
A Study on Actions for Atomic Logics

A Thesis for the Master's Degree in Fundamental Mathematics of the
University of Rennes

Raül Espejo Boix

Supervisors

Dr. Guillaume Aucher (Université de Rennes)

Prof. Rajeev P. Goré (Australian National University)

A Study on Actions for Atomic Logics

Raül Espejo Boix

Abstract

Nowadays there is a large number of non-classical logics, each one best suited for reasoning about some issues in abstract fields, such as linguistics or epistemology, among others. Proving interesting properties for each one of them supposes a big workload for logicians and computer scientists. We want an approach into this problematic that is modular. To adress this issue, the report shows new insights in the construction of Atomic Logics introduced by Guillaume Aucher. Atomic Logics let us represent very general left and right introduction rules and they come along a new kind of rules based on display logics and residuation. A new approach is taken into the definition of Atomic Logics, which is now built on a class of actions for which we prove cut-elimination. We show that some of them are equivalent to Aucher's Atomic Logics and we prove cut-elimination and Craig Interpolation for a class of them. The introduced theory is applied to the non-associative Lambek Calculus throughout the report. It is accompanied by a computer-checked formalisation of the original syntax in the proof assistant Coq.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors Rajeev Goré and Guillaume Aucher for the support and guidance I received during this master thesis, thank them for the opportunity this stage has been and also thank anyone who has taken part by giving advice or counsel throughout the stage.

Contents

1	Logical Notions	2
1.1	An Example from Linguistics	2
1.2	Logics	4
1.3	Proof Theory	8
1.3.1	Display Logics	9
1.3.2	Properties of Display Logics	12
2	Algebraic Preliminaries	13
2.1	Actions	15
2.2	Modules	16
3	Residuation and Negation on Atomic Logics	17
3.1	Original Syntax	17
3.2	The Main Result: A Finite Version of the Group Actions	24
4	Group Actions on Atomic Connectives	36
4.1	Connective Families	36
4.2	Families of Structural Connectives	39
4.3	Sequents on Connective Families	43
5	Atomic Logics for Connective Families	47
5.1	Syntax	47
5.2	Semantics	49
5.3	Sequent Calculus	51
6	Atomic Logics for $\alpha * \beta$	60
6.1	Expressivity of the Different Residuation and Negation Families	60
6.2	Boolean Connectives and Hilbert Calculus	71
7	Conclusions and Future Work	79
	References	80
	Some Comments on the Internship	81

Introduction

Logics originated as the area of philosophy which studies the *forms of valid reasoning*. What we now consider Classical Logics arises from Aristotelian syllogisms, in particular it is the historical antecedent of predicate logics, designed during the end of the 19th century to study mathematical arguments. The patterns of reasoning which can be expressed with Classical Logics can not properly study most of our daily life experiences nor our knowledge or uncertainties. For this reason the first non-classical logics appeared, studying some phenomena which falls outside of the propositional logics and for which predicate logic was too expressive.

For this Master Thesis I have been presented a class of Logics, Atomic Logics, which aim to provide an uniform and generic way to explore and study non-classical logics. The overall objective was to develop a Coq library for it, with the possible goal of expanding it into a Coq library for Non-Classical Logics, so that logicians can prove general properties for them in a common setting.

The Master Thesis research has worked with the *mathcomp* library for formalizing Atomic Logics in Coq. On [the proof of action commit](#) we can find its calculus without boolean negation. The difficulties found in the process have redirected the objective into the addition of some changes into the theory. We have had to work with group theory to provide a finite action for Atomic Logics, we have had to introduce new definitions for formally providing a concept of Connective Family and Structural Connective and we have managed to provide display calculi for a much bigger class of actions than the original one. This report is the result of my intership at IRISA and it is structured as follows.

This **first section** presents some of the logical concepts that are necessary to understand what Atomic Logics are. This includes a presentation of a case study, using Lambek Calculus from Linguistics, an informal presentation of logics and a formal presentation of proof-theoretical concepts. In the **second section** we briefly present the mathematical concepts we are going to work with, mainly those of groups and actions. In the **third section** we give out of context Guillaume Aucher's action for Atomic Logics $\alpha * \beta$ and we show two ways in which we can redefine it. In the **fourth section** we give the lacking context by formally defining the algebraic objects that represent Connectives and Structural Connectives. In the **fifth section** this is used to redefine Atomic Logics on general Connective Families, no matter what action they are using. A condition for the system to be properly displayable is given in terms of its action (we can say that it must be transversal *enough*). We also prove Craig Interpolation for Connective Families. This formalisation only accounts for the Atomic Logics and further research is required for extending it into Aucher's Molecular Logics and the addition of structural rules. In the **sixth section** we get back Aucher's Atomic Logics and we prove some interesting results about them.

During the report we will present small snippets of the **Coq code**, in the proof of action commit. The present version of the code can be found at <https://github.com/The-busy-man/Universal-FO-Logics/tree/test>, it is in an unfinished transition into using connective families.

1 Logical Notions

1.1 An Example from Linguistics

Traditionally linguistics presents the following elementary units, which constitute the atoms of a language's grammar.

- S : Sentence.
- N : Noun.
- NP : Noun Phrase.
- AP : Adjective Phrase.
- VP : Verb Phrase.
- PP : Adpositional Phrase.

Using this elementary elements we can build new expressions just by concatenation. Then, the product connective \otimes is the concatenation operator. This operator can be given left and right divisions: for any two categories¹ X and Y we say that the functor X/Y combines with an argument Y to the right to form an X and the functor $Y\backslash X$ combines with an argument Y to the left to form an X . [12]

We can see that \otimes works as a sort of conjunction by representing plain and simple concatenation of concepts and $/$, \backslash , called its left and right residuals, work as functors between the contiguous categories.

Syntactic trees can now be represented as a proposition in the language formed by the connectives $\{\otimes, /, \backslash\}$, which we call \mathbb{FL} on propositional letters $\{S, N, NP, AP, VP, PP\}$.

Example 1. (Jo) presento la lògica de la gramàtica, *where:*

- Jo is an NP .
This category can be understood as a personal pronoun.
- Presento is an $(NP\backslash S)/NP$.
This category can be understood as a transitive verb.
- La is an NP/N .
This can be understood as a determiner.
- Lògica is an N .
This can be understood as a common noun.
- De is an $(N\backslash N)/NP$.
This can be understood as a preposition.

¹Note that we are using categories in a loose sense, following the structuralist language of Moortgat's book.

Inductive derivation : lkf -> lkf -> **Type** :=
 | axiom_id : forall φ : lkf, derivation φ φ
 | res1 : forall φ ψ ρ : lkf, derivation (φ·ψ) ρ -> derivation φ (ρ/ψ)
 | res2 : forall φ ψ ρ : lkf, derivation (φ·ψ) ρ -> derivation ψ (φ\r)
 | res3 : forall φ ψ ρ : lkf, derivation φ (ρ/ψ) -> derivation (φ·ψ) ρ
 | res4 : forall φ ψ ρ : lkf, derivation ψ (φ\r) -> derivation (φ·ψ) ρ

Figure 1: Implementation of Non-Associative Lambek Calculus

- Gramàtica is an N .

This can be understood as a common noun.

To represent what in this context we have written as x is an X we will write $x : X$.

- This example would then correspond in \mathbb{FL} to:

(Jo) presento la lògica de la gramàtica :

$$NP \otimes (((NP \setminus S) / NP) \otimes ((NP / N) \otimes (N \otimes (((N \setminus N) / NP) \otimes ((NP / N) \otimes N))))))$$

- By the rules informally presented previously this reduces to

(Jo) presento la lògica de la gramàtica : S

This can be interpreted as the sentence being well-formed.

The particular formal rules of the logics we just presented can be captured in the following proof system, which we will call Non-Associative Lambek Calculus: [11]

Axiom:	For \:	For /:
$\frac{}{A \vdash A} \text{Id}$	$\frac{B \vdash A \setminus C}{A \otimes B \vdash C} L1$	$\frac{A \vdash C / B}{A \otimes B \vdash C} L3$
	$\frac{A \otimes B \vdash C}{B \vdash A \setminus C} L2$	$\frac{A \otimes B \vdash C}{A \vdash C / B} L4$

Rules of \mathbb{FL}

We have written it in Coq in Figure 1. Throughout the report we will be showing some Coq implementations from the repository related to what is being discussed.

1.2 Logics

The development of the field gave birth to a common methodology, being so that a Logic is now understood as an object of study itself, with multiple possible approaches into its construction.

Commonly, a logical system is constituted by three parts: syntax, semantics and a proof system.

- The syntax expresses how the concepts are written, usually through objects called formulas given by a grammar.
- The semantics gives meaning to syntax, usually through objects called models.
- The proof systems gives appropriate and desired ways of reasoning with the syntax (not the semantics), usually through objects called rules arranged in sets called calculus. In this case the calculi are usually divided between Hilbert/Sequent systems, depending on how much does it focuses on the axioms.

As commonly understood, both semantics and proof systems alone are enough to characterize a Logic. For example, we can begin by giving a class of models and then deriving the validities from them. It happens frequently that they are defined simultaneously, then it is of our interest showing that both methods are talking about the same Logic. It is not common to discover a Logic's syntax and semantics at the same time. For example, modal logics' Kripke semantics were not found until 1959, while the proof system was developed in the forties and sixties.

We will fix the meaning of logics on its semantical approach.

We will say that a **logics** is a triple $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}, \models)$ where

- \mathcal{L} is a logical language built as a set of well-formed expressions from a set of connectives and a set of propositional letters.
- \mathcal{E} is a class of pointed models.
- \models is a satisfaction relation relating in a compositional manner elements of \mathcal{L} to models of \mathcal{E} .

The set of formulas in \mathcal{L} such that they are satisfied in all pointed models is called the **set of validities**.

Example 2. We define semantics for Lambek Calculus.

We define the Routley-Meyer models for Lambek Calculus as structures (W, R, V) , where W is a non-empty set of worlds, R is a ternary relation over W and V is a valuation from $\mathbb{A} \times W$ to the booleans, where \mathbb{A} is the set of propositional letters in our language.

Then we define inductively on formulas its **interpretation function** through:

- $\llbracket p \rrbracket := \{w \in W \mid V(p, w)\}$.
- $\llbracket \varphi \otimes \psi \rrbracket := \{w \in W \mid \exists u, v \in W, u \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \text{ and } v \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket \text{ and } R u v w\}$.


```

Fixpoint force {W} (M : kripke W) (w : W) (φ : lkf) :=
let R := rel W M in let V := val W M in
match φ with
| var n => V n w
| φ · ψ => exists (u v : W),
  R u v w ∧ force M u φ ∧ force M v ψ
| φ / ψ => forall (u v : W),
  R w v u -> force M v ψ -> force M u φ
| φ \ ψ => forall (u v : W),
  R u w v -> force M u φ -> force M v ψ
end.

```

Figure 2: Implementation of Routley-Meyer semantics for Lambek Calculus with Internalised Forcing

- $\llbracket \varphi \setminus \psi \rrbracket := \{w \in W \mid \forall u, v \in W, R u w v \text{ and } u \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \text{ imply } v \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket\}$.
- $\llbracket \varphi / \psi \rrbracket := \{w \in W \mid \forall u, v \in W, R w v u \text{ and } v \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket \text{ imply } u \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket\}$. [7]

We define $(M, w) \models \varphi$ to hold if and only if $w \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$.

Sequent Calculi

In the early 20th century a replacement for Hilbert systems was sought in logics. They needed a system that adapted better to the usual proof methodology of mathematicians, while working in the full formality of proof systems. One of the logicians who developed the new methods was Gerhard Gentzen, who found the first natural deduction system.

In his 1969 article [9] Gentzen expanded his rule-set for classical and intuitionistic logics by introducing sequent deduction systems. It required a metatheoretical implication (which we note \vdash) bonding two formulas into a new object called sequent, but it made possible to work proofs without opening hypothesis (in contrast with natural deduction).

Compare a possible Gentzen's sequent system and a Hilbert system proofs of the law of the excluded middle:

Gentzen,

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{A \vdash A} \text{ Id} \\
 \frac{A \vdash A}{A \vdash A \vee \neg A} \vee\text{-IS} \\
 \frac{A \vdash A \vee \neg A}{\vdash A \vee \neg A, \neg A} \neg\text{-IS} \\
 \frac{\vdash A \vee \neg A, \neg A}{\vdash A \vee \neg A, A \vee \neg A} \vee\text{-IS} \\
 \frac{\vdash A \vee \neg A, A \vee \neg A}{\vdash A \vee \neg A} \text{ Contraction}
 \end{array}$$

Hilbert,

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------|
| 1. | $A \rightarrow A \vee (A \rightarrow \perp)$ | Axiom |
| 2. | $((A \vee (A \rightarrow \perp)) \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \perp$ | N 1 |
| 3. | $(A \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow A \vee (A \rightarrow \perp)$ | Axiom |
| 4. | $((A \vee (A \rightarrow \perp)) \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow \perp$ | N 3 |
| 5. | $((A \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow A$ | Axiom |
| 6. | $((A \vee (A \rightarrow \perp)) \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow A$ | B 4 5 |
| 7. | $((A \vee (A \rightarrow \perp)) \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \perp \rightarrow (((A \vee (A \rightarrow \perp)) \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow A) \rightarrow ((A \vee (A \rightarrow \perp)) \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow \perp$ | Axiom |
| 8. | $((A \vee (A \rightarrow \perp)) \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow A \rightarrow ((A \vee (A \rightarrow \perp)) \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow \perp$ | MP 7 2 |
| 9. | $((A \vee (A \rightarrow \perp)) \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow \perp$ | MP 8 6 |
| 10. | $((A \vee (A \rightarrow \perp)) \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow \perp \rightarrow A \vee (A \rightarrow \perp)$ | Axiom |
| 11. | $A \vee (A \rightarrow \perp)$ | MP 10 9 |

Where we call B the lemma

- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1. | $A \rightarrow B$ | Premise |
| 2. | $B \rightarrow C$ | Premise |
| 3. | $(B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$ | Axiom |
| 4. | $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$ | MP 2 3 |
| 5. | $(A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow A \rightarrow C$ | Axiom |
| 6. | $(B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow A \rightarrow C$ | MP 5 4 |
| 7. | $A \rightarrow C$ | MP 6 1 |

And we call N the lemma

- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1. | $A \rightarrow B$ | Premise |
| 2. | $(A \rightarrow B \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \perp$ | Axiom |
| 3. | $(B \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow \perp$ | Axiom |
| 4. | $(B \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \perp$ | B 3 2 |
| 5. | $((B \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow ((B \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)) \rightarrow (B \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \perp$ | Axiom |
| 6. | $((B \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)) \rightarrow (B \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \perp$ | MP 5 4 |
| 7. | $(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (B \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)$ | Axiom |
| 8. | $(B \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)$ | MP 7 1 |
| 9. | $(B \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \perp$ | MP 6 8 |

Both proof styles always produce tree structures.

We begin with a language of formulas, given inductively by a set of variables and connectives (including constants). Each formula is completely characterised by a labeled tree structure, called **formation tree**. Indeed, we can consider atoms as leaves and composition of formulas through a connective as a

common parent of the nodes corresponding to each of its components, we then label each node with the full formula used to construct it.

We define subformulas of φ as the labels appearing in φ 's tree. We define a formula occurrence ψ in φ as a subformula ψ in φ along with a particular node labeled ψ in the tree structure of φ .

For each of the elementary connectives we define its structural connective as another connective with the same arity. For example, in Belnap's article[6] the structure of \wedge is noted \circ , another common notation is the semicolon ; but in our case we will work with Gentzen's comma , [9]. We define structures as the closure of formulas under application of structural connectives. Substructures and structure occurrences are defined similarly to the formula case but now labels are structural variables, structural connectives and full formulas. For each pair of structures X, Y we may form a sequent $X \vdash Y$.

Let \mathcal{L} be a formal language. From any set of formulas and an extra formula in \mathcal{L} we may form an **inference**. We call the former **the premises** and the latter **the conclusion**.

A **formal system** or **proof system** based on a language \mathcal{L} is defined by a set of rules, called **inference rules**. Each rule is a set of inferences with a fixed number of premises.

We call the inference rules with no premises axioms.

The previous definition's reference to formulas has to be understood in the broader context of a formal language. In this sense we can also consider sequents as formulas in the formal language of sequents.

Example 3. In the introductory section we worked with the formal language given by

$$\mathcal{L}_L ::= V \mid \mathcal{L}_L \otimes \mathcal{L}_L \mid \mathcal{L}_L / \mathcal{L}_L \mid \mathcal{L}_L \setminus \mathcal{L}_L$$

Where $V = \{S, N, NP, AP, VP, PP\}$.

This notation must be understood as follows:

- Each $p \in V$ is a well-formed formula.
- For any p, q well-formed formulas, $p \otimes q$ is also a well-formed formula.
- For any p, q well-formed formulas, p / q is also a well-formed formula.
- For any p, q well-formed formulas, $p \setminus q$ is also a well-formed formula.

Another common formal language we will work with is the one for propositional logics:

$$\mathcal{L}_B ::= V \mid \perp \mid \top \mid \mathcal{L}_B \wedge \mathcal{L}_B \mid \mathcal{L}_B \vee \mathcal{L}_B \mid \mathcal{L}_B \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_B \mid \neg \mathcal{L}_B$$

Rules for a proof system are to be understood as transformations on derivable formulas. Sequents are to be understood as meta implications between formulas, implications with an extra abstraction level. The meaning of sequents is common in logical systems we are working with.

For the translation from structures to formulas there is some more detail which we will comment further, as commonly structures are to be understood as syntactical clauses such as parenthesis, shaping the way we can work with sequents (so that they might be seen as sets, sequences, etc.). In spite of that, we will usually see structures as meta logical connectives. The meaning of structures might vary depending on the calculi rule-set (these rules will be accordingly named structural rules).

We will call **Hilbert systems** the proof systems based on formulas.

We will call **Gentzen systems** or sequent systems the proof systems based on sequents.

Although, as mentioned before, the difference between Hilbert and Gentzen systems is commonly considered as given by the proportion of axioms over rules we will follow the Francesca Poggiolesi's criteria in *Gentzen Calculi for Modal Propositional Logic* for this formal approach.[16]

Let \mathcal{L} be a formal language. A **derivation** in a proof system \mathcal{P} based on \mathcal{L} is a finite, upward growing tree. The nodes of the tree are labeled with formulas of \mathcal{L} . For each intermediate node the label must correspond to the conclusion of an inference rule with all its premises corresponding to the labels of its immediate predecessors. If all leaves are axioms then we say that the derivation is a **proof**.²

The root of the tree is the *conclusion* of the whole derivation. The set of formulas derivables in \mathcal{P} are its **theorems**. The turnstile \vdash is commonly used to denote provability of formulas.

For a logics $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}, \models)$ and a proof system \mathcal{P} defined on \mathcal{L} , we say that \mathcal{P} is **sound** with respect to \mathcal{E} if every theorem is a validity and we say that \mathcal{P} is **complete** with respect to \mathcal{E} if every validity is a theorem.

1.3 Proof Theory

We now assume a language \mathcal{L} and a proof system \mathcal{P} we are interested in studying.

The study of logical deductions themselves grounded the area of proof theory, where the objects of study are formal proofs. Hilbert and Ackermann 1928 *Grundzüge der Theorischen Logik* can be seen a departing point for Proof Theory (following Ono), while still only working with Hilbert systems.

A rule $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{P}$ is said to be **eliminable** if whenever there is a derivation of the premises of \mathcal{R} then there is also a derivation of the conclusion not containing any application of \mathcal{R} .

²In the proof of Theorem 9 we can see two examples of derivations which are not proofs.

A rule $\mathcal{R} \notin \mathcal{P}$ is said to be **admissible** if whenever there is a derivation of the premises of \mathcal{R} then there is also a derivation of the conclusion.

A rule $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{P}$ with a set of premises T and conclusion S' is said to be **invertible** when for any $S \in T$ the inference rule with premise S' and conclusion S is admissible in \mathcal{P} or is a rule of \mathcal{P} .³ The later are called **the inverse rules** of the rule \mathcal{R} .

Commonly, with sequent systems rule-sets one can not derive transitivity of \vdash . This property is a version of the cut rule, which can be given as: For each X, Z structures and φ formula, from $X \vdash \varphi$ and $\varphi \vdash Z$ derive $X \vdash Z$. In spite of cut rule (which we will assume as being the last presented) not being derivable, Gentzen showed that it was admissible, so that the sequents derivable in the rule-set with and without cut rule were the same.

1.3.1 Display Logics

In his 1987 article *Display Logics* Nuel D. Belnap extracted 8 sufficient conditions for replicating Gentzen's Cut-Elimination and Subformula Property theorems. We follow the process, after introducing some necessary extra definitions.

We call the structure on the left of a sequent its **antecedent** and the structure on the right of a sequent its **consequent**. Depending on each syntax we will have to introduce a definition for antecedent part and consequent part. In the particular case of atomic logics we formally introduce it in definition 22.

Constituents of an inference are the structure occurrences (substructures and its tree-node) in structures in sequents participating in the inference, along with its position in the inference (whether it is antecedent or consequent and which sequent is its substructure of).

We say that a constituent X of a sequent S is **displayed** if X is the full antecedent or consequent of S .

We say that sequents S and S' are **structurally equivalent** when there is a derivation with conclusion S' and unique premise S and there is also a derivation with S' as the only premise and conclusion S .

A calculus satisfies the **display property** if for every constituent X of a sequent S there is a structurally equivalent sequent S' where X is displayed.

Parameters are those constituents which occur as substructures of structures assigned to the structure variables in the statement of a rule.

|

³For example, in the proof system GGL_C we present in section 6, left and right introduction rules are invertible, in a similar fashion to the logical variant of Gentzen Calculus given by Poggiolesi [16].

Like the parameters $U, V, W, (U, V)$ and X when $X := (U, V), W$ in the rule:

$$\frac{X, X \vdash Y}{X \vdash Y}$$

Giving the particular inference:

$$\frac{((U, V), W), ((U, V), W) \vdash Y}{((U, V), W) \vdash Y}$$

Principal Constituents are non-parametric constituents which are formulas and appear only in the conclusion of a rule.

We call a calculus **properly displayable** if it satisfies the display property and the following 8 properties.

- **C1 Preservation of formulas:**
All formulas occurring in premises are subformulas of some formula in the conclusion.
- **C2 Shape-alikeness of parameters:**
We have an equivalence relation between parameters in an inference, which we call *Congruence*. *Congruent parameters* are at least occurrences of the same structure. Conditions C3 and C4 will restrict the properties this relation must fulfill.
- **C3 Non-proliferation of parameters:**
Any parameter is congruent to maximum one parameter in the conclusion of any inference rule.
- **C4 Position-alikeness of parameters:**
Parameters are congruent only to parameters in a single side of sequents (note that this is only restricts apparition of parameters inside of each rule), in the sense that parameters in antecedent parts are only congruent to parameters in antecedent parts.
- **C5 Display of principal constituents:**
Principal constituents in conclusions are either the entire consequent or the entire antecedent of the conclusion.
- **C6 Closure under substitution for consequent parameters:**
When substituting simultaneously all congruent parameters of a consequent part in a rule for another structure the resulting inference is also in the rule set. Furthermore, constituents of the substituted parameters are also parametric and constituents not substituted are parametric or not depending on whether they originally were so.
- **C7 Closure under substitution for antecedent parameters:**
When substituting simultaneously all congruent parameters of an antecedent part in a rule for M , where M is a non-parametric formula consequent of the conclusion of some rule of the rule-set (in particular a principal constituent), the resulting inference is also in the rule set. Furthermore, constituents of the substituted parameters are also parametric and constituents

not substituted are parametric or not depending on whether they originally were so.

- **C8 Eliminability of principal constituents:**

For any pairs of conclusions from the rule set, $X \vdash \varphi$ and $\varphi \vdash Z$ of inferences I and J , where φ is a principal constituent, either φ equals X or Z or we can infer $X \vdash Z$ from the premises of I and J , using the cut rule only for strict subformulas of φ .

Theorem 1. *In any calculus satisfying the rules C2 to C8 the cut rule, expressed as follows, is admissible:*

For any pair of structures X and Z and any formula φ , from the sequents $X \vdash \varphi$ and $\varphi \vdash Z$ we can infer $X \vdash Z$.

Proof. We prove the statement by strong induction on the complexity of φ . Therefore, we want to show that if the cut rule is admissible for all proper subformulas of φ then it is admissible for φ .

We proceed by cases, depending on whether φ is parametric or not:

- If φ is non-parametric in both derivations from the premise the resulting derivation corresponds to the one given by C8.
- If φ were to be parametric only in the derivation $\varphi \vdash Z$, we already know that whenever we have a derivation $\varphi \vdash Y$ where φ is non-parametric then we can also derive $X \vdash Y$.

We recursively build a set out of the constituents congruent to the parametric φ of the derivation of $\varphi \vdash Z$ (which we call set of **parametric ancestors** of φ in the derivation of $\varphi \vdash Z$).

We build a new inference tree by substituting in the derivation of $\varphi \vdash Z$ every parametric ancestor of φ by X . It suffices to show that this inference tree with conclusion $X \vdash Z$ can be derived.

We proceed by induction on the derivation $\varphi \vdash Z$. Let us take the inference Inf of premises S_1, \dots, S_l and conclusion $U \vdash V$, falling in the set of rules. By induction hypothesis we take the derivations S'_1, \dots, S'_l with X in place of φ . We take the sequent $U' \vdash V'$ by replacing φ with X in all of its parametric ancestors which are also parametric in the conclusion Inf . By definition of parametric ancestor and C3 we have that if there is any constituent of Inf which is a parametric ancestor of φ then all of the constituents congruent to it in Inf also are parametric ancestors of φ . By C4, all the parametric ancestors of φ are antecedent parts, we can then use C7 to show that the inference with premises S'_1, \dots, S'_l and conclusion $U' \vdash V'$ falls also into the set of rules (thanks to the derivation $X \vdash \varphi$, where we already know φ to be non-parametric). If all the parametric ancestors in $U \vdash V$ were to be parametric also in the conclusion of Inf then we are done. If not, by C5 and C4, we have that φ covers all of U and therefore it is equal to U' . By the second part of C7, as U has not been substituted we know that it is non-parametric in the new inference, case which we have already shown.

- If φ were to be parametric in the derivation $X \vdash \varphi$, we already know that whenever we have a derivation $Y \vdash \varphi$ where φ is non-parametric then we can also derive $Y \vdash Z$.

We build a new inference tree by substituting in the derivation of $X \vdash \varphi$ every parametric ancestor of φ by Z . It suffices to show that this inference tree with conclusion $X \vdash Z$ can be derived.

We proceed by induction on the derivation $X \vdash \varphi$. Let us take the inference Inf of premises S_1, \dots, S_l and conclusion $U \vdash V$, falling in the set of rules. By induction hypothesis we take the derivations S'_1, \dots, S'_l with Z in place of φ . We take the sequent $U' \vdash V'$ by replacing φ with Z in all of its parametric ancestors which are also parametric in the conclusion Inf . By definition of parametric ancestor and $C3$ we have that if there is any constituent of Inf which is a parametric ancestor of φ then all the constituents congruent to it in Inf also are parametric ancestors of φ . By $C4$ all the parametric ancestors of φ are consequent parts, we can then use $C6$ to show that the inference with premises S'_1, \dots, S'_l and conclusion $U' \vdash V'$ falls also in the set of rules. If all the parametric ancestors in $U \vdash V$ were to be parametric also in the conclusion of Inf then we are done. If not, by $C5$ and $C4$, we have that φ covers all of V and therefore it is equal to V' . By the second part of $C6$, as V has not been substituted we know that it is non-parametric in the new inference, case which we have already shown.

In case our rule-set satisfies rule $C6$ also in the antecedent part, the second step of the proof can be replaced with the same proof as in the third step.

□

1.3.2 Properties of Display Logics

We have already seen Cut-Elimination as a consequence of \mathcal{P} being properly displayable, now we are going to see what else can be deduced from it.

We say that \mathcal{P} satisfies the **subformula property** if every derivable sequent has a proof where all formulas appearing are subformulas of some formula in the conclusion.

Theorem 2. *If \mathcal{P} satisfies $C1$ then it has the subformula property.*

Note that the previously presented cut rule doesn't satisfy $C1$, so that if we want cut in a proof system and the subformula property we are going to need also the cut-elimination theorem.

Proof. We proceed by induction on the deduction. Each step is a call on $C1$.

□

We call the following rule **analytic cut**:

If we can derive $X \vdash \varphi$ and $\varphi \vdash Z$ and φ is a subformula of some formula in X or Z , then we can derive $X \vdash Z$.

Cut-elimination is very handy, but not quite the unique option for proving desired properties in proof systems. For this reason, an alternative to cut-elimination is proving that the cut rule is admissible in systems with analytic cut. In this context it can be seen that the subformula property still holds.

Let J be a subset of the logical connectives of \mathcal{L} . We call the **J -fragment** of \mathcal{P} to the language only containing the formulas for logical connectives in J (the J -formulas) and the proof system only containing the rules for logical connectives in J .

Let \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' be proof systems on languages \mathcal{L} and $\mathcal{L}' \supseteq \mathcal{L}$, respectively. We say that \mathcal{P}' is a **conservative extension** of \mathcal{P} if any formula from \mathcal{L} derivable in \mathcal{P}' is also derivable in \mathcal{P} .

Theorem 3. *Whenever \mathcal{P} has the subformula property, \mathcal{P} is a conservative extension of any J -fragment of \mathcal{P} .*

Proof. We just take the proof given by the subformula property. □

Another interesting property that can be obtained by cut-elimination is Craig's Interpolation.

Let X be a sequent. We note by $V(X)$ the variables in formulas appearing in X .

We say that \mathcal{P} has the *Craig's Interpolation property* if any pair of formulas φ and ρ such that $\varphi \vdash \rho$ is derivable in \mathcal{P} , then there is a formula ψ such that $\varphi \vdash \psi$ and $\psi \vdash \rho$ are derivable and $V(\psi) \subseteq V(\varphi) \cap V(\rho)$.

We later see a new version of it, slightly stronger, for Atomic Logics.

2 Algebraic Preliminaries

A **monoid** $(C, \cdot, 1)$ is a set C equipped with an associative binary operation with identity 1 such that $\forall a \in C, a \cdot 1 = 1 \cdot a = a$.

A **group** is a monoid such that every element in C is invertible, that is, $\forall x \in C, \exists y \in C$ such that $x \cdot y = 1$. If its operation is commutative, $\forall x, y \in C, x \cdot y = y \cdot x$, we say that C is an **abelian group**. A **subgroup** of C is a subset $D \subseteq C$ such that the group operation of C restricted to D is also a group operation.

Groups have two common notations for its operators, namely $(\cdot, 1)$ and $(+, 0)$, while the later is always reserved for abelian groups, the former can be used for both. In our case we must take care, as we still use \cdot for Aucher's notation.

Let C and D be monoids. A **morphism of monoids** $\varphi : C \rightarrow D$ is a function such that $\varphi(1) = 1$ and $\forall x, y \in C, \varphi(x \cdot y) = \varphi(x) \cdot \varphi(y)$. A **morphism of groups** $\varphi : C \rightarrow D$ is a function such that $\forall x, y \in C, \varphi(x \cdot y) = \varphi(x) \cdot \varphi(y)$. An **isomorphism of groups** is a bijective morphism.

Let C be a monoid and S a set. We call a **monoid action** $a : C \times S \rightarrow S$ such that $\forall x \in S, a(1, x) = x$ and $\forall x \in S, g, h \in C, a(g, a(h, x)) = a(g \cdot h, x)$. We call a **group action** to a monoid action of a group.

Let C be a group. We note by $\text{Aut}(C)$ the group of isomorphisms $C \rightarrow C$ with product its composition. We call it the **automorphisms** group.

Let C and D be groups with group operations \cdot_C and \cdot_D respectively. The **semi-direct product** of C and D for a morphism $\varphi : D \rightarrow \text{Aut}(C)$ is composed of:

- The set $C \times D$,
- the group operation $(x, y), (z, w) \mapsto (x \cdot_C \varphi(y)(z), y \cdot_D w)$. It is noted $C \rtimes D$.

The **direct product** of C and D is the semi-direct product on C and D given by morphism $\varphi : g \mapsto \text{id}$.

$\text{Sym}(n + 1)$ is called the **symmetric group** on $n + 1$ elements. Its elements are the bijections on the set $\{1, \dots, n + 1\}$. We use for $\text{Sym}(n + 1)$ the operation $\sigma \cdot \rho = \rho \circ \sigma$, where \circ is the composition of ρ and σ as functions.

Let C and D be two groups, the **free product** of C and D , noted $C * D$, is composed of:

- The set of words W on the cartesian product $C \times D$ with identity id_W the empty word, quotiented by $v(g, h)(\text{id}_C, h')w \sim v(g, h \cdot h')w, v(g, \text{id}_D)(g', h)w \sim v(g \cdot g', \text{id}_D)w$ and $v(\text{id}_C, \text{id}_D)w = vw$, where $g, g' \in C, h, h' \in D, v, w \in C * D$,
- the operation $w, v \mapsto w \cdot v$, the concatenation of both words.

If C is a group and $D \subseteq C$ is a subgroup we call a **left D -coset** an equivalence class of the equivalence relation given by $\forall x, y \in C, x \sim y$ if and only if $x^{-1} \cdot y \in D$. In the precedent definition, y would be a member of the xD left coset. Similarly on the right.

If D is a **normal subgroup**, i.e. $\forall x \in C, xD = Dx$, its cosets form a group with product $xD, yD \mapsto xD \cdot yD = (x \cdot y)D$. We call it the **quotient group**.

Example 4. The subgroup $\text{Sym}(n) \simeq \{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n) \mid \sigma(n + 1) = n + 1\}$ provides an example for cosets which do not form a group with element-wise multiplication. It is not a normal subgroup of $\text{Sym}(n + 1)$, in accordance to what we just said. This is the reason we need to introduce left/right cosets.

Proposition 1 (First Isomorphism Theorem). *Let C and D be two groups, and let $f : C \rightarrow D$ be a morphism. Then $\bar{f} : f / \text{Ker } f \rightarrow \text{Im } f$ is an isomorphism.*

We say that an element g of a set C with operation \cdot_C is **involutive** whenever $g \cdot_C g = \text{id}$.

2.1 Actions

Let S be a set and $a : C \times S \rightarrow S$ an action. The action a is called **free** whenever for any $x \in S$, $a(g, x) = x$ implies $g = \text{id}$. The action a is called **faithful** whenever $(\forall x \in S, a(g, x) = x)$ implies $g = \text{id}$. The action a is called **transitive** whenever $\forall x, y \in S$ there is some $g \in C$ such that $a(g, x) = y$. A **regular** action is a free and transitive action.

Proposition 2. *Let G be a group, S be a set and $a : G \times S \rightarrow S$ be an action. An action is regular if and only if $\forall x \in S, a(\cdot, x)$ is a bijective function $G \rightarrow S$.*

Through this function we can define a group structure on S with neutral x .

Proof. Indeed, we send identity to x . Any other $y \in S$ has some $g \in G$ such that $a(g, x) = y$ so that we can send g to y and the application is surjective, we call it ϕ . Finally, for any two $a(g, x) = y = a(h, x)$ we have $g = h$ so that the application is injective. The other implication is trivial. We define the group operation on S by $y \cdot z = \phi(\phi^{-1}(y) \cdot \phi^{-1}(z))$.

□

Proposition 3. *Free actions are regular when restricted on their orbits.*

Proof. Let a be an action of the group G on the set S and let $x, y \in S$. As x and y are in the same orbit there is some $g \in G$ such that $a(g, x) = y$. Therefore, a restricted to $G \times a(G, x)$ is transitive.

□

Given a group G , a set A and a group action $\alpha : G \times A \rightarrow A$, the **orbit** of α over $B \subseteq A$ is the image $\alpha(G, B)$.

Whenever we can assume safely the group we are talking about we will note the orbit $\alpha(B)$. When $B = \{x\}$ for some $x \in S$ we write $\alpha(x)$.

Let A be a set. The **semi-direct product for φ of two actions** $a : G \times A \rightarrow A, b : H \times A \rightarrow A$ such that $\forall x \in A, g \in G, h \in H, b(h, a(g, x)) = a(\varphi(h, g), b(h, x))$ is the action $b \times a : G \times H \times A \rightarrow A : ((g, h), x) \mapsto a(g, b(h, x))$.

The **composition action** of two commuting actions $a : G \times A \rightarrow A, b : H \times A \rightarrow A$ is the semi-direct product of its actions over the morphism $g \mapsto \text{id}$. It is noted $a \circ b$.

$b \times a$ is an action thanks to $(b \times a)((g, h), (b \times a)((g', h'), x)) = a(g, b(h, a(g', b(h', x)))) = a(g \cdot_G \varphi(h, g), b(h \cdot_H h', x)) = (b \times a)((g, h) \cdot_{G \times H}, x)$.

$a \circ b$ equals the free product action of b and a .

Let G and H be two groups. If α and β are actions of G and H on a set X , then the **free product** action $\alpha * \beta$ is the mapping $\alpha * \beta : G * H \times X \rightarrow X$ given by $(\alpha * \beta)(g, x) = \alpha(g_1, \beta(h_1, \dots, \alpha(g_n, \beta(h_n, x))))$, where $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $g_i \in G, h_i \in H$ and $g = g_1 h_1 \dots g_n h_n$.

Let C be a group and S be a set. Let $a : C \times S \rightarrow S$ be an action. The **stabilizer** of an element $x \in C$, noted C_x , is the set of $g \in C$ such that $a(g, x) = x$.

Proposition 4. *Stabilizers are normal subgroups. Stabilizers of two elements in the same orbit are isomorphic through conjugation. Therefore, the quotient of the group with its stabilizers is well-defined (although it depends on the orbit). Free actions have trivial stabilizers (isomorphic to the trivial group, with only the identity).*

Proof. Let C be a group, S a set, $a : C \times S \rightarrow S$ an action. Let $x, y \in S$ such that $a(x) = a(y)$, then we take a $g \in C$ such that $a(g, x) = y$ and we define the morphism $\varphi : C_x \rightarrow C_y : h \mapsto g \cdot h \cdot g^{-1}$.

□

Lemma 1. *Let C and D be two groups, $\varphi : C \rightarrow D$ and $\psi : D \rightarrow C$ be morphisms. Let S be a set, $x \in S$ and $a : C \times S \rightarrow S$ and $b : D \times S \rightarrow S$ be two actions such that $\forall g \in C, b(\varphi(g), x) = a(g, x)$ and $\forall g \in D, a(\psi(g), x) = b(g, x)$. Then $C / C_x \cong D / D_x$.*

Proof. Let $x \in S$. We define morphisms $\overline{\varphi} : C \rightarrow D / D_x : g \mapsto \overline{\varphi(g)}$ and $\overline{\psi} : D \rightarrow C / C_x : g \mapsto \overline{\psi(g)}$.

We just have to show that the induced $\overline{\varphi} : C / C_x \rightarrow D / D_x$ and $\overline{\psi} : D / D_x \rightarrow C / C_x$ are inverses. Let $g \in C$. As $b(\varphi(\psi(g)), x) = a(\psi(g), x) = b(g, x)$, we know that $\varphi(\psi(g)) \in C_x$ if and only if $g \in C_x$, so that $\overline{\varphi} \circ \overline{\psi} = \text{id}$. The other order follows from the other equality.

□

2.2 Modules

We call a **ring** $(R, +, \cdot)$ an abelian group $(R, +)$ along with a monoid (R, \cdot) such that \cdot is distributive over $+$.

We call a (left) **R -module** for a ring R an abelian group $(M, +)$ together with a left action for the group $\cdot : R \times M \rightarrow M$ such that \cdot is distributive on both sides.

A **morphism of R -modules** $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$ is a morphism of groups $M \rightarrow N$ such that $\forall x \in R, m \in M, \varphi(x \cdot f) = x \cdot \varphi(f)$. Again, invertible morphisms are called isomorphisms and $M \rightarrow M$ isomorphisms are called automorphisms.

We say that the ring $(R, +, \cdot)$ is a **field** whenever $(R - \{0\}, \cdot)$ is a group. When R is a field R -modules are called **R -spaces** or vector spaces. Morphisms of vector spaces are usually called **linear transformations**.

We will note by $\text{GL}(S)$ the **general linear group** over S a module, which is the group of the automorphisms on S with operation the composition.

A regular action of an R -module (with the addition group operation) over a set will be called an **affine R -module**. A regular action of an R -space (with the addition group operation) over a set will be called an **affine R -space**.

There is an isomorphism between n -matrices on a ring R and R^n linear transformations, so that we can use them interchangeably.

Whenever we have a morphism $\varphi : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(M)$ from a group G into the linear group of an R -module M we can see φ as an action of G on M . For this reason we will use the notations $\forall g \in G, m \in M, \varphi(g, m) = \varphi(g)(m)$.

3 Residuation and Negation on Atomic Logics

In this section we will introduce both Guillaume Aucher's Atomic Logics syntax and a new way of presenting it. Although the new syntax will have to wait until sections 4 and 5 to be fully introduced, we will compare in this section the actions he has used and the action I now introduce.

3.1 Original Syntax

Definition 1. We define the signs as elements of the unique two elements group (modulo isomorphism), \mathbb{B} , where we note by $+$ and \forall the identity and by $-$ and \exists the unique other number. We note this group \mathbb{B} .

This will let us operate with signatures.

$\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z}$ is to be interpreted as the ring with two elements.

We will use the following different notations for the same two-elements group (or rather isomorphic groups) and/or ring. In this list the relation \sim wants to loosely mark a correspondence in the isomorphism.

```

Class Atomic_Skeleton := {
  sk_arity : ℕ;
  sk_permutation : 'Sym_sk_arity.+1;
  sk_sign : sk_arity.+1.-tuple ±;
  sk_quantification : Æ;
  sk_type : sk_arity.+1.-tuple pos;
}.

```

Figure 3: In Coq we have introduced this version of the Skeleton Connectives

The set is:

- $\mathbb{B} \sim \mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} \sim \text{Bool}$

The two elements are:

- $+ \sim 0 \sim \text{false}$
- $- \sim 1 \sim \text{true}$

The operations are:

- $\cdot \sim + \sim \text{XOR}$
- $\cdot \sim \text{AND}$

	+	0	1
XOR		false	true
	0		
false		false	true
	1		
true		true	false

	.	0	1
AND		false	true
	0		
false		false	false
	1		
true		false	true

The operation for `Bool` is the one used in the code. We also note \forall for $+ \in \mathbb{B}$ and \exists for $- \in \mathbb{B}$.
 I use $\mathbb{N}^* = \mathbb{N} - \{0\}$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we say that the elements of $\mathbb{C}_n := \text{Sym}(n+1) \times \{+, -\} \times \{\forall, \exists\} \times (\mathbb{N}^*)^{n+1} \times \{+, -\}^n$ are the n -**ary connective skeletons**. The 0-ary connectives are also called **atom skeletons** as they'll be fundamental in the semantics. The connective skeleton set is $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}_n$.

So, the elementary objects of Atomic Logics are composed of two parts:

- A **signature**, consisting of:
 - a **semantic sign**; its second component, assigned to a $+$ or a $-$.
The projection to the second component is noted $\pm : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$.
 - a **quantification sign**; its third component, assigned to a \forall or an \exists .
The projection to the third component is noted $\Æ : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$.
 - a **tonicity signature**; its fifth component, assigned to a tuple of $+$ and $-$.

For any and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the projections to the i -essime component of the fifth component are noted $\pm_i : \mathbb{C}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$.

- a **type signature**; its fourth component, assigned to a tuple of positive numbers.

For any $i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}$ the projections to the i -essime component of the fourth component are noted $k_i : \mathbb{C}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^*$. For connective skeletons of arity n , we will note k for k_{n+1} and call it the **output type** of the connective skeleton.

- A **permutation**; its first component, assigned to a permutation.

These parameters will allow us to define the truth conditions of the connectives of atomic logics in section 5.2.

- The semantic sign describes the assertivity of the connective skeleton: does it refer to the accessible worlds or to the complementary relation's accessible worlds?
- The quantification sign defines the quantification of the truth value: is it true in all worlds or in at least some of them?
- The tonicity signature is composed of the signs of each component (is it true on some worlds or on the complementary's - in boolean logic, is it true or is it false required in this component to get a true result?).
- The type signature is composed of two parts, the output type or simply type of the connective skeleton itself and the types of the components. It defines the nature of the truth values.
- The permutation will mark the positions of the components in the accessibility relation for the semantics.

Definition 2. We define $\alpha_n : \text{Sym}(n+1) \times \mathbb{C}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_n : (\rho, C) \mapsto \alpha_n(\rho, C)$:

- If $\rho(n+1) = n+1$, then the action maps:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\sigma, \pm, \mathcal{A}, (k_1, \dots, k_n, k_{n+1}), (\pm_1, \dots, \pm_n)) \\ & \quad \downarrow \\ & (\rho \cdot \sigma, \pm, \mathcal{A}, (k_{\rho(1)}, \dots, k_{\rho(n)}, k_{\rho(n+1)}), (\pm_{\rho(1)}, \dots, \pm_{\rho(n)})) \end{aligned}$$

- When $\rho(n+1) \neq n+1$, then the action maps:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\sigma, \pm, \mathcal{A}, (k_1, \dots, k_n, k_{n+1}), (\pm_1, \dots, \pm_n)) \\ & \quad \downarrow \\ & (\rho \cdot \sigma, -\pm_{\rho(n+1)} \pm, -\pm_{\rho(n+1)} \mathcal{A}, (k_{\rho(1)}, \dots, k_{\rho(n)}, k_{\rho(n+1)}), \\ & \quad (-\pm_{\rho(n+1)} \pm_{(n+1 \rho(n+1))(\rho(1))}, \dots, -\pm_{\rho(n+1)} \pm_{(n+1 \rho(n+1))(\rho(i-1))}, \\ & \quad \pm_{(n+1 \rho(n+1))(\rho(\rho^-(n+1)))}, \\ & \quad -\pm_{\rho(n+1)} \pm_{(n+1 \rho(n+1))(\rho(i+1))}, \dots, -\pm_{\rho(n+1)} \pm_{(n+1 \rho(n+1))(\rho(n))})) \end{aligned}$$

```

Definition sk_Residuation (C) (p : 'Sym_sk_arity.+1)
:=
let: n := (@ord_max sk_arity) in
let: i := (p n) in
let: s := (tnth sk_sign i) in
{
  sk_arity := sk_arity;
  sk_permutation := (sk_permutation * p : 'Sym_sk_arity.+1)%g;
  sk_sign :=
    if (i != n) then
      [tuple if (p j) != n
        then - + s + tnth sk_sign
          (((tperm ord_max (p ord_max) : 'Sym_sk_arity.+1) * p)%g j)
        else s | j < sk_arity.+1]
      else [tuple tnth sk_sign (p i) | i < sk_arity.+1];
  sk_quantification :=
    if (i != n) then
      - + s + sk_quantification
    else sk_quantification;
  sk_type :=
    [tuple tnth sk_type (p i) | i < sk_arity.+1]
}]%R.

```

Figure 4: Implementation of α in Coq.

In Coq we have used the group operation \circ for $\text{Sym}(n+1)$, this is because our group actions are left actions and in the libraries all group actions are right actions. The only change this supposes is the order of the group operation.

We will note the image $\alpha_n(\sigma, \star)$ as $\sigma\star$.

- We now introduce the action α as presented in Aucher's *Display and Hilbert Calculi for Atomic and Molecular Logics*.

We define the function $\alpha'_n : \text{Sym}(n+1) \times \mathbb{C}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_n : (\tau, \star) \mapsto \tau\star$ inductively as follows. We refer to Aucher's articles for its well-definedness. Let $\star = (\sigma, \pm, \mathcal{A}, \bar{k}, (\pm_1, \dots, \pm_n)) \in \mathbb{C}_n$.

- If τ is the transposition $(j \ n+1)$, then

$$\alpha'_n(\tau, \star) = ((j \ n+1) \cdot \sigma, -\pm_j \pm, -\pm_j \mathcal{A}, (k_1, \dots, k_{n+1}, \dots, k_j), (-\pm_j \pm_1, \dots, -\pm_j \pm_n))$$

- If τ is the cycle $(a_1 \ \dots \ a_k \ n+1)$, then

$$\alpha'_n(\tau, \star) = \alpha'_n((a_1 \ n+1), \dots, \alpha'_n((a_k \ n+1), \star))$$

- If τ is a cycle fixing $n + 1$, then

$$\alpha'_n(\tau, \star) = (\tau \cdot \sigma, \pm, \mathcal{A}\mathcal{E}, (k_{\tau(1)}, \dots, k_{\tau(n)}), (\pm_{\tau(1)}, \dots, \pm_{\tau(n)}))$$

- Finally, if τ is an arbitrary permutation of $\text{Sym}(n + 1)$, it can be factorized into a product of disjoint cycles $\tau = c_1 \cdot \dots \cdot c_k$ and this factorization is unique (modulo reordering). So, we define $\alpha'_n(\tau, \star) = \alpha'_n(c_1, (\dots \alpha'_n(c_k, \star)))$.

- Secondly, we need to define boolean negation as the action $\beta_n : \mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{C}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_n : (b, C) \mapsto \beta(b, C)$ defined by:

- if $b = +$, then the action maps \star to \star .
- if $b = -$, then the action maps $(\sigma, \pm, \mathcal{A}\mathcal{E}, (k, k_1, \dots, k_n), (\pm_1, \dots, \pm_n))$ to:

$$(\sigma, -\pm, -\mathcal{A}\mathcal{E}, (k, k_1, \dots, k_n), (-\pm_1, \dots, -\pm_n))$$

We will note the image $\beta_n(\pm, \star)$ as $\pm\star$.

- Closely related there is the dual action as $\delta_n : \mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{C}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_n : (b, C) \mapsto \delta(b, C)$ defined by:

- if $b = +$, then the action maps \star to \star .
- if $b = -$, then the action maps $(\sigma, \pm, \mathcal{A}\mathcal{E}, (k, k_1, \dots, k_n), (\pm_1, \dots, \pm_n))$ to:

$$(\sigma, -\pm, -\mathcal{A}\mathcal{E}, (k, k_1, \dots, k_n), (\pm_1, \dots, \pm_n))$$

- Finally, we present the switches as $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $s_i : (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \times \mathbb{C}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_n : (b, C) \mapsto s_i(b, C)$ defined by:

- if $b = +$, then the action maps \star to \star .
- if $b = -$, then the action maps $(\sigma, \pm, \mathcal{A}\mathcal{E}, (k, k_1, \dots, k_n), (\pm_1, \dots, \pm_n))$ to:

$$(\sigma, \pm, \mathcal{A}\mathcal{E}, (k, k_1, \dots, k_n), (\pm_1, \dots, -\pm_i, \dots, \pm_n))$$

Proposition 5. α_n is an action.

Proof. Checking $\alpha_n(\text{id}, \star) = \star$ is trivial.

We now want to prove that $\alpha_n(\sigma_1, \alpha_n(\sigma_2, \star)) = \alpha_n(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2, \star)$. We work on cases on the value of $\sigma_1(n + 1), \sigma_2(n + 1)$ and $\sigma_2(\sigma_1(n + 1))$.

- We suppose that none of them equals $n + 1$.

- To illustrate the method we show that both sides of the equality have the same sign \pm .

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \pm (\alpha_n(\sigma_1, \alpha_n(\sigma_2, \star))) \\
 &= - \pm_{\sigma_1(n+1)}(\alpha_n(\sigma_2, \star)) \pm (\alpha_n(\sigma_2, \star)) \\
 &= - (- \pm_{\sigma_2(n+1)}(\star) \pm_{(n+1 \sigma_2(n+1))(\sigma_2(\sigma_1(n+1)))}(\star)) (- \pm_{\sigma_2(n+1)}(\star) \pm (\star)) \\
 &= - \pm_{\sigma_2(\sigma_1(n+1))}(\star) \pm (\star) \\
 &= - \pm_{(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2)(n+1)}(\star) \pm (\star) \\
 &= \pm (\alpha_n(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2, \star))
 \end{aligned}$$

- Now we do the proof for \pm_i for $i \leq n$.
If $\sigma_1(i) \neq n + 1$ and $\sigma_2(\sigma_1(i)) \neq n + 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \pm_i (\alpha_n(\sigma_1, \alpha_n(\sigma_2, \star))) \\
 &= - \pm_{\sigma_1(n+1)}(\alpha_n(\sigma_2, \star)) \pm_{(n+1 \sigma_1(n+1))(\sigma_1(i))} (\alpha_n(\sigma_2, \star)) \\
 &= - (- \pm_{\sigma_2(n+1)}(\star) \pm_{(n+1 \sigma_2(n+1))(\sigma_2(\sigma_1(n+1)))}(\star)) \\
 & \quad (- \pm_{\sigma_2(n+1)}(\star) \pm_{(n+1 \sigma_2(n+1))\sigma_2((n+1 \sigma_1(n+1))(\sigma_1(i)))}(\star)) \\
 &= - \pm_{\sigma_2(\sigma_1(n+1))}(\star) \pm_{(n+1 \sigma_2(n+1))\sigma_2((n+1 \sigma_1(n+1))(\sigma_1(i)))}(\star) \\
 &= - \pm_{(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2)(n+1)}(\star) \pm_{(n+1 \sigma_2(\sigma_1(n+1)))\sigma_2(\sigma_1(i))}(\star) \\
 &= \pm_i (\alpha_n(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2, \star))
 \end{aligned}$$

The other cases are similar, for example when $\sigma_1(i) = n + 1$ we use that

$$\pm_{(n+1 \sigma_1(n+1))(\sigma_1(i))}(\alpha_n(\sigma_2, \star)) = \pm_{\sigma_1(n+1)}(\alpha_n(\sigma_2, \star))$$

- Whenever $\sigma_1(\sigma_2(n + 1)) = n + 1$ we should note that

$$\pm_{\sigma_1(n+1)}(\alpha_n(\sigma_2, \star)) = \pm_{(n+1 \sigma_2(n+1))(\sigma_2(\sigma_1(n+1)))}(\star)$$

- Showing the other equalities is a similar procedure.

The full proof can be seen in the appendix and the code available in GitHub, written in the SSReflect extension of Coq.

□

Proposition 6. α_n and α'_n are equal on $\text{Sym}(n + 1) \times \mathbb{C}_n$.

Proof. Now we check that $\forall \sigma \in \text{Sym}(n + 1), \star \in \mathbb{C}_n, \alpha_n(\sigma, \star) = \alpha'_n(\sigma, \star)$. We will proceed by induction on the decomposition of σ by transpositions.

```

Class ary_Skeleton := {
  sa : @Atomic_Skeleton;
  eqs_arity : n == sk_arity
}.
Coercion sa : ary_Skeleton >-> Atomic_Skeleton.

HB.instance Definition _ {n : nat} :=
  [isSub of (ary_Skeleton n) for @sa n].

Definition ska_Residuation
  (C : ary_Skeleton) (s : 'Sym_n.+1) :=
  { | sa := sk_Residuation C (cast_perm (f_equal S (eqP eqs_arity)) s);
    eqs_arity := eqs_arity
  }.
Theorem sk_α_is_action {n} :
  is_action [set: 'Sym_n.+1] (@ska_Residuation n).

Definition sk_α {n} := Action (sk_α_is_action (n:=n)).

```

Figure 5: We have provided a proof of α_n being an action

- For the base cases, involving transpositions with $n + 1$ and cycles fixing $n + 1$, it is trivial
- If $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n + 1)$ satisfies the induction hypothesis, we take $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \alpha_n((j \ n + 1) \cdot \sigma, \star) \\
 &= \alpha_n((j \ n + 1), \alpha_n(\sigma, \star)) \\
 &= \alpha_n((j \ n + 1), \alpha'_n(\sigma, \star)) \\
 &= \alpha'_n((j \ n + 1), (\alpha'_n(\sigma, \star))) \\
 &= \alpha'_n((j \ n + 1) \cdot \sigma, \star)
 \end{aligned}$$

Where the first equality comes from the new α_n being an action, the second and third equalities come from the induction hypothesis and finally, the fourth action comes from Auchers's α'_n also being an action.

□

We can also work on consecutive applications of actions α_n and β_n through its free product action $\alpha_n * \beta_n$, introduced in the Algebraic Preliminaries.

We sometimes note $\sigma \star$ for $\alpha_n(\sigma, \star)$ and $s \star$ for $\beta_n(s, \star)$.

3.2 The Main Result: A Finite Version of the Group Actions

The main motivation for this detour is that the free product action $\alpha_n * \beta_n$ used for Atomic Logics works with infinite groups, which is undesirable for working on it in Coq. We are going to redefine the free product action $\alpha_n * \beta_n$ into another group action $\alpha_n \times \varsigma_n$ which resorts only to finite groups, using the notion of semi-direct product. While the original syntax worked through all the possible sequences of compositions of the pair of actions, our new syntax will describe all connectives without repeating itself.

In this section we will introduce a new morphism Q , in subsection *Morphism Q for tonicity signatures*, which has some of the interesting properties of α while being a morphism into the general linear group of tonicity signatures, we get back our α in subsection *A new action α from Q* , in subsection *Correspondence between the α* we check that they are all the same and, finally, in subsection *The free product and the semi-direct product* we provide a translation between the connectives given by $\alpha * \beta$, defined over a free group, and some action $\alpha \times \varsigma$, defined over a finite group. For details on how Theorem 4 implies equivalence for the resulting atomic logics, we invite the reader to go to definition 14, proposition 21 and corollary 3.

Definition 3. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the **simplified n -ary connective skeletons** are the elements of $\mathbb{D}_n := \text{Sym}(n+1) \times (\mathbb{N}^*)^{n+1} \times \{+, -\}^{n+1} \times \{+, -\}$. We note the projections to the i -essime component of the fourth component \pm_i .

The last component is not going to correspond to the sign \mathcal{A} but rather to the sum $\pm + \mathcal{A}$, where \mathcal{A} is meant to represent the quantification sign and \pm the semantical sign from \mathbb{C}_n .

Definition 4. The translations back and forth from the previous data structure \mathbb{C}_n are:

- $\iota^{-1} : (\sigma, k, \pm, s) \mapsto (\sigma, \pm_{n+1}, \pm_{n+1} + s, k, (\pm_1, \dots, \pm_n))$.
- $\iota : (\sigma, \pm, \mathcal{A}, k, \pm) \mapsto (\sigma, k, (\pm_1, \dots, \pm_n, \pm), \pm + \mathcal{A})$.

From now on we will use \mathbb{C} also for referring to \mathbb{D} . On the follow, unless explicitly stated we will assume to be working with \mathbb{D} with signs \pm_i, \mathcal{A}, \pm living on $\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z}$. Furthermore, all actions we will work with do not change $\pm + \mathcal{A}$, which lets us define them in a simpler way.

Definition 5. On the new structure skeleton structures, we define the switch action as

$$\varsigma : (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \times \mathbb{D}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_n$$

$$(b, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma' \\ k \\ v \\ s \end{bmatrix}) \mapsto b + \begin{bmatrix} \sigma' \\ k \\ v \\ s \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma' \\ k \\ b + v \\ s \end{bmatrix}$$

It is again a free action, which makes its orbits along the connectives skeletons affine $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$ -spaces. In fact, most actions on connective skeletons we will work with are free.

We define the **Kronecker delta** (although we use the same greek letter for the dual action, note the difference in the notation)

$$\delta_{i,j} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases}$$

Definition 6. We define a function $P_{\mathbb{N}^*} : \text{Sym}(n+1) \hookrightarrow \text{Sym}(\mathbb{N}^{*n+1})$:

$$P_{\mathbb{N}^*}(\sigma)(n_1, \dots, n_m) := (n_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, n_{\sigma(m)})$$

We define a function $P : \text{Sym}(n+1) \hookrightarrow \text{Sym}((\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1})$, given by the matrix:

$$P(\sigma)_{i,j} := \delta_{\sigma(i),j}$$

Proposition 7. P is an injective morphism $\text{Sym}(n+1) \hookrightarrow \text{GL}(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$. $P_{\mathbb{N}^*}$ is an injective morphism.

Proof. Checking the requirement for the identity is trivial.

$$\begin{aligned} (P(\sigma)P(\sigma'))_{i,j} &= \sum_k P(\sigma)_{i,k} P(\sigma')_{k,j} = \sum_k \delta_{\sigma(i),k} \delta_{\sigma'(k),j} = \sum_k \delta_{\sigma(i),k} \delta_{k,\sigma'^{-1}(j)} \\ &= \delta_{\sigma(i),\sigma'^{-1}(j)} = \delta_{\sigma'(\sigma(i)),j} = \delta_{(\sigma \cdot \sigma')(i),j} = P(\sigma \cdot \sigma')_{i,j} \end{aligned}$$

For any $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n+1)$ we see that $P(\sigma)$ is bijective by showing $P(\sigma)P(\sigma^{-1}) = P(\text{id}) = \text{id}$. Indeed $P(\text{id})_{i,j} = \delta_{\text{id}(i),j} = \text{id}_{i,j}$.

For any $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n+1)$, $P(\sigma) = \text{id}$ implies that $\delta_{\sigma(i),j} = \delta_{i,j}$ so that $\sigma(i) = i$ and $\sigma = \text{id}$.

□

Morphism Q for tonicity signatures

We will introduce a morphism which will later be useful. It can be seen as a conjugation of P .

Definition 7. We define the morphism $Q : \text{Sym}(n+1) \rightarrow \text{Sym}(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$, given by the matrix

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\sigma)_{i,j} &:= \delta_{(n+1 \ \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(i)),j} + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} (1 + \delta_{n+1,\sigma(i)}) (1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),n+1}) \\ &= \begin{cases} \delta_{(n+1 \ \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(i)),j} & \text{if } j \notin \{n+1, \sigma(n+1)\} \\ 1 & \text{if } j \neq n+1, j = \sigma(n+1) \\ \delta_{i,j} & \text{else} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We define the linear transformation $T : (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$, given by the matrix

$$T_{i,j} := \delta_{i,j} + \delta_{j,n+1}(1 + \delta_{i,n+1})$$

We recall the action notation $Q(\sigma, v) = Q(\sigma)(v)$ introduced in the algebraic preliminaries.

Proposition 8. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n+1)$, the equality $T \cdot Q(\sigma) = P(\sigma) \cdot T$ holds.*

Proof. The proof makes use of Kronecker delta's properties and that sum is involutive in $\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z}$.

$$\begin{aligned} (T \cdot Q(\sigma))_{i,j} &= \sum_k T_{i,k} Q(\sigma)_{k,j} \\ &= \sum_k (\delta_{i,k} + \delta_{k,n+1}(1 + \delta_{i,n+1})) (\delta_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(k)),j} + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),j}(1 + \delta_{n+1,\sigma(k)})(1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),n+1})) \\ &= \sum_k \delta_{i,k} (\delta_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(k)),j} + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),j}(1 + \delta_{n+1,\sigma(k)})(1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),n+1})) \\ &\quad + \delta_{k,n+1}(1 + \delta_{i,n+1}) (\delta_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(k)),j} + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),j}(1 + \delta_{n+1,\sigma(k)})(1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),n+1})) \\ &= \delta_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(i)),j} + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),j}(1 + \delta_{n+1,\sigma(i)})(1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),n+1}) \\ &\quad + (1 + \delta_{i,n+1}) (\delta_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(n+1)),j} + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),j}(1 + \delta_{n+1,\sigma(n+1)})(1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),n+1})) \end{aligned}$$

Now we will use that $\forall i, j, k, l \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}$, $\delta_{(i j)(k),l} = \delta_{k,(i j)(l)} = \delta_{k,l}(1 + \delta_{i,l})(1 + \delta_{j,l}) + \delta_{k,j}\delta_{i,l}(1 + \delta_{j,l}) + \delta_{k,i}\delta_{j,l}$, which can be seen by doing case analysis on $\delta_{i,l}$ and $\delta_{j,l}$.

$$\begin{aligned} (T \cdot Q(\sigma))_{i,j} &= \delta_{\sigma(i),j}(1 + \delta_{n+1,j})(1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),j}) + \delta_{\sigma(i),\sigma(n+1)}\delta_{n+1,j}(1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),j}) \\ &\quad + \delta_{\sigma(i),n+1}\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),j}(1 + \delta_{n+1,\sigma(i)})(1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),n+1}) \\ &\quad + (1 + \delta_{i,n+1})(\delta_{n+1,j} + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),j}(1 + \delta_{n+1,\sigma(n+1)})) \\ &= \delta_{\sigma(i),j} + \delta_{\sigma(i),j}\delta_{n+1,j} + \delta_{\sigma(i),j}\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} + \delta_{\sigma(i),j}\delta_{n+1,j}\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} \\ &\quad + \delta_{i,n+1}\delta_{n+1,j}(1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),j}) + \delta_{\sigma(i),n+1}\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} \\ &\quad + (1 + \delta_{i,n+1})\delta_{n+1,j} + (1 + \delta_{n+1,\sigma(i)} + 1 + \delta_{i,n+1})\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j}(1 + \delta_{n+1,\sigma(n+1)}) \\ &= \delta_{\sigma(i),j} + \delta_{\sigma(i),j}\delta_{n+1,j} + \delta_{\sigma(i),\sigma(n+1)}\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} + \delta_{\sigma(i),\sigma(n+1)}\delta_{n+1,j}\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} \\ &\quad + \delta_{i,n+1}\delta_{n+1,j}\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} + \delta_{\sigma(i),n+1}\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} \\ &\quad + \delta_{n+1,j} + (\delta_{n+1,\sigma(i)} + \delta_{n+1,\sigma(i)}\delta_{n+1,\sigma(n+1)} + \delta_{i,n+1} + \delta_{i,n+1}\delta_{n+1,\sigma(n+1)})\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} \\ &= \delta_{\sigma(i),j} + \delta_{\sigma(i),j}\delta_{n+1,j} + \delta_{i,n+1}\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} + \delta_{\sigma(i),n+1}\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} \\ &\quad + \delta_{n+1,j} + (\delta_{n+1,\sigma(i)} + \delta_{n+1,\sigma(i)}\delta_{\sigma(i),\sigma(n+1)} + \delta_{i,n+1} + \delta_{i,n+1}\delta_{n+1,\sigma(i)})\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} \\ &= \delta_{\sigma(i),j} + \delta_{\sigma(i),n+1}\delta_{n+1,j} + \delta_{i,n+1}\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} + \delta_{\sigma(i),n+1}\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} \\ &\quad + \delta_{n+1,j} + (\delta_{n+1,\sigma(i)} + \delta_{i,n+1})\delta_{\sigma(n+1),j} = \delta_{\sigma(i),j} + \delta_{j,n+1}(1 + \delta_{\sigma(i),n+1}) \end{aligned}$$

On the other side we have, as desired:

$$\begin{aligned} (P(\sigma) \cdot T)_{i,j} &= \sum_k P(\sigma)_{i,k} T_{k,j} = \sum_k \delta_{\sigma(i),k} (\delta_{k,j} + \delta_{j,n+1} (1 + \delta_{k,n+1})) \\ &= \delta_{\sigma(i),j} + \delta_{j,n+1} (1 + \delta_{\sigma(i),n+1}) \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 9. *The linear transformation T is involutive with the composition and therefore bijective.*

From proposition 8 we deduce that $Q(\sigma) = T \cdot P(\sigma) \cdot T$ and that $\forall \sigma \in \text{Sym}(n+1)$, $Q(\sigma) \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$.

Proof. We just have to see that $T^2 = \text{id}$.

$$\begin{aligned} (T \cdot T)_{i,j} &= \sum_k T_{i,k} T_{k,j} = \sum_k (\delta_{i,k} + \delta_{k,n+1} (1 + \delta_{i,n+1})) (\delta_{k,j} + \delta_{j,n+1} (1 + \delta_{k,n+1})) \\ &= \delta_{i,j} + \delta_{j,n+1} (1 + \delta_{i,n+1}) + (1 + \delta_{i,n+1}) (\delta_{n+1,j} + \delta_{j,n+1} (1 + \delta_{n+1,n+1})) = \delta_{i,j} = (\text{id})_{i,j} \end{aligned}$$

As for any $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n+1)$, $T, P(\sigma) \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$, then $Q(\sigma) \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$.

□

The following tells us that Q is an action, as the product of $\text{GL}(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$ is composition.

Proposition 10. *$Q : \text{Sym}(n+1) \rightarrow \text{GL}(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$ is an injective morphism.*

Proof. Let $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{Sym}(n+1)$. By using proposition 9 we can deduce $Q(\sigma \cdot \sigma') = T \cdot P(\sigma \cdot \sigma') \cdot T = T \cdot P(\sigma) \cdot P(\sigma') \cdot T = T \cdot P(\sigma) \cdot T \cdot T \cdot P(\sigma') \cdot T = Q(\sigma) \cdot Q(\sigma')$.

Let us suppose now for some $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n+1)$ that $Q(\sigma) = \text{id}$. As $P(\sigma) = T \cdot Q(\sigma) \cdot T = T \cdot T = \text{id}$ and P is injective, we deduce $\sigma = \text{id}$.

□

As Q is an injective morphism into GL we can see straightforward that it is a faithful action.

In spite of that, Q is a not free action, as $\forall n \geq 2$, $Q((12), (0, \dots, 0)) = (0, \dots, 0)$.

$Q(\sigma)$ is a permutation of a matrix like this:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \text{id}_{\sigma(n+1)-1} & 1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),n+1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1),n+1} & \text{id}_{n+1-\sigma(n+1)} \end{pmatrix}$$

A new action α from Q

We will redefine a third time α_n , using Q . The action R represents the action α on tonicity signatures.

Definition 8. We define an action on tonicity signatures:

$$R : \text{Sym}(n+1) \times (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$$

$$(\sigma, v) \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} d_1 \\ \vdots \\ d_{n+1} \end{pmatrix} + Q(\sigma, v)$$

where $d_j = (1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(j)})(1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(n+1)})$. Note that $d_{\sigma^{-1}(n+1)} = 0$.

And an action on connective skeletons:

$$\alpha''_n : \text{Sym}(n+1) \times \mathbb{C}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_n$$

$$\left(\sigma, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma' \\ k \\ v \\ s \end{bmatrix} \right) \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \sigma \cdot \sigma' \\ P_{\mathbb{N}^*}(\sigma, k) \\ R(\sigma, v) \\ s \end{bmatrix}$$

Proposition 11. R and α''_n are actions.

Proof. R being an action entails α''_n being an action. Indeed, by using proposition 7:

$$\alpha''_n(\sigma, \alpha''_n(\sigma', \begin{bmatrix} \rho \\ k \\ v \\ s \end{bmatrix})) = \alpha''_n(\sigma, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma' \cdot \rho \\ P_{\mathbb{N}^*}(\sigma', k) \\ R(\sigma', v) \\ s \end{bmatrix}) = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma \cdot \sigma' \cdot \rho \\ P_{\mathbb{N}^*}(\sigma, P_{\mathbb{N}^*}(\sigma', k)) \\ R(\sigma, R(\sigma', v)) \\ s \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma \cdot \sigma' \cdot \rho \\ P_{\mathbb{N}^*}(\sigma \cdot \sigma', k) \\ R(\sigma \cdot \sigma', v) \\ s \end{bmatrix} = \alpha''_n(\sigma \cdot \sigma', \begin{bmatrix} \rho \\ k \\ v \\ s \end{bmatrix})$$

We state the following equality, which we will prove afterwards.

$$\begin{pmatrix} (1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(1)})(1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(n+1)}) \\ \vdots \\ (1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(n+1)})(1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(n+1)}) \end{pmatrix} + Q(\sigma, b) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + Q(\sigma, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + b) \quad (1)$$

Now we can prove the main result

$$R(\sigma, R(\sigma', v)) = R\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + Q(\sigma', \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + v)\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + Q(\sigma, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + Q(\sigma', \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + v))$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + Q(\sigma, Q(\sigma', \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + v)) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + Q(\sigma \cdot \sigma', \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + v) = R(\sigma \cdot \sigma', v)$$

where we used (1) in the first two steps, we used that the additive group $(\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$ has characteristic 2 in the third step and we used proposition 10.

The equality can be shown by case analysis on $\sigma(n+1) = n+1$.

- If $\sigma(n+1) = n+1$, then $Q(\sigma, (1, \dots, 1)) = (1, \dots, 1)$ and therefore the right hand side is $0 + Q(\sigma, b)$ like the left hand side (because $1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1), n+1} = 0$).
- If $\sigma(n+1) \neq n+1$, then $Q(\sigma, (1, \dots, 1)) = (\delta_{n+1, \sigma(1)}, \dots, \delta_{n+1, \sigma(n+1)})$ for $\sigma(n+1) \neq n+1$ and therefore we get

$$R(\sigma, b) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(1)} \\ \dots \\ 1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(n+1)} \end{pmatrix} + Q(\sigma, b)$$

□

Lemma 2. α_n'' is a free action.

Proof. Checking it is as simple as observing that in its first component $\sigma \cdot \sigma' = \sigma'$ if and only if $\sigma = \text{id}$.

□

Correspondence between the actions α

In this proposition we show that α_n and α_n'' are the same action, modulo translation between the different syntax \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{D} . We already knew that α_n and α_n' were equal.

Proposition 12. For any connective skeleton \otimes and permutation σ , $\alpha_n''(\sigma, \otimes) = \iota(\alpha_n(\sigma, \iota^{-1}(\otimes)))$, where $\iota : \mathbb{C}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_n$ is the translation given in definition 4.

Along with proposition 6 we can now tell that all the presented alpha actions are equal.

Proof. We provide the proof for

$$R(\sigma, \begin{pmatrix} \pm 1 \\ \vdots \\ \pm_{n+1} \end{pmatrix}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \pm_{\sigma(n+1)} + \pm_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(1))} \\ \vdots \\ 1 + \pm_{\sigma(n+1)} + \pm_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(i-1))} \\ \pm_{\sigma(n+1)} \\ 1 + \pm_{\sigma(n+1)} + \pm_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(i+1))} \\ \vdots \\ 1 + \pm_{\sigma(n+1)} + \pm_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(n+1))} \end{pmatrix}$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (R(\sigma, (\pm_1, \dots, \pm_n)))_i \\
 &= 1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(i)} + \sum_j Q(\sigma)_{i, j \pm_j} \\
 &= 1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(i)} + \sum_j (\delta_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(i)), j} + \delta_{\sigma(n+1), j} (1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(i)}) (1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1), n+1})) \pm_j \\
 &= 1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(i)} + \pm_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(i))} + \pm_{\sigma(n+1)} (1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(i)}) (1 + \delta_{\sigma(n+1), n+1})
 \end{aligned}$$

- If $n + 1 = \sigma(i)$ we have that

$$(R(\sigma, (\pm_1, \dots, \pm_n)))_i = \pm_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(i))} = \pm_{\sigma(n+1)}$$

- If $n + 1 \neq \sigma(i)$ but $n + 1 = \sigma(n + 1)$ we have that

$$(R(\sigma, (\pm_1, \dots, \pm_n)))_i = \pm_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(i))} = \pm_{\sigma(i)}$$

- In any other case we have

$$(R(\sigma, (\pm_1, \dots, \pm_n)))_i = 1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(i)} + \pm_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(i))} + \pm_{\sigma(n+1)}$$

Now we can easily check that for $\sigma(n + 1) \neq n + 1$

$$\alpha_n''(\sigma, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma' \\ k \\ v \\ s \end{bmatrix}) = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma \cdot \sigma' \\ P_{\mathbb{N}^*}(\sigma, k) \\ R(\sigma, v) \\ s \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma \cdot \sigma' \\ (k_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, k_{\sigma(n+1)}) \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} - \pm_{\sigma(n+1)} \pm_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(1))} \\ \vdots \\ - \pm_{\sigma(n+1)} \pm_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(i-1))} \\ \pm_{\sigma(n+1)} \\ - \pm_{\sigma(n+1)} \pm_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(i+1))} \\ \vdots \\ - \pm_{\sigma(n+1)} \pm_{(n+1 \sigma(n+1))(\sigma(n+1))} \end{array} \right) \\ s \end{bmatrix}$$

Where the last component of the equality is written in multiplicative notation of \mathbb{B} .

□

Proposition 13. Let $\otimes \in \mathbb{C}_n$, $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n + 1)$, $b, v \in (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$. Then

1. We have $R(\sigma, b + v) = Q(\sigma, b) + R(\sigma, v)$,
2. We have $\alpha_n''(\sigma, \varsigma(b, \otimes)) = \varsigma(Q(\sigma, b), \alpha_n''(\sigma, \otimes))$,
3. We have $\forall \sigma \in \text{Sym}(n + 1), b, v \in (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}, R(\sigma, b) + R(\sigma, v) = Q(\sigma, b + v)$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} R(\sigma, b + v) &= \begin{pmatrix} (1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(1)})(1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(n+1)}) \\ \vdots \\ (1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(n+1)})(1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(n+1)}) \end{pmatrix} + Q(\sigma, b + v) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(1)})(1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(n+1)}) \\ \vdots \\ (1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(n+1)})(1 + \delta_{n+1, \sigma(n+1)}) \end{pmatrix} + Q(\sigma, b) + Q(\sigma, v) = Q(\sigma, b) + R(\sigma, v) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used commutativity of +.

The points 2 and 3 are easy consequences of 1.

□

The free product and the semi-direct product

In this section we will introduce two possible ways of composing the actions on connective skeletons. The first one, with the free product, can be understood as recursively applying the actions for each element of a group appearing in a word. The second one is presented below.

Definition 9. Following proposition 13, we define the product action $\alpha_n \times \varsigma_n : (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \times \text{Sym}(n + 1) \times \mathbb{C}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_n$ on the semi-direct product $(\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \times \text{Sym}(n + 1)$ for the morphism Q .⁴

Definition 10. We call α_n the residuation action, β_n the boolean negation action and $\alpha_n \times \varsigma_n$ the signed residuation action. We note them without subindex usually.

Proposition 14. $\alpha \times \varsigma$ is a free action.

Proof. If $(\alpha \times \varsigma)((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1}), \sigma), \otimes) = \otimes$ then on the first component $\sigma \cdot \sigma' = \sigma'$ so that $\sigma = \text{id}$ and $\varsigma((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1}), \otimes) = \otimes$. We have already seen that ς is free, so that $(s_1, \dots, s_{n+1}) = (0, \dots, 0)$.

□

⁴See the Algebraic Preliminaries section for details.

This action translated into Aucher's notation corresponds to composing the switches s_i and the dual δ with α .

Definition 11. We define the morphism $\varphi : \mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} * \text{Sym}(n + 1) \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \times \text{Sym}(n + 1)$: For any $s_1, \dots, s_l \in \mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z}$, $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_l \in \text{Sym}(n + 1)$,

$$\varphi((s_1, \sigma_1) \dots (s_l, \sigma_l)) = (s_1(1, \dots, 1) + \dots + Q(\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_{l-1}, s_l(1, \dots, 1)), \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_l)$$

We define the function $\psi : (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \times \text{Sym}(n + 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} * \text{Sym}(n + 1)$: For any $s_1, \dots, s_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z}$, $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n + 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(s_1, \dots, s_{n+1}, \sigma) &= (0, (1 \ n + 1))(s_1, (1 \ n + 1)) \dots (0, (n \ n + 1))(s_n, (n \ n + 1)) \\ &\quad ((s_{n+1}, \text{id})(0, (1 \ n + 1))(s_{n+1}, (1 \ n + 1)) \dots (0, (n \ n + 1))(s_{n+1}, (n \ n + 1)))(+, \sigma) \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 15. φ is a morphism.

Proof. We first see well-definedness of φ . We have to check which are the values of $\varphi(v(\sigma, s)(\text{id}, s')w)$, $\varphi(v(\sigma, 0)(\sigma', s))$ and $\varphi(v(\text{id}, 0)w)$.

- In the first case, if $v = (\sigma_1, s_1) \dots (\sigma_{i-1}, s_{i-1})$, we have a component $Q(\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_{i-1}, s(1, \dots, 1)) + Q(\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_{i-1} \cdot \text{id}, s'(1, \dots, 1))$ which can be simplified as $Q(\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_{i-1}, (s + s')(1, \dots, 1))$. The associativity of $+$ and id being the neutral element end the proof.
- In the second case, if $v = (\sigma_1, s_1) \dots (\sigma_{i-1}, s_{i-1})$, we have a component $Q(\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_{i-1}, 0(1, \dots, 1)) = 0$, as 0 is the neutral of $+$ we can conclude.
- In the third case, if $v = (\sigma_1, s_1) \dots (\sigma_{i-1}, s_{i-1})$, we have a component $Q(\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_{i-1}, 0(1, \dots, 1)) = 0$, as 0 is the neutral of $+$ and id is the neutral element of \cdot we can conclude.

Let $s_1, \dots, s_l \in \mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z}$, $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_l, \sigma, \sigma' \in \text{Sym}(n + 1)$. We see that φ is a morphism.

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi((s_1, \sigma_1) \dots (s_l, \sigma_l)(s'_1, \sigma'_1) \dots (s'_l, \sigma'_l)) \\ &= (s_1(1, \dots, 1) + \dots + Q(\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_{l-1}, s_l(1, \dots, 1)) + Q(\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_l \cdot \sigma'_1, s'_1(1, \dots, 1)) + \dots \\ &\quad + Q(\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_l \cdot \sigma'_1 \dots \sigma'_{l-1}, s'_l(1, \dots, 1)), \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_l \cdot \sigma'_1 \dots \sigma'_l) \\ &= (s_1(1, \dots, 1) + \dots + Q(\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_{l-1}, s_l(1, \dots, 1)), \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_l) \cdot (s'_1(1, \dots, 1) + \dots \\ &\quad + Q(\sigma'_1 \dots \sigma'_{l-1}, s'_l(1, \dots, 1)), \sigma'_1 \dots \sigma'_l) \\ &= \varphi((s_1, \sigma_1) \dots (s_l, \sigma_l)) + \varphi((s'_1, \sigma'_1) \dots (s'_l, \sigma'_l)) \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we can see that the action given by the free product of α and β and the semi-direct product of α and ς are somehow equivalent on connective skeletons.

Theorem 4. *Let C be a connective family and $x \in \mathbb{C}$. The group $(\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \times \text{Sym}(n+1)$ defined in Definition 9 is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} * \text{Sym}(n+1)) / (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} * \text{Sym}(n+1))_x$. In particular we have that φ induces an isomorphism $\bar{\varphi} : (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} * \text{Sym}(n+1)) / (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} * \text{Sym}(n+1))_x \simeq (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \times \text{Sym}(n+1)$.*

Furthermore, $\forall g \in \mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} * \text{Sym}(n+1)$, $(\alpha'' \times \varsigma)(\varphi(g), x) = (\alpha * \beta)(g, x)$.

Proof. The first thing we check is the equality for the action $\alpha \times \varsigma$ on Connective Skeletons. We prove it by induction on the length l of $g = (s_1, \sigma_1) \cdots (s_l, \sigma_l)$.

Let $s_1, \dots, s_l \in \mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z}$, $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_l \in \text{Sym}(n+1)$ and $\star \in \mathbb{C}_n$. $(\alpha'' \times \varsigma)(\varphi((s_1, \sigma_1) \cdots (s_l, \sigma_l)), \star) = (\alpha * \beta)((s_1, \sigma_1) \cdots (s_l, \sigma_l), \star)$, we recall $\alpha''(\sigma, s + \star) = Q(\sigma, s) + \alpha''(\sigma, \star)$.

We show the induction step

$$\begin{aligned} & (\alpha'' \times \varsigma)(\varphi((s_1, \sigma_1) \cdots (s_{l+1}, \sigma_{l+1})), \star) \\ &= (\alpha'' \times \varsigma)((s_1(1, \dots, 1) + \dots + Q(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_l, s_{l+1}(1, \dots, 1)), \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{l+1}), \star) \\ &= (\alpha'' \times \varsigma)((s_1(1, \dots, 1) + \dots + Q(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{l-1}, s_l(1, \dots, 1)), \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_l), (\alpha \times \varsigma)((s_{l+1}(1, \dots, 1), \sigma_{l+1}), \star)) \\ &= (\alpha * \beta)((s_1, \sigma_1) \cdots (s_l, \sigma_l), (\alpha'' \times \varsigma)((s_{l+1}(1, \dots, 1), \sigma_{l+1}), \star)) \\ &= (\alpha * \beta)((s_1, \sigma_1) \cdots (s_l, \sigma_l), (\alpha'' * \beta)((s_{l+1}, \sigma_{l+1}), \star)) \\ &= (\alpha * \beta)((s_1, \sigma_1) \cdots (s_l, \sigma_l)(s_{l+1}, \sigma_{l+1}), \star) \end{aligned}$$

where in the second step we have used the fact that $\alpha \times \varsigma$ is an action of the semi-direct product by Q , so that $(\alpha'' \times \varsigma)((v + Q(\sigma, v'), \sigma \cdot \sigma'), \star) = (\alpha'' \times \varsigma)((v, \sigma) \cdot (v', \sigma'), \star)$, and in the last step we have used that $\alpha * \beta$ is an action of the free product. In the third and fourth steps we have used induction hypothesis.

To see that $\bar{\varphi}$ is an isomorphism of groups, we will use the first isomorphism theorem and proposition 4 on lemma 2.

Therefore, we need to see that $\text{Ker } \varphi = (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} * \text{Sym}(n+1))_x$. Indeed $(s_1(1, \dots, 1) + \dots + Q(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{l-1}, s_l(1, \dots, 1)), \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_l) = ((0, \dots, 0), \text{id})$ implies that $(\alpha * \beta)((s_1, \sigma_1) \cdots (s_l, \sigma_l), \star) = (\alpha'' \times \varsigma)(\varphi((s_1, \sigma_1) \cdots (s_l, \sigma_l)), \star) = (\alpha'' \times \varsigma)((0, \dots, 0), \text{id}, \star) = \star$ so that $\text{Ker } \varphi \subseteq (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} * \text{Sym}(n+1))_x$.

As we also have that $(\alpha * \beta)((s_1, \sigma_1) \cdots (s_l, \sigma_l), \star) = \star$ implies $(\alpha'' \times \varsigma)(\varphi((s_1, \sigma_1) \cdots (s_l, \sigma_l)), \star) = \star$, we can deduce that $\varphi((s_1, \sigma_1) \cdots (s_l, \sigma_l), \star) = \text{id}$ because $\alpha'' \times \varsigma$ is a free action, as shown in proposition 14. Therefore $\text{Ker } \varphi \supseteq (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} * \text{Sym}(n+1))_x$.

Now we now know that $\bar{\varphi} : (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} * \text{Sym}(n+1)) / (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} * \text{Sym}(n+1))_x \simeq \text{Im } \bar{\varphi}$.

We finish by showing that ψ is a right-inverse to φ , and therefore φ is surjective, so that $\bar{\varphi}$ is also surjective. Let $s_1, \dots, s_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z}$, $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n+1)$. We want to prove $\varphi(\psi((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1}), \sigma)) = ((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1}), \sigma)$. For it we unfold the definitions:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\psi(s_1, \dots, s_{n+1}, \sigma)) &= \varphi((0, (1 \ n+1))(s_1, (1 \ n+1)) \dots (0, (n \ n+1))(s_n, (n \ n+1)) \\ &\quad ((s_{n+1}, \text{id})(0, (1 \ n+1))(s_{n+1}, (1 \ n+1)) \dots (0, (n \ n+1))(s_{n+1}, (n \ n+1)))(+, \sigma)) \\ &= (0(1, \dots, 1) + Q((1 \ n+1), s_1(1, \dots, 1)) + Q((1 \ n+1) \cdot (1 \ n+1), 0(1, \dots, 1)) + \dots \\ &\quad + Q((1 \ n+1) \cdot (1 \ n+1) \cdots (n \ n+1), s_n(1, \dots, 1)) \\ &\quad + Q((1 \ n+1) \cdot (1 \ n+1) \cdots (n \ n+1) \cdot (n \ n+1), s_{n+1}(1, \dots, 1)) \\ &\quad + 0(1, \dots, 1) + Q((1 \ n+1), s_{n+1}(1, \dots, 1)) + Q((1 \ n+1) \cdot (1 \ n+1), 0(1, \dots, 1)) + \dots \\ &\quad + Q((1 \ n+1) \cdot (1 \ n+1) \cdots (n \ n+1), s_{n+1}(1, \dots, 1)), \\ &\quad (1 \ n+1) \cdot (1 \ n+1) \cdots (n \ n+1) \cdot (n \ n+1) \cdot (1 \ n+1) \cdot (1 \ n+1) \cdots (n \ n+1) \cdot (n \ n+1) \cdot \sigma) \end{aligned}$$

Next we use multiple times the fact that $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}$, $Q((i \ n+1), (1, \dots, 1)) = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$, where the 1 is located at component i .

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\psi(s_1, \dots, s_{n+1}, \sigma)) &= ((0, \dots, 0) + (s_1, 0, \dots, 0) + (0, \dots, 0) + \dots + (0, \dots, 0, s_n, 0) + s_{n+1}(1, \dots, 1) \\ &\quad + (0, \dots, 0) + (s_{n+1}, 0, \dots, 0) + (0, \dots, 0)) + \dots + (0, \dots, s_{n+1}, 0), \sigma) \\ &= ((s_1, \dots, s_n, 0) + (0, \dots, s_{n+1}), \sigma) \\ &= ((s_1, \dots, s_n, s_{n+1}), \sigma) \end{aligned}$$

With it we have finished the proof of the Theorem. □

When quotienting by the stabilizer of x we are equating all elements in the group with equal images on x , therefore providing a free action on a smaller group. In our case the resulting group is finite and lets us work on Atomic Logics without using the set of words on a cartesian product (which the free product is defined on).

Example 5. We now see how would the procedure used in theorem 4 transform a sequence of negations and residuations on a connective skeleton in practice by checking the following assertion:

Let \rightarrow have skeleton $((2 \ 3), -, \forall, (1, 1, 1), (-, +))$, then $-(1 \ 3)-(1 \ 2 \ 3) \rightarrow$ has skeleton $(\text{id}, +, \exists, (1, 1, 1), (+, -))$, using the original notation.

Proof. We want to see

$$\iota^{-1}(\beta(1, \alpha''((1\ 3)), \beta(1, \alpha''((1\ 2\ 3)), \iota\left(\begin{array}{c} (2\ 3) \\ - \\ \forall \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ (-, +) \end{array}\right)))) = \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{id} \\ + \\ \exists \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ (+, -) \end{array}\right]$$

By definition of $\alpha * \beta$ we have

$$\iota^{-1}(\beta(1, \alpha''((1\ 3)), \beta(1, \alpha''((1\ 2\ 3)), \iota\left(\begin{array}{c} (2\ 3) \\ - \\ \forall \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ (-, +) \end{array}\right)))) = \iota^{-1}((\alpha'' * \beta)((1, (1\ 3))(1, (1\ 2\ 3)), \left[\begin{array}{c} (2\ 3) \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ (1, 0, 0) \\ - \end{array}\right]))$$

We now use φ and theorem 4 in the first step to get the following

$$\begin{aligned} & \iota^{-1}((\alpha'' * \beta)((1, (1\ 3))(1, (1\ 2\ 3)), \left[\begin{array}{c} (2\ 3) \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ (1, 0, 0) \\ - \end{array}\right])) = (\alpha'' \times \varsigma)(\varphi((1, (1\ 3))(1, (1\ 2\ 3))), \left[\begin{array}{c} (2\ 3) \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ (1, 0, 0) \\ - \end{array}\right]) \\ & = (\alpha'' \times \varsigma)((1, (1, 1) + Q((1\ 3), (1, 1, 1)), (1\ 3) \cdot (1\ 2\ 3)), \left[\begin{array}{c} (2\ 3) \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ (1, 0, 0) \\ - \end{array}\right]) \\ & = \iota^{-1}((\alpha'' \times \varsigma)((1, (1, 1) + (1, 0, 0), (2\ 3)), \left[\begin{array}{c} (2\ 3) \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ (1, 0, 0) \\ - \end{array}\right])) = \iota^{-1}((\alpha'' \times \varsigma)((0, 1, 1), (2\ 3)), \left[\begin{array}{c} (2\ 3) \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ (1, 0, 0) \\ - \end{array}\right])) \\ & = \iota^{-1}(\varsigma((0, 1, 1), \alpha''((2\ 3), \left[\begin{array}{c} (2\ 3) \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ (1, 0, 0) \\ - \end{array}\right]))) = \iota^{-1}(\varsigma((0, 1, 1), \left[\begin{array}{c} (2\ 3) \cdot (2\ 3) \\ P_{N^*}((2\ 3), (1, 1, 1)) \\ R((2\ 3), (1, 0, 0)) \\ - \end{array}\right]))) \end{aligned}$$

We exemplify how would the component on the first row and second column for $R((2\ 3), (1, 0, 0))$ be

computed:

$$\delta_{(3 \ (2 \ 3)(3))((2 \ 3)(1)), 2} + \delta_{(2 \ 3)(3), 2}(1 + \delta_{3, (2 \ 3)(1)})(1 + \delta_{(2 \ 3)(3), 3}) = \delta_{1, 2} + \delta_{2, 2}(1 + \delta_{3, 1})(1 + \delta_{2, 3}) = 1$$

Now that we have written down the linear transformations we will have to operate, we will use the matricial expression of $R((2 \ 3), (1, 0, 0))$. And we can conclude,

$$\begin{aligned} & \iota^{-1}(\beta(1, \alpha''((1 \ 3)), \beta(1, \alpha''((1 \ 2 \ 3)), \iota\left(\begin{array}{c} (2 \ 3) \\ - \\ \forall \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ (-, +) \end{array}\right)))))) = \iota^{-1}(\varsigma((0, 1, 1), \left[\begin{array}{c} (2 \ 3) \cdot (2 \ 3) \\ P_{\mathbb{N}^*}((2 \ 3), (1, 1, 1)) \\ R((2 \ 3), (1, 0, 0)) \\ - \end{array}\right])) \\ & = \iota^{-1}(\varsigma((0, 1, 1), \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{id} \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{array}\right) + Q((2 \ 3)) \left(\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right) \\ - \end{array}\right])) = \iota^{-1}(\varsigma((0, 1, 1), \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{id} \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{array}\right) + \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{array}\right) \left(\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right) \\ - \end{array}\right])) \\ & = \iota^{-1}(\varsigma((0, 1, 1), \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{id} \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ (1 + 1 + 0, 0 + 0 + 0, 1 + 0 + 0) \\ - \end{array}\right])) = \iota^{-1}\left(\left[\begin{array}{c} \text{id} \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ (0 + 0, 1 + 0, 1 + 1) \\ - \end{array}\right]\right) = \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{id} \\ + \\ \exists \\ (1, 1, 1) \\ (+, -) \end{array}\right] \end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof. □

4 Group Actions on Atomic Connectives

4.1 Connective Families

We now introduce some algebraic objects in order to be able to work and compare different approaches on Atomic Logics. We will have to redefine the presented Atomic Logics.

Definition 12. A **connective** is a symbol to which we associate a single connective skeleton. We call $sk(\oplus)$ **the skeleton of a connective** \oplus . By abuse of notation we will use the connective symbol to refer to its skeleton, whenever it is not confusing.


```

Inductive typed_Formula {A : Connectives} : pos -> Type :=
| composition :
  forall (C : @Connective A),
  (forall i : 'I_(@arity A C),
    typed_Formula (tnth (type C) (lift ord_max i))) ->
    typed_Formula (tnth (type C) ord_max)

```

Figure 6: Implementation of formulas for $(\alpha * \beta)(\otimes)$ connective families.

A **family of connectives** or *connective family* is

- a set of connectives C ,
- a partition of it \mathcal{A} , such that $\forall D \in \mathcal{A}, \forall \otimes, \otimes' \in D, sk(\otimes) = sk(\otimes')$ implies $\otimes = \otimes'$,
- for each $D \in \mathcal{A}$ an associated group G_D and an action $a_D : G_D \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\forall \otimes, \otimes' \in a_D(sk(D)), \otimes$ and \otimes' have equal arity n and have permutations $\sigma, \sigma' \in Sym(n + 1)$, tonicity signatures $\pm, \pm' \in (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$ and type tuples $k, k' \in (\mathbb{N}^*)^{n+1}$ satisfying $P_{\mathbb{N}^*}(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, k) = k'$.

Whenever $\otimes \in D$ we note $\overline{\otimes} = D$.

A simple consequence of this definition is that $\otimes = \otimes'$ if and only $\overline{\otimes} = \overline{\otimes}'$ and $sk(\otimes) = sk(\otimes')$. It follows from injectivity of sk over the classes of the partition.

Example 6. We define the **Lambek Connective Family** L as:⁵

- the set $\{\otimes, \backslash, /\} \sqcup V$, where:
 - the tensor $sk(\otimes) = (id, (1, 1, 1), (+, +, +), -)$,
 - the right residual $sk(\backslash) = ((2\ 3), (1, 1, 1), (-, +, -), -)$,
 - the left residual $sk(/) = ((1\ 3), (1, 1, 1), (+, -, -), -)$,
 - the variables in V such that they are all propositional letters. There are at least a p and a q in V with $sk(p) = (id, s, 1, s)$ and $sk(q) = (id, -s', 1, s')$, for some $s, s' \in \mathbb{B}$.
- the partition $\{\{\otimes, \backslash, /\}\} \sqcup \{\{v\} \mid V\}$,
- the action $\alpha \times \varsigma$ on $\{\otimes, \backslash, /\}$ and the action id on each $\{v\}$, for $v \in V$.

Definition 13. Given a family of connectives C , the **atomic language** of C is defined as the smallest set \mathcal{L}_C such that if \otimes is a connective of arity n , type signature (k_1, \dots, k_n, k) and $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \mathcal{L}_C$ are of types k_1, \dots, k_n , then $\otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$ is also in \mathcal{L}_C and of type k .

Its elements are called **formulas**.

⁵For more details on this example, see section 5.

Definition 14. Over the families of connectives we define the relation $C \lesssim D$ if and only if there is an injection $\phi : C \rightarrow D$ such that for each $\otimes \in C$ there is a morphism $\varphi : G_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}} \rightarrow G_{\overline{\otimes}}$ and $\forall g \in G_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}}, a_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}}(\varphi(g), sk(\otimes)) = a_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}}(g, sk(\phi(\otimes)))$ and such that $\forall \otimes, \otimes' \in C, \overline{\otimes} = \overline{\otimes'}$ implies $\overline{\phi(\otimes)} = \overline{\phi(\otimes')}$. We say then that C is **compatible with** the action of D or that D extends C .

Over the families of connectives we define the relation $C \simeq D$ if and only if there is a bijection $\phi : C \rightarrow D$ such that for each $\otimes \in C$ there is a morphism $\varphi : G_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}} \rightarrow G_{\overline{\otimes}}, \forall g \in G, a_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}}(g, sk(\otimes)) = a_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}}(\varphi(g), sk(\phi(\otimes)))$ and for each $\otimes \in D$ there is a morphism $\psi : G_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}} \rightarrow G_{\overline{\otimes}}, \forall g \in G, a_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}}(\varphi(g), sk(\otimes)) = a_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}}(g, sk(\phi(\otimes)))$ and such that $\forall \otimes, \otimes' \in C, \overline{\otimes} = \overline{\otimes'}$ if and only if $\overline{\phi(\otimes)} = \overline{\phi(\otimes')}$.

Over the families of connectives we define the relation $C \sim'_W D$ if and only if there is a bijection $\phi : C \rightarrow D$ such that $\forall \otimes, \otimes' \in C, \overline{\otimes} = \overline{\otimes'}$ implies $\overline{\phi(\otimes)} = \overline{\phi(\otimes')}$ and for each $\otimes \in C$ there is a morphism $\varphi : G_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}} \rightarrow G_{\overline{\otimes}}, \forall g \in G, a_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}}(g, sk(\otimes)) = a_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}}(\varphi(g), sk(\phi(\otimes)))$ and the induced morphism $\overline{\varphi} : G_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}} / (G_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}})_{\phi(\otimes)} \rightarrow G_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}} / (G_{\overline{\phi(\otimes)}})_{\phi(\otimes)}$ is a group isomorphism. We define $C \sim_W D$ as the transitive-symmetric closure of \sim'_W .

For two connective families C, D , the $C \lesssim D$ relation will be used to tell that we can somehow use D 's action on C also. The precise way we can do it will be encoded by the morphisms φ .

Proposition 16. The relation \lesssim is transitive and reflexive. The relations \simeq and \sim_W are equivalence relations.

Proof. For the reflexivity we can take the identity as both the injection and the morphisms for all the relations.

For the transitivity we must take the composition of both the injection and the morphisms in both \lesssim and \simeq . In \sim_W we have it by definition.

For the symmetry of \simeq we must take the inverse of both the bijection and the morphisms. For \sim_W we have it by definition.

Checking the conditions is routine. □

Proposition 17. Let C and D be two connective families.

- $C \lesssim D$ and $D \lesssim C$ imply $C \simeq D$.
- $C \simeq D$ implies $C \sim_W D$.

Proof. We will present the proof of Schröder-Bernstein Theorem and reason over the constructed bijection for checking the extra conditions.

Let $\phi : C \rightarrow D$ and $\psi : D \rightarrow C$ be the injective functions and $\varphi : G_{C, \overline{\varphi(\cdot)}} \rightarrow G_{D, \tau}$ and $\varphi' : G_{D, \tau} \rightarrow G_{C, \overline{\varphi(\cdot)}}$ be the morphisms on groups given by \lesssim . We let ϕ^- and ψ^- be the partial right-inverses of ϕ and ψ . Then for any $x \in C$ we can define two sequences of images and pre-images by

$$\dots \rightarrow \phi^-(\psi^-(x)) \rightarrow \psi^-(x) \rightarrow x \rightarrow \phi(x) \rightarrow \psi(\phi(x)) \rightarrow \dots \quad (1)$$

The set of elements in C appearing in sequence 1 form a partition of C . Similarly for D .

Each sequence like 1 can end in an element of C or an element of D , repeat itself forever or remain forever changing on the left.

We define a new bijection by case analysis on the previous four cases on the partitions given by 1. Indeed, if two different elements are found in the same sequence, both their sequences will be exactly the same as 1.

For any element of C in a sequence ending on C or never ending, the injection ϕ is a bijection onto the elements of D in the same sequence (because for any element $y \in D$ of the sequence 1 has a pre-image $\phi^-(y)$ by definition). For any element of C in a sequence ending on D , the partial right-inverse ψ^- is well-defined and therefore it is a bijection onto the the elements of D in the same sequence. This will be the desired bijection ρ .

Now we can check on the partition given by the sequences that the new bijection still satisfies the conditions on the actions. If $\otimes \in C$ we will use the equality from ϕ or ψ^- , if $\otimes \in D$ we will use the equality from ψ or ϕ^- . Whenever \otimes is in a sequence ending on D we will have to work with ψ^- and ψ as the desired inverses, which are well-defined on \otimes . For any other case we will have to work with ϕ and ϕ^- as desired inverses, which are well-defined on \otimes .

The last point comes from lemma 1.

□

If the actions are free, $C \simeq D$ is equivalent to the existence of a bijection $\phi : C \rightarrow D$ such that $\forall \otimes, \otimes' \in C, \overline{\otimes} = \overline{\otimes'}$ if and only if $\overline{\phi(\otimes)} = \overline{\phi(\otimes')}$ and $G_C \simeq G_{\phi(C)}$ thanks to proposition 4.

Definition 15. *The connectives of n -ary skeletons are called **n -ary connectives**. The 0-ary connectives are called **propositional letters**.*

*Propositional letters whose assigned action is the identity are called **variables**.*

4.2 Families of Structural Connectives

Definition 16. *Let C be a family of connectives. A family of structural C -connectives, or simply **structural connectives**, $[C]$ is composed of:*

- a set E ,
- an injective function $[\cdot] : C \rightarrow E$,
- a partial function $p : E \rightarrow C$, right inverse of $[\cdot]$,
- an injective function $[\cdot] : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$ such that $[\mathcal{A}]$ is a partition of E , each $D \in \mathcal{A}$ has an associated action $[a_D] : G_D \times [D] \rightarrow [D]$ such that $[D] = [a_D](\{[\otimes] \mid \otimes \in D\})$,
- an application $sk : E \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $sk([\otimes]) = sk(\otimes)$, $sk([a_{\otimes}](g, [\otimes])) = a(g, sk(\otimes))$.

Note that a family of structural connectives is also by itself a connective family.

Proposition 18. *Let C be a connective family. There is at least one family of structural C -connectives. Any families of structural C -connectives $[C]$, $[C]'$ satisfy $[C] \simeq [C]'$.*

Proof. We define a family of structural C -connectives:

- The set E is $\{(\bar{g}, a_D(sk(\otimes)), D) \mid D \in \mathcal{A}, a_D(sk(\otimes)) \in \{a_D(sk(\otimes)) \mid \otimes \in D\}, \bar{g} \in G_D / (G_D)_{sk(\otimes)}\}$.
- As each $D \in \mathcal{A}$ is of fixed arity and \mathbb{C}_n is a finite set, we can give an order \leq to \mathbb{C}_n . We will call $\min_{\leq}(J)$ the minimal connective in the set J from the chosen order \leq .

The injection is then $[\cdot] : \otimes \mapsto (\bar{g}, a_D(sk(\otimes)), \bar{\otimes})$, where $\bar{g} \in G_D / (G_D)_{sk(\otimes)}$ is such that $a_D(g, \min_{\leq}(sk(a_D(sk(\otimes)))) = sk(\otimes)$.

- For every $(g, O, D) \in E$, if it exists, we note the only connective of skeleton $a_D(g, \min_{\leq}(O))$ as $p(g, O)$.

This p will be the desired partial right inverse.

- The partition $[\mathcal{A}]$ is $\{(\bar{g}, a_D(sk(\otimes)), D) \mid a_D(sk(\otimes)) \in \{a_D(sk(\otimes)) \mid \otimes \in D\}, \bar{g} \in G_D / (G_D)_{sk(\otimes)}\} \mid D \in \mathcal{A}\}$.

We can see it is in bijection with \mathcal{A} . We can use any of them interchangeably whenever they appear as an index.

- The actions are $[a_D] : (g, (\bar{h}, O, D)) \mapsto (\overline{g \cdot_{G_D} h}, O, D)$ on each $D \in [\mathcal{A}]$.
- The skeleton is $\forall D \in [\mathcal{A}], (g, O) \mapsto a_D(g, \min_{\leq}(O))$.

Checking all the conditions is routinary.

Now we want to see $[C] \simeq [C]'$ for any pair of families of structural C -connectives.

$[\mathcal{A}]$, $[\mathcal{A}]'$ and \mathcal{A} are in bijection by definition, as the latter is the image of the former and $[\cdot]$ is an injective function. Furthermore, $\forall [D] \in [\mathcal{A}], [D] = [a_D](\{[\otimes] \mid \otimes \in D\})$ and $\forall [D]' \in [\mathcal{A}]', [D]' = [a_D]'(\{[\otimes] \mid \otimes \in D\})$. As they are connective families, inside an orbit the skeleton is enough to

characterize each connective. Therefore, $\text{sk}([a_D](g, [\otimes])) = a(g, \text{sk}(\otimes)) = \text{sk}([a_D]'(g, [\otimes]))$ tells us that there are bijections between each $[D]$ and $[D]'$. This three results let us see that there is a bijection $\phi : [C] \rightarrow [C]'$.

Using the restriction on the skeleton again we can deduce that the bijection ϕ and the identity morphisms $\text{id} : G_D \rightarrow G_D$ satisfy the conditions for $[C] \lesssim [C]'$. Proposition 17 lets us deduce $[C] \simeq [C]'$.

□

This means that essentially there is only one possible family of structural connectives $[C]$ for any connective family C .

When families of connectives have free actions defined on them we can use proposition 2 to show that just by choosing an arbitrary connective as identity we can give its orbit a group structure.

By abuse of notation we will also write $[C]$ to refer to the set of a family of structural C -connectives, although it doesn't correspond to $\{[\otimes] \mid \otimes \in C\}$. Note also that $\{[\otimes] \mid \otimes \in D\} \neq [D]!$

Over families of structural connectives we'll build our Sequent Calculi. For this we introduce structures:

Definition 17. Let C be a connective family. We define $C \cap \beta(C)$ as the connective family given by the partition $\{[\otimes]' \mid \text{sk}(\otimes') = \beta(s, \text{sk}(\otimes)), \otimes' \in D, s \in \mathbb{B}\} \mid \otimes \in D, D \in \mathcal{A}$, the group \mathbb{B} , the action β and the same set C .

We say that the connective family C is compatible with β if C is compatible with the action of $C \cap \beta(C)$.

Boolean negation plays an important role on Atomic Logics. We have to give it a special place in the construction of structural language to ensure it can be applied to any connective.

Definition 18. Let C be a connective family. Each formula in \mathcal{L}_C is a structure, for each formula φ we add a new structure $*\varphi$ and for each structural n -ary connective $[\otimes]$ of input type (k_1, \dots, k_n) and $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ a structure X_i of output type k_i we have the new structure $[\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and, if \otimes is not compatible with β , the structure $*[\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n)$. We call structures resulting from the two latter cases strict structures and the former two formulas.

Structures form the set $[\mathcal{L}_C]$.

Note that structures are not the formulas on structural connectives, but rather the closure of formulas with structural connectives.

Definition 19. We define by cases **Boolean negation on structures** of a family of connectives C compatible with β as $*X$ through a morphism ψ :

- For any n -ary connective $\otimes \in C$ compatible with β and structures X_i we define $*[\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n) = [a_D](\psi(-), [\otimes])(X_1, \dots, X_n)$.
- For any formula φ , $*\varphi = *\varphi$.
- For any formula φ , $**\varphi = \varphi$.
- For any structural connective $[\otimes] \in [C]$ non-compatible with β and structures X_i , $*[\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n) = *[\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n)$.
- For any structural connective $[\otimes] \in [C]$ non-compatible with β and structures X_i , $**[\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n) = [\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n)$.

Some Useful Connective Families

Definition 20. Let \otimes be a connective and a an action on \mathbb{C} satisfying the condition of Definition 12. We define the point connective family, $\{\hat{\otimes}_a\}$ as composed of:

- The set $\{\otimes\}$,
- The partition $\{\{\otimes\}\}$,
- The action a assigned to $\{\otimes\}$.

Let C and D be connective families. We define a disjoint union connective family, $C \sqcup D$ as composed of:

- The set $C \sqcup D$,
- The partition $\mathcal{A}_C \sqcup \mathcal{A}_D$,
- If $P \in \mathcal{A}_C$ then the assigned group and action G_C, a_C and if $P \in \mathcal{A}_D$ then the assigned group and action G_D, a_D .

Let C be a set of connectives and a be a map from C into actions on \mathbb{C} , such that for any $\otimes \in C$, the action a_{\otimes} satisfies the condition of Definition 12. We define the discrete connective family, C_a as composed of:

- The set C ,
- The partition $\{\{\otimes\} \mid \otimes \in C\}$,
- The action $a(\otimes)$ for each $\otimes \in C$.

This is the disjoint union of all point connective families in C . Whenever a is the constant into the trivial action $id : \{id\} \times V \rightarrow V : (id, x) \mapsto x$ assigned to C we note C_{id} and we call it the trivial connective family.

Let \hat{C} be a connective family. Let V be a set containing at least a propositional letter of each type in the type input components appearing in C . We define a plain C connective family as the disjoint union connective family of \hat{C} and the discrete connective family V_a for some action a .

We define a plain point connective family, $\{\otimes_a\}$, as a plain connective family of $\{\hat{\otimes}_a\}$.

Let C be a connective family. We define the full connective family $\mathcal{O}(C)$ as composed of:

- The set of structural connectives $[C]$,
- The partition $\{[a_{C,P}](\{[\otimes] \mid \otimes \in P\}) \mid P \in \mathcal{A}_C\}$,
- The respective actions $(g, \otimes) \mapsto (g, sk^{-1}(\otimes)) \mapsto sk([a_{C,P}](g, [\otimes]))$ for each $P \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{O}(C)}$.

By abuse of notation we will use the connective notation for the elements of structural connectives used inside connective families.

We usually assume Connective Families to be plain.

4.3 Sequents on Connective Families

Definition 21. Let C be a connective family. We define **sequents** of \mathcal{L}_C as $\varphi \vdash \psi$ for a pair of formulas or a pair of structures $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{L}_C$, $[\mathcal{L}_C]$ of the same type. They will be the core of our proof systems.

Sequents of \mathcal{L}_C will be noted S_C and sequents of $[\mathcal{L}_C]$ will be noted $[S_C]$.

For any sign $s \in \mathbb{B}$ we note:

$$S_s(X, Y) = \begin{cases} X \vdash Y & \text{if } s = - \\ Y \vdash X & \text{if } s = + \end{cases}$$

For any function $s : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, formulas $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{L}_C$ and structure $X \in [\mathcal{L}_C]$, we note:

$$S_s(\otimes, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n, X) = S_{s(\otimes)}(\otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n), X)$$

For any function $s : [\mathbb{C}] \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and structures $X_i, X \in [\mathcal{L}_C]$, we note:

$$S_s([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_n, X) = S_{s(\otimes)}([\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n), X)$$

Definition 22. Let X and Y be structures or formulas. If $X \vdash Y \in S_C$, $[S_C]$, we call X the **antecedent** and Y the **consequent** of the sequent $X \vdash Y$.

Let X be a structure and Z a substructure occurrence of X . We define by induction on X , $s(X, Z) \in \mathbb{B}$:

- If Z is equal to X , $s(X, Z) = +$.
- If $X = *Y$ for some structure Y , then $s(X, Z) = -s(Y, Z)$.
- If $X = \otimes(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and there's some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that Z is a substructure occurrence of X_i , $s(X, Z) = \pm_i(\otimes)s(X_i, Z)$.

Let $X \vdash Y$ be a sequent,

- If Z is a substructure occurrence of X we define $s(X \vdash Y, Z) = -s(X, Z)$.

- If Z is a substructure occurrence of Y we define $s(X \vdash Y, Z) = s(Y, Z)$.

We say that Z is an **antecedent part** of a sequent S whenever $s(S, Z) = -$ and that Z is a **consequent part** of a sequent whenever $s(S, Z) = +$.

We informally understand the antecedent parts as the “left side” and the consequent parts as the “right side” of a sequent.

Definition 23. Let C be a connective family, with partition \mathcal{A} and for each $D \in \mathcal{A}$ a group G_D and action a_D . Let S be a sequent. We define a partial function $[a_D] : G_D \times [S_C] \rightarrow [S_C]$ by cases on the structures composing S :

- Let $s \in \mathbb{B}$, $[\otimes] \in [C]$ and $X_1, \dots, X_{n+1} \in [\mathcal{L}_C]$. If $S = S_s([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})$ and $g \in G_{\overline{\otimes}}$, let $g[\otimes] := [a_{\overline{\otimes}}](g, [\otimes])$, $\pm, \pm' \in (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$ be the tonicity signatures, σ, σ' be the permutations and b and b' be the last components of $[\otimes]$ and $g[\otimes]$, respectively, then

$$\begin{aligned} [a_D](g, S) &= S_{\mathcal{E}(g[\otimes]) + \mathcal{E}([\otimes]) + s}(g[\otimes]), \\ &T(\pm')_1 + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_1 + b' + b + X_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, \\ &T(\pm')_{n+1} + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_{n+1} + b' + b + X_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1)} \end{aligned}$$

Where for every structure X we consider $0 + X$ as X and $1 + X$ as $*X$, T is found in definition 7 and R in definition 8.

Proposition 19. Let C be a connective family with a partition \mathcal{A} and for each $D \in \mathcal{A}$ a group G_D and an action a_D . For each $D \in \mathcal{A}$, the partial function $[a_D] : G_D \times [S_C] \rightarrow [S_C]$ is well-defined and is a partial action.

It will be used for the definition of our display calculi.

Proof. To see that $\forall \otimes \in D$ the image of $[a_D](g, \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n))$ lives in $[S]$ we recall the property on structure families that says $\forall \otimes, \otimes' \in a_D(\text{sk}(D))$, \otimes and \otimes' have equal arity n and have permutations $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{Sym}(n+1)$ and type tuples $k, k' \in (\mathbb{N}^*)^{n+1}$ satisfying $P_{\mathbb{N}^*}(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, k) = k'$.

We can see that this action is only going to be defined in the sequents $S_s([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})$ for $[\otimes] \in [D]$. On those it is well defined thanks to the restriction on type tuples mentioned before.

Let σ, σ' and σ'' be the permutation, \pm, \pm' and \pm'' be the tonicity signature and b, b' and b'' be the last

component of $[\otimes]$, $h[\otimes]$ and $g \cdot h[\otimes]$, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}
& [a_D](g, [a_D](h, S_s([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}))) \\
&= [a_D](g, S_{\mathcal{A}(g\otimes)+\mathcal{A}(\otimes)+s}([a_D](h, [\otimes]), T(\pm')_1 + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_1 + b' + b + X_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, \\
&\quad T(\pm')_{n+1} + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_{n+1} + b' + b + X_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1)})) \\
&= S_{\mathcal{A}(g \cdot h\otimes)+\mathcal{A}(h\otimes)+\mathcal{A}(h\otimes)+\mathcal{A}(\otimes)+s}([a_D](g, [a_D](h, [\otimes])), T(\pm'')_1 + T(R(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, \pm'))_1 \\
&\quad + T(\pm')_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(1)} + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(1)} + b'' + b' + b' + b + X_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1} \cdot \sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, \\
&\quad T(\pm'')_{n+1} + T(R(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, \pm'))_{n+1} \\
&\quad + T(\pm')_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(n+1)} + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(n+1)} + b'' + b' + b' + b + X_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1} \cdot \sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1)}) \\
&= S_{\mathcal{A}(g \cdot h\otimes)+\mathcal{A}(\otimes)+s}([a_D](g \cdot h, [\otimes]), T(\pm'')_1 + T(R(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, \pm'))_1 \\
&\quad + P(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, T(\pm'))_1 + P(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm)))_1 + b'' + b + X_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, \\
&\quad T(\pm'')_{n+1} + T(R(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, \pm'))_{n+1} \\
&\quad + P(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, T(\pm'))_{n+1} + P(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm)))_{n+1} + b'' + b + X_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1)}) \\
&= S_{\mathcal{A}(g \cdot h\otimes)+\mathcal{A}(\otimes)+s}([a_D](g \cdot h, [\otimes]), T(\pm'')_1 + T(R(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, \pm'))_1 \\
&\quad + T(Q(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, \pm'))_1 + T(Q(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm)))_1 + b'' + b + X_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, \\
&\quad T(\pm'')_{n+1} + T(R(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, \pm'))_{n+1} \\
&\quad + T(Q(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, \pm'))_{n+1} + T(Q(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm)))_{n+1} + b'' + b + X_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1)}) \\
&= S_{\mathcal{A}(g \cdot h\otimes)+\mathcal{A}(\otimes)+s}([a_D](g \cdot h, [\otimes]), \\
&\quad T(\pm'')_1 + T(R(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, 0) + Q(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm)))_1 + b'' + b + X_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, \\
&\quad T(\pm'')_{n+1} + T(R(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, 0) + Q(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm)))_{n+1} + b'' + b + X_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1)}) \\
&= S_{\mathcal{A}(g \cdot h\otimes)+\mathcal{A}(\otimes)+s}([a_D](g \cdot h, [\otimes]), \\
&\quad T(\pm'')_1 + T(R(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm)))_1 + b'' + b + X_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, \\
&\quad T(\pm'')_{n+1} + T(R(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm)))_{n+1} + b'' + b + X_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1)}) \\
&= S_{\mathcal{A}(g \cdot h\otimes)+\mathcal{A}(\otimes)+s}([a_D](g \cdot h, [\otimes]), T(\pm'')_1 + T(R(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_1 + b'' + b + X_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, \\
&\quad T(\pm'')_{n+1} + T(R(\sigma'' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_{n+1} + b'' + b + X_{\sigma'' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1)}) \\
&= [a_D](g \cdot h, S_s([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}))
\end{aligned}$$

where we used proposition 8 in the fourth step and proposition 13 in the fifth and sixth steps and proposition 11 for using R as an action. □

Lemma 3. *Let C be a connective family. Let $[\otimes] \in [C]$ and $X_1, \dots, X_{n+1} \in [\mathcal{L}C]$. For any $i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}$, $g \in G_{\otimes}$, $s(S_{\mathcal{A}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}), X_i) = s([a_D](g, S_{\mathcal{A}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})), X_i)$.*

Proof. Let \pm and \pm' be the tonicity signature, σ and σ' be the permutation and b and b' be the last component of $[\otimes]$ and $[a_D](g, [\otimes])$, respectively. In this proof we use the $\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z}$ notation for signs.

In the left side, we have $s(S_{\mathcal{A}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}), X_i) = \delta_{i, n+1} + (1 + \delta_{i, n+1}) \pm_i (\otimes) + \mathcal{A}(\otimes)$ by definition 22 (it can be seen by case analysis on $\delta_{i, n+1}$). In the right side we have

$$\begin{aligned} & s([a_D](g, S_{\mathcal{A}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})), X_i) \\ = & s(S_{\pm'_{n+1} + \pm_{n+1} + b' + b + \mathcal{A}(\otimes)}(g[\otimes]), \\ & T(\pm')_1 + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_1 + b' + b + X_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, \\ & T(\pm')_{n+1} + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_{n+1} + b' + b + X_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1)}), X_i) \end{aligned}$$

We must notice now that X_i will still only be a structure occurrence of itself, so that its sign corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} & s([a_D](g, S_{\mathcal{A}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})), X_i) \\ = & s(T(\pm')_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i)} + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i)} + b' + b + X_i, X_i) \\ & + \delta_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i), n+1} + (1 + \delta_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i), n+1}) \pm'_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i)} + \pm'_{n+1} + \pm_{n+1} + b' + b + \mathcal{A}(\otimes) \\ = & T(\pm')_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i)} + P(\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm)))_i + b' + b \\ & + \delta_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i), n+1} + (1 + \delta_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i), n+1}) \pm'_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i)} + \pm'_{n+1} + \pm_{n+1} + b' + b + \mathcal{A}(\otimes) \\ = & T(\pm')_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i)} + T(Q(\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm)))_i \\ & + \delta_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i), n+1} + (1 + \delta_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i), n+1}) \pm'_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i)} + \pm'_{n+1} + \pm_{n+1} + \mathcal{A}(\otimes) \\ = & T(Q(\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm)))_i + \delta_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i), n+1} + \pm_{n+1} + \mathcal{A}(\otimes) \\ = & T(Q(\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, Q(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm)))_i + T(Q(\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, ((1 + \delta_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(j), n+1})(1 + \delta_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1), n+1}))_j^{n+1}))_i) \\ & + \delta_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i), n+1} + \pm_{n+1} + \mathcal{A}(\otimes) \\ = & T(\pm)_i + P(\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}, ((1 + \delta_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(j), n+1})(1 + \delta_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1), n+1}) + (1 + \delta_{j, n+1})(1 + \delta_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1), n+1}))_j^{n+1}))_i \\ & + \delta_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i), n+1} + \pm_{n+1} + \mathcal{A}(\otimes) \\ = & T(\pm)_i + (1 + \delta_{i, n+1})(1 + \delta_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1), n+1}) + (1 + \delta_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i), n+1})(1 + \delta_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1), n+1}) \\ & + \delta_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i), n+1} + \pm_{n+1} + \mathcal{A}(\otimes) \\ = & (1 + \delta_{i, n+1}) \pm_i + \pm_{n+1} + \delta_{i, n+1}(1 + \delta_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1), n+1}) + \delta_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i), n+1}(1 + \delta_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1), n+1}) \\ & + \delta_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i), n+1} + \pm_{n+1} + \mathcal{A}(\otimes) \\ = & (1 + \delta_{i, n+1}) \pm_i + \pm_{n+1} + \delta_{i, n+1}(1 + \delta_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1), n+1}) + \delta_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i), n+1} \delta_{\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}(n+1), n+1} + \pm_{n+1} + \mathcal{A}(\otimes) \\ = & \delta_{i, n+1} + (1 + \delta_{i, n+1}) \pm_i + \mathcal{A}(\otimes) \end{aligned}$$

where we used again proposition 8 and the $(b(j))_j^{n+1}$ notation for some function $b : \{1, \dots, n+1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z}$ is notation for $(b(1), \dots, b(n+1))$.

□

Example 7. The partial action on sequents given in definition 23 for the action $\alpha \times \varsigma$ is

$$\begin{array}{c} [a_D]((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\rho, S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})) \\ \downarrow \\ S_{\mathcal{E}}((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\rho[\otimes], s_{n+1} + s_1 + X_{\sigma(n)}, \dots, s_{n+1} + s_n + X_{\rho(n)}, s_{n+1} + X_{\rho(n+1)}) \end{array}$$

Proof. Let \otimes be a connective of arity n , permutation σ , tonicity signature \pm and action $\alpha \times \varsigma$. Let \pm' be the tonicity signature and σ' be the permutation of $(s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma[\otimes]$.

We just have to see that $\pm' + R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm) = (s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})$, as we already know that $T(s_1, \dots, s_{n+1}) = (s_1 + s_{n+1}, \dots, s_n + s_{n+1}, s_{n+1})$. We have $\pm' = (s_1, \dots, s_{n+1}) + R(\rho, \pm)$ and $\sigma' = \rho \cdot \sigma$. Therefore $\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1} = \rho$ and $\pm' + R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm) = (s_1, \dots, s_{n+1}) + R(\rho, \pm) + R(\rho, \pm) = (s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})$ as we wanted.

□

5 Atomic Logics for Connective Families

The definition of families of structural connectives will help us better understand what are the structures and how to treat them in our calculi. Through connective families we will be capable to compare the logics given by both versions of the atomic logics. All this will let us afterwards redefine Atomic Logics syntax.

For an example on how connective families work and what they are useful for the reader might want to go to the next section.

5.1 Syntax

We remind that a connective family is composed of:

- A set C ,
- A function $\text{sk} : C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$,
- A partition of C, \mathcal{A} ,
- For all $D \in \mathcal{A}$, a group G and an action $a : G \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

And it satisfies all the conditions imposed by Definition 12.

Then we set the syntax of Atomic Logics to be composed of:

- A Connective Family C ,
- Its Family of Structural Connectives $[C]$,
- Its formulas \mathcal{L}_C ,
- Its structures $[\mathcal{L}_C]$,
- Its sequents \mathcal{S}_C and $[\mathcal{S}_C]$.

An Example, Lambek and Bi-Lambek Connectives

We will further comment on the connective Family for Lambek Calculus, introduced in example 6.

We show in the following calculations that the Lambek Connectives form an orbit of the α action; as defined in the precedent chapter, we will work on the tonicity signatures as vectors and the morphism Q in its matrix form:

$$\alpha((23), \otimes) = ((23) \cdot \text{id}, P((23)) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + Q((23)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}) = ((23), \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}) = \backslash$$

$$\alpha((13), \otimes) = ((13) \cdot \text{id}, P((13)) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + Q((13)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}) = ((13), \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}) = /$$

We define the *Bi-Lambek Connective Family* BL as:

- the set $\{\otimes, \backslash, /, \oplus, >, <\} \sqcup V$, where:
 - the connective in L have the same skeletons,
 - the cotensor $\text{sk}(\oplus) = (\text{id}, (1, 1, 1), (+, +, -), -)$,
 - the right coresidual $\text{sk}(>) = ((23), (1, 1, 1), (-, +, +), -)$,
 - the left coresidual $\text{sk}(<) = ((13), (1, 1, 1), (+, -, +), -)$,
- the partition $\{\{\otimes, \backslash, /, \oplus, <, >\} \sqcup \{v\} \mid V\}$,
- the action $\alpha \times \varsigma$ on $\{\otimes, \backslash, /, \oplus, >, <\}$ and the action id on each $\{v\}$, for $v \in V$.

Just by using α we reach a skeleton outside of both families. Indeed,

$$\alpha((321), \otimes) = ((321) \cdot \text{id}, (1, 1, 1), \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}) = ((321), (1, 1, 1), \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix})$$

Another case of connective falling outside both families was given through $\alpha * \beta$ in example 5

For this reason we needed structural connectives for the calculi to be able to act on connectives. We will later use those actions to prove the display theorem.

We could have also defined the Lambek Connective Family $L \cap \alpha(L)$ as:

- the same set $\{\otimes, \backslash, /\} \sqcup V$,
- the same partition $\{\{\otimes, \backslash, /\}\} \sqcup \{\{v\} \mid v \in V\}$,
- the action α on $\{\otimes, \backslash, /\}$ and the action id on each $\{v\}$, for $v \in V$.

Then we can check that $L \lesssim L \cap \alpha(L)$ by:

- the bijection $\text{id} : L \rightarrow L \cap \alpha(L)$,
- the morphism $\iota : \text{Sym}(3) \hookrightarrow (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^3 \rtimes \text{Sym}(3) : \sigma \mapsto ((0, 0, 0), \sigma)$.

We can also check that $L \lesssim BL$ through the set inclusion and the identity morphisms.

5.2 Semantics

Now we formalize generalized Kripke semantics for all atomic logics, using its formulas \mathcal{L}_C and using an algebra of k -ary relations on sets (called structures).

This is Aucher's Semantics for Atomic Logics extended to all connective families.

Definition 24. Let C be a family of connectives of action a on the group G . A C -model for Atomic Logics is a tuple $M = (W, \mathcal{R}, R)$, where W is a non-empty set, $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \bigsqcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathcal{P}(W^i)$ and a surjective map $R : C \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ such that $\forall \otimes, \otimes' \in C$, $\overline{\otimes'} = \overline{\otimes}$ implies $R(\otimes') = R(\otimes)$ and $R(\otimes) \in W^{\sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}} k_i}$, where (k_1, \dots, k_{n+1}) is the type tuple of \otimes .

A k -assignment is a tuple from W^k . A pointed C -model of type k is a model along with a k -assignment.

The class of pointed C -models is noted \mathcal{E}_C .

For a relation $R \subseteq W^N$ we'll define the action of \pm on the set $\mathcal{P}(W^N)$ by $+R = R$ and $-R = W^N - R$ and the action of $\text{Sym}(n)$ by $\sigma R w_1 \dots w_N = R w_{\sigma(1)} \dots w_{\sigma(N)}$.

For a n -ary connective \otimes , all $i \in 1, \dots, n$, all elements a and sets A we define $a \uparrow_i^{\otimes} A = \begin{cases} a \in A & \text{if } \pm_i(\otimes) = + \\ a \notin A & \text{if } \pm_i(\otimes) = - \end{cases}$.

This notations will be used in the following definition.

Definition 25. Let C be a Connective Family and M be a C -model. We define the interpretation function of \mathcal{L}_C in M by $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^M : \mathcal{L}_C \rightarrow \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}^*} W^k$ inductively:

- For all propositional letters $p \in C$ of type k , $\llbracket p \rrbracket^m = \begin{cases} R(p) & \text{if } \pm(p) = + \\ -R(p) & \text{if } \pm(p) = - \end{cases}$.
- For all $n > 0$, all n -ary connectives $(\sigma, \pm, \mathcal{A}, (k, k_1, \dots, k_{n+1}), (\pm_1, \dots, \pm_n)) \in C$ and all $(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{L}_C^n$: $\llbracket \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \rrbracket^M = \{\bar{w} \in W^k \mid \mathcal{C}^{\otimes}(\llbracket \varphi_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket \varphi_n \rrbracket, \bar{w})\}$, where \mathcal{C}^{\otimes} is called truth condition of the connective and it is defined by cases:

- $\mathcal{C}^{\otimes}(W_1, \dots, W_n, \bar{w}) = \forall \bar{w}_1 \in W^{k_1}, \dots, \bar{w}_n \in W^{k_n}, \bar{w}_1 \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{\(\ast\}}}_1 W_1 \vee \dots \vee \bar{w}_n \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{\(\ast\}}}_n W_n \vee \pm \sigma R_{\bar{\otimes}} \bar{w}_1 \dots \bar{w}_n \bar{w}$ when $\mathcal{A}(\otimes) = \forall$.
- $\mathcal{C}^{\otimes}(W_1, \dots, W_n, \bar{w}) = \exists \bar{w}_1 \in W^{k_1}, \dots, \bar{w}_n \in W^{k_n}, \bar{w}_1 \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{\(\ast\}}}_1 W_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{w}_n \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{\(\ast\}}}_n W_n \wedge \pm \sigma R_{\bar{\otimes}} \bar{w}_1 \dots \bar{w}_n \bar{w}$ when $\mathcal{A}(\otimes) = \exists$.

We define the interpretation function of \mathcal{S}_C by $w \in \llbracket \varphi \vdash \psi \rrbracket^M$ iff if $w \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^M$ then $w \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket^M$.

We can extend this definition to $[C]$ -models by translating structures into $\mathcal{O}(C)$ -formulas.

Definition 26. The satisfaction relation $\models \subseteq \mathcal{E}_C \times \mathcal{L}_C$ is defined $\forall (M, \bar{w}) \in \mathcal{E}_C, \varphi \in \mathcal{L}_C, M, \bar{w} \models \varphi$ if and only if $\bar{w} \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^M$. In that case, we say that φ is **true** on (M, \bar{w}) .

With the formulas \mathcal{L}_C , the evaluations \mathcal{E}_C and the satisfaction relation \models we have successfully built the Atomic Logics associated to the set of connectives C .

Let two logics $L = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}, \models)$ and $L' = (\mathcal{L}', \mathcal{E}, \models')$ be given over the same class of models. We say that L' is **at least as expressive** as L if $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{L}$ there is a $\varphi' \in \mathcal{L}'$ such that $\forall M \in \mathcal{E}, M \models \varphi$ if and only if $M \models \varphi'$.

We say that L and L' are **equi-expressive** when L is at least as expressive as L' and viceversa. We say that L is **strictly less expressive** than L' whenever L' is at least as expressive as L but they are not equi-expressive.

Proposition 20. Let C and C' be two connective families. If there is a bijection $T : C \rightarrow C'$ such that $\forall \otimes \in C, \bar{\otimes} = \overline{\otimes}$ if and only if $T(\bar{\otimes}) = \overline{T(\otimes')}$ and $sk(T(\bar{\otimes})) = sk(\otimes)$, \mathcal{L}_C and $\mathcal{L}_{C'}$ are equi-expressive.

Proof. Firstly, we observe that the classes of models are the same. We recall that classes of models correspond to the class of triples (W, \mathcal{R}, R) of world sets W , relation sets \mathcal{R} and surjective functions $R : C \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$, where $R(\otimes) \in W^{\sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}} t_i}$ and the conditions $R(a_D(\otimes)) = R(\otimes)$, where $D \in \mathcal{A}_C$ and $\otimes \in C$. Similarly for C' .

Then \mathcal{E}_C are all the models with, for each $\otimes \in C$, exactly a $\sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}} k_i$ -ary relation, where (k_1, \dots, k_{n+1}) is the type tuple of \otimes . Similarly $\mathcal{E}_{C'}$ are all the models with, for each $\otimes' \in C'$, exactly a $\sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}} k_i$ -ary relation, where (k_1, \dots, k_{n+1}) is the type tuple of \otimes' .

As the bijection T preserves the partition, the relations of \otimes and \otimes' are equal if and only if those of $T(\otimes)$ and $T(\otimes')$ are. Finally, as T preserves the skeletons, $R_{\bar{\otimes}}$ and $R_{\overline{T(\otimes)}}$ are relations of the same arity (the sum of the type tuples). Therefore, they form the same class.

We give as translation between frames the identity on worlds and $T(R_{\bar{\otimes}}) = R_{\overline{T(\otimes)}}$ on relationships.

Now we give inductively the translation on formulas $T : \mathcal{L}_C \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{C'}$:

- For any n -ary connective $\star \in C$, $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \mathcal{L}_C$, we define $T(\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n))$ as $T(\star)(T(\varphi_1), \dots, T(\varphi_n))$.

Let (\mathcal{M}, w) be a pointed model. We prove by induction on φ that $\bar{w} \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{\mathcal{M}}$ if and only if $\bar{w} \in \llbracket T(\varphi) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{M}}$. The proof just uses that $C^\star(\llbracket \varphi_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket \varphi_n \rrbracket, \bar{w})$ is only determined by $\text{sk}(\star)$ and $R_{\bar{\star}}$, that $\text{sk}(\star) = \text{sk}(T(\star))$, that we have defined the translation on frames through $T(R_{\bar{\star}}) = R_{T(\bar{\star})}$ and the induction step.

□

Proposition 21. *Whenever $C \sim_W C'$, \mathcal{L}_C and $\mathcal{L}_{C'}$ are equi-expressive.*

Proof. We just use last proposition with ϕ as bijection. The condition on skeletons correspond to the recursively using equality on actions on the identity, $\text{sk}(\phi(\star)) = a(1, \text{sk}(\phi(\star))) = a(\varphi(1), \text{sk}(\phi(\star))) = a(1, \text{sk}(\star)) = \text{sk}(\star)$.

□

5.3 Sequent Calculus

Let C be a connective family with partition \mathcal{A} , and for each $D \in \mathcal{A}$, associated groups G_D , actions a_D and a morphism $\varphi_D : G_D \times (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$. The rules of our Sequent Calculi are ⁶⁷:

It must be noted that in the following rules we are using Aucher's syntax. The meaning of \cdot and $-$ must be understood as the one in \mathbb{B} . Similarly for \mathcal{A} .

⁶On this Calculus we are going to make use of proposition 19.

⁷In the present calculi we will treat full formulas like structural propositional letters non-compatible with β (not the subformulas).

Display Rules:

The rule dsr1:

For any $[D] \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\forall [\otimes] \in [D]$ of arity n , $g \in G_D$, $X_1, \dots, X_{n+1} \in [\mathcal{L}_C]$,

$$\frac{S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})}{[a_D](g, S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}))} \text{ dsr1}$$

The rule dsr2:

For any $[D] \in \mathcal{A}$ non-compatible with the action β and $\forall [\otimes] \in [D]$ of arity n , $s \in \mathbb{B}$, $X_1, \dots, X_{n+1} \in [\mathcal{L}_C]$,

$$\frac{S_s([\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n), X_{n+1})}{S_{-s}(*[\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n), *X_{n+1})} \text{ dsr2}$$

Where we write $1 + X_{\sigma(i)}$ for $*X_{\sigma(i)}$.

Left and Right Introduction Rules:

The rule $\vdash \otimes$:

For any $\otimes \in C$, $X_1, \dots, X_n \in [\mathcal{L}_C]$, $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \mathcal{L}_C$,

$$\frac{S_{\mathcal{E}\pm_1(\otimes)}(X_1, \varphi_1) \quad \dots \quad S_{\mathcal{E}\pm_n(\otimes)}(X_n, \varphi_n)}{S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_n, \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n))} \vdash \otimes$$

The rule $\otimes \vdash$:

For any $\otimes \in C$, $U \in [\mathcal{L}_C]$, $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{n+1} \in \mathcal{L}_C$,

$$\frac{S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n, U)}{S_{\mathcal{E}}(\otimes, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n, U)} \otimes \vdash$$

Rules of Atomic Sequent Calculus, ASL_C

Theorem 5. *Let C be a connective family with partition \mathcal{A} , and for each $D \in \mathcal{A}$, associated groups G_D , actions a_D and a morphism $\varphi_D : G_D \times (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$. If for all $D \in \mathcal{A}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, there is at least one structural connective $[\otimes] \in [D]$ such that its permutation σ is in the left coset $(i n + 1)\text{Sym}(n)$, then the proof system ASL_C is properly displayable.*

In all the other cases ASL_C still satisfies C1 to C7.

Apart from C8, we are going to use my syntax in the proof.

Proof. Proof of the display property:

We take C the set of connectives. We take a constituent X of a derivable sequent $S_s(Y, Z)$, for sign s and structures Y, Z . We will prove that we can derive a sequent where X is displayed, from the premiss $S_s(Y, Z)$, by induction on the structure Y .

- If Y is a formula and X is a substructure of Y the result is trivial.
- If Y is a strict structure and X is a substructure of Y , and we have $Y = [\otimes](Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ for some $[\otimes] \in [D]$ and the sequent $S_{\mathcal{E}(\otimes)}(Y, Z)$, where X is a substructure of some X_i . Let σ be the permutation of $[\otimes]$ and \pm its tonicity signature. We take some $g \in G_D$ such that

$\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1} \in (i n + 1)\text{Sym}(n)$ for σ' the permutation of $[a_D](g, [\otimes])$. Let \pm' be the tonicity signature of $[a_D](g, [\otimes])$. The display rule $\text{dsr}1 \otimes g$ lets us display any structural variable Y_i as follows

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\pm'_{n+1} \pm_{n+1}}([a_D](g, [\otimes])), \\ T(\pm'_1) + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_1 + Y_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(1)}, \dots, \\ T(\pm'_{i-1}) + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_{i-1} + Y_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i-1)}, \\ T(\pm'_i) + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_i + Z, \\ T(\pm'_{i+1}) + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_{i+1} + Y_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(i+1)}, \dots, \\ T(\pm'_n) + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_n + Y_{\sigma \cdot \sigma'^{-1}(n)}, \\ T(\pm'_{n+1}) + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_{n+1} + Y_i \end{aligned}$$

We then use $\text{dsr}2.b$, for $b = T(\pm'_{n+1}) + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_{n+1}$.

By induction hypothesis we deduce that, as X is substructure of Y_i , it can be displayed.

This shows that the calculus has the display property.

Proof of the 8 conditions:

- **C1 Preservation of formulas:**

It is enough to check that neither structural variables nor non-parametrical formulas disappear.

Let X_i be structures in the rules and φ_i formulas in the rules.

- $\text{dsr}1$ and $\text{dsr}2$ only permute the structural variables.
- $\vdash \otimes$ maintains both X_i and φ_i for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.
- $\otimes \vdash$ maintains φ_i for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and U .

- **C2 Shape-alikeness of parameters:**

Let an inference Inf , falling under a rule Ru , have a structure variable ℓ to which we assign the structure A and let B be a substructure of A , which is a parameter of Inf . We define the congruence relation of B in Inf equivalence class as composed of all the appearances of the structure occurrence of B in A , substituted inside the structure variable ℓ .

For example, let us take the rule from $X \vdash U$ infer $X, Y \vdash U$ and the specific inference with the variable X substituted by (φ, φ) , Y by (φ, φ) and U by (φ, φ) , for some formula φ . This rewrites to from $(\varphi_{X,1}, \varphi_{X,2}) \vdash (\varphi_{U,1}, \varphi_{U,2})$ infer $(\varphi_{X,1}, \varphi_{X,2}), (\varphi_{Y,1}, \varphi_{Y,2}) \vdash (\varphi_{U,1}, \varphi_{U,2})$. For all structure variable ℓ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$ all the parameters $\varphi_{\ell,i}$ represent the formula φ . The congruence relation is defined by:

- For all structure variable ℓ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$ the parameters $\varphi_{\ell,i}$ are only congruent to other appearances of $\varphi_{\ell,i}$.

- For all structure variable l the parameters $(\varphi_{l,1}, \varphi_{l,2})$ are only congruent to other appearances of $(\varphi_{l,1}, \varphi_{l,2})$.

- **C3 Non-proliferation of parameters:**

It is enough to see that structural variables have only one congruent parameter in the conclusion.

- d_{sr1} and d_{sr2} only permute the structural variables.
- $\vdash \otimes$ has only one parameter congruent to X_i in the conclusion for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.
- $\otimes \vdash$ has only one parameter congruent to U in the conclusion.

- **C4 Position-alikeness of parameters:**

It is necessary to check for all rules whether the signs (given in definition 22) of the parameters in each premise and the conclusion are equal. Let $\otimes \in C$ have tonicity signature \pm and quantification sign \mathcal{A} .

- Each X_i in $\vdash \otimes$ has sign $\mathcal{A}(\otimes) + \pm_i(\otimes)$ both in the premises and in the conclusion.
- The parameter U has sign $1 + \mathcal{A}(\otimes)$ in $\otimes \vdash$ both in the premises and in the conclusion.
- The parameters X_i have sign $\delta_{i,n+1} + (1 + \delta_{i,n+1}) \pm_i(\otimes) + \mathcal{A}(\otimes)$ in d_{sr2} both in the premises and in the conclusion.
- Now we want to check it in d_{sr1} . For any $i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}$ and $g \in G_D$, we need that $s(S_{\mathcal{A}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}), X_i) = s([a_D](g, S_{\mathcal{A}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})), X_i)$. For it we refer to lemma 3.

- **C5 Display of principal constituents:**

Principal constituents only appear in $\vdash \otimes$ and $\otimes \vdash$:

- In $\vdash \otimes, \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$ is the full antecedent or consequent by definition of S .
- Also by definition of S over a connective, the application of \otimes over $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ is the full antecedent or consequent. Note that none of the φ_i is a principal constituent as none of them appears **as a substructure** in the conclusion.

- **C6 and C7 Closure under substitution for parameters:**

When substituting any of the X_1, \dots, X_n, X, Y or U we get the same rule, as the definition of the proofs do not depend on the particular structure to be substituted.

- **C8 Eliminability of principal constituents:**

For any pairs of conclusions in the rules $X \vdash \varphi$ and $\varphi \vdash Z$, with φ a principal constituent, either Y equals X or Z or we can infer $X \vdash Z$ from the premises of both rules, using only the cut rule for strict subformulas of φ . We check it now:

Let's take the rules $\vdash \otimes$ and $\otimes \vdash$, we will let the sequents' order be given by the quantification sign of \otimes . We suppose $S_{\pm_i(\otimes)}(X_i, \varphi_i)$ for all $i \leq n$ and $S_{\mathcal{A}}([\otimes], \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n, U)$. To prove C8,

we want to infer $S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_n, U)$.

We will take for every $i \leq n$ an element $g_i \in G_D$ such that g displays X_i in any $S_s([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})$.

The proof follows by induction on the number of structural variables in

$\otimes(X_1, \dots, X_i, \varphi_{i+1}, \dots, \varphi_n)$:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], \varphi_{\tau(1)}, \dots, \varphi_{\tau(n)}, U) \\ \vdots \\ \text{Induction step with } g_i \text{ for } i < n \\ S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}, \varphi_n, U) \end{array}}{[a_D](g_n, S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}, \varphi_n, U))} \text{dsr1}\otimes.g_n \quad \frac{S_{-(\pm_n \cdot \mathcal{E})}([a_D](g_n, [\otimes]))(X_n, \varphi_n)}{S_{\mathcal{E}}([a_D](g_n, [\otimes]))(-\pm_n \varphi_n, -\pm_n X_n)} \text{dsr2-}\pm_n}{\frac{[a_D](g_n, S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}, X_n, U))}{S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_n, U)} \text{dsr1}g_n \otimes.g_n^-} \text{cut}(\varphi_n)$$

where we have used in the cut that $[a_D](g_i, \cdot)$ displays the i -essime component and that proposition 19 tells us that $dsr1g_n \otimes.g_n^-$ and $dsr1\otimes.g_n$ rules are inverses and also we have used the notation $-X = *X$ and $+X = X$.

The other possible combinations are trivial. □

Definition 27. Let \mathcal{L} be the language of formulas in a Sequent proof system \mathcal{P} . The identity axiom is the following axiom:

For any $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$,

$$\frac{}{\varphi \vdash \varphi} Id$$

Proposition 22. For any plain Connective Family C , the identity axiom is admissible in the atomic calculus ASL_C .

Proof. We will show $\varphi \vdash \varphi$ by induction on $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_C$:

- If $\varphi = p$ with negative quantification:
By $\vdash p$ we have $[p] \vdash p$ and by $p \vdash$ ends the step.
- If $\varphi = q$ with positive quantification:
By $\vdash q$ we have $q \vdash [q]$ and by $q \vdash$ ends the step.
- If, for any n -ary connective $\otimes \in C$, $\varphi = \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$:
By IH we have $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \varphi_i \vdash \varphi_i = S_{\pm_i(\otimes)}(\varphi_i, \varphi_i)$. Therefore, by $\vdash \otimes$, we have $S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n, \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n))$. We end the induction step by $\otimes \vdash$.

□

Proposition 23. *Let C be a plain connective family. The $\otimes \vdash$ in ASL_C is invertible. We note by $\otimes \vdash^-$ the resulting inference.*

Proof.

$$\frac{\frac{S_{\pm 1(\otimes)}(\varphi_1, \varphi_1) \quad \text{Id} \quad \dots \quad S_{\pm n(\otimes)}(\varphi_n, \varphi_n) \quad \text{Id}}{S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n, \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n))} \vdash \otimes \quad S_{\mathcal{E}}(\otimes, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n, U)}{S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n, U)} \text{ cut}$$

□

Corollary 1. *We set for strict structures the function $s([\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n)) = -\mathcal{E}(\otimes)$.*

Let C be a plain connective family. We can define a sign-dependent translation $\tau : [\mathcal{L}_C] \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{O}(C)}$ such that, for any formula φ , $\tau(\varphi) = \varphi$ and for any well-formed strict structure X , $S_{-s(X)}(X, \tau_s(X)(X))$. Therefore, from $S_{-s(X)}(\tau(X), U)$ we can infer $S_{-s(X)}(X, U)$.

Furthermore, from $S_{-s(X)}(X, U)$ we can infer $S_{-s(X)}(\tau(X), U)$.

Proof. For any substructure of X of the form $[\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n)$ we can check that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $s(X_{i+1}) = -\mathcal{E}(\otimes) \pm_{i+1}(\otimes)$.

We define by mutual induction two partial translations τ_-, τ_+ :

- For any formula φ ,

$$\tau_+(\varphi) = \tau_-(\varphi) = \varphi$$

- For any connective \otimes and structures X_1, \dots, X_n ,

$$\tau_{-\mathcal{E}(\otimes)}([\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n)) = \otimes(\tau_{-\mathcal{E}(\otimes)\pm_1(\otimes)}(X_1), \dots, \tau_{-\mathcal{E}(\otimes)\pm_n(\otimes)}(X_n))$$

For X a strict structure we define $\tau(X)$ as $\tau_{s(X)}(X)$ and for X a formula we define $\tau(X) = X$. This is well-defined thanks to s being well-defined on strict structures.

By induction on X we see $S_{-s(X)}(X, \tau(X))$.

- If X is a formula, then $\tau_-(X) = \tau_+(X) = X$ and both sequents are true by *Id* Axiom.
- We suppose $X = [\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n)$. The induction hypothesis tells us that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $S_{-s(X_i)}(X_i, \tau_{s(X_i)}(X_i))$. We then take $\vdash \otimes$ on all those sequents, thanks to

$$s(X_{i+1}) = -\mathcal{E}(\otimes) \pm_{i+1} (\otimes).$$

We get a derivation of

$$\begin{aligned} & S_{\mathcal{E}(\otimes)}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_n, \otimes(\tau_{s(X_1)}(X_1), \dots, \tau_{s(X_n)}(X_n))) \\ &= S_{\mathcal{E}(\otimes)}(X, \otimes(\tau_{-\mathcal{E}(\otimes)\pm_1(\otimes)}(X_1), \dots, \tau_{-\mathcal{E}(\otimes)\pm_n(\otimes)}(X_n))) = S_{-s(\otimes)}(X, \tau_s(X)(X)) \end{aligned}$$

The last bit comes from inductively using the $\otimes \vdash$, after displaying all the strict substructures of X .

□

It is trivial seeing that $\tau(X)$ is a J -formula whenever X is a $\{[\otimes] \mid \otimes \in J\}$ -structure.

We note $X \dashv\vdash Y$ whenever $X \vdash Y$ and $Y \vdash X$.

Corollary 2. *Let X and Y be two structures such that if X is strict we can derive $S_{s(X)}(\tau(X), \tau(Y))$, Y is well-formed and if X is a formula we can derive $X \dashv\vdash Y$. Then if S is a derivable sequent, the sequent $S[X/Y]$ replacing all appearances of X in S by Y is also derivable.*

Proof. We display each appearance of X in S , thanks to C4 they will all be in the same side for strict structures.

- If X is a formula we get, from displaying, the sequent $S_s(V, X)$ for some sign s and structure V , from cut rule on it and $S_s(X, Y)$ we get the result after repeating the followed display rules in the reverse order and substituting each use of $d_{sr1}\otimes.g$ for $d_{sr1}g\otimes.g^{-1}$. d_{rs1} and d_{sr2} can be applied because the changed structure is a parametric occurrence inferences.
- If X is a strict structure, by the last corollary on the displayed structure we can derive $S_{s(X)}(V, \tau(X))$ for some structure V . The cut rule with $S_{s(X)}(\tau(X), \tau(Y))$ lets us derive $S_{s(X)}(V, \tau(Y))$. Using again last corollary we find $S_{s(X)}(V, Y)$. We get the result after repeating the followed display rules in the reverse order and substituting each use of $d_{sr1}\otimes.g$ for $d_{sr1}g\otimes.g^{-1}$. d_{rs1} and d_{sr2} can be applied because the changed structure is a parametric occurrence inferences.

□

Proposition 24. *Let C be a set of connectives. The proof system ASL_C is conservative on any fragment $\{[\otimes] \mid \otimes \in C\} \subseteq J \subseteq [C]$ of structural C -connectives.*

Proof. We prove it by strong induction on the derivation of any J -structure by eliminating the undesired usages of $d_{sr1}\otimes.g$, for $[a_D](g, [\otimes]) \notin J$. We have then to act on some of the precedent inferences in the proof tree so that we can also derivate the new proof tree.

Let $[\otimes]$ be the structural connective we are willing to eliminate. We know that $[\otimes]$ is not in the conclusion of the derivation because it is not in J . As structural connectives which are not in the connective family do not have left and right introduction rules we know that the structure $[\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})$ must be a parameter in all rules which are not the very same $dsr1$ introducing or eliminating the connective. Therefore, $[\otimes]$ must have been eliminated by an application of $dsr1$, let's say $dsr1_{\otimes}.g$ for some $g \in G_D$ such that $[a_D](g, [\otimes]) \in J$.

Let us note by \pm, σ and \pm', σ' the respective tonicity signature and permutation of $[\otimes]$ and $[a_D](g, [\otimes])$. In case $T(\pm')_{n+1} + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_{n+1} = 0$, we rewrite all the congruent appearances of $S_s([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})$ with the conclusion of the $dsr1_{\otimes}.g$ inference $S_s([\otimes'], X'_1, \dots, X'_{n+1})$ up from the root until we find another congruent parameter $[\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n)$ in some inference $dsr1_{\otimes'}.g'$ or just leaves of the derivation. In the first case we change $dsr1_{\otimes'}.g'$ by $dsr1_{\otimes'}.(g \cdot g')$, who will have as conclusion $S_s([\otimes'], X'_1, \dots, X'_{n+1})$, the new tree of inferences will still be a derivation because the changed constituent is not playing any role in the inferences (it is parametric) and appears in the same side of the sequent (so that we can still apply the same introduction rules, if necessary). The second case is not possible as the premises are also J -structures.

Let us note by \pm, σ and \pm', σ' the respective tonicity signature and permutation of $[\otimes]$ and $[a_D](g, [\otimes])$. In case $T(\pm')_{n+1} + T(R(\sigma' \cdot \sigma^{-1}, \pm))_{n+1} = 1$, we note the conclusion of the $dsr1_{\otimes}.g$ inference by $S_s([\otimes'], X'_1, \dots, *X'_{n+1})$. Now we rewrite all the congruent appearances of $S_s([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})$ by $S_{-s}(*[\otimes'], X'_1, \dots, X'_n, X'_{n+1})$ up from the root until we find another congruent parameter $[\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n)$ in some inference $dr_{\otimes'}.g'$ or just leaves of the derivation. In the first case we change $dr_{\otimes'}.g'$ by $dr_{\otimes'}.(g \cdot g')$, who will have as conclusion $S_{-s}(*[\otimes'], X'_1, \dots, X'_n, X'_{n+1})$, the new tree of inferences will still be a derivation because the changed constituent is not playing any role in the inferences (it is parametric) and appears in the same side of the sequent (so that we can still apply the same introduction rules, if necessary). The second case is not possible as the premises are also J -structures.

This must end because each step reduces at least by one the proof length. Furthermore, while we have some $[\otimes] \notin J$ we can repeat this process, so that thanks to the derivation being finite we know that the resulting derivation will not have any $[\otimes] \notin J$.

□

We already know ASL_C to be conservative on formulas thanks to subformula property. We can check with a quick look that for any connective family C , the C -fragment of $ASL_{O(C)}$ corresponds to ASL_C , as they use the same structural connectives.

Definition 28. Let C be a connective family and \otimes be a connective. We now denote by $\overline{\otimes}$ the class of \otimes in the equivalence given by the orbits (and not the partition of C). We define inductively, on formulas $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$, $V_a(\overline{\otimes}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)) := \{\overline{\otimes}\} \cup V_a(\varphi_1) \cup \dots \cup V_a(\varphi_n)$. Let $[\otimes]$ be a structural connective. We

define inductively, on structures X_1, \dots, X_n , $V_a([\otimes])(X_1, \dots, X_n) := \{\overline{\otimes}\} \cup V_a(X_1) \cup \dots \cup V_a(X_n)$ and for \otimes non-compatible with β , $V_a([\otimes])(X_1, \dots, X_n) = V_a([\otimes])(X_1, \dots, X_n)$.

We define the **residuated Craig Interpolation property** as the Craig Interpolation property, but using the predicate V_a instead of V .

Note that $V_a(X) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(C)$.

It is trivial to see that this property is more restrictive than Craig Interpolation, by considering variables as 0-ary connectives. As Craig Interpolation refers to variables and predicates this result does not come as a surprise, for each orbit represents a different relation in the semantics.

Theorem 6. *Atomic Logics have the residuated Craig's Interpolation property.*

Proof. We will show that for all structures X and Y , if for some sign s the sequent $S_s(X, Y)$ is derivable then there is a formula φ such that:

- if X is a formula, $S_s(X, \varphi)$ and $S_s(\varphi, Y)$ are derivable and $V(\varphi) \subseteq V(X) \cap V(Y)$.
- if $X = [\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n)$, $S_{\mathcal{E}(\otimes)\pm_i(\otimes)}(X_i, \varphi)$ and $S_{\mathcal{E}(\otimes)}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, \varphi, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_n, Y)$ are derivable and $V(\varphi) \subseteq V(X_i) \cap (\bigcup_{j \neq i} V(X_j) \cup V(Y) \cup \{\overline{\otimes}\})$, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

We proceed by strong induction on the derivation of $S_s(X, Y)$.

- If the last inference was $\vdash \otimes$, we can assume that the property is satisfied for each $S_{-\mathcal{E}(\otimes)\pm_i(\otimes)}(\varphi_i, X_i)$ and $Y = \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$. Then the induction hypothesis lets us deduce that there is some formula ψ_i such that $V(\psi_i) \subseteq V(\varphi_i) \cap V(X_i)$, $S_{-\mathcal{E}(\otimes)\pm_i(\otimes)}(\varphi_i, \psi_i)$ and $S_{-\mathcal{E}(\otimes)\pm_i(\otimes)}(\psi_i, X_i)$ are derivable. Therefore, $V(\psi_i) \subseteq V(X_i) \cap (\bigcup_{j \neq i} V(X_j) \cup V(Y) \cup \{\overline{\otimes}\}) \subseteq V(X_i) \cap (\bigcup_{j \neq i} V(X_j) \cup V(Y) \cup \{\overline{\otimes}\})$, $S_{\mathcal{E}(\otimes)\pm_i(\otimes)}(X_i, \psi_i)$ and $S_{\mathcal{E}(\otimes)\pm_i(\otimes)}(\psi_i, \varphi_i)$, so that by applying $\vdash \otimes$ we can also derive $S_{\mathcal{E}(\otimes)}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, \psi_i, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_n, Y)$.

For the other direction of the sequent, $S_{-\mathcal{E}(\otimes)}(\otimes(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n), [\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n))$ by $\vdash \otimes$, $S_{-\mathcal{E}(\otimes)}(\otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n), \otimes(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n))$ by $\vdash \otimes$ and $\otimes \vdash$ and $V(\otimes(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n)) \subseteq \{\overline{\otimes}\} \cup (V(\varphi_1) \cap V(X_1)) \cup \dots \cup (V(\varphi_n) \cap V(X_n)) \subseteq V(Y) \cap (\{\overline{\otimes}\} \cup V(X_1) \cup \dots \cup V(X_n))$.

- If the last inference was $\otimes \vdash$, we can assume that the property is satisfied for $S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n, U)$. Then there is some ψ_i such that $V(\psi_i) \subseteq V(\varphi_i) \cap (\bigcup_{j \neq i} V(\varphi_j) \cup V(U) \cup \{\overline{\otimes}\})$, for any sign s_i , $S_{s_i}(\varphi_i, \psi_i)$ and $S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{i-1}, \psi_i, \varphi_{i+1}, \dots, \varphi_n, U)$.

Then it must be that an application of dr or an application of some $\vdash \otimes'$ precedes $\otimes \vdash$. In the second case we must have $\otimes' = \otimes$ and so we can see that $\otimes \in V(U)$ and the desired formula is $\otimes(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n)$. Therefore, $S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n, U)$ must be preceded by other sequents with the outmost structural connective still in the orbit of $[\otimes]$. As the derivation is finite, there must

be an application of $\vdash \otimes'$ preceding the sequent. By the argument we just saw, we know that $\overline{[\otimes]} = \overline{[\otimes']}$, so that $\overline{\otimes} \in V(U)$ and $V(\otimes(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n)) \subseteq V(\otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)) \cap V(U)$.

To prove it for the other direction of the sequent we must study by cases. If U is a formula, then we can use the same interpolant for the conclusion as in the premise. If U is not a formula then we can use for each component of the structural connective the same interpolant for each component as in the premise.

- If the last inference was some dr it comes trivially from doing case analysis on whether we are working with formulas or not and using the appropriate induction step from the premise.

The theorem corresponds to the case where both sides are formulas. □

On boolean atomic logics we will have to go back to the usual Craig Interpolation result.

6 Atomic Logics for $\alpha * \beta$

In this section we get back into Guillaume Aucher's action by using the families $(\alpha * \beta)(\otimes)$.

Definition 29. Let \otimes be a connective. Let V be a set of propositional letters.

We define the connective families $(\alpha * \beta)(\otimes, V)$, $(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\otimes, V)$, $(\alpha \circ \delta)(\otimes, V)$, $\alpha(\otimes, V)$, $\beta(\otimes, V)$ and $\delta(\otimes, V)$ as the families $\mathcal{O}(\{\hat{\otimes}_a\} \sqcup V_a)$, where a ranges on the previously mentioned actions.

We define the connective families $(\alpha * \beta)(\otimes)$, $(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\otimes)$, $(\alpha \circ \delta)(\otimes)$, $\alpha(\otimes)$, $\beta(\otimes)$ and $\delta(\otimes)$ as the families $\mathcal{O}(\{\hat{\otimes}_a\} \sqcup V_{id})$, where a ranges on the previously mentioned actions.

6.1 Expressivity of the Different Residuation and Negation Families

We recall theorem 4:

Theorem 4. The group $(\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \times \text{Sym}(n+1)$ previously defined is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} * \text{Sym}(n+1)) / (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z} * \text{Sym}(n+1))_x$ through a morphism φ , commuting both actions ($\alpha'' \circ \varphi = \alpha$).

Now we conclude:

Corollary 3. Let C be a set of connectives. We have that $\mathcal{O}(C_{\alpha * \beta}) \sim_W \mathcal{O}(C_{\alpha \times \varsigma})$. Therefore the logics $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{O}(C_{\alpha * \beta})}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{O}(C_{\alpha \times \varsigma})}$ are equi-expressive.

In particular $\forall \otimes \in C$, $(\alpha * \beta)(\otimes) \sim_W (\alpha \times \varsigma)(\otimes)$.

Proof. On theorem 4 we have already given the required morphism on the identity bijective function, along with the equality.

This proves the result $\forall \star \in C, (\alpha * \beta)(\star) \simeq (\alpha \times \varsigma)(\star)$. As we're working on discrete families, we can extend the bijection to the sets $\mathcal{O}(C_{\alpha * \beta})$ and $\mathcal{O}(C_{\alpha \times \varsigma})$ with the union of all of the bijections while respecting the morphisms and the conditions. □

The converse of propositions 21 and 20 is false. The following proposition shows it, as the cardinals of $\delta(\star, V)$ and $(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\star, V)$ are very different. It also shows the need for distinguishing the families' actions on all the connectives, including the propositional letters.

Proposition 25. *Let V be the propositional letters set and let \star be a connective.*

1. *For all $C, C' \in \{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\star), (\alpha \circ \delta)(\star), \alpha(\star), \beta(\star), \delta(\star), (\alpha \times \varsigma)(\star, V), (\alpha \circ \delta)(\star, V), \alpha(\star, V), \beta(\star, V), \delta(\star, V)\}$ we have $\mathcal{E}_C = \mathcal{E}_{C'}$.*
2. *For any pair of families C, C' in $\{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\star, V), (\alpha \circ \delta)(\star, V), \beta(\star, V), \delta(\star, V)\}$, \mathcal{L}_C and $\mathcal{L}_{C'}$ are equi-expressive.*
3. *The logic over $\mathcal{L}_{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\star)}$ is at least as expressive as the logics over $\mathcal{L}_{(\alpha \circ \delta)(\star)}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\beta(\star)}$. The logic over $\mathcal{L}_{(\alpha \circ \delta)(\star)}$ is at least as expressive as the logics over $\mathcal{L}_{\delta(\star)}$.*
4. *If we take a connective \star of arity $n > 0$, the logic over $\mathcal{L}_{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\star)}$ is strictly more expressive than the logic over $\mathcal{L}_{(\alpha \circ \delta)(\star)}$.*

Proof. Let n be the arity of \star . Let (k_1, \dots, k_{n+1}) be the type tuple of \star .

Firstly, we observe that the classes of models are the same. All classes of models correspond to the class of triples (W, \mathcal{R}, R) of world sets W , relation sets \mathcal{R} and surjective functions R , where $R(\star) \in W^{\sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}} t_i}$ and the conditions $R(a_V(p)) = R(p)$ and $R(a(\star)) = R(\star)$, where $p \in V$. These are all the models with exactly a $\sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}} k_i$ -ary relation and, for each $p \in V$ of type signature (k) , a k -ary relation on W . Therefore, they form the same class.

We give now four translations by induction:

- $\phi_1 : \mathcal{L}_{\delta(\star)} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\star)}, \mathcal{L}_{\delta(\star, V)} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\star, V)}$ such that:
 - For p propositional letter, $\phi_1(p) = p$.
 - For any $s \in \mathbb{B}$,

$$\phi_1(\delta(s, \star)(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)) = ((\alpha \times \varsigma)((0, \dots, 0, s), \text{id}), \star)(\phi_1(\varphi_1), \dots, \phi_n(\varphi_n))$$

- We note $\phi_2 : \mathcal{L}_{\beta(\star)} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\star)}, \phi_3 : \mathcal{L}_{\delta(\star)} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{(\alpha \circ \delta)(\star)}$ and $\phi_4 : \mathcal{L}_{(\alpha \circ \delta)(\star)} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\star)}$. This translations are trivialized when using $(\alpha * \beta)(\star)$ instead of $\alpha \times \varsigma$, thanks to corollary 3.

We need to check that $\forall i \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \llbracket \phi_i(\varphi) \rrbracket = \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$, which are routinary computations.

We now show the reciprocal translations $\psi_1 : \mathcal{L}_{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\otimes)} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\delta(\otimes)}$ and $\psi_2 : \mathcal{L}_{\beta(\otimes)} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\delta(\otimes)}$.

We define two translations by mutual induction $\psi_{1,+}, \psi_{1,-}$.

- For any atom connective $p, \psi_{1,+}(p) = p$ and $\psi_{1,-}(p) = \delta(-, p)$.
- For any residuation of \otimes ,

$$\psi_{1,t}(((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma\otimes)(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)) = \delta(t_{n+1}, \otimes)(\psi_{1,t_1}(\varphi_1), \dots, \psi_{1,t_n}(\varphi_n))$$

Where $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, t_i = \pm_i((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma\otimes) \cdot \pm_i(\otimes) \cdot t$.

We now show that $\forall t \in \mathbb{B}, \llbracket \psi_{1,t}(\varphi) \rrbracket_{\delta(\otimes)} = t \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\otimes)}$ in some model M . We proceed by induction on φ .

- For any propositional letter p it is trivial from $R(\delta(s, p)) = R(sp)$.
- For any $s_1, \dots, s_{n+1} \in \mathbb{B}, \sigma \in \text{Sym}(n+1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket \psi_{1,t}(((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma\otimes)(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)) \rrbracket_{\delta(\otimes)} \\ &= \llbracket \delta(\pm((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma\otimes) \cdot \pm(\otimes) \cdot t, \otimes) \\ & \quad (\psi_{1,\pm_1}((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma\otimes) \cdot \pm_1(\otimes) \cdot t(\varphi_1), \dots, \psi_{1,\pm_n}((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma\otimes) \cdot \pm_n(\otimes) \cdot t(\varphi_n)) \rrbracket_{\delta(\otimes)} \\ &= \{\bar{w} \in W^k \mid \mathcal{C}^{\delta(\pm((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma\otimes) \cdot \pm(\otimes) \cdot t, \otimes)} \\ & \quad (\llbracket \psi_{1,\pm_1}((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma\otimes) \cdot \pm_1(\otimes) \cdot t(\varphi_1) \rrbracket_{\delta(\otimes)}, \dots, \\ & \quad \llbracket \psi_{1,\pm_n}((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma\otimes) \cdot \pm_n(\otimes) \cdot t(\varphi_n) \rrbracket_{\delta(\otimes)}, \bar{w})\} \\ &= \{\bar{w} \in W^k \mid \mathcal{C}^{(0, \dots, 0, \pm((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma\otimes) \cdot \pm(\otimes) \cdot t, \otimes)} \\ & \quad ((\pm_1((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma\otimes) \cdot \pm_1(\otimes) \cdot t) \llbracket \varphi_1 \rrbracket_{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\otimes)}, \dots, \\ & \quad (\pm_n((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma\otimes) \cdot \pm_n(\otimes) \cdot t) \llbracket \varphi_n \rrbracket_{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\otimes)}, \bar{w})\} \\ &= \{\bar{w} \in W^k \mid \mathcal{C}^{(s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma\otimes}(\llbracket \varphi_1 \rrbracket_{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\otimes)}, \dots, \llbracket \varphi_n \rrbracket_{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\otimes)}, \bar{w})\} \\ &= \llbracket (s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma\otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

The penultimate step comes from the fact that $\mathcal{C}^{s_i(\pm, \otimes')}(W_1, \dots, W_n, \bar{w})$ if and only if not $\mathcal{C}^{\otimes'}(W_1, \dots, \pm W_i, \dots, W_n, \bar{w})$ and the previous ones come from β being an action.

We define two translations by mutual induction $\psi_{2,+}, \psi_{2,-}$.

- For any atom connective $p, \psi_{2,+}(p) = p$ and $\psi_{2,-}(p) = \delta(-, p)$.
- For any residuation of \otimes ,

$$\psi_{2,t}((s\otimes)(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)) = \delta(t_{n+1}, \otimes)(\psi_{2,t_1}(\varphi_1), \dots, \psi_{2,t_n}(\varphi_n))$$

Where $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $t_i = \pm_i(s \star) \cdot \pm_i(\star) \cdot t = s \cdot t$.

The proof of $\llbracket \psi_{2,s}(\varphi) \rrbracket = s \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$ proceeds similarly to the previous one.

We end by giving counterexamples in order to prove 4.

We will use the Proposition 5 from *Generalized Keisler Theorems for First-order Logic and Protologics* [3]. We show the case where $\mathcal{A}E = \forall$.

For p_1, \dots, p_n propositional letters, the formula $-\star(p_1, \dots, p_n) \in \mathcal{L}_{(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\star)}$ is not definable in $\mathcal{L}_{(\alpha \circ \delta)(\star)}$. In order to see it we will show that there are two bisimilar $\alpha \circ \delta$ -models, \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} , such that $\mathcal{M} \models -\star(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ and not $\mathcal{N} \models -\star(p_1, \dots, p_n)$.

The models are:

- $\mathcal{M}: \{w_1, \dots, w_n, v_1, \dots, v_n\}$,
 $R_{\star} = \{(w_1, \dots, w_n, w_1), \dots, (w_1, \dots, w_n, w_n), (w_1, \dots, w_n, v_1), \dots, (w_1, \dots, w_n, v_n)\}$
and
 $V(p_1) = \{w_1, \dots, w_n, v_2, \dots, v_3\}, \dots, V(p_n) = \{w_1, \dots, w_n, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}\}$.
- $\mathcal{N}: \{w'_1, \dots, w'_n\}$,
 $R_{\star} = \{(w'_1, \dots, w'_n, w'_1), \dots, (w'_1, \dots, w'_n, w'_n)\}$ and
 $V(p_1) = \dots = V(p_n) = \{w'_1, \dots, w'_n\}$.

The automatic bisimulation for atomic logics is $\{(v_1, w'_1), \dots, (v_n, w'_n), (w_1, w'_1), \dots, (w_n, w'_n)\}$.

We can also check $\mathcal{M} \models -\star(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ and $\mathcal{N} \models \star(p_1, \dots, p_n)$.

Checking it is routinary.

□

The orbit of $\alpha \times \varsigma$ corresponds to the n -ary connectives of fixed sign $\pm(\star)\mathcal{A}E(\star)$. This proposition tells us that whenever we have the negation of all the propositional letters in the connective family (as for the boolean case that we introduce in subsection 6.2) we do not need to work with all the $2^{n+1}(n+1)!$ connectives of $(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\star, V)$ but we have enough with the $2(n+1)!$ connectives of $(\alpha \circ \delta)(\star, V)$ or even with the 2 connectives of $\delta(\star, V)$ to express the same.

We will focus on the families $(\alpha \times \varsigma)(\star)$, $(\alpha \circ \delta)(\star)$, $\beta(\star)$ and $\delta(\star)$ with the objective of keeping the maximal possible generality, as logics do not always have negation available on all the variables. When needed, propositional letters with non-trivial actions will be explicitly introduced.

In what follows $\beta(\star)$, $\delta(\star)$ families will not be of our interest as the display theorem 5 does not apply to them. In spite of that, it is worthy noting that the translations into $\delta(\star, V)$ corresponds to the negation normal form for boolean families.

Sequent Calculus

Example 8. Let C be a connective family such that $\forall D \in \mathcal{A}$ whenever $\otimes \in D$ are not propositional letters then $a_D = \alpha \times \varsigma$ is satisfied. Then we can derive the following display rules, written in Aucher's notation along with signs in \mathbb{B} .

The rule dsr1:

For any $[D] \in \mathcal{A}$ compatible with the action $\alpha \times \varsigma$ and $\forall [\otimes] \in [D]$ of arity n , $s_1, \dots, s_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z}$, $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n+1)$, $X_1, \dots, X_n \in [\mathcal{L}_C]$,

$$\frac{S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})}{S_{\mathcal{E}}((s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})\sigma[\otimes], s_{n+1}s_1X_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, s_{n+1}s_nX_{\sigma(n)}, s_{n+1}X_{\sigma(n+1)})} \text{ dsr1}$$

Where we write $-X_{\sigma(i)}$ for $*X_{\sigma(i)}$.

The rule dsr2:

For any $[D] \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\forall [\otimes] \in [D]$ of arity n , $s \in \mathbb{B}$, $X_1, \dots, X_n \in [\mathcal{L}_C]$,

$$\frac{S_s([\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n), X_{n+1})}{S_{-s}(*[\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_n), *X_{n+1})} \text{ dsr2}$$

Proof. Follows from example 7. □

Example 9. We can see that the preceding proof system is sound and complete with respect the original one by using Corollary 3.

Let C be a connective family with action $\alpha * \beta$ on any non-variable connective. As the variables, which are not compatible with β , can't access dsr1 we can use ASL_C to get back the Aucher's display rules.

Below I write the original display rules, whose proof system (alongside with the introduction rules $\otimes \vdash$, $\vdash \otimes$) we call GGL_C^0 .

The rule dr1:

For any $[D] \in \mathcal{A}$, $\forall [\otimes] \in [D]$ of arity $n, i < n + 1, X_1, \dots, X_{n+1} \in [\mathcal{L}_C]$,

$$\frac{S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})}{S_{\mathcal{E}}((i \ n + 1)[\otimes], X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_n, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_n, X_i)} \text{ dr1}$$

The rule dr2:

For any $s \in \mathbb{B}$, $X, Y \in [\mathcal{L}_C]$,

$$\frac{S_s(X, Y)}{S_{-s}(*X, *Y)} \text{ dr2}$$

Proof. Let $\otimes \in C$. Any rule $dr1_{\otimes}.i$ can be translated into $d sr1_{\otimes}.(i \ n + 1)$. Any rule $dr2$ can be translated into $d sr2.1$.

We now want to translate the rule $d sr1$ into the original Aucher's system.

We can decompose any $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n)$ in transpositions, all having $n + 1$ in the support, by recursively multiplying σ with $(n + 1 \ \sigma^-(n + 1))$ on the left, which will take $\sigma^-(n + 1)$ out from the support of σ . Then σ will equal the permutations needed to reach the identity in the reverse order.

Therefore, we can write any (σ, b) as a sequence of $((a_1 \ n + 1), 0) \cdots ((a_l \ n + 1), 0) \cdot (\text{id}, b)$. The rule $d sr1_{\otimes}.(\sigma, b)$ of ASL_C will be a composition of rules $dr1_{\otimes}.(a_i \ n + 1)$ and, if $b = 1$, $dr2$ by using proposition 19.

Like this we will be able to translate the applications of the rule $d sr1_{\otimes}.(\sigma_1, b_1) \cdots (\sigma_k, b_k)$. Before, let us call the previously defined a_j for each σ_i as $a_{i,j}$. Indeed, the derivation is a composition of rules $dr1_{\otimes}.(a_{1,1} \ n + 1), \dots, dr1_{\otimes}.(a_{1,l_1})$, $dr2$ if $b_1 = 1$, $dr1_{\otimes}.(a_{2,1} \ n + 1), \dots, dr1_{\otimes}.(a_{2,l_2})$, $dr2$ if $b_2 = 1$, etc. We finish the recursion when we reach the application of rule $dr1_{\otimes}.(a_k, l_k)$, followed by $dr2$ if $b_k = 1$.

□

Theorem 7. *Let C be a connective family with action $\alpha * \beta$ on any non-variable connective. The proof system GGL_C^0 is sound and complete with respect to the atomic logics semantics.*

Proof. Theorem 7.10 of *Display and Hilbert Calculi for Atomic Logics*. [2]

□

```

Inductive Calculus {Generators : Connectives}
: @Structural_Formula _ (S_of_Cs (@full_Connectives Generators)) ->
  @Structural_Formula _ (S_of_Cs (@full_Connectives Generators)) ->
  Type
:=
| LRule (C : @Connective (@full_Connectives Generators))
  : forall (X : forall i:'I_(arity C),
    typed_Structural_Formula (tnth (type C) (lift ord_max i))),
    forall (φ : forall i:'I_(arity C),
    typed_Formula (tnth (type C) (lift ord_max i))),
    (forall i:'I_(arity C),
    unsigned_function
      (tnth (sign C) (lift ord_max i) + (quantification C))%R
      Calculus
        (existT _ (tnth (type C) (lift ord_max i)) (X i))
        (existT _ (tnth (type C) (lift ord_max i)) (from_formula (φ i)))) .
    unsigned_pivoted_function_S Calculus (S_of_C C)
    X
    (existT _ (tnth (type C) ord_max)
    (from_formula (composition C φ)))
| RRule (C : @Connective (@full_Connectives Generators))
  : forall (φ : forall i:'I_(arity C),
    typed_Formula (tnth (type C) (lift ord_max i))),
    forall U : Structural_Formula,
    unsigned_pivoted_function_S Calculus (S_of_C C)
      (fun i => from_formula (φ i)) U ->
    unsigned_pivoted_function_C Calculus C φ U
| dr1 (C : @Connective (full_Connectives Generators))
  (p : 'Sym_(arity C).+1)
  : forall (X : forall i:'I_(arity C).+1,
    typed_Structural_Formula (tnth (@sk_type (@skeleton _ C)) i)),
    unsigned_pivoted_function_S Calculus
      (S_of_C C)
      (fun i => X (lift ord_max i))
      (existT __ (X ord_max)) ->
    unsigned_pivoted_function_S Calculus
      (S_of_C (@full_of_restricted_C _ C
        (C_of_S (@α __ (S_of_C (restricted_of_full_C C)) p))))
      (fun i =>
        cast_Formula (@calculus_type_wf __ p i)
          ((X (p (lift ord_max i))))))
      (existT __ (X (p ord_max))).

```

Figure 7: Implementation of GGL_C^0 without $dr2$.

The unsigned functions are called S in the report, the `cast_Formulas` are to cast formulas between equal types and the `calculus_type_wf` just checks that the type tuple of the residuation is the permutation of components.

Proposition 26. *Let n be the arity of a connective \otimes .*

In the calculus $ASL_{(\alpha\beta)(\otimes)}$ there are, for any n -ary connective \otimes , $2^{n+1}(n+1)$ sets of $n!$ connectives, where each pair of connectives in each set is provably equivalent by permutations (i.e. for any two \otimes, \otimes' there is some $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n)$ such that $\otimes(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{n-1}) \dashv\vdash \otimes'(\varphi_{\sigma(0)}, \dots, \varphi_{\sigma(n-1)})$).*

Therefore, by the last corollary we can replace each appearance of \otimes, \otimes' in the same set and $[\otimes], [\otimes']$ in any derivable sequent to get a new derivable sequent.

Proof. The sets correspond to the $2^{n+1}(n+1)$ orbits of $\{\sigma \in \mathbb{B} * \text{Sym}(n+1) \mid \sigma(n) = n\}$ over the connectives forming the $\mathcal{O}(\otimes)$.

- For $\otimes, \sigma\otimes$ (where $\sigma(n) = n$ and therefore $\mathcal{A}(\sigma\otimes) = \mathcal{A}(\otimes)$):

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\text{Id}}{S_{\mathcal{A}(\otimes)}(\otimes(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{n-1}), \otimes(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{n-1}))} S_{\mathcal{A}(\otimes)}([\otimes](\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{n-1}), \otimes(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{n-1}))}{S_{\mathcal{A}(\sigma\otimes)}([\sigma\otimes](\varphi_{\sigma(0)}, \dots, \varphi_{\sigma(n-1)}), \otimes(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{n-1}))} \otimes \vdash^-}{S_{\mathcal{A}(\otimes)}(\sigma\otimes(\varphi_{\sigma(0)}, \dots, \varphi_{\sigma(n-1)}), \otimes(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{n-1}))} \text{dsr1}\otimes.\sigma}{\sigma\otimes \vdash^-}$$

The reciprocal comes from the same derivation on $\sigma\otimes \vdash^-, \text{dsr1} \vdash \otimes, \vdash^-$ and $\sigma^-(\sigma\otimes) \vdash^-$.

□

This shows that for each coset of $\text{Sym}(n+1)$ by the subgroup $\text{Sym}(n)$ we need at most a single representative, which greatly reduces the number of connectives and display rules. At the same time, for what we commented in the proof of the display properties, we need at least a representative of each residuation class $(i \ n + 1)\text{Sym}(n)$ in the family structural connectives.

Lambek on Display

The rules of the Display Calculus for Lambek Calculus are:

From Rajeev Goré's *How to display your favourite substructural logic* [10].

We have noted the connectives as follows (article's connectives in the left):

- ; as $[\otimes]$,
- $>$ as $[\wedge]$,
- $<$ as $[\vee]$.

```

Inductive display_derivation : lks -> lks -> Type :=
| display_id : forall (φ : lkf), display_derivation φ φ
| display1 : forall X Y Z,
  display_derivation X (Z [/] Y) -> display_derivation (X [·] Y) Z
| display2 : forall X Y Z,
  display_derivation (X [·] Y) Z -> display_derivation Y (X [\] Z)
| display3 : forall X Y Z,
  display_derivation Y (X [\] Z) -> display_derivation X (Z [/] Y)
| tensorL : forall X (φ ψ : lkf),
  display_derivation (φ [·] ψ) X -> display_derivation (φ·ψ) X
| tensorR : forall X Y (φ ψ : lkf), display_derivation X φ ->
  display_derivation Y ψ -> display_derivation (X [·] Y) (φ·ψ)
| rresL : forall X (φ ψ : lkf),
  display_derivation X (φ [\] ψ) -> display_derivation X (φ \ ψ)
| rresR : forall X Y (φ ψ : lkf), display_derivation X φ ->
  display_derivation ψ Y -> display_derivation (φ \ ψ) (X [\] Y)
| lresL : forall X (φ ψ : lkf),
  display_derivation X (φ [/] ψ) -> display_derivation X (φ / ψ)
| lresR : forall X Y (φ ψ : lkf), display_derivation φ X ->
  display_derivation Y ψ -> display_derivation (φ / ψ) (X [/] Y)
| cut : forall (φ : lkf) X Z, display_derivation X φ ->
  display_derivation φ Z -> display_derivation X Z
  
```

Figure 8: Implementation of Goré’s Non-Associative Lambek Display Calculus, we call it DL_{Lambek}

<p>Axiom:</p> $\frac{}{p \vdash p} \text{Id}$	<p>Residuation:</p> $\frac{X \vdash Z[/]Y}{X[\otimes]Y \vdash Z} \text{dp1}$ $\frac{X[\otimes]Y \vdash Z}{Y \vdash X[\backslash]Z} \text{dp2}$	
<p>For \otimes:</p> $\frac{X_1 \vdash \varphi_1 \quad X_2 \vdash \varphi_2}{X_1[\otimes]X_2 \vdash \varphi_1 \otimes \varphi_2} \vdash \otimes$ $\frac{\varphi_1[\otimes]\varphi_2 \vdash X}{\varphi_1 \otimes \varphi_2 \vdash X} \otimes \vdash$	<p>For \backslash:</p> $\frac{X_1 \vdash \varphi_1 \quad \varphi_2 \vdash X_2}{\varphi_1 \backslash \varphi_2 \vdash X_1[\backslash]X_2} \vdash \backslash$ $\frac{X \vdash \varphi_1[\backslash]\varphi_2}{X \vdash \varphi_1 \backslash \varphi_2} \backslash \vdash$	<p>For $/$:</p> $\frac{\varphi_1 \vdash X_1 \quad X_2 \vdash \varphi_2}{\varphi_1 / \varphi_2 \vdash X_1[/]X_2} \vdash /$ $\frac{X \vdash \varphi_1[/]\varphi_2}{X \vdash \varphi_1 / \varphi_2} / \vdash$

Rules of DL_{Lambek}

The rules of the calculus derived from atomic logics for \otimes_α are:

<p>For any $p = (\mathbf{id}, \pm, k, \pm) \in L$:</p> $\frac{[p] \vdash Z}{[p] \vdash Z} \text{ dsr1}p.\mathbf{id}$ <hr style="width: 50%; margin: 10px auto;"/> <p>For any $q = (\mathbf{id}, -\pm, k, \pm) \in L$:</p> $\frac{X \vdash [q]}{X \vdash [q]} \text{ dsr1}q.\mathbf{id}$	<p>For $\otimes \in L$:</p> $\frac{X[\otimes]Y \vdash Z}{X[\otimes]Y \vdash Z} \text{ dsr1}\otimes.\mathbf{id}$ $\frac{X[\otimes]Y \vdash Z}{Y \vdash X[\setminus]Z} \text{ dsr1}\otimes.(2\ 3)$ $\frac{Y \vdash X[\setminus]Z}{X \vdash Z[/]Y} \text{ dsr1}\otimes.(1\ 3)$ $\frac{X \vdash Z[/]Y}{Y[\otimes_{\text{rev}}]X \vdash Z} \text{ dsr1}\otimes.(1\ 2)$ $\frac{Y[\otimes_{\text{rev}}]X \vdash Z}{Y \vdash Z[/_{\text{rev}}]X} \text{ dsr1}\otimes.(1\ 2\ 3)$ $\frac{Y \vdash Z[/_{\text{rev}}]X}{X \vdash Y[\setminus_{\text{rev}}]Z} \text{ dsr1}\otimes.(3\ 2\ 1)$
---	---

Display Rules of ASL_{Lambek}

<p>For any $p = (\mathbf{id}, \pm, k, \pm) \in L$:</p> $\frac{}{[p] \vdash p} \vdash p \quad \frac{[p] \vdash X}{p \vdash X} p \vdash$	<p>For any $q = (\mathbf{id}, -\pm, k, \pm) \in L$:</p> $\frac{}{q \vdash [q]} \vdash q \quad \frac{X \vdash [q]}{X \vdash q} q \vdash$
<p>For $\otimes \in L$:</p> $\frac{X_1 \vdash \varphi_1 \quad X_2 \vdash \varphi_2}{X_1[\otimes]X_2 \vdash \varphi_1 \otimes \varphi_2} \vdash \otimes$ $\frac{\varphi_1[\otimes]\varphi_2 \vdash X}{\varphi_1 \otimes \varphi_2 \vdash X} \otimes \vdash$	
<p>For $\setminus \in L$:</p> $\frac{X_1 \vdash \varphi_1 \quad \varphi_2 \vdash X_2}{\varphi_1 \setminus \varphi_2 \vdash X_1[\setminus]X_2} \vdash \setminus$ $\frac{X \vdash \varphi_1[\setminus]\varphi_2}{X \vdash \varphi_1 \setminus \varphi_2} \setminus \vdash$	<p>For $/ \in L$:</p> $\frac{\varphi_1 \vdash X_1 \quad X_2 \vdash \varphi_2}{\varphi_1 / \varphi_2 \vdash X_1[/]X_2} \vdash /$ $\frac{X \vdash \varphi_1[/]\varphi_2}{X \vdash \varphi_1 / \varphi_2} / \vdash$

Left and Right Introduction Rules of ASL_{Lambek}

As an example, we show the calculations for the rule $dsr1.(2\ 3)$.

$$\frac{S_{\mathcal{E}}([\otimes], X, Y, Z) = S_{\exists}(X[\otimes]Y, Z) = X[\otimes]Y \vdash Z}{S_{\mathcal{E}}([\wedge], X, Z, Y) = S_{\forall}(X[\wedge]Z, Y) = Y \vdash X[\wedge]Z} dsr1\otimes.(2\ 3)$$

We will characterize the relationship between the three Calculi.

Theorem 8. *Let L be the Lambek Connective Family:*

- If $X, Y \in [\mathcal{L}_L]$ do not contain $[p]$ or $*$, $X \vdash_{ASLL} Y$ in the $\{[\otimes] \mid \otimes \in L\}$ -fragment of $ASLL$ if and only if $X \vdash_{DL_{Lambek}} Y$.
- If $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{L}_L$, $\varphi \vdash_{ASLL} \psi$ if and only if $\varphi \vdash_{DL_{Lambek}} \psi$ if and only if $\varphi \vdash_{\mathbb{FL}} \psi$.

Proof. We use proposition 24 to reduce the number of structural connective appearing in the $ASLL$ -derivation.

We begin by showing equivalence between display calculi, ignoring structural propositional connectives.

The display rules are exactly the same for the set of connectives \otimes, \backslash and $/$ and their restricted rule-set. Also, the Introduction rules for binary connectives. The systems only differ by the Axiom Id in DL and the left and right introduction rules for the propositional variables in C in $ASLL$.

We have already shown that Id is derivable in $ASLL$. Now transforming any derivation $X \vdash_{DL_{Lambek}} Y$ into a derivation $X \vdash_{ASLL} Y$ is trivial.

We want to see that if $X \vdash_{ASLL} Y$ does not contain any $[p]$ or $[q]$, then we can get a derivation $X \vdash_{DL_{Lambek}} Y$. We proceed by induction on the derivation. By what we commented before, the last inference must be some $p \vdash, q \vdash, dsr1\otimes, \otimes \vdash, \backslash \vdash, / \vdash, \vdash \otimes, \vdash \backslash$ or $\vdash /$. In the first two cases the premise has $[p]$ or $[q]$ in some sequent, so that we can't apply the induction step. We have a derivable premise $[p] \vdash X$ (where X has not any $[p']$ nor $[q']$) and therefore, on the derivation, they must have been introduced by $\vdash p$ or $\vdash q$. In either case we delete all $dsr1p.id$ and $dsr1q.id$ and we change the usages of $\vdash p$ or $\vdash q$ for premises $[p] \vdash p$ and $q \vdash [q]$, respectively. Now we change all the usages of $p \vdash$ by premises $p \vdash p$ and $q \vdash q$. The new derivation doesn't have any appearance of $[p]$ nor $[q]$ and can therefore be translated into DL_{Lambek} . Note how the premises $p \vdash p, q \vdash q$ now can be changed into instances of the id axiom, so that we get from the derivation a proof of $X \vdash_{DL_{Lambek}} Y$.

For all $X, Y \in [\mathcal{L}_L]$ not containing $[p]$ or $*$ a proof of $X \vdash_{DL} Y$ implies $\tau_- X \vdash_{\mathbb{FL}} \tau_+ Y$ and for all $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{L}_L$ a proof of $\varphi \vdash_{\mathbb{FL}} \psi$ implies $\varphi \vdash_{DL} \psi$ are found in the Coq code. By using Corollary 1 and the first point, we get the second point.

□

Corollary $\text{dp_lambek_lcf} (\varphi \psi : \text{lcf}) : (\varphi \vdash \psi) \% \text{lks} \rightarrow (\varphi \vdash \psi)$.

Theorem $\text{lambek_dp_lcf} \varphi \psi : (\varphi \vdash \psi) \rightarrow (\varphi \vdash \psi) \% \text{lks}$.

Figure 9: We have proven the second point of Theorem 8 in Coq

We can also compute its semantics.

The interpretation for Lambek Calculus' formulas given by the Atomic Logics is defined inductively as follows:

Definition 30. For the set W , the relation R and model $M = (W, \{R\})$:

- $\llbracket \varphi \otimes \psi \rrbracket := \{w \in W \mid \exists u, v \in W, u \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \wedge v \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket \wedge R u v w\}$.
- $\llbracket \varphi \setminus \psi \rrbracket := \{w \in W \mid \forall u, v \in W, u \notin \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \vee v \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket \vee R u w v\}$.
- $\llbracket \varphi / \psi \rrbracket := \{w \in W \mid \forall u, v \in W, u \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \vee v \notin \llbracket \psi \rrbracket \vee R w v u\}$.

This semantics are equal to the semantics given in definition 2.

As we commented before the Bi-Lambek calculus lacks some connectives from the full $\alpha \times \zeta$ -orbit. We list them below in Aucher's syntaxis:

- $\otimes_{\text{rev}}: ((1\ 2), +, \exists, 1, (1, 1), (+, +))$.
- $/_{\text{rev}}: ((1\ 2\ 3), -, \forall, 1, (1, 1), (+, -))$.
- $\setminus_{\text{rev}}: ((3\ 2\ 1), -, \forall, 1, (1, 1), (-, +))$.
- $\oplus_{\text{rev}}: ((1\ 2), -, \forall, 1, (1, 1), (+, +))$.
- $<_{\text{rev}}: ((1\ 2\ 3), +, \exists, 1, (1, 1), (+, -))$.
- $>_{\text{rev}}: ((3\ 2\ 1), +, \exists, 1, (1, 1), (-, +))$.

6.2 Boolean Connectives and Hilbert Calculus

Definition 31. The Boolean Connectives set B is formed of exactly the following non-variables connectives, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

- $\perp_k: (id, k, +, -)$.
- $\neg_k: (id, k, (-, +), -)$.
- $\wedge_k: (id, (k, k, k), (+, +, +), -)$.
- $\top_k: (id, k, -, -)$.
- $\rightarrow_k: ((2\ 3), (k, k, k), (-, +, -), -)$.
- $\vee_k: (id, (k, k, k), (+, +, -), -)$.

Furthermore we add a non-empty set of variables of output type k and all possible tonicities.

By abuse of notation we avoid the type subindex.

- The partition is $\{\{\perp, \top\}, \{\neg\}, \{\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow\}\}$.
- The actions are $\alpha \times \varsigma$ on the connectives and id on the variables.

We note $[\wedge] = [\vee] = ,$, $\alpha((1\ 2), [\wedge]) = \alpha((1\ 2), [\vee]) = ,_{rev}$, $\alpha((1\ 3), [\wedge]) = [\leftarrow]$, $\varsigma((+, +, -), [\leftarrow]) = [\leftarrow']$, $\alpha((1\ 2), [\leftarrow]) = [\leftarrow_{rev}]$, $\alpha \times \varsigma((+, +, -)(1\ 2), [\leftarrow]) = [\leftarrow'_{rev}]$, $\varsigma((+, +, -), [\rightarrow]) = [\rightarrow']$, $\alpha((1\ 2), [\rightarrow]) = [\rightarrow_{rev}]$, $\alpha \times \varsigma((+, +, -)(1\ 2), [\rightarrow]) = [\rightarrow'_{rev}]$ and $[\top] = [\perp] = I$. This poses no problem as the different structural connectives associated can be distinguished by whether they appear in the antecedent or the consequent.

Furthermore, we define $[\neg'] = \varsigma((+, +, -), [\neg]) = *$ and $[\neg] = *$. This is well-defined because $*[\neg] = [\neg']*$, so that $* \ast X$ has a unique meaning depending on whether it appears in the antecedent or the consequent, and $\neg\neg\varphi \dashv\vdash \varphi$ and $\neg' \neg \varphi \dashv\vdash \varphi$.

We add the following rules to GGL_B :

Structural Rules:

The rule $CI\vdash$:

For any $X, Y, U \in [\mathcal{L}_C]$,

$$\frac{(X, Y) \vdash U}{(Y, X) \vdash U} CI\vdash$$

The rule $K\vdash$:

For any $X, Y, U \in [\mathcal{L}_C]$,

$$\frac{X \vdash U}{(X, Y) \vdash U} K\vdash$$

The rule $WI\vdash$:

For any $X, U \in [\mathcal{L}_C]^n$,

$$\frac{(X, X) \vdash U}{X \vdash U} WI\vdash$$

The rule $IWI\vdash$:

For any $X, U \in [\mathcal{L}_C]^n$,

$$\frac{(X, I) \vdash U}{X \vdash U} IWI\vdash$$

The rule $dr2$:

For any $X, Y, Z \in [\mathcal{L}_C]^n$,

$$\frac{(X, Y) \vdash Z}{X \vdash (Z, *Y)} dr2$$

A Boolean Connective Family C is a Connective Family $C := B \sqcup C'$, for some Connective Family C' , where we consider its proof system GGL_C as the rules of GGL_B along with the rules of GGL_C^0 from example 9.

Using $CI\vdash$, $dsr1$ and $dr2$ we can show:

- $(X, Y) \vdash U$ if and only if $(X_{,rev} Y) \vdash U$.
- $U \vdash (X, Y)$ if and only if $U \vdash (X_{,rev} Y)$.
- $(X, *Y) \vdash U$ if and only if $X[\leftarrow']_{rev} Y \vdash U$ if and only if $Y[\rightarrow'] X \vdash U$
if and only if $Y[\rightarrow']_{rev} X \vdash U$ if and only if $X[\leftarrow'] Y \vdash U$.

- $U \vdash (X, *Y)$ if and only if $U \vdash X[\leftarrow]_{\text{rev}} Y$ if and only if $U \vdash Y[\rightarrow] X$
if and only if $U \vdash Y[\rightarrow]_{\text{rev}} X$ if and only if $U \vdash X[\leftarrow] Y$.

Proposition 27. *Let C be a Boolean Connective Family with actions on non-variable connectives $\alpha * \beta$. The rule d_{sr2} is eliminable in GGL_C .*

Proof. Let X be a structure $[\odot](X_1, \dots, X_n)$ with $[\bar{\odot}]$ non-compatible with β .

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{X \vdash Y}{(X, I) \vdash Y} \text{K}\vdash}{(I, X) \vdash Y} \text{CI}\vdash}{(I, *Y) \vdash *X} \text{dr2}}{*Y \vdash *X} \text{IW}\vdash$$

□

We note $I \vdash X$ as $\vdash X$ and $X \vdash I$ as $X \vdash$.

Let C be a Boolean Connective Family with action $\alpha * \beta$ on non-variable connectives, we will now define a new calculus for it on formulas. The rules for Atomic Hilbert's Calculus are found in figure 10.

Some other rules can be derived from AHL_C :

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\odot \in C$ of arity n , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{L}_C$, $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\odot) = \forall$,

If $\pm_j(\odot) = +$,

$$\frac{\vdash \varphi_j}{\vdash \odot(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n)} \text{R1}$$

If $\pm_j(\odot) = -$,

$$\frac{\vdash \neg \varphi_j}{\vdash \odot(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n)} \text{R2}$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\odot \in C$ of arity n , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\varphi_i, \varphi'_j \in \mathcal{L}_C$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\odot) = \exists$ and $\pm(\odot)_j = +$,

$$\frac{}{\vdash \odot(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j \vee \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \rightarrow (\odot(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \vee \odot(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n))} \text{A5}$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\odot \in C$ of arity n , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\varphi_i, \varphi'_j \in \mathcal{L}_C$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\odot) = \exists$ and $\pm(\odot)_j = -$,

$$\frac{}{\vdash \odot(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j \wedge \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \rightarrow (\odot(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \vee \odot(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n))} \text{A6}$$

Axioms:

The axiom A0:

$$\frac{}{\vdash \top} \text{A0}$$

The axiom A0':

$$\frac{}{\vdash \neg \perp} \text{A0'}$$

The axiom A1:

For any $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_C$,

$$\frac{}{\vdash \varphi \rightarrow (\varphi \wedge \varphi)} \text{A1}$$

The axiom A2:

For any $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{L}_C$,

$$\frac{}{\vdash (\varphi \wedge \psi) \rightarrow \varphi} \text{A2}$$

The axiom A3:

For any $\varphi, \psi, \rho \in \mathcal{L}_C$,

$$\frac{}{\vdash (\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\neg(\psi \wedge \rho) \rightarrow \neg(\rho \wedge \varphi))} \text{A3}$$

The axiom A4:

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\otimes \in C$ of arity n , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{L}_C$,

$$\frac{}{\vdash \neg \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \leftrightarrow \neg \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)} \text{A4}$$

The axiom A7:

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\otimes \in C$ of arity n , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{L}_C$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\otimes) = \exists$,

$$\frac{}{\vdash \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, (j \ n + 1) \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots \varphi_n) \rightarrow \varphi_j} \text{A7}$$

The axiom A8:

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\otimes \in C$ of arity n , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{L}_C$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\otimes) = \forall$,

$$\frac{}{\vdash \varphi_j \rightarrow \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, (j \ n + 1) \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots \varphi_n)} \text{A8}$$

Axioms of Hilbert Calculus of Atomic Logics

Inference Rules:

The rule R3:

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\otimes \in C$ of arity n , $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\varphi_i, \psi_j \in \mathcal{L}_C$ such that $\pm_j(\otimes)\mathcal{A}(\otimes) = \exists$,

$$\frac{\vdash \varphi_j \rightarrow \psi_j}{\vdash \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \rightarrow \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \psi_j, \dots, \varphi_n)} \text{R3}$$

The rule R4:

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\otimes \in C$ of arity n , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{L}_C$, $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\pm_j(\otimes)\mathcal{A}(\otimes) = \forall$,

$$\frac{\vdash \psi_j \rightarrow \varphi_j}{\vdash \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \rightarrow \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \psi_j, \dots, \varphi_n)} \text{R4}$$

The rule MP:

For any $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{L}_C$,

$$\frac{\vdash \varphi \quad \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\vdash \psi} \text{MP}$$

Rules of Hilbert Calculus of Atomic Logics

Figure 10: Hilbert Calculus of Atomic Logics, $AHLC$

Theorem 9. *Let C be a Boolean Connective Family. Let X, Y be $\{[\otimes] \mid \otimes \in C\}$ -structures, the sequent $X \vdash Y$ is derivable in GGL_C if and only if the formula $\vdash \tau(X \vdash Y)$ is derivable in AHL_C , where $\tau(X \vdash Y) = \tau_-(X) \rightarrow \tau_+(Y)$.*

Proof. Let X and Y be structures. We begin by taking a derivation in the $\{[\otimes] \mid \otimes \in C\}$ -fragment of ASL_C of $X \vdash_{ASL_C} Y$ and proving $\vdash \tau(X \vdash Y)$ in AHL_C , we will proceed by induction on the derivation.

The usages of *dr1* refer to the rule *dsr1* for α , in accordance to what was observed in example 9, and the usages of *dr2* refer to the one presented in GGL_C .

- If the last inference of the derivation was some of the structural rules, the derivation corresponds to a propositional logic lemma.
- If the last inference of the derivation was *dr2* and we have structures X, Y and Z such that by induction hypothesis we can derivate $\vdash \tau((X, Y) \vdash Z)$, this is $\vdash \tau_-(X) \wedge \tau_-(Y) \rightarrow \tau_+(Z)$, then by a propositional logics' lemma we get $\vdash \tau_-(X) \rightarrow \tau_+(Z) \vee \neg \tau_-(Y)$. Using *A4* and doing case analysis on Y we know that $\vdash \tau_+(*Y) \rightarrow \neg \tau_-(Y)$ so that by *R4* we get $\vdash (\tau_+(Z) \vee \neg \tau_-(Y)) \rightarrow \tau_+(Z) \vee \tau_+(*Y)$. Transitivity of \rightarrow lets us finish with $\vdash \tau(X \vdash (Z, *Y))$.
- If the last inference of the derivation was *dsr1* and $\mathcal{A}(\otimes) = \exists$, then by induction hypothesis we have $\vdash \otimes(\tau_{-\pm_1(\otimes)}(X_1), \dots, \tau_{-\pm_1(\otimes)}(X_1)) \rightarrow \tau_+(X_{n+1})$. We will prove $\vdash \tau(\alpha * \beta((b_1, \sigma_1) \cdots (b_l, \sigma_l), [\otimes](X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})))$ in the Hilbert System. It suffices to show it true α for $(i \ n + 1)$, as consecutive applications of the rule *dsr1* over σ and σ' are the same as the rule *dsr1* over $\sigma' \circ \sigma$ and β for $-$ for the same reason. If we take $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n)$ and we decompose it in transpositions, all having $n + 1$ in the support (the algorithm consists on recursively multiplying σ by $(n + 1 \ \sigma^-(n + 1))$ on the left, which will take $\sigma^-(n + 1)$ out from the support of σ , σ will equal the permutations needed to reach the identity in the reverse order), we can extend the inference to any permutation. Composing both the α and β cases we get the derivation for $\alpha * \beta$.

Let $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and we further assume $\pm_j(\otimes) = +$, by induction hypothesis we have

$$\vdash \otimes(\tau_{-\pm_1(\otimes)}(X_1), \dots, \tau_{-\pm_n(\otimes)}(X_n)) \rightarrow \tau_+(X_{n+1})$$

Therefore, by *R3*, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \vdash (j \ n + 1)\otimes(\tau_{-\pm_1(\otimes)}(X_1), \dots, \otimes(\tau_{-\pm_1(\otimes)}(X_1), \dots, \tau_{-\pm_1(\otimes)}(X_1)), \dots, \tau_{-\pm_n(\otimes)}(X_n)) \rightarrow \\ (j \ n + 1)\otimes(\tau_{-\pm_1(\otimes)}(X_1), \dots, \tau_+(X_{n+1}), \dots, \tau_{-\pm_n(\otimes)}(X_n)) \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

We conclude by transitivity of \rightarrow on the axiom $A8$

$$\vdash \tau_{-\pm_j(\otimes)}(X_j) \rightarrow (j+1)\otimes(\tau_{-\pm_1(\otimes)}(X_1), \dots, \otimes(\tau_{-\pm_1(\otimes)}(X_1), \dots, \tau_{-\pm_1(\otimes)}(X_1)), \dots, \tau_{-\pm_n(\otimes)}(X_n))$$

and the sequent on derivation 2.

Whenever $\pm_j(\otimes) = -$ we repeat the same procedure, but using $A7$ and $R4$. Whenever $\mathcal{A}(\otimes) = \forall$ we repeat the same procedure but using, respectively, $A7$ and $R3$ and $A8$ and $R4$.

- We will prove now $\vdash \otimes$, assuming that we can translate all sequents from the hypothesis. We assume $\mathcal{A}(\otimes) = \exists$. We proceed by induction on k over

$$\vdash \otimes(\tau_{-\pm_1}(X_1), \dots, \tau_{-\pm_n}(X_n)) \rightarrow \otimes(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k, \tau_{-\pm_{k+1}}(X_{k+1}), \dots, \tau_{-\pm_n}(X_n))$$

The base case $k = 0$ is the propositional logic result $\vdash A \rightarrow A$. The induction step consists on using transitivity of \rightarrow after:

- when $\pm_{k+1} = +$, $R3$ for the first induction hypothesis on $X_{k+1} \vdash \varphi_{k+1} (\vdash \tau_+(X_{k+1}) \rightarrow \varphi_{k+1})$.
- when $\pm_{k+1} = -$, $R4$ for the first induction hypothesis on $\varphi_{k+1} \vdash X_{k+1} (\vdash \varphi_{k+1} \rightarrow \tau_-(X_{k+1}))$.

When $\mathcal{A}(\otimes) = \forall$ we inverse the applications of $R3$ and $R4$.

The proof for the action of β corresponds to eliminating $dr2$.

- Applying induction hypothesis to the premises of $\otimes \vdash$ we can trivially infer the conclusions, as they are the same sequents.

We now want to prove that if we can derive $\vdash \tau(X \vdash Y)$ in $AHLC$ then we can derive $\vdash \tau(X \vdash Y)$ in $ASLC$. We proceed by induction on the Hilbert Calculi derivation.

We want to highlight the following derivations

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\varphi \vdash \psi}{\varphi, I \vdash \psi} \text{KI-}}{I, \varphi \vdash \psi} \text{CI-}}{I \vdash \varphi[\rightarrow]\psi} \text{dsr2}\wedge.(23) \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{I \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{I \vdash \varphi[\rightarrow]\psi} \rightarrow\vdash-}{\varphi, I \vdash \psi} \text{CI-}}{\varphi \vdash \psi} \text{IWI-}$$

Therefore $\varphi \vdash_{ASLL} \psi$ can be derived if and only if $\vdash_{ASLL} \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ can be derived.

- The inference rules which only use booleans connectives are lemmas from propositional logic.
- We want to prove axiom *A4*. First we prove $\vdash \neg\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \rightarrow \neg\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$ and then $\vdash \neg\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \rightarrow \neg\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$. With both sequents, by using $\vdash \wedge$ and *IWI* \vdash we derive *A4*.

We suppose first $\mathcal{A}(\star) = \exists$. To prove $\vdash \neg\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \rightarrow \neg\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$ we begin with the identities $\varphi_1 \vdash \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \vdash \varphi_n$ and applying $\vdash \star$, we infer $[\star](\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \vdash \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$. Now by *dsr2* we have $\star\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \vdash \star[\star](\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$. We then use $\neg \vdash$ on the left and $\neg\star \vdash$ on the right, to find $\neg\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \vdash \neg\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$. We end with *K* \vdash , *dsr1* \wedge and $\rightarrow \vdash$.

Now to prove $\vdash \neg\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \rightarrow \neg\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$ we begin with the identity $\neg\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \vdash \neg\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$. Using the inverse inference of $\neg\star \vdash$ (Proposition 23) and then $\neg \vdash$ we deduce $\neg\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \vdash \neg\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$. We end with *K* \vdash , *dsr1* \wedge and $\rightarrow \vdash$.

If $\mathcal{A}(\star) = \forall$ we invert the proof's order.

- Now the proof of *A7*.
It corresponds to *dr1* after applying the inverse of $(j \ n + 1)\star \vdash$ on the right of $(j \ n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \vdash (j \ n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$. We end by using *dr2*.
- The proof of *A8*. It corresponds to *dr1* after applying the inverse of $(j \ n + 1)\star \vdash$ on the left of $(j \ n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \vdash (j \ n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$. We end by using *dr2*.
- The proof of *R3*.
It corresponds to the inverse of $\rightarrow \vdash$, *dr2*, $\vdash \star$, *dr2* and $\rightarrow \vdash$ in that order.
- Finally, the proof of *R4*.
It corresponds to the inverse of $\rightarrow \vdash$, *dr2*, $\vdash \star$, *dr2* and $\rightarrow \vdash$ in that order.

□

We now write the proof of *R1* and *A5*, which will also illustrate how *R2* and *A6* are proven.

Proof of *R1*:

We have $\vdash \varphi_j$, by using *MP* on axiom *A8*

we get $\vdash \star(\varphi_1, \dots, (j \ n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n)$.

Furthermore, by Rule *R3* on the propositional logic's result $\vdash (j \ n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \rightarrow \top$

we get $\vdash \star(\varphi_1, \dots, (j \ n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n) \rightarrow \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \top, \dots, \varphi_n)$.

The rule *MP* gets us $\vdash \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \top, \dots, \varphi_n)$.

We use rule *R3* on $\vdash \top \rightarrow \varphi_j$ to get $\vdash \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \top, \dots, \varphi_n) \rightarrow \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n)$.

We end by using again the rule *MP*.

Proof of A5:

We have by axiom A8 that $\vdash \varphi_j \rightarrow (j n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n)$
and $\vdash \varphi'_j \rightarrow (j n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n)$.

We get by R3 on the propositional logics results

$\vdash \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \rightarrow \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \vee \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n)$
and $\vdash \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \rightarrow \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \vee \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n)$ that

$\vdash (j n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n)$
 $\rightarrow (j n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \vee \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n)$

and

$\vdash (j n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n)$
 $\rightarrow (j n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \vee \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n)$

By transitivity of \rightarrow we get

$\vdash \varphi_1 \rightarrow (j n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \vee \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n)$

and

$\vdash \varphi'_1 \rightarrow (j n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \vee \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n)$

Propositional logic results give us

$\vdash (\varphi_j \vee \varphi'_j) \rightarrow (j n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \vee \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n)$

By rule R3,

$\vdash \star(\varphi_1, \dots, (\varphi_j \vee \varphi'_j), \dots, \varphi_n)$
 $\rightarrow (\star(\varphi_1, \dots,$
 $(j n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \vee \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n))$

Axiom A7 tells us

$\vdash \star(\varphi_1, \dots, (j n + 1)\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \vee \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n), \dots, \varphi_n)$
 $\rightarrow (\star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_j, \dots, \varphi_n) \vee \star(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi'_j, \dots, \varphi_n))$

We finish the derivation by transitivity of \rightarrow .

7 Conclusions and Future Work

The context in which this report is written is the discovery by Aucher that residuation can be explained with two group actions. In this report we see that using a class of actions we can still prove the display theorem for their Atomic Logics, reinforcing Aucher's findings. Through this framework left and right introduction rules are already given (although it may sometimes be necessary to work with a composition of Atomic Logics rules, called then Molecular Logics), reducing the problem of defining a logics into extending the proof system with structural rules in an approach satisfying Došen principle. Some of the problems we found in the process of formalizing Atomic Logics were related to the lack of a precise definition for connective families, which we just introduced.

In this report we have provided a finitary version of Aucher's action by using the semi-direct product of the actions $\alpha : \text{Sym}(n + 1) \rightarrow \text{GL}(\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$ and $\varsigma : (\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \rightarrow \text{GL}(\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1}$. We have also given an explicit formulation for his version of the action. We constructed a new framework where we can compare different possible versions of actions on connective families. This includes definitions for connectives and structures by algebraic means. In proposition 19 we have given a result which makes it possible to construct a new sequent calculus and prove the display theorem 5 in arbitrary connective families (not necessarily using the $\alpha * \beta$ action). Other results in the report are the proof of redundancy of 4 Hilbert System Rules, the proof of equivalence between the Hilbert and the Sequent Systems for Atomic Logics, the proof of Craig Interpolation on Atomic Logics and the proof of proposition 25. This last proposition gives a contraexample to the reciprocal of proposition 20 and it shows the need for explicitly giving the partitions on propositional letters. The author personal interpretation on this report is that an algebraic interpretation of Atomic Logics properties has made possible a better understanding on the matter, and provided necessary changes on the theory for its implementation on a proof-assistant.

There are some topics this report has not covered. Namely, the construction of a connective family with action on $(\mathbb{Z} / 2\mathbb{Z})^{n+1} \times \mathbb{Z} / (n + 1)\mathbb{Z}$, whose logic is equi-expressive to the one given by $\alpha \times \varsigma$ by using proposition 26, greatly reducing so the complexity of the resulting Atomic Logics, a study on how to fully embed boolean negation structural connective $*$ inside connective families, a study on how to properly add structural rules to the proof systems and properly formalize a wider range of logics with it. Possibly this last point will be best covered in a proof-checker software, where we might profit from formalizing on it proposition 19 before establishing a choice for the actions we are interested in for Connective Families. Specially relevant would be to have a survey on those properties in proof systems we are interested in proving within the general context of fragments of first-order logics. Some open questions are whether it is possible to have connective families more expressive than those of action $\alpha * \beta$, how does adding structural connectives change a connective families and sufficient and necessary conditions for completeness of the newly presented ASL_C Calculi with regard to the Kripke semantics.

References

- [1] Guillaume Aucher. *A Characterization of Properly Displayable Atomic and Molecular Logics*. Research Report. Université de Rennes 1, Oct. 2022. URL: <https://inria.hal.science/hal-03800070>.
- [2] Guillaume Aucher. *Display and Hilbert Calculi for Atomic and Molecular Logics*. Research Report. Université de Rennes 1, Oct. 2022. URL: <https://inria.hal.science/hal-03800002>.
- [3] Guillaume Aucher. *Generalized Keisler Theorems for Atomic and Molecular Logics*. Tech. rep. Université de Rennes 1, Dec. 2022. URL: <https://hal.science/hal-03884240>.
- [4] Guillaume Aucher. “On the Universality of Atomic and Molecular Logics via Protologics.” In: *Logica Universalis* 16.1-2 (June 2022), pp. 285–322. doi: 10.1007/s11787-022-00298-5. URL: <https://hal.science/hal-03911802>.
- [5] Guillaume Aucher. “Towards Universal Logic: Gaggle Logics.” In: *Selected Topics from Contemporary Logics*. Ed. by Melvin Fitting. Landscapes in Logic. College Publications, Oct. 2021, pp. 5–73. URL: <https://hal.science/hal-03498949>.
- [6] Nuel D. Belnap. “Display Logic.” In: *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 11.4 (1982), pp. 375–417. ISSN: 00223611, 15730433. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30226258> (visited on 06/04/2023).
- [7] Katalin Bimbó and J. Michael Dunn. “Generalized Galois Logics: Relational Semantics of Non-classical Logical Calculi.” In: 2008, pp. 17–19.
- [8] J. Michael Dunn. “Gaggle theory: An abstraction of Galois connections and residuation, with applications to negation, implication, and various logical operators.” In: *Logics in AI*. Ed. by J. van Eijck. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1991, pp. 31–51. ISBN: 978-3-540-46982-7.
- [9] Gerhard Gentzen. “Investigations into Logical Deduction.” In: *American Philosophical Quarterly* 1.4 (1964), pp. 288–306. ISSN: 00030481. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20009142> (visited on 06/04/2023).
- [10] Rajeev Goré. “Substructural Logics on Display.” In: *Log. J. IGPL* 6 (1998), pp. 451–504.
- [11] Joachim Lambek. “On the Calculus of Syntactic Types.” In: 1961.
- [12] Michael Moortgat. “Categorical investigations. Logical and linguistic aspects of the Lambek calculus. Groningen-Amsterdam studies in semantics, no. 9. Foris Publications, Dordrecht and Providence 1988, xiii 285 pp.” In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 57.3 (1992), pp. 1143–1146. doi: 10.2307/2275460.
- [13] ohne Autor. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 2019. URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/index.html> (visited on 06/23/2023).
- [14] Hiroakira Ono. “Proof-Theoretic Methods in Nonclassical Logic –an Introduction.” In: 1998.

- [15] Hiroakira Ono. “Substructural Logics and Residuated Lattices — an Introduction.” In: *Trends in Logic: 50 Years of Studia Logica*. Ed. by Vincent F. Hendricks and Jacek Malinowski. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2003, pp. 193–228. ISBN: 978-94-017-3598-8. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-017-3598-8-8_8. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-3598-8_8.
- [16] F. Poggiolesi. *Gentzen Calculi for Modal Propositional Logic*. Trends in Logic. Springer Netherlands, 2010. ISBN: 9789048196708. URL: <https://books.google.fr/books?id=e7e2XCxhDEsC>.
- [17] A. S. Troelstra and H. Schwichtenberg. “N-systems and H-systems.” In: *Basic Proof Theory*. 2nd ed. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science. Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 35–59. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139168717.003.

Some Comments on the Internship

The Master Thesis research has mainly developed in two halves. On the first half we planned to write down in Coq the proof system and semantics of Atomic Logics and then going on proving the display theorem, consistency with regard to the semantics and some results on those lines. For it I chose the *mathcomp* library as an appropriate context for introducing Atomic Logics, both for its usage of group theory and for the common goal of keeping everything computable. At this point the formalization showed several difficulties, which did not seem natural in the problem we were working on. Indeed, the action presented in Guillaume Aucher’s articles required a lot of dependent typing for its definition and furthermore it used a free product of groups, which is an infinite groups. This second point was a huge problem, as *mathcomp* does not work with infinite groups. For this reason I tried to work separately with the display calculus using only the rule *dr1*, resulting on the *proof of action* commit, where I provide a version of the proof system without *dr2*. By this point I had already found a function which did the same as Guillaume Action but without having to resort to its definition as an action and I was planning to go on into adding *dr2* without even having to use the free product.

At that moment another problem showed up: I had been using full orbits and representing structures as copies of those full orbits. To have the most flexibility in the code we required for the connective set the possibility of being strict subsets of the full orbit. This point was quite worrying, as it was not clear to me what were the connective families. On this second half I begun to work on a precise formulation of connective families and structures. During this process I realised that the residuation action α in Atomic Logics was acting as a linear transformation on tonicity signatures. Guillaume pointed out to me that he had already expected some parallelism with geometry in his first article on the topic[5], so that this observation stays in line with the expectations. This geometrical interpretation turned out to be a useful insight, as it led me to use the semi-direct product of groups for providing a new action giving the same orbits to Aucher’s while being defined on a finite group.

Appendix: α is an action

In this appendix the theorem `sk_α_is_action` found in [proof of action commit](#) is presented. This constitutes a proof of Proposition 5. This original proof is quite long and Proposition 11 along with Proposition 12 constitute an alternative to it.

The code is written in the *SSReflect* extension of Coq and uses *mathcomp* libraries.

Theorem `sk_α_is_action {n} : is_action [set: 'Sym_n.+1] (@ska_Residuation n).`

Proof.

```
rewrite /ska_Residuation/sk_Residuation.
apply: is_total_action => [C|C p1 p2];
case: C => C Heq;
apply sa_inj => /=;
case: C Heq => n0 p s q t Heq.
f_equal.
- rewrite -permP => x.
  by rewrite permE /= cast_permE permE /= cast_ordKV.
- rewrite /= cast_permE permE /= cast_ordKV eq_refl /=.
  apply eq_from_tnth => i.
  by rewrite tnth_map cast_permE permE /= cast_ordKV tnth_ord_tuple.
- by rewrite cast_permE permE /= cast_ordKV eq_refl.
- apply eq_from_tnth => x.
  rewrite tnth_map /=.
f_equal.
  apply (@perm_inj _ (cast_perm (f_equal S (eqP Heq)) 1)).
  by rewrite cast_permE permE /= cast_ordKV tnth_ord_tuple.
case H1 : (cast_perm (f_equal succn (eqP Heq)) (p1 * p2) ord_max != ord_max);
last (move: H1 => /eqP H1);
(case H2 : (cast_perm (f_equal succn (eqP Heq)) p1 ord_max != ord_max);
last (move: H2 => /eqP H2);
(case H3 : (cast_perm (f_equal succn (eqP Heq)) p2 ord_max != ord_max);
last move : H3 => /eqP H3);
(f_equal;
first 1 [
  by rewrite /= -mulgA cast_perm_morphM |
apply eq_from_tnth => x;
rewrite !tnth_map !tnth_ord_tuple;
case H6 : (x != ord_max);
first (
  case H4 : (cast_perm (f_equal succn (eqP Heq)) (p1 * p2) x != ord_max);
```

```

    last (move: H4 => /eqP H4);
    (case H5 : (cast_perm (f_equal succn (eqP Heq)) p2 x != ord_max);
      last (move: H5 => /eqP H5));
      last (move: H6 => /eqP H6));
last 1 [apply eq_from_tnth => x; rewrite !tnth_map !tnth_ord_tuple;
by rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= cast_ordK];
try (rewrite !cast_permE permE /= in H1 H2 H3;
  by rewrite -[p2 _](cast_ordK (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) H3 H2 eq_refl in H1);
try (rewrite -[in RHS]H1 in H4;
  by rewrite (perm_inj H4) eq_refl in H6);
try (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3;
  rewrite -[p2 _](cast_ordK (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) H3 in H1;
  by rewrite H1 eq_refl in H2);
try (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3;
  move: H1; rewrite -[in RHS]H2 => /cast_ord_inj/perm_inj H1;
  by rewrite H1 !cast_ordKV eq_refl in H3);
try (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3;
  by rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= !cast_ordK
)).
- + rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3 H4 H5.
  repeat rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= !cast_ordK).
  rewrite !H1 /=.
  move: H1 (H4) => /negbTE H1 /negbTE H4'.
  rewrite !H1 !H4' /=.
  have H7 : (forall p' : 'Sym_n.+1, cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p' (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) x)) ==
    cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p' (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max)) = false).
  intros. apply/negbTE/eqP => /cast_ord_inj/perm_inj/cast_ord_inj/eqP.
  apply/negP. exact: H6.
  rewrite -{2}compM -{1}[p1 (p2 (cast_ord _ x))]compM.
  rewrite !H7.
  have H8 : cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p1 (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max))) ==
    cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p1 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max)) = false.
  apply/negbTE/eqP => /cast_ord_inj/perm_inj/eqP. apply/negP.
  exact: H3.
  have H9 : cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p1 (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) x))) ==
    cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p1 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max)) = false.
  apply/negbTE/eqP => /cast_ord_inj/perm_inj/eqP. apply/negP.
  exact: H5.
  rewrite !H8.

```

```

move: H5 => /negbTE H5.
rewrite !H5 !cast_ordK /= !H4 !H4' !H9.
rewrite !addTb !mulgE !addNb !negbK !addbN.
rewrite addbA -[_(+)(__ ( __ (p1 (p2 _)))(+)_]addbA.
rewrite [_ ( __ (p1 (p2 _)))(+)_ ( __ (p1 (cast_ord __)))]addbC addbA.
by rewrite addbb addFb.
+ rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3 H4 H5.
repeat (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= !cast_ordK).
move: (H1) (H4) => /negbTE H1' /negbTE H4'.
have H7 : (cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
  (p1 (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) x))) ==
  cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
  (p1 (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max)))) = false.
apply/negbTE/negP => /eqP/cast_ord_inj/perm_inj/perm_inj/cast_ord_inj.
exact/eqP.
have H9 : cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
  (p1 (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max))) ==
  cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
  (p1 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max)) = false.
apply/negbTE/eqP => /cast_ord_inj/perm_inj/eqP. apply/negP.
exact: H3.
rewrite H1' H4' H7 H9 /=.
rewrite -{1}[p2 ( __ x)](cast_ordK (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) H5.
by rewrite !addTb !mulgE !addNb -addbC.
+ rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3 H4 H5.
repeat (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= !cast_ordK).
have H7 : cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
  (p1 (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max))) ==
  cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
  (p1 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max)) = false.
apply/negbTE/negP => /eqP/cast_ord_inj/perm_inj.
exact/eqP.
have H8 : cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
  (p1 (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) x))) ==
  cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
  (p1 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max)) = false.
apply/negbTE/negP => /eqP/cast_ord_inj/perm_inj.
exact/eqP.
have H10 : cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
  (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) x))) ==
  cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
  (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max)) = false.
apply/negbTE/negP => /eqP/cast_ord_inj/perm_inj/cast_ord_inj.
exact/eqP.
move: (H1) (H5) => /negbTE H1' /negbTE H5'.

```



```

rewrite !H1 !H1' !H5' !H7 !H10 !cast_ordK !H8 !H4 eq_refl /=.
by rewrite !addTb !mulgE !addNb negbK addbC addbA addbb addFb.
+ rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3 H4 H5.
  rewrite -(p2 _)(cast_ordK (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) H5 in H4.
  by rewrite H4 eq_refl in H2.
+ rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3.
  repeat (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= !cast_ordK).
  move: (H1) (H2) (H3) => /negbTE H1' /negbTE H2' /negbTE H3'.
  have H9 : cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p1 (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max))) ==
    cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p1 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max)) = false.
  apply/negbTE/eqP => /cast_ord_inj/perm_inj/eqP. apply/negP.
  exact: H3.
  rewrite !H6 !H1 !H3 !H1' !H3' !H9 !eq_refl /= !H2' /=.
  rewrite !addTb !mulgE !addNb negbK !addbN addbA.
  by rewrite [( _ (+) _ ) as X in (X (+) __ ord_max)]addbC !addbA addbb addFb.
- rewrite tnth_map. rewrite tnth_ord_tuple. rewrite cast_permE permE /= in H1.
  rewrite compM tpermD; last first.
- apply/eqP => /perm_inj/esym. apply/eqP. exact: H3.
- rewrite eq_sym !cast_permE /= cast_ordK. exact: H1.
  rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= cast_ordK H1.
  rewrite !mulgA !mulgE [in RHS]/= !in _ (+) __ ( _ (p1 (cast_ord __)))addbC.
  by rewrite !addbA addbb addFb [_ (+) -]addbC.
+ rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3 H4 H5.
  repeat (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= !cast_ordK).
  have H9 : cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p1 (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) x))) ==
    cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p1 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max)) = false.
  apply/negbTE/eqP => /cast_ord_inj/perm_inj/eqP. apply/negP.
  exact: H5.
  have H7 : (cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p1 (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) x)))) ==
    cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p1 (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max))) = false).
  apply/negbTE/negP => /eqP/cast_ord_inj/perm_inj/perm_inj/cast_ord_inj.
  exact/eqP.
  move: (H5) (H4) => /negbTE H5' /negbTE H4'.
  rewrite !H4' !H9 !H7 /=.
  by rewrite -(p2 _ in LHS)(cast_ordK (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) H3.
+ rewrite -in RHS]H5 in H3.
  apply perm_inj in H3.
  by rewrite H3 eq_refl in H6.
+ rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3 H4 H5.

```

```

repeat (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= !cast_ordK).
rewrite !H4 eq_refl /=.
by rewrite -[(p2 _) in LHS](cast_ordK (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) H3.
+ rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3 H4 H5.
repeat (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= !cast_ordK).
rewrite -[(p2 _)](cast_ordK (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) H5 in H4.
by rewrite H4 eq_refl in H2.
+ rewrite !H6 !H3 !H1 !H2.
rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3.
repeat (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /=).
move: (H1) (H2) => /negbTE H1' /negbTE H2'.
rewrite H1' H2' !eq_refl /=.
by rewrite -[(p2 _) in LHS](cast_ordK (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) H3.
- rewrite cast_permE permE /=.
rewrite cast_permE /= in H3.
rewrite -[p2 _](cast_ordK (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) H3.
by rewrite cast_permE.
- + rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3 H4 H5.
repeat (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /=).
move: (H4) (H5) => /negbTE H4' /negbTE H5'.
have H8 : cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
  (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) x)) ==
  cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
  (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max)) = false.
apply/negbTE/eqP => /cast_ord_inj/perm_inj/eqP.
exact/negP.
have H9 : cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
  (p1 (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) x))) ==
  cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
  (p1 (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max))) = false.
apply/negbTE/eqP => /cast_ord_inj/perm_inj/perm_inj/eqP.
exact/negP.
by rewrite !H4' !H5' !H8 !H9 !cast_ordK.
+ rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3 H4 H5.
by rewrite -[p2 _](cast_ordK (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) H5 H2 eq_refl in H4.
+ rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3 H4 H5.
rewrite -[in RHS]H4 in H2.
move: H2 => /cast_ord_inj/perm_inj H2.
by rewrite -H2 cast_ordKV eq_refl in H5.
+ rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3.
repeat (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /=). rewrite !cast_ordK.
move: (H1) (H3) => /negbTE H1' /negbTE H3'.
by rewrite !H6 !H1 !H3 !H1' !H3' !eq_refl !H2.
- f_equal. f_equal.
by rewrite tnth_map /= tnth_ord_tuple !cast_permE !permE /= cast_ordK.

```

```

- + rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3 H4 H5.
  repeat (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /=). rewrite !cast_ordK.
  move: (H5) (H4) => /negbTE H5' /negbTE H4'.
  have H7 : cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p1 (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) x))) ==
    cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p1 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max)) = false.
  apply/negbTE/eqP => /cast_ord_inj/perm_inj/eqP.
  exact/negP.
  have H8 : cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) x)) ==
    cast_ord (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))
    (p2 (cast_ord (esym (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) ord_max)) = false.
  apply/negbTE/eqP => /cast_ord_inj/perm_inj/eqP.
  exact/negP.
  rewrite !H1 eq_refl /= !H5' !H8 !cast_ordK !H4' /= !H7.
  by rewrite mulgA !mulgE addbb addFb.
+ rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3 H4 H5.
  repeat (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /=). rewrite !cast_ordK.
  by rewrite !H1 eq_refl /= -[p2 _](cast_ordK (f_equal succn (eqP Heq))) H5.
+ rewrite !cast_permE !permE /= in H1 H2 H3.
  repeat (rewrite !cast_permE !permE /=). rewrite !cast_ordK.
  move: (H2) (H3) => /negbTE H2' /negbTE H3'.
  rewrite !H6 !H1 !H3 !H3' !eq_refl !H2 !H2' /=.
  by rewrite mulgA !mulgE addbb addFb.
- rewrite cast_permE permE /= in H1.
  rewrite tnth_map tnth_ord_tuple !cast_permE !permE /= cast_ordK.
  by rewrite H1 eq_refl /= mulgA !mulgE addbb addFb.
Qed.

```