

1. Suppose $L(x)$ means “x is a logician”, $C(x)$ means “x is a celebrity” and $R(x)$ means “x is a rich”, $S(x)$ means “x is a computer scientist”.

Translate the following sentences in predicate logic:

- (a) No logicians are celebrities.
- (b) Some celebrities are not logicians.
- (c) All rich logicians are computer scientists.
- (d) Not all logicians are computer scientists.
- (e) Some logicians are rich computer scientists.

Marking scheme: 2 marks for each correct formulation.

2. Which of the following structures are models for the formula:

$$\exists x \exists y \exists z (R(x, y) \wedge R(z, y) \wedge R(x, z) \wedge \neg R(z, x))$$

- (a) $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{M}} = \mathbb{N}, R^{\mathcal{M}} = \{(m, n) \mid m, n \in \mathbb{N}, m < n\})$
- (b) $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{M}} = \mathbb{N}, R^{\mathcal{M}} = \{(m, m + 1) \mid m \in \mathbb{N}\})$
- (c) $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{M}} = 2^{\mathbb{N}}, R^{\mathcal{M}} = \{(A, B) \mid A, B \subseteq \mathbb{N}, A \subseteq B\})$

Note : Here, \mathbb{N} denotes the set of natural numbers (it has 0 in it) and $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ denotes the powerset of natural numbers.

Marking scheme: (a) 3 marks (b) 4 marks (c) 3 marks.

3. Prove or disprove the following:

- (a) $(\forall x \alpha \vee \forall x \beta) \models \forall x (\alpha \vee \beta)$ *This can be proved.*
- (b) $\forall x (\alpha \vee \beta) \models (\forall x \alpha \vee \forall x \beta)$ *Disprove this with a counterexample.*

Marking scheme: 5 marks each.

4. Show that $\{\forall x \exists y (P(x) \vee Q(y))\} \models \exists y \forall x (P(x) \vee Q(y))$.

5. If $\Gamma \vdash \alpha_1, \dots, \Gamma \vdash \alpha_n$ and $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\} \models \beta$ then $\Gamma \vdash \beta$.

Marking scheme: This proof requires repeated application of modus ponens. If you have not done this 3 marks are deducted. Marks are deducted for gaps in the proof.

6. Give a proof in the proof system for FOL discussed in the class:

$$\forall x (F(x) \implies G(x)), \forall x (G(x) \implies H(x)) \vdash \forall x (F(x) \implies H(x))$$

Marking scheme: A fully formal proof without any shortcuts or gaps gets 10 marks. Marks are cut if you do not support how a particular appears in the proof. For example if you use generalization theorem, but fail to write it, marks are deducted.

7. Consider the formula: $\phi = \alpha \wedge \beta \wedge \gamma$ where

$$\alpha = \forall x R(x, f(x)) \text{ and } \beta = \forall y \neg R(y, y) \\ \text{and } \gamma = \forall u \forall v \forall w ((R(u, v) \wedge R(v, w)) \implies R(u, w)).$$

Prove or disprove: (a) Formula ϕ is satisfiable. (b) ϕ has a finite model.

Model Ans(a): Set of natural numbers, with R as $<$ (*lessthan*) and f as successor relation.

Model Ans(b): It can not have a model of finite size. Take a finite model. Pick up an arbitrary element u of it, then build a sequence $u_0 = u, u_1, u_2, \dots$ where $u_{i+1} = f(u_i)$.

Since the universe is finite there exists i and j such that $i < j$ and $u_i = u_j$. By α we get $(u_0, u_1) \in R, (u_1, u_2) \in R, (u_2, u_3) \in R, \dots$. Therefore by γ we get $(u_i, u_j) \in R$. But we have $u_i = u_j$ so we have $(u_i, u_i) \in R$, which contradicts β .

Marking scheme: (a) 3 marks for showing that the formula is sat. (b) 7 marks for showing that it does not have a finite model. A formal proof is expected here to get full marks. Partial marks are given for the incomplete proofs. In this proof you can not assume any interpretation of R .

8. *Diameter of a graph:* Diameter of a graph is the longest path among all the shortest paths in the graph.

Prove the following claim: The family of graphs with finite diameters is not definable, in FOL with equality and one binary predicate.

Marking Scheme: Step (1): Construct $\Sigma_{dia} = \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots\}$ where each ϕ_i forces a path of length at least i , and hence a diameter of length at least i in the graph.

Step (2) Assuming that Σ^* exists, which defines all the finite diameter graphs, one has to show that $\Sigma_{dia} \cup \Sigma^*$ is not satisfiable.

Step (3) Show that each finite subset of $\Sigma_{dia} \cup \Sigma^*$ is satisfiable, and using Compactness theorem $\Sigma_{dia} \cup \Sigma^*$ is satisfiable, hence leading to contradiction.

Step (1) is for 3 marks; *Step (2)* carries 2 marks; and *Step (3)* has weight of 5 marks. One needs to invoke CT, if this is not done 2 marks are deducted.