

# Locally Final Coalgebras in Denotational Semantics

Sergey Goncharov<sup>1</sup>, Marco Peressotti<sup>2</sup>, Stelios Tsampas<sup>3</sup>, Henning Urbat<sup>4</sup>, and Stefano Volpe<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Birmingham University, Birmingham, United Kingdom

`s.goncharovbham@bham.ac.uk`

<sup>2</sup> Southern Denmark University, Odense, Denmark

`peressotti@imada.sdu.dk`

<sup>3</sup> Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Erlangen, Germany

`henning.urbat@fau.de`

<sup>4</sup> Southern Denmark University, Odense, Denmark

`stelios@imada.sdu.dk`

<sup>5</sup> Southern Denmark University, Odense, Denmark

`stefano@imada.sdu.dk`

*Formal semantics* aims to assign a precise mathematical meaning to every program of a given language. Two widely used flavours are *operational semantics*, which specifies how a program  $p$  behaves when it is executed, and *denotational semantics*, which associates to a program  $p$  some object  $\llbracket p \rrbracket$  representing its abstract content. A prerequisite for a denotational semantics to be useful and well-behaved is *adequacy*: if two programs  $p$  and  $q$  are *denotationally equivalent*, i.e.  $\llbracket p \rrbracket = \llbracket q \rrbracket$ , then they are *behaviourally equivalent*, that is, their observable behaviour w.r.t. the *operational semantics* is indistinguishable. Adequacy ensures that the denotational and operational semantics are compatible, yet proving it tends to be cumbersome. For this reason, there has been longstanding interest in *categorical* accounts which mitigate this complexity via the power of abstraction.

**Abstract GSOS** Turi and Plotkin [TP97] proposed an elegant *bialgebraic* approach to operational and denotational semantics. It rests on the key observation that the operational rules of many programming or process languages can be presented as a *GSOS law*, a natural transformation

$$\varrho_X: \Sigma(X \times BX) \rightarrow B\Sigma^*X$$

parametric in a *syntax functor*  $\Sigma: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  (with free monad  $\Sigma^*$ ) modelling the constructors of the language, and a *behaviour functor*  $B: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  modelling the type of transitions that programs can make during their execution. For example, to model a simple process algebra, one takes  $\Sigma$  to be a polynomial set functor representing the process constructors, like  $\text{nil}$  or  $- \parallel -$ , and  $B$  to be the functor  $BX = (\mathcal{P}_\omega X)^L$  representing the behaviour of image-finite labelled transition systems. Every GSOS law has a canonical *operational model*, which equips the initial algebra  $\Sigma(\mu\Sigma) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mu\Sigma$  of program terms with the structure of a *coalgebra*  $\gamma: \mu\Sigma \rightarrow B(\mu\Sigma)$ . Intuitively,  $\gamma$  is the transition system that runs programs according to the operational rules encoded by the law. Dually, there is a canonical *denotational model* obtained by equipping the final coalgebra  $\nu B \xrightarrow{\cong} B(\nu B)$  (the domain of abstract program behaviours) with the structure of an *algebra*  $\alpha: \Sigma(\nu B) \rightarrow \nu B$ . The two models form the *initial* and the *final* bialgebra for the given GSOS law, respectively, and the unique bialgebra morphism  $\llbracket - \rrbracket: \mu\Sigma \rightarrow \nu B$  gives a denotational semantics of programs; see the first diagram in [Figure 1](#). The main feature of this framework is that the denotational semantics is always *compositional*: the denotation map  $\llbracket - \rrbracket$  is, by construction, a morphism of  $\Sigma$ -algebras and thus denotational equivalence is respected by all constructors of the modelled language. Moreover, adequacy of the denotational semantics comes for free because denotational and behavioural equivalence simply coincide.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \Sigma(\mu\Sigma) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mu\Sigma \xrightarrow{\gamma} B(\mu\Sigma) & \Sigma(\mu\Sigma) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mu\Sigma \xrightarrow{\gamma} B(\mu\Sigma, \mu\Sigma) & \xrightarrow{B(\text{id}, [-])} \\
 \Sigma[-] \downarrow & \downarrow [-] & \downarrow [-] \\
 \Sigma(\nu B) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \nu B \xrightarrow{\cong} B(\nu B) & \Sigma Z \xrightarrow{\alpha} Z \xrightarrow{\cong} B(Z, Z) & \xrightarrow{B([-], \text{id})} \\
 & & B(\mu\Sigma, Z)
 \end{array}$$

Figure 1: Denotational semantics in first-order and higher-order abstract GSOS.

**Higher-Order Abstract GSOS** A key limitation of Turi and Plotkin’s framework is that it is not expressive enough to capture *higher-order* languages such as the  $\lambda$ -calculus. Recently, Goncharov et al. [Gon+23] have removed this limitation by developing the *higher-order abstract GSOS* framework. The idea is simple: move from behaviour *endofunctors* to *bifunctors*  $B: \mathbb{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  of mixed variance, accounting for the fact that in higher-order languages, programs can occur both as inputs (contravariantly) and as outputs (covariantly) of programs. For example, an untyped  $\lambda$ -calculus can be modelled by a behaviour bifunctor like  $B(X, Y) = Y + Y^X$ , which reflects that a  $\lambda$ -term either  $\beta$ -reduces to a  $\lambda$ -term, or acts as a function mapping  $\lambda$ -terms to  $\lambda$ -terms. The operational rules of a higher-order language are presented as a *higher-order GSOS law*, a (di)natural transformation

$$\varrho_{X,Y}: \Sigma(X \times B(X, Y)) \rightarrow B(X, \Sigma^*(X + Y)).$$

As in the first-order case, every higher-order GSOS law has an *operational model*, which extends the initial algebra  $\mu\Sigma$  of programs (e.g.  $\lambda$ -terms) to the initial *higher-order bialgebra*; see the top of the second diagram in Figure 1. This bialgebraic framework captures the operational semantics of a wide range of higher-order languages, and operational reasoning methods such as Howe’s method [Urb+23] and logical relations [Gon+24] have been developed at this generality. In contrast, a bialgebraic treatment of higher-order *denotational* semantics along the lines of Turi and Plotkin’s original vision has been missing so far.

**Bialgebraic Denotational Semantics via Locally Final Coalgebras** In recent work [Gon+26], we have introduced denotational semantics to the world of higher-order abstract GSOS. The main challenge is to identify the proper denotational models. Following Turi and Plotkin’s ideas, the obvious approach is to use *final* higher-order coalgebras (and derived bialgebras). However, this does not work: the mixed-variance bifunctors modelling higher-order languages usually fail to have a final higher-order coalgebra, even for the simplest kinds of deterministic languages. Unlike in the first-order setting, non-existence of final higher-order coalgebras is not merely due to size issues, which could be circumvented by suitably restricting the behaviour bifunctors, but inherent to the nature of higher-order coalgebras.

The core insight of our work is to take *locally final coalgebras* instead of final ones. A higher-order coalgebra  $Z \xrightarrow{\cong} B(Z, Z)$  for a bifunctor  $B$  is locally final if it is final as a coalgebra for the *endofunctor*  $B(Z, -): \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . We think of a locally final coalgebra as a domain of abstract higher-order behaviours. Unlike final coalgebras, locally final coalgebras exist for many higher-order languages, and are often (but not always) unique up to isomorphism. Thus, they form a natural foundation for bialgebraic denotational models. This is substantiated by several results:

1. We develop a general theory of existence, construction, and uniqueness of locally final coalgebras for bifunctors. Our approach is based on the ultrametric-enriched framework of *M-categories* [BST10], which provides a natural setting for the construction of fixed points of functors. We give a sufficient criterion for a behaviour bifunctor  $B: \mathbb{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$

on an M-category to admit a (unique) locally final coalgebra, and provide an iterative construction method for it.

2. We show that every locally final coalgebra  $Z$  canonically extends to a bialgebra for a given higher-order GSOS law, provided that the latter satisfies a syntactic restriction called *relative flatness*. We thus obtain a unique denotation morphism from the initial higher-order bialgebra  $\mu\Sigma$  to the bialgebra  $Z$  (second diagram in [Figure 1](#)). This denotational semantics is adequate: denotational implies behavioural equivalence w.r.t. the final coalgebra for  $B(\mu\Sigma, -)$ . Unlike in the first-order case, where adequacy holds by definition, this is a non-trivial result, as denotational and behavioural equivalence no longer coincide.

These results induce a generic denotational semantics for languages modelled in higher-order abstract GSOS. For instance, the untyped  $\lambda$ -calculus is captured by a higher-order GSOS law in  $\mathbf{Set}^{\omega_{\text{op}}}$  (the *topos of trees*), and its generic denotational model is given by a form of *guarded interaction trees* [[FTB24](#)], while behavioural equivalence is strong *applicative bisimilarity* [[Abr90](#)].

## References

- [Abr90] Samson Abramsky. “The lazy lambda calculus”. In: *Research Topics in Functional Programming*. USA: Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., 1990, 65–116. ISBN: 0201172364.
- [BST10] Lars Birkedal, Kristian Støvring, and Jacob Thamsborg. “The category-theoretic solution of recursive metric-space equations”. en. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 411 (47 Oct. 2010), pp. 4102–4122. DOI: [10.1016/j.tcs.2010.07.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2010.07.010). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2010.07.010>.
- [FTB24] Dan Frumin, Amin Timany, and Lars Birkedal. “Modular Denotational Semantics for Effects with Guarded Interaction Trees”. en. In: *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 8 (POPL Jan. 2024), pp. 332–361. DOI: [10.1145/3632854](https://doi.org/10.1145/3632854).
- [Gon+23] Sergey Goncharov, Stefan Milius, Lutz Schröder, Stelios Tsampas, and Henning Urbat. “Towards a Higher-Order Mathematical Operational Semantics”. In: *Proc. ACM Prog. Lang.* 7, Issue POPL (2023), pp. 632–658. DOI: [10.1145/3571215](https://doi.org/10.1145/3571215).
- [Gon+24] Sergey Goncharov, Stefan Milius, Stelios Tsampas, and Henning Urbat. “Bialgebraic Reasoning on Higher-Order Program Equivalence”. In: *39th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2024)*. IEEE Computer Society Press, 2024, 39:1–39:15. DOI: [10.1145/3661814.3662099](https://doi.org/10.1145/3661814.3662099).
- [Gon+26] Sergey Goncharov, Marco Peressotti, Stelios Tsampas, Henning Urbat, and Stefano Volpe. *Towards a Higher-Order Bialgebraic Denotational Semantics*. 2026. arXiv: [2602.18295](https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.18295) [[cs.PL](#)].
- [TP97] Daniele Turi and Gordon Plotkin. “Towards a mathematical operational semantics”. In: *Twelfth Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (Warsaw, Poland)*. Vol. 1. IEEE Comput. Soc, 1997, pp. 280–291. DOI: [10.1109/lics.1997.614955](https://doi.org/10.1109/lics.1997.614955). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/lics.1997.614955>.
- [Urb+23] Henning Urbat, Stelios Tsampas, Sergey Goncharov, Stefan Milius, and Lutz Schröder. “Weak Similarity in Higher-Order Mathematical Operational Semantics”. In: *38th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2023)*. IEEE Computer Society Press, 2023. DOI: [10.1109/LICS56636.2023.10175706](https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS56636.2023.10175706).