

Semantics: Predicate Logic

LING 106
Nov. 28, 2007

Propositional Logic: A Definition

- $\Sigma = \{p, q, r, \dots, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \sim, \perp, \}$
- F , the set of formulas of Propositional Logic, is defined recursively as follows.
 - The propositions $p, q, r, \dots \in F$.
 - If $x \in F$, then $[\sim x] \in F$.
 - If $x, y \in F$, then $[x \wedge y] \in F$.
 - If $x, y \in F$, then $[x \vee y] \in F$.
 - If $x, y \in F$, then $[x \rightarrow y] \in F$.
 - Nothing else is in F .

Propositional Logic: Truth Tables

$[\sim x]$ is true if and only if x is false.

p	$[\sim p]$
T	F
F	T

it is not the case that p

p and q

p	q	$[p \wedge q]$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	F
F	F	F

$[x \wedge y]$ is true iff x and y are both true.

p or q

p	q	$[p \vee q]$
T	T	T
T	F	T
F	T	T
F	F	F

$[x \vee y]$ is false iff x and y are both false.

if p, q

p	q	$[p \rightarrow q]$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

$[x \rightarrow y]$ is false iff x is true and y is false.

More Truth Tables

$p = It's\ raining.$
 $q = John\ is\ carrying\ an\ umbrella.$
 $r = It's\ snowing.$

If it is raining, John is carrying an umbrella. $[p \rightarrow q]$
John is not carrying an umbrella. $[\sim q]$
 \therefore It is not raining. $[\sim p]$

p	q	$[p \rightarrow q]$	$[\sim q]$	$[\sim p]$
T	T	T	F	F
T	F	F	T	F
F	T	T	F	T
F	F	T	T	T

Whenever both premises are true...
...the conclusion is true.

Either it is raining or it is snowing. $[p \vee r]$
It is not snowing. $[\sim r]$
 \therefore It is raining. p

p	r	$[p \vee r]$	$[\sim r]$	p
T	T	T	F	T
T	F	T	T	T
F	T	T	F	F
F	F	F	T	F

Propositional Logic: A Basis for Semantics

- The good news: propositional logic does a good job of modeling connected propositions.
 - If you've taken LING 106, you can draw FSAs.
 - The exam will be hard, or the exam will not be hard.
 - etc.
- The bad news: it only goes so far.
 - It doesn't quite capture *if, and, etc.*
 - We need to know where propositions come from.

The Bad News, Part One

- If $p, q = [p \rightarrow q]$. True unless p is true and q is false.
 - If you fail the exam, you'll fail the class.
 - True in cases where: you fail the exam and you fail the class; you pass the exam and you pass the class; you pass the exam and you fail the class.
 - If Abe Lincoln was a Russian spy, then I'm a professor of linguistics.
 - In fact, *I am* a professor of linguistics. Is this still true?
 - If you're thirsty, there's beer in the fridge.
 - If you're not thirsty and there's no beer in the fridge, is this true?
- Answer: the last one (maybe also the second) aren't the thing being represented by \rightarrow (aka *material implication*).
 - And that's OK...but it means there are sentences that it looked like we could model, that we in fact can't.

The Bad News, Part One

- p and $q = [p \wedge q]$. True if p is true and q is true.
- p or $q = [p \vee q]$. True if p is true or q is true.
 - I started lecturing, turned on my laptop, and came into the room.
 - Really?
 - I wrote a letter to my grandmother yesterday, and six men can fit in the back seat of a Ford.
 - What?
 - Either it's November, or George W. Bush is an Irish Penn student.
 - Well, true, but...?

The Bad News, Part Two

All humans are mortal.
Socrates is a human.
 \therefore Socrates is mortal.

- That didn't help.
- What we need...
 - **human**: </hju:mən/, noun, 'sapient bipedal mammal'>
 - **mortal**: </mɔ:rtəl/, adjective, 'subject to death'>
 - **all humans are mortal**:
 - Sentence, made from noun-phrase (article + noun) and verb-phrase (verb + adjective).
 - Proposition, made from the meaning of all (whatever that is), the meaning 'sapient bipedal human', and the meaning 'subject to death'.

And Thus: Predicate Logic

- The intuition:
 - Rather than being about *propositions* (and their connectors)...
 - If it is raining, John is carrying an umbrella. [$p \rightarrow q$]
 - John is **not** carrying an umbrella. [$\sim q$]
 - \therefore It is **not** raining. [$\sim p$]
 - ...the classical, Aristotelean syllogism is about *predicates*.
 - All humans are mortal.
 - Socrates is a human.
 - \therefore Socrates is mortal.
- Note: we'll still need propositional logic; we're just adding things to the system.
- We'll still have the elements of propositional logic in our lexicon: $\{\sim, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, [,]\} \subset \Sigma$.

Predicate Logic: A Definition

- *Socrates is a human* / *The Archon of Ptharn is a squorfle* / *George W. Bush is a Penn student* is "about":
 - Socrates / the Archon of Ptharn / George W. Bush ← Individuals
 - humans / squorfles / Penn students ← Predicates
- *Socrates is a human* means "the predicate *human* holds of the individual *Socrates*".
- $\{\sim, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, [,], (,), \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \dots, \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \dots, \mathbf{z}\} \subset \Sigma$.
 - Capital letters represent predicates.
 - Lowercase letters represent individuals.
 - *Socrates is a human*: $H(s)$, where

Predicate Logic: A Definition

- *All humans are mortal* / *All squorfles are brachtly* / *All Penn students are from Ireland* is "about":
 - humans / squorfles / Penn students ← Predicates
 - mortalness / brachtliness / Irishness ← Also predicates
- *All humans are mortal* means "the predicate *human* holds of the individual..."
 - But what individual?
- *All humans are mortal* means "the predicate *human* holds of the predicate *mortal*".
 - But what would that even mean?
- We're going to need something else in the system.

Predicate Logic: A Definition

- $\{\sim, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, [,], (,), \mathbf{A}, \dots, \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{a}, \dots, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}\} \subset \Sigma$.
 - CAPITAL LETTERS represent predicates.
 - lowercase letters represent individuals.
 - *italicized lowercase letters* represent variables over individuals.
 - ...with the note that x, y, z are reserved for variables.
 - If we need more variables, we can always number them: x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots
- So *all humans are mortal* can be represented as a connection between $H(x)$ and $M(x)$.
- That'll almost cover it, but we'll need just three more things...

