

Extra Problem. As at the problem about  
sages each of alchemist tries to imagine  
what think other ones, after the order.  
Some of them know 7 ~~or~~ dishonest servants,  
some 6.

What do think the last ones?

What is clear?

If ~~somebody~~ somebody didn't know any  
traitor then his servant is traitor and  
he would be kill him;

If nobody was killed ~~at~~ <sup>the</sup> 1st night on  
2nd night ~~then~~ alchemists who know ~~only~~  
1 traitor will ~~as~~ kill his one etc.

all 7 traitor will <sup>be</sup> killed at 7th night  
by ~~to~~ <sup>all</sup> alchemists who knows only 6 traitor.  
the number of alchemists isn't essential.

$$3) A = (\forall x)(P(x) \vee Q(x))$$

$$B = (\forall y) (P(y) \vee \forall z Q(z))$$

$B \Rightarrow A$  - Tautology:

$$(\forall y) P(y) \equiv \text{True} \text{ means } P(y) \equiv \text{True}$$

B means at least one of them is Tautology but ~~its~~ their disjunction is True

But if A is True it means that for each x P(x) or Q(x) is True but it doesn't mean that ~~one of the~~ at least of them is tautology.

Typical example:

$\mathbb{N}$  P(x): x is odd; Q(x): x is ~~odd~~ even

Then  $(\forall x) P(x) \vee Q(x)$  is True

but  $(\forall y) P(y)$  and  $(\forall z) Q(z)$  are False.

# Axiomatic theories

1. Fix subject fields
2. Denote and give names basic predicates.
3. New predicates <sup>are</sup> defined through basic ones
4. Some closed formulas are taken as True one (Axioms or Postulates)
5. Other theorems are ~~the~~ consequences of axioms.

First example - Euclidean geometry on the plane. (IV cent. Bc).

## Basic subject fields

- Points ( $\mathcal{P}$ )
- Lines ( $\mathcal{L}$ )

## Basic predicates:

1.  $x \in l$

( $x$  - point,  $l$  - line)  
on the line  $l$

2.  $x < y < z$

(point  $y$  lies between  $x, z$ )

More exact:  $(\exists l) (x \in l \wedge y \in l \wedge z \in l)$   
only if



$$4. (\forall x)(\forall y) x \neq y \Rightarrow (\exists! l) x \in l \wedge y \in l$$

~~There is a line~~

For  
Through 2 different ~~pts~~ points there is a line passing through these points and this line is unique.

Theorem. Two different <sup>lines</sup> can intersect not more than 1 point.

$$(\forall l)(\forall m) l \neq m \Rightarrow ((\forall x)(\forall y)(x \in l \wedge x \in m \wedge y \in m \wedge y \in l) \Rightarrow x = y)$$

Proof. By contradiction.  $\sim Q \Rightarrow (\exists x)(\exists y) x \in l \wedge x \in m \wedge y \in l \wedge y \in m \wedge l \neq m$

Definition (Intersection point)  $\left. \begin{array}{l} \\ \end{array} \right\} \text{Contradiction with Axiom 4.}$

$$x = l \cap m = x \in l \wedge x \in m$$

Proof. Contradiction. ~~is~~

$$\sim Q: (\exists x)(\exists y) x \in l \wedge y \in l \wedge x \in m \wedge y \in m \wedge x \neq y$$

$$\text{Axiom: } (\exists! l) x \in l \wedge y \in l$$

Contradiction:  $l \neq m$

5th postulat. (axiom)  $(\forall l)(\forall x) \sim x \in l \Rightarrow (\exists m) x \in m \wedge m \neq l$

$\exists (a, b), l(x, y), x \neq y$  "line  $l$  is the unique line passing through  $x, y$ ."

There are several axioms for each basic predicates:

"lie between":

$$(\forall x)(\forall y)(\forall z) x < y < z \Rightarrow \sim (x < z < y \vee y < x < z).$$

~~Corollary:  $\exists$  a~~

$$(\forall x)(\forall y)(\forall z)(\forall u) (x, y, z) \in l \Rightarrow (\exists!) \{x, y, z, u\} \text{ which lies between 2 other ones.}$$

It's possible write by a formula

$$(\forall x)(\forall y)(\forall z)(\forall u) (x \in l \wedge y \in l \Rightarrow (\exists z)(\exists u) (x < z < y \vee y < z < x \wedge x < y < u).$$

Corollary, There is  $\infty$  set of points on any line.

$$4. (\forall x)(\forall y) x \neq y \Rightarrow (\exists! l) x \in l \wedge y \in l$$

~~There is a line~~

For ~~Through~~ 2 different ~~pts~~ points there is a line passing through these points and this line is unique.

Theorem. Two different <sup>lines</sup> can intersect not more than 1 point.

$$(\forall l)(\forall m) l \neq m \Rightarrow ((\forall x)(\forall y)(x \in l \wedge x \in m \wedge y \in l \wedge y \in m) \Rightarrow x = y)$$

Proof. By contradiction.  $\sim Q \Rightarrow (\exists x)(\exists y) x \in l \wedge x \in m \wedge y \in l \wedge y \in m \wedge l \neq m$

Definition ~~\*~~ (Intersection point)  $x = l \cap m = x \in l \wedge x \in m$  }  $\text{\textcircled{Q}}$  Contradiction with Axiom 4.

Proof. Contradiction. ~~??~~

$$\sim Q: (\exists x)(\exists y) x \in l \wedge y \in l \wedge x \in m \wedge y \in m \wedge x \neq y$$

$$\text{Axiom: } (\exists! l) x \in l \wedge y \in l$$

Contradiction:  $l \neq m$

5th postulat. (Axiom)  $(\forall l)(\forall x) \sim (x \in l \Rightarrow \exists m) x \in m \wedge m \neq l$