

Syntax

$e = x \mid \lambda x.e \mid e e$	(Expressions)
$v = \lambda x.e$	(Values)
$a = A[v]$	(Answers)
$A = [] \mid (\lambda x.A) e$	(Answer Contexts)
$E = [] \mid E e \mid (\lambda x.E[x]) E \mid (\lambda x.E) e$	(Evaluation Contexts)

Notions of Reduction

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\lambda x.E[x]) v \quad \beta_{\text{need}} \quad E[x]\{x := v\} \\
& (\lambda x.A[v]) e e' \quad \text{assoc-L} \quad (\lambda x.A[v e']) e \\
& (\lambda x.E[x]) ((\lambda y.A[v]) e) \quad \text{assoc-R} \quad (\lambda y.A[(\lambda x.E[x]) v]) e
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{need} = \beta_{\text{need}} \cup \text{assoc-L} \cup \text{assoc-R}$$

\rightarrow : compatible closure of **need**

\twoheadrightarrow : reflexive, transitive closure of \rightarrow

\Rightarrow : parallel extension of \rightarrow

Definition 1 (\Rightarrow). *Parallel reduction of all non-overlapping redexes.*

$$\begin{aligned}
e & \Rightarrow e & (1) \\
(\lambda x.E[x]) v & \Rightarrow E'[x]\{x := v'\} & \text{if } E[x] \Rightarrow E'[x], v \Rightarrow v' & (2) \\
(\lambda x.A[v]) e_1 e_2 & \Rightarrow (\lambda x.A'[v' e'_2]) e'_1 & \text{if } A[v] \Rightarrow A'[v'], e_1 \Rightarrow e'_1, e_2 \Rightarrow e'_2 & (3) \\
(\lambda x.E[x]) ((\lambda y.A[v]) e) & \Rightarrow (\lambda y.A'[(\lambda x.E'[x]) v']) e' & \text{if } E[x] \Rightarrow E'[x], A[v] \Rightarrow A'[v'], e \Rightarrow e' & (4) \\
e_1 e_2 & \Rightarrow e'_1 e'_2 & \text{if } e_1 \Rightarrow e'_1, e_2 \Rightarrow e'_2 & (5) \\
\lambda x.e & \Rightarrow \lambda x.e' & \text{if } e \Rightarrow e' & (6)
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1 (Church-Rosser). *If $e \twoheadrightarrow e_1$ and $e \twoheadrightarrow e_2$, $\exists e'$ s.t. $e_1 \twoheadrightarrow e'$ and $e_2 \twoheadrightarrow e'$.*

Proof. Use Diamond Property of \Rightarrow . □

Lemma 1 (Diamond Property of \Rightarrow). *If $e \Rightarrow e_1$ and $e \Rightarrow e_2$, $\exists e'$ s.t. $e_1 \Rightarrow e'$ and $e_2 \Rightarrow e'$.*

Proof. By structural induction on proof of $e \Rightarrow e_1$. All cases make use of lemmas 2 and 3.

Case $e = e_1$. (base)

Then $e_1 \Rightarrow e_2$, so $e' = e_2$.

Case $e \Rightarrow e_1$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(2)$.

Subcase $e \Rightarrow e_2$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(2)$.

- $e_1 \Rightarrow e'$ by substitution lemma
- $e_2 \Rightarrow e'$ by substitution lemma

Subcase $e \Rightarrow e_2$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(5)$.

- $e_1 \Rightarrow e'$ by substitution lemma
- $e_2 \Rightarrow e'$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(2)$

Case $e \Rightarrow e_1$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(3)$.

Subcase $e \Rightarrow e_2$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(3)$.

- $e_1 \Rightarrow e'$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(5)$
- $e_2 \Rightarrow e'$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(5)$

Subcase $e \Rightarrow e_2$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(5)$.

- $e_1 \Rightarrow e'$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(5)$
- $e_2 \Rightarrow e'$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(3)$

Case $e \Rightarrow e_1$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(4)$.

Subcase $e \Rightarrow e_2$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(4)$.

- $e_1 \Rightarrow e'$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(5)$
- $e_2 \Rightarrow e'$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(5)$

Subcase $e \Rightarrow e_2$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(5)$.

- $e_1 \Rightarrow e'$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(5)$
- $e_2 \Rightarrow e'$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(4)$

Case $e \Rightarrow e_1$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(5)$.

$e \Rightarrow e_2$ subcases by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(2), (3), (4), (5)$, analogous to above cases.

Case $e \Rightarrow e_1$ by $\Rightarrow \text{def}(6)$.

Claim holds by IH.

□

Lemma 2 ($E[x]$ closed under \Rightarrow). *If $e = E[x]$, $x \in \text{fv}(E[x])$, and $e \Rightarrow e'$, then for some E' , $e' = E'[x]$, $x \in \text{fv}(E'[x])$.*

Proof. Structural induction on E .

Case $E = []$.

$e = e' = x$, $E' = []$.

Case $E = E_1 e_1$.

IH: $E_1[x] \Rightarrow E'_1[x]$, so $E_1[x] e_1 \Rightarrow E'_1[x] e'_1$.

$E'_1[x] e'_1$ is not **need** redex bc $E'_1[x] \notin v$, by lemma 4, so $E' = E'_1 e'_1$,

Case $E = (\lambda y. E_2[y]) E_1$.

IH: $E_2[y] \Rightarrow E'_2[y]$, $E_1[x] \Rightarrow E'_1[x]$, so $(\lambda y. E_2[y]) E_1[x] \Rightarrow (\lambda y. E'_2[y]) E'_1[x]$.

$(\lambda y. E'_2[y]) E'_1[x]$ is not β_{need} redex bc $E'_1[x] \notin v$, by lemma 4.

$(\lambda y. E'_2[y]) E'_1[x]$ is not **assoc-L** redex bc $E'_2[y] \notin a$, by lemma 4.

$(\lambda y. E'_2[y]) E'_1[x]$ is not **assoc-R** redex bc $E'_1[x] \notin a$, by lemma 4.

so $E' = (\lambda y. E'_2[y]) E'_1$,

Case $E = (\lambda y. E_1) e_1$.

IH: $E_1[x] \Rightarrow E'_1[x]$, so $(\lambda y. E_1[x]) e_1 \Rightarrow (\lambda y. E'_1[x]) e'_1$

$(\lambda y. E'_1[x]) e'_1$ is not β_{need} redex bc $E'_1[x] \neq E_2[y]$.

$(\lambda y. E'_1[x]) e'_1$ is not **assoc-L** redex bc $E'_1[x] \notin a$, by lemma 4.

$(\lambda y. E'_1[x]) e'_1$ is not **assoc-R** redex bc $E'_1[x] \neq E_2[y]$.

so $E' = (\lambda y. E'_1) e'_1$,

□

Lemma 3 ($A[v]$ closed under \Rightarrow). *If $e = A[v]$ and $e \Rightarrow e'$, then $e' = A'[v']$.*

Proof. Structural induction on A .

Case $A = []$.

$$e' = v'$$

Case $A = (\lambda x.A_1) e_1$.

IH: $A_1[v] \Rightarrow A'_1[v']$, so $(\lambda x.A_1[v]) e_1 \Rightarrow (\lambda x.A'_1[v']) e'_1$.

$(\lambda x.A'_1[v']) e'_1$ is not β_{need} redex bc $A'_1[v'] \neq E[x]$, by lemma 5.

$(\lambda x.A'_1[v']) e'_1$ is not **assoc-L** redex bc e was not.

$(\lambda x.A'_1[v']) e'_1$ is not **assoc-R** redex bc $A'_1[v'] \neq E[x]$, by lemma 5.

so $e' = (\lambda x.A'_1[v']) e'_1$,

□

Lemma 4. *If $e = E[x]$, $e \notin a$.*

Proof. By structural induction on E .

Case $E = []$.

Case $E = E_1 e_1$.

IH: $E_1[x] \notin a$, so $E_1[x]$ is not a λ .

Case $E = (\lambda y.E_2[y]) E_1$.

IH: $E_2[y] \notin a$, $E_1[x] \notin a$,

Case $E = (\lambda y.E_1) e_1$.

IH: $E_1[x] \notin a$

□

Lemma 5. *If $e = a$, then $\nexists E$ s.t. $e = E[x]$.*

Lemma 6. *If $e = E[x]$, $x \in fv(E[x])$, $\nexists E', y \neq x, y \in fv(E')$ s.t. $e = E'[y]$.*

Lemma 7. *If $e = E[x]$, $x \in fv(E[x])$, $E[x]$ is not a **need** redex.*