## Mathematical Logic Homework 5

## Ding Yaoyao

## October 26, 2018

Solution 5.1. Because  $\Phi$  is inconsistent, for any  $\varphi$ ,  $\Phi \vdash \varphi$ . Then by the definition of  $\sim$  relation, there is only one element of the universe  $T^{\Phi}$  and the only element is the whole set of the terms  $T^S$ . Let e denote the lonely element. For any relation R, we have  $(e, \ldots, e) \in R$  because  $\Phi \vdash R(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ . For any function f, because we have only one element in universe,  $f(e, \ldots, e) = e$ . For any constant e,  $e^{\Phi} = e$ .

Solution 5.2. (1) Let's construct a S-interpretation  $\mathfrak I$  that is satisfied by the  $\Phi$ . Let the universe  $A = \{a, b\}$  and  $a \in R, b \notin R$ . Let  $\beta(x) = b$  for all  $x \in A$ . Then  $\mathfrak I \models \Phi$ . Because  $\Phi$  is satisfiable, then  $\Phi$  is consistent.

(2) Because no function and constant symbol exists,  $T^S$  only contains variables (i.e.  $T^S = \{v_0, v_1, \dots\}$ ). Then  $\neg Rt \in \Phi$ . By the lemma 2.6.a in Logic 5.pdf,  $\Phi \vdash Rt$  is equivalent to that  $\Phi \cup \{\neg Rt\}$  is inconsistent. Because  $\neg Rt \in \Phi$ , then  $\Phi \cup \{\neg Rt\} = \Phi$ . By (1),  $\Phi$  is consistent, which is a contradiction. So such term  $t \in T^S$  does not exist.

Solution 5.3. (1) Let's construct a S-interpretation  $\mathfrak{I}$  that is satisfied by  $\Phi$ . Let the universe  $A = \{a\}$  and  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $\mathfrak{I} \models \Phi$ .

- (2) It's equivalent to show that  $\Phi \cup \{\neg Rx\}$  and  $\Phi \cup \{\neg Ry\}$  are consistent by lemma 2.6.a. Let's prove  $\Phi \cup \{\neg Rx\}$  is consistent and the proof of  $\Phi \cup \{\neq Ry\}$  is completely the same. Let the universe  $A = \{a, b\}$ ,  $a \in R, b \notin R$  and  $\beta(x) = a$  and  $\beta(y) = b$ . Then  $\Im \models Rx \vee Ry$  and  $\Im \models \neg Rx$ . Then  $\Im \models \Phi \cup \{\neg Rx\}$  is consistent.
- (3) Because  $\Phi \not\vdash Rx$ , then  $\mathfrak{T}^{\Phi} \not\models Rx$ . Similarly,  $\mathfrak{T}^{\Phi} \not\models Ry$ . Thus  $\mathfrak{T}^{\Phi} \not\models Rx \lor Ry$ , which means  $\mathfrak{T}^{\Phi} \not\models \Phi$ .