Consider the inference

\[
\text{Dog (Snoopy), } (\forall x \text{ Dog}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Has-Tail}(x)) \\
\hline
\text{Has-Tail (Snoopy)}
\]

It seems that if the premises are true, so is the conclusion. Why? More generally, how can we distinguish such "truth-preserving" inferences from others? 

We need a theory of truth for FOL sentences!

This only makes sense if FOL sentences are taken to be assertions about some domain.

This in turn requires that terms like \text{Dog}, \text{Snoopy}, \text{Has-Tail}, ... refer to (denote) something in the domain.