

case 16 6-27-24

1

Ex. 'all horses in California are blue'

- let $U = \{\text{horses in CA}\}$, and let $B(x) = 'x \text{ is blue}'$

$$\forall x B(x)$$

- let $U = \{\text{horses}\}$, $C(x) = 'x \text{ lives in CA}'$

$$\forall x (C(x) \rightarrow B(x))$$

- let $U = \{\text{living things}\}$, $H(x) = 'x \text{ is a horse}'$

$$\forall x (H(x) \wedge C(x) \rightarrow B(x))$$

This is wrong:

$$\forall x (H(x) \wedge C(x) \wedge B(x))$$

1.5 Nested Quantifiers

$\equiv$ for 1st order logic.

Defn

Let A, B be expressions with Predicates and Quantifiers, and in which all variables are bound. Then $A \equiv B$ iff A and B have the same truth value for all Propositional functions and all Universes.

$$\underline{\exists x} \quad \neg \forall x P(x) \equiv \exists x \neg P(x) \quad \checkmark$$

$$\underline{\exists x} \quad \neg \forall x P(x) \not\equiv \forall x \neg P(x) \quad \checkmark$$

why? let $P(x) = 'x > 0'$, $U = \mathbb{R}$.

Then: LHS is true

RHS is false

Let $P(x, y)$ where $U_x = U_y = U$.
Then

$$(1) \quad \forall x \forall y P(x, y) \equiv \forall y \forall x P(x, y)$$

$$(2) \quad \exists x \exists y P(x, y) \equiv \exists y \exists x P(x, y)$$

$$(3) \quad \forall x \exists y P(x, y) \not\equiv \exists y \forall x P(x, y)$$

Illustrate (i) with $U = \{1, 2\}$

$$\forall x \forall y P(x, y) \equiv \forall y P(1, y) \wedge \forall y P(2, y)$$

$$\equiv (P(1, 1) \wedge P(1, 2)) \wedge (P(2, 1) \wedge P(2, 2))$$

and

$$\forall y \forall x P(x, y) \equiv \forall x P(x, 1) \wedge \forall x P(x, 2)$$

$$\equiv (P(1, 1) \wedge P(2, 1)) \wedge (P(1, 2) \wedge P(2, 2))$$

By assoc. & comm. we have

$$\text{LHS} \equiv \text{RHS} \dots$$

Proof of 13)

Let $P(x, y) = 'x < y'$, $U = \mathbb{R}$.

Then

$\forall x \exists y P(x, y)$ is true

$\exists y \forall x P(x, y)$ is false

More Translation

Let $L(x, y) = 'x \text{ loves } y'$, where

$U_x = U_y = \{ \text{people} \}$

Ex.

(1) 'everybody loves somebody'

$$\forall x \exists y L(x, y)$$

(2) 'somebody loves everybody'

$$\exists x \forall y L(x, y)$$

(3) 'nobody loves everybody'

$$\neg \exists x \forall y L(x, y)$$

$$\equiv \forall x \neg \forall y L(x, y)$$

$$\equiv \forall x \exists y \neg L(x, y)$$

□

(4) 'there is exactly one person whom everyone loves'

$$\exists y \left(\forall x L(x, y) \wedge \forall z (z \neq y \rightarrow \exists w \neg L(w, z)) \right)$$

(5) 'there is a person who loves everyone except himself'

$$\exists x \left(\neg L(x, x) \wedge \forall y (y \neq x \rightarrow L(x, y)) \right)$$

Ex.

Let $U = \{\text{people}\}$, and

$E(x) = 'x \text{ is the King of England}'$

$F(x) = 'x \text{ is the King of France}'$.

Translate: 'no King of England is not the King of France'.

$$\forall x (E(x) \rightarrow F(x))$$

$$\equiv \forall x (\neg E(x) \vee F(x))$$

$$\equiv \forall x (\neg E(x) \vee \neg \neg F(x))$$

$$\equiv \forall x \neg (E(x) \wedge \neg F(x))$$

$$\equiv \neg \exists x (E(x) \wedge \neg F(x))$$

Scope of Quantifiers

$$(1) \underbrace{\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))}_{\text{scope of } \forall x} \neq \underbrace{\forall x P(x)}_{\text{scope of } \forall x} \rightarrow \underbrace{\forall x Q(x)}_{\text{scope of } \forall x}$$

$$(2) \underbrace{\exists x (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))}_{\text{scope of } \exists x} \neq \underbrace{\exists x P(x)}_{\text{scope of } \exists x} \rightarrow \underbrace{\exists x Q(x)}_{\text{scope of } \exists x}$$

$$(3) \underbrace{\exists x (P(x) \wedge Q(x))}_{\text{scope of } \exists x} \neq \underbrace{\exists x P(x)}_{\text{scope of } \exists x} \wedge \underbrace{\exists x Q(x)}_{\text{scope of } \exists x}$$

- (1) and (2) are $\neq$ since

$U = \{\text{people}\}$

$P(x) = 'x \text{ has green eyes}'$

$Q(x) = 'x \text{ is 50 ft. tall}'$

- (3) is $\neq$ since: $U = \mathbb{R}$,

$P(x) = 'x > 0'$, $Q(x) = 'x < 0'$

Exercise investigate

$$(4) \forall x (P(x) \vee Q(x)) ? \forall x P(x) \vee \forall x Q(x)$$

$$(5) \exists x (P(x) \vee Q(x)) ? \exists x P(x) \vee \exists x Q(x)$$

$$(6) \forall x (P(x) \wedge Q(x)) ? \forall x P(x) \wedge \forall x Q(x)$$

Hint: check $U = \{1, 2\}$

From 1.1 & 1.2 on Puzzles

Self referencing statements or
groups of statements can cause
logical dependencies

Ex.

$P = \text{'this statement is false'}$

$$P = 1 \Rightarrow P = 0$$

$$P = 0 \Rightarrow P = 1$$

$\therefore P$ is not proposition

Ex.

$$P = \text{'start. } q \text{ is false'} = \neg q = \neg \neg P$$

$$q = \text{'start. } P \text{ is false'} = \neg P = \neg \neg q$$

<u>P</u>	<u>q</u>	
0	0	-X.
0	1	Possible
1	0	Possible
1	1	-X.

Ex.

- ① 'exactly 1 stmt in this list is false'
 ② ' .. 2 false'
 ③ ' .. 3 false'

①	②	③	
0	0	0	X
0	0	1	X
0	1	0	Possible
0	1	1	X
1	0	0	X
1	0	1	X
1	1	0	X
1	1	1	X

Ex. 1.2 #24

we have 3 persons

A	}	one Knight (T)
B		one Knave (F)
C		one Spy (T or F)

A says: 'C is the Knave'

B says: 'A is the Knight'

C says: 'I am the Spy'

who is who?

A	B	C
T	T	T
T	F	T
T	T	F
F	T	T
F	F	T
F	T	F
F	F	F