

Re: Minimal logic valid?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-06/msg00498.html>

- *From:* Jan Burse <janburse@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 18 Jun 2008 16:32:12 +0200
-

translogi schrieb:

The main difference is that natural deduction uses lots of inference rules and no axioms.
 while the axiomatic method uses axioms(chemata) and only detachment / modus ponens

Hilbert style calculi usually have no detachment rule. Natural deduction has it. What are you talking about?

In natural deduction you have a context G, and you can formulate a rule as such:

$$\frac{G \vdash A}{G \setminus B \vdash B \rightarrow A}$$

Or graphically:

$$\begin{array}{l} [B] \\ A \\ \hline B \rightarrow A \end{array}$$

Hilbert style calculi dont have this context. They have just rules over a single sukzedent sequents with zero context.

But a hilbert style calculi might make use of axioms G, and then we write also:

$$G \vdash A$$

And we might have the meta result, that when $G \vdash A$ is valid, that $G \setminus B \vdash B \rightarrow A$ is also valid. That is called the deduction theorem.

Re: Minimal logic valid?

The deduction theorem states that when there is a hilbert style proof $G \vdash A$, then there is "another" hilbert style proof of $G \setminus B \vdash B \rightarrow A$.

That hilbert style methods need more axiom schemas, I agree. Namely to be classical, because things go rather into the axioms than into the rules.

But that hilbert style is an axiomatic method, while natural deduction is not, I wouldn't agree. For example as soon as one has the classical apparatus in both system, one can work the same way with axiom systems.

Also an axiom schema is a degenerated instance of the following pattern of a rule:

Template_1 Template_n

Template

An axiom schema has just $n=0$, i.e. no precluding patterns. So we can compare hilbert style and natural deductions:

System Templateform n

Hilbert style $\vdash A = 0$ for the logic axioms
=0 for the axioms
=2 for MP
Natural deduction $G \vdash A = 1, 2, 3$ for the logic rules
=0 for axioms and assumptions
=1 for detachment
=2 for MP

I think both systems belong to the axiomatic method as there are some principles (the rules with $n=0$ or $n < > 0$) layed down, and we try to work from these principles.

Bye

.

Re: Minimal logic valid?