

Logic

1	Propositional Logic	2
1.1	The Language of Propositional Logic	2
1.2	Truth Assignment	3
1.3	Proof System	4

Chapter 1

Propositional Logic

1.1 The Language of Propositional Logic

Definition 1.1. An **alphabet** for propositional logic is a pair $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{C})$, where each component is as follows.

- \mathcal{V} is a countably infinite set of **propositional variables**.
- \mathcal{C} is a finite set of **connectives** with

$$\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} \mathcal{C}_i,$$

where \mathcal{C}_i is the set of connectives of arity i .

Remark. In the default setting, we usually let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}_0 &= \{\perp, \top\} \\ \mathcal{C}_1 &= \{\neg\} \\ \mathcal{C}_2 &= \{\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow\}\end{aligned}$$

and $\mathcal{C}_j = \emptyset$ for $j \geq 3$.

Definition 1.2. The language \mathcal{L} of **formulas** over alphabet $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{C})$ is the minimal set that satisfies the following statements.

- Each propositional variable in \mathcal{V} is a formula.
- If \star is a connective in \mathcal{C}_k and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k$ are formulas, then $\star\alpha_1\alpha_2\cdots\alpha_k$ is a formula.

1.2 Truth Assignment

Definition 1.3. A **truth assignment** is a function $\tau : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. It can be extended to $\bar{\tau} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by assigning each connective with arity k to a boolean function from $\{0, 1\}^k$ to $\{0, 1\}$.

Remark. By convention, we use the truth table as follows.

$\bar{\tau}(\perp) \quad \bar{\tau}(\top)$		$\bar{\tau}(\alpha)$	$\bar{\tau}(\neg\alpha)$
0	1	0	1
		1	0

$\bar{\tau}(\alpha)$	$\bar{\tau}(\beta)$	$\bar{\tau}(\alpha \wedge \beta)$	$\bar{\tau}(\alpha \vee \beta)$	$\bar{\tau}(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$	$\bar{\tau}(\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta)$
0	0	0	0	1	1
0	1	0	1	1	0
1	0	0	1	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 1.1: Truth Table

Definition 1.4. We say that a truth assignment τ **satisfies** a formula α if $\bar{\tau}(\alpha) = 1$. Also, we say that τ satisfies a set Σ of formulas if it satisfies each formula in Σ .

Definition 1.5. Let Σ be a set of formulas and let α be a formula. We say that Σ **tautologically implies** α , denoted by $\Sigma \models \alpha$, if every truth assignment satisfying Σ also satisfies α .

1.3 Proof System

Definition 1.6. The collection Λ of **axioms** consists of the formulas listed below, where α, β, γ are formulas.

$$(A1) \quad \alpha \rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow \alpha).$$

$$(A2) \quad (\alpha \rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow \gamma)) \rightarrow ((\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \gamma)).$$

$$(A3) \quad (\neg\beta \rightarrow \neg\alpha) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta).$$

Definition 1.7. A **proof** of a formula α from a collection Γ of formulas is a sequence of formulas

$$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$$

satisfying the following properties.

$$(a) \quad \alpha_n = \alpha.$$

$$(b) \quad \text{For } k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, \text{ either } \alpha_k \in \Lambda \cup \Gamma \text{ or there exist } i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\} \text{ with } \alpha_j = \alpha_i \rightarrow \alpha_k.$$

If there exists a proof of φ from Γ , we write $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$. If $\emptyset \vdash \varphi$, we write $\vdash \varphi$ for short.

Theorem 1.8. For any formula α , we have $\vdash \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$.

Proof. We have a proof of $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha$ as follows.

$$1. \quad (\alpha \rightarrow ((\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha)) \rightarrow ((\alpha \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)). \quad (A2)$$

$$2. \quad \alpha \rightarrow ((\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha). \quad (A1)$$

$$3. \quad (\alpha \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha). \quad (1, 2)$$

$$4. \quad \alpha \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha). \quad (A1)$$

$$5. \quad \alpha \rightarrow \alpha. \quad (3, 4)$$

Thus, we can conclude that $\vdash \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$. \square

Proposition 1.9. Let Γ and Δ be sets of formulas and let α be a formula. If $\Gamma \vdash \alpha$ and $\Gamma \subseteq \Delta$, then $\Delta \vdash \alpha$.

Proof. To be completed. \square

Theorem 1.10 (Deduction Theorem). Let Γ be a set of formulas and let α and β be formulas. If $\Gamma \cup \{\alpha\} \vdash \beta$, then $\Gamma \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \beta$.

Proof. If $\beta \in \Lambda \cup \Gamma$, then we have $\Gamma \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \beta$ since $\vdash \beta \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$. Furthermore, if $\beta = \alpha$, then we also have $\Gamma \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \beta$ since $\vdash \beta \rightarrow \beta$ by Theorem 1.8. Thus, one only needs to consider the case that $\beta \notin \Lambda \cup \Gamma \cup \{\alpha\}$.

Suppose that $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_n)$ is a proof of β from $\Gamma \cup \{\alpha\}$. For $1 \leq k \leq n$, we prove that $\Gamma \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \beta_k$ by induction on k . The induction basis holds for $k = 1$ since $\beta_1 \in \Lambda \cup \Gamma \cup \{\alpha\}$. For the induction step, let $k \geq 2$ and assume that $\Gamma \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \beta_\ell$ for $1 \leq \ell < k$. We have proved for the case that $\beta \in \Lambda \cup \Gamma \cup \{\alpha\}$, and thus we

assume without loss of generality that there exist $1 \leq i < k$ and $1 \leq j < k$ such that $\beta_j = \beta_i \rightarrow \beta_k$. Note that $\Gamma \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \beta_i$ and $\Gamma \vdash \alpha \rightarrow (\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_k)$ hold by induction hypothesis. Therefore, since

$$\vdash (\alpha \rightarrow (\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_k)) \rightarrow ((\alpha \rightarrow \beta_i) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta_k)),$$

we can conclude that $\Gamma \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \beta_k$, which completes the proof. \square

Theorem 1.11. For any formula α and β , we have $\vdash \neg\alpha \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$.

Proof. We have a proof of $\neg\alpha \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$ as follows.

$$1. ((\neg\beta \rightarrow \neg\alpha) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)) \rightarrow (\neg\alpha \rightarrow ((\neg\beta \rightarrow \neg\alpha) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta))). \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$2. (\neg\beta \rightarrow \neg\alpha) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta). \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$3. \neg\alpha \rightarrow ((\neg\beta \rightarrow \neg\alpha) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)). \quad (1, 2)$$

$$4. (\neg\alpha \rightarrow ((\neg\beta \rightarrow \neg\alpha) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta))) \rightarrow ((\neg\alpha \rightarrow (\neg\beta \rightarrow \neg\alpha)) \rightarrow (\neg\alpha \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta))). \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$5. (\neg\alpha \rightarrow (\neg\beta \rightarrow \neg\alpha)) \rightarrow (\neg\alpha \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)). \quad (3, 4)$$

$$6. \neg\alpha \rightarrow (\neg\beta \rightarrow \neg\alpha). \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$7. \neg\alpha \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta). \quad (5, 6)$$

Thus, we can conclude that $\vdash \neg\alpha \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$. \square