

Polymorphic Higher-order Termination

Lukasz Czajka, TU Dortmund University
Cynthia Kop, Radboud University Nijmegen

June 2019

Polynomial interpretations: first-order

Question: Does the following TRS terminate?

$$\begin{aligned} \text{append}(\text{nil}, ys) &\longrightarrow ys \\ \text{append}(\text{cons}(x, xs), ys) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(x, \text{append}(xs, ys)) \end{aligned}$$

Polynomial interpretations: first-order

Question: Does the following TRS terminate?

$$\begin{aligned} \text{append}(\text{nil}, ys) &\longrightarrow ys \\ \text{append}(\text{cons}(x, xs), ys) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(x, \text{append}(xs, ys)) \end{aligned}$$

Answer: Yes, it does.

Polynomial interpretations: first-order

Question: Does the following TRS terminate?

$$\begin{aligned}\text{append}(\text{nil}, ys) &\longrightarrow ys \\ \text{append}(\text{cons}(x, xs), ys) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(x, \text{append}(xs, ys))\end{aligned}$$

Answer: Yes, it does. Let:

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket \text{nil} \rrbracket &= 1 \\ \llbracket \text{cons} \rrbracket(s, t) &= 1 + \llbracket s \rrbracket + \llbracket t \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{append} \rrbracket(s, t) &= 2 * \llbracket s \rrbracket + \llbracket t \rrbracket\end{aligned}$$

Polynomial interpretations: first-order

Question: Does the following TRS terminate?

$$\begin{aligned}\text{append}(\text{nil}, ys) &\longrightarrow ys \\ \text{append}(\text{cons}(x, xs), ys) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(x, \text{append}(xs, ys))\end{aligned}$$

Answer: Yes, it does. Let:

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket \text{nil} \rrbracket &= 1 \\ \llbracket \text{cons} \rrbracket(s, t) &= 1 + \llbracket s \rrbracket + \llbracket t \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{append} \rrbracket(s, t) &= 2 * \llbracket s \rrbracket + \llbracket t \rrbracket\end{aligned}$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket \text{append}(\text{nil}, ys) \rrbracket &= 2 + ys \\ &> ys \\ &= \llbracket ys \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{append}(\text{cons}(x, xs), ys) \rrbracket &= 2 + 2x + 2xs + ys \\ &> 1 + x + 2xs + ys \\ &= \llbracket \text{cons}(x, \text{append}(xs, ys)) \rrbracket\end{aligned}$$

Polynomial interpretations: higher-order

Question: Does the following higher-order TRS terminate?

$$\begin{aligned} \text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs)) \end{aligned}$$

Polynomial interpretations: higher-order

Question: Does the following higher-order TRS terminate?

$$\begin{aligned}\text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs))\end{aligned}$$

Answer: Depends.

Polynomial interpretations: higher-order

Question: Does the following higher-order TRS terminate?

$$\begin{aligned}\text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs))\end{aligned}$$

Answer: Depends. **Not** terminating if:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{nil} &: \circ \\ \text{cons} &: (\circ \rightarrow \circ) \rightarrow \circ \rightarrow \circ \\ \text{map} &: ((\circ \rightarrow \circ) \rightarrow \circ \rightarrow \circ) \rightarrow \circ \rightarrow \circ\end{aligned}$$

Polynomial interpretations: higher-order

Question: Does the following higher-order TRS terminate?

$$\begin{aligned}\text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs))\end{aligned}$$

Answer: Depends. **Not** terminating if:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{nil} &: \circ \\ \text{cons} &: (\circ \rightarrow \circ) \rightarrow \circ \rightarrow \circ \\ \text{map} &: ((\circ \rightarrow \circ) \rightarrow \circ \rightarrow \circ) \rightarrow \circ \rightarrow \circ\end{aligned}$$

Let $\omega := \text{cons}(\lambda x : o. \text{map}(\lambda y : o \rightarrow o. \lambda z : o. y \ x, x), \text{nil})$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{map}(\lambda y : o \rightarrow o. \lambda z : o. y \ \omega, \omega) \\ \longrightarrow &\text{cons}(\lambda y. \lambda z. y \ \omega) (\lambda x : o. \text{map}(\lambda y : o \rightarrow o. \lambda z : o. y \ x, x)), \text{map}(\dots)) \\ \longrightarrow_{\beta} &\text{cons}(\lambda z : o. (\lambda x : o. \text{map}(\lambda y : o \rightarrow o. \lambda z : o. y \ x, x)) \ \omega, \text{map}(\dots)) \\ \longrightarrow_{\beta} &\text{cons}(\lambda z : o. \underline{\text{map}(\lambda y : o \rightarrow o. \lambda z : o. y \ \omega, \omega)}, \text{map}(\dots))\end{aligned}$$

Polynomial interpretations: higher-order

Question: Does the following higher-order TRS terminate?

$$\begin{aligned} \text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs)) \end{aligned}$$

Answer: Depends.

Polynomial interpretations: higher-order

Question: Does the following higher-order TRS terminate?

$$\begin{aligned}\text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs))\end{aligned}$$

Answer: Depends. It **does** terminate if:

```
nil   : List
cons  : Nat → List → List
map   : (Nat → Nat) → List → List
```

Polynomial interpretations: higher-order

Question: Does the following higher-order TRS terminate?

$$\begin{aligned}\text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs))\end{aligned}$$

Answer: Depends. It **does** terminate if:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{nil} &: \text{List} \\ \text{cons} &: \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{List} \rightarrow \text{List} \\ \text{map} &: (\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}) \rightarrow \text{List} \rightarrow \text{List}\end{aligned}$$

Let:

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket \text{nil} \rrbracket &= 0 \\ \llbracket \text{cons}(s, t) \rrbracket &= 1 + \llbracket s \rrbracket + \llbracket t \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{map}(s, t) \rrbracket &= (2 + \llbracket t \rrbracket) * (1 + \llbracket s \rrbracket(\llbracket t \rrbracket)) \\ \llbracket s \ t \rrbracket &= \llbracket s \rrbracket(\llbracket t \rrbracket) + \llbracket t \rrbracket \quad \text{if } s : \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}\end{aligned}$$

Polynomial interpretations: higher-order

Question: Does the following higher-order TRS terminate?

$$\begin{aligned}\text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs))\end{aligned}$$

Answer: Depends. It **does** terminate if:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{nil} &: \text{List} \\ \text{cons} &: \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{List} \rightarrow \text{List} \\ \text{map} &: (\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}) \rightarrow \text{List} \rightarrow \text{List}\end{aligned}$$

Let:

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket \text{nil} \rrbracket &= 0 \\ \llbracket \text{cons}(s, t) \rrbracket &= 1 + \llbracket s \rrbracket + \llbracket t \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{map}(s, t) \rrbracket &= (2 + \llbracket t \rrbracket) * (1 + \llbracket s \rrbracket(\llbracket t \rrbracket)) \\ \llbracket s \ t \rrbracket &= \llbracket s \rrbracket(\llbracket t \rrbracket) + \llbracket t \rrbracket \quad \text{if } s : \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}\end{aligned}$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket \text{map}(F, \text{nil}) \rrbracket &= F(0) + 1 \\ &> 0 = \llbracket \text{nil} \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) \rrbracket &= (2 + F(1 + x + xs)) * (2 + x + xs) \\ &> 1 + F(x) + x + (2 + xs) * (1 + F(xs)) \\ &= \llbracket \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs)) \rrbracket\end{aligned}$$

Polynomial interpretations: polymorphic higher-order

Question: Does the following polymorphic HO-TRS terminate?

$$\begin{aligned}\text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs))\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{nil} &: \forall \alpha. \text{List}(\alpha) \\ \text{cons} &: \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \\ \text{map} &: \forall \alpha \beta. (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{List}(\beta)\end{aligned}$$

Polynomial interpretations: polymorphic higher-order

Question: Does the following polymorphic HO-TRS terminate?

$$\begin{aligned}\text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs))\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{nil} &: \forall \alpha. \text{List}(\alpha) \\ \text{cons} &: \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \\ \text{map} &: \forall \alpha \beta. (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{List}(\beta)\end{aligned}$$

Question: What about the following?

$$\begin{aligned}\text{fold}(F, a, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow a \\ \text{fold}(F, a, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{fold}(F, F a x, xs)\end{aligned}$$
$$\text{fold} : \forall \alpha \beta. (\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \rightarrow \beta$$

Shallow vs. Higher-rank polymorphism

Shallow polymorphism:

`nil` : $\forall\alpha. \text{List}(\alpha)$
`cons` : $\forall\alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha)$
`fold` : $\forall\alpha\beta. (\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \rightarrow \beta$

`fold`(*F*, *a*, `nil`) \longrightarrow *a*
`fold`(*F*, *a*, `cons`(*x*, *xs*)) \longrightarrow `fold`(*F*, *F a x*, *xs*)

Shallow vs. Higher-rank polymorphism

Shallow polymorphism:

`List` : $* \Rightarrow *$ ⇐

`nil` : $\forall \alpha. \text{List}(\alpha)$

`cons` : $\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha)$

`fold` : $\forall \alpha \beta. (\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \rightarrow \beta$

$\text{fold}_{\tau, \sigma}(F, a, \text{nil}_{\tau}) \rightarrow a$ ⇐

$\text{fold}_{\tau, \sigma}(F, a, \text{cons}_{\tau}(x, xs)) \rightarrow \text{fold}_{\tau, \sigma}(F, F a x, xs)$ ⇐

Shallow vs. Higher-rank polymorphism

Shallow polymorphism:

`List` : $* \Rightarrow *$
`nil` : $\forall \alpha. \text{List}(\alpha)$
`cons` : $\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha)$
`fold` : $\forall \alpha \beta. (\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \rightarrow \beta$

$\text{fold}_{\tau, \sigma}(F, a, \text{nil}_{\tau}) \longrightarrow a$
 $\text{fold}_{\tau, \sigma}(F, a, \text{cons}_{\tau}(x, xs)) \longrightarrow \text{fold}_{\tau, \sigma}(F, F a x, xs)$

Higher-rank polymorphism:

`List` : $*$
`nil` : `List`
`cons` : $\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \text{List} \rightarrow \text{List}$
`fold` : $\forall \beta. (\forall \alpha. \beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \text{List} \rightarrow \beta$

$\text{fold}_{\sigma}(F, a, \text{nil}) \longrightarrow a$
 $\text{fold}_{\sigma}(F, a, \text{cons}_{\tau}(x, xs)) \longrightarrow \text{fold}_{\sigma}(F, F \tau a x, xs)$

Polymorphism

$$\begin{aligned}\text{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow a \\ \text{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \text{cons}_\tau(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{fold}_\sigma(F, F \tau x a, xs)\end{aligned}$$

Polymorphism

$$\begin{aligned}\text{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow a \\ \text{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \text{cons}_\tau(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{fold}_\sigma(F, F \tau x a, xs)\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{fold}_{\text{List}}(\text{cons}, \text{nil}, \text{cons}_{\tau_1}(a_1, \text{cons}_{\tau_2}(a_2, \text{nil})))$$

Polymorphism

$$\begin{aligned}\text{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow a \\ \text{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \text{cons}_\tau(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{fold}_\sigma(F, F \tau x a, xs)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{fold}_{\text{List}}(\text{cons}, \text{nil}, \text{cons}_{\tau_1}(a_1, \text{cons}_{\tau_2}(a_2, \text{nil}))) &\longrightarrow \\ \text{fold}_{\text{List}}(\text{cons}, \text{cons}_{\tau_1}(a_1, \text{nil}), \text{cons}_{\tau_2}(a_2, \text{nil})) &\end{aligned}$$

Polymorphism

$$\begin{aligned}\text{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow a \\ \text{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \text{cons}_\tau(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{fold}_\sigma(F, F \tau x a, xs)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{fold}_{\text{List}}(\text{cons}, \text{nil}, \text{cons}_{\tau_1}(a_1, \text{cons}_{\tau_2}(a_2, \text{nil}))) &\longrightarrow \\ \text{fold}_{\text{List}}(\text{cons}, \text{cons}_{\tau_1}(a_1, \text{nil}), \text{cons}_{\tau_2}(a_2, \text{nil})) &\longrightarrow \\ \text{fold}_{\text{List}}(\text{cons}, \text{cons}_{\tau_2}(a_2, \text{cons}_{\tau_1}(a_1, \text{nil})), \text{nil}) &\end{aligned}$$

Polymorphism

$$\begin{aligned}\text{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow a \\ \text{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \text{cons}_\tau(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{fold}_\sigma(F, F \tau x a, xs)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{fold}_{\text{List}}(\text{cons}, \text{nil}, \text{cons}_{\tau_1}(a_1, \text{cons}_{\tau_2}(a_2, \text{nil}))) &\longrightarrow \\ \text{fold}_{\text{List}}(\text{cons}, \text{cons}_{\tau_1}(a_1, \text{nil}), \text{cons}_{\tau_2}(a_2, \text{nil})) &\longrightarrow \\ \text{fold}_{\text{List}}(\text{cons}, \text{cons}_{\tau_2}(a_2, \text{cons}_{\tau_1}(a_1, \text{nil})), \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \\ \text{cons}_{\tau_2}(a_2, \text{cons}_{\tau_1}(a_1, \text{nil})) &\end{aligned}$$

Our goal: handle systems like this!

Polymorphic functional systems

- Function symbols have a type: $\forall \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n. \sigma_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \sigma_k \rightarrow \tau$
- Terms are variables, abstractions, type abstractions and:
 $\mathbf{f}_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n}(s_1, \dots, s_k) : \tau[\alpha_1 := \pi_1, \dots, \alpha_n := \pi_n]$.

Our goal: handle systems like this!

Polymorphic functional systems

- Function symbols have a type: $\forall \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n. \sigma_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \sigma_k \rightarrow \tau$
- Terms are variables, abstractions, type abstractions and:
 $\mathbf{f}_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n}(s_1, \dots, s_k) : \tau[\alpha_1 := \pi_1, \dots, \alpha_n := \pi_n]$.

List	:	*
nil	:	List
cons	:	$\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \mathbf{List} \rightarrow \mathbf{List}$
fold	:	$(\forall \alpha. \beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \mathbf{List} \rightarrow \beta$

$\mathbf{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \mathbf{nil})$	\longrightarrow	a
$\mathbf{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \mathbf{cons}_\tau(x, xs))$	\longrightarrow	$\mathbf{fold}_\sigma(F, F \ \tau \ a \ x, xs)$

Our goal: handle systems like this!

Polymorphic functional systems

- Function symbols have a type: $\forall \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n. \sigma_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \sigma_k \rightarrow \tau$
- Terms are variables, abstractions, type abstractions and:
 $\mathbf{f}_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n}(s_1, \dots, s_k) : \tau[\alpha_1 := \pi_1, \dots, \alpha_n := \pi_n]$.

List	:	*	
nil	:	List	
cons	:	$\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \mathbf{List} \rightarrow \mathbf{List}$	
fold	:	$(\forall \alpha. \beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \mathbf{List} \rightarrow \beta$	
@	:	$\forall \alpha \forall \beta. (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$	\Leftarrow
tapp	:	$\forall \alpha : * \Rightarrow *. \forall \beta. (\forall \gamma. \alpha \gamma) \rightarrow \alpha \beta$	\Leftarrow

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{fold}_{\sigma}(F, a, \mathbf{nil}) &\longrightarrow a \\ \mathbf{fold}_{\sigma}(F, a, \mathbf{cons}_{\tau}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \mathbf{fold}_{\sigma}(F, F \ \tau \ a \ x, xs) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{@}_{\sigma, \tau}(\lambda x : \sigma. s., t) &\longrightarrow s[x := t] \quad \Leftarrow \\ \mathbf{tapp}_{\lambda \alpha. \sigma, \tau}(\Lambda \alpha. s) &\longrightarrow s[\alpha := \tau] \quad \Leftarrow \end{aligned}$$

Our goal: handle systems like this!

Polymorphic functional systems

- Function symbols have a type: $\forall \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n. \sigma_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \sigma_k \rightarrow \tau$
- Terms are variables, abstractions, type abstractions and:
 $\mathbf{f}_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n}(s_1, \dots, s_k) : \tau[\alpha_1 := \pi_1, \dots, \alpha_n := \pi_n]$.

List	:	*
nil	:	List
cons	:	$\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \mathbf{List} \rightarrow \mathbf{List}$
fold	:	$(\forall \alpha. \beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \mathbf{List} \rightarrow \beta$
@	:	$\forall \alpha \forall \beta. (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$
tapp	:	$\forall \alpha : * \Rightarrow *. \forall \beta. (\forall \gamma. \alpha \gamma) \rightarrow \alpha \beta$
		fold $_{\sigma}(F, a, \mathbf{nil}) \longrightarrow a$
		fold $_{\sigma}(F, a, \mathbf{cons}_{\tau}(x, xs)) \longrightarrow$ fold $_{\sigma}(F, @_{\tau, \sigma}(@_{\sigma, \tau \rightarrow \sigma}(\mathbf{tapp}_{\lambda \alpha. \sigma \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \sigma, \tau}(F), a), x), xs)$
		@ $_{\sigma, \tau}(\lambda x : \sigma. s., t) \longrightarrow s[x := t]$
		tapp $_{\lambda \alpha. \sigma, \tau}(\Lambda \alpha. s) \longrightarrow s[\alpha := \tau]$

Our goal: handle systems like this!

Polymorphic functional systems

- Function symbols have a type: $\forall \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n. \sigma_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \sigma_k \rightarrow \tau$
- Terms are variables, abstractions, type abstractions and:
 $f_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n}(s_1, \dots, s_k) : \tau[\alpha_1 := \pi_1, \dots, \alpha_n := \pi_n].$

List	:	*
nil	:	List
cons	:	$\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \mathbf{List} \rightarrow \mathbf{List}$
fold	:	$(\forall \alpha. \beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \mathbf{List} \rightarrow \beta$
@	:	$\forall \alpha \forall \beta. (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$
tapp	:	$\forall \alpha : * \Rightarrow *. \forall \beta. (\forall \gamma. \alpha \gamma) \rightarrow \alpha \beta$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \mathbf{nil}) &\longrightarrow a \\ \mathbf{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \mathbf{cons}_\tau(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \\ &\mathbf{fold}_\sigma(F, @_{\tau, \sigma}(@_{\sigma, \tau \rightarrow \sigma}(\mathbf{tapp}_{\lambda \alpha. \sigma \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \sigma, \tau}(F), a), x), xs) \\ @_{\sigma, \tau}(\lambda x : \sigma. s., t) &\longrightarrow s[x := t] \\ \mathbf{tapp}_{\lambda \alpha. \sigma, \tau}(\Lambda \alpha. s) &\longrightarrow s[\alpha := \tau] \end{aligned}$$

- **Note:** not meant as a formalism of interest by itself, but only as a tool to analyse polymorphic systems.

Monomorphic higher-order algebras [Pol96]

Idea:

- Choose a set \mathcal{A} with well-founded ordering \succ .
- Define:
 - $\mathcal{WM}_\kappa = \mathcal{A}$ if κ is a **base type**
 - $\mathcal{WM}_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} = \{f \in \mathcal{WM}_\sigma \implies \mathcal{WM}_\tau \mid f \text{ is weakly monotonic}\}$.
- Terms of type σ are mapped to \mathcal{WM}_Σ .

Natural choice: natural numbers

Monomorphic higher-order algebras [Pol96]

$$\begin{aligned}\text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs))\end{aligned}$$

`nil` : List
`cons` : Nat → List → List
`map` : (Nat → Nat) → List → List

Interpretation to \mathbb{N} :

Monomorphic higher-order algebras [Pol96]

$$\begin{aligned}\text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs))\end{aligned}$$
$$\begin{aligned}\text{nil} &: \text{List} \\ \text{cons} &: \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{List} \rightarrow \text{List} \\ \text{map} &: (\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}) \rightarrow \text{List} \rightarrow \text{List}\end{aligned}$$

Interpretation to \mathbb{N} :

· $\mathcal{WM}_{\text{List}} = \mathcal{WM}_{\text{Nat}} = \mathbb{N}$

Monomorphic higher-order algebras [Pol96]

$$\begin{aligned}\text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs))\end{aligned}$$

`nil` : List
`cons` : Nat \rightarrow List \rightarrow List
`map` : (Nat \rightarrow Nat) \rightarrow List \rightarrow List

Interpretation to \mathbb{N} :

- $\mathcal{WM}_{\text{List}} = \mathcal{WM}_{\text{Nat}} = \mathbb{N}$
- $\mathcal{WM}_{\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}} = \{\text{weakly monotonic functions from } \mathbb{N} \text{ to } \mathbb{N}\}$

Monomorphic higher-order algebras [Pol96]

$$\begin{aligned}\text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs))\end{aligned}$$

`nil` : List
`cons` : Nat \rightarrow List \rightarrow List
`map` : (Nat \rightarrow Nat) \rightarrow List \rightarrow List

Interpretation to \mathbb{N} :

- $\mathcal{WM}_{\text{List}} = \mathcal{WM}_{\text{Nat}} = \mathbb{N}$
- $\mathcal{WM}_{\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}} = \{\text{weakly monotonic functions from } \mathbb{N} \text{ to } \mathbb{N}\}$
- $\mathcal{WM}_{\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{List} \rightarrow \text{List}} = \{\text{weakly monotonic functions from } \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \text{ to } \mathbb{N}\}$

Monomorphic higher-order algebras [Pol96]

$$\begin{aligned}\text{map}(F, \text{nil}) &\longrightarrow \text{nil} \\ \text{map}(F, \text{cons}(x, xs)) &\longrightarrow \text{cons}(F \cdot x, \text{map}(F, xs))\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{nil} &: \text{List} \\ \text{cons} &: \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{List} \rightarrow \text{List} \\ \text{map} &: (\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}) \rightarrow \text{List} \rightarrow \text{List}\end{aligned}$$

Interpretation to \mathbb{N} :

- $\mathcal{WM}_{\text{List}} = \mathcal{WM}_{\text{Nat}} = \mathbb{N}$
- $\mathcal{WM}_{\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}} = \{\text{weakly monotonic functions from } \mathbb{N} \text{ to } \mathbb{N}\}$
- $\mathcal{WM}_{\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{List} \rightarrow \text{List}} = \{\text{weakly monotonic functions from } \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \text{ to } \mathbb{N}\}$
- $\mathcal{WM}_{(\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}) \rightarrow \text{List} \rightarrow \text{List}} = \{\text{weakly monotonic functionals from } \mathcal{WM}_{\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}} \times \mathbb{N} \text{ to } \mathbb{N}\}$

Monomorphic higher-order polynomial interpretations

[FuhKop12]

Interpretation:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{nil} \rrbracket &= 0 \\ \llbracket \text{cons}(s, t) \rrbracket &= 1 + \llbracket s \rrbracket + \llbracket t \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{map}(s, t) \rrbracket &= (2 + \llbracket t \rrbracket) * (1 + \llbracket s \rrbracket(\llbracket t \rrbracket)) \\ \llbracket s \ t \rrbracket &= \llbracket s \rrbracket(\llbracket t \rrbracket) + \llbracket t \rrbracket \quad \text{if } s : \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat} \end{aligned}$$

Monomorphic higher-order polynomial interpretations

[FuhKop12]

Interpretation:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{nil} \rrbracket &= 0 \\ \llbracket \text{cons}(s, t) \rrbracket &= 1 + \llbracket s \rrbracket + \llbracket t \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{map}(s, t) \rrbracket &= (2 + \llbracket t \rrbracket) * (1 + \llbracket s \rrbracket(\llbracket t \rrbracket)) \\ \llbracket [s\ t] \rrbracket &= \llbracket s \rrbracket(\llbracket t \rrbracket) + \llbracket t \rrbracket \quad \text{if } s : \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat} \end{aligned}$$

Put differently:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{nil} \rrbracket &= 0 \\ \llbracket \text{cons} \rrbracket &= \lambda xy. 1 + x + y \\ \llbracket \text{map} \rrbracket &= \lambda fx. (2 + x) * (1 + f(x)) \\ \llbracket @_{\text{Nat}, \text{Nat}} \rrbracket &= \lambda fx. f(x) + x \end{aligned}$$

Polymorphic higher-order interpretations (our work)

- Problem: set-theoretic interpretation **fails**.
(How to interpret $\Lambda\alpha.\lambda x : \alpha.x$?)

Polymorphic higher-order interpretations (our work)

- Problem: set-theoretic interpretation **fails**.
(How to interpret $\Lambda\alpha.\lambda x : \alpha.x$?)
- Alternative: use polynomial interpretations to a set of **terms**, not **functions**!

Polymorphic higher-order interpretations (our work)

- Problem: set-theoretic interpretation **fails**.
(How to interpret $\Lambda\alpha.\lambda x : \alpha.x$?)
- Alternative: use polynomial interpretations to a set of **terms**, not **functions**!

Example:

`nil` : $\forall\alpha. \text{List}(\alpha)$
`cons` : $\forall\alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha)$
`map` : $\forall\alpha\beta. (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \text{List}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{List}(\beta)$

$\llbracket \text{List}(\alpha) \rrbracket = \alpha$
 $\llbracket \text{nil} \rrbracket = \Lambda\alpha. \text{lift}_\alpha(0)$
 $\llbracket \text{cons} \rrbracket = \Lambda\alpha.\lambda xy. \text{lift}_\alpha(1) \oplus x \oplus y$
 $\llbracket \text{map} \rrbracket = \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda fx. (\text{lift}_\beta(2) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(\text{flatten}_\alpha(x)))$
 $\quad \quad \quad \otimes (\text{lift}_\beta(1) \oplus f(x))$

Overview

- Step 1. Define a set \mathcal{I} of **interpretation terms**.
- Step 2. Define an ordering relation \succ on the set \mathcal{I} .
- Step 3. Systematically map terms s to interpretation terms $\llbracket s \rrbracket$.
- Step 4. Prove that if $s \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t$ then $\llbracket s \rrbracket \succ \llbracket t \rrbracket$.

A set of interpretation terms

An extension of system F_ω

One type constant **nat**.

A set of interpretation terms

An extension of system F_ω

One type constant **nat**.

Terms: variables, abstractions, type (constructor) abstractions, natural number constants, and function symbols

A set of interpretation terms

An extension of system F_ω

One type constant **nat**.

Terms: variables, abstractions, type (constructor) abstractions, natural number constants, and function symbols:

$$\cdot \oplus : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

A set of interpretation terms

An extension of system F_ω

One type constant **nat**.

Terms: variables, abstractions, type (constructor) abstractions, natural number constants, and function symbols:

$$\cdot \oplus : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$n \oplus_{\mathbf{nat}} m \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad n + m$$

$$s \oplus_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} t \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \lambda x : \sigma. (s \cdot x) \oplus_{\tau} (t \cdot x)$$

$$s \oplus_{\forall \alpha. \sigma} t \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \Lambda \alpha. (s * \alpha) \oplus_{\sigma} (t * \alpha)$$

$$\Lambda \alpha . x \oplus_{\alpha} y$$

$$\Lambda\alpha.x \oplus_{\alpha} y$$

$$(\Lambda\alpha.x \oplus_{\alpha} y)\tau \rightsquigarrow x \oplus_{\tau} y$$

A set of interpretation terms

An extension of system F_ω

One type constant **nat**.

Terms: variables, abstractions, type (constructor) abstractions, natural number constants, and function symbols:

$$\cdot \oplus : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$n \oplus_{\mathbf{nat}} m \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad n + m$$

$$s \oplus_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} t \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \lambda x : \sigma. (s \cdot x) \oplus_{\tau} (t \cdot x)$$

$$s \oplus_{\forall \alpha. \sigma} t \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \Lambda \alpha. (s * \alpha) \oplus_{\sigma} (t * \alpha)$$

$$\cdot \otimes : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

A set of interpretation terms

An extension of system F_ω

One type constant **nat**.

Terms: variables, abstractions, type (constructor) abstractions, natural number constants, and function symbols:

$$\cdot \oplus : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$n \oplus_{\mathbf{nat}} m \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad n + m$$

$$s \oplus_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} t \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \lambda x : \sigma. (s \cdot x) \oplus_{\tau} (t \cdot x)$$

$$s \oplus_{\forall \alpha. \sigma} t \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \Lambda \alpha. (s * \alpha) \oplus_{\sigma} (t * \alpha)$$

$$\cdot \otimes : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$\cdot \mathbf{flatten} : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \mathbf{nat}$$

A set of interpretation terms

An extension of system F_ω

One type constant **nat**.

Terms: variables, abstractions, type (constructor) abstractions, natural number constants, and function symbols:

$$\cdot \oplus : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$n \oplus_{\mathbf{nat}} m \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad n + m$$

$$s \oplus_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} t \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \lambda x : \sigma. (s \cdot x) \oplus_{\tau} (t \cdot x)$$

$$s \oplus_{\forall \alpha. \sigma} t \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \Lambda \alpha. (s * \alpha) \oplus_{\sigma} (t * \alpha)$$

$$\cdot \otimes : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$\cdot \mathbf{flatten} : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \mathbf{nat}$$

$$\mathbf{flatten}_{\mathbf{nat}} \cdot s \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad s$$

$$\mathbf{flatten}_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} \cdot s \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \mathbf{flatten}_{\tau} \cdot (s \cdot (\mathbf{lift}_{\sigma} \cdot 0))$$

$$\mathbf{flatten}_{\forall \alpha. \sigma} \cdot s \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \mathbf{flatten}_{\sigma[\alpha := \mathbf{nat}]} \cdot (s * \mathbf{nat})$$

A set of interpretation terms

An extension of system F_ω

One type constant **nat**.

Terms: variables, abstractions, type (constructor) abstractions, natural number constants, and function symbols:

$$\cdot \oplus : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$n \oplus_{\mathbf{nat}} m \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad n + m$$

$$s \oplus_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} t \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \lambda x : \sigma. (s \cdot x) \oplus_{\tau} (t \cdot x)$$

$$s \oplus_{\forall \alpha. \sigma} t \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \Lambda \alpha. (s * \alpha) \oplus_{\sigma} (t * \alpha)$$

$$\cdot \otimes : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$\cdot \mathbf{flatten} : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \mathbf{nat}$$

$$\mathbf{flatten}_{\mathbf{nat}} \cdot s \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad s$$

$$\mathbf{flatten}_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} \cdot s \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \mathbf{flatten}_{\tau} \cdot (s \cdot (\mathbf{lift}_{\sigma} \cdot 0))$$

$$\mathbf{flatten}_{\forall \alpha. \sigma} \cdot s \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \mathbf{flatten}_{\sigma[\alpha := \mathbf{nat}]} \cdot (s * \mathbf{nat})$$

$$\cdot \mathbf{lift} : \forall \alpha. \mathbf{nat} \rightarrow \alpha$$

A set of interpretation terms

An extension of system F_ω

One type constant **nat**.

Terms: variables, abstractions, type (constructor) abstractions, natural number constants, and function symbols:

$$\cdot \oplus : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$n \oplus_{\text{nat}} m \rightsquigarrow n + m$$

$$s \oplus_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} t \rightsquigarrow \lambda x : \sigma. (s \cdot x) \oplus_{\tau} (t \cdot x)$$

$$s \oplus_{\forall \alpha. \sigma} t \rightsquigarrow \Lambda \alpha. (s * \alpha) \oplus_{\sigma} (t * \alpha)$$

$$\cdot \otimes : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$\cdot \text{flatten} : \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \text{nat}$$

$$\text{flatten}_{\text{nat}} \cdot s \rightsquigarrow s$$

$$\text{flatten}_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} \cdot s \rightsquigarrow \text{flatten}_{\tau} \cdot (s \cdot (\text{lift}_{\sigma} \cdot 0))$$

$$\text{flatten}_{\forall \alpha. \sigma} \cdot s \rightsquigarrow \text{flatten}_{\sigma[\alpha := \text{nat}]} \cdot (s * \text{nat})$$

$$\cdot \text{lift} : \forall \alpha. \text{nat} \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$\text{lift}_{\text{nat}} \cdot s \rightsquigarrow s$$

$$\text{lift}_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} \cdot s \rightsquigarrow \lambda x : \sigma. \text{lift}_{\tau} \cdot s$$

$$\text{lift}_{\forall \alpha. \sigma} \cdot s \rightsquigarrow \Lambda \alpha. \text{lift}_{\sigma} \cdot s$$

A set of interpretation terms

An extension of system F_ω

Theorem

The reduction relation \rightsquigarrow is terminating.

A set of interpretation terms

An extension of system F_ω

Theorem

The reduction relation \rightsquigarrow is terminating.

Corollary

*All closed normal interpretation terms of type **nat** are natural numbers.*

The well-founded order

The relation $s \succ_{\sigma} t$ is defined coinductively by:

$$\frac{s \downarrow > t \downarrow \text{ in } \mathbb{N}}{s \succ_{\text{nat}} t}$$

$$\frac{s \cdot q \succ_{\tau} t \cdot q \text{ for all } q \in \mathcal{I}_{\sigma}^f}{s \succ_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} t}$$

$$\frac{s * \tau \succ_{\text{nf}_{\beta}(\sigma[\alpha := \tau])} t * \tau \text{ for all closed } \tau \in \mathcal{T}_{\kappa}}{s \succ_{\forall(\alpha:\kappa).\sigma} t}$$

The well-founded order

Example derivation

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{((s \oplus \mathbf{lift}_{\mathbf{nat} \rightarrow \mathbf{nat}}(1))u) \downarrow > (su) \downarrow \text{ for any } u \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{nat}}^f}{(s \oplus \mathbf{lift}_{\mathbf{nat} \rightarrow \mathbf{nat}}(1))u \succ_{\mathbf{nat}} su \text{ for any } u \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{nat}}^f}}{s \oplus \mathbf{lift}_{\mathbf{nat} \rightarrow \mathbf{nat}}(1) \succ_{\mathbf{nat} \rightarrow \mathbf{nat}} s}}$$

The well-founded order

Example derivation

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{((s \oplus \mathbf{lift}_{\mathbf{nat} \rightarrow \mathbf{nat}}(1))u)\downarrow > (su)\downarrow \text{ for any } u \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{nat}}^f}{(s \oplus \mathbf{lift}_{\mathbf{nat} \rightarrow \mathbf{nat}}(1))u \succ_{\mathbf{nat}} su \text{ for any } u \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{nat}}^f}}{s \oplus \mathbf{lift}_{\mathbf{nat} \rightarrow \mathbf{nat}}(1) \succ_{\mathbf{nat} \rightarrow \mathbf{nat}} s}}$$

$((s \oplus \mathbf{lift}_{\mathbf{nat} \rightarrow \mathbf{nat}}(1))u)\downarrow > (su)\downarrow$ holds because

$$(s \oplus \mathbf{lift}_{\mathbf{nat} \rightarrow \mathbf{nat}}(1))u \rightsquigarrow^+ su \oplus \mathbf{lift}_{\mathbf{nat} \rightarrow \mathbf{nat}}(1)u \rightsquigarrow^+ su \oplus 1$$

The well-founded order

Infinite derivations

In any derivation of $s \lambda_{\forall\alpha.\alpha} t$ there is an infinite branch.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots}{s * \forall\alpha.\alpha * \forall\alpha.\alpha \lambda_{\forall\alpha.\alpha} t * \forall\alpha.\alpha * \forall\alpha.\alpha} \dots}{s * \forall\alpha.\alpha \lambda_{\forall\alpha.\alpha} t * \forall\alpha.\alpha} \dots}{s \lambda_{\forall\alpha.\alpha} t}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$[[\text{nil}]]_{[\sigma]}[[F]]_{[a]} \oplus \text{lift}_{[\sigma]}(1) \succ^? [[a]]$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$\llbracket a \rrbracket \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) \quad \succ? \quad \llbracket a \rrbracket$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$\llbracket a \rrbracket \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) \succ \llbracket a \rrbracket$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket a \rrbracket \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) &\succ \llbracket a \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \text{cons}_\tau(x, xs)) \rrbracket &\succ? \\ \llbracket \text{fold}_\sigma(F, @_{\tau, \sigma}(@_{\sigma, \tau \rightarrow \sigma}(\text{tapp}_{\lambda\alpha.\sigma \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \sigma, \tau}(F), a), x), xs) \rrbracket &\end{aligned}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket a \rrbracket \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) &\quad \gamma \quad \llbracket a \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{cons}_\tau(x, xs) \rrbracket \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \llbracket F \rrbracket \llbracket a \rrbracket \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) &\quad \gamma? \\ \llbracket \text{fold}_\sigma(F, @_{\tau, \sigma}(@_{\sigma, \tau \rightarrow \sigma}(\text{tapp}_{\lambda\alpha.\sigma \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \sigma, \tau}(F), a), x), xs) \rrbracket &\end{aligned}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\
\mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta
\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket a \rrbracket \oplus \text{lift}_{[\sigma]}(1) \quad \gamma \quad \llbracket a \rrbracket \\
\llbracket xs \rrbracket \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \llbracket F \rrbracket (\llbracket F \rrbracket \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket x \rrbracket) \oplus \text{lift}_{[\sigma]}(1) \oplus \text{lift}_{[\sigma]}(1) & \quad \gamma? \\
& \llbracket \text{fold}_\sigma(F, @_{\tau,\sigma}(@_{\sigma,\tau \rightarrow \sigma}(\text{tapp}_{\lambda\alpha.\sigma \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \sigma,\tau}(F), a), x), xs) \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$\begin{aligned}& \llbracket a \rrbracket \oplus \text{lift}_{[\sigma]}(1) \quad \gamma \quad \llbracket a \rrbracket \\ \llbracket xs \rrbracket [\sigma] [\llbracket F \rrbracket] (\llbracket F \rrbracket [\tau] [\llbracket a \rrbracket] [\llbracket x \rrbracket]) \oplus \text{lift}_{[\sigma]}(2) \quad \gamma? \\ & \llbracket \text{fold}_\sigma(F, @_{\tau, \sigma}(@_{\sigma, \tau \rightarrow \sigma}(\text{tapp}_{\lambda\alpha.\sigma \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \sigma, \tau}(F), a), x), xs) \rrbracket\end{aligned}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \llbracket a \rrbracket \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) & \gamma & \llbracket a \rrbracket \\ \llbracket xs \rrbracket \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \llbracket F \rrbracket (\llbracket F \rrbracket \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket x \rrbracket) \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(2) & & \gamma? & \\ & \llbracket xs \rrbracket \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \llbracket F \rrbracket (\llbracket F \rrbracket \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket x \rrbracket) \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) & & \end{array}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \llbracket a \rrbracket \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) & \gamma & \llbracket a \rrbracket \\ \llbracket xs \rrbracket \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \llbracket F \rrbracket (\llbracket F \rrbracket \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket x \rrbracket) \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(2) & \gamma & \\ & & \llbracket xs \rrbracket \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \llbracket F \rrbracket (\llbracket F \rrbracket \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket x \rrbracket) \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) \end{array}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\
\mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta
\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
[a] \oplus \text{lift}_{[\sigma]}(1) & \gamma & [a] \\
[xs][\sigma][F]([F][\tau][a][x]) \oplus \text{lift}_{[\sigma]}(2) & \gamma & \\
[xs][\sigma][F]([F][\tau][a][x]) \oplus \text{lift}_{[\sigma]}(1) & & \\
[@_{\sigma,\tau}(\lambda x : \sigma.s., t)] & \gamma? & [s[x := t]]
\end{array}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\
\mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta
\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
[[a]] \oplus \text{lift}_{[\sigma]}(1) & \gamma & [[a]] \\
[[xs]][[\sigma]][[F]]([[F]][[\tau]][[a]][[x]]) \oplus \text{lift}_{[\sigma]}(2) & \gamma & \\
[[xs]][[\sigma]][[F]]([[F]][[\tau]][[a]][[x]]) \oplus \text{lift}_{[\sigma]}(1) & & \\
[[s]][x := [t]] & \gamma^? & [[s[x := t]]]
\end{array}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \llbracket a \rrbracket \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) & \succ & \llbracket a \rrbracket \\ \llbracket xs \rrbracket \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \llbracket F \rrbracket (\llbracket F \rrbracket \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket x \rrbracket) \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(2) & \succ & \\ \llbracket xs \rrbracket \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \llbracket F \rrbracket (\llbracket F \rrbracket \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket x \rrbracket) \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) & & \\ \llbracket s \rrbracket [x := \llbracket t \rrbracket] & \succeq & \llbracket s[x := t] \rrbracket \end{array}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\
\mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta
\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
& \llbracket a \rrbracket \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) & \gamma & \llbracket a \rrbracket \\
\llbracket xs \rrbracket \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \llbracket F \rrbracket (\llbracket F \rrbracket \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket x \rrbracket) \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(2) & \gamma & & \\
& \llbracket xs \rrbracket \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \llbracket F \rrbracket (\llbracket F \rrbracket \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket x \rrbracket) \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) & & \\
& \llbracket s \rrbracket [x := \llbracket t \rrbracket] & \gamma & \llbracket s[x := t] \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{tapp} \lambda\alpha.\sigma,\tau(\Lambda\alpha.s) \rrbracket & \gamma? & & \llbracket s[\alpha := \tau] \rrbracket
\end{array}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \llbracket a \rrbracket \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) & \gamma & \llbracket a \rrbracket \\ \llbracket xs \rrbracket \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \llbracket F \rrbracket (\llbracket F \rrbracket \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket x \rrbracket) \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(2) & \gamma & \\ \llbracket xs \rrbracket \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \llbracket F \rrbracket (\llbracket F \rrbracket \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket x \rrbracket) \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) & & \\ \llbracket s \rrbracket [x := \llbracket t \rrbracket] & \gamma & \llbracket s[x := t] \rrbracket \\ \llbracket s \rrbracket [\alpha := \llbracket \tau \rrbracket] & \gamma? & \llbracket s[\alpha := \tau] \rrbracket \end{array}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\
\mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta
\end{aligned}$$

Girard, “Proofs and Types”, Chapter 11

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
\llbracket a \rrbracket \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) & \gamma & \llbracket a \rrbracket \\
\llbracket xs \rrbracket \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \llbracket F \rrbracket (\llbracket F \rrbracket \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket x \rrbracket) \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(2) & \gamma & \\
\llbracket xs \rrbracket \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \llbracket F \rrbracket (\llbracket F \rrbracket \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket x \rrbracket) \oplus \text{lift}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}(1) & & \\
\llbracket s \rrbracket [x := \llbracket t \rrbracket] & \gamma & \llbracket s[x := t] \rrbracket \\
\llbracket s \rrbracket [\alpha := \llbracket \tau \rrbracket] & \gamma & \llbracket s[\alpha := \tau] \rrbracket
\end{array}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

Failure: this mapping is not monotonic!

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

Failure: this mapping is not monotonic!

$\llbracket \text{foldl}_\sigma(\lambda x.s, t, \text{nil}) \rrbracket = \llbracket \text{fold}_\sigma(\lambda x.w, t, \text{nil}) \rrbracket$ regardless of s and w .

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

First idea:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h) \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta f x \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. f x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta\end{aligned}$$

Failure: this mapping is not monotonic!

$\llbracket \text{foldl}_\sigma(\lambda x.s, t, \text{nil}) \rrbracket = \llbracket \text{fold}_\sigma(\lambda x.w, t, \text{nil}) \rrbracket$ regardless of s and w .

So if $\text{foldl}_\sigma(\lambda x.s_1, t, \text{nil}) \longrightarrow \text{foldl}_\sigma(\lambda x.s_2, t, \text{nil}) \longrightarrow \dots$

we do not have an infinite decrease in \succ .

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

Second idea:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h \\ &\quad \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(\text{flatten}_\beta(x) \oplus \\ &\quad \quad \text{flatten}_\alpha(h))) \\ &\quad \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(\text{flatten}_\beta(f\alpha x h) \oplus \\ &\quad \quad \text{flatten}_\alpha(h) \oplus 1) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta fx \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(\text{flatten}_{\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta}(f) \oplus \\ &\quad \quad \text{flatten}_\beta(x) \oplus 1) \\ \mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. fx \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(\text{flatten}_\alpha(x)) \\ \mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta \end{aligned}$$

How to interpret terms?

Type and function symbol mapping

Second idea:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{TM}(\text{List}) &= \forall\beta.(\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{nil}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f : \forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta.\lambda x : \beta.x \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{cons}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\lambda h.\lambda t. \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.t\beta f(f\alpha x h \\
&\quad \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(\text{flatten}_\beta(x) \oplus \\
&\quad \quad \text{flatten}_\alpha(h))) \\
&\quad \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(\text{flatten}_\beta(f\alpha x h) \oplus \\
&\quad \quad \text{flatten}_\alpha(h) \oplus 1) \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{foldl}) &= \Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda l. l\beta fx \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(\text{flatten}_{\forall\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta}(f) \oplus \\
&\quad \quad \text{flatten}_\beta(x) \oplus 1) \\
\mathcal{J}(@) &= \Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda f.\lambda x. fx \oplus \text{lift}_\beta(\text{flatten}_\alpha(x)) \\
\mathcal{J}(\text{tapp}) &= \Lambda\alpha.\Lambda\beta.\lambda x. x\beta
\end{aligned}$$

This works!

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \text{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \text{nil}) \rrbracket &\succ \llbracket a \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{fold}_\sigma(F, a, \text{cons}_\tau(x, xs)) \rrbracket &\succ \\
\llbracket \text{fold}_\sigma(F, @_{\tau,\sigma}(@_{\sigma,\tau \rightarrow \sigma}(\text{tapp}_{\lambda\alpha.\sigma \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \sigma,\tau}(F), a), x), xs) \rrbracket \\
\llbracket @_{\sigma,\tau}(\lambda x : \sigma.s., t) \rrbracket &\succeq \llbracket s[x := t] \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{tapp}_{\lambda\alpha.\sigma,\tau}(\Lambda\alpha.s) \rrbracket &\succeq \llbracket s[\alpha := \tau] \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

Larger applications

IPC2

The system IPC2 can be seen as a PFS with type constructors:

$$\Sigma_{\kappa}^T = \{ \perp : *, \quad \text{or} : * \Rightarrow * \Rightarrow *, \quad \text{and} : * \Rightarrow * \Rightarrow *, \quad \exists : (* \Rightarrow *) \Rightarrow * \}$$

and function symbols:

$$\begin{aligned} @ & : \forall \alpha \forall \beta. (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta \\ \text{tapp} & : \forall \alpha : * \Rightarrow *. \forall \beta. (\forall \beta [\alpha \beta]) \rightarrow \alpha \beta \\ \text{pair} & : \forall \alpha \forall \beta. \alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \text{and } \alpha \beta \\ \text{case} & : \forall \alpha \forall \beta \forall \gamma. \text{or } \alpha \beta \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow \gamma \\ \text{let} & : \forall \alpha : * \Rightarrow *. \forall \beta. (\exists(\alpha)) \rightarrow (\forall \gamma. \alpha \gamma \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \\ \text{ext} & : \forall \alpha : * \Rightarrow *. \forall \beta. \alpha \beta \rightarrow \exists(\alpha) \\ \epsilon & : \forall \alpha. \perp \rightarrow \alpha \\ \text{pr}^1 & : \forall \alpha \forall \beta. \text{and } \alpha \beta \rightarrow \alpha \\ \text{pr}^2 & : \forall \alpha \forall \beta. \text{and } \alpha \beta \rightarrow \beta \\ \text{in}^1 & : \forall \alpha \forall \beta. \alpha \rightarrow \text{or } \alpha \beta \\ \text{in}^2 & : \forall \alpha \forall \beta. \beta \rightarrow \text{or } \alpha \beta \end{aligned}$$

Larger applications

IPC2

The system ICP2 has 28 reduction rules, including:

$$\begin{aligned} @_{\sigma,\tau}(\lambda x.s, t) &\longrightarrow s[x := t] \\ \text{tapp}_{\lambda\alpha.\sigma,\tau}(\Lambda\alpha.s) &\longrightarrow s[\alpha := \tau] \\ \text{let}_{\varphi,\rho}(\text{ext}_{\varphi,\tau}(s), \Lambda\alpha.\lambda x.t) &\longrightarrow t[\alpha := \tau][x := s] \\ \text{pr}_{\sigma,\tau}^1(\text{pair}_{\sigma,\tau}(s, t)) &\longrightarrow s \\ \text{case}_{\sigma,\tau,\rho}(\text{in}_{\sigma,\tau}^1(u), \lambda x.s, \lambda y.t) &\longrightarrow s[x := u] \\ \text{pr}_{\sigma,\tau}^2(\text{pair}_{\sigma,\tau}(s, t)) &\longrightarrow t \\ \text{case}_{\sigma,\tau,\rho}(\text{in}_{\sigma,\tau}^2(u), \lambda x.s, \lambda y.t) &\longrightarrow t[x := u] \\ @_{\sigma,\tau}(\epsilon_{\sigma\rightarrow\tau}(s), t) &\longrightarrow \epsilon_{\tau}(s) \\ \epsilon_{\rho}(\text{case}_{\sigma,\tau,\perp}(u, \lambda x.s, \lambda y.t)) &\longrightarrow \text{case}_{\sigma,\tau,\rho}(u, \lambda x.\epsilon_{\rho}(s), \lambda y.\epsilon_{\rho}(t)) \\ \text{case}_{\rho,\pi,\xi}(\text{case}_{\sigma,\tau,\text{or } \rho} \pi(u, \lambda x.s, \lambda y.t), \lambda z.v, \lambda a.w) &\longrightarrow \\ \text{case}_{\sigma,\tau,\xi}(u, \lambda x.\text{case}_{\rho,\pi,\xi}(s, \lambda z.v, \lambda a.w), \lambda y.\text{case}_{\rho,\pi,\xi}(t, \lambda z.v, \lambda a.w)) & \end{aligned}$$

Larger applications

IPC2

The system ICP2 has 28 reduction rules, including:

$$\begin{aligned} @_{\sigma,\tau}(\lambda x.s, t) &\longrightarrow s[x := t] \\ \text{tapp}_{\lambda\alpha.\sigma,\tau}(\Lambda\alpha.s) &\longrightarrow s[\alpha := \tau] \\ \text{let}_{\varphi,\rho}(\text{ext}_{\varphi,\tau}(s), \Lambda\alpha.\lambda x.t) &\longrightarrow t[\alpha := \tau][x := s] \\ \text{pr}_{\sigma,\tau}^1(\text{pair}_{\sigma,\tau}(s, t)) &\longrightarrow s \\ \text{case}_{\sigma,\tau,\rho}(\text{in}_{\sigma,\tau}^1(u), \lambda x.s, \lambda y.t) &\longrightarrow s[x := u] \\ \text{pr}_{\sigma,\tau}^2(\text{pair}_{\sigma,\tau}(s, t)) &\longrightarrow t \\ \text{case}_{\sigma,\tau,\rho}(\text{in}_{\sigma,\tau}^2(u), \lambda x.s, \lambda y.t) &\longrightarrow t[x := u] \\ @_{\sigma,\tau}(\epsilon_{\sigma\rightarrow\tau}(s), t) &\longrightarrow \epsilon_{\tau}(s) \\ \epsilon_{\rho}(\text{case}_{\sigma,\tau,\perp}(u, \lambda x.s, \lambda y.t)) &\longrightarrow \text{case}_{\sigma,\tau,\rho}(u, \lambda x.\epsilon_{\rho}(s), \lambda y.\epsilon_{\rho}(t)) \\ \text{case}_{\rho,\pi,\xi}(\text{case}_{\sigma,\tau,\text{or } \rho} \pi(u, \lambda x.s, \lambda y.t), \lambda z.v, \lambda a.w) &\longrightarrow \\ \text{case}_{\sigma,\tau,\xi}(u, \lambda x.\text{case}_{\rho,\pi,\xi}(s, \lambda z.v, \lambda a.w), \lambda y.\text{case}_{\rho,\pi,\xi}(t, \lambda z.v, \lambda a.w)) & \end{aligned}$$

Most of this system can be handled by our method. Problem:

$$\text{let}_{\psi,\rho}(\text{let}_{\varphi,\exists\psi}(s, \Lambda\alpha.\lambda x : \varphi\alpha.t), u) \longrightarrow \text{let}_{\varphi,\rho}(s, \Lambda\alpha.\lambda x : \varphi\alpha.\text{let}_{\psi,\rho}(t, u))$$

Conclusions and future work

A powerful and systematic methodology to prove termination of higher-order rewriting with full impredicative polymorphism.

Conclusions and future work

A powerful and systematic methodology to prove termination of higher-order rewriting with full impredicative polymorphism.

Future work:

- automation

Conclusions and future work

A powerful and systematic methodology to prove termination of higher-order rewriting with full impredicative polymorphism.

Future work:

- automation
- handle the remaining rules of IPC2

Conclusions and future work

A powerful and systematic methodology to prove termination of higher-order rewriting with full impredicative polymorphism.

Future work:

- automation
- handle the remaining rules of IPC2
- extend other techniques for higher-order termination: orderings, dependency pairs