Predicates and Quantifiers.

Predicates

Propositional logic, studied previously, cannot adequately express the meaning of all statements in mathematics and in natural language.

Examples?

"*x* is greater than 5."

"x is greater than y."

"n is a prime number."

"user is waiting."

Def. A predicate is a proposition whose truth depends on the value of one or more variables.

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Predicates

For convenience, we can give every predicate a name:

$$P(x) = "x$$
 is greater than 5."

$$Q(x, y) =$$
" x is greater than y ."

When the values of the variables are specified, the result is a simple proposition: Depending on the, the predicats are either true or false:

$$P(4) = F$$

$$P(10) = T$$

$$Q(2,1) = T$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Let C(x) = "x is playing chess."

There are three persons in the room: *Ed*, *Paul*, and *Tom*.

Ed and *Paul* are playing chess, and *Tom* is sleeping. Formally: C(Ed) = T, C(Paul) = T, C(Tom) = F.

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Let C(x) = "x is playing chess."

There are three persons in the room: *Ed*, *Paul*, and *Tom*.

Ed and Paul are playing chess, and Tom is sleeping. Formally: C(Ed) = T, C(Paul) = T, C(Tom) = F.

Consider a proposition "Someone is playing chess in the room." Is it true?

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Let C(x) = "x is playing chess."

There are three persons in the room: *Ed*, *Paul*, and *Tom*.

Ed and Paul are playing chess, and Tom is sleeping. Formally: C(Ed) = T, C(Paul) = T, C(Tom) = F.

Consider a proposition "Someone is playing chess in the room." Is it true?

Yes, because, for example, C(Ed) = T.

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Let C(x) = "x is playing chess."

There are three persons in the room: *Ed*, *Paul*, and *Tom*.

Ed and Paul are playing chess, and Tom is sleeping.

Formally: C(Ed) = T, C(Paul) = T, C(Tom) = F.

Another proposition "Everyone is playing chess in the room."

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Let C(x) = "x is playing chess."

There are three persons in the room: *Ed*, *Paul*, and *Tom*.

Ed and Paul are playing chess, and Tom is sleeping. Formally: C(Ed) = T, C(Paul) = T, C(Tom) = F.

Another proposition "Everyone is playing chess in the room."

It's false, because C(Tom) = F.

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Always true or sometimes true?

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Let
$$P(x) = "x^2 \ge 0$$
."

Always true

Let
$$P(x) = "x^2 \ge 0$$
."

Always true:

"For all n, P(n) is true."

"For all $x, x^2 \ge 0$."

"P(n) is true for every n."

" $x^2 \ge 0$ for every x."

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Always true

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Examples

"For all
$$x, x^2 \ge 0$$
."

An assertion that a predicate is always true is called a *universal quantification*.

Always true or sometimes true?

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Examples

Another predicate:

Let
$$Q(x)$$
: " $5x^2 - 7 = 0$."

It's true only when $x = \pm \sqrt{7/5}$.

Sometimes true

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Examples

Let Q(x): " $5x^2 - 7 = 0$." It's true only when $x = \pm \sqrt{7/5}$.

Sometimes true:

"There exist an *n* such that P(n) is true."

"
$$P(n)$$
 is true for some n ."

"
$$P(n)$$
 is true for at least one n ." " $5x^2 - 7 = 0$ for at least one x ."

"There exist an x such that $5x^2 - 7 = 0$."

"
$$5x^2 - 7 = 0$$
 for some *x*."

"
$$5x^2 - 7 = 0$$
 for at least one x."

Sometimes true

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Examples

"Exists an x such that $5x^2 - 7 = 0$ is true."

An assertion that a predicate is true for some values of the variable is called

an existential quantification.

Sentences can be ambiguous

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation Examples

"If you can solve *any* problem we come up with, then you get an A for the course."

Is it a universal (for all), or an existential (for some) quantification?

Sentences can be ambiguous

The last sentence was ambiguous. The right way to say it in math class: Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Examples

Universal (always):

"You can solve *every* problem we come up with."

Existential (sometimes):

"You can solve at least one problem we come up with."

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

"For every
$$x$$
, it's true that $x + 1 > x$ "

becomes

$$\forall x (x+1>x)$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

"For every
$$x$$
, $P(x)$ "

becomes

 $\forall x (P(x))$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

"Exists
$$x$$
 such that $x^2 = 4$ " becomes

$$\exists x \ (x^2 = 4)$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Examples

"Exists x such that P(x)" becomes

 $\exists x (P(x))$

p. 20

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Examples

Universal:

 $\forall x P(x)$

means that *for every* x, P(x) is true.

Existential:

 $\exists x \ P(x)$

means that there *exists* an x such that P(x) is true.

We consider only those values of the variable x that belong to a given set called the *domain of discourse*, or the *universe of discourse*.

Example of the universe of discourse

For the predicate Odd(x) and Even(x), the universe of discourse is the set of all integers:

$$\dots$$
, -5, -4, -3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, \dots

Odd(x) is true for -5, -3, -1, 1, 3, 5, etc.

Even(x) is true for -4, -2, 0, 2, 4, etc.

We consider only those values of the variable x that belong to a given set called the *domain of discourse*, or the *universe of discourse*.

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

To prove or disprove a quantification

Statement When true? When false? $\forall x \ P(x)$ P(x) is true for every x. There is at least one counterexample x such that P(x) is false. $\exists x \ P(x)$ There is at least one x such that P(x) is false for every x. such that P(x) is true.

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity
Negation

Example

Let
$$P(x) = "x^2 > 0$$
."

The universe of discourse are all integer numbers.

Is it true or false that $\forall x P(x)$?

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Example

Let
$$P(x) = "x^2 > 0$$
."

The universe of discourse are all integer numbers.

Is it true or false that $\forall x P(x)$?

To prove it, we must show that P(x) is true for all integers. To disprove, we have to find a counterexample for which it's false. Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Example

Let
$$P(x) = "x^2 > 0$$
."

The universe of discourse are all integer numbers.

Is it true or false that $\forall x P(x)$?

To prove it, we must show that P(x) is true for all integers. To disprove, we have to find a counterexample for which it's false.

Counterexample:

P(x) is false for x = 0. So, the quantified statement $\forall x \ P(x)$ is false.

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Examples

$$\forall x (P(x) \land Q(x))$$

The *scope* of the quantifier is the expression to which it's applied. Here, the scope is $P(x) \wedge Q(x)$. Quantifiers *bind* variables inside their scope.

 \forall binds x in the logical expression $(P(x) \land Q(x))$.

Why should we care?

$$\forall x (P(x) \land Q(x)) \land \exists y (R(y))$$

is equivalent to

$$\forall x \ (\underline{P}(x) \land Q(x)) \land \exists x \ (\underline{R}(x))$$

"Every dog has four legs and has a tail; and there exists a dog that barks."

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Examples

If all variables are bound by a quantifier or set equal to a particular value then a statement is a proposition:

$$\forall x (P(x) \land Q(z)) \land \exists y (R(y))$$
, and it's given that $z = 3.1415$.

x is bound by $\forall x$, y is bound by $\exists y$, and z is specified by the given equation.

So, this is a proposition.

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity
Negation

Examples

If a variable is not bound, it's called *free*.

$$\forall x (A(y) \land B(x)) \land \exists y (C(x,y) \rightarrow D(y)).$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Examples

If a variable is not bound, it's called free.

$$\underline{\forall x} \left(A(\underline{y}) \land B(\underline{x}) \right) \land \underline{\exists y} \left(C(\underline{x}, \underline{y}) \to D(\underline{y}) \right).$$

Only the first x is bound by $\forall x$.

This is not a proposition.

Nested quantifiers

Quantifiers are nested if one is within the scope of the other:

$$\forall x \left(\exists y (x + y = 0)\right)$$

It reads as follows

"For every x exists y such that x + y = 0."

We usually drop the external parentheses. Equivalent expression:

$$\forall x \; \exists y \; (x+y=0)$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Nested quantifiers

A few more examples (you know this formulas):

$$\forall x \ \forall y \ \forall z \ (x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z)$$

$$\forall x \ \forall y \ (x + y = y + x)$$

$$\forall w \ \forall x \ \forall y \ \forall z \left((y \neq 0 \land w \neq 0) \to \frac{x}{y} + \frac{z}{w} = \frac{xw + zy}{yw} \right)$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation Examples

p. 33

Order of quantifiers

Does the order of quantifiers matter?

$$\forall x \left(\exists y (x + y = 0)\right)$$

"For every x exists y such that x + y = 0."

$$\exists y \left(\forall x \left(x + y = 0 \right) \right)$$

"Exists y such that for every x: x + y = 0."

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Order of quantifiers

Does the order of quantifiers matter?

$$\forall x \left(\exists y (x + y = 0)\right)$$

"For every x exists y such that x + y = 0."

$$\exists y \left(\forall x \left(x + y = 0 \right) \right)$$

"Exists y such that for every x: x + y = 0."

The meaning of the two expressions is different. You cannot swap nested $\forall x$ and $\exists y$.

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Order of quantifiers

However, we can swap two (or more) nested quantifiers of the same kind:

$$\forall x \ \forall y \ \forall z \ (x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z)$$

$$\forall y \ \forall x \ \forall z \ (x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z)$$

$$\forall z \ \forall x \ \forall y \ (x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z)$$

$$\exists x \; \exists y \; (x^y = 4)$$
$$\exists y \; \exists x \; (x^y = 4)$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Order of quantifiers

These two statements are equivalent:

$$\forall w \exists x \ \forall y \ \forall z \ (P(w, x, y, z))$$
$$\forall w \ \exists x \ \underline{\forall z \ \forall y} \ (P(w, x, y, z))$$

But, these two statements are not equivalent:

$$\forall w \,\exists x \,\forall y \,\underline{\forall z} \, \big(P(w, x, y, z) \big)$$
$$\forall w \,\underline{\forall z} \,\exists x \,\forall y \, \big(P(w, x, y, z) \big)$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation Examples

Order of quantifiers

"For every even integer n greater than 2, there exist prime numbers p and q such that n = p + q."

(Prime numbers are integers > 1, divisible only by itself and 1. They are 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, ...)

The universe of discourse:

n is an *even* integer, n > 2. *p* and *q* are *prime* numbers.

$$\forall n \; \exists p \; \exists q \; (n = p + q)$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Order of quantifiers

Swapping the order of different kinds of quantifiers (existential or universal) changes the meaning of a proposition.

$$\forall n \ (\exists p \ (\exists q \ (n = p + q)))$$

$$4 = 2 + 2$$

$$6 = 3 + 3$$

$$8 = 3 + 5$$
...

$$\exists p \ (\exists q \ (\forall n \ (n = p + q)))$$

$$4 \stackrel{?}{=} p + q$$

$$6 \stackrel{?}{=} p + q$$
...

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Examples

p. 39

Distributivity

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

Examples

$$\forall x (P(x) \land Q(x)) \equiv (\forall x P(x)) \land (\forall x Q(x))$$

we can distribute a universal quantifier \forall over a conjunction.

$$\exists x (P(x) \lor Q(x)) \equiv (\exists x P(x)) \lor (\exists x Q(x))$$

and we can distribute an existential quantifier \exists over a disjunction.

We **cannot** distribute \forall over a disjunction, or \exists over a conjunction.

"It is not the case that everyone likes to snowboard."

$$\neg(\forall x\,S(x))$$

"There exists someone who does not like to snowboard."

$$\exists x (\neg S(x))$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

"It is not the case that everyone likes to snowboard."

$$\neg(\forall x S(x))$$

"There exists someone who does not like to snowboard."

$$\exists x (\neg S(x))$$

To negate " \forall ":

$$\neg(\forall x \, S(x)) \equiv \exists x \, (\neg S(x))$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

"There does not exist anyone who likes skiing over magma."

$$\neg(\exists x M(x))$$

"Everyone dislikes skiing over magma."

$$\forall x (\neg M(x))$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

"There does not exist anyone who likes skiing over magma."

$$\neg(\exists x \ M(x))$$

"Everyone dislikes skiing over magma."

$$\forall x (\neg M(x))$$

To negate "∃":

$$\neg(\exists x \ M(x)) \equiv \forall x \ (\neg M(x))$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

When negating more complex expressions with quantifiers, you "flip" the quantifier, and negate the expression to which the quantifier was applied.

$$\neg (\forall z (\exists y (\forall x (P(x) \land Q(y,z)))))$$

$$= \exists z \neg (\exists y (\forall x (P(x) \land Q(y,z))))$$

$$= \exists z \forall y \neg (\forall x (P(x) \land Q(y,z)))$$

$$= \exists z \forall y \exists x \neg (P(x) \land Q(y,z))$$

$$=\exists z \left(\forall y \left(\exists x \left(\neg P(x) \lor \neg Q(y,z)\right)\right)\right)$$

Predicates

Ouantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

"Everyone at Hunter College is smart."

$$\forall x (AtHunter(x) \land Smart(x))$$

$$\forall x (AtHunter(x) \rightarrow Smart(x))$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

"Everyone at Hunter College is smart."

$$\forall x (AtHunter(x) \land Smart(x))$$
 Wrong!

"Everyone is at Hunter College and is smart. No one is elsewhere."

$$\forall x (AtHunter(x) \rightarrow Smart(x))$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

"Someone at City College is smart."

$$\exists x (AtCCNY(x) \land Smart(x))$$

$$\exists x (AtCCNY(x) \rightarrow Smart(x))$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

"Someone at City College is smart."

$$\exists x (AtCCNY(x) \land Smart(x))$$

 $\exists x (AtCCNY(x) \rightarrow Smart(x))$ Wrong!

"There is someone, who is smart if he(she) is at City College." It is true if there is anyone who is not at City College, say in Boston.

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

"All lions are fierce."
"Some lions do not drink coffee."
"Some fierce creatures do not drink coffee."

Predicates:

L(x) = x is a lion.

C(x) = x drinks coffee.

F(x) = x is fierce.

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation

"All lions are fierce."

"Some lions do not drink coffee."

"Some fierce creatures do not drink coffee."

Predicates:

L(x) = x is a lion.

C(x) = x drinks coffee.

F(x) = x is fierce.

$$\forall x (L(x) \rightarrow F(x))$$

$$\exists x (L(x) \land \neg C(x))$$

$$\exists x (F(x) \land \neg C(x))$$

Predicates

Quantifiers

Scope, bound variables

Nested quantifiers

Distributivity

Negation