Institute for Language, Logic and Information

UNIQUE NORMAL FORMS FOR COMBINATORY LOGIC WITH PARALLEL CONDITIONAL,

A CASE STUDY IN CONDITIONAL REWRITING

Roel de Vrijer

ITLI Prepublication Series
for Computation and Complexity Theory CT-90-09



University of Amsterdam

The ITLI Prepublication Series

1986

86-01 The Institute of Language, Logic and Information
86-02 Peter van Emde Boas — A Semantical Model for Integration and Modularization of Rules
86-03 Johan van Benthem — Categorial Grammar and Lambda Calculus
86-04 Reinhard Muskens — A Relational Formulation of the Theory of Types
86-05 Kenneth A. Bowen, Dick de Jongh — Some Complete Logics for Branched Time, Part I Well-founded Time, Forward looking Operators
86-06 Johan van Benthem — Logical Syntax

1987

87-01 Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof — Type shifting Rules and the Semantics of Interrogatives
87-02 Renate Bartsch — Frame Representations and Discourse Representations
87-03 Jan Willem Klop, Roel de Vrijer — Unique Normal Forms for Lambda Calculus with Surjective Pairing
87-04 Johan van Benthem — Polyadic quantifiers
87-05 Víctor Sánchez Valencia — Traditional Logicians and de Morgan's Example
87-06 Eleonore Oversteegen — Temporal Adverbials in the Two Track Theory of Time
87-07 Johan van Benthem — Categorial Grammar and Type Theory
87-08 Renate Bartsch — The Construction of Properties under Perspectives
87-09 Herman Hendriks — Type Change in Semantics: The Scope of Quantification and Coordination

1988

Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Language:
LP-88-01 Michiel van Lambalgen — Algorithmic Information Theory
LP-88-02 Yde Venema — Expressiveness and Completeness of an Interval Tense Logic
LP-88-03 — Year Report 1987
LP-88-04 Reinhard Muskens — Going partial in Montague Grammar
LP-88-05 Johan van Benthem — Logical Constants across Varying Types
LP-88-06 Johan van Benthem — Semantic Parallels in Natural Language and Computation
LP-88-07 Renate Bartsch — Tenses, Aspects, and their Scopes in Discourse
LP-88-08 Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof — Context and Information in Dynamic Semantics
LP-88-09 Theo M.V. Janssen — A mathematical model for the CAT framework of Eurotra
LP-88-10 Anneke Kleppe — A Blissymbolics Translation Program

Mathematical Logic and Foundations:
ML-88-01 Jaap van Oosten — Lifschitz' Realizabiility
ML-88-02 M.D.G. Swaen — The Arithmetical Fragment of Martin Löf's Type Theories with weak Σ-elimination
ML-88-03 Dick de Jongh, Frank Veltman — Provability Logics for Relative Interpretability
ML-88-04 A.S. Troelstra — On the Early History of Intuitionistic Logic
ML-88-05 A.S. Troelstra — Remarks on Intuitionism and the Philosophy of Mathematics

Computation and Complexity Theory:
CT-88-01 Ming Li, Paul M.B.Vitanyi — Two Decades of Applied Kolmogorov Complexity
CT-88-02 Michiel H.M. Smid — General Lower Bounds for the Partitioning of Range Trees
CT-88-03 Michiel H.M. Smid, Mark H. Overmars, Leen Torenvliet, Peter van Emde Boas — Maintaining Multiple Representations of Dynamic Data Structures
CT-88-04 Dick de Jongh, Lex Hendriks, Gerard R. Renardel de Lavalette — Computations in Fragments of Intuitionistic Propositional Logic
CT-88-05 Peter van Emde Boas — Machine Models and Simulations (revised version)
CT-88-06 Michiel H.M. Smid — A Data Structure for the Union-find Problem having good Single-Operation Complexity
CT-88-07 Johan van Benthem — Time, Logic and Computation
CT-88-08 Michiel H.M. Smid, Mark H. Overmars, Leen Torenvliet, Peter van Emde Boas — Multiple Representations of Dynamic Data Structures
CT-88-09 Theo M.V. Janssen — Towards a Universal Parsing Algorithm for Functional Grammar
CT-88-10 Edith Spaan, Leen Torenvliet, Peter van Emde Boas — Nondeterminism, Fairness and a Fundamental Analogy
CT-88-11 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Peter van Emde Boas — Towards implementing RL

Other prepublications:
X-88-01 Marc Jumelet — On Solovay's Completeness Theorem

1989

Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Language:
LP-89-01 Johan van Benthem — The Fine-Structure of Categorial Semantics
LP-89-02 Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof — Dynamic Predicate Logic, towards a compositional, non-representational semantics of discourse
LP-89-03 Yde Venema — Two-dimensional Modal Logics for Relation Algebras and Temporal Logic of Intervals
LP-89-04 Johan van Benthem — Language in Action
LP-89-05 Johan van Benthem — Modal Logic as a Theory of Information
LP-89-06 Andreja Prijatelj — Intensional Lambek Calculi: Theory and Application
LP-89-07 Heinrich Wansing — The Adequacy Problem for Sequential Propositional Logic
LP-89-08 Víctor Sánchez Valencia — Peirce's Propositional Logic: From Algebra to Graphs
LP-89-09 Zhisheng Huang — Dependency of Belief in Distributed Systems

Mathematical Logic and Foundations:
ML-89-01 Dick de Jongh, Albert Visser — Explicit Fixed Points for Interpretability Logic
ML-89-02 Roel de Vrijer — Extending the Lambda Calculus with Surjective Pairing is conservative
ML-89-03 Dick de Jongh, Franco Montagna — Rosser Orderings and Free Variables
ML-89-04 Dick de Jongh, Marc Jumelet, Franco Montagna — On the Proof of Solovay's Theorem
ML-89-05 Rineke Verbrugge — Σ-completeness and Bounded Arithmetic
ML-89-06 Michiel van Lambalgen — The Axiomatization of Randomness
ML-89-07 Dirk Roorda — Elementary Inductive Definitions in HA: from Strictly Positive towards Monoton
ML-89-08 Dirk Roorda — Investigations into Classical Linear Logic
ML-89-09 Alessandra Carbone — Provable Fixed points in $I\Delta_0+\Omega_1$

Computation and Complexity Theory:
CT-89-01 Michiel H.M. Smid — Dynamic Deferred Data Structures
CT-89-02 Peter van Emde Boas — Machine Models and Simulations
CT-89-03 Ming Li, Herman Neuféglise, Leen Torenvliet, Peter van Emde Boas — On Space Efficient Simulations
CT-89-04 Harry Buhrman, Leen Torenvliet — A Comparison of Reductions on Nondeterministic Space
CT-89-05 Pieter H. Hartel, Michiel H.M. Smid, Leen Torenvliet, Willem G. Vree — A Parallel Functional Implementation of Range Queries
CT-89-06 H.W. Lenstra, Jr. — Finding Isomorphisms between Finite Fields
CT-89-07 Ming Li, Paul M.B. Vitanyi — A Theory of Learning Simple Concepts under Simple Distributions and Average Case Complexity for the Universal Distribution (Prel. Version)
CT-89-08 Harry Buhrman, Steven Homer, Leen Torenvliet — Honest Reductions, Completeness and Nondeterminstic Complexity Classes
CT-89-09 Harry Buhrman, Edith Spaan, Leen Torenvliet — On Adaptive Resource Bounded Computations
CT-89-10 Sieger van Denneheuvel — The Rule Language RL/1
CT-89-11 Zhisheng Huang, Sieger van Denneheuvel, Peter van Emde Boas — Towards Functional Classification of Recursive Query Processing

Other Prepublications:
X-89-01 Marianne Kalsbeek — An Orey Sentence for Predicative Arithmetic
X-89-02 G. Wagemakers — New Foundations: a Survey of Quine's Set Theory
X-89-03 A.S. Troelstra — Index of the Heyting Nachlass
X-89-04 Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof — Dynamic Montague Grammar, a first sketch
X-89-05 Maarten de Rijke — The Modal Theory of Inequality
X-89-06 Peter van Emde Boas — Een Relationele Semantiek voor Conceptueel Modelleren: Het RL-project

1990 SEE INSIDE BACK COVER



Instituut voor Taal, Logica en Informatie
Institute for Language, Logic and Information

Faculteit der Wiskunde en Informatica
(Department of Mathematics and Computer Science)
Plantage Muidergracht 24
1018TV Amsterdam

Faculteit der Wijsbegeerte
(Department of Philosophy)
Nieuwe Doelenstraat 15
1012CP Amsterdam

UNIQUE NORMAL FORMS FOR COMBINATORY LOGIC WITH PARALLEL CONDITIONAL,

A CASE STUDY IN CONDITIONAL REWRITING

Roel de Vrijer
Department of Philosophy
University of Amsterdam

ITLI Prepublication Series
for Computation and Complexity Theory
ISSN 0924-8374

Received December 1990

R. C. de Vrijer

University of Amsterdam *
Department of Philosophy
Nieuwe Doelenstraat 15
1012 CP Amsterdam
The Netherlands
email: rdv@cs.vu.nl

Unique Normal Forms for Combinatory Logic with Parallel Conditional, a case study in conditional rewriting

Abstract

In this note we present a simple proof of the unicity of normal forms property for Combinatory Logic extended with 'Parallel Conditional', that is, with constants C, T and F (conditional, true, false) and extra reduction rules CTxy → x, CFxy → y and Czxx → x. The proof makes use of a method involving conditional term rewriting systems that has more general application. This method is described and some other applications are discussed.

Contents

Introduction
1. Four non-leftlinar, non-confluent TRSs
2. Conditional Term Rewriting Systems
3. Application of CTRSs to prove unicity of normal forms
4. The case of Combinatory Logic plus Parallel Conditional
5. Chew's theorem
6. Remarks and further questions
References

Introduction

A Term Rewriting System (or any Abstract Reduction System for that matter) has the *unicity of normal forms property* (UN), if every convertibility class contains at most one normal form; equivalently, if convertible normal forms are identical. A TRS satisfying UN is said to *have unique normal forms*.

In this note we present a simple proof of UN for Combinatory Logic (CL), consisting of the well-known rules for I, K and S, extended with 'Parallel Conditional'. That is, augmented with constants C, T and F (conditional, true, false) and with the extra reduction rules CTxy → x, CFxy → y and Czxx → x. This TRS, we call it CL-pc, was demonstrated to fail the Church-Rosser property (CR) by Klop [1980]. So the usual way of establishing unicity of normal forms, via CR, is not available here.

* Also: Free University , Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, de Boelelaan 1081a. 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Our proof for the case of CL-pc is based on a more general method for proving UN for certain term rewriting systems with repeated variables in the left-hand sides of the rules ('non-leftlinear' rules), that has originally been proposed by the present author and was first used in Klop [1980], see also Klop & de Vrijer [1989]. This method proceeds by proving confluence for an associated left-linear *conditional* term rewriting system, that originates from the original non-leftlinear one by—what might be called—'linearizing' the rules. Apart from the new application to Combinatory Logic with parallel conditional, the purpose of the present paper is to give this method a cogent presentation. The method of conditional linearization is shown to yield very easily yet another interesting result: all TRSs that are non-ambiguous after linearization have unique normal forms (Theorem 3.9).

Two features of the application of the method to Combinatory Logic plus parallel conditional may be worth mentioning. First it involves the use of a Conditonal Term Rewriting System with negative conditions, added in order to disambiguate the rewriting rules. Secondly, although the general method is essentially proof-theoretic, our new application uses a lemma that depends on a model-theoretic argument, using the graph model $P\omega$.

The two applications of our method that were mentioned above, also follow from a theorem stated in Chew [1981], establishing the unicity of normal forms for a wider class of non-leftlinear TRSs. Chew's theorem will be briefly discussed; we do not go into details of the proof though, as its complexity surpasses that of the proofs given here by some orders of magnitude.

1. Four non-leftlinear, non-confluent TRSs

In this note we will discuss four specific non-leftlinear extensions of Combinatory Logic: CL-sp, CL-d, CL-e and CL-pc. We recall that CL has a signature consisting of one binary operator, *application*, and three constants, S, K and I. As usual, the application operator is notationally suppressed, its role being taken over by concatenation; we adopt the usual conventions of leaving away brackets, with association to the left. The rewrite rules of CL are:

CL: $Sxyz \to xz(yz)$,
$Kxy \to x$,
$Ix \to x$.

The system CL-sp of Combinatory Logic with surjective pairing was the first non-leftlinear term rewriting system to be extensively studied, mostly in the related lambda calculus version (e.g. in Mann [1973], Barendregt [1974], Klop [1980], de Vrijer [1987, 1989], Klop & de Vrijer [1989]). It adds to CL the new constants D, D_1, and D_2, for pairing and its respective projections. The usual rewrite rules are

CL-sp: CL +
$D_1(Dxy) \to x$,
$D_2(Dxy) \to y$,
$D(D_1x)(D_2x) \to x$.

The systems CL-d and CL-e came up in the study of CL-sp; they were proposed by Hindley (see Böhm [1975], Staples [1975]) for theoretical purposes. CL-d adds to CL one new constant D and the non-leftlinear rewrite rule r-d:

CL-d: CL +
r-d: $Dxx \to x$.

In CL-e yet another constant, E, is added. The rule r-e can be seen as test for syntactic identity.

CL-e: CL +
r-e: $Dxx \rightarrow E$.

Then finally, the system we are primarily concerned with here augments CL with constants C, T and F, for *conditional*, *true* and *false* respectively. The rewrite rule r-pc makes the conditional *parallel*.

CL-pc: CL +
r-t: $CTxy \rightarrow x$,
r-f: $CFxy \rightarrow y$,
r-pc: $Czxx \rightarrow x$.

Each of these four non-leftlinear rewriting systems lacks the Church-Rosser property (Klop [1980]). But nevertheless, each can be shown to have unique normal forms. Essentially in each of these cases the method of linearizing the rules by adding conditions, described in section 3 below, can be used. Still, the case of CL-sp is very complicated (see Klop & de Vrijer [1989]) and so is the existing proof of unicity of normal forms for CL-pc via Chew's theorem. For the latter case a much simpler proof is presented in this note. The cases of CL-d and CL-e are relatively simple and are included here mainly for expository purposes.

2. Conditional Term Rewriting Systems

A general framework of rewriting that takes the possibility into account that rewrite rules may be subjected to conditions, has probably first been given in O'Donnell [1977]. Then of course, conditional rewriting has important roots in Universal Algebra and in the field of Algebraic Specifications.

Maybe less well-known, conditional rewriting has yet another origin. Out of the algebraic context, rewriting rules with conditions have been used as a proof-theoretic tool for establishing syntactic properties of unconditional rewriting systems and λ-calculus extensions in Klop [1980], de Vrijer [1987, 1989] and Klop & de Vrijer [1989]. It is the latter kind of use of conditional rewriting that we are concerned with in this note.

Algebraically, conditional rewrite rules can be viewed as implementations of equational specifications containing *positive conditional equations*:

$$t_1 = s_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge t_n = s_n \Rightarrow t_0 = s_0. \qquad (*)$$

If $n = 0$, the equation is unconditional. Conforming with the notation often used in 'equational logic programming', one mostly writes instead of (*):

$$t_0 = s_0 \Leftarrow t_1 = s_1, \ldots, t_n = s_n.$$

Then the transition from conditional equations to conditional rewrite rules can be made by just orienting the equation in the lefthand side. This gives rise to what in Dershowitz, Okada & Sivakumar [1988] has been named *semi-equational* systems. Dershowitz, Okada & Sivakumar list a number of alternative types of CTRSs, thereby extending the classification given in Bergstra & Klop [1986]; the distinctions derive from different choices that can be made in the implementation of the conditions. Apart from the semi-equational systems, we will here make use of one other type of CTRS; it does not correspond to any of the special categories and hence it falls in the inclusive category of *generalized* systems. In generalized systems there is no restriction at all on the character or the format of the conditions; they can be just any predicate.

So we consider the following two types of CTRSs:

(i) *semi-equational* systems

$$t_0 \to s_0 \Leftarrow t_1 = s_1, \ldots, t_n = s_n,$$

(ii) *generalized* systems

$$t_0 \to s_0 \Leftarrow P_1, \ldots, P_n.$$

Note that in case (i) the definition of $\to$ is circular since it depends on conditions involving a reference to $\to$ (via the conversion relation); but the rewrite rules can be taken as constituting a positive inductive definition of $\to$, since the conditions are positive. In the case of generalized CTRSs one has to take care in formulating conditions involving $\to$, in order to ensure that $\to$ is well-defined.

2.1. NOTE. Incorporating negative conditions containing $\to$ in a generalized CTRS can be dangerous. Consider the example of CL with constants C and A , and the generalized conditional rule:

$$Cx \to A \Leftarrow \text{not } x \twoheadrightarrow A.$$

The question is now whether the conditional reduction relation is well-defined. The negative condition 'not $x \twoheadrightarrow A$' is itself in terms of $\to$ and looks circular. Since the condition is negative, the clauses for $\to$ can not, without more, be taken as an inductive definition. Indeed, by a fixed point construction, there is a term Z such that $Z \twoheadrightarrow CZ$. Does $Z \twoheadrightarrow A$ hold? If not, then yes by the conditional rule. If yes, then by which reduction steps?

As a matter of fact, a simpler example already illustrates the point. Consider the generalized CTRS consisting of the single conditional rewrite rule:

$$a \to b \Leftarrow a \neq b.$$

Does $a \to b$ hold?

2.2. NOTE. A non-left linear rule can be seen as a special kind of generalized conditional rewrite rule that is leftlinear. Consider as an illustration the non-leftlinear rule r-d: $Dxx \to x$; in the format of conditional rewriting it becomes:

r-d: $Dxy \to x \Leftarrow x \equiv y.$

Recall that an *orthogonal* TRS is one that is unambiguous and left-linear.

2.3. DEFINITION. (i) Let R be a CTRS. Then R_u, the *unconditional version* of R, is the TRS which arises from R by deleting all conditions.

(ii) The CTRS R is called *(non-)leftlinear* if R_u is so; likewise for *orthogonal*.

2.4. DEFINITION. (i) Let R be a CTRS with rewrite relation $\to$, and let P be an n-ary predicate on the set of terms of R. Then P is *stable with respect to* $\to$ if for all terms t_i, t_i' such that $t_i \twoheadrightarrow t_i'$ (i = 1, ..., n):

$$P(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \Rightarrow P(t_1', \ldots, t_n').$$

(ii) Let R be a CTRS with rewrite relation $\to$. Then R is *stable* if all conditions (appearing in some conditional rewrite rule of R), viewed as predicates with the variables ranging over R-terms, are stable with respect to $\to$.

2.5. THEOREM (O'Donnell [1977]).
Let R *be a generalized, orthogonal CTRS which is stable. Then* R *is confluent.*

The proof is a rather straightforward generalization of the confluence proof for orthogonal TRSs.

Obviously, the convertibility conditions $t_i = s_i$ (i = 1, ..., n) in a rewrite rule of a semi-equational CTRS are stable. So the following theorem from Bergstra & Klop [1986] can in fact be obtained as a corollary of Theorem 2.5:

2.6. THEOREM. *Orthogonal semi-equational CTRSs are confluent.*

2.7. EXAMPLE. Let CL-e* be the orthogonal, semi-equational CTRS obtained by extending Combinatory Logic with a 'test for convertibility' (compare CL-e defined in section 1, with test for syntactic identity):

$$\begin{aligned} & Sxyz \to xz(yz) \\ & Kxy \to x \\ & Ix \to x \\ \text{r-e*:} \quad & Dxy \to E \Leftarrow x = y. \end{aligned}$$

Then R is confluent.

3. Application of CTRSs to prove unicity of normal forms.

In this section we explain the method for proving the property UN for certain non-leftlinear TRSs as a proof-theoretic application of conditional rewriting in the field of term rewriting itself. The method is based on the following simple observation concerning Abstract Reduction Systems (ARSs); recall that an ARS is just any set with a binary relation $\to$, considered as a reduction relation.

3.1. PROPOSITION. *Let* R_0 *and* R_1 *be two ARSs with the same set of objects, and with reduction relations* $\to_0$, $\to_1$ *and convertibility relations* $=_0$, $=_1$ *respectively. Let* NF_i *be the set of normal forms of* R_i *(*i = 0, 1*). Then* R_0 *is UN if each of the following conditions hold:*

(i) $\to_1$ *extends* $\to_0$;
(ii) R_1 *is CR;*
(iii) NF_1 *contains* NF_0.

PROOF. Easy. □

3.2. REMARK. The conditons (i) and (ii) could still be weakened to:
(i)' $=_1$ *extends* $=_0$;
(ii)' R_1 *is UN.*
In the applications that concern us here, however, we use 3.1 as it is stated. In particular the uniqueness of normal forms property of R_1 is always obtained as a consequence of confluence.

The interest of Proposition 3.1 derives from its applications, in particular in the method of conditional linearization for proving UN, that is the topic of this paper. By way of illustration, we can already apply it to a relatively simple, but typical example. We consider the non-confluent system CL-e = CL + {r-e: $Dxx \to E$} from section 1. In order to be able to use Proposition 3.1 for establishing UN for CL-e, we 'break' the non-leftlinearity constraint in the rule r-e by replacing it with a conditional rule:

r-e*: $Dxy \to E \Leftarrow x = y.$

Thus we get the system CL-e* of Example 2.7. Remark that the rule r-e* can be seen as resulting from r-e, written in the conditional format of Note 2.2, by relaxing the condition $x \equiv y$ to $x = y$.

3.3. PROPOSITION. *The TRS* CL-e *has unique normal forms.*

PROOF. We want to apply Proposition 3.1 with R_0 = CL-e and R_1 = CL-e*; so we must check the clauses (i), (ii) and (iii).
(i) Obviously $\rightarrow_{CL\text{-}e}$ is contained in $\rightarrow_{CL\text{-}e^*}$, since, as we just observed, the rule r-e: $Dxx \rightarrow E$ can be seen as a restriction of the more liberal conditional rule r-e*: $Dxy \rightarrow E \Leftarrow x = y$. (As a matter of fact, one easily verifies that the convertibility relations of CL-e and CL-e* coincide.)
(ii) The semi-equational CTRS CL-e* is orthogonal; hence, by Theorem 2.6, it is confluent.
(iii) It remains to be checked that each CL-e-normal form t is also a CL-e*-normal form. Consider for a proof by contradiction a term t which is a CL-e-normal form, but not a CL-e*-normal form. Moreover, take t to be of minimal length such that these properties hold. Then t must contain a subterm DXY, such that $X \not\equiv Y$ and $X =_{CL\text{-}e^*} Y$. But then, by the minimality of t, the CL-e-normal forms X and Y must be CL-e*-normal forms as well, convertible but distinct, contradicting the Church-Rosser property of CL-e*. □

In order to make the reasoning of Propositon 3.3 more generally applicable, we introduce the concept of 'linearizing'.

3.4. DEFINITION. (i) If r is a rewrite rule $t \rightarrow s$, we say that $r' = t' \rightarrow s'$ is a *left-linear version* of r if there is a substitution σ: VAR $\rightarrow$ VAR such that $r'^{\sigma} = r$ and r' is left-linear.
(ii) If $r = t \rightarrow s$ is a rewrite rule, and $r' = t' \rightarrow s'$ is a left-linear version of r, such that $r = r'^{\sigma}$, then the *conditionalized left-linear version* or *linearization* of r (associated to r') is the conditional rewrite rule:

$$t' \rightarrow s' \Leftarrow \bigwedge \{x_i = x_j \mid i > j,\ x_i^{\sigma} = x_j^{\sigma},\ x_i, x_j \in t'\}.$$

(In case r is already left-linear, it will coincide with its left-linear version r' and with the associated conditional rule.)

3.5. EXAMPLE. $Czxy \rightarrow y$ is a left-linear version of the non-leftlinear rule $Czxx \rightarrow x$, since using the substitution σ with $\sigma(z) = z$, $\sigma(x) = x$, $\sigma(y) = x$ we have

$$(Czxy \rightarrow y)^{\sigma} = (Czxy)^{\sigma} \rightarrow y^{\sigma} = Czxx \rightarrow x.$$

The associated conditional rule is

$$Czxy \rightarrow y \Leftarrow x = y.$$

Another left-linear version of $Czxx \rightarrow x$ is $Czxy \rightarrow x$, with the associated conditional rule

$$Czxy \rightarrow x \Leftarrow x = y.$$

These are the only linearizations, because we will identify rules that originate from each other by a 1-1 renaming of variables as usual.

3.6. DEFINITION. (*Linearization*)
(i) If R is a TRS, then a *linearization* of R is a semi-equational CTRS that consists of linearizations of the rules of R, for each rule of R at least one.

So a linearization R' of R can be obtained by the following two steps:

- Step 1. Choose for every rule $r \in R$ one or more of its left-linear versions; say the (left-linear) rules thus obtained are $r_1, ..., r_n$.
- Step 2. Then take R' to be the CTRS consisting of the conditional rewrite rules $r_1^*, ..., r_n^*$ associated to $r_1, ..., r_n$.

Note that by these two steps the left-linear rules of R are left untouched. In general there will be several linearizations of R, according to the choices that can be made in step 1; but in case R is already left-linear, there is only one, coinciding with R.

(ii) If R is a TRS, then R^L, the *full linearization* of R, is defined as the linearization of R that is obtained by including for each rule $r \in R$ *all* its conditionalized left-linear versions.

EXAMPLE. The system CL-e* is the result of linearizing the system CL-e.
As a matter of fact, CL-e* = CL-e^L.

3.7. LEMMA. *Let* R' *be a linearization of* R. *Then:*
(i) *The one-step reduction relation of* R' *extends that of* R: $\rightarrow_R \subseteq \rightarrow_{R'}$
(ii) *The conversion relations of* R *and of* R' *are the same:* $=_R = =_{R'}$.

PROOF. (i) For each rule r of R at least one of its linearizations r* is included in R'. In case r itself is left-linear, the rule r coincides with r*; if r is not left-linear, r is stricter than its linearization r*.
(ii) The inclusion $=_R \subseteq =_{R'}$ holds because of (i). The inclusion $=_{R'} \subseteq =_R$ follows by induction on conversion in R'. It suffices to check that the rules of R' respect convertibility in R, under the hypothesis that the conditons already hold with respect to R. □

3.8. THEOREM. *If a linearization of a term rewriting system* R *is confluent, then* R *has unique normal forms.*

PROOF. The proof runs parallel to that of Proposition 3.2; it is only a little bit more abstract. So now it sufices to check (i), (ii) and (iii) of Proposition 3.1 for R and a linearization R', that is:

(i) $\rightarrow_{R'}$ extends $\rightarrow_R$;
(ii) R' is Church-Rosser;
(iii) $NF_{R'}$ contains NF_R.

(i) follows from Lemma 3.7.
(ii) holds by assumption.

As to (iii), we prove by induction on X the implication $X \in NF_R \Rightarrow X \in NF_{R'}$. Assume $X \in NF_R$. Then X can only be not an R'-normal form, if it contains a redex Y that is an instance of a linearization r* of some non-leftlinear rule $r = t \rightarrow s$ of R. That is, $X \equiv C[Y]$ and for a leftlinear version $r' = t' \rightarrow s'$ of r (such that $r = r'^{\sigma}$), we have $Y \equiv t'^{\tau}$; moreover the conditions of r* must be satisfied, amounting to the implication $x_i^{\sigma} \equiv x_j^{\sigma} \Rightarrow x_i^{\tau} = x_j^{\tau}$, for all $x_i, x_j \in t'$. Since the x_i^{τ}'s are proper subterms of X, and hence R-normal forms, they are by the induction hypothesis also R'-normal forms. Hence, since R' has unique normal forms: $x_i^{\sigma} \equiv x_j^{\sigma} \Rightarrow x_i^{\tau} \equiv x_j^{\tau}$. But then Y would be also an R-redex, contradicting the assumption that $X \in NF_R$. □

REMARK. Like Proposition 3.1, also this theorem may be strengthened by requiring only UN for the linearization.

Now we have obtained a general method to prove unicity of normal forms for non-leftlinear TRSs: try to prove CR for one of its linearizations in order to be able to apply Theorem 3.8. Whether the method will work in a particular case, and how difficult it is, depends on the CR problem that ensues.

We first treat a simple but interesting example. Call a TRS *strongly non-ambiguous* if after replacing each non-leftlinear reduction rule by a left-linear version the resulting TRS is non-ambiguous. The following general result is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.8.

3.9. THEOREM. *Any strongly non-ambiguous TRS has unique normal forms.*

PROOF. Let R be a strongly non-ambiguous TRS. Consider a linearization R' of R consisiting of exactly one conditionalized left-linear version for each rule of R. Then R' will be an orthogonal semi-equational CTRS. Hence the result follows by Theorems 3.8 and 2.6. □

Two examples of non-leftlinear TRSs to which Theorem 3.9 can be applied to yield UN are the systems CL-d and CL-e from section 2. An example of a non-ambiguous but not strongly non-ambiguous TRS that does not have unique normal forms is the following.

3.10. EXAMPLE (Huet [1980]). $R = \{F(x, x) \to A, F(x, G(x)) \to B, C \to G(C)\}$. R is non-ambiguous; there are no critical pairs since x and G(x) cannot be unified. However, R is not strongly non-ambiguous, since $\{F(x, y) \to A, F(x, G(y)) \to B\}$ has a critical pair. The term F(C, C) has the two distinct normal forms A and B.

4. The case of Combinatory Logic plus Parallel Conditional

In this section we prove CR for the full linearization CL-pc^L of the ambiguous and non-leftlinear system CL-pc, Combinatory Logic with parallel conditional. Then the uniqueness of normal forms property for CL-pc follows by an application of Theorem 3.8. First we sum up the rules of the linearization CL-pc^L.

CL-pc^L: CL +

r-t:	$CTxy \to x$,
r-f:	$CFxy \to y$,
r-pc^1:	$Czxy \to x \Leftarrow x = y$,
r-pc^2:	$Czxy \to y \Leftarrow x = y$.

Solving the CR problem may at first look not very promising, because of the vicious cases of overlap between the pairs of rules r-t / r-pc^2, r-f / r-pc^1 and r-pc^1 / r-pc^2. Now the idea is to add extra conditions in order to remove these cases of vicious overlap. This will involve also the use of negative conditions, however, and hence there is the danger of the pitfall indicated in Note 2.1.

To avoid this pitfall we 'fix' the conditions, making them refer to $=_{CL\text{-}pc}$, convertibility in CL-pc. Thereby the conditions have a determinate meaning, independent of the inductive definition of conversion ($=_{CL\text{-}pcL\text{-}}$) they are part of. What we get is not a semi-equational, but a generalized CTRS; it will be called CL-pc^{L-}.

CL-pc^{L-}: CL +

r-t:	$CTxy \to x$,
r-f:	$CFxy \to y$,
r-pc^{1-}:	$Czxy \to x \Leftarrow x =_{CL\text{-}pc} y,\ \text{not}\ z =_{CL\text{-}pc} F$,
r-pc^{2-}:	$Czxy \to y \Leftarrow x =_{CL\text{-}pc} y,\ z =_{CL\text{-}pc} F$.

4.1. LEMMA. (i) *The convertibility relations in* CL-pc, *in* CL-pc^L, *and in* CL-pc^{L-} *coincide.*
(ii) $\to_{CL\text{-}pcL\text{-}} \subseteq \to_{CL\text{-}pcL}$

PROOF. (i) For conversion in CL-pc and CL-pc^L we have Lemma 3.7. We show that $=_{CL\text{-}pcL\text{-}} = =_{CL\text{-}pc}$. The inclusion $=_{CL\text{-}pc} \subseteq =_{CL\text{-}pcL\text{-}}$ holds since each instance of the rule r-pc of CL-pc is also an instance of either r-pc^1 or r-pc^2. So it suffices to check that the rules r-pc^1 and r-pc^2 of CL-pc^{L-} respect convertibility in CL-pc. This is immediate by the (positive) conditions $x =_{CL\text{-}pc} y$.

(ii) By (i), the conditions $x =_{CL\text{-}pc} y$ of the rules r-pc^{1-} and r-pc^{2-} amount to the same as the conditions on r-pc^{1,2}. Then the extra conditions on r-pc^{1,2} can only make the relation $\rightarrow_{CL\text{-}pcL^-}$ stricter than $\rightarrow_{CL\text{-}pcL}$. □

Now in order to prove CR for CL-pc^{L-} we need to know that $T \neq_{CL\text{-}pc} F$; this will guarantee that there is indeed no overlap in CL-pc^{L-} between the rules r-t and r-pc^2, etc. A model construction within the Graph Model Pω for CL can be used for this purpose.

The Graph Model Pω is surveyed e.g. in Barendregt [1981], Chapter 18; we assume the following preliminaries.

- The function $(,): \omega \times \omega \rightarrow \omega$ is a 1-1 coding of pairs of natural numbers;
- e(0), e(1), e(2), ... is a list of all finite subsets of ω, with e(0) the empty set;
- the function $s: \omega \rightarrow \omega$ is such that $e(s(n)) = \{n\}$, for all $n \in \omega$ (s stands for 'singleton'). □

4.2. LEMMA. $T \neq_{CL\text{-}pc} F$

PROOF. The following definitions of T, F and C within Pω can be given, satisfying the equations of CL-pc:

$T = \{1\}$,
$F = \{0\}$,
$C = \{(0,(s(n),(s(n),n))) \mid n \in \omega\} \cup \{(s(1),(s(n),(0,n))) \mid n \in \omega\} \cup \{(s(0),(0,(s(n),n))) \mid n \in \omega\}$.

The model thus obtained satisfies $=_{CL\text{-}pc}$, but not T = F. □

4.3. PROPOSITION. *The system* CL-pc^{L-} *is Church-Rosser.*

PROOF. By Lemma 4.1 it follows that the conditions of CL-pc^{L-} are stable. Moreover between the rules of CL-pc^{L-} there are no harmful cases of overlap, due to the negative condition and to Lemma 4.2. Then proving CR is a routine matter (compare Theorems 2.5, 2.6). □

The confluence of CL-pc^L can now be concluded from 4.1 and 4.3 by using the following general principle for ARSs.

4.4. PROPOSITION. *Let* R *and* R' *be ARSs such that the following three conditions are satisfied:*

(i) R' *is confluent*
(ii) $\rightarrow_{R'} \subseteq \rightarrow_R$
(iii) $=_R \subseteq =_{R'}$

Then R *is confluent.*

PROOF. Assume $t =_R s$. Then by clause (iii) also $t =_{R'} s$. Hence by (i), the terms t and s must have a common reduct in R'. But then, again by (iii), t and s have the same common reduct in R. □.

4.5. THEOREM. (i) *The system* CL-pc^L *is Church-Rosser.*
(ii) *The system* CL-pc *has unique normal forms.*

PROOF. (i) The Curch-Rosser property for CL-pc^L follows by Proposition 4.4 from 4.3 and 4.1.
(ii) Since we have confluence for the linearization CL-pc^L, Theorem 3.8 can be applied. □

5. Chew's Theorem

We will now give a brief account of a theorem stated in Chew [1981], giving sufficient conditions for a TRS to have unique normal forms. In the light of the present paper, Chew's theorem can be viewed as a generalization of Theorem 3.9: the condition of strong non-ambiguity is relaxed to allow overlap at the root between the lefthand sides of rules, but only when an extra requirement is met, called *compatibility* (see Definition 5.1). The paradigmatic example of a non-leftlinear TRS that is not strongly non-ambiguous, but still within the scope of Chew's theorem, is the system CL-pc.

So Chew's conditions imply both our theorems 3.9 and 4.5(ii). The proof in Chew [1981], however is far more complicated than the ones given here. For the relation between our method involving the use of an associated CTRS and Chew's approach see the remarks below.

5.1. DEFINITION (*Compatibility*)

(i) Let $r = t \to s$ be a rewrite rule. Then the set of all left-linear versions of r,

$$\{t' \to s_1', \ldots, t' \to s_n'\}$$

is a *cluster* of rewrite rules. (Note that the left-hand sides of the rules in the cluster corresponding to r, are taken the same. In Chew [1981] this cluster is presented as $t' \to \{s_1', \ldots, s_n'\}$.)

(ii) Now let $r_1: t_1 \to s_1$ and $r_2: t_2 \to s_2$ be two different rewrite rules of the TRS R. Let

$$\{t_1' \to s_{1i}' \mid i = 1, \ldots, n\} \text{ and}$$
$$\{t_2' \to s_{2j}' \mid j = 1, \ldots, m\}$$

be the two clusters corresponding to r_1 and r_2, respectively. We say that R has *compatible* rewrite rules (or that R is compatible) if for all r_1, r_2 the following holds:

(a) t_1' cannot be unified with a proper subterm of itself. Likewise for t_2'.

(b) t_1' cannot be unified with a proper subterm of t_2'. Likewise with 1, 2 interchanged.

(c) if t_1', t_2' can be unified (at the root), via mgu σ, then the two clusters must have a common σ-instance:

$$\{(t_1' \to s_{1i}')^\sigma \mid i = 1,\ldots,n\} \cap \{(t_2' \to s_{2j}')^\sigma \mid j = 1,\ldots,m\} \neq \emptyset.$$

5.2. NOTE. The terminology used here deviates slightly from that in Chew [1981]. There the notion *strongly non-overlapping* allows possible overlap at the root; the term *compatible* only concerns condition (ii)(c) of Definition 5.1.

5.3. THEOREM (Chew [1981]). *Let* R *be a compatible TRS; then* R *is UN.*

Like the method we described in section 3, the proof of Theorem 5.3 given in Chew [1981] does rely on Proposition 3.1. Also analogously, the extended rewriting relation (R_1) used by Chew is the result of some procedure of linearizing the non-leftlinear rules. But Chew does not make use of the notion of conditional rewriting, and accordingly his linearizations are slightly different from the ones obtained via an associated semi-equational CTRS. Then the Church-Rosser proof by Chew for the linearizations he obtains from compatible systems is by an ingenious and complex syntactic analysis.

It seems not unlikely that Chew's approach can be transferred to our CTRS framework. If R is a TRS and R^L its full linearization, we can group the conditional rules of R^L also in clusters, according to how they originated from rules in R. Thus for example for CL-pc, we have the partition in clusters (indicated by boxes) in Figure 5.1.



Figure 5.1

Now it should be proved that the full linearizations of compatible TRSs satisfy CR. Then it would follow by Theorem 3.8 that all compatible TRSs are UN.

5.4. CONJECTURE. *Let* R *be a compatible TRS and let the semi-equational CTRS* R^L *be the full linearization of* R. *Then* R^L *is confluent. (Hence* R *is UN.)*

6. Remarks and further questions

6.1. As said before, the proof of Theorem 5.3 is by an ingenious but also very complicated syntactic analysis. As a matter of fact, we have not yet succeeded in fully reconstructing all details of the argument from the rather sketchy presentation in Chew [1981].

6.2. Combinatory Logic with parallel conditional is presented here and in Chew [1981] as the paradigmatic example of a compatible, not strongly non-ambiguous TRS. We do not know yet another interesting example. It would be interesting to know if such examples exist. A related question is whether it would be possible to broaden the scope of Theorem 5.3 by extending Chew's syntactic analysis beyond the class of compatible TRSs.

6.3. There do exist non-leftlinear systems known to have unique normal forms that are not compatible and are therefore outside the scope of Chew's theorem. An example of such a TRS is CL-sp. It is covered in Klop & de Vrijer [1989].

6.4. It is at present an open question whether another linearization of CL-pc, the system CL-pc^1, is confluent. This question was suggested in a personal communication by Toyama.

CL-pc^1: CL +

$CTxy \to x$,

$CFxy \to y$,

$Czxy \to x \Leftarrow x = y$.

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank Yoshihito Toyama for some interesting communications via e-mail on the subject of this paper, and Jan Willem Klop, Aart Middeldorp and Vincent van Oostrom for their support.

References

BARENDREGT, H.P. (1974), *Pairing without conventional restraints.* Zeitschrift für Math. Logik und Grundl. der Math. 20, p. 289-306.

BARENDREGT, H.P. (1981), *The Lambda Calculus, its Syntax and Semantics.* 1st ed. North-Holland 1981, 2nd ed. North-Holland 1984.

BERGSTRA, J.A., & J.W. KLOP (1986), *Conditional rewrite rules: confluence and termination.* Journal of Computer and Systems Sciences 32, p. 323-362.

BÖHM, C. (ed.) (1975), *λ-Calculus and Computer Science Theory.* Springer Lecture Notes in Computer Science 37.

CHEW, P. (1981), *Unique normal forms in term rewriting systems with repeated variables.* In: 13th Annual ACM Symposium on the theory of Computing, p. 7-18.

DERSHOWITZ, N., OKADA, M. & SIVAKUMAR, G. (1988). *Canonical Conditional Rewrite Systems.* In: Proc. of 9th Conf. on Automated Deduction, Argonne, Springer LNCS 310, 538-549.

HUET, G. (1980). *Confluent reductions: Abstract properties and applications to term rewriting systems.* Journal of the ACM 27, No.4, p. 797-821.

KLOP, J.W. (1980), *Combinatory Reduction Systems.* Mathematical Centre Tracts 127, Centre for Mathematics and Computer Science, Amsterdam.

KLOP, J.W & R.C. DE VRIJER (1989), *Unique normal forms for lambda calculus with surjective pairting.* Information and Computation 80, p. 97-113.

MANN, C.R. (1973), *Connections between proof theory and category theory.* Dissertation, Oxford University.

O'DONNELL, M.J. (1977), *Computing in sysrems described by equations.* Springer Lecture Notes in Computer Science 58.

STAPLES, J. (1975), *Church-Rosser theorems for replacement systems.* In: Algebra and Logic (ed. J.N. Crossley), Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics 450, p. 291-307.

VRIJER, R.C. DE (1987), *Surjective pairing and strong normalization: two themes in lambda calculus.* Dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

VRIJER, R.C. DE (1989), *Extending the lambda calculus with surjective pairing is conservative.* In Proc. of the 4th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, p. 204-215.

Amsterdam
december 1990

The ITLI Prepublication Series

1990

Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Language

LP-90-01 Jaap van der Does — A Generalized Quantifier Logic for Naked Infinitives
LP-90-02 Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof — Dynamic Montague Grammar
LP-90-03 Renate Bartsch — Concept Formation and Concept Composition
LP-90-04 Aarne Ranta — Intuitionistic Categorial Grammar
LP-90-05 Patrick Blackburn — Nominal Tense Logic
LP-90-06 Gennaro Chierchia — The Variablity of Impersonal Subjects
LP-90-07 Gennaro Chierchia — Anaphora and Dynamic Logic
LP-90-08 Herman Hendriks — Flexible Montague Grammar
LP-90-09 Paul Dekker — The Scope of Negation in Discourse, towards a flexible dynamic Montague grammar
LP-90-10 Theo M.V. Janssen — Models for Discourse Markers
LP-90-11 Johan van Benthem — General Dynamics
LP-90-12 Serge Lapierre — A Functional Partial Semantics for Intensional Logic
LP-90-13 Zhisheng Huang — Logics for Belief Dependence
LP-90-14 Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof — Two Theories of Dynamic Semantics
LP-90-15 Maarten de Rijke — The Modal Logic of Inequality
LP-90-16 Zhisheng Huang, Karen Kwast — Awareness, Negation and Logical Omniscience
LP-90-17 Paul Dekker — Existential Disclosure, Implicit Arguments in Dynamic Semantics

Mathematical Logic and Foundations

ML-90-01 Harold Schellinx — Isomorphisms and Non-Isomorphisms of Graph Models
ML-90-02 Jaap van Oosten — A Semantical Proof of De Jongh's Theorem
ML-90-03 Yde Venema — Relational Games
ML-90-04 Maarten de Rijke — Unary Interpretability Logic
ML-90-05 Domenico Zambella — Sequences with Simple Initial Segments
ML-90-06 Jaap van Oosten — Extension of Lifschitz' Realizability to Higher Order Arithmetic, and a Solution to a Problem of F. Richman
ML-90-07 Maarten de Rijke — A Note on the Interpretability Logic of Finitely Axiomatized Theories
ML-90-08 Harold Schellinx — Some Syntactical Observations on Linear Logic
ML-90-09 Dick de Jongh, Duccio Pianigiani — Solution of a Problem of David Guaspari
ML-90-10 Michiel van Lambalgen — Randomness in Set Theory
ML-90-11 Paul C. Gilmore — The Consistency of an Extended NaDSet

Computation and Complexity Theory

CT-90-01 John Tromp, Peter van Emde Boas — Associative Storage Modification Machines
CT-90-02 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Gerard R. Renardel de Lavalette — A Normal Form for PCSJ Expressions
CT-90-03 Ricard Gavaldà, Leen Torenvliet, Osamu Watanabe, José L. Balcázar — Generalized Kolmogorov Complexity in Relativized Separations
CT-90-04 Harry Buhrman, Edith Spaan, Leen Torenvliet — Bounded Reductions
CT-90-05 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Karen Kwast — Efficient Normalization of Database and Constraint Expressions
CT-90-06 Michiel Smid, Peter van Emde Boas — Dynamic Data Structures on Multiple Storage Media, a Tutorial
CT-90-07 Kees Doets — Greatest Fixed Points of Logic Programs
CT-90-08 Fred de Geus, Ernest Rotterdam, Sieger van Denneheuvel, Peter van Emde Boas — Physiological Modelling using RL
CT-90-09 Roel de Vrijer — Unique Normal Forms for Combinatory Logic with Parallel Conditional, a case study in conditional rewriting

Other Prepublications

X-90-01 A.S. Troelstra — Remarks on Intuitionism and the Philosophy of Mathematics, Revised Version
X-90-02 Maarten de Rijke — Some Chapters on Interpretability Logic
X-90-03 L.D. Beklemishev — On the Complexity of Arithmetical Interpretations of Modal Formulae
X-90-04 — Annual Report 1989
X-90-05 Valentin Shehtman — Derived Sets in Euclidean Spaces and Modal Logic
X-90-06 Valentin Goranko, Solomon Passy — Using the Universal Modality: Gains and Questions
X-90-07 V.Yu. Shavrukov — The Lindenbaum Fixed Point Algebra is Undecidable
X-90-08 L.D. Beklemishev — Provability Logics for Natural Turing Progressions of Arithmetical Theories
X-90-09 V.Yu. Shavrukov — On Rosser's Provability Predicate
X-90-10 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Peter van Emde Boas — An Overview of the Rule Language RL/1
X-90-11 Alessandra Carbone — Provable Fixed points in $I\Delta_0+\Omega_1$, revised version
X-90-12 Maarten de Rijke — Bi-Unary Interpretability Logic
X-90-13 K.N. Ignatiev — Dzhaparidze's Polymodal Logic: Arithmetical Completeness, Fixed Point Property, Craig's Property
X-90-14 L.A. Chagrova — Undecidable Problems in Correspondence Theory
X-90-15 A.S. Troelstra — Lectures on Linear Logic

1991

Mathematical Logic and Foundations

ML-91-01 Yde Venema — Cylindric Modal Logic
ML-91-02 Alessandro Berarducci, Rineke Verbrugge — On the Metamathematics of Weak Theories

Other Prepublications

X-91-01 Alexander Chagrov, Michael Zakharyaschev — The Disjunction Property of Intermediate Propositional Logics
X-91-02 Alexander Chagrov, Michael Zakharyaschev — On the Undecidability of the Disjunction Property of Intermediate Propositional Logics
X-91-03 V. Yu. Shavrukov — Subalgebras of Diagonizable Algebras of Theories containing Arithmetic
X-91-04 K.N. Ignatiev — Partial Conservativity and Modal Logics