

A computational definition of the notion of vectorial space

Pablo Arrighi* Gilles Dowek†

Abstract

We usually define an algebraic structure by a set, some operations defined on this set and some propositions that the algebraic structure must validate. In some cases, we can replace these propositions by an algorithm on terms constructed upon these operations that the algebraic structure must validate. We show in this note that this is the case for the notions of vectorial space and bilinear operation.

An algorithm defined by a confluent and terminating rewrite system R on terms of a language \mathcal{L} is said to be *valid* in a structure \mathcal{M} on the language \mathcal{L} if for each rule $l \rightarrow r$ and assignment ϕ , we have $\llbracket l \rrbracket_\phi = \llbracket r \rrbracket_\phi$. Thus, algorithms and theories play the same role with respect to the notion of model: like a theory, an algorithm may or may not be valid in a model. This notion of validity of an algorithm, like the notion of validity of a theory, can be used in two ways: to study the algorithms or to define algebraic structures as models of some algorithm.

When a class of algebraic structures — such as the class of groups or that of rings — can be defined as the class of models of some equational theory T and this equational theory can be transformed into a rewrite system R , we have the following equivalence

- A is a member of the class (i.e. is a group, a ring, ...),
- A is a model of the theory T ,
- A is a model of the algorithm R .

In this case, we say that the class of algebraic structures has a *computational definition*.

The goal of this note is to show that the class of vectorial spaces has such a computational definition, *i.e.* that the axioms of vectorial spaces can be oriented as a rewrite system. Moreover, the algorithm obtained this way is a well-known algorithm in linear algebra: it is an algorithm transforming any term expressing a vector into a linear combination of the unknowns. This algorithm is also central to the operational semantic of our functional programming language

*Institut Gaspard Monge, 5 Bd Descartes, Champs-sur-Marne, 77574 Marne-la-Vallée Cedex 2, France, arrighi@univ-mlv.fr.

†École polytechnique and INRIA, LIX, École polytechnique, 91128 Palaiseau Cedex, France, Gilles.Dowek@polytechnique.fr.

for quantum computing **Lineal** [1], because in such languages a program and its input value form a term expressing a vector whose value, the output, is a linear combination of the base vectors. More generally, several algorithms used in linear algebra, such as matrix multiplication algorithms, transform a term expressing a vector with various constructs into a linear combination of base vectors. This algorithm is valid in all vectorial spaces and we show that it moreover completely defines the notion of vectorial space.

The main difficulty to orient the theory of vectorial spaces is that this theory has a sort for vectors and a sort for scalars and that the scalars must form a field. The theory of fields is already difficult to orient, because division is a partial operation. However, there are many fields, for instance the field \mathbb{Q} of rational numbers, whose addition and multiplication can be presented by a terminating and ground confluent rewrite system. Thus, we shall not consider an arbitrary vectorial space over an arbitrary field. Instead, we consider a given field \mathcal{K} defined by a terminating and ground confluent rewrite system S and focus on \mathcal{K} -vectorial spaces. Our rewrite system for vectors will thus be parametrized by a rewrite system for scalars and we will have to provide proofs of confluence and termination using minimal requirements on the scalar rewrite system. This leads to a new method to prove the confluence of a rewrite system built as the union of two systems.

Moreover, this computational definition of the notion of vectorial space can be extended to define other algebraic notions such as bilinear operations.

1 Rewrite systems

Definition 1.1 (Rewriting) *Let \mathcal{L} be a first-order language and R be a rewrite system on \mathcal{L} . We say that a term t R -rewrites in one step to a term u if and only if there is an occurrence α in the term t , a rewrite rule $l \rightarrow r$ in R , and a substitution σ such that $t|_{\alpha} = \sigma l$ and $u = t[\sigma r]_{\alpha}$.*

Definition 1.2 (Associative-Commutative Rewriting) *Let \mathcal{L} be a first-order language containing binary function symbols f_1, \dots, f_n and R be a rewrite system on \mathcal{L} . We say that a term t $R/AC(f_1, \dots, f_n)$ -rewrites in one step to a term u if and only if there is a term t' , an occurrence α in the term t' , a rewrite rule $l \rightarrow r$ in R , and a substitution σ such that $t' =_{AC} t$, $t'|_{\alpha} = \sigma l$ and $u =_{AC} t'[\sigma r]_{\alpha}$.*

Remark: This notion must be distinguished from that of R, AC -rewriting [3] where a term t rewrites to a term u only when it has a subterm AC-equivalent to an instance of the left hand side of a rewrite rule. For instance with the rule $x + x \rightarrow 2.x$ the term $t + (u + t)$ R/AC -rewrites to $2.t + u$ but is R, AC -normal.

2 Models

Definition 2.1 (Algebra) Let \mathcal{L} be a first-order language. An \mathcal{L} -algebra is a family formed by a set M and for each symbol f of \mathcal{L} of arity n , a function \hat{f} from M^n to M . The denotation $\llbracket t \rrbracket_\phi$ of a term t for an assignment ϕ mapping variables to elements of M is defined as usual.

Definition 2.2 (Model of a rewrite system) Let \mathcal{L} be a first-order language and R an algorithm defined by a rewrite system on terms of the language \mathcal{L} . An \mathcal{L} -algebra \mathcal{M} is a model of the algorithm R , or the algorithm R is valid in the model \mathcal{M} , ($\mathcal{M} \models R$) if for all rewrite rules $l \longrightarrow r$ of the rewrite system and valuations ϕ , $\llbracket l \rrbracket_\phi = \llbracket r \rrbracket_\phi$.

Definition 2.3 (Model of an AC-rewrite system) Let \mathcal{L} be a first-order language containing binary function symbols f_1, \dots, f_n , and R an algorithm defined by an $AC(f_1, \dots, f_n)$ -rewrite system on terms of the language \mathcal{L} . An \mathcal{L} -algebra \mathcal{M} is a model of the algorithm R ($\mathcal{M} \models R$) if

- for all rewrite rules $l \longrightarrow r$ of R and valuations ϕ , $\llbracket l \rrbracket_\phi = \llbracket r \rrbracket_\phi$,
- for all valuations ϕ and indices i

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket f_i(x, f_i(y, z)) \rrbracket_\phi &= \llbracket f_i(f_i(x, y), z) \rrbracket_\phi \\ \llbracket f_i(x, y) \rrbracket_\phi &= \llbracket f_i(y, x) \rrbracket_\phi\end{aligned}$$

Example: Consider the language \mathcal{L} formed by two binary symbols $+$ and \times and the algorithm R defined by the rules

$$\begin{aligned}(x + y) \times z &\longrightarrow (x \times z) + (y \times z) \\ x \times (y + z) &\longrightarrow (x \times y) + (x \times z)\end{aligned}$$

transforming for instance, the term $(a + a) \times a$ to the term $a \times a + a \times a$. The structure $\langle \{0, 1\}, \min, \max \rangle$ is a model of this algorithm.

Remark: This definition of the validity of an algorithm in a model extends some definitions of the semantics of a programming language where a semantic is defined by a set M , a function $[]$ mapping values of the language to elements of M and n -ary programs to functions from M^n to M , such that the program P taking the values v_1, \dots, v_n as input produces the value w as output if and only if $[w] = [P]([v_1], \dots, [v_n])$.

Indeed, let us consider a programming language where the set of values is defined by a first-order language, whose symbols are called *constructors*. Consider an extension of this language with a function symbol p and possibly other function symbols. A program P in this language is given by a terminating and confluent rewrite system on the extended language, such that for any n -uple of values v_1, \dots, v_n the program P taking the values v_1, \dots, v_n as input produces the

value w as output if and only if the normal form of the term $p(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ is w . Then, a model of this rewrite system is formed by a set M , for each constructor c of arity m , a function \hat{c} from M^m to M , a function \hat{p} from M^n to M , and possibly other functions, such that for all rules $l \longrightarrow r$ of the rewrite system and valuations ϕ , $\llbracket l \rrbracket_\phi = \llbracket r \rrbracket_\phi$.

The denotations of the constructors define the function $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ above mapping values to elements of M and the function \hat{p} is the function $\llbracket P \rrbracket$. For any n -uple of values v_1, \dots, v_n , if the normal form of the term $p(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ is the value w then $\llbracket w \rrbracket = \hat{p}(\llbracket v_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket v_n \rrbracket)$ and thus $\llbracket w \rrbracket = \llbracket P \rrbracket(\llbracket v_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket v_n \rrbracket)$.

3 Computing linear combinations of the unknowns

3.1 An algorithm

Let \mathcal{L} be a 2-sorted language with a sort K for scalars and a sort E for vectors containing two binary symbols $+$ and \times of rank $\langle K, K, K \rangle$, two constants 0 and 1 of sort K , a binary symbol, also written $+$, of rank $\langle E, E, E \rangle$, a binary symbol \cdot of rank $\langle K, E, E \rangle$ and a constant $\mathbf{0}$ of sort E .

To transform a term of sort E into a linear combination of the unknowns, we want to develop sums of vectors

$$\lambda.(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) \longrightarrow \lambda.\mathbf{u} + \lambda.\mathbf{v}$$

but factor sums of scalars and nested products

$$\lambda.\mathbf{u} + \mu.\mathbf{u} \longrightarrow (\lambda + \mu).\mathbf{u}$$

$$\lambda.(\mu.\mathbf{u}) \longrightarrow (\lambda \times \mu).\mathbf{u}$$

we also need the trivial rules

$$\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{0} \longrightarrow \mathbf{u}$$

$$0.\mathbf{u} \longrightarrow \mathbf{0}$$

$$1.\mathbf{u} \longrightarrow \mathbf{u}$$

and, finally, three more rules for confluence

$$\lambda.\mathbf{0} \longrightarrow \mathbf{0}$$

$$\lambda.\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \longrightarrow (\lambda + 1).\mathbf{u}$$

$$\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \longrightarrow (1 + 1).\mathbf{u}$$

As we want to be able to apply the factorization rule to a term of the form $(3.\mathbf{x} + 4.\mathbf{y}) + 2.\mathbf{x}$, reductions in the above rewrite system must be defined modulo the associativity and commutativity of $+$. This leads to the following definition.

Definition 3.1 (The rewrite system R) *The rewrite system R is the $AC(+)$ -rewrite system*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{0} &\longrightarrow \mathbf{u} \\
\mathbf{0}.\mathbf{u} &\longrightarrow \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{1}.\mathbf{u} &\longrightarrow \mathbf{u} \\
\lambda.\mathbf{0} &\longrightarrow \mathbf{0} \\
\lambda.(\mu.\mathbf{u}) &\longrightarrow (\lambda.\mu).\mathbf{u} \\
\lambda.\mathbf{u} + \mu.\mathbf{u} &\longrightarrow (\lambda + \mu).\mathbf{u} \\
\lambda.\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} &\longrightarrow (\lambda + 1).\mathbf{u} \\
\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} &\longrightarrow (1 + 1).\mathbf{u} \\
\lambda.(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) &\longrightarrow \lambda.\mathbf{u} + \lambda.\mathbf{v}
\end{aligned}$$

Definition 3.2 (Scalar rewrite system) *A scalar rewrite system is a rewrite system on a language containing at least the symbols $+$, \times , 0 and 1 such that:*

- S is terminating and ground confluent,
- for all closed terms λ , μ and ν , the pair of terms
 - $0 + \lambda$ and λ ,
 - $0 \times \lambda$ and 0 ,
 - $1 \times \lambda$ and λ ,
 - $\lambda \times (\mu + \nu)$ and $(\lambda \times \mu) + (\lambda \times \nu)$,
 - $(\lambda + \mu) + \nu$ and $\lambda + (\mu + \nu)$,
 - $\lambda + \mu$ and $\mu + \lambda$,
 - $(\lambda \times \mu) \times \nu$ and $\lambda \times (\mu \times \nu)$,
 - $\lambda \times \mu$ and $\mu \times \lambda$

have the same normal forms,

- 0 and 1 are normal terms.

We now want to prove that the for any scalar rewrite system S , the system $R \cup S$ is terminating and confluent.

3.2 Termination

Proposition 3.1 *The system R terminates.*

Proof: Consider the following interpretation (compatible with AC)

$$|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}| = 2 + |\mathbf{u}| + |\mathbf{v}|$$

$$|\lambda.\mathbf{u}| = 1 + 2|\mathbf{u}|$$

$$|\mathbf{0}| = 0$$

Each time a term \mathbf{t} rewrites to a term \mathbf{t}' we have $|\mathbf{t}| > |\mathbf{t}'|$. Hence, the system terminates. \square

Proposition 3.2 *For any scalar rewrite system S , the system $R \cup S$ terminates.*

Proof: By definition of the function $|\cdot|$, if a term \mathbf{t} S -reduces to a term \mathbf{t}' then $|\mathbf{t}| = |\mathbf{t}'|$. Consider a $(R \cup S)$ -reduction sequence. At each R -reduction step, the measure of the term strictly decreases and at each S -reduction step it remains the same. Thus there are only a finite number of R -reduction steps in the sequence and, as S terminates, the sequence is finite. \square

3.3 Confluence

Definition 3.3 (The rewrite system S_0) *The system S_0 is formed by the rules*

$$0 + \lambda \longrightarrow \lambda$$

$$0 \times \lambda \longrightarrow 0$$

$$1 \times \lambda \longrightarrow \lambda$$

$$\lambda \times (\mu + \nu) \longrightarrow (\lambda \times \mu) + (\lambda \times \nu)$$

where $+$ and \times are AC symbols.

Proposition 3.3 *The rewrite system S_0 terminates.*

Proof: Consider the following interpretation (compatible with AC)

$$||\lambda + \mu|| = ||\lambda|| + ||\mu|| + 1$$

$$||\lambda \times \mu|| = ||\lambda|| ||\mu||$$

$$||0|| = ||1|| = 2$$

Notice that all terms are worth at least 2 and thus that each time a term t rewrites to a term t' we have $||t|| > ||t'||$. Hence, the system terminates. \square

Proposition 3.4 *The system $R \cup S_0$ terminates.*

Proof: By definition of the function $|\cdot|$, if a term \mathbf{t} S_0 -reduces to a term \mathbf{t}' then $|\mathbf{t}| = |\mathbf{t}'|$. Consider a $(R \cup S_0)$ -reduction sequence. At each R -reduction step, the measure of the term strictly decreases and at each S_0 -reduction step, it remains the same. Thus there are only a finite number of R -reduction steps in the sequence and, as S_0 terminates, by Proposition 3.3, the sequence is finite. \square

Proposition 3.5 *The rewrite system $R \cup S_0$ is confluent.*

Proof: As the system terminates by Proposition 3.4, it is sufficient to prove the all critical pair close. This can be mechanically checked, for instance using the system CIME¹. \square

Definition 3.4 (Subsumption) *A terminating and confluent relation S subsumes a relation S_0 if whenever $t S_0 u$, t and u have the same S -normal form.*

Definition 3.5 (Commutation) *The relation R commutes with the relation R' , if whenever $\mathbf{t} R \mathbf{u}_1$ and $\mathbf{t} R' \mathbf{u}_2$, there exists a term \mathbf{w} such that $\mathbf{u}_1 R' \mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{u}_2 R \mathbf{w}$.*

Proposition 3.6 *Let S be a scalar rewrite system, then R commutes with the reflexive-transitive closure S^* of S .*

Proof: We check this for each rule of R , using the fact that in the left member of a rule, each subterms of sort scalar is either a variables or 0 or 1, which are normal forms. \square

Proposition 3.7 (Key Lemma) *Let R , S and S_0 be three relations defined on a set such that S is terminating and confluent, $R \cup S$ terminates, $R \cup S_0$ is confluent, S subsumes S_0 and the relation R commutes with S^* . Then, the relation $R \cup S$ is confluent.*

Proof: We write \mathbf{t}^\downarrow for the S -normal form of \mathbf{t} . We define the relation S^\downarrow by $\mathbf{t} S^\downarrow \mathbf{u}$ if \mathbf{u} is the S -normal form of \mathbf{t} and the relation $R; S^\downarrow$ by $\mathbf{t} (R; S^\downarrow) \mathbf{u}$ if there exists a term \mathbf{v} such that $\mathbf{t} R \mathbf{v} S^\downarrow \mathbf{u}$.

First notice that, if $\mathbf{t} R \mathbf{u}$ then $\mathbf{t}^\downarrow (R; S^\downarrow) \mathbf{u}^\downarrow$ using the commutation of R and S^* and the unicity of S -normal forms. Thus if $\mathbf{t} (R \cup S)^* \mathbf{u}$ then $\mathbf{t}^\downarrow (R; S^\downarrow)^* \mathbf{u}^\downarrow$ simulating each R -reduction step by a $(R; S^\downarrow)$ -reduction step on normal forms. In a similar way, if $\mathbf{t} (R \cup S_0)^* \mathbf{u}$ then $\mathbf{t}^\downarrow (R; S^\downarrow)^* \mathbf{u}^\downarrow$, simulating each R -reduction step by a $(R; S^\downarrow)$ -reduction step on normal forms and using the subsumption of S_0 by S for S_0 -steps.

¹<http://cime.lri.fr/>

We then check that $R; S^\downarrow$ is locally confluent. If $\mathbf{t} (R; S^\downarrow) \mathbf{v}_1$ and $\mathbf{t} (R; S^\downarrow) \mathbf{v}_2$ then there exist terms \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{u}_2 such that $\mathbf{t} R \mathbf{u}_1 S^\downarrow \mathbf{v}_1$ and $\mathbf{t} R \mathbf{u}_2 S^\downarrow \mathbf{v}_2$. Thus, by confluence, of $R \cup S_0$, there exists a term \mathbf{w} such that $\mathbf{u}_1 (R \cup S_0)^* \mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{u}_2 (R \cup S_0)^* \mathbf{w}$. Thus $\mathbf{u}_1 \downarrow (R; S^\downarrow)^* \mathbf{w} \downarrow$ and $\mathbf{u}_2 \downarrow (R; S^\downarrow)^* \mathbf{w} \downarrow$ i.e. $\mathbf{v}_1 (R; S^\downarrow)^* \mathbf{w} \downarrow$ and $\mathbf{v}_2 (R; S^\downarrow)^* \mathbf{w} \downarrow$.

As the relation $R; S^\downarrow$ is locally confluent and terminating, it is confluent.

Finally, if we have $\mathbf{t} (R \cup S)^* \mathbf{u}_1$ and $\mathbf{t} (R \cup S)^* \mathbf{u}_2$ then we have $\mathbf{t} \downarrow (R; S^\downarrow)^* \mathbf{u}_1 \downarrow$ and $\mathbf{t} \downarrow (R; S^\downarrow)^* \mathbf{u}_2 \downarrow$. Thus, there exists a term \mathbf{w} such that $\mathbf{u}_1 \downarrow (R; S^\downarrow)^* \mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{u}_2 \downarrow (R; S^\downarrow)^* \mathbf{w}$. Thus $\mathbf{u}_1 (R \cup S)^* \mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{u}_2 (R \cup S)^* \mathbf{w}$. \square

Proposition 3.8 *Let S be a scalar rewrite system. The rewrite system $R \cup S$ is confluent on terms containing variables of sort E but no variables of sort K .*

Proof: We use the Key Lemma on the set of semi-open terms, i.e. terms with variables of sort E but no variables of sort K . As S is ground confluent and terminating, it is confluent and terminating on semi-open terms, by Proposition 3.2, the system $R \cup S$ terminates, by Proposition 3.5, the system $R \cup S_0$ is confluent, the system S subsumes S_0 because S is a scalar rewrite system, and by Proposition 3.6, the system R commutes with S^* . \square

Remark: Confluence on semi-open terms implies ground confluence in any extension of the language with constants for vectors, typically base vectors.

3.4 Normal forms

Proposition 3.9 *Let \mathbf{t} be a normal term whose variables are among $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$. The term \mathbf{t} is $\mathbf{0}$ or a term of the form $\lambda_1 \cdot \mathbf{x}_{i_1} + \dots + \lambda_k \cdot \mathbf{x}_{i_k} + \mathbf{x}_{i_{k+1}} + \dots + \mathbf{x}_{i_{k+l}}$ where the indices i_1, \dots, i_{k+l} are distinct and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ are neither 0 nor 1.*

Proof: The term \mathbf{t} is a sum $\mathbf{u}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{u}_n$ of normal terms that are not sums (we take $n = 1$ if \mathbf{t} is not a sum).

A normal term that is not a sum is either $\mathbf{0}$, a variable, or a term of the form $\lambda \cdot \mathbf{v}$. In this case, λ is neither 0 nor 1 and \mathbf{v} is neither $\mathbf{0}$, nor a sum of two vectors nor a product of a scalar by a vector, thus it is a variable.

As the term \mathbf{t} is normal, if $n > 1$ then none of the \mathbf{u}_i is $\mathbf{0}$. Hence, the term \mathbf{t} is either $\mathbf{0}$ or a term of the form

$$\lambda_1 \cdot \mathbf{x}_{i_1} + \dots + \lambda_k \cdot \mathbf{x}_{i_k} + \mathbf{x}_{i_{k+1}} + \dots + \mathbf{x}_{i_{k+l}}$$

where $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ are neither 0 nor 1. As the term \mathbf{t} is normal, the indices i_1, \dots, i_{k+l} are distinct. \square

4 Vectorial spaces

Given a field $\mathcal{K} = \langle K, +, \times, 0, 1 \rangle$ the class of \mathcal{K} -vectorial spaces can be defined as follows.

Definition 4.1 (Vectorial space) *The structure $\langle E, +, \cdot, \mathbf{0} \rangle$ is a \mathcal{K} -vectorial space if and only if the structure $\langle K, +, \times, 0, 1, E, +, \cdot, \mathbf{0} \rangle$ is a model of the 2-sorted theory.*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \forall \mathbf{u} \forall \mathbf{v} \forall \mathbf{w} ((\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w})) \\
& \forall \mathbf{u} \forall \mathbf{v} (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) \\
& \forall \mathbf{u} (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{u}) \\
& \forall \mathbf{u} \exists \mathbf{u}' (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}' = \mathbf{0}) \\
& \forall \mathbf{u} (1.\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}) \\
& \forall \lambda \forall \mu \forall \mathbf{u} (\lambda.(\mu.\mathbf{u}) = (\lambda.\mu).\mathbf{u}) \\
& \forall \lambda \forall \mu \forall \mathbf{u} ((\lambda + \mu).\mathbf{u} = \lambda.\mathbf{u} + \mu.\mathbf{u}) \\
& \forall \lambda \forall \mathbf{u} \forall \mathbf{v} (\lambda.(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) = \lambda.\mathbf{u} + \lambda.\mathbf{v})
\end{aligned}$$

We now prove that, the class of \mathcal{K} -vectorial spaces can be defined as the class of models of the rewrite system R .

Proposition 4.1 *Let $\mathcal{K} = \langle K, +, \times, 0, 1 \rangle$ be a field. The structure $\langle E, +, \cdot, \mathbf{0} \rangle$ is a \mathcal{K} -vectorial space if and only if the structure $\langle K, +, \times, 0, 1, E, +, \cdot, \mathbf{0} \rangle$ is a model of the rewrite system R .*

Proof: We first check that all the rules of R are valid in all vectorial spaces, i.e. that the propositions

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}) \\
& \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u} \\
& \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{u} \\
& 0.\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0} \\
& 1.\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u} \\
& \lambda.\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0} \\
& \lambda.(\mu.\mathbf{u}) = (\lambda.\mu).\mathbf{u} \\
& \lambda.\mathbf{u} + \mu.\mathbf{u} = (\lambda + \mu).\mathbf{u} \\
& \lambda.\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} = (\lambda + 1).\mathbf{u} \\
& \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} = (1 + 1).\mathbf{u} \\
& \lambda.(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) = \lambda.\mathbf{u} + \lambda.\mathbf{v}
\end{aligned}$$

are theorems of the theory of vectorial spaces.

Seven of them are axioms of the theory of vectorial spaces, the propositions $\lambda.\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} = (\lambda + 1).\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} = (1 + 1).\mathbf{u}$ are consequence of $1.\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}$ and $\lambda.\mathbf{u} + \mu.\mathbf{u} = (\lambda + \mu).\mathbf{u}$. Let us prove that $0.\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$. Let \mathbf{u}' be such that $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}' = \mathbf{0}$. Then $0.\mathbf{u} = 0.\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{0} = 0.\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}' = 0.\mathbf{u} + 1.\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}' = 1.\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}' = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}' = \mathbf{0}$. Finally $\lambda.\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$ is a consequence of $0.\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\lambda.(\mu.\mathbf{u}) = (\lambda.\mu).\mathbf{u}$.

Conversely, we prove that all axioms of vectorial spaces are valid in all models of R . The validity of each of them is a consequence of the validity of a rewrite rule, except $\forall \mathbf{u} \exists \mathbf{u}' (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}' = \mathbf{0})$ that is a consequence of $\mathbf{u} + (-1).\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ itself being a consequence of $\lambda.\mathbf{u} + \mu.\mathbf{u} = (\lambda + \mu).\mathbf{u}$ and $0.\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$. \square

Proposition 4.2 (Universality) *Let \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{u} be two terms whose variables are among $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$. The following propositions are equivalent:*

1. *the normal forms of \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{u} are identical modulo AC,*
2. *the equation $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{u}$ is valid in all K -vectorial spaces,*
3. *and the denotation of \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{u} in K^n for the assignment $\phi = \mathbf{e}_1/\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n/\mathbf{x}_n$, where $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$ is the canonical base of K^n , are identical.*

Proof: Proposition (i) implies proposition (ii) and proposition (ii) implies proposition (iii). Let us prove that proposition (iii) implies proposition (i).

Let \mathbf{t} be a normal term whose variables are among $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$. The *decomposition* of \mathbf{t} along $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ is the sequence $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ such that if there is a subterm of the form $\lambda.\mathbf{x}_i$ in \mathbf{t} , then $\alpha_i = \lambda$, if there is a subterm of the form \mathbf{x}_i in \mathbf{t} , then $\alpha_i = 1$, and $\alpha_i = 0$ otherwise.

Assume $\llbracket \mathbf{t} \rrbracket_\phi = \llbracket \mathbf{u} \rrbracket_\phi$. Let $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$ be the canonical base of K^n and $\phi = \mathbf{e}_1/\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n/\mathbf{x}_n$. Call $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ the coordinates of $\llbracket \mathbf{t} \rrbracket_\phi$ in $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$. Then the decompositions of the normal forms of \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{u} are both $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ and thus they are identical modulo AC. \square

5 Bilinearity

5.1 An algorithm

Definition 5.1 (The rewrite system R') *Consider a language with four sorts: K for scalars and E , F , and G for the vectors of three vector spaces, the symbols $+$, \times , 0 , 1 for scalars, three copies of the symbols $+$, $.$ and $\mathbf{0}$ for each sort E , F , and G and a symbol \otimes of rank $\langle E, F, G \rangle$.*

The system R' is the rewrite system formed by three copies of the rules of the system R and the rules

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) \otimes \mathbf{w} &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{w}) + (\mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{w}) \\ (\lambda.\mathbf{u}) \otimes \mathbf{v} &\longrightarrow \lambda.(\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{v}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{u} \otimes (\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{v}) + (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{w})$$

$$\mathbf{u} \otimes (\lambda.\mathbf{v}) \longrightarrow \lambda.(\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{v})$$

$$\mathbf{0} \otimes \mathbf{u} \longrightarrow \mathbf{0}$$

$$\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{0} \longrightarrow \mathbf{0}$$

Proposition 5.1 *The rewrite system R' terminates.*

Proof: We extend the interpretation of Definition 3.1 with

$$|\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{v}| = (3|\mathbf{u}| + 2)(3|\mathbf{v}| + 2)$$

□

Proposition 5.2 *For any scalar rewrite system S , the system $R' \cup S$ terminates.*

Proof: As in Proposition 3.2. □

Proposition 5.3 *The system $R' \cup S_0$ terminates.*

Proof: As in Proposition 3.4. □

Proposition 5.4 *The rewrite system $R' \cup S_0$ is confluent.*

Proof: As in the proof of Proposition 3.5, we prove local confluence by checking that all critical pair close. □

Proposition 5.5 *Let S be a scalar rewrite system, then R' commutes with S^* .*

Proof: As in the proof of Proposition 3.6. □

Proposition 5.6 *Let S be a scalar rewrite system. The rewrite system $R' \cup S$ is confluent on terms containing variables of sort E , F , and G but no variables of sort K .*

Proof: Using the Key Lemma. □

Proposition 5.7 *Let \mathbf{t} be a normal term whose variables of sort E are among $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$, whose variables of sort F are among $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_p$, and that has no variables of sort G and K . If \mathbf{t} has sort E or F , then it has the same form as in Proposition 3.9. If it has sort G , then it has the form*

$$\lambda_1.(\mathbf{x}_{i_1} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{j_1}) + \dots + \lambda_k.(\mathbf{x}_{i_k} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{j_k}) + (\mathbf{x}_{i_{k+1}} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{j_{k+1}}) + \dots + (\mathbf{x}_{i_{k+l}} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{j_{k+l}})$$

where the pairs of indices $\langle i_1, j_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle i_{k+l}, j_{k+l} \rangle$ are distinct and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ are neither 0 nor 1.

Proof: The term \mathbf{t} is a sum $\mathbf{u}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{u}_n$ of normal terms that are not sums (we take $n = 1$ if \mathbf{t} is not a sum).

A normal term that is not a sum is either $\mathbf{0}$, a term of the form $\mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{w}$, or of the form $\lambda.\mathbf{v}$. In this case, λ is neither 0 nor 1 and \mathbf{v} is neither $\mathbf{0}$, nor a sum of two vectors nor a product of a scalar by a vector, thus it is of the form $\mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{w}$.

In a term of the form $\mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{w}$, neither \mathbf{v} nor \mathbf{w} is a sum, a product of a scalar by a vector or $\mathbf{0}$. Thus both \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} are variables.

As the term \mathbf{t} is normal, if $n > 1$ then none of the \mathbf{u}_i is $\mathbf{0}$. Hence, the term \mathbf{t} is either $\mathbf{0}$ or a term of the form $\lambda_1.(\mathbf{x}_{i_1} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{j_1}) + \dots + \lambda_k.(\mathbf{x}_{i_k} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{j_k}) + (\mathbf{x}_{i_{k+1}} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{j_{k+1}}) + \dots + (\mathbf{x}_{i_{k+l}} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{j_{k+l}})$ where $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ are neither 0 nor 1. As the term \mathbf{t} is normal, the pairs of indices are distinct. \square

5.2 Bilinearity

Definition 5.2 (Bilinear operation) *Let E, F , and G be three vectorial spaces on the same field. An operation \otimes from $E \times F$ to G is said to be bilinear if*

$$(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) \otimes \mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{w}) + (\mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{w})$$

$$(\lambda.\mathbf{u}) \otimes \mathbf{v} = \lambda.(\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{v})$$

$$\mathbf{u} \otimes (\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}) = (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{v}) + (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{w})$$

$$\mathbf{u} \otimes (\lambda.\mathbf{v}) = \lambda.(\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{v})$$

Proposition 5.8 *Let $\mathcal{K} = \langle K, +, \times, 0, 1 \rangle$ be a field. The structures $\langle E, +, ., \mathbf{0} \rangle$, $\langle F, +, ., \mathbf{0} \rangle$, $\langle G, +, ., \mathbf{0} \rangle$ are \mathcal{K} -vectorial spaces and \otimes is a bilinear operation from $E \times F$ to G if and only if $\langle K, +, \times, 0, 1, E, +, ., \mathbf{0}, F, +, ., \mathbf{0}, G, +, ., \mathbf{0}, \otimes \rangle$ is a model of the system R' .*

Proof: The validity of the rules of the three copies of the system R , express that $\langle E, +, ., \mathbf{0} \rangle$, $\langle F, +, ., \mathbf{0} \rangle$, $\langle G, +, ., \mathbf{0} \rangle$ are \mathcal{K} -vectorial spaces. The validity of the six other rules is the validity of the axioms of Definition 5.2 plus the two extra propositions $\mathbf{0} \otimes \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$ that are consequences of these axioms. \square

Definition 5.3 (Tensorial product) Let E and F be two vectorial spaces, the pair formed by the vectorial space G and the bilinear operation from $E \times F$ to G is a tensorial product of E and F if for all bases $(\mathbf{e}_i)_{i \in I}$ of E and $(\mathbf{e}'_j)_{j \in J}$ of F the family $(\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}'_j)_{(i,j)}$ is a base of G .

Example: Let \otimes be the unique bilinear operation such that $\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}'_j = \mathbf{e}''_{p(i-1)+j}$ where $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$ is the canonical base of K^n , $\mathbf{e}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}'_p$ that of K^p , and $\mathbf{e}''_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}''_{np}$ that of K^{np} . Then K^{np} together with \otimes is the tensorial product of K^n and K^p .

Proposition 5.9 (Universality) Let \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{u} be two terms whose variables of sort E are among $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$, whose variables of sort F are among $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_p$, and that have no variables of sort G and K . The following propositions are equivalent:

1. the normal forms of \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{u} are identical modulo AC ,
2. the equation $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{u}$ is valid in all structures formed by three vectorial spaces and a bilinear operation,
3. the equation $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{u}$ is valid in all structures formed by two vectorial spaces and their tensorial product,
4. and the denotation of \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{u} in K^{np} for the assignment

$$\phi = \mathbf{e}_1/\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n/\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{e}'_1/\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}'_p/\mathbf{y}_p$$

where $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$ is the canonical base of K^n , $\mathbf{e}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}'_p$ that of K^p and \otimes is the unique bilinear operation such that $\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}'_j = \mathbf{e}''_{p(i-1)+j}$ where $\mathbf{e}''_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}''_{np}$ is the canonical base of K^{np} .

Proof: Proposition (i) implies proposition (ii), proposition (ii) implies proposition (iii) and proposition (iii) implies proposition (iv). Let us prove that proposition (iv) implies proposition (i).

Let \mathbf{t} be a normal term of sort G with variables of sort E among $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$, variables of sort F among $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_p$, and no variables of sort G and K . The decomposition of \mathbf{t} along $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_p$, is the sequence $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{np}$ such that if there is a subterm of the form $\lambda.(\mathbf{x}_i \otimes \mathbf{y}_j)$ in \mathbf{t} , then $\alpha_{p(i-1)+j} = \lambda$, if there is a subterm of the form $\mathbf{x}_i \otimes \mathbf{y}_j$ in \mathbf{t} , then $\alpha_{p(i-1)+j} = 1$, and $\alpha_{p(i-1)+j} = 0$ otherwise.

Assume $\llbracket \mathbf{t} \rrbracket_\phi = \llbracket \mathbf{u} \rrbracket_\phi$. Call $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{np}$ the coordinates of $\llbracket \mathbf{t} \rrbracket_\phi$ in $\mathbf{e}''_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}''_{np}$. Then the decompositions of the normal forms of \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{u} are both $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{np}$ and thus they are identical modulo AC . \square

Conclusion

We usually define an algebraic structure by three components: a set, some operations defined on this set and some propositions that must be valid in the structure. For instance a \mathcal{K} -vectorial space is defined by a set E , the operations $\mathbf{0}$, $+$ and \cdot and the equations of Definition 4.1.

We can, in a more computation-oriented way, define an algebraic structure by a set, operations on this set and an algorithm on terms constructed upon these operations that must be valid in the structure. For instance a \mathcal{K} -vectorial space is defined by a set E , the operations $\mathbf{0}$, $+$ and \cdot and the algorithm R .

This algorithm is a well-known algorithm in linear algebra: it is the algorithm that transforms any linear expression into a linear combination of the unknowns. This algorithm is, at a first look, only one among the many algorithms used in linear algebra, but it completely defines the notion of vectorial space: a vectorial space is any structure where this algorithm is valid, it is any structure where linear expressions can be transformed this way into linear combinations of the unknowns.

Acknowledgements

The authors want to thank Évelyne Contejean, Claude Kirchner and Claude Marché for comments on a previous draft of this paper.

References

- [1] P. Arrighi and G. Dowek, Operational semantics for formal tensorial calculus, *2nd International Workshop on Quantum Programming Languages*, Helsinki, 2004.
- [2] N. Dershowitz and J.-P. Jouannaud, *Rewrite systems*, Handbook of theoretical computer science (vol. B): formal models and semantics, MIT Press, 1991.
- [3] G.E. Peterson and M.E. Stickel, *Complete sets of reductions for some equational theories*, Journal of the ACM, 28, 2, p.233-264, 1981.