On Proving Limiting Completeness

Peter D. Mosses
Gordon D. Plotkin*

* Department of Computer Science, University of Edinburgh, The King's
Buildings (JCMB), Mayfield Road, Edinburgh, Scotland EH9 3JZ.

ON PROVING LIMITING COMPLETENESS

Peter D. Mosses

Gordon D. Plotkin*

Abstract

We give two proofs of Wadsworth's classic Approximation Theorem for the pure λ-calculus. One of these illustrates a new method utilising a certain kind of intermediate semantics for proving correspondences between denotational and operational semantics. The other illustrates a direct technique of Milne, employing recursively-specified inclusive relations.

* Department of Computer Science, University of Edinburgh, The King's Buildings, (JCMB), Mayfield Road, Edinburgh, Scotland, EH9 3JZ. The first author is now at Computer Science Department, Aarhus University, Ny Munkegade, DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark.

Introduction

Suppose that we have both a (standard) denotational semantics and an operational semantics for some programming language. (For examples see [Sto1], [Mil2], [deB].) We would like to prove that they are _equivalent_, in that the output given by the operational semantics, for each program and input, corresponds exactly to the output specified by the denotational semantics. Thus not only is the former to be _consistent_ with the latter, but also it is to be _complete_. For diverging computations, completeness is only required "in the limit". Following [Wad], we shall refer to this property as _limiting completeness_.

In general, it is quite easy to prove consistency, using Structural Induction. See [Sto1],[deB] for some examples. We shall not consider consistency proofs any further in this paper.

Sometimes, it is also possible to prove limiting completeness quite directly using Structural Induction with subsidiary appeal to Fixpoint Induction for recursive constructs such as loops (where Structural Induction fails). However, when the programming language concerned allows self-application - either explicitly as with Algol 60 procedures, or implicitly as with dynamic bindings in LISP - then the direct method seems to be precluded, for Structural Induction fails but there is no obvious recursive construct in the language where fixed-point methods could be applied. In such cases, the domains of denotations are defined reflexively (that is, recursively), and what one wants is to use induction on the level of the projective approximations of the domains.

Wadsworth solved this problem in his study of the λ-calculus [Wad] by labelling expressions M (and their subexpressions) with integers n, so that, $M^{(n)}$ denoted the n'th projection of the denotation of M. Having introduced some extra syntax to make the levels visible, he then studied the operational properties of the $M^{(n)}$ induced by this semantics and also their relation to the operational properties of the original M. Thus one parameter - the labelling - was used both for inductions relating to the denotational semantics (the projection levels) and for inductions relating to the operational semantics. It seems fair to say that as a result a somewhat heavy apparatus was obtained.

We present two other approaches to the proof of (the difficult part of) Wadsworth's classic Approximation Theorem ([Wad Theorem 5.2]). In one the two inductions are separated and the $M^{(n)}$ avoided by means of an intermediate semantics. In the other, using ideas of Milne ([Mil1],[Mil2],[Sto1],[Sto2]), the second induction is avoided entirely. In both approaches recursively-specified inclusive relations are used ([Mil1]); these play only a technical role in the first one but lie at the heart of the second.

Our intermediate semantics is defined just like the standard denotational semantics, except that intermediate denotations take an argument k in $\mathbb{1}^\infty$ (the chain cpo of the extended natural numbers $0 \sqsubseteq 1 \sqsubseteq \ldots \sqsubseteq k \sqsubseteq \ldots \sqsubseteq \infty$). The operational idea is that at finite values of k, an intermediate denotation is to correspond to (perhaps partial) output produced by the operational semantics after at most k steps. In particular, at k = 0 it is the least element $\bot$. At k = ∞ it is by continuity the limit of the intermediate denotations.

The denotational idea is (roughly) that the intermediate denotation at ∞ of any phrase is just a function of the intermediate denotations at ∞ of its sub-phrases. This makes it possible to see the relation between the intermediate and standard denotations. To relate them formally, one defines a recursively-specified inclusive relation between the standard and the intermediate domains. The existence and properties of this relation are established by induction on the projective levels, and in fact the techniques are, for the most part, well known (see [Sto1,Mul] for example). Then a simple structural induction establishes the relation between the standard and intermediate semantics.

The idea of the second appraoch is to strengthen the hypothesis so that Structural Induction succeeds. To do this one defines (for every environment) a relation between semantic values and terms of the language which holds when the value is less than the limiting value of the term given via its operational semantics and moreover when in all suitable contexts the relation still holds. As explained by Stoy [Sto2] one can think of the relation as being that the value approximates to the term. The suitable contexts are given by other related pairs of values and terms and are determined by examining where the original proof by Structural Induction failed. As usual, the existence of such recursively specified relations is determined by induction on the projective levels and the desired result is shown by establishing by Structural Induction that the denotation of a term is related to the term itself.

Comparing the two approaches, we see that the second is the more direct while the first provides more information, via the intermediate semantics, on the details of the operational semantics. In that connection we should also remark that Wadsworth's labelled expressions have been very useful in the study of the λ-calculus, [Bar]. It may be that the intermediate semantics with its feeling of explaining resource-bounded denotations will also be of use. Technically as the reader will see the proofs are less straightforward with the second approach, at least in the present case. The references demonstrate the wide applicability of the second approach; we expect this also for the intermediate semantics method although we have no precise general recipe available for defining such semantics.

We assume the general framework of denotational semantics [Ten,Sto1,Mil2,Gor]. We take domains to be ω-complete partial orders (which are just partial orders $\underline{D} = (D, \sqsubseteq)$ with a least element, $\perp_D$, and lubs $\bigsqcup_n x_n$ of increasing sequences); see [SP] for further information on this topic, especially as regards constructions of domains including the solution of recursive domain equations. Our notation is essentially that of [Wad], to facilitate comparison of results, and that of [SP] to handle cpos.

THE INTERMEDIATE SEMANTICS APPROACH

We shall now prove the completeness of an operational semantics for the λ-calculus, relative to its usual denotational semantics, by introducing an appropriate intermediate semantics.

First let us recall the syntax of the λ-calculus. We assume a denumerable set Var of variables. Basically, the set Exp of λ-terms is taken to be the least such that:

- if x is in Var then x is in Exp;

- if x is in Var and M is in Exp then (λx.M) is in Exp;

- if M and N are in Exp then (MN) is in Exp.

However, for convenience, we extend Exp to include partial terms by means of a clause for the special symbol Ω:

- Ω is in Exp.

We may now regard Exp as a poset, taking the least partial order $\sqsubseteq$ on Exp such that:

- $\Omega \sqsubseteq M$, for all M in Exp;

- if $M \sqsubseteq M'$ then (λx.M) $\sqsubseteq$ (λx.M') for all M and M' in Exp and x in Var;

- if $M \sqsubseteq M'$ and $N \sqsubseteq N'$ then (MN) $\sqsubseteq$ (M'N') for all M,M', N,N' in Exp.

Note that (Exp, $\sqsubseteq$) is not a cpo. However, we shall ensure that all functions that we define on Exp are monotonic.

The standard denotational semantics of the λ-calculus is given by the (monotonic) function $\mathcal{V}$:Exp $\to$ (Env $\to$ D) specified in Table 1. Here D is taken to be the (initial) solution of $D \cong D \to D$ that includes some arbitrary non-trivial cpo D_0 [SP (see also our Appendix)]. (This is a slight generalisation of Scott's original D_∞- model [Sco , Wad], where only complete lattices were considered.) We omit the isomorphism $D \cong D \to D$ from formulae, when there is no danger of confusion.

Our operational semantics for the λ-calculus is given by the ω-indexed family of (monotonic) functions $\mathcal{R}^n$: Exp $\to$ Exp defined in Table 2 for any n and any M in Exp; $\mathcal{R}^n$(M) may be regarded as the partial normal form of M determined by n steps of a (parallel) reduction algorithm. That is, $\mathcal{R}^n$(M) can be obtained by making some β-reductions on M, followed by replacing all remaining β-redexes by Ω. Thus each $\mathcal{R}^n$(M) is an approximate normal form of M in the terminology of [Wad]. Moreover, $\mathcal{R}^n$(M) is monotonic in n: $\mathcal{R}^n$(M) $\sqsubseteq$ $\mathcal{R}^{n+1}$(M), for all n, as can be shown by a

simple induction on (n,M) (lexicographically ordered).

The completeness of this operational semantics (relative to the given denotational semantics) is just that for any term M, its denotation $\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!]$ is included in the limit of the denotations $\mathcal{V}[\![\mathcal{R}^n(M)]\!]$, as n goes to ∞ - this limit exists since $\mathcal{V}$ is monotonic (and $\underline{Env} \to \underline{D}$ is a cpo).

<u>Theorem 1</u>. For M in <u>Exp</u>

$$\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!] \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{n>0} \mathcal{V}[\![\mathcal{R}^n(M)]\!]$$

An   immediate corollary of this theorem is that for all   M,

$$\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!] \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup \{\mathcal{V}[\![A]\!] \mid A \text{ is an approximate normal form of } M\},$$

which is the hard part of Wadsworth's classic Approximation Theorem for the λ-calculus [Wad]. (The reverse directions of both these theorems follow easily from the consistency of β-reduction and the minimality of Ω, with respect to $\mathcal{V}$. We shall not consider consistency any further in this paper.)

To prove our theorem, we introduce an intermediate semantics $\mathcal{V}':\underline{Exp} \to \mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{Env}' \to \underline{D}'$, as given in Table 3 ($\mathcal{V}':\underline{Exp} \to \underline{Env}' \to \mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{D}'$ might be considered more natural, but leads to clumsier statements of theorems). Recall that $\mathbb{1}^\infty$ is the chain cpo of the extended natural numbers. There is an evident embedding of ω in $\mathbb{1}^\infty$, such that the usual operations of successor, predecessor and minimum on ω have unique continuous extensions to $\mathbb{1}^\infty$ - we get $\infty = \infty + 1 = \infty - 1$ and $k \underline{\min} \infty = k$. The domain $\underline{D}'$ is taken to be the (initial) solution of $\underline{D}' \simeq (\mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{D}') \to \underline{D}'$ that includes the same non-trivial domain $\underline{D}_0$ that we included earlier in $\underline{D}$. Again we often omit the isomorphism.

Our first lemma relates $\mathcal{R}^n(M)$ to $\mathcal{V}'$ at n.

<u>Lemma 1</u>   For all $n < \infty$ and M in <u>Exp</u>,

$$\mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\, n \sqsubseteq \mathcal{V}'[\![\mathcal{R}^n(M)]\!]\, n.$$

We shall prove this lemma by induction on (n,M), later in this section. By the continuity of $\mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\, n$ in n, we then get

(1) $\qquad \mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\, \infty \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{n>0} \mathcal{V}'[\![\mathcal{R}^n(M)]\!]\, \infty.$

Now putting ∞ for k in Table 3, it seems quite obvious that $\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!]$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\, \infty$, and that we should be able to infer the required result, namely,

(2)
$$\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!] \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{V}[\![\mathcal{R}^n{}_{(M)}]\!].$$

However, to prove this "obvious" equivalence between $\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!]$ and $\mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\infty$, we need to relate values of $\underline{\underline{D}}$ and $\underline{\underline{D}}'$. As we have already remarked, the techniques for this are quite standard but they appeal to the construction of solutions to reflexive domain equations, and we relegate the details to Appendix I. It would be routine to relate any reflexively-defined domain to an analogous one involving $\mathbb{1}^\infty$, in essentially the same way. (Thus the proofs of the remaining lemmas should not really be considered when assessing the complexity of our approach.)

<u>Lemma 2</u>   There exists a relation $\sim \subseteq \underline{\underline{D}} \times \underline{\underline{D}}'$ such that

   i) for all d in $\underline{\underline{D}}_0$, d $\sim$ d; and

   ii) for all d in $\underline{\underline{D}}$ and d' in $\underline{\underline{D}}'$,

   d $\sim$ d' iff for all e in $\underline{\underline{D}}$ and c' in $\mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{\underline{D}}'$,
   e $\sim$ c'(∞) implies d(e) $\sim$ d'(c')

The proof of Lemma 2 may be found in the Appendix.

The next lemma states that $\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!]$ and $\mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\infty$ are related by the relation provided by Lemma 2.

<u>Lemma 3</u>   For all M in <u>Exp</u> and ρ in <u>Env</u> and ρ' in <u>Env</u>',

   if for all z in <u>Var</u>, $\rho(z) \sim \rho'(z)\infty$

   then $\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!]\rho \sim \mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\infty\rho'$.

We shall prove this lemma by induction on M, later in this section.

According to the next lemma, if d $\sim$ d' then d is (continuously) determined by d'. This will allow us to infer (2) from (1) above.

<u>Lemma 4</u>   There exist continuous functions s:$\underline{\underline{D}} \to \underline{\underline{D}}'$ and r:$\underline{\underline{D}}' \to \underline{\underline{D}}$ such that

   i) for all d in $\underline{\underline{D}}$, d $\sim$ s(d); and

   ii) for all d in $\underline{\underline{D}}$ and d' in $\underline{\underline{D}}'$,
   if d $\sim$ d' then d = r(d').

The proof of Lemma 4 may be found in the Appendix.

We now show how our theorem follows from the above lemmata.

<u>Proof of Theorem 1</u>   Let M in <u>Exp</u> and ρ in <u>Env</u> be arbitrary. The required result will follow if we show that

$$\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!]\, \rho \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{V}[\![\mathcal{R}^n(M)]\!]\rho.$$

Define ρ' in $\underline{\underline{\text{Env}}}'$ by

$$\rho'(x) = \lambda k \in \mathbb{1}^\infty. \ s(\rho(x))$$

where $s: \underline{\underline{D}} \to \underline{\underline{D}}'$ is as in Lemma 4 i , so that for all z in $\underline{\underline{\text{Var}}}$,

$$\rho(z) \sim s(\rho(z)) = \rho'(z)\infty.$$

Now by Lemma 1, for all n in $\omega (\subseteq \mathbb{1}^\infty)$ we have

$$\mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\, n\rho' \sqsubseteq \mathcal{V}'[\![\mathcal{R}^n(M)]\!]\, n\rho'$$

which by continuity in n and $\bigsqcup_{n \geq 0} n = \infty$ (in $\mathbb{1}^\infty$) gives

$$(3) \qquad \mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\infty\rho' \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{V}'[\![\mathcal{R}^n(M)]\!]\infty\rho'$$

Lemma 3 gives

$$(4) \qquad \mathcal{V}[\![M]\!]\, \rho \sim \mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\infty\rho'$$

and that for all n,

$$(5) \qquad \mathcal{V}[\![\mathcal{R}^n(M)]\!]\, \rho \sim \mathcal{V}'[\![\mathcal{R}^n(M)]\!]\infty\rho'.$$

Let $r: \underline{\underline{D}}' \to \underline{\underline{D}}$ be as in Lemma 4 ii . Then we have

$$\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!]\, \rho = r(\mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\infty\rho') \quad \text{from (4)},$$

$$\sqsubseteq \quad r(\bigsqcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{V}'[\![\mathcal{R}^n(M)]\!]\infty\rho') \quad \text{by (3)},$$

$$= \quad \bigsqcup_{n \geq 0} r(\mathcal{V}'[\![\mathcal{R}^n(M)]\!]\infty\rho') \quad \text{by continuity},$$

$$= \quad \bigsqcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{V}[\![\mathcal{R}^n(M)]\!]\, \rho, \quad \text{from (5)},$$

as required.

We now return to our lemmata. The proof of Lemma 1 will make use of the following standard lemma about substitution, which confirms that the operator [-/x]- has been defined correctly so as to respect the static determination of bindings.

Substitution Lemma. For all M and N in Exp and ρ' in Env' and k in $\mathbb{1}^\infty$,

$$\mathcal{V}'[\![\,[N/x]M]\!]\,k\rho' =$$

$$\mathcal{V}'[\![\,M\,]\!]k(\rho'[(\lambda k' \in \mathbb{1}^\infty \,.\, \mathcal{V}'[\![N]\!]\,k'\rho')/x]).$$

We shall omit the straightforward but tedious proof by induction (on M), which is entirely analogous to the usual substitution lemma for the standard semantics, $\mathcal{V}$.

Proof of Lemma 1

We are to show that for all n < ∞ and M in Exp,

$$\mathcal{V}'[\![\,M\,]\!]n \sqsubseteq \mathcal{V}'[\![\,\mathcal{R}^n(M)\,]\!]\,n.$$

We use induction on (n,M). For n = 0 and any M, we have $\mathcal{V}'[\![\,M]\!]\,0 = \bot \sqsubseteq \mathcal{V}'[\![\,\mathcal{R}^0(M)\,]\!]0$, as required.

For n + 1 and any M_0, let v and w abbreviate $\mathcal{V}'[\![\,M_0\,]\!](n+1)$ and $\mathcal{V}'[\![\,\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(M_0)\,]\!](n+1)$, respectively. We shall show that $v \sqsubseteq w$, as required, by cases on M_0.

For Ω, we have $v = \bot$, hence $v \sqsubseteq w$.

For x, we have $\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(x) = x$, giving v = w.

For (λx.M), we have $\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(\lambda x.M) = (\lambda x.M')$, where $M' = \mathcal{R}^{n+1}(M)$. By the induction hypothesis for (n+1,M) we have $\mathcal{V}'[\![\,M\,]\!](n+1) \sqsubseteq \mathcal{V}'[\![\,M'\,]\!](n+1)$, hence $v \sqsubseteq w$ (by monotonicity).

Finally, for (MN), take ρ' in Env'. Then

$$v\rho' = (\mathcal{V}'[\![\,M\,]\!]n\rho')(\lambda k' \in \mathbb{1}^\infty \,.\, \mathcal{V}'[\![\,N\,]\!](k' \ \underline{min}\ n+1)\rho').$$

Let $M' = \mathcal{R}^{n+1}(M)$ and $N' = \mathcal{R}^{n+1}(N)$. By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]n \sqsubseteq \mathcal{V}'[\![\,\mathcal{R}^n(M)\,]\!]n$$

$$\sqsubseteq \mathcal{V}'[\![M']\!]n \quad \text{(by monotonicity)};$$

also for any $k' \in \mathbb{1}^\infty$, we have $k' \ \underline{min}\ n+1 \le n+1$ so that

$$\mathcal{V}'[\![N\,]\!](k' \ \underline{min}\ n+1) \sqsubseteq \mathcal{V}'[\![\,\mathcal{R}^{k'\underline{min}\ n+1}(N)\,]\!](k' \ \underline{min}\ n+1)$$

$$\sqsubseteq \mathcal{V}'[\![N']\!]\,(k' \ \underline{min}\ n+1) \quad \text{(by monotonicity)}.$$

Putting these calculations together we get

$$(6) \qquad v\rho' \sqsubseteq (\mathcal{V}'[\![\,M\,]\!]\,n\rho')(\lambda k' \in \mathbb{1}^{\infty}.\,\mathcal{V}'[\![\,N'\,]\!]\,(k'\,\underline{\min}\,n{+}1)\rho').$$

We shall now consider the cases for M', but note first that when n = 0, we have $\mathcal{V}'[\![\,M'\,]\!]\,0\rho' = \bot$, so that (6) gives $v\rho' \sqsubseteq \bot \sqsubseteq w\rho'$, and hence $v \sqsubseteq w$ as required. We may now suppose n > 0.

For M' = Ω, we have $\mathcal{V}'[\![\,\Omega\,]\!]\,n\rho' = \bot$, and then (6) again gives $v\rho' = \bot$ and $v \sqsubseteq w$ as required.

For M' = $\lambda x.M''$, we have

$$v\rho' \sqsubseteq (\mathcal{V}'[\![\,M'\,]\!]\,n\rho')(\lambda k'\in \mathbb{1}^{\infty}.\,\mathcal{V}'[\![\,N'\,]\!]\,k'\rho'), \text{ by } k'\,\underline{\min}\,n{+}1 \sqsubseteq k',$$

$$= \mathcal{V}'[\![\,M''\,]\!]\,n(\rho'[(\lambda k'\in \mathbb{1}^{\infty}.\,\mathcal{V}[\![\,N'\,]\!]\,k'\rho')/x])$$

$$= \mathcal{V}'[\![\,[N'/x]M''\,]\!]\,n\rho', \text{ by the Substitution Lemma,}$$

$$\sqsubseteq \mathcal{V}'[\![\,\mathcal{R}^{n}([N'/x]M'')\,]\!]\,n\rho', \text{ by induction hypothesis,}$$

$$= \mathcal{V}'[\![\,\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(MN)\,]\!]\,n\rho'$$

$$\sqsubseteq \mathcal{V}'[\![\,\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(MN)\,]\!]\,(n{+}1)\rho' = w\rho'$$

giving $v \sqsubseteq w$, as required.

In the remaining cases for M' (viz. x and (M''N'')) we have $\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(MN) = (M'N')$. Hence

$$w\rho' = (\mathcal{V}'[\![\,M'\,]\!]\,n\rho')(\lambda k'\in \mathbb{1}^{\infty}.\,\mathcal{V}'[\![\,N'\,]\!]\,(k\,\underline{\min}\,n{+}1)\rho')$$

so $v\rho' \sqsubseteq w\rho'$ by (6), giving $v \sqsubseteq w$ as required.

This exhausts the cases for M', thus completing the final case (MN) for M_0. Having now completed the induction step to n+1, we may infer the required result. ∎

We finish this section with a proof of Lemma 3. Its simplicity justifies our earlier remarks about the obviousness of the equivalence of $\mathcal{V}[\![\,M\,]\!]$ and $\mathcal{V}'[\![\,M\,]\!]^{\infty}$.

Proof of Lemma 3.

We use (structural) induction on M. Our induction hypothesis is that for all components M of M_0 in Exp,

$$(7) \quad \begin{cases} \text{for all } \rho \text{ in } \underline{Env} \text{ and } \rho' \text{ in } \underline{Env}', \\ \text{if for all } z \text{ in } \underline{Var}, \ \rho(z) \sim \rho'(z)\infty \\ \text{then } \mathcal{V}[\![M]\!]\rho \sim \mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\infty\rho'. \end{cases}$$

We shall show that (7) then holds also for M_0, by cases on M_0.

For Ω, we have $\mathcal{V}[\![\Omega]\!]\rho = \mathcal{V}'[\![\Omega]\!]\infty\rho'$, for any ρ and ρ'. But by Lemma 2 i , $\perp \sim \perp$, since $\perp \in \underline{\underline{D}}_0$. Hence (7) holds for Ω .

For x, we have $\mathcal{V}[\![x]\!]\rho = \rho(x)$ and $\mathcal{V}'[\![x]\!]\infty\rho' = \rho'(x)\infty$, for any ρ and ρ'. So (7) holds for x.

For $(\lambda x.M)$, take ρ and ρ' such that for all z in $\underline{Var}$, $\rho(z) \sim \rho'(z)\infty$. Also take e in $\underline{\underline{D}}$ and c' in $\mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{\underline{D}}'$ such that $e \sim c'(\infty)$. We have

$$(\mathcal{V}[\![\lambda x.M]\!]\rho)(e) = \mathcal{V}[\![M]\!](\rho[e/x])$$

$$\sim \mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\infty(\rho'[c'/x]), \text{ by induction hypothesis}$$

$$= (\mathcal{V}'[\![\lambda x.M]\!]\infty\rho')(c')$$

so by Lemma 2 ii we get $\mathcal{V}[\![\lambda x.M]\!]\rho \sim \mathcal{V}'[\![\lambda x.M]\!]\infty\rho'$, showing that (7) holds for $(\lambda x.M)$.

Finally, for (MN), take ρ and ρ' such that for all z, $\rho(z) \sim \rho'(z)\infty$. Now by induction hypothesis,

$$\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!]\rho \sim \mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\infty\rho', \text{ and}$$
$$\mathcal{V}[\![N]\!]\rho \sim \mathcal{V}'[\![N]\!]\infty\rho'$$
$$= (\lambda k' \in \mathbb{1}^\infty. \mathcal{V}'[\![N]\!](k' \underline{\min} \infty)\rho')(\infty)$$

so that $\mathcal{V}[\![MN]\!]\rho = (\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!]\rho)(\mathcal{V}[\![N]\!]\rho)$

$$\sim (\mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\infty\rho')(\lambda k' \in \mathbb{1}^\infty. \mathcal{V}'[\![N]\!](k' \underline{\min} \infty)\rho')$$

$$= \mathcal{V}'[\![MN]\!]\infty\rho'$$

so (7) holds in this case also.

There are no more cases, so we may infer the required result. ▨

THE RELATIONAL APPROACH

Here we use a different operational semantics $\delta^n : \underline{Exp} \to \underline{Exp}$, (given in Table 4) which is "outside-in" whereas the previous one was "inside-out" (and this seems to be needed to make the method work). Again each $\delta^n(M)$ is an approximate form of M, monotonic in n. And we will show:

Theorem 2   For all M in $\underline{Exp}$

$$\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!] \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{V}[\![\delta^n(M)]\!]$$

thereby providing our second proof of Wadsworth's Theorem.

If one tries to prove this directly by Structural Induction on M, the proof breaks down in the case where M is an application. Consequently, following the idea explained above for every ρ in $\underline{Env}$ we wish to define a relation $\sim_\rho$ between $\underline{D}$ and $\underline{Exp}$ so that:

$$d \sim_\rho M \text{ iff } d \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{n > 0} \mathcal{V}[\![\delta^n(M)]\!] \quad \text{and}$$

$$\forall e \in \underline{D}, N \in \underline{Exp}. e \sim_\rho N \supset d(e) \sim_\rho M(N)$$

These relations are constructed in Appendix II where we also demonstrate the very useful:

Lemma 5   Given any d and M if whenever $e_i \sim_\rho N_i$ for $i = 1, n'$ it is the case that

$$d(e_1) \ldots (e_{n'}) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_n \mathcal{V}[\![\delta^n(MN_1 \ldots N_{n'})]\!] \rho$$

then it follows that $d \sim_\rho M$.

Note that it follows that $\perp \sim_\rho M$ always holds.

Now to demonstrate Theorem 2 it is clearly enough to show that $\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!] (\rho) \sim_\rho M$ always holds. This is now done by proving a stronger statement (to handle free variables) by Structural Induction on M.

Lemma 6   Let M be an expression and ρ be an environment. Suppose that $a_j \sim_\rho A_j$ for $j = 1, m$. Then

$$\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!] \rho[a_1/x_1, \ldots, a_m/x_m] \sim_\rho [A_1/x_1, \ldots, A_m/x_m]M$$

holds, where the x_i are distinct variables.

<u>Proof</u> By structural induction on M. We will write $\tilde{\rho}$ for $\rho[a_1/x_1,\ldots,a_m/x_m]$ and $\tilde{K}$ for $[A_1/x_1,\ldots,A_m/x_m]K$ (for any term K), where the a_j, A_j, x_j will be understood from the context.

<u>Case I</u> M is an application, $M_1 M_2$.

By induction hypothesis we have $\mathcal{V}[\![M_i]\!]\ (\tilde{\rho}) \sim_\rho \tilde{M}_i$ (i=1,2)

So $\mathcal{V}[\![M_1]\!]\ (\tilde{\rho})\ (\mathcal{V}[\![M_2]\!]\ (\tilde{\rho})) \sim_\rho \tilde{M}_1(\tilde{M}_2)$. But as the left hand side is $\mathcal{V}[\![M_1(M_2)]\!]\ (\tilde{\rho})$ and the right hand side $\widetilde{M_1(M_2)}$ we are finished.

<u>Case II</u> M is Ω. This is by the remark after Lemma 5.

<u>Case III</u> M is a variable, x:

<u>Subcase 1</u> x is some x_j.

Then $\mathcal{V}[\![x]\!]\ \tilde{\rho} = a_j \sim_\rho A_j = \tilde{x}$.

<u>Subcase 2</u> x is no x_j. Then we must show that

$\mathcal{V}[\![x]\!]\ \rho \sim_\rho x$ and we employ Lemma 5, taking $e_i \sim_\rho N_i$ (i=1,n') and calculating:

$$\mathcal{V}[\![x]\!]\ (\rho)(e_1)\ldots(e_{n'})$$

$$\sqsubseteq \mathcal{V}[\![x]\!]\ (\rho)(\bigsqcup_n \mathcal{V}[\![\delta^n N_1]\!]\ (\rho))\ldots(\bigsqcup_n \mathcal{V}[\![\delta^n N_{n'}]\!](\rho))$$

$$\text{(since } e_i \sim_\rho N_i)$$

$$= \bigsqcup_n \mathcal{V}[\![x]\!]\ (\rho)(\mathcal{V}[\![\delta^n N_1]\!](\rho))\ldots(\mathcal{V}[\![\delta^n N_n]\!](\rho))$$

$$= \bigsqcup_n \mathcal{V}[\![x(\delta^n N_1)\ldots(\delta^n N_{n'})]\!]\ (\rho)$$

$$= \bigsqcup_n \mathcal{V}[\![\delta^{n+1}(xN_1\ldots N_{n'})]\!]\ (\rho)$$

as required.

<u>Case IV</u> M is an abstraction, $\lambda x.M'$. We may assume without loss of generality that x is no x_j and x does not occur free in any of the A_j.
We apply Lemma 5 and take $e_i \sim_\rho N_i$ (i=1,n').

<u>Subcase 1</u> n' = 0. We calculate

$$\mathcal{V}[\![\lambda x M']\!]\ \tilde{\rho} = \lambda d \in \underline{D}.\ \mathcal{V}[\![M']\!]\ \widetilde{\rho[d/x]}\ \text{(as x is no } x_j)$$

$$\sqsubseteq \lambda d \in \underline{D}.\bigsqcup_n \mathcal{V}[\![\delta^n \tilde{M'}]\!]\ \rho[d/x]\ \text{(by induction hypothesis applied to M').}$$

$$= \bigsqcup_n \lambda d \in \underline{\underline{D}} . \mathcal{V} [\![\mathcal{S}^n \widetilde{M'}]\!] (\rho[d/x])$$

$$= \bigsqcup_n \mathcal{V} [\![\lambda x \mathcal{S}^n \widetilde{M'}]\!] (\rho)$$

$$\doteq \bigsqcup_n \mathcal{V} [\![\mathcal{S}^{n+1} (\lambda x. \widetilde{M'})]\!] (\rho)$$

$$= \bigsqcup_n \mathcal{V} [\![\mathcal{S}^{n+1} (\widetilde{\lambda x. M'})]\!] (\rho)$$

as required.

Subcase 2 $n' > 0$. First calculate that:

$$\mathcal{V} [\![\lambda x. M']\!] (\widetilde{\rho})(e_1) = \mathcal{V} [\![M']\!] \rho[e_1/x, a_1/x_1, \ldots, a_m/x_m] \text{ (as x is no } x_j)$$

$$\sim_\rho [N_1/x, A_1/x_1, \ldots, A_m/x_m]M'$$

(as $e_1 \sim_\rho N_1$ and by induction hypothesis applied to M')

$$= [N_1/x]\widetilde{M'} \text{ (since x is no } x_j \text{ and does not occur free in}$$
$$\text{any } A_j)$$

So as $e_2 \sim_\rho N_2, \ldots, e_{n'} \sim_\rho N_{n'}$, we have that

$$\mathcal{V} [\![\lambda x. M']\!] (\widetilde{\rho}) e_1 \ldots e_{n'} \sim_\rho ([N_1/x]M') N_2 \ldots N_{n'}$$

and so we see that

$$\mathcal{V} [\![\lambda x. M']\!] (\widetilde{\rho}) e_1 \ldots e_{n'} \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_n \mathcal{V} [\![\mathcal{S}^n (([N_1/x]\widetilde{M'}) N_2 \ldots N_{n'})]\!] (\rho)$$

$$= \bigsqcup_n \mathcal{V} [\![\mathcal{S}^{n+1} ((\lambda x. \widetilde{M}) N_1 N_2 \ldots N_{n'})]\!] (\rho)$$

$$= \bigsqcup_n \mathcal{V} [\![\mathcal{S}^{n+1} ((\widetilde{\lambda x. M}) N_1 \ldots N_{n'})]\!] (\rho)$$

as required, concluding the proof.   ◨

Acknowledgements

REFERENCES

[Bar]   Barendregt, H., The Lambda Calculus. North-Holland, 1981.

[deB]   de Bakker, J., Mathematical Theory of Program Correctness. Prentice-Hall, 1980.

[Gor]   Gordon, M.J.C., The Denotational Description of Programming Languages. Springer-Verlag, 1979.

[Mil1]   Milne, R.E., The Formal Semantics of Computer Languages and their Implementations. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Cambridge, 1974.

[Mil2]   Milne, R.E., and Strachey, C., A Theory of Programming Language Semantics. Chapman and Hall, 1976.

[Mul]   Mulmuley, K., A Mechanizable Theory for Existence Proofs of Inclusive Predicates. To appear.

[Sco]   Scott, D.S., Continuous Lattices, in Toposes Algebraic Geometry and Logic. Proc. Dalhousie Conference 1971, F.W. Lawvere ed. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 274, Springer-Verlag, 1972.

[SP]   Smyth, M.B., and Plotkin, G.D., The Category-Theoretic Solution of Recursive Domain Equations. SIAM. J. Comput., Vol.11, No.4, 1982.

[Sto1]   Stoy, J.E., The Scott-Strachey Approach to Programming Language Theory. 1977, MIT Press.

[Sto2]   Stoy, J.E., The Congruence of Two Programming Language Definitions. TCS, Vol.13, 151-174, 1981.

[Ten]   Tennent, R.D., Principles of Programming Lnaguages. Prentice-Hall, 1981.

[Wad]   Wadsworth, C.P., The Relation Between Computational and Denotational Properties for Scott's D_∞-models of the Lambda Calculus. 1976, SIAM J. Comput., Vol.5, No.3.

TABLE 1: STANDARD SEMANTICS

Domains

$$\underline{\underline{D}} \cong \underline{\underline{D}} \to \underline{\underline{D}} \qquad \text{(See text)}$$

$$\underline{\underline{Env}} = \underline{\underline{D}}^{\underline{\underline{Var}}}$$

Denotations

$$\mathcal{V}: \underline{\underline{Exp}} \to \underline{\underline{Env}} \to \underline{\underline{D}}$$

$$\mathcal{V}[\![x]\!] \, \rho \qquad = \rho(x)$$

$$\mathcal{V}[\![\lambda x.M]\!] \rho \qquad = \lambda d \in \underline{\underline{D}}. \quad \mathcal{V}[\![M]\!](\rho[d/x])$$

$$\mathcal{V}[\![M \, N]\!] \rho \qquad = (\mathcal{V}[\![M]\!]\rho)(\mathcal{V}[\![N]\!]\rho)$$

$$\mathcal{V}[\![\Omega]\!]\rho \qquad = \perp_{\underline{\underline{D}}}$$

TABLE 2: OPERATIONAL SEMANTICS

$\mathcal{R}^n$: $\underline{Exp} \to \underline{Exp}$ (each $n \in \omega$)

$\mathcal{R}^0(M)$ $= \quad \Omega$

$\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(x)$ $= \quad x$

$\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(\lambda x.M) = \lambda x.M'$ where $M' = \mathcal{R}^{n+1}(M)$

$\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(M\ N) = \begin{cases} \Omega, \text{ if } M' = \Omega \\ \mathcal{R}^n([N'/x]M''), \text{ if } M' = \lambda x.M'' \\ (M'N'), \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$

         where $M' = \mathcal{R}^{n+1}(M)$, $N' = \mathcal{R}^{n+1}(N)$

$\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(\Omega)$ $= \quad \Omega$

($[-/x]-$: $\underline{Exp} \times \underline{Exp} \to \underline{Exp}$ is the usual substitution operator.)

TABLE 3: INTERMEDIATE SEMANTICS

Domains

$$\underline{D}' = (\mathbb{1}^{\infty} \to \underline{D}') \to \underline{D}' \qquad \text{(see text)}$$

$$\underline{Env}' = (\mathbb{1}^{\infty} \to \underline{D}')^{\underline{Var}}$$

Denotations

$$\mathcal{V}': \underline{Exp} \to \mathbb{1}^{\infty} \to \underline{Env}' \to \underline{D}'$$

$$\mathcal{V}'[\![x]\!]\, k\rho' = \begin{cases} \bot, & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \rho'(x)k, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{V}'[\![\lambda x.M]\!].k\rho' \doteq \begin{cases} \bot, & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \lambda c' \in \mathbb{1}^{\infty} \to \underline{D}'.\,\mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\, k(\rho'[c'/x]), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{V}'[\![M\ N]\!]\, k\rho' = \begin{cases} \bot, & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \mathcal{V}'[\![M]\!]\,(k-1)\rho')(\lambda k' \in \mathbb{1}^{\infty}.\,\mathcal{V}'[\![N]\!](k'\ \underline{\min}\ k)\rho'), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{V}'[\![\Omega]\!]\, k\rho' = \bot$$

TABLE 4: ANOTHER OPERATIONAL SEMANTICS

$\mathcal{S}^n$: $\underline{Exp} \to \underline{Exp}$ (each $n \in \omega$)

$\mathcal{S}^0(M) = \Omega$

$\mathcal{S}^{n+1}(\Omega N_1 \ldots N_{n'}) = \Omega$

$\mathcal{S}^{n+1}(x N_1 \ldots N_{n'}) = x \mathcal{S}^n(N_1) \ldots \mathcal{S}^n(N_{n'})$

$$\mathcal{S}^{n+1}((\lambda x.M) N_1 \ldots N_{n'}) = \begin{cases} \lambda x \mathcal{S}^n(M) & \text{(if } n' = 0) \\ \mathcal{S}^n(([N_1/x]M) N_2 \ldots N_{n'}) & \text{if } n' \neq 0) \end{cases}$$

APPENDIX I

Construction of $\underline{D}$ and $\underline{D}'$

This proceeds as described in [SP]. Let $\underline{D}_0$ be a fixed (non-trivial) cpo. For the construction of $\underline{D}$ satisfying

$$\underline{D} \cong (\underline{D} \to \underline{D})$$

first define an $\underline{\omega}$-chain $\Delta = \langle \underline{D}_n, f_n \rangle$ of cpos $\underline{D}_n$ and embeddings $f_n : \underline{D}_n \to \underline{D}_{n+1}$ by

$$\underline{D}_{n+1} = (\underline{D}_n \to \underline{D}_n)$$

and

$$f_0(d) = \lambda e \in \underline{D}_0 . d, \qquad f_0^R(g) = g(\perp_{\underline{D}_0}),$$

$$f_{n+1}(g) = f_n \circ g \circ f_n^R, \qquad f_{n+1}^R(h) = f_n^R \circ h \circ f_n.$$

Next $\underline{D}$ is the colimit of Δ, being the sub-cpo of $\prod_{n=n} D$ of all sequences d with, for every n, $d_n = f_n^R(d_{n+1})$. We have a cone $\mu : \Delta \to D$ of embeddings where

$$(\mu_n(d_n))_m = \begin{cases} f_{nm}(d_n) & (m \geq n) \\[2ex] f_{mn}^R(d_n) & (m < n) \end{cases}$$

and $\mu_n^R(d) = d_n$, for all n (and where $f_{nm} = f_{m-1} \circ \cdots \circ f_n$, $f_{nm}^R = f_n^R \circ \cdots \circ f_{m-1}^R$).

Now we have a cone $\nu : \Delta^- \to (\underline{D} \to \underline{D})$ where $\Delta^- = \langle \underline{D}_{n+1}, f_{n+1} \rangle$ is Δ less its first element and $\nu_n(g) = \mu_n \circ g \circ \mu_n^R$ (and $\nu_n^R(h) = \mu_n^R \circ h \circ \mu_n$).

Then the isomorphism pair

$$\underline{D} \overset{\Phi}{\underset{\Psi}{\rightleftarrows}} (\underline{D} \to \underline{D})$$

is given by the formulae:

$$\Phi = \bigsqcup_{n \geq 0} \nu_n \circ \mu_{n+1}^R ,$$

$$\Psi = \bigsqcup_{n \geq 0} \mu_{n+1} \circ \nu_n^R .$$

We need to examine the first formula in more detail.

For Φ we calculate that for any d, e in $\underline{D}$

$$(\Phi(d)(e)) = (\bigsqcup_m \mu_m(d_{m+1}(\mu_m^R(e))))_n$$

$$= \bigsqcup_m \mu_m(d_{m+1}(e_m))$$

and then note that for any n,m

$$(\Phi(d)(e))_n = \bigsqcup_{m \geq n} \mu_n^R(\mu_m(d_{m+1}(e_m))) \quad \text{(since } f_{nm} = \mu_m^R \circ \mu_n)$$

$$= \bigsqcup_{m \geq n} f_{nm}^R(d_{m+1}(e_m)).$$

In the case where $e = \mu_n(e_n)$ with e_n in $\underline{\underline{D}}_n$ we have

$$(\Phi(d)(\mu_n e_n))_n = \bigsqcup_{m \geq n} f_{nm}^R(d_{m+1}((\mu_n e_n)_m))$$

$$= \bigsqcup_{m \geq n} f_{nm}^R(d_{m+1}(f_{nm}(e_n)))$$

$$= \bigsqcup_{m \geq n} f_{(n+1)(m+1)}^R(d_{m+1})(e_n)$$

$$= d_{n+1}(e_n).$$

Turning to $\underline{\underline{D}}'$, which is to satisfy the isomorphism

$$\underline{\underline{D}}' \cong (\, \mathbb{1}^{\infty} \to \underline{\underline{D}}') \to \underline{\underline{D}}'$$

we take the $\underline{\underline{\omega}}$-chain $\Delta' = \langle \underline{\underline{D}}'_n, f'_n \rangle$ of cpos and embeddings where

$$\underline{\underline{D}}'_0 = \underline{\underline{D}}_0 \,, \quad \underline{\underline{D}}'_{n+1} = (\, \mathbb{1}^{\infty} \to \underline{\underline{D}}'_n) \to \underline{\underline{D}}'_n$$

and $\quad f_0(d') = \lambda c' \in (\, \mathbb{1}^{\infty} \to D'_0).\, d'$, $\quad f_0^R(g') = g'(\perp_{\mathbb{1}^{\infty} \to \underline{\underline{D}}'})$

$$f_{n+1}(g') = f'_n \circ g' \circ (f'^R_n \circ -), \quad f'^R_{n+1}(h') = f'^R_n \circ g' \circ (f'_n \circ -).$$

Now $\underline{\underline{D}}'$ is the colimit of Δ' being the sub-cpo of $\prod_{n=}^{} D'_n$ of all sequences d' with, for every n, $d'_n = f'^R_n(d'_{n+1})$. We have a cone $\mu':\Delta' \to \underline{\underline{D}}'$ of embeddings defined as before (and with $\mu'^R_n(d') = d'_n$, as before). Now we have a cone ν' from Δ'^- (defined as before) to $(\, \mathbb{1}^{\infty} \to D') \to \underline{\underline{D}}'$, where $\nu'_n(g') = \mu'_n \circ g' \circ (\mu'^R_n \circ -)$ (and $\nu'^R_n(h') = \mu'^R_n \circ h' \circ (\mu'_n \circ -))$.

Then the isomorphism pair

$$\underline{\underline{D}}' \overset{\Phi'}{\underset{\Psi'}{\gtrless}} (\, \mathbb{1}^{\infty} \to \underline{\underline{D}}') \to \underline{\underline{D}}'$$

is given by the analogous formulae to those for Φ and Ψ. Upon detailed examination these yield for any d' in $\underline{\underline{D}}'$ and $c' \in (\, \mathbb{1}^{\infty} \to \underline{\underline{D}}')$ that

$$(\Phi'(d')(c'))_n = \bigsqcup_{m \geq n} f'^R_{nm}(d'_{m+1}(\mu'^R_m \circ c')).$$

Also for any $d' \in \underline{\underline{D}}'$ and $c_n' \in (\ \mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{\underline{D}}_n')$ we have that

$$(\Phi'(d')(\mu_n' \circ c_n'))_n = d_{n+1}'(c_n')$$

The relation between $\underline{\underline{D}}$ and $\underline{\underline{D}}'$

First we inductively construct relations $\sim_n$ between $\underline{\underline{D}}_n$ and $\underline{\underline{D}}_n'$ by

$$d \sim_0 d' \quad \text{iff} \quad d = d'$$

$$d \sim_{n+1} d' \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall e \in \underline{\underline{D}}_n, \ c' \in (\ \mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{\underline{D}}_n').e \sim_n c'(\infty) \supset d(e) \sim_n d'(c').$$

We recall that for cpos $\underline{\underline{D}}$ and $\underline{\underline{E}}$ a relation $R \subseteq \underline{\underline{D}} \times \underline{\underline{E}}$ is <u>inclusive</u> (termed ω-complete in [SP]) iff it is closed under lubs of increasing sequences, which is to say that if d_n, e_n are increasing sequences in $\underline{\underline{D}}$ and $\underline{\underline{E}}$ respectively then if $R(d_n, e_n)$ holds for every n so does $R(\bigsqcup d_n, \bigsqcup e_n)$.

<u>Lemma 7</u> Each $\sim_n$ is inclusive.

<u>Proof</u> By induction on n. For n = 0 this is obvious. For n + 1 assume for all $m \geq 0$ that $d_m \sim_{n+1} d_m'$ where d,d' are increasing sequences. Take e in $\underline{\underline{D}}_n$, c' in $\mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{\underline{D}}_n'$ with $e \sim c'(\infty)$. Then $d_m(e) \sim_n d_m'(c')$ and so $\bigsqcup_m (d_m(e)) \sim_n \bigsqcup_m (d_m'(c'))$, by induction hypothesis and so we have $(\bigsqcup d)(e) = \bigsqcup_m (d_m(e)) \sim_n \bigsqcup_m (d_m'(c')) = (\bigsqcup d')(c')$, concluding the proof. $\boxtimes$

<u>Lemma 8</u>   i) For all d in $\underline{\underline{D}}_n$ and d' in $\underline{\underline{D}}_n'$,

$$d \sim_n d' \supset f_n(d) \sim_{n+1} f_n'(d').$$

ii) For all d in $\underline{\underline{D}}_{n+1}$ and d' in $\underline{\underline{D}}_{n+1}'$

$$d \sim_{n+1} d' \supset f_n^R(d) \sim_n f_n'^R(d').$$

<u>Proof</u> By simultaneous induction on n. For n = 0 suppose first that $d \sim_0 d'$. To show $f_0(d) \sim_1 f_0'(d')$ take e in $\underline{\underline{D}}_0$ and c' in $\mathbb{1}^\infty \to D_0'$ with $e \sim_0 c'(\infty)$. Then $f_0(d)(e) = d$ and $f_0'(d')(c') = d'$, so $f_0(d)(e) \sim_0 f_0'(d')(c')$ as required.

Next suppose $d \sim_1 d'$. As $\bot \sim_0 (\lambda k \in \mathbb{1}^\infty.\bot)(\infty)$ we have $f_0^R(d) = d(\bot) \sim_0 d'(\lambda k \in \mathbb{1}^\infty.\bot) = f_0'^R(d')$ as required.

For n + 1, suppose first that $d \sim_{n+1} d'$ and take e in $\underline{\underline{D}}_{n+1}$ and $c' \in (\ \mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{\underline{D}}_{n+1}')$ such that $e \sim_{n+1} c'(\infty)$. Then $f_n^R(e) \sim_n f_n'^R(c'(\infty))$ (by induction hypothesis); so $d(f_n^R(e)) \sim_n d'(f_n'^R \circ c')$ (by assumption); so $f_n(d(f_n^R(e))) \sim_{n+1} f_n'(d'(f_n'^R \circ c'))$ (by induction hypothesis). But this is just $f_{n+1}(d)(e) \sim_{n+1} f_{n+1}'(d')(c')$ as required. The proof of the second part is similar. $\boxtimes$

Now we can define our relation between $\underline{\underline{D}}$ and $\underline{\underline{D}}'$ by

$$d \sim d' \quad \text{if} \quad \forall n \, . \, d_n \sim_n d'_n.$$

By Lemma 7 and the componentwise calculation of lubs of $\underline{\omega}$-sequences in $\underline{\underline{D}}$ and $\underline{\underline{D}}'$ we get that $\sim$ is inclusive. By Lemma 8 we get that for any d in $\underline{\underline{D}}_n$ and d' in $\underline{\underline{D}}'_n$ if $d \sim_n d'$ then $\mu_n(d) \sim \mu'_n(d')$.

We are now is a position to supply the proof of Lemma 2.

<u>Lemma 2. Proof</u>   i) What this claims is that for any d_0 in $\underline{\underline{D}}_0$ it holds that $\mu_0(d_0) \sim \mu'_0(d_0)$, which follows at once by the above remark and the fact that $d_0 \sim_0 d_0$.

ii) $\Rightarrow$: First suppose $d \sim d'$ (so that $d_{n+1} \sim d'_{n+1}$ for any n). Take e in $\underline{\underline{D}}$ and c' in $\mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{\underline{D}}'$ such that $e \sim c'(\infty)$ (to show that $d(e) \sim d'(c')$, meaning that $\Phi(d)(e) \sim \Phi'(d')(c'))$. Now since $e \sim c'(\infty)$ we have for any m that $e_m \sim_m (\mu'^R_m \circ c')(\infty)$ and so by assumption, we have $d_{m+1}(e_m) \sim_m d'_{m+1}(\mu'^R_m \circ c')$. Therefore by Lemmas 7 and 8 ii we have for any n that

$$\bigsqcup_{m \geq n} f^R_{nm}(d_{m+1}(e_m)) \sim_n \bigsqcup_{m \geq n} f'^R_{nm}(d'_{m+1}(\mu'^R_m \circ c'))$$

and by the above remarks on Φ and Φ' this is just

$$(\Phi(d)(e))_n \sim_n (\Phi'(d')(c'))_n$$

showing $\Phi(d)(e) \sim \Phi'(d')(c')$ as required.

ii) $\Leftarrow$: Suppose that whenever e in $\underline{\underline{D}}$ and c' in $\mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{\underline{D}}'$ satisfy $e \sim c'(\infty)$ then $\Phi(d)(e) \sim \Phi'(d')(c')$. We wish to show that $d \sim d'$ and by Lemma 8 ii it is enough to show $d_{n+1} \sim_{n+1} d'_{n+1}$ for all n. So take e in $\underline{\underline{D}}_n$ and c' in $\mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{\underline{D}}'_n$ such that $e \sim_n c'(\infty)$. Then by a previous remark we have $\mu_n(e) \sim (\mu'_n \circ c')\infty$ and so, by our supposition, that $\Phi(d)(\mu_n(e)) \sim \Phi'(d')(\mu'_n \circ c')$.

So we have

$$d_{n+1}(e) = (\Phi(d)(\mu_n(e)))_n \quad \text{(by a calculation given above)}$$
$$\sim_n (\Phi'(d')(\mu'_n \circ c'))_n \quad \text{(as just shown)}$$
$$= d'_{n+1}(c') \quad \text{(by a calculation given above)}$$

showing that $d_{n+1} \sim d'_{n+1}$ and thereby concluding the proof.   ▨

The functions s and r

First we inductively define continuous $s_n : \underline{D}_n \to \underline{D}'_n$ and $r_n : \underline{D}'_n \to \underline{D}_n$ by

$$s_0 = r_0 = id_{\underline{D}_0},$$

$$s_{n+1}(d) = \lambda c' \in \mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{D}'_n \cdot s_n(d(r_n(c'(\infty)))),$$

$$r_{n+1}(d') = \lambda e \in \underline{D}_n \cdot r_n(d'(\lambda k \in \mathbb{1}^\infty \cdot s_n(e))).$$

<u>Lemma</u> <u>9</u>   i)   For all n, $f'^R_n \circ s_{n+1} \sqsupseteq s_n \circ f^R_n$

ii)   For all n, $f^R_n \circ r_{n+1} \sqsupseteq r_n \circ f'^R_n$

<u>Proof</u>   By simultaneous induction on n.   For n = 0, first we have $f'^R_0(s_1(d)) =$
$s_1(d)(\bot) = s_0(d(r_0(\bot(\infty)))) = d(\bot) = s_0(f^R_0(d))$; and second $f^R_0(r_1(d')) = r_1(d')(\bot) =$
$r_0(d'(\lambda k \in \mathbb{1}^\infty . s_0(\bot))) = d'(\bot) = r_0(f'^R_0(d'))$.

For n+1 and part i we first calculate that for any d in $\underline{D}_{n+2}$ and c' in $\mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{D}'_n$,

$$f'^R_{n+1}(s_{n+2}(d))(c) = f'^R_n(s_{n+2}(d)((f'_n \circ -)(c')))$$

$$= f'^R_n(s_{n+2}(d)(f'_n \circ c'))$$

$$= f'^R_n(s_{n+1}(d(r_{n+1}(f'_n(c'(\infty))))))$$

and then calculate that

$$s_{n+1}(f^R_{n+1}(d))(c') = s_n(f^R_n(d(f_n(r_n(c'(\infty)))))).$$

But $(f'_n \circ s_{n+1}) \sqsupseteq (s_n \circ f^R_n)$ (by induction hypothesis, part(i)) and also

$(r_{n+1} \circ f'_n) \sqsupseteq f_n \circ f^R_n \circ r_{n+1} \circ f'_n \sqsupseteq f_n \circ r_n \circ f'^R_n \circ f'_n$ (by induction

hypothesis, part ii) = $(f_n \circ r_n)$ and applying these two facts enables us to
complete the above calculation, showing that

$$f'^R_{n+1}(s_{n+2}(d))(c') \sqsupseteq s_{n+1}(f^R_{n+1}(d))(c')$$

as required.   For part ii the proof is similar.   ⊠

Because of part i of this lemma, for any d in $\underline{D}$ and any n, the sequence
$\langle f'^R_{nm}(s_m(d_m)) \rangle_{m \geq n}$ is increasing and so we can define $s : \underline{D} \to \underline{D}'$ by:

$$(s(d))_n = \bigsqcup_{m \geq n} f'^R_{nm}(s_m(d_m))$$

it being simple to verify that $s(d)$ is in $\underline{\underline{D}}'$. Similarly using part ii we can define $r: \underline{\underline{D}}' \to \underline{\underline{D}}$ by

$$(r(d'))_n = \bigsqcup_{m \geq n} f^R_{nm}(r_m(d'_m)).$$

<u>Lemma 10</u> i) For all d in $\underline{\underline{D}}_n$, $d \sim_n s_n(d)$.

ii) For all d in $\underline{\underline{D}}_n$ and d' in $\underline{\underline{D}}'_n$
if $d \sim_n d'$ then $d = r_n(d')$.

<u>Proof</u> Simultaneous induction on n, the case $n=0$ being evident. For $n+1$ and part i suppose d is in $\underline{\underline{D}}_{n+1}$. Take e in $\underline{\underline{D}}_n$ and c' in $\mathbb{1}^\infty \to \underline{\underline{D}}'$ such that

$e \sim_n c'(\infty)$ (so that $e = r_n(c'(\infty))$, by induction hypothesis part ii). Now we just calculate that

$$d(e) \sim_n s_n(d(e)) \text{ (by induction hypothesis part i)}$$

$$= s_n(d(r_n(c'(\infty))))$$

$$= s_{n+1}(d)(c')$$

as required.

For part ii suppose d is in $\underline{\underline{D}}_{n+1}$ and d' is in $\underline{\underline{D}}'_{n+1}$ and $d \sim_{n+1} d'$. For any e in $\underline{\underline{D}}_n$ we have

$$e \sim_n s_n(e) \text{ (by induction hypothesis, part i)}$$

$$= (\lambda k \in \mathbb{1}^\infty . s_n(e))(\infty)$$

and so $d(e) \sim_n d'(\lambda k \in \mathbb{1}^\infty . s_n(e))$, by assumption

and so $d(e) = r_n(d'(\lambda k \in \mathbb{1}^\infty . s_n(e)))$, by induction

hypothesis, part ii . But this just says, since e was chosen arbitrarily, that $d = r_{n+1}(d')$. ◼

We can now prove Lemma 4.

<u>Lemma 4</u> <u>Proof</u> i) Take d in $\underline{\underline{D}}$. Then for any m we have $d_m \sim_m s_m(d_m)$, by Lemma 10i , and so for any n and any $m \geq n$ we have by Lemma 8 ii, $d_n \sim_n f'^R_{nm}(s_m(d_m))$ and so, by Lemma 7, $d_n \sim_n (s(d))_n$, showing $d \sim s(d)$ as required.

ii)   Suppose $d \sim d'$.   Then for any m we have $d_m \sim d_m'$ and so $d_m = r_m(d_m')$ by Lemma 10 ii .   So for any n and $m \geq n$, by Lemma 8 ii we have $d_n = f_{nm}^R(d_m) = f_{nm}^R(r_m(d_m'))$ and so $d_n = (r(d'))_n$ by Lemma 7 showing $d = r(d')$, as required.   ▨

APPENDIX II

We show that a relation, $\sim_\rho$, with the required properties exists. First define relations $\sim_\rho^n$ between $\underline{\underline{D}}_n$ and $\underline{\underline{Exp}}$ for every $n \geq 0$ by:

$$d \sim_\rho^0 M \text{ iff } \forall n' \geq 0 \forall N_1,\ldots,N_{n'}.\mu_0(d) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_k \mathcal{V} [\![\mathscr{E}^k(MN_1\ldots N_{n'})]\!](\rho)$$

$$d \sim_\rho^{n+1} M \text{ iff } \mu_{n+1}(d) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_k \mathcal{V} [\![\mathscr{E}^k M]\!](\rho) \text{ and}$$

$$(\forall e \in \underline{\underline{D}}_n, N \in \underline{\underline{Exp}} . e \sim_\rho^n N \supset d(e) \sim_\rho^n M(N)).$$

<u>Lemma 11</u> i) $d \sim_\rho^0 M$ iff $\mu_0(d) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_k \mathcal{V} [\![\mathscr{E}^k M]\!](\rho)$ and for all $N, d \sim_\rho^0 M(N)$.

ii) $\perp \sim_\rho^0 M$ always holds.

<u>Proof</u>   Obvious.   ⌧

<u>Lemma 12</u>   Each $\sim_\rho^n$ is inclusive (in its first argument).

<u>Proof</u>   Easy induction on n.   ⌧

<u>Lemma 13</u>   i) If $d \sim_\rho^n M$ then $f_n(d) \sim_\rho^{n+1} M$

ii) If $d \sim_\rho^{n+1} M$ then $f_n^R(d) \sim_\rho^n M$.

<u>Proof</u> By induction on n. For n=0, assume for i that $d \sim_\rho^0 M$. Then first we calculate that:

$$\mu_1(f_0(d)) = \mu_0(d) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_k \mathcal{V} [\![\mathscr{E}^k M]\!](\rho)$$

and second, supposing that $e \sim_\rho^0 N$ we see that $f_0(d)(e) = d \sim_\rho^0 M(N)$, by Lemma 11 i . So $f_0(d) \sim_\rho^1 M$ as required.

Next, for ii suppose that $d \sim_\rho^1 M$. We show, using Lemma 11 that $f_0^R(d) \sim_\rho^0 M$. First,

$$\mu_0(f_0^n(d)) = \mu_1(f_0 \circ f_0^R(d)) \sqsubseteq \mu_1(d) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_k \mathcal{V} [\![\mathscr{E}^k M]\!](\rho),$$

since $d \sim_\rho^1 M$. Next for any N, since $\perp \sim_\rho^0 N$, by Lemma 11 ii we have

$f_0^R(d) = d(\perp) \sim_\rho^0 M(N)$, as required.

For n>0, the verification is routine.   ⌧

Note that $\bot \sim_\rho^n M$ always holds and that if $d' \sqsubseteq d \sim_\rho^n M$ then $d' \sim_\rho^n M$, that is $\sim_\rho^n$ is downwards closed in its left argument. All in all, $\{d \mid d \sim_\rho^n M\}$ is always a non-empty Scott closed set.

Now we can define the relation $\sim_\rho$ by:

$$d \sim_\rho M \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall n.\ d_n \sim_\rho^n M.$$

This is clearly inclusive using Lemma 12, and indeed $\bot \sim_\rho M$ always holds (and actually $\{d \mid d \sim_\rho M\}$ is always non-empty Scott closed). Note that, by Lemma 13, if $d \sim_\rho^n M$ then $\mu_n(d) \sim_\rho M$.

Now we show that the recursive specification for $\sim_\rho$ is satisfied.

<u>Lemma 14</u> $d \sim_\rho M$ iff $d \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_k \mathcal{V} [\![\mathcal{S}^k M]\!] \rho$ and

$$(\forall e \sim_\rho N.\ d(e) \sim_\rho M(N)).$$

<u>Proof</u> This is routine, but perhaps worth writing down.

$\Rightarrow$ Suppose $d \sim_\rho M$. Then $d_n \sim_\rho^n M$, so $\mu_n(d_n) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_k \mathcal{V} [\![\mathcal{S}^k M]\!] (\rho)$ holds for every

n and so holds for $d = \bigsqcup_n \mu_n(d_n)$ too. Next, suppose $e \sim_\rho N$. Then $e_n \sim_\rho^n N$

and so, as $d_{n+1} \sim_\rho^{n+1} M$, we have $d_{n+1}(e_n) \sim_\rho^n N$ and so $\mu_n(d_{n+1}(e_n)) \sim_\rho M(N)$ and

so, as $d(e) = \bigsqcup_n \mu_n(d_{n+1}(e_n))$, $d(e) \sim_\rho M(N)$, as required.

$\Leftarrow$ Suppose $d \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_k \mathcal{V} [\![\mathcal{S}^k M]\!] (\rho)$ and whenever $e \sim_\rho N$ then $d(e) \sim_\rho M(N)$. We will

show that $d_{n+1} \sim_\rho^{n+1} M$, for every n. Clearly $\mu_{n+1}(d_{n+1}) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_k \mathcal{V} [\![\mathcal{S}^k M]\!] (\rho)$, from

the supposition. Suppose that $e \sim_\rho^n N$. Then $\mu_n(e) \sim_\rho N$ and so $d(\mu_n e) \sim_\rho N$ and

so $d_{n+1}(e) = d(\mu_n e)_n \sim_\rho^n N$, as required. ∎

<u>Proof of Lemma 5</u> We show by induction on n that for any d, M if for any $n' \geq 0$ whenever $e_i \sim_\rho N_i$ (for $i = 1, n'$) then

$$d e_1 \ldots e_n \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_k \mathcal{V} [\![\mathcal{S}^k M N_1 \ldots N_{n'}]\!] (\rho)$$

then it follows that $d_n \sim_\rho^n M$.

First suppose $n = 0$. Take $N_1, \ldots, N_{n'}$. Then $\bot \sim_\rho N_i$ and so

$$\mu_0(d_0) = \mu_0(d_0)\perp \cdots \perp \sqsubseteq d\perp \cdots \perp\sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_k \mathcal{W} \; [\![\mathcal{S}^k{}_{MN_1\ldots.N_n}]\!] (\rho)$$

as required.

For n+1, first

$$\mu_{n+1}(d_{n+1}) \sqsubseteq d \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_k \mathcal{W} \; [\![\mathcal{S}^k{}_M]\!] (\rho)$$

and second, suppose that $e \sim_\rho^n N$. Then $\mu_n(e) \sim_\rho N$. Now suppose that, in order to apply the induction hypothesis to $d(\mu_n e)$,MN, that $e_i \sim_\rho N_i$ for $i = 1,n'$. Then

$$d(\mu_n e)e_1\cdots.e_{n'} \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_k \mathcal{W} \; [\![\mathcal{S}^k{}_{(MN)N_1\ldots.N_{n'}}]\!] (\rho)$$

by assumption on d, M and so $(d(\mu_n e))_n \sim_\rho^n MN$. But as $d(\mu_n e)_n = d_{n+1}(e)$, it follows that $d_{n+1}(e) \sim_\rho^n MN$ and so, finally, that $d_{n+1} \sim_\rho^{n+1} M$, as required. ∎