

CS3520
Programming Languages Concepts

Instructor: **Matthew Flatt**

Programming Languages Concepts

This course teaches concepts in two ways:

- **By implementing interpreters**
 - new concept => extend interpreter
- **By using Scheme**
 - we assume that you *don't* already know Scheme

Course Details

<http://www.cs.utah.edu/classes/cs3520/>

Bootstrapping Problem

- We'll learn about languages by writing interpreters in Scheme
- We'll learn about Scheme...
 - by writing an interpreter...
 - in ~~Scheme~~ **set theory**
- More specifically, we'll define Scheme as an extension of **algebra**

Algebra is a programming language?

Algebra as a Programming Language

- Algebra has a grammar:
 - $(1 + 2)$ is a legal expression
 - $(1 + +)$ is not a legal expression
- Algebra has rules for evaluation:
 - $(1 + 2) = 3$
 - $f(17) = (17 + 3) = 20$ if $f(x) = (x + 3)$

A Grammar for Algebra Programs

The grammar in **BNF** (Backus-Naur Form; *EoPL* sec 1.1.2):

```
<prog> ::= <defn>* <expr>
<defn> ::= <id>(<id>) = <expr>
<expr> ::= (<expr> + <expr>)
         ::= (<expr> - <expr>)
         ::= <id>(<expr>)
         ::= <id> | <n>
<id>    ::= a variable name: f, x, y, z, ...
<n>     ::= a number: 1, 42, 17, ...
```

- Each **meta-variable**, such as `<prog>`, defines a set

Using a BNF Grammar

```
<id> ::= a variable name: f, x, y, z, ...
<n>  ::= a number: 1, 42, 17, ...
```

- The set `<id>` is the set of all variable names
- The set `<n>` is the set of all numbers
- To make an example member of `<n>`, simply pick an element from the set

$1 \in \langle n \rangle$

$198 \in \langle n \rangle$

Using a BNF Grammar

```
<expr> ::= (<expr> + <expr>)
         ::= (<expr> - <expr>)
         ::= <id>(<expr>)
         ::= <id> | <n>
```

- The set `<expr>` is defined in terms of other sets

Using a BNF Grammar

```
<expr> ::= (<expr> + <expr>)  
        ::= (<expr> - <expr>)  
        ::= <id>(<expr>)  
        ::= <id> | <n>
```

- To make an example `<expr>`:
 - choose one case in the grammar
 - pick an example for each meta-variable
 - combine the examples with literal text

Using a BNF Grammar

```
<expr> ::= (<expr> + <expr>)  
        ::= (<expr> - <expr>)  
        ::= <id>(<expr>)  
        ::= <id> | <n>
```

- To make an example `<expr>`:
 - choose one case in the grammar
 - pick an example for each meta-variable

`7 ∈ <n>`

- combine the examples with literal text

`7 ∈ <expr>`

Using a BNF Grammar

```
<expr> ::= (<expr> + <expr>)  
        ::= (<expr> - <expr>)  
        ::= <id>(<expr>)  
        ::= <id> | <n>
```

- To make an example `<expr>`:
 - choose one case in the grammar
 - pick an example for each meta-variable

`f ∈ <id>` `7 ∈ <expr>`

- combine the examples with literal text

`f(7) ∈ <expr>`

Using a BNF Grammar

```
<expr> ::= (<expr> + <expr>)  
        ::= (<expr> - <expr>)  
        ::= <id>(<expr>)  
        ::= <id> | <n>
```

- To make an example `<expr>`:
 - choose one case in the grammar
 - pick an example for each meta-variable

`f ∈ <id>` `f(7) ∈ <expr>`

- combine the examples with literal text

`f(f(7)) ∈ <expr>`

Using a BNF Grammar

$\langle \text{prog} \rangle ::= \langle \text{defn} \rangle^* \langle \text{expr} \rangle$
 $\langle \text{defn} \rangle ::= \langle \text{id} \rangle (\langle \text{id} \rangle) = \langle \text{expr} \rangle$

$f(x) = (x + 1) \in \langle \text{defn} \rangle$

- To make a $\langle \text{prog} \rangle$ pick some number of $\langle \text{defn} \rangle$ s

$(x + y) \in \langle \text{prog} \rangle$

$f(x) = (x + 1)$
 $g(y) = f((y - 2)) \in \langle \text{prog} \rangle$
 $g(7)$

Demonstrating Set Membership

- We can run the element-generation process in reverse to **prove** that some item is a member of a set
- Such proofs have a standard tree format:

$$\frac{\text{sub-claim to prove} \quad \dots \quad \text{sub-claim to prove}}{\text{claim to prove}}$$

- Immediate membership claims serve as leaves on the tree:

$7 \in \langle n \rangle$

Demonstrating Set Membership

- We can run the element-generation process in reverse to **prove** that some item is a member of a set
- Such proofs have a standard tree format:

$$\frac{\text{sub-claim to prove} \quad \dots \quad \text{sub-claim to prove}}{\text{claim to prove}}$$

- Immediate membership claims serve as leaves on the tree:

$f \in \langle \text{id} \rangle$

Demonstrating Set Membership

- We can run the element-generation process in reverse to **prove** that some item is a member of a set
- Such proofs have a standard tree format:

$$\frac{\text{sub-claim to prove} \quad \dots \quad \text{sub-claim to prove}}{\text{claim to prove}}$$

- Other membership claims generate branches in the tree:

$$\frac{7 \in \langle n \rangle}{7 \in \langle \text{expr} \rangle}$$

Demonstrating Set Membership

- We can run the element-generation process in reverse to **prove** that some item is a member of a set
- Such proofs have a standard tree format:

$$\frac{\text{sub-claim to prove} \quad \dots \quad \text{sub-claim to prove}}{\text{claim to prove}}$$

- Other membership claims generate branches in the tree:

$$\frac{\text{f} \in \langle \text{id} \rangle \quad \frac{7 \in \langle \text{n} \rangle}{7 \in \langle \text{expr} \rangle}}{\text{f}(7) \in \langle \text{expr} \rangle}$$

The proof tree's shape is driven entirely by the grammar

Demonstrating Set Membership: Example

$$\text{f}(7) \in \langle \text{expr} \rangle$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{expr} \rangle & ::= (\langle \text{expr} \rangle + \langle \text{expr} \rangle) \\ & ::= (\langle \text{expr} \rangle - \langle \text{expr} \rangle) \\ & ::= \langle \text{id} \rangle (\langle \text{expr} \rangle) \\ & ::= \langle \text{id} \rangle \mid \langle \text{n} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

- Two meta-variables on the left means two sub-trees:
 - One for $\text{f} \in \langle \text{id} \rangle$
 - One for $7 \in \langle \text{expr} \rangle$

Demonstrating Set Membership: Example

$$\frac{\text{f} \in \langle \text{id} \rangle \quad 7 \in \langle \text{expr} \rangle}{\text{f}(7) \in \langle \text{expr} \rangle}$$

$\langle \text{id} \rangle ::=$ a variable name: $\text{f}, \text{x}, \text{y}, \text{z}, \dots$

$\langle \text{expr} \rangle ::=$ $(\langle \text{expr} \rangle + \langle \text{expr} \rangle)$
 $::= (\langle \text{expr} \rangle - \langle \text{expr} \rangle)$
 $::= \langle \text{id} \rangle (\langle \text{expr} \rangle)$
 $::= \langle \text{id} \rangle \mid \langle \text{n} \rangle$

- $\text{f} \in \langle \text{id} \rangle$ is immediate
- $7 \in \langle \text{expr} \rangle$ has one meta-variable, so one subtree

Demonstrating Set Membership: Example

$$\frac{\text{f} \in \langle \text{id} \rangle \quad \frac{7 \in \langle \text{n} \rangle}{7 \in \langle \text{expr} \rangle}}{\text{f}(7) \in \langle \text{expr} \rangle}$$

$\langle \text{n} \rangle ::=$ a number: 1, 42, 17, ...

- $7 \in \langle \text{n} \rangle$ is immediate, so the proof is complete

Demonstrating Set Membership: Another Example

$$\begin{array}{l} f(x) = (x + 1) \\ g(y) = f((y - 2)) \in \langle \text{prog} \rangle \\ g(7) \end{array}$$

$$\langle \text{prog} \rangle ::= \langle \text{defn} \rangle^* \langle \text{expr} \rangle$$

- Three meta-variables (after expanding $*$) means three sub-trees:
 - One for $f(x) = (x + 1) \in \langle \text{defn} \rangle$
 - One for $g(y) = f((y - 2)) \in \langle \text{defn} \rangle$
 - One for $g(7) \in \langle \text{expr} \rangle$

Demonstrating Set Membership: Example 2

$$\begin{array}{l} g(y) = f((y - 2)) \in \langle \text{defn} \rangle \\ f(x) = (x + 1) \in \langle \text{defn} \rangle \quad g(7) \in \langle \text{expr} \rangle \\ \hline f(x) = (x + 1) \\ g(y) = f((y - 2)) \in \langle \text{prog} \rangle \\ g(7) \end{array}$$

- Each sub-tree can be proved separately
- We'll prove only the first sub-tree for now

Demonstrating Set Membership: Example 2

$$f(x) = (x + 1) \in \langle \text{defn} \rangle$$

$$\langle \text{defn} \rangle ::= \langle \text{id} \rangle (\langle \text{id} \rangle) = \langle \text{expr} \rangle$$

- Three meta-variables, three sub-trees

Demonstrating Set Membership: Example 2

$$\begin{array}{l} f \in \langle \text{id} \rangle \quad x \in \langle \text{id} \rangle \quad (x + 1) \in \langle \text{expr} \rangle \\ \hline f(x) = (x + 1) \in \langle \text{defn} \rangle \end{array}$$

- The first two are immediate, the last requires work:

$$\begin{array}{l} \langle \text{expr} \rangle ::= (\langle \text{expr} \rangle + \langle \text{expr} \rangle) \quad \leftarrow \\ \langle \text{expr} \rangle ::= (\langle \text{expr} \rangle - \langle \text{expr} \rangle) \\ \langle \text{expr} \rangle ::= \langle \text{id} \rangle (\langle \text{expr} \rangle) \\ \langle \text{expr} \rangle ::= \langle \text{id} \rangle \mid \langle \text{n} \rangle \end{array}$$

Demonstrating Set Membership: Example 2

Final tree:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{\frac{\frac{f \in \langle id \rangle}{f \in \langle id \rangle} \quad \frac{x \in \langle id \rangle}{x \in \langle id \rangle}}{x \in \langle expr \rangle} \quad \frac{\frac{1 \in \langle n \rangle}{1 \in \langle n \rangle}}{1 \in \langle expr \rangle}}{(x + 1) \in \langle expr \rangle}}{f(x) = (x + 1) \in \langle defn \rangle}
 \end{array}$$

- This was just one of three sub-trees for the original $\in \langle prog \rangle$ proof...

Evaluation Function

- An **evaluation function**, \rightarrow , takes a single evaluation step
- It maps programs to programs:

$$(2 + (7 - 4)) \rightarrow (2 + 3)$$

Algebra as a Programming Language

- Algebra has a grammar:
 - $(1 + 2)$ is a legal expression
 - $(1 + +)$ is not a legal expression
- Algebra has rules for evaluation:
 - $(1 + 2) = 3$
 - $f(17) = (17 + 3) = 20$ if $f(x) = (x + 3)$

Evaluation Function

- An **evaluation function**, \rightarrow , takes a single evaluation step
- It maps programs to programs:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 f(x) = (x + 1) \\
 (2 + (7 - 4)) \rightarrow f(x) = (x + 1) \\
 (2 + 3)
 \end{array}$$

Evaluation Function

- An *evaluation function*, \rightarrow , takes a single evaluation step
- It maps programs to programs:

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{f(x) = (x + 1)} \\ \mathbf{g(y) = (y - 1)} \\ \mathbf{h(z) = f(z)} \\ \mathbf{(2 + f(13))} \end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{f(x) = (x + 1)} \\ \mathbf{g(y) = (y - 1)} \\ \mathbf{h(z) = f(z)} \\ \mathbf{(2 + (13 + 1))} \end{array}$$

Evaluation Function

- Apply \rightarrow repeatedly to obtain a result:

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{f(x) = (x + 1)} \\ \mathbf{(2 + (7 - 4))} \end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{f(x) = (x + 1)} \\ \mathbf{(2 + 3)} \end{array}$$
$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{f(x) = (x + 1)} \\ \mathbf{(2 + 3)} \end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{f(x) = (x + 1)} \\ \mathbf{5} \end{array}$$

Evaluation Function

- The \rightarrow function is defined by a set of pattern-matching rules:

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{f(x) = (x + 1)} \\ \mathbf{(2 + (7 - 4))} \end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{f(x) = (x + 1)} \\ \mathbf{(2 + 3)} \end{array}$$

due to the pattern rule

$$\dots (7 - 4) \dots \rightarrow \dots 3 \dots$$

Evaluation Function

- The \rightarrow function is defined by a set of pattern-matching rules:

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{f(x) = (x + 1)} \\ \mathbf{(2 + f(13))} \end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{f(x) = (x + 1)} \\ \mathbf{(2 + (13 + 1))} \end{array}$$

due to the pattern rule

$$\begin{array}{l} \dots \langle \text{id} \rangle_1 (\langle \text{id} \rangle_2) = \langle \text{expr} \rangle_1 \dots \\ \dots \langle \text{id} \rangle_1 (\langle \text{expr} \rangle_2) \dots \end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \dots \langle \text{id} \rangle_1 (\langle \text{id} \rangle_2) = \langle \text{expr} \rangle_1 \dots \\ \dots \langle \text{expr} \rangle_3 \dots \end{array}$$

where $\langle \text{expr} \rangle_3$ is $\langle \text{expr} \rangle_1$ with $\langle \text{id} \rangle_2$ replaced by $\langle \text{expr} \rangle_2$

Pattern-Matching Rules for Evaluation

- Rule 1

$$\begin{array}{l} \dots \langle id \rangle_1 (\langle id \rangle_2) = \langle expr \rangle_1 \dots \\ \dots \langle id \rangle_1 (\langle expr \rangle_2) \dots \end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{l} \dots \langle id \rangle_1 (\langle id \rangle_2) = \langle expr \rangle_1 \dots \\ \dots \langle expr \rangle_3 \dots \end{array}$$

where $\langle expr \rangle_3$ is $\langle expr \rangle_1$ with $\langle id \rangle_2$ replaced by $\langle expr \rangle_2$

- Rules 2 - ∞

| | |
|---|--|
| $\dots (0 + 0) \dots \rightarrow \dots 0 \dots$ | $\dots (0 - 0) \dots \rightarrow \dots 0 \dots$ |
| $\dots (1 + 0) \dots \rightarrow \dots 1 \dots$ | $\dots (1 - 0) \dots \rightarrow \dots 1 \dots$ |
| $\dots (0 + 1) \dots \rightarrow \dots 1 \dots$ | $\dots (0 - 1) \dots \rightarrow \dots -1 \dots$ |
| $\dots (2 + 0) \dots \rightarrow \dots 2 \dots$ | $\dots (2 - 0) \dots \rightarrow \dots 2 \dots$ |
| <i>etc.</i> | <i>etc.</i> |

Homework

- Some evaluations
- Some membership proofs
- See the web page for details
- Due next Tuesday, August 28, 11:59 PM

Where is This Going?

Next time:

- Shift syntax slightly to match that of Scheme
- Add new clauses to the expression grammar
- Add new evaluation rules

Current goal is to learn Scheme, but we'll use algebraic techniques all semester