predicate logic & dependent types

Freek Wiedijk

Type Theory & Coq
2023–2024
Radboud University Nijmegen

September 22, 2023



introduction

function types become dependent

for predicate logic one needs to generalize

$$(\lambda x : A.\, M) \;\; : \;\; A \to B$$

function types

to

$$(\lambda x : A.\, M) \;\; : \;\; \underset{\text{can contain } x}{\Pi x : A.\, B}$$

dependent function types

$$\forall x : A.\, B$$

`forall x : A, B`

three different notations for the same type

we skip chapters 3 and 5 for now

inductive types

next week

program extraction

maybe last week

last week and this week

Curry-Howard correspondence:

propositional logic	$\lambda\!\rightarrow$	simple types
predicate logic	λP	dependent types
second order logic	$\lambda 2$	polymorphic types
beyond minimal logic	CIC	inductive types

dependent types in the lambda cube



recap: propositional logic

$$A, B ::= a \mid A \to B \mid A \wedge B \mid A \vee B \mid \neg A \mid \top \mid \bot$$

$I\to$	$E\to$
$I\wedge$	$El\wedge \;\; Er\wedge$
$Il\vee \;\; Ir\vee$	$E\vee$
$I\neg$	$E\neg$
$I\top$	$E\bot$

recap: simply typed lambda calculus

$$A, B ::= a \mid A \to B$$
$$M, N ::= x \mid MN \mid \lambda x : A.\, M$$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash x : A} \quad \text{for } (x : A) \in \Gamma$$

$$\frac{\Gamma,\, x : A \vdash M : B}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x : A.\, M) : A \to B} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash F : A \to B \qquad \Gamma \vdash M : A}{\Gamma \vdash FM : B}$$

predicate logic

three predicate logics

- minimal predicate logic

$$\rightarrow \ \forall$$

- constructive predicate logic

$$\rightarrow \ \wedge \ \vee \ \neg \ \top \ \bot \ \forall \ \exists$$

- classical predicate logic

$$A \vee \neg A$$
$$\neg\neg A \rightarrow A$$

propositional versus predicate logic: syntax

$$A, B ::= a \mid A \to B \mid A \wedge B \mid A \vee B \mid \neg A \mid \top \mid \bot$$

$$\begin{aligned} M, N &::= x \mid f(\vec{M}) \\ \vec{M} &::= \cdot \mid \vec{M}, N \\ A, B &::= p(\vec{M}) \mid A \to B \mid A \wedge B \mid A \vee B \mid \neg A \mid \top \mid \bot \mid \\ &\qquad \forall x.\, A \mid \exists x.\, A \end{aligned}$$

$\forall$ and $\exists$ bind weakly

minimal propositional versus minimal predicate logic: rules

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c}[A^H]\\ \vdots\\ B\end{array}}{A \to B}\, I[H]\to \qquad \frac{\begin{array}{cc}\vdots & \vdots\\ A \to B & A\end{array}}{B}\, E\to$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ A\end{array}}{\forall x.\, A}\, I\forall \qquad \frac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \forall x.\, A\end{array}}{A[x := M]}\, E\forall$$

variable condition of $I\forall$: x not free in available assumptions

same four rules with explicit assumptions

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \to B}\, I{\to} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \to B \quad \Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash B}\, E{\to}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash \forall x.\, A}\, I\forall \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \forall x.\, A}{\Gamma \vdash A[x := M]}\, E\forall$$

variable condition of $I\forall$: x not free in Γ

rules for the existential quantifier

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ A[x := M]\end{array}}{\exists x.\, A}\, I\exists \qquad\qquad \frac{\begin{array}{cc}\vdots & \vdots\\ \exists x.\, A & \forall x.\, A \to C\end{array}}{C}\, E\exists$$

variable condition of $E\exists$: x not free in C

example proof in minimal logic

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{[\forall y.\, p(y)^{H}]}{p(x)}\, E\forall}{(\forall y.\, p(y)) \to p(x)}\, I[H]\to}{\forall x.\big((\forall y.\, p(y)) \to p(x)\big)}\, I\forall$$

variable condition check:

at the $I\forall$ step the variable x does not occur in assumptions (there are no available assumptions at that point)

example with existential quantifier

$A \leftrightarrow B := (A \to B) \wedge (B \to A)$

$$(\exists x.\, p(x)) \leftrightarrow \neg(\forall x.\, \neg p(x))$$

not constructively valid

$$(\exists x.\, p(x)) \to \neg(\forall x.\, \neg p(x))$$
$$\neg(\forall x.\, \neg p(x)) \to \neg\neg(\exists x.\, p(x))$$

example from left to right

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{[\exists x.\, p(x)^{H_0}] \quad [\forall x.\, p(x) \to \bot^{H_1}]}{\bot} E\exists}{\neg(\forall x.\, \neg p(x))}\, I[H_1]\neg}{(\exists x.\, p(x)) \to \neg(\forall x.\, \neg p(x))}\, I[H_0]\to$$

variable condition check:

at the $E\exists$ step the variable x does not occur in $\bot$

example from right to left

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{[\neg(\exists x.\, p(x))^{H_1}] \qquad \dfrac{[p(x)^{H_2}]}{\exists x.\, p(x)}\, I\exists}{\bot}\, E{\to}}{\neg p(x)}\, I[H_2]\neg}{\forall x.\, \neg p(x)}\, I\forall \qquad [\neg(\forall x.\, \neg p(x))^{H_0}]}{\bot}\, E\neg}{\neg\neg(\exists x.\, p(x))}\, I[H_1]\neg}{\neg(\forall x.\, \neg p(x)) \to \neg\neg(\exists x.\, p(x))}\, I[H_0]{\to}$$

variable condition check:

at the $I\forall$ step the variable x does not occur in assumptions

dependent type theory

types thus far

- atomic types
  $a, b, c, \ldots$
- types of proof objects of propositions
  $a, b, c, \ldots$
- function types
- datatypes
  - natural numbers
  - Booleans
  - lists
  - binary trees
  - ...

how are types introduced?

- free type variables

  STT = simple type theory

- in the context = 'axiomatic'

  PTSs = pure type systems: $\lambda\!\to$ λP λ2 λC

$$\Gamma \vdash M : A$$

$$\text{nat} : *,\ \text{O} : \text{nat},\ \text{S} : \text{nat} \to \text{nat} \vdash \text{S}\ (\text{S}\ (\text{S}\ \text{O})) : \text{nat}$$

  Coq: `Parameter`

- definitions $\longrightarrow$ next week

  CIC = Calculus of Inductive Constructions

$$E[\Gamma] \vdash M : A$$

  Coq: `Definition` `Inductive`

star and box

the sorts of the lambda cube:

$$\begin{array}{lcl} * & = & \text{the type of types} \\ \Box & = & \text{the type of } * \end{array}$$

the sort $*$ is a kind
$=$ third of four levels

$$\begin{array}{r} \text{object} : \text{type} \\ \text{type} : \text{kind} \\ \text{kind} : \Box \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{r} \text{object} : \text{type} : \text{kind} : \Box \\ \text{S} : \text{nat} \to \text{nat} : * : \Box \end{array}$$

example contexts

natural numbers:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{nat} &: * \\ \mathsf{O} &: \mathsf{nat} \\ \mathsf{S} &: \mathsf{nat} \to \mathsf{nat} \\ \mathsf{add} &: \mathsf{nat} \to \mathsf{nat} \to \mathsf{nat} \end{aligned}$$

Booleans:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{bool} &: * \\ \mathsf{true} &: \mathsf{bool} \\ \mathsf{false} &: \mathsf{bool} \end{aligned}$$

lists

lists of Booleans:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{list} &: * \\ \mathsf{nil} &: \mathsf{list} \\ \mathsf{cons} &: \mathsf{bool} \to \mathsf{list} \to \mathsf{list} \\ \mathsf{hd} &: \mathsf{list} \to \mathsf{bool} \\ \mathsf{tl} &: \mathsf{list} \to \mathsf{list} \\ \mathsf{append} &: \mathsf{list} \to \mathsf{list} \to \mathsf{list} \\ \mathsf{reverse} &: \mathsf{list} \to \mathsf{list} \end{aligned}$$

cons has two arguments
(the head and tail to be put together)

trueslist

the function 'trueslist' maps a number n to a list of length n consisting of n copies of 'true'

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{trueslist O} &= \text{nil} \\
\text{trueslist (S O)} &= \text{cons true nil} \\
\text{trueslist (S (S O))} &= \text{cons true (cons true nil)} \\
\text{trueslist (S (S (S O)))} &= \text{cons true (cons true (cons true nil))} \\
&\ldots
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{trueslist} \ : \ \text{nat} \rightarrow \text{list}$$

vectors and truesvec

vectors of Booleans:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec} &: \text{nat} \to * \\ \text{vec O} &: * && \text{vectors of length 0} \\ \text{vec (S O)} &: * && \text{vectors of length 1} \\ \text{vec (S (S O))} &: * && \text{vectors of length 2} \\ &\ldots \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{trueslist} : \text{nat} \to \text{list}$$

$$\text{truesvec} : \text{nat} \to \text{vec } n$$

$$\text{truesvec} : \Pi n : \text{nat}.\, \text{vec } n$$

vnil and vcons

$$\mathsf{vnil} : \mathsf{vec}\ \mathsf{O}$$

$$\mathsf{vcons} : \mathsf{nat} \to \mathsf{bool} \to \mathsf{vec}\ n \to \mathsf{vec}\ (\mathsf{S}\ n)$$

$$\mathsf{vcons} : \Pi n : \mathsf{nat}.\ \mathsf{bool} \to \mathsf{vec}\ n \to \mathsf{vec}\ (\mathsf{S}\ n)$$

vcons has three arguments!

$$\mathsf{truesvec}\ (\mathsf{S}\ (\mathsf{S}\ \mathsf{O}))\ :\ \mathsf{vec}\ (\mathsf{S}\ (\mathsf{S}\ \mathsf{O}))$$

$$\mathsf{truesvec}\ (\mathsf{S}\ (\mathsf{S}\ \mathsf{O})) = \mathsf{vcons}\ (\mathsf{S}\ \mathsf{O})\ \mathsf{true}\ (\mathsf{vcons}\ \mathsf{O}\ \mathsf{true}\ \mathsf{vnil})$$

types when applying vcons

$$\mathsf{truesvec}\ (\mathsf{S}\ \mathsf{O}) = \mathsf{vcons}\ \mathsf{O}\ \mathsf{true}\ \mathsf{vnil}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{truesvec} &: \Pi n : \mathsf{nat}.\ \mathsf{vec}\ n \\
\mathsf{truesvec}\ (\mathsf{S}\ \mathsf{O}) &: \mathsf{vec}\ (\mathsf{S}\ \mathsf{O})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{vcons} &: \Pi n : \mathsf{nat}.\ \mathsf{bool} \to \mathsf{vec}\ n \to \mathsf{vec}\ (\mathsf{S}\ n) \\
\mathsf{O} &: \mathsf{nat} \\
\mathsf{vcons}\ \mathsf{O} &: \mathsf{bool} \to \mathsf{vec}\ \mathsf{O} \to \mathsf{vec}\ (\mathsf{S}\ \mathsf{O}) \\
\mathsf{true} &: \mathsf{bool} \\
\mathsf{vcons}\ \mathsf{O}\ \mathsf{true} &: \mathsf{vec}\ \mathsf{O} \to \mathsf{vec}\ (\mathsf{S}\ \mathsf{O}) \\
\mathsf{vnil} &: \mathsf{vec}\ \mathsf{O} \\
\mathsf{vcons}\ \mathsf{O}\ \mathsf{true}\ \mathsf{vnil} &: \mathsf{vec}\ (\mathsf{S}\ \mathsf{O})
\end{aligned}$$

Coq

BHK-interpretation

proof of $A \to B$	function from proofs of A to proofs of B
proof of $\neg A$	function from proofs of A to proofs of $\bot$
proof of $A \wedge B$	pair of a proof of A and a proof of B
proof of $A \vee B$	either a proof of A and a proof of B
proof of $\forall x.\, A$	dependent function from objects to proofs of A
proof of $\exists x.\, A$	dependent pair of an object and a proof of A

dependent $= A$ is not fixed but *depends* on the object x

$$A \vee B \;\leftrightarrow\; \exists x \in \{\mathsf{left}, \mathsf{right}\}.\, (x = \mathsf{left} \to A) \wedge (x = \mathsf{right} \to B)$$

Curry-Howard correspondence

type theory	Coq	minimal logic
$A \to B$	A `->` B	$A \to B$
$\Pi x : D.\, A$	`forall x :` D`,` A	$\forall x.\, A$

$D : *$ is called `Terms` in the notes

proof term		type	statement proved
H	:	$A \to B$	$A \to B$
H'	:	A	A
$H\,H'$	:	B	B
H	:	$\Pi x : D.\, Px$	$\forall x.\, P(x)$
$H\,M$	:	PM	$P(M)$

Coq version of the first example

```
Parameter D : Set.
Parameter p : D -> Prop.

Lemma four :
  forall x : D,
  (forall y : D, p y) ->
  p x.
intros x H.
apply H.
Qed.

Print four.
```

```
four =
fun (x : D) (H : forall y : D, p y)
=> H x
     : forall x : D,
       (forall y : D, p y) -> p x

Arguments four _ _%function_scope
```

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{[\forall y.\, p(y)^{H}]}{p(x)}\, E\forall}{(\forall y.\, p(y)) \to p(x)}\, I[H]\to}{\forall x.\, (\forall y.\, p(y)) \to p(x)}\, I\forall$$

$$\big(\lambda x : D.\, \lambda H : (\Pi y : D.\, py).\, Hx\big) : \Pi x : D.\, (\Pi y : D.\, py) \to px$$

understanding the proof term

$$\forall x.\, (\forall y.\, p(y)) \to p(x)$$

$$\lambda x : D.\, \lambda H : (\Pi y : D.\, py).\, Hx$$

the second example in Coq, from left to right

```
Parameter D : Set.
Parameter p : D -> Prop.

Lemma five :
  (exists x : D, p x) ->
  ~ (forall x : D, ~ p x).
intros H0 H1.
elim H0.
apply H1.
Qed.
```

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{[\exists x.\, p(x)^{H_0}] \quad [\forall x.\, p(x) \to \bot^{H_1}]}{\bot}\, E\exists}{\dfrac{\bot}{\neg(\forall x.\, \neg p(x))}\, I[H_1]\neg}\, I[H_0]\to$$
$$(\exists x.\, p(x)) \to \neg(\forall x.\, \neg p(x))$$

the second example in Coq, from right to left

```
Parameter D : Set.
Parameter p : D -> Prop.

Lemma six :
  ~ (forall x : D, ~ p x) ->
  ~ ~ (exists x : D, p x).
intros H0 H1.
apply H0.
intros x H2.
apply H1.
exists x.
apply H2.
Qed.
```

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{[\neg(\forall x.\,\neg p(x))^{H_0}] \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{[\neg(\exists x.\,p(x))^{H_1}] \qquad \dfrac{[p(x)^{H_2}]}{\exists x.\,p(x)}\,I\exists}{\bot}\,E\to}{\neg p(x)}\,I[H_2]\neg}{\forall x.\,\neg p(x)}\,I\forall}{\bot}\,E\neg}{\neg\neg(\exists x.\,p(x))}\,I[H_1]\neg}{\neg(\forall x.\,\neg p(x)) \to \neg\neg(\exists x.\,p(x))}\,I[H_0]\to$$

proof rules versus Coq tactics

$I\rightarrow$ $I\forall$	`intro intros`
$E\rightarrow$ $E\forall$	`apply`
$E\wedge$ $E\vee$ $E\exists$	`elim destruct intro-patterns`
$I\wedge$	`split`
$I\vee$	`left right`
$I\exists$	`exists`

detours

proof normalization

detour = introduction rule directly followed by a elimination rule for the same connective
cut = corresponding notion in sequent calculus

can be eliminated $\longrightarrow$ reduction of the proof term

detour for implication:

'prove a lemma A and then prove B using this lemma'
detour elimination is inlining the proof$_1$ of the lemma everywhere

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}[A^H]\\ \vdots_2\\ B\end{array}}{A \to B}\, I[H]\!\to \qquad \vdots_1\ A}{B}\, E\!\to \qquad \longrightarrow_\beta \qquad \begin{array}{c}\vdots_1\\ A\\ \vdots_2\\ B\end{array}$$

detours for predicate logic

detour for the universal quantifer

generalize the statement $A[x := M]$ to A with arbitrary x
elimination is specializing the proof$_1$ to M

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\vdots_1}{A}}{\dfrac{\forall x.\, A}{A[x := M]}\, E\forall}\, I\forall \qquad \longrightarrow_\beta \qquad \dfrac{\vdots_1[x := M]}{A[x := M]}$$

$$(\lambda x : D.\, H_1)M \to_\beta H_1[x := M]$$

STT versus λP syntax

STT:

$$A, B ::= a \mid A \to B$$
$$M, N ::= x \mid MN \mid \lambda x : A.\, M$$
$$\Gamma ::= \cdot \mid \Gamma,\, x : A$$
$$\mathcal{J} ::= \Gamma \vdash M : A$$

λP:

$$s ::= * \mid \Box$$
$$M, N, A, B ::= x \mid MN \mid \lambda x : A.\, M \mid \overbrace{\Pi x : A.\, B}^{A \to B} \mid s$$
$$\Gamma ::= \cdot \mid \Gamma,\, x : A$$
$$\mathcal{J} ::= \Gamma \vdash M : A$$

$$\overbrace{a : *,\ b : *,\ f : a \to b,\ x : a}^{\Gamma} \vdash \overbrace{fx}^{M} : \overbrace{b}^{A}$$

STT versus λP

STT

3 rules

$$x \mid MN \mid \lambda x : A.\, M$$

λP

7 rules

$$x \mid MN \mid \lambda x : A.\, M \mid \Pi x : A.\, M \mid *$$

box does not have a type
$\longrightarrow$ no rule for box

variables have two rules

$+$ conversion rule

typing rules

λP

STT

$$\frac{}{\vdash * : \Box}$$

axiom rule

start rule

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : * \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash B : s}{\Gamma \vdash \Pi x : A.\, B : s}$$

product rule

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash M : B \quad \Gamma \vdash \Pi x : A.\, B : s}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : A.\, M : \Pi x : A.\, B}$$

abstraction rule

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash M : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : A.\, M : A \to B}$$

typing rules (continued)

λP

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash F : \Pi x : A.\, B \quad \Gamma \vdash M : A}{\Gamma \vdash FM : B[x := M]}$$

application rule

STT

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash F : A \to B \quad \Gamma \vdash M : A}{\Gamma \vdash FM : B}$$

truesvec : $\Pi n :$ nat. vec n

truesvec (S (S O)) : vec (S (S O))

typing rules (continued)

λP	STT
(context Γ is a list)	(context Γ is a set)

correct: $a : *,\ x : a \vdash x : a$

incorrect: $x : a,\ a : * \vdash x : a$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : s}{\Gamma,\ x : A \vdash x : A}$$

variable rule

$$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash x : A}\ (x : A) \in \Gamma$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : A \quad \Gamma \vdash B : s}{\Gamma,\ y : B \vdash M : A}$$

weakening rule

the final typing rule

$$\text{vecappend} : \Pi n_1 : \text{nat}.\, \Pi n_2 : \text{nat}.\, \text{vec}\ n_1 \to \text{vec}\ n_2 \to \text{vec}\ (\text{add}\ n_1\ n_2)$$

$\text{vecappend}\ 3\ 4\ v_1\ v_2 : \text{vec}\ (\text{add}\ 3\ 4)$

$\text{vecappend}\ 3\ 4\ v_1\ v_2 : \text{vec}\ 7$

λP

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : A \quad \Gamma \vdash A' : s}{\Gamma \vdash M : A'}\ A =_\beta A'$$

conversion rule

A and A' are convertible

$=_\beta$ is defined on preterms

λP on one slide

$$M, F, A, B ::= x \mid FM \mid \lambda x : A.\, M \mid \Pi x : A.\, B \mid s$$
$$s ::= * \mid \Box$$

$$\frac{}{\vdash * : \Box} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A : s}{\Gamma,\, x : A \vdash x : A} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : A \quad \Gamma \vdash B : s}{\Gamma,\, y : B \vdash M : A}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma,\, x : A \vdash M : B \quad \Gamma \vdash \Pi x : A.\, B : s}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : A.\, M : \Pi x : A.\, B} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A : * \quad \Gamma,\, x : A \vdash B : s}{\Gamma \vdash \Pi x : A.\, B : s}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash F : \Pi x : A.\, B \quad \Gamma \vdash M : A}{\Gamma \vdash FM : B[x := M]} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : A \quad \Gamma \vdash A' : s}{\Gamma \vdash M : A'}\ A =_\beta A'$$

the lambda cube

only the product rules differ:

$\lambda\!\to$ $$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : * \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash B : *}{\Gamma \vdash \Pi x : A.\, B : *}$$

λP $$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : * \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash B : s}{\Gamma \vdash \Pi x : A.\, B : s}$$

λ2 $$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : s \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash B : *}{\Gamma \vdash \Pi x : A.\, B : *}$$

λC $$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : s_1 \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash B : s_2}{\Gamma \vdash \Pi x : A.\, B : s_2}$$



pure type systems

$$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash s_1 : s_2}\ (s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{A}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : s_1 \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash B : s_2}{\Gamma \vdash \Pi x : A.\, B : s_3}\ (s_1, s_2, s_3) \in \mathcal{R}$$

	$\mathcal{S}$ sorts	$\mathcal{A}$ axioms	$\mathcal{R}$ rules
$\lambda*$	$\{*\}$	$\{(*,*)\}$	$\{(*,*,*)\}$
$\lambda\!\to$	$\{*,\Box\}$	$\{(*,\Box)\}$	$\{(*,*,*)\}$
λP	$\{*,\Box\}$	$\{(*,\Box)\}$	$\{(*,*,*),(*,\Box,\Box)\}$
λC	$\{*,\Box\}$	$\{(*,\Box)\}$	$\{(*,*,*),(*,\Box,\Box),(\Box,*,*),(\Box,\Box,\Box)\}$
λPRED	$\{*_s,\Box_s,*_p,\Box_p\}$	$\{(*_s,\Box_s),(*_p,\Box_p)\}$	$\{(*_s,*_s,*_s),(*_s,\Box_s,\Box_s),(*_p,*_p,*_p),(*_s,*_p,*_p)\}$

example PTS type derivation

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{}{\vdash * : \Box}}{a : * \vdash a : *} \quad \dfrac{\dfrac{}{\vdash * : \Box}}{a : * \vdash a : *}}{a : *, x : a \vdash a : *}}{a : *, x : a, y : a \vdash y : a} \quad \dfrac{\text{(next slide)}\ \vdots}{a : *, x : a \vdash a \to a : *} \quad \dfrac{\dfrac{}{\vdash * : \Box}}{a : * \vdash a : *}}{a : *, x : a \vdash (\lambda y : a.\, y) : a \to a} \quad a : *, x : a \vdash x : a$$

$$a : *, x : a \vdash (\lambda y : a.\, y)x : a$$

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{}{x : a, y : a \vdash y : a}}{x : a \vdash (\lambda y : a.\, y) : a \to a} \quad \dfrac{}{x : a \vdash x : a}}{x : a \vdash (\lambda y : a.\, y)x : a}$$

example PTS type derivation (continued)

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{}{\vdash * : \Box}}{a : * \vdash a : *} \quad \dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{}{\vdash * : \Box}}{a : * \vdash a : *} \quad \dfrac{\dfrac{}{\vdash * : \Box}}{a : * \vdash a : *}}{a : *, y : a \vdash a : *}}{a : * \vdash (\Pi y : a.\, a) : *} \quad \dfrac{\dfrac{}{\vdash * : \Box}}{a : * \vdash a : *}}{a : *, x : a \vdash \underbrace{a \to a}_{\Pi y : a.\, a} : *}$$

$$\frac{}{\vdash * : \Box} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A : s}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash x : A} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : A \quad \Gamma \vdash B : s}{\Gamma, y : B \vdash M : A}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : * \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash B : s}{\Gamma \vdash \Pi x : A.\, B : s}$$

conclusion

computing the sort of a type

$$\mathsf{type}_\Gamma(\lambda x : A.\, M) = \Pi x : A.\, \mathsf{type}_{\Gamma, x:A}(M)$$
$$\mathsf{type}_\Gamma(\Pi x : A.\, B) = \mathsf{type}_{\Gamma, x:A}(B)$$
$$\mathsf{type}_\Gamma(A \to B) = \mathsf{type}_\Gamma(B)$$

$$\mathsf{type}_\Gamma(*) = \Box$$
$$\mathsf{type}_\Gamma(x) = \Gamma(x)$$

$$\mathsf{type}_\Gamma(FM) = \ldots$$

summary

- predicate logic
- dependent types
  - vectors
  - Curry-Howard
- λP
  - lambda cube
  - PTSs
- detours



table of contents

contents