Math. Struct. in Comp. Science (1998), *vol.* 8, *pp.* 153–192. Printed in the United Kingdom
© 1998 Cambridge University Press

Normalization and the Yoneda embedding

DJORDJE ČUBRIĆ[†], PETER DYBJER[‡] and PHILIP SCOTT[§]

[†]*DPMMS, University of Cambridge, 16 Mill Lane, Cambridge CB2 1SB, UK.*
Email: cubric@triples.math.mcgill.ca

[‡]*Department of Computing Science, Chalmers University of Technology, S-412 96 Göteborg, Sweden.*
Email: peterd@cs.chalmers.se

[§]*Department of Mathematics, University of Ottawa, 585 King Edward, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5 , Canada.*
Email: phil@mathstat.uottawa.ca

Received 25 October 1996; revised 24 June 1997

We show how to solve the word problem for simply typed $\lambda\beta\eta$-calculus by using a few well-known facts about categories of presheaves and the Yoneda embedding. The formal setting for these results is $\mathscr{P}$-category theory, a version of ordinary category theory where each hom-set is equipped with a partial equivalence relation. The part of $\mathscr{P}$-category theory we develop here is constructive and thus permits extraction of programs from proofs. It is important to stress that in our method we make no use of traditional proof-theoretic or rewriting techniques. To show the robustness of our method, we give an extended treatment for more general λ-theories in the Appendix.

1. Introduction

In this paper we describe a new, categorical approach to normalization in typed λ-calculus and related theories. Traditionally, the operational semantics of λ-calculi have been based on rewriting theory or proof theory, such as normalization or cut-elimination, ordinal assignments, Church–Rosser, *etc*. Such techniques (*e.g.* the familiar Tait–Girard computability method (Girard *et al.* 1989) or the method of logical relations (Statman 1985; Mitchell 1990)) are often based on ingenuity and lack the explanatory power of a model-theoretic proof. At the same time, they introduce specialized syntactic notions intrinsic to the technique (for example, *neutral terms*, *admissible logical relations*, and so on) but orthogonal to the problem.

[†] Research supported by an NSERC postdoctoral fellowship at the Department of Pure Mathematics, Cambridge University.
[‡] Research supported from ESPRIT Basic Research Action 6811 Categorical Logic in Computer Science (CLiCS-II) and from TFR, the Swedish Technical Research Council.
[§] Research supported by an operating grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We use categorical methods to model $\beta\eta$ convertibility in a presheaf category. This arises essentially from the fact that the Yoneda functor preserves cartesian closedness. This technique has intriguing analogues to the Joyal–Gordon–Power–Street techniques for proving coherence in various structured (bi-)categories and is also closely related to the Berger and Schwichtenberg method for normalizing λ-terms (Berger and Schwichtenberg 1991). We discuss history and related work in more detail in Section 5 below.

In a certain sense, our program is dual to Lambek's original goal of categorical proof theory (Lambek 1968), in which he used cut-elimination to study categorical coherence problems. Here, we use a method inspired from categorical coherence proofs to normalize lambda terms (and thus intuitionistic proofs).

However, to actually extract an algorithm from these observations requires us to constructively reinterpret the categorical setting, as explained below. It is this intuitionistic aspect of our work that is both novel and fundamental to extracting a normalization algorithm. Not only is this a non-trivial example of program extraction from a structured proof, but it also appears to illustrate a fundamental dictum of Martin-Löf, *viz.* that one may understand normalization by direct semantic reflection.

1.1. *Categorical normal forms*

We can characterize a normal form function abstractly in the following way. Let $\mathscr{T}$ be a set of terms and $\sim$ a congruence relation on terms. One way to decide whether two terms are congruent is to find an *abstract normal form function*, by which we mean a computable function $\mathbf{nf} : \mathscr{T} \to \mathscr{T}$ satisfying the following conditions for some (finer) congruence relation $\equiv$:

NF1 $f \sim \mathbf{nf}(f)$
NF2 $f \sim g \Rightarrow \mathbf{nf}(f) \equiv \mathbf{nf}(g)$
NF3 $\equiv \subseteq \sim$
NF4 $\equiv$ is decidable.

From (NF1), (NF2) and (NF3) we see that $f \sim g \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{nf}(f) \equiv \mathbf{nf}(g)$. This clearly permits a decision procedure: to decide if two terms are equal, compute **nf** for each one, and see if they are $\equiv$ related, using (NF4). The normal form function **nf** essentially 'reduces' the decision problem of $\sim$ to that of $\equiv$.

Here we will consider the example where $\mathscr{T}$ is a set of λ-terms of a given type, $\sim$ is $\beta\eta$-conversion and $\equiv$ is α-congruence. Let us see heuristically how simply typed λ-calculus can be given a normal form function **nf**, from categorical considerations.

Recall that λ-terms modulo $\beta\eta$-conversion can be organized as the arrows of a free ccc $\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}$ on the set of sorts (atoms) $\mathscr{X}$. The universal property of a free ccc is as follows: for any ccc $\mathscr{C}$, and any interpretation of the atoms $\mathscr{X}$ in $ob(\mathscr{C})$, there is a unique (up to iso) ccc-functor $[\![-]\!] : \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}} \to \mathscr{C}$ freely extending this interpretation. Now let $\mathscr{C}$ be the presheaf category $Set^{\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}{}^{op}}$. There are two obvious ccc-functors:

(i) the Yoneda embedding $\mathscr{Y} : \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}} \to Set^{\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}{}^{op}}$ is a ccc-functor,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(ii) if we interpret the atoms by Yoneda, there is also the free extension to the ccc-functor $[\![-]\!] : \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}} \to Set^{\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}{}^{op}}$.

By the universal property, there is a natural isomorphism $q : [\![-]\!] \to \mathscr{Y}$. Hence, by the Yoneda lemma, for each hom-set we can construct an inverse of the interpretation $[\![-]\!]$ (on this hom-set) according to the following commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}(A,B) & \xrightarrow{\quad [\![-]\!] \quad} & Set^{\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}^{op}}([\![A]\!],[\![B]\!]) \\ & {\scriptstyle \mathscr{Y}} \searrow \quad \swarrow {\scriptstyle q_B{}^{o} - {}^{o}q_A{}^{-1}} & \\ & {\scriptstyle -_A(1_A)} \uparrow & \\ & Set^{\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}^{op}}(\mathscr{Y}A,\mathscr{Y}B) & \end{array}$$

Hence, for any $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}(A,B)$, we obtain natural transformations $\mathscr{Y}A \xrightarrow{q_A^{-1}} [\![A]\!] \xrightarrow{[\![f]\!]} [\![B]\!] \xrightarrow{q_B} \mathscr{Y}B$. In particular, evaluating at A gives the following functions: $\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}(A,A) \xrightarrow{q_{A,A}^{-1}} [\![A]\!]A \xrightarrow{[\![f]\!]_A} [\![B]\!]A \xrightarrow{q_{B,A}} \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}(A,B)$.

Let us now define the function

$$\mathbf{nf}(f) = q_{B,A}\,([\![f]\!]_A(q_{A,A}^{-1}(1_A)))$$

It immediately follows that

$$f = \mathbf{nf}(f)\ .$$

Indeed, this is just a restatement of part of the Yoneda isomorphism. But what does it have to do with normalization? As it stands, **nf** is nothing but the identity function on $\beta\eta$-convertibility classes of terms!

However, if we reinterpret this diagram in the setting of $\mathscr{P}$-category theory we can show that **nf** indeed maps typed λ-terms to normal forms. In a $\mathscr{P}$-category each hom-set is equipped with a partial equivalence relation (per). We can thus construct a free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)$, where the arrows are actual λ-terms and the per $\sim$ on arrows is $\beta\eta$-convertibility. In this setting **nf** will be a (per-preserving) function on terms (a $\mathscr{P}$-function), and not just on convertibility classes of terms. As above, it follows immediately that **nf** is an identity $\mathscr{P}$-function, that is, an identity *up to* $\sim$. But this is nothing but NF1:

$$f \sim \mathbf{nf}(f)\ .$$

Moreover, the part of $\mathscr{P}$-category theory that we use is constructive in the sense that all functions we construct are algorithms. Therefore **nf** is computable.

It remains to prove NF2:

$$f \sim g \Rightarrow \mathbf{nf}(f) \equiv \mathbf{nf}(g)\ .$$

This is the most subtle point. Here too the $\mathscr{P}$-version of a general categorical fact will help us: that the presheaf category $Set^{\mathscr{C}^{op}}$ is a ccc for any category $\mathscr{C}$. In particular, let $\mathscr{C}$ be the $\mathscr{P}$-category $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \equiv)$ of sequences of λ-terms up to α-congruence $\equiv$. Note that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

this $\mathscr{P}$-category has the same objects and arrows as $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)$, but the pers on arrows are different. Because of the freeness of $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)$, we have another interpretation $\mathscr{P}$-functor

$$[\![-]\!]^{\equiv} : (\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim) \to \mathscr{P}Set^{(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \equiv)^{op}}$$

($\mathscr{P}Set$ is the $\mathscr{P}$-version of the ordinary category Set). This $\mathscr{P}$-functor has the same effect on objects and arrows as the previous interpretation $\mathscr{P}$-functor:

$$[\![-]\!] : (\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim) \to \mathscr{P}Set^{(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)^{op}} .$$

Hence, we can conclude that $f \sim g$ implies $[\![f]\!] \equiv [\![g]\!]$ (here $\equiv$ refers to the per on arrows in $\mathscr{P}Set^{(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \equiv)^{op}}$). Since we can show that $q_{B,A}$ and $q_{B,A}^{-1}$ preserve $\equiv$, it follows that $\mathbf{nf}(f) \equiv \mathbf{nf}(g)$.

This concludes the summary of our method. In the remainder of the paper we develop the relevant part of $\mathscr{P}$-category theory in detail and show how to construct the normal form function. Note that the development of $\mathscr{P}$-category theory is essentially nothing but the development of ordinary category theory, where the usual (set-theoretic) equality of arrows is everywhere replaced by an explicit per on arrows, which is part of the structure of a $\mathscr{P}$-category.

1.2. *Plan of the paper*

The rest of the paper is organized as follows:

Section 2 gives the basic definitions of $\mathscr{P}$-category theory. It finishes with the definition of free $\mathscr{P}$-cccs and shows how to extract the function **nf**. It is worth emphasizing that the definition of **nf** for which NF1 holds is done uniformly for any free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc.

Section 3 contains the proof that sequences of typed λ-terms form a free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc and instantiates the general normal form function **nf** to this case. We also prove that this **nf** satisfies NF2. It is worth remarking that the proof of NF2 (unlike the proof of NF1) depends on properties of the particular presentation. For example, NF2 fails if we instead construct **nf** from the proof of freeness of the $\mathscr{P}$-ccc of categorical combinators with syntactic identity as $\equiv$.

Section 4 shows that the normal forms returned in the case of typed λ-terms are long $\beta\eta$ normal forms in the ordinary λ-calculus sense. Section 5 discusses history.

Finally, in the Appendix we show how to apply our method to the word problem for typed λ-calculi with additional axioms and operations, *i.e.*, to freely-generated ccc's modulo certain theories. This employs appropriate free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc's (over a $\mathscr{P}$-category, a $\mathscr{P}$-cartesian category, *etc.*). We introduce various notions of λ-theory, which are determined not only by a set of atomic types, but also by a set of basic typed constants as well as a set of equations between terms. Although our methods always yield an algorithm **nf**, it does not necessarily satisfy NF4 (the decidability of $\equiv$). What we obtain is a reduction of the word problems for such free ccc's to those of the underlying generating categories.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2. $\mathscr{P}$-Category theory

2.1. *Basic concepts*

As mentioned above, $\mathscr{P}$-category theory is like ordinary category theory, but equality is systematically replaced everywhere by partial equivalence relations (*i.e.*, symmetric, transitive relations).

Definition 2.1. A *$\mathscr{P}$-set* is a pair $A = (|A|, \sim_A)$, where $|A|$ is a set and $\sim_A$ is a partial equivalence relation (per) on $|A|$.

If A is a $\mathscr{P}$-set, we say $|A|$ is its underlying set and refer to $\sim_A$ as *$\mathscr{P}$-equality* . Given a $\mathscr{P}$-set A, let dom_A, the *domain* of $\sim_A$, be the set of elements $a \in |A|$ such that $a \sim_A a$. Note that $\sim_A$ is an equivalence relation on dom_A.

Definition 2.2. A *$\mathscr{P}$-function* between the $\mathscr{P}$-sets $A = (|A|, \sim_A)$ and $B = (|B|, \sim_B)$ is a function $f : |A| \to |B|$ satisfying: $a \sim_A a'$ implies $f(a) \sim_B f(a')$ for all $a, a' \in |A|$.

Although $\mathscr{P}$-sets and $\mathscr{P}$-functions form an ordinary category, and even a cartesian closed category (ccc), we shall be interested in $\mathscr{P}$-analogues of these properties. To describe this, we first introduce some fundamental operations on $\mathscr{P}$-sets corresponding to the ccc structure.

Definition 2.3. We introduce the following $\mathscr{P}$-sets:

— $\mathbf{1}$ is the *one point* $\mathscr{P}$-set $(\{*\}, \sim)$, where $* \sim *$.
— Given two $\mathscr{P}$-sets A and B, their *cartesian product* $A \times B$ is obtained by taking the cartesian product of their underlying sets, with $\sim_{A\times B}$ defined pointwise.
— Given two $\mathscr{P}$-sets A and B, their *exponential* B^A is obtained by taking the exponential of their underlying sets, with $\mathscr{P}$-equality of functions defined as follows:

$$f \sim_{B^A} g \quad \text{iff for all} \quad a, a' \in |A|,\ a \sim_A a' \quad \text{implies} \quad f(a) \sim_B g(a').$$

It is easily verified that the above constructions of $\mathscr{P}$-sets are well defined. Note that a $\mathscr{P}$-function from A to B is precisely an element in the domain of $\sim_{B^A}$. We identify $\mathscr{P}$-functions $c : \mathbf{1} \to B$ with elements $c(*) \in dom_B$.

Definition 2.4. A *$\mathscr{P}$-category* $\mathscr{C}$ is a set of objects $ob(\mathscr{C})$, an indexed family of $\mathscr{P}$-sets $(\mathscr{C}(A, B))_{A,B\in ob(\mathscr{C})}$ and two indexed families of $\mathscr{P}$-functions $1_A : \mathbf{1} \to \mathscr{C}(A, A)$, $c_{A,B,C} : \mathscr{C}(A, B) \times \mathscr{C}(B, C) \to \mathscr{C}(A, C)$ such that the appropriate diagrams from the definition of enriched category theory describe $\sim$-related arrows. Writing $c_{A,B,C}(f, g)$ as gf and all pers as $\sim$, we obtain the following explicit axioms:

(i) $f \sim f'$ implies $f' \sim f$,
(ii) $f \sim f'$ and $f' \sim f''$ implies $f \sim f''$,
(iii) $1_A \sim 1_A$,
(iv) $f \sim f'$ and $g \sim g'$ implies $fg \sim f'g'$,
(v) $f \sim f'$ implies $1f \sim f'$ and $f1 \sim f'$,
(vi) $f \sim f'$, $g \sim g'$ and $h \sim h'$ implies $(fg)h \sim f'(g'h')$.

Remark 2.5. A slightly different, but equivalent, presentation of a $\mathscr{P}$-category may be given by restricting functions to domains of pers. For example, in the definition above, (iii) says $1_A \in dom_{\mathscr{C}(A,A)}$, (v) says for all $f \in dom_{\mathscr{C}(A,A)}$, $1f \sim f$ and $f1 \sim f$, and (vi) says for all f, g, h in domains of appropriate hom $\mathscr{P}$-sets, $(fg)h \sim f(gh)$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We will also need the following notion.

Definition 2.6. Given a $\mathscr{P}$-category $\mathscr{C}$, we say $f \in \mathscr{C}(A,B)$ is a *$\mathscr{P}$-isomorphism* if there exists $f^{-1} \in \mathscr{C}(B,A)$ such that $f \sim f$, $f^{-1} \sim f^{-1}$, $ff^{-1} \sim 1_B$ and $f^{-1}f \sim 1_A$.

Observe that $\mathscr{P}$-category theory includes ordinary category theory by letting $\mathscr{P}$-equality be ordinary equality. But, in general, $\mathscr{P}$-categories are not categories, although one may obtain genuine categories from them by 'sub-quotienting'. Note that in $\mathscr{P}$-categories, as in ordinary categories, we have a *set* of objects, not a $\mathscr{P}$-set.

Notation We sometimes denote $\mathscr{P}$-categories by $(\mathscr{C}, \sim)$ if we wish to emphasize a particular per structure on the hom-sets, *i.e.*, that each hom $\mathscr{P}$-set has the form $\mathscr{C}(A,B) = (|\mathscr{C}(A,B)|, \sim_{A,B})$. Of course there may be several $\mathscr{P}$-category structures on the same underlying data: $(\mathscr{C}, \sim)$, $(\mathscr{C}, \equiv)$, and so on.

Proposition 2.7. There is a $\mathscr{P}$-category $\mathscr{P}Set$, whose objects are $\mathscr{P}$-sets and where $\mathscr{P}Set(A,B) = B^A$, the $\mathscr{P}$-set of all functions between the underlying sets, under $\mathscr{P}$-equality of functions.

Definition 2.8. Let $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{D}$ be two $\mathscr{P}$-categories. A *$\mathscr{P}$-functor* $F : \mathscr{C} \to \mathscr{D}$ is a function $F : ob(\mathscr{C}) \to ob(\mathscr{D})$ and an indexed family of $\mathscr{P}$-functions $F_{A,B} : \mathscr{C}(A,B) \to \mathscr{D}(FA, FB)$ such that all the expected diagrams from the definition of enriched functors specify related arrows. Explicitly, a $\mathscr{P}$-functor satisfies (omitting subscripts)

(i) $f \sim f'$ implies $Ff \sim Ff'$,
(ii) $F1 \sim 1$,
(iii) $f \sim f'$ and $g \sim g'$ implies $F(fg) \sim (Ff')(Fg')$.

Remark 2.9. As in Remark 2.5, we can equivalently restate some of these definitions using domains of pers. For example, (iii) would be reformulated as: for all $f \in dom_{\mathscr{C}(B,C)}, g \in dom_{\mathscr{C}(A,B)}, F(fg) \sim (Ff)(Fg)$

Definition 2.10. Let $F, G : \mathscr{C} \to \mathscr{D}$ be two $\mathscr{P}$-functors. A *$\mathscr{P}$-natural transformation* $\theta : F \to G$ is an indexed family of $\mathscr{P}$-functions $\theta_A : \mathbf{1} \to \mathscr{D}(FA, GA)$ such that all the expected diagrams from the definition of enriched natural transformation specify related arrows. Thus, a $\mathscr{P}$-natural transformation satisfies

— $\theta_A \sim \theta_A$, that is, $\theta_A \in dom_{\mathscr{D}(FA,GA)}$, for all A.
— $f \sim f' \in \mathscr{C}(A,B)$ implies $\theta_B(Ff) \sim (Gf')\theta_A$ (we call this *the $\mathscr{P}$-naturality condition*).

2.2. *$\mathscr{P}$-presheaves and $\mathscr{P}$-ccc's*

Definition 2.11. Let $\mathscr{C}$, $\mathscr{D}$ be two $\mathscr{P}$-categories. The *$\mathscr{P}$-functor category* $\mathscr{D}^{\mathscr{C}}$ is the $\mathscr{P}$-category defined as follows. Objects are $\mathscr{P}$-functors from $\mathscr{C}$ to $\mathscr{D}$. Arrows between F and G are indexed families of arrows θ_A in $|\mathscr{D}(FA, GA)|$ with $\mathscr{P}$-equality of families defined as follows: $\theta \sim_{\mathscr{D}^{\mathscr{C}}(F,G)} \theta'$ iff

— θ and θ' satisfy the $\mathscr{P}$-naturality condition,
— for all A, $\theta_A \sim_{\mathscr{D}(FA,GA)} \theta'_A$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A $\mathscr{P}$-natural transformation from F to G is precisely an element in the domain of $\sim_{\mathscr{D}^{\mathscr{C}}(F,G)}$. Note that the arrows in a $\mathscr{P}$-functor category are *all* indexed families of arrows θ_A, not just the $\mathscr{P}$-natural ones.

For every object F, we define $1_F : \mathbf{1} \to \mathscr{D}^{\mathscr{C}}(F,F)$ to be the indexed family defined by $(1_F)_D = 1_{FD}$. Likewise, we define $c_{F,G,H} : \mathscr{D}^{\mathscr{C}}(F,G) \times \mathscr{D}^{\mathscr{C}}(G,H) \to \mathscr{D}^{\mathscr{C}}(F,H)$ by $c_{F,G,H}(\theta,\psi)_A = c_{FA,GA,HA}(\theta_A,\psi_A)$.

Notation In a $\mathscr{P}$-functor category we denote the $\mathscr{P}$-set of arrows from F to G by $\mathscr{D}^{\mathscr{C}}(F,G)$ as usual, but sometimes also by $\mathscr{P}Nat(F,G)$, when the meaning is clear.

The opposite of a $\mathscr{P}$-category is again a $\mathscr{P}$-category. Therefore there is a $\mathscr{P}$-category $\mathscr{P}Set^{\mathscr{C}^{op}}$ whose objects are called *$\mathscr{P}$-presheaves.*

Definition 2.12. Let $\mathscr{C}$ be a $\mathscr{P}$-category. Define the $\mathscr{P}$-Yoneda functor $\mathscr{Y} : \mathscr{C} \longrightarrow \mathscr{P}Set^{\mathscr{C}^{op}}$ by $\mathscr{Y}B = \mathscr{C}(-,B)$.

The functor $\mathscr{Y}$ is a well-defined $\mathscr{P}$-functor, and we have the following $\mathscr{P}$-version of Yoneda's Lemma.

Lemma 2.13. ($\mathscr{P}$-Yoneda) Let $\mathscr{C}$ be a $\mathscr{P}$-category.

(i) For every $\mathscr{P}$-presheaf $F : \mathscr{C}^{op} \to \mathscr{P}Set$, $\mathscr{P}Nat(\mathscr{Y}-,F)$ is a $\mathscr{P}$-presheaf.

(ii) There is a $\mathscr{P}$-natural isomorphism of $\mathscr{P}$-presheaves

$$\theta : F \to \mathscr{P}Nat(\mathscr{Y}-,F)$$

given by: for any $c \in F(C)$, $f \in \mathscr{C}(D,C)$, $(\theta_C(c))_D(f) = (Ff)(c)$ and $\theta_C^{-1}(\eta) = \eta_C(1_C)$.

Corollary 2.14. For a $\mathscr{P}$-category $\mathscr{C}$

$$\theta_{B,A} : \mathscr{C}(A,B) \to \mathscr{P}Nat(\mathscr{Y}A,\mathscr{Y}B)$$

is a $\mathscr{P}$-isomorphism of $\mathscr{P}$-sets.

We now introduce the $\mathscr{P}$-version of a cartesian closed category.

Definition 2.15. A *$\mathscr{P}$-ccc* is a $\mathscr{P}$-category with the following distinguished arrows and arrow-forming operations:

Products $\quad A \xrightarrow{0_A} \top\ ,\ A \times B \xrightarrow{\pi_{A,B}} A\ ,\ A \times B \xrightarrow{\pi'_{A,B}} B\ ,\ \dfrac{C \xrightarrow{f} A \quad C \xrightarrow{g} B}{C \xrightarrow{\langle f,g\rangle} A \times B}$

Exponentials $\quad B^A \times A \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_{A,B}} B\ ,\ \dfrac{C \times A \xrightarrow{f} B}{C \xrightarrow{f^*} B^A}$

such that the following rules are satisfied:

— $\mathscr{P}$-Products

$$0_A \sim 0_A\ ,\ \pi_{A,B} \sim \pi_{A,B}\ ,\ \pi'_{A,B} \sim \pi'_{A,B}$$

$$\text{if } f \sim f', \text{ then } f \sim 0_A \quad (\text{for } f,f' : A \to \top)$$

$$\text{if } f \sim f', g \sim g', \text{ then } \langle f,g\rangle \sim \langle f',g'\rangle$$

$$\text{if } f \sim f', g \sim g', \text{ then } \pi_{A,B}\langle f,g\rangle \sim f'$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$$\text{if } f \sim f', g \sim g', \text{ then } \pi'_{A,B}\langle f, g\rangle \sim g'$$
$$\text{if } k \sim k', \text{ then } \langle \pi_{A,B} k, \pi'_{A,B} k\rangle \sim k'$$

— $\mathscr{P}$-Exponentials

$$\varepsilon_{A,B} \sim \varepsilon_{A,B}$$
$$\text{if } h \sim h', \text{ then } h^* \sim h'^*$$
$$\text{if } h \sim h', \text{ then } \varepsilon_{A,B}\langle h^* \pi_{C,A}, \pi'_{C,A}\rangle \sim h'$$
$$\text{if } l \sim l', \text{ then } (\varepsilon_{A,B}\langle l\pi_{C,A}, \pi'_{C,A}\rangle)^* \sim l'.$$

Proposition 2.16. $\mathscr{P}Set$ is a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc.

Proof. The $\mathscr{P}$-ccc structure of $\mathscr{P}Set$ was given in Example 2.3, with the $\mathscr{P}$-ccc structure on arrows inherited from Set. Here $\mathbf{1}$ is $\top$. □

Theorem 2.17. If $\mathscr{C}$ is a $\mathscr{P}$-category, then $\mathscr{P}Set^{\mathscr{C}^{op}}$ is a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc.

Proof. The cartesian closed structure of $\mathscr{P}Set^{\mathscr{C}^{op}}$ is given as follows:

(i) $\top A = \mathbf{1}$.
(ii) $(F \times G)A = FA \times GA$
(iii) $G^F A = \mathscr{P}Nat(\mathscr{Y}A \times F, G)$.

On arrows $f \in \mathscr{C}(B, A)$ define:

(iv) $\top f = id_{\mathbf{1}}$
(v) $(F \times G)f = (Ff) \times (Gf) : FA \times GA \to FB \times GB$
(vi) $G^F f : \mathscr{P}Nat(\mathscr{C}(-, A) \times F, G) \to \mathscr{P}Nat(\mathscr{C}(-, B) \times F, G)$ is defined as follows: for $\theta \in \mathscr{P}Nat(\mathscr{C}(-, A) \times F, G)$, $C \in ob(\mathscr{C})$, and $(g, c) \in \mathscr{C}(C, B) \times FC$:

$$(G^F f)(\theta)_C(g, c) \quad = \quad \theta_C(fg, c) \tag{1}$$

The $\mathscr{P}$-ccc structure on arrows of $\mathscr{P}Set^{\mathscr{C}^{op}}$ is defined by analogy with ordinary presheaves as follows:

(vii) The evaluation $\varepsilon : G^F \times F \to G$ is given by

$$\varepsilon_A(\theta, a) \quad = \quad \theta_A(1_A, a) \tag{2}$$

for all $\theta \in G^F A$ and $a \in FA$

(viii) The exponential transpose $\theta^* : H \to G^F$ of $\theta : H \times F \to G$ is given by: for all $x \in HA$, $h : \mathscr{C}(B, A)$, $b \in FB$,

$$(\theta^*_A(x))_B(h, b) \quad = \quad \theta_B((Hh)(x), b) \tag{3}$$

It is easy to see that all transformations above are $\mathscr{P}$-natural. □

We are interested in $\mathscr{P}$-functors that preserve $\mathscr{P}$-ccc structure up to $\mathscr{P}$-isomorphism. We shall use the following explicit notion.

Definition 2.18. Let $\mathscr{C}, \mathscr{D}$ be $\mathscr{P}$-ccc's. A *$\mathscr{P}$-ccc functor* is a $\mathscr{P}$-functor $H : \mathscr{C} \to \mathscr{D}$ equipped with specified $\mathscr{P}$-isomorphisms $r_\top : \top \longrightarrow H\top$, $r_{A\times B} : HA \times HB \to H(A \times B)$, $r_{B^A} : (HB)^{HA} \longrightarrow H(B^A)$, whose inverses are as follows:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(i) $r_{\top}^{-1} = 0_{H\top} : H\top \longrightarrow \top$.
(ii) $r_{A\times B}^{-1} = \langle H\pi, H\pi'\rangle : H(A \times B) \longrightarrow HA \times HB$.
(iii) $r_{B^A}^{-1} = ((H\varepsilon)r_{B^A\times A})^* : H(B^A) \longrightarrow (HB)^{HA}$.

Remark 2.19. The above r-notation is slightly ambiguous. A more precise notation would be to introduce three families $x : \top \longrightarrow H(\top)$, $y_{A,B} : HA \times HB \to H(A \times B)$, $z_{A,B} : H(B^A) \longrightarrow (HB)^{HA}$, along with their inverses. Note that y and z are $\mathscr{P}$-natural in both arguments. However, we shall keep the notation $r_{\top} = x$, $r_{A\times B} = y_{A,B}$ and $r_{B^A} = z_{A,B}$ in the following.

Proposition 2.20. Let $\mathscr{C}$ be a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc. The $\mathscr{P}$-Yoneda functor $\mathscr{Y} : \mathscr{C} \longrightarrow \mathscr{P}Set^{\mathscr{C}^{op}}$ is a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc functor.

Proof. We shall examine the explicit structure referred to in Definition 2.18. In each case, r^{-1} comes from that definition. So, for every object $C \in \mathscr{C}$ we define $(r_{\top})_C : \top C \to \mathscr{C}(C, \top)$, $(r_{\top}^{-1})_C : \mathscr{C}(C, \top) \to \top C$, $(r_{A\times B})_C : \mathscr{C}(C, A) \times \mathscr{C}(C, B) \to \mathscr{C}(C, A \times B)$, $(r_{A\times B}^{-1})_C : \mathscr{C}(C, A \times B) \to \mathscr{C}(C, A) \times \mathscr{C}(C, B)$, $(r_{B^A})_C : \mathscr{P}Nat(\mathscr{C}(-, C) \times \mathscr{C}(-, A), \mathscr{C}(-, B)) \to \mathscr{C}(C, B^A)$ and $(r_{B^A}^{-1})_C : \mathscr{C}(C, B^A) \to \mathscr{P}Nat(\mathscr{C}(-, C) \times \mathscr{C}(-, A), \mathscr{C}(-, B))$ as follows:

$$(r_{\top})_C(*) = 0_C, \quad (r_{\top}^{-1})_C(l) = *$$
$$(r_{A\times B})_C(f, g) = \langle f, g\rangle, \quad (r_{A\times B}^{-1})_C(h) = (\pi\, h, \pi'\, h)$$
$$(r_{B^A})_C(\theta) = (\theta_{C\times A}(\pi, \pi'))^*, \quad (r_{B^A}^{-1})_C(k)_D(c, a) = \varepsilon\langle kc, a\rangle$$


for every $l : C \to \top$, $f : C \to A$, $g : C \to B$, $h : C \to A \times B$, $k : C \to B^A$, $c : D \to C$, $a : D \to A$ and $\theta \in \mathscr{P}Nat(\mathscr{C}(-, C) \times \mathscr{C}(-, A), \mathscr{C}(-, B))$.

It is easy to see that the above are indeed components of $\mathscr{P}$-natural isomorphisms that satisfy Definition 2.18. □

2.3. *Free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc's*

We work with the following definition of freeness (for some bicategorical aspects, see Remark 3.17 below).

Definition 2.21. Let $\mathscr{X}$ be a set. $\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}$ *is a free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc on $\mathscr{X}$* provided there exists a function $I : \mathscr{X} \to ob(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}})$ such that for any $\mathscr{P}$-ccc $\mathscr{C}$ and any function $J : \mathscr{X} \to ob(\mathscr{C})$, there is a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc functor $[\![-]\!] : \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}} \to \mathscr{C}$ making the following diagram commute:



and such that for any other $\mathscr{P}$-ccc functor $G : \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}} \to \mathscr{C}$ satisfying the same property as $[\![-]\!]$, there is a $\mathscr{P}$-natural isomorphism $q : [\![-]\!] \to G$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It follows that if $\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}$ is a free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc as above, then there is a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc functor $[\![-]\!] : \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}} \to \mathscr{P}Set^{\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}{}^{op}}$ that agrees on generators with Yoneda, together with a $\mathscr{P}$-natural isomorphism $q : [\![-]\!] \to \mathscr{Y}$.

We have now developed the $\mathscr{P}$-category theory needed for the following definition of the function $\mathbf{nf} : \mathscr{C}(A,B) \to \mathscr{C}(A,B)$ for an arbitrary free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc $\mathscr{C}$, as outlined in the introduction.

Definition 2.22. For $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}(A,B)$, define

$$\mathbf{nf}\ (f) = q_{B,A}\ ([\![f]\!]_A\ (q^{-1}_{A,A}\ (1_A))).$$

Hence, as in the discussion in the introduction, we immediately conclude axiom NF1

Corollary 2.23. $f \sim \mathbf{nf}(f)$.

3. A normal form algorithm for the typed λ-Calculus

There is a well-known correspondence between cartesian closed categories and typed λ-calculi *with* product and terminal types (see Lambek and Scott (1986)). In this section, from our $\mathscr{P}$-perspective, we expand on the remark of A. Pitts (Pitts 1997, Section 4.2) that a similar and quite natural connection can be established between ccc's and typed λ-calculi *without* product and terminal types. We choose Pitts' connection, because our **nf** then satisfies $NF1 - NF4$ with $\equiv$ as ordinary α-congruence; this is not the case for Lambek and Scott's terms up to α-congruence, nor for categorical combinators up to syntactic identity (*cf.* also Remark 3.10). We first develop the connection between free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc's and typed λ-calculi with no free arrows or additional theories. The extension to the more general case is discussed in Remark 3.10.

3.1. *Typed λ-calculus*

We briefly recall the typed λ-calculus, as presented in Barendregt (1984), Girard *et al.* (1989), Lambek and Scott (1986), and Mitchell and Scott (1989).

Definition 3.1. (Typed λ-calculus) Let Sorts be a set of sorts (or atomic types). The *typed λ-calculus generated by Sorts* is a formal system consisting of Types, Terms and Equations between terms, as follows:

Types This is the set inductively generated from the set of Sorts using the following rules: Sorts are Types and if A and B are types, then so is B^A.

Terms To every type A we assign a denumerable set of typed variables denoted $x : A, \ldots$ A *context* is a finite (possibly empty) sequence of different typed variables $x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$, often denoted Σ. Terms (in context) are inductively generated using the following rules:

$$\frac{x : A \in \Sigma}{\Sigma \rhd x : A} \qquad \frac{\Sigma, x : A \rhd t : B}{\Sigma \rhd \lambda x^A.t : B^A} \qquad \frac{\Sigma \rhd s : B^A \quad \Sigma \rhd t : A}{\Sigma \rhd st : B}$$

Note, we write $\lambda x^A.t$, rather than $\lambda x : A.t$.

Equations between terms Equations between terms (in context) of the same type are inductively generated using the following axioms and rules:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$$\Sigma \rhd t = t : B \qquad \frac{\Sigma \rhd s = t : B}{\Sigma \rhd t = s : B} \qquad \frac{\Sigma \rhd s = t : B \quad \Sigma \rhd t = r : B}{\Sigma \rhd s = r : B}$$

$$\frac{\Sigma \rhd s_1 = t_1 : B^A \quad \Sigma \rhd s_2 = t_2 : A}{\Sigma \rhd s_1 s_2 = t_1 t_2 : B} \qquad \frac{\Sigma, x : A \rhd s = t : B}{\Sigma \rhd \lambda x^A.s = \lambda x^A.t : B^A}$$

$$\Sigma \rhd (\lambda x^A.t)s = t(s/x) : B \qquad (\beta)$$

$$\Sigma \rhd t = \lambda x^A.tx : B^A, \text{ if } x : A \notin \Sigma \qquad (\eta)$$

In the above, we write $t(s/x)$ to denote the substitution in $\Sigma, x : A \rhd t : B$ of the term $\Sigma \rhd s : A$ for the variable $x : A$. It is assumed that we have taken care of clashes of variables for (β) as usual.

Remark 3.2.

(i) In what follows, when we speak of 'a λ-calculus', we mean the typed λ-calculus generated by some set of Sorts, unless otherwise specified.

(ii) It is easy to see that a general substitution rule is admissible in the above system. We will use a still more general 'simultaneous substitution' rule:

$$\frac{\Sigma \rhd t_1 : A_1 \cdots \Sigma \rhd t_n : A_n \quad x_1 : A_1, \cdots, x_n : A_n \rhd s : B}{\Sigma \rhd s(t_1/x_1, \ldots t_n/x_n) : B},$$

which is also admissible in the above system.

(iii) We have chosen to work with ordinary λ-terms in this paper. The decidable equivalence relation $\equiv$ (referred to in NF2 – NF4) is α-congruence, where terms are α-congruent if they only differ with respect to names of bound variables. Alternatively, we could have used terms *à la* de Bruijn and let $\equiv$ be syntactic identity.

(iv) We adopt familiar λ-calculus notation, for example uvw denotes $(uv)w$ and $\lambda x.\lambda y.s$ denotes $\lambda x.(\lambda y.s)$. Sometimes we say a well-formed equation $\Sigma \rhd t = t' : B$ 'holds' if it can be proved using the previous inductive rules.

3.2. *Constructing a free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc from λ-terms*

Definition 3.3. Given a set of sorts $\mathscr{X}$, a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc $\mathscr{C}$ and a function $J : \mathscr{X} \to ob(\mathscr{C})$, the *interpretation of the λ-calculus generated by $\mathscr{X}$* is the following recursively defined function $[\![-]\!]$, which maps types to objects and maps a term in context $x_1 : A_1, x_2 : A_2, \ldots, x_n : A_n \rhd t : A$ to an arrow $(\ldots([\![A_1]\!] \times [\![A_2]\!]) \times \ldots) \times [\![A_n]\!] \to [\![A]\!]$ (for $n = 0$ we get an arrow $\top \to [\![A]\!]$, and for $n = 1$ we get an arrow $[\![A_1]\!] \to [\![A]\!]$), as follows:

Objects: — $[\![X]\!] = J(X)$, if $X \in \mathscr{X}$
— $[\![B^A]\!] = [\![B]\!]^{[\![A]\!]}$

Arrows: — $[\![x_1 : A_1, \cdots, x_n : A_n \rhd x_i : A_i]\!] =$
$\pi_i : (\cdots([\![A_1]\!] \times [\![A_2]\!]) \times \cdots) \times [\![A_n]\!] \to [\![A_i]\!]$
— if $\Sigma \neq \langle\,\rangle$ then $[\![\Sigma \rhd \lambda x^A.t : B^A]\!] = [\![\Sigma, x : A \rhd t : B]\!]^*$
— $[\![\ \rhd \lambda x^A.t : B^A]\!] = ([\![x : A \rhd t : B]\!]\pi'_{\top,[\![A]\!]})^*$
— $[\![\Sigma \rhd ts]\!] = \varepsilon\langle [\![\Sigma \rhd t]\!], [\![\Sigma \rhd s]\!]\rangle$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The following proposition is standard and easy to prove.

Proposition 3.4. (Soundness) Given a set of sorts $\mathscr{X}$, a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc $\mathscr{C}$ and a function $J : \mathscr{X} \to ob(\mathscr{C})$, the above induced interpretation $[\![-]\!]$ satisfies: if $\Sigma \triangleright s = t : B$, then $[\![\Sigma \triangleright s : B]\!] \sim [\![\Sigma \triangleright t : B]\!]$ in $\mathscr{C}$.

Fact: To prove Soundness, and only in the case of β, one needs to show by induction on u that $[\![x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n \triangleright u : B]\!]\langle [\![\Sigma \triangleright s_1 : A_1]\!], \ldots, [\![\Sigma \triangleright s_n : A_n]\!]\rangle \sim [\![\Sigma \triangleright u(s_1/x_1, s_2/x_2, \ldots, s_n/x_n) : B]\!]$.

To show completeness we first define a syntactic $\mathscr{P}$-ccc. We use the following notation: bold face letters denote finite sequences, for example, $\mathbf{A}$ denotes a finite sequence $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ of types and $\mathbf{t}$ denotes a finite sequence $t_1, \ldots, t_m$ of terms with the same context. The empty sequence of types will be denoted by $\langle\rangle$ and the empty sequence of terms in a context Σ is denoted by $\Sigma \triangleright$. Concatenation of two sequences will be denoted by a comma (for example, the concatenation of $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ will be denoted by $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$).

Definition 3.5. Given a λ-calculus generated by a set of sorts $\mathscr{X}$, the $\mathscr{P}$-category $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)$ is defined as follows:

Objects are finite sequences of types.

An *arrow* between $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B} = B_1, \ldots, B_m$ is a finite sequence of terms each in context $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A}$, say $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright t_1 : B_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright t_m : B_m$. Such an arrow will often be written $(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{B})$, where $\mathbf{t} = t_1, \ldots, t_m$.

Two such arrows are $\mathscr{P}$-equivalent, denoted $(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{B}) \sim (\mathbf{y} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{s} : \mathbf{B})$, if for every i, $\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright t_i(\mathbf{z}/\mathbf{x}) = s_i(\mathbf{z}/\mathbf{y})$ holds. Obviously, the above relation is an equivalence relation on sequences of terms.

The *identity* on $\mathbf{A}$ is $(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A})$. *Composition* is defined by simultaneous componentwise term substitution.

Proposition 3.6. $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)$ is a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc.

Proof. It is an easy observation that this is a category with finite products: the empty sequence is the terminal object, with the terminal arrow from $\mathbf{A}$ being $(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright)$. The product of $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ is given by $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$, that is, by concatenation of sequences. The projections $\pi : \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \to \mathbf{A}$, $\pi' : \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \to \mathbf{B}$ are defined to be $(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{y} : \mathbf{B} \triangleright \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A})$ and $(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{y} : \mathbf{B} \triangleright \mathbf{y} : \mathbf{B})$, respectively. Pairing $\langle(\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{B}), (\mathbf{y} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{s} : \mathbf{C})\rangle$ is the concatenation $(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}/\mathbf{z}) : \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x}/\mathbf{y}) : \mathbf{C})$.

We introduce some abbreviations: $B^{A_1,\ldots,A_n}$ denotes $(\cdots(B^{A_n})\cdots)^{A_1}$. In particular, $B^{\langle\rangle} = B$. We define exponents: $(B_1, \ldots, B_m)^{\mathbf{A}} = {B_1}^{\mathbf{A}}, \ldots, {B_m}^{\mathbf{A}}$. In particular, $\langle\rangle^{\mathbf{A}} = \langle\rangle$.

The arrow $\varepsilon : \mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{A}} \times \mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{B}$ is given by

$$(x_1 : {B_1}^{\mathbf{A}}, \ldots, x_m : {B_m}^{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{y} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright x_i y_1 \ldots y_n : B_i)_{i=1,\ldots,m}.$$

For an arrow $(\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{h} : \mathbf{B}) : \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{B}$, we define

$$(\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{h} : \mathbf{B})^* : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{A}}$$

to be

$$(\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C} \triangleright \lambda x_1^{A_1} \ldots . \lambda x_n^{A_n} . h_i : B_i^{\mathbf{A}})_{i=1,\cdots,m}.$$

It is easy to see that the above gives a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc. □

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Remark 3.7. There are various syntactic presentations of $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)$, each with its own advantages and disadvantages. For example, another approach (*cf.* Pitts (1997)) involves taking objects = contexts, and arrows = lists of terms in context.

A familiar Lindenbaum–Tarski style argument shows that completeness follows 'by definition'. For the record we state the following proposition.

Proposition 3.8. (Completeness) The canonical interpretation of the typed λ-calculus generated by $\mathscr{X}$ is obtained by letting $\mathscr{C} = (\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)$ and $J(X) = X$ (the singleton sequence) in Definition 3.3. For this interpretation $[\![\Sigma \rhd s : B]\!] \sim [\![\Sigma \rhd t : B]\!]$ implies $\Sigma \rhd s = t : B$.

Proposition 3.9. $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)$ is a free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc over the set of generators $\mathscr{X}$, with $I : \mathscr{X} \to ob(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}})$ the function $I(X) = X$, *qua* singleton sequence.

Suppose that we are given a function $J : \mathscr{X} \to ob(\mathscr{D})$ where $\mathscr{D}$ is a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc. Such a J determines an interpretation $[\![-]\!]$ of the simply typed λ-calculus into $\mathscr{D}$, as in Definition 3.3. We now extend $[\![-]\!]$ to a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc functor also denoted $[\![-]\!] : (\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim) \to \mathscr{D}$. The definition is by primitive list recursion, but with two base cases (one for the empty list and one for the singleton list).

On objects we let

$$\begin{aligned} [\![\langle\rangle]\!] &= \top \\ [\![A]\!] &= \text{as in Definition 3.3} \\ [\![\mathbf{A}, B]\!] &= [\![\mathbf{A}]\!] \times [\![B]\!], \end{aligned}$$

where in the last clause $\mathbf{A} \neq \langle\,\rangle$.

On arrows we let

$$\begin{aligned} [\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \rhd\ ]\!] &= 0_{[\![\mathbf{A}]\!]} \\ [\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \rhd t : A]\!] &= \text{as in Definition 3.3} \\ [\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \rhd \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{B}, s : C]\!] &= \langle [\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \rhd \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{B}]\!], [\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \rhd s : C]\!] \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last clause $\mathbf{t} \neq \langle\,\rangle$.

As required by Definition 2.18, there are obvious $\mathscr{P}$-natural isomorphisms between $[\![\mathbf{A}]\!] \times [\![\mathbf{B}]\!]$ and $[\![\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}]\!]$ and between $[\![\mathbf{B}]\!]^{[\![\mathbf{A}]\!]}$ and $[\![\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{A}}]\!]$, and hence it follows that $[\![-]\!]$ is a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc functor. Also, it is obvious that $[\![-]\!]I = J$.

Assume now that $H : \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}} \to \mathscr{D}$ is another $\mathscr{P}$-ccc functor such that $HI = J$. We want to find a $\mathscr{P}$-natural isomorphism $q : [\![-]\!] \to H$. Recall that for H to be a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc functor means that there exist $\mathscr{P}$-natural isomorphisms $r_{\top}$, $r_{\mathbf{A}\times\mathbf{B}}$, $r_{\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{A}}}$ as in Definition 2.18. We will define $q_{\mathbf{A}}$ and $q_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1}$ by induction on the complexity of $\mathbf{A}$ using these r's:

$$q_{\langle\rangle} = r_{\langle\rangle},\ \ q_{\langle\rangle}^{-1} = 0_{H(\langle\rangle)},\ \ q_X = q_X^{-1} = 1_{J(X)},$$

$$q_{B^A} = r_{B^A}(q_B \varepsilon \langle \pi, q_A^{-1}\pi' \rangle)^*,$$

$$q_{B^A}^{-1} = (q_B^{-1} H(x : B^A, y : A \rhd xy : B) r_{B^A \times A} \langle \pi, q_A \pi' \rangle)^*,$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and for a nonempty sequence $\mathbf{A}$ we have

$$q_{(\mathbf{A},B)} = r_{\mathbf{A}\times B}\langle q_{\mathbf{A}}\pi, q_B\pi'\rangle \quad \text{and}$$
$$q^{-1}_{(\mathbf{A},B)} = \langle q^{-1}_{\mathbf{A}} H(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A}, y : B \triangleright \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A}), q_B^{-1} H(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A}, y : B \triangleright y : B)\rangle.$$

Although tedious, the proof that the above defined q's are $\mathscr{P}$-natural isomorphisms is easy.

Remark 3.10. It is not difficult to see that we can extend the discussion above to more general notions of free $\mathscr{P}$-cccs (over a $\mathscr{P}$-category, a $\mathscr{P}$-cartesian category, *etc.*). Our method then applies to solving the word problem for free ccc's generated by a category, a cartesian category, *etc.* To this end, in the Appendix we introduce various notions of λ-theory that are determined not only by a set of atomic types, but also by a set of basic typed constants as well as a set of equations between terms. Then the relative soundness holds as well as completeness with respect to a 'canonical model' $I : T \to \mathscr{F}_T$, where $\mathscr{F}_T$ is built similarly to $\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}$ except that the role of the per on arrows is played by provability from the theory. Moreover, one can show that I is the 'initial' model in the following sense: for every model $J : T \to \mathscr{C}$ of a λ-theory T in a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc $\mathscr{C}$ there is a unique (up to a $\mathscr{P}$-iso) $\mathscr{P}$-ccc functor $[\![-]\!] : \mathscr{F}_T \to \mathscr{C}$ such that $[\![-]\!]I \cong J$, where $\cong$ is a naturally defined notion of isomorphism of models. (Actually, the 'right' notion of initiality here includes further coherence conditions, but we are not going to use them: *cf.* also Remark 3.17.)

3.3. *The normal form algorithm*

Recall from Section 2.3 that for an *arbitrary* free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc, we can define a normal form function such that NF1 holds. We now use the specific syntactic constructions in the above proof of freeness of $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)$ to get a normal form algorithm for the typed λ-calculus.

First, from Definition 2.22 applied to $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)$ above, we define the normal form function to be

$$\mathbf{nf}(t) = q_{B,\mathbf{A}}([\![t]\!]_{\mathbf{A}}(q^{-1}_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A}))). \tag{4}$$

Here $[\![-]\!]$ in (4) is obtained by instantiating the interpretation $\mathscr{P}$-functor in the proof of freeness (Proposition 3.9) to the case where the target $\mathscr{P}$-category $\mathscr{D}$ is the $\mathscr{P}$-presheaf category $\mathscr{P}Set^{(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}},\sim)^{op}}$, and where $J(X) = \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}(-, X)$. Moreover, q and q^{-1} in (4) are obtained by instantiating the q and q^{-1} in the freeness proof to the case where the $\mathscr{P}$-natural transformations $r_{\top}$, $r_{\mathbf{A}\times\mathbf{B}}$, $r_{\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{A}}}$ refer to the constructions used for proving that Yoneda preserves the distinguished $\mathscr{P}$-ccc structure (see Theorem 2.17 and Proposition 2.20, with $\mathscr{C} = (\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)$). We now give the details of this instantiation.

We start with $[\![-]\!]$. On an object A, $[\![A]\!]$ is a $\mathscr{P}$-presheaf, so we have to show its effects both on objects and arrows. We define it recursively as follows.

On objects:

$$[\![\langle\rangle]\!]\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{1} \tag{5}$$
$$[\![X]\!]\mathbf{C} = \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}(\mathbf{C}, X) \tag{6}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$$[\![B^A]\!]\mathbf{C} = \mathscr{P}Nat(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}(-,\mathbf{C}) \times [\![A]\!], [\![B]\!]) \tag{7}$$

$$[\![\mathbf{A}, B]\!]\mathbf{C} = [\![\mathbf{A}]\!]\mathbf{C} \times [\![B]\!]\mathbf{C} \quad \mathbf{A} \neq \langle\,\rangle\,. \tag{8}$$

On arrows:

$$[\![\langle\rangle]\!]\mathbf{h}(*) = * \tag{9}$$

$$[\![X]\!](\mathbf{w} : \mathbf{E} \triangleright \mathbf{h} : \mathbf{C})(\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C} \triangleright g : X) = (\mathbf{w} : \mathbf{E} \triangleright g(\mathbf{h}/\mathbf{z}) : X) \tag{10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}((&[\![B^A]\!](\mathbf{w} : \mathbf{E} \triangleright \mathbf{h} : \mathbf{C}))\theta)_{\mathbf{D}}((\mathbf{k} : \mathbf{D} \triangleright \mathbf{g}' : \mathbf{E}), a)\\ &= \theta_{\mathbf{D}}((\mathbf{k} : \mathbf{D} \triangleright \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{g}'/\mathbf{w}) : C), a)\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

$$([\![\mathbf{A}, B]\!]\mathbf{h})(\mathbf{a}, b) = (([\![\mathbf{A}]\!]\mathbf{h})\mathbf{a}, ([\![B]\!]\mathbf{h})b) \quad \mathbf{A} \neq \langle\,\rangle\,. \tag{12}$$

On arrows $[\![-]\!]$ is defined recursively as follows:

$$[\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \;\;]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}) = * \tag{13}$$

$$[\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright x_i : A_i]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}) = a_i \tag{14}$$

$$\begin{aligned}([\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \lambda x^A.h : B^A]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}))_{\mathbf{D}}((\mathbf{w} : \mathbf{D} \triangleright \mathbf{g} : \mathbf{C}), a') &=\\ [\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A}, x : A \triangleright h : B]\!]_{\mathbf{D}}([\![\mathbf{A}]\!](\mathbf{w} : \mathbf{D} \triangleright \mathbf{g} : \mathbf{C})(\mathbf{a}), a')&\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

$$\begin{aligned}[\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright st : B]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}) \;=&\\ ([\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright s : B^A]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}))_{\mathbf{C}}((\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C} \triangleright \mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C}), [\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright t : A]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}))\,.&\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

For a nonempty $\mathbf{t}$

$$[\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{B}, s : D]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}) = ([\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{B}]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}), [\![\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright s : D]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}))\,. \tag{17}$$

The specific instances of q are the following:

$$q_{\langle\rangle,\mathbf{C}}(*) = (\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{C} \triangleright\,) \tag{18}$$

$$q_{X,\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C} \triangleright t : X) = (\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C} \triangleright t : X) \tag{19}$$

$$\begin{aligned}q_{B^A,\mathbf{C}}(\theta) \;=&\\ \lambda x^A.q_{B,(\mathbf{C},A)}(\theta_{(\mathbf{C},A)}((\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{C}, x : A \triangleright \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{C}), q^{-1}_{A,(\mathbf{C},A)}(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{C}, x : A \triangleright x : A)))&\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

$$q_{(\mathbf{A},B),\mathbf{C}}(a, b) = (q_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{C}}(a), q_{B,\mathbf{C}}(b)) \quad \mathbf{A} \neq \langle\,\rangle \tag{21}$$

(The right-hand side of the above equation is a pairing, *i.e.*, the concatenation of the two sequences with previously equated contexts.)

$$q^{-1}_{\langle\rangle,\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C} \triangleright\,) = * \tag{22}$$

$$q^{-1}_{X,\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C} \triangleright t : X) = (\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C} \triangleright t : X) \tag{23}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$$(q^{-1}_{B^A,\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C} \triangleright t : B^A))_{\mathbf{D}}((\mathbf{w} : \mathbf{D} \triangleright \mathbf{s} : \mathbf{C}), a') \;=\; q^{-1}_{B,\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{w} : \mathbf{D} \triangleright t(\mathbf{s}/\mathbf{z})q_{A,\mathbf{D}}(a') : B)\,. \tag{24}$$

$$q^{-1}_{(\mathbf{A},B),\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C} \triangleright \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{A}, s : B) \;=\; (q^{-1}_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C} \triangleright \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{A}), q^{-1}_{B,\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{C} \triangleright s : B)) \quad \mathbf{A} \neq \langle\,\rangle\,. \tag{25}$$

This completes the algorithm. Note the similarity between this algorithm and the algorithm by Berger and Schwichtenberg (Berger and Schwichtenberg 1991, p. 203). Our $[\![-]\!]$ corresponds to their 'evaluation functional' into *Sets*. Our q corresponds to their functional 'procedure → expression' $p \to e$; and our q^{-1} corresponds to their 'make self evaluating' *mse*.

3.4. *Uniqueness of normal forms*

Following the discussion in the Introduction, we shall now prove NF2, *i.e.*, that the normal forms returned by **nf** are unique up to α-congruence $\equiv$: if $f \sim g$ then $\mathbf{nf}(f) \equiv \mathbf{nf}(g)$. Clearly, α-congruence is decidable (NF3) and is a subrelation of $\sim$ (NF4).

Recall the free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)$ from Definition 3.5. We shall now move to a $\mathscr{P}$-category given by α-conversion.

Definition 3.11. Consider the $\mathscr{P}$-category $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \equiv)$ that has the same objects and arrows as $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)$, but where the per $\equiv$ is defined from α-congruence as follows: $(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{B}) \equiv (\mathbf{y} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{s} : \mathbf{B})$, if for every i, the terms $\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright t_i(\mathbf{z}/\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright s_i(\mathbf{z}/\mathbf{y})$ are α-congruent.

To prove that $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \equiv)$ is indeed a $\mathscr{P}$-category, we use the fact that substitution of the identity arrow $(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A})$ for the free variables in a term returns an α-congruent term and that termwise simultaneous substitution is associative up to α-congruence.

Remark 3.12. What categorical properties does $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \equiv)$ enjoy? More generally, recalling Remark 3.10, given a λ-theory T, what are the categorical properties of $(\mathscr{F}_T, \equiv)$ where $\equiv$ is a per obtained without β and η, but using the rest of the rules as well as the equations from the theory? It is not difficult to show that such a ($\mathscr{P}$-)category has finite ($\mathscr{P}$-)products, and for every two objects A and B there is an object B^A that satisfies the following: there is an arrow $\varepsilon : B^A \times A \to B$, and for every arrow $f : C \times A \to B$ there exists an arrow $f^* : C \to B^A$ such that for any $g : D \to C$, $f^*g \equiv (f\langle g\pi, \pi'\rangle)^*$. This identity is a $\equiv$-version of a familiar ccc-identity (*cf.* Lambek and Scott (1986, (3.2), p. 54)). Furthermore, this is a complete characterization, since for every ($\mathscr{P}$-)category $\mathscr{C}$ with these properties, using the internal language, we can find a λ-theory $T_{\mathscr{C}}$ such that the above construction gives $\mathscr{F}_{T_{\mathscr{C}}} \cong \mathscr{C}$ where $\cong$ denotes a ($\mathscr{P}$-)equivalence of ($\mathscr{P}$-)categories. Coming back to our $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \equiv)$, we can say that this is a free object in the category of such (structured) categories.

Notation: Recall that the underlying set of a per A is denoted by $|A|$. Also recall that a $\mathscr{P}$-function f between $\mathscr{P}$-sets is a function between their underlying sets. We sometimes write $|f|$ when we want to emphasize that we consider f as an underlying function rather than a $\mathscr{P}$-function. Now, we extend this notation. For a $\mathscr{P}$-presheaf $F : (\mathscr{C}, \sim)^{op} \to \mathscr{P}Set$, we let $|F|$ denote the function $\mathscr{C} \to Set$ defined as follows: for objects C, $|F|(C) = |F(C)|$ and for

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

arrows f, $|F|(f) = F(f)$. Finally, for every arrow $\theta : F \to G$ in $\mathscr{P}$-presheaves, $|\theta|$ is used to emphasize that we consider it as a family of underlying functions $|\theta|_C = \theta_C : |F|C \to |G|C$. Obviously, $|\theta_1\theta_2| = |\theta_1||\theta_2|$, and if $|F| = |G|$, then $|1_F| = |1_G|$.

We can now state the key lemma for proving uniqueness of normal forms.

Lemma 3.13. Let $\mathscr{C}_1 = (\mathscr{C}, \sim_1)$ and $\mathscr{C}_2 = (\mathscr{C}, \sim_2)$ be two $\mathscr{P}$-categories with the same 'underlying' $\mathscr{C}$. Then, their $\mathscr{P}$-presheaf categories have the same underlying $\mathscr{P}$-ccc structure in the following sense: $|\top_1| = |\top_2|$, if $F_i, G_i \in \mathscr{C}_i^{op} \to \mathscr{P}Set$ and $|F_1| = |F_2|$ and $|G_1| = |G_2|$, then $|F_1 \times G_1| = |F_2 \times G_2|$ and $|F_1^{G_1}| = |F_2^{G_2}|$. Also, under the same assumptions $|0_{F_1}| = |0_{F_2}|$, $|\pi_{F_1,G_1}| = |\pi_{F_2,G_2}|$, $|\pi'_{F_1,G_1}| = |\pi'_{F_2,G_2}|$, if $|\theta_1| = |\theta_2|$ and $|\theta'_1| = |\theta'_2|$, then $|\langle\theta_1, \theta_2\rangle| = |\langle\theta'_1, \theta'_2\rangle|$, $|\varepsilon_1| = |\varepsilon_2|$, and if $|\theta_1| = |\theta_2|$, then $|\theta_1^*| = |\theta_2^*|$.

Proof. The proof follows from the definition of the canonical $\mathscr{P}$-ccc structure of a $\mathscr{P}$-presheaf category. □

So far we have considered $\mathscr{P}$-presheaves over $\mathscr{F}_1 = (\mathscr{F}_\mathscr{X}, \sim)$. Let us now also consider $\mathscr{P}$-presheaves over $\mathscr{F}_2 = (\mathscr{F}_\mathscr{X}, \equiv)$. Since these form a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc and $\mathscr{F}_1$ is a free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc, Proposition 3.9 shows us how to define a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc functor $[\![-]\!]^{\equiv} : \mathscr{F}_1 \to \mathscr{P}Set^{\mathscr{F}_2{}^{op}}$ with $[\![X]\!]^{\equiv} = \mathscr{F}_2(-, X)$ for each sort $X \in \mathscr{X}$. Since it is a $\mathscr{P}$-functor it satisfies

$$f \sim g \text{ implies } [\![f]\!]^{\equiv} \equiv [\![g]\!]^{\equiv}. \tag{26}$$

Lemma 3.14. For every object C and every arrow f, the following holds: $|[\![C]\!]| = |[\![C]\!]^{\equiv}|$ and $|[\![f]\!]| = |[\![f]\!]^{\equiv}|$.

Proof. The proof is by induction, using the previous lemma and the fact that $|\mathscr{F}_1(-, X)| = |\mathscr{F}_2(-, X)|$. □

Consider the $\mathscr{P}$-natural transformations q_A and q_A^{-1} defined in Subsection 3.3. Using the above lemma (and the fact that $|\mathscr{F}_1(-, A)| = |\mathscr{F}_2(-, A)|$ for every object A, not only a generator), we know their underlying functions are maps $|q_A| : |[\![A]\!]^{\equiv}| \to |\mathscr{F}_2(-, A)|$ and $|q_A^{-1}| : |\mathscr{F}_2(-, A)| \to |[\![A]\!]^{\equiv}|$. To prove uniqueness of normal forms, we need to know that these preserve $\equiv$, that is, that they are $\mathscr{P}$-functions $q_{A,B} : [\![A]\!]^{\equiv}B \to \mathscr{F}_2(B, A)$ and $q_{A,B}^{-1} : \mathscr{F}_2(B, A) \to [\![A]\!]^{\equiv}B$. To this end we prove the following stronger property.

Lemma 3.15. The above transformations $q_A : [\![A]\!]^{\equiv} \to \mathscr{F}_2(-, A)$ and $q_A^{-1} : \mathscr{F}_2(-, A) \to [\![A]\!]^{\equiv}$ are $\equiv$-natural, that is, $\mathscr{P}$-arrows in $\mathscr{P}Set^{\mathscr{F}_2{}^{op}}$. In particular, for every A and B, $q_{A,B} : [\![A]\!]^{\equiv}B \to \mathscr{F}_2(B, A)$ and $q_{A,B}^{-1} : \mathscr{F}_2(B, A) \to [\![A]\!]^{\equiv}B$ are $\mathscr{P}$-functions.

Proof. The proof is by induction on A. Only the exponential case is non-trivial. Here we show that $q_{B^A} : [\![B^A]\!]^{\equiv} \to \mathscr{F}_2(-, B^A)$ is $\equiv$-natural. The proof that $q_{B^A}^{-1} : \mathscr{F}_2(-, B^A) \to [\![B^A]\!]^{\equiv}$ is $\equiv$-natural leads to similar calculations.

We have to show that for every $\mathbf{C}$, $\mathbf{D}$, $\theta \sim \theta' \in [\![B^A]\!]\mathbf{C}$, $(\mathbf{w} : \mathbf{D} \triangleright \mathbf{s} : \mathbf{C}) \equiv (\mathbf{w}' : \mathbf{D} \triangleright \mathbf{s}' : \mathbf{C})$

(i) $q_{B^A,\mathbf{C}}(\theta) \equiv q_{B^A,\mathbf{C}}(\theta')$

(ii) $q_{B^A,\mathbf{D}}([\![B^A]\!](\mathbf{s})(\theta)) \equiv \mathscr{F}_2(\mathbf{s}', B^A)(q_{B^A,\mathbf{C}}(\theta'))$.

(i) is immediate. Let us just look at (ii). By definition of q_{B^A} (*cf.* Equation (20)) this is equivalent to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$$\lambda x^A.q_{B,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\llbracket B^A \rrbracket(\mathbf{s})(\theta))_{(\mathbf{D},A)}((\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}), q^{-1}_{A,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright x:A)) \equiv$$

$$(\lambda x^A.q_{B,(\mathbf{C},A)}(\theta'_{(\mathbf{C},A)}((\mathbf{z}:\mathbf{C}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{z}:\mathbf{C}), q^{-1}_{A,(\mathbf{C},A)}(\mathbf{z}:\mathbf{C}, x:A \triangleright x:A))))(\mathbf{s}'/\mathbf{x}).$$

By Equation (11) this is the same as

$$\lambda x^A.q_{B,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\theta_{(\mathbf{D},A)}((\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{s}:\mathbf{C}), q^{-1}_{A,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright x:A))) \equiv$$

$$(\lambda x^A.q_{B,(\mathbf{C},A)}(\theta'_{(\mathbf{C},A)}((\mathbf{z}:\mathbf{C}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{z}:\mathbf{C}), q^{-1}_{A,(\mathbf{C},A)}(\mathbf{z}:\mathbf{C}, x:A \triangleright x:A))))(\mathbf{s}'/\mathbf{x})).$$

By the definition of substitution, since $x:A \notin \mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}$, the above is the same as

$$\lambda x^A.q_{B,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\theta_{(\mathbf{D},A)}((\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{s}:\mathbf{C}), q^{-1}_{A,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright x:A))) \equiv$$

$$\lambda x^A.(q_{B,(\mathbf{C},A)}(\theta'_{(\mathbf{C},A)}((\mathbf{z}:\mathbf{C}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{z}:\mathbf{C}), q^{-1}_{A,(\mathbf{C},A)}(\mathbf{z}:\mathbf{C}, x:A \triangleright x:A)))(\mathbf{s}'/\mathbf{x})).$$

By the induction hypothesis, q_B is $\mathscr{P}$-natural. We use its naturality with respect to $(\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{s}:\mathbf{C}, x:A) \equiv (\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{s}':\mathbf{C}, x:A)$ to transform the above into the following equivalent expression:

$$\lambda x^A.q_{B,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\theta_{(\mathbf{D},A)}((\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{s}:\mathbf{C}), q^{-1}_{A,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright x:A))) \equiv$$

$$\lambda x^A.q_{B,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\llbracket B \rrbracket(\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{s}:\mathbf{C}, x:A)(\theta'_{(\mathbf{C},A)}((\mathbf{z}:\mathbf{C}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{z}:\mathbf{C}), q^{-1}_{A,(\mathbf{C},A)}(\mathbf{z}:\mathbf{C}, x:A \triangleright x:A))).$$

Now, by $\theta \sim \theta'$ (so therefore both of them are $\mathscr{P}$-natural), the above is equivalent to

$$\lambda x^A.q_{B,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\theta_{(\mathbf{D},A)}((\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{s}:\mathbf{C}), q^{-1}_{A,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright x:A))) \equiv$$

$$\lambda x^A.q_{B,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\theta_{(\mathbf{D},A)}((\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{C}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{s}:\mathbf{C}), \llbracket A \rrbracket(\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{s}:\mathbf{C}, x:A)(q^{-1}_{A,(\mathbf{C},A)}(\mathbf{z}:\mathbf{C}, x:A \triangleright x:A)))).$$

Finally, by the induction hypothesis, q^{-1}_A is $\mathscr{P}$-natural with respect to $(\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{s}:\mathbf{C}, x:A) \equiv (\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{s}:\mathbf{C}, x:A)$, and therefore the above is equivalent to

$$\lambda x^A.q_{B,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\theta_{(\mathbf{D},A)}((\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{s}:\mathbf{C}), q^{-1}_{A,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright x:A))) \equiv$$

$$\lambda x^A.q_{B,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\theta_{(\mathbf{D},A)}((\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{C}, x:A \triangleright \mathbf{s}:\mathbf{C}), q^{-1}_{A,(\mathbf{D},A)}(\mathbf{w}:\mathbf{D}, x:A \triangleright x:A)))$$

and this is true. □

Assume now that $f \sim g : A \to B$. Implication (26) gives $\llbracket f \rrbracket^{\equiv} \equiv \llbracket g \rrbracket^{\equiv}$. By Lemma 3.15 we have that $q_{B,A}\llbracket f \rrbracket^{\equiv}_A q^{-1}_{A,A}(1_A) \equiv q_{B,A}\llbracket g \rrbracket^{\equiv}_A q^{-1}_{A,A}(1_A)$. By Lemma 3.14 $q_{B,A}\llbracket f \rrbracket^{\equiv}_A q^{-1}_{A,A}(1_A) = q_{B,A}\llbracket f \rrbracket_A q^{-1}_{A,A}(1_A)$ and $q_{B,A}\llbracket g \rrbracket^{\equiv}_A q^{-1}_{A,A}(1_A) = q_{B,A}\llbracket g \rrbracket_A q^{-1}_{A,A}(1_A)$. Therefore $\mathbf{nf}(f) \equiv \mathbf{nf}(g)$. This completes the proof of $NF2$, and since the other properties were proved before, our algorithm **nf** indeed gives a normal form for terms in the typed λ-calculus. For the record we state the following theorem.

Theorem 3.16. The above specified **nf** is indeed an algorithm that satisfies the properties $NF1 - NF4$ from the Introduction, where $\sim$ is $\beta\eta$-equality of terms in simply typed λ-calculus and $\equiv$ is α-congruence.

Before we end this section, let us remark on an alternative definition of freeness.

Remark 3.17. The reader may wonder why we did not define $\llbracket - \rrbracket$ by ordinary primitive recursion on lists, which has only one base case (the empty list), rather than by the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

variant here, which has another base case for the singleton list. We could instead try to define $[\![-]\!]$ by $[\![\langle\,\rangle]\!] = \top$ and $[\![\mathbf{A}, B]\!] = [\![\mathbf{A}]\!] \times [\![B]\!]$. But then, it may seem that we have a problem since for the object that is just a singleton sequence, *e.g.*, a basic type X, we would have $[\![X]\!] = [\![\langle\,\rangle]\!] \times [\![X]\!] = \top \times J(X)$, and this does not have to be *equal* to $J(X)$. And, therefore, this more elegant definition does not satisfy our definition of freeness. But, it does satisfy another 'bicategorical' definition of freeness, which is, anyway, the preferred one when dealing with 'categories' of categories. In our case this definition goes as follows: $\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}$ is a free ($\mathscr{P}$-)ccc over $I : \mathscr{X} \to ob(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}})$ if for every ($\mathscr{P}$-)ccc $\mathscr{D}$ and every $J : \mathscr{X} \to ob(\mathscr{D})$ there exists a ($\mathscr{P}$-)ccc functor $[\![-]\!] : \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}} \to \mathscr{D}$ such that there is a $\mathscr{P}$-iso $\theta : [\![I(-)]\!] \Rightarrow J$. Moreover, for any other $J' : \mathscr{X} \to ob(\mathscr{D})$, $[\![-]\!]' : \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}} \to \mathscr{D}$ and $\theta' : [\![I(-)]\!]' \Rightarrow J'$ as above, and for any ($\mathscr{P}$-)iso $\sigma : J \Rightarrow J'$ there exists a ($\mathscr{P}$-)unique ($\mathscr{P}$-)natural iso $\rho : [\![-]\!] \Rightarrow [\![-]\!]'$ such that $\theta'(\rho \circ I) \sim \sigma\theta$ (in the 'ordinary' (non-$\mathscr{P}$) world, the last $\sim$ is actually equality). $\mathscr{P}$-uniqueness for $\mathscr{P}$-natural transformation ρ meant that for any other ρ' satisfying the above condition $\rho \sim \rho'$. Let us also mention here that the 'coherence conditions' from Remark 3.10 are the same as the above ones.

Another advantage of the above definition of freeness is that it does not use equality on objects, which is one of the basic features of 'pure' $\mathscr{P}$-category theory as well. We find it interesting that the direct inductive definitions in our study give rise to the categorically prefered notion of freeness. Yet, to make our paper more accessible to non-category theorists we decided to define freeness as in Definition 2.21, which then implied the more extensive 'case handling'.

4. Characterizing normal forms in λ-Calculus

In this section we characterize our categorical normal forms $\mathbf{nf}(t)$ as being exactly the *long $\beta\eta$-normal forms* familiar from λ-calculus (Huet 1976) (see also Čubrić (to appear) and DiCosmo (1995). Observe that we have obtained our normal forms purely categorically – without reference to rewriting techniques in λ-calculus. It is only now, when we must prove that our normal forms coincide with the usual ones, that we employ familiar syntactic methods.

4.1. *Normal forms in λ-calculus*

We now generate (by mutual induction) two collections of terms, *neutral* and *long-$\beta\eta$ normal*, and we prove that neutral terms are closed under substitution. From now on, the word 'normal' means 'long-$\beta\eta$ normal'.

Definition 4.1. Variables of arbitrary type are neutral. Neutral terms of atomic type are normal as well. If u is normal and v is neutral, vu is neutral and $\lambda x.u$ is normal.

At this point we want to show that normal terms are irreducible and that neutral terms are irreducible 'inside'. For that we need a few definitions.

Notation: By a *substitution context* $C[\ ]$, we mean a term with a hole in it (Barendregt 1984). These play a fundamental role in the rewriting theory of λ-calculi (both typed and untyped). The most important fact about contexts is that one can plug in a term (of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the right type) into the hole without paying attention to possible clashes of variables. This permits a smooth discussion of local reduction rules, as we see below. Substitution into a context $C[\ ]$ is just formal plugging-in, whereas whenever we write $u(v/x)$ we mean genuine substitution, that is, we rename bound variables by α-conversion to prevent clashes.

Let us now define the notion of (long) $\beta\eta$-reduction with respect to a substitution context $C[\ ]$ by two clauses:

$$C[(\lambda x.u)v] \xrightarrow{\beta} C[u(v/x)],$$

$$C[u^{A\to B}] \xrightarrow{\eta} C[\lambda x.(ux)]\ ,\ x \notin FV(u)$$

$$\text{provided neither } u \equiv \lambda y.w \text{ nor } C[u] \equiv D[(uw)]$$

for any term w and any substitution context $D[\ ]$. The η rule used here is sometimes called 'η-expansion' in the literature.

The term $(\lambda x.u)v$ in (β) and the term u in (η) on which reduction is possible are called (long $\beta\eta$-)*redexes*. A term that contains no redexes is called *irreducible*.

Lemma 4.2. Normal terms are irreducible and neutral terms do not have proper subterms which are redexes. Also, irreducible terms are normal.

Proof. The first sentence is proved by simultaneous induction on the structure of normal and neutral terms. The second sentence is then obviously true. □

From now on we will use the fact that normal and irreducible mean the same thing without explicitly stating it.

Lemma 4.3. If u and v are neutral terms, $u(v/x)$ is neutral, and if u is normal and v is neutral, $u(v/x)$ is normal.

Proof. This is proved by induction on u using the previous lemma. □

Remark 4.4. In what follows, we simplify notation by suppressing the context Σ when no ambiguity arises. Thus we speak simply of 'terms'.

4.2. *The characterization theorem*

In this section we shall show that for a term $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright t : B$, our categorical normal form $\mathbf{nf}(t)$ is actually the long normal form. We shall prove this by a computability argument (Girard *et al.* 1989; Lambek and Scott 1986); this is related to the glueing argument in Altenkirch *et al.* (1995).

We start with our free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}, \sim)$. Recall that the objects and arrows were finite sequences of types and terms, respectively. First we extend the notions of neutral and normal to arbitrary arrows: for an arrow $\mathbf{t} \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$, we say $\mathbf{t} \in \mathscr{NE}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ if for every i all the terms t_i are neutral; similarly, we say $\mathbf{t} \in \mathscr{NF}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ if for every i all the terms t_i are normal. In particular, empty sequences of terms in context are neutral and normal.

We shall define computability predicates $Comp_{\mathbf{B},\mathbf{C}} \subseteq [\![\mathbf{B}]\!]\mathbf{C}$ by induction on the complexity of $\mathbf{B}$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Definition 4.5.

(a) $Comp_{\langle\rangle,\mathbf{C}} = \{*\}$

(b) $Comp_{X,\mathbf{C}} = \mathscr{NE}(\mathbf{C}, X)$ for X atomic,

(c) $Comp_{B^A,\mathbf{C}} = \{\theta : \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}(-,\mathbf{C}) \times [\![A]\!] \longrightarrow [\![B]\!] \mid \forall \mathbf{D} \forall \mathbf{t} \in \mathscr{NE}(\mathbf{D},\mathbf{C})$
$\forall u \in Comp_{A,\mathbf{D}}\ \theta_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{t}, u) \in Comp_{B,\mathbf{D}}\}$, where θ is $\mathscr{P}$-natural.

(d) $Comp_{(\mathbf{B},A),\mathbf{C}} = Comp_{\mathbf{B},\mathbf{C}} \times Comp_{A,\mathbf{C}}$, where $\mathbf{B} \neq \langle\rangle$.

Lemma 4.6. For every object $\mathbf{A}$, if $\mathbf{s} \in \mathscr{NE}(\mathbf{D},\mathbf{C})$ and $\mathbf{a} \in Comp_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{C}}$ then $[\![\mathbf{A}]\!](\mathbf{s})(\mathbf{a}) \in Comp_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{D}}$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on $\mathbf{A}$ using the fact that neutral terms are closed under substitution (Lemma 4.3). The only interesting case is when $\mathbf{A}$ is a single type A. Recall that for $s : D \to C$, $[\![A]\!](s) : [\![A]\!]C \to [\![A]\!]D$.

For A atomic, since $[\![A]\!] = \mathscr{Y}(A)$, the action of $[\![A]\!](s)$ is given by composition, *i.e.*, we have $[\![A]\!](\mathbf{s})(a) = a(\mathbf{s}/\mathbf{z})$, which is neutral by the lemma, and for atomic objects this is the same as computable.

For A an exponent, say $A_1^{A_2}$, we have to check that $[\![A_1{}^{A_2}]\!](\mathbf{s})(a) \in Comp_{A_1^{A_2},\mathbf{D}}$. Using the definition of computability at an exponent, the above is equivalent to: $\forall \mathbf{E} \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathscr{NE}(\mathbf{E},\mathbf{C}) \forall u \in Comp_{A_2,\mathbf{E}}\ [\![A_1{}^{A_2}]\!](\mathbf{s})(a)_{\mathbf{E}}(\mathbf{r}, u) \in Comp_{A_1,\mathbf{E}}$. By Equation (11) this is the same as $a_{\mathbf{E}}(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{r}), u) \in Comp_{A_1,\mathbf{E}}$. This holds by the assumption of computability of a and u, and neutrality of $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{r})$ by Lemma 4.3. □

Theorem 4.7.

(i) $\theta \in Comp_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{C}}$ implies $q_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{C}}(\theta) \in \mathscr{NF}(\mathbf{C},\mathbf{A})$;

(ii) $\mathbf{f} \in \mathscr{NE}(\mathbf{C},\mathbf{A})$ implies $q^{-1}_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{f}) \in Comp_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{C}}$;

(iii) Let $\mathbf{t} \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{X}}(\mathbf{A},\mathbf{B})$. Then for all $\mathbf{a} \in Comp_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{C}}$ $[\![\mathbf{t}]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}) \in Comp_{\mathbf{B},\mathbf{C}}$.

Proof. (i) and (ii) are proved simultaneously by induction on $\mathbf{A}$. The only interesting case is when $\mathbf{A}$ is a single exponential type $A_1^{A_2}$. Then, by Equation (20) (and using π, π' as the obvious meta-notation), we have $q_{A_1^{A_2},\mathbf{C}}(\theta) = \lambda y^{A_2}.q_{A_1,(\mathbf{C},A_2)}(\theta_{(\mathbf{C},A_2)}(\pi, q^{-1}_{A_2,(\mathbf{C},A_2)}(\pi')))$. By the induction hypothesis, $q^{-1}_{A_2,(\mathbf{C},A_2)}(\pi')$ is computable, since projections/variables are normal; also by the definition of computability at an exponent, $\theta_{\mathbf{C},A_2}(\pi, q^{-1}_{A_2,(\mathbf{C},A_2)}(\pi'))$ is then computable. By the induction hypothesis applied to $q_{A_1,(\mathbf{C},A_2)}$, we have that $q_{A_1,(\mathbf{C},A_2)}(\theta_{\mathbf{C},A_2}(\pi, q^{-1}_{A_2,(\mathbf{C},A_2)}(\pi')))$ is normal. Finally, λ-abstraction of a normal term remains normal.

Let us now prove that $q^{-1}_{A_1^{A_2},\mathbf{C}}(f) \in Comp_{A_1^{A_2},\mathbf{C}}$ for a normal f. For that we have to show that $\forall \mathbf{D}\ \forall \mathbf{t} \in \mathscr{NE}(\mathbf{D},\mathbf{C})\ \forall u \in Comp_{A_2,\mathbf{D}}$,

$$(q^{-1}_{A_1^{A_2},\mathbf{C}}(f))_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{t}, u) \in Comp_{A_1,\mathbf{D}}\ .$$

Using Equation (24), we get $(q^{-1}_{A_1^{A_2},\mathbf{C}}(f))_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{t}, u) = q^{-1}_{A_1,\mathbf{D}}(f(\mathbf{t})q_{A_2,\mathbf{D}}(u))$. By the induction hypothesis, $q_{A_2,\mathbf{D}}(u)$ is normal, by Lemma 4.3 $f(\mathbf{t})$ is neutral, neutral applied to normal is neutral by the definition of normal terms, and, finally, by the induction hypothesis applied to $q^{-1}_{A_1,\mathbf{D}}$, the whole expression is computable.

(iii) is proved by induction on $\mathbf{t}$. The only interesting case is when the sequence is a single term. Also, if the term is just a variable we are again done. It remains to check two cases:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1 $t = uv : B$. Observe that by Equation (16) $[\![uv]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}\mathbf{a} = [\![u]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a})(id_{\mathbf{A}}, [\![v]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}))$. We must show $[\![u]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a})(id_{\mathbf{A}}, [\![v]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}))$ is computable. This follows by the induction hypothesis applied to u, neutrality of $id_{\mathbf{A}}$ and the computability of $[\![v]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a})$ (again by the induction hypothesis), using the definition of computability at an exponent.

2 $t = \lambda x^{B_1}.h$. We must show $[\![\lambda x^{B_1}.h]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}) \in Comp_{B_2^{B_1},\mathbf{C}}$, where $\mathbf{a} \in [\![\mathbf{A}]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}$ is computable. To show this, we must show: $\forall \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{r} \in \mathscr{NE}(\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{C}), u \in Comp_{B_1,\mathbf{D}}$ it holds that $[\![\lambda x^{B_1}.h]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a})_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{r}, u) \in Comp_{B_2,\mathbf{D}}$. But $[\![\lambda x^{B_1}.h]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a})_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{r}, u) = [\![h]\!]_{\mathbf{D}}([\![A]\!](\mathbf{r})(\mathbf{a}), u)$ (Equation (15)). The right-hand side is indeed computable by the induction hypothesis applied to h and Lemma 4.6. □

Corollary 4.8.

$$\mathbf{nf}(t) = q_{B,\mathbf{A}}([\![t]\!]_{\mathbf{A}}((q^{-1}_{\mathbf{AA}})(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A})))$$

is an element of $\mathscr{NF}(\mathbf{A}, B)$.

Proof. Observe that $(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A})$ is a finite sequence of variables, and hence computable. The result follows by using (in order) statements (ii), (iii), (i) of the theorem above. □

Observe that until now, we have only used computability techniques. However, it is worth remarking that if we appeal to the Church–Rosser theorem, we can prove the following result.

Corollary 4.9. Every element of $\mathscr{NF}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ is $\mathbf{nf}(g)$, for some g.

5. Historical background and related work

Our method is an example of normalization by intuitionistic model construction, a method going back to Martin-Löf (1975a; 1975b). The general idea is to prove normalization by first interpreting a term in a suitable model and then mapping this interpretation back to the normal form of the term. By working in an intuitionistic framework one ensures that the normalization function thus obtained is an algorithm.

Martin-Löf's approach was investigated further in Coquand and Dybjer (1997). They formulated the abstract conditions NF1 and NF2 (for the special case in which $\equiv$ is syntactic equality of terms, so that NF3 and NF4 are trivially satisfied). Moreover, they focussed on algebraic aspects and used the fact that syntax modulo *conversion* is a free model and hence has a unique homomorphic interpretation into any other model. They also related Martin-Löf's construction to the glueing construction from category theory, especially as used by Lafont (1988).

In Martin-Löf (1975a; 1975b), Martin-Löf introduced the technique for normalization in typed combinatory logic and weak λ-calculus. The same general technique was used to construct a normalization algorithm for simply typed $\lambda\beta\eta$-calculus in Berger and Schwichtenberg (1991). They inverted the interpretation function into the set-theoretic model. They were also able to generalize Friedman's completeness theorem (Friedman 1975).

Another normalization algorithm for the simply typed λ-calculus (actually, a variant with explicit substitutions) was presented in Coquand (1993). Her algorithm is similar

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to Berger and Schwichtenberg's but algebraically cleaner. It is obtained by inverting an interpretation function into a Kripke model.

Then Altenkirch *et al.* (1995) gave a 'categorical reconstruction' of the work of Berger and Schwichtenberg and Coquand in terms of inversion of an interpretation functor into the category of presheaves. The fact that the Yoneda functor preserves ccc-structure plays a key role in their reconstruction.

The present paper has exploited and reformulated the insights of Altenkirch, Hofmann, and Streicher. The crucial difference comes from our use of $\mathscr{P}$-category theory, which enables us to solve the word problem for cccs by more purely categorical means. In particular, we do not need to introduce syntactic notions such as the sets of normal and neutral terms as in their proof and in Girard's computability methods (*cf.* Girard *et al.* (1989)). Altenkirch, Hofmann, and Streicher also used a 'twisted' variant of the glueing construction, which is unnecessary here. Although for us it is a subsidiary concern, we have included a proof that our normal form function actually returns long $\beta\eta$-normal forms. This proof uses syntactic techniques related to traditional computability/glueing arguments.

$\mathscr{P}$-category theory may be of interest in its own right. An interesting feature is that a $\mathscr{P}$-category only comes equipped with a notion of equality of arrows but not with an equality of objects. It may also be the appropriate way to develop category theory inside a constructive framework such as Martin-Löf type theory. As such it provides an alternative to $\mathscr{E}$-category theory (category theory where each hom-set is equipped with an equivalence relation) as studied by Aczel (1993), Huet and Saibi (1995) and Duval and Reynaud (1994). $\mathscr{E}$-categories were also studied abstractly in Lack (1995), where they are shown to be bicategories enriched over a monoidal bicategory.

The fact that the $\mathscr{P}$-category theory we use can be formalized (programmed) in Martin-Löf type theory is one way of ensuring that our normalization function is indeed an algorithm. Of course, $\mathscr{P}$-category theory can equally well be understood in an ordinary (set-theoretic) way, but then we are left with the problem of showing that our normalization function is computable. Although ultimately all our constructs are given inductively (and therefore have an informal constructive character), to show that they are algorithms in a precise recursion-theoretic sense would require some encoding. We can use here, for example, the result that Martin-Löf type theory has a recursion-theoretic model, see Beeson (1985).

Our $\mathscr{P}$-categorical setting also highlights the connection between our technique and the abstract approach to coherence problems in ordinary category theory described, for example, by Joyal and Street (1993), Power (1989) and Gordon *et al.* (1996). As in these references, it is an essential feature of our approach that we use a $\mathscr{P}$-version of Yoneda to embed our free $\mathscr{P}$-ccc in a 'stricter' $\mathscr{P}$-ccc of $\mathscr{P}$-presheaves.

Beylin and Dybjer (1996) shows how to go from a reduction-free normalization proof for monoids to a proof of coherence for monoidal categories. They first solve the word problem for monoids using a simple version of the technique employed in the present paper. Then they show coherence for monoidal categories by examining the formal proof objects (obtained from a formalization in Martin-Löf type theory) of this proof of normalization. The proof obtained in this way is much like Joyal and Street's.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A preliminary version of the results reported in this paper was obtained in December 1995 and presented in seminars in Göteborg, Montreal and Cambridge during February and March, and at the Workshop on Constructive Programming in Kyoto in April 1996. This version was based on $\mathscr{E}$-category theory. But it then became clear to us that it would be more elegant to rework the result in the context of $\mathscr{P}$-category theory. The reason is that $\mathscr{P}$-category theory makes it possible to identify the underlying 'data parts' of the ccc-structures on presheaves over terms modulo $\beta\eta$-convertibility and terms modulo α-congruence respectively. This new version was presented at the Peripatetic Seminar on Sheaves and Logic in Dunquerque in July, at the Seventh Scandinavian Logic Symposium in Uppsala in August and at the LOGSEM Workshop in Birmingham in September, 1996.

Appendix A. λ-theories[†]

In this Appendix we apply our methods to the word problem for typed λ-calculus with additional operations and axioms, that is, to *λ-theories*. This shows the robustness of our method: the extraction of the normalization algorithm **nf** from a proof of freeness is done in essentially the same way as before (and NF1 follows for the same general reasons). What changes is that we work with new notions of freeness, which correspond to the respective notions of theory. Moreover, the proof of NF2 is also essentially unchanged. NF3 is (as always) trivial. But proving NF4, the decidability of $\equiv$, involves additional syntactical considerations. From the examples that follow (see also Remark A.10), it should be clear that our method gives an algorithm **nf** for *any* λ-theory. However, in general, this **nf** does not have to satisfy $NF4$. The examples below will satisfy $NF4$ relative to the initial theory.

We consider several theories:

(i) A λ-calculus T^{λ}_{f} with additional operations but with no additional axioms. This corresponds to a free ccc with free arrows (Harnik and Makkai 1992; Lambek and Scott 1986; Čubrić, to appear).

(ii) A λ-calculus T^{λ}_{cat} with additional operations and axioms such that all the types occurring in them are sorts and, moreover, their contexts contain exactly one variable typed by a sort. This corresponds to the free ccc generated by a category.

(iii) A λ-calculus T^{λ}_{cart} with additional operations and axioms, but in which all types are sorts. This corresponds to the free ccc generated by a cartesian category.

In each case we will obtain a solution to a word problem by constructing our normal form algorithm. In cases (ii) and (iii) this solution will be relative to the solution of the word problem for the generating category (cartesian category, respectively). Our (relative) proofs of NF4, however, are syntactical. The main technical result of this Appendix, Theorem A.5, resembles Cut-Elimination and is used to reduce the number of cases examined. Of course, to even apply our methods, we require appropriate notions of $\mathscr{P}$-category, $\mathscr{P}$-freeness, *etc. modulo* a λ-theory.

We now introduce the appropriate machinery.

[†] Added in proof: the reference Breazu-Tannen (1988) recently came to our attention. It contains results related to those in our Appendix, but using rewriting techniques and long normal forms.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A.1. *λ-theories*

In order to deal with additional operations and axioms we slightly extend our definition of λ-calculus (*cf.* Definition 3.1).

To *Terms* we add:

(a) To every sequence of types $\mathbf{A}$ and every type B we associate (a possibly empty) set of operations $Op(\mathbf{A}; B)$.

(b) The following term-formation rule:

$$(Op)\quad \frac{\Sigma \rhd t_1 : A_1 \cdots \Sigma \rhd t_n : A_n \quad c \in Op(A_1, \ldots, A_n; B)}{\Sigma \rhd c(t_1, \ldots, t_n) : B}$$

For a given Σ and B the set of all terms with context Σ and type B is denoted $Term(\Sigma, B)$.

To the *Equations between terms* we add

(a) a specified set of *basic equations* $BEq(\Sigma, B) \subseteq Term(\Sigma, B) \times Term(\Sigma, B)$, for every Σ, B.

(b) the following two rules

$$(SubOp)\quad \frac{c \in Op(A_1, \ldots, A_n; B) \quad \Sigma \rhd s_1 = u_1 : A_1 \ \cdots \ \Sigma \rhd s_n = u_n : A_n}{\Sigma \rhd c(s_1, \ldots, s_n) = c(u_1, \ldots, u_n) : B}$$

$$(Beq)\quad \frac{(t, s) \in BEq(x_1^{A_1}, \ldots, x_n^{A_n}; B) \quad \Sigma \rhd u_1 = v_1 : A_1 \ \cdots \ \Sigma \rhd u_n = v_n : A_n}{\Sigma \rhd t(u_1/x_1, \ldots, u_n/x_n) = s(v_1/x_1, \ldots, v_n/x_n) : B}$$

The pair $Sig = (Sorts, Operations)$ will be called a *signature* of a λ-calculus, the pair $\mathscr{L} = (Types, Terms)$ will be called its *language*, the basic equations BEq will be called its *axioms* and, finally, a language together with its set of provable equations will be called a *λ-theory*.

(i) T_f^λ is now defined as a λ-theory such that for every Σ and B, $BEq(\Sigma, B) = \varnothing$.

(ii) T_{cat}^λ is now defined as a λ-theory such that for every $\mathbf{A}$ and B, $Op(\mathbf{A}, B) = \varnothing$ unless B is a sort and $\mathbf{A}$ is a single sort. Moreover, we require that no basic equation $\Sigma \rhd s = t : B$ can contain exponent types, that is, all subterms of s and t are typed by sorts, and that Σ is a single variable typed by a sort.

(iii) T_{cart}^λ is the following λ-theory: for every $\mathbf{A}$ and every B, $Op(\mathbf{A}, B) = \varnothing$ unless B is a sort and $\mathbf{A}$ is a sequence of sorts. Also, we require that no basic equation $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \rhd s = t : B$ can contain exponent types (here, we do not require $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A}$ to be a single variable but only that $\mathbf{A}$ is a finite sequence of sorts).

Obviously, T_{cat}^λ is a special case of T_{cart}^λ, but T_f^λ is not a special case of either of them.

A.2. **nf** *and NF1 for theories*

To each theory T above, we associate a $\mathscr{P}$-category just as we did in Definition 3.5. The key difference is that we have to include the additional operations in the construction of terms, and in the second and third case we have to include provability from the basic equations. Therefore we define the relation $\sim_T$ in $(\mathscr{F}_T, \sim_T)$ as follows:

$$(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \ \rhd \ \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{B}) \sim_T (\mathbf{y} : \mathbf{A} \ \rhd \ \mathbf{s} : \mathbf{B}) \quad \text{iff for every } i \quad T \vdash \mathbf{z} : \mathbf{A} \ \rhd \ t_i(\mathbf{z}/\mathbf{x}) = s_i(\mathbf{z}/\mathbf{y})$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where T stands for any of T_f^λ, T_{cat}^λ or T_{cart}^λ, and $T \vdash \cdots$ denotes provability from T. In each case we get a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc (*cf.* also Remark 3.10).

As before, we will construct the normalization algorithm **nf** from a proof of $\mathscr{P}$-freeness (in the appropriate sense) and the proof that Yoneda preserves $\mathscr{P}$-ccc structure. This amounts to defining $[\![-]\!]$ and q, q^{-1} as before, except that we must now define the effect of $[\![-]\!]$ on terms of the form $c(\mathbf{t})$ too: this is the only change in the previous definition of $[\![-]\!]$. Therefore we add the following to Equations (13)–(17). For every $c \in Op(\mathbf{A}, B)$ and every $(\mathbf{w} : \mathbf{D} \triangleright \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{A})$

$$[\![\mathbf{w} : \mathbf{D} \triangleright c(\mathbf{t}) : B]\!] = [\![c]\!][\![\mathbf{w} : \mathbf{D} \triangleright \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{A}]\!] \tag{27}$$

where $[\![c]\!] : [\![\mathbf{A}]\!] \to [\![B]\!]$ is defined as

$$[\![c]\!]_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}) = q_{B,\mathbf{C}}^{-1}(c(q_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{a}))) . \tag{28}$$

In categorical terminology, we map the generating arrow $c : \mathbf{A} \to B$ to $q_B^{-1}\mathscr{Y}(c)q_{\mathbf{A}} : [\![\mathbf{A}]\!] \to [\![B]\!]$.

Therefore, just as before, we have our algorithm **nf**. Also, as before, we easily have $NF1$, that is, for every $\mathbf{t}$, $\mathbf{nf}(\mathbf{t}) \sim_T \mathbf{t}$.

A.3. *NF2 and NF3 for theories*

To prove the other properties, we first have to define a subrelation $\equiv_T$ of $\sim_T$, where T stands for any of T_f^λ, T_{cat}^λ, T_{cart}^λ. As in our previous work, $\equiv_T$ is essentially 'provability without $\beta\eta$, up to α-congruence'. More precisely, for each λ-theory T above, we first define a 'restricted' theory T^α (that is, T_f^α, T_{cat}^α, T_{cart}^α) that is the same as T except that β and η are not included.

As in Definition 3.11, we define (in each of the above cases) the $\mathscr{P}$-category $(\mathscr{F}_T, \equiv_T)$ to have the same objects and arrows as $(\mathscr{F}_T, \sim_T)$ but the relation on arrows is defined as follows:

$$(\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{B}) \equiv_T (\mathbf{y} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright \mathbf{s} : \mathbf{B}) \text{ iff for every } i \quad T^\alpha \vdash \mathbf{z} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright t_i(\mathbf{z}/\mathbf{x}) = s_i(\mathbf{z}/\mathbf{y}) .$$

Obviously, in all three cases $\equiv_T \subseteq \sim_T$, that is, condition $NF3$ is satisfied. Let us now show that $NF2$ holds as well.

As before, we would now like to show that in each of the above cases we have a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc functor $[\![-]\!]^\alpha : (\mathscr{F}_T, \sim_T) \to \mathscr{P}Set^{(\mathscr{F}_T, \equiv_T)^{op}}$. The first thing that we want to ensure is given by the following lemma.

Lemma A.1. For every theory T and $c \in Op(\mathbf{A}, B)$, $[\![c]\!]^\alpha$ defined using the same formula as in Definition 28 is a $\mathscr{P}$-arrow in $\mathscr{P}Set^{(\mathscr{F}_T, \equiv_T)^{op}}$.

Proof. By examining the proof of Lemma 3.15, we can notice that $q_{\mathbf{A}}$ and q_B^{-1} are $\equiv_T$-natural here as well. For the rest we use the rule $(SubOp)$, or in other words the fact that $\mathscr{Y}c$ is $\equiv_T$-natural as well. □

The next thing we have to ensure is that $[\![-]\!]^\alpha$ preserves the axioms. But for the case of $T = T_f^\lambda$ (the 'completely free' case) we are done since there are no axioms. Let us consider the two other cases.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lemma A.2. Let T be either T^{λ}_{cat} or T^{λ}_{cart}. Let $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \triangleright s = t : B$ be a basic equation in T. Then, $[\![s]\!]^{\alpha} \equiv_T [\![t]\!]^{\alpha}$ in $\mathscr{P}Set^{(\mathscr{F}_T, \equiv_T)^{op}}$.

Proof. First we should notice the following easy fact.

Fact. For every 'T-restricted' $\mathbf{A}$ we have $q_{\mathbf{A}} q_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \equiv_T 1_{\mathscr{F}_T(-,\mathbf{A})}$ where 'T^{λ}_{cat}-restricted' means that $\mathbf{A}$ is a single sort and 'T^{λ}_{cart}-restricted' means that $\mathbf{A}$ is a finite sequence of sorts.

By induction, and using the above fact, we can show that for every T-restricted arrow we have $[\![\mathbf{t}]\!]^{\alpha} \equiv_T q_{\mathbf{B}}^{-1}(\mathscr{Y}\mathbf{t}) q_{\mathbf{A}}$.

To prove that $[\![s]\!]^{\alpha} \equiv_T [\![t]\!]^{\alpha}$, it is enough to show that $\mathscr{Y}s \equiv_T \mathscr{Y}t$. This follows from the fact that rule *Beq* is included in T^{α}. □

Therefore, by the appropriate freeness of $(\mathscr{F}_T, \sim_T)$, we indeed have a $\mathscr{P}$-ccc functor $[\![-]\!]^{\alpha} : (\mathscr{F}_T, \sim_T) \to \mathscr{P}Set^{(\mathscr{F}_T, \equiv_T)^{op}}$ defined as above.

Using exactly the same reasoning as in Section 3.4, we can now show the property $NF2$ for all three cases of T, that is, if $s \sim_T t$, then $\mathbf{nf}(s) \equiv_T \mathbf{nf}(t)$. The only remaining thing now is to see whether $\equiv_T$ is decidable.

A.4. *NF4 for theories*

To investigate $\equiv_T$ is the same as to investigate provability in T^{α}, for each theory $T = T^{\lambda}_{f}, T^{\lambda}_{cat}, T^{\lambda}_{cart}$. As before, ordinary α-congruence among terms is denoted by $\equiv$.

First, we separate the easiest case T^{α}_{f}. As in Section 3.4, provability here is exactly the same as α-congruence and therefore NF4 holds. Now we shall prove NF4 for the other two cases. We begin with some syntax.

Recall the notion of a substitution context, *i.e.*, 'term with a hole'. Here we need to consider several holes at once: we denote a term with precisely n distinct holes by $C[\sqcup_1, \ldots, \sqcup_n]$ (strictly speaking, the indexing of the holes is redundant). Our holes are typed (although we try to avoid explicitly writing types), which means that we can plug into the holes only terms of the appropriate type.

A term is called *simple* if it does not contain any exponents, λ's or applications. It is easy to see that every term typed by a sort arises by substitution from a simple term with holes, *i.e.*, for any term typed by a sort $\Sigma \triangleright g : Z$ there is a simple term with holes $C[\sqcup_1, \ldots, \sqcup_n]$ containing no variables, and a sequence of terms $\Sigma \triangleright u_i : X_i$ such that $g \equiv C[u_1, \ldots u_n]$ and where each u_i is either an application or a sorted variable. Such a term with holes $C[\sqcup_1, \ldots, \sqcup_n]$ is called the *maximal simple head* of $\Sigma \triangleright g : Z$. For any given term $g : Z$, there is an effective method to find its maximal simple head $C[\ldots]$ and the associated terms u_i satisfying the above conditions. Moreover, they are uniquely determined. For example, assuming c and d are operation symbols typed by sorts, $c(\sqcup_1, \sqcup_2, d(\sqcup_3))$ is the maximal simple head of both $x : X, y : Y \triangleright c(x, x, d(uv)) : Z$ and $x : X, y : Y \triangleright c(x, y, d(uv)) : Z$. From now on, the notation $F[u_1, \ldots, u_l]$ always implies that $F[\ldots]$ is the appropriate maximal simple head.

We now introduce two algebraic theories T_{alg} and T_{un}, where T_{alg} refines T^{λ}_{cart} and T_{un} refines T_{alg}:

— T_{alg}: Types are only the sorts of T^{λ}_{cart}, while the terms are those terms of T^{λ}_{cart} that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

do not contain exponents. The equations of T_{alg} are formed by only those rules from T^{λ}_{cart} that do not contain exponents.

— T_{un}: T_{un} is a further restriction of T_{alg} as well as of T^{λ}_{cat} such that the contexts appearing can only have a single sorted variable.

It is folklore that T_{alg} corresponds precisely to the internal theories of cartesian categories and that T_{un} corresponds to the internal theories of categories.

Remark A.3. Since we work in $\mathscr{P}$-category theory it is important to realize that the corresponding $\mathscr{P}$-statements hold: for example, T_{alg} corresponds precisely to the internal theories of $\mathscr{P}$-cartesian categories as well.

Let $\mathscr{E}q\{\Sigma \triangleright u_i : A \mid i = 1,\dots m\}$ denote a finite set of *equations* among u's such that for every i and j, $\Sigma \triangleright u_i = u_j : A$ is in the equivalence closure of $\mathscr{E}q\{\Sigma \triangleright u_i : A \mid i = 1,\dots m\}$. Although, the above definition would be sufficient for the development below, we will further specialize equations to be in *circular form*, that is, we assume our set of equations is written

$$\mathscr{E}q\{\Sigma \triangleright u_i : A \mid i = 1,\dots m\} = \{\Sigma \triangleright u_1 = u_2 : A, \Sigma \triangleright u_2 = u_3 : A, \dots, \Sigma \triangleright u_m = u_1\}$$

(altogether m equations). From now on, whenever we write $\mathscr{E}q\{...\}$, we assume that the equations are in the above special form.

Next we notice that the following rule is admissible in T^{λ}_{cart}:

$$(ASub) \quad \frac{\mathscr{E}q\{\Sigma \triangleright u_i : X_k \mid i \in \varphi^{-1}(k)\}_{k=1,\dots,n}}{\Sigma \triangleright F[u_1,\dots,u_l] = G[u_{l+1},\dots,u_{l+l'}] : Y}$$

where $\varphi : \{1,\dots,l+l'\} \to \{1,\dots,n\}$ with the additional restrictions: $T_{alg} \vdash x_1 : X_1, \dots x_n : X_n \triangleright F[x_{\varphi(1)},\dots,x_{\varphi(l)}] = G[x_{\varphi(l+1)},\dots,x_{\varphi(l+l')}] : Y$, each u_i is either a sorted variable or an application and all the variables of $F[x_{\varphi(1)},\dots,x_{\varphi(l)}]$ and $G[x_{\varphi(l+1)},\dots,x_{\varphi(l+l')}]$ are exactly $x_{\varphi(1)},\dots,x_{\varphi(l+l')}$. (All this implies that $F[...]$ and $G[...]$ are maximal simple heads of the appropriate terms.) Moreover, when $k \notin Image(\varphi)$ we assume that $\mathscr{E}q\{\Sigma \triangleright u_i : X_k \mid i \in \varphi^{-1}(k)\}$ denotes a single equation $\Sigma \triangleright u = u : X_k$. Since such a term u is not going to cause any new occurrences in the conclusion, it does not matter which term it is – the only important thing is that such a term has to exist.

Similarly, the rule below is admissible in T^{λ}_{cat}:

$$(USub) \quad \frac{\Sigma \triangleright u = v : X}{\Sigma \triangleright f(u/x) = g(v/x)}$$

with the additional restrictions: $T_{un} \vdash x : X \triangleright f = g : Y$ and u and v are either sorted variables or applications.

Lemma A.4. Let T'^{λ}_{cart} denote the same theory as T^{λ}_{cart} except that the rules $(SubOp)$ and (Beq) are replaced by $(ASub)$. Then, both theories have the same equational consequences. Similarly, let T'^{λ}_{cat} denote the same theory as T^{λ}_{cat} except that the rules $(SubOp)$ and (Beq) are replaced by $(USub)$. Then, both theories have the same equational consequences. Moreover (and even more importantly for us), both statements hold for T^{α}_{cart} and T^{α}_{cat}.

Proof. We leave to the reader the easy exercise of showing how to replace each occurrence of $(SubOp)$ and (Beq) by a combination of the other rules plus the new rules.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

To prove the converse we use that $F[...]$ and $G[...]$ in the rule (*Asub*) are maximal simple heads. □

Now we want to further reduce the number of cases that will appear in our proofs.

Theorem A.5. Let T'^{α} denote either T'^{α}_{cart} or T'^{α}_{cat}. Then (*Transitivity*) and (*Symmetry*) are admissible rules in T'^{α}.

Both the statement and the proof of Theorem A.5 closely resemble cut elimination. Moreover, the purpose is basically the same: to obtain a kind of subterm/subformula property. Since the proof is rather long and technical, we leave it to Subsection A.5 below.

In the following proposition we reduce equality in T^{α} to the equality of simple terms.

Proposition A.6. Let T be T^{λ}_{cat} or T^{λ}_{cart} and let T^{-} denote T_{un} and T_{alg} respectively.

(a) If $T^{\alpha} \vdash \Sigma \rhd x = g : B^A$, then $g \equiv x$.

(b) If $T^{\alpha} \vdash \Sigma \rhd \lambda x^A.f = g : B^A$, then there exists h such that $g \equiv \lambda x^A.h$ and $T^{\alpha} \vdash \Sigma, x : A \rhd f = h : B$.

(c) If $T^{\alpha} \vdash \Sigma \rhd u_1 v_1 = u_2 v_2 : B$, then there are the following two possibilities: either $T^{\alpha} \vdash \Sigma, x : B, y : B \rhd x = y : B$ and B is a sort, or $T^{\alpha} \vdash \Sigma \rhd u_1 = u_2 : B^A$ and $T^{\alpha} \vdash \Sigma \rhd v_1 = v_2 : A$.

(d) If $T^{\alpha} \vdash \Sigma \rhd x = uv : X$ where X is a sort, then $T^{\alpha} \vdash \Sigma, y : X \rhd x = y : X$.

(e) If $T^{\alpha} \vdash \Sigma \rhd C[u_1, \ldots, u_l] = D[u_{l+1}, \ldots u_{l+l'}] : Z$ such that $C[\sqcup_1, \ldots, \sqcup_l]$ and $D[\sqcup_{l+1}, \ldots, \sqcup_{l+l''}]$ are the appropriate maximal simple heads and such that this case is not covered by (c) or (d), then there exists a function $\varphi : \{1, \ldots, l + l'\} \to \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and a sequence of sorts $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ so that $T^{-} \vdash x_1 : X_1, \ldots, x_n : X_n \rhd C[x_{\varphi(1)}, \ldots, x_{\varphi(l)}] = D[x_{\varphi(l+1)}, \ldots, x_{\varphi(l+l')}] : Z$ where for every i and j if $\varphi(i) = \varphi(j)$ then $T^{\alpha} \vdash \Sigma \rhd u_i = u_j : X_i$ and, moreover, for every $k \notin Image(\varphi)$ there is a term in context Σ of sort X_k. In the case when T is T^{λ}_{cat} (and $T^{-} = T_{un}$) $n = 1$.

Let us first observe that the case (e) would hold even if we were not to exclude its overlapping with (c) and (d), but this exclusion is helpful when extracting an algorithm out of the proposition.

Proof. By Theorem A.5, we may assume that proofs do not contain (*Transitivity*) or (*Symmetry*). We then proceed by induction on the height of a proof by a straightforward analysis of the last rules (for the precise definition of the *height* of a proof, see Definition A.12 below). □

To construct an algorithm from the above proposition, we would have to be able to determine the sequence $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ (in case (e)) not from the proof of $\Sigma \rhd f = g : Z$ but only from the fact that $\Sigma \rhd f : Z$ and $\Sigma \rhd g : Z$ are well-formed terms. In the case of T^{α}_{cat} (and T_{un}) it is trivial. However, in the case of T^{α}_{cart} (and T_{alg}) this is a difficult question, and in this case we will introduce a new assumption. But before we do that, let us prove a lemma.

Lemma A.7. For a type C we define its 'right sort' $R(C)$ as follows: $R(A^B) = R(A)$ and $R(X) = X$. Then

(i) If $T'^{\alpha} \vdash x : X, y : X, y_1 : A_1, \ldots, y_n : A_n \rhd x = y : X$ then $T_{alg} \vdash x : X, y : X, x_1 : R(A_1), \ldots, x_n : R(A_n) \rhd x = y : X$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(ii) If $T_{alg} \vdash x_1 : X_1, \ldots, x_n : X_n \triangleright x = y : X_1$ then $T'^{\alpha} \vdash x_1 : X_1, \ldots, x_n : X_n \triangleright x = y : X_1$.

Proof. The second statement is trivial. To prove the first, we observe that with several lambda abstractions we can always produce a term in context $x_i : R(A_i)$ of the type A_i. Substituting these terms in $x : X, y : X, y_1 : A_1, \ldots, y_n : A_n \triangleright x = y : X$, we obtain $T'^{\alpha} \vdash x : X, y : X, x_1 : R(A_1), \ldots, x_n : R(A_n) \triangleright x = y : X$. This latter equality is between two simple terms, so it can be shown that it had to hold in T_{alg}, as follows: the proof is by induction on the length of the derivation. By inspection, the only possible last rule is (Beq), for which the result follows by the induction assumption. □

Now we can introduce our additional hypothesis.

Assume: that the theory T_{alg} satisfies the 'non-empty' rule, *i.e.*,

$$\frac{\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{X}, y : Y \triangleright s = t : Z \quad y : Y \notin FV(s,t)}{\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{X} \triangleright s = t : Z}$$

(where $FV(s,t)$ denotes the variables occurring in s or t). The appropriate variant of the assumption is always trivially satisfied for T_{un}.

With this assumption, the above lemma becomes an equivalence and can be expressed as $T'_{\alpha} \vdash \Sigma \triangleright x = y : X$ iff $T_{alg} \vdash x : X, y : X \triangleright x = y : X$.

Also, the sequence $x_1 : X_1, \ldots, x_n : X_n$ in case (e) of Proposition A.6 is reduced to variables that actually appear. Since the converse of the above proposition obviously holds, the decidability of equality in T^{α}_{cart} has been reduced to the decidability of equality in T_{alg}. In that sense we have also reduced $NF4$ for $\equiv_T$ to the existence of these decision procedures.

As we mentioned above, T_{un} and T_{alg} correspond to the internal theories of categories and cartesian categories, respectively. Hence we have the following corollary.

Corollary A.8. (Reduction of Word Problems) In the case of T_{un}, our method reduces the word problem for the ccc generated by a category to the word problem of the starting category. In the case of T_{alg}, we reduce the word problem for the ccc generated by a cartesian category to the word problem of the starting cartesian category but only provided that in the starting cartesian category all projections are epi.

Let us summarize the algorithm: to test whether $T^{\lambda} \vdash \Sigma \triangleright u = v : A$, we first normalize u and v and then check $T^{\alpha} \vdash \Sigma \triangleright \mathbf{nf}(u) = \mathbf{nf}(v) : A$. For this we use Proposition A.6 and do case analysis on $\mathbf{nf}(u) : A$. First, if A is exponential, we get recursive calls corresponding to the appropriate parts of (a), (b), and (c). If A is a sort, we determine the maximal simple head of $\mathbf{nf}(u)$. When this is just a hole, we get recursive calls according to the appropriate parts of (c) and (d). Otherwise we use (e), but note that in the case of T^{α}_{cart} it is a non-trivial question to determine the sequence $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ from the sorts of the holes. With the non-emptiness assumption, we can take the sequence of sorts determined by the holes and try all of the finitely many φ's. Without the non-emptiness assumption, we would have had to consider sequences of sorts of unbounded length.

Remark A.9. There are several cases when the above assumption is satisfied: *e.g.*, when all the sorts have a closed term, or when in all the axioms all the variables appear on both sides of equations.

Remark A.10. What would happen if we were to work with an arbitrary λ-theory (*i.e.*,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

arbitrary operations and basic equations allowed). Using exactly the same reasoning as in Section A.2 we would obtain an algorithm that would satisfy NF1. But, in proving NF2, we would have to establish that $q_{A^B} q_{A^B}^{-1} \equiv 1$ (see the Fact in the proof of Lemma A.2). But to establish this, we would have to include β and η into $\equiv$. In other words, we would not reduce the problem of decidability of $\sim$ to anything but itself!

We now present an example that illustrates the need for the additional assumption on 'non-emptiness'.

Proposition A.11. There is a cartesian category with a decidable word problem but such that its free ccc closure has an undecidable word problem.

Proof. The cartesian category is the one obtained from the following algebraic theory. The sorts are Y, Z and X_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \ldots$ The generating arrows are: two constants $a, b : Z$ and the following family of constants $c_i : X_{f(i)}$ where f is a total recursive function whose range is not a recursive set. The only postulated equation is $y : Y \triangleright a = b : Z$ (the rest are provable equations in a cc).

Claim 1. Equality is decidable in this cartesian category.

Proof. (sketch) All the arrows are expressible as finite sequences of terms in context, and here we can generate only variables or constants. So, we only have to decide whether $u = v$ in context, where u, v are either variables or constants. In general they should be different, unless they are identical or they are $a = b$ and the context includes Y. □

Consider the free ccc closure of the above theory.

Claim 2. It is undecidable in this ccc closure whether

$$w : Y^{X_j} \triangleright a = b : Z\,.$$

Proof. We will show that $\{j \mid w : Y^{X_j} \triangleright a = b : Z\} = Range(f)$ and this will be sufficient. Obviously, if $j \in Range(f)$, say $j = f(i)$ for some i, then the constant c_i determines an arrow $1 \to X_j$. We then have an arrow $Y^{X_j} \to Y$. Using the fact that $y : Y \triangleright a = b : Z$, we have $w : Y^{X_j} \triangleright a = b : Z$. For the converse, assume that $w : Y^{X_j} \triangleright a = b : Z$. Then, by Proposition A.6 (e), we have $T_{alg} \vdash x_1 : X_1', \ldots, x_n : X_n' \triangleright a = b : Z$ and for every X_k' $k = 1, \ldots, n$ there exists a term/arrow in the ccc closure $Y^{X_j} \to X_k'$. By the proof of Claim 1, we know that one of X_k' must be Y. So, the above assumption $w : Y^{X_j} \triangleright a = b : Z$ is equivalent to the existence of an arrow in the ccc closure of the form $Y^{X_j} \to Y$. This is so iff there is an arrow in the ccc closure of the form $1 \to X_j$. The last equivalence is obvious from right to left. For the other direction one needs to examine the normal form of a term of sort Y with a free variable of type Y^{X_j}. It must be an application (it cannot be a λ, a variable or a basic constant). Let the application be uv. If u were not a variable it would have to be another application, *etc*. The leftmost term of this chain of applications would have to be a variable of higher type than Y^{X_j}. This is impossible, so u must be a variable of type Y^{X_j}. Now, v has to be of type X_j. If v is a constant, we are done. Otherwise, v has to be an application, but this time such a chain of applications would have to stop with the leftmost term being a variable of a 'very wrong type', *i.e*., having the rightmost type X_j, which is no good. A gluing argument following Lafont (*cf*. Lafont (1988), also

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reproduced in Crole (1993)) shows the fullness of the canonical embedding of a cartesian category into the free ccc generated by it. So, such an arrow $1 \to X_j$ has to be in the cartesian part. But the arrow must then arise from constants $c_i : X_j$, for some i such that $f(i) = j$; that is, $j \in Range(f)$. □

A.5. *Proof of Theorem A.5*

Although the main thing is the elimination of (*Transitivity*), we use the elimination of (*Symmetry*) to simplify this proof. The following exposition is modelled on the cut-elimination proof in Girard (1987). First we introduce some definitions.

Definition A.12.

(i) A *quasiterm* is a typed term without its explicit context.

(ii) For every quasiterm t its *degree* $d(t)$ is defined as follows: for a variable x, $d(x) = 1$; if $F[...]$ is not a single hole, then $d(F[u_1, \ldots, u_l]) = \max\{d(u_i) + 1 \mid i = 1, \ldots, l\}$; $d(uv) = \max\{d(u), d(v)\} + 1$; $d(\lambda x.u) = d(u) + 1$.

(iii) The *degree* $d(P)$ of a proof P of $\Sigma \triangleright f = g : A$ in T'_α is

$$sup\{d(t) \mid t \text{ is a 'middle' term of a } (Transitivity) \text{ rule in } P\}$$

and let $d(P) = 0$ if P does not contain any (*Transitivity*) rules.

(iv) The *height* $h(P)$ of a proof P in T'_α is defined inductively as follows: the height of an axiom (and of reflexivity) is 0; for all the other rules the height is defined as the maximum of the heights of the proofs of its assumptions increased by 1.

(v) The *width* $\gamma(t)$ of a term is defined to be 1 if the term is not typed by a sort; otherwise, $\gamma(t) = k$ where k is the number of holes in its maximal simple head (so, $\gamma(x) = \gamma(uv) = 1$).

(vi) The *width* $\gamma(P)$ of a proof is $\max\{\gamma(t) \mid t \text{ appears in } P \text{ as a subterm}\}$.

Now we can eliminate (*Symmetry*). We will prove the following claims and corollary.

Claim 1 For every proof in T'^{α} of $\Sigma \triangleright s = t : A$ that does not contain any (*Symmetry*) there is a proof in T'^{α} of $\Sigma \triangleright t = s : A$ of exactly the same height that does not contain the (*Symmetry*) rule either.

Proof. The proof is by induction on the height of the proof, observing that the equational consequences of T_{alg} and T_{un} are closed under (*Symmetry*). In other words: reverse each equality in the proof. □

Claim 2 For every proof in T'^{α} of $\Sigma \triangleright s = t : A$ in which the rule (*Symmetry*) was used exactly once at the end, there is a shorter proof of $\Sigma \triangleright s = t : A$ that does not use any (*Symmetry*) rule.

Proof. Just use the previous claim. □

Corollary A.13.

(a) If P is a proof in T'^{α} of $\Sigma \triangleright s = t : A$, there is a proof P' in T'^{α} of $\Sigma \triangleright s = t : A$ such that P' does not contain any symmetry and such that $d(P) = d(P')$, $h(P') \leqslant h(P)$ and $\gamma(P) = \gamma(P')$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(b) If P is a proof in T'^{α} of $\Sigma \triangleright s = t : A$ there is a proof P' in T'^{α} of $\Sigma \triangleright t = s : A$ such that P' does not contain any symmetry and such that $d(P) = d(P')$, $h(P') \leqslant h(P)$ and $\gamma(P) = \gamma(P')$.

Proof. Use the previous claims. It is important to observe that in the second part of the above statement, if P did not contain a symmetry, then P' can be obtained by reversing every equation in P. □

From now on assume that our T'^{α} does not contain the $(Symmetry)$ rule. We want to show that $(Transitivity)$ is also an admissible rule (in T'^{α}).

Lemma A.14. Given a proof P_1 of $\Sigma \triangleright f = g : A$ and a proof P_2 of $\Sigma \triangleright g = h : A$ in T'^{α} such that $d(P_1), d(P_2) < d(g) = n$, we can construct a proof P of $\Sigma \triangleright f = h : A$ in T'^{α} such that $d(P) < n$ and $h(P) \leqslant \gamma(g)(h(P_1) + h(P_2))$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on $\gamma(g)(h(P_1) + h(P_2))$. (This is a modification of Girard's approach(Girard 1987)). Recall that our rules are: $(Reflexivity)$, $(Transitivity)$ (App), (ξ) and $(ASub)$ or $(USub)$, respectively. Let us start with the easy cases.

If one of the last rules is reflexivity, just take the other proof to represent P. Obviously, it satisfies all the requirements. We have 12 more cases.

Suppose now that the last rule in P_1 is $(Transitivity)$, that is, suppose that P_1 is

$$\frac{\begin{matrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ f = b & b = g \end{matrix}}{f = g}\ (Tran)$$

and suppose that P_2 proves $g = h$. We can apply the induction hypothesis on P_{12} and P_2 and so obtain a proof P'_2 of $b = h$ of degree $< d(g)$ and $h(P'_2) \leqslant \gamma(g)(h(P_{12}) + h(P_2))$. Applying $(Transitivity)$ to the proof P_{11} of $f = b$ and to the previous proof of $b = h$, we obtain a proof of $f = h$ whose degree is again $< d(g)$ (since by assumption, $d(b) < d(g)$) and whose height is $\leqslant \max\{h(P_{11}), \gamma(g)(h(P_{12}) + h(P_2))\} + 1$. It is not difficult to see that this is $\leqslant \gamma(g)(h(P_1) + h(P_2))$.

A similar analysis holds in the case when P_2 ends with a transitivity.

Now we have 5 cases left. The cases when both proofs end with (App) or with (ξ) are quite easy: just use transitivity on their assumptions.

In the remaining 3 cases at least one rule ends up with $(ASub)$ (respectively, $(USub)$). Assume now that P_1 ends with

$$\frac{\mathscr{C}q\{\Sigma \triangleright u_i : X_k \mid i \in \varphi^{-1}(k)\}_{k=1,\ldots,n}}{\Sigma \triangleright F[u_1, \ldots, u_l] = v_1 w_1 : Y}$$

where $T_{alg} \vdash x_1 : X_1, \ldots x_n : X_n \triangleright F[x_{\varphi(1)}, \ldots, x_{\varphi(l)}] = x_{\varphi(l+1)} : Y$ and where $u_{l+1} \equiv v_1 w_1$; and assume also that P_2 is

$$\frac{\begin{matrix} P_{21} & P_{22} \\ v_1 = v_2 & w_1 = w_2 \end{matrix}}{v_1 w_1 = v_2 w_2}\ (App)$$

By the proof of the above corollary, part (b), we know that we also have a proof P'_2

$$\frac{\begin{matrix} P'_{21} & P'_{22} \\ v_2 = v_1 & w_2 = w_1 \end{matrix}}{v_2 w_2 = v_1 w_1}\ (App)$$

such that P'_2, P'_{21} and P'_{22} have the same characteristics as P_2, P_{21} and P_{22}, respectively.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let us now concentrate on $\mathscr{E}q\{\Sigma \triangleright u_i : X_k \mid i \in \varphi^{-1}(l+1)\} = \{\Sigma \triangleright u_{i_1} = u_{i_2}, \ldots, \Sigma \triangleright u_{i_{j-1}} = v_1w_1, \Sigma \triangleright v_1w_1 = u_{i_{j+1}}, \ldots, \Sigma \triangleright u_{i_r} = u_{i_1}\}$ in circular form. If this circle has only one equation, that is, $\Sigma \triangleright v_1w_1 = v_1w_1$, we can replace the proof of this equation by the reflexivity $\Sigma \triangleright v_2w_2 = v_2w_2$. Obviously, the new proof would satisfy all the requirements.

Assume now that the above circle of equations has at least two equations. By assumption, each of these equations is proved by a proof whose degree is $< d(v_1w_1)$ and whose height is $< h(P_1)$. In particular, it holds for the proof P_{11} of $u_{i_{j-1}} = v_1w_1$ and for the proof P_{12} of $v_1w_1 = u_{i_{j+1}}$. Now, we apply the induction hypothesis to P_{11} and P_2 and also to P_2' and P_{12}. In this way we obtain a proof P_3 of $u_{i_{j-1}} = v_2w_2$ and a proof P_4 of $v_2w_2 = u_{i_{j+1}}$ such that their degrees are $< d(v_1w_1)$ and $h(P_3) \leqslant 1(h(P_{11}) + h(P_2))$, $h(P_4) \leqslant 1(h(P_{12}) + h(P_2'))$. All the other equations from the above $\mathscr{E}q$ stay intact. By one application of the rule $(ASub)$ we obtain $F[u_1, \ldots, u_l] = v_2w_2$. This proof indeed has degree $< n$. Its height is

$$\begin{aligned} &\leqslant \max(\{h(P_i) + 1 \mid P_i \text{ is a proof of an 'intact' equation}\} \\ &\qquad \cup \{h(P_{11}) + h(P_2) + 1, h(P_{12}) + h(P_2') + 1\}). \end{aligned}$$

We have to show that this height is $\leqslant 1(h(P_1) + h(P_2))$. We know that

$$h(P_1) = \max(\{h(P_i) + 1 \mid P_i \text{ is a proof of an 'intact' equation}\} \cup \{h(P_{11}) + 1, h(P_{12}) + 1\}).$$

This indeed holds, since $h(P_2) = h(P_2')$.

The only remaining case is when both proofs end with $(ASub)$. So we have

$$\frac{\mathscr{E}q\{\Sigma \triangleright u_i : X_k \mid i \in \varphi^{-1}(k)\}_{k=1,\ldots,m}}{\Sigma \triangleright F[u_1, \ldots, u_l] = G[u_{l+1}, \ldots, u_{l+l'}] : Y}$$

where $T_{alg} \vdash x_1 : X_1, \ldots, x_m : X_m \triangleright F[x_{\varphi(1)}, \ldots, x_{\varphi(l)}] = G[x_{\varphi(l+1)}, \ldots, x_{\varphi(l+l')}] : Y$ and $\varphi : \{1, \ldots, l + l'\} \to \{1, \ldots m\}$) as the last rule of P_1 and

$$\frac{\mathscr{E}q\{\Sigma \triangleright u_i : X_k' \mid i \in \varphi'^{-1}(k)\}_{k=1,\ldots,m'}}{\Sigma \triangleright G[u_{l+1}, \ldots, u_{l+l'}] = H[u_{l+l'+1}, \ldots, u_{l+l'+l''}] : Y}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_{alg} \vdash x_1' : X_1', \ldots, x_{m'}' : X_{m'}' \triangleright\ & G[x'_{\varphi'(l+1)}, \ldots, x'_{\varphi'(l+l')}] \\ =\ & H[x'_{\varphi'(l+l'+1)}, \ldots, x'_{\varphi(l+l'+l'')}] : Y \end{aligned}$$

and with conditions similar to above, for example, $\varphi' : \{l + 1, \ldots, l + l' + l''\} \to \{1, \ldots, m'\}$) as the last rule of P_2.

The fact that for $j = l+1, \ldots, l+l'$ $x_{\varphi(j)}$ and $x'_{\varphi'(j)}$ take the same places in $G[\ldots]$ implies that $X_{\varphi(j)} = X'_{\varphi'(j)}$. We want to prove $\Sigma \triangleright F[u_1, \ldots, u_l] = H[u_{l+l'+1}, \ldots, u_{l+l'+l''}] : Y$ with a proof whose degree is $< d(G[u_{l+1}, \ldots, \ldots, u_{l+l'}]) = \max\{d(u_j) + 1 \mid j = l + 1, \ldots l + l'\}$ or $d(u_{l+1})$, depending on whether $G[...]$ is single hole or not, and with height $\leqslant \gamma(g)(h(P_1) + h(P_2)) = l'(h(P_1) + h(P_2))$.

Let us consider a pushout in *Sets* over $\varphi \cdot incl_2 : \{l + 1, \ldots, l + l'\} \to \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and $\varphi' \cdot incl_1' : \{l + 1 \ldots, l + l'\} \to \{1, \ldots, m'\}$. Denote the two newly obtained functions by $I : \{1, \ldots, m\} \to \{1, \ldots, m''\}$ and $I' : \{1, \ldots, m'\} \to \{1, \ldots, m''\}$. Recall that we can think of $\{1, \ldots, m''\}$ as a set of equivalence classes on the disjoint union $\{1, \ldots, m\} \sqcup \{1, \ldots, m'\}$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

generated by the relation: $\{\varphi(i) \sim \varphi'(i) \mid i = l+1,\ldots,l+l'\}$. Since φ and φ' preserve the typing, it follows that the variables in the same equivalence class have the same sort and that I and I' preserve the sorts. For every such sort we take a different variable and in that way we obtain a sequence $y_1 : Y_1,\ldots,y_{m''} : Y_{m''}$.

First we observe that if

$$T_{alg} \vdash (x_1 : X_1,\ldots,x_m : X_m \rhd F[x_{\varphi(1)},\ldots,x_{\varphi(l)}] = G[x_{\varphi(l+1)},\ldots,x_{\varphi(l+l')}] : Y)$$

then

$$T_{alg} \vdash (y_1 : Y_1,\ldots,y_{m''} : Y_{m''} \rhd F[y_{I(\varphi(1))},\ldots,y_{I(\varphi(l))}] = G[y_{I(\varphi(l+1))},\ldots,y_{I(\varphi(l+l'))}] : Y)$$

also, since all that happens is that some variables are identified, renamed, and new variables are added. Similarly, if

$$\begin{aligned} T_{alg} \vdash (x'_1 : X'_1,\ldots,x'_{m'} : X'_{m'} \rhd\ & G[x'_{\varphi'(l+1)},\ldots,x'_{\varphi'(l+l')}] \\ =\ & H[x'_{\varphi'(l+l'+1)},\ldots,x'_{\varphi(l+l'+l'')}] : Y) \end{aligned}$$

then also

$$\begin{aligned} T_{alg} \vdash (y_1 : Y_1,\ldots,y_{m''} : Y_{m''} \rhd\ & G[y_{I'(\varphi'(l+1))},\ldots,y_{I'(\varphi'(l+l'))}] \\ =\ & H[y_{I'(\varphi'(l+l'+1))},\ldots,y_{I'(\varphi(l+l'+l''))}] : Y). \end{aligned}$$

We also know that $G[y_{I(\varphi(l+1))},\ldots,y_{I(\varphi(l+l'))}] \equiv G[y_{I'(\varphi'(l+1))},\ldots,y_{I'(\varphi'(l+l'))}]$ by the definition of the above pushout. Since T_{alg} is closed under transitivity, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{alg} \vdash (y_1 : Y_1,\ldots,y_{m''} : Y_{m''} \rhd\ & F[y_{I(\varphi(1))},\ldots,y_{I(\varphi(l))}] \\ =\ & H[y_{I'(\varphi'(l+l'+1))},\ldots,y_{I'(\varphi'(l+l'+l''))}] : Y). \end{aligned}$$

(Here, we are not actually using the kind of transitivity that we want to eliminate!)

We also know that $\{1,\ldots,l+l'+l''\}$ is a pushout of $\{1,\ldots,l+l'\}$ and $\{l+1,\ldots,l+l'+l''\}$ over $\{l+1,\ldots,l+l'\}$, therefore there exists a unique function $\psi_0 : \{1,\ldots,l+l'+l''\} \to \{1,\ldots,m''\}$ satisfying the universal property. In other words, ψ_0 can be defined as follows:

$$\psi_0(i) = \begin{cases} I\varphi(i) & \text{if } i \in \{1,\ldots l\} \\ I\varphi(i) = I'\varphi'(i) & \text{if } i \in \{l+1,\ldots,l+l'\} \\ I'\varphi'(i) & \text{if } i \in \{l+l'+1,\ldots,l+l'+l''\}. \end{cases}$$

Let $\psi : \{1,\ldots,l\} \sqcup \{l+l'+1,\ldots,l+l'+l''\} \to \{1,\ldots,m''\}$ denote the appropriate restriction of ψ_0. With this notation, the above equation reads $y_1 : Y_1,\ldots,y_{m''} : Y_{m''} \rhd F[y_{\psi(1)},\ldots,y_{\psi(l))}] = H[y_{\psi(l+l'+1)},\ldots,y_{\psi(l+l'+l'')}] : Y$. Recall that our goal is to prove $\Sigma \rhd F[u_1,\ldots,u_l] = H[u_{l+l'+1},\ldots,u_{l+l'+l''}] : Y$ with a proof whose degree is $< d(G[u_{l+1},\ldots,u_{l+l'}])$ and whose height $\leqslant \gamma(g)(h(P_1)+h(P_2)) = l'(h(P_1)+h(P_2))$. Having the above equality in T_{alg} and using the rule $(ASub)$, it would be enough to show that we can obtain $\mathscr{E}q\{\Sigma \rhd u_i : Y_k \mid i \in \psi^{-1}(k)\}$ for every $k = 1,\ldots,m''$ in the 'proper' way, that is, if $\{u_{i_1},\ldots,u_{i_r}\} = \psi^{-1}(k)$, we can prove that each $\Sigma \rhd u_{i_1} = u_{i_2},\ldots,\Sigma \rhd u_{i_r} = u_{i_1}$ with a proof Q whose degree is $< d(G[u_{l+1},\ldots,\ldots,u_{l+l'}])$ and whose height is $< l'(h(P_1)+h(P_2))$.

First, notice that $\psi^{-1}(k) = \psi_0^{-1}(k) \cap (\{1,\ldots l\} \sqcup \{l+l'+1\ldots,l+l'+l''\})$. In order to maintain our assumption on $\psi^{-1}(k)$ when k is not in the image of ψ, we need the following

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

additional definitions. For $k \notin Image(\psi)$ define $\varphi_0^{-1}(k)$ to be $\varphi^{-1}(k)$ or $\varphi'^{-1}(k)$ depending on whether k is in the image of I or I'; this definition is correct since I is just inclusion on $\{1,\ldots,m\} - Image(\varphi)$ and similarly for I'. In addition, I and I' do not intersect when restricted to those sets. Recall that this means, that $\psi_0^{-1}(k)$ is a single term in context Σ and of type Y_k. We take this as the definition of $\psi^{-1}(k)$ as well for such a k. There is one more case to be considered: $k \in Image(\psi_0) - Image(\psi)$. That means that all the u's that got substituted instead of the k-th variable appeared only in $G[u_{l+1},\ldots,u_{l+l'}]$. We choose any such term u to represent $\psi^{-1}(k)$.

It is useful to visualize the situation as follows: let us call $u_1,\ldots,u_l$ 'black' terms, $u_{l+1},\ldots,u_{l+l'}$ 'gray' and $u_{l+l'+1},\ldots,u_{l+l'+l''}$ 'white'. For each $k = 1,\ldots,m$ we call $\mathscr{E}q\{\Sigma \triangleright u_i : X_k \mid i \in \varphi^{-1}(k)\}$ a 'black circle' (although it could be entirely made of gray elements!), and for each $k = 1,\ldots,m'$ we call $\mathscr{E}q\{\Sigma \triangleright u_i : X'_k \mid i \in \varphi'^{-1}(k)\}$ a 'white circle' (again a white circle could be entirely gray). Each $\psi_0^{-1}(s)$ can be considered as a union of black and white circles. Obviously, black circles are disjoint from each other as are the white ones (therefore, each gray element appears in exactly one black and one white circle). One black and one white circle can have an empty intersection or they can have several common gray elements. By the definition of the above pushout, we have that each $\psi_0^{-1}(s)$ is a maximal 'chain' of circles that are of interchanged colour (a chain is a union of circles C_1,...,C_a such that C_i and C_{i+1} have common elements). From each such chain we first want to produce a circle that may possibly have fewer gray elements but in which the black and white ones must remain the same. Let us first consider a couple of special cases that come from our convention on $\psi^{-1}(k)$ when k is not in the image of ψ. As we have said earlier, if $k \notin Image(\psi_0)$, one reflexivity will constitute the 'circle' $\mathscr{E}q\{\Sigma \triangleright u : X_k\}$ and if $k \in Image(\psi_0) - Image(\psi)$, the above chain is entirely gray and we choose an arbitrary element and reflexivity to represent this $\mathscr{E}q$ circle. Observe also that if a circle in a chain consists only of one element, there are two cases: if this element is not gray, the whole chain is actually just this 'singleton' circle; if this element is gray, it is a member of another circle or again we have a chain with just one singleton circle. Moreover, this chain can be considered as a single circle already (since otherwise we would have an intersection of two circles of the same colour). Now we are left with the less trivial case that the chain is not entirely gray and that each circle in the chain has at least two elements.

Before we analyse that, let us recall that each 'edge' in a circle is actually one equation, which, by the induction assumption, is proved with a proof whose degree is $< n$ and whose height is $\leqslant \max\{h(P_1) - 1, h(P_2) - 1\}$. So, suppose that we have circles C_1, ..., C_a. We claim that we can make such a chain into a circle where each edge will again have a proof of degree $< n$ and of height $\leqslant 2\max\{h(P_1) - 1, h(P_2) - 1\}$. Let us start with just two circles. Suppose that the first circle consists of $a_1 = a_2$,...,$a_{i-1} = c$, $c = a_{i+1}$,...,$a_n = a_1$ and the second consists of $b_1 = b_2$,...,$b_{j-1} = c$, $c = b_{j+1}$,...,$b_m = b_1$, where c denotes a common element. The new circle is going to be $a_1 = a_2$,...,$a_{i-1} = b_{j+1}$,...,$b_m = b_1$, $b_1 = b_2$,...,$b_{j-1} = a_{i+1}$,...,$a_n = a_1$. To form this new circle, we needed to use $a_{i-1} = c$ and $c = b_{j+1}$ to obtain $a_{i-1} = b_{j+1}$, and, similarly, $b_{j-1} = c$ and $c = a_{i+1}$ to obtain $b_{j-1} = a_{i+1}$. All the other equations are left as they were. We consider two cases:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(i) $G[\ldots]$ is just a single hole. In that case the middle term of transitivity is u_{l+1} and its degree is n by assumption. This has to be our c since this is the only possible common term (and in this case the maximal chain has at most two circles). By the induction hypothesis, we can obtain the new equations with proofs whose degrees are again $< n$ and whose heights are $\leqslant 1(h(P') + h(P''))$ where P' is the proof of $a_{i-1} = c$ and P'' is a proof $c = b_{j+1}$ (similarly for b's). Recall that $\gamma(c) = 1$, since c is an application or a variable. Therefore, all the equations in the new circle have proofs of degree $< n$ and heights $\leqslant h(P_1) - 1 + h(P_2) - 1$.

(ii) Assume now that $G[\ldots]$ is not a single hole and that it has l' holes (still, l' could be 1). We can obtain the above two new equations using the two transitivity rules (and not the induction hypothesis!) whose degrees are $< d(G[u_{l+1}, \ldots, u_{l+l'}] = n$ and the heights of the new proofs are $\max\{h(P'), h(P'')\} + 1$ where P' and P'' are as in the previous case. These heights are $\leqslant \max\{h(P_1), h(P_2)\}$.

If we have more than 2 circles, we do not have to consider the first case. On the other hand, we would have to repeat Step (ii) $a - 1$ times. In the final circle, every equation would have been proved with a proof whose degree is $< n$ and the height $\leqslant \max\{h(P_1), h(P_2)\} + a - 2$. Notice also that each application of Step (ii) reduces the number of gray elements by 1.

After such a procedure, we have ended up with a single circle, which possibly contains some gray elements. If this new circle does not contain gray elements, we are done. Also, we are done if such a circle has exactly one, even if gray, element.

If it does have at least 2 elements and at least one of them is gray, we again separate two cases:

(a) If $G[\ldots]$ was a single hole, the gray element could have 'survived' the above Step (i) only if Step (i) was not even applied, *i.e.*, if one of the circles consisted of only one gray element, and in this case we considered the chain to be a single circle. So, this circle can be represented as $a_1 = a_2, \ldots, a_{i-1} = c$, $c = a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_n = a_1$, where c is the single gray element. We can apply the induction assumption on $a_{i-1} = c$ and $c = a_{i+1}$ to get $a_{i-1} = a_{i+1}$ (the other equations stay intact). This proof of $a_{i-1} = a_{i+1}$ again has degree $< d(c) = n$ and height $\leqslant 1(h(P') + h(P''))$ where P' and P'' are the proofs of $a_{i-1} = c$ and $c = a_{i+1}$, respectively.

(b) If $G[u_{l+1}, \ldots, u_{l+l'}]$ is not a single hole, then again we would have a circle with at most $l' - a + 1$ gray elements such that each equation has been proved with a proof whose degree is $< n$ and whose height is $\leqslant \max\{h(P_1), h(P_2)\} + a - 2$. Also, the degree of each term in the circle is $< n$. Now applying at most $l' - a + 1$ transitivity rules, we can get rid of all the gray elements and the proofs of final equations will be of degree $< n$ and of height

$$\leqslant (\max\{h(P_1), h(P_2)\} + a - 2) + (l' - a + 1) = \max\{h(P_1), h(P_2)\} + l' - 1.$$

In this manner, we have shown that for each $k = 1, \ldots, m''$, $\mathscr{C}q\{\Sigma \triangleright u_i : Y_k \mid i \in \psi^{-1}(k)\}$ can be arranged in a circle of equations whose proofs have degrees $< n$ and whose heights are $< l'(h(P_1) + h(P_2))$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The other cases are much simpler. □

Remark A.15. If we were to work 'in parallel', the above $\gamma(g)$ in the estimate for height could have been lowered to $\lceil log_2(l') \rceil + 1$, that is, the number of digits needed to write l' in base 2.

Lemma A.16. If P is a proof of $\Sigma \triangleright a = b$ in T'_α and $d(P) > 0$, there is a proof P' of $\Sigma \triangleright a = b$ in T'_α such that $d(P') < d(P)$ and $h(P') \leqslant h(P)^{\gamma(P)}$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on $h(P)$, again examining all the possible last rules. □

We now restate and prove the elimination of transitivity theorem with some estimates.

Theorem A.17. If P is a proof of $\Sigma \triangleright a = b$ in T'_α, there exists a transitivity free proof P' of $\Sigma \triangleright a = b$ in T'_α such that $h(P') \leqslant (2\gamma)_{deg(P)}(h(P))$, where $(2\gamma)_0(h(P)) = h(P)$ and $(2\gamma)_{n+1}(h(P)) = (2\gamma)^{(2\gamma)_n(h(P))}$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on $d(P)$ and the previous lemma. □

Acknowledgements

The work on this paper has been done while D. Čubrić was an NSERC postdoctoral fellow at the Department of Pure Mathematics of Cambridge University, associated to Martin Hyland. He would like to thank them all. Part of the work on this paper was done at the Newton Institute while the second and third author participated in the programme on Semantics of Computation during the autumn of 1995. We gratefully acknowledge the support of the Newton Institute. P. Dybjer also wishes to acknowledge support from ESPRIT Basic Research Action 6811 Categorical Logic in Computer Science (CLiCS-II) and from TFR, the Swedish Technical Research Council. P. Scott was also partially supported by an operating grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC). The authors would like to thank the anonymous referee for careful reading and detailed comments.

References

Aczel, P. (1993) Galois: a theory development project. In: A report on work in progress for the Turin meeting on the *Representation of Logical Frameworks.*

Altenkirch, T., Hofmann, M. and Streicher, T. (1995) Categorical reconstruction of a reduction-free normalisation proof. Proc. CTCS '95. *Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **953** 182–199.

Barendregt, H. P. (1984) *The Lambda Calculus*, Studies in Logic **103**, North-Holland.

Barendregt, H. P. (1992) Lambda Calculus with Types. In: Abramsky, S., Gabbay, D. and Maibaum, T. (eds.) *Handbook of Logic in Computer Science*, Vol. 2, Oxford University Press.

Beeson, M. (1985) *Foundations of Constructive Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag.

Berger, U. and Schwichtenberg, H. (1991) An inverse to the evaluation functional for typed λ-calculus. *Proc. of the 6th Annual IEEE Symposium of Logic in Computer Science* 203–211.

Beylin, I. and Dybjer, P. (1996) Extracting a proof of coherence for monoidal categories from a proof of normalization for monoids. In: Berardi, S. and Coppo, M. (eds.) Types for Proofs and Programs (= TYPES '95). *Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **1158** 47–61.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Breazu-Tannen, V. (1988) Combining algebra and higher-order types. *Proc. Logic in Computer Science (LICS)* 82–90.

Coquand, C. (1993) From Semantics to Rules: a Machine Assisted Analysis. In: Gurevich, Y. and Meinke, K. (eds.) Proceedings of CSL '93, Egon Börger. *Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **832**.

Coquand, T. and Dybjer, P. (1997) Intuitionistic Model Constructions and Normalization Proofs. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* **7** 75–94.

Crole, R. (1993) *Categories for Types*, Cambridge Mathematical Textbooks.

Čubrić, D. (to appear) Embedding of a free cartesian closed category into the category of Sets. To appear in *J. Pure and Applied algebra.*

Di Cosmo, R. (1995) *Isomorphism of Types: from λ-calculus to information retrieval and language design*, Birkhäuser.

Duval, D. and Reynaud, J.-C. (1994) Sketches and computation I: basic definitions and static evaluation. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* **4** 185–238.

Friedman, H. (1975) Equality between functionals. Logic Colloquium '73. *Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **453** 22–37.

Girard, J. Y. (1987) *Proof Theory and Logical Complexity*, Vol. 1, Bibliopolis.

Girard, J. Y., Lafont, Y. and Taylor, P. (1989) *Proofs and Types*, Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science **7**, Cambridge University Press.

Gordon, R., Power, A. and Street, R. (1996) *Coherence for tricategories*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society.

Harnik, V. and Makkai, M. (1992) Lambek's categorical proof theory and Läuchli's abstract realizability. *J. Symbolic Logic* **57** 200–230.

Huet, G. (1976) *Résolution d'équations dans les langages d'ordre* $1, 2, \ldots, \omega$, Thèse d'Etat, U. Paris VII.

Huet, G. and Saibi, A. (1995) Constructive Category Theory. *Proceedings of the Joint CLICS-TYPES Workshop on Categories and Type Theory* (Göteborg), January 1995.

Joyal, A. and Street, R. (1993) Braided tensor categories. *Advances in Mathematics* **102** (1) 20–79.

Jouannaud, J.-P. and Okada, M. (1991) A Computation Model for Executable Higher-Order Algebraic Specification Languages. *LICS 6* (sixth Annual IEEE Symp. on Logic in Computer Science) 350–361.

Kelly, G. M. (1982) *Basic Concepts of Enriched Category Theory*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes **64**, Cambridge University Press.

Lack, S. G. (1995) *The algebra of distributive and extensive categories,* Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge.

Lafont, Y. (1988) *Logiques, catégories et machines*, Thèse de doctorat, Université Paris VII.

Lambek, J. (1968) Deductive Systems and Categories I. *J. Math. Systems Theory* **2** 278–318.

Lambek, J. and Scott, P. J. (1986) *Introduction to Higher Order Categorical Logic*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **7**, Cambridge University Press.

Mac Lane, S. (1971) *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **5**, Springer-Verlag.

Martin-Löf, P. (1975a) An Intuitionistic Theory of Types: Predicative Part. In: Rose, H. E. and Shepherdson, J. C. (eds.) *Logic Colloquium '73*, North-Holland 73–118.

Martin-Löf, P. (1975b) About Models for Intuitionistic Type Theories and The Notion of Definitional Equality. In: Kanger, S. (ed.) *Proceedings of the 3rd Scandinavian Logic Symposium*, North-Holland 81–109.

Mitchell, J. C. (1990) Type Systems for Programming Languages. In: Van Leeuwen, J. (ed.) *Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science*, Vol.B, (*Formal Models and Semantics*), North-Holland 365–458.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mitchell, J. C. and Scott, P. J. (1989) Typed Lambda Models and Cartesian Closed Categories. In: Gray, J. and Scedrov, A. (eds.) *Contemp. Math.: Categories in Computer Science and Logic* **92** 301–316.

Pitts, A. (1997) Categorical Logic. In: Abramsky, S., Gabbay, D. M. and Maibaum, T. S. E. (eds.) *Handbook of Logic in Computer Science*, Vol. 6, Oxford University Press (to appear).

Power, J. (1989) A general coherence result. *J. Pure and Applied Algebra* **57** 165-173.

Statman, R. (1985) Logical Relations and the Typed Lambda Calculus. *Inf. and Control* **65** 85–97.

Troelstra, A. S. (1973) Metamathematical investigations of intuitionistic arithmetic and analysis. *Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **344**.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002508 Published online by Cambridge University Press