

Sogic and Let Theory

January 20, 2020

1 Propositional Logic

Let P be a set of **primitive propositions**, i.e. P is a set of symbols with $(,), \perp, \implies \notin P$. Unless stated otherwise (i.e. that P is uncountable), we may assume that $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots\}$.

The set of **propositions**, denoted by $L(P)$ or simply just L , is defined inductively as follows:

1. $P \subset L$
2. $\perp \in L$, called FALSE
3. if $p, q \in L$, then $(p \implies q) \in L$

Each proposition is a string of symbols from $P \cup \{ (,), \perp, \implies \}$, for instance we have the propositions $p_1, (p_1 \implies p_1), ((p_1 \implies p_2) \implies (p_2 \implies (\perp \implies p_3)))$. For readability, we often draw symbols $(,)$ in different ways, for instance as $[, (, ($.

Sometimes we omit the outside pair of parentheses when writing down propositions, for instance $p_1 \implies p_2$ is shorthand for $(p_1 \implies p_2)$.

Also we use some abbreviations, e.g.:

NOT: $\neg p$ to mean $(p \implies \perp)$

OR: $p \vee q$ to mean $(\neg p \implies q)$

AND: $p \wedge q$ to mean $\neg(\neg p \vee \neg q)$

What do we mean by L “defined inductively”? Define $L_0 = P \cup \{\perp\}$. Then, given L_n , we can define $L_{n+1} = L_n \cup \{(p \implies q) : p, q \in L_n\}$. Then we set $L = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} L_n$. Note: if $p \in L \setminus (P \cup \{\perp\})$, then it is easy to show that there are **unique** $q, r \in L$ with $p = (q \implies r)$.

1.1 Semantic Entailment

A **valuation** is a function $v : L \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ satisfying:

1. $v(\perp) = 0$
2. For all $p, q \in L$, $v(p \implies q) = \begin{cases} 0 & v(p) = 1, v(q) = 0 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$.

If $p \in L$ and $v(p) = 1$ for every valuation, we say that p is a **tautology**, and write $\models p$.

Examples:

1. $\models (p \implies p)$

$v(p)$	$v(p \implies p)$
0	1
1	1

So this is a tautology.

2. $\models (p \implies (q \implies p))$

p	q	$q \implies p$	$p \implies (q \implies p)$
0	0	1	1
0	1	0	1
1	0	1	1
1	1	1	1

So this is a tautology.

3. Is $\models (p \implies (q \implies r)) \implies ((p \implies q) \implies (p \implies r))$?

Suppose not. Then for some p, q, r and valuation v we have:

$$\begin{aligned} v(p \implies (q \implies r)) &= 1 \\ v((p \implies q) \implies (p \implies r)) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

So $v(p \implies q) = 1, v(p \implies r) = 0$. Hence $v(p) = 1, v(r) = 0, v(q) = 1$. But then $v(q \implies r) = 0$, and so $v(p \implies (q \implies r)) = 0 \nmid$.

4. $\models ((p \implies \perp) \implies \perp) \implies p$, i.e. $\neg\neg p \implies p$, i.e. $(\neg p \vee p)$. This is the Law of the Excluded Middle, and is also a tautology.