

# Chapter 09

Newton Ni

August 17, 2020

## 1 9.2.1

*The pure simply typed lambda-calculus with no base types is actually degenerate, in the sense that it has no well-typed terms at all. Why?*

There are no base cases in the definition of types. There are only function types  $T ::= T \rightarrow T$ , which cannot generate a finite type.

## 2 9.2.2

*Show (by drawing derivation trees) that the following terms have the indicated types:*

$f : \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool} \vdash f \text{ (if false then true else false)} : \text{Bool}$

$$\frac{\frac{f : \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool} \in f : \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}}{f : \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool} \vdash f : \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}} \text{VAR} \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\vdash \text{false} : \text{Bool}}{\vdash \text{false} : \text{Bool}} \text{F} \quad \frac{\vdash \text{true} : \text{Bool}}{\vdash \text{true} : \text{Bool}} \text{T} \quad \frac{\vdash \text{false} : \text{Bool}}{\vdash \text{false} : \text{Bool}} \text{F}}{\text{if false then true else false} : \text{Bool}} \text{IF}}{f \text{ (if false then true else false)} : \text{Bool}} \text{APP}$$

$f : \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool} \vdash \lambda x : \text{Bool}. f \text{ (if x then false else x)} : \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\dots}{\dots \vdash f : \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}} \text{VAR} \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\dots}{\dots \vdash x : \text{Bool}} \text{VAR} \quad \frac{\vdash \text{false} : \text{Bool}}{\vdash \text{false} : \text{Bool}} \text{F} \quad \frac{\dots}{\dots \vdash x : \text{Bool}} \text{VAR}}{\dots \vdash \text{if x then false else x} : \text{Bool}} \text{IF}}{\frac{f : \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}, x : \text{Bool} \vdash f \text{ (if x then false else x)} : \text{Bool}}{f : \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool} \vdash \dots : \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}} \text{APP}} \text{ABS}$$

## 3 9.2.3

*Find a context  $\Gamma$  under which the term  $f \ x \ y$  has type  $\text{Bool}$ . Can you give a simple description of the set of all such contexts?*

The type of  $f$  could be any  $T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow \text{Bool}$ , where  $x : T_1$  and  $y : T_2$  and the latter two types are unconstrained.

## 4 9.3.2

Is there any context  $\Gamma$  and type  $T$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash x : T$ ? If so, give  $\Gamma$  and  $T$  and show a typing derivation; if not, prove it.

No. Suppose  $x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ . To successfully apply it to itself, T-APP requires that  $x : T_1$ . But there is no finite type such that  $T_1 = T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ .

## 5 9.3.9

Prove the preservation theorem:  $\Gamma \vdash t : T \wedge t \longrightarrow t' \implies \Gamma \vdash t' : T$ .

*Proof.* By induction on the small-step derivation for  $t \longrightarrow t'$ . Our induction hypothesis is:

$$H(t \longrightarrow t') : \Gamma \vdash t : T \implies \Gamma \vdash t' : T$$

*Case (E-APP1).* Here we have  $t = t_1 \ t_2$ , where:

1.  $t_1 \ t_2 \longrightarrow t_1' \ t_2$
2.  $t_1 \longrightarrow t_1'$

By the inversion lemma, we have:

3.  $\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T$
4.  $\Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_1$

We apply the induction hypothesis to (2) and (3) to obtain

5.  $\Gamma \vdash t_1' : T_1 \rightarrow T$

We then apply T-APP to (4) and (5) to conclude that  $t' = t_1' \ t_2 : T$ , as desired.

*Case (E-APP2).* This case is analagous to above, except we apply the induction hypothesis to  $t_2$  instead.

*Case (E-APPABS).* Here we have:

1.  $t = (\lambda x. t_{12}) v_2$
2.  $t' = [x \mapsto v_2] t_{12}$

By the inversion lemma, we have:

3.  $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x. t_{12} : T_1 \rightarrow T$
4.  $\Gamma \vdash v_2 : T_1$

By T-ABS, we have:

5.  $\Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash t_{12} : T$

By applying the substitution lemma to (5) and (4), we have:

6.  $\Gamma \vdash [x \mapsto v_2] t_{12} : T$

As desired. □

## 6 9.3.10

*In Exercise 8.3.6 we investigated the subject expansion property for our simple calculus of typed arithmetic expressions. Does it hold for the ‘functional part’ of the simply typed lambda-calculus? That is, suppose  $\mathfrak{t}$  does not contain any conditional expressions. Do  $\mathfrak{t} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{t}'$  and  $\Gamma \vdash \mathfrak{t}' : \mathsf{T}$  imply  $\Gamma \vdash \mathfrak{t} : \mathsf{T}$ ?*

TODO

## 7 9.4.1

*Which of the rules for the type `Bool` in Figure 8-1 are introduction rules and which are elimination rules? What about the rules for `Nat` in figure 8-2?*

For `Bool`, `T-TRUE` and `T-FALSE` are introduction rules, while `T-IF` is an elimination rule.

For `Nat`, `T-ZERO`, `T-SUCC`, and `T-PRED` are introduction rules, while `T-ISZERO` is an elimination rule.