

Course TT & log Exercises on Normalization
Some answers

① Recall that $\sigma_1 \rightarrow \sigma_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \sigma_n \rightarrow \alpha$ should be read as
 $\sigma_1 \rightarrow (\sigma_2 \rightarrow (\dots \rightarrow (\sigma_n \rightarrow \alpha) \dots))$
and this means that every type $\sigma \rightarrow \tau$ can be written as
 $\sigma_1 \rightarrow \tau_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \tau_n \rightarrow \alpha$
where $\tau = \tau_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \alpha$
by decomposing τ as far as possible.

We have two definitions of h :

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(\alpha) &= 0 & h_1(\sigma_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \sigma_n \rightarrow \alpha) &= \max(h_1(\sigma_1), \dots, h_1(\sigma_n)) + 1 \\ h_2(\alpha) &= 0 & h_2(\sigma \rightarrow \tau) &= \max(h_2(\sigma) + 1, h_2(\tau)) \end{aligned}$$

We want to show $h_1(\sigma) = h_2(\sigma)$ ($\forall \sigma \in \text{Type}$)
which we do by induction on σ

• case $\sigma = \alpha$ $\{$

• case $\sigma = \tau_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \tau_n \rightarrow \alpha$

$$\begin{aligned} h_2(\sigma) &= \max(h_2(\tau_1) + 1, h_2(\tau_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \tau_n \rightarrow \alpha)) \\ &\stackrel{IH}{=} \max(h_1(\tau_1) + 1, h_1(\tau_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \tau_n \rightarrow \alpha)) \\ &= \max(h_1(\tau_1) + 1, \max(h_1(\tau_2), \dots, h_1(\tau_n)) + 1) \\ &= \max(h_1(\tau_1), \dots, h_1(\tau_n)) + 1 \\ &= h_1(\sigma) \end{aligned}$$



Course TT&Log Ex. on Normalizability

(2) In M there are two redexes:

* II, whose height is the height of the type of the I on the left.

Its type is C, so $h(II) = h(C)$

* the whole term M, whose height is the height of the type of $\lambda x:A. x(\lambda y:B. x I)$, which is $A \rightarrow B$, so the height is $h(A \rightarrow B)$

This means that the redex with greatest height is the whole term M, so we contract that redex.

NB $h(B) = h(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) = h(\alpha) + 1 = 1$

$h(C) = h(B) + 1 = 2$

$h(A) = \max(h(C) + 1, h(B)) = h(C) + 1 = 3$

For $m(M)$ we look at height of the redex of maximum height. This is $h(A \rightarrow B) = h(A) + 1 = 4$.

So $m(M) = (4, 1)$

In N we have 4 redexes, 2 of height $h(C)$, the ~~II~~ II ones, and 2 of height $h(C \rightarrow B)$, the ones with $\lambda z:C. z(II)$ as function

So we have 2 redexes of max height $h(C \rightarrow B) = 3$

So $m(N) = (3, 2)$

So $m(M) > m(N)$

Count TT & Log Ex. on Normalizability

③ If we define $f(M) :=$ the number of type-abstractions in M , then we have

$$M \xrightarrow{\beta} N \text{ using a type reduction} \\ \Rightarrow f(M) > f(N)$$

Definition by induction of f :

- $f(\lambda x. M) = 1 + f(M)$
- $f(\lambda x : \sigma. M) = f(M)$
- $f(M N) = f(M) + f(N)$
- $f(M \sigma) = f(M)$
- $f(x) = 0$

Then $(\lambda x. M) \sigma \rightarrow M [x := \sigma]$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \downarrow f & \downarrow f \\ & f(M) + 1 & f(M) \end{array}$$



④ $X \in SAT$ of

- ① $x \vec{P} \in X$ for all $x \in Var, P_1, \dots, P_n \in SN$
- ② $X \subseteq SN$
- ③ If $M[x := N] \vec{P} \in X$, then and $N \in SN$, then

$$(\lambda x. M) N \vec{P} \in X$$

Suppose $A, B \in SAT$

$$TP: A \rightarrow B = \{ M \mid \forall N \in A (M N \in B) \} \in SAT$$

we check properties ①, ②, ③ for $A \rightarrow B$

- ① let $x \in Var, P_1, \dots, P_n \in SN$
then for $N \in A$ we know $N \in SN$, so $x P_1, \dots, P_n N \in B$ (by $B \in SAT$), so $x P_1, \dots, P_n \in A \rightarrow B$.
- ② ~~Suppose~~ Let $M \in A \rightarrow B$. Take an element in A , say x (which is in A indeed, due to ①).
So $M x \in B$, so $M x \in SN$, so $M \in SN$. (If $M \notin SN$, we would have an ∞ reduction from M , but then also from $M x$)
- ③ let $M [x := N] \vec{P} \in A \rightarrow B$ and let $Q \in A$ with $N \in SN$
Then $M [x := N] \vec{P} Q \in B$ by def of $A \rightarrow B$. So $(\lambda x. M) N \vec{P} Q \in B$, by prop ③ for B . This holds for all $Q \in A$, so $(\lambda x. M) N \vec{P} \in A \rightarrow B$



Course TT & Log Ex. on Normalization

⑤ Soundness Property

If $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$ where $\Gamma = x_1 : \tau_1, \dots, x_n : \tau_n$

then for all valuations ρ (so $\rho(x_i) \in SAT$) and all P_1, \dots, P_n with $P_i \in \llbracket \tau_i \rrbracket_\rho$

we have $M[x_1 := P_1, \dots, x_n := P_n] \in \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_\rho$

Proof by induction on the derivation of $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$.

Case \forall -intro

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash M : \forall \alpha. \sigma} \quad \alpha \notin FV(\sigma)$$

IH: $M[x_1 := P_1, \dots, x_n := P_n] \in \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_\rho$
for all ρ and P_1, \dots, P_n

Let ρ be a valuation, and P_1, \dots, P_n with $P_i \in \llbracket \tau_i \rrbracket_\rho$

Then $M[x_1 := P_1, \dots, x_n := P_n] \in \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_{\rho(\alpha=x)}$ for all $X \in SAT$,

because $\llbracket \tau_i \rrbracket_\rho$ only depends on ρ for the type variables $\beta \in FV(\tau_i)$

$$\text{So } M[x_1 := P_1, \dots, x_n := P_n] \in \bigcap_{X \in SAT} \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_{\rho(\alpha=x)} = \llbracket \forall \alpha. \sigma \rrbracket_\rho$$

