

1. While the following theorem —nicknamed “One-point rule” — will not play a big role in our lectures, still, on one hand it gives us a flavour of how we *use the axioms of equality* (Axioms 5 and 6) and on the other hand every mathematician uses it without even thinking about it, in the form, for example,

$$A(3) \text{ is the same as } (\exists x)(x = 3 \wedge A(x))$$

**0.0.1 Theorem. (One point rule — $\forall$  version)** *On the condition that  $\mathbf{x}$  does not occur in  $t$ ,<sup>†</sup> we have  $\vdash (\forall \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x} = t \rightarrow A) \equiv A[\mathbf{x} := t]$ .*

*Proof.* By Ping-Pong.

( $\rightarrow$ ) Note that since  $\mathbf{x}$  does not occur in  $t$ , we have

$$(\mathbf{x} = t \rightarrow A)[\mathbf{x} := t] \text{ means the same thing as } t = t \rightarrow A[\mathbf{x} := t]$$

Thus,

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| (1) | $(\forall \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x} = t \rightarrow A) \rightarrow t = t \rightarrow A[\mathbf{x} := t]$ | $\langle \mathbf{Ax2} \rangle$   |
| (2) | $(\forall \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x})$   | $\langle \mathbf{Ax5} \text{ —partial gen. of } \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x} \rangle$ |
| (3) | $t = t$   | $\langle (2) + \text{spec} \rangle$  |
| (4) | $(\forall \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x} = t \rightarrow A) \rightarrow A[\mathbf{x} := t]$                   | $\langle (1, 3) + \text{Post} \rangle$   |

( $\leftarrow$ ) Recall the **General form of Axiom 6**:  $s = t \rightarrow (A[\mathbf{x} := s] \equiv A[\mathbf{x} := t])$

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| (1) | $\mathbf{x} = t \rightarrow (A \equiv A[\mathbf{x} := t])$  | $\langle \mathbf{Ax6} \rangle$   |
| (2) | $A[\mathbf{x} := t] \rightarrow \mathbf{x} = t \rightarrow A$   | $\langle (1) + \text{Post} \rangle$  |
| (3) | $(\forall \mathbf{x})A[\mathbf{x} := t] \rightarrow (\forall \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x} = t \rightarrow A)$ | $\langle (2) + \forall\text{-MON} \text{ —}(2) \text{ is an absolute theorem} \rangle$ |
| (4) | $A[\mathbf{x} := t] \rightarrow (\forall \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x} = t \rightarrow A)$                     | $\langle (3) + \mathbf{Ax3} + \text{Post} \rangle$                                     |

I have done the “Post” in (4) before (previous class). Note that Ax3 is applicable since  $\mathbf{x}$  is not free in  $A[\mathbf{x} := t]$

---

<sup>†</sup>We can also say “does not occur free in  $t$ ”, but that is an overkill: A term  $t$  has NO bound variables.

**2. 0.0.2 Corollary. (One point rule  $\text{---}\exists$  version)** *On the condition that  $\mathbf{x}$  does not occur in  $t$ , we have  $\vdash (\exists \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x} = t \wedge A) \equiv A[\mathbf{x} := t]$ .*

*Proof. [Exercise!](#) (Hint. Use the  $\forall$  version and an Equational proof to prove the  $\exists$  version (use the “Def of E” Theorem).)* □

**0.0.3 Theorem.** (Bound variable renaming ( $\forall$ )) *IF  $z$  is fresh for  $A$  —that is, does not occur as either free or bound in  $A$ — then  $\vdash (\forall x)A \equiv (\forall z)A[x := z]$ .*



“Everyday mathematician’s” notation is  $\vdash (\forall x)A(x) \equiv (\forall z)A(z)$ .

But NOT our notation!



*Proof.* Ping-Pong.

( $\rightarrow$ )

- (1)  $(\forall x)A \rightarrow A[x := z]$        $\langle \mathbf{Ax2}$  —fresh  $z$ ; *no capture*: no “ $(\forall z)(\dots, x, \dots)$ ” in  $A$
- (2)  $(\forall z)(\forall x)A \rightarrow (\forall z)A[x := z]$      $\langle (1) + \forall\text{-mon} \rangle$
- (3)  $(\forall x)A \rightarrow (\forall z)(\forall x)A$        $\langle \mathbf{Ax3} \rangle$
- (4)  $(\forall x)A \rightarrow (\forall z)A[x := z]$        $\langle (2, 3) + \text{Post} \rangle$

( $\leftarrow$ ) Let us first settle a useful “lemma” for the proof below:

**0.0.4 Lemma.** *Under the assumptions about  $z$ , we have that  $A[x := z][z := x]$  is just the original  $A$ .*

*Proof.* Now,  $z$  is *neither*

- *Bound* in  $A$ . That is, there is NO “ $(\forall z)(\dots)$ ” in  $A$ . So the substitution  $A[x := z]$  *GOES THROUGH, AND* “flags” (and replaces) all FREE  $x$  in  $A$  as  $z$ .

*nor is*

- *Free* in  $A$ . So NO FREE  $z$  pre-existed in  $A$  before doing  $A[x := z]$ . That is, ALL FREE  $z$  in  $A[x := z]$  are EXACTLY the  $x$  that became  $z$ . *These  $z$  are PLACEHOLDERS for THE ORIGINAL FREE  $x$  in  $A$ .*

BUT then! Doing now  $[z := x]$  changes ALL  $z$  in  $A[x := z]$  back to  $x$ .

We are back to the original  $A$ !

□

- (1)  $(\forall \mathbf{z})A[\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{z}] \rightarrow A[\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{z}][\mathbf{z} := \mathbf{x}]$      $\langle \mathbf{Ax2} - A[\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{z}][\mathbf{z} := \mathbf{x}]$  defined by lemma  $\rangle$
- (2)  $(\forall \mathbf{z})A[\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{z}] \rightarrow A$      $\langle$  same as (1) —see lemma  $\rangle$
- (3)  $(\forall \mathbf{x})(\forall \mathbf{z})A[\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{z}] \rightarrow (\forall \mathbf{x})A$      $\langle$  abs. thm (2) +  $\forall$  MON  $\rangle$
- (4)  $(\forall \mathbf{z})A[\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{z}] \rightarrow (\forall \mathbf{x})(\forall \mathbf{z})A[\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{z}]$      $\langle \mathbf{Ax3}$ ; no free  $\mathbf{x}$  in lhs  $\rangle$
- (5)  $(\forall \mathbf{z})A[\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{z}] \rightarrow (\forall \mathbf{x})A$      $\langle$  (3, 4) + Post  $\rangle$     □

## Lecture #18, Nov. 18

### 0.1. Adding and Removing the Quantifier“( $\exists x$ )”

First, introducing (adding)  $\exists$  is easy via the following tools:

**0.1.1 Theorem. (Dual of Ax2)**  $\vdash A[x := t] \rightarrow (\exists \mathbf{x})A$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}
 & A[x := t] \rightarrow (\exists \mathbf{x})A \\
 \Leftrightarrow & \langle \text{WL} + \text{“Def of E” (this is an abs. thm); “Denom:” } A[x := t] \rightarrow \mathbf{p} \rangle \\
 & A[x := t] \rightarrow \neg(\forall \mathbf{x})\neg A \\
 \Leftrightarrow & \langle \text{tautology} \rangle \\
 & (\forall \mathbf{x})\neg A \rightarrow \neg A[x := t] \qquad \text{Bingo! } \square
 \end{aligned}$$

**0.1.2 Corollary. (The Dual of Specialisation)**  $A[x := t] \vdash (\exists \mathbf{x})A$

*Proof.* 0.1.1 and MP. □

**0.1.3 Corollary.**  $A \vdash (\exists \mathbf{x})A$

*Proof.* 0.1.2, taking  $\mathbf{x}$  as  $t$ . □



Either corollaries above we call “*Dual Spec*” in annotating proofs.



But how can I remove a leading (the entire formula)  $\exists$ ?

We need two preliminary results to answer this.

**0.1.4 Metatheorem. ( $\forall$  Introduction)** *If  $x$  does not occur free in  $\Gamma$  nor in  $A$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B$  iff  $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow (\forall x)B$ .*

*Proof.* of the “iff”.

( $\rightarrow$ ) direction.

Assumption gives  $\Gamma \vdash (\forall x)(A \rightarrow B)$  by valid generalisation.

But we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\forall x)(A \rightarrow B) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \langle \text{thm from NOTES/Class} \rangle \\ & A \rightarrow (\forall x)B \end{aligned}$$

So the bottom formula is a  $\Gamma$ -theorem.

( $\leftarrow$ ) direction.

This time we know the bottom of the above short Equational proof is a  $\Gamma$ -theorem.

Then so is the top. But from the latter I get  $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B$  by spec. □

**0.1.5 Corollary. (∃ Introduction)** *IF  $\mathbf{x}$  does not occur free in  $\Gamma$  nor in  $B$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B$  iff  $\Gamma \vdash (\exists \mathbf{x})A \rightarrow B$ .*



Note how we shifted the condition for  $\mathbf{x}$  from  $A$  to  $B$ .



*Proof.* of the “*iff*”. Well,

$$\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B \stackrel{Post}{\text{iff}} \Gamma \vdash \neg B \rightarrow \neg A \stackrel{0.1.4}{\text{iff}} \Gamma \vdash \neg B \rightarrow (\forall \mathbf{x})\neg A \stackrel{Post}{\text{iff}} \Gamma \vdash \neg(\forall \mathbf{x})\neg A \rightarrow B$$

□