

CIS 500

Software Foundations

Fall 2005

26 October, 2005

Simply-Typed Lambda Calculus

Last time

Last time we talked about proving type soundness for the simply-typed lambda calculus with booleans. This involved showing:

- ◆ Canonical Forms
- ◆ Inversion Lemmas
- ◆ Progress Theorem
- ◆ Preservation Theorem

Preservation

Theorem: If $\vdash t : T$ and $t \longrightarrow t'$, then $\vdash t' : T$.

We got to the point where we needed a **substitution lemma** to show the preservation theorem:

If $x:S \vdash t : T$ and $\vdash s : S$, then $\vdash [x \mapsto s]t : T$.

Typing rules

(T-TRUE)

$$\Gamma \vdash \text{true} : \text{Bool}$$

(T-FALSE)

$$\Gamma \vdash \text{false} : \text{Bool}$$

(T-IF)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : \text{Bool} \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T \quad \Gamma \vdash t_3 : T}{\Gamma \vdash \text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 : T}$$

(T-VAR)

$$\frac{x : T \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : T}$$

(T-ABS)

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash t_2 : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : T_1. t_2 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2}$$

(T-APP)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_1}{\Gamma \vdash t_1 t_2 : T_2}$$

Strengthened induction hypothesis

Lemma: Types are preserved under substitution.

If $\Gamma, x:S \vdash t : T$ and $\Gamma \vdash s : S$, then $\Gamma \vdash [x \mapsto s]t : T$.

Lemmas about the context

Lemma [Permutation]: If $\Gamma \vdash t : T$ and Δ is a permutation of Γ then $\Delta \vdash t : T$.

Lemma [Weakening]: If $\Gamma \vdash t : T$ and $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$ then $\Gamma, x : S \vdash t : T$.

Important points about type soundness for STLC

- ◆ Typing rules need a context to deal with variables.
- ◆ Progress lemma must have an empty context to be true.
- ◆ Preservation lemma need not (see TAPL).
- ◆ Application case of preservation lemma needs substitution lemma.
- ◆ Substitution lemma must be strengthened to non-empty contexts.
- ◆ Substitution lemma cannot be proved by induction on typing derivation.

On to real programming languages...

The Unit type

New typing rules

$t ::= \dots$
 $v ::= \dots$
 $\Gamma ::= \dots$
 Unit

terms
constant unit
values
constant unit
types
unit type

$\Gamma \vdash t : \Gamma$

$\Gamma \vdash \text{unit} : \text{Unit}$

(Γ -UNIT)

Sequencing

t ::= ... $t_1 ; t_2$

terms

Sequencing

terms

t ::= ...
 $t_1 ; t_2$

(E-SEQ)

$$\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{t_1 ; t_2 \rightarrow t'_1 ; t_2}$$

(E-SEQNEXT)

$$\text{unit}; t_2 \rightarrow t_2$$

(T-SEQ)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : \text{Unit} \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash t_1 ; t_2 : T_2}$$

Derived forms

One way to extend a programming language is through **derived forms**.

A derived form is a new syntax, operational semantics $t \xrightarrow{E} t'$ and type

system $\Gamma \vdash^E t : T$ for a language such that there is a function e that translates the new language into the old language with the following properties:

$$\blacklozenge t \xrightarrow{E} t' \text{ iff } e(t) \longrightarrow e(t').$$

$$\blacklozenge \Gamma \vdash t : T \text{ iff } \Gamma \vdash e(t) : T.$$

Derived forms are also called **syntactic sugar**.

Sequencing as a derived form

$t_1; t_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\lambda x: \text{Unit}. t_2) t_1$

where $x \notin FV(t_2)$

Equivalence of the two definitions

[board]

Let-bindings

New syntactic forms

$t ::= \dots$

$\text{let } x=t \text{ in } t$

let binding

terms

New evaluation rules

$\text{let } x=v_1 \text{ in } t_2 \longrightarrow [x \mapsto v_1]t_2$

(E-LETV)

$t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1$

$\text{let } x=t_1 \text{ in } t_2 \longrightarrow \text{let } x=t'_1 \text{ in } t_2$

(E-LET)

New typing rules

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \quad \Gamma, x:T_1 \vdash t_2 : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{let } x=t_1 \text{ in } t_2 : T_2}$$

(T-LET)

$\Gamma \vdash t : T$

$t \longrightarrow t'$

Pairs

<i>terms</i>	$t ::= \dots$	t
<i>pair</i>	$\{t, t\}$	
<i>first projection</i>	$t.1$	
<i>second projection</i>	$t.2$	
<i>values</i>	$v ::= \dots$	v
<i>pair value</i>	$\{v, v\}$	
<i>types</i>	$T ::= \dots$	T
<i>product type</i>	$T_1 \times T_2$	

Evaluation rules for pairs

(E-PAIRBETA1)

$$\{v_1, v_2\}.1 \rightarrow v_1$$

(E-PAIRBETA2)

$$\{v_1, v_2\}.2 \rightarrow v_2$$

(E-PROJ1)

$$\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{t_1.1 \rightarrow t'_1.1}$$

(E-PROJ2)

$$\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{t_1.2 \rightarrow t'_1.2}$$

(E-PAIR1)

$$\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{\{t_1, t_2\} \rightarrow \{t'_1, t_2\}}$$

(E-PAIR2)

$$\frac{t_2 \rightarrow t'_2}{\{v_1, t_2\} \rightarrow \{v_1, t'_2\}}$$

Typing rules for pairs

$$\text{(T-PAIR)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \{t_1, t_2\} : T_1 \times T_2}{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_2}$$

$$\text{(T-PROJ1)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \times T_{12}}$$

$$\text{(T-PROJ2)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1.2 : T_{12}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \times T_{12}}$$

Tuples

<i>terms</i>	$t ::= \dots$	$\{t_i\}_{i \in I \dots n}$	$t.i$
<i>tuple projection</i>			
<i>values</i>	$v ::= \dots$	$\{v_i\}_{i \in I \dots n}$	
<i>tuple value</i>			
<i>types</i>	$T ::= \dots$	$\{T_i\}_{i \in I \dots n}$	
<i>tuple type</i>			

Evaluation rules for tuples

$$(E\text{-ProjTuple}) \quad \{v_i \mid i \in I \dots n\}.j \rightarrow v_j$$

$$(E\text{-Proj}) \quad \frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{t_1.i \rightarrow t'_1.i}$$

$$(E\text{-Tuple}) \quad \frac{t_j \rightarrow t'_j \quad \{v_i \mid i \in I \dots j-1, t_j, t_k \mid k \in j+1 \dots n\}}{\rightarrow \{v_i \mid i \in I \dots j-1, t'_j, t_k \mid k \in j+1 \dots n\}}$$

Typing rules for tuples

$$\text{(T-TUPLE)} \quad \frac{\text{for each } i \quad \Gamma \vdash t_i : T_i}{\Gamma \vdash \{t_i\}_{i \in I \dots n} : \{T_i\}_{i \in I \dots n}}$$

$$\text{(T-PROJ)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : \{T_i\}_{i \in I \dots n}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1.j : T_j}$$

Records

<i>terms</i>	$\dots ::= t$
<i>record</i>	$\{l_i = t_i \mid i \in I \dots n\}$
<i>projection</i>	$t.l$
<i>values</i>	$\dots ::= v$
<i>record value</i>	$\{l_i = v_i \mid i \in I \dots n\}$
<i>types</i>	$\dots ::= T$
<i>type of records</i>	$\{l_i : T_i \mid i \in I \dots n\}$

Evaluation rules for records

$$(E\text{-ProjRCD}) \quad \{l_i = v_i \mid i \in 1..n\}.l_j \longrightarrow v_j$$

$$(E\text{-Proj}) \quad \frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{t_1.l \longrightarrow t'_1.l}$$

$$(E\text{-RCD}) \quad \frac{t_j \longrightarrow t'_j \quad \{l_i = v_i \mid i \in 1..j-1, l_j = t_j, l_k = t_k \mid k \in j+1..n\}}{\{l_i = v_i \mid i \in 1..j-1, l_j = t'_j, l_k = t_k \mid k \in j+1..n\} \longrightarrow}$$

Typing rules for records

$$\text{(T-RCD)} \quad \frac{\text{for each } i \quad \Gamma \vdash t_i : T_i}{\Gamma \vdash \{l_i = t_i \mid i \in I \dots n\} : \{l_i : T_i \mid i \in I \dots n\}}$$

$$\text{(T-PROJ)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \dots t_n : T_n}{\Gamma \vdash t_1.l_j : T_j}$$

Discussion

Intro vs. elim forms

An **introduction form** for a given type gives us a way of **constructing** elements of this type.

An **elimination form** for a type gives us a way of **using** elements of this type. What typing rules are introduction forms? What are elimination forms?

Erase

$$\begin{aligned} \text{erase}(x) &= x \\ \text{erase}(\lambda x:T_1. t_2) &= \lambda x. \text{erase}(t_2) \\ \text{erase}(t_1 t_2) &= \text{erase}(t_1) \text{erase}(t_2) \end{aligned}$$

Typability

An untyped λ -term m is said to be **typable** if there is some term t in the simply typed lambda-calculus, some type T , and some context Γ such that $erase(t) = m$ and $\Gamma \vdash t : T$.

Cf. **type reconstruction** in OCaml.