

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Mathematics for Computer Science  
MIT 6.042J/18.062J

## Predicate Logic, II

# Validity & Soundness



Albert R Meyer, February 17, 2012

pred2.1

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

## Propositional Validity

True for all truth-values.  
Example:

$(P \text{ IMPLIES } Q) \text{ OR } (Q \text{ IMPLIES } P)$



Albert R Meyer, February 17, 2012

pred2.2

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

## Predicate Calculus Validity

True for all domains and predicates. Example:

$\forall z.[P(z) \text{ AND } Q(z)] \text{ IMPLIES } [\forall x.P(x) \text{ AND } \forall y.Q(y)]$



Albert R Meyer, February 17, 2012

pred2.3

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

## Predicate Calculus Validity

True for all domains and predicates\*. Example:

$\forall z.[P(z) \text{ AND } Q(z)] \text{ IMPLIES } [\forall x.P(x) \text{ AND } \forall y.Q(y)]$

\*aka tautology



Albert R Meyer, February 17, 2012

pred2.4

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

## DeMorgan's Law for Quantifiers

Another valid formula:

$$\text{NOT}(\forall x. P(x)) \text{ IFF } \exists y. \text{NOT}(P(y))$$



Albert R Meyer, February 17, 2012

pred2.5

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

## DeMorgan's Law for Quantifiers

Another valid formula:

$$\text{NOT}(\text{AND}_x P(x)) \text{ IFF } \text{OR}_y \text{NOT}(P(y))$$



Albert R Meyer, February 17, 2012

pred2.6

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

## Proving Validity

$\forall z.[P(z) \text{ AND } Q(z)]$  IMPLIES

$[\forall x.P(x) \text{ AND } \forall y.Q(y)]$

*Proof strategy: assume left side is T, then prove right side is T*



Albert R Meyer, February 17, 2012

pred2.7

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

## Proving Validity

$\forall z[Q(z) \wedge P(z)] \rightarrow [\forall x.Q(x) \wedge \forall y.P(y)]$

*Proof:* Assume left hand side. That is, for all values of  $z$  in the domain,  $Q(z)$  AND  $P(z)$  is true. Suppose  $\text{val}(z) = c$ , an element in the domain. Then  $Q(c)$  AND  $P(c)$  holds, and so  $Q(c)$  by itself holds. But  $c$  could have been any element of the domain. So we conclude  $\forall x.Q(x)$ . (by **UG**) Similarly conclude  $\forall y.P(y)$ . Therefore,  $\forall x.Q(x)$  AND  $\forall y.P(y)$  QED



Albert R Meyer, February 17, 2012

pred2.8

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

### Similar Example is Not Valid

$$\forall z.[P(z) \text{ OR } Q(z)] \text{ IMPLIES } [\forall x.P(x) \text{ OR } \forall y.Q(y)]$$

Proof: Give counter-model, where left side of IMPLIES is T, but right side is F.  
 Namely, let domain ::= {1, 2},  
 $Q(z) ::= [z = 1]$ ,  $P(z) ::= [z = 2]$ .



6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

### Universal Generalization (UG)

$$\frac{F(c)}{\forall x.F(x)}$$

where  $c$  is a constant symbol that has not appeared earlier



6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

### Universal Generalization (UG)

$$\frac{F(c)}{\forall x.F(x)}$$

$c$  is a "fresh symbol"



6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

### Universal Generalization (UG)

$$\frac{F(c)}{\forall x.F(x)}$$

Subtlety:

$F(c)$  does not imply  $\forall x.F(x)$



6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

### Universal Generalization (UG)

$$\frac{F(c)}{\forall x.F(x)}$$

...unlike propositional case  
instead have weaker notion  
of Soundness:



6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

### Universal Generalization (UG)

Weaker notion of Soundness  
If  $F(c)$  is valid then  
 $\forall x.F(x)$  is valid

