

A Log-Sensitive Encoding of Turing Machines in the λ -Calculus

Beniamino Accattoli¹, Ugo Dal Lago², and Gabriele Vanoni²

¹Inria, & LIX, École Polytechnique, UMR 7161, France

²Università di Bologna & Inria Sophia Antipolis, Italy

Abstract

This note modifies the reference encoding of Turing machines in the λ -calculus by Dal Lago and Accattoli [DLA17], which is tuned for time efficiency, as to accommodate logarithmic space. There are two main changes: Turing machines now have *two* tapes, an input tape and a work tape, and the input tape is encoded differently, because the reference encoding comes with a linear space overhead for managing tapes, which is excessive for studying logarithmic space.

1 Introduction

This note presents a new encoding of Turing machines into the λ -calculus and proves its correctness. It is based over Dal Lago and Accattoli's reference encoding of single tape Turing machines [DLA17]. The new encoding is tuned for studying logarithmic space complexity even though such a study is not carried out here but in a companion paper. The aim of this note is to provide the formal definition of the encoding and the tedious calculations to prove its correctness.

The key points of the new encoding with respect to the reference one are:

- *Log-sensitivity*: the reference encoding cannot account for logarithmic space complexity because it is based on Turing machines with a single tape. Logarithmic space requires Turing machines with a read-only input tape, of input string i , and an ordinary work tape, and to only count the space used on the work tape—if one counts the space for i , it is impossible to use only $\mathcal{O}(\log |i|)$ space. We refer to such a separation of tapes as to *log-sensitivity*. The reference encoding is *log-insensitive* instead.
- *Different encoding of the input tape*: simply adapting the reference encoding to two tapes is not enough for preserving logarithmic space, because the reference encoding is tuned for time: it reads from tapes in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time but the reading mechanism comes with a $\mathcal{O}(|i|)$ space overhead, while the input tape has to be handled with at most $\mathcal{O}(\log |i|)$ space overhead. We then change the encoding and the reading mechanism of the input tape, trading time for space, as to read in $\mathcal{O}(|i| \log |i|)$ time with $\mathcal{O}(\log |i|)$ space overhead. The idea is that the position of the head is indicated by a

pointer, given by the position index (of logarithmic size), and reading from the input requires scrolling the input tape sequentially, until the position index is reached.

- *Different time complexity*: by trading time for space, the new encoding is slower. If a Turing machine \mathcal{M} takes time $T_{\mathcal{M}}(|i|)$ on input string i then the encoding evaluates in $\Theta((T_{\mathcal{M}}(|i|) + 1) \cdot |i| \cdot \log |i|)$ β -steps rather than in $\Theta(T_{\mathcal{M}}(|i|))$ as in the reference encoding, because each transition reads from the input. The time complexity is however still polynomial and thus the encoding is reasonable for time (considered as the number of β -steps).

Intrinsic and Mathematical Tape Representations A TM tape is a string plus a distinguished position, representing the head. There are two tape representations, dubbed *intrinsic* and *mathematical* by van Emde Boas in [vEB12], described next.

- The *intrinsic* one represents both the string i and the current position of the head as the triple $i = i_l \cdot h \cdot i_r$, where i_l and i_r are the prefix and suffix of i surrounding the character h read by the head.

The reference encoding of TMs in the λ -calculus uses the intrinsic representation of tapes and, as already mentioned, reading costs $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time but the reading mechanism comes with a $\mathcal{O}(|i|)$ space overhead.

- The *mathematical* representation of tapes, instead, is simply given by the index $n \in \mathbb{N}$ of the head position, that is, the triple $i_l \cdot h \cdot i_r$ is replaced by the pair $(i, |i_l| + 1)$. The index $|i_l| + 1$ has the role of a pointer, of logarithmic size when represented in binary.

An encoding in the λ -calculus based on the mathematical representation reads in $\mathcal{O}(|i| \log |i|)$ time with $\mathcal{O}(\log |i|)$ space overhead. The time cost is due to the fact that accessing the tape is done sequentially, by moving of one cell at a time on the tape and at each step decrementing of one the index, until the index is 0. Therefore, accessing the right cell requires to decrement the index $|i_l| + 1$ times, each time requiring time $\log |i_l| + 1$, because the index is represented in binary.

The new log-sensitive encoding keeps the intrinsic representation for the work tape, and instead adopts the mathematical representation for the input tape. This is because linear space overhead for the work tape is not a problem for log-sensitivity, while the mathematical representation makes it harder to write on the tape.

Binary Arithmetic and Literature. For implementing on the λ -calculus the manipulation of the head index, one needs to develop an encoding of binary strings and three operations: successor, predecessor, and lookup of the n -th character of a string starting from the binary representation of n . We do this using the Scott encoding of binary string, but using a reversed representation of binary strings.

We developed our encoding of binary arithmetic from scratch, in a seemingly ad-hoc way. We discovered afterwards that our approach is a variation over encodings in the literature. Namely, it is quite similar to Mogensen’s encoding [Mog01], itself building over Goldberg’s study [Gol00].

2 The Deterministic λ -Calculus and the Scott Encoding of Strings

As it is the case for the reference encoding, also the new encodings has as image a restricted form of λ -calculus, what we refer to as the deterministic λ -calculus, where, in particular, call-by-name and call-by-value evaluation coincide.

Deterministic λ -Calculus. The language and the evaluation contexts of the *deterministic λ -calculus* Λ_{det} are given by:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Terms} & t, u, r, w ::= v \mid tv \\ \text{Values} & v, w, v' ::= \lambda x.t \mid x \\ \\ \text{Evaluation Contexts} & E ::= \langle \cdot \rangle \mid Ev \end{array}$$

Note that

- *Arguments are values:* the right subterm of an application has to be a value, in contrast to what happens in the ordinary λ -calculus.
- *Weak evaluation:* evaluation contexts are *weak*, i.e. they do not enter inside abstractions.

Evaluation is then defined by:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{RULE AT TOP LEVEL} & \text{CONTEXTUAL CLOSURE} \\ (\lambda x.t)u \mapsto_{\beta} t\{x \leftarrow u\} & E\langle t \rangle \rightarrow_{\text{det}} E\langle u \rangle \quad \text{if } t \mapsto_{\beta} u \end{array}$$

Convention: to improve readability we omit some parenthesis, giving precedence to application with respect to abstraction. Therefore $\lambda x.tu$ stands for $\lambda x.(tu)$ and not for $(\lambda x.t)u$, that instead requires parenthesis.

The name of this calculus is motivated by the following immediate lemma.

Lemma 2.1 (Determinism). *Let $t \in \Lambda_{\text{det}}$. If $t \rightarrow_{\text{det}} u$ and $t \rightarrow_{\text{det}} r$ then $u = r$.*

Proof. By induction on t . If t is a variable or an abstraction then it cannot reduce. If $t = wv$ then there are two cases:

- *w is an abstraction $\lambda x.s$.* Then $t = (\lambda x.s)v \rightarrow_{\text{det}} s\{x \leftarrow v\}$ is the unique redex of t , that is, $u = r = s\{x \leftarrow v\}$.
- *w is not an abstraction.* Then the two steps from t come from two steps $w \rightarrow_{\text{det}} u'$ and $w \rightarrow_{\text{det}} r'$ with $u = u'v$ and $r = r'v$, because $\langle \cdot \rangle v$ is the only possible evaluation context. By *i.h.*, $u' = r'$, that is, $u = r$. \square

Fixpoint. The encoding of Turing machines requires a general form of recursion, that is usually implemented via a fixpoint combinator. We use Turing's fixpoint combinator, in its call-by-value variant, that fits into Λ_{det} and that returns a fixpoint up to η -equivalence. Let fix be the term $\theta\theta$, where

$$\theta := \lambda x.\lambda y.y(\lambda z.xxyz).$$

Now, given a term u let us show that $\text{fix } u$ is a fixpoint of u up to η -equivalence.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{fix } u &= (\lambda x. \lambda y. y(\lambda z. xxyz))\theta u \\
&\rightarrow_{det} (\lambda y. y(\lambda z. \theta\theta yz))u \\
&\rightarrow_{det} u(\lambda z. \theta\theta uz) \\
&= u(\lambda z. \text{fix } uz) \\
&=_{\eta} u(\text{fix } u)
\end{aligned}$$

It is well-known that η -equivalent terms are indistinguishable in the λ -calculus (this is Böhm's theorem). Therefore, we will simply use the fact that $\text{fix } u \rightarrow_{det}^2 u(\lambda z. \text{fix } uz)$ without dealing with η -equivalence. This fact will not induce any complication.

Encoding alphabets. Let $\Sigma = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ be a finite alphabet. Elements of Σ are encoded as follows:

$$\lceil a_i \rceil^{\Sigma} := \lambda x_1. \dots \lambda x_n. x_i .$$

When the alphabet will be clear from the context we will simply write $\lceil a \rceil_i$. Note that

1. the representation fixes a total order on Σ such that $a_i < a_j$ iff $i < j$;
2. the representation of an element $\lceil a_i \rceil^{\Sigma}$ requires space linear (and not logarithmic) in $|\Sigma|$. But, since Σ is fixed, it actually requires constant space.

Encoding strings. A string in $s \in \Sigma^*$ is represented by a term \overline{s}^{Σ^*} . Our encoding exploits the fact that a string is a concatenation of characters *followed by the empty string* ε (which is generally omitted). For that, the encoding uses $|\Sigma| + 1$ abstractions, the extra one (x_{ε} in the definition below) being used to represent ε . The encoding is defined by induction on the structure of s as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\varepsilon}^{\Sigma^*} &:= \lambda x_1. \dots \lambda x_n. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_{\varepsilon} , \\
\overline{a_i}^{\Sigma^*} &:= \lambda x_1. \dots \lambda x_n. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_i \overline{\varepsilon}^{\Sigma^*} .
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the representation depends on the cardinality of Σ . As before, however, the alphabet is a fixed parameter, and so such a dependency is irrelevant. As an example, the encoding of the string aba with respect to the alphabet $\{a, b\}$ ordered as $a < b$ is

$$\overline{aba}^{\{a,b\}} = \lambda x_a. \lambda x_b. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_a (\lambda x_a. \lambda x_b. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_b (\lambda x_a. \lambda x_b. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_a (\lambda x_a. \lambda x_b. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_{\varepsilon})))$$

Lemma 2.2 (Appending a character in constant time). *Let Σ be an alphabet and $a \in \Sigma$ one of its characters. There is a term append_{Σ}^a such that for every continuation term k and every string $s \in \Sigma^*$,*

$$\text{append}_{\Sigma}^a k \overline{s} \xrightarrow[det]{O(1)} k(\overline{as}).$$

Proof. Define the term $\text{append}_{\Sigma}^a := \lambda k'. \lambda s'. k'(\lambda x_1. \dots \lambda x_{|\Sigma|}. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_{i_a} s')$ where i_a is the index of a in the ordering of Σ fixed by its encoding, that appends the character a to the string s' relatively to the alphabet Σ . We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{append}_{\Sigma}^a k \bar{s} &= (\lambda k'. \lambda s'. k'(\lambda x_1. \dots \lambda x_{|\Sigma|}. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_{i_a} s')) k \bar{s} \\
&\xrightarrow{2}_{det} k(\lambda x_1. \dots \lambda x_{|\Sigma|}. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_{i_a} \bar{s}) \\
&= k(as).
\end{aligned}$$

□

2.1 Binary Arithmetic

In order to navigate the input word, we consider a counter (in binary). Moving the head left (respectively right) amounts to decrement (respectively increment) the counter by one. The starting idea is to see a number as its binary string representation and to use the Scott encoding of strings. Since it is tricky to define the successor and predecessor on such an encoding, we actually define an ad-hoc encoding.

The first unusual aspect of our encoding is that the binary string is represented in reverse order, so that the representation of 2 is 01 and not 10. This is done to ease the definition of the successor and predecessor functions as λ -terms, which have to process strings from left to right, and that with the standard representation would have to go to the end of the string and then potentially back from right to left. With a reversed representation, these functions need to process the string only once from left to right.

The second unusual aspect is that, in order to avoid problems with strings made out of all 0s and strings having many 0s on the right (which are not meaningful), we collapse all suffixes made out of all 0 on to the empty string. A consequence is that the number 0 is then represented with the empty string. Non-rightmost 0 bits are instead represented with the usual Scott encoding.

If $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we write $[n]$ for the binary string representing n . Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
[0] &:= \varepsilon \\
[1] &:= 1 \\
[2] &:= 01 \\
[3] &:= 11 \\
[4] &:= 001
\end{aligned}$$

And so on. Binary strings are then encoded as λ -terms using the Scott encoding, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\varepsilon} &:= \lambda x_0. \lambda x_1. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_{\varepsilon} \\
\overline{0 \cdot s} &:= \lambda x_0. \lambda x_1. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_0 \bar{s} \\
\overline{1 \cdot s} &:= \lambda x_0. \lambda x_1. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_1 \bar{s}
\end{aligned}$$

Successor Function. The successor function `SUCC` on the reversed binary representation can be defined as follows (in Haskell-like syntax):

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{SUCC } \varepsilon &= 1 \\
\text{SUCC } 0 \cdot s &= 1 \cdot s \\
\text{SUCC } 1 \cdot s &= 0 \cdot (\text{SUCC } s)
\end{aligned}$$

For which we have $\text{SUCC}([n]) = [n + 1]$.

Lemma 2.3. *There is a λ -term `succ` such that for every continuation term k and every natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\text{succ } k \overline{[n]} \rightarrow_{det}^{\mathcal{O}(\log n)} k \overline{\text{SUCC } [n]}.$$

Proof. Define `succ` := $\Theta \text{succaux}$ and `succaux` := $\lambda f.\lambda k'.\lambda n'.n'N_0N_1N_\varepsilon f k'$ where:

- $N_0 := \lambda f'.\lambda s'.\lambda k'.\text{append}^1 k' s'$
- $N_1 := \lambda f'.\lambda s'.\lambda k'.f'(\lambda z.\text{append}^0 k' z)s'$
- $N_\varepsilon := \lambda f'.\lambda k'.k' \overline{1 \cdot \varepsilon}$

We rather prove $\text{succ } k \overline{[n]} \rightarrow_{det}^{\mathcal{O}(|[n]|)} k \overline{\text{SUCC } [n]}$, where clearly $|[n]| = \log n$, because the proof is naturally by induction on the length of $[n]$ as a string. The first steps of the evaluation of `succ` $k \overline{[n]}$ are common to all natural numbers $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{succ } k \overline{[n]} &= \text{fix succaux } k \overline{[n]} \\ &\rightarrow_{\beta}^2 \text{succaux}(\lambda z.\text{succ } z)k \overline{[n]} \\ &= (\lambda f.\lambda k'.\lambda n'.n'N_0N_1N_\varepsilon f k')(\lambda z.\text{succ } z)k \overline{[n]} \\ &\rightarrow_{\beta}^3 \overline{[n]}N_0N_1N_\varepsilon(\lambda z.\text{succ } z)k \end{aligned}$$

Cases of n :

- *Zero*, that is, $n = 0$, $[n] = \varepsilon$, and $\overline{[n]} = \lambda x_0.\lambda x_1.\lambda x_\varepsilon.x_\varepsilon$: then

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{[n]}N_0N_1N_\varepsilon(\lambda z.\text{succ } z)k &= (\lambda x_0.\lambda x_1.\lambda x_\varepsilon.x_\varepsilon)N_0N_1N_\varepsilon(\lambda z.\text{succ } z)k \\ &\rightarrow_{\beta}^3 N_\varepsilon(\lambda z.\text{succ } z)k \\ &= (\lambda f'.\lambda k'.k' \overline{1 \cdot \varepsilon})k \\ &\rightarrow_{\beta} k \overline{1 \cdot \varepsilon} \\ &= k \overline{\text{SUCC } [0]} \end{aligned}$$

- *Not zero*. Then there are two sub-cases, depending on the first character of the string $[n]$:

– *0 character*, i.e. $[n] = 0 \cdot s$: then

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{0 \cdot r}N_0N_1N_\varepsilon(\lambda z.\text{succ } z)k \\ &= (\lambda x_0.\lambda x_1.\lambda x_\varepsilon.x_0\overline{s})N_0N_1N_\varepsilon(\lambda z.\text{succ } z)k \\ &\rightarrow_{\beta}^3 N_0\overline{s}(\lambda z.\text{succ } z)k \\ &= (\lambda f'.\lambda s'.\lambda k'.\text{append}^1 k' s')\overline{s}(\lambda z.\text{succ } z)k \\ &\rightarrow_{\beta}^3 \text{append}^1 k \overline{s} \\ (L. 2.2) \quad &\rightarrow_{\beta}^{\mathcal{O}(1)} k \overline{1 \cdot s} \\ &= k \overline{\text{SUCC } [n]} \end{aligned}$$

– 1 character, i.e. $[n] = 1 \cdot s$: then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \overline{1 \cdot r N_0 N_1 N_\varepsilon} (\lambda z. \text{succ } z) k \\
= & (\lambda x_0. \lambda x_1. \lambda x_\varepsilon. x_1 \bar{s}) N_0 N_1 N_\varepsilon (\lambda z. \text{succ } z) k \\
\rightarrow_{\beta}^3 & N_1 \bar{s} (\lambda z. \text{succ } z) k \\
= & (\lambda f'. \lambda s'. \lambda k'. f' (\lambda z. \text{append}^0 k' z) s') \bar{s} (\lambda z. \text{succ } z) k \\
\rightarrow_{\beta}^3 & (\lambda z. \text{succ } z) (\lambda z. \text{append}^0 k z) \bar{s} \\
\rightarrow_{\beta} & \text{succ } (\lambda z. \text{append}^0 k z) \bar{s} \\
(i.h.) \rightarrow_{\beta}^{\mathcal{O}(|s|)} & (\lambda z. \text{append}^0 k z) \overline{\text{SUCC } s} \\
\rightarrow_{det} & \overline{\text{append}^0 k \text{SUCC } s} \\
(L. 2.2) \rightarrow_{\beta}^{\mathcal{O}(1)} & \overline{k \cdot 0 \cdot (\text{SUCC } s)} \\
= & \overline{k \text{SUCC } (1 \cdot s)} \\
= & \overline{k \text{SUCC } [n]}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Predecessor Function. We now define and implement a predecessor function. We define it assuming that it shall only be applied to the encoding $[n]$ of a natural number n different from 0, as it shall indeed be the case in the following. Such a predecessor function PRED is defined as follows on the reversed binary representation (in Haskell-like syntax):

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{PRED } 0 \cdot s &= 1 \cdot (\text{PRED } s) \\
\text{PRED } 1 \cdot \varepsilon &= \varepsilon \\
\text{PRED } 1 \cdot b \cdot s &= 0 \cdot b \cdot s
\end{aligned}$$

It is easily seen that $\text{PRED}([n]) = [n-1]$ for all $0 < n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $\text{PRED}([n])$ does not introduce a rightmost 0 bit when it changes the rightmost bit of $[n]$, that is, $\text{PRED } 001 = 11$ and not 110.

Lemma 2.4. *There is a λ -term `pred` such that for every continuation term k and every natural number $1 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\text{pred } k \overline{[n]} \rightarrow_{det}^{\mathcal{O}(\log n)} k \overline{\text{PRED } [n]}.$$

Proof. Define `pred` := `fix predaux` and `predaux` := $\lambda f. \lambda k'. \lambda n'. n' N_0 N_1 N_\varepsilon f k'$ where:

- $N_0 := \lambda r'. \lambda f. \lambda k'. f (\lambda z. \text{append}^1 k' z) r'$;
- $N_1 := \lambda r'. \lambda f. r' M_0 M_1 M_\varepsilon$, where:
 - $M_0 := \lambda v. \lambda k. \text{append}^0 (\lambda z. \text{append}^1 k z) v$;
 - $M_1 := \lambda v. \lambda k. \text{append}^1 (\lambda z. \text{append}^1 k z) v$;
 - $M_\varepsilon := \lambda k'. k' \bar{\varepsilon}$;
- N_ε is whatever closed term.

We rather prove $\text{pred } k \overline{[n]} \rightarrow_{det}^{\mathcal{O}(|[n]|)} k \overline{\text{PRED } [n]}$, where clearly $|[n]| = \log n$, because the proof is naturally by induction on the length of $[n]$ as a string. The

first steps of the evaluation of $\text{pred } k \overline{[n]}$ are common to all natural numbers $1 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{pred } k \overline{[n]} &= \text{fix predaux } k \overline{[n]} \\
&\rightarrow_{\beta}^2 \text{predaux}(\lambda z. \text{pred } z) k \overline{[n]} \\
&= \overline{(\lambda f. \lambda k'. \lambda n'. n' N_0 N_1 N_{\varepsilon} f k')} (\lambda z. \text{pred } z) k \overline{[n]} \\
&\rightarrow_{\beta}^3 \overline{[n]} N_0 N_1 N_{\varepsilon} (\lambda z. \text{pred } z) k
\end{aligned}$$

By hypothesis, $n \geq 1$. Then \overline{n} is a non-empty string. Cases of its first character:

- 0 character, i.e. $[n] = 0 \cdot r$: then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\overline{[n]} N_0 N_1 N_{\varepsilon} (\lambda z. \text{pred } z) k \\
&= (\lambda x_0. \lambda x_1. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_0 \overline{r}) N_0 N_1 N_{\varepsilon} (\lambda z. \text{pred } z) k \\
&\rightarrow_{\beta}^3 N_0 \overline{r} (\lambda z. \text{pred } z) k \\
&= (\lambda r'. \lambda f. \lambda k'. f(\lambda z. \text{append}^1 k' z) r') \overline{r} (\lambda z. \text{pred } z) k \\
&\rightarrow_{\beta}^3 (\lambda z. \text{pred } z) (\lambda z. \text{append}^1 k' z) \overline{r} \\
&\rightarrow_{\beta} \text{pred}(\lambda z. \text{append}^1 k z) \overline{r} \\
(i.h.) \quad &\rightarrow_{\beta}^{\mathcal{O}(|r|)} (\lambda z. \text{append}^1 k z) \overline{\text{PRED } r} \\
&\rightarrow_{\beta} \text{append}^1 k \overline{\text{PRED } r} \\
(L. 2.2) \quad &\rightarrow_{\beta}^{\mathcal{O}(1)} k \overline{1 \cdot (\text{PRED } r)} \\
&= k \overline{\text{PRED } 0 \cdot r} \\
&= k \overline{\text{PRED } [n]}
\end{aligned}$$

- 1 character, i.e. $[n] = 1 \cdot r$: then

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{[n]} N_0 N_1 N_{\varepsilon} (\lambda z. \text{pred } z) k &= (\lambda x_0. \lambda x_1. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_1 \overline{r}) N_0 N_1 N_{\varepsilon} (\lambda z. \text{pred } z) k \\
&\rightarrow_{\beta}^3 N_1 \overline{r} (\lambda z. \text{pred } z) k \\
&= (\lambda r'. \lambda f. r' M_0 M_1 M_{\varepsilon}) \overline{r} (\lambda z. \text{pred } z) k \\
&\rightarrow_{\beta} \overline{r} M_0 M_1 M_{\varepsilon} k
\end{aligned}$$

There are three sub-cases, depending on the string r :

- r is empty, i.e. $r = \varepsilon$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\varepsilon} M_0 M_1 M_{\varepsilon} k &= (\lambda x_0. \lambda x_1. \lambda x_{\varepsilon}. x_{\varepsilon}) M_0 M_1 M_{\varepsilon} k \\
&\rightarrow_{\beta}^3 M_{\varepsilon} k \\
&= (\lambda k'. k' \overline{\varepsilon}) k \\
&\rightarrow_{\beta} k \overline{\varepsilon} \\
&\rightarrow_{\beta} k \overline{[0]} \\
&= k \overline{\text{PRED } [1]}
\end{aligned}$$

– r start with 0, that is, $[n] = 1 \cdot r = 1 \cdot 0 \cdot p$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{0 \cdot p} M_0 M_1 M_\varepsilon k &= (\lambda x_0. \lambda x_1. \lambda x_\varepsilon. x_0 \overline{p}) M_0 M_1 M_\varepsilon k \\
&\xrightarrow{\beta^3} M_0 \overline{p} k \\
&= (\lambda v. \lambda k. \text{append}^0(\lambda z. \text{append}^0 k z) v) \overline{p} k \\
&\xrightarrow{\beta^2} \text{append}^0(\lambda z. \text{append}^0 k z) \overline{p} \\
(L. 2.2) \quad &\xrightarrow{\beta^{\mathcal{O}(1)}} (\lambda z. \text{append}^0 k z) \overline{0 \cdot p} \\
&\xrightarrow{\beta} \text{append}^0 k \overline{0 \cdot p} \\
(L. 2.2) \quad &\xrightarrow{\beta^{\mathcal{O}(1)}} k \overline{0 \cdot p} \\
&= k \overline{0 \cdot r} \\
&= k \overline{\text{PRED } 1 \cdot r} \\
&= k \text{PRED } [n]
\end{aligned}$$

– r start with 1, that is, $[n] = 1 \cdot r = 1 \cdot 1 \cdot p$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{0 \cdot p} M_0 M_1 M_\varepsilon k &= (\lambda x_0. \lambda x_1. \lambda x_\varepsilon. x_1 \overline{p}) M_0 M_1 M_\varepsilon k \\
&\xrightarrow{\beta^3} M_1 \overline{p} k \\
&= (\lambda v. \lambda k. \text{append}^1(\lambda z. \text{append}^0 k z) v) \overline{p} k \\
&\xrightarrow{\beta^2} \text{append}^1(\lambda z. \text{append}^0 k z) \overline{p} \\
(L. 2.2) \quad &\xrightarrow{\beta^{\mathcal{O}(1)}} (\lambda z. \text{append}^0 k z) \overline{1 \cdot p} \\
&\xrightarrow{\beta} \text{append}^0 k \overline{1 \cdot p} \\
(L. 2.2) \quad &\xrightarrow{\beta^{\mathcal{O}(1)}} k \overline{0 \cdot 1 \cdot p} \\
&= k \overline{0 \cdot r} \\
&= k \overline{\text{PRED } 1 \cdot r} \\
&= k \text{PRED } [n]
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lookup Function. Given a natural number n , we need to be able to extract the $n + 1$ -th character from a non-empty string s . The partial function `LOOKUP` can be defined as follows (in Haskell-like syntax):

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{LOOKUP } [0] \ (c \cdot s) &= c \\
\text{LOOKUP } [n] \ (c \cdot s) &= \text{LOOKUP } (\text{PRED } [n]) \ s \quad \text{if } n > 0
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.5. *There is a λ -term `lookup` such that for every continuation term k , every natural number n and every non-empty string $i \in \mathbb{B}^+$,*

$$\text{lookup } k \overline{[n] i} \xrightarrow[\text{det}]{\mathcal{O}(n \log n)} k [\text{LOOKUP } [n] i].$$

Proof. We can now code the function `lookup := fix lookupaux` where:

$$\text{lookupaux} := \lambda f. \lambda k'. \lambda n'. \lambda i'. n' N_0 N_1 N_\varepsilon f k' i'$$

where:

- $N_0 := \lambda p'. \lambda f. \lambda k'. \lambda i'. i' M_0 M_0 M_\varepsilon p' f k'$, where
 - $M_0 := \lambda r'. \lambda p'. \lambda f. \lambda k'. \text{append}^0(\lambda z''. \text{pred}(\lambda z'. f k' z') z'') p' r'$;
 - M_ε is whatever closed term.

- $N_1 := \lambda p'. \lambda f. \lambda k'. \lambda i'. i' M_1 M_1 M_\varepsilon p' f k'$, where
 - $M_1 := \lambda r'. \lambda p'. \lambda f. \lambda k'. \mathbf{append}^1(\lambda z''. \mathbf{pred}(\lambda z'. f k' z') z'') p' r'$;
 - M_ε is whatever closed term.
- $N_\varepsilon := \lambda f. \lambda k'. \lambda i'. i' O_0 O_1 O_L O_R O_\varepsilon k'$, where
 - $O_b := \lambda s'. \lambda k'. k' [b]$;
 - O_ε is whatever closed term.

The first steps of the evaluation of $\mathbf{lookup} k \overline{[n]i}$ are common to all strings $i \in \mathbb{B}^+$ and natural numbers $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{lookup} k \overline{[n]i} &= \mathbf{fix} \mathbf{lookupaux} k \overline{[n]i} \\
 &\xrightarrow{2}_\beta \mathbf{lookupaux}(\lambda z. \mathbf{lookup} z) k \overline{[n]i} \\
 &= (\lambda f. \lambda k'. \lambda n'. \lambda i'. n' N_0 N_1 N_\varepsilon f k' i')(\lambda z. \mathbf{lookup} z) k \overline{[n]i} \\
 &\xrightarrow{4}_\beta \overline{[n]} N_0 N_1 N_\varepsilon (\lambda z. \mathbf{lookup} z) k \overline{i}
 \end{aligned}$$

Cases of n :

- $n = 0$, and so $\overline{[n]} = \varepsilon$: then

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\overline{\varepsilon} N_0 N_1 N_\varepsilon (\lambda z. \mathbf{lookup} z) k \overline{i} \\
 = &(\lambda x_0. \lambda x_1. \lambda x_\varepsilon. x_\varepsilon) N_0 N_1 N_\varepsilon (\lambda z. \mathbf{lookup} z) k \overline{i} x_\varepsilon N_\varepsilon (\lambda z. \mathbf{lookup} z) k \overline{i} \\
 = &(\lambda f. \lambda k'. \lambda i'. i' O_0 O_1 O_L O_R O_\varepsilon k')(\lambda z. \mathbf{lookup} z) k \overline{i} \\
 \xrightarrow{3}_{det} &\overline{i} O_0 O_1 O_L O_R O_\varepsilon k
 \end{aligned}$$

Let i start with $b \in \mathbb{B}$, that is, $i = b \cdot s$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \overline{b \cdot s} O_0 O_1 O_L O_R O_\varepsilon k &= (\lambda x_0. \lambda x_1. \lambda x_\varepsilon. x_b \overline{s}) O_0 O_1 O_L O_R O_\varepsilon k \\
 &\xrightarrow{3}_{det} O_b \overline{s} k \\
 &= (\lambda s'. \lambda k'. k' [b]) \overline{s} k \\
 &\xrightarrow{2}_\beta k [b] \\
 &= k [\mathbf{LOOKUP} \varepsilon (b \cdot s)] \\
 &= k [\mathbf{LOOKUP} [0] i]
 \end{aligned}$$

- *Non-empty string starting with 0*, that is, $n > 0$ and $\overline{[n]} = 0 \cdot p$: then

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\overline{[n]} N_0 N_1 N_\varepsilon (\lambda z. \mathbf{lookup} z) k \overline{i} \\
 = &(\lambda x_0. \lambda x_1. \lambda x_\varepsilon. x_0 \overline{p}) N_0 N_1 N_\varepsilon (\lambda z. \mathbf{lookup} z) k \overline{i} \\
 \xrightarrow{3}_\beta &N_0 \overline{p} (\lambda z. \mathbf{lookup} z) k \overline{i} \\
 = &(\lambda p'. \lambda f. \lambda k'. \lambda i'. i' M_0 M_0 M_\varepsilon p' f k') \overline{p} (\lambda z. \mathbf{lookup} z) k \overline{i} \\
 \xrightarrow{4}_\beta &\overline{i} M_0 M_0 M_\varepsilon \overline{p} (\lambda z. \mathbf{lookup} z) k
 \end{aligned}$$

Let i start with $b \in \mathbb{B}$, that is, $i = b \cdot r$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \overline{b \cdot r} M_0 M_0 M_\varepsilon k \\
& = \\
& (\lambda x_0. \lambda x_1. \lambda x_\varepsilon. x_b \bar{r}) M_0 M_0 M_\varepsilon \bar{p} (\lambda z. \text{lookup } z) k \\
& \xrightarrow[\text{det}]{|\Sigma|} \\
& M_0 \bar{r} \bar{p} (\lambda z. \text{lookup } z) k \\
& = \\
& (\lambda r'. \lambda p'. \lambda f. \lambda k'. \text{append}^0 (\lambda z''. \text{pred} (\lambda z'. f k' z'') z'') p' r') \bar{r} \bar{p} (\lambda z. \text{lookup } z) k \\
& \xrightarrow[\text{det}]{4} \\
& \text{append}^0 (\lambda z''. \text{pred} (\lambda z'. (\lambda z. \text{lookup } z) k z') z'') \bar{p} \bar{r} \\
& (L. 2.2 \xrightarrow[\text{det}]{\mathcal{O}(1)}) \\
& (\lambda z''. \text{pred} (\lambda z'. (\lambda z. \text{lookup } z) k z') z'') \overline{0 \cdot p} \bar{r} \\
& \xrightarrow[\text{det}]{} \\
& \text{pred} (\lambda z'. (\lambda z. \text{lookup } z) k z') \overline{0 \cdot p} \bar{r} \\
& = \\
& \text{pred} (\lambda z'. (\lambda z. \text{lookup } z) k z') \overline{[n]} \bar{r} \\
& (L. 2.4 \xrightarrow[\text{det}]{\mathcal{O}(\log n)}) \\
& (\lambda z'. (\lambda z. \text{lookup } z) k z') \overline{\text{PRED } [n]} \bar{r} \\
& \xrightarrow[\text{det}]{2} \\
& \text{lookup } k \overline{\text{PRED } [n]} \bar{r} \\
& = \\
& \text{lookup } k \overline{[n-1]} \bar{r} \\
& (i.h.) \xrightarrow[\text{det}]{\mathcal{O}((n-1) \cdot \log(n-1))} \\
& k(\lceil \text{LOOKUP } [n-1] r \rceil) \\
& = \\
& k(\lceil \text{LOOKUP } [n] s \rceil)
\end{aligned}$$

The number of β steps then is $\mathcal{O}(\log n) + \mathcal{O}((n-1) \cdot \log(n-1)) + h$ for a certain constant h , which is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot \log n)$, as required.

- *Non-empty string starting with 1*, that is, $n > 0$ and $[n] = 1 \cdot p$: same as the previous one, simply replacing N_0 with N_1 , and thus M_0 with M_1 . In particular, it takes the same number of steps. \square

2.2 The New Encoding of Turing Machines

Turing Machines. Let $\mathbb{B}_1 := \{0, 1, L, R\}$ and $\mathbb{B}_W := \{0, 1, \square\}$ where L and R delimit the input (binary) string, and \square is our notation for the blank symbol. A deterministic binary Turing machine \mathcal{M} with input is a tuple $(Q, q_{in}, q_T, q_F, \delta)$ consisting of:

- A finite set $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_m\}$ of *states*;
- A distinguished state $q_{in} \in Q$, called the *initial state*;
- Two distinguished states $Q_{fin} := \{q_T, q_F\} \subseteq Q$, called the *final states*;
- A partial *transition function* $\delta : \mathbb{B}_1 \times \mathbb{B}_W \times Q \rightarrow \{-1, +1, 0\} \times \mathbb{B}_W \times \{\leftarrow, \rightarrow, \downarrow\} \times Q$ such that $\delta(b, a, q)$ is defined only if $q \notin Q_{fin}$.

A configuration for \mathcal{M} is a tuple

$$(i, n, w_l, a, w_r, q) \in \mathbb{B}_1^* \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{B}_W^* \times \mathbb{B}_W \times \mathbb{B}_W^* \times Q$$

where:

- i is the immutable input string and is formed as $i = L \cdot s \cdot R$, $s \in \mathbb{B}^*$;
- $n \in \mathbb{N}$ represents the position of the input head. It is meant to be represented in binary (that is, as an element of \mathbb{B}^*), to take space $\log n$, but for ease of reading we keep referring to it as a number rather than as a string;
- $w_l \in \mathbb{B}_W^*$ is the work tape on the left of the work head;
- $a \in \mathbb{B}_W$ is the element on the cell of the work tape read by the work head;
- $w_r \in \mathbb{B}_W^*$ is the work tape on the right of the work head;
- $q \in Q$ is the state of the machine.

For readability, we usually write a configuration (i, n, w_l, a, w_r, q) as $(i, n \mid w_l, a, w_r \mid q)$, separating the input components, the working components, and the current state.

Given an input string $i \in \mathbb{B}_1^*$ (where $i = L \cdot s \cdot R$ and $s \in \mathbb{B}^*$) we define:

- the *initial configuration* $C_{\text{in}}(i)$ for i is $C_{\text{in}}(i) := (i, 0 \mid \varepsilon, \square, \varepsilon \mid q_{\text{in}})$,
- the *final configuration* $C_{\text{fin}} := (s, n \mid w_l, a, w_r \mid q)$, where $q \in Q_{\text{fin}}$.

For readability, a transition, say, $\delta(i_n, a, q) = (-1, a', \leftarrow, q')$, is usually written as $(-1 \mid a', \leftarrow \mid q')$ to stress the three components corresponding to those of configurations (input, work, state).

As in Goldreich, we assume that the machine never scans the input beyond the boundaries of the input. This does not affect space complexity.

An example of transition: if $\delta(i_n, a, q) = (-1 \mid a', \leftarrow \mid q')$, then \mathcal{M} evolves from $C = (i, n \mid w_l a'', a, w_r \mid q)$, where the n th character of i is i_n , to $D = (i, n-1 \mid w_l, a'', a' w_r \mid q')$ and if the tape on the left of the work head is empty, i.e. if $C = (i, n \mid \varepsilon, a, w_r \mid q)$, then the content of the new head cell is a blank symbol, that is, $D := (i, n-1 \mid \varepsilon, \square, a' w_r \mid q')$. The same happens if the tape on the right of the work head is empty. If \mathcal{M} has a transition from C to D we write $C \rightarrow_{\mathcal{M}} D$. A configuration having as state a final state $q \in Q_{\text{fin}}$ is *final* and cannot evolve.

A Turing machine $(Q, q_{\text{in}}, q_T, q_F, \delta)$ computes the function $f : \mathbb{B}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ in time $T : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and space $S : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ if for every $i \in \mathbb{B}^+$, the initial configuration for i evolves to a final configuration of state $q_{f(i)}$ in $T(|i|)$ steps and using at most $S(|i|)$ cells on the work tape.

Encoding configurations. A configuration $(i, n \mid s, a, r \mid q)$ of a machine $\mathcal{M} = (Q, q_{\text{in}}, q_T, q_F, \delta)$ is represented by the term

$$\overline{(i, n \mid w_l, a, w_r \mid q)}^{\mathcal{M}} := \lambda x. (x \bar{i}^{\mathbb{B}^+} \overline{[n]}^{\mathbb{B}} \overline{w_l^{\mathbb{B}_W^*}} [a]^{\mathbb{B}_W} \overline{w_r^{\mathbb{B}_W^*}} [q]^Q).$$

where $w_l^{\mathbb{R}}$ is the string w_l with the elements in reverse order. We shall often rather write

$$\overline{(i, n \mid w_l, a, w_r \mid q)} := \lambda x. (x \bar{i} \overline{[n]} \overline{w_l^{\mathbb{R}}} [a] \overline{w_r} [q]).$$

letting the superscripts implicit. To ease the reading, we sometimes use the following notation for tuples $\langle s, q \mid t, u, r \mid w \rangle := \lambda x.(xsqturw)$, so that $\overline{\langle i, n \mid w_l, a, w_r \mid q \rangle} = \langle \bar{i}, \bar{n} \mid \bar{w}_l^R, \bar{a}, \bar{w}_r \mid \bar{q} \rangle$.

Encoding the transition functions The transition function $\delta(b, a, q)$ is implemented by looking up into a 3-dimensional table T having for coordinates:

- *Input*: the current bit b on the input tape, which is actually retrieved from the input tape i and the counter n of the current input position,
- *Work*: the current character a on the work tape, and
- *State*: the current state q ,

The transition function is encoded as a recursive λ -term `trans` taking as argument the encodings of i , and n —to retrieve b —and a and q . It works as follows:

- It first retrieves b from n and i by applying the `lookup` function;
- It has a subterm A_b for the four values of b . The right sub-term is selected by applying the encoding \bar{b} of b to A_0, A_1, A_L and A_R .
- Each A_b in turn has a sub-term $B_{b,a}$ for every character $a \in \mathbb{B}_W$, corresponding to the working tape coordinates. The right sub-term is selected by applying the encoding \bar{a} of the current character a on the work tape to $B_{b,0}, B_{b,1}, B_{b,\square}$.
- Each $B_{b,a}$ in turn has a subterm $C_{b,a,q}$ for every character q in Q . The right sub-term is selected by applying the encoding \bar{q} of the current state q to $C_{b,a,q_1}, \dots, B_{b,a,q_{|Q|}}$.
- The subterm $C_{b,a,q}$ produces the (encoding of the) next configuration according to the transition function δ . If δ decreases (resp. increases) the counter for the input tape then $C_{b,a,q}$ applies `pred` (resp. `succ`) to the input counter and then applies a term corresponding to the required action on the work tape, namely:
 - S (for *stay*) if the head does not move. This case is easy, S simply produces the next configuration.
 - L if it moves left. Let $w_l = wa''$, a' the element that the transition has to write and q' the new state. Then L has a subterm $L_{a'',q'}$ for each $a'' \in \mathbb{B}_W$ the task of which is to add a' to the right part of the work tape, remove a'' from the left part of the work tape (which becomes w), and make a'' the character in the work head position.
 - R if it moves right. Its structure is similar to the one of L .

In order to be as modular as possible we use the definition of S , L , and R for the cases when the input head moves also for the cases where it does not move, even if this requires a useless (but harmless) additional update of the counter n .

Define the term $\text{trans}^{\mathcal{M}}$, or simply trans , as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{transaux} &:= \lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda C'.C'(\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\lambda w'_l.\lambda a'.\lambda w'_r.\lambda q'.\text{lookup } K i' n') \\ \text{trans} &:= \text{fix transaux}, \end{aligned}$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} T &:= \lambda b'.b' A_0 A_1 A_L A_R a' q' x k' i' n' w'_l w'_r \\ A_b &:= \lambda a'.a' B_{b,0} B_{b,1} B_{b,\square} \\ B_{b,a} &:= \lambda q'.q' C_{b,a,q_1} \dots C_{b,a,q_{|Q|}} \\ C_{b,a,q} &:= \lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\lambda w'_l.\lambda w'_r. \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} k' \langle i', n' \mid w'_l, [a], w'_r \mid [q] \rangle & \text{if } q \in Q_{\text{fin}} \\ Sn' & \text{if } \delta(b, a, q) = (0 \mid a', \downarrow \mid q') \\ Ln' & \text{if } \delta(b, a, q) = (0 \mid a', \leftarrow \mid q') \\ Rn' & \text{if } \delta(b, a, q) = (0 \mid a', \rightarrow \mid q') \\ \text{pred}Sn' & \text{if } \delta(b, a, q) = (-1 \mid a', \downarrow \mid q') \\ \text{pred}Ln' & \text{if } \delta(b, a, q) = (-1 \mid a', \leftarrow \mid q') \\ \text{pred}Rn' & \text{if } \delta(b, a, q) = (-1 \mid a', \rightarrow \mid q') \\ \text{succ}Sn' & \text{if } \delta(b, a, q) = (+1 \mid a', \downarrow \mid q') \\ \text{succ}Ln' & \text{if } \delta(b, a, q) = (+1 \mid a', \leftarrow \mid q') \\ \text{succ}Rn' & \text{if } \delta(b, a, q) = (+1 \mid a', \rightarrow \mid q') \end{array} \right. \\ S &:= \lambda n''.xk' \langle i', n'' \mid w'_l, [a'], w'_r \mid [q'] \rangle \\ L &:= \lambda n''.w'_l L_0^{q',a'} L_1^{q',a'} L_{\square}^{q',a'} L_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'} xk' i' n'' w'_r \\ R &:= \lambda n''.w'_r R_0^{q',a'} R_1^{q',a'} R_{\square}^{q',a'} R_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'} xk' i' n'' w'_l \\ L_{a''}^{q',a'} &:= \lambda w'_l.\lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\text{append}^{a'}(\lambda w'_r.xk' \langle i', n' \mid w'_l, [a''], w'_r \mid [q'] \rangle) \\ L_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'} &:= \lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\text{append}^{a'}((\lambda d.\lambda w'_r.xk' \langle i', n' \mid d, [\square], w'_r \mid [q'] \rangle)\bar{\varepsilon}) \\ R_{a''}^{q',a'} &:= \lambda w'_r.\lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\text{append}^{a'}(\lambda w'_l.xk' \langle i', n' \mid w'_l, [a''], w'_r \mid [q'] \rangle) \\ R_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'} &:= \lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\text{append}^{a'}((\lambda d.\lambda w'_l.xk' \langle i', n' \mid w'_l, [\square], d \mid [q'] \rangle)\bar{\varepsilon}) \end{aligned}$$

3 Time Correctness of the Encoding

Turning the input string into the initial configuration. The following lemma provides the term init that builds the initial configuration.

Lemma 3.1 (Turning the input string into the initial configuration). *Let $\mathcal{M} = (Q, q_{\text{in}}, q_T, q_F, \delta)$ be a Turing machine. There is a term $\text{init}^{\mathcal{M}}$, or simply init , such that for every continuation term k and for every input string $i \in \mathbb{B}_1^*$ (where $i = \text{L} \cdot s \cdot \text{R}$ and $s \in \mathbb{B}^*$):*

$$\text{init } k \bar{i} \rightarrow_{\text{det}}^{\Theta(1)} k \overline{C_{\text{in}}(i)}$$

where $C_{\text{in}}(i)$ is the initial configuration of \mathcal{M} for i .

Proof. Define

$$\text{init} := (\lambda d.\lambda e.\lambda f.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.k' \langle i', d \mid e, [\square]^{\mathbb{B}_w}, f \mid [q_{\text{in}}] \rangle) \overline{[0]_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^{\mathbb{B}_w^*} \bar{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{B}_w^*}}$$

Please note that the term is not in normal form. This is for technical reasons that will be clear next. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{init } k \bar{i}^{\mathbb{B}^*} &= (\lambda d. \lambda e. \lambda f. \lambda k'. \lambda i'. k' \langle i', d \mid e, [\square]^{\mathbb{B}^w}, f \mid [q_{in}]^Q \rangle) \overline{[0]}_{\bar{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{B}^w} \bar{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{B}^*} k \bar{i}^{\mathbb{B}^*}} \\
&\xrightarrow{5}_{det} k \langle \bar{i}^{\mathbb{B}^*}, \overline{[0]} \mid \bar{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{B}^w}, [\square]^{\mathbb{B}^w}, \bar{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{B}^*} \mid [q_{in}]^Q \rangle \\
&= k \langle i, 0 \mid \varepsilon, \square, \varepsilon \mid q_{in} \rangle \\
&= k C_{in}(i)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Extracting the output from the final configuration.

Lemma 3.2 (Extracting the output from the final configuration). *Let $\mathcal{M} = (Q, q_{in}, q_T, q_F, \delta)$ be a Turing machine. There is a term $\mathbf{final}^{\mathcal{M}}$, or simply \mathbf{final} , such that for every continuation term k and for every final configuration C of state $q \in Q_{fin}$:*

$$\mathbf{final} k \bar{C} \xrightarrow{\Theta(|Q|)}_{det} \begin{cases} k(\lambda x. \lambda y. x) & \text{if } q = q_T \\ k(\lambda x. \lambda y. y) & \text{if } q = q_F \end{cases}$$

Proof. Define

$$\mathbf{final} := \lambda k'. \lambda C'. C'(\lambda i'. \lambda n'. \lambda w'_l. \lambda a'. \lambda w'_r. \lambda q'. q' N_1 \dots N_{|Q|} k')$$

where:

$$N_i := \begin{cases} \lambda k'. k'(\lambda x. \lambda y. x) & \text{if } q_i = q_T \\ \lambda k'. k'(\lambda x. \lambda y. y) & \text{if } q_i = q_F \\ \text{whatever closed term (say, the identity)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{final} k \bar{C} \\
&= (\lambda k'. \lambda C'. C'(\lambda i'. \lambda n'. \lambda w'_l. \lambda a'. \lambda w'_r. \lambda q'. q' N_1 \dots N_{|Q|} k')) k \bar{C} \\
&\xrightarrow{2}_{det} \overline{C}(\lambda i'. \lambda n'. \lambda w'_l. \lambda a'. \lambda w'_r. \lambda q'. q' N_1 \dots N_{|Q|} k) \\
&= \overline{(i, n \mid w_l, a, w_r \mid q)}(\lambda i'. \lambda n'. \lambda w'_l. \lambda a'. \lambda w'_r. \lambda q'. q' N_1 \dots N_{|Q|} k) \\
&= (\lambda x. x \bar{i}^{\mathbb{B}^*} \overline{[n]} \overline{w_l^{\mathbb{B}^*}} \overline{[a]}^{\mathbb{B}^w} \overline{w_r^{\mathbb{B}^*}} \overline{[q]}^Q)(\lambda i'. \lambda n'. \lambda w'_l. \lambda a'. \lambda w'_r. \lambda q'. q' N_1 \dots N_{|Q|} k) \\
&\xrightarrow{det} (\lambda i'. \lambda n'. \lambda w'_l. \lambda a'. \lambda w'_r. \lambda q'. q' N_1 \dots N_{|Q|} k) \bar{i}^{\mathbb{B}^*} \overline{[n]} \overline{w_l^{\mathbb{B}^*}} \overline{[a]}^{\mathbb{B}^w} \overline{w_r^{\mathbb{B}^*}} \overline{[q]}^Q \\
&\xrightarrow{6}_{det} \overline{[q]}^Q N_1 \dots N_{|Q|} k \\
&= (\lambda x_1 \dots x_{|Q|}. x_j) N_1 \dots N_{|Q|} k \\
&\xrightarrow{|Q|}_{det} N_j k
\end{aligned}$$

If $q = q_T$, then:

$$\begin{aligned}
N_j k &= (\lambda k'. k'(\lambda x. \lambda y. x)) k \\
&\xrightarrow{det} k(\lambda x. \lambda y. x)
\end{aligned}$$

If $q = q_F$, then:

$$\begin{aligned}
N_j k &= (\lambda k'. k'(\lambda x. \lambda y. y)) k \\
&\xrightarrow{det} k(\lambda x. \lambda y. y)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Simulation of a machine transition. Now we show that the given encoding of the transition function δ of a Turing machine as a λ -term simulates every single transition in $\mathcal{O}(|i| \log |i|)$ time, where i is the input string. This is the heart of the encoding, and the most involved proof.

Lemma 3.3 (Simulation of a machine transition). *Let $\mathcal{M} = (Q, q_{in}, q_T, q_F, \delta)$ be a Turing machine. The term $\mathbf{trans}^{\mathcal{M}}$ is such that for every continuation term k and for every configuration C of input string $i \in \mathbb{B}^+$:*

- Final configuration: *if C is a final configuration then $\mathbf{trans} k \overline{C} \xrightarrow[\text{det}]{\mathcal{O}(|i| \log |i|)} k \overline{C}$;*
- Non-final configuration: *if $C \rightarrow_{\mathcal{M}} D$ then $\mathbf{trans} k \overline{C} \xrightarrow[\text{det}]{\mathcal{O}(|i| \log |i|)} \mathbf{trans} k \overline{D}$.*

Proof. Let $C = (i, n \mid w_l, a, w_r \mid q)$. We are now going to show the details of how the λ -calculus simulates the transition function. At the level of the number of steps, the main cost is payed at the beginning, by the `lookup` function that looks up the n -th character of the input string i . The cost of one such call is $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$, but since n can vary and $n \leq |i|$, such a cost is bound by $\mathcal{O}(|i| \log |i|)$. The cases of transition where the position on the input tape does not change have a constant cost. Those where the input position changes require to change the counter n via `pred` or `succ`, which requires $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$, itself bound by the cost $\mathcal{O}(|i| \log |i|)$ of the previous look-up.

Now, if `LOOKUP [n]i = b` then:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{trans } k \overline{C} \\
& = \\
& \text{fix transaux } k \overline{C} \\
& \xrightarrow{2}_{det} \\
& \text{transaux}(\lambda z. \text{fix transaux } z) k \overline{C} \\
& = \\
& \text{transaux}(\lambda z. \text{trans } z) k \overline{C} \\
& = \\
& (\lambda x. \lambda k'. \lambda C'. C'(\lambda i'. \lambda n'. \lambda w'_l. \lambda a'. \lambda w'_r. \lambda q'. \text{lookup } T i' n'))(\lambda z. \text{trans } z) k \overline{C} \\
& \xrightarrow{3}_{det} \\
& \overline{C}(\lambda i'. \lambda n'. \lambda w'_l. \lambda a'. \lambda w'_r. \lambda q'. \text{lookup } T \{x \leftarrow \lambda z. \text{trans } z\} i' n') \\
& = \\
& \overline{(i, n \mid w_l, a, w_r \mid q)}(\lambda i'. \lambda n'. \lambda w'_l. \lambda a'. \lambda w'_r. \lambda q'. \text{lookup } T \{x \leftarrow \lambda z. \text{trans } z\} i' n') \\
& = \\
& (\lambda x. x \overline{i[n] w'_l^R} [a] \overline{w_r} [q])(\lambda i'. \lambda n'. \lambda w'_l. \lambda a'. \lambda w'_r. \lambda q'. \text{lookup } T \{x \leftarrow \lambda z. \text{trans } z\} i' n') \\
& = \\
& (\lambda i'. \lambda n'. \lambda w'_l. \lambda a'. \lambda w'_r. \lambda q'. \text{lookup } T \{x \leftarrow \lambda z. \text{trans } z\} i' n') \overline{i[n] w'_l^R} [a] \overline{w_r} [q] \\
& \xrightarrow{6}_{det} \\
& \text{lookup}(\lambda b'. b' A_0 A_1 A_L A_R [a] [q](\lambda z. \text{trans } z) k' \overline{i[n] w'_l^R w_r} \overline{i[n]}) \\
& L. 2.5 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}(n \log n)}_{det} \\
& (\lambda b'. b' A_0 A_1 A_L A_R [a] [q](\lambda z. \text{trans } z) k' \overline{i[n] w'_l^R w_r}) \overline{i[n]} [b] \\
& \xrightarrow{det} \\
& [b] A_0 A_1 A_L A_R [a] [q](\lambda z. \text{trans } z) k \overline{i[n] w'_l^R w_r} \\
& \xrightarrow{4}_{det} \\
& A_b [a] [q](\lambda z. \text{trans } z) k \overline{i[n] w'_l^R w_r} \\
& = \\
& (\lambda a'. a' B_{b,0} B_{b,1} B_{b,\square}) [a] [q](\lambda z. \text{trans } z) k \overline{i[n] w'_l^R w_r} \\
& \xrightarrow{det} \\
& [a] B_{b,0} B_{b,1} B_{b,\square} [q](\lambda z. \text{trans } z) k \overline{i[n] w'_l^R w_r} \\
& \xrightarrow{3}_{det} \\
& B_{b,a} [q](\lambda z. \text{trans } z) k \overline{i[n] w'_l^R w_r} \\
& = \\
& (\lambda q'. q' C_{b,a,q_1} \dots C_{b,a,q_{|Q|}}) [q](\lambda z. \text{trans } z) k \overline{i[n] w'_l^R w_r} \\
& \xrightarrow{det} \\
& [q] C_{b,a,q_1} \dots C_{b,a,q_{|Q|}} (\lambda z. \text{trans } z) k \overline{i[n] w'_l^R w_r} \\
& \xrightarrow{|Q|}_{det} \\
& C_{b,a,q} (\lambda z. \text{trans } z) k \overline{i[n] w'_l^R w_r}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, consider the following four cases, depending on the value of $\delta(b, a, q)$:

1. *Final state*: if $\delta(b, a, q)$ is undefined, then $q \in Q_{fin}$ and replacing $C_{b,a,q}$ with the corresponding λ -term we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& C_{b,a,q}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_l^R\bar{w}_r} \\
& = \\
& (\lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\lambda w_l'.\lambda w_r'.k'\langle i', n' \mid w_l', [a], w_r' \mid [q] \rangle)(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_l^R\bar{w}_r} \\
& \xrightarrow{\delta_{det}^6} \\
& k\langle \bar{i}, \overline{[n]} \mid \overline{w_l^R}, [a], \overline{w_r} \mid [q] \rangle \\
& = \\
& \overline{k(i, n \mid w_l, a, w_r \mid q)} \\
& = \\
& k\bar{C}
\end{aligned}$$

2. *The heads do not move:* if $\delta(b, a, q) = (0 \mid a', \downarrow \mid q')$, then $D = (i, n \mid w_l, a', w_r, q')$.
The simulation continues as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& C_{b,a,q}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_l^R\bar{w}_r} \\
& = \\
& (\lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\lambda w_l'.\lambda w_r'.Sn')(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_l^R\bar{w}_r} \\
& = \\
& (\lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\lambda w_l'.\lambda w_r'.(\lambda n''.xk'\langle i', n'' \mid w_l', [a'], w_r' \mid [q'] \rangle)n')(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_l^R\bar{w}_r} \\
& \xrightarrow{\delta_{det}^6} \\
& (\lambda n''.(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\langle \bar{i}, n'' \mid \overline{w_l^R}, [a'], \overline{w_r} \mid [q'] \rangle)\overline{[n]} \\
& \xrightarrow{\delta_{det}^2} \\
& \mathbf{trans} k\langle \bar{i}, \overline{[n]} \mid \overline{w_l^R}, [a'], \overline{w_r} \mid [q'] \rangle \\
& = \\
& \mathbf{trans} \overline{k(i, n \mid w_l, a', w_r \mid q')} \\
& = \\
& \mathbf{trans} k\bar{D}
\end{aligned}$$

3. *The input head does not move and the work head moves left:* if $\delta(b, a, q) = (0 \mid a', \leftarrow \mid q')$ and $w_l = wa''$ then:

$$\begin{aligned}
& C_{b,a,q}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_l^R\bar{w}_r} \\
& = \\
& (\lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n''.\lambda w_l'.\lambda w_r'.Ln')(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_l^R\bar{w}_r} \\
& = \\
& (\lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n''.\lambda w_l'.\lambda w_r'.(\lambda n'''.w_l'L_0^{q',a'}L_1^{q',a'}L_{\square}^{q',a'}L_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}xk'i'n''w_r')n')(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_l^R\bar{w}_r} \\
& \xrightarrow{\delta_{det}^6} \\
& (\lambda n'''.\overline{w_l^R}L_0^{q',a'}L_1^{q',a'}L_{\square}^{q',a'}L_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_r})\overline{[n]} \\
& \xrightarrow{\delta_{det}} \\
& \overline{w_l^R}L_0^{q',a'}L_1^{q',a'}L_{\square}^{q',a'}L_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_r}
\end{aligned}$$

Two sub-cases, depending on whether w_l is an empty or a compound string.

- (a) w_l is the compound string wa'' . Then $w_l^R = a''w^R$ and $D = (i, n \mid w_l, a'', a'w_r \mid q')$.
The simulation continues as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \\
&\overline{a''w_r} L_0^{q',a'} L_1^{q',a'} L_{\square}^{q',a'} L_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'} (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \overline{i[n]w_r} \\
&\xrightarrow{4}_{det} \\
&L_{a''}^{q',a'} \overline{w_r} (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \overline{i[n]w_r} \\
&= \\
&(\lambda w'_l. \lambda x. \lambda k'. \lambda i'. \lambda n'. \mathbf{append}^{a'} (\lambda w'_r. x k' \langle i', n' | w'_l, [a''], w'_r | [q'] \rangle)) \overline{w_r} (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \overline{i[n]w_r} \\
&\xrightarrow{5}_{det} \\
&\mathbf{append}^{a'} (\lambda w'_r. (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \langle \overline{i}, \overline{[n]} | \overline{w_r}, [a''], w'_r | [q'] \rangle) \overline{w_r} \\
&L. 2.2 \xrightarrow{O(1)}_{det} \\
&(\lambda w'_r. (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \langle \overline{i}, \overline{[n]} | \overline{w_r}, [a''], w'_r | [q'] \rangle) \overline{a'w_r} \\
&\xrightarrow{2}_{det} \\
&\mathbf{trans} k \langle \overline{i}, \overline{[n]} | \overline{w_r}, [a''], \overline{a'w_r} | [q'] \rangle \\
&= \\
&\mathbf{trans} k \overline{(i, n | w, a'', a'w_r | q')} \\
&= \\
&\mathbf{trans} k \overline{D}
\end{aligned}$$

(b) w_l is the empty string ε . Then $D = (i, n | \varepsilon, \square, a'w_r | q')$. The simulation continues as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \\
&\overline{\varepsilon} L_0^{q',a'} L_1^{q',a'} L_{\square}^{q',a'} L_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'} (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \overline{i[n]w_r} \\
&\xrightarrow{4}_{det} \\
&L_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'} (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \overline{i[n]w_r} \\
&= \\
&(\lambda x. \lambda k'. \lambda i'. \lambda n'. \mathbf{append}^{a'} ((\lambda d. \lambda w'_r. x k' \langle i', n' | d, [\square], w'_r | [q'] \rangle) \overline{\varepsilon})) (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \overline{i[n]w_r} \\
&\xrightarrow{5}_{det} \\
&\mathbf{append}^{a'} ((\lambda d. \lambda w'_r. (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \langle \overline{i}, \overline{[n]} | d, [\square], w'_r | [q'] \rangle) \overline{\varepsilon}) \overline{w_r} \\
&L. 2.2 \xrightarrow{O(1)}_{det} \\
&((\lambda d. \lambda w'_r. (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \langle \overline{i}, \overline{[n]} | d, [\square], w'_r | [q'] \rangle) \overline{\varepsilon}) \overline{a'w_r} \\
&\xrightarrow{3}_{det} \\
&\mathbf{trans} k \langle \overline{i}, \overline{[n]} | \overline{\varepsilon}, [\square], \overline{a'w_r} | [q'] \rangle \\
&= \\
&\mathbf{trans} k \overline{(i, n | \varepsilon, \square, a'w_r | q')} \\
&= \\
&\mathbf{trans} k \overline{D}
\end{aligned}$$

4. The input head does not move and the work head moves right: if $\delta(b, a, q) = (0 | a', \rightarrow | q')$ and $w_r = a''w$ then:

$$\begin{aligned}
& C_{b,a,q}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}[\bar{n}]w_l^R\bar{w}_r \\
& = \\
& (\lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\lambda w_l'.\lambda w_r'.Rn')(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}[\bar{n}]w_l^R\bar{w}_r \\
& = \\
& (\lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\lambda w_l'.\lambda w_r'.(\lambda n''.w_r'.R_0^{q',a'}R_1^{q',a'}R_{\square}^{q',a'}R_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}xk'i'n''w_l')n')(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}[\bar{n}]w_l^R\bar{w}_r \\
& \xrightarrow{6}_{det} \\
& (\lambda n''.\bar{w}_r.R_0^{q',a'}R_1^{q',a'}R_{\square}^{q',a'}R_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}n''\bar{w}_l^R)[\bar{n}] \\
& \xrightarrow{det} \\
& \bar{w}_r.R_0^{q',a'}R_1^{q',a'}R_{\square}^{q',a'}R_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}[\bar{n}]w_l^R
\end{aligned}$$

Two sub-cases, depending on whether w_l is an empty or a compound string.

- (a) w_r is the compound string $a''w$. Then $D = (i, n \mid w_l a', a'', w \mid q')$. The simulation continues as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& = \\
& \bar{a}''w.R_0^{q',a'}R_1^{q',a'}R_{\square}^{q',a'}R_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}[\bar{n}]w_l^R \\
& \xrightarrow{4}_{det} \\
& R_{a''}^{q',a'}\bar{w}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}[\bar{n}]w_l^R \\
& = \\
& (\lambda w_r'.\lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\mathbf{append}^{a'}(\lambda w_l'.xk'\langle i', n' \mid w_l', [a''], w_r' \mid [q'] \rangle))\bar{w}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}[\bar{n}]w_l^R \\
& \xrightarrow{5}_{det} \\
& \mathbf{append}^{a'}(\lambda w_l'.(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\langle \bar{i}, \bar{n} \mid w_l', [a''], w \mid [q'] \rangle)\bar{w}_l^R \\
& L. 2.2 \xrightarrow{O(1)}_{det} (\lambda w_l'.(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\langle \bar{i}, \bar{n} \mid w_l', [a''], w \mid [q'] \rangle)\bar{a}''w_l^R \\
& \xrightarrow{2}_{det} \\
& \mathbf{trans} k\langle \bar{i}, \bar{n} \mid \bar{a}''w_l^R, [a''], w \mid [q'] \rangle \\
& = \\
& \mathbf{trans} k\langle \bar{i}, \bar{n} \mid (\bar{w}_l a')^R, [a''], w \mid [q'] \rangle \\
& = \\
& \mathbf{trans} k\langle i, n \mid w_l a', a'', w \mid q' \rangle \\
& = \\
& \mathbf{trans} k\bar{D}
\end{aligned}$$

- (b) w_r is the empty string ε . Then $D = (i, n \mid w_l a', \square, \varepsilon \mid q')$. The simulation continues as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \\
&\bar{\varepsilon} R_0^{q',a'} R_1^{q',a'} R_{\square}^{q',a'} R_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'} (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \bar{i} \overline{[n] w_l^R} \\
&\xrightarrow{4}_{det} \\
&R_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'} (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \bar{i} \overline{[n] w_l^R} \\
&= \\
&(\lambda x. \lambda k'. \lambda i'. \lambda n'. \mathbf{append}^{a'} ((\lambda d. \lambda w'_l. x k' \langle i', n' \mid w'_l, [\square], d \mid [q'] \rangle) \bar{\varepsilon})) (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \bar{i} \overline{[n] w_l^R} \\
&\xrightarrow{5}_{det} \\
&\mathbf{append}^{a'} ((\lambda d. \lambda w'_l. (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \langle \bar{i}, \overline{[n]} \mid w'_l, [\square], d \mid [q'] \rangle) \bar{\varepsilon}) \overline{w_l^R} \\
&L. 2.2 \xrightarrow{O(1)}_{det} \\
&((\lambda d. \lambda w'_l. (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \langle \bar{i}, \overline{[n]} \mid w'_l, [\square], d \mid [q'] \rangle) \bar{\varepsilon}) \overline{a' w_l^R} \\
&\xrightarrow{3}_{det} \\
&\mathbf{trans} k \langle \bar{i}, \overline{[n]} \mid \overline{a' w_l^R}, [\square], \bar{\varepsilon} \mid [q'] \rangle \\
&= \\
&\mathbf{trans} k \langle \bar{i}, \overline{[n]} \mid \overline{(w_l a')^R}, [\square], \bar{\varepsilon} \mid [q'] \rangle \\
&= \\
&\mathbf{trans} k \overline{(i, n \mid w_l a', \square, \varepsilon \mid q')} \\
&= \\
&\mathbf{trans} k \bar{D}
\end{aligned}$$

5. *The input head moves left and the work head does not move:* if $\delta(b, a, q) = (-1 \mid a', \downarrow \mid q')$, then $D = (i, n-1 \mid w_l, a', w_r, q')$. The simulation continues as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&C_{b,a,q} (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \bar{i} \overline{[n] w_l^R \overline{w_r}} \\
&= \\
&(\lambda x. \lambda k'. \lambda i'. \lambda n'. \lambda w'_l. \lambda w'_r. \mathbf{pred} S (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \bar{i} \overline{[n] w_l^R \overline{w_r}} \\
&= \\
&(\lambda x. \lambda k'. \lambda i'. \lambda n'. \lambda w'_l. \lambda w'_r. \mathbf{pred} (\lambda n''. x k' \langle i', n'' \mid w'_l, [a'], w'_r \mid [q'] \rangle) n') (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \bar{i} \overline{[n] w_l^R \overline{w_r}} \\
&\xrightarrow{6}_{det} \\
&\mathbf{pred} (\lambda n''. (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \langle \bar{i}, n'' \mid \overline{w_l^R}, [a'], \overline{w_r} \mid [q'] \rangle) \overline{[n]} \\
&L. 2.4 \xrightarrow{O(\log n)}_{det} \\
&(\lambda n''. (\lambda z. \mathbf{trans} z) k \langle \bar{i}, n'' \mid \overline{w_l^R}, [a'], \overline{w_r} \mid [q'] \rangle) \overline{[n-1]} \\
&= \\
&\mathbf{trans} k \overline{(i, [n-1] \mid w_l, a', w_r \mid q')} \\
&= \\
&\mathbf{trans} k \overline{(i, [n-1] \mid w_l, a', w_r \mid q')} \\
&= \\
&\mathbf{trans} k \bar{D}
\end{aligned}$$

6. *The input head moves left and the work head moves left:* if $\delta(b, a, q) = (-1 \mid a', \leftarrow \mid q')$ and $w_l = w a''$, then $D = (i, n-1 \mid w, a'', a' w_r, q')$. The simulation continues as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& C_{b,a,q}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_l^R\bar{w}_r} \\
& = \\
& (\lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\lambda w_l'.\lambda w_r'.\mathbf{pred} Ln')(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_l^R\bar{w}_r} \\
& = \\
& (\lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\lambda w_l'.\lambda w_r'.\mathbf{pred}(\lambda n''.w_l'L_0^{q',a'}L_1^{q',a'}L_{\square}^{q',a'}L_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}xk'i'n''w_r')n')(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_l^R\bar{w}_r} \\
& \xrightarrow{6}_{det} \\
& \mathbf{pred}(\lambda n''.\overline{w_l^R}L_0^{q',a'}L_1^{q',a'}L_{\square}^{q',a'}L_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{n''\bar{w}_r})\overline{[n]} \\
& \text{by } L. 2.4 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}(\log n)}_{det} \\
& (\lambda n''.\overline{w_l^R}L_0^{q',a'}L_1^{q',a'}L_{\square}^{q',a'}L_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{n''\bar{w}_r})\overline{[n-1]} \\
& \xrightarrow{det} \\
& \overline{w_l^R}L_0^{q',a'}L_1^{q',a'}L_{\square}^{q',a'}L_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n-1]\bar{w}_r}
\end{aligned}$$

And then the case continues with the two sub-cases of case 3 (input head does not move and work head moves left), with the only difference that $\overline{[n]}$ is replaced by $\overline{[n-1]}$.

7. *The input head moves left and the work head moves right:* if $\delta(b, a, q) = (-1 | a', \leftarrow | q')$ and $w_l = wa''$, then $D = (i, n-1 | w, a'', a'w_r, q')$. The simulation continues as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& C_{b,a,q}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_l^R\bar{w}_r} \\
& = \\
& (\lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\lambda w_l'.\lambda w_r'.\mathbf{pred} Rn')(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_l^R\bar{w}_r} \\
& = \\
& (\lambda x.\lambda k'.\lambda i'.\lambda n'.\lambda w_l'.\lambda w_r'.\mathbf{pred}(\lambda n''.w_r'R_0^{q',a'}R_1^{q',a'}R_{\square}^{q',a'}R_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}xk'i'n''w_l')n')(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n]w_l^R\bar{w}_r} \\
& \xrightarrow{6}_{det} \\
& \mathbf{pred}(\lambda n''.\overline{w_r}R_0^{q',a'}R_1^{q',a'}R_{\square}^{q',a'}R_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{n''\bar{w}_l})\overline{[n]} \\
& \text{by } L. 2.4 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}(\log n)}_{det} \\
& (\lambda n''.\overline{w_r}R_0^{q',a'}R_1^{q',a'}R_{\square}^{q',a'}R_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{n''\bar{w}_l})\overline{[n-1]} \\
& \xrightarrow{det} \\
& \lambda n''.\overline{w_r}R_0^{q',a'}R_1^{q',a'}R_{\square}^{q',a'}R_{\varepsilon}^{q',a'}(\lambda z.\mathbf{trans} z)k\bar{i}\overline{[n-1]\bar{w}_l^R}
\end{aligned}$$

And then the case continues with the two sub-cases of case 4 (input head does not move and work head moves right), with the only difference that $\overline{[n]}$ is replaced by $\overline{[n-1]}$.

8. *The input head moves right and the work head does not move:* exactly as case 5 (input head left, work head does not move) just replacing **pred** with **succ** and using Lemma 2.3 instead of Lemma 2.4.
9. *The input head moves right and the work head moves left:* exactly as case 6 (input head left, work head left) just replacing **pred** with **succ** and using Lemma 2.3 instead of Lemma 2.4.
10. *The input head moves right and the work head moves right:* exactly as case 7 (input head right, work head right) just replacing **pred** with **succ** and using Lemma 2.3 instead of Lemma 2.4. \square

Straightforward inductions on the length of executions provide the following corollaries.

Corollary 3.4 (Executions). *Let \mathcal{M} be a Turing machine. Then there exist a term \mathbf{trans} encoding \mathcal{M} as given by Lemma 3.3 such that for every configuration C of input string $i \in \mathbb{B}^+$*

1. Finite computation: *if D is a final configuration reachable from C in n transition steps then there exists a derivation ρ such that $\rho : \mathbf{trans} k[C] \xrightarrow[\det]{\mathcal{O}((n+1)|i| \log |i|)} k[D]$;*
2. Diverging computation: *if there is no final configuration reachable from C then $\mathbf{trans} k[C]$ diverges.*

The Simulation Theorem. We now have all the ingredients for the final theorem of this note.

Theorem 3.5 (Simulation). *Let $f : \mathbb{B}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ a function computed by a Turing machine \mathcal{M} in time $T_{\mathcal{M}}$. Then there is an encoding $[\cdot]$ into Λ_{\det} of \mathbb{B} , strings, and Turing machines over \mathbb{B} such that for every $i \in \mathbb{B}^+$, there exists ρ such that $\rho : [\mathcal{M}][i] \xrightarrow[\det]{n} [f(i)]$ where $n = \Theta((T_{\mathcal{M}}(|i|) + 1) \cdot |i| \cdot \log |i|)$.*

Proof. Intuitively, the term is simply

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}} := \mathbf{init}(\mathbf{trans}(\mathbf{final}))$$

where the identity \mathbf{l} plays the role of the initial continuation.

Such a term however does not belong to the deterministic λ -calculus, because the right subterms of applications are not always values. The solution is simple, it is enough to η -expand the arguments. Thus, define

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}} := \mathbf{init}(\lambda y. \mathbf{trans}(\lambda x. \mathbf{final} x) y)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{M}}[i] &= \\ \mathbf{init}(\lambda y. \mathbf{trans}(\lambda x. \mathbf{final} x) y)[i] &\xrightarrow[\det]{\Theta(1)} && \text{(by L. 3.1)} \\ (\lambda y. \mathbf{trans}(\lambda x. \mathbf{final} x) y)[C_{\mathbf{in}}^{\mathcal{M}}(s)] &\xrightarrow[\det]{} \\ \mathbf{trans}(\lambda x. \mathbf{final} x)[C_{\mathbf{in}}^{\mathcal{M}}(s)] &\xrightarrow[\det]{\Theta((T_{\mathcal{M}}(|i|)+1) \cdot |i| \cdot \log |i|)} && \text{(by Cor. 3.4)} \\ (\lambda x. \mathbf{final} x)[C_{\mathbf{in}}(f(i))] &\xrightarrow[\det]{} \\ \mathbf{final}[C_{\mathbf{in}}(f(i))] &\xrightarrow[\det]{\Theta(|Q|)} && \text{(by L. 3.2)} \\ \mathbf{l}[f(i)] &\xrightarrow[\det]{} \\ [f(i)] & \end{aligned}$$

□

References

- [DLA17] Ugo Dal Lago and Beniamino Accattoli. Encoding turing machines into the deterministic lambda-calculus. *CoRR*, abs/1711.10078, 2017.
- [Gol00] Mayer Goldberg. Theoretical pearl: An adequate and efficient left-associated binary numeral system in the lambda-calculus. *J. Funct. Program.*, 10(6):607–623, 2000.

- [Mog01] Torben Æ. Mogensen. An investigation of compact and efficient number representations in the pure lambda calculus. In Dines Bjørner, Manfred Broy, and Alexandre V. Zamulin, editors, *Perspectives of System Informatics, 4th International Andrei Ershov Memorial Conference, PSI 2001, Akademgorodok, Novosibirsk, Russia, July 2-6, 2001, Revised Papers*, volume 2244 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 205–213. Springer, 2001.
- [vEB12] Peter van Emde Boas. Turing machines for dummies - why representations do matter. In Mária Bieliková, Gerhard Friedrich, Georg Gottlob, Stefan Katzenbeisser, and György Turán, editors, *SOFSEM 2012: Theory and Practice of Computer Science - 38th Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Computer Science, Špindlerův Mlýn, Czech Republic, January 21-27, 2012. Proceedings*, volume 7147 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 14–30. Springer, 2012.