

“Introduction to Models of Computation” Solutions

Yanyan Jiang

Spring, 2012

1 Recursive Functions

1.1 Prove: for any fixed k , unary number theoretic function $x + k \in \mathcal{BF}$.

Proof. We have $+_0 = P_1^1$ and $+_k = \underbrace{S \circ S \circ \dots \circ S}_{k-1 \text{ times}} \in \mathcal{BF}$ for all $k \geq 1$. \square

1.2 Prove: for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $f : \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, there always exists h satisfying $f(\mathbf{x}) < \|\mathbf{x}\| + h$ if $f \in \mathcal{BF}$.

Proof. We perform a structural induction on the constructive length ℓ of basic function f .

When $\ell = 0$, $f \in \mathcal{IF}$. Thus $f(x) \leq S(x) < x + 2$ for all x . Let $h_0 = 2$.

We assume when $0 \leq \ell \leq n$, all functions f with constructive length no longer than ℓ satisfy $f(\mathbf{x}) < \|\mathbf{x}\| + h_n$.

In the case of $\ell = n + 1$, assume that f is constructed by sequence f_0, f_1, \dots, f_n, f . If $f \in \mathcal{IF}$, it is trivial that $f(x) \leq S(x) < \|\mathbf{x}\| + 2h_n$. Elsewise, $f = \text{Comp}_k^m[f_{i_0}, f_{i_1}, \dots, f_{i_k}]$. By inductive hypothesis we have $f_{i_j} < h_n$ for all j , thus $f(\mathbf{x}) < \max\{f_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})\} + h_n < \|\mathbf{x}\| + 2h_n$. Therefore, by letting $h = 2^{\ell+1}$, $f(\mathbf{x}) < \|\mathbf{x}\| + h$ always holds. \square

1.3 Prove: binary number theoretic function $x + y \notin \mathcal{BF}$.

Proof. We have already proved that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $f : \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, there always exists h satisfying $f(\mathbf{x}) < \|\mathbf{x}\| + h$ if $f \in \mathcal{BF}$.

If $x + y \in \mathcal{BF}$, there is h such that $x + x = 2x = 2\|\mathbf{x}\| < \|\mathbf{x}\| + h$, which implies $x < h$, leading to contradiction. \square

1.4 Prove: binary number theoretic function $x - y \notin \mathcal{BF}$.

Proof. Since $\text{pred} = \text{Comp}_2^1[P_1^1, S \circ Z]$, proving $\text{pred} \notin \mathcal{BF}$ is enough to show $x - y \notin \mathcal{BF}$. Assume there exists shortest construction procedure $f_0, f_1, \dots, f_n, \text{pred}$. There are two cases:

Case 1. $f_n \in \{S, Z, P\}$ is not the case.

Case 2. f_n is a composition of S, Z or P . f_n cannot be composition of S because $S(x) > 0$ for all x , and $\text{pred}(1) = 0$. Also, f_n cannot be composition of Z because $\text{pred}(x)$ can be arbitrarily large. Finally, f_n cannot be composition of P because this contradicts the shortest construction assumption. \square

1.5 Let $\text{pg}(x, y) = 2^x(2y + 1) - 1$. Prove that there exists elementary function $K(x)$ and $L(x)$ such that $K(\text{pg}(x, y)) = x$, $L(\text{pg}(x, y)) = y$ and $\text{pg}(K(z), L(z)) = z$.

Proof. Let $K(x) = \text{ep}_0(x + 1)$, $L(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{x + 1}{2^{K(x)}} - 1 \right)$, we have

$$\text{pg}(K(z), L(z)) = 2^{\text{ep}_0(z+1)} \left(\frac{z + 1}{2^{\text{ep}_0(z+1)}} \right) - 1 = z. \quad \square$$

1.6 Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Prove that f could be left function in a pairing function if and only if $|\{x \in \mathbb{N} : f(x) = i\}| = \aleph_0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. The necessity is trivial by a simple contradiction. For the sufficiency, $|\{x \in \mathbb{N} : f(x) = i\}| = \aleph_0$ implies that there exists 1-1 onto mapping $f_i : N_i \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $N_i = \{x \mid f(x) = i\}$ for all i , which implies that f_i^{-1} exists for all i . By letting $\text{pg}(x, y) = f_x^{-1}(y)$, we have $K(z) = f(f_x^{-1}(z)) = x$ and $L(z) = f_x(z) = f_x(f_x^{-1}(y)) = y$. \square

1.7 Prove that all elementary function can be generated by applying composition and $\prod_{i=n}^m [\cdot]$ operator.

Proof. We first build some function by the conditioning ability of Π :

$$N(x) = \prod_{i=1}^x Z(i), \text{ leq}(x, y) = \prod_{i=x}^y Z(i), \text{ and } \text{geq}(x, y) = \prod_{i=y}^x Z(i).$$

Also, we can construct integral power and thus equality by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pow}(x, k) &= \prod_{i=1}^k x, \\ \text{eq}(x, y) &= \text{leq}(x, y)^{\prod_{i=1}^{\text{geq}(x, y)} 1}, \end{aligned}$$

and finally Σ operator by creating logarithm:

$$\begin{aligned} \log(x) &= \prod_{i=0}^x i^{N(\text{eq}(2^i, x))}, \\ \sum_{i=n}^m f(i, \mathbf{x}) &= \log \prod_{i=n}^m 2^{f(i, \mathbf{x})}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $x \times y = \sum_{i=1}^x y$, $x + y = \log(2^x \cdot 2^y)$, and $|x - y| = \left(\sum_{i=x+1}^y 1 \right) + \left(\sum_{i=y+1}^x 1 \right)$, our proof is complete. \square

1.8 Let $M(x)$ be $M(M(x+11))$ when $x \leq 100$ and $x-10$ when $x > 100$. Prove $M(x) = 91$ when $x \leq 100$.

Proof. The basic case is $M(99) = M(M(110)) = M(100) = M(M(111)) = M(101) = 91$, and $M(x) = M(M(x)) = M(x+1)$ when $90 \leq x \leq 100$. An induction on x shows $M(x) = 91$ for all $0 \leq x \leq 100$. \square

1.9 Prove: $\min x \leq n.[f(x, \mathbf{y})] = n - \max x \leq n.[f(n-x, \mathbf{y})]$,
and $\max x \leq n.[f(x, \mathbf{y})] = n - \min x \leq n.[f(n-x, \mathbf{y})]$.

Proof. For simplicity, let $m = \min x \leq n.[f(x, \mathbf{y})]$ and $M = \max x \leq n.[f(n-x, \mathbf{y})]$.

If there is no $0 \leq x \leq n$ satisfying $f(x, \mathbf{y}) = 0$, we have $m = n$ and $M = 0$, hence $m + M = n$. Otherwise, let a be the minimum root of $f(x, \mathbf{y})$, thus $f(x, \mathbf{y}) \neq 0$ for all $x < a$, and $f(n - x, \mathbf{y}) \neq 0$ for all $x > n - a$. By definition, we can easily see that $m + M = n$. Since both m and M will not exceed n , $m + M = n$ yields $m = n - M$ and $M = n - m$.

The another case is trivial by symmetry. \square

1.10 Prove: \mathcal{EF} is closed under the bounded max operator.

Proof. For any $f \in \mathcal{EF}$,

$$\max x \leq n. [f(x, \mathbf{y})] = \sum_{i=0}^n \left[\left\lfloor \left(\sum_{x=0}^i N(x, \mathbf{y}) \right) / \left(\sum_{x=0}^n N(x, \mathbf{y}) \right) \right\rfloor \times i \right]. \quad \square$$

1.11 Prove: Euler's totient function $\varphi \in \mathcal{EF}$.

$$\textbf{Proof. } \varphi(x) = \left\{ \sum_{y=0}^n N \left[\left(\sum_{d=0}^{x+y} |\text{rs}(x, d) - \text{rs}(y, d)| \right) - 2 \right] \right\} - 1. \quad \square$$

1.12 Let $h(x)$ be subscript of the greatest prime factor. Assume that $h(0) = h(1) = 0$, prove that $h \in \mathcal{EF}$.

$$\textbf{Proof. } h(x) = \max i \leq x. \left\{ N^2 \left| \sum_{j=0}^i [N(\text{rs}(i, j))] - 2 \right| + N^2[\text{rs}(x, i)] \right\}. \quad \square$$

1.13 Prove that the Fibonacci sequence $f(0) = f(1) = 1, f(x+2) = f(x) + f(x+1) \in \mathcal{EF}$ and \mathcal{PRF} .

Proof. Let $\{\text{pg}, K, L\}$ be any paring function in \mathcal{PRF} . Let

$$\begin{aligned} F(0) &= \text{pg}(1, 0) \\ F(x+1) &= \text{pg}(K(F(x)) + L(f(x)), K(F(x))), \end{aligned}$$

we have F is in \mathcal{PRF} and $K(F(x)) = f(x)$, therefore $f \in \mathcal{PRF}$.

On the other hand, $f(x)$ is the number of binary strings of length $x-1$ without successive 1s. Therefore

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{2^{n-1}-1} N \left[\sum_{j=0}^{n-2} \text{neq} \left(\frac{\text{rs}(i, 2^j)}{2^{j-1}}, 1 \right) \text{neq} \left(\frac{\text{rs}(i, 2^{j+1})}{2^j}, 1 \right) \right] \in \mathcal{EF}. \quad \square$$

1.14 Prove that the number theoretic function $Q(x, y, z, v) \equiv p(\langle x, y, z \rangle) \mid v$ is elementary.

Proof. We have already seen that $p(n) \in \mathcal{EF}$ and $\langle x, y, z \rangle = 2^x \cdot 3^y \cdot 5^z \in \mathcal{EF}$. Therefore $Q(x, y, z) = \text{eq}(\text{rs}(v, p(\langle x, y, z \rangle)), 0) \in \mathcal{EF}$. \square

1.15 Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, $f(0) = 1, f(1) = 4, f(2) = 6, f(x+3) = f(x) + f^2(x+1) + f^3(x+2)$. Prove that $f \in \mathcal{PRF}$.

Proof. Let $G(0) = \langle 1, 4, 6 \rangle$ and

$$G(x+1) = \langle \text{ep}_1(G(x)), \text{ep}_2(G(x)), \text{ep}_0(G(x)) + \text{ep}_1^2(G(x)) + \text{ep}_2^3(G(x)) \rangle,$$

we have $\text{ep}_0(G(x)) = f(x)$. \square

1.16 Let $f(n) = n^{n^{\dots^n}}$, prove that $f \in \mathcal{PRF} - \mathcal{EF}$.

Proof. Let $g(n, 0) = 0$ and $g(n, x+1) = n^{g(n, x)}$. Thus $g \in \mathcal{PRF}$ and $g(n, n) = f(n)$, therefore $f \in \mathcal{PRF}$. On the other hand, $G(k, x) = 2^{2^{\dots^x}}$ is one among the control functions of \mathcal{EF} . If $f \in \mathcal{EF}$, there exists k such that $G(k, n) > f(n)$ for all n . However, this is impossible because $f(k+2)$ is always greater than $G(k, k+2)$. \square

1.17 Let $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \in \mathcal{PRF}$, $f : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ satisfies that $f(x, 0) = g(x)$, $f(x, y+1) = f(f(\dots f(f(x, y), y-1), \dots), 0)$. Prove that $f \in \mathcal{PRF}$.

Proof. Let $G(x, 0) = x$ and $G(x, y+1) = g(G(x, y))$. A simple induction shows that $f(x, y) = g^{2^{y-1}}(x)$, thus $f(x, y) = G(x, 2^{y-1}) \in \mathcal{PRF}$. \square

1.18 If $f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ differs for only finitely many values. Prove that $f \in \mathcal{GRF}$ if and only if $g \in \mathcal{GRF}$.

Proof. For the necessity, we have $g \in \mathcal{GRF}$ and $S = \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_k\}$ satisfies that for all $x \in \mathbb{N} \setminus S$, $f(x) = g(x)$.

Let $F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^k g(s_i) \cdot N(\text{eq}(s_i, x)) + N\left(\sum_{i=0}^k N(\text{eq}(s_i, x))\right) g(x)$, because the Σ in F is walked through finitely many of values, F is in \mathcal{GRF} , and $f(x) = F(x)$ for all x , thus $f \in \mathcal{GRF}$. Also, the sufficiency case is trivial by symmetry. \square

1.19 Prove that $\left\lfloor \left(\frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2} \right) n \right\rfloor \in \mathcal{EF}$.

Proof. Let $\varphi = \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2}$, we can rewrite the solution of $y = \lfloor \varphi n \rfloor$ by

$$\begin{aligned} y &= \max_{x \in \mathbb{N}} x \\ \text{s.t. } &\varphi n \leq x, \end{aligned}$$

therefore $y = \max x \leq 2n \cdot \text{eq}(x^2 - nx - n^2, 0)$. \square

1.20 Prove that $\text{Ack}(4, n) \in \mathcal{PRF} - \mathcal{RF}$.

Proof. Let $f(0) = 1$, $f(n+1) = 2^{f(n)}$, we immediately have $f \in \mathcal{PRF}$, therefore $\text{Ack}(4, n) = f(n+3) - 3 \in \mathcal{PRF}$.

$G(k, x) = 2^{2^{\dots^x}}$ is the control function of \mathcal{EF} . Assume that $\text{Ack}(4, n) \in \mathcal{EF}$, thus $G'(k, x) = \text{Ack}(4, x+k) + 3 \in \mathcal{EF}$. However, $G(k, x) < G'(k, x)$ contradicts the assumption, yielding $\text{Ack}(4, n) \in \mathcal{PRF} - \mathcal{EF}$. \square

1.21 Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and being 1-1 and onto. Prove that $f \in \mathcal{GRF}$ if and only if $f^{-1} \in \mathcal{GRF}$.

Proof. The sufficiency can be shown by the fact that

$$f^{-1}(x) = \mu y. |f(y) - x|$$

because there exists unique y such that $f(y) = x$, and hence the root of $|f(y) - x|$. Therefore, $\mu y. |f(y) - x|$ is the unique value of y satisfying $f(y) = x$, i.e., $y = f^{-1}(x)$. Also because $(f^{-1})^{-1} = f$, the case of necessity is trivial by symmetry. \square

1.22 Let p be a polynomial with integral coefficient, and $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined by the non-negative root of $f(a) = p(x) - a$. Prove that $f \in \mathcal{RF}$.

Proof. Let $p(x) = a_n x^n + \dots + a_1 x + a_0$, $S = \{i \mid a_i > 0\}$, and $T = \{i \mid a_i < 0\}$, we have

$$|p(x) - a| = \left| \sum_{i \in S} |a_i| x^i - \left(a + \sum_{i \in T} |a_i| x^i \right) \right| \in \mathcal{EF}.$$

Therefore, $f(a) = \mu x. |p(x) - a| \in \mathcal{RF}$. □

1.23 Let $f(x, y) = x/y$ if $y \neq 0 \wedge y \mid x$ and \uparrow otherwise. Prove that $f \in \mathcal{RF}$.

Proof. $f(x, y) = \mu k. |x - ky| + \mu k. N(x + y) \in \mathcal{RF}$. □

1.24 Define $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by $g(0) = 0, g(1) = 1, g(n + 2) = \text{rs}((2002g(n + 1) + 2003g(n)), 2005)$. Find $g(2006)$.

Proof. We have $g(n) = \text{rs}\left(\frac{(-1)^{n+1} + 2003^n}{2004}, 2005\right)$ and $2005 = 5 \cdot 401$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} g(2006) \bmod 2005 &= \left((2003^{2006} - 1) \times 2004^{-1} \right) \bmod 2005 \\ &= \left((2^{2006} - 1) \times 2004 \right) \bmod 2005. \end{aligned}$$

Since $a^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod p$ for all prime p , $2^{2006} \equiv 2^2 \equiv 4 \pmod 5$, $2^{2006} \equiv 2^6 \equiv 64 \pmod{401}$. According to the Chinese remainder theorem, $2^{2006} \equiv 64 \pmod{2005}$. Therefore, $g(2006) \equiv 63 \times 2004 \equiv 1942 \pmod{2005}$. □

1.25 Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be the n -th digit in the decimal representation of π . Prove that $f \in \mathcal{GRF}$.

Proof. Given a m by m grid, we count the integral point of (x, y) within a circle centered at $(0, 0)$ with radius m by

$$S = \left| \{(x, y) \mid x, y \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } x^2 + y^2 \leq m^2\} \right|$$

to approximately find π . S is elementary because

$$S(m) = \sum_{i=0}^m \sum_{j=0}^m N(i^2 + j^2 - m^2).$$

Area of the circle is $S_c(m) = \pi m^2/4$, and by the fact that the circle intersects with at most $2m$ 1×1 blocks, we have $|S(m) - S_c(m)| < 2m$, therefore

$$\left| \frac{S(m)}{m^2} - \frac{\pi}{4} \right| = \frac{1}{m^2} |S(m) - S_c(m)| < 2m^{-1}, \text{ and} \\ |4S(m) - m^2\pi| < 8m.$$

To compute $f(n)$, we need an exponentially large grid, say, $m = 10^k$. Then we have $|4S(10^k) - 10^{2k} \cdot \pi| < 10^{k+1}$. We know that $4S(10^k)$ has $2k$ digits and last k of them is inaccurate, so we use regular μ operator to enumerate k until we met a non-zero digit between the first $n+1$ digits and the last k digits:

$$K(n) = \mu k. \left\{ n+1-k + N \left[\text{rs} \left(\frac{S(10^k)}{10^k}, 10^{k-n-1} \right) \right] \right\}.$$

Since there is no infinitely long successive zeros in decimal representation of π (otherwise π will be rational), regularity is ensured and thus $K \in \mathcal{GRF}$, therefore $f(n) = \text{rs} \left[\frac{S(10^{K(n)})}{10^{K(n)+1}}, 10 \right] \in \mathcal{GRF}$. \square

2 Abacus Machines

2.1 Construct AM for $f(x) = 2x$.

Proof. $f = \langle \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{A}_3 \rangle_1 \text{move}_{2,1} \text{move}_{3,1}$. \square

2.2 Construct AM for $f(x) = \lfloor x/2 \rfloor$.

Proof. $f = \mathbf{A}_1 \langle \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{A}_2 \rangle_1 \text{move}_{2,1} \mathbf{S}_1$. \square

2.3 Construct AM for $f(x) = x \cdot y$.

Proof. $f = \text{move}_{1,3} \langle \text{copy}_{3,1,4} \mathbf{S}_2 \rangle_2 \mathbf{Z}_3$. □

2.4 Construct AM for $g(x) = \mu y.[f(x, y)]$ assuming that $\mathbf{F} \in \text{AM}$ defines f .

Proof. Assume that \mathbf{F} uses at most k pillars. If x, y is located at position $k+1, k+2$, respectively, we can compute $f(x, y)$ by

$$\mathbf{M} = \text{copy}_{k+1,1} \text{copy}_{k+2,2} \mathbf{F}.$$

Therefore, g can be constructed by repeatedly enumerate y until f becomes zero:

$$g = \text{move}_{1,k+1} \mathbf{M} \langle \mathbf{A}_{k+2} \text{copy}_{k+1,1} \text{copy}_{k+2,2} \mathbf{M} \rangle_1 \text{move}_{k+2,1} \mathbf{Z}_{k+1}. \quad \square$$

2.5 Construct AM for $f(x) = 2^x$.

Proof. $f = \text{move}_{1,2} \mathbf{Z}_1 \mathbf{A}_1 \langle \text{copy}_{1,3} \text{move}_{3,1} \mathbf{S}_2 \rangle_2$. □

3 λ -calculus

3.1 Prove the *Parenthesis Lemma*: for all $M \in \Lambda$, the occurrence of left parenthesis is equal to the occurrence of right parenthesis.

Proof. Let $p(M)$ be the difference of the occurrence of left and right parenthesis in M . We have $p(x) = 0$, $p[(M_1 M_2)] = p(M_1) + p(M_2)$ and $p[(\lambda x.M)] = p(M)$. A formal proof comes from a simple structural induction. □

3.2 Find β -nf of $SSSS$.

Proof. According to $S \equiv \lambda xyz.xz(yz)$ and $SS =_\beta \lambda xyz.yz(xyz)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} SSSS &=_\beta SS(SS) \\ &=_\beta \lambda xy.[xy(SSxy)] \\ &=_\beta \lambda xy.xy(\lambda z.yz(xyz)) = M. \end{aligned}$$

$M =_\beta SSSS$ is β -nf of $SSSS$ because it has no redex. □

3.3 Prove that there is no β -nf for $(\lambda x.xxx)(\lambda x.xxx)$.

Proof. Let $N = \lambda x.xxx$ and $M = NN$, we have $\text{Sub}(M) = \{N, NN\}$. It is trivial that $NN \in \text{Sub}(M)$. If $\text{Sub}(A) = \bigcup_{i=1}^k N^k$ and $A \rightarrow_\beta B$, $\text{Sub}(B)$ will be either $\text{Sub}(A)$ or $\text{Sub}(A) \cup N^{k+1}$, hence $NN \in \text{Sub}(M')$ holds for all $M \rightarrow_\beta M'$.

Assume that the β -nf of M is M_β , we have $NN \in \text{Sub}(M_\beta)$ which leads to a contradiction. \square

3.4 Let $F \in \Lambda$ with the form of $\lambda x.M$. Prove that $\lambda z.Fz =_\beta F$ and $\lambda z.yz \neq_\beta y$.

Proof. $\lambda z.Fz \equiv \lambda z.(\lambda x.M)z \rightarrow_\beta \lambda z.(M[x := z]) \equiv M$. \square

3.5 Prove the fixed-point theorem for two variables: for all $F, G \in \Lambda$, exists $X, Y \in \Lambda$ such that $FXY = X$ and $GXY = Y$.

Proof. According to the equation $(GX)Y = Y$, let Y be the fixed-point of GX , say $\mathbf{Y}(GX)$, we have $FX(\mathbf{Y}(GX)) = X$, thus

$$\lambda x.[Fx(\mathbf{Y}(Gx))]X = X.$$

We can now derive a solution by letting $X = \mathbf{Y}[\lambda x.Fx(\mathbf{Y}(Gx))]$ and $Y = \mathbf{Y}(GX)$. \square

3.6 Prove for all $M, N \in \Lambda^\circ$, there is a solution for $xN = Mx$.

Proof. Let x be the form of $\lambda a.T$, this makes $(\lambda a.T)N = T$. This reduces rest of our proof to finding a solution to

$$T = M(\lambda a.T) = [\lambda t.M(\lambda a.t)]T.$$

Let $T = \mathbf{Y}[\lambda t.M(\lambda a.t)]$ hence $x = \lambda x.\mathbf{Y}[\lambda y.M(\lambda z.y)]$, $xN = Mx$ is satisfied. \square

3.7 Prove that for all $P, Q \in \Lambda$, $P \rightarrow_\beta Q$ implies the existence of $n \geq 0$ and $P_0, \dots, P_n \in \Lambda$ satisfying $P \equiv P_0$, $Q \equiv P_n$ and $P_i \rightarrow_\beta P_{i+1}$ for all $i < n$.

Proof. According to the fact that

$$\rightarrow_\beta = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} (\rightarrow_\beta)^i,$$

for all $P, Q \in \Lambda$, $P \rightarrow_\beta Q$ implies existence of k such that $P(\rightarrow_\beta)^k Q$. A structural induction on k directly leads to a proof. \square

3.8 Prove that for all $P, Q \in \Lambda$, $P \rightarrow_\beta Q$ implies $\lambda z.P \rightarrow_\beta \lambda z.Q$.

Proof. According to 3.7, sequence $P_0, \dots, P_n \in \Lambda$ with $P \equiv P_0$, $Q \equiv P_n$ and $P_i \rightarrow_\beta P_{i+1}$. Also because \rightarrow_β is the compatible closure of β , we have $\lambda z.A \rightarrow_\beta \lambda z.B$ for all $A \rightarrow_\beta B$. Thus for all $i < n$,

$$\lambda z.P_i \rightarrow_\beta \lambda z.P_{i+1}$$

in $\lambda z.P_0, \lambda z.P_1, \dots, \lambda z.P_n$ always holds, that is, $\lambda z.P \rightarrow_\beta \lambda z.Q$. \square

3.9 Prove that for all $P, Q \in \Lambda$, $P =_\beta Q$ implies the existence of $n \geq 0$ and $P_0, \dots, P_n \in \Lambda$ satisfying $P \equiv P_0$, $Q \equiv P_n$ and $P_i \rightarrow_\beta P_{i+1}$ or $P_{i+1} \rightarrow_\beta P_i$ for all $i < n$.

Proof. The technique used is exactly the same as in problem 3.7, except we are using $=_\beta = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} (\rightarrow_\beta \cup \rightarrow_\beta^{-1})^i$. \square

3.10 Prove that for all $M, N \in \Lambda$, $M =_\beta N$ if and only if $\lambda\beta \vdash M = N$.

Proof. The axiom of $\lambda\beta$ shows that $M = M$ and $(\lambda x.M)N = M[x := N]$. Also because $\beta \equiv \{((\lambda x.M)N, M[x := N]) : M, N \in \Lambda \wedge x \in V\}$ and $=_\beta$ is reflexive, $M =_\beta M$ and $(\lambda x.M)N =_\beta M[x := N]$ holds. This serves our inductive basis.

Assume that $\lambda\beta \vdash M = N$ implies $M =_\beta N$ for all formula $M = N$ with construction length less or equal to ℓ . A formula of construction length $\ell + 1$ will be within either of the following cases:

1. $(\sigma) : M = N \vdash N = M, =_\beta$ is symmetric makes $N =_\beta M$;
2. $(\tau) : M = N, N = L \vdash M = L, =_\beta$ is transitive makes $N =_\beta M$;
3. $(\mu) : M = N \vdash ZM = ZN, =_\beta$ is compatible makes $ZM =_\beta ZN$;
4. $(\nu) : M = N \vdash MZ = NZ, =_\beta$ is compatible makes $MZ =_\beta NZ$;
5. $(\xi) : M = N \vdash \lambda x.M = \lambda x.N, =_\beta$ is compatible makes $\lambda x.M =_\beta \lambda x.N$.

Therefore, $\lambda\beta \vdash M = N$ implies $M =_\beta N$.

On the other side, $M \rightarrow_\beta N$ implies $M =_\beta N$ because either $M\beta N$ thus $M = N$ by (β) , or (M, N) is in the compatible closure of $\{(M', N')\}$ for some $M'\beta N'$.

By the theorem proved in 3.9, for all $M =_\beta N$, there exists $n \geq 0$ and $P_0, \dots, P_n \in \Lambda$ such that $P \equiv P_0, Q \equiv P_n$ and either $P_i \rightarrow_\beta P_{i+1}$ or $P_{i+1} \rightarrow_\beta P_i$ for all $i < n$. Take the case of $n = 0$, which is that $M =_\beta M$ implies $\lambda\beta \vdash M = M$ as inductive basis, we perform an induction on the shortest construction length of n .

Assuming that for all $A =_\beta B$ with construction length of m less than n , $\lambda\beta \vdash A = B$ holds. For construction sequence $M = P_0, \dots, P_{n-1}, P_n = N$, we have $\lambda\beta \vdash M = P_{n-1}$ by the inductive hypothesis. Because $P_{n-1} \rightarrow_\beta P_n$ or $P_n \rightarrow_\beta P_{n-1}$ means that $\lambda\beta \vdash P_{n-1} = P_n$, according to (τ) , $\lambda\beta \vdash M = P_{n-1} = P_n = N$, therefore $A =_\beta B$ implies $\lambda\beta \vdash A = B$.

In summary, $=_\beta$ is equivalent to the formal system of $\lambda\beta$. \square

3.11 Prove that for all $M, N \in \Lambda$, $M =_{\beta\eta} N$ if and only if $\lambda\beta\eta \vdash M = N$.

Proof. Exactly the same technique used in problem 3.10 can be applied to this problem. \square

3.12 (This problem is duplicated with 3.16.)

3.13 Prove that by extending $\lambda\beta$ by axiom of $\lambda xy.x = \lambda xy.y$, $\lambda\beta^* \vdash M = N$ for all $M, N \in \Lambda$.

Proof. For all $M, N \in \Lambda$, $\lambda xy.x = \lambda xy.y \Rightarrow (\lambda xy.x)M = (\lambda xy.y)N \Rightarrow (\lambda xy.x)MN = (\lambda xy.y)MN \Rightarrow (\lambda xy.x)MN = (\lambda xy.y)MN \Rightarrow M = (\lambda xy.y)MN \Rightarrow M = N$. \square

3.14 Prove that for binary relation R on Λ , $M \in NF_R$ implies: (1) there is no $N \in \Lambda$ such that $M \rightarrow_R N$; (2) $M \twoheadrightarrow_R N \Rightarrow M \equiv N$.

Proof.

3.15 Prove that $M \triangleright_{\text{mcd}} M'$ and $N \triangleright_{\text{mcd}} N'$ implies $MN \triangleright_{\text{mcd}} M'N'$.

Proof.

3.16 Prove that for all $M, N \in \Lambda$, $M =_\beta N$ implies the existence of T such that $M \twoheadrightarrow_\beta T$ and $N \twoheadrightarrow_\beta T$.

Proof.

3.17 Find $F \in \Lambda^\circ$ such that F λ -defines $f(x) = 3x$.

Proof. We are to construct $F \ulcorner n \urcorner = \ulcorner 3n \urcorner = \lambda fx.f^n(f^n(f^n x))$.

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda fx.f^n(f^n(f^n x)) &= \lambda fx.f^n(f^n(\ulcorner n \urcorner fx)) \\ &= \lambda fx.f^n(\ulcorner n \urcorner f(\ulcorner n \urcorner fx)) \\ &= \lambda fx.\ulcorner n \urcorner f(\ulcorner n \urcorner f(\ulcorner n \urcorner fx)) \\ &= [\lambda nfx.nf(nf(nfx))]\ulcorner n \urcorner. \end{aligned}$$

therefore, $F = \lambda xyz.xy(xy(xyz))$ λ -defines $f(x) = 3x$. \square