Mathematical Logic and Linguistics

Glyn Morrill & Oriol Valentín

Department of Computer Science Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya morrill@cs.upc.edu & oriol.valentin@gmail.com

> BGSMath Course Autumn 2015

> > < □ > < 同 > < Ξ > < Ξ > < Ξ > < Ξ < </p>

Cut elimination or Cut admissibility

Consider the Cut rule:

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow A \qquad \Delta(A) \Rightarrow B}{\Delta(\Gamma) \Rightarrow B} Cut$$

- ► We want to provide an algorithm that given a proof D, we transform it into a new one D* such that it is Cut-free, i.e. all the Cut rule instances have been "removed".
- ► This algorithm should preserve the *derivational semantics* of *D*, i.e..

 $[[\mathcal{D}]] = [[\mathcal{D}^*]]$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Cut elimination or Cut admissibility

▲□▶▲圖▶▲≣▶▲≣▶ ≣ のQ@

Cut elimination or Cut admissibility

- Define the length |A| of a formula A as the number of connectives it contains.
- Define the *length* |∆| of a configuration ∆ as the sum of the lengths of its formula-occurrences.
- Given an instance of the Cut rule, we define its Cut complexity as:

$$\left|\begin{array}{c} \Delta \Rightarrow A & \Gamma(A) \Rightarrow B \\ \hline \Delta(\Gamma) \Rightarrow B \end{array} Cut \right| \triangleq |\Delta| + |\Gamma| + |A| + |B|$$

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Strategy of the proof

▲ロ▶▲圖▶▲≣▶▲≣▶ ≣ のQ@

Strategy of the proof

Suppose we have a proof D whose last rule is Cut, but its premises do not use the Cut rule, i.e. they are Cut-free:

$$\mathcal{D} = \frac{\stackrel{\vdots}{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{D}_1}{\Delta \Rightarrow A} \quad \frac{\stackrel{\vdots}{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{D}_2}{\Gamma(A) \Rightarrow B} Cut$$

We want to transform \mathcal{D} into a new proof with strictly decreased Cut-complexities, or a new proof which is already Cut-free.

< □ > < 同 > < Ξ > < Ξ > < Ξ > < Ξ < </p>

Reduction steps

▲口▶▲圖▶▲匣▶▲匣▶ 匣 のへで

As previously mentioned, assume we have a proof with only one Cut and whose last rule is this Cut. We have the following reductions:

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

- The so-called principal cases.
- The so-called permutation conversions.

Principal cases

▲ロ▶▲圖▶▲≣▶▲≣▶ ≣ のQ@

Principal cases

Observe that we have a new proof with exactly two Cuts, but whose Cut complexities are strictly smaller. For:

$$\begin{aligned} |Cut_2| &= |\Delta()| + |\Gamma| + |\Theta| + |A| + |C| \\ &< |\Delta()| + |\Gamma| + |\Theta| + |C| + |A| + |B| + 1 \\ &= |\Delta()| + |\Gamma| + |\Theta| + |C| + |B/A| \\ &= |Cut_1| \end{aligned}$$

▲□▶▲圖▶▲≣▶▲≣▶ ≣ のへで

Similarly we have:

 $|Cut_3| < |Cut_1|$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

There are two other principal cases:

- ► \ case (Exercise).
- case.

▲□▶▲圖▶▲≣▶▲≣▶ ≣ のへで

Product • case: $\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow A \quad \Gamma \Rightarrow B}{\Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow A \bullet B} \bullet L \qquad \qquad \frac{\Theta(A, B) \Rightarrow C}{\Theta(A \bullet B) \Rightarrow C} \bullet R$ $\Theta(\Delta, \Gamma) \Rightarrow C$ $\underbrace{ \begin{array}{c} \Gamma \Rightarrow B \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \Delta \Rightarrow A \quad \Theta(A,B) \Rightarrow C \\ \hline \Theta(\Delta,B) \Rightarrow C \\ \hline Cut_{3} \end{array} Cut_{2} \end{array} }_{Cut_{3}}$ $\Theta(\Delta,\Gamma) \Rightarrow C$

Since $|A, B| < |A \bullet B|$, therefore:

 $\begin{array}{rcl} |Cut_2| & < & |Cut_1| \\ |Cut_3| & < & |Cut_1| \end{array}$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ののの

▲□▶▲圖▶▲≣▶▲≣▶ ≣ のへで

Case involving the continuous unit:

$$\frac{1}{\Lambda \Rightarrow I} \frac{A(\Lambda) \Rightarrow A}{\Delta(I) \Rightarrow A} \stackrel{IL}{\longrightarrow} Cut$$

$$\sim$$

$$\Delta(\Lambda) \Rightarrow A$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● のへぐ

Permutation conversions

◆□> < □> < □> < □> < □> < □> < □> < □</p>

Permutation conversions

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow A}{\Gamma(C/B,\Theta;A) \Rightarrow D} \frac{\left(\begin{array}{c} \Theta \Rightarrow B \\ \Gamma(C/B,\Theta;A) \Rightarrow D \end{array} \right)}{\Gamma(C/B,\Theta;\Delta) \Rightarrow D} Cut_{1} \\ \\ \\ \frac{\Theta \Rightarrow B}{\Gamma(C;\Delta) \Rightarrow D} Cut_{2} \\ \\ \hline \\ \Gamma(C/B,\Theta;\Delta) \Rightarrow D \end{array}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |Cut_2| &= |\Gamma| + |\Delta| + |C| + |D| \\ &< |\Gamma| + |\Delta| + |C| + |B| + 1 + |D|, \text{ since } |C/B| = |C| + |B| + 1 \\ &= |Cut_1| \end{aligned}$$

Other cases are similar, and are left as exercises.

Identity case

▲□▶▲圖▶▲≣▶▲≣▶ ≣ のQ@

Identity case

$$\frac{\overrightarrow{A \Rightarrow A} \quad d}{\Delta(A) \Rightarrow B} Cut$$

$$\overset{\sim}{\rightarrow}$$

$$\overline{\Delta(A) \Rightarrow A}$$

▲□▶▲圖▶▲≣▶▲≣▶ ≣ のQ@

The proof of Cut elimination or Cut admissibility

- ► The number of Cuts in a L-proof is finite.
- Apply iteratively the previous reductions to top-most Cuts.

< □ > < 同 > < Ξ > < Ξ > < Ξ > < Ξ < </p>

- Each iteration properly reduces the Cut complexity.
- Cut complexity cannot be negative.
- Therefore we are done.

Applications of Cut admissibility

▲□▶▲□▶▲≡▶▲≡▶ ≡ のへで

Applications of Cut admissibility

We have only to consider Cut-free proofs. Let us see some of its nice corollaries:

- ► The subformula property.
- In a Cut-free proof, since the length of the premises are strictly smaller than the lengths of their premises, it turns out that the proof-search space is finite.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ののの

- ► Therefore, proof-derivability in L is decidable.
- The so-called *finite reading property* holds.