

Formal Methods

Lecture 8

(B. Pierce's slides for the book “Types and Programming Languages”)

Erasure and Typability

Erasure

We can transform terms in λ_{\rightarrow} to terms of the untyped lambda-calculus simply by erasing type annotations on lambda-abstractions.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{erase}(x) &= x \\ \text{erase}(\lambda x:T_1. t_2) &= \lambda x. \text{erase}(t_2) \\ \text{erase}(t_1 t_2) &= \text{erase}(t_1) \text{erase}(t_2) \end{aligned}$$

Typability

Conversely, an untyped λ -term m is said to be *typable* if there is some term t in the simply typed lambda-calculus, some type T , and some context Γ such that $\text{erase}(t) = m$ and $\Gamma \vdash t : T$.

This process is called *type reconstruction* or *type inference*.

Typability

Conversely, an untyped λ -term m is said to be *typable* if there is some term t in the simply typed lambda-calculus, some type T , and some context Γ such that $\text{erase}(t) = m$ and $\Gamma \vdash t : T$.

This process is called *type reconstruction* or *type inference*.

Example: Is the term

$\lambda x. x x$

typable?

The Curry-Howard Correspondence

Intro vs. elim forms

An *introduction form* for a given type gives us a way of *constructing* elements of this type.

An *elimination form* for a type gives us a way of *using* elements of this type.

The Curry-Howard Correspondence

In *constructive logics*, a proof of P must provide *evidence* for P .

- △ “law of the excluded middle” — $P \vee \neg P$ — not recognized.

A proof of $P \wedge Q$ is a *pair* of evidence for P and evidence for Q .

A proof of $P \supset Q$ is a *procedure* for transforming evidence for P into evidence for Q .

Propositions as Types

Logic

propositions

proposition $P \supset Q$

proposition $P \wedge Q$

proof of proposition P

proposition P is provable

proof simplification

(a.k.a. “cut elimination”)

Programming languages

types

type $P \rightarrow Q$

type $P \times Q$

term t of type P

type P is inhabited (by some term)

evaluation

On to real programming
languages...

Base types

Up to now, we've formulated "base types" (e.g. `Nat`) by adding them to the syntax of types, extending the syntax of terms with associated constants (`zero`) and operators (`succ`, etc.) and adding appropriate typing and evaluation rules. We can do this for as many base types as we like.

For more theoretical discussions (as opposed to programming) we can often ignore the term-level inhabitants of base types, and just treat these types as uninterpreted constants.

E.g., suppose `B` and `C` are some base types. Then we can ask (without knowing anything more about `B` or `C`) whether there are any types `S` and `T` such that the term

$$(\lambda f:S. \lambda g:T. f \ g) (\lambda x:B. x)$$

is well typed.

The Unit type

$t ::= \dots$

unit

terms

constant unit

$v ::= \dots$

unit

values

constant
 unit

$T ::= \dots$

Unit

types

unit type

New typing rules

$\Gamma \vdash t : T$

$\Gamma \vdash \text{unit} : \text{Unit}$

(T-Unit)

Sequencing

$t ::= \dots$
 $t_1; t_2$

terms

Sequencing

$t ::= \dots$
 $t_1; t_2$

terms

$$\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{t_1; t_2 \rightarrow t'_1; t_2} \quad (\text{E-Seq})$$

$$\text{unit}; t_2 \rightarrow t_2 \quad (\text{E-SeqNext})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : \text{Unit} \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash t_1; t_2 : T_2} \quad (\text{T-Seq})$$

Derived forms

- ▲ Syntactic sugar
- ▲ Internal language vs. external (surface) language

Sequencing as a derived form

$$t_1; t_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\lambda x: \text{Unit}. t_2) \ t_1$$

where $x \notin FV(t_2)$

Ascription

New syntactic forms

$t ::= \dots$
 $t \text{ as } T$

New evaluation rules

$v_1 \text{ as } T \rightarrow v_1$

(E-Ascribe)

$$\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{t_1 \text{ as } T \rightarrow t'_1 \text{ as } T}$$

(E-Ascribe1)

New typing rules

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T}{\Gamma \vdash t_1 \text{ as } T : T}$$

(T-Ascribe)

terms

ascription

$t \rightarrow t'$

$\Gamma \vdash t : T$

Ascription as a derived form

$$t \text{ as } T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\lambda x:T. x) \ t$$

Let-bindings

New syntactic forms

$t ::= \dots$
 $\text{let } x=t \text{ in } t$

New evaluation rules

terms

let binding

$t \rightarrow t'$

$\text{let } x=v_1 \text{ in } t_2 \rightarrow [x \rightarrow v_1]t_2 \quad (\text{E-Let V})$

$$\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{\text{let } x=t_1 \text{ in } t_2 \rightarrow \text{let } x=t'_1 \text{ in } t_2} \quad (\text{E-Let})$$

New typing rules

$\Gamma \vdash t : T$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \quad \Gamma, x:T_1 \vdash t_2 : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{let } x=t_1 \text{ in } t_2 : T_2} \quad (\text{T-Let})$$

Pairs, tuples, and records

Pairs

$t ::= \dots$

terms

$\{t, t\}$

pair

$t.1$

first projection

$t.2$

second projection

$v ::= \dots$

values

$\{v, v\}$

pair

value

$T ::= \dots$

types

$T_1 \times T_2$

product

type

Evaluation rules for pairs

$$\{v_1, v_2\}.1 \longrightarrow v_1 \quad (\text{E-Pair Beta 1})$$

$$\{v_1, v_2\}.2 \longrightarrow v_2 \quad (\text{E-Pair Beta 2})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{t_{1.1} \longrightarrow t'_{1.1}} \quad (\text{E-Proj1})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{t_{1.2} \longrightarrow t'_{1.2}} \quad (\text{E-Proj2})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{\{t_1, t_2\} \longrightarrow \{t'_1, t_2\}} \quad (\text{E-Pair 1})$$

$$\frac{t_2 \longrightarrow t'_2}{\{v_1, t_2\} \longrightarrow \{v_1, t'_2\}} \quad (\text{E-Pair 2})$$

Typing rules for pairs

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash \{t_1, t_2\} : T_1 \times T_2} \quad (\text{T-Pair})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \times T_{12}}{\Gamma \vdash t_{1.1} : T_{11}} \quad (\text{T-Proj1})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \times T_{12}}{\Gamma \vdash t_{1.2} : T_{12}} \quad (\text{T-Proj2})$$

Tuples

$t ::= \dots$
 $\{t_i \mid i \in 1..n\}$
 $t.i$

terms
tuple
projection

$v ::= \dots$
 $\{v_i \mid i \in 1..n\}$

values
tuple value

$T ::= \dots$
 $\{T_i \mid i \in 1..n\}$

types
tuple type

Evaluation rules for tuples

$$\{v_i \mid i \in 1..n\}.j \longrightarrow v_j \quad (\text{E-PROJTUPLE})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{t_1.i \longrightarrow t'_1.i} \quad (\text{E-PROJ})$$

$$\frac{t_j \longrightarrow t'_j}{\begin{array}{l} \{v_i \mid i \in 1..j-1, t_j, t_k \mid k \in j+1..n\} \\ \longrightarrow \{v_i \mid i \in 1..j-1, t'_j, t_k \mid k \in j+1..n\} \end{array}} \quad (\text{E-TUPLE})$$

Typing rules for tuples

$$\frac{\text{for each } i \quad \Gamma \vdash t_i : T_i}{\Gamma \vdash \{t_i \mid i \in 1..n\} : \{T_i \mid i \in 1..n\}} \quad (\text{T-Tuple})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : \{T_i \mid i \in 1..n\}}{\Gamma \vdash t_{1.j} : T_j} \quad (\text{T-Proj})$$

Records

$t ::= \dots$
 $\{ l_i = t_i \mid i \in 1..n \}$
 $t.l$

terms
record
projection

$v ::= \dots$
 $\{ l_i = v_i \mid i \in 1..n \}$

values
record value

$T ::= \dots$
 $\{ l_i : T_i \mid i \in 1..n \}$

types
type of records

Evaluation rules for records

$$\{l_i = v_i \mid i \in 1..n\} . l_j \longrightarrow v_j \quad (\text{E-PROJ RCD})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{t_1 . l \longrightarrow t'_1 . l} \quad (\text{E-PROJ})$$

$$\frac{t_j \longrightarrow t'_j}{\begin{array}{l} \{l_i = v_i \mid i \in 1..j-1, l_j = t_j, l_k = t_k \mid k \in j+1..n\} \\ \longrightarrow \{l_i = v_i \mid i \in 1..j-1, l_j = t'_j, l_k = t_k \mid k \in j+1..n\} \end{array}} \quad (\text{E-RCD})$$

Typing rules for records

$$\frac{\text{for each } i \quad \Gamma \vdash t_i : T_i}{\Gamma \vdash \{l_i = t_i \mid i \in 1..n\} : \{l_i : T_i \mid i \in 1..n\}} \quad (\text{T-Rcd})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : \{l_i : T_i \mid i \in 1..n\}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1.l_j : T_j} \quad (\text{T-Proj})$$

Sums and variants

Sums – motivating example

```
PhysicalAddr = {firstlast:String, addr:String}
VirtualAddr  = {name:String, email:String}
Addr         = PhysicalAddr + VirtualAddr
inl  : "PhysicalAddr → PhysicalAddr+VirtualAddr"
inr  : "VirtualAddr  → PhysicalAddr+VirtualAddr"
```

```
getName = λa:Addr.
  case a of
    inl x ⇒ x.firstlast
  | inr y ⇒ y.name;
```

New syntactic forms

$t ::= \dots$	<i>terms</i>
$\text{inl } t$	<i>tagging (left)</i>
$\text{inr } t$	<i>tagging (right)</i>
$\text{case } t \text{ of } \text{inl } x \Rightarrow t \mid \text{inr } x \Rightarrow t$	<i>case</i>
$v ::= \dots$	<i>values</i>
$\text{inl } v$	<i>tagged value (left)</i>
$\text{inr } v$	<i>tagged value (right)</i>
$T ::= \dots$	<i>types</i>
$T + T$	<i>sum</i>
	<i>type</i>

$T_1 + T_2$ is a *disjoint union* of T_1 and T_2 (the tags inl and inr ensure disjointness)

New evaluation rules

$$\boxed{t \longrightarrow t'}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{case (inl } v_0) \\ \text{of inl } x_1 \Rightarrow t_1 \mid \text{inr } x_2 \Rightarrow t_2 \end{array} \longrightarrow [x_1 \mapsto v_0]t_1 \quad (\text{E-CASEINL})$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{case (inr } v_0) \\ \text{of inl } x_1 \Rightarrow t_1 \mid \text{inr } x_2 \Rightarrow t_2 \end{array} \longrightarrow [x_2 \mapsto v_0]t_2 \quad (\text{E-CASEINR})$$

$$\frac{t_0 \longrightarrow t'_0}{\begin{array}{l} \text{case } t_0 \text{ of inl } x_1 \Rightarrow t_1 \mid \text{inr } x_2 \Rightarrow t_2 \\ \longrightarrow \text{case } t'_0 \text{ of inl } x_1 \Rightarrow t_1 \mid \text{inr } x_2 \Rightarrow t_2 \end{array}} \quad (\text{E-CASE})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{\text{inl } t_1 \longrightarrow \text{inl } t'_1} \quad (\text{E-INL})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{\text{inr } t_1 \longrightarrow \text{inr } t'_1} \quad (\text{E-INR})$$

New typing rules

$$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash t : T}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inl } t_1 : T_1 + T_2} \quad (\text{T-Inl})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inr } t_1 : T_1 + T_2} \quad (\text{T-Inr})$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \Gamma \vdash t_0 : T_1 + T_2 \\ \Gamma, x_1 : T_1 \vdash t_1 : T \quad \Gamma, x_2 : T_2 \vdash t_2 : T \end{array}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{case } t_0 \text{ of inl } x_1 \Rightarrow t_1 \mid \text{inr } x_2 \Rightarrow t_2 : T} \quad (\text{T-Case})$$

Sums and Uniqueness of Types

Problem:

If t has type T , then $\text{inl } t$ has type $T+U$ for every U .

I.e., we've lost uniqueness of types.

Possible solutions:

- ▲ “Infer” U as needed during typechecking
- ▲ Give constructors different names and only allow each name to appear in one sum type (requires generalization to “variants,” which we'll see next) — OCaml's solution
- ▲ Annotate each inl and inr with the intended sum type.

For simplicity, let's choose the third.

New syntactic forms

$t ::= \dots$
 $\text{inl } t \text{ as } T$
 $\text{inr } t \text{ as } T$

terms
 tagging (left)
 tagging (right)

$v ::= \dots$
 $\text{inl } v \text{ as } T$
 $\text{inr } v \text{ as } T$

values
 tagged value (left)
 tagged value (right)

Note that $\text{as } T$ here is not the ascription operator that we saw before — i.e., not a separate syntactic form: in essence, there is an ascription “built into” every use of inl or inr .

New typing rules

$$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash t : T}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inl } t_1 \text{ as } T_1+T_2 : T_1+T_2} \quad (\text{T-Inl})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inr } t_1 \text{ as } T_1+T_2 : T_1+T_2} \quad (\text{T-Inr})$$

Evaluation rules ignore annotations:

$$\boxed{t \longrightarrow t'}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{case (inl } v_0 \text{ as } T_0) \\ \text{of inl } x_1 \Rightarrow t_1 \mid \text{inr } x_2 \Rightarrow t_2 \\ \longrightarrow [x_1 \rightarrow v_0]t_1 \end{array} \quad (\text{E-CaseInl})$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{case (inr } v_0 \text{ as } T_0) \\ \text{of inl } x_1 \Rightarrow t_1 \mid \text{inr } x_2 \Rightarrow t_2 \\ \longrightarrow [x_2 \rightarrow v_0]t_2 \end{array} \quad (\text{E-CaseInr})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{\text{inl } t_1 \text{ as } T_2 \longrightarrow \text{inl } t'_1 \text{ as } T_2} \quad (\text{E-Inl})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{\text{inr } t_1 \text{ as } T_2 \longrightarrow \text{inr } t'_1 \text{ as } T_2} \quad (\text{E-Inr})$$

Variants

Just as we generalized binary products to labeled records, we can generalize binary sums to labeled *variants*.

New syntactic forms

$t ::= \dots$
 $\langle l=t \rangle \text{ as } T$
 $\text{case } t \text{ of } \langle l_i = x_i \rangle \Rightarrow t_i \quad i \in 1 \dots n$

terms
tagging
case

$T ::= \dots$
 $\langle l_i : T_i \quad i \in 1 \dots n \rangle$

types
type of variants

New evaluation rules

$$\boxed{t \longrightarrow t'}$$

$$\text{case } (\langle l_j = v_j \rangle \text{ as } T) \text{ of } \langle l_i = x_i \rangle \Rightarrow t_i \text{ }^{i \in 1 \dots n} \longrightarrow [x_j \rightarrow v_j] t_j \quad (\text{E-CaseVariant})$$

$$\frac{t_0 \longrightarrow t'_0}{\text{case } t_0 \text{ of } \langle l_i = x_i \rangle \Rightarrow t_i \text{ }^{i \in 1 \dots n} \longrightarrow \text{case } t'_0 \text{ of } \langle l_i = x_i \rangle \Rightarrow t_i \text{ }^{i \in 1 \dots n}} \quad (\text{E-Case})$$

$$\frac{t_i \longrightarrow t'_i}{\langle l_i = t_i \rangle \text{ as } T \longrightarrow \langle l_i = t'_i \rangle \text{ as } T} \quad (\text{E-Variant})$$

New typing rules

$$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash t : T}$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \frac{\Gamma \vdash t_j : T_j}{\langle l_j = t_j \rangle \text{ as } \langle l_i : T_i \mid i \in 1 \dots n \rangle : \langle l_i : T_i \mid i \in 1 \dots n \rangle} \text{ (T-Variant)}$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \frac{\begin{array}{c} \Gamma \vdash t_0 : \langle l_i : T_i \mid i \in 1 \dots n \rangle \\ \text{for each } i \quad \Gamma, x_i : T_i \vdash t_i : T \end{array}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{case } t_0 \text{ of } \langle l_i = x_i \rangle \Rightarrow t_i \mid i \in 1 \dots n : T} \text{ (T-Case)}$$

Example

```
Addr = <physical:PhysicalAddr, virtual:VirtualAddr>;
```

```
a = <physical=pa> as Addr;
```

```
getName = λa:Addr.  
  case a of  
    <physical=x> ⇒ x.firstlast  
  | <virtual=y> ⇒ y.name;
```

Options

Just like in OCaml...

```
OptionalNat = <none:Unit, some:Nat>;
```

```
Table = Nat → OptionalNat;
```

```
emptyTable = λn:Nat. <none=unit> as OptionalNat;
```

```
extendTable =
```

```
  λt:Table. λm:Nat. λv:Nat.
```

```
    λn:Nat.
```

```
      if equal n m then <some=v> as OptionalNat
```

```
      else t n;
```

```
x = case t(5) of
```

```
  <none=u> ⇒ 999
```

```
  | <some=v> ⇒ v;
```

Enumerations

```
Weekday = <monday:Unit, tuesday:Unit, wednesday:Unit,  
          thursday:Unit, friday:Unit>;
```

```
nextBusinessDay = λw:Weekday.
```

```
  case w of <monday=x>    ⇒ <tuesday=unit> as Weekday  
    | <tuesday=x>         ⇒ <wednesday=unit> as Weekday  
    | <wednesday=x>      ⇒ <thursday=unit> as Weekday  
    | <thursday=x>       ⇒ <friday=unit> as Weekday  
    | <friday=x>         ⇒ <monday=unit> as Weekday;
```

Recursion

Recursion in $\lambda \rightarrow$

- △ In $\lambda \rightarrow$, all programs terminate.
- △ Hence, untyped terms like `omega` and `fix` are not typable.
- △ But we can *extend* the system with a (typed) fixed-point operator...

Example

```
ff = λie:Nat→Bool.  
    λx:Nat.  
      if iszero x then true  
      else if iszero (pred x) then false else  
      ie (pred (pred x));
```

```
iseven = fix ff;
```

```
iseven 7;
```


New syntactic forms

$t ::= \dots$
 $\text{fix } t$

terms

fixed point of t

New evaluation rules

$$\boxed{t \longrightarrow t'}$$

$$\text{fix } (\lambda x:T_1. t_2) \longrightarrow [x \rightarrow (\text{fix } (\lambda x:T_1. t_2))]t_2 \quad (\text{E-FixBeta})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{\text{fix } t_1 \longrightarrow \text{fix } t'_1} \quad (\text{E-Fix})$$

New typing rules

$\Gamma \vdash t : T$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_1}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fix } t_1 : T_1}$$

(T-Fix)

A more convenient form

$\text{letrec } x:T_1=t_1 \text{ in } t_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{let } x = \text{fix } (\lambda x:T_1.t_1) \text{ in } t_2$

```
letrec iseven : Nat → Bool =  
  λx:Nat.  
    if iszero x then true  
    else if iszero (pred x) then false  
    else iseven (pred (pred x))  
in  
  iseven 7;
```