

# Upper Bounds for Standardizations and an Application

Hongwei Xi

Department of Mathematical Sciences  
Carnegie Mellon University  
5000 Forbes Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213  
Email: [hwxi+@cs.cmu.edu](mailto:hwxi+@cs.cmu.edu)

## Abstract

We present a new proof for the standardization theorem in  $\lambda$ -calculus, which is largely built upon structural induction on  $\lambda$ -terms. We then extract some bounds for the number of  $\beta$ -reduction steps in the standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence obtained from transforming a given  $\beta$ -reduction sequence, sharpening the standardization theorem. As an application, we establish a super exponential bound for the lengths of  $\beta$ -reduction sequences from any given simply typed  $\lambda$ -terms.

## 1 Introduction

The standardization theorem of Curry and Feys [CF58] is a fundamental theorem in  $\lambda$ -calculus, stating that if  $u$  reduces to  $v$  for  $\lambda$ -terms  $u$  and  $v$ , then there is a *standard*  $\beta$ -reduction sequences from  $u$  to  $v$ . With the help of this theorem, we can readily prove the normalisation theorem, i.e., a  $\lambda$ -term has a normal form if and only if the leftmost  $\beta$ -reduction sequence from the term is finite. The importance of lazy evaluation in functional programming languages largely follows from the normalisation theorem. Moreover, the standardization theorem can be viewed as a syntactic version of sequentiality theorem in [Ber78]. For instance, it can be readily argued that *parallel “or”* operator is inexpressible in  $\lambda$ -calculus by using the standardization theorem. In fact, a syntactic proof of the sequentiality theorem can be given with the help of the standardization theorem.

There have been many proofs of the standardization theorem in the literature such as the ones in [Mit79], [Klo80], [Bar84] and [Tak95]. In the presented proof we intend to find a bound for standardizations, namely, to measure the length of standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence obtained from a given  $\beta$ -reduction sequence. This method presents a concise and more accurate formulation of the standardization theorem. As an application, we establish a super exponential bound on the number of  $\beta$ -reduction steps in  $\beta$ -reduction sequences from any given simply typed  $\lambda$ -terms. This not only strengthens the strong normalisation theorem in the simply typed  $\lambda$ -calculus  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ , but also yields more understanding on  $\mu(t)$ , the number of steps in a longest  $\beta$ -reduction sequence from a given simply typed  $\lambda$ -term  $t$ . Since  $\mu(t)$  can often be used as an induction order, its structure plays a key role in understanding related inductive proofs.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Some preliminaries are explained in Section 2. Our proof of the standardization theorem is presented in Section 3, and some upper bounds for standardizations are extracted in Section 4. In Section 5, we establish a bound for the lengths of  $\beta$ -reduction sequences from any given simply typed  $\lambda$ -terms. Finally, some related work is mentioned in Section 6.

## 2 Preliminaries

We give a brief explanation on the notations and terminology used in this paper. Most details not included here appear in [Bar84].

**Definition 2.1** ( $\lambda$ -terms) *The set  $\Lambda$  of  $\lambda$ -terms is defined inductively as follows.*

- (variable) *There are infinitely many variables  $x, y, z, \dots$  in  $\Lambda$ ; variables are the only subterms of themselves.*
- (abstraction) *If  $t \in \Lambda$  then  $(\lambda x.t) \in \Lambda$ ;  $u$  is a subterm of  $(\lambda x.t)$  if  $u$  is  $(\lambda x.t)$  or a subterm of  $t$ .*
- (application) *If  $t_0, t_1 \in \Lambda$  then  $t_0(t_1) \in \Lambda$ ;  $u$  is a subterm of  $t_0(t_1)$  if  $u$  is  $t_0(t_1)$  or a subterm of  $t_i$  for some  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ .*

*The set  $\text{FV}(t)$  of free variables in  $t$  is defined as follows.*

$$\text{FV}(t) = \begin{cases} \{x\} & \text{if } t = x \text{ for some variable } x; \\ \text{FV}(t_0) - \{x\} & \text{if } t = (\lambda x.t_0); \\ \text{FV}(t_0) \cup \text{FV}(t_1) & \text{if } t = t_0(t_1). \end{cases}$$

*The set  $\Lambda_I$  of  $\lambda I$ -terms is the maximal subset of  $\Lambda$  such that, for every term  $t \in \Lambda_I$ , if  $(\lambda x.t_0)$  is a subterm of  $t$  then  $x \in \text{FV}(t_0)$ .*

We use  $u\{x := v\}$  for the result of substituting  $v$  for all free occurrences of  $x$  in  $u$ . Note that  $\alpha$ -conversion or renaming bounded variables may have to be performed in order to avoid name collisions. Rigorous definitions are omitted here. We assume some basic properties on substitution such as the Substitution Lemma (Lemma 2.1.16 [Bar84]).

**Definition 2.2** ( $\beta$ -redex,  $\beta$ -reduction and  $\beta$ -normal form) *a  $\beta$ -redex is a term of form  $(\lambda x.u)(v)$ ;  $u\{x := v\}$  is the contractum of the  $\beta$ -redex;  $t \rightarrow_{\beta} t'$  stands for a  $\beta$ -reduction step where  $t'$  is obtained from replacing some  $\beta$ -redex in  $t$  with its contractum; a  $\beta$ -normal form is a term in which there is no  $\beta$ -redex.*

Let  $\rightarrow_{\beta}^n$  stand for  $n$  steps of  $\beta$ -reduction, and  $\twoheadrightarrow_{\beta}$  stand for some steps of  $\beta$ -reduction, which could be 0. Usually there are many different  $\beta$ -redexes in a term  $t$ ; a  $\beta$ -redex  $r_1$  in  $t$  is to the left of another  $\beta$ -redex  $r_2$  in  $t$  if the first symbol of  $r_1$  is to the left of that of  $r_2$ .

**Definition 2.3** (Multiplicity) *Given a  $\beta$ -redex  $r = (\lambda x.u)(v)$ ; the multiplicity  $m(r)$  of  $r$  is the number of free occurrences of the variable  $x$  in  $u$ .*

**Definition 2.4** ( $\beta$ -reduction sequence) *Given a  $\beta$ -redex  $r$  in  $t$ ;  $t \xrightarrow{r}_\beta u$  stands for the  $\beta$ -reduction step in which  $\beta$ -redex  $r$  gets contracted;  $[r_1] + \dots + [r_n]$  stands for a  $\beta$ -reduction sequence of the following form.*

$$t_0 \xrightarrow{r_1}_\beta t_1 \xrightarrow{r_2}_\beta \dots \xrightarrow{r_n}_\beta t_n$$

**Notations** We use  $\sigma, \tau, \dots$  for  $\beta$ -reduction sequences;

$$\sigma : t \longrightarrow_\beta t' \quad \text{and} \quad t \xrightarrow{\sigma}_\beta t'$$

for a  $\beta$ -reduction sequence from  $t$  to  $t'$ ;  $|\sigma|$  for the length of  $\sigma$ , namely, the number of  $\beta$ -reduction steps in  $\sigma$ , which might be 0.

**Definition 2.5** (Concatenation) *Given  $\sigma : t_0 \longrightarrow_\beta t_1$  and  $\tau : t_1 \longrightarrow_\beta t_2$ ;  $\sigma + \tau$  stands for the concatenation of  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$ , namely,  $\sigma + \tau : t_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma}_\beta t_1 \xrightarrow{\tau}_\beta t_2$ .*

**Conventions** Let  $\sigma : u \longrightarrow_\beta v$  and  $C[ ]$  be a context, then  $\sigma$  can also be regarded as the  $\beta$ -reduction sequence which reduces  $C[u]$  to  $C[v]$  in the obvious way. In other words, we may use  $\sigma$  to stand for  $C[\sigma]$ . An immediate consequence of this is that  $\sigma + \tau$  can be regarded as  $C_1[\sigma] + C_2[\tau]$  for some proper contexts  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ .

We now introduce the concept of *residuals* of  $\beta$ -redexes. The rigorous definition of this notion can be found in [Hue94]. Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a set of  $\beta$ -redexes in a term  $t$ ,  $r = (\lambda x.u)(v)$  in  $\mathcal{R}$ , and  $t \xrightarrow{r}_\beta t'$ . This  $\beta$ -reduction step affects  $\beta$ -redexes  $r'$  in  $\mathcal{R}$  in the following way. We assume that all bound variables in  $u$  are distinct from the free variables in  $v$ .

- $r'$  is  $r$ . Then  $r'$  has no residual in  $t'$ .
- $r'$  is in  $v$ . All copies of  $r'$  in  $u\{x := v\}$  are called residuals of  $r'$  in  $t'$ ;
- $r'$  is in  $u$ . Then  $r'\{x := v\}$  in  $u\{x := v\}$  is the only residual of  $r'$  in  $t'$ ;
- $r'$  contains  $r$ . Then the residual of  $r'$  is the term obtained by replacing  $r$  in  $r'$  with  $u\{x := v\}$ ;
- Otherwise,  $r'$  is not affected and is its own residual in  $t'$ .

The residual relation is transitive.

**Definition 2.6** (Developments) *Given a  $\lambda$ -term  $t$  and a set  $\mathcal{R}$  of redexes in  $t$ ; if  $\sigma : t \longrightarrow_\beta u$  contracts only  $\beta$ -redexes in  $\mathcal{R}$  or their residuals, then  $\sigma$  is a development.*

**Definition 2.7** (Involvement) *Given  $t \longrightarrow_\beta u$  and  $\sigma : u \longrightarrow_\beta v$ ; a  $\beta$ -redex in  $t$  is involved in  $\sigma$  if some of its residuals is contracted in  $\sigma$ .*

**Definition 2.8** (Head  $\beta$ -redex) *Given  $t$  of form  $\lambda x_1 \dots \lambda x_m.r(t_1) \dots (t_n)$ , where  $r$  is a  $\beta$ -redex and  $m, n \geq 0$ ;  $r$  is called the head  $\beta$ -redex in  $t$ ; a  $\beta$ -reduction is a head  $\beta$ -reduction if the contracted  $\beta$ -redex is a head  $\beta$ -redex.*

**Proposition 2.9** *We have the following.*

- Let  $r_h$  be the head  $\beta$ -redex in  $t$ ; if  $t \xrightarrow{r} u$  for some  $r \neq r_h$  then  $r_h$  has exactly one residual in  $u$ , which is the head  $\beta$ -redex of  $u$ .
- If  $\sigma : t \longrightarrow_{\beta} u$  contains a head  $\beta$ -reduction, then  $t$  contains a head  $\beta$ -redex  $r_h$  and  $r_h$  is involved in  $\sigma$ .

**Proof** Please see Section 8.3 [Bar84] for proofs. ■

### 3 The Proof of Standardization Theorem

Standardization theorem of Curry and Feys [CF58] states that any  $\beta$ -reduction sequence can be standardized in the following sense.

**Definition 3.1** (Standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence) *Given a  $\beta$ -reduction sequence*

$$\sigma : t = t_0 \xrightarrow{r_0}_{\beta} t_1 \xrightarrow{r_1}_{\beta} t_2 \xrightarrow{r_2}_{\beta} \cdots;$$

*$\sigma$  is standard if for all  $0 \leq i < j$ ,  $r_j$  is not a residual of some  $\beta$ -redex to the left of  $r_i$ .*

**Lemma 3.2** *Given  $t \xrightarrow{\sigma_s}_{\beta} u \xrightarrow{r}_{\beta} v$ , where  $\sigma_s$  is standard and  $r$  is the residual of the head  $\beta$ -redex in  $t$ ; then we can construct a standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence  $t \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\beta} v$  such that*

$$|\tau| \leq 1 + \max\{m(r), 1\} \cdot |\sigma_s|.$$

**Proof** Let  $r_h$  be the head  $\beta$ -redex in  $t$ , and we proceed by a structural induction on  $t$ .

- $t = (\lambda x.t_0)$ . By the induction hypothesis on  $t_0$ , this case is trivial.
- $t = t_0(t_1)$ , and  $r_h$  is in  $t_0$ . Then we may assume  $\sigma_s = \sigma_0 + \sigma_1$ , where  $t_i \xrightarrow{\sigma_i}_{\beta} u_i$  are standard for  $i = 0, 1$ , and  $u = u_0(u_1)$ . Note that  $r$  must be in  $u_0$  by Proposition 2.9 (1). Hence  $v = v_0(u_1)$ , where  $u_0 \xrightarrow{r}_{\beta} v_0$ . By induction hypothesis, we can construct a standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence  $t_0 \xrightarrow{\tau_0}_{\beta} v_0$  with  $|\tau_0| \leq 1 + \max\{m(r), 1\} \cdot |\sigma_0|$ . Let  $\tau = \tau_0 + \sigma_1$ , then  $t \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\beta} v$  is standard. It can be readily verified that  $|\tau| \leq 1 + \max\{m(r), 1\} \cdot |\sigma_s|$ .
- $t = (\lambda x.t_0)(t_1)$ , and  $r_h$  is  $t$ . Then we can assume  $\sigma_s = \sigma_0 + \sigma_1$ , where  $t_i \xrightarrow{\sigma_i}_{\beta} u_i$  are standard for  $i = 0, 1$ , and  $r = u = (\lambda x.u_0)u_1$ . Hence,  $v = u_0\{x := u_1\}$ . Let  $\sigma_0 = [r_1] + \cdots + [r_n]$ , and  $\sigma_0^* = [r_1^*] + \cdots + [r_n^*]$ , where  $r_j^* = r_j\{x := t_1\}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . Then we know  $\sigma_0^* : t_0\{x := t_1\} \longrightarrow_{\beta} u_0\{x := t_1\}$  is also standard. Notice that  $\sigma_0^* + \sigma_1 + \cdots + \sigma_1$  is a  $\beta$ -reduction sequence which reduces  $t_0\{x := t_1\}$  to  $v = u_0\{x := u_1\}$ , where  $\sigma_1$  occurs  $m(r)$  times and each  $\sigma_1$  reduces one occurrence of  $t_1$  in  $u_0\{x := t_1\}$  to  $u_1$ . If a  $\beta$ -redex contracted in some  $\sigma_1$  is to the left of some  $r_j^*$ , then all  $\beta$ -redexes contracted in that  $\sigma_1$  are to the left of that  $r_j^*$ . Hence, we can move that  $\sigma_1$  to the front of  $r_j^*$ . In this way, we can construct a standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence from  $t_0\{x := t_1\}$  to  $v = u_0\{x := u_1\}$  in the following form.

$$\sigma_s^* = \cdots + [r_1^*] + \cdots + \dots + \cdots + [r_n^*] + \cdots,$$

where  $\cdots$  stands for a  $\beta$ -reduction sequence of form  $\sigma_1 + \cdots + \sigma_1$ , which may be empty, and  $r_j^*$  may also denote their corresponding residuals. Hence  $\tau = [r_h] + \sigma_s^*$  is a standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence from  $t$  to  $v$ . Notice

$$|\tau| = 1 + |\sigma_s^*| = 1 + |\sigma_0^*| + m(r) * |\sigma_1| \leq 1 + \max\{m(r), 1\} \cdot |\sigma_s|.$$

■

**Lemma 3.3** *Given  $t \xrightarrow{\sigma_s} \beta u \xrightarrow{r} \beta v$ , where  $\sigma_s$  is standard; then we can construct a standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence  $t \xrightarrow{\tau} \beta v$  with  $|\tau| \leq 1 + \max\{m(r), 1\} \cdot |\sigma_s|$ .*

**Proof** The proof proceeds by induction on  $|\sigma_s|$  and the structure of  $t$ , lexicographically ordered. By Corollary 8.3.8 [Bar84],  $t$  is of form

$$\lambda x_1 \dots \lambda x_m. t_0(t_1) \dots (t_n),$$

where  $m, n \geq 0$ , and  $t_0$  is either a variable or an  $\lambda$ -abstraction. We have two cases.

- $\sigma_s + [r]$  contains no head  $\beta$ -reduction. Then we may assume  $\sigma_s$  to be of form

$$\sigma_{0,s} + \sigma_{1,s} + \dots + \sigma_{n,s},$$

where  $\sigma_{i,s}$  are standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequences from  $t_i$  to  $u_i$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$  and  $u = \lambda x_1 \dots \lambda x_m. u_0(u_1) \dots (u_n)$ . Note that  $r$  must be in some  $u_k$ . Let  $u_k \xrightarrow{r} \beta v_k$ . By induction hypothesis, there exists a standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence  $\tau_k$  from  $t_k$  to  $v_k$  with  $|\tau_k| \leq 1 + \max\{m(r), 1\} \cdot |\sigma_{k,s}|$ . Let  $\tau = \sigma_{0,s} + \dots + \tau_k + \dots + \sigma_{n,s}$ , then  $\tau$  is standard.

- $\sigma_s + [r]$  contains some head  $\beta$ -reduction. By Proposition 2.9 (2), let  $r_h$  be the head  $\beta$ -redex in  $t$ , which is involved in  $\sigma_s + [r]$ . We have two subcases.
  - $r$  is the residual of  $r_h$ . Then by Lemma 3.2 we are done.
  - $r_h$  is involved in  $\sigma_s$ . Since  $\sigma_s$  is standard,

$$\sigma_s = [r_h] + \sigma_{h,s} : t \xrightarrow{r_h} \beta t_h \xrightarrow{\sigma_{h,s}} \beta u$$

for some standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence  $\sigma_{h,s}$ . Note  $|\sigma_{h,s}| < |\sigma_s|$ . By induction hypothesis, we can construct a standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence  $\tau_h : t_h \xrightarrow{\beta} v$ . Clearly,  $\tau = [r_h] + \tau_h : t \xrightarrow{\beta} v$  is a standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence.

In either case, it can be verified immediately that  $|\tau| \leq 1 + \max\{m(r), 1\} \cdot |\sigma_s|$ . ■

**Theorem 3.4** (Standardization) *Every finite  $\beta$ -reduction sequence can be standardized.*

**Proof** Given  $t \xrightarrow{\sigma} \beta v$ , we proceed by induction on  $|\sigma|$ . If  $\sigma$  is empty then  $\sigma$  is standard. Now assume  $\sigma = \sigma' + [r]$ , where  $t \xrightarrow{\sigma'} \beta u \xrightarrow{r} \beta v$ . By induction hypothesis, we can construct a standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence  $t \xrightarrow{\sigma'_s} \beta u$ . Hence, the result follows from Lemma 3.3. ■

## 4 The Upper Bounds

It is clear from the previous proofs that we actually have an algorithm to transform any  $\beta$ -reduction sequences into standard ones. Let  $\text{std}(\sigma)$  denote the standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence obtained from transforming a given  $\beta$ -reduction sequence  $\sigma$ . We are ready to give some upper bounds on the number of  $\beta$ -reduction steps in  $\text{std}(\sigma)$ .

**Theorem 4.1** (Standardization with bound) *Given a  $\beta$ -reduction sequence*

$$\sigma : t \longrightarrow_{\beta} u,$$

where  $\sigma = [r_0] + [r_1] + \cdots + [r_n]$  for some  $n \geq 1$ , then there exists a standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence  $t \xrightarrow{\sigma_s}_{\beta} u$  such that

$$|\sigma_s| \leq (1 + \max\{m(r_1), 1\}) \cdots (1 + \max\{m(r_n), 1\}).$$

**Proof** Let  $\sigma_i = [r_0] + [r_1] + \cdots + [r_i]$  and  $l_i = |\text{std}(\sigma_i)|$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$ . By Lemma 3.3, we have  $l_{i+1} \leq 1 + \max\{m(r_{i+1}), 1\} \cdot l_i$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$  according to the proof of Theorem 3.4. Note  $1 \leq l_i$ , and thus, for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ ,

$$l_{i+1} \leq 1 + \max\{m(r_{i+1}), 1\} \cdot l_i \leq (1 + \max\{m(r_{i+1}), 1\}) \cdot l_i.$$

Since  $l_0 = 1$ , this yields  $l_n \leq (1 + \max\{m(r_1), 1\}) \cdots (1 + \max\{m(r_n), 1\})$ . Note  $\sigma = \sigma_n$ . Let  $\sigma_s = \text{std}(\sigma_n)$ , then we are done.  $\blacksquare$

Clearly, this simple bound is not very tight, but it is intelligible. With a closer study, a tighter but more complex bound can be given in the same fashion. Unlike many earlier proofs in the literature, our proof of the standardization theorem does not use the *finiteness of developments theorem* (FD). In this respect, our proof is similar to the one in [Tak95]. We remark that the uses of FD in other proofs are inessential in general and can be avoided in proper ways. As a matter of fact, Theorem 4.1 can be modified to show that all developments are finite, following the application in the next section. We will not pursue in this direction since the work in [dV85] has produced an exact bound for finiteness of developments.

Given  $\sigma : t \longrightarrow_{\beta} u$ , we can also give a bound on  $|\text{std}(\sigma)|$  in terms of  $|\sigma|$  and the size of  $t$  defined below.

**Definition 4.2** *The size  $|t|$  of a term  $t$  is defined inductively as follows.*

$$|t| = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \text{ is a variable;} \\ 1 + |t_0| & \text{if } t = (\lambda x.t_0); \\ |t_0| + |t_1| & \text{if } t = t_0(t_1). \end{cases}$$

**Proposition 4.3** *If  $t \longrightarrow_{\beta} u$  then  $|u| < |t|^2$ .*

**Proof** A structural induction on  $t$  yields the result.  $\blacksquare$

**Corollary 4.4** *Given  $\sigma : t \longrightarrow_{\beta} u$ ; then there is a standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence  $\sigma_s : t \longrightarrow_{\beta} u$  with  $|\sigma_s| < |t|^{2^{|\sigma|}}$ .*

**Proof** This clearly holds if  $|\sigma| = 1$ . Now assume  $\sigma = [r_0] + [r_1] + \cdots + [r_{n-1}] : t \longrightarrow_{\beta} u$ . By Proposition 4.3, we have  $|r_i| < |t|^{2^i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ , which yields  $1 + \max\{m(r_i), 1\} \leq |t|^{2^i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ . By Theorem 4.1, we can construct a standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence  $\sigma_s : t \longrightarrow_{\beta} u$  with  $|\sigma_s| \leq |t|^{2^1} \cdots |t|^{2^{n-1}} < |t|^{2^n}$ .  $\blacksquare$

Now we introduce a lemma which will be used in the next section.

**Lemma 4.5** *If  $\sigma : t \longrightarrow_{\beta} u$  is a development, then  $|u| < 2^{|t|}$ .*

**Proof** This can be verified by a structural induction on  $t$ . See [Xi96b] for a detailed proof.  $\blacksquare$

## 5 An Application

It is a well-known fact that the simply typed  $\lambda$ -calculus  $\lambda^\rightarrow$  enjoys strong normalisation. Given a simply typed  $\lambda$ -term  $t$ , let  $\mu(t)/\nu(t)$  be the length of a longest/shortest  $\beta$ -reduction sequence which reduces  $t$  to a  $\beta$ -normal form. In this section, as an application of our previous result, we will give an upper bound on  $\mu(t)$ . We first show for simply typed  $\lambda$ -terms  $t$  that  $\nu(t)$  is not an elementary function. This can bring us some feeling on how tight our upper bound on  $\mu(t)$  is. Among various proofs showing the strong normalisation property of  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ , some proofs such as the ones in [Gan80a] and [Sch91] can yield super exponential upper bounds on  $\mu(t)$ . Gandy invented a semantic approach in [Gan80a], which is now called *functional interpretations* and has its traces in many following papers such as [Sch82], [Pol94] and [Kah95]. In [Sch91], Schwichtenberg adopted a syntactic approach from [How80], which bases on cut elimination in intuitionistic logic.

Compared with other related methods in the literature, our following syntactic method is not only innovative but also yields a quite intelligible and tight bound. It also exhibits a nice way in  $\lambda^\rightarrow$  to transform strong normalisation into weak normalisation, simplifying a much involved transformation in [Sch91]. Therefore, the new transformation has its own value in this respect.

**Definition 5.1** (Simple Types and  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ -terms) *Types are formulated in the following way.*

- *Atomic types are types.*
- *If  $U$  and  $V$  are types then  $U \rightarrow V$  is a type.*

$\lambda^\rightarrow$ -terms are defined inductively as follows.

- *(variable) For each type  $U$ , there are infinitely many variables  $x^U, y^U, \dots$  of that type.*
- *(abstraction) If  $v$  is of type  $V$  then  $(\lambda x^U.v)$  is of type  $U \rightarrow V$ .*
- *(application) If  $u$  is of type  $U \rightarrow V$  and  $v$  is of type  $U$ , then  $u(v)$  is of type  $V$ .*

$\lambda^\rightarrow$ -I-terms can be defined accordingly. We often omit the type superscript of a variable if this causes no confusion. On the other hand, superscripts may be used to indicate the types of  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ -terms.

### 5.1 $\nu(t)$ is not elementary for $\lambda^\rightarrow$ -terms $t$

It is obvious that we can code  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ -terms with some elementary functions;  $\nu(t)$  can then be regarded as a functions defined on the codings of  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ -terms; we omit the detailed treatment.

**Definition 5.2** *Given an atomic type  $A$ ; let  $U_0 = A$  and  $U_{n+1} = U_n \rightarrow U_n$  for  $n \geq 0$ ; let  $\bar{i}_n = \lambda f^{U_{n+1}} \lambda x^{U_n}. f(\dots(f(x))\dots)$ , where  $i, n \geq 0$  and  $f$  occurs  $i$  times; let  $s_n = \bar{2}_n(\bar{2}_{n-1}) \cdots (\bar{2}_0)$  for  $n \geq 0$ ; let function  $\text{tower}(n, m)$  be defined as follows.*

$$\text{tower}(n, m) = \begin{cases} m & \text{if } n = 0; \\ 2^{\text{tower}(n-1, m)} & \text{if } n > 0. \end{cases}$$

The following properties follow immediately.

**Proposition 5.3** For every  $n \geq 0$ ,

- $|s_n| = 5(n + 1)$ ;
- $\bar{i}_{n+1}\bar{j}_n \longrightarrow_{\beta} \bar{k}_n$  for  $k = j^i$ ;
- $s_n \longrightarrow_{\beta} \bar{k}_0$  for  $k = \text{tower}(n + 1, 1)$ .

**Theorem 5.4**  $\nu(t)$  is not elementary.

**Proof** Let  $\sigma$  be a shortest  $\beta$ -reduction sequence which reduces  $s_n$  to its  $\beta$ -normal form, which is  $\bar{k}_0$  for  $k = \text{tower}(n + 1, 1)$  by the Church-Rosser theorem. Hence, it follows from Proposition 4.3 that

$$\text{tower}(n + 1, 1) < |\bar{k}_0| < |s_n|^{2^{\nu(s_n)}} = (5(n + 1))^{2^{\nu(s_n)}}$$

for  $n \geq 0$ . Since  $\text{tower}(n + 1, 1)$  is not elementary,  $\nu(\cdot)$  cannot be elementary, either. ■

## 5.2 A bound on $\mu(t)$ for $\lambda^{\rightarrow}I$ -terms $t$

Since the leftmost  $\beta$ -reduction sequence from any  $\lambda I$ -term  $t$  is a longest one among all  $\beta$ -reduction sequences from  $t$ , it goes straightforward to establish a bound on  $\mu(t)$  for  $\lambda^{\rightarrow}I$ -terms  $t$  if we can find any normalisation sequences for them. In order to get a tighter bound, the key is to find shorter normalisation sequences. We start with a weak normalisation proof due to Turing according to [Gan80], which can also be found in many other literatures such as [And71, GLT89].

**Definition 5.5** The rank  $\rho(T)$  of a simple type  $T$  is defined as follows.

$$\rho(T) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } T \text{ is atomic;} \\ 1 + \max\{\rho(T_0), \rho(T_1)\} & \text{if } T = T_0 \rightarrow T_1. \end{cases}$$

The rank  $\rho(r)$  of a  $\beta$ -redex  $r = (\lambda x^U . v^V)u^U$  is  $\rho(U \rightarrow V)$ , and the rank of a term  $t$  is

$$\hat{\rho}(t) = \begin{cases} \langle 0, 0 \rangle & \text{if } t \text{ is in } \beta\text{-normal form;} \text{ or} \\ \langle k = \max\{\rho(r) : r \text{ is a } \beta\text{-redex in } t\}, & \\ \text{the number of } \beta\text{-redexes } r \text{ in } t \text{ with } \rho(r) = k \rangle, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The ranks of terms are lexicographically ordered.

Notice that a  $\beta$ -redex has a redex rank, which is a number, and also has a term rank, which is a pair of numbers. Since several (weak) normalisation proofs for  $\lambda^{\rightarrow}$  in the following style have been given in details [And71, GLT89], we only make some observations which we need shortly.

**Observations** Now let us observe the following.

- If  $t \longrightarrow_{\beta} t'$  and  $\beta$ -redex  $r'$  in  $t'$  is a residual of some  $\beta$ -redex  $r$  in  $t$ , then  $\rho(r') = \rho(r)$ .
- Given  $t = C[r]$  with  $\hat{\rho}(t) = \langle k, n \rangle$ , where  $r = (\lambda x^V . u^U)v^V$  is a  $\beta$ -redex with  $\rho(r) = k$  and no  $\beta$ -redexes in  $r$  have rank  $k$ . Then  $\hat{\rho}(t') < \hat{\rho}(t)$  for  $t = C[r] \longrightarrow_{\beta} t' = C[u\{x := v\}]$ . This can be verified by counting the number of  $\beta$ -redexes in  $t'$  with rank  $k$ . It is easy to see that any  $\beta$ -redex in  $t'$  which is not a residual must have rank  $\rho(U)$  or  $\rho(V)$ , which is less than  $k$ . Hence, a  $\beta$ -redex in  $r'$  with rank  $k$  must be a residual of some  $\beta$ -redex  $r_1$  in  $t$  with rank  $k$ . Note  $r_1$  has only one residual in  $t'$  since  $r_1$  is not in  $r$ . This yields  $\hat{\rho}(t') < \hat{\rho}(t)$  since  $\hat{\rho}(t')$  is either  $\langle k, n - 1 \rangle$  or  $\langle k', n' \rangle$  for some  $k' < k$ .



**Lemma 5.6** *Given  $t$  with  $\hat{\rho}(t) = \langle k, n \rangle$  for some  $k > 0$ ; then we can construct a development  $\sigma : t \longrightarrow_{\beta} u$  such that  $|\sigma| = n$  and  $\hat{\rho}(u) = \langle k', n' \rangle$  for some  $k' < k$ .*

**Proof** Following the observations, we can always reduce innermost  $\beta$ -redexes with rank  $k$  until there exist no  $\beta$ -redexes with rank  $k$ . This takes  $n$  steps and reaches a term with a less rank. ■

**Definition 5.7** *We define*

$$\mathcal{M}(\sigma) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |\sigma| = 0; \\ (1 + \max\{m(r_1), 1\}) \cdots (1 + \max\{m(r_n), 1\}) & \text{if } \sigma = [r_1] + \cdots + [r_n]. \end{cases}$$

Clearly,  $\mathcal{M}(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2) = \mathcal{M}(\sigma_1)\mathcal{M}(\sigma_2)$ .

**Theorem 5.8** *If  $t$  is a  $\lambda^{\rightarrow}$ -term with  $\hat{\rho}(t) = \langle k, n \rangle$  for some  $k > 0$ , then there exists  $\sigma : t \longrightarrow_{\beta} u$  such that  $u$  is in  $\beta$ -normal form and*

$$\mathcal{M}(\sigma) < \text{tower}(1, \sum_{i=1}^k (\text{tower}(i-1, |t|))^2).$$

**Proof** By Lemma 5.6, there exists a development  $\sigma' : t \longrightarrow_{\beta} t'$  with  $|\sigma'| = n$  and  $\hat{\rho}(t') = \langle k', n' \rangle$  for some  $k' < k$ . Let  $\sigma' = [r_1] + \cdots + [r_n]$ , then  $1 + m(r_n) < 2^{|t|}$  by Lemma 4.5. Hence,  $\mathcal{M}(\sigma') < 2^{n|t|} < 2^{|t|^2}$  since  $n < |t|$  clearly holds. Now let us proceed by an induction on  $k$ .

- $k = 1$ . Since  $t'$  is in  $\beta$ -normal form, let  $\sigma = \sigma'$  and we are done.
- $k > 1$ . By induction hypothesis, there exists  $\sigma'' : t' \longrightarrow_{\beta} u$  such that  $u$  is in  $\beta$ -normal form and  $\mathcal{M}(\sigma'') < \text{tower}(1, \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\text{tower}(i-1, |t'|))^2)$ . Let  $\sigma = \sigma' + \sigma''$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\sigma) &= \mathcal{M}(\sigma')\mathcal{M}(\sigma'') \\ &< \text{tower}(1, |t|^2)\text{tower}(1, \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\text{tower}(i-1, |t'|))^2) \\ &< \text{tower}(1, \sum_{i=1}^k (\text{tower}(i-1, |t|))^2) \end{aligned}$$

since  $|t'| < 2^{|t|}$  by Lemma 4.5. ■

It is a well-known fact that the leftmost  $\beta$ -reduction sequence from a  $\lambda I$ -term  $t$  is a longest one if  $t$  has a  $\beta$ -normal form.

**Corollary 5.9** *Given any simply typed  $\lambda^{\rightarrow} I$ -term  $t$  with  $\hat{\rho}(t) = \langle k, n \rangle$ ; every  $\beta$ -reduction sequence from  $t$  is of length less than  $\text{tower}(k+1, |t|)$ .*

**Proof** It can be verified that the result holds if  $|t| \leq 3$ . For  $|t| > 3$ , we have the following by an induction on  $k$ :

$$\text{tower}(1, \sum_{i=1}^k (\text{tower}(i-1, |t|))^2) \leq \text{tower}(k+1, |t|).$$

By Theorem 5.8, there exists  $t \xrightarrow{\sigma}_{\beta} u$  such that  $\mathcal{M}(\sigma) < \text{tower}(k+1, |t|)$  and  $u$  is in  $\beta$ -normal form. This yields that  $|\text{std}(\sigma)| < \text{tower}(k+1, |t|)$  by Theorem 4.1. Since  $t$  is a  $\lambda^{\rightarrow} I$ -term, the leftmost  $\beta$ -reduction sequence from  $t$  is a longest one. This concludes the proof. ■

**Example** Given a term  $t = s_n$  for some  $n > 0$ , where  $s_n$  is defined in Definition 5.2; then  $\hat{\rho}(t) = \langle n + 2, 1 \rangle$ , and, by Corollary 5.9, every  $\beta$ -reduction sequence from  $t$  is of length less than  $\text{tower}(n + 3, 5(n + 1))$ . Clearly, we have  $t \twoheadrightarrow_{\beta} \bar{i}_1$  for  $i = \text{tower}(n, 1)$ . Though it is not easy to calculate the exact value of  $\mu(t)$ , it can be readily verified that the standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence from  $\bar{i}_1$  to  $\bar{j}_0$  for  $j = \text{tower}(n + 1, 1)$  is of length greater than  $\text{tower}(n + 1, 1)$ , and this yields

$$\text{tower}(n + 1, 1) < \mu(t) < \text{tower}(n + 3, 5(n + 1)).$$

This example gives us some feeling on how tight the bound given in Corollary 5.9 is.

Notice that the leftmost  $\beta$ -reduction sequence from  $t$  may not yield a longest one if  $t$  is not a  $\lambda^{\rightarrow}I$ -term. Therefore, the proof of Corollary 5.9 cannot go through directly for all  $\lambda^{\rightarrow}$ -terms.

### 5.3 An upper bound on $\mu(t)$ for $\lambda^{\rightarrow}$ -terms $t$

Our following method is to transform a  $\lambda^{\rightarrow}$ -term  $t$  into a  $\lambda^{\rightarrow}I$ -term  $\llbracket t \rrbracket$  such that  $\mu(t) \leq \mu(\llbracket t \rrbracket)$ . Since we have already established a bound for  $\mu(\llbracket t \rrbracket)$ , this bound certainly works for  $\mu(t)$ .

**Lemma 5.10** *Given  $t = r(u_1) \dots (u_n)$  and  $t_0 = u\{x := v\}(u_1) \dots (u_n)$ , where  $r = (\lambda x.u)(v)$ ; if  $t_0$  and  $v$  are strongly normalisable, then  $t$  is strongly normalisable and  $\mu(t) \leq 1 + \mu(t_0) + \mu(v)$ .*

**Proof** Let  $\sigma : t \twoheadrightarrow_{\beta} t^*$  be a  $\beta$ -reduction sequence, and we verify that  $|\sigma| \leq 1 + \mu(t_0) + \mu(v)$ . Clearly, we can assume that  $\beta$ -redex  $r$  is involved in  $\sigma$ . Then  $\sigma = \sigma_1 + [r'] + \sigma_2$  is of the following form.

$$t \xrightarrow{\sigma_1}_{\beta} (\lambda x.u')(v')(u'_1) \dots (u'_n) \xrightarrow{r'}_{\beta} u'\{x := v'\}(u'_1) \dots (u'_n) \xrightarrow{\sigma_2}_{\beta} t^*,$$

where  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_u + \sigma_v + \sigma_{u_1} + \dots + \sigma_{u_n}$  for  $u \xrightarrow{\sigma_u}_{\beta} u'$ ,  $v \xrightarrow{\sigma_v}_{\beta} v'$ ,  $u_1 \xrightarrow{\sigma_{u_1}}_{\beta} u'_1, \dots$ , and  $u_n \xrightarrow{\sigma_{u_n}}_{\beta} u'_n$ . Let  $\tau_1 : u\{x := v\} \twoheadrightarrow_{\beta} u\{x := v'\}$  be the  $\beta$ -reduction sequence which reduces each occurrence of  $v$  in  $u\{x := v\}$  to  $v'$  by following  $\sigma_v$ , and let  $\tau_2 : u\{x := v'\} \twoheadrightarrow_{\beta} u'\{x := v'\}$  be the  $\beta$ -reduction sequence which reduces  $u\{x := v'\}$  to  $u'\{x := v'\}$  by following  $\sigma_u$ . Clearly,  $|\tau_1| = m(r)|\sigma_v|$  and  $|\tau_2| = |\sigma_u|$ . Also let  $\tau : u\{x := v\}(u_1) \dots (u_n) \twoheadrightarrow_{\beta} t^*$  be  $\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \sigma_{u_1} + \dots + \sigma_{u_n} + \sigma_2$ , then  $|\tau| \leq \mu(t_0)$  by definition. Note

$$|\sigma| = |\sigma_1 + [r'] + \sigma_2| = |\sigma_u| + |\sigma_v| + |\sigma_{u_1}| + \dots + |\sigma_{u_n}| + 1 + |\sigma_2| \leq 1 + |\tau| + |\sigma_v|.$$

By definition,  $|\sigma_v| \leq \mu(v)$ . Hence,  $|\sigma| \leq 1 + \mu(t_0) + \mu(v)$ . ■

**Definition 5.11** (Transformation) *To facilitate the presentation, we assume that there exist constants  $\langle, \rangle$  of type  $U \rightarrow (V \rightarrow U)$  for all types  $U$  and  $V$ . Let  $\langle u, v \rangle$  denote  $\langle, \rangle(u)(v)$ .*

$$\llbracket t \rrbracket = \begin{cases} t, & \text{if } t \text{ is a variable;} \\ \lambda x \lambda y_1^{U_1} \dots \lambda y_m^{U_m} . \langle \llbracket t_0 \rrbracket (y_1) \dots (y_m), x \rangle, & \text{if } t = (\lambda x.t_0), \\ & \text{where } t_0 \text{ has type } U_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow U_m \rightarrow V \text{ and } V \text{ is atomic;} \\ \llbracket t_0 \rrbracket (\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket), & \text{if } t = t_0(t_1). \end{cases}$$

We will see clearly that  $\langle, \rangle$  can always be replaced by a free variable of the same type without altering our following argument..

**Proposition 5.12** *For every  $\lambda^{\rightarrow}$ -term  $t$  of type  $T$ , we have the following.*

1.  $\llbracket t \rrbracket$  is a  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ -term of type  $T$ ;
2.  $\llbracket t\{x^U := u\} \rrbracket = \llbracket t\{x^U := \llbracket u \rrbracket\} \rrbracket$  for any  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ -term  $u$  of type  $U$ ;
3.  $\mu(t) \leq \mu(\llbracket t \rrbracket)$ .

**Proof** (1) and (2) can be readily proven by structural induction on  $t$ . By (1) and Corollary 5.9, we know  $\mu(\llbracket t \rrbracket)$  exists for every  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ -term  $t$ . We now proceed to show (3) by an induction on  $\mu(\llbracket t \rrbracket)$  and the structure of  $t$ , lexicographically ordered.

- $t = \lambda x.u$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\mu(t) = \mu(u) \leq \mu(\llbracket u \rrbracket) \leq \mu(\llbracket t \rrbracket)$ .
- $t = x(u_1) \dots (u_n)$ , where  $x$  is some variable. Note  $\mu(\llbracket t \rrbracket) = x(\llbracket u_1 \rrbracket) \dots (\llbracket u_n \rrbracket)$ . By induction hypothesis,

$$\mu(t) = \mu(u_1) + \dots + \mu(u_n) \leq \mu(\llbracket u_1 \rrbracket) + \dots + \mu(\llbracket u_n \rrbracket) = \mu(\llbracket t \rrbracket).$$

- $t = r(u_1) \dots (u_n)$ , where  $r = (\lambda x.u)(v)$ . By definition,

$$\llbracket t \rrbracket = \llbracket r \rrbracket(\llbracket u_1 \rrbracket) \dots (\llbracket u_n \rrbracket) \text{ and } \llbracket r \rrbracket = (\lambda x \lambda y_1 \dots \lambda y_m. \langle \llbracket u \rrbracket(y_1) \dots (y_m), x \rangle)(\llbracket v \rrbracket).$$

Hence,

$$\llbracket r \rrbracket \rightarrow_{\beta} \lambda y_1 \dots \lambda y_m. \langle \llbracket u \rrbracket\{x := \llbracket v \rrbracket\}(y_1) \dots (y_m), \llbracket v \rrbracket \rangle.$$

Since  $\llbracket u \rrbracket(y_1) \dots (y_m)$  is of atomic type,  $m \geq n$ . This yields

$$\llbracket t \rrbracket \rightarrow_{\beta} \lambda y_{n+1} \dots \lambda y_m. \langle \llbracket u \rrbracket\{x := \llbracket v \rrbracket\}(\llbracket u_1 \rrbracket) \dots (\llbracket u_n \rrbracket)(y_{n+1}) \dots (y_m), \llbracket v \rrbracket \rangle.$$

By (2),  $\llbracket u \rrbracket\{x := \llbracket v \rrbracket\} = \llbracket u\{x := v\} \rrbracket$ , and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket u \rrbracket\{x := \llbracket v \rrbracket\}(\llbracket u_1 \rrbracket) \dots (\llbracket u_n \rrbracket) &= \llbracket u\{x := v\} \rrbracket(\llbracket u_1 \rrbracket) \dots (\llbracket u_n \rrbracket) \\ &= \llbracket u\{x := v\}(u_1) \dots (u_n) \rrbracket. \end{aligned}$$

By induction hypothesis,

$$\mu(u\{x := v\}(u_1) \dots (u_n)) \leq \mu(\llbracket u\{x := v\}(u_1) \dots (u_n) \rrbracket).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 5.10,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(t) &\leq 1 + \mu(u\{x := v\}(u_1) \dots (u_n)) + \mu(v) \\ &\leq 1 + \mu(\llbracket u\{x := v\}(u_1) \dots (u_n) \rrbracket) + \mu(\llbracket v \rrbracket) \leq \mu(\llbracket t \rrbracket). \end{aligned}$$

■

**Corollary 5.13** *Given any simply typed  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ -term  $t$  with  $\hat{\rho}(t) = \langle k, n \rangle$ ; every reduction sequence from  $t$  is of length less than  $\text{tower}(k+1, (2k+3)|t|)$ .*

**Proof** Given a subterm  $\lambda x.u$  of type  $U = U_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow U_m \rightarrow V$  in  $t$ , where  $V$  is atomic, we can simply transform  $\lambda x.u$  into  $\lambda x.\llbracket u \rrbracket$  if  $k < \rho(U)$  since no  $\beta$ -redexes with rank greater than  $k$  can occur in any  $\beta$ -reduction sequence of  $t$ ; if  $\rho(U) \leq k$ , we have

$$\llbracket \lambda x.u \rrbracket = |\lambda x \lambda y_1 \dots \lambda y_m. \langle \llbracket u \rrbracket(y_1) \dots (y_m), x \rangle| = \llbracket u \rrbracket + 2m + 3 \leq \llbracket u \rrbracket + 2k + 3.$$

Thus, it can be readily shown that  $\llbracket t \rrbracket \leq (2k+3)|t|$ . Also it can be immediately verified by the definition that if  $\hat{\rho}(t) = \langle k, n \rangle$  for some  $k$  and  $n$  then  $\hat{\rho}\llbracket t \rrbracket = \langle k, n \rangle$ . By Corollary 5.9, we have

$$\mu(\llbracket t \rrbracket) < \text{tower}(k+1, \llbracket t \rrbracket) \leq \text{tower}(k+1, (2k+3)|t|).$$

This yields  $\mu(t) < \text{tower}(k+1, (2k+3)|t|)$  by Proposition 5.12 (3). ■

Note that Proposition 5.12 (3) also yields that weak  $\beta$ -normalisation implies strong  $\beta$ -normalisation in  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ : assume that every  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ -term  $t$  is weakly normalising; then  $\llbracket t \rrbracket$  is normalising since it is a  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ -term; this yields that  $\mu(\llbracket t \rrbracket)$  is finite since  $\llbracket t \rrbracket$  is a  $\lambda I$ -term, and therefore,  $t$  is strongly normalising by Proposition 5.12 (3). Please see [Xi97] for further details related to this subject.

## 6 Related Work and Conclusion

For those who know the strong equivalence relation  $\cong$  on  $\beta$ -reductions in [Bar84], originally due to Berry and Lévy, it can be verified that  $\sigma \cong \text{std}(\sigma)$  for all  $\beta$ -reduction sequences  $\sigma$ .

There is a short proof of the standardization theorem due to Mitschke [Mit79], which analyzes the relation between head and internal  $\beta$ -reductions. It shows any  $\beta$ -reduction sequence can be transformed into one which starts with head  $\beta$ -reductions followed by internal  $\beta$ -reductions. In this formulation, it is not easy to extract a bound directly from the proof. Our proof is a variant of Mitschke's proof. Lemma 3.2 simplifies the process which commutes head  $\beta$ -reduction with internal  $\beta$ -reductions, illuminating on why this process halts eventually. In this respect, our proof resembles a proof in [Tak95], where Takahashi exploited the notion of parallel  $\beta$ -reduction to show the termination of the commutation process.

There are also two proofs due to Klop [Klo80], to which the present proof bears some connection. Though all these proofs aim at commuting the contracted leftmost  $\beta$ -redexes to the front, our proof uses a different strategy to show the termination of such commutations. While Klop focuses on the strong equivalence relation  $\cong$ , we establish Lemma 3.2 by a structural induction without using the finiteness developments theorem. This naturally yields an upper bound for standardizations.

In our application, an upper bound is given for the lengths of  $\beta$ -reduction sequences in  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ . This is a desirable result since  $\mu(t)$ , the length of a longest  $\beta$ -reduction sequence from  $t$ , can often be used as an induction order in many proofs. Gandy mentions a similar bound in [Gan80a] but details were left out. His semantic method, which aims at giving strong normalisation proofs, is quite different from ours. Schwichtenberg presents a similar bound in [Sch91] using an approach adopted from [How80]. His method of transforming  $\lambda^\rightarrow$ -terms into  $\lambda^\rightarrow I$ -terms closely relates to our presented method but is very much involved. It seems – in the author's opinion – that such involvedness is not only unnecessary but also obscures the merits in Schwichtenberg's proof. In addition, the proof of *finiteness of developments* theorem by de Vrijer [dV85] yields an exact bound for the lengths of developments, and thus, is casually related to our proof of the standardization theorem with bound.

In Gentzen's sequent calculus, there exists a similar bound for the sizes of cut-free proofs obtained from cut elimination. Mints [Min79] (of which I have only learned the abstract) showed a way of computing the maximum length of a  $\beta$ -reduction from the length of a standard  $\beta$ -reduction sequence. In this respect, our work can be combined with his to compute the maximum length of a  $\beta$ -reduction sequence from the length of an *arbitrary* one. This also motivates our

planning on establishing a similar bound for the first-order  $\lambda$ -calculus with dependent types. On the other hand, Theorem 5.4 suggests that a lower bound for  $\mu(t)$  have a similar super exponential form, and this makes it a challenging task to sharpen our presented bound for  $\mu(t)$ , although it seems to be somewhat exaggerated. Also Statman proved that  $\lambda^\rightarrow$  is not elementary [Sta79].

## 7 Acknowledgement

I gratefully acknowledge Richard Statman's efforts on reading the paper and providing me of his comments. Also I thank some anonymous referees for their detailed comments and suggestions, which undoubtedly have significantly enhanced the quality of the paper. Lastly, I thank Frank Pfenning and Peter Andrews for their support and for providing me with such a nice working environment.

## References

- [And71] P.B. Andrews (1971), Resolution in type theory, *J. Symbolic Logic* 36, pp. 414-432.
- [Bar84] H.P. Barendregt (1984), The Lambda Calculus: Its Syntax And Semantics. *North-Holland publishing company, Amsterdam*.
- [Ber78] G. Berry (1978), Séquentialité de l'évaluation formelle des  $\lambda$ -expressions. *Proc. 3-e Colloque International sur la Programmation, Paris*.
- [Chu41] A. Church, (1941), The calculi of lambda conversion. *Princeton University Press, Princeton*.
- [CF58] H.B. Curry and R. Feys (1958), Combinatory Logic. *North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam*.
- [dV85] R. de Vrijer (1985), A direct proof of the finite developments theorem. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 50:339-343.
- [Gan80] R.O. Gandy (1980), An early proof of normalization by A.M. Turing. *To: H.B. Curry: Essays on combinatory logic, lambda calculus and formalism*, edited by J.P. Seldin and J.R. Hindley, Academic press, pp. 453-456.
- [Gan80a] R.O. Gandy (1980), Proofs of Strong Normalization, *To: H.B. Curry: Essays on Combinatory logic, lambda calculus and formalism*. edited by J.P. Seldin and J.R. Hindley, Academic press, pp. 457-478.
- [GLM92] G. Gonthier, J.J. Lévy and P.-A. Melliès (1992). An abstract standardization theorem, in *Proceedings of Logic in Computer Science*, pp. 72–81.
- [GLT89] J.-Y. Girard et al. (1989), Proofs and types. *Cambridge Press*, 176 pp.
- [Hue94] Gérard Huet (1994), Residual Theory in  $\lambda$ -Calculus: A Formal Development. *Journal of Functional Programming Vol. 4*, pp. 371–394.
- [Hin78] J.R. Hindley (1978), Reductions of residuals are finite. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 240, pp. 345-361.
- [How80] W. Howard (1980), Ordinal analysis of terms of finite type. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 45(3):493-504.
- [Hyl73] J.M.E. Hyland (1973), A simple proof of the Church-Rosser theorem. *Typescript, Oxford University*, 7 pp.

- [Kah95] Stefan Kahrs (1995), Towards a Domain Theory for Termination Proofs. *Laboratory for Foundation of Computer Science*, 95-314, Department of Computer Science, The University of Edinburgh.
- [Klo80] J.W. Klop (1980), Combinatory reduction systems. *Ph.D. thesis, CWI, Amsterdam, Mathematical center tracts, No. 127*.
- [Lév78] J.-J. Lévy (1978), Réductions correctes et optimales dans le lambda calcul. *Thèse de doctorat d'état, Université Paris VII*.
- [Min79] G.E. Mints (1979), A primitive recursive bound of strong normalization for predicate calculus (in Russian with English abstract). *Zapiski Naucnyh Seminarov Leningradskogo Otdelenija Matematicheskogo Instituta im V.A. Steklova Akademii Nauk SSSR (LOMI) 88*, pp. 131-135.
- [Mit79] G. Mitschke (1979), The standardization theorem for the  $\lambda$ -calculus. *Z. Math. Logik Grundlag. Math. 25*, pp. 29-31.
- [Pol94] J. van de Pol (1994), Strict functionals for termination proofs. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science 902*, edited by J. Heering, pp. 350-364.
- [Sta79] Richard Statman (1979), The typed  $\lambda$ -calculus is not elementary. *Theoretical Computer Science 9*, pp. 73-81.
- [Sch82] H. Schwichtenberg (1982), Complexity of normalization in the pure typed lambda-calculus, *The L.E.J. Brouwer Centenary Symposium*. edited by A.S. Troelstra and D. van Dalen, North-Holland publishing company, pp. 453-457.
- [Sch91] H. Schwichtenberg (1991), An upper bound for reduction sequences in the typed lambda-calculus. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 30:405-408.
- [Tak95] Masako Takahashi (1995), Parallel Reductions in  $\lambda$ -Calculus. *Information and Computation 118*, pp. 120-127.
- [Wad76] C.P. Wadsworth (1976), The relation between computational and denotational properties for Scott's  $D_\infty$ -models of  $\lambda$ -calculus. *SIAM Journal of Computing*, 5(3):488-521.
- [Xi96a] H. Xi (1996), An induction measure on  $\lambda$ -terms and its applications. *Technical report 96-192, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh*.
- [Xi96b] H. Xi (1996), Separating developments in  $\lambda$ -calculus. *Manuscripts*.
- [Xi97] H. Xi (1997), Weak and Strong Beta Normalisations in Typed Lambda-Calculi. In Proceedings of 3<sup>rd</sup> *International Conference on Typed Lambda-Calculi and Applications*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 1210, pp 390-404, Nancy.