

Typed Lambda Calculus

Jacques Garrigue, 2009.05.21

Contrary to mathematical functions, λ -calculus does not define a function's domain and range. For instance, c_+ has no meaning if its arguments are not Church numerals, but there is no way to make this explicit.

1 Types and terms

Typed λ -calculi use *types* in place of sets. In the simply typed λ -calculus, each value belongs to a single type. There are two kinds of types: base types, and functional/structural types.

$$\begin{aligned} b &::= \text{int} \mid \text{bool} \mid \dots \\ t &::= b \mid t \rightarrow t \mid t \times t \end{aligned}$$

Type information also appears inside λ -terms.

$$M ::= x \mid c_t \mid \lambda x:t.M \mid (M M) \mid (M, M)$$

In order to manipulate values other than functions, δ -rules are introduced in addition to β -reduction.

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda x:\tau.M) N &\rightarrow [N/x]M \\ (\text{fst}_{\tau \times \theta \rightarrow \tau} (M, N)) &\rightarrow M \\ (\text{snd}_{\tau \times \theta \rightarrow \theta} (M, N)) &\rightarrow N \\ (\text{s}_{\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}} n_{\text{int}}) &\rightarrow (n + 1)_{\text{int}} \\ (\text{if0}_{\text{int} \rightarrow \tau \rightarrow \tau \rightarrow \tau} 0_{\text{int}} M N) &\rightarrow M \\ (\text{if0}_{\text{int} \rightarrow \tau \rightarrow \tau \rightarrow \tau} n_{\text{int}} M N) &\rightarrow N \\ \dots & \end{aligned}$$

In the above rules, s has a unique type, but fst , snd and if0 can be used with several types. τ and θ represent types that the user can choose as needed.

2 Typing derivation

The following judgment states that M is well-typed.

$$\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$$

M and τ are respectively a λ -term and its type. Γ is a *typing environment*, associating variables to their types; it has the form: $\{x_1 : \tau_1, \dots, x_n : \tau_n\}$.

A typing judgment is correct when it can be derived from the following typing rules.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Variable} & \Gamma \vdash x : \tau \quad (x : \tau \in \Gamma) \\ \text{Constant} & \Gamma \vdash c_\tau : \tau \\ \text{Abstraction} & \frac{\Gamma, x : \theta \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x:\theta.M : \tau} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{Application} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \theta \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash N : \theta}{\Gamma \vdash (M N) : \tau} \\
 \text{Product} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash N : \theta}{\Gamma \vdash (M, N) : \tau \times \theta}
 \end{array}$$

Example 1 (derivation)

$$\frac{\frac{x : \text{int} \vdash \text{s}_{\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}} : \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int} \quad x : \text{int} \vdash x : \text{int}}{x : \text{int} \vdash (\text{s}_{\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}} x) : \text{int}} \quad \vdash 1_{\text{int}} : \text{int}}{\vdash ((\lambda x : \text{int}. (\text{s}_{\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}} x)) 1_{\text{int}}) : \text{int}}$$

Properties

The following properties are stated for the simply typed λ calculus with only δ -rules for **fst** and **snd**.

Theorem 1 (subject reduction) *Whenever $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ and $M \rightarrow N$ are valid, $\Gamma \vdash N : \tau$ is valid.*

Theorem 2 (termination) *If $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$, then there is no infinite reduction sequence $(M \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow \dots)$.*

Having termination means that some otherwise computable functions cannot be defined. For instance, the term $(\lambda x.x x)(\lambda x.x x)$ was definable in untyped λ -calculus, but it cannot be typed. Let's try to build a derivation:

$$\frac{x : \tau \vdash x : \tau \rightarrow \theta \quad x : \tau \vdash x : \tau}{\frac{x : \tau \vdash x x : \theta}{\vdash \lambda x : \tau. x x : \theta}}$$

From the structure of the term, this is the only possible shape for a derivation, but it requires that $\tau = (\tau \rightarrow \theta)$. According to our definition of types, this equation has no solution (it would require infinite types).

Similarly, if we introduce a term Y , we can define non-terminating computations, so by contradiction there is no typable version of Y in the simply typed λ -calculus.

3 Relation to Logic

If we only look at types in derivations, we obtain valid derivations for *intuitionistic logic*, which motivated the λ -calculus. In such a system, constants behave as axioms.

For instance, starting from the derivation for $\lambda x : \tau \times \theta. (\text{snd } x, \text{fst } x)$:

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma \vdash \text{snd} : \tau \times \theta \rightarrow \theta \quad \Gamma \vdash x : \tau \times \theta \quad \vdash \text{fst} : \tau \times \theta \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash x : \tau \times \theta}{\Gamma \vdash (\text{snd } x) : \theta} \quad \Gamma \vdash (\text{fst } x) : \tau}{\Gamma = x : \tau \times \theta \vdash (\text{snd } x, \text{fst } x) : \theta \times \tau} \quad \vdash \lambda x : \tau \times \theta. (\text{snd } x, \text{fst } x) : \tau \times \theta \rightarrow \theta \times \tau$$

we obtain the following proof in intuitionistic logic:

$$\frac{\frac{A \wedge B \rightarrow B \quad A \wedge B^{(1)}}{B} \quad \frac{A \wedge B \rightarrow A \quad A \wedge B^{(1)}}{A}}{\frac{B \wedge A}{A \wedge B \rightarrow B \wedge A}^{(1)}}$$

Since we can mechanically find a unique derivation for any well-typed λ -term, we can view it as a proof.

The following relation is called the *Curry-Howard isomorphism*.

λ -calculus	Logic
Type	Proposition
λ -Term	Proof
\rightarrow	\Rightarrow
\times	\wedge
$+$	\vee

4 Universality

As we have seen above, if we limit ourselves to the above definition the typed λ -calculus is not universal. This is due to two different reasons.

The addition of numbers through δ -rules is necessary because we cannot encode Church numerals. More precisely, we can type them, but not in a sufficiently general way.

$$\vdash \lambda f : \tau \rightarrow \tau. \lambda x : \tau. f^n x : (\tau \rightarrow \tau) \rightarrow \tau \rightarrow \tau$$

The trouble is that in order to define the above term, we need to choose a specific τ . Since Church numerals need to be used with different kinds of f and x , this encoding proves insufficient. This can be solved by the addition of the above δ -rules.

For fixpoints, the problem is different: we cannot define them for any type. But the solution is similar: we can add a δ -rule.

$$Y_{(\tau \rightarrow \tau) \rightarrow \tau} M \rightarrow M (Y_{(\tau \rightarrow \tau) \rightarrow \tau} M)$$

If we add natural numbers and Y , λ -calculus becomes universal. Evaluation can be defined either using directly δ -rules, or through a translation to untyped λ -calculus.

With a stronger type system it becomes possible to encode Church numerals directly. Second-order λ -calculus introduces type variables.

$$\begin{aligned} t & ::= \dots \mid \tau \mid \forall \tau. t \\ M & ::= \dots \mid \Lambda \tau. M \mid M[t] \end{aligned}$$

Using them we can encode Church numerals as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \vdash c_n &= \Lambda \tau. \lambda f : \tau \rightarrow \tau. \lambda x : \tau. f^n x : \forall \tau. (\tau \rightarrow \tau) \rightarrow \tau \rightarrow \tau \\ \vdash c_+ &= \lambda m : Int. \lambda n : Int. \Lambda \tau. \lambda f : \tau \rightarrow \tau. \lambda x : \tau. (m[\tau] x (n[\tau] f x)) : Int \rightarrow Int \rightarrow Int \\ \vdash c_\times &= \lambda m : Int. \lambda n : Int. \Lambda \tau. \lambda f : \tau \rightarrow \tau. (m[\tau] (n[\tau] f)) : Int \rightarrow Int \rightarrow Int \\ \vdash c_{\text{exp}} &= \lambda m : Int. \lambda n : Int. \Lambda \tau. n[\tau \rightarrow \tau] (m[\tau]) : Int \rightarrow Int \rightarrow Int \end{aligned}$$

Here $Int = \forall \tau. (\tau \rightarrow \tau) \rightarrow \tau \rightarrow \tau$.

However, second-order λ -calculus still guarantees termination, and as a result we cannot encode Y in it. This is not necessarily a weakness: if all computation terminate, then we can give a concrete meaning to all terms.

We could also choose to extend λ -calculus with recursive types. They allow to solve equations such as $\tau = (\tau \rightarrow \theta)$, and are sufficient to give a type to Y . However, we then loose termination.