

## 14 Completeness of Propositional Logic

Whenever  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n \models \psi$  holds then there exists a natural deduction proof for the sequent  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n \vdash \psi$ .

*Proof Sketch*

1. Assuming (1), we show that  $\models \phi_1 \rightarrow (\phi_2 \rightarrow \dots (\phi_n \rightarrow \psi))$  holds.
2. We show that  $\vdash \phi_1 \rightarrow (\phi_2 \rightarrow \dots (\phi_n \rightarrow \psi))$  is valid.
3.  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n \vdash \psi$  is valid.

Please refer the textbook for the proof.

### 14.1 Corollary[Soundness and Completeness of Propositional Logic]

Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n$  and  $\psi$  be formulae of propositional logic. Then,  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n \vdash \psi$  is valid.

### 14.2 Semantic Equivalence

Let  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  be formulas in propositional logic. We say that,  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are semantically equivalent iff  $\phi \models \psi$  holds and  $\psi \models \phi$  holds as well.

We write  $\phi \equiv \psi$

We call  $\phi$  valid iff  $\models \phi$  holds. Semantic equivalence is identical to provable equivalence.

e.g.  $p \rightarrow q \equiv \neg q \rightarrow \neg p$   
 $p \rightarrow q \equiv \neg p \vee q$

We want to transform formulae into forms in which validity checks are easy.  
 $\phi \rightarrow \psi \equiv \neg \phi \vee \psi$ .

**Definition:** A literal  $L$  is either an atom or negation of atom.

A formula  $C$  in Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF) if it is a conjunction of the

clauses where each clause is a disjunction of literals.  
e.g.

$$(1) (p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p \vee r) (2) (\neg(q \vee \neg p) \vee r) \wedge (p \vee q)$$

(2) is not in CNF form as it has negation of clause.

### Definition of CNF in Backus Norm Form (BNF)

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Literal} & L ::= p | \neg p \\ \text{Clause} & D ::= L | L \vee D \\ \text{CNF Formula} & C ::= D | D \wedge C \end{array}$$

Observations:

1. A CNF is a conjunction of clauses  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n$   
i.e.  $C \equiv C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge \dots \wedge C_n$ .  
For  $C$  to be true it must be the case that each one of  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n$  are true.  
Suppose  $C_i$  is not a valid formula then  $C$  is not valid. Now there may be a single clause featuring all  $n$  atoms.