First Order Logic: A Brief Introduction (Parts 1 and 2)

Supratik Chakraborty
IIT Bombay

Notation

- Variables: $x, y, z, \ldots$
  - Represent elements of an underlying set
- Constants: $a, b, c, \ldots$
  - Specific elements of underlying set
- Function symbols: $f, g, h, \ldots$
  - *Arity* of function: $\#$ of arguments
  - 0-ary functions: constants
- Relation (predicate) symbols: $P, Q, R, \ldots$
  - Hence, also called "predicate calculus"
  - *Arity* of predicate: $\#$ of arguments
- Fixed symbols:
  - Carried over from prop. logic: $\wedge$, $\vee$, $\neg$, $\rightarrow$, $\leftrightarrow$, (,)
  - New in FOL: $\exists$, $\forall$ ("quantifiers")

Equality in FOL

- A special binary predicate, used widely in maths
- Represented by special predicate symbol "="
- Semantically, binary identity relation (more on this later ...)
- First-order logic with equality
  - Different expressive power vis-a-vis first-order logic
  - Most of our discussions will assume availability of "="
  - Refer to as "first-order logic" unless the distinction is important

Syntax of FOL

Two classes of syntactic objects: *terms* and *formulas*

Terms

- Every variable is a term
- If f is an m-ary function, $t_1, \ldots t_m$ are terms, then $f(t_1, \ldots t_m)$ is also a term

Atomic formulas

- If R is an n-ary predicate, $t_1, \ldots t_n$ are terms, then $R(t_1, \ldots t_m)$ is an atomic formula
- Special case: $t_1 = t_2$

Syntax of FOL

- *Primitive* fixed symbols: $\wedge$, $\neg$, $\exists$
  - Other choices also possible: E.g., $\vee$, $\neg$, $\forall$

Rules for formuling formulas

- Every atomic formula is a formula
- If φ is a formula, so are $\neg\varphi$ and (φ)
- If φ_1 and φ_2 are formulas, so is $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$
- If φ is a formula, so is $\exists x\, \varphi$ for any variable x

- Formulas with other fixed symbols definable in terms of formulas with primitive symbols.
  - $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \;\triangleq\; \neg(\neg\varphi_1 \wedge \neg\varphi_2)$
  - $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \;\triangleq\; \neg\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$
  - $\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2 \;\triangleq\; (\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge (\varphi_2 \rightarrow \varphi_1)$
  - $\forall x\, \varphi \;\triangleq\; \neg(\exists x\, \neg\varphi)$

FOL formulas as strings

- Alphabet (over which strings are constructed):
  - Set of variable names, e.g. $\{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$
  - Set of constants, functions, predicates, e.g. $\{a, b, f, =, P\}$
  - Fixed symbols $\{\neg, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow, \exists, \forall\}$
- Well-formed formula: string formed according to rules on prev. slide
  - $\forall x_1 (\forall x_2 (((x_1 = a) \vee (x_1 = b)) \wedge \neg(f(x_2) = f(x_1))))$ is well-formed
  - $\forall(\forall x_1 (x_1 = ab) \neg() x_2)$ is not well-formed
- Well-formed formulas can be represented using parse trees
  - Consider the rules on prev. slide as production rules in a context-free grammar

Vocabulary

- Alphabet (over which strings are constructed):
  - Set of variable names, e.g. $\{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$
  - **Set of constants, functions, predicates, e.g.** $\{a, b, f, =\}$: **Vocabulary**
  - Fixed symbols $\{\neg, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow, \exists, \forall\}$

Vocabulary

- Alphabet (over which strings are constructed):
  - Set of variable names, e.g. $\{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$
  - **Set of constants, functions, predicates, e.g.** $\{a, b, f, =\}$: **Vocabulary**
  - Fixed symbols $\{\neg, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow, \exists, \forall\}$
- Smallest vocabulary to generate $\forall x_1 (\forall x_2 (((x_1 = a) \vee (x_1 = b)) \wedge \neg(f(x_2) = f(x_1))))$?

Vocabulary

- Alphabet (over which strings are constructed):
  - Set of variable names, e.g. $\{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$
  - **Set of constants, functions, predicates, e.g.** $\{a, b, f, =\}$: **Vocabulary**
  - Fixed symbols $\{\neg, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow, \exists, \forall\}$
- Smallest vocabulary to generate $\forall x_1 (\forall x_2 (((x_1 = a) \vee (x_1 = b)) \wedge \neg(f(x_2) = f(x_1))))$?
  - $\{a, b, f, =\}$

Free Variables in a Formula

Free variables are those that are not quantified in a formula.
Let free(φ) denote the set of free variables in φ

- If φ is an atomic formula, $\text{free}(\varphi) = \{x \mid \text{x occurs in } \varphi\}$
- If $\varphi = \neg\psi$ or $\varphi = (\psi)$, $\text{free}(\varphi) = \text{free}(\psi)$
- If $\varphi = \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$, $\text{free}(\varphi) = \text{free}(\varphi_1) \cup \text{free}(\varphi_2)$
- if $\varphi = \exists x\, \varphi_1$, $\text{free}(\varphi) = \text{free}(\varphi_1) \setminus \{x\}$

Free Variables in a Formula

Free variables are those that are not quantified in a formula.
Let free(φ) denote the set of free variables in φ

- If φ is an atomic formula, free(φ) $= \{x \mid \text{x occurs in } \varphi\}$
- If $\varphi = \neg\psi$ or $\varphi = (\psi)$, free(φ) $=$ free(ψ)
- If $\varphi = \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$, free($\varphi$) $=$ free(φ_1) $\cup$ free(φ_2)
- if $\varphi = \exists x\, \varphi_1$, free($\varphi$) $=$ free(φ_1) $\setminus \{x\}$

- What is free($(\exists x\, P(x, y)) \wedge (\forall y\, Q(x, y))$) ?

Free Variables in a Formula

Free variables are those that are not quantified in a formula.
Let free(φ) denote the set of free variables in φ

- If φ is an atomic formula, $\text{free}(\varphi) = \{x \mid \text{x occurs in } \varphi\}$
- If $\varphi = \neg\psi$ or $\varphi = (\psi)$, $\text{free}(\varphi) = \text{free}(\psi)$
- If $\varphi = \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$, $\text{free}(\varphi) = \text{free}(\varphi_1) \cup \text{free}(\varphi_2)$
- if $\varphi = \exists x\, \varphi_1$, $\text{free}(\varphi) = \text{free}(\varphi_1) \setminus \{x\}$

- What is $\text{free}((\exists x\, P(x,y)) \wedge (\forall y\, Q(x,y)))$?
  - $= \text{free}((\exists x\, P(x,y))) \ \cup\ \text{free}(\forall y\, Q(x,y))$
  - $= \text{free}(P(x,y)) \setminus \{x\} \ \cup\ \text{free}(Q(x,y)) \setminus \{y\}$
  - $= \{x,y\} \setminus \{x\} \ \cup\ \{x,y\} \setminus \{y\} \ = \ \{x,y\}$

Free Variables in a Formula

Free variables are those that are not quantified in a formula.
Let free(φ) denote the set of free variables in φ

- If φ is an atomic formula, free(φ) $= \{x \mid \text{x occurs in } \varphi\}$
- If $\varphi = \neg\psi$ or $\varphi = (\psi)$, free(φ) $=$ free(ψ)
- If $\varphi = \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$, free($\varphi$) $=$ free(φ_1) $\cup$ free(φ_2)
- if $\varphi = \exists x\, \varphi_1$, free($\varphi$) $=$ free(φ_1) $\setminus \{x\}$

- What is free$((\exists x\, P(x,y)) \wedge (\forall y\, Q(x,y)))$?
  - $=$ free$((\exists x\, P(x,y)))$ $\cup$ free$(\forall y\, Q(x,y))$
  - $=$ free$(P(x,y)) \setminus \{x\}$ $\cup$ free$(Q(x,y)) \setminus \{y\}$
  - $= \{x,y\} \setminus \{x\} \,\cup\, \{x,y\} \setminus \{y\} \;=\; \{x,y\}$

If φ has free variables $\{x,y\}$, we write $\varphi(x,y)$
A formula with no free variables is a **sentence**, e.g. $\exists x \forall y\, f(x) = y$

Bound Variables in a Formula

Bound variables are those that are quantified in a formula.
Let $\mathrm{bnd}(\varphi)$ denote the set of bound variables in φ

- If φ is an atomic formula, $\mathrm{bnd}(\varphi) = \emptyset$
- If $\varphi = \neg\psi$ or $\varphi = (\psi)$, $\mathrm{bnd}(\varphi) = \mathrm{bnd}(\psi)$
- If $\varphi = \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$, $\mathrm{bnd}(\varphi) = \mathrm{bnd}(\varphi_1) \cup \mathrm{bnd}(\varphi_2)$
- if $\varphi = \exists x\, \varphi_1$, $\mathrm{bnd}(\varphi) = \mathrm{bnd}(\varphi_1) \cup \{x\}$

Bound Variables in a Formula

Bound variables are those that are quantified in a formula.
Let $\mathrm{bnd}(\varphi)$ denote the set of bound variables in φ

- If φ is an atomic formula, $\mathrm{bnd}(\varphi) = \emptyset$
- If $\varphi = \neg\psi$ or $\varphi = (\psi)$, $\mathrm{bnd}(\varphi) = \mathrm{bnd}(\psi)$
- If $\varphi = \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$, $\mathrm{bnd}(\varphi) = \mathrm{bnd}(\varphi_1) \cup \mathrm{bnd}(\varphi_2)$
- if $\varphi = \exists x\, \varphi_1$, $\mathrm{bnd}(\varphi) = \mathrm{bnd}(\varphi_1) \cup \{x\}$

- What is $\mathrm{bnd}((\exists x\, P(x,y)) \wedge (\forall y\, Q(x,y)))$?

Bound Variables in a Formula

Bound variables are those that are quantified in a formula.
Let $\text{bnd}(\varphi)$ denote the set of bound variables in φ

- If φ is an atomic formula, $\text{bnd}(\varphi) = \emptyset$
- If $\varphi = \neg\psi$ or $\varphi = (\psi)$, $\text{bnd}(\varphi) = \text{bnd}(\psi)$
- If $\varphi = \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$, $\text{bnd}(\varphi) = \text{bnd}(\varphi_1) \cup \text{bnd}(\varphi_2)$
- if $\varphi = \exists x\, \varphi_1$, $\text{bnd}(\varphi) = \text{bnd}(\varphi_1) \cup \{x\}$

- What is $\text{bnd}((\exists x\, P(x,y)) \wedge (\forall y\, Q(x,y)))$?
  - $= \text{bnd}((\exists x\, P(x,y))) \;\cup\; \text{bnd}(\forall y\, Q(x,y))$
  - $= \text{bnd}(P(x,y)) \cup \{x\} \;\cup\; \text{bnd}(Q(x,y)) \cup \{y\}$
  - $= \emptyset \cup \{x\} \;\cup\; \emptyset \cup \{y\}$
  - $= \{x\} \;\cup\; \{y\} = \{x,y\}$!!!
- $\text{free}(\varphi)$ and $\text{bnd}(\varphi)$ are not complements!

Substitution in FOL

Suppose $x \in \text{free}(\varphi)$ and t is any term.
We wish to replace every free occurrence of x in φ with t, such that free variables in t stay free in the resulting formula.

Term t is free for x in φ if no free occurrence of x in φ is in the scope of $\forall y$ or $\exists y$ for any variable y occurring in t.

- $\varphi \triangleq \exists y\, R(x, y) \vee \forall x\, R(z, x)$, and t is $f(z, x)$
- $f(z, x)$ is free for x in φ, but $f(y, x)$ is not

$\varphi[t/x]$: Formula obtained by replacing each free occurrence of x in φ by t, if t is free for x in φ

- For φ defined above,
  $\varphi[f(z, x)/x] \triangleq \exists y\, R(f(z, x), y) \vee \forall x\, R(z, x)$

Semantics of FOL: Some Intuition

$$\varphi \triangleq \forall x \forall y \, (P(x,y) \rightarrow \exists z \, (\neg(z = x) \wedge \neg(z = y) \wedge P(x,z) \wedge P(z,y)))$$

Semantics of FOL: Some Intuition

$$\varphi \triangleq \forall x \forall y \, (P(x, y) \rightarrow \exists z \, (\neg(z = x) \wedge \neg(z = y) \wedge P(x, z) \wedge P(z, y))$$

English reading: For every x and y, if $P(x, y)$ holds, we can find z distinct from x and y such that both $P(x, z)$ and $P(z, y)$ hold.

Semantics of FOL: Some Intuition

$$\varphi \triangleq \forall x \forall y \,(P(x,y) \rightarrow \exists z\,(\neg(z = x) \wedge \neg(z = y) \wedge P(x,z) \wedge P(z,y))$$

English reading: For every x and y, if $P(x,y)$ holds, we can find z distinct from x and y such that both $P(x,z)$ and $P(z,y)$ hold.

Case 1:

- Variables take values from **real numbers**
- $P(x,y)$ represents $\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{y}$
- English reading simply states "real numbers are dense"
- φ is **true**

$$\varphi \triangleq \forall x \forall y \, (P(x, y) \rightarrow \exists z \, (\neg(z = x) \wedge \neg(z = y) \wedge P(x, z) \wedge P(z, y))$$

Case 2:

- Variables take values from **real numbers**
- $P(x, y)$ represents $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}$
- English reading requires the following to be true
  - If $x = y$, there is a z such that $z \neq x$, $x \leq z$ and $z \leq x$
  - Thus, $z \neq x$ and $z = x$
- φ is **false**

$$\varphi \triangleq \forall x \forall y\, (P(x,y) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = x) \wedge \neg(z = y) \wedge P(x,z) \wedge P(z,y))$$

Case 3:

- Variables take values from **natural numbers**
- $P(x,y)$ represents $\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{y}$
- English reading states that "natural numbers are dense"
- φ is **false**

$$\varphi \triangleq \forall x \forall y \, (P(x,y) \rightarrow \exists z \, (\neg(z = x) \wedge \neg(z = y) \wedge P(x,z) \wedge P(z,y))$$

Case 3:

- Variables take values from **natural numbers**
- $P(x,y)$ represents $\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{y}$
- English reading states that "natural numbers are dense"
- φ is **false**

Truth of φ depends on the underlying set from which variables take values, and on how constants, functions, predicates are interpreted

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: E.g. $\mathcal{V} : \{a, f, =, R\}$

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: E.g. $\mathcal{V} : \{a, f, =, R\}$

$\mathcal{V}$-formula: E.g. $\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \to \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

$\mathrm{free}(\varphi) = \{y\}$

Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: E.g. $\mathcal{V} : \{a, f, =, R\}$

$\mathcal{V}$-formula: E.g. $\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

$\text{free}(\varphi) = \{y\}$

Truth of φ depends on

Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: E.g. $\mathcal{V} : \{a, f, =, R\}$

$\mathcal{V}$-formula: E.g. $\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

$\mathrm{free}(\varphi) = \{y\}$

Truth of φ depends on

1. *Universe U* from which variables take values, e.g. $\mathbb{N}$

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: E.g. $\mathcal{V} : \{a, f, =, R\}$

$\mathcal{V}$-formula: E.g. $\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

$\mathrm{free}(\varphi) = \{y\}$

Truth of φ depends on

1. *Universe* U from which variables take values, e.g. $\mathbb{N}$
2. *Interpretation* of vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$ on U

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: E.g. $\mathcal{V} : \{a, f, =, R\}$

$\mathcal{V}$-formula: E.g. $\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

$\mathrm{free}(\varphi) = \{y\}$

Truth of φ depends on

1. *Universe* U from which variables take values, e.g. $\mathbb{N}$
2. *Interpretation* of vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$ on U
   - Map each constant symbol to an element of U, e.g. $a \mapsto 0$

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: E.g. $\mathcal{V} : \{a, f, =, R\}$

$\mathcal{V}$-formula: E.g. $\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

$\text{free}(\varphi) = \{y\}$

Truth of φ depends on

1. *Universe* U from which variables take values, e.g. $\mathbb{N}$
2. *Interpretation* of vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$ on U
   - Map each constant symbol to an element of U, e.g. $a \mapsto 0$
   - Map each n-ary function symbol to a function from U^n to U, e.g. $f(u, v) = u + v$

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: E.g. $\mathcal{V} : \{a, f, =, R\}$

$\mathcal{V}$-formula: E.g. $\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

$\mathsf{free}(\varphi) = \{y\}$

Truth of φ depends on

1. *Universe* U from which variables take values, e.g. $\mathbb{N}$
2. *Interpretation* of vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$ on U
   - Map each constant symbol to an element of U, e.g. $a \mapsto 0$
   - Map each n-ary function symbol to a function from U^n to U, e.g. $f(u, v) = u + v$
   - Map each m-ary predicate symbol to a subset of U^m
     e.g. Interp. for $=$: $\{(c, c) \mid c \in \mathbb{N}\}$ – fixed interpretation
     Interp. for R : $\{(c, d) \mid c, d \in U, c < d\}$

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: E.g. $\mathcal{V} : \{a, f, =, R\}$

$\mathcal{V}$-formula: E.g. $\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

$\text{free}(\varphi) = \{y\}$

Truth of φ depends on

1. *Universe* U from which variables take values, e.g. $\mathbb{N}$
2. *Interpretation* of vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$ on U
    - Map each constant symbol to an element of U, e.g. $a \mapsto 0$
    - Map each n-ary function symbol to a function from U^n to U, e.g. $f(u, v) = u + v$
    - Map each m-ary predicate symbol to a subset of U^m
      e.g. Interp. for $=$: $\{(c, c) \mid c \in \mathbb{N}\}$ – fixed interpretation
      Interp. for R : $\{(c, d) \mid c, d \in U, c < d\}$

$$\boxed{\text{1 and 2 define a } \mathcal{V}\textbf{-structure } M = (U^M, (a^M, f^M, R^M))}$$

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: E.g. $\mathcal{V} : \{a, f, =, R\}$

$\mathcal{V}$-formula: E.g. $\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

$\text{free}(\varphi) = \{y\}$

Truth of φ depends on

1. *Universe* U from which variables take values, e.g. $\mathbb{N}$
2. *Interpretation* of vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$ on U
   - Map each constant symbol to an element of U, e.g. $a \mapsto 0$
   - Map each n-ary function symbol to a function from U^n to U, e.g. $f(u, v) = u + v$
   - Map each m-ary predicate symbol to a subset of U^m
     e.g. Interp. for $=$: $\{(c, c) \mid c \in \mathbb{N}\}$ – fixed interpretation
     Interp. for R : $\{(c, d) \mid c, d \in U, c < d\}$

1 and 2 define a $\mathcal{V}$-**structure** $M = (U^M, (a^M, f^M, R^M))$

3. *Binding (aka environment)* $\alpha : \text{free}(\varphi) \rightarrow U$
   e.g. $\alpha(y) = 2$

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Given structure M and binding α, does φ evaluate to **true**?
Notationally, does $\mathbf{M}, \alpha \models \varphi$?

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Given structure M and binding α, does φ evaluate to **true**?
Notationally, does $\mathbf{M}, \alpha \models \varphi$?

- Extend $\alpha : \text{free}(\varphi) \rightarrow U^M$ to $\overline{\alpha} : \mathit{Terms}(\varphi) \rightarrow U^M$
  - If t is a variable x, $\overline{\alpha}(t) = \alpha(x)$
  - If t is $f(t_1, \ldots t_m)$, $\overline{\alpha}(t) = f^M(\overline{\alpha}(t_1), \ldots \overline{\alpha}(t_m))$

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Given structure M and binding α, does φ evaluate to **true**?
Notationally, does $\mathbf{M}, \alpha \models \varphi$?

- Extend $\alpha : \text{free}(\varphi) \rightarrow U^M$ to $\overline{\alpha} : \mathit{Terms}(\varphi) \rightarrow U^M$
  - If t is a variable x, $\overline{\alpha}(t) = \alpha(x)$
  - If t is $f(t_1, \ldots t_m)$, $\overline{\alpha}(t) = f^M(\overline{\alpha}(t_1), \ldots \overline{\alpha}(t_m))$
    - In prev. example, $\overline{\alpha}(f(y, a)) = f^M(\alpha(y), a^M) = 2 + 0 = 2$

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Given structure M and binding α, does φ evaluate to **true**?
Notationally, does $\mathbf{M}, \alpha \models \varphi$?

- Extend $\alpha : \mathsf{free}(\varphi) \rightarrow U^M$ to $\overline{\alpha} : \mathit{Terms}(\varphi) \rightarrow U^M$
    - If t is a variable x, $\overline{\alpha}(t) = \alpha(x)$
    - If t is $f(t_1, \ldots t_m)$, $\overline{\alpha}(t) = f^M(\overline{\alpha}(t_1), \ldots \overline{\alpha}(t_m))$
        - In prev. example, $\overline{\alpha}(f(y, a)) = f^M(\alpha(y), a^M) = 2 + 0 = 2$
- If φ is an atomic formula
    - $M, \alpha \models (t_1 = t_2)$ iff $\overline{\alpha}(t_1)$ and $\overline{\alpha}(t_2)$ coincide
    - $M, \alpha \models P(t_1, \ldots t_m)$ iff $(\overline{\alpha}(t_1), \ldots \overline{\alpha}(t_m)) \in P^M$

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Given structure M and binding α, does φ evaluate to **true**?
Notationally, does $\mathbf{M}, \alpha \models \varphi$?

- Extend $\alpha : \mathrm{free}(\varphi) \rightarrow U^M$ to $\overline{\alpha} : \mathit{Terms}(\varphi) \rightarrow U^M$
  - If t is a variable x, $\overline{\alpha}(t) = \alpha(x)$
  - If t is $f(t_1, \ldots t_m)$, $\overline{\alpha}(t) = f^M(\overline{\alpha}(t_1), \ldots \overline{\alpha}(t_m))$
    - In prev. example, $\overline{\alpha}(f(y, a)) = f^M(\alpha(y), a^M) = 2 + 0 = 2$
- If φ is an atomic formula
  - $M, \alpha \models (t_1 = t_2)$ iff $\overline{\alpha}(t_1)$ and $\overline{\alpha}(t_2)$ coincide
  - $M, \alpha \models P(t_1, \ldots t_m)$ iff $(\overline{\alpha}(t_1), \ldots \overline{\alpha}(t_m)) \in P^M$
    - In prev. example, suppose $\alpha'(x) = 1, \alpha'(y) = 2$. Then $M, \alpha' \models R(x, f(y, a))$ as $(\overline{\alpha'}(x), \overline{\alpha'}(f(y, a))) = (1, 2) \in R^M$.

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Given structure M and binding α, does φ evaluate to **true**?
Notationally, does $\mathbf{M}, \alpha \models \varphi$?

- Extend $\alpha : \text{free}(\varphi) \to U^M$ to $\overline{\alpha} : \mathit{Terms}(\varphi) \to U^M$
  - If t is a variable x, $\overline{\alpha}(t) = \alpha(x)$
  - If t is $f(t_1, \ldots t_m)$, $\overline{\alpha}(t) = f^M(\overline{\alpha}(t_1), \ldots \overline{\alpha}(t_m))$
    - In prev. example, $\overline{\alpha}(f(y, a)) = f^M(\alpha(y), a^M) = 2 + 0 = 2$
- If φ is an atomic formula
  - $M, \alpha \models (t_1 = t_2)$ iff $\overline{\alpha}(t_1)$ and $\overline{\alpha}(t_2)$ coincide
  - $M, \alpha \models P(t_1, \ldots t_m)$ iff $(\overline{\alpha}(t_1), \ldots \overline{\alpha}(t_m)) \in P^M$
    - In prev. example, suppose $\alpha'(x) = 1, \alpha'(y) = 2$. Then $M, \alpha' \models R(x, f(y, a))$ as $(\overline{\alpha'}(x), \overline{\alpha'}(f(y, a))) = (1, 2) \in R^M$.
- $M, \alpha \models \neg\varphi_i$ iff $M, \alpha \not\models \varphi_1$

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Given structure M and binding α, does φ evaluate to **true**?
Notationally, does $\mathbf{M}, \alpha \models \varphi$?

- Extend $\alpha : \text{free}(\varphi) \rightarrow U^M$ to $\overline{\alpha} : \mathit{Terms}(\varphi) \rightarrow U^M$
  - If t is a variable x, $\overline{\alpha}(t) = \alpha(x)$
  - If t is $f(t_1, \ldots t_m)$, $\overline{\alpha}(t) = f^M(\overline{\alpha}(t_1), \ldots \overline{\alpha}(t_m))$
    - In prev. example, $\overline{\alpha}(f(y, a)) = f^M(\alpha(y), a^M) = 2 + 0 = 2$
- If φ is an atomic formula
  - $M, \alpha \models (t_1 = t_2)$ iff $\overline{\alpha}(t_1)$ and $\overline{\alpha}(t_2)$ coincide
  - $M, \alpha \models P(t_1, \ldots t_m)$ iff $(\overline{\alpha}(t_1), \ldots \overline{\alpha}(t_m)) \in P^M$
    - In prev. example, suppose $\alpha'(x) = 1, \alpha'(y) = 2$. Then $M, \alpha' \models R(x, f(y, a))$ as $(\overline{\alpha'}(x), \overline{\alpha'}(f(y, a))) = (1, 2) \in R^M$.
- $M, \alpha \models \neg\varphi_i$ iff $M, \alpha \not\models \varphi_1$
- $M, \alpha \models \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ iff $M, \alpha \models \varphi_1$ and $M, \alpha \models \varphi_2$

Semantics of FOL: Formalizing the intuition

Given structure M and binding α, does φ evaluate to **true**?
Notationally, does $\mathbf{M}, \alpha \models \varphi$?

- Extend $\alpha : \text{free}(\varphi) \rightarrow U^M$ to $\overline{\alpha} : \mathit{Terms}(\varphi) \rightarrow U^M$
    - If t is a variable x, $\overline{\alpha}(t) = \alpha(x)$
    - If t is $f(t_1, \ldots t_m)$, $\overline{\alpha}(t) = f^M(\overline{\alpha}(t_1), \ldots \overline{\alpha}(t_m))$
        - In prev. example, $\overline{\alpha}(f(y, a)) = f^M(\alpha(y), a^M) = 2 + 0 = 2$
- If φ is an atomic formula
    - $M, \alpha \models (t_1 = t_2)$ iff $\overline{\alpha}(t_1)$ and $\overline{\alpha}(t_2)$ coincide
    - $M, \alpha \models P(t_1, \ldots t_m)$ iff $(\overline{\alpha}(t_1), \ldots \overline{\alpha}(t_m)) \in P^M$
        - In prev. example, suppose $\alpha'(x) = 1, \alpha'(y) = 2$. Then $M, \alpha' \models R(x, f(y, a))$ as $(\overline{\alpha'}(x), \overline{\alpha'}(f(y, a))) = (1, 2) \in R^M$.
- $M, \alpha \models \neg\varphi_i$ iff $M, \alpha \not\models \varphi_1$
- $M, \alpha \models \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ iff $M, \alpha \models \varphi_1$ and $M, \alpha \models \varphi_2$
- $M, \alpha \models \exists x\, \varphi$ iff there is some $c \in U^M$ such that $M, \alpha[x \mapsto c] \models \varphi$, where
    - $\alpha[x \mapsto c](v) = \alpha(v)$, if variable v is different from x
    - $\alpha[x \mapsto c](x) = c$

Semantics of FOL: Illustration

$$\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$$

$\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V} : \{a, f, =, R\}$

Semantics of FOL: Illustration

$\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V} : \{a, f, =, R\}$
- $M = (\overbrace{\mathbb{N}}^{U^M}, (\overbrace{0}^{a^M}, \overbrace{u + v}^{f^M(u,v)}, \overbrace{u < v}^{R^M(u,v)}))$

Semantics of FOL: Illustration

$$\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y,a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z,y))$$

- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: $\{a, f, =, R\}$
- $M = (\overbrace{\mathbb{N}}^{U^M}, (\overbrace{0}^{a^M}, \overbrace{u+v}^{f^M(u,v)}, \overbrace{u<v}^{R^M(u,v)}))$
- $\text{free}(\varphi) = \{y\}$, and $\alpha(y) = 2$

$\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V} : \{a, f, =, R\}$
- $M = (\overbrace{\mathbb{N}}^{U^M}, (\overbrace{0}^{a^M}, \overbrace{u + v}^{f^M(u,v)}, \overbrace{u < v}^{R^M(u,v)}))$
- $\mathrm{free}(\varphi) = \{y\}$, and $\alpha(y) = 2$
- $M, \alpha[z \mapsto 1] \models (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$
- Therefore, $M, \alpha \models \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

Semantics of FOL: Illustration

$\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V} : \{a, f, =, R\}$
- $M = (\overbrace{\mathbb{N}}^{U^M}, (\overbrace{0}^{a^M}, \overbrace{u+v}^{f^M(u,v)}, \overbrace{u<v}^{R^M(u,v)}))$
- $\mathrm{free}(\varphi) = \{y\}$, and $\alpha(y) = 2$
- $M, \alpha[z \mapsto 1] \models (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$
- Therefore, $M, \alpha \models \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$
- Similarly, $M, \alpha[x \mapsto 0] \models R(x, f(y, a))$
- Therefore, $M, \alpha \models \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a))$

Semantics of FOL: Illustration

$\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$

- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: $\{a, f, =, R\}$
- $M = (\overbrace{\mathbb{N}}^{U^M}, (\overbrace{0}^{a^M}, \overbrace{u + v}^{f^M(u,v)}, \overbrace{u < v}^{R^M(u,v)}))$
- free$(\varphi) = \{y\}$, and $\alpha(y) = 2$
- $M, \alpha[z \mapsto 1] \models (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$
- Therefore, $M, \alpha \models \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$
- Similarly, $M, \alpha[x \mapsto 0] \models R(x, f(y, a))$
- Therefore, $M, \alpha \models \exists x\, R(x, f(y, a))$
- Finally, $M, \alpha \models \varphi$

Semantics of FOL: Illustration

$\varphi \triangleq \exists x\, R(x, f(y,a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z,y))$

- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: $\{a, f, =, R\}$
- $M = (\overbrace{\mathbb{N}}^{U^M}, (\overbrace{0}^{a^M}, \overbrace{u+v}^{f^M(u,v)}, \overbrace{u<v}^{R^M(u,v)}))$
- $\mathrm{free}(\varphi) = \{y\}$, and $\alpha(y) = 2$
- $M, \alpha[z \mapsto 1] \models (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z,y))$
- Therefore, $M, \alpha \models \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z,y))$
- Similarly, $M, \alpha[x \mapsto 0] \models R(x, f(y,a))$
- Therefore, $M, \alpha \models \exists x\, R(x, f(y,a))$
- Finally, $M, \alpha \models \varphi$
- Note that if $\alpha'(y) = 1$, $M, \alpha' \not\models \varphi$

Semantic Relations in FOL

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \ldots\}$ be a (possibly infinite) set of formulas, and ψ be a formula

Semantic Relations in FOL

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \ldots\}$ be a (possibly infinite) set of formulas, and ψ be a formula

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \ldots\}$ be a (possibly infinite) set of formulas, and ψ be a formula

- **Semantic Entailment:** $\mathcal{F} \models \psi$ holds iff whenever $M, \alpha \models \varphi_i$ for all $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{F}$, then $M, \alpha \models \psi$ as well.
  - $\{\forall x\, ((x = a) \vee R(x, y)), \quad R(a, y)\} \quad \models \quad \forall z\, R(z, y)$

Semantic Relations in FOL

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \ldots\}$ be a (possibly infinite) set of formulas, and ψ be a formula

- **Semantic Entailment:** $\mathcal{F} \models \psi$ holds iff whenever $M, \alpha \models \varphi_i$ for all $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{F}$, then $M, \alpha \models \psi$ as well.
  - $\{\forall x\, ((x = a) \vee R(x, y)), \quad R(a, y)\} \quad \models \quad \forall z\, R(z, y)$
- **Satisfiability:** ψ is satisfiable iff there is some M and α such that $M, \alpha \models \psi$
  - $\exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$ is satisfiable

Semantic Relations in FOL

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \ldots\}$ be a (possibly infinite) set of formulas, and ψ be a formula

- **Semantic Entailment:** $\mathcal{F} \models \psi$ holds iff whenever $M, \alpha \models \varphi_i$ for all $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{F}$, then $M, \alpha \models \psi$ as well.
  - $\{\forall x\, ((x = a) \vee R(x, y)),\ \ R(a, y)\} \ \models\ \forall z\, R(z, y)$
- **Satisfiability:** ψ is satisfiable iff there is some M and α such that $M, \alpha \models \psi$
  - $\exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$ is satisfiable
- **Validity:** A $\mathcal{V}$-formula ψ is valid iff $M, \alpha \models \psi$ for all $\mathcal{V}$-structures M and all bindings α that assign values from U^M to free(ψ).
  - $\forall x\, P(x, y) \rightarrow \exists x\, P(x, y)$ is valid

Semantic Relations in FOL

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \ldots\}$ be a (possibly infinite) set of formulas, and ψ be a formula

- **Semantic Entailment:** $\mathcal{F} \models \psi$ holds iff whenever $M, \alpha \models \varphi_i$ for all $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{F}$, then $M, \alpha \models \psi$ as well.
  - $\{\forall x\,((x = a) \vee R(x, y)),\quad R(a, y)\} \quad \models \quad \forall z\, R(z, y)$
- **Satisfiability:** ψ is satisfiable iff there is some M and α such that $M, \alpha \models \psi$
  - $\exists x\, R(x, f(y, a)) \rightarrow \exists z\, (\neg(z = a) \wedge R(z, y))$ is satisfiable
- **Validity:** A $\mathcal{V}$-formula ψ is valid iff $M, \alpha \models \psi$ for all $\mathcal{V}$-structures M and all bindings α that assign values from U^M to free(ψ).
  - $\forall x\, P(x, y) \rightarrow \exists x\, P(x, y)$ is valid
- **Consistency:** $\mathcal{F}$ is consistent iff there is at least one M and α such that $M, \alpha \models \varphi_i$ for all $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{F}$.
  - $\{\exists x\, R(x, y),\ \exists x\, R(f(x), y),\ \exists x\, R(f(f(x)), y), \ldots\}$ is consistent

Sematic Equivalence in FOL

$\varphi \equiv \psi$ iff $\{\varphi\} \models \psi$ and $\{\psi\} \models \varphi$.

Quantifier Equivalences

- $\forall x \forall y\, \varphi \;\equiv\; \forall y \forall x\, \varphi, \quad \exists x \exists y\, \varphi \;\equiv\; \exists y \exists x\, \varphi$
- $\forall x\, (\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2) \;\equiv\; (\forall x\, \varphi_1) \wedge (\forall x\, \varphi_2)$
- $\exists x\, (\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) \;\equiv\; (\exists x\, \varphi_1) \vee (\exists x\, \varphi_2)$
- If $x \notin \mathrm{free}(\varphi_2)$, then $Qx\, (\varphi_1 \text{ op } \varphi_2) \;\equiv\; (Qx\, \varphi_1) \text{ op } \varphi_2$, where $Q \in \{\exists, \forall\}$ and op $\in \{\vee, \wedge\}$.

Renaming Quantified Variables

Let $z \notin \mathrm{free}(\varphi) \cup \mathrm{bnd}(\varphi)$.
Then $Qx\, \varphi \;\equiv\; Qz\, \varphi[z/x]$ for $Q \in \{\exists, \forall\}$.

Enabler for substitution, e.g., $\exists x\, R(f(x, y), w) \;\equiv\; \exists z\, R(f(z, y), w)$
$f(x, y)$ not free for y in $\exists x\, R(f(x, y), w)$, but is free for y in $\exists z\, R(f(z, y), w)$.

A Proof System for FOL

All proof rules considered for Propositional Logic are sound for FOL

Additional proof rules for quantifiers and equality

$$\frac{}{\{\} \vdash t = t} \quad (= \text{introduction})$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{F} \vdash t_1 = t_2 \quad \mathcal{F} \vdash \varphi[t_1/x]}{\mathcal{F} \vdash \varphi[t_2/x]} \quad (= \text{elimination})$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{F} \vdash \forall x\, \varphi}{\mathcal{F} \vdash \varphi[t/x]} \quad (\forall \text{ elimination})$$

$$\frac{[x_0 \quad \cdots \quad \mathcal{F} \vdash \varphi[x_0/x]]}{\mathcal{F} \vdash \forall x\, \varphi} \quad (\forall \text{ introduction})$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{F} \vdash \varphi[t/x]}{\mathcal{F} \vdash \exists x\, \varphi} \quad (\exists \text{ introduction})$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{F} \vdash \exists x\, \varphi \quad [x_0 \quad \cdots \quad \mathcal{F} \cup \{\varphi[x_0/x]\} \vdash \psi]}{\mathcal{F} \vdash \psi} \quad (\exists \text{ elimination})$$

Soundness, Completeness, Undecidability

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a set of FOL formulas, and ψ be a FOL formula.
We say $\mathcal{F} \vdash \psi$ if ψ can be syntactically derived from $\mathcal{F}$ by a finite sequence of application of our proof rules.

Soundness

If $\mathcal{F} \vdash \psi$, then $\mathcal{F} \models \psi$

Completeness

If $\mathcal{F} \models \psi$, then $\mathcal{F} \vdash \psi$

Soundness, Completeness, Undecidability

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a set of FOL formulas, and ψ be a FOL formula. We say $\mathcal{F} \vdash \psi$ if ψ can be syntactically derived from $\mathcal{F}$ by a finite sequence of application of our proof rules.

Soundness

If $\mathcal{F} \vdash \psi$, then $\mathcal{F} \models \psi$

Completeness

If $\mathcal{F} \models \psi$, then $\mathcal{F} \vdash \psi$

Undecidabilty

Given a FOL formula φ, checking validity of φ, i.e. does $\{\} \models \varphi$ is undecidable.

Completeness implies that detecting non-validity is non-terminating, in general

First-order Definable Structures

- If φ is a $\mathcal{V}$-sentence (no free vars), no binding α necessary for evaluating truth of φ
  - Given $\mathcal{V}$-structure M, we can ask if $M \models \varphi$
  - Class of $\mathcal{V}$-structures defined by φ is $\{M \models \varphi\}$
- Some examples of structures: graphs, databases, number systems

A graph G

- U^G: set of vertices
- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: $\{E, =\}$, where E is a binary (edge) relation
- Interpretation: For $a, b \in U^G$, $E^G(a, b) =$ **true** iff there is an edge from vertex a to vertex b in G

Graphs as FO structures

A graph G

- U^G: set of vertices
- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: $\{E, =\}$, where E is a binary (edge) relation
- Interpretation: For $a, b \in U^G$, $E^G(a, b) = \textbf{true}$ iff there is an edge from vertex a to vertex b in G

Examples of classes of graphs definable in FOL:

- $\forall x \forall y\, (\neg(x = y) \rightarrow E(x, y))$
  - (Infinite) class of all cliques

Graphs as FO structures

A graph G

- U^G: set of vertices
- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: $\{E, =\}$, where E is a binary (edge) relation
- Interpretation: For $a, b \in U^G$, $E^G(a, b) =$ **true** iff there is an edge from vertex a to vertex b in G

Examples of classes of graphs definable in FOL:

- $\forall x \forall y\, (\neg(x = y) \rightarrow E(x, y))$
  - (Infinite) class of all cliques
- $\exists x \forall y\, (\neg(x = y) \rightarrow \neg E(x, y))$
  - (Infinite) class of all graphs with at least one vertex from which there is no edge to any other vertex

A graph G

- U^G: set of vertices
- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: $\{E, =\}$, where E is a binary (edge) relation
- Interpretation: For $a, b \in U^G$, $E^G(a, b) = \textbf{true}$ iff there is an edge from vertex a to vertex b in G

Examples of classes of graphs definable in FOL:

- $\forall x \forall y \, (\neg(x = y) \rightarrow E(x, y))$
  - (Infinite) class of all cliques
- $\exists x \forall y \, (\neg(x = y) \rightarrow \neg E(x, y))$
  - (Infinite) class of all graphs with at least one vertex from which there is no edge to any other vertex
- $\forall x \forall y \forall z \, (\neg(x = y) \wedge \neg(y = z) \wedge \neg(z = x)) \rightarrow$
  $\neg(E(x, y) \wedge E(y, z) \wedge E(z, x))$
  - (Infinite) class of all graphs with no cycles of length 3

Graphs as FO structures

A graph G

- U^G: set of vertices
- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: $\{E, =\}$, where E is a binary (edge) relation
- Interpretation: For $a, b \in U^G$, $E^G(a, b) =$ **true** iff there is an edge from vertex a to vertex b in G

Examples of classes of graphs definable in FOL:

- $\forall x \forall y\, (\neg(x = y) \rightarrow E(x, y))$
    - (Infinite) class of all cliques
- $\exists x \forall y\, (\neg(x = y) \rightarrow \neg E(x, y))$
    - (Infinite) class of all graphs with at least one vertex from which there is no edge to any other vertex
- $\forall x \forall y \forall z\, (\neg(x = y) \wedge \neg(y = z) \wedge \neg(z = x)) \rightarrow \neg(E(x, y) \wedge E(y, z) \wedge E(z, x))$
    - (Infinite) class of all graphs with no cycles of length 3
- $\exists x \exists y\, (\neg(x = y) \wedge E(x, y) \wedge \forall z\, ((x = z) \vee (y = z)))$
    - (Finite) class of graphs with exactly two connected vertices.

Relational Databases as FO structures

A relational database D

- U^D: set of (possibly differently typed) data items
- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: $\{P_1, \ldots P_k, =\}$, where P_i is a k_i-ary predicate corr. to the i^{th} table in database with k_i columns
- Interpretation: For $a_1, \ldots a_{k_i} \in U^D$, $P_i(a_1, \ldots a_{k_i}) =$ **true** iff $(a_1, \ldots a_{k_1})$ is a row of the i^{th} table

Relational Databases as FO structures

A relational database D

- U^D: set of (possibly differently typed) data items
- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: $\{P_1, \ldots P_k, =\}$, where P_i is a k_i-ary predicate corr. to the i^{th} table in database with k_i columns
- Interpretation: For $a_1, \ldots a_{k_i} \in U^D$, $P_i(a_1, \ldots a_{k_i}) =$ **true** iff $(a_1, \ldots a_{k_1})$ is a row of the i^{th} table

Examples of classes of databases definable in FOL:

- $\forall x \forall y \forall z \, \mathrm{StRec}(x, y, z) \leftrightarrow \mathrm{Dob}(x, y) \wedge \mathrm{Class}(x, z)$
  - Table StRec is the natural join of Tables Dob and Class

Relational Databases as FO structures

A relational database D

- U^D: set of (possibly differently typed) data items
- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: $\{P_1, \ldots P_k, =\}$, where P_i is a k_i-ary predicate corr. to the i^{th} table in database with k_i columns
- Interpretation: For $a_1, \ldots a_{k_i} \in U^D$, $P_i(a_1, \ldots a_{k_i}) = \mathbf{true}$ iff $(a_1, \ldots a_{k_1})$ is a row of the i^{th} table

Examples of classes of databases definable in FOL:

- $\forall x \forall y \forall z\, \mathsf{StRec}(x, y, z) \leftrightarrow \mathsf{Dob}(x, y) \wedge \mathsf{Class}(x, z)$
  - Table StRec is the natural join of Tables Dob and Class
- $\forall x \forall y\, \mathsf{Dob}(x, y) \rightarrow \exists z\, \mathsf{StRec}(x, y, z)$
  - Table Dob is a projection of Table StRec

Relational Databases as FO structures

A relational database D

- U^D: set of (possibly differently typed) data items
- Vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$: $\{P_1, \ldots P_k, =\}$, where P_i is a k_i-ary predicate corr. to the i^{th} table in database with k_i columns
- Interpretation: For $a_1, \ldots a_{k_i} \in U^D$, $P_i(a_1, \ldots a_{k_i}) =$ **true** iff $(a_1, \ldots a_{k_1})$ is a row of the i^{th} table

Examples of classes of databases definable in FOL:

- $\forall x \forall y \forall z\, \mathrm{StRec}(x, y, z) \leftrightarrow \mathrm{Dob}(x, y) \wedge \mathrm{Class}(x, z)$
  - Table StRec is the natural join of Tables Dob and Class
- $\forall x \forall y\, \mathrm{Dob}(x, y) \rightarrow \exists z\, \mathrm{StRec}(x, y, z)$
  - Table Dob is a projection of Table StRec

Example database query:

- $\varphi(x) \triangleq \exists y \exists z\, (\mathrm{Dob}(x, y) \wedge \mathrm{After}(y, \text{“}01/01/1990''\text{)} \wedge \mathrm{Class}(x, z) \wedge \mathrm{Primary}(z))$

  Defines set of students born after “01/01/1990” and studying in a primary class.

Number systems as FO structures

Natural/real numbers with addition, multiplication, linear ordering and constants $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ (fixed interpretation)

- $\mathfrak{N} = (\mathbb{N}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \times, +, <, =)$
- $\mathfrak{R} = (\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \times, +, <, =)$

Number systems as FO structures

Natural/real numbers with addition, multiplication, linear ordering and constants $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ (fixed interpretation)

- $\mathfrak{N} = (\mathbb{N}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \times, +, <, =)$
- $\mathfrak{R} = (\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \times, +, <, =)$

Examples of properties expressible in FOL:

- $\mathfrak{R} \models \forall x \exists y\, (x = ((y \times y) \times y))$
  - Every real number has a real cube root

Number systems as FO structures

Natural/real numbers with addition, multiplication, linear ordering and constants $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ (fixed interpretation)

- $\mathfrak{N} = (\mathbb{N}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \times, +, <, =)$
- $\mathfrak{R} = (\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \times, +, <, =)$

Examples of properties expressible in FOL:

- $\mathfrak{R} \models \forall x \exists y\, (x = ((y \times y) \times y))$
  - Every real number has a real cube root
- $\mathfrak{N} \not\models \forall x \exists y \exists z\, (x \ = \ (y \times y) + (z \times z))$
  $\mathfrak{R} \models \forall x \exists y \exists z\, (x \ = \ (y \times y) + (z \times z))$
  - Not every natural number can be expressed as the sum of squares of two natural numbers. This can be done for real numbers

Number systems as FO structures

Natural/real numbers with addition, multiplication, linear ordering and constants $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ (fixed interpretation)

- $\mathfrak{N} = (\mathbb{N}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \times, +, <, =)$
- $\mathfrak{R} = (\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \times, +, <, =)$

Examples of properties expressible in FOL:

- $\mathfrak{R} \models \forall x \exists y\, (x = ((y \times y) \times y))$
    - Every real number has a real cube root
- $\mathfrak{N} \not\models \forall x \exists y \exists z\, (x \;=\; (y \times y) + (z \times z))$
  $\mathfrak{R} \models \forall x \exists y \exists z\, (x \;=\; (y \times y) + (z \times z))$
    - Not every natural number can be expressed as the sum of squares of two natural numbers. This can be done for real numbers
- $\mathfrak{N} \models \forall x \exists y\, ((x < y) \wedge$
  $(\forall z \forall w\, (y = z \times w) \rightarrow ((z = y) \vee (w = y)))$
    - There are infinitely many prime natural numbers

Compactness of FOL

Compactness Theorem

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a (possibly infinite) set of FOL formulas. If all finite subsets of $\mathcal{F}$ are consistent (satisfiable), then so is $\mathcal{F}$

Compactness of FOL

Compactness Theorem

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a (possibly infinite) set of FOL formulas. If all finite subsets of $\mathcal{F}$ are consistent (satisfiable), then so is $\mathcal{F}$

Corollary

If $\mathcal{F}$ is inconsistent, then there is a finite subset of $\mathcal{F}$ that is also inconsistent (unsatisfiable)

- **Upward Lowenheim Skolem Theorem:** Let φ be a $\mathcal{V}$-sentence such that for every natural number $n \geq 1$, there is a $\mathcal{V}$-structure M_n with $\geq n$ elements in its universe, such that $M_n \models \varphi$. Then there exists a $\mathcal{V}$-structure M with inifnetely many elements in its universe, such that $M \models \varphi$
  Proof: Follows from Compactness Theorem
  Consequences:
  There is no FOL sentence that describes the class of of finite cliques
  There is no FOL sentence that describes the class of finite sets