

Comp 411
Principles of Programming Languages
Lecture 14
Eliminating Lambda Using Combinators

Corky Cartwright
February 24, 2021

How to Eliminate **lambda** (**map** in Jam)

Goal: devise a few combinators (functions expressed as λ -abstractions with no free variables) that enable us to express all λ -expressions without explicitly using λ .

Notation: let $\lambda^*x.M$ denote $\lambda x.M$ *converted* to an equivalent syntactic form that eliminates the starred λ . Then

$$\lambda^*x.x \rightarrow \mathbf{I} \quad (\text{where } \mathbf{I} = \lambda x.x)$$

$$\lambda^*x.y \rightarrow \mathbf{K}y \quad (\text{where } \mathbf{K} = \lambda y.\lambda x.y)$$

$$\lambda^*x.(M N) \rightarrow \mathbf{S}(\lambda^*x.M)(\lambda^*x.N)$$

$$(\text{where } \mathbf{S} = \lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda z.((x z)(y z)))$$

How to Eliminate **lambda** (**map** in Jam) cont.

Question: Where did **S** come from?

- Intuition: it falls out when we formulate the translation to combinatory form using structural recursion on the abstract syntax of **λ**-expressions.
- The first two cases on the preceding slide do not involve recursion.
- In the third case, the form of the “magic” **S** combinator is determined by structural recursion! It is simply the pure **λ**-abstraction that works when plugged in for **λ***.

How Can We Systematically Eliminate All λ s?

Strategy:

- Eliminate λ -abstractions from inside out, one-at-a-time. This process terminates because it strictly reduces the sum of the *depth**s of every λ -abstraction. The definition of *depth** is a bit tricky because each reduction rule (on slide 2) must strictly lower it for all λ -abstractions. The rule involving **S** must be handled delicately.
- Warning: this transformation can (and usually does) cause exponential blow-up because the third rule replaces one λ -abstraction by two of them. Note that the *depth** function grows exponentially with tree depth because the *depth** must add the depths of both subtrees of an application.

Final Observations

- Checking the **App** case

$$\begin{aligned} & S \ (\lambda x.M) \ (\lambda x.N) \\ &= (\lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda z.(x \ z)(y \ z)) \ (\lambda x.M) \ (\lambda x.N) \\ &= (\lambda y.\lambda z.((\lambda x.M) \ z)(y \ z)) \ (\lambda x.N) \\ &= (\lambda z.((\lambda x.M) \ z)((\lambda x.N) \ z)) \\ &= (\lambda z.(M_{x \leftarrow z}) \ ((\lambda x.N) \ z)) \\ &= (\lambda z.(M_{x \leftarrow z}) \ (N_{x \leftarrow z})) = \lambda x.(M \ N) \quad (\text{by } \alpha\text{-conversion}) \end{aligned}$$

Note: the names $x \ y \ z$ are fresh and arbitrary, distinct from any free names in $\lambda x.M \ \lambda x.N$