

Sub-Permutation Grammar

by Sven Nilsen, 2018

In this paper I develop a sub-permutation grammar from the notation of generalized swap grammar. This has applications in permutative path semantics, which reasons about sub-types of permutations.

In grammar for sub-sets of permutation, it is common to write the following for sub-permutations:

$$a(bcd)e = abcde + abdce + acbde + acdbe + adbce + adcbe$$

In “Generalized Swap Grammar”, I extended this notation of 2 letters with `[]`, `[]` and `[]`. In this paper I will build on this further to more than 2 letters, a sub-permutation grammar.

The first thing I will do, is change the interpretation of `[]` for more than 2 letters. In this sub-permutation grammar, I will use a `[]` after the rule for sub-permutations. This is consistent with the factorial notation, which counts the members of sub-permutations:

$$a(bcd)!e = abcde + abdce + acbde + acdbe + adbce + adcbe$$

$$|(bcd)!| = |(bcd)|! = 3! = 3 \cdot 2 \cdot 1 = 6$$

Instead, `[]` without the `[]` is interpreted as “forward then backward”:

$$a(bcd)e = abcde + adcbe$$

For `[]` with 2 letters, the these two interpretations are the same:

$$(ab) = (ab)! = ab + ba$$

The motivation for this is, when defining `[]` and `[]` for more than 2 letters, the following holds:

$$\begin{array}{l} |D|! \geq |C| \\ |D|! \geq |C| = |C|! = |C|! = |C| \leq |C|! \\ |C| \geq |D| \qquad |C| \leq |C| \\ |D| \geq |C| \qquad |C| = 2 \qquad |C| \leq |C| \end{array}$$

This set of rules is called “two in the house” and makes it easy to remember the relative number of members: At the floor, one compares the smallest sub-grammars. At the roof, one compares the sub-grammars holding at least `N!`, but the pipe gets even higher than the roof.

The “two in the house” rule holds for sub-grammars of same number of letters. There is a “house” for every number of letters, which can be thought of a city where 2 people live in every house. With other words, a “sub-permutation city”.

The exception of course, is rules with 1 or 0 letters, which has 1 and 0 members respectively, regardless of how one uses `[a]`, `[a]`, `[a]`, `[a]` or `[a]!`, `[a]!`, `[a]!`, `[a]!`.

In nested grammars of generalized swap grammar, such as `[ab][cd]`, one can imagine it as going forward through the rules and then backward, picking up letters that has not been picked up before.

For the more general grammar of sub-permutations, one can think of it as swiping forward and backward until all letters are picked up, or transforming the grammar into sub-grammars:

$$\begin{aligned} a[bcd]e &= \\ a b e [c d] &+ a c e [b d] + a d e [b c] = \\ a b c d + a b e d c + &a c e b d + a c e d b + a d e b c + a d e c b \end{aligned}$$

Swiping forward and backward is the same as placing the unpicked sub-grammars at the end.

Notice that in this case, adding `!` after the rule produces the same result:

$$a[bcd]!e = a[bcd]e$$

The interpretation of the arrow `[]` is similar, by removing the picked letters and appending the rest:

$$\begin{aligned} a[bcd]e &= \\ a b c d e &+ a c d e [b] + a d e [b c] = \\ a b c d e &+ a c d e b + a d e b c + a d e c b \end{aligned}$$

By adding `!` after the bracket, one permutes all the sub-grammars:

$$\begin{aligned} a[bcd]!e &= a[bcd]e + a[bdc]e + a[cbd]e + a[cdb]e + a[dbc]e + a[dc b]e \\ a[bcd]e &= a b c d e + a c d e [b] + a d e [b c] = a b c d e + a c d e b + a d e b c + a d e c b + \\ a[bdc]e &= a b d c e + a d c e [b] + a c e [b d] = a b d c e + a d c e b + a c e b d + a c e d b + \\ a[cbd]e &= a c b d e + a b d e [c] + a d e [c b] = a c b d e + a b d e c + a d e c b + a d e b c + \\ a[cdb]e &= a c d b e + a d b e [c] + a b e [c d] = a c d b e + a d b e c + a b e c d + a b e d c + \\ a[dbc]e &= a d b c e + a b c e [d] + a c e [d b] = a d b c e + a b c e d + a c e d b + a c e b d + \\ a[dc b]e &= a d c b e + a c b e [d] + a b e [d c] = a d c b e + a c b e d + a b e d c + a b e c d \end{aligned}$$

Notice that this gives fewer members than permutation of 4 letters, because some members are redundant, but more members than permutation of 3 letters. It also turns out that `a(bcd)!e` is a sub-set of `a[cbd]!e`:

$$a(bcd)!e \subseteq a[cbd]!e$$

$$\begin{aligned} a(bcd]e &= \\ a b e (c d] &+ a c e (b d] + a d c b e = \\ a b e c d + a b e d c + &a c e b d + a c e d b + a d c b e \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} a(bcd]!e &= a(bcd]e + a(bdc]e + a(cbd]e + a(cdb]e + a(dbc]e + a(dcb]e \\ a(bcd]e &= a b e (c d] + a c e (b d] + a d c b e = a b e c d + a b e d c + a c e b d + a c e d b + a d c b e \\ a(bdc]e &= a b e (d c] + a d e (b c] + a c d b e = a b e d c + a b e c d + a d e b c + a d e c b + a c d b e \\ a(cbd]e &= a c e (b d] + a b e (c d] + a d b c e = a c e b d + a c e d b + a b e c d + a b e d c + a d b c e \\ a(cdb]e &= a c e (d b] + a d e (c b] + a b d c e = a c e d b + a c e b d + a d e c b + a d e b c + a b d c e \\ a(dbc]e &= a d e (b c] + a b e (d c] + a c b d e = a d e b c + a d e c b + a b e d c + a b e c d + a c b d e \\ a(dcb]e &= a d e (c b] + a c e (d b] + a b c d e = a d e c b + a d e b c + a c e d b + a c e b d + a b c d e \end{aligned}$$