

# THEORETICAL PEARL

## *A Bargain for Intersection Types: A Simple Strong Normalization Proof*

PETER MØLLER NEERGAARD

*Michtom School of Computer Science, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02454*  
(e-mail: [turtle@achilles.linearity.org](mailto:turtle@achilles.linearity.org))

### Abstract

This pearl gives a discount proof of the folklore theorem that every strongly  $\beta$ -normalizing  $\lambda$ -term is typable with an intersection type. (We consider typings that do not use the empty intersection  $\omega$  which can type any term.) The proof uses the perpetual reduction strategy which finds a longest path. This is a simplification over existing proofs that consider any longest reduction path. The choice of reduction strategy avoids the need for weakening or strengthening of type derivations. The proof becomes a bargain because it works for more intersection type systems, while being simpler than existing proofs.

Do we have a bargain for you! We prove that the set of  $\lambda$ -terms typable with an intersection type is exactly the strongly normalizing terms. The bargain is that we—to paraphrase Walmart—get more for less: our proof is simpler than existing proofs, but handles more systems of intersection types. The novel idea is that we use a specific reduction strategy rather than considering “any maximal reduction path”. A benefit of approach is that our type system does not need weakening or strengthening of type derivations.

Intersection types have been around for about three decades. The original interest was theoretical: intersection types were introduced to characterize the set of solvable terms. Within the last decade they have gained traction for more practical purposes of program analysis.<sup>1</sup> The key idea is to introduce an intersection type operator  $\wedge$  with the meaning that a term of type  $\tau \wedge \sigma$  can be used at both types  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$ . This provides a finite polymorphism where the various types of a term is listed explicitly and where strictly more terms can be typed than with the well-known universal polymorphism. In fact, it is a folklore theorem that the set of strongly  $\beta$ -normalizing  $\lambda$ -terms is exactly the set of terms that can be given an intersection type. This was first presented by Pottinger (1980). According to Kfoury (2000) Betty Venneri found subtle errors in the part that all strongly normalizing terms have an intersection types in that and a large number of subsequent proofs. Kfoury

<sup>1</sup> Kfoury (2000) gives references on the history and Kfoury and Wells (2004) provide references on the practical usage.

attributes the first correct proof in the published literature to Amadio and Curien some fifteen years later (Amadio & Curien, 1998).

In this pearl we focus on the tricky direction and prove that all strongly  $\beta$ -normalizing  $\lambda$ -terms have an intersection type. The general approach taken in many proofs, including the proof by Amadio and Curien, is the following:

1. establish that all  $\beta$ -normal forms have an intersection type, and
2. show that the type system has subject expansion under non-erasing reductions ( $I$ -redexes), i.e., that if the term  $M$  reduces to  $N$  (written  $M \rightarrow_{\beta} N$ ) and  $N$  is typable, then  $M$  is typable *with the same typing*.

By definition, all strongly normalizing terms have a longest reduction path. We consider any such reduction path

$$M_0 \rightarrow_{\beta} M_1 \rightarrow_{\beta} \cdots \rightarrow_{\beta} M_n$$

where  $M_n$  is a  $\beta$ -normal form. We want to prove that  $M_0$  is typable. The base case where  $n = 0$  and  $M_n = M_0$  is covered by Point 1. In the inductive step, we use Point 2 when  $M_0 \rightarrow_{\beta} M_1$  is non-erasing. When  $M_0 \rightarrow_{\beta} M_1$  erases a subterm of  $M_0$ , both the contractum and the erased subterm have shorter longest reduction paths than  $M_0$ . Therefore, they are typable by induction hypothesis and it is easy to construct a type for  $M_0$ .

It is straightforward to prove Point 1. However, Point 2 requires weakening and strengthening of type derivations, i.e., that we can add or remove unused variables to the type environment. This poses a problem as the most rigid intersection type systems do not have weakening or strengthening, e.g., System- $\mathbb{I}$  proposed by Kfoury and Wells (2004). Consequently, we cannot transfer Amadio and Curien's proof to these systems, but need indirect means. For instance, Kfoury and Wells prove that all System- $\mathbb{I}$  terms are strongly normalizing by a translation into a type system that Kfoury has previously proved strongly normalizing (Kfoury, 2000).

In this pearl, we circumvent weakening and strengthening by considering a specific longest reduction path, the perpetual strategy. The longest reduction path is chosen so we can transform a typing of the reduced term to a typing of the original term without strengthening and weakening. Combining this result with Point 1, we conclude that all strongly normalizable terms are typable. We get a simpler proof that works for more type systems. Now, that could be considered a bargain.

## 1 Outline

In the following section we recall a few notions of the  $\lambda$ -calculus and define intersection types. In Section 3, we introduce our reduction strategy and establish the properties outlined above. We conclude the pearl with a discussion of related work.

All omitted details of the proof can be found in my dissertation (Møller Neergaard, 2004), where the proof method is applied to System- $\mathbb{I}$ .

Table 1. *Terminology*

Concept	Syntax	Meta variables
Term variable	$\mathcal{V}_\Lambda$	$x, y, z, v, u, f, g$
Terms	$\Lambda \ni M ::= x \mid \lambda x.M \mid M M$	$M, N, P, Q, R$
Type variable	$\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{T}$	$a, b$
Strict type	$\overline{\mathcal{T}} \ni \overline{\tau} ::= a \mid \tau \rightarrow \overline{\tau}$	$\overline{\tau}$
Type	$\mathcal{T} \ni \tau ::= \overline{\tau} \mid \tau \wedge \tau$	$\tau$
Type environment		$\Gamma$

Fig. 1. Intersection type typing rules

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{x : \overline{\tau} \vdash x : \overline{\tau}} \text{Var} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, x : \tau \vdash P : \overline{\tau}}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda^I x.P : \tau \rightarrow \overline{\tau}} \lambda\text{I} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash P : \overline{\tau}'}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda^K x.P : \overline{\tau} \rightarrow \overline{\tau}'} \lambda\text{K} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash P : \tau \quad \Gamma' \vdash P : \tau'}{\Gamma \wedge \Gamma' \vdash P : \tau \wedge \tau'} \wedge \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash P : \tau \rightarrow \overline{\tau} \quad \Gamma' \vdash Q : \tau}{\Gamma \wedge \Gamma' \vdash P Q : \overline{\tau}} @
\end{array}$$

## 2 Preliminaries on Rigid Intersection Types

We consider  $\lambda$ -terms typed with intersection types. Let  $\mathcal{V}_\Lambda$  and  $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{T}$  be a countably infinite sets of (term) variables and type variables, resp. Table 1 presents the term and type syntax and meta variable conventions for the remainder of the paper. We use  $\text{fv}(P)$  for the set of free variables in  $P$  and use  $\lambda x^I.P$  to denote an abstraction where  $x \in \text{fv}(P)$  and  $\lambda x^K.P$  when  $x \notin \text{fv}(P)$ . We adopt Barendregt's variable convention (Barendregt, 1984) and assume implicitly that an abstraction variable is not mentioned elsewhere in the current context (proof, discussion, etc). We define  $\beta$ -reduction in the usual way:

$$(\lambda x.P) Q \quad \beta \quad P[Q/x]$$

where  $P[Q/x]$  is the capture-free substitution of  $Q$  for  $x$  in  $P$ . The compatible closure of  $\beta$  is  $\rightarrow_\beta$ . The set of normal forms under  $\rightarrow_\beta$  is  $\text{NF}_\beta$ .

As usual, a type environment is a finite mapping from  $\mathcal{V}_\Lambda$  to  $\mathcal{T}$ . We write  $x : \tau$  for  $\Gamma(x) = \tau$ . When  $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$ , we write  $\Gamma, x : \tau$  for the extension of  $\Gamma$  with  $x : \tau$ . We extend  $\wedge$  to a binary operation on type environments  $\Gamma_0$  and  $\Gamma_1$  by intersecting the type of common variables:

$$\Gamma_0 \wedge \Gamma_1 = \{x : \tau \mid x : \tau \in \Gamma_i, x \notin \Gamma_{1-i}\} \cup \{x : \tau_0 \wedge \tau_1 \mid x : \tau_i \in \Gamma_i\} .$$

We give the typing rules in Fig. 1. When there is a derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ , we call  $\langle \Gamma; \tau \rangle$  a typing of  $M$ .

There are some subtleties to be aware of: As all rules but  $\wedge$  conclude with a strict

type, the  $\wedge$ -rule can only be used on the operand of an application or at the very bottom of a type derivation. There is exactly one variable in the type environment of the Var rule—this prevents weakening.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, due to the definition of  $\Gamma \wedge \Gamma'$  and the formulation of the @-rule, the type of a variable with  $n$  occurrences is the intersection of  $n$  types. This makes our type system less flexible than most presentations where the intersection operator is taken to be *associative*, *commutative*, and *idempotent*, i.e.,

$$\tau \wedge \sigma = \sigma \wedge \tau \quad \tau \wedge (\sigma \wedge \rho) = (\tau \wedge \sigma) \wedge \rho \quad \tau \wedge \tau = \tau . \quad (1)$$

We do not need (1) and therefore refer to the intersection operator as *rigid*. The result is a system without some of the usual features of type systems. For instance, the system does not enjoy subject reduction:<sup>3</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda x^{a \wedge (a \rightarrow b)}. (\lambda y^{a \rightarrow b}. y^{a \rightarrow b} x^a) x^{a \rightarrow b})^{(a \wedge (a \rightarrow b)) \rightarrow b} &\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda x^{(a \rightarrow b) \wedge a}. x^{a \rightarrow b} x^a)^{(a \rightarrow b) \wedge a} \rightarrow b \\ (\lambda x^{a \wedge b}. (\lambda z^b. x^a) x^b)^{(a \wedge b) \rightarrow a} &\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda x^a. x^a)^{a \rightarrow a} . \end{aligned}$$

In the first example, we lack commutativity and in the second weakening. Since rigid intersections are more restrictive than other intersection systems, all the proofs below carry through if we adopt any (or all) of the identities in (1). Therefore, it is a strength that our proof works for rigid intersections.

With the system at hand, we readily prove Point 1 mentioned in the introduction:

*Lemma 1 (All Normal Forms Are Typable With a Strict Type)*

Let  $M \in \Lambda$  be a term. If  $M \in \text{NF}_{\beta}$ , then  $M$  is typable with a strict type, i.e., there is a derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash M : \bar{\tau}$  for some environment  $\Gamma$  and strict type  $\bar{\tau}$ .

*Proof*

As  $M$  is a normal form, we have either  $M = \lambda x.N$  or  $M = x N_1 \dots N_n$  where  $n \geq 0$  and  $N, N_1, \dots, N_n$  are normal forms. We use induction on the structure of  $M$ .  $\square$

### 3 All Strongly Normalizing Terms Are Typable

We can now turn to the proof that all strongly normalizing terms have an intersection type. We want a longest reduction path where we can fold the typing back over each step in the reduction. The following perpetual strategy<sup>4</sup> defined by Barendregt et al. (1976) serves our purpose:

*Definition 2*

The *perpetual* reduction strategy  $F_{\infty}$  is defined as  $F_{\infty}(M) = M$  when  $M \in \text{NF}_{\beta}$  and otherwise

1.  $F_{\infty}(x P_1 \dots P_n) = x P_1 \dots P_{m-1} F_{\infty}(P_m) P_{m+1} \dots P_n$  when  $P_i \in \text{NF}_{\beta}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m-1$  and  $P_m \notin \text{NF}_{\beta}$ ;

<sup>2</sup> Formally, weakening is that  $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$  implies  $\Gamma, x : \tau' \vdash M : \tau$ . Strengthening is that  $\Gamma, x : \tau' \vdash M : \tau$  implies  $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$  when  $x \notin \text{fv}(M)$ .

<sup>3</sup> Subject reduction is the property that  $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$  and  $M \rightarrow_{\beta} N$  implies  $\Gamma \vdash N : \tau$ .

<sup>4</sup> A reduction strategy is *perpetual* (Barendregt, 1984) if it preserves the existence of an infinite reduction path.

2.  $F_\infty(\lambda x.P) = \lambda x.F_\infty(P)$ ;
3.  $F_\infty((\lambda x.P_0) P_1 \dots P_n) = P_0[P_1/x] P_2 \dots P_n$  when  $x \in \text{fv}(P_0)$  or  $P_1 \in \text{NF}_\beta$ ;
4.  $F_\infty((\lambda x.P_0) P_1 \dots P_n) = (\lambda x.P_0) F_\infty(P_1) P_2 \dots P_n$  when  $x \notin \text{fv}(P_0)$  and  $P_1 \notin \text{NF}_\beta$

where  $n \geq 1$ .

We note that  $F_\infty$  is a reduction strategy as  $M \rightarrow_\beta F_\infty(M)$  if  $M \notin \text{NF}_\beta$  and  $F_\infty(M) = M$  otherwise.

*Remark 3*

There are several proofs that  $F_\infty$  picks a reduction path that is the longest possible. It is implicit in de Vrijer's functionals for the length of  $\beta$ -reduction paths (de Vrijer, 1987). It is proved explicitly by Regnier and Danos (Regnier, 1994), Khasidashvili (1994), van Raamsdonk and Severi (1995), and Sørensen (1996).

The idea of the proof is to use induction on the length of longest reduction path. In the inductive case, one considers a term  $M$  with a longest reduction path of length  $n$  and show that  $F_\infty(M)$  has a reduction path of length  $n - 1$ .

As mentioned, we have lost subject reduction due to the rigidity of the intersection operator. Likewise, we do not have subject expansion, i.e., unlike most intersection system  $M \rightarrow_\beta N$  and  $\Gamma \vdash N : \tau$  does not imply  $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ . However, we can establish a weaker form of subject expansion where we only consider whether a typing exists: if the contractum of a term under  $F_\infty$  is typable, then the term is typable. It hinges on the following lemma:

*Lemma 4 (Typability Is Preserved Under Substitution)*

Let  $M$  and  $N$  be terms and let  $x \in \text{fv}(M)$ . If  $M[N/x]$  is typable with typing  $\langle \Gamma; \tau \rangle$  then there are  $\Gamma'$  and  $\Gamma''$  and a type  $\tau'$  such that  $N$  is typable with  $\langle \Gamma'; \tau' \rangle$  and  $M$  is typable with  $\langle \Gamma'', x : \tau' \rangle; \tau$  where  $\Gamma''(y) = \Gamma(y)$  for  $y \notin \text{fv}(N)$ .

*Proof*

Since  $M[N/x]$  is typable, there is a derivation  $\Delta$  of  $\Gamma \vdash M[N/x] : \tau$ . We use induction on the height of  $\Delta$ . In the case of an application  $M = P Q$  we split on whether  $x \in \text{fv}(P) \cap \text{fv}(Q)$ ,  $x \in \text{fv}(P) \setminus \text{fv}(Q)$ , or  $x \in \text{fv}(Q) \setminus \text{fv}(P)$ .  $\square$

*Corollary 5 (Weak Subject Expansion Under Substitution)*

Let  $M$  and  $N$  be terms and let  $x \in \text{fv}(M)$ . If  $M[N/x]$  is typable with typing  $\langle \Gamma; \tau \rangle$  then  $(\lambda x.M) N$  is typable with  $\langle \Gamma'; \tau \rangle$  for some  $\Gamma'$ .

Using the corollary, we establish weak subject expansion under  $F_\infty$ .

*Proposition 6 (Weak Subject Expansion Under  $F_\infty$ )*

Let  $M \in \Lambda$  be a term. If  $F_\infty(M)$  is typable, then  $M$  is typable.

*Proof*

We note that if  $F_\infty(M)$  is typable then there is a derivation  $\Delta$  of  $\Gamma \vdash F_\infty(M) : \tau$ . When  $M \in \text{NF}_\beta$ , then  $\Delta$  is a typing of  $M$  as  $F_\infty(M) = M$ . When  $M \notin \text{NF}_\beta$ , we use induction on the height of  $\Delta$  to prove that there is a typing  $\langle \Gamma', \tau' \rangle$  of  $M$  and that  $\tau \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}$  if and only if  $\tau' \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}$ :

1. If the derivation  $\Delta$  ends in

$$\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash F_\infty(M) : \tau_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash F_\infty(M) : \tau_2}{\Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2 \vdash F_\infty(M) : \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2}$$

we get

$$\frac{\Gamma'_1 \vdash M : \tau'_1 \quad \Gamma'_2 \vdash M : \tau'_2}{\Gamma'_1 \wedge \Gamma'_2 \vdash M : \tau'_1 \wedge \tau'_2}$$

from the induction hypothesis. We note that  $\tau_1 \wedge \tau_2, \tau'_1 \wedge \tau'_2 \notin \bar{\mathcal{T}}$ .

2.  $M \equiv x P_1 \dots P_n$  and  $\tau = \bar{\tau}$ . The type derivation for  $F_\infty(M)$  ends in:

$$\frac{x : \tau_0 \vdash x : \tau_0 \quad \Delta_1 \cdots \Delta_{m-1} \quad \Gamma_m \vdash F_\infty(P_m) : \tau_m \quad \Delta_{m+1} \cdots \Delta_n}{(\cdots ((x : \tau_0) \wedge \Gamma_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge \Gamma_n) \vdash x P_1 \dots P_{m-1} F_\infty(P_m) P_{m+1} \dots P_n : \bar{\tau}}$$

where  $\Delta_i$  derives  $\Gamma_i \vdash P_i : \tau_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m-1, m+1, \dots, n$  and  $\tau_0 = \tau_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \tau_n \rightarrow \bar{\tau}$ . By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\frac{x : \tau'_0 \vdash x : \tau'_0 \quad \Delta_1 \cdots \Delta_{m-1} \quad \Gamma'_m \vdash P_m : \tau'_m \quad \Delta_{m+1} \cdots \Delta_n}{(\cdots ((x : \tau'_0) \wedge \Gamma_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge \Gamma_{m-1}) \wedge \Gamma'_m \wedge \Gamma_{m+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \Gamma_n) \vdash x P_1 \dots P_n : \bar{\tau}}$$

where  $\tau'_0 \equiv \tau_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \tau_{m-1} \rightarrow \tau'_m \rightarrow \tau_{m+1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \tau_n \rightarrow \bar{\tau}$ .

3.  $M \equiv (\lambda x.P_0) P_1 \dots P_n$  and  $x \in \text{fv}(P_0)$  and  $\tau = \bar{\tau}$ . The type derivation for  $F_\infty(M)$  ends in

$$\frac{\Gamma_0 \vdash P_0[P_1/x] : \tau_0 \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash P_2 : \tau_2 \quad \cdots \quad \Gamma_n \vdash P_n : \tau_n}{(\cdots (\Gamma_0 \wedge \Gamma_2) \wedge \cdots \wedge \Gamma_n) \vdash P_0[P_1/x] P_2 \dots P_n : \bar{\tau}}$$

where  $\tau_0 \equiv \tau_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \tau_n \rightarrow \bar{\tau}$ . Using Corollary 5, we have

$$\frac{\Gamma'_0 \vdash (\lambda x.P_0) P_1 : \tau_0 \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash P_2 : \tau_2 \quad \cdots \quad \Gamma_n \vdash P_n : \tau_n}{(\cdots (\Gamma'_0 \wedge \Gamma_2) \wedge \cdots \wedge \Gamma_n) \vdash (\lambda x.P_0) P_1 \dots P_n : \bar{\tau}}$$

4.  $M \equiv (\lambda x.P_0) P_1 \dots P_n$  where  $x \notin \text{fv}(P_0)$ ,  $P_1 \in \text{NF}_\beta$ , and  $\tau = \bar{\tau}$ . The type derivation for  $F_\infty(M)$  ends in

$$\frac{\Gamma_0 \vdash P_0 : \tau_0 \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash P_2 : \tau_2 \quad \cdots \quad \Gamma_n \vdash P_n : \tau_n}{(\cdots (\Gamma_0 \wedge \Gamma_2) \wedge \cdots \wedge \Gamma_n) \vdash P_0 P_2 \dots P_n : \bar{\tau}}$$

where  $\tau_0 \equiv \tau_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \tau_n \rightarrow \bar{\tau}$ . As  $P_1 \in \text{NF}_\beta$ , we have a typing  $\Gamma_1 \vdash P_1 : \bar{\tau}_1$  by Lemma 1. We obtain

$$\frac{\Gamma_0 \vdash P_0 : \tau_0}{\Gamma_0 \vdash \lambda x.P_0 : \bar{\tau}_1 \rightarrow \tau_0} \quad \frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash P_1 : \bar{\tau}_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash P_2 : \tau_2 \quad \cdots \quad \Gamma_n \vdash P_n : \tau_n}{(\cdots ((\Gamma_0 \wedge \Gamma_1) \wedge \Gamma_2) \wedge \cdots \wedge \Gamma_n) \vdash (\lambda x.P_0) P_1 \dots P_n : \bar{\tau}}$$

5.  $M \equiv (\lambda x.P_0) P_1 \dots P_n$  where  $x \notin \text{fv}(P_0)$ ,  $P_1 \notin \text{NF}_\beta$ , and  $\tau = \bar{\tau}$ . The type derivation for  $F_\infty(M)$  ends in

$$\frac{\Gamma_0 \vdash P_0 : \tau_0}{\Gamma_0 \vdash (\lambda x.P_0) : \bar{\tau}_1 \rightarrow \tau_0} \quad \frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash F_\infty(P_1) : \bar{\tau}_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash P_2 : \tau_2 \quad \cdots \quad \Gamma_n \vdash P_n : \tau_n}{(\cdots (\Gamma_0 \wedge \Gamma_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge \Gamma_n) \vdash (\lambda x.P_0) F_\infty(P_1) \dots P_n : \bar{\tau}}$$

where  $\tau_0 \equiv \tau_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \tau_n \rightarrow \bar{\tau}$ . Using the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma_0 \vdash P_0 : \tau_0}{\Gamma_0 \vdash (\lambda x.P_0) : \bar{\tau}'_1 \rightarrow \tau_0} \quad \Gamma'_1 \vdash P_1 : \bar{\tau}'_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash P_2 : \tau_2 \quad \dots \quad \Gamma_n \vdash P_n : \tau_n}{(\dots((\Gamma_0 \wedge \Gamma'_1) \wedge \Gamma_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Gamma_n) \vdash (\lambda x.P_0) P_1 \dots P_n : \bar{\tau}}$$

This exhausts the cases so we conclude weak subject expansion under  $F_\infty$ .  $\square$

We now have the following standard theorem.

*Corollary 7*

Let  $M$  be a strongly normalizing term, then  $M$  is typable.

*Proof*

We consider any strongly normalizing term  $M \in \Lambda$ . There exists an  $n$  such that  $F_\infty^n(M) \in \text{NF}_\beta$ . Now,  $F_\infty^n(M)$  is typable by Lemma 1. By induction on  $n$  using the proposition it follows that  $M$  is typable.  $\square$

The opposite direction, strong normalization of every term typable with an intersection type, is usually done by the realizability method due to Tait (1975). This is a semantic method where each type is interpreted as a suitable strongly normalizing set of terms and the type derivation is shown to be sound with respect to the interpretation.

*Theorem 8*

Let  $M$  be typable, then  $M$  is strongly normalizing.

*Proof (sketch)*

Define the following sets by induction on types  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ :  $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket = \text{SN}_\beta$ ,  $\llbracket \rho \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket = \{F \in \Lambda \mid \forall a \in \llbracket \rho \rrbracket. F a \in \llbracket \tau \rrbracket\}$ , and  $\llbracket \rho \wedge \tau \rrbracket = \{M \in \Lambda \mid M \in \llbracket \rho \rrbracket, \llbracket \tau \rrbracket\}$ . By induction on the structure of the types, we show that  $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket \subseteq \text{SN}_\beta$  and  $x \in \llbracket \tau \rrbracket$  for all types  $\tau$

Let a *valuation* be a map  $v : V \rightarrow \Lambda$ . Let  $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v = M[v(x_1)/x_1, \dots, v(x_n)/x_n]$  where  $\text{fv}(M) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ . We define the model relation  $\models$  as follows:  $v \models M : \tau$  if and only if  $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \in \llbracket \tau \rrbracket$ . Moreover,  $v \models \Gamma$  if and only if  $v(x) \in \llbracket \rho \rrbracket$  for all  $x : \tau \in \Gamma$ . Finally,  $\Gamma \models M : \rho$  if and only if  $v \models \Gamma$  implies  $v \models M : \rho$  for all valuations  $v$ .

We prove that  $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$  implies  $\Gamma \models M : \tau$  by induction on the derivation. We consider the trivial valuation  $v(x) = x$ . We have  $v \models \Gamma$ . It follows that  $M = \llbracket M \rrbracket_v \in \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \subseteq \text{SN}_\beta$ .  $\square$

An alternative approach is taken by Kfoury and Wells who give a proof-theoretic proof (Kfoury & Wells, 1995).

## 4 Concluding Remarks and Related Work

We have with simple means reproved the well-known theorem that all strongly  $\beta$ -normalizing  $\lambda$ -terms have an intersection type. The simplicity stems from the fact that we consider a concrete reduction strategy and therefore can use weak subject expansion rather than subject expansion. In particular, we do not need such

properties as weakening and strengthening of type derivations. I conjecture that the method works for all intersection type systems without nullary intersections, i.e., the type constant  $\omega$  typing all terms in all contexts.

Of the two essential properties needed in the proof, typability of all normal forms and weak subject expansion, it is the weak subject expansion that sets intersection type systems apart from other type systems. There are many type systems where all  $\beta$ -normal forms are typable, e.g., System F (Reynolds, 1974; Girard, 1972). On the other hand, Urzyczyn proves that the following  $\lambda$ -term

$$(\lambda x.z (x (\lambda f \lambda u.f u)) (x (\lambda v g.v g))) (\lambda y.y y y)$$

is not typable in the extremely powerful type system  $\mathbf{F}_\omega$ , while its only reduct

$$z ((\lambda y.y y y) (\lambda f \lambda u.f u)) ((\lambda y.y y y) (\lambda v g.v g))$$

is typable (Urzyczyn, 1997).

### Acknowledgments

Without numerous discussions about intersection types with Sébastien Carlier, Assaf J. Kfoury, and Joe B. Wells, I would not have been able to come up with this proof. Franklyn Turbak's feedback helped make the paper accessible to more than the aficionados.

### References

- Amadio, Roberto, & Curién, Pierre-Louis. (1998). *Domains and lambda calculi*. Cambridge tracts in theoretical computer science, vol. 46. Cambridge University Press.
- Barendregt, H. P. (1984). *The lambda calculus: Its syntax and semantics*. Revised edn. North-Holland.
- Barendregt, H. P., Bergstra, J., Klop, J. W., & Volken, H. (1976). Some notes on lambda-reduction. *Pages 13–53 of: Degrees, reductions and representability in the lambda calculus*. Preprint 22. Mathematical Institute, Utrecht, The Netherlands.
- de Vrijer, Roel. (1987). Exactly estimating functionals and strong normalization. *Proceedings of the koninklijke nederlandse akademie van wetenschappen, series a*, **90**(4), 479–493.
- Girard, J.-Y. (1972). *Interprétation fonctionnelle et élimination des coupures de l'arithmétique d'ordre supérieur*. Thèse d'Etat, Université de Paris VII.
- Kfoury, A. J., & Wells, J. B. (1995). New notions of reduction and non-semantic proofs of  $\beta$ -strong normalization in typed  $\lambda$ -calculi. *Pages 311–321 of: Proc. 10th ann. IEEE symp. logic in comput. sci.*
- Kfoury, Assaf J. (2000). A linearization of the lambda-calculus. *Journal of logic and computation*, **10**(3). Special issue on Type Theory and Term Rewriting. Kamareddine and Klop (editors).
- Kfoury, Assaf J., & Wells, J. B. (2004). Principality and type inference for intersection types using expansion variables. *Theoretical computer science*, **311**(1–3), 1–70.
- Khasidashvili, Zurab. (1994). The longest perpetual reductions in orthogonal expression reduction systems. *Pages 191–203 of: Nerode, A., & Matiyasevich, Yu. V. (eds), Proc. of the 3<sup>rd</sup> international conference on logical foundations of computer science, 'logic at st. petersburg', LFCS '94*. LNCS, vol. 813. Springer-Verlag.

- Møller Neergaard, Peter. 2004 (Oct.). *Complexity aspects of programming language design—from logspace to elementary time via proofnets and intersection types*. Ph.D. thesis, Brandeis University.
- Pottinger, Garrel. (1980). A type assignment for the strongly normalizable  $\lambda$ -terms. *Pages 561–577 of: Hindley, J. R., & Seldin, J. P. (eds), To H. B. Curry: Essays on combinatory logic, lambda calculus, and formalism*. Academic Press.
- Regnier, Laurent. (1994). Une équivalence sur les lambda-termes. *Theoretical computer science*, **126**(2), 281–292. According to private communication this is joint work with Vincent Danos.
- Reynolds, J. C. (1974). Towards a theory of type structure. *Pages 408–425 of: Colloque sur la programmation*. LNCS, vol. 19. Springer-Verlag.
- Sørensen, Morten Heine. (1996). Effective longest and infinite reduction paths in untyped  $\lambda$ -calculi. *Pages 287–301 of: Kirchner, H. (ed), Colloquium on trees in algebra and programming*. LNCS, vol. 1059. Springer-Verlag.
- Tait, W. W. (1975). A realizability interpretation of the theory of species. *Pages 240–251 of: Parikh, R. (ed), Logic colloquium*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 453. Springer-Verlag.
- Urzyczyn, Paweł. (1997). Type reconstruction in  $\mathbf{F}_\omega$ . *Mathematical structures in computer science*, **7**(4), 329–358.
- van Bakel, Steffen J. (1992). Complete restrictions of the intersection type discipline. *Theoret. comput. sci.*, **102**(1), 135–163.
- van Raamsdonk, Femke, & Severi, P. (1995). *On normalisation*. Tech. rept. CS-R9545. CWI.