $M(x)$: course x is math. Symbolically,
 $\forall x(M(x) \rightarrow D(x)), \exists x(U(x) \wedge M(x)), \therefore \exists x(U(x) \wedge D(x))$

Proof of validity:

$\exists x(U(x) \wedge M(x))$ (Hyp.)

$U(c) \wedge M(c)$ for a particular c (EI)

$U(c)$ (Simp.)

$M(c)$ (Simp.)

Inference with quantifiers, examples

“All math courses are difficult. The university offers a discrete math course. Therefore the university has a difficult course.” $U(x)$: course x is offered by the university, $D(x)$: course x is difficult, $M(x)$: course x is math. Symbolically,
 $\forall x(M(x) \rightarrow D(x)), \exists x(U(x) \wedge M(x)), \therefore \exists x(U(x) \wedge D(x))$

Proof of validity:

$\exists x(U(x) \wedge M(x))$ (Hyp.)

$U(c) \wedge M(c)$ for a particular c (EI)

$U(c)$ (Simp.)

$M(c)$ (Simp.)

$\forall x(M(x) \rightarrow D(x))$ (Hyp)

$M(c) \rightarrow D(c)$ for the particular c named above (UI)

Inference with quantifiers, examples

“All math courses are difficult. The university offers a discrete math course. Therefore the university has a difficult course.” $U(x)$: course x is offered by the university, $D(x)$: course x is difficult, $M(x)$: course x is math. Symbolically,
 $\forall x(M(x) \rightarrow D(x)), \exists x(U(x) \wedge M(x)), \therefore \exists x(U(x) \wedge D(x))$

Proof of validity:

$\exists x(U(x) \wedge M(x))$ (Hyp.)

$U(c) \wedge M(c)$ for a particular c (EI)

$U(c)$ (Simp.)

$M(c)$ (Simp.)

$\forall x(M(x) \rightarrow D(x))$ (Hyp)

$M(c) \rightarrow D(c)$ for the particular c named above (UI)

$D(c)$ (MP)

Inference with quantifiers, examples

“All math courses are difficult. The university offers a discrete math course. Therefore the university has a difficult course.” $U(x)$: course x is offered by the university, $D(x)$: course x is difficult, $M(x)$: course x is math. Symbolically,
 $\forall x(M(x) \rightarrow D(x)), \exists x(U(x) \wedge M(x)), \therefore \exists x(U(x) \wedge D(x))$

Proof of validity:

$\exists x(U(x) \wedge M(x))$ (Hyp.)

$U(c) \wedge M(c)$ for a particular c (EI)

$U(c)$ (Simp.)

$M(c)$ (Simp.)

$\forall x(M(x) \rightarrow D(x))$ (Hyp)

$M(c) \rightarrow D(c)$ for the particular c named above (UI)

$D(c)$ (MP)

$U(c) \wedge D(c)$ (Conj.)

Inference with quantifiers, examples

“All math courses are difficult. The university offers a discrete math course. Therefore the university has a difficult course.” $U(x)$: course x is offered by the university, $D(x)$: course x is difficult, $M(x)$: course x is math. Symbolically,
 $\forall x(M(x) \rightarrow D(x)), \exists x(U(x) \wedge M(x)), \therefore \exists x(U(x) \wedge D(x))$

Proof of validity:

$\exists x(U(x) \wedge M(x))$ (Hyp.)

$U(c) \wedge M(c)$ for a particular c (EI)

$U(c)$ (Simp.)

$M(c)$ (Simp.)

$\forall x(M(x) \rightarrow D(x))$ (Hyp)

$M(c) \rightarrow D(c)$ for the particular c named above (UI)

$D(c)$ (MP)

$U(c) \wedge D(c)$ (Conj.)

$\exists x(U(x) \wedge D(x))$ (EG).

(A) “Every student who has a permission slip can go on the field trip. Every student has a permission slip. Therefore every student can go on the field trip.”

(B) “Every student on the honor roll received an A. No student who got a detention received an A. No student who got a detention is on the honor roll.”

Use $H(x)$, $A(x)$, $D(x)$ for whether a student is on honor roll, received an A, and got detention.