

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**CSE505, Winter 2012, Midterm Examination  
February 7, 2012**

Rules:

- The exam is closed-book, closed-notes, except for one side of one 8.5x11in piece of paper.
- **Please stop promptly at 10:20.**
- You can rip apart the pages, but please write your name on each page.
- There are **100 points** total, distributed **unevenly** among **5** questions (which have multiple parts).

Advice:

- Read questions carefully. Understand a question before you start writing.
- Write down thoughts and intermediate steps so you can get partial credit.
- The questions are not necessarily in order of difficulty. **Skip around.** In particular, make sure you get to all the problems.
- If you have questions, ask.
- Relax. You are here to learn.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

For your reference:

$$\begin{aligned}
 s &::= \text{skip} \mid x := e \mid s; s \mid \text{if } e \text{ } s \text{ } s \mid \text{while } e \text{ } s \\
 e &::= c \mid x \mid e + e \mid e * e \\
 (c &\in \{\dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots\}) \\
 (x &\in \{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots, \dots\})
 \end{aligned}$$

$H; e \Downarrow c$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{CONST} \\
 \frac{}{H; c \Downarrow c} \\
 \text{VAR} \\
 \frac{}{H; x \Downarrow H(x)} \\
 \text{ADD} \\
 \frac{H; e_1 \Downarrow c_1 \quad H; e_2 \Downarrow c_2}{H; e_1 + e_2 \Downarrow c_1 + c_2} \\
 \text{MULT} \\
 \frac{H; e_1 \Downarrow c_1 \quad H; e_2 \Downarrow c_2}{H; e_1 * e_2 \Downarrow c_1 * c_2}
 \end{array}$$

$H_1; s_1 \rightarrow H_2; s_2$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{ASSIGN} \\
 \frac{H; e \Downarrow c}{H; x := e \rightarrow H, x \mapsto c; \text{skip}} \\
 \text{SEQ1} \\
 \frac{}{H; \text{skip}; s \rightarrow H; s} \\
 \text{SEQ2} \\
 \frac{H; s_1 \rightarrow H'; s'_1}{H; s_1; s_2 \rightarrow H'; s'_1; s_2} \\
 \text{IF1} \\
 \frac{H; e \Downarrow c \quad c > 0}{H; \text{if } e \text{ } s_1 \text{ } s_2 \rightarrow H; s_1} \\
 \text{IF2} \\
 \frac{H; e \Downarrow c \quad c \leq 0}{H; \text{if } e \text{ } s_1 \text{ } s_2 \rightarrow H; s_2} \\
 \text{WHILE} \\
 \frac{}{H; \text{while } e \text{ } s \rightarrow H; \text{if } e \text{ } (s; \text{while } e \text{ } s) \text{ skip}}
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 e &::= \lambda x. e \mid x \mid e e \mid c \\
 v &::= \lambda x. e \mid c \\
 \tau &::= \text{int} \mid \tau \rightarrow \tau
 \end{aligned}$$

$e \rightarrow e'$

$$\frac{}{(\lambda x. e) v \rightarrow e[v/x]} \quad \frac{e_1 \rightarrow e'_1}{e_1 e_2 \rightarrow e'_1 e_2} \quad \frac{e_2 \rightarrow e'_2}{v e_2 \rightarrow v e'_2}$$

$e[e'/x] = e''$

$$\frac{}{x[e/x] = e} \quad \frac{y \neq x}{y[e/x] = y} \quad \frac{}{c[e/x] = c} \\
 \frac{e_1[e/x] = e'_1 \quad y \neq x \quad y \notin FV(e)}{(\lambda y. e_1)[e/x] = \lambda y. e'_1} \quad \frac{e_1[e/x] = e'_1 \quad e_2[e/x] = e'_2}{(e_1 e_2)[e/x] = e'_1 e'_2}$$

$\Gamma \vdash e : \tau$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash c : \text{int}} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash x : \Gamma(x)} \quad \frac{\Gamma, x : \tau_1 \vdash e : \tau_2}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x. e : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau_2}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 e_2 : \tau_1}$$

- Preservation: If  $\cdot \vdash e : \tau$  and  $e \rightarrow e'$ , then  $\cdot \vdash e' : \tau$ .
- Progress: If  $\cdot \vdash e : \tau$ , then  $e$  is a value or there exists an  $e'$  such that  $e \rightarrow e'$ .
- Substitution: If  $\Gamma, x : \tau' \vdash e : \tau$  and  $\Gamma \vdash e' : \tau'$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash e[e'/x] : \tau$ .

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

1. (35 points) This problem adds a single *toggle* to IMP. The *toggle* has two states: **up** and **down**. A new *expression* form **read** evaluates to 1 if the toggle is currently **up** and 0 if the toggle is currently **down**. A new *statement* form **toggle** switches the state of the toggle. The judgment forms for the operational semantics are adapted accordingly.

$$\begin{array}{l} e ::= \dots \mid \mathbf{read} \\ s ::= \dots \mid \mathbf{toggle} \\ t ::= \mathbf{up} \mid \mathbf{down} \end{array} \quad \boxed{H ; t ; e \Downarrow c} \quad \boxed{H ; t ; s \rightarrow H' ; t' ; s'}$$

- (a) Give *all* the inference rules for large-step expression evaluation.
- (b) Give *all* the inference rules for small-step statement evaluation.
- (c) If this statement is true, prove it formally, else give a counterexample:  
If  $H ; \mathbf{up} ; e \Downarrow c$ , then  $H ; \mathbf{up} ; e' \Downarrow c$  where  $e'$  is  $e$  with every **read** replaced by 1.
- (d) If this statement is true, prove it formally, else give a counterexample:  
(Notice the  $*$  for 0 or more steps)  
If  $H ; \mathbf{up} ; s \rightarrow^* H' ; \mathbf{up} ; \mathbf{skip}$ , then  $H ; \mathbf{up} ; s' \rightarrow^* H' ; \mathbf{up} ; \mathbf{skip}$  where  $s'$  is  $s$  with every **read** (in every expression) replaced by 1.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

(Extra space for answering problem 1)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

2. (31 points) This problem uses Caml and continues using IMP-with-toggle from problem 1. You are given the type definitions for IMP-with-toggle and the “mysterious” function `foo`:

```
type exp = Int of int | Var of string | Plus of exp * exp | Times of exp * exp | Read
type stmt = Skip | Assign of string * exp | Seq of stmt * stmt
           | If of exp * stmt * stmt | While of exp * stmt | Toggle
```

```
let foo lst =
  let rec f lst s =
    match lst with
    [] -> true
    | hd::tl -> hd <> s && f tl s in (* <> is "not equal" *)
  let rec g i =
    let t = "_t" ^ (string_of_int i) in (* ^ concatenates strings *)
    if f lst t then t else g (i+1) in
  g 0
```

- (a) Document `foo`: What does it take and what does it return (in terms of types and values)? Do *not* describe *how* `foo` is implemented.
- (b) Write a Caml function `allVars` of type `stmt -> string list` that returns all the variables appearing anywhere in the statement. Hints:
- Duplicate strings are fine; do *not* bother removing them.
  - Sample solution is approximately 15 lines total.
  - You will need a helper function.
  - Caml’s append operator `@` is very useful.
- (c) IMP-with-toggle is kind of stupid because we can *encode* the concept in regular IMP. Describe in 1–3 English sentences how you could *translate* IMP-with-toggle to regular IMP.
- (d) Implement the translation you described in part (c) with a Caml function `translate` of type `stmt -> stmt`. Hints:
- The result should not use `Toggle` or `Read`.
  - The sample solution is approximately 20 lines total.
  - You will need a helper function.
  - There’s a reason parts (a) and (b) are part of this problem.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

(Extra space for answering problem 2)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

3. (13 points) This problem uses the untyped lambda-calculus and full reduction. Recall this encoding of pairs:

- “mkpair”  $\lambda x. \lambda y. \lambda z. z x y$
- “fst”  $\lambda p. p \lambda x. \lambda y. x$
- “snd”  $\lambda p. p \lambda x. \lambda y. y$

We would expect a correct encoding to show “fst” (“mkpair”  $z z$ ) evaluates to  $z$ . But this sequence of steps allegedly shows that “fst” (“mkpair”  $z z$ ) evaluates to “fst”:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\lambda p. p \lambda x. \lambda y. x)((\lambda x. \lambda y. \lambda z. z x y) z z) \\ \rightarrow & (\lambda p. p \lambda x. \lambda y. x)((\lambda y. \lambda z. z z y) z) \\ \rightarrow & (\lambda p. p \lambda x. \lambda y. x)(\lambda z. z z z) \\ \rightarrow & (\lambda z. z z z) \lambda x. \lambda y. x \\ \rightarrow & (\lambda x. \lambda y. x) (\lambda x. \lambda y. x) (\lambda x. \lambda y. x) \\ \rightarrow & (\lambda y. (\lambda x. \lambda y. x)) (\lambda x. \lambda y. x) \\ \rightarrow & \lambda x. \lambda y. x \end{aligned}$$

- The sequence of steps is wrong. Which steps are wrong and why are they wrong?
- Show a correct sequence of steps that produces  $z$  but is otherwise very similar to the sequence of steps shown above.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

4. (10 points) In this problem, assume the simply-typed lambda calculus. For each of the following:

- If the answer is *yes*, give an example  $\Gamma$  and  $\tau$ .
- If the answer is *no*, you can just say “no.”

- (a) Is there a  $\Gamma$  and  $\tau$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x. x) x : \tau$  ?
- (b) Is there a  $\Gamma$  and  $\tau$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x. (x x) : \tau$  ?
- (c) Is there a  $\Gamma$  and  $\tau$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash x x : \tau$  ?
- (d) Is there a  $\Gamma$  and  $\tau$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash x (\lambda x. x) : \tau$  ?



Name: \_\_\_\_\_

5. (11 points) Consider this lemma, which is slightly different from the Preservation Lemma we proved for the simply-typed lambda calculus:

Differently Preserved: If  $\cdot \vdash e : \tau$  and  $e \rightarrow e'$ , then there exists a  $\tau'$  such that  $\cdot \vdash e' : \tau'$ .

- (a) Is the Differently Preserved Lemma *weaker*, *stronger*, or *incomparable* to the Preservation Lemma? Explain.
- (b) Is the Differently Preserved Lemma true? Explain.
- (c) Is the Differently Preserved Lemma (instead of the Preservation Lemma) and the Progress Lemma sufficient to prove Type Safety? Explain.
- (d) Explain why we proved the Preservation Lemma instead of just the Differently Preserved Lemma.