

CSE 526: Principles of Programming Languages

Spring 2010

Final Exam

Max: 100 points

May 13, 2010

Duration: 2h 30m

1. An untyped lambda term t is typable if there is a typed lambda term t' such that $erase(t') = t$ and t' is well-typed. The definition of $erase$, taken from the textbook, is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}erase(x) &= x \\erase(\lambda x : T. t) &= \lambda x. erase(t) \\erase(t_1 t_2) &= erase(t_1) erase(t_2)\end{aligned}$$

- (a) [15 points] State whether each of the following untyped lambda terms is typable. If a term is typable, give its principal type. If a term is not typable, formally explain why not.
- $\lambda x. \lambda y. (x y)$
 - $\lambda x. (x x)$
 - $\lambda x. \lambda y. x (x y)$
 - $\lambda x. \lambda y. x (y x)$
 - $\lambda x. \lambda y. (x y) y$
- (b) [8 points] Show that if t is typable, then every subterm of t is typable.
2. A lambda term is said to follow the *De Barendregt convention* if the names of all bound variables are different from each other, and different from any free variable. Every lambda term can be alpha-converted to a term that follows the De Barendregt convention. Note that De Barendregt convention is different from the de Bruijn notation.
- (a) [6 points] For each of the following lambda terms, write an alpha-equivalent term that follows the De Barendregt convention.
- $\lambda x. (\lambda y. x y) y$
 - $\lambda x. \lambda y. x (y \lambda x. x)$
 - $\lambda x. (x x)$
- (b) [9 points] Formally define the De Barendregt convention using an inductive definition. More specifically, give an inductive definition of a function *followsdb* whose domain is the set of all lambda terms and whose range is Boolean, such that *followsdb* maps t to *true* iff t follows the De Barendregt convention. You may assume the definitions of the set of free variables of t (denoted by $FV(t)$) and the set of all variables of t (denoted by $Vars(t)$). If you need additional auxiliary definitions, make sure those are defined inductively too.
3. (a) [4 points] Recall the extension of pure lambda calculus with **let** construct of the form “**let** $x = t_1$ **in** t_2 ”. This construct can be considered as syntactic sugar, expanding to $(\lambda x. t_2) t_1$. OCAML’s **let** construct is a more general and has the form **let** $x_1 x_2 \dots x_n = t_1$ **in** t_2 where x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n are distinct variables. For instance, **let** $x = 2$ **in** **let** $f y = y+1$ **in** $f x$ is an OCAML expression. Show OCAML’s **let** expressions can be treated as syntactic sugar; i.e. expand OCAML’s **let** expressions into pure lambda terms. [For full credit, your description should be precise and complete].

(b) [5 points] Another extension to the lambda calculus discussed in class is the `fix` construct to permit the definition of recursive functions. OCAML has the `let rec` construct for defining recursive functions. Show how OCAML expressions with `let rec` can be converted to lambda calculus with `fix`. [For full credit, your description should be precise and complete]

(c) [5 points] Show how mutually recursive functions can be written in lambda calculus; you may use any extension of the lambda calculus (including, but not necessarily: `let`, records, variants, `fix`, references and exceptions).

(d) [5 points] Consider the OCAML expression

```
let x = nil in (1::x, true::x)
```

Is the above expression well typed? Why or why not?

(e) [5 points] Consider the OCAML expression

```
(fun x -> (1::x, true::x)) nil
```

where “`fun x -> t`” is OCAML’s way of writing $\lambda x. t$

Is the above expression well typed? Why or why not?

4. (a) [12 points] Write the normal forms of the following expressions in lambda calculus extended with `let`, tuples and references.

i. `let r = ref 0 in !r`

ii. `let a = {ref 0, ref 0} in !(a.1)`

iii. `let a = {ref 0, ref 0} in a.1 := 1; !(a.2)`

iv. `let b = let x = ref 0 in {x, x} in b.1 := 1; !(b.2)`

(b) [12 points] Write expressions in lambda calculus extended with `let`, tuples and references that, when evaluated in an empty store result in the following stores.

i. $\{l_1 \mapsto 0\}$

ii. $\{l_1 \mapsto \{0, 0\}\}$

iii. $\{l_1 \mapsto \{l_2, 1\}, l_2 \mapsto 0\}$

iv. $\{l_1 \mapsto \lambda x : \text{Nat}. (!l_1) x\}$

5. [14 points] Let `MS <: Grad <: Student` be a subtype relation among base types `MS`, `Grad` and `Student`.

(a) Which of the following are subtypes of `{a:Grad, b:Student}`? Justify each answer briefly.

i. `{a:Grad}`

ii. `{a:Student, b:MS}`

iii. `{a:Grad, b:MS, c:Student}`

(b) Which of the following are subtypes of `Grad → Grad`? Justify each answer briefly.

i. `MS → Grad`

ii. `Grad → MS`

iii. `Grad → Student`

iv. `Student → Grad`

END OF EXAM