

(2.2.13) Def. Suppose X is an L -formula involving prop. vars. p_1, \dots, p_n . Suppose \mathcal{L} is a 1st order language and ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n are \mathcal{L} -formulas.

A substitution instance of X is obtained by replacing each p_i in X by ϕ_i (for $i=1, \dots, n$). Call the result θ .

(2.2.14) Thm (1) θ is an \mathcal{L} -formula.

(2) Let v be an valuation in an \mathcal{L} -str. \mathcal{A} .

Let w be a prop. valuation LII.
with $w(p_i) = v[\phi_i]$
(for $i=1, \dots, n$).

Then $v[\theta] = w(X)$
 \mathcal{L} -formula \uparrow \mathcal{L} -formula

(3) $\models \theta$ if X is a tautology
then θ is logically valid.
(Sketch)

Pf: \hookrightarrow (1) Omit.

(3) follows from (2) -
(as $w(X) = T$ in this case).

(2) By induction on the number of connectives in X .

Base case Ex.

Inductive step:

(a) X is $(\neg \alpha)$

(b) X is $(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$

[for L -formulas α, β]

(a) $\exists x$.

(b) θ is of the form
 $(\theta_1 \rightarrow \theta_2)$

where θ_1 is obtained from
 α by substituting ϕ_i in
place of p_i in α ;
similarly for θ_2 .

$$w(X) = F$$

$$\Leftrightarrow w(\alpha) = T \text{ \& } w(\beta) = F$$

$$\Leftrightarrow v[\theta_1] = T \text{ \& } v[\theta_2] = F$$

induction

$$\Leftrightarrow v[(\theta_1 \rightarrow \theta_2)] = F \quad (2)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow v[\theta] = F$$

which does the ind. step in this
case. \parallel $\#$

Note: Not all logically valid formulas
arise in this way

Eg. $((\exists x_2)(\forall x_1)\phi \rightarrow (\forall x_1)(\exists x_2)\phi)$
is logically valid, but not a
subst. instance of a prop. tautology.

\equiv

(2.3) Bound and free variables.

1) Eg: ψ_1
 $(R_1(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow (\forall x_3) R_2(x_1, x_3))$

Annotations:
- x_1, x_2 are free (indicated by red arrows labeled "free").
- x_3 is bound (indicated by a red arrow labeled "bound").
- The scope of the quantifier $(\forall x_3)$ is $R_2(x_1, x_3)$ (indicated by a red bracket labeled "scope of").

(2.3.1) Def. Suppose ϕ, ψ are \mathcal{L} -formulas and $(\forall x_i)\phi$ occurs as a subformula of ψ i.e. ψ is $\dots (\forall x_i)\phi \dots$

We say that ϕ is the scope of the quantifier $(\forall x_i)$ here.

A occurrence of a variable x_j in ψ is bound if it is in the scope of

a quantifier $(\forall x_j)$ in ψ (3) (or it is the x_j here).

Otherwise, it is a free occurrence in ψ . Variables having a free occurrence in ψ are called free variables of ψ .

A formula with no free variables is called a closed formula (or an \mathcal{L} -sentence).

Examples

2) ψ_2 :
 $((\forall x_1) R_1(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow R_2(x_1, x_2))$

Annotations:
- x_1 is bound (indicated by a red arrow labeled "bound").
- x_2 is free (indicated by a red arrow labeled "free").
- The scope of the quantifier $(\forall x_1)$ is $R_1(x_1, x_2)$ (indicated by a red bracket labeled "scope").

Compare with :

$$(\forall x_1) \underbrace{(R_1(x_1 \rightarrow x_2) \rightarrow R_2(x_1, x_2))}_{\text{scope}}$$

bound

$$3) \psi_3 : \underbrace{(\exists x_3) R_1(x_1, x_2)}_{\text{scope}} \rightarrow (\forall x_2) \underbrace{R_2(x_2, x_3)}_{\text{scope}}$$

free bound free

//

(2.3.2) Notation :

If ψ is an \mathcal{L} -formula
with free variables amongst
 x_1, \dots, x_n write $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$

(instead of ψ) .

If t_1, \dots, t_n are terms (4)
then by $\psi(t_1, \dots, t_n)$
we mean the \mathcal{L} -formula
obtained by replacing each
free occurrence of x_i in ψ
by t_i (for $i=1, \dots, n$) .

Eg

$$\psi(x_1, x_2) \quad \begin{matrix} \text{free} \\ \downarrow \end{matrix} \rightarrow \left((\forall x_1) R_1(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow (\forall x_3) R_2(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right)$$

t_1

$f_1(x_1)$
 $f_2(x_1, x_2)$

t_2

$\psi(t_1, t_2)$

$$\left((\forall x_1) R_1(x_1, f(x_1, x_2)) \rightarrow (\forall x_3) R_2(f_1(x_1), f(x_1, x_2), x_3) \right)$$

(2.3.3) Theorem

Suppose ϕ is a closed \mathcal{L} -formula and \mathcal{A} is an \mathcal{L} -str. Then

either $\mathcal{A} \models \phi$
or $\mathcal{A} \models (\neg \phi)$

More generally, if ϕ has free variables amongst x_1, \dots, x_n and v, w are valuations in \mathcal{A} with

$v(x_i) = w(x_i)$ for $i=1, \dots, n$

then $v[\phi] = T \Leftrightarrow w[\phi] = T$

(allow $n=0$ here: no free vars.)

Pf: Note that the first statement follows from the general statement

If ϕ has no free variables

then for any valuations ^{L12} v, w (in \mathcal{A}) they agree on the free variables, so ⑥
 $v[\phi] = w[\phi]$

Prove generalization by ind. on number of connectives & quantifiers in ϕ .

Base case: ϕ is atomic

$R(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ t_j terms.

The t_j only involve ~~the~~ variables from x_1, \dots, x_n . So

$v(t_j) = w(t_j)$ for $j=1, \dots, m$
(compare 2.2.6).

then (2.2.9 ?)

$$v[R(t_1, \dots, t_m)] = T$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \bar{R}(v(t_1), \dots, v(t_m)) \text{ holds in } \mathcal{A}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \bar{R}(w(t_1), \dots, w(t_m)) \text{ holds in } \mathcal{A}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow w[R(t_1, \dots, t_m)] = T.$$

=
Ind. step. ϕ is
 $(\neg \psi)$, $(\psi \rightarrow \chi)$ or
 $(\forall x_i) \psi$.

First two cases : Ex.

Suppose ϕ is $(\forall x_i) \psi$

Suppose $v[\phi] = F$.

Want to show $w[\phi] = F$.

(By symmetry, this is enough.)

By Def 2.2.9^(a)₁(c) ~~there~~ there is ⁽⁷⁾
a valuation v' x_i -equiv. to v
with $v'[\psi] = F$.

The free variables of ψ are
amongst x_1, \dots, x_n, x_i .

Let w' be the valuation x_i -equiv.
to w with $w'(x_i) = v'(x_i)$.

Then v', w' agree on the
free variables of ψ .

By ind. hyp. (on ψ)

$$v'[\psi] = w'[\psi]$$

so $w'[\psi] = F$. As w'

is x_i -equiv. to w , we have

$$w[(\forall x_i) \psi] = F, \text{ i.e. } w[\phi] = F.$$

#

Notation: If A is an L -structure and $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is an L -formula (whose free vars. are amongst x_1, \dots, x_n) and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ (Domain of A) then write

$$A \models \psi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$$

to mean

$v[\psi] = T$ whenever

v is a valuation with

$v(x_i) = a_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

(Note: By pf. of 2.3.3 (8)
this holds if $v[\psi] = T$
for some such v .)

(2.3.4) Warning Example

An example where

$$A \models (\forall x_1) \phi(x_1)$$

but where we a term t_1

and a valuation v in A

with $v[\phi(t_1)] = F$.

(?? Expect $v[\phi(t_1)] = T$)
But no.

$\phi(x_1): ((\forall x_2) R(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow S(x_1))$
 t_1 is the term x_2 .

$\phi(t_1): ((\forall x_2) R(x_2, x_2) \rightarrow S(x_2))$

\mathcal{A} Domain $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$
 $R(x_1, x_2)$ interpreted as ' $x_1 \leq x_2$ '
 $S(x_1)$ interpreted as ' $x_1 = 0$ '

So $\mathcal{A} \models (\forall x_1) \phi(x_1)$

$(\mathcal{A} \models (\forall x_1)((\forall x_2) R(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow S(x_1)))$

BUT if $v(x_2) = 1$ then

$v[\phi(t_1)] = F$ //

(2.3.5) Def. Let ϕ be an \mathcal{L} -formula, x_i a variable and t a term of \mathcal{L} . We say that t is free for x_i in ϕ

if there is no variable x_j in t such that x_i occurs free within the scope of a quantifier $(\forall x_j)$ in ϕ .

NOT free for x_i is ϕ :

$\phi: \dots (\forall x_j) \dots x_i$
 (scope)

$t \dots x_j \dots$

In example: t_1 is not free for x_1 in ϕ .

(2.3.6) Then
 Suppose $\phi(x_1)$ is an \mathcal{L} -formula
 (possibly with other free variables).
 Let t be a term free for
 x_1 in ϕ .

then $\models ((\forall x_1)\phi(x_1) \rightarrow \phi(t))$.

In particular if \mathcal{A} is
 an \mathcal{L} -str. with $\mathcal{A} \models (\forall x_1)\phi(x_1)$

then $\mathcal{A} \models \phi(t)$.

Eg: take $t = x_1$ here.

So if $\mathcal{A} \models (\forall x_1)\phi(x_1)$
 then $\mathcal{A} \models \phi(x_1)$.

Follows from:

(2.3.7) Lemma Suppose (15)
 v is a valuation in \mathcal{A} . Let
 v' be the val. in \mathcal{A} which is
 x_1 -equiv. to v with

$$v'(x_1) = v(t)$$

then $v'[\phi(x_1)] = T$

$$\Leftrightarrow v[\phi(t)] = T.$$

Lemma \Rightarrow then:

Suppose v is a valuation with
 $v[\phi(t)] = F$. Show $v[(\forall x_1)\phi(x_1)] = F$.

Take v' as in the lemma.

then by lemma $v'[\phi(x_1)] = F$

So $v[(\forall x_1)\phi(x_1)] = F$ as
 v' is x_1 -equiv. to v . //