

## Section 1.4: Predicate Logic

January 23, 2006

### Abstract

We now consider the logic associated with predicate wffs, including a new set of derivation rules for demonstrating validity (the analogue of tautology in the propositional calculus).

### 1 Derivation rules

- First of all, all the rules of propositional logic still hold. Whew! Propositional wffs are simply boring, variable-less predicate wffs.
- Our author suggests the following “general plan of attack”:
  - strip off the quantifiers
  - work with the separate wffs
  - insert quantifiers as necessary

---

Now, how may we legitimately do so?

- New rules for predicate logic: in the following, you should understand by the symbol  $x$  in  $P(x)$  an expression with free variable  $x$ , possibly containing other (quantified) variables: e.g.

$$P(x) = (\forall y)(\exists z)Q(x, y, z) \quad (1)$$

- **Universal Instantiation:** from  $(\forall x)P(x)$  deduce  $P(t)$ .

*Caveat:*  $t$  must not already appear as a variable in the expression for  $P(x)$ : in the equation above, (1), it would not do to use  $P(y)$  or  $P(z)$ , as they appear in the expression already.

Example: Practice 22, p. 48

$$(\forall x)[P(x) \rightarrow R(x)] \wedge [R(y)]' \rightarrow [P(y)]'$$

1.  $(\forall x)[P(x) \rightarrow R(x)]$       hyp
2.  $[R(y)]'$       hyp
3.  $P(y) \rightarrow R(y)$       1, ui
4.  $[P(y)]'$       3, 2 mt

- **Existential Instantiation:** from  $(\exists x)P(x)$  deduce  $P(t)$ .

*Caveat:*  $t$  must be introduced for the first time (so do these early in proofs). You can do a universal instantiation which also uses  $t$  after an existential instantiation with  $t$ , but not *vice versa* (e.g. Example 27).

Example: Ex. #11, p. 58 (start).

$$(\forall x)P(x) \wedge (\exists x)Q(x) \rightarrow (\exists x)[P(x) \wedge Q(x)]$$

1.  $(\forall x)P(x)$       hyp
2.  $(\exists x)Q(x)$       hyp
3.  $Q(x)$       2, ei
4.  $P(x)$       1, ui
5.  $P(x) \wedge Q(x)$       3, 4, con

---

$$6. (\exists x)[P(x) \wedge Q(x)] \quad 5, eg$$

– **Universal Generalization:** from  $P(x)$  deduce  $(\forall x)P(x)$ .

Caveats:

- \*  $P(x)$  hasn't been deduced by existential instantiation from any hypothesis in which  $x$  was free, and
- \*  $P(x)$  hasn't been deduced by existential instantiation from another wff in which  $x$  was free.

Example: Ex. #17, p. 58

- $$(\forall x) [P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)] \rightarrow [(\forall x)P(x) \rightarrow (\forall x)Q(x)]$$
1.  $(\forall x) [P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)]$  hyp
  2.  $P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)$  1, ui
  3.  $(\forall x)P(x)$  deduction method
  4.  $P(x)$  3, ui
  5.  $Q(x)$  2, 4 mp
  6.  $(\forall x)Q(x)$  5, ug
  7.  $(\forall x)P(x) \rightarrow (\forall x)Q(x)$  deduction method.  
(Note: the deduction method still applies, of course.)

– **Existential Generalization:** from  $P(a)$  deduce  $(\exists x)P(x)$ .

*Caveat:*  $x$  must not appear in  $P(a)$ .

Example: Ex. #11, p. 58 (finish).



Look at the three proofs using a temporary hypothesis (Examples #31, and 32(a,b)). Notice how the introduction of the temporary hypothesis ends with an implication, which is then useful for the continuation of the proof.

Example: Practice 25, p. 52

$$(\forall x)[B(x) \vee C(x) \rightarrow A(x)] \rightarrow (\forall x)[B(x) \rightarrow A(x)]$$

1.  $(\forall x)[B(x) \vee C(x) \rightarrow A(x)]$  hyp
2.  $B(x) \vee C(x) \rightarrow A(x)$  1, ui
3.  $B(x)$  temp hyp
4.  $B(x) \vee C(x)$  3, add
5.  $A(x)$  2, 4, mp
6.  $B(x) \rightarrow A(x)$  temp hyp discharged
7.  $(\forall x)[B(x) \rightarrow A(x)]$  uq.

So now, how would we demonstrate that

$$(\exists y)[P(x) \rightarrow Q(x, y)] \iff [P(x) \rightarrow (\exists y)Q(x, y)]$$

Show in both directions

$$(\exists y)[P(x) \rightarrow Q(x, y)] \rightarrow [P(x) \rightarrow (\exists y)Q(x, y)]$$

1.  $(\exists y)[P(x) \rightarrow Q(x, y)]$  hyp
2.  $P(x) \rightarrow Q(x, y)$  1, ei
3.  $P(x)$  deduction method
4.  $Q(x, y)$  2, 3 mp
5.  $(\exists y)Q(x, y)$  4, eg. Q.E.D.

---


$$[P(x) \rightarrow (\exists y)Q(x, y)] \rightarrow (\exists y)[P(x) \rightarrow Q(x, y)]$$

1.  $P(x) \rightarrow (\exists y)Q(x, y)$  hyp
2.  $P(x)$  temp hyp
3.  $(\exists y)Q(x, y)$  1, 2, mp

- |    |   |                      |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 4. | $Q(x, y)$                               | 3, e.i.              |
| 5. | $P(x) \rightarrow Q(x, y)$              | temp hyp d. enclosed |
| 6. | $(\exists y)[P(x) \rightarrow Q(x, y)]$ | 5, e.g. Q.E.D.       |

$$[P(x) \rightarrow (\exists y)Q(x, y)] \wedge [P(x) \rightarrow Q(x, y)] \rightarrow (\exists y)[P(x) \rightarrow Q(x, y)]$$

new ammo!

$\therefore$  The two wffs are equivalent.

|