

One-step recurrent term in λ -calculus

Sachio HIROKAWA

Department of Information Science,
Faculty of Engineering, Shizuoka University,
Hamamatsu 432, Japan

Abstract.

The notion of a one-step recurrent term is introduced as a weakened notion of the recurrent term [3,4,6]. A recurrent term is a term in λ - β -calculus which is reducible to itself after any reduction. A term is one-step recurrent if and only if every its one-step reductum is reducible to itself. It is obvious that every recurrent term is one-step recurrent. In this paper we prove that the converse is equivalent to one of the conjectures by J.W.Klop [5]. And we also prove that the converse is true for the terms having at most two redexes, i.e., every one-step recurrent term having at most two redexes is recurrent. The proof uses the characterization of the recurrent terms by Böhm and Micali [3].

§1. Klop's conjecture.

We assume the reader acquainted with the basic theory given, for example, in [1], especially chapter 11, or [4] chapter 4. We write $M \rightarrow N$ for terms M and N when M is reducible to N by a one-step reduction, i.e., by a contraction of some redex in M . The symbol " $\rightarrow$ " denotes the transitive reflexive closure

of $\rightarrow$. We write $M \leftrightarrow N$ (cyclic equivalence) when $M \twoheadrightarrow N$ and $M \twoheadleftarrow N$. We call a cyclic equivalence class a plane. The plane containing a term M is represented by $[M]$. Let $N \in [M]$ be a term such that there is a irreversible step $N \rightarrow L$ for some L (i.e. $L \notin [M]$). Then we will say that we can leave the plane directly (in one step).

Now the original conjecture by J.W.Klop [5] is stated as follows:

- (A) If a plane can be left somewhere, then it can be left at any point (Fig.1).




Fig. 1

A term M is recurrent if and only if $\forall N (M \twoheadrightarrow N \Rightarrow N \twoheadrightarrow M)$, i.e., N may be reduced to M whenever M reduces to N . M is a one-step recurrent term if and only if $\forall N (M \rightarrow N \Rightarrow N \rightarrow M)$, i.e., every one-step reductum of M is reducible to M . The conjecture (A) can be restated by using the notion of one-step recurrent terms as follows:

- (B) If M and N are cyclically equivalent and M is not one-step recurrent, then N is not one-step recurrent.

The contraposotion of (B) is given by

- (C) If M and N are cyclically equivalent and M is one-step recurrent, then N is also one-step recurrent.

In Theorem 1 below we prove still another equivalence (A) $\Leftrightarrow$ (D):

- (D) M is a recurrent term if and only if M is one-step recurrent.

Theorems 2 and 3 will later show that (D) is true under the condition that M has at most two redexes.

Theorem 1 : (A) is equivalent to (D).

Proof : We prove $(C) \Leftrightarrow (D)$.

Let M be a one-step recurrent term and N be a term which is cyclically equivalent to M . Then by (D) M and N are recurrent terms. Therefore N is one-step recurrent, proving $(D) \Rightarrow (C)$.

For showing the converse $(C) \Rightarrow (D)$, let M be a one-step recurrent term and N be any reductum of M . We now prove the existence of a reduction $N \twoheadrightarrow M$ by induction on the length of the reduction $M \twoheadrightarrow N$. Let the reduction $M \twoheadrightarrow N$ be of length n , say,

$$M \equiv M_0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow M_{n-1} \rightarrow M_n \equiv N.$$

Since M_0 is one-step recurrent, M_1 is reducible to M_0 . Thus M and N are cyclically equivalent. Therefore, M_1 is one-step recurrent by (C). This argument can be continued until M_{n-1} , and all M_i 's are one-step recurrent. So there exists the reduction

$$M \equiv M_0 \leftarrow M_1 \leftarrow M_2 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow M_{n-1} \leftarrow M_n \equiv N. \quad \text{Q.E.D.}$$

§2. One-step recurrent term and recurrent term.

To show that (D) is true under the condition that M has at most two redexes, we need to state a result from Böhm and Micali [3]. Given a set $\mathcal{F}$ of redexes in a term M , a development of $(M, \mathcal{F})$ is a reduction path σ in which all redexes contracted in σ are residuals of $\mathcal{F}$, so that the prolongation of the reduction as $(M, \mathcal{F})$ -development is not possible. Let $G(M)$ denote the term obtained by a complete development of $(M, \mathcal{F})$, where $\mathcal{F}$ is the set of all redexes in M .

Lemma (Böhm and Micali [3]) : M is a recurrent term if and only if $G(M)$ reduces to M .

Now we have the following results :

Theorem 2 : Any one-step recurrent term having only one redex is recurrent.

Proof : Let M be one -step recurrent term which has only one redex. Since M has only one redex in it , its one-step reductum and $G(M)$ agree precisely. M is one-step recurrent, therefore $G(M)$ reduces to M . Thus M is a recurrent term by the lemma.

Q.E.D.

Theorem 3 : Any one-step recurrent term having exactly two redexes is recurrent.

Proof : Let M be an arbitrary one-step recurrent term which has exactly two redexes in it. Applying the lemma , it suffices to show that $G(M)$ reduces to M . We prove it by induction on the structure of M .

Case 1 : M is in head normal form , i.e. , $M = \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. x_i M_1 M_2 \dots M_m$.

Then every M_i is one-step recurrent and has at most two redexes.

So it is recurrent from Theorem 2 and induction hypothesis.

Thus M is recurrent.

Case 2 : M is not in head normal form , i.e. ,

$M \equiv \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. (\lambda x. M_0) M_1 M_2 \dots M_m (m \geq 1)$.

Case 2a : M_0 has one redex. Then all M_i 's are in normal form, so

that $G(M) \equiv \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. G(M_0) [x := M_1] M_2 \dots M_m$, where $G(M_0)[x := M_1]$ represents


the term obtained from $G(M_0)$ by substituting every free occurrence

of x by M_1 . Since M is one-step recurrent, one-step reductums,

$N_1 \equiv \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. M_0 [x := M_1] M_2 \dots M_m$ and $N_2 \equiv \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. (\lambda x. G(M_0)) M_1 M_2 \dots M_m$, of M

have a reduction path which ends at M . Let σ and τ be such

reductions :



If the residual of the left most redex $(\lambda x.G(M_0))M_1$ in N_2 is contracte in σ , then we can construct from σ another reduction path from N_2 to M which goes through $G(M)$. Thus $G(M)$ reduces to M . On the other hand, if σ does not contract the residual of $(\lambda x.G(M_0))M_1$, then there exists a "subreduction" in σ which reduces $G(M_0)$ to M_0 . Hence we have the reduction :

$$G(M) \equiv \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. G(M_0)[x:=M_1] M_2 \dots M_m \xrightarrow{\tau} \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. M_0[x:=M_1] M_2 \dots M_m \xrightarrow{\tau} M.$$

Case 2b : M_1 has one redex. Then we have the diagram :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M \equiv \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. (\lambda x. M_0) M_1 M_2 \dots M_m & & \\ \tau \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow \sigma \\ \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. M_0[x:=M_1] M_2 \dots M_m & & \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. (\lambda x. M_0) G(M_1) M_2 \dots M_m \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ G(M) \equiv \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. M_0[x:=G(M_1)] M_2 \dots M_m, & & \end{array}$$

where the dotted arrows have an existential meaning. If σ contracts the residual of $(\lambda x. M_0)G(M_1)$, then there is a reduction which is strongly equivalent to σ and goes through $G(M)$. Therefore $G(M)$ reduces to M . On the other hand, if σ does not contract the residual of $(\lambda x. M_0)G(M_1)$, then σ contains a subreduction which reduces $G(M_1)$ to M_1 . Thus we have the reduction :

$$G(M) \equiv \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. M_0[x:=G(M_1)] M_2 \dots M_m \xrightarrow{\tau} \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. M_0[x:=M_1] M_2 \dots M_m \xrightarrow{\tau} M.$$

Case 2c : M_i has one redex for some i ($2 \leq i \leq m$). Then we have the diagram :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M \equiv \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. (\lambda x. M_0) M_1 M_2 \dots M_i \dots M_m & & \\ \tau \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow \sigma \\ \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. M_0[x:=M_1] M_2 \dots M_i \dots M_m & & \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. (\lambda x. M_0) M_1 M_2 \dots G(M_i) \dots M_m \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ G(M) \equiv \lambda x_1 \dots x_n. M_0[x:=M_1] M_2 \dots G(M_i) \dots M_m. & & \end{array}$$

We can prove the existence of a reduction $G(M) \rightarrow M$ in the same manner as in Case 2b. Q.E.D.

Acknowledgement.

The author thanks Professor Henk Barendregt for showing him the problem treated in this paper.

References

- [1] H.P.Barendregt, The lambda-Calculus, Its Syntax and Semantics, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1981.
- [2] H.P.Barendregt, The type free lambda calculus, in Handbook of Mathematical Logic (Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol.90), North Holland, Amsterdam, 1977.
- [3] C.Böhm and S.Micali, Minimal forms in λ -calculus computations, Journal of Symbolic Logic, 45, 1, 1980.
- [4] H.B.Curry and R.Feys, Combinatory Logic, Vol.I, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1972.
- [5] J.W.Klop, Reduction cycles in combinatory logic, in J.R.Hindley and J.P.Seldin (eds.), To H.B.Curry : Essays on Combinatory Logic, Lambda-Calculus and Formalism, Academic Press, New York and London, 1980.
- [6] M.Venturini-Zilli, Head recurrent terms in combinatory logic : a generalization of the notion of head-normal form, Proceedings of the 5 th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, no.62, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1978.