

MATH

4215H

Completeness of First-Order Logic V

2021-04-05

①

Satisfaction in the structure

Thm: Suppose  $\Sigma$  is a maximally consistent set of sentences and  $C$  is a set of witnesses for  $\Sigma$  in the first-order language  $\mathcal{L}$ . Then there is a structure  $\mathcal{M}$  for  $\mathcal{L}$  s.t.  $\mathcal{M} \models \Sigma$ .

pf: So far, we've defined  $\mathcal{M}$  as follows:

Define an equivalence relation  $\sim$  on  $C$

by  $c \sim d \Leftrightarrow \Sigma \vdash c = d \Leftrightarrow c = d \in \Sigma$ .

Then the universe of  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $|\mathcal{M}| = \{[c]_{\sim} \mid c \in C\}$ .

For each constant symbol  $c$  of  $\mathcal{L}$ ,

$$c^{\mathcal{M}} = \begin{cases} [c]_{\sim} & \text{if } c \in C \\ [d]_{\sim} & \text{for some } d \in C \text{ s.t. } c = d \in \Sigma \\ & \text{if } c \notin C. \end{cases}$$



For each  $k$ -place function symbol  $f$  of  $\mathcal{L}$ ,

$$f^{\mathcal{M}}([c_1]_{\mathcal{E}}, \dots, [c_k]_{\mathcal{E}}) = [c]_{\mathcal{E}}$$

for a  $c \in C$  s.t.  $\sum_1 \vdash c = f_{c_1, \dots, c_k}$   
( $\text{i.e. } c = f_{c_1, \dots, c_k} \in \Sigma_1$ )

For each  $k$ -place relation symbol of  $\mathcal{L}$ ,

$P^{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq |\mathcal{M}|^k$  is given by

$$P^{\mathcal{M}} = \{ ([c_1]_{\mathcal{E}}, \dots, [c_k]_{\mathcal{E}}) \in |\mathcal{M}|^k \mid \sum_1 \vdash P_{c_1, \dots, c_k} \}$$

( $\text{i.e. } P_{c_1, \dots, c_k} \in \Sigma_1$ )

[Checking that  $\mathcal{M}$  is well-defined,  $\text{i.e.}$  that the definitions of  $f^{\mathcal{M}}$ ,  $c^{\mathcal{M}}$ ,  $P^{\mathcal{M}}$  don't depend on the particular representatives chosen from each equivalence class is left to the interested reader.]



We need to show that for any formula  $\varphi$  of  $\mathcal{L}$  and assignment  $s: V \rightarrow |\mathcal{M}|$ , we have

(3)

$$(*) \quad \Sigma_1 \vDash \varphi[s] \iff \Sigma_1 \vDash \varphi_{x_1, \dots, x_n}^{c_1, \dots, c_n} \iff \varphi_{x_1, \dots, x_n}^{c_1, \dots, c_n} \in \Sigma_1$$

where  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  are all the free variables of  $\varphi$   
 $\& c_i$  is given by  $s(x_i) = [c_i]_{\mathcal{M}}$ .

Lemma: If  $s: V \rightarrow |\mathcal{M}|$  is an assignment and  $f$  is a  $k$ -place fn. symbol of  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $t_1, \dots, t_k$  are terms of  $\mathcal{L}$ , then

$$\bar{s}(ft_1 \dots t_k) = f^{\mathcal{M}}(\underbrace{\bar{s}(t_1)}_{[c_1]_{\mathcal{M}}}, \dots, \underbrace{\bar{s}(t_k)}_{[c_k]_{\mathcal{M}}})$$

(by defn.)  $= [c]_{\mathcal{M}}$

s.t.  $\Sigma_1 \vDash a = fc_1 \dots c_k$  ( $\exists c = fc_1 \dots c_k \in \Sigma_1$ ).

pf: By def'n. //



We'll prove (\*) by induction on how formulas are built, i.e. on the number  $n$  of quantifiers &/or connectives in  $\varphi$ . (4)

Base Step: ( $n=0$ )  $\varphi$  has no connectives or quantifiers, so it is atomic, i.e.  $\varphi$  is (1)  $t_1 = t_2$  for some terms  $t_1$  &  $t_2$  or (2)  $\varphi$  is  $P t_1 \dots t_k$  for some  $k$ -place relation symbol  $P$  of  $\mathcal{L}$ .

$$(1) \Sigma_1 \Vdash t_1 = t_2 [s] \Leftrightarrow \bar{s}(t_1) = \bar{s}(t_2) = [c]_n \quad \text{for some } c \in \mathcal{C}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \Sigma_1 \Vdash c = t_1 \quad \begin{matrix} x_1, \dots, x_k \\ c_1, \dots, c_k \end{matrix}$$

for the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  occurring in  $t_1$  &  $t_2$  & constants  $c_1, \dots, c_k \in \mathcal{C}$

$$\& \Sigma_1 \Vdash c = t_2 \quad \begin{matrix} x_1, \dots, x_k \\ c_1, \dots, c_k \end{matrix}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \Sigma_1 \Vdash (t_1 = t_2) \quad \begin{matrix} x_1, \dots, x_k \\ c_1, \dots, c_k \end{matrix}$$

[This follows from the lemma.]

(2) Similarly for  $P t_1 \dots t_k, \dots$



Inductive Hypothesis: Assume that  $\Sigma_n \models \varphi [s]$  (5)  
 ( $n \leq m$ )  $\Leftrightarrow \Sigma_n \vdash \varphi$  <sup>atomic</sup> <sub>connectives</sub>  
 for all formulas  $\varphi$  with  $n \leq m$  ~~free~~ <sup>connectives</sup> <sub>quantifiers</sub>  
 & all assignments  $s: V \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ .

Inductive Step: ( $n = m+1$ ) Suppose  $\varphi$  has  $m+1$  connectives  
 &/or quantifiers.

Three cases:

- (1)  $\varphi$  is  $(\neg \alpha)$  for some  $\alpha$
- (2)  $\varphi$  is  $(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$  — " —  $\alpha$  &  $\beta$
- (3)  $\varphi$  is  $\forall x \alpha$  — " —  $\alpha$ .

More next time!