

Math 55 Lecture 2: Predicates + Quantifiers §1.4, 1.5, 1.6

Let $P(x)$ be the statement $x+2=10$.

Recall: Not a proposition, because

Called a propositional function.
Once we assign value to x ,

Can also have statements involving several variables.

Ex: Let $Q(x,y)$ denote statement $x=y+3$

Another way to create a proposition from propositional function involves quantifiers ...
English words used in quantifiers include

Def: The domain of a propositional function $P(x)$

Def: We use notation $\forall x P(x)$ to denote the statement

Ex: Let $P(x)$ be the statement " $x^2 < x$ "
What is truth value of $\forall x P(x)$, where the domain consists
How about if domain

" \forall " is the universal quantifier.

Def: We use notation $\exists x P(x)$ to denote the statement

Many other quantifiers besides \forall , \exists , such as:
-
-

Def: The notation $\exists! P(x)$ means

Example: Show that
 $\exists x (P(x) \vee Q(x))$ and $\exists x P(x) \vee \exists x Q(x)$ are
logically equivalent.

Need to show:

Solution: Must show 2 things:

(1)

(2)

How to negate a quantified expression:

How do we negate $\forall x P(x)$?

This illustrates logical equivalence:

Similarly,
These are De Morgan's Laws for quantifiers.

Example:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Translated into math:

Question: Does #3 follow from #1 and #2?
(We'll learn how to determine, soon)

§ 1.5 Nested Quantifiers

Two quantifiers are nested if one is in scope of another, e.g.

$$\forall x \exists y (x - 7y = 0)$$

Example: Let domain for variables x, y, z be real numbers \mathbb{R} . The statement

Ex: Let domain for x, y be \mathbb{R} . The statement

Note: Order of quantifiers matters!

Ex: Translate the statement

"The abs value of the product of 2 integers is the product of their absolute values."
Let domain be all integers \mathbb{Z} .

Ex of sudoku from last time:

$\bigwedge_{j=1}^9 \bigwedge_{n=1}^9 \bigvee_{i=1}^9 p(i, j, n)$ expresses the statement

"every column contains each integer between 1 and 9."
How to write using quantifiers?

§1.6 Rules of Inference

Consider this argument:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Is this a valid argument?

Def: An argument in propositional logic is
one is called the final
called & the rest
if An argument is valid

To verify that a statement is true, we use

To deduce new statements from statements
we already have, we use

Example: Law of detachment or modus ponens
is based on tautology:

Let p & q be the prop's
" My cell phone rings " and
" I will disturb the lecture. "

(p.72)
for
bugger
list

Rule of Inference	Tautology	Name

NB: Don't need to memorize these names!! ↑

Ex: Use Rules of Inference to draw a conclusion based on the hypotheses

Let p, q, r be "I eat spicy foods,"
"I have strange dreams,"
"there is thunder while I sleep."
Then hypotheses are:

<u>Step</u>	<u>Reason</u>
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	

Conclusion:

Common mistake (fallacy):

The proposition $[(p \rightarrow q) \wedge q] \rightarrow p$ is not tautology.
(It is false when p is false & q is true).
Do not use it in an argument!

Rules of Inference for Quantified Statements

Universal instantiation:

Given the premise $\forall x P(x)$,
we can conclude that $P(c)$ is true
(provided c is element of domain).

Ex:

Rule of Inference	Name

Ex: