

# Discrete Mathematics: Lecture 20

argument (proposition), building arguments, predicate logic, quantifiers, WFFs

Xuming He

Associate Professor

School of Information Science and Technology

ShanghaiTech University

Spring Semester, 2022

Notes by Prof. Liangfeng Zhang

# Argument

**DEFINITION:** An **argument** (论证) is a sequence of propositions

- **Conclusion** (结论): the final proposition
- **Premises** (假设): all the other propositions
- **Valid** (有效): the truth of premises implies that of the conclusion
- **Proof** (证明): a valid argument that establishes the truth of a conclusion

**EXAMPLE:** a valid argument, a proof

- If  $\{2^{-n}\}$  is convergent, then  $\{2^{-n}\}$  has a convergent subsequence.
- $\{2^{-n}\}$  is convergent.
- $\{2^{-n}\}$  has a convergent subsequence.

# Argument Form

**DEFINITION:** An **argument form**<sup>(论证形式)</sup> is a sequence of formulas.

- **Valid**<sup>(有效)</sup>: no matter which propositions are substituted for the propositional variables, the truth of conclusion follows from the truth of premises  
• **Rules of inference**<sup>(推理规则)</sup>: valid argument forms (relatively simple)

**EXAMPLE:** a valid argument form and an invalid argument form

<i>premises</i> 不一定为真	$p \rightarrow q$	$p: \{(-1)^n\}$ is convergent.
	$p$	$q: \{(-1)^n\}$ has a convergent subsequence.
$q$		
valid	$p \rightarrow q$	If $\{(-1)^n\}$ is convergent, then $\{(-1)^n\}$ has a convergent subsequence.
	$p \rightarrow q$	$\neg p: \{(-1)^n\}$ is not convergent.
	$\neg p$	$\neg q: \{(-1)^n\}$ does not have a convergent subsequence.
	$\neg q$	
invalid	The truth of $\neg p$ and $p \rightarrow q$ does not imply that of $\neg q$	

# Building Arguments

**QUESTION:** Given the premises  $P_1, \dots, P_n$ , show a conclusion  $Q$ , that is, show that  $P_1 \wedge \dots \wedge P_n \Rightarrow Q$ .

Name	Operations
Premise	Introduce the <u>given formulas</u> $P_1, \dots, P_n$ in the process of constructing proofs.
Conclusion	Quote the <u>intermediate formula</u> <sup>中间结论</sup> that have been deducted.
Rule of replacement	Replace a formula with a <u>logically equivalent</u> formula.
Rules of Inference	Deduct a new formula with a <u>tautological implication</u> .
Rule of substitution	Deduct a formula from a <u>tautology</u> .

# Review: Tautological Implications

Name	Tautological Implication	NO.
Conjunction(合取)	$(P) \wedge (Q) \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$	1
Simplification(化简)	$P \wedge Q \Rightarrow P$	2
Addition(附加)	$P \Rightarrow P \vee Q$	3
Modus ponens(假言推理)	$P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow Q$	4
Modus tollens(拒取)	$\neg Q \wedge (P \rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow \neg P$	5
Disjunctive syllogism(析取三段论)	$\neg P \wedge (P \vee Q) \Rightarrow Q$	6
Hypothetical syllogism(假言三段论)	$(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow R) \Rightarrow (P \rightarrow R)$	7
Resolution (归结)	$(P \vee Q) \wedge (\neg P \vee R) \Rightarrow Q \vee R$	8

# Building Arguments

**EXAMPLE:** Show that the premises 1, 2, 3, and 4 lead to conclusion 5.

1. "It is not sunny this afternoon and it is colder than yesterday,"  $\neg p \wedge q$
2. "We will go swimming only if it is sunny,"  $r \rightarrow p$
3. "If we do not go swimming, then we will take a canoe trip,"  $\neg r \rightarrow s$
4. "If we take a canoe trip, then we will be home by sunset"  $s \rightarrow t$
5. "We will be home by sunset."  $t$

- **Translating the premises and the conclusion into formulas. Let**
  - $p$ : "It is sunny this afternoon"
  - $q$ : "It is colder than yesterday"
  - $r$ : "We will go swimming"
  - $s$ : "We will take a canoe trip"
  - $t$ : "We will be home by sunset"
  - The premises are  $\neg p \wedge q, r \rightarrow p, \neg r \rightarrow s$ , and  $s \rightarrow t$ .
  - The conclusion is  $t$ .
- **Question:  $?( \neg p \wedge q ) \wedge ( r \rightarrow p ) \wedge ( \neg r \rightarrow s ) \wedge ( s \rightarrow t ) \Rightarrow t$** 
  - Can be proven with truth table. 32 rows!

# Building Arguments

**EXAMPLE:** Show that the premises 1, 2, 3, and 4 lead to conclusion 5.

1. “It is not sunny this afternoon and it is colder than yesterday,”
2. “We will go swimming only if it is sunny,”
3. “If we do not go swimming, then we will take a canoe trip,”
4. “If we take a canoe trip, then we will be home by sunset”
5. “We will be home by sunset.”

■ **Show that**  $(\neg p \wedge q) \wedge (r \rightarrow p) \wedge (\neg r \rightarrow s) \wedge (s \rightarrow t) \Rightarrow t$

(1)	$\neg p \wedge q$	Premise (注記)	
(2)	$\neg p$	Simplification using (1)	$p \wedge q \Rightarrow p$
(3)	$r \rightarrow p$	Premise	$\neg p \wedge (r \rightarrow p) \Rightarrow \neg r$
(4)	$\neg r$	<u>Modus tollens</u> using (2) and (3)	
(5)	$\neg r \rightarrow s$	Premise	$\neg r \wedge (\neg r \rightarrow s) \Rightarrow s$
(6)	$s$	Modus ponens using (4) and (5)	
(7)	$s \rightarrow t$	Premise	$s \wedge (s \rightarrow t) \Rightarrow t$
(8)	$t$	Modus ponens using (6) and (7)	

# Building Arguments

**EXAMPLE:** Show that  $(P \vee Q) \wedge (P \rightarrow R) \wedge (Q \rightarrow S) \Rightarrow S \vee R$

(1)	$P \vee Q$	Premise
(2)	$\neg P \rightarrow Q$	Rule of replacement applied to (1)
(3)	$Q \rightarrow S$	Premise
(4)	$\neg P \rightarrow S$	Hypothetical syllogism applied to (2) and (3)
(5)	$\neg S \rightarrow P$	Rule of replacement applied to (4)
(6)	$P \rightarrow R$	Premise
(7)	$\neg S \rightarrow R$	Hypothetical syllogism applied to (5) and (6)
(8)	$S \vee R$	Rule of replacement applied to (7)



# Limitation of Propositional Logic

**EXAMPLE:** What is the underlying tautological implication in the following proof?

- If  $1/3$  is a rational number, then  $1/3$  is a real number.
- $1/3$  is a rational number.
- $1/3$  is a real number.
  - $q \rightarrow r$ : "If  $1/3$  is a rational number, then  $1/3$  is a real number."
  - $q$ : " $1/3$  is a rational number"
  - $r$ : " $1/3$  is a real number"
  - What is the underlying tautological implication?
    - $(q \rightarrow r) \wedge q \Rightarrow r$
    - YES. This is a tautological implication.

# Limitation of Propositional Logic

**EXAMPLE:** What is the underlying tautological implication in the following proof?

- All rational numbers are real numbers
- $1/3$  is a rational number
- $1/3$  is a real number
  - $p$ : "All rational numbers are real numbers"
  - $q$ : " $1/3$  is a rational number"
  - $r$ : " $1/3$  is a real number"
  - What is the underlying tautological implication?
    - $p \wedge q \Rightarrow r$ ?
      - NO.  $p \wedge q \rightarrow r$  is not a tautology.
        - Why is this a proof?
          - We need **predicate logic**.

谓词逻辑

# Predicate and Individual

**Predicate**<sub>谓词</sub>: describe the property of the subject term (in a sentence) 主语

- A predicate is a function from a domain of individuals to  $\{\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F}\}$
- **$n$ -ary predicate** <sub>$n$ 元谓词</sub>: a predicate on  $n$  individuals
  - $I$ : “is an integer” // unary
  - $G$ : “is greater than” //binary
- **Predicate constant**<sub>谓词常项</sub>: a concrete predicate //  $I, G$
- **Predicate variable**<sub>谓词变项</sub>: a symbol that represents any predicate

**Individual**<sub>个体词</sub>: the object you are considering (in a sentence)

- “ $\sqrt{1 + 2\sqrt{1 + 3\sqrt{1 + \dots}}}$  is an integer”
- “ $e^\pi$  is greater than  $\pi^e$ ”
  - **Individual Constant**<sub>个体常项</sub>:  $\sqrt{1 + 2\sqrt{1 + 3\sqrt{1 + \dots}}}$ ,  $e^\pi, \pi^e$
  - **Individual Variable**<sub>个体变项</sub>:  $x, y, z$
  - **Domain**<sub>个体域</sub>: the set of all individuals in consideration

# From Predicates to Propositions

**Propositional function**命题函数:  $P(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , where  $P$  is an  $n$ -ary predicate

- $P(x, y)$ : “ $x$  is greater than  $y$ ”
- $P(x, y)$  gives a proposition when we assign values to  $x, y$ 
  - $P(e^\pi, \pi^e)$  is a proposition (a true proposition)
- $P(x, y)$  is not a proposition

**EXAMPLE:**  $p$ : “Alice’s father is a doctor”;  $q$ : “Bob’s father is a doctor”

- Individuals: Alice’s father, Bob’s father; Predicate  $D$ : “is a doctor”
- $p = D(\text{Alice's father})$ ,  $q = D(\text{Bob's father})$

**Function of Individuals:** a map on the domain of individuals

- $f(x) = x$ ’s father
- $p = D(f(\text{Alice}))$ ;  $q = D(f(\text{Bob}))$

# Universal Quantifier

**DEFINITION:** Let  $P(x)$  be a propositional function. The **universal quantification**<sub>全称量化</sub> of  $P(x)$  is “ $P(x)$  for all  $x$  in the domain”.

- notation:  $\forall x P(x)$ ; read as “for all  $x P(x)$ ” or “for every  $x P(x)$ ”
  - “ $\forall$ ” is called the **universal quantifier**<sub>全称量词</sub>
  - “ $\forall x P(x)$ ” is true iff  $P(x)$  is true for every  $x$  in the domain
  - “ $\forall x P(x)$ ” is false iff there is an  $x_0$  in the domain such that  $P(x_0)$  is false
    - **Counterexample**<sub>反例</sub>: an  $x_0$  such that  $P(x_0)$  is false

**EXAMPLE:**  $P(n)$ : “ $n^2 + n + 41$  is a prime”

- When domain = natural numbers, “ $\forall n P(n)$ ” is “for every natural number  $n$ ,  $n^2 + n + 41$  is a prime”
- When domain is  $D = \{0, 1, \dots, 39\}$ , “ $\forall n P(n)$ ” is “for every  $n \in D$ ,  $n^2 + n + 41$  is a prime”

$$D = \emptyset$$

**REMARK:** If the domain is empty, then “ $\forall x P(x)$ ” is true for any  $P$ .

# Existential Quantifier

**DEFINITION:** Let  $P(x)$  be a propositional function. The **existential quantification**<sub>存在量化</sub> of  $P(x)$  is “there is an  $x$  in the domain such that  $P(x)$ ”

- notation:  $\exists x P(x)$ ; read as “for some  $x P(x)$ ” or “there is an  $x$  s. t.  $P(x)$ ”
  - “ $\exists$ ” is called the **existential quantifier**<sub>存在量词</sub>
  - “ $\exists x P(x)$ ” is true iff there is an  $x$  in the domain such that  $P(x)$  is true
  - “ $\exists x P(x)$ ” is false iff  $P(x)$  is false for every  $x$  in the domain

**EXAMPLE:**  $P(x): “x^2 - x + 1 = 0”$

- “ $\exists x P(x)$ ” is false when  $D = \mathbb{R}$  and is true when  $D = \mathbb{C}$

**REMARK:** If the domain is empty, then “ $\exists x P(x)$ ” is false for any  $P$ .

**REMARK:** if not stated, the individual can be anything.

# Binding Variables and Scope

绑定变量

作用域

**DEFINITION:** An individual variable  $x$  is **bound**<sub>约束的</sub> if a quantifier ( $\forall, \exists$ ) is used on  $x$ ; otherwise,  $x$  is said to be **free**<sub>自由的</sub>.

- $\exists x(x + y = 1)$ 
  - $x$  is bound and  $y$  is free
- **scope**<sub>辖域</sub> of a quantifier: the part of a formula to which a quantifier is used
  - the scope of  $\exists x$  in  $\exists x(x + y = 1)$  is  $(x + y = 1)$

**Predicate Logic**<sub>谓词逻辑</sub>: the area of logic that deals with predicates and quantifiers (a.k.a. **predicate calculus**)

- predicate logic is an extension of propositional logic

# Well-Formed Formulas

## Elements that may appear in Well-Formed Formulas 合式公式:

- Propositional constants: **T, F**,  $p, q, r, \dots$
- Propositional variables:  $p, q, r, \dots$
- Logical Connectives:  $\neg, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow$
- Parenthesis:  $(, )$
- Individual constants:  $a, b, c, \dots$
- Individual variables:  $x, y, z, \dots$
- Predicate constants:  $P, Q, R, \dots$
- Predicate variables:  $P, Q, R, \dots$
- Quantifiers:  $\forall, \exists$
- Functions of individuals:  $f, g, \dots$



# Well-Formed Formulas

**DEFINITION:** well-formed formulas 合式公式/formulas

- 1) propositional constants, propositional variables, and propositional functions without connectives are WFFs
- 2) If  $A$  is a WFF, then  $\neg A$  is also a WFF
- 3) If  $A, B$  are WFFs and there is no individual variable  $x$  which is bound in one of  $A, B$  but free in the other, then  $(A \wedge B), (A \vee B), (A \rightarrow B), (A \leftrightarrow B)$  are WFFs.
- 4) If  $A$  is a WFF with a free individual variable  $x$ , then  $\forall x A, \exists x A$  are WFFs.
- 5) WFFs can be constructed with 1)-4).

- Example:  $\forall x F(x) \vee G(x), \forall x P(y)$  are not WFFs

*合式公式* • Example:  $\exists x (A(x) \rightarrow \forall y B(x, y))$  is a WFF

**Precedence:**  $\forall, \exists$  have higher precedence than  $\neg, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow$

- $\forall x P(x) \rightarrow Q(y)$  means  $(\forall x P(x)) \rightarrow Q(y)$ , not  $\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow Q(y))$