```
(\phi) denotes the empty typing environment.)
 (1) \phi + if 184 (-1) then 0 else 1 : Int
 (2) \phi \vdash -1 @ Nil[Int] : List [Int]
 (3) $\phi$ + let x:\Int = 0 in let x:\List[\Int] = \Ni\[\Int]\] in $\pi$: List[\Ni\I]
 (4) \phi \vdash (3@N_{i}[[Int])@N_{i}[[List[Int]] : 
         Fill in ? so that the expression is well-typed.
 (5) \phi \vdash (\lambda_x: lnt. \lambda_x: List[lnt].x): lnt \rightarrow List[lnt] \rightarrow :
         Fill in ? So that the expression is well-typed.
 (6) \phi \vdash fix (\lambda x: lnt. x) : lnt
 (7) \phi \vdash fix (\lambda f: lnt \rightarrow lnt, \lambda x: lnt, x) : 
      (i) Fill in? so that the expression is well-typed.
      (ii) (\lambda f: lnt \rightarrow lnt, \lambda x: lnt, x) is the generator of Some
         function g. What is g? what does g do?
*(8) Ø F fix ( >f: Int > Int. >x: Int. if x=0 then 1 else f(n-1) * x):
          This is also the generator of some function g.
               What is 9?
     (ii) Fill in? So that the expression is well-typed.
 (9) Show that under \phi, (\lambda f: lnt \rightarrow lnt. 42) (if 1 then 2 else 3)
       is ill-typed. Which rule gets stuck?
```

- * (10) Show that if we introduce a new type I with no constructors and no evaluation rules at all, there still exists a term in λ^{\dagger} that has type I.

 (Hint: See exercise 6).
 - (11) let x:Int=1 in x+(let x:List[Int] = x@Nil[Int] in (x)

 λ^{+} extensions:

1) Concrete syntax:

- \x:T. e

T can be Int, List[T], $T \rightarrow T$

- let $x:T = e_1$ in e_2

E.g.

- NillTJ

2) Abstract syntax:

- Lambda of string * typ option * expr
- Let Bind of string * typ option * expr * expr
- ListNil of typ option

where typ represents T.

In HW5, you may assume all type annotations are provided.

That is, a typ option expression must be Some(t).