

Analysis of Polyadic Arguments;
Instances of Quantificational Schemata

I. Two Polyadic Arguments

A. Argument 1

1. Some logicians are philosophers
2. Some logicians respect no philosopher
3. THEREFORE, some logicians are not respected by all logicians.

B. Argument 2.

1. Any philosopher who isn't a logician is respected by a logician.
2. No logician respects all philosophers.
3. THEREFORE, a philosopher not respected by all logicians is a logician.

II. Notation for talking about **arbitrary** quantificational schemata.

A. I will from now on write " $\Phi(u)$ ", " $(\forall u)\Phi(u)$," and " $(\exists u)\Phi(u)$ " to indicate arbitrary schemata with certain properties.

B. In this notation, " u " indicates an arbitrary, unspecified variable: for example,

1. " x "
2. " y "
3. " z "
4. " w ", etc.

C. " $\Phi(u)$ " indicates an arbitrary, unspecified, *open* schema, with " u " the unspecified free variable: for example,

1. " Fx "
2. " $Gy \supset Hy$ "
3. " $Fz \equiv Hz \vee Gz$ ", etc.

D. " $(\forall u)\Phi(u)$," and " $(\exists u)\Phi(u)$ " indicate arbitrary simple quantificational schemata, where the unspecified variable " u " is the same after the quantifier and in $\Phi(u)$, for example:

1. " $(\forall y)(Gy \supset Hy)$ "
2. " $(\exists z)(Fz \equiv Hz \vee Gw)$ ", etc.

E. The last example shows that by writing " $\Phi(u)$ " I indicate that *at least* " u " occurs as a free variable in " Φ ", but there may be other free variable in " Φ " as well.

III. Substitution Instances

A. If we start with an open sentence " $\Phi(x)$," " $\Phi(y)$," called a **SUBSTITUTION INSTANCE** of $\Phi(x)$, is the open sentence that satisfies the two following requirements:

1. “ $\Phi(y)$ ” results from “ $\Phi(x)$ ” by replacing all **FREE** occurrences of “ x ” in “ $\Phi(x)$ ” by “ y ”; i.e., substituting “ y ” for all **FREE** occurrences of “ x ”.
2. No occurrence of “ y ” that results from this substitution is bound by a quantifier.

IV. Regular and Irregular Substitution Instances:

- A. If a substitution instance contains more free occurrences of the new variable than the original schema contained of the original free variable, it is an **IRREGULAR SUBSTITUTION INSTANCE**.
- B. If a substitution instance and original schemata contain the same number of occurrences of their respective free variables, then the instance is a **REGULAR SUBSTITUTION INSTANCE**.

V. Instances of quantified schemata, Conservative and Nonconservative:

- A. “ $\Phi(y)$ ” is an **INSTANCE** of “ $(\forall x)\Phi(x)$ ” if “ $\Phi(y)$ ” is a **SUBSTITUTION INSTANCE** of “ $\Phi(x)$ ”.
- B. “ $\Phi(y)$ ” is a **CONSERVATIVE INSTANCE** of “ $(\forall x)\Phi(x)$ ” if $\Phi(y)$ is a **regular** substitution of $\Phi(x)$.
- C. “ $\Phi(y)$ ” is a **NON-CONSERVATIVE INSTANCE** of “ $(\forall x)\Phi(x)$ ” if $\Phi(y)$ is a **irregular** substitution of $\Phi(x)$.
- D. Similarly for “ $\Phi(y)$ ” and “ $(\exists x)\Phi(x)$ ”.

VI. Alphabetic Variants

- A. Suppose that “ $\Phi(u)$ ” and “ $\Phi(v)$ ” are substitution instances of one another.
- B. Then “ $(\forall u)\Phi(u)$ ” and “ $(\forall v)\Phi(v)$ ” are **ALPHABETIC VARIANTS** of one another, as are “ $(\exists u)\Phi(u)$ ” and “ $(\exists v)\Phi(v)$ ”.

VII. Test your understanding of Instances and Alphabetic Variants

- A. Is $Fzz \supset (\exists y)Gzy$ an instance of $(\forall x)[Fxx \supset (\exists y)Gxy]$?
- B. Consider the schema

$$(\exists x)[((\forall y)Fyy.(\exists z)Gzx) \vee (\exists w)Hxwt]$$

Are the following all instances? Which of the instances are conservative?

1. $((\forall y)Fyy.(\exists z)Gzs) \vee (\exists w)Hswt$
 2. $((\forall y)Fyy.(\exists z)Gzt) \vee (\exists w)Htw$
 3. $((\forall y)Fyy.(\exists z)Gzz) \vee (\exists w)Hxwt$
 4. $((\forall y)Fyy.(\exists z)Gzy) \vee (\exists w)Hywt$
- C. Are $(\forall z)[Fzz \supset (\exists y)Gzy]$ and $(\forall x)[Fxx \supset (\exists y)Gxy]$ alphabetic variants?