

# Logic I – Session 13



# Plan

- Damien on psets
- Quick summary of completeness
- Compactness
- Limitations of SL
- Intro to PL



# Completeness

$\Gamma \not\models \mathcal{P}$



$\Gamma \cup \{\sim \mathcal{P}\}$  is C-SD



$\Gamma \cup \{\sim \mathcal{P}\} \subseteq$  a MC-SD set  $\Gamma^*$



If  $\Gamma^*$  is MC-SD then  $\Gamma^*$  is TF-C



$\Gamma \cup \{\sim \mathcal{P}\} \subseteq$  a TF-C set  $\Gamma^*$



$\Gamma \cup \{\sim \mathcal{P}\}$  is TF-C



$\Gamma \not\models \mathcal{P}$



# Compactness

- A cool result of completeness:
  - **Compactness:**  $\Gamma$  is TF-C iff every finite subset of  $\Gamma$  is TF-C.
- So: a set  $\Gamma$  is TF-IC only if a finite subset of  $\Gamma$  is TF-IC.
- So, intuitively, there's no TF inconsistency that you need an infinite number of SL sentences to get!
- Let's prove compactness by proving each direction.



# Compactness

- First, left-to-right:
  - If  $\Gamma$  is TF-C, then every finite subset of  $\Gamma$  is TF-C.
    - If there were a subset  $\Gamma'$  such that no TVA m.e.m.  $\Gamma'$ -true, then there would be no TVA m.e.m.  $\Gamma$  true.
- Now, right-to-left:
  - If every finite subset of  $\Gamma$  is TF-C, then  $\Gamma$  is TF-C.
  - **Equiv: If  $\Gamma$  is TF-IC, then some finite subset  $\Gamma'$  of  $\Gamma$  is TF-IC.**



# Compactness

- Assume  $\Gamma$  is TF-IC. Then there's no TVA that m.e.m.  $\Gamma$  true.
- So every TVA that m.e.m.  $\Gamma$  true makes some  $R \& \sim R$  true.
- That is:  $\Gamma \models R \& \sim R$ .
- So by completeness,  $\Gamma \vdash R \& \sim R$ .
- But since every derivation is finite,  
there's a finite  $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$  such that  $\Gamma' \vdash R \& \sim R$ .
- So by soundness,  $\Gamma' \models R \& \sim R$ .
- But no TVA makes  $R \& \sim R$  true.
- So no TVA makes  $\Gamma'$  true. I.e.  $\Gamma'$  is TF-IC.
- So if  $\Gamma$  is TF-IC, then a finite subset of  $\Gamma$  is TF-IC.



# Limitations of SL

- We want our formal language and derivation system to help us prove that certain arguments are valid, that certain sets of sentences are inconsistent, etc...
- SL can't do that for some arguments and sentences.
- Everything in the house smells bad.  
Fido is in the house.  
So, Fido smells bad.
- Nothing has horns and also wings.  
Some animals at Neverland Ranch have horns.  
All chickens have wings.  
So not all animals at Neverland Ranch are chickens.



MIT OpenCourseWare  
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

24.241 Logic I  
Fall 2009

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.