

Proofs as Programs Summer School  
Eugene Oregon June - July 2002

## Type Systems

Herman Geuvers  
Nijmegen University, NL

Lecture 1: Simple Type Theory

Simplest system:  $\lambda \rightarrow$  just **arrow types**

$$\text{Typ} := \text{TVar} \mid (\text{Typ} \rightarrow \text{Typ})$$

- Examples:  $(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \alpha$ ,  $(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow ((\beta \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \gamma))$
- Brackets associate to the right and outside brackets are omitted:  
 $(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \gamma$
- Types are denoted by  $\sigma, \tau, \dots$

### **Terms:**

- typed variables  $x_1^\sigma, x_2^\sigma, \dots$ , countably many for every  $\sigma$ .
- application: if  $M : \sigma \rightarrow \tau$  and  $N : \sigma$ , then  $(MN) : \tau$
- abstraction: if  $P : \tau$ , then  $(\lambda x^\sigma. P) : \sigma \rightarrow \tau$

Examples:

$$\lambda x^\sigma . \lambda y^\tau . x : \sigma \rightarrow \tau \rightarrow \sigma$$

$$\lambda x^{\alpha \rightarrow \beta} . \lambda y^{\beta \rightarrow \gamma} . \lambda z^\alpha . y(xz) : (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \gamma$$

$$\lambda x^\alpha . \lambda y^{(\beta \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha} . y(\lambda z^\beta . x) : \alpha \rightarrow ((\beta \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha)$$

For every type there is a term of that type:

$$x^\sigma : \sigma$$

Not for every type there is a **closed term** of that type:

$$(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha \text{ is not } \mathbf{inhabited}$$

## Typed Terms versus Type Assignment:

- With **typed terms** also called **typing à la Church**, we have **terms with type information** in the  $\lambda$ -abstraction

As a consequence:

- Terms have unique types,
- The type is directly computed from the type info in the variables.

- With **typed assignment** also called **typing à la Curry**, we assign types to **untyped  $\lambda$ -terms**

As a consequence:

- Terms do not have unique types,
- A **principal type** can be computed using unification.

Examples:

- **Typed Terms:**

$$\lambda x^\alpha . \lambda y^{(\beta \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha} . y(\lambda z^\beta . x)$$

has **only** the type  $\alpha \rightarrow ((\beta \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$

- **Type Assignment:**

$$\lambda x . \lambda y . y(\lambda z . x)$$

can be given the types

- $\alpha \rightarrow ((\beta \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$
- $\alpha \rightarrow ((\beta \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow \gamma$
- $(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow ((\beta \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow \gamma$
- ...

with  $\alpha \rightarrow ((\beta \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow \gamma$  being the **principal type**

Example of computing a **principle type**:

$$\lambda x.\lambda y.y(\lambda z.yx)$$

Example of computing a **principle type**:

$$\lambda x. \lambda y. y(\lambda z. yx)$$

1. Assign a type variable to all variables:  $x : \alpha, y : \beta, z : \gamma$ .

Example of computing a **principle type**:

$$\lambda x^\alpha . \lambda y^\beta . y^\beta (\lambda z^\gamma . y^\beta x^\alpha)$$

1. Assign a type variable to all variables:  $x : \alpha, y : \beta, z : \gamma$ .
2. Generate equations between types, necessary for the term to be typable:



Example of computing a **principle type**:

$$\lambda x^\alpha . \lambda y^\beta . y^\beta (\lambda z^\gamma . y^\beta x^\alpha)$$

1. Assign a type variable to all variables:  $x : \alpha, y : \beta, z : \gamma$ .
2. Generate equations between types, necessary for the term to be typable:
  - $\beta = \alpha \rightarrow \delta$

Example of computing a **principle type**:

$$\lambda x^\alpha . \lambda y^\beta . y^\beta (\lambda z^\gamma . y^\beta x^\alpha)$$

1. Assign a type variable to all variables:  $x : \alpha, y : \beta, z : \gamma$ .
2. Generate equations between types, necessary for the term to be typable:
  - $\beta = \alpha \rightarrow \delta$
  - $\beta = (\gamma \rightarrow \delta) \rightarrow \epsilon$

Example of computing a **principle type**:

$$\lambda x^\alpha . \lambda y^\beta . y^\beta (\lambda z^\gamma . y^\beta x^\alpha)$$

1. Assign a type variable to all variables:  $x : \alpha, y : \beta, z : \gamma$ .
2. Generate equations between types, necessary for the term to be typable:
  - $\beta = \alpha \rightarrow \delta$
  - $\beta = (\gamma \rightarrow \delta) \rightarrow \epsilon$
3. Find a most general substitution for the type variables that solves the equations:

$$\alpha := \gamma \rightarrow \delta, \beta := (\gamma \rightarrow \delta) \rightarrow \epsilon, \delta := \epsilon$$

Example of computing a **principle type**:

$$\lambda x^\alpha . \lambda y^\beta . y^\beta (\lambda z^\gamma . y^\beta x^\alpha)$$

1. Assign a type variable to all variables:  $x : \alpha, y : \beta, z : \gamma$ .
2. Generate equations between types, necessary for the term to be typable:
  - $\beta = \alpha \rightarrow \delta$
  - $\beta = (\gamma \rightarrow \delta) \rightarrow \epsilon$
3. Find a most general substitution for the type variables that solves the equation:

$$\alpha := \gamma \rightarrow \delta, \beta := (\gamma \rightarrow \delta) \rightarrow \epsilon, \delta := \epsilon$$

4. The **principal type** of  $\lambda x . \lambda y . y (\lambda z . y x)$  is now

$$(\gamma \rightarrow \epsilon) \rightarrow ((\gamma \rightarrow \epsilon) \rightarrow \epsilon) \rightarrow \epsilon$$

Typical problems one would like to have an **algorithm** for:

- $M : \sigma?$  Type Checking Problem **TCP**
- $M : ?$  Type Synthesis Problem **TSP**
- $? : \sigma$  Type Inhabitation Problem (by a **closed** term) **TIP**

Typical problems one would like to have an **algorithm** for:

$M : \sigma?$  Type Checking Problem **TCP**

$M : ?$  Type Synthesis Problem **TSP**

$? : \sigma$  Type Inhabitation Problem (by a **closed** term) **TIP**

For  $\lambda \rightarrow$ , all these problems are **decidable**,  
both for the **Curry** style as for the **Church** style presentation.

Typical problems one would like to have an **algorithm** for:

$M : \sigma?$	Type Checking Problem	TCP
$M : ?$	Type Synthesis Problem	TSP
$? : \sigma$	Type Inhabitation Problem (by a <b>closed</b> term)	TIP

For  $\lambda \rightarrow$ , all these problems are **decidable**,  
both for the **Curry** style as for the **Church** style presentation.

Remarks:

- TCP and TSP are (usually) equivalent:  
To solve  $MN : \sigma$ , one has to solve  $N : ?$  (and if this gives answer  $\tau$ , solve  $M : \tau \rightarrow \sigma$ ).
- For **Curry** systems, TCP and TSP soon become **undecidable** if we go beyond  $\lambda \rightarrow$ .
- TIP is undecidable for most extensions of  $\lambda \rightarrow$ , as it corresponds to **provability** in some logic.

From now on we focus on the **Church** formulation of simple type theory:

terms with type information.

Formulation with **contexts** to declare the free variables:

$$x_1 : \sigma_1, x_2 : \sigma_2, \dots, x_n : \sigma_n$$

is a **context**, usually denoted by  $\Gamma$ .

**Derivation rules** of  $\lambda \rightarrow$ :

$$\frac{x:\sigma \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : \sigma} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash N : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash MN : \tau} \quad \frac{\Gamma, x:\sigma \vdash P : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x:\sigma. P : \sigma \rightarrow \tau}$$

$\Gamma \vdash_{\lambda \rightarrow} M : \sigma$  if there is a derivation using these rules with conclusion  $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$



## Formulas-as-Types (Curry, Howard):

There are **two readings** of a judgement  $M : \sigma$

1. term as **algorithm/program**, type as **specification**:

$M$  is a function of type  $\sigma$

2. type as a **proposition**, term as its **proof**:

$M$  is a proof of the proposition  $\sigma$

## Formulas-as-Types (Curry, Howard):

There are **two readings** of a judgement  $M : \sigma$

1. term as **algorithm/program**, type as **specification**:

$M$  is a function of type  $\sigma$

2. type as a **proposition**, term as its **proof**:

$M$  is a proof of the proposition  $\sigma$

- There is a **one-to-one correspondence** between

- **typable terms** in  $\lambda \rightarrow$

- **derivations** in minimal proposition logic

- The judgement

$$x_1 : \tau_1, x_2 : \tau_2, \dots, x_n : \tau_n \vdash M : \sigma$$

can be read as

$M$  is a **proof** of  $\sigma$  from the **assumptions**  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n$ .

## Example

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{[\alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma]^3 \quad [\alpha]^1}{\beta \rightarrow \gamma} \quad \frac{[\alpha \rightarrow \beta]^2 \quad [\alpha]^1}{\beta} \\
 \hline
 \frac{\frac{\frac{\gamma}{\alpha \rightarrow \gamma} \quad 1}{\alpha \rightarrow \gamma} \quad 2}{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \gamma} \quad 3 \\
 \hline
 (\alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \gamma
 \end{array}$$

 $\approx$ 

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \lambda x: \alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma. \lambda y: \alpha \rightarrow \beta. \lambda z: \alpha. xz(yz) \\
 : (\alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \gamma
 \end{array}$$

## Example

$$\frac{\frac{[\alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma]^3 \quad [\alpha]^1}{\beta \rightarrow \gamma} \quad \frac{[\alpha \rightarrow \beta]^2 \quad [\alpha]^1}{\beta}}{\frac{\frac{\frac{\gamma}{\alpha \rightarrow \gamma} \quad 1}{\alpha \rightarrow \gamma} \quad 2}{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \gamma} \quad 3} (\alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \gamma} \approx \lambda x: \alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma. \lambda y: \alpha \rightarrow \beta. \lambda z: \alpha. xz(yz) : (\alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \gamma$$

$$\frac{\frac{[\mathbf{x} : \alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma]^3 \quad [\mathbf{z} : \alpha]^1}{\mathbf{xz} : \beta \rightarrow \gamma} \quad \frac{[\mathbf{y} : \alpha \rightarrow \beta]^2 \quad [\mathbf{z} : \alpha]^1}{\mathbf{yz} : \beta}}{\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathbf{xz}(\mathbf{yz}) : \gamma}{\lambda z: \alpha. \mathbf{xz}(\mathbf{yz}) : \alpha \rightarrow \gamma} \quad 1}{\lambda y: \alpha \rightarrow \beta. \lambda z: \alpha. \mathbf{xz}(\mathbf{yz}) : (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \gamma} \quad 2}{\lambda x: \alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma. \lambda y: \alpha \rightarrow \beta. \lambda z: \alpha. \mathbf{xz}(\mathbf{yz}) : (\alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \gamma} \quad 3}$$

## Computation:

- **$\beta$ -reduction:**  $(\lambda x:\sigma.M)P \longrightarrow_{\beta} M[P/x]$
- **$\eta$ -reduction:**  $\lambda x:\sigma.Mx \longrightarrow_{\eta} M$  if  $x \notin \text{FV}(M)$

Cut-elimination in minimal logic =  $\beta$ -reduction in  $\lambda \rightarrow$ .

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{\frac{[\sigma]^1}{\mathcal{D}_1} \quad 1}{\frac{\tau}{\sigma \rightarrow \tau}} \quad \frac{\mathcal{D}_2}{\sigma}}{\tau} \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \frac{\mathcal{D}_2}{\sigma} \\
 \mathcal{D}_1
 \end{array}$$
  

$$\frac{\frac{[\mathbf{x} : \sigma]^1}{\mathcal{D}_1} \quad 1}{\frac{\mathbf{M} : \tau}{\lambda x:\sigma.M : \sigma \rightarrow \tau}} \quad \frac{\mathcal{D}_2}{P : \sigma}}{(\lambda x:\sigma.M)P : \tau} \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \frac{\mathcal{D}_2}{P : \sigma} \\
 \mathcal{D}_1 \\
 \mathbf{M}[P/x] : \tau$$

## Properties of $\lambda \rightarrow$ .

- **Uniqueness of types**

If  $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$  and  $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ , then  $\sigma = \tau$ .

- **Subject Reduction**

If  $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$  and  $M \longrightarrow_{\beta\eta} N$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash N : \sigma$ .

- **Strong Normalization**

If  $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$ , then all  $\beta\eta$ -reductions from  $M$  terminate.

## Properties of $\lambda \rightarrow$ .

- **Uniqueness of types**

If  $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$  and  $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ , then  $\sigma = \tau$ .

- **Subject Reduction**

If  $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$  and  $M \longrightarrow_{\beta\eta} N$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash N : \sigma$ .

- **Strong Normalization**

If  $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$ , then all  $\beta\eta$ -reductions from  $M$  terminate.

- **Substitution property**

If  $\Gamma, x : \tau, \Delta \vdash M : \sigma$ ,  $\Gamma \vdash P : \tau$ , then  $\Gamma, \Delta \vdash M[P/x] : \sigma$ .

- **Thinning**

If  $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$  and  $\Gamma \subseteq \Delta$ , then  $\Delta \vdash M : \sigma$ .

- **Strengthening**

If  $\Gamma, x : \tau \vdash M : \sigma$  and  $x \notin \text{FV}(M)$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$ .

**Strong Normalization** of  $\beta$  for  $\lambda \rightarrow$ .

**Note:**

- Terms may get **larger** under reduction
- Redexes may get **multiplied** under reduction.

**Definition**

- $[[\alpha]] := \text{Term}(\alpha) \cap \text{SN}$ .
- $[[\sigma \rightarrow \tau]] := \{M : \sigma \rightarrow \tau \mid \forall N \in [[\sigma]](MN \in [[\tau]])\}$ .

**Lemma** (all by induction on  $\sigma$ )

- $[[\sigma]] \subseteq \text{SN}$
- $x^\sigma \in [[\sigma]]$
- If  $M \in [[\sigma]]$ ,  $N \in [[\tau]]$ ,  $M[N/x] \in \text{SN}$ , then  $M[N/x] \in [[\sigma]]$ .

**Proposition**

$$M : \sigma \Rightarrow M \in [[\sigma]]$$



Corollary  $\lambda \rightarrow$  is SN