

# The Y-Combinator in Scheme

Programming language theorists usually develop the Y-Combinator as a "fixed-point operator", so that for any expression  $X$  the result  $(Y X)$  is a fixed-point of  $X$ , meaning that  $(X (Y X)) = (Y X)$ . Unless you have a lot of experience with the right sort of mathematics it is hard to see the implications of that, so we will develop it in a different way.

Our goal will be to find a way to write recursive functions in the pure lambda-calculus. At first glance that is impossible: how can a lambda expression "call itself" if it doesn't have a name?? It turns out that the Y-Combinator is the solution to this puzzle, but it will take some work to get there.

We need a recursive function to work with. We could use almost anything, but a particularly simple target is the recursive length function. In Scheme this is

```
(define length (lambda (lat)
  (cond
    [(null? lat) 0]
    [else (+ 1 (length (cdr lat)))])))
```

We are looking for a way to write this in the lambda-calculus without assigning names to anything.

First, here is a function that loops forever:

```
(define eternity (lambda (x) (eternity x)))
```

There is no problem making this definition, but if we ever call function `eternity` with any argument it will recurse forever.

Here is a function related to the length function:

```
(define L (lambda (f)
            (lambda (lat)
              (cond
                [(null? lat) 0]
                [else (+ 1 (f (cdr lat)))]))))
```

Here are some functions we can get from L:

```
(define L0 (L eternity))
```

(L<sub>0</sub> null) is 0; (L<sub>0</sub> lat) runs forever if lat isn't null

```
(define L1 (L L0)) == (L (L eternity))
```

(L<sub>1</sub> lat) is the correct length of lat if lat has 0 or 1 elements; it fails if lat has more than 1 elements

```
(define L2 (L L1)) == (L (L (L eternity)))
```

```
(define L3 (L L2))
```

```
(define L4 (L L3))
```

etc.

Function L<sub>n</sub> finds the length of all lats that have no more than n elements.

We are getting somewhere, but we would need L<sub>∞</sub> to find the length of all lats.

Here is a slightly more complicated approach:

```
(define M1
  (let ([g (lambda (f)
            (lambda (lat)
              (cond
                [(null? lat) 0]
                [else (+ 1 ((f eternity) (cdr lat))))]))])
    (g g)))
```

Note that (g eternity) is

```
(lambda (lat)
  (cond
    [(null? lat) 0]
    [else (+ 1 ((eternity eternity) (cdr lat))))]))
```

which is functionally the same as L<sub>0</sub>

```
and (g g) is
  (lambda (lat)
    (cond
      [(null? lat) 0]
      [else (+ 1 ((g eternity) (cdr lat)))])))
```

This is the same as (L L0). So  $M_1$  is a stand-alone function that is equivalent to  $L_1$ . We are getting somewhere.



```

(define N
  (let ([h (lambda (f)
             (lambda (lat)
               (cond
                [(null? lat) 0]
                [else (+ 1 ( (f f) (cdr lat))]))))]
        (h h)))

```

N is (h h), which is

```

(lambda (lat)
  (cond
   [(null? lat) 0]
   [else (+ 1 ( (h h) (cdr lat)))]))

```

That last line could be written [else (+ 1 (N (cdr lat)))]

so N is exactly the recursive length function.

Don't allow the let-expression in the definition of N throw you off.

(let ([a b]) exp) is completely equivalent to ( (lambda (a) exp) b) so we could rewrite N as a pure lambda-expression:

```
(define N
  ( (lambda (h) (h h))
    (lambda (f)
      (lambda (lat)
        (cond
          [(null? lat) 0]
          [else (+ 1 ( (f f) (cdr lat))]))))))))
```

We can write other recursive functions in this style:

The member? function is

```
(define member?  
  (let ([e (lambda (f)  
            (lambda (a lat)  
              (cond  
                [(null? lat) #f]  
                [(eq? a (car lat)) #t]  
                [else ( (f f) a (cdr lat))]])))]  
    (e e)))
```

The factorial function is

```
(define Factorial
  (let ([c (lambda (f)
            (lambda (n)
              (cond
                [(= 0 n) 1]
                [else (* n ( (f f) (- n 1))])]))))
    (c c)))
```

There is a pattern to coding like this. Consider the following which is an encoding of the Y-Combinator:

```
(define Y (lambda (exp)
  (let ([a (lambda (f)
             (exp (lambda (x) ( (f f) x)))))])
    (a a))))
```

Then (Y (lambda(s)  
 (lambda (lat)  
 (cond  
 [(null? lat) 0]  
 [else (+ 1 (s (cdr lat))]))))))

is the length function

To see why, note that

```
(Y (lambda (s)
    (lambda (lat)
      (cond
        [(null? lat) 0]
        [else (+ 1 (s (cdr lat)))]))))))
```

is

```
(let ([a (lambda (f)
    (lambda (lat)
      (cond
        [(null? lat) 0]
        [else (+ 1 (lambda (x) ((f f) x))(cdr lat))])
      (a a)
    )
  )])
```

which is equivalent to

```
(let ([a (lambda (f)
    (lambda (lat)
      (cond
        [(null? lat) 0]
        [else (+ 1 ((f f) (cdr lat))])
      (a a)
    )
  )])
```

and this last expression is the same as  $N$ .

Similarly,

```
(Y (lambda (s)
  (lambda (n)
    (cond
      [(= 0 n) 1]
      [else (* n (s (- n 1)))]))))))
```

is the factorial function.

In general, if you take the definition of any recursive function of one variable, wrap a `(lambda (s) ...)` around it and use `s` as the name of the function for the recursive call, `Y` takes this expression and turns it into a recursive function.



Y converts expressions into recursive functions of 1 variable.

If we define Y2 as

```
(define Y2 (lambda (name)
  (let ([a (lambda (f)
             (name (lambda (x y) ((f f) x y))))])
    (a a))))
```

then Y2 makes recursive functions of 2 variables.

For example

```
(Y2 (lambda (s)
      (lambda (a lat)
        (cond
          [(null? lat) null]
          [(eq? a (car lat)) (cdr lat)]
          [else (cons (car lat) (s a (cdr lat)))]))))))
```

is the rember function and

```
(Y2 (lambda (s)
      (lambda (a lat)
        (cond
          [(null? lat) null]
          [(eq? a (car lat)) (s a (cdr lat))]
          [else (cons (car lat) (s a (cdr lat)))]))))))
```

is the rember-all function

The Y-Combinator shows that all recursive functions can be written in the pure lambda-calculus. Using this fact, it can be shown that the lambda-calculus is *Turing Complete*: Turing Machines, and hence any algorithm, can be expressed in the lambda-calculus. We have seen an algorithm for expressing any lambda-expression in terms of the combinators S and K. This means not only that the Combinatorial Calculus is Turing Complete, but that all possible algorithms can be expressed as combinations of two simple combinators: S and K. This is remarkable.

We have also shown that recursion does not require functions to be given names. Anonymous functions can be recursive! Who knew?