

Is dependence logical?

Fredrik Engström
Göteborg University
LINT

2008-12-06

My background

Dependence logic

Logical constants

My background

- ▶ Non-standard models of Peano Arithmetic, PA.
- ▶ Extending the notion of resplendent models to non-first-order languages (transplendent models).
- ▶ Scott set: A boolean algebra of sets of natural numbers closed under computability and weak König's lemma.
- ▶ Standard system: $SSy(M) = \{ A \cap \mathbb{N} \mid A \in \text{Def}(M) \}$.
- ▶ Scott's problem: Are the standard systems exactly the Scott sets? (All standard systems are Scott sets and every Scott set of cardinality $\leq \aleph_1$ is a standard system.)
- ▶ Second-order arithmetic.

Recursive saturation


- ▶ A type over M is a set of formulas with finitely many parameters \bar{a} from M and finitely many free variables \bar{x} consistent with $\text{Th}(M, \bar{a})$.
- ▶ M is recursively saturated if all recursive types over M are realized in M .
- ▶ PA: There is a Σ_1^1 -sentence characterizing recursive saturation (“ M -logic is consistent”).
- ▶ Countable recursively saturated models of PA are nice: They are uniquely determined by its first-order theory and its standard system.

Resplendent models

- ▶ M is resplendent if for any recursive theory T in an expanded language $\mathcal{L} \supseteq \mathcal{L}_A \cup \{\bar{a}\}$ such that $T + \text{Th}(M, \bar{a})$ is consistent there is an expansion of M satisfying T .
- ▶ All resplendent models are recursively saturated.
- ▶ All countable recursively saturated models are resplendent.
- ▶ PA: There is a Δ_2^1 sentence Θ characterizing resplendency.
- ▶ Θ says that M -logic is consistent and that for every sentence φ consistent in M -logic there is a satisfaction class including φ .

Dependence logic

- ▶ $= (x_1, \dots, x_k, y)$ means $\exists f(f(x_1, \dots, x_k) = y)$
- ▶ Why not “ $x_1, \dots, x_k \mapsto y$ ”?



- ▶ Thus, there is a \mathcal{D} -sentence characterizing recursive saturation.
- ▶ Also, truth is definable in \mathcal{D} , i.e., there is a formula $\text{Tr}(x)$ such that $M \models \varphi$ iff $M \models \text{Tr}(\varphi)$ for models $M \models \text{PA}$.

Logical constants in FOL I

- ▶ The semantic value of a formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ on a model M is $\varphi(M|\bar{x}) = \{ \bar{a} \in M \mid M \models \varphi[\bar{a}/\bar{x}] \}$.
- ▶ Let $S_k(M) = \{ X \subseteq M^k \}$ be the set of all (possible) semantic values (of arity k). ($S_0 = \{ \text{t}, \text{f} \}$)
- ▶ A k -ary quantifier on M is a function $S_k \rightarrow \{ \text{t}, \text{f} \}$
- ▶ \exists_M as a unary quantifier: $S_1(M) \rightarrow S_0$, $\exists_M(X) = \text{t}$ iff $X \neq \emptyset$.
- ▶ A k -ary operator F on M is a set of functions $F^n : S_{n+k} \rightarrow S_n$.
- ▶ \exists_M as a unary operator: $\exists_M^n : S_{n+1}(M) \rightarrow S_n(M)$ (projection).
- ▶ A k -ary quantifier Q gives rise to a k -ary operator:

$$S_{n+k}(M) \ni X \mapsto \{ \bar{b} \in M^n \mid Q(X_{\bar{b}}) = \text{t} \}$$

where $X_{\bar{b}} = \{ \bar{a} \in M^k \mid \langle \bar{a}, \bar{b} \rangle \in X \}$ is the \bar{b} -slice of X .

Logical constants FOL II

- ▶ Which quantifiers are logical constants?
- ▶ Given a relation \equiv on models, a quantifier Q respects \equiv if given $(M, A) \equiv (N, B)$ we have $Q_M(A) = Q_N(B)$.
- ▶ Different relations \equiv have been proposed for characterizing logical constants: Automorphic, isomorphic, homomorphic and back-and-forth equivalent.
- ▶ What if we shift view and work with operators instead of quantifiers? (Nothing happens in the isomorphism case.)

Logical constants in dependence logic I

- ▶ What is the semantic value of a formula in dependence logic?
- ▶ $T_k(M) = P(M^k) - \emptyset$
- ▶ $M \models_{T/\bar{x}} \varphi$
- ▶ $[\bar{x}|\varphi]_M = \{ T \in T_k(M) \mid M \models_{T/\bar{x}} \varphi \}$
- ▶ $[\varphi]$ can not be the semantic value of φ if we want the semantics to be compositional wrt negation.
- ▶ $[\bar{x}|\varphi]$ be the *partial* function $T_k(M) \rightarrow \{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{f}\}$ such that

$$[\bar{x}|\varphi]_M(T) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{t} & \text{if } M \models_{\bar{x}/T} \varphi \\ \mathbf{f} & \text{if } M \models_{\bar{x}/T} \neg\varphi . \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- ▶ Let $S_k(M)$ be the set of partial functions $T_k(M) \rightarrow \{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{f}\}$.

Logical constants in dependence logic II

- ▶ A k -ary \mathcal{D} -quantifier on M is a partial function

$$Q_M : S_k(M) \rightarrow \{ \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{f} \}.$$

- ▶ A team-structure is a set M together with $f \in S_k(M)$.
- ▶ Thus, a \mathcal{D} -quantifier Q is a partial function from the class of team-structures to $\{ \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{f} \}$.
- ▶ Given a relation \equiv on team structures a quantifier Q respects the relation if for any $(M, f) \equiv (N, g)$ we have $Q_M(f) = Q_N(g)$.
- ▶ To do: Characterize the quantifiers respecting certain (interesting) relations.

Quantifiers and \mathcal{D} -quantifiers

- ▶ Every quantifier Q gives, in a natural way, a \mathcal{D} -quantifier by

$$Q_M^{\mathcal{D}}(f) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{t} & \text{if } \cup f^{-1}(\mathbf{t}) \in Q_M \\ \mathbf{f} & \text{if } \cup f^{-1}(\mathbf{f}) \notin Q_M \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- ▶ If $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \text{FOL}$ and Q is a quantifier then $M \models Q\bar{x}\varphi(\bar{x})$ iff $M \models Q^{\mathcal{D}}\bar{x}\varphi(\bar{x})$.
- ▶ Test: Does this transformation respect logicity?

Thanks