

## Quantification and WFFS of FOL

### Quantification

- In English and other natural languages, basic sentences are made by combining noun phrases and verb phrases.
- The simplest noun phrases are names, like Max and Claire, which correspond to the constant symbols of FOL.
- More complex noun phrases are formed by combining common nouns with words known as determiners, such as every, some, most, the, three, and no.
- This gives us noun phrases like *every cube*, *some man from Indiana*, *most children in the class*, *the dodecahedron in the corner*, *three blind mice*, and *no student of logic*.
- Logicians call noun phrases of this sort quantified expressions, and sentences containing them quantified sentences.
- They are so called because they allow us to talk about quantities of things: *every cube*, *most children*, and so forth.

## Quantified Sentences

| Every rich actor is a good actor.

| Brad Pitt is a rich actor.

| Brad Pitt is a good actor.

| Many rich actors are good actors.

| Brad Pitt is a rich actor.

| Brad Pitt is a good actor.

| No rich actor is a good actor.

| Brad Pitt is a rich actor.

| Brad Pitt is a good actor.

## Hidden Quantification

*Max is home whenever Claire is at the library.*

- Translate to:

*Every time when Claire is at the library is a time when Max is at home.*

## Variables

- The language FOL has an infinite number of variables, any of  $t$ ,  $u$ ,  $v$ ,  $w$ ,  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$ , with or without numerical subscripts.
- Variables can occur in atomic wffs in any position normally occupied by a name.
- The program Fitch understands all of these variables; Tarski's World only understands variables  $u$  through  $z$  without subscripts.

## Universal Quantifier ( $\forall$ )

- In English, we have quantified phrases like *everything*, *each thing*, *all things*, and *anything*.
- In Logic, the symbol  $\forall$  is used to express universal claims.
- It is always used in connection with a variable.
- It is a *variable binding* operator.
- The combination  $\forall x$  is read "for every object  $x$ "
- Somewhat misleadingly: "for all  $x$ "
- If we wanted to translate the (rather unlikely) English sentence *Everything is at home* into first-order logic, we would use the FOL sentence:  $\forall x \text{ Home}(x)$
- This says that every object  $x$  meets the following condition:  $x$  is at home.
- To put it more naturally, it says that everything whatsoever is at home.

## Universal Quantifier ( $\forall$ )

- Of course, we rarely make such unconditional claims about absolutely everything.
- More common are restricted universal claims like *Every doctor is smart*.
- This sentence would be translated as:  

$$\forall x (\text{Doctor}(x) \rightarrow \text{Smart}(x))$$
- This FOL sentence claims that given any object at all - call it  $x$  - if  $x$  is a doctor, then  $x$  is smart.
- To put it another way, the sentence says that if you pick anything at all, you'll find either that it is not a doctor or that it is smart (or perhaps both).

## Existential Quantifier ( $\exists$ )

- In English we have quantified phrases like *something*, *at least one thing*, *a*, and *an*.
- In Logic, the symbol  $\exists$  is used to express existential claims.
- It is always used in connection with a variable
- It is a variable binding operator.
- The combination  $\exists x$  is read *for some object  $x$* .
- Somewhat misleadingly: *For some  $x$* .
- If we wanted to translate the English sentence *Something is at home* into first-order logic, we would use the FOL sentence:  $\exists x \text{ Home}(x)$
- This says that some object  $x$  meets the following condition:  $x$  is at home.

## Existential Quantifier ( $\exists$ )

- While it is possible to make such claims, it is more common to assert that something of a particular kind meets some condition, say, *Some doctor is smart*.
- This sentence would be translated as:  

$$\exists x (\text{Doctor}(x) \wedge \text{Smart}(x))$$
- This sentence claims that some object, call it  $x$ , meets the complex condition:  $x$  is both a doctor and smart.
- More colloquially, it says that there is at least one smart doctor.

## Free and Bound Variables

- A variable that occurs in an atomic wff is *free* or *unbound*.
- We use the quantifiers to bind variables.
- Any occurrence of the variable  $v$  is bound in the following two wffs:
  - $\forall v P$
  - $\exists v P$
- A variable may occur free or bound in a wff.
- Use parentheses to indicate scope of quantifiers.
- A *sentence* is a wff with **no free** variables.

## Semantics for the Quantifiers

- Defined through “satisfaction.”

## Satisfaction

- We say that an object satisfies the atomic wff  $\text{Cube}(x)$  if and only if the object is a cube.
- Similarly, we say an object satisfies the complex wff  $\text{Cube}(x) \wedge \text{Small}(x)$  if and only if it is both a cube and small.

## Semantics of $\exists$

- A sentence of the form  $\exists x S(x)$  is true if and only if **there is at least one** object that satisfies the constituent wff  $S(x)$ .
- For example,  $\exists x (\text{Cube}(x) \wedge \text{Small}(x))$  is true if there is at least one object that satisfies  $\text{Cube}(x) \wedge \text{Small}(x)$
- In other words, there is at least one small cube.

## Semantics of $\forall$

- A sentence of the form  $\forall x S(x)$  is true if and only if **every** object satisfies the constituent wff  $S(x)$ .
- For example,  $\forall x (\text{Cube}(x) \rightarrow \text{Small}(x))$  is true if every object satisfies  $\text{Cube}(x) \rightarrow \text{Small}(x)$ .
- In other words, every object either isn't a cube or it is small.

## Domain of Discourse

- In general, sentences containing quantifiers are only true or false relative to some domain of discourse or domain of quantification.
- Sometimes the intended domain contains all objects there are.
- Usually, the intended domain is a much more restricted collection of things, say the people in the room, or some particular set of physical objects, or some collection of numbers.

## Aristotelian Forms

- All P's are Q's.
- Some P's are Q's.
- No P's are Q's.
- Some P's are not Q's.



## Aristotelian Forms

- All P's are Q's.  $\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$
- Some P's are Q's.
- No P's are Q's.
- Some P's are not Q's.

## Aristotelian Forms

- All P's are Q's.  $\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$
- Some P's are Q's.  $\exists x (P(x) \wedge Q(x))$
- No P's are Q's.
- Some P's are not Q's.

## Aristotelian Forms

- All P's are Q's.  $\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$
- Some P's are Q's.  $\exists x (P(x) \wedge Q(x))$
- No P's are Q's.  $\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow \neg Q(x))$
- Some P's are not Q's.

## Aristotelian Forms

- All P's are Q's.  $\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$
- Some P's are Q's.  $\exists x (P(x) \wedge Q(x))$
- No P's are Q's.  $\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow \neg Q(x))$
- Some P's are not Q's.  $\exists x (P(x) \wedge \neg Q(x))$

## Translating Complex Noun Phrases

- *A small, happy dog is at home.*
- This sentence claims that there is an object which is simultaneously a small, happy dog, and at home.
- We would translate it as:  

$$\exists x [(Small(x) \wedge Happy(x) \wedge Dog(x)) \wedge Home(x)]$$

## Translating Complex Noun Phrases

- *Every small dog that is at home is happy.*
- This claims that everything with a complex property, that of being a small dog at home, has another property, that of being happy.
- We would translate it as:  

$$\forall x [(Small(x) \wedge Dog(x) \wedge Home(x)) \rightarrow Happy(x)]$$
- In this case, the parentheses are not optional.
- Without them the expression would not be well formed.

## Translating Complex Noun Phrases

- *Max owns a small, happy dog.*

$$\exists x [(Small(x) \wedge Happy(x) \wedge Dog(x)) \wedge Owns(max, x)]$$

## Translating Complex Noun Phrases

- *Max owns every small, happy dog.*

$$\forall x [(Small(x) \wedge Happy(x) \wedge Dog(x)) \rightarrow Owns(max, x)]$$