

### "Good" vs. "Bad" Expressions

- ; interp-expr : FAE? ... -> FAE-Value?
- Does interp-expr produce a value for all expressions?
- Of course not!
- (interp-expr (parse '{5 5})) etc ...
- But do we know enough about expressions to tell before actually calling interp-expr?

• Question #1: What is the value of the following expression?

 $\{+ 1 2\}$ 

• Answer: 3

• Question #2: What is the value of the following expression?

#### {+ fun 17 8}

- Wrong answer: error
- Answer: Trick question! {+ fun 17 8} is not an expression

### Language Grammar for Quiz

<MFAE> ::= <num> true false  $\{+ \langle MFAE \rangle \langle MFAE \rangle\}$  $\{- \langle MFAE \rangle \langle MFAE \rangle \}$  $\{= \langle MFAE \rangle \langle MFAE \rangle \}$ <id> {fun {<id>\*} <MFAE>}  $\{ < MFAE > < MFAE > * \}$ {if <MFAE> <MFAE> <MFAE>}

- Question #3: Is the following an expression?
  {{fun {x y} 1} 7}
- Wrong answer: **No**
- Answer: **Yes** (according to our grammar)

• Question #4: What is the value of the following expression?

```
\{\{fun \{x y\} 1\} 7\}
```

- Answer: {fun {y} 1} (according to some interpreters)
- But no real language would accept
   {{fun {x y} 1} 7}
- Let's agree to call { { fun {x y} 1} 7 } an ill-formed expression because { fun {x y} 1 } should be used only with two arguments
- Let's agree to never evaluate ill-formed expressions

• Question #5: What is the value of the following expression?

```
\{\{fun \{x y\} 1\} 7\}
```

• Answer: None - the expression is ill-formed

• Question #6: Is the following a well-formed expression?

```
{+ {fun {} 1} 8}
```

• Answer: **Yes** (according to our definition of well-formed)

• Question #7: What is the value of the following expression?

#### {+ {fun {} 1} 8}

• Answer: **None** - it produces an error:

numeric operation expected number

 Let's agree that a fun expression cannot be inside a + form

• Question #8: Is the following a well-formed expression?

```
{+ {fun {} 1} 8}
```

• Answer: **No** (according to our new definition)

• Question #9: Is the following a well-formed expression?

```
\{+ \{\{ fun \{x\} x\} 7\} 5\}
```

- Answer: Depends on what we meant by inside in our most recent agreement
  - Anywhere inside **No**
  - Immediately inside Yes
- Since our intrepreter produces **12**, and since that result makes sense, let's agree on *immediately inside*

• Question #10: Is the following a well-formed expression?

```
\{+ \{\{fun \{x\} x\} \{fun \{y\} y\}\} 5\}
```

• Answer: Yes, but we don't want it to be!

- Question #11: Is it possible to define well-formed (as a decidable property) so that we reject all expressions that produce errors?
- Answer: **Yes**: reject *all* expressions!

- Question #12: Is it possible to define well-formed (as a decidable property) so that we reject only expressions that produce errors?
- Answer: **No**

#### $\{+ 1 \{ if \ldots 1 \{ fun \{x\} x\} \} \}$

- If we always knew whether . . . produces true or false, we could solve the halting problem
- See also: Rice's theorem: all *non-trivial*, *semantic* properties of programs are undecidable

Solution to our dilemma

 In the process of rejecting expressions that are certainly bad, also reject some expressions that are good

- It's a tradeoff: do we care more about rejecting bad programs, or about not rejecting good ones?
  - Different languages pick different tradeoffs
  - **Typed:** Java, Scala, Haskell, etc.
  - **Untyped:** Racket, Python, Javascript, etc.
    - AKA dynamically typed

# Types

- Overall strategy:
  - Assign a **type** to each expression without evaluating
  - Compute the type of a complex expression based on the types of its subexpressions

## Types

