


Institute for Logic, Language and Computation

**COMPLETENESS AND DECIDABILITY OF THE
MIXED STYLE OF INFERENCE WITH COMPOSITION**

Makoto Kanazawa

ILLC Prepublication Series
for Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Language LP-93-09




University of Amsterdam

The ILLC Prepublication Series

1990 *Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Language*

- LP-90-01 Jaap van der Does A Generalized Quantifier Logic for Naked Infinitives
 LP-90-02 Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof Dynamic Montague Grammar
 LP-90-03 Renate Bartsch Concept Formation and Concept Composition
 LP-90-04 Aarne Ranta Intuitionistic Categorical Grammar
 LP-90-05 Patrick Blackburn Nominal Tense Logic
 LP-90-06 Gennaro Chierchia The Variability of Impersonal Subjects
 LP-90-07 Gennaro Chierchia Anaphora and Dynamic Logic
 LP-90-08 Herman Hendriks Flexible Montague Grammar
 LP-90-09 Paul Dekker The Scope of Negation in Discourse, towards a Flexible Dynamic Montague grammar
 LP-90-10 Theo M.V. Janssen Models for Discourse Markers
 LP-90-11 Johan van Benthem General Dynamics
 LP-90-12 Serge Lapierre A Functional Partial Semantics for Intensional Logic
 LP-90-13 Zhisheng Huang Logics for Belief Dependence
 LP-90-14 Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof Two Theories of Dynamic Semantics
 LP-90-15 Maarten de Rijke The Modal Logic of Inequality
 LP-90-16 Zhisheng Huang, Karen Kwast Awareness, Negation and Logical Omniscience
 LP-90-17 Paul Dekker Existential Disclosure, Implicit Arguments in Dynamic Semantics
 ML-90-01 Harold Schellinx *Mathematical Logic and Foundations* Isomorphisms and Non-Isomorphisms of Graph Models
 ML-90-02 Jaap van Oosten A Mathematical Proof of De Jongh's Theorem
 ML-90-03 Yde Venema Relational Games
 ML-90-04 Maarten de Rijke Unary Interpretability Logic
 ML-90-05 Domenico Zambella Sequences with Simple Initial Segments
 ML-90-06 Jaap van Oosten Extension of Lifschitz' Realizability to Higher Order Arithmetic, and a Solution to a Problem of F. Richman
 ML-90-07 Maarten de Rijke A Note on the Interpretability Logic of Finitely Axiomatized Theories
 ML-90-08 Harold Schellinx Some Syntactical Observations on Linear Logic
 ML-90-09 Dick de Jongh, Duccio Pianigiani Solution of a Problem of David Guaspari
 ML-90-10 Michiel van Lambalgen Randomness in Set Theory
 ML-90-11 Paul C. Gilmore The Consistency of an Extended NaDSets
 CT-90-01 John Tromp, Peter van Emde Boas *Computation and Complexity Theory* Associative Storage Modification Machines
 CT-90-02 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Gerard R. Renardel de Lavalette A Normal Form for PCSJ Expressions
 CT-90-03 Ricard Gavaldà, Leen Torenvliet, Osamu Watanabe, José L. Balcázar Generalized Kolmogorov Complexity in Relativized Separations
 CT-90-04 Harry Buhrman, Edith Spaan, Leen Torenvliet Bounded Reductions
 CT-90-05 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Karen Kwast Efficient Normalization of Database and Constraint Expressions
 CT-90-06 Michiel Smid, Peter van Emde Boas Dynamic Data Structures on Multiple Storage Media, a Tutorial
 CT-90-07 Kees Doets Greatest Fixed Points of Logic Programs
 CT-90-08 Fred de Geus, Ernest Rotterdam, Sieger van Denneheuvel, Peter van Emde Boas Physiological Modelling using RL
 CT-90-09 Roel de Vrijer Unique Normal Forms for Combinatory Logic with Parallel
Other Prepublications
 X-90-01 A.S. Troelstra Conditional, a case study in conditional rewriting
 X-90-02 Maarten de Rijke Remarks on Intuitionism and the Philosophy of Mathematics, Revised Version
 X-90-03 L.D. Beklemishev Some Chapters on Interpretability Logic
 X-90-04 Annual Report 1989
 X-90-05 Valentin Shehtman On the Complexity of Arithmetical Interpretations of Modal Formulae
 X-90-06 Valentin Goranko, Solomon Passy Derived Sets in Euclidean Spaces and Modal Logic
 X-90-07 V. Yu. Shavrukov Using the Universal Modality: Gains and Questions
 X-90-08 L.D. Beklemishev The Lindenbaum Fixed Point Algebra is Undecidable
 X-90-09 V. Yu. Shavrukov Provability Logics for Natural Turing Progressions of Arithmetical Theories
 X-90-10 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Peter van Emde Boas On Rosser's Provability Predicate
 X-90-11 Alessandra Carbone An Overview of the Rule Language RL/1
 X-90-12 Maarten de Rijke Provable Fixed points in $\mathcal{I}\Delta_0 + \Omega_1$, revised version
 X-90-13 K.N. Ignatiev Bi-Unary Interpretability Logic
 X-90-14 L.A. Chagrova Dzhaparidze's Polymodal Logic: Arithmetical Completeness, Fixed Point Property, Craig's Property
 X-90-15 A.S. Troelstra Undecidable Problems in Correspondence Theory
 X-90-16 A.S. Troelstra Lectures on Linear Logic
- 1991 LP-91-01 *Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Language* Wiebe van der Hoek, Maarten de Rijke Generalized Quantifiers and Modal Logic
 LP-91-02 Frank Veltman Defaults in Update Semantics
 LP-91-03 Willem Groeneveld Dynamic Semantics and Circular Propositions
 LP-91-04 Makoto Kanazawa The Lambek Calculus enriched with Additional Connectives
 LP-91-05 Zhisheng Huang, Peter van Emde Boas The Schoenmakers Paradox: Its Solution in a Belief Dependence Framework
 LP-91-06 Zhisheng Huang, Peter van Emde Boas Belief Dependence, Revision and Persistence
 LP-91-07 Henk Verkuyl, Jaap van der Does The Semantics of Plural Noun Phrases
 LP-91-08 Víctor Sánchez Valencia Categorical Grammar and Natural Reasoning
 LP-91-09 Arthur Nieuwendijk Semantics and Comparative Logic
 LP-91-10 Johan van Benthem Logic and the Flow of Information
- ML-91-01 Yde Venema *Mathematical Logic and Foundations* Cylindric Modal Logic
 ML-91-02 Alessandro Berarducci, Rineke Verbrugge On the Metamathematics of Weak Theories
 ML-91-03 Domenico Zambella On the Proofs of Arithmetical Completeness for Interpretability Logic
 ML-91-04 Raymond Hoofman, Harold Schellinx Collapsing Graph Models by Preorders
 ML-91-05 A.S. Troelstra History of Constructivism in the Twentieth Century
 ML-91-06 Inge Bethke Finite Type Structures within Combinatory Algebras
 ML-91-07 Yde Venema Modal Derivation Rules
 ML-91-08 Inge Bethke Going Stable in Graph Models
 ML-91-09 V. Yu. Shavrukov A Note on the Diagonalizable Algebras of PA and ZF
 ML-91-10 Maarten de Rijke, Yde Venema Sahlqvist's Theorem for Boolean Algebras with Operators
 ML-91-11 Rineke Verbrugge Feasible Interpretability
 ML-91-12 Johan van Benthem Modal Frame Classes, revisited
 CT-91-01 Ming Li, Paul M.B. Vitányi *Computation and Complexity Theory* Kolmogorov Complexity Arguments in Combinatorics
 CT-91-02 Ming Li, John Tromp, Paul M.B. Vitányi How to Share Concurrent Wait-Free Variables
 CT-91-03 Ming Li, Paul M.B. Vitányi Average Case Complexity under the Universal Distribution Equals Worst Case Complexity
 CT-91-04 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Karen Kwast Weak Equivalence
 CT-91-05 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Karen Kwast Weak Equivalence for Constraint Sets
 CT-91-06 Edith Spaan Census Techniques on Relativized Space Classes
 CT-91-07 Karen L. Kwast The Incomplete Database
 CT-91-08 Kees Doets Levationis Laus
 CT-91-09 Ming Li, Paul M.B. Vitányi Combinatorial Properties of Finite Sequences with high Kolmogorov Complexity
 CT-91-10 John Tromp, Paul Vitányi A Randomized Algorithm for Two-Process Wait-Free Test-and-Set
 CT-91-11 Lane A. Hemachandra, Edith Spaan Quasi-Injective Reductions
 CT-91-12 Krzysztof R. Apt, Dino Pedreschi Reasoning about Termination of Prolog Programs
 CL-91-01 J.C. Scholtes *Computational Linguistics* Kohonen Feature Maps in Natural Language Processing
 CL-91-02 J.C. Scholtes Neural Nets and their Relevance for Information Retrieval
 CL-91-03 Hub Prüst, Remko Scha, Martin van den Berg A Formal Discourse Grammar tackling Verb Phrase Anaphora
 X-91-01 Alexander Chagrov, Michael Zakharyashev *Other Prepublications* The Disjunction Property of Intermediate Propositional Logics
 X-91-02 Alexander Chagrov, Michael Zakharyashev On the Undecidability of the Disjunction Property of Intermediate Propositional Logics
 X-91-03 V. Yu. Shavrukov Subalgebras of Diagonalizable Algebras of Theories containing Arithmetic
 X-91-04 K.N. Ignatiev Partial Conservativity and Modal Logics
 X-91-05 Johan van Benthem Temporal Logic



Institute for Logic, Language and Computation

Plantage Muidersgracht 24

1018TV Amsterdam

Telephone 020-525.6051, Fax: 020-525.5101

COMPLETENESS AND DECIDABILITY OF THE MIXED STYLE OF INFERENCE WITH COMPOSITION

Makoto Kanazawa
Department of Linguistics
Stanford University

ILLC Prepublications
for Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Language
ISSN 0928-3307

Coordinating editor: Dick de Jongh

received October 1993

Completeness and Decidability of the Mixed Style of Inference with Composition

Makoto Kanazawa*
Department of Linguistics
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305–2150, USA
kanazawa@csl.i.stanford.edu

Abstract

I present a complete calculus for mixed inference [1] with composition and prove that it has the finite model property and is therefore decidable. I also present a variant of the calculus complete with respect to functional models, and mention the completeness and (un)decidability of other styles of inference involving composition, including dynamic inference [1].

A recent trend in one corner of logic is to regard the meaning of a sentence as a relation on information states. As discussed in [1], this ‘dynamic’ perspective gives rise to a number of new conceptions of inference, allowing different answers to the question of what it means for conclusion C to follow from premises P_1, \dots, P_n . One such dynamic notion of inference is what van Benthem [1] calls *mixed inference*, which is of particular interest for its connection to Veltman’s [8] update semantics. In this paper, we investigate mixed inference with respect to such standard logical questions as axiomatizability and decidability. Other dynamic styles of inference will be discussed briefly in the last section of the paper.

1 Van Benthem’s Mixed Inference

1.1 Calculus \mathbf{M}

In [1], van Benthem introduces the following calculus \mathbf{M} , to capture the general properties of the style of inference that he calls *mixed inference*. \mathbf{M} is a calculus for deriving a sequent from a set of sequents. In \mathbf{M} , a *sequent* is an expression of the form $X \Rightarrow d$, where X is a finite sequence of atomic formulas, and d is an atomic formula. In what follows, p, q, c, d (with or without subscripts) range over atomic formulas, and X, Y, Z, W, V (with or without subscripts) range over finite sequences of formulas.

Calculus \mathbf{M} .

- Axioms: \mathbf{M} has no axioms.

*I would like to thank Johan van Benthem for his guidance.

– Rules of Inference: \mathbf{M} has two rules of inference:¹

$$\text{Left Monotonicity} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow d}{X \Rightarrow d}$$

$$\text{Left Cut} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow c \quad X c Y \Rightarrow d}{X Y \Rightarrow d}$$

We write $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{M}} \mathcal{I}$ if Γ is a finite set of sequents and \mathcal{I} is a sequent derivable from sequents in Γ using the two rules of inference of \mathbf{M} .

1.2 Semantics

The intended semantics for \mathbf{M} is as follows. A model for \mathbf{M} is a structure $M = \langle |M|, R_0, R_1, R_2, \dots \rangle$, where $|M|$ is a non-empty set and each R_i is a binary relation on $|M|$.

- The interpretation $\llbracket q_i \rrbracket_M$ of the i -th atomic formula q_i is R_i .
- $M \models p_1 \dots p_n \Rightarrow d$ if and only if $\text{range}(\llbracket p_1 \rrbracket_M \circ \dots \circ \llbracket p_n \rrbracket_M) \subseteq \text{fix}(\llbracket d \rrbracket_M)$, where $\text{fix}(R) = \{x \mid \langle x, x \rangle \in R\}$.

We write $M \models \Gamma$ if $M \models \mathcal{I}$ for all \mathcal{I} in Γ .

- $\Gamma \models \mathcal{I}$ iff for all M , $M \models \Gamma$ implies $M \models \mathcal{I}$.

\mathbf{M} is complete with respect to the intended semantics in the sense that $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{M}} \mathcal{I}$ if and only if $\Gamma \models \mathcal{I}$. This is proved in [1], by showing a method of constructing for any finite set Γ of sequents a canonical model M_Γ such that for every sequent \mathcal{I} , $M_\Gamma \models \mathcal{I}$ if and only if $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{M}} \mathcal{I}$.

1.3 Decidability

It is easy to see that \mathbf{M} has the finite model property; i.e., \mathbf{M} is complete with respect to the class of finite models. This is so because the definition of $M \models \mathcal{I}$ translates into a universal first-order sentence without function symbols. Suppose $M \models \Gamma$ and $M \not\models p_1 \dots p_n \Rightarrow d$, so that there are x_0, \dots, x_n such that $\langle x_0, x_1 \rangle \in \llbracket p_1 \rrbracket_M, \dots, \langle x_{n-1}, x_n \rangle \in \llbracket p_n \rrbracket_M$ and $\langle x_n, x_n \rangle \notin \llbracket d \rrbracket_M$. Then the finite submodel M_0 of M such that $|M_0| = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ has $M_0 \models \Gamma$ and $M_0 \not\models p_1 \dots p_n \Rightarrow d$. That \mathbf{M} has the finite model property implies that it is decidable.

Grigori Mints (p.c.) has shown the decidability of \mathbf{M} using an equivalent natural deduction type calculus \mathbf{NDM} , for which he proves a normalization theorem. (See my notes [5, 6].)

¹In [1], the following version of Left Cut was used:

$$\text{Left Cut} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow c \quad Y X c Z \Rightarrow d}{Y X Z \Rightarrow d}$$

In the presence of Left Monotonicity, the two versions of Left Cut are equivalent.

2 Adding Connectives

The language of \mathbf{M} has no connective, so \mathbf{M} does not deal with complex formulas. It would be interesting to see how \mathbf{M} can be extended to languages with various connectives. Here we consider two conjunctions, \cap and \bullet , which are interpreted as intersection and composition, respectively. Let M be a model in the above sense. The interpretation of a complex formula is given as follows. (Below, P, C, D (with or without subscripts) range over (possibly complex) formulas.)

- $\llbracket D_1 \cap D_2 \rrbracket_M = \llbracket D_1 \rrbracket_M \cap \llbracket D_2 \rrbracket_M$.
- $\llbracket D_1 \bullet D_2 \rrbracket_M = \llbracket D_1 \rrbracket_M \circ \llbracket D_2 \rrbracket_M$.

A sequent is now an expression of the form $X \Rightarrow D$, where X is a finite sequence of (possibly complex) formulas, and D is a (possibly complex) formula. The definition of truth and semantic consequence remains the same, except that we are now dealing with complex formulas as well as atomic ones.

- $M \models P_1 \dots P_n \Rightarrow D$ if and only if $\text{range}(\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket_M \circ \dots \circ \llbracket P_n \rrbracket_M) \subseteq \text{fix}(\llbracket D \rrbracket_M)$.
- $\Gamma \models \mathcal{I}$ iff for all M , $M \models \Gamma$ implies $M \models \mathcal{I}$.

The problem now is to find a complete set of rules governing the newly introduced connectives.

2.1 Intersection

As usual, intersection is the easier one to deal with. It is quite straightforward to extend \mathbf{M} to the language with \cap as its only connective. (Below, $P[C]$ denotes a formula with a specified subformula occurrence C .)

Calculus $\mathbf{M}(\cap)$.

- Axioms: $\mathbf{M}(\cap)$ has no axioms.
- Rules of Inference: $\mathbf{M}(\cap)$ has the following rules of inference:

$$\text{Left Monotonicity} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow D}{P X \Rightarrow D}$$

$$\text{Left Cut} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow C \quad X C Y \Rightarrow D}{X Y \Rightarrow D}$$

$$(\cap \Rightarrow) \quad \frac{X P_i Y \Rightarrow D}{X P_1 \cap P_2 Y \Rightarrow D} \quad i = 1, 2$$

$$(\Rightarrow \cap_1) \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow D_1 \quad X \Rightarrow D_2}{X \Rightarrow D_1 \cap D_2}$$

$$(\Rightarrow \cap_2) \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow D_1 \cap D_2}{X \Rightarrow D_i} \quad i = 1, 2$$

$$(\text{Assoc. } \cap \Rightarrow) \quad \frac{X P[\{(C_1 \cap C_2) \cap C_3\}] Y \Rightarrow D}{X P[(C_1 \cap (C_2 \cap C_3))] Y \Rightarrow D} \quad \downarrow \uparrow \text{ both ways}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Perm. } \cap \Rightarrow) \quad & \frac{X P[(C_1 \cap C_2)] Y \Rightarrow D}{X P[(C_2 \cap C_1)] Y \Rightarrow D} \\ (\text{Contr. } \cap \Rightarrow) \quad & \frac{X P[(C \cap C)] Y \Rightarrow D}{X P[C] Y \Rightarrow D} \end{aligned}$$

The completeness of $\mathbf{M}(\cap)$ can be shown by a minor modification of van Benthem's [1] construction. The finite model property of $\mathbf{M}(\cap)$ is also obvious.

2.2 Composition

Let us now consider the language with \bullet as its only connective. Although it is not immediately obvious, the following set of rules turns out to constitute a complete calculus for this language.

Calculus $\mathbf{M}(\bullet)$.

- Axioms: $\mathbf{M}(\bullet)$ has no axioms.
- Rules of Inference: $\mathbf{M}(\bullet)$ has the following rules of inference:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Left Monotonicity} \quad & \frac{X \Rightarrow D}{P X \Rightarrow D} \\ \text{Left Cut} \quad & \frac{X \Rightarrow C \quad X C Y \Rightarrow D}{X Y \Rightarrow D} \\ (\bullet \Rightarrow_1) \quad & \frac{X P_1 P_2 Y \Rightarrow D}{X P_1 \bullet P_2 Y \Rightarrow D} \\ (\bullet \Rightarrow_2) \quad & \frac{X P_1 \bullet P_2 Y \Rightarrow D}{X P_1 P_2 Y \Rightarrow D} \\ (\Rightarrow \bullet_1) \quad & \frac{X \Rightarrow D_1 \quad X \Rightarrow D_2}{X \Rightarrow D_1 \bullet D_2} \\ (\Rightarrow \bullet_2) \quad & \frac{X D_1 \Rightarrow D_2 \quad X \Rightarrow D_1 \bullet D_3}{X \Rightarrow (D_1 \bullet D_2) \bullet D_3} \\ (\Rightarrow \text{Assoc. } \bullet) \quad & \frac{X \Rightarrow D[\{(C_1 \bullet C_2) \bullet C_3\}]}{X \Rightarrow D[(C_1 \bullet (C_2 \bullet C_3))]} \downarrow \uparrow \text{ both ways} \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\mathbf{M}(\bullet)$ also enjoys the finite model property, and is therefore decidable. This requires a slightly more elaborate argument than before.²

We prove the completeness and finite model property of $\mathbf{M}(\bullet)$ in the following three sections. Here, let us note

Lemma 2.1 *The following rule is derivable in $\mathbf{M}(\bullet)$:*

$$(\Rightarrow \bullet_3) \quad \frac{X D_1 \Rightarrow D_2 \quad X \Rightarrow D_1}{X \Rightarrow D_1 \bullet D_2}$$

²That $\mathbf{M}(\bullet)$ is decidable is perhaps mildly surprising, as it is easy to show that the corresponding calculus for *dynamic inference* [1] with composition is undecidable. See Section 8.

PROOF.

$$\frac{X \Rightarrow D_1 \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow D_1 \quad X D_1 \Rightarrow D_2}{X \Rightarrow D_2} \text{Left Cut}}{X \Rightarrow D_1 \bullet D_2} (\Rightarrow \bullet_1)$$

■

Remark $(\Rightarrow \bullet_1)$ and $(\Rightarrow \bullet_3)$ can be thought of as special cases of $(\Rightarrow \bullet_2)$, where D_1 and D_3 are ‘empty’, respectively.

3 Calculus $\mathbf{M}\mu$

In proving the completeness and finite model property of $\mathbf{M}(\bullet)$, it is convenient to work with an equivalent calculus $\mathbf{M}\mu$ with multiple succedents, whose language has no connective. An $\mathbf{M}\mu$ sequent is of the form $X \Rightarrow Y$, where X is a finite sequence of atomic formulas and Y is a non-empty finite sequence of atomic formulas.

Calculus $\mathbf{M}\mu$.

- Axioms: $\mathbf{M}\mu$ has no axioms.
- Rules of Inference: $\mathbf{M}\mu$ has three rules of inference:

$$\text{Left Monotonicity} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow Y}{p X \Rightarrow Y}$$

$$\text{Left Cut} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow Y \quad X Y Z \Rightarrow W}{X Z \Rightarrow W}$$

$$(\Rightarrow \bullet) \quad \frac{X Y \Rightarrow Z \quad X \Rightarrow Y W}{X \Rightarrow Y Z W}$$

The definition of truth for $\mathbf{M}\mu$ sequents is as follows:

- $M \models p_1 \dots p_n \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_m$ if and only if $\text{range}(\llbracket p_1 \rrbracket_M \circ \dots \circ \llbracket p_n \rrbracket_M) \subseteq \text{fix}(\llbracket d_1 \rrbracket_M \circ \dots \circ \llbracket d_m \rrbracket_M)$.

If \mathcal{I} is an $\mathbf{M}(\bullet)$ sequent, let $\mathcal{I}^\#$ be the $\mathbf{M}\mu$ sequent which results from erasing all occurrences of \bullet and parentheses in \mathcal{I} .

Lemma 3.1 $M \models \mathcal{I}$ if and only if $M \models \mathcal{I}^\#$.

Lemma 3.2 $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{M}(\bullet)} \mathcal{I}$ if and only if $\Gamma^\# \vdash_{\mathbf{M}\mu} \mathcal{I}^\#$, where $\Gamma^\# = \{ \mathcal{J}^\# \mid \mathcal{J} \in \Gamma \}$.

By the above lemmas, to show the completeness and finite model property of $\mathbf{M}(\bullet)$, it is enough to show the completeness and finite model property of $\mathbf{M}\mu$. In what follows, we write \vdash for $\vdash_{\mathbf{M}\mu}$.

4 Completeness

Given a finite set Γ of $\mathbf{M}\mu$ sequents, we construct a model M_Γ such that for all $\mathbf{M}\mu$ sequents \mathcal{I} , $M_\Gamma \models \mathcal{I}$ if and only if $\Gamma \vdash \mathcal{I}$.

Definition For any finite set Γ of $\mathbf{M}\mu$ sequents, M_Γ is the model such that

- $|M_\Gamma|$ consists of all finite sequences X of atomic formulas and all expressions of the form $X | Y$, where X is a non-empty finite sequence of atomic formulas and Y is any finite sequence of atomic formulas.
- For $\alpha, \beta \in |M_\Gamma|$, $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \in \llbracket p \rrbracket_{M_\Gamma}$ if and only if one of the following holds:
 - (i) $\beta = \alpha p$
 - (ii) $\alpha = X$ and $\beta = X p |$ for some X .
 - (iii) $\alpha = X Y$, $\beta = X$, and $\Gamma \vdash X \Rightarrow Y p$ for some X, Y .
 - (iv) $\alpha = X | Y Z$, $\beta = X | Y$, and $\Gamma \vdash X Y \Rightarrow Z p$ for some X, Y, Z .

In what follows, α, β, γ (with or without subscripts) range over elements of $|M_\Gamma|$. We use \mathbf{A} to denote the empty expression (which is in $|M_\Gamma|$). For every $\alpha \in |M_\Gamma|$, let $(\alpha)^\dagger = X Y$ if $\alpha = X | Y$, and $(\alpha)^\dagger = X$ if $\alpha = X$. Let $\text{lh}(\alpha)$ be the number of occurrences of atomic formulas in $(\alpha)^\dagger$.

Definition An expression of the form

$$\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_n} \alpha_n$$

is called a *path* (from α_0 to α_n) (in M_Γ) if $\langle \alpha_0, \alpha_1 \rangle \in \llbracket d_1 \rrbracket_{M_\Gamma}, \dots, \langle \alpha_{n-1}, \alpha_n \rangle \in \llbracket d_n \rrbracket_{M_\Gamma}$. The *label* of this path is $d_1 \dots d_n$.

The bar $|$ in $X | Y \in |M_\Gamma|$ is there to indicate that there is no way to get back from $X | Y$ to an initial segment X' of X . If $\alpha_0 (= X | Y) \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_n} \alpha_n$ is a path, $X |$ is an initial segment of each α_i ($0 \leq i \leq n$).

Definition A path $\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_n} \alpha_n$ is called *non-shrinking* if $\text{lh}(\alpha_0) \leq \text{lh}(\alpha_i)$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$. A non-shrinking path $\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_n} \alpha_n$ is called a *loop* if $n \geq 1$ and $\alpha_0 = \alpha_n$. A *minimal loop* is a loop with no proper subloop (i.e., a loop such that no proper subpath of it is a loop).

If $\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_n} \alpha_n$ is a non-shrinking path, α_0 is an initial segment of each α_i ($0 \leq i \leq n$). The following lemma is straightforward.

Lemma 4.1 *Let α and β be elements of $|M_\Gamma|$ such that $\beta = \alpha \gamma$ for some $\gamma \in |M_\Gamma|$. Then there exists a unique shortest path from α to β , and the label of this path is $(\gamma)^\dagger$.*

Lemma 4.2 *A non-shrinking path from α to β that does not contain a loop is the shortest path from α to β .*

PROOF. Let

$$\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_n} \alpha_n \tag{1}$$

be a non-shrinking path. (1) is the shortest path from α_0 to α_n if and only if $\text{lh}(\alpha_{i+1}) = \text{lh}(\alpha_i) + 1$ for $0 \leq i < n$. Suppose that (1) is not the shortest path from α_0 to α_n , so that for some i such that $0 \leq i < n$, $\text{lh}(\alpha_i) \geq \text{lh}(\alpha_{i+1})$. Pick

the smallest such i . Then (1) must begin with

$$\alpha_0 (= \alpha \gamma_0) \xrightarrow{d_1} \alpha_0 \gamma_1 \xrightarrow{d_2} \dots \xrightarrow{d_i} \alpha_0 \gamma_i$$

where $(\gamma_k)^\dagger = d_1 \dots d_k$ ($0 \leq k \leq i$), and α_{i+1} must be $\alpha_0 \gamma_j$ for some j such that $0 \leq j \leq i$. Thus,

$$\alpha_0 \gamma_j \xrightarrow{d_{j+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{d_i} \alpha_0 \gamma_i \xrightarrow{d_{i+1}} \alpha_0 \gamma_j$$

is a loop, which is contained in (1). \blacksquare

Lemma 4.3 *If $\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_n} \alpha_n$ is a minimal loop, then $\Gamma \vdash (\alpha_0)^\dagger \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_n$.*

PROOF. The path $\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_{n-1}} \alpha_{n-1}$ is non-shrinking and does not contain a loop, so by Lemma 4.2, it is the shortest path from α_0 to α_{n-1} . Then it must be that $\alpha_{n-1} = \alpha_0 d_1 \dots d_{n-1}$, and the lemma follows. \blacksquare

Lemma 4.4 *If $\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_n} \alpha_n$ is a loop, then $\Gamma \vdash (\alpha_0)^\dagger \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_n$.*

PROOF. By induction on the number k of proper subloops in $\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_n} \alpha_n$.

CASE 1. $k = 0$. By Lemma 4.3.

CASE 2. $k \geq 1$. Take the leftmost minimal subloop $\alpha_i \xrightarrow{d_{i+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{d_j} \alpha_j (= \alpha_i)$ of $\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_n} \alpha_n$. The path $\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_i} \alpha_i$ is non-shrinking and does not contain a loop, so by Lemma 4.2, it is the shortest path from α_0 to α_i . Note that $\alpha_i = \alpha_0 \gamma$ for some γ . Then, by Lemma 4.1, $d_1 \dots d_i = (\gamma)^\dagger$, so $(\alpha_i)^\dagger = (\alpha_0)^\dagger d_1 \dots d_i$. Hence by Lemma 4.3,

$$\Gamma \vdash (\alpha_0)^\dagger d_1 \dots d_i \Rightarrow d_{i+1} \dots d_j \quad (2)$$

Moreover, $\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_i} \alpha_i (= \alpha_j) \xrightarrow{d_{j+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{d_n} \alpha_n$ is a loop with no more than $k - 1$ subloops, so by the induction hypothesis,

$$\Gamma \vdash (\alpha_0)^\dagger \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_i d_{j+1} \dots d_n \quad (3)$$

From (2) and (3), we get

$$\Gamma \vdash (\alpha_0)^\dagger \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_i d_{i+1} \dots d_j d_{j+1} \dots d_n$$

by $(\Rightarrow \bullet)$. \blacksquare

Corollary 4.5 *If*

$$\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_n} \alpha_n$$

is a path and $\alpha_0 = \alpha_n = X$ | for some X , then

$$\Gamma \vdash X \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_n.$$

PROOF. Every path that starts from $X \mid$ must be non-shrinking, so $\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{d_n} \alpha_n$ is a loop. ■

Lemma 4.6 *If $\Gamma \vdash \mathcal{I}$, then $M_\Gamma \models \mathcal{I}$.*

PROOF. Assume that $\Gamma \vdash p_1 \dots p_n \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_m$ and there is a path

$$\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{p_1} \dots \xrightarrow{p_n} \alpha_n.$$

Given the construction of M_Γ , it suffices to show

$$\Gamma \vdash (\alpha_n)^\dagger \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_m \quad (4)$$

for, then, there is a loop

$$\alpha_n \xrightarrow{d_1} \alpha_n d_1 \xrightarrow{d_2} \dots \xrightarrow{d_{m-1}} \alpha_n d_1 \dots d_{m-1} \xrightarrow{d_m} \alpha_n.$$

Since $\Gamma \vdash p_1 \dots p_n \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_m$ by assumption, $\Gamma \vdash (\alpha_0)^\dagger p_1 \dots p_n \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_m$ by Left Monotonicity. Note that, by Lemma 4.1, $(\alpha_0)^\dagger$ is the label of the shortest path from \mathbf{A} to α_0 , and so $(\alpha_0)^\dagger p_1 \dots p_n$ is the label of a path from \mathbf{A} to α_n . Thus, to prove (4), it suffices to show that if there is a path

$$\beta_0 (= \mathbf{A}) \xrightarrow{c_1} \dots \xrightarrow{c_l} \beta_l \quad (5)$$

and

$$\Gamma \vdash c_1 \dots c_l \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_m \quad (6)$$

then

$$\Gamma \vdash (\beta_l)^\dagger \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_m \quad (7)$$

We prove this by induction on the number k of loops in (5).

CASE 1. $k = 0$. Then, by Lemma 4.2, (5) is the shortest path from \mathbf{A} to β_l and, by Lemma 4.1, $c_1 \dots c_l = (\beta_l)^\dagger$. So (6) is (7).

CASE 2. $k \geq 1$. Take a leftmost loop

$$\beta_i \xrightarrow{c_{i+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{c_j} \beta_j (= \beta_i)$$

in (5). Since by Lemma 4.2 $\beta_0 \xrightarrow{c_1} \dots \xrightarrow{c_i} \beta_i$ must be the shortest path from $\beta_0 (= \mathbf{A})$ to β_i , $c_1 \dots c_i = (\beta_i)^\dagger$ by Lemma 4.1. By Lemma 4.4, then,

$$\Gamma \vdash c_1 \dots c_i \Rightarrow c_{i+1} \dots c_j \quad (8)$$

From (6) and (8),

$$\Gamma \vdash c_1 \dots c_i c_{j+1} \dots c_l \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_m$$

by Left Cut. But

$$\beta_0 (= \mathbf{A}) \xrightarrow{c_1} \dots \xrightarrow{c_i} \beta_i (= \beta_j) \xrightarrow{c_{j+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{c_l} \beta_l$$

is a path with no more than $k - 1$ loops, so the induction hypothesis applies to give (7). ■

Theorem 1 *$M_\Gamma \models \mathcal{I}$ if and only if $\Gamma \vdash \mathcal{I}$.*

PROOF. The *if* direction is Lemma 4.6, and the *only if* direction follows from Corollary 4.5, noting that $p_1 \dots p_n \in \text{range}(\llbracket p_1 \rrbracket_{M_\Gamma} \circ \dots \circ \llbracket p_n \rrbracket_{M_\Gamma})$, and the fact that every path starting from \mathbf{A} must be non-shrinking (to take care of the case of empty antecedent). ■

5 Filtration

That $\mathbf{M}\mu$ has the finite model property can be shown by the method of filtration.

Let a finite set Γ of $\mathbf{M}\mu$ sequents and an $\mathbf{M}\mu$ sequent $p_1 \dots p_N \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_L$ be given, and suppose that $M \models \Gamma$ and $M \not\models p_1 \dots p_N \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_L$. Below, we shall describe a method of constructing a finite model M_0 such that $M_0 \models \Gamma$ and $M_0 \not\models p_1 \dots p_N \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_L$.

In this section, we write

$$x \xrightarrow{q} y$$

to mean $\langle x, y \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_M$. Let \mathcal{P} be the (finite) set of atomic formulas that appear in $\Gamma \cup \{p_1 \dots p_N \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_L\}$.

Definition Let $w \in |M|$ be such that $w \in \text{range}(\llbracket p_1 \rrbracket_M \circ \dots \circ \llbracket p_N \rrbracket_M)$ and $w \notin \text{fix}(\llbracket d_1 \rrbracket_M \circ \dots \circ \llbracket d_L \rrbracket_M)$. For each natural number n , define an equivalence relation \equiv_n on $|M|$ by induction as follows. For every $x, y \in |M|$,

$$\begin{aligned} x \equiv_0 y & \text{ iff } x = y = w \text{ or } x \neq w, y \neq w \\ x \equiv_{n+1} y & \text{ iff } \text{(i) } x \equiv_n y \text{ and} \\ & \text{(ii) for all } z \in |M| \text{ and all } q \in \mathcal{P}, \\ & \text{ if } z \xrightarrow{q} x, \text{ then for some } v \in |M|, \\ & v \xrightarrow{q} y \text{ and } z \equiv_n v \\ & \text{ and vice versa.} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.1 *For each n , \equiv_n has only finitely many equivalence classes.*

PROOF. Induction on n . The basis $n = 0$ is obvious. For the induction step, assume that \equiv_n has $f(n)$ equivalence classes. The clause (ii) of the definition of \equiv_{n+1} can be rewritten as

$$\{ \langle q, [z]_{\equiv_n} \rangle \mid q \in \mathcal{P}, z \in |M|, z \xrightarrow{q} x \} = \{ \langle q, [z]_{\equiv_n} \rangle \mid q \in \mathcal{P}, z \in |M|, z \xrightarrow{q} y \}.$$

($[z]_{\equiv_n} = \{v \in |M| \mid z \equiv_n v\}$.) This makes it clear that \equiv_{n+1} has at most $f(n) \cdot 2^{\text{card}(\mathcal{P}) \cdot f(n)}$ equivalence classes. ($\text{card}(A)$ is the cardinality of A .) ■

Lemma 5.2 *Let $k \leq n$. If*

$$x_0 \equiv_n y_0 \xrightarrow{c_1} x_1 \equiv_n y_1 \xrightarrow{c_2} \dots \xrightarrow{c_k} x_k \equiv_n y_k,$$

then there are z_0, \dots, z_k such that

$$x_0 \equiv_{n-k} z_0 \xrightarrow{c_1} z_1 \xrightarrow{c_2} \dots \xrightarrow{c_k} z_k \equiv_n y_k.$$

PROOF. Induction on k . The case $k = 0$ is obvious. Let $k \geq 1$ and suppose

$$x_0 \equiv_n y_0 \xrightarrow{c_1} x_1 \equiv_n y_1 \xrightarrow{c_2} \dots \xrightarrow{c_k} x_k \equiv_n y_k.$$

By induction hypothesis, there are z_1, \dots, z_k such that

$$x_1 \equiv_{n-k+1} z_1 \xrightarrow{c_2} \dots \xrightarrow{c_k} z_k \equiv_n y_k.$$

Since $n - k + 1 \geq 1$ and $y_0 \xrightarrow{c_1} x_1$ and $x_1 \equiv_{n-k+1} z_1$, there must be a z_0 such that $z_0 \xrightarrow{c_1} z_1$ and $y_0 \equiv_{n-k} z_0$. Since $x_0 \equiv_n y_0$, we have $x_0 \equiv_{n-k} z_0$. ■

Corollary 5.3 *Let $k \leq n$. If*

$$w = x_0 \equiv_n y_0 \xrightarrow{c_1} x_1 \equiv_n y_1 \xrightarrow{c_2} \dots \xrightarrow{c_k} x_k \equiv_n y_k = w,$$

then there are z_0, \dots, z_k such that

$$w = z_0 \xrightarrow{c_1} z_1 \xrightarrow{c_2} \dots \xrightarrow{c_k} z_k = w.$$

Definition For each n , define a model M/\equiv_n as follows:

- $|M/\equiv_n| = \{ [x]_{\equiv_n} \mid x \in |M| \}$.
- $\llbracket q \rrbracket_{M/\equiv_n} = \{ \langle [x]_{\equiv_n}, [y]_{\equiv_n} \rangle \mid \langle x, y \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_M \}$.

By Lemma 5.1, M/\equiv_n is a finite model for each n .

Let K be the maximal length of antecedents in Γ .

Lemma 5.4 *If $n \geq K$, $M/\equiv_n \models \Gamma$.*

PROOF. Let $c_1 \dots c_k \Rightarrow q_1 \dots q_j \in \Gamma$, and let $[y_k]_{\equiv_n} \in \text{range}(\llbracket c_1 \rrbracket_{M/\equiv_n} \circ \dots \circ \llbracket c_k \rrbracket_{M/\equiv_n})$. Then there must be $y_0, x_1, y_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, y_{k-1}, x_k$ such that

$$y_0 \xrightarrow{c_1} x_1 \equiv_n y_1 \xrightarrow{c_2} \dots \xrightarrow{c_k} x_k \equiv_n y_k.$$

$k \leq K \leq n$. Then, by Lemma 5.2, there are z_0, \dots, z_k such that

$$z_0 \xrightarrow{c_1} \dots \xrightarrow{c_k} z_k \equiv_n y_k.$$

Since $M \models \Gamma$, there must be v_0, \dots, v_j such that

$$z_k = v_0 \xrightarrow{q_1} \dots \xrightarrow{q_j} v_j = z_k.$$

It follows that $[y_k]_{\equiv_n} \in \text{fix}(\llbracket q_1 \rrbracket_{M/\equiv_n} \circ \dots \circ \llbracket q_j \rrbracket_{M/\equiv_n})$. ■

Lemma 5.5 *If $n \geq L$, $[w]_{\equiv_n} \notin \text{fix}(\llbracket d_1 \rrbracket_{M/\equiv_n} \circ \dots \circ \llbracket d_L \rrbracket_{M/\equiv_n})$.*

PROOF. Immediate from Corollary 5.3 and the assumption about w . ■

Theorem 2 *If $n \geq \max(K, L)$, then M/\equiv_n is a finite model such that $M/\equiv_n \models \Gamma$ and $M/\equiv_n \not\models p_1 \dots p_N \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_L$.*

PROOF. By Lemmas 5.1, 5.4, 5.5, and the fact that $[w]_{\equiv_n} \in \text{range}(\llbracket p_1 \rrbracket_{M/\equiv_n} \circ \dots \circ \llbracket p_N \rrbracket_{M/\equiv_n})$. ■

6 Reduction to Propositional Dynamic Logic with Intersection

Decidability of $\mathbf{M}\mu$ can also be shown by a translation into propositional dynamic logic with intersection, which is known to be decidable [2]. In what follows, I assume familiarity with propositional dynamic logic.

Definition Let $\text{tr}(p_1 \dots p_n \Rightarrow d_1 \dots d_m) = [p_1] \dots [p_n] \langle (d_1; \dots; d_m) \cap (\top)? \rangle \top$. Let $\text{tr}(\{\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_k\}) = \text{tr}(\mathcal{I}_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \text{tr}(\mathcal{I}_k)$.

Lemma 6.1 *Let \mathcal{I} be an $\mathbf{M}\mu$ sequent. $M \models \mathcal{I}$ in mixed inference if and only if $M \models \text{tr}(\mathcal{I})$ in propositional dynamic logic with intersection.*

Lemma 6.2 *Let Γ be a finite set of $\mathbf{M}\mu$ sequents, \mathcal{I} be an $\mathbf{M}\mu$ sequent, and q_1, \dots, q_l be the atomic formulas occurring in $\Gamma \cup \{\mathcal{I}\}$. Then $\Gamma \models \mathcal{I}$ in mixed inference if and only if $\models [(q_1 \cup \dots \cup q_l)^*] \text{tr}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{tr}(\mathcal{I})$ in propositional dynamic logic with intersection.*

PROOF. The *if* direction is clear. For the *only if* direction, assume that $M, w \models [(q_1 \cup \dots \cup q_l)^*] \text{tr}(\Gamma)$ and $M, w \models \neg \text{tr}(\mathcal{I})$. Let M_0 be the submodel of M whose states are those that can be reached from w via $(q_1 \cup \dots \cup q_l)^*$. Then $M_0 \models \text{tr}(\Gamma)$ and $M_0, w \models \neg \text{tr}(\mathcal{I})$. This means that $M_0 \models \Gamma$ and $M_0 \not\models \mathcal{I}$, so $\Gamma \not\models \mathcal{I}$. ■

7 Functional Models

Let us call a model $M = \langle |M|, R_0, R_1, R_2, \dots \rangle$ where each R_i is a partial function a *functional model*. It is interesting to consider mixed inference with respect to the class of functional models, because of the close connection with update semantics of Veltman [8].³

In the simple case where there is no connective and the succedent of the sequent is a single formula, addition of the following rule to \mathbf{M} results in a calculus complete with respect to functional models. Let us call the resulting calculus \mathbf{U} .

$$\text{Cautious Monotonicity} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow c \quad X Y \Rightarrow d}{X c Y \Rightarrow d}$$

In the multiple succedent case (which is equivalent to having composition), more rules become necessary:

$$\text{Cautious Monotonicity} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow Y \quad X Z \Rightarrow W}{X Y Z \Rightarrow W}$$

$$(\Rightarrow \bullet^{-1}) \quad \frac{X Y \Rightarrow Z \quad X \Rightarrow Y Z W}{X \Rightarrow Y W}$$

$$\text{Rotation} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow Y Z}{X Y \Rightarrow Z Y}$$

³A difference between update semantics and mixed inference with respect to functional models is that Reflexivity $P \Rightarrow P$ holds in the former, but not in the latter.

The calculus which results from adding the above three rules to $\mathbf{M}\mu$ is called $\mathbf{U}\mu$. $\mathbf{U}\mu$ can be shown to be complete with respect to functional models. I state the necessary results without proof.

Definition For any finite set Γ of multiple-succedent sequents, $M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{U}\mu}$ is the model such that

$$\begin{aligned} - |M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{U}\mu}| &= \{ X \mid X \text{ is a finite sequence of atomic formulas and} \\ &\quad \neg \exists X_1 X_2 X_3 (X = X_1 X_2 X_3 \wedge X_2 \neq \mathbf{A} \wedge \Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{U}\mu} X_1 \Rightarrow X_2) \}. \\ - \llbracket p \rrbracket_{M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{U}\mu}} &= \{ \langle X, X p \rangle \mid X, X p \in |M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{U}\mu}| \} \cup \\ &\quad \{ \langle X Y, X \rangle \mid X Y \in |M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{U}\mu}|, \Gamma \vdash X \Rightarrow Y p \}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.1 *In $M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{U}\mu}$, the interpretation of each atomic formula is a total function.*

Below, I write

$$X \xrightarrow{d_1 \dots d_n} Y$$

to mean $\langle X, Y \rangle \in \llbracket d_1 \rrbracket_{M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{U}\mu}} \circ \dots \circ \llbracket d_n \rrbracket_{M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{U}\mu}}$.

Lemma 7.2 *If $\mathbf{A} \xrightarrow{W} X$, then $\Gamma \cup \{X \Rightarrow Y\} \vdash_{\mathbf{U}\mu} W \Rightarrow Y$ for any Y .*

Lemma 7.3 *If $X \xrightarrow{Y} X$, then $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{U}\mu} X \Rightarrow Y$.*

Lemma 7.4 *If $M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{U}\mu} \models X \Rightarrow Y$, then $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{U}\mu} X \Rightarrow Y$.*

Lemma 7.5 *If $\mathbf{A} \xrightarrow{W} X$, then $\Gamma \cup \{W \Rightarrow Y\} \vdash_{\mathbf{U}\mu} X \Rightarrow Y$ for any Y .*

Lemma 7.6 *If $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{U}\mu} X \Rightarrow Y$ and $X \in |M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{U}\mu}|$, then $X \xrightarrow{Y} X$.*

Lemma 7.7 *If $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{U}\mu} X \Rightarrow Y$, then $M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{U}\mu} \models X \Rightarrow Y$.*

Theorem 3 *$\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{U}\mu} X \Rightarrow Y$ if and only if $M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{U}\mu} \models X \Rightarrow Y$.*

Theorem 3 shows that $\mathbf{U}\mu$ is complete with respect to models where the interpretation of each atomic formula is a *total* function.

The calculus \mathbf{U} for the single succedent case is decidable. As in the case of \mathbf{M} , this is easy to see by translation into first-order logic, noting that the partial functionality of the relevant relations can be expressed by universal first-order sentences. On the other hand, I have been unable to prove the decidability of $\mathbf{U}\mu$. The method of filtration used in Section 5 does not necessarily lead to functional models, so proof of the finite model property would require additional work.⁴

⁴Note also that the problem of whether or not a formula of propositional dynamic logic with intersection has a deterministic model is Σ_1^1 -hard [4].

8 Other Styles of Inference

Let us consider the styles of inference determined by the following stipulations:

- (a) $M \models P_1 \dots P_n \Rightarrow C$ if and only if $\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket_M \circ \dots \circ \llbracket P_n \rrbracket_M \subseteq \llbracket C \rrbracket_M$.
- (b) $M \models P_1 \dots P_n \Rightarrow C$ if and only if $\text{range}(\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket_M \circ \dots \circ \llbracket P_n \rrbracket_M) \subseteq \text{dom}(\llbracket C \rrbracket_M)$.
- (c) $M \models P_1 \dots P_n \Rightarrow C$ if and only if $\text{dom}(\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket_M \circ \dots \circ \llbracket P_n \rrbracket_M) \subseteq \text{dom}(\llbracket C \rrbracket_M)$.

The first notion (a), called *dynamic inference* in [1], is axiomatized as follows. The first calculus \mathbf{L} is for the single succedent (connective-free) case, and the second calculus $\mathbf{L}\mu$ is for the multiple succedent case.

Calculus \mathbf{L} .

- Axiom: Reflexivity $p \Rightarrow p$
- Rule of Inference:

$$\text{Cut} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow c \quad Y \ c \ Z \Rightarrow d}{Y \ X \ Z \Rightarrow d}$$

Calculus $\mathbf{L}\mu$.

- Axiom: Reflexivity $X \Rightarrow X$
- Rule of Inference:

$$\text{Cut} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow Y \quad Z \ Y \ W \Rightarrow V}{Z \ X \ W \Rightarrow V}$$

One can extract from $\mathbf{L}\mu$ the calculus $\mathbf{L}(\bullet)$ for dynamic inference with composition. \mathbf{L} and $\mathbf{L}(\bullet)$ are fragments of the Lambek calculus, and the completeness of \mathbf{L} and $\mathbf{L}(\bullet)$ (or $\mathbf{L}\mu$) is a consequence of the known strong completeness of the Lambek calculus with respect to relational semantics [7].

The problem ‘ $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{L}} X \Rightarrow d?$ ’ is decidable in cubic time, while the problem ‘ $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{L}\mu} X \Rightarrow Y?$ ’ (or, equivalently, ‘ $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{L}(\bullet)} X \Rightarrow D?$ ’) is undecidable. This follows from the observation that the first problem is equivalent to the universal membership problem for context-free grammars, and the second to that for semi-Thue systems (Type 0 grammars). That is, if we reverse the arrows of sequents, single-succedent sequents behave just like rules of context-free grammars, and multiple-succedent sequents behave just like unrestricted rewriting rules. Reflexivity and Cut have the effect of taking the reflexive transitive closure of one-step rewriting, and derivations in the two calculi precisely correspond to the derivations in the respective types of grammars. The undecidability of $\mathbf{L}\mu$ (or, equivalently, of $\mathbf{L}(\bullet)$) contrasts with the situation with mixed inference and the other two styles of inference considered below.

The remaining two styles of inference, (b) and (c), are axiomatized by the following calculi $\mathbf{G}\mu$ and $\mathbf{E}\mu$, respectively (in the multiple succedent case).⁵

⁵The style of inference given by (b) is related to dynamic predicate logic of Groenendijk and Stokhof [3].

Calculus $\mathbf{G}\mu$.

- Axioms: $\mathbf{G}\mu$ has no axioms.
- Rules of Inference:

$$\text{Left Monotonicity} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow Y}{p X \Rightarrow Y}$$

$$\text{Right Anti-Monotonicity} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow Y \ d}{X \Rightarrow Y}$$

$$(\Rightarrow \bullet_3) \quad \frac{X Y \Rightarrow Z \quad X \Rightarrow Y}{X \Rightarrow Y Z}$$

Calculus $\mathbf{E}\mu$.

- Axiom: Reflexivity $X \Rightarrow X$
- Rules of Inference:

$$\text{Right Monotonicity} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow Y}{X p \Rightarrow Y}$$

$$\text{Right Cut} \quad \frac{X \Rightarrow Y \quad Z Y \Rightarrow W}{Z X \Rightarrow W}$$

The completeness of $\mathbf{G}\mu$ and of $\mathbf{E}\mu$ can be shown by a canonical model construction. Here, I only note the definitions of canonical models.

Definition For any finite set Γ of multiple-succedent sequents, $M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{G}\mu}$ is the model such that

- $|M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{G}\mu}|$ consists of all finite sequences X of atomic formulas and all expressions of the form $X | Y$ where X and Y are finite sequences of atomic formulas.
- For $\alpha, \beta \in |M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{G}\mu}|$, $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \in \llbracket p \rrbracket_{M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{G}\mu}}$ if and only if one of the following holds:
 - (i) $\alpha = X$ and $\beta = X p$ for some X .
 - (ii) $\alpha = X$ and $\beta = X p |$ for some X .
 - (iii) $\alpha = X | Y$, $\beta = X | Y p$, and $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{G}\mu} X \Rightarrow Y p$ for some X, Y .

Definition For any finite set Γ of multiple-succedent sequents, $M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{E}\mu}$ is the model such that

- $|M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{E}\mu}|$ consists of all expressions of the form $X | Y$ where X and Y are finite sequences of atomic formulas.
- For $\alpha, \beta \in |M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{E}\mu}|$, $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \in \llbracket p \rrbracket_{M_\Gamma^{\mathbf{E}\mu}}$ if and only if $\alpha = X | Y$, $\beta = X | Y p$, and $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{E}\mu} X \Rightarrow Y p$ for some X, Y .

The finite model property of $\mathbf{G}\mu$ can be proved in exactly the same way as for $\mathbf{M}\mu$, using the same definition of \equiv_n . As for $\mathbf{E}\mu$, a minor modification (using the ‘forward’ version of \equiv_n) works. Also, the decidability of $\mathbf{G}\mu$ and $\mathbf{E}\mu$

can be shown by reduction to propositional dynamic logic (this time using only regular program constructions).

References

- [1] van Benthem, Johan. 1991. Logic and the Flow of Information. CSLI Report No. CSLI-91-160. Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University. (Also in D. Prawitz, B. Skyrms, and D. Westerståhl, eds., *Proceedings 9th International Congress of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, North Holland, Amsterdam.)
- [2] Danecki, Ryszard. 1985. Nondeterministic Propositional Dynamic Logic with Intersection is Decidable. In A. Skowron, ed., *Computation Theory, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **208**, pp. 34–53, Springer, Berlin.
- [3] Groenendijk, Jeroen and Martin Stokhof. 1991. Dynamic Predicate Logic. *Linguistics and Philosophy* **14**, 39–101.
- [4] Harel, David. 1983. Recurring Dominoes: Making the Highly Undecidable Highly Understandable. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Foundations of Computing Theory, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **158**, pp. 177–194, Springer, Berlin.
- [5] Kanazawa, Makoto. 1993. Decidability of the Mixed Style of Inference. Manuscript, Stanford University.
- [6] Kanazawa, Makoto. 1993. Natural Deduction for the Mixed Style of Inference. Manuscript, Stanford University.
- [7] Mikulás, Szabolcs. 1992. The Completeness of the Lambek Calculus with Respect to Relational Semantics. ITLI Prepublication Series LP-92-03. Institute for Language, Logic and Information, University of Amsterdam.
- [8] Veltman, Frank. 1991. Defaults in Update Semantics. ITLI Prepublication Series LP-91-02. Institute for Language, Logic and Information, University of Amsterdam.

The ILLC Prepublication Series

- X-91-06 Annual Report 1990
X-91-07 A.S. Troelstra Lectures on Linear Logic, Errata and Supplement
X-91-08 Giorgie Dzhaparidze Logic of Tolerance
X-91-09 L.D. Beklemishev On Bimodal Provability Logics for Π_1 -axiomatized Extensions of Arithmetical Theories
X-91-10 Michiel van Lambalgen Independence, Randomness and the Axiom of Choice
X-91-11 Michael Zakharyashev Canonical Formulas for K4. Part I: Basic Results
X-91-12 Herman Hendriks Flexibele Categoriale Syntaxis en Semantiek: de proefschriften van Frans Zwarts en Michael Moortgat
X-91-13 Max I. Kanovich The Multiplicative Fragment of Linear Logic is NP-Complete
X-91-14 Max I. Kanovich The Horn Fragment of Linear Logic is NP-Complete
X-91-15 V. Yu. Shavrukov Subalgebras of Diagonalizable Algebras of Theories containing Arithmetic, revised version
X-91-16 V.G. Kanovei Undecidable Hypotheses in Edward Nelson's Internal Set Theory
X-91-17 Michiel van Lambalgen Independence, Randomness and the Axiom of Choice, Revised Version
X-91-18 Giovanna Cepparello New Semantics for Predicate Modal Logic: an Analysis from a standard point of view
X-91-19 Papers presented at the Provability Interpretability Arithmetic Conference, 24-31 Aug. 1991, Dept. of Phil., Utrecht University
1992 *Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Language* Annual Report 1991
LP-92-01 Víctor Sánchez Valencia Lambek Grammar: an Information-based Categorical Grammar
LP-92-02 Patrick Blackburn Modal Logic and Attribute Value Structures
LP-92-03 Szabolcs Mikulás The Completeness of the Lambek Calculus with respect to Relational Semantics
LP-92-04 Paul Dekker An Update Semantics for Dynamic Predicate Logic
LP-92-05 David I. Beaver The Kinematics of Presupposition
LP-92-06 Patrick Blackburn, Edith Spaan A Modal Perspective on the Computational Complexity of Attribute Value Grammar
LP-92-07 Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof A Note on Interrogatives and Adverbs of Quantification
LP-92-08 Maarten de Rijke A System of Dynamic Modal Logic
LP-92-09 Johan van Benthem Quantifiers in the world of Types
LP-92-10 Maarten de Rijke Meeting Some Neighbours (a dynamic modal logic meets theories of change and knowledge representation)
LP-92-11 Johan van Benthem A note on Dynamic Arrow Logic
LP-92-12 Heinrich Wansing Sequent Calculi for Normal Modal Propositional Logics
LP-92-13 Dag Westerståhl Iterated Quantifiers
LP-92-14 Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof Interrogatives and Adverbs of Quantification
ML-92-01 A.S. Troelstra *Mathematical Logic and Foundations* Comparing the theory of Representations and Constructive Mathematics
ML-92-02 Dmitriy P. Skvortsov, Valentin B. Shehtman Maximal Kripke-type Semantics for Modal and Superintuitionistic Predicate Logics
ML-92-03 Zoran Marković On the Structure of Kripke Models of Heyting Arithmetic
ML-92-04 Dimitar Vakarelov A Modal Theory of Arrows, Arrow Logics I
ML-92-05 Domenico Zambella Shavrukov's Theorem on the Subalgebras of Diagonalizable Algebras for Theories containing $\text{ID}_0 + \text{EXP}$
ML-92-06 D.M. Gabbay, Valentin B. Shehtman Undecidability of Modal and Intermediate First-Order Logics with Two Individual Variables
ML-92-07 Harold Schellinx How to Broaden your Horizon
ML-92-08 Raymond Hoofman Information Systems as Coalgebras
ML-92-09 A.S. Troelstra Realizability
ML-92-10 V.Yu. Shavrukov A Smart Child of Peano's
CT-92-01 Erik de Haas, Peter van Emde Boas *Computation and Complexity Theory* Object Oriented Application Flow Graphs and their Semantics
CT-92-02 Karen L. Kwast, Sieger van Denneheuvel Weak Equivalence: Theory and Applications
CT-92-03 Krzysztof R. Apt, Kees Doets A new Definition of SLDNF-resolution
X-92-01 Heinrich Wansing *Other Prepublications* The Logic of Information Structures
X-92-02 Konstantin N. Ignatiev The Closed Fragment of Dzhaparidze's Polymodal Logic and the Logic of Σ_1 conservativity
X-92-03 Willem Groeneveld Dynamic Semantics and Circular Propositions, revised version
X-92-04 Johan van Benthem Modeling the Kinematics of Meaning
X-92-05 Erik de Haas, Peter van Emde Boas Object Oriented Application Flow Graphs and their Semantics, revised version
1993 *Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Language* Parallel Quantification
LP-93-01 Martijn Spaan Dynamic Generalized Quantifiers and Monotonicity
LP-93-02 Makoto Kanazawa Completeness of the Lambek Calculus with respect to Relativized Relational Semantics
LP-93-03 Nikolai Pankrat'ev Identity, Quarrelling with an Unproblematic Notion
LP-93-04 Jacques van Leeuwen Sums and Quantifiers
LP-93-05 Jaap van der Does Updates in Dynamic Semantics
LP-93-06 Paul Dekker On the Equivalence of Lambek Categorical Grammars and Basic Categorical Grammars
LP-93-07 Wojciech Buszkowski Information Acquisition from Multi-Agent resources; abstract
LP-93-08 Zisheng Huang, Peter van Emde Boas Completeness and Decidability of the Mixed Style of Inference with Composition
LP-93-09 Makoto Kanazawa Weak vs. Strong Readings of Donkey Sentences and Monotonicity Inference in a Dynamic Setting
LP-93-10 Makoto Kanazawa *Mathematical Logic and Foundations* Commutative Lambek Categorical Grammars
ML-93-01 Maciej Kandulski Modal Quantification over Structured Domains
ML-93-02 Johan van Benthem, Natasha Alechina The Conjoinability Relation in Lambek Calculus and Linear Logic
ML-93-03 Mati Pentus Bounded Contraction and Many-Valued Semantics
ML-93-04 Andreja Prijatelj Models of the Untyped λ -calculus in Semi Cartesian Closed Categories
ML-93-05 Raymond Hoofman, Harold Schellinx Categorical Generalization of Algebraic Recursion Theory
ML-93-06 J. Zashchepko Algorithmic Problems Concerning First-Order Definability of Modal Formulas on the Class of All Finite Frames
ML-93-07 A.V. Chagrov, L.A. Chagrova Remarks on the Theory of Semi-Functors
ML-93-08 Raymond Hoofman, Ieke Moerdijk Natural Deduction for Intuitionistic Linear Logic
ML-93-09 A.S. Troelstra Harold Schellinx
ML-93-10 Vincent Danos, Jean-Baptiste Joinet, The Structure of Exponentials: Uncovering the Dynamics of Linear Logic Proofs
ML-93-11 Lex Hendriks Inventory of Fragments and Exact Models in Intuitionistic Propositional Logic
ML-93-12 V.Yu. Shavrukov Remarks on Uniformly Finitely Precomplete Positive Equivalences
ML-93-13 V.Yu. Shavrukov Undecidability in Diagonalizable Algebras
ML-93-14 Dick de Jongh, Albert Visser Embeddings of Heyting Algebras
ML-93-15 G.K. Dzhaparidze Effective Truth
ML-93-16 Maarten de Rijke Correspondence Theory for Extended Modal Logics
ML-93-17 Alexander Chagrov, Michael Zakharyashev On the Independent Axiomatizability of Modal and Intermediate Logics
ML-93-18 Jaap van Oosten Extensional Realizability
ML-93-19 Raymond Hoofman Comparing Models of the Non-Extensional Typed λ -Calculus
CT-93-01 Marianne Kalsbeek *Computation and Complexity Theory*
CT-93-02 Sophie Fischer The Vanilla Meta-Interpreter for Definite Logic Programs and Ambivalent Syntax
CT-93-03 Johan van Benthem, Jan Bergstra A Note on the Complexity of Local Search Problems
CT-93-04 Karen L. Kwast, Sieger van Denneheuvel Logic of Transition Systems
CT-93-05 Erik Aarts The Meaning of Duplicates in the Relational Database Model
CT-93-06 Krzysztof R. Apt Proving Theorems of the Lambek Calculus of Order 2 in Polynomial Time
CL-93-01 Noor van Leusen, László Kálmán Declarative programming in Prolog
CL-93-02 Theo M.V. Janssen *Computational Linguistics* The Interpretation of Free Focus
X-93-01 Paul Dekker *Other Prepublications*
X-93-02 Maarten de Rijke An Algebraic View On Rosetta
X-93-03 Michiel Leezenberg Existential Disclosure, revised version
X-93-04 A.S. Troelstra (editor) What is Modal Logic?
X-93-05 A.S. Troelstra (editor) Gorani Influence on Central Kurdish: Substratum or Prestige Borrowing
X-93-06 Michael Zakharyashev Metamathematical Investigation of Intuitionistic Arithmetic and Analysis, Corrections to the First Edition
Metamathematical Investigation of Intuitionistic Arithmetic and Analysis, Second, corrected Edition
Canonical Formulas for K4. Part II: Cofinal Subframe Logics