

Exercises for the Lecture Logics  
Sheet 11

Prof. Dr. Klaus Madlener

Delivery until 13. Juli 2011 10:00 Uhr

**Exercise 1:** [Axiomatisation, tutorial]

1. Define a first-order-formula  $A_n$ , such that every interpretation satisfying  $A_n$  has exactly  $n$  elements. More precisely, in every interpretation satisfying  $A_n$ , the domain  $D$  has exactly  $n$  elements.
2. Define a first-order-formula  $A_\infty$ , such that every satisfying interpretation of  $A_\infty$  has infinitely many elements.
3. Prove that the compactness theorem does not hold for second order predicate logic.

**Exercise 2:** [Deductions in  $\mathcal{F}$ , 2+2P]

Prove:

1.  $\forall x[p(x, y)], y = z \vdash_{\mathcal{F}} \forall x[p(x, z)]$ .
2.  $\forall x[p(x) \rightarrow q(x)], \forall x[p(x)] \vdash_{\mathcal{F}} q(f(a))$

**Exercise 3:** [Soundness of  $\mathcal{F}'$ , 4+1P]

1. Prove that the generalisation rule is sound.
2. As mentioned in the lecture, the proposition  $\Sigma \vdash_{\mathcal{F}'} A \rightsquigarrow \Sigma \vdash_{\mathcal{F}} A$  *does not generally hold*. This means that there are conclusions from  $\Sigma$  which can be deduced in  $\mathcal{F}'$ , but not in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Why does this result not contradict the fact that both systems are sound?

**Exercise 4:** [Theories, 3+3P]

Prove:

1. Let  $M$  be a first-order-theory. There is an interpretation  $I$  that satisfies  $M$ , iff  $M$  is consistent.
2. If  $T$  is a consistent, incomplete first-order-theory, then for every closed formula  $A$  with  $A, \neg A \notin \Sigma$ , both  $T_{T \cup \{A\}}$  and  $T_{T \cup \{\neg A\}}$  are consistent theories.
3. Let  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  be first-order theories. If  $T_1 \subsetneq T_2$  and  $T_1$  complete, then  $T_2$  inconsistent.

**Exercise 5:** [Theories, 5P]

Let  $T$  be a consistent, incomplete first-order-theory. Prove that there are at least two different relational structures satisfying  $T$ .

**Exercise 6:** [Non standard models, 5P]

Prove that there are non-standard-models for the Peano axioms (slide 220). I.e. prove that there is an interpretation that satisfies the Peano axioms but that is not isomorphic to  $\mathbb{N}$ .

**Hint:** Consider the following extended axiom system and apply the compactness theorem:

$$P^* := P \cup \{A_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

where  $A_i \equiv \exists z [S^i(0) + z = \infty]$ .  $\infty$  is a new constant and  $S^i(0)$  is the  $i$ -fold application of  $S$  to 0. I.e.  $S^3(0) \equiv S(S(S(0)))$ .

**Exercise 7:** [Axiomatisation, 1+3+5P]

Characterise propositional logic (with the operators  $\neg$ ,  $\wedge$ , and  $\vee$  and with the constants *true* and *false*) using predicate logic. Do the following:

1. Find a suitable language of predicate logic, s.t. every term represents a boolean formula.
2. Find Axioms that characterise the boolean operators. I.e. if two terms  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are equivalent in propositional logic and if an interpretation  $I$  satisfies your axioms, then  $I(t_1) = I(t_2)$  must hold.
3. Find axioms for the predicate constants  $taut(x)$ ,  $uns(x)$ ,  $conc(x)$ , and  $eq(x, y)$  such that
  - $\Sigma \models taut(t)$  iff  $t$  is a propositional tautology.
  - $\Sigma \models uns(t)$  iff  $t$  is unsatisfiable in propositional logic.
  - $\Sigma \models conc(t_1, t_2)$  iff  $t_1 \models t_2$  holds in propositional logic.
  - $\Sigma \models eq(t_1, t_2)$  iff  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are equivalent in propositional logic.

$\Sigma$  is the set of your axioms in (2) and (3). Argue for the soundness of your axioms. How would you formally prove the soundness?

**Delivery:** until 13. Juli 2011 10:00 Uhr into the box next to room 34-401.4