

433-431 (433-631) — Quiz 2  
The lambda calculus  
Semester 1, 2008

Bernie Pope

## Notes

The Greek letters ‘ $\alpha$ ’, ‘ $\beta$ ’, and ‘ $\eta$ ’, are pronounced ‘alpha’, ‘beta’, and ‘eta’ respectively.

### Question 1 (8 minutes)

Let  $\rightarrow^*$  be the multi-step reduction relation for  $\beta$  reduction. If  $e_1, e_2, e_3$  are expressions in the lambda calculus, and  $e_1 \rightarrow^* e_3$ , and  $e_2 \rightarrow^* e_3$ , is it always true that  $e_1 \rightarrow^* e_2$ ? If yes, explain why, if no, give a counter example.

### Question 2 (2 minutes)

Draw this lambda calculus expression as a tree:  $\lambda x.f x (f x)$ .

### Question 3 (2 minutes)

Give an example of a term which is an  $\eta$  normal form, but not a  $\beta$  normal form.

### Question 4 (5 minutes)

Describe the variable capture problem of  $\beta$  reduction using an example. Explain *briefly* (in a couple of sentences) a strategy to solve the problem for your specific example.

### Question 5 (8 minutes)

The following statement is true. There exists a non-empty subset of the lambda calculus expressions which have a normal form which can be found by *both* the applicative-order *and* the normal-order reduction strategies.

For all such expressions which have that property, is it necessarily the case that the normal-order strategy will find the normal form in fewer reduction steps than the applicative-order strategy? If yes, explain why, if no, give a counter example.

### Question 6 (5 minutes)

Give a procedure (in whatever notation you like best) which will find the set of all *free variables* in a lambda calculus expression.

### Question 7 (5 minutes)

Let  $Y = \lambda h. (\lambda x . h (x x)) (\lambda x . h (x x))$ . That is, let  $Y$  be Curry's fixed point finder. Demonstrate that  $Y$  is indeed a fixed point finder for *all* expressions in the lambda calculus. Remember that  $Y$  must satisfy this equation:  $Y e = e (Y e)$ , for all lambda calculus expressions  $e$ .

### Question 8 (8 minutes)

This is the simple form of the Church-Rosser theorem for confluence of the lambda calculus:

Let  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$  be expressions in the lambda calculus. Let  $\rightarrow^*$  be the multi-step reduction relation for  $\beta$  and  $\eta$  reduction, and  $\alpha$  conversion. If  $e_1 \rightarrow^* e_2$ , and  $e_1 \rightarrow^* e_3$ , then there exists an expression  $e_4$ , such that  $e_2 \rightarrow^* e_4$ , and  $e_3 \rightarrow^* e_4$ .

Explain why this theorem implies that if an expression has a normal form, then it is unique (in other words: all lambda calculus expressions have at most one normal form).

### Question 9 (6 minutes)

Consider the following lambda calculus expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} K &= \lambda x . (\lambda y . x) \\ L &= (\lambda x . x x y) (\lambda x . x x y) \\ E &= \lambda x . z x \end{aligned}$$

Suppose we have an expression constructed like so:  $(K E) L$ , which has a  $(\beta, \eta)$  normal form. Show a sequence of reduction steps which transforms the expression to its normal form.

### Question 10 (6 minutes)

Two lambda calculus expressions are "syntactically equal" if they have exactly the same syntax. For example  $(\lambda x . x)$  is *not* syntactically equal to  $(\lambda y . y)$ , even though they are  $\alpha$  convertible. Explain why syntactic equality is considered a weak form of equality.