

Truth values algebras and proof normalization

Gilles Dowek

École polytechnique and INRIA,
LIX, École polytechnique, 91128 Palaiseau Cedex, France
<http://lix.polytechnique.fr/~dowek/>
Gilles.Dowek@polytechnique.edu

Abstract. We extend the notion of Heyting algebra to a notion of *truth values algebra* and prove that a theory is consistent if and only if it has a \mathcal{B} -valued model for some non trivial truth values algebra \mathcal{B} . A theory that has a \mathcal{B} -valued model for all truth values algebras \mathcal{B} is said to be *super-consistent*. We prove that super-consistency is a model-theoretic sufficient condition for strong normalization.

1 Introduction

Proving that a theory has the cut elimination property has some similarities with proving that it has a model. These similarities appear, for instance, in the model theoretic proofs of cut elimination, where cut elimination is obtained as a corollary of a strengthening of the completeness theorem, expressing that if a formula is valid in all models of a theory, then it has a *cut free* proof in this theory. Such a method has been used, for instance, by Schütte, Kanger, Beth, Hintikka and Smullyan. It has then been used by Tait [15], Prawitz [13], Takahashi [17] and Andrews [1] to prove cut elimination for simple type theory. It has been generalized, more recently, by De Marco and Lipton [2] to prove cut elimination for an intuitionistic variant of simple type theory, by Hermant [8,10] to prove cut elimination for classical and intuitionistic theories in deduction modulo and by Okada [11] to prove cut elimination for intuitionistic linear logic.

An alternative method to prove cut elimination is to prove that all proofs strongly normalize. Following Tait [16] and Girard [7], this is proved by assigning a set of proofs, called a *reducibility candidate*, to each formula. Here also, the proofs have some similarities with the construction of models, except that, in these models, the truth values 0 and 1 are replaced by reducibility candidates. This analogy has been exploited in a joint work with Werner [5], where we have defined a notion of reducibility candidate valued models, called *pre-models*, and proved that if a theory in deduction modulo has such a model, then it has the strong normalization property.

The fact that both cut elimination proofs and strong normalization proofs proceed by building models raises the problem of the difference between cut elimination and strong normalization. It is well-known that strong normalization implies cut elimination, but what about the converse ? This problem can be precisely stated in deduction modulo, where instead of using an *ad hoc* notion

of cut for each theory of interest, we can formulate a general notion of cut for a large class of theories, that subsumes the usual *ad hoc* notions. This problem has been solved by Hermant [9] and surprisingly the answer is negative: there are theories that have the cut elimination property, but not the strong normalization property and even not the weak normalization property. Thus, although the model theoretic cut elimination proofs and the strong normalization proofs both proceed by building models, these methods apply to different theories.

In this paper, we focus on the model theoretic characterization of theories in deduction modulo that have the strong normalization property. It has been proved in [5] that a theory has the strong normalization property if it has a reducibility candidate valued model. However, the usual model constructions use very little of the properties of reducibility candidates. In particular, these constructions seem to work independently of the chosen variant of the closure conditions defining reducibility candidates. This suggests that this notion of reducibility candidate valued model can be further generalized, by considering an abstract notion of reducibility candidate.

Abstracting this way on the notion of reducibility candidate leads to introduce a class of algebras, called *truth values algebras*, that also generalize Heyting algebras. However there is an important difference between truth values algebras and Heyting algebras: in a Heyting algebra valued model the formula $P \Leftrightarrow Q$ is valid if and only if the formulae P and Q have the same denotation. In particular, all theorems have the same denotation. This is not necessarily the case in truth values algebra valued models where two theorems may have different denotation. Thus, truth values algebra valued models are more “intentional” than Heyting algebra valued models. In particular, it is possible to distinguish in the model between the computational equivalence of formulae (the congruence of deduction modulo, or the definitional equality of Martin-Löf’s type theory) and the provable equivalence: the denotations of two computationally equivalent formulae are the same, but not necessarily those of two logically equivalent formulae. Thus, independently of normalization, this generalization of Heyting algebras seems to be of interest for the model theory of deduction modulo and type theory.

We shall first introduce the notion of truth values algebra and compare it with the notion of Heyting algebra. Then, we shall consider plain predicate logic, define a notion of model based on these truth values algebras and prove a soundness and a completeness theorem for this notion of model. We shall then show that this notion of model extends to deduction modulo. Finally, we shall strengthen the notion of consistency into a notion of *super-consistency* and prove that all super-consistent theories have the strong normalization property.

2 Truth values algebras

2.1 Definition

Definition 1 (Truth values algebra). *Let \mathcal{B} be a set, whose elements are called truth values, \mathcal{B}^+ be a subset of \mathcal{B} , whose elements are called positive truth*

values, \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{E} be subsets of $\wp(\mathcal{B})$, $\tilde{\top}$ and $\tilde{\perp}$ be elements of \mathcal{B} , $\tilde{\Rightarrow}$, $\tilde{\wedge}$, and $\tilde{\vee}$ be functions from $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}$ to \mathcal{B} , $\tilde{\forall}$ be a function from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} and $\tilde{\exists}$ be a function from \mathcal{E} to \mathcal{B} . The structure $\mathcal{B} = \langle \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}^+, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}, \tilde{\top}, \tilde{\perp}, \tilde{\Rightarrow}, \tilde{\wedge}, \tilde{\vee}, \tilde{\forall}, \tilde{\exists} \rangle$ is said to be a truth value algebra if the set \mathcal{B}^+ is closed by the intuitionistic deduction rules i.e. if for all a, b, c in \mathcal{B} , A in \mathcal{A} and E in \mathcal{E} ,

1. if $a \tilde{\Rightarrow} b \in \mathcal{B}^+$ and $a \in \mathcal{B}^+$ then $b \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
2. $a \tilde{\Rightarrow} b \tilde{\Rightarrow} a \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
3. $(a \tilde{\Rightarrow} b \tilde{\Rightarrow} c) \tilde{\Rightarrow} (a \tilde{\Rightarrow} b) \tilde{\Rightarrow} a \tilde{\Rightarrow} c \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
4. $\tilde{\top} \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
5. $\tilde{\perp} \tilde{\Rightarrow} a \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
6. $a \tilde{\Rightarrow} b \tilde{\Rightarrow} (a \tilde{\wedge} b) \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
7. $(a \tilde{\wedge} b) \tilde{\Rightarrow} a \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
8. $(a \tilde{\wedge} b) \tilde{\Rightarrow} b \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
9. $a \tilde{\Rightarrow} (a \tilde{\vee} b) \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
10. $b \tilde{\Rightarrow} (a \tilde{\vee} b) \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
11. $(a \tilde{\vee} b) \tilde{\Rightarrow} (a \tilde{\Rightarrow} c) \tilde{\Rightarrow} (b \tilde{\Rightarrow} c) \tilde{\Rightarrow} c \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
12. the set $a \tilde{\Rightarrow} A = \{a \tilde{\Rightarrow} e \mid e \in A\}$ is in \mathcal{A} and the set $E \tilde{\Rightarrow} a = \{e \tilde{\Rightarrow} a \mid e \in E\}$ is in \mathcal{A} ,
13. if all elements of A are in \mathcal{B}^+ then $\tilde{\forall} A \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
14. $\tilde{\forall} (a \tilde{\Rightarrow} A) \tilde{\Rightarrow} a \tilde{\Rightarrow} (\tilde{\forall} A) \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
15. if $a \in A$, then $(\tilde{\forall} A) \tilde{\Rightarrow} a \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
16. if $a \in E$, then $a \tilde{\Rightarrow} (\tilde{\exists} E) \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
17. $(\tilde{\exists} E) \tilde{\Rightarrow} \tilde{\forall} (E \tilde{\Rightarrow} a) \tilde{\Rightarrow} a \in \mathcal{B}^+$.

Definition 2 (Full). A truth values algebra is said to be full if $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{E} = \wp(\mathcal{B})$, i.e. if $\tilde{\forall} A$ and $\tilde{\exists} A$ exist for all subsets A of \mathcal{B} .

Definition 3 (Trivial). A truth values algebra is said to be trivial if $\mathcal{B}^+ = \mathcal{B}$.

Example 1. Let $\mathcal{B} = \{0, 1\}$. Let $\mathcal{B}^+ = \{1\}$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{E} = \wp(\mathcal{B})$, $\tilde{\top} = 1$, $\tilde{\perp} = 0$, $\tilde{\Rightarrow}$, $\tilde{\wedge}$, $\tilde{\vee}$ be the usual boolean operations, $\tilde{\forall}$ be the function mapping the sets $\{0\}$ and $\{0, 1\}$ to 0 and \emptyset and $\{1\}$ to 1 and $\tilde{\exists}$ be the function mapping the sets \emptyset and $\{0\}$ to 0 and $\{1\}$ and $\{0, 1\}$ to 1. Then $\langle \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}^+, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}, \tilde{\top}, \tilde{\perp}, \tilde{\Rightarrow}, \tilde{\wedge}, \tilde{\vee}, \tilde{\forall}, \tilde{\exists} \rangle$ is a truth value algebra.

Example 2. Let \mathcal{B} be an arbitrary set, $\mathcal{B}^+ = \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{E} = \wp(\mathcal{B})$ and $\tilde{\top}$, $\tilde{\perp}$, $\tilde{\Rightarrow}$, $\tilde{\wedge}$, $\tilde{\vee}$, $\tilde{\forall}$ and $\tilde{\exists}$ be arbitrary operations. Then $\langle \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}^+, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}, \tilde{\top}, \tilde{\perp}, \tilde{\Rightarrow}, \tilde{\wedge}, \tilde{\vee}, \tilde{\forall}, \tilde{\exists} \rangle$ is a trivial truth value algebra.

2.2 Pseudo-Heyting algebras

In this section, we show that truth values algebras can alternatively be characterized as pseudo-Heyting algebras.

Definition 4 (Pseudo-Heyting algebra).

Let \mathcal{B} be a set, \leq be a relation on \mathcal{B} , \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{E} be subsets of $\wp(\mathcal{B})$, $\tilde{\top}$ and $\tilde{\perp}$ be elements of \mathcal{B} , $\tilde{\Rightarrow}$, $\tilde{\wedge}$, and $\tilde{\vee}$ be functions from $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}$ to \mathcal{B} , $\tilde{\forall}$ be

a function from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} and $\tilde{\exists}$ be a function from \mathcal{E} to \mathcal{B} , the structure $\mathcal{B} = \langle \mathcal{B}, \leq, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}, \tilde{\top}, \tilde{\perp}, \tilde{\Rightarrow}, \tilde{\wedge}, \tilde{\vee}, \tilde{\exists} \rangle$ is said to be a pseudo-Heyting algebra if for all a, b, c in \mathcal{B} , A in \mathcal{A} and E in \mathcal{E} , (the relation \leq is a pre-order)

- $a \leq a$,
- if $a \leq b$ and $b \leq c$ then $a \leq c$,

($\tilde{\top}$ and $\tilde{\perp}$ are maximum and minimum elements (notice that these need not be unique))

- $a \leq \tilde{\top}$,
- $\tilde{\perp} \leq a$,

($a \tilde{\wedge} b$ is a greatest lower bound of a and b and $a \tilde{\vee} b$ is a least upper bound of a and b (again, these need not be unique))

- $a \tilde{\wedge} b \leq a$,
- $a \tilde{\wedge} b \leq b$,
- if $c \leq a$ and $c \leq b$ then $c \leq a \tilde{\wedge} b$,
- $a \leq a \tilde{\vee} b$,
- $b \leq a \tilde{\vee} b$,
- if $a \leq c$ and $b \leq c$ then $a \tilde{\vee} b \leq c$,

(the set \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{E} have closure conditions)

- $a \tilde{\Rightarrow} A$ and $E \tilde{\Rightarrow} a$ are in \mathcal{A} ,

($\tilde{\vee}$ and $\tilde{\exists}$ are infinite greatest lower bound and least upper bound)

- if $a \in A$ then $\tilde{\vee} A \leq a$,
- if for all a in A , $b \leq a$ then $b \leq \tilde{\vee} A$,
- if $a \in E$ then $a \leq \tilde{\exists} E$,
- if for all a in E , $a \leq b$ then $\tilde{\exists} E \leq b$,

and

- $a \leq b \Leftrightarrow c$ if and only if $a \tilde{\wedge} b \leq c$.

Proposition 1. Consider a truth values algebra $\langle \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}^+, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}, \tilde{\top}, \tilde{\perp}, \tilde{\Rightarrow}, \tilde{\wedge}, \tilde{\vee}, \tilde{\exists} \rangle$ then the algebra $\langle \mathcal{B}, \leq, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}, \tilde{\top}, \tilde{\perp}, \tilde{\Rightarrow}, \tilde{\wedge}, \tilde{\vee}, \tilde{\exists} \rangle$ where the relation \leq is defined by $a \leq b$ if and only if $a \tilde{\Rightarrow} b \in \mathcal{B}^+$ is a pseudo-Heyting algebra.

Proof. - Using 1. 2. and 3. we get that $a \tilde{\Rightarrow} a \in \mathcal{B}^+$.

- Using 1. 2. and 3. we get that $a \tilde{\Rightarrow} b \in \mathcal{B}^+$ and $b \tilde{\Rightarrow} c \in \mathcal{B}^+$ then $a \tilde{\Rightarrow} c \in \mathcal{B}^+$.
- Using 1. 2. and 4. we get that $a \tilde{\Rightarrow} \tilde{\top} \in \mathcal{B}^+$.
- $\tilde{\perp} \tilde{\Rightarrow} a \in \mathcal{B}^+$ is condition 5.
- $(a \tilde{\wedge} b) \tilde{\Rightarrow} a \in \mathcal{B}^+$ is condition 7.
- $(a \tilde{\wedge} b) \tilde{\Rightarrow} b \in \mathcal{B}^+$ is condition 8.
- Using 1. 2. 3. and 6. we get that if $c \tilde{\Rightarrow} a \in \mathcal{B}^+$ and $c \tilde{\Rightarrow} b \in \mathcal{B}^+$ then $c \tilde{\Rightarrow} (a \tilde{\wedge} b) \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
- $a \tilde{\Rightarrow} (a \tilde{\vee} b) \in \mathcal{B}^+$ is condition 9.

- $b \Rightarrow (a \tilde{\vee} b) \in \mathcal{B}^+$ is condition 10.
- Using 1. 2. 3. and 11. we get that if $a \Rightarrow c \in \mathcal{B}^+$ and $b \Rightarrow c \in \mathcal{B}^+$ then $(a \tilde{\vee} b) \Rightarrow c \in \mathcal{B}^+$.
- The closure conditions are 12.
- If $a \in A$ then $(\tilde{\vee} A) \Rightarrow a \in \mathcal{B}^+$ is condition 15.
- From 13. and 14. we get if for all $a \in A$ $b \Rightarrow a \in \mathcal{B}^+$, then $b \Rightarrow \tilde{\vee} A \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
- If $a \in A$ then $a \Rightarrow (\exists A) \in \mathcal{B}^+$ is condition 16.
- From 1. 2. 3. 13. and 17. we get that if for all $a \in A$ $a \Rightarrow b \in \mathcal{B}^+$, then $\exists A \Rightarrow b \in \mathcal{B}^+$,
- From 1. 2. 3. 6. 7. and 8. we get that $a \Rightarrow (b \Rightarrow c) \in \mathcal{B}^+$ if and only if $(a \tilde{\wedge} b) \Rightarrow c \in \mathcal{B}^+$.

Proposition 2. Consider a pseudo-Heyting algebra $\langle \mathcal{B}, \leq, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}, \tilde{\top}, \tilde{\perp}, \Rightarrow, \tilde{\wedge}, \tilde{\vee}, \tilde{\exists}, \tilde{\exists} \rangle$, then the algebra $\langle \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}^+, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}, \tilde{\top}, \tilde{\perp}, \Rightarrow, \tilde{\wedge}, \tilde{\vee}, \tilde{\exists} \rangle$, where $\mathcal{B}^+ = \{x \mid \tilde{\top} \leq x\}$ is a truth values algebra.

Proof. Let us first prove the following lemma: if $x \leq a \Rightarrow b$ and $x \leq a$ then $x \leq b$. From $x \leq x$ and $x \leq a$, we get $x \leq x \tilde{\wedge} a$ and as $x \leq a \Rightarrow b$, we have $x \tilde{\wedge} a \leq b$. By transitivity, we get $x \leq b$.

1. Using the lemma above, we get that if $\tilde{\top} \leq a \Rightarrow b$ and $\tilde{\top} \leq a$ then $\tilde{\top} \leq b$.
2. We have $(\tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} a) \tilde{\wedge} b \leq \tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} a \leq a$. Hence $\tilde{\top} \leq a \Rightarrow b \Rightarrow a$.
3. Let $x = \tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} (a \Rightarrow b \Rightarrow c) \tilde{\wedge} (a \Rightarrow b) \tilde{\wedge} a$. We have $x \leq a \Rightarrow b \Rightarrow c$, $x \leq a \Rightarrow b$ and $x \leq a$. Using the lemma three times, we get $x \leq c$. Hence $\tilde{\top} \leq (a \Rightarrow b \Rightarrow c) \Rightarrow (a \Rightarrow b) \Rightarrow a \Rightarrow c$.
4. We have $\tilde{\top} \leq \tilde{\top}$.
5. We have $\tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} \tilde{\perp} \leq \tilde{\perp} \leq a$, thus $\tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} \tilde{\perp} \leq a$. Hence $\tilde{\top} \leq \tilde{\perp} \Rightarrow a$.
6. We have $(\tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} a) \tilde{\wedge} b \leq \tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} a \leq a$ and $(\tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} a) \tilde{\wedge} b \leq b$. Hence $(\tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} a) \tilde{\wedge} b \leq a \tilde{\wedge} b$ and $\tilde{\top} \leq a \Rightarrow b \Rightarrow (a \tilde{\wedge} b)$.
7. We have $\tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} (a \tilde{\wedge} b) \leq (a \tilde{\wedge} b) \leq a$. Hence $\tilde{\top} \leq (a \tilde{\wedge} b) \Rightarrow a$.
8. We have $\tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} (a \tilde{\wedge} b) \leq (a \tilde{\wedge} b) \leq b$. Hence $\tilde{\top} \leq (a \tilde{\wedge} b) \Rightarrow b$.
9. We have $\tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} a \leq a \leq (a \tilde{\vee} b)$. Hence $\tilde{\top} \leq a \Rightarrow (a \tilde{\vee} b)$.
10. We have $\tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} b \leq b \leq (a \tilde{\vee} b)$. Hence $\tilde{\top} \leq b \Rightarrow (a \tilde{\vee} b)$.
11. Let $x = \tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} (a \tilde{\vee} b) \tilde{\wedge} (a \Rightarrow c) \tilde{\wedge} (b \Rightarrow c)$. We have $x \leq a \tilde{\vee} b$, $x \leq a \Rightarrow c$ and $x \leq b \Rightarrow c$. We have $x \leq a \tilde{\vee} b$ and $x \leq x$, hence $x \leq (a \tilde{\vee} b) \tilde{\wedge} x$. We have $a \tilde{\wedge} x \leq x \tilde{\wedge} a \leq c$, thus $a \leq x \Rightarrow c$ and, in a similar way, $b \leq x \Rightarrow c$. Thus, we have $a \tilde{\vee} b \leq x \Rightarrow c$, i.e. $(a \tilde{\vee} b) \tilde{\wedge} x \leq c$. By transitivity, we conclude $x \leq c$. Hence $\tilde{\top} \leq (a \tilde{\vee} b) \Rightarrow (a \Rightarrow c) \Rightarrow (b \Rightarrow c) \Rightarrow c$.
12. The closure conditions of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{E} are the same.
13. If all elements of A are in \mathcal{B}^+ then $\tilde{\vee} A \in \mathcal{B}^+$. Indeed, for all elements x of A , $\tilde{\top} \leq x$ hence $\tilde{\top} \leq \tilde{\vee} A$.
14. Let $x = \tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} \tilde{\vee} (a \Rightarrow A) \tilde{\wedge} a$. Let y be an arbitrary element of A . Notice that, by definition of $a \Rightarrow A$, $a \Rightarrow y \in a \Rightarrow A$. We have $x \leq \tilde{\vee} (a \Rightarrow A)$ hence $x \leq a \Rightarrow y$. We also have $x \leq a$, hence using the lemma $x \leq y$.
For all $y \in A$, we have $x \leq y$, thus $x \leq \forall A$. Hence $\tilde{\top} \leq \tilde{\vee} (a \Rightarrow A) \Rightarrow a \Rightarrow (\tilde{\vee} A)$.
15. If $a \in A$, then we have $\tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} (\tilde{\vee} A) \leq \tilde{\vee} A \leq a$. Hence $\tilde{\top} \leq (\tilde{\vee} A) \Rightarrow a$.
16. If $a \in A$, then we have $\tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} a \leq a \leq \exists A$. Hence $\tilde{\top} \leq a \Rightarrow (\exists A)$.

17. Let $x = \tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} (\tilde{\exists} A) \tilde{\wedge} \tilde{\vee} (A \Rightarrow a)$. We have $x \leq (\tilde{\exists} A)$ and $x \leq \tilde{\vee} (A \Rightarrow a)$. We have $x \leq (\tilde{\exists} A)$ and $x \leq x$ thus $x \leq (\tilde{\exists} A) \tilde{\wedge} x$. As $x \leq \tilde{\vee} (A \Rightarrow a)$. For all y in A , $x \leq y \Rightarrow a$, i.e. $(x \tilde{\wedge} y) \leq a$. For all y in A , we have $y \tilde{\wedge} x \leq x \tilde{\wedge} y \leq a$ i.e. $y \leq x \Rightarrow a$. Thus, $\tilde{\exists} A \leq x \Rightarrow a$, i.e. $\tilde{\exists} A \tilde{\wedge} x \leq a$. By transitivity, we get $x \leq a$. Hence $\tilde{\top} \leq (\tilde{\exists} A) \Rightarrow \tilde{\vee} (A \Rightarrow a) \Rightarrow a$.

Definition 5 (Heyting algebra). A pseudo-Heyting algebra is said to be a Heyting algebra if the relation \leq is antisymmetric

$$- x \leq y \Rightarrow y \leq x \Rightarrow x = y.$$

Remark. If the pseudo-Heyting algebra $\langle \mathcal{B}, \leq, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}, \tilde{\top}, \tilde{\perp}, \Rightarrow, \tilde{\wedge}, \tilde{\vee}, \tilde{\exists} \rangle$ is a Heyting algebra, then the set $\mathcal{B}^+ = \{x \mid \tilde{\top} \leq x\}$ is the singleton $\{\tilde{\top}\}$. Indeed, if $a \in \mathcal{B}^+$ then $\tilde{\top} \leq a$ and $a \leq \tilde{\top}$. Hence $a = \tilde{\top}$.

Definition 6. A function F from a truth value algebra \mathcal{B}_1 to a truth value algebra \mathcal{B}_2 is said to be a morphism of truth values algebras if

- $x \in \mathcal{B}_1^+$ if and only if $F(x) \in \mathcal{B}_2^+$,
- if $A \in \mathcal{A}_1$ then $F(A) \in \mathcal{A}_2$, if $E \in \mathcal{E}_1$ then $F(E) \in \mathcal{E}_2$,
- $F(\tilde{\top}_1) = \tilde{\top}_2$, $F(\tilde{\perp}_1) = \tilde{\perp}_2$, $F(a \Rightarrow_1 b) = F(a) \Rightarrow_2 F(b)$, $F(a \tilde{\wedge}_1 b) = F(a) \tilde{\wedge}_2 F(b)$, $F(a \tilde{\vee}_1 b) = F(a) \tilde{\vee}_2 F(b)$, $F(\tilde{\exists}_1 A) = \tilde{\exists}_2 F(A)$, $F(\tilde{\exists}_1 E) = \tilde{\exists}_2 F(E)$.

Morphisms of pseudo-Heyting algebras are defined in a similar way except that the first condition is replaced by

$$- x \leq_1 y \text{ if and only if } F(x) \leq_2 F(y).$$

Proposition 3. Let \mathcal{B} be a pseudo-Heyting algebra, then there exists a pseudo-Heyting algebra $\mathcal{B}/\mathcal{B}^+$ that is a Heyting algebra and a morphism of pseudo-Heyting algebras Φ from \mathcal{B} to $\mathcal{B}/\mathcal{B}^+$.

Proof. We define a relation \simeq on elements of \mathcal{B} by $a \simeq b$ if and only if $a \leq b$ and $b \leq a$. It is routine to check that this relation is an equivalence relation and that all the operations of \mathcal{B} are compatible with this relation. We define $\mathcal{B}/\mathcal{B}^+$ as the quotient \mathcal{B}/\simeq and the morphism Φ by $\Phi(a) = a/\simeq$.

Remark. We have proved that, in the definition of Heyting algebras, the antisymmetry is useless and can be dropped. The equivalence of truth values algebras and pseudo-Heyting algebras shows that antisymmetry is the only property that can be dropped and that truth values algebras are, in some sense, the best possible generalization of Heyting algebras, as we cannot require less than closure by intuitionistic deduction rules.

2.3 Examples of truth values algebras

We have seen that the algebra $\{0, 1\}$ is a truth value algebra and more generally that all Heyting algebras are truth values algebras. We give in this section two examples of truth values algebras that are not Heyting algebras.

Example 3. The truth value algebra \mathcal{T}_1 is defined as follows. The set \mathcal{T}_1 is $\{0, I, 1\}$ and the set \mathcal{T}_1^+ is $\{I, 1\}$. The sets \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{E} are $\wp(\mathcal{T}_1)$. The functions $\tilde{\top}$, \perp , $\tilde{\wedge}$, $\tilde{\vee}$, $\tilde{\vee}$ and $\tilde{\exists}$ are the same as in the algebra $\{0, 1\}$, except that their value on I is the same as their value on 1. For instance the table of the operation $\tilde{\vee}$ is

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | I | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| I | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

The function \Rightarrow is defined by the table

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | I | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| I | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | I | I |

Notice that as $I \Rightarrow 1$ and $1 \Rightarrow I$ are both in \mathcal{T}_1^+ we have $I \leq 1$ and $1 \leq I$. Hence the relation \leq is not antisymmetric and the truth value algebra \mathcal{T}_1 is not a Heyting algebra.

Example 4. The truth value algebra \mathcal{T}_2 is similar to \mathcal{T}_1 , except that the function \Rightarrow is defined by the table

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | I | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | I |
| I | 0 | 1 | I |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | I |

2.4 Ordered truth values algebras

We consider truth values algebras extended with an order relation \sqsubseteq on \mathcal{B} . This order relation extends to sets of truth values in a trivial way: $A \sqsubseteq B$ if for all x in A there exists a y in B such that $x \sqsubseteq y$.

Definition 7 (Ordered truth values algebra). *An ordered truth values algebra is a truth values algebra together with a relation \sqsubseteq on \mathcal{B} such that*

- \sqsubseteq is an order relation,
- \mathcal{B}^+ is upward closed,
- $\tilde{\top}$ is a maximal element,
- $\tilde{\wedge}$, $\tilde{\vee}$, $\tilde{\vee}$ and $\tilde{\exists}$ are monotonous, \Rightarrow is left anti-monotonous and right monotonous.

Definition 8 (Complete ordered truth values algebra). *A ordered truth values algebra is said to be complete if every subset of \mathcal{B} has a greatest lower bound for \sqsubseteq . Notice that this implies that every subset also has a least upper bound. We write $glb(a, b)$ and $lub(a, b)$ the greatest lower bound and the least upper bound of a and b for the order \sqsubseteq .*

Example 5. The algebra \mathcal{T}_1 ordered by $0 \sqsubseteq I \sqsubseteq 1$ is complete.

Example 6. The algebra \mathcal{T}_2 cannot be extended to a complete ordered algebra. Indeed the set $\{I, 1\}$ would need to have a least upper bound. This least upper bound cannot be 0 because \mathcal{T}_2^+ would then not be upward closed. If it were 1 then we would have $I \sqsubseteq 1$ and thus $1 \Rightarrow I \sqsubseteq 1 \Rightarrow 1$, i.e. $1 \sqsubseteq I$. Thus the relation \sqsubseteq would not be antisymmetric. If it were I then we would have $1 \sqsubseteq I$ and thus $1 \Rightarrow 1 \sqsubseteq 1 \Rightarrow I$, i.e. $I \sqsubseteq 1$. Thus the relation \sqsubseteq would not be antisymmetric.

Proposition 4. *The order relation \sqsubseteq is finer than \leq , i.e. if $a \sqsubseteq b$ then $a \leq b$.*

Proof. If $a \sqsubseteq b$, then $a \Rightarrow a \sqsubseteq a \Rightarrow b$, hence $a \Rightarrow b \in \mathcal{B}^+$, i.e. $a \leq b$.

Proposition 5.

$$glb(a, b) \leq a \tilde{\wedge} b \leq glb(a \tilde{\wedge} \tilde{\top}, \tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} b)$$

Proof. We have $glb(a, b) \sqsubseteq a$ and $glb(a, b) \sqsubseteq b$. Thus, by Proposition 4, $glb(a, b) \leq a$ and $glb(a, b) \leq b$. Thus $glb(a, b) \leq a \tilde{\wedge} b$.

We have $a \sqsubseteq a$ and $b \sqsubseteq \tilde{\top}$ thus $a \tilde{\wedge} b \sqsubseteq a \tilde{\wedge} \tilde{\top}$. Similarly, $a \tilde{\wedge} b \sqsubseteq \tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} b$. Thus $a \tilde{\wedge} b \sqsubseteq glb(a \tilde{\wedge} \tilde{\top}, \tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} b)$ and, by Proposition 4, $a \tilde{\wedge} b \leq glb(a \tilde{\wedge} \tilde{\top}, \tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} b)$.

Proposition 6. *In a Heyting algebra, \leq and \sqsubseteq are extensionally equal, i.e. $a \sqsubseteq b$ if and only if $a \leq b$.*

Proof. In a Heyting algebra the relation \leq is antisymmetric and $a = a \tilde{\wedge} \tilde{\top} = \tilde{\top} \tilde{\wedge} a$. Thus, from Proposition 5, we get $glb(a, b) = a \tilde{\wedge} b$. If $a \leq b$, we have $a \tilde{\wedge} b = a$, thus $glb(a, b) = a$, thus $a \sqsubseteq b$. Conversely, by Proposition 4, if $a \sqsubseteq b$ then $a \leq b$.

2.5 Completion

We now want to prove that for any truth value algebra \mathcal{B} , there is another truth value algebra \mathcal{B}_C that is full, ordered and complete and a morphism Φ from \mathcal{B} to \mathcal{B}_C . Notice that we do not require the morphism Φ to be injective.

There are two ways to prove this, the first is to use Proposition 3 in a first step to build a truth value algebra $\mathcal{B}/\mathcal{B}^+$ that is a Heyting algebra and a morphism for \mathcal{B} to $\mathcal{B}/\mathcal{B}^+$ and then apply in a second step MacNeille completion to the algebra $\mathcal{B}/\mathcal{B}^+$ to embed it into a full Heyting algebra. Together with its natural order, this algebra is a full, ordered and complete truth value algebra. The second is to apply MacNeille completion directly to \mathcal{B} noticing that antisymmetry is not used in MacNeille completion, except to prove the injectivity of the morphism.

To keep the paper self-contained we follow this second way.

Definition 9 (Closure). *Let X a subset of \mathcal{B} , then the set of upper bounds of X is $u(X) = \{y \mid \forall x (x \in X \Rightarrow x \leq y)\}$ the set of lower bounds of X is $l(X) = \{y \mid \forall x (x \in X \Rightarrow y \leq x)\}$ and the closure of X is $C(X) = l(u(X))$.*

It is easily checked that

$$X \subseteq Y \Rightarrow u(Y) \subseteq u(X)$$

$$X \subseteq Y \Rightarrow l(Y) \subseteq l(X)$$

$$X \subseteq Y \Rightarrow C(X) \subseteq C(Y)$$

Proposition 7. $X \subseteq C(X)$

Proof. Consider $x \in X$. For all $y \in u(X)$, $x \leq y$. Hence $x \in l(u(X))$.

Proposition 8. If $X \in \mathcal{E}$, then $\tilde{\exists} X \in C(X)$

Proof. For all $y \in u(X)$, $\tilde{\exists} X \leq y$. Hence $\tilde{\exists} X \in l(u(X))$.

Definition 10 (Closed). A subset X of \mathcal{B} is said to be closed if $C(X) = X$ or, equivalently, $C(X) \subseteq X$.

Proposition 9. Any set of the form $C(X)$ is closed.

Proof. Consider an arbitrary set Z . Consider $z \in Z$. For all $y \in l(Z)$, $y \leq z$. Hence $z \in u(l(Z))$. Thus, for an arbitrary Z , $Z \subseteq u(l(Z))$ and in particular $u(X) \subseteq u(l(u(X)))$. Thus $l(u(l(u(X)))) \subseteq l(u(X))$, i.e. $C(C(X)) \subseteq C(X)$.

Proposition 10.

$$a \in C(\{b\}) \Leftrightarrow a \leq b$$

$$C(\{a\}) \subseteq C(\{b\}) \Leftrightarrow a \leq b$$

If X is closed, $x \in X$ and $y \leq x$ then $y \in X$

Proof. $a \in C(\{b\})$ if and only if $a \in l(u(\{b\}))$ if and only if $\forall x (x \in u(\{b\}) \Rightarrow a \leq x)$ if and only if $\forall x (b \leq x \Rightarrow a \leq x)$ if and only if (as the relation \leq is reflexive and transitive) $a \leq b$.

If $C(\{a\}) \subseteq C(\{b\})$ then $\{a\} \subseteq C(\{a\}) \subseteq C(\{b\})$. Hence $a \in C(\{b\})$, i.e. $a \leq b$. Conversely, if $a \leq b$ then $a \in C(\{b\})$, $\{a\} \subseteq C(\{b\})$, hence $C(\{a\}) \subseteq C(C(\{b\})) = C(\{b\})$.

If X is closed, $x \in X$ and $y \leq x$ then let z be an element of $u(X)$, we have $x \leq z$ and $y \leq x$, thus, by transitivity, $y \leq z$, i.e. $y \in l(u(X)) = C(X) = X$.

Proposition 11. Let \mathcal{B} be a pseudo-Heyting algebra. Let \mathcal{B}_C be the set of closed subsets of \mathcal{B} , \leq_C be inclusion, $\mathcal{A}_C = \mathcal{E}_C = \wp(\mathcal{B}_C)$, $\tilde{\perp}_C = C(\{\tilde{\perp}\})$, $\tilde{\top}_C = C(\{\tilde{\top}\})$, $\tilde{\wedge}_C$ be intersection, $\tilde{\vee}_C$ be defined by $X\tilde{\vee}_C Y = C(X \cup Y)$, $\tilde{\vee}_C$ be intersection, $\tilde{\exists}_C$ be defined by $\tilde{\exists}_C E = C(\bigcup E)$, $\tilde{\Rightarrow}_C$ be defined by $X\tilde{\Rightarrow}_C Y = \bigcap_{C(\{x\}) \subseteq X, Y \subseteq C(\{y\})} C(\{x \Rightarrow y\})$.

Then the structure $\langle \mathcal{B}_C, \leq_C, \mathcal{A}_C, \mathcal{E}, \tilde{\perp}_C, \tilde{\top}_C, \tilde{\Rightarrow}_C, \tilde{\wedge}_C, \tilde{\vee}_C, \tilde{\vee}_C, \tilde{\exists}_C \rangle$ is a full, ordered and complete Heyting algebra.

Proof. 1. Inclusion is trivially an order relation.

2. The set $C(\{\tilde{\perp}\})$ is closed. It is a minimum in \mathcal{B}_C , because if X is closed, it is a set of lower bounds and hence $\tilde{\perp} \in X$. Thus $C(\{\tilde{\perp}\}) \subseteq C(X) = X$.
3. The set $C(\{\tilde{\top}\})$ is closed. It is a maximum in \mathcal{B}_C , because it is equal to \mathcal{B} .
4. Let us check that binary and arbitrary intersections of closed sets are closed sets. We detail only the case of the operation $\tilde{\vee}$, the binary operation being a particular case. If all elements of A are closed sets, we have for every X in A , $\tilde{\vee}_C A \subseteq X$, $C(\tilde{\vee}_C A) \subseteq C(X) = X$. Thus $C(\tilde{\vee}_C A) \subseteq \tilde{\vee}_C A$. Moreover, binary and arbitrary intersections are obviously greatest lower bounds in \mathcal{B}_C .
5. The sets $C(X \cup Y)$ and $C(\bigcup E)$ are closed. Let us check that they are least upper bounds. Again, we detail case of the case of the operation $\tilde{\exists}_C$, the binary operation being a particular case. The operation $\tilde{\exists}_C$ is an upper bound as if X is an element of E , $X \subseteq \bigcup E \subseteq C(\bigcup E)$. Then, it is the least as, if A is an element of \mathcal{B}_C such that for all X in E , $X \subseteq Z$ then $\bigcup E \subseteq Z$ hence $C(\bigcup E) \subseteq C(Z)$ and $C(\bigcup E) \subseteq Z$.
6. The set $\bigcap_{C(\{x\}) \subseteq X, Y \subseteq C(\{y\})} C(\{x \Rightarrow y\})$ is closed as it is an intersection of closed sets. Let us check that $X \leq_C A \Rightarrow_C B$ if and only if $X \tilde{\wedge}_C A \subseteq B$. Assume $X \subseteq A \Rightarrow_C B$ and let $x \in X \tilde{\wedge}_C A$. Let $b \in u(B)$. We have $x \in X$, thus $x \in A \Rightarrow_C B$. We have $x \in A$, thus $C(\{x\}) \subseteq C(A) = A$. We have $b \in u(B)$, thus $\forall y (y \in B \Rightarrow y \leq b)$, $\forall y (y \in B \Rightarrow y \in C(\{b\}))$ and $B \subseteq C(\{b\})$. We have $x \in A \Rightarrow_C B$, $C(\{x\}) \subseteq A$, and $B \subseteq C(\{b\})$ thus $x \in C(\{x \Rightarrow b\})$, i.e. $x \leq x \Rightarrow b$, $x \tilde{\wedge} x \leq b$, $x \leq b$. Thus, for all b in $u(B)$, $x \leq b$, i.e. $x \in l(u(B))$, $x \in C(B)$ and $x \in B$.
Conversely, assume $X \tilde{\wedge}_C A \subseteq B$. Let $x \in X$. Let a such that $C(\{a\}) \subseteq A$ and b such that $B \subseteq C(\{b\})$. We have $x \tilde{\wedge} a \leq x$ and $x \in X$, hence $x \tilde{\wedge} a \in X$. We have $x \tilde{\wedge} a \leq a \in C(\{a\}) \subseteq A$, hence $x \tilde{\wedge} a \in A$. Thus $x \tilde{\wedge} a \in X \tilde{\wedge}_C A \subseteq B \subseteq C(\{b\})$. Therefore $x \tilde{\wedge} a \in C(\{b\})$, $x \tilde{\wedge} a \leq b$, $x \leq a \Rightarrow b$ and $x \in C(\{a \Rightarrow b\})$. Thus $x \in A \Rightarrow_C B$.

Proposition 12. *The function $a \mapsto C(\{a\})$ is a morphism of pseudo-Heyting algebras.*

Proof. 1. $a \leq b \Leftrightarrow C(\{a\}) \subseteq C(\{b\})$.

2. $C(\{\tilde{\top}\}) = \tilde{\top}_C$ by definition.

3. $C(\{\tilde{\perp}\}) = \tilde{\perp}_C$ by definition.

4. $C(\{a \tilde{\wedge} b\}) = C(\{a\}) \tilde{\wedge}_C C(\{b\})$. Indeed $x \in C(\{a \tilde{\wedge} b\})$ if and only if $x \leq a \tilde{\wedge} b$ if and only if $x \leq a$ and $x \leq b$ if and only if $x \in C(\{a\})$ and $x \in C(\{b\})$ if and only if $x \in C(\{a\}) \tilde{\wedge}_C C(\{b\})$.

5. $C(\{a \tilde{\vee} b\}) = C(\{a\}) \tilde{\vee}_C C(\{b\})$. Indeed we have $a \in C(\{a\}) \cup C(\{b\})$, thus if $x \in u(C(\{a\}) \cup C(\{b\}))$, then $a \leq x$. In a similar way, if $x \in u(C(\{a\}) \cup C(\{b\}))$, then $b \leq x$. Thus if $x \in u(C(\{a\}) \cup C(\{b\}))$, then $a \tilde{\vee} b \leq x$, i.e. if $x \in u(C(\{a\}) \cup C(\{b\}))$, then $x \in u(\{a \tilde{\vee} b\})$ i.e. $u(C(\{a\}) \cup C(\{b\})) \subseteq u(\{a \tilde{\vee} b\})$. Hence $l(u(\{a \tilde{\vee} b\})) \subseteq l(u(C(\{a\}) \cup C(\{b\})))$ i.e. $C(\{a \tilde{\vee} b\}) \subseteq C(C(\{a\}) \cup C(\{b\}))$ i.e. $C(\{a \tilde{\vee} b\}) \subseteq C(\{a\}) \tilde{\vee}_C C(\{b\})$. Conversely, we have $a \leq a \tilde{\vee} b$, thus $C(\{a\}) \subseteq C(\{a \tilde{\vee} b\})$. In a similar way $C(\{b\}) \subseteq C(\{a \tilde{\vee} b\})$. Thus $C(\{a\}) \cup C(\{b\}) \subseteq C(\{a \tilde{\vee} b\})$ and $C(C(\{a\}) \cup C(\{b\})) \subseteq C(C(\{a \tilde{\vee} b\}))$ i.e. $C(\{a\}) \tilde{\vee}_C C(\{b\}) \subseteq C(\{a \tilde{\vee} b\})$.

6. $C(\{\tilde{\vee} A\}) = \tilde{\vee}_C \{C(\{a\}) \mid a \in A\}$. Indeed, $x \in C(\{\tilde{\vee} A\})$ if and only if $x \leq \tilde{\vee} A$ if and only if for all a in A , $x \leq a$ if and only if for all a in A , $x \in C(\{a\})$ if and only if $x \in \tilde{\vee}_C \{C(\{a\}) \mid a \in A\}$.
7. $C(\{\tilde{\exists} E\}) = \tilde{\exists}_C \{C(\{e\}) \mid e \in E\}$. Indeed, for all e in E we have $e \in C(\{e\})$ and thus $E \subseteq \bigcup \{C(\{e\}) \mid e \in E\}$ and $C(E) \subseteq C(\bigcup \{C(\{e\}) \mid e \in E\})$ i.e. $C(E) \subseteq \tilde{\exists}_C \{C(\{e\}) \mid e \in E\}$. As, by Proposition 8, $\tilde{\exists} E \in C(E)$, we have $C(\{\tilde{\exists} E\}) \subseteq C(E)$, and thus $C(\{\tilde{\exists} E\}) \subseteq \tilde{\exists}_C \{C(\{e\}) \mid e \in E\}$. Conversely, for all e in E , $e \leq \tilde{\exists} E$, hence $C(\{e\}) \subseteq C(\{\tilde{\exists} E\})$. Thus, $\bigcup \{C(\{e\}) \mid e \in E\} \subseteq C(\{\tilde{\exists} E\})$ and $C(\bigcup \{C(\{e\}) \mid e \in E\}) \subseteq C(\{\tilde{\exists} E\})$ i.e. $\tilde{\exists}_C \{C(\{e\}) \mid e \in E\} \subseteq C(\{\tilde{\exists} E\})$.
8. $C(\{a \tilde{\Rightarrow} b\}) = C(\{a\}) \tilde{\Rightarrow}_C C(\{b\})$. Indeed, $z \in C(\{a\}) \tilde{\Rightarrow}_C C(\{b\})$ if and only if for all x and y such that $C(\{x\}) \subseteq C(\{a\})$ and $C(\{b\}) \subseteq C(\{y\})$ we have $z \in C(\{x \tilde{\Rightarrow} y\})$ if and only if for all x and y such that $x \leq a$ and $b \leq y$, we have $z \leq x \tilde{\Rightarrow} y$ if and only if $z \leq a \tilde{\Rightarrow} b$ if and only if $z \in C(\{a \tilde{\Rightarrow} b\})$.

Proposition 13. *Let \mathcal{B} be a truth value algebra, then there exists a full, ordered and complete truth value algebra \mathcal{B}_C and a morphism of truth values algebras from \mathcal{B} to \mathcal{B}_C .*

Proof. The Heyting algebra \mathcal{B}_C is a full, ordered and complete truth value algebra and the function $a \mapsto C(\{a\})$ is a morphism of truth values algebras.

Example 7. The algebra \mathcal{T}_2 cannot be extended to a complete ordered algebra, but it can be embedded with a non injective morphism in the full ordered and complete algebra $\{0, 1\}$.

3 Predicate Logic

3.1 Models

Definition 11 (\mathcal{B} -valued structure). *Let $\mathcal{L} = \langle f_i, P_j \rangle$ be a language in predicate logic and \mathcal{B} be a truth values algebra, a \mathcal{B} -valued structure for the language \mathcal{L} , $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}, \hat{f}_i, \hat{P}_j \rangle$ is a structure such that \hat{f}_i is a function from \mathcal{M}^n to \mathcal{M} where n is the arity of the symbol f_i and \hat{P}_j is a function from \mathcal{M}^n to \mathcal{B} where n is the arity of the symbol P_j .*

This definition extends trivially to many-sorted languages.

Definition 12 (Denotation). *Let \mathcal{B} be a truth values algebra, \mathcal{M} be a \mathcal{B} -valued structure and ϕ be an assignment. The denotation $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\phi$ of a formula A in \mathcal{M} is defined as follows*

- $\llbracket x \rrbracket_\phi = \phi(x)$,
- $\llbracket f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \rrbracket_\phi = \hat{f}(\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket_\phi, \dots, \llbracket t_n \rrbracket_\phi)$,
- $\llbracket P(t_1, \dots, t_n) \rrbracket_\phi = \hat{P}(\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket_\phi, \dots, \llbracket t_n \rrbracket_\phi)$,
- $\llbracket \top \rrbracket_\phi = \top$,
- $\llbracket \perp \rrbracket_\phi = \perp$,

- $\llbracket A \Rightarrow B \rrbracket_\phi = \llbracket A \rrbracket_\phi \overset{\sim}{\Rightarrow} \llbracket B \rrbracket_\phi,$
- $\llbracket A \wedge B \rrbracket_\phi = \llbracket A \rrbracket_\phi \overset{\sim}{\wedge} \llbracket B \rrbracket_\phi,$
- $\llbracket A \vee B \rrbracket_\phi = \llbracket A \rrbracket_\phi \overset{\sim}{\vee} \llbracket B \rrbracket_\phi,$
- $\llbracket \forall x A \rrbracket_\phi = \overset{\sim}{\forall} \{ \llbracket A \rrbracket_{\phi+(x,e)} \mid e \in \mathcal{M} \},$
- $\llbracket \exists x A \rrbracket_\phi = \overset{\sim}{\exists} \{ \llbracket A \rrbracket_{\phi+(x,e)} \mid e \in \mathcal{M} \}.$

Notice that the denotation of a formula containing quantifiers may be undefined, but it is always defined if the truth value algebra is full.

Definition 13 (Model). A formula A is said to be valid in a \mathcal{B} -valued structure \mathcal{M} , and the \mathcal{B} -valued structure \mathcal{M} is said to be a model of A , $\mathcal{M} \models A$, if for all assignments ϕ , $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\phi$ is defined and is a positive truth value.

The \mathcal{B} -valued structure \mathcal{M} is said to be a model of a theory \mathcal{T} if it is a model of all the axioms of \mathcal{T} .

3.2 Soundness and completeness

As the notion of truth values algebra extends that of Heyting algebra, the completeness theorem for the notion of model introduced above is a simple corollary of the completeness theorem for the notion of model based on Heyting algebras. But, it has a simpler direct proof. It is well-known that completeness proofs for boolean algebra valued models and Heyting algebra valued models are simpler than for $\{0, 1\}$ -valued models. For truth values algebra valued models, it is even simpler. We want to prove that if A is valid in all models of \mathcal{T} where it has a denotation then $\mathcal{T} \vdash A$. To do so, we consider a theory \mathcal{T} and we construct a model of \mathcal{T} such that the formulae valid in this model are the intuitionistic theorems of \mathcal{T} .

Definition 14 (Lindenbaum model). Let \mathcal{T} be a theory in a language \mathcal{L} . Let S be an infinite set of constants and $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L} \cup S$. Let \mathcal{M} be the set of closed terms of \mathcal{L}' and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}$ be the set of closed formulae of \mathcal{L}' . Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^+$ be the set of elements A of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}$, such that the sequent $\mathcal{T} \vdash A$ is provable. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{E}$ be the set of subsets of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}$ of the form $\{(t/x)A \mid t \in \mathcal{M}\}$ for some A . Notice that, in this case, the formula A is unique.

The operations $\overset{\sim}{\top}$, $\overset{\sim}{\perp}$, $\overset{\sim}{\Rightarrow}$, $\overset{\sim}{\wedge}$ and $\overset{\sim}{\vee}$ are \top , \perp , \Rightarrow , \wedge and \vee . The operations $\overset{\sim}{\forall}$ and $\overset{\sim}{\exists}$ are defined as follows

- $\overset{\sim}{\forall} \{(t/x)A \mid t \in \mathcal{M}\} = (\forall x A),$
- $\overset{\sim}{\exists} \{(t/x)A \mid t \in \mathcal{M}\} = (\exists x A).$

If f is a function symbol, we let \hat{f} be the function mapping t_1, \dots, t_n to $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$. If P is a predicate symbol, we let \hat{P} be the function mapping t_1, \dots, t_n to $P(t_1, \dots, t_n)$.

Proposition 14. The algebra $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a truth values algebra.

Proof. The condition 1. to 11. are trivial recalling that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^+$ is the set of theorems of \mathcal{T} . The condition 12. is a simple consequence of the definition of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{E} .

For condition 13., consider a set $A = \{(t/x)P \mid t \in \mathcal{M}\}$ and c a constant occurring neither in \mathcal{T} nor in P . If all elements of A are in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^+$, $(c/x)P$ is in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^+$ thus $\mathcal{T} \vdash (c/x)P$ is provable. Thus, $\mathcal{T} \vdash \forall x P$ is provable and $\forall x P$ is in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^+$, i.e. $\tilde{\forall} A$ is in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^+$.

For condition 14. consider an element A of \mathcal{A} , by definition there exists a formula P such that $A = \{(t/x)P \mid t \in \mathcal{M}\}$ and we have $\tilde{\forall} A = \forall x P$ and $\tilde{\forall} (a \Rightarrow A) = \forall x (a \Rightarrow P)$. Thus, the condition rephrases

$$\mathcal{T} \vdash (\forall x (a \Rightarrow P)) \Rightarrow a \Rightarrow \forall x P$$

which is obvious as the formula $(\forall x (a \Rightarrow P)) \Rightarrow a \Rightarrow \forall x P$ is intuitionistically provable. The conditions 15., 16. and 17. are checked in a similar way.

Proposition 15. *Let A be a formula and ϕ be an assignment mapping the free variables of A to elements of \mathcal{M} . Notice that ϕ is also a substitution and that ϕA is a closed formula. Then $\llbracket A \rrbracket_{\phi}$ is always defined and*

$$\llbracket A \rrbracket_{\phi} = \phi A$$

Proof. By induction over the structure of A . We consider only the case where $A = \forall x B$. We have $\llbracket \forall x B \rrbracket_{\phi} = \tilde{\forall} \{ \llbracket (t/x)B \rrbracket_{\phi} \mid t \in \mathcal{M} \} = \tilde{\forall} \{ \phi((t/x)B) \mid t \in \mathcal{M} \} = \tilde{\forall} \{ (t/x)(\phi B) \mid t \in \mathcal{M} \} = \forall x (\phi B) = \phi(\forall x B)$.

Proposition 16. *The closed formulae valid in the Lindenbaum model of \mathcal{T} in \mathcal{L} are intuitionistic theorems of \mathcal{T} .*

Proof. If A is valid in the Lindenbaum model then for every assignment ϕ , $\llbracket A \rrbracket_{\phi} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^+$, i.e. $\mathcal{T} \vdash \llbracket A \rrbracket_{\phi}$ is provable. Thus, $\mathcal{T} \vdash \phi A$ is provable and in particular $\mathcal{T} \vdash A$ is provable.

Proposition 17 (Completeness). *If A is valid in all the models of \mathcal{T} where it is defined, then $\mathcal{T} \vdash A$.*

Proof. It is valid in the Lindenbaum model of \mathcal{T} .

Using Proposition 13, we can strengthen this completeness theorem.

Proposition 18. *If A is valid in all the models of \mathcal{T} where the truth values algebra is full, ordered and complete then $\mathcal{T} \vdash A$.*

The converse is a simple induction over proof structure.

Proposition 19 (Soundness). *If $\mathcal{T} \vdash A$ then A is valid in all the models of \mathcal{T} where the truth value algebra is full, ordered and complete.*

We finally get the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *$\mathcal{T} \vdash A$ if and only if A is valid in all the models of \mathcal{T} where the truth values algebra is full, ordered and complete.*

3.3 Consistency

Definition 15. A theory is said to be consistent if there exists a non provable formula in this theory.

In the completeness theorem above, we did not assume the theory \mathcal{T} to be consistent. If it is not, then the algebra of the Lindenbaum model is trivial, *i.e.* all truth values are positive and every formula is valid. But we have the following theorem.

Proposition 20. The theory \mathcal{T} is consistent if and only if it has a \mathcal{B} -valued model, for some non trivial full, ordered and complete truth values algebra \mathcal{B} .

Proof. The algebra of the Lindenbaum model and its completion are non trivial.

4 Deduction modulo

4.1 Deduction modulo

In Deduction modulo [3,5], a theory is defined by a set of axioms \mathcal{T} and a congruence \equiv defined by a confluent rewrite system rewriting terms to terms and atomic formulae to formulae. The deduction rules are modified to take the congruence \equiv into account. For instance, the *modus ponens* rule is not stated as usual

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

but

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\equiv} C \quad \Gamma \vdash_{\equiv} A}{\Gamma \vdash_{\equiv} B} C \equiv A \Rightarrow B$$

In deduction modulo, there are theories for which there exists proofs that do not normalize. For instance, in the theory formed with the rewrite rule $P \rightarrow (P \Rightarrow Q)$, the proof

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\overline{P \vdash_{\equiv} P \Rightarrow Q} \text{ axiom}}{P \vdash_{\equiv} Q} \Rightarrow\text{-intro} \quad \frac{\overline{P \vdash_{\equiv} P} \text{ axiom}}{\vdash_{\equiv} P \Rightarrow Q} \Rightarrow\text{-intro}}{\vdash_{\equiv} P \Rightarrow Q} \Rightarrow\text{-elim} \quad \frac{\frac{\overline{P \vdash_{\equiv} P \Rightarrow Q} \text{ axiom}}{P \vdash_{\equiv} Q} \Rightarrow\text{-intro} \quad \frac{\overline{P \vdash_{\equiv} P} \text{ axiom}}{\vdash_{\equiv} P} \Rightarrow\text{-intro}}{\vdash_{\equiv} Q} \Rightarrow\text{-elim}}{\vdash_{\equiv} Q} \Rightarrow\text{-elim}$$

does not normalize and, moreover, the formula Q has no normal proof.

But, as we shall see, in some other theories, such as the theory formed with the rewrite rule $P \rightarrow (Q \Rightarrow P)$, all proofs strongly normalize.

In deduction modulo, like in predicate logic, normal proofs of a sequent of the form $\vdash_{\equiv} A$ always end with an introduction rule. Thus, when a theory can be expressed in deduction modulo with rewrite rules only, *i.e.* with no axioms, in such a way that proofs modulo these rewrite rules strongly normalize, then the theory is consistent, it has the disjunction property and the witness property, various proof search methods for this theory are complete, ...

Many theories can be expressed this way in deduction modulo, in particular arithmetic [6] and simple type theory [4] and the notion of cut of deduction modulo subsumes the *ad hoc* notions of cut defined for these theories.

4.2 Models

Definition 16 (Model). Let \mathcal{T}, \equiv be a theory in deduction modulo. The \mathcal{B} -valued structure \mathcal{M} is said to be a model of the theory \mathcal{T}, \equiv if all axioms of \mathcal{T} are valid in \mathcal{M} and for all terms or formulae A and B such that $A \equiv B$ and assignments ϕ , $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\phi$ and $\llbracket B \rrbracket_\phi$ are defined and $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\phi = \llbracket B \rrbracket_\phi$.

Example 8. Let \mathcal{B} be an arbitrary truth value algebra, then the theory $P \longrightarrow (Q \Rightarrow R)$ has a \mathcal{B} -valued model. We take $\hat{P} = (\tilde{\top} \Rightarrow \tilde{\top})$ and $\hat{Q} = \hat{R} = \tilde{\top}$.

Example 9. Let \mathcal{B} be an arbitrary full, ordered and complete truth value algebra, then the theory $P \longrightarrow (Q \Rightarrow P)$ has a \mathcal{B} -valued model. The function $a \mapsto (\perp \Rightarrow a)$ is monotonous for the order \sqsubseteq and this order is complete. Hence, it has a fixed point b . We define a \mathcal{B} -valued model of this theory by $\hat{P} = b$ and $\hat{Q} = \perp$.

In the same way, if \mathcal{B} be an arbitrary full, ordered and complete truth value algebra, then the theory $P \longrightarrow (\perp \Rightarrow P)$ has a \mathcal{B} -valued model.

Example 10. The theory $P \longrightarrow (P \Rightarrow Q)$ has a $\{0, 1\}$ -valued model ($\hat{P} = \hat{Q} = 1$), but no \mathcal{T}_1 -valued model. Indeed there is no 0 in the line 0 of the table of the function \Rightarrow of \mathcal{T}_1 , no I in the line I and no 1 in the line 1.

4.3 Soundness and completeness

To extend the completeness and the soundness theorem to deduction modulo, we replace terms by classes of congruent terms and formulae by classes of congruent formulae.

Definition 17. Let \mathcal{T}, \equiv be a theory in a language \mathcal{L} . Let S be an infinite set of constants and $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L} \cup S$. We define an equivalence relation \sim on formulae of \mathcal{L}' inductively as the smallest congruence such that if $A \equiv B$ then $A \sim B$, if $A \sim B$ and $A' \sim B'$ then $(A \wedge A') \sim (B \wedge B')$, $(A \vee A') \sim (B \vee B')$, and $(A \Rightarrow A') \sim (B \Rightarrow B')$, and if for each term t there exist a term u such that $(t/x)A \sim (u/x)B$ and for each term u there exist a term t such that $(u/x)B \sim (t/x)A$ then $\forall x A \sim \forall x B$ and $\exists x A \sim \exists x B$.

Remark that if we consider the congruence \equiv defined by the rewrite rule $f(f(x)) \longrightarrow x$ we have $\forall x P(x) \not\equiv \forall x P(f(x))$ but we have $\forall x P(x) \sim \forall x P(f(x))$ as $P(x)$ and $P(f(x))$ have the same instances (the instance t in one formula corresponds to the instance $f(t)$ in the other).

Proposition 21. If $t \equiv u$ and $A \sim B$ then $(t/x)A \sim (u/x)B$.

Proof. By induction on the derivation of $A \sim B$.

Proposition 22. *If $A \sim B$ then $A \Leftrightarrow B$ is provable modulo \equiv .*

Proof. By induction on the derivation of $A \sim B$ if $A = \forall x A'$ and $B = \forall x B'$ and for each term t there exist a term u such that $(t/x)A \sim (u/x)B$ and for each term u there exist a term t such that $(u/x)B \sim (t/x)A$ then let c be a constant of S occurring neither in A nor in B . We have to prove the sequent $\forall x A' \vdash (c/x)B'$. Let t be a term such that $(t/x)A' \sim (c/x)B'$, by induction hypothesis we get $(t/x)A' \Leftrightarrow (c/x)B'$, and as we have $\forall x A'$ we can deduce $(t/x)A'$, and thus $(c/x)B'$.

Definition 18 (The Lindenbaum model). *Let \mathcal{T}, \equiv be a theory in a language \mathcal{L} . Let S be an infinite set of constants and $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L} \cup S$. Let \mathcal{M} be the set of \equiv -classes of closed terms of \mathcal{L}' and \mathcal{B} be the set of \sim -classes of closed formulae of \mathcal{L}' . Let \mathcal{B}^+ be the set of elements A of \mathcal{B} , such that the sequent $\mathcal{T} \vdash_{\equiv} A$ is provable. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{E}$ be the set of subsets of \mathcal{B} of the form $\{(t/x)A/\sim \mid t \in \mathcal{M}\}$ for some A .*

The operations $\tilde{\top}, \tilde{\perp}, \tilde{\Rightarrow}, \tilde{\wedge}$ and $\tilde{\vee}$ are $\top, \perp, \Rightarrow, \wedge$ and \vee extended to \sim -classes. To define the operations $\tilde{\forall}$ and $\tilde{\exists}$, we choose for each element a of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{E} a formula A such that $a = \{(t/x)A/\sim \mid t \in \mathcal{M}\}$ and we let

- $\tilde{\forall} a = (\forall x A)/\sim$,
- $\tilde{\exists} a = (\exists x A)/\sim$.

Notice that the elements $(\forall x A)/\sim$ and $(\exists x A)/\sim$ are independent of the choice of A .

If f is a function symbol, we let \hat{f} be the function mapping the classes of t_1, \dots, t_n to that of $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$. If P is a predicate symbol, we let \hat{P} be the function mapping the classes of t_1, \dots, t_n to that of $P(t_1, \dots, t_n)$.

Proposition 23. *Let A be a formula and ϕ be a assignment mapping the free variables of A to elements of \mathcal{M} . Notice that ϕ is also a substitution and that ϕA is a closed formula. Then $\llbracket A \rrbracket_{\phi} = \phi A/\sim$.*

Proof. By induction over the structure of A . We consider only the case where $A = \forall x B$. We have $\llbracket \forall x B \rrbracket_{\phi} = \tilde{\forall} \{ \llbracket B \rrbracket_{\phi+(x=a)} \mid a \in \mathcal{M} \}$. By induction hypothesis, $\llbracket \forall x B \rrbracket_{\phi} = \tilde{\forall} \{ (a/x)\phi B/\sim \mid a \in \mathcal{M} \} = (\forall x \phi B)/\sim = \phi(\forall x B)/\sim$.

Proposition 24. *The algebra \mathcal{B} is a truth values algebra.*

Proof. The condition 1. to 11. are trivial using the fact that \mathcal{B}^+ is the set of theorems of \mathcal{T}, \equiv . The condition 12. is a simple consequence of the definition of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{E} .

For condition 13., consider a set A in \mathcal{A} and P the formula associated to this set, and c a constant occurring neither in \mathcal{T} nor in the rewrite system defining the congruence \equiv , nor in P . If all elements of A are in \mathcal{B}^+ , $(c/x)P$ is in \mathcal{B}^+ thus $\mathcal{T} \vdash_{\equiv} (c/x)P$ is provable. Thus, $\mathcal{T} \vdash_{\equiv} \forall x P$ is provable and $\forall x P$ is in \mathcal{B}^+ , i.e. $\tilde{\forall} A$ is in \mathcal{B}^+ .

For condition 14., consider an element A of \mathcal{A} and the formula P associated to this element and Q the formula associated to the set $a \Rightarrow A$. By Proposition

22, the formula $(\forall x (a \Rightarrow P)) \Leftrightarrow (\forall x Q)$ is provable. We have $\tilde{\forall} A = \forall x P$ and $\tilde{\forall} (a \Rightarrow A) = \forall x Q$. Thus, the condition rephrases

$$\mathcal{T} \vdash_{\equiv} \forall x Q \Rightarrow a \Rightarrow \forall x P$$

which is a consequence of the fact that the formula $(\forall x (a \Rightarrow P)) \Leftrightarrow (\forall x Q)$ is provable. The conditions 15., 16. and 17. are checked in a similar way.

Proposition 25. *The closed formulae valid in the Lindenbaum model of \mathcal{T}, \equiv in \mathcal{L} are intuitionistic theorems of \mathcal{T}, \equiv .*

Proof. If A is valid in the Lindenbaum model, then for every assignment ϕ , $\llbracket A \rrbracket_{\phi} \in \mathcal{B}^+$, i.e. $\mathcal{T} \vdash_{\equiv} \llbracket A \rrbracket_{\phi}$ is provable in deduction modulo. Thus, $\mathcal{T} \vdash_{\equiv} \phi A$ is provable in deduction modulo and in particular $\mathcal{T} \vdash_{\equiv} A$ is provable in deduction modulo.

Proposition 26 (Completeness). *If A is valid in all the models of \mathcal{T}, \equiv where it is defined, then $\mathcal{T} \vdash_{\equiv} A$.*

Proof. It is valid in the Lindenbaum model of \mathcal{T}, \equiv .

Using Proposition 13, we can strengthen this completeness theorem.

Proposition 27. *If A is valid in all the models of \mathcal{T}, \equiv where the truth values algebra is full, ordered and complete then $\mathcal{T} \vdash_{\equiv} A$.*

The converse is a simple induction over proof structure.

Proposition 28 (Soundness). *If $\mathcal{T} \vdash_{\equiv} A$ then A is valid in all the models of \mathcal{T}, \equiv where the truth value algebra is full, ordered and complete.*

We finally get the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *$\mathcal{T} \vdash_{\equiv} A$ if and only if A is valid in all the models of \mathcal{T}, \equiv where the truth values algebra is full, ordered and complete.*

4.4 Consistency

Proposition 29. *The theory \mathcal{T}, \equiv is consistent if and only if it has a \mathcal{B} -valued model, for some non trivial full, ordered and complete truth values algebra \mathcal{B} .*

Proof. The algebra of the Lindenbaum model and its completion are non trivial.

5 Super-consistency

5.1 Definition

By Proposition 29, a theory is consistent if it has a \mathcal{B} -valued model for some non trivial full, ordered and complete truth values algebra. We now strengthen this condition and require that the theory has a \mathcal{B} -valued model for all full, ordered and complete truth values algebras \mathcal{B} .

Definition 19 (Super-consistent). *A theory \mathcal{T}, \equiv in deduction modulo is super-consistent if it has a \mathcal{B} -valued model for all full, ordered and complete truth values algebras \mathcal{B} .*

Notice that, as there exists non trivial full, ordered and complete truth values algebras (e.g. $\{0, 1\}$), super-consistent theories are consistent.

5.2 Examples of super-consistent theories

We have seen that the theories $P \longrightarrow (Q \Rightarrow R)$ and $P \longrightarrow (Q \Rightarrow P)$ are super-consistent, but that the theory $P \longrightarrow (P \Rightarrow Q)$ is not. We give other examples of super-consistent theory. In particular, we show that all the theories that have been proved to have the strong normalization property in [5,6] are super-consistent.

Definition 20 (Simple type theory). *Simple type theory is a many-sorted theory defined as follows. The sorts are inductively defined by ι and o are sorts and if T and U are sorts then $T \rightarrow U$ is a sort. The language contains the constants $S_{T,U,V}$ of sort $(T \rightarrow U \rightarrow V) \rightarrow (T \rightarrow U) \rightarrow T \rightarrow V$, $K_{T,U}$ of sort $T \rightarrow U \rightarrow T$, $\dot{\top}$ of sort o and $\dot{\perp}$ of sort o , $\dot{\Rightarrow}$, $\dot{\wedge}$ and $\dot{\vee}$ of sort $o \rightarrow o \rightarrow o$, $\dot{\forall}_T$ and $\dot{\exists}_T$ 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 rules are*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \alpha(\alpha(\alpha(S_{T,U,V}, x), y), z) \longrightarrow \alpha(\alpha(x, z), \alpha(y, z)) \\
& \alpha(\alpha(K_{T,U}, x), y) \longrightarrow x \\
& \varepsilon(\dot{\top}) \longrightarrow \top \\
& \varepsilon(\dot{\perp}) \longrightarrow \perp \\
& \varepsilon(\alpha(\alpha(\dot{\Rightarrow}, x), y)) \longrightarrow \varepsilon(x) \Rightarrow \varepsilon(y) \\
& \varepsilon(\alpha(\alpha(\dot{\wedge}, x), y)) \longrightarrow \varepsilon(x) \wedge \varepsilon(y) \\
& \varepsilon(\alpha(\alpha(\dot{\vee}, x), y)) \longrightarrow \varepsilon(x) \vee \varepsilon(y) \\
& \varepsilon(\alpha(\dot{\forall}_T, x)) \longrightarrow \forall y \varepsilon(\alpha(x, y)) \\
& \varepsilon(\alpha(\dot{\exists}_T, x)) \longrightarrow \exists y \varepsilon(\alpha(x, y))
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 30. *Simple type theory is super-consistent.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{B} be a full truth values algebra. The model $\mathcal{M}_\iota = \{0\}$, $\mathcal{M}_o = \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{M}_{T \rightarrow U} = \mathcal{M}_U^{\mathcal{M}^T}$, $\hat{S}_{T,U,V} = a \mapsto (b \mapsto (c \mapsto a(c)(b(c))))$, $\hat{K}_{T,U} = a \mapsto (b \mapsto a)$, $\hat{a}(a, b) = a(b)$, $\hat{e}(a) = a$, $\hat{\top} = \tilde{\top}$, $\hat{\perp} = \tilde{\perp}$, $\hat{\Rightarrow} = \tilde{\Rightarrow}$, $\hat{\wedge} = \tilde{\wedge}$, $\hat{\vee} = \tilde{\vee}$, $\hat{\forall}_T = a \mapsto \tilde{\forall}(Range(a))$, $\hat{\exists}_T = a \mapsto \tilde{\exists}(Range(a))$ where $Range(a)$ is the range of the function a , is a \mathcal{B} -valued model of simple type theory.

Definition 21 (Arithmetic). *Arithmetic is a many-sorted theory defined as follows. The sorts are ι and κ . The language contains the constant 0 of sort ι , the function symbols S and $Pred$ of rank $\langle \iota, \iota \rangle$ and $+$ and \times of rank $\langle \iota, \iota, \iota \rangle$, the predicate symbols $=$ of rank $\langle \iota, \iota \rangle$, $Null$ and N of rank $\langle \iota \rangle$ and \in of rank $\langle \iota, \kappa \rangle$ and for each formula P in the language $0, S, Pred, +, \times, =, Null$ and N and whose free variables are among x, y_1, \dots, y_n of sort ι , the function symbol $f_{x, y_1, \dots, y_n, P}$ of rank $\langle \iota, \dots, \iota, \kappa \rangle$. The rewrite rules are*

$$\begin{aligned}
x \in f_{x, y_1, \dots, y_n, P}(y_1, \dots, y_n) &\longrightarrow P \\
y = z &\longrightarrow \forall p (y \in p \Rightarrow z \in p) \\
N(n) &\longrightarrow \forall p (0 \in p \Rightarrow \forall y (N(y) \Rightarrow y \in p \Rightarrow S(y) \in p) \Rightarrow n \in p) \\
Pred(0) &\longrightarrow 0 \\
Pred(S(x)) &\longrightarrow x \\
Null(0) &\longrightarrow \top \\
Null(S(x)) &\longrightarrow \perp \\
0 + y &\longrightarrow y \\
S(x) + y &\longrightarrow S(x + y) \\
0 \times y &\longrightarrow 0 \\
S(x) \times y &\longrightarrow x \times y + y
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 31. *Arithmetic is super-consistent.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{B} be a full, ordered and complete truth value algebra. We take $\mathcal{M}_\iota = \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{M}_\kappa = \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$. The denotations of $0, S, +, \times, Pred$ are obvious. We take $\hat{Null}(0) = \tilde{\top}$, $\hat{Null}(n) = \tilde{\perp}$ if $n \neq 0$. The denotation of \in is the function mapping n and f to $f(n)$. Then, we can define the denotation of $\forall p (y \in p \Rightarrow z \in p)$ and the denotation of $=$ accordingly.

To define the denotation of N , for each function f of $\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$ we can define an interpretation \mathcal{M}_f of the language of the formula

$$\forall p (0 \in p \Rightarrow \forall y (N(y) \Rightarrow y \in p \Rightarrow S(y) \in p) \Rightarrow n \in p)$$

where the symbol N is interpreted by the function f . We define the function Φ from $\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to $\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$ mapping f to the function mapping the natural number x to the truth value

$$\llbracket \forall p (0 \in p \Rightarrow \forall y (N(y) \Rightarrow y \in p \Rightarrow S(y) \in p) \Rightarrow n \in p) \rrbracket_{x/n}^{\mathcal{M}_f}$$

The order on $\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$ defined by $f \sqsubseteq g$ if for all n , $f(n) \sqsubseteq g(n)$ is a complete order and the function Φ is monotonous as the occurrence of N is positive in

$$\forall p (0 \in p \Rightarrow \forall y (N(y) \Rightarrow y \in p \Rightarrow S(y) \in p) \Rightarrow n \in p)$$

Hence it has a fixed point g . We interpret the symbol N by the function g . Finally, the denotation of the symbols of the form $f_{x,y_1,\dots,y_n,P}$ is defined in the obvious way.

Proposition 32 (Quantifier free). *A theory defined by a confluent and terminating rewrite systems such that no quantifier appears in the rewrite rules is super-consistent. For instance, the theory defined by the rewrite system $P \longrightarrow Q \Rightarrow R$ is super-consistent.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{B} be an arbitrary full truth value algebra. We associate an element of \mathcal{B} to each normal closed quantifier free formula as follows: if A is atomic then $|A| = \tilde{\top}$, $|\top| = \tilde{\top}$, $|\perp| = \tilde{\perp}$, $|A \Rightarrow B| = |A| \Rightarrow |B|$, $|A \wedge B| = |A| \tilde{\wedge} |B|$, $|A \vee B| = |A| \tilde{\vee} |B|$. We then define a \mathcal{B} -valued model as follows: \mathcal{M} is the set of normal closed terms, $\hat{f}(t_1, \dots, t_n) = f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \downarrow$, $\hat{P}(t_1, \dots, t_n) = |P(t_1, \dots, t_n) \downarrow|$ where $a \downarrow$ is the normal form of the a .

Proposition 33 (Positive terminating). *A theory defined by a confluent and terminating rewrite systems such that all atomic formulae appear at positive occurrences in the rewrite rules is super-consistent. For instance the theory defined by the rewrite system $P(0) \longrightarrow \forall x P(x)$ is super-consistent.*

Proof. Consider a full, ordered and complete truth value algebra \mathcal{B} . Let \mathcal{T} be the set of closed terms and $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{T} / \equiv$. Let \hat{f} be the function mapping the classes e_1, \dots, e_n to the class of the term $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ where t_1, \dots, t_n are elements of e_1, \dots, e_n (since the relation \equiv is a congruence, this class does not depend of the choice of representatives). Let \mathcal{C} be the set of models that have the domain \mathcal{M} , the truth value algebra \mathcal{B} and where the function symbols f are interpreted by the functions \hat{f} . Two models of \mathcal{C} differ only by the interpretation of predicate symbols. Let \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 be two models of the class \mathcal{C} , we say that $\mathcal{M}_1 \sqsubseteq \mathcal{M}_2$ if and only if for every predicate symbol P and sequence of elements of \mathcal{M} e_1, \dots, e_n , we have

$$\hat{P}^{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_1, \dots, e_n) \sqsubseteq \hat{P}^{\mathcal{M}_2}(e_1, \dots, e_n)$$

As the algebra \mathcal{B} is complete, the set \mathcal{C} is a complete lattice for the order \sqsubseteq . Let \mathcal{F} be the function from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{C} defined by

$$\hat{P}^{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})}(e_1, \dots, e_n) = \llbracket P(e_1, \dots, e_n) \downarrow \rrbracket_{\emptyset}^{\mathcal{M}}$$

As all atomic formulae appear at positive occurrences in the rewrite system, the function \mathcal{F} is monotone. Hence, as \mathcal{C} is a complete lattice, it has a fixed point. This fixed point is a \mathcal{B} -valued model of the theory.

Proposition 34 (Positive deterministic). *A theory defined by a rewrite systems such that each atomic formula has at most one one-step reduct and all atomic formulae appear at positive occurrences in the rewrite rules is super-consistent. For instance, the theory defined by the rewrite system $P \longrightarrow (P \wedge P)$ is super-consistent.*

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 33, we consider a full, ordered and complete truth value algebra \mathcal{B} and we define the complete lattice \mathcal{C} of models.

Let \mathcal{F} be the function from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{C} defined by

$$\hat{P}^{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})}(t_1, \dots, t_n) = \llbracket P(t_1, \dots, t_n) \rrbracket_{\emptyset}^{\mathcal{M}}$$

where $A+$ is the unique one-step reduct of A if it exists and A otherwise. As all atomic formulae appear at positive occurrences in the rewrite system, the function \mathcal{F} is monotone. Hence, as \mathcal{C} is a complete lattice, it has a fixed point. This fixed point is a \mathcal{B} -valued model of the theory.

5.3 Normalization

We have seen that the theory $P \longrightarrow (P \Rightarrow Q)$, that does not have the strong normalization property, is consistent but not super-consistent, *i.e.* it has \mathcal{B} -valued models for some non trivial, full, ordered and complete truth values algebras \mathcal{B} , but not all. We prove now that, in contrast, all super-consistent theories have the strong normalization property. To prove this, we build a particular full, ordered and complete truth values algebra: the algebra of reducibility candidates.

We refer, for instance, to [5] for the definition of proof-terms, neutral proof-terms and of proof-term reduction \triangleright and we define the following operations on sets of proofs.

Definition 22. – *The set $\tilde{\top}$ is the set of strongly normalizing proof-terms.*

- *The set \perp is the set of strongly normalizing proof-terms.*
- *If a and b are two sets of proofs-terms, then $a \Rightarrow b$ is the set of strongly normalizing proof-terms π such that if π reduces to $\lambda\alpha \pi_1$ then for every π' in a , $(\pi'/\alpha)\pi_1$ is in b .*
- *If a and b are two sets of proof-terms, then $a \tilde{\wedge} b$ is the set of strongly normalizing proof-terms π such that if π reduces to $\langle \pi_1, \pi_2 \rangle$ then π_1 is in a and π_2 is in b .*
- *If a and b are two sets of proof-terms, then $a \tilde{\vee} b$ is the set of strongly normalizing proof-terms π such that if π reduces to $i(\pi_1)$ (resp. $j(\pi_2)$) then π_1 (resp. π_2) is in a (resp. b).*
- *If A is a set of sets of proof-terms, then $\tilde{\forall} A$ is the set of strongly normalizing proof-terms π such that if π reduces to $\lambda x \pi_1$ then for every term t and every element a of A , $(t/x)\pi_1$ is in a .*
- *If A is a set of sets of proof-terms, then $\tilde{\exists} A$ is the set of strongly normalizing proof-terms π such that if π reduces to $\langle t, \pi_1 \rangle$, there exists an element a of A such that π_1 is an element of a .*

Definition 23 (Reducibility candidate). A set R of proof-terms is a reducibility candidate if

- if $\pi \in R$, then π is strongly normalizable,
- if $\pi \in R$ and $\pi \triangleright^* \pi'$ then $\pi' \in R$,
- if π is neutral and if for every π' such that $\pi \triangleright^1 \pi'$, $\pi' \in R$ then $\pi \in R$.

Proposition 35. The set of reducibility candidates is closed by the operations of Definition 22.

Proof. All the cases are similar. Let us detail, for instance, the case of the operation $\tilde{\vee}$. Let A be a set of candidates and let us prove that the set $\tilde{\vee} A$ is a candidate.

By definition, all proof-terms of $\tilde{\vee} A$ are strongly normalizing. Closure by reduction is a simple consequence of the fact that if $\pi \in \tilde{\vee} A$ and $\pi \triangleright^* \pi'$ then π is strongly normalizing and thus so is π' and if π' reduces to $\lambda x \pi_1$ then so does π and thus for every term t and every a in A , $(t/x)\pi_1$ is in a .

Now, assume that π is a neutral proof-term and that for every π' such that $\pi \triangleright^1 \pi'$, $\pi' \in \tilde{\vee} A$. We want to prove that π is in $\tilde{\vee} A$. Following the definition of $\tilde{\vee} A$, we first prove that π is strongly normalizing and then that if it reduces to $\lambda x \pi_1$ then for every term t and every a in A , $(t/x)\pi_1$ is in a .

Consider a reduction sequence issued from π . If it is empty it is finite. Otherwise it has the form $\pi \triangleright^1 \pi_2 \triangleright^1 \dots$. The proof-term π_2 is an element of $\tilde{\vee} A$ thus it is strongly normalizing and the reduction sequence is finite. If π reduces to $\lambda x \pi_1$ then consider a reduction sequence from π to $\lambda x \pi_1$. As π is neutral and $\lambda x \pi_1$ is not, this sequence is not empty. Thus, there exists a proof-term π_2 such that $\pi \triangleright^1 \pi_2 \triangleright^* \lambda x \pi_1$. We have $\pi_2 \in \tilde{\vee} A$ and thus for every term t and every a in A , $(t/x)\pi_1$ is in a .

Definition 24 (The algebra of reducibility candidates). The set \mathcal{B} is the set of reducibility candidates. The set \mathcal{B}^+ may be any set closed by intuitionistic deduction rules, e.g. the set of all candidates. The sets \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{E} are $\wp(\mathcal{B})$. The operations are those of definition 22. The order \sqsubseteq is inclusion.

Theorem 3 (Normalization). If the theory \mathcal{T}, \equiv is super-consistent, then all proofs strongly normalize in \mathcal{T}, \equiv .

Proof. Consider the full, ordered and complete truth values algebra \mathcal{B} of reducibility candidates. As it is super-consistent, the theory \mathcal{T}, \equiv has a \mathcal{B} -valued model. This model is a reducibility candidate valued model of \equiv [5], called *pre-models* there. Hence all proofs strongly normalize in \mathcal{T}, \equiv .

An alternative would be to define the set of candidates directly as the smallest set of sets of proofs closed by the operations of definition 22 and arbitrary intersections, like [12].

Notice that the pre-order \leq is trivial and thus not antisymmetric. Hence, the truth values algebra of reducibility candidates is not a Heyting algebra. The fact that the choice of the set \mathcal{B}^+ is immaterial is due to the fact that \mathcal{B}^+ matters for the interpretation of axioms but not for that of the congruence and cut elimination is a property of the congruence of a theory, not of its axioms.

6 Conclusion

We have generalized the notion of Heyting algebra into a notion of *truth values algebra* and proved that a theory is consistent if and only if it has a \mathcal{B} -valued model for some non trivial full, ordered and complete truth values algebra \mathcal{B} . Unlike Heyting algebra valued models, truth values algebra valued models allow to distinguish computational equivalence from provable equivalence.

When a theory has a \mathcal{B} -valued model for all full, ordered and complete truth values algebras, it is said to be super-consistent and all proofs strongly normalize in this theory. Proving strong normalization by proving super-consistency is easier than proving strong normalization directly. For instance the proof that simple type theory is super-consistent (Proposition 30) takes only a few lines. All the technicalities related to the notion of reducibility candidate are now hidden in the proof that super-consistency implies strong normalization and are not used in the proof that the theory of interest is super-consistent.

The notion of super-consistency is a model theoretic sufficient condition for strong normalization. It remains to understand if it also a necessary condition or if some theories have the strong normalization property without being super-consistent. To prove that strong normalization implies super-consistency, we might need to restrict further the notion of super-consistency. For instance, we have already restricted it by considering only ordered and complete truth values algebras. Indeed, without such a completeness property, we could not use the fixed point theorem to prove that the theory $P \longrightarrow (\perp \Rightarrow P)$ had a \mathcal{B} -valued model for all \mathcal{B} , and indeed, this theory does not have a \mathcal{T}_2 -valued model. Thus, the fact that the algebra of reducibility candidates, ordered by inclusion, is complete seems to be an essential property that needs to be kept when abstracting on reducibility candidates. It remains to understand if there are other essential properties of candidates that need to be kept this way, so that strong normalization may imply super-consistency.

7 Acknowledgments

Thierry Coquand suggested to characterize truth values algebras as pseudo-Heyting algebras. Lisa Allali, Frédéric Blanqui, Olivier Hermant and Milly Maitti provided many helpful comments on a previous version of the paper.

References

1. P.B. Andrews. Resolution in type theory. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 36(3):414–432, 1971.
2. M. De Marco and J. Lipton. Completeness and cut-elimination in the intuitionistic theory of types. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 15:821–854, 2005.
3. G. Dowek, T. Hardin, and C. Kirchner. Theorem proving modulo. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 31:32–72, 2003.

4. 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.
5. G. Dowek and B. Werner. Proof normalization modulo. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 68(4):1289–1316, 2003.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. O. Hermant. A model based cut elimination proof. In *2nd St-Petersbourg Days in Logic and Computability*, 2003.
9. O. Hermant. *Méthodes sémantiques en déduction modulo*. Doctoral Thesis. Université de Paris 7, 2005.
10. O. Hermant. Semantic cut elimination in the intuitionistic sequent calculus. In P. Urzyczyn, editor, *Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications*, number 3461 in Lectures Notes in Computer Science, pages 221–233, 2005.
11. M. Okada. A uniform semantic proof for cut elimination and completeness of various first and higher order logics. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 281:471–498, 2002.
12. M. Parigot. *Strong normalization for the second orclassical natural deduction*. *Logic in Computer Science*, 39–46, 1993.
13. D. Prawitz. Hauptsatz for higher order logic. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 33:452–457, 1968.
14. H. Rasiowa and R. Sikorski. *The mathematics of metamathematics*. Polish Scientific Publishers, 1963.
15. W. W. Tait. A non constructive proof of Gentzen's Hauptsatz for second order predicate logic. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 72:980–983, 1966.
16. W. W. Tait. Intentional interpretations of functionals of finite type I. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 32:198–212, 1967.
17. M. o. Takahashi. A proof of cut-elimination theorem in simple type theory. *Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan*, 19:399–410, 1967.