Dependence logic Problems 5 Tuesday 29.4.2014

1. Every sentence  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$  is logically equivalent to a sentence  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}$  of the form

$$\forall x_1 \dots \forall x_n \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_m (\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2), \tag{1}$$

where  $\theta_1$  is a conjunction of dependence atoms and  $\theta_2$  is a quantifier-free first-order formula. Is the following generalization of this result possible: Every sentence  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$  is strongly logically equivalent to a sentence as in (1)?

- **2.** Let  $\phi$  be a sentence of dependence logic that is in negation normal-form and does not contain any universal quantifiers. Show that there is a first-order sentence  $\phi^*$  which is logically equivalent to  $\phi$ . (Hint: Use induction on  $\phi$ . Note also that over teams  $X = \{s\}$  with just one assignment dependence atoms can be replaced with  $\top$ .)
- **3.** Show that

$$=(x_1,...,x_n) \equiv x_n \perp_{x_1,...,x_{n-1}} x_n.$$

- **4.** Show that every formula of inclusion logic and independence logic can be translated to  $\Sigma^1_1$  by extending the translation  $\phi \mapsto \tau_{1,\phi}$  between dependence logic and  $\Sigma^1_1$  by clauses corresponding to independence atoms and inclusion atoms. (see Theorem 6.2 of the course textbook on page 88.)
- **5.** The connective called intuitionistic implication  $\phi \rightarrow \psi$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{M} \models_X \phi \twoheadrightarrow \psi$$
 iff ( for all  $Y \subseteq X$ : if  $\mathcal{M} \models_Y \phi$  then  $\mathcal{M} \models_Y \psi$ ).

Let  $\mathcal{D}(\twoheadrightarrow)$  be the extension of dependence logic in which  $\twoheadrightarrow$  is introduced as a new connective but negation is only allowed in front of atomic formulas (  $\land$  and  $\forall$  are also available). Show that dependence atoms  $=(t_1, ..., t_k)$  can be expressed in  $\mathcal{D}(\twoheadrightarrow)$  using only dependence atoms of the form  $=(t_i)$ .

**6.** Let  $\phi$  be a sentence of  $\mathcal{D}(\twoheadrightarrow)$ . Construct a sentence  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(\twoheadrightarrow)$  such that for all  $\mathcal{M}$ :

$$\mathcal{M} \models \psi \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \not\models \phi.$$

This shows that, for sentences,  $\mathcal{D}(\rightarrow)$  is closed under classical negation.