

Recall: Truth in a model $M = (\mathcal{D}, I)$ for a predication $\Pi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$, where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are constants:

$$\vdash_M \Pi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \text{ iff } \langle \alpha_1^I, \dots, \alpha_n^I \rangle \in \Pi^I$$

Interpreting functions & functional terms

$$\text{e.g., } \text{age}^I = \{\langle r, 16 \rangle, \langle j, 14 \rangle, \langle 14, 14 \rangle, \langle 16, 16 \rangle\}$$

In general, for α an n -place fcn. constant,

let $\alpha^I : \mathcal{D}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, a total fcn,
i.e., a single-valued relation on \mathcal{D}^{n+1}
(& domain $(\alpha^I) = \mathcal{D}^n$)

To interpret functional terms $\alpha(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$, extend I to T_I , "term assignment for"

$$T_I(\beta) = I(\beta) = \beta^I \text{ for } \beta \text{ a constant}$$

$$T_I(\alpha(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)) = \alpha^I(T_I(\beta_1), \dots, T_I(\beta_n))$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{e.g., } T_I(\text{age}(\text{Juliet})) &= \text{age}^I(T_I(\text{Juliet})) \\ &= \text{age}^I(\text{Juliet}^I) \\ &= \{\langle r, 16 \rangle, \langle j, 14 \rangle, \langle 14, 14 \rangle, \langle 16, 16 \rangle\}(j) \\ &= 14 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{e.g., } T_I(\text{age}(\text{age}(\text{Juliet})))$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \text{age}^I(T_I(\text{age}(\text{Juliet}))) \\ &= \text{age}^I(\text{age}^I(T_I(\text{Juliet}))) \\ &= \text{age}^I(\text{age}^I(\text{Juliet}^I)) \\ &= \text{age}^I(\text{age}^I(j)) = \text{age}^I(14) = 14 \end{aligned}$$

Truth conditions for equality, given $M = (\mathcal{D}, I)$:

meta-equality

$$\vdash_M (\alpha = \beta) \text{ iff } T_I(\alpha) = T_I(\beta)$$

$$\text{e.g., } \vdash_M (\text{Juliet} = \text{Juliet})$$

$$\text{iff } T_I(\text{Juliet}) = T_I(\text{Juliet})$$

iff $\text{Juliet}^I = \text{Juliet}^I \dots \text{TRUE, because } I \text{ is a function!}$

Truth conditions for predication

$\Pi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ where α_i may be functional terms:

$$\models_M \Pi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \text{ iff } \langle T_I(\alpha_1), \dots, T_I(\alpha_n) \rangle \in \Pi^I$$

e.g.: $\models_M \text{Loves}(\text{Romeo}, \text{age}(\text{Juliet}))$??

$$\text{if } \langle T_I(\text{Romeo}), T_I(\text{age}(\text{Juliet})) \rangle \in \text{Loves}^I$$

$$\text{if } \langle I(\text{Romeo}), \text{age}^I(T_I(\text{Juliet})) \rangle \in \text{Loves}^I$$

$$\text{if } \langle r, \text{age}^I(j) \rangle \in \{ \langle r, j \rangle, \langle j, r \rangle, \langle s, b \rangle, \dots \}$$

$$\text{if } \langle r, 14 \rangle \in \{ \langle r, j \rangle, \dots \} \quad \text{but not } \langle r, 14 \rangle$$

FALSE

Truth conditions for sentences with \neg , \wedge , \vee , \Rightarrow :

$$\models_M \neg \varphi \text{ iff not } \models_M \varphi$$

$$\models_M (\varphi \wedge \psi) \text{ iff } \models_M \varphi \text{ and } \models_M \psi$$

... \vee or ...

$$\models_M (\varphi \Rightarrow \psi) \text{ iff not } \models_M \varphi \text{ or } \models_M \psi$$

Consider again the F0 language containing constants Snoopy, Romeo, Juliet, 14, 16; Dog, Has-Tail; Loves; age

and the model (D, I) , $D = \{s, r, j, 14, 16, \dots\}$

$$\text{Snoopy}^I = s, \text{ Romeo}^I = r, \text{ etc}$$

$$\text{Dog}^I = \{s, f, \dots\} \text{ but not } r, j, 14, 16 !$$

$$\text{Loves}^I = \{ \langle r, j \rangle, \langle j, r \rangle, \langle s, b \rangle, \dots \}$$

e.g., $\models_M \neg \text{Dog}(\text{Romeo})$??

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{iff not } \models_M \text{Dog}(\text{Romeo}) \quad (\text{written } \not\models_M) \text{ by the} \\ &\text{if not } \text{Romeo}^I \in \text{Dog}^I \quad \text{truth cond's of } \neg \\ &\text{if not } r \in \{s, f, \dots\} \quad \text{TRUE} \end{aligned}$$

e.g., $\models_M (\neg \text{Dog}(\text{Romeo})) \Rightarrow \text{age}(\text{Juliet}) = 16$??

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{iff not } \underbrace{\models_M \neg \text{Dog}(\text{Romeo})}_{\text{TRUE (see above)}} \text{ or } \models_M \text{age}(\text{Juliet}) = 16 \\ &\quad \text{FALSE} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{iff FALSE or } \underbrace{T_I(\text{age}(\text{Juliet})) = T_I(16)}_{14 \text{ (seen earlier)}} \underbrace{16^I = 16}_{\text{FALSE}} \\ &\therefore \text{FALSE} \end{aligned}$$

ALLOWING FOR VARIABLES

e.g., $P(A, x)$... "truth" in $M = (\mathcal{D}, I)$
doesn't quite make sense

Introduce variable assignment function U

$$U : \{\text{variables of}\} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$$

e.g., $U(x) = r$, or $x^U = r$,
 $U(y) = 16$, etc $y^U = 16, \dots$

Extend T_I to T_{IU} : (term assign. fcn)

$$\begin{aligned} T_{IU}(\alpha) &= \alpha^I \quad \text{if } \alpha \text{ is an ind. constant} \\ &= \alpha^U \quad \text{--- --- variable} \end{aligned}$$

$$T_{IU}(\alpha(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)) = \alpha^I(T_{IU}(\beta_1), \dots, T_{IU}(\beta_n))$$

e.g., $T_{IU}(\text{Romeo}) = \text{Romeo}^I = r$.

$$T_{IU}(x) = x^U = r$$

$$T_{IU}(\text{age}(\text{Romeo})) = \text{age}^I(T_{IU}(\text{Romeo}))$$

$$= \text{age}^I(r) = 16$$

$$\begin{aligned} T_{IU}(\text{age}(y)) &= \text{age}^I(T_{IU}(y)) = \text{age}^I(y^U) \\ &= \text{age}^I(16) = 16 \end{aligned}$$

For formulas involving variables,
we speak of satisfaction conditions
rather than truth conditions (but
we'll come back to truth soon!)

Satisfaction conditions for equality and predication

$\models_M (\alpha = \beta) [U]$ "v.a. U satisfies $(\alpha = \beta)$
relative to model M "

$$\text{iff } T_{IU}(\alpha) = T_{IU}(\beta)$$

$\models_M \Pi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) [U]$ "v.a. U satisfies $\Pi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$
relative to model M "

$$\text{iff } \langle T_{IU}(\alpha_1), \dots, T_{IU}(\alpha_n) \rangle \in \Pi^I$$

e.g., for the Snoopy + Romeo & Juliet model M ,
and $U(x) = r, U(y) = 16$

$\models_M \text{Loves}(\text{Romeo}, x) [U]$

$$\text{if } \langle T_{IU}(\text{Romeo}), T_{IU}(x) \rangle \in \text{Loves}^I$$

$$\text{if } \langle r, r \rangle \in \text{Loves}^I, \text{ which is FALSE}$$

Satisfaction conditions for $\neg, \vee, \wedge, \Rightarrow$:

$\models_M \neg \varphi [U]$ iff not $\models_M \varphi [U]$

$\models_M (\varphi \wedge \psi) [U]$ iff $\models_M \varphi [U]$ and $\models_M \psi [U]$
or
etc

Satisfaction conditions for \forall

$\models_M (\forall x \varphi) [U]$ iff for all v.a.'s U'
identical with U except possibly
that $U'(x) \neq U(x)$, $\models_M \varphi [U']$

($\forall x \varphi$)
"scope"

Writing $U_{x:d}$ for the assignment function
that is the same as U except that $U_{x:d}(x) = d$,
we can equivalently say (with $M = (\mathcal{D}, I)$):

$\models_M (\forall x \varphi) [U]$ iff for all $d \in \mathcal{D}$,
 $\models_M \varphi [U_{x:d}]$.

Note: Since $U_{x:d}(x) = d$ by defⁿ of $U_{x:d}$,

$$T_{IU_{x:d}}(x) = U_{x:d}(x) \text{ by defⁿ of } T_{IU} \\ = d$$

e.g., $M = (\mathcal{D}, I)$

$$\{a, b\}$$

$$A^I = a$$

$$B^I = b$$

$$P^I = \{a, b\}$$

$$Q^I = \{a\}$$

U = any v.a. we like, for at least
variable x

$\models_M (\forall x P(x)) [U] ??$

iff for all $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $\models_M P(x) [U_{x:d}]$ Justificⁿ?

iff for all $d \in \{a, b\}$, $T_{IU_{x:d}}(x) \in P^I = \{a, b\} \dots$

iff for all $d \in \{a, b\}$, $U_{x:d}(x) \in \{a, b\}$

iff for all $d \in \{a, b\}$, $d \in \{a, b\}$

TRUE

Note: it didn't matter what U is!

e.g., $\models_M (\forall x (Q(x) \Rightarrow P(x)) [U] ??$

iff for all $d \in D$, $\models_M (Q(x) \Rightarrow P(x)) [U_{x:d}]$

iff for all $d \in D$, not $\models_M Q(x) [U_{x:d}]$ or $\models_M P(x) [U_{x:d}]$

iff for all $d \in \{a, b\}$, not $d \in Q^I = \{a\}$ or $d \in P^I = \{a, b\}$
TRUE

Note: U didn't matter!

(Generally true for closed wffs)

Satisfaction conditions for \exists

$$\models_M (\exists x \varphi) [U] \text{ iff for some } d \in D, \models_M \varphi [U_{x:d}]$$

e.g., M, U as above,

$\models_M (\exists x Q(x)) [U] ??$

iff for some $d \in D$, $\models_M Q(x) [U_{x:d}]$

iff for some $d \in \{a, b\}$, $T_{IU_{x:d}}(x) \in Q^I = \{a\}$

iff for some $d \in \{a, b\}$, $d \in \{a\}$ TRUE

(use $d = a$)

Now redefine truth (at least for wffs involving variables) in terms of satisfaction:

$\models_M \varphi \text{ iff for all v.a.'s } U,$
 $\models_M \varphi [U]$

e.g., in the previous model, we found

$$\models_M (\forall x P(x)) [U],$$

$$\models_M (\forall x (Q(x) \Rightarrow P(x)) [U],$$

$$\models_M (\exists x Q(x)) [U]$$

in each case independently of the choice of U . So for this M we have

$$\models_M (\forall x P(x))$$

$$\models_M (\forall x (Q(x) \Rightarrow P(x)))$$

$$\models_M (\exists x Q(x))$$