

Types and Programming Languages

Lecture 4. Types, the simply typed λ -calculus

Xiaojuan Cai

`cxj@sjtu.edu.cn`

BASICS Lab, Shanghai Jiao Tong University

Spring, 2016

Outline

Typed arithmetic expressions

- Typing relation

- Safety = Progress + Preservation

Simply typed λ -calculus

- Function types

By anonymous

Q: Why bother doing proofs about programming languages? They are almost always boring if the definitions are right.

A: The definitions are almost always wrong.

Arithmetic expressions

$t ::=$	<i>terms</i>
true	<i>constant true</i>
false	<i>constant false</i>
if t then t else t	<i>conditional</i>
0	<i>constant zero</i>
succ t	<i>successor</i>
pred t	<i>predecessor</i>
iszero t	<i>zero test</i>

$v ::=$	<i>values</i>
true	<i>true value</i>
false	<i>false value</i>
nv	<i>numeric value</i>

$nv ::=$	<i>numeric values</i>
0	<i>zero value</i>
succ nv	<i>successor value</i>

Types

- ▶ Recall that evaluating a term can either result in a value or else get **stuck** at some stage, by reaching a term like `pred false`.
- ▶ In fact, we can tell *stuck terms* without actually evaluating it.
- ▶ Coming soon: If a term is **well typed**, i.e., it has some **type** T , then it never get stuck (never goes *wrong*).

Typing relation

The typing relation for arithmetic expressions, written “ $t : T$ ”, is defined by a set of inference rules assigning types to terms.

$T ::=$

- types
- Bool *type of booleans*
- Nat *type of natural numbers*

Typing rules:

$\text{T-TRUE} \frac{}{\text{true} : \text{Bool}} \quad \text{T-FALSE} \frac{}{\text{false} : \text{Bool}} \quad \text{T-ZERO} \frac{}{0 : \text{Nat}}$

$\text{T-Succ} \frac{t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{succ } t_1 : \text{Nat}} \quad \text{T-Pred} \frac{t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{pred } t_1 : \text{Nat}}$

$\text{T-IF} \frac{t_1 : \text{Bool} \quad t_2 : T \quad t_3 : T}{\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 : T} \quad \text{T-IsZero} \frac{t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{iszero } t_1 : \text{Bool}}$

Uniqueness of types

When reasoning about the typing relation, we will often inverse the typing relation.

Lemma 8.2.2:

1. If $\text{true} : R$ or $\text{false} : R$, then $R = \text{Bool}$;
2. If $\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 : R$, then $t_1 : \text{Bool}$, $t_2 : R$, and $t_3 : R$.
3. If $0 : R$, or $\text{succ } t_1 : R$, or $\text{pred } t_1 : R$, then $R = \text{Nat}$ and $t_1 : \text{Nat}$.
4. If $\text{iszero } t_1 : R$, then $R = \text{Bool}$ and $t_1 : \text{Nat}$.

Theorem 8.2.4 [Uniqueness of types]: Each term t has at most one type.

Above theorem does not hold for languages with subtyping rules.

The most basic property of type system

Safety = Progress + Preservation

- ▶ **Progress**: A well-typed term is not stuck (either it is a value or it can take a step according to the evaluation rules).
- ▶ **Preservation**: If a well-typed term takes a step of evaluation, then the resulting term is also well typed.

Progress

Lemma 8.3.1 [Canonical forms]:

- ▶ If v is a value of type `Bool`, then v is either `true` or `false`.
- ▶ If v is a value of type `Nat`, then v is a numeric value according to the grammar.

Theorem 8.3.2 [Progress]: Suppose t is a well-typed term (that is, $t : T$ for some T). Then either t is a value or else there is some t' with $t \longrightarrow t'$.

Proof. By induction on a derivation of $t : T$.

Preservation

Theorem 8.3.3 [Preservation]: If $t : T$ and $t \longrightarrow t'$, then $t' : T$.

Proof. Either by induction on a derivation of $t : T$, or by induction on a derivation of $t \longrightarrow t'$.

Outline

Typed arithmetic expressions

Typing relation

Safety = Progress + Preservation

Simply typed λ -calculus

Function types

Add types to λ -calculus

Coming soon: A typing relation for variables, abstractions, and applications that

- ▶ **maintain type safety**: satisfy the type progress and preservation;
- ▶ **are not too conservative**: they should assign types to most of the programs we actually care about writing.

Turing completeness of λ -calculus implies that there is **no hope** of giving an exact type analysis for these primitives. For example:

```
if ⟨long and tricky computation⟩ then true else ( $\lambda x.x$ )
```

Arrow type

For a function,

1. we care about the types of both arguments and results:

arrow type $T \rightarrow T$

Note the difference between $T \rightarrow T \rightarrow T$ and $(T \rightarrow T) \rightarrow T$

2. the type of an abstraction relies on the type of argument, e.g.

$\lambda x.x : \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}$ or $\lambda x.x : \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}$

3. Hence, the typing relation on abstractions should be written as

$\lambda x : T_1 . t_2 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$

But how do we derive T_2 ? We assume $x : T_1$!!! So we need an **environment** (**context**) for our typing relation:

$\Gamma \vdash t : T$

Pure simply typed λ -calculus ($\lambda_{\rightarrow}$)

Terms $t ::= x \mid \lambda x : T. t \mid t t$

Values $v ::= \lambda x : T. t$

Types $T ::= T \rightarrow T$

Contexts $\Gamma ::= \emptyset \mid \Gamma, x : T$

Typing

$$\text{T-VAR} \frac{x : T \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : T} \quad \text{T-ABS} \frac{\Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash t_2 : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : T_1. t_2 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2}$$

$$\text{T-APP} \frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_1}{\Gamma \vdash t_1 t_2 : T_2}$$

- Quiz:** 1. Please draw the type derivation tree of the term $(\lambda x : \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Nat}. x \text{ true})(\lambda x : \text{Bool}. \text{if } x \text{ then } 0 \text{ else } (\text{succ } 0))$.
2. What about this term $\lambda x : \text{Bool}. x x$?

Properties of typing

Lemma 9.3.1 [Inversion of the Typing Relation]:

1. If $\Gamma \vdash x : R$, then $x : R \in \Gamma$.
2. If $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : T_1 . t_2 : R$, then $R = T_1 \rightarrow R_2$ for some R_2 with $\Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash t_2 : R_2$.
3. If $\Gamma \vdash t_1 t_2 : R$, then there is some type T_1 such that $t_1 : T_1 \rightarrow R$ and $\Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_1$.
4. for booleans $\dots$

Theorem 9.3.3 [Uniqueness of types]: In a given typing context Γ , a term t (with free variables all in the domain of Γ) has at most one type.

Progress

Lemma 9.3.4 [Canonical forms]:

- ▶ If v is a value of type `Bool`, then v is either `true` or `false`.
- ▶ If v is a value of type $T_1 \rightarrow T_2$, then $v = \lambda x : T_1. t_2$.

Theorem 9.3.5 [Progress]: Suppose t is a closed, well-typed term (that is, $\Gamma \vdash t : T$ for some T). Then either t is a value or else there is some t with $t \longrightarrow t$.

Preservation

Theorem 9.3.9 [Preservation]: If $\Gamma \vdash t : T$ and $t \longrightarrow t'$, then $\Gamma \vdash t' : T$.

Quiz. Please try to prove above theorem and figure out what lemmas we need.

Lemma 9.3.6 [Permutation]: If $\Gamma \vdash t : T$ and Δ is a permutation of Γ , then $\Delta \vdash t : T$. Moreover, the latter derivation has the same depth as the former.

Theorem 9.3.7 [Weakening]: If $\Gamma \vdash t : T$ and $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then $\Gamma, x : S \vdash t : T$. Moreover, the latter derivation has the same depth as the former.

Theorem 9.3.8 [Preservation of types under substitution]: If $\Gamma, x : S \vdash t : T$ and $\Gamma \vdash s : S$, then $\Gamma \vdash [x \mapsto s]t : T$.

The Curry-Howard correspondence

Other names for typing rules from a logic view.

The $\rightarrow$ type constructor comes with typing rules of two kinds:

- ▶ an **introduction** rule (T-ABS) describing how elements of the type can be created, and
- ▶ an **elimination** rule (T-APP) describing how elements of the type can be used.

Curry-Howard Correspondence, or isomorphism

LOGIC	PROGRAMMING LANGUAGES
proposition	types
proposition $P \supset Q$	type $P \rightarrow Q$
proposition $P \wedge Q$	type $P \times Q$
proof of proposition P	term t of type P
proposition P is provable	type P is inhabited (by some term)

Erasure and Typability

Type annotations are be used during *type checking*, and will be erased before evaluation.

Definition 9.5.1 [Erasure]: The **erasure** of a simply typed term t is defined as follows:

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

Definition 9.5.3 [Typability]: A term m in the untyped λ -calculus is said to be **typable** in $\lambda_{\rightarrow}$ if there are some simply typed term t , type T , and context Γ such that $\text{erase}(t) = m$ and $\Gamma \vdash t : T$.

Conclusion

- ▶ Typing system $\Gamma \vdash t : T$ can remove some terms before they run into *stuck* states.
- ▶ However, it also removes well-behaved terms.
- ▶ Type safety = progress + preservation
- ▶ For proving safety, some other properties such as *canonical forms*, *uniqueness of type* are needed.
- ▶ Simply typed λ -calculus is non-Turing-complete.

Homework

- ▶ 8.3.4, 8.3.6, 8.3.7, 9.2.2, 9.2.3, 9.3.2, 9.4.1

Projects. Extend arith with

- ▶ Untyped lambda calculus (Chapter 7), due on Apr. 14
(*Thursday of Week 8*)
- ▶ Simple typed lambda calculus (Chapter 10) , due on May. 12
(*Thursday of Week 12*)
- ▶ Subtyping (Chapter 17) , due on Jun. 9 (*Thursday of Week 16*)