

# A minimal classical sequent calculus free of structural rules

DOMINIC HUGHES  
Stanford University\*

April 22, 2009

Gentzen's classical sequent calculus **LK** has explicit structural rules for contraction and weakening. They can be absorbed (in a right-sided formulation) by replacing the axiom  $P, \neg P$  by  $\Gamma, P, \neg P$  for any context  $\Gamma$ , and replacing the original disjunction rule with  $\Gamma, A, B$  implies  $\Gamma, A \vee B$ .

This paper presents a classical sequent calculus which is also free of contraction and weakening, but more symmetrically: both contraction and weakening are absorbed into conjunction, leaving the axiom rule intact. It uses a blended conjunction rule, combining the standard context-sharing and context-splitting rules:  $\Gamma, \Delta, A$  and  $\Gamma, \Sigma, B$  implies  $\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B$ . We refer to this system **M** as *minimal sequent calculus*.

We prove a *minimality theorem* for the propositional fragment **Mp**: any propositional sequent calculus  $S$  (within a standard class of right-sided calculi) is complete *if and only if*  $S$  contains **Mp** (that is, each rule of **Mp** is derivable in  $S$ ). Thus one can view **M** as a minimal complete core of Gentzen's **LK**.

## 1 Introduction

The following Gentzen-Schütte-Tait [Gen39, Sch50, Tai68] system, denoted **GS1p** in [TS96], is a standard right-sided formulation of the propositional fragment of Gentzen's classical sequent calculus **LK**:

**System GS1p**

$\frac{}{P, \neg P}$	$\frac{\Gamma, A \quad \Gamma, B}{\Gamma, A \wedge B} \ \&$	$\frac{\Gamma, A_i}{\Gamma, A_1 \vee A_2} \ \oplus_i$
	$\frac{\Gamma}{\Gamma, A} \ \text{W}$	$\frac{\Gamma, A, A}{\Gamma, A} \ \text{C}$

Here  $P$  ranges over propositional variables,  $A, A_i, B$  range over formulas,  $\Gamma$  ranges over disjoint unions of formulas, and comma denotes disjoint union.<sup>1</sup> By defining a sequent as a disjoint union of formulas, rather than an ordered list, we avoid an exchange/permutation

\*Visiting Scholar, Concurrency Group, Computer Science Department, Stanford University. I gratefully acknowledge my host, Vaughan Pratt.

<sup>1</sup>We label the conjunction and disjunction rules with  $\&$  and  $\oplus$  for reasons which will become apparent later.

rule (cf. [TS96, §1.1]). Negation is primitive on propositional variables  $P$ , and extends to compound formulas by de Morgan duality.<sup>2</sup>

The structural rules, weakening  $W$  and contraction  $C$ , are absorbed in the following variant, a right-sided formulation of the propositional part of the calculus of [Ket44], called **GS3p** in [TS96].<sup>3</sup>

<b>System GS3p</b>		
$\frac{}{\Gamma, P, \neg P}$	$\frac{\Gamma, A \quad \Gamma, B}{\Gamma, A \wedge B} \&$	$\frac{\Gamma, A, B}{\Gamma, A \vee B} \wp$

The new axiom  $\Gamma, P, \neg P$  amounts to the original axiom  $P, \neg P$  followed immediately by weakenings. This paper presents a propositional classical sequent calculus **Mp** which is also free of structural rules:

<b>System Mp</b>			
$\frac{}{P, \neg P}$	$\frac{\Gamma, \Delta, A \quad \Gamma, \Sigma, B}{\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \wedge$	$\frac{\Gamma, A, B}{\Gamma, A \vee B} \wp$	$\frac{\Gamma, A_i}{\Gamma, A_1 \vee A_2} \oplus_i$

A distinguishing feature of **Mp** is the *blended conjunction rule*<sup>4</sup>

$$\frac{\Gamma, \Delta, A \quad \Gamma, \Sigma, B}{\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \wedge$$

which combines the standard context-sharing and context-splitting conjunction rules:

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \quad \Gamma, B}{\Gamma, A \wedge B} \& \quad \frac{\Delta, A \quad \Sigma, B}{\Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \otimes$$

We refer to **Mp** as (cut-free propositional) *minimal sequent calculus*. In contrast to **GS3p**, contraction and weakening are absorbed symmetrically: both are absorbed into the conjunction rule, leaving the axiom rule intact.

**Mp** is evidently sound, since each of its rules can be derived (encoded) in **GS1p**. Theorem 1 (page 4) is completeness for formulas: a formula is valid iff it is derivable in **Mp**.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup>  $\neg(A \vee B) = (\neg A) \wedge (\neg B)$  and  $\neg(A \wedge B) = (\neg A) \vee (\neg B)$ .

<sup>3</sup> We label the disjunction rule as  $\wp$  to distinguish it from the disjunction rule  $\oplus$  of **GS1p**. The notation is derived from linear logic [Gir87].

<sup>4</sup> By analogy with **GS3** and **GS3p** in [TS96], we reserve the symbol **M** for a full system with quantifiers, and use **Mp** to denote the propositional system. Following [TS96], we treat cut separately. To maximise emphasis on the blended conjunction rule, we omit quantifiers and cut in this paper.

<sup>5</sup> Completeness here refers specifically to formulas, not to sequents. Section 6 discusses completeness for sequents.

## 1.1 Minimality

The blended conjunction rule  $\wedge$  is critical for the liberation from structural rules: Proposition 2 (page 6) shows that relaxing it to the union of the the two standard conjunction rules  $\&$  and  $\otimes$  breaks completeness.<sup>6</sup> The main theorem of the paper (page 7) formalises the sense in which **Mp** is a minimal complete core of classical sequent calculus:

### Theorem 2: Minimality

A standard sequent calculus  $S$  is complete iff  $S \sqsupseteq \mathbf{Mp}$ .

Here  $S \sqsupseteq T$  (“ $S$  contains  $T$ ”) iff every rule of  $T$  is derivable in  $S$ , and a *standard sequent calculus* is any propositional sequent calculus with the axiom  $\overline{P}, \overline{\neg P}$  and any subset of the following *standard rules*:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \frac{\Gamma, A \quad \Gamma, B}{\Gamma, A \wedge B} \& \quad \frac{\Gamma, A, B}{\Gamma, A \vee B} \wp \quad \quad \frac{\Gamma}{\Gamma, A} \text{W} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Delta, A \quad \Sigma, B}{\Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \otimes \quad \quad \frac{\Gamma, A_i}{\Gamma, A_1 \vee A_2} \oplus_i \quad \quad \frac{\Gamma, A, A}{\Gamma, A} \text{C}
 \end{array}$$

## 2 Notation and terminology

Formulas are built from literals (propositional variables  $P, Q, R \dots$  and their formal complements  $\overline{P}, \overline{Q}, \overline{R}, \dots$ ) by the binary connectives **and**  $\wedge$  and **or**  $\vee$ . Define **negation** or **not**  $\neg$  as an operation on formulas (rather than as a connective):  $\neg P = \overline{P}$  and  $\neg \overline{P} = P$  for all propositional variables  $P$ , with  $\neg(A \wedge B) = (\neg A) \vee (\neg B)$  and  $\neg(A \vee B) = (\neg A) \wedge (\neg B)$ .

We identify a formula with its parse tree, a tree labelled with literals at the leaves and connectives at the internal vertices. A **sequent** is a non-empty disjoint union of formulas.<sup>7</sup> Comma denotes disjoint union. Throughout the document,  $P, Q, \dots$  range over propositional variables,  $A, B, \dots$  over formulas, and  $\Gamma, \Delta, \dots$  over (possibly empty) disjoint unions of formulas.

A formula  $A$  is **valid** if it evaluates to 1 under all possible 0/1-assignments of its propositional variables (with the usual interpretation of  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$  on  $\{0, 1\}$ ). A sequent  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  is valid iff the formula  $A_1 \vee (A_2 \vee (\dots \vee (A_{n-1} \vee A_n) \dots))$  is valid. A **subsequent** of a sequent  $\Gamma$  is any result of deleting zero or more formulas from  $\Gamma$ ; if at least one formula is deleted, the result is a **proper subsequent**.

<sup>6</sup>In other words, if we remove the  $\wedge$  rule and add both the  $\&$  and the  $\otimes$  rules, the resulting system fails to be complete. The formula  $((P \wedge Q) \vee (\overline{Q} \wedge P)) \vee \overline{P}$  becomes undervivable (see the proof of Proposition 2, page 6).

<sup>7</sup>Thus a sequent is a particular kind of labelled forest. This foundational treatment of formulas and sequents as labelled trees and forests sidesteps the common problem of “formulas” versus “formula occurrences”: disjoint unions of graphs are well understood in graph theory [Bol02].

### 3 Completeness

THEOREM 1 (COMPLETENESS) *Every valid formula is derivable in **Mp**.*

The proof is via the following auxiliary definitions and lemmas.

A sequent is *minimally valid*, or simply *minimal*, if it is valid while no proper subsequent is valid. For example, the sequents  $P, \neg P$  and  $P \wedge Q, \overline{Q} \wedge P, \overline{P}$  are minimal, while  $P, \neg P, Q$  is not.

LEMMA 1 *Every valid sequent contains a minimal subsequent.*

*Proof.* Immediate from the definition of minimality. □

LEMMA 2 *Suppose a sequent  $\Gamma$  is a disjoint union of literals (i.e.,  $\Gamma$  contains no  $\wedge$  or  $\vee$ ). Then  $\Gamma$  is minimal iff  $\Gamma = P, \neg P$  for some propositional variable  $P$ .*

*Proof.* By definition of validity in terms of valuations,  $\Gamma$  is valid iff it contains a complementary pair of literals, i.e., iff  $\Gamma = P, \neg P, \Delta$  with  $\Delta$  a disjoint union of zero or more literals. Since  $P, \neg P$  is valid,  $\Gamma$  is minimal iff  $\Delta$  is empty. □

Suppose  $\Gamma$  and  $\Delta$  are each disjoint unions of formulas (so each is either a sequent or empty). Write  $\Gamma \subseteq \Delta$  if  $\Gamma$  results from deleting zero or more formulas from  $\Delta$ .

LEMMA 3 *Suppose  $\Gamma, A_1 \wedge A_2$  is minimal. Choose  $\Gamma_1 \subseteq \Gamma$  and  $\Gamma_2 \subseteq \Gamma$  such that  $\Gamma_1, A_1$  and  $\Gamma_2, A_2$  are minimal (existing by Lemma 1, since  $\Gamma, A_1$  and  $\Gamma, A_2$  are valid). Then every formula of  $\Gamma$  is in at least one of the  $\Gamma_i$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose the formula  $B$  of  $\Gamma$  is in neither  $\Gamma_i$ . Let  $\Gamma'$  be the result of deleting  $B$  from  $\Gamma$ . Then  $\Gamma', A_1 \wedge A_2$  is a valid proper subsequent of  $\Gamma, A_1 \wedge A_2$ , contradicting minimality. (The sequent  $\Gamma', A_1 \wedge A_2$  is valid since  $\Gamma_1, A_1$  and  $\Gamma_2, A_2$  are valid.) □

LEMMA 4 *Suppose  $\Gamma, A \vee B$  is minimal and  $\Gamma, A$  is valid. Then  $\Gamma, A$  is minimal.*

*Proof.* If not, some proper subsequent  $\Delta$  of  $\Gamma, A$  is valid. If  $\Delta$  does not contain  $A$ , then it is also a proper subsequent of  $\Gamma, A \vee B$ , contradicting minimality. Otherwise let  $\Delta'$  be the result of replacing  $A$  in  $\Delta$  by  $A \vee B$ . Since  $\Delta$  is valid, so also is  $\Delta'$ . Thus  $\Delta'$  is a valid proper subsequent of  $\Gamma, A \vee B$ , contradicting minimality. □

LEMMA 5 *Suppose  $\Gamma, A \vee B$  is minimal and neither  $\Gamma, A$  nor  $\Gamma, B$  is valid. Then  $\Gamma, A, B$  is minimal.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\Gamma, A, B$  had a valid proper subsequent  $\Delta$ . Since neither  $\Gamma, A$  nor  $\Gamma, B$  is valid,  $\Delta$  must contain both  $A$  and  $B$ . Let  $\Delta'$  result from replacing  $A, B$  by  $A \vee B$  in  $\Delta$ . Then  $\Delta'$  is a valid proper subsequent of  $\Gamma, A \vee B$ , contradicting minimality. □

Since a formula (viewed as a singleton sequent) is a minimal sequent, the Completeness Theorem (Theorem 1) is a special case of:

PROPOSITION 1 *Every minimal sequent is derivable in **Mp**.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\Gamma$  is a minimal sequent. We proceed by induction on the number of connectives in  $\Gamma$ .

- *Induction base (no connective).* Since  $\Gamma$  is minimal, Lemma 2 implies  $\Gamma = P, \neg P$ , the conclusion of the axiom rule  $\overline{P, \neg P}$ .
- *Induction step (at least one connective).*

1. *Case:*  $\Gamma = \Delta, A_1 \wedge A_2$ . By Lemma 3,  $\Gamma = \Sigma, \Delta_1, \Delta_2, A_1 \wedge A_2$  for  $\Sigma, \Delta_1, A_1$  and  $\Sigma, \Delta_2, A_2$  minimal. Write down the conjunction rule

$$\frac{\Sigma, \Delta_1, A_1 \quad \Sigma, \Delta_2, A_2}{\Sigma, \Delta_1, \Delta_2, A_1 \wedge A_2} \wedge$$

and appeal to induction with the two hypothesis sequents.

2. *Case:*  $\Gamma = \Delta, A_1 \vee A_2$ .

- (a) *Case:*  $\Delta, A_i$  is valid for some  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Write down the disjunction rule

$$\frac{\Delta, A_i}{\Delta, A_1 \vee A_2} \oplus_i$$

then appeal to induction with  $\Delta, A_i$ , which is minimal by Lemma 4.

- (b) *Case:*  $\Delta, A_i$  is not valid for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Thus  $\Delta, A_1, A_2$  is minimal, by Lemma 5. Write down the disjunction rule

$$\frac{\Delta, A_1, A_2}{\Delta, A_1 \vee A_2} \wp$$

then appeal to induction with  $\Delta, A_1, A_2$ .

( $\Gamma$  may match both 1 and 2 in the inductive step, permitting some choice in the construction of the derivation. There is choice in case 2(a) if both  $\Delta, A_1$  and  $\Delta, A_2$  are valid.)  $\square$

Note that completeness does not hold for arbitrary valid sequents. For example, the sequent  $P, \neg P, Q$  is valid but not derivable in **Mp**. A sequent is valid iff some some subsequent is derivable in **Mp**. Thus **Mp** is complete for sequents modulo final weakenings. In this sense, **Mp** is akin to system **GS5p** of [TS96, §7.4] (related to resolution). (See also Section 6.)

## 4 The Minimality Theorem

Relaxing blended conjunction to the pair of standard conjunction rules (context-sharing  $\&$  and context-splitting  $\otimes$ ) breaks completeness. Let **Mp**<sup>-</sup> be the following subsystem of **Mp**.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup>This precursor of **Mp** is (cut-free) multiplicative-additive linear logic [Gir87] with *tensor*  $\otimes$  and *with*  $\&$  collapsed to  $\wedge$ , and *plus*  $\oplus$  and *par*  $\wp$  collapsed to  $\vee$ .

**System  $\mathbf{Mp}^-$**

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \overline{P, \neg P} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma, A \quad \Gamma, B}{\Gamma, A \wedge B} \& \quad \frac{\Gamma, A, B}{\Gamma, A \vee B} \wp \\
 \\
 \frac{\Delta, A \quad \Sigma, B}{\Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \otimes \quad \frac{\Gamma, A_i}{\Gamma, A_1 \vee A_2} \oplus_i
 \end{array}$$

PROPOSITION 2 *System  $\mathbf{Mp}^-$  is incomplete.*

*Proof.* We show that the valid formula  $A = ((P \wedge Q) \vee (\overline{Q} \wedge P)) \vee \overline{P}$  is not derivable in  $\mathbf{Mp}^-$ . The placement of the two outermost  $\vee$  connectives forces the last two rules of a potential derivation to be disjunction rules. Since  $P \wedge Q, \overline{Q} \wedge P, \overline{P}$  is minimal (no proper subsequent is valid), the two disjunction rules must be  $\wp$  rather than  $\oplus$ :

$$\frac{\frac{P \wedge Q, \overline{Q} \wedge P, \overline{P}}{(P \wedge Q) \vee (\overline{Q} \wedge P), \overline{P}} \wp}{((P \wedge Q) \vee (\overline{Q} \wedge P)) \vee \overline{P}} \wp$$

It remains to show that  $P \wedge Q, \overline{Q} \wedge P, \overline{P}$  is not derivable in  $\mathbf{Mp}^-$ . There are only two connectives, both  $\wedge$ , so the last rule must be a conjunction.

1. *Case: the last rule is a context-sharing  $\&$ -rule.*

(a) *Case: The last rule introduces  $P \wedge Q$ .*

$$\frac{P, \overline{Q} \wedge P, \overline{P} \quad Q, \overline{Q} \wedge P, \overline{P}}{P \wedge Q, \overline{Q} \wedge P, \overline{P}} \&$$

The left hypothesis  $P, \overline{Q} \wedge P, \overline{P}$  cannot be derived in  $\mathbf{Mp}^-$ , since there is no  $Q$  to match the  $\overline{Q}$  (and no weakening).

(b) *Case: The last rule introduces  $\overline{Q} \wedge P$ .* The same as the previous case, by symmetry, and exchanging  $Q \leftrightarrow \overline{Q}$ .

2. *Case: the last rule is a context-splitting  $\otimes$ -rule.*

(a) *Case: The last rule introduces  $P \wedge Q$ .*

$$\frac{P, \Gamma \quad Q, \Delta}{P \wedge Q, \overline{Q} \wedge P, \overline{P}} \otimes$$

We must allocate each of  $\overline{Q} \wedge P$  and  $\overline{P}$  either to  $\Gamma$  or to  $\Delta$ . If  $\overline{Q} \wedge P$  is in  $\Gamma$ , then  $P, \Gamma$  is not derivable in  $\mathbf{Mp}^-$ , since it contains no  $Q$  to match the  $\overline{Q}$ . So  $\overline{Q} \wedge P$  is in  $\Delta$ . But then the  $\overline{P}$  is required in both  $\Gamma$  and  $\Delta$ .

- (b) *Case: The last rule introduces  $\overline{Q} \wedge P$ . The same as the previous case, by symmetry, and exchanging  $Q \leftrightarrow \overline{Q}$ .*

□

A *standard system* is any propositional sequent calculus containing the axiom  $\overline{P}, \neg\overline{P}$  and any of the following *standard rules*:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \frac{\Gamma, A \quad \Gamma, B}{\Gamma, A \wedge B} \& \quad \quad \quad \frac{\Gamma, A, B}{\Gamma, A \vee B} \wp \quad \quad \quad \frac{\Gamma}{\Gamma, A} \text{W} \\ \frac{\Delta, A \quad \Sigma, B}{\Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \otimes \quad \quad \quad \frac{\Gamma, A_i}{\Gamma, A_1 \vee A_2} \oplus_i \quad \quad \quad \frac{\Gamma, A, A}{\Gamma, A} \text{C} \end{array}$$

Thus there are  $2^6 = 64$  such systems (many of which will not be complete).

System  $S$  *contains* system  $T$ , denoted  $S \sqsupseteq T$ , if each rule of  $T$  is a derived rule of  $S$ . For example, system **GS1p** (page 1) contains **Mp** since the blended conjunction rule  $\wedge$  and the disjunction rule  $\wp$  of **Mp** can be derived in **GS1p**:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \frac{\Gamma, \Delta, A \quad \Gamma, \Sigma, B}{\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \wedge & \longleftarrow & \frac{\frac{\Gamma, \Delta, A}{\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, A} \text{W}^* \quad \frac{\Gamma, \Sigma, B}{\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, B} \text{W}^*}{\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \& \\ \\ \frac{\Gamma, A, B}{\Gamma, A \vee B} \wp & \longleftarrow & \frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma, A, B}{\Gamma, A, A \vee B} \oplus_2}{\Gamma, A \vee B, A \vee B} \oplus_1}{\Gamma, A \vee B} \text{C} \end{array}$$

where  $W^*$  denotes a sequence of zero or more weakenings.

**THEOREM 2 (MINIMALITY THEOREM)** *A standard system is complete iff it contains **Mp**.*

#### 4.1 Proof of the Minimality Theorem

Two systems are *equivalent* if each contains the other. For example, it is well known that **GS1p** (page 1) is equivalent to:<sup>9</sup>

$$\frac{}{P, \neg P} \quad \frac{\Delta, A \quad \Sigma, B}{\Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \otimes \quad \frac{\Gamma, A_1, A_2}{\Gamma, A_1 \vee A_2} \wp \quad \frac{\Gamma}{\Gamma, A} \text{W} \quad \frac{\Gamma, A, A}{\Gamma, A} \text{C}$$

<sup>9</sup>This system is multiplicative linear logic [Gir87] plus contraction and weakening (with the connectives denoted  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$  instead of  $\otimes$  and  $\wp$ ).

via the following rule derivations:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Delta, A \quad \Sigma, B}{\Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \otimes \quad \longleftarrow \quad \frac{\frac{\Delta, A}{\Delta, \Sigma, A} W^* \quad \frac{\Sigma, B}{\Delta, \Sigma, B} W^*}{\Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \& \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, A_i}{\Gamma, A_1 \vee A_2} \oplus_i \quad \longleftarrow \quad \frac{\frac{\Gamma, A_i}{\Gamma, A_1, A_2} W}{\Gamma, A_1 \vee A_2} \wp \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, A, B}{\Gamma, A \vee B} \wp \quad \longleftarrow \quad \frac{\frac{\Gamma, A, B}{\Gamma, A, A \vee B} \oplus_2}{\frac{\Gamma, A \vee B, A \vee B}{\Gamma, A \vee B} \oplus_1} C \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, A \quad \Gamma, B}{\Gamma, A \wedge B} \& \quad \longleftarrow \quad \frac{\frac{\Gamma, A \quad \Gamma, B}{\Gamma, \Gamma, A \wedge B} \otimes}{\Gamma, A \wedge B} C^*
\end{array}$$

We shall abbreviate these four rule derivations as follows, and write analogous abbreviations for other rule derivations.<sup>10</sup>

$$\begin{array}{cc}
\otimes \longleftarrow \& W & \& \longleftarrow \otimes C \\
\oplus \longleftarrow \wp W & \wp \longleftarrow \oplus C
\end{array}$$

#### 4.1.1 The three complete standard systems

As a stepping stone towards the Minimality Theorem, we shall prove that, up to equivalence, there are only three complete standard systems.

We abbreviate a system by listing its non-axiom rules. For example, **GS1p** = (&, ⊕, W, C) and **Mp** = (∧, ⊕, ⋈). Besides **GS1p**, we shall pay particular attention to the systems

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{Pp} = (\otimes, \oplus, C) & \textit{Positive calculus} \\
\mathbf{Np} = (\&, \wp, W) & \textit{Negative calculus}
\end{array}$$

(Our terminology comes from polarity of connectives in linear logic [Gir87]: *tensor* ⊗ and *plus* ⊕ are positive, and *with* & and *par* ⋈ are negative.)

<sup>10</sup>“Context-splitting conjunction ⊗ is derivable from context-sharing conjunction & and weakening W”, etc.



PROPOSITION 3 *Up to equivalence:*

- (1) **GS1p** = ( $\&$ ,  $\oplus$ ,  $C$ ,  $W$ ) is the only complete standard system with both contraction  $C$  and weakening  $W$ ;
- (2) **Pp** = ( $\otimes$ ,  $\oplus$ ,  $C$ ) is the only complete standard system without weakening  $W$ ;
- (3) **Np** = ( $\&$ ,  $\wp$ ,  $W$ ) is the only complete standard system without contraction  $C$ .

The proof is via the following lemmas.

LEMMA 6 **Mp** = ( $\wedge$ ,  $\oplus$ ,  $\wp$ ) is contained in each of **Pp** = ( $\otimes$ ,  $\oplus$ ,  $C$ ), **Np** = ( $\&$ ,  $\wp$ ,  $W$ ) and **GS1p** = ( $\&$ ,  $\oplus$ ,  $C$ ,  $W$ ).

*Proof.* **Pp** contains **Mp** since  $\wedge \leftarrow C\otimes$ ,

$$\frac{\Gamma, \Delta, A \quad \Gamma, \Sigma, B}{\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \wedge \quad \leftarrow \quad \frac{\frac{\Gamma, \Delta, A \quad \Gamma, \Sigma, B}{\Gamma, \Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \otimes}{\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} C^*$$

(where  $C^*$  denotes zero or more consecutive contractions) and  $\wp \leftarrow \oplus C$ :

$$\frac{\Gamma, A, B}{\Gamma, A \vee B} \wp \quad \leftarrow \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma, A, B}{\Gamma, A, A \vee B} \oplus_2}{\Gamma, A \vee B, A \vee B} \oplus_1}{\Gamma, A \vee B} C$$

**Np** contains **Mp** since  $\wedge \leftarrow W\&$ , and  $\oplus \leftarrow W\wp$  (see page 8). **GS1p** = ( $\&$ ,  $\oplus$ ,  $C$ ,  $W$ ) is equivalent to ( $\otimes$ ,  $\&$ ,  $\oplus$ ,  $\wp$ ,  $C$ ,  $W$ ) since  $\otimes$  and  $\wp$  are derivable. Thus **GS1p** contains **Pp** (and **Np**), hence **Mp**.  $\square$

LEMMA 7 **Pp** = ( $C$ ,  $\otimes$ ,  $\oplus$ ) and **Np** = ( $\&$ ,  $\wp$ ,  $W$ ) are complete.<sup>11</sup>

*Proof.* Each contains **Mp** by Lemma 6, which is complete (Theorem 1).  $\square$

LEMMA 8 *Up to equivalence, system **GS1p** = ( $\&$ ,  $\oplus$ ,  $C$ ,  $W$ ) is the only complete standard system with both contraction  $C$  and weakening  $W$ .*

*Proof.* **GS1p** is complete (see e.g. [TS96], or by the fact that **GS1p** contains **Mp** which is complete). Any complete system must have a conjunction rule ( $\otimes$  or  $\&$ ) and a disjunction rule ( $\oplus$  or  $\wp$ ). In the presence of  $C$  and  $W$ , the two conjunctions are derivable from one other, as are the two disjunctions (see page 8).  $\square$

LEMMA 9 *A complete standard system without weakening  $W$  must contain **Pp** = ( $\otimes$ ,  $\oplus$ ,  $C$ ).*

<sup>11</sup>Recall that completeness refers to formulas, not sequents in general.

*Proof.* System  $\mathbf{Mp}^- = (\otimes, \oplus, \&, \wp)$ , with both conjunction rules and both disjunction rules, is incomplete (Proposition 2, page 6), therefore we must have contraction C.

Without the  $\oplus$  rule, the valid formula  $(P \vee \overline{P}) \vee Q$  is not derivable: the last rule must be  $\wp$ , leaving us to derive  $P \vee \overline{P}, Q$ , which is impossible without weakening W (*i.e.*, with at most  $\wp, \&, \otimes$  and C available), since, after a necessary axiom  $\overline{P}, \overline{P}$  at the top of the derivation, there is no way to introduce the formula  $Q$ .

Without the context-splitting  $\otimes$  rule, the valid formula  $P \vee (Q \vee (\overline{P} \wedge \overline{Q}))$  is not derivable. The last two rules must be  $\wp$ , for if we use a  $\oplus$  we will not be able to match complementary literals in the axioms at the top of the derivation. Thus we are left to derive  $P, Q, \overline{P} \wedge \overline{Q}$ , using  $\&$  and C. The derivation must contain an axiom rule  $\overline{P}, \overline{P}$ . The next rule can only be a  $\&$  (since  $P, \overline{P}$  cannot be the hypothesis sequent of a contraction C rule). Since the only  $\wedge$ -formula in the final concluding sequent  $P, Q, \overline{P} \wedge \overline{Q}$  is  $\overline{P} \wedge \overline{Q}$ , and the  $\&$  rule is context sharing, the  $\&$ -rule must be

$$\frac{\overline{P}, \overline{P} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ P, \overline{Q} \end{array}}{P, \overline{P} \wedge \overline{Q}} \&$$

but  $P, \overline{Q}$  is not derivable. □

LEMMA 10 *Up to equivalence,  $\mathbf{Pp} = (\otimes, \oplus, C)$  is the only complete standard system without weakening W.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 7,  $\mathbf{Pp}$  is complete. By Lemma 9, every W-free complete standard system contains  $\mathbf{Pp}$ . All other W-free standard systems containing  $\mathbf{Pp}$  are equivalent to  $\mathbf{Pp}$ , since the standard rule derivations  $\& \leftarrow \otimes C$  and  $\wp \leftarrow \oplus C$  yield  $\&$  and  $\wp$  (see page 8). □

LEMMA 11 *A complete standard system without contraction C must contain  $\mathbf{Np} = (\&, \wp, W)$ .*

*Proof.* System  $\mathbf{Mp}^- = (\otimes, \oplus, \&, \wp)$ , with both conjunction rules and both disjunction rules, is incomplete (Proposition 2, page 6), therefore we must have weakening W.

Without the  $\wp$  rule, the valid formula  $P \vee \overline{P}$  would not be derivable.

Without the  $\&$  rule the valid formula  $P \vee (\overline{P} \wedge \overline{P})$  would not be derivable. The last rule must be a  $\wp$  (rather than a  $\oplus$ , otherwise we lack either  $P$  or  $\overline{P}$ ), so we are left to derive  $P, \overline{P} \wedge \overline{P}$ . The last rule cannot be  $\wp$  or  $\oplus$ , as the only connective is  $\wedge$ . It cannot be W, or else we lack either  $P$  or  $\overline{P}$ . It cannot be  $\otimes$ , as one of the two hypotheses will be the single formula  $\overline{P}$ . □

LEMMA 12 *Up to equivalence,  $\mathbf{Np} = (\&, \wp, W)$  is the only complete standard system without contraction C.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 7,  $\mathbf{Np}$  is complete. By Lemma 11, every C-free complete standard system contains  $\mathbf{Np}$ . All other C-free standard systems containing  $\mathbf{Np}$  are equivalent to  $\mathbf{Np}$ , since the standard rule derivations  $\otimes \leftarrow \& W$  and  $\oplus \leftarrow \wp W$  yield  $\otimes$  and  $\oplus$  (see page 8). □

*Proof of Proposition 3.* Parts (1), (2) and (3) are Lemmas 8, 10 and 12, respectively. □

LEMMA 13 *Every standard complete system has contraction C or weakening W.*

*Proof.* Otherwise it is contained in  $\mathbf{Mp}^- = (\otimes, \oplus, \&, \wp)$ , which is incomplete (Prop. 2).  $\square$


THEOREM 3 *Up to equivalence, there are only three complete standard systems:*

1. *The Gentzen-Schütte-Tait system*  $\mathbf{GS1p} = (\&, \oplus, C, W)$ .
2. *Positive calculus*  $\mathbf{Pp} = (\otimes, \oplus, C)$ .
3. *Negative calculus*  $\mathbf{Np} = (\&, \wp, W)$ .

*Proof.* Proposition 3 and Lemma 13.  $\square$

*Proof of Minimality Theorem (Theorem 2).* Each of the three complete standard systems contains  $\mathbf{Mp}$  (Lemma 6).  $\square$

The three inequivalent complete standard systems  $\mathbf{GS1p}$ ,  $\mathbf{Pp}$  and  $\mathbf{Np}$ , together with propositional minimal sequent calculus  $\mathbf{Mp}$ , sit in the following Hasse diagram of containments:



Thus we can view propositional minimal sequent calculus  $\mathbf{Mp}$  as a minimal complete core of  $\mathbf{GS1p}$ , hence of (propositional) Gentzen's  $\mathbf{LK}$ .

## 5 Extended Minimality Theorem

Define an *extended system* as one containing the axiom rule  $\overline{P, \overline{P}}$  and any of the following rules. (We have extended the definition of *standard system* by making blended conjunction available.)

### Extended system rules

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{\Delta, A \quad \Sigma, B}{\Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \otimes \quad \frac{\Gamma, \Delta, A \quad \Gamma, \Sigma, B}{\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, A \wedge B} \wedge \quad \frac{\Gamma, A \quad \Gamma, B}{\Gamma, A \wedge B} \& \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma, A_i}{\Gamma, A_1 \vee A_2} \oplus_i \quad \frac{\Gamma, A, B}{\Gamma, A \vee B} \wp \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma, A, A}{\Gamma, A} C \quad \frac{\Gamma}{\Gamma, A} W
 \end{array}$$

The Minimality Theorem (Theorem 2, page 7) extends as follows.

**THEOREM 4 (EXTENDED MINIMALITY THEOREM)** *An extended system is complete iff it contains propositional minimal sequent calculus **Mp**.*

To prove this theorem, we require two lemmas.

**LEMMA 14** *Suppose  $S$  is a complete extended system with the blended conjunction rule  $\wedge$ , and with at least one of contraction  $C$  or weakening  $W$ . Then  $S$  is equivalent to a standard system.*

*Proof.* If  $S$  has weakening  $W$ , let  $S'$  be the result of replacing the blended conjunction rule  $\wedge$  in  $S$  by context-sharing conjunction  $\&$ ; otherwise  $S$  has contraction, and let  $S'$  result from replacing  $\wedge$  by context-splitting  $\otimes$ . Then  $S'$  is equivalent to  $S$ , since  $\wedge \leftarrow \otimes C$  (page 9) and  $\wedge \leftarrow \& W$  (page 7).  $\square$

**LEMMA 15** *Suppose  $S$  is a complete extended system with neither contraction  $C$  nor weakening  $W$ . Then  $S$  is equivalent to propositional minimal sequent calculus **Mp**.*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{Mp}^- = (\otimes, \&, \oplus, \wp)$  is incomplete (Proposition 2, page 6),  $S$  must have the blended conjunction rule  $\wedge$  either directly or as a derived rule. Since  $S$  is complete, it must have a disjunction rule, therefore it could only fail to be equivalent to  $\mathbf{Mp} = (\wedge, \oplus, \wp)$  if (a) it has  $\oplus$  and  $\wp$  is not derivable, *i.e.*,  $S$  is equivalent to  $(\wedge, \oplus)$ , or (b) it has  $\wp$  and  $\oplus$  is not derivable, *i.e.*,  $S$  is equivalent to  $(\wedge, \wp)$ . In case (a), the valid formula  $P \vee \overline{P}$  would not be derivable, and in case (b) the valid formula  $(P \vee \overline{P}) \vee Q$  would not be derivable, either way contradicting the completeness of  $S$ .  $\square$

*Proof of the Extended Minimality Theorem (Theorem 4).* Suppose  $S$  is a complete extended system. If  $S$  has contraction  $C$  or weakening  $W$  then it is equivalent to a standard system by

Lemma 14, hence contains **Mp** by the original Minimality Theorem. Otherwise  $S$  is equivalent to **Mp** by Lemma 15, hence in particular contains **Mp**.

Conversely, suppose  $S$  is an extended system containing **Mp**. Then  $S$  is complete since **Mp** is complete.  $\square$

We also have the following extension of Theorem 3 (page 11), which stated that, up to equivalence, there are only three complete standard systems, **GS1p**, **Pp** and **Np**.

**THEOREM 5** *Up to equivalence, there are only four complete extended systems:*

1. *The Gentzen-Schütte-Tait system **GS1p** = ( $\&$ ,  $\oplus$ , C, W).*
2. *Positive calculus **Pp** = ( $\otimes$ ,  $\oplus$ , C).*
3. *Negative calculus **Np** = ( $\&$ ,  $\wp$ , W).*
4. *Propositional minimal sequent calculus **Mp** = ( $\wedge$ ,  $\oplus$ ,  $\wp$ ).*

*Proof.* Theorem 3 together with Lemmas 14 and 15.  $\square$

## 6 Degrees of completeness

We defined a system as *complete* if every valid formula (singleton sequent) is derivable. To avoid ambiguity with forthcoming definitions, let us refer to this default notion of completeness as *formula-completeness*. Define a system as *minimal-complete* if every minimal<sup>12</sup> sequent is derivable, and *sequent-complete* if every valid sequent is derivable. (Thus *sequent-complete* implies *minimal-complete* implies *formula-complete*.)

For a minimal-complete system  $S$ , a sequent  $\Gamma$  is valid iff a subsequent of  $\Gamma$  is derivable in  $S$ . Thus a minimal-complete system  $S$  can be viewed as sequent-complete, modulo final weakenings. (Cf. system **GS5p** of [TS96, §7.4] (related to resolution).)

**PROPOSITION 4** **Pp** = ( $\otimes$ ,  $\oplus$ , C) and **Mp** = ( $\wedge$ ,  $\oplus$ ,  $\wp$ ) are formula-complete and minimal-complete, but not sequent-complete.

*Proof.* We have already proved that **Mp** (hence also **Pp**, by containment) is minimal-complete (Proposition 1).


We show that the valid (non-minimal) sequent  $P, \overline{P}, Q$  is not derivable in **Pp** (hence also in **Mp**). A derivation must contain an axiom rule  $\overline{P}, \overline{P}$ . This cannot be followed by a  $\otimes$  or  $\oplus$  rule, otherwise we introduce a connective  $\wedge$  or  $\vee$  which cannot subsequently be removed by any other rule before the concluding sequent  $P, \overline{P}, Q$ . Neither can it be followed by contraction C, since there is nothing to contract.  $\square$

**PROPOSITION 5** **Np** = ( $\&$ ,  $\wp$ , W) is formula-, minimal- and sequent-complete.

<sup>12</sup>Recall that a valid sequent is minimal if no proper subsequent is valid.

*Proof.* **Np** is minimal-complete since it contains **Mp**. Suppose  $\Gamma$  is a valid but not minimal sequent. Choose a minimal subsequent  $\Delta$  of  $\Gamma$  (see Lemma 1, page 4). By minimal-completeness,  $\Delta$  has a derivation. Follow this with weakenings to obtain  $\Gamma$ .  $\square$

Below we have annotated our Hasse diagram with completeness strengths.



## 7 Possible future work

1. *Cut.* Chapter 4 of [TS96] gives a detailed analysis of cut for Gentzen systems. One could pursue an analogous analysis of cut for minimal sequent calculus. Aside from context-splitting and context-sharing cut rules

$$\frac{\Delta, A \quad \Sigma, \neg A}{\Delta, \Sigma} \text{cut}_{\otimes} \qquad \frac{\Gamma, A \quad \Gamma, \neg A}{\Gamma} \text{cut}_{\&}$$

one might also investigate a blended cut rule:

$$\frac{\Gamma, \Delta, A \quad \Gamma, \Sigma, \neg A}{\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma} \text{cut}$$

2. *Quantifiers.* Explore the various ways of adding quantifiers to **Mp**, for a full first-order system **M**.
3. *Mix (nullary multicut).* Gentzen's multicut rule

$$\frac{\Delta, A_1, \dots, A_m \quad \Sigma, \neg A_1, \dots, \neg A_n}{\Delta, \Sigma}$$

in the nullary case  $m = n = 0$  has been of particular interest to linear logicians [Gir87], who call it the *mix* rule. One could investigate context-splitting, context-sharing and blended incarnations:

$$\frac{\Delta \quad \Sigma}{\Delta, \Sigma} \text{mix}_{\otimes} \quad \frac{\Gamma \quad \Gamma}{\Gamma} \text{mix}_{\&} \quad \frac{\Gamma, \Delta \quad \Gamma, \Sigma}{\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma} \text{mix}$$

## References

- [Bol02] B. Bollobás. *Modern Graph Theory*. Springer-Verlag, 2002.
- [Gen39] G. Gentzen. Untersuchungen über das logische Schließen I, II. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 39:176–210 405–431, 1939. Translation in [Gen69, 68–131].
- [Gen69] G. Gentzen. *The Collected Papers of Gerhard Gentzen*. North-Holland, 1969. Edited and introduced by M.E. Szabo.
- [Gir87] J.-Y. Girard. Linear logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 50:1–102, 1987.
- [Ket44] J. Ketonen. Untersuchungen zum Prädikatenkalkül. *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, ser. A, I. Mathematica-physica*, 23, 1944.
- [Sch50] K. Schütte. Schlußweisen-Kalküle der Prädikatenlogik. *Mathematische Annalen*, 123:166–186 405–431, 1950.
- [Tai68] W. W. Tait. Normal derivability in classical logic. In *The Syntax and Semantics of Infinitary Languages*, volume 72 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 204–236. Springer-Verlag, 1968.
- [TS96] A. S. Troelstra and H. Schwichtenberg. *Basic Proof Theory*. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 1996.
- [Urb00] C. Urban. *Classical Logic and Computation*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2000.
- [UB01] C. Urban and G. Bierman. Strong Normalisation of Cut-Elimination in Classical Logic. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 45:123–155, 2001.