

Property

The subject-construction theorem:

let  $\Delta$  be a  $TA_\lambda$ -deduction of a formula  $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ .

(i) If we remove from each formula in  $\Delta$  everything except its subject,  $\Delta$  changes to a tree of terms which is exactly the construction-tree for  $M$ .

(ii) If  $M$  is an atom,  $M \equiv x$ , then  $\Gamma = \{x : \tau\}$  and  $\Delta$  contains only one formula, namely the axiom  $x : \tau \vdash x : \tau$

(iii) If  $M \equiv PQ$  the last step in  $\Delta$  must be an application of  $(\rightarrow E)$  to two formulae with form  $\Gamma \vdash P \vdash Q : \sigma$  for some  $\sigma$ .

$$\Gamma \vdash P \vdash P : \sigma \rightarrow \tau$$

restriction  $\text{subjects}(P) = FV(P)$

(iv) If  $M \equiv \lambda x. P$  then  $\tau$  must have form  $\rho \rightarrow \sigma$   
if  $x \in FV(P)$  the last step in  $\Delta$  must be an application of  $(\rightarrow I)_{\text{main}}$  to

$$\Gamma, x : \rho \vdash P : \sigma$$

if  $x \notin FV(P)$  the last step in  $\Delta$  must be an application of  $(\rightarrow I)_{\text{vac}}$  to

$$\Gamma \vdash P : \sigma$$

Deductions in  $TA_\lambda$  may not be unique

Example :-

$$\Delta_M \left[ \begin{array}{l} \frac{y : a \vdash y : a}{\vdash (\lambda y. y) : a \rightarrow a} (\rightarrow I) \\ \frac{\vdash (\lambda y. y) : a \rightarrow a}{\vdash (\lambda x. \lambda y. y) : (\sigma \rightarrow \sigma) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow a)} (\rightarrow I) \\ \frac{\vdash (\lambda x. \lambda y. y) : (\sigma \rightarrow \sigma) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow a) \quad \frac{z : \sigma \vdash z : \sigma}{\vdash (\lambda z. z) : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma} (\rightarrow I)}{\vdash (\lambda x. \lambda y. y) (\lambda z. z) : a \rightarrow a} (\rightarrow E) \end{array} \right.$$

here  $M \equiv (\lambda x. \lambda y. y) (\lambda z. z)$   $\tau \equiv a \rightarrow a$   $\Gamma = \emptyset$   
here  $\sigma$  can be anything and this makes the  $\Delta_M$  unique.

(Property)

## Uniqueness of deductions for normal forms.

Let  $M$  be a  $\beta$ -nf and  $\Delta$  a  $TA_2$ -deduction of  $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ .

Then (i) every type in  $\Delta$  has an occurrence in  $\tau$  or in a type in  $\Gamma$ ,

(ii)  $\Delta$  is unique, i.e., if  $\Delta'$  is also a deduction of  $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$  then  $\Delta' \equiv \Delta$ .

## Subject reduction and expansion (Property)

If  $P$  has type  $\tau$  we can think of  $P$  as being in some sense "safe".

If  $P$  represents a stage in some computation which continues by  $\beta$ -reducing  $P$  then all later stages in the computation are also "safe". (Unsafe means mismatch of types.)

Subject-reduction theorem :-

If  $\Gamma \vdash P : \tau$  and  $P \rightarrow_\beta Q$  then  $\Gamma \vdash Q : \tau$ .

Exact Proof :-  $\rightarrow_\beta$  means there is a deduction of  $\langle P, \beta, \tau \rangle$  in  $TA_2$ .

$$P \equiv (\lambda x. M) N \quad Q \equiv M[N/x]$$

Let  $x \in FV(M)$ , then by the subject-construction theorem the lower steps of  $\Delta$  must have the form

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma_1, x:\sigma \vdash M:\tau \quad (\rightarrow I)_{\text{main}}}{\Gamma_1 \vdash (\lambda x. M):\sigma \rightarrow \tau} \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash N:\sigma}{\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \vdash ((\lambda x. M)N) : \tau} \quad Q : \tau$$

Now  $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$  and  $\text{Subjects}(\Gamma) = FV(P)$   
so we have a deduction for  $\Gamma \vdash P : \tau$   
but  $(\lambda x. M)N \rightarrow_\beta Q$  i.e.  $P \rightarrow_\beta Q$ .  
so we also have a deduction for  $\Gamma \vdash Q : \tau$ .  $\square$ .

subject-expansion theorem :-

If  $\Gamma \vdash Q : \tau$  and  $P \rightarrow_\beta Q[*]$  then  $\Gamma \vdash P : \tau$ .

[\*] by non-duplicating and non-cancelling contractions.

The above condition [\*] is very important. Removing it will make the conclusion false.

4.4.2025

Defn: ( $\beta$ -contraction)

a  $\beta$ -redex is any term  $(\lambda x. M)N$

beta-redex is that which can reduce.

its contractum is  $M[N/x]$

its rewrite rule is  $(\lambda x. M)N \triangleright_{\beta} M[N/x]$

If  $P$  contains a  $\beta$ -redex-occurrence  $R \equiv (\lambda x. M)N$

and  $Q$  is the result of replacing this by  $M[N/x]$ ,

we say  $P$   $\beta$ -contracts to  $Q$  ( $P \triangleright_{\beta} Q$ )

we call  $(P, R, Q)$  a  $\beta$ -contraction of  $P$ .

(Property)

Lemma:  $P \triangleright_{\beta} Q \Rightarrow FV(P) \supseteq FV(Q)$

Defn ( $\beta$ -reduction)

a  $\beta$ -reduction of a term  $P$  is a finite or infinite sequence

of  $\beta$ -contractions with form

$\langle P_1, R_1, Q_1 \rangle, \dots \langle P_2, R_2, Q_2 \rangle, \dots$

$P_1 \equiv_{\alpha} P \quad Q_i \equiv_{\alpha} P_{i+1} \quad (i=1, 2, \dots)$

If there is a reduction from  $P$  to  $Q$  we say  $P$   $\beta$ -reduces to  $Q$   
 $P \triangleright_{\beta} Q$

NB:  $\alpha$ -conversions are allowed in a  $\beta$ -reduction.

Defn: ( $\beta$ -inversion)

If we can change  $P$  to  $Q$  by a finite sequence of

$\beta$ -reductions and reversed  $\beta$ -reductions we say

$P$   $\beta$ -converts to  $Q$  or

$P$  is  $\beta$ -equal to  $Q$ .

$P =_{\beta} Q$

a reversed  $\beta$ -reduction is called  $\beta$ -expansion.

$P \triangleright_{\beta} Q$ :  $P$   $\beta$ -reduces to  $Q$

$P =_{\beta} Q$ :  $P$   $\beta$ -reduces to  $Q$  and  $Q$   $\beta$ -reduces to  $P$ .



Let  $X_F = YF$

$X_F$  beta-converts to  $YF$

Prove:  $FX_F =_{\beta} X_F$

(i)  ~~$FX_F$~~   $FX_F \triangleright_{\beta} X_F$

(ii)  $X_F \triangleright_{\beta} FX_F$

Y here is Y combinator

(i)  ~~$FX_F$~~   $= F(YF)$   
 $= F(F(YF))$   
 $= F(FX_F)$   
 $= \text{ ~~$FX_F$~~ }$

$FX_F = F(YF)$   
 $= YF$  (property of "Y")  
 $= X_F$

(ii)  $X_F = YF$   
 $= F(YF)$  (property of "Y")  
 $= FX_F$

Defn ( $\beta$ -normal form) :  $\beta$ -nf

A  $\beta$ -nf is a term that contains no  $\beta$ -redexes.

The class of all  $\beta$ -nf's is called  $\beta$ -nf.

We say a term  $M$  has  $\beta$ -nf  $N$  iff

$M \triangleright_{\beta} N$  and  $N \in \beta$ -nf

A reduction can be thought of as a computation and a  $\beta$ -nf as a result.

(Terms need not have  $\beta$ -nf) eg  $\lambda x. \lambda x. x$   $\lambda x. \lambda x. x = (\lambda x. \lambda x. x)$

$\forall M$  s.t.  $M : \tau$  (for some  $\tau$ ),  $\Rightarrow M$  has a  $\beta$ -nf.

Every term with a type has a  $\beta$ -nf.

Defn: A  $\beta$ -contraction  $(\lambda x. M)N \triangleright_{\beta} M[N/x]$  is said to

cancel  $N$  iff  $x$  does not occur free in  $M$ ;

it is said to duplicate  $N$  iff  $x$  has at least two free occurrences in  $M$ .

A  $\beta$ -reduction is non-duplicating iff none of its contractions duplicates; it is non-cancelling iff none cancels.

Definition :  $\text{Types}(M)$

If  $M$  is closed, define  $\text{Types}(M)$  to be the set of all  $\tau$  s.t.  $\vdash M : \tau$

$x$  in  $\text{sa}$  will not have any type.

Note:  $\text{Types}(M)$  is either empty or infinite.

if the  $\text{types}(M)$  is empty, then there doesn't exist a deduction tree for  $M$

Property

Lemma: Let  $P$  be closed. Then

(i)  $P \triangleright_{\beta} Q \Rightarrow \text{Types}(P) \subseteq \text{Types}(Q)$

(ii) if  $P \triangleright_{\beta} Q$  by a non-cancelling and non-duplicating reduction, then  $\text{Types}(P) = \text{Types}(Q)$

Note

We need not always have

$M =_{\beta} N \Rightarrow \text{Types}(M) = \text{Types}(N)$

Note

It could be that  $M =_{\beta} N$  but  $\text{Types}(M) \cap \text{Types}(N) = \emptyset$

Note

$\text{Types}(M)$  is more than  $\text{Types}(N)$  means that  $\text{Types}(M)$  is a larger set than  $\text{Types}(N)$ . This means that there is a type of  $M$  that is less constrained than a type of  $N$ . (See (i) of the above Lemma).

The Typable terms :-

$\text{TA}_{\lambda}$  divides the  $\lambda$ -terms into two complementary classes:

those which can receive types (eg,  $\lambda x. \lambda y. \lambda z. x(yz)$ ) — safe

and those which cannot (eg,  $\lambda x. xx$ ).

Definition :- A term  $M$  is called  $(\text{TA}_{\lambda})$ -typable iff there exist

$\Gamma$  and  $\tau$  s.t.  $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$

If a deduction proof exists for a lambda term with a given type, then it will be typable.

## Purity

Lemma: The class of all  $TA_1$ -typable terms is closed under the foll. operations

- (i) taking subterms (all subterms of a typable term are typable)
- (ii)  $\beta$ -reduction
- (iii)  $\eta$ -cancellation and non-duplicating  $\beta$ -expansion
- (iv)  $\lambda$ -abstraction (i.e. if  $M$  is typable so is  $\lambda x.M$ ).

Theorem: The class of all  $TA_1$ -typable terms is decidable. i.e., there is an algorithm which decides whether a given term is typable in  $TA_1$ .

Proof: The Principal-type algorithm (PT-algorithm).

Weak Normalization Theorem :- (Purity). (WN Thm).

Every  $TA_1$ -typable term is  $\beta$ -nf. (excluding  $\eta$ -nf)

Strong Normalization (SN) Thm :- (Purity) If  $M$  is a  $TA_1$ -typable term, every  $\beta$ -reduction that starts at  $M$  is finite. (excluding  $\eta$ -reduction).

SN  $\Rightarrow$  WN but the proof of Turing in WN is simpler, and mostly we use WN.

strong normalization will imply weak normalization.

## Theorem (Purity)

there is a decision procedure for  $\beta$ -equality of  $TA_1$ -typable terms i.e. an algorithm which, given any typable terms  $P$  and  $Q$ , will decide whether  $P \equiv_{\beta} Q$ .

Proof: by WN, reduce  $P, Q$  to their nf's. Then check whether they differ.