

General properties of $\lambda \rightarrow$

- Definition: 1) The domain $\text{dom}(\Gamma)$ of a context $\Gamma \equiv x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_n : \sigma_n$ is the list of variables $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$
- 2) Γ' is a subcontext of Γ ($\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$) if all declarations in Γ' also occur in Γ in the same order
- 3) Γ' is a permutation of Γ if all declarations in Γ' also occur in Γ and vice versa.
- 4) For a context Γ and a set of variables Φ , the projection of Γ on Φ ($\Gamma \upharpoonright \Phi$) is the subcontext Γ' of Γ satisfying $\text{dom}(\Gamma') = \text{dom}(\Gamma) \cap \Phi$

- Examples:
- 1) $\text{dom}(\Phi) = \Phi$, $\text{dom}(\gamma : \sigma, x_1 : \tau_1, x_2 : \tau_2) = (\gamma, x_1, x_2)$
- 2) $\Phi \subseteq x_1 : \tau_1 \subseteq \gamma : \sigma, x_1 : \tau_1, x_2 : \tau_2$
- 3) $x_1 : \tau_1, \gamma : \sigma, x_2 : \tau_2$ is a permutation of $\gamma : \sigma, x_1 : \tau_1, x_2 : \tau_2$
- 4) $\gamma : \sigma, x_1 : \tau_1, x_2 : \tau_2 \upharpoonright \{\gamma, x_2\} = \gamma : \sigma, x_2 : \tau_2$

Free variable lemma $\forall \Gamma \vdash L : \sigma$, then $FV(L) \subseteq \text{dom}(\Gamma)$

Proof: see Lemma 2.10.3 (induction)

- Thinning, Condensing, Permutation lemma
- (1) $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma''$, $\Gamma' \vdash M : \sigma \Rightarrow \Gamma'' \vdash M : \sigma$
- (2) $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma \Rightarrow \Gamma \upharpoonright FV(M) \vdash M : \sigma$
- (3) $\Gamma' \vdash M : \sigma$, Γ'' permutation of Γ' $\Rightarrow \Gamma'' \vdash M : \sigma$

Remark: The above lemma implies that in $\lambda \rightarrow$ we could define a context to be a set instead of a list. In other systems lists are necessary because the order will be important.

- Generation lemma:
- (1) $\Gamma \vdash x : \sigma \Rightarrow x : \sigma \in \Gamma$
- (2) $\Gamma \vdash MM : \tau \Rightarrow \exists \sigma \in \Pi : \Gamma \vdash M : \sigma \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Gamma \vdash N : \sigma$
- (3) $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : \sigma. M : \tau \Rightarrow \exists \beta \in \Pi : \Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash M : \beta \text{ and } \tau \equiv \sigma \rightarrow \beta$

Subterm lemma: If M is legal then every subterm of M is legal, i.e.

$$\exists \Gamma_1, \sigma_1 : \Gamma_1 \vdash M : \sigma_1, L \text{ subterm of } M \Rightarrow \exists \Gamma_2, \sigma_2 : \Gamma_2 \vdash L : \sigma_2$$

Example: Let $M \equiv (\lambda z : \beta. \lambda m : \gamma. z)(\gamma x)$, $L \equiv \lambda m : \gamma. z$

$$x : \gamma \rightarrow \gamma, \gamma : (\gamma \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow \beta \vdash M : \gamma \rightarrow \beta$$

$$x : \gamma \rightarrow \gamma, \gamma : (\gamma \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow \beta, z : \beta \vdash L : \gamma \rightarrow \beta \text{ or } z : \beta \vdash L : \gamma \rightarrow \beta$$

Uniqueness of types lemma $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$, $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau \Rightarrow \sigma \equiv \tau$

Decidability lemma In $\lambda \rightarrow$ the following problems are decidable:

- (1) Well-typedness : $? \vdash \text{term} : ?$
- (1a) Type assignment : $\text{context} \vdash \text{term} : ?$
- (2) Type checking : $\text{context} \stackrel{?}{\vdash} \text{term} : \text{type}$
- (3) Term finding : $\text{context} \vdash ? : \text{type}$

Reduction in $\lambda \rightarrow$ Definition (substitution) (1a) $x[x := N] \equiv N$ (1b) $y[x := N] \equiv y$ if $x \neq y$ (2) $(PQ)[x := N] \equiv (P[x := N])(Q[x := N])$ (3) $(\lambda y:G. P)[x := N] \equiv \lambda z:G. (P^{y \rightarrow z}[x := N])$ if $\lambda z:G. P^{y \rightarrow z}$ is an L -variant of $\lambda y:G. P$ such that $z \notin FV(N)$ Substitution lemma $\Gamma', x:G, \Gamma'' \vdash M:T$ and $\Gamma' \vdash N:G \Rightarrow \Gamma', \Gamma'' \vdash M[x := N]:T$ Note: $\Gamma' \vdash N:G$ implies that $x \in FV(N)$ ($\Leftarrow$ Free variable lemma)Definition (one-step β -reduction, $\rightarrow_\beta$ for λ_π) (1) (Basic) $(\lambda x:G. M)N \rightarrow_\beta M[x := N]$ (2) (compatibility) $M \rightarrow_\beta N \Rightarrow ML \rightarrow_\beta NL$ $LM \rightarrow_\beta LN$ $\lambda x:G. M \rightarrow_\beta \lambda x:G. N$ Definition (zero-or-more-step β -reduction, $\rightarrow_\beta^*$, $\equiv_\beta$ in λ_π): Analogous to $\rightarrow_\beta^*$, $\equiv_\beta$ in λ Church-Böster Theorem holds for $\lambda \rightarrow$ Corollary $M \equiv_\beta N \Rightarrow \exists L: M \rightarrow_\beta^* L, N \rightarrow_\beta^* L$ Subject reduction lemma $\Gamma \vdash L:G, L \rightarrow_\beta L' \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash L':G$ Consequence: $\boxed{\beta\text{-reduction does not affect typability!}}$ Example: $x: L \rightarrow L, y: (L \rightarrow L) \rightarrow \beta \vdash \lambda n: \gamma. yx: \gamma \rightarrow \beta$ because $x: L \rightarrow L, y: (L \rightarrow L) \rightarrow \beta \vdash (\lambda z: \beta. \lambda m: \gamma. z)(yx): \gamma \rightarrow \beta$ Strong normalisation theorem: Every legal term is strongly normalisingConsequences: 1) There is no self-application in $\lambda \rightarrow$ (Generation lemma)2) Existence of β -nfs is guaranteed (Strong normalisation theorem)3) Not every legal λ -term has a fixed pointProof: Let F legal λ -t. $\Gamma \vdash F: G \rightarrow T$ with $G \neq T$ and assume $\exists M \text{ legal}: FM \equiv_\beta M$ Then, $M: G, FM: T$. Consequently, $\exists N: FM \rightarrow_\beta N, M \rightarrow_\beta N$ $\Gamma \vdash N: T, \Gamma \vdash N: G \Downarrow$ $\uparrow$ subject reduction $\lambda \rightarrow$ is not Turing complete, but natural numbers and addition and multiplication can be defined: $n \equiv \lambda f: L \rightarrow L. \lambda x: L. \underbrace{f(\dots (fx) \dots)}_{n\text{-times}} \quad , \quad m: (L \rightarrow L) \rightarrow L \rightarrow L$ Class of functions definable in $\lambda \rightarrow$ (on natural numbers) = generalised polynomials, i.e. piecewise polynomial functions where axes are defined by whether variables do or do not vanish,e.g. $f(m, n) = \begin{cases} k & \text{if } m=0, n=0 \\ P_1(n) & \text{if } m=0, n \neq 0 \\ P_2(m) & \text{if } m \neq 0, n=0 \\ P_3(m, n) & \text{if } m \neq 0, n \neq 0 \end{cases}$ Make $\lambda \rightarrow$ Turing complete by introducing Y -combinator: $YG = (G \rightarrow G) \rightarrow G, YG f \rightarrow f(YG f)$