Proof Theory of Modal Logic

Lecture 2: Labelled Proof Systems

Tiziano Dalmonte, Marianna Girlando

Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, University of Amsterdam

ESSLLI 2024

Leuven, 5-9 August 2024

Partial references:

- [Kanger, 1957] Spotted formulas for S5
- [Fitting, 1983], [Goré 1998] Tableaux + labels
- [Simpson, 1994], [Viganò, 1998] Natural deduction + labels
- [Mints, 1997], [Viganò, 2000], [Negri,2005] Sequent calculus + labels

We follow the approach of Negri:

- *Proof analysis in modal logics* [Negri, 2005]
- *Contraction-free sequent calculi for geometric theories with an application to Barr's theorem* [Negri, 2003]

The plan

- Labelled sequent calculus for K
- Frame conditions: a general recipe
- Semantic completeness

Labelled sequent calculus for K



Enriching the language

$$A, B ::= p \mid \bot \mid A \wedge B \mid A \vee B \mid A \to B \mid \Box A \mid \Diamond A$$

Enriching the language

$$A, B ::= p \mid \bot \mid A \wedge B \mid A \vee B \mid A \rightarrow B \mid \Box A \mid \Diamond A$$

Take countably many variables $x, y, z, \dots$ (the lables)

$$A, B ::= p \mid \bot \mid A \wedge B \mid A \vee B \mid A \to B \mid \Box A \mid \Diamond A$$

Take countably many variables $x, y, z, \ldots$ (the lables)

Labelled formulas

- xRy meaning 'x has access to y' (relational atoms)
- $x{:}A$ meaning 'x satisfies A'

$$A, B ::= p \mid \bot \mid A \wedge B \mid A \vee B \mid A \rightarrow B \mid \Box A \mid \Diamond A$$

Take countably many variables $x, y, z, \ldots$ (the lables)

Labelled formulas

- xRy meaning 'x has access to y' (relational atoms)
- $x{:}A$ meaning 'x satisfies A'

Labelled sequent

$$\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$$

where

- $\mathcal{R}$ is a multiset of relational atoms;
- Γ, Δ are multisets of labelled formulas *without* relational atoms.

$$A, B ::= p \mid \bot \mid A \wedge B \mid A \vee B \mid A \to B \mid \Box A \mid \Diamond A$$

Take countably many variables $x, y, z, \ldots$ (the lables)

Labelled formulas

- xRy meaning 'x has access to y' (relational atoms)
- $x{:}A$ meaning 'x satisfies A'

Labelled sequent

$$\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$$

where

- $\mathcal{R}$ is a multiset of relational atoms;
- Γ, Δ are multisets of labelled formulas *without* relational atoms.

Labelled sequents lack a formula interpretation

Rules of labK

$$\text{init}\ \frac{}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}p, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}p} \qquad \bot_L\ \frac{}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}\bot, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$$

Rules of labK

$$\text{init}\ \dfrac{}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}p, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}p} \qquad \bot_{\mathrm{L}}\ \dfrac{}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}\bot, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$$

$$\wedge_{\mathrm{R}}\ \dfrac{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A, x{:}B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A \wedge B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \wedge_{\mathrm{L}}\ \dfrac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \quad \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}B}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \wedge B}$$

$$\vee_{\mathrm{L}}\ \dfrac{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \quad \mathcal{R}, x{:}B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A \vee B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \vee_{\mathrm{R}}\ \dfrac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A, x{:}B}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \vee B}$$

$$\rightarrow_{\mathrm{L}}\ \dfrac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \quad \mathcal{R}, x{:}B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A \rightarrow B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \rightarrow_{\mathrm{R}}\ \dfrac{x{:}A, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}B}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \rightarrow B}$$

Rules of labK

$$\text{init}\ \frac{}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}p, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}p} \qquad \bot_\text{L}\ \frac{}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}\bot, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$$

$$\wedge_\text{R}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A, x{:}B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A \wedge B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \wedge_\text{L}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \quad \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}B}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \wedge B}$$

$$\vee_\text{L}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \quad \mathcal{R}, x{:}B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A \vee B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \vee_\text{R}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A, x{:}B}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \vee B}$$

$$\to_\text{L}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \quad \mathcal{R}, x{:}B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A \to B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \to_\text{R}\ \frac{x{:}A, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}B}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \to B}$$

$$\Box_\text{L}\ \frac{xRy, \mathcal{R}, y{:}A, x{:}\Box A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{xRy, \mathcal{R}, x{:}\Box A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \Box_\text{R}\ \frac{xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, y{:}A}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}\Box A}\ y \text{ fresh}$$

y fresh means y does not occur in $\mathcal{R} \cup \Gamma \cup \Delta$

Rules of labK

$$\text{init}\ \frac{}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}p, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}p} \qquad \bot_{\mathrm{L}}\ \frac{}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}\bot, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$$

$$\wedge_{\mathrm{R}}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A, x{:}B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A \wedge B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \wedge_{\mathrm{L}}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \quad \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}B}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \wedge B}$$

$$\vee_{\mathrm{L}}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \quad \mathcal{R}, x{:}B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A \vee B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \vee_{\mathrm{R}}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A, x{:}B}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \vee B}$$

$$\rightarrow_{\mathrm{L}}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \quad \mathcal{R}, x{:}B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}A \rightarrow B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \rightarrow_{\mathrm{R}}\ \frac{x{:}A, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}B}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \rightarrow B}$$

$$\Box_{\mathrm{L}}\ \frac{xRy, \mathcal{R}, y{:}A, x{:}\Box A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{xRy, \mathcal{R}, x{:}\Box A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \Box_{\mathrm{R}}\ \frac{xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, y{:}A}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}\Box A}\ y \text{ fresh}$$

$$\Diamond_{\mathrm{L}}\ \frac{xRy, \mathcal{R}, y{:}A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, x{:}\Diamond A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}\ y \text{ fresh} \qquad \Diamond_{\mathrm{R}}\ \frac{xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}\Diamond A, y{:}A}{xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}\Diamond A}$$

y fresh means y does not occur in $\mathcal{R} \cup \Gamma \cup \Delta$

We write $\vdash_{\text{labK}} \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ if there is a derivation of $\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ in labK.

Example: $\vdash_{\text{labK}} \Rightarrow x{:}(\Diamond p \to \Box q) \to \Box(p \to q)$

$$
\dfrac{
\dfrac{\dfrac{}{xRy, y{:}p \Rightarrow y{:}q, x{:}\Diamond p, y{:}p}\,\text{init}}{xRy, y{:}A \Rightarrow y{:}q, x{:}\Diamond p}\,\Diamond_R
\qquad
\dfrac{\dfrac{}{xRy, x{:}\Box q, y{:}q, y{:}p \Rightarrow y{:}q}\,\text{init}}{xRy, x{:}\Box q, y{:}p \Rightarrow y{:}q}\,\Box_L
}{
\dfrac{
\dfrac{xRy, x{:}\Diamond p \to \Box q, y{:}p \Rightarrow y{:}q}{xRy, x{:}\Diamond p \to \Box q \Rightarrow y{:}p \to q}\,\to_R
}{
\dfrac{x{:}\Diamond p \to \Box q \Rightarrow x{:}\Box(p \to q)}{\Rightarrow x{:}(\Diamond p \to \Box q) \to \Box(p \to q)}\,\to_R
}\,\Box_R
}\,\to_L
$$

labK: main results

Given a sequent $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$, and a model $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, R, v \rangle$, let $\mathsf{Lb}(\mathcal{S}) = \{x \mid x \in \mathcal{R} \cup \Gamma \cup \Delta\}$, and $\rho : \mathsf{Lb}(\mathcal{S}) \to W$ (interpretation).

Given a sequent $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$, and a model $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, R, v \rangle$, let $\mathsf{Lb}(\mathcal{S}) = \{x \mid x \in \mathcal{R} \cup \Gamma \cup \Delta\}$, and $\rho : \mathsf{Lb}(\mathcal{S}) \to W$ (interpretation).

Satisfiability of labelled formulas at $\mathcal{M}$ under ρ :

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash xRy & \textit{iff} & \mathcal{M} \Vdash \rho(x) R \rho(y) \\ \mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash x{:}A & \textit{iff} & \mathcal{M}, \rho(x) \Vdash A \end{array}$$

Given a sequent $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$, and a model $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, R, v \rangle$, let $\mathsf{Lb}(\mathcal{S}) = \{x \mid x \in \mathcal{R} \cup \Gamma \cup \Delta\}$, and $\rho : \mathsf{Lb}(\mathcal{S}) \to W$ (interpretation).

Satisfiability of labelled formulas at $\mathcal{M}$ under ρ :

$$\mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash xRy \quad \textit{iff} \quad \mathcal{M} \Vdash \rho(x) R \rho(y)$$
$$\mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash x{:}A \quad \textit{iff} \quad \mathcal{M}, \rho(x) \Vdash A$$

Satisfiability of sequents at $\mathcal{M}$ under ρ (φ is xRy or $x{:}A$):

$$\mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \quad \textit{iff}$$

if for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{R} \cup \Gamma$ it holds that $\mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash \varphi$,
then for some $x{:}D \in \Delta$ it holds that $\mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash x{:}D$.

Given a sequent $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$, and a model $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, R, v \rangle$, let $\mathsf{Lb}(\mathcal{S}) = \{x \mid x \in \mathcal{R} \cup \Gamma \cup \Delta\}$, and $\rho : \mathsf{Lb}(\mathcal{S}) \to W$ (interpretation).

Satisfiability of labelled formulas at $\mathcal{M}$ under ρ :

$$\mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash xRy \quad \textit{iff} \quad \mathcal{M} \Vdash \rho(x)R\rho(y)$$
$$\mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash x{:}A \quad \textit{iff} \quad \mathcal{M}, \rho(x) \Vdash A$$

Satisfiability of sequents at $\mathcal{M}$ under ρ (φ is xRy or $x{:}A$):

$$\mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \quad \textit{iff}$$

if for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{R} \cup \Gamma$ it holds that $\mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash \varphi$,

then for some $x{:}D \in \Delta$ it holds that $\mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash x{:}D$.

A sequent $\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ has a countermodel iff there are $\mathcal{M}$, ρ such that:

- $\mathcal{M}, \rho \models \varphi$, for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{R} \cup \Gamma$, and
- $\mathcal{M}, \rho \not\models x{:}D$, for all $x{:}D \in \Delta$.

Given a sequent $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$, and a model $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, R, v \rangle$, let $\mathsf{Lb}(\mathcal{S}) = \{x \mid x \in \mathcal{R} \cup \Gamma \cup \Delta\}$, and $\rho : \mathsf{Lb}(\mathcal{S}) \to W$ (interpretation).

Satisfiability of labelled formulas at $\mathcal{M}$ under ρ :

$$\mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash xRy \quad \textit{iff} \quad \mathcal{M} \Vdash \rho(x) R \rho(y)$$
$$\mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash x{:}A \quad \textit{iff} \quad \mathcal{M}, \rho(x) \Vdash A$$

Satisfiability of sequents at $\mathcal{M}$ under ρ (φ is xRy or $x{:}A$):

$$\mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \quad \textit{iff}$$

$$\textit{if} \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{R} \cup \Gamma \text{ it holds that } \mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash \varphi,$$
$$\textit{then} \quad \text{for some } x{:}D \in \Delta \text{ it holds that } \mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash x{:}D.$$

A sequent $\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ has a countermodel iff there are $\mathcal{M}$, ρ such that:

- $\mathcal{M}, \rho \models \varphi$, for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{R} \cup \Gamma$, and
- $\mathcal{M}, \rho \not\models x{:}D$, for all $x{:}D \in \Delta$.

Validity of sequents in a class of frames $\mathcal{X}$:

$$\models_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \quad \textit{iff} \quad \text{for any } \rho \text{ and any } \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{X},\ \mathcal{M}, \rho \Vdash \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$$

Soundness of labK [Negri, 2009]

Theorem (Soundness). If $\vdash_{\mathsf{labK}} \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ then $\models \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$

labK: main results

Towards cut-admissibility of labK 1/2 [Negri, 2005]

Substitution on labelled formulas:

$$xRy[z/y] \quad := \quad xRz$$
$$y{:}A[z/y] \quad := \quad z{:}A$$

Substitution on multisets of labelled formulas $\Gamma[z/y]$

Substitution on labelled formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} xRy[z/y] &:= xRz \\ y{:}A[z/y] &:= z{:}A \end{aligned}$$

Substitution on multisets of labelled formulas $\Gamma[z/y]$

Lemma (Substitution). Rule subst is hp-admissible.

$$\text{subst}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}[y/x], \Gamma[y/x] \Rightarrow \Delta[y/x]}$$

Towards cut-admissibility of labK 1/2 [Negri, 2005]

Substitution on labelled formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} xRy[z/y] &:= xRz \\ y{:}A[z/y] &:= z{:}A \end{aligned}$$

Substitution on multisets of labelled formulas $\Gamma[z/y]$

Lemma (Substitution). Rule subst is hp-admissible.

$$\text{subst}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}[y/x], \Gamma[y/x] \Rightarrow \Delta[y/x]}$$

Lemma (Weakening). Rules $\mathsf{wk_L}$, $\mathsf{wk_R}$ are hp-admissible (φ is xRy or $x{:}A$).

$$\mathsf{wk_L}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\varphi, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \mathsf{wk_R}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \varphi}$$

Lemma (Invertibility).
For every rule r, if the conclusion of r is derivable with a derivation of height *h*, then each of its premisses is derivable, with at most the same *h*.

Lemma (Contraction). Rules $\mathsf{ctr_L}$, $\mathsf{ctr_R}$ are hp-admissible (φ is xRy or $x{:}A$).

$$\mathsf{ctr_L}\ \frac{\varphi, \varphi, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\varphi, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \mathsf{ctr_R}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \varphi, \varphi}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \varphi}$$

Cut admissibility of labK [Negri, 2005]

Lemma (Cut). The cut rule is admissible.

$$\text{cut}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \quad x{:}A, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'}$$

Proof. By induction on $(c(A), h_1 + h_2)$.

Lemma (Cut). The cut rule is admissible.

$$\text{cut}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \quad x{:}A, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'}$$

Proof. By induction on $(c(A), h_1 + h_2)$.

$$\text{cut}\ \frac{\Box_R\ \dfrac{xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, y{:}A}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}\Box A} \qquad \Box_L\ \dfrac{xRz, \mathcal{R}', x{:}\Box A, z{:}A, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{xRz, \mathcal{R}', x{:}\Box A, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}}{\mathcal{R}, xRz, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'}$$

Lemma (Cut). The cut rule is admissible.

$$\text{cut}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \quad x{:}A, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'}$$

Proof. By induction on $(c(A), h_1 + h_2)$.

$$\text{cut}\ \frac{\Box_R\ \dfrac{xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, y{:}A}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}\Box A} \quad \Box_L\ \dfrac{xRz, \mathcal{R}', x{:}\Box A, z{:}A, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{xRz, \mathcal{R}', x{:}\Box A, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}}{\mathcal{R}, xRz, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'}$$

$$\text{ctr}_L,\text{ctr}_R\ \dfrac{\text{cut}\ \dfrac{xRz, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, z{:}A \quad \text{cut}\ \dfrac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}\Box A \quad xRz, \mathcal{R}', x{:}\Box A, z{:}A, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{xRz, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}', z{:}A, \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}, xRz, xRz, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma, \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta, \Delta'}}{\mathcal{R}, xRz, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'}$$

Lemma (Cut). The cut rule is admissible.

$$\text{cut}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \qquad x{:}A, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'}$$

Proof. By induction on $(c(A), h_1 + h_2)$.

$$\text{cut}\ \dfrac{\square_R\ \dfrac{xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, y{:}A}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}\square A} \qquad \square_L\ \dfrac{xRz, \mathcal{R}', x{:}\square A, z{:}A, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{xRz, \mathcal{R}', x{:}\square A, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}}{\mathcal{R}, xRz, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'}$$

$$\text{ctr}_L,\text{ctr}_R\ \dfrac{\text{cut}\ \dfrac{xRz, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, z{:}A \qquad \text{cut}\ \dfrac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}\square A \qquad xRz, \mathcal{R}', x{:}\square A, z{:}A, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{xRz, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}', z{:}A, \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}, xRz, xRz, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma, \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta, \Delta'}}{\mathcal{R}, xRz, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'}$$

For Γ set of formulas and $x{:}\Gamma = \{x{:}G \mid \text{for each } G \in \Gamma\}$:

Theorem (Syntactic Completeness). If $\Gamma \vdash_K A$ then $\vdash_{\text{labK}} x{:}\Gamma \Rightarrow x{:}A$.

labK: main results

Frame conditions: a general recipe



What do we mean by modularity?

Let $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{CPL} \cup \{\mathsf{k}, \mathsf{nec}\}$. Logic K is characterised by the class of all Kripke frames.

Let $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{CPL} \cup \{\mathsf{k}, \mathsf{nec}\}$. Logic K is characterised by the class of all Kripke frames.

Name	Axiom	Frame condition	
d	$\Box A \to \Diamond A$	Seriality	$\forall x \exists y (xRy)$
t	$\Box A \to A$	Reflexivity	$\forall x (xRx)$
b	$A \to \Box\Diamond A$	Symmetry	$\forall x \forall y (xRy \to yRx)$
4	$\Box A \to \Box\Box A$	Transitivity	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \land yRz) \to xRz)$
5	$\Diamond A \to \Box\Diamond A$	Euclideaness	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \land xRz) \to yRz)$

Let $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{CPL} \cup \{\mathsf{k}, \mathsf{nec}\}$. Logic K is characterised by the class of all Kripke frames.

Name	Axiom	Frame condition	
d	$\Box A \to \Diamond A$	Seriality	$\forall x \exists y (xRy)$
t	$\Box A \to A$	Reflexivity	$\forall x (xRx)$
b	$A \to \Box\Diamond A$	Symmetry	$\forall x \forall y (xRy \to yRx)$
4	$\Box A \to \Box\Box A$	Transitivity	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \wedge yRz) \to xRz)$
5	$\Diamond A \to \Box\Diamond A$	Euclideaness	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \wedge xRz) \to yRz)$

Take $\mathsf{X} \subseteq \{\mathsf{d}, \mathsf{t}, \mathsf{b}, 4, 5\}$.

Let $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{CPL} \cup \{\mathsf{k}, \mathsf{nec}\}$. Logic K is characterised by the class of all Kripke frames.

Name	Axiom	Frame condition	
d	$\Box A \to \Diamond A$	Seriality	$\forall x \exists y (xRy)$
t	$\Box A \to A$	Reflexivity	$\forall x (xRx)$
b	$A \to \Box \Diamond A$	Symmetry	$\forall x \forall y (xRy \to yRx)$
4	$\Box A \to \Box \Box A$	Transitivity	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \land yRz) \to xRz)$
5	$\Diamond A \to \Box \Diamond A$	Euclideaness	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \land xRz) \to yRz)$

Take $\mathsf{X} \subseteq \{\mathsf{d}, \mathsf{t}, \mathsf{b}, 4, 5\}$.

We write $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathsf{K} \cup \mathsf{X}} A$ iff A is derivable from Γ in the axiom system $\mathsf{K} \cup \mathsf{X}$.

Let $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{CPL} \cup \{\mathsf{k}, \mathsf{nec}\}$. Logic K is characterised by the class of all Kripke frames.

Name	Axiom	Frame condition	
d	$\Box A \to \Diamond A$	Seriality	$\forall x \exists y (xRy)$
t	$\Box A \to A$	Reflexivity	$\forall x (xRx)$
b	$A \to \Box \Diamond A$	Symmetry	$\forall x \forall y (xRy \to yRx)$
4	$\Box A \to \Box \Box A$	Transitivity	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \wedge yRz) \to xRz)$
5	$\Diamond A \to \Box \Diamond A$	Euclideaness	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \wedge xRz) \to yRz)$

Take $\mathsf{X} \subseteq \{\mathsf{d}, \mathsf{t}, \mathsf{b}, 4, 5\}$.

We write $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathsf{K} \cup \mathsf{X}} A$ iff A is derivable from Γ in the axiom system $\mathsf{K} \cup \mathsf{X}$.

We denote by $\mathcal{X}$ the class of frames satisfying properties in X.
We write $\Gamma \models_{\mathcal{X}} A$ iff A is logical consequence of Γ in the class of frames $\mathcal{X}$.

What do we mean by modularity?

Let $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{CPL} \cup \{\mathsf{k}, \mathsf{nec}\}$. Logic K is characterised by the class of all Kripke frames.

Name	Axiom	Frame condition	
d	$\Box A \to \Diamond A$	Seriality	$\forall x \exists y (xRy)$
t	$\Box A \to A$	Reflexivity	$\forall x (xRx)$
b	$A \to \Box\Diamond A$	Symmetry	$\forall x \forall y (xRy \to yRx)$
4	$\Box A \to \Box\Box A$	Transitivity	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \land yRz) \to xRz)$
5	$\Diamond A \to \Box\Diamond A$	Euclideaness	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \land xRz) \to yRz)$

Take $\mathsf{X} \subseteq \{\mathsf{d}, \mathsf{t}, \mathsf{b}, 4, 5\}$.

We write $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathsf{K} \cup \mathsf{X}} A$ iff A is derivable from Γ in the axiom system $\mathsf{K} \cup \mathsf{X}$.

We denote by $\mathcal{X}$ the class of frames satisfying properties in X.
We write $\Gamma \models_{\mathcal{X}} A$ iff A is logical consequence of Γ in the class of frames $\mathcal{X}$.

Theorem. For $\mathsf{X} \subseteq \{\mathsf{d}, \mathsf{t}, \mathsf{b}, 4, 5\}$, $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathsf{K} \cup \mathsf{X}} A$ iff $\Gamma \models_{\mathcal{X}} A$.

Main ingredients

Name	Axiom	Frame condition	
d	$\Box A \to \Diamond A$	Seriality	$\forall x \exists y (xRy)$
t	$\Box A \to A$	Reflexivity	$\forall x (xRx)$
b	$A \to \Box\Diamond A$	Symmetry	$\forall x \forall y (xRy \to yRx)$
4	$\Box A \to \Box\Box A$	Transitivity	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \wedge yRz) \to xRz)$
5	$\Diamond A \to \Box\Diamond A$	Euclideaness	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \wedge xRz) \to yRz)$

Name	Axiom	Frame condition	
d	$\Box A \to \Diamond A$	Seriality	$\forall x \exists y (xRy)$
t	$\Box A \to A$	Reflexivity	$\forall x (xRx)$
b	$A \to \Box\Diamond A$	Symmetry	$\forall x \forall y (xRy \to yRx)$
4	$\Box A \to \Box\Box A$	Transitivity	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \wedge yRz) \to xRz)$
5	$\Diamond A \to \Box\Diamond A$	Euclideaness	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \wedge xRz) \to yRz)$

Frame conditions can be characterised by first-order logic formulas, in the language consisting of a single predicate symbol, $R(x, y)$.

Name	Axiom	Frame condition	
d	$\Box A \to \Diamond A$	Seriality	$\forall x \exists y (xRy)$
t	$\Box A \to A$	Reflexivity	$\forall x (xRx)$
b	$A \to \Box\Diamond A$	Symmetry	$\forall x \forall y (xRy \to yRx)$
4	$\Box A \to \Box\Box A$	Transitivity	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \land yRz) \to xRz)$
5	$\Diamond A \to \Box\Diamond A$	Euclideaness	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \land xRz) \to yRz)$

Frame conditions can be characterised by first-order logic formulas, in the language consisting of a single predicate symbol, $R(x, y)$.

Proof systems for geometric theories, [Negri, 2003]:

"axioms-as-rules"

How to transform axioms of geometric theories (geometric implications) into rules, preserving the structural properties of the calculus.

Name	Axiom	Frame condition	
d	$\Box A \to \Diamond A$	Seriality	$\forall x \exists y (xRy)$
t	$\Box A \to A$	Reflexivity	$\forall x (xRx)$
b	$A \to \Box\Diamond A$	Symmetry	$\forall x \forall y (xRy \to yRx)$
4	$\Box A \to \Box\Box A$	Transitivity	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \land yRz) \to xRz)$
5	$\Diamond A \to \Box\Diamond A$	Euclideaness	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((xRy \land xRz) \to yRz)$

Frame conditions can be characterised by first-order logic formulas, in the language consisting of a single predicate symbol, $R(x, y)$.

Proof systems for geometric theories, [Negri, 2003]:

"axioms-as-rules"

How to transform axioms of geometric theories (geometric implications) into rules, preserving the structural properties of the calculus.

The first-order logic formulas corresponding to the frame conditions above (and many more!) are geometric implications

A first-order signature is a tuple $\sigma = \langle c, d, \ldots, f, g, \ldots p, q, \ldots \rangle$

- Constant symbols $c, d, \ldots$
- Function symbols $f, g, \ldots$, each with arity > 0
- Predicate symbols $p, q, \ldots$, each with arity ≥ 0

A first-order signature is a tuple $\sigma = \langle c, d, \ldots, f, g, \ldots p, q, \ldots \rangle$

- Constant symbols $c, d, \ldots$
- Function symbols $f, g, \ldots$, each with arity > 0
- Predicate symbols $p, q, \ldots$, each with arity ≥ 0

A first-order language over a signature σ, denoted $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$, consists of:

- The terms generated from a countably many variables $x, y, \ldots$ using the constants and function symbols of σ;
- The formulas generated from the terms of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ and predicate symbols of σ using the operators $\bot, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \forall, \exists$.

A first-order signature is a tuple $\sigma = \langle c, d, \ldots, f, g, \ldots p, q, \ldots \rangle$

- Constant symbols $c, d, \ldots$
- Function symbols $f, g, \ldots$, each with arity > 0
- Predicate symbols $p, q, \ldots$, each with arity ≥ 0

A first-order language over a signature σ, denoted $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$, consists of:

- The terms generated from a countably many variables $x, y, \ldots$ using the constants and function symbols of σ;
- The formulas generated from the terms of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ and predicate symbols of σ using the operators $\bot, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \forall, \exists$.

A first-order language with equality over a signature σ, denoted $\mathcal{L}^{=}(\sigma)$, additionally comprises a binary predicate for equality.

A first-order signature is a tuple $\sigma = \langle c, d, \ldots, f, g, \ldots p, q, \ldots \rangle$

- Constant symbols $c, d, \ldots$
- Function symbols $f, g, \ldots$, each with arity > 0
- Predicate symbols $p, q, \ldots$, each with arity ≥ 0

A first-order language over a signature σ, denoted $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$, consists of:

- The terms generated from a countably many variables $x, y, \ldots$ using the constants and function symbols of σ;
- The formulas generated from the terms of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ and predicate symbols of σ using the operators $\bot, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \forall, \exists$.

A first-order language with equality over a signature σ, denoted $\mathcal{L}^{=}(\sigma)$, additionally comprises a binary predicate for equality.

Example.
$\mathcal{L}^{=}(0, suc^1, +^2, \times^2)$ is the language of arithmetic

$\mathcal{L}(R^2)$ is the language we use to express frame conditions

Fix a first-order language $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ (with or without equality).

Fix a first-order language $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ (with or without equality).

A first-order theory over $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ is a set of closed formulas of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$.

Example. Peano Arithmetic and Robinson Arithmetic are first-order theories over $\mathcal{L}^{=}(0, \mathit{suc}, +, \times)$.

Fix a first-order language $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ (with or without equality).

A first-order theory over $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ is a set of closed formulas of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$.

Example. Peano Arithmetic and Robinson Arithmetic are first-order theories over $\mathcal{L}^{=}(0, \mathit{suc}, +, \times)$.

A geometric formula is a formula of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ which does not contain $\rightarrow$ or $\forall$.

Fix a first-order language $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ (with or without equality).

A first-order theory over $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ is a set of closed formulas of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$.

Example. Peano Arithmetic and Robinson Arithmetic are first-order theories over $\mathcal{L}^{=}(0, suc, +, \times)$.

A geometric formula is a formula of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ which does not contain $\to$ or $\forall$.

A geometric implication is closed formula of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ of the shape:

$$\forall \vec{x}(A \to B), \quad \text{for } A, B \text{ geometric formulas}$$

Fix a first-order language $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ (with or without equality).

A first-order theory over $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ is a set of closed formulas of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$.

Example. Peano Arithmetic and Robinson Arithmetic are first-order theories over $\mathcal{L}^{=}(0, suc, +, \times)$.

A geometric formula is a formula of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ which does not contain $\to$ or $\forall$.

A geometric implication is closed formula of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ of the shape:

$$\forall \vec{x}(A \to B), \quad \text{for } A, B \text{ geometric formulas}$$

A geometric theory over $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ is a first-order theory over $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ whose formulas are geometric implications.

Example. Robinson arithmetic is a geometric theory over the language $\mathcal{L}^{=}(0, suc, +, \times)$.

Geometric implications can be expressed as conjunctions of geometric axioms, i.e., closed formulas of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ having the form:

$$\forall \vec{x}\Big(P \to \big(\exists \vec{y}_1(Q_1) \vee \cdots \vee \exists \vec{y}_m(Q_m)\big)\Big)$$

- $\vec{x}$, $\vec{y}_1, \ldots, \vec{y}_m$ are (possibly empty) vectors of variables;
- $m \geq 0$;
- P, $Q_1, \ldots, Q_m$ are (possibly empty) conjunctions of atomic formulas of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$;
- $\vec{y}_1, \ldots, \vec{y}_m$ do not occur in P.

Geometric implications can be expressed as conjunctions of geometric axioms, i.e., closed formulas of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ having the form:

$$\forall\vec{x}\Big(P \to \big(\exists\vec{y}_1(Q_1) \vee \cdots \vee \exists\vec{y}_m(Q_m)\big)\Big)$$

- $\vec{x}, \vec{y}_1, \ldots, \vec{y}_m$ are (possibly empty) vectors of variables;
- $m \geq 0$;
- P, $Q_1, \ldots, Q_m$ are (possibly empty) conjunctions of atomic formulas of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$;
- $\vec{y}_1, \ldots, \vec{y}_m$ do not occur in P.

Geometric axioms can be turned into sequent calculus rules:

$$\text{GA}\ \frac{\Xi_1[\vec{z}_1/\vec{y}_1], \Pi, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \quad \cdots \quad \Xi_m[\vec{z}_m/\vec{y}_m], \Pi, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Pi, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$$

- Π is the multiset of atomic formulas in P;
- Ξ_i is the multiset of atomic formulas in Q_i, for each $i \leq m$;
- $\vec{z}_1, \ldots, \vec{z}_m$ do not occur in $\Gamma \cup \Delta$.

Geometric implications can be expressed as conjunctions of geometric axioms, i.e., closed formulas of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ having the form:

$$\forall\vec{x}\Big(P \to \big(\exists\vec{y}_1(Q_1) \vee \cdots \vee \exists\vec{y}_m(Q_m)\big)\Big)$$

- $\vec{x}, \vec{y}_1, \ldots, \vec{y}_m$ are (possibly empty) vectors of variables;
- $m \geq 0$;
- P, $Q_1, \ldots, Q_m$ are (possibly empty) conjunctions of atomic formulas of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$;
- $\vec{y}_1, \ldots, \vec{y}_m$ do not occur in P.

Geometric axioms can be turned into sequent calculus rules:

$$\mathrm{GA}\ \frac{\Xi_1[\vec{z}_1/\vec{y}_1], \Pi, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \quad \cdots \quad \Xi_m[\vec{z}_m/\vec{y}_m], \Pi, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Pi, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$$

- Π is the multiset of atomic formulas in P;
- Ξ_i is the multiset of atomic formulas in Q_i, for each $i \leq m$;
- $\vec{z}_1, \ldots, \vec{z}_m$ do not occur in $\Gamma \cup \Delta$.

Examples

$$\forall \vec{x}\Big(P \to \big(\exists \vec{y}_1(Q_1) \vee \cdots \vee \exists \vec{y}_m(Q_m)\big)\Big)$$

$$\text{GA}\ \frac{\Xi_1[\vec{z}_1/\vec{y}_1], \Pi, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \quad \cdots \quad \Xi_m[\vec{z}_m/\vec{y}_m], \Pi, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Pi, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$$

Labelled calculi for the S5-cube [Negri, 2005]

$$\text{ser}\ \frac{xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}\ y \text{ fresh} \qquad \text{ref}\ \frac{xRx, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \text{sym}\ \frac{yRx, xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$$

$$\text{tr}\ \frac{xRz, xRy, yRz, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{xRy, yRz, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \text{euc}\ \frac{yRz, xRy, xRz, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{xRy, xRz, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$$

$$\text{ser}\ \frac{xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}\ y \text{ fresh} \qquad \text{ref}\ \frac{xRx, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \text{sym}\ \frac{yRx, xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$$

$$\text{tr}\ \frac{xRz, xRy, yRz, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{xRy, yRz, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \qquad \text{euc}\ \frac{yRz, xRy, xRz, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{xRy, xRz, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$$

For $\mathsf{X} \subseteq \{\mathsf{d}, \mathsf{t}, \mathsf{b}, 4, 5\}$, $\mathsf{labK} \cup \mathsf{X}$ is defined by adding to labK the rules for frame conditions corresponding to elements of X, plus the rules obtained by to satisfy the closure condition (contracted instances of the rules):

$$\text{euc}\ \frac{yRy, xRy, xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{xRy, xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \text{euc}'\ \frac{yRy, xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$$

Example: $\mathsf{labK} \cup \{5\}$ denotes the proof system $\mathsf{labK} \cup \{\mathsf{euc}, \mathsf{euc}'\}$.

We denote by $\vdash_{\mathsf{labK} \cup \mathsf{X}} \mathcal{S}$ derivability of labelled sequent $\mathcal{S}$ in $\mathsf{labK} \cup \mathsf{X}$.

For $X \subseteq \{d, t, b, 4, 5\}$:

Theorem (Soundness). If $\vdash_{\mathsf{labK} \cup \mathsf{X}} \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ then $\models_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$.

Example. If the premiss of rule ser is valid in all serial models, then its conclusion is valid in all serial models.

$$\mathsf{ser}\ \frac{xRy, \mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}\ y \text{ fresh}$$

Lemma (Cut). The cut rule is admissible in labK ∪ X:

$$\mathsf{cut}\ \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x{:}A \qquad x{:}A, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}', \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'}$$

For Γ set of formulas and $x{:}\Gamma = \{x{:}G \mid \text{for each } G \in \Gamma\}$:

Theorem (Syntactic Completeness). If $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathsf{K} \cup \mathsf{X}} A$ then $\vdash_{\mathsf{labK} \cup \mathsf{X}} x{:}\Gamma \Rightarrow x{:}A$.

Beyond geometric axioms

- Systems of rules [Negri, 2016], to capture theories / logics characterized by generalized geometric implications:

$$
\begin{aligned}
GA_0 &= \forall\vec{x}\Big(P \to \big(\exists\vec{y}_1(Q_1) \vee \cdots \vee \exists\vec{y}_m(Q_m)\big)\Big)\\
GA_1 &= \forall\vec{x}\Big(P \to \big(\exists\vec{y}_1(\bigwedge GA_0) \vee \cdots \vee \exists\vec{y}_m(\bigwedge GA_0)\big)\Big)\\
GA_{n+1} &= \forall\vec{x}\Big(P \to \big(\exists\vec{y}_1(\bigwedge GA_{k_1}) \vee \cdots \vee \exists\vec{y}_m(\bigwedge GA_{k_m})\big)\Big)
\end{aligned}
$$

for $k_1, \ldots, k_m \geq n$

- Systems of rules [Negri, 2016], to capture theories / logics characterized by generalized geometric implications:

$$
\begin{aligned}
GA_0 &= \forall \vec{x}\Big(P \rightarrow \big(\exists \vec{y}_1(Q_1) \vee \cdots \vee \exists \vec{y}_m(Q_m)\big)\Big) \\
GA_1 &= \forall \vec{x}\Big(P \rightarrow \big(\exists \vec{y}_1(\bigwedge GA_0) \vee \cdots \vee \exists \vec{y}_m(\bigwedge GA_0)\big)\Big) \\
GA_{n+1} &= \forall \vec{x}\Big(P \rightarrow \big(\exists \vec{y}_1(\bigwedge GA_{k_1}) \vee \cdots \vee \exists \vec{y}_m(\bigwedge GA_{k_m})\big)\Big)
\end{aligned}
$$

for $k_1, \ldots, k_m \geq n$

Systems of rules cover all systems of normal modal logics axiomatised by Sahlqvist formulas.

- Systems of rules [Negri, 2016], to capture theories / logics characterized by generalized geometric implications:

$$\begin{aligned} GA_0 &= \forall \vec{x}\Big(P \to \big(\exists \vec{y}_1(Q_1) \vee \cdots \vee \exists \vec{y}_m(Q_m)\big)\Big) \\ GA_1 &= \forall \vec{x}\Big(P \to \big(\exists \vec{y}_1(\bigwedge GA_0) \vee \cdots \vee \exists \vec{y}_m(\bigwedge GA_0)\big)\Big) \\ GA_{n+1} &= \forall \vec{x}\Big(P \to \big(\exists \vec{y}_1(\bigwedge GA_{k_1}) \vee \cdots \vee \exists \vec{y}_m(\bigwedge GA_{k_m})\big)\Big) \end{aligned}$$

  for $k_1, \ldots, k_m \geq n$

  Systems of rules cover all systems of normal modal logics axiomatised by Sahlqvist formulas.
- Gödel-Löb provability logic (GL):

  Transitivity: R is transitive
  Converse well-foundedness: there are no infinite R-chains

- Systems of rules [Negri, 2016], to capture theories / logics characterized by generalized geometric implications:

$$GA_0 = \forall \vec{x}\Big(P \to \big(\exists \vec{y}_1(Q_1) \lor \cdots \lor \exists \vec{y}_m(Q_m)\big)\Big)$$

$$GA_1 = \forall \vec{x}\Big(P \to \big(\exists \vec{y}_1(\bigwedge GA_0) \lor \cdots \lor \exists \vec{y}_m(\bigwedge GA_0)\big)\Big)$$

$$GA_{n+1} = \forall \vec{x}\Big(P \to \big(\exists \vec{y}_1(\bigwedge GA_{k_1}) \lor \cdots \lor \exists \vec{y}_m(\bigwedge GA_{k_m})\big)\Big)$$

  for $k_1, \ldots, k_m \geq n$

  Systems of rules cover all systems of normal modal logics axiomatised by Sahlqvist formulas.

- Gödel-Löb provability logic (GL):

  Transitivity: R is transitive

  Converse well-foundedness: there are no infinite R-chains

  [Negri, 2005]: labelled proof system for GL!

- Derive axiom 4, that is, $\Box A \to \Box\Box A$, in $\mathsf{labK} \cup \{\mathsf{t}, 5\}$. Then, show that rule tr is derivable in $\mathsf{labK} \cup \{\mathsf{t}, 5\} \cup \{\mathsf{wk_L}, \mathsf{wk_R}\}$.
- Derive axiom 5, that is, $\Diamond A \to \Box\Diamond A$, in $\mathsf{labK} \cup \{\mathsf{b}, 4\}$. Then, show that rule euc is derivable in $\mathsf{labK} \cup \{\mathsf{b}, 4\} \cup \{\mathsf{wk_L}, \mathsf{wk_R}\}$.
- Write down the labelled rule corresponding to the frame condition of confluence:

$$\forall x, y, z \big((xRy \wedge xRz) \to \exists k(yRk \wedge zRk)\big)$$

- Write down the sequent calculus rules corresponding to the axioms of Robinson Arithmetic. Can we use the results from [Negri, 2003] to prove consistency of Robinson Arithmetic? If yes, how?

labK $\cup$ X: main results