

## syn.1 Terms and Formulas

fol:syn:frm:  
sec Once a first-order language  $\mathcal{L}$  is given, we can define expressions built up from the basic vocabulary of  $\mathcal{L}$ . These include in particular *terms* and *formulas*.

fol:syn:frm:  
defn:terms **Definition syn.1** (Terms). The set of *terms*  $\text{Trm}(\mathcal{L})$  of  $\mathcal{L}$  is defined inductively by:

1. Every **variable** is a term.
2. Every **constant symbol** of  $\mathcal{L}$  is a term.
3. If  $f$  is an  $n$ -place **function symbol** and  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  are terms, then  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  is a term.
4. Nothing else is a term.

A term containing no **variables** is a *closed term*.

The **constant symbols** appear in our specification of the language and the terms as a separate category of symbols, but they could instead have been included as zero-place **function symbols**. We could then do without the second clause in the definition of terms. We just have to understand  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  as just  $f$  by itself if  $n = 0$ . explanation

fol:syn:frm:  
defn:formulas **Definition syn.2** (Formula). The set of *formulas*  $\text{Frm}(\mathcal{L})$  of the language  $\mathcal{L}$  is defined inductively as follows:

1.  $\perp$  is an atomic **formula**.
2.  $\top$  is an atomic **formula**.
3. If  $R$  is an  $n$ -place **predicate symbol** of  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  are terms of  $\mathcal{L}$ , then  $R(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  is an atomic **formula**.
4. If  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are terms of  $\mathcal{L}$ , then  $=(t_1, t_2)$  is an atomic **formula**.
5. If  $\varphi$  is a **formula**, then  $\neg\varphi$  is **formula**.
6. If  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are **formulas**, then  $(\varphi \wedge \psi)$  is a **formula**.
7. If  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are **formulas**, then  $(\varphi \vee \psi)$  is a **formula**.
8. If  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are **formulas**, then  $(\varphi \rightarrow \psi)$  is a **formula**.
9. If  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are **formulas**, then  $(\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi)$  is a **formula**.
10. If  $\varphi$  is a **formula** and  $x$  is a **variable**, then  $\forall x \varphi$  is a **formula**.
11. If  $\varphi$  is a **formula** and  $x$  is a **variable**, then  $\exists x \varphi$  is a **formula**.
12. Nothing else is a **formula**.

**explanation** The definitions of the set of terms and that of **formulas** are *inductive definitions*. Essentially, we construct the set of **formulas** in infinitely many stages. In the initial stage, we pronounce all atomic formulas to be formulas; this corresponds to the first few cases of the definition, i.e., the cases for  $\top$ ,  $\perp$ ,  $R(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  and  $=(t_1, t_2)$ . “Atomic **formula**” thus means any **formula** of this form.

The other cases of the definition give rules for constructing new **formulas** out of **formulas** already constructed. At the second stage, we can use them to construct **formulas** out of atomic **formulas**. At the third stage, we construct new formulas from the atomic formulas and those obtained in the second stage, and so on. A **formula** is anything that is eventually constructed at such a stage, and nothing else.

By convention, we write  $=$  between its arguments and leave out the parentheses:  $t_1 = t_2$  is an abbreviation for  $=(t_1, t_2)$ . Moreover,  $\neg=(t_1, t_2)$  is abbreviated as  $t_1 \neq t_2$ . When writing a formula  $(\psi * \chi)$  constructed from  $\psi$ ,  $\chi$  using a two-place connective  $*$ , we will often leave out the outermost pair of parentheses and write simply  $\psi * \chi$ .

**intro** Some logic texts require that the **variable**  $x$  must occur in  $\varphi$  in order for  $\exists x \varphi$  and  $\forall x \varphi$  to count as **formulas**. Nothing bad happens if you don't require this, and it makes things easier.

If we work in a language for a specific application, we will often write two-place **predicate symbols** and **function symbols** between the respective terms, e.g.,  $t_1 < t_2$  and  $(t_1 + t_2)$  in the language of arithmetic and  $t_1 \in t_2$  in the language of set theory. The successor function in the language of arithmetic is even written conventionally *after* its argument:  $t'$ . Officially, however, these are just conventional abbreviations for  $A_0^2(t_1, t_2)$ ,  $f_0^2(t_1, t_2)$ ,  $A_0^2(t_1, t_2)$  and  $f_0^1(t)$ , respectively.

**Definition syn.3** (Syntactic identity). The symbol  $\equiv$  expresses syntactic identity between strings of symbols, i.e.,  $\varphi \equiv \psi$  iff  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are strings of symbols of the same length and which contain the same symbol in each place.

The  $\equiv$  symbol may be flanked by strings obtained by concatenation, e.g.,  $\varphi \equiv (\psi \vee \chi)$  means: the string of symbols  $\varphi$  is the same string as the one obtained by concatenating an opening parenthesis, the string  $\psi$ , the  $\vee$  symbol, the string  $\chi$ , and a closing parenthesis, in this order. If this is the case, then we know that the first symbol of  $\varphi$  is an opening parenthesis,  $\varphi$  contains  $\psi$  as a substring (starting at the second symbol), that substring is followed by  $\vee$ , etc.

## Photo Credits

## Bibliography