# Typed Lambda Calculus (2/3)

#### Eduardo Bonelli

"There may, indeed, be other applications of the system other than its use as a logic"

Alonzo Church, 1932

February 14, 2019

### Two More Extensions

References

Imperative Programming = Functional Programming + Effects

- Recursion
  - None of the extensions seen up until now allow the definition of recursive functions
  - All functions currently definable are total

### References - Motivation

- ▶ In an expression such as let x = 2 in M
  - x is a variable declared to have value 2
  - ▶ The value of x remains unaltered during the evaluation of M
  - ▶ In this sense x is immutable: there is no assignment operation
- ► In imperative programming every variable is mutable
- We extend  $\lambda_V^{\mathbb{B}, \to}$  with mutable variables

## **Basic Operations**

#### Allocation

ref M generates a fresh reference whose contents is the value of M

#### Dereference

!x dereferences reference x and returns its contents

### Assignment

x := M updates the contents of reference x with the value of M

- ▶ let  $x = ref \ \underline{2} \ in \ (\lambda_- : unit.!x) \ (x := succ(!x))$  evaluates to  $\underline{3}$
- ▶ What does *let* x = ref 2 *in* x evaluate to?
- ▶ let x = 2 in x evaluates to 2
- ▶ let  $x = ref \ \underline{2}$  in let y = x in  $(\lambda_- : unit.!x) (y := succ(!y))$  evaluates to  $\underline{3}$ 
  - x and y are aliases for the same memory cell

## Commands = Expressions with Effects

- ▶ Consider let  $x = ref \ 2$  in x := succ(!x). What is its value?
- Assignment is evaluated to cause an effect, not return a value
  - ▶ Hence it makes little sense to consider the value of assignment
  - It does make sense to ask about its effect

### Command

Expression that is evaluated to cause an effect; we set *unit* to be its value

Pure Functional Language: one in which all expressions are pure in the sense of causing no effects

# Type Expressions for $\lambda_V^{\mathbb{B},\mathbb{U}, o,Ref}$

The type expressions are extended as follows:

$$\sigma ::= \ldots | Ref \sigma$$

### Informally:

- Ref  $\sigma$  is the type of references to values of type  $\sigma$
- ▶ Eg. Ref ( $\mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{N}$ ) is type of references to functions from  $\mathbb{B}$  to  $\mathbb{N}$

### **Terms**

$$\begin{array}{cccc} M & ::= & x \\ & \mid & \lambda x : \sigma.M \\ & \mid & M N \\ & \mid & unit \\ & \mid & ref & M \\ & \mid & !M \\ & \mid & M := N \end{array}$$

The type system must exclude "illegal" terms such as:

- ▶ !2
- **▶** 2 := 3

## Typing Rules

- Presented in two stages
- First presentation:
  - Preliminary
  - based on syntax of terms introduced up until now
- Second presentation:
  - Definitive
  - when presenting the operational semantics the need will arise to extend the syntax
  - based on this extended syntax

# Typing Rules - Preliminary

$$\frac{\Gamma \rhd M_1 : \sigma}{\Gamma \rhd ref \ M_1 : Ref \ \sigma} \text{(T-Ref)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rhd M_1 : Ref \ \sigma}{\Gamma \rhd ! M_1 : \sigma} \text{(T-DeRef)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rhd M_1 : Ref \ \sigma}{\Gamma \rhd M_1 : Ref \ \sigma_1 \quad \Gamma \rhd M_2 : \sigma_1} \text{(T-Assign)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rhd M_1 : Ref \ \sigma_1 \quad \Gamma \rhd M_2 : \sigma_1}{\Gamma \rhd M_1 := M_2 : \mathbb{U}} \text{(T-Assign)}$$

- ▶ let  $x = ref \ \underline{2} \ in \ (\lambda_- : unit.!x) \ (x := succ(!x))$
- ▶ let x = ref 2 in x
- let x = in x
- ▶ let  $x = ref \ \underline{2}$  in let y = x in  $(\lambda_- : unit.!x) (y := succ(!y))$

Note: the item in the first bullet can also be written as follows:

let 
$$x = ref \underline{2}$$
 in  $(x := succ(!x))$ ; !x

## **Operational Semantics**

- ▶ What are the values of type  $Ref \sigma$ ?
- ▶ How may we model evaluation of the term *ref M*?

The answers depend on another question:

What is a reference?

A. It is an abstraction of a portion of memory

## Memory or Store

▶ We use symbolic addresses or "locations"  $I, I_i \in \mathcal{L}$  to model references

Memory (or store): partial function from locations to values

- ▶ We use letters  $\mu, \mu'$  for stores
- ► Notation:=
  - $\mu[I \mapsto V]$  is the store obtained from  $\mu$  by overriding  $\mu(I)$  with V
  - ▶  $\mu \oplus (I \mapsto V)$  is an extended store resulting from extending  $\mu$  with a new association  $I \mapsto V$  (we assume  $I \notin Dom(\mu)$ )

### Evaluation judgements:

$$M \mid \mu \rightarrow M' \mid \mu'$$

### **Values**

Intuition:

$$\frac{l \notin Dom(\mu)}{ref \ V \mid \mu \to l \mid \mu \oplus (l \mapsto V)}$$
(E-REFV)

Possible values now include locations

$$V ::= unit | \lambda x : \sigma.M | I$$

Given that values are a subset of the terms,

- we must add locations to terms
- note that these are not meant for programmers to manipulate explicitly

## **Terms**

```
M ::= x
| \lambda x : \sigma.M
| M N
| unit
| ref M
| !M
| M := N
```

# Typing Judgement

**□** ▷ / : ?

- Depends on the values stored in I
- Similar situation to that of free variables
- ▶ We need a "typing context" for locations:
  - ightharpoonup partial function from locations to types

New Typing Judgement

$$\Gamma | \Sigma \triangleright M : \sigma$$

# Typing Rules - Definitive

$$\frac{\Gamma|\Sigma \rhd M_1 : \sigma}{\Gamma|\Sigma \rhd ref \ M_1 : Ref \ \sigma} (\text{T-Ref})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma|\Sigma \rhd M_1 : Ref \ \sigma}{\Gamma|\Sigma \rhd !M_1 : \sigma} (\text{T-DeRef})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma|\Sigma \rhd M_1 : Ref \ \sigma}{\Gamma|\Sigma \rhd M_1 : Ref \ \sigma_1 \quad \Gamma|\Sigma \rhd M_2 : \sigma_1} (\text{T-Assign})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma|\Sigma \rhd M_1 := M_2 : \mathbb{U}}{\Gamma|\Sigma \rhd I : Ref \ \sigma} (\text{T-Loc})$$

# Evaluation Judgement - Small-Step

- We now return to the operational semantics
- ► We introduce axioms and inference rules that define the meaning of evaluation judgements

$$M \mid \mu \rightarrow M' \mid \mu'$$

Recall the set of values:

$$V ::= unit | \lambda x : \sigma.M | I$$

# Evaluation Judgement (1/4)

$$\frac{M_1 \mid \mu \to M_1' \mid \mu'}{M_1 M_2 \mid \mu \to M_1' M_2 \mid \mu'} \text{(E-APP1)}$$

$$\frac{M_2 \mid \mu \to M_2' \mid \mu'}{V_1 M_2 \mid \mu \to V_1 M_2' \mid \mu'} \text{(E-APP2)}$$

$$\frac{(\lambda x : \sigma.M) V \mid \mu \to M\{x := V\} \mid \mu}{(\lambda x : \sigma.M) V \mid \mu \to M\{x := V\} \mid \mu}$$

Note: These rules do not modify the store

# Evaluation Judgement (2/4)

$$\frac{M_1 \mid \mu \to M_1' \mid \mu'}{!M_1 \mid \mu \to !M_1' \mid \mu'} \text{(E-DEREF)}$$

$$\frac{\mu(I) = V}{!I \mid \mu \to V \mid \mu} \text{(E-DEREFLOC)}$$

# Evaluation Judgement (3/4)

$$\frac{M_1 \mid \mu \to M_1' \mid \mu'}{M_1 := M_2 \mid \mu \to M_1' := M_2 \mid \mu'} \text{(E-Assign1)}$$

$$\frac{M_2 \mid \mu \to M_2' \mid \mu'}{V := M_2 \mid \mu \to V := M_2' \mid \mu'} \text{(E-Assign2)}$$

$$\frac{I := V \mid \mu \to unit \mid \mu[I \mapsto V]}{I := V \mid \mu \to unit \mid \mu[I \mapsto V]}$$

# Evaluation Judgement (4/4)

$$\frac{\mathit{M}_{1} \mid \mu \to \mathit{M}_{1}' \mid \mu'}{\mathit{ref} \; \mathit{M}_{1} \mid \mu \to \mathit{ref} \; \mathit{M}_{1}' \mid \mu'} \text{(E-Ref)}$$

$$\frac{\mathit{I} \notin \mathit{Dom}(\mu)}{\mathit{ref} \; \textcolor{red}{V} \mid \mu \to \mathit{I} \mid \mu \oplus (\mathit{I} \mapsto \textcolor{red}{V})} \text{(E-RefV)}$$

```
\begin{array}{l} \textit{let } x = \textit{ref } 2 \textit{ in } (\lambda_{-} : \mathbb{U}.!x) \, \big( x := \textit{succ}(!x) \big) \\ \rightarrow \quad \textit{let } x = \textit{l}_{1} \textit{ in } (\lambda_{-} : \mathbb{U}.!x) \, \big( x := \textit{succ}(!x) \big) \mid \mu \oplus (\textit{l}_{1} \mapsto \underline{2}) \\ \rightarrow \quad (\lambda_{-} : \mathbb{U}.!\textit{l}_{1}) \, \big( \textit{l}_{1} := \textit{succ}(!\textit{l}_{1}) \big) \\ \rightarrow \quad (\lambda_{-} : \mathbb{U}.!\textit{l}_{1}) \, \big( \textit{l}_{1} := \textit{succ}(\underline{2}) \big) \\ \rightarrow \quad (\lambda_{-} : \mathbb{U}.!\textit{l}_{1}) \, \textit{unit } \mid \mu [\textit{l}_{1} := \underline{3}] \\ \rightarrow \quad !\textit{l}_{1} \\ \rightarrow \quad 3 \end{array}
```

Sea

```
M = \lambda r : Ref(\mathbb{U} \to \mathbb{U}).
                               let f = 1r
                                 in (r := \lambda x : \mathbb{U}.f x); (!r) unit
         M(ref(\lambda x : \mathbb{U}.x))
\rightarrow M l_1 \mid \mu \oplus (l_1 \mapsto \lambda x : \mathbb{U}.x)
\rightarrow let f = |I_1| in (I_1 := \lambda x : \mathbb{U}.f x); (!I_1) unit
\rightarrow let f = \lambda x : \mathbb{U}.x in (I_1 := \lambda x : \mathbb{U}.f x); (!I_1) unit
\rightarrow (I_1 := \lambda x : \mathbb{U}.(\lambda x : \mathbb{U}.x)x); (!I_1) unit
\rightarrow unit; (!I_1) unit
\rightarrow (!/1) unit | \mu \oplus (I_1 \mapsto \lambda x : \mathbb{U}.(\lambda x : \mathbb{U}.x)x)
\rightarrow (\lambda x : \mathbb{U}.(\lambda x : \mathbb{U}.x)x) unit
\rightarrow (\lambda x : \mathbb{U}.x) unit
\rightarrow unit
```

Sea

$$M = \lambda r : Ref(\mathbb{U} \to \mathbb{U}).$$

$$let f = !r$$

$$in (r := \lambda x : \mathbb{U}.f x); (!r) unit$$

We replace f with !r obtaining

$$M = \lambda r : Ref (\mathbb{U} \to \mathbb{U}).$$
  
 $(r := \lambda x : \mathbb{U}.(!r) x); (!r) unit$ 

Let us evaluate the new M and see what happens...

```
M = \lambda r : Ref (\mathbb{U} \to \mathbb{U}).
                      (r := \lambda x : \mathbb{U}.(!r)x); (!r) unit
         M(ref(\lambda x : \mathbb{U}.x))
\rightarrow M I_1 \mid \mu \oplus (I_1 \mapsto \lambda x : \mathbb{U}.x)
\rightarrow (I_1 := \lambda x : \mathbb{U}.(!I_1)x); (!I_1) unit
\rightarrow (!l_1) unit \mid \mu \oplus (l_1 \mapsto \lambda x : \mathbb{U}.(!l_1) x)
\rightarrow (\lambda x : \mathbb{U}.(!I_1)x) unit
\rightarrow (!I_1) unit
```

Note: Not every typable term in  $\lambda_V^{\mathbb{B},\mathbb{U},\to,Ref}$  is terminating

### References

Motivation Types and Typing Operational Semantics

## Safety

Termination for  $\lambda_V^{\mathbb{B},\mathbb{U},\to,Ref}$ 

#### Recursion

Introduction
Syntax, Typing, Semantics

## Safety - Last Class

$$Safety = Progress + Preservation$$

### **Progress**

If M is closed and typable, then

- 1. M is a value; or
- 2. there exists M' s.t.  $M \rightarrow M'$

Evaluation cannot get stuck on closed, typable terms that are not values

### Preservation

If  $\Gamma \rhd M : \sigma$  and  $M \to N$ , then  $\Gamma \rhd N : \sigma$ 

Evaluation preserves types

Must revise!

### Preservation - Naive Formulation

The naive formulation is incorrect:

$$\Gamma | \Sigma \rhd M : \sigma \text{ and } M | \mu \to M' | \mu' \text{ imply } \Gamma | \Sigma \rhd M' : \sigma$$

- ▶ The problem: evaluation may not respect the types for the locations assumed by the type system (i.e.  $\Sigma$ )
- Example

## Preservation - Naive Formulation

$$\Gamma | \Sigma \rhd M : \sigma \text{ and } M | \mu \to M' | \mu' \text{ implies } \Gamma | \Sigma \rhd M' : \sigma$$

### Suppose

- ► M =!/
- Γ = ∅
- $\triangleright \Sigma(I) = \mathbb{N}$
- $\blacktriangleright \mu(I) = true$

#### Note that

- ▶  $\Gamma \mid \Sigma \triangleright M : \mathbb{N}$ ; and
- $M \mid \mu \rightarrow true \mid \mu$ ;
- ▶ but  $\Gamma | \Sigma \triangleright true : \mathbb{N}$  fails

### Preservation - Naive Formulation

$$\Gamma | \Sigma \rhd M : \sigma \text{ and } M | \mu \to M' | \mu' \text{ implies } \Gamma | \Sigma \rhd M' : \sigma$$

### Suppose

- ► M =!/
- Γ = ∅
- $ightharpoonup \Sigma(I) = \boxed{\mathbb{N}}$
- $\blacktriangleright \mu(I) = \boxed{\text{true}}$

#### Note that

- ▶  $\Gamma \mid \Sigma \triangleright M : \mathbb{N}$ ; and
- $M \mid \mu \rightarrow true \mid \mu$
- ▶ but  $\Gamma | \Sigma \triangleright true : \mathbb{N}$  fails

### Preservation - Revisited

- We need a notion of compatibility between the store and the typing context for stores
  - ► We have to type stores
- New typing judgement

$$\Gamma | \Sigma > \mu$$

Defined as follows:

$$\Gamma | \Sigma \rhd \mu \text{ iff}$$

- 1.  $Dom(\Sigma) = Dom(\mu)$ ; and
- 2.  $\Gamma | \Sigma \rhd \mu(I) : \Sigma(I)$  for all  $I \in Dom(\mu)$

### Preservation - Revisited

Si 
$$\Gamma | \Sigma \rhd M : \sigma \lor M \to N \lor \Gamma | \Sigma \rhd \mu : \Sigma$$
, entonces  $\Gamma | \Sigma \rhd N : \sigma$ 

- Almost correct
- ightharpoonup Does not cater for the possibility that the domain of  $\Sigma$  might have grown
  - ▶ Due to possible allocations

## Preservation - Revisited

- $ightharpoonup \Gamma | \Sigma \rhd M : \sigma;$
- ightharpoonup M o N; and
- $\triangleright \Gamma | \Sigma \triangleright \mu : \Sigma$

imply there exist  $\Sigma' \supseteq \Sigma$  s.t.  $\Gamma|\Sigma' \rhd N : \sigma$ 

## Progress - Revisited

If *M* is closed and typed (i.e.  $\emptyset \Sigma \triangleright M : \sigma$  for some  $\Sigma, \sigma$ ) then

- 1. M is a value; or
- 2. for any store  $\mu$  s.t.  $\emptyset | \Sigma \rhd \mu$ , there exists M' and  $\mu'$  s.t.  $M | \mu \to M' | \mu'$

### References

 $\begin{array}{l} \text{Motivation} \\ \text{Types and Typing} \\ \text{Operational Semantics} \\ \text{Safety} \\ \text{Termination for } \lambda_V^{\mathbb{B},\mathbb{U},\rightarrow,\textit{Ref}} \end{array}$ 

#### Recursion

Introduction
Syntax, Typing, Semantics

### References

- G. Boudol. Typing termination in a higher-order concurrent imperative language. In Proc. CONCUR, Springer LNCS 4703:272-286, 2007.
- ▶ Roberto M. Amadio: On Stratified Regions. APLAS 2009: 210-225

### References

 $\begin{array}{l} \text{Motivation} \\ \text{Types and Typing} \\ \text{Operational Semantics} \\ \text{Safety} \\ \text{Termination for } \lambda_V^{\mathbb{B},\mathbb{U},\rightarrow,Ref} \end{array}$ 

#### Recursion

#### Introduction

Syntax, Typing, Semantics

### Recursion

### Recursive equation

$$f = \dots f \dots f \dots$$

### Two explanations

- Denotational
  - Limit of a sequence of approximations
- Operational
  - ▶ The "unfolder" and fixed-points

Note: On the board

# Terms and Types

$$M ::= \ldots \mid fix M$$

- No new types
- New typing rule

$$\frac{\Gamma \rhd M : \sigma_1 \to \sigma_1}{\Gamma \rhd \textit{fix } M : \sigma_1} \text{ (T-Fix)}$$

# Semántica operacional small-step

- No new values
- New evaluation rules

$$\frac{M_1 \to M_1'}{\textit{fix } M_1 \to \textit{fix } M_1'} \left(\text{E-Fix}\right)$$

$$\frac{}{\textit{fix } (\lambda x : \sigma.M) \to M\{x := \textit{fix } (\lambda x : \sigma.M)\}} \left(\text{E-FixBeta}\right)$$

# **Examples**

#### Let *M* be the term

$$\lambda f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}.$$
 $\lambda x : \mathbb{N}.$ 
if  $x = 0$  then  $\underline{1}$  else  $x * f(pred(x))$ 

in

let fact = fix M in fact  $\underline{3}$ 

# **Examples**

$$fix(\lambda x: \mathbb{N}.x+1)$$

# **Examples**

#### Let M be the term

```
\lambda s : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}.
\lambda x : \mathbb{N}.
\lambda y : \mathbb{N}.
if x = 0 then y else succ(s \operatorname{pred}(x) y)
```

in

let sum = fix M in  $sum \underline{23}$ 

#### Letrec

## Alternative primitive for defining recursive functions

*letrec* 
$$f : \sigma = \lambda x : \tau.M$$
 *in*  $N$ 

For example,

letrec

fact : 
$$\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N} = \lambda x$$
 :  $\mathbb{N}$ .if  $x = 0$  then  $\underline{1}$  else  $x * f(pred(x))$  in fact 3

letrec can be encoded using fix:

*let* 
$$f = fix(\lambda f : \sigma \to \sigma.\lambda x : \tau.M)$$
 *in* N