

Predicates:

Statements involving variables, such as

“ **$x > 3$** ” and “Computer x is functioning properly”
can be true or false depending on the value of x .

Statement “ **x is greater than 3**” has two parts:

1. Subject: variable **x**
2. Predicate: “**is greater than 3**”

We can denote the statement “ x is greater than 3” by **$P(x)$** , where x is a variable.

P denotes the predicate “is greater than 3”.

P is also called as “Propositional Function”.

Predicate Logic (Predicate Calculus):

The area of logic that deals with predicates and quantifiers.

Essentially, it's dealing with the declarative statements which has **propositional variables** and convert them into **propositions**.

How?

1. By assigning a value to the variable.
2. By quantifying the value of the variable.

$P(x)$ is the value of the **propositional function** P at x .

$P(x)$ becomes a proposition when a value is assigned to x (and P is defined).

Eg: Let $P(x)$ denote the statement “ $x > 3$ ”.

$P(4)$ denotes “ $4 > 3$ ”, which is true.

$\therefore P(4)$ is true.

$P(2)$ denotes “ $2 > 3$ ”, which is false.

$\therefore P(2)$ is false.

Eg: Let $P(x,y)$ denote the statement “ $x = y + 3$ ”.

$P(1, 2)$ denotes “ $1 = 2 + 3$ ”, which is false.

$\therefore P(1, 2)$ is false.

$P(4, 1)$ denotes “ $4 = 1 + 3$ ”, which is true.

$\therefore P(4, 1)$ is true.

$P(x, y)$ is a binary predicate.

$P(x)$ is an unary predicate.

n-ary predicate:

A statement having n variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n can be denoted by $P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$.

A statement of the form $P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ is the value of the propositional function P at the n -tuple (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) .

P is called as n -place predicate or an n -ary predicate.

Quantifiers:

Another way to convert a propositional function to a proposition.

Universal Quantification:

$\forall xP(x)$: “ $P(x)$ for all values of x in the domain”

Eg: “All politicians are dishonest”

Existential Quantification:

$\exists xP(x)$: “There exists an element x in the domain such that $P(x)$ ”

Eg: “There is a politician who is honest”

Let dishonest $\equiv \neg$ honest.

Universal Quantification:

$\forall xP(x)$: “ $P(x)$ for all values of x in the domain”

or “for all x $P(x)$ ”

or “for every x $P(x)$ ”

or *for each, all of, given any, for arbitrary, or for any*

$\forall xP(x)$ is true when $P(x)$ is true for all the values of x in the domain.

Just one counterexample is good enough to prove $\forall xP(x)$ is false.

Existential Quantification:

$\exists xP(x)$: “There exists an element x in the domain such that $P(x)$ ”

or “there exists an x such that $P(x)$ ”

or “there is at least one value of x such that $x P(x)$ ”

Or *for some*, there is a

$\exists xP(x)$ is true when $P(x)$ is true for at least one value of x in the domain.

$\exists xP(x)$ is false only when $P(x)$ is false for all x .

Q: Let $P(x)$ be the statement “ $x^2 > 0$ ”. What is the truth value of the quantification $\forall x P(x)$, where the domain consists of the set of **integers**.

Soln: $P(x)$ is not true for $x=0$. $P(0)$ is false.

It is a counterexample.

$\therefore \forall x P(x)$ is a false proposition.

Q: ... $\forall x P(x)$... **positive integers**.

Soln: $P(x)$ is true for all the values of x in the domain.

$\therefore \forall x P(x)$ is a true proposition.

Q: ... $\exists x P(x)$... **integers**.

Soln: $P(x)$ is true for $x=1$. $P(1)$ is true.

$\therefore \exists x P(x)$ is a true proposition.

When all the elements of the domain can be listed like x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n (domain is a finite set),

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

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

Eg: $P(x)$: “ $x^2 < 9$ ” and x is an int in the range $[1, 3]$.

$$\forall x P(x) \equiv P(1) \wedge P(2) \wedge P(3)$$

$P(3)$, which is “ $3^2 < 9$ ” is false.

$\therefore \forall x P(x)$ is a false proposition

$$\exists x P(x) \equiv P(1) \vee P(2) \vee P(3)$$

$P(1)$, which is “ $1^2 < 9$ ” is true.

$\therefore \exists x P(x)$ is a true proposition

Binding Variables:

$\exists x(x+y=1)$, the variable x is bound, but y is free. Hence, it is not a proposition. If any variable in the expression is not bound, the expression is not yet a proposition.

$\exists x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \vee \forall xR(x)$ and $\forall x\exists y(x+y = 1)$ are propositions because all the involved variables are bound.

Precedence of quantifiers and logical operators:

$\forall \exists$

\neg

$\wedge \vee$

$\rightarrow \leftrightarrow$

Eg: $p \vee \neg q \wedge r \rightarrow s$ is same as $(p \vee (\neg q) \wedge r) \rightarrow s$

Eg: $\forall x P(x) \vee Q(x)$ is same as $(\forall x P(x)) \vee Q(x)$

$$\sum_1^n (a + b) = \sum_1^n a + \sum_1^n b$$

$$\sum_1^4 (3 + 5) = \sum_1^4 3 + \sum_1^4 5$$

$$\begin{aligned} & (3 + 5) + (3 + 5) + (3 + 5) + (3 + 5) \\ &= (3 + 3 + 3 + 3) + (5 + 5 + 5 + 5) \end{aligned}$$

$$8 + 8 + 8 + 8 = 12 + 20$$

$$32 = 32$$

Logical Equivalences involving quantifiers

Which of the following logical equivalences are valid?

$$\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \equiv \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$$

$$\forall x(P(x) \vee Q(x)) \equiv \forall xP(x) \vee \forall xQ(x)$$

$$\exists x(P(x) \vee Q(x)) \equiv \exists xP(x) \vee \exists xQ(x)$$

$$\exists x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \equiv \exists xP(x) \wedge \exists xQ(x)$$

Logical Equivalences involving quantifiers

Universal quantification of conjunction of two predicates is equivalent to conjunction of universal quantification of the two predicates, where same domain is used throughout.

$$\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \equiv \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$$

$$\exists x(P(x) \vee Q(x)) \equiv \exists xP(x) \vee \exists xQ(x)$$

But, $\forall x(P(x) \vee Q(x)) \not\equiv \forall xP(x) \vee \forall xQ(x)$

$$\exists x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \not\equiv \exists xP(x) \wedge \exists xQ(x)$$

Logical Equivalences involving quantifiers

Q: Show that $\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \equiv \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ where the same domain is used throughout.

(That is, a universal quantifier can be distributed over a conjunction)

Proof: $\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \equiv \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ means $\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \leftrightarrow \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ is a tautology.

That is, to prove

$\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \rightarrow \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ is a tautology **and**
 $\forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x) \rightarrow \forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ is a tautology.

To prove: $\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \rightarrow \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ is a T.

Suppose, $\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ is true.

$P(a) \wedge Q(a)$ is true for any 'a' in the domain.

$P(a)$ is true and $Q(a)$ is true.

Because 'a' is an arbitrary element in the domain and $P(a)$ is true, we can conclude that $\forall xP(x)$ is true.

Similarly, $\forall xQ(x)$ is true.

That means $\forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ is true.

$\therefore \forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \rightarrow \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ is a tautology ..①

To prove: $\forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x) \rightarrow \forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ is a T.

Suppose, $\forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ is true.

That is, $\forall xP(x)$ is true and $\forall xQ(x)$ is true.

$P(a)$ is true and $Q(a)$ is true for any 'a' in the domain.

Because $P(a)$ and $Q(a)$ true for all values in the domain,
for a given 'a', $P(a) \wedge Q(a)$.

Because 'a' is an arbitrary element in the domain,

$\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ is true

$\therefore \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x) \rightarrow \forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ is a tautology. ---②

By ① and ②,

$\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \leftrightarrow \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$ is a tautology.

$\therefore \forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \equiv \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$

Eg: What is the **negation** of “All politicians are dishonest”?

Let $P(x)$ be “ x is a dishonest politician”.

$\forall xP(x)$ is “All politicians are dishonest”.

$\neg \forall xP(x)$ would be “It is not the case that all politicians are dishonest”.

In other words, “Not all politicians are dishonest”.

That is, “There is a politician who is not dishonest”.

$\neg \forall xP(x) \equiv \exists x \neg P(x)$ ***not dishonest***
≡ honest

$\exists x \neg P(x)$ would be “There exists a politician who is **not** dishonest”.

Q: Prove that $\neg \forall x P(x) \equiv \exists x \neg P(x)$

Proof: $\neg \forall x P(x)$ is true iff $\forall x P(x)$ is false.

$\forall x P(x)$ is false iff there is an element x in the domain for which $P(x)$ is false.

There is an element x in the domain for which $\neg P(x)$ is true.

That is, $\exists x \neg P(x)$ is true.

$\therefore \neg \forall x P(x) \equiv \exists x \neg P(x)$

Logical Equivalences involving quantifiers

$$\forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \equiv \forall xP(x) \wedge \forall xQ(x)$$

$$\exists x(P(x) \vee Q(x)) \equiv \exists xP(x) \vee \exists xQ(x)$$

But, $\forall x(P(x) \vee Q(x)) \not\equiv \forall xP(x) \vee \forall xQ(x)$

$$\exists x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \not\equiv \exists xP(x) \wedge \exists xQ(x)$$

De Morgan's laws for quantifiers

$$\neg \forall xP(x) \equiv \exists x \neg P(x)$$

$$\neg \exists xP(x) \equiv \forall x \neg P(x)$$

Eg: $\forall x (x^2 > 0)$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$

$\forall_{x < 0} (x^2 > 0)$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}$

For every real number x which is lesser than zero, $x^2 > 0$.

In other words, for every real number x ,
if $x < 0$, then $x^2 > 0$.

i.e. $\forall x (x < 0 \rightarrow x^2 > 0)$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}$

Eg: $\forall_{x < 0} (x^2 > 0)$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}$

For every real number x which is lesser than zero,
 $x^2 > 0$.

In other words, for every real number x ,
if $x < 0$, then $x^2 > 0$.

i.e. **$\forall x (x < 0 \rightarrow x^2 > 0)$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}$**

Eg: $\exists_{x < 0} (x^2 = 2)$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}$

There exists a real number $x < 0$, such that $x^2 = 2$.

In other words, there exists a real number x ,
such that $x < 0$ and $x^2 = 2$.

i.e. **$\exists x ((x < 0) \wedge (x^2 = 2))$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}$**

Eg: $\forall_{x < 0} (x^2 > 0)$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}$

Equivalent to: $\forall x (x < 0 \rightarrow x^2 > 0)$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}$

Not equivalent to: $\forall x (x < 0 \wedge x^2 > 0)$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}$

Eg: $\exists_{x < 0} (x^2 = 2)$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}$

Equivalent to: $\exists x ((x < 0) \wedge (x^2 = 2))$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}$

Not equivalent to: $\exists x ((x < 0) \rightarrow (x^2 = 2))$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}$

Let the domain be all the animals.

$D(x)$: x is a dog

$M(x)$: x is a mammal

$C(x)$: x is cute

“All dogs are mammals” is equivalent to

$\forall x (D(x) \rightarrow M(x))$ or $\forall x (D(x) \wedge M(x))$?

“Some dogs are cute” is equivalent to

$\exists x (D(x) \rightarrow C(x))$ or $\exists x (D(x) \wedge C(x))$?

Explanation for: “All dogs are mammals”

What does $\forall x (D(x) \rightarrow M(x))$ mean?

$$\forall x (D(x) \rightarrow M(x)) \equiv \forall x (\neg D(x) \vee M(x))$$

Each animal is a non-dog or a mammal.

It means all dogs are mammals.

What does $\forall x (D(x) \wedge M(x))$ mean?

$$\forall x (D(x) \wedge M(x)) \equiv (\forall x D(x)) \wedge (\forall x M(x))$$

All animals are dogs and all animals are mammals.

It is **not** same as “All dogs are mammals”.

Explanation for: “Some dogs are cute”

What does $\exists x (D(x) \wedge C(x))$ mean?

There exists an animal, which is both a dog and a cute animal.

It means there exists a cute dog.

What does $\exists x (D(x) \rightarrow C(x))$ mean?

$\exists x (D(x) \rightarrow C(x)) \equiv \exists x (\neg D(x) \vee C(x))$

$\equiv (\exists x \neg D(x)) \vee (\exists x C(x))$

There is a non-dog animal or there is a cute animal.

It is **not** same as “Some dogs are cute”

Nested Quantifiers

Eg: $\forall x \exists y (x+y=0)$ where $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$

In words, “For each real number x , there exists a real number y such that $x+y=0$ ”.

$\forall x \exists y (x+y=0)$ is a proposition

$\forall x Q(x)$ where $Q(x)$ is $\exists y (x+y=0)$.

$\forall x Q(x)$ where $Q(x)$ is $\exists y P(x,y)$ and $P(x,y)$ is $x+y=0$

Other Quantifiers:

We can define quantifier other than the standard universal and existential quantifiers.

$\forall x \exists! y (x+y=0)$ where $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$ means

“For each real number x , there exists **exactly one** real number y such that $x+y=0$ ”.

$\exists!$ means “there exists exactly one”

\exists_{10} means “there exists exactly 10”

Eg: $\forall x \forall y ((x < 0) \wedge (y < 0) \rightarrow (xy > 0))$ where $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$

“For each pair of real numbers (x, y) , if both are greater than 0, then their product is greater than 0”

$\forall y \forall x ((x > 0) \wedge (y > 0) \rightarrow (xy > 0))$ where $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$?

Eg: $\exists x \exists y \exists z (x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ where $x, y, z \in \mathbf{Z}^+$

“There is a 3-tuple (x, y, z) of non-trivial positive integers for which $(x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ is true”

$\exists y \exists z \exists x (x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ where x, y, z are non-trivial positive integers ?

$$\forall x \exists y P(x,y) \equiv \exists y \forall x P(x,y) ?$$

Let $P(x, y): x+y=0$

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

“For each real number x , there exists a real number y such that $x+y=0$ ”

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

“There is a real number y which matches with every real number x such that $x+y=0$ ”

$$\therefore \forall x \exists y P(x,y) \not\equiv \exists y \forall x P(x,y)$$

Nested Quantification of two variables

$\forall x \forall y P(x,y)$ $\forall y \forall x P(x,y)$	$P(x,y)$ is true for every pair (x,y)
$\exists x \exists y P(x,y)$ $\exists y \exists x P(x,y)$	$P(x,y)$ is true for at least one pair of (x,y)
$\forall x \exists y P(x,y)$	For each x , there is a y such that $P(x,y)$ is true
$\exists x \forall y P(x,y)$	There is a x such that $P(x,y)$ is true for every y

Are these statements true?

$\exists x \exists y \exists z (x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ where $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^+$

$\forall x \exists y \exists z (x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ where $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^+$

$\forall x \forall y \exists z (x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ where $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^+$

$\forall x \forall y \forall z (x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ where $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^+$

Are these statements true?

$\exists x \exists y \exists z (x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ where $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^+$

“There is a 3-tuple (x, y, z) for which $(x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ is true”

$\forall x \exists y \exists z (x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ where $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^+$

“For all x , there is a pair (y, z) for which $(x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ is true”

$\forall x \forall y \exists z (x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ where $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^+$

“For every pair (x, y) there is a z for which $(x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ is true”

$\forall x \forall y \forall z (x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ where $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^+$

“For every 3-tuple (x, y, z) , $(x^2 + y^2 = z^2)$ is **false**”

Eg: Negation of $\forall x \exists y (xy = 1)$.

Soln: Negation of $\forall x \exists y (xy = 1)$

$\equiv \neg \forall x \exists y (xy = 1)$

Eg: Negation of $\forall x \exists y (xy = 1)$.

Soln: Negation of $\forall x \exists y (xy = 1)$

$$\equiv \neg \forall x \exists y (xy = 1)$$

$$\equiv \exists x \neg \exists y (xy = 1)$$

$$\equiv \exists x \forall y \neg (xy = 1)$$

$$\equiv \exists x \forall y (xy \neq 1)$$

$$\therefore \neg \forall x P(x) \equiv \exists x \neg P(x)$$

$$\therefore \neg \exists x P(x) \equiv \forall x \neg P(x)$$