

Suppes' Theorem For Probability Logic

Matthew Doty

February 3, 2026

Abstract

We develop finitely additive probability logic and prove a theorem of Patrick Suppes that asserts that $\Psi \vdash \phi$ in classical propositional logic if and only if $(\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. 1 - \mathcal{P}\psi) \geq 1 - \mathcal{P}\phi$ holds for all probabilities \mathcal{P} . We also provide a novel *dual* form of Suppes' Theorem, which holds that $(\sum \phi \leftarrow \Phi. \mathcal{P}\phi) \leq \mathcal{P}\psi$ for all probabilities \mathcal{P} if and only if $(\bigvee \Phi) \vdash \psi$ and all of the formulae in Φ are logically exclusive from one another. Our proofs use *Maximally Consistent Sets*, and as a consequence, we obtain two *collapse* theorems. In particular, we show $(\sum \phi \leftarrow \Phi. \mathcal{P}\phi) \geq \mathcal{P}\psi$ holds for all probabilities \mathcal{P} if and only if $(\sum \phi \leftarrow \Phi. \delta \phi) \geq \delta \psi$ holds for all binary-valued probabilities δ , along with the dual assertion that $(\sum \phi \leftarrow \Phi. \mathcal{P}\phi) \leq \mathcal{P}\psi$ holds for all probabilities \mathcal{P} if and only if $(\sum \phi \leftarrow \Phi. \delta \phi) \leq \delta \psi$ holds for all binary-valued probabilities δ .

Contents

1	Probability Logic	2
1.1	Definition of Probability Logic	2
1.2	Why Finite Additivity?	3
1.3	Basic Properties of Probability Logic	3
1.4	Alternate Definition of Probability Logic	4
1.5	Basic Probability Logic Inequality Results	9
1.6	Dirac Measures	10
2	Suppes' Theorem	13
2.1	Suppes' List Theorem	13
2.2	Suppes' Set Theorem	16
2.3	Converse Suppes' Theorem	17
2.4	Implication Inequality Completeness	23
2.5	Characterizing Logical Exclusiveness In Probability Logic	23

Chapter 1

Probability Logic

```
theory Probability-Logic
imports
  Propositional-Logic-Class.Classical-Connectives
  HOL.Real
  HOL-Library.Countable
begin

unbundle no funcset-syntax
```

1.1 Definition of Probability Logic

Probability logic is defined in terms of an operator over classical logic obeying certain postulates. Scholars often credit George Boole for first conceiving this kind of formulation [1]. Theodore Hailperin in particular has written extensively on this subject [6, 7, 8].

The presentation below roughly follows Kolmogorov's axiomatization [10]. A key difference is that we only require *finite additivity*, rather than *countable additivity*. Finite additivity is also defined in terms of implication (\rightarrow).

```
class probability-logic = classical-logic +
  fixes  $\mathcal{P} :: 'a \Rightarrow \text{real}$ 
  assumes probability-non-negative:  $\mathcal{P} \varphi \geq 0$ 
  assumes probability-unity:  $\vdash \varphi \Longrightarrow \mathcal{P} \varphi = 1$ 
  assumes probability-implicational-additivity:
     $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi \rightarrow \perp \Longrightarrow \mathcal{P} ((\varphi \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow \psi) = \mathcal{P} \varphi + \mathcal{P} \psi$ 
```

A similar axiomatization may be credited to Rescher [11, pg. 185]. However, our formulation has fewer axioms. While Rescher assumes $\vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi \Longrightarrow \mathcal{P} \varphi = \mathcal{P} \psi$, we show this is a lemma in §1.4.

1.2 Why Finite Additivity?

In this section we touch on why we have chosen to employ finite additivity in our axiomatization of *probability-logic* and deviate from conventional probability theory.

Conventional probability obeys an axiom known as *countable additivity*. Traditionally it states if S is a countable set of sets which are pairwise disjoint, then the limit $\sum_{s \in S} \mathcal{P} s$ exists and $\mathcal{P} (\bigcup S) = (\sum_{s \in S} \mathcal{P} s)$. This is more powerful than our finite additivity axiom $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi \rightarrow \perp \implies \mathcal{P} ((\varphi \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow \psi) = \mathcal{P} \varphi + \mathcal{P} \psi$.

However, we argue that demanding countable additivity is not practical.

Historically, the statisticians Bruno de Finetti and Leonard Savage gave the most well known critiques. In [2] de Finetti shows various properties which are true for countably additive probability measures may not hold for finitely additive measures. Savage [12], on the other hand, develops probability based on choices prizes in lotteries.

We instead argue that if we demand countable additivity, then certain properties of real world software would no longer be formally verifiable as we demonstrate here. In particular, it prohibits conventional recursive data structures for defining propositions. Our argument is derivative of one given by Giangiacomo Gerla [5, Section 3].

By taking equivalence classes modulo $\lambda\varphi \psi. \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$, any classical logic instance gives rise to a Boolean algebra known as a *Lindenbaum Algebra*. In the case of 'a classical-propositional-formula this Boolean algebra is both countable and *atomless*. A theorem of Horn and Tarski [9, Theorem 3.2] asserts there can be no countably additive Pr for a countable atomless Boolean algebra.

The above argument is not intended as a blanket refutation of conventional probability theory. It is simply an impossibility result with respect to software implementations of probability logic. Plenty of classic results in probability rely on countable additivity. A nice example, formalized in Isabelle/HOL, is Bouffon's needle [3].

1.3 Basic Properties of Probability Logic

lemma (in *probability-logic*) *probability-additivity*:

assumes $\vdash \sim (\varphi \sqcap \psi)$

shows $\mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcup \psi) = \mathcal{P} \varphi + \mathcal{P} \psi$

using

assms

unfolding
conjunction-def
disjunction-def
negation-def
by (*simp add: probability-implicational-additivity*)

lemma (*in probability-logic*) *probability-alternate-additivity*:
assumes $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi \rightarrow \perp$
shows $\mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcup \psi) = \mathcal{P} \varphi + \mathcal{P} \psi$
using *assms*
by (*metis*
probability-additivity
double-negation-converse
modus-ponens
conjunction-def
negation-def)

lemma (*in probability-logic*) *complementation*:
 $\mathcal{P} (\sim \varphi) = 1 - \mathcal{P} \varphi$
by (*metis*
probability-alternate-additivity
probability-unity
bivalence
negation-elimination
add.commute
add-diff-cancel-left')

lemma (*in probability-logic*) *unity-upper-bound*:
 $\mathcal{P} \varphi \leq 1$
by (*metis*
(no-types)
diff-ge-0-iff-ge
probability-non-negative
complementation)

1.4 Alternate Definition of Probability Logic

There is an alternate axiomatization of probability logic, due to Brian Gaines [4, pg. 159, postulates P7, P8, and P8] and independently formulated by Brian Weatherson [14]. As Weatherson notes, this axiomatization is suited to formulating *intuitionistic* probability logic. In the case where the underlying logic is classical the Gaines/Weatherson axiomatization is equivalent to the traditional Kolmogorov axiomatization from §1.1.

class *gaines-weatherson-probability* = *classical-logic* +
fixes $\mathcal{P} :: 'a \Rightarrow \text{real}$
assumes *gaines-weatherson-thesis*:
 $\mathcal{P} \top = 1$

assumes *gaines-weatherson-antithesis*:
 $\mathcal{P} \perp = 0$
assumes *gaines-weatherson-monotonicity*:
 $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi \implies \mathcal{P} \varphi \leq \mathcal{P} \psi$
assumes *gaines-weatherson-sum-rule*:
 $\mathcal{P} \varphi + \mathcal{P} \psi = \mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcap \psi) + \mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcup \psi)$

sublocale *gaines-weatherson-probability* \subseteq *probability-logic*

proof

fix φ
have $\vdash \perp \rightarrow \varphi$
by (*simp add: ex-falso-quodlibet*)
thus $0 \leq \mathcal{P} \varphi$
using
gaines-weatherson-antithesis
gaines-weatherson-monotonicity
by *fastforce*
next
fix φ
assume $\vdash \varphi$
thus $\mathcal{P} \varphi = 1$
by (*metis*
gaines-weatherson-thesis
gaines-weatherson-monotonicity
eq-iff
axiom-k
ex-falso-quodlibet
modus-ponens
verum-def)
next
fix $\varphi \psi$
assume $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi \rightarrow \perp$
hence $\vdash \sim (\varphi \sqcap \psi)$
by (*simp add: conjunction-def negation-def*)
thus $\mathcal{P} ((\varphi \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow \psi) = \mathcal{P} \varphi + \mathcal{P} \psi$
by (*metis*
add commute
add right-neutral
eq-iff
disjunction-def
ex-falso-quodlibet
negation-def
gaines-weatherson-antithesis
gaines-weatherson-monotonicity
gaines-weatherson-sum-rule)
qed

lemma (**in** *probability-logic*) *monotonicity*:

$\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi \implies \mathcal{P} \varphi \leq \mathcal{P} \psi$

proof –
assume $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$
hence $\vdash \sim (\varphi \sqcap \sim \psi)$
unfolding *negation-def conjunction-def*
by (*metis*
conjunction-def
exclusion-contrapositive-equivalence
negation-def
weak-biconditional-weaken)
hence $\mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcup \sim \psi) = \mathcal{P} \varphi + \mathcal{P} (\sim \psi)$
by (*simp add: probability-additivity*)
hence $\mathcal{P} \varphi + \mathcal{P} (\sim \psi) \leq 1$
by (*metis unity-upper-bound*)
hence $\mathcal{P} \varphi + 1 - \mathcal{P} \psi \leq 1$
by (*simp add: complementation*)
thus *?thesis* **by** *linarith*

qed

lemma (*in probability-logic*) *biconditional-equivalence:*

$\vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi \implies \mathcal{P} \varphi = \mathcal{P} \psi$

by (*meson*
eq-iff
modus-ponens
biconditional-left-elimination
biconditional-right-elimination
monotonicity)

lemma (*in probability-logic*) *sum-rule:*

$\mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcup \psi) + \mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcap \psi) = \mathcal{P} \varphi + \mathcal{P} \psi$

proof –

have $\vdash (\varphi \sqcup \psi) \leftrightarrow (\varphi \sqcup \psi \setminus (\varphi \sqcap \psi))$

proof –

have $\forall \mathfrak{M}. \mathfrak{M} \models_{prop} (\langle \varphi \rangle \sqcup \langle \psi \rangle) \leftrightarrow (\langle \varphi \rangle \sqcup \langle \psi \rangle \setminus (\langle \varphi \rangle \sqcap \langle \psi \rangle))$

unfolding

classical-logic-class.subtraction-def
classical-logic-class.negation-def
classical-logic-class.biconditional-def
classical-logic-class.conjunction-def
classical-logic-class.disjunction-def

by *simp*

hence $\vdash (\langle \langle \varphi \rangle \sqcup \langle \psi \rangle \rangle \leftrightarrow (\langle \langle \varphi \rangle \sqcup \langle \psi \rangle \setminus (\langle \varphi \rangle \sqcap \langle \psi \rangle) \rangle))$

using *propositional-semantics* **by** *blast*

thus *?thesis* **by** *simp*

qed

moreover **have** $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow (\psi \setminus (\varphi \sqcap \psi)) \rightarrow \perp$

proof –

have $\forall \mathfrak{M}. \mathfrak{M} \models_{prop} \langle \varphi \rangle \rightarrow (\langle \psi \rangle \setminus (\langle \varphi \rangle \sqcap \langle \psi \rangle)) \rightarrow \perp$

unfolding

classical-logic-class.subtraction-def

classical-logic-class.negation-def
classical-logic-class.biconditional-def
classical-logic-class.conjunction-def
classical-logic-class.disjunction-def
by simp
hence $\vdash (\langle \varphi \rangle \rightarrow (\langle \psi \rangle \setminus (\langle \varphi \rangle \sqcap \langle \psi \rangle))) \rightarrow \perp$
using *propositional-semantic* **by blast**
thus *?thesis* **by simp**
qed
hence $\mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcup \psi) = \mathcal{P} \varphi + \mathcal{P} (\psi \setminus (\varphi \sqcap \psi))$
using
probability-alternate-additivity
biconditional-equivalence
calculation
by auto
moreover have $\vdash \psi \leftrightarrow (\psi \setminus (\varphi \sqcap \psi) \sqcup (\varphi \sqcap \psi))$
proof –
have $\forall \mathfrak{M}. \mathfrak{M} \models_{prop} \langle \psi \rangle \leftrightarrow (\langle \psi \rangle \setminus (\langle \varphi \rangle \sqcap \langle \psi \rangle) \sqcup (\langle \varphi \rangle \sqcap \langle \psi \rangle))$
unfolding
classical-logic-class.subtraction-def
classical-logic-class.negation-def
classical-logic-class.biconditional-def
classical-logic-class.conjunction-def
classical-logic-class.disjunction-def
by auto
hence $\vdash (\langle \psi \rangle \leftrightarrow (\langle \psi \rangle \setminus (\langle \varphi \rangle \sqcap \langle \psi \rangle) \sqcup (\langle \varphi \rangle \sqcap \langle \psi \rangle)))$
using *propositional-semantic* **by**
blast
thus *?thesis* **by simp**
qed
moreover have $\vdash (\psi \setminus (\varphi \sqcap \psi)) \rightarrow (\varphi \sqcap \psi) \rightarrow \perp$
unfolding
subtraction-def
negation-def
conjunction-def
using
conjunction-def
conjunction-right-elimination
by auto
hence $\mathcal{P} \psi = \mathcal{P} (\psi \setminus (\varphi \sqcap \psi)) + \mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcap \psi)$
using
probability-alternate-additivity
biconditional-equivalence
calculation
by auto
ultimately show *?thesis*
by simp
qed

sublocale *probability-logic* \subseteq *gaines-weatherson-probability*
proof

show $\mathcal{P} \top = 1$
by (*simp add: probability-unity*)

next

show $\mathcal{P} \perp = 0$
by (*metis*
add-cancel-left-right
probability-additivity
ex-falso-quodlibet
probability-unity
bivalence
conjunction-right-elimination
negation-def)

next

fix $\varphi \psi$
assume $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$
thus $\mathcal{P} \varphi \leq \mathcal{P} \psi$
using *monotonicity*
by *auto*

next

fix $\varphi \psi$
show $\mathcal{P} \varphi + \mathcal{P} \psi = \mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcap \psi) + \mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcup \psi)$
by (*metis sum-rule add.commute*)

qed

sublocale *probability-logic* \subseteq *consistent-classical-logic*

proof

show $\neg \vdash \perp$ **using** *probability-unity gaines-weatherson-antithesis* **by** *auto*

qed

lemma (**in** *probability-logic*) *subtraction-identity*:

$\mathcal{P} (\varphi \setminus \psi) = \mathcal{P} \varphi - \mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcap \psi)$

proof –

have $\vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow ((\varphi \setminus \psi) \sqcup (\varphi \sqcap \psi))$

proof –

have $\forall \mathfrak{M}. \mathfrak{M} \models_{prop} \langle \varphi \rangle \leftrightarrow ((\langle \varphi \rangle \setminus \langle \psi \rangle) \sqcup (\langle \varphi \rangle \sqcap \langle \psi \rangle))$

unfolding

classical-logic-class.subtraction-def
classical-logic-class.negation-def
classical-logic-class.biconditional-def
classical-logic-class.conjunction-def
classical-logic-class.disjunction-def

by (*simp, blast*)

hence $\vdash (\langle \varphi \rangle \leftrightarrow ((\langle \varphi \rangle \setminus \langle \psi \rangle) \sqcup (\langle \varphi \rangle \sqcap \langle \psi \rangle)))$

using *propositional-semantics* **by** *blast*

thus *?thesis* **by** *simp*

qed

hence $\mathcal{P} \varphi = \mathcal{P} ((\varphi \setminus \psi) \sqcup (\varphi \sqcap \psi))$

using *biconditional-equivalence*
by *simp*
moreover have $\vdash \sim((\varphi \setminus \psi) \sqcap (\varphi \sqcap \psi))$
proof –
have $\forall \mathfrak{M}. \mathfrak{M} \models_{prop} \sim((\langle \varphi \rangle \setminus \langle \psi \rangle) \sqcap (\langle \varphi \rangle \sqcap \langle \psi \rangle))$
unfolding
classical-logic-class.subtraction-def
classical-logic-class.negation-def
classical-logic-class.conjunction-def
classical-logic-class.disjunction-def
by *simp*
hence $\vdash (\sim((\langle \varphi \rangle \setminus \langle \psi \rangle) \sqcap (\langle \varphi \rangle \sqcap \langle \psi \rangle))) \Downarrow$
using *propositional-semantic* **by** *blast*
thus *?thesis* **by** *simp*
qed
ultimately show *?thesis*
using *probability-additivity*
by *auto*
qed

1.5 Basic Probability Logic Inequality Results

lemma (in *probability-logic*) *disjunction-sum-inequality*:

$$\mathcal{P}(\varphi \sqcup \psi) \leq \mathcal{P}\varphi + \mathcal{P}\psi$$

proof –

$$\text{have } \mathcal{P}(\varphi \sqcup \psi) + \mathcal{P}(\varphi \sqcap \psi) = \mathcal{P}\varphi + \mathcal{P}\psi$$

$$0 \leq \mathcal{P}(\varphi \sqcap \psi)$$

by (*simp add: sum-rule, simp add: probability-non-negative*)

thus *?thesis* **by** *linarith*

qed

lemma (in *probability-logic*)

arbitrary-disjunction-list-summation-inequality:

$$\mathcal{P}(\bigsqcup \Phi) \leq (\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \mathcal{P}\varphi)$$

proof (*induct* Φ)

case *Nil*

then show *?case* **by** (*simp add: gaines-weatherson-antithesis*)

next

case (*Cons* φ Φ)

$$\text{have } \mathcal{P}(\bigsqcup (\varphi \# \Phi)) \leq \mathcal{P}\varphi + \mathcal{P}(\bigsqcup \Phi)$$

using *disjunction-sum-inequality*

by *simp*

with *Cons* **have** $\mathcal{P}(\bigsqcup (\varphi \# \Phi)) \leq \mathcal{P}\varphi + (\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \mathcal{P}\varphi)$ **by** *linarith*

then show *?case* **by** *simp*

qed

lemma (in *probability-logic*) *implication-list-summation-inequality*:

assumes $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \bigsqcup \Psi$

shows $\mathcal{P}\varphi \leq (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. \mathcal{P}\psi)$

using
assms
arbitrary-disjunction-list-summation-inequality
monotonicity
order-trans
by *blast*

lemma (in *probability-logic*) *arbitrary-disjunction-set-summation-inequality*:
 $\mathcal{P} (\bigsqcup \Phi) \leq (\sum \varphi \in \text{set } \Phi. \mathcal{P} \varphi)$
by (*metis*
arbitrary-disjunction-list-summation-inequality
arbitrary-disjunction-remdups
biconditional-equivalence
sum.set-conv-list)

lemma (in *probability-logic*) *implication-set-summation-inequality*:
assumes $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \bigsqcup \Psi$
shows $\mathcal{P} \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \in \text{set } \Psi. \mathcal{P} \psi)$
using
assms
arbitrary-disjunction-set-summation-inequality
monotonicity
order-trans
by *blast*

1.6 Dirac Measures

Before presenting *Dirac measures* in probability logic, we first give the set of all functions satisfying probability logic.

definition (in *classical-logic*) *probabilities* :: (*'a* \Rightarrow *real*) *set*
where *probabilities* =
 $\{ \mathcal{P}. \text{class.probability-logic } (\lambda \varphi. \vdash \varphi) (\rightarrow) \perp \mathcal{P} \}$

Traditionally, a Dirac measure is a function δ_x where $\delta_x S = 1$ if $x \in S$ and $\delta_x S = 0$ otherwise. This means that Dirac measures correspond to special ultrafilters on their underlying σ -algebra which are closed under countable unions.

Probability logic, as discussed in §1.2, may not have countable joins in its underlying logic. In the setting of probability logic, Dirac measures are simple probability functions that are either 0 or 1.

definition (in *classical-logic*) *dirac-measures* :: (*'a* \Rightarrow *real*) *set*
where *dirac-measures* =
 $\{ \mathcal{P}. \text{class.probability-logic } (\lambda \varphi. \vdash \varphi) (\rightarrow) \perp \mathcal{P} \wedge (\forall x. \mathcal{P} x = 0 \vee \mathcal{P} x = 1) \}$

lemma (in *classical-logic*) *dirac-measures-subset*:

dirac-measures \subseteq *probabilities*
unfolding
probabilities-def
dirac-measures-def
by *fastforce*

Maximally consistent sets correspond to Dirac measures. One direction of this correspondence is established below.

lemma (in *classical-logic*) *MCS-dirac-measure*:
assumes *MCS* Ω
shows $(\lambda \chi. \text{if } \chi \in \Omega \text{ then } (1 :: \text{real}) \text{ else } 0) \in \text{dirac-measures}$
(is $?P \in \text{dirac-measures}$)
proof –
have *class.probability-logic* $(\lambda \varphi. \vdash \varphi) (\rightarrow) \perp ?P$
proof (*standard, simp,*
meson
assms
formula-maximally-consistent-set-def-reflection
maximally-consistent-set-def
set-deduction-weaken)
fix $\varphi \psi$
assume $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi \rightarrow \perp$
hence $\varphi \sqcap \psi \notin \Omega$
by (*metis*
assms
formula-consistent-def
formula-maximally-consistent-set-def-def
maximally-consistent-set-def
conjunction-def
set-deduction-modus-ponens
set-deduction-reflection
set-deduction-weaken)
hence $\varphi \notin \Omega \vee \psi \notin \Omega$
using
assms
formula-maximally-consistent-set-def-reflection
maximally-consistent-set-def
conjunction-set-deduction-equivalence
by *meson*
have $\varphi \sqcup \psi \in \Omega = (\varphi \in \Omega \vee \psi \in \Omega)$
by (*metis*
 $\langle \varphi \sqcap \psi \notin \Omega \rangle$
assms
formula-maximally-consistent-set-def-implication
maximally-consistent-set-def
conjunction-def
disjunction-def)
have $?P (\varphi \sqcup \psi) = ?P \varphi + ?P \psi$
proof (*cases* $\varphi \sqcup \psi \in \Omega$)

```

case True
hence  $\diamond: 1 = ?\mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcup \psi)$  by simp
show ?thesis
proof (cases  $\varphi \in \Omega$ )
  case True
  hence  $\psi \notin \Omega$ 
    using  $\langle \varphi \notin \Omega \vee \psi \notin \Omega \rangle$ 
    by blast
  have  $?\mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcup \psi) = (1::real)$  using  $\diamond$  by simp
  also have  $\dots = 1 + (0::real)$  by linarith
  also have  $\dots = ?\mathcal{P} \varphi + ?\mathcal{P} \psi$ 
    using  $\langle \psi \notin \Omega \rangle \langle \varphi \in \Omega \rangle$  by simp
  finally show ?thesis .
next
case False
hence  $\psi \in \Omega$ 
  using  $\langle \varphi \sqcup \psi \in \Omega \rangle \langle (\varphi \sqcup \psi \in \Omega) = (\varphi \in \Omega \vee \psi \in \Omega) \rangle$ 
  by blast
  have  $?\mathcal{P} (\varphi \sqcup \psi) = (1::real)$  using  $\diamond$  by simp
  also have  $\dots = (0::real) + 1$  by linarith
  also have  $\dots = ?\mathcal{P} \varphi + ?\mathcal{P} \psi$ 
    using  $\langle \psi \in \Omega \rangle \langle \varphi \notin \Omega \rangle$  by simp
  finally show ?thesis .
qed
next
case False
moreover from this have  $\varphi \notin \Omega \ \psi \notin \Omega$ 
  using  $\langle (\varphi \sqcup \psi \in \Omega) = (\varphi \in \Omega \vee \psi \in \Omega) \rangle$  by blast+
ultimately show ?thesis by simp
qed
thus  $?\mathcal{P} ((\varphi \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow \psi) = ?\mathcal{P} \varphi + ?\mathcal{P} \psi$ 
  unfolding disjunction-def .
qed
thus ?thesis
  unfolding dirac-measures-def
  by simp
qed

unbundle funcset-syntax

end

```

Chapter 2

Suppes' Theorem

```
theory Suppes-Theorem
  imports Probability-Logic
begin
```

```
unbundle no funcset-syntax
```

An elementary completeness theorem for inequalities for probability logic is due to Patrick Suppes [13].

A consequence of this Suppes' theorem is an elementary form of *collapse*, which asserts that inequalities for probabilities are logically equivalent to the more restricted class of *Dirac measures* as defined in §1.6.

2.1 Suppes' List Theorem

We first establish Suppes' theorem for lists of propositions. This is done by establishing our first completeness theorem using *Dirac measures*.

First, we use the result from §1.5 that shows $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \bigsqcup \Psi$ implies $\mathcal{P} \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. \mathcal{P} \psi)$. This can be understood as a *soundness* result.

To show completeness, assume $\neg \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \bigsqcup \Psi$. From this obtain a maximally consistent Ω such that $\varphi \rightarrow \bigsqcup \Psi \notin \Omega$. We then define $\delta \chi = (if \chi \in \Omega then 1 else 0)$ and show δ is a *Dirac measure* such that $\delta \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. \delta \psi)$.

lemma (in *classical-logic*) *dirac-list-summation-completeness*:

$(\forall \delta \in \text{dirac-measures}. \delta \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. \delta \psi)) = \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \bigsqcup \Psi$

proof –

```
{
  fix  $\delta :: 'a \Rightarrow real$ 
  assume  $\delta \in \text{dirac-measures}$ 
  from this interpret probability-logic ( $\lambda \varphi. \vdash \varphi$ ) ( $\rightarrow$ )  $\perp \delta$ 
  unfolding dirac-measures-def
```

by *auto*
 assume $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \bigsqcup \Psi$
 hence $\delta \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. \delta \psi)$
 using *implication-list-summation-inequality*
 by *auto*
 }
 moreover {
 assume $\neg \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \bigsqcup \Psi$
 from *this* obtain Ω where Ω :
 MCS Ω
 $\varphi \in \Omega$
 $\bigsqcup \Psi \notin \Omega$
 by (*meson*
 insert-subset
 formula-consistent-def
 formula-maximal-consistency
 formula-maximally-consistent-extension
 formula-maximally-consistent-set-def-def
 set-deduction-base-theory
 set-deduction-reflection
 set-deduction-theorem)
 hence $\forall \psi \in \text{set } \Psi. \psi \notin \Omega$
 using *arbitrary-disjunction-exclusion-MCS* by *blast*
 define δ where $\delta = (\lambda \chi. \text{if } \chi \in \Omega \text{ then } (1 :: \text{real}) \text{ else } 0)$
 from $\langle \forall \psi \in \text{set } \Psi. \psi \notin \Omega \rangle$ have $(\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. \delta \psi) = 0$
 unfolding δ -def
 by (*induct* Ψ , *simp*, *simp*)
 hence $\neg \delta \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. \delta \psi)$
 unfolding δ -def
 by (*simp add:* $\Omega(2)$ *)*
 hence
 $\exists \delta \in \text{dirac-measures}. \neg (\delta \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. \delta \psi))$
 unfolding δ -def
 using $\Omega(1)$ *MCS-dirac-measure* by *auto*
 }
 ultimately show *?thesis* by *blast*
 qed

theorem (in *classical-logic*) *list-summation-completeness*:
 ($\forall \mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities}. \mathcal{P} \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. \mathcal{P} \psi) = \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \bigsqcup \Psi$
 (is *?lhs* = *?rhs*))

proof
 assume *?lhs*
 hence $\forall \delta \in \text{dirac-measures}. \delta \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. \delta \psi)$
 unfolding *dirac-measures-def* *probabilities-def*
 by *blast*
 thus *?rhs*
 using *dirac-list-summation-completeness* by *blast*
 next

```

assume ?rhs
show ?lhs
proof
  fix  $\mathcal{P} :: 'a \Rightarrow \text{real}$ 
  assume  $\mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities}$ 
  from this interpret probability-logic  $(\lambda \varphi. \vdash \varphi) (\rightarrow) \perp \mathcal{P}$ 
  unfolding probabilities-def
  by auto
  show  $\mathcal{P} \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. \mathcal{P} \psi)$ 
  using  $\langle ?rhs \rangle$  implication-list-summation-inequality
  by simp
qed
qed

```

The collapse theorem asserts that to prove an inequalities for all probabilities in probability logic, one only needs to consider the case of functions which take on values of 0 or 1.

```

lemma (in classical-logic) suppes-collapse:
   $(\forall \mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities}. \mathcal{P} \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. \mathcal{P} \psi))$ 
   $= (\forall \delta \in \text{dirac-measures}. \delta \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. \delta \psi))$ 
by (simp add:
  dirac-list-summation-completeness
  list-summation-completeness)

```

```

lemma (in classical-logic) probability-member-neg:
  fixes  $\mathcal{P}$ 
  assumes  $\mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities}$ 
  shows  $\mathcal{P} (\sim \varphi) = 1 - \mathcal{P} \varphi$ 
proof –
  from assms interpret probability-logic  $(\lambda \varphi. \vdash \varphi) (\rightarrow) \perp \mathcal{P}$ 
  unfolding probabilities-def
  by auto
  show ?thesis
  by (simp add: complementation)
qed

```

Suppes' theorem has a philosophical interpretation. It asserts that if $\Psi \vdash \varphi$, then our *uncertainty* in φ is bounded above by our uncertainty in Ψ . Here the uncertainty in the proposition φ is $1 - \mathcal{P} \varphi$. Our uncertainty in Ψ , on the other hand, is $\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. 1 - \mathcal{P} \psi$.

```

theorem (in classical-logic) suppes-list-theorem:
   $\Psi \vdash \varphi = (\forall \mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities}. (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. 1 - \mathcal{P} \psi) \geq 1 - \mathcal{P} \varphi)$ 
proof –
  have
   $\Psi \vdash \varphi = (\forall \mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities}. (\sum \psi \leftarrow \sim \Psi. \mathcal{P} \psi) \geq \mathcal{P} (\sim \varphi))$ 
  using
  list-summation-completeness
  weak-biconditional-weaken

```

contra-list-curry-uncurry
list-deduction-def
 by *blast*
moreover have
 $\forall \mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities}. (\sum \psi \leftarrow (\sim \Psi). \mathcal{P} \psi) = (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. \mathcal{P} (\sim \psi))$
 by (*induct* Ψ , *auto*)
ultimately show *?thesis*
 using *probability-member-neg*
 by (*induct* Ψ , *simp+*)
qed

2.2 Suppes' Set Theorem

Suppes theorem also obtains for *sets*.

lemma (in *classical-logic*) *dirac-set-summation-completeness*:
 $(\forall \delta \in \text{dirac-measures}. \delta \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \in \text{set } \Psi. \delta \psi)) = \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \sqcup \Psi$
 by (*metis*
dirac-list-summation-completeness
modus-ponens
arbitrary-disjunction-remdups
biconditional-left-elimination
biconditional-right-elimination
hypothetical-syllogism
sum.set-conv-list)

theorem (in *classical-logic*) *set-summation-completeness*:
 $(\forall \delta \in \text{probabilities}. \delta \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \in \text{set } \Psi. \delta \psi)) = \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \sqcup \Psi$
 by (*metis*
dirac-list-summation-completeness
dirac-set-summation-completeness
list-summation-completeness
sum.set-conv-list)

lemma (in *classical-logic*) *suppes-set-collapse*:
 $(\forall \mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities}. \mathcal{P} \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \in \text{set } \Psi. \mathcal{P} \psi))$
 $= (\forall \delta \in \text{dirac-measures}. \delta \varphi \leq (\sum \psi \in \text{set } \Psi. \delta \psi))$
 by (*simp add*:
dirac-set-summation-completeness
set-summation-completeness)

In our formulation of logic, there is not reason that $\sim a = \sim b$ while $a \neq b$. As a consequence the Suppes theorem for sets presented below is different than the one given in §2.1.

theorem (in *classical-logic*) *suppes-set-theorem*:
 $\Psi \vdash \varphi$
 $= (\forall \mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities}. (\sum \psi \in \text{set } (\sim \Psi). \mathcal{P} \psi) \geq 1 - \mathcal{P} \varphi)$
proof –
 have $\Psi \vdash \varphi$

$= (\forall \mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities}. (\sum \psi \in \text{set } (\sim \Psi). \mathcal{P} \psi) \geq \mathcal{P} (\sim \varphi))$
using
contra-list-curry-uncurry
list-deduction-def
set-summation-completeness
weak-biconditional-weaken
by *blast*
thus *?thesis*
using *probability-member-neg*
by (*induct* Ψ , *auto*)
qed

2.3 Converse Suppes' Theorem

A formulation of the converse of Suppes' theorem obtains for lists/sets of *logically disjoint* propositions.

lemma (*in probability-logic*) *exclusive-sum-list-identity*:

assumes $\vdash \coprod \Phi$
shows $\mathcal{P} (\bigsqcup \Phi) = (\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \mathcal{P} \varphi)$
using *assms*
proof (*induct* Φ)
case *Nil*
then show *?case*
by (*simp add: gaines-weatherson-antithesis*)
next
case (*Cons* $\varphi \Phi$)
assume $\vdash \coprod (\varphi \# \Phi)$
hence $\vdash \sim (\varphi \sqcap \bigsqcup \Phi) \vdash \coprod \Phi$ **by** *simp+*
hence $\mathcal{P} (\bigsqcup (\varphi \# \Phi)) = \mathcal{P} \varphi + \mathcal{P} (\bigsqcup \Phi)$
 $\mathcal{P} (\bigsqcup \Phi) = (\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \mathcal{P} \varphi)$
using *Cons.hyps probability-additivity* **by** *auto*
hence $\mathcal{P} (\bigsqcup (\varphi \# \Phi)) = \mathcal{P} \varphi + (\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \mathcal{P} \varphi)$ **by** *auto*
thus *?case* **by** *simp*
qed

lemma *sum-list-monotone*:

fixes $f :: 'a \Rightarrow \text{real}$
assumes $\forall x. f x \geq 0$
and $\text{set } \Phi \subseteq \text{set } \Psi$
and *distinct* Φ
shows $(\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. f \varphi) \leq (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. f \psi)$
using *assms*
proof –
assume $\forall x. f x \geq 0$
have $\forall \Phi. \text{set } \Phi \subseteq \text{set } \Psi$
 \rightarrow *distinct* Φ
 $\rightarrow (\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. f \varphi) \leq (\sum \psi \leftarrow \Psi. f \psi)$
proof (*induct* Ψ)

```

case Nil
then show ?case by simp
next
case (Cons ψ Ψ)
{
  fix Φ
  assume set Φ ⊆ set (ψ # Ψ)
  and distinct Φ
  have (∑ φ←Φ. f φ) ≤ (∑ ψ'←(ψ # Ψ). f ψ')
  proof -
  {
    assume ψ ∉ set Φ
    with ⟨set Φ ⊆ set (ψ # Ψ)⟩ have set Φ ⊆ set Ψ by auto
    hence (∑ φ←Φ. f φ) ≤ (∑ ψ←Ψ. f ψ)
    using Cons.hyps ⟨distinct Φ⟩ by auto
    moreover have f ψ ≥ 0 using ⟨∀ x. f x ≥ 0⟩ by metis
    ultimately have ?thesis by simp
  }
  moreover
  {
    assume ψ ∈ set Φ
    hence set Φ = insert ψ (set (removeAll ψ Φ))
    by auto
    with ⟨set Φ ⊆ set (ψ # Ψ)⟩ have set (removeAll ψ Φ) ⊆ set Ψ
    by (metis
      insert-subset
      list.simps(15)
      set-removeAll
      subset-insert-iff)
    moreover from ⟨distinct Φ⟩ have distinct (removeAll ψ Φ)
    by (meson distinct-removeAll)
    ultimately have (∑ φ←(removeAll ψ Φ). f φ) ≤ (∑ ψ←Ψ. f ψ)
    using Cons.hyps
    by simp
    moreover from ⟨ψ ∈ set Φ⟩ ⟨distinct Φ⟩
    have (∑ φ←Φ. f φ) = f ψ + (∑ φ←(removeAll ψ Φ). f φ)
    using distinct-remove1-removeAll sum-list-map-remove1
    by fastforce
    ultimately have ?thesis using ⟨∀ x. f x ≥ 0⟩
    by simp
  }
  ultimately show ?thesis by blast
qed
}
thus ?case by blast
qed
moreover assume set Φ ⊆ set Ψ and distinct Φ
ultimately show ?thesis by blast
qed

```

lemma *count-remove-all-sum-list*:
fixes $f :: 'a \Rightarrow \text{real}$
shows $\text{real} (\text{count-list } xs \ x) * f \ x + (\sum x' \leftarrow (\text{removeAll } x \ xs). f \ x')$
 $= (\sum x \leftarrow xs. f \ x)$
by (*induct xs, simp, simp, metis combine-common-factor mult-cancel-right1*)

lemma (*in classical-logic*) *dirac-exclusive-implication-completeness*:
 $(\forall \delta \in \text{dirac-measures}. (\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \delta \ \varphi) \leq \delta \ \psi) = (\vdash \coprod \Phi \wedge \vdash \sqcup \Phi \rightarrow \psi)$
proof –
{
 fix δ
 assume $\delta \in \text{dirac-measures}$
 from this interpret *probability-logic* $(\lambda \varphi. \vdash \varphi) (\rightarrow) \perp \delta$
 unfolding *dirac-measures-def*
 by *simp*
 assume $\vdash \coprod \Phi \vdash \sqcup \Phi \rightarrow \psi$
 hence $(\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \delta \ \varphi) \leq \delta \ \psi$
 using *exclusive-sum-list-identity monotonicity by fastforce*
}
moreover
{
 assume $\neg \vdash \coprod \Phi$
 hence $(\exists \varphi \in \text{set } \Phi. \exists \psi \in \text{set } \Phi. \varphi \neq \psi \wedge \neg \vdash \sim (\varphi \sqcap \psi)) \vee (\exists \varphi \in \text{duplicates } \Phi. \neg \vdash \sim \varphi)$
 using *exclusive-equivalence set-deduction-base-theory by blast*
 hence $\neg (\forall \delta \in \text{dirac-measures}. (\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \delta \ \varphi) \leq \delta \ \psi)$
 proof (*elim disjE*)
 assume $\exists \varphi \in \text{set } \Phi. \exists \chi \in \text{set } \Phi. \varphi \neq \chi \wedge \neg \vdash \sim (\varphi \sqcap \chi)$
 from this obtain φ **and** χ
 where $\varphi\chi$ -*properties*:
 $\varphi \in \text{set } \Phi$
 $\chi \in \text{set } \Phi$
 $\varphi \neq \chi$
 $\neg \vdash \sim (\varphi \sqcap \chi)$
 by *blast*
 from this obtain Ω **where** $\Omega: \text{MCS } \Omega \sim (\varphi \sqcap \chi) \notin \Omega$
 by (*meson*
 insert-subset
 formula-consistent-def
 formula-maximal-consistency
 formula-maximally-consistent-extension
 formula-maximally-consistent-set-def-def
 set-deduction-base-theory
 set-deduction-reflection
 set-deduction-theorem)
 let $?\delta = \lambda \chi. \text{if } \chi \in \Omega \text{ then } (1 :: \text{real}) \text{ else } 0$
 from Ω **have** $\varphi \in \Omega \ \chi \in \Omega$
 by (*metis*)

```

    formula-maximally-consistent-set-def-implication
    maximally-consistent-set-def
    conjunction-def
    negation-def)+
with  $\varphi\chi$ -properties have
   $(\sum \varphi \leftarrow [\varphi, \chi]. ?\delta \varphi) = 2$ 
  set  $[\varphi, \chi] \subseteq \text{set } \Phi$ 
  distinct  $[\varphi, \chi]$ 
   $\forall \varphi. ?\delta \varphi \geq 0$ 
  by simp+
hence  $(\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. ?\delta \varphi) \geq 2$  using sum-list-monotone by metis
hence  $\neg (\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. ?\delta \varphi) \leq ?\delta (\psi)$  by auto
thus ?thesis
  using  $\Omega(1)$  MCS-dirac-measure
  by auto
next
assume  $\exists \varphi \in \text{duplicates } \Phi. \neg \vdash \sim \varphi$ 
from this obtain  $\varphi$  where  $\varphi \in \text{duplicates } \Phi \neg \vdash \sim \varphi$ 
  using
    exclusive-equivalence [where  $\Gamma = \{\}$ ]
    set-deduction-base-theory
  by blast
from  $\varphi$  obtain  $\Omega$  where  $\Omega: \text{MCS } \Omega \sim \varphi \notin \Omega$ 
  by (meson
    insert-subset
    formula-consistent-def
    formula-maximal-consistency
    formula-maximally-consistent-extension
    formula-maximally-consistent-set-def-def
    set-deduction-base-theory
    set-deduction-reflection
    set-deduction-theorem)
hence  $\varphi \in \Omega$ 
  using negation-def by auto
let  $?\delta = \lambda \chi. \text{if } \chi \in \Omega \text{ then } (1 :: \text{real}) \text{ else } 0$ 
from  $\varphi$  have count-list  $\Phi \varphi \geq 2$ 
  using duplicates-alt-def [where  $xs = \Phi$ ]
  by blast
hence real (count-list  $\Phi \varphi) * ?\delta \varphi \geq 2$  using  $\langle \varphi \in \Omega \rangle$  by simp
moreover
{
  fix  $\Psi$ 
  have  $(\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Psi. ?\delta \varphi) \geq 0$  by (induct  $\Psi$ , simp, simp)
}
moreover have  $(0 :: \text{real})$ 
   $\leq (\sum a \leftarrow \text{removeAll } \varphi \Phi. \text{if } a \in \Omega \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } 0)$ 
  using  $\langle \bigwedge \Psi. 0 \leq (\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Psi. \text{if } \varphi \in \Omega \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } 0) \rangle$ 
  by presburger
ultimately have real (count-list  $\Phi \varphi) * ?\delta \varphi$ 

```

```

      + (∑ φ ← (removeAll φ Φ). ?δ φ) ≥ 2
using ⟨2 ≤ real (count-list Φ φ) * (if φ ∈ Ω then 1 else 0)⟩
by linarith
hence (∑ φ ← Φ. ?δ φ) ≥ 2 by (metis count-remove-all-sum-list)
hence ¬ (∑ φ ← Φ. ?δ φ) ≤ ?δ (ψ) by auto
thus ?thesis
  using Ω(1) MCS-dirac-measure
  by auto
qed
}
moreover
{
  assume ¬ ⊢ ⊔ Φ → ψ
  from this obtain Ω φ
  where
    Ω: MCS Ω
    and ψ: ψ ∉ Ω
    and φ: φ ∈ set Φ φ ∈ Ω
  by (meson
    insert-subset
    formula-consistent-def
    formula-maximal-consistency
    formula-maximally-consistent-extension
    formula-maximally-consistent-set-def-def
    arbitrary-disjunction-exclusion-MCS
    set-deduction-base-theory
    set-deduction-reflection
    set-deduction-theorem)
  let ?δ = λ χ. if χ ∈ Ω then (1 :: real) else 0
  from φ have (∑ φ ← Φ. ?δ φ) ≥ 1
  proof (induct Φ)
    case Nil
    then show ?case by simp
  next
    case (Cons φ' Φ)
    obtain f :: real list ⇒ real where f:
      ∀ rs. f rs ∈ set rs ∧ ¬ 0 ≤ f rs ∨ 0 ≤ sum-list rs
    using sum-list-nonneg by metis
    moreover have f (map ?δ Φ) ∉ set (map ?δ Φ) ∨ 0 ≤ f (map ?δ Φ)
    by fastforce
    ultimately show ?case
    by (simp, metis Cons.hyps Cons.prem1) φ(2) set-ConsD)
  qed
  hence ¬ (∑ φ ← Φ. ?δ φ) ≤ ?δ (ψ) using ψ by auto
  hence ¬ (∀ δ ∈ dirac-measures. (∑ φ ← Φ. δ φ) ≤ δ ψ)
  using Ω(1) MCS-dirac-measure
  by auto
}
ultimately show ?thesis by blast

```

qed

theorem (in *classical-logic*) *exclusive-implication-completeness*:

$(\forall \mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities}. (\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \mathcal{P} \varphi) \leq \mathcal{P} \psi) = (\vdash \coprod \Phi \wedge \vdash \sqcup \Phi \rightarrow \psi)$
(is ?lhs = ?rhs)

proof

assume ?lhs

thus ?rhs

by (meson

dirac-exclusive-implication-completeness

dirac-measures-subset

subset-eq)

next

assume ?rhs

show ?lhs

proof

fix $\mathcal{P} :: 'a \Rightarrow \text{real}$

assume $\mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities}$

from *this* interpret *probability-logic* $(\lambda \varphi. \vdash \varphi) (\rightarrow) \perp \mathcal{P}$

unfolding *probabilities-def*

by *simp*

show $(\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \mathcal{P} \varphi) \leq \mathcal{P} \psi$

using

$\langle ?rhs \rangle$

exclusive-sum-list-identity

monotonicity

by *fastforce*

qed

qed

lemma (in *classical-logic*) *dirac-inequality-completeness*:

$(\forall \delta \in \text{dirac-measures}. \delta \varphi \leq \delta \psi) = \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$

proof –

have $\vdash \coprod [\varphi]$

by (*simp add: conjunction-right-elimination negation-def*)

hence $(\vdash \coprod [\varphi] \wedge \vdash \sqcup [\varphi] \rightarrow \psi) = \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$

by (*metis*

arbitrary-disjunction.simps(1)

arbitrary-disjunction.simps(2)

disjunction-def implication-equivalence

negation-def

weak-biconditional-weaken)

thus ?thesis

using *dirac-exclusive-implication-completeness* [where $\Phi = [\varphi]$]

by *auto*

qed

2.4 Implication Inequality Completeness

The following theorem establishes the converse of $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi \implies \mathcal{P} \varphi \leq \mathcal{P} \psi$, which was proved in §1.4.

theorem (in *classical-logic*) *implication-inequality-completeness*:

$$(\forall \mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities}. \mathcal{P} \varphi \leq \mathcal{P} \psi) = \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$$

proof –

have $\vdash \coprod [\varphi]$

by (*simp add: conjunction-right-elimination negation-def*)

hence $(\vdash \coprod [\varphi] \wedge \vdash \sqcup [\varphi] \rightarrow \psi) = \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$

by (*metis*

arbitrary-disjunction.simps(1)

arbitrary-disjunction.simps(2)

disjunction-def implication-equivalence

negation-def

weak-biconditional-weaken)

thus *?thesis*

using *exclusive-implication-completeness* [where $\Phi=[\varphi]$]

by *simp*

qed

2.5 Characterizing Logical Exclusiveness In Probability Logic

Finally, we can say that $\mathcal{P} (\sqcup \Phi) = (\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \mathcal{P} \varphi)$ if and only if the propositions in Φ are mutually exclusive (i.e. $\vdash \coprod \Phi$). This result also obtains for sets.

lemma (in *classical-logic*) *dirac-exclusive-list-summation-completeness*:

$$(\forall \delta \in \text{dirac-measures}. \delta (\sqcup \Phi) = (\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \delta \varphi)) = \vdash \coprod \Phi$$

by (*metis*

antisym-conv

dirac-exclusive-implication-completeness

dirac-list-summation-completeness

trivial-implication)

theorem (in *classical-logic*) *exclusive-list-summation-completeness*:

$$(\forall \mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities}. \mathcal{P} (\sqcup \Phi) = (\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \mathcal{P} \varphi)) = \vdash \coprod \Phi$$

by (*metis*

antisym-conv

exclusive-implication-completeness

list-summation-completeness

trivial-implication)

lemma (in *classical-logic*) *dirac-exclusive-set-summation-completeness*:

$$\begin{aligned} (\forall \delta \in \text{dirac-measures}. \delta (\sqcup \Phi) &= (\sum \varphi \in \text{set } \Phi. \delta \varphi)) \\ &= \vdash \coprod (\text{remdups } \Phi) \end{aligned}$$

by (*metis*

(mono-tags)
 eq-iff
 dirac-exclusive-implication-completeness
 dirac-set-summation-completeness
 trivial-implication
 set-remdups
 sum.set-conv-list eq-iff
 dirac-exclusive-implication-completeness
 dirac-set-summation-completeness
 trivial-implication
 set-remdups
 sum.set-conv-list
 antisym-conv)

theorem (in *classical-logic*) *exclusive-set-summation-completeness*:

($\forall \mathcal{P} \in \text{probabilities.}$

$\mathcal{P} (\bigsqcup \Phi) = (\sum \varphi \in \text{set } \Phi. \mathcal{P} \varphi) = \vdash \bigsqcup (\text{remdups } \Phi)$)

by (*metis*

(mono-tags, opaque-lifting)
 antisym-conv
 exclusive-list-summation-completeness
 exclusive-implication-completeness
 implication-inequality-completeness
 set-summation-completeness
 order.refl
 sum.set-conv-list)

lemma (in *probability-logic*) *exclusive-list-set-inequality*:

assumes $\vdash \bigsqcup \Phi$

shows $(\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \mathcal{P} \varphi) = (\sum \varphi \in \text{set } \Phi. \mathcal{P} \varphi)$

proof –

have *distinct* (remdups Φ) **using** *distinct-remdups* **by** *auto*

hence *duplicates* (remdups Φ) = $\{\}$

by (*induct* Φ , *simp+*)

moreover have *set* (remdups Φ) = *set* Φ

by (*induct* Φ , *simp*, *simp add: insert-absorb*)

moreover have ($\forall \varphi \in \text{duplicates } \Phi. \vdash \sim \varphi$)

$\wedge (\forall \varphi \in \text{set } \Phi. \forall \psi \in \text{set } \Phi. (\varphi \neq \psi) \longrightarrow \vdash \sim (\varphi \sqcap \psi))$

using

assms
exclusive-elimination1
exclusive-elimination2
set-deduction-base-theory

by *blast*

ultimately have

$(\forall \varphi \in \text{duplicates } (\text{remdups } \Phi). \vdash \sim \varphi)$

$\wedge (\forall \varphi \in \text{set } (\text{remdups } \Phi). \forall \psi \in \text{set } (\text{remdups } \Phi).$

$(\varphi \neq \psi) \longrightarrow \vdash \sim (\varphi \sqcap \psi))$

by *auto*

hence $\vdash \coprod (\text{remdups } \Phi)$
by (*meson exclusive-equivalence set-deduction-base-theory*)
hence $(\sum \varphi \in \text{set } \Phi. \mathcal{P} \varphi) = \mathcal{P} (\coprod \Phi)$
by (*metis*
arbitrary-disjunction-remdups
biconditional-equivalence
exclusive-sum-list-identity
sum.set-conv-list)
moreover have $(\sum \varphi \leftarrow \Phi. \mathcal{P} \varphi) = \mathcal{P} (\coprod \Phi)$
by (*simp add: assms exclusive-sum-list-identity*)
ultimately show *?thesis* **by** *metis*
qed

unbundle *funcset-syntax*

end

Bibliography

- [1] G. Boole. Chapter XVI. On The Theory Of Probabilities. In *An Investigation of the Laws of Thought On Which Are Founded the Mathematical Theories of Logic and Probabilities*, pages 243–252. 1853.
- [2] B. De Finetti. Sui passaggi al limite nel calcolo delle probabilità. *Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere*, 63:1–12, 1930.
- [3] M. Eberl. Buffon’s needle problem. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, June 2017.
- [4] B. R. Gaines. Fuzzy and probability uncertainty logics. *Information and Control*, 38(2):154–169, Aug. 1978.
- [5] G. Gerla. Inferences in probability logic. *Artificial Intelligence*, 70(1-2):33–52, Oct. 1994.
- [6] T. Hailperin. Probability Logic. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 25(3):198–212, July 1984.
- [7] T. Hailperin. *Boole’s Logic and Probability: A Critical Exposition from the Standpoint of Contemporary Algebra, Logic and Probability Theory*. Number 85 in Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2. ed, rev. and enl edition, 1986.
- [8] T. Hailperin. *Sentential Probability Logic: Origins, Development, Current Status, and Technical Applications*. Lehigh University Press, Bethlehem : London ; Cranbury, N.J, 1996.
- [9] A. Horn and A. Tarski. Measures in Boolean algebras. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 64(3):467–467, Mar. 1948.
- [10] A. Kolmogoroff. Chapter 1. Die elementare Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung. In *Grundbegriffe der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung*, number 2 in Ergebnisse der Mathematik und Ihrer Grenzgebiete, pages 1–12. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, first edition, 1933.
- [11] N. Rescher. *Many-Valued Logic*. McGraw-Hill, New York, first edition, Jan. 1969.

- [12] L. J. Savage. Difficulties in the Theory of Personal Probability. *Philosophy of Science*, 34(4):305–310, 1967.
- [13] P. Suppes. Probabilistic Inference and the Concept of Total Evidence. In J. Hintikka and P. Suppes, editors, *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, volume 43 of *Aspects of Inductive Logic*, pages 49–65. Elsevier, Jan. 1966.
- [14] B. Weatherson. From Classical to Intuitionistic Probability. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 44(2):111–123, Apr. 2003.