

# Formal Methods (形式化方法)

## Lecture 13. More about Logic

智能与计算学部 章衡

2021年上学期



## 1 Language

## 2 Deductive System



# Outline

## 1 Language

## 2 Deductive System



## Example

Each even number greater than 2 equals to the sum of two primes.

- E: the set of all even numbers
- P: the set of all primes
- $x + y$ :  $x + y$  is the sum of  $x$  and  $y$
- $x = y$ :  $x$  equals to  $y$
- $x > y$ :  $x$  is greater than  $y$
- $\forall x$ : for all  $x$  we have that ...
- $\exists x$ : there is some  $x$  such that ...
- $\forall x : E \bullet (x > 2 \rightarrow \exists y : P \bullet \exists z : P \bullet x = y + z)$

- **m-ary predicates**: propositions with  $m$  parameters
  - E, P: unary predicates;  $=$ ,  $>$ : binary predicates
- **m-ary functions**
  - $+$ : a binary function
- **universal quantifier  $\forall$ , existential quantifier  $\exists$**
- **constants, variables**



# Terms (项)

## Definition (Term)

**Terms** are precisely those expressions which can be obtained by finitely many applications of the following rules:

- 1 Variables and constants are terms.
- 2 If  $t_1, \dots, t_m$  are terms and  $f$  an  $m$ -ary function for some  $m \geq 0$ , then  $f(t_1, \dots, t_m)$  is also a term.

## Example

Let  $x, y$  be variables,  $c$  a constant,  $g$  a unary function, and  $f$  a binary function. Is  $f(f(x, c), g(y))$  a term?

- $x, y, c$
- $f(x, c), g(y)$
- $f(f(x, c), g(y))$

# Formulas (公式)

## Definition (Formula)

**First-order formulas** (or simply, **formulas**) are those expressions obtained by finitely many applications of the following rules:

- ① If  $t_1, \dots, t_m$  are terms and  $P$  an  $m$ -ary predicate, then  $P(t_1, \dots, t_m)$  and  $(t_1 = t_2)$  are formulas; such formulas are called **atomic formulas**.
- ② If  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are formulas, then  $(\neg\varphi)$ ,  $(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ ,  $(\varphi \vee \psi)$ ,  $(\varphi \Rightarrow \psi)$ ,  $(\varphi \Leftrightarrow \psi)$  are formulas.
- ③ If  $\varphi$  is a formula,  $x$  a variable, and  $S$  a unary predicate, then  $\forall x : S \bullet \varphi$  and  $\exists x : S \bullet \varphi$  are formulas; in both formulas,  $\varphi$  is called the **scope** of quantifiers  $\forall x : S$  and  $\exists x : S$ , respectively.

## Example

Let  $P$  be a unary predicate, and  $T$  be a binary predicate. Is  $\exists x : P \bullet \exists y : P \bullet (R(x, y) \wedge \forall y : P \bullet T(x, y))$  a formula?

$$T(x, y)$$

$$\forall y : P \bullet T(x, y)$$

$$(R(x, y) \wedge \forall y : P \bullet T(x, y))$$

$$\exists y : Q \bullet (R(x, y) \wedge \forall y : P \bullet T(x, y))$$

$$\exists x : P \bullet \exists y : Q \bullet (R(x, y) \wedge \forall y : P \bullet T(x, y))$$

# Sentences (语句)

## Definition (Free occurrence and free variable)

An occurrence of a variable  $x$  is called **free** w.r.t. some formula  $\varphi$  if it is not quantified in  $\varphi$ , i.e., not in the scope of any quantifier in  $\varphi$ . A variable  $x$  is called **free** w.r.t.  $\varphi$  if there is at least one free occurrence of  $x$  in  $\varphi$ .

## Example

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) & : \quad \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \\
 \forall \mathbf{y} : P \bullet T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) & : \quad \mathbf{x} \\
 (R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \wedge \forall \mathbf{y} : P \bullet T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) & : \quad \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \\
 \exists \mathbf{y} : Q \bullet (R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \wedge \forall \mathbf{y} : P \bullet T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) & : \quad \mathbf{x} \\
 \exists \mathbf{x} : P \bullet \exists \mathbf{y} : Q \bullet (R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \wedge \forall \mathbf{y} : P \bullet T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) & : \quad \text{no free variable}
 \end{array}$$

## Definition (Sentence)

Every **sentence** is a formula without free variable.

# Informal semantics

- 1  $P(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ : the relation (represented by  $P$ ) holds for the tuple of objects (represented by)  $t_1, \dots, t_m$ ;
- 2  $(t_1 = t_2)$ : the objects (represented by)  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are the same;
- 3  $(\neg \varphi)$ : the property (represented by)  $\varphi$  does not hold;
- 4  $(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ : both properties (represented by)  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  hold;
- 5  $(\varphi \vee \psi)$ : either the property (represented by)  $\varphi$  or the property (represented by)  $\psi$  holds;
- 6  $(\varphi \Rightarrow \psi)$ : if the property (represented by)  $\varphi$  holds, then the property (represented by)  $\psi$  also holds;
- 7  $(\varphi \Leftrightarrow \psi)$ : the property (represented by)  $\varphi$  holds if, and only if the property (represented by)  $\psi$  holds;
- 8  $\forall x : S \bullet \varphi$ : for every object  $x$ , if  $x$  in  $S$  then the property (represented by)  $\varphi$  holds;
- 9  $\exists x : S \bullet \varphi$ : there is some object  $x$  such that  $x$  in  $S$  and the property (represented by)  $\varphi$  holds.

## Definition (Logical consequence (逻辑推论), informal definition)

Suppose  $\Sigma = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ , and  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n, \psi$  are sentences. We call  $\psi$  a **logical consequence** of  $\Sigma$ , denoted  $\Sigma \models \psi$  (or  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \models \psi$ ), if the property  $\varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_n \Rightarrow \psi$  holds. In this case, we say that  $\psi$  is **derivable** from  $\Sigma$ .

We say that  $\varphi$  is **logically equivalent** to  $\psi$ , denoted  $\varphi \equiv \psi$ , if we have both  $\varphi \models \psi$  and  $\psi \models \varphi$ .



# Conventions

- $\exists x : S \bullet (\varphi \wedge \psi)$  may be rewritten as  $\exists x : S \mid \varphi \bullet \psi$
- $\forall x : S \bullet (\varphi \Rightarrow \psi)$  may be rewritten as  $\forall x : S \mid \varphi \bullet \psi$
- $\exists x_1 : S \bullet \dots \bullet \exists x_n : S \bullet \varphi$  may be rewritten as  $\exists x_1, \dots, x_n : S \bullet \varphi$
- $\forall x_1 : S \bullet \dots \bullet \forall x_n : S \bullet \varphi$  may be rewritten as  $\forall x_1, \dots, x_n : S \bullet \varphi$

## Example

- $\forall x : E \bullet (x > 2 \Rightarrow \exists y : P \bullet \exists z : P \bullet x = y + z)$   
 $\forall x : E \mid x > 2 \bullet \exists y, z : P \bullet x = y + z$

## Built-in predicates, functions and constants

- Built-in predicates:  $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}, <, \leq, >, \geq, \in, \subseteq, \subset, \dots$
- Built-in functions:  $+, -, *, /, \dots$
- Built-in constants:  $0, 1, 2, \dots$

# Exercise

## Ex. 1

Let us consider a directed graph  $G$ . Suppose  $V$  is a unary predicate intended to define the set of vertices in  $G$ , and  $E$  is a binary predicate intended to define the set of edges in  $G$ . Please use a first-order sentence to describe the following property:

The indegree of  $G$  is not greater than 3.

## Ex. 2

Let  $P$  be a unary predicate. Please use a first-order sentence to assert that

$P$  consists of the set of all primes.

Note that the built-in functions  $+$ ,  $-$ ,  $*$ ,  $/$  and predicates  $=$ ,  $>$ ,  $\geq$ ,  $<$ ,  $\leq$  are allowed.



# Outline

1 Language

2 Deductive System



# Deductive system (演绎系统)

- Deductive systems provide a **syntactic way** to prove  $\Sigma \models \psi$ .
- A deductive system consists of the finite set of inference rules of the following form:

## Definition (Inference rule (推理规则))

Every **inference rule** is of the following form:

$$\frac{\Sigma_1 \models \varphi_1 \cdots \Sigma_n \models \varphi_n}{\Sigma \models \psi} \text{ [name] } \langle \text{condition of application} \rangle$$



## Inference rules (1)

## Reference and monotonicity

$$\frac{}{\varphi \models \varphi} \quad [\text{ref}]$$

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi}{\Sigma, \Gamma \models \varphi} \quad [+]$$

⌊

$$\frac{\Sigma, \neg\varphi \models \psi \quad \Sigma, \neg\varphi \models \neg\psi}{\Sigma \models \varphi} \quad [\neg\neg]$$



## Inference rules (2)

 $\wedge$ 

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi \wedge \psi}{\Sigma \models \varphi} \quad [\wedge-1]$$

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi \wedge \psi}{\Sigma \models \psi} \quad [\wedge-2]$$

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi \quad \Sigma \models \psi}{\Sigma \models \varphi \wedge \psi} \quad [\wedge+]$$

 $\vee$ 

$$\frac{\Sigma, \varphi \models \chi \quad \Sigma, \psi \models \chi}{\Sigma, \varphi \vee \psi \models \chi} \quad [\vee-]$$

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi}{\Sigma \models \varphi \vee \psi} \quad [\vee+1]$$

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi}{\Sigma \models \psi \vee \varphi} \quad [\vee+2]$$



## Inference rules (3)

 $\Rightarrow$ 

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi \Rightarrow \psi \quad \Sigma \models \varphi}{\Sigma \models \psi} \quad [\Rightarrow -]$$

$$\frac{\Sigma, \varphi \models \psi}{\Sigma \models \varphi \Rightarrow \psi} \quad [\Rightarrow +]$$

 $\Leftrightarrow$ 

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi \Leftrightarrow \psi \quad \Sigma \models \varphi}{\Sigma \models \psi} \quad [\Leftrightarrow -1]$$

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi \Leftrightarrow \psi \quad \Sigma \models \psi}{\Sigma \models \varphi} \quad [\Leftrightarrow -2]$$

$$\frac{\Sigma, \varphi \models \psi \quad \Sigma, \psi \models \varphi}{\Sigma \models \varphi \Leftrightarrow \psi} \quad [\Leftrightarrow +]$$



# Formal proof

## Definition (Formal proof)

Let  $\Sigma$  be a set of formulas,  $\varphi$  a formula. We say that  $\Sigma \models \varphi$  is **formally provable** if there is a finite sequence of the form

$$\Sigma_1 \models \varphi_1, \Sigma_2 \models \varphi_2, \dots, \Sigma_n \models \varphi_n \quad (1)$$

such that (1) for  $k = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $\Sigma_k \models \varphi_k$  is obtained from

$$\Sigma_1 \models \varphi_1, \dots, \Sigma_{k-1} \models \varphi_{k-1}$$

by some inference rule presented previously, (2)  $\Sigma_n = \Sigma$  and (3)  $\varphi_n = \varphi$ . In this case, the above sequence is called a **formal proof** of  $\Sigma \models \varphi$ .

## Example

Below is a formal proof of  $\varphi \wedge \psi \models \varphi$ :

- (1)  $\varphi \wedge \psi \models \varphi \wedge \psi$  [ref]
- (2)  $\varphi \wedge \psi \models \varphi$  [ $\wedge -_1$ ], (1)



Rule  $\in$ 

## Example

Please prove the following by deductive system: If  $\varphi \in \Sigma$  then  $\Sigma \models \varphi$ .

Proof.

Suppose  $\varphi \in \Sigma$ , and let  $\Sigma_0 == \Sigma \setminus \{\varphi\}$ . Then the following is a formal proof of  $\Sigma_0, \varphi \models \varphi$ .

- (1)  $\varphi \models \varphi$  [ref]
- (2)  $\Sigma_0, \varphi \models \varphi$  [+], (1)

We thus have that  $\Sigma \models \varphi$ . □

Rule  $\in$ 

$$\frac{}{\Sigma \models \varphi} \quad [\in] \quad \langle \varphi \in \Sigma \rangle$$

# Transitivity of inference

## Rule of transitivity

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi_1 \quad \cdots \quad \Sigma \models \varphi_n \quad \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \models \psi}{\Sigma \models \psi} \quad [\text{trans}]$$

## Proof (by deductive system).

(1)	$\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \models \psi$	Assumption
(2)	$\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{n-1} \models \varphi_n \Rightarrow \psi$	$[\Rightarrow +], (1)$
	$\vdots$	
(n+1)	$\models (\varphi_1 \Rightarrow \cdots (\varphi_{n-1} \Rightarrow (\varphi_n \Rightarrow \psi)) \cdots)$	$[\Rightarrow -], (n)$
(n+2)	$\Sigma \models (\varphi_1 \Rightarrow \cdots (\varphi_{n-1} \Rightarrow (\varphi_n \Rightarrow \psi)) \cdots)$	$[+], (n+1)$
(n+3)	$\Sigma \models \varphi_1$	Assumption
(n+4)	$\Sigma \models (\varphi_2 \Rightarrow \cdots (\varphi_{n-1} \Rightarrow (\varphi_n \Rightarrow \psi)) \cdots)$	$[\Rightarrow -], (n+1)$
	$\vdots$	
(m-2)	$\Sigma \models \varphi_n \Rightarrow \psi$	$[\Rightarrow -], (n+1)$
(m-1)	$\Sigma \models \varphi_n$	Assumption
(m)	$\Sigma \models \psi$	$[\Rightarrow -], (m-2), (m-1)$



# Example 1

## Example

Please give a formal proof of  $\neg\varphi \Rightarrow \psi \vdash \neg\psi \Rightarrow \varphi$ .

## Proof.

- (1)  $\neg\varphi \Rightarrow \psi, \neg\psi, \neg\varphi \vdash \neg\varphi \Rightarrow \psi$   $[\in]$
- (2)  $\neg\varphi \Rightarrow \psi, \neg\psi, \neg\varphi \vdash \neg\varphi$   $[\in]$
- (3)  $\neg\varphi \Rightarrow \psi, \neg\psi, \neg\varphi \vdash \psi$   $[\Rightarrow -], (1), (2)$
- (4)  $\neg\varphi \Rightarrow \psi, \neg\psi, \neg\varphi \vdash \neg\psi$   $[\in]$
- (5)  $\neg\varphi \Rightarrow \psi, \neg\psi \vdash \varphi$   $[\neg -], (3), (4)$
- (6)  $\neg\varphi \Rightarrow \psi \vdash \neg\psi \Rightarrow \varphi$   $[\Rightarrow +], (5)$



## Example 2

### Example

Please give a formal proof of  $\varphi \Rightarrow \psi, \psi \Rightarrow \chi \vdash \varphi \Rightarrow \chi$ .

### Proof.

- (1)  $\varphi \Rightarrow \psi, \psi \Rightarrow \chi, \varphi \vdash \varphi \Rightarrow \psi$  [ $\in$ ]
- (2)  $\varphi \Rightarrow \psi, \psi \Rightarrow \chi, \varphi \vdash \varphi$  [ $\in$ ]
- (3)  $\varphi \Rightarrow \psi, \psi \Rightarrow \chi, \varphi \vdash \psi$  [ $\Rightarrow -$ ], (1), (2)
- (4)  $\varphi \Rightarrow \psi, \psi \Rightarrow \chi, \varphi \vdash \psi \Rightarrow \chi$  [ $\in$ ]
- (5)  $\varphi \Rightarrow \psi, \psi \Rightarrow \chi, \varphi \vdash \chi$  [ $\Rightarrow -$ ], (4), (3)
- (6)  $\varphi \Rightarrow \psi, \psi \Rightarrow \chi \vdash \varphi \Rightarrow \chi$  [ $\Rightarrow +$ ], (5)



# Exercise

## Ex. 3

Please prove the following by deductive system:

- 1  $(\varphi \wedge \psi) \vee (\varphi \wedge \chi) \models \varphi \wedge (\psi \vee \chi)$ .
- 2 If  $\Sigma$  is finite, and we have both  $\Sigma, \varphi \models \psi$  and  $\Sigma, \varphi \models \neg\psi$ , then we also have  $\Sigma \models \neg\varphi$ .



## First-order inference rules (1)

 $\forall$ 

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \forall x : S \bullet \varphi}{\Sigma \models t \in S \Rightarrow \varphi[t/x]} \quad [\forall-]$$

$$\frac{\Sigma \models x \in S \Rightarrow \varphi}{\Sigma \models \forall x : S \bullet \varphi} \quad [\forall+] \quad \langle x \text{ has no free occurrence in } \Sigma \rangle$$

where  $\varphi[t/x]$  denote the formula obtained from  $\varphi$  by substituting  $t$  for all occurrences of  $x$ .

 $\exists$ 

$$\frac{\Sigma, x \in S, \varphi \models \psi}{\Sigma, \exists x : S \bullet \varphi \models \psi} \quad [\exists-] \quad \langle x \text{ has no free occurrence in } \Sigma \text{ and } \psi \rangle$$

$$\frac{\Sigma \models t \in S \wedge \varphi(t)}{\Sigma \models \exists x : S \bullet \varphi(x)} \quad [\exists+]$$

where  $\varphi(x)$  is obtained from  $\varphi(t)$  by substituting  $x$  for some occurrences of  $t$ .

## First-order inference rules (2)

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi(t) \quad \Sigma \models t = t'}{\Sigma \models \varphi(t')} \quad [= -]$$
$$\frac{}{\models x = x} \quad [= +]$$

where  $\varphi(t')$  is obtained from  $\varphi(t)$  by substituting  $t'$  for some occurrences of  $t$ .



# Example 3

## Example

Prove the following by deductive systems:  $\forall x : S \bullet \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y) \equiv \forall y : T \bullet \forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x, y)$ .

## Proof.

Due to the symmetry, only prove  $\forall x : S \bullet \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y) \vdash \forall y : T \bullet \forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x, y)$ .

- (1)  $\forall x : S \bullet \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y), x \in S, y \in T \vdash \forall x : S \bullet \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y)$  [ $\in$ ]
- (2)  $\forall x : S \bullet \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y), x \in S, y \in T \vdash x \in S \Rightarrow \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y)$  [ $\forall -$ ], (1)
- (3)  $\forall x : S \bullet \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y), x \in S, y \in T \vdash x \in S$  [ $\in$ ]
- (4)  $\forall x : S \bullet \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y), x \in S, y \in T \vdash \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y)$  [ $\Rightarrow -$ ], (2), (3)
- (5)  $\forall x : S \bullet \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y), x \in S, y \in T \vdash y \in T \Rightarrow \varphi(x, y)$  [ $\forall -$ ], (4)
- (6)  $\forall x : S \bullet \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y), x \in S, y \in T \vdash y \in T$  [ $\in$ ]
- (7)  $\forall x : S \bullet \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y), x \in S, y \in T \vdash \varphi(x, y)$  [ $\Rightarrow -$ ], (5), (6)
- (8)  $\forall x : S \bullet \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y), y \in T \vdash x \in S \Rightarrow \varphi(x, y)$  [ $\Rightarrow +$ ], (7)
- (9)  $\forall x : S \bullet \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y), y \in T \vdash \forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x, y)$  [ $\forall +$ ], (8)
- (10)  $\forall x : S \bullet \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y) \vdash y \in T \Rightarrow \forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x, y)$  [ $\Rightarrow +$ ], (9)
- (11)  $\forall x : S \bullet \forall y : T \bullet \varphi(x, y) \vdash \forall y : T \bullet \forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x, y)$  [ $\forall +$ ], (10)

□



# Example 2

## Example

Prove the following by deductive systems:  $\neg\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x) \equiv \exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x)$ .

## Proof.

Only prove  $\neg\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x) \models \exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x)$ .

- (1)  $\neg\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x), \neg\exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x), x \in S, \neg\varphi(x) \models x \in S$  [ $\in$ ]
- (2)  $\neg\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x), \neg\exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x), x \in S, \neg\varphi(x) \models \neg\varphi(x)$  [ $\in$ ]
- (3)  $\neg\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x), \neg\exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x), x \in S, \neg\varphi(x) \models x \in S \wedge \neg\varphi(x)$  [ $\wedge+$ ], (1), (2)
- (4)  $\neg\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x), \neg\exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x), x \in S, \neg\varphi(x) \models \exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x)$  [ $\exists+$ ], (3)
- (5)  $\neg\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x), \neg\exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x), x \in S, \neg\varphi(x) \models \neg\exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x)$  [ $\in$ ]
- (6)  $\neg\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x), \neg\exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x), x \in S \models \varphi(x)$  [ $\neg-$ ], (5)
- (7)  $\neg\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x), \neg\exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x) \models x \in S \Rightarrow \varphi(x)$  [ $\Rightarrow+$ ], (6)
- (8)  $\neg\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x), \neg\exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x) \models \forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x)$  [ $\forall+$ ], (7)
- (9)  $\neg\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x), \neg\exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x) \models \neg\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x)$  [ $\in$ ]
- (10)  $\neg\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x) \models \exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x)$  [ $\neg-$ ]



## Example 3 (one-point rule)

Example (Prove the following property by deductive system)

- If  $\Sigma \models \exists x : S \bullet (\varphi \wedge x = t)$  and  $x$  does not occur in  $t$ , then  $\Sigma \models t \in S \wedge \varphi[t/x]$ .

Proof.

- |     |  |                            |
|-----|--|----------------------------|
| (1) | $x \in S \wedge \varphi \wedge x = t \models x \in S \wedge \varphi \wedge x = t$  | [ref]                      |
| (2) | $x \in S \wedge \varphi \wedge x = t \models x = t$                                | $[\wedge -_2], (1)$        |
| (3) | $x \in S \wedge \varphi \wedge x = t \models x \in S \wedge \varphi$               | $[\wedge -_1], (1)$        |
| (4) | $x \in S \wedge \varphi \wedge x = t \models t \in S \wedge \varphi[t/x]$          | $[= -], (3)$               |
| (5) | $\exists x : S \bullet (\varphi \wedge x = t) \models t \in S \wedge \varphi[t/x]$ | $[\exists -], (4)$         |
| (6) | $\Sigma \models \exists x : S \bullet (\varphi \wedge x = t)$                      | Assumption                 |
| (7) | $\Sigma \models t \in S \wedge \varphi[t/x]$                                       | $[\text{trans}], (6), (5)$ |

□

One-point rule (单点规则)

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \exists x : S \bullet (\varphi \wedge x = t)}{\Sigma \models t \in S \wedge \varphi[t/x]} \quad [1\text{-point}] \quad \langle x \text{ does not occur in } t \rangle$$

# Assignments

Prove the following by deductive system:

- 1  $\vdash \varphi \vee \neg\varphi$  (i.e.,  $\emptyset \vdash \varphi \vee \neg\varphi$ ).
- 2  $\exists x : S \bullet \neg\varphi(x) \vdash \neg\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x)$ .
- 3 If  $x$  does not occur in  $\psi$ , then  $\exists x : S \bullet (\varphi(x) \Rightarrow \psi) \vdash (\forall x : S \bullet \varphi(x)) \Rightarrow \psi$ .

