



Higher-order dependency pairs

Frédéric Blanqui

► **To cite this version:**

Frédéric Blanqui. Higher-order dependency pairs. Eighth International Workshop on Termination - WST 2006, Aug 2006, Seattle, United States. 2006. <inria-00084821v2>

HAL Id: inria-00084821

<https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00084821v2>

Submitted on 11 Sep 2006

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 Higher-order dependency pairs

Frédéric Blanqui

LORIA*, Campus Scientifique, BP 239, 54506 Vandoeuvre-lès-Nancy, France

Abstract. Arts and Giesl proved that the termination of a first-order rewrite system can be reduced to the study of its “dependency pairs”. We extend these results to rewrite systems on simply typed λ -terms by using Tait’s computability technique.

1.1 Introduction

Let \mathcal{F} be a set of function symbols, \mathcal{X} be a set of variables and \mathcal{R} be a set of rewrite rules over the set $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{X})$ of first-order terms. Let \mathcal{D} be the set of symbols occurring at the top of a rule left hand-side and $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{D}$. The set $\mathcal{DP}(\mathcal{R})$ of *dependency pairs* of \mathcal{R} is the set of pairs (l, t) such that l is the left hand-side of a rule $l \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}$ and t is a subterm of r headed by some symbol $f \in \mathcal{D}$. The term t represents a potential recursive call. The chain relation is $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{C}} = \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}i}^* \rightarrow_{\mathcal{DP}h}$, where $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}i}^*$ is the reflexive and transitive closure of the restriction of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ to non-top positions and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{DP}h}$ is the restriction of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{DP}}$ to top positions. Arts and Giesl prove in [1] that $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ is strongly normalizing (SN) (or terminating, well-founded) iff the chain relation so is. Moreover, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{C}}$ is terminating if there is a weak reduction ordering $>$ such that $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \geq$ and $\mathcal{DP}(\mathcal{R}) \subseteq >$ (only dependency pairs need to strictly decrease).

We would like to extend these results to higher-order rewriting. There are several approaches to higher-order rewriting. In Higher-order Rewrite Systems (HRSs) [7], terms and rules are simply typed λ -terms in β -normal η -long form, left hand-sides are patterns à la Miller and matching is modulo $\beta\eta$. An extension of dependency pairs for HRSs is studied in [10,9]. In Combinatory Reduction Systems (CRSs) [6], terms are λ -terms, rules are λ -terms with meta-variables, left hand-sides are patterns à la Miller and matching uses α -conversion and some variable occur-checks. The relation between the two kinds of rewriting is studied in [12]. It appears that the matching algorithms are similar and that, in HRSs, one does more β -reductions after having applied the matching substitution. But, in both cases, β -reduction is used at the meta-level for normalizing right hand-sides after the application of the matching substitution. So, a third more atomic approach is to have no meta-level β -reduction and add β -reduction at the object level. This is the approach that we consider in this paper.

So, we assume given a set \mathcal{R} of rewrite rules made of simply typed λ -terms and study the termination of $\rightarrow_{\beta} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ when using CRS-like matching. This

* UMR 7503 CNRS-INPL-INRIA-Nancy2-UHP

clearly implies the termination of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ in the corresponding CRS or HRS. Another advantage of this approach is that we can rely on Tait's technique for proving termination [11,3]. This paper explores its use with dependency pairs. This is in contrast with [10,9].

In Tait's technique, to each type T , one associates a set $\llbracket T \rrbracket$ of terms of type T . Terms of $\llbracket T \rrbracket$ are said *computable*. Before giving some properties of computable terms, let us introduce a few definitions. The sets $\text{Pos}^+(T)$ and $\text{Pos}^-(T)$ of *positive and negative positions* in T are defined as follows:

- $\text{Pos}^+(B) = \{\varepsilon\}$ and $\text{Pos}^-(B) = \emptyset$ if B is a base type,
- $\text{Pos}^\delta(T \Rightarrow U) = 1 \cdot \text{Pos}^{-\delta}(T) \cup 2 \cdot \text{Pos}^\delta(U)$.

We use \mathbf{T} to denote a sequence of types T_1, \dots, T_n of length $|\mathbf{T}| = n$. The i -th argument of a function symbol $f : \mathbf{T} \Rightarrow B$ is *accessible* if B occurs only positively in T_i . Let $\text{Acc}(f)$ be the set of indexes of the accessible arguments of f . A base type B is *basic* if, for all $f : \mathbf{T} \Rightarrow B$ and $i \in \text{Acc}(f)$, T_i is a base type. After [3,4], given a relation R , *computability wrt R* can be defined so that the following properties are satisfied:

- (1) A computable term is strongly normalizable wrt $\rightarrow_\beta \cup R$.
- (2) A term of basic type is computable if it is SN wrt $\rightarrow_\beta \cup R$.
- (3) A term $v^{T \Rightarrow U}$ is computable if, for all t^T computable, vt is computable.
- (4) If t is computable then every reduct of t is computable.
- (5) A term ft is computable if all its reducts wrt $\rightarrow_\beta \cup R$ are computable.
- (6) If ft is computable then, for all $i \in \text{Acc}(f)$, t_i is computable.
- (7) If t contains no $f \in \mathcal{D}$ and σ is computable, then $t\sigma$ is computable.
- (8) Every term is computable whenever every $f \in \mathcal{D}$ is computable.

1.2 Admissible rules

An important property of the first-order case is that, given a term t , a substitution σ and a variable $x \in \mathcal{V}(t)$, $x\sigma$ is strongly normalizable whenever $t\sigma$ so is. This is not always true in the higher-order case. So, we need to introduce some restrictions on rules to keep this property.

Definition 1 (Admissible rules) A rule $fl \rightarrow r$ is *admissible* if $\text{FV}(r) \subseteq \text{PCC}(\mathbf{l})$, where PCC is defined in Figure 1.1.

The Pattern Computability Closure (PCC) is called *accessibility* in [2]. It includes most usual higher-order patterns [8].

Lemma 2 If $fl \rightarrow r$ is admissible, $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subseteq \text{FV}(\mathbf{l})$ and $\mathbf{l}\sigma$ is computable, then $\sigma|_{\text{FV}(r)}$ is computable.

Proof. We prove by induction that, for all $u \in \text{PCC}(\mathbf{t})$ and computable substitution θ such that $\text{dom}(\theta) \subseteq \text{FV}(u) \setminus \text{FV}(\mathbf{t})$, $u\sigma\theta$ is computable.

Fig. 1.1. Pattern Computability Closure [2]

| | |
|-------------|--|
| (arg) | $t_i \in \text{PCC}(\mathbf{t})$ |
| (acc) | $\frac{gu \in \text{PCC}(\mathbf{t}) \quad i \in \text{Acc}(g)}{u_i \in \text{PCC}(\mathbf{t})}$ |
| (lam) | $\frac{\lambda y u \in \text{PCC}(\mathbf{t}) \quad y \notin \text{FV}(\mathbf{t})}{u \in \text{PCC}(\mathbf{t})}$ |
| (app-left) | $\frac{uy \in \text{PCC}(\mathbf{t}) \quad y \notin \text{FV}(\mathbf{t}) \cup \text{FV}(u)}{u \in \text{PCC}(\mathbf{t})}$ |
| (app-right) | $\frac{y^{U \Rightarrow T \Rightarrow U} u \in \text{PCC}(\mathbf{t}) \quad y \notin \text{FV}(\mathbf{t}) \cup \text{FV}(u)}{u \in \text{PCC}(\mathbf{t})}$ |

- (arg) Since $\text{dom}(\theta) = \emptyset$, $l_i \sigma \theta = l_i \sigma$ is computable by assumption.
- (acc) By induction hypothesis, $gu \sigma$ is computable. Thus, by property (6), $u_i \sigma$ is computable.
- (lam) Let $\theta' = \theta|_{\text{dom}(\theta) \setminus \{y\}}$. Wlog, we can assume that $y \notin \text{codom}(\sigma \theta)$. Hence, $(\lambda y u) \sigma \theta' = \lambda y u \sigma \theta'$. Now, since $\text{dom}(\theta) \subseteq \text{FV}(u) \setminus \text{FV}(\mathbf{t})$, $\text{dom}(\theta') \subseteq \text{FV}(\lambda y u) \setminus \text{FV}(\mathbf{t})$. Thus, by induction hypothesis, $\lambda y u \sigma \theta'$ is computable. Since $y \theta$ is computable, by (3), $(\lambda y u \sigma \theta') y \theta$ is computable and, by (4), $u \sigma \theta' \{y \mapsto y \theta\}$ is computable. Finally, since $y \notin \text{dom}(\sigma \theta') \cup \text{codom}(\sigma \theta')$, $u \sigma \theta' \{y \mapsto y \theta\} = u \sigma \theta$.
- (app-left) Let $v : T_y$ computable and $\theta' = \theta \cup \{y \mapsto v\}$. Since $\text{dom}(\theta) \subseteq \text{FV}(u) \setminus \text{FV}(\mathbf{t})$ and $y \notin \text{FV}(\mathbf{t})$, $\text{dom}(\theta') = \text{dom}(\theta) \cup \{y\} \subseteq \text{FV}(uy) \setminus \text{FV}(\mathbf{t})$. Thus, by induction hypothesis, $(uy) \sigma \theta' = u \sigma \theta' v$ is computable. Since $y \notin \text{FV}(u)$, $u \sigma \theta' = u \sigma \theta$. Thus, $u \sigma \theta$ is computable.
- (app-right) Let $v = \lambda x^U \lambda y^T x$ and $\theta' = \theta \cup \{y \mapsto v\}$. By (3), v is computable. Since $\text{dom}(\theta) \subseteq \text{FV}(u) \setminus \text{FV}(\mathbf{t})$ and $y \notin \text{FV}(\mathbf{t})$, $\text{dom}(\theta') \subseteq \text{FV}(yu) \setminus \text{FV}(\mathbf{t})$. Thus, by induction hypothesis, $(yu) \sigma \theta' = v u \sigma \theta'$ is computable. Since $y \notin \text{FV}(u)$, $u \sigma \theta' = u \sigma \theta$. Thus, by (4), $u \sigma \theta$ is computable. \square

1.3 Higher-order dependency pairs

In the following, we assume given a set \mathcal{R} of admissible rules. The sets $\text{FAP}(t)$ of *full application positions* of a term t and the *level* of a term t are defined as follows:

- $\text{FAP}(x) = \emptyset$ and $\text{level}(x) = 0$
- $\text{FAP}(\lambda x t) = 1 \cdot \text{FAP}(t)$ and $\text{level}(\lambda x t) = \text{level}(t)$

If $f \in \mathcal{D}$ then:

- $\text{level}(f t_1 \dots t_n) = 1 + \max\{\text{level}(t_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$

$$- \text{FAP}(ft_1 \dots t_n) = \{\varepsilon\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^n 1^{n-i} 2 \cdot \text{FAP}(t_i)$$

If $t \neq ft_1 \dots t_n$ with $f \in \mathcal{D}$, then $\text{FAP}(tu) = 1 \cdot \text{FAP}(t) \cup 2 \cdot \text{FAP}(u)$ and $\text{level}(tu) = \max\{\text{level}(t), \text{level}(u)\}$.

Definition 3 (Dependency pairs) The set of *dependency pairs* is $\mathcal{DP} = \{l \rightarrow r|_p \mid l \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}, p \in \text{FAP}(r)\}$. The *chain relation* is $\rightarrow_C = \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_i}^* \rightarrow_{\mathcal{DP}_h}$, where $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_i}$ is the restriction of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ to non-top positions, and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{DP}_h}$ is the restriction of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{DP}}$ to top positions.

Since $\rightarrow_C \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^+ \supseteq$, \rightarrow_{β_C} is terminating whenever $\rightarrow_{\beta_{\mathcal{R}}}$ so is.

Theorem 4 Assume that, for all $l \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}$ and $p \in \text{FAP}(r)$, $\text{FV}(r|_p) \subseteq \text{FV}(r)$ and $r|_p$ has the type of l (*). Then, $\rightarrow_{\beta_{\mathcal{R}}}$ is terminating if \rightarrow_{β_C} so is.

Proof. By (1), this is so if every term is computable wrt $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$. By (8), this is so if every $f^{\mathbf{T} \Rightarrow B} \in \mathcal{D}$ is computable. By (3), this is so if, for all $\mathbf{t} : \mathbf{T}$ computable, $f\mathbf{t}$ is computable. We prove it by induction on $(f\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t})$ with $(\rightarrow_C, (\rightarrow_{\beta_{\mathcal{R}}})_{\text{lex}})_{\text{lex}}$ as well-founded ordering (H1). Indeed, by (1), \mathbf{t} are strongly normalizable wrt $\rightarrow_{\beta_{\mathcal{R}}}$. By (5), it suffices to prove that every reduct of $f\mathbf{t}$ is computable. If $\mathbf{t} \rightarrow_{\beta_{\mathcal{R}}} \mathbf{t}'$ then, by (H1), $f\mathbf{t}'$ is computable since, by (4), \mathbf{t}' are computable and $\rightarrow_{\beta_C}(f\mathbf{t}') = \rightarrow_{\beta_C}(f\mathbf{t})$. Now, assume that there is $f\mathbf{l} \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}$ and σ such that $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{l}\sigma$. Since rules are admissible, by Lemma 2, $\sigma' = \sigma|_{\text{FV}(r)}$ is computable. We now prove that $r\sigma'$ is computable by induction on the level n of r (H2). Let p_1, \dots, p_k be the positions in r of the subterms of level $n-1$; \mathbf{y}^i be the variables of $\text{FV}(r|_{p_i}) \setminus \text{FV}(r)$; x_1, \dots, x_k be distinct variables not occurring in r ; r' be the term obtained by replacing $r|_{p_i}$ by $x_i \mathbf{y}^i$ in r ; and $\theta = \{x_i \mapsto \lambda \mathbf{y}^i r|_{p_i} \sigma'\}$. We have $\text{level}(r') = 0$ and $r'\sigma'\theta \rightarrow_{\beta}^* r\sigma'$. If θ is computable then, by (7), $r'\sigma'\theta$ is computable and we are done. By (*), $\{\mathbf{y}^i\} = \emptyset$ and it suffices to prove that $r_{p_i} \sigma'$ is computable. For all $i \leq k$, $r|_{p_i}$ is of the form $g\mathbf{u}$ with $\text{level}(u_j) < n$. By (H2), $\mathbf{u}\sigma'$ are computable and, since $f\mathbf{t} \rightarrow_C r|_{p_i} \sigma'$, by (H1), $x_i \theta$ is computable. \square

The condition on free variables is an important restriction since it is not satisfied by function calls with bound variables like in $(\text{lim } F) + x \rightarrow \text{lim } \lambda n (Fn + x)$.

Theorem 5 An higher-order reduction pair is two relations $(>, \geq)$ such that:

- $>$ is well-founded and stable by substitution,
- \geq is a reflexive and transitive rewrite relation containing \rightarrow_{β} ,
- $\geq \circ > \subseteq >$.

In the conditions of Theorem 4, \rightarrow_{β_C} is well-founded whenever $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \geq$ and $\mathcal{DP} \subseteq >$.

Proof. By (1), this is so if every term is computable wrt \rightarrow_C . By (8), this is so if every $f^{\mathbf{T} \Rightarrow B} \in \mathcal{D}$ is computable. By (3), this is so if, for all

$t : T$ computable, ft is computable. We prove it by induction on (ft, t) with $(>, (\rightarrow_{\beta\mathcal{R}})_{\text{lex}})_{\text{lex}}$ as well-founded ordering (H1). Indeed, by (1) and Theorem 4, t are strongly normalizable wrt $\rightarrow_{\beta\mathcal{R}}$. By (5), it suffices to prove that every reduct of ft is computable. If $t \rightarrow_{\beta\mathcal{R}} t'$ then, by (H1), ft' is computable since, by (4), t' are computable and $>(ft') \subseteq >(ft)$ since $\rightarrow_{\beta\mathcal{R}} \subseteq \geq$ and $\geq \circ > \subseteq >$. Now, assume that there is $fl \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{DP}$ and σ such that $t = l\sigma$. Since rules are admissible, by Lemma 2, $\sigma' = \sigma|_{\text{FV}(r)}$ is computable. Since $\mathcal{DP} \subseteq >$ and $>$ is stable by substitution, $ft > r\sigma'$. Thus, by (H1), $r\sigma'$ is computable. \square

An example of reduction pair can be given by using the higher-order recursive path ordering $>_{\text{horpo}}$ [5]. Take $\geq = (\rightarrow_{\beta} \cup >_{\text{horpo}})^+$ and $\geq = (\rightarrow_{\beta} \cup >_{\text{horpo}})^*$. The study of these two relations has to be done. However, $>_{\text{horpo}}$ does not take advantage of the fact that $>$ does not need to be monotonic. Such a relation is given by the weak higher-order recursive computability ordering $>_{\text{whorco}}$, whose monotonic closure strictly contains $>_{\text{horpo}}$ [4]. Moreover, $>_{\text{whorco}}$ is transitive, which is not the case of $>_{\text{horpo}}$. It would therefore be interesting to look for reduction pairs built from $>_{\text{whorco}}$.

References

1. T. Arts and J. Giesl. Termination of term rewriting using dependency pairs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 236:133–178, 2000.
2. F. Blanqui. Termination and confluence of higher-order rewrite systems. In *Proc. of RTA'00*, LNCS 1833.
3. F. Blanqui. Definitions by rewriting in the Calculus of Constructions. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 15(1):37–92, 2005.
4. F. Blanqui. (HO)RPO revisited, 2006. Manuscript.
5. J.-P. Jouannaud and A. Rubio. The Higher-Order Recursive Path Ordering. In *Proc. of LICS'99*.
6. J. W. Klop, V. van Oostrom, and F. van Raamsdonk. Combinatory reduction systems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 121:279–308, 1993.
7. R. Mayr and T. Nipkow. Higher-order rewrite systems and their confluence. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 192(2):3–29, 1998.
8. D. Miller. A logic programming language with lambda-abstraction, function variables, and simple unification. In *Proc. of ELP'89*, LNCS 475.
9. M. Sakai and K. Kusakari. On dependency pair method for proving termination of higher-order rewrite systems. *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems*, E88-D(3):583–593, 2005.
10. M. Sakai, Y. Watanabe, and T. Sakabe. An extension of dependency pair method for proving termination of higher-order rewrite systems. *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems*, E84-D(8):1025–1032, 2001.
11. W. W. Tait. Intensional interpretations of functionals of finite type I. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 32(2):198–212, 1967.
12. V. van Oostrom and F. van Raamsdonk. Comparing Combinatory Reduction Systems and Higher-order Rewrite Systems. In *Proc. of HOA'93*, LNCS 816.