

CST II 2000. Paper 9, q13

Types

PLC typing judgements take the form

$$\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$$

where $\Gamma = (\Gamma_{tv}, \Gamma_{ta})$

Γ_{tv} = finite set of type variables

Γ_{ta} = finite function from variables to types

M = PLC expression

τ = PLC type.

Write " $\Gamma \text{ ok}$ " to mean free type variables of types in Γ_{ta} are contained in Γ_{tv} .

The valid typing judgements are inductively generated by the following axiom & rules

(var) $\Gamma \vdash x : \tau$ if $\Gamma \text{ ok}$ & $(x : \tau) \in \Gamma_{ta}$

(fn)
$$\frac{\Gamma, x : \tau_1 \vdash M : \tau_2}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : \tau_1. (M) : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma_{ta})$$

(gen)
$$\frac{\alpha, \Gamma \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \Lambda \alpha (M) : \forall \alpha (\tau)} \quad \alpha \notin \Gamma_{tv} \text{ \& } \Gamma_{ok}$$

(spec)
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \forall \alpha (\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash M \tau' : \tau[\tau'/\alpha]} \quad \text{ftv}(\tau') \subseteq \Gamma_{tv}.$$

(app)
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash M' : \tau_1}{\Gamma \vdash M M' : \tau_2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \rho(\forall \alpha(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)) &= \rho[\alpha \mapsto \text{true}](\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \& \rho[\alpha \mapsto \text{false}](\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \\
 &= (\text{true} \Rightarrow \text{true}) \& (\text{false} \Rightarrow \text{false}) \\
 &= \text{true} \& \text{true} \\
 &= \text{true}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \rho(\forall \alpha(\alpha)) &= \rho[\alpha \mapsto \text{true}](\alpha) \& \rho[\alpha \mapsto \text{false}](\alpha) \\
 &= \text{true} \& \text{false} \\
 &= \text{false}
 \end{aligned}$$

(2)

Writing $\Phi(\Gamma, M, \tau)$ to mean

$\forall \rho. \rho(\tau) = \text{false} \Rightarrow \exists (x': \tau') \in \Gamma_{\text{ta}}. \rho(\tau') = \text{false}$,
 we show Φ is closed under (var) — (spec)
 and hence that if $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ holds then
 so does $\Phi(\Gamma, M, \tau)$.

Case (var): — trivial.

Case (fn): Assume

(1) $\Phi(\Gamma, x : \tau_1, M, \tau_2)$ with $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma_{\text{ta}})$.

If $\rho(\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2) = \text{false}$, i.e. if $\rho(\tau_1) \Rightarrow \rho(\tau_2) = \text{false}$,
 then can only have

(2) $\rho(\tau_1) = \text{true}$

(3) $\rho(\tau_2) = \text{false}$

Now (1) + (3) imply $\exists (x' : \tau') \in (\Gamma, x : \tau_1)_{\text{ta}}^{\sim}$
 with $\rho(\tau') = \text{false}$. By (2), can't have

$(x' : \tau') = (x : \tau_1)$, so $(x' : \tau') \in \Gamma_{\text{ta}}$.

So $\Phi(\Gamma, \lambda x : \tau_1. (M), \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2)$ holds. \checkmark

Case (gen): Assume

(4) $\Phi(\alpha, \Gamma, M, \tau)$ with $\alpha \notin \Gamma_{tr} \& \Gamma_{ok}$.

If $\rho(\forall \alpha(\tau)) = \text{false}$,
i.e. $\rho[\alpha \mapsto \text{true}](\tau) \& \rho[\alpha \mapsto \text{false}](\tau) = \text{false}$,
then

either $\rho[\alpha \mapsto \text{true}](\tau) = \text{false}$

or $\rho[\alpha \mapsto \text{false}](\tau) = \text{false}$

In either case, by (4) we have

$\exists (x': \tau') \in (\alpha, \Gamma)_{ta} = \Gamma_{ta}$ with

either $\rho[\alpha \mapsto \text{true}](\tau') = \text{false}$

or $\rho[\alpha \mapsto \text{false}](\tau') = \text{false}$.

But since Γ_{ok} , $\text{ftv}(\tau') \subseteq \Gamma_{tr} \not\ni \alpha$.

So $\rho[\alpha \mapsto b](\tau') = \rho(\tau')$.

Hence in either case $\rho(\tau') = \text{false}$.

Thus $\Phi(\Gamma, \lambda \alpha(M), \forall \alpha(\tau))$ holds. ✓

Case (spec): Assume

(5) $\Phi(\Gamma, M, \forall \alpha(\tau))$ & $\text{ftv}(\tau') \subseteq \Gamma_{tr}$.

If $\rho(\tau[\tau' / \alpha]) = \text{false}$, then

$\rho[\alpha \mapsto \rho(\tau')](\tau) = \text{false}$.

so $\rho[\alpha \mapsto \text{true}](\tau) \& \rho[\alpha \mapsto \text{false}](\tau) = \text{false}$

(Since $\rho(\tau') \in \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$)

i.e. $\rho(\forall \alpha(\tau)) = \text{false}$. So by (5), $\exists (x': \tau'') \in \Gamma_{ta}$

with $\rho(\tau'') = \text{false}$. Thus $\Phi(\Gamma, M\tau', \tau[\tau' / \alpha])$ holds. ✓

Case (app): Assume

$$(6) \quad \Phi(\Gamma, M, \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2)$$

$$(7) \quad \Phi(\Gamma, M', \tau_1)$$

If $\rho(\tau_1) = \text{false}$, then
either $\rho(\tau_1) = \text{false}$, in which case by (7)

$$\exists (x' : \tau') \in \Gamma_{ta} \text{ with } \rho(\tau') = \text{false}$$

or $\rho(\tau_1) = \text{true}$, in which case

$$\rho(\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2) = \rho(\tau_1) \Rightarrow \rho(\tau_2) = (\text{true} \Rightarrow \text{false}) = \text{false}$$

so by (6) $\exists (x' : \tau') \in \Gamma_{ta}$ with $\rho(\tau') = \text{false}$.

So in either case $\Phi(\Gamma, MM', \tau_2)$ holds. \checkmark .

If there was closed $M : \forall \alpha(\alpha)$, then

$$\emptyset, \emptyset \vdash M : \forall \alpha(\alpha)$$

would hold. We saw that, choosing any ρ ,
 $\rho(\forall \alpha(\alpha)) = \text{false}$. So by the result above

$\Gamma = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ has to satisfy $\exists (x' : \tau') \in \Gamma_{ta} \cdot \rho(\tau') = \text{false}$

which is impossible.