Proof interpretations: what they are and what they are good for

Jaime Gaspar

INRIA Paris-Rocquencourt, πr^2 , Univ Paris Diderot, Sorbonne Paris Cité, F-78153 Le Chesnay, France Financially supported by the French Fondation Sciences Mathématiques de Paris



T is consistent

CL is consistent



Unprovability

T doesn't prove S

ZF doesn't prove AC



Computational content

T proves
$$\exists x \leq b S(x)$$







Unprovability

T doesn't prove S

ZF doesn't prove AC



Computational content

T proves
$$\exists x \leq b S(x)$$





T is consistent

CL is consistent



Unprovability

T doesn't prove S

ZF doesn't prove AC



Computational content

T proves
$$\exists x \leq b S(x)$$







T is consistent

CL is consistent



Unprovability

T doesn't prove S

ZF doesn't prove AC



Computational content

T proves
$$\exists x \leq b S(x)$$









T is consistent

CL is consistent



Unprovability

T doesn't prove S

ZF doesn't prove AC



Computational content

T proves
$$\exists x \leq b S(x)$$







T is consistent

CL is consistent



Unprovability

T doesn't prove S

ZF doesn't prove AC



Computational content

T proves
$$\exists x \leq b S(x)$$





T is consistent

CL is consistent



Unprovability T doesn't prove SComputational content T proves $\exists x \leq b \ S(x)$ $T_1 = PA^{\omega} + \forall n \ \exists p \text{ prime } n
<math display="block">T_2 = T_1$ I = monotone functional interpretationafter a negative translation $1 \ (2) \ (3) \ 4 \ (5) \ 6$ $(7) \ 8 \ 9 \ 10 \ (1) \ 12$ $(3) \ 14 \ 15 \ 16 \ (7) \ 18$ $(9) \ 20 \ 21 \ 22 \ (2) \ 24$



T is consistent

CL is consistent



Unprovability

T doesn't prove S

ZF doesn't prove AC



Computational content

T proves
$$\exists x \leq b S(x)$$

