

B1.1 Logic

Martin Bays

(Slides adapted from slides written by
Prof. J. Koenigsmann)

Oxford, MT 2023

Introduction

1. What is mathematical logic for?

- Provides a uniform, unambiguous **language** for mathematics;
- gives a precise formal definition of a **proof**;
- explains and guarantees **exactness, rigour and certainty** in mathematics;
- establishes the **foundations** of mathematics.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{B1 (Foundations)} \\ & = \text{B1.1 (Logic)} + \text{B1.2 (Set theory)} \end{aligned}$$

N.B.: Course does not teach you to think logically, but it explores what it *means* to think logically.

2. Historical motivation

- *19th cent.:*

Search for conceptual foundations in analysis: attempts to formalise the notions of **infinity, infinitesimal, limit, ...**

“The definitive clarification of the nature of the infinite has become necessary, not merely for the special interests of the individual sciences but for the honour of human understanding itself.” – Hilbert 1926

- Hilbert’s 2nd Problem, 1900 ICM address: prove consistency of an axiom system for arithmetic.

“I am convinced that it must be possible to find a direct proof for the compatibility of the arithmetical axioms.” – Hilbert 1900

2. Historical motivation (cont)

- Early attempts to formalise mathematics:
 - *Cantor's naive* set theory;
 - *Frege's Begriffsschrift* and *Grundgesetze*.
For any expressible property $P(x)$, Frege's system posited the existence of the set

$$\{x : P(x)\}.$$

- **Russell's paradox:**

consider the set $R := \{s : s \notin s\}$

$$R \in R \Rightarrow R \notin R \text{ contradiction}$$

$$R \notin R \Rightarrow R \in R \text{ contradiction}$$

\rightsquigarrow *fundamental crisis in the foundations of mathematics*

3. Hilbert's Program

1. find a uniform formal **language** for all mathematics
 2. find a complete system of **inference rules/ deduction rules**
 3. find a complete system of mathematical **axioms**
 4. prove that the resulting system is **consistent**, i.e. does not lead to contradictions
- ★ **complete:** every mathematical sentence can be proved or disproved using 2. and 3.
 - ★ 1., 2. and 3. should be **finitary/effective/computable/algorithmic**
so, e.g., in 3. you can't take as axioms
the system of all true sentences in mathematics

4. Solutions to Hilbert's program

Step 1. (formal language for mathematics)
possible in the framework of
ZF = *Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory* or
ZFC = **ZF** + *Axiom of Choice*

(this is an empirical fact)

↷ B1.2 Set Theory

Step 2. (complete proof system)
possible in **1st-order logic**:
Gödel's Completeness Theorem

↷ B1.1 Logic - this course

Step 3. (complete axiom system)
not possible (↷ C1.2):
Gödel's 1st Incompleteness Theorem:
there is no effective axiomatization
of arithmetic

Step 4. (proving consistency)
not possible (↷ C1.2):
Gödel's 2nd Incompleteness Theorem

5. Decidability

Step 3. of Hilbert's program fails:

there is no effective axiomatization
for the entire body of mathematics

But: many important parts of mathematics
are completely and effectively axiomatizable;
they are **decidable**, i.e. there is an
algorithm = program = effective procedure
to decide whether a sentence is true or false
↪ allows proofs by computer

Example: $Th(\mathbb{C}; +, \cdot)$, the **1st-order theory**
of the field \mathbb{C} .

Axioms = *field axioms*

- + *all non-constant polynomials have a zero*
- + *the characteristic is 0*

Every **algebraic** property of \mathbb{C} follows from
these axioms.

Similarly for $Th(\mathbb{R})$.

↪ C1.1 Model Theory

6. Why *mathematical* logic?

1. Language and deduction rules are tailored for *mathematical objects* and mathematical ways of reasoning
N.B.: Logic tells you what a proof *is*, not how to *find* one
2. The *method* is mathematical:
we will develop logic as a *calculus* with sentences and formulas
⇒ Logic is itself a mathematical discipline,
not meta-mathematics or philosophy,
no ontological questions like *what is a number?*
3. Logic has *applications* in other areas of mathematics, and also in theoretical computer science