

## Trivial

A term rewrite step  $s \rightarrow t$  is *trivial* if  $s = t$ . One would expect that if a term allows a trivial step, it cannot be normalising. . . Unless, of course, another step eliminating the trivial one can be performed. The term  $a$  in the term rewrite system (TRS)  $\{a \rightarrow a, a \rightarrow b\}$  allows a trivial step, but can be normalised to  $b$  as well. The term  $f(a)$  in the orthogonal TRS  $\{a \rightarrow a, f(x) \rightarrow b\}$  allows a trivial step, but can be normalised to  $a$ . The elimination is caused by a critical step in the former, and by an erasing step in the latter case. These are the only problems. A term allowing a trivial head-step cannot be normalising in an (almost) orthogonal TRS by the results of [2, 3].

**Lemma** *A term  $s$  allowing a trivial head-step  $\phi$  by rule  $\rho : l \rightarrow r$  is not normalising in a weakly orthogonal term TRS, i.e. a left-linear TRS such that  $s = t$  for every critical pair  $(s, t)$ .*

**Proof** We construct a prefix  $C$ , such that  $l^\Omega \leq C \leq t$  for any  $s \rightarrow t$ , where  $l^\Omega = l^{\lceil \bar{x} := \Omega \rceil}$ :

- Let  $C = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} C_i$ , where  $C_0 = l^\Omega$ , and for  $i \geq 0$ ,  $C_{i+1} = \triangleleft_\phi C_i$  [1]. (See below for examples.)

Remark that for any prefix  $D$  of  $s$ ,  $\triangleleft_\phi D$  is a prefix of  $s$  again [3]. Hence to show  $l^\Omega \leq C \leq s$ , it suffices by  $C_0 = l^\Omega$  to show monotonicity:  $C_i \leq C_{i+1}$ ,  $\forall i \geq 0$ , by induction on  $i$ . The base case  $l^\Omega \leq C_1$  holds since the head-symbol of  $r$  traces back to any position in  $l$ . In the induction step, suppose  $p \in C_i$  for some  $i > 0$ . By definition of  $C_i$ , there exists some  $q \in C_{i-1}$  such that  $p \triangleright_\phi q$ . By the induction hypothesis  $q \in C_i$ , hence  $p \in C_{i+1}$ .

To show  $C \leq t$ , for any  $s \rightarrow t$ , it suffices to show that  $C[s_1, \dots, s_n] \rightarrow t$  implies  $t = C[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ , for any  $s_1, \dots, s_n$ . Remark that this holds for the special case of a head-step by rule  $\rho$ , since any position in  $C$  descends to some position in  $C$  again, by construction of  $C$ . Consider a general step. If it takes places in one of  $s_1, \dots, s_n$ , then it is clear again. For a proof by contradiction, consider a step  $\psi$  at position  $p$ , overlapping with  $C$  and modifying some symbol in  $C$  at position  $q$ . Let  $C_i$  be the first prefix containing  $q$ , for  $i \geq 0$ . Then by construction,  $q$  has a unique trace through the  $C_i, \dots, C_0$  to some position in  $l^\Omega$ , along a reduction  $\mathcal{R}$  consisting of  $i$  head- $\rho$ -steps. Since  $p$  is above  $q$ , this induces a unique trace of  $p$  through  $C_i, \dots, C_0$  along  $\mathcal{R}$  as well, until it overlaps  $l^\Omega$ . Let  $q'$  be the descendant of  $q$ , and  $\psi'$  be the residual of  $\psi$ , at that moment. Contracting  $\psi'$  modifies position  $q'$  since  $\psi'$  is a residual of  $\psi$ , but contracting the overlapping rule  $\rho$  would not modify  $q'$  as was seen in the special case. This contradicts weak orthogonality.

The result follows, since any reduct of  $s$  is of shape  $C[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ , hence a redex for rule  $\rho$ .  $\square$

We give some examples illustrating the construction of  $C$ .

1. Consider the trivial head-step  $f(a, a) \rightarrow f(a, a)$  in the TRS  $\{f(x, y) \rightarrow f(y, x), a \rightarrow b\}$ . Then  $C = f(\Omega, \Omega)$ . Note that projecting the infinite trivial head-reduction over the step  $f(a, a) \rightarrow f(b, a)$  yields an infinite non-trivial head-reduction:  $f(b, a) \rightarrow f(a, b) \rightarrow f(b, a) \rightarrow \dots$
2. Consider the trivial head-step  $f(a, a, \dots, a) \rightarrow f(a, a, \dots, a)$  in the TRS  $\{f(a, x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow f(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_n)\}$ . Then the  $C_i$  stabilise only after  $n$  steps:  $C_0 = f(a, \Omega, \dots, \Omega)$ ,  $C_1 = f(a, a, \dots, \Omega), \dots, C_n = f(a, a, \dots, a) = C$ .

This proof is terribly ad hoc. A theory of descendants for non-orthogonal rewriting seems required.

## References

- [1] I. Bethke, J.W. Klop, and R. de Vrijer. Descendants and origins in term rewriting. *I&C*, ?? 72 pp.
- [2] A. Middeldorp. Call by need computations to root-stable form. *POPL97*, pp. 94–105, 1997.
- [3] V. van Oostrom. Normalisation in weakly orthogonal rewriting. *RTA99*, LNCS 1631, pp. 60–74, 1999.