# “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 $+_k = \underbrace{S \circ S \circ \ldots \circ S}_{k-1 \text{ times}} \in \mathcal{BF}$ for all $k \geq 1$. $\square$

### 1.2 Prove: for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^+, f : \mathbb{N}^k \to \mathbb{N}$, 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 $\ell$ 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 $\ell$ satisfy $f(\mathbf{x}) < \|\mathbf{x}\| + h_n$.

In the case of $\ell = n + 1$, assume that $f$ is constructed by sequence $f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n, f$. If $f \in \mathcal{IF}$, it is trivial that $f(x) \leq S(x) < \|\mathbf{x}\| + 2h_n$. Elsewise, $f = \mathrm{Comp}_k^m[f_{i_0}, f_{i_1}, \ldots, f_{i_k}]$. 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 $k \in \mathbb{N}^+, f : \mathbb{N}^k \to \mathbb{N}$, 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 $f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n, \text{pred}$. 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

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

## 1.6 Let $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$. 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 $f_i : N_i \to \mathbb{N}$ 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 $\Pi$:

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

Also, we can construct integral power and thus equality by

$$\mathrm{pow}(x, k) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} x,$$
$$\mathrm{eq}(x, y) = \mathrm{leq}(x, y)^{N(\mathrm{geq}(x,y))},$$

and finally $\Sigma$ operator by creating logarithm:

$$\log(x) = \prod_{i=0}^{x} i^{N(\mathrm{eq}(2^i,x))},$$
$$\sum_{i=n}^{m} f(i, \mathbf{x}) = \log \prod_{i=n}^{m} 2^{f(i,\mathbf{x})}.$$

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

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

**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 $90 \le x \le 100$. An induction on $x$ shows $M(x) = 91$ for all $0 \le x \le 100$. □

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

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

If there is no $0 \le x \le n$ 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. □

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Proof.** $$h(x) = \max i \le x. \left\{ N^2 \left| \sum_{j=0}^{i} [N(\mathrm{rs}(i, j))] - 2 \right| + N^2[\mathrm{rs}(x, i)] \right\}. \qquad \square$$

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

$$F(0) = \mathrm{pg}(1, 0)$$
$$F(x + 1) = \mathrm{pg}(K(F(x)) + L(f(x)), K(F(x))),$$

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

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

### 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 $Q(x, y, z) = \mathrm{eq}(\mathrm{rs}(v, p(\langle x, y, z\rangle)), 0) \in \mathcal{EF}$. $\square$

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

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

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

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

### 1.16 Let $f(n) = n^{n^{\cdot^{\cdot^{\cdot^{n}}}}}$, 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, $G(k, x) = 2^{2^{\cdot^{\cdot^{\cdot^{x}}}}}$ is one among the control functions of $\mathcal{EF}$. If $f \in EF$, 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 $g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N} \in \mathcal{PRF}, f : \mathbb{N}^2 \to \mathbb{N}$ satisfies that $f(x, 0) = g(x)$, $f(x, y + 1) = f(f(\ldots f(f(x, y), y - 1), \ldots), 0)$. 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 $f(x, y) = g^{2^{y-1}}(x)$, thust $f(x, y) = G(x, 2^{y-1}) \in \mathcal{PRF}$. $\square$

### 1.18 If $f, g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ 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 $S = \{s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_k\}$ satisfies that for all $x \in \mathbb{N} \setminus S$, $f(x) = g(x)$.

Let $F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} g(s_i) \cdot N(\text{eq}(s_i, x)) + N\left(\sum_{i=0}^{k} N\Big(\text{eq}(s_i, x)\Big)\right) g(x)$, because the $\Sigma$ 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

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

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

## 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 $\text{Ack}(4, n) = f(n+3) - 3 \in \mathcal{PRF}$.

$G(k, x) = 2^{2^{\cdots^{x}}}$ 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 $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ 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 $\left(f^{-1}\right)^{-1} = f$, the case of necessity is trivial by symmetry. $\square$

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

**Proof.** Let $p(x) = a_n x^n + \ldots + a_1 x + a_0$, $S = \{i \mid a_i > 0\}$, 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, $f(a) = \mu x.|p(x) - a| \in \mathcal{RF}$. $\square$

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

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

**Proof.** We have $g(n) = \mathrm{rs}\left(\dfrac{(-1)^{n+1} + 2003^n}{2004}, 2005\right)$ 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 $a^{p-1} \equiv 1 \bmod p$ for all prime $p$, $2^{2006} \equiv 2^2 \equiv 4 \bmod 5, 2^{2006} \equiv 2^6 \equiv 64 \bmod 401$. According to the Chinese remainder theorem, $2^{2006} \equiv 64 \bmod 2005$. Therefore, $g(2006) \equiv 63 \times 2004 \equiv 1942 \bmod 2005$. $\square$

## 1.25 Let $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ be the $n$-th digit in the decimal representation of $\pi$. 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 $\pi$. $S$ 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 $2m$ $1 \times 1$ 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 $\mu$ operator to enumerate $k$ until we met a non-zero digit between the first $n+1$ digits and the last $k$ digits:

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

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

# 2 Abacus Machines

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

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

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

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

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

**Proof.** $f = \mathbf{move}_{1,3} \left\langle \mathbf{copy}_{3,1,4} \mathbf{S}_2 \right\rangle_2 \mathbf{Z}_3$. $\square$

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

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

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

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

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

**Proof.** $f = \mathbf{move}_{1,2} \mathbf{Z}_1 \mathbf{A}_1 \left\langle \mathbf{copy}_{1,3} \mathbf{move}_{3,1} \mathbf{S}_2 \right\rangle_2$. $\square$

## 3 $\lambda$-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. $\square$

### 3.2 Find $\beta$-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 $\beta$-nf of $SSSS$ because it has no redex. $\square$

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

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

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

## 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.** $\lambda z.Fz \equiv \lambda z.(\lambda x.M)z \to_\beta \lambda z.(M[x := z]) \equiv M$. □

## 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 $Y = \mathbf{Y}(GX)$. □

## 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. □

### 3.7 Prove that for all $P, Q \in \Lambda$, $P \twoheadrightarrow_\beta Q$ implies the existence of $n \geq 0$ and $P_0, \ldots, P_n \in \Lambda$ 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

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

for all $P, Q \in \Lambda$, $P \twoheadrightarrow_\beta Q$ 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 $P, Q \in \Lambda$, $P \twoheadrightarrow_\beta Q$ implies $\lambda z.P \twoheadrightarrow_\beta \lambda z.Q$.

**Proof.** According to 3.7, sequence $P_0, \ldots, P_n \in \Lambda$ with $P \equiv P_0$, $Q \equiv P_n$ and $P_i \rightarrow_\beta P_{i+1}$. Also because $\rightarrow_\beta$ is the compatible closure of $\beta$, 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 $\lambda z.P_0, \lambda z.P_1, \ldots, \lambda z.P_n$ always holds, that is, $\lambda z.P \twoheadrightarrow_\beta \lambda z.Q$. $\square$

### 3.9 Prove that for all $P, Q \in \Lambda$, $P =_\beta Q$ implies the existence of $n \geq 0$ and $P_0, \ldots, P_n \in \Lambda$ 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 $=_\beta = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(\rightarrow_\beta \cup \rightarrow_\beta^{-1}\right)^i$. $\square$