

A Unified Gentzen-style Framework for Until-free LTL

Norihiro Kamide

Nagoya City University, Japan
drnkamide08@kpd.biglobe.ne.jp

Sara Negri

University of Genoa, Italy
sara.negri@unige.it

A unified Gentzen-style framework for until-free propositional linear-time temporal logic is introduced. The proposed framework, based on infinitary rules and rules for primitive negation, can handle uniformly both a single-succedent sequent calculus and a natural deduction system. Furthermore, an equivalence between these systems, alongside with proofs of cut-elimination and normalization theorems, is established.

1 Introduction

Linear-time temporal logic (LTL) and its fragments and variants have been studied extensively [29, 20, 10, 3, 4, 5, 15, 11, 14, 7, 8, 19, 16, 9]. In particular, many of Gentzen-style sequent calculi for LTL and its until-free fragment have been introduced and investigated [20, 24, 28, 32, 4, 15, 11, 14, 16]. Some natural deduction systems for LTL and its until-free fragment have also been introduced and investigated [3, 5]. This study considers the until-free propositional fragment of LTL as a target logic. A reason for considering this fragment is that it is highly compatible with Gentzen’s sequent calculus and natural deduction systems, LJ and NJ, [12, 30] for intuitionistic logic. Namely, the proposed Gentzen-style sequent calculus and Gentzen-style natural deduction system for the fragment can be obtained as modified extensions of LJ and NJ, respectively.

Gentzen-style sequent calculi for LTL have been considered previously in the literature. A sequent calculus LT_ω was introduced by Kawai for first-order until-free LTL, and cut elimination and completeness were proved [20]. A 2-sequent calculus $2S\omega$ for first-order until-free LTL, with a cut elimination and a completeness proved were given by Baratella and Masini [4]. An equivalence theorem between the propositional fragments of LT_ω and $2S\omega$ was proved by Kamide [15], with alternative proofs of cut elimination as consequence of the equivalence theorem. Embedding-based proofs of the cut-elimination and completeness theorems for LT_ω and its propositional fragment were presented by Kamide [16]. The present study newly introduces a single-succedent version SLT_ω of LT_ω .

Gentzen-style natural deduction systems PNK and PNJ for classical and intuitionistic until-free LTLs, respectively, were introduced by Baratella and Masini [3]. PNK and PNJ were regarded as extensions of Gentzen’s NK and NJ, respectively, and were called by the authors the logics of positions. A natural deduction system $PLTL_{ND}$ was introduced by Bolotov et al. [5] for a full classical propositional LTL with the until operator U. $PLTL_{ND}$ uses labelled formulas of the form $i : \alpha$ and a temporal induction rule concerning the next-time operator X and the “globally in the future” operator G. PNK, PNJ, and $PLTL_{ND}$ use an induction rule and do not use infinite premise rules for temporal operators. In contrast, the proposed natural deduction system uses infinite premise rules and do not use an induction rule. By using this setting, we obtain a unified framework.

In this study, we introduce a unified Gentzen-style framework for the until-free propositional logic LTL that can handle Gentzen-style single-succedent sequent calculus and natural deduction uniformly. We obtain the equivalence among these systems and the fact that cut elimination for the single-succedent sequent calculus implies normalization for the natural deduction system.

A unified treatment of the systems of sequent calculus and natural deduction is the main aim and the original contribution of this study because a treatment of this type for LTL has not been studied to date, instead, sequent calculus and natural deduction for LTL and its fragments have been studied separately. A uniform handling of these systems eases the import of meta-results from one formalism to another and is a clear theoretical bonus for their applications.

To address the problem of the correspondence between cut elimination and normalization, we need a Gentzen-style single-succedent sequent calculus because the cut-elimination theorem for usual Gentzen-style multiple-succedent sequent calculi for the standard classical LTL does not imply the normalization theorem for the corresponding natural deduction system. The same situation occurs when considering Gentzen's LK and NK for classical logic. On the contrary, it is known that cut elimination for the single-succedent calculus LJ implies normalization for NJ. Thus, we try to obtain an LJ-like single-succedent sequent calculus for the target logic.

To obtain a calculus of this type, we use the following temporal (single-succedent) excluded middle rule:

$$\frac{X^i \neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma \quad X^i \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (ex-middle)}$$

where X^i is an i -times nested next-time operator. By using this rule, we can prove the law of excluded middle $\alpha \vee \neg \alpha$. The non-temporal version of this rule, which has no occurrence of X^i , was originally introduced by von Plato [25, 21]. Pursuing the idea of correspondence between cut elimination and normalization, he introduced a single-succedent sequent calculus for classical logic, proved cut elimination, and established normalization for the corresponding natural deduction system. We thus try to extend this idea to the target temporal logic. Actually, the single-succedent sequent calculus SLT_ω proposed in this study can be regarded as a temporal extension of von Plato's calculus and the cut-elimination result for SLT_ω an extension of his cut-elimination result on classical logic.

Moreover, to obtain the corresponding natural deduction system for the target logic, we use the following rules:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} [X^i \neg \alpha] \\ \vdots \\ \gamma \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} [X^i \alpha] \\ \vdots \\ \gamma \end{array}}{\gamma} \text{ (EXM)} \quad \frac{X^i \neg \alpha \quad X^i \alpha}{\gamma} \text{ (EXP)} \quad \frac{\begin{array}{c} [X^i \alpha] \\ \vdots \\ X^j \neg \gamma \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} [X^i \alpha] \\ \vdots \\ X^j \gamma \end{array}}{X^i \neg \alpha} \text{ (-I)}$$

where (EXM) corresponds to (ex-middle). As mentioned above, the non-temporal version of (EXM), which has no occurrence of X^i , was originally introduced by von Plato [25, 21] and the non-temporal version of (EXP) and (-I) were originally introduced by Gentzen. For more information on these rules, see [26, 27]. (EXP) has also been used by Bolotov and Shangin [6] for constructing the paracomplete logic PCont, by Kürbis and Petrukhin [23] for developing some natural deduction systems for a family of many-valued logics including N3, and by Kamide and Negri [17, 18] for formalizing Gurevich logic [13] and Nelson logic [22, 2]. Some similar rules to (EXP) were proposed by Priest [31] for constructing natural deduction systems for logics in the FDE (First Degree Entailment) family. (EXP) is regarded as a counterpart rule of (EXM) and is useful for appropriately handling natural deduction systems with negation as a primitive connective (instead of negation defined through implication and the falsity constant). The proposed natural deduction system NLT_ω in this study can thus be regarded as a modified temporal extension of von Plato's classical system with the addition of the use of (EXP) and (-I), and the normalization result for NLT_ω an extension of the normalization result by von Plato for classical logic.

2 Sequent calculus and cut elimination

Formulas of the logic discussed in this study are constructed using countably many propositional variables, the logical connectives \rightarrow (implication), \neg (negation), \wedge (conjunction), \vee (disjunction), G (globally in the future), F (eventually in the future), and X (next-time). We use small letters p, q, \dots to denote propositional variables and Greek small letters α, β, \dots to denote formulas. We use Greek capital letters Γ, Δ, \dots to denote finite (possibly empty) sets of formulas. For any $\sharp \in \{G, F, X\}$, we use an expression $\sharp\Gamma$ to denote the set $\{\sharp\gamma \mid \gamma \in \Gamma\}$. The symbol \equiv is used to denote definitional equality. The symbol ω is used to represent the set of natural numbers. An expression $X^i\alpha$ for any $i \in \omega$ is defined inductively by $X^0\alpha \equiv \alpha$ and $X^{n+1}\alpha \equiv X^nX\alpha$. We use lower-case letters i, j and k to denote any natural numbers.

We will define Kawai's sequent calculus LT_ω [20] and a new alternative single-succedent sequent calculus SLT_ω . Prior to defining these sequent calculi, we need to define some notions and notations.

Definition 2.1 A sequent for LT_ω is an expression of the form $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$, and a sequent for SLT_ω is an expression of the form $\Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$ where γ is a formula or the empty set. We use the expression $L \vdash S$ to express the fact that a sequent S is derivable in a sequent calculus L . We say that a rule R is admissible in a sequent calculus L if the following condition is satisfied: For any instance $\frac{S_1 \dots S_n}{S}$ of R , if $L \vdash S_i$ for all i , then $L \vdash S$. The height of a derivation in L is the number of nodes in a maximal branch of a derivation minus one. A rule R is height-preserving admissible if whenever the premises $S_1 \dots S_n$ are derivable with height at most n then also the conclusion S is derivable with the same bound on the derivation height. Furthermore, we say that R is derivable in L if there is a derivation in L of S from S_1, \dots, S_n .

Definition 2.2 (LT_ω) In the following definitions, i and k represent any natural numbers. The initial sequents of LT_ω are of the form $X^i p \Rightarrow X^i p$ for any propositional variable p . The structural rules of LT_ω are of the form:

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \quad \alpha, \Sigma \Rightarrow \Pi}{\Gamma, \Sigma \Rightarrow \Delta, \Pi} \text{ (cut)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (we-left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha} \text{ (we-right)}.$$

The logical rules of LT_ω are of the form:

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^i\alpha \quad X^i\beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{X^i(\alpha \rightarrow \beta), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\rightarrow left)} \quad \frac{X^i\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^i\beta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^i(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)} \text{ (\rightarrow right)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^i\alpha}{X^i\neg\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\neg left)} \quad \frac{X^i\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^i\neg\alpha} \text{ (\neg right)} \\ \\ \frac{X^i\alpha, X^i\beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{X^i(\alpha \wedge \beta), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\wedge left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^i\alpha \quad \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^i\beta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^i(\alpha \wedge \beta)} \text{ (\wedge right)} \quad \frac{X^i\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \quad X^i\beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\vee left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^i\alpha, X^i\beta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^i(\alpha \vee \beta)} \text{ (\vee right)} \\ \\ \frac{X^{i+k}\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{X^iG\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (Gleft)} \quad \frac{\{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^{i+j}\alpha\}_{j \in \omega}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^iG\alpha} \text{ (Gright)} \quad \frac{\{X^{i+j}\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta\}_{j \in \omega}}{X^iF\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (Fleft)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^{i+k}\alpha}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^iF\alpha} \text{ (Fright)}.\end{array}$$

Remark 2.3 The calculus LT_ω introduced here is a slightly modified propositional version of Kawai's sequent calculus [20] for until-free first-order linear-time temporal logic. The following cut-elimination theorem holds for LT_ω . The rule (cut) is admissible in cut-free LT_ω . We will use this theorem in the following discussion. The cut-elimination theorem for (the original first-order) LT_ω was proved by Kawai in [20].

Next, we introduce SLT_ω . We use the same names for the rules of SLT_ω as those of LT_ω , although the forms of the rules are different.

Definition 2.4 (SLT_ω) In the following definitions, i and k represent any natural numbers and γ represents a formula or the empty set. The initial sequents of SLT_ω are of the form $X^i p, \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i p$ for any propositional variable p .

The structural rules of SLT_ω are of the form:

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \quad \alpha, \Sigma \Rightarrow \gamma}{\Gamma, \Sigma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (cut)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha} \text{ (we-right)}.$$

The logical rules of SLT_ω are of the form:

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \alpha \quad X^i \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma}{X^i(\alpha \rightarrow \beta), \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (\rightarrow left)} \quad \frac{X^i \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \beta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)} \text{ (\rightarrow right)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \alpha}{X^i \neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (\neg left)} \quad \frac{X^i \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma}{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \neg \alpha} \text{ (\neg right)} \\ \\ \frac{X^i \neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma \quad X^i \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (ex-middle)} \quad \frac{X^i \alpha, X^i \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma}{X^i(\alpha \wedge \beta), \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (\wedge left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \alpha \quad \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \beta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i(\alpha \wedge \beta)} \text{ (\wedge right)} \\ \\ \frac{X^i \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma \quad X^i \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma}{X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (\vee left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \alpha}{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i(\alpha \vee \beta)} \text{ (\vee right1)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \beta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i(\alpha \vee \beta)} \text{ (\vee right2)} \\ \\ \frac{X^{i+k} \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma}{X^i G \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (Gleft)} \quad \frac{\{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^{i+j} \alpha\}_{j \in \omega}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i G \alpha} \text{ (Gright)} \quad \frac{\{X^{i+j} \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma\}_{j \in \omega}}{X^i F \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (Fleft)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^{i+k} \alpha}{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i F \alpha} \text{ (Fright)}.$$

Proposition 2.5 Let L be LT_ω or SLT_ω . The sequents of the form $X^i \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \alpha$ for any formula α and any natural number i are derivable in L .

Proof. By induction on α . ■

Proposition 2.6 The following rule is height-preserving admissible in cut-free SLT_ω :

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma}{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (we-left)}.$$

Proof. By straightforward induction on the height of the derivation since weakening is in-built in initial sequents and all the rules have an arbitrary context on the left. ■

Next, we show the cut-elimination theorem for SLT_ω using the method by Africk [1]. We also prove a theorem that establishes an equivalence between SLT_ω and LT_ω . Prior to proving these theorems, we show the following proposition and lemmas.

Proposition 2.7 The following rule is derivable in cut-free SLT_ω :

$$\frac{X^i \neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma}{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \alpha} \text{ (\neg left}^{-1}\text{)}.$$

Proof. By using (ex-middle), (we-right), and Proposition 2.5. ■

Lemma 2.8 For any sequent $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$, if $\text{LT}_\omega - \text{(cut)} \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$, then $\text{SLT}_\omega - \text{(cut)} \vdash \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow$.

Proof. By induction on the derivations \mathcal{D} of $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ in cut-free LT_ω . We distinguish the cases according to the last inference of \mathcal{D} . We show only the case of (\vee right) as follows. The last inference of \mathcal{D} is of the form:

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^i \alpha, X^i \beta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, X^i(\alpha \vee \beta)} \text{ (\vee right)}.$$

By induction hypothesis, we have $\text{SLT}_\omega - \text{(cut)} \vdash \neg X^i \alpha, \neg X^i \beta, \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow$. Then, we obtain the required derivation:

$$\begin{array}{c} \vdots \text{ Ind. hyp.} \\ \frac{\neg X^i \alpha, \neg X^i \beta, \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow}{\neg X^i \beta, \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \alpha} \text{ (\neg left}^{-1}\text{)} \\ \frac{\neg X^i \beta, \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \alpha}{\neg X^i \beta, \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i(\alpha \vee \beta)} \text{ (\vee right1)} \\ \frac{\neg X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg X^i \beta, \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow}{\neg X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \beta} \text{ (\neg left)} \\ \frac{\neg X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg X^i \beta, \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \beta}{\neg X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i(\alpha \vee \beta)} \text{ (\neg left}^{-1}\text{)} \\ \frac{\neg X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i(\alpha \vee \beta)}{\neg X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow} \text{ (\vee right2)} \\ \frac{\neg X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow}{\neg X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow} \text{ (\neg left)} \end{array}$$

where $\neg X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow$ is equivalent to $\neg X^i(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg \Delta, \Gamma \Rightarrow$ (because the antecedent of the sequent is a set of formulas) and $(\neg\text{-left}^{-1})$ is derivable in cut-free SLT_ω by Proposition 2.7. ■

Lemma 2.9 *For any sequent $\Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$, if $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$, then $\text{LT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$.*

Proof. By induction on the derivations \mathcal{D} of $\Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$ in SLT_ω . We distinguish the cases according to the last inference of \mathcal{D} . An initial sequent of SLT_ω , i.e. of the form $X^i p, \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i p$, is derived from an initial sequent of LT_ω using weakening steps. Next, we show only the critical case of (ex-middle) as follows. The last inference of \mathcal{D} is fo the form:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ X^i \neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ X^i \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma \end{array}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (ex-middle)}.$$

By induction hypotheses, we have $\text{LT}_\omega \vdash X^i \neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$ and $\text{LT}_\omega \vdash X^i \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$. We then obtain the required derivation:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \text{ Prop. 2.5} \\ X^i \alpha \Rightarrow X^i \alpha \\ \Rightarrow X^i \alpha, X^i \neg \alpha \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \text{ Ind. hyp.} \\ X^i \neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma \end{array}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma, X^i \alpha} \text{ (-right)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma, X^i \alpha \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \text{ Ind. hyp.} \\ X^i \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma \end{array}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (cut)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma, X^i \alpha \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \text{ Ind. hyp.} \\ X^i \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma \end{array}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (cut)}$$

■

Theorem 2.10 (Cut elimination for SLT_ω) *The rule (cut) is admissible in cut-free SLT_ω .*

Proof. Suppose $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$. Then, we obtain $\text{LT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$ by Lemma 2.9. Thus, we have $\text{LT}_\omega - (\text{cut}) \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$ by the cut-elimination theorem for LT_ω [20, 15]. Thus, we obtain $\text{SLT}_\omega - (\text{cut}) \vdash \neg \gamma, \Gamma \Rightarrow$ by Lemma 2.8. We thus obtain the required fact $\text{SLT}_\omega - (\text{cut}) \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$ by applying $(\neg\text{-left}^{-1})$ to $\neg \gamma, \Gamma \Rightarrow$, where $(\neg\text{-left}^{-1})$ is derivable in cut-free SLT_ω by Proposition 2.7. ■

Theorem 2.11 (Equivalence between SLT_ω and LT_ω) *For any formula α , $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Rightarrow \alpha$ iff $\text{LT}_\omega \vdash \Rightarrow \alpha$.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) : By Lemma 2.9. (\Leftarrow) : Suppose $\text{LT}_\omega \vdash \Rightarrow \alpha$. Then, we obtain $\text{LT}_\omega - (\text{cut}) \vdash \Rightarrow \alpha$ by the cut-elimination theorem for LT_ω [20, 15]. We then obtain $\text{SLT}_\omega - (\text{cut}) \vdash \neg \alpha \Rightarrow$ by Lemma 2.8. Thus, we obtain the required fact $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Rightarrow \alpha$ by applying $(\neg\text{-left}^{-1})$ to $\neg \alpha \Rightarrow$, where $(\neg\text{-left}^{-1})$ is derivable in cut-free SLT_ω by Proposition 2.7. ■

3 Natural deduction

As usual in the definition of a natural deduction system, the notation $[\alpha]$ denotes that the formula α is a discharged assumption by the underlying logical inference rule.

We define a Gentzen-style natural deduction system NLT_ω for until-free propositional LTL.

Definition 3.1 (NLT $_\omega$) *Let i and k be any natural numbers. The logical rules of NLT_ω are of the following form, where in $(\rightarrow\text{I})$ the discharge can be vacuous:*

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} [X^i \alpha] \\ \vdots \\ X^i \beta \end{array}}{X^i(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)} \text{ (}\rightarrow\text{I)} \quad \frac{X^i(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \quad X^i \alpha}{X^i \beta} \text{ (}\rightarrow\text{E)} \quad \frac{X^i \neg \alpha \quad X^i \alpha}{\gamma} \text{ (EXP)} \quad \frac{\begin{array}{c} [X^i \neg \alpha] \quad [X^i \alpha] \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \\ \gamma \quad \gamma \end{array}}{\gamma} \text{ (EXM)}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c} [X^i\alpha] \\ \vdots \\ X^j\neg\gamma \\ X^j\gamma \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} [X^i\alpha] \\ \vdots \\ X^j\gamma \\ X^j\gamma \end{array} \\
\hline
X^i\neg\alpha \quad (\neg I) \quad \frac{X^i\alpha \quad X^i\beta}{X^i(\alpha\wedge\beta)} (\wedge I) \quad \frac{X^i(\alpha\wedge\beta)}{X^i\alpha} (\wedge E1) \quad \frac{X^i(\alpha\wedge\beta)}{X^i\beta} (\wedge E2) \\
\\
\frac{X^i\alpha}{X^i(\alpha\vee\beta)} (\vee I1) \quad \frac{X^i\beta}{X^i(\alpha\vee\beta)} (\vee I2) \quad \frac{X^i(\alpha\vee\beta)}{\gamma} \quad \begin{array}{c} [X^i\alpha] \\ \vdots \\ \gamma \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} [X^i\beta] \\ \vdots \\ \gamma \end{array} (\vee E) \\
\\
\frac{\{X^{i+j}\alpha\}_{j\in\omega}}{X^iG\alpha} (GI) \quad \frac{X^iG\alpha}{X^{i+k}\alpha} (GE) \quad \frac{X^{i+k}\alpha}{X^iF\alpha} (FI) \quad \frac{X^iF\alpha \quad \{ \gamma \}_{j\in\omega}}{\gamma} (\text{FE}). \\
\begin{array}{c} [X^{i+j}\alpha] \\ \vdots \\ \gamma \end{array}
\end{array}$$

Remark 3.2 (EXP), (EXM), and (\neg I) are characteristic rules in NLT_ω . The rule (EXP) and (\neg I) are temporal generalizations of the original rules introduced by Gentzen. The rule (EXM) is a temporal generalization of the original rule introduced by von Plato [25, 21]. The non-temporal versions of (EXP), (EXM), and (\neg I) were also used by Kamide and Negri in [18] for constructing natural deduction systems for logics with strong negation. Using (EXP) and (EXM), we can prove the formulas of the form $(\neg\alpha\wedge\alpha)\rightarrow\gamma$ and $\neg\alpha\vee\alpha$, respectively. Using (\neg I) and (EXP), we can prove the formulas of the form $\alpha\rightarrow\neg\neg\alpha$ and $\neg\neg(\alpha\rightarrow\alpha)$ by:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{[\neg\alpha]^2 \quad [\alpha]^1}{\neg\alpha} (\text{EXP}) \quad \frac{[\neg\alpha]^2 \quad [\alpha]^1}{\alpha} (\text{EXP})}{\neg\neg\alpha} (\neg I)^2} {\alpha\rightarrow\neg\neg\alpha} (\neg I)^1 \quad \frac{\frac{[\alpha]^3}{\alpha\rightarrow\alpha} (\neg I)^3 \quad \frac{[\neg(\alpha\rightarrow\alpha)]^1}{\neg(\alpha\rightarrow\alpha)} (\text{EXP})}{\neg\neg(\alpha\rightarrow\alpha)} (\neg I)^1} {\alpha\rightarrow\alpha} (\neg I)^2} {\neg\neg(\alpha\rightarrow\alpha)} (\neg I)^1.$$

Next, we define some notions for NLT_ω .

Definition 3.3 The rules (\rightarrow I), (\wedge I), (\vee I1), (\vee I2), (\neg I), (GI), (FI), and (EXM) are called introduction rules, and the rules (\rightarrow E), (\wedge E1), (\wedge E2), (\vee E), (GE), (FE), and (EXP) are called elimination rules. The notions of major and minor premises of the rules without (EXM) and (EXP) are defined as usual. If $X^i\neg\alpha$ and $X^i\alpha$ are both premises of (EXP), then $X^i\neg\alpha$ and $X^i\alpha$ are called the major and minor premises of (EXP), respectively. The notions of derivation, (open and discharged) assumptions of a derivation, and end-formula of a derivation are also defined as usual. For a derivation \mathcal{D} , we use the expression $\text{oa}(\mathcal{D})$ to denote the set of open assumptions of \mathcal{D} and the expression $\text{end}(\mathcal{D})$ to denote the end-formula of \mathcal{D} . A formula α is said to be provable in a natural deduction system L if there exists a derivation of L with no open assumption whose end-formula is α .

Remark 3.4 There are no notions of major and minor premises of (EXM) and (\neg I). Namely, the premises of (EXM) and (\neg I) are neither major nor minor premises. In this study, (EXP) is treated as an elimination rule, and (EXM) is treated as an introduction rule.

Next, we define a reduction relation \gg on the set of derivations in NLT_ω . Prior to defining \gg , we define some notions concerning \gg .

Definition 3.5 Let α be a formula occurring in a derivation \mathcal{D} in NLT_ω . Then, α is called a maximum formula in \mathcal{D} if α satisfies the following conditions: (1) α is the conclusion of an introduction rule, (\vee E), or (EXP) and (2) α is the major premise of an elimination rule. A derivation is said to be normal if it contains no maximum formula. The notion of substitution of derivations for assumptions is defined as usual. We assume that the set of derivations is closed under substitution.

Definition 3.6 (Reduction relation) Let γ be a maximum formula in a derivation that is the conclusion of a rule R . The definition of the reduction relation \gg at γ in NLT_ω is obtained by the following conditions.

1. R is $(\rightarrow\text{I})$ and γ is $X^i(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$:

$$\frac{\frac{\begin{array}{c} [X^i\alpha] \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D} \\ X^i\beta \end{array}}{X^i(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)} (\rightarrow\text{I}) \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E} \\ X^i\alpha \end{array}}{X^i\beta} (\rightarrow\text{E}) \gg \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E} \\ X^i\alpha \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D} \\ X^i\beta. \end{array}$$

2. R is (EXP):

$$\frac{\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_1 \\ X^i\neg\delta \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_2 \\ X^i\delta \end{array}}{\gamma} (\text{EXP}) \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E}_1 \\ \pi_1 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E}_2 \\ \pi_2 \end{array}}{\pi} R' \gg \frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_1 \\ X^i\neg\delta \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_2 \\ X^i\delta \end{array}}{\pi} (\text{EXP})$$

where R' is an arbitrary rule, and both \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are derivations of the minor premises of R' if they exist.

3. R is $(\neg\text{I})$, γ is $X^i\neg\alpha$, and β is the conclusion of (EXP):

$$\frac{\frac{\begin{array}{c} [X^i\alpha] \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_1 \\ X^j\neg\delta \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} [X^i\alpha] \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_2 \\ X^j\delta \end{array}}{X^i\neg\alpha} (\neg\text{I}) \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E} \\ X^i\alpha \end{array}}{\beta} (\text{EXP}) \gg \frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E} \\ X^i\alpha \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E} \\ X^i\alpha \end{array}}{\beta} (\text{EXP}).$$

4. R is $(\neg\text{I})$, γ is $X^i\neg\delta$, and $X^i\delta$ is the conclusion of (EXP):

$$\frac{\frac{\begin{array}{c} [X^i\delta] \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_1 \\ X^j\neg\beta \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} [X^i\delta] \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_2 \\ X^j\beta \end{array}}{X^i\neg\delta} (\neg\text{I}) \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E} \\ X^i\delta \end{array}}{X^i\delta} (\text{EXP}) \gg \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E} \\ X^i\delta \end{array}$$

5. R is (EXM) and γ is $X^i(\gamma_1 \rightarrow \gamma_2)$, $X^i(\gamma_1 \wedge \gamma_2)$, or $X^i(\gamma_1 \vee \gamma_2)$:

$$\frac{\frac{\begin{array}{c} [X^i\neg\alpha] \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_1 \\ \gamma \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} [X^i\alpha] \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_2 \\ \gamma \end{array}}{\gamma} (\text{EXM}) \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E}_1 \\ \delta_1 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E}_2 \\ \delta_2 \end{array}}{\delta} R' \gg \frac{\begin{array}{c} [X^i\neg\alpha] \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_1 \\ \gamma \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E}_1 \\ \delta_1 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E}_2 \\ \delta_2 \end{array}}{\delta} R' \quad \frac{\begin{array}{c} [X^i\alpha] \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_2 \\ \gamma \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E}_1 \\ \delta_1 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E}_2 \\ \delta_2 \end{array}}{\delta} (\text{EXM})$$

where R' is $(\rightarrow\text{E})$, $(\wedge\text{E1})$, $(\wedge\text{E2})$, or $(\vee\text{E})$, and both \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are derivations of the minor premises of R' if they exist.

6. R is (EXM), γ is $X^i\neg\delta$, and $X^i\delta$ is the conclusion of (EXP):

$$\frac{\frac{\begin{array}{c} [X^i\neg\alpha] \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_1 \\ X^i\neg\delta \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} [X^i\alpha] \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_2 \\ X^i\neg\delta \end{array}}{X^i\neg\delta} (\text{EXM}) \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E} \\ X^i\delta \end{array}}{X^i\delta} (\text{EXP}) \gg \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{E} \\ X^i\delta. \end{array}$$

7. R is $(\wedge I)$ and γ is $X^i(\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2)$:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}_1}{X^i \alpha_1} \quad \frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}_2}{X^i \alpha_2}}{X^i(\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2)} (\wedge I)}{X^i \alpha_i} (\wedge E_i) \gg \frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}_i}{X^i \alpha_i} \text{ where } i \text{ is } 1 \text{ or } 2.$$

8. R is $(\vee I1)$ or $(\vee I2)$ and γ is $X^i(\alpha_1 \vee \alpha_2)$:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}}{X^i \alpha_i} (\vee I_i)}{X^i(\alpha_1 \vee \alpha_2)} \quad \frac{\frac{[X^i \alpha_1]}{\vdots \mathcal{E}_1} \quad [X^i \alpha_2]}{\delta} (\vee E)}{\delta}}{\delta} (\vee E) \gg \frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}}{X^i \alpha_i} \quad \vdots \mathcal{E}_i}{\delta}}{\delta} \text{ where } i \text{ is } 1 \text{ or } 2.$$

9. R is $(\vee E)$:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}_1}{X^i(\alpha \vee \beta)} \quad \frac{[X^i \alpha]}{\vdots \mathcal{D}_2} \quad \frac{[X^i \beta]}{\vdots \mathcal{D}_3}}{\pi} (\vee E)}{\delta} \quad \frac{\vdots \mathcal{E}_n}{\{\delta_n\}} R'}{\delta} \gg \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}_1}{X^i(\alpha \vee \beta)} \quad \frac{[X^i \alpha]}{\vdots \mathcal{D}_2} \quad \frac{\vdots \mathcal{E}_n}{\{\delta_n\}}}{\delta} R'}{\delta} \quad \frac{\frac{[X^i \beta]}{\vdots \mathcal{D}_3} \quad \frac{\vdots \mathcal{E}_n}{\{\delta_n\}}}{\delta} R'}{\delta} (\vee E)}$$

where R' is an arbitrary rule, and $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \dots, \mathcal{E}_n, \dots$ are derivations of the minor premises of R' if they exist.

10. R is (GI) and γ is $X^i G \alpha$:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}_j}{\{X^{i+j} \alpha\}_{j \in \omega}} (GI)}{X^i G \alpha} (GE)}{X^{i+k} \alpha} \gg \frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}_k}{X^{i+k} \alpha} \text{ where } k \in \omega.$$

11. R is (FI) and γ is $X^i F \alpha$:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}_k}{X^{i+k} \alpha} (FI)}{X^i F \alpha} \quad \frac{[X^{i+j} \alpha]}{\vdots \mathcal{E}_j} \quad \frac{\vdots \mathcal{E}_n}{\{\delta\}_{j \in \omega}} (FE)}{\delta} (\vee E) \gg \frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}_k}{X^{i+k} \alpha} \quad \vdots \mathcal{E}_k}{\delta}}{\delta} \text{ where } k \in \omega.$$

12. R is (FE) :

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}}{X^i F \alpha} \quad \frac{[X^{i+j} \alpha]}{\vdots \mathcal{D}_j}}{\pi} (\vee E)}{\delta} \quad \frac{\vdots \mathcal{E}_n}{\{\delta_n\}} R'}{\delta} \gg \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}}{X^i F \alpha} \quad \frac{[X^{i+j} \alpha]}{\vdots \mathcal{D}_j} \quad \frac{\vdots \mathcal{E}_n}{\{\delta_n\}}}{\delta} R'}{\delta} (\vee E)}{\delta}}$$

where R' is an arbitrary rule, and $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \dots, \mathcal{E}_n, \dots$ are derivations of the minor premises of R' if they exist.

13. The set of derivations are closed under \gg .

Definition 3.7 If \mathcal{D}' is obtained from \mathcal{D} by the reduction relation of Definition 3.6, we write $\mathcal{D} \gg \mathcal{D}'$. A sequence $\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1, \dots$ of derivations is called a reduction sequence if it satisfies the following conditions: (1) $\mathcal{D}_i \gg \mathcal{D}_{i+1}$ for all $i \geq 0$, and (2) the last derivation in the sequence is normal if the sequence is finite. A derivation \mathcal{D} is called normalizable if there is a finite reduction sequence starting from \mathcal{D} .

4 Equivalence and normalization

In the following discussion, a derivation of $\Gamma \Rightarrow$ in SLT_ω is interpreted as a derivation \mathcal{D} in NLT_ω such that $\text{oa}(\mathcal{D}) = \Gamma$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{D}) = \neg p \wedge p$.

Lemma 4.1 *We have the following statements.*

1. *If \mathcal{D} is a derivation in NLT_ω such that $\text{oa}(\mathcal{D}) = \Gamma$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{D}) = \beta$, then $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow \beta$,*
2. *If $\text{SLT}_\omega - (\text{cut}) \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow \beta$, then we obtain a derivation \mathcal{D}' in NLT_ω such that (a) $\text{oa}(\mathcal{D}') = \Gamma$, (b) $\text{end}(\mathcal{D}') = \beta$, and (c) \mathcal{D}' is normal.*

Proof.

1. We prove 1 by induction on the derivations \mathcal{D} of NLT_ω such that $\text{oa}(\mathcal{D}) = \Gamma$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{D}) = \beta$. We distinguish the cases according to the last inference of \mathcal{D} . We show some cases. Observe that we shall use (we-left), which is admissible by Proposition 2.6.

- (a) Case (\rightarrow I): We show only the following subcase, which has no discharged assumption $[X^i\alpha]$. \mathcal{D} is of the form:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \Gamma \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{E} \\ X^i\gamma \end{array}}{X^i(\alpha \rightarrow \gamma)} (\rightarrow\text{I})$$

where $\text{oa}(\mathcal{D}) = \Gamma$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{D}) = \gamma$. By induction hypothesis, we have $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i\gamma$. Then, we obtain that $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i(\alpha \rightarrow \gamma)$:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \text{ Ind. hyp.} \\ \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i\gamma \end{array}}{X^i\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i\gamma} (\text{we-left}) \\ \frac{\quad}{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i(\alpha \rightarrow \gamma)} (\rightarrow\text{right}).$$

- (b) Case (\neg I): \mathcal{D} is of the form:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} [X^i\alpha]\Gamma_1 \quad [X^i\alpha]\Gamma_2 \\ \vdots \mathcal{D}_1 \quad \vdots \mathcal{D}_2 \\ X^{j\neg}\gamma \quad X^j\gamma \end{array}}{X^{i\neg}\alpha} (\neg\text{I})$$

where $\text{oa}(\mathcal{D}) = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{D}) = X^{i\neg}\alpha$. By induction hypotheses, we have $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash X^i\alpha, \Gamma_1 \Rightarrow X^{j\neg}\gamma$ and $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash X^i\alpha, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow X^j\gamma$. Then, we obtain that $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow X^{i\neg}\alpha$:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \text{ Ind. hyp.} \\ \vdots \text{ Ind. hyp.} \quad \frac{X^i\alpha, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow X^j\gamma}{X^{j\neg}\gamma, X^i\alpha, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow} (\neg\text{left}) \\ X^i\alpha, \Gamma_1 \Rightarrow X^{j\neg}\gamma \quad X^{j\neg}\gamma, X^i\alpha, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \end{array}}{X^i\alpha, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow} (\text{cut}) \\ \frac{\quad}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow X^{i\neg}\alpha} (\neg\text{right}).$$

- (c) Case (EXP): \mathcal{D} is of the form:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \\ \vdots \mathcal{E}_1 \quad \vdots \mathcal{E}_2 \\ X^{i\neg}\alpha \quad X^i\alpha \end{array}}{\beta} (\text{EXP})$$

where $\text{oa}(\mathcal{D}) = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{D}) = \beta$. By induction hypotheses, we have $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma_1 \Rightarrow X^i \neg \alpha$ and $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow X^i \alpha$. Then, we obtain that $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \beta$:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \text{Ind.hyp.} \quad \Gamma_1 \Rightarrow X^i \neg \alpha \quad \frac{\vdots \text{Ind.hyp.} \quad X^i \alpha \Rightarrow X^i \alpha}{X^i \neg \alpha, X^i \alpha \Rightarrow} (\neg\text{-left})}{\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow X^i \alpha} \quad X^i \alpha, \Gamma_1 \Rightarrow}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow} (\text{cut})}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \beta} (\text{we-right}).$$

(d) Case (EXM): \mathcal{D} is of the form:

$$\frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{E}_1}{\gamma} \quad \frac{\vdots \mathcal{E}_2}{\gamma}}{\gamma} (\text{EXM})$$

where $\text{oa}(\mathcal{D}) = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{D}) = \gamma$. By induction hypotheses, we have $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash X^i \neg \alpha, \Gamma_1 \Rightarrow \gamma$ and $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash X^i \alpha, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \gamma$. Then, we obtain that $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \gamma$:

$$\frac{\frac{\vdots \text{Ind.hyp.} \quad X^i \neg \alpha, \Gamma_1 \Rightarrow \gamma \quad \vdots (\text{we-left})}{X^i \neg \alpha, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \gamma} \quad \frac{\vdots \text{Ind.hyp.} \quad X^i \alpha, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \gamma \quad \vdots (\text{we-left})}{X^i \alpha, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \gamma}}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \gamma} (\text{ex-middle}).$$

(e) Case (GI): \mathcal{D} is of the form:

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma_j \quad \vdots P_j}{\{X^{i+j}\alpha\}_{j \in \omega}}}{X^i G \alpha} (\text{GI})$$

where $\text{oa}(\mathcal{D}) = \Gamma = \bigcup_{j \in \omega} \Gamma_j$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{D}) = X^i G \alpha$. By induction hypotheses, we have $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma_j \Rightarrow X^{i+j} \alpha$ for all $j \in \omega$. Then, we obtain that $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i G \alpha$:

$$\frac{\frac{\vdots \text{Ind.hyp.} \quad \Gamma_j \Rightarrow X^{i+j} \alpha \quad \vdots (\text{we-left})}{\{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^{i+j} \alpha\}_{j \in \omega}}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow X^i G \alpha} (\text{Gright}).$$

Note that the induction hypothesis is applied for each of the denumerable set of premises.

(f) Case (FE): \mathcal{D} is of the form:

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma' \quad [X^{i+j}\alpha]\Gamma_j \quad \vdots \mathcal{D}' \quad \vdots \mathcal{D}_j}{X^i F \alpha \quad \{\gamma\}_{j \in \omega}}}{\gamma} (\text{FE})$$

where $\text{oa}(\mathcal{D}) = \Gamma' \cup \Gamma$ with $\Gamma = \bigcup_{j \in \omega} \Gamma_j$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{D}) = \gamma$. By induction hypotheses, we have

$\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma' \Rightarrow X^i F \alpha$ and $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash X^{i+j} \alpha, \Gamma_j \Rightarrow \gamma$ for all $j \in \omega$. Then we obtain that $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma', \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$ by the following derivation where the induction hypothesis is applied for each of

the denumerable set of premises:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \text{Ind.hyp.} \\ X^{i+j}\alpha, \Gamma_j \Rightarrow \gamma \\ \vdots \text{(we-left)} \\ \vdots \text{Ind.hyp.} \quad \{X^{i+j}\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma\}_{j \in \omega} \\ \Gamma' \Rightarrow X^i F\alpha \quad X^i F\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma \end{array}}{\Gamma', \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \begin{array}{l} \text{(Fleft)} \\ \text{(cut)}. \end{array}$$

2. We prove 2 by induction on the derivations \mathcal{D} of $\Gamma \Rightarrow \beta$ in $\text{SLT}_\omega - (\text{cut})$. We distinguish the cases according to the last inference of \mathcal{D} . We show some cases.

(a) Case (we-right): \mathcal{D} is of the form:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D}' \\ \Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \end{array}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha} \text{(we-right)}$$

By induction hypothesis, we have a normal derivation \mathcal{E}' in NLT_ω of the form:

$$\begin{array}{c} \Gamma \\ \vdots \mathcal{E}' \\ \neg p \wedge p \end{array}$$

where $\text{oa}(\mathcal{E}') = \Gamma$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{E}') = \neg p \wedge p$. Then, we obtain a required normal derivation \mathcal{E} by:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \Gamma \\ \vdots \mathcal{E}' \\ \neg p \wedge p \\ \hline \neg p \end{array} \text{(\wedge E1)} \quad \begin{array}{c} \Gamma \\ \vdots \mathcal{E}' \\ \neg p \wedge p \\ \hline p \end{array} \text{(\wedge E2)}}{\alpha} \text{(Exp)}$$

where $\text{oa}(\mathcal{E}) = \Gamma$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{E}) = \alpha$.

(b) Case (\neg -left): \mathcal{D} is of the form:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D}' \\ \Gamma \Rightarrow X^i \alpha \end{array}}{X^i \neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow} \text{(\neg-left)}.$$

By induction hypothesis, we have a normal derivation \mathcal{E}' in NLT_ω of the form:

$$\begin{array}{c} \Gamma \\ \vdots \mathcal{E}' \\ X^i \alpha \end{array}$$

where $\text{oa}(\mathcal{E}') = \Gamma$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{E}') = X^i \alpha$. Then, we obtain a required normal derivation \mathcal{E} by:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \Gamma \\ \vdots \mathcal{E}' \\ X^i \neg \alpha \quad X^i \alpha \end{array}}{\neg p \wedge p} \text{(EXP)}$$

where $\text{oa}(\mathcal{E}) = \{X^i \neg \alpha\} \cup \Gamma$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{E}) = \neg p \wedge p$ (i.e., \perp). We remark that the last inference (EXP) in \mathcal{E} cannot be replaced with (\rightarrow E), because using (\rightarrow E) entails a possibility of developing a non-normal derivation. Namely, there is a possibility of the case that the last inference of \mathcal{E}' is (\rightarrow I*).

(c) Case (ex-middle): \mathcal{D} is of the form:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D}_1 \\ X^i \neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D}_2 \\ X^i \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma \end{array}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{(ex-middle)}.$$

By induction hypotheses, we have normal derivations \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 in NLT_ω of the form:

$$\begin{array}{c} X^i \neg \alpha, \Gamma \\ \vdots \mathcal{E}_1 \\ \gamma \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} X^i \alpha, \Gamma \\ \vdots \mathcal{E}_2 \\ \gamma \end{array}$$

where $\text{oa}(\mathcal{E}_1) = \{X^i \neg \alpha\} \cup \Gamma$, $\text{oa}(\mathcal{E}_2) = \{X^i \alpha\} \cup \Gamma$, $\text{end}(\mathcal{E}_1) = \gamma$, and $\text{end}(\mathcal{E}_2) = \gamma$. Then, we obtain a required normal derivation \mathcal{E} by:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} [X^i \neg \alpha] \Gamma \\ \vdots \mathcal{E}_1 \\ \gamma \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} [X^i \alpha] \Gamma \\ \vdots \mathcal{E}_2 \\ \gamma \end{array}}{\gamma} \text{ (EXM)}$$

where $\text{oa}(\mathcal{E}) = \Gamma$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{E}) = \gamma$.

(d) Case (Fleft): \mathcal{D} is of the form:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D}' \\ \{X^{i+k} \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma\}_{j \in \omega} \end{array}}{X^i F \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (Fleft)}$$

By induction hypotheses, we have normal derivations \mathcal{E}_j for all $j \in \omega$ in NLT_ω of the form:

$$\begin{array}{c} X^{i+j} \alpha \quad \Gamma_j \\ \vdots \mathcal{E}_j \\ \gamma \end{array}$$

where $\text{oa}(\mathcal{E}_j) = \{X^{i+j} \alpha\} \cup \Gamma_j$ with $\Gamma = \bigcup_{j \in \omega} \Gamma_j$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{E}_j) = \gamma$. Then, we obtain a required normal derivation \mathcal{E} by:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} [X^{i+j} \alpha] \quad \Gamma_j \\ \vdots \mathcal{E}_j \end{array}}{X^i F \alpha \quad \{\gamma\}_{j \in \omega}} \text{ (FE)}$$

where $\text{oa}(\mathcal{E}) = \{X^i F \alpha\} \cup \Gamma$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{E}) = \gamma$. ■

Theorem 4.2 (Equivalence between NLT_ω and SLT_ω) For any formula α , $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Rightarrow \alpha$ iff α is derivable in NLT_ω .

Proof. Taking \emptyset as Γ in Lemma 4.1, we obtain the required fact. ■

Theorem 4.3 (Normalization for NLT_ω) All derivations in NLT_ω are normalizable. More precisely, if a derivation \mathcal{D} in NLT_ω is given, then we obtain a normal derivation \mathcal{E} in NLT_ω such that $\text{oa}(\mathcal{E}) = \text{oa}(\mathcal{D})$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{E}) = \text{end}(\mathcal{D})$.

Proof. Suppose that a derivation \mathcal{D} in NLT_ω is given, and suppose that $\text{oa}(\mathcal{D}) = \Gamma$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{D}) = \beta$. Then, by Lemma 4.1 (1), we obtain $\text{SLT}_\omega \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow \beta$. By the cut-elimination theorem for SLT_ω , we obtain $\text{SLT}_\omega - (\text{cut}) \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow \beta$. Then, by Lemma 4.1 (2), we obtain a normal derivation \mathcal{Q} in NLT_ω such that $\text{oa}(\mathcal{E}) = \text{oa}(\mathcal{D})$ and $\text{end}(\mathcal{E}) = \text{end}(\mathcal{D})$. ■

5 Concluding remarks and acknowledgments

In this paper we introduced a unified Gentzen-style framework for the until-free propositional logic LTL. In this framework, based on infinitary rules and rules for primitive negation, sequent calculus and natural deduction can be treated in a uniform way, that eases a proof of their deductive equivalence and a proof of normalization for the natural deduction system. More specifically, natural deduction derivations are translated to sequent calculus derivations with cuts, and cut-free derivations are translated to normal derivations in natural deduction. In this way, cut elimination provides the bridge to an indirect proof normalization. In future work, we plan to improve the correspondence between cut elimination and normalization to a bi-directional one with the use of general elimination rules (as in [21, Chapter 8]). This should also address a question posed by one of the referees (who are gratefully acknowledged for their valuable comments) on the correspondence between steps of cut elimination and reduction steps in a normalization sequence. Other desiderata for further work include a direct proof of normalization, and an inquiry on strong normalization and the Church-Rosser theorem.

This research was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23K10990, the project “Infinity and Intensionality: Towards A New Synthesis” funded by the Research Council of Norway, and “Modalities in Substructural Logics: Theory, Methods and Applications MOSAIC”, funded by the Community Research and Development Information Service (CORDIS) of the European Commission. The second author also acknowledges the MIUR Excellence Department Project awarded to Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Genova, CUP D33C23001110001 and the “Gruppo Nazionale per le Strutture Algebriche, Geometriche e le loro Applicazioni” (GNSAGA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM).

References

- [1] Henry Africk (1992): *Classical logic, intuitionistic logic, and the Peirce rule*. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 33 (2), pp. 229-235, doi:10.1305/ndjfl/1093636101.
- [2] Ahmad Almukdad & David Nelson (1984): *Constructible falsity and inexact predicates*. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 49 (1), pp. 231-233, doi:10.2307/2274105.
- [3] Stefano Baratella & Andrea Masini (2003): *A proof-theoretic investigation of a logic of positions*. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 123, pp. 135-162, doi:10.1016/S0168-0072(03)00021-6.
- [4] Stefano Baratella & Andrea Masini (2004): *An approach to infinitary temporal proof theory*. *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 43 (8), pp. 965-990, doi:10.1007/S00153-004-0237-Z.
- [5] Alexander Bolotov, Artie Basukoski, Oleg M. Grigoriev & Vasilyi Shangin (2006): *Natural deduction calculus for linear-time temporal logic*. *Proceedings of the 10th European Conference on Logics in Artificial Intelligence (JELIA 2006)*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 4160, pp. 56-68, doi:10.1007/11853886_7.
- [6] Alexander Bolotov & Vasilyi Shangin (2012): *Natural deduction system in paraconsistent setting: Proof search for PCont*. *Journal of Intelligent Systems* 21 (1), pp. 1-24, doi:10.1515/JISYS-2011-0021.
- [7] Bianca Boretti & Sara Negri (2009): *Decidability for Priorean linear time using a fixed-point labelled calculus*. *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Automated Reasoning with Analytic Tableaux and Related Methods (TABLEAUX)*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 5607, pp. 108-122, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-02716-1_9.
- [8] Bianca Boretti & Sara Negri (2010): *On the finitization of Priorean linear time*. In D’Agostino et al., editor: *New Essays in Logic and Philosophy of Science*, College Publications, London.

- [9] Serenella Cerrito, Valentin Goranko & Sophie Paillocher (2023): *Partial model checking and partial model synthesis in LTL using a Tableau-based approach*. *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Formal Structures for Computation and Deduction (FSCD)*, pp. 23:1-23:21, doi:10.4230/LIPICS.FSCD.2023.23.
- [10] E. Allen Emerson (1990): *Temporal and modal logic*. In: *Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science, Formal Models and Semantics (B)*, Jan van Leeuwen (Ed.), pp. 995-1072, Elsevier and MIT Press, doi:10.1016/B978-0-444-88074-1.50021-4.
- [11] Joxe Gaintzarain, Montserrat Hermo, Paqui Lucio, Marisa Navarro & Fernando Orejas (2007): *A cut-free and invariant-free sequent calculus for PLTL*. *Proceedings of the 21st International Workshop on Computer Science Logic, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 4646*, pp. 481-495, doi:10.1007/978-3-540-74915-8_36.
- [12] Gerhard Gentzen (1969): *Collected papers of Gerhard Gentzen*. M.E. Szabo (ed.), *Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics, North-Holland (English translation)*, doi:10.2307/2272429.
- [13] Yuri Gurevich (1977): *Intuitionistic logic with strong negation*. *Studia Logica* 36, pp. 49–59, doi:10.1007/BF02121114.
- [14] Kai Brännler & Martin Lange (2008): *Cut-free sequent systems for temporal logic*. *Journal of Logic and Algebraic Methods in Programming* 76 (2), pp. 216-225, doi:10.1016/J.JLAP.2008.02.004.
- [15] Norihiro Kamide (2006): *An equivalence between sequent calculi for linear-time temporal logic*. *Bulletin of the Section of the Logic* 35(4), pp. 187–194.
- [16] Norihiro Kamide (2015): *Embedding theorems for LTL and its variants*. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* 25(1), pp. 83–134, doi:10.1017/S0960129514000048.
- [17] Norihiro Kamide (2023): *Natural deduction with explosion and excluded middle*. *Proceedings of the 53rd IEEE International Symposium on Multiple-valued Logic (ISMVL 2023)*, pp. 24–29, doi:10.1109/ISMVL57333.2023.00016.
- [18] Norihiro Kamide & Sara Negri (2024): *Unified natural deduction for logics of strong negation*. Draft.
- [19] Norihiro Kamide & Heinrich wansing (2011): *A paraconsistent linear-time temporal logic*. *Fundamenta Informaticae* 106 (1), pp. 1-23, doi:10.3233/FI-2011-374.
- [20] Hiroya Kawai (1987): *Sequential calculus for a first order infinitary temporal logic*. *Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 33, pp. 423-432, doi:10.1002/MALQ.19870330506.
- [21] Sara Negri & Jan von Plato (2001): *Structural Proof Theory*. Cambridge University Press, doi:10.1017/CB09780511527340.
- [22] David Nelson (1949): *Constructible falsity*. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 14, pp. 16-26, doi:10.2307/2268973.
- [23] Nils Kürbis & Yaroslav Petrukhin (2021): *Normalisation for some quite interesting many-valued logics*. *Logic and Logical Philosophy* 30(3), pp. 493–534, doi:10.12775/LLP.2021.009.
- [24] Barbara Paech (1988): *Gentzen-systems for propositional temporal logics*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 385, pp. 240-253, doi:10.1007/BFB0026305.
- [25] Jan von Plato (1999): *Proof theory of full classical propositional logic*. Manuscript, 16 pages.
- [26] Jan von Plato (2014): *Elements of Logical Reasoning*. Cambridge University Press, doi:10.1017/CB09781139567862.
- [27] Jan von Plato (2017): *Saved from the Cellar: Gerhard Gentzen's Shorthand Notes on Logic & Foundations of Mathematics*. Springer.
- [28] Regimantas Pliuškevičius (1991): *Investigation of finitary calculus for a discrete linear time logic by means of infinitary calculus*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 502, pp. 504-528, doi:10.1007/BFB0019366.
- [29] Amir Pnueli (1977): *The temporal logic of programs*. *Proceedings of the 18th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pp. 46-57, doi:10.1109/SFCS.1977.32.

- [30] Dag Prawitz (1965): *Natural deduction: a proof-theoretical study*. Almqvist and Wiksell, Stockholm, doi:10.2307/2271676.
- [31] G. Priest (2019): *Natural deduction systems for logics in the FDE family*. *New Essays on Belnap–Dunn Logic (Synthese Library 418)*, pp. 279-292, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-31136-0_16.
- [32] Manfred E. Szabo (1980): *A sequent calculus for Kröger logic*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science 148*, pp. 295-303, doi:10.1007/3-540-11981-7_21.