

[Dashboard](#) / [Courses](#) / [University](#) / [2021-2022](#) / [Spring 2022](#) / [Bachelors](#) / [Block 2 Bs](#) / [\[S22\]ACC&PA](#) / [Quizzes — 10%](#)  
/ [Quiz 3 — Mar 31 from 9:10 to 9:20 \(10 minutes\)](#)

**Started on** Thursday, 31 March 2022, 9:10 AM

**State** Finished

**Completed on** Thursday, 31 March 2022, 9:17 AM

**Time taken** 7 mins 24 secs

**Marks** 3.00/4.00

**Grade** 7.50 out of 10.00 (75%)

**Question 1**

Correct

Mark 1.00 out of 1.00

True or False? Let binding can be defined as a derived form by using a lambda abstraction, but only if the type of the binding is explicitly specified in the let. In other words:

- **let  $x = t_1$  in  $t_2$**  cannot be a derived form in simply typed lambda calculus
- **let  $x:T = t_1$  in  $t_2$**  can be a derived form in simply typed lambda calculus

Select one:

- ☐ True
- ☒ False ✓

The correct answer is 'False'.

## Question 2

Correct

Mark 1.00 out of 1.00

Consider the following lambda term with records. Is it well-typed? If yes, what is the type? If not, what is the type error?

**let**  $f = (\lambda x:\{a:\text{Nat}, b:\text{Bool}\}. \{a = x.b, b = x.a\})$  **in**  $f \{a = 1, b = \text{true}\}$

- ☐ a. Ill-typed.  $x$  is not a record
- ☐ b. Ill-typed.  $x.b$  is expected to have type  $\text{Nat}$ , but actually has type  $\text{Bool}$
- ☐ c. Well-typed.  $\{a:\text{Nat}, b:\text{Bool}\}$
- ☒ d. Well-typed.  $\{a:\text{Bool}, b:\text{Nat}\}$
- ☐ e. Ill-typed.  $x.a$  is expected to have type  $\text{Nat}$ , but actually has type  $\text{Bool}$
- ☐ f. Ill-typed.  $x.a$  is expected to have type  $\text{Bool}$ , but actually has type  $\text{Nat}$
- ☐ g. Ill-typed. Cannot apply  $f$  to  $\{a = 1, b = \text{true}\}$ , as it does not have the right type.
- ☐ h. Ill-typed.  $x.b$  is expected to have type  $\text{Bool}$ , but actually has type  $\text{Nat}$



Your answer is correct.

The correct answer is:

Well-typed.  $\{a:\text{Bool}, b:\text{Nat}\}$

## Question 3

Correct

Mark 1.00 out of 1.00

Consider the following lambda term with records. Is it well-typed? If yes, what is the type? If not, what is the type error?

**let**  $f = (\lambda x:\{a:\text{Nat}, b:\text{Nat}\}. \{a = x.b, b = x.a\})$  **in**  $f \{a = 1, b = \text{true}\}$

- ☐ a. Ill-typed.  $x.b$  is expected to have type  $\text{Bool}$ , but actually has type  $\text{Nat}$
- ☐ b. Ill-typed.  $x.a$  is expected to have type  $\text{Nat}$ , but actually has type  $\text{Bool}$
- ☐ c. Ill-typed.  $x.a$  is expected to have type  $\text{Bool}$ , but actually has type  $\text{Nat}$
- ☐ d. Ill-typed.  $x.b$  is expected to have type  $\text{Nat}$ , but actually has type  $\text{Bool}$
- ☐ e. Ill-typed.  $x$  is not a record
- ☐ f. Well-typed.  $\{a:\text{Nat}, b:\text{Bool}\}$
- ☒ g. Ill-typed. Cannot apply  $f$  to  $\{a = 1, b = \text{true}\}$ , as it does not have the right type.
- ☐ h. Well-typed.  $\{a:\text{Bool}, b:\text{Nat}\}$



Your answer is correct.

The correct answer is:

Ill-typed. Cannot apply  $f$  to  $\{a = 1, b = \text{true}\}$ , as it does not have the right type.

## Question 4

Incorrect

Mark 0.00 out of 1.00

Assuming call-by-value evaluation strategy with standard one-step reduction semantics, how many steps does it take to evaluate the following term with pairs?

$(\lambda x:\text{Nat} \times \text{Nat}. \{x.2, x.1\}) \{\text{pred}(\text{succ } 0), \text{if true then } \{0, \text{false}\} \text{ else } \{1, \text{true}\}\}$

Select one:

- ☐ a. 6
- ☐ b. 2
- ☒ c. 3
- ☐ d. 5
- ☐ e. 1
- ☐ f. 9
- ☐ g. 10
- ☐ h. 0 (this term is already a value)
- ☐ i. This term will get stuck during evaluation.
- ☐ j. 4
- ☐ k. 8
- ☐ l. 7
- ☐ m. Infinitely many. This term will never compute to a value.



Your answer is incorrect.

The correct answers are:

5,

6,

Infinitely many. This term will never compute to a value.,

This term will get stuck during evaluation.

◀ Quiz 2 — Mar 30 from 10:50 to 11:00 (10 minutes)

Jump to...

Quiz 4 — Apr 6 from 10:50 to 11:00 (10 minutes) ►

[Data retention summary](#)

[Get the mobile app](#)