

# FREGE'S BEGRIFFSSCHRIFT IS FIRST-ORDER COMPLETE

YANG LIU

1. It is widely taken that the first-order part of Frege's *Begriffsschrift* is complete.<sup>1</sup> However, there does not seem to be a formal verification of this received claim. The general concern is that Frege's system is one axiom short in first-order predicate calculus compared to, by now, the standard theory. Yet Frege has one extra inference rule in his system. Then the question is whether Frege's first-order calculus is still deductively sufficient as far as the first-order completeness is concerned. In this short note we confirm that the missing axiom is derivable from his stated axioms and inference rules, and hence the logic system in the *Begriffsschrift* is indeed first-order complete.

2. We provide a list of Frege's axioms and inference rules for first-order calculus. We use modern notations instead of Frege's two dimensional notations.<sup>2</sup>

## Logical Axioms

Sentential calculus

$$A1. A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow A) \tag{1}$$

$$A2. [A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C)] \rightarrow [(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C)] \tag{2}$$

$$A3. [A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C)] \rightarrow [B \rightarrow (A \rightarrow C)] \tag{8}$$

$$A4. (A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (\neg B \rightarrow \neg A) \tag{28}$$

$$A5. \neg\neg A \rightarrow A \tag{31}$$

$$A6. A \rightarrow \neg\neg A \tag{41}$$

Predicate calculus

$$A7. c \equiv d \rightarrow [f(c) \rightarrow f(d)] \tag{52}$$

$$A8. c \equiv c \tag{54}$$

$$A9. \forall x \varphi(x) \rightarrow \varphi(t) \text{ if } t \text{ is free for } x \text{ in } \varphi(x) \tag{58}$$

## Inference Rules

i. Modus ponens (MP)  (§6)

$$\frac{\vdash A \quad \vdash A \rightarrow B}{\vdash B}$$

---

The result presented here grew out of professor Haim Gaifman's Philosophy of Logic class in Fall 2009 at Columbia University, who independently proved the same claim using a different method.

<sup>1</sup>Frege, Gottlob, 1879, *Begriffsschrift: eine der arithmetischen nachgebildete Formelsprache des reinen Denkens*, Halle a. S.: Louis Nebert. Translated as *Concept Script*, a formal language of pure thought modeled upon that of arithmetic, by S. Bauer-Mengelberg in J. van Heijenoort (ed.), *From Frege to Gödel: A Source Book in Mathematical Logic, 1879-1931*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1967.

<sup>2</sup>The equation/section numbers at the end of each line refer to the original propositions or sections numbers appeared in the *Begriffsschrift*.

ii. Frege's universal generalization rule (FUG) (§11)

$$\frac{\vdash A \rightarrow \varphi(x)}{\vdash A \rightarrow \forall x\varphi(x)}, \quad \text{provided that } x \text{ is not free in } A.$$

iii. Universal Generalization (UG) (§11)

$$\frac{\vdash \varphi(x)}{\vdash \forall x\varphi(x)}.$$

3. The following axiom in standard first-order logic is absent from Frege's system:

$$\forall x(\varphi(x) \rightarrow \psi(x)) \rightarrow (\forall x\varphi(x) \rightarrow \forall x\psi(x)) \quad (\star)$$

We show that  $(\star)$  is derivable from the stated axioms and rules. In order to do so, we first establish the following lemma.

**Lemma.** Suppose that  $\Gamma, A \vdash B$ , no application of FUG or UG to a wff has as its quantified variable a free variable of  $A$ .<sup>3</sup> Then  $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}$  be a proof of  $B$  from  $\Gamma$  and  $A$ . We show that, for every  $i < n$ ,

$$\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow \alpha_i.$$

- i. It is easy to show, by choosing proper tautologies, that the lemma holds for the cases in which  $\alpha_i$  is either an axiom or a member of  $\Gamma \cup \{A\}$ , or can be derived from previous steps by MP.
- ii. If  $\alpha_i$  is obtained from  $\alpha_j$  by FUG, where  $\alpha_j = \alpha_r \rightarrow \alpha_k(x)$  for some  $r, k < j < i$ , and  $x$  is not free in  $\alpha_r$ , that is,  $\alpha_i = \alpha_r \rightarrow \forall x\alpha_k(x)$ . And by the assumption of the lemma we know that  $x$  is not free in  $A$ . We want to show  $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow (\alpha_r \rightarrow \forall x\alpha_k(x))$ , namely,  $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow \alpha_i$ . Note that, by the inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow \alpha_r$  and  $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow \alpha_k$ . For the latter, we have that  $x$  is not free in  $A$ , then by FUG we get  $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow \forall x\alpha_k(x)$ . These together with the tautology  $(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow [(A \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C))]$  give us  $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow (\alpha_r \rightarrow \forall x\alpha_k(x))$ , which is what we want.
- iii. If  $\alpha_i$  is obtained from  $\alpha_j$  by UG, that is,  $\alpha_i = \forall x\alpha_j$  for some  $j < i$ . By the inductive hypothesis  $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow \alpha_j$ , and by the assumption of the lemma that  $x$  is not free in  $A$ , we therefore have, by FUG,  $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow \forall x\alpha_j$ , and hence  $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow \alpha_i$ .  $\square$

**Theorem.** For any wffs  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$ , show that  $(\star)$  holds.

|   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Proof.</i> (1) $\forall x(\varphi(x) \rightarrow \psi(x))$   | Hyp                   |
| (2) $\forall x\varphi(x)$   | Hyp                   |
| (3) $\varphi(x) \rightarrow \psi(x)$  | (1) and A9            |
| (4) $\varphi(x)$  | (2) and A9            |
| (5) $\psi(x)$   | (3), (4), and MP      |
| (6) $\forall x\psi(x)$  | (5) and UG            |
| (7) $\forall x(\varphi(x) \rightarrow \psi(x)), \forall x\varphi(x) \vdash \forall x\psi(x)$                          | (1)-(6)               |
| (8) $\vdash \forall x(\varphi(x) \rightarrow \psi(x)) \rightarrow (\forall x\varphi(x) \rightarrow \forall x\psi(x))$ | (7) and Lemma (twice) |
|   | $\square$             |

<sup>3</sup>That is to say, no variable in a wff which becomes quantified by applying FUG or UG is a free variable in  $A$ . Actually, we can broaden the application of this lemma by considering the possibility that  $A$  does not play any role in proving  $B$ , then in this case the quantified variable can be a free variable in  $A$ . The proof for this case is easy.