

# Non-Monotonic Logic and System $\mathbf{G}^1$

Jon Doyle  
September 25, 1981

## Abstract

*This note refutes the conjecture that Boolos' modal logic  $\mathbf{G}$  forms a basis for an interesting non-monotonic logic.*

In [2] and [3] I conjectured that the correct non-monotonic logic is the weak logic of [3] strengthened by axiom schema corresponding to the theorems of Boolos' modal logic  $\mathbf{G}$  [1]. The motivation for this conjecture was the view that since nonmonotonic logic is a logic concerning provability, it ought to reduce to the logic of ordinary provability "in the limit" as the specifically nonmonotonic aspects were ignored. Because  $\mathbf{G}$  captures the logic of provability in Peano arithmetic, I concluded it was the correct "limit" for such reductions. I was wrong.

The interesting property of  $\mathbf{G}$  is that it exactly captures the notion of provability in Peano arithmetic ( $\mathbf{PA}$ ) by means of its modality. Put another way,  $\mathbf{G}$  exactly characterizes the set of theorems of the axiom set  $\mathbf{PA}$  in the set of all formulas  $L$ .  $\mathbf{G}$  exactly describes the sets  $Th(\mathbf{PA})$  and  $L - Th(\mathbf{PA})$ .

The point of non-monotonic logic, however, is to describe the notion of provability under varying sets of axioms and assumptions. For each set of axioms and assumptions  $A$ , the modality of non-monotonic logic should characterize the sets of formulas  $Th(A)$  and  $L - Th(A)$ . Since  $\mathbf{PA}$  is merely one possible set  $A$ , restricting the modality of non-monotonic logic to describing  $Th(\mathbf{PA})$  and  $L - Th(\mathbf{PA})$  misses the point of the logic.

The weak logic of [3] does require strengthening to capture a better notion of provability, but should not include notions of provability from a fixed set of axioms.

1. Boolos, G., 1979. *The Unprovability of Consistency*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Panel on non-monotonic logic, *First Annual Conference of the American Association for Artificial Intelligence*, Stanford, California, August 1980.
3. McDermott, D., and Doyle, J., 1980. Non-monotonic logic—I, *Artificial Intelligence* **13**, 41-72.

---

<sup>1</sup>Questions from Robert Moore and Richard Stallman helped lead me to this refutation. This research was supported by Carnegie-Mellon University.