

Making first order linear logic a generating grammar

Sergey Slavnov
slavnovserge@gmail.com

June 22, 2022

Abstract

It is known that different categorial grammars have surface representation in a fragment of first order multiplicative linear logic. We show that the fragment of interest is equivalent to the recently introduced *extended tensor type calculus*. This provides the former not only with some alternative syntax and intuitive geometric representation, but also with an intrinsic deductive system, which has been absent.

1 Introduction

The best known examples of categorial grammars are Lambek grammars, which are based on Lambek calculus (LC) [5], i.e. noncommutative intuitionistic linear logic (for background on linear logic see [2],[3]). These, however, have somewhat limited expressive power, and a lot of extensions/variations have been proposed, using discontinuous tuples of strings and λ -terms, commutative and non-commutative logical operations, modalities etc, let us mention displacement grammars [10], abstract categorial grammars (also called λ -grammars and linear grammars) [1], [11], [12] and hybrid type logical categorial grammars [4].

It has been known for a while that different grammatical formalisms, such as those just mentioned, have surface representation in the familiar first order multiplicative intuitionistic linear logic (MILL1), which provides them in this way with some common ground. In the seminal work [9] it was shown that Lambek calculus (LC) translates into MILL1 as a conservative fragment; later similar representations were obtained for other systems (in the case of displacement calculus, the representation is not conservative though, see [6]). This applies equally well to the *classical* setting of first order multiplicative linear logic (MLL1), which is a conservative extension of MILL1 anyway.

The translations are based on interpreting first order variables as denoting *string positions*; this extends then to interpretation of certain well-formed formulas and sequents as expressing relations between strings, in particular, those encoded in formal grammars. It should be emphasised that only a small fragment, let us call it *linguistically well-formed*, admits such an interpretation (and is actually used in

the above translations). However, standard deductive systems of linear logic are not *intrinsic* to this fragment: typically, when deriving, say, the **MILLI** translation of an **LC** sequent, in general, we have to use at intermediate steps sequents that have no apparent linguistic meaning at all. Representation of formal grammars makes first order linear logic an auxiliary tool, but hardly something like a generating grammar. Derivations do not translate step-by-step to operations generating language elements.

Extended tensor type calculus (ETTC) based on (classical) propositional **MLL**, recently proposed in [14] (elaborating on [13]), was directly designed for linguistic interpretation. It was shown in [14] that *tensor grammars* based on **ETTC** include both Lambek grammars and abstract categorial grammars as conservative fragments, with representation very similar to that in **MILLI**. Unlike the case of **MILLI**, in **ETTC** derivations each rule corresponds to a concrete operation on strings, more precisely on certain graphs decorated with strings, so that it can be conveniently visualized. In this work we show that **ETTC** is equivalent precisely to the above discussed linguistically well-formed fragment of **MLLI**, thus providing it with an alternative syntax, together with an intrinsic deductive system and intuitive pictorial representation. (Actually, we consider a notationally enriched variation of the system proposed in [14], allowing more concise and transparent computations.)

We will work on the basis of classical linear logic, mostly because it suggests some nice symmetric notation, but all constructions automatically restrict to the intuitionistic setting.

2 Background: systems of linear logic

Language and sequent calculus of *first order multiplicative linear logic (MLL1)* are shown in Figures 1a, 1b. We are given a set $Pred_+$ of *positive predicate symbols* with assigned arities and a set Var of variables. The sets $Pred_-$ and $Pred$ of *negative* and of all predicate symbols respectively are defined. The sets of first order *atomic*, respectively, linear multiplicative formulas are denoted as At , respectively, Fm . Connectives \otimes and \wp are called respectively *tensor* (also *times*) and *cotensor* (also *par*). *Linear negation* $\overline{(\cdot)}$ is not a connective, but is *definable* by induction on formula construction, as in Figure 1a. Note that, somewhat non-traditionally, we follow the convention that negation flips tensor/cotensor factors, typical for *noncommutative* systems. This does not change the logic (the formulas $A \otimes B$ and $B \otimes A$ are provably equivalent), but is more consistent with our intended geometric interpretation. A context Γ is a finite sequence of formulas. The set of free variables of Γ is denoted as $FV(\Gamma)$.

First order multiplicative intuitionistic logic (MILL1) is the fragment of **MLL1** restricted to sequents of the form $\vdash B, \overline{A_1}, \dots, \overline{A_n}$, written in **MILL1** in a two-sided form as $A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash B$, where A_1, \dots, A_n, B are *multiplicative intuitionistic formulas*, which means constructed using only positive predicate symbols, quantifiers, tensor and *linear implication* defined by $A \multimap B = B \wp \overline{A}$.

The language of *Lambek calculus (LC)*, i.e. noncommutative multiplicative intuitionistic linear logic, is summarised in Figure 1c. Noncommutative tensor is de-

$$\begin{aligned}
Pred_- &= \{\overline{p} \mid p \in Pred_+\}, \quad p \text{ is } n\text{-ary} \Rightarrow \overline{p} \text{ is } n\text{-ary}, \quad Pred = Pred_+ \cup Pred_-, \\
At &= \{p(e_1, \dots, e_n) \mid e_1, \dots, e_n \in Var \cup Const, p \in Pred, p \text{ is } n\text{-ary}\}, \\
Fm &::= At \mid (Fm \otimes Fm) \mid (Fm \wp Fm) \mid \forall x Fm \mid \exists x Fm, x \in Var \\
\overline{p(e_1, \dots, e_n)} &= \overline{p}(e_n, \dots, e_1), \quad \overline{\overline{p(e_1, \dots, e_n)}} = p(e_n, \dots, e_1) \text{ for } P \in Pred_+, \\
\overline{A \otimes B} &= \overline{B} \wp \overline{A}, \quad \overline{A \wp B} = \overline{B} \otimes \overline{A}, \quad \overline{\forall x A} = \exists x(\overline{A}), \quad \overline{\exists x A} = \forall x(\overline{A}).
\end{aligned}$$

(a) **MLL1 language**

$$\begin{array}{c}
\vdash \overline{A}, A, A \in At \text{ (Id)} \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A \quad \vdash \overline{A}, \Theta}{\vdash \Gamma, \Theta} \text{ (Cut)} \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, B, \Theta}{\vdash \Gamma, B, A, \Theta} \text{ (Ex)} \\
\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A \wp B} \text{ } (\wp) \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A \quad \vdash B, \Theta}{\vdash \Gamma, A \otimes B, \Theta} \text{ } (\otimes) \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, x \notin FV(\Gamma)}{\vdash \Gamma, \forall x A} \text{ } (\forall) \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A[e/x]}{\vdash \Gamma, \exists x A} \text{ } (\exists)
\end{array}$$

(b) **MLL1 sequent calculus**

$$Fm ::= Prop \mid (Fm \setminus Fm) \mid (Fm / Fm) \mid (Fm \bullet Fm)$$

(c) **LC language**

$$\begin{aligned}
\|p\|^{(l,r)} &= p(l,r) \text{ for } p \in Prop, & \|B/A\|^{(l,r)} &= \forall x \|A\|^{(r,x)} \multimap \|B\|^{(l,x)}, \\
\|A \bullet B\|^{(l,r)} &= \exists x \|A\|^{(l,x)} \otimes \|B\|^{(x,r)}, & \|A \setminus B\|^{(l,r)} &= \forall x \|A\|^{(x,l)} \multimap \|B\|^{(x,r)}.
\end{aligned}$$

$$A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash_{\mathbf{LC}} B \iff \|A_1\|^{(c_0, c_1)}, \dots, \|A_n\|^{(c_{n-1}, c_n)} \vdash_{\mathbf{MILL1}} \|B\|^{(c_0, c_n)}.$$

(d) **Translating LC to MILL1**

Figure 1: Systems of linear logic

noted as \bullet , and the two *directed* implications caused by noncommutativity are denoted as slashes. We will not reproduce the rules which can be found, for example, in [5]. Formulas of **LC** are often called *types*. Given a finite alphabet T of *terminal symbols*, a *Lambek grammar* G is a pair $G = (Lex, S)$, where Lex , the (*lexicon*) is a finite set of *lexical entries*, which are expressions $t : A$, where $t \in T$ and A is a type, and S is a selected atomic type. The *language* $L(G)$ of G is the set of words

$$L(G) = \left\{ t_1 \cdots t_n \mid \begin{array}{l} t_1 : A_1, \dots, t_n : A_n \in Lex, \\ A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash_{\mathbf{LC}} S \end{array} \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where dot denotes string concatenation.

Given two variables l, r , the *first order translation* $\|F\|^{(l,r)}$ of an **LC** formula F parameterized by l, r is shown in Figure 1d (**LC** propositional symbols are treated as binary predicate symbols). This provides a conservative embedding of **LC** into **MILL1** [9].

3 MILL1 grammars and linguistic fragment

Translation from **LC** suggests defining **MILL1** grammars similar to Lambek grammars.

Let a finite alphabet T of terminal symbols be given. Assume for convenience that our first order language contains two special variables (or constants) l, r .

Let us say that a **MILLI** *lexical entry* is a pair (w, A) , where $w \in T^*$ is nonempty, and A is a **MILLI** formula with one occurrence of l and one occurrence of r and no other free variables. For the formula A occurring in a lexical entry we will write $A[x; y] = A[x/l, y/r]$ (so that $A = A[l; r]$).

A **MILLI** *grammar* G is a pair (Lex, s) , where Lex is a finite set of **MILLI** lexical entries, and s is a binary predicate symbol. The *language* $L(G)$ *generated by* G or, simply, the *language of* G is defined by

$$L(G) = \left\{ w_1 \cdots w_n \mid \begin{array}{l} (w_1, A_1), \dots, (w_n, A_n) \in Lex, \\ A_1[c_0; c_1], \dots, A_n[c_{n-1}; c_n] \vdash_{\mathbf{MILLI}} s(c_0, c_n) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (2)$$

It seems clear that, under such a definition, Lambek grammars translate to **MILLI** grammars generating the same language (compare (2) with (1)).

It has been shown [7], [8] that **MILLI** allows representing more complex systems such as displacement calculus, abstract categorial grammars, hybrid type-logical grammars. This suggests that the above definition should be generalized to allow more complex lexical entries, corresponding to word tuples rather than just words.

Now let us isolate the fragment of first order logic that is actually used in translations of linguistic systems.

3.1 Linguistic fragment

Let us say that a first order language is *linguistically marked* if each n -ary predicate symbol p is equipped with *valency* $v(p) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, $v(p) = (v_l(p), v_r(p))$, where $v_l(p) + v_r(p) = n$, such that $v(\overline{p}) = (v_r(p), v_l(p))$. When $v(p) = (k, m)$ we say that first k occurrences x_1, \dots, x_k in the atomic formula $p(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ are *left* occurrences or have *left polarity*, and x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n are *right* occurrences, with *right polarity*. In a compound multiplicative formula, context or sequent, occurrence polarity is defined by its polarity in the corresponding atomic formula.

A formula, context or sequent is *linguistically marked* if every quantifier binds exactly one left and one right variable occurrence. A linguistically marked formula or context is *linguistically well-formed* if, furthermore, it has at most one left and at most one right occurrence of any free variable. A linguistically marked *sequent* is linguistically well-formed if each of its free variables has *exactly* one left and one right occurrence. A **MILLI** grammar is well-formed if the formula in every lexical entry is linguistically well-formed with l and r occurring with left and right polarity respectively.

Evidently, if we understand **MILLI** as a fragment of **MLL1**, then the translation of **LC** in Figure 1d has precisely the linguistically well-formed fragment as its target (with $v(p) = (1, 1)$ for all $p \in Pred$), and Lambek grammars translate to linguistically well-formed ones. Similar observations apply to translations in [7], [8].

Our goal is to provide an *intrinsic* deductive system for the linguistically well-formed fragment.

$$\vdash \underbrace{a(e; t), \bar{a}(t; e)} \otimes \underbrace{a(e; s), \bar{a}(s; e)} \xRightarrow{(\exists)} \vdash \underbrace{a(e; t), \exists x(\bar{a}(t; x) \otimes a(x; s))}_{\text{link}}, \bar{a}(s; e)$$

Figure 2: Occurrence net example

3.1.1 Occurrence nets

Let us introduce some convenient format and terminology for derivations of linguistically well-formed sequents. An *occurrence net* of a linguistically marked **MLL1** sequent $\vdash \Gamma$ is a perfect matching σ between left and right free occurrences in Γ , such that each pair (*link*) in σ consists of occurrences of the same variable. Note that for a linguistically well-formed sequent there is only one occurrence net possible. Basically, occurrence nets are rudiments of proof-nets. To each cut-free derivation π of a linguistically marked sequent $\vdash \Gamma$ we assign by induction an occurrence net $\sigma(\pi)$.

For the axiom $\vdash \bar{X}, X$, where $X = p(e_1, \dots, e_n)$, the net is defined by matching an occurrence e_i in X with the occurrence e_i in $\bar{X} = \bar{p}(e_n, \dots, e_1)$. For π obtained from a derivation π' by the (\exists) rule, we put $\sigma(\pi) = \sigma(\pi')$, and for π obtained from derivations π_1, π_2 by the (\otimes) rule, $\sigma(\pi) = \sigma(\pi_1) \cup \sigma(\pi_2)$. If π is obtained from some π' by the (\forall) rule introducing a formula $\forall xA$, then the variable x has no free occurrences in the premise other than those in A , and, since the sequent is linguistically marked, there is precisely one left and one right occurrence of x in A , say, x_l and x_r . It follows that $(x_l, x_r) \in \sigma(\pi')$ and we put $\sigma(\pi) = \sigma(\pi') \setminus \{(x_l, x_r)\}$. The rule erases the link (x_l, x_r) from the occurrence net.

Finally, let π be obtained from π' by the (\exists) rule applied to a formula $A' = A[e/x]$ and introducing the formula $\exists xA$. Since the sequent is linguistically marked, there is exactly one left and one right occurrence of x in A , and to them correspond a left and a right occurrence of e in A' , say e_l and e_r . There are two cases.

If $(e_l, e_r) \in \sigma(\pi')$, put $\sigma(\pi) = \sigma(\pi') \setminus \{(e_l, e_r)\}$. The rule erases a link. Otherwise let e'_l, e'_r be such that $(e'_l, e_r), (e_l, e'_r) \in \sigma(\pi')$. Put $\sigma(\pi) = \sigma(\pi') \setminus \{(e'_l, e_r), (e_l, e'_r)\} \cup \{(e'_l, e'_r)\}$. The rule glues two links into one. An example for the latter case is shown in Figure 2.

The following is easily proved by induction on derivation.

Proposition 3.1 *Let π be a cut-free derivation of a linguistically marked sequent $\vdash \Gamma$, and assume that $(e_l, e_r) \in \sigma(\pi)$. Let $e' \in Var$ be fresh and $\Gamma' = \Gamma[e'/e_l, e'/e_r]$. Then $\vdash \Gamma'$ is derivable in **MLL1** with a derivation π' of the same size as π and $\sigma(\pi') = \sigma(\pi) \setminus \{(e_l, e_r)\} \cup \{(e'_l, e'_r)\}$. \square*

3.1.2 Linguistic derivations

Assume that we have a derivable linguistically well-formed sequent $\vdash \Theta$, where $\Theta = \Gamma, A$, and let $s, t \in Var$, $s \neq t$, have, respectively, a left and a right free occurrences in A , denoted as s_l and t_r . Let e be a fresh variable.

Put $A' = \exists xA[x/s_l, x/t_r]$ and $\Theta' = \Gamma, A'$, and next $\Theta'' = \Theta'[e/s, e/t]$. The sequent $\vdash \Theta''$ is derivable by the (\exists) rule from the sequent $\vdash \Theta_0$, where $\Theta_0 = \Theta[e/s, e/t]$, and Θ_0 is derivable by Proposition 3.1. We say that $\vdash \Theta''$ is obtained from $\vdash \Theta$ by the (\exists')

rule. Note that, on the level of occurrence nets, seen as bipartite graphs, the (\exists') rule does the same gluing as (\exists) ; only vertex labels are changed.

We will say that derivations of linguistically well-formed sequents using rules of **MLL1** and the (\exists') rule and involving only linguistically well-formed sequents are *linguistic derivations*.

Lemma 3.2 *Any MLL1 derivation π of a linguistically well-formed sequent $\vdash \Theta$ translates to a linguistic derivation.*

Proof by induction on a cut-free form of π . If the last step in π is the (\exists) rule applied to a non-linguistically well-formed premise, then, using Proposition 3.1, we replace the premise with a linguistically well-formed sequent and obtain $\vdash \Theta$ by the (\exists') rule. \square

Thus, adding the (\exists') rule, we obtain a kind of intrinsic deductive system for the linguistically well-formed fragment. It seems though that the usual syntax of first order sequent calculus is not very natural for such a system, and some other representation might be desirable.

4 Tensor type calculus

4.1 Language

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

Indices will have upper or lower occurrences, which may be free or bound. We will write $e^{[i/j]}$, respectively $e_{[i/j]}$, for the expression obtained from e by replacing the upper, respectively lower, free occurrence(s) of the index j with i . We will write $I^\bullet(e)$ and $I_\bullet(e)$ for the sets of upper and lower indices of e respectively, and $I(e)$ for the pair $(I^\bullet(e), I_\bullet(e))$; similarly, $FI(e) = (FI^\bullet(e), FI_\bullet(e))$ for sets of free indices.

For pairs of index sets $W_i = (U_i, V_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, we write binary operations componentwise, e.g. $W_1 \cup W_2 = (U_1 \cup U_2, V_1 \cup V_2)$, and we write $W_1 \perp W_2$ for $U_1 \cap U_2 = V_1 \cap V_2 = \emptyset$. We also write $(i, j) \perp (U, V)$ for $i \notin U, j \notin V$.

4.1.1 Tensor terms

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \frac{\frac{ab}{i} \quad \frac{cd}{j}}{j} \rightarrow_{\beta} \frac{abcd}{i} & \frac{\frac{abc}{i}}{i} \rightarrow_{\beta} \textcircled{abc} & \textcircled{\quad} \rightarrow_{\beta} \emptyset \\
 \text{(a) } [ab]_i^j [cd]_j^k \rightarrow_{\beta} [abcd]_i^k & \text{(b) } [abc]_i^i \rightarrow_{\beta} [abc] & \text{(c) } \delta_i^i \rightarrow 1
 \end{array}$$

Figure 3: Meaning of β -reductions

Let T be an alphabet of *terminal symbols*. Consider the free commutative monoid (written multiplicatively with the unit denoted as 1) generated by the sets

$$\{[w]_i^j \mid i, j \in \text{Ind}, w \in T^*\} \text{ and } \{[w] \mid w \in T^*\} \quad (3)$$

of *elementary regular* and *singular tensor terms* respectively. *Tensor terms* are monoid elements satisfying the constraint that any index has at most one lower and one upper occurrence. β -Reduction of tensor terms is generated by the relations

$$\begin{aligned} [u]_i^j \cdot [v]_j^k &\rightarrow_\beta [uv]_i^k, & [w]_i^i &\rightarrow_\beta [w], & [\epsilon] &\rightarrow_\beta 1, \\ [a_1 \dots a_n] &\rightarrow_\beta [a_n a_1 \dots a_{n-1}] \text{ for } a_1, \dots, a_n \in T, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where ϵ denotes the empty word. Terms related by β -reduction are β -equivalent, notation: $t \equiv_\beta s$. (The adjective “tensor” will often be omitted in the following.)

An index in a term t is *free* if it occurs in t exactly once; this property is invariant under β -equivalence. A term is β -reduced if it has no repeated indices; obviously, any term is β -equivalent to a β -reduced one. A term is *regular* if it is β -equivalent to the product of elementary regular terms, otherwise the term is *singular*. We denote the elementary term $[\epsilon]_i^j$ as δ_i^j , when $i \neq j$ it is called *Kronecker delta*. Multiplication by Kronecker deltas amounts to renaming indices: if t is a term with $(i, j) \in FI(t)$ and $(i', j') \perp I(t)$, then $\delta_i^{i'} \cdot t \equiv_\beta t^{[i'/i]}$ and $\delta_{j'}^j \cdot t \equiv_\beta t_{[j'/j]}$. For the case of $i = j$, we have from (4) that $\delta_i^i \equiv_\beta 1$.

We think of regular terms as bipartite graphs whose vertices are labeled with indices and edges with words, and direction of edges is from lower indices to upper ones. A regular term $[w]_i^j$, $i \neq j$, corresponds to a single edge from i to j labeled with w , the product of two terms without common indices is the disjoint union of the corresponding graphs, and a term with repeated indices corresponds to a graph obtained by gluing edges along matching vertices; this representation is invariant under β -equivalence. The unit 1 corresponds to the empty graph. As for singular terms, such as $[w]_i^i$, they correspond to closed loops (with no vertices) labeled with *cyclic* words (this explains the last relation in (4)). These arise when edges are glued cyclically, with the convention that when there are no labels, loops evaporate ($\delta_i^i \equiv_\beta 1$). See Figure 3 for an illustration. Singular terms are pathological, but we need them for consistency of definitions. (In the system introduced in [14] empty loops are not factored out, but this is a purely cosmetic difference.)

We say that a term t is *lexical* if it is not β -equivalent to some term of the form $\delta_j^i \cdot t'$ with $(i, j) \in FI(t)$. Geometrically this means that every edge has a nonempty label.

4.1.2 Tensor formulas and types

The set \widetilde{Fm} of tensor pseudoformulas is built according to the grammar in Figure 4. We assume that we are given a set $Li t_+$ of *positive literals*, and every element $p \in Li t_+$ is assigned a *valency* $v(p) \in \mathbb{N}^2$. Then the set $Li t_-$ of *negative literals* and the set $Li t$ of all literals are defined. The convention for negative literals is that $v(\overline{p}) = (m, n)$ if $v(p) = (n, m)$. The set \widetilde{At} is the set atomic pseudoformulas. Duality (\cdot) is not a connective or operator, but is definable.

The symbols ∇, Δ are *binding operators*. These bind indices exactly in the same way as quantifiers bind variables. The operator $Q \in \{\nabla, \Delta\}$ in front of an expression $Q_j^i A$ has A as its scope and binds all lower occurrences of i , respectively, upper occurrences of j in A that are not already bound by some other operator.

$$\begin{aligned}
Lit_- &= \{\overline{p} \mid p \in Lit_+\}, \quad \overline{\overline{p}} = p \text{ for } p \in Lit_+, \quad Lit = Lit_+ \cup Lit_- \\
\widetilde{At} &= \{p^{i_1 \dots i_m} \mid p \in Lit, v(p) = (m, n), i_1, \dots, i_m, j_1, \dots, j_n \in Ind\}. \\
\widetilde{Fm} &::= \widetilde{At} | (\widetilde{Fm} \otimes \widetilde{Fm}) | (\widetilde{Fm} \wp \widetilde{Fm}) | \nabla_j^i \widetilde{Fm} | \Delta_j^i \widetilde{Fm}, \quad i, j \in Ind, \quad i \neq j. \\
&\quad \overline{p^{i_1, \dots, i_n}} = \overline{p^{j_m, \dots, j_1}}. \\
\overline{A \otimes B} &= \overline{B} \wp \overline{A}, \quad \overline{A \wp B} = \overline{B} \otimes \overline{A}, \quad \overline{\nabla_j^i A} = \Delta_j^i \overline{A}, \quad \overline{\Delta_j^i A} = \nabla_j^i \overline{A}.
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 4: ETTC Language

A pseudoformula A is *well-formed* when any index has at most one upper and one lower free occurrence in A , and every binding operator binds exactly one lower and one upper index occurrence. Then we say that A is a *tensor formula* or a *pseudotype*. If, moreover, $FI^*(A) \cap FI_*(A) = \emptyset$, we say that A is a *tensor type*. (Caution: unlike terms and types, general pseudotypes may have *repeated free indices*.) The set of atomic types (i.e. coming from atomic pseudoformulas) is denoted as At .

A *tensor pseudotype context* Γ is a finite sequence of pseudotypes such that for any two distinct $A, B \in \Gamma$ we have that $FI(A) \perp FI(B)$. The pseudotype context is a *type context* if $FI^*(\Gamma) \cap FI_*(\Gamma) = \emptyset$, where $FI(\Gamma) = \bigcup_{A \in \Gamma} FI(A)$.

4.2 Sequents and typing judgements

A *tensor sequent* or *pseudotyping judgement* Σ is an expression of the form $t \vdash \Gamma$, where Γ is a pseudotype context and t is a tensor term such that

$$I(t) \perp FI(\Gamma), \quad FI^*(t) \cup FI^*(\Gamma) = FI_*(t) \cup FI_*(\Gamma) \quad (5)$$

(in words: if we erase all bound indices of Γ , then every remaining index has exactly one upper and one lower occurrence).




Figure 5: Tensor sequent

When $t = 1$ we write Σ simply as $\vdash \Gamma$. When t is β -reduced or lexical we say that Σ is, respectively, β -reduced or lexical. When Γ is a type (not just pseudotype) context, we say that Σ is a *tensor typing judgement* and read it as “ t has type Γ ”. In this case we necessarily have $FI^*(t) = FI_*(\Gamma)$, $FI_*(t) = FI^*(\Gamma)$.

We think of the tensor sequent $\Sigma = (t \vdash \Gamma)$ as an edge-labeled graph with a particular pictorial representation. Free index occurrences in Γ correspond to vertices, ordered, say, from left to right, from top to bottom. We depict the sequent as a graph on these vertices, aligned, say, horizontally according to the ordering. For every free index repeated in Γ , we connect the corresponding vertices with an edge carrying no

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\vdash A, \bar{A}, A \in At} (\text{Id}) \quad \frac{t \vdash \Gamma, A \quad s \vdash \bar{A}, \Theta}{ts \vdash \Gamma, \Theta} (\text{Cut}) \quad \frac{t \vdash \Gamma, A, B, \Theta}{t \vdash \Gamma, B, A, \Theta} (\text{Ex}) \quad \frac{t \vdash \Gamma, t \rightarrow_{\beta} t'}{t' \vdash \Gamma} (\rightarrow_{\beta}) \\
\frac{t \vdash \Gamma}{\delta_j^i t \vdash \Gamma^{[j/i]}} (\alpha\eta^{-}) \quad \frac{t \vdash \Gamma}{\delta_i^j t \vdash \Gamma_{[j/i]}} (\alpha\eta_{-}) \quad \frac{\delta_j^i t \vdash \Gamma^{[i/j]}}{t \vdash \Gamma} (\alpha\eta^{-}) \quad \frac{\delta_j^i t \vdash \Gamma^{[i/j]}}{t \vdash \Gamma} (\alpha\eta^{-}) \\
\frac{t \vdash \Gamma, A, B}{t \vdash \Gamma, A \wp B} (\wp) \quad \frac{t \vdash \Gamma, A \quad s \vdash B, \Theta}{ts \vdash \Gamma, A \otimes B, \Theta} (\otimes) \quad \frac{\delta_{\beta}^{\alpha} \cdot t \vdash \Gamma, A}{t \vdash \Gamma, \nabla_{\beta}^{\alpha} A} (\nabla) \quad \frac{t \vdash \Gamma, A}{\delta_{\alpha}^{\beta} \cdot t \vdash \Gamma, \Delta_{\beta}^{\alpha} A} (\Delta)
\end{array}$$

Figure 6: ETTC sequent rules

label, directed from the upper occurrence to the lower one. Remaining free indices in Γ are in bijection with free indices/vertices of t and we connect them with labeled edges corresponding to factors of t . (Bound indices of Γ are not in the picture.) An example of a concrete tensor sequent representation is given in Figure 5. When Σ is actually a typing judgement, free indices of Γ and t match exactly, and the whole picture becomes a representation of the term/graph t induced by Σ .

Relations of β - and α -equivalence and η -expansion of sequents are generated by the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
t \equiv_{\beta} t' &\Rightarrow (t \vdash \Gamma) \equiv_{\beta} (t' \vdash \Gamma), \quad i \in FI^{\bullet}(t) \cup FI^{\bullet}(\Gamma), j \text{ fresh} \Rightarrow (t \vdash \Gamma) \equiv_{\alpha} (t \vdash \Gamma)_{[j/i]}^{[j/i]}, \\
i \in FI^{\bullet}(\Gamma) \cap FI_{\bullet}(\Gamma), j \text{ fresh} &\Rightarrow (t \vdash \Gamma) \rightarrow_{\eta} (\delta_j^i t \vdash \Gamma^{[j/i]}), \quad (t \vdash \Gamma) \rightarrow_{\eta} (\delta_i^j t \vdash \Gamma_{[j/i]}).
\end{aligned}$$

For example, the sequent $[xy]_{m'}^{i'} \cdot [ba]_j^l \vdash a_{i'} \otimes b_{k'}^j, c^{k'm'}$ is α -equivalent to the one in Figure 5, while $[xy]_m^i \cdot [ba]_j^l \cdot \delta_k^{\mu} \vdash a_i \otimes b_{\mu l}^j, c^{k'm}$ is an η -expansion of the latter. Sequents related by η -expansion are η -equivalent. Sequents that are typing judgements are η -long in the sense that they cannot be η -expanded, and lexical tensor sequents are η -reduced in the sense that they are not η -expansions of anything. Obviously any tensor sequent has (many $\alpha\beta$ -equivalent) η -long and η -reduced forms. Obviously, $\alpha\beta\eta$ -equivalent tensor sequents have identical geometric representation when indices are erased. Lexical tensor typing judgements, at once η -long and η -reduced, will have natural interpretation as nonlogical axioms.

4.3 Sequent calculus

4.3.1 Rules

Tensor sequents are derived using the rules of *extended tensor type calculus* (ETTC) in Figure 6. (The title “extended” refers in [14] to usage of binding operators, which extend plain types of MLL.)

There is an implicit restriction in the rules that all expressions must be well-formed, i.e, there are no forbidden index repetitions and upper occurrences match lower ones.

Note that in the (∇) and (Δ) rules it is required that $(\beta, \alpha) \in FI(A)$, hence there must also be an *upper* and a *lower* free occurrence of α and β respectively in the




Figure 7: Pictures for **ETTC**

premise. This guarantees that the expression in the conclusion of the (Δ) rule is indeed a well-formed tensor sequent (this might be not immediately obvious).

The (\rightarrow_β) and $(\alpha\eta)$ rules transform sequents to $(\alpha\beta\eta)$ -equivalent ones, making **ETTC** derivability closed under $\alpha\eta$ -equivalence and β -reduction. As for the terminal alphabet, it does not participate in this purely logical system. Terminal symbols will appear in *nonlogical axioms*, i.e. lexical entries of formal grammars.

4.3.2 Geometric meaning

Schematic pictures corresponding to the structural rules of **ETTC** are shown in Figure 7a. As for other rules, the (\otimes) rule puts two graphs together in the disjoint union and the (\wp) rule does nothing in the picture. The (\rightarrow_β) and $(\alpha\eta)$ rules do not change the picture either; they could be thought of as *coordinate transformations*.

Finally, the (Δ) rule glues together two indices/vertices, and the (∇) rule is applicable only in the case when the corresponding indices/vertices are connected with an edge carrying no label. Then this edge is erased from the picture completely (the information about the erased edge is stored in the introduced type).

Thus, terms of (pseudo-)type $\nabla_\beta^\alpha A$ encode a particular “subtype” of A : consisting of terms whose indices/vertices corresponding to α and β are connected with an edge carrying no label. Consider the case when A, B are types with exactly one free upper and one free lower index. Regular terms of type A or B are, essentially, strings. As for the implication type $A \multimap B = B \wp \bar{A}$, its terms are rather pairs of strings, as Figure 7b suggests. There are two “degenerate subtypes”, shown in Figure 7c, where one of the two strings is empty. (They are degenerate, for example, for having no lexical terms). These are precisely “subtypes” of the kind encoded by ∇ . Now, it is easy to see that terms of the first “subtype” act on type A terms by multiplication

(concatenation) on the left, and terms of the second one act by multiplication on the right (see Figure 7d). That is, the two “degenerate subtypes” of the implication type correspond precisely to two implicational types of **LC**. Which suggests that the implicational types of **LC** should be translated to **ETTC** as in Figure 7e (compare with Figure 1d).

4.3.3 η -Long fragment

The η -long fragment **ETTC** $_{\eta\rightarrow}$ is defined by removing the $(\alpha\eta)$ rules and replacing the (Id) axioms with their η -long forms:

$$\delta_{i_1}^{k_n} \dots \delta_{i_n}^{k_1} \delta_{l_m}^{j_1} \dots \delta_{l_1}^{j_m} \vdash p_{j_1 \dots j_m}^{i_1 \dots i_n}, \bar{p}_{k_1 \dots k_n}^{l_1 \dots l_m}, p \in Lit(\text{Id}_{\eta\rightarrow}). \quad (6)$$

Lemma 4.1 **ETTC** $_{\eta\rightarrow}$ is a conservative fragment of **ETTC**. A pseudotyping judgement is derivable in **ETTC** iff its η -long form is derivable in **ETTC** $_{\eta\rightarrow}$.

Proof By induction on derivation we prove the following. If $t \vdash \Gamma$ is an **ETTC** derivable sequent and the pair $(i, j) \in FI(\Gamma)$ is such that $i = j$ or $t = \delta_i^j t'$ for some term t' , then either the upper and lower occurrence of, respectively, i and j in Γ are in different formulas or the minimal subformula containing them both has \wp as the main connective. This implies that in any application of the (Cut) rule in an **ETTC** derivation the cut-formula has no repeated indices, i.e. is a type (otherwise the preceding statement cannot hold for both sides of the cut). This, in turn, implies that $(\alpha\eta)$ rules commute with the Cut rule (and they obviously commute with all other rules). So any **ETTC** derivation can be transformed to a form where all $(\alpha\eta)$ rules are applied in the beginning. If the conclusion is η -long then the sequence of $(\alpha\eta)$ rules in the beginning should transform (Id) axioms to their η -long forms (6), which are axioms of **ETTC** $_{\eta\rightarrow}$, and the first claim of the lemma follows. The second claim is immediate because $(\alpha\eta)$ -equivalent tensor sequents are derivable from each other. \square

It was precisely the η -long fragment that was introduced and discussed in [14] under the name **ETTC**, but the above lemma shows that the current enriched system is, basically, equivalent. The enriched **ETTC** of this work has the advantage of more concise notation; derivations in the **ETTC** $_{\eta\rightarrow}$ tend to become overloaded with indices and barely readable.

The η -long fragment is easily seen to be cut-free [14]; it follows from the preceding lemma that **ETTC** is cut-free as well (since any tensor sequent is cut-free derivable from its η -long form by $(\alpha\eta)$ rules).

5 Natural deduction and grammars

For derivations from nonlogical axioms it seems more convenient to allow variables standing for tensor terms, in the style of natural deduction (abbreviated below as “n.d.”). N.d. formulation might also be more convenient if we want to consider

the purely intuitionistic fragment of **ETTC** that is restricted to types built using only binding operators, tensor and linear implication defined as in Figure 7b.

We introduce a countable set var_{\otimes} of *tensor variable symbols* of different valencies, where valency $\nu(x)$ of the symbol x , as usual, is a pair of nonnegative integers, and define the set Var_{\otimes} of *tensor variables* as the subset of

$$\{x_{j_1 \dots j_n}^{i_1 \dots i_m} \mid x \in var_{\otimes}, \nu(x) = (m, n), i_1, \dots, i_m, j_1, \dots, j_n \in \text{Ind}\}$$

satisfying the constraint that there are no repeated indices. N.d. tensor terms are defined exactly as in Section 4.1, with the modification that we add Var_{\otimes} to sets (3) of generators, and all equations

$$\delta_i^j X \rightarrow_{\beta} X^{[j/i]}, \delta_l^k X \rightarrow_{\beta} X_{[l/k]}, \text{ where } X \in Var_{\otimes}, (i, k) \in I(X), (j, l) \perp I(X),$$

to defining relations (4). *Lexical n.d. terms* are defined as in Section 4.1 with the addition that they contain no tensor variables. An *n.d. tensor pseudotyping*, respectively *typing*, *judgement* is an expression of the form $t : C$ where t is an n.d. tensor term and C a tensor pseudotype, respectively type, satisfying the same relation (5) as t and Γ in the definition of usual tensor pseudotyping judgement. Lexical, β -reduced and α -, β - or η -equivalent pseudotyping judgements are defined as previously.

A *variable declaration* is an n.d. *typing judgement* $X : A$, where X is a tensor variable. An *n.d. typing context* Γ is a finite *set* (rather than a sequence) of variable declarations that have no common variable symbols and such that for any two distinct variables X, Y in Γ we have $I(X) \perp I(Y)$. An *n.d. tensor sequent* is an expression of the form $\Gamma \vdash \Sigma$, where Γ is an n.d. typing context, and Σ an n.d. pseudotyping judgement.

Natural deduction system **ETTC**_{n.d.} is given by the rules in Figure 8a with the usual implicit restriction of well-formedness.

It is immediate that any sequent derivable in **ETTC**_{n.d.} is η -equivalent to a one of the form

$$X_{(1)} : A_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)} : A_{(n)} \vdash X_{(1)} \cdots X_{(n)} \cdot t : B. \quad (7)$$

The following observations are completely standard.

Lemma 5.1 (“Deduction theorem”) *Let Ξ be a finite set of n.d. lexical typing judgements $\tau_{(i)} : A_{(i)}$ with $FI(A_{(i)}) \perp FI(A_{(j)})$ for $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$.*

An n.d. sequent of the form $\vdash \sigma : B$ is derivable from Ξ using each element of Ξ exactly once iff there is an n.d. sequent of the form (7) derivable without nonlogical axioms such that $t \cdot \tau_{(1)} \dots \tau_{(n)} \rightarrow_{\beta} \sigma$. \square



Lemma 5.2 *Sequent (7) is derivable in **ETTC**_{n.d.} iff its sequent calculus translation*

$$t \vdash B, \overline{A_{(n)}}, \dots, \overline{A_{(1)}}. \quad (8)$$

is derivable in the sequent calculus formulation. \square

$$\begin{array}{c}
X : A \vdash X : A \text{ (Id)} \\
\frac{t \vdash \Gamma}{\delta_j^i t \vdash \Gamma^{[j/i]}} (\alpha\eta^-) \quad \frac{t \vdash \Gamma}{\delta_i^j t \vdash \Gamma_{[j/i]}} (\alpha\eta^-) \\
\frac{\Gamma, X : A \vdash X \cdot t : B}{\Gamma \vdash t : B \wp \bar{A}} (\wp\text{I}) \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : B \wp \bar{A} \quad \Gamma \vdash t : A \quad \Theta \vdash s : B}{\Gamma, \Theta \vdash ts : A \otimes B} (\otimes\text{I}) \\
\frac{\Gamma, \Theta \vdash ts : A \otimes B}{\Gamma \vdash \delta_\beta^\alpha \cdot t : A} (\text{VI}) \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A}{\Gamma \vdash \delta_\alpha^\beta \cdot t : \Delta_\beta^\alpha A} (\Delta\text{I}) \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A, t \rightarrow_\beta t'}{\Gamma \vdash t' : A} (\rightarrow\beta) \\
\frac{\delta_j^i t \vdash \Gamma^{[i/j]} \quad \Gamma \vdash t' : A}{\delta_j^i t \vdash \Gamma^{[i/j]}} (\alpha\eta^-) \quad \frac{\delta_j^i t \vdash \Gamma^{[i/j]}}{t \vdash \Gamma} (\alpha\eta^-) \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash s : B \wp \bar{A} \quad \Theta \vdash t : A}{\Gamma, \Theta \vdash st : B} (\wp\text{E}) \\
\frac{\Gamma, \Theta \vdash st : B \quad \Gamma \vdash t : A \otimes B \quad X : A, Y : B, \Theta \vdash X \cdot Y \cdot s : C}{\Gamma, \Theta \vdash ts : C} (\otimes\text{E}) \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \nabla_\beta^\alpha A}{\Gamma \vdash \delta_\beta^\alpha \cdot t : A} (\nabla\text{E}) \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \Delta_\beta^\alpha A \quad X : A, \Theta \vdash \delta_\alpha^\beta \cdot X \cdot s : B}{\Gamma, \Theta \vdash ts : B} (\Delta\text{E})
\end{array}$$

(a) Rules

(b) Picture for the $(\wp\text{I})$ rule(c) Picture for the $(\wp\text{E})$ rule

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : (b/a)_j^i \quad \Theta \vdash s : a_k^j}{\Gamma, \Theta \vdash ts : b_k^i} (\text{/E}) \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : a_j^i \quad \Theta \vdash t : (a/b)_k^j}{\Gamma, \Theta \vdash st : b_k^i} (\backslash\text{E})$$

(d) Admissible rules

Figure 8: Natural deduction for **ETTC**

5.1 Examples

Translating to sequent calculus we obtain geometric representation for n.d. sequents and derivations. In this case it is natural to depict indices occurring to the left and to the right of the turnstile as vertices aligned on *two* parallel lines (continuously deforming the graph of translation (8)). In Figures 8b, 8c, 9b we align vertices vertically. With such a convention, the geometric representation for the (\wp) rules can be shown schematically as in Figures 8b, 8c. The $(\wp\text{I})$ rule does not change the graph, but changes its pictorial representation by a continuous deformation.

We also have admissible slash elimination rules in Figure 8d (with notation of Figure 7e), as is easy to show along the lines of the derivation in Figure 7e, which is our first example for natural deduction.

A more elaborate, linguistically motivated example of a derivation from nonlogical axioms is given in Figure 10. For better readability, we omit free indices in formulas, whenever they are uniquely determined by free indices in terms. Figure 10a shows our axioms (the lexicon), which we assume closed under α -equivalence of typing judgements, and in Figure 10b we derive the noun phrase “Mary who John loves madly”. It might be entertaining to reproduce the derivation in the geometric

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{y_m^j : \nabla_i^k (b_k^m \wp \bar{a}_j^i) \vdash y_m^j : \nabla_i^k (b_k^m \wp \bar{a}_j^i)}{y_m^j : \nabla_i^k (b_k^m \wp \bar{a}_j^i) \vdash \delta_i^k y_m^j : b_k^m \wp \bar{a}_j^i} \text{ (}\nabla\text{E)} \\
\frac{}{y_m^j : (b/a)_j^m \vdash \delta_i^k y_m^j : b_k^m \wp \bar{a}_j^i} \text{ (=)} \\
\frac{y_m^j : (b/a)_j^m \vdash y_m^j : b_i^m \wp \bar{a}_j^i}{y_m^j : (b/a)_j^m, x_j^i : a_i^j \vdash y_m^j x_j^i : b_i^m} \text{ (}\alpha\eta\text{-)} \quad \frac{x_j^i : a_i^j \vdash x_j^i : a_i^j}{\text{ (}\wp\text{E)}}
\end{array}$$

(a) Derivation




Figure 9: Example for natural deduction

language.

5.2 Grammars

The preceding example suggests defining tensor grammars. Let us say that a *tensor lexical entry* as an α -equivalence class of β -reduced lexical typing judgements and a *tensor grammar* is a pair (Lex, s) , where Lex is a finite set of lexical entries and s is an atomic type symbol of valency $(1, 1)$. For a tensor grammar G we will write $\vdash_G \sigma : A$ to indicate that the sequent $\sigma : A$ is derivable in **ETTC** from elements of Lex . The *language* $L(G)$ of G is the set

$$L(G) = \{w \mid \vdash_G [w]_j^i : s_i^j\}. \quad (9)$$

6 Correspondence with first order logic

Given a linguistically marked first order language, we identify predicate symbols with literals of the same valencies and define the η -reduced and η -long translations, denoted respectively as $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\eta\rightarrow}$, of linguistically well-formed formulas and contexts to tensor formulas and contexts.

$$\begin{array}{c}
[Mary]_j^i : np, \quad [John]_j^i : np, \quad [loves]_j^i : (np \setminus s) / np, \\
[madly]_j^i : ((np \setminus s) \setminus (np \setminus s)), \quad [who]_j^i : (np \setminus np) / \Delta_t^u (s \wp \overline{np}_u^t) \\
\text{(that is } [who]_j^i : (np \setminus np) / \Delta_t^u ((np)_t^u \multimap s)). \\
\text{(a) Axioms} \\
\frac{\vdash [loves]_l^k : (np \setminus s) / np \quad x_k^j : np \vdash x_k^j : np}{x_k^j : np \vdash [loves]_l^k x_k^j : np \setminus s} (/E) \quad \vdash [madly]_j^i : (np \setminus s) \setminus (np \setminus s) \\
\frac{x_k^j : np \vdash [loves]_l^k x_k^j [madly]_j^i : np \setminus s}{\vdash [John]_m^l : np \quad x_k^j : np \vdash [loves]_l^k x_k^j [madly]_j^i : np \setminus s} (\wedge E) \\
\frac{x_k^j : np \vdash [John]_m^l [loves]_l^k x_k^j [madly]_j^i : s_i^m}{\vdash x_k^j : np \vdash [John \text{ loves}]_m^k x_k^j [madly]_j^i : s_i^m} (\rightarrow \beta) \\
\frac{\vdash x_k^j : np \vdash [John \text{ loves}]_m^k x_k^j [madly]_j^i : s_i^m}{\vdash [John \text{ loves}]_m^k [madly]_j^i : s_i^m \wp \overline{np}_k^j} (\wp I) \\
\frac{\vdash [John \text{ loves}]_m^k [madly]_j^i : s_i^m \wp \overline{np}_k^j}{\vdash \delta_k^j \cdot [John \text{ loves}]_m^k \cdot [madly]_j^i : \Delta_j^k (s_i^m \wp \overline{np}_k^j)} (\Delta I) \\
\frac{\vdash \delta_k^j \cdot [John \text{ loves}]_m^k \cdot [madly]_j^i : \Delta_j^k (s_i^m \wp \overline{np}_k^j)}{\vdash [John \text{ loves madly}]_m^i : \Delta_j^k (s \wp \overline{np}_k^j)} (\rightarrow \beta) \\
\frac{\vdash [who]_u^m : (np \setminus np) / \Delta_j^k (s \wp \overline{np}_k^j) \quad \vdash [John \text{ loves madly}]_m^i : \Delta_j^k (s \wp \overline{np}_k^j)}{\vdash [who \text{ John loves madly}]_u^i : np \setminus np} (/E, \rightarrow \beta) \\
\frac{\vdash [Mary]_n^u : np \quad \vdash [who \text{ John loves madly}]_u^i : np \setminus np}{\vdash [Mary \text{ who John loves madly}]_n^i : np} (\wedge E, \rightarrow \beta) \\
\text{(b) Derivation}
\end{array}$$

Figure 10: Example with nonlogical axioms

For the η -reduced translation we identify first order variables with indices, left occurrences with upper ones and right occurrences with lower ones. For the η -long translation, on the other hand, we identify free variable *occurrences* with indices, so that for each $x \in Var$ there are two indices x_l, x_r , corresponding to its left and right occurrence respectively. Translations of purely propositional formulas and connectives are obvious. For quantifiers we use the prescription

$$\begin{array}{l}
\|\forall x A\| = \nabla_v^u \|A\|_{[u/x]}^{[v/x]}, \quad \|\exists x A\| = \Delta_v^u \|A\|_{[u/x]}^{[v/x]}, \\
\|\forall x A\|_{\eta \rightarrow} = \nabla_{x_l}^{x_r} \|A\|_{\eta \rightarrow}, \quad \|\exists x A\|_{\eta \rightarrow} = \Delta_{x_l}^{x_r} \|A\|_{\eta \rightarrow}.
\end{array}$$

The choice of u, v in the η -reduced translation is immaterial, as long as they produce well-defined tensor formulas (since renaming bound indices results in provably equivalent formulas). In addition, we associate to every linguistically well-formed sequent $\vdash \Gamma$ the tensor term $\sigma(\Gamma)$ which is the product $\sigma(\Gamma) = \prod_{x \in FV(\Gamma)} \delta_{x_l}^{x_r}$.

The η -reduced and η -long translations of Γ are, respectively, the tensor typing judgements $\vdash \|\Gamma\|$ and $\sigma(\Gamma) \vdash \|\Gamma\|_{\eta\rightarrow}$ (which are obviously $\alpha\eta$ -equivalent).

Lemma 6.1 *A linguistically well-formed sequent is derivable in **MLL1** iff its η -reduced and η -long translations are derivable in **ETTC**. Conversely, any **ETTC** derivable sequent is $\alpha\beta\eta$ -equivalent to a translation of an **MLL1** derivable linguistically well-formed sequent.*

Proof In view of Lemma 4.1 it is sufficient to consider the η -long version. In terms of the geometric representation, the translation $\pi(\Gamma) \vdash \|\Gamma\|_{\eta\rightarrow}$ of a linguistically well-formed sequent Γ is the occurrence net of Γ , encoded as a β -reduced η -long typing judgement, and **ETTC** $_{\eta\rightarrow}$ rules correspond to transformations of occurrence nets under linguistic derivation rules. The (\forall) rule, which erases a link from the occurrence net, naturally corresponds to the (∇) rule, and the (\exists') rule, which glues links together, to the (Δ) rule. The (\exists) rule applied to a linguistically well-formed sequent erases a link in the same way as the (\forall) rule. This corresponds to the situation when the (Δ) rule is applied to a sequent of the form $\delta_j^i t \vdash \Gamma$ and binds the pair of occurrences $(j, i) \in FI(\Gamma)$, introducing to the left of the turnstile the term $\delta_i^j \cdot \delta_j^i t \equiv_{\beta} t$, basically, erasing δ_j^i from the premise.

Thus we prove by induction on linguistic derivations that for a derivable linguistically well-formed sequent its translation is derivable in **ETTC** $_{\eta\rightarrow}$, and by induction on **ETTC** $_{\eta\rightarrow}$ derivations that any derivable β -reduced η -long typing judgement is the translation of a derivable linguistically well-formed sequent. \square

Restricting to intuitionistic fragments we obtain analogous correspondence. Note that the η -reduced fragment of **ETTC** and the linguistically well-formed fragment of **MLL1** become literally the same thing written in different notation (up to bound indices/variables renaming).

It can be observed that if we did not have the reduction $\delta_i^i \rightarrow_{\beta} 1$, which factors out the empty loops, the translation from linguistically well-formed fragment would depend on derivation: every application of the (\exists) rule would introduce the “bubble” term $\delta = [\epsilon]$ to the left of the turnstile, and the correspondence with **ETTC** would be only modulo some power $(\delta)^n$ of δ . This might be not necessarily meaningless.

6.1 Translating grammars

Any well-formed **MLL1** grammar G translates to a tensor grammar \tilde{G} by writing for every lexical entry (w, A) of G the tensor lexical entry $[w]_r^l : \|A\|$. Then, comparing formulas (9) and (2), we immediately see that the two grammars generate the same language $L(G) = L(\tilde{G})$.

Indeed, let $w \in L(\tilde{G})$, so that $\vdash_G [w]_r^l : s_r^l$.

Obviously w is the concatenation $w = w_0 \dots w_{n-1}$ of all words occurring in lexical entries $[w_{\mu}]_j^i : \|A_{(\mu)}\|_{[i/l]}^{[j/r]}$, $\mu = 0, \dots, n-1$, used in the derivation. Let us denote $(a_{(\mu)})_i^j = \|A_{(\mu)}\|_{[i/l]}^{[j/r]}$.

By Lemma 5.1 (“Deduction theorem”), the n.d. sequent

$$(x_{(1)})_{j_1}^{i_1} : (a_{(1)})_{i_1}^{j_1}, \dots, (x_{(n)})_{j_n}^{i_n} : (a_{(n)})_{i_n}^{j_n} \vdash \delta_{i_1}^{j_2} \dots \delta_{i_{n-1}}^{j_n} \cdot (x_{(1)})_{j_1}^{i_1} \dots (x_{(n)})_{j_n}^{i_n} : s_{i_n}^{j_1}$$

is derivable, This corresponds, by Lemma 5.2, to the derivable typing judgement

$$\delta_{i_1}^{j_2} \cdots \delta_{i_{n-1}}^{j_n} \vdash s_{i_n}^{j_1}, \overline{(a_{(n)})}_{j_n}^{i_n}, \dots, \overline{(a_{(1)})}_{j_1}^{i_1}.$$

The above is just (α -equivalent to) the η -long translation of

$$\vdash s[c_0; c_n], \overline{A_n}[c_n; c_{n-1}], \dots, \overline{A_1}[c_1; c_0].$$

The latter is identified as the image of a **MILL1** sequent expressing, by definition, that $w \in L(G)$. The opposite inclusion is similar.

References

- [1] 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.
- [2] Jean-Yves Girard, “Linear logic”, Theoretical Computer Science, 50:1-102, 1987.
- [3] 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.
- [4] Y. Kubota, R. Levine, “Gapping as like-category coordination”, in D. Béchet & A. Dikovskiy, eds, ‘Logical Aspects of Computational Linguistics’, Vol. 7351 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, Nantes, pp. 135-150, 2012.
- [5] J. Lambek, "The mathematics of sentence structure", *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 65: 154-170, 1958.
- [6] R. Moot, “Comparing and evaluating extended Lambek calculi”. In Kubota, Y. and Levine, R., editors, *Proceedings for ESSLLI 2015 Workshop ‘Empirical Advances in Categorical Grammar’*, University of Tsukuba and Ohio State, pp. 108–131, 2015.
- [7] R. Moot, “Extended Lambek calculi and first-order linear logic”. In C. Casadio, B. Coecke, M. Moortgat, and P. Scott, eds., *Categories and Types in Logic, Language, and Physics: Essays dedicated to Jim Lambek on the Occasion of this 90th Birthday*, No. 8222 in *Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence*, 2970330, Springer, 2014.
- [8] 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.
- [9] R. Moot and M. Piazza, “Linguistic applications of first order multiplicative linear logic”. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*, 10(2):211-232, 2001.

- [10] G. Morrill, O. Valentín, M. Fadda, “The displacement calculus”, *Journal of Logic, Language and Information* 20(1), 1-48, 2011.
- [11] R. Muskens, “Separating syntax and combinatorics in categorial grammar”, *Research on Language and Computation* 5(3), 267-285, 2007.
- [12] 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.
- [13] S. Slavnov, “Cobordisms and commutative categorial grammars”, *Journal of Cognitive Science*, 22, 68-91, 2021.
- [14] S. Slavnov, “On embedding Lambek calculus into commutative categorial grammars”, *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 2021.