# Models for Normalization(s)

Olivier Hermant

19 November 2007

# Deduction and Computation

- Computation is at the root of mathematics.

# Deduction and Computation

- Computation is at the root of mathematics.
- It has been forgotten by the formalization of the mathematics.

# Deduction and Computation

- Computation is at the root of mathematics.
- It has been forgotten by the formalization of the mathematics.
- reborn with informatics: rewriting rules.
- we need a balance between deduction steps and computation steps.

# Natural Deduction: the logical framework

- first-order logic: function and predicate symbols, logical connectors: $\wedge, \vee, \Rightarrow, \neg$, and quantifiers $\forall, \exists$.

$$Even(0)$$
$$\forall n(Even(n) \Rightarrow Odd(n+1))$$
$$\forall n(Odd(n) \Rightarrow Even(n+1))$$

# Natural Deduction: the logical framework

- first-order logic: function and predicate symbols, logical connectors: $\wedge, \vee, \Rightarrow, \neg$, and quantifiers $\forall, \exists$.

$$Even(0)$$
$$\forall n(Even(n) \Rightarrow Odd(n+1))$$
$$\forall n(Odd(n) \Rightarrow Even(n+1))$$

- a sequent :

$$\overbrace{\Gamma}^{\text{hyp.}} \vdash \overbrace{A}^{\text{conc.}}$$

- rules to form them: natural deduction (or sequent calculus)
- framework: intuitionnistic logic (classical, linear, higher-order, constraints ...)

# Deduction System : natural deduction (NJ)

- A deduction rule:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \qquad \Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}$$

- introduction and elimination rules

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, A \vdash A}\ \text{axiom}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}\ \wedge\text{-i} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash A}\ \wedge\text{-e1} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash B}\ \wedge\text{-e2}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \Rightarrow B}\ \Rightarrow\text{-i} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \Rightarrow B \qquad \Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash B}\ \Rightarrow\text{-e}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \forall x A[x]}{\Gamma \vdash A[t]}\ \forall\text{-e, any } t \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A[x]}{\Gamma \vdash \forall x A[x]}\ \forall\text{-i, } x \text{ free}$$

# Example: 1

$$\forall x P(x) \vdash P(0) \wedge P(1)$$

# Example: 1

$$\frac{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(0) \qquad \forall x P(x) \vdash P(1)}{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(0) \wedge P(1)} \wedge\text{-i}$$

# Example: 1

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\forall x P(x) \vdash \forall x P(x)}{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(0)}\,\forall\text{-e} \qquad \dfrac{\forall x P(x) \vdash \forall x P(x)}{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(1)}\,\forall\text{-e}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(0) \wedge P(1)}\,\wedge\text{-i}$$

# Example: 1

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{}{\forall x P(x) \vdash \forall x P(x)}\ \text{axiom}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(0)}\ \forall\text{-e} \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{}{\forall x P(x) \vdash \forall x P(x)}\ \text{axiom}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(1)}\ \forall\text{-e}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(0) \wedge P(1)}\ \wedge\text{-i}$$

# Axioms vs. rewriting

| Axioms | Rewriting |
| --- | --- |
| $x + S(y) = S(x + y)$<br>$x + 0 = x$<br>$x * 0 = 0$<br>$x * S(y) = x + x * y$<br>$(x * y = 0) \Leftrightarrow (x = 0 \vee y = 0)$ | $x + S(y) \rightarrow S(x + y)$<br>$x + 0 \rightarrow x$<br>$x * 0 \rightarrow 0$<br>$x * S(y) \rightarrow x + x * y$<br>$(x * y = 0) \rightarrow (x = 0 \vee y = 0)$ |
| $\vdots$<br>$\dfrac{\dfrac{}{\mathcal{T} \vdash 2 * 2 = 4}}{\mathcal{T} \vdash \exists x(2 * x = 4)}$ | $\dfrac{\dfrac{}{\vdash 4 = 4}}{\vdash \exists x(2 * x = 4)}$ |

# Deduction modulo: allowed rewriting

- General form (free variables are possible):

$$l \to r$$

# Deduction modulo: allowed rewriting

- General form (free variables are possible):

$$l \to r$$

- use: We replace $t = \sigma l$ by $\sigma r$ (unification). Rewriting could be deep in the term.

# Deduction modulo: allowed rewriting

- General form (free variables are possible):

$$l \to r$$

- use: We replace $t = \sigma l$ by $\sigma r$ (unification). Rewriting could be deep in the term.
- rewriting on terms:

$$x + S(y) \to S(x + y)$$

# Deduction modulo: allowed rewriting

- General form (free variables are possible):

$$l \to r$$

- use: We replace $t = \sigma l$ by $\sigma r$ (unification). Rewriting could be deep in the term.
- rewriting on terms:

$$x + S(y) \to S(x + y)$$

- and on **propositions** (predicate symbols):

$$x * y = 0 \to x = 0 \vee y = 0$$

- advantage: expressiveness

# Deduction modulo: allowed rewriting

- General form (free variables are possible):

$$l \to r$$

- use: We replace $t = \sigma l$ by $\sigma r$ (unification). Rewriting could be deep in the term.
- rewriting on terms:

$$x + S(y) \to S(x + y)$$

- and on **propositions** (predicate symbols):

$$x * y = 0 \to x = 0 \vee y = 0$$

- advantage: expressiveness
- we obtain a congruence modulo $\mathcal{R}$ (chosen set of rules): $\equiv$

# Deduction modulo: allowed rewriting

- General form (free variables are possible):

$$l \to r$$

- use: We replace $t = \sigma l$ by $\sigma r$ (unification). Rewriting could be deep in the term.
- rewriting on terms:

$$x + S(y) \to S(x + y)$$

- and on **propositions** (predicate symbols):

$$x * y = 0 \to x = 0 \vee y = 0$$

- advantage: expressiveness
- we obtain a congruence modulo $\mathcal{R}$ (chosen set of rules): $\equiv$
- deduction rules transform as such:

$$\text{axiom}\ \frac{}{\Gamma, A \vdash A} \qquad \text{becomes} \qquad \frac{}{\Gamma, A \vdash B}\ \text{axiom},\ A \equiv B$$

# Deduction modulo : natural deduction modulo - first presentation

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, A \vdash A}\text{axiom}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B} \wedge\text{-i} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash A} \wedge\text{-e1} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash B} \wedge\text{-e2}$$

$$\Rightarrow\text{-i}\ \frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \Rightarrow B} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \Rightarrow B \qquad \Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash B} \Rightarrow\text{-e}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \forall x A[x]}{\Gamma \vdash A[t]} \forall\text{-e, any } t \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A[x]}{\Gamma \vdash \forall x A[x]} \forall\text{-i, } x \text{ free}$$

# Deduction modulo : first presentation

Add then the following conversion rule:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash B}\, A \equiv B$$

# Deduction modulo : natural deduction modulo, reloaded

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, A \vdash B}\text{axiom, } A \equiv B$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash C} \wedge\text{-i, } C \equiv A \wedge B \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash C}{\Gamma \vdash A} \wedge\text{-e1,} C \equiv A \wedge B \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash C}{\Gamma \vdash B} \wedge\text{-e2,} C \equiv A \wedge B$$

$$\Rightarrow\text{-i, } C \equiv A \wedge B \ \frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash C} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash C \qquad \Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash B} \Rightarrow\text{-e, } C \equiv A \wedge B$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A[x]}{\Gamma \vdash B}\forall\text{-i, } x \text{ free,} B \equiv \forall x A[x] \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A[t]}\forall\text{-e, any } t, B \equiv \forall x A[x]$$

# Example: 3

- consider the rewriting system $\mathcal{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} P(0) &\rightarrow A \\ P(1) &\rightarrow B \end{aligned}$$

$$\forall x P(x) \vdash A \wedge B$$

# Example: 3

- consider the rewriting system $\mathcal{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} P(0) &\rightarrow A \\ P(1) &\rightarrow B \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{\forall x P(x) \vdash A \qquad \forall x P(x) \vdash B}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A \wedge B} \wedge\text{-i}$$

# Example: 3

- consider the rewriting system $\mathcal{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} P(0) &\to A \\ P(1) &\to B \end{aligned}$$

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{}{\forall x P(x) \vdash \forall x P(x)}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A}\,\forall\text{-e} \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{}{\forall x P(x) \vdash \forall x P(x)}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash B}\,\forall\text{-e}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A \wedge B}\,\wedge\text{-r}$$

# Example: 3

- consider the rewriting system $\mathcal{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} P(0) &\to A \\ P(1) &\to B \end{aligned}$$

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\forall x P(x) \vdash \forall x P(x)}{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(0)}\,\forall\text{-e}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A}\,\text{conv} \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\forall x P(x) \vdash \forall x P(x)}{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(1)}\,\forall\text{-e}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash B}\,\text{conv}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A \wedge B}\,\wedge\text{-r}$$

# Example: 3

- consider the rewriting system $\mathcal{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} P(0) &\to A \\ P(1) &\to B \end{aligned}$$

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{}{\forall x P(x) \vdash \forall x P(x)}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A}\,\forall\text{-e} \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{}{\forall x P(x) \vdash \forall x P(x)}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash B}\,\forall\text{-e}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A \wedge B}\,\wedge\text{-r}$$

# Example: 3

- consider the rewriting system $\mathcal{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} P(0) &\rightarrow A \\ P(1) &\rightarrow B \end{aligned}$$

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{}{\forall x P(x) \vdash \forall x P(x)}\,\text{axiom}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A}\,\forall\text{-e} \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{}{\forall x P(x) \vdash \forall x P(x)}\,\text{axiom}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash B}\,\forall\text{-e}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A \wedge B}\,\wedge\text{-r}$$

# A Cut: a detour

$$\dfrac{\Gamma \vdash A \qquad \dfrac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \Rightarrow B}\Rightarrow\text{-i}}{\Gamma \vdash B}\Rightarrow\text{-e}$$

- show $\Gamma \vdash A$
- show $\Gamma, A \vdash B$
- then, you have showed $\Gamma \vdash B$
- it is the application of a lemma.

# A cut: a detour

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\pi_1}{\Gamma \vdash A} \quad \dfrac{\pi_2}{\Gamma \vdash B}}{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}\ \wedge\text{-i}}{\Gamma \vdash A}\ \wedge\text{-e}$$

Replace it by $\pi_1$. And in the previous proof,

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\theta}{\Gamma \vdash A} \quad \dfrac{\dfrac{\pi}{\Gamma, A \vdash B}}{\Gamma \vdash A \Rightarrow B}\ \Rightarrow\text{-i}}{\Gamma \vdash B}\ \Rightarrow\text{-e}$$

$\pi$ is directly a proof of $\Gamma \vdash B$ *replace uses of* $A$ *(nb: axioms) by* $\theta$. In clear: don't use the lemma, reprove its instances.

General definition: a cut is an elimination plus an introduction (same symbol).

# A cut: a detour

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\theta}{\Gamma \vdash A'} \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{\pi}{\Gamma, A \vdash B}}{\Gamma \vdash C} \Rightarrow\text{-i}, C \equiv A \Rightarrow B}{\Gamma \vdash B'} \Rightarrow\text{-e}, C \equiv A' \Rightarrow B'$$

- we show $\Gamma, A \vdash B$ and $\Gamma \vdash A$
- then we have showed $\Gamma \vdash B$.
- lemma: the good way for a human being.
- in practice: not adapted for automatic demonstration.

# A cut: a detour

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\theta}{\Gamma \vdash A'} \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{\pi}{\Gamma, A \vdash B}}{\Gamma \vdash C} \Rightarrow\text{-i}, C \equiv A \Rightarrow B}{\Gamma \vdash B'} \Rightarrow\text{-e}, C \equiv A' \Rightarrow B'$$

- we show $\Gamma, A \vdash B$ and $\Gamma \vdash A$
- then we have showed $\Gamma \vdash B$.
- lemma: the good way for a human being.
- in practice: not adapted for automatic demonstration.
- in theory: consistency, proof normalization (Curry-Howard) depend of its elimination.

# A cut: a detour

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\theta}{\Gamma \vdash A'} \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{\pi}{\Gamma, A \vdash B}}{\Gamma \vdash C} \Rightarrow\text{-i}, C \equiv A \Rightarrow B}{\Gamma \vdash B'} \Rightarrow\text{-e}, C \equiv A' \Rightarrow B'$$

- we show $\Gamma, A \vdash B$ and $\Gamma \vdash A$
- then we have showed $\Gamma \vdash B$.
- lemma: the good way for a human being.
- in practice: not adapted for automatic demonstration.
- in theory: consistency, proof normalization (Curry-Howard) depend of its elimination.
- eliminating cuts: a central result.

$$\Gamma \vdash A \quad \triangleright \quad \Gamma \vdash_{cf} A$$

- two main paths towards:
  - proof normalization (syntactic).
  - semantical methods.

# A cut: a detour

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\theta}{\Gamma \vdash A'} \quad \dfrac{\dfrac{\pi}{\Gamma, A \vdash B}}{\Gamma \vdash C} \Rightarrow\text{-i}, C \equiv A \Rightarrow B}{\Gamma \vdash B'} \Rightarrow\text{-e}, C \equiv A' \Rightarrow B'$$

- we show $\Gamma, A \vdash B$ and $\Gamma \vdash A$
- then we have showed $\Gamma \vdash B$.
- lemma: the good way for a human being.
- in practice: not adapted for automatic demonstration.
- in theory: consistency, proof normalization (Curry-Howard) depend of its elimination.
- eliminating cuts: a central result.

$$\Gamma \vdash A \quad \triangleright \quad \Gamma \vdash_{cf} A$$

- two main paths towards:
  - proof normalization (syntactic).
  - semantical methods.
- in deduction modulo: indecidable, need for conditions on $\mathcal{R}$.

# The semantical method



# The semantical method



# The semantical method



# The normalization method(s)

- Curry-Howard: proofs = programs
- formulas = types
- proof tree = typing tree
- at the heart of proof assistants (PVS, Coq, Isabelle, ...)
- when a program calculates, it performs a cut elimination procedure.

# The normalization method(s)

- Curry-Howard: proofs = programs
- formulas = types
- proof tree = typing tree
- at the heart of proof assistants (PVS, Coq, Isabelle, ...)
- when a program calculates, it performs a cut elimination procedure.
- show that all typables function terminates.

# Curry-Howard correspondence

- Notation for proofs. Give a name to each of the hypothesis:

$$\Gamma = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash x : A}\ \text{Axiom} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \pi : A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash fst(\pi) : A}\ \wedge\text{-e1}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \pi_1 : A \qquad \Gamma \vdash \pi_2 : B}{\Gamma \vdash \langle \pi_1, \pi_2 \rangle : A \wedge B}\ \wedge\text{-i} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \pi : A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash snd(\pi) : A}\ \wedge\text{-e2}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash \pi : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.\pi : A \Rightarrow B}\ \Rightarrow\text{-i} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \pi' : A \qquad \Gamma \vdash \pi : A \Rightarrow B}{\Gamma \vdash (\pi\pi') : B}$$

# Curry-Howard correspondence

- Notation for proofs. Give a name to each of the hypothesis:

$$\Gamma = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash x : A}\ \text{Axiom} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \pi : A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash fst(\pi) : A}\ \wedge\text{-e1}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \pi_1 : A \qquad \Gamma \vdash \pi_2 : B}{\Gamma \vdash \langle \pi_1, \pi_2 \rangle : A \wedge B}\ \wedge\text{-i} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \pi : A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash snd(\pi) : A}\ \wedge\text{-e2}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash \pi : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.\pi : A \Rightarrow B}\ \Rightarrow\text{-i} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \pi' : A \qquad \Gamma \vdash \pi : A \Rightarrow B}{\Gamma \vdash (\pi\pi') : B}$$

- **very** similar to a type system

# Curry-Howard correspondence

- Notation for proofs. Give a name to each of the hypothesis:

$$\Gamma = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash x : A}\ \text{Axiom} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \pi : A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash fst(\pi) : A}\ \wedge\text{-e1}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \pi_1 : A \qquad \Gamma \vdash \pi_2 : B}{\Gamma \vdash \langle \pi_1, \pi_2 \rangle : A \wedge B}\ \wedge\text{-i} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \pi : A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash snd(\pi) : A}\ \wedge\text{-e2}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash \pi : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.\pi : A \Rightarrow B}\ \Rightarrow\text{-i} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \pi' : A \qquad \Gamma \vdash \pi : A \Rightarrow B}{\Gamma \vdash (\pi\pi') : B}$$

- **very** similar to a type system
- in deduction modulo, rewrite rules are silent:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \pi : A}{\Gamma \vdash \pi : B}\ A \equiv B$$

# Cut elimination with proof terms

- Cut elimination is a **process**, similar to function execution.

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\Gamma \vdash \pi_1 : A \qquad \Gamma \vdash \pi_2 : B}{\Gamma \vdash \langle \pi_1, \pi_2 \rangle : A \wedge B}\,\wedge\text{-i}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathit{fst}(\langle \pi_1, \pi_2 \rangle) : A}\,\wedge\text{-e} \quad \rhd \quad \Gamma \vdash \pi_1 : A$$

$$\dfrac{\Gamma \vdash \theta : A \qquad \dfrac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash \pi : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.\pi : A \Rightarrow B}\,\Rightarrow\text{-i}}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x.\pi)\theta : B}\,\Rightarrow\text{-e} \quad \rhd \quad \Gamma \vdash \{\theta/x\}\pi : B$$

# Cut elimination with proof terms

- Cut elimination is a **process**, similar to function execution.

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\Gamma \vdash \pi_1 : A \qquad \Gamma \vdash \pi_2 : B}{\Gamma \vdash \langle \pi_1, \pi_2 \rangle : A \wedge B}\,\wedge\text{-i}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathit{fst}(\langle \pi_1, \pi_2 \rangle) : A}\,\wedge\text{-e} \quad \rhd \quad \Gamma \vdash \pi_1 : A$$

$$\dfrac{\Gamma \vdash \theta : A \qquad \dfrac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash \pi : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.\pi : A \Rightarrow B}\,\Rightarrow\text{-i}}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x.\pi)\theta : B}\,\Rightarrow\text{-e} \quad \rhd \quad \Gamma \vdash \{\theta/x\}\pi : B$$

- showing that every proof normalizes: the cut elimination process terminates.

# Normalization

- deduction modulo is high-level: we need reducibility candidates.

# Normalization

- deduction modulo is high-level: we need reducibility candidates.
- A reducibility candidate: a set of proofs that are normalizing (and some other properties).

# Normalization

- deduction modulo is high-level: we need reducibility candidates.
- A reducibility candidate: a set of proofs that are normalizing (and some other properties).
- to each formula $A$, associates a candidate $[\![A]\!]$. Show that if $\Gamma \vdash \pi : A$ then $\pi \in [\![A]\!]$.

# Normalization

- deduction modulo is high-level: we need reducibility candidates.
- A reducibility candidate: a set of proofs that are normalizing (and some other properties).
- to each formula $A$, associates a candidate $[\![A]\!]$. Show that if $\Gamma \vdash \pi : A$ then $\pi \in [\![A]\!]$.
- in deduction modulo, if $A \equiv B$, additional constraint:

$$[\![A]\!] = [\![B]\!]$$

# Towards “usual” semantics

- such methods are defined in deduction modulo (Heyting arithmetic, higher-order logic, Zermelo’s set theory, ...)

# Towards “usual” semantics

- such methods are defined in deduction modulo (Heyting arithmetic, higher-order logic, Zermelo’s set theory, ...)
- the sets of candidates have a structure: pseudo Heyting algebras [Dowek].

# Heyting algebras

- a universe $\Omega$
- an order

# Heyting algebras

- a universe $\Omega$
- an order
- operations on it: lowest upper bound (join: $\cup$ – pseudo union), greatest lower bound (meet: $\cap$ – intersection).

  $a \cap b \leq a \quad a \cap b \leq b \quad c \leq a$ and $c \leq b$ implies $c \leq a \cap b$

  $a \leq a \cup b \quad b \leq a \cup b \quad a \leq c$ and $b \leq c$ implies $a \cup b \leq c$

- think about $\mathbb{R}$ and closed sets (infinite l.u.b. is not infinite union)

# Heyting algebras

Used in semantic cut elimination (Lipton, e.g.):



# Heyting algebras

- a universe $\Omega$
- an order
- operations on it: lowest upper bound (join: $\cup$ – pseudo union), greatest lower bound (meet: $\cap$ – intersection).

$$a \cap b \leq a \quad a \cap b \leq b \quad c \leq a \text{ and } c \leq b \text{ implies } c \leq a \cap b$$
$$a \leq a \cup b \quad b \leq a \cup b \quad a \leq c \text{ and } b \leq c \text{ implies } a \cup b \leq c$$

- like boolean algebra, but with weaker complement.
- think about $\mathbb{R}$ and closed sets (infinite l.u.b. is not infinite union)

# pseudo-Heyting algebras, aka Truth Values Algebras

- a universe $\Omega$
- a pre-order: $a \leq b$ and $b \leq a$ with $a \neq b$ possible.
- operations on it: lowest upper bound (join: $\cup$ – pseudo union), greatest lower bound (meet: $\cap$ – intersection).

$a \cap b \leq a \quad a \cap b \leq b \quad c \leq a$ and $c \leq b$ implies $c \leq a \cap b$

$a \leq a \cup b \quad b \leq a \cup b \quad a \leq c$ and $b \leq c$ implies $a \cup b \leq c$

# Candidates form a pseudo-Heyting algebra

- $\top = \bot = \mathcal{SN}$
- $[\![A]\!] \cap [\![B]\!] = [\![A \wedge B]\!]$
- and so on.
- pre-order: trivial one.
- But $[\![A \wedge A]\!] \leq\geq [\![A]\!]$ only.

# Super consistency

- consistency: there exists a model.
- condition in DM: $A \equiv B$ implies $[\![A]\!] = [\![B]\!]$

# Super consistency

- consistency: there exists a model.
- super-consistency: for every (pseudo-Heyting) structure, there exists a model (interpretation).
- condition in DM: $A \equiv B$ implies $[\![A]\!] = [\![B]\!]$

# Super consistency

- e.g. higher-order logic is super-consistent:

$$\begin{aligned} M_\iota &= \iota \text{ (dummy)} \\ M_o &= \Omega \\ M_{t\to u} &= M_u^{M_t} \end{aligned}$$

# Super consistency

- e.g. higher-order logic is super-consistent:

$$\begin{aligned} M_\iota &= \iota \text{ (dummy)} \\ M_o &= \Omega \\ M_{t\to u} &= M_u^{M_t} \end{aligned}$$

- hence, it has a model in the candidates pseudo-Heying Algebra
- $\Gamma \vdash \pi : A$ implies $\pi \in [\![A]\!]$.
- the system enjoys proof normalization.

# Towards usual semantics



# Towards usual semantics

- assuming we have a model $\mathcal{M}$, $[\![_]\!]$ in the previous pseudo-Heyting algebra.
- first idea: pseudo-Heyting to Heyting by quotienting.

# Towards usual semantics

- assuming we have a model $\mathcal{M}$, $[\![_]\!]$ in the previous pseudo-Heyting algebra.
- first idea: pseudo-Heyting to Heyting by quotienting.
- trivial pseudo order implies $\top = \bot$.

# The link: fibring

define

$$[A]^{\sigma}_{\phi} = [\![A]\!]_{\phi} \lhd A\sigma = \{\Gamma \mid \Gamma \vdash \pi : A\sigma, \pi \in [\![A]\!]_{\phi}\}$$

- $[\![A]\!]_{\phi}$ is a candidate of reducibility. It contains some proof terms $\Delta \vdash \nu : B$. We don't want them.

# The link: fibring

define

$$[A]^{\sigma}_{\phi} = [\![A]\!]_{\phi} \lhd A\sigma = \{\Gamma \mid \Gamma \vdash \pi : A\sigma, \pi \in [\![A]\!]_{\phi}\}$$

- $[\![A]\!]_{\phi}$ is a candidate of reducibility. It contains some proof terms $\Delta \vdash \nu : B$. We don't want them.
- **weak** definition: for *some* $\pi$ only.
- this is a Heyting algebra ($[A]$: basis)

# The link: fibring

define

$$[A]^{\sigma}_{\phi} = [\![A]\!]_{\phi} \lhd A\sigma = \{\Gamma \mid \Gamma \vdash \pi : A\sigma, \pi \in [\![A]\!]_{\phi}\}$$

- $[\![A]\!]_{\phi}$ is a candidate of reducibility. It contains some proof terms $\Delta \vdash \nu : B$. We don't want them.
- **weak** definition: for *some* $\pi$ only.
- this is a Heyting algebra ($[A]$: basis)
- interpretation of formulas in it:

$$A^* = [A]^{\sigma}_{\phi} = [\![A]\!]_{\phi} \lhd A\sigma$$

- interpetation of terms in it:

$$t^* = \langle t, [\![t]\!]_{\phi} \rangle$$

# The link: fibring

define

$$[A]^{\sigma}_{\phi} = [\![A]\!]_{\phi} \lhd A\sigma = \{\Gamma \mid \Gamma \vdash \pi : A\sigma, \pi \in [\![A]\!]_{\phi}\}$$

- $[\![A]\!]_{\phi}$ is a candidate of reducibility. It contains some proof terms $\Delta \vdash \nu : B$. We don't want them.
- **weak** definition: for *some* $\pi$ only.
- this is a Heyting algebra ($[A]$: basis)
- interpretation of formulas in it:

$$A^* = [A]^{\sigma}_{\phi} = [\![A]\!]_{\phi} \lhd A\sigma$$

- interpetation of terms in it:

$$t^* = \langle t, [\![t]\!]_{\phi} \rangle$$

- this proves semantical cut elimination.

# Wait a minute !

- interpretation ? $[A]^{\sigma}_{\phi}$.

# Wait a minute !

- interpretation ? $[A]^{\sigma}_{\phi}$.
- Need for *one single* substitution. hybridization: $\sigma \times \phi$.

$$D = \mathcal{T} \times M$$

# Wait a minute !

- interpretation ? $[A]^{\sigma}_{\phi}$.
- Need for *one single* substitution. hybridization: $\sigma \times \phi$.

$$D = \mathcal{T} \times M$$

- interpretation for symbols

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{f}^{\mathcal{D}}(\langle t_1, d_1\rangle, ..., \langle t_n, d_n\rangle) &= \langle f(t_1, ..., t_n), \hat{f}^{\mathcal{M}}(d_1, ..., d_n)\rangle \\
\hat{P}^{\mathcal{D}}(\langle t_1, d_1\rangle, ..., \langle t_n, d_n\rangle) &= [(t_1/x_1, ..., t_n/x_n)P]_{(d_1/x_1,...,d_n/x_n)} \\
&= \{\Gamma \mid (\Gamma \vdash P(t_1, ..., t_n)) \in [\![P]\!]_{(d_1/x_1,...,d_n/x_n)}\}
\end{aligned}$$

# Wait a minute !

- interpretation ? $[A]^{\sigma}_{\phi}$.
- Need for *one single* substitution. hybridization: $\sigma \times \phi$.

$$D = \mathcal{T} \times M$$

- interpretation for symbols

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{f}^{\mathcal{D}}(\langle t_1, d_1\rangle, ..., \langle t_n, d_n\rangle) &= \langle f(t_1, ..., t_n), \hat{f}^{\mathcal{M}}(d_1, ..., d_n)\rangle \\
\hat{P}^{\mathcal{D}}(\langle t_1, d_1\rangle, ..., \langle t_n, d_n\rangle) &= [(t_1/x_1, ..., t_n/x_n)P]_{(d_1/x_1,...,d_n/x_n)} \\
&= \{\Gamma \mid (\Gamma \vdash P(t_1, ..., t_n)) \in [\![P]\!]_{(d_1/x_1,...,d_n/x_n)}\}
\end{aligned}$$

- pointwise application

$$\langle t, v\rangle \odot \langle t', v'\rangle = \langle (tt'), (vv')\rangle$$

# Wait a minute !

- interpretation ? $[A]^{\sigma}_{\phi}$.
- Need for *one single* substitution. hybridization: $\sigma \times \phi$.

$$D = \mathcal{T} \times M$$

- interpretation for symbols

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{f}^{\mathcal{D}}(\langle t_1, d_1\rangle, ..., \langle t_n, d_n\rangle) &= \langle f(t_1, ..., t_n), \hat{f}^{\mathcal{M}}(d_1, ..., d_n)\rangle \\
\hat{P}^{\mathcal{D}}(\langle t_1, d_1\rangle, ..., \langle t_n, d_n\rangle) &= [(t_1/x_1, ..., t_n/x_n)P]_{(d_1/x_1,...,d_n/x_n)} \\
&= \{\Gamma \mid (\Gamma \vdash P(t_1, ..., t_n)) \in [\![P]\!]_{(d_1/x_1,...,d_n/x_n)}\}
\end{aligned}$$

- pointwise application

$$\langle t, v\rangle \odot \langle t', v'\rangle = \langle (tt'), (vv')\rangle$$

- We embed a (potentially) complex structure (e.g. candidates) inside $D$.

# Wait a minute !

- interpretation ? $[A]^{\sigma}_{\phi}$.
- Need for *one single* substitution. hybridization: $\sigma \times \phi$.

$$D = \mathcal{T} \times M$$

- interpretation for symbols

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{f}^{\mathcal{D}}(\langle t_1, d_1\rangle, ..., \langle t_n, d_n\rangle) &= \langle f(t_1, ..., t_n), \hat{f}^{\mathcal{M}}(d_1, ..., d_n)\rangle \\
\hat{P}^{\mathcal{D}}(\langle t_1, d_1\rangle, ..., \langle t_n, d_n\rangle) &= [(t_1/x_1, ..., t_n/x_n)P]_{(d_1/x_1,...,d_n/x_n)} \\
&= \{\Gamma \mid (\Gamma \vdash P(t_1, ..., t_n)) \in [\![P]\!]_{(d_1/x_1,...,d_n/x_n)}\}
\end{aligned}$$

- pointwise application

$$\langle t, v\rangle \odot \langle t', v'\rangle = \langle (tt'), (vv')\rangle$$

- We embed a (potentially) complex structure (e.g. candidates) inside $D$.
- proves directly $[A \wedge B] = [A] \cap [B]$. Usually, only:

$$A \wedge B \in [A] \cap [B] \subset [A \wedge B]$$

# Wait a minute !

- interpretation ? $[A]^{\sigma}_{\phi}$.
- Need for *one single* substitution. hybridization: $\sigma \times \phi$.

$$D = \mathcal{T} \times M$$

- interpretation for symbols

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{f}^{\mathcal{D}}(\langle t_1, d_1\rangle, ..., \langle t_n, d_n\rangle) &= \langle f(t_1, ..., t_n), \hat{f}^{\mathcal{M}}(d_1, ..., d_n)\rangle \\
\hat{P}^{\mathcal{D}}(\langle t_1, d_1\rangle, ..., \langle t_n, d_n\rangle) &= [(t_1/x_1, ..., t_n/x_n)P]_{(d_1/x_1,...,d_n/x_n)} \\
&= \{\Gamma \mid (\Gamma \vdash P(t_1, ..., t_n)) \in [\![P]\!]_{(d_1/x_1,...,d_n/x_n)}\}
\end{aligned}$$

- pointwise application

$$\langle t, v\rangle \odot \langle t', v'\rangle = \langle (tt'), (vv')\rangle$$

- We embed a (potentially) complex structure (e.g. candidates) inside $D$.
- proves directly $[A \wedge B] = [A] \cap [B]$. Usually, only:

$$A \wedge B \in [A] \cap [B] \subset [A \wedge B]$$

- proof resembles the proof for normalization.

# Cut admissibility

Assume $\Gamma \vdash A$ has a proof (with cuts)

- $[\Gamma] \leq [A]$ in $\mathcal{D}$ by (usual) soundness
- $\Gamma \in [\Gamma]$
- $\Gamma \in [A]$ implies $\Gamma \vdash_{cf} A$
- Q.E.D.

# Cut admissibility

Assume $\Gamma \vdash A$ has a proof (with cuts)

- $[\Gamma] \leq [A]$ in $\mathcal{D}$ by (usual) soundness
- $\Gamma \in [\Gamma]$
- $\Gamma \in [A]$ implies $\Gamma \vdash_{cf} A$
- Q.E.D.
- definition:

$$[A]^{\sigma}_{\phi} = [\![A\sigma]\!]_{\phi} \lhd A\sigma = \{\Gamma \mid \Gamma \vdash \pi : A\sigma, \pi \in [\![A]\!]_{\phi}\}$$

  is weak (some $\pi$ only)
- we get (weak) normalization by evaluation.




- This diagram does not commute in deduction modulo.

# Further work

- there is normalization by evaluation work, but in a Kripke style: links ?
- do the proof terms (candidates) always have a “pseudo-” structure ?
- realizing rewrite rule not with $\lambda x.x$ (not silently), could recover normalization and make the previous diagram commute again.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \pi : A}{\Gamma \vdash \pi : B}\, A \equiv B$$