



A semantic method to prove strong normalization from weak normalization

Denis Cousineau

► To cite this version:

Denis Cousineau. A semantic method to prove strong normalization from weak normalization. 2009. inria-00385520

HAL Id: inria-00385520

<https://inria.hal.science/inria-00385520>

Preprint submitted on 19 May 2009

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

A semantic method to prove strong normalization from weak normalization (draft)

Denis Cousineau
<http://www.denis.cousineau.eu>

TypiCal - INRIA Saclay Île de France - Ecole Polytechnique

1 Minimal deduction modulo

1.1 Syntax

We consider a set (T) of *sorts*, an infinite set of *variables* of each sort, a set (f) of function symbols, and a set (P) of predicate symbols, that come with their *rank*. The formation rules for objects and propositions are the usual ones.

- Variables of sort T are terms of sort T .
- If f is a function symbol of rank $\langle T_1, \dots, T_n, U \rangle$ and t_1, \dots, t_n are respectively objects of sort T_1, \dots, T_n , then $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is a term of sort U .
- If P is a predicate symbol of rank $\langle T_1, \dots, T_n \rangle$ and t_1, \dots, t_n are respectively objects of sort T_1, \dots, T_n , then $P(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is an *atomic proposition*.

Propositions are built-up from atomic propositions with the usual connective \Rightarrow and quantifier \forall . Remark that, implicitly, quantification in $\forall x.A$ is restricted over the sort of the variable x .

Definition 1 (Terms and Propositions).

We call \mathcal{O} (as objects), the set of terms: $t ::= x \mid f \ t \dots t$

We call \mathcal{P} , the set of propositions: $A ::= P \ t \dots t \mid A \Rightarrow A \mid \forall x.A$

In this language, proof-terms can contain both term variables (written x, y, \dots) and proof variables (written α, β, \dots). Terms are written t, u, \dots while proof-terms are written π, ρ, \dots . We call \mathcal{X} the set of proof variables and \mathcal{Y} the set of term variables.

Definition 2 (Proof-terms).

We call \mathcal{T} , the set of proof-terms: $\pi ::= \alpha \mid \lambda \alpha. \pi \mid \pi \ \pi' \mid \lambda x. \pi \mid \pi \ t$

Notice that variables α and x are bound in the constructions $\lambda \alpha. \pi$, and $\lambda x. \pi$. Alphabetic equivalence, free and bound variables are defined as usual.

Each proof-term construction corresponds to a natural deduction rule: terms of the form α express proofs built with the axiom rule, terms of the form $\lambda \alpha. \pi$ and $(\pi \ \pi')$ express proofs built respectively with the introduction and elimination

rules of the implication and terms of the form $\lambda x.\pi$ and (πt) express proofs built with the introduction and elimination rules of the universal quantifier.

We call *neutral* those proof-terms of \mathcal{T} that are not abstractions *i.e.* of the form α , $(\pi\pi')$ or (πt) . A proof-term is called *isolated* if it is neutral and only reduces on neutral terms.

1.2 Typing rules

We call *contexts*, lists of declarations $[\alpha : A]$ where α is a proof-variable and A is a proposition, such that each variable in a declaration is different from all the other variables of the context (in this way, we only consider *well formed* contexts, therefore we have to deal with alphabetic equivalence, when concatening them).

Given a congruence relation on propositions \equiv , we define typing rules as usual, in deduction modulo:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\Gamma, \alpha : A \vdash_{\equiv} \alpha : B} \quad A \equiv B \quad (\text{axiom}) \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, \alpha : A \vdash_{\equiv} \pi : B}{\Gamma \vdash_{\equiv} \lambda \alpha \pi : C} \quad C \equiv A \Rightarrow B \quad (\Rightarrow\text{-intro}) \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\equiv} \pi : C \quad \Gamma \vdash_{\equiv} \pi' : A}{\Gamma \vdash_{\equiv} (\pi \pi') : B} \quad C \equiv A \Rightarrow B \quad (\Rightarrow\text{-elim}) \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\equiv} \pi : A}{\Gamma \vdash_{\equiv} \lambda x.\pi : B} \quad B \equiv \forall x.A, \quad x \notin FV(\Gamma) \quad (\forall\text{-intro}) \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\equiv} \pi : B}{\Gamma \vdash_{\equiv} \pi t : C} \quad B \equiv \forall x.A, \quad C \equiv (t/x)A, \quad t \text{ has the sort of } x \quad (\forall\text{-elim})
\end{array}$$

Fig. 1. Typing rules

1.3 Proof reduction rules and strong normalization

As usual in deduction modulo, the process of cut elimination is modeled by β -reduction. We consider the contextual closure of the reduction rules given figure 2. These rules correspond to proof reduction in natural deduction.

$$\begin{array}{c}
(\lambda \alpha.\pi \pi') \rightarrow_{\beta_{\pi}} (\pi' / \alpha) \pi \\
(\lambda x.\pi t) \rightarrow_{\beta_t} (t/x) \pi \quad (\text{if } x \text{ and } t \text{ have the same sort})
\end{array}$$

Fig. 2. Proof reduction rules

We write $(\pi'/\alpha)\pi$ (resp. $(t/x)\pi$) the substitution of α (resp. x) by π' (resp. t) in π . We say that π reduces to π' if $\pi \rightarrow_{\beta_i} \pi'$ or $\pi \rightarrow_{\beta_\pi} \pi'$. We write $\pi \rightarrow \pi'$ if π reduces in one step to π' , $\pi \rightarrow^+ \pi'$ if π reduces in at least one step to π' , and $\pi \rightarrow^* \pi'$ if π reduces in an arbitrary number of steps to π' .

A proof is said to be *normal* if it contains no redex. It is said to be weakly *normalizing* if it has a normal form and *strongly normalizing* if all reduction sequences issued from this proofs are finite. We write SN for the set of strongly normalizing proofs.

1.4 Theories expressed in minimal deduction modulo

A theory expressed in minimal deduction modulo is defined by a many-sorted language in predicate logic $\mathcal{L} = \langle ((T), (F), (P)) \rangle$ and a congruence relation \equiv on propositions of the associated many-sorted logic. We suppose \equiv not *ambiguous*, i.e. there does not exist $x \in \mathcal{Y}$, $A, B, C \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $A \Rightarrow B \equiv \forall x.C$. We will call \mathcal{L}_\equiv this theory.

Remark 1. Given a theory \mathcal{L}_\equiv , we will write \vdash for \vdash_\equiv .

Proposition 1 (confluence and subject-reduction). \rightarrow is confluent.

And for all contexts Γ , proof-terms π, π' and propositions A , if $\Gamma \vdash \pi : A$ and $\pi \rightarrow \pi'$, then $\Gamma \vdash \pi' : A$.

Example As mentioned above deduction modulo permits to express (intentional) simple type theory [1] without any axiom. We show in the following, how minimal deduction modulo permits to express minimal (intentional) simple type theory, without any axiom (see [6] for details).

- The *sorts* are *simple types* inductively defined by:
 - ι and o are sorts,
 - if T and U are sorts then $T \rightarrow U$ is a sort.

The language is composed of the individual symbols

- $S_{T,U,V}$ of sort $(T \rightarrow U \rightarrow V) \rightarrow (T \rightarrow U) \rightarrow T \rightarrow V$,
- $K_{T,U}$ of sort $T \rightarrow U \rightarrow T$,
- $\dot{\Rightarrow}$, of sort o ,
- $\dot{\forall}_T$ of sort $(T \rightarrow o) \rightarrow o$,

the function symbols $\alpha_{T,U}$ of rank $\langle T \rightarrow U, T, U \rangle$,

and the predicate symbol ε of rank $\langle o \rangle$.

The combinators $S_{T,U,V}$ and $K_{T,U}$ are used to express functions. The objects $\dot{\Rightarrow}$, and $\dot{\forall}_T$ allow to represent propositions as objects of sort o . Finally, the predicate ε allows to transform such an object t of type o into the actual corresponding proposition $\varepsilon(t)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\alpha(\alpha(S_{T,U,V}, x), y), z) &\rightarrow \alpha(\alpha(x, z), \alpha(y, z)) \\ \alpha(\alpha(K_{T,U}, x), y) &\rightarrow x \\ \varepsilon(\alpha(\alpha(\dot{\Rightarrow}, x), y)) &\rightarrow \varepsilon(x) \dot{\Rightarrow} \varepsilon(y) \\ \varepsilon(\alpha(\dot{\forall}_T, x)) &\rightarrow \forall y \varepsilon(\alpha(x, y)) \end{aligned}$$

2 Language-dependent truth values algebras

2.1 Definition

For all sets E , we call $\mathbb{P}(E)$ the set of subsets of E .

For all sorts T of a language \mathcal{L} , we write \hat{T} , the set of closed terms of sort T .

Definition 3 (language-dependent tvas).

Let $\mathcal{L} = \langle (T), (f), (P) \rangle$ be a many-sorted language in predicate logic.

$\langle \mathcal{B}, \Rightarrow, (\hat{\mathcal{A}}_T), (\hat{\forall}_T) \rangle$ is a LDTVA for \mathcal{L} if and only if:

- \mathcal{B} is a set,
- \Rightarrow is a function from $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}$ to \mathcal{B} ,
- for all sorts T ,
 - $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_T$ is a set of functions from \hat{T} to \mathcal{B} : $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_T \subseteq \hat{T} \mapsto \mathcal{B}$
 - $\hat{\forall}_T$ is a function from $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_T$ to \mathcal{B} .

Definition 4 (Morphism).

Let $\mathcal{B}^1 = \langle \mathcal{B}^1, \Rightarrow^1, (\hat{\mathcal{A}}_T^1), (\hat{\forall}_T^1) \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B}^2 = \langle \mathcal{B}^2, \Rightarrow^2, (\hat{\mathcal{A}}_T^2), (\hat{\forall}_T^2) \rangle$ be two LDTVAs. A morphism from \mathcal{B}^1 to \mathcal{B}^2 is a function F from \mathcal{B}^1 to \mathcal{B}^2 such that:

- for all $E, G \in \mathcal{B}^1$, $F(E \Rightarrow^1 G) = F(E) \Rightarrow^2 F(G)$,
- for all sorts T , $x \in \hat{T}$ and $f \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}_T^1$, $F(\hat{\forall}_T^1 f) = \hat{\forall}_T^2 F \circ f$.

Definition 5 (Valuation).

Given a LDTVA for $\mathcal{L} = \langle (T), (f), (P) \rangle$, a valuation φ is a substitution mapping term-variables of a sort to closed terms of the same sort. For all propositions A (resp. terms t), we call $\text{VAL}(A)$ (resp. $\text{VAL}(t)$) the set of valuations whose domain contains the set of free variables of A (resp. t).

We write $x \notin \varphi$ for expressing the fact that $\varphi(x)$ is not defined.

Definition 6. For all $A \in \mathcal{P}$, terms t and $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(A)$, we write $|A|_\varphi$ the result of the substitution φ on A .

Definition 7 (Models).

Let $\mathcal{L} = \langle (T), (f), (P) \rangle$ be a many-sorted language in predicate logic,

let \equiv be a congruence relation on propositions of minimal deduction based on \mathcal{L} ,

let $\mathcal{B} = \langle \mathcal{B}, \Rightarrow, (\hat{\mathcal{A}}_T), (\hat{\forall}_T) \rangle$ be a LDTVA for \mathcal{L} .

1. We call \mathcal{B} -valued interpretations those functions which map every ordered pair of a proposition A and a valuation in $\text{VAL}(A)$ to an element of \mathcal{B} .
2. A \mathcal{B} -valued interpretation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is a \mathcal{B} -valued model if and only if:
 - for all $A, B \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(A \Rightarrow B)$, $\llbracket A \Rightarrow B \rrbracket_\varphi = \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi \Rightarrow \llbracket B \rrbracket_\varphi$
 - for all $A \in \mathcal{P}$, x of sort T and $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(\forall x.A)$ such that $x \notin \varphi$,
 $\llbracket \forall x.A \rrbracket_\varphi = \hat{\forall}_T(t \mapsto \llbracket A \rrbracket_{\varphi + \langle x, t \rangle})$
 - for all $A \in \mathcal{P}$, x of sort T , $t \in \hat{T}$ and $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(\forall x.A)$ such that $x \notin \varphi$,
 $\llbracket (t/x)A \rrbracket_\varphi = \llbracket A \rrbracket_{\varphi + \langle x, t \rangle}$.

3. A \mathcal{B} -valued model $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is a model of the theory \mathcal{L}_{\equiv} if and only if:
for all $A, A' \in \mathcal{P}$, $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(A)$ and $\psi \in \text{VAL}(A')$, if $|A|_{\varphi} \equiv |A'|_{\psi}$,
then $\llbracket A \rrbracket_{\varphi} = \llbracket A' \rrbracket_{\psi}$

Remark 2. The previous conditions can be reformulated as: 2. Interpretations of propositions have to be adapted to the connectives to be a model. 3. Models have to be adapted to the congruence to be a model of the associated theory.

The following lemma explains that our definition of morphism is correct for the property of being a model of a theory \mathcal{L}_{\equiv} .

Lemma 1. For all LDTVAs \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 and morphisms F from \mathcal{B}_1 to \mathcal{B}_2 , if $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is a \mathcal{B}_1 -valued model of a theory \mathcal{L}_{\equiv} , then $F \circ \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is a \mathcal{B}_2 -valued model of \mathcal{L}_{\equiv} .

3 About WN-reducibility candidates and typing

3.1 \mathcal{D}_{\equiv} , a ldtva of (\equiv) well-typed WN-reducibility candidates

Definition 8 (\mathcal{U}).

$\mathcal{U} = \{(\Gamma, \pi) \text{ such that } \Gamma \text{ is a context and } \pi \text{ is a proof-term}\}.$

Definition 9.

For all $E \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, we define the following properties :

- (P_{\equiv}) There exists A_E such that $\forall (\Gamma, \pi) \in E, \Gamma \vdash \pi : A_E$
- $(P_{1\equiv})$ For all $(\Gamma, \pi) \in E, \pi \in \text{WN}$
- $(P_{2\equiv})$ For all $(\Gamma, \pi) \in E$ and $\pi' \in \text{WN}$ such that $\pi \rightarrow \pi', (\Gamma, \pi') \in E$
- $(P_{3\equiv})$ For all $(\Gamma, \pi) \in \mathcal{U}$,
 - If $\pi \in \text{WN}$, π is isolated and $\Gamma \vdash \pi : A_E$, then $(\Gamma, \pi) \in E$
 - If $(\Gamma, \pi) \in E$ and $\pi' \rightarrow_{\beta_i} \pi$, then $(\Gamma, \pi') \in E$.

Remark 3. For all $E \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, if E satisfies (P_{\equiv}) and $(P_{3\equiv})$, then for all proof-variables α , $(\alpha : A_E, \alpha) \in E$, as α is isolated and in WN .

Definition 10 (domain \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}). We call \mathcal{D}_{\equiv} the set of subsets of \mathcal{U} which satisfy (P_{\equiv}) , $(P_{1\equiv})$, $(P_{2\equiv})$ and $(P_{3\equiv})$.

Definition 11 (leaves).

The leaves of a proof-term π are its first reducts which are normal or not neutral. (ρ is a leaf of π if and only if it is normal or not neutral and there exists $n \geq 0$ and $\pi_1 \dots \pi_{n-1}$ neutral not normal terms such that $\pi = \pi_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \pi_{n-1} \rightarrow \rho$). We call $\mathcal{L}(\pi)$ the set of leaves of π , $\mathcal{L}_1(\pi)$ the set of neutral normal leaves of π , and \mathcal{L}_{λ} the set of not neutral leaves of π .

Remark 4. - The only leaf of a normal or not neutral proof-term is itself.
- If π is a neutral non-normal proof-term, then $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\pi)$ if and only if there exists a one-step reduct π' of π such that $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\pi')$.
- If $\pi \in \text{WN}$, then $\mathcal{L}(\pi) \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 12 (\Rightarrow). For all $E, F \in \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}$,
 $E \Rightarrow F = \{(\Gamma, \pi) \in \mathcal{U} \text{ such that } \pi \in WN, \Gamma \vdash \pi : A_E \Rightarrow A_F \text{ and}$
 $\quad - \forall \rho \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda(\pi), \rho = \lambda\alpha.\rho' \text{ with } (\Gamma, \alpha : A_E, \rho) \in F$
 $\quad - \forall \rho \in \mathcal{L}_\downarrow(\pi) \text{ and } (\Gamma', \pi') \in E, (\Gamma\Gamma', \rho\pi') \in F\}$

Remark 5. We recall the fact that we only consider well-formed contexts, therefore the only variables Γ and Γ' can share have to be declared proofs of equivalent propositions, otherwise we have to deal with α -conversion when concatenating Γ and Γ' .

Lemma 2. \Rightarrow is a function from $\mathcal{D}_{\equiv} \times \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}$ to \mathcal{D}_{\equiv} .

Proof. Let $E, F \in \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}$, and $(\Gamma, \pi) \in E \Rightarrow F$,

(P _{\equiv}) By definition, $A_{E \Rightarrow F} \equiv A_E \Rightarrow A_F$.

(P_{1 \equiv}) By definition.

(P_{2 \equiv}) By subject-reduction, the fact that F satisfies (P_{2 \equiv}) and the fact that all leaves of a reduct of a proof term π are also leaves or reducts of leaves of π .

(P_{3 \equiv})

- By the fact that an isolated term has only neutral leaves, and that if π is a neutral normal term, and π' is a term in WN , then $\pi\pi'$ is isolated and in WN .
- By the fact that if $\pi' \rightarrow_{\beta_t} \pi$, then in a given context, π and π' have the same type, if $\pi \in WN$ then so does π' and all leaves of π' are either leaves of π , either " β_t -expansions" of leaves of π .

Definition 13 (\mathring{A}_T). For all sorts T ,

$\mathring{A}_T = \{f : \hat{T} \mapsto \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}, \text{ such that there exists } A_f \in \mathcal{P} \text{ and } x_f \in \mathcal{X} \text{ such that}$
 $\quad \text{for all } t \in \hat{T} \text{ and } (\Gamma, \pi) \in f(t), \Gamma \vdash \pi : (t/x_f)A_f\}$

Definition 14 ($\mathring{\forall}_T$). For all sorts T and functions $f \in \mathring{A}_T$,

$\mathring{\forall}_T.f = \{(\Gamma, \pi) \in \mathcal{U} \text{ such that for all } t \in \hat{T}, (\Gamma, \pi t) \in f(t)\}$

Lemma 3. For all sorts T , $\mathring{\forall}_T$ is a function from \mathring{A}_T to \mathcal{D}_{\equiv} .

Proof. Let $f \in \mathring{A}_T$, and $(\Gamma, \pi) \in \mathring{\forall}_T.f$

(P _{\equiv}) Let $t \in \hat{T} (\neq \emptyset)$. Then $(\Gamma, \pi t) \in f(t)$. As $f \in \mathring{\forall}_T$, we have $\Gamma \vdash \pi t : (t/x_f)A_f$. Therefore $\Gamma \vdash \pi : \forall x_f.A_f$, by case on the last rule used in the derivation of $\Gamma \vdash \pi t : (t/x_f)A_f$. Finally, $A_{\mathring{\forall}_T.f} \equiv \forall x_f.A_f$.

(P_{1 \equiv}) Let $t \in \hat{T} (\neq \emptyset)$. Then $(\Gamma, \pi t) \in f(t) \in \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}$ therefore $\pi t \in WN$ and so does π .

(P_{2 \equiv}) Let π' such that $\pi \rightarrow \pi'$. Then, for all $t \in \hat{T}$, $\pi t \rightarrow \pi' t$, therefore $\pi' t \in f(t) \in \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}$.

(P_{3 \equiv})

- Let $(\Gamma, \tau) \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\tau \in WN$, τ is isolated and $\Gamma \vdash \tau : \forall x_f.A_f$. Let $t \in \hat{T}$ then $\Gamma \vdash \tau t : (t/x_f)A_f$, τt is isolated as τ is, and $\tau t \in WN$, as $\tau \in WN$. Finally, $\tau \in \mathring{\forall}_T.f$, as $f(t)$ satisfies (P_{3 \equiv}), for all $t \in \hat{T}$.

- Let π' such that $\pi' \rightarrow_{\beta_t} \pi$, then for all $t \in \hat{T}$, $\pi't \rightarrow_{\beta_t} \pi t$ therefore $(\Gamma, \pi't) \in f(t)$ as it satisfies $(P_{3\equiv})$. Hence $(\Gamma, \pi') \in \check{\forall}_T f$.

Definition 15 (\mathcal{D}_{\equiv}). \mathcal{D}_{\equiv} is the LDTVVA $\langle \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}, \overset{\circ}{\Rightarrow}, (\mathring{A}_T), (\check{\forall}_T) \rangle$.

3.2 Building a \mathcal{D}_{\equiv} -valued interpretation of WN theories \mathcal{L}_{\equiv}

Let us now define a first \mathcal{D}_{\equiv} -valued model, by using directly definitions of $\overset{\circ}{\Rightarrow}$ and $\check{\forall}_T$, and well-chosen interpretations of atomic propositions.

Definition 16. Let A be a proposition and $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(A)$.

We define the subset of \mathcal{U} , $[A]_{\varphi}$ by induction over the structure of A .

- $[P t_1 \dots t_n]_{\varphi} = \{(\Gamma, \pi) \in \mathcal{U} \text{ such that } \pi \in \text{WN and } \Gamma \vdash \pi : P \varphi(t_1) \dots \varphi(t_n)\}$
- $[B \Rightarrow C]_{\varphi} = [B]_{\varphi} \overset{\circ}{\Rightarrow} [C]_{\varphi}$
- $[\forall x.B]_{\varphi} = \check{\forall}_T (t \mapsto [B]_{\varphi + \langle x, t \rangle})$

Lemma 4. For all $A \in \mathcal{P}$, x of sort T , $t \in \hat{T}$ and $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(\forall x.A)$ such that $x \notin \varphi$, we have $[(t/x)A]_{\varphi} = [A]_{\varphi + \langle x, t \rangle}$.

Proof. By induction on A .

Lemma 5. For all $A \in \mathcal{P}$, and $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(A)$,

$[A]_{\varphi} \in \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}$ with $A_{[A]_{\varphi}} = A_{\varphi}$ (i.e., $\forall(\Gamma, \pi) \in [A]_{\varphi}, \Gamma \vdash \pi : A_{\varphi}$).

Proof. By induction on A .

- If A is an atomic proposition $P t_1 \dots t_n$,
 - (P_{\equiv}) By definition. (with $A_{[P t_1 \dots t_n]_{\varphi}} \equiv P \varphi(t_1) \dots \varphi(t_n)$).
 - ($P_{1\equiv}$) By definition.
 - ($P_{2\equiv}$) By subject-reduction.
 - ($P_{3\equiv}$) By definition.
- If $A = B \Rightarrow C$, as $\overset{\circ}{\Rightarrow} : \mathcal{D}_{\equiv} \times \mathcal{D}_{\equiv} \mapsto \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}$, we conclude by induction hypothesis (with $A_{[B \Rightarrow C]_{\varphi}} = A_{[B]_{\varphi} \overset{\circ}{\Rightarrow} [C]_{\varphi}} \equiv A_{[B]_{\varphi}} \Rightarrow A_{[C]_{\varphi}} \equiv B_{\varphi} \Rightarrow C_{\varphi} = (B \Rightarrow C)_{\varphi}$).
- If $A = \forall x.B$, let T be the sort of x and $f = t \mapsto [B]_{\varphi + \langle x, t \rangle}$.
Then f is a function from \hat{T} to \mathcal{D}_{\equiv} , by induction hypothesis. Moreover, for all $t \in \hat{T}$, $A_{f(t)} = B_{\varphi + \langle x, t \rangle} = (t/x)B_{\varphi}$, by induction hypothesis. Therefore $f \in \mathring{A}_T$ and $\check{\forall}_T f \in \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}$ (with $A_{[\forall x.B]_{\varphi}} = \forall x.A_f = \forall x.B_{\varphi}$).

At this point, we have \mathcal{D}_{\equiv} -valued model which is adapted to typing but not necessarily \equiv -adapted. Indeed, in a theory where we have two atomic proposition symbols P and Q such that $P \equiv (Q \Rightarrow Q)$ (notice that such a theory can be weakly normalizing), then for all valuations $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(P) \cap \text{VAL}(Q)$, $[P]_{\varphi} \neq [Q]_{\varphi} \overset{\circ}{\Rightarrow} [Q]_{\varphi}$. We have then to modify this interpretation to make it a \mathcal{D}_{\equiv} -valued model of \mathcal{L}_{\equiv} .

3.3 Adapting this interpretation to the congruence

Definition 17. We define a second interpretation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$, as follows :
for all $A \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(A)$,

$$\llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi = \bigcap_{A_\varphi \equiv A'_\psi} \llbracket A' \rrbracket_\psi$$

Remark 6. For all $A, A' \in \mathcal{P}$, $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(A)$ and $\psi \in \text{VAL}(A')$ such that $A_\varphi \equiv A'_\psi$, we have $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi = \llbracket A' \rrbracket_\psi$, by definition.

Then we prove that $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is also a \mathcal{D}_\equiv -valued interpretation adapted to typing.

Lemma 6. For all $A \in \mathcal{P}$, and $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(A)$,

$$\llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi \in \mathcal{D}_\equiv \quad \text{with } A_{\llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi} = A_\varphi \quad (\text{i.e.}, \forall (\Gamma, \pi) \in \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi, \Gamma \vdash \pi : A_\varphi).$$

Proof. Let $A \in \mathcal{P}$, and $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(A)$,

By lemma 5 and the fact that $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi \subseteq \llbracket A' \rrbracket_\psi$, for all $A'_\psi \equiv A_\varphi$.

Lemma 7. For all $A \in \mathcal{P}$, x of sort T , $t \in \hat{T}$ and $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(\forall x.A)$ such that $x \notin \varphi$, we have $\llbracket (t/x)A \rrbracket_\varphi = \llbracket A \rrbracket_{\varphi + \langle x, t \rangle}$.

Proof. By lemma 7.

Finally, we proved, that $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is a \mathcal{D}_\equiv -valued interpretation of propositions adapted to typing and to the congruence relation \equiv . Let us now show that $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is also a \mathcal{D}_\equiv -valued model of weakly normalizing theories \mathcal{L}_\equiv , i.e. it is also adapted to connectives, when \mathcal{L}_\equiv is weakly normalizing.

3.4 $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is a \mathcal{D}_\equiv -valued model of weakly normalizing theories \mathcal{L}_\equiv

In order to prove that $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is a \mathcal{D}_\equiv -valued model of \mathcal{L}_\equiv , if it is weakly normalizing, we proceed by *reductio ad absurdum*, showing that if $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is not connectives-adapted, then we can exhibit a typing judgement $\Gamma \vdash \pi : A$ such that $\pi \notin \text{WN}$.

Lemma 8.

If there exists $A, B \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(A \Rightarrow B)$, such that $\llbracket A \Rightarrow B \rrbracket_\varphi \neq \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi \Rightarrow \llbracket B \rrbracket_\varphi$ then there exists $\pi \in \mathcal{T}$, $C \in \mathcal{P}$, $\psi \in \text{VAL}(C)$ such that $\Gamma \vdash \pi : C_\psi$ and $(\Gamma, \pi) \notin \llbracket C \rrbracket_\psi$.

Proof. – If there exists $(\Gamma, \pi) \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $(\Gamma, \pi) \notin \llbracket A \Rightarrow B \rrbracket_\varphi$ and

$(\Gamma, \pi) \in \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi \Rightarrow \llbracket B \rrbracket_\varphi$. Then $\Gamma \vdash \pi : A_\varphi \Rightarrow B_\varphi = (A \Rightarrow B)_\varphi$.

We take $C = A \Rightarrow B$ and $\psi = \varphi$.

– If there exists $(\Gamma, \pi) \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $(\Gamma, \pi) \in \llbracket A \Rightarrow B \rrbracket_\varphi$ and $(\Gamma, \pi) \notin \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi \Rightarrow \llbracket B \rrbracket_\varphi$.

Notice that as $\Gamma \vdash \pi : A_\varphi \Rightarrow B_\varphi$, π cannot reduce to a term-abstraction, by subject-reduction. Then, as $\pi \in \text{WN}$ and $\Gamma \vdash \pi : A_\varphi \Rightarrow B_\varphi$, either there exists $\lambda \alpha. \rho \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda(\pi)$ such that $(\Gamma, \alpha : A_\varphi, \rho) \notin \llbracket B \rrbracket_\varphi$, with $\Gamma, \alpha : A_\varphi \vdash \rho : B_\varphi$ by subject-reduction. Either there exists $\rho \in \mathcal{L}_\downarrow(\pi)$ and $(\Gamma', \pi') \in \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi$ such that $(\Gamma \Gamma', \rho \pi') \notin \llbracket B \rrbracket_\varphi$, with $\Gamma \Gamma' \vdash \rho \pi' : B_\varphi$ by subject-reduction. We take $C = B$ and $\psi = \varphi$

Lemma 9.

If there exists $A \in \mathcal{P}$, $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(A)$, and x of sort T such that $x \notin \varphi$, and

$$[\forall x.A]_\varphi \neq \forall_T(t \mapsto [A]_{\varphi+\langle x,t \rangle})$$

then there exists $\pi \in \mathcal{T}$, $C \in \mathcal{P}$, $\psi \in \text{VAL}(C)$ such that $\Gamma \vdash \pi : C_\psi$ and $(\Gamma, \pi) \notin [C]_\psi$.

Proof. – If there exists $(\Gamma, \pi) \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $(\Gamma, \pi) \notin [\forall x.A]_\varphi$ and

$$(\Gamma, \pi) \in \forall_T(t \mapsto [A]_{\varphi+\langle x,t \rangle}). \text{ Then } \Gamma \vdash \pi : (\forall x.A)_\varphi.$$

We take $C = \forall x.A$ and $\psi = \varphi$.

– If there exists $(\Gamma, \pi) \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $(\Gamma, \pi) \in [\forall x.A]_\varphi$ and $(\Gamma, \pi) \notin \forall_T(t \mapsto [A]_{\varphi+\langle x,t \rangle})$.

Then there exists $t \in \hat{T}$ such that $(\Gamma, \pi t) \notin [A]_{\varphi+\langle x,t \rangle}$. As $\Gamma \vdash \pi : (\forall x.A)_\varphi$,

we have $\Gamma \vdash \pi t : (t/x)A_\varphi = A_{\varphi+\langle x,t \rangle}$. We take $C = A$ and $\psi = \varphi + \langle x, t \rangle$

Lemma 10.

If there exists $A, B \in \mathcal{P}$, $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(A \Rightarrow B)$ or $\varphi' \in \text{VAL}(\forall x.A)$ with x of sort T , $x \notin \varphi'$ and

$$[A \Rightarrow B]_\varphi \neq [A]_\varphi \Rightarrow [B]_\varphi \quad \text{or} \quad [\forall x.A]_{\varphi'} \neq \forall_T(t \mapsto [A]_{\varphi'+\langle x,t \rangle})$$

then there exists $D \in \mathcal{P}$, $\pi \in \mathcal{T}$, $\psi \in \text{VAL}(D)$ such that $\Gamma \vdash \pi : D_\psi$ and $(\Gamma, \pi) \notin [D]_\psi$.

Proof. By lemmas 8 and 9, there exists C , Γ , π and ψ such that $\Gamma \vdash \pi : C_\psi$ and $(\Gamma, \pi) \notin [C]_\psi$. Therefore, there exists a proposition D and $\psi' \in \text{VAL}(D)$ such that $D_{\psi'} \equiv C_\psi$ and $(\Gamma, \pi) \notin [D]_{\psi'}$. And $\Gamma \vdash \pi : D_{\psi'}$, by equivalence of C_ψ and $D_{\psi'}$.

Lemma 11.

If there exists $A, B \in \mathcal{P}$, $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(A \Rightarrow B)$ or $\varphi' \in \text{VAL}(\forall x.A)$ with x of sort T , $x \notin \varphi'$ and

$$\text{and} \quad [A \Rightarrow B]_\varphi \neq [A]_\varphi \Rightarrow [B]_\varphi \quad \text{or} \quad [\forall x.A]_{\varphi'} \neq \forall_T(t \mapsto [A]_{\varphi'+\langle x,t \rangle})$$

then there exists a (term-closed) proposition E , $\pi \in \mathcal{T}$ and a context Γ such that

$$\Gamma \vdash \pi : E \text{ and } \pi \notin \text{WN}.$$

Proof. By lemma 10, there exists a proposition D , a context Γ , a proof π and $\varphi \in \mathcal{V}(D)$ such that $\Gamma \vdash \pi : D_\varphi$ and $(\Gamma, \pi) \notin [D]_\varphi$. By induction on D .

– if D is atomic, then as $\Gamma \vdash \pi : D_\varphi$, we have $\pi \notin \text{WN}$.

– if $D = (F \Rightarrow G)_\varphi$,

then $\Gamma \vdash \pi : (F \Rightarrow G)_\varphi$ and $(\Gamma, \pi) \notin [F \Rightarrow G]_\varphi = [F]_\varphi \Rightarrow [G]_\varphi$. If $\pi \in \text{WN}$, either there exists $\lambda\alpha.\rho \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda(\pi)$ such that $(\Gamma, \alpha : F_\varphi, \rho) \notin [G]_\varphi$. Either there exists $\rho \in \mathcal{L}_\downarrow(\pi)$ and $(\Gamma', \pi') \in [F]_\varphi$ such that $(\Gamma\Gamma', \rho\pi') \notin [G]_\varphi$, with $\Gamma\Gamma' \vdash \rho\pi' : G_\varphi$. We conclude by induction hypothesis.

– if $D = \forall x.F$,

then $\Gamma \vdash \pi : (\forall x.F)_\varphi$ and $(\Gamma, \pi) \notin [\forall x.F]_\varphi$. Therefore there exists $t \in \hat{T}$ such that $(\Gamma, \pi t) \notin [F]_{\varphi+\langle x,t \rangle}$, with $\Gamma \vdash \pi t : A_{\varphi+\langle x,t \rangle}$. We conclude by induction hypothesis.

Proposition 2 (Completeness). If the theory \mathcal{L}_\equiv is weakly normalizing, then $[\cdot]_\cdot = \langle A, \varphi \rangle \mapsto [A]_\varphi$ is a \mathcal{D}_\equiv -model of this theory.

Proof. By remark 6 and lemmas 6 and 11.

4 From \mathcal{D}_{\equiv} to \mathcal{C}'

4.1 \mathcal{C}' , yet another algebra of candidates.

Definition 18.

For all sets E of proof-terms, we define the following properties :

- (CR₁) For all $\pi \in E$, $\pi \in SN$.
- (CR₂) For all $\pi \in E$, for all $\pi' \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\pi \rightarrow \pi'$, then $\pi' \in E$.
- (CR'₃) for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $\nu, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_n \in \mathcal{T}$, if
 - for all $i \leq n$, μ_i is neutral and not normal,
 - $\forall \rho_1, \dots, \rho_n \in \mathcal{T}$ such that for all $i \leq n$, $\mu_i \leq_n \rightarrow \rho_i$, $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu \in E$
 then $(\mu_i/\alpha_i)\nu \in E$.

Remark 7. If E satisfies (CR'₃) then, in particular, all neutral *not normal* terms whose all one-steps reducts are in E , is in E . That is slightly different from the usual (CR₃) of reducibility candidates, where the neutral term can be normal, therefore all neutral normal terms are in all reducibility candidates.

Definition 19 (\Rightarrow).

For all $E, F \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, $E \Rightarrow F = \{\pi \in SN \text{ such that}$

- $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{L}_{\lambda}(\pi)$, $\rho = \lambda\alpha.\rho'$ with $\rho \in F$
- $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{L}_{\downarrow}(\pi)$ and $\pi' \in E$, $\rho\pi' \in F\}$

Lemma 12. \Rightarrow is a function from $\mathcal{C}' \times \mathcal{C}'$ to \mathcal{C}' .

Proof. Let $E, F \in \mathcal{C}'$ and $\pi \in E \Rightarrow F$,

- (CR₁) $\pi \in SN$, by definition.
- (CR₂) If π' is a one-step reduct of π , then for all $\pi' \in SN$ and all its leaves are leaves of π , or reducts of leaves of π .
- (CR'₃) Let $\pi = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)\nu$ with each μ_i neutral not normal and such that for all (ρ_i) each respectively a one-step reduct of μ_i , $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)\nu \in E \Rightarrow F$. We can first notice that π cannot reduce to a term-abstraction, by confluence. Let us prove that $\pi \in E \Rightarrow F$, by induction on the length l of the maximal length of a reductions sequence from π to one of its leaves.
 - If $l = 0$, then π is either normal and neutral, either a proof-abstraction.
 - * If π is neutral and normal then none of the μ_i appears in ν , hence $\pi \in E \Rightarrow F$.
 - * If $\pi = \lambda\alpha.\pi'$ then, as each μ_i is neutral, $\nu = \lambda\alpha.\nu'$, with $\pi' = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)\nu'$. And for all (ρ_i) each respectively a one-step reduct of μ_i , $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)\nu = \lambda\alpha.(\rho_i/\alpha_i)\nu' \in E \Rightarrow F$, therefore $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)\nu' \in F$. Finally, $\pi' \in F$ as it satisfies (CR'₃), and $\pi = \lambda\alpha.\pi' \in E \Rightarrow F$.
 - If $l > 0$, then all its leaves are leaves of a one-step reduct of π , wich is in $E \Rightarrow F$, by induction hypothesis.

Definition 20 ($\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_T$).

For all sorts T , $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_T = \hat{T} \mapsto \mathcal{C}'$.

Definition 21 ($\tilde{\forall}_T$). For all sorts T and function $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_T$,
 $\tilde{\forall}_T.f = \{\pi \in \mathcal{T} \text{ such that for all } t \in \hat{T}, \pi t \in f(t)\}$

Lemma 13. For all sorts T , $\tilde{\forall}_T$ is a function from $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_T$ to \mathcal{C}' .

Proof. Let T be a sort, $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_T$ and $\pi \in \tilde{\forall}_T.f$.

- (CR₁) Let $t \in \hat{T} (\neq \emptyset)$, then $\pi t \in f(t) \in \mathcal{C}'$, therefore $\pi t \in SN$ and so does π .
- (CR₂) Let π' such that $\pi \rightarrow \pi'$. Then for all $t \in \hat{T}$, $\pi' t$ is a one-step reduct of πt .
- (CR₃') If there exists $\nu, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_n \in \mathcal{T}$, such that each μ_i is neutral not normal, $\tau = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu$ and for all $(\rho_i)_{i \leq n} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, such that for all $i \leq n$, $\mu_{i \leq n} \rightarrow \rho_i$, then $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu \in \tilde{\forall}_T.f$. Then, for all $t \in \hat{T}$, $\tau t = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu t = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu'$ with $\nu' = \nu t$. And for all $(\rho_i)_{i \leq n} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, such that for all $i \leq n$, $\mu_{i \leq n} \rightarrow \rho_i$, we have $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu' = (\rho_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu t \in f(t)$ by hypothesis, therefore $\tau t \in f(t)$ as it satisfies (CR₃'). And finally, $\tau \in \tilde{\forall}_T.f$.

Definition 22 (\mathcal{C}'). \mathcal{C}' is the LDTV $\langle \mathcal{C}', \Rightarrow, (\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_T), (\tilde{\forall}_T) \rangle$.

4.2 Building a function from \mathcal{D}_{\equiv} to \mathcal{C}'

Definition 23 (Δ). We consider a context which contains an infinite number of variables for each proposition. $\Delta = (\beta_i^A : A)_{A \in \mathcal{P}, i \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Definition 24 (Cl). For all $E \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, we define $Cl(E)$ as follows :
for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

- $Cl^0(E) = \{\pi \in \mathcal{T} \text{ such that } (\Delta, \pi) \in E \text{ and } \pi \text{ is normal} \}$
- $Cl^{k+1}(E) = \{\pi \in \mathcal{T}, \text{ such that there exists } n \in \mathbb{N} :$
 $\exists \nu_\pi \in \mathcal{T}, \exists (\mu_i)_{i \leq n} \subseteq SN, \text{ each neutral not normal s.t.}$
 $\pi = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu_\pi \text{ and } \forall (\rho_i)_{i \leq n} \subseteq \mathcal{T}, \text{ s.t. } \forall i \leq n, \rho_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mu_i),$
 $\text{we have } (\rho_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu_\pi \in Cl^k(E)\}$
- $Cl(E) = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Cl^n(E)$

Remark 8. For all $E \in \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}$,

1. for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $Cl^k(E) \subseteq Cl^{k+1}(E)$,
2. $Cl(E) \neq \emptyset$ as $Cl^0(E)$ contains all variables α such that $\Delta \vdash \alpha : A_E$.
3. if $\pi \in Cl(E)$ and π is normal, then $\pi \in Cl^0(E)$.

Proposition 3.

For all $E \in \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}$, $Cl(E) \in \mathcal{C}'$.

Proof. See [2]

4.3 Proving that $Cl(\cdot)$ is a morphism

\Rightarrow -morphism

We prove now that for all $E, F \in \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}$, we have $Cl(E \Rightarrow F) = Cl(E) \Rightarrow Cl(F)$.

Lemma 14. *For all $E \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and $\pi \in \mathcal{T}$,*

If $\pi \in SN$, π is neutral not normal and $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{L}(\pi)$, $\rho \in Cl(E)$, then $\pi \in Cl(E)$

Proof. As $\pi \in SN$, $\mathcal{L}(\pi)$ is defined and finite.

And, if we call $k_m = \max\{\min\{k, \rho \in Cl^k(E)\}, \rho \in \mathcal{L}(\pi)\}$,

then $\pi \in Cl^{k_m+1}(E) \subseteq Cl(E)$.

Remark 9. In the same way, if there exists $\nu_\pi \in \mathcal{T}$, and $(\mu_i)_{i \leq n} \subseteq SN$, each neutral not normal such that $\pi = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu_\pi$ and $\forall (\rho_i)_{i \leq n} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, such that for all $i \leq n$, $\rho_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mu_i)$, then $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu_\pi \in Cl(E)$, we have $\pi \in Cl(E)$.

Remark 10. If $\pi \in Cl(E \Rightarrow F)$, then its normal form ρ is in $Cl^0(E \Rightarrow F)$, hence $\Delta \vdash \rho : A_E \Rightarrow A_F$ and therefore, π cannot reduce to a term abstraction, by confluence.

Proposition 4. *For all $E, F \in \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}$, then $Cl(E \Rightarrow F) = Cl(E) \Rightarrow Cl(F)$.*

Proof. \subseteq Let $\pi \in Cl(E \Rightarrow F)$,

then $\pi \in SN$ as $Cl(E \Rightarrow F)$ satisfies (CR₁).

- Let $\rho \in \mathcal{L}_\downarrow(\pi)$, then $\rho \in Cl(E \Rightarrow F)$ by (CR₂), and as it is normal, it is, in particular, in $Cl^0(E \Rightarrow F)$, hence $(\Delta, \rho) \in E \Rightarrow F$. Let $\pi' \in Cl(E)$, then there exists (a minimal) $j \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\pi' \in Cl^j(E)$. Let us show that $\rho\pi' \in Cl(F)$ by induction on j .
 - * If $j = 0$, then π' is normal and $(\Delta, \pi') \in E$, therefore $(\Delta, \rho\pi') \in F$, as $(\Delta, \rho) \in E \Rightarrow F$. Moreover, $\rho\pi'$ is normal as π' is normal and ρ is neutral and normal. Finally $\rho\pi' \in Cl^0(F)$.
 - * If $j > 0$, then there exists $\nu_{\pi'} \in \mathcal{T}$, and $(\mu_i)_{i \leq n} \subseteq SN$, each neutral not normal such that $\pi' = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu_{\pi'}$ and $\forall (\rho_i)_{i \leq n} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, such that for all $i \leq n$, $\rho_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mu_i)$, then $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu_{\pi'} \in Cl^{j-1}(E)$, therefore $\rho (\rho_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu_{\pi'} \in Cl(F)$, by induction hypothesis. Finally, $\rho\pi' = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} (\rho\nu_{\pi'}) \in Cl(F)$ by remark 9.
- Let $\lambda\alpha.\rho \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda(\pi)$, then $\lambda\alpha.\rho \in Cl(E \Rightarrow F)$ by (CR₂), and there exists (a minimal) $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\lambda\alpha.\rho \in Cl^k(E \Rightarrow F)$. Let us prove that $\rho \in Cl(F)$ by induction on k .
 - * If $k = 0$, then $\lambda\alpha.\rho \in SN$ and $(\Delta, \lambda\alpha.\rho) \in E \Rightarrow F$, therefore $\rho \in SN$ and $(\Delta, \rho) \in F$, as we can choose α such that $\Delta \vdash \alpha : A_E$, by α -conversion. Finally, $\rho \in Cl^0(F)$.
 - * If $k > 0$, then there exists $\nu \in \mathcal{T}$, and $(\mu_i)_{i \leq n} \subseteq SN$, each neutral not normal such that $\lambda\alpha.\rho = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu$ and $\forall (\rho_i)_{i \leq n} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, such that for all $i \leq n$, $\rho_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mu_i)$, then $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu \in Cl^{k-1}(E \Rightarrow F)$. As each μ_i is neutral, there exists ν' such that $\nu = \lambda\alpha.\nu'$, therefore $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu' \in Cl(F)$, by induction hypothesis. Finally, $\rho = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} (\nu') \in Cl(F)$ by remark 9.

Finally, $\pi \in Cl(E) \Rightarrow Cl(F)$.

- \supseteq Let $\pi \in Cl(E) \Rightarrow Cl(F)$. then $\pi \in SN$ and π cannot reduce to a term-abstraction, by definition of \Rightarrow .
- If π is a proof-abstraction $\lambda\alpha.\rho$, then $\rho \in Cl(F)$ and there exists (a minimal) $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\rho \in Cl^k(F)$. Let us prove that $\pi \in Cl(E \Rightarrow F)$ by induction on k .
 - * If $k = 0$, then ρ is normal and $(\Delta, \rho) \in F$, therefore $\lambda\alpha.\rho$ is normal and $(\Delta, \lambda\alpha.\rho) \in E \Rightarrow F$, as we can choose α such that $\Delta \vdash \alpha : A_E$, by α -conversion. Finally, $\pi = \lambda\alpha.\rho \in Cl^0(E \Rightarrow F)$.
 - * If $k > 0$, then there exists $\nu \in T$, and $(\mu_i)_{i \leq n} \subseteq SN$, each neutral not normal such that $\rho = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu$ and $\forall (\rho_i)_{i \leq n} \subseteq T$, such that for all $i \leq n$, $\rho_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mu_i)$, then $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} \nu \in Cl^{k-1}(F)$. Hence $\pi = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_{i \leq n} (\lambda\alpha.\nu) \in Cl(E \Rightarrow F)$ by induction hypothesis and remark 9.
 - If π is neutral and normal, let $\alpha \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\Delta \vdash \alpha : A_E$, then $\pi\alpha \in Cl(F)$. Moreover π is neutral and normal, therefore $\pi\alpha$ is normal, hence $\pi\alpha \in Cl^0(F)$. Then $\Delta \vdash \pi\alpha : A_F$ and $\Delta \vdash \pi : A_E \Rightarrow A_F$. Let $(\Gamma', \pi') \in E$, then $\Gamma' \vdash \pi' : A_E$, by (P_{\equiv}) , therefore $\Delta\Gamma' \vdash \pi\pi' : A_F$. Finally, as π is neutral and normal and $\pi' \in WN$, we have $\pi\pi' \in WN$, and $\pi\pi'$ is isolated, therefore $(\Delta\Gamma', \pi\pi') \in F$ as it satisfies $(P_{3\equiv})$. Hence $(\Delta, \pi) \in E \Rightarrow F$ and $\pi \in Cl^0(E \Rightarrow F)$, as it is normal.
 - Otherwise, $\pi \in SN$, is neutral and not normal. All its leaves are either neutral, either proof-abstractions and all these leaves are in $Cl(E) \Rightarrow Cl(F)$, as it satisfies (CR_2) , therefore they also are in $Cl(E \Rightarrow F)$, as we saw in the previous points. Finally, $\pi \in Cl(E \Rightarrow F)$, by lemma 14.

\forall -morphism

We prove now that for all sorts T and $f \in \mathring{A}_T$, $Cl(\mathring{\forall}_T f) = \tilde{\forall}_T Cl \circ f$. Notice that for all functions $f \in \mathring{A}_T$, $Cl \circ f \in \tilde{A}_T$.

Lemma 15. *For all $E \in \mathcal{D}_{\equiv}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, terms t and term-variables x of same sort, proof-terms π' , if $(t/x)\pi \in Cl^k(E)$, then $(\lambda x.\pi)t \in Cl^k(E)$.*

Proof. By induction on k .

- If $k = 0$, by $(P_{3\equiv})$.
- If $k > 0$, by induction hypothesis.

Proposition 5. *For all sorts T and $f \in \mathring{A}_T$, $Cl(\mathring{\forall}_T f) = \tilde{\forall}_T Cl \circ f$.*

Proof. \subseteq Let $\pi \in Cl(\mathring{\forall}_T f)$, then there exists (a minimal) $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\pi \in Cl^k(\mathring{\forall}_T f)$. By induction on k .

- If $k = 0$, $(\Delta, \pi) \in \mathring{\forall}_T f$ and $\pi \in SN$, then for all $t \in \hat{T}$, $(\Delta, \pi t) \in f(t)$, therefore $\pi t \in SN$ and its normal form is in $Cl^0 \circ f(t)$, hence $\pi t \in Cl \circ f(t)$, by lemma ???. Finally, $\pi \in \tilde{\forall}_T Cl \circ f$.

- If $k > 0$, then $\pi = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_i \nu$, with each μ_i neutral not normal and such that for all $(\rho_i)_{i \leq n}$ each respectively a leaf of μ_i , we have $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)_i \nu \in Cl^{k-1}(\check{\forall}_T f) \subseteq \check{\forall}_T Cl \circ f$, by induction hypothesis. Let $t \in \hat{T}$, then if we write $\nu' = \nu t$, we have $\pi t = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_i \nu'$ and for all $(\rho_i)_{i \leq n}$ each respectively a leaf of μ_i , $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)_i \nu' = (\rho_i/\alpha_i)_i \nu t \in Cl \circ f(t)$. Therefore $\pi t \in Cl \circ f(t)$ by remark 9. Finally, $\pi \in \check{\forall}_T Cl \circ f$.
- \supseteq Let $\pi \in \check{\forall}_T Cl \circ f$, then there exists a minimal $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that there exists $t \in \hat{T}$, $\pi t \in Cl^k \circ f(t)$. By induction on k .
 - If $k = 0$, then there exists $t \in \hat{T}$ such that $\pi t \in Cl^0 \circ f(t)$. Hence $(\Delta, \pi t) \in f(t)$ and πt is normal. Hence π is normal and for all $t' \in \hat{T}$, $\pi t'$ is also normal, therefore, as $\pi t' \in Cl \circ f(t)$, we have, in particular, $\pi t' \in Cl^0 \circ f(t)$. Finally, for all $t' \in \hat{T}$, $(\Delta, \pi t') \in f(t)$, therefore $(\Delta, \pi) \in \check{\forall}_T f$, and $\pi \in Cl^0(\check{\forall}_T f)$, as it is normal.
 - If $k > 0$, let $t \in \hat{T}$ such that $\pi t \in Cl^k \circ f(t)$. Therefore $\pi t = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_i \nu$, with each μ_i neutral not normal and such that for all $(\rho_i)_{i \leq n}$ each respectively a leaf of μ_i , we have $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)_i \nu \in Cl^{k-1} \circ f(t)$.
 - * If $\nu \neq \alpha_1$, then $\nu = \nu' t$, with $\pi = (\mu_i/\alpha_i)_i \nu'$, and for all $(\rho_i)_{i \leq n}$ each respectively a leaf of μ_i , we have $(\rho_i/\alpha_i)_i \nu' \in Cl(\check{\forall}_T f)$, by induction hypothesis. We conclude by lemma 14.
 - * Otherwise, every leaf of πt is in $Cl^{k-1} \circ f(t)$. If π is isolated, then all its leaves ρ are neutral and normal, hence ρt is a leaf of πt , therefore $\rho \in Cl(\check{\forall}_T f)$, by induction hypothesis, and we conclude by lemma 14. If π reduces to $\lambda x. \pi'$ then all leaves of $(t/x)\pi'$ are in $Cl^{k-1} \circ f(t)$, therefore, for all leaves ρ of π' , we have $(\lambda x. \rho)t \in Cl^{k-1} \circ f(t)$, by lemma 15, hence $\lambda x. \rho \in Cl(\check{\forall}_T f)$, by induction hypothesis. And finally, $\lambda x. \pi' \in Cl(\check{\forall}_T f)$, and so does π .

We finally get the following (second) completeness result:

Proposition 6.

If \mathcal{L}_{\equiv} is strongly normalizing, then $Cl \circ [\cdot]$ is a \mathcal{C}' -valued model of \mathcal{L}_{\equiv} (and each element of the model contains an infinity of proof-variables).

Proof. By lemma 1 and propositions 2, 3, 4, 5.

5 Soundness

We finally prove in this section, that having a \mathcal{C}' -valued model is also a sound condition of strongly normalizing theories \mathcal{L}_{\equiv} .

Lemma 16. *If $[\cdot]$ is a \mathcal{C}' -valued model of a theory \mathcal{L}_{\equiv} , such that each element of the model contains an infinity of proof-variables, then for all $A \in \mathcal{P}$, contexts Γ , $\varphi \in \text{VAL}(A) \cap \text{VAL}(\Gamma)$, $\pi \in \mathcal{T}$ and σ substitutions such that for all declarations $\alpha : B$ in Γ , $\sigma\alpha \in [B]_{\varphi}$, we have:*

$$\text{if } \Gamma \vdash \pi : A \text{ then } \sigma\varphi\pi \in [A]_{\varphi}.$$

Proof. By induction on the length of the derivation of $\Gamma \vdash \pi : A$. By case on the last rule used. If the last rule used is :

- axiom: in this case, π is a variable α , and Γ contains a declaration $\alpha : B$ with $A \equiv B$ (therefore $|A|_\varphi \equiv |B|_\varphi$). Then $\sigma\varphi\pi = \sigma\alpha \in \llbracket B \rrbracket_\varphi = \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi$.
- \Rightarrow -intro: in this case, π is an abstraction $\lambda\alpha.\tau$, and we have $\Gamma, \alpha : B \vdash \tau : C$ with $A \equiv B \Rightarrow C$. Hence, by induction hypothesis, if we choose α such that $\alpha \in \llbracket B \rrbracket_\varphi$, by α -conversion, we have $\sigma(\alpha/\alpha)\varphi\tau = \sigma\varphi\tau \in \llbracket C \rrbracket_\varphi$. Therefore $\sigma\varphi(\lambda\alpha.\tau) = \lambda\alpha.\sigma\varphi\tau \in \llbracket B \rrbracket_\varphi \Rightarrow \llbracket C \rrbracket_\varphi = \llbracket B \Rightarrow C \rrbracket_\varphi$.
- \Rightarrow -elim: in this case, π is an application $\rho\tau$, and we have $\Gamma \vdash \rho : C \equiv B \Rightarrow A$ and $\Gamma \vdash \tau : B$. Then $\sigma\varphi\tau \in \llbracket B \rrbracket_\varphi$, by induction hypothesis.
 - If $\sigma\varphi\rho$ is a proof-abstraction then ρ is a proof-abstraction $\lambda\alpha.\rho'$, and we have $\Gamma, \alpha : B \vdash \rho' : A$, therefore $(\sigma\varphi\tau/\alpha)\sigma\varphi\rho' \in \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi$, by induction hypothesis, hence $\sigma\varphi(\lambda\alpha.\rho' \tau) \in \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi$ as it satisfies (CR₃').
 - If $\sigma\varphi\rho$ is neutral and normal, as $\sigma\varphi\rho \in \llbracket A \Rightarrow B \rrbracket_\varphi = \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi \Rightarrow \llbracket B \rrbracket_\varphi$, we have $\sigma\varphi(\rho\tau) \in \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi$.
 - Otherwise, $\sigma\varphi\rho$ is neutral and not normal and all its leaves μ satisfy $\mu(\sigma\varphi\tau) \in \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi$ as we saw in the previous points.

Finally, $\sigma\varphi(\rho\tau) \in \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi$ as it satisfies (CR₃).

- \forall -intro: in this case, π is a term abstraction $\lambda x.\pi'$ and we have $\Gamma \vdash \pi' : B$ with $A \equiv \forall x.B$. Let $t \in \hat{T}$ (with T the sort of x), and $\varphi' = \varphi + \langle x, t \rangle$. Then $\sigma\varphi'\pi' = \sigma\varphi(t/x)\pi' \in \llbracket B \rrbracket_{\varphi'}$, by induction hypothesis. Therefore, $\sigma\varphi(\lambda x.\pi') \in \check{\forall}_T(t \mapsto \llbracket B \rrbracket_{\varphi + \langle x, t \rangle}) = \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi$ (by induction on the maximal length of a reductions sequence from πt , with $t \in \hat{T}$, using the fact that for all $t \in \hat{T}$, $\llbracket B \rrbracket_{\varphi + \langle x, t \rangle}$ satisfies (CR₂) and (CR₃')).
- \forall -elim: in this case, π is an application ρt , and we have $\Gamma \vdash \rho : \forall x.B$ with $A = (t/x)B$ and $x \notin FV(\Gamma)$. By induction hypothesis, we have $\sigma\varphi\rho \in \llbracket \forall x.B, \varphi \rrbracket = \check{\forall}_T(t \mapsto \llbracket B \rrbracket_{\varphi + \langle x, t \rangle})$. Therefore $\sigma\varphi(\rho t) = \sigma\varphi\rho(\varphi t) \in \llbracket B \rrbracket_{\varphi + \langle x, \varphi t \rangle} = \llbracket (t/x)B \rrbracket_\varphi = \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi$.

Theorem 1. *If \mathcal{L}_\equiv has a \mathcal{C}' -valued model (such that each element contains an infinite number of variables), then \mathcal{L}_\equiv is strongly normalizing.*

Proof. If \mathcal{F} is a \mathcal{C}' -valued model of \equiv then for all typing judgement $\Gamma \vdash \pi : A$ and σ and φ as in the previous proposition, we have $\sigma\varphi\pi \in \llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi \neq \emptyset$ hence $\sigma\varphi\pi \in SN$, therefore $\pi \in SN$.

6 Rice Salad

Theorem 2. *If \mathcal{L}_\equiv is weakly normalizing then it is strongly normalizing.*

References

1. A. Church, A formulation of the simple theory of types, *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 5:56–68, 1940.
2. D. Cousineau, A completeness theorem for strong normalization in minimal deduction modulo, *submitted*.
3. D. Cousineau and G. Dowek, Embedding Pure Types Systems in the lambda Pi-calculus modulo, *Typed Lambda calculi and Applications*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 4583, Springer. pp. 102-117. 2007.
4. G.Dowek. Truth values algebras and proof normalization. *Types for proofs and programs*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 4502. 2007, pp. 110-124.
5. G.Dowek, T.Hardin, and C.Kirchner. Theorem proving modulo. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 31:32–72, 2003.
6. G.Dowek, T.Hardin, and C.Kirchner. HOL-lambda-sigma: an intentional first-order expression of higher-order logic. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 11:1–25, 2001.
7. G.Dowek and A. Miquel, Cut elimination for Zermelo set theory, *manuscript*, 2007.
8. G.Dowek and B.Werner. Proof normalization modulo. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 68(4):1289–1316, 2003.
9. G.Dowek and B.Werner. Arithmetic as a theory modulo. J. Giesel (Ed.), *Term rewriting and applications*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 3467, Springer-Verlag, 2005, pp. 423-437.
10. M. Fiore, G. Plotkin and D. Turi. Abstract syntax and variable binding. *14th Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 193–202, 1999.
11. J.-Y. Girard. Une extension de l’interprétation de Gödel à l’analyse, et son application à l’élimination des coupures dans l’analyse et la théorie des types. In J.Fenstad, editor, *2nd Scandinavian Logic Symposium*, pages 63–92. North Holland, 1971.
12. K.Gödel. Über die Vollständigkeit des Logikkalküls. *Doctoral dissertation*, University Of Vienna. 1929.
13. M. Hamana, Universal Algebra for Termination of Higher-Order Rewriting, *16th International Conference on Rewriting Techniques and Applications*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 3467, Springer, pp. 135-149, 2005.
14. O.Hermant. A model based cut elimination proof. In *2nd St-Petersbourg Days in Logic and Computability*, 2003.
15. O.Hermant. *Méthodes sémantiques en déduction modulo*. Doctoral Thesis. Université de Paris 7, 2005.
16. P.A.Melliès, B.Werner. A Generic Normalization Proof for Pure Type Systems. *Types for proofs and programs*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1512. 1996.
17. C. Riba. On the Stability by Union of Reducibility Candidates. *10th International Conference on Foundations of Software Science and Computational Structures*, pp 317-331. (2007)
18. W.W. Tait. Intentional interpretations of functionals of finite type I. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 32:198–212, 1967.