

Lecture
Models of computation
(DIT311, TDA184)

Nils Anders Danielsson

2018-11-19

Today

X, a small functional language:

- ▶ Concrete and abstract syntax.
- ▶ Operational semantics.
- ▶ Several variants of the halting problem.
- ▶ Representing inductively defined sets.

Concrete syntax

Concrete syntax

$$\begin{array}{l} e ::= x \\ | (e_1 e_2) \\ | \lambda x. e \\ | C(e_1, \dots, e_n) \\ | \mathbf{case} e \mathbf{of} \{ C_1(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow e_1; \dots \} \\ | \mathbf{rec} x = e \end{array}$$

Variables (x) and constructors (C) are assumed to come from two disjoint, countably infinite sets.

Sometimes extra parentheses are used, and sometimes parentheses are omitted around applications: $e_1 e_2 e_3$ means $((e_1 e_2) e_3)$.

Examples

X	Haskell
$\lambda x. e$	<code>\x -> e</code>
<code>True()</code>	<code>True</code>
<code>Suc(n)</code>	<code>Suc n</code>
<code>Cons(x, xs)</code>	<code>x : xs</code>
<code>rec x = e</code>	<code>let x = e in x</code>

Note: Haskell is typed and non-strict, λ is untyped and strict.

Another example

X:

case e **of** { **Zero**() $\rightarrow x$; **Suc**(n) $\rightarrow y$ }

Haskell:

```
case e of
  Zero  -> x
  Suc n -> y
```

And two more

rec $add = \lambda m. \lambda n. \mathbf{case\ } n \mathbf{ of}$
 { $\mathbf{Zero}() \rightarrow m$
 ; $\mathbf{Suc}(n) \rightarrow \mathbf{Suc}(add\ m\ n)$
 }

$\lambda m. \mathbf{rec\ } add = \lambda n. \mathbf{case\ } n \mathbf{ of}$
 { $\mathbf{Zero}() \rightarrow m$
 ; $\mathbf{Suc}(n) \rightarrow \mathbf{Suc}(add\ n)$
 }

What is the value of the following expression?

```
(rec foo = λ m. λ n. case n of {  
  Zero() → m;  
  Suc(n) → case m of {  
    Zero() → Zero();  
    Suc(m) → foo m n } })  
Suc(Suc(Zero())) Suc(Zero())
```

- ▶ Zero()
- ▶ Suc(Zero())
- ▶ Suc(Suc(Zero()))
- ▶ Suc(Suc(Suc(Zero())))

Abstract syntax

Abstract syntax

$$\frac{x \in Var}{\text{var } x \in Exp}$$

$$\frac{e_1 \in Exp \quad e_2 \in Exp}{\text{apply } e_1 e_2 \in Exp}$$

$$\frac{x \in Var \quad e \in Exp}{\text{lambda } x e \in Exp}$$

$$\frac{x \in Var \quad e \in Exp}{\text{rec } x e \in Exp}$$

Var: Assumed to be countably infinite.

Abstract syntax

$$\frac{c \in \text{Const} \quad es \in \text{List Exp}}{\text{const } c \text{ } es \in \text{Exp}}$$

$$\frac{e \in \text{Exp} \quad bs \in \text{List Br}}{\text{case } e \text{ } bs \in \text{Exp}}$$

$$\frac{c \in \text{Const} \quad xs \in \text{List Var} \quad e \in \text{Exp}}{\text{branch } c \text{ } xs \text{ } e \in \text{Br}}$$

Const: Assumed to be countably infinite.

Operational semantics

Operational semantics

- ▶ $e \Downarrow v$: e terminates with the value v .
- ▶ The expression e terminates (with a value) if $\exists v. e \Downarrow v$.
- ▶ Note that a “crash” does not count as termination (with a value).

Operational semantics

- ▶ The binary relation \Downarrow relates *closed* expressions.
- ▶ An expression is closed if it has no free variables.

Quiz

Which of the following expressions are closed?

- ▶ y
- ▶ $\lambda x. \lambda y. x$
- ▶ **case** x **of** { **Cons**(x, xs) $\rightarrow x$ }
- ▶ **case** **Suc**(**Zero**()) **of** { **Suc**(x) $\rightarrow x$ }
- ▶ **rec** $f = \lambda x. f$

Operational semantics (1/3)

$$\overline{\text{lambda } x e \Downarrow \text{lambda } x e}$$
$$\frac{e_1 \Downarrow \text{lambda } x e \quad e_2 \Downarrow v_2 \quad e [x \leftarrow v_2] \Downarrow v}{\text{apply } e_1 e_2 \Downarrow v}$$
$$\frac{e [x \leftarrow \text{rec } x e] \Downarrow v}{\text{rec } x e \Downarrow v}$$

Substitution

- ▶ $e[x \leftarrow e']$: Substitute e' for every *free* occurrence of x in e .
- ▶ To keep things simple: e' must be closed.
- ▶ If e' is not closed, then this definition is prone to *variable capture*.

Substitution

$$\text{var } x [x \leftarrow e'] = e'$$

$$\text{var } y [x \leftarrow e'] = \text{var } y \quad \text{if } x \neq y$$

$$\text{apply } e_1 e_2 [x \leftarrow e'] =$$

$$\text{apply } (e_1 [x \leftarrow e']) (e_2 [x \leftarrow e'])$$

$$\text{lambda } x e [x \leftarrow e'] = \text{lambda } x e$$

$$\text{lambda } y e [x \leftarrow e'] =$$

$$\text{lambda } y (e [x \leftarrow e']) \quad \text{if } x \neq y$$

And so on...

Quiz

What is the result of

$(\text{rec } y = \text{case } x \text{ of } \{ C() \rightarrow x; D(x) \rightarrow x \}) [x \leftarrow \lambda z. z]$?

$\text{rec } y = \text{case } x \quad \text{of } \{ C() \rightarrow x; \quad D(x) \quad \rightarrow x \quad \}$

$\text{rec } y = \text{case } x \quad \text{of } \{ C() \rightarrow \lambda z. z; D(x) \quad \rightarrow x \quad \}$

$\text{rec } y = \text{case } \lambda z. z \text{ of } \{ C() \rightarrow x; \quad D(x) \quad \rightarrow x \quad \}$

$\text{rec } y = \text{case } \lambda z. z \text{ of } \{ C() \rightarrow \lambda z. z; D(x) \quad \rightarrow x \quad \}$

$\text{rec } y = \text{case } \lambda z. z \text{ of } \{ C() \rightarrow \lambda z. z; D(x) \quad \rightarrow \lambda z. z \}$

$\text{rec } y = \text{case } \lambda z. z \text{ of } \{ C() \rightarrow \lambda z. z; D(\lambda z. z) \rightarrow \lambda z. z \}$

Operational semantics (2/3)

$$\frac{es \Downarrow^* vs}{\text{const } c \text{ es} \Downarrow \text{const } c \text{ vs}}$$

$$\overline{\text{nil} \Downarrow^* \text{nil}}$$

$$\frac{e \Downarrow v \quad es \Downarrow^* vs}{\text{cons } e \text{ es} \Downarrow^* \text{cons } v \text{ vs}}$$

An example

$$\frac{\frac{\text{lambda } x \text{ (var } x) \Downarrow}{\text{lambda } x \text{ (var } x)}}{\frac{\frac{\frac{\text{nil } \Downarrow^* \text{ nil}}{\text{const } c \text{ nil } \Downarrow} \quad \frac{\text{nil } \Downarrow^* \text{ nil}}{\text{var } x [x \leftarrow \text{const } c \text{ nil}] \Downarrow}}{\text{const } c \text{ nil}}}{\text{apply (lambda } x \text{ (var } x)) \text{ (const } c \text{ nil) } \Downarrow \text{ const } c \text{ nil}}}$$

Operational semantics (3/3)

$$\frac{e \Downarrow \text{const } c \text{ vs} \quad \textit{Lookup } c \text{ bs } xs \ e' \quad e' [xs \leftarrow vs] \mapsto e'' \quad e'' \Downarrow v}{\text{case } e \text{ bs } \Downarrow v}$$

Operational semantics (3/3)

$$\frac{e \Downarrow \text{const } c \text{ vs} \quad \text{Lookup } c \text{ bs } xs \ e' \quad e' [xs \leftarrow vs] \mapsto e'' \quad e'' \Downarrow v}{\text{case } e \text{ bs } \Downarrow v}$$

The first matching branch, if any:

$$\frac{\text{Lookup } c \text{ (cons (branch } c \text{ } xs \ e) \text{ bs) } xs \ e}{c \neq c' \quad \text{Lookup } c \text{ bs } xs \ e}{\text{Lookup } c \text{ (cons (branch } c' \text{ } xs' \ e') \text{ bs) } xs \ e}$$

Operational semantics (3/3)

$$\frac{e \Downarrow \text{const } c \text{ vs} \quad \text{Lookup } c \text{ bs } xs \ e' \quad e' [xs \leftarrow vs] \mapsto e'' \quad e'' \Downarrow v}{\text{case } e \text{ bs } \Downarrow v}$$

$e [xs \leftarrow vs] \mapsto e'$ holds iff

- ▶ there is some n such that
 $xs = \text{cons } x_1 (\dots(\text{cons } x_n \text{ nil}))$ and
 $vs = \text{cons } v_1 (\dots(\text{cons } v_n \text{ nil}))$, and
- ▶ $e' = ((e [x_n \leftarrow v_n]) \dots) [x_1 \leftarrow v_1]$.

Operational semantics (3/3)

$$\frac{e \Downarrow \text{const } c \text{ vs} \quad \text{Lookup } c \text{ bs } xs \ e' \quad e' [xs \leftarrow vs] \mapsto e'' \quad e'' \Downarrow v}{\text{case } e \text{ bs } \Downarrow v}$$

$$\frac{}{e [\text{nil} \leftarrow \text{nil}] \mapsto e}$$

$$\frac{e [xs \leftarrow vs] \mapsto e'}{e [\text{cons } x \ xs \leftarrow \text{cons } v \ vs] \mapsto e' [x \leftarrow v]}$$

Quiz

Which of the following sets are inhabited?

case C() of { C() → D(); C() → C() } ↓ C()

case C() of { C() → D(); C() → C() } ↓ D()

case C() of { C(x) → D(); C() → D() } ↓ D()

case C(C(), D()) of { C(x, x) → x } ↓ C()

case Suc(False()) of

{ Zero() → True(); Suc(n) → n } ↓ False()

case Suc(False()) of

{ Zero() → True(); Suc() → False() } ↓ False()

Some
properties

Deterministic

The semantics is deterministic:

$e \Downarrow v_1$ and $e \Downarrow v_2$ imply $v_1 = v_2$.

Values

- ▶ An expression e is called a value if $e \Downarrow e$.
- ▶ Values can be characterised inductively:

$$\frac{}{\text{Value } (\text{lambda } x \ e)} \qquad \frac{\text{Values } es}{\text{Value } (\text{const } c \ es)}$$

$$\frac{}{\text{Values nil}} \qquad \frac{\text{Value } e \quad \text{Values } es}{\text{Values } (\text{cons } e \ es)}$$

- ▶ $\text{Value } e$ holds iff $e \Downarrow e$.
- ▶ If $e \Downarrow v$, then $\text{Value } v$.

There is a non-terminating expression

- ▶ The program $\text{rec } x (\text{var } x)$ does not terminate with a value.

- ▶ Recall the rule for rec :
$$\frac{e [x \leftarrow \text{rec } x e] \Downarrow v}{\text{rec } x e \Downarrow v}.$$

- ▶ Note that

$$\text{var } x [x \leftarrow \text{rec } x (\text{var } x)] = \text{rec } x (\text{var } x).$$

- ▶ Idea:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{rec } x (\text{var } x) \quad \rightarrow \\ \text{var } x [x \leftarrow \text{rec } x (\text{var } x)] = \\ \text{rec } x (\text{var } x) \quad \rightarrow \\ \vdots \end{array}$$

There is a non-terminating expression

- ▶ If the program did terminate, then there would be a *finite* derivation of the following form:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\text{rec } x (\text{var } x) \Downarrow v}}{\text{rec } x (\text{var } x) \Downarrow v}}{\text{rec } x (\text{var } x) \Downarrow v}}$$

- ▶ Exercise: Prove more formally that this is impossible, using induction on the structure of the semantics.

The halting problem

The extensional halting problem

There is no closed expression *halts* such that, for every closed expression *p*,

- ▶ $halts (\lambda x. p) \Downarrow \text{True}()$, if *p* terminates, and
- ▶ $halts (\lambda x. p) \Downarrow \text{False}()$, otherwise.

The extensional halting problem

Note the abuse of notation:

- ▶ The variables *halts* and *p* are not χ variables.
- ▶ *Meta-variables* standing for χ expressions.
- ▶ An alternative is to use abstract syntax:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{apply } \textit{halts} \text{ (lambda } \underline{x} \text{ } p) \Downarrow \text{const } \underline{\textit{True}} \text{ nil} \\ \text{apply } \textit{halts} \text{ (lambda } \underline{x} \text{ } p) \Downarrow \text{const } \underline{\textit{False}} \text{ nil} \end{array}$$

(For *distinct* $\underline{\textit{True}}, \underline{\textit{False}} \in \textit{Const.}$)

- ▶ More verbose.

The extensional halting problem

- ▶ Assume that *halts* can be defined.
- ▶ Define $terminv \in Exp \rightarrow Exp$:

$$terminv\ p = \mathbf{case\ } halts\ (\lambda x. p)\ \mathbf{of}$$
$$\quad \{ \mathbf{True}() \rightarrow \mathbf{rec\ } x = x$$
$$\quad ; \mathbf{False}() \rightarrow \mathbf{Zero}()$$
$$\quad \}$$

- ▶ For any closed expression p :
 $terminv\ p$ terminates iff p does not terminate.

The extensional halting problem

- ▶ Now consider the closed expression *strange* defined by $\mathbf{rec} \ p = \mathit{terminv} \ p$ (where $p \neq x$).
- ▶ We get a contradiction:

$$\begin{array}{lll} (\exists v. \mathit{strange} & \Downarrow v) & \Leftrightarrow \\ (\exists v. \mathbf{rec} \ p = \mathit{terminv} \ p & \Downarrow v) & \Leftrightarrow \\ (\exists v. \mathit{terminv} \ p [p \leftarrow \mathit{strange}] & \Downarrow v) & \Leftrightarrow \\ (\exists v. \mathit{terminv} \ \mathit{strange} & \Downarrow v) & \Leftrightarrow \\ \neg (\exists v. \mathit{strange} & \Downarrow v) & \end{array}$$

The extensional halting problem

- ▶ Note that we apply *halts* to a program, not to the source code of a program.
- ▶ How can source code be represented?

Representing
inductively
defined sets

Natural numbers

One method:

- ▶ Notation: $\ulcorner n \urcorner \in Exp$ represents $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- ▶ Representation:

$$\ulcorner \text{zero} \urcorner = \text{Zero}()$$

$$\ulcorner \text{suc } n \urcorner = \text{Suc}(\ulcorner n \urcorner)$$

Natural numbers

One method:

- ▶ Notation: $\ulcorner n \urcorner \in \text{Exp}$ represents $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- ▶ Representation:

$$\ulcorner \text{zero} \urcorner = \text{Zero}()$$

$$\ulcorner \text{suc } n \urcorner = \text{Suc}(\ulcorner n \urcorner)$$

- ▶ Note that the concrete syntax should be interpreted as abstract syntax:

$$\ulcorner \text{zero} \urcorner = \text{const } \underline{\text{Zero}} \text{ nil}$$

$$\ulcorner \text{suc } n \urcorner = \text{const } \underline{\text{Suc}} (\text{cons } \ulcorner n \urcorner \text{ nil})$$

(For some distinct $\underline{\text{Zero}}, \underline{\text{Suc}} \in \text{Const.}$)

Lists

If elements in A can be represented, then elements in $List\ A$ can also be represented:

$$\begin{aligned}\lceil \text{nil} \rceil &= \text{Nil}() \\ \lceil \text{cons } x\ xs \rceil &= \text{Cons}(\lceil x \rceil, \lceil xs \rceil)\end{aligned}$$

Many inductively defined sets can be treated in the same way.

Variables, constants

- ▶ *Var*: Countably infinite.
- ▶ Thus each variable $x \in Var$ can be assigned a unique natural number $code\ x \in \mathbb{N}$.
- ▶ Define $\ulcorner x \urcorner = \ulcorner code\ x \urcorner$.
- ▶ Similarly for constants.

Variables, constants

- ▶ Var : Countably infinite.
- ▶ Thus each variable $x \in Var$ can be assigned a unique natural number $code\ x \in \mathbb{N}$.
- ▶ Define $\ulcorner x \urcorner^{Var} = \ulcorner code\ x \urcorner^{\mathbb{N}}$.
- ▶ Similarly for constants.

Source code

$\ulcorner \text{var } x \urcorner$	$=$	$\text{Var}(\ulcorner x \urcorner)$
$\ulcorner \text{apply } e_1 e_2 \urcorner$	$=$	$\text{Apply}(\ulcorner e_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner e_2 \urcorner)$
$\ulcorner \text{lambda } x e \urcorner$	$=$	$\text{Lambda}(\ulcorner x \urcorner, \ulcorner e \urcorner)$
$\ulcorner \text{rec } x e \urcorner$	$=$	$\text{Rec}(\ulcorner x \urcorner, \ulcorner e \urcorner)$
$\ulcorner \text{const } c es \urcorner$	$=$	$\text{Const}(\ulcorner c \urcorner, \ulcorner es \urcorner)$
$\ulcorner \text{case } e bs \urcorner$	$=$	$\text{Case}(\ulcorner e \urcorner, \ulcorner bs \urcorner)$
$\ulcorner \text{branch } c xs e \urcorner$	$=$	$\text{Branch}(\ulcorner c \urcorner, \ulcorner xs \urcorner, \ulcorner e \urcorner)$

Example

- ▶ Concrete syntax: $\lambda x. \text{Suc}(x)$.
- ▶ Abstract syntax:

lambda \underline{x} (const $\underline{\text{Suc}}$ (cons (var \underline{x}) nil))

(for some $\underline{x} \in \text{Var}$ and $\underline{\text{Suc}} \in \text{Const}$).

- ▶ Representation (concrete syntax):

Lambda($\ulcorner \underline{x} \urcorner$,
Const($\ulcorner \underline{\text{Suc}} \urcorner$, Cons(Var($\ulcorner \underline{x} \urcorner$), Nil()))))

- ▶ If \underline{x} and $\underline{\text{Suc}}$ both correspond to zero:

Lambda(Zero(),
Const(Zero(),
Cons(Var(Zero()), Nil()))))

Example

Representation (abstract syntax):

```
const Lambda (  
  cons (const Zero nil) (  
    cons (const Const (  
      cons (const Zero nil) (  
        cons (const Cons (  
          cons (const Var (cons (const Zero nil) nil)) (  
            cons (const Nil nil)  
          nil)))  
        nil)))  
      nil)))  
    nil))
```

Quiz

How is $\text{rec } x = x$ represented?

Assume that x corresponds to 1.

- ▶ $\text{Rec}(X(), X())$
- ▶ $\text{Rec}(X(), \text{Var}(X()))$
- ▶ $\text{Equals}(\text{Rec}(X()), X())$
- ▶ $\text{Rec}(\text{Suc}(\text{Zero}()), \text{Suc}(\text{Zero}()))$
- ▶ $\text{Rec}(\text{Suc}(\text{Zero}()), \text{Var}(\text{Suc}(\text{Zero}())))$
- ▶ $\text{Equals}(\text{Rec}(\text{Suc}(\text{Zero}())), \text{Suc}(\text{Zero}()))$

The halting
problem,
take two

The intensional halting problem (with self-application)

There is no closed expression *halts* such that,
for every closed expression *p*,

- ▶ $halts \ulcorner p \urcorner \Downarrow \text{True}()$, if $p \ulcorner p \urcorner$ terminates, and
- ▶ $halts \ulcorner p \urcorner \Downarrow \text{False}()$, otherwise.

With self-application

- ▶ Assume that *halts* can be defined.
- ▶ Define the closed expression *terminv*:

$$\begin{aligned} \textit{terminv} = \lambda p. \mathbf{case} \textit{halts} \textit{p} \mathbf{of} \\ \quad \{ \text{True}() \rightarrow \mathbf{rec} \ x = x \\ \quad \quad ; \text{False}() \rightarrow \mathbf{Zero}() \\ \quad \quad \} \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ For any closed expression *p*:
terminv $\ulcorner p \urcorner$ terminates iff
p $\ulcorner p \urcorner$ does not terminate.
- ▶ Thus *terminv* $\ulcorner \textit{terminv} \urcorner$ terminates iff
terminv $\ulcorner \textit{terminv} \urcorner$ does not terminate.

The intensional halting problem

There is no closed expression $halts$ such that, for every closed expression p ,

- ▶ $halts \ulcorner p \urcorner \Downarrow \text{True}()$, if p terminates, and
- ▶ $halts \ulcorner p \urcorner \Downarrow \text{False}()$, otherwise.

The intensional halting problem

- ▶ Assume that *halts* can be defined.
- ▶ If we can use *halts* to solve the previous variant of the halting problem, then we have found a contradiction.

The intensional halting problem

Exercise: Define a closed expression $code$ satisfying

$$code \ulcorner p \urcorner \Downarrow \ulcorner \ulcorner p \urcorner \urcorner$$

for any closed expression p .

The intensional halting problem

Exercise: Define a closed expression *code* satisfying

$$code \ulcorner p \urcorner \Downarrow \ulcorner \ulcorner p \urcorner \urcorner$$

for any closed expression *p*.

Example:

$$\ulcorner \ulcorner \lambda x. x \urcorner \urcorner$$

The intensional halting problem

Exercise: Define a closed expression *code* satisfying

$$code \ulcorner p \urcorner \Downarrow \ulcorner \ulcorner p \urcorner \urcorner$$

for any closed expression *p*.

Example:

$$\ulcorner \ulcorner \text{lambda } \underline{x} (\text{var } \underline{x}) \urcorner \urcorner$$

The intensional halting problem

Exercise: Define a closed expression *code* satisfying

$$code \ulcorner p \urcorner \Downarrow \ulcorner \ulcorner p \urcorner \urcorner$$

for any closed expression p .

Example:

$$\ulcorner \text{Lambda}(\ulcorner \underline{x} \urcorner, \text{Var}(\ulcorner \underline{x} \urcorner)) \urcorner$$

The intensional halting problem

Exercise: Define a closed expression *code* satisfying

$$code \ulcorner p \urcorner \Downarrow \ulcorner \ulcorner p \urcorner \urcorner$$

for any closed expression *p*.

Example:

$$\ulcorner \text{Lambda}(\text{Zero}(), \text{Var}(\text{Zero}())) \urcorner$$

The intensional halting problem

Exercise: Define a closed expression *code* satisfying

$$code \ulcorner p \urcorner \Downarrow \ulcorner \ulcorner p \urcorner \urcorner$$

for any closed expression *p*.

Example:

```
 $\ulcorner$  const Lambda (  
  cons  $\ulcorner$  Zero()  $\urcorner$  (  
    cons  $\ulcorner$  Var(Zero())  $\urcorner$   
    nil))  $\urcorner$ 
```

The intensional halting problem

Exercise: Define a closed expression *code* satisfying

$$code \ulcorner p \urcorner \Downarrow \ulcorner \ulcorner p \urcorner \urcorner$$

for any closed expression *p*.

Example:

```
\ulcorner const Lambda (  
  cons (const Zero nil) (  
    cons \ulcorner Var(Zero()) \urcorner  
    nil)) \urcorner
```

The intensional halting problem

Exercise: Define a closed expression *code* satisfying

$$code \ulcorner p \urcorner \Downarrow \ulcorner \ulcorner p \urcorner \urcorner$$

for any closed expression *p*.

Example:

```
\ulcorner const Lambda (  
  cons (const Zero nil) (  
    cons (const Var (cons (const Zero nil) nil))  
    nil)) \urcorner
```

The intensional halting problem

Exercise: Define a closed expression *code* satisfying

$$code \ulcorner p \urcorner \Downarrow \ulcorner \ulcorner p \urcorner \urcorner$$

for any closed expression *p*.

Example:

```
Const(Lambda,
  Cons(Const(Zero, Nil()),
    Cons(Const(Var,
      Cons(Const(Zero, Nil()),
        Nil()))),
    Nil()))))
```

The intensional halting problem

Exercise: Define a closed expression *code* satisfying

$$code \ulcorner p \urcorner \Downarrow \ulcorner \ulcorner p \urcorner \urcorner$$

for any closed expression *p*.

Example:

```
Const(Suc(Zero()),  
  Cons(Const(Suc(Suc(Zero()))), Nil()),  
  Cons(Const(Suc(Suc(Suc(Zero()))),  
        Cons(Const(Suc(Suc(Zero()))), Nil()),  
        Nil())),  
  Nil()))
```

The intensional halting problem

Define the closed expression $halts'$ by

$$\lambda p. halts \text{ Apply}(p, code\ p).$$

For any closed expression p :

$p \text{ } \ulcorner p \urcorner$ terminates		\Rightarrow
$halts \text{ } \ulcorner p \text{ } \ulcorner p \urcorner \urcorner$	$\Downarrow \text{True}()$	\Rightarrow
$halts \text{ Apply}(\ulcorner p \urcorner, \ulcorner \ulcorner p \urcorner \urcorner)$	$\Downarrow \text{True}()$	\Rightarrow
$halts \text{ Apply}(\ulcorner p \urcorner, code \ulcorner p \urcorner)$	$\Downarrow \text{True}()$	\Rightarrow
$halts' \text{ } \ulcorner p \urcorner$	$\Downarrow \text{True}()$	

The intensional halting problem

Define the closed expression $halts'$ by

$$\lambda p. halts \text{ Apply}(p, \text{code } p).$$

For any closed expression p :

$p \text{ } \ulcorner p \urcorner$ does not terminate		\Rightarrow
$halts \text{ } \ulcorner p \text{ } \ulcorner p \urcorner \urcorner$	$\Downarrow \text{False}()$	\Rightarrow
$halts \text{ Apply}(\ulcorner p \urcorner, \ulcorner \ulcorner p \urcorner \urcorner)$	$\Downarrow \text{False}()$	\Rightarrow
$halts \text{ Apply}(\ulcorner p \urcorner, \text{code } \ulcorner p \urcorner)$	$\Downarrow \text{False}()$	\Rightarrow
$halts' \text{ } \ulcorner p \urcorner$	$\Downarrow \text{False}()$	

Thus $halts'$ solves the previous variant of the halting problem, and we have found a contradiction.

Summary

- ▶ Concrete and abstract syntax.
- ▶ Operational semantics.
- ▶ Several variants of the halting problem.
- ▶ Representing inductively defined sets.