

# Finitistic Higher Order Logic

Matthias Eberl

ABM - LMU Munich, 14.12.2017

# Introduction

## Aim:

- ▶ A finitistic understanding of mathematics
- ▶ Forerunner: Jan Mycielski (Local finite theories, JSL '86)

## Our approach: Use model theory

- ▶ FOL: Adopt Tarskian semantics
- ▶ HOL: Adopt models of STT

## Main idea:

Infinite sets are not actual infinite, but indefinitely extensible —  
This applies also to the syntax. No notion of computability.

# First order logic I

## Basic change:

Use a family  $(\mathcal{M}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  with finite sets  $\mathcal{M}_i$  and a directed index set  $\mathcal{I}$  instead of an infinite set  $\mathcal{M}$ .

## Approximation declaration:

Introduce approximation declarations  $C \vdash t : i$  and  $C \vdash \Phi$  with approximation context  $C = (i_0, \dots, i_{n-1})$  being a list of indices.

## Sufficiently large:

Use a relation  $i \gg C$  meaning “ $i$  is sufficiently large relative to  $C$ ”.  
Restrict contexts to those satisfying  $i_k \gg (i_0, \dots, i_{k-1})$ .

## Interpretation:

Interpret  $\models_{\gg} \forall x \Phi[\mathbf{a} : C]$  as: There is some “sufficiently large” index  $i \gg C$  such that  $\models_{\gg} \Phi[\mathbf{a}, b : C.i]$  holds for all  $b \in \mathcal{M}_i$ .

# First order logic II

## Main result:

- ▶ A model  $(\mathcal{M}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  validates the same formulas as the limit model  $\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{M}_i$ .
- ▶ We have soundness and completeness.
- ▶ New metatheory: e.g. no unavoidable non-standard models, categoricity of first order PA becomes possible.
- ▶ Applicable also to Kripke models and intuitionistic logic.

# First order logic II

## Main result:

- ▶ A model  $(\mathcal{M}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  validates the same formulas as the limit model  $\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{M}_i$ .
- ▶ We have soundness and completeness.
- ▶ New metatheory: e.g. no unavoidable non-standard models, categoricity of first order PA becomes possible.
- ▶ Applicable also to Kripke models and intuitionistic logic.

## No infinity at all:

Model theory is applicable to background theory: Model of model theory is also finitistic (in particular: Index  $\mathcal{I}$  is not infinitely large).

# Towards higher order logic I

## New in HOL:

Infinite objects are approximated, too. No infinite functions as  $f : (\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , but approximations  $f : (\mathbb{N}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_j) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_k$  with  $\mathbb{N}_i = \{0, \dots, i-1\}$  and  $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ .

# Towards higher order logic I

## New in HOL:

Infinite objects are approximated, too. No infinite functions as  $f : (\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , but approximations  $f : (\mathbb{N}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_j) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_k$  with  $\mathbb{N}_i = \{0, \dots, i-1\}$  and  $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ .

## Total or partial functions?

Domain theory provides a notion of approximation of infinite objects. But it uses partial functions. We use total functions:

- ▶ Partial functions not suitable for a HOL (Type *bool* has partial truth values).
- ▶ Since we only have finite sets  $\mathcal{M}_i$ , there is no need to approximate functions by finite partial functions.

## Towards higher order logic II

### Partial surjections:

Partial surjections  $\overset{P}{\mapsto}$  arise when embeddings on base types are extended to higher type as logical relations. But at higher types the partial surjections are not transitive (composable):

$$f'' \overset{P}{\mapsto} f' \overset{P}{\mapsto} f \not\Rightarrow f'' \overset{P}{\mapsto} f.$$

Use instead property:

$$\exists f'' \quad f'' \overset{P}{\mapsto} f' \text{ and } f'' \overset{P}{\mapsto} f \iff f' \overset{P}{\mapsto} f. \quad (1)$$



## Towards higher order logic II

### Partial surjections:

Partial surjections  $\xrightarrow{P}$  arise when embeddings on base types are extended to higher type as logical relations. But at higher types the partial surjections are not transitive (composable):

$$f'' \xrightarrow{P} f' \xrightarrow{P} f \not\Rightarrow f'' \xrightarrow{P} f.$$

Use instead property:

$$\exists f'' \quad f'' \xrightarrow{P} f' \text{ and } f'' \xrightarrow{P} f \iff f' \xrightarrow{P} f. \quad (1)$$

### Embedding and projection:

Property (1) too weak to extend it to higher types. Auxiliary structure of embedding-projection pair around  $\xrightarrow{P}$  necessary. But: Several choices possible.

# Towards higher order logic III

## Limit construction:

New limit construction necessary: In FOL the direct limit suffices, in HOL we need more, e.g.  $id_{i,j} : \mathbb{N}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_j$  with  $i \leq j$  has limit  $id : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ .

Idea: Use partial surjections for the limit construction with property (1) formulated as a universal property.

# Towards higher order logic III

## Limit construction:

New limit construction necessary: In FOL the direct limit suffices, in HOL we need more, e.g.  $id_{i,j} : \mathbb{N}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_j$  with  $i \leq j$  has limit  $id : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ .

Idea: Use partial surjections for the limit construction with property (1) formulated as a universal property.

## Sufficiently many:

Additionally required: A notion of “sufficiently many” (“almost all”), a kind of Fréchet filter  $\mathfrak{F}$ .

# Two views

Two views:

(FIN) Dynamic finitistic multiverse e.g.  $id_{i,j} : \mathbb{N}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_j$ .

(INF) Static universe with actual infinity e.g.  $id : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ .

From (FIN) to (INF):

Limit construction with  $\varinjlim$ .

Structure on (INF):

Family  $\approx_i$  of partial equivalence relations (PERs) over  $\mathcal{I}$ , generated by  $\varinjlim$ . Idea:  $\approx_i$  approximates equality.

From (INF) to (FIN):

Take the equivalence classes of  $\approx_i$ .

# Universes with families of PERs

Auxiliary structure:

Embedding  $\leftrightarrow$  Points (representatives of equivalence classes).

Projection  $\leftrightarrow$  Extension of PER to equivalence relation.

# Universes with families of PERs

## Auxiliary structure:

Embedding  $\leftrightarrow$  Points (representatives of equivalence classes).

Projection  $\leftrightarrow$  Extension of PER to equivalence relation.

## Universe view:

Set  $\mathcal{M}$  with PERs  $\approx_i$  for  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , approximating equality on  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Properties:

- ▶  $\approx_i$  dense in  $\mathcal{M}$ , i.e.,  $\{i \in \mathcal{I} \mid a \approx_i a\} \in \mathfrak{F}$ .
- ▶  $\approx_{i'}$  finer than  $\approx_i$  for  $i' \geq i$ , but not necessarily  $\approx_{i'} \subseteq \approx_i$ .
- ▶ Further properties in combination with points and extension.
- ▶ Functions are extensional (due to universal property of the limit).
- ▶ Limit is complete (define convergent families  $(a^i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  w.r.t.  $\approx_i$  and limit elements).

# One-to-one correspondence

## Main idea:

- ▶ To each multiverse with partial surjections there is exactly one (extensional and complete) limit universe with PERs.
- ▶ To each universe with PERs the equivalence classes form a multiverse with partial surjections.

Hence: The limit structure satisfies the principle of finite support.

# One-to-one correspondence

## Main idea:

- ▶ To each multiverse with partial surjections there is exactly one (extensional and complete) limit universe with PERs.
- ▶ To each universe with PERs the equivalence classes form a multiverse with partial surjections.

Hence: The limit structure satisfies the principle of finite support.

## However:

From a finitistic perspective we need only multiverse with partial surjections. Nevertheless, the limit can be seen as an indefinitely large stage in  $(\mathcal{M}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ .



# Open questions

## Limit structure:

What exactly is this limit structure? Are they the (hereditarily) total continuous functionals (Kleene-Kreisel)?

## Continuity:

What is the notion of continuity with respect to  $\approx_i$ ?

$f$  is  $i$ - $j$ -continuous iff  $a \approx_i b$  implies  $f(a) \approx_j f(b)$ .

Define  $f$  is uniform continuous iff there are sufficiently many  $(i, j)$  such that  $f$  is  $i$ - $j$ -continuous. Too restrictive?

## Approximation declaration:

What is the corresponding notion in HOL?

Any questions?

Thank you for your attention.