

# On embedding Lambek calculus into commutative categorial grammars

Sergey Slavnov  
National Research University Higher School of Economics  
sslavnov@yandex.ru

August 4, 2020

**Abstract**

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Commutative and noncommutative grammars

The best known approach to categorial grammars is based on noncommutative variants of linear logic, most notably, on Lambek calculus [8] and its variations/extensions, such as *non-associative Lambek calculus* [9], various *mixed multimodal* systems [10], *displacement calculus* [13] etc.

*Abstract categorial grammars* (ACG) [3], as well as their close relatives  $\lambda$ -grammars [14] or *linear grammars* [15], arise from an alternative or, rather, complementary approach, based on the ordinary implicational linear logic and linear  $\lambda$ -calculus. They can be called “commutative” in contrast to the “noncommutative” Lambek grammars. Commutative grammars are remarkably flexible and expressive (sometimes even too expressive for effective parsing [18]). On the other hand they are also remarkably simple because of the much more familiar and intuitive underlying logic.

However, as far as natural language modeling is concerned, it turns out that, in many situations, commutative grammars, such as ACG, behave very poorly compared to noncommutative variants. In fact, it has even been argued that ACG are *descriptively inadequate* [12]. Simple and striking instances of this inadequacy arise, for example, when linguistic coordination is considered.

The reason is that, as an analysis shows, “commutative” types of ACG and its relatives are too coarse to distinguish actual linguistic categories. Thus, if we want to model important linguistic phenomena in the commutative setting, we need somehow to enrich the formalism with a finer structure of *subtypes* corresponding to the “noncommutative” types of Lambek calculus.

One solution to this problem, was proposed in [17] (but see also [6]), where an explicit subtyping mechanism was added to the system. Unfortunately, this

results in a rather impressive complication of the formalism (as it seems to us). Another proposed direction is, simply, to enrich a commutative system with explicit noncommutative constructions. (This suggests a comparison with the quite long known Abrusci-Ruet logic [1].) *Hybrid type logical categorial grammars* (HTLCG) [7] have three kinds of implication on the level of types (one commutative implication of linear logic and two noncommutative slashes of Lambek calculus) and two kinds of application on the level of terms, the usual application of  $\lambda$ -terms and an additional operation of concatenation. Both approaches, of [17] and of [7], led to, at least partially, successful developments. An apparent drawback though, as it seems to us, is that the attractive simplicity of ACG gets somewhat lost.

An interesting perspective comes from considering *first order logic* [11], [12]. It turns out that different grammatical formalisms including Lambek grammars, ACG and HTLCG can be faithfully represented as fragments of *first order multiplicative intuitionistic linear logic* (**MILL1**). This suggests another approach to combining commutative and noncommutative features, as well as provides some common ground on which different systems can be compared.

## 1.2 Content of this work

*Tensor grammars* of this work are an elaboration of the so called *linear logic grammars* (LLG) introduced in [16].

LLG are another example of commutative grammars, based on the *classical*, rather than intuitionistic, multiplicative linear logic (**MLL**). They were defined in terms of certain bipartite graphs (generalizing **MLL** *proof-nets*) with string-labeled edges.

LLG (as well as tensor grammars of this work) can be seen as a surface representation of ACG. Derivations of ACG translate to derivations of tensor grammars and this translation is isomorphic on the level of string languages (as well as tree languages). On the logical side, this is, simply, a reflection of the fact that implicational linear logic is a conservative fragment of classical **MLL** and linear  $\lambda$ -terms can be represented as proof-nets. An advantage of this representation, as it seems to us, is that the syntax becomes extremely simple and a direct geometric meaning is transparent.

In this work we introduce an in-line notation for edge-labeled graphs of LLG and reformulate the system in these new terms. Then we address the problem of encoding noncommutative operations of Lambek calculus in our setting. This turns out possible after enriching the system with new unary operators, which results in *extended tensor grammars*.

### 1.2.1 Tensor grammars

*Tensor terms* are, basically, tuples of words (written multiplicatively, as products) with labeled endpoints. We write words in square brackets and represent the endpoints as lower and upper indices, lower indices standing for left end-

points, and upper indices, for right ones. Thus, tensor terms can have the form

$$[a]_i^j, \quad [a]_i^j \cdot [b]_k^l \cdot [c]_r^s, \quad [\epsilon]_i^j$$

(where  $\epsilon$  stands for the empty word) and so on. The index notation is taken directly from usual tensor algebra.

An index in a term can be repeated at most twice, once as an upper, and once as a lower one. A repeated index means that the corresponding words are concatenated along matching endpoints. For example, we have the term equality

$$[a]_i^j \cdot [b]_k^l \cdot [c]_j^k = [acb]_i^l$$

(the product is commutative).

*Tensor term calculus (TTC)* equips tensor terms with types. Tensor types are **MLL** formulas decorated with indices, which should match indices in corresponding terms, with the convention that upper indices in types match lower indices in terms and vice versa. A *tensor typing judgement* looks, for example, as the following:

$$[a]_i^j \cdot [b]_k^l \cdot [c]_r^s \vdash (A_j^k \otimes B_l) \wp C_s^{ir}.$$

Typing rules, of course, are rules of **MLL** decorated with terms and indices.

A *tensor grammar* is defined then by a set of *lexical axioms*, which are tensor typing judgements as above, and the *sentence type*  $S_i^j$  with exactly one upper and one lower index. Tensor terms of the sentence type are single words and they constitute the language of the grammar.

Of course, this is an oversimplified inaccurate sketch rather than a consistent formalism. But we think that it is easy to believe that technical details can be worked out, as well as that the resulting formalism indeed provides a representation for ACG. Unfortunately it does not allow simple representation of noncommutative operations of Lambek calculus.

Before approaching noncommutativity we note that indices in our formalism can be thought of as first order variables, which suggests a comparison with **MILL1** and the work in [11]. The system of **MILL1** has an extra degree of freedom because of binding operators in formulas, i.e. quantifiers. It is thanks to quantifiers that representation of noncommutative systems becomes possible.

This suggests that we need to extend tensor grammars with *index binding operators* on types.

### 1.2.2 Extended tensor types

Tensor representation makes very transparent how the “non-commutative” types of Lambek calculus look inside “coarse” implicational types of commutative grammars.

Atomic types of Lambek calculus correspond to tensor types with one upper and one lower index. If  $A = A_i^j$  and  $B = B_l^k$  are two such types, then, by the standard definition of linear implication in **MLL**, the implicational type  $A \multimap B$  is the type  $\overline{A}_i^j \wp B_l^k$  (where we denote linear negation as a bar). Thus, elements of the type  $A \multimap B$  are tensor terms with four indices.

We can single out two important *subtypes* of the tensor type  $A \multimap B$ . The first subtype consists of terms of the form

$$[u]_k^i \cdot [\epsilon]_j^l, \quad (1)$$

and the second one, of terms of the form

$$[u]_j^l \cdot [\epsilon]_k^i. \quad (2)$$

It is easily computed that terms of form (1) act on elements of  $A_i^j$  by multiplication (concatenation) on the left, and elements of form (2), by multiplication on the right. Indeed, for a term  $[v]_i^j$  of type  $A_i^j$ , we have

$$[v]_i^j \cdot ([u]_k^i \cdot [\epsilon]_j^l) = [uv]_k^l, \quad [v]_i^j \cdot ([u]_j^l \cdot [\epsilon]_k^i) = [vu]_k^l.$$

It follows that the subtype defined by (1) corresponds to the Lambek type  $A \setminus B$ , while the subtype defined by (2), to the Lambek type  $B / A$ .

Following this insight, we emulate noncommutative implications by means of a new type constructor  $\nabla$ , which *binds indices in types*.

If  $A$  is a tensor type with a *free* upper index  $i$  and lower index  $j$ , we define the new type  $\nabla_i^j A$ , in which the indices  $i$  and  $j$  are no longer free. The rule for introducing  $\nabla$  is

$$\frac{t \cdot [\epsilon]_i^j \vdash \Gamma, A_{J_1 j J_2}^{I_1 i I_2}}{t \vdash \Gamma, \nabla_i^j(A_{J_1 j J_2}^{I_1 i I_2})},$$

and noncommutative implications are encoded as

$$(A \setminus B)_j^l = \nabla_j^l(\overline{A}_i^j \wp B_i^k), \quad (B / A)_i^j = \nabla_i^j(\overline{A}_i^j \wp B_i^k),$$

as formulas (1), (2) suggest.

In fact, since we work in the setting of classical linear logic, we also have to introduce the *dual* operator  $\Delta$  of  $\nabla$ . Remarkably, this second binding operator serves to encode the product of Lambek calculus.

Along these lines we develop *extended tensor type calculus* (**ETTC**) of tensor terms and define *extended tensor grammars*. Both ACG and Lambek grammars embed in **ETTC**. We would expect that HTLCG do embed as well, but this requires a proof.

Again, it seems to us that the formalism of **ETTC** is rather simple and intuitive, and this makes the work interesting.

### 1.2.3 Background and organization

We assume that the reader has some acquaintance with  $\lambda$ -calculus (see [2]) as well as with linear logic [4] and Lambek calculus [8], in particular, with basic ideas of cut-elimination. Most of proofs are straightforward computations. They are omitted or given in the appendix.

## 2 Tensor terms

### 2.1 Term expressions

Throughout the paper we assume that we are given an infinite set  $Ind$  of *indices*. They will be used in all syntactic objects (terms, types, typing judgements) that we consider.

Now let  $T$  be an alphabet of *terminal symbols* or, simply, *terminals*.

We will build *tensor term expressions* from terminal symbols, using elements of  $Ind$  as *upper* and *lower* indices. The set of upper, respectively lower, indices occurring in a term expression  $t$  will be denoted as  $Sup(t)$ , respectively  $Sub(t)$ . The set of all indices of  $t$  will be denoted as  $Ind(t) = Sup(t) \cup Sub(t)$ .

*Tensor terms* will be defined as tensor term expressions quotiented by an appropriate equivalence.

Term expressions are defined by induction.

- If  $w \in T^*$  and  $i, j \in Ind$ , then  $t = [w]_j^i$  is a term expression;
- if  $w \in T^*$  then  $t = [w]$  is a term expression;
- if  $t_{(1)}, t_{(2)}$  are term expressions with

$$Sup(t_{(1)}) \cap Sup(t_{(2)}) = \emptyset, \quad Sub(t_{(1)}) \cap Sub(t_{(2)}) = \emptyset$$

then  $t = (t_{(1)} \cdot t_{(2)})$  is a term expression.

The multiplication symbol (dot) will usually be omitted, i.e., we will write  $(ts)$  for  $(t \cdot s)$ .

The definition implies that an index can occur in a term expression at most twice: once as an upper one and once as a lower one. We say that an index occurring in a term expression  $t$  is *free* in  $t$ , if it occurs in  $t$  once. Otherwise we say that the index is *bound*.

We denote the set of free upper, respectively lower indices of  $t$  as  $FSup(t)$ , respectively  $FSub(t)$ . We denote the set of all free indices of  $t$  as  $FInd(t) = FSup(t) \cup FSub(t)$ . We say that a term expression is *normal* if it has no bound indices.

We say that a term expression is *closed* if it has no occurrence of a terminal symbol.

An *elementary regular* term expression is an expression of the form  $[w]_i^j$ , where  $j \neq i$ . An *elementary singular* term expression is an expression of the form  $[w]_i^i$  or  $[w]$ . Singular term expressions should be considered as pathological (in the context of this work), we need them for consistency of definitions. We will discuss their meaning shortly.

### 2.2 Terms

We define *congruence* of term expressions as the smallest equivalence relation satisfying the conditions

$$((t \cdot s) \cdot k) \equiv (t \cdot (s \cdot k)), \quad (t \cdot s) \equiv (s \cdot t), \quad t \equiv s \Rightarrow (t \cdot k) \equiv (s \cdot k),$$

$$[u]_i^j [v]_j^k \equiv [uv]_i^k, \quad [u]_i^i \equiv [u].$$

$$[a_1 a_2 \dots a_n] \equiv [a_n a_1 \dots a_{n-1}], \quad \text{for } a_1, \dots, a_n \in T.$$

Congruence has a simple geometric meaning, which we will discuss shortly.

*Tensor terms* (over a given alphabet of terminal symbols) are defined as equivalence classes for congruence of term expressions.

Multiplication of terms is associative, therefore we will usually omit brackets in term expressions in the sequel.

The sets of free upper and lower indices of a term expression are easily seen to be invariant under congruence. Thus they are well-defined for terms as well. For a term  $t$  we write  $FSup(t)$ ,  $FSub(t)$  for the sets of free upper, respectively lower, indices of  $t$  and  $FInd(t) = FSup(t) \cup FSub(t)$ .

A crucial role will be played by the following closed constants (*Kronecker deltas*), familiar from linear algebra:

$$\delta_i^j = [\epsilon]_i^j, \quad \delta_{i_1 \dots i_n}^{j_1 \dots j_n} = \delta_{i_1}^{j_1} \dots \delta_{i_n}^{j_n},$$

where  $\epsilon$  stands for the empty word.

We have the relations

$$\delta_i^j \cdot [w]_j^k \equiv [w]_i^k, \quad \delta_i^i \cdot [w]_k^i \equiv [w]_k^j,$$

and these imply the following property.

**Proposition 1** *Let  $t$  be a tensor term expression, and*

$$i_1, \dots, i_m \in FSup(t), \quad j_1, \dots, j_n \in FSub(t),$$

$$i'_1, \dots, i'_m, j'_1, \dots, j'_n \notin Ind(t).$$

*Let the term expression  $t'$  be obtained from  $t$  by replacing the indices*

$$i_1, \dots, i_m, j_1, \dots, j_n$$

*with*

$$i'_1, \dots, i'_m, j'_1, \dots, j'_n$$

*respectively.*

*Then*

$$\delta_{i_1, \dots, i_m}^{i'_1, \dots, i'_m} \cdot \delta_{j'_1, \dots, j'_n}^{j_1, \dots, j_n} \cdot t \equiv t'.$$

□

Apparently, writing long sequences of indices as in the above proposition would be rather cumbersome. In the sequel, we adopt the convention that capital Latin letters stand for sequences of indices and small Latin letters, for individual indices.

### 2.2.1 Geometric representation and normalization

Regular tensor term expressions and terms have a simple geometric representation as bipartite graphs whose vertices are labeled with indices and edges, with words, and direction of edges is from lower indices to upper ones.

Thus, an elementary term expression  $[w]_i^j$ ,  $i \neq j$ , corresponds to a single edge.

$$i \bullet \xrightarrow{w} j$$

The product of two terms without common indices is represented as the disjoint union of the corresponding graphs; the term  $[u]_i^j \cdot [v]_k^l$  is represented as two edges.

$$\begin{array}{c} k \bullet \xrightarrow{v} l \\ i \bullet \xrightarrow{u} j \end{array}$$

A term with bound indices corresponds to a graph obtained by gluing edges along matching vertices. Thus, the term  $[u]_i^j \cdot [v]_k^l \cdot [w]_j^r$  is represented as the following.

$$\begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{w} r \\ \curvearrowright \\ k \bullet \xrightarrow{v} l \\ \bullet \\ i \bullet \xrightarrow{u} \bullet \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} k \bullet \xrightarrow{v} l \\ i \bullet \xrightarrow{uw} r \end{array}$$

Obviously, congruent term expressions have the same geometric representation.

As for singular terms, they arise when edges are glued cyclically, for example, when the endpoints of the same edge are glued together as in  $[w]_i^i$ , which is the same as  $[w]$ .

Then a singular term  $[a_1 \dots a_n]$ , where  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in T$ , should be represented as a closed loop labeled with the cyclically ordered sequence  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ . The ordering is cyclic, because there is no way to say which letter is first. This is no longer a graph (because there are no vertices), but it has an obvious geometric meaning (it is a topological space, even a manifold).

In general, a tensor term can be represented as a finite set of word-labeled edges with index-labeled vertices and a finite multiset of closed loops labeled with cyclically ordered words. These geometric objects were introduced in [16] under the name of *word cobordisms* or *cowordisms* for short, and *linear logic grammars* (LLG) were formulated directly in the geometric language. Tensor grammars of this work are a reformulation and an elaboration of constructions of [16].

The geometric representation makes especially obvious that any term expression is congruent to a normal one (which is unique up to associativity and commutativity of multiplication).

On the other hand, any normal term expression  $t$  is the product  $t = t_{(1)} \cdots t_{(n)}$  of elementary regular and elementary singular term expressions. We say that  $t$  is *regular*, if  $t_{(1)}, \dots, t_{(n)}$  are regular. Otherwise we say that  $t$  is *singular*.

We say that a tensor term is *regular*, respectively *singular*, if it is the congruence class of a regular, respectively, singular term expression.

### 3 Tensor type calculus

#### 3.1 Tensor types

Our goal is to assign types to terms. Our types will be formulas of *multiplicative linear logic* (**MLL**), decorated with indices intended to match free indices of terms.

We assume that we are given a set  $P$  of *positive atomic type symbols*, and every element  $p \in P$  is assigned a *valency*  $v(p) \in \mathbf{N}^2$ .

The set of *atomic type symbols* is defined as  $P \cup \overline{P}$ , where  $\overline{P} = \{\overline{p} \mid p \in P\}$ . Elements of  $\overline{P}$ , *negative atomic type symbols*, are assigned valencies by the rule: if  $p \in P$  and  $v(p) = (n, m)$ , then  $v(\overline{p}) = (m, n)$ .

Types, similarly to terms, will have upper and lower indices. Accordingly, we will denote the set of upper, respectively lower indices occurring in a type  $A$  as  $Sup(A)$ , respectively  $Sub(A)$  and the set of all indices occurring in  $A$  as  $Ind(A) = Sup(A) \cup Sub(A)$ .

In a tensor type, each index occurs at most once, so there are no bound indices. However, later we will add more constructors, which allow binding indices in types as well. Therefore we will explicitly use the adjective “free” for type indices right from the start and use the tautological notation  $FSup(A) = Sup(A)$ ,  $FSub(A) = Sub(A)$ ,  $FInd(A) = Ind(A)$ .

Given a set  $P$  of positive atomic type symbols together with the valency function  $v : P \rightarrow \mathbf{N}^2$ , the set of *tensor types* over  $P$  is defined by the following rules.

- If  $p \in P$  with  $v(p) = (n, m)$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_m, j_1, \dots, j_n$  are pairwise distinct elements of  $Ind$  then  $A = p_{i_1 \dots i_m}^{j_1 \dots j_n}$  is a positive atomic type;
- if  $p \in P$  with  $v(p) = (n, m)$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_m, j_1, \dots, j_n$  are pairwise distinct elements of  $Ind$  then  $A = \overline{p}_{j_1 \dots j_n}^{i_1 \dots i_m}$  is a negative atomic type;
- if  $A, B$  are types with  $FInd(A) \cap FInd(B) = \emptyset$  then  $A \otimes B$ ,  $A \wp B$  are types.

A *tensor type symbol* (over  $P$ ) is a tensor type (over  $P$ ) with all indices erased. We denote the set of tensor type symbols over  $P$  as  $Tp_{\otimes}(P)$ .

*Type valency* extends from atomic type symbols to all tensor type symbols in the obvious way:

$$v(A \otimes B) = v(A \wp B) = v(A) + v(B), \quad (3)$$

where addition of elements of  $\mathbf{N}^2$  is defined componentwise:  $(n_1, m_1) + (n_2, m_2) = (n_1 + m_1, n_2 + m_2)$ .

Tensor type symbols are formulas of **MLL** equipped with valencies. In order to obtain a type from a type symbol it is sufficient to specify the ordered sets



of free upper and lower indices. Accordingly, we will use the notation  $A_I^J$  to denote a tensor type whose symbol is  $A$ , and whose ordered sets of free upper and lower indices are  $I$  and  $J$  respectively.

The *dual type symbol*  $\overline{A}$  of a tensor type symbol  $A$ , is defined by induction, as in **MLL**.

The base case is  $A \in P$ , which has already been discussed. The induction steps are

$$\overline{\overline{p}} = p \text{ for } p \in \overline{P}, \quad \overline{A \otimes B} = \overline{A} \overline{\otimes} \overline{B}, \quad \overline{A \overline{\otimes} B} = \overline{A} \otimes \overline{B}. \quad (4)$$

The *linear implication type symbol* is defined by

$$A \multimap B = \overline{A} \overline{\otimes} B. \quad (5)$$

### 3.2 Typing judgements

A *tensor sequent* (over a set  $P$ ) is a finite multiset of tensor type symbols (over  $P$ ) A *tensor type sequent* (over a set  $P$ ) is a finite set of tensor types (over  $P$ ) whose elements have no common free indices. If  $\Gamma = A_{(1)}, \dots, A_{(n)}$  is a tensor sequent, then the notation  $\overline{\Gamma}$  stands for the sequent  $\overline{\Gamma} = \overline{A_{(1)}}, \dots, \overline{A_{(n)}}$ .

For a tensor type sequent  $\Gamma$  we define the sets of free upper and lower indices of  $\Gamma$  by

$$FSup(\Gamma) = \bigcup_{A \in \Gamma} FSup(A), \quad FSub(\Gamma) = \bigcup_{A \in \Gamma} FSub(A).$$

A *syntactic tensor typing judgement* (over sets  $P$  and  $T$ ) is a pair  $(t, \Gamma)$ , denoted as  $t \vdash \Gamma$ , where  $\Gamma$  is a tensor type sequent (over  $P$ ), and  $t$  is a term expression (over  $T$ ), such that  $FSub(t) = FSub(\Gamma)$ ,  $FSub(t) = FSup(\Gamma)$ .

We often will use the notation  $t \vdash \Gamma_I^J$  for typing judgements, implying that  $\Gamma$  is a tensor sequent and  $\Gamma_I^J$  is obtained as a decoration of  $\Gamma$  with some indices:

$$I = I_1 \dots I_n, \quad J = J_1 \dots J_n,$$

$$\Gamma = A_{(1)}, \dots, A_{(n)}, \quad \Gamma_I^J = (A_{(1)})_{I_1}^{J_1}, \dots, (A_{(n)})_{I_n}^{J_n}.$$

We define *congruence* of syntactic typing judgements as the smallest equivalence relation on syntactic tensor typing judgements satisfying the conditions:

- if  $t \vdash \Gamma$ ,  $t' \vdash \Gamma'$  are syntactic typing judgements,  $i \in FInd(t)$ ,  $i' \notin Ind(t)$ , and  $t'$ , respectively  $\Gamma'$ , are obtained by replacing the index  $i$  in  $t$ , respectively  $\Gamma$ , with  $i'$ , then  $t \vdash \Gamma \equiv t' \vdash \Gamma'$  ( $\alpha$ -conversion);
- if  $t \vdash \Gamma$ ,  $t' \vdash \Gamma$  are syntactic typing judgements, and  $t \equiv t'$ , then  $t \vdash \Gamma \equiv t' \vdash \Gamma$ .

We define a *tensor typing judgement* as an equivalence class for congruence of syntactic tensor typing judgements.

We say that a typing judgement  $t \vdash \Gamma$  is *regular* if the term  $t$  is regular.

### 3.3 Typing rules

Typing judgements are derived by the following rules of *Tensor type calculus* (**TTC**).

$$\delta_{IJ'}^{I'J} \vdash \bar{p}_{J'}, p_I^J, p \in P \text{ (Id)}, \quad \frac{t \vdash \Gamma, A_I^J \quad s \vdash \bar{A}_{J'}, \Theta}{\delta_{IJ'}^{I'J} \cdot ts \vdash \Gamma, \Theta} \text{ (Cut)},$$

$$\frac{t \vdash \Gamma, A, B}{t \vdash \Gamma, A \wp B} (\wp) \quad \frac{t \vdash \Gamma, A \quad s \vdash B, \Theta}{ts \vdash \Gamma, A \otimes B, \Theta} (\otimes).$$

It is implicit in the rules above that all typing judgements are well defined, i.e. there are no index collisions. For example, syntactic representatives for the two premises of the  $(\otimes)$ , respectively, the Cut rule must be chosen to have no common indices.

The rules of **TTC** are those of *multiplicative linear logic* (**MLL**), decorated with indices and terms. One might observe that the syntax of tensor typing judgements is, basically, an in-line notation for **MLL** proof-nets.

In **MLL** it is understood that commas in sequents are, essentially, erased  $\wp$ -connectives, and the  $\wp$ -connective itself is a symmetrized implication as in (5). We collect a couple of straightforward observations from **MLL**, for further reference.

**Proposition 2** *A typing judgement  $t \vdash \Gamma, A, B$  is derivable in **TTC** iff the typing judgement  $t \vdash \Gamma, A \wp B$  is derivable.  $\square$*

**Corollary 1** *If typing judgements*

$$s \vdash \Gamma, \bar{A}_{J'}, \wp B, \quad t \vdash \Gamma', A_I^J$$

*are derivable in **TTC**, then the typing judgement*

$$\delta_{IJ'}^{I'J} \cdot s \cdot t \vdash \Gamma, \Gamma', B$$

*is derivable as well.  $\square$*

#### 3.3.1 Cut-elimination

**Lemma 1** *Any typing judgement derivable in **TTC** can be derived without the Cut rule.*

**Proof** in the Appendix.

**Corollary 2** *Any typing judgement derivable in **TTC** is regular.*

**Proof** by induction on a cut-free derivation.  $\square$

### 3.4 Tensor signatures

Let  $\Xi$  be a finite multiset of typing judgements (over some sets  $P$  and  $T$ ).

Choose syntactic typing judgements

$$t_{(1)} \vdash \Gamma_{(1)}, \dots, t_{(n)} \vdash \Gamma_{(n)}$$

representing elements of  $\Xi$  so that different elements have no indices in common.

The following is straightforward.

**Proposition 3** *In the setting as above, for any typing judgement  $t \vdash A$  derivable from elements of  $\Xi$  using each element exactly once, there exists a syntactic representation such that*

$$t = t_{(0)} \cdot t_{(1)} \cdots t_{(n)},$$

where  $t_{(0)}$  is a closed term.  $\square$

**Lemma 2 (“Deduction theorem”)** *Let  $\Xi$  be a finite multiset of typing judgements.*

*Choose representatives*

$$t_{(1)} \vdash (\Gamma_{(1)})_{I_1}^{J_1}, \dots, t_{(n)} \vdash (\Gamma_{(n)})_{I_n}^{J_n}$$

*of elements of  $\Xi$  so that different elements have no indices in common.*

*Let  $t_{(0)}$  be a closed term expression.*

*The typing judgement*

$$t_{(0)} \cdot t_{(1)} \cdots t_{(n)} \vdash \Gamma \tag{6}$$

*is derivable in **TTC** from elements of  $\Xi$  using each element exactly once iff the typing judgement*

$$t_{(0)} \cdot \delta_{I'_1 J'_1}^{I_1 J_1} \cdots \delta_{I'_n J'_n}^{I_n J_n} \vdash \overline{(\Gamma_{(1)})_{J'_1}^{I'_1}}, \dots, \overline{(\Gamma_{(n)})_{J'_n}^{I'_n}}, \Gamma \tag{7}$$

*is derivable in **TTC**.*

**Proof** If (7) is derivable, then (6) is derivable from  $\Xi$  by the Cut rule.

For the opposite direction use induction on derivation.  $\square$

A *tensor signature*  $\Sigma$  is a tuple  $\Sigma = (P, T, \Xi)$ , where  $P$  is a set of positive atomic type symbols,  $T$  is an alphabet of terminal symbols and  $\Xi$  is a set of typing judgements over  $P$  and  $T$ , called *axioms of  $\Sigma$* .

A typing judgement is *derivable in  $\Sigma$*  if it is derivable in **TTC** from the axioms of  $\Sigma$ .

### 3.5 Grammars

A *tensor grammar*  $G = (\Sigma, S)$  is a tensor signature  $\Sigma = (P, T, \Xi)$ , where  $T$  and  $\Xi$  are finite, together with a positive atomic type symbol  $S \in P$  of valency  $(1,1)$ .

We say that  $G$  *generates* a word  $w \in T^*$  if the typing judgement

$$[w]_i^j \vdash S_j^i$$

is derivable in  $\Sigma$ .

The *language* generated by  $G$  (*language of*  $G$ ) is the set of all words generated by  $G$ .

## 4 Examples and inadequacy

The formalism of tensor grammars can be seen as a surface representation of *abstract categorial grammars* (ACG), which will be discussed in the next section. Derivations of ACG translate to derivations of tensor grammars and this translation is isomorphic on the level of string languages (on the level of tree languages as well [16]).

In this section we discuss toy examples, adapted, in fact, from ACG, and then analyse the notorious inadequacy [12] of commutative grammars (such as ACG), which becomes very transparent in tensor representation.

### 4.1 Examples

Consider the alphabet of atomic type symbols  $P = \{NP, S\}$  with  $v(NP) = v(S) = (1, 1)$ .

Let the terminal alphabet be

$$\{\text{John, Mary, loves}\}$$

and consider the tensor grammar defined by the following axioms

$$[\text{John}]_i^j \vdash \text{NP}_j^i, \quad [\text{Mary}]_i^j \vdash \text{NP}_j^i, \quad [\text{loves}]_i^j \cdot \delta_k^l \cdot \delta_r^s \vdash \overline{\text{NP}}_r^i, \overline{\text{NP}}_j^k, S_1^s.$$

(If we agree that commas in a sequent are “hypocrisies” for  $\wp$  and  $\wp$  is a symmetrized implication, then the type of “loves” is, of course,  $NP \multimap NP \multimap S$ .)

With this we can derive the typing judgement

$$\frac{\frac{[\text{Mary}]_{j'}^{i'} \vdash \text{NP}_{i'}^{j'} \quad \delta_k^l \cdot \delta_s^r \cdot [\text{loves}]_i^j \vdash \overline{\text{NP}}_r^i, \overline{\text{NP}}_j^k, S_1^s}{\delta_{i'}^{k j'} \delta_k^l \cdot \delta_s^r \cdot [\text{loves}]_i^j \cdot [\text{Mary}]_{j'}^{i'} \vdash \overline{\text{NP}}_r^i, S_1^s} (\text{Cut})}{\delta_{i'}^l \cdot \delta_s^r \cdot [\text{loves}]_i^j \cdot [\text{Mary}]_{j'}^{i'} \vdash \overline{\text{NP}}_r^i, S_1^s} (\equiv)}{\delta_s^r \cdot [\text{loves Mary}]_i^j \vdash \overline{\text{NP}}_r^i, S_1^s} (\equiv),$$

and then, in a similar way,

$$\frac{[\text{John}]_{j'}^{i'} \vdash \text{NP}_{i'}^{j'} \quad \delta_s^r \cdot [\text{loves Mary}]_i^j \vdash \overline{\text{NP}}_r^i, S_1^s}{\delta_{i' r}^{s j'} \cdot [\text{John}]_{j'}^{i'} \cdot \delta_s^r \cdot [\text{loves Mary}]_i^j \vdash S_1^s} (\text{Cut})$$

which, after a straightforward computation yields the standard sentence “John loves Mary”.

For a more elaborate example with medial extraction let us add terminal symbols

$$\{\text{leaves, madly, who}\}$$

and axioms

$$\delta_k^l \cdot [\text{leaves}]_i^j \vdash \overline{\text{NP}}_j^k, S_1^i, \quad \delta_k^l \cdot \delta_r^s \cdot \delta_t^u \cdot [\text{madly}]_i^j \vdash \overline{\text{NP}}_u^r \otimes \overline{S}_1^i, \overline{\text{NP}}_s^t, S_j^k,$$

$$\delta_k^l \cdot \delta_r^s \cdot \delta_t^u \cdot [\text{who}]_i^j \vdash \text{NP}_1^k \otimes \overline{S}_j^t, \overline{\text{NP}}_s^i, \text{NP}_u^r.$$

After a straightforward computation we derive the typing judgements

$$\delta_k^s \cdot [\text{loves}]_t^l [\text{madly}]_i^j \vdash \overline{\text{NP}}_1^i, \overline{\text{NP}}_s^t, S_j^k, \quad [\text{John loves}]_k^l [\text{madly}]_i^j \vdash \overline{\text{NP}}_1^i, S_j^k,$$

$$\delta_r^s \cdot [\text{who John loves madly}]_i^u \vdash \overline{\text{NP}}_s^i, \text{NP}_u^r,$$

and, finally, get the sentence

Mary who John loves madly leaves.

## 4.2 Inadequacy

(The discussion in the remainder of this section presupposes some familiarity with ACG [3] and Lambek grammars [8]. They will be considered in a greater detail in subsequent sections.)

It can be observed that representation of data in tensor grammars is rather non-economical.

For example, if we encode a transitive verb in a term of type  $NP \multimap NP \multimap S$ , as is customary in categorial grammars, then we need to keep in memory *three* strings (elementary terms), although only one of them is nonempty. This contrasts with Lambek grammars, where English transitive verb, for example, is customarily represented as a *single* string of type  $(NP \setminus (S/NP))$ . Of course, the contrast becomes even more striking when we consider more complicated grammatical categories.

The reason is that in tensor grammars (as well as in ACG) all information about positioning words in a sentence is contained in the corresponding term, while in Lambek grammars this information is stored in the corresponding type, once for all type elements. Apparently it would be desirable to have some finer structure on tensor types allowing similar economy.

These considerations become even more relevant when we consider complex linguistic phenomena, such as *coordination*. It was very convincingly explained in [11] that, in contrast to Lambek grammars, ACG are in a certain sense *inadequate* for modeling (non-constituent) coordination, at least, in the most direct, “naive” approach. This analysis applies to tensor grammars equally well.

In fact, tensor representation makes this “inadequacy” very transparent. Consider, as a very simple example, the sentence

John loves and Jim hates Mary.

The elements that are coordinated are the strings “John loves” and “Jim hates”, which are customarily modeled as terms of type  $NP \multimap S$ . It follows that we need a coordinating operator of type

$$(NP \multimap S) \multimap (NP \multimap S) \multimap (NP \multimap S).$$

But the tensor type  $NP \multimap S$  is not elementary, i.e. its elements are not strings. Rather, they are ordered pairs of strings. Coordinating them means gluing two pairs of strings into one pair, and there are too many ways of doing this... But apparently none of these ways corresponds to actual coordination occurring in the language.

Staying with the toy grammar of the preceding subsection, we can generate at least three different kinds of terms in the type  $\overline{NP}_j^i \wp S_l^k$ , namely:

$$[\text{John loves}]_k^j \cdot \delta_i^l, \quad \delta_k^j \cdot [\text{loves Mary}]_i^l, \quad [\text{John loves}]_k^j \cdot [\text{madly}]_i^l.$$

Obviously, all three terms have direct linguistic meaning. At the same time they cannot be coordinated with each other.

On the other hand, we can note that terms of the first kind correspond to the Lambek grammar type  $S/NP$  and can be coordinated with each other. Similarly, the second kind corresponds to the type  $NP \setminus S$  and its elements can be coordinated with each other equally well. As for the third kind, its elements cannot be represented as strings and cannot be coordinated in a simple way.

This simple analysis shows once again that the structure of tensor types (or linear implicational types in the case of ACG) is too coarse, at least for simple intuitive modeling of non-constituent coordination. It seems clear that we need type constructors capable of emulating Lambek calculus.

### 4.3 Towards Lambek types

The tensor representation makes very transparent how the “non-commutative” types of Lambek calculus look inside “commutative” types of tensor grammars and ACG.

Indeed, let  $A, B$  be types of Lambek grammar. Their elements are strings, so they can be emulated as tensor types of valency (1,1), say  $A_j^i$  and  $B_l^k$ . Then elements of the complex Lambek grammar types  $A \setminus B$  and  $B / A$  can be represented as elements of the tensor type  $\overline{A}_j^i \wp B_l^k$  of the form, respectively,

$$[u]_k^i \cdot \delta_j^l \text{ and } [u]_j^l \cdot \delta_k^i. \tag{8}$$

It is easily computed that elements of the first form act (by means of the Cut rule) on elements of  $A_i^j$  by multiplication (concatenation) on the left, and elements of the second form, by multiplication on the right.

The two formats in (8) identify two *subtypes* of the implicational tensor type that correspond to two implicational types of Lambek calculus. Note that, if we restrict to either of these subtypes, then only two of the four available type indices become relevant, while two other indices are automatically connected with an empty string (Kronecker delta). This suggests that the new type constructors for emulating Lambek calculus should *bind indices in types*.

In the next section we accurately discuss tensor representation of ACG. After that we develop *extended tensor type calculus* for embedding Lambek grammars basing on the above considerations.

## 5 Representing abstract categorial grammars

In this section we assume that the reader is familiar with basic notions of  $\lambda$ -calculus, see [2] for a reference.

### 5.1 Linear $\lambda$ -calculus

Given a set  $X$  of *variables* and a set  $C$  of *constants*, with  $C \cap X = \emptyset$ , the set  $\Lambda(X, C)$  of *linear  $\lambda$ -terms* is defined by the following.

- Any  $a \in X \cup C$  is in  $\Lambda(X, C)$ ;
- if  $t, s \in \Lambda(X, C)$  are linear  $\lambda$ -terms whose sets of free variables are disjoint then  $(t \cdot s) \in \Lambda(X, C)$ ;
- if  $t \in \Lambda(X, C)$ , and  $x \in X$  occurs freely in  $t$  exactly once then  $(\lambda x.t) \in \Lambda(X, C)$ .

We use common notational conventions such as omitting dots and outermost brackets and writing iterated applications as

$$(tsk) = (ts)k. \tag{9}$$

Given a set  $P$  of *propositional symbols* or *atomic types*, the set  $Tp_{\multimap}(P)$  of *linear implicational types* over  $P$  is defined by induction.

- Any  $A \in P$  is in  $Tp_{\multimap}(P)$ ;
- if  $A, B \in Tp_{\multimap}(P)$ , then  $(A \multimap B) \in Tp_{\multimap}(P)$ .

Since we are not going to discuss any non-linear fragment, the title “linear” in the context of  $\lambda$ -calculus will usually be omitted.

A  *$\lambda$ -typing assumption* is an expression of the form  $x : A$ , where  $x \in X$  and  $A \in Tp_{\multimap}(P)$ . A (linear)  *$\lambda$ -typing context* is a finite set

$$x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n \tag{10}$$

of typing assumptions, where  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$  are pairwise distinct.

Writing  $\Gamma = A_1, \dots, A_n$  for the sequence of types in (10), and  $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  for the vector of variables, we denote typing context (10) as  $\vec{x} : \Gamma$ .

A (linear)  $\lambda$ -typing judgement is a sequent of the form  $\vec{x} : \Gamma \vdash t : A$ , where  $t \in \Lambda(X, C)$ ,  $A \in Tp_{\multimap}(P)$ , and  $\vec{x} : \Gamma$  is a typing context.

$\lambda$ -Typing judgements are derived from the following type inference rules.

$$x : A \vdash x : A \text{ (Id),}$$

$$\frac{\vec{x} : \Gamma \vdash t : A \multimap B \quad \vec{y} : \Theta \vdash s : A}{\vec{x} : \Gamma, \vec{y} : \Theta \vdash (ts) : B} \text{ (}\multimap\text{ E),} \quad \frac{\vec{u} : \Gamma, x : A \vdash t : B}{\vec{u} : \Gamma \vdash (\lambda x.t) : A \multimap B} \text{ (}\multimap\text{ I).}$$

**Lemma 3** *Let*

$$\Xi = \{\vdash t_{(1)} : A_{(1)}, \dots, \vdash t_{(n)} : A_{(n)}\}$$

*be a finite multiset of  $\lambda$ -typing judgements.*

*A typing judgement  $\vec{x} : \Gamma \vdash t : A$  is derivable in  $\Sigma$  from elements of  $\Xi$  using each element exactly once iff there exists a term  $t'$  and a typing judgement  $\sigma'$  of the form*

$$\vec{x} : \Gamma \vdash t' : A_{(1)} \multimap \dots \multimap A_{(n)} \multimap A$$

*derivable in linear  $\lambda$ -calculus such that*

$$t' t_{(1)} \dots t_{(n)} \sim_{\beta} t.$$

**Proof** By induction on derivation.  $\square$

A  $\lambda$ -signature  $\Sigma$  is a triple  $\Sigma = (P, C, \mathfrak{T})$ , where  $P$  is a finite set of atomic types,  $C$  is a finite set of constants and  $\mathfrak{T}$  is a function assigning to each constant  $c \in C$  a linear implicational type  $\mathfrak{T}(c) \in Tp(P)$ .

Typing judgements of the form

$$\vdash c : \mathfrak{T}(c), \tag{11}$$

where  $c \in C$ , are called *signature axioms* of  $\Sigma$ .

Given a  $\lambda$ -signature  $\Sigma$ , we say that a typing judgement  $\vec{x} : \Gamma \vdash t : A$  is *derivable in  $\Sigma$*  if it is derivable from axioms of  $\Sigma$  by rules of linear  $\lambda$ -calculus. We write in this case  $\vec{x} : \Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} t : A$ .

The following is standard.

**Proposition 4** *For any  $\lambda$ -signature  $\Sigma$ , the set of derivable typing judgements is closed under the substitution rule*

$$\frac{\vec{u} : \Gamma \vdash t : A \quad x : A, \vec{y} : \Gamma' \vdash s : B}{\vec{u} : \Gamma, \vec{y} : \Gamma' \vdash s[x := t] : B} \text{ (Subst).}$$

**Proof** by induction on derivation.  $\square$

## 5.2 Translating $\lambda$ -signatures

Let  $\Sigma = (P, C, \mathfrak{T})$  be a  $\lambda$ -signature, and assume that every element  $p \in P$  is assigned a valency  $v(p) \in \mathbf{N}^2$ .

Valency defines an embedding

$$tr : Tp_{\multimap}(P) \rightarrow Tp_{\otimes}(P)$$



of implicational types to tensor type symbols by the following induction:

$$tr(p) = p \text{ for } p \in P, \quad tr(A \multimap B) = \overline{tr(A)} \wp tr(B). \quad (12)$$

By abuse of notation, in the following we will denote an implicational type  $A$  and the corresponding tensor type symbol  $tr(A)$  the same.

Now let a finite alphabet  $T$  of terminal symbols be given, and assume that each axiom  $\vdash c : A$  of  $\Sigma$  is assigned a tensor typing judgement  $\tilde{c} \vdash A_I^J$  over  $P$  and  $T$ , its *tensor translation*.

Let  $\Xi = \{\tilde{c} \vdash A \mid \vdash c : A \text{ is an axiom of } \Sigma\}$ .

This defines a tensor signature  $\tilde{\Sigma} = (P, T\Xi)$ , the *tensor translation* of  $\Sigma$ .

We are going to extend tensor translation from axioms to all  $\lambda$ -typing judgements derivable in  $\Sigma$ .

In order to avoid cumbersome notation, we will omit indices from tensor types and write only tensor type symbols, unless this leads to a confusion.

We translate  $\lambda$ -typing judgement of form  $\vec{x} : \Gamma \vdash t : A$  derivable in  $\Sigma$  to a tensor typing judgement of the form  $\tilde{t} \vdash \bar{\Gamma}, A$ , where  $\tilde{t}$  is some tensor term, by the following induction on derivation.

- The axiom  $x : A \vdash x : A$  translates as  $\delta_{I,J}^{I',J'} \vdash \bar{A}_{J'}, A_I^J$ .
- Let a  $\lambda$ -typing judgement derivable in  $\Sigma$  have the form

$$\Gamma \vdash \lambda x. t : A \multimap B. \quad (13)$$

Then it was obtained by the  $(\multimap \text{I})$  rule.

By the induction hypothesis, the premise

$$\Gamma, x : A \vdash t : B$$

translates as a tensor typing judgement of the form  $\tilde{t} \vdash \bar{\Gamma}, \bar{A}, B$ .

Translate (13) as  $\tilde{t} \vdash \bar{\Gamma}, \bar{A} \wp B$ , which is derivable from the above by the  $(\wp)$  rule.

- Let the  $\lambda$ -typing judgement

$$\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash ft : B. \quad (14)$$

be obtained from the premises

$$\Gamma \vdash f : A \multimap B, \quad \Gamma' \vdash t : A$$

by the  $(\multimap \text{E})$  rule.

By the induction hypothesis, the premises translate as tensor typing judgements of the form, respectively

$$\tilde{f} \vdash \bar{\Gamma}, \bar{A}_{J'} \wp B, \quad \tilde{t} \vdash \bar{\Gamma}', A_I^J.$$

Translate conclusion (14) as

$$\delta_{I,J}^{I',J'} \cdot \tilde{f} \cdot \tilde{t} \vdash \bar{\Gamma}, \bar{\Gamma}', B,$$

which is derivable by Corollary 1.

### 5.2.1 Preservation of $\beta\eta$ -equivalence

**Lemma 4** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a  $\lambda$ -signature translated to a tensor signature  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  as above. Assume that  $\lambda$ -typing judgements*

$$\vec{u} : \Gamma \vdash t : A, \quad (15)$$

$$x : A, \vec{y} : \Theta \vdash s : B, \quad (16)$$

*derivable in  $\Sigma$  are translated, respectively, as tensor typing judgements*

$$\tilde{t} \vdash \overline{\Gamma}, A_I^J \quad (17)$$

$$\tilde{s} \vdash \overline{A}_{J'}, \overline{\Theta}, B. \quad (18)$$

*Then the  $\lambda$ -typing judgement obtained from (15), (16) by the substitution rule (see Proposition 4) translates as the tensor typing judgement obtained from (17), (18) by the Cut rule.*

**Proof** in the Appendix.

**Lemma 5** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a  $\lambda$ -signature translated to a tensor signature  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ . Assume that  $\lambda$ -typing judgements*

$$\vec{u} : \Gamma \vdash t : A, \quad \vec{u} : \Gamma \vdash t' : A, \quad (19)$$

*are derivable in  $\Sigma$ , and  $t \sim_\beta t'$ .*

*Then tensor translations of typing judgements in (19) coincide.*

**Proof** in the Appendix.

**Lemma 6** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a  $\lambda$ -signature translated to a tensor signature  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ .*

*If  $\lambda$ -typing judgements (19) are derivable in  $\Sigma$ , and  $t \sim_\eta t'$ , then their tensor translations coincide.*

**Proof** in the Appendix.

**Corollary 3** *In the setting as above, if  $\lambda$ -typing judgements (19) are derivable in  $\Sigma$ , and  $t \sim_{\beta\eta} t'$ , then their tensor translations coincide.  $\square$*

### 5.2.2 Conservativity

**Lemma 7** *Assume that we have a translation of implicational types to tensor types as previously.*

*Let  $F_{(1)}, \dots, F_{(n)}, F$  be implicational types, and let  $\tau$  be a tensor term.*

*Then the tensor typing judgement*

$$\tau \vdash \overline{F_{(1)}}, \dots, \overline{F_{(n)}}, F \quad (20)$$

*is derivable in **TTC** iff there is a  $\lambda$ -typing judgement*

$$x_{(1)} : F_{(1)}, \dots, x_{(n)} : F_{(n)} \vdash t : F \quad (21)$$

*derivable in linear  $\lambda$ -calculus whose translation is (20).*

**Proof** in the Appendix.

**Corollary 4** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a  $\lambda$ -signature translated to a tensor signature  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ .*

*Let  $F_{(1)}, \dots, F_{(n)}, F$  be implicational formulas, and let  $\tau$  be a tensor term.*

*Then tensor typing judgement (20) is derivable in  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  iff there is a  $\lambda$ -typing judgement of form (21) derivable in  $\Sigma$  whose translation is (20).*

**Proof** Lemma 7, Lemma 2 and Lemma 3.  $\square$

## 5.3 Translating string ACG

### 5.3.1 String signature

Let  $T$  be a finite alphabet.

The  $\lambda$ -string signature  $Str_{\lambda, T}$  over  $T$  is the linear  $\lambda$ -signature with a single atomic type  $O$ , the alphabet  $T$  as the set of constants and the typing assignment

$$\mathfrak{T}(c) = O \multimap O \quad \forall c \in T.$$

We denote the implicational type  $O \multimap O$  as *str*.

If  $t$  is a closed (i.e. not having free variables) term such that  $\vdash_{Str_{\lambda, T}} t : str$ , we say that  $t$  is a *string term*.

Any word  $a_1 \dots a_n$  in the alphabet  $T$  can be represented as the string term

$$\rho(a_1 \dots a_n) = (\lambda x. a_1(\dots (a_n(x)) \dots)). \quad (22)$$

It is not hard to see that, if we identify  $\beta\eta$ -equivalent terms, the map  $\rho$  has an inverse.

**Lemma 8** *Any string term  $t$  is  $\beta\eta$ -equivalent to the term  $\rho(w)$  for some  $w \in T^*$ .*

**Proof** in the Appendix,

In the setting of Lemma 8, we say that the word  $w$  is *represented* by the string term  $t$ .

The *tensor string signature*  $Str_{\otimes, T}$  over  $T$  is the tensor signature with the single positive atomic type  $O$  of valency  $v(O) = (1, 0)$ , the alphabet  $T$  of terminal symbols and axioms

$$[c]_i^j \vdash \bar{O}_j \wp O^i \quad \forall c \in T.$$

We denote the set of tensor types generated by  $\{O, \bar{O}\}$  as  $Tp_{\otimes}(O)$  and we identify  $Tp_{\multimap}(O)$  with a subset of  $Tp_{\otimes}(O)$  using formulas (12).

It is rather obvious that  $Str_{\otimes, T}$  is a tensor translation of  $Str_{\lambda, T}$ .

**Proposition 5** *Let  $w \in T^*$  be a word in the terminal alphabet.*

*The  $\lambda$ -typing judgement  $\vdash \rho(w) : O \multimap O$ , derivable in  $Str_{\lambda, T}$ , translates in  $Str_{\otimes, T}$  as  $[w]_i^j \vdash \bar{O}_j \wp O^i$ .  $\square$*

### 5.3.2 String ACG

Given two linear  $\lambda$ -signatures  $\Sigma_i = (N_i, C_i, \mathfrak{T}_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , a *map of  $\lambda$ -signatures*

$$\phi : \Sigma_1 \rightarrow \Sigma_2$$

is a pair  $\phi = (F, G)$ , where

- $F : Tp_{\rightarrow}(\Sigma_1) \rightarrow Tp_{\rightarrow}(\Sigma_2)$  is a function satisfying the homomorphism property

$$F(A \multimap B) = F(A) \multimap F(B),$$

- $G : C_1 \rightarrow \Lambda(X, C_2)$  is a function such that for any  $c \in C_1$  it holds that  $\vdash_{\Sigma_2} G(c) : F(\mathfrak{T}(c))$ .

The map  $G$  above extends inductively to a map

$$G : \Lambda(X, C_1) \rightarrow \Lambda(X, C_2)$$

by

$$G(x) = x, \quad x \in X,$$

$$G(ts) = (G(t)G(s)), \quad G(\lambda x.t) = (\lambda x.G(t)).$$

For economy of notation, we write  $\phi(A)$  for  $F(A)$  when  $A \in Tp_{\rightarrow}(C_1)$ , and we write  $\phi(t)$  for  $G(t)$  when  $t \in \Lambda(X, C_1)$ .

A *string abstract categorial grammar (string ACG)*  $G$  is a tuple  $G = (\Sigma, T, \phi, S)$ , where

- $\Sigma$ , the *abstract signature*, is a linear  $\lambda$ -signature;
- $\phi : \Sigma \rightarrow Str_{\lambda, T}$ , the *lexicon*, is a map of  $\lambda$ -signatures;
- $S$ , the *sentence type*, is an atomic type of  $\Sigma$  with  $\phi(S) = O \multimap O$ .

The *string language*  $L(G)$  generated by a string ACG  $G$  is the set of words

$$L(G) = \{w \in T^* \mid \exists t \rho(w) = \phi(t), \vdash_{\Sigma} t : S\}.$$

### 5.3.3 Translation

Now let a string ACG  $G = (\Sigma, T, \phi, S)$  be given.

Let  $P$  be the set of atomic types of  $\Sigma$ .

Let  $p \in P$ .

We have an implicational type  $\phi(p)$  of  $Str_{\lambda, T}$  and its tensor translation (which we denote by the same expression) in  $Str_{\otimes, T}$ . We assign to  $p$  the valency  $v(p) = v(\phi(p))$  and consider it as a positive atomic type for a new tensor signature. In this way we get the new set  $Tp_{\otimes}(P)$  of tensor types. We identify implicational types  $Tp_{\rightarrow}(P)$  with a subset of  $Tp_{\otimes}(P)$  using (12).

The map  $\phi : Tp_{\rightarrow}(P) \rightarrow Tp_{\rightarrow}(O)$  extends to a map

$$\phi : Tp_{\otimes}(P) \rightarrow Tp_{\otimes}(O) \tag{23}$$

in the obvious way, setting

$$\phi(\overline{A}) = \overline{\phi(A)}, \quad \phi(A \otimes B) = \phi(A) \otimes \phi(B).$$

Note that map (23) preserves valencies of tensor types.

Now, for each axiom  $\vdash c : A$  of  $\Sigma$ , we have the  $\lambda$ -typing judgement

$$\vdash \phi(c) : \phi(A) \tag{24}$$

derivable in  $Str_{\lambda, T}$ , and, since  $Str_{\otimes, T}$  is a tensor translation of  $Str_{\lambda, T}$ , there is a tensor translation

$$\tau_{j_1 \dots j_k}^{i_1 \dots i_n} \vdash (\phi(A))_{i_1 \dots i_n}^{j_1 \dots j_k} \tag{25}$$

of (24) derivable in  $Str_{\otimes, T}$ , where  $\tau_{j_1 \dots j_k}^{i_1 \dots i_n}$  is some tensor term over  $T$  and  $v(\phi(A)) = (k, n)$ .

Now,  $v(A) = v(\phi(A))$ , so the tensor typing judgement

$$\tau_{j_1 \dots j_k}^{i_1 \dots i_n} \vdash A_{i_1 \dots i_n}^{j_1 \dots j_k} \tag{26}$$

is well-defined.

We take (26) as the tensor translation of (24).

We define the tensor signature  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  over  $P$  and  $T$  by taking as axioms all translations of axioms of  $\Sigma$ .

**Proposition 6** *Let  $\vdash t : A$  be a  $\lambda$ -typing judgement derivable in  $\Sigma$ , and  $\tau \vdash A$  be its tensor translation in  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ , where  $\tau$  is some tensor term.*

*Then the  $\lambda$ -typing judgement  $\phi(t) \vdash \phi(A)$  translates in  $\widetilde{Str}_T$  as  $\tau \vdash \phi(A)$ .  $\square$*

We define a tensor grammar  $\tilde{G}$  as  $\tilde{G} = (\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{S})$ . We say that  $\tilde{G}$  is the *tensor representation* of  $G$ .

**Proposition 7** *For any ACG  $G$ , the string language  $L(G)$  of  $G$  coincides with the language  $L(\tilde{G})$  of its tensor representation  $\tilde{G}$ .*

**Proof** If  $w \in L(G)$ , then for some  $\lambda$ -term  $t$  we have  $\vdash_{\Sigma} t : S$  and  $\phi(t) = \rho(w)$ . It follows from Proposition 6 and Proposition 5 that the typing judgement  $\vdash t : S$  translates in  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  as  $[w]_i^j \vdash S_j^i$ , hence  $w \in L(\tilde{G})$ .

If  $w \in L(\tilde{G})$ , then the tensor typing judgement  $[w]_i^j \vdash S_j^i$  is derivable in  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ . By Lemma 4 there is a  $\lambda$ -typing judgement  $\vdash t : S$  derivable in  $\Sigma$  whose translation is  $[w]_i^j \vdash S_j^i$ . By Proposition 6 we have that the  $\lambda$ -typing judgement  $\vdash \phi(t) : str$  translates in  $Str_{\otimes, T}$  as  $[w]_i^j \vdash \overline{O}_j \phi O^i$ . It follows from Lemma 8, Corollary 3 and Proposition 5 that  $t \sim_{\beta\eta} \rho(w)$ . Hence  $\vdash \rho(w) : str$  and  $w \in L(G)$ .  $\square$

(We should note that, generally speaking, the tensor representation of a string ACG is faithful only on the “surface” level of the string language. In principle, it can be degenerate on the level of the abstract signature. If non-equivalent typing judgements of the abstract signature  $\Sigma$  are identified by the lexicon map  $\phi$ , then they will be identified by the tensor representation as well.)

## 6 Extended tensor grammars

We proceed now to extending tensor grammars with *binding operators* in order to accommodate noncommutative constructions. The two new operators will be denoted as  $\nabla$  and  $\Delta$ .

Loosely speaking, *extended tensor types* are defined by the same rules as tensor types plus a rule for binding operators:

- If  $A$  is a type with  $i \in FSup(A)$ ,  $j \in FSub(A)$ , then  $\nabla_i^j A$ ,  $\Delta_j^i A$  are types.

However, as is usual with binding operators, we need to be accurate and treat all “bureaucratic” details carefully.

### 6.1 Extended tensor types

We first define *extended tensor type expressions*.

Extended tensor type expressions have upper and lower indices that may have multiple occurrences. An index occurrence may be *free* or *bound*, and any index may have at most one free occurrence. A bound index occurrence is bound by some binding operator. Also, a binding operator occurring in an extended type expression  $A$  has a *scope*, which is a set of free index occurrences in  $A$ .

For an extended tensor type expression we will denote the set of indices having a free occurrence as an upper, respectively lower, index in  $A$  as  $FSup(A)$ , respectively  $FSub(A)$ . As usual, we write  $FInd(A) = FSup(A) \cup FSub(A)$ .

Given a set  $P$  of positive atomic type symbols together with the valency function  $v : P \rightarrow \mathbf{N}^2$ , we simultaneously define *extended tensor type expressions*, *free and bound index occurrences* and *binding operator scopes* by the following rules.

- If  $p \in P$  with  $v(p) = (n, m)$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_m, j_1, \dots, j_n$  are pairwise distinct elements of  $Ind$  then  $A = p_{i_1 \dots i_m}^{j_1 \dots j_n}$ , respectively  $A = \bar{p}_{j_1 \dots j_n}^{i_1 \dots i_m}$ , is an extended tensor type expression, and every index occurrence is free.
- If  $A, B$  are extended tensor type expressions with  $FInd(A) \cap FInd(B) = \emptyset$  then  $C = A \otimes B$ , respectively  $C = A \wp B$ , is an extended tensor type expression.  
A free index occurrence in  $A$  or  $B$  remains free in  $C$ . An occurrence bound by a binding operator  $Q$  in  $A$  or  $B$  remains bound by  $Q$  in  $C$ . A free occurrence in the scope of a binding operator  $Q$  in  $A$  or  $B$  remains in the scope of  $Q$  in  $C$ .
- If  $A$  is an extended tensor type expression with  $i \in FSup(A)$ ,  $j \in FSub(A)$ , then  $A' = \nabla_i^j A$ , respectively  $A' = \Delta_j^i A$ , is an extended tensor type expression.  
A free occurrence of an index  $k \neq i, j$  in  $A$  remains free in  $A'$ . An occurrence bound by a binding operator  $Q$  in  $A$  remains bound by  $Q$  in  $A'$ . A free occurrence of an index  $k \neq i, j$  in the scope of a binding operator  $Q$  in  $A$  remains in the scope of  $Q$  in  $A'$ .

The unique free occurrences of  $i$  and  $j$  in  $A$  are bound in  $A'$  by the binding operator  $\nabla_i^j$ , respectively  $\Delta_i^j$ , in the beginning of  $A'$ . Any free index occurrence in  $A'$  is in the scope of the binding operator  $\nabla_i^j$ , respectively  $\Delta_i^j$ , in the beginning of  $A'$ .

We define  $\alpha$ -equivalence of extended tensor type expressions, denoted as  $\sim_\alpha$ , as the smallest equivalence relation satisfying the following.

- Let  $A$  be an extended tensor type expression,  $Q = \nabla_i^j$ , respectively  $Q = \Delta_i^j$ , be an occurrence of a binding operator in  $A$ ,  $i' \neq j$  be an index not occurring freely in  $A$  in the scope of  $Q$ . Let  $A'$  be obtained from  $A$  by simultaneously replacing  $Q$  with  $\nabla_{i'}^j$ , respectively  $\Delta_{i'}^j$  and replacing the unique occurrence of  $i$  bound by  $Q$  in  $A$  with  $i'$ . Then  $A \sim_\alpha A'$ .
- Let  $A$  be an extended tensor type expression,  $Q = \nabla_i^j$ , respectively  $Q = \Delta_i^j$ , be an occurrence of a binding operator in  $A$ ,  $j' \neq i$  be an index not occurring freely in  $A$  in the scope of  $Q$ . Let  $A'$  be obtained from  $A$  by simultaneously replacing  $Q$  with  $\nabla_i^{j'}$ , respectively  $\Delta_i^{j'}$ , and replacing the unique occurrence of  $j$  bound by  $Q$  in  $A$  with  $j'$ . Then  $A \sim_\alpha A'$ .

An *extended tensor type* is an equivalence class for the  $\alpha$ -equivalence of extended tensor type expressions.

Note that the sets of free indices are invariant under  $\alpha$ -equivalence of extended tensor type expressions, so they are well-defined for extended tensor types as well.

Finally, in an analogy with tensor type symbols, we want to define *extended tensor type symbols* as extended tensor types with all free indices erased... but locations of bound indices kept intact.

In order to do this accurately we introduce the last equivalence relation in this section, defined on extended tensor types by the following rules.

- If  $A \sim_\alpha A'$  then  $A \sim A'$ .
- Let  $i \in FInd(A)$  and  $i' \notin FInd(A)$  be such that if the unique free occurrence of  $i$  in  $A$  is in the scope of a binding operator  $Q$ , then  $i'$  is not bound by  $Q$  in  $A$ . Let  $A'$  be obtained from  $A$  by replacing the unique free occurrence of  $i$  in  $A$  with  $i'$ . Then  $A \sim A'$ .

We define *extended tensor type symbols* as equivalence classes for the above relation.

We denote the set of extended tensor type symbols over  $P$  as  $Tp_{\otimes, \nabla}(P)$ .

Just as in the case of tensor types, an extended tensor type can be reconstructed from its symbol by specifying the ordered sets of free upper and lower indices. Accordingly, we continue to use the notation  $A_I^J$  to denote the extended tensor type defined by the extended tensor type symbol  $A$  and ordered index sets  $I$  and  $J$ .

*Type valency* for extended tensor type symbols is defined by formula (3) supplemented with

$$v(\nabla_i^j A) = v(\Delta_i^j A) = v(A) - (1, 1).$$

Finally, the *dual type symbol*  $\overline{A}$  of an extended tensor type symbol  $A$  is defined by (4) supplemented with

$$\overline{\nabla_i^j A_{J_1 j J_2}^{I_1 i I_2}} = \Delta_i^j \overline{A_{I_1 i I_2}^{J_1 j J_2}}, \quad \overline{\Delta_i^j A_{J_1 j J_2}^{I_1 i I_2}} = \nabla_i^j \overline{A_{I_1 i I_2}^{J_1 j J_2}}. \quad (27)$$

(Formula (27) is written in terms of type expressions representing type symbols.)

## 6.2 Extended typing rules

*Extended tensor sequents* and *extended tensor typing judgements* are defined exactly as ordinary tensor sequents and tensor typing judgements, by replacing every occurrence of the adjective “tensor” with “extended tensor”.

We are going now to define extended tensor type calculus.

*Extended tensor type calculus* (**ETTC**) is defined by the rules of **TTC** supplemented with the following

$$\frac{\delta_i^j \cdot t \vdash \Gamma, A}{t \vdash \Gamma, \nabla_i^j A} (\nabla), \quad \frac{t \vdash \Gamma, A}{\delta_i^j \cdot t \vdash \Gamma, \Delta_j^i A} (\Delta),$$

where in the  $(\nabla)$  rule it is assumed that  $i \in FSup(A)$ ,  $j \in FSub(A)$ , and in the  $(\Delta)$  rule, that  $j \in FSup(A)$ ,  $i \in FSub(A)$ .

*Lambek restriction* on the  $(\nabla)$  rule consists in requiring that the context  $\Gamma$  is not empty. *Extended tensor type calculus with Lambek restriction* (**ETTC<sub>-</sub>**) is defined by the rules of **ETTC** with Lambek restriction on the  $(\nabla)$  rule.

### 6.2.1 Cut elimination

**Lemma 9** *Any typing judgement derivable in **ETTC** (**ETTC<sub>-</sub>**) is derivable without the Cut rule.*

**Proof** in the Appendix.

## 6.3 Grammars

There are two versions of extended tensor type calculus, with and without Lambek restriction. Accordingly, there are two possible versions of corresponding grammars. We will say loosely *extended tensor grammar* without specifying the version.

Obviously, *extended tensor signatures* and *extended tensor grammars* are defined exactly the same as tensor signatures and tensor grammars with the adjective “tensor” replaced with “extended tensor” and the title **TTC** replaced with **ETTC** (respectively, **ETTC<sub>-</sub>**).

We discuss now variations of Lemma 2, “Deduction theorem” in the setting of extended tensor types. This will be necessary for embedding Lambek calculus into **ETTC** as a conservative fragment.



### 6.3.1 Lambek style types

Lemma 2, “Deduction theorem”, strictly speaking, is not valid for **ETTC**. (In the same way as the usual Deduction theorem is not valid for first order logic.)

However, there is a limited form of Lemma 2, which will be sufficient for our purposes.

Let us say that an extended tensor type symbol  $A$  is *Lambek-style* if  $v(A) = (1, 1)$ . An extended tensor type is Lambek style if its symbol is Lambek style. An extended tensor typing judgement  $t \vdash A$  is Lambek-style if  $A$  is a Lambek style type, and  $t$  is not closed (i.e.,  $t$  contains letters from the terminal alphabet).

The following is straightforward.

**Proposition 8** *Proposition 3 holds for **ETTC** (respectively **ETTC**<sub>-</sub>) when all typing judgements in  $\Xi$  are Lambek style.  $\square$*

The following is proved by induction on derivation similarly to Lemma 2

**Lemma 10** *Lemma 2 holds for **ETTC** (respectively **ETTC**<sub>-</sub>) when all typing judgements in  $\Xi$  are Lambek style.  $\square$*

## 7 Embedding Lambek calculus

### 7.1 Lambek calculus

Given a set  $P$  of atomic types, the set  $Tp_{\setminus, /, \bullet}(P)$  of *Lambek types* over  $P$ , is defined by induction.

- Any  $A \in P$  is in  $Tp_{\setminus, /, \bullet}(P)$ ;
- if  $A, B \in Tp_{\setminus, /, \bullet}(P)$ , then  $(A \setminus B), (A / B), (A \bullet B) \in Tp_{\setminus, /, \bullet}(P)$ .

A *Lambek sequent* is an expression of the form  $\Gamma \vdash A$ , where the *context*  $\Gamma$  is a finite *sequence* of Lambek types, and  $A$  is a Lambek type.

The Lambek sequent above satisfies the *Lambek restriction* if  $\Gamma \neq \emptyset$ .

Lambek sequents are derived from the following inference rules of *Lambek calculus* (**LC**) [8]:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 A \vdash A \text{ (Id)}, \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Theta_1, A, \Theta_2 \vdash B}{\Theta_1, \Gamma, \Theta_2 \vdash B} \text{ (Cut)}, \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash B/A} \text{ (/R)}, \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Theta_1, B, \Theta_2 \vdash C}{\Theta_1, B/A, \Gamma, \Theta_2 \vdash C} \text{ (/L)}, \\
 \\
 \frac{A, \Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \setminus B, \Gamma} \text{ (\setminus R)}, \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Theta_1, B, \Theta_2 \vdash C}{\Theta_1, \Gamma, A \setminus B, \Theta_2 \vdash C} \text{ (\setminus L)}, \\
 \\
 \frac{\Theta_1 \vdash A \quad \Theta_2 \vdash B}{\Theta_1, \Theta_2 \vdash A \bullet B} \text{ (\bullet R)}, \quad \frac{\Theta_1, A, B, \Theta_2 \vdash C}{\Theta_1, A \bullet B, \Theta_2 \vdash C} \text{ (\bullet L)}.
 \end{array}$$

*Lambek calculus with Lambek restriction* is obtained by adding to the ( $\setminus$ L) and ( $/$ L) rules above the requirement  $\Gamma \neq \emptyset$ . We will denote this system as **LC**<sub>-</sub>.

It is easy to see that all sequents derivable in  $\mathbf{LC}_-$  satisfy Lambek restriction. (Our notation and terminology is somewhat unconventional. Usually, it is the version *with Lambek restriction* that is taken as default.)

It is well known that Lambek calculus is cut-free: any sequent derivable in  $\mathbf{LC}$  ( $\mathbf{LC}_-$ ) is derivable without the Cut rule [8].

## 7.2 Translating Lambek calculus

Given a set of atomic types  $P$ , we assign to every element  $p \in P$  valency  $v(p) = (1, 1)$  and treat it as an atomic tensor type symbol.

This allows us to define an embedding

$$tr : Tp_{\setminus, /, \bullet}(P) \rightarrow Tp_{\otimes, \nabla}$$

of Lambek types to extended tensor type symbols.

We will abuse notation and denote a Lambek type and its extended tensor translation by the same expression.

Translation is defined in terms of extended tensor type expressions by the following:

$$(A \bullet B)_i^j = \Delta_\alpha^\beta(A_i^\beta \otimes B_\alpha^j), \quad (B/A)_j^i = \nabla_\beta^\alpha(\bar{A}_\alpha^i \wp B_j^\beta), \quad (A \setminus B)_j^i = \nabla_\beta^\alpha(B_\alpha^i \wp \bar{A}_j^\beta). \quad (28)$$

Any Lambek type is translated to an extended tensor type of valency  $(1, 1)$ , i.e., to a Lambek style type.

If  $A$  is a Lambek type, then we will call its image  $A$  in  $Tp_{\otimes, \nabla}$  a *positive Lambek type symbol*, and the dual  $\bar{A} \in Tp_{\otimes, \nabla}$  of its image, a *negative Lambek type symbol*.

We are going to translate  $\mathbf{LC}$  derivations to derivable extended tensor typing judgements. For that purpose we introduce some more terminology.

Let

$$A_{(1)}, \dots, A_{(n)} \quad (29)$$

be a cyclically ordered sequence of Lambek style type symbols.

The *Lambek cycle* of (29) is the typing judgement

$$t \vdash (A_{(1)})_{j_1}^{i_1}, \dots, (A_{(n)})_{j_n}^{i_n}, \text{ where } t = \delta_{i_1}^{j_n} \cdot \delta_{i_2}^{j_1} \dots \delta_{i_n}^{j_{n-1}}. \quad (30)$$

The term  $t$  in (30) depends on the choice of a syntactic representation, but it is unique up to renaming of indices. We will say that  $t$  is a *Lambek cycle term* of (29). In fact, we will often omit indices in a Lambek cycle since they can be recovered from the cyclic ordering of type symbols.

**Lemma 11** *Let a sequent  $\Gamma \vdash A$  be derivable in  $\mathbf{LC}$ , respectively  $\mathbf{LC}_-$ .*

*Then the Lambek cycle of the cyclically ordered sequent  $\bar{\Gamma}, A$  is derivable in  $\mathbf{ETTC}$ , respectively  $\mathbf{ETTC}_-$ .*

**Proof** Induction on a cut-free derivation  $\pi$  of  $\Gamma \vdash A$ . Single-premise rules of  $\mathbf{LC}$  translate as the  $(\wp)$  rule followed by the  $(\nabla)$  rule of  $\mathbf{ETTC}$ , and two-premise rules of  $\mathbf{LC}$  translate as the  $(\otimes)$  rule followed by the  $(\Delta)$  rule of  $\mathbf{ETTC}$ . A detailed computation is given in the Appendix.

### 7.2.1 Conservativity of translation

**Lemma 12** *Let  $\Gamma$  be an extended tensor sequent consisting of positive Lambek types, negative Lambek types, and types of the form  $A \otimes B$ , where each of  $A, B$  can be a positive or a negative Lambek type.*

*Let a typing judgement  $t \vdash \Gamma$  be derivable in **ETTC**, respectively **ETTC**<sub>-</sub>. Then there exist cyclically ordered sequents of Lambek style types*

$$\Gamma_{(1)}, \dots, \Gamma_{(n)}$$

such that

- the Lambek cycles

$$t_{(1)} \vdash \Gamma_{(1)}, \dots, t_{(n)} \vdash \Gamma_{(n)} \quad (31)$$

are derivable in **ETTC**;

- Lambek cycles in (31) are translations of sequents derivable in **LC**, respectively **LC**<sub>-</sub>;
- the typing judgement  $t \vdash \Gamma$  can be obtained from (31) using only the  $(\otimes)$  rule, and  $t = t_{(1)} \cdots t_{(n)}$ .

**Proof** by induction on a cut-free derivation is given in the Appendix.

**Corollary 5** *Let  $\Gamma \vdash X$  be a Lambek sequent.*

*The extended tensor typing judgement  $t \vdash \bar{\Gamma}, X$  is derivable in the **ETTC**, respectively **ETTC**<sub>-</sub>, iff it is the translation of an **LC**, respectively **LC**<sub>-</sub>, derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash X$ .  $\square$*

## 7.3 Translating Lambek grammars

### 7.3.1 Lambek grammars

A Lambek grammar  $G$  is a tuple  $G = (P, T, Lex, S)$ , where

- $P$  is a set of atomic types;
- $T$  is a finite alphabet of *terminal symbols*;
- $Lex$ , the *Lexicon*, is a finite set of expressions of the form  $a : A$ , called *axioms*, where  $a \in T$ ,  $A \in Tp_{\setminus, \cdot, \bullet}$ ;
- $S$ , the *sentence type*, is an element of  $P$ .

A word  $w \in T^*$  is in the *type  $A$  generated* by  $G$ , if there exist axioms

$$a_{(1)} : A_{(1)}, \dots, a_{(n)} : A_{(n)} \in Lex,$$

such that the sequent  $A_{(1)}, \dots, A_{(n)} \vdash A$  is derivable in **LC**<sub>-</sub>, and

$$w = a_{(1)} \dots a_{(n)}.$$

The *language of  $G$*  is the set of all words in the sentence type generated by  $G$ .

A Lambek grammar without Lambek restriction is defined as above, replacing **LC**<sub>-</sub> with **LC**.

### 7.3.2 Translation

Let a Lambek Grammar  $G = (P, T, Lex, S)$  we given.

We treat elements of  $P$  as atomic tensor type symbols and translate all Lambek types to extended tensor type symbols using formulas (28).

The axioms of  $G$  are immediately translated to extended tensor typing judgements. An axiom of the form  $w : A \in Lex$  translates as  $[w]_j^i \vdash A_i^j$ , where we denote a Lambek type and its translation the same.

Then the set of extended tensor typing judgements  $\{[w]_j^i \vdash A_i^j \mid w : A \in Lex\}$  defines an extended tensor signature  $\widetilde{Lex}$  over  $P$  and  $T$ .

We define an extended tensor grammar translating  $G$  as  $\tilde{G} = (\widetilde{Lex}, S)$ .

**Theorem 1** *For any Lambek type  $A \in Tp_{\setminus, /, \bullet}$ , a word  $w \in T^*$  is in the Lambek type  $A$  generated by  $G$  iff the extended tensor typing judgement  $[w]_j^i \vdash A_i^j$  is derivable in the signature  $\widetilde{Lex}$ .*

**Proof** Lemma 10 and Corollary 5.  $\square$

**Corollary 6** *The languages generated by  $G$  and  $\tilde{G}$  coincide.*  $\square$

## References

- [1] V.M. Abrusci, P. Ruet, Paul, “Non-commutative logic I: the multiplicative fragment”, *Annals of pure and applied logic*, 101(1):29–64, 1999.
- [2] H.P. Barendregt, “The Lambda Calculus Its Syntax and Semantics”. *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. 103. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1985.
- [3] P. de Groote, “Towards Abstract Categorical Grammars”, in , *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL '01*, pp.148-155, 2001.
- [4] Jean-Yves Girard, “Linear logic”, *Theoretical Computer Science*, 50:1-102, 1987.
- [5] Jean-Yves Girard, “Linear logic: its syntax and semantics”, in J.-Y.Girard, Y.Lafont and L.Regnier, eds. *Advances in Linear Logic*, 1-42, Cambridge University Press, 1995, *Proc. of the Workshop on Linear Logic*, Ithaca, New York, June, 1993.
- [6] M. Kanazawa, “Syntactic features for regular constraints and an approximation of directional slashes in Abstract Categorical Grammars”, in Y. Kubota, R. Levine (eds.), *Proceedings for ESSLLI 2015 Workshop Empirical Advances in Categorical Grammar*, 3470. University of Tsukuba & Ohio State University, 2015.

- [7] Y. Kubota, R. Levine, “Gapping as like-category coordination”, in D. Béchet & A. Dikovsky, eds, ‘Logical Aspects of Computational Linguistics’, Vol. 7351 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, Nantes, pp. 135-150, 2012.
- [8] J. Lambek, Joachim, ”The mathematics of sentence structure”, Amer. Math. Monthly, 65: 154170, 1958.
- [9] J. Lambek, “On the calculus of syntactic types’, in R. Jakobson, editor, Structure of Language and its Mathematical Aspects, pp. 166-178, Providence, 1961.
- [10] M. Moortgat, “Categorial type logics”, in Johan van Benthem and Alice ter Meulen, eds., Handbook of Logic and Language, chapter 2, pp. 93178, Elsevier, MIT Press, 1997.
- [11] R. Moot, “Comparing and evaluating extended Lambek calculi” . In Kubota, Y. and Levine, R., editors, Proceedings for ESSLLI 2015 Workshop Empirical Advances in Categorial Grammar, University of Tsukuba and Ohio State, pp. 108131, 2015.
- [12] R. Moot, “Hybrid type-logical grammars, 1rst-order linear logic and the descriptive inadequacy of lambda grammars”, <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00996724>, 2014.
- [13] G. Morrill, O. Valentín, M. Fadda, “The displacement calculus”, Journal of Logic, Language and Information 20(1), 1-48, 2011.
- [14] R. Muskens, “Separating syntax and combinatorics in categorial grammar”, Research on Language and Computation 5(3), 267-285, 2007.
- [15] V. Mihaliček, C. Pollard, “Distinguishing phenogrammar from tectogrammar simplifies the analysis of interrogatives.” In Proceedings of the 15th and 16th International Conference on Formal Grammar (FG’10/FG’11), 130-145. Springer 2012.
- [16] S. Slavnov, “Classical linear logic, cobordisms and categorial grammars”, arXiv:1911.03962v2 [math.LO], 2019.
- [17] C. Worth, Christopher. 2016. “English coordination in Linear Categorial Grammar”, Ohio State University, dissertation, 2016.
- [18] R. Yoshinaka, M. Kanazawa, “The Complexity and Generative Capacity of Lexicalized Abstract Categorial Grammars”. In: Blache P., Stabler E., Busquets J., Moot R. (eds) Logical Aspects of Computational Linguistics. LACL. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 3492. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005.

## A Proof of Lemma 1

Proof is parallel to cut-elimination in **MLL**.

Let us work out basic cut-elimination steps.

Let a derivation end with the Cut rule where one of the premises is an (Id) axiom:

$$\frac{t \vdash \Gamma, p_J^I \quad \delta_{KI'}^{J'L} \vdash \bar{p}_L^K, p_{J'}^{I'}}{\delta_{JL}^{KI} \cdot \delta_{KI'}^{J'L} \cdot t \vdash \Gamma, p_{J'}^{I'}} (\text{Cut}).$$

We have for the term in the conclusion

$$\delta_{JL}^{KI} \cdot \delta_{KI'}^{J'L} \cdot t \equiv \delta_{KI'}^{J'L} \cdot \delta_{JL}^{KI} \cdot t \equiv \delta_{JI'}^{J'I} \cdot t,$$

(by Proposition 1), and applying Proposition 1 once more we see that the conclusion is congruent to  $t \vdash \Gamma, p_J^I$ , which has already been derived.

Let a derivation end with the Cut rule of the form

$$\frac{\frac{t \vdash \Gamma, A_J^I \quad s \vdash B_{J'}^{I'}, \Theta}{t \cdot s \vdash \Gamma, A_J^I \otimes B_{J'}^{I'}, \Theta} (\otimes) \quad \frac{u \vdash \Psi, \bar{A}_L^K, \bar{B}_{L'}^{K'}}{u \vdash \Psi, \bar{A}_L^K \wp \bar{B}_{L'}^{K'}} (\wp)}{\delta_{J'J''L'L'}^{K'K''I''} \cdot t \cdot s \cdot u \vdash \Gamma, \Theta, \Psi} (\text{Cut}).$$

This can be replaced with the derivation

$$\frac{\frac{t \vdash \Gamma, A_J^I \quad u \vdash \Theta, \bar{A}_L^K, \bar{B}_{L'}^{K'}}{\delta_{JL}^{KI} t \cdot u \vdash \Gamma, \bar{B}_{L'}^{K'}, \Psi} (\text{Cut}) \quad s \vdash B_{J'}^{I'}, \Theta, \Psi}{\delta_{J'L'}^{K'I'} \delta_{JL}^{KI} t \cdot u \cdot s \vdash \Gamma, \Theta, \Psi} (\text{Cut}),$$

which results in the same typing judgement (by commutativity of term multiplication).  $\square$

## B Proof of Lemma 4

Induction on derivation of (16).

The key step is when the derivation ends with the ( $\multimap$  E) rule.

So assume that  $\Theta = \Psi, \Psi'$ ,  $\vec{y} = (\vec{z}, \vec{z}')$ ,  $s = fk$ , and (16) was obtained from

$$x : A, \vec{z} : \Psi \vdash f : C \multimap B, \quad \vec{z}' : \Psi' \vdash k : C. \quad (32)$$

Then (32) translates as

$$\tilde{f} \vdash \bar{\Psi}, \bar{C}_L^K \wp B, \quad \tilde{k} \vdash \bar{A}_{J'}^{I'}, \bar{\Psi}', C_{K'}^{L'} \quad (33)$$

and typing judgement (18) has the form

$$\delta_{K'L}^{KL'} \cdot \tilde{f} \vdash \bar{A}_{J'}^{I'}, \bar{\Theta}, B. \quad (34)$$

Now the  $\lambda$ -typing judgement obtained by the substitution rule from (15), (16) is derivable in  $\Sigma$  as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\vec{u} : \Gamma \vdash t : A, \quad x : A, \vec{z} : \Psi \vdash f : C \multimap B}{\vec{u} : \Gamma, \vec{z} : \Psi \vdash f[x := t] : C \multimap B} \text{ (Subst)} \quad \vec{z}' : \Psi' \vdash k : C}{\vec{u} : \Gamma, \vec{y}' : \Theta \vdash f[x := t] \cdot k : B} \text{ (}\multimap \text{E)}.$$

Applying the induction hypothesis, we translate the conclusion of the above as the tensor typing judgement

$$\delta_{K'L'}^{K'L'} \delta_{J'I'}^{J'I'} \cdot \tilde{t} \cdot \tilde{f} \cdot \tilde{k} \vdash \bar{\Gamma}, \bar{\Theta}, B.$$

Applying the Cut rule to (34), (18) results in a congruent typing judgement. Remaining possibilities are treated similarly.  $\square$

## C Proof of Lemma 5

It is sufficient to show that the statement holds for the case when  $t$   $\beta$ -reduces to  $t'$  in one step.

So assume that

$$t = (\lambda x. \tau)s, \quad t' = t[x := s], \quad \Gamma = \Gamma', \Gamma'', \quad \vec{u} = (\vec{u}', \vec{u}''),$$

and we have a type  $B$  and the derivation

$$\frac{\frac{\vec{u}' : \Gamma', x : B \vdash \tau : A}{\vec{u}' : \Gamma' \vdash \lambda x. \tau : B \multimap A} \text{ (}\multimap \text{I)} \quad \vec{u}'' : \Gamma'' \vdash s : B}{\vec{u} : \Gamma \vdash t : A} \text{ (}\multimap \text{E)}.$$

This reduces to the derivation

$$\frac{\Gamma'' \vdash s : B \quad \Gamma', x : B \vdash \tau : A}{\Gamma \vdash t' : A} \text{ (}\multimap \text{Subst)}.$$

We compute the translations of  $\lambda$ -typing judgements in (19) (using Lemma 4) for the second one) and see that they are congruent.  $\square$

## D Proof of Lemma 6

Induction on the definition of  $\eta$ -equivalence.

The base case is that  $t' = (\lambda x. t)x$ .

Then  $A = B \multimap C$  and we have the derivation

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : B \multimap C, \quad x : B \vdash x : B}{\Gamma, x : B \vdash tx : C} \text{ (}\multimap \text{E)}}{\Gamma \vdash t' : A} \text{ (}\multimap \text{E)}.$$

Given a translation of  $\Gamma \vdash t' : A$ , the translation of  $\Gamma \vdash t' : A$  is computed immediately and is seen to be the same.

Induction steps are trivial.  $\square$

## E Proof of Lemma 7

If (21) is derivable and translates to (20), then the statement is trivial.

In the opposite direction use induction on a cut-free derivation of (20).

Let us consider the  $(\otimes)$ -rule step.

The rule cannot introduce the formula  $F$ , because  $F$  must be expressible as an implicational formula. So for some  $i$  we have  $F_{(i)} = G \multimap H$ , so that  $\overline{F_{(i)}} = G \otimes \overline{H}$ , and the derivation has the form

$$\frac{\sigma \vdash \overline{F_{(1)}}, \dots, \overline{F_{(i-1)}}, G, \quad \rho \vdash \overline{H}, \overline{F_{(i+1)}}, \dots, \overline{F_{(i_n)}}, F}{\sigma \cdot \rho \vdash \overline{F_{(1)}}, \dots, \overline{F_{(i_n)}}, F} (\otimes)$$

where  $\tau = \sigma \cdot \rho$ . By the induction hypothesis we have derivable  $\lambda$ -typing judgements

$$x_{(1)} : F_{(1)}, \dots, x_{(i)} : F_{(i-1)} \vdash s : G, \quad y : H, x_{(i+1)} : F_{(1)}, \dots, x_{(n)} : F_{(n)} \vdash r : F,$$

and we obtain the desired  $\lambda$ -typing judgement by setting  $t = r[y := x_{i+1} \cdot s]$  in (21).

The rest is similar.  $\square$

## F Proof of Lemma 8

- (i) There is no  $\lambda$ -term  $t$  such that  $\vdash_{Str_T} t : O$  (for example, because any derivable typing judgement has an even number of  $O$  occurrences).
- (ii) Using (i), we prove by induction on type inference that if  $t$  is a  $\beta$ -normal term such that  $\vdash_{Str_T} t : F$  for some type  $F$ , then  $t$  is either a constant  $t \in T$ , or an abstraction,  $t = (\lambda x.t')$  for some variable  $x$  and term  $t'$ .
- (iii) Using (ii), we prove by induction on type inference that for any derivable typing judgement  $x : O \vdash_{Str_T} t : O$ , where  $t$  is a  $\beta$ -normal term, it holds that  $t = c_1(\dots(c_n(x))\dots)$  for some constants  $c_1, \dots, c_n \in T$ .

Now without loss of generality we can assume that  $t$  in the hypothesis of the lemma is  $\beta$ -normal.

If  $t$  is a constant then  $t$  is  $\beta\eta$ -equivalent to  $\rho(t)$ . Otherwise claim (ii) implies that the last rule in the derivation of the typing judgement  $t : O \multimap O$  is  $(\multimap E)$ . Then the statement of the lemma follows from (iii).  $\square$

## G Proof of Lemma 9

Similar to Lemma 1.

Let us work out the new cut-elimination step corresponding to the new operators.



Let a derivation end with the Cut rule of the form

$$\frac{\frac{\delta_i^j \cdot t \vdash \Gamma, A_{J_1 j J_2}^{I_1 i I_1}}{t \vdash \Gamma, \nabla_i^j(A_{J_1 j J_2}^{I_1 i I_1})} (\nabla) \quad \frac{s \vdash \Theta, \overline{A}_{L_1 l L_2}^{K_1 k K_1}}{\delta_l^k \cdot s \vdash \Theta, \Delta_k^l(\overline{A}_{L_1 l L_2}^{K_1 k K_1})} (\Delta)}{\delta_{J_1 J_2}^{K_1 K_2} \cdot \delta_{L_1 L_2}^{I_1 I_2} \cdot \delta_l^k \cdot t s \vdash \Gamma, \Theta} (\text{Cut}).$$

This reduces to the derivation with a cut on a simpler type

$$\frac{\delta_i^j \cdot t \vdash \Gamma, A_{J_1 j J_2}^{I_1 i I_1} \quad s \vdash \Theta, \overline{A}_{L_1 l L_2}^{K_1 k K_1}}{\delta_{J_1 j J_2}^{K_1 k K_2} \cdot \delta_{L_1 l L_2}^{I_1 i I_2} \cdot \delta_i^j \cdot t s \vdash \Gamma, \Theta} (\text{Cut}),$$

which results in a congruent typing judgement since

$$\delta_{J_1 j J_2}^{K_1 k K_2} \cdot \delta_{L_1 l L_2}^{I_1 i I_2} \cdot \delta_i^j \equiv \delta_{J_1 J_2}^{K_1 K_2} \cdot \delta_{L_1 L_2}^{I_1 I_2} \cdot \delta_j^k \cdot \delta_l^i \cdot \delta_i^j \equiv \delta_{J_1 J_2}^{K_1 K_2} \cdot \delta_{L_1 L_2}^{I_1 I_2} \cdot \delta_l^k. \quad \square$$

## H Proof of Lemma 11

Induction on derivation.

For the Identity axiom the statement is clear.

Consider the single-premise rules.

Let  $\pi$  be obtained from a derivation  $\pi'$  by the ( $(/R)$ ), ( $(\backslash R)$ ) or ( $(\bullet L)$ ) rule.

Then the possibilities are that  $\pi'$  has the conclusion

$$\Gamma, A \vdash B, \text{ or } A, \Gamma \vdash B, \text{ or } \Theta_{(1)}, A, B, \Theta_{(2)} \vdash C,$$

while the conclusion of  $\pi$  is

$$\Gamma \vdash B/A, \text{ or } \Gamma \vdash A \backslash B, \Gamma \text{ or } \Theta_{(1)}, A \bullet B, \Theta_{(2)} \vdash C.$$

respectively.

By the induction hypothesis we have a derivable Lambek cycle  $tr(\pi')$  of the form, respectively,

$$t \cdot \delta_\beta^\alpha \vdash \overline{\Gamma}, \overline{A}_\alpha^j, B_i^\beta, \text{ or } t \cdot \delta_\beta^\alpha \vdash \overline{\Gamma}, B_\alpha^j, \overline{A}_i^\beta, \text{ or } t \cdot \delta_\beta^\alpha \vdash \overline{\Theta}_{(1)}, \overline{A}_\alpha^j, \overline{B}_i^\beta, \overline{\Theta}_{(1)}, C.$$

(Remember that types in a Lambek cycle are ordered only up to a cyclic permutation.)

Applying the ( $\wp$ ) rule and then the  $\nabla$  rule we derive from  $tr(\pi')$ , respectively the typing judgements

$$t \vdash \overline{\Gamma}, \nabla_\beta^\alpha(\overline{A}_\alpha^j \wp B_i^\beta), \text{ or } t \vdash \overline{\Gamma}, \nabla_\beta^\alpha(B_\alpha^j \wp \overline{A}_i^\beta), \text{ or } t \vdash \overline{\Theta}_{(1)}, \nabla_\beta^\alpha(\overline{A}_\alpha^j \wp \overline{B}_i^\beta), \overline{\Theta}_{(1)}, C,$$

which are easily seen to be Lambek cycles of the required format.

Note that Lambek restriction is respected, if necessary.

The case of the two-premise rules is similar. The ( $(/L)$ ), ( $(\backslash L)$ ) or ( $(\bullet R)$ ) rules correspond to a combination of the ( $\otimes$ ) and the ( $\Delta$ ) rule.

Let us consider the ( $\bullet$ R) rule

$$\frac{\Theta_{(1)} \vdash A \quad \Theta_{(2)} \vdash B}{\Theta_{(1)}, \Theta_{(2)} \vdash A \bullet B}.$$

This translates as

$$\frac{\frac{t \vdash \overline{\Theta_{(1)}}, A_k^\alpha \quad s \vdash \overline{\Theta_{(2)}}, B_\beta^l}{ts \vdash \overline{\Theta_{(1)}}, \overline{\Theta_{(2)}}, A_k^\alpha \otimes B_\beta^l} (\otimes)}{ts \cdot \delta_\beta^\alpha \vdash \overline{\Theta_{(1)}}, \overline{\Theta_{(2)}}, \Delta_\alpha^\beta(A_k^\alpha \otimes B_\beta^l)} (\Delta).$$

Spelling this out in a greater detail, let

$$\overline{\Theta_{(1)}} = (X_{(1)})_{k_1}^{i_1}, \dots, (X_{(n)})_{k_n}^{i_n}, \quad \overline{\Theta_{(2)}} = (Y_{(1)})_{j_1}^{l_1}, \dots, (Y_{(m)})_{j_m}^{l_m}.$$

By the induction hypothesis, the terms  $t$  and  $s$  in the derivation above are the Lambek cycle terms

$$t = \delta_{i_1}^k \cdot \delta_{i_2}^{k_1} \dots \delta_{i_n}^{k_{n-1}} \cdot \delta_{\alpha}^{k_n}, \quad s = \delta_{l_1}^\beta \cdot \delta_{l_2}^{j_1} \dots \delta_{l_m}^{j_{m-1}} \cdot \delta_l^{j_m},$$

and we immediately compute that

$$\begin{aligned} ts \cdot \delta_\beta^\alpha &= t \cdot \delta_\beta^\alpha \cdot s \\ &= \delta_{i_1}^k \cdot \delta_{i_2}^{k_1} \dots \delta_{i_n}^{k_{n-1}} \cdot \delta_{\alpha}^{k_n} \cdot \delta_\beta^\alpha \cdot \delta_{l_1}^\beta \cdot \delta_{l_2}^{j_1} \dots \delta_{l_m}^{j_{m-1}} \cdot \delta_l^{j_m} = \\ &= \delta_{i_1}^k \cdot \delta_{i_2}^{k_1} \dots \delta_{i_n}^{k_{n-1}} \cdot \delta_{l_1}^{j_1} \dots \delta_{l_m}^{j_{m-1}} \cdot \delta_l^{j_m} \end{aligned}$$

is the Lambek cycle term of the cyclically ordered sequent

$$\overline{\Theta_{(1)}}, \overline{\Theta_{(2)}}, \Delta_\alpha^\beta(A_k^\alpha \otimes B_\beta^l).$$

In a similar way the ( $/$ L) rule

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Theta_{(1)}, B, \Theta_{(2)} \vdash C}{\Theta_1, B/A, \Gamma, \Theta_2 \vdash C}$$

translates as

$$\frac{\frac{t \vdash \overline{\Gamma}, A_k^\alpha \quad s \vdash \overline{\Theta_{(1)}}, \overline{B}_\beta^l, \overline{\Theta_{(2)}}, C}{ts \vdash \overline{\Theta_{(1)}}, \overline{\Gamma}, A_k^\alpha \otimes \overline{B}_\beta^l, \overline{\Theta_{(2)}}, C} (\otimes)}{ts \cdot \delta_\beta^\alpha \vdash \overline{\Theta_{(1)}} \overline{\Gamma}, \Delta_\alpha^\beta(A_k^\alpha \otimes \overline{B}_\beta^l), \overline{\Theta_{(2)}}, C} (\Delta),$$

and the ( $\backslash$ L) rule

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Theta_{(1)}, B, \Theta_{(2)} \vdash C}{\Theta_1, \Gamma, A \backslash B, \Theta_2 \vdash C},$$

as

$$\frac{\frac{t \vdash \overline{\Gamma}, A_\beta^l \quad s \vdash \overline{\Theta_{(1)}}, \overline{B}_k^\alpha, \overline{\Theta_{(2)}}, C}{ts \vdash \overline{\Theta_{(1)}}, \overline{\Gamma}, \overline{B}_k^\alpha \otimes A_\beta^l, \overline{\Theta_{(2)}}, C} (\otimes)}{ts \cdot \delta_\beta^\alpha \vdash \overline{\Theta_{(1)}}, \overline{\Gamma}, \Delta_\alpha^\beta(\overline{B}_k^\alpha \otimes A_\beta^l), \overline{\Theta_{(2)}}, C} (\Delta).$$

Again, Lambek restriction is respected by the translation.  $\square$

## I Proof of Lemma 12

Induction on a cut-free derivation of  $t \vdash \Gamma$ . We will consider the case without Lambek restriction.

**Base:** For the axiom, the statement is clear.

- ( $\otimes$ ): The case when the last rule in the derivation is ( $\otimes$ ) is immediate from the induction hypothesis.
- ( $\wp$ ): The case when the last rule in the derivation is ( $\wp$ ) is impossible, because it introduces a type of a wrong format.
- ( $\nabla$ ): Assume that the last rule in the derivation is ( $\nabla$ ), introducing a type  $F_l^k$ . Assume that  $F$  is a positive Lambek type symbol. Then there are only two possibilities:

$$F_l^k = \nabla_\beta^\alpha(\overline{A}_\alpha^k \wp B_l^\beta) \text{ or } F_l^k = \nabla_\beta^\alpha(B_\alpha^k \wp \overline{A}_l^\beta),$$

where  $A, B$  are positive Lambek type symbols.

Assume, for definiteness, that the first possibility holds.

Then the typing judgement  $t \vdash \Gamma$  was obtained from the derivable typing judgement

$$t \cdot \delta_\beta^\alpha \vdash \Gamma', \overline{A}_\alpha^k \wp B_l^\beta, \quad (35)$$

hence the typing judgement

$$t \cdot \delta_\beta^\alpha \vdash \Gamma', \overline{A}_\alpha^k, B_l^\beta \quad (36)$$

is derivable by Proposition 2. Furthermore, typing judgement (35) can be obtained from (36) by the ( $\wp$ ) rule.

The induction hypothesis applies, and (36) was obtained from some Lambek cycles (31), using only the ( $\otimes$ ) rules, so that

$$t \cdot \delta_\beta^\alpha = t_{(1)} \cdots t_{(n)},$$

and all Lambek cycles in (31) are translations of **LC** derivations.

It follows that for some  $m$  we have the  $m$ -th Lambek cycle in (31) has the form

$$\tau_{(1)} \cdot \delta_\beta^\alpha \cdot \tau_{(2)} \vdash \Theta_{(1)}, \overline{A}_\alpha^k, B_l^\beta, \Theta_{(2)} \quad (37)$$

and we can derive from (37) the typing judgement

$$\tau \vdash \Theta, \quad (38)$$

where

$$\tau = \tau_{(1)} \cdot \tau_{(2)}, \quad \Theta = \Theta_{(1)}, \nabla_\beta^\alpha(\overline{A}_\alpha^k \wp B_l^\beta), \Theta_{(2)},$$

and it is easy to see that (38) is again a Lambek cycle.

Then  $t \vdash \Gamma$  can be obtained from

$$t_{(1)} \vdash \Gamma_{(1)}, \cdots t_{(m-1)} \vdash \Gamma_{(m-1)}, \tau \vdash \Theta, t_{(m+1)} \vdash \Gamma_{(m+1)}, \cdots t_{(n)} \vdash \Gamma_{(n)}$$

using only the  $(\otimes)$  rule.

It remains to show that Lambek cycle (38) is the translation of an **LC** derivation.

We have that Lambek cycle (37) is the translation of some **LC** derivation  $\pi$  in Lambek calculus whose conclusion  $\Theta' \vdash X$  translates as  $\Gamma_{(m)}$ , i.e.  $\Gamma_{(m)} = \overline{\Theta'}, X$ .

Since  $B$  is a positive Lambek type, it follows that  $X = B$ , while  $A$  occurs in  $\Theta'$ . Since  $\delta_\beta^\alpha$  occurs in  $t_{(m)}$ , and the latter is the Lambek cycle term of  $\Gamma_{(m)}$ , it follows that  $\overline{A}$  and  $B$  are consecutive in  $\Gamma_{(m)}$ , i.e.

$$\Gamma_m = \overline{\Theta'_{(0)}}, \overline{A}_\alpha^k, B_l^\beta,$$

and the conclusion of  $\pi$  is

$$\Theta'_{(0)}, A \vdash B.$$

Then we get a derivation  $\pi'$  with conclusion  $\Theta'_{(0)} \vdash B/A$  by applying the  $(/R)$  rule to  $\pi$ , and its translation is precisely (38).

Other cases of the  $(\nabla)$  rule are treated similarly with the  $(\backslash R)$  or the  $(\bullet L)$  rules.

( $\Delta$ ): Assume that the last rule in the derivation was  $(\Delta)$ , introducing a type  $F_l^k$ .

Assume that  $F$  is a negative Lambek type symbol.

Then there are only two possibilities:

$$F_l^k = \Delta_\beta^\alpha(A_l^\beta \otimes \overline{B}_\alpha^k) \text{ or } F_l^k = \Delta_\alpha^\beta(\overline{B}_l^\alpha \otimes A_\beta^k),$$

where  $A, B$  are positive Lambek type symbols.

Assume, for definiteness, that the first possibility holds.

Then  $t \vdash \Gamma$  has the form

$$t' \cdot \delta_\alpha^\beta \vdash \Gamma', F_l^k, \quad (39)$$

while it was obtained from the derivable typing judgement

$$t' \vdash \Gamma', A_l^\beta \otimes \overline{B}_\alpha^k, \quad (40)$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are not connected in  $t'$ .

The induction hypothesis applies, and (40) was obtained from some Lambek cycles (31), using only the  $(\otimes)$  rules, so that  $t' = t_{(1)} \cdots t_{(n)}$ .

It follows that, that  $A_l^\beta$  and  $\overline{B}_\alpha^k$  occur in different Lambek cycles in sequence (31), and, reordering (31) if necessary, we can assume that  $A$  occurs in  $\Gamma_{(m)}$  and  $\overline{B}$  in  $\Gamma_{(m+1)}$ .

Then  $\Gamma_{(m)}$  and  $\Gamma_{(m+1)}$  have, respectively, the forms

$$\Gamma_{(m)} = \Theta_{(1)}, A_l^\beta, \quad \Gamma_{(m+1)} = \Theta_{(2)}, B_\alpha^k$$

and we can derive from  $t_{(m)} \vdash \Gamma_{(m)}$  and  $t_{(m+1)} \vdash \Gamma_{(m+1)}$  the typing judgement

$$\tau \vdash \Theta, \text{ where } \tau = t_{(m)} \cdot \delta_\alpha^\beta \cdot t_{(m+1)}, \quad \Theta = \Theta_{(1)}, \Theta_{(2)}, \Delta_\beta^\alpha(A_l^\beta \otimes \overline{B}_\alpha^k), \quad (41)$$

applying the  $(\otimes)$  and then the  $(\Delta)$  rule.  
It is easy to see that (41) is again a Lambek cycle.  
Then  $t \vdash \Gamma$  can be obtained from

$$t_{(1)} \vdash \Gamma_{(1)}, \dots, t_{(m-1)} \vdash \Gamma_{(m-1)}, \tau \vdash \Theta, t_{(m+2)} \vdash \Gamma_{(m+2)}, \dots, t_{(n)} \vdash \Gamma_{(n)}$$

using only the  $(\otimes)$  rule.

It is easy to show that (41) is the translation of an **LC** derivation.  
Indeed, the  $m$ -th and the  $(m+1)$ -th Lambek cycles in (31) are the translations of some **LC** derivations  $\pi_1, \pi_2$ , whose respective conclusions

$$\Theta'_{(1)} \vdash X_{(1)}, \quad \Theta'_{(2)} \vdash X_{(2)}$$

translate as

$$t_{(m)} \vdash \Theta_{(1)}, A_l^\beta, \quad t_{(m+1)} \vdash \overline{B}_\alpha^k, \Theta_{(2)}.$$

Since  $A$  is a positive Lambek type, while  $\overline{B}$  is negative, it follows that  $X_{(1)} = A$ , while  $B$  occurs in  $\Theta'_{(2)}$ .

Thus, the conclusions of  $\pi_1, \pi_2$  are respectively, of the forms

$$\Xi \vdash A, \quad \Phi, B, \Psi \vdash X_{(2)},$$

and we have

$$\Theta_{(1)} = \overline{\Xi}, \quad \Theta_{(2)} = \overline{\Psi}, X_{(2)}, \overline{\Phi}.$$

Then the proof of

$$\Phi, B/A, \Xi, \Psi \vdash X_2$$

obtained from  $\pi_1, \pi_2$  by the  $(/L)$  rule translates as

$$t_{(m)} t_{(m+1)} \delta_\alpha^\beta \vdash \overline{\Xi}, \Delta_\beta^\alpha (A_l^\beta \otimes \overline{B}_\alpha^k), \overline{\Theta}_2, \overline{\Psi}, X_2, \overline{\Phi},$$

which is precisely (41).

Other cases of the  $(\Delta)$  rule are treated similarly with the  $(\backslash L)$  or the  $(\bullet R)$  rules.  $\square$