

# CSE581

## Computer Science Fundamentals: Theory

Professor Anita Wasilewska

# LOGIC LECTURE 0

## GENERAL INFORMATION

## Course Book B1

Anita Wasilewska

### **Logics for Computer Science: Classical and Non-Classical**

Springer 2018

ISBN 978-3-319-92590-5 ISBN 978-3-319-92591-2 (e-book)

You can get the book in **Hard cover**, or in **Electronic form**  
**Springer** also has an option of providing you with **chapters** of your choice

<https://www.springer.com/us/book/9783319925905>

## Book B1

I wrote **Book B1** with students on my mind so that they can **read** and **learn** by themselves, **before** coming to class  
For sure, it is also **essential** to study after the class

We start our **Part 1: LOGIC** Lectures from **Chapter 2**  
It is an intuitive **introduction** to the Classical **Propositional** and **Predicate Logic** appropriate for somebody **without** much of previous knowledge of **Symbolic Logic**

**Chapter 3** provides a generalization of classical propositional part of **Chapter 2** Formal Propositional Languages and Extensional Semantics: **Classical and Many Valued**

## Logic Main Tasks

**First Task** when one builds a **symbolic logic**, or **foundations** of mathematics, or **foundations** of computer science, is to **define formally** a proper **symbolic language**

We distinguish and **define** two kind of languages:  
**propositional** and **predicate**

They are also called also **zero** and **first order languages**, respectively

## Logic Main Tasks

**Second Task** is to define formally what does it mean that **formulas** of a **symbolic language** are considered to be **true**, and **always true** i.e. we have to define a notion of a **tautology**

It means that we **define** what is called a **semantics** for a given **language**

**The same languages can have different semantics**

**For example**, the languages for **classical** and **intuitionistic logics** can be the same, but their **semantics** are **different**

## Logic Main Task

**Third Task** is to define a **syntactical** notion of a **proof** in a **proof system** based on a given **language**

It allows us to find out **what** can, or cannot be **proved** if certain **axioms** and **rules of inference** are assumed

This part of **syntax** is also called a **proof theory**



## Logic Main Tasks

**Fourth Task** is to investigate the **relationship** between a **syntactical** notion of a **proof system** based on a given language and a **semantics** for that language

It means we establish **formal** relationship between the **syntax** and **semantics** for a given **language**

This **relationship** is established by providing answers to the following **two questions**

## Logic Main Tasks

**Fourth Task** is to pose and answer the following questions

**Q1:** Is everything one **proves** in a given proof system **tautology** under a given semantics?

The **positive answer** to the question **Q1** is called **Soundness Theorem** for a given proof system and a given semantics proof system

Such proof system is called a **sound proof system**

## Logic Soundness Theorem

We write the **Soundness Theorem** symbolically as follows

**Soundness Theorem** (with respect to a semantics **M**)

Let **S** be a proof system and **A** any formula of its language,  
then the following holds

$$\text{IF } \vdash_S A \text{ THEN } \models_M A$$

## Logic Main Questions

**Q2:** Is it also possible to guarantee a **provability** in a **sound proof system** of everything we know to be a **tautology** under a given semantics?

The **positive answer** to the question **Q2** is called **Completeness Theorem** for a proof system under a given semantics

Such proof system is called **complete proof system** with respect to the given semantics

## Completeness Theorem

We write the **Completeness Theorem** symbolically as follows

**Completeness Theorem** (with respect to a semantics **M**)

Let **S** be a proof system and **A** any formula of its language,  
then the following holds

$$\vdash_S A \text{ if and only if } \models_M A$$

## Logic Main Tasks

**Fifth Task** is to **develop proof systems** in which a process of **finding proofs** can be carried **fully automatically**

These are **automated** theorem proving systems

The book presents various **Gentzen Type automated theorem proving systems** and discusses various methods of proving the **Completeness Theorem** for them

In our **Part 1: LOGIC** Lectures we cover, as an example, a theorem proving **system RS** and give a constructive and very easy **proof** of the **Completeness Theorem**

## Main Goals

**The first set** of **Main Goals** of the BOOK is to formally define and develop the above **FIVE TASKS** in case of **Classical** Propositional and Predicate Logic

**The second set** of **Main Goals** is to develop and discuss the **FIVE TASKS** for some **Non-Classical** Propositional Logics, namely for some extensional **Many Valued** logics, for the **Intuitionistic** logic, and **Modal S4, S5** logics

## Main Goals of the Book

The third set of **Main Goals** of the book is to formally define and develop the notion of a **formal theory** based on a given **proof system** for a first order **logic**

It discusses notions of a **model** of a theory, its semantical and syntactical **consistency** and **completeness**

The book presents some **Formal Theories** based on **classical** predicate logic

In particular it presents the **Peano Arithmetic** of Natural Numbers **PA** and discusses and proves the **Gödel Incompleteness Theorems**