

Formal semantics

✓ Predicate logic-logical relations within the sentence

Propositional logic-logical relations between sentences

Metalanguage

Truth-conditional semantics and the Fregean Program

There is a bag in my car.-

Alfred Tarski: the meaning of a sentence is to know its truth-conditions

What must be the world like so that we can say if the sentence is true or not? As long as there is a bag in my car, the sentence is true. $\{0,1\}$

Is the meaning of the sentence only its truth-conditions?

- Compositional semantics: Frege, Montague
- More interested in the semantic composition of sentences:

Frege:

“sentences are split up into two parts: one complete in itself and the other in need of supplementation, or ‘unsaturated’... Only when this place [the unsaturated one] is filled up with a proper name, or with an expression..., does a complete sense appear.”

Using the metalanguage

- Bruce is clever.
- Bruce sleeps.
- A property is predicated of an individual.

- b - individual constant
- C, S - predicates (predicate constants)
- $S(b); C(b)$

Formalizing sentences

$C(b)$ - proposition (predicate and individual constant)

$C(x)$ - open sentence (predicate and individual variable)

x is not an individual constant but an individual variable. It does not stand for any particular individual but for any individual.

X stands for an arbitrary individual

$F(x)$ - predicate variable and individual variable

A predicate variable stands for any property

Individual term

- Constants and variables are called terms. Individual terms following the predicate are called arguments.
- The sentences below have the same logical structure: they consist of one predicate term and one individual term
- Tarzan is asleep. $A(t)$
- Tarzan surrendered. $S(t)$
- Tarzan is brave. $B(t)$
- Tarzan is a man. $M(t)$

$P(t)$

P-predicate term

t-Tarzan (individual term), argument

Sentences with more than one term

- Tarzan found a hammer. $F(t,h)$
- Tarzan admires Jane. $A(t,j)$
- Tarzan loves the monkeys. $L(t,m)$
- Tarzan is wiser than Thor. $W(t,th)$

Here the predicate takes two arguments (individual terms). This type of predicate is called two-place predicate. Predicates that take only one argument are called one-place predicate.

Predicate structure

$P(t)$ one-place

$P(t_1, t_2)$ two-place

$P(t_1, t_2, t_3)$ three-place

$P(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n)$ n-place

Tarzan gave Jane the apple.

$G(t, j, a)$

Quantifiers

Universal Quantifier \forall

- All students are clever.
- C(all students)

Problem with this representation: the expression ‘all students’ does not refer to an individual the same way as names do. We need another one.

What this sentence says is that if we find a student we expect it to be clever, or if somebody is a student, he is clever.

Universal quantifier \forall : logical constant with the meaning every/all

$$\forall x (S(x) \longrightarrow C(x))$$

How to read a statement with an universal quantifier

$$\forall(x)(S(x) \longrightarrow C(x))$$

x-any individual in a domain/universe, does not refer to any particular individual.

- \forall is a logical operator that **ranges over all individuals in a domain/universe.**
- For every x it holds that if x is a student, x is clever.
- For everything, it holds that if it is a student, it is clever
- If something is a student, then it is clever
- All students are clever/Every student is clever.

A less complex open proposition: **Everybody is clever.**

$C(x)$: a property C applies to an individual, which is a variable (not a particular one) but in which way?

How exactly do we represent this statement?

$\forall x C(x)$ -everybody has the property of being clever.

The property of being clever holds for everybody.

- $C(x)$ - x , x being any individual in a domain, has a property C .
- **Domain** {Bill, Anna, Tom}
- $x=Bill$
- $x=Anna$
- $x=Tom$

Steve? He does not belong to the domain, therefore he will not satisfy the property.

What is x, why not &?

$$\forall (x)(S(x) \rightarrow C(x))$$

The logical connective is an implication.

Why don't we use the logical connective & (conjunction)?

If we use &, we would state that every individual is both clever and student, which is not the same.

x is the same in both expressions. We say that the quantifier binds the x's.

A variable, bound by a quantifier is called a bound variable.

The parenthesis after the quantifier shows its SCOPE.

Existential quantifier - \exists

There is an x , such that x is a student.

The existential quantifier states that there is at least one member in the universe of discourse that satisfies the open sentence $S(x)$, e.g.

$\exists xS(x)$ - formula

Natural language sentences corresponding to the formula:

Some student/at least one student/a student

There exists a student.

Someone is a student. A student exists.