
CS 421 – Spring 2007

Lecture Notes Set 27:

Lambda Calculus Continued

Elsa L. Gunter¹

Transcribed by: Pooja Mathur

Corresponding to Slides: 10-lambda-intro (slides 18-28)

Made available: April 4, 2007

Revision 1.0

1 Change Log

1.0 Initial Release.

2 α equivalence (slides 18-19)

Last time we talked about congruency. The we extended that idea to α equivalence. Here we said that α equivalence is the smallest congruent term that has an α conversion.

Let's look at an example to better understand this. We want to show that $\lambda x. (\lambda y. y x) x$ is α equivalent to $\lambda y. (\lambda x. x y) y$

Our first step is to convert the x's to z's. We can do this with α conversion because allows for conversions when a variable isn't restricted by being bound. So now we have:

$$\lambda x. (\lambda y. y x) x \sim \lambda z. (\lambda y. y z) z$$

Now for the inner λ , there are no x's bound in there, so we can convert the y's to x's and get:

$$\lambda z. (\lambda y. y z) z \sim \lambda z. (\lambda x. x z) z$$

Here, we can replace the z's with y's (just like we converted the x's to z's earlier).

$$\lambda z. (\lambda x. x z) z \sim \lambda y. (\lambda x. x y) y$$

So now we just showed that we were able to convert $\lambda x. (\lambda y. y x) x$ to $\lambda y. (\lambda x. x y) y$.

3 η Reduction (slide 20)

Now, let's take a look at η reduction. Here we say that if we have some equation, $\lambda x. f x$, with η reduction, we can simplify this to f . Not that this is not the same as saying $(\lambda x. f) x$. So the difference here is that x in the second equation is a free variable, while it is bound in the first. To reduce it, it has to be bound. If it were free, that is an instance of β reduction.

An example of η reduction is $\lambda x. (\lambda y. y) x$ is equivalent to $\lambda y. y$

4 Substitution (slides 21-24)

With α equivalence, there is also the notion of substitution. Where you see $[N / x] P$, it means for every x that you see, that is free, in the term P, you replace it with N only if you don't end up binding anything new during the substitution. To avoid this, you can rename bound variables in P.

Let's look at a couple examples. If you had $[N / x] x$ you would just get N after the substitution. That is because that line is saying, for every x we see in x, replace it with N. So that is what we did. But if you had $[N / x] y$, you

¹© 2007, Share and Enjoy

would get y back (provided that x did not equal y). That is because the line is saying, for every x we see in y , replace it with N . There are no x 's in y , so we replace nothing.

So what is then the problem with doing $[(\lambda x. x y) / z] (\lambda y. y z)$. The problems with this is that the z is in the scope of y . So replacing the z with something that has a y in it will bind the y . That is, we'll get: $\lambda y. y (\lambda x. x y)$.

But we want the inner y to be free. So to fix it, we can do a simple α conversion and turn $(\lambda y. y z)$ to $(\lambda w. w z)$. Now, when we replace z , we have $\lambda w. w (\lambda x. x y)$

Note, that you only replace the free variables. So if you had $[(\lambda x. x) / z] (\lambda y. y z (\lambda z. z))$. That doesn't equal $\lambda y. y (\lambda x. x) (\lambda z. (\lambda x. x))$ but rather $\lambda y. y (\lambda x. x) (\lambda z. z)$

5 β reduction (slides 25-26)

β reduction is also defined by α equivalences and is the essence of computation in λ calculus. The idea is that when you have the an equation with something like $(\lambda x. P) N$, you can reduce it too simply saying, $[N / x] P$ or for every x you see in P , replace it with N . This is basically the idea of applying an argument to a function.

Here is an example. If we started $(\lambda z. (\lambda x. x y) z) (\lambda y. y z)$, our first step would be to get rid of the first z by η reduction. So then we would have $(\lambda x. x y)(\lambda y. y z)$. The next step would be to do the β reduction and replace the x 's. So we have $(\lambda y. y z) y$. Then after that, we do another η reduction and end up with simply yz as our final answer.

6 $\alpha\beta$ equivalence (slides 27-28)

This is the smallest congruency that has an α equivalence and β reduction. Also, we say that a term is in normal form if there exists no subterm that is α equivalent to a term that can be β reduced. We also say that if two expressions are $\alpha\beta$ equivalent and both in normal forms, then they are also α equivalent.

Note that not all terms will reduce to normal forms. Also, not all reduction strategies will produce a normal form if there is one, so you may have to play around with them to see what is going on.