Predicates and Quantifiers

CS 231 Dianna Xu

Predicates

- Consider P(x) = x < 5
 - P(x) has no truth values (x is not given a value)
 - -P(1) is true -1<5 is true
 - -P(10) is false -10 < 5 is false
- Thus, P(x) will become a statement/proposition when x is given a value

Truth set of predicates

- Let P(x) = "x is a multiple of 5"
 - For what values of x is P(x) true?

- Let P(x) = x+1 > x
 - For what values of x is P(x) true?

- Let P(x) = x + 3
 - For what values of x is P(x) true?

Multiple variables

Functions/predicates with multiple variables:

$$-P(x,y) = x + y == 0$$

• P(1,2) is false, P(1,-1) is true

$$-P(x,y,z) = x + y == z$$

• P(3,4,5) is false, P(1,2,3) is true

$$-P(x_1,x_2,x_3 ... x_n) = ...$$

Quantifiers

 A quantifier is "an operator that limits the variables of a predicate"

- Two types:
 - Universal
 - Existential

Universal quantifiers 1

- Represented by an upside-down A: ∀
 - It means "for all"
 - Let P(x) = x+1 > x

- We can state the following:
 - $\forall x, P(x)$
 - English translation: "for all values of x, P(x) is true"
 - English translation: "for all values of x, x+1>x is true"

Universal quantifiers 2

- But is that always true?
 - $\forall x P(x)$
- Let x = the character 'a'
 - ls 'a' + 1 > 'a' ?
- Let x = the state of Pennsylvania
 - Is Pennsylvania+1 > Pennsylvania?
- You need to specify your universe!
 - What values x can represent
 - Known as the "domain" of x

Universal quantifiers 3

- $\forall x \in \mathcal{R}, P(x)$
- Let P(x) = x/2 < x $- \forall x \in \mathcal{R}, P(x)$?
- To prove that a universal quantification is true, it must be shown for ALL cases – exhaustion
- To prove that a universal quantification is false, it must be shown to be false for only ONE case – counter example

Existential quantification 1

- Represented by an backwards E: ∃
 - It means "there exists"
 - Let P(x) = x+1 > x

- We can state the following:
 - $-\exists x, P(x)$
 - English translation: "there exists (a value of) x such that P(x) is true"
 - English translation: "for at least one value of x, x+1>x is true"

Existential quantification 2

- Note that you still have to specify your domain
 - If the domain we are talking about is all the states in the US, then $\exists x P(x)$ is not true

Existential quantification 3

 In order to show an existential quantification is true, you only have to find ONE value

 In order to show an existential quantification is false, you have to show it's false for ALL values

A note on quantifiers

• P(x) = x < 1

- There are two ways to make a predicate (propositional function) into a statement (proposition):
 - Supply it with a value
 - For example, P(5) is false, P(0) is true
 - Provide a quantification
 - ∀x ∈ Z, P(x) is false and ∃x ∈ Z, P(x) is true

Universal Conditional Statements

- $\forall x$, if P(x) then Q(x)
- $\forall x, P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)$
- $\forall x \in \mathcal{R}$, if x > 0 then x+2 > 0
- Consider "If a number is positive, then it is not zero"
- Implicit quantification
 - -P(x) implies $Q(x) \equiv \forall x, P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)$
 - -P(x) iff $Q(x) \equiv \forall x, P(x) \leftrightarrow Q(x)$

- Consider "All cats are black"
 - Let C be the set of all cats
 - ∀x ∈ C, x is black
 - Let B(x) be "x is black": $\forall x \in C$, B(x)
- "Some people are crazy"
 - Let P be the set of all people
 - \exists x ∈ P, x is crazy
 - Let Crazy(x) be "x is crazy": $\exists x \in P$, Crazy(x)

- Consider "Every student in this class has studied compound statements"
- Rephrased: "For every student x in this class, x has studied compound statements"
 - Let C(x) be "x has studied compound statements"
 - ∀x, C(x), where the domain is "all students in this class"

Equivalent forms

- What if the domain is all people?
 - Let S(x) be "x is a student in this class"
 - Consider: $\forall x (S(x) \land C(x))$
- $\forall x, S(x) \rightarrow C(x)$
- ∀x, C(x), where the domain is "all students in this class"
- ∀x ∈ U, S(x) → C(x) ≡ ∀x ∈ D, C(x), where D is the domain consisting of the truth set of S(x)

Consider:

- "Some students have visited Mexico"
- " Every student has visited Canada or Mexico"

• Let:

- S(x) be "x is a student"
- M(x) be "x has visited Mexico"
- C(x) be "x has visited Canada"

- Consider: "Some students have visited Mexico"
- $\exists x \in D$, M(x) where D = all students
- What if the domain is all people?
 - Consider: $\exists x, (S(x) \rightarrow M(x))$
 - $-\exists x, (S(x) \land M(x))$

- Consider: "Every student has visited Canada or Mexico"
- $\forall x \in D, M(x) \lor C(x)$
 - D = all students
- $\forall x, (S(x) \rightarrow (M(x) \lor C(x))$

Negating quantifications

- Consider the statement:
 - All students in this class have red hair
- What is required to show the statement is false?
 - There exists a student in this class that does NOT have red hair
- To negate a universal quantification:
 - Negate the predicate
 - AND change to an existential quantification
 - Change "All are" to "Some are not"
 - $-\sim(\forall x\in D, P(x))\equiv \exists x\in D, \sim P(x)$

Negating quantifications 2

- Consider the statement:
 - There is a student in this class with red hair
- What is required to show the statement is false?
 - All students in this class do not have red hair
- Thus, to negate an existential quantification:
 - Negate the predicate
 - AND change to a universal quantification
 - $-\sim(\exists x\in D, P(x))\equiv \forall x\in D, \sim P(x)$

More negations



- "No man is an island" John Donne
 - $\forall x, x \text{ is not an island}$
 - ∃x, x is an island
 - Some men are islands
- "All that glitters is not gold" Chaucer and Shakespeare

Negation of universal conditionals

- \sim ($\forall x \in D, P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)$) $\equiv \exists x \in D, \sim$ ($P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)$)
- $\sim (\forall x \in D, P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)) \equiv \exists x \in D, P(x) \land \sim Q(x)$
- For all people x, if x is rich then x is happy
 - There is one person who is rich and is not happy
 - There is one person who is rich but not happy

\forall and \land

 Given a predicate P(x) and values in the domain {x₁, ..., x_n}

The universal quantification ∀x P(x) implies:

$$P(x_1) \wedge P(x_2) \wedge ... \wedge P(x_n)$$

∃ and ∨

 Given a predicate P(x) and values in the domain {x₁, ..., x_n}

The existential quantification ∃x P(x) implies:

$$P(x_1) \vee P(x_2) \vee \ldots \vee P(x_n)$$

- Translate the statements:
 - "All hummingbirds are richly colored"
 - "No large birds live on honey"
 - "Birds that do not live on honey are dull in color"
 - "Hummingbirds are small"
- Assign our predicates
 - Let P(x) be "x is a hummingbird"
 - Let Q(x) be "x is large"
 - Let R(x) be "x lives on honey"
 - Let S(x) be "x is richly colored"
- Let our domain be all birds

- "All hummingbirds are richly colored"
 - $\forall x, (P(x) \rightarrow S(x))$
- "No large birds live on honey"
 - $\sim \exists x, (Q(x) \land R(x))$
 - Alternatively: $\forall x$, ($\sim Q(x) \lor \sim R(x)$)
- "Birds that do not live on honey are dull in color"
 - $\forall x, (\sim R(x) \rightarrow \sim S(x))$
- "Hummingbirds are small"
 - $\forall x, (P(x) \rightarrow \sim Q(x))$