

Syntax of predicate logic: variables and terms

Variables are expressions of the form x_i with $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$

Predicate symbols are expressions of the form P_i^k , where $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ and $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

Function symbols are expressions of the form f_i^k , where $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ and $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

We call i the **(identification) index** and k the **arity** of the symbol.

Terms are inductively defined as follows:

- (1) Variables are terms.
- (2) Function symbols of arity 0 are terms.
- (3) If f is a function symbol with arity $k \geq 1$ and t_1, \dots, t_k are terms then $f(t_1, \dots, t_k)$ is a term.

Function symbols of arity 0 are called **constants**.

Syntax of predicate logic: formulas

Formulas (of predicate logic) are inductively defined as follows:.

- (1) Predicate symbols of arity 0 are formulas.
- (2) If P is a predicate symbol of arity $k \geq 1$ and t_1, \dots, t_k are terms then $P(t_1, \dots, t_k)$ is a formula.
- (3) If F is a formula, then $\neg F$ is also a formula.
- (4) If F and G are formulas, then $(F \wedge G)$ and $(F \vee G)$ are also formulas.
- (5) If x is a variable and F is a formula, then $\exists x F$ and $\forall x F$ are also formulas. The symbols \exists and \forall are called the **existential** and the **universal quantifier**, respectively.

Formulas of the form P for some predicate symbol of arity 0 or of the form $P(t_1, \dots, t_k)$ are called **atomic formulas**. The **syntax tree** and the **subformulas** of a formula are defined as usual.

Free and bounded variables, closed formulas

A variable x **occurs** in a formula F if it appears in some term of F .

An occurrence of a variable in a formula is either **free** or **bounded**.

An occurrence of x in F is bounded if it belongs to some subformula of F of the form $\exists xG$ or $\forall xG$; the smallest such subformula is the **scope** of the occurrence. Otherwise the occurrence is free.

A formula without any free occurrence of any variable is **closed**.

The **matrix** of a formula F is the formula obtained by removing from F every occurrence of the quantifiers \exists and \forall , together with the (occurrence of a) variable following them. The matrix of F is denoted by F^* .

We introduce the usual abbreviations $(F \rightarrow G)$ and $(F \leftrightarrow G)$ as in propositional logic.

Exercise

NF: non-formula F: formula, but not closed C: closed formula

	NF	F	C
$\forall x P(a)$			
$\forall x \exists y (Q(x, y) \vee R(x, y))$			
$\forall x (Q(x, x) \rightarrow \exists x Q(x, y))$			
$\forall x (P(x) \vee \forall x Q(x, x))$			
$\forall x (P(y) \wedge \forall y P(x))$			
$(P(x) \rightarrow \exists x Q(x, P(x)))$			
$\forall f \exists x P(f(x))$			

NF: non-formula F: formula, but not closed C: closed formula

	NF	F	C
$\forall x (\neg \forall y Q(x, y) \wedge R(x, y))$			
$\exists x R(\forall y, x)$			
$\exists z ((Q(z, x) \vee R(y, z)) \rightarrow \exists y (R(x, y) \wedge Q(x, z)))$			
$\exists x (\neg P(x) \vee P(f(a)))$			
$(P(x) \rightarrow \exists x P(x))$			
$\exists x \forall y ((P(y) \rightarrow Q(x, y)) \vee \neg P(x))$			
$\forall y (R(f(Q(y, y))))$			
$\exists x \forall x Q(x, x)$			

Semantics of predicate logic: structures

A **structure** is a pair $\mathcal{A} = (U_{\mathcal{A}}, I_{\mathcal{A}})$, where $U_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an arbitrary, **nonempty** set called the **ground set** or **universe** of \mathcal{A} , and $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a **partial** function that maps

- predicate symbols of arity $k \geq 1$ to predicates over $U_{\mathcal{A}}$ of arity k (i.e., to functions of type $U_{\mathcal{A}}^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ or, equivalently, to subsets of $U_{\mathcal{A}}^k$),
- predicate symbols of arity 0 to either 0 or 1
- function symbols of arity $k \geq 1$ to functions over $U_{\mathcal{A}}$ of arity k (i.e., to functions of type $U_{\mathcal{A}}^k \rightarrow U_{\mathcal{A}}$),
- constants f of arity 0 to elements of the universe $U_{\mathcal{A}}$, and
- variables x to elements of the universe $U_{\mathcal{A}}$.

In other words:

- The domain of $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a subset of $\{P_i^k, f_i^k, x_i \mid i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$.
- The image of $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a subset of the set of all predicates and functions over $U_{\mathcal{A}}$ and elements of $U_{\mathcal{A}}$.

We abbreviate $I_{\mathcal{A}}(P)$ by $P^{\mathcal{A}}$, $I_{\mathcal{A}}(f)$ by $f^{\mathcal{A}}$, and $I_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$ by $x^{\mathcal{A}}$.

Let F be a formula and let $\mathcal{A} = (U_{\mathcal{A}}, I_{\mathcal{A}})$ be a structure.

\mathcal{A} is **suitable** for F if all predicate and function symbols occurring in F and all variables occurring free in F belong to the domain of $I_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Evaluation of a term in a structure

Let F be a formula and let \mathcal{A} be a structure suitable for F . For every term t that can be constructed from variables and function symbols that appear in F , we define the **value** of t in the structure \mathcal{A} , denoted by $\mathcal{A}(t)$. The definition is inductive:

- (1) If $t = x$ for some variable x , then $\mathcal{A}(t) = x^{\mathcal{A}}$.
- (2) If $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_k)$ for some function symbol f of arity k and terms t_1, \dots, t_k , then $\mathcal{A}(t) = f^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}(t_1), \dots, \mathcal{A}(t_k))$.
- (3) If $t = a$ for some constant a , then $\mathcal{A}(t) = a^{\mathcal{A}}$.

Analogously, we define inductively the (truth-)value of a formula F in the structure \mathcal{A} , denoted by $\mathcal{A}(F)$:

- If $F = P(t_1, \dots, t_k)$ for some predicate symbol P of arity k and terms t_1, \dots, t_k then

$$\mathcal{A}(F) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (\mathcal{A}(t_1), \dots, \mathcal{A}(t_k)) \in P^{\mathcal{A}} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- If $F = \neg G$ for some formula G then

$$\mathcal{A}(F) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{A}(G) = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- If $F = (G \wedge H)$ for some formulas G and H then

$$\mathcal{A}(F) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{A}(G) = 1 \text{ and } \mathcal{A}(H) = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- If $F = (G \vee H)$ for some formulas G and H then

$$\mathcal{A}(F) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{A}(G) = 1 \text{ or } \mathcal{A}(H) = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- If $F = \forall x G$ for some formula G and variable x then

$$\mathcal{A}(F) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if for every } d \in U_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A}_{[x/d]}(G) = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- If $F = \exists x G$ for some formula G and variable x then

$$\mathcal{A}(F) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if there exists } d \in U_{\mathcal{A}} \text{ such that: } \mathcal{A}_{[x/d]}(G) = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{A}_{[x/d]}$ denotes the structure \mathcal{A}' that coincides with \mathcal{A} everywhere, but (possibly) in the definition of $x^{\mathcal{A}'}$: it holds $x^{\mathcal{A}'} = d$, whether x belongs to the domain of $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ or not.

Model, validity, satisfiability

We write $\mathcal{A} \models F$ to denote that the structure \mathcal{A} is suitable for the formula F and $\mathcal{A}(F) = 1$ holds. We say that F **holds** in \mathcal{A} or that \mathcal{A} is a **model** of F .

If every structure suitable for F is a model of F , then we write $\models F$ and say that F is **valid**.

If F has at least one model then we say that F is **satisfiable**.

Exercise

V: valid S: satisfiable, but not valid U: unsatisfiable

	V	S	U
$\forall x P(a)$			
$\forall x (P(x, x) \rightarrow \exists x \forall y P(x, y))$			
$\exists x (\neg P(x) \vee P(a))$			
$P(a) \rightarrow \exists x P(x)$			
$P(x) \rightarrow \exists x P(x)$			
$\forall x P(x) \rightarrow \exists x P(x)$			
$\forall x P(x) \wedge \neg \forall y P(y)$			

Consequence and equivalence

A formula G is a **consequence** of the formulas F_1, \dots, F_k if every structure suitable for F_1, \dots, F_k and for G that is model of $\{F_1, \dots, F_k\}$ is also model of G .

We write $F_1, \dots, F_k \models G$ to denote that G is a consequence of F_1, \dots, F_k .

Two formulas F and G are (**semantically**) **equivalent** if every structure \mathcal{A} suitable for both F and G satisfies $\mathcal{A}(F) = \mathcal{A}(G)$. We then write $F \equiv G$.

Exercise

(1) $\forall x P(x) \vee \forall x Q(x, x)$

(2) $\forall x (P(x) \vee Q(x, x))$

(3) $\forall x (\forall z P(z) \vee \forall y Q(x, y))$

	Y	N
(1) \models (2)		
(2) \models (3)		
(3) \models (1)		

Exercise

(1) $\exists y \forall x P(x, y)$

(2) $\forall x \exists y P(x, y)$

	Y	N
(1) \models (2)		
(2) \models (1)		

Exercise

	Y	N
$\forall x \forall y F \equiv \forall y \forall x F$		
$\forall x \exists y F \equiv \exists x \forall y F$		
$\exists x \exists y F \equiv \exists y \exists x F$		
$(\forall x F \vee \forall x G) \equiv \forall x (F \vee G)$		
$(\forall x F \wedge \forall x G) \equiv \forall x (F \wedge G)$		
$(\exists x F \vee \exists x G) \equiv \exists x (F \vee G)$		
$(\exists x F \wedge \exists x G) \equiv \exists x (F \wedge G)$		

Predicate logic with equality

Predicate logic

+

distinguished predicate symbol “=” of arity 2.

Semantics : a structure \mathcal{A} of predicate logic with equality always maps the predicate symbol = to the identity relation:

$$\mathcal{A}(=) = \{(d, d) \mid d \in U_{\mathcal{A}}\}.$$

V: valid S: satisfiable, but not valid U: unsatisfiable

	V	S	U
$\forall x \forall y (x = y \rightarrow f(x) = f(y))$			
$\forall x \forall y (f(x) = f(y) \rightarrow x = y)$			
$\exists x \exists y \exists z (f(x) = y \wedge f(x) = z \wedge y \neq z)$			

Formalizing statements

A statement in natural language is formalized as a formula F and a structure \mathcal{A} . The formalizer claims that the statement is true iff F is true in some adequate structure extending \mathcal{A} .

\mathcal{A} fixes the meaning of the predicates that are taken as known. F may contain definitions of predicates or functions (see example in the next slides).

The names of the predicate symbols are chosen to suggest their meaning in the structure. The structure is often omitted, because it is assumed to be known (**danger!**).

We consider the following example

There are infinitely many prime numbers

Formalization I

If the meaning of “prime” and “greater-than” are assumed to be known, then we can take

Formula F_1 : $\forall x \exists y (Pri(y) \wedge Gt(y, x))$

Structure \mathcal{A}_1 :

$$U_{\mathcal{A}_1} = \mathbb{N}$$
$$Pri^{\mathcal{A}_1} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n \text{ is prime}\}$$
$$Gt^{\mathcal{A}_1} = \{(n, m) \in \mathbb{N} \mid n > m\}$$

What if the meaning of “prime” is not clear to everybody?

Formalization II

If the meaning of “divides” is known , then we can take

Formula F_2 :

$$F_1 \wedge \forall x (Pri(x) \leftrightarrow \neg(x = one) \wedge (\forall y Div(y, x) \rightarrow (y = x \vee y = one)))$$

Structure \mathcal{A}_2 :

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\mathcal{A}_2} &= \mathbb{N} \\ Gt^{\mathcal{A}_2} &= \{(n, m) \in \mathbb{N} \mid n > m\} \\ Div^{\mathcal{A}_2} &= \{(n, m) \in \mathbb{N} \mid n \text{ divides } m\} \\ one^{\mathcal{A}_2} &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

\mathcal{A}_2 does not interpret Pri , but a structure that extends \mathcal{A}_2 and interprets Pri can only satisfy F_2 if it assigns to Pri “the right meaning” .

What if the meaning of “divides” is not clear to everybody?

Formalization III

If the meaning of “product” is known , then we can take

Formula F_3 : $F_2 \wedge \forall x \forall y (Div(x, y) \leftrightarrow \exists z \text{prod}(x, z) = y)$

Structure \mathcal{A}_3 :

$$U_{\mathcal{A}_3} = \mathbb{N}$$

$$Gt^{\mathcal{A}_3} = \{(n, m) \in \mathbb{N} \mid n > m\}$$

$$one^{\mathcal{A}_3} = 1$$

$$\text{prod}^{\mathcal{A}_3}(n, m) = n \cdot m$$

What if the meaning of “product” is not clear to everybody?

Formalization IV

If the meaning of “sum”, “successor”, “one” and “zero” is known, then we can take

Formula F_4 : $F_3 \wedge F'_4 \wedge F''_4$

$$F'_4 = \forall x \text{ prod}(x, \text{zero}) = \text{zero}$$

$$F''_4 = \forall x \forall y \text{ prod}(x, \text{succ}(y)) = \text{sum}(\text{prod}(x, y), y)$$

Structure \mathcal{A}_4 :

$$U_{\mathcal{A}_4} = \mathbb{N}$$

$$Gt^{\mathcal{A}_4} = \{(n, m) \in \mathbb{N} \mid n > m\}$$

$$\text{one}^{\mathcal{A}_4} = 1 \quad \text{zero}^{\mathcal{A}_4} = 0$$

$$\text{sum}^{\mathcal{A}_4}(n, m) = n + m$$

$$\text{succ}^{\mathcal{A}_4}(n) = n + 1$$

What if the meaning of “sum” is not clear to everybody?

Formalization V

We can take

Formula F_5 : $F_4 \wedge F'_5 \wedge F''_5$

$$F'_5 = \forall x \text{ sum}(x, \text{zero}) = x$$

$$F''_5 = \forall x \forall y \text{ sum}(x, \text{succ}(y)) = \text{succ}(\text{sum}(x, y))$$

Structure \mathcal{A}_5 :

$$U_{\mathcal{A}_5} = \mathbb{N}$$

$$Gt^{\mathcal{A}_5} = \{(n, m) \in \mathbb{N} \mid n > m\}$$

$$\text{one}^{\mathcal{A}_5} = 1 \quad \text{zero}^{\mathcal{A}_5} = 0$$

$$\text{succ}^{\mathcal{A}_5}(n) = n + 1$$

What if the meaning of ‘greater than’ and ‘one’ is not clear to everybody?

Formalization VI

We can take

Formula F_6 : $F_5 \wedge F'_6 \wedge F''_6$

$$F'_6 = \text{succ}(\text{zero}) = \text{one}$$

$$F''_6 = \forall x \forall y (Gt(x, y) \leftrightarrow \exists z (\text{sum}(y, z) = x \wedge \neg(z = \text{zero})))$$

Structure \mathcal{A}_6 :

$$U_{\mathcal{A}_6} = \mathbb{N}$$
$$\text{zero}^{\mathcal{A}_6} = 0$$
$$\text{succ}^{\mathcal{A}_6}(n) = n + 1$$