

**NOTICE WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS:**

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, U.S. Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Any copying of this document without permission of its author may be prohibited by law.

# There is an effective one-step cofinal reduction strategy for combinators

by

Rick Statman

Carnegie Mellon University  
Department of Mathematics  
Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Research Report No. 95-177<sub>2</sub>  
June, 1995

510.6  
C28R  
95-177

# There is an effective one-step cofinal reduction strategy for combinators

by

Rick Statman  
Carnegie Mellon

## Abstract:

In this note we shall construct an effective one-step reduction strategy for combinators. The construction clearly does not work for lambda calculus since it depends on the parallel residual property for combinators

*Residuals of redexes are disjoint.*

However, it holds for a variety of combinatory reduction systems.

## Introduction:

In [ 1 ], page 350, exercise 13.6.6, Barendregt asks if there is an effective one-step cofinal reduction strategy. In this note we shall answer this question in the affirmative for combinators. We do not know the answer for lambda terms. The question arises from the work of Bergstra and Klop on effective Church-Rosser strategies. The question of the existence of an effective one-step Church-Rosser strategy remains open, and is the most interesting question in the area.

## The algorithm:

We adopt for the most part the notations of [ 1 ], especially those of chapter 12. If  $s$  is a reduction from  $M$  to  $N$  we write  $s : M \twoheadrightarrow N$ . We also consider pairs  $(M,F)$  where  $F$  is a set of disjoint (non-overlapping) redexes of  $M$ .  $F/s$  is the set of residuals of members of  $F$  under the reduction  $s$ . It is also a set of non-overlapping redexes. We write  $s : (M,F) \twoheadrightarrow (N,F/s)$  to show the action of  $s : M \twoheadrightarrow N$  on  $F$ .  $\text{cpl}(M,F)$  is the complete reduction of  $M$  w.r.t.  $F$ .  $\text{depth}(M)$  is just the depth of  $M$  as a binary

---

tree.

Let  $D$  be the digraph of the one-step reduction relation  $\rightarrow$ , and  $D(m)$  the subdigraph of  $D$  induced by all combinators of depth  $\leq m$ . Let  $D(M)$  be the weak component of  $D(\text{depth}(M))$  containing  $M$ . We say  $(N,F)$  is in  $D(M)$  if  $N \in D(M)$ .  $(N,F)$  in  $D(M)$  is said to be active for  $M$  if there is an  $s$  contained in  $D(M)$  such that  $s : N \rightarrow M$  but there is no  $t$  contained in  $D(M)$  such that  $t : (N,F) \rightarrow (M,\phi)$ . An  $s : (N,F) \rightarrow (M,F/s)$  contained in  $D(M)$  with  $|F/s|$  as small as possible is said to be minimal.

Remark; if there is no active  $(P,F)$  in  $D(M)$  then  $M$  is recurrent ([3]). For if for each disjoint set of redexes  $F$  contained in  $M$  there is a reduction  $(M,F) \rightarrow (M,\phi)$  then by induction  $M \rightarrow N \Rightarrow N \rightarrow M$ .

The pairs  $(N,F)$  can be ordered in type  $\omega^*$ , the type of the non-positive integers. We refer to the non-positive integer corresponding to  $(N,F)$  as its priority.

The algorithm A:

Input; a combinator  $M$ .

Output; a combinator  $A(M)$  such that  $M \rightarrow A(M)$  unless  $M$  is normal in which case  $A(M) \equiv M$ .

- (1) Decide whether there is a pair  $(P,F)$  in  $D(M)$  which is active for  $M$
- (2) If the answer to (1) is yes then find such a  $(P,F)$  of highest priority and a minimal  $s : (P,F) \rightarrow (M,F/s)$  contained in  $D(M)$  else go to (5)
- (3) If  $F/s = \{R\}$  then set  $A(M) := \text{cpl}(M,R)$  else select  $R \in F/s$  so that  $\text{depth}(M) \leq \text{depth}(\text{cpl}(M,R))$  and set  $A(M) := \text{cpl}(M,R)$ .
- (4) Exit
- (5) If  $M$  is normal set  $A(M) := M$  else set  $A(M) :=$  any  $N$  such that  $M \rightarrow N$ .
- (6) Exit

Theorem: A is an effective one-step cofinal reduction strategy.

Proof; we must show cofinality.

Consider the iterations  $M \rightarrow A(M) \rightarrow A(A(M)) \rightarrow \dots$  of the algorithm A on  $M$ . If this reduction sequence does not leave  $D(M)$

then it must cycle; in other words it contains a segment of the form  $N \rightarrow A(N) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow A^n(N) \rightarrow N$ . Let  $k$  be largest so that

$$\text{depth}(A^k(N)) = \max \{ \text{depth}(A^i(N)) : i = 0, 1, \dots, n \}$$

and set  $N(i) := A^{k+i \pmod n}(N)$ . Thus the reduction sequence

$$N(0) \rightarrow N(1) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow N(n) \rightarrow N(0)$$

is contained in  $D(N(0))$ . By our previous remark, if instruction (5) in  $A$  is executed for any of the transitions  $N(i) \rightarrow N(i+1)$  then the corresponding  $N(i)$  is recurrent and the sequence of iterations of  $A$  on  $M$  is clearly cofinal. Otherwise for each  $i = 0, \dots, n$  we can find  $(P(i), F(i)) \in D(N(i))$  and  $s(i) : (P(i), F(i)) \rightarrow (N(i), F(i)/s(i))$ , contained in  $D(N(i))$ , obtained in the execution of instruction (2) in  $A$  on  $N(i)$ .

By induction on  $i$  we see that  $\text{depth}(N(0)) = \text{depth}(N(i))$  and  $F(i)/s(i)$  has some residuals in  $N(0)$  after the reduction

$$N(i) \rightarrow N(i+1) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow N(0).$$

For  $i = 0$ ,  $F(0)/s(0)$  has residuals in  $N(0)$  since  $(P(0), F(0))$  was active. For  $i > 0$ , since  $F(i-1)/s(i-1)$  has residuals in  $N(0)$  we have  $\text{depth}(N(i)) \geq \text{depth}(N(i-1))$ . In particular,  $D(N(i)) = D(N(i-1)) = \dots = D(N(0))$ . If  $F(i)/s(i)$  has no residuals in  $N(0)$  then the reduction  $s \rightarrow N(i+1) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow N(0) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow N(i+1)$  is contained in  $D(N(i))$  and this contradicts the activity of  $(P(i), F(i))$ .

Next by induction on  $i$  we see that each  $(P(i), F(i)) = (P(0), F(0))$ . For let  $k$  be smallest so that  $(P(k), F(k)) \neq (P(0), F(0))$ . Then  $(P(k), F(k))$  has higher priority than  $(P(0), F(0))$  since  $(P(0), F(0))$  is active for  $N(k)$ . But then  $(P(k), F(k))$  cannot be active for  $N(0)$ , so there is a reduction  $t : (P(k), F(k)) \rightarrow (N(0), \phi)$  contained in  $D(N(0))$ . But then the reduction  $t \rightarrow N(1) \rightarrow N(2) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow N(k)$  is contained in  $D(N(k))$  and this contradicts the activity of  $(P(k), F(k))$  for  $N(k)$ .

Now it is easily seen that  $|F(i+1)/s(i+1)| < |F(i)/s(i)|$  for  $i = 0, \dots, n-1$ . Thus the reduction  $s(n) \rightarrow N(0)$  leaves fewer residuals of  $F(0)$  in  $N(0)$  than  $s(0)$  does. This contradicts the minimality of  $s(0)$ . Thus we conclude that the sequence of iterations of  $A$  on  $M$  is cofinal by cycling in  $D(M)$  or it exits from  $D(M)$  at some  $A^m(M)$  with  $\text{depth}(A^m(M)) > \text{depth}(M)$ .

---

Let  $M(i) := A^i(M)$  and suppose that the sequence  $M(0) \rightarrow M(1) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow M(m) \rightarrow \dots$  never cycles. Then there is an infinite increasing sequence  $f(0), f(1), \dots$  such that  $M(0) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow M(f(i))$  is contained in  $D(M(f(i)))$ . We prove by induction on  $\text{priority}$  that each  $(P, F)$  is active for at most finitely many of the  $M(f(i))$ . Suppose that this is true for all pairs of priority higher than  $(P, F)$ . Let  $k$  be so large that all pairs of priority higher than  $(P, F)$  are inactive past  $M(f(k))$  in the subsequence of  $M(f(i))$ 's. If  $(P, F)$  is active for  $M(f(k+1))$  it is of highest priority and the number of residuals of  $F$  is reduced by the transition  $M(f(k+1)) \rightarrow M(f(k+1)+1)$ . Moreover  $\text{depth}(M(f(k+1))) \leq \text{depth}(M(f(k+1)+1))$ , if any residuals remain after the transition. This remark can be repeated for  $M(f(k+1)+1), M(f(k+1)+2), \dots$ , etc. Thus  $(P, F)$  will be inactive for any  $M(f(j))$  with  $j > k$  the number of residuals of  $F$  in  $M(f(k+1))$ . We can now show that the sequence

$$M \rightarrow A(M) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow A^m(M) \rightarrow \dots$$

is cofinal.

Suppose that  $s : M \twoheadrightarrow N$ . We shall prove by induction on  $s$  that for some  $m$ ,  $N \twoheadrightarrow A^m(M)$ . Again we let  $M(m) := A^m(M)$ . Let  $M \twoheadrightarrow N \rightarrow P$ . By induction hypothesis there is an  $m$  such that  $N \twoheadrightarrow M(m)$ . Suppose that

$$\begin{array}{c} R \\ N \rightarrow P, \end{array}$$

and let  $F$  be the set of residuals of  $R$  in  $M(m)$ . By the previous paragraph we can find  $n > m$  so that the pair  $(M(m), F)$  belongs to  $D(M(n))$  and  $(M(m), F)$  is not active for  $M(n)$ . Then, by the strip lemma,  $P \twoheadrightarrow M(n)$ , and this completes the proof.

## References:

- [1] Barendregt, The Lambda Calculus  
North Holland, 1984
- [2] Bergstra&Klop, Church-Rosser strategies in the lambda  
calculus  
Preprint 62  
University of Utrecht, Department of Math.

APR 15 2008



July 1977

[3] Jacopini&Venturini-Zilli, Equating for recurrent terms of  
lambda calculus and combinatory logic

Pubblicazioni dell' Istituto per le Applicazioni  
del Calcolo

Ser.III 85

CNR, Rome, 1978

