

Chapter 27: Q-Valuations

The *vocabulary* V of a set of **QL** *wffs* is the set of constants and predicates that appear in those *wffs*.

A "*q-valuation*" for a set of *wffs* with vocabulary V does three things:

1. Fixes a domain of objects D . Convention: Must be non-empty, but can contain nameless objects.
2. Assigns to each constant in V , an object in D (its *reference*).
3. Assigns to each n -place predicate in V , a set of n -tuples of objects in D (its *extension*).

The *extension* of a predicate is the (ordered) set of objects that satisfy it.

Ex. **F** means ____ is wise

Extension of **F** = {Yoda, Einstein, Socrates, Lao Tzu...}

L means ____ loves ____

Extension of **L** = {⟨Barack, Michelle⟩, ⟨Hillary, Bill⟩, ⟨Angelina, Brad⟩, ...}

An *n-tuple* is an ordered set of n objects.

Ex. 2-tuple: $\langle \text{Angelina, Brad} \rangle$

3-tuple: $\langle \text{Socrates, Plato, Aristotle} \rangle$

So: A q -valuation assigns to each n -place predicate, the set of n -tuples that satisfy it.

Formal Definition of q -valuation:

A q -valuation on a vocabulary V of a set of wffs of QL

- (1) specifies a non-empty set of objects as the domain D ;
- (2) assigns to any constant \mathbf{c}_k in V an object in D as its q -value;
- (3) assigns to any 0-place predicate \mathbf{P}^0_k in V a truth-value as its q -value;
- (4) assigns to any n -place predicate \mathbf{P}^n_k in V , $n > 0$, a (possibly empty) set of n -tuples of objects $\{ \langle m_1, \dots, m_n \rangle, \dots \}$ in D as its q -value.

Note: The trickiest part of the semantics of **QL** involves the semantic rules for quantifier expressions.

Recall: How should the truth-conditions for " $\forall xFx$ " be set?

Suppose: $\forall xFx$ is true just when all its instances in some vocabulary V are true:

$\forall xFx$ is true *if and only if* $(Fm \wedge Fn \wedge Fo \wedge \dots)$ is true.

But: If the domain has nameless objects, it's possible for $(Fm \wedge Fn \wedge Fo \wedge \dots)$ to be true, but $\forall xFx$ to be false!

So: To allow for this, consider:

$\forall xFx$ is true *if and only if* $\left(Fx \text{ is true, no matter } \textit{what} \ x \text{ refers to in the domain (named or nameless objects)} \right)$

In general, consider:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| (1) $\forall v C(\dots v \dots v \dots)$ | $\forall \mathbf{x} F \mathbf{x}$ |
| (2) $\exists v C(\dots v \dots v \dots)$ | $\exists \mathbf{x} F \mathbf{x}$ |
| (3) $C(\dots v \dots v \dots)$ | $F \mathbf{x}$ |

Idea: " v " stands for a generic variable. An explicit example is the variable \mathbf{x} . " $C(\dots v \dots v \dots)$ " stands for a generic *wff* in which v occurs one or more times. An explicit example is $F \mathbf{x}$.

- (1) is true so long as (3) is true, no matter what the reference of the "pronoun" v is.
- (2) is true so long as (3) is true for at least *one* reference of the "pronoun" v .
- To implement this, need the notion of a " v -variant" of a q -valuation:

An ***extended q -valuation*** defined over vocabulary V is a q -valuation defined over V , augmented by an assignment of objects as q -values to one or more variables.

An extended q -valuation q' is a ***v -variant*** of another (extended) q -valuation q just when q' assigns some object to the variable v and otherwise agrees exactly with q .

Now stipulate:

$\left(\forall v C(\dots v \dots v \dots) \text{ is true under a } q\text{-valuation } q \right)$	<i>if and only if</i>	$\left(C(\dots v \dots v \dots) \text{ is true for all } v\text{-variants of } q. \right)$
$\left(\exists v C(\dots v \dots v \dots) \text{ is true under a } q\text{-valuation } q \right)$	<i>if and only if</i>	$\left(C(\dots v \dots v \dots) \text{ is true for at least one } v\text{-variant of } q. \right)$

The Semantic Rules for QL

Let " $\Rightarrow_q T$ " mean "is true under q -valuation q ".

(Q0) For atomic *wff* A

(a) If $n = 0$, then $A \Rightarrow_q T$ if the q -value of A is T . Otherwise $A \Rightarrow_q F$.

(b) If $n > 0$, then $A \Rightarrow_q T$ if the n -tuple formed by taking the q -values of the terms in A in order is an element of the q -value of A . Otherwise $A \Rightarrow_q F$.

How to unpack (Q0b):

- Note: An atomic *wff* A takes the form $P_k^n t_1, \dots, t_n$ where P_k^n is an n -place predicate and t_1, \dots, t_n are terms
- Now: The n -tuple formed by taking the q -values of the terms in A in order takes the form $\langle o_1, \dots, o_n \rangle$, where each o_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) is the q -value of the term t_i in A .

Each of the o_i is an object in D , so $\langle o_1, \dots, o_n \rangle$ is an n -tuple of objects in D .

- Also: The q -value of A is the set $\{\langle m_1, \dots, m_n \rangle, \dots\}$ of n -tuples that q assigns to A .

Each n -tuple is an n -tuple of objects in D , and the set of all these n -tuples is the extension in D of the predicate P_k^n .

- So: An atomic *wff* of the form $P_k^n t_1, \dots, t_n$ for $n > 0$ says "The things referred to by the terms t_1, \dots, t_n stand in the relation P_k^n ".
- And: (Q0b) says this is true under a q -valuation q just when the n objects in the domain specified by q to which q assigns t_1, \dots, t_n actually do stand in the relation P_k^n to each other.

- (Q1) For any *wff* A , $\neg A \Rightarrow_q \text{T}$ if $A \Rightarrow_q \text{F}$; otherwise $\neg A \Rightarrow_q \text{F}$.
- (Q2) For *wffs* A, B , $(A \wedge B) \Rightarrow_q \text{T}$ if both $A \Rightarrow_q \text{T}$ and $B \Rightarrow_q \text{T}$; otherwise $(A \wedge B) \Rightarrow_q \text{F}$.
- (Q3) For *wffs* A, B , $(A \vee B) \Rightarrow_q \text{F}$ if both $A \Rightarrow_q \text{F}$ and $B \Rightarrow_q \text{F}$; otherwise $(A \vee B) \Rightarrow_q \text{T}$.
- (Q4) For *wffs* A, B , $(A \supset B) \Rightarrow_q \text{F}$ if $A \Rightarrow_q \text{T}$ and $B \Rightarrow_q \text{F}$; otherwise $(A \supset B) \Rightarrow_q \text{T}$.
- (Q5) For *wffs* A, B , $(A \equiv B) \Rightarrow_q \text{T}$ if $A \Rightarrow_q \text{T}$ and $B \Rightarrow_q \text{T}$, or if $A \Rightarrow_q \text{F}$ and $B \Rightarrow_q \text{F}$; otherwise $(A \equiv B) \Rightarrow_q \text{F}$.
- (Q6) For *wff* $C(\dots v \dots v \dots)$ with variable v free, $\forall v C(\dots v \dots v \dots) \Rightarrow_q \text{T}$ if $C(\dots v \dots v \dots) \Rightarrow_{q^+} \text{T}$ for every v -variant q^+ of q ; otherwise $\forall v C(\dots v \dots v \dots) \Rightarrow_q \text{F}$.
- (Q7) For *wff* $C(\dots v \dots v \dots)$ with variable v free, $\exists v C(\dots v \dots v \dots) \Rightarrow_q \text{T}$ if $C(\dots v \dots v \dots) \Rightarrow_{q^+} \text{T}$ for at least one v -variant q^+ of q ; otherwise $\exists v C(\dots v \dots v \dots) \Rightarrow_q \text{F}$.

Example: $V = \{m, n, F, G, L\}, \quad \{\forall xFx, \forall y\neg(Fy \wedge Gy), \forall x\exists yLxy\}$

To determine the truth-values of these *wffs*, first specify a *q*-valuation, call it *q*:

- (1) Domain $D = \{Socrates, Plato, Aristotle\}$
(2) Assignment of constants in V : $m \Rightarrow Socrates, \quad n \Rightarrow Plato$
(3) Assignment of predicates in V :
 $F \Rightarrow \{Socrates, Aristotle\}$
 $G \Rightarrow \{\}$ (empty set)
 $L \Rightarrow \{\langle Socrates, Plato \rangle, \langle Plato, Aristotle \rangle, \langle Plato, Socrates \rangle, \langle Aristotle, Aristotle \rangle\}$
- Note:* D has a "nameless" object: the Aristotle-object

Under *q*, what is the truth-value of $\forall xFx$?

Note: $\forall xFx \Rightarrow_q T$ just when $Fx \Rightarrow_{q^+} T$ for all *x*-variants q^+ of *q*. (Q6)

Now: There are three possible *x*-variants of *q*:

$q_1: \mathbf{x} \Rightarrow Socrates \quad q_2: \mathbf{x} \Rightarrow Plato \quad q_3: \mathbf{x} \Rightarrow Aristotle$

And: $Fx \Rightarrow_{q_1} T, Fx \Rightarrow_{q_2} F, Fx \Rightarrow_{q_3} T$. (Q0)

Thus: Not all *x*-variants of *q* make Fx true.

Hence: $\forall xFx \Rightarrow_q F$

Example: $V = \{m, n, F, G, L\}, \quad \{\forall xFx, \forall y\neg(Fy \wedge Gy), \forall x\exists yLxy\}$

To determine the truth-values of these *wffs*, first specify a *q*-valuation, call it *q*:

- (1) Domain $D = \{Socrates, Plato, Aristotle\}$
- (2) Assignment of constants in V : $m \Rightarrow Socrates, \quad n \Rightarrow Plato$
- (3) Assignment of predicates in V :
 - $F \Rightarrow \{Socrates, Aristotle\}$
 - $G \Rightarrow \{\}$ (empty set)
 - $L \Rightarrow \{\langle Socrates, Plato \rangle, \langle Plato, Aristotle \rangle, \langle Plato, Socrates \rangle, \langle Aristotle, Aristotle \rangle\}$

Note: D has a "nameless" object: the Aristotle-object

Under *q*, what is the truth-value of $\forall y\neg(Fy \wedge Gy)$?

Note: $\forall y\neg(Fy \wedge Gy) \Rightarrow_q T$ just when $\neg(Fy \wedge Gy) \Rightarrow_{q^+} T$ for *all* *y*-variants q^+ of *q*. (Q6)

And: $\neg(Fy \wedge Gy) \Rightarrow_{q^+} T$ just when $(Fy \wedge Gy) \Rightarrow_{q^+} F$. (Q1)

And: $(Fy \wedge Gy) \Rightarrow_{q^+} F$ just when either $Fy \Rightarrow_{q^+} F$ or $Gy \Rightarrow_{q^+} F$. (Q2)

Now: For any *y*-variant q^+ , $Gy \Rightarrow_{q^+} F$. (Since the q^+ -value of G is $\{\}$.)

So: $\forall y\neg(Fy \wedge Gy) \Rightarrow_q T$.

Example: $V = \{m, n, F, G, L\}, \quad \{\forall xFx, \forall y\neg(Fy \wedge Gy), \forall x\exists yLxy\}$

To determine the truth-values of these *wffs*, first specify a q -valuation, call it q :

- (1) Domain $D = \{Socrates, Plato, Aristotle\}$

(2) Assignment of constants in V : $m \Rightarrow Socrates, \quad n \Rightarrow Plato$

(3) Assignment of predicates in V :

$F \Rightarrow \{Socrates, Aristotle\}$

$G \Rightarrow \{\}$ (empty set)

$L \Rightarrow \{\langle Socrates, Plato \rangle, \langle Plato, Aristotle \rangle, \langle Plato, Socrates \rangle, \langle Aristotle, Aristotle \rangle\}$
- Note:* D has a "nameless" object: the Aristotle-object

Under q , what is the truth-value of $\forall x\exists yLxy$?

Note: $\forall x\exists yLxy \Rightarrow_q T$ just when $\exists yLxy \Rightarrow_{q^+} T$ for *all* x -variants q^+ of q . (Q6)

And: There are three possible x -variants of q :

$q_1: \mathbf{x} \Rightarrow Socrates \quad q_2: \mathbf{x} \Rightarrow Plato \quad q_3: \mathbf{x} \Rightarrow Aristotle$

Now: $\exists yLxy \Rightarrow_{q^+} T$ just when $Lxy \Rightarrow_{q^{++}} T$ for *at least one* y -variant q^{++} of q^+ . (Q7)

And: There are three possible y -variants of q^+ :

$q_1': \mathbf{y} \Rightarrow Socrates \quad q_2': \mathbf{y} \Rightarrow Plato \quad q_3': \mathbf{y} \Rightarrow Aristotle$

Now Check: For each q^+ , is there at least one q^{++} such that Lxy is true?

For q_1 , there's q_2' .

For q_2 , there're q_1' and q_3' .

For q_3 , there's q_3' .

Thus: For each q^+ , there is at least one q^{++} such that $Lxy \Rightarrow_{q^{++}} T$.

So: $\forall x\exists yLxy \Rightarrow_q T$.

Some results about q -valuations

(V1) *If a q -valuation q makes a universal quantification true, it makes its instances true, too:*

If a q -valuation makes $\forall v C(\dots v \dots v \dots)$ true, then, given q assigns a value to c , q makes $C(\dots c \dots c \dots)$ true. And if q doesn't assign a value to c , there is an extension q^+ of q which does and which makes $C(\dots c \dots c \dots)$ true.

Example:

Suppose: q is a q -valuation defined for a vocabulary V that includes the constant \mathfrak{n} , and suppose $\forall \mathbf{x} \mathbf{F}\mathbf{x} \Rightarrow_q \mathbf{T}$.

Then: Every x -variant of q makes $\mathbf{F}\mathbf{x}$ true. (Q6).

Now: Suppose the q -value of \mathfrak{n} is the object \mathcal{O} .

So: The x -variant q^+ which assigns \mathbf{x} to \mathcal{O} makes $\mathbf{F}\mathbf{x}$ true.

So: \mathcal{O} is in the extension of \mathbf{F} .

So: $\mathbf{F}\mathfrak{n} \Rightarrow_q \mathbf{T}$. (Q0)

Now suppose: V contains no constants, and $\forall \mathbf{x} \mathbf{F}\mathbf{x} \Rightarrow_q \mathbf{T}$.

Then: There's at least one object in the domain of q (by definition): call it \mathcal{O} .

Now: Define q^+ as the same as q except for assigning to \mathcal{O} the new constant \mathbf{a} .

Then: $\mathbf{F}\mathbf{a} \Rightarrow_{q^+} \mathbf{T}$, since \mathcal{O} is in the extension of \mathbf{F} .

(V2) *If a q -valuation q makes an existential quantification true, it has an extension which makes an instance of the quantification true:*

If a q -valuation q makes $\exists vC(\dots v\dots v\dots)$ true, and c is a constant not in the vocabulary of q , then there is an extension q^+ of q which gives a q -value to c and makes $C(\dots c\dots c\dots)$ true.

Example:

Suppose: The vocabulary V of a q -valuation q doesn't have the constant \mathbf{a} .
And suppose $\exists \mathbf{x} \mathbf{F} \mathbf{x} \Rightarrow_q \mathbf{T}$.

Then: There's at least one x -variant of q that makes $\mathbf{F} \mathbf{x}$ true. (Q7)

So: There's some object in the domain (same for q and all variants), call it \mathcal{O} , that can be assigned \mathbf{x} so that $\mathbf{F} \mathbf{x}$ is true.

Now: Let q^+ be an extension of q that agrees with q and assigns \mathbf{a} to \mathcal{O} .

Then: $\mathbf{F} \mathbf{a} \Rightarrow_{q^+} \mathbf{T}$.

(V3) If a q -valuation q makes $\neg\forall vC(\dots v\dots v\dots)$ true, then it also makes true $\exists v\neg C(\dots v\dots v\dots)$.

Example:

Suppose: A q -valuation q makes $\neg\forall xFx$ true.

Then: $\forall xFx \Rightarrow_q F$. (Q1)

So: Not all x -variants of q make Fx true. (There's at least one x -variant of q that makes Fx false.)

And: This x -variant makes $\neg Fx$ true.

So: There's an x -variant of q that makes $\neg Fx$ true.

Thus: $\exists x\neg Fx \Rightarrow_q T$. (Q7)

(V4) If a q -valuation q makes $\neg\exists vC(\dots v\dots v\dots)$ true, then it also makes true $\forall v\neg C(\dots v\dots v\dots)$.

(V5) *Extending a q -valuation q to cover a new constant c doesn't affect the truth-values q assigns to wffs that do not contain c :*
Suppose a q -valuation q is defined on a vocabulary V that does not contain the constant c ; and suppose q^+ is an extension of q that assigns to c some object in the domain. Let W be a wff using symbols in V . Then if $W \Rightarrow_q T$, then $W \Rightarrow_{q^+} T$.