

## F. Brief review of classical predicate logic (PC)

### F.I. Syntax (LfP 4.1)

#### F.I.1. Primitive symbols

**Primitive vocabulary of PC** (LfP 90):

- connectives:  $\rightarrow, \sim, \forall$
- variables:  $x, y, \dots$  (with or without numerical subscripts)
- $n$ -place predicates  $F, G, \dots$  (with or without numerical subscripts)
- individual constants (names):  $a, b, \dots$  (with or without numerical subscripts)
- parentheses

*Terminology.* We'll often drop the "individual" and just call  $a, b, \dots$  "constants".

#### F.I.2. Complex expressions

We simultaneously define (PC-) term and (PC-) wff recursively:

**Definition of a term (for PC)** (LfP 90):

- If  $\alpha$  is a variable or an individual constant,  $\alpha$  is a term.

**Definition of a wff (for PC):**

- If  $\Pi$  is an  $n$ -place predicate and  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  are terms,  $\Pi\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  is a wff.
- If  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are wffs, and  $\alpha$  is a variable,  $\sim\phi$ ,  $(\phi \rightarrow \psi)$ , and  $\forall\alpha\phi$  are wffs.

*Remark.* Only strings that can be shown to be terms and wffs using these clauses are wffs. We'll leave this qualification tacit in the following.

#### F.I.3. Free variables

**Definition of free variable occurrence** (LfP 91): an occurrence of variable  $\alpha$  in wff  $\phi$  is *bound* in  $\phi$  iff it occurs in a wff of the form  $\forall\alpha\psi$ . Otherwise it is free.

*Remark.* In other words all and only the occurrences of  $\alpha$  in the scope of a  $\forall\alpha$  are bound.

#### F.I.4. Unofficial connectives

The connectives  $\wedge, \vee$  and  $\leftrightarrow$  are introduced as before; we also add  $\exists$ :

**Definition of  $\exists$**  (in the metalanguage, LfP 91):  $\exists\alpha\phi$  is short for  $\sim\forall\alpha\sim\phi$ .

## F.II. Semantics (LfP 4.2)

### F.II.1. PC-Models

The primitive symbols of PC, save for variables, are interpreted by a PC-model:

**Definition of a PC-model** A PC-model is a pair  $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$  such that:

- $\mathcal{D}$  is a non-empty set (“the domain”)
- $\mathcal{I}$  is a function meeting the following conditions: (‘‘the interpretation function’’)
  - $\mathcal{I}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{D}$  for  $\alpha$  a constant
  - $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$  is an  $n$ -place relation over  $\mathcal{D}$  for  $n$ -place predicate  $\Pi$

*Remark.* Recall that an  $n$ -place relation over  $\mathcal{D}$  is a set of  $n$ -tuples of members of  $\mathcal{D}$ .

### F.II.2. Variable assignments

The variables of PC are interpreted by a variable assignment:

**Definition of a variable assignment:** a *variable assignment*  $g$  for a PC-model  $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$  is a function with  $g(\alpha) \in \mathcal{D}$  for each variable  $\alpha$ .

The semantics for quantifiers also deploy the following notion:

**Definition of a variant assignment:** When  $g$  is a variable assignment for  $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$  and  $u \in \mathcal{D}$ , we define  $g_u^\alpha$  as follows:

$$g_u^\alpha(\beta) = \begin{cases} g(\beta) & \text{if } \beta \neq \alpha \\ u & \text{if } \beta = \alpha \end{cases}$$

### F.II.3. Term denotations

The denotation of a term is settled by either the model or the assignment:

**Definition of term denotation:** Let  $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$  be a PC-model,  $g$  an assignment for  $\mathcal{M}$ :

- $[\alpha]_{\mathcal{M},g} = \mathcal{I}(\alpha)$  if  $\alpha$  is a constant
- $[\alpha]_{\mathcal{M},g} = g(\alpha)$  if  $\alpha$  is a variable

### F.II.4. PC-valuations

Valuations assign truth-values to wffs:

**Definition of valuation (for PC)** (LfP 94): The valuation function,  $V_{\mathcal{M},g}$  for a PC-model  $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$  and variable assignment  $g$  is the unique function that assigns 0 or 1 to each wff and satisfies the following conditions:

- $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\Pi\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n) = 1$  iff  $\langle [\alpha_1]_{\mathcal{M},g}, \dots, [\alpha_n]_{\mathcal{M},g} \rangle \in \mathcal{I}(\Pi)$ , for terms  $\alpha_i$ ,  $n$ -ary predicate  $\Pi$ .
- $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\sim\phi) = 1$  iff  $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\phi) = 0$ , for wff  $\phi$ .
- $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\phi \rightarrow \psi) = 1$  iff  $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\phi) = 0$  or  $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\psi) = 1$ , for wffs  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ .
- $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\forall\alpha\phi) = 1$  iff, for every  $u \in \mathcal{D}$ ,  $V_{\mathcal{M},g_u^\alpha}(\phi) = 1$ , for wff  $\phi$  and variable  $\alpha$ .

This delivers the expected truth-condition for  $\exists$ :

*Remark.*  $V_g(\exists\alpha\phi) = 1$  iff, for some  $u \in \mathcal{D}$ ,  $V_{g_u^\alpha}(\phi) = 1$ .

### F.II.5. Validity

Truth is defined as truth under all assignments:

**Definition of truth in a model** (LfP 95): a wff  $\phi$  is *true in* a PC-model  $\mathcal{M}$  iff  $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\phi) = 1$  for every assignment  $g$  for  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Note that the truth-value of a sentence is unaffected by the assignment, indeed:

**Fact about variable assignments:** if  $g$  and  $h$  agree on the free variables in  $\phi$ ,  $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\phi) = V_{\mathcal{M},h}(\phi)$ .

*Proof.* Sheet 5, q. 1. □

And, as usual, validity is defined as truth in all models:

**Definition of PC-validity** (LfP 95): a wff  $\phi$  is PC-valid—in symbols:  $\models_{\text{PC}} \phi$ —iff  $\phi$  is true in all PC-models.

*Remark.* One way to show  $\models_{\text{PC}} \phi$  is to show that  $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\phi) = 0$  generates a contradiction.

### F.II.6. Semantic Consequence

Semantic consequence is defined as truth preservation in every model and assignment:

**Definition of PC-semantic consequence:** a wff  $\phi$  is a semantic consequence of a set of wffs  $\Gamma$ — $\Gamma \models_{\text{PC}} \phi$ —iff  $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\phi) = 1$  for every PC-model  $\mathcal{M}$  and assignment  $g$  with  $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\gamma) = 1$  for each  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ .

## G. Four extensions of PC.

### G.I. The identity predicate, = (LfP 5.1)

To add = as a further logical primitive, we amend the syntax and semantics of PC:

#### G.I.1. Complex expressions

Terms and wffs are defined as before, with one additional clause in the definition of wff:

**Definition of a wff** [additional clause for =] (LfP 107):

- If  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are terms, then  $\alpha = \beta$  is a wff.

#### G.I.2. Valuations

We add one further clause to the definition of a valuation:

**Definition of valuation** [additional clause for =] (LfP 108):

- $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\alpha = \beta) = 1$  iff  $[\alpha]_{\mathcal{M},g} = [\beta]_{\mathcal{M},g}$

If we're just adding identity, the definition of term denotation remains the same.

*Remark.* To just add =, these are the *only* changes we make:

- The notion of model remains the same as for PC (without =).
- The definitions of validity and consequence also remain the same.
- This is the case for all of the extensions considered in this section.<sup>1</sup>

#### G.I.3. Application: numerical quantifiers

Identity lets us express numerical quantifiers (which can't be symbolized in PC):

*Example.* Symbolize 'There is exactly one  $F$ '.

<sup>1</sup>But it's not the case if we add further *non-logical* expressions—e.g. function symbols, see LfP 5.2.

## G.II. The description operator, $\iota$ (LfP 5.3)

We know how—with some violence to surface form—to capture definite description in PC with  $=$  by applying Russell’s theory of descriptions—an alternative is to use  $\iota$ .

*Worked Example.* Formalize the following sentence:

(1) The author of *Logic for Philosophy* likes metaphysics.

(i) in the language of PC with  $=$ ; (ii) in the language of PC with  $\iota$ .

### G.II.1. Complex expressions

**Definition of a term** [additional clause for  $\iota$ ] (LfP 114):

- If  $\phi$  is a wff and  $\alpha$  is a variable, then  $\iota\alpha\phi$  is a term.

*Notation.* We sometimes write  $\iota\alpha.\phi$  to improve readability.

### G.II.2. Term denotations

**Definition of term denotation:** [additional clause for  $\iota$ ] (LfP 115)

- $[\iota\beta\phi]_{\mathcal{M},g} = \begin{cases} \text{the } u \text{ in } \mathcal{D} \text{ such that } V_{\mathcal{M},g_u}(\phi) = 1 \text{ if there is a unique such } u \\ \text{undefined, else} \end{cases}$

### G.II.3. Valuations

**Definition of valuation** [modified clauses for possibly undefined  $\iota$ -terms]

- $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\Pi\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = 1$   
iff  $[\alpha_1]_{\mathcal{M},g}, \dots, [\alpha_n]_{\mathcal{M},g}$  are all defined and  $\langle [\alpha_1]_{\mathcal{M},g}, \dots, [\alpha_n]_{\mathcal{M},g} \rangle \in \mathcal{I}(\Pi)$

*Remarks.*

1. Note that denotation/valuation are now defined *simultaneously* by recursion.
2. The new definition makes all formulas of the form  $\Pi\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  false, with undefined  $\iota$ -terms false.
3. To add  $\iota$  and  $=$  we combine the additions in the obvious way—similarly for the other additions.
4. If we have  $=$  too we modify its semantic clause analogously to make  $\alpha = \beta$  false for undefined  $\iota$ -terms (see LfP 115).
5. There’s a sense in which  $\iota$  is eliminable in the presence of identity—see LfP 117.

### G.III. The lambda operator, $\lambda$ (LfP 5.5)

Just as  $\iota$  makes complex terms,  $\lambda$  makes complex predicates.

*Worked Example.* Formalize the following sentence, with and without  $\lambda$ :

(2) Logic is such that it is good and necessary.

To extend PC (or an extension of PC) with  $\lambda$ , we make the following additions:

#### G.III.1. Complex predicates

Complex predicates are defined recursively alongside terms and wffs:

**Definition of a complex predicate** [new clause for  $\lambda$ ] (LfP 126):

- if  $\alpha$  is a variable and  $\phi$  a wff, then  $\lambda\alpha\phi$  is a one-place predicate.

*Notation.* When  $F$  is unary, we write  $\lambda xFxy$  as  $\lambda xFx(y)$  or  $(\lambda x.Fx)(y)$ .

#### G.III.2. Valuations

One preliminary definition—in effect, we take the extension of the complex predicate  $\lambda\alpha\phi$  to be defined as follows:

**Definition: “extension of  $\lambda\alpha\phi$ ”** (LfP 120):  $\phi^{\mathcal{M},g,\alpha} = \{u \in \mathcal{D} : \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{M},g_u^\alpha}(\phi) = 1\}$

*Remark.* The idea is that  $\phi(\alpha)^{\mathcal{M},g,\alpha}$  is the set of things that satisfy  $\phi(\alpha)$ —make  $\phi(\alpha)$  true when assigned to  $\alpha$ —but since  $\phi(\alpha)$  may in general contain more than one free variable, we need to specify an assignment to fix the values of the others.

*Worked Example.* Suppose  $g(y) = 5$  and that  $\mathcal{M}$  has  $\mathcal{I}$  with:

$$\mathcal{I}(E) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \text{ is even}\}$$

$$\mathcal{I}(L) = \{\langle n, m \rangle : n, m \in \mathbb{N}, n < m\}$$

Compute:  $(Ex \wedge Lxy)^{\mathcal{M},g,x}$ .

We then add the following clause for complex predicates to the definition of valuation:

**Definition of valuation** [additional clause for  $\lambda$ -predicates]

- $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{M},g}((\lambda\alpha\phi)(\beta)) = 1$  iff  $[\beta]_{\mathcal{M},g} \in \phi^{\mathcal{M},g,\alpha}$

## G.IV. Second-order logic (SOL) (LfP 5.4.3)

First-order logic (FOL)—e.g. PC—quantifies into name position; SOL also quantifies into predicate position.

We add  $n$ -place predicate variables  $X, Y, \dots$  and second-order quantifiers  $\forall X$  to FOL:

### G.IV.1. Complex expressions

**Definition of a wff** [additional clauses for SOL] :

- If  $\pi$  is an  $n$ -place predicate variable, and  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  are (individual) terms, then  $\pi\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n$  is a wff.
- If  $\pi$  is an  $n$ -place predicate variable and  $\phi$  is a wff,  $\forall\pi\phi$  is a wff.

*Example.*  $\forall X(Xa \vee \sim Xa)$  is a wff.

### G.IV.2. Variable assignments

The notion of model is unchanged from PC. Assignments and variants are generalized in the natural way: assignments now also map  $n$ -place predicate variables to  $n$ -place relations.

**Definition of a variable assignment:** a *variable assignment*  $g$  for a PC-model  $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$  is a function which assigns a member of  $\mathcal{D}$  to each individual variable  $\alpha$  and an  $n$ -place relation over  $\mathcal{D}$  to each  $n$ -place predicate variable  $\pi$ .

**Definition of a variant assignment:** When  $g$  is a variable assignment for  $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$  and  $U$  is an  $n$ -place relation over  $\mathcal{D}$  we define,  $g_U^\pi$  as follows:

$$g_U^\pi(\sigma) = \begin{cases} g(\sigma) & \text{if } \sigma \neq \pi \\ U & \text{if } \sigma = \pi \end{cases}$$

### G.IV.3. Valuations

**Definition of PC-valuation** [additional clauses for SOL]

- $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\pi\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = 1$  iff  $\langle [\alpha_1]_{\mathcal{M},g}, \dots, [\alpha_n]_{\mathcal{M},g} \rangle \in g(\pi)$
- $V_{\mathcal{M},g}(\forall\pi\phi) = 1$  iff, for every  $n$ -place relation  $U$  over  $\mathcal{D}$ ,  $V_{\mathcal{M},g_U^\pi}(\phi) = 1$

## G.V. Further extensions

- Function symbols: LfP 5.2.
- Generalized quantifiers, e.g. ‘most’: LfP 5.4.1–2.