


Institute for Logic, Language and Computation

LAMBEK CALCULUS IS L-COMPLETE

Mati Pentus

ILLC Prepublication Series
for Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Language LP-93-14



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 Arne 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 Lapiere 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 Semantical 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 NaDSet
 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 Conditional, a case study in Conditional Rewriting
 Other Prepublications
 X-90-01 A.S. Troelstra Remarks on Intuitionism and the Philosophy of Mathematics, Revised Version
 X-90-02 Maarten de Rijke Some Chapters on Interpretability Logic
 X-90-03 L.D. Beklemishev On the Complexity of Arithmetical Interpretations of Modal Formulae
 X-90-04 Annual Report 1989
 X-90-05 Valentin Shehtman Derived Sets in Euclidean Spaces and Modal Logic
 X-90-06 Valentin Goranko, Solomon Passy Using the Universal Modality: Gains and Questions
 X-90-07 V. Yu. Shavrukov The Lindenbaum Fixed Point Algebra is Undecidable
 X-90-08 L.D. Beklemishev Provability Logics for Natural Turing Progressions of Arithmetical Theories
 X-90-09 V. Yu. Shavrukov On Rosser's Provability Predicate
 X-90-10 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Peter van Emde Boas An Overview of the Rule Language RL/1
 X-90-11 Alessandra Carbone Provable Fixed points in $\text{IA}_0 + \Omega_1$, revised version
 X-90-12 Maarten de Rijke Bi-Unary Interpretability Logic
 X-90-13 K.N. Ignatiev Dzhaparidze's Polymodal Logic: Arithmetical Completeness, Fixed Point Property, Craig's Property
 X-90-14 L.A. Chagrova Undecidable Problems in Correspondence Theory
 X-90-15 A.S. Troelstra Lectures on Linear Logic

1991 LP-91-01 Wiebe van der Hoek, Maarten de Rijke *Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Language* 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
 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



Institute for Logic, Language and Computation

Plantage Muidersgracht 24
1018TV Amsterdam
Telephone 020-525.6051, Fax: 020-525.5101

LAMBEK CALCULUS IS L-COMPLETE

Mati Pentus

Department of Mathematical Logic, Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics
Moscow State University, Moscow, RUSSIA, 119899

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

Coordinating editor: Dick de Jongh

received November 1993

Lambek calculus is L-complete

Mati Pentus

September 30, 1993

Abstract

We prove that the Lambek calculus is complete w.r.t. L-models, i.e., free semigroup models. We also prove the completeness w.r.t. relational models over the natural linear order of integers.

Introduction

In 1958 J. Lambek [8] introduced a calculus for deriving reduction laws of syntactic types. *Free semigroup models* (also called *language models* or *L-models*) for this calculus were considered in [2], [3], and [4]. The more general class of *groupoid models* has been studied in [5], [6], and [7]. In [3] W. Buszkowski established that the product-free fragment of the Lambek calculus is L-complete (i.e., complete w.r.t. free semigroup models), using the canonical model. The question of L-completeness of the full Lambek calculus remained open (cf. [1]).

This problem has attracted the attention of the group of mathematical logicians attending S. Artemov's workshops at Moscow University. In 1991-1992 N. Pankratiev presented an exposition of the latest results in the field and noticed that canonical models can not be used for proving L-completeness of the full calculus.

In December 1992, after one of the workshops at Moscow University M. Kanovich announced about a positive solution of the language completeness problem for the full Lambek calculus. However, he has not presented the proof yet. A fortnight later, at the end of December 1992, the author of this paper came up with his own proof. It has been improved after several talks in Amsterdam and Moscow. Here we deliver the modified proof.

Another interesting particular case of groupoid semantics considered here is relational semantics. Sz. Mikulás proved in 1992 [9] that the Lambek calculus is complete w.r.t. relational models (R-models for short). N. Pankratiev [10] proved the completeness w.r.t. R-models over the left-divisor relation in a special residuated semigroup. In this paper we prove the completeness of the Lambek calculus w.r.t. models on a very simple frame, namely on the natural order of integers.

1 Preliminaries

1.1 Lambek calculus

We consider the syntactic calculus introduced in [8]. The types of the Lambek calculus are built of primitive types p_1, p_2, \dots , and three binary connectives $\bullet, \backslash, /$. We shall denote the set of all types by Tp . The set of finite sequences of types (resp. finite non-empty sequences of types) is denoted by Tp^* (resp. Tp^+). The symbol Λ will stand for the empty sequence of types.

Capital letters A, B, \dots range over types. Capital Greek letters range over finite (possibly empty) sequences of types.

Sequents of the Lambek calculus are of the form $\Gamma \rightarrow A$, where Γ is a non-empty sequence of types.

Axioms: $A \rightarrow A$

Rules:

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{A\Pi \rightarrow B}{\Pi \rightarrow A \backslash B} (\rightarrow \backslash) \quad \text{where } \Pi \neq \Lambda \qquad \frac{\Phi \rightarrow A \quad \Gamma B \Delta \rightarrow C}{\Gamma \Phi (A \backslash B) \Delta \rightarrow C} (\backslash \rightarrow) \\ \\ \frac{\Pi A \rightarrow B}{\Pi \rightarrow B / A} (\rightarrow /) \quad \text{where } \Pi \neq \Lambda \qquad \frac{\Phi \rightarrow A \quad \Gamma B \Delta \rightarrow C}{\Gamma (B / A) \Phi \Delta \rightarrow C} (/ \rightarrow) \\ \\ \frac{\Gamma \rightarrow A \quad \Delta \rightarrow B}{\Gamma \Delta \rightarrow A \bullet B} (\rightarrow \bullet) \qquad \frac{\Gamma A B \Delta \rightarrow C}{\Gamma (A \bullet B) \Delta \rightarrow C} (\bullet \rightarrow) \\ \\ \frac{\Phi \rightarrow B \quad \Gamma B \Delta \rightarrow A}{\Gamma \Phi \Delta \rightarrow A} (CUT) \end{array}$$

The cut-elimination theorem for this calculus is proved in [8]. We write $L \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow A$ if the sequent $\Gamma \rightarrow A$ is derivable in the Lambek calculus.

Definition. The *length* of a type is defined as the total number of primitive type occurrences in the type.

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_i\| &\equiv 1 & \|A \bullet B\| &\equiv \|A\| + \|B\| \\ \|A \backslash B\| &\equiv \|A\| + \|B\| & \|A / B\| &\equiv \|A\| + \|B\| \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for sequences of types we put $\|A_1 \dots A_n\| \equiv \|A_1\| + \dots + \|A_n\|$.

Definition. The set of primitive types *occurring* in a type is defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(p_i) &\equiv \{p_i\} & \text{Var}(A \bullet B) &\equiv \text{Var}(A) \cup \text{Var}(B) \\ \text{Var}(A \backslash B) &\equiv \text{Var}(A) \cup \text{Var}(B) & \text{Var}(A / B) &\equiv \text{Var}(A) \cup \text{Var}(B) \end{aligned}$$

Definition. For any integer m , we write $\text{Tp}(m)$ for the finite set of types

$$\text{Tp}(m) \equiv \{A \in \text{Tp} \mid \text{Var}(A) \subseteq \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m\} \text{ and } \|A\| \leq m\}.$$

By $\text{Tp}(m)^+$ we denote the set of all non-empty finite sequences of types from $\text{Tp}(m)$.

Definition. For any two integers m and n , we write $\text{LST}_{m,n}$ (limited sequences of types) for the following finite subset of $\text{Tp}(m)^+$.

$$\text{LST}_{m,n} \rightleftharpoons \{A_1 \dots A_l \mid 1 \leq l \leq n, A_1 \in \text{Tp}(m), \dots, A_l \in \text{Tp}(m)\}$$

Definition. Sometimes we shall write $\bullet(A_1 \dots A_n)$ or $A_1 \bullet \dots \bullet A_n$ instead of $(\dots (A_1 \bullet A_2) \bullet \dots \bullet A_n)$.

1.2 Partial semigroup models

Definition. We say that $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ \rangle$ is a partial semigroup iff \circ is a partial function from $\mathbf{W} \times \mathbf{W}$ into \mathbf{W} such that, whenever $a \circ (b \circ c)$ or $(a \circ b) \circ c$ is defined, the other expression is also defined and $a \circ (b \circ c) = (a \circ b) \circ c$. (We do not exclude the case $\mathbf{W} = \emptyset$.)

Example 1 Here are some examples of partial semigroups.

(a) Any semigroup.

(b) The free semigroup with a countable set of generators.

Here \mathbf{W} is the set of all non-empty words over the alphabet $\{a_j \mid j \in \mathbf{N}\}$ (\mathbf{N} stands for the set of all natural numbers). The binary operator \circ is the concatenation of words.

(c) The free semigroup with two generators.

(d) A binary relational frame (*R-frame* for short).

Here $\mathbf{W} \subset \mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{D}$ and \mathbf{W} is an irreflexive transitive binary relation over a domain \mathbf{D} .

$$\langle s_1, t_1 \rangle \circ \langle s_2, t_2 \rangle \rightleftharpoons \begin{cases} \langle s_1, t_2 \rangle & \text{if } t_1 = s_2 \\ \text{undefined} & \text{if } t_1 \neq s_2 \end{cases}$$

Here $s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2 \in \mathbf{D}$.

(e) The natural order on integers as a binary relational frame (we shall denote this R-frame by $\langle \mathbf{Z}, \circ \rangle$).

$$\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{Z}, \quad \mathbf{W} = \{\langle s, t \rangle \mid s \in \mathbf{Z}, t \in \mathbf{Z}, \text{ and } s < t\}$$

By \mathbf{Z} we denote the set of all integers. The operation \circ is defined as in (d).

(f) The natural order on a finite interval of integers $[p, q]$, where $p \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $q \in \mathbf{Z}$.

$$\mathbf{D}_{[p,q]} = [p, q] = \{s \in \mathbf{Z} \mid p \leq s \leq q\}$$

$$\mathbf{W}_{[p,q]} = \{\langle s, t \rangle \mid s \in \mathbf{Z}, t \in \mathbf{Z}, \text{ and } p \leq s < t \leq q\}$$

The operation \circ is defined as in (d).

We shall denote by \mathcal{S}_Z the class¹ of all partial semigroups from Example 1 (f).

Definition. Let $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ \rangle$ be a partial semigroup.

We say that $\langle \mathbf{V}, * \rangle$ is a *sub-partial-semigroup* of $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ \rangle$ iff

- (1) $V \subseteq W$;
- (2) V is closed under $*$;
- (3) $*$ is the restriction of \circ to V .

Remark. The associativity law holds automatically in every sub-partial-semigroup.

Example 2 Every partial semigroup from \mathcal{S}_Z is a sub-partial-semigroup of $\langle \mathbf{Z}, \circ \rangle$.

We shall use the following shorthand notation. For any sets $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathbf{W}$ and $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbf{W}$ we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{T} &\doteq \{ \gamma \in \mathbf{W} \mid \text{there are } \alpha \in \mathcal{R} \text{ and } \beta \in \mathcal{T} \text{ such that } \alpha \circ \beta = \gamma \}; \\ \mathcal{R} \circ \beta &\doteq \mathcal{R} \circ \{ \beta \}; \quad \alpha \circ \mathcal{T} \doteq \{ \alpha \} \circ \mathcal{T}. \end{aligned}$$

We shall denote the set of all subsets of a set \mathbf{W} by $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{W})$.

Definition. A partial semigroup model $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ is a partial semigroup $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ \rangle$ together with a valuation w associating with each type of the Lambek calculus a subset of \mathbf{W} (i.e., $w: \text{Tp} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{W})$) and satisfying for any types A and B the following conditions.

- (1) $w(A \cdot B) = w(A) \circ w(B)$
- (2) $w(A \setminus B) = \{ \gamma \in \mathbf{W} \mid \text{for all } \alpha \in w(A), \text{ if } \alpha \circ \gamma \text{ is defined then } \alpha \circ \gamma \in w(B) \}$
- (3) $w(B / A) = \{ \gamma \in \mathbf{W} \mid \text{for all } \alpha \in w(A), \text{ if } \gamma \circ \alpha \text{ is defined then } \gamma \circ \alpha \in w(B) \}$

Remark. One can reformulate (2) and (3) as follows.

- (2') $w(A \setminus B) = \{ \gamma \in \mathbf{W} \mid w(A) \circ \gamma \in w(B) \}$
- (3') $w(B / A) = \{ \gamma \in \mathbf{W} \mid \gamma \circ w(A) \in w(B) \}$

For any valuation w and for any types A_1, \dots, A_n , we write $\bar{w}(A_1 \dots A_n)$ as a shorthand for $w(A_1) \circ \dots \circ w(A_n)$.

Definition. A sequent $\Gamma \rightarrow B$ is *true* in a model $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ iff $\bar{w}(\Gamma) \subseteq w(B)$.

A sequent is *false* in a model iff it is not true in the model.

Definition. A partial semigroup model $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ is called an *R-model* iff $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ \rangle$ is an R-frame (cf. Example 1 (d)).

¹In this paper ‘class’ and ‘set’ are synonyms.

Remark. Partial semigroups form a subclass of associative ternary frames [7].

It is known that the Lambek calculus is sound w.r.t. associative ternary frames. Thus it is also sound w.r.t. all partial semigroup models, i.e., $\bar{w}(\Gamma) \subseteq w(B)$ for any partial semigroup model $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$, whenever $L \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow B$. On the other hand, W. Buszkowski [5] has proved that the Lambek calculus is complete w.r.t. models over arbitrary semigroups (Example 1 (a)). The completeness w.r.t. models over binary relational frames (Example 1 (d)) has been proved by Sz. Mikulás [9].

In this paper we prove that the Lambek calculus is also complete w.r.t. smaller classes of models, namely the models over the partial semigroups presented in Example 1 (b), (c) and (e).

The problem of completeness w.r.t. finite linear R-models (i.e., models over R-frames from \mathcal{S}_Z) is still open.

2 Quasimodels

In this section we introduce the notion of $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodels and describe an algorithm of constructing a partial semigroup model as the limit of an infinite sequence of $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodels, which are conservative extensions of each other.

Definition. A *quasimodel* $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ is a valuation w over a partial semigroup $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ \rangle$ such that

- (1) $w(A \bullet B) = w(A) \circ w(B)$ for any $A \in \text{Tp}$, $B \in \text{Tp}$;
- (2) if $L \vdash A \rightarrow B$ then $w(A) \subseteq w(B)$.

Remark. Every partial semigroup model is a quasimodel.

Definition. A $\text{Tp}(m)$ -*quasimodel* $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ is a valuation w over a partial semigroup $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ \rangle$ such that

- (1) if $A \bullet B \in \text{Tp}(m)$, then $w(A \bullet B) = w(A) \circ w(B)$;
- (2) if $\Gamma \in \text{Tp}(m)^+$, $B \in \text{Tp}(m)$, and $L \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow B$, then $\bar{w}(\Gamma) \subseteq w(B)$.

Remark. In the definition of a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel the condition (1) can be replaced by (1').

- (1') If $A \bullet B \in \text{Tp}(m)$, then $w(A \bullet B) \subseteq w(A) \circ w(B)$.

(Note that $w(A) \circ w(B) \subseteq w(A \bullet B)$ follows from (2)).

Lemma 2.1 *Every quasimodel is a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel for any m .*

PROOF. (1) is obvious. To prove (2) we assume $L \vdash A_1 \dots A_l \rightarrow B$ and verify that $w(A_1) \circ \dots \circ w(A_l) \subseteq w(B)$, where $A_1 \in \text{Tp}(m)$, \dots , $A_l \in \text{Tp}(m)$, and $B \in \text{Tp}(m)$.

Evidently $w(A_1) \circ \dots \circ w(A_l) = w(A_1 \cdot \dots \cdot A_l)$. Note that $L \vdash A_1 \cdot \dots \cdot A_l \rightarrow B$, whence $w(A_1 \cdot \dots \cdot A_l) \subseteq w(B)$. ■

Definition. A sequent $\Gamma \rightarrow A$ is *true* in a quasimodel (resp. $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel) $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ iff $\bar{w}(\Gamma) \subseteq w(A)$.

Definition. A $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ is a *conservative extension* of another $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ, v \rangle$ iff

- (1) $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ \rangle$ is a sub-partial-semigroup of $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ \rangle$;
- (2) $w(A) \cap \mathbf{V} = v(A)$ for any type A .

Remark. The condition (2) can be reformulated in the following way.

(2') For any $\alpha \in \mathbf{V}$ and for any type A , $\alpha \in v(A)$ if and only if $\alpha \in w(A)$.

Remark. If $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ is a conservative extension of $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ, v \rangle$, then $v(A) \subseteq w(A)$ for every $A \in \text{Tp}$.

Lemma 2.2 *If $\langle \mathbf{W}_2, \circ, w_2 \rangle$ is a conservative extension of $\langle \mathbf{W}_1, \circ, w_1 \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{W}_3, \circ, w_3 \rangle$ is a conservative extension of $\langle \mathbf{W}_2, \circ, w_2 \rangle$, then $\langle \mathbf{W}_3, \circ, w_3 \rangle$ is a conservative extension of $\langle \mathbf{W}_1, \circ, w_1 \rangle$.*

PROOF. Evidently \mathbf{W}_1 is a sub-partial-semigroup of \mathbf{W}_3 .

In view of $\mathbf{W}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{W}_2$ we have $w_3(A) \cap \mathbf{W}_1 = w_3(A) \cap (\mathbf{W}_2 \cap \mathbf{W}_1) = (w_3(A) \cap \mathbf{W}_2) \cap \mathbf{W}_1$. Further, $(w_3(A) \cap \mathbf{W}_2) \cap \mathbf{W}_1 = w_2(A) \cap \mathbf{W}_1 = w_1(A)$. ■

Definition. We say that a sequence of $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodels $\langle \mathbf{W}_i, \circ, w_i \rangle$ ($i \in \mathbf{N}$) is *conservative* iff, for every $i \in \mathbf{N}$, $\langle \mathbf{W}_{i+1}, \circ, w_{i+1} \rangle$ is a conservative extension of $\langle \mathbf{W}_i, \circ, w_i \rangle$. (Here m is constant.)

Definition. The *limit* of a conservative sequence $\langle \mathbf{W}_i, \circ, w_i \rangle$ ($i \in \mathbf{N}$) is the $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel $\langle \mathbf{W}_\infty, \circ, w_\infty \rangle$ defined as follows.

- (i) $\mathbf{W}_\infty \rightleftharpoons \bigcup_{i \in \mathbf{N}} \mathbf{W}_i$
- (ii) $w_\infty(A) \rightleftharpoons \bigcup_{i \in \mathbf{N}} w_i(A)$

Lemma 2.3 *The definition of the limit is correct, i.e., $\langle \mathbf{W}_\infty, \circ, w_\infty \rangle$ is really a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel.*

PROOF.

(1) Proof of \subseteq .

Let $A \cdot B \in \text{Tp}(m)$ and $\gamma \in w_\infty(A \cdot B)$. Then $\gamma \in w_n(A \cdot B) = w_n(A) \circ w_n(B)$ for some n .

Thus $\gamma = \alpha \circ \beta$, where $\alpha \in w_n(A)$ and $\beta \in w_n(B)$. Evidently $\alpha \in w_\infty(A)$ and $\beta \in w_\infty(B)$, whence $\gamma = \alpha \circ \beta \in w_\infty(A) \circ w_\infty(B)$.

(1) Proof of \supseteq .

Let $A \bullet B \in \text{Tp}(m)$ and $\gamma \in w_\infty(A) \circ w_\infty(B)$. Then $\gamma = \alpha \circ \beta$, where $\alpha \in w_\infty(A)$ and $\beta \in w_\infty(B)$, i.e., $\alpha \in w_i(A)$ and $\beta \in w_j(B)$ for some i and j . Put $n \doteq \max(i, j)$.

Note that $\langle \mathbf{W}_n, \circ, w_n \rangle$ is a conservative extension of $\langle \mathbf{W}_i, \circ, w_i \rangle$. Hence $\alpha \in w_n(A)$. Similarly $\beta \in w_n(B)$. Thus $\gamma = \alpha \circ \beta \in w_n(A) \circ w_n(B) = w_n(A \bullet B) \subseteq w_\infty(A \bullet B)$.

(2)

Let $L \vdash A_1 \dots A_l \rightarrow B$, where $A_1 \in \text{Tp}(m), \dots, A_l \in \text{Tp}(m)$, and $B \in \text{Tp}(m)$. Assume that $\gamma \in \overline{w_\infty}(A_1 \dots A_l)$, i.e., $\gamma = \alpha_1 \circ \dots \circ \alpha_l$, where $\alpha_1 \in w_\infty(A_1), \dots, \alpha_l \in w_\infty(A_l)$. Then $\alpha_1 \in w_{i_1}(A_1), \dots, \alpha_l \in w_{i_l}(A_l)$ for some $i_1, \dots, i_l \in \mathbb{N}$. Put $n \doteq \max(i_1, \dots, i_l)$.

Evidently $\alpha_1 \in w_n(A_1), \dots, \alpha_l \in w_n(A_l)$, whence $\gamma = \alpha_1 \circ \dots \circ \alpha_l \in \overline{w_n}(A_1 \dots A_l) \subseteq w_n(B) \subseteq w_\infty(B)$. ■

Lemma 2.4 *The limit of a conservative sequence is a conservative extension of any of the elements of the sequence.*

PROOF. We verify that $w_\infty(A) \cap \mathbf{W}_i = w_i(A)$. If $i \leq j$ then $w_i(A) \subseteq w_j(A)$. Thus $w_\infty(A) = \bigcup_j w_j(A) = \bigcup_{j \geq i} w_j(A)$, whence $w_\infty(A) \cap \mathbf{W}_i = (\bigcup_{j \geq i} w_j(A)) \cap \mathbf{W}_i = \bigcup_{j \geq i} (w_j(A) \cap \mathbf{W}_i)$. Note that $w_j(A) \cap \mathbf{W}_i = w_i(A)$ for any $j \geq i$. Now $\bigcup_{j \geq i} (w_j(A) \cap \mathbf{W}_i) = \bigcup_{j \geq i} w_i(A) = w_i(A)$. ■

Definition. Let $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ be a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel. Let $A, B \in \text{Tp}$, $\alpha \in \mathbf{W}$, $\gamma \in \mathbf{W}$, and $\gamma \notin w(A \setminus B)$. We say that α is a *witness of $\gamma \notin w(A \setminus B)$* iff $\alpha \circ \gamma$ is defined, $\alpha \in w(A)$, and $\alpha \circ \gamma \notin w(B)$.

Let $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ be a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel. Let $A, B \in \text{Tp}$, $\alpha \in \mathbf{W}$, $\gamma \in \mathbf{W}$, and $\gamma \notin w(B/A)$. We say that α is a *witness of $\gamma \notin w(B/A)$* iff $\gamma \circ \alpha$ is defined, $\alpha \in w(A)$, and $\gamma \circ \alpha \notin w(B)$.

Remark. Let $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ be a partial semigroup model. Then for any $A \in \text{Tp}$, $B \in \text{Tp}$, $\gamma \in \mathbf{W}$, if $\gamma \notin w(A \setminus B)$ then there is a witness of $\gamma \notin w(A \setminus B)$ in $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$.

Definition. Let $\langle \mathbf{U}, \circ \rangle$ be a partial semigroup. Let \mathcal{K} be a class of $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodels over sub-partial-semigroups of $\langle \mathbf{U}, \circ \rangle$. We say that the class \mathcal{K} is *witnessed* iff

- (1) for any $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ, v \rangle \in \mathcal{K}$, for any type of the form $A \setminus B$ from $\text{Tp}(m)$, and for any $\gamma \in \mathbf{V}$, if $\gamma \notin v(A \setminus B)$ then there is a conservative extension $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ of $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ, v \rangle$ in \mathcal{K} and $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ contains a witness of $\gamma \notin w(A \setminus B)$;
- (2) for any $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ, v \rangle \in \mathcal{K}$, for any type of the form B/A from $\text{Tp}(m)$, and for any $\gamma \in \mathbf{V}$, if $\gamma \notin v(B/A)$ then there is a conservative extension $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ of $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ, v \rangle$ in \mathcal{K} and $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ contains a witness of $\gamma \notin w(B/A)$.

Theorem 1 *Let m be a positive integer and \mathcal{K} be a witnessed class of $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodels over sub-partial-semigroups of a countable partial semigroup $\langle \mathbf{U}, \circ \rangle$. Let $E \in \text{Tp}(m)$, $F \in \text{Tp}(m)$, and the sequent $E \rightarrow F$ be false in a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel from \mathcal{K} .*

Then $E \rightarrow F$ is also false in a partial semigroup model over a sub-partial-semigroup of $\langle \mathbf{U}, \circ \rangle$.

PROOF. The following proof is similar to the R-completeness proof in [9].

Evidently there is a function $\sigma: \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \text{Tp}(m) \times \mathbf{U}$ such that for any $\gamma \in \mathbf{U}$ and for any $C \in \text{Tp}(m)$ there are infinitely many natural numbers i , for which $\sigma(i) = \langle C, \gamma \rangle$. For example, the function σ can be obtained from any bijection $\tau: \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \text{Tp}(m) \times \mathbf{U} \times \mathbf{N}$.

Given a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel $\langle \mathbf{W}_0, \circ, w_0 \rangle$, in which $E \rightarrow F$ is false, we define by induction on i a conservative sequence $\langle \mathbf{W}_i, \circ, w_i \rangle$ ($i \in \mathbf{N}$).

CASE 1:

If $\sigma(i) = \langle A \setminus B, \gamma \rangle$, $\gamma \in \mathbf{W}_i$, $\gamma \notin w_i(A \setminus B)$, and there are no witnesses of $\gamma \notin w_i(A \setminus B)$ in $\langle \mathbf{W}_i, \circ, w_i \rangle$, then take $\langle \mathbf{W}_{i+1}, \circ, w_{i+1} \rangle$ to be any conservative extension of $\langle \mathbf{W}_i, \circ, w_i \rangle$ in \mathcal{K} , containing a witness of $\gamma \notin w_{i+1}(A \setminus B)$. Such a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel $\langle \mathbf{W}_{i+1}, \circ, w_{i+1} \rangle$ exists, since \mathcal{K} is witnessed.

CASE 2:

If $\sigma(i) = \langle B/A, \gamma \rangle$, $\gamma \in \mathbf{W}_i$, $\gamma \notin w_i(B/A)$, and there are no witnesses of $\gamma \notin w_i(B/A)$ in $\langle \mathbf{W}_i, \circ, w_i \rangle$, then take $\langle \mathbf{W}_{i+1}, \circ, w_{i+1} \rangle$ to be any conservative extension of $\langle \mathbf{W}_i, \circ, w_i \rangle$ in \mathcal{K} , containing a witness of $\gamma \notin w_{i+1}(B/A)$.

CASE 3:

Otherwise put $\langle \mathbf{W}_{i+1}, \circ, w_{i+1} \rangle \doteq \langle \mathbf{W}_i, \circ, w_i \rangle$.

Let $\langle \mathbf{W}_\infty, \circ, w_\infty \rangle$ be the limit of the conservative sequence $\langle \mathbf{W}_i, \circ, w_i \rangle$. Evidently, $E \rightarrow F$ is false in $\langle \mathbf{W}_\infty, \circ, w_\infty \rangle$. Now we define a valuation v over $\langle \mathbf{W}_\infty, \circ \rangle$ by induction on the complexity of a type.

$$\begin{aligned} v(p_i) &\doteq w_\infty(p_i) \\ v(A \bullet B) &\doteq v(A) \circ v(B) \\ v(A \setminus B) &\doteq \{ \gamma \mid \forall \alpha \in w(A) \text{ if } \alpha \circ \gamma \text{ is defined then } \alpha \circ \gamma \in w(B) \} \\ v(B/A) &\doteq \{ \gamma \mid \forall \alpha \in w(A) \text{ if } \gamma \circ \alpha \text{ is defined then } \gamma \circ \alpha \in w(B) \} \end{aligned}$$

Evidently $\langle \mathbf{W}_\infty, \circ, v \rangle$ is a partial semigroup model. Next we verify that $w_\infty(C) = v(C)$ for any $C \in \text{Tp}(m)$.

Induction on the complexity of $C \in \text{Tp}(m)$. Induction step.

CASE 1: $C = A \bullet B$

Obvious, since both v and w_∞ are $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodels.

CASE 2: $C = A \setminus B$

First we prove that if $\gamma \in w_\infty(A \setminus B)$ then $\gamma \in v(A \setminus B)$. Let $\gamma \in w_\infty(A \setminus B)$. Take any $\alpha \in v(A)$ such that $\alpha \circ \gamma$ is defined. By the induction hypothesis $\alpha \in w_\infty(A)$. Evidently $\alpha \circ \gamma \in \overline{w_\infty}(A(A \setminus B))$. Hence $\alpha \circ \gamma \in w_\infty(B)$ in view of $L \vdash A(A \setminus B) \rightarrow B$. By the induction hypothesis $\alpha \circ \gamma \in v(B)$. Thus $\gamma \in v(A \setminus B)$.

Now we prove that if $\gamma \notin w_\infty(A \setminus B)$ then $\gamma \notin v(A \setminus B)$. If $\gamma \notin \mathbf{W}_\infty$, then this is obvious. Let $\gamma \in \mathbf{W}_j$. There exists an integer $i \geq j$ such that $\sigma(i) = \langle A \setminus B, \gamma \rangle$. According to the construction of $\langle \mathbf{W}_{i+1}, \circ, w_{i+1} \rangle$ there exists $\alpha \in \mathbf{W}_{i+1}$ such that $\alpha \circ \gamma$ is

defined, $\alpha \in w_{i+1}(A)$, and $\alpha \circ \gamma \notin w_{i+1}(B)$. Since w_∞ is conservative over w_{i+1} , we have $\alpha \in w_\infty(A)$ and $\alpha \circ \gamma \notin w_\infty(B)$. By the induction hypothesis, $\alpha \in v(A)$ and $\alpha \circ \gamma \notin v(B)$. Thus $\gamma \notin v(A \setminus B)$.

CASE 3: $C = B/A$

Similar to case 2.

Now we can prove that $\langle \mathbf{W}_\infty, \circ, v \rangle$ is the desired partial semigroup model. First, $\langle \mathbf{W}_\infty, \circ \rangle$ is a sub-partial-semigroup of $\langle \mathbf{U}, \circ \rangle$. It remains to show that $v(E) \not\subseteq v(F)$.

Since $w_0(E) \not\subseteq w_0(F)$, there is $\alpha \in \mathbf{W}_0$ such that $\alpha \in w_0(E)$ and $\alpha \notin w_0(F)$. In view of Lemma 2.4 we have $\alpha \in w_\infty(E)$ and $\alpha \notin w_\infty(F)$. Thus $\alpha \in v(E)$ and $\alpha \notin v(F)$. ■

3 Faithful quasimodels over linear order

The aim of this section is to introduce “left” quasimodels $\langle \mathbf{V}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}, \circ, v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}} \rangle$ (and “right” quasimodels $\langle \mathbf{V}_{m,n}^{\text{rg}}, \circ, v_{m,n}^{\text{rg}} \rangle$), which will later be used in the proof of Lemma 4.1, where we construct a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel containing a witness for given $\delta \notin E \setminus F$ (resp. $\delta \notin F/E$).

Lemma 3.1 *There is a family of quasimodels $\langle \mathbf{V}_\Gamma, \circ, v_\Gamma \rangle$ indexed by sequences of types $\Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*$, such that $\langle \mathbf{V}_\Gamma, \circ \rangle \in \mathcal{S}_Z$ for any Γ (cf. Example 1 (f)). We denote the domain of $\langle \mathbf{V}_\Gamma, \circ \rangle$ by \mathbf{D}_Γ (i.e., $\mathbf{V}_\Gamma \subset \mathbf{D}_\Gamma \times \mathbf{D}_\Gamma$).*

There are designated elements $\psi \in \mathbf{D}_\Lambda$ and $\chi_\Gamma \in \mathbf{D}_\Gamma$ such that

- (i) $(\forall \Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*) (\forall C \in \text{Tp}) \langle \psi, \chi_\Gamma \rangle \in v_\Gamma(C) \Leftrightarrow L \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow C$
- (ii) $(\forall \Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*) (\forall \Pi \in \text{Tp}^*) \mathbf{D}_\Gamma \subseteq \mathbf{D}_{\Gamma\Pi}$ and $\mathbf{V}_\Gamma \subseteq \mathbf{V}_{\Gamma\Pi}$
- (iii) $(\forall \Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*) (\forall \Pi \in \text{Tp}^*) (\forall C \in \text{Tp}) v_\Gamma(C) \subseteq v_{\Gamma\Pi}(C)$
- (iv) $(\forall \Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*) (\forall B \in \text{Tp}) \langle \chi_\Gamma, \chi_{\Gamma B} \rangle \in v_{\Gamma B}(B)$

Lemma 3.1 will be proved in Section 6.5.

Lemma 3.2 *If $L \not\vdash E \rightarrow F$ then there is a quasimodel $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ such that $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ \rangle \in \mathcal{S}_Z$ and $w(E) \not\subseteq w(F)$.*

PROOF. Consider $\langle \mathbf{V}_E, \circ, v_E \rangle$. In view of $L \not\vdash E \rightarrow F$ we have $\langle \psi, \chi_E \rangle \notin v_E(F)$. In view of $L \vdash E \rightarrow E$ we have $\langle \psi, \chi_E \rangle \in v_E(E)$. ■

Lemma 3.3 *There is an R -quasimodel $\langle \mathbf{V}^{\text{lf}}, \circ, v^{\text{lf}} \rangle$ over an infinite linear order $\mathbf{V}^{\text{lf}} \subset \mathbf{D}^{\text{lf}} \times \mathbf{D}^{\text{lf}}$, there is a designated element $g \in \mathbf{D}^{\text{lf}}$, and there is a family of elements $h_\Gamma \in \mathbf{D}^{\text{lf}}$ for $\Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*$, such that*

- (i) $(\forall \Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*) (\forall C \in \text{Tp}) \langle g, h_\Gamma \rangle \in v^{\text{lf}}(C) \Leftrightarrow L \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow C$
- (ii) $(\forall \Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*) (\forall B \in \text{Tp}) \langle h_\Gamma, h_{\Gamma B} \rangle \in v^{\text{lf}}(B)$

PROOF. We construct the quasimodel $\langle \mathbf{V}^{\text{lf}}, \circ, v^{\text{lf}} \rangle$ using the family of quasimodels $\langle \mathbf{V}_\Gamma, \circ, v_\Gamma \rangle$ from Lemma 3.1.

$\mathbf{D}^{\text{lf}} \rightleftharpoons \{ \langle \xi_\Gamma^s \mid \Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*, s \in \mathbf{D}_\Gamma \rangle \}$, where ξ_Γ^s are new formal symbols.

$\mathbf{W} \rightleftharpoons \{ \langle \langle \xi_\Gamma^s, \xi_{\Gamma\Delta}^t \rangle \mid \Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*, \Delta \in \text{Tp}^*, s \in \mathbf{D}_\Gamma, t \in \mathbf{D}_{\Gamma\Delta}, \langle s, t \rangle \in \mathbf{V}_{\Gamma\Delta} \rangle \}$

Evidently \mathbf{W} is irreflexive. Next we verify that \mathbf{W} is transitive.

Let $\langle \xi_\Gamma^r, \xi_{\Gamma\Delta}^s \rangle \in \mathbf{W}$ and $\langle \xi_{\Gamma\Delta}^s, \xi_{\Gamma\Delta\Pi}^t \rangle \in \mathbf{W}$. Then $\langle r, s \rangle \in \mathbf{V}_{\Gamma\Delta}$ and $\langle s, t \rangle \in \mathbf{V}_{\Gamma\Delta\Pi}$. From Lemma 3.1 (ii) we obtain $\langle r, s \rangle \in \mathbf{V}_{\Gamma\Delta\Pi}$. Thus $\langle r, t \rangle = \langle r, s \rangle \circ \langle s, t \rangle \in \mathbf{V}_{\Gamma\Delta\Pi}$. Hence $\langle \xi_\Gamma^r, \xi_{\Gamma\Delta\Pi}^t \rangle \in \mathbf{W}$.

We take \mathbf{V}^{lf} to be any linear order on \mathbf{D}^{lf} such that $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{V}^{\text{lf}}$. We put

$v^{\text{lf}}(A) \rightleftharpoons \{ \langle \xi_\Gamma^r, \xi_{\Gamma\Delta}^t \rangle \mid \Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*, \Delta \in \text{Tp}^*, s \in \mathbf{D}_\Gamma, t \in \mathbf{D}_{\Gamma\Delta}, \langle s, t \rangle \in v_{\Gamma\Delta}(A) \}$.

$g \rightleftharpoons \xi_\Lambda^\psi \quad h_\Gamma \rightleftharpoons \xi_\Gamma^{\chi_\Gamma}$

First, we verify that $\langle \mathbf{V}^{\text{lf}}, \circ, v^{\text{lf}} \rangle$ is a quasimodel (conditions (2) and (1) from the definition of a quasimodel at page 5).

(2)

If $L \vdash A \rightarrow B$, then $v_{\Gamma\Delta}(A) \subseteq v_{\Gamma\Delta}(B)$ for any $\Gamma, \Delta \in \text{Tp}^*$, whence $v^{\text{lf}}(A) \subseteq v^{\text{lf}}(B)$.

(1) $v^{\text{lf}}(A \bullet B) \subseteq v^{\text{lf}}(A) \circ v^{\text{lf}}(B)$

Let $\langle \xi_\Gamma^r, \xi_{\Gamma\Delta}^t \rangle \in v^{\text{lf}}(A \bullet B)$. Since $\langle r, t \rangle \in v_{\Gamma\Delta}(A \bullet B) = v_{\Gamma\Delta}(A) \circ v_{\Gamma\Delta}(B)$, there is s such that $\langle r, s \rangle \in v_{\Gamma\Delta}(A)$ and $\langle s, t \rangle \in v_{\Gamma\Delta}(B)$. Note that $s \in \mathbf{D}_{\Gamma\Delta}$, since $\langle s, t \rangle \in v_{\Gamma\Delta}(B) \subseteq \mathbf{D}_{\Gamma\Delta} \times \mathbf{D}_{\Gamma\Delta}$.

According to the definition of v^{lf} , $\langle \xi_\Gamma^r, \xi_{\Gamma\Delta}^s \rangle \in v^{\text{lf}}(A)$ and $\langle \xi_{\Gamma\Delta}^s, \xi_{\Gamma\Delta}^t \rangle \in v^{\text{lf}}(B)$. Thus $\langle \xi_\Gamma^r, \xi_{\Gamma\Delta}^t \rangle \in v^{\text{lf}}(A) \circ v^{\text{lf}}(B)$.

(1) $v^{\text{lf}}(A) \circ v^{\text{lf}}(B) \subseteq v^{\text{lf}}(A \bullet B)$

Let $\langle \xi_\Gamma^r, \xi_{\Gamma\Delta}^s \rangle \in v^{\text{lf}}(A)$ and $\langle \xi_{\Gamma\Delta}^s, \xi_{\Gamma\Delta\Pi}^t \rangle \in v^{\text{lf}}(B)$. We have $\langle r, s \rangle \in v_{\Gamma\Delta}(A)$ and $\langle s, t \rangle \in v_{\Gamma\Delta\Pi}(B)$. By Lemma 3.1 (iii), $v_{\Gamma\Delta}(A) \subseteq v_{\Gamma\Delta\Pi}(A)$. Thus $\langle r, s \rangle \in v_{\Gamma\Delta\Pi}(A)$, whence $\langle r, t \rangle = \langle r, s \rangle \circ \langle s, t \rangle \in v_{\Gamma\Delta\Pi}(A) \circ v_{\Gamma\Delta\Pi}(B) = v_{\Gamma\Delta\Pi}(A \bullet B)$. We see that $\langle \xi_\Gamma^r, \xi_{\Gamma\Delta\Pi}^t \rangle \in v^{\text{lf}}(A \bullet B)$.

Next, we prove that $\langle \mathbf{V}^{\text{lf}}, \circ, v^{\text{lf}} \rangle$ has the properties (i) and (ii).

(i)

Evidently, $\langle g, h_\Gamma \rangle \in v^{\text{lf}}(C)$ if and only if $\langle \psi, \chi_\Gamma \rangle \in v_\Gamma(C)$. According to Lemma 3.1 (i), $\langle \psi, \chi_\Gamma \rangle \in v_\Gamma(C)$ if and only if $L \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow C$.

(ii)

By Lemma 3.1 (iv), $\langle \chi_\Gamma, \chi_{\Gamma B} \rangle \in v_{\Gamma B}(B)$, whence $\langle \xi_\Gamma^{\chi_\Gamma}, \xi_{\Gamma B}^{\chi_{\Gamma B}} \rangle \in v^{\text{lf}}(B)$. ■

Lemma 3.4 *For any positive integers m and n there is a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel $\langle \mathbf{V}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}, \circ, v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}} \rangle$ over a finite linear order $\mathbf{V}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}} \subset \mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}} \times \mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}$, there is a designated element $g \in \mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}$, and there is a family of elements $h_\Gamma \in \mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}$ for $\Gamma \in \text{LST}_{m,n}$, such that*

(i) $(\forall \Gamma \in \text{LST}_{m,n}) (\forall C \in \text{Tp}(m)) \langle g, h_\Gamma \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(C) \Leftrightarrow L \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow C$

(ii) $(\forall \Gamma \in \text{LST}_{m,n-1}) (\forall B \in \text{Tp}(m)) \langle h_\Gamma, h_{\Gamma B} \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B)$

PROOF.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}} &\rightleftharpoons \{\xi_\Gamma^s \mid \Gamma \in \text{LST}_{m,n}, s \in \mathbf{D}_\Gamma\} \cup \{\xi_\Lambda^s \mid s \in \mathbf{D}_\Lambda\} \\
\mathbf{V}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}} &\rightleftharpoons \mathbf{V}^{\text{lf}} \cap (\mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}} \times \mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}) \\
v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(A) &\rightleftharpoons v^{\text{lf}}(A) \cap (\mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}} \times \mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}) \text{ for any } A \in \text{Tp}(m) \\
g &\rightleftharpoons \xi_\Lambda^\psi \quad h_\Gamma \rightleftharpoons \xi_\Gamma^{\chi_\Gamma}
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to repeat the proof of Lemma 3.3. ■

Evidently, all the lemmas of this section have also inverted duals. We formulate the dual of Lemma 3.4.

Lemma 3.5 *For any positive integers m and n there is a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel $\langle \mathbf{V}_{m,n}^{\text{rg}}, \circ, v_{m,n}^{\text{rg}} \rangle$ over a finite linear order $\mathbf{V}_{m,n}^{\text{rg}} \subset \mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{rg}} \times \mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{rg}}$, there is a designated element $g \in \mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{rg}}$, and there is a family of elements $h_\Gamma \in \mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{rg}}$ for $\Gamma \in \text{LST}_{m,n}$, such that*

- (i) $(\forall \Gamma \in \text{LST}_{m,n}) (\forall C \in \text{Tp}(m)) \langle h_\Gamma, g \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{rg}}(C) \Leftrightarrow L \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow C$
- (ii) $(\forall \Gamma \in \text{LST}_{m,n-1}) (\forall B \in \text{Tp}(m)) \langle h_{B\Gamma}, h_\Gamma \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{rg}}(B)$

4 R-completeness

In this section we demonstrate how a partial semigroup $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ \rangle$ and a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ, v \rangle$ satisfying certain conditions can be used to construct an ‘almost’ $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, u \rangle$, which is ‘conservative’ over $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ, v \rangle$ (cf. Lemma 4.1).

Using this result, we are going to prove that the class of all $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodels over finite intervals of integers is witnessed (cf. Lemma 4.2) and the class of certain $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodels over finitely generated free semigroups is witnessed (cf. Lemma 5.1).

Lemma 4.1 *Given $m, n \in \mathbf{N}$, let $\mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}} = [0, k]$ (and thus $\mathbf{V}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}} = \{\langle s, t \rangle \mid 0 \leq s < t \leq k\}$). Let $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ, v \rangle$ be a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel, $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ \rangle$ be a partial semigroup, $E \in \text{Tp}(m)$, $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$, $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbf{W}$, and π be a function $\pi: \mathbf{V}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$. We denote*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_0 &= \{\pi\langle s, t \rangle \mid 0 \leq s < t < k\}; \\
\mathcal{P}_1 &= \{\pi\langle s, k \rangle \mid 0 \leq s < k\}; \\
\mathcal{P}_2 &= \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \mathcal{R}; \\
\mathcal{P} &= \mathcal{P}_0 \cup \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Let the following conditions hold.

- (1) The partial semigroup $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ \rangle$ is a sub-partial-semigroup of $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ \rangle$.
- (2) $\mathcal{P}_0 \cap \mathcal{P}_1 = \emptyset$
- (3) $\mathcal{P}_0 \cap \mathcal{P}_2 = \emptyset$

- (4) $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_2 = \emptyset$
- (5) $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathbf{V} = \emptyset$
- (6) $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{T} = \emptyset$
- (7) $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathbf{V} = \emptyset$
- (8) $\mathcal{T} \circ (\mathcal{P} \cup \mathbf{V}) \subseteq \mathcal{T} \quad (\mathcal{P} \cup \mathbf{V}) \circ \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$
- (9) $\pi\langle r, s \rangle \circ \pi\langle s, t \rangle = \pi\langle r, t \rangle$
- (10) *If $s \neq s'$ and $\pi\langle r, s \rangle \circ \pi\langle s', t \rangle$ is defined, then $\pi\langle r, s \rangle \circ \pi\langle s', t \rangle \in \mathcal{T}$.*
- (11) $\mathbf{V} \circ \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$
- (12) $\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathbf{V} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$
- (13) *For any $s < k$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$, $\pi\langle s, k \rangle \circ \rho$ is defined.*
- (14) $\mathcal{P}_1 \circ \{\beta \in \mathbf{W} \mid \beta \notin \mathcal{R}\} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$
- (15) *If $s < k$, $s' < k$, and $\pi\langle s, k \rangle = \pi\langle s', k \rangle$ then $s = s'$.*
- (16) *If $s < k$, $s' < k$, $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$, $\rho' \in \mathcal{R}$, and $\pi\langle s, k \rangle \circ \rho = \pi\langle s', k \rangle \circ \rho'$ then $s = s'$ and $\rho = \rho'$.*
- (17) $\alpha_1 \circ \dots \circ \alpha_n \notin \mathcal{R}$, for any $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbf{W}$. (Here n is the given natural number.)

Then there is a function $u: \text{Tp}(m) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{W})$ satisfying the following conditions (i)–(vii).

- (i) For any $A \bullet B \in \text{Tp}(m)$, $u(A \bullet B) \subseteq u(A) \circ u(B)$.
- (ii) For any $B_1, \dots, B_l, C \in \text{Tp}(m)$, if $L \vdash B_1 \dots B_l \rightarrow C$, then $u(B_1) \circ \dots \circ u(B_l) \subseteq u(C) \cup \mathcal{T}$.
- (iii) $\pi\langle g, k \rangle \in u(E)$ (Recall that g is the designated element in $\mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}$ and thus $0 \leq g \leq k$.)
- (iv) If $F \in \text{Tp}(m)$ and $L \not\vdash E \rightarrow F$, then $\pi\langle g, k \rangle \notin u(F)$.
- (v) If $F \in \text{Tp}(m)$, $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$, and $\rho \notin v(E \setminus F)$, then $\pi\langle g, k \rangle \circ \rho \notin u(F)$.
- (vi) $v(A) \subseteq u(A)$ for any $A \in \text{Tp}(m)$.
- (vii) $u(A) \subseteq v(A) \cup \mathcal{P}$ for any $A \in \text{Tp}(m)$.

PROOF. We define the function u associating subsets of \mathbf{W} not only with single types from $\text{Tp}(m)$, but also with sequences of types from $\text{Tp}(m)$, i.e., $u: \text{Tp}(m)^+ \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{W})$.

$$\begin{aligned} u_0(\Theta) &\Rightarrow \{\pi\langle s, t \rangle \mid 0 \leq s < t < k \text{ and } \langle s, t \rangle \in \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta)\} \\ u_1(\Theta) &\Rightarrow \{\pi\langle s, k \rangle \mid 0 \leq s < k \text{ and } \langle s, h_E \rangle \in \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta)\} \\ u_2(\Theta) &\Rightarrow \{\pi\langle s, k \rangle \circ \rho \mid 0 \leq s < k, \rho \in \mathcal{R}, \text{ and } \exists \Delta \in \text{LST}_{m,n-1}, \\ &\quad \rho \in \bar{v}(\Delta), \langle s, h_{E\Delta} \rangle \in \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta)\} \\ u(\Theta) &\Rightarrow u_0(\Theta) \cup u_1(\Theta) \cup u_2(\Theta) \cup \bar{v}(\Theta) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $u_0(\Theta) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_0$, $u_1(\Theta) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_1$, $u_2(\Theta) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_2$, and $u(\Theta) \subseteq \mathcal{P} \cup \mathbf{V}$.

Lemma 4.1.1 *Let $\Theta \in \text{Tp}(m)^+$ and $B \in \text{Tp}(m)$. Then $u(\Theta) \circ u(B) \subseteq u(\Theta B) \cup \mathcal{T}$.*

PROOF. Let $\gamma \in u(\Theta) \circ u(B)$. Then $\gamma = \alpha \circ \beta$ for some $\alpha \in u(\Theta) = u_0(\Theta) \cup u_1(\Theta) \cup u_2(\Theta) \cup \bar{v}(\Theta)$ and $\beta \in u(B) = u_0(B) \cup u_1(B) \cup u_2(B) \cup v(B)$. Assume that $\alpha \circ \beta$ is defined. We consider the corresponding sixteen cases and prove that $\alpha \circ \beta \in u_0(\Theta B) \cup u_1(\Theta B) \cup u_2(\Theta B) \cup v(\Theta B) \cup \mathcal{T}$.

CASE 1: $\alpha \in u_0(\Theta)$

$$\alpha = \pi\langle r, s \rangle, 0 \leq r < s < k, \langle r, s \rangle \in \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta)$$

CASE 1a: $\beta \in u_0(B)$

$$\beta = \pi\langle s', t \rangle, 0 \leq s' < t < k, \langle s', t \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B)$$

If $s \neq s'$, then $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{T}$ in view of (10).

If $s = s'$, then $\alpha \circ \beta = \pi\langle r, s \rangle \circ \pi\langle s, t \rangle = \pi\langle r, t \rangle \in u_0(\Theta B)$, since $\langle r, t \rangle = \langle r, s \rangle \circ \langle s, t \rangle \in \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta) \circ v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B) = \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta B)$.

CASE 1b: $\beta \in u_1(B)$

$$\beta = \pi\langle s', k \rangle, \langle s', h_E \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B)$$

If $s \neq s'$, then $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{T}$ in view of (10).

If $s = s'$, then $\alpha \circ \beta = \pi\langle r, s \rangle \circ \pi\langle s, k \rangle = \pi\langle r, k \rangle \in u_1(\Theta B)$, since $\langle r, h_E \rangle = \langle r, s \rangle \circ \langle s, h_E \rangle \in \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta) \circ v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B) = \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta B)$.

CASE 1c: $\beta \in u_2(B)$

$$\beta = \pi\langle s', k \rangle \circ \rho, \rho \in \mathcal{R}, \Delta \in \text{LST}_{m,n-1}, \rho \in \bar{v}(\Delta), \langle s', h_{E\Delta} \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B), 0 \leq s' < k$$

If $s \neq s'$, then $\alpha \circ \beta = \pi\langle r, s \rangle \circ \pi\langle s', k \rangle \circ \rho \in \mathcal{T} \circ \rho \subseteq \mathcal{T} \circ \mathbf{V} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$.

If $s = s'$, then $\alpha \circ \beta = \pi\langle r, k \rangle \circ \rho \in u_2(\Theta B)$, since $\langle r, h_{E\Delta} \rangle \in \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta) \circ v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B) = \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta B)$.

CASE 1d: $\beta \in v(B)$

Evidently $\alpha \circ \beta \in \pi\langle r, s \rangle \circ v(B) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathbf{V} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ in view of (12).

CASE 2: $\alpha \in u_1(\Theta)$

$$\alpha = \pi\langle r, k \rangle, \langle r, h_E \rangle \in \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta), 0 \leq r < k$$

CASE 2ab: $\beta \in u_0(B) \cup u_1(B)$

$$\beta = \pi\langle s, t \rangle, 0 \leq s < t \leq k$$

From (10) we obtain $\alpha \circ \beta = \pi\langle r, k \rangle \circ \pi\langle s, t \rangle \in \mathcal{T}$, since $k \neq s$.

CASE 2c: $\beta \in u_2(B)$

From (10) and (8) we obtain $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{T} \circ \mathbf{V} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ (cf. case 2ab and case 1c).

CASE 2d: $\beta \in v(B)$

If $\beta \notin \mathcal{R}$, then $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{T}$ in view of (14).

Now we prove that if $\beta \in \mathcal{R}$ then $\alpha \circ \beta \in u_2(\Theta B)$. We take $\Delta = B$ and $\rho = \beta$. From (17) we see that $n > 1$. Thus $\Delta \in \text{LST}_{m,n-1}$. By Lemma 3.4 (ii) we have $\langle h_E, h_{EB} \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B)$. Thus $\langle r, h_{EB} \rangle = \langle r, h_E \rangle \circ \langle h_E, h_{EB} \rangle \in \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta) \circ v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B) = \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta B)$, whence $\alpha \circ \beta \in u_2(\Theta B)$.

CASE 3: $\alpha \in u_2(\Theta)$

$\alpha = \pi \langle r, k \rangle \circ \rho$, $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$, $\Delta \in \text{LST}_{m,n-1}$, $\Delta \neq \Lambda$, $\rho \in \bar{v}(\Delta)$, $\langle r, h_{E\Delta} \rangle \in \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta)$, $0 \leq r < k$

Note that $\alpha \in \mathcal{P} \circ \mathbf{V}$.

CASE 3abc: $\beta \in u_0(B) \cup u_1(B) \cup u_2(B) \subseteq \mathcal{P}$

In view of (11) and (8) we have $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{P} \circ \mathbf{V} \circ \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$.

CASE 3d: $\beta \in v(B)$

If $\rho \circ \beta \notin \mathcal{R}$, then $\alpha \circ \beta = \pi \langle r, k \rangle \circ (\rho \circ \beta) \in \mathcal{T}$ in view of (14).

Now we prove that if $\rho \circ \beta \in \mathcal{R}$ then $\alpha \circ \beta \in u_2(\Theta B)$. We take $\Delta' = \Delta B$ and $\rho' = \rho \circ \beta$. Evidently $\rho \circ \beta \in \bar{v}(\Delta) \circ v(B) = \bar{v}(\Delta B)$. Thus $\rho \circ \beta = \alpha_1 \circ \dots \circ \alpha_l$, where l is the number of types in the sequence ΔB . In view of (17), $\Delta B \in \text{LST}_{m,n-1}$. By Lemma 3.4 (ii) we have $\langle h_{E\Delta}, h_{E\Delta B} \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B)$. Thus $\langle r, h_{E\Delta B} \rangle = \langle r, h_{E\Delta} \rangle \circ \langle h_{E\Delta}, h_{E\Delta B} \rangle \in \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta) \circ v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B) = \overline{v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}}(\Theta B)$.

CASE 4: $\alpha \in \bar{v}(\Theta)$

CASE 4abc: $\beta \in u_0(B) \cup u_1(B) \cup u_2(B) \subseteq \mathcal{P}$

In view of (11) we have $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathbf{V} \circ \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$.

CASE 4d: $\beta \in v(B)$

Evidently $\alpha \circ \beta \in \bar{v}(\Theta) \circ v(B) = \bar{v}(\Theta B)$. ■

Lemma 4.1.2 *Let $B_1 \in \text{Tp}(m), \dots, B_l \in \text{Tp}(m)$. Then $u(B_1) \circ \dots \circ u(B_l) \subseteq u(B_1 \dots B_l) \cup \mathcal{T}$.*

PROOF. Induction on l . Induction step. We must prove that if $u(B_1) \circ \dots \circ u(B_l) \subseteq u(B_1 \dots B_l) \cup \mathcal{T}$ then $u(B_1) \circ \dots \circ u(B_l) \circ u(B_{l+1}) \subseteq u(B_1 \dots B_l B_{l+1}) \cup \mathcal{T}$. It is sufficient to verify that $(u(B_1 \dots B_l) \cup \mathcal{T}) \circ u(B_{l+1}) \subseteq u(B_1 \dots B_l B_{l+1}) \cup \mathcal{T}$.

From Lemma 4.1.1 we obtain $u(B_1 \dots B_l) \circ u(B_{l+1}) \subseteq u(B_1 \dots B_l B_{l+1}) \cup \mathcal{T}$. According to (8), $\mathcal{T} \circ u(B_{l+1}) \subseteq u(B_1 \dots B_l B_{l+1}) \cup \mathcal{T}$. ■

Lemma 4.1.3 *Let $A \cdot B \in \text{Tp}(m)$ and $\gamma \in u(A \cdot B)$. Then there are $\alpha \in u(A)$ and $\beta \in u(B)$ such that $\alpha \circ \beta = \gamma$.*

PROOF.

CASE 1: $\gamma \in u_0(A \cdot B)$

$\gamma = \pi \langle r, t \rangle$, $0 \leq r < t < k$, $\langle r, t \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(A \cdot B)$

Since $\langle \mathbf{V}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}, \circ, v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}} \rangle$ is a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel, there is $s \in [0, k]$ such that $\langle r, s \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(A)$ and $\langle s, t \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B)$.

Now $\gamma = \pi\langle r, t \rangle = \pi\langle r, s \rangle \circ \pi\langle s, t \rangle \in u_0(A) \circ u_0(B)$.

CASE 2: $\gamma \in u_1(A \bullet B)$

$\gamma = \pi\langle r, k \rangle, \langle r, h_E \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(A \bullet B), 0 \leq r < k$

Like in case 1, there is $s \in [0, k]$ such that $\langle r, s \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(A)$ and $\langle s, h_E \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B)$.

Thus $\gamma = \pi\langle r, k \rangle = \pi\langle r, s \rangle \circ \pi\langle s, k \rangle \in u_0(A) \circ u_1(B)$.

CASE 3: $\gamma \in u_2(A \bullet B)$

$\gamma = \pi\langle r, k \rangle \circ \rho, \rho \in \mathcal{R}, \Delta \in \text{LST}_{m,n-1}, \rho \in \bar{v}(\Delta), \langle r, h_{E\Delta} \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(A \bullet B), 0 \leq r < k$

There is s such that $\langle r, s \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(A)$ and $\langle s, h_{E\Delta} \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B)$.

Now $\pi\langle r, s \rangle \in u_0(A)$ and $\pi\langle s, k \rangle \circ \rho \in u_2(B)$; whence $\gamma \in u_0(A) \circ u_2(B)$.

CASE 4: $\gamma \in v(A \bullet B)$

Obvious from $v(A \bullet B) \subseteq v(A) \circ v(B)$. ■

We continue the proof of Lemma 4.1.

(i)

See Lemma 4.1.3.

(ii)

Let $B_1, \dots, B_l, C \in \text{Tp}(m)$ and $L \vdash B_1 \dots B_l \rightarrow C$. According to Lemma 4.1.2, $u(B_1) \circ \dots \circ u(B_l) \subseteq u(B_1 \dots B_l) \cup \mathcal{T}$. It remains to prove that $u(B_1 \dots B_l) \subseteq u(C)$. This follows from $\bar{v}(B_1 \dots B_l) \subseteq v(C)$ and $\bar{v}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(B_1 \dots B_l) \subseteq v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(C)$.

(iii)

From Lemma 3.4 (i) we obtain $\langle g, h_E \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(E)$. Thus $\pi\langle g, k \rangle \in u_1(E)$.

(iv)

Let $F \in \text{Tp}(m)$ and $\pi\langle g, k \rangle \in u(F)$. Evidently $\pi\langle g, k \rangle \in \mathcal{P}_1$. From (2), (4), and (5) we see that $\pi\langle g, k \rangle \in u_1(F)$. Thus $\langle g, h_E \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(F)$ according to (15). From Lemma 3.4 (i) we obtain $L \vdash E \rightarrow F$.

(v)

Let $F \in \text{Tp}(m)$, $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$, and $\pi\langle g, k \rangle \circ \rho \in u(F)$. Evidently $\pi\langle g, k \rangle \circ \rho \in \mathcal{P}_2$. From (3), (4), and (5) we see that $\pi\langle g, k \rangle \circ \rho \in u_2(F)$. According to (16) there is $\Delta \in \text{LST}_{m,n-1}$ such that $\rho \in \bar{v}(\Delta)$ and $\langle g, h_{E\Delta} \rangle \in v_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}(F)$. From Lemma 3.4 (i) we obtain $L \vdash E\Delta \rightarrow F$. Applying the rule $(\rightarrow \backslash)$ we derive $L \vdash \Delta \rightarrow E \backslash F$, whence $\bar{v}(\Delta) \subseteq v(E \backslash F)$. We have proved that $\rho \in v(E \backslash F)$.

(vi) Obvious.

(vii) Obvious. ■

Definition. By $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{Z}}^m$ we denote the class of all $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodels over binary relational frames from $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{Z}}$ (cf. Example 1 (f)).

Lemma 4.2 *Let $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ, v \rangle \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{Z}}^m$, $E \backslash F \in \text{Tp}(m)$, $\delta \in \mathbf{V}$, and $\delta \notin v(E \backslash F)$. Then there is $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{Z}}^m$ such that $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ is a conservative extension of $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ, v \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ contains a witness of $\delta \notin w(E \backslash F)$ (i.e., there is $\alpha \in w(E)$ such that $\alpha \circ \delta \notin w(F)$).*

PROOF. Let $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ \rangle = \langle \mathbf{W}_{[p,q]}, \circ \rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{Z}}$ and $\delta = \langle a, b \rangle \in \mathbf{V}$ (i.e., $p \leq a < b \leq q$). Put $\mathcal{T} \doteq \emptyset$, $\mathcal{R} \doteq \{\langle a, j \rangle \mid a < j \leq q\}$, and $n \doteq q - a + 1$.

Recall that we identify $\mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}}$ with $[0, k]$ for a suitable natural number k . We take $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ \rangle$ to be $\langle \mathbf{W}_{[p-k, q]}, \circ \rangle$.

We define

$$\begin{aligned}\pi\langle s, k \rangle &\rightleftharpoons \langle p - k + s, a \rangle; \\ \pi\langle s, t \rangle &\rightleftharpoons \langle p - k + s, p - k + t \rangle \text{ if } t < k.\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_0 &= \{\langle i, j \rangle \mid p - k \leq i < j < p\}; \\ \mathcal{P}_1 &= \{\langle i, a \rangle \mid p - k \leq i < p\}; \\ \mathcal{P}_2 &= \{\langle i, j \rangle \mid p - k \leq i < p, a < j \leq q\}.\end{aligned}$$

The conditions (1)–(17) from Lemma 4.1 are easy to verify. We take w to be the function u from Lemma 4.1.

According to Lemma 4.1 (i) and (ii), $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ is a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel. The conservativity of $\langle \mathbf{W}, \circ, w \rangle$ over $\langle \mathbf{V}, \circ, v \rangle$ follows from Lemma 4.1 (vi) and (vii). The witness of $\delta \notin w(E \setminus F)$ is $\pi\langle g, k \rangle$ (cf. Lemma 4.1 (iii) and (v), note that $\delta \in \mathcal{R}$). ■

Theorem 2 *The Lambek calculus is complete with respect to the class of all R-models on subsemigroups of $\langle \mathbf{Z}, \circ \rangle$ (cf. Example 1 (e)).*

PROOF. Immediate from Theorem 1, Lemma 3.2, and Lemma 4.2. ■

Remark. The Lambek calculus is also complete with respect to the class of all R-models on the partial semigroup $\langle \mathbf{Z}, \circ \rangle$ itself.

Open question. Is the Lambek calculus complete w.r.t. finite R-models? In particular, does the proof of Theorem 2 give a finite countermodel for any given underivable sequent?

5 L-completeness

Definition. Let \mathcal{V} be any alphabet, i.e., any set, the elements of which are called symbols. We denote by \mathcal{V}^+ the set of all non-empty words over the alphabet \mathcal{V} . By \mathcal{V}^* we denote the set of all words over the alphabet \mathcal{V} , including the *empty word* ε .

Definition. Let α be a word over an alphabet \mathcal{V} . Then $|\alpha|$ (the *length* of α) is the number of symbols in α .

Definition. By $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Free}}$ we denote the class of all free semigroups $\langle \mathcal{V}^+, \circ \rangle$, where \mathcal{V} is a finite subset of a fixed countable alphabet $\{a_j \mid j \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Definition. By $\mathcal{K}_{\text{Free}}^m$ we denote the class of all $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodels $\langle \mathcal{V}^+, \circ, v \rangle$, over free semigroups from $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Free}}$, such that for every $A \in \text{Tp}(m)$ there is $\alpha \in v(A)$ satisfying $|\alpha| \leq m$.

Lemma 5.1 Let $m \in \mathbf{N}$, $\langle \mathcal{V}^+, \circ, v \rangle \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{Free}}^m$, $\delta \in \mathcal{V}^*$, and $E \in \text{Tp}(m)$.

Then there is a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel $\langle \mathcal{W}^+, \circ, w \rangle \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{Free}}^m$ and there is $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}^+$ such that

- (i) $\langle \mathcal{W}^+, \circ, w \rangle$ is a conservative extension of $\langle \mathcal{V}^+, \circ, v \rangle$;
- (ii) $\alpha \in w(E)$;
- (iii) for any $F \in \text{Tp}(m)$, if $L \not\vdash E \rightarrow F$, then $\alpha \notin w(F)$;
- (iv) for any $F \in \text{Tp}(m)$, if $\delta \in \mathcal{V}^+$ and $\delta \notin v(E \setminus F)$, then $\alpha \circ \delta \notin w(F)$;

PROOF. We are going to apply Lemma 4.1. First, we put $\mathbf{V} \doteq \mathcal{V}^+$ and $n \doteq |\delta| + 1$. Let $\mathbf{D}_{m,n}^{\text{lf}} = [0, k]$. Let $x, z, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k$ be any $k + 2$ distinct elements of $\{a_j \mid j \in \mathbf{N}\}$, which do not occur in \mathcal{V} . We denote $\mathcal{Y} \doteq \{x, z, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k\}$ and put $\mathbf{W} \doteq \mathcal{W}^+$, where $\mathcal{W} \doteq \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Y}$.

We define the function π as follows.

$$\pi\langle s, t \rangle \doteq (x^m \circ y_{s+1} \circ z^m) \circ (x^m \circ y_{s+2} \circ z^m) \circ \dots \circ (x^m \circ y_t \circ z^m)$$

Here $x^m \doteq \underbrace{x \circ \dots \circ x}_{m \text{ times}}$.

We define the function $\text{Subword}: \mathcal{W}^+ \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{W}^+)$ as

$$\text{Subword}(\beta) \doteq \{\alpha \in \mathcal{W}^+ \mid \beta = \gamma_1 \circ \alpha \circ \gamma_2 \text{ for some } \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{W}^*\}.$$

Thus, $\text{Subword}(\beta)$ is the set of all non-empty subwords of β . Next we introduce several subsets of \mathcal{W}^+ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R} &\doteq \{\rho \in \mathcal{V}^+ \mid \rho \circ \alpha = \delta \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathcal{V}^*\} \\ \mathcal{P}_0 &\doteq \{\pi\langle s, t \rangle \mid 0 \leq s < t < k\} \\ \mathcal{P}_1 &\doteq \{\pi\langle s, k \rangle \mid 0 \leq s < k\} \\ \mathcal{P}_2 &\doteq \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \mathcal{R} \\ \mathcal{P} &\doteq \mathcal{P}_0 \cup \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2 \\ \mathcal{M}_1 &\doteq \{\alpha \in \mathcal{W}^+ \mid \alpha \notin \mathcal{V}^+ \text{ and } \alpha \notin \text{Subword}(\pi\langle 0, k \rangle \circ \delta)\} \\ \mathcal{M}_2 &\doteq z \circ \mathcal{W}^* \\ \mathcal{M}_3 &\doteq \mathcal{W}^* \circ x \\ \mathcal{M} &\doteq \mathcal{M}_1 \cup \mathcal{M}_2 \cup \mathcal{M}_3 \\ \mathcal{T} &\doteq \underbrace{\mathcal{M} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{M}}_{m \text{ times}} \end{aligned}$$

Before applying Lemma 4.1 we establish several properties of these sets of words.

Lemma 5.1.1

- (i) $\mathcal{W}^* \circ \mathcal{M}_1 \circ \mathcal{W}^* \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1$

(i') If $\beta \in \mathcal{W}^+$, $\alpha \in \text{Subword}(\beta)$, and $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_1$, then $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_1$.

(ii) $\mathcal{M}_2 \circ \mathcal{W}^* \subseteq \mathcal{M}_2$

(iii) $\mathcal{W}^* \circ \mathcal{M}_3 \subseteq \mathcal{M}_3$

PROOF. Obvious. ■

Lemma 5.1.2

(a) $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{V}^+ = \emptyset$

(b) $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{M} = \emptyset$

(c) $\mathcal{V}^+ \cap \mathcal{M} = \emptyset$

(d) $\mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$

(e) $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$

(f) $\mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{V}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{M}$

(g) $\mathcal{V}^+ \circ \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$

(h) $\mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$

(i) $\mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$

(j) $\mathcal{T} \circ (\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{V}^+ \cup \mathcal{M}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}$

(k) $(\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{V}^+ \cup \mathcal{M}) \circ \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$

(l) If $s \neq s'$ then $\pi\langle r, s \rangle \circ \pi\langle s', t \rangle \in \mathcal{T}$.

(m) $\mathcal{V}^+ \circ \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$

(n) $\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{V}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{T}$

(o) $\mathcal{P}_1 \circ \{\beta \in \mathcal{W}^+ \mid \beta \notin \mathcal{R}\} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$

(p) $\mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{V}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}$

(q) $\mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}$

PROOF.

(a)

Evident from $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}^+ \circ \mathcal{V}^*$.

(b)

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$. Then the leftmost symbol of α is x and the rightmost symbol of α belongs to $\mathcal{V} \cup \{z\}$. Thus $\alpha \notin \mathcal{M}_2$ and $\alpha \notin \mathcal{M}_3$. Note that $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \text{Subword}(\pi\langle g, k \rangle \circ \delta)$. Thus $\alpha \notin \mathcal{M}_1$.

(c)

Obvious.

(d)

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$. We verify that $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{M}$. If $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_1$ then $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{M}_1$. If $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_2$ then $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{M}_2$. If $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_1$ then $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{M}_1$. If $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_3$ then $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{M}_3$. The only complicated case is $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_3$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_2$, i.e., $\alpha = \alpha' \circ x$ and $\beta = z \circ \beta'$. Note that then $x \circ z \in \text{Subword}(\alpha \circ \beta)$ and $x \circ z \in \mathcal{M}_1$. It remains to apply Lemma 5.1.1 (i').

(e)

Follows from (d).

(f)

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{V}^+$. We verify that $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{M}$. If $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_1$ then $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{M}_1$. If $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_2$ then $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{M}_2$. The only complicated case is $\alpha = \alpha' \circ x$. In this case $x \circ \beta \in \text{Subword}(\alpha \circ \beta)$ and $x \circ \beta \in \mathcal{M}_1$.

(g)

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{V}^+$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$. We verify that $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{M}$. If $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_1$ then $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{M}_1$. If $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_3$ then $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{M}_3$. The only complicated case is $\beta = z \circ \beta'$. Note that in that case $\alpha \circ z \in \text{Subword}(\alpha \circ \beta)$ and $\alpha \circ z \in \mathcal{M}_1$.

In the following part of the proof we denote by $\pi\langle s, s \rangle$ the empty word in \mathcal{W}^* .

(h)

Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{M}$.

CASE 1: $\gamma = \pi\langle s, t \rangle \circ \beta$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$

Evidently $\gamma = \underbrace{x \circ \dots \circ x}_{m-1 \text{ times}} \circ \phi$, where $\phi = x \circ y_{s+1} \circ z^m \circ \pi\langle s+1, t \rangle \circ \beta$. We must verify that $\phi \in \mathcal{M}$.

If $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_1$ then $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_1$. If $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_3$ then $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_3$. Let now $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_2$, i.e. $\beta = z \circ \beta'$. Evidently $z^{m+1} \in \text{Subword}(y_{s+1} \circ z^m \circ \pi\langle s+1, t \rangle \circ z \circ \beta')$ and $z^m \in \mathcal{M}_1$.

CASE 2: $\gamma = \pi\langle s, k \rangle \circ \rho \circ \beta$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$, $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$

Evidently $\gamma = \underbrace{x \circ \dots \circ x}_{m-1 \text{ times}} \circ \phi$, where $\phi = x \circ y_{s+1} \circ z^m \circ \pi\langle s+1, k \rangle \circ \rho \circ \beta$. The only complicated case is $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_2$, i.e., $\beta = z \circ \beta'$. Note that $\rho \circ z \in \text{Subword}(\phi)$ and $\rho \circ z \in \mathcal{M}_1$.

(i) and (m)

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{V}^+$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{P}$. We must prove that $\alpha \circ \beta \in \underbrace{\mathcal{M} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{M}}_{m \text{ times}}$.

CASE 1: $\beta = \pi\langle s, t \rangle$

Evidently $\alpha \circ \beta = \phi \circ \underbrace{z \circ \dots \circ z}_{m-1 \text{ times}}$, where $\phi = (\alpha \circ \pi\langle s, t-1 \rangle \circ x^m \circ y_t \circ z)$. Obviously $z \in \mathcal{M}_2$.

It remains to verify that $\phi \in \mathcal{M}$.

CASE 1a: $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_1$

Obvious from Lemma 5.1.1 (i).

CASE 1b: $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_2$

Obvious from Lemma 5.1.1 (ii).

CASE 1c: $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_3$

Note that the rightmost symbol of α is x and the first m symbols of $\pi\langle s, t-1 \rangle \circ x^m \circ y_t \circ z$ are x^m . Thus $x^{m+1} \in \text{Subword}(\phi)$. In view of $x^{m+1} \in \mathcal{M}_1$ we have $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_1$.

CASE 1d: $\alpha \in \mathcal{V}^+$

Evidently $\alpha \circ x \in \text{Subword}(\phi)$. On the other hand, $\alpha \circ x \in \mathcal{V}^+ \circ \mathcal{Y}^+$ and $\mathcal{V}^+ \circ \mathcal{Y}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1$. According to Lemma 5.1.1 (i'), $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_1$.

CASE 2: $\beta = \pi\langle s, k \rangle \circ \rho$, $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$

Now $\alpha \circ \beta = \phi \circ \underbrace{z \circ \dots \circ z}_{m-2 \text{ times}} \circ (z \circ \rho)$, where ϕ is the same as in the previous case. We have already verified that $z \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{M}$. Evidently also $z \circ \rho \in \mathcal{M}$.

(j)

In view of (i) and (e) we have $\mathcal{T} \circ \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{M}^m \circ \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{M}^{m-1} \circ \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{M}^m = \mathcal{T}$. From (f) we obtain $\mathcal{T} \circ \mathcal{V}^+ = \mathcal{M}^m \circ \mathcal{V}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{M}^m = \mathcal{T}$. According to (d) we have $\mathcal{T} \circ \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{m+1} \subseteq \mathcal{M}^m = \mathcal{T}$.

(k)

Similar. We use (h), (e), (g), and (d).

(l)

Evidently $\pi\langle r, s \rangle \circ \pi\langle s', t \rangle = \phi \circ \underbrace{z \circ \dots \circ z}_{m-1 \text{ times}}$, where $\phi = (\pi\langle r, s \rangle \circ \pi\langle s', t-1 \rangle \circ x^m \circ y_t \circ z)$.

We only need to prove that $\phi \in \mathcal{M}$. Note that $y_s \circ z^m \circ x^m \circ y_{s'+1} \in \phi$. On the other hand $y_s \circ z^m \circ x^m \circ y_{s'+1} \in \mathcal{M}_1$, since $s \neq s'$. According to Lemma 5.1.1 (i'), $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_1$.

(n)

Let $\alpha = \pi\langle s, t \rangle$, $t < k$, and $\beta \in \mathcal{V}^+$. Evidently $\alpha \circ \beta = \underbrace{x \circ \dots \circ x}_{m-1 \text{ times}} \circ \phi$, where $\phi = x \circ y_{s+1} \circ z^m \circ \pi\langle s+1, t \rangle \circ \beta$. Note that $y_t \circ z^m \circ \beta \in \text{Subword}(\phi)$. On the other hand, $y_t \circ z^m \circ \beta \in \mathcal{M}_1$, since $t \neq k$. Thus $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_1$.

(o)

Let $\alpha = \pi\langle s, k \rangle$ and $\beta \notin \mathcal{R}$. Evidently $\alpha \circ \beta = \underbrace{x \circ \dots \circ x}_{m-1 \text{ times}} \circ \phi$, where $\phi = x \circ y_{s+1} \circ z^m \circ \pi\langle s+1, k \rangle \circ \beta$. Note that $z \circ \beta \in \text{Subword}(\phi)$. On the other hand, $z \circ \beta \in \mathcal{M}_1$, since β is not a left subword of δ (see the definition of \mathcal{R}). Thus $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_1$.

(p)

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{V}^+$. We must prove that $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}$.

CASE 1: $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_0$

According to (n), $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{T}$.

CASE 2: $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_1$

If $\beta \in \mathcal{R}$ then $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{P}_2$. If $\beta \notin \mathcal{R}$, then $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{T}$ in view of (o).

CASE 3: $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_2$

Evidently $\mathcal{P}_2 \circ \mathcal{V}^+ = (\mathcal{P}_1 \circ \mathcal{R}) \circ \mathcal{V}^+ = \mathcal{P}_1 \circ (\mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{V}^+) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \mathcal{V}^+$ and we can apply case 2.

(q)

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{P}$. We must prove that $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}$.

CASE 1: $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_0 \cup \mathcal{P}_1$, i.e., $\alpha = \pi\langle r, s \rangle$, where $0 \leq r < s \leq k$

CASE 1a: $\beta \in \mathcal{P}_0 \cup \mathcal{P}_1$, i.e., $\beta = \pi\langle s', t \rangle$, where $0 \leq s', t \leq k$

If $s = s'$, then $\alpha \circ \beta = \pi\langle r, s \rangle \circ \pi\langle s, t \rangle = \pi\langle r, t \rangle \in \mathcal{P}$ according to the definition of the

function π . If $s \neq s'$, then $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{T}$ according to (1).

CASE 1b: $\beta \in \mathcal{P}_2$

Evidently $\alpha \circ \beta \in \alpha \circ \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \mathcal{R}$. According to case 1a, $\alpha \circ \beta \in (\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}) \circ \mathcal{R} \subseteq (\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}) \circ \mathcal{V}^+$.

From (p) and (j) we obtain $(\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}) \circ \mathcal{V}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}$.

CASE 2: $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_2$

From (m) and (k) we get $\mathcal{P}_2 \circ \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_1 \circ (\mathcal{V}^+ \circ \mathcal{P}) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$.

This completes the proof of Lemma 5.1.2. ■

Now we apply Lemma 4.1 and obtain a function $u: \text{Tp}(m) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{W})$ satisfying the conditions (i)–(vii) from Lemma 4.1.

We define a function $\text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}: \mathcal{W}^+ \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{W}^+)$ and two valuations $w_0: \text{Tp}(m) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{W}^+)$ and $w: \text{Tp}(m) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{W}^+)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(q) &\rightleftharpoons \mathcal{M} \cup \{q\} \text{ if } q \in \mathcal{W} \\ \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha \circ q) &\rightleftharpoons \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha) \circ (\{q\} \cup \mathcal{M}) \text{ if } \alpha \in \mathcal{W}^+ \text{ and } q \in \mathcal{W} \end{aligned}$$

The set $\text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)$ consists of all words that are obtained replacing some (may be none) of symbol occurrences in α by words from the set \mathcal{M} .

$$\begin{aligned} w_0(A) &\rightleftharpoons \bigcup_{\alpha \in v(A)} \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha, \mathcal{M}) \\ w(A) &\rightleftharpoons u(A) \cup w_0(A) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.1.3 *Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}^+$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{W}^+$. Then $\text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha \circ \beta) = \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha) \circ \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\beta)$.*

PROOF. Induction on $|\beta|$. ■

Lemma 5.1.4 *Let $A \in \text{Tp}(m)$. Then*

- (i) $v(A) \subseteq w_0(A)$;
- (ii) $w_0(A) \subseteq v(A) \cup \mathcal{M}$.

PROOF. It suffices to verify that, for any $\alpha \in v(A)$,

- (i) $\alpha \in \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)$;
- (ii) $\text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha) \subseteq \{\alpha\} \cup \mathcal{M}$.

We prove this by induction on $|\alpha|$ for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}^+$.

Induction step.

(i)

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}^+$, $q \in \mathcal{W}$, and $\alpha \in \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)$. Then $\alpha \circ q \in \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha) \circ \{q\} \subseteq \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha \circ q)$.

(ii)

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}^+$, $q \in \mathcal{W}$, and $\text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha) \subseteq \{\alpha\} \cup \mathcal{M}$. Then $\text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha \circ q) = \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha) \circ (\{q\} \cup \mathcal{M}) \subseteq (\{\alpha\} \cup \mathcal{M}) \circ (\{q\} \cup \mathcal{M}) = \{\alpha \circ q\} \cup (\{\alpha\} \circ \mathcal{M}) \cup (\mathcal{M} \circ \{q\}) \cup (\mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{M})$. From Lemma 5.1.2 (g), (f), and (d) we obtain $\text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha \circ q) \subseteq \{\alpha \circ q\} \cup \mathcal{M}$. ■

Lemma 5.1.5 *Let $A \in \text{Tp}(m)$. Then $\mathcal{T} \subseteq w(A)$.*

PROOF. Since $\langle \mathcal{V}^+, \circ, v \rangle \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{Free}}^m$, we can choose a word $\alpha \in v(A)$ such that $|\alpha| \leq m$. Evidently $\underbrace{\mathcal{M} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{M}}_{|\alpha| \text{ times}} \subseteq \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha) \subseteq w_0(A) \subseteq w(A)$. In view of $\mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ and taking into account that $|\alpha| \leq m$, we have $\underbrace{\mathcal{M} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{M}}_{m \text{ times}} \subseteq \underbrace{\mathcal{M} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{M}}_{|\alpha| \text{ times}}$. Thus $\mathcal{T} = \underbrace{\mathcal{M} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{M}}_{m \text{ times}} \subseteq w(\alpha)$. ■

In order to make the formulation of the next lemma more readable we introduce the following two subsets of \mathcal{W}^* (recall that ε stands for the empty word).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q} &\Rightarrow \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{V}^+ \cup \mathcal{M} \\ \mathcal{Q}_\infty &\Rightarrow \{\varepsilon\} \cup \mathcal{Q} \cup (\mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{Q}) \cup (\mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{Q}) \cup \dots \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.1.6

- (i) $\mathcal{Q}_\infty \circ \mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{Q}_\infty \subseteq \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}$
- (ii) $\mathcal{Q}_\infty \circ \mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{Q}_\infty \circ \mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{Q}_\infty \subseteq \mathcal{T}$
- (iii) $\mathcal{Q}_\infty \circ \mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{Q}_\infty \circ \mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{Q}_\infty \subseteq \mathcal{T}$

PROOF.

(i) From Lemma 5.1.2 (q), (m), (i) and (k) we obtain $\mathcal{Q} \circ (\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}) \subseteq \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}$. Now we can easily prove $\underbrace{\mathcal{Q} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}}_{l \text{ times}} \circ \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}$ by induction on l .

From Lemma 5.1.2 (q), (p), (h) and (j) we obtain $(\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}) \circ \mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}$. By induction on l we see that $\mathcal{Q}_\infty \circ \mathcal{P} \circ \underbrace{\mathcal{Q} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}}_{l \text{ times}} \subseteq \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}$.

(ii) We prove that $(\mathcal{Q}_\infty \circ \mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{Q}_\infty) \circ \mathcal{M} \circ \underbrace{\mathcal{Q} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}}_{l \text{ times}} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ by induction on l .

Induction base. First we apply (i). Further, from Lemma 5.1.2 (h) and (j) we obtain $(\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}) \circ \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$.

Induction step. From Lemma 5.1.2 (j) we see that $\mathcal{T} \circ \mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$.

(iii) We prove that $\underbrace{\mathcal{Q} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}}_{l \text{ times}} \circ \mathcal{M} \circ (\mathcal{Q}_\infty \circ \mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{Q}_\infty) \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ by induction on l .

Induction base. From Lemma 5.1.2 (i) and (k) we obtain $\mathcal{M} \circ (\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}$.

Induction step. From Lemma 5.1.2 (k) we see that $\mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$. ■

Lemma 5.1.7 *$\langle \mathcal{W}^+, \circ, w \rangle$ is a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel.*

PROOF. We verify the conditions (1') and (2) from the definition of a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel at page 5.

(1')

Let $A \bullet B \in \text{Tp}(m)$ and $\gamma \in w(A \bullet B)$. We must prove that $\gamma \in w(A) \circ w(B)$.

CASE 1: $\gamma \in u(A \bullet B)$

Obvious from Lemma 4.1 (i).

CASE 2: $\gamma \in w_0(A \bullet B)$

Evidently $\gamma \in \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma')$ for some $\gamma' \in v(A \bullet B) = v(A) \circ v(B)$. Thus $\gamma' = \alpha' \circ \beta'$, where $\alpha' \in v(A)$ and $\beta' \in v(B)$. According to Lemma 5.1.3,

$\text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma') = \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha') \circ \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\beta') \subseteq w_0(A) \circ w_0(B)$.

(2)

Let $A_1, \dots, A_l, B \in \text{Tp}(m)$, $L \vdash A_1 \dots A_l \rightarrow B$, $\alpha_1 \in w(A_1), \dots, \alpha_l \in w(A_l)$. We must prove that $\alpha_1 \circ \dots \circ \alpha_l \in w(B)$.

CASE 1: $(\forall i \leq l) \alpha_i \in u(A_i)$

According to Lemma 4.1 (ii), $\alpha_1 \circ \dots \circ \alpha_l \in u(B) \cup \mathcal{T}$.

In view of Lemma 5.1.5, $\alpha_1 \circ \dots \circ \alpha_l \in w(B)$.

CASE 2: $(\forall j \leq l) \alpha_j \in w_0(A_j)$

This means that for every number $j \leq l$ there is a word $\beta_j \in v(A_j)$ such that $\alpha_j \in \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\beta_j)$. According to Lemma 5.1.3, $\alpha_1 \circ \dots \circ \alpha_l \in \text{Subst}_{\mathcal{M}}(\beta_1 \circ \dots \circ \beta_l)$. Note that $\beta_1 \circ \dots \circ \beta_l \in v(A_1) \circ \dots \circ v(A_l) \subseteq v(B)$, since $\langle \mathcal{V}^+, \circ v \rangle$ is a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel. Thus $\alpha_1 \circ \dots \circ \alpha_l \in w_0(B)$.

CASE 3: $(\exists i \leq l) \alpha_i \notin u(A_i)$ and $(\exists j \leq l) \alpha_j \notin w_0(A_j)$

Evidently $\alpha_i \in w_0(A_i)$. From Lemma 5.1.4 (ii) and Lemma 4.1 (vi) we obtain $\alpha_i \in v(A_i) \cup \mathcal{M}$ and $\alpha_i \notin v(A_i)$ respectively. Thus $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{M}$.

Evidently $\alpha_j \in u(A_j)$. From Lemma 4.1 (vii) and Lemma 5.1.4 (i) we obtain $\alpha_j \in v(A_j) \cup \mathcal{P}$ and $\alpha_j \notin v(A_j)$ respectively. Thus $\alpha_j \in \mathcal{P}$.

Note that $\alpha_{k'} \in \mathcal{Q}$ for every $k' \leq l$. According to Lemma 5.1.6 (i) and (ii), $\alpha_1 \circ \dots \circ \alpha_l \in \mathcal{T}$. It remains to apply Lemma 5.1.5. ■

We continue the proof of Lemma 5.1. The desired word $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}^+$ is taken to be $\alpha \rightleftharpoons \pi\langle g, k \rangle$.

(i)

Let $A \in \text{Tp}(m)$. We must verify that $w(A) \cap \mathcal{V}^+ = v(A)$.

From the definition of w we see that $w(A) \cap \mathcal{V}^+ = (u(A) \cap \mathcal{V}^+) \cup (w_0(A) \cap \mathcal{V}^+)$. According to Lemma 4.1 (vi) and (vii), and Lemma 5.1.2 (a) we have $u(A) \cap \mathcal{V}^+ = v(A)$. On the other hand, in view of Lemma 5.1.4 and Lemma 5.1.2 (c), $w_0(A) \cap \mathcal{V}^+ = v(A)$.

(ii)

Immediate from Lemma 4.1 (iii).

(iii)

Immediate from Lemma 4.1 (iv), if we take into account that $\pi\langle g, k \rangle \notin \mathcal{V}^+ \cup \mathcal{M}$ and thus $\pi\langle g, k \rangle \notin w_0(F)$ for any $F \in \text{Tp}(m)$.

(iv)

Immediate from Lemma 4.1 (v), if we take into account that $\pi\langle g, k \rangle \circ \delta \notin \mathcal{V}^+ \cup \mathcal{M}$ and thus $\pi\langle g, k \rangle \circ \delta \notin w_0(F)$ for any $F \in \text{Tp}(m)$. ■

Before proving that the Lambek calculus is L-complete we have to verify that the class $\mathcal{K}_{\text{Free}}^m$ is not empty.

Lemma 5.2 *The class $\mathcal{K}_{\text{Free}}^m$ is not empty.*

PROOF.

We define the *positive count* $\bar{\#}$ as the following mapping from types to positive integers.

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\#}p_i &\Leftrightarrow 1 \\ \bar{\#}(A \bullet B) &\Leftrightarrow \bar{\#}A + \bar{\#}B \\ \bar{\#}(A \setminus B) &\Leftrightarrow \max(1, \bar{\#}B - \bar{\#}A) \\ \bar{\#}(A / B) &\Leftrightarrow \max(1, \bar{\#}A - \bar{\#}B)\end{aligned}$$

The positive count of a sequence of types is defined in the natural way.

$$\bar{\#}(A_1 \dots A_l) \Leftrightarrow \bar{\#}A_1 + \dots + \bar{\#}A_l$$

Lemma 5.2.1 *For any type A , $\bar{\#}A \leq \|A\|$.*

Lemma 5.2.2 *If $L \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow A$ then $\bar{\#}\Gamma \geq \bar{\#}A$.*

PROOF. Straightforward induction on the length of the derivation.

CASE 1: Axiom

Obvious.

CASE 2: $(\rightarrow \setminus)$ Given $\frac{A \ \Pi \rightarrow B}{\Pi \rightarrow A \setminus B} (\rightarrow \setminus)$ where $\Pi \neq \Lambda$.

By the induction hypothesis $\bar{\#}A + \bar{\#}\Pi \geq \bar{\#}B$, whence $\bar{\#}\Pi \geq \bar{\#}B - \bar{\#}A$. On the other hand, for any non-empty sequence of types Π , $\bar{\#}\Pi \geq 1$.

Thus $\bar{\#}\Pi \geq \max(1, \bar{\#}B - \bar{\#}A) = \bar{\#}(A \setminus B)$.

CASE 3: $(\rightarrow /)$

Similar.

CASE 4: $(\setminus \rightarrow)$ Given $\frac{\Phi \rightarrow A \quad \Gamma B \Delta \rightarrow C}{\Gamma \Phi (A \setminus B) \Delta \rightarrow C} (\setminus \rightarrow)$

By the induction hypothesis $\bar{\#}\Phi \geq \bar{\#}A$ and $\bar{\#}\Gamma + \bar{\#}B + \bar{\#}\Delta \geq \bar{\#}C$.

Note that $\bar{\#}(A \setminus B) \geq \bar{\#}B - \bar{\#}A$.

Hence $\bar{\#}\Gamma + \bar{\#}\Phi + \bar{\#}(A \setminus B) + \bar{\#}\Delta \geq \bar{\#}\Gamma + \bar{\#}A + (\bar{\#}B - \bar{\#}A) + \bar{\#}\Delta \geq \bar{\#}C$.

CASE 5: $(/ \rightarrow)$

Similar.

CASE 6: $(\rightarrow \bullet)$ Given $\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow A \quad \Delta \rightarrow B}{\Gamma \Delta \rightarrow A \bullet B} (\rightarrow \bullet)$

If $\bar{\#}\Gamma \geq \bar{\#}A$ and $\bar{\#}\Delta \geq \bar{\#}B$, then $\bar{\#}\Gamma + \bar{\#}\Delta \geq \bar{\#}A + \bar{\#}B = \bar{\#}(A \bullet B)$.

CASE 7: $(\bullet \rightarrow)$ Given $\frac{\Gamma A B \Delta \rightarrow C}{\Gamma (A \bullet B) \Delta \rightarrow C} (\bullet \rightarrow)$

Evidently $\bar{\#}(\Gamma (A \bullet B) \Delta) = \bar{\#}(\Gamma A B \Delta)$. ■

Now we define a $\text{Tp}(m)$ -quasimodel $\langle \mathcal{V}^+, \circ, v \rangle$.

$$\mathcal{V} \rightleftharpoons \{a_0\} \quad v(A) \rightleftharpoons \underbrace{\{a_0 \circ \dots \circ a_0\}}_{k \text{ times}} \mid k \geq \bar{\#}A\}$$

It is immediate from Lemma 5.2.1 and Lemma 5.2.2 that $\langle \mathcal{V}^+, \circ, v \rangle \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{Free}}^m$. This completes the proof of Lemma 5.2. ■

Theorem 3 *The Lambek calculus is complete with respect to the class of all language models (L-models).*

PROOF. Let $L \not\vdash E \rightarrow F$. We are going to prove that there is an L-model $\langle \mathcal{W}^+, \circ, w \rangle$ such that

(i) $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \{a_j \mid j \in \mathbb{N}\}$;

(ii) $w(E) \not\subseteq w(F)$.

Evidently, there is a natural number m such that $E \in \text{Tp}(m)$ and $F \in \text{Tp}(m)$. We apply Lemma 5.1 putting $\delta = \varepsilon$ (the empty word) and taking any L-model from $\mathcal{K}_{\text{Free}}^m$ as $\langle \mathcal{V}^+, \circ, v \rangle$ (cf. Lemma 5.2). Thus we obtain an L-model $\langle \mathcal{W}_0^+, \circ, w_0 \rangle \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{Free}}^m$ such that $w_0(E) \not\subseteq w_0(F)$ (see Lemma 5.1 (ii) and (iii)).

To apply Theorem 1, we must first verify that the class $\mathcal{K}_{\text{Free}}^m$ is witnessed. This follows from Lemma 5.1 (i), (ii), and (iv). ■

Theorem 4 *The Lambek calculus is complete with respect to the class of all language models over a two symbol alphabet $\{b, c\}$.*

PROOF. Let $L \not\vdash E \rightarrow F$. Following the proof of Theorem 3 we find a free semigroup model $\langle \mathcal{V}^+, \circ, v \rangle$, where $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \{a_j \mid j \in \mathbb{N}\}$, such that $v(E) \not\subseteq v(F)$ and $v(A) \neq \emptyset$ for every $A \in \text{Tp}(m)$. We take $\mathcal{W} \rightleftharpoons \{b, c\}$ and define a function $g: \mathcal{V}^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{W}^+$ as follows.

$$g(a_j) \rightleftharpoons b \circ \underbrace{c \circ \dots \circ c}_{j \text{ times}} \circ b \quad g(\alpha \circ \beta) \rightleftharpoons g(\alpha) \circ g(\beta)$$

Now we put $w(p_i) \rightleftharpoons \{g(\gamma) \mid \gamma \in v(p_i)\}$ for every primitive type p_i and define $w(A)$ for complex types like in the proof of Theorem 1.

By induction on $\|A\|$ we see that $w(A) \rightleftharpoons \{g(\gamma) \mid \gamma \in v(A)\}$ for every $A \in \text{Tp}(m)$. Thus $w(E) \not\subseteq w(F)$. ■

6 Weights

In this section we assign to every derivable sequent of the form $\Gamma \rightarrow B \cdot C$ a set of positive integers. These integers are “weights” of the type B with respect to different derivations of $\Gamma \rightarrow B \cdot C$. The main properties of the weights are the following.

- Given a fixed sequence Γ , there is only a finite number of possible values for the weights of B with respect to derivations of $\Gamma \rightarrow B \cdot C$.
- If the weights of B_1 and B_2 with respect to some derivations of $\Gamma \rightarrow B_1 \cdot C_1$ and $\Gamma \rightarrow B_2 \cdot C_2$ are equal, then the sequents $\Gamma \rightarrow B_1 \cdot C_2$ and $\Gamma \rightarrow B_2 \cdot C_1$ are derivable in the Lambek calculus (cf. Lemma 6.7).

At the end of this section we shall prove Lemma 3.1. The domain \mathbf{D}_Γ of the quasimodel $\langle \mathbf{V}_\Gamma \subset \mathbf{D}_\Gamma \times \mathbf{D}_\Gamma, \circ, v_\Gamma \rangle$ will consist of all possible values for the weights corresponding to the antecedent Γ .

6.1 Calculus L^μ with multiple succedents

Here we introduce an alternative axiomatization of the Lambek calculus.

The sequents of L^μ are of the form $\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$, where Γ and Δ are non-empty sequences of types. The intended interpretation of $A_1 \dots A_m \rightarrow B_1 \dots B_n$ is $A_1 \cdot \dots \cdot A_m \rightarrow B_1 \cdot \dots \cdot B_n$.

The axiom scheme is $\Pi \rightarrow \Pi$, where $\Pi \neq \Lambda$.

The rules of L^μ are the following.

$$\frac{A\Pi \rightarrow B}{\Pi \rightarrow A \setminus B} (\rightarrow \setminus) \quad \text{where } \Pi \neq \Lambda \qquad \frac{\Phi \rightarrow A \quad \Gamma B \Delta \rightarrow \Theta}{\Gamma \Phi (A \setminus B) \Delta \rightarrow \Theta} (\setminus \rightarrow)$$

$$\frac{\Pi A \rightarrow B}{\Pi \rightarrow B / A} (\rightarrow /) \quad \text{where } \Pi \neq \Lambda \qquad \frac{\Phi \rightarrow A \quad \Gamma B \Delta \rightarrow \Theta}{\Gamma (B / A) \Phi \Delta \rightarrow \Theta} (/ \rightarrow)$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Theta A B \Xi}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Theta (A \cdot B) \Xi} (\rightarrow \cdot) \qquad \frac{\Gamma A B \Delta \rightarrow \Theta}{\Gamma (A \cdot B) \Delta \rightarrow \Theta} (\cdot \rightarrow)$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Theta \quad \Delta \rightarrow \Xi}{\Gamma \Delta \rightarrow \Theta \Xi} (CON)$$

We shall label L^μ -derivations with symbols \mathcal{D} , \mathcal{D}_1 , \mathcal{D}' , etc. We write $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Theta$ for ‘ \mathcal{D} is an L^μ -derivation of $\Gamma \rightarrow \Theta$ ’.

6.2 Equivalence of L^μ and L

Lemma 6.1 $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow A_1 \dots A_n$ if and only if $L \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow A_1 \cdot \dots \cdot A_n$.

PROOF. ‘If’ part.

Straightforward induction on the length of a cutfree derivation of $\Gamma \rightarrow A_1 \cdot \dots \cdot A_n$.

‘Only if’ part.

Induction on the length of the L^μ -derivation of $\Gamma \rightarrow A_1 \dots A_n$.

In the case of the rule

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow C_1 \dots \cdot C_m A B D_1 \dots \cdot D_n}{\Gamma \rightarrow C_1 \dots \cdot C_m (A \cdot B) D_1 \dots \cdot D_n} (\rightarrow \cdot)$$

we apply cut with the sequent

$$((C_1 \dots \cdot C_m \cdot A) \cdot B) \cdot D_1 \dots \cdot D_n \rightarrow (C_1 \dots \cdot C_m \cdot (A \cdot B)) \cdot D_1 \dots \cdot D_n.$$

In the case of the rule

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow A_1 \dots A_n \quad \Delta \rightarrow B_1 \dots B_m}{\Gamma \Delta \rightarrow A_1 \dots A_n B_1 \dots B_m} (CON)$$

we apply cut with the sequent $C \cdot (\dots (B_1 \cdot B_2) \dots \cdot B_m) \rightarrow (\dots ((C \cdot B_1) \cdot B_2) \dots \cdot B_m)$, where $C = A_1 \cdot \dots \cdot A_n$.

Other cases are trivial. ■

Lemma 6.2 *The rule*

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta \quad \Delta \rightarrow \Pi}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Pi} (CUT)$$

is admissible in the calculus L^μ .

PROOF. We derive in L^μ .

$$\frac{\frac{\Delta \rightarrow \Pi}{\bullet \Delta} (\bullet \rightarrow)}{\bullet \Delta} (\bullet \rightarrow)$$

According to Lemma 6.1 $L \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow (\bullet \Delta)$ and $L \vdash (\bullet \Delta) \rightarrow (\bullet \Pi)$. By an application of cut we obtain $L \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow (\bullet \Pi)$, whence $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow \Pi$. ■

6.3 Definition of weights

For any sequence $\Gamma \in \text{Tp}(m)$ we denote by $[\Gamma]$ the sequence of primitive types obtained from Γ by omitting parentheses and connectives. Thus $[\Gamma]$ is a word in the alphabet $\{p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots\}$. Note that $\|\Gamma\| = \|[\Gamma]\|$.

Example 3

$$[p_1 (p_1 \setminus (p_2 \cdot p_3))] = p_1 p_1 p_2 p_3$$

We are going to associate with every L^μ -derivation $\Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} C_1 \dots C_n$ a fragmentation of $[\Gamma]$ into n continuous subwords ζ_1, \dots, ζ_n such that $[\Gamma] = \zeta_1 \circ \dots \circ \zeta_n$. This will be done by induction on the length of the derivation \mathcal{D} . The *weight* of the type C_i (where $1 \leq i \leq n$) w.r.t. the derivation $\Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} C_1 \dots C_n$ is the length of ζ_i and it is denoted by $w^{\mathcal{D}}(C_i)$.

Obviously, the words ζ_1, \dots, ζ_n are uniquely defined if $w^{\mathcal{D}}(C_1), \dots, w^{\mathcal{D}}(C_n)$ and Γ are given. The following definitions and lemmas are given in terms of $w^{\mathcal{D}}(C_i)$, not ζ_i .

We shall write $w^{\mathcal{D}}(C_i C_{i+1} \dots C_j)$ for $w^{\mathcal{D}}(C_i) + w^{\mathcal{D}}(C_{i+1}) + \dots + w^{\mathcal{D}}(C_j)$.

Definition. The weights are defined by induction on the length of a derivation.

CASE 1: Axiom $C_1 \dots C_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} C_1 \dots C_n$.
 $w^{\mathcal{D}}(C_i) \rightleftharpoons \|C_i\|$

CASE 2: $(\rightarrow \backslash) \quad \frac{A \Pi \rightarrow B}{\Pi \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} A \backslash B} (\rightarrow \backslash)$
 $w^{\mathcal{D}}(A \backslash B) \rightleftharpoons \|\Pi\|$

CASE 3: $(\rightarrow /) \quad \frac{\Pi A \rightarrow B}{\Pi \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} B / A} (\rightarrow /)$
 $w^{\mathcal{D}}(B / A) \rightleftharpoons \|\Pi\|$

CASE 4: $(\backslash \rightarrow) \quad \frac{\Phi \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} A \quad \Gamma B \Delta \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{D}}} C_1 \dots C_n}{\Gamma \Phi(A \backslash B) \Delta \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} C_1 \dots C_n} (\backslash \rightarrow)$

$$w^{\mathcal{D}}(C_i) \rightleftharpoons \begin{cases} w^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(C_i) + \|\Phi\| + \|A\| & \text{if } w^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(C_1 \dots C_{i-1}) \leq \|\Gamma\| \text{ and } w^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(C_1 \dots C_i) > \|\Gamma\| \\ w^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(C_i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

CASE 5: $(/ \rightarrow) \quad \frac{\Phi \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} A \quad \Gamma B \Delta \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{D}}} C_1 \dots C_n}{\Gamma(B / A) \Phi \Delta \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} C_1 \dots C_n} (/ \rightarrow)$

$$w^{\mathcal{D}}(C_i) \rightleftharpoons \begin{cases} w^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(C_i) + \|\Phi\| + \|A\| & \text{if } w^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(C_{i+1} \dots C_n) \leq \|\Delta\| \text{ and } w^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(C_i \dots C_n) > \|\Delta\| \\ w^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(C_i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

CASE 6: $(\rightarrow \bullet) \quad \frac{\Gamma \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{D}}} \Theta A B \Xi}{\Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Theta(A \bullet B) \Xi} (\rightarrow \bullet)$

$$\begin{aligned} w^{\mathcal{D}}(A \bullet B) &\rightleftharpoons w^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(A) + w^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(B) \\ w^{\mathcal{D}}(C) &\rightleftharpoons w^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(C) \text{ for any placed type } C \text{ in } \Theta \text{ or } \Xi \end{aligned}$$

CASE 7: $(\bullet \rightarrow) \quad \frac{\Gamma A B \Delta \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{D}}} \Theta}{\Gamma(A \bullet B) \Delta \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Theta} (\bullet \rightarrow)$

$$w^{\mathcal{D}}(C) \rightleftharpoons w^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(C) \text{ for any placed type } C \text{ in } \Theta$$

$$\text{CASE 8: (CON)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} A_1 \dots A_n \quad \Delta \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{D}}} B_1 \dots B_m}{\Gamma \Delta \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} A_1 \dots A_n B_1 \dots B_m} \text{ (CON)}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{w}^{\mathcal{D}}(A_i) &\rightleftharpoons \mathfrak{w}^{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(A_i) \\ \mathfrak{w}^{\mathcal{D}}(B_i) &\rightleftharpoons \mathfrak{w}^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(B_i) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6.3 *If $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} C_1 \dots C_n$, then $\mathfrak{w}^{\mathcal{D}}(C_i) > 0$ for every $i \leq n$.*

Lemma 6.4 *If $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} C_1 \dots C_n$ then $\mathfrak{w}^{\mathcal{D}}(C_1 \dots C_n) = \|\Gamma\|$.*

PROOF. Straightforward induction on the length of the proof \mathcal{D} . The only non-trivial rules are $(\setminus \rightarrow)$ and $(/\rightarrow)$. We consider the following case.

$$\frac{\Phi \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} A \quad \Gamma B \Delta \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{D}}} C_1 \dots C_n}{\Gamma \Phi(A \setminus B) \Delta \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} C_1 \dots C_n} (\setminus \rightarrow)$$

By the induction hypothesis $\mathfrak{w}^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(C_1 \dots C_n) = \|\Gamma B \Delta\| > \|\Gamma\|$. Consequently there exists a unique number i_0 such that $\mathfrak{w}^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(C_1 \dots C_{i_0-1}) \leq \|\Gamma\|$ and $\mathfrak{w}^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(C_1 \dots C_{i_0}) > \|\Gamma\|$. Evidently

$$\mathfrak{w}^{\mathcal{D}}(C_1 \dots C_n) = \mathfrak{w}^{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(C_1 \dots C_n) + \|\Phi\| + \|A\| = \|\Gamma B \Delta\| + \|\Phi\| + \|A\|.$$

■

6.4 Properties of weights

The aim of this section is to prove two properties (Lemma 6.7 and Lemma 6.8 (i)), which will later be used in the proof of Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 6.5 *If $\Pi \Pi' \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}''} \Theta \Theta'$, $\Theta \neq \Lambda$, $\Theta' \neq \Lambda$, and $\mathfrak{w}^{\mathcal{D}''}(\Theta) = \|\Pi\|$, then*

- (i) *there is a derivation \mathcal{D} of the sequent $\Pi \rightarrow \Theta$ such that $\mathfrak{w}^{\mathcal{D}}(C) = \mathfrak{w}^{\mathcal{D}''}(C)$ for any placed type C in Θ ,*
- (ii) *there is a derivation \mathcal{D}' of the sequent $\Pi' \rightarrow \Theta'$ such that $\mathfrak{w}^{\mathcal{D}'}(C) = \mathfrak{w}^{\mathcal{D}''}(C)$ for any placed type C in Θ' .*

PROOF. Induction on the length of \mathcal{D}'' .

$$\text{CASE 1:} \quad \frac{\Phi \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{D}}} A \quad \Gamma B \Delta \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} C_1 \dots C_n}{\Gamma \Phi(A \setminus B) \Delta \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}''} C_1 \dots C_n} (\setminus \rightarrow)$$

Note that, for all k , either $\mathfrak{w}^{\mathcal{D}''}(C_1 \dots C_k) \leq \|\Gamma\|$ or $\mathfrak{w}^{\mathcal{D}''}(C_1 \dots C_k) > \|\Gamma\| + \|\Phi\| + \|A\|$. Thus we have two subcases.

$$\text{CASE 1a: } \frac{\Phi' \xrightarrow{\hat{D}} A' \quad \Gamma\Gamma'B'\Delta' \xrightarrow{\tilde{D}} \Theta\Theta'}{\Gamma\Gamma'\Phi'(A'\setminus B')\Delta' \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}''} \Theta\Theta'} (\setminus \rightarrow) \quad \text{and } w^{\tilde{D}}(\Theta) = \|\Gamma\|$$

$$\text{CASE 1b: } \frac{\Phi \xrightarrow{\hat{D}} A \quad \Gamma B\Delta\Delta' \xrightarrow{\tilde{D}} \Theta\Theta'}{\Gamma\Phi(A\setminus B)\Delta\Delta' \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}''} \Theta\Theta'} (\setminus \rightarrow) \quad \text{and } w^{\tilde{D}}(\Theta) = \|\Gamma B\Delta\|$$

Both subcases are easily reduced to the induction hypothesis.

The rule ($/ \rightarrow$) is treated similarly, other cases are trivial. ■

Lemma 6.6 *If $L^\mu \vdash \Pi_1 C \Delta_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_1} \Theta_1 \Xi_1$, $L^\mu \vdash \Pi_2 C \Delta_2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_2} \Theta_2 \Xi_2$, and $0 < w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1) - \|\Pi_1\| = w^{\mathcal{D}_2}(\Theta_2) - \|\Pi_2\| < \|C\|$, then there is a derivation \mathcal{D} of the sequent $\Pi_1 C \Delta_2 \rightarrow \Theta_1 \Xi_2$ such that*

(i) $w^{\mathcal{D}}(B) = w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(B)$ for any placed type B in Θ_1 ;

(ii) $w^{\mathcal{D}}(B) = w^{\mathcal{D}_2}(B)$ for any placed type B in Ξ_2 .

PROOF. Induction on the total length of \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 . We distinguish three cases.

CASE 1: C is the main type of the last rules of both \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 .

CASE 1a: $C = E \setminus F$

Given

$$\frac{\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{\hat{D}_1} E \quad \Gamma_1 F \Delta_1 \xrightarrow{\tilde{D}_1} \Theta_1 \Xi_1}{\Gamma_1 \Phi_1 (E \setminus F) \Delta_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_1} \Theta_1 \Xi_1} (\setminus \rightarrow) \quad \frac{\Phi_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{D}_2} E \quad \Gamma_2 F \Delta_2 \xrightarrow{\tilde{D}_2} \Theta_2 \Xi_2}{\Gamma_2 \Phi_2 (E \setminus F) \Delta_2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_2} \Theta_2 \Xi_2} (\setminus \rightarrow)$$

Here $\Pi_1 = \Gamma_1 \Phi_1$ and $\Pi_2 = \Gamma_2 \Phi_2$.

First we verify that $0 < w^{\tilde{D}_1}(\Theta_1) - \|\Gamma_1\| = w^{\tilde{D}_2}(\Theta_2) - \|\Gamma_2\| < \|F\|$ and next we apply the induction hypothesis to \tilde{D}_1 and \tilde{D}_2 .

If $w^{\tilde{D}_1}(\Theta_1) \leq \|\Gamma_1\|$ then, by the definition of the weights, $w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1) \leq \|\Gamma_1\| < \|\Pi_1\|$. This is in contradiction with $0 < w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1) - \|\Pi_1\|$. Thus $w^{\tilde{D}_1}(\Theta_1) > \|\Gamma_1\|$.

Further, by the definition of weights, $w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1) = w^{\tilde{D}_1}(\Theta_1) + \|\Phi_1\| + \|E\|$. Therefore

$$w^{\tilde{D}_1}(\Theta_1) - \|\Gamma_1\| = (w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1) - \|\Phi_1\| - \|E\|) - \|\Gamma_1\| = (w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1) - \|\Gamma_1 \Phi_1\|) - \|E\|$$

and similarly

$$w^{\tilde{D}_2}(\Theta_2) - \|\Gamma_2\| = (w^{\mathcal{D}_2}(\Theta_2) - \|\Gamma_2 \Phi_2\|) - \|E\|.$$

By the assumption of the lemma, the right hand sides of these equalities are equal.

This proves $w^{\tilde{D}_1}(\Theta_1) - \|\Gamma_1\| = w^{\tilde{D}_2}(\Theta_2) - \|\Gamma_2\|$.

Now we see that

$$w^{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1}(\Theta_1) - \|\Gamma_1\| = (w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1) - \|\Gamma_1\Phi_1\|) - \|E\| < \|E \setminus F\| - \|E\| = \|F\|.$$

By the induction hypothesis we find a derivation $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ of the sequent $\Gamma_1 F \Delta_2 \rightarrow \Theta_1 \Xi_2$.

$$\frac{\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{D}}_1} E \quad \Gamma_1 F \Delta_2 \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \Theta_1 \Xi_2}{\Gamma_1 \Phi_1 (E \setminus F) \Delta_2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Theta_1 \Xi_2} (\setminus \rightarrow)$$

CASE 1b: $C = E/F$

This case is treated in the same way as case 1a.

CASE 1c: $C = E \cdot F$

Given

$$\frac{\Pi_1 EF \Delta_1 \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{D}}_1} \Theta_1 \Xi_1}{\Pi_1 (E \cdot F) \Delta_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_1} \Theta_1 \Xi_1} (\cdot \rightarrow) \quad \frac{\Pi_2 EF \Delta_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{D}}_2} \Theta_2 \Xi_2}{\Pi_2 (E \cdot F) \Delta_2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_2} \Theta_2 \Xi_2} (\cdot \rightarrow)$$

If $w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1) = \|\Pi_1\| + \|E\|$, then we find an appropriate derivation of $\Pi_1 EF \Delta_2 \rightarrow \Theta_1 \Xi_2$ from Lemma 6.5 applying the rule (*CON*), otherwise from the induction hypothesis of this lemma. After that we derive

$$\frac{\Pi_1 EF \Delta_2 \rightarrow \Theta_1 \Xi_2}{\Pi_1 (E \cdot F) \Delta_2 \rightarrow \Theta_1 \Xi_2} (\cdot \rightarrow)$$

CASE 2: C is not the main type of the last rule of \mathcal{D}_1 .

We consider different subcases depending on the last rule of \mathcal{D}_1 .

CASE 2a: $(\setminus \rightarrow)$

CASE 2a.i: Given

$$\frac{\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{D}}_1} E_1 \quad \Gamma_1 F_1 \Psi_1 C \Delta_1 \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1} \Theta_1 \Xi_1}{\Gamma_1 \Phi_1 (E_1 \setminus F_1) \Psi_1 C \Delta_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_1} \Theta_1 \Xi_1} (\setminus \rightarrow) \quad \Pi_2 C \Delta_2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_2} \Theta_2 \Xi_2$$

It follows immediately from the definition of weights that

$w^{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1}(\Theta_1) - \|\Gamma_1 F_1 \Psi_1\| = w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1) - \|\Gamma_1 \Phi_1 (E_1 \setminus F_1) \Psi_1\|$. Thus we can apply the induction hypothesis to $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1$ and \mathcal{D}_2 .

$$\frac{\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{D}}_1} E_1 \quad \Gamma_1 F_1 \Psi_1 C \Delta_2 \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \Theta_1 \Xi_2}{\Gamma_1 \Phi_1 (E_1 \setminus F_1) \Psi_1 C \Delta_2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Theta_1 \Xi_2} (\setminus \rightarrow)$$

Other subcases are similar to case 2a.i.

CASE 3: C is not the main type of the last rules of \mathcal{D}_2 .

Similar to case 2. ■

Lemma 6.7 *If $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_1} \Theta_1 \Xi_1$, $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_2} \Theta_2 \Xi_2$, and $w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1) = w^{\mathcal{D}_2}(\Theta_2)$ then there is a derivation \mathcal{D} of the sequent $\Gamma \rightarrow \Theta_1 \Xi_2$ such that*

- (i) $w^{\mathcal{D}}(B) = w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(B)$ for any placed type B in Θ_1 ;
- (ii) $w^{\mathcal{D}}(B) = w^{\mathcal{D}_2}(B)$ for any placed type B in Ξ_2 .

PROOF. Let $\Gamma = A_1 \dots A_n$. Take $k \Leftarrow \min\{i \mid \|A_1 \dots A_i\| \geq w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1)\}$.

CASE 1: $\|A_1 \dots A_k\| > w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1)$

Evidently $\|A_1 \dots A_{k-1}\| < w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1) = w^{\mathcal{D}_2}(\Theta_2) < \|A_1 \dots A_{k-1}\| + \|A_k\|$.

We apply Lemma 6.6 with $C = A_k$, $\Pi_1 = \Pi_2 = A_1 \dots A_{k-1}$, and $\Delta_1 = \Delta_2 = A_{k+1} \dots A_n$.

CASE 2: $\|A_1 \dots A_k\| = w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1)$

If $k = 0$ then take $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_2$. If $k = n$ then take $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_1$.

If $0 < k < n$, then $L \vdash A_1 \dots A_k \rightarrow \Theta_1$, $L \vdash A_{k+1} \dots A_n \rightarrow \Xi_1$, $L \vdash A_1 \dots A_k \rightarrow \Theta_2$, and $L \vdash A_{k+1} \dots A_n \rightarrow \Xi_2$ according to Lemma 6.5. Applying the rule (CON) we obtain $L \vdash A_1 \dots A_k A_{k+1} \dots A_n \rightarrow \Theta_1 \Xi_2$. ■

There are several cut rules admissible in L^μ . We are interested in the following rule.

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Theta \Delta \Xi \quad \Delta \rightarrow \Psi}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Theta \Psi \Xi}$$

Lemma 6.8 (i) *If $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_1} \Theta \Delta \Xi$ and $L^\mu \vdash \Delta \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \Phi$, then there is a derivation \mathcal{D} of the sequent $\Gamma \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi$ such that $w^{\mathcal{D}}(A) = w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(A)$ for any placed type A in Θ and $w^{\mathcal{D}}(B) = w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(B)$ for any placed type B in Ξ .*

(ii) *If $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_1} \Theta \Delta_1$, $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma_3 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_3} \Delta_3 \Xi$, and $L^\mu \vdash \Delta_1 \Delta_3 \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \Phi$, then there is a derivation \mathcal{D} of the sequent $\Gamma_1 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi$ such that $w^{\mathcal{D}}(A) = w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(A)$ for any placed type A in Θ and $w^{\mathcal{D}}(B) = w^{\mathcal{D}_3}(B)$ for any placed type B in Ξ .*

(iii) *If $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_1} \Theta \Delta_1$, $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma_2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_2} \Delta_2$, $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma_3 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_3} \Delta_3 \Xi$, and $L^\mu \vdash \Delta_1 \Delta_2 \Delta_3 \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \Phi$, where Δ_1 and Δ_2 are non-empty, then there is a derivation \mathcal{D} of the sequent $\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi$ such that $w^{\mathcal{D}}(A) = w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(A)$ for any placed type A in Θ and $w^{\mathcal{D}}(B) = w^{\mathcal{D}_3}(B)$ for any placed type B in Ξ .*

PROOF. First we prove (iii) by induction on the total length of \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_3 . After this it is easy to prove (ii) and (i) in the similar way.

We consider a number of cases depending on the last rules of \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_3 in (iii).

CASE 1: (CON) in \mathcal{D}_1

CASE 1a:

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma_1 \rightarrow \Theta \Delta_1 \quad \Gamma'_1 \rightarrow \Delta'_1}{\Gamma_1 \Gamma'_1 \rightarrow \Theta \Delta_1 \Delta'_1} (CON) \quad \Gamma_2 \rightarrow \Delta_2 \quad \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Delta_3 \Xi \quad \Delta_1 \Delta_2 \Delta_3 \rightarrow \Phi}{\Gamma_1 \Gamma'_1 \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi}$$

↓

$$\frac{\Gamma_1 \rightarrow \Theta \Delta_1 \quad \frac{\Gamma'_1 \rightarrow \Delta'_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \rightarrow \Delta_2}{\Gamma'_1 \Gamma_2 \rightarrow \Delta'_1 \Delta_2} (CON) \quad \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Delta_3 \Xi \quad \Delta_1 \Delta_2 \Delta_3 \rightarrow \Phi}{\Gamma_1 \Gamma'_1 \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi}$$

CASE 1b:

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma'_1 \rightarrow \Theta' \quad \Gamma_1 \rightarrow \Theta \Delta_1}{\Gamma'_1 \Gamma_1 \rightarrow \Theta' \Theta \Delta_1} (CON) \quad \Gamma_2 \rightarrow \Delta_2 \quad \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Delta_3 \Xi \quad \Delta_1 \Delta_2 \Delta_3 \rightarrow \Phi}{\Gamma'_1 \Gamma_1 \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta' \Theta \Phi \Xi}$$

↓

$$\frac{\Gamma'_1 \rightarrow \Theta' \quad \frac{\Gamma_1 \rightarrow \Theta \Delta_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \rightarrow \Delta_2 \quad \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Delta_3 \Xi \quad \Delta_1 \Delta_2 \Delta_3 \rightarrow \Phi}{\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi}}{\Gamma'_1 \Gamma_1 \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta' \Theta \Phi \Xi} (CON)$$

CASE 2: ($\setminus \rightarrow$) in \mathcal{D}_1

$$\frac{\frac{\Psi \rightarrow A \quad \Gamma B \Pi \rightarrow \Theta \Delta_1}{\Gamma \Psi (A \setminus B) \Pi \rightarrow \Theta \Delta_1} (\setminus \rightarrow) \quad \Gamma_2 \rightarrow \Delta_2 \quad \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Delta_3 \Xi \quad \Delta_1 \Delta_2 \Delta_3 \rightarrow \Phi}{\Gamma \Psi (A \setminus B) \Pi \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi}$$

↓

$$\frac{\Psi \rightarrow A \quad \frac{\Gamma B \Pi \rightarrow \Theta \Delta_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \rightarrow \Delta_2 \quad \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Delta_3 \Xi \quad \Delta_1 \Delta_2 \Delta_3 \rightarrow \Phi}{\Gamma B \Pi \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi}}{\Gamma \Psi (A \setminus B) \Pi \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi} (\setminus \rightarrow)$$

CASE 3: ($/ \rightarrow$) in \mathcal{D}_1

$$\frac{\frac{\Psi \rightarrow A \quad \Gamma B \Pi \rightarrow \Theta \Delta_1}{\Gamma (B/A) \Psi \Pi \rightarrow \Theta \Delta_1} (\setminus \rightarrow) \quad \Gamma_2 \rightarrow \Delta_2 \quad \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Delta_3 \Xi \quad \Delta_1 \Delta_2 \Delta_3 \rightarrow \Phi}{\Gamma (B/A) \Psi \Pi \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi}$$

↓

$$\frac{\Psi \rightarrow A \quad \frac{\Gamma B \Pi \rightarrow \Theta \Delta_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \rightarrow \Delta_2 \quad \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Delta_3 \Xi \quad \Delta_1 \Delta_2 \Delta_3 \rightarrow \Phi}{\Gamma B \Pi \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi}}{\Gamma (B/A) \Psi \Pi \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi} (\setminus \rightarrow)$$

CASE 4: ($\rightarrow \bullet$) in \mathcal{D}_1

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma_1 \rightarrow \Theta \Psi AB \Pi}{\Gamma_1 \rightarrow \Theta \Psi(A \cdot B) \Pi} (\rightarrow \bullet) \quad \frac{\Gamma_2 \rightarrow \Delta_2 \quad \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Delta_3 \Xi \quad \Psi(A \cdot B) \Pi \Delta_2 \Delta_3 \rightarrow \Phi}{\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi}}{\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi} \downarrow$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_1 \rightarrow \Theta \Psi AB \Pi \quad \Gamma_2 \rightarrow \Delta_2 \quad \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Delta_3 \Xi \quad \frac{\Psi AB \Pi \Delta_2 \Delta_3 \rightarrow \Phi}{\Psi(A \cdot B) \Pi \Delta_2 \Delta_3 \rightarrow \Phi} (\rightarrow \bullet)^{-1}}{\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Theta \Phi \Xi}$$

CASE 5: $(\bullet \rightarrow)$ in \mathcal{D}_1

Similar to case 2.

CASE 6: (CON) , $(\backslash \rightarrow)$, $(/ \rightarrow)$, $(\rightarrow \bullet)$, or $(\bullet \rightarrow)$ in \mathcal{D}_3

Similar to the corresponding case for \mathcal{D}_1 .

CASE 7: $(\rightarrow \backslash)$ or $(\rightarrow /)$ in \mathcal{D}_1 and $(\rightarrow \backslash)$ or $(\rightarrow /)$ in \mathcal{D}_2

Evidently, both Θ and Ξ are empty. According to Lemma 6.2, $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma_1 \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Phi$. ■

6.5 Construction of the R-models $\langle \mathbf{V}_\Gamma, \circ, v_\Gamma \rangle$

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.1. We must construct a family of quasimodels $\langle \mathbf{V}_\Gamma \subseteq \mathbf{D}_\Gamma \times \mathbf{D}_\Gamma, \circ, v_\Gamma \rangle$ indexed by sequences of types $\Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*$, such that $\langle \mathbf{V}_\Gamma, \circ \rangle \in \mathcal{S}_Z$ for any Γ (cf. Example 1 (f)).

We have to point out designated elements $\psi \in \mathbf{D}_\Lambda$ and $\chi_\Gamma \in \mathbf{D}_\Gamma$ such that

- (i) $(\forall \Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*) (\forall C \in \text{Tp}) \langle \psi, \chi_\Gamma \rangle \in v_\Gamma(C) \Leftrightarrow L \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow C$
- (ii) $(\forall \Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*) (\forall \Pi \in \text{Tp}^*) \mathbf{D}_\Gamma \subseteq \mathbf{D}_{\Gamma\Pi}$ and $\mathbf{V}_\Gamma \subseteq \mathbf{V}_{\Gamma\Pi}$
- (iii) $(\forall \Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*) (\forall \Pi \in \text{Tp}^*) (\forall C \in \text{Tp}) v_\Gamma(C) \subseteq v_{\Gamma\Pi}(C)$
- (iv) $(\forall \Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*) (\forall B \in \text{Tp}) \langle \chi_\Gamma, \chi_{\Gamma B} \rangle \in v_{\Gamma B}(B)$

This is done as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_\Gamma &\Leftrightarrow \{i \in \mathbf{N} \mid 0 \leq i \leq \|\Gamma\|\} \\ \mathbf{V}_\Gamma &\Leftrightarrow \{\langle i, j \rangle \in \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{N} \mid 0 \leq i < j \leq \|\Gamma\|\} \\ v_\Gamma(C) &\Leftrightarrow \\ &\{\langle i, j \rangle \in \mathbf{V}_\Gamma \mid (\exists \Theta \in \text{Tp}^*) (\exists \Xi \in \text{Tp}^*) (\exists \mathcal{D}) L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Theta C \Xi, \mathbf{w}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Theta) = i, \mathbf{w}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Theta C) = j\} \\ &\psi \Leftrightarrow 0 \quad \chi_\Gamma \Leftrightarrow \|\Gamma\| \end{aligned}$$

First, we verify that for any $\Gamma \in \text{Tp}^*$, $\langle \mathbf{V}_\Gamma, \circ, v_\Gamma \rangle$ is a quasimodel.

- (1) $v_\Gamma(A) \circ v_\Gamma(B) \subseteq v_\Gamma(A \cdot B)$

Let $\langle i, j \rangle \in v_\Gamma(A)$ and $\langle j, k \rangle \in v_\Gamma(B)$. This means that $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_1} \Theta_1 A \Xi_1$, $L^\mu \vdash$

$\Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_2} \Theta_2 B \Xi_2$, $w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1) = i$, $w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta_1 A) = j$, $w^{\mathcal{D}_2}(\Theta_2) = j$, and $w^{\mathcal{D}_2}(\Theta_2 B) = k$. According to Lemma 6.7, $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Theta_1 A B \Xi_2$. Further, $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}'} \Theta_1(A \cdot B) \Xi_2$. Note that $w^{\mathcal{D}'}(\Theta_1) = i$ and $w^{\mathcal{D}'}(\Theta_1(A \cdot B)) = k$. Thus $\langle i, k \rangle \in v_\Gamma(A \cdot B)$.

$$(1) \quad v_\Gamma(A \cdot B) \subseteq v_\Gamma(A) \circ v_\Gamma(B)$$

Let $\langle i, k \rangle \in v_\Gamma(A \cdot B)$. This means that $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_1} \Theta(A \cdot B) \Xi$, $w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta) = i$, $w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta(A \cdot B)) = k$. Note that $L^\mu \vdash (A \cdot B) \rightarrow AB$. According to Lemma 6.8 (i) there is a derivation \mathcal{D} such that $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Theta A B \Xi$, $w^{\mathcal{D}}(\Theta) = i$, $w^{\mathcal{D}}(\Theta A B) = k$. Let $j \Leftarrow w^{\mathcal{D}}(\Theta A)$. Evidently $\langle i, j \rangle \in v_\Gamma(A)$ and $\langle j, k \rangle \in v_\Gamma(B)$.

$$(2)$$

Let $L \vdash A \rightarrow B$ and $\langle i, j \rangle \in v_\Gamma(A)$. This means that $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_1} \Theta A \Xi$, $w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta) = i$, and $w^{\mathcal{D}_1}(\Theta A) = j$. In view of Lemma 6.1, $L^\mu \vdash A \rightarrow B$. According to Lemma 6.8 (i) there is a derivation \mathcal{D} such that $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Theta B \Xi$, $w^{\mathcal{D}}(\Theta) = i$, $w^{\mathcal{D}}(\Theta B) = j$. Thus $\langle i, j \rangle \in v_\Gamma(B)$.

Now we verify that $\langle V_\Gamma, \circ, v_\Gamma \rangle$ satisfies (i)–(iv).

$$(i)$$

Let $L \vdash \Gamma \rightarrow C$. Then $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} C$ and $w^{\mathcal{D}}(C) = \|\Gamma\|$, whence $\langle 0, \|\Gamma\| \rangle \in v_\Gamma(C)$.

For the converse, let $\langle 0, \|\Gamma\| \rangle \in v_\Gamma(C)$. Then $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Theta C \Xi$, $w^{\mathcal{D}}(\Theta) = 0$, and $w^{\mathcal{D}}(\Theta C) = \|\Gamma\| = w^{\mathcal{D}}(\Theta C \Xi)$. Thus $\Theta = \Lambda$ and $\Xi = \Lambda$.

$$(ii)$$

Obvious.

$$(iii)$$

Let $\langle i, j \rangle \in v_\Gamma(C)$, i.e., $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Theta C \Xi$, $w^{\mathcal{D}}(\Theta) = i$, and $w^{\mathcal{D}}(\Theta C) = j$. Applying the rule (CON) we obtain $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma \Pi \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}'} \Theta C \Xi \Pi$, $w^{\mathcal{D}'}(\Theta) = i$, and $w^{\mathcal{D}'}(\Theta C) = j$.

$$(iv)$$

There is a derivation \mathcal{D} such that $L^\mu \vdash \Gamma B \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Gamma B$, $w^{\mathcal{D}}(\Gamma) = \|\Gamma\| = \chi_\Gamma$, and $w^{\mathcal{D}}(\Gamma B) = \|\Gamma B\| = \chi_{\Gamma B}$. Thus $\langle \chi_\Gamma, \chi_{\Gamma B} \rangle \in v_{\Gamma B}(B)$. ■

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank S. Artemov, L. Beklemishev, M. Kanovich, and N. Pankratiev for constructive discussions of matters treated here. I am also grateful to J. van Benthem, M. Kanazawa, Y. Venema, and G. Dzhaparidze for valuable comments on the first draft of this paper. I wish to express my gratitude to W. Buszkowski for providing information about the history of the Lambek calculus.

References

- [1] J. van Benthem. *Language in Action: Categories, Lambdas and Dynamic Logic*.

- North-Holland, Amsterdam, (Studies in Logic 130), 1991.
- [2] W. Buszkowski. Undecidability of some logical extensions of Ajdukiewicz-Lambek calculus. *Studia Logica*, 37:59–64, 1978.
 - [3] W. Buszkowski. Compatibility of categorial grammar with an associated category system. *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik*, 28:229–238, 1982.
 - [4] W. Buszkowski. Some decision problems in the theory of syntactic categories. *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik*, 28:539–548, 1982.
 - [5] W. Buszkowski. Completeness Results for Lambek Syntactic Calculus. *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik*, 32:13–28, 1986.
 - [6] K. Došen. A Completeness Theorem for the Lambek Calculus of Syntactic Categories. *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik*, 31:235–241, 1985.
 - [7] K. Došen. A brief survey of frames for the Lambek calculus. Bericht 5-90, Konstanzer Berichte zur Logik und Wissenschaftstheorie, Universität Konstanz, 1990. To appear in *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik*.
 - [8] J. Lambek. The mathematics of sentence structure. *American Mathematical Monthly*, 65(3):154–170, 1958.
 - [9] Sz. Mikulás. The Completeness of the Lambek Calculus with respect to Relational Semantics. 1992.
 - [10] N. Pankratiev. Completeness of the Lambek Calculus with respect to Relativized Relational Semantics. ILLC Prepublication Series LP-93-03, Institute for Logic, Language and Computation, University of Amsterdam, 1993.

The ILLC Prepublication Series

- 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 Flexible Categoriele 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 Dmitrij 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 Dimiter 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 $IA_0 + EXP$
 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 LP-93-01 Martijn Spaan *Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Language* Parallel Quantification
 LP-93-02 Makoto Kanazawa Dynamic Generalized Quantifiers and Monotonicity
 LP-93-03 Nikolai Pankrat'ev Completeness of the Lambek Calculus with respect to Relativized Relational Semantics
 LP-93-04 Jacques van Leeuwen Identity, Quarrelling with an Unproblematic Notion
 LP-93-05 Jaap van der Does Sums and Quantifiers
 LP-93-06 Paul Dekker Updates in Dynamic Semantics
 LP-93-07 Wojciech Buszkowski On the Equivalence of Lambek Categorical Grammars and Basic Categorical Grammars
 LP-93-08 Zisheng Huang, Peter van Emde Boas Information Acquisition from Multi-Agent resources; abstract
 LP-93-09 Makoto Kanazawa Completeness and Decidability of the Mixed Style of Inference with Composition
 LP-93-10 Makoto Kanazawa Weak vs. Strong Readings of Donkey Sentences and Monotonicity Inference in a Dynamic Setting
 LP-93-11 Friederike Moltmann Resumptive Quantifiers in Exception Sentences
 LP-93-12 Jaap van der Does On Complex Plural Noun Phrases
 LP-93-13 Natasha Alechina Binary Quantifiers and Relational Semantics
 LP-93-14 Mati Pentus Lambek Calculus is L-complete
 ML-93-01 Maciej Kandulski *Mathematical Logic and Foundations* Commutative Lambek Categorical Grammars
 ML-93-02 Johan van Benthem, Natasha Alechina Modal Quantification over Structured Domains
 ML-93-03 Mati Pentus The Conjoinability Relation in Lambek Calculus and Linear Logic
 ML-93-04 Andreja Priatelj Bounded Contraction and Many-Valued Semantics
 ML-93-05 Raymond Hoofman, Harold Schellinx Models of the Untyped λ -calculus in Semi Cartesian Closed Categories
 ML-93-06 J. Zashnev Categorical Generalization of Algebraic Recursion Theory
 ML-93-07 A.V. Chagrov, L.A. Chagrova Algorithmic Problems Concerning First-Order Definability of Modal Formulas on the Class of All Finite Frames
 ML-93-08 Raymond Hoofman, Ieke Moerdijk Remarks on the Theory of Semi-Functors
 ML-93-09 A.S. Troelstra Natural Deduction for Intuitionistic Linear Logic
 ML-93-10 Vincent Danos, Jean-Baptiste Joinet, Harold Schellinx 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
 ML-93-20 L.A. Chagrova, Dick de Jongh The Decidability of Dependency in Intuitionistic Propositional Logic
 CT-93-01 Marianne Kalsbeek *Computation and Complexity Theory* The Vanilla Meta-Interpreter for Definite Logic Programs and Ambivalent Syntax
 CT-93-02 Sophie Fischer A Note on the Complexity of Local Search Problems
 CT-93-03 Johan van Benthem, Jan Bergstra Logic of Transition Systems
 CT-93-04 Karen L. Kwast, Sieger van Denneheuvel The Meaning of Duplicates in the Relational Database Model
 CT-93-05 Erik Aarts Proving Theorems of the Lambek Calculus of Order 2 in Polynomial Time
 CT-93-06 Krzysztof R. Apt Declarative programming in Prolog
 CL-93-01 Noor van Leusen, László Kálmán *Computational Linguistics* The Interpretation of Free Focus
 CL-93-02 Theo M.V. Janssen An Algebraic View On Rosetta
 CL-93-03 Patrick Blackburn, Claire Gardent, Wilfried Meyer-Viol Talking about Trees
 X-93-01 Paul Dekker *Other Prepublications* Existential Disclosure, revised version
 X-93-02 Maarten de Rijke What is Modal Logic?
 X-93-03 Michiel Leezenberg Gorani Influence on Central Kurdish: Substratum or Prestige Borrowing
 X-93-04 A.S. Troelstra (editor) Metamathematical Investigation of Intuitionistic Arithmetic and Analysis, Corrections to the First Edition
 X-93-05 A.S. Troelstra (editor) Metamathematical Investigation of Intuitionistic Arithmetic and Analysis, Second, corrected Edition
 X-93-06 Michael Zakharyashev Canonical Formulas for K4. Part II: Cofinal Subframe Logics