

# Towards an Efficient and Economic Deductive System of Matching Logic

FSL group

January 20, 2017

We aim for a Hilbert style deductive system which has a relatively large number of axioms but only a few inference rules.

## 1 Grammar and extended grammar

The formal language  $\mathcal{L}$  we use to write matching logic patterns is defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} P ::= & x \\ & | P_1 \wedge P_2 \\ & | \neg P \\ & | \forall x. P \\ & | \sigma(P_1, \dots, P_n) \\ (** \text{ extended } **) \\ & | P_1 \vee P_2 \\ & | P_1 \wedge P_2 \\ & | P_1 \leftrightarrow P_2 \\ & | \exists x. P \\ & | [P] \\ & | \lfloor P \rfloor \\ & | P_1 = P_2 \\ & | P_1 \neq P_2 \\ & | \top \\ & | \perp \\ & | P_1 \subseteq P_2 \\ & | x \in P \end{aligned}$$

with the extended grammar defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1 \vee P_2 &:= \neg P_2 \rightarrow P_1 \\
P_1 \wedge P_2 &:= \neg(\neg P_1 \vee \neg P_2) \\
P_1 \leftrightarrow P_2 &:= (P_1 \rightarrow P_2) \wedge (P_2 \rightarrow P_1) \\
\exists x.P &:= \neg \forall x. \neg P \\
[P] &:= \neg[\neg P] \\
P_1 = P_2 &:= [P_1 \leftrightarrow P_2] \\
P_1 \neq P_2 &:= \neg(P_1 = P_2) \\
\perp &:= x_1 \wedge \neg x_1 \\
\top &:= \neg \perp \\
P_1 \subseteq P_2 &:= [P_1 \rightarrow P_2] \\
x \in P &:= [x \wedge P]
\end{aligned}$$

We will extend the grammar to a many-sorted one in the future.

## 2 Hilbert proof system

Axioms in  $\mathcal{L}$  are given by the following nine axiom schemata where  $P, Q, R$  are arbitrary patterns and  $x, y$  are variables.

- (K1)  $P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow P)$
- (K2)  $(P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow R)) \rightarrow ((P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow (P \rightarrow R))$
- (K3)  $(\neg P \rightarrow \neg Q) \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow P)$
- (K4)  $\forall x.(P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow (P \rightarrow \forall x.Q)$  if  $x$  does not occur free in  $P$
- (K5)  $\exists y.x = y$
- (K6)  $\exists y.Q = y \rightarrow (\forall x.P(x) \rightarrow P[Q/x])$  if  $Q$  is free for  $x$  in  $P$
- (K7)  $P_1 = P_2 \rightarrow (Q[P_1/x] \rightarrow Q[P_2/x])$
- (M1)  $x \in y = (x = y)$
- (M2)  $x \in \neg P = \neg(x \in P)$
- (M3)  $x \in P \wedge Q = (x \in P) \wedge (x \in Q)$
- (M4)  $x \in \exists y.P = \exists y.x \in P$  where  $x$  is distinct from  $y$
- (M5)  $x \in \sigma(\dots, P_i, \dots) = \exists y.y \in P_i \wedge x \in \sigma(\dots, y, \dots)$

Inference rules include

- (Modus Ponens) From  $P$  and  $P \rightarrow Q$ , deduce  $Q$ .

- (Universal Generalization) From  $P$ , deduce  $\forall x.P$ .
- (Membership Introduction) From  $P$ , deduce  $\forall x.(x \in P)$ , where  $x$  does not occur free in  $P$ .
- (Membership Elimination) From  $\forall x.(x \in P)$ , deduce  $P$ , where  $x$  does not occur free in  $P$ .

**Theorem 1** (Soundness of  $K_{\mathcal{L}}$ ). *Theorems of  $K_{\mathcal{L}}$  are valid.*

*Proof.* Trivial. □

We provide some metatheorems of  $K_{\mathcal{L}}$ .

**Proposition 2** (Tautology). *For any propositional tautology  $\mathcal{A}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$  where  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  are propositional variables,*

$$\vdash \mathcal{A}(P_1, \dots, P_n).$$

*Proof.* Omit proof here. □

**Remark** Proposition 2 makes any metatheorem of propositional logic a metatheorem of  $K_{\mathcal{L}}$ .

**Proposition 3** (Variable Substitution).  $\vdash \forall x.P \rightarrow P[y/x]$ .

**Proposition 4** (Functional Substitution).  $\vdash \exists y.(Q = y) \rightarrow (P[Q/x] \rightarrow \exists x.P(x))$ .

**Proposition 5** ( $\vee$ -Introduction).  $\vdash P$  implies  $\vdash P \vee Q$ .

*Proof.* Use Proposition 2 and Modus Ponens. Note that in general,  $\vdash P \vee Q$  does not imply  $\vdash P$  or  $\vdash Q$ . □

**Proposition 6** ( $\wedge$ -Introduction and Elimination).  $\vdash P$  and  $\vdash Q$  iff  $\vdash P \wedge Q$ .

*Proof.* Use Proposition 2 and Modus Ponens. □

**Proposition 7** (Equality Introduction).  $\vdash P = P$ .

*Proof.* Use Membership Introduction and Proposition 2. □

**Proposition 8** (Equality Replacement).  $\vdash P_1 = P_2$  and  $\vdash Q[P_1/x]$  implies  $\vdash Q[P_2/x]$ .

*Proof.* Use Axiom (K7) and Modus Ponens. □

**Proposition 9** (Equality Establishment).  $\vdash P \leftrightarrow Q$  implies  $\vdash P = Q$ .

*Proof.* Use Membership Axioms and  $\vee$ -Introduction. □

**Corollary 10.**  $\vdash P$  implies  $\vdash P = \top$ .

**Proposition 11.**  $\vdash x \in [y]$ .

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \vdash x \in [y] \\
& \text{if } \vdash \forall x.(x \in [y]) & (K5, K6, \text{ and Modus Ponens}) \\
& \text{iff } \vdash [y].
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition 12.**  $\vdash P \rightarrow [P]$ .

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \vdash P \rightarrow [P] \\
& \text{iff } \vdash \forall x.(x \in P \rightarrow [P]) \\
& \text{if } \vdash x \in P \rightarrow [P] \\
& \text{iff } \vdash x \in P \rightarrow x \in [P] \\
& \text{iff } \vdash x \in P \rightarrow \exists y.(y \in P \wedge x \in [y]) \\
& \text{iff } \vdash x \in P \rightarrow \neg \forall y.(y \notin P \vee x \notin [y]) \\
& \text{iff } \vdash \forall y.(y \notin P \vee x \notin [y]) \rightarrow x \notin P \\
& \text{if } \vdash x \notin P \vee x \notin [x] \rightarrow x \notin P \\
& \text{iff } \vdash x \in P \rightarrow x \in P \wedge x \in [x] \\
& \text{iff } \vdash x \in P \rightarrow x \in [x] \\
& \text{if } \vdash x \in [x]
\end{aligned}$$

**Remark** Similarly we can show  $\vdash [P] \rightarrow P$ .

□

**Proposition 13.**  $\vdash \forall x.(x \in P) = [P]$ , where  $x$  occurs free in  $P$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 9 and 6, it suffices to show

$$\vdash \forall x.(x \in P) \rightarrow [P] \tag{1}$$

and

$$\vdash [P] \rightarrow \forall x.(x \in P). \tag{2}$$

To show (1),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \vdash \forall x.(x \in P) \rightarrow [P] \\
& \text{iff } \vdash \forall x.[x \wedge P] \rightarrow \neg[\neg P] \\
& \text{iff } \vdash [\neg P] \rightarrow \exists x.\neg[x \wedge P] \\
& \text{iff } \vdash \forall y.(y \in ([\neg P] \rightarrow \exists x.\neg[x \wedge P])) \\
& \text{if } \vdash y \in ([\neg P] \rightarrow \exists x.\neg[x \wedge P]) \\
& \text{iff } \vdash \exists z_1.(z_1 \notin P \wedge y \in [z_1]) \rightarrow \\
& \quad \exists x.\neg(\exists z_2.(z_2 = x \wedge z_2 \in P \wedge y \in [z_2])) \\
& \text{iff } \vdash \exists z_1.(z_1 \notin P \wedge \top) \rightarrow \quad \quad \quad (\text{Proposition 11, 8, and Corollary 10}) \\
& \quad \exists x.\neg(\exists z_2.(z_2 = x \wedge z_2 \in P \wedge \top)) \\
& \text{iff } \vdash \exists z_1.(z_1 \notin P) \rightarrow \exists x.\neg(\exists z_2.(z_2 = x \wedge z_2 \in P)) \\
& \text{iff } \vdash \forall x.(\exists z_2.(z_2 = x \wedge z_2 \in P)) \rightarrow \forall z_1.(z_1 \in P) \\
& \text{if } \vdash \forall z_1.(\forall x.(\exists z_2.(z_2 = x \wedge z_2 \in P)) \rightarrow (z_1 \in P)) \\
& \text{if } \vdash \forall x.(\exists z_2.(z_2 = x \wedge z_2 \in P)) \rightarrow (z_1 \in P).
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\vdash \forall x.(\exists z_2.(z_2 = x \wedge z_2 \in P)) \rightarrow \exists z_2.(z_2 = z_1 \wedge z_2 \in P)$ , it suffices to show

$$\begin{aligned}
& \vdash \exists z_2.(z_2 = z_1 \wedge z_2 \in P) \rightarrow (z_1 \in P) \\
& \text{iff } \vdash z_1 \notin P \rightarrow \forall z_2.(z_2 \neq z_1 \vee z_2 \notin P) \\
& \text{if } \vdash \forall z_2.(z_1 \notin P \rightarrow z_2 \neq z_1 \vee z_2 \notin P) \\
& \text{if } \vdash z_1 \notin P \rightarrow z_2 \neq z_1 \vee z_2 \notin P \\
& \text{if } \vdash z_2 = z_1 \wedge z_2 \in P \rightarrow z_1 \in P.
\end{aligned}$$

And we proved (1).

Similarly, to show (2),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \vdash [P] \rightarrow \forall x.(x \in P) \\
& \text{iff } \vdash \exists x.\neg[x \wedge P] \rightarrow [\neg P] \\
& \text{iff } \vdash \forall y.(y \in \exists x.\neg[x \wedge P] \rightarrow [\neg P]) \\
& \text{if } \vdash y \in \exists x.\neg[x \wedge P] \rightarrow [\neg P] \\
& \text{iff } \vdash \exists x.\neg\exists z_2.(z_2 = x \wedge z_2 \in P) \rightarrow \exists z_1.(z_1 \notin P) \\
& \text{iff } \vdash \forall z_1.(z_1 \in P) \rightarrow \exists z_2.(z_2 = z_1 \wedge z_2 \in P) \\
& \text{iff } \vdash x \in P \rightarrow \exists z_2.(z_2 = x \wedge z_2 \in P).
\end{aligned}$$

We proved (2).

**Remark** If  $x$  occurs free in  $P$ , the result does not hold. For example, let  $P$  be  $upto(x)$  where  $upto(\cdot)$  is interpreted to  $upto(n) = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  on  $\mathbb{N}$ .  $\square$

**Remark** From Membership Introduction and Elimination inference rules and Proposition 13,  $\vdash P$  iff  $\vdash [P]$ .

**Proposition 14** (Classification Reasoning). *For any  $P$  and  $Q$ , from  $\vdash P \rightarrow Q$  and  $\vdash \neg P \rightarrow Q$  deduce  $\vdash Q$ .*

*Proof.* From  $\vdash \neg P \rightarrow Q$  deduce  $\vdash \neg Q \rightarrow P$ . Notice that  $\vdash P \rightarrow Q$ , so we have  $\vdash \neg Q \rightarrow Q$ , i.e.,  $\vdash \neg\neg Q \vee Q$  which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 15.** *For any  $P_1, P_2$ , and  $Q$  are patterns with  $\vdash P_1 \vee P_2$ , from  $\vdash P_1 \rightarrow Q$  and  $\vdash P_2 \rightarrow Q$ , deduce  $\vdash Q$ .*

**Definition 16** (Predicate Pattern). *A pattern  $P$  is called a predicate pattern or a predicate if  $\vdash (P = \top) \vee (P = \perp)$ .*

**Remark** Predicate patterns are closed under all logic connectives.

**Remark** For any  $P$ ,  $\lceil P \rceil$  is a predicate pattern.

**Proposition 17.**  $\vdash (\lceil P \rceil = \perp) = (P = \perp)$  and  $\vdash (\lfloor P \rfloor = \top) = (P = \top)$ .

*Proof.* It is easy to prove one derivation from the other, so we only prove the first one. By Proposition 9, it suffices to prove

$$\vdash (\lceil P \rceil = \perp) \rightarrow (P = \perp) \quad (3)$$

and

$$\vdash (P = \perp) \rightarrow (\lceil P \rceil = \perp) \quad (4)$$

The proof of (4) is trivial and we left it as an exercise. We now prove (3) through the following backward reasoning.

$$\begin{aligned} & \vdash (\lceil P \rceil = \perp) \rightarrow (P = \perp) \\ \text{iff} \quad & \vdash \forall y. (y \in ((\lceil P \rceil = \perp) \rightarrow (P = \perp))) \\ \text{if} \quad & \vdash y \in ((\lceil P \rceil = \perp) \rightarrow (P = \perp)) \\ \text{iff} \quad & \vdash (y \in (\lceil P \rceil = \perp) \rightarrow (y \in (P = \perp))). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

While for any pattern  $Q$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \vdash y \in (Q = \perp) \\ \text{iff} \quad & \vdash y \in \neg[\neg(Q \leftrightarrow \perp)] \\ \text{iff} \quad & \vdash y \in \neg[Q] \\ \text{iff} \quad & \vdash \neg\exists z. (z \in Q \wedge y \in \lceil z \rceil) \\ \text{iff} \quad & \vdash \neg\exists z. (z \in Q) \end{aligned}$$

So we continue to prove (5) by showing

$$\begin{aligned}
& \vdash (y \in ([P] = \perp)) \rightarrow (y \in (P = \perp)) \\
\text{iff } & \vdash \neg \exists z. (z \in [P]) \rightarrow \neg \exists z. (z \in P) \\
\text{iff } & \vdash \exists z. (z \in P) \rightarrow \exists z. (z \in [P]) \\
\text{iff } & \vdash \exists z. (z \in P) \rightarrow \exists z. (\exists z_1. (z_1 \in P \wedge z \in [z_1])) \\
\text{iff } & \vdash \exists z. (z \in P) \rightarrow \exists z. \exists z_1. (z_1 \in P) \\
\text{iff } & \vdash \exists z_1. (z_1 \in P) \rightarrow \exists z. \exists z_1. (z_1 \in P).
\end{aligned}$$

And we finish the proof by noticing the fact that for any pattern  $Q$  and variable  $x$ ,

$$\vdash Q \rightarrow \exists x. Q.$$

□

**Proposition 18.** *For any predicate  $P$ ,  $\vdash (P \neq \top) = (P = \perp)$  and  $\vdash (P \neq \perp) = (P = \top)$ .*

*Proof.* We only prove the first derivation, by showing both

$$\vdash (P \neq \top) \rightarrow (P = \perp) \tag{6}$$

and

$$\vdash (P = \perp) \rightarrow (P \neq \top). \tag{7}$$

Proving (7) is trivial. We now prove (6), which is also trivial by transforming disjunction to implication. □

**Proposition 19.** *For any pattern  $Q$  and any predicate pattern  $P$ ,  $\vdash P \vee Q$  iff  $\vdash P \vee [Q]$ .*

*Proof.*  $(\Leftarrow)$  is obtained immediately by the remark of Proposition 12. We now prove  $(\Rightarrow)$ .

Because  $\vdash Q = \top \vee Q \neq \top$ , it suffices to show

$$\vdash Q = \top \rightarrow (P \vee [Q] = \top) \tag{8}$$

and

$$\vdash Q \neq \top \rightarrow (P \vee [Q] = \top) \tag{9}$$

by Corollary 15, and the fact that  $\vdash P \vee [Q] = \top$  and  $\vdash \top$  imply  $\vdash P \vee [Q]$ .

The proof of (8) is straightforward as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \vdash Q = \top \rightarrow (P \vee [Q] = \top) \\
\text{if } & \vdash Q = \top \rightarrow (P \vee [\top] = \top) \\
\text{if } & \vdash Q = \top \rightarrow (\top = \top) \\
\text{if } & \vdash \top.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of (9) needs more effort:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \vdash Q \neq \top \rightarrow (P \vee \lfloor Q \rfloor = \top) \\
\text{iff } & \vdash (Q = \top) \vee (P \vee \lfloor Q \rfloor = \top) \\
\text{iff } & \vdash (\lfloor Q \rfloor = \top) \vee (P \vee \lfloor Q \rfloor = \top) \\
\text{iff } & \vdash \lfloor Q \rfloor \neq \top \rightarrow (P \vee \lfloor Q \rfloor = \top) \\
\text{iff } & \vdash \lfloor Q \rfloor = \perp \rightarrow (P \vee \lfloor Q \rfloor = \top) \\
\text{if } & \vdash \lfloor Q \rfloor = \perp \rightarrow (P \vee \perp = \top) \\
\text{iff } & \vdash \lfloor Q \rfloor = \perp \rightarrow (P = \top) \\
\text{if } & \vdash Q = \top \vee P = \top.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that  $P$  is a predicate pattern, so it suffices to show

$$\vdash P = \top \rightarrow (Q = \top \vee P = \top),$$

whose validity is obvious, and

$$\vdash P = \perp \rightarrow (Q = \top \vee P = \top),$$

which is proved by showing

$$\vdash P = \perp \rightarrow Q = \top. \quad (10)$$

Because  $\vdash P \vee Q$ , it suffices to show

$$\begin{aligned}
& \vdash P = \perp \rightarrow (P \vee Q) \rightarrow (Q = \top) \\
\text{if } & \vdash P = \perp \rightarrow (\perp \vee Q) \rightarrow (Q = \top) \\
\text{iff } & \vdash P = \perp \rightarrow Q \rightarrow (Q = \top) \\
\text{if } & \vdash Q \rightarrow (Q = \top) \\
\text{iff } & \vdash (Q \neq \top) \rightarrow \neg Q \\
\text{iff } & \vdash (\lfloor Q \rfloor = \perp) \rightarrow \neg Q.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice we have  $\vdash Q \rightarrow \lfloor Q \rfloor$ , which means  $\vdash \neg \lfloor Q \rfloor \rightarrow \neg Q$ , so it suffices to show

$$\begin{aligned}
& \vdash (\lfloor Q \rfloor = \perp) \rightarrow \neg \lfloor Q \rfloor \\
\text{iff } & \vdash (\lfloor Q \rfloor = \perp) \rightarrow \neg \perp \\
\text{iff } & \vdash (\lfloor Q \rfloor = \perp) \rightarrow \top \\
\text{iff } & \vdash \top.
\end{aligned}$$

And this concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 20** (Deduction Theorem). *If  $\Gamma \cup \{P\} \vdash Q$  and the derivation does not use  $\forall x$ -Generalization where  $x$  is free in  $P$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash \lfloor P \rfloor \rightarrow Q$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is by induction on  $n$ , the length of the derivation of  $Q$  from  $\Gamma \cup \{P\}$ .



Base step:  $n = 1$ , and  $Q$  is an axiom, or  $P$ , or a member of  $\Gamma$ . If  $Q$  is an axiom or a member of  $\Gamma$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash Q$  and as a result,  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q$ . If  $Q$  is  $P$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q$  by Proposition 12.

Induction step: Let  $n > 1$ . Suppose that if  $P'$  can be deduced from  $\Gamma \cup \{P\}$  without using  $\forall x$ -Generalization where  $x$  is free in  $P$ , in a derivation containing fewer than  $n$  steps, then  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow P'$ .

Case 1:  $Q$  is an axiom, or  $P$ , or a member of  $\Gamma$ . Precisely as in the Base step, we show that  $\vdash [P] \rightarrow Q$ .

Case 2:  $Q$  follows from two previous patterns in the derivation by an application of Modus Ponens. These two patterns must have the forms  $Q_1$  and  $Q_1 \rightarrow Q$ , and each one can certainly be deduced from  $\Gamma \cup \{P\}$  by a derivation with fewer than  $n$  steps, by just omitting the subsequent members from the original derivation from  $\Gamma \cup \{P\} \vdash Q$ . So we have  $\Gamma \cup \{P\} \vdash Q_1$  and  $\Gamma \cup \{P\} \vdash Q_1 \rightarrow Q$ , and, applying the hypothesis of induction,  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q_1$  and  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow (Q_1 \rightarrow Q)$ . It follows immediately that  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q$ .

Case 3:  $Q$  follows from a previous pattern in the derivation by an application of  $\forall x_i$ -Generalization where  $x_i$  does not occur free in  $P$ . So  $Q$  is  $\forall x_i. Q_1$ , say, and  $Q_1$  appears previously in the derivation. Thus  $\Gamma \cup \{P\} \vdash Q_1$ , and the derivation has fewer than  $n$  steps, so  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q_1$ , since there is no application of Universal Generalization involving a free variable of  $P$ . Also  $x_i$  cannot occur free in  $P$ , as it is involved in an application of Universal Generalization in the deduction of  $Q$  from  $\Gamma \cup \{P\}$ . So we have a derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q \\ \text{iff } & \Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow \forall x_i. Q_1 \\ \text{if } & \Gamma \vdash \forall x_i. ([P] \rightarrow Q_1) \\ \text{if } & \Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q_1. \end{aligned}$$

So  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q$  as required.

Case 4:  $Q$  follows from a previous pattern in the derivation by an application of Membership Introduction. So  $Q$  is  $\forall x_i. (x_i \in Q_1)$  with  $x_i$  is free in  $Q_1$ , say, and  $Q_1$  appears previously in the derivation. Thus  $\Gamma \cup \{P\} \vdash Q_1$ , and the derivation has fewer than  $n$  steps, so  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q_1$ , since there is no application of Universal Generalization involving a free variable of  $P$ . So we have a derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q \\ \text{iff } & \Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow \forall x_i. (x_i \in Q_1) \\ \text{iff } & \Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow [Q_1], \end{aligned}$$

which follows by the hypothesis of induction  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q_1$  and the fact that  $\Gamma \vdash Q_1 \rightarrow [Q_1]$  (by the Remark in Proposition 12).

Case 5:  $Q$  follows from a previous pattern in the derivation by an application of Membership Elimination. The previous pattern must have the form  $\forall x_i. (x_i \in Q)$ , and can be deduced from  $\Gamma \cup \{P\}$  by a derivation with fewer than  $n$  steps, by just omitting

the subsequent members from the original derivation from  $\Gamma \cup \{P\} \vdash Q$ . So we have  $\Gamma \cup \{P\} \vdash \forall x_i.(x_i \in Q)$ , and, applying the hypothesis of induction,  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow \forall x_i.(x_i \in Q)$ . So we have a derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q \\
\text{iff } & \Gamma \vdash \neg[P] \vee Q \\
\text{iff } & \Gamma \vdash \neg[P] \vee [Q] & \text{(Proposition 19)} \\
\text{iff } & \Gamma \vdash \neg[P] \vee \forall x_i.(x_i \in Q) \\
\text{iff } & \Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow \forall x_i.(x_i \in Q),
\end{aligned}$$

which is the hypothesis of induction. And this concludes our inductive proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 21** (Closed-form Deduction Theorem). *If  $P$  is closed,  $\Gamma \cup \{P\} \vdash Q$  implies  $\Gamma \vdash [P] \rightarrow Q$ .*

### 3 Inference rules

**Axioms**

$$\frac{\cdot}{\Gamma \vdash A}$$

where  $A$  is an axiom.

**Inclusion**

$$\frac{\cdot}{\Gamma \vdash P}$$

where  $P \in \Gamma$ .

**Modus Ponens**

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash Q \rightarrow P \quad \Gamma \vdash Q}{\Gamma \vdash P}$$

**Closed-Form Deduction Theorem**

$$\frac{\Gamma \cup \{P\} \vdash Q}{\Gamma \vdash P \rightarrow Q}$$

where  $P$  is closed.

**Universal Generalization**

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash P}{\Gamma \vdash \forall x.P} (\forall x)$$

**Conjunction Splitting**

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash P \quad \Gamma \vdash Q}{\Gamma \vdash P \wedge Q}$$