

TYPES AND λ -CALCULUS

Problem Sheet 2

- * 1. Write these terms using the minimum number of parentheses and λ , according to our conventions.
- (a) $(\lambda y. ((y\ y)(z\ z)))$
 - (b) $(\lambda y. (((y\ y)\ y)\ y))$
 - (c) $((S\ Z)(\lambda y. (\lambda z. (z\ (S\ y)))))$
- * 2. Write the term $(\lambda x y z. x y (x z))(\lambda x y. x)$ with all the parentheses and λ that we will usually omit tediously put back in.
- * 3. Perform the following substitutions:
- (a) $(\lambda x. (\lambda y. x z) z)[(\lambda z. z)/z]$
 - (b) $(\lambda x. y x)[y z/x]$
 - (c) $(\lambda y. x y)[y x/x]$
- * 4. Perform one step of reduction for each of the following terms:
- (a) const pred pred
 - (b) sub const
 - (c) $(\lambda x. x\ x)(\lambda x. x\ x)$
 - (d) const (pred pred)

* 5. Let us define the Booleans as follows:

$$\underline{\text{false}} = \underline{0}$$

$$\underline{\text{true}} = \underline{1}$$

Define Boolean conjunction as a term and, disjunction as a term or and negation as a term not.

* 6. Define terms curry and uncurry with the following behaviour:

$$\underline{\text{curry}} M N P \triangleright \dots \triangleright M (N P)$$

$$\underline{\text{uncurry}} M (N, P) \triangleright \dots \triangleright M N P$$

** 7.

(a) For all terms M and N , define a *local definition* term:

$$\underline{\text{let}} x = N \underline{\text{in}} M$$

(M and N will occur inside your answer), with the following behaviour:

$$\underline{\text{let}} x = N \underline{\text{in}} M \triangleright M[N/x]$$

In other words, $\underline{\text{let}} x = N \underline{\text{in}} M$ behaves like M but where we have defined x locally to be N .

(b) Define a family of local definition forms that are specialised to functions of a certain number of arguments, i.e. a family of terms $\underline{\text{let}} f x_1 \dots x_n = N \underline{\text{in}} M$, that behave like M but where we have defined f to be the function that takes arguments x_1, \dots, x_n and returns N .

** 8. Complete the following partial proof of the following statement, by filling out (a), (b) (c) and (d). This proof is a particularly good test of how carefully you are keeping track of the proof state.

Suppose P and Q are terms, x and y are variables. If $x \neq y$ and $x \notin \text{FV}(Q)$ then for all terms M :

$$M[P/x][Q/y] = M[Q/y][P[Q/y]/x]$$

(which tells us how to reorder substitutions in general).

Proof. Suppose P and Q are terms. Suppose x and y are variables. The rest of the proof is by induction on $M \in \Lambda$.

- In case M is some variable z , we argue as follows. Assume $x \neq y$ and $x \neq \text{FV}(Q)$. Our goal is to show:

$$z[P/x][Q/y] = z[Q/y][P[Q/y]/x]$$

Now, either $z = x$, $z = y$ or z is neither x nor y . We proceed by a case analysis on this fact:

- Suppose $z = x$. By our assumption, it follows that $z \neq y$. Then, by definition of substitution, $z[P/x][Q/y] = P[Q/y]$ and

$$z[Q/y][P[Q/y]/x] = z[P[Q/y]/x] = P[Q/y]$$

Hence, the desired equality follows.

- Suppose $z = y$. (a)
- Suppose $z \neq x$ and $z \neq y$. Then $z[P/x][Q/y] = z$ on the left side of the goal and also $z[Q/y][P[Q/y]/x] = z$ on the right side, so the result follows.
- (b)
- In case M is some application N_1N_2 we argue as follows. Assume $x \neq y$ and $x \neq \text{FV}(Q)$. Additionally, assume the induction hypothesis:

(IH1) if $x \neq y$ and $x \neq \text{FV}(Q)$ then $N_1[P/x][Q/y] = N_1[Q/y][P[Q/y]/x]$

(IH2) if $x \neq y$ and $x \neq \text{FV}(Q)$ then $N_2[P/x][Q/y] = N_2[Q/y][P[Q/y]/x]$

Our goal is to show that:

$$(N_1N_2)[P/x][Q/y] = (N_1N_2)[Q/y][P[Q/y]/x]$$

(c)

- In case M is of shape $\lambda z.N$, we argue as follows. We can assume by the bound variable convention that z is different from any variable in scope, so $z \neq x$ and $z \neq y$ and $z \notin \text{FV}(P)$ and $z \notin \text{FV}(Q)$. (d)

□