### **LiU-FP2016: Lecture 2** *The Untyped* $\lambda$ *-Calculus: Introduction*

Henrik Nilsson

University of Nottingham, UK

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 2 – p.1/15

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 2 – p.2/15

۲

 Pure notion of effective computation procedure: all computation reduced to function definition and application.

- Pure notion of effective computation procedure: all computation reduced to function definition and application.
- Invented in the 1920s by Alonzo Church.

- Pure notion of effective computation procedure: all computation reduced to function definition and application.
- Invented in the 1920s by Alonzo Church.
- Cf. other formalisations of the notion of effective computation; e.g., the Turing machine.

- Pure notion of effective computation procedure: all computation reduced to function definition and application.
- Invented in the 1920s by Alonzo Church.
- Cf. other formalisations of the notion of effective computation; e.g., the Turing machine.
- The λ-calculus and Turing Machines are equivalent in that they capture the exact same notion of what "computation" means.

 The Church-Turing Hypothesis: The λ-calculus, Turing Machines, etc. coincides with our intuitive understanding of what "computation" means.

- The Church-Turing Hypothesis: The λ-calculus, Turing Machines, etc. coincides with our intuitive understanding of what "computation" means.
- The λ-calculus is important because it is at once:
  - very simple, yet in essence a practically useful programming language
  - mathematically precise, allowing for formal reasoning.



 $\lambda$ -abstraction (or anonymous function):



### $\lambda$ -abstraction (or anonymous function):



one-argument function

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 2 – p.4/15

### $\lambda$ -abstraction (or anonymous function):



### one-argument function

### formal argument

### $\lambda$ -abstraction (or anonymous function):



one-argument function function body formal argument

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 2 - p.4/15

### $\lambda$ -abstraction (or anonymous function):



Multiple arguments handled by "returning" lambda abstractions that then are applied to further arguments: *Currying*.

 $\begin{array}{cccc} t & \to & & \\ & & & x \\ & & & \lambda x.t \\ & & & t t \end{array}$ 

terms: variable abstraction application

۲

 $\begin{array}{cccc} t & \to & & \\ & & & x \\ & & | & \lambda x.t \\ & | & t t \end{array}$ 

terms: variable abstraction application

Note:

۲



#### Note:

x is the syntactic category of variables. We will use actual names like x, y, z, u, v, w, ...



#### Note:

- x is the syntactic category of variables. We will use actual names like x, y, z, u, v, w, ...
- $\lambda$ -abstractions often named for convenience. E.g.  $I \equiv \lambda x.x$ .



#### Note:

- x is the syntactic category of variables. We will use actual names like x, y, z, u, v, w, ...
- $\lambda$ -abstractions often named for convenience. E.g.  $I \equiv \lambda x.x$ . Just an abbreviation!



#### Note:

- x is the syntactic category of variables. We will use actual names like x, y, z, u, v, w, ...
- $\lambda$ -abstractions often named for convenience. E.g.  $I \equiv \lambda x.x$ . Just an abbreviation! So e.g.  $F \equiv \lambda x.(\dots F \dots)$  not valid def. Why?

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 2 – p.6/15

۲

# • An occurrence of x is bound if it occurs in the body t of a $\lambda$ -abstraction $\lambda x.t$ .

An occurrence of x is bound if it occurs in the body t of a λ-abstraction λx.t.
A non-bound occurrence is free.

- An occurrence of x is bound if it occurs in the body t of a  $\lambda$ -abstraction  $\lambda x.t$ .
- A non-bound occurrence is free.
- A λ-term with no free variables is called closed. Otherwise open.

- An occurrence of x is bound if it occurs in the body t of a  $\lambda$ -abstraction  $\lambda x.t$ .
- A non-bound occurrence is free.
- A λ-term with no free variables is called closed. Otherwise open.
- A closed  $\lambda$ -term is called a *combinator*.

EP2016: Lecture 2 – p.6/15

### Exercise

### In the following:

- Which variables are free and which are bound?
- Which terms are open and which are closed?

(a) x (d)  $\lambda x.\lambda y.x y$ (b)  $\lambda x.x$  (e)  $(\lambda x.x) x$ (c)  $\lambda x.y$  (f)  $\lambda x.\lambda y.(\lambda x.x y) (\lambda z.x y)$ 

-FP2016: Lecture 2 – p.7/15

### **Operational Semantics (1)**

Sole means of computation:  $\beta$ -reduction or function application:

$$(\lambda x.t_1) t_2 \xrightarrow{\beta} [x \mapsto t_2]t_1$$

where

$$[x \mapsto t_2]t_1$$

means "term  $t_1$  with all free occurrences of x (with respect to  $t_1$ ) replaced by  $t_2$ ."

Subtle problems concerning *name clashes* will be considered later.

### **Operational Semantics (2)**

A term that can be  $\beta$ -reduced is called a  $(\beta$ -)redex.

Exercise: Underline the redexes in

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

### **Programming In the** $\lambda$ **-Calculus**

How can such a simple language express arbitrary computations?

### **Programming In the** $\lambda$ **-Calculus**

How can such a simple language express arbitrary computations?

Nothing that looks like arithmetic, or conditionals, and seems not even recusrion allowed?

### **Programming In the** $\lambda$ **-Calculus**

How can such a simple language express arbitrary computations?

Nothing that looks like arithmetic, or conditionals, and seems not even recusrion allowed?

To make it plausible that the  $\lambda$ -calculus indeed is a general notion of computation, we will see how to express:

2016: Lecture 2 – p.10/15

- Booleans
- Arithmetic
- Recursion

### **Church Booleans**

True, false, and conditional:

 $T \equiv \lambda t.\lambda f.t$   $F \equiv \lambda t.\lambda f.f$  $IF \equiv \lambda l.\lambda m.\lambda n.l m n$ 

### **Church Booleans**

True, false, and conditional:

 $T \equiv \lambda t.\lambda f.t$   $F \equiv \lambda t.\lambda f.f$  $IF \equiv \lambda l.\lambda m.\lambda n.l m n$ 

Exercise: Evaluate IF T v w

### **Church Booleans**

True, false, and conditional:

 $T \equiv \lambda t.\lambda f.t$   $F \equiv \lambda t.\lambda f.f$  $IF \equiv \lambda l.\lambda m.\lambda n.l m n$ 

### Exercise: Evaluate IF T v wLogical connectives:

 $AND \equiv \lambda b.\lambda c.b \ c \ F$  $OR \equiv \lambda b.\lambda c.b \ T \ c$  $NOT \equiv \lambda b.b \ F \ T$ 

### Pairs

If we can represent pairs, then we can represent any kind of compound data:

 $PAIR \equiv \lambda f.\lambda s.\lambda b.b f s$  $FST \equiv \lambda p.p T$  $SND \equiv \lambda p.p F$ 

•

### **Church Numerals (1)**

Idea: The natural number n is represented by a function that applies its first argument n times to its second argument.

 $C_{0} \equiv \lambda s.\lambda z.z$   $C_{1} \equiv \lambda s.\lambda z.s z$   $C_{2} \equiv \lambda s.\lambda z.s (s z)$   $C_{3} \equiv \lambda s.\lambda z.s (s (s z))$ 

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 2 – <u>p.13/15</u>

Etc.

### **Church Numerals (2)**

### **Operations:**

 $SUCC \equiv \lambda n.\lambda s.\lambda z.s (n \ s \ z)$   $PLUS \equiv \lambda m.\lambda n.\lambda s.\lambda z.m \ s (n \ s \ z)$   $TIMES \equiv \lambda m.\lambda n.\lambda s.m (n \ s)$   $POWER \equiv \lambda m.\lambda n.m \ n$   $ISZERO \equiv \lambda m.m (\lambda x.F) \ T$ 

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 2 – p.14/15

### **Church Numerals (3)**

Subtraction is more intricate. Let us consider the predecessor function:

 $ZZ \equiv PAIR C_0 C_0$   $SS \equiv \lambda p.PAIR (SND p) (SUCC (SND p))$  $PRED \equiv \lambda m.FST (m SS ZZ)$ 

Idea: *SS* maps (m, n) to (n, n + 1). Iterating *SS* n times on (0, 0) means that the first component of the result is n - 1.