## Problem Set 12 (24.241 Symbolic Logic)

## Due Saturday Dec. 3rd by Noon Eastern Please scan and upload to Canvas as a pdf

Note: the last four questions are really straightforward and can be answered succinctly. The first two require more work. Unless noted otherwise, let ' $\vdash$ ' stand for ' $\vdash_{SND}$ '

Question 0: if you worked with up to two classmates, please list their names!

- 1. In our inductive proof of the soundness of SND, prove the case where the sentence  $P_{k+1}$  is justified by Negation Elimination. [14pts] (this is the missing 'Case 10' in the *Logic Book*'s proof of soundness, p. 249).
- 2. Prove missing case (c) of Theorem 6.4.11 on p. 258 of the *Logic Book*, Chapter 6. i.e. If  $\Gamma^*$  is a maximally consistent set in SND and P and Q are two arbitrary wffs of SL, prove that  $(P \vee Q) \in \Gamma^*$  if and only if either  $P \in \Gamma^*$  or  $Q \in \Gamma^*$ . [28pts]
  - Note that you have to prove **BOTH directions** of this if-and-only-if statement!
  - In your proof, you will probably appeal to a schematic SND derivation, and you **MUST PROVIDE** this derivation (see bottom of p. 258 for examples)
- 3. Prove missing case (3) of Theorem 6.4.8 on p. 259-260 of the *Logic Book*. [20pts] i.e. Show that a sentence of the form  $Q \vee R$  with k+1-many connectives is true on the truth value assignment  $\mathbf{A}^*$  if and only if the sentence  $Q \vee R$  belongs to a given maximally consistent set of sentences  $\Gamma^*$ . Where here " $\mathbf{A}^*$ " is defined as the TVA that assigns True to every atomic sentence in  $\Gamma^*$  and False to every atomic sentence not in  $\Gamma^*$ . (Note that you will ultimately appeal to what you have just shown in the prior problem)
- 4. Let S be a sentence of SL and  $\Gamma$  an *infinite* set of SL sentences. Using the completeness and soundness theorems (but **NOT** compactness), prove the following: if  $\Gamma \vDash S$ , then there is some *finite* set  $\Delta \subset \Gamma$  such that  $\Delta \vDash S$ . [14pts]
- 5. Using the soundness theorem, show that you cannot SND-derive two contradictory sentences R and  $\sim R$  from just the atomic sentence B. (i.e. prove that the set  $\{B\}$  is "consistent in SND".) [14pts]
- 6. Say that we add a new rule  $R^*$  to the rules of SND, to form a larger system SND\*, equipped with its own single turnstile  $\Gamma \vdash_{SND^*} S$  for "S is derivable from the set  $\Gamma$  using the rules of SND\*".

Say that there is a set  $\Gamma$  of sentences of SL and a sentence S of SL such that  $\Gamma \vdash_{SND^*} S$  but  $\Gamma \nvdash_{SND} S$  (i.e. we can derive S from  $\Gamma$  in SND\* but not in SND).

Prove that SND\* is an unsound system of rules. [10pts]