

Refresher on the Syntax, Semantics, and Derivation Rules of Propositional and Predicate Logic

Alexis Wellwood

1. Syntax of PL

The syntactic rules for *PL* (predicate logic) defines the class of well-formed propositions (PL sentences, formulas, etc.)¹ They say what counts as the basic expressions of PL, and the rules for generating more complex expressions.

A. ‘Lexicon’ of *PL*

(1)	Category	Type	Basic expressions
	Names/individual constants	Term	d, n, j, m
	(Individual) variables	Term	$x, y, z, \dots$
	One-place predicate	Pred	M, B
	Two-place predicate	Pred	K, L

B. Formation rules of *PL*

- (2)
 - i. If δ is a one-place predicate and α is a term, then $\delta(\alpha)$ is a sentence.
 - ii. If γ is a two-place predicate and α and β are terms, then $\gamma(\alpha, \beta)$ is a sentence.
 - iii. If ϕ is a sentence, then $\neg\phi$ is a sentence.
 - iv. If ϕ and ψ are sentences, then $(\phi \wedge \psi)$ is a sentence.
 - v. If ϕ and ψ are sentences, then $(\phi \vee \psi)$ is a sentence.
 - vi. If ϕ and ψ are sentences, then $(\phi \rightarrow \psi)$ is a sentence.
 - vii. If ϕ and ψ are sentences, then $(\phi \leftrightarrow \psi)$ is a sentence.
 - viii. If v is a variable, and ϕ is a sentence, then $\forall v\phi$ is a sentence.
 - ix. If v is a variable, and ϕ is a sentence, then $\exists v\phi$ is a sentence.
 - x. Nothing else is a sentence.

¹I follow Dowty, Wall, and Peters’ (?) formulation, with modifications and additions based on a handout by Barbara Partee (http://people.umass.edu/partee/RGGU_2008/RGGU081.pdf).

Some notes:

- Expanding the language to arbitrary n -place predicates can be accomplished by generalizing (2i)-(2ii) as in:
 - If ρ is an n -place predicate, and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are terms, then $\rho(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is a sentence.
- Parentheses are omitted in many uses of PL:
 - e.g. where in this handout I have written things like $K(d, j)$, others might write it Kdj or even dKj .

Some sentences of PL , with some of “the proof” that they are well-formed given

- | | | | |
|-----|----|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (3) | a. | $M(d)$ | (2i) |
| | b. | $K(d, j)$ | (2ii) |
| | c. | $\neg M(d)$ | (3a), (2iii) |
| | d. | $\neg K(d, j)$ | (3b), (2iii) |
| | e. | $\forall x(L(d, x) \rightarrow B(x))$ | (2i), (2ii), (2vi), (2viii) |
| | f. | $\exists y(B(y) \wedge K(m, y))$ | (2i), (2ii), (2iv), (2ix) |

2. Semantics of PL

The semantic component determines an interpretation relative to a **model**, $\mathcal{M}$:

$$\mathcal{M} = \langle D, I \rangle$$

- D is the **set of entities** we can use the language to talk about
- I is a **lexical interpretation function** that assigns semantic values to the constants
- There is a set G of **assignment functions**, g , that map variables to entities in D .
 - e.g., $g_9 = \{\langle x, d \rangle, \langle y, n \rangle, \langle z, j \rangle, \langle w, m \rangle\}$
 - e.g., $g_{946} = \{\langle x, n \rangle, \langle y, j \rangle, \langle z, m \rangle, \langle w, d \rangle\}$, etc.
- A **semantic interpretation**, $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M}, g}$, is built up recursively on the basis of I , and assigns to every expression α its semantic value in $\mathcal{M}$ relative to some g , i.e.:

The interpretation of α is $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M}, g}$.

A. ‘Lexical’ rules of PL

- (4) a. If α is a constant, then $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = I(\alpha)$.
 b. If α is a variable, then $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = g(\alpha)$.

B. Composition rules of PL

- (5) i. If δ is a one-place predicate and α is a name,
 then $\llbracket \delta(\alpha) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$ iff $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} \in \llbracket \delta \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g}$.
 ii. If γ is a two-place predicate and α and β are names,
 then $\llbracket \gamma(\alpha, \beta) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$ iff $\langle \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g}, \llbracket \beta \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} \rangle \in \llbracket \gamma \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g}$.
 iii. If ϕ is a sentence,
 then $\llbracket \neg\phi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$ iff $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \perp$.
 iv. If ϕ and ψ are sentences,
 then $\llbracket (\phi \wedge \psi) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$ iff $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$ and $\llbracket \psi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$.
 v. If ϕ and ψ are sentences,
 then $\llbracket (\phi \vee \psi) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$ iff either $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$ or $\llbracket \psi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$.
 vi. If ϕ and ψ are sentences,
 then $\llbracket (\phi \rightarrow \psi) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$ iff either $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \perp$ or $\llbracket \psi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$.
 vii. If ϕ and ψ are sentences,
 then $\llbracket (\phi \leftrightarrow \psi) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$ iff
either $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$ and $\llbracket \psi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$ **or** $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \perp$ and
 $\llbracket \psi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \perp$.
 viii. If α is a variable and ϕ is a sentence,
 then $\llbracket \forall\alpha\phi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$ iff for all $e \in D$, $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g[e/\alpha]} = \top$.
 ix. If α is a variable and ϕ is a sentence,
 then $\llbracket \exists\alpha\phi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = \top$ iff there is a $e \in D$, $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g[e/\alpha]} = \top$.

• Some notes:

- The Greek lowercase variables are used in the metalanguage as variables over *expressions*. Otherwise, regular math mode lowercase letters are used (e.g. the e s in (5viii) and (5ix) range over individuals in D , not expressions).
- If the language is expanded to allow arbitrary n -place predicates, (5i)-(5iii) generalize as:
 - * If ρ is an n -place predicate and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are names,
 then $\llbracket \rho(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} = 1$ iff $\langle \llbracket \alpha_1 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g}, \dots, \llbracket \alpha_n \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g} \rangle \in \llbracket \rho \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M},g}$
- All of rules (5iii)-(5ix) are **syncategorematic** interpretations—this type of interpretation is only **necessary** (it seems) for (5viii) and (5ix), though.

- Rules (5iii)-(5vii) have the effect of the familiar truth tables for the connectives from Propositional Logic.
- **The notation $g[e/\alpha]$ means:** ‘the variable assignment that is just like g except for the (possible) difference that $g[e/\alpha]$ assigns the individual e to α ’.
 - * For any name α , $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M}, g[e/x]} = I(\alpha)$.
 - * For any variable α , $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M}, g[e/\alpha]} = g[e/\alpha](\alpha) = e$.

3. Proof rules cheatsheet

Derivation rules of propositional logic

$\frac{\text{Reiteration (R)}}{\triangleright \mid \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{P} \end{array}}$	
$\frac{\text{Conjunction Introduction (\&I)}}{\triangleright \mid \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{P \& Q} \end{array}}$	$\frac{\text{Conjunction Elimination (\&E)}}{\triangleright \mid \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P \& Q} \\ \mathbf{P} \end{array} \quad \triangleright \mid \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P \& Q} \\ \mathbf{Q} \end{array}}$
$\frac{\text{Conditional Introduction (\supset I)}}{\triangleright \mid \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{P \supset Q} \end{array}}$	$\frac{\text{Conditional Elimination (\supset E)}}{\triangleright \mid \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P \supset Q} \\ \mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{Q} \end{array}}$
$\frac{\text{Negation Introduction (\sim I)}}{\triangleright \mid \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{Q} \\ \sim \mathbf{Q} \\ \sim \mathbf{P} \end{array}}$	$\frac{\text{Negation Elimination (\sim E)}}{\triangleright \mid \begin{array}{c} \sim \mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{Q} \\ \sim \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{P} \end{array}}$
$\frac{\text{Disjunction Introduction (\vee I)}}{\triangleright \mid \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{P \vee Q} \end{array} \quad \triangleright \mid \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{Q \vee P} \end{array}}$	$\frac{\text{Disjunction Elimination (\vee E)}}{\triangleright \mid \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P \vee Q} \\ \mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{R} \\ \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{R} \end{array}}$
$\frac{\text{Biconditional Introduction (\equiv I)}}{\triangleright \mid \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{P \equiv Q} \end{array}}$	$\frac{\text{Biconditional Elimination (\equiv E)}}{\triangleright \mid \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P \equiv Q} \\ \mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{Q} \end{array} \quad \triangleright \mid \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P \equiv Q} \\ \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{P} \end{array}}$

Derivation rules of predicate logic

Substitution instance of $\mathbf{P}$: If $\mathbf{P}$ is a sentence of *PLE* of the form $(\forall \mathbf{x})\mathbf{Q}$ or $(\exists \mathbf{x})\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{t}$ is a closed individual term, then $\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{t}/\mathbf{x})$ is a substitution instance of $\mathbf{P}$. The individual term $\mathbf{t}$ is the *instantiating individual term*.

Universal Elimination ($\forall E$)

$$\begin{array}{|l} (\forall \mathbf{x})\mathbf{P} \\ \hline \triangleright \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{a}/\mathbf{x}) \end{array}$$

Existential Introduction ($\exists I$)

$$\begin{array}{|l} \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{a}/\mathbf{x}) \\ \hline \triangleright (\exists \mathbf{x})\mathbf{P} \end{array}$$

Universal Introduction ($\forall I$)

$$\begin{array}{|l} \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{a}/\mathbf{x}) \\ \hline \triangleright (\forall \mathbf{x})\mathbf{P} \end{array}$$

provided that

- (i) $\mathbf{a}$ does not occur in an open assumption.
- (ii) $\mathbf{a}$ does not occur in $(\forall \mathbf{x})\mathbf{P}$.

Existential Elimination ($\exists E$)

$$\begin{array}{|l} (\exists \mathbf{x})\mathbf{P} \\ \hline \begin{array}{|l} \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{a}/\mathbf{x}) \\ \hline \mathbf{Q} \end{array} \\ \hline \triangleright \mathbf{Q} \end{array}$$

provided that

- (i) $\mathbf{a}$ does not occur in an open assumption.
- (ii) $\mathbf{a}$ does not occur in $(\exists \mathbf{x})\mathbf{P}$.
- (iii) $\mathbf{a}$ does not occur in $\mathbf{Q}$.