ON THE SEMANTICS OF PROOFS IN CLASSICAL SEQUENT CALCULUS

Fabio Massaioli

Seminario di Logica, Dipartimento di Scienze Matematiche, Fisiche e Naturali, Università degli Studi Roma Tre – 16 Giugno 2023

Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, Italy

GENTZEN'S CALCULUS LK (PROPOSITIONAL FRAGMENT) $F, G := \alpha \mid \neg F \mid F \to G \mid F \lor G \mid F \land G \qquad (\alpha \in \mathcal{A})$

Identity group:

$$\frac{}{F \vdash F} = \frac{}{F \vdash \Delta, F \quad F, I} \\ \frac{}{\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash \Delta,}$$

Additive group (context sharing): $\frac{F, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{F \land G, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \land_1 \vdash$ $\frac{G, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{F \land G, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \land_{\mathbf{r}} \vdash$ $\begin{array}{c|c} \Gamma \vdash \Delta, F & \Gamma \vdash \Delta, G \\ \hline \Gamma \vdash \Delta, F \land G \end{array} \vdash \land \quad \begin{array}{c} F, \\ \hline F, \end{array}$

Structural group: $\frac{\Gamma' \vdash \Delta'}{\Lambda'} \text{cut} \qquad \frac{\Gamma, F, G, \Gamma' \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma, G, F, \Gamma' \vdash \Delta} \operatorname{xch} \vdash$ $\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, F, G\Delta'}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, G, F, \Delta'} \vdash \texttt{xch}$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta}{F, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \text{wk} \vdash \frac{F, F, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{F, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \text{ctr} \vdash \frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, F, F}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, F, F} \vdash \text{ctr}$$

THE CALCULUS LK (PROPOSITIONAL FRAGMENT, ONE SIDED)

 $\overline{(\alpha)} = \overline{\alpha}$

ax $\vdash A, A$

 $F, G ::= \alpha \mid \overline{\alpha} \mid F \lor G \mid F \land G$

$$\overline{\overline{\alpha}} = \alpha \qquad \overline{\overline{F} \vee G} = \overline{F} \wedge \overline{\overline{G}}$$



$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A \vdash \Delta, \overline{A}}{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \text{cut} \qquad \frac{\vdash \Gamma}{\vdash \Gamma, A} \text{wk} \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, A}{\vdash \Gamma, A} \text{ctr}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} Logical \ group: \\ \hline \Gamma, A, B \\ \hline \Gamma, A \lor B \end{array} \lor \begin{array}{c} \vdash \Gamma, A \quad \vdash \Delta, B \\ \hline \Gamma, \Delta, A \land B \end{array} \land \end{array}$$

$(\alpha \in \mathcal{A})$

$\overline{F \wedge G} = \overline{F} \vee \overline{G}$

Structural group:

Define functions $[-]: LK \to X$ mapping derivations to *denotations*, such that

CUT-ELIMINATION THEOREMS

Coarse form. The cut-rule is admissible.

Refined form. For every derivation $P \vdash \Gamma$ there is a cut-free derivation $Q \vdash \Gamma$ such that $P \longrightarrow Q$.

Denotational semantics:

 $P \longrightarrow Q \implies \llbracket P \rrbracket = \llbracket Q \rrbracket$



CUT-ELIMINATION THEOREMS Coarse form. *The cut-rule is admissible.* **Refined form.** For every derivation $P \vdash \Gamma$ there is a cut-free derivation $Q \vdash \Gamma$ such that $P \longrightarrow Q$. Interesting invariants: *Coarsest* – correctness and conclusions. *Finest* – normal form (if unique).

CUT-ELIMINATION THEOREMS

Coarse form. There is a rewriting relation that preserves correctness and conclusions and decreases the number of cuts.

Refined form. For every derivation $P \vdash \Gamma$ there is a cut-free derivation $Q \vdash \Gamma$ such that $P \longrightarrow Q$.

Interesting invariants:

Coarsest – correctness and conclusions.

Finest – normal form (if unique).

CUT-ELIMINATION THEOREMS

Coarse form. There is a rewriting relation that preserves correctness and conclusions and decreases the number of cuts.

Refined form. For every derivation $P \vdash \Gamma$ there is a cut-free derivation $Q \vdash \Gamma$ such that $P \longrightarrow Q$.

Interesting invariants:

Coarsest – correctness and conclusions.

Finest – normal form (if unique).

Intermediate ones?





CUT-ELIMINATION – KEY CASES

CUT-ELIMINATION – STRUCTURAL CASES





CUT-ELIMINATION – COMMUTATIVE CASES (EXAMPLES)

 $\vdash \Gamma, F, G, H$ $\vdash \Gamma, F \lor G, H$

: P $\vdash \Gamma_1, F, H \vdash \Gamma_2, G$ $\vdash \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, F \land G, H$ $\vdash \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, F \land G, \Delta$









PATHOLOGICAL CRITICAL PAIRS











PATHOLOGICAL CRITICAL PAIRS







LAFONT'S EXAMPLE & CO. (PROOFS AND TYPES, 1989)

ctr

denotations in some space X. **Fact.** [P'] = [Q'], hence [P] = [Q].



Assumption 1. There is a denotational interpretation $[-]: LK \to X$ mapping LK derivations to **Assumption 2.** The interpretation is such that $\llbracket P' \rrbracket = \llbracket P \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket Q' \rrbracket = \llbracket Q \rrbracket$.



LAFONT'S EXAMPLE & CO. (PROOFS AND TYPES, 1989)



denotations in some space X.

Fact. [P'] = [Q'].

Assumption 1. There is a denotational interpretation $[-]: LK \to X$ mapping LK derivations to



LAFONT'S EXAMPLE & CO. (PROOFS AND TYPES, 1989)

: *P* $\vdash l$ mix $\vdash \Gamma, \Delta$





?





PATHOLOGICAL CRITICAL PAIRS







IDEA #1 – TRACKING AXIOMS Track existence, avoid counting. (Andrews 1976, Lamarche & Straßburger 2004+) ax ax α, α α, α wk wk $\vdash \alpha, \alpha, \gamma$ $\vdash \alpha, \alpha, \beta$ α, γ Ú μ, μ α, α ά w, ctr



IDEA #1 – TRACKING AXIOMS Track existence, avoid counting. (Andrews 1976, Lamarche & Straßburger 2004+) ax ax α, α $\vdash \alpha, \alpha$ wk wk $\vdash \alpha, \alpha, \beta$ $\vdash \alpha, \alpha, \gamma$ α, γ α \sim α α, α ctr





Track existence, avoid counting. (Andrews 1976, Lamarche & Straßburger 2004+)



Track existence, avoid counting. (Andrews 1976, Lamarche & Straßburger 2004+)



Track existence, avoid counting. (Andrews 1976, Lamarche & Straßburger 2004+)

Theorem (Führmann & Pym 2004). Mating graphs decrease under cut-reduction.

IDEA #1 – TRACKING AXIOMS Track existence, avoid counting. (Andrews 1976, Lamarche & Straßburger 2004+) Axioms may be preserved, deleted, duplicated, but *never created*.

 $\vdash G, H, H$ ax ctr $\vdash \overline{F}, F$ $\vdash \overline{H}, \overline{H}$ $\vdash G, H$ -ctr $\vdash \overline{F}, F \land G, H$ $\vdash \overline{H}$ cut $\vdash \overline{F}, F \land G$

IDEA #1 – TRACKING AXIOMS Track existence, avoid counting. (Andrews 1976, Lamarche & Straßburger 2004+) Axioms may be preserved, deleted, duplicated, but *never created*. $\vdash \overline{H}, \overline{H}$





Track existence, avoid counting. (Andrews 1976, Lamarche & Straßburger 2004+)

























 $\vdash F \wedge G$

IDEA #2 – TARGET INVERTIBILITY

Identity group:

 $\begin{array}{c} \overline{} & \overline{} \\ \vdash \Gamma, A, \overline{A} \end{array} \overset{ax}{=} \begin{array}{c} \vdash \Gamma, A & \vdash \Gamma, \overline{A} \\ & \vdash \Gamma \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{cut} \end{array}$

Structural group:

$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma \vdash \Gamma}{\vdash \Gamma} \operatorname{sum}$$

Logical group:

 $\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A \lor B} \lor \qquad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A \vdash \Gamma, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A \land B} \land$

 $\vdash A, C \vdash A, D \\ \vdash A, C \land D$ $\vdash A \land B, C \land D$

IDEA #2 – TARGET INVERTIBILITY





 $\vdash A, C \vdash A, D$ $\vdash A, C \land D$ $\vdash A \land B, C \land D$

Theorem. Mating graphs are invariant under arbitrary permutations of logical rules in the cut-free fragment of GS3.

IDEA #2 – TARGET INVERTIBILITY





IDEA #3 – ADD BRANCH ANNOTATIONS



IDEA #3 – ADD BRANCH ANNOTATIONS



 $\vdash (\overline{\alpha} \lor \alpha) \land (\overline{\alpha} \lor \alpha)$

$$\frac{\overline{\overline{\alpha}, \alpha, \overline{\alpha}}}{\overline{\overline{\alpha} \vee \alpha, \overline{\alpha}}}$$
 v
$$\frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$$
 cut





(1)



IDEA #3 – ADD BRANCH ANNOTATIONS



(2)

 $\vdash (\overline{\alpha} \lor \alpha) \land (\overline{\alpha} \lor \alpha)$





 $|\alpha_x| = \alpha$

NAMED FORMULAS & SEQUENTS

 $A, B ::= \alpha_x \mid \overline{\alpha}_x \mid A \lor B \mid A \land B \qquad (\alpha \in \mathcal{A}, x \in \mathcal{N})$

$$\overline{\alpha}_{x} \quad \overline{(\overline{\alpha}_{x})} = \alpha_{x} \quad \overline{A \lor B} = \overline{A} \land \overline{B} \quad \overline{A}$$
$$|\overline{\alpha}_{x}| = \overline{\alpha} \quad |A \lor B| = |A| \land |B| \quad |A|$$
$$A \equiv B \iff |A| = |B|$$

$$\vdash A_1, \dots, A_n$$

Sharing-free formula, sequent, set of formulas: *each name occurs at most once*.

$\overline{A \land B} = \overline{A} \lor \overline{B}$ (negation)

$\wedge B| = |A| \vee |B|$

(underlying formula)

(congruence)

(sequent)

NAMED DERIVATIONS

Identity group:

 $\begin{array}{c} \overline{F} \to \Gamma, A, \overline{B} \end{array}^{\operatorname{ax}_{\{A, \overline{B}\}}} & (A \equiv B) \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \overline{F} \to \Gamma, A \to \Gamma, \overline{A} \\ \overline{F} \to \Gamma \end{array} \text{cut} \end{array}$

Structural group:

$$\begin{array}{c} \vdash \varGamma & \vdash \varGamma \\ \hline & \vdash \varGamma \end{array} \\ \end{array}$$

Logical group:

 $\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A \lor B} \lor \qquad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A \vdash \Gamma, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A \land B} \land$



Operations: Subgraph relation: $G \sqcup H = \langle V_G \cup V_H, \prec_G \cup \prec_H \rangle$ $G \sqsubseteq H \iff V_G \subseteq V_H \land \prec_G \subseteq \prec_H$ $G \upharpoonright_X = \langle V_G \cap X, \{ (e, Y) \in \prec_G | Y \subseteq X \} \rangle$

BRANCH-LABELED MATINGS

Pairs $G(H, K, ...) = \langle V_G, \prec_G \rangle$

where $V_G \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ is a set of names (vertices)

 $\prec_G \subseteq \binom{V_G}{2} \times \mathscr{P}(V_G) \text{ is a relation between } unordered \text{ pairs of }$ vertices (*edges*) and arbitrary sets of vertices (*branch labels*), such that $e \prec_G X \implies e \subseteq X$

if and only if there is a complete alternating Z-labeled path $z_1, ..., z_n$

BRANCH-SENSITIVE COMPOSITION

Composition:

 $G \odot_I H = \langle (V_G \cup V_H) \setminus I, \prec \rangle \quad (I \subseteq \mathcal{N})$ where for all $x \neq y \in (V_G \cup V_H) \setminus I$ $xy \prec Z$

between *G* and *H* through the interface *I*,

such that $z_1 = x$ and $z_n = y$.

BRANCH-LABELED ALTERNATING PATH

Alternating X-labeled path between G and H through the interface I:

Complete if $x_1, x_n \notin I$ (i.e. the endpoints lie outside the interface).

Labeling modulo interfaces:

 $e \prec^{I}_{G} X \iff \exists Y . e \prec_{G} Y \land X = Y \setminus I$

a finite sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in V_G \cup V_H$ of pairwise distinct vertices, such that

(*ii*) either $e_i \prec_G^I X$ for all odd $1 \le i < n$ and $e_i \prec_H^I X$ for all even $1 \le i < n$, or $e_i \prec^I_H X$ for all odd $1 \le i < n$ and $e_i \prec^I_G X$ for all even $1 \le i < n$,

where $e_i = x_i x_{i+1}$.

(i) $x_i \in I$ for all 1 < i < n (internal vertices lie in the interface I)

$$\left\| \vdash \Gamma, \alpha_x, \overline{\alpha}_y \right\| \overset{\mathsf{ax}_{\{\alpha_x, \alpha_y\}}}{\vdash} \mathcal{A}_x, \mathcal{A}_y$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} & P_1 \\ & P_1 \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ &$$

THE INTERPRETATION









Theorem (Soundness). Branch-annotated mating graphs are invariant under arbitrary permutations of logical rules in the full calculus.

3. For commutations involving cuts, reason about alternating paths. The only complex case is the conjunction-cut one.

MAIN RESULTS

Proof sketch

1. Use compositionality.

2. Trivial for logical, union rule commutations.

Theorem (Cut-elimination). For any GS4 derivation there is a cut-free GS4 derivation with the same conclusion and denotation.

2. Use logical rule permutations to reduce the *conclusion* of the cut to an atomic clause.

3. Compute the denotation and reconstruct the resulting derivation.

MAIN RESULTS

Proof sketch

1. Upon finding a cut, normalize recursively its sub-derivations.

 $\frac{\beta_{x}, \alpha_{z}, \alpha_{v}, \delta_{w}}{\sum_{x}, u, w} \qquad \beta_{x}, \beta_{x}, \alpha_{v}, \delta_{w}} \qquad \overline{\delta}_{y}, \alpha_{z}, \alpha_{v}, \delta_{w}} \qquad \overline{\delta}_{y}, \beta_{u}, \alpha_{v}, \delta_{w}} \qquad \beta_{x} \wedge \overline{\delta}_{y}, \alpha_{z} \wedge \overline{\beta}_{u}, \alpha_{v} \vee \delta_{w}} \qquad \beta_{x} \wedge \overline{\delta}_{y}, \alpha_{z} \wedge \overline{\beta}_{u}, \alpha_{v} \vee \delta_{w}}$ $\beta_{x} \wedge \delta_{y}, \alpha \wedge \beta_{u}, \alpha \vee \delta_{w}$ $\frac{\beta_{x}, \alpha, \overline{\alpha}, \delta_{v}}{x, v, w} \qquad \beta_{x}, \overline{\beta}, \overline{\alpha}, \delta_{v} \qquad \overline{\delta}_{y}, \alpha, \overline{\alpha}, \delta_{v} \qquad \overline{\delta}_{y}, \overline{\beta}, \overline{\alpha}, \delta_{v}}{\beta_{x}, \alpha, \overline{\delta}, \delta_{y}, \alpha, \overline{\delta}, \overline{\delta}, \overline{\alpha}, \delta_{v}} \qquad \beta_{x} \wedge \overline{\delta}, \alpha \wedge \overline{\beta}, \overline{\alpha} \vee \delta_{w}$ $\beta_{x}, \alpha, \alpha, \delta_{v}, \delta_{w} \qquad \beta_{x}, \beta_{u}, \alpha, \delta_{v} \qquad \frac{1}{\delta}, \alpha, \alpha, \delta_{y}, \alpha, \alpha, \delta_{v}, \delta_{v}$ $\overline{\delta}_{y}, \overline{\beta}_{u}, \overline{\alpha}, \delta_{w}$ $\beta_{x} \wedge \overline{\delta}_{y}, \alpha \wedge \beta_{u}, \overline{\alpha} \vee \delta_{w}$ $\beta_{x} \wedge \overline{\delta}_{y}, \alpha \wedge \overline{\beta}_{u}, \overline{\alpha} \vee \delta_{w}$





Moreover, the size of P is polynomially bounded by the size of G.

MAIN RESULTS

Theorem (Sequentialization). A branch-annotated mating G is correct w.r.t. some sequent $\vdash \Gamma$ if and only if there is a GS4 derivation $P \vdash \Gamma$ whose denotation is G

Moreover, the size of P is polynomially bounded by the size of G.

MAIN RESULTS

Theorem (Sequentialization). A branch-annotated mating G is correct w.r.t. some sequent $\vdash \Gamma$ if and only if there is a GS4 derivation $P \vdash \Gamma$ whose denotation is G

Rule permutations are identities Efficient invertibility Admissibility of rules by algebraic reasoning

SHORTCOMINGS

• Cuts do not commute! • No local cut-reduction procedure. • Has the original problem been solved? Unclear.

• No predicate calculus.

THANK YOU