Introduction to Type Theory

February 2008

Alpha Lernet Summer School

Piriapolis, Uruguay

Herman Geuvers

Type Theory, Fall 2009

Lecture Simple Type Theory and Polymorphic Type Theory: normalization

Normalization of β for $\lambda\!\rightarrow$

What is the problem?

- Terms may get larger under reduction
  $(\lambda f.\lambda x.f(fx))P \longrightarrow_\beta \lambda x.P(Px)$
- Redexes may get multiplied under reduction.
  $(\lambda f.\lambda x.f(fx))((\lambda y.M)Q) \longrightarrow_\beta \lambda x.((\lambda y.M)Q)(((\lambda y.M)Q)x)$
- New redexes may be created under reduction.
  $(\lambda f.\lambda x.f(fx))(\lambda y.N) \longrightarrow_\beta \lambda x.(\lambda y.N)((\lambda y.N)x)$

First: Weak Normalization

- Weak Normalization: there is a reduction sequence that terminates,
- Strong Normalization: all reduction sequences terminate.

Towards Weak Normalization

There are four ways in which a “new” β-redex can be created.

- Creation

$$(\lambda x. \ldots x\, P \ldots)\,(\lambda y.Q) \longrightarrow_\beta \ldots (\lambda y.Q)\, P \ldots$$

- Multiplication

$$(\lambda x. \ldots x \ldots x \ldots)\,((\lambda y.Q)\, R) \longrightarrow_\beta \ldots (\lambda y.Q)\, R \ldots (\lambda y.Q)\, R \ldots$$

- Identity

$$(\lambda x.x)(\lambda y.Q)\, R \longrightarrow_\beta (\lambda y.Q)R$$

- Hidden Redex

$$(\lambda x.\lambda y.Q)\, P\, R \longrightarrow_\beta (\lambda y.Q[x := P])R$$

We will count redexes in terms; hidden redexes will also be counted!

Definition

The height (or order) of a type $h(\sigma)$ is defined by

- $h(\alpha) := 0$
- $h(\sigma_1 \to \ldots \to \sigma_n \to \alpha) := \max(h(\sigma_1), \ldots, h(\sigma_n)) + 1.$

NB [Exercise] This is the same as defining

- $h(\sigma \to \tau) := \max(h(\sigma) + 1, h(\tau)).$

Definition

The height of a redex $(\lambda x{:}\sigma.P)Q$ is the height of the type of $\lambda x{:}\sigma.P$
Idem for a 'hidden redex'.

Towards Weak Normalization

Definition

We give a measure m to the terms by defining $m(N) := (h(N), \#N)$ with

- $h(N) =$ the maximum height of a redex in N,
- $\#N =$ the number of redexes of height $h(N)$ in N.

The measures of terms are ordered lexicographically:

$$(h_1, x) <_l (h_2, y) \text{ iff } h_1 < h_2 \text{ or } (h_1 = h_2 \text{ and } x < y).$$

This is a well-founded ordering.

Theorem: Weak Normalization

If P is a typable term in $\lambda\!\rightarrow$, then there is a terminating reduction starting from P.

Proof

Pick a redex of height $h(P)$ inside P that does not contain any other (non-hidden) redex of height $h(P)$. [Note that this is always possible!]
Reduce this redex, to obtain Q. This does not create a new redex of height $h(P)$. [This is the important step. Exercise: check this; distinguish the ways in which new redexes can be created.]
So $m(Q) <_l m(P)$
As there are no infinitely decreasing $<_l$ sequences, this process must terminate and then we have arrived at a normal form.

Strong Normalization for $\lambda\!\rightarrow$ à la Curry

This is proved by constructing a model of $\lambda\!\rightarrow$.

Definition

- $[\![\alpha]\!] :=$ SN (the set of strongly normalizing λ-terms).
- $[\![\sigma\!\rightarrow\!\tau]\!] := \{M \mid \forall N \in [\![\sigma]\!](MN \in [\![\tau]\!])\}$.

Lemma

1. $xN_1 \ldots N_k \in [\![\sigma]\!]$ for all x, σ and $N_1, \ldots, N_k \in$ SN.
2. $[\![\sigma]\!] \subseteq$ SN
3. If $M[x := N]\vec{P} \in [\![\sigma]\!]$, $N \in$ SN, then $(\lambda x.M)N\vec{P} \in [\![\sigma]\!]$.

Strong Normalization for $\lambda\!\rightarrow$ à la Curry

Lemma

1. $xN_1 \ldots N_k \in [\![\sigma]\!]$ for all x, σ and $N_1, \ldots, N_k \in$ SN.
2. $[\![\sigma]\!] \subseteq$ SN
3. If $M[x := N]\vec{P} \in [\![\sigma]\!]$, $N \in$ SN, then $(\lambda x.M)N\vec{P} \in [\![\sigma]\!]$.

Proof: By induction on σ; the first two are proved simultaneously.
NB for the proof of (2): We need that $[\![\sigma]\!]$ is non-empty, which is guaranteed by the induction hypothesis for (1).
Also, use that $MN \in$ SN $\Rightarrow M \in$ SN. Think of it a bit and see it's true.

Proposition

$$\left.\begin{array}{r} x_1{:}\tau_1, \ldots, x_n{:}\tau_n \vdash M : \sigma \\ N_1 \in [\![\tau_1]\!], \ldots, N_n \in [\![\tau_n]\!] \end{array}\right\} \Rightarrow M[x_1 := N_1, \ldots x_n := N_n] \in [\![\sigma]\!]$$

Proof By induction on the derivation of $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$. (Using (3) of the previous Lemma.)

Corollary $\lambda{\rightarrow}$ is SN

Proof By taking $N_i := x_i$ in the Proposition. (That can be done, because $x_i \in [\![\tau_i]\!]$ by (1) of the Lemma.)
Then $M \in [\![\sigma]\!] \subseteq$ SN, using (2) of the Lemma. QED

Exercise Verify the details of the Strong Normalization proof. (That is, prove the Lemma and the Proposition.)

A little bit on semantics

$\lambda\!\!\rightarrow$ has a simple set-theoretic model. Given sets $[\![\alpha]\!]$ for type variables α, define

$$[\![\sigma \rightarrow \tau]\!] := [\![\tau]\!]^{[\![\sigma]\!]} \text{ (set theoretic function space } [\![\sigma]\!] \rightarrow [\![\tau]\!])$$

If any of the base sets $[\![\alpha]\!]$ is infinite, then there are higher and higher (uncountable) cardinalities among the $[\![\sigma]\!]$

There are smaller models, e.g.

$$[\![\sigma \rightarrow \tau]\!] := \{f \in [\![\sigma]\!] \rightarrow [\![\tau]\!] | f \text{ is definable}\}$$

where definability means that it can be constructed in some formal system. This restricts the collection to a countable set.

For example

$$[\![\sigma \rightarrow \tau]\!] := \{f \in [\![\sigma]\!] \rightarrow [\![\tau]\!] | f \text{ is } \lambda\text{-definable}\}$$

Strong Normalization of β for $\lambda 2$

- There are two kinds of β-reductions
  - $(\lambda x{:}\sigma.M)P \longrightarrow_\beta M[x := P]$
  - $(\lambda\alpha.M)\tau \longrightarrow_\beta M[\alpha := \tau]$
- The second does no harm, so we can just look at $\lambda 2$ à la Curry

Recall the proof for $\lambda{\rightarrow}$:

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

Question:

How to define $[\![\forall\alpha.\sigma]\!]$??

$$[\![\forall\alpha.\sigma]\!] := \Pi_{X\in U}[\![\sigma]\!]_{\alpha:=X}??$$

Strong Normalization of β for $\lambda 2$

Question:

How to define $[\![\forall\alpha.\sigma]\!]$??

$$[\![\forall\alpha.\sigma]\!] := \Pi_{X\in U}[\![\sigma]\!]_{\alpha:=X}??$$

- What should be U?

  The collection of "all possible interpretations" of types (?)

- $\Pi_{X\in U}[\![\sigma]\!]_{\alpha:=X}$ gets too big: $\mathsf{card}(\Pi_{X\in U}[\![\sigma]\!]_{\alpha:=X}) > \mathsf{card}(U)$

- Girard: $[\![\forall\alpha.\sigma]\!]$ should be small

$$\bigcap_{X\in U}[\![\sigma]\!]_{\alpha:=X}$$

- Girard: Definition of U.

Strong Normalization of β for $\lambda 2$

U := SAT, the collection of saturated sets of (untyped) λ-terms.

$X \subset \Lambda$ is saturated if

- $xP_1 \dots P_n \in X$ (for all $x \in$ Var, $P_1, \dots, P_n \in$ SN)
- $X \subseteq$ SN
- If $M[x := N]\vec{P} \in X$ and $N \in$ SN, then $(\lambda x.M)N\vec{P} \in X$.

Let ρ : TVar $\to$ SAT be a valuation of type variables. Define $[\![\sigma]\!]_\rho$ by:

- $[\![\alpha]\!]_\rho := \rho(\alpha)$
- $[\![\sigma \to \tau]\!]_\rho := \{M | \forall N \in [\![\sigma]\!]_\rho (MN \in [\![\tau]\!]_\rho)\}$
- $[\![\forall \alpha.\sigma]\!]_\rho := \cap_{X \in \mathsf{SAT}} [\![\sigma]\!]_{\rho, \alpha := X}$

Proposition

$$x_1 : \tau_1, \ldots, x_n : \tau_n \vdash M : \sigma \Rightarrow M[x_1 := P_1, \ldots, x_n := P_n] \in [\![\sigma]\!]_\rho$$

for all valuations ρ and $P_1 \in [\![\tau_1]\!]_\rho, \ldots, P_n \in [\![\tau_n]\!]_\rho$

Proof

By induction on the derivation of $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$.

Corollary $\lambda 2$ is SN

(Proof: take P_1 to be x_1, ..., P_n to be x_n.)

A little bit on semantics

$\lambda 2$ does not have a set-theoretic model! [Reynolds]

Theorem: If

$$[\![\sigma \to \tau]\!] := [\![\tau]\!]^{[\![\sigma]\!]} \quad \text{(set theoretic function space)}$$

then $[\![\sigma]\!]$ is a singleton set for every σ.

So: in a $\lambda 2$-model, $[\![\sigma \to \tau]\!]$ must be 'small'.