

The Soundness Theorem

$$(\Sigma \vdash \phi \Rightarrow \Sigma \models \phi)$$

ie: if ϕ is deducible from Σ , then whenever every statement in Σ is true, so is ϕ

Proof

Suppose $\Sigma \vdash \phi$, ie there is a deduction $\Psi_1, \Psi_2, \dots, \Psi_n$ where each Ψ_i is:

- (1) a logical axiom
- (2) a hypothesis (ie $\Psi_i \in \Sigma$)
- or
- (3) it follows from some Ψ_j, Ψ_k (with $j, k < i$) by MP

We'll use induction on n (the length of the deduction) to show that if every statement in Σ is true, so is Ψ_n

Base Step: ($n=1$)

- In this case Ψ_1 is the deduction
- suppose that every statement in Σ is true (for some assignment of T/F to each atomic formula occurring in a formula in Σ)
- then Ψ_1 is true b/c either $\Psi_1 \in \Sigma$ (so it's true) or it's a logical axiom (so it's true)

Inductive Hypothesis: ($n=k$)

- If Ψ_1, \dots, Ψ_k is a deduction from Σ
- then whenever every statement in Σ is true, so is Ψ_k

Inductive Step: ($n=k+1$)

- so our deduction is $\Psi_1, \dots, \Psi_k, \Psi_{k+1}$

(We show: if every statement in Σ is true, then so is Ψ_{k+1})

- then Ψ_{k+1} is:

- (1) a logical axiom
- (2) $\Psi_{k+1} \in \Sigma$
- or
- (3) follows from Ψ_i, Ψ_j ($i, j < k+1$) by MP

- then if every statement in Σ is true (cases (1) & (2)), then Ψ_{k+1} is true, if it is an axiom or in Σ
- in case (3), where Ψ_{k+1} follows from $\Psi_i \& \Psi_j$ by MP, by the Induction Hypothesis, since $i, j < k+1$, $\Psi_i \& \Psi_j$ are true whenever every statement in Σ is true
- since Ψ_{k+1} follows from $\Psi_i \& \Psi_j$ by MP, we either have $\Psi_i \& \Psi_j \Rightarrow \Psi_{k+1}$ OR $\Psi_j \& \Psi_i \Rightarrow \Psi_{k+1}$
- if $\Psi_i \& \Psi_j \Rightarrow \Psi_{k+1}$ & both $\Psi_i \& \Psi_j \Rightarrow \Psi_{k+1}$ are true, then Ψ_{k+1} is true by how " \Rightarrow " works
- Similarly for every other case

∴ If the Induction Hypothesis is true, the Inductive Step works

- By mathematical induction, if $\Sigma \vdash \phi$, then $\Sigma \models \phi$ is correct //

Another example of Induction

"Every official formula of propositional logic has exactly as many left as right parentheses"

Proof:

We will proceed by induction on the number of connectives in the formula

Base Step: ($n=0$)

- then the formula is atomic, so it has no parentheses & hence an equal number of left & right parentheses

Induction Hypothesis: ($n=k$)

- every formula with k connectives has an equal number of left & right parentheses

Inductive Step: ($n=k+1$)

- suppose the formula α has $k+1$ connectives

- then α is either $(\neg \beta)$ for some formula β or α is $(\gamma \Rightarrow \delta)$ for some formulas $\gamma \& \delta$

- (1) if α is $(\neg \beta)$, then β has $(k+1)-1=k$ connectives

- By the I.H., β has the same # of left as right parentheses, we'll call this number b .

- then α has $1+b$ left parentheses & $b+1$ right parentheses (hence the same number of each).

(2) If α is $(\gamma \Rightarrow \delta)$, then $\gamma \ \& \ \delta$ together have k connectives

\Rightarrow By the IH since $\gamma \ \& \ \delta$ each have to have $k+1$ connectives, they each have the same number of left as right parentheses, say $g \ \& \ d$ respectively

\Rightarrow then α (which is $(\gamma \Rightarrow \delta)$) has $1+g+d$ left parentheses $\& \ g+d+1$ right parentheses, hence an equal number of each

\Rightarrow thus, α has the same number of left $\& \$ right parentheses

\therefore by induction, every official formula has the same number of left $\& \$ right parentheses

Propositional logic does not handle quantifiers:

\Rightarrow "for all" \forall

\Rightarrow "there exists" \exists

A "first-order" language needs:

- quantifiers: \forall, \exists

- variables: x, y, z, \dots *lower end of the alphabet*

$\Rightarrow (x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots)$ more formally

- functions: f, g, h *middle of the alphabet*

$\Rightarrow f: \mathcal{U}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ *$k = \#$ of parts of input*

$\Rightarrow (+, -, \times, \div)$

- connectives: $(\neg, \rightarrow, \wedge, \vee, \leftrightarrow)$

- grouping symbols: $(,)$

- constants: a, b, c, \dots

$\Rightarrow (e, i, o, \dots)$ more formally

\Rightarrow examples: $0, 1, \pi, e, 2, \dots$

- relations: P, Q, R

\Rightarrow example: $=, <, >, \dots$

$\Rightarrow R_n: \mathcal{U}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ *$n = \#$ of parts*

(won't do higher than first order languages)

A (minimal) language for set theory

- quantifier: \forall

$\Rightarrow (\exists x) \phi$ shorthand for $(\neg \forall x (\neg \phi))$

- variables: x, y, z, \dots

$\Rightarrow x, y, z$

- grouping symbols: $(,)$

- relations: \in

$\Rightarrow \cup, \cap, \setminus, \subseteq$

- equality: $=$

\Rightarrow screwed if we can't tell when two things are equal

- functions: none (\emptyset)

- constants: none (\emptyset)

- connectives: \neg, \rightarrow

$\Rightarrow \wedge, \vee, \leftrightarrow$

The formulas of the language are:

(1) the "atomic" formulas are: $x \in y \ \& \ y \in x$

(2) if $\alpha \ \& \ \beta$ are formulas, so are $(\neg \alpha) \ \& \ (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$

(3) if α is a formula, so is $\forall x \alpha \rightarrow$ for any variables

(4) nothing else is a formula