# Lecture 13 Compactness for predicate logic

The compactness theorem, non-standard models of arithmetic

Dr Christoph Haase University of Oxford (with small changes by Javier Esparza)

## The compactness theorem

#### Theorem

Let S be a countably infinite set of first-order formulas. Then S is satisfiable if and only if every finite subset of S is satisfiable.

## The compactness theorem

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

#### Theorem

Let S be a countably infinite set of first-order formulas. Then S is satisfiable if and only if every finite subset of S is satisfiable.

#### Proof.

Let  $\mathcal T$  be obtained from skolemising  $\mathcal S,$  and let  $\mathcal E$  be the Herbrand expansion of  $\mathcal T.$  Then

finite subsets of $\mathcal{S}$ are satisfiable
finite subsets of ${\mathcal S}$ are satisfiable

- $\Rightarrow$  all finite subsets of  $\mathcal{T}$  are satisfiable
  - $\Rightarrow$  all finite subsets of  $\mathcal{E}$  are satisfiable
- $\Rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  is satisfiable
  - $\Rightarrow \mathcal{T}$  is satisfiable
  - $\Rightarrow S$  is satisfiable.

# Justification of individual proof steps

- Not immediate how to construct *T*, since *S* could use up all function symbols *f*<sub>1</sub>, *f*<sub>2</sub>,...
- Rename *f<sub>i</sub>* to *f<sub>2i</sub>* to ensure there are infinitely many unused function symbols *f<sub>2i+1</sub>*, *i* ≥ 0 available

# Justification of individual proof steps

- Not immediate how to construct *T*, since *S* could use up all function symbols *f*<sub>1</sub>, *f*<sub>2</sub>,...
- Rename *f<sub>i</sub>* to *f<sub>2i</sub>* to ensure there are infinitely many unused function symbols *f<sub>2i+1</sub>*, *i* ≥ 0 available
- $(1) \Rightarrow (2)$  since skolemisation preserves satisfiability
- (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) cf. ground resolution
- (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4) since propositional logic is compact
- (4) ⇒ (5) a propositional model A for E induces a Herbrand model in which in particular

$$(t_1,\ldots,t_k)\in P_{\mathcal{H}}\iff \mathcal{A}\models P(t_1,\ldots,t_k)$$

• (5)  $\Rightarrow$  (6) analogue to proof that skolemisation preserves satisfiability

Compactness theorem puts limits to the expressive power of first-order formulas.

Compactness theorem puts limits to the expressive power of first-order formulas.

#### Example

Let *F* be a  $\sigma$ -sentence over some signature  $\sigma$  such that *F* has a model  $A_n$  with  $|U_{A_n}| = n$  for every n > 1. Then *F* has a model with an infinite universe.

Compactness theorem puts limits to the expressive power of first-order formulas.

#### Example

Let *F* be a  $\sigma$ -sentence over some signature  $\sigma$  such that *F* has a model  $A_n$  with  $|U_{A_n}| = n$  for every n > 1. Then *F* has a model with an infinite universe.

#### Proof.

Introduce fresh binary predicate R, and for n > 1 define  $G_n = \forall x \neg R(x, x) \land \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n \bigwedge_{1 \le i \le j \le n} R(x_i, x_j)$ . In particular,

 $\mathcal{B} \models G_n$  implies  $|U_{\mathcal{B}}| \ge n$ .

Compactness theorem puts limits to the expressive power of first-order formulas.

#### Example

Let *F* be a  $\sigma$ -sentence over some signature  $\sigma$  such that *F* has a model  $A_n$  with  $|U_{A_n}| = n$  for every n > 1. Then *F* has a model with an infinite universe.

#### Proof.

Introduce fresh binary predicate R, and for n > 1 define  $G_n = \forall x \neg R(x, x) \land \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n \land_{1 \le i < j \le n} R(x_i, x_j)$ . In particular,

 $\mathcal{B} \models G_n$  implies  $|U_{\mathcal{B}}| \ge n$ .

Moreover,  $F_n = F \wedge G_n$  is satisfiable for every n > 1.

Compactness theorem puts limits to the expressive power of first-order formulas.

#### Example

Let *F* be a  $\sigma$ -sentence over some signature  $\sigma$  such that *F* has a model  $A_n$  with  $|U_{A_n}| = n$  for every n > 1. Then *F* has a model with an infinite universe.

#### Proof.

Introduce fresh binary predicate R, and for n > 1 define  $G_n = \forall x \neg R(x, x) \land \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n \land_{1 \le i \le n} R(x_i, x_j)$ . In particular,

 $\mathcal{B} \models G_n$  implies  $|U_{\mathcal{B}}| \ge n$ .

Moreover,  $F_n = F \land G_n$  is satisfiable for every n > 1. Now define  $S := \bigcup_{n>1} \{F_n\}$ . Every finite subset of S is satisfiable, hence S has model B. If  $|U_B|$  were equal to some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  then  $B \not\models F_{n+1}$ .

Compactness theorem puts limits to the expressive power of first-order formulas.

#### Example

Let *F* be a  $\sigma$ -sentence over some signature  $\sigma$  such that *F* has a model  $A_n$  with  $|U_{A_n}| = n$  for every n > 1. Then *F* has a model with an infinite universe.

#### Proof.

Introduce fresh binary predicate R, and for n > 1 define  $G_n = \forall x \neg R(x, x) \land \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n \bigwedge_{1 \le i \le j \le n} R(x_i, x_j)$ . In particular,

 $\mathcal{B} \models G_n$  implies  $|U_{\mathcal{B}}| \ge n$ .

Moreover,  $F_n = F \land G_n$  is satisfiable for every n > 1. Now define  $S := \bigcup_{n>1} \{F_n\}$ . Every finite subset of S is satisfiable, hence S has model  $\mathcal{B}$ . If  $|U_{\mathcal{B}}|$  were equal to some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  then  $\mathcal{B} \not\models F_{n+1}$ . Hence  $|U_{\mathcal{B}}|$  is infinite, and  $\mathcal{B}$  induces model  $\mathcal{A}$  of F with an infinite universe.

Let  $\sigma = \langle 0, s, +, \cdot, = \rangle$  be the signature of arithmetic. Can we find a possibly infinite set of  $\sigma$ -formulas whose only model up to isomorphism is the classical arithmetic?

Let  $\sigma = \langle 0, s, +, \cdot, = \rangle$  be the signature of arithmetic. Can we find a possibly infinite set of  $\sigma$ -formulas whose only model up to isomorphism is the classical arithmetic?



Figure: Giuseppe Peano (1858 - 1932)

Let  $\sigma = \langle 0, s, +, \cdot, = \rangle$ . Peano axioms axiomatise elementary facts about arithmetic in first-order logic with equality:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \neg (s(x) = 0) & \forall x \forall y x + s(y) = s(x + y) \\ \forall x \forall y (s(x) = s(y) \rightarrow x = y) & \forall x x \cdot 0 = 0 \\ \forall x x + 0 = x & \forall x \forall y (x \cdot s(y) = (x \cdot y) + x) \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\sigma = \langle 0, s, +, \cdot, = \rangle$ . Peano axioms axiomatise elementary facts about arithmetic in first-order logic with equality:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \neg (s(x) = 0) & \forall x \forall y x + s(y) = s(x + y) \\ \forall x \forall y (s(x) = s(y) \rightarrow x = y) & \forall x x \cdot 0 = 0 \\ \forall x x + 0 = x & \forall x \forall y (x \cdot s(y) = (x \cdot y) + x) \end{aligned}$$

Induction over natural numbers:

$$\forall Y (0 \in Y \land \forall x (x \in Y \rightarrow s(x) \in Y)) \rightarrow \forall x x \in Y.$$

Let  $\sigma = \langle 0, s, +, \cdot, = \rangle$ . Peano axioms axiomatise elementary facts about arithmetic in first-order logic with equality:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \neg (s(x) = 0) & \forall x \forall y x + s(y) = s(x + y) \\ \forall x \forall y (s(x) = s(y) \rightarrow x = y) & \forall x x \cdot 0 = 0 \\ \forall x x + 0 = x & \forall x \forall y (x \cdot s(y) = (x \cdot y) + x) \end{aligned}$$

Induction over natural numbers:

$$\forall Y (0 \in Y \land \forall x (x \in Y \rightarrow s(x) \in Y)) \rightarrow \forall x x \in Y.$$

Problem: Cannot quantify over sets in first-order logic, instead resort to induction scheme for all formulas  $\phi(x, y_1, \dots, y_K)$ :

$$\forall y_1 \dots y_k (\phi(0) \land \forall x(\phi(x) \to \phi(s(x)))) \to \forall x \phi(x).$$

Let  $\sigma = \langle 0, s, +, \cdot, = \rangle$ . Peano axioms axiomatise elementary facts about arithmetic in first-order logic with equality:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \neg (s(x) = 0) & \forall x \forall y x + s(y) = s(x + y) \\ \forall x \forall y (s(x) = s(y) \rightarrow x = y) & \forall x x \cdot 0 = 0 \\ \forall x x + 0 = x & \forall x \forall y (x \cdot s(y) = (x \cdot y) + x) \end{aligned}$$

Induction over natural numbers:

$$\forall Y (0 \in Y \land \forall x (x \in Y \rightarrow s(x) \in Y)) \rightarrow \forall x x \in Y.$$

Problem: Cannot quantify over sets in first-order logic, instead resort to induction scheme for all formulas  $\phi(x, y_1, \dots, y_K)$ :

$$\forall y_1 \dots y_k (\phi(0) \land \forall x(\phi(x) \to \phi(s(x)))) \to \forall x \phi(x).$$

Let  $S_{PA}$  be the union of all formulas above, then "classical arithmetic" is a model of  $S_{PA}$ .

# Non-standard models of arithmetic

## Theorem (without proof)

First-order logic with equality is compact.

# Non-standard models of arithmetic

### Theorem (without proof)

First-order logic with equality is compact.

To obtain a non-standard model arithmetic:

Introduce new constant symbol c and set

$$\mathcal{C} = \{\neg (\boldsymbol{c} = \boldsymbol{s}^{i}(\boldsymbol{0})) : i \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

- Every finite subset of S<sub>PA</sub> ∪ C is satisfiable, hence S<sub>PA</sub> ∪ C has model A
- But  $c_{\mathcal{A}} \neq s^i_{\mathcal{A}}(0_{\mathcal{A}})$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$
- Hence A is not isomorphic to the standard "classical" model of arithmetic

# The Löwenheim-Skolem theorems

Theorem (Upward Löwenheim-Skolem theorem)

If S has an infinite model A then for any cardinal  $\kappa$  it has a model B with a universe of cardinality  $\kappa$  that extends A.

Theorem (Downward Löwenheim-Skolem theorem)

If S has an infinite model A then it has a model B with a countable universe which is a substructure of A.

# The Löwenheim-Skolem theorems

Theorem (Upward Löwenheim-Skolem theorem)

If S has an infinite model A then for any cardinal  $\kappa$  it has a model B with a universe of cardinality  $\kappa$  that extends A.

Theorem (Downward Löwenheim-Skolem theorem)

If S has an infinite model A then it has a model B with a countable universe which is a substructure of A.

Corollary

Classical arithmetic is not first-order axiomatisable.