

Philosophy 109, Modern Logic, Queens College
Russell Marcus, Instructor
email: philosophy@thatmarcusfamily.org
website: <http://philosophy.thatmarcusfamily.org>
Office phone: (718) 997-5287

Introducing and Eliminating Quantifiers, §8.2

There are four rules for deductions in predicate logic, in addition to the ones used in propositional logic.

I. Taking off the universal quantifier

Recall the argument:

All philosophers are happy: $(x)(Px \supset Hx)$

Emily is a philosopher: Pe

\therefore Emily is happy: He

We need to add a rule that will generate this conclusion out of these premises.

Rule #1: Universal Instantiation (UI)

Remove the leading universal quantifier.

Replace all occurrences of variables bound by that quantifier with either a variable (x, y, z) or a constant (a, b, c).

Use only when the main connective is a quantifier, i.e. on whole lines.

We write these as:

$(x)\mathcal{F}x / \mathcal{F}y$

$(x)\mathcal{F}x / \mathcal{F}a$

Binding Rule: When you use instantiate or generalize, you must change all the bound variables in the same way.

So $(x)[Sx \vee (Pa \cdot Tx)]$ can be instantiated as:

$Sa \vee (Pa \cdot Ta)$

$Sb \vee (Pa \cdot Tb)$

$Sx \vee (Pa \cdot Tx)$

$Sy \vee (Pa \cdot Ty)$

But it can not be instantiated as:

$Sa \vee (Pa \cdot Tb)$

$Sx \vee (Pa \cdot Ta)$

Returning to the argument above:

1. $(x)(Px \supset Hx)$

2. Pe / He

3. $Pe \supset He$ 1, UI

4. He 3, 2, MP

QED

II. Putting on the universal quantifier

Consider:

1. Everything happy is content

2. No miser is content.

\therefore No miser is happy.

Regiment this as:

1. $(x)(Hx \supset Cx)$

2. $(x)(Mx \supset \sim Cx)$ / $(x)(Mx \supset \sim Hx)$

We need to remove the quantifiers and put them back on

What if we introduce a rule such as: ' $\mathcal{I}a / (x)\mathcal{I}x$ ' ?

Consider ' $Pa / (x)Px$ ' where we interpret 'P' to mean 'is portly' and 'a' to mean 'Adam'.

We're concluding that everything is portly from just one instance.

This is called the Fallacy of Hasty Generalization.

Solution: Never universally quantify over a constant.

That is, you may not replace a constant with a variable bound by a universal quantifier.

That keeps us from ever quantifying over too few cases.

But quantifying over a variable is acceptable.

You're not committing the same fallacy, because the variable can stand for anything and everything.

Rule #2: Universal Generalization (UG)

Place a universal quantifier in front of a whole statement, so that the scope of the quantifier is now the whole statement.

Replace all occurrences of the variable over which you are quantifying with the variable in the quantifier.

That is, bind all instances of the variable.

Warning: you must replace all occurrences!

$\mathcal{I}y / (x)\mathcal{I}x$

But never $\mathcal{I}a / (x)\mathcal{I}x$

For example:

1. $(x)(Hx \supset Cx)$
 2. $(x)(Mx \supset \sim Cx)$ / $(x)(Mx \supset \sim Hx)$
 3. $Hy \supset Cy$ 1, UI
 4. $My \supset \sim Cy$ 2, UI
 5. $\sim Cy \supset \sim Hy$ 3, Trans
 6. $My \supset \sim Hy$ 4, 5, HS
 7. $(x)(Mx \supset \sim Hx)$ 6, UG
- QED

III. Putting on the existential quantifier

Consider: Oscar is a Costa Rican. So there are Costa Ricans.

Rule #3: Existential Generalization (EG)

Place an existential quantifier in front of any statement.

Change any or all occurrences of the variable over which you are quantifying with the quantifier letter.

$\mathcal{I}a / (\exists x)\mathcal{I}x$

$\mathcal{I}y / (\exists x)\mathcal{I}x$

So:

1. Co / $(\exists x)Cx$
 2. $(\exists x)Cx$ 1, EG
- QED

IV. Taking off the existential quantifier

Consider: All New Yorkers are Americans. Some New Yorkers are bald. So, some Americans are bald.

$(x)(Nx \supset Ax)$

$(\exists x)(Nx \cdot Bx)$ / $(\exists x)(Ax \cdot Bx)$

We have to take off the ' $\exists x$ ' in the second premise.

The ' $\exists x$ ' only commits us to the existence of one thing.

So, when we take it off, we have to put on a constant.

We can't have said anything about that constant earlier - it has to be a new thing!

Rule #4: Existential Instantiation (EI)

Remove the leading existential quantifier.

Replace all occurrences which were bound by the quantifier with the same, new constant.

$(\exists x)\mathcal{F}x / \mathcal{F}a$, where a is a new name

But never: $(\exists x)\mathcal{F}x / \mathcal{F}y$

About new names. Consider what would happen without that restriction:

1. $(\exists x)(Fx \cdot Px)$ (Some fruits are pears)
2. $(\exists x)(Fx \cdot Ox)$ (Some fruits are oranges)
3. $Fa \cdot Pa$ 1, EI
4. $Fa \cdot Oa$ 2, EI: but wrong!
5. Pa 3, Com, Simp
6. Oa 4, Com, Simp
7. $Pa \cdot Oa$ 5, 6, Conj
8. $(\exists x)(Px \cdot Ox)$ 7, EG (Some pears are oranges. Uh-oh!)

Since we have this restriction on EI, but not on UI, always EI before you UI!

A sample derivation:

1. $(x)(Nx \supset Ax)$
 2. $(\exists x)(Nx \cdot Bx)$ / $(\exists x)(Ax \cdot Bx)$
 3. $Na \cdot Ba$ 2, EI
 4. $Na \supset Aa$ 1, UI
 5. Na 3, Simp
 6. Aa 4, 5, MP
 7. Ba 3, Com, Simp
 8. $Aa \cdot Ba$ 6, 7, Conj
 9. $(\exists x)(Ax \cdot Bx)$ 8, EG
- QED

V. **Exercises A.** Derive the conclusions of each of the following arguments:

1)

1. $(x)(Ax \supset Bx)$
2. $(\exists x)(Ax)$ / $(\exists x)(Bx)$

2)

1. $(\exists x)(\sim Fx \cdot \sim Gx)$
2. $(x)(\sim Gx \supset \sim Hx)$ / $(\exists x)\sim(Fx \vee Hx)$

3)

1. $(x)(Jx \vee \sim Kx)$
2. $(x)\sim Jx$ / $(x)\sim Kx$

VI. Examples of more complex derivations

Sometimes terms can be unbound:

1. $(x)(Dx \cdot Ex)$
 2. $(x)Dx \supset Fa$ / $(\exists x)Fx$
 3. $Dx \cdot Ex$ 1, UI
 4. Dx 3, Simp
 5. $(x)Dx$ 4, UG
 6. Fa 2, 5, MP
 7. $(\exists x)Fx$ 6, EG
- QED

Two quantifiers on a line:

1. $(x)(Jx \vee Kx) \supset (\exists y)Ly$
 2. $(x)(Jx \vee Lx)$
 3. $(x)(\sim Lx \vee Kx)$ / $(\exists y)Ly$
 4. $Jx \vee Lx$ 2, UI
 5. $\sim Jx \supset Lx$ 4, DN, Impl
 6. $\sim Lx \vee Kx$ 3, UI
 7. $Lx \supset Kx$ 6, Impl
 8. $\sim Jx \supset Kx$ 5, 7, HS
 9. $Jx \vee Kx$ 8, Impl, DN
 10. $(x)(Jx \vee Kx)$ 9, UG
 11. $(\exists y)Ly$ 1, 10, MP
- QED

Instantiating twice from the same statement:

1. $(x)(Mx \supset Nx)$
 2. $(x)(Nx \supset Ox)$
 3. $Ma \cdot Mb$ / $Na \cdot Ob$
 4. $Ma \supset Na$ 1, UI
 5. Ma 3, Simp
 6. Na 4, 5, MP
 7. $Mb \supset Nb$ 1, UI
 8. Mb 3, Com, Simp
 9. Nb 7, 8, MP
 10. $Nb \supset Ob$ 2, UI
 11. Ob 10, 9, MP
 12. $Na \cdot Ob$ 6, 11, Conj
- QED

VII. Exercises B. Derive the conclusions of each of the following arguments.

1)

1. $(x)(Mx \supset Nx)$
2. $\sim Na$ / $\sim Ma$

2)

1. $(x)(Ox \supset \sim Px)$
2. $(\exists x)(Rx \cdot Px)$ / $(\exists x)(Rx \cdot \sim Ox)$

3)

1. $(\exists x)Sx \supset (x)Tx$
2. $(\exists x)Ux \supset (\exists x)Wx$
3. $Sb \cdot Ub$ / $(\exists x)(Wx \cdot Tx)$

4)

1. $(\exists x)Gx \supset (y)(\sim Hy \vee Iy)$
2. Gc
3. $\sim If$ / $(\exists x)\sim Hx$

5)

1. $(\exists x)Ax \supset (x)(Bx \supset Ex)$
2. $(\exists x)Dx \supset (\exists x)\sim Ex$
3. $(\exists x)(Ax \cdot Dx)$ / $(\exists x)\sim Bx$