Lambda Calculus 1

Sven Tennie

July 8, 2018

Outline

Lambda Calculus

- Invented by Alonzo Church (1920s)
- Equally expressive to the Turing Machine(s)
- Formal Language
- Computational Model
    - Lisp (1950s)
    - ML
    - Haskell
- "Lambda Expressions" in almost every modern programming language

Why should I care?

- Simple Computational Model
  - to describe structure and behaviour (E.g. Operational Semantics)
  - to reason and proove
- Explains why things in FP are like they are
  - pure functions
  - higher-order functions
  - currying
  - lazy evaluation
- Understand FP Compilers
  - Good starting-point when you want to introduce FP stuff into other languages
  - Good base when you what to write your own compiler
  - GHC uses an enriched Lambda Calculus internally

Untyped Lambda Calculus

$t ::=$	x	Variable
	$\lambda x.t$	Abstraction
	$t\ t$	Application

Untyped Lambda Calculus

$$
\begin{aligned}
t ::= \ & x && \text{Variable} \\
& \lambda x.t && \text{Abstraction} \\
& t \ t && \text{Application}
\end{aligned}
$$

Example

- Identity

$$\underbrace{\underbrace{\lambda x.x}_{\text{Abstraction}} \quad \underbrace{y}_{\text{Variable}}}_{\text{Application}} \to y$$

More fun with Identity

- Higher Order Functions

$$\underbrace{\underbrace{\lambda x.x}_{\text{Abstraction}} \quad \underbrace{\lambda y.y}_{\text{Abstraction}}}_{\text{Application}} \to \lambda y.y$$

More fun with Identity

- Higher Order Functions

$$\underbrace{\underbrace{\lambda x.x}_{\text{Abstraction}} \quad \underbrace{\lambda y.y}_{\text{Abstraction}}}_{\text{Application}} \rightarrow \lambda y.y$$

- Let's use parentheses to clearify what we mean...

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda y.\lambda z.y\ z\ \lambda x.x \\ \rightarrow & ? \end{aligned}$$

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

How to apply parentheses *exactly*?

Remarks

- Everything (Term) is an Expression
  - No statements
- No "destructive" Variable Assignments
  - The reason why FP Languages promote pure functions

Some Vocabulary

$\lambda x.(x\ y)$

- x is *bound* by the surrounding abstraction
- y is *free*
  - E.g. part of the environment

Reductions and Conversions

- Alpha conversion

$\lambda x.x \rightarrow_{\alpha} \lambda y.y$

Reductions and Conversions

- Alpha conversion

$\lambda x.x \rightarrow_{\alpha} \lambda y.y$

- Beta reduction

$(\lambda x.x)y \rightarrow_{\beta} y$

Reductions and Conversions

- Alpha conversion

$\lambda x.x \to_\alpha \lambda y.y$

- Beta reduction

$(\lambda x.x)y \to_\beta y$

- Eta conversion
  - iff (if and only if) x is not free in f

$(\lambda x.f\ x) \to_\eta f$
$(\lambda x.(\lambda y.y)\ x) \to_\eta \lambda y.y$

- x is not free in f

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

Currying

$(\lambda x.\lambda y.xy)z \rightarrow \lambda y.zy$

- Example
  - (+1) Section in Haskell

$(\lambda x.\lambda y. + xy)1 \rightarrow \lambda y. + 1y$

- Partial Application is built-in

Church Encodings

- Encode Data into the Lambda Calculus
- To simplify our formulas, let's say that we have declarations

$$id \equiv \lambda x.x$$

id y $\rightarrow y$

Booleans

$$\begin{aligned} true &\equiv \lambda t.\lambda f.t \\ false &\equiv \lambda t.\lambda f.f \end{aligned}$$

$$if\_then\_else \equiv \lambda c.\lambda b_{true}.\lambda b_{false}.c\ b_{true}\ b_{false}$$

Example

$$\begin{aligned} & if\_then\_else\ true\ a\ b \\ \equiv\ & (\lambda c.\lambda b_{true}.\lambda b_{false}.c\ b_{true}\ b_{false})\ true\ a\ b \\ \rightarrow & true\ a\ b \\ \equiv & (\lambda t.\lambda f.t)\ a\ b \\ \rightarrow & (\lambda f.a)\ b \\ \rightarrow & a \end{aligned}$$

And

$$true \equiv \lambda t.\lambda f.t$$
$$false \equiv \lambda t.\lambda f.f$$

$$and \equiv \lambda p.\lambda q.p\ q\ p$$

- Example

$$\begin{aligned}
&and\ true\ false \\
\equiv&(\lambda p.\lambda q.p\ q\ p)\ true\ false \\
\rightarrow&(\lambda q.true\ q\ true)\ false \\
\rightarrow&true false true \\
\equiv&(\lambda t.\lambda f.t)\ false\ true \\
\rightarrow&(\lambda f.false) true \\
\rightarrow&false
\end{aligned}$$

Or

$$\lambda p.\lambda q.ppq$$

Pairs

$$
\begin{aligned}
pair &\equiv \lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda z.z\ x\ y \\
first &\equiv (\lambda p.p)(\lambda x.\lambda y.x) \\
second &\equiv (\lambda p.p)(\lambda x.\lambda y.y)
\end{aligned}
$$

Example

$$
\begin{aligned}
pair_{AB} \equiv pair && a\ b \\
\equiv && (\lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda z.z\ x\ y)\ a\ b \\
\rightarrow && (\lambda y.\lambda z.z\ a\ y) b \\
\rightarrow && \lambda z.z\ a\ b \\
\equiv && pair'_{ab}
\end{aligned}
$$

Pair Example (continued)

$$
\begin{aligned}
pair'_{ab} &\equiv && \lambda z.z\ a\ b \\
first &\equiv && (\lambda p.p)(\lambda x.\lambda y.x) \\
\\
first\ pair'_{ab} &\equiv && (\lambda p.p)(\lambda x.\lambda y.x)pair'_{ab} \\
&\rightarrow && pair'_{ab}(\lambda x.\lambda y.x) \\
&\equiv && (\lambda z.z\ a\ b)(\lambda x.\lambda y.x) \\
&\rightarrow && (\lambda x.\lambda y.x)\ a\ b \\
&\rightarrow && (\lambda y.a)\ b \\
&\rightarrow && a
\end{aligned}
$$

Numerals

- Peano axioms
  - Every natural number can be defined with 0 and a successor function

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &\equiv \lambda f.\lambda x.x \\
1 &\equiv \lambda f.\lambda x.f\ x \\
2 &\equiv \lambda f.\lambda x.f\ (f\ x) \\
3 &\equiv \lambda f.\lambda x.f\ (f\ (f\ x))
\end{aligned}
$$

- Meaning

  0 f is evaluated 0 times
  1 f is evaluated once
  x can be every lambda term

Numerals Example - Successor

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 \equiv & \quad \lambda f.\lambda x.x \\
1 \equiv & \quad \lambda f..f\ x \\
\\
\mathit{successor} \equiv & \quad \lambda n.\lambda f.\lambda x.f\ (n\ f\ x) \\
\\
\mathit{successor} 1 \equiv & \quad (\lambda n.\lambda f.\lambda x.f\ (n\ f\ x))1 \\
\rightarrow & \quad \lambda f.\lambda x.f\ (1\ f\ x) \\
\equiv & \ \lambda f.\lambda x.f\ ((\lambda f.\lambda x.f\ x)\ f\ x) \\
\mathit{to} & \quad \lambda f.\lambda x.f\ ((\lambda x.f\ x)\ x) \\
\mathit{to} & \quad \lambda f.\lambda x.f\ (f\ x) \\
\equiv & \quad 2
\end{aligned}
$$

Numerals Example - 0 + 0

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &\equiv \lambda f.\lambda x.x \\
plus &\equiv \lambda m.\lambda n.\lambda f.\lambda x.mf(nfx)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
plus\ 0\ 0 &\equiv (\lambda m.\lambda n.\lambda f.\lambda x.mf(nfx))\ 0\ 0 \\
&\rightarrow (\lambda n.\lambda f.\lambda x.0f(nfx))\ 0 \\
&\rightarrow (\lambda f.\lambda x.0f(0fx)) \\
&\equiv (\lambda f.\lambda x.(\lambda f.\lambda x.x)f(0fx)) \\
&\rightarrow (\lambda f.\lambda x.(\lambda x.x)(0fx)) \\
&\rightarrow (\lambda f.\lambda x.(0fx)) \\
&\equiv (\lambda f.\lambda x.((\lambda f.\lambda x.x)fx)) \\
&\rightarrow (\lambda f.\lambda x.((\lambda x.x)x)) \\
&\rightarrow (\lambda f.\lambda x.x \\
&\equiv 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Books

The implementation of programming languages Type Systems

Thanks

- Hope you enjoyed this talk and learned something new.
- Hope it wasn't too much math and dusty formulas . . . :)