

## S mantiq e des Langages de Programmation (SemLP)

### TD n o 7 : Typed $\lambda$ -calculus

**Exercice 1 :**

Show that if  $x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n \vdash M : B$  is derivable then  $(A_1 \rightarrow \dots (A_n \rightarrow B) \dots)$  is a *tautology* of propositional logic where we interpret  $\rightarrow$  as implication and atomic types as propositional variables. Conclude that there are types  $A$  which are *not inhabited*, i.e., there is no (closed)  $\lambda$ -term  $M$  such that  $\emptyset \vdash M : A$ .

**Exercice 2 :**

Show that there is no  $\lambda$ -term  $M$  such that  $\emptyset \vdash M : (b \rightarrow b) \rightarrow b$ . Write  $A \rightarrow b$  as  $\neg A$ . Show that there are  $\lambda$ -terms  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  such that :

$$\emptyset \vdash N_1 : A \rightarrow (\neg\neg A) , \quad \emptyset \vdash N_2 : (\neg\neg\neg A) \rightarrow (\neg A) .$$

On the other hand, there are tautologies which are not inhabited! For instance, consider :  $A \equiv ((t \rightarrow s) \rightarrow t) \rightarrow t$ . Show that there is no  $\lambda$ -term  $M$  in normal form such that  $\emptyset \vdash M : A$  is derivable. This is enough because later we will show that all typable  $\lambda$ -terms normalize to a  $\lambda$ -term of the same type. For another example, show that there is no  $\lambda$ -term  $M$  in normal form such that  $\emptyset \vdash M : \neg\neg t \rightarrow t$  is derivable (the intuitionistic/constructive negation is not involutive!).

**Exercice 3 :**

Suppose we reconsider the *non-logical extension* of the simply typed  $\lambda$ -calculus with a *basic type nat*, constants  $Z, S, Y$ , and with the following fixed-point rule :

$$C[YM] \rightarrow C[M(YM)] .$$

Let a *program* be a closed typable  $\lambda$ -term of type *nat* and let a *value* be a  $\lambda$ -term of the shape  $(S \dots (SZ) \dots)$ . Show that if  $P$  is a program in *normal form* (cannot reduce) then  $P$  is a *value*.

**Exercice 4 :**

Assume a *recursively defined type*  $t$  satisfying the equation  $t = t \rightarrow b$  and suppose we add a rule for typing up to type equality :

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : A \quad A = B}{\Gamma \vdash M : B} .$$

Show that in this case the following  $\lambda$ -term (Curry's fixed point combinator) is typable (e.g., in Curry's style) :

$$Y \equiv \lambda f. (\lambda x. f(xx)) (\lambda x. f(xx)) .$$

Are the  $\lambda$ -terms typable in this system terminating?