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Semantics — What is it?

How to describe a programming language? Need to give:

- the syntax of programs; and
- their semantics (the meaning of programs, or how they behave).

Styles of description:

- the language is defined by whatever some particular compiler does
- natural language ‘definitions’
- mathematically

Mathematical descriptions of syntax use formal grammars (eg BNF) — precise, concise, clear. In this course we’ll see how to work with mathematical definitions of semantics/behaviour.
What do we use semantics for?

1. to understand a particular language — what you can depend on as a programmer; what you must provide as a compiler writer

2. as a tool for language design:
   (a) for expressing design choices, understanding language features and how they interact.
   (b) for proving properties of a language, eg type safety, decidability of type inference.

3. as a foundation for proving properties of particular programs
Warmup

In C, if initially $x$ has value 3, what’s the value of the following?

$$x++ + x++ + x++ + x++$$
delegate int IntThunk();

class M {
    public static void Main() {
        IntThunk[] funcs = new IntThunk[11];
        for (int i = 0; i <= 10; i++)
        {
            funcs[i] = delegate() { return i; };
        }
        foreach (IntThunk f in funcs)
        {
            System.Console.WriteLine(f());
        }
    }
}
Output:

1 1
1 1
1 1
1 1
1 1
1 1
1 1
1 1
1 1
1 1
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1 1
```javascript
function bar(x) {
  return function() {
    var x = 5;
    return x;
  };
}

var f = bar(200);

f()
```
function bar(x) {
  return function() {
    var x = x;
    return x;
  };
}

var f = bar(200);

f()
Styles of Semantic Definitions

- Operational semantics
- Denotational semantics
- Axiomatic, or Logical, semantics
‘Toy’ languages

Real programming languages are large, with many features and, often, with redundant constructs – things that can be expressed in the rest of the language.

When trying to understand some particular combination of features it’s usual to define a small ‘toy’ language with just what you’re interested in, then scale up later. Even small languages can involve delicate design choices.
What’s this course?

Core

• operational semantics and typing for a tiny language

• technical tools (abstract syntax, inductive definitions, proof)

• design for functions, data and references

More advanced topics

• Subtyping and Objects

• Semantic Equivalence

• Concurrency
(assignment and while) L1\(^1,2,3,4\)
(functions and recursive definitions) L2\(^5,6\)
(products, sums, records, references) L3\(^8\)

Subtyping and Objects\(^9\)
Semantic Equivalence\(^10\)

Operational semantics
Type systems
Implementations
Language design choices
Inductive definitions
Inductive proof – structural; rule
Abstract syntax up to alpha
Concurrency\(^12\)
Admin

- Please let me know of typos, and if it is too fast/too slow/too interesting/too dull (please complete the on-line feedback at the end)
- Not all previous Tripos questions are relevant (see the notes)
- Exercises in the notes.
- Implementations on web.
- Books (Hennessy, Pierce, Winskel)
L1
L1 – Example

L1 is an imperative language with store locations (holding integers), conditionals, and **while** loops. For example, consider the program

\[
l_2 := 0;
\]

**while** \(l_1 \geq 1\) **do** ( \(l_2 := !l_2 + !l_1;\) \(l_1 := !l_1 + -1\) )

in the initial store \(\{l_1 \mapsto 3, l_2 \mapsto 0\}\).
L1 – Syntax

Booleans \( b \in \mathbb{B} = \{ \text{true}, \text{false} \} \)

Integers \( n \in \mathbb{Z} = \{ ..., -1, 0, 1, ... \} \)

Locations \( \ell \in \mathbb{L} = \{ l, l_0, l_1, l_2, ... \} \)

Operations \( op ::= + | \geq \)

Expressions

\[
\begin{align*}
e & ::= n \mid b \mid e_1 \ op \ e_2 \mid \text{if } e_1 \ \text{then } e_2 \ \text{else } e_3 \mid \\
\ell & ::= e \mid !\ell \\
\text{skip} & \mid e_1 ; e_2 \\
\text{while } e_1 & \ \text{do } e_2
\end{align*}
\]

Write \( L_1 \) for the set of all expressions.
Transition systems

A transition system consists of

- a set \( \text{Config} \), and

- a binary relation \( \rightarrow \subseteq \text{Config} \times \text{Config} \).

The elements of \( \text{Config} \) are often called configurations or states. The relation \( \rightarrow \) is called the transition or reduction relation. We write \( \rightarrow \) infix, so \( c \rightarrow c' \) should be read as ‘state \( c \) can make a transition to state \( c' \)’. 
Say stores $s$ are finite partial functions from $\mathbb{L}$ to $\mathbb{Z}$. For example:

$$\{l_1 \mapsto 7, \ l_3 \mapsto 23\}$$

Take configurations to be pairs $\langle e, s \rangle$ of an expression $e$ and a store $s$, so our transition relation will have the form

$$\langle e, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$$
Transitions are single computation steps. For example we will have:

\[
\langle l := 2 + !l, \{l \mapsto 3\} \rangle \\
\vdash \langle l := 2 + 3, \{l \mapsto 3\} \rangle \\
\vdash \langle l := 5, \{l \mapsto 3\} \rangle \\
\vdash \langle \text{skip}, \{l \mapsto 5\} \rangle
\]

want to keep on until we get to a value \(v\), an expression in

\[
V = B \cup Z \cup \{\text{skip}\}.
\]

Say \(\langle e, s \rangle\) is stuck if \(e\) is not a value and \(\langle e, s \rangle \not\vdash\). For example \(2 + \text{true}\) will be stuck.
L1 Semantics (2 of 4) – Rules (basic operations)

\[(\text{op } +) \quad \langle n_1 + n_2, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle n, s \rangle \quad \text{if } n = n_1 + n_2\]

\[(\text{op } \geq) \quad \langle n_1 \geq n_2, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle b, s \rangle \quad \text{if } b = (n_1 \geq n_2)\]

\[(\text{op1}) \quad \langle e_1, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e'_1, s' \rangle \]

\[\langle e_1 \ op \ e_2, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e'_1 \ op \ e_2, s' \rangle\]

\[(\text{op2}) \quad \langle e_2, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e'_2, s' \rangle \]

\[\langle v \ op \ e_2, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle v \ op \ e'_2, s' \rangle\]
Example

If we want to find the possible sequences of transitions of \( \langle (2 + 3) + (6 + 7), \emptyset \rangle \) ... look for derivations of transitions.

(you might think the answer *should be* 18 – but we want to know what *this definition* says happens)

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{op1}) & \quad (\text{op +}) \quad \langle 2 + 3, \emptyset \rangle \rightarrow \langle 5, \emptyset \rangle \\
& \quad \langle (2 + 3) + (6 + 7), \emptyset \rangle \rightarrow \langle 5 + (6 + 7), \emptyset \rangle \\
(\text{op2}) & \quad (\text{op +}) \quad \langle 6 + 7, \emptyset \rangle \rightarrow \langle 13, \emptyset \rangle \\
& \quad \langle 5 + (6 + 7), \emptyset \rangle \rightarrow \langle 5 + 13, \emptyset \rangle \\
& \quad (\text{op +}) \quad \langle 5 + 13, \emptyset \rangle \rightarrow \langle 18, \emptyset \rangle
\end{align*}
\]
L1 Semantics (3 of 4) – store and sequencing

(deref) \[ \langle !\ell, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle n, s \rangle \quad \text{if } \ell \in \text{dom}(s) \text{ and } s(\ell) = n \]

(assign1) \[ \langle \ell := n, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{skip}, s + \{\ell \mapsto n\} \rangle \quad \text{if } \ell \in \text{dom}(s) \]

(assign2) \[ \frac{\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle}{\langle \ell := e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \ell := e', s' \rangle} \]

(seq1) \[ \langle \text{skip}; e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s \rangle \]

(seq2) \[ \frac{\langle e_1, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_1, s' \rangle}{\langle e_1; e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_1; e_2, s' \rangle} \]
Example

\[
\langle l := 3; !l, \{l \mapsto 0\} \rangle \quad \longrightarrow \quad \langle \text{skip}; !l, \{l \mapsto 3\} \rangle \\
\quad \longrightarrow \quad \langle !l, \{l \mapsto 3\} \rangle \\
\quad \longrightarrow \quad \langle 3, \{l \mapsto 3\} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle l := 3; l :=!l, \{l \mapsto 0\} \rangle \quad \longrightarrow \quad ?
\]

\[
\langle 15+!l, \emptyset \rangle \quad \longrightarrow \quad ?
\]
L1 Semantics (4 of 4) – The rest (conditionals and while)

(if1) \[
\langle \text{if true then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s \rangle
\]

(if2) \[
\langle \text{if false then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_3, s \rangle
\]

(if3) \[
\begin{align*}
\langle e_1, s \rangle & \rightarrow \langle e'_1, s' \rangle \\
\langle \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3, s \rangle & \rightarrow \langle \text{if } e'_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3, s' \rangle
\end{align*}
\]

(while) \[
\langle \text{while } e_1 \text{ do } e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } (e_2; \text{while } e_1 \text{ do } e_2) \text{ else } \text{skip}, s \rangle
\]
Example

If

\[ e = (l_2 := 0; \textbf{while} \ !l_1 \geq 1 \ \textbf{do} \ (l_2 :=!l_2 +!l_1; l_1 :=!l_1 + -1)) \]

\[ s = \{l_1 \mapsto 3, l_2 \mapsto 0\} \]

then

\[ \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow^* ? \]
L1: Collected Definition

Syntax

Booleans \( b \in B = \{ \text{true, false} \} \)
Integers \( n \in \mathbb{Z} = \{ \ldots, -1, 0, 1, \ldots \} \)
Locations \( \ell \in L = \{ l, l_0, l_1, l_2, \ldots \} \)
Operations \( op ::= + | \geq \)

Expressions

\[
e ::= n \mid b \mid e_1 \ op \ e_2 \mid \text{if} \ e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3 \mid \\
\ell ::= e \mid !\ell \mid \\
\text{skip} \mid e_1 ; e_2 \\
\text{while } e_1 \text{ do } e_2
\]

Operational Semantics

Note that for each construct there are some computation rules, doing ‘real work’, and some context (or congruence) rules, allowing subcomputations and specifying their order.

Stores \( s \) are finite partial functions from \( L \) to \( \mathbb{Z} \). Values \( v \) are expressions from the grammar \( v ::= b \mid n \mid \text{skip} \).

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{deref}) & \quad \langle !\ell, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle n, s \rangle \quad \text{if } \ell \in \text{dom}(s) \text{ and } s(\ell) = n \\
(\text{assign1}) & \quad \langle \ell := n, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{skip}, s + \{ \ell \mapsto n \} \rangle \quad \text{if } \ell \in \text{dom}(s) \\
(\text{assign2}) & \quad \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \quad \langle \ell := e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \ell := e', s' \rangle \\
(\text{seq1}) & \quad \langle \text{skip}; e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s \rangle \\
(\text{seq2}) & \quad \langle e_1; e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1', e_2', s' \rangle \\
(\text{if1}) & \quad \langle \text{if true then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s \rangle \\
(\text{if2}) & \quad \langle \text{if false then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_3, s \rangle \\
(\text{if3}) & \quad \langle \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{if } e_1' \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3, s' \rangle \\
(\text{while}) & \quad \langle \text{while } e_1 \text{ do } e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } (e_2; \text{while } e_1 \text{ do } e_2) \text{ else skip}, s \rangle
\end{align*}
\]
Determinacy

Theorem 1 (L1 Determinacy) If $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1, s_1 \rangle$ and $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle$ then $\langle e_1, s_1 \rangle = \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle$.

Proof – see later
L1 implementation

Many possible implementation strategies, including:

1. animate the rules — use unification to try to match rule conclusion left-hand-sides against a configuration; use backtracking search to find all possible transitions. Hand-coded, or in Prolog/LambdaProlog/Twelf.

2. write an interpreter working directly over the syntax of configurations. Coming up, in ML and Java.

3. compile to a stack-based virtual machine, and an interpreter for that. See Compiler Construction.

4. compile to assembly language, dealing with register allocation etc. etc. See Compiler Construction/Optimizing Compilers.
L1 implementation

Will implement an interpreter for L1, following the definition. Use mosml (Moscow ML) as the implementation language, as datatypes and pattern matching are good for this kind of thing.

First, must pick representations for locations, stores, and expressions:

```
type loc = string

type store = (loc * int) list
```
datatype oper = Plus | GTEQ

datatype expr =
    Integer of int
| Boolean of bool
| Op of expr * oper * expr
| If of expr * expr * expr
| Assign of loc * expr
| Deref of loc
| Skip
| Seq of expr * expr
| While of expr * expr
Store operations

Define auxiliary operations

\[
\text{lookup} : \text{store} \times \text{loc} \rightarrow \text{int option}
\]

\[
\text{update} : \text{store} \times (\text{loc} \times \text{int}) \rightarrow \text{store option}
\]

which both return \text{NONE} if given a location that is not in the domain of the store. Recall that a value of type \text{T option} is either \text{NONE} or \text{SOME v} for a value \text{v} of \text{T}.
The single-step function

Now define the single-step function

\[
\text{reduce} : \text{expr*store} \rightarrow \text{(expr*store) option}
\]

which takes a configuration \((e, s)\) and returns either

\text{NONE}, if \(\langle e, s \rangle \not\rightarrow \),

\text{or SOME (e', s')}, if it has a transition \(\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle\).

Note that if the semantics didn’t define a deterministic transition system we’d have to be more elaborate.
fun reduce (Integer n, s) = NONE
  | reduce (Boolean b, s) = NONE
  | reduce (Op (e1, opr, e2), s) =
    (case (e1, opr, e2) of
      (Integer n1, Plus, Integer n2) => SOME (Integer (n1+n2), s)
    | (Integer n1, GTEQ, Integer n2) => SOME (Boolean (n1 >= n2), s)
    | (e1, opr, e2) => ...
    ...
if (is_value e1) then
  case reduce (e2, s) of
    SOME (e2', s') =>
      SOME (Op(e1, opr, e2'), s')
    | NONE => NONE
  else
    case reduce (e1, s) of
      SOME (e1', s') =>
        SOME (Op(e1', opr, e2), s')
      | NONE => NONE
  end
reduce (Assign (l,e),s) =

  (case e of
      Integer n =>
        (case update (s,(l,n)) of
            SOME s' => SOME(Skip, s')
            | NONE => NONE)
    | _ =>
      (case reduce (e,s) of
            SOME (e',s') =>
              SOME(Assign (l,e'), s')
            | NONE => NONE))

(assign1), (assign2)
The many-step evaluation function

Now define the many-step evaluation function

evaluate: expr*store -> (expr*store) option

which takes a configuration \((e, s)\) and returns the \((e', s')\) such that
\[
\langle e, s \rangle \xrightarrow{*} \langle e', s' \rangle \not\xrightarrow{\text{false}},
\]
if there is such, or does not return.

fun evaluate \((e, s)\) =

  case reduce \((e, s)\) of
    NONE => (e, s)
  | SOME \((e', s')\) => evaluate \((e', s')\)
Demo
The Java Implementation

Quite different code structure:

- the ML groups together all the parts of each algorithm, into the `reduce`, `infertype`, and `prettyprint` functions;
- the Java groups together everything to do with each clause of the abstract syntax, in the `IfThenElse`, `Assign`, etc. classes.
Language design 1. Order of evaluation

For \((e_1 \ op \ e_2)\), the rules above say \(e_1\) should be fully reduced, to a value, before we start reducing \(e_2\). For example:

\[
\langle (l := 1; 0) + (l := 2; 0), \{ l \mapsto 0 \} \rangle \rightarrow^5 \langle 0, \{ l \mapsto 2 \} \rangle
\]

For right-to-left evaluation, replace \((op1)\) and \((op2)\) by

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(op1b)} & \quad \langle e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_2, s' \rangle \\
& \quad \langle e_1 \ op \ e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1 \ op \ e'_2, s' \rangle \\
\text{(op2b)} & \quad \langle e_1, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_1, s' \rangle \\
& \quad \langle e_1 \ op \ v, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_1 \ op \ v, s' \rangle
\end{align*}
\]

In this language (call it \(L1b\))

\[
\langle (l := 1; 0) + (l := 2; 0), \{ l \mapsto 0 \} \rangle \rightarrow^5 \langle 0, \{ l \mapsto 1 \} \rangle
\]
Language design 2. Assignment results

Recall

(assign1) \( \langle \ell := n, s \rangle \xrightarrow{} \langle \text{skip}, s + \{\ell \mapsto n\} \rangle \) if \( \ell \in \text{dom}(s) \)

(seq1) \( \langle \text{skip}; e_2, s \rangle \xrightarrow{} \langle e_2, s \rangle \)

So

\[
\langle l := 1; l := 2, \{l \mapsto 0\} \rangle \xrightarrow{} \langle \text{skip}; l := 2, \{l \mapsto 1\} \rangle \xrightarrow{*} \langle \text{skip}, \{l \mapsto 2\} \rangle
\]

We’ve chosen \( \ell := n \) to result in skip, and \( e_1; e_2 \) to only progress if \( e_1 = \text{skip} \), not for any value. Instead could have this:

(assign1’) \( \langle \ell := n, s \rangle \xrightarrow{} \langle n, s + (\ell \mapsto n) \rangle \) if \( \ell \in \text{dom}(s) \)

(seq1’) \( \langle v; e_2, s \rangle \xrightarrow{} \langle e_2, s \rangle \)
Language design 3. Store initialization

Recall that

\[(\text{deref}) \quad \langle !\ell, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle n, s \rangle \quad \text{if } \ell \in \text{dom}(s) \text{ and } s(\ell) = n\]

\[(\text{assign1}) \quad \langle \ell := n, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{skip}, s + \{\ell \mapsto n\} \rangle \quad \text{if } \ell \in \text{dom}(s)\]

both require \( \ell \in \text{dom}(s) \), otherwise the expressions are stuck.

Instead, could

1. implicitly initialize all locations to 0, or

2. allow assignment to an \( \ell \not\in \text{dom}(s) \) to initialize that \( \ell \).
Language design 4. Storable values

Recall stores $s$ are finite partial functions from $\mathbb{L}$ to $\mathbb{Z}$, with rules:

- **(deref)** $\langle \! \ell, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle n, s \rangle$ if $\ell \in \text{dom}(s)$ and $s(\ell) = n$

- **(assign1)** $\langle \ell := n, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{skip}, s + \{ \ell \mapsto n \} \rangle$ if $\ell \in \text{dom}(s)$

- **(assign2)**

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle}{\langle \ell := e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \ell := e', s' \rangle}
\end{align*}
$$

Can store only integers. $\langle l := \text{true}, s \rangle$ is stuck.

Why not allow storage of any value? of locations? of programs?

Also, store is global. We will consider programs that can create new locations later.
Language design 5. Operators and basic values

Booleans are really not integers (unlike in C)

The L1 impl and semantics aren’t quite in step.

Exercise: fix the implementation to match the semantics.

Exercise: fix the semantics to match the implementation.
Expressiveness

Is L1 expressive enough to write interesting programs?

- yes: it’s Turing-powerful (try coding an arbitrary register machine in L1).
- no: there’s no support for gadgets like functions, objects, lists, trees, modules,.....

Is L1 too expressive? (ie, can we write too many programs in it)

- yes: we’d like to forbid programs like $3 + \text{false}$ as early as possible, rather than let the program get stuck or give a runtime error. We’ll do so with a type system.
L1 Typing
Type systems

used for

• describing when programs make sense
• preventing certain kinds of errors
• structuring programs
• guiding language design

Ideally, well-typed programs don’t get stuck.
Run-time errors

**Trapped** errors. Cause execution to halt immediately. (E.g. jumping to an illegal address, raising a top-level exception, etc.) Innocuous?

**Untrapped** errors. May go unnoticed for a while and later cause arbitrary behaviour. (E.g. accessing data past the end of an array, security loopholes in Java abstract machines, etc.) Insidious!

Given a precise definition of what constitutes an untrapped run-time error, then a language is **safe** if all its syntactically legal programs cannot cause such errors.

Usually, safety is desirable. Moreover, we’d like as few trapped errors as possible.
Formal type systems

We will define a ternary relation $\Gamma \vdash e : T$, read as ‘expression $e$ has type $T$, under assumptions $\Gamma$ on the types of locations that may occur in $e$’. For example (according to the definition coming up):

\[
\begin{align*}
\{\} & \vdash \text{if true then } 2 \text{ else } 3 + 4 : \text{int} \\
{\mathit{l_1}} : \text{intref} & \vdash \text{if } \!\mathit{l_1} \geq 3 \text{ then } \!\mathit{l_1} \text{ else } 3 : \text{int} \\
\{\} & \not\vdash 3 + \text{false} : T \text{ for any } T \\
\{\} & \not\vdash \text{if true then } 3 \text{ else false} : \text{int}
\end{align*}
\]
Types for L1

Types of expressions:

\[ T ::= \text{int} \mid \text{bool} \mid \text{unit} \]

Types of locations:

\[ T_{\text{loc}} ::= \text{intref} \]

Write \( T \) and \( T_{\text{loc}} \) for the sets of all terms of these grammars.

Let \( \Gamma \) range over \( \text{TypeEnv} \), the finite partial functions from locations \( \mathbb{L} \) to \( T_{\text{loc}} \). Notation: write a \( \Gamma \) as \( l_1:\text{intref}, \ldots, l_k:\text{intref} \) instead of \( \{ l_1 \mapsto \text{intref}, \ldots, l_k \mapsto \text{intref} \} \).
Defining the type judgement \[ \Gamma \vdash e : T \] (1 of 3)

(int) \[ \Gamma \vdash n : \text{int} \quad \text{for} \quad n \in \mathbb{Z} \]

(bool) \[ \Gamma \vdash b : \text{bool} \quad \text{for} \quad b \in \{ \text{true, false} \} \]

(op +) \[ \begin{align*}
\Gamma & \vdash e_1 : \text{int} \\
\Gamma & \vdash e_2 : \text{int} \\
\Gamma & \vdash e_1 + e_2 : \text{int}
\end{align*} \quad \begin{align*}
\Gamma & \vdash e_1 : \text{int} \\
\Gamma & \vdash e_2 : \text{int} \\
\Gamma & \vdash e_1 \geq e_2 : \text{bool}
\end{align*} \]

(if) \[ \begin{align*}
\Gamma & \vdash e_1 : \text{bool} \\
\Gamma & \vdash e_2 : T \\
\Gamma & \vdash e_3 : T \\
\Gamma & \vdash \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3 : T
\end{align*} \]
Example

To show $\{\} \vdash \text{if false then } 2 \text{ else } 3 + 4 : \text{int}$ we can give a type derivation like this:

\[
\begin{align*}
\{\} & \vdash \text{false} : \text{bool} \\
\{\} & \vdash 2 : \text{int} \\
\{\} & \vdash \text{if false then } 2 \text{ else } 3 + 4 : \text{int}
\end{align*}
\]

where $\nabla$ is
Example

To show \{\} \vdash \textbf{if} \ false \ \textbf{then} \ 2 \ \textbf{else} \ 3 + 4 : \textbf{int} we can give a type derivation like this:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(bool)} \\
\{\} \vdash \textbf{false} : \textbf{bool} \\
\text{(if)} \\
\{\} \vdash \textbf{if} \ false \ \textbf{then} \ 2 \ \textbf{else} \ 3 + 4 : \textbf{int} \\
\end{array}
\]

where \(\triangledown\) is

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(int)} \\
\{\} \vdash 3 : \textbf{int} \\
\text{(op +)} \\
\{\} \vdash 3 + 4 : \textbf{int} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(int)} \\
\{\} \vdash 4 : \textbf{int} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\{\} \vdash 3 + 4 : \textbf{int} \\
\end{array}
\]
Defining the type judgement \( \Gamma \vdash e : T \) (2 of 3)

(assign)

\[
\frac{\Gamma(\ell) = \text{intref} \quad \Gamma \vdash e : \text{int}}{\Gamma \vdash \ell := e : \text{unit}}
\]

(deref)

\[
\frac{\Gamma(\ell) = \text{intref}}{\Gamma \vdash !\ell : \text{int}}
\]
Defining the type judgement $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ (3 of 3)

(skip) $\Gamma \vdash \text{skip} : \text{unit}$

(seq) $\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \text{unit} \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 ; e_2 : T}$

(while) $\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \text{bool} \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \text{unit}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{while } e_1 \text{ do } e_2 : \text{unit}}$
Properties

Theorem 2 (Progress)  If $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ and $\text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s)$ then either $e$ is a value or there exist $e'$, $s'$ such that $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$.

Theorem 3 (Type Preservation)  If $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ and $\text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s)$ and $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$ then $\Gamma \vdash e' : T$ and $\text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s')$.

From these two we have that well-typed programs don’t get stuck:

Theorem 4 (Safety)  If $\Gamma \vdash e : T$, $\text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s)$, and $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle e', s' \rangle$ then either $e'$ is a value or there exist $e''$, $s''$ such that $\langle e', s' \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'', s'' \rangle$. 
Type checking, typeability, and type inference

**Type checking problem** for a type system: given \( \Gamma, e, T \), is \( \Gamma \vdash e : T \) derivable?

**Type inference problem**: given \( \Gamma \) and \( e \), find \( T \) such that \( \Gamma \vdash e : T \) is derivable, or show there is none.

Second problem is usually harder than the first. Solving it usually results in a type inference algorithm: computing a type \( T \) for a phrase \( e \), given type environment \( \Gamma \) (or failing, if there is none).

For this type system, though, both are easy.
More Properties

Theorem 5 (Type inference) Given $\Gamma, e$, one can find $T$ such that $\Gamma \vdash e : T$, or show that there is none.

Theorem 6 (Decidability of type checking) Given $\Gamma, e, T$, one can decide $\Gamma \vdash e : T$.

Also:

Theorem 7 (Uniqueness of typing) If $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ and $\Gamma \vdash e : T'$ then $T = T'$. 
Type inference – Implementation

First must pick representations for types and for $\Gamma$'s:

```plaintext
datatype type_L1 =
    int |
    unit |
    bool

datatype type_loc =
    intref

type typeEnv = (loc*type_loc) list
```

Now define the type inference function
infertype : typeEnv -> expr -> type_Ll option
The Type Inference Algorithm
fun infertype gamma (Integer n) = SOME int
  | infertype gamma (Boolean b) = SOME bool
  | infertype gamma (Op (e1, opr, e2))
    = (case (infertype gamma e1, opr, infertype gamma e2) of
        (SOME int, Plus, SOME int) => SOME int
      | (SOME int, GTEQ, SOME int) => SOME bool
      | _ => NONE)
  | infertype gamma (If (e1, e2, e3))
    = (case (infertype gamma e1, infertype gamma e2, infertype gamma e3) of
        (SOME bool, SOME t2, SOME t3) =>
          if t2 = t3 then SOME t2 else NONE
      | _ => NONE)
  | infertype gamma (Deref l)
    = (case lookup (gamma, l) of
        SOME intref => SOME int
      | NONE => NONE)
  | infertype gamma (Assign (l, e))
    = (case (lookup (gamma, l), infertype gamma e) of
        (SOME intref, SOME int) => SOME unit
      | _ => NONE)
  | infertype gamma (Skip) = SOME unit
  | infertype gamma (Seq (e1, e2))
    = (case (infertype gamma e1, infertype gamma e2) of
        (SOME unit, SOME t2) => SOME t2
      | _ => NONE )
  | infertype gamma (While (e1, e2))
    = (case (infertype gamma e1, infertype gamma e2) of
        ...
The Type Inference Algorithm – **If**

\[
\text{infertype gamma (If (e1,e2,e3))} = \begin{cases} 
\text{case (infertype gamma e1, infertype gamma e2, infertype gamma e3) of} \\
(SOME bool, SOME t2, SOME t3) \Rightarrow \text{if t2=t3 then SOME t2 else NONE} \\
_ \Rightarrow \text{NONE}
\end{cases}
\]
\[\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \text{bool} \]
\[\Gamma \vdash e_2 : T \]
\[\Gamma \vdash e_3 : T \]

(if)

\[\Gamma \vdash \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3 : T \]
The Type Inference Algorithm – Deref

\[ \text{(deref)} \quad \frac{\Gamma(\ell) = \text{intref}}{\Gamma \vdash \ell : \text{int}} \]
Demo
Executing L1 in Moscow ML

L1 is essentially a fragment of Moscow ML – given a typable L1 expression $e$ and an initial store $s$, $e$ can be executed in Moscow ML by wrapping it

```ml
let val skip = ()
  and l1 = ref n1
  and l2 = ref n2
  ...
  and lk = ref nk
in
  e
end;
```

where $s$ is the store $\{l_1 \mapsto n_1, \ldots, l_k \mapsto n_k\}$ and all locations that occur in $e$ are contained in $\{l_1, \ldots, l_k\}$. 
Why Not Types?

- "I can't write the code I want in this type system."
  (the Pascal complaint) usually false for a modern typed language
- "It's too tiresome to get the types right throughout development."
  (the untyped-scripting-language complaint)
- "Type annotations are too verbose."
  type inference means you only have to write them where it’s useful
- "Type error messages are incomprehensible."
  hmm. Sadly, sometimes true.
- "I really can’t write the code I want."
Induction
We’ve stated several ‘theorems’, but how do we know they are true?

Intuition is often wrong – we need proof.

Use proof process also for strengthening our intuition about subtle language features, and for debugging definitions – it helps you examine all the various cases.

Most of our definitions are inductive. To prove things about them, we need the corresponding induction principles.
Three forms of induction

Prove facts about all natural numbers by *mathematical induction*.

Prove facts about all terms of a grammar (e.g. the L1 expressions) by *structural induction*.

Prove facts about all elements of a relation defined by rules (e.g. the L1 transition relation, or the L1 typing relation) by *rule induction*.

We shall see that all three boil down to induction over certain *trees*.
Principle of Mathematical Induction

For any property $\Phi(x)$ of natural numbers $x \in \mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$, to prove

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{N}. \Phi(x)$$

it’s enough to prove

$\Phi(0)$ and $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}. \Phi(x) \Rightarrow \Phi(x + 1)$.

i.e.

$$\left( \Phi(0) \land (\forall x \in \mathbb{N}. \Phi(x) \Rightarrow \Phi(x + 1)) \right) \Rightarrow \forall x \in \mathbb{N}. \Phi(x)$$
(Φ(0) ∧ (∀ x ∈ N. Φ(x) ⇒ Φ(x + 1))) ⇒ ∀ x ∈ N. Φ(x)

For example, to prove

**Theorem 8** \(1 + 2 + \ldots + x = 1/2 \times x \times (x + 1)\)

use mathematical induction for

\(Φ(x) = (1 + 2 + \ldots + x = 1/2 \times x \times (x + 1))\)

There’s a model proof in the notes, as an example of good style. Writing a clear proof structure like this becomes essential when things get more complex – you have to *use* the formalism to help you get things right. Emulate it!
Abstract Syntax and Structural Induction

How to prove facts about all expressions, e.g. Determinacy for L1?

**Theorem 1 (Determinacy)** If \( \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1, s_1 \rangle \) and \( \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle \) then \( \langle e_1, s_1 \rangle = \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle \).

First, don’t forget the elided universal quantifiers.

**Theorem 1 (Determinacy)** For all \( e, s, e_1, s_1, e_2, s_2 \), if \( \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1, s_1 \rangle \) and \( \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle \) then \( \langle e_1, s_1 \rangle = \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle \).
Abstract Syntax

Then, have to pay attention to what an expression is.

Recall we said:

\[
e ::= n | b | e \text{ op } e | \text{ if } e \text{ then } e \text{ else } e | \\
l ::= e | !l | \\
\text{skip} | e; e | \\
\text{while } e \text{ do } e
\]

defining a set of expressions.
Q: Is an expression, e.g. \( \text{if } !l \geq 0 \text{ then skip else (skip; } l := 0) \): 

1. a list of characters \(['i', 'f', '_', '!', 'l', ..]';

2. a list of tokens \([ \text{IF, DEREF, LOC "l", GTEQ, ..} ]\); or

3. an abstract syntax tree?

```
if_then_else_
    \[
    \geq
    \]
    \[
    !l \ 0
    \]
    \[
    \text{skip}
    \]
    \[
    ;
    \]
    \[
    \text{skip}
    \]
    \[
    l := \]
    \[
    0
    ```
A: an abstract syntax tree. Hence: \( 2 + 2 \neq 4 \)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
+ \\
\downarrow \\
2 \\
\downarrow \\
2 \\
\end{array}
\]

\( 1 + 2 + 3 \) – ambiguous

\( (1 + 2) + 3 \neq 1 + (2 + 3) \)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
+ \\
\downarrow \\
\begin{array}{c}
+ \\
\downarrow \\
1 \\
\downarrow \\
2 \\
\end{array} \\
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
+ \\
\downarrow \\
\begin{array}{c}
1 \\
\downarrow \\
2 \\
\downarrow \\
3 \\
\end{array} \\
\end{array}
\]

Parentheses are only used for disambiguation – they are not part of the grammar. \( 1 + 2 = (1 + 2) = (((1 + 2)) = ((((1)))) + ((2))) \)
Principle of Structural Induction (for abstract syntax)

For any property $\Phi(e)$ of expressions $e$, to prove

$$\forall e \in L_1. \Phi(e)$$

it’s enough to prove for each tree constructor $c$ (taking $k \geq 0$ arguments) that if $\Phi$ holds for the subtrees $e_1, \ldots, e_k$ then $\Phi$ holds for the tree $c(e_1, \ldots, e_k)$. i.e.

$$\left( \forall c. \forall e_1, \ldots, e_k. (\Phi(e_1) \land \ldots \land \Phi(e_k)) \Rightarrow \Phi(c(e_1, \ldots, e_k)) \right) \Rightarrow \forall e. \Phi(e)$$

where the tree constructors (or node labels) $c$ are $n, \text{true}, \text{false}, \text{!l}, \text{skip},\ l :=, \text{while}_d_0_, \text{if}_t_h_e_n_\_e_l_s_e_, \text{etc.}$
In particular, for $L_1$: to show $\forall e \in L_1. \Phi(e)$ it's enough to show:

**nullary:** $\Phi(\text{skip})$

$\forall b \in \{\text{true, false}\}. \Phi(b)$

$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}. \Phi(n)$

$\forall \ell \in L. \Phi(!\ell)$

**unary:** $\forall \ell \in L. \forall e. \Phi(e) \Rightarrow \Phi(\ell := e)$

**binary:** $\forall \text{op}. \forall e_1, e_2. (\Phi(e_1) \land \Phi(e_2)) \Rightarrow \Phi(e_1 \ \text{op} \ e_2)$

$\forall e_1, e_2. (\Phi(e_1) \land \Phi(e_2)) \Rightarrow \Phi(e_1; e_2)$

$\forall e_1, e_2. (\Phi(e_1) \land \Phi(e_2)) \Rightarrow \Phi(\text{while } e_1 \ \text{do} \ e_2)$

**ternary:** $\forall e_1, e_2, e_3. (\Phi(e_1) \land \Phi(e_2) \land \Phi(e_3)) \Rightarrow \Phi(\text{if } e_1 \ \text{then } e_2 \ \text{else})$

(See how this comes directly from the grammar)
Proving Determinacy (Outline)

Theorem 1 (Determinacy) If $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1, s_1 \rangle$ and $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle$ then $\langle e_1, s_1 \rangle = \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle$.

Take

$$\Phi(e) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \forall s, e', s', e'', s''. \left( \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \land \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'', s'' \rangle \right) \Rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle = \langle e'', s'' \rangle$$

and show $\forall e \in L_1. \Phi(e)$ by structural induction.
\[ \Phi(e) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \forall s, e', s', e'', s''. \]
\[ (\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \land \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'', s'' \rangle) \]
\[ \Rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle = \langle e'', s'' \rangle \]

nullary: \( \Phi(\text{skip}) \)

\[ \forall b \in \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}. \Phi(b) \]

\[ \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}. \Phi(n) \]

\[ \forall \ell \in \mathbb{L}. \Phi(!\ell) \]

unary: \( \forall \ell \in \mathbb{L}. \forall e. \Phi(e) \Rightarrow \Phi(\ell := e) \)

binary: \( \forall \text{op} . \forall e_1, e_2. (\Phi(e_1) \land \Phi(e_2)) \Rightarrow \Phi(e_1 \text{ op } e_2) \)

\[ \forall e_1, e_2. (\Phi(e_1) \land \Phi(e_2)) \Rightarrow \Phi(e_1; e_2) \]

\[ \forall e_1, e_2. (\Phi(e_1) \land \Phi(e_2)) \Rightarrow \Phi(\text{while } e_1 \text{ do } e_2) \]

ternary: \( \forall e_1, e_2, e_3. (\Phi(e_1) \land \Phi(e_2) \land \Phi(e_3)) \Rightarrow \Phi(\text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3) \)
Inductive Definitions and Rule Induction

How to prove facts about all elements of the L1 typing relation or the L1 reduction relation, e.g. Progress or Type Preservation?

**Theorem 2 (Progress)** If $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ and $\text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s)$ then either $e$ is a value or there exist $e', s'$ such that $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$.

**Theorem 3 (Type Preservation)** If $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ and $\text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s)$ and $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$ then $\Gamma \vdash e' : T$ and $\text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s')$.

What does $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$ really mean?
Inductive Definitions

We defined the transition relation \( \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \) and the typing relation \( \Gamma \vdash e : T \) by giving some rules, eg

\[
\text{(op +)} \quad \langle n_1 + n_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle n, s \rangle \quad \text{if} \quad n = n_1 + n_2
\]

\[
\text{(op1)} \quad \frac{\langle e_1, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_1, s' \rangle}{\langle e_1 \ op \ e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_1 \ op \ e_2, s' \rangle}
\]

\[
\text{(op +)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \text{int} \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \text{int}}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 + e_2 : \text{int}}
\]

What did we actually mean?
These relations are just normal set-theoretic relations, written in infix notation.

For the transition relation:

- Start with $A = L_1 \ast \text{store} \ast L_1 \ast \text{store}$.
- Write $\rightarrow \subseteq A$ infix, e.g. $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$ instead of $(e, s, e', s') \in \rightarrow$.

For the typing relation:

- Start with $A = \text{TypeEnv} \ast L_1 \ast \text{types}$.
- Write $\vdash \subseteq A$ mixfix, e.g. $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ instead of $(\Gamma, e, T) \in \vdash$. 
For each rule we can construct the set of all concrete rule instances, taking all values of the metavariables that satisfy the side condition. For example, for \((\text{op} + \)\) and (op1) we take all values of \(n_1, n_2, s, n\) (satisfying \(n = n_1 + n_2\)) and of \(e_1, e_2, s, e'_1, s'\).

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{op} + \) & \quad \frac{\langle 2 + 2, \{\} \rangle \rightarrow \langle 4, \{\} \rangle}{}, \quad (\text{op} + \) & \quad \frac{\langle 2 + 3, \{\} \rangle \rightarrow \langle 5, \{\} \rangle}{}, \quad \ldots \\
(\text{op}1) & \quad \frac{\langle 2 + 2, \{\} \rangle \rightarrow \langle 4, \{\} \rangle}{\langle (2 + 2) + 3, \{\} \rangle \rightarrow \langle 4 + 3, \{\} \rangle}, \quad (\text{op}1) & \quad \frac{\langle 2 + 2, \{\} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{false}, \{\} \rangle}{\langle (2 + 2) + 3, \{\} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{false} + 3, \{\} \rangle}
\end{align*}
\]
Now a *derivation* of a transition \( \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \) or typing judgment \( \Gamma \vdash e : T \) is a finite tree such that each step *is* a concrete rule instance.

\[
\frac{\langle 2 + 2, \{\} \rangle \rightarrow \langle 4, \{\} \rangle}{\langle (2 + 2) + 3, \{\} \rangle \rightarrow \langle 4 + 3, \{\} \rangle} \quad (\text{op+})
\]

\[
\frac{\langle (2 + 2) + 3 \geq 5, \{\} \rangle \rightarrow \langle 4 + 3 \geq 5, \{\} \rangle}{\langle (2 + 2) + 3 \geq 5, \{\} \rangle \rightarrow \langle 4 + 3 \geq 5, \{\} \rangle} \quad (\text{op1})
\]

\[
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \text{!}l : \text{int} \quad \Gamma \vdash 2 : \text{int} \quad \Gamma \vdash 3 : \text{int}}{\Gamma \vdash (\text{!}l + 2) : \text{int} \quad \Gamma \vdash (\text{!}l + 2) + 3 : \text{int}} \quad (\text{int})
\]

\[
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \text{!}l : \text{int} \quad \Gamma \vdash 2 : \text{int}}{\Gamma \vdash (\text{!}l + 2) : \text{int} \quad \Gamma \vdash (\text{!}l + 2) + 3 : \text{int}} \quad (\text{op+})
\]

\[
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \text{!}l : \text{int} \quad \Gamma \vdash 3 : \text{int}}{\Gamma \vdash (\text{!}l + 2) : \text{int} \quad \Gamma \vdash (\text{!}l + 2) + 3 : \text{int}} \quad (\text{op+})
\]

and \( \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \) is an element of the reduction relation (resp. \( \Gamma \vdash e : T \) is an element of the transition relation) iff there is a derivation with that as the root node.
Principle of Rule Induction

For any property $\Phi(a)$ of elements $a$ of $A$, and any set of rules which define a subset $S_R$ of $A$, to prove

$$\forall a \in S_R. \Phi(a)$$

it’s enough to prove that $\{ a \mid \Phi(a) \}$ is closed under the rules, ie for each concrete rule instance

$$\frac{h_1 \ldots h_k}{c}$$

if $\Phi(h_1) \land \ldots \land \Phi(h_k)$ then $\Phi(c)$. 
Principle of rule induction (a slight variant)

For any property $\Phi(a)$ of elements $a$ of $A$, and any set of rules which inductively define the set $S_R$, to prove

$$\forall a \in S_R. \Phi(a)$$

it's enough to prove that

for each concrete rule instance

$$\frac{h_1 \ldots h_k}{c}$$

if $\Phi(h_1) \land \ldots \land \Phi(h_k) \land h_1 \in S_R \land \ldots \land h_k \in S_R$ then $\Phi(c)$. 
Proving Progress (Outline)

Theorem 2 (Progress) If $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ and $\text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s)$ then either $e$ is a value or there exist $e'$, $s'$ such that $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$.

Proof Take

$$\Phi(\Gamma, e, T) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \forall s. \, \text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s) \Rightarrow \text{value}(e) \lor (\exists e', s'. \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle)$$

We show that for all $\Gamma, e, T$, if $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ then $\Phi(\Gamma, e, T)$, by rule induction on the definition of $\vdash$. 
Principle of Rule Induction (variant form): to prove \( \Phi(a) \) for all \( a \) in the set \( S_R \), it's enough to prove that for each concrete rule instance

\[
\frac{\ h_1 \ \ldots \ h_k \ }{ \ c \ }
\]

if \( \Phi(h_1) \land \ldots \land \Phi(h_k) \land h_1 \in S_R \land \ldots \land h_k \in S_R \) then \( \Phi(c) \).

Instantiating to the L1 typing rules, have to show:

\begin{align*}
\text{(int)} & \quad \forall \Gamma, n. \Phi(\Gamma, n, \text{int}) \\
\text{(deref)} & \quad \forall \Gamma, \ell. \Gamma(\ell) = \text{intref} \Rightarrow \Phi(\Gamma, !\ell, \text{int}) \\
\text{(op \textit{+})} & \quad \forall \Gamma, e_1, e_2. (\Phi(\Gamma, e_1, \text{int}) \land \Phi(\Gamma, e_2, \text{int}) \land \Gamma \vdash e_1:\text{int} \land \Gamma \vdash e_2:\text{int}) \\
& \quad \quad \Rightarrow \Phi(\Gamma, e_1 + e_2, \text{int}) \\
\text{(seq)} & \quad \forall \Gamma, e_1, e_2, T. (\Phi(\Gamma, e_1, \text{unit}) \land \Phi(\Gamma, e_2, T) \land \Gamma \vdash e_1:\text{unit} \land \Gamma \vdash e_2:T) \\
& \quad \quad \Rightarrow \Phi(\Gamma, e_1; e_2, T)
\end{align*}

etc.
Having proved those 10 things, consider an example

\[ \Gamma \vdash (!l + 2) + 3 : \text{int} \]. To see why \( \Phi(\Gamma, (!l + 2) + 3, \text{int}) \) holds:

\[
\frac{
\frac{
\frac{\Gamma \vdash !l : \text{int}}{\text{deref}}
\quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash 2 : \text{int}}{\text{int}}
}{\Gamma \vdash (!l + 2) : \text{int}}
\quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash 3 : \text{int}}{\text{int}}
}{\Gamma \vdash (!l + 2) + 3 : \text{int}}
\]
Which Induction Principle to Use?

Which of these induction principles to use is a matter of convenience – you want to use an induction principle that matches the definitions you’re working with.
Example Proofs

In the notes there are detailed example proofs for Determinacy (structural induction), Progress (rule induction on type derivations), and Type Preservation (rule induction on reduction derivations).

You should read them off-line, and do the exercises.
When is a proof a proof?

What’s a proof?

**Formal:** a derivation in formal logic (e.g. a big natural deduction proof tree). Often far too verbose to deal with by hand (but can *machine-check* such things).

**Informal but rigorous:** an argument to persuade the reader that, if pushed, you could write a fully formal proof (the usual mathematical notion, e.g. those we just did). Have to learn by practice to see when they are rigorous.

**Bogus:** neither of the above.
Rant

clear structure matters!
Sometimes it seems hard or pointless to prove things because they seem ‘too obvious’....

1. proof lets you see (and explain) why they are obvious

2. sometimes the obvious facts are false...

3. sometimes the obvious facts are not obvious at all

4. sometimes a proof contains or suggests an algorithm that you need – eg, proofs that type inference is decidable (for fancier type systems)
Lemma: Values don’t reduce

Lemma 9  For all \( e \in L_1 \), if \( e \) is a value then
\[
\forall s. \neg \exists e', s'. \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle.
\]

Proof  By defn \( e \) is a value if it is of one of the forms \( n, b, \text{skip} \). By
examination of the rules on slides ..., there is no rule with conclusion of
the form \( \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \) for \( e \) one of \( n, b, \text{skip} \). □
Inversion

In proofs involving multiple inductive definitions one often needs an inversion property, that, given a tuple in one inductively defined relation, gives you a case analysis of the possible “last rule” used.

**Lemma 10 (Inversion for \( \rightarrow \))** If \( \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \hat{e}, \hat{s} \rangle \) then either

1. \((\text{op } +)\) there exists \(n_1, n_2, \) and \(n\) such that \(e = n_1 + n_2, \hat{e} = n, \hat{s} = s, \) and \(n = n_1 + n_2\) (NB watch out for the two different \(+\)s), or

2. \((\text{op}1)\) there exists \(e_1, e_2, \) \(\text{op }\), and \(e'_1\) such that \(e = e_1 \text{ op } e_2, \hat{e} = e'_1 \text{ op } e_2, \) and \(\langle e_1, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_1, s' \rangle\), or

3. ...

**Lemma 11 (Inversion for \( \vdash \))** If \( \Gamma \vdash e : T \) then either

1. ...

Lemma: Values of integer type

Lemma 12 for all $\Gamma, e, T$, if $\Gamma \vdash e : T$, $e$ is a value and $T = \text{int}$ then for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $e = n$. 
Proving Progress

**Theorem 2 (Progress)** \(\text{If } \Gamma \vdash e : T \text{ and } \text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s) \text{ then either } e \text{ is a value or there exist } e', s' \text{ such that } \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle.\)**

**Proof** Take

\[
\Phi(\Gamma, e, T) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \forall s. \text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s) \Rightarrow \text{value}(e) \lor (\exists e', s'. \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle)
\]

We show that for all \(\Gamma, e, T\), if \(\Gamma \vdash e : T\) then \(\Phi(\Gamma, e, T)\), by rule induction on the definition of \(\vdash\).
Principle of Rule Induction (variant form): to prove $\Phi(a)$ for all $a$ in the set $S_R$ defined by the rules, it’s enough to prove that for each rule instance

$$\frac{h_1 \ldots h_k}{c}$$

if $\Phi(h_1) \land \ldots \land \Phi(h_k) \land h_1 \in S_R \land \ldots \land h_k \in S_R$ then $\Phi(c)$.

Instantiating to the L1 typing rules, have to show:

(int) $\forall \Gamma, n. \Phi(\Gamma, n, \text{int})$

(deref) $\forall \Gamma, \ell. \Gamma(\ell) = \text{intref} \Rightarrow \Phi(\Gamma, !\ell, \text{int})$

(op $+$) $\forall \Gamma, e_1, e_2. (\Phi(\Gamma, e_1, \text{int}) \land \Phi(\Gamma, e_2, \text{int}) \land \Gamma \vdash e_1: \text{int} \land \Gamma \vdash e_2: \text{int})$

$\Rightarrow \Phi(\Gamma, e_1 + e_2, \text{int})$

(seq) $\forall \Gamma, e_1, e_2, T. (\Phi(\Gamma, e_1, \text{unit}) \land \Phi(\Gamma, e_2, T) \land \Gamma \vdash e_1: \text{unit} \land \Gamma \vdash e_2: T)$

$\Rightarrow \Phi(\Gamma, e_1; e_2, T)$

etc.
\[ \Phi(\Gamma, e, T) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \forall s. \text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s) \implies \]
\[ \text{value}(e) \lor (\exists e', s'. \langle e, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle) \]

**Case** (op\( + \)). Recall the rule

\[
\begin{align*}
\Gamma &\vdash e_1: \text{int} \\
\Gamma &\vdash e_2: \text{int} \\
\text{(op} + \text{)} &
\begin{array}{c}
\Gamma \vdash e_1 + e_2: \text{int}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

Suppose \( \Phi(\Gamma, e_1, \text{int}), \Phi(\Gamma, e_2, \text{int}), \Gamma \vdash e_1: \text{int}, \) and \( \Gamma \vdash e_2: \text{int} \).

We have to show \( \Phi(\Gamma, e_1 + e_2, \text{int}) \).

Consider an arbitrary \( s \). Assume \( \text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s) \).

Now \( e_1 + e_2 \) is not a value, so we have to show
\( \exists (e', s'). \langle e_1 + e_2, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \).
Using $\Phi(\Gamma, e_1, \text{int})$ and $\Phi(\Gamma, e_2, \text{int})$ we have:

**case** $e_1$ reduces. Then $e_1 + e_2$ does, using (op1).

**case** $e_1$ is a value but $e_2$ reduces. Then $e_1 + e_2$ does, using (op2).

**case** Both $e_1$ and $e_2$ are values. Want to use:

\[
\text{(op +)} \quad \langle n_1 + n_2, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle n, s \rangle \quad \text{if} \quad n = n_1 + n_2
\]

**Lemma 13** for all $\Gamma, e, T$, if $\Gamma \vdash e : T$, $e$ is a value and $T = \text{int}$ then for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $e = n$.

We assumed (the variant rule induction principle) that $\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \text{int}$ and $\Gamma \vdash e_2 : \text{int}$, so using this Lemma have $e_1 = n_1$ and $e_2 = n_2$.

Then $e_1 + e_2$ reduces, using rule (op+).
All the other cases are in the notes.
Having proved those 10 things, consider an example

\[ \Gamma \vdash (l + 2) + 3 : \text{int} \]. To see why \( \Phi(\Gamma, (l + 2) + 3, \text{int}) \) holds:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\Gamma \vdash !l : \text{int} \\
\Gamma \vdash 2 : \text{int} \\
\Gamma \vdash (!l + 2) : \text{int} \\
\Gamma \vdash (l + 2) + 3 : \text{int}
\end{array}
\]

Theorem 1 (Determinacy) If $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1, s_1 \rangle$ and $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle$ then $\langle e_1, s_1 \rangle = \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle$.

Take

$$
\Phi(e) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \forall s, e', s', e'', s''.

(\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \land \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'', s'' \rangle)

\Rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle = \langle e'', s'' \rangle
$$

We show $\forall e \in L_1. \Phi(e)$ by structural induction.
Principle of Structural Induction: to prove $\Phi(e)$ for all expressions $e$ of L1, it’s enough to prove for each tree constructor $c$ that if $\Phi$ holds for the subtrees $e_1, \ldots, e_k$ then $\Phi$ holds for the tree $c(e_1, \ldots, e_k)$.

Instantiating to the L1 grammar, have to show:

nullary: $\Phi(\text{skip})$

$\forall b \in \{\text{true, false}\}. \Phi(b)$

$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}. \Phi(n)$

$\forall \ell \in \mathbb{L}. \Phi(!\ell)$

unary: $\forall \ell \in \mathbb{L}. \forall e. \Phi(e) \Rightarrow \Phi(\ell := e)$

binary: $\forall \text{op} . \forall e_1, e_2. (\Phi(e_1) \land \Phi(e_2)) \Rightarrow \Phi(e_1 \phantom{.} \text{op} \phantom{.} e_2)$

$\forall e_1, e_2. (\Phi(e_1) \land \Phi(e_2)) \Rightarrow \Phi(e_1; e_2)$

$\forall e_1, e_2. (\Phi(e_1) \land \Phi(e_2)) \Rightarrow \Phi(\text{while } e_1 \text{ do } e_2)$

ternary: $\forall e_1, e_2, e_3. (\Phi(e_1) \land \Phi(e_2) \land \Phi(e_3)) \Rightarrow \Phi(\text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3)$
(op +) \( \langle n_1 + n_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle n, s \rangle \) if \( n = n_1 + n_2 \)

(op ≥) \( \langle n_1 \geq n_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle b, s \rangle \) if \( b = (n_1 \geq n_2) \)

(op1) \( \frac{\langle e_1, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_1, s' \rangle}{\langle e_1 \ op \ e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_1 \ op \ e_2, s' \rangle} \)

(if1) \( \langle \text{if true then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s \rangle \)

(if2) \( \langle \text{if false then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_3, s \rangle \)

(if3) \( \langle \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2, s \rangle \)

(deref) \( \langle \ell, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle n, s \rangle \) if \( \ell \in \text{dom}(s) \) and \( s(\ell) = n \)

(assign1) \( \langle \ell := n, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{skip}, s + \{ \ell \mapsto n \} \rangle \) if \( \ell \in \text{dom}(s) \)

(assign2) \( \frac{\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle}{\langle \ell := e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \ell := e', s' \rangle} \)

(while) \( \langle \text{while } e_1 \text{ do } e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2, s \rangle \)

(seq1) \( \langle \text{skip}; e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s \rangle \)

(seq2) \( \frac{\langle e_1, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_1, s' \rangle}{\langle e_1; e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_1; e_2, s' \rangle} \)
\[\Phi(e) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \forall s, e', s', e'', s''.
(\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \wedge \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'', s'' \rangle) \Rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle = \langle e'', s'' \rangle\]

(assign1) \[\langle \ell := n, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{skip}, s + \{\ell \mapsto n\} \rangle \quad \text{if } \ell \in \text{dom}(s)\]

(assign2) \[\frac{\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle}{\langle \ell := e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \ell := e', s' \rangle}\]
All the other cases are in the notes.
Having proved those 9 things, consider an example \((!l + 2) + 3\). To see why \(\Phi((!l + 2) + 3)\) holds:
Summarising Proof Techniques

Determinacy  structural induction for $e$

Progress  rule induction for $\Gamma \vdash e : T$

Type Preservation  rule induction for $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$

Safety  mathematical induction on $\rightarrow^k$

Uniqueness of typing  ...

Decidability of typability  exhibiting an algorithm

Decidability of checking  corollary of other results
Functions – L2
fun addone x = x+1

public int addone(int x) {
  x+1
}

<script type="text/vbscript">
function addone(x)
  addone = x+1
end function
</script>
delegate int IntThunk();

class M {
    public static void Main() {
        IntThunk[] funcs = new IntThunk[11];
        for (int i = 0; i <= 10; i++) {
            funcs[i] = delegate() { return i; };
        }
        foreach (IntThunk f in funcs) {
            System.Console.WriteLine(f());
        }
    }
}

Functions – Examples

We will add expressions like these to L1.

\[(\text{fn } x: \text{int} \Rightarrow x + 1)\]
\[(\text{fn } x: \text{int} \Rightarrow x + 1) \, 7\]
\[(\text{fn } y: \text{int} \Rightarrow (\text{fn } x: \text{int} \Rightarrow x + y))\]
\[(\text{fn } y: \text{int} \Rightarrow (\text{fn } x: \text{int} \Rightarrow x + y)) \, 1\]
\[(\text{fn } x: \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int} \Rightarrow (\text{fn } y: \text{int} \Rightarrow x \, (x \, y)))\]
\[(\text{fn } x: \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int} \Rightarrow (\text{fn } y: \text{int} \Rightarrow x \, (x \, y))) \, (\text{fn } x: \text{int} \Rightarrow x + 1)\]
\[( ((\text{fn } x: \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int} \Rightarrow (\text{fn } y: \text{int} \Rightarrow x \, (x \, y))) \, (\text{fn } x: \text{int} \Rightarrow x + 1) \, ) \, 7]
Functions – Syntax

First, extend the L1 syntax:

Variables $x \in \mathbb{X}$ for a set $\mathbb{X} = \{x, y, z, \ldots\}$

Expressions

\[ e ::= \ldots \mid \text{fn } x: T \Rightarrow e \mid e_1 e_2 \mid x \]

Types

\[ T ::= \text{int} \mid \text{bool} \mid \text{unit} \mid T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \]
\[ T_{loc} ::= \text{intref} \]
Variable shadowing

\[
(fn \ x:\text{int} \Rightarrow (fn \ x:\text{int} \Rightarrow x + 1))
\]

class F {
    void m() {
        int y;
        {int y; ... } // Static error
        ...
        {int y; ... }
        ...
    }
}
Alpha conversion

In expressions $\text{fn } x:T \Rightarrow e$ the $x$ is a binder.

- inside $e$, any $x$’s (that aren’t themselves binders and are not inside another $\text{fn } x:T' \Rightarrow ...$) mean the same thing – the formal parameter of this function.

- outside this $\text{fn } x:T \Rightarrow e$, it doesn’t matter which variable we used for the formal parameter – in fact, we shouldn’t be able to tell. For example, $\text{fn } x:\text{int} \Rightarrow x + 2$ should be the same as $\text{fn } y:\text{int} \Rightarrow y + 2$.

$\text{cf } \int_0^1 x + x^2 \, dx = \int_0^1 y + y^2 \, dy$
Alpha conversion – free and bound occurrences

In a bit more detail (but still informally):

Say an occurrence of $x$ in an expression $e$ is *free* if it is not inside any $(\text{fn } x:T \Rightarrow \ldots)$. For example:

$$17$$
$$x + y$$
$$\text{fn } x:\text{int} \Rightarrow x + 2$$
$$\text{fn } x:\text{int} \Rightarrow x + z$$

$$\text{if } y \text{ then } 2 + x \text{ else } ((\text{fn } x:\text{int} \Rightarrow x + 2)z)$$

All the other occurrences of $x$ are *bound* by the closest enclosing $\text{fn } x:T \Rightarrow \ldots$. 
Alpha conversion – Binding examples

\[
\text{fn } x : \text{int} \Rightarrow x + 2
\]

\[
\text{fn } x : \text{int} \Rightarrow x + z
\]

\[
\text{fn } y : \text{int} \Rightarrow y + z
\]

\[
\text{fn } z : \text{int} \Rightarrow z + z
\]

\[
\text{fn } x : \text{int} \Rightarrow (\text{fn } x : \text{int} \Rightarrow x + 2)
\]
Alpha Conversion – The Convention

Convention: we will allow ourselves to any time at all, in any expression
…(\text{fn } x: T \Rightarrow e)…, replace the binding \( x \) and all occurrences of \( x \) that
are bound by that binder, by any other variable – so long as that doesn’t
change the binding graph.

For example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fn } x: \text{int} & \Rightarrow x + z = \text{fn } y: \text{int} \Rightarrow y + z \\
\quad & \neq \text{fn } z: \text{int} \Rightarrow z + z
\end{align*}
\]

This is called ‘working up to alpha conversion’. It amounts to regarding
the syntax not as abstract syntax trees, but as abstract syntax trees with
pointers...
Abstract Syntax up to Alpha Conversion

\[ \text{fn } x : \text{int} \Rightarrow x + z = \text{fn } y : \text{int} \Rightarrow y + z \neq \text{fn } z : \text{int} \Rightarrow z + z \]

Start with naive abstract syntax trees:

```
\text{fn } x : \text{int} \Rightarrow
  +
  \downarrow
  x
  \downarrow
  Z
```

```
\text{fn } y : \text{int} \Rightarrow
  +
  \downarrow
  y
  \downarrow
  z
```

```
\text{fn } z : \text{int} \Rightarrow
  +
  \downarrow
  z
  \downarrow
  Z
```

add pointers (from each \( x \) node to the closest enclosing \( \text{fn } x : T \Rightarrow \) node);
remove names of binders and the occurrences they bind

```
\text{fn } \cdot : \text{int} \Rightarrow
  +
  \downarrow
  \cdot
  \downarrow
  Z
```

```
\text{fn } \cdot : \text{int} \Rightarrow
  +
  \downarrow
  \cdot
  \downarrow
  Z
```

```
\text{fn } \cdot : \text{int} \Rightarrow
  +
  \downarrow
  \cdot
  \downarrow
  Z
```
\[
\text{fn } x: \text{int} \Rightarrow (\text{fn } x: \text{int} \Rightarrow x + 2) \\
= \text{fn } y: \text{int} \Rightarrow (\text{fn } z: \text{int} \Rightarrow z + 2) \neq \text{fn } z: \text{int} \Rightarrow (\text{fn } y: \text{int} \Rightarrow z + 2)
\]
(fn x:int ⇒ x) 7

fn z:int → int → int ⇒ (fn y:int ⇒ z y y)
De Bruijn indices

Our implementation will use those pointers – known as *De Bruijn indices*. Each occurrence of a bound variable is represented by the number of nodes you have to count out to get to its binder.

\[
\text{fn} \cdot : T \Rightarrow (\text{fn} \cdot : \text{int} \Rightarrow v_0 + 2) \neq \text{fn} \cdot : \text{int} \Rightarrow (\text{fn} \cdot : \text{int} \Rightarrow v_1 + \ldots)
\]
Free Variables

Say the *free variables* of an expression $e$ are the set of variables $x$ for which there is an occurrence of $x$ free in $e$.

\[
\begin{align*}
fv(x) & = \{x\} \\
fv(e_1 \text{ op } e_2) & = fv(e_1) \cup fv(e_2) \\
fv(\text{fn } x:T \Rightarrow e) & = fv(e) - \{x\}
\end{align*}
\]

Say $e$ is *closed* if $fv(e) = \{}$.

If $E$ is a set of expressions, write $fv(E)$ for $\bigcup_{e \in E} fv(e)$.

(note this definition is alpha-invariant - all our definitions should be)
Substitution – Examples

The semantics for functions will involve substituting actual parameters for formal parameters.

Write \( \{ e/x \} e' \) for the result of substituting \( e \) for all free occurrences of \( x \) in \( e' \). For example

\[
\begin{align*}
\{3/x\}(x \geq x) &= (3 \geq 3) \\
\{3/x\}((\text{fn } x:\text{int} \Rightarrow x + y)x) &= (\text{fn } x:\text{int} \Rightarrow x + y)3 \\
\{y + 2/x\}(\text{fn } y:\text{int} \Rightarrow x + y) &= \text{fn } z:\text{int} \Rightarrow (y + 2) + z
\end{align*}
\]
Substitution – Definition

Defining that:

\[
\{ e/z \} x = e \quad \text{if } x = z
\]

\[
\{ e/z \} x = x \quad \text{otherwise}
\]

\[
\{ e/z \}(\text{fn } x: T \Rightarrow e_1) = \text{fn } x: T \Rightarrow (\{ e/z \} e_1) \quad \text{if } x \neq z (\star)
\]

and \( x \notin \text{fv}(e) \) (\star)

\[
\{ e/z \}(e_1 e_2) = (\{ e/z \} e_1)(\{ e/z \} e_2)
\]

...

if (\star) is not true, we first have to pick an alpha-variant of \( \text{fn } x: T \Rightarrow e_1 \) to make it so (always can)
Substitution – Example Again

\[
\{y + 2/x\}(\text{fn } y:\text{int} \Rightarrow x + y)
\]

\[
= \{y + 2/x\}(\text{fn } y':\text{int} \Rightarrow x + y') \text{ renaming}
\]

\[
= \text{fn } y':\text{int} \Rightarrow \{y + 2/x\}(x + y') \text{ as } y' \neq x \text{ and } y' \notin \text{fv}(y + 2)
\]

\[
= \text{fn } y':\text{int} \Rightarrow \{y + 2/x\}x + \{y + 2/x\}y'
\]

\[
= \text{fn } y':\text{int} \Rightarrow (y + 2) + y'
\]

(could have chosen any other \(z\) instead of \(y'\), except \(y\) or \(x\))
Simultaneous substitution

A substitution $\sigma$ is a finite partial function from variables to expressions.

Notation: write a $\sigma$ as $\{e_1/x_1, \ldots, e_k/x_k\}$ instead of $\{x_1 \mapsto e_1, \ldots, x_k \mapsto e_k\}$ (for the function mapping $x_1$ to $e_1$ etc.)

A definition of $\sigma \ e$ is given in the notes.
Consider the expression

\[ e = (\text{fn } x:\text{unit} \Rightarrow (l := 1); x) (l := 2) \]

then

\[ \langle e, \{ l \mapsto 0 \} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{skip}, \{ l \mapsto ??? \} \rangle \]
Function Behaviour. Choice 1: Call-by-value

Informally: reduce left-hand-side of application to a fn-term; reduce argument to a value; then replace all occurrences of the formal parameter in the fn-term by that value.

\[ e = (\text{fn } x:\text{unit} \Rightarrow (l := 1); x)(l := 2) \]

\[
\langle e, \{l = 0\} \rangle \quad \rightarrow \quad \langle (\text{fn } x:\text{unit} \Rightarrow (l := 1); x)\text{skip}, \{l = 2\} \rangle \\
\rightarrow \quad \langle (l := 1); \text{skip}, \{l = 2\} \rangle \\
\rightarrow \quad \langle \text{skip}; \text{skip}, \{l = 1\} \rangle \\
\rightarrow \quad \langle \text{skip}, \{l = 1\} \rangle
\]
L2 Call-by-value

Values \( v ::= b \mid n \mid \text{skip} \mid \text{fn } x:T \Rightarrow e \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(app1)} & \quad \langle e_1, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_1, s' \rangle \\
\langle e_1 \ e_2, s \rangle & \rightarrow \langle e'_1 \ e_2, s' \rangle
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(app2)} & \quad \langle e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_2, s' \rangle \\
\langle v \ e_2, s \rangle & \rightarrow \langle v \ e'_2, s' \rangle
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{(fn)} \quad \langle (\text{fn } x:T \Rightarrow e) \ v, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \{v/x\} e, s \rangle
\]
L2 Call-by-value – reduction examples

\[ \langle (\text{fn} \ x:\text{int} \Rightarrow \text{fn} \ y:\text{int} \Rightarrow x + y) \ (3 + 4) \ 5 \ , \ s \rangle \]

\[ = \langle ((\text{fn} \ x:\text{int} \Rightarrow \text{fn} \ y:\text{int} \Rightarrow x + y) \ (3 + 4)) \ 5 \ , \ s \rangle \]

\[ \longrightarrow \langle ((\text{fn} \ x:\text{int} \Rightarrow \text{fn} \ y:\text{int} \Rightarrow x + y) \ 7) \ 5 \ , \ s \rangle \]

\[ \longrightarrow \langle \{7/x\}(\text{fn} \ y:\text{int} \Rightarrow x + y)) \ 5 \ , \ s \rangle \]

\[ = \langle ((\text{fn} \ y:\text{int} \Rightarrow 7 + y)) \ 5 \ , \ s \rangle \]

\[ \longrightarrow \langle 7 + 5 \ , \ s \rangle \]

\[ \longrightarrow \langle 12 \ , \ s \rangle \]

\( (\text{fn} \ f:\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int} \Rightarrow f \ 3) \ (\text{fn} \ x:\text{int} \Rightarrow (1 + 2) + x) \)
Function Behaviour. Choice 2: Call-by-name

Informally: reduce left-hand-side of application to a fn-term; then replace all occurrences of the formal parameter in the fn-term by the argument.

\[ e = (\text{fn } x: \text{unit} \Rightarrow (l := 1); x) (l := 2) \]

\[
\langle e, \{l \mapsto 0\} \rangle \quad \rightarrow \quad \langle (l := 1); l := 2, \{l \mapsto 0\} \rangle \\
\rightarrow \quad \langle \text{skip} ; l := 2, \{l \mapsto 1\} \rangle \\
\rightarrow \quad \langle l := 2, \{l \mapsto 1\} \rangle \\
\rightarrow \quad \langle \text{skip} , \{l \mapsto 2\} \rangle
\]
**L2 Call-by-name**

(same typing rules as before)

(CBN-app) \[ \langle e_1, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_1, s' \rangle \]
\[ \langle e_1 \; e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_1 \; e_2, s' \rangle \]

(CBN-fn) \[ \langle (\text{fn} \; x:T \Rightarrow e) \; e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \{ e_2/x \} \; e, s \rangle \]

Here, don’t evaluate the argument at all if it isn’t used

\[ \langle (\text{fn} \; x:\text{unit} \Rightarrow \text{skip}) (l := 2), \{ l \mapsto 0 \} \rangle \]
\[ \rightarrow \langle \{ l := 2/x \} \text{skip} , \{ l \mapsto 0 \} \rangle \]
\[ = \langle \text{skip} , \{ l \mapsto 0 \} \rangle \]

but if it is, end up evaluating it repeatedly.
Function Behaviour. Choice 3: Full beta

Allow both left and right-hand sides of application to reduce. At any point where the left-hand-side has reduced to a fn-term, replace all occurrences of the formal parameter in the fn-term by the argument. Allow reduction inside lambdas.

\[(\text{fn } x: \text{int} \Rightarrow 2 + 2) \longrightarrow (\text{fn } x: \text{int} \Rightarrow 4)\]
L2 Beta

(beta-app1) \[
\begin{align*}
\langle e_1, s \rangle & \rightarrow \langle e'_1, s' \rangle \\
\langle e_1 \ e_2, s \rangle & \rightarrow \langle e'_1 \ e_2, s' \rangle
\end{align*}
\]

(beta-app2) \[
\begin{align*}
\langle e_2, s \rangle & \rightarrow \langle e'_2, s' \rangle \\
\langle e_1 \ e_2, s \rangle & \rightarrow \langle e_1 \ e'_2, s' \rangle
\end{align*}
\]

(beta-fn1) \[
\langle (\text{fn} \ x:T \Rightarrow e) \ e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \{ e_2/x \} \ e, s \rangle
\]

(beta-fn2) \[
\begin{align*}
\langle e, s \rangle & \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \\
\langle \text{fn} \ x:T \Rightarrow e, s \rangle & \rightarrow \langle \text{fn} \ x:T \Rightarrow e', s' \rangle
\end{align*}
\]
L2 Beta: Example

\[(\text{fn } x: \text{int} \Rightarrow x + x)(2 + 2)\]

\[(\text{fn } x: \text{int} \Rightarrow x + x) 4 \quad (2 + 2) + (2 + 2)\]

\[4 + (2 + 2) \quad (2 + 2) + 4\]

\[4 + 4 \quad 4 + 4\]

\[8\]
Function Behaviour. Choice 4: Normal-order reduction

Leftmost, outermost variant of full beta.
Purity
Call-By-Need Example (Haskell)
let notdivby x y = y \text{ `mod` } x /= 0
enumFrom n = n : (enumFrom (n+1))
sieve (x:xs) =
  x : sieve (filter (notdivby x) xs)
in
sieve (enumFrom 2) ==>
...Interrupted!
Back to CBV (from now on).
Typing functions (1)

Before, $\Gamma$ gave the types of store locations; it ranged over $\text{TypeEnv}$ which was the set of all finite partial functions from locations $\mathbb{L}$ to $\mathbb{T}_{\text{loc}}$. Now, it must also give assumptions on the types of variables:

Type environments $\Gamma$ are now pairs of a $\Gamma_{\text{loc}}$ (a partial function from $\mathbb{L}$ to $\mathbb{T}_{\text{loc}}$ as before) and a $\Gamma_{\text{var}}$, a partial function from $\mathbb{X}$ to $\mathbb{T}$.

For example, we might have $\Gamma_{\text{loc}} = l_{1}:\text{intref}$ and $\Gamma_{\text{var}} = x:\text{int}, y:\text{bool} \rightarrow \text{int}$.

Notation: we write $\text{dom}(\Gamma)$ for the union of $\text{dom}(\Gamma_{\text{loc}})$ and $\text{dom}(\Gamma_{\text{var}})$. If $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma_{\text{var}})$, we write $\Gamma, x:T$ for the pair of $\Gamma_{\text{loc}}$ and the partial function which maps $x$ to $T$ but otherwise is like $\Gamma_{\text{var}}$. 
Typing functions (2)

(var) \[ \Gamma \vdash x : T \quad \text{if} \quad \Gamma(x) = T \]

(fn) \[ \begin{align*} \Gamma, x : T & \vdash e : T' \\ \Gamma & \vdash \text{fn } x : T \Rightarrow e : T \rightarrow T' \end{align*} \]

(app) \[ \begin{align*} \Gamma & \vdash e_1 : T \rightarrow T' \\ \Gamma & \vdash e_2 : T \\ \Gamma & \vdash e_1 \ e_2 : T' \end{align*} \]
Typing functions – Example

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{var} & \quad \text{(var)} \\
\text{int} & \quad \text{(int)} \\
\text{op} & \quad \text{(op)} \\
\text{fn} & \quad \text{(fn)} \\
\text{app} & \quad \text{(app)}
\end{align*}
\]
Properties of Typing

We only consider executions of closed programs, with no free variables.

**Theorem 14 (Progress)** If $e$ closed and $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ and $\text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s)$ then either $e$ is a value or there exist $e', s'$ such that $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$.

Note there are now more stuck configurations, e.g. $\langle3, 4\rangle$.

**Theorem 15 (Type Preservation)** If $e$ closed and $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ and $\text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s)$ and $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$ then $\Gamma \vdash e' : T$ and $e'$ closed and $\text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s')$. 
Theorem 15 (Type Preservation) If \( e \) closed and \( \Gamma \vdash e: T \) and \( \text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s) \) and \( \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \) then \( \Gamma \vdash e': T \) and \( e' \) closed and \( \text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s') \).

Taking

\[
\Phi(e, s, e', s') = \\
\forall \Gamma, T. \\
\Gamma \vdash e: T \land \text{closed}(e) \land \text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s) \\
\Rightarrow \\
\Gamma \vdash e': T \land \text{closed}(e') \land \text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s')
\]

we show \( \forall e, s, e', s'. \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \Rightarrow \Phi(e, s, e', s') \) by rule induction.
To prove this one uses:

**Lemma 16 (Substitution)**  If $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ and $\Gamma, x : T \vdash e' : T'$ with $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$ then $\Gamma \vdash \{e/x\} e' : T'$. 
Theorem 17 (Normalization)  *In the sublanguage without while loops or store operations, if* $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ *and* $e$ *closed then there does not exist an infinite reduction sequence* $\langle e, \emptyset \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1, \emptyset \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, \emptyset \rangle \rightarrow \ldots$.

*Proof*  *can’t do a simple induction, as reduction can make terms grow.*

See Pierce Ch.12 (the details are not in the scope of this course).  $\square$
Local definitions

For readability, want to be able to name definitions, and to restrict their scope, so add:

\[
e \ ::= \ldots \mid \text{let val } x: T = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \text{ end}
\]

this \( x \) is a binder, binding any free occurrences of \( x \) in \( e_2 \).

Can regard just as syntactic sugar:

\[
\text{let val } x: T = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \text{ end} \rightsquigarrow (\text{fn } x: T \Rightarrow e_2)e_1
\]
Local definitions – derived typing and reduction rules (CBV)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{let } \text{val } x : T = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \text{ end } & \rightsquigarrow (\text{fn } x : T \Rightarrow e_2) e_1 \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\frac{
\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T \\
\Gamma, x : T \vdash e_2 : T'
}{
\Gamma \vdash \text{let } \text{val } x : T = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \text{ end} : T'
}
\end{array}
\]
\[(let1)\]

\[
\langle e_1, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1', s' \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{let val } x : T = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \text{ end, } s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{let val } x : T = e_1' \text{ in } e_2 \text{ end, } s \rangle
\]

\[(let2)\]

\[
\langle \text{let val } x : T = v \text{ in } e_2 \text{ end, } s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \{v/x\} e_2, s \rangle
\]
Recursive definitions – first attempt

How about

\[ x = (\text{fn } y:\text{int} \Rightarrow \text{if } y \geq 1 \text{ then } y + (x(y + -1)) \text{ else } 0) \]

where we use \( x \) within the definition of \( x \)? Think about evaluating \( x^3 \).

Could add something like this:

\[ e ::= \ldots | \text{let val rec } x:T = e \text{ in } e' \text{ end} \]

(here the \( x \) binds in both \( e \) and \( e' \)) then say

\[
\text{let val rec } x:\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int} = \\
(\text{fn } y:\text{int} \Rightarrow \text{if } y \geq 1 \text{ then } y + (x(y + -1)) \text{ else } 0) \\
\text{in } x^3 \text{ end}
\]
But...

What about

\[
\text{let val rec } \ x = (x, x) \ \text{in} \ x \ \text{end} \ ?
\]

Have some rather weird things, eg

\[
\text{let val rec } \ x: \ \text{int list} = 3 :: x \ \text{in} \ x \ \text{end}
\]

does that terminate? if so, is it equal to

\[
\text{let val rec } \ x: \ \text{int list} = 3 :: 3 :: x \ \text{in} \ x \ \text{end} \ ?
\]

\[
\text{let val rec } \ x: \ \text{int list} = 3 :: (x + 1) \ \text{in} \ x \ \text{end}
\]

terminate?

In a CBN language, it is reasonable to allow this kind of thing, as will only compute as much as needed. In a CBV language, would \textit{usually} disallow, allowing recursive definitions only of functions...
Recursive Functions

So, specialize the previous let val rec construct to

\[
T = T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \quad \text{recursion only at function types}
\]

\[
e = \text{fn } y : T_1 \Rightarrow e_1 \quad \text{and only of function values}
\]

\[
e ::= \ldots \mid \text{let val rec } x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 = (\text{fn } y : T_1 \Rightarrow e_1) \text{ in } e_2 \text{ end}
\]

(here the \( y \) binds in \( e_1 \); the \( x \) binds in \((\text{fn } y : T \Rightarrow e_1)\) and in \( e_2 \))

(\text{let rec fn})

\[
\frac{\Gamma, x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2, y : T_1 \vdash e_1 : T_2 \quad \Gamma, x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \vdash e_2 : T}{\Gamma \vdash \text{let val rec } x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 = (\text{fn } y : T_1 \Rightarrow e_1) \text{ in } e_2 \text{ end}}
\]

Concrete syntax: In ML can write let fun \( f(x : T_1) : T_2 = e_1 \) in \( e_2 \) end, or even let fun \( f(x) = e_1 \) in \( e_2 \) end, for let val rec \( f : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 = \text{fn } x : T_1 \Rightarrow e_1 \) in \( e_2 \) end.
Recursive Functions – Semantics

(letrecfn) \[ \langle \text{let val rec } x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 = (\text{fn } y : T_1 \Rightarrow e_1) \text{ in } e_2 \text{ end, } s \rangle \]

\[ \rightarrow \]

\[ \langle \{(\text{fn } y : T_1 \Rightarrow \text{let val rec } x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 = (\text{fn } y : T_1 \Rightarrow e_1) \text{ in } e_1 \text{ end})\} / \]
Recursive Functions – Minimization Example

Below, in the context of the `let val rec`, \( x \ f \ n \) finds the smallest \( n' \geq n \) for which \( f \ n' \) evaluates to some \( m' \leq 0 \).

```ml
let val rec \( x: \text{int} \to \text{int} \to \text{int} \)
   = fn \( f: \text{int} \to \text{int} \Rightarrow \text{fn} \ z: \text{int} \Rightarrow \text{if} \ (f \ z) \geq 1 \ \text{then} \ x \ f \ (z + 1) \ \text{else} \) in

let val \( f: \text{int} \to \text{int} \)
   = (fn \( z: \text{int} \Rightarrow \text{if} \ z \geq 3 \ \text{then} \ (\text{if} \ 3 \geq z \ \text{then} \ 0 \ \text{else} \ 1) \ \text{else} \ 1) \) in

\( x \ f \ 0 \)

end
end
```
More Syntactic Sugar

Do we need $e_1; e_2$?

No: Could encode by $e_1; e_2 \rightsquigarrow (\text{fn } y:\text{unit} \Rightarrow e_2)e_1$

Do we need $\textbf{while } e_1 \textbf{ do } e_2$?

No: could encode by $\textbf{while } e_1 \textbf{ do } e_2 \rightsquigarrow$

\[
\text{let val rec } w:\text{unit }\rightarrow\text{unit }=\\
\text{fn } y:\text{unit }\Rightarrow\text{if } e_1 \text{ then } (e_2; (w \text{ skip})) \text{ else skip }\\
\text{in}\\
w \text{ skip }\\
\text{end}
\]

for fresh $w$ and $y$ not in $fv(e_1) \cup fv(e_2)$.
OTOH, Could we encode recursion in the language without? We know at least that you can’t in the language without `while` or store, as had normalisation theorem there and can write

```
let val rec x:int → int = fn y:int ⇒ x(y + 1) in x 0 end
```

here.
Implementation

There is an implementation of L2 on the course web page. See especially Syntax.sml and Semantics.sml. It uses a front end written with mosmllex and mosmlyac.
Implementation – Scope Resolution
datatype expr_raw = ...
  | Var_raw of string
  | Fn_raw of string * type_expr * expr_raw
  | App_raw of expr_raw * expr_raw
  | ...

datatype expr = ...
  | Var of int
  | Fn of type_expr * expr
  | App of expr * expr

resolve scopes : expr_raw -> expr
Implementation – Substitution

\[\text{subst} : \text{expr} \to \text{int} \to \text{expr} \to \text{expr}\]

\[\text{subst } e \ 0 \ e'\] substitutes \(e\) for the outermost var in \(e'\).

(the definition is only sensible if \(e\) is closed, but that’s ok – we only evaluate whole programs. For a general definition, see [Pierce, Ch. 6])

```plaintext
fun subst e n (Var n1) = if n=n1 then e else Var n1
| subst e n (Fn(t,e1)) = Fn(t,subst e (n+1) e1)
| subst e n (App(e1,e2)) = App(subst e n e1,subst e n e2)
| subst e n (Let(t,e1,e2))
  = Let (t,subst e n e1,subst e (n+1) e2)
| subst e n (Letrecfn (tx,ty,e1,e2))
  = Letrecfn (tx,ty,subst e (n+2) e1,subst e (n+1) e2)
| ...
```
reduce \((\text{App} \ (e_1,e_2),s)\) = (case \(e_1\) of

\(\text{Fn} \ (t,e)\) =>

(if (is\_value \(e_2\)) then
    SOME \((\text{subst} \ e_2 \ 0 \ e,s)\)
else

    (case reduce \((e_2,s)\) of
        SOME\((e_2',s')\) => SOME\((\text{App} \ (e_1,e_2'),s')\)
        | NONE => NONE))

| _ => (case reduce \((e_1,s)\) of
        SOME\((e_1',s')\) => SOME\((\text{App} \ (e_1',e_2),s')\)
        | NONE => NONE)

)}}
Implementation – Type Inference
type typeEnv
    = (loc\*type_loc) list * type_expr list

infntype gamma (Var n) = nth (#2 gamma) n
infntype gamma (Fn (t,e))
    = (case infntype (#1 gamma, t::(#2 gamma)) e of
        SOME t' => SOME (func(t,t'))
    | NONE => NONE )

infntype gamma (App (e1,e2))
    = (case (infntype gamma e1, infntype gamma e2) of
        (SOME (func(t1,t1')), SOME t2) =>
            if t1=t2 then SOME t1' else NONE
    )
Implementation – Closures

Naively implementing substitution is expensive. An efficient implementation would use *closures* instead – cf. Compiler Construction.

We could give a more concrete semantics, closer to implementation, in terms of closures, and then prove it corresponds to the original semantics...

(if you get that wrong, you end up with dynamic scoping, as in original LISP)
**Aside: Small-step vs Big-step Semantics**

Throughout this course we use *small-step* semantics, $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$. There is an alternative style, of *big-step* semantics $\langle e, s \rangle \Downarrow \langle v, s' \rangle$, for example

$$\begin{align*}
\langle n, s \rangle \Downarrow \langle n, s \rangle & \quad \langle e_1, s \rangle \Downarrow \langle n_1, s' \rangle \\
\langle e_2, s' \rangle \Downarrow \langle n_2, s'' \rangle & \quad \langle e_1 + e_2, s \rangle \Downarrow \langle n, s'' \rangle \\
& \quad n = n_1 + n_2
\end{align*}$$

(see the notes from earlier courses by Andy Pitts).

For sequential languages, it doesn’t make a major difference. When we come to add concurrency, small-step is more convenient.
Data – L3
Products

\[ T ::= \ldots \mid T_1 \ast T_2 \]

\[ e ::= \ldots \mid (e_1, e_2) \mid \#_1 e \mid \#_2 e \]
Products – typing

(pair) \[
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash (e_1, e_2) : T_1 \ast T_2}
\]

(proj1) \[
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : T_1 \ast T_2}{\Gamma \vdash \#1 e : T_1}
\]

(proj2) \[
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : T_1 \ast T_2}{\Gamma \vdash \#2 e : T_2}
\]
Products – reduction

\[ v ::= ... \mid (v_1, v_2) \]

(pair1) \[ \langle e_1, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e'_1, s' \rangle \]
\[ \langle (e_1, e_2), s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle (e'_1, e_2), s' \rangle \]

(pair2) \[ \langle e_2, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e'_2, s' \rangle \]
\[ \langle (v_1, e_2), s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle (v_1, e'_2), s' \rangle \]

(proj1) \[ \langle \#1(v_1, v_2), s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle v_1, s \rangle \] (proj2) \[ \langle \#2(v_1, v_2), s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle v_2, s \rangle \]

(proj3) \[ \langle e, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \]
\[ \langle \#1 e, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \#1 e', s' \rangle \]

(proj4) \[ \langle e, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \]
\[ \langle \#2 e, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \#2 e', s' \rangle \]
Sums (or Variants, or Tagged Unions)

\[
T ::= \ldots \mid T_1 + T_2
\]

\[
e ::= \ldots \mid \text{inl } e : T \mid \text{inr } e : T \mid \text{case } e \text{ of inl } (x_1 : T_1) \Rightarrow e_1 \mid \text{inr } (x_2 : T_2) \Rightarrow e_2
\]

Those \( x \)'s are binders, treated up to alpha-equivalence.
Sums – typing

**(inl)**

\[
\Gamma \vdash e : T_1 \\
\Gamma \vdash \text{inl} e : T_1 + T_2 : T_1 + T_2
\]

**(inr)**

\[
\Gamma \vdash e : T_2 \\
\Gamma \vdash \text{inr} e : T_1 + T_2 : T_1 + T_2
\]

**(case)**

\[
\Gamma \vdash e : T_1 + T_2 \\
\Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash e_1 : T \\
\Gamma, y : T_2 \vdash e_2 : T \\
\Gamma \vdash \text{case } e \text{ of inl } (x : T_1) \Rightarrow e_1 \mid \text{inr } (y : T_2) \Rightarrow e_2 : T
\]
Sums – type annotations

case \( e \) of \( \text{inl} \ (x_1 : T_1) \Rightarrow e_1 \mid \text{inr} \ (x_2 : T_2) \Rightarrow e_2 \)

Why do we have these type annotations?

To maintain the unique typing property. Otherwise

\( \text{inl} \ 3 : \text{int} + \text{int} \)

and

\( \text{inl} \ 3 : \text{int} + \text{bool} \)
Sums – reduction

\[ v ::= \ldots | \text{inl } v : T | \text{inr } v : T \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle e, s \rangle & \longrightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \\
\langle \text{inl } e : T, s \rangle & \longrightarrow \langle \text{inl } e' : T, s' \rangle
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\langle e, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle \text{case } e \ \text{of inl } (x : T_1) \Rightarrow e_1 \mid \text{inr } (y : T_2) \Rightarrow e_2, s \rangle & \longrightarrow \langle \text{case } e' \ \text{of inl } (x : T_1) \Rightarrow e_1 \mid \text{inr } (y : T_2) \Rightarrow e_2, s' \rangle \\
\langle \text{case inl } v : T \ \text{of inl } (x : T_1) \Rightarrow e_1 \mid \text{inr } (y : T_2) \Rightarrow e_2, s \rangle & \longrightarrow \langle \{ v / x \} e_1, s \rangle
\end{align*}
\]

(inr) and (case3) like (inl) and (case2)
### Constructors and Destructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type</th>
<th>constructors</th>
<th>destructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( T \rightarrow T )</td>
<td>( \text{fn } x: T \Rightarrow _ )</td>
<td>_ ( e )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T \times T )</td>
<td>( (_{ }, _) )</td>
<td>#1 _ _ #2 _</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T + T )</td>
<td>( \text{inl } (<em>) ) \text{ inr } (</em>{ })</td>
<td>_ \text{ case}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bool</td>
<td>true false</td>
<td>_ \text{ if}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proofs as programs: The Curry-Howard correspondence

(var) \[ \Gamma, x: T \vdash x: T \]

(fn) \[ \frac{\Gamma, x: T \vdash e: T'}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fn} \ x: T \Rightarrow e : T \rightarrow T'} \]

(app) \[ \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1: T \rightarrow T' \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2: T}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 \ e_2: T'} \]

\[ \Gamma, P \vdash P \]

\[ \Gamma, P \vdash P' \]

\[ \Gamma \vdash P \rightarrow P' \]

\[ \Gamma \vdash P' \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(var)</th>
<th>$\Gamma, x: T \vdash x: T$</th>
<th>$\Gamma, P \vdash P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(fn)</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash \text{fn } x: T \Rightarrow e : T' \rightarrow T''$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash P \rightarrow P' \quad \Gamma \vdash P'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(app)</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T \rightarrow T' \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash P \rightarrow P' \quad \Gamma \vdash P$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash e_1 \ e_2 : T'$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash P$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pair)</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T_2$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash P_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash P_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash (e_1, e_2) : T_1 \ast T_2$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash P_1 \land P_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(proj1)</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash e : T_1 \ast T_2$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash P_1 \land P_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash P_1 \land P_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash #1 \ e : T_1$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash P_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash P_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(proj2)</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash e : T_1 \ast T_2$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash P_1 \land P_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash P_1 \land P_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash #2 \ e : T_2$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash P_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash P_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inl)</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash e : T_1$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash P_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash \text{inl } e : T_1 + T_2 : T_1 + T_2$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash P_1 \lor P_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(inr), (case), (unit), (zero), etc.. – but not (letrec)
ML Datatypes

Datatypes in ML generalize both sums and products, in a sense

\[
\text{datatype IntList} = \text{Null of unit} \\
| \text{Cons of Int } \times \text{IntList}
\]

is (roughly!) like saying

\[
\text{IntList} = \text{unit} + (\text{Int } \times \text{IntList})
\]
Records

A generalization of products.

Take field labels

Labels $lab \in \text{LAB}$ for a set \text{LAB} = \{p, q, \ldots\}

\[
T ::= ... | \{lab_1:T_1, \ldots, lab_k:T_k\}
\]

\[
e ::= ... | \{lab_1 = e_1, \ldots, lab_k = e_k\} | \#lab \ e
\]

(where in each record (type or expression) no $lab$ occurs more than once)
Records – typing

\[
\begin{align*}
\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1 & \quad \ldots \quad \Gamma \vdash e_k : T_k \\
\Gamma \vdash \{lab_1 = e_1, \ldots, lab_k = e_k\} : \{lab_1 : T_1, \ldots, lab_k : T_k\}
\end{align*}
\]

(record)

\[
\begin{align*}
\Gamma \vdash e : \{lab_1 : T_1, \ldots, lab_k : T_k\} \\
\Gamma \vdash \#lab_i e : T_i
\end{align*}
\]

(recordproj)
Records – reduction

\[ v ::= ... \mid \{ lab_1 = v_1, \ldots, lab_k = v_k \} \]

\[ \langle e_i, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_i, s' \rangle \]

(record1) \[ \langle \{ lab_1 = v_1, \ldots, lab_i = e_i, \ldots, lab_k = e_k \}, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \{ lab_1 = v_1, \ldots, lab_i = e'_i, \ldots, lab_k = e_k \}, s' \rangle \]

(record2) \[ \langle \# lab_i \{ lab_1 = v_1, \ldots, lab_k = v_k \}, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle v_i, s \rangle \]

(record3) \[ \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \]
\[ \langle \# lab_i \ e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \# lab_i \ e', s' \rangle \]
Mutable Store

Most languages have some kind of mutable store. Two main choices:

1. What we’ve got in L1 and L2:

\[
e ::= ... \mid l := e \mid !l \mid x
\]

- locations store mutable values
- variables refer to a previously-calculated value, immutably
- explicit dereferencing and assignment operators for locations

\[
\text{fn } x: \text{int} \Rightarrow l := (!l) + x
\]
In C and Java,

- variables let you refer to a previously calculated value and let you overwrite that value with another.

```java
void foo(x:int) {
    l = l + x
    ...
}
```

- implicit dereferencing,

- have some limited type machinery to limit mutability.

– pros and cons: ....
References

\[ T ::= \ldots \mid T \text{ ref} \]

\[ T_{loc} ::= \text{intref} \ T \text{ ref} \]

\[ e ::= \ldots \mid \ell := e \mid \ell \]

\[ e_1 := e_2 \mid \ell \]

\[ e \mid \text{ref } e \mid \ell \]
References – Typing

(ref) \[
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : T}{\Gamma \vdash \text{ref } e : T \text{ ref}}
\]

(assign) \[
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T \text{ ref} \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 := e_2 : \text{unit}}
\]

(deref) \[
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : T \text{ ref}}{\Gamma \vdash !e : T}
\]

(loc) \[
\frac{\Gamma(\ell) = T \text{ ref}}{\Gamma \vdash \ell : T \text{ ref}}
\]
A location is a value:

\[ v ::= \ldots \mid \ell \]

Stores \( s \) were finite partial maps from \( \mathbb{L} \) to \( \mathbb{Z} \). From now on, take them to be finite partial maps from \( \mathbb{L} \) to the set of all values.

\[(\text{ref1})\quad \langle \text{ref } v, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \ell, s + \{\ell \mapsto v\} \rangle \quad \ell \notin \text{dom}(s)\]

\[(\text{ref2})\quad \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle\]

\[\langle \text{ref } e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{ref } e', s' \rangle\]
(deref1) \( \langle !\ell, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle v, s \rangle \) if \( \ell \in \text{dom}(s) \) and \( s(\ell) = v \)

(deref2) \[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\langle e, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle}{\langle !e, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle !e', s' \rangle}
\end{align*}
\]

(assign1) \( \langle \ell := v, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{skip}, s + \{\ell \mapsto v\} \rangle \) if \( \ell \in \text{dom}(s) \)

(assign2) \[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\langle e, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle}{\langle \ell := e, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \ell := e', s' \rangle}
\end{align*}
\]

(assign3) \[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\langle e, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle}{\langle e := e_2, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e' := e_2, s' \rangle}
\end{align*}
\]
Type-checking the store

For L1, our type properties used $\text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s)$ to express the condition ‘all locations mentioned in $\Gamma$ exist in the store $s$’.

Now need more: for each $\ell \in \text{dom}(s)$ need that $s(\ell)$ is typable. Moreover, $s(\ell)$ might contain some other locations...
Type-checking the store – Example

Consider

\[ e = \text{let val } x:(\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}) \text{ ref } = \text{ref}(\text{fn } z:\text{int} \Rightarrow z) \text{ in } \]

\[ (x := (\text{fn } z:\text{int} \Rightarrow \text{if } z \geq 1 \text{ then } z + ((!x) (z + -1)) \text{ else } 0) \]

\[ (!x) 3) \text{ end} \]

which has reductions

\[ \langle e, \{\} \rangle \longrightarrow^* \]

\[ \langle e_1, \{ l_1 \mapsto (\text{fn } z:\text{int} \Rightarrow z) \} \rangle \longrightarrow^* \]

\[ \langle e_2, \{ l_1 \mapsto (\text{fn } z:\text{int} \Rightarrow \text{if } z \geq 1 \text{ then } z + ((!l_1) (z + -1)) \text{ else } 0) \} \]

\[ \longrightarrow^* \langle 6, \ldots \rangle \]
So, say $\Gamma \vdash s$ if $\forall \ell \in \text{dom}(s). \exists T. \Gamma(\ell) = T \ \text{ref} \land \Gamma \vdash s(\ell):T$.

The statement of type preservation will then be:

**Theorem 18 (Type Preservation)**  If $e$ closed and $\Gamma \vdash e:T$ and $\Gamma \vdash s$ and $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$ then for some $\Gamma'$ with disjoint domain to $\Gamma$ we have $\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash e':T$ and $\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash s'$. 
Definition 19 (Well-typed store) Let $\Gamma \vdash s$ if $\text{dom}(\Gamma) = \text{dom}(s)$ and if for all $\ell \in \text{dom}(s)$, if $\Gamma(\ell) = T \text{ ref}$ then $\Gamma \vdash s(\ell):T$.

Theorem 20 (Progress) If $e$ closed and $\Gamma \vdash e:T$ and $\Gamma \vdash s$ then either $e$ is a value or there exist $e'$, $s'$ such that $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$.

Theorem 21 (Type Preservation) If $e$ closed and $\Gamma \vdash e:T$ and $\Gamma \vdash s$ and $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$ then $e'$ is closed and for some $\Gamma'$ with disjoint domain to $\Gamma$ we have $\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash e':T$ and $\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash s'$.

Theorem 22 (Type Safety) If $e$ closed and $\Gamma \vdash e:T$ and $\Gamma \vdash s$ and $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle e', s' \rangle$ then either $e'$ is a value or there exist $e''$, $s''$ such that $\langle e', s' \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'', s'' \rangle$. 
Implementation

The collected definition so far is in the notes, called L3.

It is again a Moscow ML fragment (modulo the syntax for \( T + T \)), so you can run programs. The Moscow ML record typing is more liberal than that of L3, though.
Evaluation Contexts

Define evaluation contexts

\[ E ::= \_ \ op \ e \mid v \ op \ \_ \mid \text{if} \_ \ \text{then} \ e \ \text{else} \ e \mid \_; \ e \mid \_ \ e \mid v \_ \mid \text{let} \ \text{val} \ x:T = \_ \ \text{in} \ e_2 \ \text{end} \mid (-, e) \mid (v, \_) \mid \#1 \_ \mid \#2 \_ \mid \text{inl} \_::T \mid \text{inr} \_::T \mid \text{case} \_ \ \text{of} \ \text{inl} \ (x:T) \Rightarrow e \mid \text{inr} \ (x:T) \Rightarrow e \mid \{ \text{lab}_1 = v_1, \ldots, \text{lab}_i = \_, \ldots, \text{lab}_k = e_k \} \mid \#\text{lab} \_ \mid \_ := e \mid v := \_ \mid !_\_ \mid \text{ref} \_ \]
and have the single context rule

\[
\begin{align*}
(e, s) &\longrightarrow (e', s') \\
\langle E[e], s \rangle &\longrightarrow \langle E[e'], s' \rangle
\end{align*}
\]

replacing the rules (all those with $\geq 1$ premise) (op1), (op2), (seq2), (if3), (app1), (app2), (let1), (pair1), (pair2), (proj3), (proj4), (inl), (inr), (case1), (record1), (record3), (ref2), (deref2), (assign2), (assign3).

To (eval) we add all the computation rules (all the rest) (op $\triangleright+$), (op $\triangleright=+$), (seq1), (if1), (if2), (while), (fn), (let2), (letrecfn), (proj1), (proj2), (case2), (case3), (record2), (ref1), (deref1), (assign1).

**Theorem 23** The two definitions of $\longrightarrow$ define the same relation.
## A Little History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal logic</td>
<td>1880–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped lambda calculus</td>
<td>1930s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simply-typed lambda calculus</td>
<td>1940s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortran</td>
<td>1950s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry-Howard, Algol 60, Algol 68, SECD machine (64)</td>
<td>1960s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascal, Polymorphism, ML, PLC</td>
<td>1970s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Operational Semantics</td>
<td>1981–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard ML definition</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskell</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtyping</td>
<td>1980s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module systems</td>
<td>1980–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object calculus</td>
<td>1990–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typed assembly and intermediate languages</td>
<td>1990–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And now? module systems, distribution, mobility, reasoning about objects, security, typed compilation, .......
(assignment and while) L1\(^{1,2,3,4}\)
(functions and recursive definitions) L2\(^{5,6}\)
(products, sums, records, references) L3\(^8\)

Subtyping and Objects\(^9\)
Semantic Equivalence\(^{10}\)

Operational semantics
Type systems
Implementations
Language design choices
Inductive definitions
Inductive proof – structural; rule
Abstract syntax up to alpha
Concurrency\(^{12}\)
Subtyping and Objects
Polymorphism

Ability to use expressions at many different types.

- Ad-hoc polymorphism (overloading).
  e.g. in Moscow ML the built-in + can be used to add two integers or to add two reals. (see Haskell type classes)

- Parametric Polymorphism – as in ML. See the Part II Types course.
  can write a function that for any type $\alpha$ takes an argument of type $\alpha$ list and computes its length (parametric – uniform in whatever $\alpha$ is)

- Subtype polymorphism – as in various OO languages. See here.
  Dating back to the 1960s (Simula etc); formalized in 1980, 1984,...
Recall

\[ \Gamma \vdash e_1 : T \rightarrow T' \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash e_1 \ e_2 : T' \]

so can’t type

\[ \forall (\text{fn} \ x : \{p : \text{int}\} \Rightarrow \#p \ x) \ \{p = 3, q = 4\} : \text{int} \]

even though we’re giving the function a better argument, with more structure, than it needs.
Subsumption

‘Better’? Any value of type \{p:int, q:int\} can be used wherever a value of type \{p:int\} is expected. (*)

Introduce a subtyping relation between types, written \(T <: T'\), read as \(T\) is a subtype of \(T'\) (a \(T\) is useful in more contexts than a \(T'\)).

Will define it on the next slides, but it will include \(\{p:int, q:int\} <: \{p:int\} <: {}\)

Introduce a subsumption rule

\[
\text{(sub)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e : T}{\Gamma \vdash e : T'} \quad T <: T'
\]

allowing subtyping to be used, capturing (*)

Can then deduce \(\{p = 3, q = 4\} : \{p:int\}\), hence can type the example.
Example

\[
\frac{x:\{p:\text{int}\} \vdash x:\{p:\text{int}\}}{(\text{var})} \\
\frac{x:\{p:\text{int}\} \vdash \#p \ x:\text{int}}{(\text{record-proj})} \\
\frac{\{\} \vdash \text{fn} \ x:\{p:\text{int}\} \Rightarrow \#p \ x:\{p:\text{int}\} \rightarrow \text{int}}{(\text{fn})} \\
\frac{\{} \vdash 3:\text{int} \quad \{\} \vdash 4:\text{int} \quad \{\} \vdash \{p = 3, q = 4\}:\{p:\text{int}, q:\text{int}\}}{(\text{var})} \\
\frac{\{} \vdash \{p = 3, q = 4\}:\{p:\text{int}, q:\text{int}\}}{(\text{record})} \quad \frac{\{} \vdash \{p = 3, q = 4\}:\{p:\text{int}\}}{(\star)} \\
\frac{\{\} \vdash (\text{fn} \ x:\{p:\text{int}\} \Rightarrow \#p \ x:\{p:\text{int}\} \rightarrow \text{int}) \{p = 3, q = 4\}:#p \ x:\{p:\text{int}\}}{(\text{app})} \\
\{\} \vdash (\text{fn} \ x:\{p:\text{int}\} \Rightarrow \#p \ x\{p = 3, q = 4\}:p:\text{int})
\]

where (\star) is \{p:\text{int}, q:\text{int}\} <: \{p:\text{int}\}
The Subtype Relation $T <: T'$

(s-refl) $T <: T$

(s-trans) $T <: T' \quad T' <: T'' \quad T <: T''$
Forgetting fields on the right:

\[
\{ \text{lab}_1: T_1, \ldots, \text{lab}_k: T_k, \text{lab}_{k+1}: T_{k+1}, \ldots, \text{lab}_{k+k'}: T_{k+k'} \} <: \text{(s-record-width)} \{ \text{lab}_1: T_1, \ldots, \text{lab}_k: T_k \}
\]

Allowing subtyping within fields:

\[
\text{(s-record-depth)} \quad T_1 <: T'_1 \quad \ldots \quad T_k <: T'_k \\
\{ \text{lab}_1: T_1, \ldots, \text{lab}_k: T_k \} <: \{ \text{lab}_1: T'_1, \ldots, \text{lab}_k: T'_k \}
\]

Combining these:

\[
\{\text{p:int, q:int}\} <: \{\text{p:int}\} \quad \{\text{r:int}\} <: \{} \quad \text{(s-record-width)}
\]

\[
\{\text{x:{p:int, q:int}, y:{r:int}}\} <: \{\text{x:{p:int}, y:{}}\} \quad \text{(s-record-depth)}
\]
Allowing reordering of fields:

\[ \{ \text{lab}_1 : T_1, \ldots, \text{lab}_k : T_k \} <: \{ \text{lab}_{\pi(1)} : T_{\pi(1)}, \ldots, \text{lab}_{\pi(k)} : T_{\pi(k)} \} \]

\[ \pi \text{ a permutation of } 1, \ldots, k \]

(the subtype order is not anti-symmetric – it is a preorder, not a partial order)
Subtyping – Functions

\[(s\text{-fn})\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
T_1' <: T_1 \\
\hline
T_1 \rightarrow T_2 <: T_2' \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
T_1' <: T_1 \quad T_2 <: T'_2
\]

\[
T_1 \rightarrow T_2 <: T'_1 \rightarrow T'_2
\]

*contravariant* on the left of \(\rightarrow\)

*covariant* on the right of \(\rightarrow\) (like \((s\text{-record\text{-}depth})\))
If \( f : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \) then we can give \( f \) any argument which is a subtype of \( T_1 \); we can regard the result of \( f \) as any supertype of \( T_2 \). e.g., for

\[
f = \text{fn } x: \{ p: \text{int} \} \Rightarrow \{ p = \# p \, x, q = 28 \}
\]

we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\{} & \vdash f: \{ p: \text{int} \} \rightarrow \{ p: \text{int}, q: \text{int} \} \\
\{} & \vdash f: \{ p: \text{int} \} \rightarrow \{ p: \text{int} \} \\
\{} & \vdash f: \{ p: \text{int}, q: \text{int} \} \rightarrow \{ p: \text{int}, q: \text{int} \} \\
\{} & \vdash f: \{ p: \text{int}, q: \text{int} \} \rightarrow \{ p: \text{int} \}
\end{align*}
\]

as

\[
\{ p: \text{int}, q: \text{int} \} \ll \{ p: \text{int} \}
\]
On the other hand, for

\[ \text{fn } x:\{p:\text{int}, q:\text{int}\} \Rightarrow \{p = (#p x) + (#q x)\} \]

we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\{\} & \vdash f:\{p:\text{int}, q:\text{int}\} \rightarrow \{p:\text{int}\} \\
\{\} & \models f:\{p:\text{int}\} \rightarrow T \quad \text{for any } T \\
\{\} & \models f:T \rightarrow \{p:\text{int}, q:\text{int}\} \quad \text{for any } T
\end{align*}
\]
Subtyping – Products

Just like (s-record-depth)

\[
\begin{align*}
(s\text{-pair}) \quad & \frac{T_1 <: T'_1 \quad T_2 <: T'_2}{T_1 \times T_2 <: T'_1 \times T'_2}
\end{align*}
\]

Subtyping – Sums

Exercise.
Subtyping – References

Are either of these any good?

\[ T <: T' \]
\[
\frac{T}{T \text{ ref} <: T' \text{ ref}}
\]

\[ T' <: T \]
\[
\frac{T'}{T \text{ ref} <: T' \text{ ref}}
\]

No...
Semantics

No change (note that we’ve not changed the expression grammar).

Properties

Have Type Preservation and Progress.

Implementation

Type inference is more subtle, as the rules are no longer syntax-directed. Getting a good runtime implementation is also tricky, especially with field re-ordering.
Subtyping – Down-casts

The subsumption rule (sub) permits up-casting at any point. How about down-casting? We could add

\[ e ::= ... \mid (T) e \]

with typing rule

\[
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : T'}{
\Gamma \vdash (T)e : T}
\]

then you need a dynamic type-check...

This gives flexibility, but at the cost of many potential run-time errors. Many uses might be better handled by Parametric Polymorphism, aka Generics. (cf. work by Martin Odersky at EPFL, Lausanne, now in Java 1.5)
(Very Simple) Objects

\begin{verbatim}
let val c:{get:unit \to int, inc:unit \to unit} =
  let val x:int ref = ref 0 in
  {get = fn y:unit \Rightarrow !x,
   inc = fn y:unit \Rightarrow x := 1+!x}
end

in

  (#inc c)(); (#get c)()
end
\end{verbatim}

\textit{Counter} = \{get:unit \to int, inc:unit \to unit\}.
Using Subtyping

```plaintext
let val c: {get: unit → int, inc: unit → unit, reset: unit → unit} =
  let val x: int ref = ref 0 in
  {get = fn y: unit ⇒ !x,
   inc = fn y: unit ⇒ x := 1 + !x,
   reset = fn y: unit ⇒ x := 0}
end

in

(#inc c)(); (#get c)()
end

ResetCounter = {get: unit → int, inc: unit → unit, reset: unit → unit}
<: Counter = {get: unit → int, inc: unit → unit}.```
Object Generators

let val newCounter:unit → {get:unit → int, inc:unit → unit} = 
    fn y:unit ⇒ 
        let val x:int ref = ref 0 in 
        {get = fn y:unit ⇒ !x, 
         inc = fn y:unit ⇒ x := 1+!x}
    end

in

    (#inc (newCounter ()) ()
end

and onwards to simple classes...
Reusing Method Code (Simple Classes)

Recall $Counter = \{\text{get:unit} \to \text{int}, \text{inc:unit} \to \text{unit}\}$.

First, make the internal state into a record.
CounterRep = \{p: \text{int} \; \text{ref}\}.

let val counterClass: CounterRep \rightarrow Counter =

fn x: CounterRep \Rightarrow

\{get = fn y: unit \Rightarrow !(#p x),
inc = fn y: unit \Rightarrow (#p x) := 1+!(#p x)\}

let val newCounter: unit \rightarrow Counter =

fn y: unit \Rightarrow

let val x: CounterRep = \{p = \text{ref} \ 0\} in
counterClass x
let val resetCounterClass: CounterRep → ResetCounter =
  fn x: CounterRep ⇒
  let val super = counterClass x in
  {get = #get super,
   inc = #inc super,
   reset = fn y: unit ⇒ (#p x) := 0}

CounterRep = {p: int ref}.

Counter = {get: unit → int, inc: unit → unit}.

ResetCounter = {get: unit → int, inc: unit → unit, reset: unit → unit}.
class Counter
{
    protected int p;

    Counter() { this.p=0; }

    int get () { return this.p; }

    void inc () { this.p++; }

};

class ResetCounter
    extends Counter
{
    void reset () {this.p=0;}

};
Subtyping – Structural vs Named

\[ A' = \{\} \text{ with } \{p: \text{int}\} \]
\[ A'' = A' \text{ with } \{q: \text{bool}\} \]
\[ A''' = A' \text{ with } \{r: \text{int}\} \]
Concurrency
Our focus so far has been on semantics for *sequential* computation. But the world is not sequential...

- hardware is intrinsically parallel (fine-grain, across words, to coarse-grain, e.g. multiple execution units)
- multi-processor machines
- multi-threading (perhaps on a single processor)
- networked machines
Problems

- the state-spaces of our systems become large, with the combinatorial explosion – with $n$ threads, each of which can be in 2 states, the system has $2^n$ states.
- the state-spaces become complex
- computation becomes nondeterministic (unless synchrony is imposed), as different threads operate at different speeds.
- parallel components competing for access to resources may deadlock or suffer starvation. Need mutual exclusion between components accessing a resource.
More Problems!

• *partial failure* (of some processes, of some machines in a network, of some persistent storage devices). Need *transactional mechanisms*.

• *communication between different environments* (with different local resources (e.g. different local stores, or libraries, or...))

• *partial version change*

• communication between administrative regions with *partial trust* (or, indeed, *no trust*); protection against malicious attack.

• dealing with contingent complexity (embedded historical accidents; upwards-compatible deltas)
Theme: as for sequential languages, but much more so, it’s a complicated world.

Aim of this lecture: just to give you a taste of how a little semantics can be used to express some of the fine distinctions. Primarily (1) to boost your intuition for informal reasoning, but also (2) this can support rigorous proof about really hairy crypto protocols, cache-coherency protocols, comms, database transactions,....

Going to define the simplest possible concurrent language, call it L1, and explore a few issues. You’ve seen most of them informally in C&DS.
Booleans $b \in \mathbb{B} = \{\text{true, false}\}$

Integers $n \in \mathbb{Z} = \{\ldots, -1, 0, 1, \ldots\}$

Locations $\ell \in \mathbb{L} = \{l, l_0, l_1, l_2, \ldots\}$

Operations $op ::= + \mid \geq$

Expressions

\[
e ::= n \mid b \mid e_1 \; op \; e_2 \mid \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3 \mid \ell := e \mid !\ell \mid \\
\text{skip} \mid e_1; e_2 \mid \\
\text{while } e_1 \; \text{do } e_2 \\
e_1 \mid e_2
\]
\[ T ::= \text{int} \mid \text{bool} \mid \text{unit} \mid \text{proc} \]

\[ T_{\text{loc}} ::= \text{intref} \]
Parallel Composition: Typing and Reduction

(thread) \[
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \text{unit}}{\Gamma \vdash e : \text{proc}}
\]

(parallel) \[
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \text{proc} \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \text{proc}}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 | e_2 : \text{proc}}
\]

(parallel1) \[
\frac{\langle e_1, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1', s' \rangle}{\langle e_1 | e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1' | e_2, s' \rangle}
\]

(parallel2) \[
\frac{\langle e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2', s' \rangle}{\langle e_1 | e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1 | e_2', s' \rangle}
\]
Parallel Composition: Design Choices

- threads don’t return a value
- threads don’t have an identity
- termination of a thread cannot be observed within the language
- threads aren’t partitioned into ‘processes’ or machines
- threads can’t be killed externally
Threads execute asynchronously – the semantics allows any interleaving of the reductions of the threads.

All threads can read and write the shared memory.
But, assignments and dereferencing are atomic. For example,
\[
\langle l := 3498734590879238429384 \mid l := 7, \{ l \mapsto 0 \} \rangle
\]
will reduce to a state with \( l \) either 3498734590879238429384 or 7, not something with the first word of one and the second word of the other. Implement?

But but, in \((l := e) \mid e'\), the steps of evaluating \( e \) and \( e' \) can be interleaved.

Think of \((l := 1+!l) \mid (l := 7+!l)\) – there are races....
The behaviour of \( (l := 1 + !l) | (l := 7 + !l) \) for the initial store \( \{l \mapsto 0\} \):
Morals

- There is a combinatorial explosion.
- Drawing state-space diagrams only works for really tiny examples – we need better techniques for analysis.
- Almost certainly you (as the programmer) didn’t want all those 3 outcomes to be possible – need better idioms or constructs for programming.
So, how do we get anything coherent done?

Need some way(s) to synchronize between threads, so can enforce mutual exclusion for shared data.

cf. Lamport’s “Bakery” algorithm from Concurrent and Distributed Systems. Can you code that in L1? If not, what’s the smallest extension required?

Usually, though, you can depend on built-in support from the scheduler, e.g. for mutexes and condition variables (or, at a lower level, \texttt{tas} or \texttt{cas}).
Adding Primitive Mutexes

Mutex names $m \in M = \{m, m_1, \ldots\}$

Configurations $\langle e, s, M \rangle$ where $M : M \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ is the mutex state

Expressions $e ::= \ldots \mid \text{lock } m \mid \text{unlock } m$

\[
\begin{align*}
\Gamma \vdash \text{lock } m : \text{unit} \\
\Gamma \vdash \text{unlock } m : \text{unit}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle \text{lock } m, s, M \rangle & \rightarrow \langle (), s, M + \{m \mapsto \text{true}\} \rangle \text{ if } \neg M(m) \\
\langle \text{unlock } m, s, M \rangle & \rightarrow \langle (), s, M + \{m \mapsto \text{false}\} \rangle
\end{align*}
\]
Need to adapt all the other semantic rules to carry the mutex state $M$ around. For example, replace

$$(\text{op2}) \quad \langle e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_2, s' \rangle$$

$$\langle v \ op \ e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle v \ op \ e'_2, s' \rangle$$

by

$$(\text{op2}) \quad \langle e_2, s, M \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_2, s', M' \rangle$$

$$\langle v \ op \ e_2, s, M \rangle \rightarrow \langle v \ op \ e'_2, s', M' \rangle$$
Using a Mutex

Consider

\[ e = (\text{lock } m; l := 1 + !l; \text{unlock } m) | (\text{lock } m; l := 7 + !l; \text{unlock } m) \]

The behaviour of \( \langle e, s, M \rangle \), with the initial store \( s = \{l \mapsto 0\} \) and initial mutex state \( M_0 = \lambda m \in M.\text{false} \), is:

\[ \langle (l := 1 + !l; \text{unlock } m) | (\text{lock } m; l := 7 + !l; \text{unlock } m), s, M' \rangle \]

(Where \( M' = M_0 + \{m \mapsto \text{true}\} \))
Using Several Mutexes

`lock m` can block (that’s the point). Hence, you can *deadlock*.

\[
e = \left( \text{lock } m_1; \text{lock } m_2; l_1 :=! l_2; \text{unlock } m_1; \text{unlock } m_2 \right) \\
| \left( \text{lock } m_2; \text{lock } m_1; l_2 :=! l_1; \text{unlock } m_1; \text{unlock } m_2 \right)
\]
Locking Disciplines

So, suppose we have several programs $e_1, \ldots, e_k$, all well-typed with $\Gamma \vdash e_i : \text{unit}$, that we want to execute concurrently without ‘interference’ (whatever that is). Think of them as transaction bodies.

There are many possible locking disciplines. We’ll focus on one, to see how it – and the properties it guarantees – can be made precise and proved.
An Ordered 2PL Discipline, Informally

Fix an association between locations and mutexes. For simplicity, make it 1:1 – associate \(l\) with \(m\), \(l_1\) with \(m_1\), etc.

Fix a lock acquisition order. For simplicity, make it \(m, m_0, m_1, m_2, \ldots\).

Require that each \(e_i\)

- acquires the lock \(m_j\) for each location \(l_j\) it uses, before it uses it
- acquires and releases each lock in a properly-bracketed way
- does not acquire any lock after it’s released any lock (two-phase)
- acquires locks in increasing order

Then, informally, \((e_1 | \ldots | e_k)\) should (a) never deadlock, and (b) be *serializable* – any execution of it should be ‘equivalent’ to an execution of \(e_{\pi(1)}; \ldots; e_{\pi(k)}\) for some permutation \(\pi\).
Problem: Need a Thread-Local Semantics

Our existing semantics defines the behaviour only of global configurations $\langle e, s, M \rangle$. To state properties of subexpressions, e.g.

- $e_i$ acquires the lock $m_j$ for each location $l_j$ it uses, before it uses it

which really means

- in any execution of $\langle (e_1 | ... | e_i | ... | e_k), s, M \rangle$, $e_i$ acquires the lock $m_j$ for each location $l_j$ it uses, before it uses it

we need some notion of the behaviour of the thread $e_i$ on its own
Solution: Thread local semantics

Instead of only defining the global \( \langle e, s, M \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e', s', M' \rangle \), with rules

\[(\text{assign1}) \quad \langle \ell := n, s, M \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{skip}, s + \{ \ell \mapsto n \}, M \rangle \quad \text{if} \quad \ell \in \text{dom}(s)\]

\[(\text{parallel1}) \quad \frac{\langle e_1, s, M \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e'_1, s', M' \rangle}{\langle e_1 | e_2, s, M \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e'_1 | e_2, s', M' \rangle}\]

define a per-thread \( e \xrightarrow{a} e' \) and use that to define \( \langle e, s, M \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e', s', M' \rangle \), with rules like

\[(\text{t-assign1}) \quad \ell := n \xrightarrow{\ell := n} \text{skip}\]

\[(\text{t-parallel1}) \quad \frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{a} e'_1}{e_1 | e_2 \xrightarrow{a} e'_1 | e_2}\]

\[(\text{c-assign}) \quad \frac{e \xrightarrow{\ell := n} e' \quad \ell \in \text{dom}(s)}{\langle e, s, M \rangle \longrightarrow \langle e', s + \{ \ell \mapsto n \}, M \rangle}\]
Note the per-thread rules don’t mention $s$ or $M$. Instead, we record in the label $a$ what interactions with the store or mutexes it has.

\[
a ::= \tau \mid \ell ::= n \mid !\ell = n \mid \text{lock } m \mid \text{unlock } m
\]

Conventionally, $\tau$ (tau), stands for “no interactions”, so $e \xrightarrow{\tau} e'$ if $e$ does an internal step, not involving the store or mutexes.

**Theorem 24 (Coincidence of global and thread-local semantics)** *The two definitions of $\rightarrow$ agree exactly.*

**Proof strategy:** a couple of rule inductions.
Example of Thread-local transitions

For \( e = (\text{lock } m; (l := 1+!l; \text{unlock } m)) \) we have

\[
\begin{align*}
  e & \xrightarrow{\text{lock } m} \text{skip; (l := 1+!l; unlock } m) \\
  & \xrightarrow{\tau} (l := 1+!l; \text{unlock } m) \\
  & \xrightarrow{!l=n} (l := 1 + n; \text{unlock } m) \quad \text{for any } n \in \mathbb{Z} \\
  & \xrightarrow{\tau} (l := n'; \text{unlock } m) \quad \text{for } n' = 1 + n \\
  & \xrightarrow{l:=n'} \text{skip; unlock } m \\
  & \xrightarrow{\tau} \text{unlock } m \\
  & \xrightarrow{\text{unlock } m} \text{skip}
\end{align*}
\]

Hence, using (t-parallel) and the (c-*) rules, for \( s' = s + \{ l \mapsto 1 + s(l) \} \),

\[
\langle e | e', s, M_0 \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \ldots \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle \text{skip} | e', s', M_0 \rangle
\]
### Global Semantics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{op } \mapsto) (n_1 + n_2, s, M) \rightarrow (n_1, s, M)$</td>
<td>if $n = n_1 + n_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{op } \geq) (n_1 \geq n_2, s, M) \rightarrow (b, s, M)$</td>
<td>if $b = (n_1 \geq n_2)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{op } 1)$</td>
<td>$(e_1, s, M) \rightarrow (e_1', s', M')$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{op } 2)$</td>
<td>$(v \cdot e_2, s, M) \rightarrow (v \cdot e_2', s', M')$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{deref}) (\ell, s, M) \rightarrow (n, s, M)$</td>
<td>if $\ell \in \text{dom}(s)$ and $n(\ell) = n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{assign } 1)$</td>
<td>$(\ell := n, s, M) \rightarrow (\text{skip}, s + {\ell \mapsto n}, M)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{assign } 2)$</td>
<td>$(e_1, s, M) \rightarrow (e_1', s', M')$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{seq } 1)$</td>
<td>$(\text{skip}; e_2, s, M) \rightarrow (e_2, s, M)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{seq } 2)$</td>
<td>$(e_1; e_2, s, M) \rightarrow (e_1', e_2', s', M')$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{if } 1)$</td>
<td>$(\text{if then } c_2 \text{ else } c_1, s, M) \rightarrow (c_2, s, M)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{if } 2)$</td>
<td>$(\text{if false then } c_2 \text{ else } c_1, s, M) \rightarrow (c_1, s, M)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{if } 3)$</td>
<td>$(\text{if then } c_2 \text{ else } c_1, s, M) \rightarrow (\text{if then } c_2 \text{ else } c_1, s, M)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{while } 1)$</td>
<td>$(\text{while } e_1 \text{ do } e_2, s, M) \rightarrow (\text{if } e_1 \text{ then } (e_2, s, M) \text{ while } e_1 \text{ do } e_2 \text{ else skip })$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{par } 1)$</td>
<td>$(e_1, s, M) \rightarrow (e_1', s', M')$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{par } 2)$</td>
<td>$(e_2, s, M) \rightarrow (e_2', s', M')$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{lock } 1)$</td>
<td>$(\text{lock } m, s, M) \rightarrow ({\ell, s, M + {m \mapsto \text{true}}})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{unlock } 1)$</td>
<td>$(\text{unlock } m, s, M) \rightarrow ({\ell, s, M + {m \mapsto \text{false}}})$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Thread-Local Semantics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{op } \mapsto) n_1 + n_2 \rightarrow n$</td>
<td>if $n = n_1 + n_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{op } \geq) n_1 \geq n_2 \rightarrow b$</td>
<td>if $b = (n_1 \geq n_2)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{op } 1)$</td>
<td>$e_1 \mapsto e_1'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{op } 2)$</td>
<td>$e_2 \mapsto e_2'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{deref}) \ell \mapsto n$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{assign } 1)$</td>
<td>$e_1 \mapsto e_1'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{assign } 2)$</td>
<td>$e_2 \mapsto e_2'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{seq } 1)$</td>
<td>$e_2 \rightarrow e_2'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{seq } 2)$</td>
<td>$e_1 \rightarrow e_1'$, $e_2 \rightarrow e_2'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{if } 1)$</td>
<td>$c_2 \rightarrow c_2'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{if } 2)$</td>
<td>$c_1 \rightarrow c_1'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{if } 3)$</td>
<td>$c_1 \rightarrow c_1'$; $c_2 \rightarrow c_2'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{while } 1)$</td>
<td>while $e_1$ do $e_2$ if $c_1$ then $(e_2$, while $e_1$ do $e_2$ else skip) }</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{par } 1)$</td>
<td>$e_1 \rightarrow e_1'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{par } 2)$</td>
<td>$e_2 \rightarrow e_2'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{lock } 1)$</td>
<td>$\text{lock } m \mapsto \text{false}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{unlock } 1)$</td>
<td>$\text{unlock } m \mapsto \text{false}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now can make the Ordered 2PL Discipline precise

Say $e$ obeys the discipline if for any (finite or infinite)

$$e \xrightarrow{a_1} e_1 \xrightarrow{a_2} e_2 \xrightarrow{a_3} \ldots$$

- if $a_i$ is $l_j := n$ or $!l_j = n$ then for some $k < i$ we have $a_k = \text{lock } m_j$ without an intervening $\text{unlock } m_j$.

- for each $j$, the subsequence of $a_1, a_2, \ldots$ with labels $\text{lock } m_j$ and $\text{unlock } m_j$ is a prefix of $((\text{lock } m_j)(\text{unlock } m_j))^*$. Moreover, if $\neg(e_k \xrightarrow{a} )$ then the subsequence does not end in a $\text{lock } m_j$.

- if $a_i = \text{lock } m_j$ and $a_i' = \text{unlock } m_j'$ then $i < i'$

- if $a_i = \text{lock } m_j$ and $a_i' = \text{lock } m_{j'}$ and $i < i'$ then $j < j'$
... and make the guaranteed properties precise

Say $e_1, \ldots, e_k$ are **serializable** if for any initial store $s$, if
\[
\langle (e_1 \mid \ldots \mid e_k), s, M_0 \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle e', s', M' \rangle \not\rightarrow
\]
then for some permutation $\pi$ we have
\[
\langle e_{\pi(1)}; \ldots; e_{\pi(k)}, s, M_0 \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle e'', s', M' \rangle.
\]

Say they are **deadlock-free** if for any initial store $s$, if
\[
\langle (e_1 \mid \ldots \mid e_k), s, M_0 \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle e', s', M \rangle \not\rightarrow
\]
then not $e' \xrightarrow{\text{lock } m} e''$, i.e. $e'$ does not contain any blocked **lock** $m$ subexpressions.

(Warning: there are many subtle variations of these properties!)
Theorem

Conjecture 25  If each $e_i$ obeys the discipline, then $e_1, \ldots, e_k$ are serializable and deadlock-free.

(may be false!)

Proof strategy: Consider a (derivation of a) computation

$$
\langle (e_1 | \ldots | e_k), s, M_0 \rangle \rightarrow \langle \hat{e}_1, s_1, M_1 \rangle \rightarrow \langle \hat{e}_2, s_2, M_2 \rangle \rightarrow \ldots
$$

We know each $\hat{e}_i$ is a corresponding parallel composition. Look at the points at which each $e_i$ acquires its final lock. That defines a serialization order. In between times, consider commutativity of actions of the different $e_i$ – the premises guarantee that many actions are semantically independent, and so can be permuted.
We’ve not discussed *fairness* – the semantics allows any interleaving between parallel components, not only fair ones.
Language Properties

(Obviously!) don’t have Determinacy.

Still have Type Preservation.

Have Progress, but it has to be modified – a well-typed expression of type proc will reduce to some parallel composition of unit values.

Typing and type inference is scarcely changed.

(very fancy type systems can be used to enforce locking disciplines)
Semantic Equivalence
\[ 2 + 2 \quad ? \quad 4 \]

In what sense are these two expressions the same?

They have different abstract syntax trees.

They have different reduction sequences.

But, you’d hope that in any program you could replace one by the other without affecting the result....

\[
\int_0^{2+2} e^{\sin(x)} \, dx = \int_0^4 e^{\sin(x)} \, dx
\]
How about $(l := 0; 4) \approx (l := 1; 3 + !l)$

They will produce the same result (in any store), but you cannot replace one by the other in an arbitrary program context. For example:

$C[\_] = \_+!l$

\[
C[l := 0; 4] = (l := 0; 4) + !l \\
\nequiv \\
C[l := 1; 3 + !l] = (l := 1; 3 + !l) + !l
\]

On the other hand, consider

$(l := !l + 1); (l := !l - 1) \approx (l := !l)$
Those were all particular expressions – may want to know that some general laws are valid for all $e_1, e_2, \ldots$. How about these:

$$e_1; (e_2; e_3) \sim (e_1; e_2); e_3$$

$$(\text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3); e \sim \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2; e \text{ else } e_3; e$$

$$e; (\text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3) \sim \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e; e_2 \text{ else } e; e_3$$

$$e; (\text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3) \sim \text{if } e; e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3$$
let val x = ref 0 in fn y:int ⇒ (x :=!x + y); !x
≈

let val x = ref 0 in fn y:int ⇒ (x :=!x − y); (0−!x)
Temporarily extend L3 with pointer equality

\[ \text{op ::= ... |=} \]

\[ \Gamma \vdash e_1 : T \, \text{ref} \]

\[ \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T \, \text{ref} \]

\[ (\text{op} =) \quad \frac{} \Gamma \vdash e_1 = e_2 : \text{bool} \]

\[ (\text{op} =) \quad \langle \ell = \ell', s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle b, s \rangle \quad \text{if} \ b = (\ell = \ell') \]
\[ f = \begin{array}{l}
\text{let val } x = \text{ref 0 in} \\
\text{let val } y = \text{ref 0 in} \\
\text{fn } z:\text{int ref } \Rightarrow \text{if } z = x \text{ then } y \text{ else } x \\
\text{end end}
\end{array} \]

\[ g = \begin{array}{l}
\text{let val } x = \text{ref 0 in} \\
\text{let val } y = \text{ref 0 in} \\
\text{fn } z:\text{int ref } \Rightarrow \text{if } z = y \text{ then } y \text{ else } x \\
\text{end end}
\end{array} \]

\[ f \equiv g \]
\[
f = \begin{aligned}
&\text{let val } x = \text{ref 0 in} \\
&\text{let val } y = \text{ref 0 in} \\
&\text{fn } z:\text{int ref } \Rightarrow \text{if } z = x \text{ then } y \text{ else } x
\end{aligned}
\]

\[
g = \begin{aligned}
&\text{let val } x = \text{ref 0 in} \\
&\text{let val } y = \text{ref 0 in} \\
&\text{fn } z:\text{int ref } \Rightarrow \text{if } z = y \text{ then } y \text{ else } x
\end{aligned}
\]

\[
f ? g \ldots \text{ no:}
\]

Consider \( C = t \), where

\[
t = \text{fn } h:\text{int ref } \rightarrow \text{int ref} \Rightarrow
\]

\[
\begin{aligned}
&\text{let val } z = \text{ref 0 in} \\
&h (h z) = h z
\end{aligned}
\]

\[
\langle t \, f, \{} \rangle \xrightarrow{*} \langle \text{false, ...} \rangle \\
\langle t \, g, \{} \rangle \xrightarrow{*} \langle \text{true, ...} \rangle
\]
With a ‘good’ notion of semantic equivalence, we might:

1. understand what a program is

2. prove that some particular expression (say an efficient algorithm) is equivalent to another (say a clear specification)

3. prove the soundness of general laws for equational reasoning about programs

4. prove some compiler optimizations are sound (source/IL/TAL)

5. understand the differences between languages
What does it mean for $\sim$ to be ‘good’?

1. programs that result in observably-different values (in some initial store) must not be equivalent

\[
(\exists \ s, s_1, s_2, v_1, v_2. \langle e_1, s \rangle \xrightarrow{*} \langle v_1, s_1 \rangle \wedge \langle e_2, s \rangle \xrightarrow{*} \langle v_2, s_2 \rangle \wedge v_1 \neq v_2) \implies e_1 \not\sim e_2
\]

2. programs that terminate must not be equivalent to programs that don’t

3. $\sim$ must be an equivalence relation

\[
e \sim e, \quad e_1 \sim e_2 \implies e_2 \sim e_1, \quad e_1 \sim e_2 \sim e_3 \implies e_1 \sim e_3
\]

4. $\sim$ must be a congruence

if $e_1 \sim e_2$ then for any context $C$ we must have $C[e_1] \sim C[e_2]

5. $\sim$ should relate as many programs as possible subject to the above.
Consider Typed L1 again.

Define \( e_1 \sim_T^\Gamma e_2 \) to hold iff for all \( s \) such that \( \text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s) \), we have \( \Gamma \vdash e_1 : T, \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T \), and either

(a) \( \langle e_1, s \rangle \longrightarrow^\omega \) and \( \langle e_2, s \rangle \longrightarrow^\omega \), or

(b) for some \( v, s' \) we have \( \langle e_1, s \rangle \longrightarrow^* \langle v, s' \rangle \) and \( \langle e_2, s \rangle \longrightarrow^* \langle v, s' \rangle \).
If $T = \text{unit}$ then $C = \_; \_l$.

If $T = \text{bool}$ then $C = \text{if } \_ \text{ then } !l \text{ else } !l$.

If $T = \text{int}$ then $C = l_1 := \_; \_l$. 
Congruence for Typed L1

The L1 contexts are:

\[
C ::= \_\ op\ e_2 \mid e_1\ op\ \_ \mid
\]

\[
\text{if } \_ \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3 \mid \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } \_ \text{ else } e_3 \mid
\]

\[
\text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } \_ \mid
\]

\[
\ell ::= \_ \mid
\]

\[
\_;\ e_2 \mid e_1;\_ \mid
\]

\[
\text{while } \_ \text{ do } e_2 \mid \text{while } e_1 \text{ do } \_
\]

Say \(\sim^T_T\) has the congruence property if whenever \(e_1 \sim^T_T e_2\) we have, for all \(C\) and \(T'\), if \(\Gamma \vdash C[e_1]:T'\) and \(\Gamma \vdash C[e_2]:T'\) then \(C[e_1] \sim^T_T C[e_2]\).
Theorem 26 (Congruence for L1) \( \sim^T_\Gamma \) has the congruence property.

**Proof Outline** By case analysis, looking at each L1 context \( C \) in turn.

For each \( C \) (and for arbitrary \( e \) and \( s \)), consider the possible reduction sequences

\[
\langle C[e], s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1, s_1 \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle \rightarrow \cdots
\]

For each such reduction sequence, deduce what behaviour of \( e \) was involved

\[
\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \hat{e}_1, \hat{s}_1 \rangle \rightarrow \cdots
\]

Using \( e \sim^T_\Gamma e' \) find a similar reduction sequence of \( e' \).

Using the reduction rules construct a sequence of \( C[e'] \).
Theorem 26 (Congruence for L1) $\sim_{\Gamma}^{T}$ has the congruence property.

By case analysis, looking at each L1 context in turn.

Case $C = (\ell := _)$. Suppose $e \sim_{\Gamma}^{T} e'$, $\Gamma \vdash \ell := e : T'$ and $\Gamma \vdash \ell := e' : T'$. By examining the typing rules $T = \text{int}$ and $T' = \text{unit}$.

To show $(\ell := e) \sim_{\Gamma}^{T'} (\ell := e')$ we have to show for all $s$ such that $\text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s)$, then $\Gamma \vdash \ell := e : T'$ (✓), $\Gamma \vdash \ell := e' : T'$ (✓), and either

1. $\langle \ell := e, s \rangle \rightarrow^{\omega} \omega$ and $\langle \ell := e', s \rangle \rightarrow^{\omega} \omega$, or

2. for some $v, s'$ we have $\langle \ell := e, s \rangle \rightarrow^{*} \langle v, s' \rangle$ and $\langle \ell := e', s \rangle \rightarrow^{*} \langle v, s' \rangle$. 

Consider the possible reduction sequences of a state \( \langle \ell := e, s \rangle \). Either:

**Case:** \( \langle \ell := e, s \rangle \rightarrow^\omega \), i.e.

\[
\langle \ell := e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1, s_1 \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle \rightarrow \ldots
\]

hence all these must be instances of (assign2), with

\[
\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \hat{e}_1, s_1 \rangle \rightarrow \langle \hat{e}_2, s_2 \rangle \rightarrow \ldots
\]

and \( e_1 = (\ell := \hat{e}_1), e_2 = (\ell := \hat{e}_2), \ldots \)

**Case:** \( \neg(\langle \ell := e, s \rangle \rightarrow^\omega) \), i.e.

\[
\langle \ell := e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1, s_1 \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle \ldots \rightarrow \langle e_k, s_k \rangle \not\rightarrow
\]

hence all these must be instances of (assign2) except the last, which must be an instance of (assign1), with

\[
\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \hat{e}_1, s_1 \rangle \rightarrow \langle \hat{e}_2, s_2 \rangle \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow \langle \hat{e}_{k-1}, s_{k-1} \rangle
\]

and \( e_1 = (\ell := \hat{e}_1), e_2 = (\ell := \hat{e}_2), \ldots, e_{k-1} = (\ell := \hat{e}_{k-1}) \) and for some \( n \) we have \( \hat{e}_{k-1} = n, e_k = \text{skip} \), and \( s_k = s_{k-1} + \{ \ell \mapsto n \} \).
Now, if \( \langle \ell := e, s \rangle \rightarrow^{\omega} \) we have \( \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow^{\omega} \), so by \( e \sim^{T} e' \) we have \( \langle e', s \rangle \rightarrow^{\omega} \), so (using (assign2)) we have \( \langle \ell := e', s \rangle \rightarrow^{\omega} \).

On the other hand, if \( \neg(\langle \ell := e, s \rangle \rightarrow^{\omega}) \) then by the above there is some \( n \) and \( s_{k-1} \) such that \( \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow^{*} \langle n, s_{k-1} \rangle \) and \( \langle \ell := e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{skip}, s_{k-1} + \{\ell \mapsto n\} \rangle \).

By \( e \sim^{T} e' \) we have \( \langle e', s \rangle \rightarrow^{*} \langle n, s_{k-1} \rangle \).

Then using (assign1)

\[
\langle \ell := e', s \rangle \rightarrow^{*} \langle \ell := n, s_{k-1} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{skip}, s_{k-1} + \{\ell \mapsto n\} \rangle = \langle e_{k}, s_{k} \rangle \text{ as required.}
\]
Back to the Examples

We defined $e_1 \sim^T_{\Gamma} e_2$ iff for all $s$ such that $\text{dom}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{dom}(s)$, we have
$\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T$, $\Gamma \vdash e_2 : T$, and either

1. $\langle e_1, s \rangle \rightarrow^* \omega$ and $\langle e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow^* \omega$, or

2. for some $v, s'$ we have $\langle e_1, s \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle v, s' \rangle$ and $\langle e_2, s \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle v, s' \rangle$.

So:

$2 + 2 \sim^{\text{int}}_{\Gamma} 4$ for any $\Gamma$

$(l := 0; 4) \not\sim^{\text{int}}_{\Gamma} (l := 1; 3 + !l)$ for any $\Gamma$

$(l := {!l + 1}); (l := {!l - 1}) \sim^{\text{unit}}_{\Gamma} (l := {!l})$ for any $\Gamma$ including $l:\text{intref}$
And the general laws?

**Conjecture 27** \( e_1; (e_2; e_3) \simeq_T (e_1; e_2); e_3 \) for any \( \Gamma, T, e_1, e_2 \) and \( e_3 \) such that \( \Gamma \vdash e_1: \text{unit}, \Gamma \vdash e_2: \text{unit}, \) and \( \Gamma \vdash e_3: T \)

**Conjecture 28**
\[
(((\text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3); e) \simeq_T ((\text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2; e \text{ else } e_3; e)) \text{ for any } \Gamma, T, e, e_1, e_2 \text{ and } e_3 \text{ such that } \Gamma \vdash e_1: \text{bool}, \Gamma \vdash e_2: \text{unit}, \Gamma \vdash e_3: \text{unit}, \text{ and } \Gamma \vdash e: T
\]

**Conjecture 29**
\[
(e; ((\text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3))) \simeq_T ((\text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e; e_2 \text{ else } e; e_3)) \text{ for any } \Gamma, T, e, e_1, e_2 \text{ and } e_3 \text{ such that } \Gamma \vdash e: \text{unit}, \Gamma \vdash e_1: \text{bool}, \Gamma \vdash e_2: T, \text{ and } \Gamma \vdash e_3: T
\]
Q: Is a typed expression $\Gamma \vdash e : T$, e.g.

\[ l : \text{intref} \vdash \text{if } !l \geq 0 \text{ then skip else (skip ; } l := 0) : \text{unit} \]:

1. a list of tokens \[[ \text{IF, DEREF, LOC "l", GTEQ, ..} ]\];

2. an abstract syntax tree

3. the function taking store $s$ to the reduction sequence

\[ \langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_1, s_1 \rangle \rightarrow \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle \rightarrow \ldots \]; or

4. \( \{ e' \mid e \sim^T_\Gamma e' \}\)

- the partial function $[e]_\Gamma$ that takes any store $s$ with

\[ \text{dom}(s) = \text{dom}(\Gamma) \] and either is undefined, if $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow^\omega$, or is

\[ \langle v, s' \rangle \] ; if $\langle e, s \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle v, s' \rangle$
Suppose $\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \text{unit}$ and $\Gamma \vdash e_2 : \text{unit}$.

When is $e_1 ; e_2 \sim^\text{unit}_\Gamma e_2 ; e_1$?
Contextual equivalence for L3

**Definition 30** Consider typed L3 programs, $\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T$ and $\Gamma \vdash e_2 : T$. We say that they are **contextually equivalent** if, for every context $C$ such that $\{\} \vdash C[e_1] : \text{unit}$ and $\{\} \vdash C[e_2] : \text{unit}$, we have either

(a) $\langle C[e_1], \{\} \rangle \rightarrow^\omega$ and $\langle C[e_2], \{\} \rangle \rightarrow^\omega$, or

(b) for some $s_1$ and $s_2$ we have $\langle C[e_1], \{\} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{skip}, s_1 \rangle$ and $\langle C[e_2], \{\} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{skip}, s_2 \rangle$. 
Low-level semantics
Can usefully apply semantics not just to high-level languages but to

- Intermediate Languages (e.g. Java Bytecode, MS IL, C−−)
- Assembly languages (esp. for use as a compilation target)
- C-like languages (cf. Cyclone)

By making these type-safe we can make more robust systems.

(see separate handout)
Epilogue
Lecture Feedback

Please do fill in the lecture feedback form – we need to know how the course could be improved / what should stay the same.
Good language design?

Need:

- precise definition of what the language is (so can communicate among the designers)
- technical properties (determinacy, decidability of type checking, etc.)
- pragmatic properties (usability in-the-large, implementability)
What can you use semantics for?

1. to understand a particular language — what you can depend on as a programmer; what you must provide as a compiler writer

2. as a tool for language design:
   (a) for expressing design choices, understanding language features and how they interact.
   (b) for proving properties of a language, eg type safety, decidability of type inference.

3. as a foundation for proving properties of particular programs
The End