

CS2120 F22

From Propositional to Predicate Logic

The Expressiveness of a Logic

- The expressiveness of a logic refers to the range of ideas it can encode
 - Propositional logic
 - Syntax
 - The basic truth value constants (true, false)
 - Boolean variables for propositions (X, Y, Z, NiftyIsACat, TomLivesInCVille, etc.)
 - The basic logical connectives
 - Semantics
 - An *interpretation* gives a Boolean value to each variable in an expression
 - The logical connectives are also interpreted: as specifying Boolean functions
 - The meaning of a larger proposition is composed from the meanings of its parts
 - Propositional logic extended with *background theories*
 - Syntax:
 - Same logical connectives with the same meaning
 - Elementary propositions can be expressed in terms of *background theories* (e.g., arithmetic)
 - Semantics:
 - Richer notion *interpretation*: e.g., variables can now also refer to objects such as numbers
 - Think about our circle/triangle/square puzzle: these funny looking variables refer to numbers
 - Can specify much richer ideas, e.g., “no two numbers in a row or column can be equal”

Limitations on the Expressiveness of Propositional Logic

- Variables can't refer to objects of arbitrary types; no notion of types at all
 - *Boolean*, sure
 - But *person*, *electron*, *mathematical group*, *school*, *class*, *employee*, *principal*, ... no
- Cannot *quantify* over sets of objects, or over functions, n-ary relations, etc
 - Every interpretation for proposition P makes P true (P is valid)
 - Some interpretation for proposition P makes P true (P is satisfiable)
 - No interpretation for proposition P makes P true (P is unsatisfiable)
- No mechanism for *parameterizing* propositions
 - Yes: *SocratesIsHuman*, *KantIsHuman*, *SearleIsHuman*, *X*, *Y*, *Z*, etc.
 - No: *IsHuman(X)*, where X can be any person: *isHuman(Socrates)*, *isHuman(Kant)*, etc.
 - A *parameterized* proposition is called a *predicate*: e.g., *isHuman*, *isEven*, *isMortal*, ...
 - Predicates can have multiple parameters: e.g., $=(m,n)$; $<(m,n)$; *relativelyPrime(m,n)*; etc.
 - A *proposition* is a degenerate predicate with no parameters, e.g., *isHuman(Socrates)*

Predicate Logic

- Predicate logic addresses each limitation vastly expanding its expressiveness
 - Variables can range over values of *arbitrary types*
 - Syntax adds *universal* and *existential quantifiers*
 - $\forall x, P x$ – for *all*, for *any*, for *every* value of x , $P(x)$ is true
 - $\exists x, P x$ – there *exists*, for *some* value of x , $P(x)$ is true
 - Predicate logic has *predicates*, denoting whole families of propositions
- But this increase in expressiveness comes with heavy costs
 - Vastly more complex notions of *interpretation* and *truth*
 - No longer any possibility of an automated satisfiability solver
 - Can no longer rely on truth table checking as a test of validity
 - One must use *deductive reasoning* (using *inference rules*) to check validity
 - A chain of deductive inferences showing validity is what we usually mean by a *proof*

Rest of today

- Quick reminder of what a natural deduction proof looks like
- Quick exposure to variants of predicate logic
 - Intuitionistic or constructive logic (a.k.a. *type theory*)
 - First-order predicate logic
- Practice with predicates and quantifiers

Proofs in propositional and predicate logic

- How would you prove that this proposition is valid? $X \wedge Y \rightarrow Y \wedge X$
- If it's propositional logic, use a truth table (evaluate it for each interpretation)
- In predicate logic you will generally need to use deductive reasoning
 - Assume H: $X \wedge Y$ (hypothesis, or premise)
 - Goal: In this context, show $Y \wedge X$
 - Apply *and-elimination* to H to deduce X and Y separately
 - Apply *and-introduction* to Y and X in that (reverse) order to show $Y \wedge X$
 - Having shown that *if* $X \wedge Y$ then $Y \wedge X$ apply *arrow introduction* to conclude $X \wedge Y \rightarrow Y \wedge X$
- *Arrow intro*: If in a context with H, you can prove K, you can deduce $H \rightarrow K$
- A proof in predicate logic is a very different beast than in propositional logic!

Major Variants of Predicate Logic

- First-order predicate logic
 - No explicit types
 - everything is just an object
 - use predicates in lieu of types
 - E.g., $\forall x, \text{isHuman } x \rightarrow \text{isMortal } x$
 - Read that as, “With x being any *object*, if x is Human then x is mortal”
 - You can quantify over sets of objects but not over functions, relations, predicates, propositions
 - Predicates can have objects but not predicates, functions, relations, propositions as arguments
- Higher-Order constructive logic
 - Generally come with an exceptionally expressive *type systems*, including user-defined types
 - E.g., if Human is a defined type, you can now write $\forall (x : \text{Human}), \text{isMortal } x$
 - In FOPL, you can apply isMortal to any object, in HOCL applying it to non-human is a type error
 - In FOPL, you can write *isMortal oxygen*; in HOCL it's just a type error
 - In HOCL, you can quantify over functions, propositions, etc.
 - HOCL can serve as both a logic and a typed functional programming language
 - FOPL is a subset of HOCL (as propositional logic is a subset of predicate logic)

Let's play with quantifiers: formalize in HOCL

- Every person is mortal
- Some person is happy
- Someone likes everyone
- Everyone likes someone
- There is someone everyone likes
- For any persons, P, Q, R , if P likes Q , and Q likes R , then P might like R
- The enemy of your enemy is your friend
- For any natural number, n , if n is even then $n+1$ is odd
- With n being any natural number, if $n \geq 2$, then if no number in $2, \dots, n/2$ divides n evenly, then n is prime
- No one likes everyone
- If there's a person everyone likes, then everyone likes someone