

# Do it yourself: Design and metatheory of a $\lambda$ -calculus with dependent types.

2019-12-21

The objectives of this session:

- Design a type system from scratch.
- Introduce a dependently-typed representational language.
- Study the implementation techniques for conversion rules.

Instructions:

- Do the exercise at your own pace, ask for help from me or your classmates. It is more important to do things properly than to do them quickly.
- You can send me your answers by email<sup>1</sup> or by dropping them in my mail box at the third floor of Sophie Germain building. If I receive them before next Tuesday, I will give you my feedback during the next session.

## 1 Type system

We consider the following syntax for  $\lambda_\pi$ , a  $\lambda$ -calculus with dependent types.

$$t ::= \begin{array}{l} x \\ | \quad t u \\ | \quad \lambda(x : \tau).t \end{array} \quad \text{Terms}$$

$$\tau ::= \begin{array}{l} \alpha \\ | \quad \pi(x : \tau).\tau \\ | \quad \tau t \end{array} \quad \text{Types}$$

where  $x, y, \dots$  denote identifiers taken in some enumerable set  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\alpha, \beta, \dots$  denote type identifiers taken in some enumerable set  $\mathcal{V}$ .

One specificity of this type algebra is to include a **dependent product** construction for function types. The inhabitants of the type  $\pi(x : \tau_1).\tau_2$  are the functions that take a value  $x$  of type  $\tau_1$  as input to produce a value of type  $\tau_2$  where  $x$  can be a free variable of  $\tau_2$ . Typically, the constructor for vectors of  $T$  can be given the types:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{nil} & : \text{list } 0 \\ \text{cons} & : \pi(n : \mathbf{nat}).\pi(x : T).\pi(l : \text{list } n).\text{list } (n + 1) \end{array}$$

For the sake of conciseness, we write  $\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2$  for  $\pi(x : \tau_1).\tau_2$  where  $x$  is not free in  $\tau_2$ . For instance:

$$\text{cons} : \pi(n : \mathbf{nat}).T \rightarrow \text{list } n \rightarrow \text{list } (n + 1)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>yrg@irif.fr

### Exercise 1:

1. Notice that terms can appear in types. Therefore, a type can be ill-formed because it contains an ill-typed term. Propose a syntax for kinds, which will serve as “types for types”. Deduce the shape of the judgments needed to define the type system of  $\lambda_\pi$ .
2. Propose typing rules for term variables, term abstractions and term applications.
3. Motivate the introduction of a conversion rule for this type system. What equivalence should we use on types? on kinds? Give the rules for these equivalences.

## 2 $\lambda_\pi$ as a representational language

Consider the following (incomplete) signature:

term	:	$\star$
app	:	term $\rightarrow$ term $\rightarrow$ term
lam	:	ty $\rightarrow$ (term $\rightarrow$ term) $\rightarrow$ term
ty	:	$\star$
arrow	:	ty $\rightarrow$ ty $\rightarrow$ ty
iota	:	ty
of	:	term $\rightarrow$ ty $\rightarrow$ $\star$
tc-app	:	$\pi(tu : \text{term}).\pi(ab : \text{ty}).\text{of } t \text{ (arrow } a b) \rightarrow \text{of } u a \rightarrow \text{of } (\text{app } t u) b$
tc-lam	:	?

This signature is meant to encode the simply typed  $\lambda$ -calculus using the technique called higher-order abstract syntax. Roughly speaking, the idea behind this encoding is to reuse the  $\lambda$ -abstraction of  $\lambda_\pi$  to encode the  $\lambda$ -abstraction of the object language (here the STLC). For instance, the term of  $\lambda(x : \iota).x$  is encoded by:

$$\text{lam iota } (\lambda x. x)$$

1. Why is it no constant for the variable constructor of the STLC terms?
2. Propose a type for tc-lam.
3. Give the well-typed term that encodes the following judgment of STLC:

$$\emptyset \vdash (\lambda(f : \iota \rightarrow \iota)(x : \iota).fx)(\lambda(x : \iota).x) : \iota \rightarrow \iota$$

4. Why is  $\lambda_\pi$  often called a “Logical Framework”?

## 3 Efficient convertibility decision procedure

1. Is every well-typed term of  $\lambda_\pi$  strongly normalizing?
2. Deduce a naive algorithm from the previous question.
3. What are weak head normal forms?
4. How weak head normalization can help in implementing a more efficient decision procedure (in the negative case)?