

## TYPES AND $\lambda$ -CALCULUS

# Problem Sheet 2

- \* 1. Write these terms using the minimum number of parentheses and  $\lambda$ , 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  $\lambda$  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)

□