# UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

# Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences

Examination in: MAT-INF3600 — Mathematical logic.

Day of examination: Wednesday, December 18, 2019.

Examination hours: 14:30 – 18:30.

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 P and Q be unary relation symbols. Let R be a binary relation symbol. Let c be a constant symbol. Let f be a unary function symbol. Furthermore, x and y denote variables.

# Problem 1 (weight 10 %)

Let  $\Sigma = \{ \neg Qc, \forall x[Px \rightarrow Qx] \}$ . Give a full  $\Sigma$ -deduction of  $\neg \forall x[Px]$ . Name all the logical axioms and inference rules involved in the deduction.

# Problem 2 (weight 10 %)

Let  $\Sigma' = \{ \neg Qc, \forall x[Px \rightarrow Qx], \forall x[Px] \}$ . Is  $\Sigma'$  consistent? Does  $\Sigma'$  have a model? Give a brief justification of your answers.

# Problem 3 (weight 20 %)

**Twenty Questions:** Answer each question with a YES or a NO (and nothing else). If you do not answer a question, your answer to that question will be considered as wrong.

- 1. Does  $\forall x[Qx]$  follow tautologically from  $\{ \ \forall x[Px] \rightarrow \forall x[Qx] \,,\, \forall x[Px] \ \}$ ?
- 2. Does  $\forall x[Qx]$  follow logically from  $\{ \forall x[Px] \rightarrow \forall x[Qx], \forall x[Px] \}$ ?
- 3. Does Qc follow tautologically from  $\{ \forall x[Px] \rightarrow \forall x[Qx], \forall x[Px] \}$ ?
- 4. Does Qc follow logically from  $\{ \forall x[Px] \rightarrow \forall x[Qx], \forall x[Px] \}$ ?
- 5. Does  $\forall x[Px \to Qx]$  follow logically from  $\{ \forall x[Px] \to \forall x[Qx], \forall x[Px] \}$ ?

- 6. Does  $\forall x[Px] \to \forall x[Qx]$  follow logically from  $\{ \forall x[Px \to Qx], \forall x[Px] \}$ ?
- 7. Does  $\forall x[Px \to Qx]$  follow logically from  $\{ \forall x[Px] \to \forall x[Qx] \}$ ?
- 8. Does  $\forall x[Px] \rightarrow \forall x[Qx]$  follow logically from  $\{ \ \forall x[Px \rightarrow Qx] \ \}$ ?
- 9. Does  $\exists y \forall x [Rxy]$  follow logically from  $\{ \forall x [Rxfx] \}$ ?
- 10. Does  $\forall x \exists y [Rxy]$  follow logically from  $\{ \forall x [Rxfx] \}$ ?
- 11. Does  $\exists y \forall x [Rxy]$  follow logically from  $\{ \forall x [Rxc] \}$ ?
- 12. Does  $\forall x \exists y [Rxy]$  follow logically from  $\{ \forall x [Rxc] \}$ ?
- 13. Does Qf(c) follow tautologically from  $\{ \forall x[Px \to Qx], \forall x[Px] \to \forall x[Qx] \}$ ?
- 14. Does Qf(c) follow logically from  $\{ \forall x[Px \to Qx], \forall x[Px] \to \forall x[Qx] \}$ ?
- 15. Does  $Pc \to \forall x[Qx]$  follow logically from  $\{Pc \to Qx\}$ ?
- 16. Does  $Px \to \forall x[Qx]$  follow logically from  $\{Px \to Qx\}$ ?
- 17. Does  $\exists x[Px] \to \forall x[Qx]$  follow logically from  $\{Px \to \forall x[Qx]\}$ ?
- 18. Does x = x follow logically from  $\emptyset$ ?
- 19. Does x = y follow logically from  $\emptyset$ ?
- 20. Does  $\neg x = y$  follow logically from  $\emptyset$ ?

# Part II

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the first-order language  $\{\leq, f, c\}$  where  $\leq$  is a binary relation symbol, f is a binary function symbol and c is a constant symbol. Let T be the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory consisting of the non-logical axioms

- $(T_1) \ \forall xy [\ \neg c = f(x,y)\ ]$
- $(T_2) \ \forall x_1 x_2 y_1 y_2 [\ f(x_1, x_2) = f(y_1, y_2) \ \rightarrow \ (x_1 = y_1 \land x_2 = y_2) \ ]$
- $(T_3) \ \forall x [\ x \leq c \leftrightarrow x = c \ ]$
- $(T_4) \ \forall xy_1y_2 [\ x \leq f(y_1, y_2) \ \leftrightarrow \ (\ x = f(y_1, y_2) \lor x \leq y_1 \lor x \leq y_2) \ ].$

#### Problem 4 (weight 10 %)

Show that

$$T \vdash \neg f(c,c) = f(f(c,c),c)$$
.

Sketch a formal deduction.

## Problem 5 (weight 10 %)

Show that

$$T \vdash \neg s = t$$
.

for any variable-free  $\mathcal{L}$ -terms s, t where  $s \neq t$  (so s and t are not syntactically equal). Use induction on the structure of s.

**Lemma 1.** For any variable-free  $\mathcal{L}$ -terms s and t, we have  $T \vdash s \leq t$  or  $T \vdash \neg s \leq t$ .

# Problem 6 (weight 10 %)

Prove Lemma 1. Use induction on the structure of t.

## Problem 7 (weight 10 %)

Let  $\phi$  be a quantifier-free and variable-free  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula. Prove that we have  $T \vdash \phi$  or  $T \vdash \neg \phi$ . Use Lemma 1.

## Problem 8 (weight 10 %)

Do we have  $T \vdash \forall x [\neg x = f(x, x)]$ ? Justify your answer.

We say that an  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  is *ill-founded* if its universe contains elements  $a_0, a_1, a_2, \ldots$  such that  $a_{i+1} \neq a_i$  and  $a_{i+1} \leq^{\mathfrak{A}} a_i$  (for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ).

#### Problem 9 (weight 10 %)

Explain why any consistent extension of T has an ill-founded model.

END