

Outline

- ➔ ● **Programming with Functions**
- **Defining a Language**
- **Defining Type Rules**
- **Type Soundness**

Programming with Functions

- A program comprises function definitions and applications

$$\mathbf{f(x) \equiv (x \times x) + 10}$$

$$\mathbf{f(2) = 14}$$

Programming with Functions

- A program comprises function definitions and applications

$$\mathbf{f(x) \equiv (x \times x) + 10}$$

$$\mathbf{g(y) \equiv 3 \times y}$$

$$\mathbf{g(f(2)) = 42}$$

Programming with Functions

- Functions consume and produce more than numbers

mkpair(x, y) ≡ ⟨x, y⟩

mkpair(1, 2) = ⟨1, 2⟩

Programming with Functions

- Functions consume and produce more than numbers

mkpair(x, y) ≡ ⟨x, y⟩

mklist(x, y) ≡ mkpair(x, mkpair(y, empty))

mklist(1, 2) = ⟨1, ⟨2, empty⟩⟩

Programming with Functions

- Functions consume and produce more than numbers

$$\mathbf{mkpair(x, y) \equiv \langle x, y \rangle}$$

$$\mathbf{mklist(x, y) \equiv mkpair(x, mkpair(y, \text{empty}))}$$

$$\mathbf{fst(\langle x, y \rangle) \equiv x}$$

$$\mathbf{fst(mklist(1, 2)) = 1}$$

Programming with Functions

- Use functions to build complex data from simple constructs
- Implement branches with conditional functions

$$\mathbf{add(n, N, pb) \equiv \langle\langle n, N \rangle, pb \rangle}$$

$$\mathbf{lookup(n, \langle\langle n2, N \rangle, pb \rangle) \equiv \begin{cases} n = n2 & N \\ n \neq n2 & \mathbf{lookup}(n, pb) \end{cases}}$$

lookup("Jack", add("Jack", "x1212", empty)) = "x1212"

Computation as Algebra

- Compute using algebraic equivalences

$$\mathbf{f(x) \equiv (x \times x) + 10}$$

$$\mathbf{f(2) =}$$

Computation as Algebra

- Compute using algebraic equivalences

$$\mathbf{f(x) \equiv (x \times x) + 10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f(2)} &= (2 \times 2) + 10 \\ &= 4 + 10 \\ &= 14 \end{aligned}$$

Computation as Algebra

- Equivalence is pattern matching...

$$\mathbf{mkpair(x, y) \equiv \langle x, y \rangle}$$

$$\mathbf{mklist(x, y) \equiv mkpair(x, mkpair(y, \text{empty}))}$$



$$\mathbf{mklist(1, 2) =}$$

Computation as Algebra

- Equivalence is pattern matching...

$$\mathbf{mkpair(x, y) \equiv \langle x, y \rangle}$$

$$\mathbf{mklist(x, y) \equiv mkpair(x, mkpair(y, \text{empty}))}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{mklist(1, 2)} &= \mathbf{mkpair(1, mkpair(2, \text{empty}))} \\ &= \langle 1, \mathbf{mkpair(2, \text{empty})} \rangle \\ &= \langle 1, \langle 2, \text{empty} \rangle \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{or} &= \mathbf{mkpair(1, mkpair(2, \text{empty}))} \\ &= \mathbf{mkpair(1, \langle 2, \text{empty} \rangle)} \\ &= \langle 1, \langle 2, \text{empty} \rangle \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Computation as Algebra

- ... and matching with conditionals

$$\mathbf{add(n, N, pb) \equiv \langle\langle n, N \rangle, pb\rangle}$$

$$\mathbf{lookup(n, \langle\langle n2, N \rangle, pb \rangle) \equiv \begin{cases} n = n2 & N \\ n \neq n2 & \mathbf{lookup}(n, pb) \end{cases}}$$

lookup("Jack", add("Jack", "x1212", empty))

= lookup("Jack", ⟨⟨"Jack", "x1212"⟩, empty)⟩

= "x1212"

Computation as Algebra

- ... and matching with conditionals

$$\mathbf{add(n, N, pb) \equiv \langle\langle n, N \rangle, pb \rangle}$$

$$\mathbf{lookup(n, \langle\langle n2, N \rangle, pb \rangle) \equiv \begin{cases} n = n2 & N \\ n \neq n2 & \mathbf{lookup}(n, pb) \end{cases}}$$

lookup("Jill", add("Jack", "x1212", empty))

= lookup("Jill", ⟨⟨"Jack", "x1212"⟩, empty)⟩

= lookup("Jill", empty)

stuck implies an error

Higher-Order Functions

- A *higher-order function* is one that consumes or produces functions

$$\mathbf{f(x) \equiv x \times x}$$

$$\mathbf{twice(g, x) \equiv g(g(x))}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{twice(f, 2)} &= \mathbf{f(f(2))} \\ &= \mathbf{f(2 \times 2)} \\ &= \mathbf{f(4)} \\ &= \mathbf{4 \times 4} \\ &= \mathbf{16} \end{aligned}$$

Higher-Order Functions

- A *higher-order function* is one that consumes or produces functions

$$\mathbf{fst}(\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle) \equiv \mathbf{x}$$

$$\mathbf{twice}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{x}) \equiv \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}))$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{twice}(\mathbf{fst}, \langle \langle 1, 2 \rangle, 3 \rangle) &= \mathbf{fst}(\mathbf{fst}(\langle \langle 1, 2 \rangle, 3 \rangle)) \\ &= \mathbf{fst}(\langle 1, 2 \rangle) \\ &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

The Direction of Evaluation

$$3 + 4 = ?$$

The Direction of Evaluation

$$3 + 4 = 3 + (2 + 2)$$

The Direction of Evaluation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f(2)} &= -1 + \mathbf{f(2)} + 1 \\ &= -1 + \mathbf{f(\mathbf{sqrt(4)})} + 1 \\ &= \dots \end{aligned}$$

- For programming, we want an evaluation direction that produces *values*

Expressions and Values

- Many possible *expressions*

8

$2 + 7 + \mathbf{sqrt}(9)$

fst

$\langle 1, \mathbf{fst}(\langle \text{empty}, \text{empty} \rangle) \rangle$

- Certain expressions are designated as *values*

8

fst

$\langle 1, \text{empty} \rangle$

Evaluation

- Define evaluation to *reduce* expressions to values

$$\begin{aligned}(2 + 7) + 8 &\rightarrow 9 + 8 \\ &\rightarrow 17\end{aligned}$$

Evaluation with Higher-Order Functions

- Problem: creating new function values

$$\mathbf{f(x) \equiv x + 1}$$

$$\mathbf{g(y) \equiv y + 2}$$

$$\mathbf{compose(a, b) \equiv \dots}$$

can't put $\mathbf{a(b(\dots))}$ in place of \dots

Evaluation with Higher-Order Functions

- Problem: creating new function values

$$\mathbf{f(x) \equiv x + 1}$$

$$\mathbf{g(y) \equiv y + 2}$$

$$\mathbf{compose(a, b) \equiv \dots}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{compose(f, g)} \rightarrow \dots \\ \phantom{\mathbf{compose(f, g)}} \rightarrow \mathbf{h} \end{array}$$

where

$$\mathbf{h(z) = f(g(z))}$$

Evaluation with Higher-Order Functions

- Redirection-friendly function notation:

Replace

$$\mathbf{f(x) \equiv x + 1}$$

with

$$\mathbf{f \equiv (\lambda x . x + 1)}$$

Evaluation with Higher-Order Functions

- Definition with \equiv merely creates a shorthand

$$\mathbf{f} \equiv (\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{x} + 1)$$

- Apply functions through λ -application reduction

$$(\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{M})(\mathbf{v}) \rightarrow \mathbf{M} \text{ with } \mathbf{x} \text{ replaced by } \mathbf{v}$$

Evaluation with Higher-Order Functions

- Definition with \equiv merely creates a shorthand

$$\mathbf{f} \equiv (\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{x} + 1)$$

- Apply functions through λ -application reduction

$$(\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{M})(\mathbf{v}) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}[\mathbf{v}/\mathbf{x}]$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}(10) &= (\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{x} + 1)(10) \\ &\rightarrow 10 + 1 \\ &\rightarrow 11 \end{aligned}$$

Evaluation with Higher-Order Functions

- Simple functions as values

mkadder $\equiv (\lambda m . (\lambda n . m + n))$

add1 $\equiv \text{mkadder}(1)$

add5 $\equiv \text{mkadder}(5)$

add5 = $(\lambda m . (\lambda n . m + n))(5)$
 $\rightarrow (\lambda n . 5 + n)$

Evaluation with Higher-Order Functions

- Simple functions as values

mkadder $\equiv (\lambda m . (\lambda n . m + n))$

add1 $\equiv \text{mkadder}(1)$

add5 $\equiv \text{mkadder}(5)$

add5(1) = $(\lambda m . (\lambda n . m + n))(5)(1)$
→ $(\lambda n . 5 + n)(1)$
→ $5 + 1$
→ 6

Evaluation with Higher-Order Functions

- Returning to the definition of **compose**

$$\mathbf{f} \equiv (\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{x} + 1)$$

$$\mathbf{g} \equiv (\lambda \mathbf{y} . \mathbf{y} + 2)$$

$$\mathbf{compose} \equiv (\lambda (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) . (\lambda \mathbf{z} . \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{z}))))$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{compose}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) &= (\lambda (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) . (\lambda \mathbf{z} . \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{z}))))(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \\ &\rightarrow (\lambda \mathbf{z} . \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}))) \end{aligned}$$

Abbreviations

fac $\equiv \lambda n . \text{if0 } n$
 then $\lceil 1 \rceil$
 else $n \times \text{fac}(n - \lceil 1 \rceil)$

Illegal: **fac** isn't merely a shorthand
because it mentions itself

mkfac $\equiv \lambda f . \lambda n . \text{if0 } n$
 then $\lceil 1 \rceil$
 else $n \times (f(f))(n - \lceil 1 \rceil)$
fac $\equiv \text{mkfac}(\text{mkfac})$

Outline

- **Programming with Functions**
- ➔ ● **Defining a Language**
- **Defining Type Rules**
- **Type Soundness**

Defining a Functional Language

Steps to defining a language:

- Define the syntax for expressions
- Designate certain expressions as values
- Define the reduction rules on expressions

Syntax: Expressions

M = **[n]**
| **x**
| **M - M**
| **M × M**
| **if 0 M then M else M**
| **λ x . M**
| **M M**
n = an integer
x = a variable

where parentheses can be put around any **M**

[5] represents 5

Syntax: Expressions

M = $[n]$
| **x**
| **M - M**
| **M × M**
| **if 0 M then M else M**
| $\lambda x. M$
| **M M**
n = an integer
x = a variable

where parentheses can be put around any **M**

$[5] - [3]$ represents the subtraction of
3 from 5

Syntax: Expressions

M = [**n**]
| **x**
| **M** - **M**
| **M** × **M**
| **if** 0 **M** **then** **M** **else** **M**
| λ **x** . **M**
| **M** **M**
n = an integer
x = a variable

where parentheses can be put around any **M**

λ **x** . **x** represents the identity
function

Syntax: Expressions

M = $[n]$
| **x**
| **M - M**
| **M × M**
| **if 0 M then M else M**
| $\lambda x . M$
| **M M**
n = an integer
x = a variable

where parentheses can be put around any **M**

 $(\lambda x . x)([5])$

represents applying the
identity function to 5

Syntax: Values

$$\mathbf{v} = \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{[n]} \\ | \\ \lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{M} \end{array}$$

$\mathbf{[5]}$ a value

$\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{x}$ a value

$\mathbf{[5]} - \mathbf{[3]}$ **not** a value

$(\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{[5]})$ **not** a value

$\lambda \mathbf{y} . ((\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{y}))$ a value

Reductions

$$\begin{array}{l} \llbracket n_1 \rrbracket - \llbracket n_2 \rrbracket \\ \llbracket n_1 \rrbracket \times \llbracket n_2 \rrbracket \end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \llbracket n_1 - n_2 \rrbracket \\ \llbracket n_1 \times n_2 \rrbracket \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{if } 0 \llbracket 0 \rrbracket \text{ then } M_1 \text{ else } M_2 \\ \text{if } 0 \llbracket n \rrbracket \text{ then } M_1 \text{ else } M_2 \end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} M_1 \\ M_2 \end{array}$$

if $n \neq 0$

$$(\lambda x. M)(V) \quad \rightarrow \quad M[V/x]$$

$$\llbracket 5 \rrbracket - \llbracket 3 \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket 2 \rrbracket$$

Reductions

$$\begin{array}{l} \llbracket \mathbf{n}_1 \rrbracket - \llbracket \mathbf{n}_2 \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \mathbf{n}_1 \rrbracket \times \llbracket \mathbf{n}_2 \rrbracket \end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \llbracket \mathbf{n}_1 - \mathbf{n}_2 \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \mathbf{n}_1 \times \mathbf{n}_2 \rrbracket \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{if0 } \llbracket 0 \rrbracket \text{ then } \mathbf{M}_1 \text{ else } \mathbf{M}_2 \\ \text{if0 } \llbracket \mathbf{n} \rrbracket \text{ then } \mathbf{M}_1 \text{ else } \mathbf{M}_2 \end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{M}_1 \\ \mathbf{M}_2 \end{array}$$

if $\mathbf{n} \neq 0$

$$(\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{M})(\mathbf{V}) \quad \rightarrow \quad \mathbf{M}[\mathbf{V}/\mathbf{x}]$$

$$\text{if0 } \llbracket 0 \rrbracket \text{ then } \llbracket 5 \rrbracket \text{ else } (\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \llbracket 5 \rrbracket$$

Reductions

$$\begin{array}{l} \llbracket \mathbf{n}_1 \rrbracket - \llbracket \mathbf{n}_2 \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \mathbf{n}_1 \rrbracket \times \llbracket \mathbf{n}_2 \rrbracket \end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \llbracket \mathbf{n}_1 - \mathbf{n}_2 \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \mathbf{n}_1 \times \mathbf{n}_2 \rrbracket \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{if0 } \llbracket 0 \rrbracket \text{ then } \mathbf{M}_1 \text{ else } \mathbf{M}_2 \\ \text{if0 } \llbracket \mathbf{n} \rrbracket \text{ then } \mathbf{M}_1 \text{ else } \mathbf{M}_2 \end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{M}_1 \\ \mathbf{M}_2 \\ \text{if } \mathbf{n} \neq 0 \end{array}$$

$$(\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{M})(\mathbf{V}) \quad \rightarrow \quad \mathbf{M}[\mathbf{V}/\mathbf{x}]$$

$$\text{if0 } \llbracket 1 \rrbracket \text{ then } \llbracket 5 \rrbracket \text{ else } (\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{x}) \rightarrow (\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{x})$$

Reductions

$$\begin{array}{l} \llbracket \mathbf{n}_1 \rrbracket - \llbracket \mathbf{n}_2 \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \mathbf{n}_1 \rrbracket \times \llbracket \mathbf{n}_2 \rrbracket \end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \llbracket \mathbf{n}_1 - \mathbf{n}_2 \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \mathbf{n}_1 \times \mathbf{n}_2 \rrbracket \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{if } 0 \llbracket 0 \rrbracket \text{ then } \mathbf{M}_1 \text{ else } \mathbf{M}_2 \\ \text{if } 0 \llbracket \mathbf{n} \rrbracket \text{ then } \mathbf{M}_1 \text{ else } \mathbf{M}_2 \end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{M}_1 \\ \mathbf{M}_2 \\ \text{if } \mathbf{n} \neq 0 \end{array}$$

$$(\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{M})(\mathbf{V}) \quad \rightarrow \quad \mathbf{M}[\mathbf{V}/\mathbf{x}]$$

$$(\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{x} \times \llbracket 10 \rrbracket)(\llbracket 8 \rrbracket) \rightarrow \llbracket 8 \rrbracket \times \llbracket 10 \rrbracket$$

Reductions in Context

$$\mathbf{M}_1 - \mathbf{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}'_1 - \mathbf{M}_2$$

where $\mathbf{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}'_1$

$$\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{V} - \mathbf{M}'_2$$

where $\mathbf{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}'_2$

$$\mathbf{M}_1 \times \mathbf{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}'_1 \times \mathbf{M}_2$$

...

$$(\lceil 5 \rceil \times \lceil 2 \rceil) - (\lceil 3 \rceil \times \lceil 4 \rceil) \rightarrow \lceil 10 \rceil - (\lceil 3 \rceil \times \lceil 4 \rceil)$$

Reductions in Context

$$\mathbf{M}_1 - \mathbf{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}'_1 - \mathbf{M}_2$$

where $\mathbf{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}'_1$

$$\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{V} - \mathbf{M}'_2$$

where $\mathbf{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}'_2$

$$\mathbf{M}_1 \times \mathbf{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}'_1 \times \mathbf{M}_2$$

...

$$[10] - ([3] \times [4]) \rightarrow [10] - [12]$$

Reductions in Context

if0 M then M₁ else M₂ → if0 M' then M₁ else M₂
where **M → M'**

M₁ M₂ → M'₁ M₂
where **M₁ → M'₁**

V M₂ → V M'₂
where **M₂ → M'₂**

(λ x . x)([2] × [2]) → (λ x . x)([4])

Reductions in Context

if0 M then M₁ else M₂ → if0 M' then M₁ else M₂
where **M → M'**

M₁ M₂ → M'₁ M₂
where **M₁ → M'₁**

V M₂ → V M'₂
where **M₂ → M'₂**

((λ x . x)(λ y . y))([2] × [2]) → (λ y . y)([2] × [2])

Reductions in Context

A simpler way: define context

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{E} = [] \\ | \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{M} \\ | \mathbf{V} - \mathbf{E} \\ | \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{M} \\ | \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{E} \\ | (\mathbf{E} \ \mathbf{M}) \\ | (\mathbf{V} \ \mathbf{E}) \\ | \text{if } \mathbf{0} \ \mathbf{E} \ \text{then } \mathbf{M} \ \text{else } \mathbf{M} \end{array}$$
$$\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{M}] \rightarrow \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{M}'] \quad \text{where } \mathbf{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}'$$

$\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{M}]$ means \mathbf{E} with $[]$ replaced by \mathbf{M}

Reductions in Context

A simpler way: define context

$$\begin{aligned} E &= [] \\ &| E - M \\ &| V - E \\ &| E \times M \\ &| V \times E \\ &| (E M) \\ &| (V E) \\ &| \text{if } 0 E \text{ then } M \text{ else } M \end{aligned}$$
$$E[M] \rightarrow E[M'] \quad \text{where } M \rightarrow M'$$
$$\begin{aligned} E &= [4] - ([] \times ([2] + [1])) \\ E([4] - [5]) &= [4] - (([4] - [5]) \times ([2] + [1])) \end{aligned}$$

Reductions

$$\begin{array}{l} \lceil n_1 \rceil - \lceil n_2 \rceil \\ \lceil n_1 \rceil \times \lceil n_2 \rceil \end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{l} \lceil n_1 - n_2 \rceil \\ \lceil n_1 \times n_2 \rceil \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{if } 0 \lceil 0 \rceil \text{ then } M_1 \text{ else } M_2 \\ \text{if } 0 \lceil n \rceil \text{ then } M_1 \text{ else } M_2 \end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{l} M_1 \\ M_2 \\ \text{if } n \neq 0 \end{array}$$

$$(\lambda x . M)(V) \rightarrow M[V/x]$$

$$E[M] \rightarrow E[M'] \\ \text{where } M \rightarrow M'$$

Is this language deterministic?

Deterministic Reduction

Theorem: For any \mathbf{M} , at most one reduction rule applies.

Proof: By induction on the structure of \mathbf{M} .

... requires a lemma ...

Lemma: There exists at most one \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{M}_0 such that $\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{M}_0] = \mathbf{M}$ where \mathbf{M}_0 is reducible by one of the first five reduction rules.

Proof: By induction on the structure of \mathbf{M} .

Induction on Expressions

M = [n]
| x
| M - M
| M × M
| if 0 M then M else M
| λ x . M
| M M

base case inductive case

Base Cases

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} = & \quad [] \mid \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{V} - \mathbf{E} \mid \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{E} \\ & \mid (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{M}) \mid (\mathbf{V} \mathbf{E}) \mid \text{if } 0 \mathbf{E} \text{ then } \mathbf{M} \text{ else } \mathbf{M} \end{aligned}$$

- Assume $\mathbf{M} = [n]$
 - The only way to match the grammar for \mathbf{E} is $\mathbf{E} = []$ and $\mathbf{M}_0 = [n]$.
But that \mathbf{M}_0 is not reducible, so there are no matches.
- Assume $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{x}$
 - The only way to match the grammar for \mathbf{E} is $\mathbf{E} = []$ and $\mathbf{M}_0 = \mathbf{x} \dots$

Inductive Cases

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} = & \quad [] \mid \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{V} - \mathbf{E} \mid \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{E} \\ & \mid (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{M}) \mid (\mathbf{V} \mathbf{E}) \mid \text{if } 0 \mathbf{E} \text{ then } \mathbf{M} \text{ else } \mathbf{M} \end{aligned}$$

- Assume $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}_1 - \mathbf{M}_2$
 - Assume $\mathbf{M}_1 \neq \mathbf{V}_1$. The only match is $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_1 - \mathbf{M}_2$. By induction, there is a unique $\mathbf{E}_1[\mathbf{M}'_0] = \mathbf{M}_1$, and $\mathbf{M}'_0 = \mathbf{M}_0$.
 - Assume $\mathbf{M}_1 = \mathbf{V}_1$. This matches $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_1 - \mathbf{M}_2$, but \mathbf{E}_1 would have to be $[]$ and \mathbf{M}_0 would have to be \mathbf{V}_1 , which is not reducible. So $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{V}_1 - \mathbf{E}_2$. By induction, there is a unique $\mathbf{E}_2[\mathbf{M}'_0] = \mathbf{M}_2$, and $\mathbf{M}'_0 = \mathbf{M}_0$.

Inductive Cases

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} = & \quad [] \mid \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{V} - \mathbf{E} \mid \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{E} \\ & \mid (\mathbf{E} \ \mathbf{M}) \mid (\mathbf{V} \ \mathbf{E}) \mid \text{if } 0 \ \mathbf{E} \ \text{then } \mathbf{M} \ \text{else } \mathbf{M} \end{aligned}$$

- Assume $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}_1 \times \mathbf{M}_2$.
 - Analogous to the subtraction case.

Inductive Cases

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} = & \quad [] \mid \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{V} - \mathbf{E} \mid \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{E} \\ & \mid (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{M}) \mid (\mathbf{V} \mathbf{E}) \mid \text{if } 0 \mathbf{E} \text{ then } \mathbf{M} \text{ else } \mathbf{M} \end{aligned}$$

- Assume $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{M}_2$.
 - Analogous to the subtraction case.

Inductive Cases

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} = & \quad [] \mid \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{V} - \mathbf{E} \mid \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{E} \\ & \mid (\mathbf{E} \ \mathbf{M}) \mid (\mathbf{V} \ \mathbf{E}) \mid \text{if } 0 \ \mathbf{E} \ \text{then } \mathbf{M} \ \text{else } \mathbf{M} \end{aligned}$$

- Assume $\mathbf{M} = \lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{M}_1$.
 - Analogous to the number case.

Inductive Cases

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} = & \quad [] \mid \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{V} - \mathbf{E} \mid \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{E} \\ & \mid (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{M}) \mid (\mathbf{V} \mathbf{E}) \mid \text{if0 } \mathbf{E} \text{ then } \mathbf{M} \text{ else } \mathbf{M} \end{aligned}$$

- Assume $\mathbf{M} = \text{if0 } \mathbf{M}_1 \text{ then } \mathbf{M}_2 \text{ else } \mathbf{M}_3$. The only match is $\mathbf{E} = \text{if0 } \mathbf{E}_1 \text{ then } \mathbf{M}_2 \text{ else } \mathbf{M}_3$.
 - Assume $\mathbf{M}_1 = \mathbf{V}_1$. Then $\mathbf{E}_1 = []$ and there is no non-value \mathbf{M}_0 .
 - Assume $\mathbf{M}_1 \neq \mathbf{V}_1$. By induction, there is a unique $\mathbf{E}_1[\mathbf{M}'_0] = \mathbf{M}_1$, and $\mathbf{M}'_0 = \mathbf{M}_0$.

Inductive Cases

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} = & \quad [] \mid \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{V} - \mathbf{E} \mid \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{E} \\ & \mid (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{M}) \mid (\mathbf{V} \mathbf{E}) \mid \text{if } 0 \mathbf{E} \text{ then } \mathbf{M} \text{ else } \mathbf{M} \end{aligned}$$

Since we have covered every possible shape of \mathbf{M} , the lemma is proved.

Handling State

M = ...
| newref M
| defref M
| setref M = M

E = ...
| newref E
| deref E
| setref E = M
| setref V = E

Handling State

Possible reduction rules:

$$\mathbf{V} = \dots \mid \mathbf{newref\ V}$$

$$\mathbf{deref\ (newref\ V)} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$$

$$\mathbf{setref\ (newref\ V_1) = V_2} \rightarrow \mathbf{newref\ V_2}$$

Example:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\lambda r . \mathbf{deref\ r})(\mathbf{setref\ (newref\ [5]) = [12]}) \\ &= (\lambda r . \mathbf{deref\ r})(\mathbf{newref\ [12]}) \\ &= \mathbf{deref\ (newref\ [12])} \\ &= \mathbf{[12]} \end{aligned}$$

Handling State

Possible reduction rules:

$$\mathbf{V} = \dots \mid \mathbf{newref\ V}$$

$$\mathbf{deref\ (newref\ V)} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$$

$$\mathbf{setref\ (newref\ V_1) = V_2} \rightarrow \mathbf{newref\ V_2}$$

Problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\lambda r . (\lambda d . \mathbf{deref\ r})(\mathbf{setref\ r = [10]}))(\mathbf{newref\ [5]}) \\ &= (\lambda d . \mathbf{deref\ (newref\ 5)})(\mathbf{setref\ (newref\ [5]) = [10]}) \\ &= (\lambda d . \mathbf{deref\ (newref\ 5)})(\mathbf{newref\ [10]}) \\ &= \mathbf{deref\ (newref\ [5])} \\ &= \mathbf{[5]} \end{aligned}$$

Handling State

Correct reduction requires a *store*

σ = a store address

\mathbf{S} = a mapping from σ to \mathbf{V}

\mathbf{V} = ... | σ

$\langle \mathbf{S}, [\mathbf{n}_1] - [\mathbf{n}_2] \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{S}, [\mathbf{n}_1 - \mathbf{n}_2] \rangle$

...

$\langle \mathbf{S}, \text{newref } \mathbf{V} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{S}[\sigma = \mathbf{V}], \sigma \rangle$
where σ is not in \mathbf{S}

$\langle \mathbf{S}[\sigma = \mathbf{V}], \text{deref } \sigma \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{S}[\sigma = \mathbf{V}], \mathbf{V} \rangle$

$\langle \mathbf{S}[\sigma = \mathbf{V}_1], \text{setref } \sigma = \mathbf{V}_2 \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{S}[\sigma = \mathbf{V}_2], \sigma \rangle$

Handling State

$$\langle \mathbf{S}, \lceil n_1 \rceil - \lceil n_2 \rceil \rangle \quad \rightarrow \quad \langle \mathbf{S}, \lceil n_1 - n_2 \rceil \rangle$$

...

$$\langle \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{newref\ V} \rangle \quad \rightarrow \quad \langle \mathbf{S}[\sigma = \mathbf{V}], \sigma \rangle$$

where σ is not in \mathbf{S}

$$\langle \mathbf{S}[\sigma = \mathbf{V}], \mathbf{deref\ \sigma} \rangle \quad \rightarrow \quad \langle \mathbf{S}[\sigma = \mathbf{V}], \mathbf{V} \rangle$$

$$\langle \mathbf{S}[\sigma = \mathbf{V}_1], \mathbf{setref\ \sigma = V_2} \rangle \quad \rightarrow \quad \langle \mathbf{S}[\sigma = \mathbf{V}_2], \sigma \rangle$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \{\}, (\lambda r . (\lambda d . \mathbf{deref\ r})(\mathbf{setref\ r = \lceil 10 \rceil}))(\mathbf{newref\ \lceil 5 \rceil}) \rangle \\ &= \langle \{\sigma = \lceil 5 \rceil\}, (\lambda r . (\lambda d . \mathbf{deref\ r})(\mathbf{setref\ r = \lceil 10 \rceil}))(\sigma) \rangle \\ &= \langle \{\sigma = \lceil 5 \rceil\}, (\lambda d . \mathbf{deref\ \sigma})(\mathbf{setref\ \sigma = \lceil 10 \rceil}) \rangle \\ &= \langle \{\sigma = \lceil 10 \rceil\}, (\lambda d . \mathbf{deref\ \sigma})(\sigma) \rangle \\ &= \langle \{\sigma = \lceil 10 \rceil\}, \mathbf{deref\ \sigma} \rangle \\ &= \langle \{\sigma = \lceil 10 \rceil\}, \lceil 10 \rceil \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Handling State

After changing the language, we have to go back and fix the proofs (in principle).

Outline

- **Programming with Functions**
- **Defining a Language**
- ➔ ● **Defining Type Rules**
- **Type Soundness**

Type Rules

$[5]: \text{int}$

$[6] - [1]: \text{int}$

$(\lambda x. x)([8]): \text{int}$

$(\lambda x. x) - [10]: \text{no type}$

$\text{if } 0 [0] \text{ then } [1] \text{ else } (\lambda x. x): \text{no type}$

Type Rules

- arithmetic expressions produce integers

$$\llbracket n \rrbracket : \text{int}$$
$$\frac{\mathbf{M}_1 : \text{int} \quad \mathbf{M}_2 : \text{int}}{\mathbf{M}_1 - \mathbf{M}_2 : \text{int}}$$

$$\frac{\llbracket 5 \rrbracket : \text{int} \quad \frac{\llbracket 3 \rrbracket : \text{int} \quad \llbracket 1 \rrbracket : \text{int}}{\llbracket 3 \rrbracket - \llbracket 1 \rrbracket : \text{int}}}{\llbracket 5 \rrbracket - (\llbracket 3 \rrbracket - \llbracket 1 \rrbracket) : \text{int}}$$

Type Rules

- `if0`: assume both branches have the same type

$$\frac{M : \text{int} \quad M_1 : T \quad M_2 : T}{\text{if0 } M \text{ then } M_1 \text{ else } M_2 : T}$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} [0] : \text{int} \\ \frac{[2] : \text{int} \quad [3] : \text{int}}{[2] + [3] : \text{int}} \end{array} \quad [1] : \text{int}}{\text{if0 } [0] \text{ then } ([2] + [3]) \text{ else } [1] : \text{int}}$$

Type Rules

- What about variables?

x
shouldn't have a type

$\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{x}$
x needs a type, used towards the expression type

- Accumulate variable context in an environment, Γ

$\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{T}$ if $\Gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{T}$

$\{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{int}\} \vdash \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{int}$

Type Rules

- Fix up old rules

$$\Gamma \vdash [n] : \text{int}$$
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M_1 : \text{int} \quad \Gamma \vdash M_2 : \text{int}}{\Gamma \vdash M_1 - M_2 : \text{int}}$$
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \text{int} \quad \Gamma \vdash M_1 : T \quad \Gamma \vdash M_2 : T}{\Gamma \vdash \text{if0 } M \text{ then } M_1 \text{ else } M_2 : T}$$

$$\frac{\{x=\text{int}\} \vdash [9] : \text{int} \quad \{x=\text{int}\} \vdash x : \text{int}}{\{x=\text{int}\} \vdash [9] - x : \text{int}}$$

Type Rules

- Function type: $\mathbf{T}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_2$

$$\frac{\Gamma\{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{T}'\} \vdash \mathbf{M} : \mathbf{T}}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{M}) : \mathbf{T}' \rightarrow \mathbf{T}}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{M}_1 : \mathbf{T}' \rightarrow \mathbf{T} \quad \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{M}_2 : \mathbf{T}'}{\Gamma \vdash (\mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{M}_2) : \mathbf{T}}$$

$$\frac{\frac{\{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{int}\} \vdash \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{int}}{\{\}\vdash (\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{int} \rightarrow \mathbf{int}} \quad [5] : \mathbf{int}}{\{\}\vdash (\lambda \mathbf{x} . \mathbf{x})([5]) : \mathbf{int}}$$

Type Rules

- One more function example (abbreviate `int` with `i`)

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\{f=i \rightarrow i\} \vdash f : i \rightarrow i}{\{f=i \rightarrow i\} \vdash 5 : i}}{\{f=i \rightarrow i\} \vdash f[5] : i}}{\{\} \vdash (\lambda f . f[5]) : (i \rightarrow i) \rightarrow i} \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\{y=i\} \vdash y : i}{\{y=i\} \vdash [1] : i}}{\{y=i\} \vdash y - [1] : i}}{\{\} \vdash (\lambda y . y - [1]) : i \rightarrow i}}{\{\} \vdash (\lambda f . f[5])(\lambda y . y - [1]) : i}$$

Type Rules

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : T}{\Gamma \vdash \text{newref } M : \text{ref } T}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \text{ref } T}{\Gamma \vdash \text{deref } M : T}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M_1 : \text{ref } T \quad \Gamma \vdash M_2 : T}{\Gamma \vdash \text{setref } M_1 = M_2 : \text{ref } T}$$

$$\{\} \vdash [5] : \text{int}$$

$$\{\} \vdash \text{newref } [5] : \text{ref int}$$

$$\{\} \vdash [7] : \text{int}$$

$$\{\} \vdash \text{setref } (\text{newref } [5]) = [7] : \text{ref int}$$

$$\{\} \vdash \text{deref } (\text{setref } (\text{newref } [5]) = [7]) : \text{int}$$

Outline

- **Programming with Functions**
- **Defining a Language**
- **Defining Type Rules**
- ➔ ● **Type Soundness**

Soundness

Theorem: If $\{\} \vdash \mathbf{M} : \mathbf{T}$ then either

- There exists \mathbf{S}' and \mathbf{V} such that $\langle \{\}, \mathbf{M} \rangle \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{S}', \mathbf{V} \rangle$
- For all \mathbf{S}' and \mathbf{M}' , if $\langle \{\}, \mathbf{M} \rangle \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{S}', \mathbf{M}' \rangle$ then there exists \mathbf{S}'' and \mathbf{M}'' such that $\langle \mathbf{S}', \mathbf{M}' \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{S}'', \mathbf{M}'' \rangle$

In other words, an evaluation never gets stuck.

The proof relies on two lemmas: a **preservation lemma** and a **progress lemma**.

Soundness: Preservation

Lemma (Preservation): If

- $\langle \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{M} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{S}', \mathbf{M}' \rangle$ and
- $\|\mathbf{S}\| \vdash \mathbf{M} : \mathbf{T}$,

then

- $\|\mathbf{S}'\| \vdash \mathbf{M}' : \mathbf{T}$

where $\|\mathbf{S}\|(\sigma) = \mathbf{T}$ if $\mathbf{S}(\sigma) = \mathbf{V}$ and $\{\} \vdash \mathbf{V} : \mathbf{T}$.

Proof: By induction on \mathbf{M} .

Soundness: Progress

Lemma (Progress): If

- **M** is not a **V** and
- and $\|\mathbf{S}\| \vdash \mathbf{M} : \mathbf{T}$,

then

- there exist **M'** and **S'** such that $\langle \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{M} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{S}', \mathbf{M}' \rangle$.

Proof: By induction on **M**.

Soundness Proof Sketch

Lemma: If $\|\mathbf{S}\| \vdash \mathbf{M} : \mathbf{T}$ then either

- There exists \mathbf{S}' and \mathbf{V} such that $\langle \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{M} \rangle \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{S}', \mathbf{V} \rangle$
- For all \mathbf{S}' and \mathbf{M}' , if $\langle \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{M} \rangle \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{S}', \mathbf{M}' \rangle$ then there exists \mathbf{S}'' and \mathbf{M}'' such that $\langle \mathbf{S}', \mathbf{M}' \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{S}'', \mathbf{M}'' \rangle$

Proof sketch:

- The Progress Lemma says that we can take a step if we're not yet to a value.
- The Preservation Lemma says that the step preserves the type, so we'll be able to take another step.

Conclusion

- Programming languages are formally defined using algebra
- A language definition comprises
 - a grammar
 - a set of reduction rules
 - an optional set of typing rules
- Soundness ensures that the type rules and reduction rules are consistent