

## Dependent Types (cont.)

A rule for PTSs: type conversion

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \quad \Gamma \vdash B : s \text{ (s sort)} \quad A =_{\beta} B}{\Gamma \vdash t : B}$$

$\beta$ -equivalent types are "equal"

Ex:

$$(\lambda x : *. x) N =_{\beta} N$$

$$P((\lambda x : N. x) 5) =_{\beta} P 5$$

(reminder: for all the PTS rules,  
see Barendregt)

---

For CoC:

- type uniqueness (up to  $\beta$ )
  - strong normalisation
  - Church Rosser
  - Subject Reduction
- 

More advanced PTSs exist, allowing  
more/different sorts than  $*$ ,  $\Pi$

Ex: "infinite universes"

$$5 : \Pi : * : * : * : * : \dots$$

Some choices for sorts, however,  
lead to an inconsistent logic!

$$\text{E.g. } 5 : \Pi : * : *$$

leads to the Girard's Paradox  
(possible project)

## Encoding more types in CoC

We can use the same System F encodings for  $\mathbb{B}$ ,  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $+$ ,  $\times$ ,  $0$ ,  $1$ ,  $-$   $-$   $-$

Ex: for  $\mathbb{B}$  (booleans)

$$\mathbb{B} = \prod_{\alpha: * } \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$\text{intros: } \text{tt} = \lambda \alpha: *. \lambda x, y: \alpha. x$$

$$\text{ff} = \lambda \alpha: *. \lambda x, y: \alpha. y$$

$$\text{elim: } \text{if } b \text{ then } t \text{ else } e \\ = b \tau \text{ } \bar{t} \ e$$

where  $\tau$  is the common type of  $t$  and  $e$

However, we now want more!

We would like to "prove":

$$\prod_{b: \mathbb{B}} \prod_{P: \mathbb{B} \rightarrow *} P \text{tt} \rightarrow P \text{ff} \rightarrow P b$$

"dependent elimination"

$\approx$  the returned type is no longer a fixed type " $\alpha: *$ ", but is a family of types " $P: \mathbb{B} \rightarrow *$ " which "depends" on the value we are eliminating.

If  $P b$  is a constant family, i.e.

$$P b = \alpha \quad \text{for all } b: \mathbb{B}$$

then we get the regular, non-dependent elimination:

$$\prod_{b: \mathbb{B}} \prod_{P: \mathbb{B} \rightarrow *} P \text{tt} \rightarrow P \text{ff} \rightarrow P b \\ \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \left( \prod_{\alpha: *} \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \right)$$

In  $\text{CoC}$  we can NOT prove  
the dependent elimination principle!

More expressive type theories are  
needed. Eg. the Calculus of  
Inductive Constructions (Coq)

We now see some examples in  
Coq.