

# CENG 2010 - Programming Language Concepts

## Weeks 10-11: Simply Typed $\lambda$ -Calculus ( $\lambda \rightarrow$ )

Burak Ekici

May 15 – May 22, 2023

# Outline

1 Typing In General

2 STLC( $\lambda \rightarrow$ )

## Need for Types

- In (untyped)  $\lambda$ -Calculus, we can easily misuse terms:

false    :=    $\lambda x. \lambda y. y$

0        :=    $\lambda s. \lambda z. z$

## Need for Types

- In (untyped)  $\lambda$ -Calculus, we can easily misuse terms:

`false`     $:=$      $\lambda x. \lambda y. y$

`0`         $:=$      $\lambda s. \lambda z. z$

`false 0`    $=_{\beta}$     $\lambda y. y$

## Need for Types

- In (untyped)  $\lambda$ -Calculus, we can easily misuse terms:

$$\text{false} \quad := \quad \lambda x. \lambda y. y$$
$$0 \quad := \quad \lambda s. \lambda z. z$$
$$\text{false } 0 \quad =_{\beta} \quad \lambda y. y$$

- there is an obvious need to guarantee that function parameters are “valid” in terms of function application to prevent errors during the evaluation

## Need for Types

- In (untyped)  $\lambda$ -Calculus, we can easily misuse terms:

$$\text{false} \quad := \quad \lambda x. \lambda y. y$$
$$0 \quad := \quad \lambda s. \lambda z. z$$
$$\text{false } 0 \quad =_{\beta} \quad \lambda y. y$$

- there is an obvious need to guarantee that function parameters are “valid” in terms of function application to prevent errors during the evaluation
- this is in fact the fundamental purpose of **type systems**

## Type Systems in General

- **type system** is a set of rules that assigns a property called a **type** to the terms (perhaps to other various constructs) in a program with a purpose to reduce possibilities for bugs, and evaluation errors

## Type Systems in General

- **type system** is a set of rules that assigns a property called a **type** to the terms (perhaps to other various constructs) in a program with a purpose to reduce possibilities for bugs, and evaluation errors
- some mechanism to distinguish “good” and “bad” programs

$0 + 1$	is	well-typed	good
$0 + \text{false}$	is	ill-typed	bad
$\text{if false then } 10 \text{ else } 20$	is	well-typed	good
$1 + (\text{if true then } 10 \text{ else false})$	is	ill-typed	bad



## Type Systems in General (cont'd)

- main point is to **classify terms into types**
- given a set of (inductively generated) types

$$Ty \quad := \quad T_1 \mid T_2 \mid T_3 \mid \dots$$

- a term  $t$  might be of type  $T_1, T_2, T_3, \dots$

## Type Systems in General (cont'd)

- main point is to **classify terms into types**
- given a set of (inductively generated) types

$$Ty \quad := \quad T_1 \mid T_2 \mid T_3 \mid \dots$$

- a term  $t$  might be of type  $T_1, T_2, T_3, \dots$  (thanks to a **typing relation**)

## Typing Relations in General

- typing relation “ $:$ ” assigns types to terms

## Typing Relations in General

- typing relation “ $:$ ” assigns types to terms
- formally, a **typing relation** is a partial binary predicate “ $:$ ” :  $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{T}y \rightarrow Bool$  where
  - $\mathcal{E}$  is the set of all possible terms
  - $\mathcal{T}y$  is the set of all possible types

## Typing Relations in General

- typing relation “ $:$ ” assigns types to terms
- formally, a **typing relation** is a partial binary predicate “ $:$ ” :  $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{T}y \rightarrow Bool$  where
  - $\mathcal{E}$  is the set of all possible terms
  - $\mathcal{T}y$  is the set of all possible types
- some related notions:

language	$:=$	as a set $\mathcal{E}$ of all possible terms
type language	$:=$	as a set $\mathcal{T}y$ of all possible types
typing relation	$:=$	as a partial relation “ $:$ ” $\subseteq \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{T}y$

## Typing Relations in General

- typing relation “ $:$ ” assigns types to terms
- formally, a **typing relation** is a partial binary predicate “ $:$ ” :  $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{T}y \rightarrow Bool$  where
  - $\mathcal{E}$  is the set of all possible terms
  - $\mathcal{T}y$  is the set of all possible types
- some related notions:

language	$:=$	as a set $\mathcal{E}$ of all possible terms
type language	$:=$	as a set $\mathcal{T}y$ of all possible types
typing relation	$:=$	as a partial relation “ $:$ ” $\subseteq \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{T}y$

- **categorical approach** is slightly different:

language	$:=$	internal language of a certain category $\mathcal{C}$
types	$:=$	objects of $\mathcal{C}$
terms	$:=$	arrows of $\mathcal{C}$

# Outline

1 Typing In General

2 STLC( $\lambda \rightarrow$ )

Definition (Simply Typed  $\lambda$ -Calculus ( $\lambda \rightarrow$ ))Types  $A, B, C, \dots :=$ 

- |  $G, G', G'', \dots$  “ground” types
- |  $\text{unit}$  unit type
- |  $A \times B$  product type
- |  $A \rightarrow B$  function type



Definition (Simply Typed  $\lambda$ -Calculus ( $\lambda \rightarrow$ ))Types  $A, B, C, \dots :=$ 

	$G, G', G'', \dots$	“ground” types
	$\text{unit}$	unit type
	$A \times B$	product type
	$A \rightarrow B$	function type

Terms  $s, t, r :=$ 

	$c^A$	constants (of given type $A$ )
	$x$	variable (countable many)
	$()$	unit value
	$(s, t)$	pair
	$\text{fst } t$	first pair projection
	$\text{snd } t$	second pair projection
	$\lambda x: A. t$	function abstraction
	$s \ t$	function application

### Example (term examples)

- $\lambda z: (A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C). \lambda x: A. ((\text{fst } z) x, (\text{snd } z) x)$

### Example (term examples)

- $\lambda z: (A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C). \lambda x: A. ((\text{fst } z) x, (\text{snd } z) x)$
- $\lambda z: A \rightarrow (B \times C). (\lambda x: A. \text{fst } (z x), \lambda y: A. \text{snd } (z y))$

### Example (term examples)

- $\lambda z: (A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C). \lambda x: A. ((\text{fst } z) x, (\text{snd } z) x)$
- $\lambda z: A \rightarrow (B \times C). (\lambda x: A. \text{fst } (z x), \lambda y: A. \text{snd } (z y))$
- $\lambda z: A \rightarrow (B \times C). \lambda x: A. ((\text{fst } z) x, (\text{snd } z) x)$

## Definition ( $\lambda \rightarrow$ typing relation: $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ )

$\Gamma$  ranges over **typing environments (or typing contexts)**

$\Gamma :=$

- |  $[]$       “empty” environment
- |  $\Gamma, x : A$       “non-empty” environment

**Definition ( $\lambda \rightarrow$  typing relation:  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ )**

$\Gamma$  ranges over **typing environments (or typing contexts)**

$\Gamma :=$

- |  $[]$       “empty” environment
- |  $\Gamma, x : A$       “non-empty” environment

typing environments are comma-separated snoc-lists of (variable,type)-pairs – in fact only the lists whose variables are mutually distinct get used

## Definition ( $\lambda \rightarrow$ typing relation: $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ )

$\Gamma$  ranges over typing environments (or typing contexts)

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &:= \\ &| [] \quad \text{“empty” environment} \\ &| \Gamma, x : A \quad \text{“non-empty” environment} \end{aligned}$$

typing environments are comma-separated snoc-lists of (variable,type)-pairs – in fact only the lists whose variables are mutually distinct get used

## Notation

- $\Gamma$  ok means that no variable occurs more than once in  $\Gamma$

## Definition ( $\lambda \rightarrow$ typing relation: $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ )

$\Gamma$  ranges over typing environments (or typing contexts)

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &:= \\ &| [] \quad \text{“empty” environment} \\ &| \Gamma, x : A \quad \text{“non-empty” environment} \end{aligned}$$

typing environments are comma-separated snoc-lists of (variable,type)-pairs – in fact only the lists whose variables are mutually distinct get used

## Notation

- $\Gamma$  ok means that no variable occurs more than once in  $\Gamma$
- $\text{dom } \Gamma$  denotes the finite set of variables occurring in  $\Gamma$



Definition ( $\lambda \rightarrow$  typing relation:  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$  (cont'd))

$$\frac{\Gamma \text{ ok} \quad x \notin \text{dom } \Gamma}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash x : A} \text{ (var)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash x : A \quad x' \notin \text{dom } \Gamma}{\Gamma, x' : A \vdash x : A} \text{ (var')}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \text{ ok}}{\Gamma \vdash c^A : A} \text{ (const)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \text{ ok}}{\Gamma \vdash () : \text{unit}} \text{ (unit)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash s : A \quad \Gamma \vdash t : B}{\Gamma \vdash (s, t) : A \times B} \text{ (pair)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \times B}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fst } t : A} \text{ (fstT)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \times B}{\Gamma \vdash \text{snd } t : B} \text{ (sndT)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash t : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : A. t : A \rightarrow B} \text{ (fun)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash s : A \rightarrow B \quad \Gamma \vdash t : A}{\Gamma \vdash s \ t : B} \text{ (app)}$$

### Example (term examples)

- $[] \vdash \lambda z: (A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C). \lambda x: A. ((\text{fst } z) \ x, (\text{snd } z) \ x)$

### Example (term examples)

- $[] \vdash \lambda z: (A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C). \lambda x: A. ((\text{fst } z) \ x, (\text{snd } z) \ x)$  has type  $((A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow (B \times C)))$

### Example (term examples)

- $[] \vdash \lambda z: (A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C). \lambda x: A. ((\text{fst } z) \ x, (\text{snd } z) \ x)$  has type  $((A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow (B \times C)))$
- $[] \vdash \lambda z: A \rightarrow (B \times C). (\lambda x: A. \text{fst } (z \ x), \lambda y: A. \text{snd } (z \ y))$  has type

### Example (term examples)

- $[] \vdash \lambda z: (A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C). \lambda x: A. ((\text{fst } z) \ x, (\text{snd } z) \ x)$  has type  $((A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow (B \times C)))$
- $[] \vdash \lambda z: A \rightarrow (B \times C). (\lambda x: A. \text{fst } (z \ x), \lambda y: A. \text{snd } (z \ y))$  has type  $(A \rightarrow (B \times C)) \rightarrow ((A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C))$

### Example (term examples)

- $[] \vdash \lambda z: (A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C). \lambda x: A. ((\text{fst } z) x, (\text{snd } z) x)$  has type  $((A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow (B \times C)))$
- $[] \vdash \lambda z: A \rightarrow (B \times C). (\lambda x: A. \text{fst } (z x), \lambda y: A. \text{snd } (z y))$  has type  $(A \rightarrow (B \times C)) \rightarrow ((A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C))$
- $[] \vdash \lambda z: A \rightarrow (B \times C). \lambda x: A. ((\text{fst } z) x, (\text{snd } z) x)$

### Example (term examples)

- $[] \vdash \lambda z: (A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C). \lambda x: A. ((\text{fst } z) \ x, (\text{snd } z) \ x)$  has type  $((A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow (B \times C)))$
- $[] \vdash \lambda z: A \rightarrow (B \times C). (\lambda x: A. \text{fst } (z \ x), \lambda y: A. \text{snd } (z \ y))$  has type  $(A \rightarrow (B \times C)) \rightarrow ((A \rightarrow B) \times (A \rightarrow C))$
- $[] \vdash \lambda z: A \rightarrow (B \times C). \lambda x: A. ((\text{fst } z) \ x, (\text{snd } z) \ x)$  has no type (ill-typed term)

## Example (typing derivation)

in a typing context  $\Gamma = [], f : A \rightarrow B, g : B \rightarrow C$ , we have an example derivation of a term  $s : A \rightarrow C$  as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma \vdash g : B \rightarrow C}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash g : B \rightarrow C} \text{ (var)}}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash g : B \rightarrow C} \text{ (var')}}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash g : B \rightarrow C} \text{ (var)}}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash g : B \rightarrow C} \text{ (var')}}{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma \vdash f : A \rightarrow B}{[\ ], f : A \rightarrow B \vdash f : A \rightarrow B} \text{ (var)}}{\Gamma \vdash f : A \rightarrow B} \text{ (var')}}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash f : A \rightarrow B} \text{ (var')}}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash f : A \rightarrow B} \text{ (var')}}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash f : A \rightarrow B} \text{ (var')}}}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash f x : B} \text{ (app)}}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash g (f x) : C} \text{ (app)}}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : A. g (f x) : A \rightarrow C} \text{ (fun)}$$



### Example (typing derivation)

in a typing context  $\Gamma = [], f: A \rightarrow B, g: B \rightarrow C$ , we have an example derivation of a term  $s: A \rightarrow C$  as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash g: B \rightarrow C} \text{ (var)} \qquad \frac{}{[], f: A \rightarrow B \vdash f: A \rightarrow B} \text{ (var)} \\
 \frac{}{\Gamma, x: A \vdash g: B \rightarrow C} \text{ (var')} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash f: A \rightarrow B}{\Gamma, x: A \vdash f: A \rightarrow B} \text{ (var')} \qquad \frac{}{\Gamma, x: A \vdash x: A} \text{ (var)} \\
 \frac{}{\Gamma, x: A \vdash f x: B} \text{ (app)} \qquad \frac{}{\Gamma, x: A \vdash g (f x): C} \text{ (app)} \\
 \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x: A. g (f x): A \rightarrow C} \text{ (fun)}
 \end{array}$$

### Remark

the  $\lambda \rightarrow$  typing rules are “syntax-directed”, by the structure of terms  $t$  and then in the case of variables  $x$ , by the structure of typing environments  $\Gamma$ .

## Definition ( $\alpha$ -equivalence)

- names of  $\lambda$ -bound variables should not affect meaning

## Definition ( $\alpha$ -equivalence)

- names of  $\lambda$ -bound variables should not affect meaning
- e.g.,  $\lambda f: A \rightarrow B. \lambda x: A. f\ x$  should have the same meaning as  $\lambda x: A \rightarrow B. \lambda y: A. x\ y$

## Definition ( $\alpha$ -equivalence)

- names of  $\lambda$ -bound variables should not affect meaning
- e.g.,  $\lambda f: A \rightarrow B. \lambda x: A. f\ x$  should have the same meaning as  $\lambda x: A \rightarrow B. \lambda y: A. x\ y$
- this issue is best dealt with at the level of syntax rather than semantics

Definition ( $\alpha$ -equivalence)

- names of  $\lambda$ -bound variables should not affect meaning
- e.g.,  $\lambda f: A \rightarrow B. \lambda x: A. f\ x$  should have the same meaning as  $\lambda x: A \rightarrow B. \lambda y: A. x\ y$
- this issue is best dealt with at the level of syntax rather than semantics
- from now on we re-define  $\lambda \rightarrow$  term to mean not an abstract syntax tree but rather an equivalence class of such trees with respect to  $\alpha$ -equivalence  $s =_\alpha t$ :

$$\overline{c^A =_\alpha c^A}$$

$$\overline{x =_\alpha x}$$

$$\overline{() =_\alpha ()}$$

$$\frac{s =_\alpha s' \quad t =_\alpha t'}{(s, t) =_\alpha (s', t')}$$

$$\frac{t =_\alpha t'}{\text{fst } t =_\alpha \text{fst } t'}$$

$$\frac{t =_\alpha t'}{\text{snd } t =_\alpha \text{snd } t'}$$

$$\frac{s =_\alpha s' \quad t =_\alpha t'}{s\ t =_\alpha s'\ t'}$$

$$\frac{t \cdot (y\ x) =_\alpha t' \cdot (y\ x') \quad y \text{ does not occur in } \{x, x', t, t'\}}{\lambda x: A. t =_\alpha \lambda x': A. t'}$$

where  $t \cdot (y\ x)$  denotes the result of replacing all occurrences of  $x$  with  $y$  in  $t$

### Example ( $\alpha$ -equivalence)

$$\begin{array}{llll} \lambda x:A. x\ x & =_{\alpha} & \lambda y:A. y\ y & \neq_{\alpha} \lambda x:A. x\ y \\ (\lambda y:A. y)\ x & =_{\alpha} & (\lambda x:A. x)\ x & \neq_{\alpha} (\lambda x:A. x)\ y \end{array}$$

## Definition (substitution)

- substitution  $t[s/x]$  denotes the result of replacing all **free occurrences** of variable  $x$  in term  $t$  (i.e. those not occurring within the scope of a  $\lambda x: A. \_$  binder) by the term  $s$

## Definition (substitution)

- substitution  $t[s/x]$  denotes the result of replacing all free occurrences of variable  $x$  in term  $t$  (i.e. those not occurring within the scope of a  $\lambda x: A. \_$  binder) by the term  $s$
- alpha-converting  $\lambda$ -bound variables in  $t$  to avoid them “capturing” any free variables of  $t$



## Definition (substitution)

- substitution  $t[s/x]$  denotes the result of replacing all free occurrences of variable  $x$  in term  $t$  (i.e. those not occurring within the scope of a  $\lambda x: A. \_$  binder) by the term  $s$
- alpha-converting  $\lambda$ -bound variables in  $t$  to avoid them “capturing” any free variables of  $t$
- e.g.,  $(\lambda y: A. (y, x))[y/x]$  is  $\lambda z: A. (z, y)$  and is not  $\lambda y: A. (y, y)$

## Definition (substitution)

- substitution  $t[s/x]$  denotes the result of replacing all free occurrences of variable  $x$  in term  $t$  (i.e. those not occurring within the scope of a  $\lambda x: A. \_$  binder) by the term  $s$
- alpha-converting  $\lambda$ -bound variables in  $t$  to avoid them “capturing” any free variables of  $s$
- e.g.,  $(\lambda y: A. (y, x))[y/x]$  is  $\lambda z: A. (z, y)$  and is not  $\lambda y: A. (y, y)$
- the relation  $t[s/x] = t'$  can be inductively defined by the following rules:

$$\frac{}{c^A[s/x] = c^A}$$

$$\frac{}{x[s/x] = s}$$

$$\frac{y \neq x}{y[s/x] = y}$$

$$\frac{}{() [s/x] = ()}$$

$$\frac{t_1[s/x] = t'_1 \quad t_2[s/x] = t'_2}{(t_1, t_2)[s/x] = (t'_1, t'_2)}$$

$$\frac{t[s/x] = t'}{(\text{fst } t)[s/x] = \text{fst } t'}$$

$$\frac{t[s/x] = t'}{(\text{snd } t)[s/x] = \text{snd } t'}$$

$$\frac{t_1[s/x] = t'_1 \quad t_2[s/x] = t'_2}{(t_1 \ t_2)[s/x] = t'_1 \ t'_2}$$

$$\frac{t[s/x] = t' \quad y \neq x \text{ and } y \text{ does not freely occur in } s}{(\lambda y: A. t)[s/x] = \lambda y: A. t'}$$

## Definition ( $\beta\eta$ -equality)

the relation  $\Gamma \vdash s =_{\beta\eta} t : A$  (where  $\Gamma$  ranges over typing environments,  $s$  and  $t$  over terms and  $A$  over types) is inductively defined by the following rules:

- $\beta$ -conversion

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash t : B \quad \Gamma \vdash s : A}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x : A. t) s =_{\beta\eta} t[s/x] : B}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash s : A \quad \Gamma \vdash t : B}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fst}(s, t) =_{\beta\eta} s : A}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash s : A \quad \Gamma \vdash t : B}{\Gamma \vdash \text{snd}(s, t) =_{\beta\eta} t : B}$$

Definition ( $\beta\eta$ -equality)

the relation  $\Gamma \vdash s =_{\beta\eta} t : A$  (where  $\Gamma$  ranges over typing environments,  $s$  and  $t$  over terms and  $A$  over types) is inductively defined by the following rules:

- $\beta$ -conversion

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash t : B \quad \Gamma \vdash s : A}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x : A. t) s =_{\beta\eta} t[s/x] : B}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash s : A \quad \Gamma \vdash t : B}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fst}(s, t) =_{\beta\eta} s : A}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash s : A \quad \Gamma \vdash t : B}{\Gamma \vdash \text{snd}(s, t) =_{\beta\eta} t : B}$$

- $\eta$ -conversion

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \rightarrow B \quad x \text{ does not occur in } t}{\Gamma \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} (\lambda x : A. t x) : A \rightarrow B}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \times B}{\Gamma \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} (\text{fst } t, \text{snd } t) : A \times B}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \text{unit}}{\Gamma \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} () : \text{unit}}$$

Definition ( $\beta\eta$ -equality)

the relation  $\Gamma \vdash s =_{\beta\eta} t : A$  (where  $\Gamma$  ranges over typing environments,  $s$  and  $t$  over terms and  $A$  over types) is inductively defined by the following rules:

- $\beta$ -conversion

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash t : B \quad \Gamma \vdash s : A}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x : A. t) s =_{\beta\eta} t[s/x] : B} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : A \quad \Gamma \vdash t : B}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fst}(s, t) =_{\beta\eta} s : A} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : A \quad \Gamma \vdash t : B}{\Gamma \vdash \text{snd}(s, t) =_{\beta\eta} t : B}$$

- $\eta$ -conversion

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \rightarrow B \quad x \text{ does not occur in } t}{\Gamma \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} (\lambda x : A. t x) : A \rightarrow B} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \times B}{\Gamma \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} (\text{fst } t, \text{snd } t) : A \times B} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \text{unit}}{\Gamma \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} () : \text{unit}}$$

- congruence rules

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} t' : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : A. t =_{\beta\eta} \lambda x : A. t' : A \rightarrow B} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s =_{\beta\eta} s' : A \rightarrow B \quad \Gamma \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} t' : A}{\Gamma \vdash s t =_{\beta\eta} s' t' : B}$$

Definition ( $\beta\eta$ -equality)

the relation  $\Gamma \vdash s =_{\beta\eta} t : A$  (where  $\Gamma$  ranges over typing environments,  $s$  and  $t$  over terms and  $A$  over types) is inductively defined by the following rules:

- $\beta$ -conversion

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash t : B \quad \Gamma \vdash s : A}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x : A. t) s =_{\beta\eta} t[s/x] : B} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : A \quad \Gamma \vdash t : B}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fst}(s, t) =_{\beta\eta} s : A} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : A \quad \Gamma \vdash t : B}{\Gamma \vdash \text{snd}(s, t) =_{\beta\eta} t : B}$$

- $\eta$ -conversion

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \rightarrow B \quad x \text{ does not occur in } t}{\Gamma \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} (\lambda x : A. t x) : A \rightarrow B} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \times B}{\Gamma \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} (\text{fst } t, \text{snd } t) : A \times B} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \text{unit}}{\Gamma \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} () : \text{unit}}$$

- congruence rules

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} t' : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : A. t =_{\beta\eta} \lambda x : A. t' : A \rightarrow B} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s =_{\beta\eta} s' : A \rightarrow B \quad \Gamma \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} t' : A}{\Gamma \vdash s t =_{\beta\eta} s' t' : B}$$

- $=_{\beta\eta}$  is reflexive, symmetric and transitive

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A}{\Gamma \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} t : A} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s =_{\beta\eta} t : A}{\Gamma \vdash t =_{\beta\eta} s : A} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash r =_{\beta\eta} s : A \quad \Gamma \vdash s =_{\beta\eta} t : A}{\Gamma \vdash r =_{\beta\eta} t : A}$$

### Theorem (Progress)

$\forall e: \text{term}, \vdash e: \tau \implies \text{value } e \vee \exists e', e \rightarrow_{\beta} e'$

### Theorem (Progress)

$\forall e: \text{term}, \vdash e: \tau \implies \text{value } e \vee \exists e', e \rightarrow_{\beta} e'$

### Theorem (Preservation)

$\forall e, e': \text{term}, \vdash e: \tau \wedge e \rightarrow_{\beta} e' \implies \vdash e': \tau$



Thanks! & Questions?