Semantic WFF(x) specified syntactically

According to Wikipedia: x ⊨ y is a semantic rather than syntactic relationship. I specify this relationship as syntactic because I can see how this relationship can be formalized using Rudolf Carnap (1952) Meaning Postulates.

Hypothesis:
WFF(x) can be applied to the semantics of formalized declarative sentences such that:
WFF(x) ↔ (~True(x) ↔ False(x)) // (see proof sketch below)
For clarity we focus on atomic propositions expressing a single relation between two Things.

Alfred Tarski: // metalanguage M defines expressions in object language L
∀x True(x) ↔ φ(x) // Tarski's Formal correctness of True(x) formula

Sketch of a proof of the hypothesis:
Thing : Relation : Binary-Relation // inheritance hierarchy
∀a ∈ Binary-Relation ∃b ∈ types & ∃c ∈ types | Compatible-Types(a, b, c)

Get-Binary-Relation(x) ↦ (binary-relation ∈ Binary-Relation ∨ Ø)
∀x True(x) ↔ φ(x) // Tarski's Formal correctness of True(x) formula
φ(x) ↔ WFF(x) & binary-relation(arg1, arg2)
WFF(x) ↔ (Get-Binary-Relation(x) & Compatible-Types(binary-relation, arg1, arg2))

Truth Teller Paradox: "This sentence is true" ↔ x ⊨ True(x)
To evaluate True(x) we begin with WFF(x) corresponding to:
(a) Binary-Relation(x) == true // Logical-Entailment is a binary relation
(b) Compatible-Types(Logical-Entailment, x, True(x))
The second argument to Logical-Entailment specifies infinite recursion, thus ~WFF(x).