

**Quantifiers**

Everything is broken:  $\forall x \text{ Broken}(x)$

Something is broken:  $\exists x \text{ Broken}(x)$

What does  $\exists$  mean? We give the meaning of  $\exists$  by specifying what it takes for a sentence containing  $\exists$  to be true:

1. Give every object a name.
2. For each name in turn, create a new sentence like this: delete the quantifier and replace all instances of the variable it binds with that name
3. If ANY OF the new sentences are true, so is the original.

**First quantifier rule of proof:  $\forall$ Elim**

$\forall$ Elim  
 $\forall x S(x)$   
 ...  
 $S(c)$

*Proof example with  $\rightarrow$*

1.  $P \rightarrow Q$   
 2.  $\neg Q$   
 ---  
 6.  $\neg P$

**Truth table for  $\rightarrow$**

Assuming that the rules of Fitch are such that it is impossible to prove an argument which is not logically valid, the truth-table for  $\rightarrow$  is fixed if we accept  $\rightarrow$ Elim and  $\rightarrow$ Intro.  
*How do the rules of proof for  $\rightarrow$  fix its truth table?*

A	B	$A \rightarrow B$
T	T	
T	F	
F	T	
F	F	

**$\neg$ Intro proof example**

1.  $A \wedge B$   
 ---  
 $\neg(\neg A \vee \neg B)$

**Scope**

In  $P \wedge (Q \vee R)$ , the scope of  $\wedge$  is  $P \wedge (Q \vee R)$

In  $P \wedge (Q \vee R)$ , the scope of  $\vee$  is  $(Q \vee R)$

In  $(P \wedge Q) \vee R$ , the scope of  $\wedge$  is  $(P \wedge Q)$

In  $(P \wedge Q) \vee R$ , the scope of  $\vee$  is  $(P \wedge Q) \vee R$

The scope of a connective is the smallest constituent expression which contains that connective.

### Wrong proofs

Step 7 of this proof is wrong. Why?

T	1. $R \vee S$			
	2. $R$			
	3. $S \vee R$	$\vee$ Intro: 2		
	4. $S$			
	5. $S \vee R$	$\vee$ Intro: 4		
	6. $S \vee R$	$\vee$ Elim: 1,2-3,4-5		
F	7. $R \wedge S$	$\wedge$ Intro: 2,4		

Which step of this proof is wrong? Why?

	1. $\neg\neg(\neg A \wedge \neg\neg A)$	
	2. $(\neg A \wedge \neg\neg A)$	$\neg$ Elim: 1
	3. $(\neg A \wedge A)$	$\neg$ Elim: 2

### What not to confuse

- $\exists x (\text{Square}(x) \wedge \text{Blue}(x))$  vs.  $\exists x \text{Square}(x) \wedge \exists x \text{Blue}(x)$
- $\neg(P \vee Q)$  vs.  $\neg P \vee \neg Q$
- $\neg(P \wedge Q)$  vs.  $\neg P \wedge \neg Q$
- $\neg(P \rightarrow Q)$  vs.  $P \rightarrow \neg Q$

### Fubar rules

$\wedge$ Fubar:  
 $\begin{array}{|l} * \\ \dots \\ * \wedge \# \end{array}$

- Q1. What would be wrong with adding  $\wedge$ Fubar to Fitch?
- Q2. What would be wrong with having  $\wedge$ Fubar in any system of proof?

### Exercises (for Seminar 4)

- 9.2 (quantifiers)
- 9.4–5, 9.8–10, 9.12 (quantifiers)
- 9.15–17, (translation)
- EITHER* 6.17–20 (proof)
- OR* 6.33, 6.40 (proofs)
- DO NOT USE TAUT CON. EVER.