

Math 293A: Strong Normalization for $\mathbf{Nm}_{\rightarrow}$, λ_{\rightarrow} and Arithmetic

Ting Zhang (tingz@cs.stanford.edu)
Department of Computer Science
Stanford University
November 12, 2002

1 Introduction

In this report we present strong normalization proofs of $\mathbf{Nm}_{\rightarrow}$ and arithmetic respectively [TS00] [Lei75]. As we shall see the two proofs bear great similarity.

2 Strong Normalization for $\mathbf{Nm}_{\rightarrow}$ and λ_{\rightarrow} [TS00]

Definition 2.1. $\mathbf{Nm}_{\rightarrow}$ is the natural deduction system of minimal implicational logic and λ_{\rightarrow} is the system of λ terms of corresponding deductions.

Definition 2.2 (Strongly Normalizable). A λ_{\rightarrow} term t is **strongly normalizable (s.n.)** if any β -conversion sequence beginning with t terminates. Let \succ denote 1-step β -conversion and \succ^* multi-step β -conversion respectively.

Definition 2.3. A λ_{\rightarrow} term t is **non-introduced** if t is not of the form $\lambda x.s$. In other words t is non-introduced if the final rule of the corresponding derivation is not $\rightarrow I$.

Example 2.1. $\mathbf{k}_{\lambda}^{A,B} \equiv \lambda x^A y^B . x^A$ is introduced while terms of the form st is non-introduced.

Definition 2.4. We define **computability predicate** $Comp_T(t)$ recursively as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} Comp_X(t) &:= \mathbf{SN}(t) \\ Comp_{A \rightarrow B}(t) &:= \forall s (Comp_A(s) \rightarrow Comp_B(ts)) \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.5 (Strong Computability). A term $t : B$ is **strongly computable** if $FV(t) \subseteq \{x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n\}$ and $Comp_{A_i}(s_i)$ for $i \geq n$, then $Comp_B(t[x_1, \dots, x_n/s_1, \dots, s_n])$.

Lemma 2.1. Four properties hold for *Comp*.

C1 If $Comp_A(t)$, then $\mathbf{SN}(t)$.

C2 If $Comp_A(t)$ and $t \gg t'$, then $Comp_A(t')$.

C3 If t is non-introduced and $\forall t' \prec t \text{ } Comp_A(t')$, then $Comp_A(t)$.

C4 If t is non-introduced and normal, then $Comp_A(t)$.

Proof. We show C1-C3 by induction simultaneously and C4 follows outright from C3 since if t is normal then $\forall t' \prec t \text{ } Comp_A(t')$ vacuously holds.

Induction Base: $A \equiv X$.

C1, C2 and C3 follow immediately from the definition.

Induction Step: $A \equiv B \rightarrow C$.

C1 Suppose that $Comp_{B \rightarrow C}(t)$ and let x be a variable of type B . By definition $Comp_C(tx)$ and by IH of C1, $\mathbf{SN}(tx)$. It follows that $\mathbf{SN}(t)$ as any reduction tree of t is embedded in a reduction tree of tx .

C2 Let $t' \prec t$ and $s \in Comp_B$. By definition $Comp_C(ts)$ and since $ts \gg t's$, by IH $Comp_C(t's)$. It follows from definition that $Comp_{B \rightarrow C}(t')$.

C3 Let $s \in Comp_B$ and $t'' \prec ts$. As t is non-introduction, either $t'' \equiv t's$ and $t' \prec t$ or $t'' \equiv ts'$ and $s' \prec s$.

– $t'' \equiv t's$ and $t' \prec t$. By assumption $Comp_{B \rightarrow C}(t')$ and hence $Comp_C(t's)$, that is $Comp_C(t'')$. By IH of C3, $Comp_C(ts)$ and by definition $Comp_{B \rightarrow C}(t)$ as s is arbitrary.

– $t'' \equiv ts'$ and $s' \prec s$. We use subinduction on the length of reduction of s . The base case is trivial as s can not be normal. As the length of reduction of s' is less than that of s , by sub IH, $Comp_C(ts')$ and by IH, $Comp_C(ts)$ and so $Comp_{B \rightarrow C}(t)$.

□

Lemma 2.2 (Substitution). If $\forall s(Comp_A(s) \rightarrow Comp_B(t[x/s]))$, then $Comp_{A \rightarrow B}(\lambda x.t)$.

Proof. Let $s \in \text{Comp}_A$. We need to show that $\text{Comp}_B((\lambda x.t)s)$. Let if $t'' \prec (\lambda x.t)s$. By Lemma 2.1.C3 it suffices to show $\text{Comp}_B(t'')$. We do induction on the sum $h_s + h_t$ of reduction heights of s and t .

Base case: $h_s + h_t = 0$.

Then $t'' \equiv t[x/s]$ and by assumption $\text{Comp}_B(t'')$.

Induction step.

1. $t'' \equiv (\lambda x.t)s'$ and $s' \prec s$. So $t[x/s'] \succ t[x/s]$. By Lemma 2.1 C2 $\text{Comp}_B(t[x/s'])$ and by IH, $\text{Comp}_B(t'')$.
2. $t'' \equiv (\lambda x.t')s$ and $t' \prec t$. So $t'[x/s] \prec t[x/s]$. By Lemma 2.1 C2 $\text{Comp}_B(t'[x/s])$ and by IH, $\text{Comp}_B(t'')$.
3. $t'' \equiv t[x/s]$ and by assumption $\text{Comp}_B(t'')$.

□

Theorem 2.1 (Strong Computability). *All terms of λ_{\rightarrow} are strongly computable under substitution.*

Proof. By induction on t . If t is a variable, then t is strongly computable by assumption. Let $t^* = t[x_1/s_1, \dots, x_n/s_n]$.

1. $t^B = t_1^{A \rightarrow B} t_2^A$. Then $t^{*,B} = t_1^{*,A \rightarrow B} t_2^{*,A}$. By IH $\text{Comp}_{A \rightarrow B}(t_1^*)$ and $\text{Comp}_A(t_2^*)$. By definition $\text{Comp}_B(t_1^* t_2^*)$.
2. $t^{A \rightarrow B} = \lambda x^A. t_1^B$. Let $s \in \text{Comp}_A$. Note that

$$t_1^*[x/s] \equiv t_1[x, x_1, \dots, x_n/s, s_1, \dots, s_n].$$

By IH $\text{Comp}_B(t_1^*[x/s])$ and by Lemma 2.2 $\text{Comp}_{A \rightarrow B}(\lambda x.t_1^*)$, that is, $\text{Comp}_{A \rightarrow B}(t^*)$.

□

Corollary 2.1. *All terms of λ_{\rightarrow} (deductions in $\mathbf{Nm}_{\rightarrow}$) are strongly normalizable.*

2.1 Reduction of strong normalization between systems

In general if we can map one derivation step in system \mathbf{S} to finite number of derivation steps in system \mathbf{S}' , then strong normalization of \mathbf{S}' implies strong normalization for \mathbf{S} .

Example 2.2. *Reduction of strong normalization for $\lambda_{\forall\rightarrow}$ to strong normalization for λ_{\rightarrow} .*

Define reduction map φ recursively as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(Rt_1 \dots t_n) &= R^* \quad (R^* \in \mathcal{PV}) \\ \varphi(A \rightarrow B) &= \varphi(A) \rightarrow \varphi(B) \\ \varphi(\forall x Ax) &= (Q \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow A \quad (Q \in \mathcal{PV} \text{ distinct from } R^*)\end{aligned}$$

Every derivation of $\lambda_{\forall\rightarrow}$ is mapped under φ to a derivation of λ_{\rightarrow} . More precisely,

1.
$$\frac{\frac{[A]}{\Sigma} \frac{B}{A \rightarrow B}}{A \rightarrow B} (\rightarrow I) \quad \mapsto^{\varphi} \quad \frac{\frac{[\varphi(A)]}{\varphi(\Sigma)} \frac{\varphi(B)}{\varphi(A) \rightarrow \varphi(B)}}{\varphi(A) \rightarrow \varphi(B)} (\rightarrow I)$$
2.
$$\frac{\frac{\Sigma(a)}{A(a)} \frac{A(a)}{\forall x Ax}}{\forall x Ax} (\forall I) \quad \mapsto^{\varphi} \quad \frac{\frac{\varphi(\Sigma(a))}{\varphi(A(a))} \frac{\varphi(A(a))}{(Q \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow \varphi(A(a))}}{(Q \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow \varphi(A(a))} (\forall I)$$
3.
$$\frac{\frac{\Sigma}{\forall x Ax} \frac{A(a)}{At}}{\forall x Ax} (\forall E) \quad \mapsto^{\varphi} \quad \frac{\frac{\varphi(\Sigma)}{(Q \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow \varphi(A)} \frac{Q}{Q \rightarrow Q}}{\varphi(At)} (\rightarrow E)$$

It is easily seen that this reduction is sound, i.e., one derivation step in $\lambda_{\forall\rightarrow}$ corresponds to one or two derivation steps in λ_{\rightarrow} . As λ_{\rightarrow} is **s.n.**, so is $\lambda_{\forall\rightarrow}$.

3 Strong Normalization for Arithmetic [Lei75]

Definition 3.1 (Complexity Measure). *The measure μ on formulas is defined recursively on their structures:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(A) &:= 0 \text{ for } A \text{ atomic,} \\ \mu(A \& B) &:= \mu(A \vee B) := \max(\mu(A), \mu(B)), \\ \mu(\forall x Ax) &:= \mu(\exists x Ax) = \mu(A\bar{0}), \\ \mu(A \rightarrow B) &:= \max(\mu(A) + 1, \mu(B)).\end{aligned}$$

We define $\mu(\Delta)$ to be $\mu(A)$ where A is derived formula of Δ .

Definition 3.2 (Detour Reduction). *There are five detour reductions, denoted by \succ_{\odot} for $\odot \equiv \&, \vee, \rightarrow, \forall, \exists$.*

$$\begin{array}{c}
\succ_{\&} \\
\frac{\frac{\Sigma_0 \quad \Sigma_1}{A_0 \quad A_1}}{A_0 \& A_1}}{A_i} \quad \succ_{\&} \quad \frac{\Sigma_i}{A_i} \quad (i = 0, 1) \\
\\
\succ_{\vee} \\
\frac{\frac{\Sigma \quad [A_0] \quad [A_1]}{A_i \quad \Delta_0 \quad \Delta_1}}{A_0 \vee A_1} \quad C}{C} \quad \succ_{\vee} \quad \frac{\Sigma \quad [A_i]}{\Delta_i} \quad C \quad (i = 0, 1) \\
\\
\succ_{\rightarrow} \\
\frac{\frac{[A] \quad \Sigma \quad B}{A \rightarrow B} \quad \Delta \quad A}{B} \quad \succ_{\rightarrow} \quad \frac{\Delta \quad [A]}{\Sigma \quad B} \\
\\
\succ_{\forall} \\
\frac{\frac{\Sigma(a) \quad Aa}{\forall x Ax}}{At} \quad \succ_{\forall} \quad \frac{\Sigma(t)}{At} \\
\\
\succ_{\exists} \\
\frac{\frac{\Sigma \quad [Aa]}{At} \quad \Delta(a) \quad B}{\exists x Ax} \quad \succ_{\exists} \quad \frac{\Sigma \quad [At]}{\Delta(t)} \quad B
\end{array}$$

Definition 3.3 (Strongly Normalizable). *A derivation Δ is **strongly normalizable (s.n.)** if it is impossible to have the infinitely descending chain as follows:*

$$\Delta \succ \Delta_1 \succ \dots$$

If Δ is s.n., we write $\nu(\Delta)$ for the maximum n such that

$$\Delta \succ \Delta_1 \succ \dots \Delta_n$$

$\nu(\Delta)$ is well-defined by König's Lemma and the fact that every derivation has only finite number of reducts.

Definition 3.4 (Improper Reduction). *There are five corresponding improper reductions (written \succsim_{\odot} for $\odot \equiv \&, \vee, \rightarrow, \forall, \exists$) which are only used in the proof.*

$$\begin{array}{l}
\mathcal{R}_{\&} \\
\frac{\Sigma_0 \quad \Sigma_1}{A_0 \& A_1} \quad \mathcal{R}_{\&} \quad \frac{\Sigma_i}{A_i} \quad (i = 0, 1) \\
\\
\mathcal{R}_{\vee} \\
\frac{\Sigma}{A_i} \quad \mathcal{R}_{\vee} \quad \frac{\Sigma}{A_i} \quad (i = 0, 1) \\
\\
\mathcal{R}_{\rightarrow} \\
\frac{\frac{[A]}{\Sigma} B}{A \rightarrow B} \quad \mathcal{R}_{\rightarrow} \quad \frac{\Delta}{\frac{[A]}{\Sigma} B} \quad \left(\frac{\Delta}{A} \text{ is stable} \right) \\
\\
\mathcal{R}_{\forall} \\
\frac{\Sigma(a)}{Aa} \quad \mathcal{R}_{\forall} \quad \frac{\Sigma(t)}{At} \\
\\
\mathcal{R}_{\exists} \\
\frac{\Sigma}{At} \quad \mathcal{R}_{\exists} \quad \frac{\Sigma}{At}
\end{array}$$

Definition 3.5 (Stability). We write $\Delta > \Delta'$ if $\Delta \succ \Delta'$ or $\Delta \lesssim \Delta'$ and $\Delta \gg \Delta'$ if for some $n \geq 0$ we have as a sequence

$$\Delta \equiv \Delta_0 > \Delta_1 > \dots > \Delta_n \equiv \Delta'$$

$\Delta < \Delta'$ and $\Delta \ll \Delta'$ are defined similarly.

We say Δ is **stable** if for any $\Delta' \Delta \gg \Delta'$ implies Δ' is **s.n.**.

Definition 3.6 (Substitution Stability). We write $\Delta \mapsto \Delta^*$ if Δ^* is obtained by substituting any terms for parameters in Δ and then substituting stable derivations for some open assumptions in Δ . We say Δ is **stable under substitution** (**s.s.**) if for any $\Delta^* \Delta \mapsto \Delta^*$ implies Δ^* is stable.

3.1 Easy Lemmas

Lemma 3.1. Δ is stable if and only if $\Delta > \Delta'$ implies Δ' is stable.

Lemma 3.2. Δ is s.s. implies Δ is stable and Δ is stable implies Δ is s.n..

Lemma 3.3. *Let*

$$\Delta \equiv \frac{\Delta_0 \ (\Delta_1)}{A} (\rho)$$

where ρ is an introduction rule other than $\forall I$ or $\forall E$. If Δ_0 (and Δ_1) are stable, then Δ is stable.

Lemma 3.4. *If a is free in*

$$\frac{\Delta_0(a)}{Aa}$$

and $\Delta_0(t)$ is stable for every t , then

$$\Delta \equiv \frac{\Delta(a)}{\frac{Aa}{\forall xAx}}$$

is stable.

Proof. We show the result by induction on $\nu(\Delta_0)$. Suppose that

$$\Delta \succ \Delta' \equiv \frac{\Delta'_0(a)}{\frac{Aa}{\forall xAx}}$$

Then $\nu(\Delta'_0) < \nu(\Delta_0)$. By IH Δ' is stable. Suppose

$$\Delta \succsim \Delta' \equiv \frac{\Delta_0(t)}{At}$$

Then Δ' is stable by assumption. So By Lemma 3.1 Δ is stable. \square

Lemma 3.5. *If*

$$\frac{\Delta_0}{At}$$

is stable, then

$$\Delta \equiv \frac{\Delta_0}{\frac{At}{\exists xAx}}$$

is stable.

Proof. We show the result by induction on $\nu(\Delta_0)$. Suppose

$$\Delta \succ \Delta' \equiv \frac{\Delta'_0}{\frac{At}{\exists xAx}}$$

Then $\nu(\Delta'_0) < \nu(\Delta_0)$. By IH Δ' is stable. Suppose

$$\Delta \succsim \Delta' \equiv \frac{\Delta_0}{At}$$

Then Δ' is stable by assumption. So By Lemma 3.1 Δ is stable. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let*

$$\Pi \quad \equiv \quad \frac{\Pi_0 \quad \Pi_1}{A} (\rho)$$

where ρ is an elimination rule other than $\exists E$ or $\forall E$. If Π_0 and Π_1 are stable, then Π is stable.

Proof. 1. Inner Reduction.

By induction on $\nu(\Pi_0) + \nu(\Pi_1)$. Note that $<$ is exactly \succ for all derivation ending with elimination rules. Let

$$\Pi \quad \succ \quad \Pi' \quad \equiv \quad \frac{\Pi'_0 \quad \Pi'_1}{A}$$

where $\Pi_0 \succ \Pi'_0$ and $\Pi_1 \succ \Pi'_1$. By assumption Π'_0 and Π'_1 are stable and since $\nu(\Pi'_0) + \nu(\Pi'_1) < \nu(\Pi_0) + \nu(\Pi_1)$, by IH Π' is stable. By Lemma 3.1 Π is stable.

2. Detour Reduction.

Take the case $\rho = \forall E$. Let

$$\Pi \quad \equiv \quad \frac{\frac{\Sigma(a)}{Aa}}{\frac{\forall xAx}{At}} \quad \succ \quad \frac{\Sigma(t)}{At}$$

Since

$$\frac{\Sigma(a)}{Aa} \quad \succ \quad \frac{\Sigma(t)}{At}$$

and

$$\frac{\Sigma(a)}{\forall xAx}$$

is stable by assumption, $\Sigma(t)$ is stable by Lemma 3.1. By Lemma 3.1 again Π is stable. □

Lemma 3.7. *Let*

$$\Pi \quad \equiv \quad \frac{\Pi_0 \quad \Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2}{A} (\forall E)$$

If Π_0 , Π_1 and Π_2 are stable, then Π is stable.

Proof. Analogous to Lemma 3.6. □

Lemma 3.8. *Let*

$$\Pi \quad \equiv \quad \frac{\frac{\Pi_0 \quad \frac{[A(a)] \quad \Pi_1(a)}{B} (\exists E)}{\exists x Ax} B}{B} (\exists E)$$

If Π_0 is stable and for every t $\Pi_1(t)$ is stable under Π_0 at $[At]$, then Π is stable.

Proof. c.f. [Lei75] □

3.2 Main Theorems

Theorem 3.1. *Let*

$$\Delta \quad \equiv \quad \frac{\Delta_0 \quad (\Delta_1)}{A} (\rho)$$

*where ρ is an introduction rule. If Δ_0 (and Δ_1) are **s.s.**, then Δ is **s.s.***

Proof. For ρ is $\forall I$, $\&I$ or $\rightarrow I$ it is an outright application of definition. We show that case where ρ is $\exists I$. In this case Δ_1 is empty. Let

$$\Delta \quad \equiv \quad \frac{\Delta_0}{\frac{At}{\exists x Ax}} (\exists I)$$

where

$$\frac{\Delta_0}{At}$$

is **s.s.**, and

$$\Delta \quad \mapsto \quad \Delta^* \quad \equiv \quad \frac{\Delta_0^*}{\frac{A^*t}{\exists x A^*x}} (\exists I)$$

Since

$$\frac{\Delta_0}{At} \quad \mapsto \quad \frac{\Delta_0^*}{A^*t}$$

it follows that

$$\frac{\Delta_0^*}{A^*t}$$

is stable and then by Lemma 3.5 Δ^* is stable and so Δ is **s.s.** □

Theorem 3.2. *Let*

$$\Pi \quad \equiv \quad \frac{\Pi_0 \quad \Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2}{A} (\rho)$$

*where ρ is an elimination rule. If Π_0 , Π_1 and Π_2 are **s.s.**, then Π is **s.s.***

Proof. We show the case where ρ is $\exists E$. Let

$$\Pi \equiv \frac{\frac{\Sigma}{Bt} \quad \frac{[B(a)]}{\Pi_1(a)}}{\frac{\exists x Bx}{A}} (\exists E)$$

$$\Pi \mapsto \Pi^* \equiv \frac{\frac{\Pi_0^* \quad \frac{[B(a)]}{\Pi_1^*(a)}}{\exists x Bx}}{A} (\exists E)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_0 &\equiv \frac{\Sigma}{Bt} \mapsto \Pi_0^* \\ \Pi_1 &\mapsto \frac{[B(a)]}{\Pi_1^*(a)} \\ &\quad A \end{aligned}$$

Since a appears free in any assumptions of Π , we have

$$\Pi_1 \mapsto \frac{\Sigma}{\frac{[B(t)]}{\Pi_1^*(t)}} \\ A$$

for any term t and stable derivation

$$\frac{\Sigma}{Bt}$$

Without loss assume that

$$\Pi_0^* \succ \dots \succ \frac{\Theta}{\frac{Bt}{\exists x Bx}} \succ \frac{\Theta}{Bt}$$

By assumption Π_0 is s.s., so Π_0^* is stable and then

$$\frac{\Theta}{Bt}$$

is stable. It follows that

$$\frac{\Theta}{\frac{[Bt]}{\Pi_1^*(t)}} \\ A$$

is stable. So $\Pi_1^*(t)$ is stable under Π_0^* at $[Bt]$ for any term t . By Lemma 3.8

$$\Pi^* \quad \equiv \quad \frac{\frac{\Pi_0 \quad \frac{\frac{\Sigma}{[B(t)]} \quad \Pi_1(t)}{\exists x Bx} \quad A}{A} (\exists E)}{A} (\exists E)$$

is stable and hence Π is **s.s.** □

Theorem 3.3. *Every derivation Π is s.s..*

Proof. By induction on derivation length $\lambda(\Pi)$. If $\lambda(\Pi) = 1$ the theorem follows from the definition of **s.s.** If Π ends with an introduction rule, it follows from Theorem 3.1 and if Π ends with an elimination rule, it follows from Theorem 3.2. □

Corollary 3.1 (Strong Normalization). *Every derivation is s.n..*

Proof. By Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.2 □

References

- [Lei75] Daniel Leivant. Strong normalization for arithmetic (variations on a theme of prawitz). *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 500, 1975.
- [TS00] A.S. Troelstra and H. Schwichtenberg. *Basic Proof Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.