Announcements & Such

- Administrative Stuff
  - HW #4 resubs should be done now. See `bspace`...
  - **HW #6 is due today. Final HW assignment! *LMPL Proofs*.**
  - **Next week, I will be giving lectures. I will use them for review, and for some "logic beyond LMPL" topics (not on the final).**
  - **I'll have office hours today from 2–4, and next Thurs. from 2–4.**
  - **There's a review session on Monday, May 10 @ 4pm.** (room TBA)
  - **Stay tuned for further announcements *via* email (+ lecture).**
  - I've posted a handout with *all* natural deduction rules (for final).
- Today: Chapter 6 — Natural Deductions in LMPL
- **Next week**: L2PL (beyond LMPL) and review for final exam(s).

The Rule of ∃-Elimination: Official Definition

∃-Elimination: If $\ulcorner(\exists\nu)\phi\nu\urcorner$ occurs at i depending on $a_1,\ldots,a_n$, an instance $\phi\tau$ of $\ulcorner(\exists\nu)\phi\nu\urcorner$ is *assumed* at j, and $\mathscr{P}$ is inferred at k depending on $b_1,\ldots,b_u$, then at line m we may infer $\mathscr{P}$, with label 'i, j, k ∃E' and dependencies $\{a_1,\ldots,a_n\}\cup\{b_1,\ldots,b_u\}/j$:

$$
\begin{array}{rcll}
a_1,\ldots,a_n & (i) & (\exists\nu)\phi\nu & \\
 & \vdots & & \\
j & (j) & \phi\tau & \text{Assumption} \\
 & \vdots & & \\
b_1,\ldots,b_u & (k) & \mathscr{P} & \\
 & \vdots & & \\
\{a_1,\ldots,a_n\}\cup\{b_1,\ldots,b_u\}/j & (m) & \mathscr{P} & \text{i, j, k } \exists\text{E}
\end{array}
$$

Provided that ***all four*** of the following conditions are met:

- τ (in $\phi\tau$) replaces ***every*** occurrence of ν in $\phi\nu$. [avoids fallacies]
- τ ***does not occur in*** $\ulcorner(\exists\nu)\phi\nu\urcorner$. [generalizability]
- τ ***does not occur in*** $\mathscr{P}$. [generalizability]
- τ ***does not occur in*** *any* of $b_1,\ldots,b_u$, except (possibly) $\phi\tau$ itself. [generalizability]

The Rule of ∃-Elimination: Nine Examples

- Here are 9 examples of proofs involving all four quantifier rules.

  1. $(\exists x){\sim}Fx \vdash {\sim}(\forall x)Fx$ [p. 200, example 5]
  2. $(\exists x)(Fx \rightarrow A) \vdash (\forall x)Fx \rightarrow A$ [p. 201, example 6]
  3. $(\forall x)(\forall y)(Gy \rightarrow Fx) \vdash (\forall x)[(\exists y)Gy \rightarrow Fx]$ [p. 203, I. # 19 ⇒]
  4. $(\exists x)[Fx \rightarrow (\forall y)Gy] \vdash (\exists x)(\forall y)(Fx \rightarrow Gy)$ [p. 203, I. # 20 ⇐]
  5. $A \vee (\exists x)Fx \vdash (\exists x)(A \vee Fx)$ [p. 203, II. # 2 ⇐]
  6. $(\exists x)(Fx \,\&\, {\sim}Fx) \vdash (\forall x)(Gx \,\&\, {\sim}Gx)$ [p. 203, I. # 12 ⇒]
  7. $(\forall x)[Fx \rightarrow (\forall y){\sim}Fy] \vdash {\sim}(\exists x)Fx$ [p. 203, I. # 5]
  8. $(\forall x)(\exists y)(Fx \,\&\, Gy) \vdash (\exists y)(\forall x)(Fx \,\&\, Gy)$ [p. 201, example 7]
  9. $(\exists y)(\forall x)(Fx \,\&\, Gy) \vdash (\forall x)(\exists y)(Fx \,\&\, Gy)$ [other direction]

Proof of (1)

Problem is: $(\exists x){\sim}Fx \vdash {\sim}(\forall x)Fx$

1	(1)	$(\exists x){\sim}Fx$	Premise
2	(2)	$(\forall x)Fx$	Assumption
3	(3)	${\sim}Fa$	Assumption
2	(4)	Fa	2 ∀E
2,3	(5)	$\wedge$	3,4 ~E
1,2	(6)	$\wedge$	1,3,5 ∃E
1	(7)	${\sim}(\forall x)Fx$	2,6 ~I

Proof of (2)

Problem is: $(\exists x)(Fx \rightarrow A) \vdash (\forall x)Fx \rightarrow A$

1	(1)	$(\exists x)(Fx \rightarrow A)$	Premise
2	(2)	$(\forall x)Fx$	Assumption
3	(3)	$Fa \rightarrow A$	Assumption
2	(4)	Fa	2 $\forall$E
2,3	(5)	A	3,4 $\rightarrow$E
1,2	(6)	A	1,3,5 $\exists$E
1	(7)	$(\forall x)Fx \rightarrow A$	2,6 $\rightarrow$I

Proof of (3)

Problem is: $(\forall x)(\forall y)(Gy \rightarrow Fx) \vdash (\forall x)((\exists y)Gy \rightarrow Fx)$

1	(1)	$(\forall x)(\forall y)(Gy \rightarrow Fx)$	Premise
2	(2)	$(\exists y)Gy$	Assumption
3	(3)	Gb	Assumption
1	(4)	$(\forall y)(Gy \rightarrow Fa)$	1 $\forall$E
1	(5)	$Gb \rightarrow Fa$	4 $\forall$E
1,3	(6)	Fa	5,3 $\rightarrow$E
1,2	(7)	Fa	2,3,6 $\exists$E
1	(8)	$(\exists y)Gy \rightarrow Fa$	2,7 $\rightarrow$I
1	(9)	$(\forall x)((\exists y)Gy \rightarrow Fx)$	8 $\forall$I

Proof of (4)

Problem is: $(\exists x)(Fx \rightarrow (\forall y)Gy) \vdash (\exists x)(\forall y)(Fx \rightarrow Gy)$

1	(1)	$(\exists x)(Fx \rightarrow (\forall y)Gy)$	Premise
2	(2)	$Fa \rightarrow (\forall y)Gy$	Assumption
3	(3)	Fa	Assumption
2,3	(4)	$(\forall y)Gy$	2,3 $\rightarrow$E
2,3	(5)	Gb	4 $\forall$E
2	(6)	$Fa \rightarrow Gb$	3,5 $\rightarrow$I
2	(7)	$(\forall y)(Fa \rightarrow Gy)$	6 $\forall$I
2	(8)	$(\exists x)(\forall y)(Fx \rightarrow Gy)$	7 $\exists$I
1	(9)	$(\exists x)(\forall y)(Fx \rightarrow Gy)$	1,2,8 $\exists$E

Proof of (5)

Problem is: $A \vee (\exists x)Fx \vdash (\exists x)(A \vee Fx)$

1	(1)	$A \vee (\exists x)Fx$	Premise
2	(2)	A	Assumption
2	(3)	$A \vee Fa$	2 $\vee$I
2	(4)	$(\exists x)(A \vee Fx)$	3 $\exists$I
5	(5)	$(\exists x)Fx$	Assumption
6	(6)	Fa	Assumption
6	(7)	$A \vee Fa$	6 $\vee$I
6	(8)	$(\exists x)(A \vee Fx)$	7 $\exists$I
5	(9)	$(\exists x)(A \vee Fx)$	5,6,8 $\exists$E
1	(10)	$(\exists x)(A \vee Fx)$	1,2,4,5,9 $\vee$E

Proof of (6)

Problem is: $(\exists x)(Fx\&{\sim}Fx) \vdash (\forall x)(Gx\&{\sim}Gx)$

1	(1)	$(\exists x)(Fx\&{\sim}Fx)$	Premise
2	(2)	$Fa\&{\sim}Fa$	Assumption
3	(3)	${\sim}Gb$	Assumption
2	(4)	${\sim}Fa$	2 &E
2	(5)	Fa	2 &E
2	(6)	$\curlywedge$	4,5 ~E
2	(7)	${\sim}{\sim}Gb$	3,6 ~I
2	(8)	Gb	7 DN
9	(9)	Gb	Assumption
2	(10)	${\sim}Gb$	9,6 ~I
2	(11)	$Gb\&{\sim}Gb$	8,10 &I
2	(12)	$(\forall x)(Gx\&{\sim}Gx)$	11 ∀I
1	(13)	$(\forall x)(Gx\&{\sim}Gx)$	1,2,12 ∃E

Proof of (7)

Problem is: $(\forall x)(Fx \rightarrow (\forall y)\sim Fy) \vdash \sim(\exists x)Fx$

1	(1)	$(\forall x)(Fx \rightarrow (\forall y)\sim Fy)$	Premise
2	(2)	$(\exists x)Fx$	Assumption
3	(3)	Fa	Assumption
1	(4)	$Fa \rightarrow (\forall y)\sim Fy$	1 $\forall$E
1,3	(5)	$(\forall y)\sim Fy$	4,3 $\rightarrow$E
1,3	(6)	$\sim Fa$	5 $\forall$E
1,3	(7)	Λ	6,3 ~E
1,2	(8)	Λ	2,3,7 $\exists$E
1	(9)	$\sim(\exists x)Fx$	2,8 ~I

Proof of (8)

Problem is: $(\forall x)(\exists y)(Fx\&Gy) \vdash (\exists y)(\forall x)(Fx\&Gy)$

1	(1)	$(\forall x)(\exists y)(Fx\&Gy)$	Premise
1	(2)	$(\exists y)(Fa\&Gy)$	1 $\forall$E
3	(3)	$Fa\&Gb$	Assumption
1	(4)	$(\exists y)(Fc\&Gy)$	1 $\forall$E
5	(5)	$Fc\&Gd$	Assumption
5	(6)	Fc	5 &E
1	(7)	Fc	4,5,6 $\exists$E
3	(8)	Gb	3 &E
1,3	(9)	$Fc\&Gb$	7,8 &I
1,3	(10)	$(\forall x)(Fx\&Gb)$	9 $\forall$I
1,3	(11)	$(\exists y)(\forall x)(Fx\&Gy)$	10 $\exists$I
1	(12)	$(\exists y)(\forall x)(Fx\&Gy)$	2,3,11 $\exists$E

Proof of (9)

Problem is: $(\exists y)(\forall x)(Fx\&Gy) \vdash (\forall x)(\exists y)(Fx\&Gy)$

1	(1)	$(\exists y)(\forall x)(Fx\&Gy)$	Premise
2	(2)	$(\forall x)(Fx\&Gb)$	Assumption
2	(3)	$Fa\&Gb$	2 $\forall$E
2	(4)	$(\exists y)(Fa\&Gy)$	3 $\exists$I
1	(5)	$(\exists y)(Fa\&Gy)$	1,2,4 $\exists$E
1	(6)	$(\forall x)(\exists y)(Fx\&Gy)$	5 $\forall$I

Two LMPL Extensions of Sequent Introduction

- Here are two additions to our list of SI sequents:

(QS) One can infer ⌜$(\forall x){\sim}\phi x$⌝ from (the *logically equivalent* sentence) ⌜${\sim}(\exists x)\phi x$⌝, and *vice versa*; and, that one can infer ⌜$(\exists x){\sim}\phi x$⌝ from (the *logically equivalent*) ⌜${\sim}(\forall x)\phi x$⌝, and *vice versa*.

$$(\forall x){\sim}\phi x \dashv\vdash {\sim}(\exists x)\phi x\text{; and, } (\exists x){\sim}\phi x \dashv\vdash {\sim}(\forall x)\phi x \qquad \text{(QS)}$$

(AV) One can infer a *closed* LMPL sentence ψ from (the *logically equivalent* sentence) ψ', and *vice versa*, where ψ and ψ' are *alphabetic variants*. Two formulas are *alphabetic variants* if and only if they differ *only* in a (conventional) choice of individual *variable* letters (*not* kosher for constants!). *E.g.*, '$(\forall x)Fx$' and '$(\forall y)Fy$' are (closed) *alphabetic variants*, because they differ *only* in which individual variable ('x' or 'y') is used, but they have the same *logical* (*i.e.*, *syntactical*) *structure*.

$$\psi \dashv\vdash \psi' \qquad \text{(AV)}$$

Our (New) Official List of Sequents and Theorems (see pp. 123, 204, and 206)

(DS)	$A \vee B, \sim A \vdash B$; or; $A \vee B, \sim B \vdash A$	(Imp)	$A \to B \dashv\vdash \sim A \vee B$
(MT)	$A \to B, \sim B \vdash \sim A$	(Neg-Imp)	$\sim(A \to B) \dashv\vdash A \,\&\, \sim B$
(PMI)	$A \vdash B \to A$	(Dist)	$A \,\&\, (B \vee C) \dashv\vdash (A \,\&\, B) \vee (A \,\&\, C)$
(PMI)	$\sim A \vdash A \to B$	(Dist)	$A \vee (B \,\&\, C) \dashv\vdash (A \vee B) \,\&\, (A \vee C)$
(DN^{+})	$A \vdash \sim\sim A$	(EFQ, or $\curlywedge$E)	$\curlywedge \vdash A$
(DEM)	$\sim(A \,\&\, B) \dashv\vdash \sim A \vee \sim B$	(Com)	$A * B \vdash B * A$
(DEM)	$\sim(A \vee B) \dashv\vdash \sim A \,\&\, \sim B$	(SDN)	$\sim\sim A * \sim\sim B \dashv\vdash A * B$
(DEM)	$\sim(\sim A \vee \sim B) \dashv\vdash A \,\&\, B$	(SDN)	$A * B \dashv\vdash \sim\sim A * B \dashv\vdash A * \sim\sim B$
(DEM)	$\sim(\sim A \,\&\, \sim B) \dashv\vdash A \vee B$	(LEM)	$\vdash A \vee \sim A$
(QS)	$(\forall x)\sim\phi x \dashv\vdash \sim(\exists x)\phi x$	(QS)	$(\exists x)\sim\phi x \dashv\vdash \sim(\forall x)\phi x$
		(AV)	$\psi \dashv\vdash \psi'$

In (Com), '$*$' can be any binary connective *except* '$\to$'. In (SDN), '$*$' can be *any* binary connective. In (AV), ψ must be *closed*, and ψ' must be an *alphabetic variant* of ψ.

The Value of (QS) — Its Four Simplest Instances

(∀x)~Fx ⊢ ~(∃x)Fx			
1	(1)	(∀x)~Fx	Premise
2	(2)	(∃x)Fx	Ass
3	(3)	Fa	Ass
1	(4)	~Fa	1 ∀E
1,3	(5)	⋏	4,3 ~E
1,2	(6)	⋏	2,3,5 ∃E
1	(7)	~(∃x)Fx	2,6 ~I

~(∃x)Fx ⊢ (∀x)~Fx			
1	(1)	~(∃x)Fx	Premise
2	(2)	Fa	Ass
2	(3)	(∃x)Fx	2 ∃I
1,2	(4)	⋏	1,3 ~E
1	(5)	~Fa	2,4 ~I
1	(6)	(∀x)~Fx	5 ∀I

(∃x)~Fx ⊢ ~(∀x)Fx			
1	(1)	(∃x)~Fx	Premise
2	(2)	(∀x)Fx	Ass
3	(3)	~Fa	Ass
2	(4)	Fa	2 ∀E
2,3	(5)	⋏	3,4 ~E
1,2	(6)	⋏	1,3,5 ∃E
1	(7)	~(∀x)Fx	2,6 ~I

~(∀x)Fx ⊢ (∃x)~Fx			
1	(1)	~(∀x)Fx	Premise
2	(2)	~(∃x)~Fx	Ass
3	(3)	~Fa	Ass
3	(4)	(∃x)~Fx	3 ∃I
2,3	(5)	⋏	2,4 ~E
2	(6)	~~Fa	3,5 ~I
2	(7)	Fa	6 DN
2	(8)	(∀x)Fx	7 ∀I
1,2	(9)	⋏	1,8 ~E
1	(10)	~~(∃x)~Fx	2,9 ~I
1	(11)	(∃x)~Fx	10 DN

Three Examples Involving the LMPL SI Extension (QS)

- Here are three examples of proofs involving SI (QS):
  1. $\sim(\forall x)\sim Fx \vdash (\exists x)Fx$ [p. 207, #7 $\Leftarrow$]
  2. $\sim(\exists x)(Fx \,\&\, Gx) \vee (\exists x)\sim Gx, (\forall y)Gy \vdash (\forall z)(Fz \to \sim Gz)$ [p. 205, ex. 1]
  3. $(\forall x)Fx \to A \vdash (\exists x)(Fx \to A)$ [p. 205, ex. 2]

Proof of (1)

1	(1)	$\sim(\forall x)\sim Fx$	Premise
2	(2)	$\sim(\exists x)Fx$	Assumption
2	(3)	$(\forall x)\sim Fx$	2 SI (QS)
1,2	(4)	$\curlywedge$	1, 3 ~E
1	(5)	$\sim\sim(\exists x)Fx$	2, 4 ~I
1	(6)	$(\exists x)Fx$	5 DN

Proof of (2)

1	(1)	$\sim(\exists x)(Fx \,\&\, Gx) \vee (\exists x)\sim Gx$	Premise
2	(2)	$(\forall y)Gy$	Premise
3	(3)	$\sim(\exists x)(Fx \,\&\, Gx)$	Assumption
3	(4)	$(\forall x)\sim(Fx \,\&\, Gx)$	3 SI (QS)
3	(5)	$\sim(Fa \,\&\, Ga)$	4 $\forall$E
3	(6)	$\sim Fa \vee \sim Ga$	5 SI (DeM)
3	(7)	$Fa \to \sim Ga$	6 SI (Imp)
3	(8)	$(\forall z)(Fz \to \sim Gz)$	7 $\forall$I
9	(9)	$(\exists x)\sim Gx$	Assumption
10	(10)	$\sim Ga$	Assumption
2	(11)	Ga	2 $\forall$E
2,10	(12)	$\curlywedge$	10, 11 $\sim$E
2,10	(13)	$(\forall z)(Fz \to \sim Gz)$	12 SI (EFQ)
2,9	(14)	$(\forall z)(Fz \to \sim Gz)$	9, 10, 13 $\exists$E
1,2	(15)	$(\forall z)(Fz \to \sim Gz)$	1, 3, 8, 9, 14 $\vee$E

Proof of (3)

Problem is: $(\forall x)Fx \rightarrow A \vdash (\exists x)(Fx \rightarrow A)$

1	(1)	$(\forall x)Fx \rightarrow A$	Premise
1	(2)	$\sim(\forall x)Fx \vee A$	1 SI (Imp)
3	(3)	$\sim(\forall x)Fx$	Assumption
3	(4)	$(\exists x)\sim Fx$	3 SI (QS)
5	(5)	$\sim Fa$	Assumption
5	(6)	$Fa \rightarrow A$	5 SI (PMI)
5	(7)	$(\exists x)(Fx \rightarrow A)$	6 ∃I
3	(8)	$(\exists x)(Fx \rightarrow A)$	4,5,7 ∃E
9	(9)	A	Assumption
9	(10)	$Fa \rightarrow A$	9 SI (PMI)
9	(11)	$(\exists x)(Fx \rightarrow A)$	10 ∃I
1	(12)	$(\exists x)(Fx \rightarrow A)$	2,3,8,9,11 ∨E

The Value of (AV)

- Here are the two simplest instances of (AV):

$(\forall x)Fx \vdash (\forall y)Fy$				$(\exists x)Fx \vdash (\exists y)Fy$			
1	(1)	$(\forall x)Fx$	Premise	1	(1)	$(\exists x)Fx$	Premise
1	(2)	Fa	1 $\forall$E	2	(2)	Fa	Ass
1	(3)	$(\forall y)Fy$	2 $\forall$I	2	(3)	$(\exists y)Fy$	2 $\exists$I
				1	(4)	$(\exists y)Fy$	1,2,3 $\exists$E

- Here's an (AV)-aided proof of the following sequent

$$(\forall x)Fx, (\forall y)Fy \to (\forall y)Gy \vdash (\forall z)Gz$$

1	(1)	$(\forall x)Fx$	Premise
2	(2)	$(\forall y)Fy \to (\forall y)Gy$	Premise
1	(3)	$(\forall y)Fy$	1 SI (AV)
1,2	(4)	$(\forall y)Gy$	2,3 $\to$E
1,2	(5)	$(\forall z)Gz$	4 SI (AV)

☞ **This is the end of material to be covered on the final(s).**


Valid *Abstract* Argument?
Abstract Argument
Articulation of Thought in English
English Argument
Symbolization
Chapters 2, 5 & 7
Valid *English* Argument?
Logical Form
LSL / LMPL / L2PL
Deciding Formal Validity
Chapters 3, 4, 6 & 8
Valid Form?

Beyond LMPL: 2-Place Predicates (*a.k.a.*, Relations) II

- From the point of view of logic (as opposed to mathematics) what matters is *capturing validities*. And, LMPL captures more than LSL.
- But, LMPL also has its own *logical* limitations. The problem: we can't capture some of the intuitively valid arguments involving *relations*.
- Consider the following argument, which involves a 2-place predicate:

(1) Brutus killed Caesar.
(2) ∴ Brutus killed someone and someone killed Caesar.

- If we were to symbolize this argument using monadic predicates, we would end-up with something like the following LMPL reconstruction:

(1′) Kb.
(2′) $\therefore (\exists x)Bx \,\&\, (\exists y)Ky$.

Where Kx: x killed Caesar, Bx: Brutus killed x, and b: Brutus.

- This argument is *not* valid in LMPL. But, the English argument *is* valid!

- The problem here is that "x killed y" is a *2-place* predicate (or *relation*).
- If we expand our language to include predicates that can take 2 arguments, then we can capture statements and arguments like these.
- In chapter 7, a more general language is introduced that allows n-place predicates, for any finite n. We will only discuss 2-place predicates.
- For instance, we can introduce the 2-place predicate Kxy: x killed y. With this relation in hand, we can express the above argument as:

(1⋆) Kbc.

(2⋆) $\therefore (\exists x)Kbx \,\&\, (\exists y)Kyc$.

- In 2-place predicate logic ("L2PL"), this argument *is* valid. So, this is a more accurate and faithful formalization of the English argument.
- We will (in chapter 8) discuss the semantics for 2-place predicate logic (L2PL). The natural deduction system for L2PL is *the same as* LMPL's!
- Before that, we will look at various complexities of L2PL *symbolization*.

Some Sample L2PL Symbolization Problems

1. Someone loves someone. [Lxy: x loves y]

   - First, work on the the quantifier with widest scope, then *work in*.
   - There exists an x such that x loves someone.

   (i) $(\exists x)$ x loves someone.

   - Now, work on expression within the scope of the quantifier in (i).

   (ii) x loves someone

   – there exists a y such that Lxy

   – $(\exists y)Lxy$

   - Plugging the symbolization of (ii) into (i) yields the **final product**:

$$(\exists x)(\exists y)Lxy$$

2. Everyone loves everyone.
   - For all x, x loves everyone.
   - $(\forall x)$ x loves everyone.
   - x loves everyone $\mapsto (\forall y)Lxy$
   - $(\forall x)(\forall y)Lxy$
3. Everyone loves someone.
   - For all x, x loves someone.
   - $(\forall x)$ x loves someone.
   - x loves someone $\mapsto (\exists y)Lxy$
   - $(\forall x)(\exists y)Lxy$
4. Someone loves everyone.
   - There exists an x such that x loves everyone.
   - $(\exists x)$ x loves everyone.
   - x loves everyone $\mapsto (\forall y)Lxy$
   - $(\exists x)(\forall y)Lxy$

Four Important Properties of Binary Relations

- **Reflexivity**. A binary relation R is said to be *reflexive* iff $(\forall x)Rxx$.
- **Symmetry**. R is *symmetric* iff $(\forall x)(\forall y)(Rxy \to Ryx)$.
- **Transitivity**. R is *transitive* iff $(\forall x)(\forall y)(\forall z)[(Rxy \,\&\, Ryz) \to Rxz]$.
- If R has *all three* of these properties, then R is an *equivalence relation*.
- **Fact.** If R is Euclidean and reflexive, then R is an equivalence relation.

Relation	Reflexive?	Symmetric?	Transitive?	Euclidean?
$x > y$	No	No	Yes	No
$x \vDash y$	Yes	No	Yes	No
x is a sibling of y	No	Yes	No	No
$x \approx y$	Yes	Yes	No	No
x respects y	No	No	No	No
$x = y$	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

L2PL Interpretations I

- Here's an example L2PL interpretation. Oxy: x was older than y, $\mathcal{D}$: The Three Stooges, Ref(a) = Curly, Ref(b) = Larry, and Ref(c) = Moe.
- The matrix representation of Ext(O) for this interpretation is:

O	α	β	γ
α	$-$	$+$	$+$
β	$-$	$-$	$+$
γ	$-$	$-$	$-$

- The pictorial or diagrammatic representation of Ext(O) is:



L2PL Interpretations III

($\mathcal{I}_1$) Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the set consisting of George W. Bush (α) and Jeb Bush (β). And, let Bxy: x is a brother of y. Determine $\mathcal{I}_1$-truth-values for:

1. $(\forall x)(\exists y)Bxy$
2. $(\exists y)(\forall x)Bxy$



α β

- (1) is $\top$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$, since *both* of its $\mathcal{D}$-instances are $\top$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$.
  - ‘$(\exists y)Bay$’ is $\top$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$ because its instance ‘Bab’ is $\top$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$.
    - That is, $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \in \text{Ext}(B)$. Note: $\text{Ext}(B) = \{\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle, \langle \beta, \alpha \rangle\}$.
  - ‘$(\exists y)Bby$’ is $\top$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$ because its instance ‘Bba’ is $\top$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$.
- (2) is $\perp$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$, since *both* of its $\mathcal{D}$-instances are $\perp$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$.
  - ‘$(\forall x)Bxa$’ is $\perp$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$ because its instance ‘Baa’ is $\perp$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$.
    - That is, $\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle \notin \text{Ext}(B)$.
  - ‘$(\forall x)Bxb$’ is $\perp$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$ because its instance ‘Bbb’ is $\perp$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$.

L2PL Interpretations IV

- Just as with LMPL, L2PL interpretations can be used as counterexamples to validity claims. Establishing $\nvDash$ claims works just as you'd expect.
- We have just seen an L2PL interpretation that shows the following:

$$(\forall x)(\exists y)Rxy \nvDash (\exists x)(\forall y)Rxy$$

- Interpretation $\mathcal{I}_1$ on the previous slide is a counterexample. Why?
  - $(\forall x)(\exists y)Bxy$ is $\top$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$, since both of its instances are $\top$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$.
  - $(\exists x)(\forall y)Rxy$ is $\perp$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$, since both of its instances are $\perp$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$.
- Here is a *very important* L2PL invalidity:

$$(\dagger)\ \ (\forall x)(\exists y)Rxy, (\forall x)(\forall y)(\forall z)[(Rxy \,\&\, Ryz) \to Rxz] \nvDash (\exists x)Rxx$$

- ($\dagger$) reveals a surprising difference between LMPL (and LSL) and L2PL — **sometimes *infinite* interpretations are needed to prove $\nvDash$ in L2PL!**

Why (†) is So Important — L2PL *vs* LMPL: Infinite Domains

- In LMPL, if p is true on any interpretation $\mathcal{I}$, then it is true on a *finite* interpretation. Indeed, p will be true on an interpretation of size no greater than 2^k, where k is the # of monadic predicate letters in p.
- In L2PL, some statements are true *only* on *infinite* interpretations. It is for this reason that there is no general decision procedure for validity (or logical truth) in L2PL. (†) on the last slide is a good example of this.

(†) $(\forall x)(\exists y)Rxy, (\forall x)(\forall y)(\forall z)[(Rxy \,\&\, Ryz) \to Rxz] \nvDash (\exists x)Rxx$

- **Fact**. *Only infinite interpretations $\mathcal{I}$ can be counterexamples to the validity in* (†). To see why, try to *construct* such an interpretation.
- We start by showing that no interpretation $\mathcal{I}_1$ with a 1-element domain can be an interpretation on which the premises of (†) are $\top$ and its conclusion is $\bot$. Then, we will repeat this argument for I_2 and $\mathcal{I}_3$.
- This reasoning can, in fact, be shown correct for *all* (finite) n. So, only $\mathcal{I}$'s with infinite domains will work [*e.g.*, $\mathcal{D} = \mathbb{N}$, Rxy: $x < y$].
- Begin with a 1-element domain $\{\alpha\}$. For the conclusion of (4) to be $\bot$, no

object can be related to itself: $(\forall x){\sim}Rxx$. Thus, we must have ${\sim}Raa$:



- But, to make the first premise $\top$, we need there to be *some* y such that Ray is $\top$. That means we need *another object* β to allow Rab. Thus:



- Now, because we need the conclusion to remain $\bot$, we must have ${\sim}Rbb$. And, because we need the first premise to remain $\top$, we need there to be *some* y such that Rby is $\top$. We could *try* to make Rba $\top$, as follows:



- But, this picture is not consistent with the second premise being $\top$ and (at the same time) the conclusion being $\bot$. If R is transitive, then $Rab \,\&\, Rba$ (as pictured) entails Raa, which makes the conclusion $\top$.

Transitivity of R and 

entails: 

- Thus, the only way to consistently ensure that there is some y such that Rby is to introduce *yet another object* γ (such that Rbc), which yields:



- Again, in order to make the conclusion $\bot$, we must have $\sim Rcc$, and in order to make the first premise $\top$, there must be some y such that Rcy.

- We could *try* to make either Rca or Rcb true. But, both of these choices will end-up with the same sort of inconsistency we just saw with β.

- In other words, *no finite interpretation* will give us what we want here.
- However, if we let $\mathcal{D} = \mathbb{N}$ and Rxy: $x < y$, then we get what we want.



- That is, the relation Rxy: $x < y$ *on the natural numbers* $\mathbb{N}$ is such that:
  - For all x, there exists a y such that $x < y$. [seriality]
  - For all x, y, z, if $x < y$ and $y < z$, then $x < z$. [transitivity]
  - For all x, $x \nless x$. [irreflexivity]
- It is crucial that the set $\mathbb{N}$ of *all* natural numbers is *infinite*. The relation $<$ cannot satisfy all three of these properties on *any finite* domain.
- *I.e.*, no finite subset of $\mathbb{N}$ will suffice to show that the invalidity in (4) holds. Equivalently, the following sentence of L2PL is $\perp$ on *all finite* $\mathcal{I}$'s:

$$p \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\forall x)(\exists y)Rxy \mathbin{\&} (\forall x)(\forall y)(\forall z)[(Rxy \mathbin{\&} Ryz) \to Rxz] \mathbin{\&} (\forall x){\sim}Rxx$$

- This sort of thing *cannot happen* in LMPL. In this sense, the introduction of a single 2-place predicate involves a *quantum leap* in complexity.

Some Further Remarks on Validity in L2PL

- As I just explained, there is no general decision procedure for $\vDash$ claims in L2PL. This is because we can't always establish $\nvDash$ claims in finite time.
- However, there is a method for proving $\vDash$ claims — *natural deduction*. And, L2PL's natural deduction system *is exactly the same as LMPL's*!
- Before we get to proofs, however, I want to look at the alternating quantifier example that I said separates LMPL and L2PL.
- As we have seen, $(\forall x)(\exists y)Rxy \nvDash (\exists y)(\forall x)Rxy$. But, the converse entailment *does* hold. That is, $(\exists y)(\forall x)Rxy \vDash (\forall x)(\exists y)Rxy$.
- We will *prove — i.e., deduce* — $(\exists y)(\forall x)Rxy \vdash (\forall x)(\exists y)Rxy$ shortly.
- Before we do that, let's think about $(\exists y)(\forall x)Rxy \vDash (\forall x)(\exists y)Rxy$ using our definitions, and our informal method of thinking of $\forall$ as & and $\exists$ as $\vee$. This is interesting for both directions of the entailment.
- But, we need to be much more careful here than with LMPL!

- First, consider what $(\exists y)(\forall x)Rxy$ says on a domain of size n:
  $$(\exists y)(\forall x)Rxy \approx_n (\forall x)Rxa \vee (\forall x)Rxb \vee \cdots \vee (\forall x)Rxn$$
  $\approx_n (Raa \,\&\cdots\&\, Rna) \vee (Rab \,\&\cdots\&\, Rnb) \vee \cdots \vee (Ran \,\&\cdots\&\, Rnn)$
- Next, consider what $(\forall x)(\exists y)Rxy$ says on a domain of size n:
  $$(\forall x)(\exists y)Rxy \approx_n (\exists y)Ray \,\&\, (\exists y)Rby \,\&\cdots\&\, (\exists y)Rny$$
  $\approx_n (Raa \vee \cdots \vee Ran) \,\&\, (Rba \vee \cdots \vee Rbn) \,\&\cdots\&\, (Rna \vee \cdots \vee Rnn)$
- Then, we notice that these two sentential forms are intimately related. Specifically, we note that $(\exists y)(\forall x)Rxy$ has the following n-form:
  $\mathcal{X}_n = (p_1 \,\&\, p_2 \,\&\cdots\&\, p_n) \vee (q_1 \,\&\, q_2 \,\&\cdots\&\, q_n) \vee \cdots \vee (r_1 \,\&\, r_2 \,\&\cdots\&\, r_n)$
- And, we notice that $(\forall x)(\exists y)Rxy$ has the following n-form:
  $\mathcal{Y}_n = (p_1 \vee q_1 \vee \cdots \vee r_1) \,\&\, (p_2 \vee q_2 \vee \cdots \vee r_2) \,\&\cdots\&\, (p_n \vee q_n \vee \cdots \vee r_n)$
- **Fact.** $\mathcal{X}_n \vDash \mathcal{Y}_n$, *for any* n. Each disjunct of $\mathcal{X}_n$ entails every conjunct of $\mathcal{Y}_n$. **Caution!** This ***doesn't*** show that $(\exists y)(\forall x)Rxy \vDash (\forall x)(\exists y)Rxy$!
- **Fact.** $\mathcal{Y}_n \nvDash \mathcal{X}_n$, for all $n > 1$. This can be shown (next slide) using only LSL reasoning. This ***does*** show that $(\forall x)(\exists y)Rxy \nvDash (\exists y)(\forall x)Rxy$.
- The moral is that our "informal" semantical approach to the quantifiers works for LMPL, since no infinite domains are required for $\nvDash$ in LMPL.

- However, our "informal" semantical approach breaks down for L2PL, since we sometimes need an infinite domain to establish $\nvDash$ in L2PL.
- In L2PL, if the "informal" method above reveals $p_n \nvDash q_n$ for *some* finite n, then it *does* follow that $p \nvDash q$. For instance, $\mathcal{Y}_2 \nvDash \mathcal{X}_2$ on the last slide:
  - $(Raa \vee Rab) \,\&\, (Rba \vee Rbb) \nvDash (Raa \,\&\, Rba) \vee (Rab \,\&\, Rbb)$
  - This is just an LSL problem with 4-atoms [$A = Raa$, $B = Rab$, $C = Rba$, $D = Rbb$]. Truth-tables will generate a counterexample.
- On the other hand, if (in L2PL) our "informal" method indicates (as above) that $p_n \vDash q_n$ for *all* finite n, this does *not* guarantee $p \vDash q$. *E.g.*:
  - $p = (\forall x)(\exists y)Rxy \,\&\, (\forall x)(\forall y)(\forall z)[(Rxy \,\&\, Ryz) \to Rxz]$.
  - $q = (\exists x)Rxx$.
- We showed above (informally) that $p_n \vDash q_n$ for *all* finite n. But, we also saw that there are infinite interpretations on which p is $\top$ but q is $\bot$.