

3. Second-order logic

Fix some vocabulary τ :

alphabet: $\Sigma_2(\tau) \text{ def } \Sigma_2 \cup \tau$:

- vocabulary τ
 - countable set of object variables x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots
 - countable set of relation variables X_0, X_1, X_2, \dots
(with arities)
 - equation symbol =
 - connectives $\neg, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow$
 - quantifier symbols \exists, \forall
 - parentheses (,)
- Σ_2

Definition 1.

The set $T_2(\tau)$ of $SOL(\tau)$ -terms is defined as follows:

- atomic terms:

$c \in \tau$ constant symbol $\rightarrow c \in T_2(\tau)$

$x_i \in \tau$ object variable $\rightarrow x_i \in T_2(\tau)$

- composite terms:

$t_1, \dots, t_n \in T_2(\tau)$, f n -ary function symbol

$\Rightarrow f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in T_2(\tau)$

(or: $f t_1, \dots, t_n \in T_2(\tau)$)

Definition 2.

The set $SO(\tau)$ of $SO(\tau)$ -formulas is defined as follows:

- atomic formulas :

$$t_1, t_2 \in T_2(\tau) \Rightarrow (t_1 = t_2) \in SO(\tau)$$

$$t_1, \dots, t_n \in T_2(\tau), R \text{ n-ary relation symbol} \\ \Rightarrow R(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in SO(\tau)$$

$$\rightarrow t_1, \dots, t_n \in T_2(\tau), X_i \text{ n-ary relation variable} \\ \rightarrow X_i(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in SO(\tau)$$

- composite formulas :

$$\varphi \in SO(\tau) \Rightarrow \neg \varphi \in SO(\tau)$$

$$\varphi, \psi \in SO(\tau) \rightarrow (\varphi \wedge \psi), (\varphi \vee \psi), (\varphi \rightarrow \psi), (\varphi \Leftrightarrow \psi) \in SO(\tau)$$

$$\varphi \in SO(\tau), x_i \text{ object variable} \rightarrow \exists x_i \varphi, \forall x_i \varphi \in SO(\tau)$$

$$\rightarrow \varphi \in SO(\tau), X_i \text{ relation variable} \rightarrow \exists X_i \varphi, \forall X_i \varphi \in SO(\tau)$$

We define semantics of second-order logic:

Definition 3.

Let τ be a vocabulary.

A pair $I = (\alpha, \beta)$ is called τ -interpretation iff

(1.) $\alpha = (\alpha_i)$ is a τ -structure

(2.) x_i object variable $\rightarrow \beta(x_i) \in A$

(3.) X_i n-ary relation variable

$$\rightarrow \beta(X_i) : A^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$$

Definition 4.

Let \mathcal{T} be a vocabulary. Let $I = (\alpha, \beta)$ be a \mathcal{T} -interpretation, $\mathcal{O} = (A, \omega)$ a \mathcal{T} -structure.

(1.) The interpretation $[t]^I$ of a \mathcal{T} -term t is defined as follows:

- $[c]^I =_{def} \alpha(c)$ for all const. symbols $c \in T_2(c)$
- $[x_i]^I =_{def} \beta(x_i)$ for all object var. $x_i \in T_2(c)$
- $[ft_1 \dots t_n]^I =_{def} \alpha(f)([t_1]^I, \dots, [t_n]^I)$
for all n -ary function symbol $f \in$

(2.) The interpretation $[\varphi]^I$ of a formula $\varphi \in S(\mathcal{T})$ is defined as follows:

- atomic formulas:

$$[t_1 = t_2]^I =_{def} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } [t_1]^I = [t_2]^I \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$[Rt_1 \dots t_n]^I =_{def} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } ([t_1]^I, \dots, [t_n]^I) \in \alpha(R) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$[X_i t_1 \dots t_n]^I =_{def} \begin{cases} 1 & ([t_1]^I, \dots, [t_n]^I) \in \beta(X_i) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- composite formulas:

$$[\neg \varphi]^I =_{def} \text{not } ([\varphi]^I)$$

$$[\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2]^I =_{def} \text{et } ([\varphi_1]^I, [\varphi_2]^I)$$

$$[\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2]^I =_{def} \text{vel } ([\varphi_1]^I, [\varphi_2]^I)$$

$$[\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2]^I =_{def} \text{seq } ([\varphi_1]^I, [\varphi_2]^I)$$

$$[\exists \varphi]^\mathcal{I} =_{\text{def}} \text{seq}([\forall]^F, [\varphi]^\mathcal{I})$$

$$[\exists x_i \varphi]^\mathcal{I} =_{\text{def}} \max_{\mathcal{I}' \models I} [\varphi]^{I'}$$

$$[\forall x_i \varphi]^\mathcal{I} =_{\text{def}} \min_{\mathcal{I}' \models I} [\varphi]^{I'}$$

$$\rightarrow [\exists X_i \varphi]^\mathcal{I} =_{\text{def}} \max_{\mathcal{I}' \models I} [\varphi]^{I'}$$

$$\rightarrow [\forall X_i \varphi]^\mathcal{I} =_{\text{def}} \min_{\mathcal{I}' \models I} [\varphi]^{I'}$$

Example: $\Sigma = \{0, s\}$, unary function symbol, 0 const. symbol. Consider

$$\varphi =_{\text{def}} \forall X ((x(0) \wedge \forall x (X(x) \rightarrow X(s(x)))) \rightarrow \forall y X(y))$$

Consider $I = (\alpha, \beta)$, $\alpha = (N, \alpha)$:

- $\alpha(0) =_{\text{def}} 0$
- $\alpha(s) =_{\text{def}} n \mapsto n+1$
- β irrelevant

We obtain:

$$[\forall]^I = \min_{\mathcal{I}' \models I} \text{seq}([\exists x(0) \wedge \forall x (X(x) \rightarrow X(s(x)))]^F, [\forall y X(y)]^I)$$

$$= \min_{\mathcal{I}' \models I} \text{seq}(\text{et}([\exists x(0)]^{\mathcal{I}'}, [\forall x (X(x) \rightarrow X(s(x)))]^I), [\forall y X(y)]^I)$$

Suppose $[\forall y X(y)]^{\mathcal{I}'} = 0$. We have:

$$0 = [\forall y X(y)]^{\mathcal{I}'}$$

$$= \min_{\mathcal{I}'' \models I} [\exists X(y)]^{\mathcal{I}''}$$

$$= \min_{I'' \leq I} \beta'(x) (\mathbb{I}_{Y^{\mathbb{I}''}})$$

$$= \min_{n \in N} \beta'(x)(n)$$

Let n be minimal subject to $n \notin \beta'(x)$, i.e., $\beta'(x)(n) = 0$.

Two cases:

$$(i) n=0: \mathbb{I}[X(0)]^{\mathbb{I}'} = \beta'(x)(\alpha(0)) = \beta'(x)(0) = 0$$

$$(ii) n > 0: \mathbb{I}[\forall x(X(x) \rightarrow X(s(x)))]^{\mathbb{I}'} \\$$

$$= \min_{I'' \leq I'} \text{seq}(\mathbb{I}[X(x)]^{\mathbb{I}''}, \mathbb{I}[X(s(x))]^{\mathbb{I}''})$$

$$= \min_{I'' \leq I'} \text{seq}(\beta'(x)(\mathbb{I}[x]^{\mathbb{I}''}), \beta'(x)(\underbrace{\mathbb{I}[x]^{\mathbb{I}''} + 1}_{\alpha(s)(\mathbb{I}[x]^{\mathbb{I}''})}))$$

$$= \min_{m \in N} \text{seq}(\beta'(x)(m), \beta'(x)(m+1))$$

$$= 0 \quad (\text{for } m = n-1)$$

Hence, $\mathbb{I}\varphi]^{\mathbb{I}} = 1$. Induction principle is correct on N .

Definition 5.

Let τ be a vocabulary. Let I be a τ -interpretation.

(1.) I is said to be a **model** of $\varphi \in \text{SOTC}$ iff $\mathbb{I}\varphi]^{\mathbb{I}} = 1$.

(2.) I is said to be a **model** of $\Phi \subseteq \text{SOTC}$ iff

$\mathbb{I}\varphi]^{\mathbb{I}} = 1$ for all $\varphi \in \Phi$ (i.e., $\mathbb{I}\Phi]^{\mathbb{I}} = 1$)

(3.) $\Phi \models \varphi$ iff $\mathbb{I}\Phi]^{\mathbb{I}} \leq \mathbb{I}\varphi]^{\mathbb{I}}$ for all I .

Example:

(1) $\Phi = \text{def } \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3\}$ where

$$\varphi_1 = \text{def } \forall x \exists s(x) = 0$$

$$\varphi_2 = \text{def } \forall x \forall y (s(x) = s(y) \rightarrow x = y)$$

$$\varphi_3 = \text{def } \forall$$

Then, $(\mathbb{N}, s, 0)$ s.t. $s(x) = x + 1$ is a model of Φ

Desideratum: Each model of Φ is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{N}, s, 0)$

(2) $\varphi_f(X) = \text{def } \forall x \exists y X(x, y) \wedge$

$$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((X(x, y) \wedge X(x, z)) \rightarrow y = z)$$

X is a total function

$\varphi_{\text{inj}}(X) = \text{def } \varphi_f(X) \wedge \forall x \forall y \forall z ((X(x, z) \wedge X(y, z)) \rightarrow x = y)$

X is injective

$\varphi_{\text{fin}} = \text{def } \forall X (\varphi_{\text{inj}}(X) \rightarrow \forall y \exists x X(x, y))$

Then,

$\alpha = (A, d)$ model of φ_{fin}

\Leftrightarrow each injective function $f: A \rightarrow A$ is onto
(surjective)

$\Leftrightarrow A$ is finite

(3) $\forall x \forall y ((x = y) \leftrightarrow \forall X (X(x) \leftrightarrow X(y)))$ is true

(4) $\forall X \forall x \forall y ((X(x) \wedge X(y)) \rightarrow \neg x = y)$ so

$$\forall x \forall y \neg x = y$$

FO

Theorem 6.

The compactness theorem for \vdash does not hold for $\text{SO}(\tau)$.

That is, there is $\Phi \subseteq \text{SO}(\tau)$ and $\varphi \in \text{SO}(\tau)$ s.t. the following equivalence is not true:

$$\underline{\Phi} \vdash \varphi \Leftrightarrow \text{there is a finite } \underline{\Phi}_0 \subseteq \underline{\Phi} \text{ s.t. } \underline{\Phi}_0 \vdash \varphi$$

Proof: we show ex. of $\underline{\Phi}, \varphi$ s.t. $\underline{\Phi} \vdash \varphi$ and $\underline{\Phi}_0 \nvdash \varphi$ for all finite $\underline{\Phi}_0 \subseteq \underline{\Phi}$. Consider the following formulas for $k \geq 2$:

$$\varphi_k^{\geq} =_{\text{def}} \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_k \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{k-1} \bigwedge_{j=i+1}^k x_i = x_j \right) \Rightarrow x_i = x_j$$

That is: (A, α) is a model of $\varphi_k^{\geq} \Leftrightarrow |A| \geq k$

Define

$$\underline{\Phi} =_{\text{def}} \{ \varphi_k^{\geq} \mid k \geq 2 \} \cup \{ \varphi_{\text{fin}} \}$$

\vdash has no model; thus, $\vdash \vdash = \text{SO}(\tau)$. Choose $\varphi \in \text{SO}(\tau)$. Hence, $\vdash \vdash \varphi \wedge \neg \varphi$.

Assume $\underline{\Phi}_0 \vdash \varphi \wedge \neg \varphi$ for some finite $\underline{\Phi}_0 \subseteq \underline{\Phi}$. Then, $\underline{\Phi}_0$ has a model: let k be maximal subject to $\varphi_k^{\geq} \in \underline{\Phi}_0$. Each ~~set~~ finite set A s.t. $|A| = k$ is a model of $\underline{\Phi}_0$. However, for each model I of $\underline{\Phi}_0$, $[\vdash \varphi \wedge \neg \varphi]_I = 1$, i.e., $[\vdash \varphi]_I = [\vdash \neg \varphi]_I = 1$. \square

Theorem F.

$\text{SO}(\Sigma)$ is incomplete for each vocabulary Σ , i.e., there ex. no set of derivation rules which is correct and complete.

Proof: Suppose there is a set of derivation rules such that \vdash is defined which is correct, i.e., $\Phi^+ \subseteq \overline{\Phi}^+$, and complete, i.e., $\overline{\Phi}^+ \subseteq \Phi^+$. Thus, $\overline{\Phi}^+ = \Phi^+$ for all sets $\Phi \subseteq \text{SO}(\Sigma)$.

However, applying a derivation rules connects a finite number of formulas to obtain a new formula. Thus, compactness theorem always holds for \vdash . Since $\overline{\Phi}^+ = \Phi^+$, by assumption, the compactness theorem holds for \vdash . \downarrow ■

4. Finite model theory

want to prove that $(aa)^+$ is not FO -definable

4.1 Predicate logic on words

words as structures:

- Σ finite, non-empty alphabet
- vocabulary $\Sigma_2 = \{ < \in \mathcal{G} \cup \{ P_a \mid a \in \Sigma \} \mathcal{G} \}$ where
 - < is a binary relation symbol
 - P_a is a unary relation symbol