

an Intensional Dependent Type Theory with Type-in-Type and Recursion

February 13, 2021

1 Examples

1.1 pretending $\star =_{\star} \perp$

spoofing an equality

$(\lambda pr : (\star =_{\star} \perp). pr (\lambda x.x) \perp : \neg \star =_{\star} \perp) refl_{\star:\star}$

elaborates to

$(\lambda pr : (\star =_{\star} \perp). pr (\lambda x.x) \perp : \neg \star =_{\star} \perp) (refl_{\star:\star} :: (\star =_{\star} \star) =_l (\star =_{\star} \perp))$

$refl_{\star:\star} :: (\star =_{\star} \star) =_l (\star =_{\star} \perp) (\lambda x.x) \perp : \perp$

$(\lambda C : (\star \rightarrow \star). \lambda x : C \star.x :: (\Pi C : (\star \rightarrow \star). C \star \rightarrow C \star) =_l (\Pi C : (\star \rightarrow \star). C \star \rightarrow C \perp)) (\lambda x.x) \perp$
: \perp

$(\lambda x : \star.x :: (\star \rightarrow \star) =_{l,bod} (\star \rightarrow \perp)) \perp : \perp$

$(\perp :: \star =_{l,bod,bod} \perp) : \perp$

note that the program has not yet “gotten stuck”. to exercise this error,
 \perp must be eliminated, this can be done by tying to summon another type by
applying it to \perp

$((\perp :: \star =_{l,bod,bod} \perp) : \perp) \star$

$((\Pi x : \star.x) :: \star =_{l,bod,bod} (\Pi x : \star.x)) \star$

the computation is stuck, and the original application can be blamed on
account that the “proof” has a discoverable type error

$refl_{\star:\star} : \star =_{\star} \perp$

$\lambda C : (\star \rightarrow \star). \lambda x : C \star.x : \Pi C : (\star \rightarrow \star). C \star \rightarrow \underline{C \perp}$

when

$C := \lambda x.x$

$C \perp = \perp \neq \star = C \star$

2 TODO

- syntax and rules
- Example of why function types alone are underwhelming
 - pair, singleton

- walk through of various examples
- theorem statements
 - substitution!
- proofs
- exposition
- archive
- paper target

3 Scratch

$S_{a:A} := a$
 $S_{a:A} := \Pi P : A \rightarrow \star. P a \rightarrow \star$
 \dots
 $\neg \star =_{\star} (\star \rightarrow \star)$ is provable?
 $\lambda pr : (\Pi C : (\star \rightarrow \star). C \text{Unit} \rightarrow C \perp). pr (\lambda x.x) \perp \quad : \neg \star =_{\star} \perp$
 \dots
 evaluating $\neg true_c =_{\mathbb{B}_c} false_c$ with an incorrect proof.
 $(\lambda pr : (\Pi C : (\mathbb{B}_c \rightarrow \star). C true_c \rightarrow C false_c). pr (\lambda b : \mathbb{B}_c. b \star \text{Unit} \perp) tt \quad : \neg true_c =_{\mathbb{B}_c} false_c) refl_{true_c : \mathbb{B}_c}$
 is elaborated to
 $(\lambda pr : (\Pi C : (\mathbb{B}_c \rightarrow \star). C true_c \rightarrow C false_c). pr (\lambda b : \mathbb{B}_c. b \star \text{Unit} \perp) tt \quad : \neg true_c =_{\mathbb{B}_c} false_c) (refl_{true_c : \mathbb{B}_c})$
 $\rightsquigarrow ((refl_{true_c : \mathbb{B}_c} :: true_c =_{\mathbb{B}_c} true_c =_l true_c =_{\mathbb{B}_c} false_c) (\lambda b : \mathbb{B}_c. b \star \text{Unit} \perp) tt \quad : \perp)$
 de-sugars to
 $(((\lambda C : (\mathbb{B}_c \rightarrow \star). \lambda x : C true_c. x) :: (\Pi C : (\mathbb{B}_c \rightarrow \star). C true_c \rightarrow C true_c) =_l (\Pi C : (\mathbb{B}_c \rightarrow \star). C true_c \rightarrow C false_c))$
 $\rightsquigarrow (((\lambda x : (true_c \star \text{Unit} \perp). x) :: (true_c \star \text{Unit} \perp \rightarrow true_c \star \text{Unit} \perp) =_{l, bod} ((true_c \star \text{Unit} \perp) \rightarrow false_c \star \text{Unit} \perp))$
 def eq to
 $(((\lambda x : \text{Unit}. x) :: (\text{Unit} \rightarrow \text{Unit}) =_{l, bod} (\text{Unit} \rightarrow \perp)) tt \quad : \perp)$
 $\rightsquigarrow (tt :: \text{Unit} =_{l, bod. bod} \perp \quad : \perp)$
 note that the program has not yet “gotten stuck”. to exercise this error,
 \perp must be eliminated, this can be done by tying to summon another type by
 applying it to \perp
 $(tt :: \text{Unit} =_{l, bod. bod} \perp \quad : \perp) \perp \quad : \perp$
bad attempt
 $(tt :: \text{Unit} =_{l, bod. bod} \perp \quad : \perp) \perp \quad : \perp$
 de-sugars to
 $(((\lambda A : \star. \lambda a : A. a) :: \Pi A : \star. A \rightarrow A =_{l, bod. bod} \Pi x : \star. x \quad : \perp) \perp \quad : \perp)$
 $\rightsquigarrow (\lambda a. a) :: \perp \rightarrow \perp =_{l, bod. bod. bod} \perp \quad : \perp$
 but still
 $((\lambda a. a) :: \perp \rightarrow \perp =_{l, bod. bod. bod} \perp \quad : \perp) \star$
 $((\lambda a. a) :: \perp \rightarrow \perp =_{l, bod. bod. bod} \Pi x : \star. x \quad : \perp) \star$
 $(\star :: \star =_{l, bod. bod. bod. aty} \perp =_{l, bod. bod. bod. bod} \star)$
bad attempt

$(tt :: Unit =_{l,bod.bod} \perp \quad : \perp) \star \rightarrow \star \quad : \star \rightarrow \star$
 de-sugars to
 $((\lambda A : \star. \lambda a : A. a) :: \Pi A : \star. A \rightarrow A =_{l,bod.bod} \Pi x : \star. x \quad : \perp) \star \rightarrow \star \quad :$
 $\star \rightarrow \star$
 $\rightsquigarrow (. \lambda a. a) :: (\star \rightarrow \star) \rightarrow (\star \rightarrow \star) =_{l,bod.bod.bod} \star \rightarrow \star \quad : \star \rightarrow \star$
 not yet “gotten stuck”
 $\rightsquigarrow (. \lambda a. a) :: (\star \rightarrow \star) \rightarrow (\star \rightarrow \star) =_{l,bod.bod.bod} \star \rightarrow \star \quad : \star \rightarrow \star$
bad attempt
 de-sugars to
 $((\lambda A : \star. \lambda a : A. a) :: \Pi A : \star. A \rightarrow A =_{l,bod.bod} \Pi x : \star. x \quad : \perp) \mathbb{B}_c \quad : \mathbb{B}_c$
 $\rightsquigarrow (. \lambda a : \mathbb{B}_c. a) :: \mathbb{B}_c \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_c =_{l,bod.bod.bod} \mathbb{B}_c \quad : \mathbb{B}_c$
 attempt
 $(tt :: Unit =_{l,bod.bod} \perp \quad : \perp) \mathbb{B}_c \quad : \mathbb{B}_c$
 de-sugars to
 $((\lambda A : \star. \lambda a : A. a) :: \Pi A : \star. A \rightarrow A =_{l,bod.bod} \Pi x : \star. x \quad : \perp) \mathbb{B}_c \quad : \mathbb{B}_c$
 $\rightsquigarrow (. \lambda a : \mathbb{B}_c. a) :: \mathbb{B}_c \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_c =_{l,bod.bod.bod} \mathbb{B}_c \quad : \mathbb{B}_c$
 .
 .
 .
 .
 .
 .