

---

**From:** Martin Doerr <martin@ics.forth.gr>  
**Sent:** 22 March 2022 12:39  
**To:** Christian-Emil Smith Ore  
**Subject:** Re: statement for the .1 properties

I agree in all points!

On 3/22/2022 1:33 PM, Christian-Emil Smith Ore wrote:

I have two non-logical comments

From a technical point of view the following is correct and unproblematic.  
The property P14.1 in the role of is described as the ternary predicate symbol corresponding to property P14 carried out by (performed) :

$P14(x,y) \Rightarrow E7(x)$

$P14(x,y) \Rightarrow E39(y)$

$P14(x,y,z) \Rightarrow [P14(x,y) \wedge E55(z)]$

When I read it now, may be easier to understand if there is a adjustment as indicated in green

Properties of properties, indicated by a '.1' after the property number are described as ternary predicate symbols. For example, the property P14.1 *in the role of* is described as the ternary predicate symbol corresponding to property P14 carried out by (performed) :

$P14(x,y) \Rightarrow E7(x)$

$P14(x,y) \Rightarrow E39(y)$

$P14(x,y,z) \Rightarrow [P14(x,y) \wedge E55(z)]$

\*\*\*\*\*

Add at the end of "Property Quantifiers" :

Note that the quantification of all properties of properties, ".1 properties", is "many to many", and therefore does not appear explicitly in their definitions. In this sentence there may be too much use of ellipsis in the second half.

Note that the quantification of all properties of properties, ".1 properties", is "many to many", and therefore quantification does not appear explicitly in definitions of '.1' properties.

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1sLxnAZM5fvCqUGBxk-jGfxWyZ2doOXFnHTJHQwr\\_Kco/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1sLxnAZM5fvCqUGBxk-jGfxWyZ2doOXFnHTJHQwr_Kco/edit)