

Normalisation by Completeness

Thorsten Altenkirch

School of Computer Science
University of Nottingham

August 15, 2009

How NBE (for $=^{\beta\eta}$) was discovered . . .

- Helmut Schwichtenberg needed to implement $\beta\eta$ -conversion for his MINLOG system.
- The implementation language was SCHEME.
- He wondered how he could exploit SCHEME's evaluator. . .
- This lead to the LICS 91 paper by Berger and Schwichtenberg.

How NBE should have been discovered. . .

- Derive normalisation from intuitionistic completeness proofs.
- Simpler than NBE because we ignore equality.
- Minimal logic (\approx simply typed λ calculus).
- Investigate disjunction (\approx coproducts).

References:

- CTCS 95 A., Hofmann, Streicher
Reconstruction of a reduction-free normalisation proof
- LICS 01 A., Dybjer, Hofmann, Scott
Normalization by evaluation for typed lambda calculus with coproducts

$$\frac{}{\Gamma.A \vdash A} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma.B \vdash A}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B \quad \Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash B} \quad \frac{\Gamma.A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B}$$

with:

Propositions $A :: X \mid \dots \mid A \rightarrow A$ with $X = \{P, Q, R, \dots\}$ atoms.

Contexts $\Gamma :: \text{empty} \mid \Gamma.A$

Exercise

Show that $\not\vdash (P \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P$.

Solution

Use truth-table semantics: if $\vdash A$ then $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\rho = \text{true}$ for any truth assignment. However

$$\llbracket (P \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P \rrbracket_{P \mapsto \text{false}} = \text{false}$$

hence $\not\vdash (P \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P$.

Exercise

Show that $\not\models ((P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P$.

Solutions

- 1 Use Normalisation...
- 2 Use Kripke semantics...

Normal derivations

$$\frac{}{\Gamma.A \vdash_v A} \quad \frac{t : \Gamma \vdash_v A}{\Gamma.B \vdash_v A}$$
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_v A}{\Gamma \vdash_{ne} A} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash_{ne} A \rightarrow B \quad \Gamma \vdash_{nf} A}{\Gamma \vdash_{ne} B}$$
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{ne} P}{\Gamma \vdash_{nf} P} \quad \frac{\Gamma.A \vdash_{nf} B}{\Gamma \vdash_{nf} A \rightarrow B}$$

Lemma : $\not\vdash_{nf} ((P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P$

Proof: Analyze possible derivations.

Normalisation theorem:

$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash_{nf} A}$ hence $\not\vdash ((P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P$

- But how do we prove normalisation?

Kripke model

A Kripke model $K = (W, \leq, \Vdash)$ is given by

- A preordered set of worlds (W, \leq) .

- A monotone forcing relation $\Vdash \subseteq W \times X$:
$$\frac{w' \leq w \quad w \Vdash P}{w' \Vdash P}$$

Forcing

We recursively extend the forcing relation to:

propositions $w \Vdash A \rightarrow B = \forall w' \leq w. w' \Vdash A \rightarrow w' \Vdash B$

contexts $w \Vdash A_0 \dots A_n = w \Vdash A_0 \wedge \dots \wedge w \Vdash A_n$

Lemma

Monotonicity holds for all propositions:

$$\frac{w' \leq w \quad w \Vdash A}{w' \Vdash A}$$

Soundness

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\forall w. w \Vdash \Gamma \rightarrow w \Vdash A} \text{ sound}$$

$\not\models ((P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P$ using a Kripke model

A countermodel

- $W = \{0, 1\}$ with $0 \leq 1$.
- $1 \Vdash P$

$$0 \not\models ((P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P$$

hence using soundness

$$\not\models ((P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P$$

How good are Kripke models ?

- We can refute some unprovable propositions using truth tables.
- We can refute more unprovable propositions using Kripke models.
- Are all unprovable propositions refutable by Kripke models?
- Or positively: are all propositions which hold in all Kripke models, provable.
- Even better there is one universal Kripke model U in which precisely the derivable propositions hold:

$$\frac{\forall w. w \Vdash \Gamma \rightarrow w \Vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash A}$$

Define: $\Gamma \vdash^* A_1 \dots A_n = \Gamma \vdash A_1 \wedge \dots \Gamma \vdash A_n$, we can show:

$$\textcircled{1} \quad \Gamma \vdash^* \Gamma$$

$$\textcircled{2} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash^* \Delta \quad \Delta \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash A}$$

$$\textcircled{3} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash^* \Delta \quad \Delta \vdash^* \Theta}{\Gamma \vdash^* \Theta}$$

The universal model

$U = (\text{Contexts}, \vdash^*, \vdash)$

- $(\text{Contexts}, \vdash^*)$ is a preorder by 1,3
- \vdash is monotone by 2

quote and unquote

$$\frac{\Gamma \Vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash A} \textit{quote} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \Vdash A} \textit{unquote}$$

Proof: mutual induction over A .

Completeness

$$\frac{\forall \Delta. \Delta \Vdash^* \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta \Vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash A} \textit{Compl}$$

Proof: Combine quote and unquote.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\forall \Delta. \Delta \Vdash^* \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta \Vdash A} \text{ sound}$$
$$\frac{\forall \Delta. \Delta \Vdash^* \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta \Vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash A} \text{ compl}$$

- What have we achieved?
- We would like to obtain $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{nf}} A$.
- Let's shrink the model. . .
- and revisit completeness.

$$1 \quad \Gamma \vdash_v^* \Gamma$$

$$2 \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash_v^* \Delta \quad \Delta \vdash_x A}{\Gamma \vdash_x A}$$

with $x \in \{v, ne, nf\}$

$$3 \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash_v^* \Delta \quad \Delta \vdash_v^* \Theta}{\Gamma \vdash_v^* \Theta}$$

The universal model (with normal forms)

$U = (\text{Contexts}, \vdash_v^*, \vdash_{ne} (= \vdash_{nf}))$

- $(\text{Contexts}, \vdash_v^*)$ is a preorder by 1,3
- \vdash_{ne} is monotone by 2

Completeness (with normal forms)

quote and unquote

$$\frac{\Gamma \Vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{nf}} A} \textit{quote} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ne}} A}{\Gamma \Vdash A} \textit{unquote}$$

Completeness

$$\frac{\forall \Delta. \Delta \Vdash^* \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta \Vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{nf}} A} \textit{Compl}$$

Proof: Combine quote and unquote.

Normalisation from completeness

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\forall \Delta. \Delta \Vdash^* \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta \Vdash A} \text{ sound}}{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{nf}} A} \text{ compl}$$

- Normalisation is a consequence of completeness!
- We adjust the model and check the proof to show that completeness always produces normal forms.
- Once we have normalisation we don't need the models anymore!

NBC	NBE
minimal logic	λ -calculus (CCC)
preorder	category
monotone	functorial
Kripke model	presheaf model
soundness	presheaves are cartesian closed

Adding connectives

Conjunction

$$w \Vdash A \wedge B = w \Vdash A \wedge w \Vdash B$$

$$w \Vdash \top = \top$$

Soundness ok
Completeness ok

Disjunction

$$w \Vdash A \vee B = w \Vdash A \vee w \Vdash B$$

$$w \Vdash \perp = \perp$$

Soundness ok
Completeness ???

The problem with disjunction

$$U = (\text{Contexts}, \vdash^*, \vdash)$$

$$\frac{\frac{P \vee Q \vdash P \vee Q}{P \vee Q \Vdash P \vee Q} \text{unquote}}{\frac{(P \vee Q \Vdash P) \vee (P \vee Q \Vdash Q)}{(P \vee Q \vdash P) \vee (P \vee Q \vdash Q)} \text{quote}}$$

- But aren't Kripke models complete for intuitionistic logic?
- Yes, but the universal model has to be constructed differently.
- Contexts are replaced by *saturated contexts* . . .
- The construction of the universal model now requires decidability:

$$\Gamma \vdash A \vee \Gamma \not\vdash A$$

- Indeed, completeness for Kripke models for intuitionistic predicate logic is **not** provable intuitionistically.
- Instead, we will consider a different class of models.

Beth model

A Beth model $B = (W, \leq, \Vdash, \triangleleft)$ is given by

- A Kripke model (W, \leq, \Vdash) .
- A covering relation $\triangleleft \subseteq W \times \mathcal{P}W$ such that:

$$\text{trivial } w \triangleleft \{w' \mid w' \leq w\}$$

$$\text{monotone } \frac{w \triangleleft P \quad w' \leq w}{w' \triangleleft P}$$

$$\text{union } \frac{w \leq P \quad \forall w' \in P. w' \triangleleft Q}{w \triangleleft Q}$$

$$\text{paste } \frac{w \triangleleft P \quad \forall w' \in P. w' \Vdash Q}{w \Vdash Q}$$

Forcing

We extend the forcing relation:

$$w \Vdash A \vee B = \exists P. w \triangleleft P \wedge \forall w' \in P. w' \triangleleft A \vee w' \triangleleft B$$

$$w \Vdash \perp = w \triangleleft \{\}$$

Soundness for Beth models

Lemma:

Monotonicity and paste hold for all formulas:

$$\frac{w \triangleleft A \quad \forall w' \in P. w' \Vdash A}{w \Vdash A} \qquad \frac{w' \leq w \quad w \Vdash A}{w' \Vdash A}$$

Soundness:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\forall w. w \Vdash \Gamma \rightarrow w \Vdash A} \text{ sound}$$

The universal Beth model

$U = (\text{Contexts}, \vdash^*, \vdash, \triangleleft)$

- $(\text{Contexts}, \vdash^*, \vdash)$ is the universal Kripke model.
- \triangleleft is defined inductively:

1 $\Gamma \triangleleft \{\Delta \mid \Delta \leq \Gamma\}$

2
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \perp}{\Gamma \triangleleft P}$$

3
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \vee B \quad \Gamma.A \triangleleft P \quad \Gamma.B \triangleleft Q}{\Gamma \triangleleft P \cup Q}$$

Completeness

$$\frac{\forall \Delta. \Delta \Vdash^* \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta \Vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash A} \text{ Compl}$$

Proof: Extend quote and unquote.

Normalisation?

- Left as an exercise.
- First step: come up with a good notion of normal form. . .

From NBC to NBE (contd)

NBC	NBE
\triangleleft Beth model	Grothendieck topology sheaf model

- We have solved simpler problems: the existence of normal forms.
- We have ignored equality of derivations.
- We have shown that normalisation can be obtained by a modified universal model.
- NBE can be recovered by moving to corresponding proof-relevant constructions.
- Now for something completely different:
Why is it hard to formalize Type Theory in Type Theory?