

Ex. 1: Convert Haskell types  $\rightarrow$  minHS types, give example values:

① data Direction = East | West | North | South  $\cong$   $1 + (1 + (1 + 1))$

In minHS, North is InR (InR (InL ()))

② data Foo = Foo Int Bool Int  $\cong$  ~~Int  $\times$  (Bool  $\times$  Int)~~

In minHS, Foo 1 True 2 is (1, (True, 2))

③ data Tree = Node Tree Tree | Leaf  $\cong$  rect. (txt) + 1

In minHS, Node Leaf Leaf is roll (InL (roll (InR ()), roll (InR ())))

Proof: We have Leaf = roll (InR (1))

choose  $T_1$  in InR intro

InR () : (rect. (txt) + 1, rect. (txt) + 1) + 1

roll (InR ()) : rect. (txt) + 1

(roll, InR (), ...) : (rect. (txt) + 1)  $\times$  ...

InL ( ) : (rect. (txt) + 1  $\times$  ...) + 1

roll ( ) : rect. (txt) + 1.

choose as  $T_2$   
in InL intro.

Ex. 2: mintHS value of These types:

① rec t. ( $\text{Int} + t$ )

② rec t. ( $\text{Int} \times \text{Bool}$ )

③ rec t. ( $\text{Int} \times t$ ) is infinite, but recfun  $f x = \text{roll}(x, f x)$

Ex. 3: Find The type isom. classes: assume strict semantics

$T_A = \text{rec t. } (t \times t)$  → can't construct strictly

$T_B = 0$

$T_C = 1$

$T_D = 1 \times 0$

$T_E = \text{rec t. } (t \times 1)$  → can't construct strictly

$T_F = \text{rec t. } (t + 1)$  → is "isom." to  $\mathbb{N}$ , i.e. countably infinite

Ex. 4: Give a type for these terms:

①  $\text{InL } \text{True} : \text{Bool} + \alpha$  for all  $\alpha$

②  $\text{InR } \text{True} :$

③  $\text{InL } (\text{InL } \text{True}) :$

④  $\text{roll } (\text{InR } \text{True}) :$

⑤  $(\lambda, \text{InL } ()) :$

Ex. 5: Is there a MINTS function with this type?

$$\textcircled{1} \quad (a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow c) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow c) \xrightarrow{\text{C.H.}} (A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow C)$$

Ans: Yes

why? The logical prop<sup>n</sup> is just transitivity of  $\Rightarrow$

$$\textcircled{2} \quad ((a \times b) \rightarrow c) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow c) \xrightarrow{\text{C.H.}} ((A \wedge B) \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow C)$$

Ans: No

why? If  $A = T$ ,  $B = C = \perp$ , then we get  $T \Rightarrow \perp$  which is false, i.e. the logical prop<sup>g</sup> is not a tautology. So not provable.

$$\textcircled{3} \quad (a \rightarrow c) \rightarrow ((a \times b) \rightarrow c) \xrightarrow{\text{C.H.}} (A \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow ((A \wedge B) \Rightarrow C)$$

Ans: Yes

why? We can just impl. the function. Not sure about a pure logic answer here.

Ex. 6: Write a MINTS program which proved  $(A \vee B) \Rightarrow (B \vee A)$

Ex.8: Difference between two polymorphic functions:

$$\forall a. \ a \rightarrow a \quad \text{vs.} \quad (\forall a. a) \rightarrow (\forall a. a)$$

Ex.9: Deductions based on type signature:

①  $f_1: \forall a. [a] \rightarrow a$

②  $f_2: \forall a b. [a] \rightarrow [b]$

③  $f_3: \forall a b. [a] \rightarrow b$

④  $f_4: [\text{Int}] \rightarrow [\text{Int}]$