

Computer Science 131

Programming Languages

November 16, 2000

Typed Lambda Calculi and Logic

Pure Simply-Typed λ -Calculus

- Syntax

$M, N ::= x$ *variables*
 | $\lambda x:t.M$ *functions*
 | $M N$ *applications*

$t, u ::= a_1 \mid a_2 \mid \dots$ *type variables*
 | $t \rightarrow u$ *function types*

One-step b-Reduction

- The relation \rightarrow_b is defined by:

$$\frac{}{(l \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{t} . M)N \rightarrow_b M[\mathbf{x} \rightarrow N]}$$

$$\frac{M \rightarrow_b M'}{M N \rightarrow_b M' N}$$

$$\frac{N \rightarrow_b N'}{M N \rightarrow_b M N'}$$

$$\frac{M \rightarrow_b M'}{l \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{t} . M \rightarrow_b l \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{t} . M'}$$

Static Semantics

$$\frac{}{\dots, \mathbf{x:t}, \dots \vdash \mathbf{x : t}}$$
$$\frac{G, \mathbf{x:t} \vdash \mathbf{M : u}}{G \vdash (\lambda \mathbf{x:t}. \mathbf{M}) : \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}}$$
$$\frac{G \vdash \mathbf{M : t} \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \quad G \vdash \mathbf{N : t}}{G \vdash \mathbf{M N : u}}$$

Encodings

- Given a fixed type t , we can define

$$\underline{tt}_t := \lambda x:t. \lambda y:t. x \quad : \quad t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$$

$$\underline{ff}_t := \lambda x:t. \lambda y:t. y \quad : \quad t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$$

$$0_t := \lambda b:t. \lambda f:(t \rightarrow t). b$$

$$\underline{1}_t := \lambda b:t. \lambda f:(t \rightarrow t). (f(b))$$

$$\underline{n}_t := \lambda b:t. \lambda f:(t \rightarrow t). (f^n(b))$$
$$: \quad t \rightarrow (t \rightarrow t) \rightarrow t$$

Encodings

- Not all untyped lambda terms can be given types.
 - E.g., no type τ makes $\lambda x:\tau.xx$ typecheck
 - The Υ and Q combinators also can't be typed.
- Consequence: *pure simply-typed* λ -calculus is "less expressive".

Properties

1. Confluence holds for well-typed terms.
2. Convertibility is *consistent*.
 - There are terms which are not convertible.
 - Distinct normal forms are not convertible.
3. The **b**-reduction relation is *strongly normalizing*
 - No term permits an infinite sequence of reductions
4. Convertibility is *decidable*.

This slide intentionally left blank

Extension: Adding Pairs

- Syntax as in NQSML

$M, N ::=$	\dots	
	$\langle M, N \rangle$	<i>pairs</i>
	$M.1 \mid M.2$	<i>projections</i>
$t, u ::=$	\dots	
	$t * u$	<i>pair types</i>

Typing and Reduction

$$\frac{G \vdash M : t \quad G \vdash N : u}{G \vdash \langle M, N \rangle : t * u}$$

$$\frac{G \vdash M : t * u}{G \vdash M.1 : t}$$

$$\frac{G \vdash M : t * u}{G \vdash M.2 : u}$$

$$\frac{}{\langle M, N \rangle.1 \rightarrow M}$$

$$\frac{}{\langle M, N \rangle.2 \rightarrow N}$$

Plus "congruence rules"

Extension: Sum Types

$M, N ::= \dots$

- | $\text{inl}_{t,u} M$ *tagging*
- | $\text{inr}_{t,u} M$
- | $(\text{case } M \text{ of}$ *case analysis*
 - $\text{inl}(x) \Rightarrow N_1$
 - | $\text{inr}(x) \Rightarrow N_2)$

$t, u ::= \dots$

- | $t + u$ *sum types*

Typing and Reduction

$$\frac{G \vdash M : t}{G \vdash \mathbf{inl}_{t,u}(M) : t+u} \qquad \frac{G \vdash M : u}{G \vdash \mathbf{inr}_{t,u}(M) : t+u}$$

$$\frac{G \vdash M : t_1+t_2 \quad G, x:t_1 \vdash N_1 : u \quad G, x:t_2 \vdash N_2 : u}{G \vdash (\mathbf{case } M \mathbf{ of } \mathbf{inl}(x) \Rightarrow N_1 \mid \mathbf{inr}(x) \Rightarrow N_2) : u}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{case } \mathbf{inl}_{t,u}(M) \mathbf{ of } \mathbf{inl}(x) \Rightarrow N_1 \mid \mathbf{inr}(x) \Rightarrow N_2) \\ &\quad \rightarrow N_1[x \rightarrow M] \end{aligned}$$

*Plus "case inr_{t,u}(M)..."
and congruence rules*

Typed Combinatory Logic

- Syntax

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{M, N} \quad ::= \quad \mathbf{S}_{t, u, v} \\ \quad \quad \quad | \quad \mathbf{K}_{t, u} \\ \quad \quad \quad | \quad \mathbf{M N} \quad \quad \quad \textit{applications} \end{array}$$
$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{t, u, v} \quad ::= \quad \mathbf{a_1 \mid a_2 \mid \dots} \quad \textit{type variables} \\ \quad \quad \quad | \quad \mathbf{t \rightarrow u} \quad \quad \quad \textit{function types} \end{array}$$

Typing Rules

$$\frac{}{K_{t,u} : t \rightarrow u \rightarrow t}$$

$$S_{t,u,v} : (t \rightarrow u \rightarrow v) \rightarrow (t \rightarrow u) \rightarrow (t \rightarrow v)$$

$$\frac{M : t \rightarrow u \quad N : t}{M N : u}$$

Claim: $S_{t,t \rightarrow t,t} K_{t,t \rightarrow t} K_{t,t} : t \rightarrow t$

Recall: Static Semantics

$$\frac{}{\dots, \mathbf{x:t}, \dots \vdash \mathbf{x : t}}$$

$$\frac{G, \mathbf{x:t} \vdash \mathbf{M : u}}{G \vdash (\mathbf{\lambda x:t.M}) : \mathbf{t \rightarrow u}} \quad \frac{G \vdash \mathbf{M : t \rightarrow u} \quad G \vdash \mathbf{N : t}}{G \vdash \mathbf{M N : u}}$$

$$\frac{G \vdash \mathbf{M : t} \quad G \vdash \mathbf{N : u}}{G \vdash \langle \mathbf{M, N} \rangle : \mathbf{t * u}}$$

$$\frac{G \vdash \mathbf{M : t * u}}{G \vdash \mathbf{M.1 : t}}$$

$$\frac{G \vdash \mathbf{M : t * u}}{G \vdash \mathbf{M.2 : u}}$$

Erasing All but the Types

$$\frac{}{\dots, \mathbf{t}, \dots \vdash \mathbf{t}}$$

$$\frac{G, \mathbf{t} \vdash \mathbf{u}}{G \vdash \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}}$$

$$\frac{G \vdash \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \quad G \vdash \mathbf{t}}{G \vdash \mathbf{u}}$$

$$\frac{G \vdash \mathbf{t} \quad G \vdash \mathbf{u}}{G \vdash \mathbf{t} * \mathbf{u}}$$

$$\frac{G \vdash \mathbf{t} * \mathbf{u}}{G \vdash \mathbf{t}}$$

$$\frac{G \vdash \mathbf{t} * \mathbf{u}}{G \vdash \mathbf{u}}$$

Rules for Propositional Logic

$$\frac{}{\dots, \mathbf{p}, \dots \vdash \mathbf{p}}$$

$$\frac{G, \mathbf{p} \vdash \mathbf{q}}{G \vdash \mathbf{p} \supset \mathbf{q}}$$

$$\frac{G \vdash \mathbf{p} \supset \mathbf{q} \quad G \vdash \mathbf{p}}{G \vdash \mathbf{q}}$$

$$\frac{G \vdash \mathbf{p} \quad G \vdash \mathbf{q}}{G \vdash \mathbf{p} \wedge \mathbf{q}}$$

$$\frac{G \vdash \mathbf{p} \wedge \mathbf{q}}{G \vdash \mathbf{p}}$$

$$\frac{G \vdash \mathbf{p} \wedge \mathbf{q}}{G \vdash \mathbf{q}}$$

Curry-Howard Isomorphism

- a.k.a. "Proofs as programs", "Propositions as types"
- Every type corresponds to a logical proposition
 - Type variables correspond to propositional variables
 - Function types correspond to implications
 - Pair types correspond to conjunctions
- A proposition is provable if and only if there is a term of the corresponding type
 - Such types are said to be *inhabited*.
 - Typed λ -terms are encodings of proofs.

Examples

1. Show that

$$\vdash p \text{ P } (p \dot{\cup} p)$$

by finding a term of type

$$a \rightarrow (a * a)$$

2. Show that

$$\vdash (p \text{ P } (q \text{ P } r)) \text{ P } ((p \dot{\cup} q) \text{ P } r)$$

by finding a term of type

$$(a \rightarrow (b \rightarrow g)) \rightarrow ((a * b) \rightarrow g)$$

Extensions

- The **true** proposition corresponds to a non-empty type
 - Typically, **unit**.
- The **false** proposition corresponds to an empty type.
 - Typically, **void**.
 - Encode $\neg p$ as $(p \multimap \mathbf{false})$.
- Second-order predicate calculus: polymorphic types
 - Second-order = quantifying over *propositions*.
 - E.g., " $\lambda a. a \multimap (a * a)$ " vs. " $\lambda p. p \multimap (p \dot{\cup} p)$ "
- Propositional logic: dependent types
- Modal logic: run-time code generation
- Linear logic: linear types

Intuitionism

- Generally, λ -calculi correspond to *constructive* or *intuitionistic* logics.
 - E.g., no terms of type
 - " a . a + (a->void) (" p. p or $\neg p$)
 - " a . ((a->void)->void) -> a (" p. $\neg\neg p \vdash p$)
 - " a ." b . ((a->b)->a) -> a (*Pierce's Law*)
- However, there has been some work on extending the isomorphism to classical logics
 - Corresponds to calculi with **callcc**-like operators

Proof Normalization

- Reductions as proof "simplifications".

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{G \vdash \mathbf{M} : \mathbf{t} \quad G \vdash \mathbf{N} : \mathbf{u}}{G \vdash \langle \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N} \rangle : \mathbf{t} * \mathbf{u}} \\
 \frac{G \vdash \langle \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N} \rangle : \mathbf{t} * \mathbf{u}}{G \vdash \langle \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N} \rangle . 1 : \mathbf{t}}
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 G \vdash \mathbf{M} : \mathbf{t}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{G \vdash \mathbf{t} \quad G \vdash \mathbf{u}}{G \vdash \mathbf{t} \dot{\cup} \mathbf{u}} \\
 \frac{G \vdash \mathbf{t} \dot{\cup} \mathbf{u}}{G \vdash \mathbf{t}}
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 G \vdash \mathbf{t}$$

Summary

λ-Calculus

- Type
- Term (program)
- Reduction

Logic

- Proposition
- Proof
- Proof
Normalization

Fixed Points

- Suppose we add in recursion (fixed points)
 - As in NQSML
 - No longer true that reduction always terminates
 - There is a term of *every* type
- Corresponds to an inconsistent logic
 - i.e., logic where every proposition is provable

Typed Combinatory Logic

$$K_{t,u} : t \rightarrow u \rightarrow t$$

$$S_{t,u,v} : (t \rightarrow u \rightarrow v) \rightarrow (t \rightarrow u) \rightarrow (t \rightarrow v)$$
$$M : t \rightarrow u \quad N : t$$

$$M N : u$$

Hilbert System for Implication

Axiom Schema

$$\frac{}{p \supset (q \supset p)}$$

$$\frac{}{(p \supset (q \supset r)) \supset ((p \supset q) \supset (p \supset r))}$$

Modus Ponens

$$\frac{p \supset q \quad p}{q}$$