## Jamie Sweeney - 213728s

#### **Question 4**

Use `n` to denote  $\lambda$ -term for n.

$$size(`n`) = 7n + 2$$

# **Question 5**

- T Not linear
- F Not linear.
- Z Linear.
- S Not linear.
- pair Linear.
- fst Not linear.
- snd Not linear.

#### **Question 6**

#### Base case:

M is a variable, x.

Then M[x := N] = N.

Since N is linear so too is M[x:=N].

# Inductive step:

M is an application AB.

$$(AB)[x := N] = (A[x := N])(B[x := N])$$

By induction hypothesis A[x := N] and B[x := N] are linear

Since A[x := N] and B[x := N] are linear so too is (AB)[x := N]

## Inductive step:

M is an abstraction λy.A

$$M[x := N] = \lambda y.(A[x := N])$$

By induction hypothesis A[x:=N] is linear if N and A are linear Since A[x:=N] is linear so too is M[x:=N]

## **Question 7**

#### Base case:

M is a variable x.

$$size(M) = 1$$

$$Then M[x := N] = N$$

$$We have size(M[x := N]) = size(N)$$

$$And size(M) + size (N) = size(N) + 1$$

$$Since size(N) < size(N) + 1, we have size(M[x := N]) < size(M) + size(N)$$

$$Inductive step:$$

$$M is an abstraction \lambda y.A$$

$$size(M) = size(A) + 1$$

$$M[x := N] = \lambda y.(A[x := N])$$

$$size(M[x := N]) = size(A[x := N]) + 1$$

$$By our induction hypothesis, size(A[x := N]) < size(A) + size(N)$$

$$So, size(A[x := N]) + 1 < size(A) + size(N) + 1$$

$$Substitute LHS with size(M[x := N]) to get,$$

$$size(M[x := N]) < size(A) + size(N) + 1$$

$$Substitute with size(M) to get,$$

$$size(M[x := N]) < size(M) + size(N)$$

$$So hypothesis holds.$$

$$Inductive step:$$

$$M is an application AB$$

$$size(M) = size(A) + size(B)$$

$$M[x := N] = (A[x := N])(B[x := N])$$

$$size(M[x := N]) = size(A[x := N]) + size(B[x := N])$$

$$By our induction hypothesis, size(A[x := N]) < size(A) + size(N)$$

$$And size(B[x := N]) < size(B) + size(N)$$

$$So, size((A[x := N])(B[x := N])) < size(A) + size(B) + 2*size(N)$$

size(M[x := N]) < size(A) + size(B) + 2\*size(N)

Substitute LHS with size(M[x := N]) to get,

Substitute with size(M) to get, size(M[x := N]) < size(M) + 2\*size(N)

Therefore

size(M[x := N]) < size(M) + size(N)

So hypothesis holds.

#### **Question 8**

## **Question 9**

```
For any \beta reduction we have: (\lambda x.M)N \rightarrow \beta M[x := N]

Size(LHS) = size((\lambda x.M)N) = 1+size(M) + size(N)

Size(RHS) = size(M[x := N])

We know that size(M[x := N]) < size(M) + size(N)

So,

Size(RHS) < size(M) + size(N)

Since size(M) + size(N) < 1+size(M) + size(N)

size(RHS) < Size(LHS)

So for any linear M, if M \rightarrow \beta N.

size(RHS) < Size(LHS)

size(N) < Size(M)
```

#### **Question 10**

Linear  $\lambda$ -calculus seems quite limited in the scope of computations that are available. From Q4 we see that only Z and pair are linear. I would expect that the terms expressible in linear  $\lambda$ -calculus would be those with no 'branches' in computation or conditional terms.