Master Sciences Informatiques

Advanced Semantics (ASM)

Final Exam, January 2020

Khalil Ghorbal and Alan Schmitt

1 Operational Semantics

Recall that the *call by value* strategy evaluates the arguments of a function before passing them to the function. Using such strategy

- 1. Give a big-step semantics for the λ -calculus
- 2. Give a small-step semantics for the λ -calculus
- 3. Give a reduction strategy for the λ -calculus
- 4. Give an abstract machine semantics for the λ -calculus
- 5. Select any two semantics from 1. to 4. above and show their equivalence

2 Categorical Semantics

A. Monadic Semantics

- Suppose you have a 'let' binder in your language, that is 'let x = t in u' is a term (x is a variable and t, u are terms). Is it possible to give a general big-step operational semantics for such binder without discussing the possible reduction of the term u once the variable x is substituted by t? Explain.
- 2. Recall what a Kleisli triple is and describe concisely how does it capture the semantics of a particular computation.
- 3. Explain why and how types are used in a Kleisli triple and give the semantics of the let binder with respect to a given computation.

B. Category Theory: Pullbacks

A commutative diagram of a category ${\mathscr C}$



is called a *pullback* diagram (*produit fibré* dans la langue de Molière) when the following property holds: for every commutative diagram



there exists a unique morphism $h: T \to P$ such that the following diagram commutes.



- 1. Given $f : X \to Z$ and $g : Y \to Z$, give explicitly a pullback in the category of sets (objects are sets and morphisms are functions).
- 2. Given two pullback diagrams

$$\begin{array}{cccc} P & \xrightarrow{p_1'} & X' & & X' \xrightarrow{p_1} & X \\ p_2' \downarrow & & \downarrow f' & & f' \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ Y' & \xrightarrow{g'} & Z' & & Z' \xrightarrow{g} & Z \end{array}$$

show that we can construct another pullback by gluing together the given pullbacks:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \stackrel{p_1'}{\longrightarrow} & X' & \stackrel{p_1}{\longrightarrow} & X \\ p_2' \downarrow & & & \downarrow f \\ Y' & \stackrel{g'}{\longrightarrow} & Z' & \stackrel{g}{\longrightarrow} & Z \end{array}$$

3. A morphism $m : A \to B$ in \mathcal{C} is a *monomorphism* (or mono) if we can remove it from the left for every pair of morphisms $f, g : X \to A$, that is

$$m \circ f = m \circ g \implies f = g$$
.

Show that monomorphisms correspond to injective functions in the category of sets.

4. Similarly, a morphism $e : A \to B$ in \mathcal{C} is an *epimorphism* (or epi) if we can remove it from the right for pair of morphisms $f, g : B \to Y$, that is

$$f \circ e = g \circ e \implies f = g$$
 .

Show that epimorphisms correspond to surjective functions in the category of sets.

5. Show that a morphism m is mono if and only if the following commutative diagram is a pullback.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \stackrel{id}{\longrightarrow} & A \\ \stackrel{id}{\downarrow} & & \downarrow^m \\ A & \stackrel{m}{\longrightarrow} & B \end{array}$$

What is the meaning of this property in the category of sets?

6. Show that every pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{J} & X \\ m & & & \downarrow m' \\ Y & \xrightarrow{g} & Z \end{array}$$

satisfies $m : A \to Y$ and $m' : X \to Z$ are mono. Does the converse hold? Can you think of a counter-example in the category of sets?