

# Natural Proof Search for Classical Logic

Adam Lassiter  
Department of Computer Science  
University of Bath

Willem Heijltjes  
Department of Computer Science  
University of Bath

December 2, 2018

## Abstract

We investigate a natural algorithm for proof search within classical logic.

## 1 Classical Logic

**Definition 1.1.** Formulae

A *formula* within classical logic is constructed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A, B, C &::= \perp \mid \top \mid a \mid \neg a \mid A \vee B \mid A \wedge B \\ \Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma &::= A_1 \dots A_n \end{aligned}$$

where  $\vee, \wedge$  are additive linear logic disjunction and conjunction respectively and  $\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma$  are contexts..

**Example.**

**Definition 1.2.** Sequent Proofs

Within *classical logic*, a *sequent proof* is constructed from the following rules:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \frac{}{\vdash \top} \top & \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A}{\vdash \Gamma, A \vee B} \vee R & \frac{\vdash \Gamma}{\vdash \Gamma, A} w \\ \frac{}{\vdash a, \neg a} ax & \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A \quad \vdash \Gamma, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A \wedge B} \wedge R & \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, A}{\vdash \Gamma, A} c \end{array}$$

where  $A, B, C$  are formulae and  $\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma$  are sequents. A sequent proof provides, without context, a proof of its conclusion and each line of the proof represents a tautology.

**Example.**

**Remark 1.3.** Within the context of weakening and contraction, *additive* and *multiplicative* rules are inter-derivable.

**Definition 1.4.** Derivations

Given *tops*  $\Gamma_1 \dots \Gamma_n$  for the sequent proof  $\vdash \Delta$ , a *derivation* is a tree providing a proof of  $\Gamma_1 \dots \Gamma_n \implies \Delta$ .

A derivation is written as:

$$\frac{\frac{\vdash \Gamma_1 \quad \dots \quad \vdash \Gamma_n}{\vdash \Delta} [label]}$$

where the *label* describes which rules may be used within the derivation.

**Corollary 1.5.** Derivation Equivalence

A sequent proof is a derivation where all top derivations of the tree are  $\vdash \top, ax$ . Equivalence of derivations may be weakly defined up to equivalence of leaves and conclusion.

**Example.**

**Definition 1.6.** Additive Stratification

A proof tree is said to be *additively stratified* if  $\vdash P$  is structured as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdash A_1}{\vdash \Gamma_1} w \quad \dots \quad \frac{\frac{\vdash A_n}{\vdash \Gamma_n} w}{\vdash P \dots P} \wedge, \vee}{\vdash P} c$$

That is, the inferences made in an additively stratified proof are strictly ordered by:

1. Top/Axiomatic
2. Weakening
3. Conjunction/Disjunction
4. Contraction

**Example.**

**Theorem 1.7.** Stratification Equivalence

Given  $\vdash A$ , there exists an additively stratified proof of  $A$ .

*Proof.* For each instance of a weakening below another inference, there exists an equivalent subproof that is additively stratified:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A \vee B} \vee}{\vdash \Gamma, A \vee B, C} w &\quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \frac{\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A, B, C} w}{\vdash \Gamma, A \vee B, C} \vee \\[10pt] \frac{\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A \quad \vdash \Gamma, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A \wedge B} \wedge}{\vdash \Gamma, A \wedge B, C} w &\quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \frac{\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A}{\vdash \Gamma, A, C} w \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, B}{\vdash \Gamma, B, C} w}{\vdash \Gamma, A \wedge B, C} \wedge \\[10pt] \frac{\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, A}{\vdash \Gamma, A} c}{\vdash \Gamma, A, B} w &\quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \frac{\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, A}{\vdash \Gamma, A, A, B} w}{\vdash \Gamma, A, B} c \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for each instance of a contraction above another inference, there exists an equivalent subproof that is additively stratified:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, A, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A, B} c}{\vdash \Gamma, A \vee B} \vee}{\vdash \Gamma, A \vee B} \vee \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, A, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A, A, B, B} w}{\vdash \Gamma, A \vee B, A, B} \vee}{\vdash \Gamma, A \vee B, A \vee B} \vee}{\vdash \Gamma, A \vee B} c
\end{array}$$
  

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, A}{\vdash \Gamma, A} c}{\vdash \Gamma, A \wedge B} \wedge}{\vdash \Gamma, A \wedge B} \wedge \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdash \Gamma, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A, B} w}{\vdash \Gamma, A, A \wedge B} \wedge}{\vdash \Gamma, A \wedge B, A \wedge B} \wedge}{\vdash \Gamma, A \wedge B} c
\end{array}$$

By induction from the leaves downwards on a finite height tree, apply the associated rule to each pair of inferences of the form ( $c$  above  $inf$ ). Any given  $\vdash P$  may be rewritten:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdash A_1}{\vdash \Gamma_1} \top, ax}{\vdash \Gamma_1} \wedge, \vee, w}{\vdash P} \quad \dots \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdash A_n}{\vdash \Gamma_n} \top, ax}{\vdash \Gamma_n} \wedge, \vee, w}{\vdash P} c}{\vdash P}$$

Again, by induction from the root upwards on this partially stratified tree, apply the associated rule to each pair of inferences of the form ( $w$  below  $inf$ ).  $\vdash P$  may then be further rewritten:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdash A_1}{\vdash \Gamma_1} \top, ax}{\vdash \Gamma_1} w}{\vdash P \dots P} \wedge, \vee}{\vdash P} c$$

□

## 2 Coalescence

**Definition 2.1.** Petri Nets

A petri net is ...

**Example.**

**Definition 2.2.** Coalescence

The coalescence algorithm is ...

**Theorem 2.3.** Coalescence Proof Search

The coalescence algorithm is a proof search ...

*Proof.* By relation of:

- $c \iff$  dimensionality
- $ax \iff$  2-D token initialisation
- $w \iff$  n-D extension of tokens

- $\wedge R, \vee R \equiv$  petri net firing

□