

# Lecture 8: Lambda Calculus

CSC 131  
Spring, 2019

Kim Bruce

## Pure Lambda Calculus

- Terms of pure lambda calculus
  - $M ::= v \mid (M M) \mid \lambda v. M$
  - Impure versions add constants, but not necessary!
  - Turing-complete
- Left associative:  $M N P = (M N) P$ .
- Computation based on substituting actual parameter for formal parameters

## Free Variables

- Substitution easy to mess up!
- Def: If  $M$  is a term, then  $FV(M)$ , the collection of free variables of  $M$ , is defined as follows:
  - $FV(x) = \{x\}$
  - $FV(M N) = FV(M) \cup FV(N)$
  - $FV(\lambda v. M) = FV(M) - \{v\}$

## Substitution

- Write  $[N/x] M$  to denote result of replacing all free occurrences of  $x$  by  $N$  in expression  $M$ .
  - $[N/x] x = N$ ,
  - $[N/x] y = y$ , if  $y \neq x$ ,
  - $[N/x] (L M) = ([N/x] L) ([N/x] M)$ ,
  - $[N/x] (\lambda y. M) = \lambda y. ([N/x] M)$ , if  $y \neq x$  and  $y \notin FV(N)$ ,
  - $[N/x] (\lambda x. M) = \lambda x. M$ .

## Computation Rules

- Reduction rules for lambda calculus:

$$(\alpha) \lambda x. M \rightarrow \lambda y. ([y/x] M), \text{ if } y \notin FV(M).$$

*change name of parameters if new not capture old*

$$(\beta) (\lambda x. M) N \rightarrow [N/x] M.$$

*computation by subst function argument for formal parameter*

$$(\eta) \lambda x. (M x) \rightarrow M.$$

*Optional rule to get rid of excess  $\lambda$ 's*

## Why so complicated?

*illegal substitution*

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda f. \lambda z. f (f z)) (\lambda x. x + z) &\rightarrow \lambda z. (\lambda x. x + z) ((\lambda x. x + z) z) \\ &\rightarrow \lambda z. (\lambda x. x + z) (z + z) \\ &\rightarrow \lambda z. (z + z) + z = \lambda z. 3z. \end{aligned}$$

- rather than the correct

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda f. \lambda y. f (f y)) (\lambda x. x + z) &\rightarrow \lambda y. (\lambda x. x + z) ((\lambda x. x + z) y) \\ &\rightarrow \lambda y. (\lambda x. x + z) (y + z) \\ &\rightarrow \lambda y. (y + z) + z = \lambda y. y + 2z. \end{aligned}$$

## Normal Forms

- A term  $M$  is in normal form if no reduction rules apply, even after applications of  $\alpha$ .
- Not all terms have normal forms
  - $\Omega = (\lambda x. (x x)) (\lambda x. (x x))$

## How to evaluate

- Many strategies:
  - $(\lambda x. x + 32) ((\lambda y. y * 3) 5) \rightarrow (\lambda x. x + 32) 15 \rightarrow 47$  *Inside-out*
  - versus
  - $(\lambda x. x + 32) ((\lambda y. y * 3) 5) \rightarrow ((\lambda y. y * 3) 5) + 32 \rightarrow 47$  *Outside-in*
- Confluence: If  $M$  can be reduced to a normal form, then there is only one such normal form.
- However, not all strategies give a normal form:
  - $(\lambda x. 47) \Omega$

## Computability

- Can encode all computable functions in pure untyped lambda calculus.
  - true =  $\lambda u. \lambda v. u$ 
    - true a b = a
  - false =  $\lambda u. \lambda v. v$ 
    - false a b = b
  - cond =  $\lambda u. \lambda v. \lambda w. u v w$ 
    - cond true a b = ?      cond false a b = ?

## Lambda Encoding

- Pairing:
  - Pair =  $\lambda m. \lambda n. \lambda b. \text{cond } b m n.$
  - fst =  $\lambda p. p \text{ true}$ 
    - fst (Pair a b) = ?
  - snd =  $\lambda p. p \text{ false}$ 
    - snd (Pair a b) = ?

## Encoding Natural Numbers

- Natural numbers:
  - 0 =  $\lambda s. \lambda z. z.$
  - 1 =  $\lambda s. \lambda z. s z.$
  - 2 =  $\lambda s. \lambda z. s (s z).$
- Integers encode repetition:
  - 2 f x = f (f x)
  - 3 f x = f (f (f x))
  - n f x = f<sup>(n)</sup> (x)

## Arithmetic

- Succ =  $\lambda n. \lambda s. \lambda z. s (n s z)$ 
  - Succ n =  $\lambda s. \lambda z. s (n s z) = \lambda s. \lambda z. s (s^{(n)} z) = \underline{n+1}$
- Plus =  $\lambda n. \lambda m. \lambda s. \lambda z. m s (n s z).$
- Mult =  $\lambda n. \lambda m. (m (\text{Plus } n) \text{0}).$
- isZero =  $\lambda n. n (\lambda x. \text{false}) \text{true}$
- Subtraction is hard!!

## Predecessor

- $\underline{\text{PZero}} = \langle 0, 0 \rangle = \underline{\text{Pair}} \ 0 \ 0$
- $\underline{\text{PSucc}} = \lambda n. \underline{\text{Pair}} (\underline{\text{snd}} \ n) (\underline{\text{Succ}} (\underline{\text{snd}} \ n))$ 
  - $\underline{\text{PSucc}} \ \underline{\text{PZero}} = \langle 0, 1 \rangle$
  - $\underline{n} \ \underline{\text{PSucc}} \ \underline{\text{PZero}} = \langle \underline{n-1}, \underline{n} \rangle$  for  $n > 0$
- $\underline{\text{Pred}} = \lambda n. \underline{\text{fst}} (\underline{n} \ \underline{\text{PSucc}} \ \underline{\text{PZero}})$ 
  - $\underline{\text{Pred}} \ \underline{n} = \underline{n-1}$ , for  $n > 0$ ,
  - $\underline{\text{Pred}} \ 0 = 0$

## Recursion

- Recursive definitions are handy
  - $\text{fact} = \lambda n. \text{cond} (\text{isZero } n) \ 1 \ (\text{Mult } n \ (\text{fact} (\text{Pred } n)))$
  - *Not* a legal definition in lambda calculus because can't name functions!
- Compute by expanding:
  - $\text{fact } 2$
  - $= \text{cond} (\text{isZero } 2) \ 1 \ (\text{Mult } 2 \ (\text{fact} (\text{Pred } 2)))$
  - $= \text{Mult } 2 \ (\text{fact } 1)$
  - $= \text{Mult } 2 \ (\text{cond} (\text{isZero } 1) \ 1 \ (\text{Mult } 1 \ (\text{fact} (\text{Pred } 1))))$
  - $= \text{Mult } 2 \ (\text{Mult } 1 \ (\text{fact } 0)) = \dots = \text{Mult } 2 \ (\text{Mult } 1 \ 1) = 2$

## Recursion

- A different perspective: Start with
  - $\text{fact} = \lambda n. \text{cond} (\text{isZero } n) \ 1 \ (\text{Mult } n \ (\text{fact} (\text{Pred } n)))$
- Let F stand for the closed term:
  - $\lambda f. \lambda n. \text{cond} (\text{isZero } n) \ 1 \ (\text{Mult } n \ (f \ (\text{Pred } n)))$
  - Notice  $F(\text{fact}) = \text{fact}$ .
  - $\text{fact}$  is a *fixed point* of F
  - To find  $\text{fact}$ , need only find fixed point of F!
- Easy w/  $g(x) = x * x$ , but F????

## Fixed Points

- Several fixed point operators:
  - Ex:  $\underline{Y} = \lambda f. (\lambda x. f \ (xx))(\lambda x. f \ (xx))$
- Claim for all  $g$ ,  $\underline{Y} \ g = g \ (\underline{Y} \ g)$ 

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{Y} \ g &= (\lambda f. (\lambda x. f \ (xx))(\lambda x. f \ (xx))) \ g \\ &= (\lambda x. g \ (xx))(\lambda x. g \ (xx)) \\ &= g((\lambda x. g \ (xx)) \ (\lambda x. g \ (xx))) \\ &= g \ (\underline{Y} \ g) \end{aligned}$$
- If let  $x_0 = \underline{Y} \ g$ , then  $g \ (x_0) = x_0$ .

*Invented by Haskell Curry*

## Factorial

- Recursive definition:
  - let  $F = \lambda f. \lambda n. \text{cond } (\text{isZero } n) \ 1 \ (\text{Mult } n \ (f \ (\text{Pred } n)))$
  - let  $\text{fact} = \underline{Y} \ F$
  - then  $F(\text{fact}) = \text{fact}$  because  $Y$  always gives fixed points
- Compute:
  - $\text{fact } 0 = (F \ (\text{fact})) \ 0$  because  $\text{fact}$  is a fixed point of  $F$
  - $= \text{cond } (\text{isZero } 0) \ 1 \ (\text{Mult } 0 \ (\text{fact } (\text{Pred } 0)))$
  - $= 1$  by the definition of  $\text{cond}$

## Computing Factorials

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{fact } 1 &= (F \ (\text{fact})) \ 1 && \text{because fact is a fixed point of } F \\
 &= (\lambda n. \text{cond } (\text{isZero } n) \ 1 \ (\text{Mult } n \ (\text{fact } (\text{Pred } n)))) \ 1 && \text{expanding } F \\
 &= \text{cond } (\text{isZero } 1) \ 1 \ (\text{Mult } 1 \ (\text{fact } (\text{Pred } 1))) && \text{applying it} \\
 &= \text{Mult } 1 \ (\text{fact } (\text{Pred } 1)) && \text{by the definition of cond} \\
 &= \text{fact } 0 && \text{by the definition of Mult and Pred} \\
 &= 1 && \text{by the above calculation}
 \end{aligned}$$

## Lambda Calculus

- $\lambda$ -calculus invented in 1928 by Church in Princeton & first published in 1932.
- Goal to provide a foundation for logic
- First to state explicit conversion rules.
- Original version inconsistent, but corrected
  - “If this sentence is true then  $1 = 2$ ” problematic!!
- 1933, definition of natural numbers

## Collaborators



- 1931-1934: Grad students:

- J. Barkley Rosser and Stephen Kleene
- Church-Rosser confluence theorem ensured consistency (earlier version inconsistent)
- Kleene showed  $\lambda$ -definable functions very rich
  - Equivalent to Herbrand-Gödel recursive functions
  - Equivalent to Turing-computable functions.
  - Founder of recursion theory, invented regular expressions



- Church's thesis:

- $\lambda$ -definability  $\equiv$  effectively computable