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## Today's Session

$\rightarrow$ Two hours (but longer if you like)
$\rightarrow$ Plan: Few words to start us off, then questions from you
$\rightarrow$ I have slides working through two types of questions:
$\rightarrow$ "Is this substitution correct?"
$\rightarrow$ "Is this system sound?"
$\rightarrow$...but l've prepared all three exams, so we can go through any of them on the board

## Exam Information

$\rightarrow$ Your exam:
$\rightarrow$ Time: Tuesday, 16th May 2017
$\rightarrow$ Location: Patersons Land - 1.26 (Holyrood)
$\rightarrow$ (Be sure to check closer to the time - these sometimes change!)
$\rightarrow$ Exam format:
$\rightarrow$ Two hours
$\rightarrow$ Question 1 is compulsory, then you have a choice between questions 2 and 3.
$\rightarrow$ Revision Exercises:
$\rightarrow$ Three papers:
$\rightarrow$ Mock exam (on EPL course page)
$\rightarrow$ 2015/16 exam
$\rightarrow$ 2015/16 resit exam
$\rightarrow$ Tutorial questions

## 15/16 Resit Exam, Question 1(b)

Consider the following substitutions:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \rightarrow(\lambda x \cdot x y)[x / y]=\lambda z \cdot z x \\
& \rightarrow(\lambda x \cdot \lambda y \cdot(x, y, z))[(y, z) / x]=\lambda x \cdot \lambda y \cdot((y, z), y, z) \\
& \rightarrow(\lambda x \cdot x+((\lambda y \cdot y) z))[y / z]=\lambda x \cdot x+((\lambda y \cdot y) y) \\
& \rightarrow(\lambda x \cdot x+((\lambda y \cdot y) z))[x / z]=\lambda x \cdot x+((\lambda y \cdot y) x)
\end{aligned}
$$

For each one, explain whether the substitution has been performed correctly or not. If not, give the correct answer for the right-hand side.
[8 marks]

15/16 Resit Exam, Question 1(b)

$$
(\lambda x \cdot x y)[x / y]=\lambda z . z x
$$

## 15/16 Resit Exam, Question 1(b)

$$
(\lambda x . x y)[x / y]=\lambda z . z x
$$

This is correct.
$\rightarrow$ Substituting $x$ for $y$ naïvely would result in $\lambda x . x x$. Here, $x$ would be captured by the $\lambda x$ binder, changing the meaning of the program.
$\rightarrow$ Instead, it is always safe to perform substitution by choosing fresh variables for the binders, and then performing the substitution:

$$
\rightarrow(\lambda z . z y)[x / y]=(\lambda z . z x)
$$

15/16 Resit Exam, Question 1(b)
$(\lambda x \cdot \lambda y \cdot(x, y, z))[(y, z) / x]=\lambda x \cdot \lambda y \cdot((y, z), y, z)$

## 15/16 Resit Exam, Question 1(b)

$$
(\lambda x \cdot \lambda y \cdot(x, y, z))[(y, z) / x]=\lambda x \cdot \lambda y \cdot((y, z), y, z)
$$

$\rightarrow$ This is incorrect.
$\rightarrow$ Whereas the $y$ in $(y, z)$ was free before the substitution, $y$ has been captured by the $\lambda y$ afterwards.
$\rightarrow$ To correct the substitution, freshen the binders beforehand:

$$
(\lambda a \cdot \lambda b \cdot(a, b, z))[(y, z) / x]=\lambda a \cdot \lambda b \cdot(a, b, z)
$$

15/16 Resit Exam, Question 1(b)
$(\lambda x \cdot x+((\lambda y \cdot y) z))[y / z]=\lambda x \cdot x+((\lambda y \cdot y) y)$

## 15/16 Resit Exam, Question 1(b)

$$
(\lambda x \cdot x+((\lambda y \cdot y) z))[y / z]=\lambda x \cdot x+((\lambda y \cdot y) y)
$$

$\rightarrow$ This is correct.
$\rightarrow z$ is not in the scope $f$ the $\lambda y$ binder, so $y$ is not captured when it is substituted.

## 15/16 Resit Exam, Question 1(b)

$$
(\lambda x \cdot x+((\lambda y \cdot y) z))[x / z]=\lambda x \cdot x+((\lambda y \cdot y) x)
$$

$\rightarrow$ This is incorrect.
$\rightarrow z$ is in the scope of $\lambda x$ before the substitution, so $x$ is captured by the binder.
$\rightarrow$ As ever, this can be solved by freshening the binder before substituting:

$$
(\lambda a \cdot a+((\lambda y \cdot y) z)[x / z]=\lambda a \cdot a+((\lambda y \cdot y) x)
$$

## 15/16 Resit Paper: 2(d)

"Type soundness is often proved using two properties, called preservation and progress". Define the preservation property.

## 15/16 Resit Paper: 2(d)

"Type soundness is often proved using two properties, called preservation and progress". Define the preservation property.
$\rightarrow$ Preservation: Typing is preserved under reduction.
$\rightarrow$ More formally, if $\Gamma \vdash e: \tau$ and $e \mapsto e^{\prime}$, then $\Gamma \vdash e^{\prime}: \tau$.
$\rightarrow$ Progress: A well-typed term is either a value, or can take a reduction step (evaluation doesn't get "stuck")
$\rightarrow$ More formally, if $\Gamma \vdash e: \tau$, then either $e$ is a value $v$, or there exists some $e^{\prime}$ such that $e \mapsto e^{\prime}$.
$\rightarrow$ Soundness: A system is sound if it satisfies preservation and progress.

These seem to come up a lot - they're worth knowing!

## 15/16 Resit Paper: 2(e)

Consider the following rules which we might add to handle random number generation to a language that already has basic arithmetic:

$$
e \mapsto e^{\prime}
$$

$$
\frac{e \mapsto e^{\prime}}{\operatorname{randInt}(e) \mapsto \operatorname{randInt}\left(e^{\prime}\right)} \quad \frac{0 \leq n<v}{\operatorname{randInt}(v) \mapsto n} \quad \frac{v \leq 0}{\operatorname{randInt}(v) \mapsto 0}
$$

$$
\Gamma \vdash e: \tau
$$

$$
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e: \text { int }}{\Gamma \vdash \operatorname{randInt}(e): \text { int }}
$$

Is this system sound? Briefly explain why or why not.

15/16 Resit Paper: 2(e)
$\frac{e \mapsto e^{\prime}}{\operatorname{randInt}(e) \mapsto \operatorname{randInt}\left(e^{\prime}\right)} \quad \frac{0 \leq n<v}{\operatorname{randInt}(v) \mapsto n} \quad \frac{v \leq 0}{\operatorname{randInt}(v) \mapsto 0}$

$$
\Gamma \vdash e: \tau
$$

$$
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e: \operatorname{int}}{\Gamma \vdash \operatorname{randInt}(e): \mathrm{int}}
$$

Does the system satisfy preservation? If something reduces, does it have the same type?
$\rightarrow$ Yes: the type is int before and after reduction.
Does the system satisfy progress? Can we always reduce?
$\rightarrow$ Yes: if randInt is evaluating a value, then all values accounted for by the last two rules. If evaluating a subexpression, we can assume it takes a step, and thus conclude with the first rule.

## 15/16 Resit Paper: 2(e)

$\frac{e \mapsto e^{\prime}}{\operatorname{randInt}(e) \mapsto \operatorname{randInt}\left(e^{\prime}\right)} \quad \frac{0 \leq n<v}{\operatorname{randInt}(v) \mapsto}$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e: \operatorname{int}}{\Gamma \vdash \operatorname{randInt}(e): \mathrm{int}}$

How would we prove this formally?
$\rightarrow$ Preservation: by induction on $e \mapsto e^{\prime}$.
$\rightarrow$ Progress: by induction on $\Gamma \vdash e: \tau$.

## 15/16 Paper: Question 2(c)

$$
\frac{e_{1} \mapsto e_{1}^{\prime}}{e_{1} \div e_{2} \mapsto e_{1}^{\prime} \div e_{2}} \quad \frac{e_{2} \mapsto e_{2}^{\prime}}{v_{1} \div e_{2} \mapsto v_{1} \div e_{2}^{\prime}} \quad \frac{v_{2} \neq 0}{v_{1} \div v_{2} \mapsto \operatorname{div}\left(v_{1}, v_{2}\right)}
$$

$$
\Gamma \vdash e: \tau
$$

$c$ is a floating-point constant
$\Gamma \vdash c:$ float

Is this system sound?

## 15/16 Paper: Question 2(c)

$\boxed{e \mapsto e^{\prime}}$
$\frac{e_{1} \mapsto e_{1}^{\prime}}{e_{1} \div e_{2} \mapsto e_{1}^{\prime} \div e_{2}} \quad \frac{e_{2} \mapsto e_{2}^{\prime}}{v_{1} \div e_{2} \mapsto v_{1} \div e_{2}^{\prime}} \quad \frac{v_{2} \neq 0}{v_{1} \div v_{2} \mapsto f \operatorname{div}\left(v_{1}, v_{2}\right)}$
$\frac{c \text { is a floating-point constant }}{\Gamma \vdash c: \text { float }} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_{1}: \text { float } \Gamma \vdash e_{2}: \text { float }}{\Gamma \vdash e_{1} \div e_{2}: \text { float }}$

Is this system sound?
$\rightarrow$ No.
$\rightarrow$ Preservation holds: if we take a reduction step, we still end up with a float.
$\rightarrow$ Progress does not hold: we cannot reduce $v_{1} \div 0$ since no rules match, yet $v_{1} \div 0$ is not a value.

