

15-399 Supplementary Notes: Substitution

Robert Harper

February 10, 2005

Substitution

We will make frequent use of *substitution* of a term, M , for the free occurrences of a variable, u , in another term, N . This is written $[M/u]N$. The intuitive idea is clear, but there are pitfalls that must be avoided; some examples are given in the Pfenning notes. Here we give a precise definition of substitution to have as a reference.

Free and Bound Variables

First we define the set $FV(M)$ of *free variables* occurring in M .

$$\begin{aligned} FV(u) &= \{u\} \\ FV(\langle \rangle) &= \emptyset \\ FV(\langle M_1, M_2 \rangle) &= FV(M_1) \cup FV(M_2) \\ FV(\mathbf{fst}(M)) &= FV(M) \\ FV(\mathbf{snd}(M)) &= FV(M) \\ FV(\lambda u.P.M) &= FV(M) \setminus \{u\} \\ FV(M_1 M_2) &= FV(M_1) \cup FV(M_2) \\ FV(\mathbf{abort}_P(M)) &= FV(M) \\ FV(\mathbf{inl}(M)) &= FV(M) \\ FV(\mathbf{inr}(M)) &= FV(M) \\ FV(\mathbf{case } M \mathbf{ of } \mathbf{inl}(u_1) \Rightarrow M_1 \mid \mathbf{inr}(u_2) \Rightarrow M_2) &= \\ &FV(M) \cup (FV(M_1) \setminus \{u_1\}) \cup (FV(M_2) \setminus \{u_2\}) \end{aligned}$$

If a variable u occurs in M , but $u \notin FV(M)$, then we say that u is *bound* in M . We say that M *lies apart* from N , written $M \# N$, iff $FV(M) \cap FV(N) = \emptyset$. We most often use this notation in the form $u \# M$, which therefore means $u \notin FV(M)$. In particular, $u \# v$ iff $u \neq v$.

Renaming of Bound Variables

Intuitively, the terms $\lambda u.P.u$ and $\lambda v.P.v$ are the “same”, since they differ only in the name of the bound variable. Two terms that differ only in the names

of their bound variables are said to be α -equivalent, or α -convertible.¹ It is remarkably tricky to give a precise definition of this relation.

We first define the notion of *variable swapping*. We write $[u \leftrightarrow v]M$ to mean that *all* occurrences of u in M are to be replaced by v , and *all* occurrences of v in M are to be replaced by u . We emphasize “all”, because the replacement applies even to binders such as λ . For example, $[u \leftrightarrow v]\lambda v:P.u = \lambda u:P.v$.

The relation $M =_\alpha N$ is inductively defined by the following rules:²

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{}{\overline{u =_\alpha u}} \quad \frac{}{\langle \rangle =_\alpha \langle \rangle} \quad \frac{M =_\alpha M' \quad N =_\alpha N'}{\langle M, N \rangle =_\alpha \langle M', N' \rangle} \\ \\ \frac{M =_\alpha M'}{\mathbf{fst}(M) =_\alpha \mathbf{fst}(M')} \quad \frac{M =_\alpha M'}{\mathbf{snd}(M) =_\alpha \mathbf{snd}(M')} \\ \\ \frac{M =_\alpha M'}{\lambda u:P.M =_\alpha \lambda u:P.M'} \quad \frac{u \# v \quad v \# M \quad [u \leftrightarrow v]M =_\alpha M'}{\lambda u:P.M =_\alpha \lambda v:P.M'} \end{array}$$

The last two lines are the most interesting. When comparing two λ 's that bind the same variable, we simply compare their bodies. If, however, they have different bound variables, then we replace u by v (and v by u) in the first to reconcile the difference, and continue comparing. Since $v \# M$ the replacement of v by u in M does not change any *free* variable, but ensures that no confusion can occur when replacing u by v in M due to *bound* occurrences of v in M .

¹The origin of the phrase is essentially a historical accident, but this terminology is too deeply entrenched to be changed now.

²We omit the rules for case analysis and abort for the sake of brevity.

Substitution

Substitution is inductively defined by the following clauses:

$$\begin{aligned}
[M/u]u &= M \\
[M/u]v &= v && (u \# v) \\
[M/u]\langle \rangle &= \langle \rangle \\
[M/u]\langle N_1, N_2 \rangle &= \langle [M/u]N_1, [M/u]N_2 \rangle \\
[M/u]\mathbf{fst}(N) &= \mathbf{fst}([M/u]N) \\
[M/u]\mathbf{snd}(N) &= \mathbf{snd}([M/u]N) \\
[M/u]\lambda v:P.N &= \lambda v:P.[M/u]N && (v \# M) \\
[M/u](N_1 N_2) &= [M/u]N_1 [M/u]N_2 \\
[M/u]\mathbf{abort}(N) &= \mathbf{abort}([M/u]N) \\
[M/u]\mathbf{inl}(N) &= \mathbf{inl}([M/u]N) \\
[M/u]\mathbf{inr}(N) &= \mathbf{inr}([M/u]N) \\
[M/u]\mathbf{case} N \mathbf{of} \mathbf{inl}(u_1) \Rightarrow N_1 \mid \mathbf{inr}(u_2) \Rightarrow N_2 &= \\
\mathbf{case} [M/u]N \mathbf{of} \mathbf{inl}(u_1) \Rightarrow [M/u]N_1 \mid \mathbf{inr}(u_2) \Rightarrow [M/u]N_2 &= \\
&&& (u_1 \# \mathbf{FV}(M), u_2 \# \mathbf{FV}(M))
\end{aligned}$$

The conditions on substitution into a λ or **case** expression mean that the substitution $[M/u]N$ need not be defined! For example, the attempted substitution $[\langle u, u \rangle / v] \lambda u:P.\langle u, v \rangle$ is undefined, because the bound variable, u , occurs free in $\langle u, u \rangle$. However, if we first rename the bound variable of the λ , then substitution is defined:

$$[\langle u, u \rangle / v] \lambda u':P.\langle u', v \rangle = \lambda u':P.\langle u', \langle u, u \rangle \rangle.$$

This situation is typical of the general case.

- Theorem 0.1** 1. For any M, N , and u , there exists N' and N'' such that $N =_\alpha N'$ and $[M/u]N' = N''$.
2. If $N =_\alpha N'$ and $N =_\alpha N''$ and $[M/u]N'$ and $[M/u]N''$ both exist, then $[M/u]N' =_\alpha [M/u]N''$.

Thus we say that *substitution is well-defined up to α -equivalence*.

Bound Variable Convention

Since bound variable names may be chosen arbitrarily, it is technically convenient to ignore the choice by systematically “modding out” by α -equivalence.

This means that we *always* work with α -equivalence classes of terms, and implicitly choose representatives of each equivalence class so that all relevant substitutions are well-defined. This frees us from having to think about the fundamentally irrelevant choice of bound variable names when manipulating terms.