Exercises for Lecture: Functional Programming Exercise Sheet 11 (λ -Calculus, Strictness)

Problem 1 (λ -Calculus)

An application $(\lambda x. E) A$ is evaluated (i.e., a β -reduction is performed) by substituting A for x in $E: (\lambda x. E) A \to_{\beta} E[x := A]$. Evaluate the following λ -expressions as far as possible (including the evaluation of arithmetic expressions). Underline the redex of each β -reduction and state the substitution explicitly (i.e., give the intermediate step E[x := A] before carrying out the substitution).

```
(a) (\lambda f. f(x+1)) (\lambda x. 2 \cdot x)
```

- (b) $(\lambda y. (\lambda x. x \cdot y) (y+1)) x$
- (c) $(\lambda f. f f) (\lambda x. (\lambda y. x)) (\lambda z. z)$

Problem 2 (Fixed-Point Operator)

The lecture introduced the fixed-point operator Y, which satisfies $Y =_{\beta} f$ (Y f), but not $Y f \rightarrow_{\beta} f$ (Y f). In other words, it is not possible to go from Y f to f (Y f) with β -reductions alone, on has to perform one β -reduction "backwards", i.e, formally, Y has the property that there is a λ -term t which satisfies $Y f \rightarrow_{\beta} t$ und f $(Y f) \rightarrow_{\beta} t$.

Show (by performing the necessary β -reductions) that the λ -term Z = V V with $V = (\lambda z \, x. \, x \, (z \, z \, x))$ has the property $Z f \rightarrow_{\beta} f (Z f)$.

(Y was discovered Haskell B. Curry, Z by Alan Turing.)

Problem 3 (Enriched λ -Calculus)

Let the following abstract syntax for λ -expressions be given (cf. the files Syntax.hs, Reduce.hs und Main.hs in Stud.IP):

```
data LExp = V String
                                     -- variable
          | CInt Int
                                     -- Int constant
          | CBool Bool
                                     -- Bool constant
          | LExp : @: LExp
                                     -- application
                                     -- \lambda-abstraction
          | L String LExp
          | If LExp LExp LExp
                                     -- If c t e means if c then t else e
          Y LExp
                                     -- fixed point operator
          | Prim Op [LExp]
                                     -- predefined operator
          deriving (Show)
```

This syntax has been enriched (compared to the simple λ -calculus) with constructors for integer and boolean constants, if-then-else, Y and primitive operations.

Complete the definitions in the modules Synatax and Reduce. Implement the functions

- (a) fv, bv :: LExp -> [String] to determine the free and bound variables in an expression,
- (b) occursNot :: [String] -> String to generate a fresh name,
- (c) substitute :: String -> LExp -> LExp for substitution, and
- (d) red_Redex_LMHead :: LExp -> Maybe LExp to perform a reduction step towards weak head normal form (WHNF). Use a suitable definition for a reduction step for Y und If.

Test your implementation with module Main. Calling main should output CInt 120 as the reduction result.

Problem 4 (Strictness of foldl)

Let us consider the function foldl again:

```
foldl :: (a \rightarrow b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a \rightarrow [b] \rightarrow a
foldl f x [] = x
foldl f x (y:ys) = foldl f (f x y) ys
```

We want to study how fold1 behaves when a strict function f is used. Start GHCi for this exercise with ghci +RTS -K10m -RTS to limit the stack to 10MB.

- (a) Evaluate in GHCi foldl (+) 0 [1..n] for different values of n; with the above setting for the run-time stack, a stack overflow should occur around n=320000 (on x86_64) or n=640000 (on x86). How is that possible although foldl is defined by a tail recursion?
- (b) Could the compiler, at least in theory, avoid the problem, if it had access to more information (e.g., about (+))?
- (c) The problem can be remediated by putting strictness annotations in the definition (using seq). Implement a function foldlStrict, which uses seq to realize a reduction with constant stack consumption. Test with

```
foldlStrict (+) 0 [1..10<sup>7</sup>].
```

Note: The semantics of x 'seq' y is to evaluate x, then return y. x is evaluated as far as is needed to determine which is the outermost constructor in the expression, i.e., x is evaluated to weak head normal form. The arguments of the constructor are not evaluated.

Examples:

```
Prelude> let x = error "bar" in x 'seq' 5
*** Exception: bar
Prelude> let x = error "bar" in 5
5
Prelude> let xs = [ 1, 2, 3 'div' 0 ] in xs 'seq' 42
42
(There is no exception here because xs = (:) 1 [ 2, 3 'div' 0 ]
and constructor arguments are not evaluated.)
```

Due date: Tuesday, July 4, 2023 at 16:00

Upload your solutions to the Submissions folder for this exercise in Stud.IP.