

First-order logic properly displayed

G. Greco, M. A. Moshier, A. Palmigiano, and A. Tzimoulis

The existing sequent calculi for first-order logic [18] contain special rules for the introduction of quantification and for substitution. The application of these rules depends on the unbounded and bounded variables occurring in formulas. For example, in the standard Gentzen calculus for first-order logic the rules

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, A[x]}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \forall x A} \quad \frac{\Gamma, A[x] \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma, \exists x A \vdash \Delta}$$

are sound only when x does not appear free in the conclusions of the rules.

A proposal for a display calculus for fragments of first-order logic was first presented in [21, 20]. The key idea of this approach is that existential quantification can be viewed as a diamond-like operator of modal logic, and universal quantification can be seen as a box-like operator as discussed in [14, 19]. The underlying reason for these similarities which have been observed and exploited in [14, 19, 21, 20] is order-theoretic and pertains to the phenomenon of adjunction: indeed the set theoretic semantic interpretation of the existential and universal quantification are the left and right adjoint respectively of the inverse projection map and more generally, in categorical semantics, the left and right adjoint of the pullbacks along projections [15], [7, Chapter 15]. However, the display calculus of [21] contains rules with side conditions on the free and bounded variables of formulas similar to the ones presented above. This implies that the rules are not closed under uniform substitution, that is, the display calculus is not *proper* [20, Section 4.1].

We present results based on ongoing work in [10] on a proper display calculus for first-order logic. The design of our calculus is based on the multi-type methodology first presented in [5, 2], motivated by considerations discussed in [8, 4], for DEL and PDL and further developed in [3, 6, 11, 12, 13, 1], in synergy with algebraic techniques [9]. The multi-type approach allows for the co-existence of terms of different types bridged by heterogeneous connectives. The requirement for the calculus is that in a derivable sequent $x \vdash y$ the structures x and y must be of the same type. In this framework properness means uniform substitution within each type.

Using insights from [15, 16, 17] we introduce a proper display calculus for first-order logic. The conditions on rules are internalised in the calculus by the use of appropriate types. The language of first-order logic is expanded with a unary heterogeneous connective that serves as the right adjoint of the existential quantifier and the left adjoint of the universal quantifier. In the context of the calculus this connective signifies the introduction of a fresh variable to a formula.

In my talk I will present the proper display calculus for first-order logic and discuss its completeness, soundness, cut-elimination and conservativity.

References

- [1] M. Bilkova, G. Greco, A. Palmigiano, A. Tzimoulis, and N. Wijnberg. The logic of resources and capabilities. *Submitted.*, ArXiv preprint 1608.02222.
- [2] S. Frittella, G. Greco, A. Kurz, and A. Palmigiano. Multi-type display calculus for propositional dynamic logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 2014. doi: 10.1093/logcom/exu064.
- [3] S. Frittella, G. Greco, A. Kurz, A. Palmigiano, and V. Sikimic. Multi-type sequent calculi. *Proc. Trends in Logic XIII*, pages 81–93, 2014.

- [4] S. Frittella, G. Greco, A. Kurz, A. Palmigiano, and V. Sikimić. A proof-theoretic semantic analysis of dynamic epistemic logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 2014. doi: 10.1093/logcom/exu063.
- [5] S. Frittella, G. Greco, A. Kurz, A. Palmigiano, and V. Sikimić. A multi-type display calculus for dynamic epistemic logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 2014. doi: 10.1093/logcom/exu068.
- [6] S. Frittella, G. Greco, A. Palmigiano, and F. Yang. A multi-type calculus for inquisitive logic. In J. Väänänen, Å. Hirvonen, and R. de Queiroz, editors, *Logic, Language, Information, and Computation: 23rd International Workshop, WoLLIC 2016, Puebla, Mexico, August 16-19th, 2016. Proceedings*, LNCS 9803, pages 215–233. Springer, 2016. ArXiv preprint 1604.00936.
- [7] R. Goldblatt. *Topoi: the categorical analysis of logic*, volume 98. Elsevier, 2014.
- [8] G. Greco, A. Kurz, and A. Palmigiano. Dynamic epistemic logic displayed. In H. Huang, D. Grossi, and O. Roy, editors, *Proceedings of the 4th International Workshop on Logic, Rationality and Interaction (LORI-4)*, volume 8196 of LNCS, 2013.
- [9] G. Greco, M. Ma, A. Palmigiano, A. Tzimoulis, and Z. Zhao. Unified correspondence as a proof-theoretic tool. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 2016. doi: 10.1093/logcom/exw022. ArXiv preprint 1603.08204.
- [10] G. Greco, M. A. Moshier, A. Palmigiano, and A. Tzimoulis. First-order logic properly displayed. *In preparation*.
- [11] G. Greco and A. Palmigiano. Multi-type algebraic proof theory. *In preparation*.
- [12] G. Greco and A. Palmigiano. Lattice logic properly displayed. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.05930*, 2016.
- [13] G. Greco and A. Palmigiano. Linear logic properly displayed. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.04181*, 2016.
- [14] S. T. Kuhn. Quantifiers as modal operators. *Studia Logica*, 39(2-3):145–158, 1980.
- [15] F. W. Lawvere. Functorial semantics of elementary theories. In *Journal of symbolic logic*, volume 31, page 294, 1966.
- [16] A. Mostowski. On the rules of proof in the pure functional calculus of the first order. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 16(02):107–111, 1951.
- [17] A. M. Pitts. *Nominal sets: Names and symmetry in computer science*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [18] A. S. Troelstra and H. Schwichtenberg. *Basic proof theory*. Number 43. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [19] J. van Benthem. Modal foundations for predicate logic. *Logic Journal of the IGPL*, 5(2):259, 1997.
- [20] H. Wansing. *Displaying modal logic*, volume 3. Springer, Trends in Logic, 1998.
- [21] H. Wansing. Predicate logics on display. *Studia Logica*, 62(1):49–75, 1999.