

Higher-Order Termination From Kruskal to Computability

Jean-Pierre Jouannaud
École Polytechnique
91400 Palaiseau, France

Project LogiCal, Pôle Commun de Recherche en
Informatique du Plateau de Saclay, CNRS, École
Polytechnique, INRIA, Université Paris-Sud.

Joint work with Frédéric Blanqui and Albert Rubio

Workshop RHO 2006, London, october 17, 2006

Outline

- 1 Higher-order algebras
- 2 Tait's method
- 3 Recursive path ordering
- 4 General Schema
- 5 Higher Order Recursive Path Ordering
- 6 HORPO and Closure

Higher-order algebras [Jouannaud, Rubio, JACM to appear]

- \mathcal{S} : set of *sort symbols* of a fixed arity, denoted by $s : *^n \Rightarrow *$

- $$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}} := s(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}^n) \mid (\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}})$$

for $s : *^n \Rightarrow * \in \mathcal{S}$

- $$\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{X} \mid (\lambda \mathcal{X}. \mathcal{T}) \mid @(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}) \mid \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}, \dots, \mathcal{T}).$$

We will sometimes write $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{T})$ for $@(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T})$.

- \mathcal{S} : set of *sort symbols* of a fixed arity, denoted by $\mathbf{s} : *^n \Rightarrow *$



$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}} := \mathbf{s}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}^n) \mid (\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}})$$

for $\mathbf{s} : *^n \Rightarrow * \in \mathcal{S}$



$$\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{X} \mid (\lambda \mathcal{X}. \mathcal{T}) \mid @(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}) \mid \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}, \dots, \mathcal{T}).$$

We will sometimes write $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{T})$ for $@(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T})$.

- \mathcal{S} : set of *sort symbols* of a fixed arity, denoted by $s : *^n \Rightarrow *$



$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}} := s(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}^n) \mid (\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}})$$

for $s : *^n \Rightarrow * \in \mathcal{S}$



$$\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{X} \mid (\lambda \mathcal{X}. \mathcal{T}) \mid @(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}) \mid \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}, \dots, \mathcal{T}).$$

We will sometimes write $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{T})$ for $@(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T})$.

Variables:

$$\frac{x : \sigma \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : \sigma}$$

Abstraction:

$$\frac{\Gamma \cup \{x : \sigma\} \vdash t : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x : \sigma. t) : \sigma \rightarrow \tau}$$

Functions:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} f : \sigma_1 \times \dots \times \sigma_n \Rightarrow \sigma \\ \Gamma \vdash t_1 : \tau_1 \dots \Gamma \vdash t_n : \tau_n \\ \theta = mgu(\sigma_1 = \tau_1 \ \& \ \dots \ \& \ \sigma_n = \tau_n) \end{array}}{\Gamma \vdash f(t_1, \dots, t_n) : \sigma}$$

Application:

$$\frac{\Gamma \cup \{x : \sigma\} \vdash s : \sigma \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash t : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash @(s, t) : \tau}$$

Higher-order rules, first-order pattern matching

\mathbf{N}, α : *

$0, x$: \mathbf{N}

s : $\mathbf{N} \Rightarrow \mathbf{N}$

rec : $\mathbf{N} \times \alpha \times (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha$

U : α

X : $\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$

$rec(0, U, X) \rightarrow U$

$rec(s(x), U, X) \rightarrow @(X, x, rec(x, U, X))$

Higher-order rules, first-order pattern matching

α : *

$0, x$: Ord

s : $Ord \rightarrow Ord$

lim : $(\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \Rightarrow Ord$

rec : $Ord \times \alpha \times (Ord \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \times ((\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha)$
 $\rightarrow \alpha$

F : $\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord$

U : α

X : $Ord \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$

W : $(\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$

$rec(0, U, X, W) \rightarrow U$

$rec(s(x), U, X, W) \rightarrow @(X, x, rec(x, U, X, W))$

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \rightarrow @(W, F, \lambda n. rec(@(F, n), U, X, W))$

Automate strong normalization proofs

Tait's method

- Simple type discipline
- One rewrite schema:

$$@(\lambda x.u, v) \rightarrow u\{x \mapsto v\}$$

- $\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$, the *computability predicate* of type σ s.t.:
- (i) computable terms are **strongly normalizing**;
 - (ii) reducts of computable terms are computable;
 - (iii) a **neutral term** u is computable iff all its reducts are computable;
 - (iv) $u : \sigma \rightarrow \tau$ is computable iff so is $@(u, v)$ for all computable v ;
 - (v) (optionnal) $\lambda x. u$ is computable iff so is $u\{x \mapsto v\}$ for all computable v .

Except (v), no explicit mention of β -reduction.

- Basic types: there are two possibilities

$s : \sigma \in \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$ iff s is strongly normalizing
or

$s : \sigma \in \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$ iff $\forall t : \tau$ s.t. $s \longrightarrow t$ then $t \in \llbracket \tau \rrbracket$

- Functional types:

$s : \theta \rightarrow \tau \in \llbracket \sigma \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket$ iff $@(s, u) : \tau \in \llbracket \tau \rrbracket$ for every $u : \theta \in \llbracket \theta \rrbracket$.

Given term s and computable substitution γ , then $s\gamma$ is computable.

By induction on the structure of terms.

- 1 $s \in \mathcal{X}$. $s\gamma$ computable by assumption.
- 2 $s = @(u, v)$. $u\gamma$ and $v\gamma$ are computable by induction hypothesis, hence $s\gamma = @(u\gamma, v\gamma)$ is computable by computability property (iv).
- 3 $s = \lambda x.u$. By property (v), $s\gamma = \lambda x.u\gamma$ is computable iff $u\gamma\{x \mapsto v\} = u(\gamma \cup \{x \mapsto v\})$ is computable for all computable v . We conclude by induction hypothesis.

Recursive path ordering

Recursive path ordering: $s \succ_{rpo} t$ iff

- 1 $s = f(\bar{s})$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}$, and $u \succ_{rpo} t$ for some $u \in \bar{s}$
- 2 $s = f(\bar{s})$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}$, and $t = g(\bar{t})$ with $f \succ_{\mathcal{F}} g$, and A
- 3 $s = f(\bar{s})$ and $t = g(\bar{t})$ with $f =_{\mathcal{F}} g$, and A and $\bar{s} (\succ_{rpo})_{stat_f} \bar{t}$

$$\text{where } \begin{cases} s \succ_{rpo} t \text{ iff } s \succ_{rpo} t \text{ or } s = t \\ A = \forall v \in \bar{t}. f(\bar{s}) \succ_{horpo} v \end{cases}$$

Computability is defined as strong normalization, implying all computability properties trivially. We add a new computability property:

(vi) Let $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and \bar{s} be computable terms. Then $f(\bar{s})$ is computable.

Tait's strong normalization proof of RPO

First (vi): \bar{s} computable implies $f(\bar{s})$ computable.

The restriction of \succ_{rpo} to terms smaller than or equal to the terms in \bar{s} w.r.t. \succ_{rpo} is a well-founded ordering which we use for building an outer induction on the pairs (f, \bar{s}) ordered by $(\succ_{\mathcal{F}}, (\succ_{rpo})_{stat_f})_{lex}$.

We now show that $f(\bar{s})$ is computable by proving that t is computable for all t such that $f(\bar{s}) \succ_{rpo} t$. This property is itself proved by an inner induction on $|t|$, and by case analysis upon the proof that $f(\bar{s}) \succ_{rpo} t$.

- 1 subterm: $\exists u \in \bar{s}$ such that $u \succ_{rpo} t$. By assumption, u is computable. Reduct t too.
- 2 precedence: $t = g(\bar{t})$, $f >_{\mathcal{F}} g$, and $s \succ_{rpo} \bar{t}$. By inner induction, \bar{t} is computable. By outer induction, $g(\bar{t}) = t$ is computable.
- 3 status: $t = g(\bar{t})$ with $f =_{\mathcal{F}} g \in Lex$, $\bar{s}(\succ_{rpo})_{lex} \bar{t}$, and $s \succ_{rpo} \bar{t}$. By inner induction, \bar{t} is computable. By outer induction, $g(\bar{t}) = t$ is computable. \square

We prove by induction on the structure of terms that every term $t = f(\bar{t})$ is computable.

By induction hypothesis, \bar{t} is computable. By property (vi), t is computable.

The well-foundedness of \succ_{rpo} follows by Property (i).

General Schema

The *computability closure* $\mathcal{CC}(t = f(\bar{t}))$, with $f \in \mathcal{F}$, is the set $\mathcal{CC}(t, \emptyset)$, s.t. $\mathcal{CC}(t, \mathcal{V})$, with $\mathcal{V} \cap \text{Var}(t) = \emptyset$, is the smallest set of typable terms containing all variables in \mathcal{V} and terms in \bar{t} , closed under:

- 1 basic type subterm; application; abstraction;
- 2 precedence: let $f >_{\mathcal{F}} g$, and $\bar{s} \in \mathcal{CC}(t, \mathcal{V})$; then $g(\bar{s}) \in \mathcal{CC}(t, \mathcal{V})$;
- 3 recursive call: let $f(\bar{s})$ be a term s.t. terms in \bar{s} belong to $\mathcal{CC}(t, \mathcal{V})$ and $\bar{t}(\longrightarrow_{\beta_{\text{UD}}})_{\text{stat}_f} \bar{s}$; then $g(\bar{s}) \in \mathcal{CC}(t, \mathcal{V})$ for every $g =_{\mathcal{F}} f$;
- 4 reduction: let $u \in \mathcal{CC}(t, \mathcal{V})$, and $u \longrightarrow_{\beta_{\text{UD}}} v$; then $v \in \mathcal{CC}(t, \mathcal{V})$.

We say that a rewrite system R satisfies the *general schema* if

$$R = \{f(\bar{I}) \rightarrow r \mid r \in \mathcal{CC}(f(\bar{I}))\}$$

We now consider computability with respect to the rewrite relation $\longrightarrow_R \cup \longrightarrow_\beta$, and add the computability property (vii) whose proof can be easily adapted from the previous one. We can then add a new case in Tait's Main Lemma, for terms headed by an algebraic function symbol.

Conclusion: $\longrightarrow_\beta \cup \longrightarrow_R$ is SN.

$$\text{rec}(s(x), U, X) \rightarrow @ (X, x, \text{rec}(x, U, X))$$

Higher Order Recursive Path Ordering

- A quasi-ordering on types $\geq_{\mathcal{I}_S}$ called *the type ordering* s.t.
 - (i) $>_{\mathcal{I}_S}$ is well-founded;
 - (ii) **Arrow preservation:** $\tau \rightarrow \sigma =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ iff $\alpha = \tau' \rightarrow \sigma'$, $\tau' =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \tau$ and $\sigma =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \sigma'$;
 - (iii) **Arrow decreasingness:** $\tau \rightarrow \sigma >_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ implies $\sigma \geq_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ or $\alpha = \tau' \rightarrow \sigma'$, $\tau' =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \tau$ and $\sigma >_{\mathcal{I}_S} \sigma'$;
 - (iv) **Arrow monotonicity:** $\tau \geq_{\mathcal{I}_S} \sigma$ implies $\alpha \rightarrow \tau \geq_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha \rightarrow \sigma$ and $\tau \rightarrow \alpha \geq_{\mathcal{I}_S} \sigma \rightarrow \alpha$;

Example: RPO with restricted subterm for \rightarrow

- A quasi-ordering $\geq_{\mathcal{F}}$ on \mathcal{F} , called the *precedence*, such that $>_{\mathcal{F}}$ is well-founded.
- A *status* $stat_f \in \{Mul, Lex\}$ for every symbol $f \in \mathcal{F}$.

HORPO's Definition: $s \succ_{horpo} t$ iff $\sigma \succeq_{\mathcal{I}_S} \tau$ and

- 1 $s = f(\bar{s})$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}$, and $u \succeq_{horpo} t$ for $u \in \bar{s}$
- 2 $s = f(\bar{s})$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}$, and $t = g(\bar{t})$ with $f \succ_{\mathcal{F}} g$, and A
- 3 $s = f(\bar{s})$ and $t = g(\bar{t})$ with $f =_{\mathcal{F}} g$, and A and $\bar{s} \left(\succeq_{horpo} \right)_{stat_f} \bar{t}$

where $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} s \succeq_{horpo} t \text{ iff } s \succ_{horpo} t \text{ or } s =_{\alpha} t \\ A = \forall v \in \bar{t}. s \succ_{horpo} v \text{ or } \exists u \in \bar{s}. u \succeq_{horpo} v \end{array} \right.$

- 4 $s = f(\bar{s})$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $t = @(\bar{t})$ and A
- 5 $s = f(\bar{s})$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $t = \lambda x : \alpha. v$ with $x \notin \text{Var}(v)$ and $s \succ_{horpo} v$

Higher-Order Recursive Path Ordering : Definition

- 6 $s = @(s_1, s_2)$, and $s_1 \underset{horpo}{\succ} t$ or $s_2 \underset{horpo}{\succ} t$
- 7 $s = @(\bar{s})$, $t = @(\bar{t})$, and $\bar{s} \underset{horpo}{\succ} \bar{t}$
- 8 $s = @(\lambda x : \alpha. u, v)$ and $u\{x \mapsto v\} \underset{horpo}{\succ} t$
- 9 $s = \lambda x : \alpha. u$ with $x \notin \text{Var}(t)$, and $u \underset{horpo}{\succ} t$
- 10 $s = \lambda x : \alpha. u$, $t = \lambda x : \beta. v$, $\alpha =_{\mathcal{T}_S} \beta$, and $u \underset{horpo}{\succ} v$
- 11 $s = \lambda x : \alpha. @(u, x)$, $x \notin \text{Var}(u)$ and $u \underset{horpo}{\succ} t$

Example: simple proof of system T

$$\text{rec}(s(x), U, X) \rightarrow @ (X, x, \text{rec}(x, U, X))$$

HORPO and Closure

We change the subterm case:

$$\textcircled{1} \quad s = f(\bar{s}) \text{ with } f \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } u \underset{\text{horpo}}{\succeq} t \text{ for } u \in \bar{s}$$

in

$$s = f(\bar{s}) \text{ with } f \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } u \underset{\text{horpo}}{\succeq} t \text{ for } u \in \mathcal{CC}(f(\bar{s}))$$

Drawbacks:

- $\textcircled{1}$ Decidability of HORPO is lost;
- $\textcircled{2}$ There are many repetitions;
- $\textcircled{3}$ Type checking is no much help, but a lot of burden;
- $\textcircled{4}$ Treatment of abstractions remains weak.

Ingredients:

- 1 A set of strictly positive inductive types inducing an accessibility relationship $\bar{s} \triangleq_{acc} V$ such that $v \in \bar{u}$ or v is accessible from $u \in \bar{s}$
- 2 a precedence on function symbols
- 3 a congruence on types
- 4 $s \succ^X t$ for the main ordering
- 5 $s : \sigma \succ_{I_S}^X t : \tau$ for $s \succ^X t$ and $\sigma =_{I_S} \tau$
- 6 $l \succ_{I_S}^{\emptyset} r$ as initial call for each $l \rightarrow r \in R$

Definition : $s \succ^X t$ iff

Case 1: $s = f(\bar{s})$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $t \in X$ or

- 1 $u \preceq_{T_S}^X t$ for some u such that $\bar{s} \triangleright_{acc} u$
- 2 $t = g(\bar{t})$ with $f \succ_{\mathcal{F}} g \in \mathcal{F} \cup \{\text{@}\}$ and $s \succ^X \bar{t}$
- 3 $t = g(\bar{t})$ with $f =_{\mathcal{F}} g \in \mathcal{F}$ and $s \succ^X \bar{t}$ and $\bar{s} (\succ_{T_S}^X)_{stat_f} \bar{t}$
- 4 $t = \lambda x. u$ with $x \notin X$ and $f(\bar{s}) \succ^{X \cup \{x\}} u$

Case 2: $s = \text{@}(v, w)$ and

- 1 $t = \text{@}(u, r)$ and $(v, w) (\succ_{T_S}^X)_{mon} (u, r)$
- 2 $v = \lambda x. u$ and $u\{x \mapsto w\} \succ^X t$

Case 3: $s = \lambda x : \alpha. u$ and

- 1 $t = \lambda x : \beta. v$, $x \notin X$, $\alpha =_{T_S} \beta$ and $u \succ^{X \cup \{x\}} v$
- 2 $u = \text{@}(v, x)$, $x \notin \text{Var}(v)$ and $v \succ^X t$

Case 1: $s = f(\bar{s})$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $t \in X$ or

- ① $u \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^X t$ for some u such that $\bar{s} \triangleright_{acc} u$
- ② $t = g(\bar{t})$ with $f \succ_{\mathcal{F}} g \in \mathcal{F} \cup \{\text{@}\}$ and $s \succ^X \bar{t}$
- ③ $t = g(\bar{t})$ with $f =_{\mathcal{F}} g \in \mathcal{F}$ and $s \succ^X \bar{t}$ and $\bar{s} (\succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^X)_{stat_f} \bar{t}$
- ④ $t = \lambda x. u$ with $x \notin X$ and $f(\bar{s}) \succ^{X \cup \{x\}} u$

Case 2: $s = \text{@}(v, w)$ and

- ① $t = \text{@}(u, r)$ and $(v, w) (\succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^X)_{mon} (u, r)$
- ② $v = \lambda x. u$ and $u\{x \mapsto w\} \succ^X t$

Case 3: $s = \lambda x : \alpha. u$ and

- ① $t = \lambda x : \beta. v$, $x \notin X$, $\alpha =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \beta$ and $u \succ^{X \cup \{x\}} v$
- ② $u = \text{@}(v, x)$, $x \notin \text{Var}(v)$ and $v \succ^X t$

Case 1: $s = f(\bar{s})$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $t \in X$ or

- ① $u \succeq_{T_S}^X t$ for some u such that $\bar{s} \triangleright_{acc} u$
- ② $t = g(\bar{t})$ with $f \succ_{\mathcal{F}} g \in \mathcal{F} \cup \{\text{@}\}$ and $s \succ^X \bar{t}$
- ③ $t = g(\bar{t})$ with $f =_{\mathcal{F}} g \in \mathcal{F}$ and $s \succ^X \bar{t}$ and $\bar{s} (\succ_{T_S}^X)_{stat_f} \bar{t}$
- ④ $t = \lambda x. u$ with $x \notin X$ and $f(\bar{s}) \succ^{X \cup \{x\}} u$

Case 2: $s = \text{@}(v, w)$ and

- ① $t = \text{@}(u, r)$ and $(v, w) (\succ_{T_S}^X)_{mon} (u, r)$
- ② $v = \lambda x. u$ and $u\{x \mapsto w\} \succ^X t$

Case 3: $s = \lambda x : \alpha. u$ and

- ① $t = \lambda x : \beta. v$, $x \notin X$, $\alpha =_{T_S} \beta$ and $u \succ^{X \cup \{x\}} v$
- ② $u = \text{@}(v, x)$, $x \notin \text{Var}(v)$ and $v \succ^X t$

Brouwer's ordinals

$lim : (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \Rightarrow Ord$ $F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord$ $n : \mathbf{N}$
 $rec : Or \times \alpha \times (Or \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \times ((\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Or) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha$

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{Ts}^{\emptyset} @(W, F, \lambda n.rec(@(F, n), U, X, W))$
yields 2 subgoals:

- 1 $\alpha =_{Ts} \alpha$ which is trivially satisfied, and
- 2 $rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ^{\emptyset} \{W, F, \lambda n.rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$
which simplifies to:
 - 1 $rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ^{\emptyset} W$ which succeeds by Case 1.1,
 - 2 $rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ^{\emptyset} F$, which succeeds by Case 1.1,
 - 3 $rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ^{\emptyset} \lambda n.rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields
 - 4 $rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ^{(n)} rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields
 - 5 $\{lim(F), U, X, W\} \succ_{Ts}^{(n)} mul\{(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$, hence
 - 6 $lim(F) \succ_{Ts}^{(n)} @(F, n)$ whose type-check succeeds, and yields
 - 7 $lim(F) \succ^{(n)} F$ which succeeds by Case 1.2, and
 - 8 $lim(F) \succ^{(n)} n$ which succeeds by Case 1.
- 3 $rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ^{(n)} \{(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$, our remaining goal, succeeds easily by Cases 1.2.

Brouwer's ordinals

$lim : (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \Rightarrow Ord \quad F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord \quad n : \mathbf{N}$
 $rec : Or \times \alpha \times (Or \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \times ((\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Or) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha$

1

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} @(W, F, \lambda n. rec(@(F, n), U, X, W))$
yields 2 subgoals:

2

$\alpha =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ which is trivially satisfied, and

3

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \{W, F, \lambda n. rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$
which simplifies to:

4

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} W$ which succeeds by Case 1.1,

5

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} F$, which succeeds by Case 1.1,

6

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \lambda n. rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

7

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

8

$\{lim(F), U, X, W\} \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \text{mul}\{(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$, hence

9

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} @(F, n)$ whose type-check succeeds, and yields

10

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} F$ which succeeds by Case 1.2, and

11

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} n$ which succeeds by Case 1.

12

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$, our remaining goal, succeeds easily by Cases 1.2. 1 and 1.1

Brouwer's ordinals

$lim : (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \Rightarrow Ord \quad F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord \quad n : \mathbf{N}$
 $rec : Or \times \alpha \times (Or \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \times ((\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Or) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha$

1

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} @(W, F, \lambda n. rec(@(F, n), U, X, W))$
yields 2 subgoals:

2

$\alpha =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ which is trivially satisfied, and

3

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \{W, F, \lambda n. rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$
which simplifies to:

4

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} W$ which succeeds by Case 1.1,

5

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} F$, which succeeds by Case 1.1,

6

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \lambda n. rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

7

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

8

$\{lim(F), U, X, W\} \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \text{mul}\{(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$, hence

9

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} @(F, n)$ whose type-check succeeds, and yields

10

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} F$ which succeeds by Case 1.2, and

11

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} n$ which succeeds by Case 1.

12

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$, our remaining goal, succeeds easily by Cases 1.2. 1 and 1.1

Brouwer's ordinals

$lim : (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \Rightarrow Ord \quad F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord \quad n : \mathbf{N}$
 $rec : Or \times \alpha \times (Or \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \times ((\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Or) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha$

1

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} @(W, F, \lambda n.rec(@(F, n), U, X, W))$
yields 2 subgoals:

2

$\alpha =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ which is trivially satisfied, and

3

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \{W, F, \lambda n.rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$
which simplifies to:

4

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} W$ which succeeds by Case 1.1,

5

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} F$, which succeeds by Case 1.1,

6

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \lambda n.rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

7

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

8

$\{lim(F), U, X, W\} \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \text{mul}\{@(F, n), U, X, W\}$, hence

9

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} @(F, n)$ whose type-check succeeds, and yields

10

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} F$ which succeeds by Case 1.2, and

11

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} n$ which succeeds by Case 1.

12

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{@(F, n), U, X, W\}$, our remaining goal, succeeds easily by Cases 1.2.1 and 1.1.1

Brouwer's ordinals

$lim : (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \Rightarrow Ord \quad F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord \quad n : \mathbf{N}$
 $rec : Or \times \alpha \times (Or \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \times ((\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Or) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha$

1

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} @(W, F, \lambda n.rec(@(F, n), U, X, W))$
yields 2 subgoals:

2

$\alpha =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ which is trivially satisfied, and

3

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \{W, F, \lambda n.rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$
which simplifies to:

4

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} W$ which succeeds by Case 1.1,

5

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} F$, which succeeds by Case 1.1,

6

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \lambda n.rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

7

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

8

$\{lim(F), U, X, W\} \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \text{mul}\{@(F, n), U, X, W\}$, hence

9

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} @(F, n)$ whose type-check succeeds, and yields

10

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} F$ which succeeds by Case 1.2, and

11

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} n$ which succeeds by Case 1.

12

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{@(F, n), U, X, W\}$, our remaining goal, succeeds easily by Cases 1.2.1 and 1.1

Brouwer's ordinals

$lim : (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \Rightarrow Ord \quad F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord \quad n : \mathbf{N}$
 $rec : Or \times \alpha \times (Or \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \times ((\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Or) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha$

1

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} @(W, F, \lambda n. rec(@(F, n), U, X, W))$
yields 2 subgoals:

2

$\alpha =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ which is trivially satisfied, and

3

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \{W, F, \lambda n. rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$
which simplifies to:

4

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} W$ which succeeds by Case 1.1,

5

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} F$, which succeeds by Case 1.1,

6

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \lambda n. rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

7

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

8

$\{lim(F), U, X, W\} \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \text{mul}\{@(F, n), U, X, W\}$, hence

9

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} @(F, n)$ whose type-check succeeds, and yields

10

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} F$ which succeeds by Case 1.2, and

11

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} n$ which succeeds by Case 1.

12

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{@(F, n), U, X, W\}$, our remaining goal, succeeds easily by Cases 1.2.1 and 1.1

Brouwer's ordinals

$lim : (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \Rightarrow Ord \quad F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord \quad n : \mathbf{N}$
 $rec : Or \times \alpha \times (Or \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \times ((\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Or) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha$

1

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} @(W, F, \lambda n. rec(@(F, n), U, X, W))$
yields 2 subgoals:

2

$\alpha =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ which is trivially satisfied, and

3

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \{W, F, \lambda n. rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$
which simplifies to:

4

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} W$ which succeeds by Case 1.1,

5

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} F$, which succeeds by Case 1.1,

6

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \lambda n. rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

7

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

8

$\{lim(F), U, X, W\} \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{@(F, n), U, X, W\}$, hence

9

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} @(F, n)$ whose type-check succeeds, and yields

10

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} F$ which succeeds by Case 1.2, and

11

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} n$ which succeeds by Case 1.

12

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{@(F, n), U, X, W\}$, our remaining goal, succeeds easily by Cases 1.2.1 and 1.1

Brouwer's ordinals

$lim : (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \Rightarrow Ord \quad F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord \quad n : \mathbf{N}$
 $rec : Or \times \alpha \times (Or \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \times ((\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Or) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha$

1

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} @(W, F, \lambda n.rec(@(F, n), U, X, W))$
yields 2 subgoals:

2

$\alpha =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ which is trivially satisfied, and

3

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \{W, F, \lambda n.rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$
which simplifies to:

4

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} W$ which succeeds by Case 1.1,

5

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} F$, which succeeds by Case 1.1,

6

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \lambda n.rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

7

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} rec(@(F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

8

$\{lim(F), U, X, W\} \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} mul\{(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$, hence

9

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} @(F, n)$ whose type-check succeeds, and yields

10

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} F$ which succeeds by Case 1.2, and

11

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} n$ which succeeds by Case 1.

12

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{(@(F, n), U, X, W)\}$, our remaining goal, succeeds easily by Cases 1.2.1 and 1.1

Brouwer's ordinals

$lim : (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \Rightarrow Ord \quad F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord \quad n : \mathbf{N}$
 $rec : Or \times \alpha \times (Or \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \times ((\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Or) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha$

1

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} @ (W, F, \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W))$
yields 2 subgoals:

2

$\alpha =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ which is trivially satisfied, and

3

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \{W, F, \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)\}$
which simplifies to:

4

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} W$ which succeeds by Case 1.1,

5

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} F$, which succeeds by Case 1.1,

6

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

7

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

8

$\{lim(F), U, X, W\} \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} mul \{ @ (F, n), U, X, W \}$, hence

9

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} @ (F, n)$ whose type-check succeeds, and yields

10

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} F$ which succeeds by Case 1.2, and

11

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} n$ which succeeds by Case 1.

12

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{ @ (F, n), U, X, W \}$, our remaining goal, succeeds easily by Cases 1.2.1 and 1.1

Brouwer's ordinals

$lim : (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \Rightarrow Ord \quad F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord \quad n : \mathbf{N}$
 $rec : Or \times \alpha \times (Or \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \times ((\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Or) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha$

1

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} @ (W, F, \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W))$
yields 2 subgoals:

2

$\alpha =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ which is trivially satisfied, and

3

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \{W, F, \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)\}$
which simplifies to:

4

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} W$ which succeeds by Case 1.1,

5

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} F$, which succeeds by Case 1.1,

6

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

7

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

8

$\{lim(F), U, X, W\} \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{@ (F, n), U, X, W\}$, hence

9

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} @ (F, n)$ whose type-check succeeds, and yields

10

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} F$ which succeeds by Case 1.2, and

11

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} n$ which succeeds by Case 1.

12

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{@ (F, n), U, X, W\}$, our remaining goal, succeeds easily by Cases 1.2.1 and 1.1

Brouwer's ordinals

$lim : (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \Rightarrow Ord \quad F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord \quad n : \mathbf{N}$
 $rec : Or \times \alpha \times (Or \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \times ((\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Or) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha$

1

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} @ (W, F, \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W))$
yields 2 subgoals:

2

$\alpha =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ which is trivially satisfied, and

3

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \{W, F, \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)\}$
which simplifies to:

4

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} W$ which succeeds by Case 1.1,

5

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} F$, which succeeds by Case 1.1,

6

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

7

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

8

$\{lim(F), U, X, W\} \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{@ (F, n), U, X, W\}$, hence

9

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} @ (F, n)$ whose type-check succeeds, and yields

10

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} F$ which succeeds by Case 1.2, and

11

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} n$ which succeeds by Case 1.

12

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{@ (F, n), U, X, W\}$, our remaining goal, succeeds easily by Cases 1.2.1 and 1.1

Brouwer's ordinals

$lim : (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \Rightarrow Ord \quad F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord \quad n : \mathbf{N}$
 $rec : Or \times \alpha \times (Or \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \times ((\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Or) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha$

1

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} @ (W, F, \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W))$
yields 2 subgoals:

2

$\alpha =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ which is trivially satisfied, and

3

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \{W, F, \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)\}$
which simplifies to:

4

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} W$ which succeeds by Case 1.1,

5

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} F$, which succeeds by Case 1.1,

6

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

7

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

8

$\{lim(F), U, X, W\} \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{ @ (F, n), U, X, W \}$, hence

9

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} @ (F, n)$ whose type-check succeeds, and yields

10

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} F$ which succeeds by Case 1.2, and

11

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} n$ which succeeds by Case 1.

12

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{ @ (F, n), U, X, W \}$, our remaining goal, succeeds easily by Cases 1.2.1 and 1.1

Brouwer's ordinals

$lim : (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord) \Rightarrow Ord \quad F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow Ord \quad n : \mathbf{N}$
 $rec : Or \times \alpha \times (Or \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \times ((\mathbf{N} \rightarrow Or) \rightarrow (\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha$

1

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} @ (W, F, \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W))$
yields 2 subgoals:

2

$\alpha =_{\mathcal{I}_S} \alpha$ which is trivially satisfied, and

3

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \{W, F, \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)\}$
which simplifies to:

4

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} W$ which succeeds by Case 1.1,

5

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} F$, which succeeds by Case 1.1,

6

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\emptyset} \lambda n. rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

7

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} rec(@ (F, n), U, X, W)$ yields

8

$\{lim(F), U, X, W\} \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \text{mul} \{ @ (F, n), U, X, W \}$, hence

9

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} @ (F, n)$ whose type-check succeeds, and yields

10

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} F$ which succeeds by Case 1.2, and

11

$lim(F) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} n$ which succeeds by Case 1.

12

$rec(lim(F), U, X, W) \succ_{\mathcal{I}_S}^{\{n\}} \{ @ (F, n), U, X, W \}$, our remaining goal, succeeds easily by Cases 1.2. 1 and 1.1

Achievements: A quite powerful powerful which adapts easily to higher-order rewriting based on higher-order pattern matching. See [Jouannaud and Rubio, RTA'2006]

Remaining problems:

- Use term interpretations instead of a precedence on function symbols;
- Integrate AC;
- Generalization to the Calculus of Inductive Constructions;
- Develop the tool (see our Web page).

Acknowledgments: to **Mitsuhiro Okada** for our long standing collaboration on these matters.