

# A Report of *Type Theory and Formal Proof*

Juan Pablo Royo Sales

Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya

February 14, 2021

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Untyped lambda calculus</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Definition . . . . .	2
2.1.1	Lambda-terms . . . . .	3
2.2	Free and bound variables . . . . .	4
2.2.1	Alpha conversion . . . . .	4
2.3	Substitution . . . . .	4
2.4	Beta reduction . . . . .	5
2.5	Fixed Point Theorem . . . . .	5
2.6	Exercises . . . . .	6
2.6.1	1.10 Church numerals . . . . .	6
2.6.2	1.11 - Successor . . . . .	7
2.6.3	1.12 - If then else . . . . .	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Simply typed lambda calculus</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Simple types . . . . .	8
3.1.1	Remarks . . . . .	8
3.2	Church-typing and Curry-typing . . . . .	9
3.2.1	Typing à la Church . . . . .	9
3.2.2	Typing à la Curry . . . . .	9
3.3	Derivation rules for Church's $\lambda \rightarrow$ . . . . .	9
3.3.1	Example . . . . .	10
3.4	Derivation formats . . . . .	10
3.4.1	Linear format . . . . .	10
3.4.2	Flag notation . . . . .	10

3.5	Problems solved with judgement in Type Theory . . . . .	11
3.5.1	Well-typedness in $\lambda \rightarrow$ . . . . .	11
3.5.2	Type Checking in $\lambda \rightarrow$ . . . . .	12
3.5.3	Term finding in $\lambda \rightarrow$ . . . . .	13
3.6	General properties of $\lambda \rightarrow$ . . . . .	14
3.7	Reductions and $\lambda \rightarrow$ . . . . .	14
3.8	Exercises . . . . .	15
3.8.1	2.5 Find pre-typed terms . . . . .	15
3.8.2	2.9 Type checking . . . . .	15
<b>References</b>		<b>17</b>

## 1 Introduction

This report is going to provide a summary over the book [NG14]. Alongside the different chapters of the book I am going to describe briefly the most important parts of each chapter and, at the same time, I am going to solve 1 or 2 of the exercises proposed by the authors.

The organization of the report is going to be the same as the chapters of the book.

## 2 Untyped lambda calculus

In this first chapter the authors define and describe Lambda Calculus ( *$\lambda$ -calculus*) system which encapsulates the formalization of basic aspects of mathematical functions, in particular construction and use. In  *$\lambda$ -calculus* formalization system there are *typed* and *untyped* formalization of the same system. In this first case authors introduced the first basic and simple formalization which is *untyped*.

### 2.1 Definition

There are *two constructions principles* and *one evaluation rule*

#### Construction principles:

- *Abstraction*: Given an expression  $M$  and a variable  $x$  we can construct the expression:  $\lambda x.M$ . This is abstraction of  $x$  over  $M$  Example:  $\lambda y.(\lambda x.x - y)$  Abstraction of  $y$  over  $\lambda x.x - y$

- *Application*: Given 2 expressions  $M$  and  $N$  we can construct the expression:  $M N$ . This is the application of  $M$  to  $N$ . Example:  $(\lambda x.x^2+1)(3)$   
Application of 3 over  $\lambda x.x^2 + 1$

**Evaluation Rule:** Formalization of this process is called Beta Reduction ( $\beta$ -reduction).  $\beta$ -reduction: An expression  $(\lambda x.M)N$  can be rewritten to  $M[x := N]$ , which means every  $x$  should be replaced by  $N$  in  $M$ . This process is called  $\beta$ -reduction of  $(\lambda x.M)N$  to  $M[x := N]$ .

Example:  $(\lambda x.x^2 + 1)(3)$  reduces to  $(x^2 + 1)[x := 3]$ , which is  $3^2 + 1$ .

In this book, functions on  $\lambda$ -calculus notation are *Curried*.

### 2.1.1 Lambda-terms

Expressions in  $\lambda$ -calculus are called Lambda Terms ( $\lambda$ -term)

**Definition 2.1.** *The set  $\Lambda$  of all  $\lambda$ -term*

1. (Variable) If  $u \in V$ , then  $u \in \Lambda$   
Example:  $x, y, z$
2. (Application) If  $M$  and  $N \in \Lambda$ , then  $(MN) \in \Lambda$   
Example:  $(xy), (x(xy))$
3. (Abstraction) If  $u \in V$  and  $M \in \Lambda$ , then  $(\lambda u.M) \in \Lambda$   
Example:  $(\lambda x.(xz)), (\lambda y.(\lambda z.x))$

**Definition 2.2.** *Multiset of subterms  $Sub$*

1. (Basis)  $Sub(x) = \{x\}$ , for each  $x \in V$
2. (Application)  $Sub((MN)) = Sub(M) \cup Sub(N) \cup \{(MN)\}$
3. (Abstraction)  $Sub((\lambda x.M)) = Sub(M) \cup \{(\lambda x.M)\}$

**Lemma 2.1.** (1) (*Reflexivity*) For all  $\lambda$ -term  $M$ , we have  $M \in Sub(M)$ . (2) (*Transitivity*) If  $L \in Sub(M)$  and  $M \in Sub(N)$ , then  $L \in Sub(N)$ .

**Definition 2.3** (Proper subterm).  $L$  is a proper subterm of  $M$  if  $L$  is a subterm of  $M$ , but  $L \neq M$

- Parenthesis can be omitted
- Application is left-associative,  $MNL$  is  $((MN)L)$
- Application takes precedence over Abstraction

## 2.2 Free and bound variables

Variables can be *free*, *bound* and *binding*. A variable  $x$  which is *free* in  $M$  becomes *bound* in  $\lambda x.M$ .  $M$  is called a *binding* variable occurrence.

**Definition 2.4** (FV, set of free variables of a  $\lambda$ -term).

1. (Variable)  $FV(x) = \{x\}$
2. (Application)  $FV(MN) = FV(M) \cup FV(N)$
3. (Abstraction)  $FV(\lambda x.M) = FV(M) \setminus \{x\}$

**Definition 2.5** (Closed  $\lambda$ -term; combinator;  $\Lambda^0$ ). *The  $\lambda$ -term  $M$  is closed if  $FV(M) = \emptyset$ . This is also called a combinator. The set of all closed  $\lambda$ -term is denoted by  $\Lambda^0$*

### 2.2.1 Alpha conversion

It is based on the possibility of renaming bound and binding variables.

**Definition 2.6** (Renaming;  $M^{x \rightarrow y}$ ;  $=_\alpha$ ). *Let  $M^{x \rightarrow y}$  denote the result of replacing every free occurrence of  $x$  in  $M$  by  $y$ . Renaming, expressed by  $=_\alpha$  is defined as:  $\lambda x.M =_\alpha \lambda y.M^{x \rightarrow y}$ , provided that  $y \notin FV(M)$  and  $y$  is not binding in  $M$*

**Definition 2.7** ( $\alpha$ -conversion or  $\alpha$ -equivalence;  $=_\alpha$ ).

1. (Renaming) same as 2.6
2. (Compatibility) If  $M =_\alpha N$ , then  $ML =_\alpha NL$ ,  $LM =_\alpha LN$  and, for any arbitrary  $z$ ,  $\lambda z.M =_\alpha \lambda z.N$
3. (Reflexivity)  $M =_\alpha M$
4. (Symmetry) If  $M =_\alpha N$  then  $N =_\alpha M$
5. (Transitivity) If both  $L =_\alpha M$  and  $M =_\alpha N$ , then  $L =_\alpha N$

## 2.3 Substitution

**Definition 2.8** (Substitution).

1.  $x[x := N] \equiv N$
2.  $y[x := N] \equiv y$  if  $x \neq y$
3.  $(PQ)[x := N] \equiv (P[x := N])(Q[x := N])$

4.  $(\lambda y.P)[x := N] \equiv \lambda z.(P^{y \rightarrow z}[x := N])$ , if  $\lambda z.P^{y \rightarrow z}$  is  $\alpha$ -variant of  $\lambda y.P$  such that  $z \notin FV(N)$

## 2.4 Beta reduction

**Definition 2.9** (One-step  $\beta$ -reduction,  $\rightarrow_\beta$ ).

1. (Basis)  $(\lambda x.M)N \rightarrow_\beta M[x := N]$ ,
2. (Compatibility) If  $M \rightarrow_\beta N$ , then  $ML \rightarrow_\beta NL$ ,  $LM \rightarrow_\beta LN$  and  $\lambda x.M \rightarrow_\beta \lambda x.N$

In 1 the left part of  $\rightarrow_\beta$  is called *redex* (reducible expression), and the right side is called *contractum* (of the redex).

**Definition 2.10** ( $\beta$ -reduction (zero-or-more-step),  $\twoheadrightarrow_\beta$ ).  $M \twoheadrightarrow_\beta N$  if there is an  $n \geq 0$  and there are terms  $M_0$  to  $M_n$  such that  $M_0 \equiv M$ ,  $M_n \equiv N$  and for all  $i, 0 \leq i < n$ :

$$M_i \rightarrow_\beta M_{i+1}$$

Hence, if  $M \twoheadrightarrow_\beta N$ , there exists a chain of single-step  $\beta$ -reductions, starting with  $M$  and ending with  $N$ :

$$M \equiv M_0 \rightarrow_\beta M_1 \rightarrow_\beta M_2 \rightarrow_\beta \dots \rightarrow_\beta M_{n-2} \rightarrow_\beta M_{n-1} \rightarrow_\beta M_n \equiv N$$

**Definition 2.11** ( $\beta$ -conversion,  $\beta$ -equality;  $=_\beta$ ).  $M =_\beta N$  if there is an  $n \geq 0$  and there are terms  $M_0$  to  $M_n$  such that  $M_0 \equiv M$ ,  $M_n \equiv N$  and for all  $i, 0 \leq i < n$ :

$$\text{either } M_i \rightarrow_\beta M_{i+1} \text{ or } M_{i+1} \rightarrow_\beta M_i$$

## 2.5 Fixed Point Theorem

**Theorem 2.1.** For all  $L \in \Lambda$  there is  $M \in \Lambda$  such that  $LM =_\beta M$

*Proof.* For given  $L$ , define  $M := (\lambda x.L(xx))(\lambda x.L(xx))$  This  $M$  is a redex, so we have:

$$M \equiv (\lambda x.L(xx))(\lambda x.L(xx)) \tag{1a}$$

$$\rightarrow_\beta L((\lambda x.L(xx))(\lambda x.L(xx))) \tag{1b}$$

$$\equiv LM \tag{1c}$$

Therefore,  $LM =_\beta M$  □

## 2.6 Exercises

### 2.6.1 1.10 Church numerals

Having that:

- $zero := \lambda f x. x$
- $one := \lambda f x. f x$
- $two := \lambda f x. f(f x)$
- $add := \lambda m n f x. m f (n f x)$
- $mult := \lambda m n f x. m (n f) x$

(a). Show that:  $(add\ one\ one \rightarrow_{\beta} two)$

*Proof.* Replacing by lambda expressions

$$add\ one\ one := (\lambda m n f x. m f (n f x)) (\lambda f x. f x) (\lambda f x. f x) \quad (2a)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda n f x. (\lambda f x. f x) f (n f x)) (\lambda f x. f x) \quad (2b)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda f x. (\lambda f x. f x) f ((\lambda f x. f x) f x)) \quad (2c)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda f x. (\lambda f x. f x) f (f x)) \quad (2d)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda f x. f (f x)) \quad (2e)$$

$$:= two \quad (2f)$$

□

(b). Show that:  $(add\ one\ one \not\rightarrow_{\beta} mult\ one\ zero)$

*Proof.* We need to reduce  $(mult\ one\ zero)$  and show that is not  $two$

$$mult\ one\ zero := (\lambda m n f x. m (n f) x) (\lambda f x. f x) (\lambda f x. x) \quad (3a)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda n f x. (\lambda f x. f x) (n f) x) (\lambda f x. x) \quad (3b)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda f x. (\lambda f x. f x) ((\lambda f x. x) f) x) \quad (3c)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda f x. (\lambda x. ((\lambda f x. x) f) x) x) \quad (3d)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda f x. (\lambda x. (\lambda x. x) x) x) \quad (3e)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda f x. (\lambda x. x) x) \quad (3f)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda f x. x) \quad (3g)$$

$$:= zero \quad (3h)$$

□

### 2.6.2 1.11 - Successor

Having that  $suc := \lambda m.fx.f(mx)$ . Check the following

(a).  $suc\ zero =_{\beta} one$

*Proof.*

$$suc\ zero =_{\beta} (\lambda m.fx.f(mx))(\lambda fx.x) \quad (4a)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda fx.f((\lambda fx.x)fx)) \quad (4b)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda fx.f((\lambda x.x)x)) \quad (4c)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda fx.fx) \quad (4d)$$

$$:= one \quad (4e)$$

□

(b).  $suc\ one =_{\beta} two$

*Proof.*

$$suc\ one =_{\beta} (\lambda m.fx.f(mx))(\lambda fx.fx) \quad (5a)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda fx.f((\lambda fx.fx)fx)) \quad (5b)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda fx.f((\lambda x.fx)x)) \quad (5c)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda fx.f(fx)) \quad (5d)$$

$$:= two \quad (5e)$$

□

### 2.6.3 1.12 - If then else

The term 'If  $x$  then  $u$  else  $v$ ' is represented by  $\lambda x.xuv$ . Check this by calculating  $\beta$ -normal forms of  $(\lambda x.xuv)true$  and  $(\lambda x.xuv>false$ , having that:

- $true := \lambda xy.x$
- $false := \lambda xy.y$

$(\lambda x.xuv)true$ .

$$:= (\lambda x.xuv)(\lambda xy.x) \quad (6a)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda xy.x)uv \quad (6b)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda y.u)v \quad (6c)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} u \quad (6d)$$

$$(6e)$$

□

$(\lambda x.xuv).false.$

$$:= (\lambda x.xuv)(\lambda xy.y) \quad (7a)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda xy.y)uv \quad (7b)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} (\lambda y.y)v \quad (7c)$$

$$\rightarrow_{\beta} v \quad (7d)$$

$$(7e)$$

□

### 3 Simply typed lambda calculus

In this chapter authors introduce **Types** to  $\lambda$ -calculus Formalization system. When we are acting on mathematical functions, the natural thing is to restrict over some domain, both the image and the pre-image. The addition of types to the formalization system prevents some anomalies that are present in the regular  $\lambda$ -calculus model.

#### 3.1 Simple types

It is done adding type *variables* with an infinite set  $\mathbb{V} = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \dots\}$

**Definition 3.1** (The set  $\mathbb{T}$  of all simple types).

1. (Type variable) If  $\alpha \in \mathbb{V}$ , then  $\alpha \in \mathbb{T}$
2. (Arrow type) If  $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{T}$ , then  $(\sigma \rightarrow \tau) \in \mathbb{T}$

Also,  $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{V} \mid \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ .

Parenthesis in *arrow types* are right-associative

##### 3.1.1 Remarks

- *Type variable* represent simple types like *Nat*, *Lists*, etc.
- *Arrow types* represent functions such as *nat*  $\rightarrow$  *real*
- '*term*  $M$  *has type*  $\sigma$ ' (typing statement) is represented as  $M : \sigma$
- '*variable*  $x$  *has type*  $\sigma$ ' is represented as  $x : \sigma$
- If  $x : \sigma$  and  $x : \tau$  then  $\sigma \equiv \tau$



- *Application*: If  $M : \sigma \rightarrow \tau$  and  $N : \sigma$ , then  $MN : \tau$
- *Abstraction*: If  $x : \sigma$  and  $M : \tau$ , then  $\lambda x.M : \sigma \rightarrow \tau$

## 3.2 Church-typing and Curry-typing

### 3.2.1 Typing à la Church

Unique type for each variable upon its introduction [Chu40].

**Example:** If  $x$  has type  $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha$  and  $y$  has type  $(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \beta$ , then  $yx$  has type  $\beta$ .

If  $z$  has type  $\beta$  and  $u$  has type  $\gamma$ , then  $\lambda zu.z$  has type  $\beta \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow \beta$ . Therefore application  $(\lambda zu.z)(yx)$  is permitted.

### 3.2.2 Typing à la Curry

Not give the types of variables, leave them *implicit*, therefore is called *implicit typing*.

**Example:** Suppose we have  $M \equiv (\lambda zu.z)(yx)$  but types are not given. Guessing we have  $\lambda zu.z$  should have some type  $A \rightarrow B$ , so  $(yx)$  must be of type  $A$ , then  $M$  is of type  $B$ . If we continue with the guessing assigning type variables after replacing we end up with the same expression as explicit typing.

Most of the book use *Typing a la Church* because in math and logic types are usually fixed and known beforehand.

## 3.3 Derivation rules for Church's $\lambda \rightarrow$

**Definition 3.2** (Pre-typed  $\lambda$ -term,  $\Lambda_{\mathbb{T}}$ ).

$$\Lambda_{\mathbb{T}} = V \mid (\Lambda_{\mathbb{T}} \Lambda_{\mathbb{T}}) \mid (\lambda V : \mathbb{T}. \Lambda_{\mathbb{T}}) \quad (8)$$

We want to express things like ' $\lambda$ -term  $M$  has type  $\sigma$ ' relative to context  $\Gamma$

**Definition 3.3** (Statement, declaration, context, judgement).

1. **Statement:**  $M : \sigma$ , where  $M \in \Lambda_{\mathbb{T}}$  and  $\sigma \in \mathbb{T}$ .  $M$  is called *subject* and  $\sigma$  *type*
2. **Declaration:** Is a statement with a *variable* as subject. Example  $x : \alpha \rightarrow \beta$

3. **Context:** List of Declarations with different subjects

4. **Judgement:**  $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$ , where  $\Gamma$  is a *Context* and  $M : \sigma$  is a *Statement*.

**Definition 3.4** (Derivation rules for  $\lambda \rightarrow$ ).

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\text{var}) \quad & \Gamma \vdash x : \sigma \text{ if } x : \sigma \in \Gamma \\
 (\text{appl}) \quad & \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash N : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash MN : \tau} \\
 (\text{abst}) \quad & \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : \sigma. M : \sigma \rightarrow \tau}
 \end{aligned}$$

These rules are **universal**.

**Definition 3.5** (Legal  $\lambda \rightarrow$ -terms). A pre-typed term  $M$  in  $\lambda \rightarrow$  is called **legal** if there exist a context  $\Gamma$  and type  $\rho$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash M : \rho$

### 3.3.1 Example

$$\frac{
 \frac{
 \frac{
 y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta, z : \alpha \vdash y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta \quad y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta, z : \alpha \vdash z : \alpha
 }{y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta, z : \alpha \vdash yz : \beta}
 }{y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta \vdash \lambda z : \alpha. yz : \alpha \rightarrow \beta}
 }{\emptyset \vdash \lambda y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta. \lambda z : \alpha. yz : (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta}$$

## 3.4 Derivation formats

### 3.4.1 Linear format

1.  $y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta, z : \alpha \vdash y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta$  (*var*)
2.  $y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta, z : \alpha \vdash z : \alpha$  (*var*)
3.  $y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta, z : \alpha \vdash yz : \beta$  (*appl*) on 1 and 2
4.  $y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta \vdash \lambda z : \alpha. yz : \alpha \rightarrow \beta$  (*abst*) on 3
5.  $\emptyset \vdash \lambda y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta. \lambda z : \alpha. yz : (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta$  (*abst*) on 4

### 3.4.2 Flag notation

Flag notation is a succinct and useful way to represent Derivation rules on Typed- $\lambda$ -calculus. It is represented using a *flag* (rectangular box) as a declaration, and everything that is below and attached to this *flag* are statements that belong to it. This is also called *flag pole*. Let's see an example of derivation:

We can translate *linear format* into *flag notation*:

(1)	$y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta$	
(2)	$z : \alpha$	
(3)	$y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta$	(var) on (1)
(4)	$z : \alpha$	(var) on (2)
(5)	$yz : \beta$	(appl) on (3) and (4)
(6)	$\lambda z : \alpha. yz : \alpha \rightarrow \beta$	(abst) on (5)
(7)	$\lambda y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta. \lambda z : \alpha. yz : (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta$	(abst) on (6)

Even more succinct without *var* rule:

(1)	$y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta$	
(2)	$z : \alpha$	
(3)	$yz : \beta$	(appl) on (1) and (2)
(4)	$\lambda z : \alpha. yz : \alpha \rightarrow \beta$	(abst) on (3)
(5)	$\lambda y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta. \lambda z : \alpha. yz : (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta$	(abst) on (4)

### 3.5 Problems solved with judgement in Type Theory

- Well-typedness in  $\lambda \rightarrow$
- Type Checking in  $\lambda \rightarrow$
- Term finding in  $\lambda \rightarrow$

#### 3.5.1 Well-typedness in $\lambda \rightarrow$

Find out when a term is legal:

$? \vdash \text{term} : ?$

We want to show that a  $\lambda$ -term  $M$  is legal or not. This is done following the derivation tree and trying to find a context  $\Gamma$  and a type  $\rho$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash M : \rho$

In our previous example of derivation if we start checking that the term  $\lambda y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta. \lambda z : \alpha. yz : ?$  is legal. If we check with our flag notation from bottom up in the derivation tree, we are going to find the context in which this term is legal, but for example if that term would have been  $\lambda y : \alpha \rightarrow \beta. \lambda z : \beta. yz : ?$ , we have not because  $z : \beta$  cannot be applied to  $y$ .

### 3.5.2 Type Checking in $\lambda \rightarrow$

It is checking the validity of a full *judgement*. Given the following:

$$x : \alpha \rightarrow \alpha, y : (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \beta \quad \vdash \quad (\lambda z : \beta. \lambda u : \gamma. z)(yx) : \gamma \rightarrow \beta$$

$$\begin{array}{l|l} (1) & x : \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \\ (2) & \begin{array}{|l} y : (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \beta \\ \vdots \end{array} \\ (3) & (\lambda z : \beta. \lambda u : \gamma. z)(yx) : \gamma \rightarrow \beta \end{array}$$

The idea is to fill the dots:

$$\begin{array}{l|l} (1) & x : \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \\ (2) & \begin{array}{|l} y : (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \beta \\ \lambda z : \beta. \lambda u : \gamma. z : ?_1 \\ \vdots \\ yx : ?_2 \end{array} \\ (3) & \\ (4) & \\ (5) & (\lambda z : \beta. \lambda u : \gamma. z)(yx) : \gamma \rightarrow \beta \quad \text{(appl) on (3) and (4), (?)} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l|l} (1) & x : \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \\ (2) & \begin{array}{|l} y : (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \beta \\ \begin{array}{|l} z : \beta \\ \begin{array}{|l} u : \gamma \\ z : \beta \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \\ (3) & \\ (4) & \\ (5) & \quad \quad \quad \text{(var) on (3)} \\ (6) & \quad \quad \quad \lambda u : \gamma. z : \gamma \rightarrow \beta \quad \text{(abst) on (5)} \end{array}$$

- |     |   |                            |
|-----|---|----------------------------|
| (7) | $\lambda z : \beta. \lambda u : \gamma. z : \beta \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow \beta$ | (abst) on (6)              |
| (8) | $yx : \beta$  | (appl) on (1) and (2)      |
| (9) | $(\lambda z : \beta. \lambda u : \gamma. z)(yx) : \gamma \rightarrow \beta$             | (appl) on (7) and (8), (?) |

### 3.5.3 Term finding in $\lambda \rightarrow$

Finding an appropriated term of certain type, in a certain context. A *term* that belongs to certain type is called ***inhabitant*** of that type.

This process is constructed starting with an empty context and exploring the situation on which the type is an expression from logic: a *proposition*. Every inhabitant then codes a *proof* of this proposition, hence declaring it to be a 'true' one.

#### Procedure:

- Take  $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow A$  as a logical expression. This is a *tautology*
- Assume  $A$  holds.
- Assume  $B$  holds, then  $A$  holds.

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| (1) | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;"><math>x : A</math></div> |  |
|     | $\vdots$  |  |
| (2) | $? : B \rightarrow A$   |  |
|     | $\vdots$  |  |
| (3) | $\dots A \rightarrow B \rightarrow A$ (abst) on (2)   |  |

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| (1) | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;"><math>x : A</math></div> |  |
| (2) | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;"><math>y : B</math></div> |  |
|     | $\vdots$  |  |
| (3) | $? : A \rightarrow A$   |  |
| (4) | $\dots : B \rightarrow A$ (abst) on (3)   |  |
| (5) | $\dots A \rightarrow B \rightarrow A$ (abst) on (4)   |  |

- $$\begin{array}{ll}
(1) & \boxed{x : A} \\
(2) & \boxed{\boxed{y : B}} \\
(3) & \boxed{x : A} \quad (\text{var}) \text{ on } (1) \\
(4) & \boxed{\lambda y : B. x : B \rightarrow A} \quad (\text{abst}) \text{ on } (3) \\
(5) & \lambda x : A. \lambda y : B. x : A \rightarrow B \rightarrow A \quad (\text{abst}) \text{ on } (4)
\end{array}$$

### 3.6 General properties of $\lambda \rightarrow$

**Definition 3.6** (Domain,  $\text{dom}$ , subcontext,  $\subseteq$ , permutation, projection,  $\upharpoonright$ ).

1. If  $\Gamma \equiv x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_n : \sigma_n$ , then the *domain* of  $\Gamma$  or  $\text{dom}(\Gamma)$  is the list  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ .
2.  $\Gamma'$  is a subcontext of  $\Gamma$ , or  $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ , if all declarations in  $\Gamma'$  occurs in  $\Gamma$ , in the same order.
3.  $\Gamma'$  is a *permutation* of  $\Gamma$ , if all declarations in  $\Gamma'$  also occurs in  $\Gamma$  and vice versa.
4. If  $\Gamma$  is a context and  $\phi$  a set of variables, the *projection* in  $\Gamma$  on  $\phi$ , or  $\Gamma \upharpoonright \phi$ , is the subcontext  $\Gamma'$  of  $\Gamma$  with  $\text{dom}(\Gamma') = \text{dom}(\Gamma) \cap \phi$

**Lemma 3.1** (Free Variables Lemma). *If  $\Gamma \vdash L : \sigma$ , then  $FV(L) \subseteq \text{dom}(\Gamma)$*

**Lemma 3.2** (Thinning, Condensing, Permutation).

1. (Thinning) Let  $\Gamma'$  and  $\Gamma''$  be contexts such that  $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma''$ . If  $\Gamma' \vdash M : \sigma$ , then also  $\Gamma'' \vdash M : \sigma$
2. (Condensing) If  $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$ , then also  $\Gamma \upharpoonright FV(M) \vdash M : \sigma$
3. (Permutation) If  $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$ , and  $\Gamma'$  is a permutation of  $\Gamma$ , then  $\Gamma'$  is also a context and  $\Gamma' \vdash M : \sigma$

**Lemma 3.3** (Uniqueness of Types). *Assume  $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$ , and  $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ , then  $\sigma \equiv \tau$*

### 3.7 Reductions and $\lambda \rightarrow$

It is an adapted version of 2.4

$$(3)(\lambda y : \sigma.P)[x := N] \equiv \lambda z : \sigma.(P^{y \rightarrow z}[x := N]) \quad (9)$$

where  $\lambda z : \sigma.P^{y \rightarrow z}$  is  $\alpha$ -variant, such that  $z \notin FV(N)$

**Lemma 3.4** (Substituion Lemma). *Assume  $\Gamma', x : \sigma, \Gamma'' \vdash M : \tau$  and  $\Gamma' \vdash N : \sigma$ , then  $\Gamma', \Gamma'' \vdash M[x := N] : \tau$*

**Definition 3.7** (One-step  $\beta$ -reduction,  $\rightarrow_\beta$ , for  $\Lambda_{\mathbb{T}}$ ).

1. (Basis)  $(\lambda x : \sigma.M)N \rightarrow_\beta M[x := N]$
2. (Compatibility) As 2

### 3.8 Exercises

#### 3.8.1 2.5 Find pre-typed terms

(a).  $\lambda xy.x(\lambda z.y)y$

*Proof.* Having the following:

- Lets assume  $x : \sigma \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma$ ,  $\lambda z.y : \sigma$  and  $y : \beta$
- If  $z : \rho$ , then  $\lambda z : \rho.y : \rho \rightarrow \beta \equiv \sigma$  should hold.
- Taking the assumption  $x : (\rho \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma$
- there is a legal term  $\lambda x : (\rho \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma.\lambda y : \beta.x(\lambda z : \rho.y)y$  with type  $((\rho \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma$

□

(b).  $\lambda xy.x(\lambda z.x)y$

*Proof.* Having the following:

- Having similar assumptions as before but  $\lambda z.x : \sigma$  and  $y : \beta$
- If  $z : \rho$ , then  $\lambda z : \rho.x : \rho \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma \equiv \sigma$  which does not hold.

Therefore, term is not typeable.

□

#### 3.8.2 2.9 Type checking

(a).  $x : \delta \rightarrow \delta \rightarrow \alpha, y : \gamma \rightarrow \alpha, z : \alpha \rightarrow \beta \vdash \lambda u : \delta.\lambda v : \gamma.z(yv) : \delta \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow \beta$

(1)	$x : \delta \rightarrow \delta \rightarrow \alpha$	
(2)	$y : \gamma \rightarrow \alpha$	
(3)	$z : \alpha \rightarrow \beta$	
(4)	$u : \delta$	
(5)	$v : \gamma$	
(6)	$yv : \alpha$	(appl) on (2) and (5)
(7)	$z(yv) : \beta$	(appl) on (3) and (6)
(8)	$\lambda v : \gamma. z(yv) : \gamma \rightarrow \beta$	(abst) on (7)
(9)	$\lambda u : \delta. \lambda v : \gamma. z(yv) : \delta \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow \beta$	(abst) on (8)

*Proof.*

□

(b).  $x : \delta \rightarrow \delta \rightarrow \alpha, y : \gamma \rightarrow \alpha, z : \alpha \rightarrow \beta \quad \vdash \quad \lambda u : \delta. \lambda v : \gamma. z(xuu) : \delta \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow \beta$

(1)	$x : \delta \rightarrow \delta \rightarrow \alpha$	
(2)	$y : \gamma \rightarrow \alpha$	
(3)	$z : \alpha \rightarrow \beta$	
(4)	$u : \delta$	
(5)	$v : \gamma$	
(6)	$xuu : \alpha$	(appl) on (1) and (4) twice
(7)	$z(xuu) : \beta$	(appl) on (3) and (6)
(8)	$\lambda v : \gamma. z(xuu) : \gamma \rightarrow \beta$	(abst) on (7)
(9)	$\lambda u : \delta. \lambda v : \gamma. z(xuu) : \delta \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow \beta$	(abst) on (8)

*Proof.*

□



## References

- [Chu40] Alonzo Church. A formulation of the simple theory of types. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 5(2):56–68, 1940.
- [NG14] Rob Nederpelt and Herman Geuvers. *Type Theory and Formal Proof*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kindom, 2014.