

## syn.1 $\eta$ -conversion

lam:syn:eta:  
sec There is another relation on  $\lambda$  terms. In ?? we used the example  $\lambda x.(fx)$ , which accepts an argument and applies  $f$  to it. In other words, it is the same function as  $f: \lambda x.(fx)N$  and  $fN$  both reduce to  $fN$ . We use  $\eta$ -reduction (and  $\eta$ -extension) to capture this idea.

lam:syn:eta:  
defn:beredone **Definition syn.1 ( $\eta$ -contraction,  $\xrightarrow{\eta}$ ).**  $\eta$ -contraction ( $\xrightarrow{\eta}$ ) is the smallest compatible relation on terms satisfying the following condition:

$$\lambda x.Mx \xrightarrow{\eta} M \text{ provided } x \notin FV(M)$$

lam:syn:eta:  
defn:bered **Definition syn.2 ( $\beta\eta$ -reduction,  $\xrightarrow{\beta\eta}$ ).**  $\beta\eta$ -reduction ( $\xrightarrow{\beta\eta}$ ) is the smallest reflexive, transitive relation on terms containing  $\xrightarrow{\beta}$  and  $\xrightarrow{\eta}$ , i.e., the rules of reflexivity and transitive plus the following two rules:

lam:syn:eta:  
defn:bered3 1. If  $M \xrightarrow{\beta} N$  then  $M \xrightarrow{\beta\eta} N$ .

lam:syn:eta:  
defn:bered4 2. If  $M \xrightarrow{\eta} N$  then  $M \xrightarrow{\beta\eta} N$ .

**Definition syn.3.** We extend the equivalence relation  $=$  with the  $\eta$ -conversion rule:

$$\lambda x.fx = f$$

and denote the extended relation as  $\stackrel{\eta}{=}$ .

$\eta$ -equivalence is important because it is related to extensionality of lambda terms:

**Definition syn.4 (Extensionality).** We extend the equivalence relation  $=$  with the (*ext*) rule:

$$\text{If } Mx = Nx \text{ then } M = N, \text{ provided } x \notin FV(MN).$$

and denote the extended relation as  $\stackrel{ext}{=}$ .

Roughly speaking, the rule states that two terms, viewed as functions, should be considered equal if they behave the same for the same argument.

We now prove that the  $\eta$  rule provides exactly the extensionality, and nothing else.

**Theorem syn.5.**  $M \stackrel{ext}{=} N$  if and only if  $M \stackrel{\eta}{=} N$ .

*Proof.* First we prove that  $\stackrel{\eta}{=}$  is closed under the extensionality rule. That is, *ext* rule doesn't add anything to  $\stackrel{\eta}{=}$ . We then have  $\stackrel{\eta}{=}$  contains  $\stackrel{ext}{=}$ , and if  $M \stackrel{ext}{=} N$ , then  $M \stackrel{\eta}{=} N$ .

To prove  $\stackrel{\eta}{=}$  is closed under *ext*, note that for any  $M = N$  derived by the *ext* rule, we have  $Mx \stackrel{\eta}{=} Nx$  as premise. Then we have  $\lambda x. Mx \stackrel{\eta}{=} \lambda x. Nx$  by a rule of  $=$ , applying  $\eta$  on both side gives us  $M \stackrel{\eta}{=} N$ .

Similarly we prove that the  $\eta$  rule is contained in  $\stackrel{ext}{=}$ . For any  $\lambda x. Mx$  and  $M$  with  $x \notin FV(M)$ , we have that  $(\lambda x. Mx)x \stackrel{ext}{=} Mx$ , giving us  $\lambda x. Mx \stackrel{ext}{=} M$  by the *ext* rule.  $\square$

## Photo Credits

## Bibliography