Lambda Calculus

CS 1520 (Spring 2025)

Harvard University

Tuesday, February 18, 2025

Today, we will learn about

- Lambda calculus
- α-equivalence
- β-reduction
- Call-by-value semantics
- Call-by-name semantics



λ-calculus



- universal model of computation

- e := x *// variable*
  | λx.e *// function abstraction*
  | e e *// function application*

$\lambda x . e$


function
λ x . e


λx. e
parameter


λ x . e
body


function
λx.e
body
parameter

Lambda calculus: Intuition

A function is a rule for determining a value from an argument. Some examples of functions in mathematics are

$$f(x) = x^3$$
$$g(y) = y^3 - 2y^2 + 5y - 6.$$

Lambda calculus: Intuition

A function is a rule for determining a value from an argument. Some examples of functions in mathematics are

$$f = \lambda x.x^3$$
$$g = \lambda y.y^3 - 2y^2 + 5y - 6.$$

Pure vs Applied Lambda Calculus

- The pure λ-calculus contains just function definitions (called *abstractions*), variables, and function *applications*.
- If we add additional data types and operations (such as integers and addition), we have an *applied* λ-calculus.

Pure Lambda Calculus: Syntax

$$
\begin{array}{rll}
e ::= & x & \text{variable} \\
\mid & \lambda x.\, e & \text{abstraction} \\
\mid & e_1\ e_2 & \text{application}
\end{array}
$$

Abstractions

Abstractions

- An abstraction $\lambda x.\, e$ is a function
- Variable x is the *parameter*
- Expression e is the *body* of the function.
- The expression $\lambda y.\, y \times y$ is a function that takes an argument y and returns square of y.

Applications

- An application $e_1\ e_2$ requires that e_1 is (or evaluates to) a function, and then applies the function to the expression e_2.
- For example, $(\lambda y.\, y \times y)\ 5$ is 25

Examples

$\lambda x.\, x$	a lambda abstraction called the *identity function*
$\lambda x.\, (f\ (g\ x)))$	another abstraction
$(\lambda x.\, x)\ 42$	an application
$\lambda y.\, \lambda x.\, x$	an abstraction, ignores its argument and returns the identity function

Lambda expressions extend as far to the right as possible

$\lambda x.\, x\ \lambda y.\, y$ is the same as $\lambda x.\, (x\ (\lambda y.\, y))$, and is not the same as $(\lambda x.\, x)\ (\lambda y.\, y)$.

Application is left-associative

$e_1\ e_2\ e_3$ is the same as $(e_1\ e_2)\ e_3$.

Use parentheses!

In general, use parentheses to make the parsing of a lambda expression clear if you are in doubt.

Variable binding

- An occurrence of a variable x in a term is bound if there is an enclosing $\lambda x.\, e$; otherwise, it is *free*.

- A *closed term* is one in which all identifiers are bound.

Variable binding: $\lambda x.\,(x\ (\lambda y.\,y\ a)\ x)\ y$

Variable binding: $\lambda x.\,(x\ (\lambda y.\,y\ a)\ x)\ y$

- Both occurrences of x are bound
- The first occurrence of y is bound
- The a is free
- The last y is also free, since it is outside the scope of the λy.

Binding operator

The symbol λ is a *binding operator*: variable x is bound in e in the expression $\lambda x.\, e$.

α-equivalence

- $\lambda x.\, x$ is the same function as $\lambda y.\, y$.
- Expressions e_1 and e_2 that differ only in the name of bound variables are called *α-equivalent* ("alpha equivalent")
- Sometimes written $e_1 =_\alpha e_2$.

Quiz: α-equivalence

- Are $\lambda x.\, \lambda y.\, x\ y$ and $\lambda y.\, \lambda x.\, y\ x$ α-equivalent?

Higher-order functions

- In lambda calculus, functions are values.
- In the pure lambda calculus, every value is a function, and every result is a function!

Higher-order functions

$$\lambda f.\, f\ 42$$

Higher-order functions

$$\lambda v.\, \lambda f.\, (f\ v)$$

Takes an argument v and returns a function that applies its own argument (a function) to v.

Semantics

β-equivalence

- We would like to regard $(\lambda x.\, e_1)\ e_2$ as equivalent to e_1 where every (free) occurrence of x is replaced with e_2.

- E.g. we would like to regard $(\lambda y.\, y \times y)\ 5$ as equivalent to 5×5.

Substitution $e_1\{e_2/x\}$

- We write $e_1\{e_2/x\}$ to mean expression e_1 with all free occurrences of x replaced with e_2.
- We call $(\lambda x.\, e_1)\ e_2$ and $e_1\{e_2/x\}$ *β-equivalent*.
- Rewriting $(\lambda x.\, e_1)\ e_2$ into $e_1\{e_2/x\}$ is called a *β-reduction*.
- This corresponds to executing a lambda calculus expression.

Different semantics for the lambda calculus

$$(\lambda x.\, x + x)\ ((\lambda y.\, y)\ 5)$$

Different semantics for the lambda calculus

$$(\lambda x.\, x + x)\ ((\lambda y.\, y)\ 5)$$

We could use β-reduction to get either $((\lambda y.\, y)\ 5) + ((\lambda y.\, y)\ 5)$ or $(\lambda x.\, x + x)\ 5$.

Evaluation strategies: Full β-reduction

Allows $(\lambda x.\, e_1)\ e_2$ to step to $e_1\{e_2/x\}$ at any time.

Full β-reduction: small-step operational semantics

$$\beta\text{-REDUCTION}\ \frac{}{(\lambda x.\, e_1)\ e_2 \longrightarrow e_1\{e_2/x\}}$$

Full β-reduction: small-step operational semantics

$$\beta\text{-REDUCTION}\ \frac{}{(\lambda x.\, e_1)\ e_2 \longrightarrow e_1\{e_2/x\}}$$

$$\frac{e_1 \longrightarrow e_1'}{e_1\ e_2 \longrightarrow e_1'\ e_2}$$

Full β-reduction: small-step operational semantics

$$\beta\text{-REDUCTION}\ \frac{}{(\lambda x.\, e_1)\ e_2 \longrightarrow e_1\{e_2/x\}}$$

$$\frac{e_1 \longrightarrow e_1'}{e_1\ e_2 \longrightarrow e_1'\ e_2} \qquad \frac{e_2 \longrightarrow e_2'}{e_1\ e_2 \longrightarrow e_1\ e_2'}$$

Full β-reduction: small-step operational semantics

$$\beta\text{-REDUCTION}\ \frac{}{(\lambda x.\, e_1)\ e_2 \longrightarrow e_1\{e_2/x\}}$$

$$\frac{e_1 \longrightarrow e_1'}{e_1\ e_2 \longrightarrow e_1'\ e_2} \qquad \frac{e_2 \longrightarrow e_2'}{e_1\ e_2 \longrightarrow e_1\ e_2'}$$

$$\frac{e \longrightarrow e'}{\lambda x.\, e \longrightarrow \lambda x.\, e'}$$

Normal form

A term e is said to be in *normal form* when there is no e' such that $e \longrightarrow e'$.

Not every term has a normal form under full β-reduction.

Consider $\Omega = (\lambda x.\, x\ x)\ (\lambda x.\, x\ x)$.

$$\Omega = (\lambda x.\, x\ x)\ (\lambda x.\, x\ x) \longrightarrow (\lambda x.\, x\ x)\ (\lambda x.\, x\ x) = \Omega$$

It's an infinite loop!

Well-behaved nondeterminism

$$(\lambda x.\, \lambda y.\, y)\ \Omega\ (\lambda z.\, z)$$

Well-behaved nondeterminism

$$(\lambda x.\, \lambda y.\, y)\ \Omega\ (\lambda z.\, z)$$

This term has two redexes in it, the one with abstraction λx, and the one inside Ω.

Well-behaved nondeterminism

- The full β-reduction strategy is non-deterministic.
- When a term has a normal form, however, it never has more than one.

Full β-reduction is confluent

Theorem (Confluence)

If $e \longrightarrow^* e_1$ *and* $e \longrightarrow^* e_2$ *then there exists* e' *such that* $e_1 \longrightarrow^* e'$ *and* $e_2 \longrightarrow^* e'$.



Full β-reduction is confluent

Corollary

If $e \longrightarrow^* e_1$ *and* $e \longrightarrow^* e_2$ *and both* e_1 *and* e_2 *are in normal form, then* $e_1 = e_2$.

Proof.

An easy consequence of confluence. □

Normal Order Evaluation

- *Normal order evaluation* uses the full β-reduction rules, except the left-most redex is always reduced first.
- Will eventually yield the normal form, if one exists.
- Allows reducing redexes inside abstractions

Call-by-value

- *Call-by-value* only allows an application to reduce after its argument has been reduced to a value and does not allow evaluation under a λ.
- Given an application $(\lambda x.\, e_1)\ e_2$, CBV semantics makes sure that e_2 is a value before calling the function.
- A value is an expression that can not be reduced/executed/simplified any further.

CBV: Small step operational semantics

$$\beta\text{-REDUCTION}\ \frac{}{(\lambda x.\, e)\ v \longrightarrow e\{v/x\}}$$

CBV: Small step operational semantics

$$\beta\text{-REDUCTION}\ \frac{}{(\lambda x.\, e)\ v \longrightarrow e\{v/x\}}$$

$$\frac{e_1 \longrightarrow e_1'}{e_1\ e_2 \longrightarrow e_1'\ e_2}$$

CBV: Small step operational semantics

$$\beta\text{-REDUCTION}\ \frac{}{(\lambda x.\, e)\ v \longrightarrow e\{v/x\}}$$

$$\frac{e_1 \longrightarrow e_1'}{e_1\ e_2 \longrightarrow e_1'\ e_2} \qquad \frac{e \longrightarrow e'}{v\ e \longrightarrow v\ e'}$$

CBV: Examples

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\lambda x.\, \lambda y.\, y\ x)\ (5+2)\ \lambda x.\, x+1 &\longrightarrow (\lambda x.\, \lambda y.\, y\ x)\ 7\ \lambda x.\, x+1 \\
&\longrightarrow (\lambda y.\, y\ 7)\ \lambda x.\, x+1 \\
&\longrightarrow (\lambda x.\, x+1)\ 7 \\
&\longrightarrow 7+1 \\
&\longrightarrow 8
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\lambda f.\, f\ 7)\ ((\lambda x.\, x\ x)\ \lambda y.\, y) &\longrightarrow (\lambda f.\, f\ 7)\ ((\lambda y.\, y)\ (\lambda y.\, y)) \\
&\longrightarrow (\lambda f.\, f\ 7)\ (\lambda y.\, y) \\
&\longrightarrow (\lambda y.\, y)\ 7 \\
&\longrightarrow 7
\end{aligned}
$$

Call-by-name semantics

- Applies the function as soon as possible.
- No need to ensure that the expression to which a function is applied is a value.

Call-by-name semantics

$$\beta\text{-REDUCTION}\ \frac{}{(\lambda x.\, e_1)\ e_2 \longrightarrow e_1\{e_2/x\}}$$

Call-by-name semantics

$$\beta\text{-REDUCTION}\ \frac{}{(\lambda x.\, e_1)\ e_2 \longrightarrow e_1\{e_2/x\}}$$

$$\frac{e_1 \longrightarrow e_1'}{e_1\ e_2 \longrightarrow e_1'\ e_2}$$

Call-by-name semantics: example

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\lambda x.\, \lambda y.\, y\ x)\ (5+2)\ \lambda x.\, x+1 &\longrightarrow (\lambda y.\, y\ (5+2))\ \lambda x.\, x+1 \\
&\longrightarrow (\lambda x.\, x+1)\ (5+2) \\
&\longrightarrow (5+2)+1 \\
&\longrightarrow 7+1 \\
&\longrightarrow 8
\end{aligned}
$$

compare to CBV:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\lambda x.\, \lambda y.\, y\ x)\ (5+2)\ \lambda x.\, x+1 &\longrightarrow (\lambda x.\, \lambda y.\, y\ x)\ 7\ \lambda x.\, x+1 \\
&\longrightarrow (\lambda y.\, y\ 7)\ \lambda x.\, x+1 \\
&\longrightarrow (\lambda x.\, x+1)\ 7 \\
&\longrightarrow 7+1 \\
&\longrightarrow 8
\end{aligned}
$$

Call-by-name semantics: example

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\lambda f.\, f\ 7)\ ((\lambda x.\, x\ x)\ \lambda y.\, y) &\longrightarrow ((\lambda x.\, x\ x)\ \lambda y.\, y)\ 7 \\
&\longrightarrow ((\lambda y.\, y)\ (\lambda y.\, y))\ 7 \\
&\longrightarrow (\lambda y.\, y)\ 7 \\
&\longrightarrow 7
\end{aligned}
$$

compare to CBV:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\lambda f.\, f\ 7)\ ((\lambda x.\, x\ x)\ \lambda y.\, y) &\longrightarrow (\lambda f.\, f\ 7)\ ((\lambda y.\, y)\ (\lambda y.\, y)) \\
&\longrightarrow (\lambda f.\, f\ 7)\ (\lambda y.\, y) \\
&\longrightarrow (\lambda y.\, y)\ 7 \\
&\longrightarrow 7
\end{aligned}
$$

CBV vs CBN

One way in which CBV and CBN differ is when arguments to functions have no normal forms.

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

Under CBV semantics, this term does not have a normal form. If we use CBN semantics, then we have

$$(\lambda x.(\lambda y.y))\ \Omega \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{CBN}} \lambda y.y$$

CBV and CBN

- CBV and CBN are common evaluation orders
- Many programming languages use CBV semantics
- "Lazy" languages, such as Haskell, typically use Call-by-need semantics, a more efficient semantics similar to Call-by-name in that it does not evaluate actual arguments unless necessary
- However, Call-by-value semantics ensures that arguments are evaluated at most once.

Break

- If possible, give a program that cannot reduce in CBN and CBV, but reduces in full β-reduction.
- If possible, give a program that steps to the same expression in CBN and CBV.
- Formulate the rules of CBV in big-step style.
- How would you create a let-binding in lambda calculus?
- How do we define $e_1\{e_2/x\}$ formally?

CBV in big-step

$$\frac{}{\lambda x.\, e \Downarrow \lambda x.\, e}$$

$$\frac{e_1 \Downarrow \lambda x.\, e_{12} \qquad e_2 \Downarrow v_2 \qquad e_{12}\{v_2/x\} \Downarrow v}{e_1\ e_2 \Downarrow v}$$

$e_1\{e_2/x\}$ formally

$$
\begin{aligned}
x\{e/x\} &= e \\
y\{e/x\} &= y && \text{if } y \neq x \\
(\lambda y.\, e_1)\{e/x\} &= \lambda y.\, (e1\{e/x\}) && \text{if } y \neq x \text{ and } y \notin FV(e) \\
(e_1\ e_2)\{e/x\} &= (e_1\{e/x\})\ (e_2\{e/x\})
\end{aligned}
$$

$e_1\{e_2/x\}$ (almost) formally

$$
\begin{aligned}
x\{e/x\} &= e && \\
y\{e/x\} &= y && \text{if } y \neq x \\
(\lambda y.\, e_1)\{e/x\} &= \lambda y.\, (e1\{e/x\}) && \text{if } y \neq x \text{ and } y \notin FV(e) \\
(e_1\ e_2)\{e/x\} &= (e_1\{e/x\})\ (e_2\{e/x\}) &&
\end{aligned}
$$



Alligator Eggs! by Bret Victor



Alligator Eggs! by Bret Victor

Rules

- α-conversion
  λx.e[x] $\rightarrow$ λy.e[y]

- β-reduction
  (λx.e1) e2 $\rightarrow$ e1{e2/x}

- η-conversion
  (λx.e x) $\rightarrow$ e if x does not occur free in e

Rules



- α-conversion
  λx.e[x] → λy.e[y]

- β-reduction
  (λx.e1) e2 → e1{e2/x}

- η-conversion
  (λx.e x) → e if x does not occur free in e

image credit: Bret Victor

Rules



- α-conversion
  λx.e[x] → λy.e[y]

- β-reduction
  (λx.e1) e2 → e1{e2/x}

- η-conversion
  (λx.e x) → e if x does not occur free in e

image credit: Bret Victor

β-reduction



β-reduction

$$(\lambda x.e1)\ e2 \rightarrow\ e1\{e2/x\}$$

β-reduction



β-reduction



β-reduction



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

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


(λx.x) ((λx.x) (λz.(λx.x) z))
CBN


(λx.x) ((λx.x) (λz.(λx.x) z))
CBV

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


(λx.x) ((λx.x) (λz.(λx.x) z))
CBN
CBV
only allowed in full