

Lecture Notes on Embedding Linear Logic in Intuitionistic Logic

15-816: Linear Logic
Frank Pfenning

Lecture 24
April 18, 2012

In this lecture we continue our investigation of the resource semantics for linear logic from the previous lecture. We first consider the so-called additive connectives of linear logic. While we will be able to develop a resource sequent calculus which is still in bijective correspondence with the linear sequent calculus, it suggests a more elementary resource semantics which also has an elegant natural deduction formulation. This can be accomplished by “untethering” the left rules of the resource sequent calculus as much as possible.

The material in this lecture is based on work by Jason Reed [Ree07, Ree09] or joint work with Jason Reed [RP10], although I do not believe it has previously been presented in this exact form.

1 Additive Connectives

In linear logic, there are two forms of conjunction. Besides the simultaneous conjunction (called multiplicative), there is an *alternative conjunction* (called additive), written $A \& B$. We can achieve $A \& B$ as a goal with the current resources, if we can achieve both A and B with the current resources. This means that if we have a resource $A \& B$ we can choose to convert this to either A or B .

$$\frac{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash A \quad \Delta; \Gamma \vdash B}{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash A \& B} \&R$$
$$\frac{\Delta; \Gamma, A \vdash C}{\Delta; \Gamma, A \& B \vdash C} \&L_1 \qquad \frac{\Delta; \Gamma, B \vdash C}{\Delta; \Gamma, A \& B \vdash C} \&L_2$$

The resource representation is straightforward, and the proof of the previous lecture will extend naturally.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A@p \quad \Gamma \vdash B@p}{\Gamma \vdash A \& B@p} \&R$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \& B@alpha, A@beta \vdash C@p * beta}{\Gamma, A \& B@alpha \vdash C@p * alpha} \&L_1^\beta \quad \frac{\Gamma, A \& B@alpha, B@beta \vdash C@p * beta}{\Gamma, A \& B@alpha \vdash C@p * alpha} \&L_2^\beta$$

While the alternative conjunction embodies one form of choice, the disjunction ($A \oplus B$) represents another form of choice. When we have a resource $A \oplus B$ we do not know whether A or B will be provided and we have to account for both possibilities.

$$\frac{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash A}{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash A \oplus B} \oplus R_1 \quad \frac{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash B}{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash A \oplus B} \oplus R_2$$

$$\frac{\Delta; \Gamma, A \vdash C \quad \Delta; \Gamma, B \vdash C}{\Delta; \Gamma, A \oplus B \vdash C} \oplus L$$

Note that the apparent violation of linearity is not a mistake, as can be seen by verifying the appropriate cases of cut elimination: only one of either A or B can be inferred by a right rule, so only one of the premises of the left rule will come into play in any situation.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A@p}{\Gamma \vdash A \oplus B@p} \oplus R_1 \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash B@p}{\Gamma \vdash A \oplus B@p} \oplus R_2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \oplus B@alpha, A@beta \vdash C@p * beta \quad \Gamma, A \oplus B@alpha, B@gamma \vdash C@p * gamma}{\Gamma, A \oplus B@alpha \vdash C@p * alpha} \oplus L^{\beta, \gamma}$$

The identity elements for $\&$ and \oplus are \top and $\mathbf{0}$. While $\&$ has only a right rule, \oplus has only a left rule. We summarize the rules and their resource formulation.

$$\frac{}{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash \top} \top R \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \top@p} \top R$$

$$\frac{}{\Delta; \Gamma, \mathbf{0} \vdash C} \mathbf{0}L \quad \frac{}{\Gamma, \mathbf{0}@alpha \vdash C@p * alpha} \mathbf{0}L$$

It is important to remember that $\mathbf{0}$ must be tethered to the succedent, so we have license to use it.

2 Untethering

While the rules we have presented so far are isomorphic to the sequent calculus rules for linear logic, taken by themselves they have several somewhat questionable aspects. We should three examples and then try to find a unified reformulation that eliminates these.

copy. The copy rule

$$\frac{\Gamma, A@{\epsilon}, A@{\alpha} \vdash C@p * \alpha}{\Gamma, A@{\epsilon} \vdash C@p} \text{copy}^{\alpha}$$

is sound from the resource perspective, but its necessity can only be explained by reference to the linear sequent calculus. It seems we should be able to directly use any assumption $A@{\epsilon}$ instead of having to copy it! This suggests a revision where we change all left rules to have a conclusion of the form

$$\Gamma, A@p \vdash C@p * q$$

where A is the principal formula, $p = \epsilon$ or $p = \alpha$, and p is consumed as part of the inference.

This seems possible, although we have not verified the details at present.

$\&L_i$. We have not discussed a calculus of natural deduction, but clearly the natural rules for the alternative conjunction would be

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A@p \quad \Gamma \vdash B@p}{\Gamma \vdash A \& B@p} \&I$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \& B@p}{\Gamma \vdash A@p} \&E_1 \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \& B@p}{\Gamma \vdash B@p} \&E_2$$

These rules do not quite match our left rules in the resource sequent calculus. The natural rules would be

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \& B@p, A@p \vdash C@r}{\Gamma, A \& B@p \vdash C@r} \&L_1 \quad \frac{\Gamma, A \& B@p, B@p \vdash C@r}{\Gamma, A \& B@p \vdash C@r} \&L_2$$

where $p = \alpha$ or $p = \epsilon$ (if we take the previous remark about the copy rule into account).

This rule changes one of the fundamental invariants of the system, namely that all resource parameters in the antecedent have at most one occurrence.

This affects the translation from the resource calculus to the linear sequent calculus. Recall that if $\Gamma \vdash C@p$ then $\Gamma|_p \vdash C$, where

$$\begin{aligned} (\cdot)|_\epsilon &= (\cdot) \\ (\Gamma, \Gamma')|_{p*q} &= \Gamma|_p, \Gamma'|_q \\ (A@_\alpha)|_\alpha &= A \text{ } eph \\ (A@_\alpha)|_\epsilon &= (\cdot) \\ (A@_\epsilon)|_\epsilon &= A \text{ } pers \end{aligned}$$

This definition remains unchanged, but it is now nondeterministic because if there are multiple assumptions at α , where α occurs in p , then one of them has to be selected (third clause) while all others are ignored (fourth clause).

We believe the remaining system is still sound and complete, even though we have not checked the details at present. One noteworthy aspect of this system is that the left rule for conjunction is no longer tethered. If we have an assumption $A \& B@_\alpha$ where α does *not* appear in r while proving $C@r$, then we can still apply the rule, but with no bad consequence. Strengthening will erase all assumptions labeled with α .

With this generalization we can, for example, directly deduce unrestricted assumptions from others. For example, when mapped back to the linear sequent calculus, the instance of $\&L_1$ with $p = \epsilon$ is

$$\frac{\Delta, A \& B, A; \Gamma \vdash C}{\Delta, A \& B; \Gamma \vdash C}$$

which is not otherwise derivable (although it is, of course, admissible).

$\multimap L$. Again, in linear natural deduction we would expect the rule

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \multimap B@p \quad \Gamma \vdash A@q}{\Gamma \vdash B@p * q} \multimap E$$

Compare this with the cumbersome

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \multimap B@_\alpha \vdash A@q \quad \Gamma, A \multimap B@_\alpha, B@_\beta \vdash C@p * \beta}{\Gamma, A \multimap B@_\alpha \vdash C@p * q * \alpha} \multimap L^\beta$$

A more direct translation following the connection between natural deduction might be the (untethered)

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \multimap B@p \vdash A@q \quad \Gamma, A \multimap B@p, B@p * q \vdash C@r}{\Gamma, A \multimap B@p \vdash C@r} \multimap L^\beta$$

To write this rule, we must loosen our invariants further, allowing not only hypotheses $A@α$ and $A@ε$ but more generally $A@p$ for arbitrary p .

If we allow that, we have to revisit the translation that maps resource hypotheses to linear hypotheses.

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\cdot)|_\epsilon &= (\cdot) \\
 (\Gamma, \Gamma')|_{p*q} &= \Gamma|_p, \Gamma'|_q \\
 (A@p)|_p &= A \text{ eph} \\
 (A@p)|_\epsilon &= (\cdot) \\
 (A@ε)|_\epsilon &= A \text{ pers}
 \end{aligned}$$

There are several sources of nondeterminism; the important part is the total preservation of resources. We expect the following property:

If $\Gamma \vdash C@p$ then for some $\Psi = \Gamma|_p$ we have $\Psi \vdash C$.

With these observations, we can rewrite the inference rules as shown in Figure 1. We conjecture (but have not checked the details at present) that this resource semantics is sound and complete with respect to linear sequent calculus.

A few observations about this calculus. The rules that require a coordination between the resources in the antecedent and succedent are *init* (which applies to atomic formulas) as well as the left rules for so-called *positive* propositions ($A \otimes B$, $\mathbf{1}$, $!A$, $A \oplus B$, and $\mathbf{0}$). The left rules for the *negative* propositions ($A \multimap B$, $A \& B$, \top) are untethered and can be applied without reference to the succedent. This means that the negative fragment is particularly elegant, as can be seen from its dependent form worked out by Reed [Ree07, Ree09].

A second observation is that the structure of proofs in the untethered sequent calculus is different from the linear sequent calculus. This difference is particularly apparent for the exponentials (empty resource).

We can further modify or extend this calculus in ways which is impossible in linear logic. For example, we can define

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \& B@p, A@p, B@p \vdash C@r}{\Gamma, A \& B@p \vdash C@r} \&L$$

This single rule can replace two rules, $\&L_1$ and $\&L_2$. Unlike those two rules, this one is asynchronous and we can indeed drop $A \& B@p$ in a so-called *focused* version of this system. This kind of left-invertible rule is impossible for $A \& B$ in linear logic, because we cannot represent the ties of A and B (when A is used, B becomes unusable, and vice versa).

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{\Gamma, P@p \vdash P@p} \text{init} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma \vdash A@p \quad \Gamma \vdash B@q}{\Gamma \vdash A \otimes B@p * q} \otimes R \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma, A \otimes B@q, A@{\beta}, B@{\gamma} \vdash C@p * \beta * \gamma}{\Gamma, A \otimes B@q \vdash C@p * q} \otimes L^{\beta, \gamma} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma, A@{\alpha} \vdash B@p * \alpha}{\Gamma \vdash A \multimap B@p} \multimap R^{\alpha} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma, A \multimap B@p \vdash A@q \quad \Gamma, A \multimap B@p, B@p * q \vdash C@r}{\Gamma, A \multimap B@p \vdash C@r} \multimap L \\
 \\
 \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{1}@{\epsilon}} \mathbf{1}R \qquad \frac{\Gamma, \mathbf{1}@q \vdash C@p}{\Gamma, \mathbf{1}@q \vdash C@p * q} \mathbf{1}L \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma \vdash A@{\epsilon}}{\Gamma \vdash !A@{\epsilon}} !R \qquad \frac{\Gamma, !A@q, A@{\epsilon} \vdash C@p}{\Gamma, !A@q \vdash C@p * q} !L \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma \vdash A@p \quad \Gamma \vdash B@p}{\Gamma \vdash A \& B@p} \&R \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma, A \& B@p, A@p \vdash C@r}{\Gamma, A \& B@p \vdash C@r} \&L_1 \qquad \frac{\Gamma, A \& B@p, B@p \vdash C@r}{\Gamma, A \& B@p \vdash C@r} \&L_2 \\
 \\
 \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \top@p} \top R \qquad \text{no } \top L \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma \vdash A@p}{\Gamma \vdash A \oplus B@p} \oplus R_1 \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash B@p}{\Gamma \vdash A \oplus B@p} \oplus R_2 \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma, A \oplus B@q, A@{\beta} \vdash C@p * \beta \quad \Gamma, A \oplus B@q, B@{\gamma} \vdash C@p * \gamma}{\Gamma, A \oplus B@q \vdash C@p * q} \oplus L^{\beta, \gamma} \\
 \\
 \text{no } \mathbf{0}R \qquad \frac{}{\Gamma, \mathbf{0}@q \vdash C@p * q} \mathbf{0}L
 \end{array}$$

Figure 1: Untethered resource sequent calculus

The fact that we have explicit resources means that we can also define some new connectives that do not exist in linear logic. For example,

$$\frac{\Gamma, A@p \vdash B@p}{\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B@p} \rightarrow R$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \rightarrow B@p \vdash A@p \quad \Gamma, A \rightarrow B@p, B@p \vdash C@r}{\Gamma, A \rightarrow B@p \vdash C@r} \rightarrow L$$

Whether the connective above really makes sense, and which other ones might be interesting is a topic for future research. Some hints can be found in the above-cited work by Reed.

3 Embedding into Intuitionistic Logic

We can now exploit the ideas detailed above to provide a whole-sale translation of linear logic into intuitionistic logic with equality. We present this only for the negative fragment of the language, where it is particularly elegant. Positive connectives can be added [RP10], but present difficulties. In lecture, we attempted a slightly different and simpler translation which, however, ended up being unsound.

The idea is to give a compositional translation with respect to a given set of resources. The target of our translation is plain old intuitionistic logic (not linear), where one of the types consists of the resource terms and is subject to the resource equations. The translation is

$$(A)@p = B$$

where A comes from linear logic, p is a resource expression, and B is a proposition in *intuitionistic* logic.

Motivated by the right rule for linear implication, we translate implication as follows

$$(A \multimap B)@p = \forall \alpha. (A)@p \multimap (B)@p * \alpha$$

To translate atomic propositions, we give them an additional argument which is of resource type.

$$(P)@p = P p$$

Under this interpretation, the linear initial sequents $P \vdash P$ will be translated to intuitionistic initial sequents $\Gamma, P p \vdash P q$ where $p = q$.

Additive conjunction exploits the ideas developed earlier in these notes.

$$(A \& B)@p = (A)@p \wedge (B)@p$$

Let's translate an example:

$$\begin{aligned} & (a \multimap (a \multimap b) \multimap b)@e \\ &= \forall \alpha_1. a(\alpha_1) \supset ((a \multimap b) \multimap b)@_{\alpha_1} \\ &= \forall \alpha_1. a(\alpha_1) \supset (\forall \alpha_2. (a \multimap b)@_{\alpha_2} \supset (b)@_{\alpha_1 * \alpha_2}) \\ &= \forall \alpha_1. a(\alpha_1) \supset \forall \alpha_2. (\forall \alpha_3. a(\alpha_3) \supset b(\alpha_2 * \alpha_3)) \supset b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2) \end{aligned}$$

Now we can prove that, but rather than using small steps, we prove it with focusing. In many cases of translations, focusing is the key to control nondeterminism in the target of the translation in the proof of: if $\vdash (A)@e$ in intuitionistic logic, then $\vdash A$ in linear logic.

At first, we have an inversion phase that requires new parameters α_1 and α_2 to be introduced, leaving us with the sequent

$$\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ a(\alpha_1), \forall \alpha_3. a(\alpha_3) \supset b(\alpha_2 * \alpha_3) \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2) \end{array}$$

We assume all atoms are negative, and focus on the universally quantified proposition. We haven't formally introduced focusing for intuitionistic logic, but its behavior is quite analogous to the linear case. In particular, when focused on a universal quantifier, we instantiate it with a new variable. We write Q here for an appropriate resource variable.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ a(\alpha_1), [a(Q) \supset b(\alpha_2 * Q)] \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2) \end{array}}{a(\alpha_1), [\forall \alpha_3. a(\alpha_3) \supset b(\alpha_2 * \alpha_3)] \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2)} \forall L$$

$$\frac{\quad}{a(\alpha_1), \forall \alpha_3. a(\alpha_3) \supset b(\alpha_2 * \alpha_3) \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2)} \text{focL}$$

With the left rule for implication, we get two subgoals

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ a(\alpha_1), [b(\alpha_2 * Q)] \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2) \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ a(\alpha_1) \rightarrow [a(Q)] \end{array}}{a(\alpha_1), [a(Q) \supset b(\alpha_2 * Q)] \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2)} \supset L$$

$$\frac{\quad}{a(\alpha_1), [\forall \alpha_3. a(\alpha_3) \supset b(\alpha_2 * \alpha_3)] \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2)} \forall L$$

$$\frac{\quad}{a(\alpha_1), \forall \alpha_3. a(\alpha_3) \supset b(\alpha_2 * \alpha_3) \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2)} \text{focL}$$

Now the first subgoal succeeds, under the constraint $\alpha_2 * Q = \alpha_1 * \alpha_2$. In two more steps, the second subgoal also succeeds, with the constraint $\alpha_1 = Q$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{\alpha_1 = Q}{[a(\alpha_1)] \rightarrow a(Q)} \text{id} \\
 \frac{[a(\alpha_1)] \rightarrow a(Q)}{a(\alpha_1) \rightarrow a(Q)} \text{focL} \\
 \frac{\alpha_2 * Q = \alpha_1 * \alpha_2}{a(\alpha_1), [b(\alpha_2 * Q)] \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2)} \text{id} \quad \frac{a(\alpha_1) \rightarrow a(Q)}{a(\alpha_1) \rightarrow [a(Q)]} \text{blur} \\
 \frac{a(\alpha_1), [b(\alpha_2 * Q)] \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2)}{a(\alpha_1), [a(Q) \supset b(\alpha_2 * Q)] \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2)} \supset L \\
 \frac{a(\alpha_1), [a(Q) \supset b(\alpha_2 * Q)] \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2)}{a(\alpha_1), [\forall \alpha_3. a(\alpha_3) \supset b(\alpha_2 * \alpha_3)] \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2)} \forall L \\
 \frac{a(\alpha_1), [\forall \alpha_3. a(\alpha_3) \supset b(\alpha_2 * \alpha_3)] \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2)}{a(\alpha_1), \forall \alpha_3. a(\alpha_3) \supset b(\alpha_2 * \alpha_3) \rightarrow b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2)} \text{focL}
 \end{array}$$

Fortunately, we can solve all the constraints with the substitution $Q = \alpha_1$, so the above is a proof.

Note that its structure is identical to the proof if carried out in linear logic directly, except that one step may be replaced by two.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{[a] \rightarrow a} \text{id} \\
 \frac{[a] \rightarrow a}{a \rightarrow a} \text{focL} \\
 \frac{}{[b] \rightarrow b} \text{id} \quad \frac{a \rightarrow a}{a \rightarrow [a]} \text{blur} \\
 \frac{[b] \rightarrow b \quad a \rightarrow [a]}{a, [a \multimap b] \rightarrow b} \multimap L \\
 \frac{a, [a \multimap b] \rightarrow b}{a, a \multimap b \rightarrow b} \text{focL}
 \end{array}$$

In this presentation we have taken the liberty of guessing the split of resources in the $\multimap L$ rule. We could have done the same by guessing Q in the intuitionistic derivation above.

This correspondence can be made precise: our translation induces a bijective correspondence between focusing proofs in the source and the target. This theorem, for a larger fragment of linear logic, is proven in [RP10].

This kind of result allows us to use a theorem prover for, say, intuitionistic logic that can handle equations, to work as a theorem prover for linear logic.

References

- [Ree07] Jason Reed. Hybridizing a logical framework. In *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Hybrid Logic (HyLo'06)*, pages 135–148. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, v.174(6), 2007.
- [Ree09] Jason C. Reed. *A Hybrid Logical Framework*. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, September 2009. Available as Technical Report CMU-CS-09-155.
- [RP10] Jason C. Reed and Frank Pfenning. Focus-preserving embeddings of substructural logics in intuitionistic logic. Unpublished Manuscript, January 2010.