

# Interpretation and Satisfiability in the First Order Logic

Edmund Woronowicz  
Warsaw University  
Białystok

**Summary.** The main notion discussed is satisfiability. Interpretation and some auxiliary concepts are also introduced.

MML Identifier: VALUAT\_1.

WWW: [http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/valuat\\_1.html](http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/valuat_1.html)

The articles [6], [8], [9], [2], [3], [1], [7], [5], [4], and [10] provide the notation and terminology for this paper.

In this paper  $i, k$  denote natural numbers and  $A, D$  denote non empty sets.

Let  $A$  be a set. The functor  $V(A)$  yields a set and is defined as follows:

(Def. 1)  $V(A) = A^{\text{BoundVar}}$ .

Let us consider  $A$ . Observe that  $V(A)$  is non empty and functional.

Next we state the proposition

(2)<sup>1</sup> For every set  $x$  such that  $x$  is an element of  $V(A)$  holds  $x$  is a function from  $\text{BoundVar}$  into  $A$ .

Let us consider  $A$ . Then  $V(A)$  is a non empty set of functions from  $\text{BoundVar}$  to  $A$ .

Let  $f$  be a function. We say that  $f$  is boolean-valued if and only if:

(Def. 2)  $\text{rng } f \subseteq \text{Boolean}$ .

Let us note that there exists a function which is boolean-valued.

Let  $f$  be a boolean-valued function and let  $x$  be a set. Note that  $f(x)$  is boolean.

Let  $A$  be a set. Note that every element of  $\text{Boolean}^A$  is boolean-valued.

Let  $p$  be a boolean-valued function. The functor  $\neg p$  yields a function and is defined by:

(Def. 3)  $\text{dom } \neg p = \text{dom } p$  and for every set  $x$  such that  $x \in \text{dom } p$  holds  $(\neg p)(x) = \neg p(x)$ .

Let  $q$  be a boolean-valued function. The functor  $p \wedge q$  yielding a function is defined by:

(Def. 4)  $\text{dom}(p \wedge q) = \text{dom } p \cap \text{dom } q$  and for every set  $x$  such that  $x \in \text{dom}(p \wedge q)$  holds  $(p \wedge q)(x) = p(x) \wedge q(x)$ .

Let us note that the functor  $p \wedge q$  is commutative.

Let  $p$  be a boolean-valued function. One can verify that  $\neg p$  is boolean-valued. Let  $q$  be a boolean-valued function. Observe that  $p \wedge q$  is boolean-valued.

In the sequel  $x, y$  are bound variables and  $v, v_1$  are elements of  $V(A)$ .

Let us consider  $A$  and let  $p$  be an element of  $\text{Boolean}^A$ . Then  $\neg p$  is an element of  $\text{Boolean}^A$  and it can be characterized by the condition:

---

<sup>1</sup> The proposition (1) has been removed.

(Def. 5) For every element  $x$  of  $A$  holds  $(\neg p)(x) = \neg p(x)$ .

Let  $q$  be an element of  $\mathit{Boolean}^A$ . Then  $p \wedge q$  is an element of  $\mathit{Boolean}^A$  and it can be characterized by the condition:

(Def. 6) For every element  $x$  of  $A$  holds  $(p \wedge q)(x) = p(x) \wedge q(x)$ .

Let us consider  $A$ ,  $x$  and let  $p$  be an element of  $\mathit{Boolean}^{\mathbf{V}(A)}$ . The functor  $\bigwedge_x p$  yields an element of  $\mathit{Boolean}^{\mathbf{V}(A)}$  and is defined by:

(Def. 7) For every  $v$  holds  $(\bigwedge_x p)(v) = \mathit{Boolean}(\mathit{false} \notin \{p(v'); v' \text{ ranges over elements of } \mathbf{V}(A): \bigwedge_y (x \neq y \Rightarrow v'(y) = v(y))\})$ .

The following two propositions are true:

(7)<sup>2</sup> Let  $p$  be an element of  $\mathit{Boolean}^{\mathbf{V}(A)}$ . Then  $(\bigwedge_x p)(v) = \mathit{false}$  if and only if there exists  $v_1$  such that  $p(v_1) = \mathit{false}$  and for every  $y$  such that  $x \neq y$  holds  $v_1(y) = v(y)$ .

(8) Let  $p$  be an element of  $\mathit{Boolean}^{\mathbf{V}(A)}$ . Then  $(\bigwedge_x p)(v) = \mathit{true}$  if and only if for every  $v_1$  such that for every  $y$  such that  $x \neq y$  holds  $v_1(y) = v(y)$  holds  $p(v_1) = \mathit{true}$ .

In the sequel  $l_1$  is a variables list of  $k$ .

Let us consider  $A$ ,  $k$ ,  $l_1$ ,  $v$ . Then  $v \cdot l_1$  is a finite sequence of elements of  $A$  and it can be characterized by the condition:

(Def. 8)  $\text{len}(v \cdot l_1) = k$  and for every  $i$  such that  $1 \leq i$  and  $i \leq k$  holds  $(v \cdot l_1)(i) = v(l_1(i))$ .

We introduce  $v * l_1$  as a synonym of  $v \cdot l_1$ .

Let us consider  $A$ ,  $k$ ,  $l_1$  and let  $r$  be an element of  $\text{Rel}(A)$ . The functor  $l_1 \varepsilon r$  yields an element of  $\mathit{Boolean}^{\mathbf{V}(A)}$  and is defined by:

(Def. 9) For every element  $v$  of  $\mathbf{V}(A)$  holds if  $v * l_1 \in r$ , then  $(l_1 \varepsilon r)(v) = \mathit{true}$  and if  $v * l_1 \notin r$ , then  $(l_1 \varepsilon r)(v) = \mathit{false}$ .

Let us consider  $A$ , let  $F$  be a function from CQC-WFF into  $\mathit{Boolean}^{\mathbf{V}(A)}$ , and let  $p$  be an element of CQC-WFF. Then  $F(p)$  is an element of  $\mathit{Boolean}^{\mathbf{V}(A)}$ .

Let us consider  $D$ . A function from  $\text{PredSym}$  into  $\text{Rel}(D)$  is said to be an interpretation of  $D$  if:

(Def. 10) For every element  $P$  of  $\text{PredSym}$  and for every element  $r$  of  $\text{Rel}(D)$  such that  $\text{it}(P) = r$  holds  $r = \emptyset_D$  or  $\text{Arity}(P) = \text{Arity}(r)$ .

For simplicity, we adopt the following convention:  $p$ ,  $q$ ,  $t$  denote elements of CQC-WFF,  $J$  denotes an interpretation of  $A$ ,  $P$  denotes a  $k$ -ary predicate symbol, and  $r$  denotes an element of  $\text{Rel}(A)$ .

Let us consider  $A$ ,  $k$ ,  $J$ ,  $P$ . Then  $J(P)$  is an element of  $\text{Rel}(A)$ .

Let us consider  $A$ ,  $J$ ,  $p$ . The functor  $\text{Valid}(p, J)$  yielding an element of  $\mathit{Boolean}^{\mathbf{V}(A)}$  is defined by the condition (Def. 11).

(Def. 11) There exists a function  $F$  from CQC-WFF into  $\mathit{Boolean}^{\mathbf{V}(A)}$  such that

(i)  $\text{Valid}(p, J) = F(p)$ ,

(ii)  $F(\text{VERUM}) = \mathbf{V}(A) \mapsto \mathit{true}$ , and

(iii) for all elements  $p$ ,  $q$  of CQC-WFF and for every bound variable  $x$  and for every natural number  $k$  and for every variables list  $l_1$  of  $k$  and for every  $k$ -ary predicate symbol  $P$  holds  $F(P[l_1]) = l_1 \varepsilon (J(P))$  and  $F(\neg p) = \neg F(p)$  and  $F(p \wedge q) = F(p) \wedge F(q)$  and  $F(\forall_x p) = \bigwedge_x F(p)$ .

One can prove the following propositions:

<sup>2</sup> The propositions (3)–(6) have been removed.

- (13)<sup>3</sup>  $\text{Valid}(\text{VERUM}, J) = \mathbf{V}(A) \mapsto \text{true}$ .
- (14)  $\text{Valid}(\text{VERUM}, J)(v) = \text{true}$ .
- (15)  $\text{Valid}(P[l_1], J) = l_1 \varepsilon(J(P))$ .
- (16) If  $p = P[l_1]$  and  $r = J(P)$ , then  $v * l_1 \in r$  iff  $\text{Valid}(p, J)(v) = \text{true}$ .
- (17) If  $p = P[l_1]$  and  $r = J(P)$ , then  $v * l_1 \notin r$  iff  $\text{Valid}(p, J)(v) = \text{false}$ .
- (19)<sup>4</sup>  $\text{Valid}(\neg p, J) = \neg \text{Valid}(p, J)$ .
- (20)  $\text{Valid}(\neg p, J)(v) = \neg \text{Valid}(p, J)(v)$ .
- (21)  $\text{Valid}(p \wedge q, J) = \text{Valid}(p, J) \wedge \text{Valid}(q, J)$ .
- (22)  $\text{Valid}(p \wedge q, J)(v) = \text{Valid}(p, J)(v) \wedge \text{Valid}(q, J)(v)$ .
- (23)  $\text{Valid}(\forall_x p, J) = \bigwedge_x \text{Valid}(p, J)$ .
- (24)  $\text{Valid}(p \wedge \neg p, J)(v) = \text{false}$ .
- (25)  $\text{Valid}(\neg(p \wedge \neg p), J)(v) = \text{true}$ .

Let us consider  $A, p, J, v$ . The predicate  $J, v \models p$  is defined as follows:

(Def. 12)  $\text{Valid}(p, J)(v) = \text{true}$ .

We now state a number of propositions:

- (27)<sup>5</sup>  $J, v \models P[l_1]$  iff  $(l_1 \varepsilon(J(P)))(v) = \text{true}$ .
- (28)  $J, v \models \neg p$  iff  $J, v \not\models p$ .
- (29)  $J, v \models p \wedge q$  iff  $J, v \models p$  and  $J, v \models q$ .
- (30)  $J, v \models \forall_x p$  iff  $(\bigwedge_x \text{Valid}(p, J))(v) = \text{true}$ .
- (31)  $J, v \models \forall_x p$  iff for every  $v_1$  such that for every  $y$  such that  $x \neq y$  holds  $v_1(y) = v(y)$  holds  $\text{Valid}(p, J)(v_1) = \text{true}$ .
- (32)  $\text{Valid}(\neg\neg p, J) = \text{Valid}(p, J)$ .
- (33)  $\text{Valid}(p \wedge p, J) = \text{Valid}(p, J)$ .
- (35)<sup>6</sup>  $J, v \models p \Rightarrow q$  iff  $\text{Valid}(p, J)(v) = \text{false}$  or  $\text{Valid}(q, J)(v) = \text{true}$ .
- (36)  $J, v \models p \Rightarrow q$  iff if  $J, v \models p$ , then  $J, v \models q$ .
- (37) For every element  $p$  of *Boolean*  $\mathbf{V}(A)$  such that  $(\bigwedge_x p)(v) = \text{true}$  holds  $p(v) = \text{true}$ .

Let us consider  $A, J, p$ . The predicate  $J \models p$  is defined by:

(Def. 13) For every  $v$  holds  $J, v \models p$ .

In the sequel  $w$  denotes an element of  $\mathbf{V}(A)$ .

The scheme *Lambda Val* deals with a non empty set  $\mathcal{A}$ , bound variables  $\mathcal{B}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}$ , and elements  $\mathcal{D}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}$  of  $\mathbf{V}(\mathcal{A})$ , and states that:

There exists an element  $v$  of  $\mathbf{V}(\mathcal{A})$  such that for every bound variable  $x$  such that  $x \neq \mathcal{B}$  holds  $v(x) = \mathcal{D}(x)$  and  $v(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{C})$

for all values of the parameters.

Next we state three propositions:

<sup>3</sup> The propositions (9)–(12) have been removed.

<sup>4</sup> The proposition (18) has been removed.

<sup>5</sup> The proposition (26) has been removed.

<sup>6</sup> The proposition (34) has been removed.

- (39)<sup>7</sup> If  $x \notin \text{snb}(p)$ , then for all  $v, w$  such that for every  $y$  such that  $x \neq y$  holds  $w(y) = v(y)$  holds  $\text{Valid}(p, J)(v) = \text{Valid}(p, J)(w)$ .
- (40) If  $J, v \models p$  and  $x \notin \text{snb}(p)$ , then for every  $w$  such that for every  $y$  such that  $x \neq y$  holds  $w(y) = v(y)$  holds  $J, w \models p$ .
- (41)  $J, v \models \forall_x p$  iff for every  $w$  such that for every  $y$  such that  $x \neq y$  holds  $w(y) = v(y)$  holds  $J, w \models p$ .

In the sequel  $s'$  denotes a formula.

The following propositions are true:

- (42) If  $x \neq y$  and  $p = s'(x)$  and  $q = s'(y)$ , then for every  $v$  such that  $v(x) = v(y)$  holds  $\text{Valid}(p, J)(v) = \text{Valid}(q, J)(v)$ .
- (43) If  $x \neq y$  and  $x \notin \text{snb}(s')$ , then  $x \notin \text{snb}(s'(y))$ .
- (44)  $J, v \models \text{VERUM}$ .
- (45)  $J, v \models p \wedge q \Rightarrow q \wedge p$ .
- (46)  $J, v \models (\neg p \Rightarrow p) \Rightarrow p$ .
- (47)  $J, v \models p \Rightarrow (\neg p \Rightarrow q)$ .
- (48)  $J, v \models (p \Rightarrow q) \Rightarrow (\neg(q \wedge t) \Rightarrow \neg(p \wedge t))$ .
- (49) If  $J, v \models p$  and  $J, v \models p \Rightarrow q$ , then  $J, v \models q$ .
- (50)  $J, v \models \forall_x p \Rightarrow p$ .
- (51)  $J \models \text{VERUM}$ .
- (52)  $J \models p \wedge q \Rightarrow q \wedge p$ .
- (53)  $J \models (\neg p \Rightarrow p) \Rightarrow p$ .
- (54)  $J \models p \Rightarrow (\neg p \Rightarrow q)$ .
- (55)  $J \models (p \Rightarrow q) \Rightarrow (\neg(q \wedge t) \Rightarrow \neg(p \wedge t))$ .
- (56) If  $J \models p$  and  $J \models p \Rightarrow q$ , then  $J \models q$ .
- (57)  $J \models \forall_x p \Rightarrow p$ .
- (58) If  $J \models p \Rightarrow q$  and  $x \notin \text{snb}(p)$ , then  $J \models p \Rightarrow \forall_x q$ .
- (59) For every formula  $s$  such that  $p = s(x)$  and  $q = s(y)$  and  $x \notin \text{snb}(s)$  and  $J \models p$  holds  $J \models q$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] Grzegorz Bancerek and Krzysztof Hryniewiecki. Segments of natural numbers and finite sequences. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. [http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/finseq\\_1.html](http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/finseq_1.html).
- [2] Czesław Byliński. Functions and their basic properties. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. [http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/funct\\_1.html](http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/funct_1.html).
- [3] Czesław Byliński. Functions from a set to a set. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. [http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/funct\\_2.html](http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/funct_2.html).
- [4] Czesław Byliński. A classical first order language. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 2, 1990. [http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/cqc\\_lang.html](http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/cqc_lang.html).
- [5] Piotr Rudnicki and Andrzej Trybulec. A first order language. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. [http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/qc\\_lang1.html](http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/qc_lang1.html).

<sup>7</sup> The proposition (38) has been removed.

- [6] Andrzej Trybulec. Tarski Grothendieck set theory. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, Axiomatics, 1989. <http://mizar.org/JFM/Axiomatics/tarski.html>.
- [7] Andrzej Trybulec. Function domains and Fränkel operator. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 2, 1990. <http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/fraenkel.html>.
- [8] Zinaida Trybulec. Properties of subsets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. [http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/subset\\_1.html](http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/subset_1.html).
- [9] Edmund Woronowicz. Relations and their basic properties. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. [http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/relat\\_1.html](http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/relat_1.html).
- [10] Edmund Woronowicz. Many-argument relations. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 2, 1990. <http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/margrell.html>.

*Received June 1, 1990*

*Published January 2, 2004*

---