

# UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences

Examination in: MAT-INF3600 — Mathematical logic.

Day of examination: Friday, December 15, 2017.

Examination hours: 9:00–13:00.

This problem set consists of 3 pages.

Appendices: None.

Permitted aids: None.

Please make sure that your copy of the problem set is complete before you attempt to answer anything.

## Part I

Let  $R$  and  $S$  be a unary relation symbols, and let  $a$  be a constant symbol. Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the language  $\{a, R, S\}$ .

### Problem 1

State the Soundness Theorem for first-order logic. State the Completeness Theorem for first-order logic.

### Problem 2

Let  $\phi$  be an  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula such that  $\not\vdash \phi$ . Explain why there exists an  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  such that  $\mathfrak{A} \not\models \phi$ . Give a brief answer.

### Problem 3

Below you will find six  $\mathcal{L}$ -formulas ( $\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \phi_4, \phi_5, \phi_6$ ). For each formula  $\phi_i$ , we either have  $\vdash \phi_i$  or  $\not\vdash \phi_i$ . If  $\vdash \phi_i$ , you should give a detailed deduction of  $\phi_i$  (name all the axioms and inference rules involved in the deduction). If  $\not\vdash \phi_i$ , you should give an  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  such that  $\mathfrak{A} \not\models \phi_i$ .

- $\phi_1 := Ra \rightarrow (Sa \rightarrow Ra)$
- $\phi_2 := \exists x[Rx] \rightarrow \exists x[Sx \rightarrow Rx]$
- $\phi_3 := \forall x[Rx] \rightarrow \forall x[Sx \rightarrow Rx]$
- $\phi_4 := \exists x[Sx \rightarrow Rx] \rightarrow \exists x[Rx]$
- $\phi_5 := \forall x[Sx \rightarrow Rx] \rightarrow \forall x[Rx]$

(Continued on page 2.)

- $\phi_6 := (\forall x[Rx] \rightarrow Ra) \vee (\forall x[Sx \rightarrow Rx] \rightarrow \forall x[Rx])$

## Part II

Let  $<$  be a binary relation symbol, let  $S$  be unary function symbols, and let  $0$  be a constant symbol. Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the language  $\{0, S, <\}$ . Let  $T$  be the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory where we have the following non-logical axioms:

$$(T_1) \quad \forall x[\neg Sx = 0]$$

$$(T_2) \quad \forall xy[Sx = Sy \rightarrow x = y]$$

$$(T_3) \quad \forall x[\neg Sx = x]$$

$$(T_4) \quad \forall x[\neg x < 0]$$

$$(T_5) \quad \forall xy[x < Sy \leftrightarrow (x < y \vee x = y)]$$

## Problem 4

Prove that the axiom  $T_3$  is independent of the other axioms of  $T$ , that is, prove that

$$\{T_1, T_2, T_4, T_5\} \not\vdash T_3 \quad \text{and} \quad \{T_1, T_2, T_4, T_5\} \not\vdash \neg T_3 .$$

Let  $\phi(x)$  be any  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula (as usual  $\phi(t)$  denotes  $\phi(x)$  where every free occurrence of the variable  $x$  is replaced by the term  $t$ ). We will consider three axiom schemes.

**The scheme of Zero Intolerance.** This is the scheme

$$\forall x[\phi(Sx)] \rightarrow \forall x[\phi(x)] \tag{Z}$$

The theory  $T_Z$  is the theory  $T$  extended by this axiom scheme.

**The scheme of Pseudo Induction.** This is the scheme

$$(\phi(0) \wedge \forall x[\phi(Sx)]) \rightarrow \forall x[\phi(x)] \tag{P}$$

The theory  $T_P$  is the theory  $T$  extended by this axiom scheme.

**The scheme of Induction.** This is the scheme

$$(\phi(0) \wedge \forall x[\phi(x) \rightarrow \phi(Sx)]) \rightarrow \forall x[\phi(x)] \tag{I}$$

The theory  $T_I$  is the theory  $T$  extended by this axiom scheme.

## Problem 5

Give a  $T_Z$ -deduction of  $\neg 0 = 0$ . Give a full deduction. Name all the axioms and inference rules involved in the deduction.

(Continued on page 3.)

### Problem 6

Explain why we have  $T_Z \vdash \theta$  for every  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula  $\theta$ .

### Problem 7

Prove that

$$T_P \vdash \forall x[x = 0 \vee \exists y[Sy = x]] .$$

Sketch a  $T_P$ -deduction of the formula. Name all the non-logical axioms involved in the deduction.

### Problem 8

Prove that

$$T \not\vdash \forall x[x = 0 \vee \exists y[Sy = x]] .$$

### Problem 9

Let  $\theta$  be any  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula. Prove that  $T_P \vdash \theta$  implies  $T_I \vdash \theta$  .

### Problem 10

Does it exist an  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula  $\eta$  such that  $T_I \vdash \eta$  and  $T_P \not\vdash \eta$ ? Justify your answer. If you can, prove that your answer is correct.

END