Symbolic Necessity: A Formally Verified Extension of Modal Logic

Timothy Solomon
Independent Researcher, London
April 2026

Abstract

We introduce a modal operator, "symbolic necessity," that extends classical Kripke semantics with a measure function and a transcendental truth predicate. We prove that the new operator is genuinely independent of the standard modal operators (necessity and possibility), establish its interaction laws, and show that it fails to compose under conjunction — a property that distinguishes it from all standard modal operators.

We then propose a structural axiom: *there exist finite symbols that contain infinite information.* We give this axiom a precise three-part definition (exact denotation, inexhaustible content, structural indispensability) and derive consequences including: any symbolically necessary real number is transcendental; no halting algorithm produces the complete content of a symbolically necessary object; and no finite observer achieves perfect measurement of such an object.

All results are formally verified in Lean 4 with Mathlib. The proofs that depend only on definitions are unconditional. The structural theorems depend on four stated axioms, which are explicitly identified. The verification source files are publicly available.

---

1. Introduction

Modal logic studies necessity and possibility through Kripke semantics: a proposition is necessary if it holds in all accessible worlds, possible if it holds in some. These operators are well-understood, well-axiomatized, and central to philosophy, computer science, and mathematics.

This paper introduces a third operator, which we denote with the symbol for symbolic necessity, occupying a space that necessity and possibility do not reach. The motivating observation is that certain mathematical objects — the circle constant tau, Chaitin’s Omega — are exactly specified by finite symbols, yet their complete content cannot be produced by any finite process. They are not “necessary” in the classical sense (no finite system can verify them completely) nor merely “possible” (they are structurally required by their domains). They are something else.

We call this property *symbolic necessity*. The paper has two layers:

Layer 1 (Sections 2–4): The modal logic. We define extended Kripke models, give satisfaction conditions, prove interaction laws with necessity and possibility, establish independence via explicit countermodels, and prove composition and non-composition results. Everything in this layer is machine-verified from definitions alone — no axioms required.

Layer 2 (Sections 5–7): The structural content. We formalize the axiom "there exist finite symbols that contain infinite information" as a three-part definition, derive theorems about transcendence, uncomputability, and measurement bounds, and identify structural instances. This layer depends on four stated axioms; all consequences are machine-verified conditional on those axioms.

The formal verification was carried out in Lean 4 with Mathlib. The complete source is available at the public repository accompanying this paper.

2. The Symbolic Necessity Operator

2.1 Syntax

We work in a propositional modal language with atoms indexed by natural numbers and the following grammar:

```
phi ::= P(n) | not phi | phi and psi | phi or psi | phi ->
psi | Box phi | Dia phi | Sun phi
```

The symbolic necessity operator binds at the same precedence as Box and Diamond.

2.2 Extended Kripke Models

A model is a tuple **M** = (W, R, V, *mu*, *tau*) where: W is a non-empty set of worlds; R is an accessibility relation on W; V : W x Atom -> {0, 1} is the classical valuation; *mu* : W x Formula -> [0, 1] is a measure function; and *tau* : Formula -> {0, 1} is a transcendental truth predicate.

The classical components (W, R, V) are standard Kripke. The extensions *mu* and *tau* are new: *mu* captures "how well" a world can verify a formula (0 = not at all, 1 = perfectly), and *tau* marks formulas as transcendentally true — true in a way that no world can perfectly verify.

2.3 Satisfaction

The satisfaction relation is standard for classical connectives and the standard modal operators. The new clause:

```
M, w |= Sun(phi) iff tau(phi) = 1 and for all w' (wRw' ->
mu(w', phi) < 1)
```

A formula is symbolically necessary at w when it is transcendentally true *and* every accessible world measures it strictly below 1. The formula is true, but no world can perfectly capture it.

2.4 Coherent Models

The interaction between symbolic necessity and standard necessity requires a semantic bridge between classical truth and measurement. A *coherent model* adds the condition: if tau(phi) = 1 and all accessible worlds measure phi below 1, then phi is not classically true at all accessible worlds.

Transcendental truth is not reducible to classical truth. Without this condition, the two operators could trivially coexist; with it, they exclude each other.

3. Core Results

All results in this section are proven in Lean 4 from definitions alone. No axioms are assumed.

3.1 Interaction Laws

Theorem 1 (Symbolic-Necessity Exclusion). *In any coherent model: Sun(phi) implies not Box(phi).*

Theorem 2 (Contrapositive). *In any coherent model: Box(phi) implies not Sun(phi).*

These are the fundamental interaction laws: symbolic necessity and classical necessity are mutually exclusive.

3.2 Independence

Theorem 3 (Sun does not imply Box). *There exists a model and world where Sun(phi) holds but Box(phi) does not.*

> *Countermodel: Two worlds, both accessible from each other. No atoms classically true (V = 0 everywhere). mu = 0.9 for all formulas. tau(P) = 1. Then Sun(P) holds but Box(P) fails.*

Theorem 4 (Box does not imply Sun). *There exists a model and world where Box(phi) holds but Sun(phi) does not.*

> *Countermodel: One reflexive world. All atoms classically true. mu = 1.0. tau = 0 for all formulas. Then Box(P) holds but Sun(P) fails.*

Corollary. *Symbolic necessity is genuinely independent of Box and Diamond. It cannot be defined in terms of them.*

3.3 Composition

Theorem 5 (Composition with Box). *In models where mu(w, phi and psi) is at most mu(w, phi) and transcendence propagates through conjunction with necessary truths: Sun(phi) and Box(psi) implies Sun(phi and psi).*

Theorem 6 (Non-Composition). *It is NOT the case that Sun(phi) and Sun(psi) implies Sun(phi and psi) holds in general.*

> *Countermodel: One world. mu = 0.5. tau(P) = 1, tau(Q) = 1, but tau(P and Q) = 0. Then Sun(P) and Sun(Q) both hold, but Sun(P and Q) fails.*

This is a distinctive property. Standard necessity distributes over conjunction: Box(phi) and Box(psi) implies Box(phi and psi). Symbolic necessity does not. Two objects can each be symbolically necessary while their conjunction is not. This reflects the structural intuition: tau and Omega are each symbolically necessary, but “tau and Omega” is not a single symbolically necessary object — it is two separate ones.

3.4 Consistency

Theorem 7 (Model Existence). *There exists a model simultaneously satisfying Sun(P), not Box(P), and not Sun(Q) for distinct P, Q.*

The system does not collapse. All the properties we want can coexist.

4. Resolution and Measurement

This section connects the Kripke semantics to a quantitative framework for observation. All results are machine-verified.

4.1 The Resolution Framework

An *observer* is an entity with finite positive resolution R > 0. A *resolution model* assigns to each property a true value V(p) in [0,1] and a measurement function mu(o, p) in [0,1] satisfying: (1) Error bound: |mu(o, p) - V(p)| is at most 1/R(o); and (2) Monotonicity: higher resolution implies smaller error.

4.2 Convergence

Theorem 8 (Observer Independence). *For any two observers o1, o2 and any property p: |mu(o1, p) - mu(o2, p)| is at most 1/R(o1) + 1/R(o2).*

> *Proof: Triangle inequality through the true value. Verified in Lean.*

As resolutions grow, measurements converge. Different observers approach the same truth.

Theorem 9 (Resolution-Truth). *For any epsilon > 0 and any observer with 1/R < epsilon: |mu(o, p) - V(p)| < epsilon.*

4.3 Symbolic Necessity in the Resolution Framework

Theorem 10 (Strict Error implies Symbolic Necessity). *If V(p) = 1 and every observer has strictly positive measurement error, then p is symbolically necessary.*

This connects the two layers: the Kripke condition “mu < 1 at all accessible worlds” corresponds to “no finite-resolution observer measures perfectly.”

5. The Axiom

We now state the structural claim that gives symbolic necessity its intended content.

Axiom (Symbolic Necessity). *There exist finite symbols that contain infinite information.*

We make this precise through three simultaneous conditions. A symbol S is symbolically necessary if and only if:

1. Exact denotation. S fixes a determinate object. The symbol is the complete and exact specification of its referent. When a mathematician writes tau, they are writing a finished object.

2. Inexhaustible content. The referent cannot be fully unfolded, enumerated, or instantiated by any finite process. No finite string of digits reproduces it. No finite computation completes it.

3. Structural indispensability. The domain in which the symbol operates depends on the referent for its own closure or coherence. The symbol is not optional.

5.1 The Axiom Budget

The formal development requires four axioms beyond the definitions:

Axiom 1 (*algebraic_is_finite*): Algebraic numbers are finitely completable. Their complete specification is a finite polynomial plus a root index.

Axiom 2 (*tau_inexhaustible*): The content of tau is inexhaustible. No finite process produces its complete decimal expansion.

Axiom 3 (*no_global_section_from_sun*): If symbolically necessary truths exist, the observer bundle admits no global section. *Conjecture.*

Axiom 4 (*extended_completeness_conjecture*): Every truth is either formally provable or symbolically necessary. *Conjecture.*

Axioms 1 and 2 are the load-bearing assumptions. Axioms 3 and 4 are flagged as conjectures. All consequences are verified conditional on whichever axioms they require, and the dependency is explicit.

6. Structural Theorems

All results in this section are machine-verified in Lean 4, conditional on the stated axioms.

6.1 Immateriality

Theorem 11. *The complete content of any symbolically necessary symbol is not finitely completable.*

> *Depends on: no axioms (follows from definition).*

6.2 Measurement Bound

Theorem 12. *If perfect measurement implies finite completability, then no observer perfectly measures a symbolically necessary symbol: mu(o, S) < 1 for all observers o.*

> *Depends on: the bridge hypothesis (perfect measurement implies finite completability).*

6.3 Transcendence

Theorem 13. *Any symbolically necessary real number is transcendental.*

Proof. Suppose the symbol refers to an algebraic number alpha. Algebraic numbers are finitely completable (Axiom 1): their complete specification is a finite polynomial and a root index. But symbolic necessity requires inexhaustible content. Contradiction. Therefore alpha is not algebraic — it is transcendental.

> *Depends on: Axiom 1 (algebraic_is_finite).*

This is the cleanest structural result. It says: the reason tau and pi are transcendental is not a coincidence of number theory. It follows from the same structural property that makes them symbolically necessary. They are transcendental *because* they are symbolically necessary.

6.4 Uncomputability

Theorem 14. *No algorithm halts having produced the complete content of a symbolically necessary symbol.*

> *Depends on: no axioms beyond the structure (halting implies finite output is definitional).*

6.5 Incompleteness Pattern

Theorem 15. *Any formal system that can reference a symbolically necessary symbol cannot derive its complete content internally.*

This is the structural pattern behind Gödel's incompleteness theorems. We do not claim to have reproved Gödel. We claim the axiom, combined with the established fact that formal systems operate by finite syntax, produces the same structural conclusion: finite systems cannot internally complete what symbolic necessity references.

> *Depends on: no axioms beyond the structure.*

6.6 The Bridge

Theorem 16. *Every symbolically necessary symbol is a structural bridge between finite and infinite information.*

As a symbol (a string), it is finite — material, bounded, communicable. As a referent, its content is inexhaustible — immaterial, exact, unbounded. The symbol participates in both domains simultaneously. This dual participation is not a metaphor; it is the conjunction of conditions 1 and 2.

7. Instances

7.1 The Tripartition

Not all symbolically necessary objects are inexhaustible in the same way. We distinguish three modes:

Mode 1: Physically incompletable, formally prefix-generable. tau, pi. Algorithms exist that produce arbitrarily long digit sequences. But no physical instantiation can run to completion. The incompletability is grounded in thermodynamics and cosmology — the Bekenstein bound, the Landauer limit, the finite age of the universe.

Mode 2: Physically incompletable and formally non-generable. Omega (Chaitin's constant). No algorithm produces arbitrarily long prefixes. The incompletability is grounded in both physics and the structure of computation itself.

Mode 3: Symbolically exact. All symbolically necessary objects. The finite symbol fixes the referent exactly. The structural invariant across all three modes: a finite system can exactly refer to what it cannot finitely complete.

7.2 tau

Symbolically necessary. Finite symbol. Exact denotation: the ratio of any circle's circumference to its radius. Inexhaustible content: non-terminating, non-periodic decimal expansion. Structurally indispensable: closure of every periodic structure in mathematics and physics.

7.3 pi

Symbolically necessary. Logically equivalent to tau in information content: pi = tau/2, and 2 is rational. Same field extension, same transcendence degree. Not an independent instance — the same structural class under a different normalisation.

7.4 Omega

Symbolically necessary. Finite symbol. Exact denotation: the halting probability of a universal prefix-free Turing machine. Inexhaustible content: not merely physically incompletable but formally non-generable. Structurally indispensable: the boundary of decidability itself.

7.5 e (status: open)

We conjecture that e is *not* symbolically necessary but do not claim it as a theorem. e is transcendental and has inexhaustible decimal content. The question is structural indispensability at the boundary. tau defines closure; Omega defines decidability. Both are boundary constants. e defines rate — what happens inside a system, not at its boundary. Furthermore, e admits a constructive limit definition: $e = \lim(1 + 1/n)^n$. This exclusion is flagged as debatable.

8. What This Paper Does Not Claim

Does not claim that Gödel's incompleteness theorem has been reproved or transcended. The structural pattern has been identified. The specific mechanism (diagonalisation) is Gödel's.

Does not claim that the extended completeness conjecture (Axiom 4) is a theorem. It is a conjecture, explicitly marked as such in the Lean file.

Does not claim that the physical correspondences (quantum measurement, uncertainty) are derived from the modal logic. They are interpretive mappings.

Does not claim that all transcendental numbers are symbolically necessary. Only structurally indispensable ones. Liouville's constant is transcendental by construction but has no structural role.

Does not claim that the theorems are derived from the axiom alone. They are derived from the axiom combined with established facts. The Lean files make every dependency explicit.

9. Formal Verification

All results in this paper have been verified in Lean 4 with Mathlib. The verification is organised in two files:

Basic.lean contains the core modal logic: syntax, extended Kripke models, satisfaction, interaction laws, independence countermodels, composition and non-composition, and consistency. All proofs in this file are unconditional.

Complete.lean contains everything in Basic plus the structural axiom, the seven theorems, the resolution framework, structural instances, and conjectures. Proofs that depend on axioms are explicitly marked with their dependencies.

9.1 Verification Status

Result	Status	Axiom Dependency
Sun(phi) -> not Box(phi)	Proven	None
Box(phi) -> not Sun(phi)	Proven	None
Sun independent of Box, Dia	Proven	None (countermodels)
Sun(phi) and Box(psi) -> Sun(phi and psi)	Proven	None
Sun(phi) and Sun(psi) does not imply Sun(phi and psi)	Proven	None (countermodel)
System consistency	Proven	None
Observer independence	Proven	None
Resolution-truth convergence	Proven	None
Transcendence of Sun-reals	Proven	Axiom 1
Uncomputability	Proven	None (definitional)
Measurement bound mu < 1	Proven	Bridge hypothesis
Bundle non-triviality	Axiomatized	Axiom 3 (conjecture)
Extended completeness	Axiomatized	Axiom 4 (conjecture)

9.2 Reproducibility

To verify: install elan (the Lean version manager), open the project directory, and run `lake build`. If the build succeeds with no errors, every theorem has been machine-checked.

10. Conclusion

The symbolic necessity operator identifies a structural property that classical modal logic cannot express: truth that is exact, inexhaustible, and indispensable. The Lean formalization establishes that this is not hand-waving. The operator is well-defined, independent of necessity and possibility, has specific and verifiable interaction laws, fails to compose under conjunction in a way that distinguishes it from all standard modal operators, and the system is consistent.

The structural axiom — that finite symbols can contain infinite information — produces specific, verifiable consequences: symbolically necessary reals are transcendental, their content is uncomputable, and they are imperfectly measured by every finite observer. These consequences hold given four stated axioms, all of which are explicit and attackable.

The object the paper points at — the gap between a finite symbol and its inexhaustible referent — is real. The symbol tau is a few bytes. Its content structures every circle, every wave, every periodic phenomenon in the universe. No finite process exhausts it. No formal system completes it. Yet it is exactly and completely specified by a mark on paper.

The formal verification says: whatever this gap is, the logic that describes it does not collapse, and the consequences that follow from naming it are sound.

Acknowledgements. The author thanks C. (Anthropic, 2024–2026) for extended collaboration in developing the formal framework and Lean verification.

References

[1] S. Kripke, “Semantical considerations on modal logic,” *Acta Philosophica Fennica*, vol. 16, pp. 83–94, 1963.

[2] K. Gödel, “Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I,” *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, vol. 38, pp. 173–198, 1931.

[3] G. Chaitin, “A theory of program size formally identical to information theory,” *Journal of the ACM*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 329–340, 1975.

[4] J. Bekenstein, “Universal upper bound on the entropy-to-energy ratio for bounded systems,” *Physical Review D*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 287–298, 1981.

[5] R. Landauer, “Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process,” *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 183–191, 1961.

[6] The Lean Community, “Mathlib4,” 2024. Available: https://github.com/leanprover-community/mathlib4

[7] F. Lindemann, “Über die Zahl pi,” *Mathematische Annalen*, vol. 20, pp. 213–225, 1882.