

1 A proof of focalisation

Let $\vdash_{\text{foc}} \Gamma$ mean “there is a *focalised* proof of $\vdash \Gamma$ ”, in the sense of [Laurent04].

We define the focalised syntactic phase model as (M, \perp, φ) where M is the free commutative monoid over formulas of MALL, $\perp = \{\Gamma \in M \mid \vdash_{\text{foc}} \Gamma\}$, and $\varphi(X) = \{X\}^\perp$ for positive atoms X . Let $\llbracket A \rrbracket$ be the interpretation of a formula A in this model.

For a formula A , let $|A|$ denote the number of main negative subformulas in A . Define Ψ_A as a $|A|$ -ary monotonous operator on $\mathcal{P}(M)$ by induction:

- $\Psi_A(N) = N$ if A is negative
- $\Psi_X() = \{X^\perp\}$
- $\Psi_{B \otimes C}(B_1, \dots, B_{|B|}, C_1, \dots, C_{|C|}) = \Psi_B(B_1, \dots, B_{|B|}) \cdot \Psi_C(C_1, \dots, C_{|C|})$
- $\Psi_{B \oplus C}(B_1, \dots, B_{|B|}, C_1, \dots, C_{|C|}) = \Psi_B(B_1, \dots, B_{|B|}) \cup \Psi_C(C_1, \dots, C_{|C|})$
- $\Psi_1() = \{\emptyset\}$
- $\Psi_0() = \emptyset$

Lemma 1. *For any formula A with main negative subformulas $A_1, \dots, A_{|A|}$, $\llbracket A \rrbracket = \Psi_A(\llbracket A_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket A_{|A|} \rrbracket)^{\perp\perp}$.*

Proof. By induction, using positivity results from [Girard99, appendix F]: $(X^{\perp\perp} \cdot Y^{\perp\perp})^{\perp\perp} = (X \cdot Y)^{\perp\perp}$ and $(X^{\perp\perp} \cup Y^{\perp\perp})^{\perp\perp} = (X \cup Y)^{\perp\perp}$.

- If A is negative, then $\llbracket A \rrbracket = \llbracket A \rrbracket^{\perp\perp}$ because $\llbracket A \rrbracket$ is a fact.
- If $A = X$, then $\llbracket X \rrbracket = \{X\}^\perp \subseteq \{X^\perp\}^{\perp\perp}$, which is equivalent to the atomic cut rule:

$$\frac{\vdash_{\text{foc}} \Gamma, X \quad \vdash_{\text{foc}} X^\perp, \Delta}{\vdash_{\text{foc}} \Gamma, \Delta}$$

And clearly $\{X\}^\perp \subseteq \{X^\perp\}^{\perp\perp}$, hence $\llbracket X \rrbracket = \{X^\perp\}^{\perp\perp}$.

- If $A = B \otimes C$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket B \otimes C \rrbracket &= (\llbracket B \rrbracket \cdot \llbracket C \rrbracket)^{\perp\perp} \\ &= (\Psi_B(\llbracket B_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket B_{|B|} \rrbracket)^{\perp\perp} \cdot \Psi_C(\llbracket C_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket C_{|C|} \rrbracket)^{\perp\perp})^{\perp\perp} \\ &= (\Psi_B(\llbracket B_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket B_{|B|} \rrbracket) \cdot \Psi_C(\llbracket C_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket C_{|C|} \rrbracket))^{\perp\perp} \\ &= \Psi_{B \otimes C}(\llbracket B_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket B_{|B|} \rrbracket, \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket C_{|C|} \rrbracket)^{\perp\perp} \end{aligned}$$

- If $A = B \oplus C$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket B \oplus C \rrbracket &= (\llbracket B \rrbracket \cup \llbracket C \rrbracket)^{\perp\perp} \\ &= (\Psi_B(\llbracket B_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket B_{|B|} \rrbracket)^{\perp\perp} \cup \Psi_C(\llbracket C_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket C_{|C|} \rrbracket)^{\perp\perp})^{\perp\perp} \\ &= (\Psi_B(\llbracket B_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket B_{|B|} \rrbracket) \cup \Psi_C(\llbracket C_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket C_{|C|} \rrbracket))^{\perp\perp} \\ &= \Psi_{B \oplus C}(\llbracket B_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket B_{|B|} \rrbracket, \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket C_{|C|} \rrbracket)^{\perp\perp} \end{aligned}$$

- If $A = 1$ then $\llbracket 1 \rrbracket = \{\emptyset\}^{\perp\perp}$ by definition.
- If $A = 0$ then $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket = \emptyset^{\perp\perp}$ by definition.

□

Lemma 2. For any formula A with main negative subformulas $A_1, \dots, A_{|A|}$, $\Psi_A(\{A_1\}^\perp, \dots, \{A_{|A|}\}^\perp) \subseteq \{A\}^\perp$.

Proof. Let $\vdash_{\text{foc}(A)} A, \Gamma$ mean “there is a proof of $\vdash_{\text{foc}} A, \Gamma$ in which the last rule introduces the main connective of A ” if A is positive, and $\vdash_{\text{foc}} A, \Gamma$ otherwise. Let $\text{Foc}(A) = \{\Gamma \in M \mid \vdash_{\text{foc}(A)} A, \Gamma\}$. Clearly $\text{Foc}(A) \subseteq \{A\}^\perp$.

We prove by induction on A that $\Psi_A(\text{Foc}(A_1), \dots, \text{Foc}(A_{|A|})) = \text{Foc}(A)$:

- If A is negative, the result is trivial.
- If $A = X$, then $\Psi_X() = \{X^\perp\} = \text{Foc}(X)$.
- If $A = B \otimes C$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_A(\text{Foc}(A_1), \dots, \text{Foc}(A_{|A|})) &= \Psi_B(\text{Foc}(B_1), \dots, \text{Foc}(B_{|B|})) \cdot \Psi_C(\text{Foc}(C_1), \dots, \text{Foc}(C_{|C|})) \\ &= \text{Foc}(B) \cdot \text{Foc}(C) \end{aligned}$$

by the induction hypothesis. Moreover,

$$\frac{\vdash_{\text{foc}(B)} B, \Gamma \quad \vdash_{\text{foc}(C)} C, \Delta}{\vdash_{\text{foc}(B \otimes C)} B \otimes C, \Gamma, \Delta}$$

And this rule is invertible, hence $\text{Foc}(B) \cdot \text{Foc}(C) = \text{Foc}(B \otimes C)$, from which the result follows.

- If $A = B \oplus C$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_A(\text{Foc}(A_1), \dots, \text{Foc}(A_{|A|})) &= \Psi_B(\text{Foc}(B_1), \dots, \text{Foc}(B_{|B|})) \cup \Psi_C(\text{Foc}(C_1), \dots, \text{Foc}(C_{|C|})) \\ &= \text{Foc}(B) \cup \text{Foc}(C) \end{aligned}$$

by the induction hypothesis. Moreover,

$$\frac{\vdash_{\text{foc}(B)} B, \Gamma}{\vdash_{\text{foc}(B \oplus C)} B \oplus C, \Gamma, \Delta} \quad \frac{\vdash_{\text{foc}(C)} C, \Delta}{\vdash_{\text{foc}(B \oplus C)} B \oplus C, \Gamma, \Delta}$$

And these rules are complete, hence $\text{Foc}(B) \cup \text{Foc}(C) = \text{Foc}(B \oplus C)$, from which the result follows.

- If $A = 1$, clearly $\Psi_1() = \{\emptyset\} = \text{Foc}(1)$.
- If $A = 0$, clearly $\Psi_0() = \emptyset = \text{Foc}(0)$.

Since $A_1, \dots, A_{|A|}$ are negative, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_A(\{A_1\}^\perp, \dots, \{A_{|A|}\}^\perp) &= \Psi_A(\text{Foc}(A_1), \dots, \text{Foc}(A_{|A|})) \\ &= \text{Foc}(A) \\ &\subseteq \{A\}^\perp \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3. For any formula A , $\llbracket A \rrbracket \subseteq \{A\}^\perp$.

Proof. By induction:

- If $A = X$, then $\llbracket X \rrbracket = \{X\}^\perp$ by definition.
- If $A = X^\perp$, we have $\{X^\perp\} \subseteq \{X\}^\perp$ using the axiom rule, hence $\llbracket X^\perp \rrbracket = \{X\}^{\perp\perp} \subseteq \{X^\perp\}^\perp$.

- If $A = B \& C$, we have $\llbracket B \& C \rrbracket = \llbracket B \rrbracket \cap \llbracket C \rrbracket \subseteq \{B\}^\perp \cap \{C\}^\perp$ by the induction hypothesis. Moreover,

$$\frac{\vdash_{\text{foc}} B, \Gamma \quad \vdash_{\text{foc}} C, \Gamma}{\vdash_{\text{foc}} B \& C, \Gamma}$$

Hence $\{B\}^\perp \cap \{C\}^\perp \subseteq \{B \& C\}^\perp$, from which the result follows.

- If $A = \top$, we have $\llbracket \top \rrbracket = M = \{\top\}^\perp$ using the rule for \top .
- If $A = B \wp C$, let $\Gamma \in \llbracket B \wp C \rrbracket = (\llbracket B \rrbracket^\perp \cdot \llbracket C \rrbracket^\perp)^\perp$. By the induction hypothesis, $\llbracket B \rrbracket \subseteq \{B\}^\perp$, hence $B \in \{B\}^{\perp\perp} \subseteq \llbracket B \rrbracket^\perp$, and similarly $C \in \llbracket C \rrbracket^\perp$, therefore $\vdash_{\text{foc}} B, C, \Gamma$. Moreover,

$$\frac{\vdash_{\text{foc}} B, C, \Gamma}{\vdash_{\text{foc}} B \wp C, \Gamma}$$

Hence $\Gamma \in \{B \wp C\}^\perp$, from which the result follows.

- If $A = \perp$, we have $\llbracket \perp \rrbracket = \perp = \{\perp\}^\perp$ using the rule for \perp .
- Otherwise, A is a positive non-atomic formula with main negative subformulas $A_1, \dots, A_{|A|}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket A \rrbracket &= \Psi_A(\llbracket A_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket A_{|A|} \rrbracket)^{\perp\perp} && \text{by lemma 1} \\ &\subseteq \Psi_A(\{A_1\}^\perp, \dots, \{A_{|A|}\}^\perp)^{\perp\perp} && \text{by the induction hypothesis and monotonicity of } \Psi_A \\ &\subseteq \{A\}^{\perp\perp\perp} = \{A\}^\perp && \text{by lemma 2} \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 4 (Focalised completeness). *If a formula A of MALL is valid in all phase models, then A has a focalised proof.*

Proof. In particular $\emptyset \in \llbracket A \rrbracket$, hence $\emptyset \in \{A\}^\perp$ by lemma 3, therefore $\vdash_{\text{foc}} A$. □

Combining this with the soundness theorem, we get:

Corollary 4.1 (Focalisation). *Every provable formula A of MALL has a focalised proof.*

References

- [Laurent04] Olivier Laurent. ‘A proof of the focalization property of linear logic’. In: (Apr. 2004).
- [Girard99] Jean-Yves Girard. ‘On the Meaning of Logical Rules I: Syntax Versus Semantics’. In: *Computational Logic*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1999, pp. 215–272. ISBN: 978-3-642-58622-4.