axd.1 Proof-Theoretic Notions

fol:axd:ptn: sec

Just as we've defined a number of important semantic notions (validity, entailment, satisfiabilty), we now define corresponding *proof-theoretic notions*. These are not defined by appeal to satisfaction of sentences in structures, but by appeal to the derivability or non-derivability of certain formulas. It was an important discovery, due to Gödel, that these notions coincide. That they do is the content of the *completeness theorem*. explanation

The proof-theoretic notions for propositional logic are similar.

Definition axd.1 (Derivability)**.** A formula φ is *derivable* from Γ, written $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$, if there is a derivation from Γ ending in φ.

Definition axd.2 (Theorems)**.** A formula φ is a *theorem* if there is a derivation of φ from the empty set. We write $\vdash \varphi$ if φ is a theorem and $\nvdash \varphi$ if it is not.

Definition axd.3 (Consistency)**.** A set Γ of formulas is *consistent* if and only if $\Gamma \nvdash \bot$; it is *inconsistent* otherwise.

fol:axd:ptn: prop:reflexivity

Proposition axd.4 (Reflexivity)**.** *If $\varphi \in \Gamma$, then $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$.*

Proof. The formula φ by itself is a derivation of φ from Γ. □

fol:axd:ptn: prop:monotony

Proposition axd.5 (Monotony)**.** *If $\Gamma \subseteq \Delta$ and $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$, then $\Delta \vdash \varphi$.*

Proof. Any derivation of φ from Γ is also a derivation of φ from Δ. □

fol:axd:ptn: prop:transitivity

Proposition axd.6 (Transitivity)**.** *If $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ for every $\varphi \in \Delta$ and $\Delta \vdash \psi$, then $\Gamma \vdash \psi$.*

Proof. Suppose $\Delta \vdash \psi$. Then there is a derivation $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_l = \psi$ from Δ. Some of the steps in that derivation will be correct because of a rule which refers to a prior line ψ_i that includes a formula $\psi_i \in \Delta$. Let $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ be all the formulas in Δ so referenced. For each one of them, by hypothesis, there is a derivation of φ_i from Γ, i.e., a derivation $\varphi_i^1, \dots, \varphi_i^{k_i} = \varphi_i$ where every φ_i^j is an axiom, an element of Γ, or correct by a rule of inference. Now consider the sequence

$$\varphi_1^1, \dots, \varphi_1^{k_1}, \dots, \varphi_n^1, \dots, \varphi_n^{k_n}, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_l = \psi.$$

This is a correct derivation of ψ from Γ since each $\psi_i \in \Delta$ needed to justify the inferences in the part $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_l$ is now justified itself. □

fol:axd:ptn: prop:incons

Proposition axd.7. *Γ is inconsistent iff $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ for every sentence φ.*

Proof. Exercise. □

Problem axd.1. Prove Proposition axd.7

fol:axd:ptn: prop:proves-compact

Proposition axd.8 (Compactness)**.**

1. *If $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ then there is a finite subset $\Gamma_0 \subseteq \Gamma$ such that $\Gamma_0 \vdash \varphi$.*

2. *If every finite subset of Γ is consistent, then Γ is consistent.*

Proof. 1. If $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$, then there is a finite sequence of formulas $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ so that $\varphi \equiv \varphi_n$ and each φ_i is either a logical axiom, an element of Γ or follows from previous formulas by modus ponens. Take Γ_0 to be those φ_i which are in Γ. Then the derivation is likewise a derivation from Γ_0, and so $\Gamma_0 \vdash \varphi$.

2. This is the contrapositive of (1) for the special case $\varphi \equiv \bot$.

□

Photo Credits

Bibliography