

MPRI
PRFSYS

Benjamin Werner

Higher-Order Logic

30 Sept. 2025

Motivations / Introduction

(on the blackboard)

note to self: start with definitional / propositional equality

$$T ::= \iota \mid o \mid T \rightarrow T$$

$$t ::= x^T \mid t t \mid \lambda x^T. t$$

$$\vdash x^T : T \qquad \frac{\vdash t : A \rightarrow B \quad \vdash u : A}{\vdash t u : B}$$

$$\frac{\vdash t : B}{\vdash \lambda x^A. t : A \rightarrow B}$$

One rule per form:

- ▶ $x^A : B \Rightarrow A=B$
- ▶ $t u : B \Rightarrow \exists A. t : A \rightarrow B \text{ and } u:A$
- ▶ $\lambda x^A. t : C \Rightarrow \exists B. C = A \rightarrow B, t : B$

Two simple properties of simply typed λ -calculus

- ▶ Subject reduction: if $t : A$ and $t \triangleright_{\beta} t'$ then $t' : A$
- ▶ Strong normalization: if $t : A$, there is no infinite sequence
 $t \triangleright_{\beta} t_1 \triangleright_{\beta} t_2 \triangleright_{\beta} t_3 \triangleright_{\beta} t_4 \dots$

Alternative inductive definition: SN is the smallest set of terms such that:
 $(\forall u, t \triangleright_{\beta} u \Rightarrow u \in \text{SN}) \Rightarrow t \in \text{SN}$

Proof: in part 2

A very simple model

For each atomic type α , take a set $U(\alpha)$

Define : $| \alpha | \equiv U(\alpha)$

$| A \rightarrow B | \equiv | B |^{| A |}$ (total set-theoretical functions)

Given $\mathcal{J}$ s.t. $\mathcal{J}(x^A) \in | A |$ we define for every $t : B$, $| t |_{\mathcal{J}} \in | B |$

- ▶ $| x^B |_{\mathcal{J}} \equiv \mathcal{J}(x^B)$
- ▶ $| (t \ u) |_{\mathcal{J}} \equiv | t |_{\mathcal{J}}(| u |_{\mathcal{J}})$
- ▶ $| \lambda x^A . t |_{\mathcal{J}} \equiv \gamma \in | A | \mapsto | t |_{\mathcal{J}}; x^A \leftarrow \gamma$

Is this linked to normalization ?

A very simple model (2)

If we add the possibility for non-terminating functions :

$$Y_A : ((A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow A)) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow A) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad Y_A F \triangleright F (Y_A F)$$

$$F : (A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow A)$$

$$YF : (A \rightarrow A)$$

$$F (Y F) : (A \rightarrow A)$$

corresponds to $\text{let rec } f (x:A) = \dots (f \ t) \dots (f \ u) \dots$

What happens with the model ?

$|Y_A|$ is not (totally) defined

Normal terms in simply typed calculus

Normal λ -terms: x , $\lambda x.n$, $\lambda x_1.\lambda x_2.n \dots$

$(x n_1 n_2 \dots n_{\mathbf{m}})$

in the end : $\lambda x_1.\lambda x_2. \dots \lambda x_{\mathbf{k}}. (x n_1 n_2 \dots n_{\mathbf{m}})$

Consider the following signature :

$0 : \iota$, $S : \iota \rightarrow \iota$, $+ \times : \iota \rightarrow \iota \rightarrow \iota$

what terms $f : \iota \rightarrow \iota$ can we construct ?

S $(+ n)$ $(\times n)$

$\lambda x^\iota. n$

$\lambda x^\iota. 0$

$(S n)$

$(+ n_1 n_2)$

$(\times n_1 n_2)$

x^ι

only polynomials (with constant exponents)

Higher-Order Logic

Aka : Simple Theory of Types Church 1940

Two atomic types : ι (natural numbers) and o (propositions)

Constants : $0 : \iota$, $S : \iota \rightarrow \iota$, $+ \times : \iota \rightarrow \iota \rightarrow \iota$

$\Rightarrow : o \rightarrow o \rightarrow o$

$\forall_T : (T \rightarrow o) \rightarrow o$

Propositions are objects

$$[] \text{ wf} \quad \frac{\Gamma \text{ wf} \quad \vdash A : o}{\Gamma ; A \text{ wf}}$$

$$Ax \quad \frac{\Gamma \text{ wf}}{\Gamma \vdash A} \text{ if } A \in \Gamma$$

Higher-Order Logic : rules

$$Ax \quad \frac{\Gamma \text{ wf}}{\Gamma \vdash A} \quad \text{if } A \in \Gamma$$

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

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

$(\Rightarrow A B)$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash \forall_T x^T. A} \quad \text{if } x \notin FV(\Gamma)$$

$(\forall_T \lambda x^T. A)$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \forall_T A \quad \vdash t : T}{\Gamma \vdash (A t)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \vdash A' : o}{\Gamma \vdash A'} \quad \text{if } A =_\beta A'$$

If $\Gamma \vdash A$, then $\Gamma \text{ wf}$ and $\vdash A : o$

HOL : defining connectives

$$\perp \equiv \forall X^o. X^o$$

$$\lambda A^o. \lambda B^o. \forall X^o. (A^o \Rightarrow B^o \Rightarrow X^o) \Rightarrow X^o$$

$$\lambda A^o. \lambda B^o. \forall X^o. (A^o \Rightarrow X^o) \Rightarrow (B^o \Rightarrow X^o) \Rightarrow X^o$$

These are inductive definitions
elim rules "for free". We need to prove the intro rules

$$= \equiv \lambda x^T. \lambda y^T. \forall P^{T \rightarrow o}. (P x^T) \Rightarrow (P y^T)$$

Existential

$$\exists_T \equiv \lambda P^{T \rightarrow o} . \forall X^o . (\forall x^T . (P\ x^T) \Rightarrow X^o) \Rightarrow X^o$$

Inductive properties

$$= \equiv \lambda x^T. \lambda y^T. \forall P^{T \rightarrow o}. (P x^T) \Rightarrow (P y^T)$$

What about :

$$= ' \equiv \lambda x^T. \lambda y^T. \forall R^{T \rightarrow T \rightarrow o}. (\forall z^T. R z^T z^T) \Rightarrow (R x^T y^T)$$

Inductive properties

How do we talk about x^y ?

Think of a function as a relation

$(\text{Exp } n \ 0 \ 1)$

$(\text{Exp } n \ m \ r) \Rightarrow (\text{Exp } n \ (S \ m) \ (n \times r))$

$\text{Exp} \equiv \lambda n. \lambda m. \lambda r. \forall R.$

$(R \ 0 \ 1) \Rightarrow$

$(\forall b \ c. (R \ b \ c) \Rightarrow (R \ (S \ b) \ (n \times c))) \Rightarrow$

$R \ m \ r$

Naming functions: Hilbert operator

$\mathcal{E}(P)$ "The" object verifying P ("choice operator")

$$\frac{\vdash (P \ t)}{\vdash (P \ \mathcal{E}(P))}$$

Using $\mathcal{E}$ is not (really) intuitionistic (see Coq exercise)