

# A generic imperative language for polynomial time

Daniel Leivant (leivant@indiana.edu)

SICE, Indiana University and IRIF, Université Paris-Diderot

## Abstract

The ramification method in Implicit Computational Complexity has been associated with functional programming, but adapting it to generic imperative programming is highly desirable, given the wider algorithmic applicability of imperative programming.

We introduce a new approach to ramification which, among other benefits, adapts readily to fully general imperative programming. The novelty is in ramifying finite second-order objects, namely finite structures, rather than ramifying elements of free algebras.

In so doing we bridge between Implicit Complexity's type theoretic characterizations of feasibility, and the data-flow approach of Static Analysis.

**Keywords:** Finite partial structures, structure transformation, imperative programs, ramification, polynomial time, implicit computational complexity.

# 1 Introduction

The analysis and certification of resource requirements of computer programs is of obvious practical as well as foundational importance. Of particular interest is the certification of *feasibility*, commonly identified with polynomial time (PTime), i.e. algorithms that terminate in a number of steps polynomial in the size of the input.

Two main approaches to the development of PTime-certified programs have been Implicit Computational Complexity (ICC) and *Static Analysis* (SA). ICC strives to characterize complexity by means that do not refer directly to resource usage. A major strand of ICC has been the design of type systems that guarantee the feasibility of *declarative* programs, based notably on data ramification and linear types. In contrast SA attempts to ascertain the feasibility of *imperative* programs, primarily via data-flow analysis at compile time. SA has the advantage of applying readily to algorithms in which inert data play a direct role, such as nodes of a graph or raw data in memory management. Consequently, bridging the two approaches, notably via type systems for imperative programs, is highly desirable.

The main ICC approach to PTime originates with Cobham’s characterization of PTime in terms of bounded recurrence [11]. Advances in this area since the 1990’s were focused on mechanisms that limit data-duplication (linearity), data-growth (non-size-increase), and nesting of iteration (predicativity) (see [40] for a survey). In its basic form, *predicative recurrence*, also known as *ramified recurrence*, refers to computational ranks, and requires that every iteration is paced by data-objects of higher rank than the output produced. This prevents the use of non-trivial computed functions as the step-functions of recurrence.

## 1.1 The ramification method

One main strand of implicit computational complexity (ICC) has been ramified recurrence, also known as “ranked”, “stratified”, “predicative”, and “normal/safe” recurrence (i.e. primitive recursion over free algebras). The approach has raised the hope for a practical delineation of feasible computing within the primitive recursive functions, which arguably include all functions of interest. This idea goes back to Ritchie and Cobham [39, 11], who introduced recurrence restricted explicitly by bounding conditions. although the characterizations they obtained use one form of bounded resources (i.e. output size) to delineate another form (i.e. time/space resources), they proved useful, for example in suggesting complexity measures for higher-order functionals [12].

A more foundational approach was initiated by a proof theoretic characterization of FTime based on a distinction between two second order definitions of the natural numbers [22]. This triggered<sup>1</sup> the “safe recurrence” characterization of PTime by Bellantoni and Cook [4], as well as the formally more general approach of [22].

---

<sup>1</sup>Personal communication with Steve Bellantoni

In fact, the ramification of programs can be traced to the type theory of Fundamenta Mathematicae [42] whose simplest form is conveyed in schütte’s ramified second order logic [41]. The idea is to prevent impredicative set quantification. A formula  $F \equiv \forall s F_0[s]$  implies in second order logic<sup>2</sup>  $F_0[\lambda x.g]$ , for any formula  $G$ , even if it is more complex than  $F$ . Thus, the truth of  $f$  depends on the truth of  $f_0[\lambda x.g]$ , which may itself have  $f$  as a subformula. While this form of circularity is generally admitted as sound, it does raise ontological and epistemological questions [17], and implies a dramatic increase in definitional, computational, and proof-theoretic complexities of second-order over first-order logic. Schütte’s ramified second-order logic blocks impredicative inferences of the kind above by assigning a rank to each set definition, starting with set variables. In particular, the rank of  $f \equiv \forall s .f_0$ , is larger than the rank of  $s$ , so  $s$  cannot be instantiated to  $f$  (or any formula having  $f$  as a subformula).

Schütte’s ramification of sets yields a separate definition of  $\mathbb{N}$  for each rank  $k$ :  $(\forall s \text{ of rank } k) c[s] \rightarrow s(x)$  where  $c[s]$  is  $s(0) \wedge \forall z. s(z) \rightarrow s(s(z))$  analogously, ramified recurrence allows the definition of a function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  with output of rank  $k$  only if the recurrence argument is of rank  $> k$ .

Ramified recurrence has been used to obtain machine-independent characterizations of several major complexity classes, such as polynomial time [4, 22] and polynomial space [26, 36], as well as alternating log time [8, 27], alternating polylog time [8], NC [23, 35], logarithmic space [34], monotonic PTime [13], linear space [21, 15, 22], NP [2, 37], the poly-time hierarchy [3], exponential time [10], Kalmar-elementary resources [24], and probabilistic polynomial time [20]. The method is all the more of interest given the roots of ramification in the foundations of mathematics [42, 41], thus bridging abstraction levels in set-theory and type-theory to computational complexity classes.

While the ramification method has the markings of practicality as well as a foundational pedigree, implementation, in particular for algorithms over finite structures, has been problematic. Notwithstanding its strengths, the ramification method has, unfortunately, failed to date to evolve into an effective practical method for static certification of computational resources. One limitation is unavoidable: *any* effective characterization of PTime is necessarily *extensional*: even if every PTime *function* is captured, not every PTime *algorithm* can be, not even via effective enumeration:

**THEOREM 1** *Let  $L$  be a Turing-complete programming language, whose programs simulate Turing machines within PTime overhead.<sup>3</sup> Let  $L^p$  consist of the PTime  $L$ -programs. Then  $L^p$  is not semi-decidable.*

A proof is given in Appendix 1.<sup>4</sup>

But the trouble with ramification is that a number of fundamental algorithms elude it. Caseiro observed [9] that important algorithms, notably for sorting, do

<sup>2</sup>We write  $\lambda x G$  for the set consisting of those elements  $a$  for which  $G$  is true under the valuation  $x \mapsto a$ .

<sup>3</sup>As do all programming languages in use.

<sup>4</sup>The undecidability of PTime is folklore, but non-semi-decidability seems to be a new observation.

use recursively defined step functions, and yet are in PTime, because those step functions are not increasing the size of their principal argument. Hofmann built on that observation [16, 1], and developed a type system for non-size-increasing PTime functions, based on linearity and an explicit account of information unit. Unfortunately, the functions obtained are all non-size-increasing, leaving open the meshing of meshing these results with full PTime.

These difficulties seem related to foundational issues. For one, confining ramification to recurrence ties it to inductive data, thereby dissociating it from finite data-structures. More generally, the focus on declarative programming complicates direct access to memory which lies at the heart of many feasible algorithms. To overcome these limitations one needs a germane applicability of the ramification method to imperative programming, which is what we are proposing.

While ramification (and closely-related methods) has been considered for imperative programming, they have focused on restricted data-types, such as stacks [19, 18], words in [30, 31], and finite graphs in [28], in constrained contexts that do not seem to generalize naturally.

The challenge is thus to design programming languages that accommodate PTime algorithmic methods as comprehensively and flexibly as possible. Given that PTime is often related to micro-code and memory management, a PTime certification framework that applies to imperative programming, and encompasses both inductive types and micro-level data, should be particularly desirable. We propose here just such a framework.

## 1.2 Static analysis

We mentioned that leading approaches to resource certification include Implicit Computational Complexity (ICC) and Static Analysis (SA). SA is algorithmic in nature: it focuses on a broad programming language of choice, and seeks to determine by syntactic means whether given programs in that language are feasible. This is in contrast to ICC, which attempts to create from the outset specialized programming languages or methods that delineate a complexity class. Thus, SA’s focus is on compile time, making no demand on the programmer; whereas ICC is a language-design discipline, that seeks to confine programming to a safe regime. The distinction between SA and ICC is not clear cut, however: the syntactic restrictions embedded in a programming language designed by ICC, might be derived by a smart compiler; conversely, program properties sought by an SA algorithm might be broad enough to be rephrased as delineating a programming language. An example of the SA approach is the line of research that refers to the Meyer-Ritchie characterization of primitive recursion by imperative “loop”-programs over  $\mathbb{N}$  [33], seeking algorithms for ascertaining the PTime termination of such programs [18, 19, 7, 5, 6].

## 1.3 A new approach to ramification

One novelty of our approach is the use of finite partial-functions as fundamental data-objects. That choice leads to using data-consumption as a generic form

of recurrence, capturing primitive recursive complexity [29]. However, a simple-minded ramification of data-depletion is fruitless, because it blocks all forms of duplication, resulting in linear-time programs.<sup>5</sup> We resolve this snag by ramifying all data, and trading off size-reduction of depleted data with size-increase of non-depleted data within the same rank.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the use of finite partial (fp) functions as basic data, and describes an imperative programming language of primitive-recursive complexity, based on fp-functions depletion [25, 29]. Section 3 introduces the ramified programming language **STR**, shows that it is sound for PTime, and presents examples that illustrate the methods and scope of the language. Some of those examples are used in §4 to prove that **STR** is extensionally complete for PTime, i.e. has a program for every PTime mapping between finite partial-structures. The conclusion (§5) argues that the method is particularly amenable to serve as a synthesis of an ICC core language, whose implementation can be refined using SA methods.

## 2 Programs for transformation of structured data

### 2.1 Finite functions as data objects

Basic data objects come in two forms: structure-less “points”, such as the nodes of graphs, versus elements of inductive data, such as natural numbers and strings over an alphabet. The former have no independent computational content, whereas the computational nature of the latter is conveyed by the recursive definition of the entire data type to which they belong, via the corresponding recurrence operators. This dichotomy is antithetical, however, to an ancient alternative approach that takes individual inductive data objects, such as natural numbers, to be finite structures on their own, whose computational behavior is governed by their internal makings [14, 32]. Under this approach, computing over inductive data is reduced to operating over finite structures, and functions over inductive data are construed as mappings between finite structures.

Embracing this approach yields a number of benefits. First, we obtain a common “hardware-based” platform for programming not only within finite structures, but also for the transformation of inductive data. Conjoining these two provides a common platform for microcode and high-level programming constructs. In particular, the depletion of natural numbers the drives the schema of recurrence over  $\mathbb{N}$ , is generalized here to the depletion of finite functions as loop variants.

Yet another benefit of our approach is the generalization of the ramification method in implicit computational complexity to imperative programs over finite structures. The step of ramifying recurrence over  $\mathbb{N}$  (or  $\{0, 1\}^*$ ) to obtain a

---

<sup>5</sup>This issue does not come up with traditional ramified recurrence, due to the free repetition of variables in function composition.

PTime form of recurrence, is reformulated here in an imperative context which provides greater algorithmic flexibility, and deals with algorithms that are difficult to express using traditional ramified recurrence.

Focusing on finite structures may seem akin to finite model theory, with finite structures taken to be particular Tarskian structures. But once we construe finite structures as data objects, we obtain an infinite data type, such as  $\mathbb{N}$ , to be a collection of particular finite structures, and computing over  $\mathbb{N}$  as a process of transforming those structures. For instance, a program for string reversal takes as input a string-as-finite-structure and yields another string-as-finite-structure.

## 2.2 Finite partial-structures

We take our basic data-objects to be *finite partial-functions* (fp-functions) in the following sense. We posit a denumerable set  $A$  of *atoms*, i.e. unspecified and unstructured objects. To accommodate in due course non-denoting terms we extend  $A$  to a set  $A_\perp =_{\text{df}} A \cup \{\perp\}$ , where  $\perp$  is a fresh object intended to denote “undefined.” The elements of  $A$  are the *standard* elements of  $A_\perp$ . A (*k*-ary) *fp-function* is a function  $F : A_\perp^k \rightarrow A_\perp$  which satisfies:

1.  $F(\vec{a}) = \perp$  for all  $\vec{a} \in A^k$  except for a  $\vec{a}$  in a finite set  $A_F$ , dubbed here the *domain* of  $F$ .
2.  $F$  is strict:  $F(\vec{a}) = \perp$  whenever  $\perp$  is one of the arguments  $\vec{a}$ .

An *entry* of  $F$  is a tuple  $\langle a_1 \dots a_k, b \rangle$  where  $b = F(a_1, \dots, a_k) \neq \perp$ . The *image* of  $F$  is the set  $\{b \in A \mid b = F(\vec{a}) \text{ for some } \vec{a} \in A^k\}$ .

Function partiality provides a natural representation of finite relations over  $A$  by partial functions, avoiding *ad hoc* constants. Namely, a finite *k*-ary relation  $R$  over  $A$  ( $k > 0$ ) is represented by the fp-functions

$$\xi_R^k(a_1, \dots, a_k) = \text{if } R(a_1, \dots, a_k) \text{ then } a_1 \text{ else } \perp$$

Conversely, any partial *k*-ary function  $F$  over  $A$  determines the *k*-ary relation

$$R_F = \{\langle \vec{a} \rangle \in A^k \mid F(\vec{a}) \text{ is defined} \}$$

A *vocabulary* is a finite set  $V$  of function-identifiers, referred to as *V-ids*, where each  $\mathbf{f} \in V$  is assigned an *arity*  $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{f}) \geq 0$ . We optionally right-superscript an identifier by its arity, when convenient. We refer to nullary *V-ids* as *tokens* and to identifiers of positive arities as *pointers*. Our default is to use type-writer symbols for identifiers:  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{e}, \dots$  for tokens and  $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, 0, 1, \dots$  for pointers. The distinction between tokens and pointers is computationally significant, because (non-nullary) functions can serve as unbounded memory, atoms cannot. For a vocabulary  $V$ , we write  $V^0$  for the set of tokens, and  $V^+$  for the set of pointers.

An *fp-structure over V*, or briefly a *V-structure*, is a mapping  $\sigma$  that to each  $\mathbf{f}^k \in V$ , assigns a *k*-ary fp-function  $\sigma(\mathbf{f})$ , said to be a *component* of  $\sigma$ . The intention is to identify isomorphic fp-structures, but That intention may be left implicit without complicating matters with perpetual references to equivalence classes. Note that a tuple  $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k)$  of fp-structures is representable as

a single structure, defined as the union  $\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq k} \sigma_i$  over the disjoint union of the vocabularies  $V_i$ .

The *domain* (respectively, *range*) of an fp-structure  $\sigma$  is the union of the domains (ranges) of its components, and its *scope* is the union of its domain and its range. If  $\sigma$  is a  $V$ -structure, and  $\tau$  a  $W$ -structure,  $W \supseteq V$ , then  $\tau$  is an *expansion* of  $\sigma$  (to  $W$ ), and  $\sigma$  a *reduct* of  $\tau$  (to  $V$ ), if the two structures have identical interpretations for each identifier in  $V$ .

Given  $\mathbf{f} \in V$  and a  $V$ -structure  $\sigma$ , the *size of  $\mathbf{f}$  in  $\sigma$* , denoted  $|\mathbf{f}|_\sigma$ , is the number of entries in  $\sigma(\mathbf{f})$ . For  $Q \subseteq V$  the *size of  $Q$  in  $\sigma$* , denoted  $|Q|_\sigma$ , is  $\sum \{|\mathbf{f}|_\sigma \mid \mathbf{f} \in Q\}$ . We refer to  $|V|_\sigma$  as the *size of  $\sigma$* .

## 2.3 Terms

Given a vocabulary  $V$ , the set  $\mathbf{Tm}_V$  of  $V$ -terms is generated inductively, as usual:  $\omega \in \mathbf{Tm}_V$ ; and if  $\mathbf{f}^k \in V$  ( $k \geq 0$ ), and  $\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_k \in \mathbf{Tm}_V$  then  $\mathbf{f}\mathbf{t}_1 \cdots \mathbf{t}_k \in \mathbf{Tm}_V$ . A term  $\mathbf{t}$  is *standard* if  $\omega$  does not occur in it. Note that tokens assume here the traditional role of program variables. In other words, we do not distinguish between an underlying structure and a store.

We write function application in formal terms without parentheses and commas, as in  $\mathbf{f}x$  or  $\mathbf{f}\vec{x}$ . Also, we implicitly posit that the arity of a function matches the number of arguments displayed; thus writing  $\mathbf{f}^k\vec{a}$  assumes that  $\vec{a}$  is a vector of length  $k$ , and  $\mathbf{f}\vec{a}$  (with no superscript) that the vector  $\vec{a}$  is as long as  $\mathbf{f}$ 's arity.

Given a  $V$ -structure  $\sigma$  the *value* of a  $V$ -term  $\mathbf{t}$  in  $\sigma$ , denoted  $\sigma(\mathbf{t})$ , is obtained by recurrence on  $\mathbf{t}$ :  $\sigma(\omega) = \perp$ ; and for  $\mathbf{f}^k \in V$ ,  $\sigma(\mathbf{f}\mathbf{t}_1 \cdots \mathbf{t}_k) = \sigma(\mathbf{f})(\sigma(\mathbf{t}_1), \dots, \sigma(\mathbf{t}_k))$ . An atom  $a \in A$  is *V-accessible in  $\sigma$*  if it is the value in  $\sigma$  of some  $V$ -term. A  $V$ -structure  $\sigma$  is *accessible* if every atom in the domain of  $\sigma$  is  $V$ -accessible (and therefore every atom in the range of  $\sigma$  is also accessible).

If every atom in the range of an accessible structure  $\sigma$  is the value of a *unique*  $V$ -term then  $\sigma$  is *free*. It is not hard to see that an accessible  $V$ -structure  $\sigma$  is free iff there is a finite set  $T$  of  $V$ -terms, closed under taking sub-terms, such that the valuation function  $\sigma : T \rightarrow A$  is injective.

If  $\mathbf{q}$  is a standard  $V$ -term, and  $T$  consists of the sub-terms of  $\mathbf{q}$ , then we write  $\varphi_{\mathbf{q}}$  for the resulting *free* fp-structure, with a token  $\blacksquare$  designating the term as a whole. Examples are in Appendix 2.

## 2.4 Structure updates

Fix a vocabulary  $V$ . We consider the following three basic operations on  $V$ -structures. In each case we indicate how an input  $W$ -structure  $\sigma$  (with  $W \supseteq V$ ) is transformed by the operation into a  $W$ -structure  $\sigma'$  that differs from  $\sigma$  only as indicated.

1. A *V-extension* is a phrase  $\mathbf{f}\mathbf{t}_1 \cdots \mathbf{t}_k \downarrow \mathbf{q}$  where  $\mathbf{q}$  and each  $\mathbf{t}_i$  are standard  $V$ -terms. The intent is that if  $\sigma(\mathbf{f}\mathbf{t}_1 \cdots \mathbf{t}_k) = \perp$ , then  $\sigma'(\mathbf{f}\mathbf{t}_1 \cdots \mathbf{t}_k) = \sigma(\mathbf{q})$ . Thus,  $\sigma'$  is identical to  $\sigma$  if  $\sigma(\mathbf{f}\mathbf{t}_1 \cdots \mathbf{t}_k)$  is defined.

2. A *V-contraction*, the dual of an extension, is a phrase of the form  $\mathbf{ft}_1 \cdots \mathbf{t}_k \uparrow$ . The intent is that  $\sigma'(\mathbf{f})(\sigma(\mathbf{t}_1), \dots, \sigma(\mathbf{t}_k)) = \perp$ . Note that this removes the entry  $\langle \sigma(\mathbf{t}_1), \dots, \sigma(\mathbf{t}_k), \sigma(\mathbf{ft}_1 \cdots \mathbf{t}_k) \rangle$  (if defined) from  $\sigma(\mathbf{f})$ , but not from  $\sigma(\mathbf{g})$  for other identifiers  $\mathbf{g}$ .
3. A *V-inception* is a phrase of the form  $\mathbf{c} \Downarrow$ , where  $\mathbf{c}$  is a *V*-token. A common alternative notation is  $\mathbf{c} := \mathbf{new}$ . The intent is that  $\sigma'$  is identical to  $\sigma$ , except that if  $\sigma(\mathbf{c}) = \perp$ , then  $\sigma'(\mathbf{c})$  is an atom not in the scope of  $\sigma$ .

In all cases we omit the reference to the vocabulary *V* if in no danger of confusion.

We refer to extensions and contractions as *revisions*, and to revisions and inceptions as *updates*. The identifiers  $\mathbf{f}$  in the revision templates above are the revision's *eigen-id*. An extension [contraction] is *active (in  $\sigma$ )* if, when triggered in  $\sigma$ , it adds [respectively, removes] an entry from its eigen-id.

**Remarks.**

1. An assignment  $\vec{\mathbf{ft}} := \mathbf{q}$  can be programmed by composing extensions and contractions:

$$\mathbf{b} \Downarrow \mathbf{q}; \vec{\mathbf{ft}} \uparrow; \vec{\mathbf{ft}} \Downarrow \mathbf{b}; \mathbf{b} \uparrow \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{b}$  is a fresh token which memorizes the atom denoted by  $\mathbf{q}$ , in case the contraction renders it inaccessible.

2. Inception does not have a dual operation, since atoms can be released from a structure by repeated contractions.
3. A more general form of inception, with a fresh atom assigned to an arbitrary term  $\mathbf{t}$ , may be defined by

$$\mathbf{b} \Downarrow; \mathbf{t} \Downarrow \mathbf{b}; \mathbf{b} \uparrow \quad (\mathbf{b} \text{ a fresh token})$$

## 2.5 Programs for transformation of fp-structures

Fix a vocabulary *V*. A *V-guard* is a boolean combination of *V*-equations. A *V-variant* is a set of *V* pointers. The imperative programming language **STV**, consists of the *V-programs* inductively generated as follows [25, 29], (We omit the references to *V* if in no danger of confusion.)

[**Update**] A *V-update* is a *V-program*.

If *P* and *Q* are programs, then so are the following.

[**Composition**]  $P; Q$

[**Branching**]  $\text{if}[G] \{P\} \{Q\} \quad (G \text{ a } V\text{-guard})$

**[Iteration]**      **do**  $[G][T]\{P\}$     ( $G$  a  $V$ -guard,  $T$  a  $V$ -variant)

The denotational semantics of the Iteration template above calls for the loop's body  $P$  to be entered initially if  $G$  is true in the initial structure  $\sigma$ , and re-enter if

1.  $G$  is true for the current structure, and
2. The size of the variant  $T$  is reduced, that is: the execution of the latest pass through  $P$  executes more active contractions than active extensions of the variant.

In particular, the loop is existed if the variant  $T$  is depleted. A formal definition of this semantics in terms of configurations and execution traces is routine.

From the vantage point of language design, termination by depletion is a common practice. However, keeping track of the balance of active extensions and active contractions requires an unbounded counter. If this, for some reason, is to be avoided, one can resort to more local forms of control. Here are two such options.

1. Syntactically, require that loops **do** $[G][T]\{P\}$  have no extension of  $T$  in  $P$ . Semantically, scale down the depletion condition of **STV** to just one active contraction. This implementation eliminates the need for unbounded counters in an implementation of **STV** to just one flag per loop. The resulting variation of **STV** still yields full primitive recursion [29].
2. Define a *pod* to be the composition of updates (possibly a single update). Programs are then generated from pods as basic building blocks.

The semantics of iteration is defined in terms of pods, as follows. Say that the execution of a pod-occurrence is *positive* [respectively, *negative*] in  $\sigma$  the number of active extensions is larger [respectively, smaller] than the number of active contractions.

The semantics of **do** $[G][T]\{P\}$  is calls, then, to exit the loop if the latest pass has no positive execution of any pod, and has at least one negative one. This reduces the unbounded counter of **STV** to local counters for each pod.

The *resources* of a  $V$ -program  $p$  are defined in terms of the size of an input fp-structure, i.e. the total number of entries (not of atoms). For a function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  we say that program  $p$  is in  $\text{space}(f)$  if there is a constant  $c > 0$  such that for all fp-structures  $\sigma$  the size of structures  $\sigma'$  in the execution trace of  $P$  for input  $\sigma$  is  $\leq c \cdot f(|\sigma|)$ .  $P$  is in  $\text{PSpace}$  if it is in  $\text{space}(\lambda n. n^k)$  for some  $k$ .  $P$  is in  $\text{time}(f)$  if there is a  $c$  such that for all fp-structures  $\sigma$  as input,  $P$  terminates using an execution trace of length  $\leq c \cdot f(|\sigma|)$ .  $P$  is in  $\text{PTime}$  if it runs in time  $o(\lambda n. n^k)$  for some  $k$ . We focus here on programs as transducers. a partial mapping  $\varphi : \mathfrak{c} \rightarrow \mathfrak{c}'$  from a class  $\mathfrak{c}$  of  $V$ -structures to a class  $\mathfrak{c}'$  of  $V'$ -structures is *computed* by a program  $P$ , over vocabulary  $W \supseteq V \cup V'$ , if for every  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{c}$ ,  $\sigma^W \rightarrow_P \sigma'$  for some  $W$ -expansion  $\sigma'$  of  $\varphi(\sigma)$ , where  $\sigma^W$  is the trivial expansion of  $\sigma$  to  $W$ , with every  $f \in w-v$  interpreted as empty (i.e. undefined for all arguments).

**THEOREM 2** [29] *Every **STV**-program runs in time and space primitive-recursive in the size of the input.*

### 3 Feasible termination

#### 3.1 Programs for generic PTime

We define the programming language **STR**, which modifies **STV** by the ramification of variants. We depart from traditional ramification, which assigns ranks to first-order inductive data-objects, and ramify instead the loop variants, i.e. second-order objects. This is in direct agreement with the ramification of second-order logic [41] and, more broadly, of type theory [42, 38].

Ramification is a classification of the computational powers of objects that drive iteration. we use natural numbers for ranks.

A *ramified vocabulary* is a pair  $(V, \rho)$  where  $V$  is a vocabulary and  $\rho : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ . we refer to  $\rho(\mathbf{f})$  as the *rank* of  $\mathbf{f}$ , and let  $V_r =_{\text{df}} \{\mathbf{f} \in v \mid \rho(\mathbf{f}) = r\}$ . A *variant (of rank  $r$ )*, for a ramified vocabulary  $(V, \rho)$ , is a set  $T \subseteq V_r$ .

The syntax of **STR** is identical to **STV**, except for the iteration clause, which is replaced by

- **[Ramified Iteration]** If  $G$  is a guard,  $T$  a variant of rank  $r$ ,  $\mathbf{do}[G][T]\{P\}$  is a program.

The semantics of this iterative program has the loop's body  $P$  re-entered when in configuration (i.e. fp-structure)  $\sigma$  if the two conditions of **STV** above are supplemented by a third:

1.  $G$  is true in  $\sigma$ .
2.  $|T|$  is shrunk in the previous pass, i.e. the number of active contractions of components of  $T$  in  $P$  exceeds the number of active extensions.
3. For  $j \geq r$ ,  $|V_j|$  does not grow; that is, the total number of active extensions of pointers of rank  $j$  does not exceed the total number of active contraction.

**Remarks.**

1. A loop with a variant  $T$  of rank  $r$  will be re-entered after decreasing  $T$  even if that decrease is offset by *extensions* of pointers in  $V_r - T$ . Allowing such extensions is essential: programs in which loops of rank  $r$  cannot extend  $V_r - T$  execute in linear time, as can easily be seen by structural induction.
2. We caution the reader familiar with existing approaches to ramified recurrence that our ranks are properties of function-identifiers, and not of atoms, fp-functions, or terms. Moreover, no ranking for atoms or functions is inherited from the ranking of function-ids: an fp-function may be the value of distinct identifiers, possibly of different ranks. In particular, there is no rank-driven restriction on inceptions or extensions: the function-entries created have no rank, e.g. an extension  $\mathbf{fc} \downarrow \mathbf{q}$  may have  $\mathbf{f}$  of rank 0 whereas  $\mathbf{q}$  refers to arbitrarily large ranks.

3. The condition on non-increase of  $V_j$  for  $j > r$  has no parallel in ramified recurrence, but is needed for imperative programs, in which every variable may be considered an output-variable.
4. If unbounded counters for the size of ranks are to be avoided, they can be replaced by local counters for pods, as in §. The simpler approach described there, of disallowing extensions altogether, is not available for **STR**, because (as observed) extensions of an iteration's rank is essential to permit data-transfers within that rank.

### 3.2 PTime soundness of STR

**THEOREM 3** *For each STR-program  $P$  with loop ranks  $\leq \ell$ , there is a positive<sup>6</sup> polynomial  $M_P[n_0 \dots n_\ell]$  such that for all  $V$ -structures  $\sigma$*

$$\text{Time}_P(\sigma) \leq M_P[|\sigma|_0 \dots |\sigma|_\ell]$$

Moreover, for each  $j \leq \ell$  there is a positive polynomial  $Z_{P,j}[n_{j+1} \dots n_\ell]$  such that

$$\text{Space}_{P,j}(\sigma) \leq |\sigma|_j + Z_{P,j}[|\sigma|_{j+1}, \dots, |\sigma|_\ell]$$

**PROOF.** Parts 1 and 2 are proved by a simultaneous induction on  $P$ . Non-trivial case:  $P \equiv \mathbf{do}[G][T]\{Q\}$ , where (by the definition of programs)  $T \subseteq V_r$  is decreasing in  $Q$ , and  $V_r, V_{r+1}, \dots, V_\ell$  are each non-increasing in  $Q$ . Suppose  $\sigma \Rightarrow_P \tau$ , where

$$\sigma = \sigma_0 \Rightarrow_Q \sigma_1 \dots \Rightarrow_Q \sigma_k = \tau$$

Since  $T$  is decreasing in  $Q$ , we have  $k \leq |T|_\sigma \leq |\sigma|_r$ . For each  $j \geq r$   $V_j$  is non-increasing in  $P$ , so we take  $Z_{P,j} \equiv 0$ .

For  $j = r - d$ ,  $d = 0, \dots, r$ , we proceed by a secondary induction on  $d$ . The induction base  $d = 0$ , i.e.  $j = r$ , is already proven. For the step, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Space}_{P,r-(d+1)}(\sigma) &= \max_{i < k} \text{Space}_{Q,r-(d+1)}(\sigma_i) \\ &\leq \max_{i < k} Z_{Q,r-(d+1)}[|\sigma_i|_{r-d}, \dots, |\sigma_i|_\ell] && \text{(by main IH)} \\ &\leq Z_{Q,r-(d+1)}[\text{Space}_{P,r-d}(\sigma), \dots, \text{Space}_{P,\ell}(\sigma)] && \text{(by definition of Space}_{P,j} \text{ and since each } Z_{Q,j} \text{ is positive)} \\ &\leq Z_{Q,r-(d+1)}[A_{r-d}, \dots, A_\ell] && \text{(by secondary IH)} \\ &\quad \text{where } A_j \text{ stands for } |\sigma|_j + Z_{P,j}[|\sigma|_{j+1}, \dots, |\sigma|_\ell] \end{aligned}$$

So it suffices to take

$$Z_{P,r-(d+1)}[n_{r-d}, \dots, n_\ell] \equiv_{\text{df}} Z_{Q,r-(d+1)}[B_{r-d} \dots B_\ell]$$

where  $B_j$  stands for  $n_j + Z_{P,j}[n_{j+1}, \dots, n_\ell]$ .

---

<sup>6</sup>I.e. defined without subtraction

This concludes the inductive step for (2).  
 For the inductive step for (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Time}_P(\sigma) &\leq k + \sum_{i < k} \text{Time}_Q(\sigma_i) \\
 &\leq k + \sum_{i < k} M_Q(|\sigma_i|_0, \dots, |\sigma_i|_\ell) \quad \text{by IH} \\
 &\leq k + \sum_{i < k} M_Q[A_0, \dots, A_\ell] \quad \text{with the } A_j \text{'s above} \\
 &\leq |\sigma|_r (1 + M_Q[A_0, \dots, A_\ell])
 \end{aligned}$$

So it suffices to take

$$M_P(n) \equiv_{\text{df}} n_r(1 + M_Q[B_0, \dots, B_\ell])$$

where the  $B_i$ 's are as above.  $\square$

From Lemma 3 we conclude:

**THEOREM 4** *Every program of STR runs in time polynomial in the size of the input structure.*

### 3.3 Examples of STR-programs

Aside of illustrating our ramification mechanism, the following examples will establish structural expansions (§§5.1-5.3, to be used in §§3.3.4 and 3.3.4), consider arithmetic operations (§5.4, used in §3.3.4), and code several sorting algorithms (§5.5) which are problematic under the traditional ramification regime.

#### 3.3.1 String duplication

The following program has as input a token  $\mathbf{e}$  and unary pointers  $\mathbf{f}_0$  and  $\mathbf{f}_1$  of rank 1. The intended output consists of  $\mathbf{e}$  and the unary pointers  $\mathbf{g}_0, \mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}'_0$  and  $\mathbf{g}'_1$  of rank 0. Termination is triggered solely by depletion of the variant  $\{\mathbf{f}_0, \mathbf{f}_1\}$ , whence an empty guard (i.e. **true**).<sup>7</sup> Note that the loop's body executes a contraction of the variant, unless the variant is empty.

```

 $\mathbf{a} := \mathbf{e};$ 
 $\mathbf{do} \ [ \ ] [\mathbf{f}_0, \mathbf{f}_1]$ 
   $\mathbf{if} \ [! \mathbf{f}_0 \mathbf{a}]$ 
     $\{ \langle \mathbf{g}_0 \mathbf{a} \downarrow \mathbf{f}_0 \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}'_0 \mathbf{a} \downarrow \mathbf{f}_0 \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \downarrow \mathbf{f}_0 \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}_0 \mathbf{a} \uparrow \rangle \}$ 
     $\{ \langle \mathbf{g}_1 \mathbf{a} \downarrow \mathbf{f}_1 \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}'_1 \mathbf{a} \downarrow \mathbf{f}_1 \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \downarrow \mathbf{f}_1 \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}_1 \mathbf{a} \uparrow \rangle \}$ 
  }

```

The program consumes the variant while creating two copies at a lower rank, but in fact a rank-1 copy ( $\mathbf{f}'_0, \mathbf{f}'_1$ ) of the variant may be constructed as well:

$$\langle \mathbf{g}_0 \mathbf{a} \downarrow \mathbf{f}_0 \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}'_0 \mathbf{a} \downarrow \mathbf{f}_0 \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}'_0 \mathbf{a} \downarrow \mathbf{f}_0 \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \downarrow \mathbf{f}_0 \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}_0 \mathbf{a} \uparrow \rangle$$

---

<sup>7</sup>Termination by depletion is indeed frequent in imperative programming!

and similarly for  $\mathbf{f}_1$ . The variant still decreases with each pass, while  $V_1$  is non-increasing. Of course, no more than a single rank-1 copy can be created, lest  $V_1$  would increase.

The copy  $\mathbf{f}'$  created must be syntactically different from the variant  $\mathbf{f}$ , but the loop above can be followed by a loop that similarly renames  $\mathbf{f}'$  to  $\mathbf{f}$ . We shall refer to this sort of variant re-creation as *spawning*. In particular, given a chain  $L = (a, e)$  and a guard  $G$ , spawning in rank 0 allows a scan of  $L$  for an atom that satisfies  $G$ , while consuming  $L$  as a variant and recreating it at the same time.

### 3.3.2 Enumerators

We refer to an implementation of lists that we dub *chain*, consisting of a token  $\mathbf{e}$  and a unary injective pointer  $\mathbf{f}$ . The intent is to represent a list of atoms as the denotations of  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{ff}\mathbf{a} \dots \mathbf{f}^{[i]}\mathbf{a} \dots$ , where  $\sigma(\mathbf{f})$  is injective. Since  $\sigma$  is an fp-structure and  $\sigma(\mathbf{f})$  injective, the chain must be finite.

A chain  $(e, f)$  is an *enumerator* for an fp-structure  $\sigma$  if for some  $n$

$$e, f(e), f(f(e)), \dots, f^{[n]}(e)$$

is a listing (possibly with repetitions) of the *accessible* atoms of  $\sigma$ , and  $f^{[n+1]}(e) = \perp$ .

Let  $(V, \rho)$  be a ramified vocabulary. We may assume that  $\rho$  uses only ranks  $> 1$ , since raising all ranks by 2 results in a ranking function equivalent to  $\rho$  (i.e. yielding the same domination relation on  $V$ ).

We outline an **STR**-program  $E_V$  that for a  $V$ -structure  $\sigma$  as input yields an expansion  $\sigma_E$  of  $\sigma$  with an enumerator  $(\mathbf{a}, 1)$  in rank 0 for  $\sigma$ .

$E$  initializes  $1$  to a listing of  $\sigma(\mathbf{a})$  for  $V$ 's tokens  $\mathbf{a}$ .

Let  $m = \sum_{\mathbf{f} \in V} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{f})$ .  $E$  iterates then its main cycle  $C$ , which collects accessible elements that are not yet listed in  $1$ , into  $m$  copies of a unary cache  $\mathbf{p}$  of rank 0, with for each  $\mathbf{f} \in V$  of arity  $k$  a block  $B(\mathbf{f})$  of  $k$  copies of  $\mathbf{p}$  dedicated to  $\mathbf{f}$ . Using the entire vocabulary  $V$  as variant,  $C$  takes each  $\mathbf{f}^k \in V$  in turn, cycles through all  $k$ -tuples in  $B(\mathbf{f})i$  and for each tuple appends  $\sigma(\mathbf{f})\vec{a}$  to all  $m$  copies of  $\mathbf{p}$  if it is not already in  $\mathbf{p}$ . That cycling through  $B(\mathbf{f})$  takes  $B(\mathbf{f})$  as variant in rank 1, using spawning to preserve  $B(\mathbf{f})$  as needed. When this process is completed for all  $\mathbf{f} \in V$ ,  $C$  concatenates (any one of the copies of)  $\mathbf{p}$  to  $1$ ,

The loop is exited by variant-depletion, when the cache  $\mathbf{p}$  remains empty at the end of  $C$  (no new atom found). If input  $\sigma$  is free, then the enumerator  $1$  is *monotone*: for each term  $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{f}^k \mathbf{t}_1 \dots \mathbf{t}_k$  the enumerator lists  $\mathbf{t}_i$  before  $\mathbf{q}$ .  $\square$

### 3.3.3 Arithmetic functions

Natural numbers are taken to be the free structures  $\varphi_{\mathbf{n}}$  for the unary numerals  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ , for a vocabulary with one token (the “zero”) and on unary pointer (the “successor”).

Addition can be computed in rank 0, which should not be surprising since it does not increase the (combined) size of the inputs. Splicing one input onto

the other is not quite acceptable syntactically, since the two inputs are given with different successor identifiers. But the sum of natural numbers  $(\square, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{s})$  and  $(\square_0, \mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{s}_0)$ , both of rank 0, can be computed by a loop that uses  $\mathbf{s}$  as variant, and appends the first input to the first, starting from  $\square$ .

Note though that the first input is depleted in the process, and that spawning (in the sense of 3.3.1) is disallowed since the first input is in rank 0. Positing that the first input is in rank 1 enables spawning, whence a re-use of the first input.

That is precisely what we need for a program for multiplication. We take both inputs to be in rank 1. The second input is a variant for an outer loop, that sets the output to  $\varphi_0$ , and then iterates an inner loop driven by the first input as variant, that adds itself to the input while spawning itself as well.

It is worthwhile to observe how ramification blocks exponentiation, as predicted by Theorem 4. A simple program for exponentiation iterates the doubling operation starting with 1. We have seen that any  $\varphi_n$  in rank  $t$  can be duplicated into any number of copies, but at most one of these can be in rank  $t$ , and all others in ranks  $< t$ .

As for an iteration of multiplication, our program above for the product function takes two inputs in rank  $t$ , yielding an output in rank  $< t$ , a process that can be repeated only  $t$  many times for any fixed rank  $t$ .

### 3.3.4 Insertion Sort

*Insertion sort* is a non-size-increasing algorithm, and consequently has an unramified (i.e. single ranked) **STR**-program. In general, we construe sorting algorithms as taking a chain  $L = (a, e)$  and a partial order relation  $\leq$ , and return a chain  $K = (b, f)$  listing the same atoms as  $L$  without repetition, and consistent with  $\leq$ , i.e.


$$\begin{array}{lll} e^{[n]}(a) \neq \omega & \text{implies} & e^{[n]}(a) = f^{[m]}(b) \quad \text{for some } m \\ f^{[m]}(a) \neq \omega & \text{implies} & f^{[m]}(b) = e^{[n]}(a) \quad \text{for some } n \\ & & f^{[m]}(a) < f^{[m+1]}(a) \quad \text{for all } m \end{array}$$

Our program for Insertion Sort is:

```

b ↓ a;
do [ ] [e]    (f depleted via a spawned copy)
{ { fa ↓ fc, fc ↑, fc ↓ a, c ↑, d ↓ ea, ea ↑, a ↑, a ↓ d, d ↑ } }

```



Note that the pod executes two extensions and two contractions, while executing just one contraction on  $\mathbf{e}$ .

## 4 Completeness of STR for PTime

### 4.1 Closure of STR under composition

**THEOREM 5** *If partial-mappings  $\Phi_1, \Phi_2$  between fp-structures are defined by STR-programs, then so is their composition  $\Phi_1 \circ \Phi_2$ .*

**PROOF.** Given a transducer-program  $P$  that uses ranks  $r_1, \dots, r_k$  for the input vocabulary, we can modify  $P$  to a program  $P'$  that takes inputs that are all of a rank  $r \geq r_1, \dots, r_k$ , copy the input into ranks  $r_1, \dots, r_k$ , and then invokes  $P$ . Dually, if the outputs of  $P$  use ranks  $q_1, \dots, q_m$ , we can modify  $P'$  to  $P''$  that invokes  $P'$  and then copies the outputs into a rank  $q_0 \leq q_1, \dots, q_m$ .

Let transducer-programs  $P_1, P_2$  of **STR** compute  $\Phi_1, \Phi_2$ , respectively. Suppose that the outputs of  $P_1$  are the inputs of  $P_2$  (so that composition may be defined). As observed above, we may assume that  $P_i$ 's inputs have a common rank  $t_i$ , and the outputs have a common rank  $s_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). We wish to obtain an **STV** transducer program for  $\Phi_1 \circ \Phi_2$ .

If  $s_1 = t_2 + d$  where  $d \geq 0$ , let  $P'_2$  be  $P_2$  with all ranks incremented by  $d$ .  $P'_2$  is trivially a correct program of **STV**, with input of rank equal to the output rank of  $P_1$ . So  $P_1; P'_2$  is a correct **STV**-program for  $\Phi_1 \circ \Phi_2$ .

Otherwise,  $t_2 = s_1 + d$ , where  $d > 0$ . Let  $P'_1$  be  $P_1$  with all ranks incremented by  $d$ . Then  $P'_1; P_2$  is a correct **STV**-program for  $\Phi_1 \circ \Phi_2$ .  $\square$

### 4.2 Extensional completeness of STR for PTime

As noted in Theorem 1, no programming language can be sound and complete for PTime *algorithms*. **STR** is, however, *extensionally* complete for PTime. This statement is best interpreted in relation to the programming language **ST** of [25]. **ST** is simply **STV** without the variants, and it is easily seen to be Turing complete.

**THEOREM 6** *Every ST-program  $P$  running in PTime is extensionally equivalent to some STR program  $P^*$ ; i.e.  $P^*$  computes the same mapping between fp-structures as  $P$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $P$  be an **ST**-program over vocabulary  $V$ , running within time  $c \cdot n^\ell$ . For simplicity, we'll use  $c \cdot n^\ell$  as common bound on the iteration of every loop in  $P$ .  $P^*$  is defined by recurrence on the loop-nesting depth of  $P$ .  $P^*$  is  $P$  if  $P$  is loop-free;  $(Q; R)^*$  is  $Q^*; R^*$ ; and  $(\text{if}[G]\{Q\}\{R\})^*$  is  $\text{if}[G]\{Q^*\}\{R^*\}$ .

If  $P$  is  $\mathbf{do}[G]\{Q\}$ , let  $n_0 < \dots < n_{k-1}$  be the ranks in  $Q^*$ . Note that we can define a “clock” program  $C$  that yields for an input structure  $\sigma$  a listing of size  $c \cdot |\sigma|^\ell$ . Indeed, by §3.3.2 there is an **STR**-program  $E$  that augment any  $V$ -structures with an enumerator  $(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{e}_0)$ . By § 3.3.3 there is a program  $M$  that for a listing  $\nu$  as input outputs a listing of length  $c \cdot |\nu|^\ell$ . By §3.3.4 we can compose  $E$  and  $M$  to obtain our **STR**-program  $C$ , generating a listing  $((\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{e})$  of length  $c \cdot |\nu|^\ell$ . Choose  $C$  with fresh identifiers, and with  $\mathbf{e}$  dominating all ranked identifiers in  $Q^*$ .

Now define  $P^*$  to be  $C; \mathbf{do}[G][\mathbf{e}]\{\mathbf{b} \downarrow \mathbf{ea}; \mathbf{ea} \uparrow; \mathbf{a} \uparrow; \mathbf{a} \downarrow \mathbf{b}; Q^*\}$ . Since  $\mathbf{e}$  dominates all ranked identifiers in  $Q^*$ , the operation of  $Q^*$  is the same in  $P^*$  as in  $P$ . Also, since the size of  $\mathbf{e}$  exceeds the number of iterations of  $Q^*$  in  $P$ , and the variant  $\mathbf{e}$  is contracted in each pass, in **STR** of the loop above remains the same as in **ST**.  $\square$

## 5 Conclusion and Directions

The quest for a programming language for PTime has no final destination, because no language can be both sound and complete for PTime algorithms. Over the decades a good number of methods were proposed that were sound and *extensionally* complete for PTime, i.e. complete for PTime computability. But the existence of such methods is trivial, and the methods proposed so far all miss important classes of PTime algorithms. We propose here a novel approach, which yields a natural programming language for PTime, which is generic for both inductive data and classes of finite structures, and which accommodates a substantially broader class of algorithms than previous approaches.

We built on [25, 29], where finite partial-functions form the basic data, and are used as loop-variants whose depletion is an abstract form of recurrence. We consider here a ramification of data that applied simultaneously to each variant and to its entire rank. This leads to a programming language **STR** for PTime, which is more inclusive than previously proposed works.

While the purely functional approach of ramified recurrence does not require a change of semantics of the underlying recurrence operation, this is no longer the case for our flexible imperative programming. The semantics of loops is modified here to ensure the necessary forms of data depletion, which in the functional realm are guaranteed by the simplicity of the syntax. This trade-off is necessary, if we strive for more algorithmically inclusive programming languages. The static analysis method, mentioned in the Introduction, can be called upon to complement the ICC framework to demonstrate that certain **STR** programs satisfy the depletion conditions under the standard semantics of looping, following the line of research of [18, 19, 7, 5, 6] for Meyer-Ritchie’s loop programs, but here with far greater generality.

## References

- [1] Klaus Aehlig, Ulrich Berger, Martin Hofmann, and Helmut Schwichtenberg. An arithmetic for non-size-increasing polynomial-time computation. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 318(1-2):3–27, 2004.
- [2] Stephen Bellantoni. *Predicative Recursion and Computational Complexity*. PhD thesis, University of Toronto, 1992.
- [3] Stephen Bellantoni. Predicative recursion and the polytime hierarchy. In Peter Clote and Jeffery Remmel, editors, *Feasible Mathematics II*, Perspectives in Computer Science, pages 15–29. Birkhäuser, 1994.
- [4] Stephen Bellantoni and Stephen A. Cook. A new recursion-theoretic characterization of the polytime functions. *Computational Complexity*, 2:97–110, 1992.
- [5] Amir Ben-Amram. On decidable growth-rate properties of imperative programs. In Patrick Baillot, editor, *International Workshop on Developments in Implicit Computational Complexity*, volume 23 of *EPTCS*, pages 1–14, 2010.
- [6] Amir Ben-Amram and Geoff Hamilton. Tight worst-case bounds for polynomial loop programs. In Mikolaj Bojańczyk and Alex Simpson, editors, *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures (FOSSACS) - 22nd International Conference*, volume 11425 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 80–97. Springer, 2019.
- [7] Amir Ben-Amram, Neil Jones, and Lars Kristiansen. Polynomial or exponential? complexity inference in polynomial time. In *Computability in Europe 2008: Logic and Theory of Algorithms*, volume 5028 of *LNCS*, pages 67–76. Springer-Verlag, 2008.
- [8] Stephen Bloch. Functional characterizations of uniform log-depth and polylog-depth circuit families. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Structure in Complexity Theory Conference*, pages 193–206. IEEE Computer Society Press, 1992.
- [9] Vuokko Caseiro. *Equations for defining poly-time functions*. PhD thesis, University of Oslo, 1997.
- [10] Peter Clote. A safe recursion scheme for exponential time. In *Logical Foundations of Computer Science 4th International Symposium*, pages 44–52, 1997.
- [11] A. Cobham. The intrinsic computational difficulty of functions. In Y. Bar-Hillel, editor, *Proceedings of the International Conference on Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science*, pages 24–30. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1962.
- [12] Robert Constable. Type two computational complexity. In *Proceedings of the Fifth ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 108–121, 1973.
- [13] Anupam Das and Isabel Oitavem. A recursion-theoretic characterisation of the positive polynomial-time functions. In Dan Ghica and Achim Jung, editors, *27th Computer Science Logic*, volume 119 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics*, pages 18:1–18:17, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2018. Schloss Dagstuhl.
- [14] Euclid. *Elements*. Dover, New York, 1956. Translated to English by Thomas L. Heath.
- [15] W.G. Handley. Bellantoni and Cook’s characterization of polynomial time functions. Typescript, August 1992.
- [16] Martin Hofmann. Linear types and non-size-increasing polynomial time computation. *Inf. Comput.*, 183(1):57–85, 2003.

- [17] Georg Kreisel. La prédictivité. *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France*, 88:371–391, 1960.
- [18] Lars Kristiansen. The implicit computational complexity of imperative programming languages. Technical report, BRICS, 2001.
- [19] Lars Kristiansen and Karl-Heinz Niggl. On the computational complexity of imperative programming languages. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 318(1-2):139–161, 2004.
- [20] Ugo Dal Lago and Paolo Parisen Toldin. A higher-order characterization of probabilistic polynomial time. *Inf. Comput.*, 241:114–141, 2015.
- [21] Daniel Leivant. Stratified functional programs and computational complexity. In *Twentieth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, pages 325–333, New York, 1993. ACM.
- [22] Daniel Leivant. Predicative recurrence in finite types. In *Logical Foundations of Computer Science 3rd International Symposium*, pages 227–239, 1994.
- [23] Daniel Leivant. A characterization of NC by tree recurrence. In *Thirty Ninth Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 716–724, Los Alamitos, CA, 1998. IEEE Computer Society.
- [24] Daniel Leivant. Ramified recurrence and computational complexity III: Higher type recurrence and elementary complexity. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 1998. Special issue in honor of Rohit Parikh’s 60th Birthday; editors: M. Fitting, R. Ramanujam and K. Georgatos.
- [25] Daniel Leivant. A theory of finite structures. *Logical methods in computer science*, 2019. To appear. Preliminary version as arXiv.org:1808.04949.
- [26] Daniel Leivant and Jean-Yves Marion. Ramified recurrence and computational complexity II: substitution and poly-space. In L. Pacholski and J. Tiuryn, editors, *Proceedings of CSL 94*, volume 933 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 486–500, Berlin and New York, 1995. Springer Verlag.
- [27] Daniel Leivant and Jean-Yves Marion. A characterization of alternating log time by ramified recurrence. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 236(1-2):193–208, 2000.
- [28] Daniel Leivant and Jean-Yves Marion. Evolving graph-structures and their implicit computational complexity. In *Automata, Languages, and Programming - 40th International Colloquium*, pages 349–360, 2013.
- [29] Daniel Leivant and Jean-Yves Marion. Primitive recursion in the abstract. *Mathematical structures in computer science*, 2019. To appear. Preliminary version under the title Implicit complexity via structure transformation, in arXiv:1802.03115.
- [30] Jean-Yves Marion. A type system for complexity flow analysis. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 123–132, 2011.
- [31] Jean-Yves Marion and Romain Péchoux. Complexity information flow in a multi-threaded imperative language. In *Theory and Applications of Models of Computation - 11th Annual Conference*, pages 124–140, 2014.
- [32] John P. Mayberry. *The Foundations of Mathematics in the Theory of Sets*, volume 82 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [33] Albert Meyer and Dennis Ritchie. The complexity of loop programs. In *Proceedings of the 1967 22nd National Conference*, pages 465–469, New York, NY, USA, 1967. ACM.

- [34] Isabel Oitavem. Logspace without bounds. In Ralf Schindler, editor, *Ways of Proof Theory*, volume 40 of *Computer Science*, pages 355–362. World Scientific, 1993.
- [35] Isabel Oitavem. Characterizing nc with tier 0 pointers. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 50(1):917, 2004.
- [36] Isabel Oitavem. Characterizing pspace with pointers. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 54(3):323–329, 2008.
- [37] Isabel Oitavem. A recursion-theoretic approach to NP. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 162(8):661–666, 2011.
- [38] Erik Palmgren. A constructive examination of a russell-style ramified type theory. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*, 24(1):90–106, 2018.
- [39] R.W. Ritchie. Classes of predictably computable functions. *Trans. A.M.S.*, 106:139–173, 1963.
- [40] Stefan Schimanski. *Polynomial Time Calculi*. PhD thesis, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, 2008. Published as a monograph by Lulu.com, 2009.
- [41] Kurt Schütte. *Proof Theory*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977.
- [42] Alfred North Whitehead and Bertrand Russell. *Principia Mathematica*, volume II. Cambridge University Press, 1912.

## Appendix 1: Proof of Theorem 1.

The decision problem that asks whether a Turing acceptor  $M$  fails to accept the empty string is well-known to be non-semi-decidable. We reduce it to  $L^p$ , thereby showing that  $L^p$  is not semi-decidable either. Fix a Turing acceptor  $F$  running in time  $O(n)$ , and a Turing acceptor  $N$  running in time  $\Omega(2^n)$ . Our reduction maps a given Turing machine  $M$  to the machine  $M'$  that on input  $x$  simulates the computation of  $F$  on input  $x$  and, in lockstep, the computation of  $M$  on input  $\varepsilon$ . If the former terminates first,  $M'$  accepts  $x$  if  $F$  accepts  $x$ . If the latter computation terminates first, then  $M'$  switches to simulating  $N$  on input  $x$ . Thus, if  $M$  fails to accept  $\varepsilon$  then  $M'$  runs in time  $O(n)$ , and is thus in  $L^p$ ; whereas if  $M$  accepts  $\varepsilon$ , say in  $k$  steps, then, since  $N$  runs in time  $\Omega(2^n)$ ,  $M'$  also runs in time  $\Omega(2^n)$ , with the possible exception of a finite number of inputs (accepted by  $N$  within fewer than  $k$  steps). Thus  $M'$  runs in time  $\Omega(2^n)$ , and is thus not in  $L^p$ , completing the reduction.  $\square$

## Appendix 2: Examples of fp-structures.

Here are the free structures for the natural number 3 (i.e. the term  $\text{sssz}$ ), the binary string 110 (the term  $\text{110e}$ ), and the binary trees for the terms  $\text{p(prr)r}$  and  $\text{p(prr)(prr)}$ . They use 4, 4, 3 and 3 atoms, respectively. (The vocabulary identifiers are in green, the atoms are indicated by bullets, and the formal terms they represent are in smaller font.)

