

Allegories of Symbolic Manipulations

Francesco Gavazzo
University of Pisa
francesco.gavazzo@unipi.it

Abstract—Moving from the mathematical theory of (abstract) syntax, we develop a general *relational* theory of symbolic manipulation parametric with respect to, and accounting for, general notions of syntax. We model syntax relying on categorical notions, such as free algebras and monads, and show that a general theory of symbolic manipulation in the style of rewriting systems can be obtained by extending such notions to an allegorical setting. This way, we obtain an augmented calculus of relations accounting for syntax-based rewriting. We witness the effectiveness of the relational approach by generalising and unifying milestones results in rewriting, such as the parallel moves and the Tait-Martin-Löf techniques.

Index Terms—Rewriting, Relational Reasoning, Confluence

I. INTRODUCTION

The study of symbolic expressions and their manipulation has always been one of the prime goals of mathematics and, even more, of theoretical computer science. Indeed, it is precisely its “symbol pushing” that makes *symbolic reasoning*, and the associated notion of *symbolic computation*, so effective. Charles Wells¹ greatly summarises the deep and fundamental relationship between symbolic expressions and their manipulation by writing *symbolic terms are encapsulated computations*.

The study of symbolic expressions as used by mathematicians, logicians, and computer scientists has been of little interest to mathematicians and logicians for a long time. Remarkable achievements, instead, have been achieved by computer scientists starting from the seventies [1]–[13], mostly in the field of programming language theory, where algebraic theories of (abstract) syntax have been developed in terms of initial algebras and free monads [1]. Altogether, these results gave raise to a new research field which is generically referred to as *mathematics of syntax*, where syntax is tacitly understood as being abstract.

Symbolic syntax, however, is largely sterile without a (symbolic) *dynamics* or *operational semantics*.² Traditionally, *rewriting theory* [14]–[17] is the discipline studying such symbolic, discrete transformations between expressions. However, even if considerably older than the aforementioned mathematics of syntax, rewriting has arguably not yet reached the same level of generality. Symbolic expressions, in fact, come in different flavours: they can be first-order, as in algebra, or higher-order, as in calculus; typed, as in programming language theory, or untyped, as in logic; one-dimensional, as

in traditional mathematics, or two-dimensional, as in category theory, etc. This simple observation is at the very heart of the mathematical theory of syntax previously mentioned: there, different forms of syntax are obtained by different data structures which are uniformly understood in terms of algebras [1].

1) *Rewriting*: Does anything similar happen to rewriting? Not really! Indeed, each kind of expressions previously mentioned leads to the development of a specific, syntax-based rewriting theory. Term rewriting [15]–[17], for instance, studies the symbolic manipulation of first-order expressions, whereas higher-order [15], [18] and nominal [19] rewriting focus on expressions with variable binding. This proliferation of *ad hoc* rewriting formalism has prevented rewriting from qualifying as a general theory of symbolic manipulation.

Actually, a general theory of symbolic manipulation, the so-called theory of *Abstract Reduction Systems* (ARSs) [14], [17], has been proposed almost one century ago (although its current formulation is due to Huet [17]). Such a theory moves from the conceptual assumption that “symbol pushing” is a *relational* notion and studies abstract properties of such a relation, such as confluence and termination. ARSs achieve their generality by simply ignoring the syntactic structure of expressions and they thus provide a limited (albeit not negligible) contribution to a general theory of symbolic manipulation. Unfortunately, being essentially syntax-free, ARSs can only account for symbolic manipulation as discrete transformations, this way giving no information on how such transformations interact with the syntactic structure of expressions. Quoting Ghani and Lüth [20]:

[...] ARSs lack sufficient structure to adequately model key concepts such as substitution, context and the layer structure whereby terms from one system are layered over terms from another in modularity problems. Hence ARSs are mainly used as an organisational tool with the difficult results proved directly at the syntactic level.

The proliferation of *ad hoc* syntax-based theories of rewriting is precisely caused by the aforementioned deficiencies of ARSs. To overcome all of that and move towards a *general* theory of symbolic reduction parametric with respect to, but at the same time accounting for, the syntactic structure of expressions, several authors have proposed to rebuild rewriting on a *categorical*, rather than *relational*, basis, notable examples being theories based on polygraphs [21], Lawvere theories [22], 2-categories (and variations thereof) [23]–[26], and (enriched) monads [20], [27], [28].

¹See <https://abstractmath.org/MM/> (The Symbolic Language of Math).

²Operational semantics usually covers a large class of semantic behaviours, symbolic manipulation being just one of them.

Although employing different categorical frameworks, all these theories share two common traits: first, they loose the relational understanding of symbolic manipulation replacing it with categorical constructions, such as suitable natural transformations, that are conceptually farther from the everyday practice and understanding of symbolic manipulation; second, they are *denotational*, rather than *operational*, meaning that symbolic manipulation is defined not on syntactic expressions, but on denotations thereof (e.g. arrows in suitable categories). Generality is thus achieved only denotationally, and at the expense of intuition. The question is now obvious: can the same level of generality be achieved *operationally*, maintaining the intuitive, relational understanding of symbolic manipulation?

A. Contribution

In this paper, we answer the above question in the affirmative by showing that the relational approach at the heart of ARSs can account for a large class of syntactic expressions in a highly general, modular, and remarkably natural way that complements the previously mentioned mathematics of (abstract) syntax. This allows us to establish a new bridge between what one may ambitiously refer to as the mathematics of (formal) expressions and the mathematics of their (symbolic) manipulation. Whereas the former is algebraic and builds upon category theory, the latter is relational and builds upon *allegory theory* [29]. Remarkably, what is needed to define the relational theory of rewriting is exactly the allegorical counterpart of the categorical notions used to define syntax, namely initial algebras, free monads, etc. This outlines a general framework where categorical notions are used to define syntactic expressions, and their allegorical extensions provide symbolic manipulations for such expressions. We achieve these results proceeding as follows.

1. We use suitable categories (viz. Grothendieck toposes [30]) \mathcal{E} to model the different kinds of expressions we are interested in (e.g. sets for first-order expressions [1] and presheaves for expressions with binders [2], [7]).
2. Syntax specification is then given by suitable signature functors on \mathcal{E} , whereas syntax itself is defined by free monads over such functors.
3. We then apply the relational methodology observing that if a topos \mathcal{E} models a universe of expressions, then its induced *allegory* [29], [31] $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ models symbolic transformations between such expressions.
4. By extending functors, monads, and (initial) algebras from \mathcal{E} to $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ – something that, under suitable conditions, can be always done [32]–[35] – we define new syntax-based operators on relations that allow us to define interesting notions of rewriting in a purely relational way.
5. By exploiting the algebraic laws of the aforementioned operators, we model and prove nontrivial rewriting properties. For instance, we prove confluence of orthogonal systems by giving relational generalisation of the so-called *parallel moves* [18] and *Tait and Martin-Löf* [36]–[38] techniques.

1) *The Augmented Calculus of Relations*: By extending the categorical constructions defining syntax to allegories, we

obtain a rich and novel relational vocabulary that allows us to define many rewriting notions in an allegorical setting. Even if such a vocabulary is obtained throughout a relational analysis of (the mathematics of) syntax, it turns out that all that matters for our purposes is the collection of new operators given by such an analysis, together with the (algebraic) laws governing their (operational) behaviour. At this point, the abstraction step is natural: we can forget about the syntax structure (and its relational counterpart) and work in a completely axiomatic fashion within a calculus of relations [39]–[41] *augmented* with the aforementioned operators and their laws. Much in the same way as the ordinary calculus of relations provide an elegant framework for the study of abstract reduction systems, the aforementioned augmented calculus of relations provide a similar framework for the study of (several kinds of) syntax-based reduction systems in a rather syntax-independent way.

2) *A Bridge Between Rewriting and Program Equivalence*: Perhaps surprisingly, this augmented calculus of relations is not entirely new: it can be seen as a (nontrivial) generalisation of the calculus of λ -term relations developed by Lassen [42], [43] in the context of higher-order program equivalence. This way, we obtain a novel connection between rewriting and program equivalence. A first (and surprising) consequence of that is the observation that the construction of the so-called multi-step reduction [36]–[38] as used in the Tait and Martin-Löf confluence technique coincides with Howe’s construction [44], [45] of the pre-congruence candidate, the key notion in the (operational) proof of congruence of applicative bisimilarity [46]. This connection not only allows us to import results and techniques from the field of program equivalence to rewriting (as we shall do in this work), but also sheds new light on operational notions (for instance, we will see that the aforementioned Howe’s construction is obtained via initial relational algebras).

B. Related Work

Looking at the literature on rewriting, it is quite natural to classify theories and results according to three distinct schools of thought [47] reflecting mainstream divisions in program semantics: *operational* [15], [16], *logical* [48], and *denotational* [20]–[28]. There is, however, a fourth, albeit less known, school of thought, namely the *relational* one.

The first observation of the relevance of relational reasoning in rewriting is due to Bäumer [49] and since then several relational calculi (and alike) have been employed to study *abstract* reduction systems. Among the many results achieved in this line of research, we mention relational proofs of Church-Rosser theorem [50], of Newman’s Lemma [51], [52], and modularity theorems for termination [51], [53]. Relational rewriting has been also extended to non-traditional notions of relations, such as monadic relations [54] and fuzzy and quantitative relations [55]–[58]. To the best of the author’s knowledge, the literature offers no relational analysis of syntax-based systems. Finally, we mention the axiomatic approach to rewriting [59]–[64] which, even if non-relational, is close in spirit to the present work.

II. PROLOGUE: (TERM) REWRITING WITHOUT SYNTAX

Before moving to the general theory of rewriting, we gently introduce the reader to some of the main ideas behind this work by studying a simple, yet instructive example: *term rewriting*. In their broadest sense, term rewriting systems [15]–[17] (TRSs) specify how *first-order terms* can be syntactically manipulated. Given a signature Σ , i.e. a set containing operation symbols o and their arity, and a set X of variables, recall that the set $\mathcal{T}(X)$ of (Σ -)terms is inductively defined thus:

$$\frac{x \in X}{x \in \mathcal{T}(X)} \quad \frac{t_1 \in \mathcal{T}(X) \cdots t_n \in \mathcal{T}(X) \quad (o, n) \in \Sigma}{o(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \mathcal{T}(X)}$$

A TRS is then given by a binary relation \mapsto on $\mathcal{T}(X)$. We refer to relations such as \mapsto as *reduction relations*.

Viewed that way, there is no conceptual difference between TRSs and ARSs, the latter being sets endowed with a binary endorelation. It takes only a few seconds, however, to realise that the relation \mapsto alone is of little interest, as it says nothing on how to instantiate \mapsto on arbitrarily complex expressions, nor on how to propagate it along their structures. For instance, consider the following relation modelling natural number addition: $\text{add}(0, y) \mapsto y$, $\text{add}(\text{succ}(x), y) \mapsto \text{succ}(\text{add}(x, y))$. Relying on \mapsto only, there is no way to reduce, e.g., the term $\text{succ}(\text{add}(0, 0))$ to $\text{succ}(0)$, as the former is not a redex,³ although it contains a substitution instance of one.

Consequently, to obtain useful notions of reduction on Σ -terms we need (i) to consider substitution instances of \mapsto and (ii) to specify how such instances can be propagated along term syntax. The first point is handled by working with the substitution closure \rightarrow of \mapsto , whereby we consider (substitution) *instances* of \mapsto .⁴ For the second point, there are many possible natural extensions of \rightarrow , depending on the notion of reduction one has in mind. For example:

- *Sequential reduction* is the relation \rightarrow that \rightarrow -reduces exactly one redex at a time.
- *Parallel reduction* is the relation \Rightarrow that \rightarrow -reduces an arbitrary number of non-nested redexes in parallel.
- *Full reduction* is the relation \Rightarrow that \rightarrow -reduces an arbitrary number of possibly nested redexes in parallel.

A formal definition of all these notions requires to first introduce several specific syntactic notions on terms, such as positions, occurrences, contexts, etc. Sequential reduction, for example, is defined by stipulating that $C[t]_p \rightarrow C[s]_p$ holds if and only if $t \rightarrow s$ does, where p is a position and $C[-]_p$ is a context with one hole at position p . As a main consequence of that, TRSs become intrinsically *term-dependent*, this way loosing the relational understanding of reduction given by ARSs. The shift from reduction relations *per se* to the *syntactic structure* of the objects reduced massively impacts the way one reasons about TRSs, with relational reasoning leaving the place to *syntactic* arguments on terms. Such arguments have several well-known drawbacks: they are error-prone, difficult to formalise, and, most importantly, they lack modularity.

Small changes in the syntactic structure of terms require to (re)develop the underlying rewriting theory from scratch.

1) *Term Rewriting, Syntactically Relationally*: The just described scenario shows a conceptual gap between abstract and term (and, more generally, syntax-based) rewriting systems. This gap, however, is by no means substantial and it is possible to develop a fully relational theory of TRSs, as we shall show in this paper.

First, we observe that parallel and full reduction can be obtained by means of suitable relational constructions applied on \rightarrow .⁵ For instance, the following relational construction, known as *compatible refinement* [42], [65], defines relations \hat{a} between terms with the same outermost syntactic constructs and argumentwise a -related terms.

$$\frac{x \in X}{x \hat{a} x} \quad \frac{t_1 \hat{a} s_1 \quad \cdots \quad t_n \hat{a} s_n}{o(t_1, \dots, t_n) \hat{a} o(s_1, \dots, s_n)}$$

Using compatible refinement, we obtain a relational (inductive) definition of \Rightarrow as $\mu x. \rightarrow \vee \hat{x}$. This change of perspective is not just a way to give more compact definitions. Having separated the definition of \Rightarrow from the (simplest) one of $\hat{_}$, it is natural to focus on the algebraic properties of the latter, rather than on the syntax of terms. For instance, it is easy to prove that $\hat{_}$ is functorial (it preserves relation composition and the identity relation) and (ω -)continuous: this way, not only the aforementioned relational definition of \Rightarrow is well-given, but it also allows us to reason about parallel reduction using algebraic calculations and fixed point induction [66].

Moreover, we can use algebraic and relational reasoning to prove rewriting properties of \Rightarrow . As an example, in section VII we shall prove the diamond property of \Rightarrow for orthogonal systems [17] by showing the following Kleisli-like extension lemma (here properly instantiated to \Rightarrow) akin to a semi-confluence proof technique: $\leftarrow; \Rightarrow \subseteq \Rightarrow; \leftarrow$ implies $\leftarrow; \Rightarrow \subseteq \Rightarrow; \leftarrow$. We will prove such a result relying on algebraic laws only, and then show that the inclusion in the aforementioned extension lemma holds for a large class of (relationally-defined) reduction systems (i.e. *orthogonal systems*) using the same methodology. All of that is done relationally by decomposing \rightarrow throughout a further relational construction, viz. *relation substitution* [42], and its algebraic laws. The reader familiar with TRSs can see such a result as a generalisation of the well-known *parallel moves technique* [18].

2) *Hello Syntax, My Old Friend*: The discussion made so far hints that a relational analysis of TRSs is possible by introducing suitable relational operators describing, at an algebraic level, how syntax act on reductions. This makes the operational analysis of TRSs indeed closer to the corresponding one of ARSs: for the former one simply needs a more powerful calculus of relations than the one needed for ARSs (we shall come back to this point later). All of that significantly improves reasoning, but does not overcome syntax-dependency: the definition of the new relational constructions, such as $\hat{_}$, still relies on the syntax at hand.

³Recall that a redex is a term that can be \mapsto -reduced.

⁴Formally, we have $t[\bar{v}/\bar{x}] \rightarrow s[\bar{v}/\bar{x}]$ whenever $t \mapsto s$.

⁵The same can be said about sequential reduction too, although we leave its formal analysis for future work (see section X).

To make the relational framework truly general, we notice that the actual syntax of term is not really needed for our purposes. In fact, it is well-known that notions of syntax can be modelled as free algebras (and their associated monads) over suitable signature functors [1]. In the case of first-order terms, any signature Σ induces a (signature) functor Σ on the category *Set* of sets and functors. Such a functor acts as syntax specification and induces a functor \mathcal{S} that, given a set X , returns the set of Σ -terms over X . The functor \mathcal{S} is the carrier of a monad $(\mathcal{S}, \eta, \rho)$, which is the free monad over Σ , in the sense that the structure $X \xrightarrow{\eta} \mathcal{S}X \xleftarrow{\sigma} \Sigma(\mathcal{S}X)$ gives the free Σ -algebra over X . The map η acts as the variable constructor mapping x to \mathfrak{x} , whereas the map σ describe the inductive step in the definition of Σ -terms, whereby terms are closed under operation symbols; the multiplication ρ , finally, flattens a ‘term of terms’ into a term, and it is *de facto* recursively defined relying on η and σ .

The key observation now is to notice that these data acting on sets (of terms) are precisely what is needed to define (the relational operators behind) reduction relations, provided that we can extend their action from functions to *relations*, hence to the category *Rel* of sets and relations. For instance, given a relation a on $\mathcal{S}X$, we recover \hat{a} as $\eta^\circ; \eta \vee \sigma^\circ; \overline{\Sigma}a; \sigma$ where, for a relation⁶ $a : A \leftrightarrow B$, we denote by $a^\circ : B \leftrightarrow A$ the converse of a and by $\overline{\Sigma}$ the *relational extension* of Σ , namely a functor-like mapping a to $\overline{\Sigma}a : \Sigma A \leftrightarrow \Sigma B$ (of course, we have to check that using $\overline{\Sigma}$ we indeed recover \hat{a} , but we will see that this is the case; even more, this is *canonically* the case).

The question now is: how can we define $\overline{\Sigma}$? Luckily, the answer has been given long ago, and we can now rely on a mature theory of relational extensions of set-constructions [67]–[69]. In particular, by a celebrated result by Barr [32], Σ extends to a converse-preserving monotone functor $\overline{\Sigma}$ on *Rel*. Moreover, $\overline{\Sigma}$ – which is usually generically referred to as the *Barr extension* of Σ – is *unique* and it furthermore induces a converse-preserving monotone functor $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ which, as suggested by the notation, is the Barr extension of \mathcal{S} .

Converse-preserving monotone functors are known as *relator* [33], [70], [71] and there is a rich theory both on relators and on how to extend functors to relators. We view relators as describing how (reduction) relations are propagated along the syntactic structure given by the underlying functor. For instance, $\overline{\Sigma}$ indeed defines $\hat{\cdot}$ as sketched above. Moreover, looking at $\mathcal{S}X$ monadically, we can use $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ to obtain a further decomposition of \Rightarrow as $\rho^\circ; \overline{\mathcal{S}}(\rightarrow); \rho$. From a syntactic perspective, this definition corresponds to the ‘context-based’ definition of parallel reduction, where using relators we can talk about contexts in a syntax-free way. Finally, we can show that the two definitions of parallel reduction hereby sketched indeed coincide.

3) *From Algebra to Program Equivalence*: This (informal) analysis shows that parallel reduction can be fully understood relationally; moreover, the role played by relators (and by Barr

extensions, in particular) hints that parallel reduction is *the* canonical notion of reduction induced by the syntax. Is that really the case? And what about other notions of reduction?

The answer to the first question is in the affirmative, at least as long as we think about \mathcal{S} as a *monad*. At the same time, however, parallel reduction is not the only canonical notion of reduction induced by the syntax. In fact, $\mathcal{S}X$ being free, the theory of initial algebra tells us that we can equivalently described it as the *initial algebra* of the (*Set*) functor $X + \Sigma(-)$, so that we can think about syntax also as an initial algebra.

How is that relevant for rewriting? The so-called Eilenberg-Wright Lemma [34] states that an initial algebra in *Set* is such also in *Rel*. In particular, whenever we have a relation $a : X + \Sigma A \leftrightarrow A$, then initiality gives a unique relation $\langle a \rangle : \mathcal{S}X \leftrightarrow A$ such that⁷ $[\eta, \sigma]; \langle a \rangle = \overline{\Sigma}\langle a \rangle; a$. Thinking about a as a reduction, then $\langle a \rangle$ recursively a -reduces along the syntactic structure of terms.

Moving from this intuition, we discover that \Rightarrow is precisely $\langle [\eta, \sigma]; \rightarrow \rangle$. But this is not the end of the story. In fact, even if this initial algebra-based definition of \Rightarrow goes ‘beyond’ the relational operators used to define (the least fixed point characterisation of) parallel reduction, we can give an inductive characterisation of \Rightarrow using that vocabulary, viz. as $\mu x. \hat{x}; \rightarrow$. This should ring a bell to the reader familiar with program equivalence: in fact, relations of the form $\mu x. \hat{x}; a$ are not new, as they are precisely the so-called pre-congruence candidates (on a) used in the well-known Howe’s technique [44], [45] to prove congruence of applicative bisimilarity [46]. As for parallel reduction, this relational machinery is powerful enough also to prove interesting rewriting properties of \Rightarrow . We will witness that by giving a fully relational generalisation of the so-called Tait-Martin-Löf technique [36]–[38].

4) *Beyond TRSs*: The discussion conducted so far hints that the theory of TRSs can be given within a relational framework. This observation builds upon three crucial points: (i) the syntax of *first-order* expressions can be modelled *categorically* on *Set*; (ii) the latter category has a rich category of relations, viz. *Rel*, that models symbolic manipulations of first-order expressions; (iii) the categorical notions modelling syntax can be extended to *Rel*, and such notions are precisely what is needed to define reduction relations and to prove theorems about them ((iv) as a bonus point that we will discuss later, we notice that such extensions allow us to extend the rich calculus of relations given by *Rel* with suitable operators, this way giving a kind of extended calculus of relations within which rewriting theories can be expressed).

The realm of symbolic expressions, however, is far richer than first-order terms: there are expressions with names and binders [2], [7], sorted and typed expressions, diagrams and two-dimensional expressions [73], etc. All these expressions come with suitable notions of symbolic manipulation between them (e.g. higher-order rewriting [15], [18], nominal rewriting [19], diagrammatic rewriting [74]–[77], etc.), and

⁶We use the notation $a : A \leftrightarrow B$ in place of $a \subseteq A \times B$.

⁷By Lambek Lemma [72], we have $[\eta, \sigma] : X + \Sigma(\mathcal{S}X) \cong \mathcal{S}X$.

to qualify as a general theory of symbolic manipulation, the relational theory we are going to develop has to account for all these examples.

To achieve this goal, we notice that the aforementioned key points are not at all specific to *Set*, *Rel*, and first-order terms. All the expressions mentioned so far can be understood in terms of initial algebras and free monads, provided that one moves to categories other than *Set*. For instance, expressions with binders are modelled on variable (i.e. presheaves) [7] and nominal sets [2], [3], whereas diagrammatic expressions rely on categories of spans [74].

This allows us to recover point (i) above. If we recover points (ii) and (iii) too, then we can give relational theories of symbolic manipulation for all the classes of symbolic expressions at issue. This is indeed the case, as each category \mathcal{E} mentioned so far induces a rich category of relations $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ over it together with extensions of syntax functors and monads on \mathcal{E} to $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$. The last step we need to take to achieve a truly general theory is to crystallise the above procedure by means of a suitable axiomatics that captures the essential structure \mathcal{E} and $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ need to have. We will achieve that goal by taking a non-minimal yet effective axiomatisation whereby \mathcal{E} is a Grothendieck topos [30]. In fact, any Grothendieck topos \mathcal{E} induces a category of relations $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ that has the structure of a *locally complete power allegory* [29], [31]. The latter allegories provide a powerful and highly expressive calculus of relations that allows us to develop a general theory of rewriting in a remarkably clear and elegant way. Although slogans should be avoided, the allegorical theory of rewriting we develop in this paper and its deep connection with the mathematical theory of syntax, seem to suggest that syntax is categorical, and syntax manipulation is allegorical.

5) *An Axiomatic Approach*: Let us summarise what we have achieved so far. Looking at syntax as a categorical construction and considering its relational extension, we have recovered notions of reduction in fully relational ways. This process can be organised into two complementary approaches, both of which define notions of reduction and prove properties about them. The first approach proceeds in an *algebraic* fashion by enriching traditional relational calculi with suitable operators on relations (compatible refinement, relation substitution, etc.) and relying on their algebraic laws to prove rewriting properties. The second approach, instead, is *structural* and builds upon the relationally extended categorical properties of syntax to give definitions of reduction, relying on their universality to prove rewriting properties.

A natural further abstraction step is to make the first approach completely *axiomatic*. That is, rather than building upon signature functors, relators, etc. to build relational operators, we simply add them (as well as their algebraic laws) to the traditional calculus of relations (or variations thereof) [39]–[41] in an axiomatic fashion. We can then develop theory of rewriting systems within such an *augmented calculus of relations*, this way giving a truly relational foundation to rewriting. The structural approach previously mentioned can then be seen as a way to build models of such a calculus. This

axiomatic approach have several advantages: for instance, it allows us to establish novel and deep connections between rewriting and program equivalence, and opens the door to enhance proof formalisation of rewriting theories.⁸

Now that the reader has familiarised with the spirit of this work, we move to its formal development.

III. MATHEMATICAL PRELIMINARIES

Before going any further, we recall some preliminary notions. We assume the reader is familiar with basic category theory [79]. We will use standard notation except for: composition of arrows is in diagrammatic order ($f;g$) and identity is denoted as Δ (relational notation).

1) *Initial Algebras*: Given a category \mathcal{C} and a functor $\Sigma : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ on it, a Σ -algebra consists of an object A (the carrier) and an arrow $\alpha : \Sigma A \rightarrow A$ (the algebra map). Such algebras are the objects of a category, $\Sigma\text{-Alg}$, whose arrows $f : (A, \alpha) \rightarrow (B, \beta)$ are \mathcal{C} -arrows $f : A \rightarrow B$ such that $\alpha; f = \Sigma f; \beta$. The *initial algebra* of Σ , if it exists, is the initial object in $\Sigma\text{-Alg}$. Explicitly, it is a Σ -algebra $(\mu\Sigma, \xi)$ such that for any Σ -algebra (A, α) , there exists a unique $\Sigma\text{-Alg}$ -arrow $(\alpha) : \mu\Sigma \rightarrow A$. We denote the carrier of the initial algebra Σ by $\mu\Sigma$ (or $\mu x.\Sigma x$) and refer to arrows (α) as *catamorphisms*. Being initial objects, initial algebras are unique up-to isomorphism. Moreover, the well-known Lambek Lemma [72] states that ξ has an inverse and thus $\mu\Sigma \cong \Sigma(\mu\Sigma)$.

Initial algebras need not exist, in general. The following result [80] gives a sufficient condition on functors that guarantees existence of initial algebras.

Theorem 1 ([80]). *Let \mathcal{C} be a category with initial object 0 and let Σ be a finitary endofunctor on it, i.e. Σ preserves ω -colimits. Then $\mu\Sigma$ exists and coincides with colimit of the chain $0 \xrightarrow{!} \Sigma 0 \xrightarrow{\Sigma^!} \Sigma^2 0 \xrightarrow{\Sigma^{2!}} \dots \Sigma^n 0 \xrightarrow{\Sigma^{n!}} \dots$.*

2) *Monads*: Recall that a monad on a category \mathcal{C} is a triple $(\mathcal{R}, \eta, \rho)$ consisting of a functor $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and natural transformations $\eta_A : A \rightarrow \mathcal{R}A$, $\rho_A : \mathcal{R}\mathcal{R}A \rightarrow \mathcal{R}A$ satisfying suitable coherence conditions [79]. To avoid unnecessary proliferation of notation, we denote by \mathcal{R} both the monad $(\mathcal{R}, \eta, \rho)$ and its carrier functor, provided that does not create confusion.

When a functor Σ as above has initial algebra (and \mathcal{C} has enough structure), it induces a monad \mathcal{S} , called the *free monad over Σ* . Let us assume that \mathcal{C} has finite coproducts and that for any object A the initial algebra of the functor $A + \Sigma(-)$ exists, which it does whenever the one of Σ does. Then, the assignment $\mathcal{S}A \triangleq \mu x.A + \Sigma x$ determines a monad, called the (*algebraically*) *free monad* generated by Σ [79]. The initial algebra map $\xi : A + \Sigma\mathcal{S}A \rightarrow \mathcal{S}A$ can be decomposed as $[\eta, \sigma]$, with $\eta : A \rightarrow \mathcal{S}A$ and $\sigma : \Sigma\mathcal{S}A \rightarrow \mathcal{S}A$. Both η and σ are mono, provided that coproducts injections are monos in \mathcal{C} , a condition satisfied by any topos. The arrow η gives the

⁸Relational calculi turned out to be well-suited for proof formalisation [40], [78], with remarkable example of that in rewriting being given by the proof of Newman's Lemma [51], [78].

unit of \mathcal{S} , whereas the multiplication ρ is defined by initiality as $([\Delta, \sigma])$.

IV. OUTLINE OF A CATEGORICAL THEORY OF SYNTAX

Having recalled the notions of initial algebra and free monad, in this section we succinctly summarise how these notions can be instantiated to give a mathematical theory of syntax [1]–[13]. Although different authors propose different approaches to (different aspects of) abstract syntax, all such approaches can (perhaps) be understood in the following conceptual framework (see figure 1).

1. A category (the universe of expressions) \mathcal{E} capturing the kind of expressions one is interested in is fixed.
2. Syntax specification is given by a (signature) functor $\Sigma : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, usually polynomial, that specifies how expressions can be combined
3. The actual syntax of the language is given by the free monad \mathcal{S} generated by Σ .

Obviously, the above schema does work only for suitable categories and functors which, in turn, may depend on specific features the framework aims to describe. In what follows, we discuss each point in detail and explicitly state the axioms of our propaedeutic theory of syntax (upon which we shall develop the theory of symbolic manipulations).

1) *Universe of Expressions*: Beginning with point 1, i.e. the universe of expressions \mathcal{E} , we have already observed that formal expressions come in several flavours (first-order, higher-order, typed, two-dimensional, etc.) and that each of these alternatives corresponds to a specific category (sets, presheaves, nominal sets, spans, hypergraphs, etc.). The purpose of the category \mathcal{E} is precisely to formally specify the nature of expressions. As the examples mentioned so far share the same structure: the category \mathcal{E} is a *topos*; even more, it is a Grothendieck topos [30]. In light of that, we formulate the first axiom of our theory.

Assumption 1. The universe \mathcal{E} is a Grothendieck topos.

Assumption 1 is by no means minimal and we could weaken it in many ways (e.g. working with elementary toposes with countable colimits, or even weaker structure) The advantage of Assumption 1 is that (i) it covers many interesting examples without requiring the introduction of *ad hoc* definitions; (ii) \mathcal{E} supports an expressive calculus of relations upon which we shall build a general theory of symbolic manipulation.

2) *Syntax Specification*: The signature functor $\Sigma : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ specifies how expressions can be articulated, i.e. combined together to form new expressions. We require that Σ captures a crucial features of the kind of syntax we are interested in: syntax is *finitary* and *recursively* defined⁹. By Theorem 1, this means that Σ must be finitary. Additionally, we need to be able to manipulate expressions along their syntactic structures so that, for instance, we can apply a syntactic transformation on *parts* of an expression.

⁹We leave the investigation of infinitary syntax to future work.

Assumption 2. The signature functor $\Sigma : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$: (i) nearly preserves pullbacks (pbs); (ii) preserves strong epimorphisms; (iii) is finitary.

Conditions (i) and (ii), which we shall discuss in detail in the next section, ensure that Σ comes with a well-behaved notion of “symbol pushing”, the latter being obtained via relational extensions of Σ . Such conditions, due to Carboni et al. [33], are rather weak: condition (i) is implied by weak pbs preservation, which is in turn implied by pbs preservation; condition (ii), instead, is equivalent to regular epimorphisms preservation [29], which is itself implied by epimorphisms preservation. In *Set*, the presence of the axiom of choice ensures that any functor preserves epimorphisms, but this is not the case in arbitrary topoi. Nonetheless, one can show that in any topos \mathcal{E} simple polynomial functors preserve epimorphisms.

3) *Syntax*: Having axioms on \mathcal{E} and Σ , there is not much to say about \mathcal{S} . It simply acts as the actual syntax of the language which, given an object A representing some collection of basic expressions, builds full expressions by recursively combining previously defined expressions according to Σ . Indeed, since \mathcal{E} has coproducts, if \mathcal{S} exists it maps an object A to $\mu xA + \Sigma x$. Assumption 2 ensures such an initial algebra to exist and, additionally, to be obtained by Theorem 1, since \mathcal{S} is finitary whenever Σ is. This precisely captures our assumption that syntax is finitary. Clearly, \mathcal{S} should also have a relational extension, and thus we may ask whether additional requirements have to imposed on \mathcal{S} . The answer is in the negative, for \mathcal{S} has a relational extension if Σ has, as we shall see in next sections.

A. Examples

We conclude this section by looking at some examples of how specific notions of abstract syntax are captured by the general categorical framework.

Example 1. Before moving to concrete examples, we observe that a large family of instances of the theory of syntax is obtained throughout *simple polynomial functors*. Recall that a functor on a topos \mathcal{E} is a *simple polynomial functor* [81] if it is built from the identity and constant functors using composition, finite products, and set-indexed coproducts.¹⁰ Simple polynomial functors (and suitable extensions thereof) can be thought as abstract notions of syntax (specification) [8].

Example 2 (First-Order Terms). We have already seen in section II that a first-order signature Σ induces a (simple polynomial) functor Σ on *Set*, and that \mathcal{S} gives the syntax of Σ -terms.

¹⁰More generally, given an arrow $f : B \rightarrow A$ in \mathcal{E} , the polynomial functor $P_f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ induced by f is defined as $P_f(X) = \sum_{a:A} X^{B(a)}$, where the latter expression is written using the internal language of \mathcal{E} (equivalently, let us consider the adjoint functors on the slice category $\sum_B \dashv f^* \dashv \prod_B$ with $\sum_B, \prod_B : \mathcal{E}/B \rightarrow \mathcal{E}/A$ and $f^* : \mathcal{E}/A \rightarrow \mathcal{E}/B$; writing $B^* : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}/B$ for the functor obtained taking $A = 1$ (and thus $f : B \rightarrow 1$), we have $P_f = B^*; \prod_f; \sum_f$).

Categorical Syntax

- Universe of Expressions: A Grothendieck topos \mathcal{E}
- Syntax Specification: A functor $\Sigma : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$
 - Finitary syntax means *finitary functor*
 - If Σ is finitary, then $\mu\Sigma = \text{colim } \Sigma^n(0)$
- Syntax: Free monad $\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$
 - Free monad exists iff $\mu\Sigma$ does
 - $SA = \mu x.A + \Sigma x$

Allegorical Syntax

- Universe of Relations: The LCP allegory $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$
- Relational Signature: A relator $\overline{\Sigma} : \mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ for Σ
 - $\overline{\Sigma}$ exists unique if Σ preserves strong epis and nearly preserves pbs
 - Σ is finitary implies $\overline{\Sigma}$ ω -continuous: $\overline{\Sigma}(\bigvee_n a_n) = \bigvee_n \overline{\Sigma} a_n$
- Relational Syntax: a relator $\overline{\mathcal{S}} : \mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ for \mathcal{S}
 - $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ exists if $\overline{\Sigma}$ does, and $Sa = \mu x.\eta^\circ; a; \eta \vee \sigma^\circ; \overline{\Sigma}; \sigma$

Fig. 1: Basic Notions of Categorical (left) and Allegorical (right) Theory of Syntax

Example 3 (Higher-Order Terms: the λ -calculus). We now go beyond first-order syntax and introduce variable binding. For the sake of exposition, instead of defining binding signatures and terms in full generality (something that can be easily done [7]), we focus on a single example of such syntax: terms of the λ -calculus modulo α -conversion [82]. Following the seminal work by Fiore et al. [7], the key insight to model terms with binders is to move from *Set* to categories of expressions in context. Let \mathcal{N} be the category of finite cardinals, i.e. the full subcategory of *Set* with objects sets $\mathbf{n} \triangleq \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. We think of sets \mathbf{n} as (indexes of variables of) finite contexts and of a function $f : \mathbf{n} \rightarrow \mathbf{m}$ as a context renaming. Accordingly, we consider the presheaf category $\text{Set}^{\mathcal{N}}$ of sets (of expressions) in context. Fixed a countable collection of variables x_0, x_1, \dots , the presheaf Λ of λ -terms maps \mathbf{n} to the set $\Lambda(\mathbf{n})$ of λ -terms modulo (α -)renaming with free variables in $\{x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$. An inductive definition of Λ is given thus:

$$\frac{i \in \mathbf{n}}{x_i \in \Lambda(\mathbf{n})} \quad \frac{\mathbf{t} \in \Lambda(\mathbf{n}+1)}{\lambda_{x_{n+1}}.\mathbf{t} \in \Lambda(\mathbf{n})} \quad \frac{\mathbf{t} \in \Lambda(\mathbf{n}) \quad \mathbf{s} \in \Lambda(\mathbf{n})}{\mathbf{t} \mathbf{s} \in \Lambda(\mathbf{n})}$$

As it is customary [45], we oftentimes write $\mathbf{n} \vdash \mathbf{t}$ (or $\bar{x} \vdash \mathbf{t}$, tacitly assuming $\bar{x} = x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}$) in place of $\mathbf{t} \in \Lambda(\mathbf{n})$. Let us consider the signature functor $\Sigma X \triangleq \delta X + (X \times X)$, where $\delta X(\mathbf{n}) \triangleq X(\mathbf{n}+1)$, and let us write V for the presheaf of variables mapping \mathbf{n} to x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} . Then the free monad \mathcal{S} over Σ maps V to the presheaf $SV \cong V + \delta(SV) + (SV \times SV)$ of λ -terms modulo α -renaming. The functor δ is finitary polynomial [7], [8] and satisfies the conditions of Assumption 2), so that the whole functor Σ does. In light of that, we can extend the class of simple polynomial functors by including δ without altering the ‘good’ properties of simple polynomial functors. The resulting class is sometimes referred to as the class of *binding functors* [83].

Example 4 (Nominal Sets). An alternative universe for modelling expressions with variable binding and names is given by the category *Nom* of nominal sets [2], [3]. Due to space constraints, we will not give details about that but simply remark that *Nom* is a Grothendieck topos (it is isomorphic to the Schanuel topos [2]), and that syntax for expressions with names and binders can be given as free monads over a mild variation of the binding functors defined in the previous example.

Example 5 (Further Examples). More generally, presheaf categories of the form $\text{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{op}}$, with \mathcal{C} small, can be used to model many universes of expressions, and several notions

of syntax have been given as initial algebras of suitable functors on them. Examples include sorted expressions [84], simply [8] and polymorphically-typed expressions [9], [10], graphs and hypergraphs, and diagrams [73]. For instance, Bonchi et al. [74] model string diagram as initial algebra of polynomial-like functors in the category of spans $\mathbb{N} \leftarrow S \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ in *Set* (arrows are span morphisms). Notice that such a category is isomorphic to $\text{Set}^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}}$, where $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ is the discrete category with objects pairs of natural numbers.

B. Substitution

In addition to the aforementioned crucial features of mathematical syntax (e.g. recursive term formation, structural induction, etc.), there is another major syntactic-like structure that characterise (many notions of) symbolic syntax: *substitution*. Whereas there is a general consensus on the initial algebra approach to term-formation, several axiomatizations for substitution have been proposed — such as monoids on monoidal categories [7], [9], substitution algebras and (heterogeneous) structure [7], [85], monads with pointed strength [86], modules [87]–[90], and monads on nominal sets [2], [3], just to mention but a few — and a general consensus on them is arguably missing.

Nonetheless, all these approaches share a common trait; they all view substitution as a (structurally) recursively-defined syntax-preserving morphism. When dealing with first-order syntax (i.e. signature functors and their free algebras on *Set*), a satisfactory account of substitution can be given in terms of monads only: being in *Set*, it is possible to internalise the monad structure of \mathcal{S} , this way obtaining (monadic binding) maps $\varsigma : SX \times SX^X \rightarrow SX$, natural in X , implementing substitution: given a term \mathbf{t} and a substitution $[\bar{s}/\bar{x}]$ viewed as a map from variables X to SX , the term $\varsigma(\mathbf{t}, [\bar{s}/\bar{x}])$ — usually written as $\mathbf{t}[\bar{s}/\bar{x}]$ — represents the result of simultaneously substituting variables x_i with s_i in \mathbf{t} . Monad laws ensures desired equational properties of substitution: moreover, since any signature functor Σ has a strength $\varpi : \Sigma A \times B \rightarrow \Sigma(A \times B)$, we recover substitution via (a suitable instance of) the unique arrow $SA \times B \rightarrow S(A \times B)$ extending ϖ [7]. This way, we obtain a structurally recursive definition of substitution.

The aforementioned view of substitution does not scale to richer forms of syntax, such as syntax with variable binding. To overcome this problem, among the many structures defined, we rely on *substitution algebras* [7], namely objects A together with arrows $\nu : 1 \rightarrow A^V$ (*generic new variable*) and $\varsigma : A \times A^V \rightarrow A$ (*substitution*) subject to suitable coherence

conditions. Here, V is a suitable object acting as an object of variables. Intuitively, the latter is any object ensuring the existence of maps for variable manipulation (like duplicating or swapping variables) that are necessary to express the aforementioned coherence conditions.¹¹

Fixed such an object V , the (currying of the) map η gives us a candidate map ν ; moreover, assuming Σ to have strength $\varpi : \Sigma(\mathcal{S}V^V) \times \mathcal{S}V \rightarrow \Sigma(\mathcal{S}V^V \times \mathcal{S}V)$,¹² we obtain the map ς by initiality. These maps are compatible with the Σ -algebra structure of $\mathcal{S}V$, and thus give to ΣV the status of an initial Σ -substitution algebra [7].

- Definition 1.**
1. An object V of \mathcal{E} is an *object of variables* if it comes with the maps given in [7, Definition 3.1].
 2. A *substitution algebra* is a triple (A, ν, ς) with A an object of \mathcal{E} , and arrows $\nu : 1 \rightarrow A^V$ and $\varsigma : A \times A^V \rightarrow A$. We require these data to satisfy the compatibility conditions of [7, Definition 3.1].
 3. Σ -*substitution algebras* are Σ -algebras endowed with a compatible substitution algebra structure as in [7].

Finally, we assume the signature functor Σ to have the aforementioned (pointed) strength, this way ensuring $(\mathcal{S}V, [\eta, \sigma], \nu, \varsigma)$ to be Σ -substitution algebra.

Remark 1. Definition 1 is deliberately sloppy and there is no objective reason to rely on substitution algebras rather than on other structures. The reason behind all of that is twofold: on the one hand, this choice improves accessibility of the paper by making it digestible to the reader lacking the specific categorical background; on the other hand (and most importantly), once gone throughout the relational analysis of rewriting, the reader should be convinced that the chosen model of substitution is not *operationally* relevant: what matters is to have a notion of substitution inducing an operationally well-behaved relational substitution operator. By operationally well-behaved we mean a collection of algebraic laws giving an axiomatic definition of relational substitution. Such laws (Proposition 9 and Proposition 10) are all that matters for rewriting, up to the point that we could be completely agnostic with respect to the substitution structure used and simply assume to have one inducing such a relational operator. Substitution algebras do so, but the reader can easily check that many other structures (such as Σ -monoids) do that as well. As a general (albeit informal) principle, any structure modelling substitution as a recursively-defined syntax-preserving map gives raise to a well-behaved relational substitution operator (see Remark 4 and the end of section VI).

¹¹For instance, in the presheaf-based framework by Fiore et al. [7], such an object is given by the presheaf of variables, whereas in nominal sets it is given by the (nominal) sets of names. A more general analysis of objects of names is given by Menni [91].

¹²This point is actually delicate: in fact, it turns out that crucial in this procedure is the fact that $\mathcal{S}V$ is *pointed* on V , meaning that we have an arrow $V \rightarrow \mathcal{S}V$. This observation led to the identification of monads with pointed strength as a way to internalise notions of substitutions [86].

Initial algebras and free monads provide an elegant mathematical description of (abstract) syntax. The kind of syntax we are interested in here is the one of symbolic expressions. The “mathematics of syntax approach” works perfectly for this kind of syntax (as witnessed by the many examples previously mentioned), but it does not capture its deep essence, that thing that makes symbolic syntax different from the syntax of, e.g., natural language. The peculiarity of symbolic expressions, in fact, does not rely in their syntax, but in their (operational) “semantics”: they can be manipulated symbolically (cf. section I: *symbolic terms are encapsulated computations*).

In this work, we move from the conceptual assumption that symbolic manipulation is an inherently relational notion. Such a conceptual point of view is remarkably powerful as it draws a path from syntax to semantics: to obtain the symbolic dynamics of expressions, we simply take the categorical theory of abstract syntax and extend it to a relational setting, in a precise sense that we are going to define. Any universe of expressions \mathcal{E} , in fact, induces a category $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ of relations describing manipulations between expressions. $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ is an allegory [29] and thus we can rely on a rich relational framework to study it.

Switching from the categorical to the allegorical point of view one sees that many categorical notions have an allegorical counterpart, and that to define a relational theory of symbolic manipulation one precisely needs the allegorical extensions of the notions defining categorical syntax, namely free monads and initial algebras, as summarised in figure 1. We dedicate this section to study such extensions.

A. Allegories

Given a universe of expressions \mathcal{E} , the category of its relations $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ has objects of \mathcal{E} as objects, whereas an arrow from A to B is a subobject $a : A \times B \rightarrow \Omega$, where Ω is the subobject classifier of \mathcal{E} . Subobjects of the form $a : A \times B \rightarrow \Omega$ behave as relations from A to B : they have converse, compositions, union, etc. The precise sense in which they behave relationally has been defined through the notion of an *allegory* [29]. More precisely, $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ is a locally-complete power allegory [29], [35].

Definition 2 ([29]). An allegory \mathcal{A} is a category such that each hom-set $\mathcal{A}(A, B)$ is endowed with: (i) a partial order \leq and a meet operation \wedge making composition monotone; (ii) an order-preserving contravariant involution $-\circ$ (so that $a^{\circ\circ} = a$, $(a; b)^{\circ} = b^{\circ}$; a° , and $(a \wedge b)^{\circ} = a^{\circ} \wedge b^{\circ}$). All these data, additionally, have to obey the so-called *modular law*: $a; b \wedge c \leq (a \wedge c; b)^{\circ}$.

Given an allegory \mathcal{A} , we refer to its arrows as *relations* and we call the relation $a^{\circ} : B \rightarrow A$ the *converse* of $a : A \rightarrow B$. As usual, we say that a relation $a : A \rightarrow A$ is *reflexive*, *symmetric*, and *transitive* if $\Delta \leq a$, $a^{\circ} \leq a$, and $a; a \leq a$, respectively. Moreover, we say that $a : A \rightarrow B$ is *entire* if $\Delta \leq a; a^{\circ}$, *simple* if $a^{\circ}; a \leq \Delta$, and that it is a *map* if it is entire and simple. The subcategory $\mathbf{Map}(\mathcal{A})$ of an allegory

\mathcal{A} is the category having objects of \mathcal{A} as objects and *maps* of \mathcal{A} as arrows.

Example 6. Maps in $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ are precisely arrows in \mathcal{E} , so that $\mathbf{Map}(\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})) \simeq \mathcal{E}$. This means that instead of working with \mathcal{E} as a primitive notion we may (and we will) take a truly relational perspective and work with (an axiomatisation) of $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$, this way thinking about \mathcal{E} as the restriction of $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ to functional relation.¹³ Theorem 2 generalises this correspondence to large classes of allegories and categories.

Remark 2. To avoid ambiguities when working both with \mathcal{E} and $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$, we use the notation $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $a : A \rightrightarrows B$ for arrows in \mathcal{E} and in $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$, respectively. We actually need this convention in this section only, since in the next one we will in a full allegorical framework.

Definition 3. Given an allegory \mathcal{A} , we say that \mathcal{A} is:

1. *Tabular* if any relation $a : A \rightarrow B$ has a (necessary unique, up-to isomorphism) tabulation, i.e. maps $f : R \rightarrow A$ and $g : R \rightarrow B$ such that $a = f^\circ; g$ and $f; f^\circ \wedge g; g^\circ = \Delta$.
2. *Unitary* if it has a unit U , i.e. an object U such that: (i) $\Delta : U \rightarrow U$ is the largest relation in $\mathcal{A}(U, U)$; (ii) for any object A , there is an entire relation (which is necessarily a map) $u : A \rightarrow U$.
3. *Locally complete* if it is unitary and tabular and, for all objects A, B , the set $\mathcal{A}(A, B)$ is a complete lattice with composition and finite intersection distributing over arbitrary joins.¹⁴ We denote by $a \vee b$ the relation $\bigvee\{a, b\}$ and by \perp the relation $\bigvee \emptyset$.
4. A *locally complete power allegory* (LCP allegory) if it is locally complete and for any object A there is a power object PA such that: (i) to any relation $a : A \rightarrow B$ is associated a map $\Lambda a : A \rightarrow PB$; (ii) there are relations $\exists_A : PA \rightarrow A$; (iii) such that $f = \Lambda a$ iff $f; \exists = a$.

Definition 3 is standard in the literature on allegory theory. From a categorical perspective, it can be motivated by the following result.

Theorem 2 ([29], [31]). *For any Grothendieck topos \mathcal{E} , its category of relations $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ is a LCP allegory, and $\mathcal{E} \simeq \mathbf{Map}(\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E}))$. Vice versa, for any LCP allegory \mathcal{A} , its subcategory of maps $\mathbf{Map}(\mathcal{A})$ is a Grothendieck topos, and $\mathcal{A} \simeq \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbf{Map}(\mathcal{A}))$.*

Consequently, for a universe of expressions \mathcal{E} , we see that $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ is a LCP allegory.

Example 7. Examples are, in principle, not needed (just construct $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ for the examples of \mathcal{E} seen in the previous section). Nonetheless, we mention:

1. $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathbf{Set})$ is \mathbf{Rel} .
2. $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{N}})$ is the allegory of dependent relations closed under context renaming and weakening. That is, a relation

$a : A \rightarrow B$ is an element $a \in \prod_n \mathbf{Rel}(A(\mathbf{n}), B(\mathbf{n}))$ such that, for any $\phi : \mathbf{n} \rightarrow \mathbf{m}$, we have: $a(\mathbf{n}); B\phi \subseteq A\phi; a(\mathbf{m})$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A(\mathbf{n}) & \xrightarrow{A\phi} & A(\mathbf{m}) \\ a(\mathbf{n}) \downarrow & \subseteq & \downarrow a(\mathbf{m}) \\ B(\mathbf{n}) & \xrightarrow{B\phi} & B(\mathbf{m}) \end{array}$$

Notice that considering the presheaf of λ -terms, relations in $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{F})$ are precisely the so-called term relations [42], [45], [93] used in relational reasoning on λ -terms. Accordingly, we employ the notation $\bar{x} \vdash t \ a \ s$ to state that $\bar{x} \vdash t, s$ and $t \ a(\bar{x}) \ s$. In particular, notice that we have the following weakening and renaming rule:

$$\frac{\bar{x} \vdash t \ a \ s}{\bar{x}, \bar{y} \vdash t \ a \ s} \quad \frac{\bar{x} \vdash t \ a \ s}{\bar{y} \vdash t[\bar{y}/\bar{x}] \ a \ s[\bar{y}/\bar{x}]}$$

3. $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathbf{Nom})$ is the allegory of equivariant relations [2].

B. Relators

The construction of $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ from \mathcal{E} gives a relational counterpart of Assumption 1: we need a LCP allegory. To extend syntax and syntax specification, however, we need to understand what are the relational counterparts of initial algebras and free monads. The crucial notion to do that is the one of a *relator* [35], [68], [70], [71]¹⁵, the relational counterpart of functors.

Definition 4. A relator on an allegory \mathcal{A} is a functor $\Gamma : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ that is monotone and preserves converse.

In particular, a relator Γ satisfies the law $\Gamma(a^\circ) = (\Gamma a)^\circ$, so that we can unambiguously write Γa° . It is easy to prove that Γf is a map, whenever f is. Moreover, since \mathcal{A} is tabular, we see that a functor is a relator if and only if it preserves converse [35, Theorem 5.1].

Since abstract syntax is specified by functors on \mathcal{E} , we are interested in the following question: *given a functor Σ on \mathcal{E} , can we extend it to a relator $\bar{\Sigma}$ on $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$?*

Definition 5. A relational extension of a functor $\Sigma : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, is a relator $\bar{\Sigma}$ on $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ such that $\bar{\Sigma}A = \Sigma A$ and $\bar{\Sigma}f = \Sigma f$, for any object A and map f .

Consequently, we see that if a is tabulated as $f^\circ; g$, then we must have $\bar{\Sigma}a = \bar{\Sigma}(f^\circ; g) = \bar{\Sigma}f^\circ; \bar{\Sigma}g = (\Sigma f)^\circ; \Sigma g$. Therefore, a relational extension of Σ , if it exists, it must be unique and defined by $\bar{\Sigma}(f^\circ; g) \triangleq (\Sigma f)^\circ; \Sigma g$ (notice that this definition is independent of the choice of the tabulation). This means that for any Σ , we have a candidate relator $\bar{\Sigma}$. Barr [32] and Carboni et al. [33] found conditions to answer the aforementioned question in the affirmative, this way ensuring that $\bar{\Sigma}$ is indeed a relator.

¹³Following this perspective, we think about a topos as a structure in which relations coincide with set-valued maps [92].

¹⁴In particular, we have $a; \bigvee_i b_i = \bigvee_i a; b_i$ and $(\bigvee_i a_i); b = \bigvee_i a_i; b$.

¹⁵Notions essentially equivalent to the one of a relator, such as *relational extensions* [32], *relation lifting* [81], [94], and *lax extensions* [67], [95] have been independently introduced in several fields.

Theorem 3 ([32], [33]). $\bar{\Sigma}$ is a relator if and only if Σ nearly preserves pullbacks and preserves strong epimorphisms. Moreover, $\bar{\Sigma}$ is the only relational extension of Σ .

Theorem 3 can also be seen from an allegorical perspective by stating that any relator $\Gamma : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ gives a functor $\Gamma : \mathbf{Map}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Map}(\mathcal{A})$ that nearly preserves pullbacks and preserves strong epimorphisms. It is worth noticing that if a functor preserves (weak) pullbacks, then it nearly preserves pullbacks and that strong and regular epimorphisms coincide in any topos (cf. Assumption 2).

- Example 8.**
1. Since *Set* satisfies the axiom of choice, any functor on it preserves regular epimorphisms. Therefore, if Σ nearly preserves pullbacks, then $\bar{\Sigma}$ is a relator.
 2. Simple polynomial functors all extend to relators [92]. The resulting class of relators is called the class of *polynomial relators*. Polynomial relators can be defined explicitly by means of (co)product (bi)relators, constant, and identity relator. [92]
 3. The functor δ on $Set^{\mathcal{N}}$ extends to a relator [7], [83], so that binding polynomial functors all extends to relators.

Summing up, Assumption 1 entails that $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ is a LCP allegory, whereas Assumption 2 implies that $\bar{\Sigma}$ is a relator. The latter axiom, however, imposes a further condition on Σ that is not needed to ensure that $\bar{\Sigma}$ is a relator: Σ must be finitary. How does that impact on $\bar{\Sigma}$? Playing a bit with the definition of countable union in $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ (which uses the coproduct relator [92]), we see that if Σ is finitary, then $\bar{\Sigma}$ is ω -continuous, meaning that $\bar{\Sigma}(\bigvee_n a_n) = \bigvee_n \bar{\Sigma}a_n$, for any ω -chain $(a_n)_{n \geq 0}$ of relations.

Proposition 1. If $\Sigma : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is finitary, then $\bar{\Sigma}$ is ω -continuous.

In light of Proposition 1, we say that a relator on \mathcal{A} is *finitary* if it is so as a functor on $\mathbf{Map}(\mathcal{A})$. Consequently, $\bar{\Sigma}$ is finitary whenever Σ is. What remains to do is to give a relational counterpart to \mathcal{S} . Since (the carrier of) \mathcal{S} is a functor, we can simply pick $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ as its relational extension. Of course, we have to ensure that $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ is a relator. That directly follows from the fact that $\bar{\Sigma}$ is a relator.

Proposition 2 ([35]). If $\bar{\Sigma}$ is a relator, then so is $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$.

Example 9.

1. Let Σ be the functor given by a first-order signature Σ on *Set*, so that \mathcal{S} is the Σ -term monad. The relator $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ has the following inductive characterisation:

$$\frac{x a y \quad \tau_1 \bar{\mathcal{S}}a s_1 \quad \cdots \quad \tau_n \bar{\mathcal{S}}a s_n}{x \bar{\mathcal{S}}a y \quad o(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \bar{\mathcal{S}}a o(s_1, \dots, s_n)}$$

Equivalently, we say that $\tau \bar{\mathcal{S}}a s$ if and only if there exists a context C such that $\tau = C[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, $s = C[y_1, \dots, y_n]$, and $x_i a y_i$, for any i .

2. A similar inductive characterisation can be given for, e.g., the monad of λ -term on $Set^{\mathcal{N}}$.

1) *Relational Initial Algebras:* At this point a question natural arises. The relationship between a functor Σ on \mathcal{E} and

the free monad \mathcal{S} it generates is clear: the latter is essentially defined as the (unique) fixed point of a suitable construction on Σ (Lambek Lemma). If, additionally, Σ is finitary, then \mathcal{S} is the fixed point of iterated application of (a construction on) Σ (Theorem 1). Does something similar hold for $\bar{\Sigma}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$? The answer is in the affirmative and a fixed point characterisation of \mathcal{S} as a suitable fixed point can be elegantly given relying on two beautiful results: the already mentioned *Eilenberg-Wright Lemma* [34] and the *Hylomorphism Theorem* [35].

Theorem 4 (Eilenberg-Wright Lemma). Given a functor Σ on a topos \mathcal{E} with relational extension $\bar{\Sigma}$, initial Σ -algebras in \mathcal{E} coincide with initial $\bar{\Sigma}$ -algebras in $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$.

Consequently, given an initial algebra $\xi : \Sigma(\mu\Sigma) \rightarrow \mu\Sigma$ (in \mathcal{E}) and a relation $a : \Sigma A \rightarrow A$, there is a unique relation $\langle a \rangle : \mu\Sigma \rightarrow A$ such that $\xi; \langle a \rangle = \bar{\Sigma}\langle a \rangle; a$.

Before stating the hylomorphism theorem, we recall that in LCP allegory \mathcal{A} , by Knaster-Tarski Theorem [96], any monotone (set-theoretic) function of the form $F : \mathcal{A}(A, B) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(A, B)$ has a least fixed point, denoted by μF (or $\mu x.F$), which is the least of the pre-fixed points of F .

Theorem 5 (Hylomorphism). Given $a : \Sigma A \rightarrow A$ and $b : \Sigma B \rightarrow B$, we have $\langle b \rangle^\circ; \langle a \rangle = \mu x.b^\circ; \bar{\Sigma}x; a$.

Theorem 5 gives a powerful proof technique that we shall extensively use in subsequent sections. We conclude this section showing how Theorem 5 gives an inductive characterisation of $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$. To the best of the author's knowledge, this result, which is folklore on *Set*, is not present in the literature.

Proposition 3. $\bar{\mathcal{S}}a = \mu x.(\eta^\circ; a; \eta) \vee (\sigma^\circ; \bar{\Sigma}x; \sigma)$.

Proof. Since $[\eta, \sigma]^\circ; (a + \Sigma x); [\eta, \sigma] = (\eta^\circ; a; \eta) \vee (\sigma^\circ; \bar{\Sigma}x; \sigma)$, it is enough to show $\bar{\mathcal{S}}a = \mu x.[\eta, \sigma]^\circ; (a + \Sigma x); [\eta, \sigma]$. Let us consider a tabulation $A \xleftarrow{f} R \xrightarrow{g} B$ of a , so that $a = f^\circ; \Delta_R; g$ and $\bar{\mathcal{S}}a = (\mathcal{S}f)^\circ; \mathcal{S}g$. Since $\mathcal{S}f = \langle [f; \eta, \sigma] \rangle$ (and similarly for g), we obtain, $\bar{\mathcal{S}}a = \langle [f; \eta, \sigma] \rangle^\circ; \langle [g; \eta, \sigma] \rangle$ and thus $\bar{\mathcal{S}}a = \mu x.[f; \eta, \sigma]^\circ; (\Delta_R + \bar{\Sigma}x); [g; \eta, \sigma]$, by Theorem 5 and the definition of Barr extension of coproduct and constant functors. We then obtain the desired thesis thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{S}}a &= \langle [f; \eta, \sigma] \rangle^\circ; \langle [g; \eta, \sigma] \rangle \\ &= \mu x.[f; \eta, \sigma]^\circ; (\Delta_R + \bar{\Sigma}x); [g; \eta, \sigma] \\ &= \mu x.(\eta^\circ; f^\circ; \Delta_R; g; \eta) \vee (\sigma^\circ; \bar{\Sigma}x; \sigma) \\ &= \mu x.(\eta^\circ; a; \eta) \vee (\sigma^\circ; \bar{\Sigma}x; \sigma) \end{aligned}$$

□

C. On Fixed Points and Induction

Before moving to the main subject of this work, namely the allegorical theory of symbolic manipulations, we exploit a few fixed point induction principles [66], [96] that we shall use in proofs of theorem about such a theory notions about fixed points. In the following, we tacitly assume that functions are of the form of the form $F : \mathcal{A}(A, B) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(A, B)$. The first induction principle we state is the so-called fixed point

induction principle, which is an immediate consequence of Knaster-Tarski Theorem.

Proposition 4 (Fixed Point Induction). *If F is monotone, then to prove $\mu F \leq a$, it is sufficient to prove $F(a) \leq a$.*

Almost all the relational operators we will define in next sections are not just monotone, but ω -continuous — recall that F is ω -continuous if preserves joins of ω -chains: $F(\bigvee_n x_n) = \bigvee_n F(x_n)$. By Kleene Fixed Point Theorem [96], if F is ω -continuous, then we can give an iterative characterisation of μF , namely: $\mu F = \bigvee_n F^n(\perp)$, where F^n is the n -th iteration of F . As for Knaster-Tarski, also Kleene Fixed Point Theorem comes with an associated induction principle, to which we refer to as ω -continuous fixed point induction.¹⁶

Proposition 5 (ω -Continuous Fixed Point Induction). *If F is ω -continuous, then to prove $\mu F \leq a$, it is sufficient to prove $x \leq \mu F \wedge a \implies F(x) \leq a$, for any x .*

Proof. Let us assume $\forall x. x \leq \mu F \wedge a \implies F(x) \leq a$ (to which we refer to as the induction hypothesis). Since F is ω -continuous, proving $\mu F \leq a$ means proving $\bigvee_n F^n(\perp) \leq a$. We proceed by induction on n . The base is trivial, since $F^0(\perp) = \perp \leq a$. Assuming now $F^k(\perp) \leq a$, we show $F(F^k(\perp)) \leq a$. Since $F^k(\perp) \leq \bigvee_n F^n(\perp) = \mu F$, from $F^k(\perp) \leq a$ we infer $F^k(\perp) \leq \mu F \wedge a$. We can thus use the induction hypothesis to conclude $F(F^k(\perp)) \leq a$. \square

Finally, we mention an enhancement of Proposition 5 whereby we can perform induction insider an ω -continuous strict function (recall that F is strict if $F(\perp) = \perp$).

Proposition 6 (Enhanced ω -Continuous Fixed Point Induction). *Let F, G be ω -continuous functions. Assume also that G is strict. Then, to prove $G(\mu F) \leq a$, it is sufficient to show that for any x such that $x \leq \mu F$ and $G(x) \leq a$, we have $G(F(x)) \leq x$.*

Proof. Let us assume $G(x) \leq a$ implies $G(F(x)) \leq x$, for any $x \leq \mu F$. We call this implication the induction hypothesis. Proving $G(F(x)) \leq a$ means proving $G(\bigvee_n F^n(\perp)) \leq a$, i.e. $\bigvee_n G(F^n(\perp)) \leq a$, since G is ω -continuous. We proceed by induction on n . The base case amounts to prove $G(\perp) \leq a$, which holds since G is strict (hence $G(\perp) = \perp$). For the inductive, we assume $G(F^k(\perp)) \leq a$ and notice that we can appeal to the induction hypothesis, since $F^k(\perp) \leq \mu F$. \square

We will use Proposition 6 for functions G of the form $G(x) \triangleq a; x; b$, for given relations a, b . Notice that G is indeed strict and ω -continuous (this follows from distributivity of composition over join).

Finally, we observe that using fixed points, we can easily generalise relational notions useful in rewriting to any LCP allegory. For instance, the reflexive and transitive closure a^* of $a : A \rightarrow A$ is defined as $\mu x. \Delta \vee a; x$. Moreover, any relator

¹⁶Even if straightforward to prove, the author was unable to find the induction principle of Proposition 5 in the literature. For the sake of completeness, we thus give a proof of it.

has least fixed point, and on finitary ones we can apply ω -continuous fixed point induction principle just stated. Notice also that if Γ is finitary and f, g are maps, then $f^\circ; \Gamma(-); g$ is finitary too. This also entails that both $\overline{\Sigma}$ and \overline{S} are finitary whenever Σ is.

VI. AN ALLEGORICAL THEORY OF SYMBOLIC MANIPULATIONS

We are now ready to put the allegorical machinery to work. In this section, we formalise the main contribution of the paper, this way beginning to develop an allegorical theory of symbolic manipulations. The main structure studied by such a theory is the one of an (abstract) *expression system* (E -system, for short),¹⁷ namely a triple (Σ, V, a) consisting of a signature functor $\Sigma : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, an object of variables V , and a (ground) reduction relation $a : SV \rightarrow SV$ in $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$. As in concrete systems one assumes the collection variables and the signature to be disjoint, we assume $\eta; \sigma^\circ = \perp$.

Example 10. Standard examples of E -systems include TRSs (Σ, X, \mapsto) on *Set* and higher-order rewriting systems [97] in presheaves. As a paradigmatic example of the latter, we consider the E -system of λ -terms (Σ, V, β) , where Σ is the signature of λ -terms and $\vec{x} \vdash (\lambda x. t)s \beta t[s/x]$.

Remark 3. To facilitate the development of the theory of E -systems, it is convenient to work within an allegorical setting right from the beginning. Consequently, instead of starting with a topos \mathcal{E} and a signature functor Σ (from which one constructs $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\overline{\Sigma}$), from now on we assume to have fixed (i) a LCP allegory \mathcal{A} and (ii) a finitary signature relator $\Sigma : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. Consequently, we think about \mathcal{E} as $\mathbf{Map}(\mathcal{A})$ and as the signature functor as the relator Σ on $\mathbf{Map}(\mathcal{A})$. This way we also obtain the syntax relator \mathcal{S} which indeed gives the free monad over Σ when restricted to $\mathbf{Map}(\mathcal{A})$. In light of that, we use the notation $a : A \rightarrow B$ for arrows (hence relations) in \mathcal{A} , this way dropping the distinction between \rightarrow and \mapsto (but we still reserve letters f, g, \dots for maps in \mathcal{A}). Finally, recall that by Theorem 4, $[\eta, \sigma] : V + \Sigma(SV) \rightarrow SV$ is the initial $(V + \Sigma(-))$ -algebra in \mathcal{A} .

Given an E -system (Σ, V, a) , the relation a is meant to model *ground* reduction. Actual reduction relations shall be then obtained by extending a to account for the substitution structure of syntax — this way allowing to consider *substitution instances* of a — and by propagating reductions along the syntactic structure of terms. Both these (families of) operations, which are generally defined in a syntactic fashion, can be elegantly recovered in a purely relational fashion. In what follows, we introduce the powerful operations of *relational substitution* and *compatible refinement* [42], [65], [93] which will be crucial to define the aforementioned extensions of ground reduction.

¹⁷For the sake of readability, we depart from standard rewriting nomenclature and follow Aczel's terminology [37].

1) *Compatible Refinement*: The compatible refinement of [65] relation a relates expressions that have the same outermost syntactic construct and a -related arguments, and thus plays a crucial role in the definition and analysis of many forms of (parallel) reduction.

Definition 6. Given an E -system (Σ, V, a) , the *compatible refinement* of a is the relation $\widehat{a} : SV \rightarrow SV$ defined as $[\eta, \sigma]^\circ; (\Delta_V + \Sigma a); [\eta, \sigma]$. Notice that $\widehat{a} = \eta^\circ; \eta \vee \sigma^\circ; \Sigma a; \sigma$.

Since $\widehat{a} = \eta^\circ; \eta \vee \sigma^\circ; \Sigma a; \sigma$, we can clean up the definition of $\widehat{\cdot}$ by defining the operator $\widetilde{a} \triangleq \sigma^\circ; \Sigma a; \sigma$, hence recovering \widehat{a} by joining \widetilde{a} with the relation $\mathbb{I}_\eta \triangleq \eta^\circ; \eta$ (viz. $\widehat{a} = \mathbb{I}_\eta \vee \widetilde{a}$). The latter is a so-called *coreflexive* [29], [35], namely relation a such that $a \leq \Delta$, and it can be regarded as the property of being a variable (in *Set*, for instance, \mathbb{I}_η states that a term is actually a variable). Moreover, since we assume that variables and signatures are disjoint — i.e. $\eta; \sigma^\circ = \perp$ — we have $\widetilde{a} \wedge \mathbb{I}_\eta = \perp$, from which follows $\mathbb{I}_\eta; \widetilde{a} = \perp (= \widetilde{a}; \mathbb{I}_\eta)$, since $\mathbb{I}_\eta \leq \Delta$.

Proposition 7. Both $\widetilde{\cdot}$ and $\widehat{\cdot}$ are ω -continuous relators.

When instantiated on a first-order system (Σ, X, \mapsto) , we see that \widehat{a} is defined by the following rules:

$$\frac{x \in X}{x \widehat{\mapsto} x} \quad \frac{\tau_1 \mapsto s_1 \quad \cdots \quad \tau_n \mapsto s_n \quad o \in \Sigma}{o(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \widehat{\mapsto} o(s_1, \dots, s_n)}$$

If we consider the second rule only, we obtain $\widetilde{\mapsto}$.

Having the notion of a compatible refinement, the natural next step is to define the notion of *compatibility* and the associated *context closure* operator.

Definition 7. 1. A relation a is *compatible* if $\widehat{a} \leq a$.
2. The *context closure* of a is defined thus: $a^c \triangleq \mu x. a \vee \widehat{x}$.

Continuing the example of first-order systems (Σ, X, \mapsto) , we see that \mapsto^c is inductively defined as follows:

$$\frac{\tau \mapsto s \quad x \in X}{\tau \mapsto^c s \quad x \mapsto^c x} \quad \frac{\tau_1 \mapsto^c s_1 \quad \cdots \quad \tau_n \mapsto^c s_n \quad o \in \Sigma}{o(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \mapsto^c o(s_1, \dots, s_n)}$$

It is easy to see that \cdot^c is monotone and idempotent, and that if $\widehat{a} \leq a$, then $a^c = a$. Since $a^c = a \vee \widehat{a^c}$, we observe that a^c is compatible and extends a , and thus a^c is the least compatible relation containing a . Moreover, as $\widehat{a} = \eta^\circ; \eta \vee \sigma^\circ; \Sigma a; \sigma$, we have that a^c is reflexive on variables. Given the inductive nature of a^c , it is then natural to expect to have full reflexivity of a^c . This is indeed the case (cf. binary induction principle [98]).

Proposition 8. *The identity relation is the least compatible relation — i.e. $\Delta = \mu x. \widehat{x}$ — and thus any compatible relation is reflexive.*

Proof. We already know $\widehat{\Delta} \leq \Delta$. We prove that it is the least such a relation. Given a compatible relation a , by initiality we have $\Delta = ([\eta, \sigma])$, so that to prove $\Delta \leq a$ we can rely on Theorem 5 and prove $\eta^\circ; \eta \vee \sigma^\circ; \Sigma a; \sigma \leq a$, but this is nothing but $\widehat{a} \leq a$. \square

2) *Relational Substitution*: Having compatible refinement and context closure — hence ways to propagate reductions along syntactic constructs — we now need an operator extending substitution to (reduction) relations. For that, we rely on an extension of Lassen’s *relation substitution* [42].

Definition 8. Given a substitution algebra $A \times A^V \xrightarrow{\zeta} A \xleftarrow{\zeta'} V$ and relations $a, b : A \rightarrow A$, we define the substitution of b into a as the relation $a[b] : A \rightarrow A$ defined by $\zeta^\circ; (a \times b^V); \zeta$, where we recall that both \times and V^- are the (bi)relator associated with the corresponding functor.

When instantiated on, e.g., first- or second-order syntax, the relation $a[b]$ relates all terms $\tau[\overline{s}/\overline{x}]$, $\tau'[\overline{s}'/\overline{x}]$ such that τ, τ' are related by a and s_i, s'_i are related by b , for any i .

Proposition 9 ([42], [99]). 1) $-[=]$ is a (bi-)relator.
2) $-[=]$ is ω -continuous in the first argument.
3) $-[=]$ is associative: $a[b][c] = a[b[c]]$.

When it comes to calculate with $-[=]$, it is useful to notice that it has a right adjoint [42]: $a[b] \leq x$ iff $a \leq b \gg x$. Explicitly, $a \gg b = \bigvee \{x \mid x[a] \leq b\}$. Notice that \gg is lax functorial (i.e. $(a \gg b); (a' \gg b') \leq (a; a') \gg (b; b')$), antitone in the first argument, and monotone in the second one.

Definition 9. We say that a relation a is *closed under substitution* if $a[\Delta] \leq a$, and that it is *substitutive* if $a[a] \leq a$.

In particular, we think about $a[\Delta]$ as the reduction obtained by taking substitution instances of a . For instance, in a TRS (Σ, X, \mapsto) , the relation \rightarrow seen in section II is precisely $\mapsto[\Delta]$. Notice that since $-[=]$ is ω -continuous in the first argument, the (unary) operator $-[\Delta]$ is ω -continuous itself.

At this point we have introduced some new relational operators that compactly describe rewriting notions (as we shall better see in forthcoming sections). To make them really useful, we also have to provide algebraic laws for calculating with them.¹⁸

Proposition 10. *We have the following laws [42], [99]:*

- 1) $\widetilde{a}[b] \leq \widehat{a}[b]$
- 2) $\mathbb{I}_\eta[b] \leq b$
- 3) $\widehat{a}[b] \leq \widehat{a[b]} \vee b$.

Remark 4. The algebraic laws in Proposition 10 and Proposition 9 constitute the *operational* definition of substitution at a relational level. Even if built upon a specific definition of substitution structure (viz. substitution algebra), what truly

¹⁸Laws in Proposition 10 have been first proved by Lassen [42], and then extended by Levy [99], in the context of specific λ -calculi. Our rule $\widehat{a}[b] \leq \widehat{a[b]} \vee b$ differs from Lassen’s one — namely $\widehat{a}[b] \leq \widehat{a[b]} \vee b$ — which seems wrong. For suppose $x \widehat{a} x$ and $\lambda y. y b yy$. Then, taking the two substitutions $[\lambda y. y/x]$ and yy/x , we obtain $\lambda y. y \widehat{a}[b] yy$. The latter terms, however, cannot be related by the compatible refinement of any relation, as they are not variables and have different outermost syntactic constructs (viz. abstraction, for the first, and application, for the second). Notice that this inequality plays a crucial role in Lassen’s proof of substitutivity of the Howe extension of a relation. Contrary to usual presentations of the same results, Lassen does not require the relation to be transitive, a condition which is instead needed if one reviews the proof using the correct inequality as stated in Proposition 10.

matters when it comes to (operational) reasoning and symbolic manipulation is to have an operator $-[=]$ obeying the aforementioned algebraic laws. For instance, ω -continuity of $-[=]$ in the first argument says that substitution is defined by structural recursion, whereas the rule $\tilde{a}[b] \leq \widehat{a}[b]$ states that substitution behaves as a syntax-preserving morphism. The actual structure used to model substitution is irrelevant: any ‘good’ structure will induce a relational substitution operator satisfying the aforementioned laws. For instance, readers can convince themselves that replacing substitution algebras with, e.g., Σ -monoid, leads to essentially (i.e. operationally) the same operator $-[=]$. Moreover, as soon as a ‘substitution’ operator satisfying Proposition 10 and Proposition 9 is available, one can study rewriting properties of substitution, regardless of the actual definition of the latter. This observation can be pushed even further by completely forgetting the actual syntax of a system and working axiomatically within an augmented calculus of relations, viz. a traditional calculus of relations enriched with operators and laws as described in this section: whenever there is a model of syntax admitting an instance of such a relational calculus, rewriting is obtained for free. We will comment further on the axiomatic approach at the end of this section.

Finally, we can merge the definition of substitution and context closure, this way obtaining the *substitutive context closure* of a .

Definition 10. The *substitutive context closure* of a relation a is the relation $a^{\text{sc}} \triangleq a[\Delta]^c = \mu x.a[\Delta] \vee \widehat{x}$.

When instantiated on a first-order system (Σ, X, a) , we obtain the following inductive characterisation of a^{sc} :

$$\frac{t \mapsto s}{\mathfrak{t}[\bar{v}/\bar{x}] \mapsto^{\text{sc}} \mathfrak{s}[\bar{v}/\bar{x}]} \quad \frac{x \in X}{x \mapsto^{\text{sc}} x} \quad \frac{\forall i \leq n. \mathfrak{t}_i \mapsto^{\text{sc}} \mathfrak{s}_i \quad o \in \Sigma}{o(\mathfrak{t}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{t}_n) \mapsto^{\text{sc}} o(\mathfrak{s}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{s}_n)}$$

We conclude this section with a methodological (and perhaps conceptual) consideration.

3) *The Augmented Calculus of Relations:* Let us have a look at the relational apparatus developed so far from an operational perspective. Accordingly, can think about our framework as an *augmented calculus of relations* where, in addition to the classic operations on relations (such as composition, meet, join, etc), we have the operations $\widetilde{-}$, \mathbb{I}_η (hence $\widehat{-}$), and $-[=]$ together with suitable equational laws (viz. those in Proposition 7, Proposition 9, and Proposition 10) and proof principles (viz. fixed point induction). Assuming to have fixed point operators, one can then define inside such an augmented calculus the operators $-^{\text{sc}}$ and $-^c$ (otherwise, one can add them as primitive operators, together with suitable equational laws and proof principles).

As we are going to see, this augmented calculus of relation is expressive enough to define interesting notions of reductions and to prove nontrivial properties about them. Moving from this observation, we could make the whole relational framework developed completely axiomatic, abstracting over syntax and simply working with the aforementioned augmented rela-

tional calculus. The fact that we have extracted such a calculus out of a syntactic system (Σ, V) can be then read as a way to build a model of the augmented calculus.

The remaining part of the paper is devoted to the definition and analysis of specific notions of reduction: we shall do so first relying on the algebra of syntax (this way showing how they indeed correspond to those given in the rewriting literature), and then showing how syntax-dependency can be avoided by giving equivalent definitions in the augmented calculus of relations. Moreover, to prove our confluence theorems — the main result proved — we will use the laws of the augmented calculus only, hence witnessing the effectiveness of the axiomatic approach (see also section X for a more general discussion on the impact of such an approach in operational reasoning).

VII. PARALLEL REDUCTION

Having defined E -systems and a (augmented) relational calculus to reason about them, it is time to introduce extensions of ground reductions, such extensions giving actual (operational) reduction. We shall focus on two such extensions — namely *parallel* and *full* reduction — confining ourselves to just few observations on *sequential* reduction in the last part of the work. Besides introducing such notions and proving basic facts about them, the main results we proved are confluence theorems for a generalisation of the so-called *orthogonal* systems [17]. We begin with *parallel reduction*.

Remark 5. In the remaining part of the paper, we assume that in an E -system (Σ, V, a) , we have $\mathbb{I}_\eta; a = \perp$. This corresponds to the usual assumption that the left-hand side of reduction rule cannot be a variable [15].

Let us ignore substitution for the moment and recall that, in concrete reduction systems (such as term and higher-order systems), parallel reduction applies ground reduction on arbitrarily chosen set of disjoint redexes in parallel. Abstractly, we obtain parallel reduction relying on the monad structure of syntax (as we will see, parallel reduction corresponds to looking at syntax as a *monad*, whereas full reduction corresponds to looking at syntax as a *free algebra*).

Definition 11. Given an E -system (Σ, V, a) , we define *parallel reduction* (without substitution) $a^{\text{p}} : SV \rightarrow SV$ as $\rho^\circ; \mathcal{S}a; \rho$.¹⁹ *Substitutive parallel extension* is defined as $a^{\text{sp}} \triangleq a[\Delta]^{\text{p}}$.

The relation a^{sp} generalises the context-based definition of parallel reduction in syntax-based rewriting systems.

Example 11. When instantiated on a TRS (Σ, X, \mapsto) , we see that $\mathfrak{t} \Rightarrow \mathfrak{s}$, where $\Rightarrow = \mapsto^{\text{sp}}$, if and only if there exist a context C , terms $\mathfrak{t}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{t}_n, \mathfrak{s}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{s}_n$, and substitutions γ_i such that: (i) $\mathfrak{t}_i \mapsto \mathfrak{s}_i$, for each i ; (ii) $t = C[\mathfrak{t}_1\gamma_1, \dots, \mathfrak{t}_n\gamma_n]$; (iii) $s = C[\mathfrak{s}_1\gamma_1, \dots, \mathfrak{s}_n\gamma_n]$; (iv) all \mathfrak{t}_i and \mathfrak{s}_j are pairwise disjoint in t and s , respectively.


¹⁹Recall that working naively within allegories, \mathcal{S} is a relator (which is necessarily the Barr extension of its restriction to $\text{Map}(\mathcal{A})$).

Since \mathcal{S} is finitary, we immediately notice that $-^P$ inherits many of the structural properties of \mathcal{S} : it is ω -continuous (and thus monotone) and commutes with converse ($a^{P^\circ} = a^{\circ P}$). Moreover, it indeed extends a , i.e. $a \leq a^P$.

The definition of a^P (and thus of a^{SP}) relies on the monad multiplication of \mathcal{S} , and thus goes beyond the augmented calculus of relations outlined in the previous section. As it happens in concrete syntax-based systems, a^P can be characterised inductively and such a characterisation precisely shows us how to define parallel extension in the relational calculus.

Proposition 11. $a^P = a^c (= \mu x.a \vee \widehat{x})$, and thus $a^{\text{SP}} = a^{\text{SC}}$.

Proof. First, we notice that $a^P = a \vee \widehat{a^P}$, and thus $a^c \leq a^P$. To see that, consider the following diagram and calculation (where we use the inductive characterisation of \mathcal{S} provided by Proposition 3):



$$\begin{aligned}
 a^P &= \rho^\circ; Sa; \rho \\
 &= ((\Delta + \Sigma \rho); [\Delta, \sigma])^\circ; (a + \Sigma Sa); (\Delta + \Sigma \rho); [\Delta, \sigma] \\
 &= [\Delta, \Sigma \rho; \sigma]^\circ; (a + \Sigma Sa); [\Delta, \Sigma \rho; \sigma] \\
 &= a \vee \sigma^\circ; \Sigma \rho^\circ; \Sigma Sa; \Sigma \rho; \sigma \\
 &= a \vee \sigma^\circ; \Sigma(\rho^\circ; Sa; \rho); \sigma \\
 &= a \vee \sigma^\circ; \Sigma a^P; \sigma \\
 &= a \vee \widehat{a^P}
 \end{aligned}$$

Let us now prove $a^P \leq a^c$. Since by Proposition 3 we have $Sa = \mu x.(\eta^\circ; a; \eta) \vee (\sigma^\circ; \Sigma x; \sigma)$, we can proceed by ω -continuous fixed point induction on. Assuming $\rho^\circ; x; \rho \leq a^c$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\rho^\circ; ((\eta^\circ; a; \eta) \vee (\sigma^\circ; \Sigma x; \sigma)); \rho \\
 &= (\rho^\circ; \eta^\circ; a; \eta; \rho) \vee (\rho^\circ; \sigma^\circ; \Sigma x; \sigma; \rho) \\
 &= a \vee (\rho^\circ; \sigma^\circ; \Sigma x; \sigma; \rho) \\
 &= a \vee (\sigma^\circ; \Sigma \rho^\circ; \Sigma x; \Sigma \rho; \sigma;) \\
 &= a \vee (\sigma^\circ; \Sigma(\rho^\circ; x; \rho); \sigma;) \\
 &= a \vee (\sigma^\circ; \Sigma a^c; \sigma;) \\
 &= a \vee \widehat{a^c} \\
 &= a^c.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

By Proposition 11, a^P and a^{SP} are compatible, and since compatible relations are reflexive, they are reflexive too.

Therefore, we see that indeed a^P reduces disjoint redexes *at will*. Before moving to confluence properties of a^{SP} , we observe that a^{SP} is closed under substitution.

Proposition 12. $a^{\text{SP}}[\Delta] \leq a^{\text{SP}}$.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove $a^{\text{SP}} \leq \Delta \gg a^{\text{SP}}$, and we do so by fixed point induction. The interesting case is showing $\widehat{\Delta \gg a^{\text{SP}}} \leq \Delta \gg a^{\text{SP}}$. For that, we notice that we have the general law $\widehat{x \gg y} \leq x \gg (\widehat{y \vee x})$,²⁰ which gives $\widehat{\Delta \gg a^{\text{SP}}} \leq \Delta \gg (\widehat{a^{\text{SP}} \vee \Delta}) \leq \Delta \gg a^{\text{SP}}$, since \gg is monotone in the second argument and a^{SP} is reflexive and compatible. □

A. The Relational Parallel Moves Technique

Having defined parallel reduction, we now give evidences of its effectiveness. We do so by looking at one of the most important property of symbolic systems: *confluence* [100]. In full generality: (i) a relation $a : A \rightarrow A$ has the diamond property if $a^\circ; a \leq a; a^\circ$, (ii) is *confluent* if a^* has the *diamond property*, (iii) is *weakly confluent* if $a^\circ; a \leq a^*; a^{*\circ}$ (notice that $a^{\circ*} = a^{*\circ}$).

When it comes to prove confluence of parallel reduction a^{SP} (and reductions alike), it is desirable to have *local* proof techniques at disposal. Confluence, in fact, is a non-local property in two ways: (i) it refers to reduction sequences (viz. $a^{\text{SP}*}$) rather than single reduction steps; (ii) it performs reduction inside complex expressions. The proof techniques we shall prove in this paper are mostly given in the form of diamond-like properties (hence obtaining locality of the first type above) with hypotheses formulated on ground reduction a or substitution instances thereof, viz. $a[\Delta]$, hence obtaining semi-locality of the second type above.

The first main result we prove here is an abstract and relational version of the so-called parallel moves lemma [18], a well-known technique to prove confluence of *orthogonal* systems [17]. When specialised to first-order systems, orthogonality of a TRS means that the system has no critical pair [17] and all ground reductions are left-linear (i.e. variables in a ground redexes occur at most once). These conditions are heavily syntax-dependent and they hardly generalise to arbitrarily syntax-based systems.

We overcome this issue by isolating an *operational* notion of orthogonality which, when instantiated to TRSs, is indeed implied by the aforementioned syntactic definition of orthogonality. Such an operational notion of orthogonality directly translates into the relational framework the informal intuition behind orthogonal systems, namely that redexes remains so whenever their subterms are reduced (stated otherwise: reduction is local, in the sense that reducing a redex does not affect other redexes).

Definition 12. An E -system (Σ, V, a) is *orthogonal* if:

$$a[\Delta]^\circ; a[\Delta] \leq \Delta \quad a[\Delta]^\circ; \widehat{a^{\text{SP}}} \leq a^\circ[a^{\text{SP}}].$$

□

²⁰It is sufficient to prove $\widehat{x \gg y[x]} \leq \widehat{y \vee x}$. The latter follows from Proposition 9 thus: $\widehat{x \gg y[x]} \leq (x \gg y)[x] \vee x \leq \widehat{y \vee x}$.

The first condition in Definition 12 is clear: ground reduction rules are essentially unique.²¹ The second condition states that a redex (instance) remains such when we reduce its subterms. In the case of TRSs, we can spell out such a condition as follows: for any ground reduction $\ell \mapsto r$, if we reduce a proper subterm s of an instance $\ell[\bar{v}/\bar{x}]$ of ℓ , say $s \Rightarrow t$, then $t = \ell[\bar{w}/\bar{x}]$ and $v_i \Rightarrow w_i$. Notice that using the compatible refinement operator, we can indeed express that the reduction $s \Rightarrow t$ happens on a proper subterm of $\ell[\bar{v}/\bar{x}]$.

Our goal now is to prove that orthogonal systems are confluent by showing that parallel reduction has the diamond property: this technique goes under the name of *parallel moves* [15], [18]. Before going any further, we remark that the latter statement is not true in general; it fails, for instance, for syntax involving variable binding. In those cases, parallel reduction is only weakly confluent. Working relationally, we see clearly the point where the parallel moves technique breaks and thus we can isolate the operational condition needed to make it work, such a condition holding for, e.g., first-order syntax. Moreover, by weakening the orthogonality condition, we obtain (perhaps) novel techniques to prove weak confluence of non-orthogonal systems.

As a first step towards confluence, we notice that the parallel operator enjoys a Kleisli-like lifting property.

Lemma 1. *If $a^\circ; a^p \leq a^p; a^{p^\circ}$, then $a^{p^\circ}; a^p \leq a^p; a^{p^\circ}$*

Proof. We assume $a^\circ; a^p \leq a^p; a^{p^\circ}$ and notice that, dualising, we also obtain $a^{p^\circ}; a \leq a^p; a^{p^\circ}$. Since $a^{p^\circ} = a^{\circ p} = \mu x. a^\circ \vee \hat{x}$, we can prove the thesis by ω -continuous induction (notice that indeed $\phi(x) \triangleq a^\circ \vee \hat{x}$ is ω -continuous — this also follows from Proposition 11 — and that so is $\phi(x); a^p$). Let us assume $x \leq a^{p^\circ}$ and $x; a^p \leq a^p; a^{p^\circ}$. We show $(a^\circ \vee \hat{x}); a^p \leq a^p; a^{p^\circ}$. The latter amounts to prove $a^\circ; a^p \vee \hat{x}; a^p \leq a^p; a^{p^\circ}$, which in turn follows from $a^\circ; a^p \leq a^p; a^{p^\circ}$ and $\hat{x}; a^p \leq a^p; a^{p^\circ}$. The former follows by hypothesis. For the latter, since $a^p = a \vee \hat{a}^p$, it is sufficient to prove $\hat{x}; a \leq a^p; a^{p^\circ}$ and $\hat{x}; \hat{a}^p \leq a^p; a^{p^\circ}$. The first follows from (the dualised version of the) hypothesis, since $x \leq a^{p^\circ}$ gives

$$\hat{x}; a \leq \widehat{a^{p^\circ}}; a \leq \widehat{a^p}; a \leq a^p; a^{p^\circ}; a.$$

For the second inequality, we first use the induction hypothesis as follows

$$\hat{x}; \hat{a}^p = \widehat{x; a^p} \leq \widehat{a^p; a^{p^\circ}}$$

and then notice that $a^p; a^{p^\circ}$ is indeed compatible (from which the thesis follows). For

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{a^p; a^{p^\circ}} &= \widehat{a^p}; \widehat{a^{p^\circ}} \\ &= \widehat{a^p}; \widehat{a^{\circ p}} \\ &\leq (a \vee \hat{a}^p); (a^\circ \vee \widehat{a^{\circ p}}) \\ &= a^p; a^{\circ p} \\ &= a^p; a^{p^\circ}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Since $a^{\text{SP}} = a[\Delta]^p$, we can prove that the latter has the diamond property relying on Lemma 1 by showing $a[\Delta]^\circ; a[\Delta]^p \leq a[\Delta]^p; a[\Delta]^{p^\circ}$. To do so, we need two auxiliary results. The first stating that parallel reduction extends to substitutions.²²

Lemma 2. $\Delta[a^{\text{SP}}] \leq a^{\text{SP}}$.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove $\Delta \leq a^{\text{SP}} \gg a^{\text{SP}}$. Since $\Delta = \mu x. \hat{x}$, we proceed by fixed point induction showing that $a^{\text{SP}} \gg a^{\text{SP}}$ is compatible. Since a^{SP} is compatible (and \gg is monotone in the second argument), we have: $\widehat{a^{\text{SP}} \gg a^{\text{SP}}} \leq a^{\text{SP}} \gg (\widehat{a^{\text{SP}}} \vee a^{\text{SP}}) \leq a^{\text{SP}} \gg a^{\text{SP}}$. □

The second property needed states that a reduction cannot produce *nested* redexes.

Definition 13. An E -system (Σ, V, a) has the *nesting property* if $a^\circ[a^{\text{SP}}] \leq a^{\text{SP}}; a^\circ[\Delta]$.

The nesting property holds for TRSs, as well as for higher-order systems without binders [101]. However, as already mentioned, it fails on syntax with variable binding. For instance, in the case of the λ -calculus, it states that whenever we have

$$\tau[\bar{v}/\bar{x}][s[\bar{v}/\bar{x}]/x] \leftarrow_{\beta} (\lambda x. \tau[\bar{v}/\bar{x}])s[\bar{v}/\bar{x}] \Rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda x. \tau[\bar{w}/\bar{x}])s[\bar{w}/\bar{x}],$$

then $\tau[\bar{v}/\bar{x}][s[\bar{v}/\bar{x}]/x] \Rightarrow \tau[\bar{w}/\bar{x}][s[\bar{w}/\bar{x}]/x]$. The latter reduction does not hold, as there could *nested* redexes v_i s. As we shall see in the next section, such a property is implied by substitutivity, a property not enjoyed by a^{SP} .

Theorem 6 (Parallel Moves). *Let (Σ, V, a) be an orthogonal system satisfying the nesting property. Then a^{SP} has the diamond property.*

Proof. By Lemma 1 it is sufficient to prove $a[\Delta]^\circ; a[\Delta]^p \leq a[\Delta]^p; a[\Delta]^{p^\circ}$. Let b be $a[\Delta]^p; a[\Delta]^{p^\circ}$. Since $a[\Delta]^p = a[\Delta] \vee \widehat{a[\Delta]^p}$, it is sufficient to show $a[\Delta]^\circ; a[\Delta] \leq b$ and $a[\Delta]^\circ; \widehat{a[\Delta]^p} \leq b$, i.e. $a[\Delta]^\circ; \widehat{a^{\text{SP}}} \leq b$. The former directly follows from orthogonality, since $\Delta \leq b$. For the latter, it is sufficient to show $a[\Delta]^\circ; \mathbb{I}_\eta \leq b$ and $a[\Delta]^\circ; \widehat{a^{\text{SP}}} \leq b$. The first trivially follows by Remark 5, whereas for the second by orthogonality and the nesting property, we have

$$a[\Delta]^\circ; \widehat{a^{\text{SP}}} \leq a^\circ[a^{\text{SP}}] \leq a^{\text{SP}}; a^\circ[\Delta].$$

We conclude the thesis since a^{SP} is closed under substitution (Lemma 2) (and thus $a^\circ[\Delta] \leq a^{\text{SP}\circ}[\Delta] \leq a^{\text{SP}\circ}$). □

1) *Beyond Confluence:* We have seen that in presence of the nesting property orthogonal systems are confluent. But what happens if such a property fails, as in the case of the λ -calculus? In the next section, we shall see another route to achieve confluence. Here, we notice that our relational parallel moves technique outlines a blueprint that can be used to prove weaker forms of confluence in presence of relaxed conditions. For instance, we can massage Lemma 1 to deal with weak confluence.

²¹Notice that such a rule actually gives *weak* orthogonality [15].

²²On a TRS we have: $v_i \Rightarrow w_i$ implies $\tau[\bar{v}/\bar{x}] \Rightarrow \tau[\bar{w}/\bar{x}]$.

Lemma 3. $\widehat{a^*} = \widehat{a^*}$.

Proof. By Proposition 7 using that $a^* = \mu x. \Delta \vee a; x$. \square

Proposition 13. *If $a^\circ; a^p \leq a^{p^*}; a^{p^*\circ}$, then $a^{p^\circ}; a^p \leq a^{p^*}; a^{p^*\circ}$*

Proof Sketch. We proceed as in the proof of Lemma 1 by noticing that: (i) $\widehat{a^{p^*}} \leq a^{p^*}$ (this follows from Lemma 3); and (ii) $\widehat{a^{p^*}; a^{p^*\circ}} \leq a^{p^*}; a^{p^*\circ}$. \square

Taking advantage of Proposition 13, we can now mimic the proof of Theorem 6 but with weaker assumptions. For instance, we can weaken the nesting property by allowing multiple steps of parallel reductions, i.e. $a^\circ[a^{sp}] \leq a[\Delta]; \Delta[a^{sp^\circ}]$. Such a property, that holds also on syntax with binders, allows us to conclude that orthogonal systems are weakly confluent. This may not be that interesting, as we are going to see that using deep reduction we can prove confluence of orthogonal systems, but observe that the result can be further weakened by, e.g., requiring $a^\circ[\Delta]; a[\Delta] \leq a^{sp^*}; a^{sp^*\circ}$, hence going beyond orthogonality.

VIII. FULL REDUCTION

Looking at syntax as the (free) *monad* \mathcal{S} , we can qualify parallel reduction — which is defined relying on the monad multiplication and relational extension — as the canonical notion of reduction induced by the syntax \mathcal{S} . We can also look at \mathcal{S} as an *initial algebra* and rely on Theorem 4 to exploit initiality at a relational level. In fact, any ground relation $a : \mathcal{S}V \rightarrow \mathcal{S}V$ (for reasons that will become clear soon, we will actually consider $a \vee \Delta$) induces a relational $(V + \Sigma)$ -algebra on $\mathcal{S}V$ via post-composition with the algebra map $[\eta, \sigma] : V + \Sigma(\mathcal{S}V) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}V$.

Definition 14. Given an E -system (Σ, V, a) , we define the *full reduction* relation as $a^f \triangleq ([\eta, \sigma]; (a \vee \Delta))$.

Specific instances of deep reduction have been extensively employed both in first- and higher-order rewriting to prove confluence. For instance, for a TRS (X, Σ, \mapsto) , we see that \mapsto^f is the relation inductively defined thus:

$$\frac{}{x \mapsto^f x} \quad \frac{x \mapsto t}{x \mapsto^f t} \quad \frac{t_1 \mapsto^f s_1 \ \cdots \ t_n \mapsto^f s_n}{o(t_1, \dots, t_n) \mapsto^f o(s_1, \dots, s_n)} \\ \frac{t_1 \mapsto^f s_1 \ \cdots \ t_n \mapsto^f s_n \quad o(s_1, \dots, s_n) \mapsto u}{o(t_1, \dots, t_n) \mapsto^f u}$$

Notice that since in TRSs variables cannot be redexes, the second clause above never applies. By taking $a[\Delta]^f$, we recover the traditional notion of full reduction \Rightarrow .

The relation a^f recursively applies $a \vee \Delta$ on the whole expression, hence reducing in parallel possibly nested redexes at will. This ensures that a^f extends a . Moreover, the presence of Δ allows one to stop reducing at any time.

Lemma 4. 1) $\Delta \leq a^f$,
2) $a \leq a^f$.

Using Theorem 5 we can exploit the inductive nature of a^f .

Proposition 14. $a^f = \mu x. \text{I}_\eta \vee \text{I}_\eta; a \vee \widetilde{x} \vee \widetilde{x}; a$.

Remark 6. Actually, if we exploit the assumption in Remark 5, we further simplify Proposition 14 obtaining $a^f = \mu x. \text{I}_\eta \vee \text{I}_\eta; a \vee \widetilde{x} \vee \widetilde{x}; a$.

Before studying rewriting properties of a^f , it is natural to ask how a^f relates to a^p . Intuitively, the latter is the subrelation of the former obtained by reducing non-nested redexes only. Consequently, one expects $a^p \leq a^f$. Moreover, the same kind of argument suggests that a^f can be recovered by possibly many steps of a^p . This is indeed the case: actually, a^f and a^p determine the same reduction sequences.

Lemma 5. $a^p \leq a^f \leq a^{p^*} = a^{f^*}$.

Proof Sketch. The proof is a straightforward (fixed point) induction. The only (perhaps) non-immediately trivial passage is observing that $\widehat{a^{p^*}}; a \leq a^{p^*}$. This follows from Lemma 3 thus: $\widehat{a^{p^*}}; a \leq a^{p^*}; a \leq a^{p^*}; a \leq a^{p^*}; a^p \leq a^{p^*}$. \square

Writing a^{sf} for $a[\Delta]^f$, we see that all the above results extend to a^{sf} and a^{sp} .

Let us now move to confluence of full reduction. Since a^{sf} reduces also nested redexes, we expect such a relation to satisfy the nesting property of Definition 13 (properly reformulated replacing a^{sp} with a^{sf}), at least on orthogonal systems, where now orthogonality is defined as in Definition 12 but with a^{sf} in place of a^{sp} . To prove the nesting property for a^{sf} we first observe that the latter is implied by substitutivity.

Lemma 6. *If a^{sf} is substitutive (i.e. $a^{\text{sf}}[a^{\text{sf}}] \leq a^{\text{sf}}$), then it has the nesting property: that is, $a^\circ[a^{\text{sf}}] \leq a^{\text{sf}}; a^\circ[\Delta]$.*

Proof. Recall that $-[=]$ is functorial and that $\Delta \leq a^{\text{sf}}$. We have: $a^\circ; [a^{\text{sf}}] = (\Delta; a^\circ)[a^{\text{sf}}; \Delta] \leq (a^{\text{sf}}; a^\circ)[a^{\text{sf}}; \Delta] = a^{\text{sf}}[a^{\text{sf}}]; a^\circ[\Delta] \leq a^{\text{sf}}; a^\circ[\Delta]$, where the last inequality follows from substitutivity. \square

We now aim to prove substitutivity of a^{sf} . We do so by exploiting an unexpected connection between a^{sf} and a well-known relational technique in program equivalence: *Howe's method* [44], [45].

A. Full Reduction and Howe's Method

Howe's method is a powerful operational technique to prove congruence of applicative (bi)similarity originally developed in the context of the pure λ -calculus. Howe's method has been extended to a variety of concrete formalism — such as calculi with computational effects [42], [99], [102]–[111] — and categorical semantics [112]–[114]. Gordon [65], [93] and Lassen [42], [43] have developed an elegant relational account of Howe's method on specific λ -calculi; such an account can be made completely general by abstracting over the concrete syntax, along the lines of section VI.

We are going to show that the Howe extension of a relation a coincides with a^f . The advantage of such an equality — which is, in spite of its simplicity, new (at least to the best of the author's knowledge) — is twofold: on the one hand, we obtain a novel understanding of Howe's method in terms of

initial relation algebras as in Definition 14; on the other hand, we obtain powerful proof techniques for reasoning about full reduction.

Definition 15. For a relation $a : SV \rightarrow SV$, define its *Howe extension*²³ as $a^H \triangleq \mu x.\widehat{x}; (a \vee \Delta)$. We define a^{SH} as $a[\Delta]^H$.

We now show that a^H and a^F coincides, and infer from that an inductive characterisation of a^{SF} . For the remaining part of this section, we use the notation y^- for the reflexive closure of y , i.e. $y^- \triangleq y \vee \Delta$.

Lemma 7. $a^H = a^F$.

Proof. By Theorem 5, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} a^F &= ([\eta, \sigma]; a^-) \\ &= \mu x. [\eta, \sigma]^\circ; (\Delta_V + \Sigma x); [\eta, \sigma]; a^- \\ &= \mu x. \eta^\circ; \eta; a^- \vee \sigma^\circ; \Sigma x; \sigma; a^- \\ &= \mu x. \mathbb{I}_\eta; a^- \vee \widetilde{x}; a^- \\ &= \mu x. (\mathbb{I}_\eta \vee \widetilde{x}); a^- \\ &= \mu x. \widehat{x}; a^- \\ &= a^H. \end{aligned}$$

□

To exploit the consequences of Lemma 7, we first make explicit a (straightforward) property of the reflexive closure operator.

Lemma 8. $a[\Delta]^- = a^-[\Delta]$.

Proof. Unfolding the definition of $(-)^-$, we see that we have to prove $a[\Delta] \vee \Delta = (a \vee \Delta)[\Delta]$. First, we notice that $a[\Delta] \vee \Delta \leq (a \vee \Delta)[\Delta]$ follows from $a[\Delta] \leq (a \vee \Delta)[\Delta]$ (which follows from Proposition 9, since $a \leq a \vee \Delta$) and $\Delta \leq (a \vee \Delta)[\Delta]$. (again, by Proposition 9 we have $\Delta = \Delta[\Delta] \leq (a \vee \Delta)[\Delta]$). To conclude the proof, it is thus enough to prove the opposite inequality, namely $(a \vee \Delta)[\Delta] \leq a[\Delta] \vee \Delta$. The latter is equivalent to $a \vee \Delta \leq \Delta \gg (a[\Delta] \vee \Delta)$, which follows from $a \leq \Delta \gg (a[\Delta] \vee \Delta)$ (i.e. $a[\Delta] \leq a[\Delta] \vee \Delta$, which trivially holds) and $\Delta \leq \Delta \gg (a[\Delta] \vee \Delta)$ (i.e. $\Delta[\Delta] \leq a[\Delta] \vee \Delta$, which trivially follows from $\Delta[\Delta] = \Delta$). □

Proposition 15. For an E -system (Σ, V, a) , we have:

- 1) $a^{SF} = a^{SH} = \mu x. \mathbb{I}_\eta \vee \widetilde{x}; a^-[\Delta]$.
- 2) $a^{SF^\circ} = a^{SH^\circ} \mu x. \mathbb{I}_\eta \vee a^-[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{x}$.

Proof. We prove item 1, as item 2 is a direct consequence of it. By Lemma 7, we have

$$a^{SF} = a^{SH} = a[\Delta]^H = \mu x. \widehat{x}; a[\Delta]^-.$$

²³Usually one defines a^H as $\mu x. \widehat{x}; a$ — hence without forcing reflexivity on a — and then restricts the analysis to reflexive relations (program approximations and equivalences being such). For the ease of exposition, we force reflexivity into the very definition of a^H , much in the same way as we did with a^F . Of course, it is possible to remove reflexivity from both such definitions and obtain the same results we prove in this section *mutatis mutandis*.

We then calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu x. \widehat{x}; a[\Delta]^- &= \mu x. \widehat{x}; a^-[\Delta] && \text{(Lemma 8)} \\ &= \mu x. (\mathbb{I}_\eta \vee \widetilde{x}); a^-[\Delta] \\ &= \mu x. \mathbb{I}_\eta; a^-[\Delta] \vee \widetilde{x}; a^-[\Delta] \\ &= \mu x. \mathbb{I}_\eta; a[\Delta]^- \vee \widetilde{x}; a^-[\Delta] && \text{(Lemma 8)} \\ &= \mu x. \mathbb{I}_\eta; (a[\Delta] \vee \Delta) \vee \widetilde{x}; a^-[\Delta] \\ &= \mu x. \mathbb{I}_\eta; a[\Delta] \vee \mathbb{I}_\eta \vee \widetilde{x}; a^-[\Delta] \\ &= \mu x. \perp \vee \mathbb{I}_\eta \vee \widetilde{x}; a^-[\Delta] && \text{(Remark 5)} \\ &= \mu x. \mathbb{I}_\eta \vee \widetilde{x}; a^-[\Delta]. \end{aligned}$$

□

We are now ready to prove substitutivity (and compatibility) of full reduction.

Proposition 16. a^{SF} is compatible and substitutive.

Proof. We first show that a^{SF} is substitutive, i.e. $a^{SF}[a^{SF}] \leq a^{SF}$. We prove the equivalent inequality $a^{SF} \leq a^{SF} \gg a^{SF}$ by ω -continuous fixed point induction (recall that $-[\]$ is ω -continuous in the first argument). using Proposition 15. We thus assume $x \leq a^{SF}$ and $x \leq a^{SF} \gg a^{SF}$ — i.e. $x[a^{SF}] \leq a^{SF}$ — and show $\mathbb{I}_\eta \vee \widetilde{x}; a^-[\Delta] \leq a^{SF} \gg a^{SF}$. Proving the latter amounts to prove $\mathbb{I}_\eta \leq a^{SF} \gg a^{SF}$ and $\widetilde{x}; a^-[\Delta] \leq a^{SF} \gg a^{SF}$. The former is equivalent to $\mathbb{I}_\eta[a^{SF}] \leq a^{SF}$, which follows from Proposition 9. For the latter, it sufficient to prove $(\widetilde{x}; a^-[\Delta])[a^{SF}] \leq a^{SF}$. We calculate:²⁴

$$\begin{aligned} (\widetilde{x}; a^-[\Delta])[a^{SF}] &= (\widetilde{x}; a^-[\Delta])[a^{SF}; \Delta] \\ &\leq \widetilde{x}[a^{SF}]; a^-[\Delta] \\ &\leq \widetilde{x}[a^{SF}]; a^-[\Delta] \\ &\leq \widetilde{a}^{SF}; a^-[\Delta] && \text{(since } x[a^{SF}] \leq a^{SF}\text{)} \\ &\leq \mathbb{I}_\eta \vee \widetilde{a}^{SF}; a^-[\Delta] \\ &= a^{SF}. \end{aligned}$$

For compatibility, i.e. $\widehat{a^{SH}} \leq a^{SH}$, we notice that since $a^-[\Delta]$ is reflexive, we have $\widehat{a^{SH}} = a^{SH}; \Delta \leq \widehat{a^{SH}}; a^-[\Delta] \leq a^{SH}$. □

Remark 7. Notice that substitutivity of a^{SH} holds independently of reflexivity of $a^-[\Delta]$ (whereas compatibility actively uses it). This is a consequence of Remark 5 — which gives Proposition 15 — whereby we do *not* have to account for the case $\mathbb{I}_\eta; a^-[\mathbb{I}_\eta] \leq a^{SF} \gg a^{SF}$. To handle such a case, we indeed need to rely on reflexivity of $a^-[\mathbb{I}_\eta]$.

Putting together Proposition 16 and Lemma 6 we obtain the nesting property for a^{SF} .

Corollary 1. Full reduction a^{SF} has the nesting property.

We now have all the ingredients to prove that full reduction has the diamond property. Before that, however, we mention another candidate definition of a ‘full reduction’ that makes active use of substitutivity. Such a definition is usually

²⁴By associativity of relation substitution, i.e. $x[y][z] = x[y[z]]$, we have $a^-[\Delta][\Delta] = a^-[\Delta[\Delta]] \leq a^-[\Delta]$.

called multi-step reduction in term rewriting [15] and it is sometimes used in the context of the so-called Tait-Martin-Löf technique [36]–[38] — notice, however, that in concrete calculi, such as the λ -calculus, such a technique uses (concrete instances of) full reduction, rather than multi-step reduction.

As for parallel and full reduction, also multi-step reduction can be (re)discovered in the literature on program equivalence, where it goes under the name of *substitutive context closure* of a relation [42], [43].

Definition 16. Let (Σ, V, a) be an E -system. The *substitutive context closure* of a is defined as $a^{\text{scc}} \triangleq \mu x. a[x] \vee \widehat{x}$.

Since a^{SH} is substitutive and compatible, a^{scc} is contained in it ($a^{\text{scc}} \leq a^{\text{SH}}$), and the two relations give the same reduction sequences. We do not investigate multi-step reduction any further, although we observe (without giving a formal proof) that a^{scc} enjoys the so-called *triangle property* (i.e. $x \leq x; x^\circ$) from which confluence follows.

B. The Tait-Martin-Löf Technique

We are finally ready to prove the main result of this section, namely that in orthogonal systems full reduction has the diamond property, and thus it is confluent. Our result provides an abstract and relational version of the so-called Tait-Martin-Löf technique [36]–[38], whereby confluence of a system (originally the λ -calculus) is proved showing the diamond property of full reduction.

Theorem 7. Say that an E -system (Σ, V, a) is orthogonal if $a[\Delta]^\circ; a[\Delta] \leq \Delta$ and $a[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}} \leq a^\circ[a^{\text{SF}}]$. Then, in an orthogonal system full reduction a^{SF} has the diamond property: $a^{\text{SF}\circ}; a^{\text{SF}} \leq a^{\text{SF}}; a^{\text{SF}\circ}$.

Proof. First of all, we notice that using orthogonality and the nesting property (Corollary 1), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} a[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}} &\leq a^\circ[a^{\text{SF}}] \leq a^{\text{SF}}; a^\circ[\Delta] && \text{(ortho-nesting)} \\ \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}\circ}; a[\Delta] &\leq a[a^{\text{SF}\circ}] \leq a[\Delta]; a^{\text{SF}\circ} && \text{(ortho-nesting}^\circ) \end{aligned}$$

Let $s \triangleq a^{\text{SF}}; a^{\text{SF}\circ}$. We prove $a^{\text{SF}\circ}; a^{\text{SF}} \leq s$ by ω -continuous fixed point induction on $a^{\text{SF}\circ}$ (Proposition 15). We thus assume $x \leq a^{\text{SF}\circ}$ and $x; a^{\text{SF}} \leq s$ and show (we tacitly exploit distributivity of composition over join and the universal property of the latter):

$$\mathbb{I}_\eta; a^{\text{SF}} \leq s \quad (1)$$

$$a^\circ[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{x}; a^{\text{SF}} \leq s \quad (2)$$

For (1), we first observe that $\mathbb{I}_\eta; \widetilde{z} = \perp$, for any z . Consequently, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}_\eta; a^{\text{SF}} &= \mathbb{I}_\eta; (\mathbb{I}_\eta \vee \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; a^\circ[\Delta]) \\ &= \mathbb{I}_\eta; \mathbb{I}_\eta \vee \mathbb{I}_\eta; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; a^\circ[\Delta] \\ &= \mathbb{I}_\eta \vee \perp \\ &\leq s. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now move to (2). Proceeding as for (1), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} a^\circ[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{x}; a^{\text{SF}} &= a^\circ[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{x}; (\mathbb{I}_\eta \vee \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; a^\circ[\Delta]) \\ &= a^\circ[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{x}; \mathbb{I}_\eta \vee a^\circ[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{x}; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; a^\circ[\Delta] \\ &= a^\circ[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{x}; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; a^\circ[\Delta]. \end{aligned}$$

We now exploit the induction hypothesis and obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} a^\circ[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{x}; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; a^\circ[\Delta] &= a^\circ[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{x}; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; a^\circ[\Delta] \\ &\leq a^\circ[\Delta]^\circ; a^{\text{SF}}; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}\circ}; a^\circ[\Delta] \\ &\leq a^\circ[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}\circ}; a^\circ[\Delta]. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, to conclude the thesis it is sufficient to prove $a^\circ[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}\circ}; a^\circ[\Delta] \leq s$. We use Lemma 8 (which also gives $a^\circ[\Delta]^\circ = a^\circ[\Delta]^\circ = a[\Delta]^\circ$) and reduce the proof of the above inequality to the proofs of the following ones:

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}\circ} &\leq s \\ a[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}\circ} &\leq s \\ \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}\circ}; a[\Delta] &\leq s \\ a[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}\circ}; a[\Delta] &\leq s. \end{aligned}$$

The first is tautological. For the second, we calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} a[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}\circ}; a[\Delta] &\leq a^{\text{SF}}; a^\circ[\Delta]; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}\circ}; a[\Delta] \quad \text{(ortho-nesting)} \\ &= a^{\text{SF}}; a[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}\circ}; a[\Delta] \\ &= a^{\text{SF}}; (\widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; a[\Delta])^\circ \\ &\leq a^{\text{SF}}; (\widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; a^\circ[\Delta])^\circ \\ &\leq a^{\text{SF}}; a^{\text{SF}\circ} (= s). \end{aligned}$$

For the third inequality we proceed as for the second one, but in a dual fashion (hence relying on (ortho-nesting $^\circ$)). Finally, for the fourth inequality we have:

$$\begin{aligned} a[\Delta]^\circ; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}}; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}\circ}; a[\Delta] &\leq a^{\text{SF}}; a^\circ[\Delta]; \widetilde{a}^{\text{SF}\circ}; a[\Delta] \quad \text{(ortho-nesting)} \\ &\leq a^{\text{SF}}; a^\circ[\Delta]; a[\Delta]; a^{\text{SF}\circ} \quad \text{(ortho-nesting}^\circ) \\ &\leq a^{\text{SF}}; a^{\text{SF}\circ} (= s). \quad \text{(Orthogonality)} \end{aligned}$$

□

IX. SEQUENTIAL REDUCTION: A FEW WORDS ONLY

The theory developed so far shows that parallel and full reduction are remarkably natural, at least from a structural and algebraic perspective. When it comes to think about reduction computationally, however, *sequential* (or *linear*) reduction is usually considered more fundamental. In fact, almost all textbooks in rewriting theory first define sequential reduction, and then introduce parallel (and full) reduction on top of that.

Even if the relational analysis of sequential reduction is still work in progress, we mention that sequential reduction can be recovered in the allegorical framework, both structurally and algebraically. In the former case, one relies on the *derivative* [115]–[118] of the signature functor (as well as of the corresponding monad). In fact, the derivative of a functor $F : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, if it exists, is the functor $\partial F : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ coming with a plug-in *weakly cartesian* natural transformation

$dF_X : \partial FX \times X \rightarrow FX$ satisfying the following universal mapping property: for any functor G with a weakly cartesian²⁵ natural transformation $\vartheta : GX \times X \rightarrow FX$, there exists a unique weakly cartesian natural transformation $\vartheta' : GX \rightarrow \partial FX$ satisfying the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \partial FX \times X & \xrightarrow{\theta} & FX \\ \vartheta' \times \Delta \uparrow & \nearrow \vartheta & \\ GX \times X & & \end{array}$$

Derivatives of simple polynomial functors and of their free monads, for instance, always exist [116]–[118]. In those cases, one clearly sees that such derivatives provides contexts with one *linear* hole, which is exactly what is required to define sequential reduction. Consequently, one possible definition of the sequential reduction (on an E -system (Σ, V, a) is the relation $a^\perp \triangleq d\mathcal{S}^\circ; (\Delta \times a); d\mathcal{S}$.

In a similar fashion, it is possible to define a *linear* compatible refinement operator $\widehat{a} \triangleq d\Sigma^\circ; (\Delta \times a); d\Sigma$ and use the latter to give an inductive characterisation of a^\perp as $\mu x.a \vee \widehat{x}$. At this point, it is possible to proceed following the methodology of the augmented calculus of relations isolating the algebraic laws defining $\widehat{_}$. Notice, however, that such laws largely differ from those of $\widehat{_}$. For instance, we have $\widehat{a}; \widehat{b} \leq \widehat{a}; \widehat{b}$ but not the vice versa.

Another option to capture forms of sequentiality (albeit not sequential reduction itself) is to think about parallel and full reduction as primitives, and to regard sequential-like reductions as their restrictions. Following this direction, we may introduce the notion of a *sequentialisation* of a relator Σ , namely a family of finitary maps $\Gamma : \mathcal{A}(A, A) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\Sigma A, \Sigma A)$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= \Gamma \Delta \\ \Gamma(a^\circ) &= (\Gamma a)^\circ \\ \Gamma(a \vee b) &= \Gamma a \vee \Gamma b \\ \Gamma a &\leq \Sigma a \\ \Sigma a &\leq (\Gamma a)^*. \end{aligned}$$

For instance, if Σ is the functor induced by a first-order signature, then a sequentialisation of (the Barr extension of) Σ is the following inductively defined map:

$$\frac{x \ a \ y \quad \tau \ \Gamma a \ s \quad n \geq 0}{x \ \Gamma a \ y \quad o(u_1, \dots, \tau, \dots, u_n) \ \Gamma a \ o(u_1, \dots, s, \dots, u_n)}$$

Notice that (the reduction induced by) Γ does *not* coincide with the usual sequential reduction. In fact, Γ allows to always reduce 0-ary operations (i.e. constants) to themselves (otherwise, it behaves as sequential reduction).

At this point, we can proceed as in the previous sections, simply working with (fixed) a sequentialisation Γ of Σ in place of the latter. We do not go any further but simply remark that

²⁵A natural transformation is weakly cartesian if its naturality squares are weak pullbacks [119]. Intuitively, we can think about such natural transformations as *linear* maps between functors [120].

a weak Kleisli-like lemma along the lines of Proposition 13 can be easily proved for sequentialised reductions.

X. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have outlined a general relational theory of symbolic manipulations in rewriting style. The theory is given in the framework of allegory theory and goes in tandem with the so-called mathematical theory of syntax: remarkably, these two theories build upon the same collection of concepts, the theory of syntax implementing them in a categorical way, the theory of symbolic manipulation implementing them in an allegorical, relational way. We have then pushed the relational approach even further by noticing how the aforementioned relational counterparts of syntactic notions define new operators on relations subject to specific algebraic laws. Such operators and their laws turned out to be all that matters to study symbolic manipulation, and thus give raise to a syntax-independent augmented calculus of relations within which we have defined classic reduction relations (viz. parallel and full reduction) and proved nontrivial properties about them.

A. Relational Rewriting and Operational Semantics

The results presented in this paper give (first) evidences that the relational approach to rewriting goes considerably beyond abstract reduction systems. The author hopes that such results will contribute to a renewed interest in the relational approach to rewriting (an outline of a research program for that is given in the next section).

(Relational) Rewriting, however, is just one piece in the (operational) jigsaw. In fact, the augmented calculus of relations and, most importantly, its underlying methodology, suggest that (part of) operational reasoning can be developed in an axiomatic and syntax-independent fashion. Indeed, one way to read the results of this work, together with previous results on program equivalence, is that the augmented calculus of relations is expressive enough to account for two main forms of operational reasoning: *rewriting* and *program equivalence* (and refinement).²⁶ Furthermore, the author conjectures that much more operational reasoning, such as theories of program dynamics, can be developed within such a calculus (or variations thereof).

This perspective, which we may refer to as *relational or allegorical operational semantics*, aims to achieve a systematic development of operational techniques within a (truly) relational paradigm, whereby program relations,²⁷ their operations, and algebraic properties are first-class citizens. The successful application of relational calculi to the field of program equivalence and rewriting hints that the relational approach to operational semantics has the potential to achieve

²⁶Calculi subsumed by the augmented calculus of relations have been employed to give relational accounts of logical relations [111], contextual and CIU equivalence [42], [106], and applicative and normal bisimilarity [42], [65], [104], [121]–[123].

²⁷I.e. suitable notions of relation on programs texts, rather than on their abstract denotations.

a general axiomatic and largely syntax-independent basis for operational reasoning.²⁸

B. Future Work

Following the discussion made so far, future work can be divided into two research directions. The first one is devoted to the development of relational rewriting, hence complementing the confluence results proved in previous sections; the second, instead, focuses on extending the relational framework to cover more operational behaviours, hence going towards the aforementioned allegorical operational semantics.

Beginning with the former and omitting the already discussed issue of sequential reduction (section IX), here is a possible research agenda.

1. *Termination*. The work by Hasegawa [124] shows how syntax-based *termination techniques* (such as multiset and recursive path ordering [15]) on TRSs can be abstractly recovered in terms of lifting of (analytic) functors [115], and thus suggests that syntax-based termination can be indeed analysed in a relational framework.²⁹ It thus seems natural to incorporate and extend Hasegawa’s results in the allegorical framework.
2. *Strategies and Factorisation*. Together with confluence and termination, another crucial property of rewriting systems is *factorisation* [127]. The Kleisli-like lemmas proved in the paper can be already generalised to factorisation techniques (simply replace a° and alike with arbitrary relations b). These, however, provide only a superficial account of factorisation and it is thus interesting to ask whether deeper analyses of factorisation can be given relationally, perhaps along the line of the recent work by Accattoli et al. [128].
3. *Analytic Functors and Rewriting Modulo*. In this work, our examples were intended to model notions of syntax-based symbolic systems. Consequently, we focused on syntax-like finitary functors (and free monads), polynomial functors being a prime examples of those. Another interesting class of examples that we have not studied is the one of *analytic functors* [115]. In a first approximation, analytic functors can be seen as polynomial functors modulo an equivalence obtained via a group of symmetries. From a rewriting perspective, working with analytic functors we recover notions of syntax modulo permutations, in a very general sense. Looking at analytic functors, consequently, we may apply relational rewriting to rather liberal notions of syntax carrying a nontrivial semantic import.
4. *Infinitary and Coinductive Rewriting*. The theory developed in this paper applies to finitary syntax and rewriting. This naturally leads to asking whether the allegorical account scales to infinitary syntax and coinductive rewriting. An educated guess in this direction is to replace finitary

syntax with infinitary one, modelling the latter through iterative algebras [129], or structures alike. Notice that doing so, reduction relations will be still defined via relators, although they would be recasted in the extended calculus of relations not as inductive relations (viz. least fixed points), but as *coinductive* (viz. greatest fixed points) or *mixed inductive-conductive* (viz. nested least and greatest fixed points) relations [130].

5. *Quantitative Rewriting*. Last but not least, an interesting limitation of the allegorical framework is that it cannot cope with quantitative forms of rewriting [55]–[58]. The problem is foundational, in the sense that categories of quantitative relations do *not* form an allegory, as they fail to satisfy the modular law. However, they form Frobenius quantaloids [131] and it is natural to explore whether an allegorical-like theory of rewriting can be given on top of such structures (very likely enriched with structures such as power objects). Interestingly, from the axiomatic perspective of the augmented calculus of relations, one observes that relational calculi for modal and quantitative program equivalence (viz. program metrics) have already been defined [111], [132]. Such calculi are impressively close to the augmented calculus of relations except for the addition of a graded comonadic modality acting as scaling [133], [134]. Consequently, one promising direction to approach quantitative rewriting is to proceed axiomatically by extending the augmented calculus of relations with suitable modalities.

Let us now move to allegorical operational semantics. In this case, outlining a research agenda is more difficult, as the subject is considerably vast. Nonetheless, we can fix a couple of general research-goals aiming to explore the potential of the relational approach (and, more specifically, of the augmented calculus of relations) as a foundational formalism for operational reasoning.

1. *Reduction-Based Semantics*. A first, natural question to answer in order to test the robustness of relational calculi is: *can theories of program dynamics be given in such calculi?* A possible path towards an answer is showing that reduction-based operational semantics can be given inside suitable extensions of the augmented calculus of relations. Such extensions should be obtained in a rather uniform way by defining a relational counterpart of Felleisen-style evaluation contexts [135] methodology. Accordingly, the specification of an operational dynamics, such as a call-by-name one, is given not syntactically by means of suitable evaluation contexts, but relationally throughout context operators defining the action of evaluation contexts on relations. Notice that this approach closely relates to reduction strategies, and we can see context operators as refining the compatible refinement operator used in this work (morally, the latter operator would be recovered as the context operator regarding any context as an evaluation context). Following this idea, it becomes interesting to focus *not* on explicit definitions of operational dynamics, but on suitable axiomatics on context operators ensuring

²⁸Notice also that such a basis seems to be also well suited for machine formalisation.

²⁹Relational analysis of termination for abstract systems have already been given, especially concerning modularity results [51], [125], [126].

desirable semantic properties: for instance, rather than giving an explicit definition of a call-by-name semantics (which is language specific), we may prove that any lax functorial context operator behaves in such and such way, showing only in a second moment that, on suitable families of languages, a call-by-name dynamics induces such an operator.

2. *Computational Effects*. Operational behaviours being oftentimes effectful, it is desirable to have extensions of the relational framework accounting for the production of computational effects. One way to introduce them in operational semantics is by means of monadic evaluation semantics [104], [136]; another, approach, that seems better suited for our purposes, is the one of *monadic rewriting* [54]. The latter develops a general relational theory of *abstract* reduction systems with (monadic) computational effects relying on monadic relations which, roughly, can be seen as arrows in the Kleisli allegory of the monad modelling computational effects. Unfortunately, monadic rewriting has been developed for abstract systems only, and no extension of the theory to syntax-based systems is currently available. The theory developed in this paper suggests that the key to account for both syntax-based and effectful rewriting relies on the combination of monads for syntax and for computational effects, at an allegorical level.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful observations. Special thanks go to Filippo Bonchi, Francesco Dagnino, Ugo Dal Lago, and Simone Martini.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. A. Goguen, J. W. Thatcher, E. G. Wagner, and J. B. Wright, "Initial algebra semantics and continuous algebras," *J. ACM*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 68–95, 1977.
- [2] A. Pitts, *Nominal Sets: Names and Symmetry in Computer Science*, ser. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [3] M. Gabbay and A. M. Pitts, "A new approach to abstract syntax involving binders," in *14th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Trento, Italy, July 2-5, 1999*. IEEE Computer Society, 1999, pp. 214–224.
- [4] A. M. Pitts, "A fresh approach to representing syntax with static binders in functional programming," in *Proceedings of the Sixth ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP '01), Firenze (Florence), Italy, September 3-5, 2001*, B. C. Pierce, Ed. ACM, 2001, p. 1.
- [5] —, "Equivariant syntax and semantics," in *Automata, Languages and Programming, 29th International Colloquium, ICALP 2002, Malaga, Spain, July 8-13, 2002, Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, P. Widmayer, F. T. Ruiz, R. M. Bueno, M. Hennessy, S. J. Eidenbenz, and R. Conejo, Eds., vol. 2380. Springer, 2002, pp. 32–36.
- [6] —, "Alpha-structural recursion and induction," *J. ACM*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 459–506, 2006.
- [7] M. P. Fiore, G. D. Plotkin, and D. Turi, "Abstract syntax and variable binding," in *14th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Trento, Italy, July 2-5, 1999*. IEEE Computer Society, 1999, pp. 193–202.
- [8] N. Arkor and M. Fiore, "Algebraic models of simple type theories: A polynomial approach," in *LICS '20: 35th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Saarbrücken, Germany, July 8-11, 2020*, H. Hermans, L. Zhang, N. Kobayashi, and D. Miller, Eds. ACM, 2020, pp. 88–101.

- [9] M. Hamana, "Free s-monoids: A higher-order syntax with metavariables," in *Programming Languages and Systems: Second Asian Symposium, APLAS 2004, Taipei, Taiwan, November 4-6, 2004. Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, W. Chin, Ed., vol. 3302. Springer, 2004, pp. 348–363.
- [10] —, "Polymorphic abstract syntax via grothendieck construction," in *Foundations of Software Science and Computational Structures - 14th International Conference, FOSSACS 2011, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2011, Saarbrücken, Germany, March 26-April 3, 2011. Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, M. Hofmann, Ed., vol. 6604. Springer, 2011, pp. 381–395.
- [11] M. Hofmann, "Semantical analysis of higher-order abstract syntax," in *14th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Trento, Italy, July 2-5, 1999*. IEEE Computer Society, 1999, pp. 204–213.
- [12] F. Pfenning and C. Elliott, "Higher-order abstract syntax," in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN'88 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI), Atlanta, Georgia, USA, June 22-24, 1988*, R. L. Wexelblat, Ed. ACM, 1988, pp. 199–208.
- [13] D. Miller, "Abstract syntax for variable binders: An overview," in *Computational Logic - CL 2000, First International Conference, London, UK, 24-28 July, 2000, Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, J. W. Lloyd, V. Dahl, U. Furbach, M. Kerber, K. Lau, C. Palamidessi, L. M. Pereira, Y. Sagiv, and P. J. Stuckey, Eds., vol. 1861. Springer, 2000, pp. 239–253.
- [14] M. H. A. Newman, "On theories with a combinatorial definition of "equivalence"," *Annals of Mathematics*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 223–243, 1942.
- [15] M. Bezem, J. Klop, E. Barendsen, R. de Vrijer, and Terese, *Term Rewriting Systems*, ser. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [16] F. Baader and T. Nipkow, *Term rewriting and all that*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [17] G. P. Huet, "Confluent reductions: Abstract properties and applications to term rewriting systems: Abstract properties and applications to term rewriting systems," *J. ACM*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 797–821, 1980.
- [18] J. W. Klop, "Combinatory reduction systems," Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. Utrecht, 1980.
- [19] M. Fernández and M. Gabbay, "Nominal rewriting," *Inf. Comput.*, vol. 205, no. 6, pp. 917–965, 2007.
- [20] N. Ghani and C. Lüth, "Rewriting via coinseters," *Nord. J. Comput.*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 290–312, 2003.
- [21] A. Burroni, "Higher-dimensional word problems with applications to equational logic," *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 115, no. 1, pp. 43–62, 1993.
- [22] A. Power, "An abstract formulation for rewrite systems," in *Category Theory and Computer Science*, D. Pitt, D. Rydeheard, P. Dybjer, A. Pitts, and A. Poigné, Eds., vol. 389. Springer, 1989, pp. 300–312.
- [23] H. Reichel, "A 2-category approach to critical pair completion," in *Recent Trends in Data Type Specification*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 534. Springer Verlag, 1991, pp. 266–273.
- [24] D. E. Rydeheard and J. G. Stell, "Foundations of equational deduction: A categorical treatment of equational proofs and unification algorithms," in *Category Theory and Computer Science*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 283. Springer Verlag, 1987, pp. 114–139.
- [25] J. G. Stell, "Modelling term rewriting systems by sesqui-categories," Keele University, Tech. Rep. TR94-02, 1994.
- [26] R. A. G. Seely, "Modelling computations: A 2-categorical framework," in *Proceedings of the Second Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, 1987, pp. 65–71.
- [27] C. Lüth and N. Ghani, "Monads and modular term rewriting," in *Category Theory in Computer Science CTCS'97*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 1290. Santa Margherita, Italy: Springer Verlag, 1997, pp. 69–86.
- [28] C. Lüth, "Categorical term rewriting: Monads and modularity," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1998.
- [29] P. J. Freyd and A. Scedrov, *Categories, allegories*, ser. North-Holland mathematical library. North-Holland, 1990, vol. 39.
- [30] P. Johnstone, *Sketches of an Elephant: A Topos Theory Compendium: Volume 2*, ser. Oxford Logic Guides. Clarendon Press, 2002.
- [31] A. M. Pitts, "Applications of sup-lattice enriched category theory to sheaf theory," *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, vol. 57, pp. 433–480, 1988.
- [32] M. Barr, "Relational algebras," *Lect. Notes Math.*, vol. 137, pp. 39–55, 1970.

- [33] A. Carboni, G. M. Kelly, and R. J. Wood, “A 2-categorical approach to change of base and geometric morphisms i,” *Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie Différentielle Catégoriques*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 47–95, 1991.
- [34] S. Eilenberg and J. B. Wright, “Automata in general algebras,” *Information and Control*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 452–470, 1967.
- [35] R. S. Bird and O. de Moor, *Algebra of programming*, ser. Prentice Hall International series in computer science. Prentice Hall, 1997.
- [36] A. Barber, “Dual intuitionistic linear logic,” The Laboratory for Foundations of Computer Science, University of Edinburgh, Tech. Rep. ECS-LFCS-96-347, 1996.
- [37] P. Aczel, “A general church-rosser theorem,” *Draft, Manchester*, 1978.
- [38] M. Takahashi, “Parallel reductions in lambda-calculus,” *Inf. Comput.*, vol. 118, no. 1, pp. 120–127, 1995.
- [39] A. Tarski, “On the calculus of relations,” *J. Symb. Log.*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 73–89, 1941.
- [40] G. Schmidt, *Relational Mathematics*, ser. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2011, vol. 132.
- [41] R. D. Maddux, “Relation algebras,” in *Relational Methods in Computer Science*, ser. Advances in computing science, C. Brink, W. Kahl, and G. Schmidt, Eds. Springer, 1997, pp. 22–38.
- [42] S. Lassen, “Relational reasoning about functions and nondeterminism,” Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Computer Science, University of Aarhus, May 1998.
- [43] —, “Relational reasoning about contexts,” in *Higher Order Operational Techniques in Semantics*, A. D. Gordon and A. M. Pitts, Eds., 1998, pp. 91–136.
- [44] D. Howe, “Proving congruence of bisimulation in functional programming languages,” *Inf. Comput.*, vol. 124, no. 2, pp. 103–112, 1996.
- [45] A. Pitts, “Howe’s method for higher-order languages,” in *Advanced Topics in Bisimulation and Coinduction*, ser. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science, D. Sangiorgi and J. Rutten, Eds. Cambridge University Press, 2011, vol. 52, pp. 197–232.
- [46] S. Abramsky, “The lazy lambda calculus,” in *Research Topics in Functional Programming*, D. Turner, Ed. Addison Wesley, 1990, pp. 65–117.
- [47] A. Corradini, F. Gadducci, and U. Montanari, “Relating two categorical models of term rewriting,” in *Proc. of RTA 1995*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, J. Hsiang, Ed., vol. 914. Springer, 1995, pp. 225–240.
- [48] J. Meseguer, “Twenty years of rewriting logic,” *The Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming*, vol. 81, no. 7, pp. 721–781, 2012, rewriting Logic and its Applications.
- [49] H. Bäumer, “On the use of relation algebra in the theory of reduction systems,” in *CSN*, vol. 92, 1992, p. 5464.
- [50] G. Struth, “Calculating church-rosser proofs in kleene algebra,” in *Proc. of ReMICS 2001*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, H. C. M. de Swart, Ed., vol. 2561. Springer, 2001, pp. 276–290.
- [51] H. Doornbos, R. C. Backhouse, and J. van der Woude, “A calculational approach to mathematical induction,” *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 179, no. 1-2, pp. 103–135, 1997.
- [52] G. Struth, “Abstract abstract reduction,” *J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program.*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 239–270, 2006.
- [53] L. Bachmair and N. Dershowitz, “Commutation, transformation, and termination,” in *Proc. of International Conference on Automated Deduction 1986*. Springer, 1986, pp. 5–20.
- [54] F. Gavazzo and C. Faggian, “A relational theory of monadic rewriting systems, part I,” in *Proc. of LICS 2021*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–14.
- [55] R. Belohlávek, T. Kuhr, and V. Vychodil, “Confluence and termination of fuzzy relations,” *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 180, no. 17, pp. 3288–3303, 2010.
- [56] —, “Confluence and related properties of fuzzy relations,” in *FUZZ-IEEE 2009, IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems, Jeju Island, Korea, 20-24 August 2009, Proceedings*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 569–574.
- [57] T. Kuhr and V. Vychodil, “Rewriting systems over similarity and generalized pseudometric spaces and their properties,” *Fuzzy Sets Syst.*, vol. 275, pp. 110–129, 2015.
- [58] F. Gavazzo and C. Di Florio, “Elements of quantitative rewriting,” *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, vol. 7, no. POPL, jan 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571256>
- [59] G. Gonthier, J. Lévy, and P. Melliès, “An abstract standardisation theorem,” in *Proc. of LICS 1992*. IEEE Computer Society, 1992, pp. 72–81.
- [60] P. Melliès, “A factorisation theorem in rewriting theory,” in *Proc. of CTCS 1997*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, E. Moggi and G. Rosolini, Eds., vol. 1290. Springer, 1997, pp. 49–68.
- [61] —, “A stability theorem in rewriting theory,” in *Proc. of LICS 1998*. IEEE Computer Society, 1998, pp. 287–298.
- [62] —, “Axiomatic rewriting theory II: the $\lambda\sigma$ -calculus enjoys finite normalisation cones,” *J. Log. Comput.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 461–487, 2000.
- [63] —, “Axiomatic rewriting theory VI residual theory revisited,” in *Proc. of RTA 2002*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, S. Tison, Ed., vol. 2378. Springer, 2002, pp. 24–50.
- [64] —, “Axiomatic rewriting theory I: A diagrammatic standardization theorem,” in *Processes, Terms and Cycles: Steps on the Road to Infinity, Essays Dedicated to Jan Willem Klop, on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, A. Middeldorp, V. van Oostrom, F. van Raamsdonk, and R. C. de Vrijer, Eds., vol. 3838. Springer, 2005, pp. 554–638.
- [65] A. D. Gordon, “Bisimilarity as a theory of functional programming,” in *Proc. of MFPS 1995*, ser. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, S. D. Brookes, M. G. Main, A. Melton, and M. W. Mislove, Eds., vol. 1. Elsevier, 1995, pp. 232–252.
- [66] R. C. Backhouse, “Galois connections and fixed point calculus,” in *Algebraic and Coalgebraic Methods in the Mathematics of Program Construction, International Summer School and Workshop, Oxford, UK, April 10-14, 2000, Revised Lectures*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, R. C. Backhouse, R. L. Crole, and J. Gibbons, Eds., vol. 2297. Springer, 2000, pp. 89–148.
- [67] D. Hoffman, “A cottage industry of lax extensions,” *Categories and General Algebraic Structures with Applications*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 113–151, 2015.
- [68] R. C. Backhouse and P. F. Hoogendijk, “Elements of a relational theory of datatypes,” in *Formal Program Development - IFIP TC2/WG 2.1 State-of-the-Art Report*, 1993, pp. 7–42.
- [69] A. Kurz and J. Velebil, “Relation lifting, a survey,” *J. Log. Algebr. Meth. Program.*, vol. 85, no. 4, pp. 475–499, 2016.
- [70] Y. Kawahara, “Notes on the universality of relational functors,” *Memoirs of the Faculty of Science, Kyushu University. Series A, Mathematics*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 275–289, 1973.
- [71] R. C. Backhouse, P. J. de Bruin, P. F. Hoogendijk, G. Malcolm, E. Voermans, and J. van der Woude, “Polynomial relators (extended abstract),” in *Proc. of (AMAST ’91, ser. Workshops in Computing*, Springer, 1991, pp. 303–326.
- [72] J. Lambek, “A fixpoint theorem for complete categories,” *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, vol. 103, pp. 151–161, 1968.
- [73] P. Selinger, *A Survey of Graphical Languages for Monoidal Categories*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 289–355.
- [74] F. Bonchi, R. Piedeleu, P. Sobocinski, and F. Zanasi, “Bialgebraic semantics for string diagrams,” in *30th International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2019, August 27-30, 2019, Amsterdam, the Netherlands*, ser. LIPIcs, W. J. Fokkink and R. van Glabbeek, Eds., vol. 140. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019, pp. 37:1–37:17.
- [75] F. Bonchi, F. Gadducci, A. Kissinger, P. Sobocinski, and F. Zanasi, “String diagram rewrite theory i: Rewriting with frobenius structure,” *Journal of the ACM*, 2022.
- [76] —, “String diagram rewrite theory ii: Rewriting with symmetric monoidal structure,” *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 2022.
- [77] —, “String diagram rewrite theory iii: Confluence with and without frobenius,” *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 2022.
- [78] D. Pous, C. Doczkal, I. Stucke, and Coq development team, “Relation algebra and kat in coq.” [Online]. Available: <http://perso.ens-lyon.fr/damien.pous/ra/#desc>
- [79] S. MacLane, *Categories for the Working Mathematician*. Springer-Verlag, 1971.
- [80] J. Adámek, “Free algebras and automata realizations in the language of categories,” *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, vol. 015, no. 4, pp. 589–602, 1974.
- [81] B. Jacobs, *Introduction to Coalgebra: Towards Mathematics of States and Observation*, ser. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science. Cambridge University Press, 2016, vol. 59.
- [82] H. Barendregt, *The lambda calculus: its syntax and semantics*, ser. Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics. North-Holland, 1984.

- [83] M. Miculan, “A categorical model of the fusion calculus,” in *Proceedings of the 24th Conference on the Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics, MFPS 2008, Philadelphia, PA, USA, May 22-25, 2008*, ser. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, A. Bauer and M. W. Mislove, Eds., vol. 218. Elsevier, 2008, pp. 275–293.
- [84] E. Robinson, “Variations on algebra: Monadicity and generalisations of equational theories,” *Formal Aspects Comput.*, vol. 13, no. 3-5, pp. 308–326, 2002.
- [85] R. Matthes and T. Uustalu, “Substitution in non-wellfounded syntax with variable binding,” *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 82, no. 1, pp. 191–205, 2003, cMCS’03, Coalgebraic Methods in Computer Science (Satellite Event for ETAPS 2003).
- [86] M. P. Fiore, “Second-order and dependently-sorted abstract syntax,” in *Proc. of LICS 2008*. IEEE Computer Society, 2008, pp. 57–68.
- [87] A. Hirschowitz and M. Maggesi, “Modules over monads and linearity,” in *Proc. of WoLLIC 2007*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, D. Leivant and R. J. G. B. de Queiroz, Eds., vol. 4576. Springer, 2007, pp. 218–237.
- [88] —, “Modules over monads and initial semantics,” *Inf. Comput.*, vol. 208, no. 5, pp. 545–564, 2010.
- [89] A. Hirschowitz, T. Hirschowitz, and A. Lafont, “Modules over monads and operational semantics (expanded version),” *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, vol. 18, no. 3, 2022.
- [90] A. Hirschowitz, T. Hirschowitz, A. Lafont, and M. Maggesi, “Variable binding and substitution for (nameless) dummies,” in *Proc. of FOSACS 2022*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, P. Bouyer and L. Schröder, Eds., vol. 13242. Springer, 2022, pp. 389–408.
- [91] M. Menni, “About n -quantifiers,” *Appl. Categorical Struct.*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 421–445, 2003.
- [92] O. de Moor, “Categories, relations and dynamic programming,” *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 33–69, 1994. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129500000360>
- [93] A. Gordon, “A tutorial on co-induction and functional programming,” in *Workshops in Computing*. Springer London, September 1994, pp. 78–95.
- [94] C. Hermida and B. Jacobs, “Structural induction and coinduction in a fibrational setting,” *Inf. Comput.*, vol. 145, no. 2, pp. 107–152, 1998.
- [95] D. Hofmann, G. Seal, and W. Tholen, Eds., *Monoïdal Topology. A Categorical Approach to Order, Metric, and Topology*, ser. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2014, no. 153.
- [96] B. Davey and H. Priestley, *Introduction to lattices and order*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [97] M. Hamana, “An initial algebra approach to term rewriting systems with variable binders,” *High. Order Symb. Comput.*, vol. 19, no. 2-3, pp. 231–262, 2006.
- [98] B. Jacobs and J. J. M. M. Rutten, “A tutorial on (co)algebras and (co)induction,” *Bulletin of The European Association for Theoretical Computer Science*, 1997.
- [99] P. Levy, “Infinitary howe’s method,” *Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 164, no. 1, pp. 85–104, 2006.
- [100] A. Church and J. B. Rosser, “Some properties of conversion,” *Trans. AMS*, vol. 39, pp. 472–482, 1936.
- [101] T. Yamada, “Confluence and termination of simply typed term rewriting systems,” in *Proc. of RTA 2001*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, A. Middeldorp, Ed., vol. 2051. Springer, 2001, pp. 338–352.
- [102] C. L. Ong, “Non-determinism in a functional setting,” in *Proc. of LICS 1993*. IEEE Computer Society, 1993, pp. 275–286.
- [103] U. Dal Lago, D. Sangiorgi, and M. Alberti, “On coinductive equivalences for higher-order probabilistic functional programs,” in *Proc. of POPL 2014*, 2014, pp. 297–308.
- [104] U. Dal Lago, F. Gavazzo, and P. Levy, “Effectful applicative bisimilarity: Monads, relators, and howe’s method,” in *Proc. of LICS 2017*, 2017, pp. 1–12.
- [105] U. Dal Lago and F. Gavazzo, “On bisimilarity in lambda calculi with continuous probabilistic choice,” 2019, to appear.
- [106] F. Gavazzo, “Coinductive equivalences and metrics for higher-order languages with algebraic effects,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Bologna, Italy, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://amsdottorato.unibo.it/9075/>
- [107] U. Dal Lago, F. Gavazzo, and R. Tanaka, “Effectful applicative similarity for call-by-name lambda calculi,” in *Joint Proceedings of the 18th Italian Conference on Theoretical Computer Science and the 32nd Italian Conference on Computational Logic co-located with the 2017 IEEE International Workshop on Measurements and Networking (2017 IEEE M&N)*, 2017, pp. 87–98.
- [108] R. Crubillé and U. Dal Lago, “On probabilistic applicative bisimulation and call-by-value lambda-calculi,” in *Proc. of ESOP 2014*, 2014, pp. 209–228.
- [109] D. Biernacki and S. Lenglet, “Applicative bisimilarities for call-by-name and call-by-value $\lambda\mu$ -calculus,” *Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 308, pp. 49–64, 2014.
- [110] U. Dal Lago, F. Gavazzo, and R. Tanaka, “Effectful applicative similarity for call-by-name lambda calculi,” *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 813, pp. 234–247, 2020.
- [111] U. Dal Lago and F. Gavazzo, “A relational theory of effects and coefficients,” *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, vol. 6, no. POPL, pp. 1–28, 2022.
- [112] P. Borthelle, T. Hirschowitz, and A. Lafont, “A cellular howe theorem,” in *Proc. of LICS 2020*, H. Hermans, L. Zhang, N. Kobayashi, and D. Miller, Eds. ACM, 2020, pp. 273–286.
- [113] T. Hirschowitz and A. Lafont, “A categorical framework for congruence of applicative bisimilarity in higher-order languages,” *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, vol. 18, no. 3, 2022.
- [114] H. Urbat, S. Tsampas, S. Goncharov, S. Milius, and L. Schröder, “Weak similarity in higher-order mathematical operational semantics,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2302.08200, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.08200>
- [115] A. Joyal, “Foncteurs analytiques et espèces de structures,” *Comptes rendus de l’Académie des sciences. Série I. Mathématique*, vol. 298, no. 15, pp. 393–396, 1984.
- [116] C. McBride, “The derivative of a regular type is its type of one-hole contexts (extended abstract),” 04 2009.
- [117] M. G. Abbott, T. Altenkirch, N. Ghani, and C. McBride, “Derivatives of containers,” in *Proc. of TLCA 2003*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, M. Hofmann, Ed., vol. 2701. Springer, 2003, pp. 16–30.
- [118] M. G. Abbott, T. Altenkirch, C. McBride, and N. Ghani, “for data: Differentiating data structures,” *Fundam. Informaticae*, vol. 65, no. 1-2, pp. 1–28, 2005.
- [119] M. M. Clementino, D. Hofmann, and G. Janelidze, “The monads of classical algebra are seldom weakly cartesian,” *Journal of Homotopy and Related Structures*, vol. 9, pp. 175–197, 2014.
- [120] C. Faggian, “Probabilistic rewriting: Normalization, termination, and unique normal forms,” in *Proc. of FSCD 2019*, 2019, pp. 19:1–19:25.
- [121] S. B. Lassen, “Bisimulation in untyped lambda calculus: Böhm trees and bisimulation up to context,” *Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 20, pp. 346–374, 1999.
- [122] —, “Eager normal form bisimulation,” in *Proceedings of LICS 2005*, 2005, pp. 345–354.
- [123] U. Dal Lago and F. Gavazzo, “Effectful normal form bisimulation,” in *Proc. of ESOP 2019*, 2019, pp. 263–292.
- [124] R. Hasegawa, “Two applications of analytic functors,” *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 272, no. 1-2, pp. 113–175, 2002.
- [125] H. Doornbos and B. von Karger, “On the union of well-founded relations,” *Log. J. IGPL*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 195–201, 1998.
- [126] H. Doornbos and R. C. Backhouse, “Algebra of program termination,” in *Algebraic and Coalgebraic Methods in the Mathematics of Program Construction, International Summer School and Workshop, Oxford, UK, April 10-14, 2000, Revised Lectures*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, R. C. Backhouse, R. L. Crole, and J. Gibbons, Eds., vol. 2297. Springer, 2000, pp. 203–236.
- [127] H. Curry and R. Feys, *Combinatory Logic*, ser. Combinatory Logic. North-Holland Publishing Company, 1958, no. v. 1.
- [128] B. Accattoli, C. Faggian, and G. Guerrieri, “Factorize factorization,” in *Proc. of CSL 2021*, ser. LIPIcs, C. Baier and J. Goubault-Larrecq, Eds., vol. 183. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021, pp. 6:1–6:25.
- [129] E. Nelson, “Iterative algebras,” *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 67–94, 1983.
- [130] J. Endrullis, H. H. Hansen, D. Hendriks, A. Polonsky, and A. Silva, “Coinductive foundations of infinitary rewriting and infinitary equational logic,” *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2018.
- [131] C. Schubert, “Lax algebras: A scenic approach,” Ph.D. dissertation, Universität Bremen, 2006.
- [132] F. Gavazzo, “Quantitative behavioural reasoning for higher-order effectful programs: Applicative distances,” in *Proceedings of the 33rd*

Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2018, Oxford, UK, July 09-12, 2018, 2018, pp. 452–461.

- [133] D. Orchard, V.-B. Liepelt, and H. Eades III, “Quantitative program reasoning with graded modal types,” *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, vol. 3, no. ICFP, pp. 110:1–110:30, 2019.
- [134] F. Dagnino and F. Pasquali, “Logical foundations of quantitative equality,” pp. 16:1–16:13, 2022.
- [135] A. K. Wright and M. Felleisen, “A syntactic approach to type soundness,” *Inf. Comput.*, vol. 115, no. 1, pp. 38–94, 1994.
- [136] G. D. Plotkin and J. Power, “Adequacy for algebraic effects,” in *Proc. of FOSSACS 2001*, 2001, pp. 1–24.