CS 6110 — Advanced Programming Languages

Lecture 1 Introduction

24 January 2011

Programming Languages

One of the oldest fields in Computer Science...

•	λ -calculus – Church	(1936)
•	FORTRAN – Backus	(1957)
•	LISP – McCarthy	(1958)
•	ALGOL 60 – Backus, Naur, Perlis, & others	(1960)
•	Pascal – Wirth	(1970)
•	C – Ritchie	(1972)
•	Smalltalk – Kay & others	(1972)
•	ML – Milner and others	(1978)
•	C++ – Stroustrup	(1982)
•	Haskell - Hudak, Peyton Jones, Wadler, & others	(1989)
•	Java – Gosling	(1995)
•	C# – Microsoft	(2001)
•	Scala – Odersky	(2003)
•	F# – Syme	(2005)

Programming Languages

...and one of the most vibrant areas today!

PL intersects with many other areas

Current trends

- Domain-specific languages
- Static analysis and types
- Language-based security
- Verification and model checking
- Concurrency

Both theoretically and practically "meaty"

Syllabus

Course Goals

- Learn techniques for modeling programs*
 - Formal semantics (operational, axiomatic, denotational)
 - Extend to advanced language features
 - Develop reasoning principles (induction, co-induction)
- Explore applications of these techniques
 - Optimization
 - Static analysis
 - Verification
- PhD students: cover material for PL qualifying exam
- Have fun :-)

*and whole languages!

Advanced Programming Languages MWF 10:10-11:00 Phillips 213



	- F	lome	Syllabus	Sc	hedule Resources		
24 Jan	Introduction	PDF		21 Mar	Spring break (no class)		
26 Jan	λ-calculus			23 Mar	Spring break (no class)		
28 Jan	λ -calculus encodings and recursion			25 Mar	Spring break (no class)		
31 Jan	Normal forms, reduction strategies, and confluence			28 Mar	Review		
2 Feb	Substitution, big step vs. small-step			30 Mar	Simply-typed λ-calculus		
4 Feb	Structured Operational Semantics and IMP			1 Apr	Products, sums, and more		
7 Feb	Inductive definitions and least fixed points			4 Apr	Type soundness		
9 Feb	Well-Founded Induction and rule induction			6 Apr	Subtyping		
11 Feb	Evaluation contexts and definitional Translation			8 Apr	Minimal typing		
14 Feb	uML and strong typing			11 Apr	Type Inference		
16 Feb	Naming and scope			13 Apr	Parametric polymorphism		
18 Feb	Recursive bindings and modules			15 Apr	Strong normalization and logical relations		
21 Feb	State and mutable variables			18 Apr	Propositions as types		
23 Feb	Call by reference, continuation-passing style, CPS conversi	n		20 Apr	Recursive types		
25 Feb	Non-local control, errors, and exceptions			22 Apr	Solving recursive domain equations		
28 Feb	First-class continuations and threads			25 Apr	Existential types		
2 Mar	Compiling with continuations			27 Apr	Parameterized types		
4 Mar	Hoare logic			29 Apr	Bounded quantification		
7 Mar	Weakest preconditions			2 May	Object encodings		
9 Mar	Verification conditions and applications			4 May	Current research in Programming Languages		
11 Mar	Denotational semantics of IMP			6 May	Review		
14 Mar	The fixed-point theorem			9 May	Study Period (no class)		
16 Mar	Domain constructions			11 May	Study Period (no class)		
18 Mar	Metalanguage for denotational semantics			13 May	Final Exam (2:00-4:30pm)		

Advanced Programming Languages MWF 10:10-11:00 Phillips 213



	Home	Syllabus	Sc	hedule	Resources		
24 Jan	Introduction PDF		21 Mar	Spring break (no clas	s)		
			23 Mar	Spring break (no clas	5)		
			25 Mar	Spring break (no clas	5)		
	Mathemetical Preliminaries	s &	28 Mar				
			30 Mar				
	Operational Semantics		1 Apr				
			4 Apr				
			6 Apr				
			8 Apr				
14 Feb			11 Apr				
16 Feb			13 Apr				
18 Feb			15 Apr				
21 Feb			18 Apr				
23 Feb			20 Apr				
25 Feb			22 Apr				
28 Feb			25 Apr				
2 Mar			27 Apr				
4 Mar			29 Apr				
7 Mar			2 May				
9 Mar			4 May				
11 Mar			6 May	Review			
14 Mar			9 May	Study Period (no clas	s)		
16 Mar			11 May	Study Period (no clas	s)		
18 Mar			13 May	Final Exam (2:00-4:30			

Advanced Programming Languages MWF 10:10-11:00 Phillips 213



	Home S	yllabus	Sc	hedule	Resources		
24 Jan	Introduction PDF		21 Mar	Spring break (no class	}		
			23 Mar	Spring break (no class			
			25 Mar	Spring break (no class			
	Mathemetical Preliminaries 8	1	28 Mar				
	Substitution (Compare and Comp		30 Mar				
	Operational Semantics		1 Apr				
			4 Apr				
			6 Apr				
			8 Apr				
			11 Apr				
			13 Apr				
			15 Apr				
	Advanced Language Feature		18 Apr				
	Auvanceu Language reatures	,	20 Apr				
			22 Apr				
			25 Apr				
			27 Apr				
			29 Apr				
7 Mar			2 May				
9 Mar			4 May				
11 Mar			6 May	Review			
14 Mar			9 May	Study Period (no class)			
16 Mar			11 May	Study Period (no class)			
18 Mar			13 May	Final Exam (2:00-4:30c	m)		

Advanced Programming Languages MWF 10:10-11:00 Phillips 213



Home Sy	ilabus Sc	chedule Resources
24 Jan Introduction PDF	21 Mar	Spring break (no class)
	23 Mar 25 Mar	Spring break (no class) Spring break (no class)
Mathemetical Preliminaries &	28 Mar 30 Mar	
Area Operational Semantics	1 Apr	
	4 Apr	
	6 Apr 8 Apr	
14 Feb will and stress brains	11 407	
	13 Apr	
	15 Apr	
Advanced Language Features	18 Apr	
	20 Apr	
	22 Apr	
	25 Apr	
	27 Apr	
7 Mar Weakest preconditions	2 May	
Axiomatic & Denotational	4 May	Current research in Programming Languages
Semantics	omay	
16 Mar. Domain constructions	9 May	Study Period (no class)
	13 May	Final Exam (200-4-30nm)

Advanced Programming Languages MWF 10:10-11:00 Phillips 213



		Syllabus		hedule	Resources
24 Jan 26 Jan 28 Jan	Introduction PDF A-calculus A-calculus A-calculus		21 Mar 23 Mar 25 Mar	Spring break (no class) Spring break (no class) Spring break (no class)	Spring Break
	Mathemetical Preliminaries Operational Semantics	s &	28 Mar 30 Mar 1 Apr	Review Simply-typed λ-calculus Products, sums, and mo	re
7 Feb 9 Feb 11 Feb	Inductive definitions and least fixed points		4 Apr 6 Apr 8 Apr		
			11 Apr 13 Apr 15 Apr		
	Advanced Language Featu	res	18 Apr 20 Apr 22 Apr		
			25 Apr 27 Apr 29 Apr		
7 Mar 9 Mar 11 Mar	Axiomatic & Denotationa	al	2 May 4 May 6 May	Object encodings Current research in Prog Review	
	Semantics		9 May 11 May 13 May	Study Period (no class) Study Period (no class) Final Exam (2:00-4:30pm	1)

Advanced Programming Languages MWF 10:10-11:00 Phillips 213



24 Inc. Introduction DDE	21 May Caving bank (no class)
	20 Mar Spring break Incident 26 Mar Spring break Incident
Mathemetical Preliminaries & Operational Semantics	28 Mar Breese Preliminary Exam
7 Feb Inductive definitions and least fixed points 9 Feb Well Founded Induction and rule induction 11 Feb Text Text Text Text Text Text Text Text	Apr Type soundness Gapr Subtyping
14Feb UML and strong typing 16Feb Naming and scope	Frankrik Appr 11 Apr Type Inference 13 Apr Parametric polymorphism
Advanced Language Features	15 Apr Strong normalization and logical relations 18 Apr Propositions as types 20 Apr Recursive types
	22 Apr Solving recursive domain equations 25 Apr Existential types 27 Apr Purameterized types
Axiomatic & Denotational	29Apr Bounded quantification 2May Object encodings 4 May Current research in Programming Languages
14 Mar Northele control for the Semantics	6 May Review 9 May Study Period (no dass) 11 May Study Period (no dass) 13 May Electron (2004 allown) 13 May Electron (2004 allown)

Advanced Programming Languages MWF 10:10-11:00 Phillips 213



Home Syllabus	Schedule Resources
24 Jan Introduction PDF 26 Jan 3-calculus 22 Jan 4-calculus 22 Ja	21 Mar Spring break (no das) 21 Mar Spring break (no das) 22 Mar Spring break (no das)
Mathemetical Preliminaries & Operational Semantics	28 Mar Several Preliminary Exam
7 Feb Inductive definitions and least fixed points 9 Feb With Founded duction and rule induction 9 Feb	4 Apr Type soundness 6 Apr Subtyping
14 Feb utilit, and strong typing 16 Feb Naming and scope 16 Feb Naming and scope 18 Feb Naming and scope	Type Induced playing Types Types Solution Solutio
Advanced Language Features	18 Apr Propositions as types 20 Apr Presenter types 22 Apr Solving requiring equations
28 Feb First-class continuations and threads 2 Mar Compiling with continuations 4 Mar Home logic	25 Apr Extendial types 22 Apr Parameterised types 23 Apr Parameterised types 23 Apr I Bounded quantification
Axiomatic & Denotational	2 May Object encodings 4 May Current research in Programming Languages 6 May Review
14 Mar Include controlocion 16 Mar Include controlocion 18 Mar Include general referenciates a sementic	9 May Study Period (no class) 11 May Study Period (no class) 13 May Final Exam (2:00-4:30pm)

Advanced Programming Languages MWF 10:10-11:00 Phillips 213



1	Home Syllabus	Schedule Resources
24 Jan Introduction 26 Jan A-calculus 28 Jan A-calculus encodings and recursion	PDF	11 Mar Spring break (no class) 13 Mar Spring break (no class) 15 Mar Spring break (no class)
Mathemetical Prelin	minaries &	Preliminary Exam
Operational Sem	nantics	30 Mar Simply-typed A-calculus 1 Apr Products, sums, and more
		4 Apr Type soundness
		6 Apr Subtyping
11 Feb Evaluation contexts and definitional Translation		8 Apr Minimal typing
		11 Apr Type Inference Types
		13 Apr Parametric polymorphism
		15 Apr Strong normalization and logical relations
Advanced Language	e Features	18 Apr Propositions as types
	e . eutur es	20 Apr Recursive types
		22 Apr Solving recursive domain equations
		25 Apr Existential types
		Advanced Types
7 Mar Weakest oregon ditions		2 May Object encodings
Aviomatic & Deno	tational	4 May Current research in Programming Languages
Axiomatic & Deno	lational	6 May Review
14 Mar Semantics	;	9 May Study Period (no class)
		11 May Study Period (no class)
		13 May Final Exam (2:00-4:30pm)

Advanced Programming Languages MWF 10:10-11:00 Phillips 213



Home Syllabus	Schedule Resources
24 Jan Introduction PDF 26 Jan 3 calculus 3 28 Jan Analysis 3	21 Mar Spring break (no dan) 22 Mar Spring break (no dan) 23 Mar Spring break (no dan)
Mathemetical Preliminaries & Operational Semantics	28 Mar Server Preliminary Exam
7Feb Inductive definitions and least fixed points 9Feb Web Founded Induction and rule induction 11Feb Evaluation contexts and rule induction	4 Apr Type soundness 6 Apr Subtyping 8 Apr Minimal training 6 Apr Minimal training 8 Apr Minimal training
14Feb will, and strong typing 16Feb Xaming and score 18Feb Recursive bindings and modules	11 Apr - Types Information 11 Apr - Types Information 15 Apr - Types Information 15 Apr - Types Information
Advanced Language Features	18 Apr / Popositions as types 20 Apr / Reconvertiges 22 Apr / Solving reconvertiges
28 Feb First-class continuations and threads 2 Mar Compiling with continuations 4 Mar Hearn logic	23 Aur Commenced To Advanced Types
Axiomatic & Denotational	2 May Object encodings 4 May Convert encode in Programming Languages 6 May Review
14 Mar The fixed point horses Schridting Street Schridting Schridt	11 May 15 out freed too dan! Study Period 11 May 15 out freed too dan! Final Exam

Advanced Programming Languages MWF 10:10-11:00 Phillips 213





Advanced Programming Languages MWF 10:10-11:00 Phillips 213





Prerequisites

Programming Experience

- e.g., C, Java, Prolog, OCaml, Haskell, Scheme/Racket
- Comfortable with a functional language
- For undergrads: CS 3110 or 4110 or equivalent

Mathematical Maturity

- e.g., set theory, rigorous proofs, induction
- Much of this class will involve formal reasoning
- Hardest topic: denotational semantics

Interest (having fun is a goal! :-)

If you don't meet these prerequisites, get in touch.

Course Work

Participation (5%)

- Lectures, recitations, and office hours
- Email list discussions
- Homework (25%)
- 6 assignments, roughly every other week
- Mostly theoretical, some programming
- Must work in groups of 2-3

Preliminary Exam (30%)

• Wednesday, March 30th + take-home problems.

Final Exam (40%)

- Friday, May 13th, 2pm-4:30pm
- Cumulative, with focus on the material from 2nd half

Two simple requests:

- 1. Most of you are here training to become members of the research community. Conduct yourself with integrity.
- 2. If you aren't sure what is allowed and what isn't, please ask!

Special Needs and Wellness

• I will provide reasonable accommodations to students who have a documented disability (e.g., physical, learning, psychiatric, vision, hearing, or systemic).

• If you are experiencing undue personal or academic stress at any time during the semester (or if you notice that a fellow student is), contact me, Engineering Advising, or Gannett.

Course Staff

Instructor

Nate Foster Office: Upson 4137 Hours: Wed 11am-12pm

Teaching Assistant

Jean-Baptiste Jeannin Office: Upson 4142 Hours: Tue 4:45pm-5:45pm and Thu 7pm-8pm

(office hours start next week)

Web Page

http://www.cs.cornell.edu/Courses/cs6110/2011sp

Mailing List

http://lists.semantics-is-gorges.org/listinfo/cs6110

Language Specification

Language Specification

Formal Semantics: what do programs mean?

Three Approaches

- Operational
 - Models program by its execution on abstract machine
 - Useful for implementing compilers and interpreters
- Axiomatic
 - Models program by the logical formulas it obeys
 - Useful for proving program correctness
- Denotational
 - Models program literally as mathematical objects
 - Useful for theoretical foundations

Language Specification

Formal Semantics: what do programs mean?

Three Approaches

- Operational
 - Models program by its execution on abstract machine
 - Useful for implementing compilers and interpreters
- Axiomatic
 - Models program by the logical formulas it obeys
 - Useful for proving program correctness
- Denotational
 - Models program literally as mathematical objects
 - Useful for theoretical foundations

Question: few languages have a formal semantics. Why?

Formal Semantics

Too Hard?

- Modeling a real-world language is hard
- Notation can gets very dense
- Sometimes requires developing new mathematics
- Not yet cost-effective for everyday use

Overly General?

- Explains the behavior of a program on every input
- Most programmers are content knowing the behavior of their program on *this* input (or these inputs)

Okay, so who needs semantics?

A Tricky Example

Question #1: is the following Java program legal?

Question #2: if yes, what does it do?

class A { static int a = B.b + 1; }
class B { static int b = A.a + 1; }

Who Needs Semantics?

Unambiguous Description

- Anyone who wants to design a new feature
- Basis for most formal arguments
- Standard tool in PL research

Exhaustive Reasoning

- Sometimes have to know behavior on all inputs
- Compilers and interpreters
- Static analysis tools
- Program transformation tools
- Critical software

Language Design

Design Desiderata

Question: What makes a good programming language?

Design Desiderata

Question: What makes a good programming language?

One answer: "a good language is one people use"

Question: What makes a good programming language?

One answer: "a good language is one people use"

Wrong! Are COBOL and JavaScript the best languages?

Question: What makes a good programming language?

One answer: "a good language is one people use"

Wrong! Are COBOL and JavaScript the best languages?

Some good features:

- Simplicity (clean, orthogonal constructs)
- Readability (elegant syntax)
- Safety (guarantees that programs won't "go wrong")
- Support for programming in the large (modularity)
- Efficiency (good execution model and tools)

Unfortunately these goals almost always conflict

- Types restrict expressiveness in general, but they provide strong guarantees
- Safety checks eliminate errors but have a cost, either when compiling or when the program is executed
- Some verification tools are so complicated, one essentially needs a PhD to use them

Unfortunately these goals almost always conflict

- Types restrict expressiveness in general, but they provide strong guarantees
- Safety checks eliminate errors but have a cost, either when compiling or when the program is executed
- Some verification tools are so complicated, one essentially needs a PhD to use them

A lot of PL research is about finding ways to gain without too much pain

Story: Unexpected Interactions

A real story illustrating the perils of language design

Cast of characters includes famous computer scientists

Timeline:

- 1982: ML is a functional language with type inference, polymorphism (generics), and monomorphic references (pointers)
- 1985: Standard ML innovates by adding polymorphic references \rightarrow unsoundness
- 1995: The "innovation" fixed

Polymorphism: allows code to be used at different types

Examples:

- List.length : $\forall \alpha. \ \alpha \text{ list} \rightarrow \text{int}$
- List.hd : $\forall \alpha. \alpha$ list $\rightarrow \alpha$

Type Inference: $e \rightsquigarrow \tau$

- e.g., let *id* (\mathbf{x}) = $\mathbf{x} \rightsquigarrow \forall \alpha. \ \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$
- Generalize types not constrainted by the program
- Instantiate types at use *id* (true) → bool

By default, values in ML are immutable.

But can extend the language with imperative features.

Add reference types of the form τ ref

Add expressions of the form

- ref e : τ ref where e : τ (allocate)
- $!e: \tau$ where $e: \tau$ ref (dereference)
- $e_1 := e_2 : unit$ where $e_1 : \tau$ ref and $e_2 : \tau$ (assign)

Works as you'd expect—i.e., just like pointers in C

Code	Inferred Type
let id(x) = x	$id: \forall \alpha \; \alpha \to \alpha$

Code	Inferred Type
let $id(x) = x$	$id: \forall \alpha \ \alpha \to \alpha$
let p = ref id	$\mathbf{p}: \forall \alpha \; (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \; \mathbf{ref}$

Code	Inferred Type
let $id(x) = x$	$id: \forall \alpha \; \alpha \to \alpha$
let p = ref id	p:oralllpha ($lpha ightarrow lpha$) ref
let inc(n) = n+1	inc:int oint

Code	Inferred Type
let id(x) = x	$id: \forall \alpha \; \alpha \to \alpha$
let p = ref id	$\mathbf{p}: \forall \alpha \; (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \; \mathbf{ref}$
let inc(n) = n+1	inc:int oint
let () = p := inc	OK since $p:(int \rightarrow int)$ ref

Code	Inferred Type
let id(x) = x	$id: \forall \alpha \; \alpha \to \alpha$
let p = ref id	p:oralllpha ($lpha ightarrow lpha$) ref
let inc(n) = n+1	inc:int oint
let () = p := inc	OK since $p:(int \rightarrow int)$ ref
(!p) true	OK since $p : (bool \rightarrow bool)$ ref

Problem

- Type system is not sound
- Well-typed program \rightarrow^* type error!

Problem

- Type system is not sound
- Well-typed program \rightarrow^* type error!

Proposed Solutions

- 1. "Weak" type variables
 - Can only be instantiated in restricted ways
 - But type exposes functional vs. imperative
 - Somewhat difficult to use

Problem

- Type system is not sound
- Well-typed program \rightarrow^* type error!

Proposed Solutions

- 1. "Weak" type variables
 - Can only be instantiated in restricted ways
 - But type exposes functional vs. imperative
 - Somewhat difficult to use
- 2. Value restriction
 - Only generalize types of values
 - Most ML programs already obey it
 - Simple proof of type soundness

- Features often interact in unexpected ways
- The design space is huge
- Good designs are sparse \rightarrow don't happen by accident
- Simplicity is rare: *n* features lead to *n*² interactions
- Most PL researchers work with really small languages (e.g., λ -calculus) to study core issues in isolation
- But must pay attention to whole languages too

Mathematical Preliminaries

The *product* of two sets *A* and *B*, written $A \times B$, contains all ordered pairs (a, b) with $a \in A$ and $b \in B$.

The *product* of two sets *A* and *B*, written $A \times B$, contains all ordered pairs (a, b) with $a \in A$ and $b \in B$.

A binary relation on A and B is just a subset $R \subseteq A \times B$.

The *product* of two sets A and B, written $A \times B$, contains all ordered pairs (a, b) with $a \in A$ and $b \in B$.

A binary relation on A and B is just a subset $R \subseteq A \times B$.

Given a binary relation $R \subseteq A \times B$, the set A is called the *domain* of R and B is called the *range* (or *codomain*) of R.

The *product* of two sets *A* and *B*, written $A \times B$, contains all ordered pairs (a, b) with $a \in A$ and $b \in B$.

A binary relation on A and B is just a subset $R \subseteq A \times B$.

Given a binary relation $R \subseteq A \times B$, the set A is called the *domain* of R and B is called the *range* (or *codomain*) of R.

Some Important Relations

- empty \emptyset
- total $A \times B$
- identity on $A \{(a, a) \mid a \in A\}$.
- composition R; $S \{(a, c) \mid \exists b. (a, b) \in R \land (b, c) \in S\}$

A (total) function f is a binary relation $f \subseteq A \times B$ with the property that every $a \in A$ is related to exactly one $b \in B$.

A (total) function f is a binary relation $f \subseteq A \times B$ with the property that every $a \in A$ is related to exactly one $b \in B$.

When *f* is a function, we usually write $f : A \rightarrow B$ instead of $f \subseteq A \times B$.

A (total) function f is a binary relation $f \subseteq A \times B$ with the property that every $a \in A$ is related to exactly one $b \in B$.

When f is a function, we usually write $f : A \rightarrow B$ instead of $f \subseteq A \times B$.

The *domain* and *range* of *f* are defined in exactly the same way as for relations.

A (total) function f is a binary relation $f \subseteq A \times B$ with the property that every $a \in A$ is related to exactly one $b \in B$.

When f is a function, we usually write $f : A \rightarrow B$ instead of $f \subseteq A \times B$.

The *domain* and *range* of *f* are defined in exactly the same way as for relations.

The *image* of *f* is the set of elements $b \in B$ that are mapped to by at least one $a \in A$:

 $\{f(a) \mid a \in A\}$

Given two functions $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow C$, the composition of f and g is defined by:

$$(g \circ f)(x) = g(f(x))$$
 Note order!

Given two functions $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow C$, the composition of f and g is defined by:

$$(g \circ f)(x) = g(f(x))$$
 Note order!

A partial function $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a total function $f : A' \rightarrow B$ on a set $A' \subseteq A$. The notation dom(f) refers to A'.

Given two functions $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow C$, the composition of f and g is defined by:

$$(g \circ f)(x) = g(f(x))$$
 Note order!

A partial function $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a total function $f : A' \rightarrow B$ on a set $A' \subseteq A$. The notation dom(f) refers to A'.

A function $f : A \rightarrow B$ is said to be *injective* (or *one-to-one*) if and only if $a_1 \neq a_2$ implies $f(a_1) \neq f(a_2)$.

Given two functions $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow C$, the composition of f and g is defined by:

$$(g \circ f)(x) = g(f(x))$$
 Note order!

A partial function $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a total function $f : A' \rightarrow B$ on a set $A' \subseteq A$. The notation dom(f) refers to A'.

A function $f : A \rightarrow B$ is said to be *injective* (or *one-to-one*) if and only if $a_1 \neq a_2$ implies $f(a_1) \neq f(a_2)$.

A function $f : A \rightarrow B$ is said to be *surjective* (or *onto*) if and only if the image of f is B.

Mathematically, a function *f* is defined by its *extension*: the set of pairs of inputs and outputs.

A function can also be described by an *intensional* representation: a program or procedure that computes an output given an input.

Mathematically, a function *f* is defined by its *extension*: the set of pairs of inputs and outputs.

A function can also be described by an *intensional* representation: a program or procedure that computes an output given an input.

The same function can have several intensional representations—e.g., for the identity:

- *\a.a*
- λa . if true then a else a
- λa . if false then a else a

- λ**a**. π₁ (a, a)
- λ**a**. π₂ (**a**, **a**)
- λ**a**. (λ**y**. **y**) a