Deduction and Computation through Deduction Modulo

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.

Deduction systems: the logical framework

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

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

Deduction systems: 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: sequent calculus (or natural deduction)
- framework: intuitionnistic logic (classical, linear, higher-order, constraints ...)

Deduction System : sequents calculus (LJ)

- A deduction rule:

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

- right and left rules

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, A \vdash A}\text{axiom} \qquad \frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B \;\; \Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash B}\text{cut}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \;\; \Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}\wedge\text{-r} \qquad \frac{\Gamma, A, B \vdash C}{\Gamma, A \wedge B \vdash C}\wedge\text{-l}$$

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

Example: 1

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

Example: 1

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

Example: 1

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

Example: 1

$$\dfrac{\forall\text{-l}\dfrac{\dfrac{}{\forall x P(x), P(0) \vdash P(0)}\,\text{axiom}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(0)} \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{}{\forall x P(x), P(1) \vdash P(0)}\,\text{axiom}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(1)}\,\forall\text{-l}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(0) \wedge P(1)}\,\wedge\text{-r}$$

Example: 2

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

Example: 2

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

Example: 2

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\text{axiom}\ \dfrac{}{\forall x P(x), P(1), P(0) \vdash P(0)} \qquad \dfrac{}{\forall x P(x), P(1), P(0) \vdash P(1)}\ \text{axiom}}{\forall x P(x), P(1), P(0) \vdash P(0) \wedge P(1)}\ \wedge\text{-r}}{\forall x P(x), P(0) \vdash P(0) \wedge P(1)}\ \forall\text{-l}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(0) \wedge P(1)}\ \forall\text{-l}$$

Example: 2

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\text{axiom}}{\forall x P(x), P(1), P(0) \vdash P(0)} \quad \dfrac{\text{axiom}}{\forall x P(x), P(1), P(0) \vdash P(1)}}{\forall x P(x), P(1), P(0) \vdash P(0) \wedge P(1)}\ \wedge\text{-r}}{\forall x P(x), P(0) \vdash P(0) \wedge P(1)}\ \forall\text{-l}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash P(0) \wedge P(1)}\ \forall\text{-l}$$

- the first rule is not always “don’t care”: free variable condition.

Axioms vs. rewriting

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

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 σr (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 σr (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 σr (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 σr (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 σr (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 : sequent calculus modulo

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, A \vdash B}\text{axiom } A \equiv B \qquad \frac{\Gamma, A \vdash C \quad \Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash C}\text{cut } A \equiv B$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash C} \wedge\text{-r } A \wedge B \equiv C \qquad \frac{\Gamma, A, B \vdash C}{\Gamma, D \vdash C} \wedge\text{-l } A \wedge B \equiv D$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, B, A[t] \vdash C}{\Gamma, B \vdash C}\forall\text{-l } \forall x A[x] \equiv B \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A[x]}{\Gamma \vdash B}\forall\text{-r}^{*} \ \forall x A[x] \equiv B$$

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 $\mathcal{R}$:

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

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

Example: 3

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

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

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

Example: 3

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

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

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

Cut rule: a detour

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B \quad \Gamma \vdash C}{\Gamma \vdash B}\ \text{cut},\ A \equiv C$$

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

Example: 4

- 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: 4

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

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

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

Example: 4

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

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

$$\dfrac{\forall x P(x), A \vdash A \wedge B \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{Ax.}{\forall x P(x), P(0) \vdash A}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A}\ \forall\text{-r}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A \wedge B}\ \text{cut}$$

Example: 4

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

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

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\text{Ax.}}{\forall x P(x), A \vdash A}}{\forall x P(x), A \vdash A \wedge B}\wedge\text{-r} \quad \dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\text{Ax.}}{\forall x P(x), P(1), A \vdash B}}{\forall x P(x), A \vdash B}\forall\text{-r} \quad \dfrac{\dfrac{\text{Ax.}}{\forall x P(x), P(0) \vdash A}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A}\forall\text{-}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A \wedge B}\text{cut}$$

Example: 4

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

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

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\text{Ax.}}{\forall x P(x), A \vdash A} \quad \dfrac{\dfrac{\text{Ax.}}{\forall x P(x), P(1), A \vdash B}}{\forall x P(x), A \vdash B}\,\forall\text{-r}}{\forall x P(x), A \vdash A \wedge B}\,\wedge\text{-r} \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{\text{Ax.}}{\forall x P(x), P(0) \vdash A}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A}\,\forall\text{-r}}{\forall x P(x) \vdash A \wedge B}\,\text{cut}$$

- an unnecessary detour
- we could have cutted on any formula!

The cut rule: a detour

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B \quad \Gamma \vdash C}{\Gamma \vdash B}\ \text{cut}\ A \equiv C$$

- 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.
  Nb: resolution method *do not* proceed by cuts !

The cut rule: a detour

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B \quad \Gamma \vdash C}{\Gamma \vdash B}\ \text{cut}\ A \equiv C$$

- 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.
  Nb: resolution method *do not* proceed by cuts !
- in theory: consistence, proof normalization (Curry-Howard) depend of its elimination.

The cut rule: a detour

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B \quad \Gamma \vdash C}{\Gamma \vdash B}\ \text{cut}\ A \equiv C$$

- 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.
  Nb: resolution method *do not* proceed by cuts !
- in theory: consistence, proof normalization (Curry-Howard) depend of its elimination.
- eliminating cuts: a key result.

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

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

The cut rule: a detour

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B \quad \Gamma \vdash C}{\Gamma \vdash B}\ \text{cut}\ A \equiv C$$

- 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.
  Nb: resolution method *do not* proceed by cuts !
- in theory: consistence, proof normalization (Curry-Howard) depend of its elimination.
- eliminating cuts: a key 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 general criterions on $\mathcal{R}$

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.

The semantical method(s)

- define a semantical space (truth value). Ex: Boolean algebras.
- we must have soundness/completeness wrt the semantic.

The semantical method(s)

- define a semantical space (truth value). Ex: Boolean algebras.
- we must have soundness/completeness wrt the semantic.
- there is links between both methods (last part of the talk).

The semantical method



The semantical method



The semantical method



A semantic for deduction modulo

Two main semantics for intuitionistic logic:

A semantic for deduction modulo

Two main semantics for intuitionistic logic:

- Heyting algebras [Lipton,Okada]

A semantic for deduction modulo

Two main semantics for intuitionistic logic:

- Heyting algebras [Lipton,Okada]
- Kripke structures

A semantic for deduction modulo

Two main semantics for intuitionistic logic:

- Kripke structures

A Kripke Structure (KS) is a tuple $\langle K, \leq, D, \Vdash \rangle$:

A semantic for deduction modulo

Two main semantics for intuitionistic logic:

- Kripke structures

A Kripke Structure (KS) is a tuple $\langle K, \leq, D, \Vdash \rangle$:

- K the set of worlds, partially ordered with $\leq$ (a “temporal relation”: past, present, possible futures: partial information)

A semantic for deduction modulo

Two main semantics for intuitionistic logic:

- Kripke structures

A Kripke Structure (KS) is a tuple $\langle K, \leq, D, \Vdash \rangle$:

- K the set of worlds, partially ordered with $\leq$ (a "temporal relation": past, present, possible futures: partial information)
- $D : \alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{S}et$ a monotone function (interpretation domain for terms).

A semantic for deduction modulo

Two main semantics for intuitionistic logic:

- Kripke structures

A Kripke Structure (KS) is a tuple $\langle K, \leq, D, \Vdash \rangle$:

- K the set of worlds, partially ordered with $\leq$ (a "temporal relation": past, present, possible futures: partial information)
- $D : \alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{S}et$ a monotone function (interpretation domain for terms).
- $\Vdash$ is a relation between worlds and formulas, verifiying:

A semantic for deduction modulo

- P atomic: if $\alpha \leq \beta$ and $\alpha \Vdash P$, then $\beta \Vdash P$.
- $\alpha \Vdash A \Rightarrow B$ iff for any $\beta \geq \alpha$, when $\beta \Vdash A$ then $\beta \Vdash B$.
- $\alpha \Vdash A \vee B$ iff $\alpha \Vdash A$ or $\alpha \Vdash B$.

A semantic for deduction modulo

- P atomic: if $\alpha \leq \beta$ and $\alpha \Vdash P$, then $\beta \Vdash P$.
- $\alpha \Vdash A \Rightarrow B$ iff for any $\beta \geq \alpha$, when $\beta \Vdash A$ then $\beta \Vdash B$.
- $\alpha \Vdash A \vee B$ iff $\alpha \Vdash A$ or $\alpha \Vdash B$.
- Additional constraint in deduction modulo:

$$A \equiv B \quad \text{implies} \quad \alpha \Vdash A \Leftrightarrow \alpha \Vdash B$$

Kripke structures at work

- $A \vee (\neg A)$ is well-known not to be valid in intuitionistic logic.
- we build a structure that is invalidating this formula. Note: at least two worlds (single world = boolean model).
- $\neg A = A \Rightarrow \bot$

$$\begin{array}{c} \beta \Vdash A \\ | \\ \alpha \Vdash \emptyset \end{array}$$

Kripke structures at work

- $A \vee (\neg A)$ is well-known not to be valid in intuitionistic logic.
- we build a structure that is invalidating this formula. Note: at least two worlds (single world = boolean model).
- $\neg A = A \Rightarrow \bot$

$$\begin{array}{c} \beta \Vdash A \\ | \\ \alpha \Vdash \emptyset \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \beta \Vdash A \\ | \\ \alpha \Vdash \emptyset \text{ and } \alpha \nVdash A, \neg A, A \vee \neg A \end{array}$$

Constructive proof: the algorithm behind



Constructive proof: the algorithm behind



Constructive proof: the algorithm behind



The tableau method

- Searching for a counter-model

The tableau method

- Searching for a counter-model
- Exhaustive algorithm, each *branch* represents a potential counter-model.

The tableau method

- Searching for a counter-model
- Exhaustive algorithm, each *branch* represents a potential counter-model.
- some rules:

$$\frac{T p \Vdash A \vee B}{T p \Vdash A \quad | \quad T p \Vdash B}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} F p \Vdash A \vee B \\ | \\ F p \Vdash A \\ | \\ F p \Vdash B \end{array}$$

$$\frac{T p \Vdash A \Rightarrow B}{T q \Vdash B \quad | \quad F q \Vdash A}$$

with proviso on q

$$\begin{array}{c} F p \Vdash A \Rightarrow B \\ | \\ T q \Vdash A \\ | \\ F q \Vdash B \end{array}$$

The tableau method

- Searching for a counter-model
- Exhaustive algorithm, each *branch* represents a potential counter-model.
- some rules:

$$\dfrac{T p \Vdash A \vee B}{T p \Vdash A \quad T p \Vdash B} \qquad \begin{array}{c} F p \Vdash A \vee B \\ | \\ F p \Vdash A \\ | \\ F p \Vdash B \end{array}$$

$$\dfrac{T p \Vdash A \Rightarrow B}{T q \Vdash B \quad F q \Vdash A} \qquad \begin{array}{c} F p \Vdash A \Rightarrow B \\ | \\ T q \Vdash A \\ | \\ F q \Vdash B \end{array}$$

with proviso on q

- in deduction modulo: allow rewrite rules, define a new systematic research algorithm with $\mathcal{R}$.

Tableau: example 1

- We want to show "$A \vee B \vdash C \Rightarrow A$"
- tranlsation in tableau language: there is NO (node of no) Kripke structure satisfying $A \vee B$ without satisfying also $C \Rightarrow A$. Let's see if the counter-model search fails or not.
- We choose as usual sequences of integers for the set of worlds (partial order: prefix).

$T\emptyset \Vdash A \vee B, F\emptyset \Vdash C \Rightarrow A$

Tableau: example 1

$T\emptyset \Vdash A \vee B, F\emptyset \Vdash C \Rightarrow A$

Tableau: example 1

$$T\emptyset \Vdash A \vee B, F\emptyset \Vdash C \Rightarrow A$$

$$\Big|$$

$$T1 \Vdash C$$

$$\Big|$$

$$F1 \Vdash A$$

Tableau: example 1



Tableau: example 1



Tableau: example 1



Tableau: example 1



Tableau: example 2

- We want to show "$\vdash (A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow B)$"

$F_{\varnothing} \Vdash (A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow A \Rightarrow B$

Tableau: example 2

$$F_\varnothing \Vdash (A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow A \Rightarrow B$$

$$\Big|$$

$$T_1 \Vdash (A \Rightarrow B)$$

$$\Big|$$

$$F_1 \Vdash A \Rightarrow B$$

Tableau: example 2



Tableau: example 2



Tableau: example 2



Tableau: example 2



Tableau: example 2



Tableau: example 2



Tableaux completeness

- If the systematic tableau generation fails (does not terminate): does it generate a counter-model ?
- well known in the classical sequent calculus.

Tableaux completeness

- If the systematic tableau generation fails (does not terminate): does it generate a counter-model ?
- well known in the classical sequent calculus.
  - defining a model from an infinite branch: the latter has the needed properties.

Tableaux completeness

- If the systematic tableau generation fails (does not terminate): does it generate a counter-model ?
- well known in the classical sequent calculus.
  - defining a model from an infinite branch: the latter has the needed properties.
  - the model is consistent with the branch:

$$Tp \Vdash P \quad \text{iff} \quad p \Vdash P$$

Tableaux completeness

- If the systematic tableau generation fails (does not terminate): does it generate a counter-model ?
- well known in the classical sequent calculus.
  - defining a model from an infinite branch: the latter has the needed properties.
  - the model is consistent with the branch:

$$Tp \Vdash P \quad \text{iff} \quad p \Vdash P$$

  - deduction modulo: it has also to be a model of the rewrite rules $\mathcal{R}$.

Tableaux completeness

- If the systematic tableau generation fails (does not terminate): does it generate a counter-model ?
- well known in the classical sequent calculus.
  - defining a model from an infinite branch: the latter has the needed properties.
  - the model is consistent with the branch:

$$Tp \Vdash P \quad \text{iff} \quad p \Vdash P$$

  - deduction modulo: it has also to be a model of the rewrite rules $\mathcal{R}$.
- constructive point of view: if there is no counter-model, does the method terminate? (KS definition is modified)

Remember the tableau for $A \vee B \vdash C \Rightarrow A$:



- the right path generates counter model.
- the nerve: the atomic formulas each world entails (forces), extension by induction.

Conditions on rewrite rules

Providing the confluence of the rewrite system $\mathcal{R}$, and for:

- an order condition: $\succ$, well-founded, having the subformula property, and such that $P \rightarrow^* Q$ implies $P \succ Q$.

the tableau method is complete.

Conditions on rewrite rules

Providing the confluence of the rewrite system $\mathcal{R}$, and for:

- an order condition: $\succ$, well-founded, having the subformula property, and such that $P \rightarrow^* Q$ implies $P \succ Q$.
- a positivity condition: if $A \rightarrow P$ then P has only positive occurences of atoms.

the tableau method is complete.

Conditions on rewrite rules

Providing the confluence of the rewrite system $\mathcal{R}$, and for:

- an order condition: $\succ$, well-founded, having the subformula property, and such that $P \to^* Q$ implies $P \succ Q$.
- a positivity condition: if $A \to P$ then P has only positive occurences of atoms.
- both conditions mixed: $\mathcal{R}_\succ \cup \mathcal{R}_+$, with a compatibility condition.

the tableau method is complete.

Conditions on rewrite rules

Providing the confluence of the rewrite system $\mathcal{R}$, and for:

- an order condition: $\succ$, well-founded, having the subformula property, and such that $P \to^* Q$ implies $P \succ Q$.
- a positivity condition: if $A \to P$ then P has only positive occurences of atoms.
- both conditions mixed: $\mathcal{R}_\succ \cup \mathcal{R}_+$, with a compatibility condition.
- the rule:

$$R \in R \to \forall y\ (\forall x(y \in x \Rightarrow R \in x) \Rightarrow (y \in R \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow A)))$$

the tableau method is complete.


$\Gamma \vdash \Delta$
soundness
$\Gamma \models \Delta$
tableaux
completeness
$\Gamma \vdash_{cf} \Delta$
Tab $(T\emptyset \Vdash \Gamma,$
$F\emptyset \Vdash \Delta) \hookrightarrow \odot$

Tableaux soundness

We show the following theorem:

Theorem

If a tableau starting with $T\emptyset \Vdash \Gamma, F\emptyset \Vdash P$ is closed, then we can transform it into a proof of $\Gamma \vdash_{cf} P$.

- intuitionistic diffculty: in a tableau, there might be more than one “non true” formula:

$$\begin{array}{c} F\emptyset \Vdash P \vee Q \\ | \\ F\emptyset \Vdash P \\ | \\ F\emptyset \Vdash Q \end{array}$$

Tableaux soundness

We show the following theorem:

Theorem

If a tableau starting with $T\emptyset \Vdash \Gamma, F\emptyset \Vdash P$ is closed, then we can transform it into a proof of $\Gamma \vdash_{cf} P$.

- intuitionistic diffculty: in a tableau, there might be more than one “non true” formula:

$$\begin{array}{c} F\emptyset \Vdash P \vee Q \\ | \\ F\emptyset \Vdash P \\ | \\ F\emptyset \Vdash Q \end{array}$$

- we must derive the following rule:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{cf} A \vee B \quad \Gamma \vdash_{cf} A \vee C}{\Gamma \vdash_{cf} A \vee (B \wedge C)}$$

(similar to “multi succedent intuitionistic sequent calculus”).

Tableaux soundness

We show the following theorem:

Theorem

If a tableau starting with $T\emptyset \Vdash \Gamma, F\emptyset \Vdash P$ is closed, then we can transform it into a proof of $\Gamma \vdash_{cf} P$.

- intuitionistic diffculty: in a tableau, there might be more than one “non true” formula:

$$\begin{array}{c} F\emptyset \Vdash P \vee Q \\ | \\ F\emptyset \Vdash P \\ | \\ F\emptyset \Vdash Q \end{array}$$

- we must derive the following rule:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{cf} A \vee B \quad \Gamma \vdash_{cf} A \vee C}{\Gamma \vdash_{cf} A \vee (B \wedge C)}$$

  (similar to “multi succedent intuitionistic sequent calculus”).

- easy with cut, hard without.

Normalization (in a nutshell)

Curry-Howard correspondence

- Notation for proofs:

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

Curry-Howard correspondence

- Notation for proofs:

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

- **very** similar to a type system !

Curry-Howard correspondence

- Notation for proofs:

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

- **very** similar to a type system !
- extends to deduction modulo: rewrite rules are silent.

Curry-Howard correspondence

- Notation for proofs:

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

- **very** similar to a type system !
- extends to deduction modulo: rewrite rules are silent.
- cut elimination is a **process**, similar to function execution.

Curry-Howard correspondence

- Notation for proofs:

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

- **very** similar to a type system !
- extends to deduction modulo: rewrite rules are silent.
- cut elimination is a **process**, similar to function execution.
- aim: show that every proof normalizes: then 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).
- our aim: to each formula A, find 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).
- our aim: to each formula A, find 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 Ω
- an order

Heyting algebras

- a universe Ω
- 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)

pseudo-Heyting algebras

- a universe Ω
- a pseudo 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 $a \cup b \leq c$

Towards “usual” semantics

- such methods are defined in deduction modulo (Heyting arithmetic, higher-order logic, ...)
- the sets of candidates have a structure: pseudo Heyting algebras.

Towards “usual” semantics

- such methods are defined in deduction modulo (Heyting arithmetic, higher-order logic, ...)
- the sets of candidates have a structure: pseudo Heyting algebras.
- but ... Heyting algebras used for semantical cut elimination.

The link: fibring

define

$$[A] = [\![A]\!] \triangleleft A = \{\Gamma \mid \Gamma \vdash \pi : A, \pi \in [\![A]\!]\}$$

- **weak** definition: for *some* π only.
- this is a Heyting algebra.

The link: fibring

define

$$[A] = [\![A]\!] \triangleleft A = \{\Gamma \mid \Gamma \vdash \pi : A, \pi \in [\![A]\!]\}$$

- **weak** definition: for *some* π only.
- this is a Heyting algebra.
- interpretation of formulas in it:

$$A^* = [A] = [\![A]\!] \triangleleft A$$

The link: fibring

define

$$[A] = [\![A]\!] \triangleleft A = \{\Gamma \mid \Gamma \vdash \pi : A, \pi \in [\![A]\!]\}$$

- **weak** definition: for *some* π only.
- this is a Heyting algebra.
- interpretation of formulas in it:

$$A^* = [A] = [\![A]\!] \triangleleft A$$

- interpetation of terms in it:

$$t^* = \langle t, [\![t]\!] \rangle$$

The link: fibring

define

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

- **weak** definition: for *some* π only.
- this is a Heyting algebra.
- interpretation of formulas in it:

$$A^* = [A] = [\![A]\!] \lhd A$$

- interpetation of terms in it:

$$t^* = \langle t, [\![t]\!] \rangle$$

- this proves semantical cut elimination.

The link: fibring

define

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

- **weak** definition: for *some* π only.
- this is a Heyting algebra.
- interpretation of formulas in it:

$$A^* = [A] = [\![A]\!] \lhd A$$

- interpetation of terms in it:

$$t^* = \langle t, [\![t]\!] \rangle$$

- this proves semantical cut elimination.
- Takahashi, Prawitz, Schütte, higher-order V-complexes (extended).

Computational content: what kind of algorithm ?

Let's consider the rule:

$$R \in R \to \forall y\ (\forall x(y \in x \Rightarrow R \in x) \Rightarrow (y \in R \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow A)))$$

- has semantical cut elimination but no normalization.

Computational content: what kind of algorithm ?

Let's consider the rule:

$$R \in R \to \forall y\ (\forall x(y \in x \Rightarrow R \in x) \Rightarrow (y \in R \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow A)))$$

- has semantical cut elimination but no normalization.
- this can not be a normalization algorithm.

Computational content: what kind of algorithm ?

Let's consider the rule:

$$R \in R \to \forall y\ (\forall x(y \in x \Rightarrow R \in x) \Rightarrow (y \in R \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow A)))$$

- has semantical cut elimination but no normalization.
- this can not be a normalization algorithm.
- it is more or less the tableau method described in the first part.



- This diagram does not commute.



- This diagram does not commute.
- But: normalization methods “generate” a certain kind of semantical cut elimination proof: normalization by evaluation (**weak** fibring).

Further work

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