

Re: Request for Reference/Link to example of defining a theory/logic.

## Re: Request for Reference/Link to example of defining a theory/logic.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2006-11/msg00313.html>

---

- *From:* "Scott" <ToaTerra@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 13 Nov 2006 10:44:52 -0800
- 

Charlie-Boo wrote:

I am unsure what is  
the minimum theorem/proofs necessary to demonstrate that the formal  
system does indeed include first-order logic and set theory.

With the above approach, choose a set theory and just make sure you can  
prove its axioms.

Does this work as well for first-order logic as well? If I show the new  
theory maps each of the operators (NOT and Implication) to a new theory  
function, is this sufficient? What if the new theory "extends"  
first-order logic (for example, shows that another operator exists)? Is  
there any trip-ups I should look out for in this case?

Scott

.