

Meta-Logic (S01): Assignment

1. Give a rigorous proof on the basis of the truth-definition that the following formulas are valid:
($\forall x Px \vee \sim \forall x Px$); $\forall x(Px \vee \sim Px)$; $\forall x(Px \vee \sim \forall x Px)$.

2. (i) A formula A (possibly containing free variables) is said to be *true under* a model M if $M \models A[\delta]$ for any assignment δ and to be *false under* a model M if $M \not\models A[\delta]$ for any assignment δ (I use ' \models ' for 'falsifies'). Show that under this definition a formula cannot be both true and false but may be neither true nor false.

(ii) Suppose that we had defined a formula A to be *true under* a model M if $M \models A[\delta]$ for *some* assignment δ and to be *false under* a model M if $M \not\models A[\delta]$ for *some* assignment δ . Show that under this new definition a formula must be true or false but may be both truth and false.

3. Consider the following formulas:

T(transitivity). $\forall x \forall y \forall z (Rxy \ \& \ Ryz \supset \ Rxz)$;

A(symmetry). $\forall x \forall y (Rxy \supset \sim Ryx)$;

I(ireflexivity). $\forall x \sim Rxx$.

In the case of each formula, consider whether it is a consequence of the other two. Either show that it is or produce a counter-model to show that it is not.