PLC typing judgements take the form [+M: 7 Where $\Gamma = (\Gamma_{tv}, \Gamma_{ta})$ The = finite set of type variables Ita = finite map from variables to types and where M is a PLC term & Ta PLC type. Write Tok to mean free type vars of Ita are in For. Valid typing judgements are industriety generated by following axiom & mles: (var) $\Gamma + x : \tau$ if $\Gamma \in \mathcal{S}(x) \in \Gamma_{ta}$ (fn) [,z: t, + M: T2 if x & dom([ta) [+] x: q(M): 71-> 72 Where & (Gx: Ti) to = Ito $\lfloor (\Gamma, x : \tau_i)_{ta} = \lceil ta \lceil x \mapsto \tau_i \rceil$ a, F + M: T if a & For (gen) [r Na(m): Yalt)) (Q, () to = (Q) U for ${(\alpha,\Gamma)_{ta}} = {(\tau_a)_{ta}}$ [+M: Valt) (spec) if ftv(r') s ltv [+ MT': T[T'(a] GresnH of substituting tofor free occurrence of & in T 1+M: 7,720 [+M1:7, (app)

[+MM': 5

(5)

```
(a) Yes: T = \forall \alpha(\alpha) \rightarrow \forall \alpha(\alpha)
                        [NOOF :
                                       \frac{(\beta)}{(\beta)}, \{x: \forall \alpha(\alpha)\} \vdash x: \forall \alpha(\alpha)
                                       \frac{1}{\beta}, \frac{1}{3}: \frac{1}{3}:
2
                                      \phi, \{x : \forall \alpha(\alpha)\} + \Lambda \beta(x\beta) : \forall \beta(\beta) (fn)
                                        \Phi, \psi \vdash \lambda x : \forall \alpha(\alpha) (\Lambda \beta (x \beta)) : \forall \alpha(\alpha) \rightarrow \forall \beta(\beta)
                                                                                                                                                           YX(X) -> YX(X).
         (b) No such t exists.
                If \phi, \phi \vdash \Lambda \alpha(\lambda \alpha : \alpha(\Lambda \beta(\alpha \beta))) : \tau were provable,
                 it would have had to be proved by an application
                   of rule (gen) to
                                       \forall \alpha \}, \phi \vdash \lambda x : \alpha (\Lambda \beta(x \beta)) : \tau_i
                 where \tau = \forall \alpha(\tau_i). This in turn would have
               to have been proved by applying (fn) to
                         \{\alpha\},\{x:\alpha\}\vdash \Lambda\beta(x\beta): T_2
              where \tau_1 = \alpha \rightarrow \tau_2. This in turn must have some
          from (gen) on
                       (α,β), (2: α)+ 2β: T3
            Where \tau_2 = \forall \beta(\tau_3). And this must have home
            from (Spec) on
                                    \forall \alpha, \beta \gamma, \{\alpha; \alpha\} \vdash \alpha : \forall \gamma(\tau_4)
            Where T3 = T4[B/8]. But the latter is not provable,
             because x + Yy(T4) for any 8, T4.
```

(3)

```
(c) Yes: T = \forall \alpha(\alpha).
                                                          \frac{(NOT)}{\{\alpha\},\{x:T\}\vdash 1:\forall\alpha(\alpha)} (Nar) \qquad \{\alpha\},\{x:T\}\vdash \lambda:\forall\alpha(\alpha) \qquad \{spec)} = \frac{\{\alpha\},\{x:T\}\vdash \lambda:\forall\alpha(\alpha)}{\{\alpha\},\{x:T\}\vdash \lambda:\alpha:\alpha} (spec)} = \frac{\{\alpha\},\{x:T\}\vdash \lambda:\alpha:\alpha}{\{\alpha\},\{x:T\}\vdash \lambda:\alpha} (spec)} = \frac{\{\alpha\},\{x:T\}\vdash \lambda:\alpha:\alpha}{\{\alpha\},\{x:T\}\vdash \lambda:\alpha} (spec)} = \frac{\{\alpha\},\{x:T\}\vdash \lambda:\alpha:\alpha}{\{\alpha\},\{x:T\}\vdash \lambda:\alpha} (spec)} = \frac{\{\alpha\},\{x:T\}\vdash \lambda:\alpha}{\{\alpha\},\{x:T\}\vdash \lambda:\alpha} (spec)} = \frac{\{\alpha\},\{x:T\}\vdash \lambda:\alpha}{\{\alpha\},\{x
                                                                                                                                                                                                     Φ, {2: τ} + Λα(n(α>α)(nα)): ∀α(α) = ∀β(β)
                                                                                                                                                                                                   \phi, \phi \vdash \lambda x : \tau(\Lambda \alpha(x(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)(2\alpha))) : \tau \rightarrow \forall \beta(\beta).
               (d) Yes: \tau = \forall \alpha (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)
                         Proof Writing \Gamma \triangleq \{\alpha\}, \{1:\tau\},
\frac{\Gamma + \chi : \forall \alpha (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi : \forall \alpha (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi : \forall \alpha (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi : \forall \alpha (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha)}{(\gamma \alpha)} = \frac{\Gamma + \chi (\alpha)}{(
                                                                                                                                                                                                \frac{\Gamma + \alpha(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)(\alpha \alpha) : \alpha \rightarrow \alpha}{\Phi_1(\alpha : \tau) + \lambda\alpha(\alpha(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)(\alpha \alpha)) : \forall \alpha(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)} (gn)} 
                                                                                                                                                                                                Φ, Φ+ λη: τ(Λα()(α>α)()(): T-> Ya(2-)a)
(e) No.
                                      <u>Proof.</u> If \emptyset, \phi \vdash \Lambda \alpha (\lambda \alpha : \tau(\alpha \mid \alpha \rightarrow \alpha)(\alpha \mid \alpha)) : \forall \alpha (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)
                                     were provable, it must have been proved by applying
                                  (gen) to {x}, p+ \n: \( \lambda \( \lambda + \alpha \) : \( \lambda + \alpha \)
                      and for this to be provable, it must be the case that
                             T = Q Q \{Q\}, \{1:Q\} \vdash I(Q \rightarrow Q)(1)Q : Q is
                   provable: but this requires 20 to be typeable in
                      context (a), (1.a), which is impossible because a is not of the form \forall r(z) for any \gamma \in \mathcal{C}(cf.(a)).
```