

C411 – Type Inference Study Guide

Corky Cartwright

Produced: March 18, 2017

1 Synopsis of Implicitly Polymorphic Jam

The syntax of (Implicitly) Polymorphic Jam is a restriction of the syntax of untyped Jam. Every legal Polymorphic Jam program is also a legal untyped Jam Program. But the converse is false, because there may not be a valid typing for a given untyped Jam program.

1.1 Abstract Syntax

The following grammar describes the abstract syntax of Polymorphic Jam. Each clause in the grammar corresponds directly to a node in the abstract syntax tree. The `let` construction has been limited to a single binding for the sake of notational simplicity. It is straightforward to generalize the rule to multiple bindings (with mutual recursion). Note that `let` is *recursive*.

```
M ::= M (M...M) | P (M...M) | if M then M else M | let x := M in M
      | V
V ::= map x...x to M | x | n | true | false | null
n ::= 1 | 2 | ...
P ::= cons | first | rest | null? | cons? | + | - | / | * | = | < |
      <= | <- | + | - | ~ | ref | !
x ::= variable names
```

In the preceding grammar, unary and binary operators are treated exactly like primitive functions.

Monomorphic types in the language are defined by τ , below. Polymorphic types are defined by σ . The \rightarrow corresponds to a function type, whose inputs are to the left of the arrow and whose output is to the right of the arrow.

```
 $\sigma ::= \forall\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n. \tau$ 
 $\tau ::= \text{int} | \text{bool} | \text{unit} | \tau_1 \times \dots \times \tau_n \rightarrow \tau | \alpha | \text{list } \tau | \text{ref } \tau$ 
 $\alpha ::= \text{type variable names}$ 
```

1.2 Type Checking Rules

In the following rules, the notation $\Gamma[x_1 : \tau_1, \dots, x_n : \tau_n]$ means the $\Gamma \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \cup \{x_1 : \tau_1, \dots, x_n : \tau_n\}$ and Γ' abbreviates $\Gamma[x_1 : \tau'_1, \dots, x_n : \tau'_n]$. Note that $\Gamma \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ means Γ less the type assertions (if any) for $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$.

$$\frac{\Gamma[x_1 : \tau_1, \dots, x_n : \tau_n] \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{map} \ x_1 \dots x_n \ \mathbf{to} \ M : \tau_1 \times \dots \times \tau_n \rightarrow \tau} [\mathbf{abs}]$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \tau_1 \times \dots \times \tau_n \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash M_1 : \tau_1 \quad \dots \quad \Gamma \vdash M_n : \tau_n}{\Gamma \vdash M \ (M_1 \dots M_n) : \tau} [\mathbf{app}]$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M_1 : \mathbf{bool} \quad \Gamma \vdash M_2 : \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash M_3 : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{if} \ M_1 \ \mathbf{then} \ M_2 \ \mathbf{else} \ M_3 : \tau} [\mathbf{if}]$$

Note that there are two rules for **let** expressions. The **[letmono]** rule corresponds to the **let** rule of Typed Jam; it places no restriction on the form of the right-hand side M_1 of the **let** binding. The **[letpoly]** rule generalizes the free type variables (not occurring in the type environment Γ) in the type inferred for the right-hand-side of a **let** binding – provided that the right-hand-side M_1 is a *syntactic* value: a *constant* like **null** or **cons**, a **map** expression, or a variable. Syntactic values are expressions whose evaluation is trivial, excluding evaluations that allocate storage.

$$\Gamma[x : \tau] \vdash x : \tau$$

$$\frac{\Gamma' \vdash M_1 : \tau'_1 \quad \dots \quad \Gamma' \vdash M_n : \tau'_n \quad \Gamma' \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{let} \ x_1 := M_1; \dots; x_n := M_n; \mathbf{in} \ M : \tau} [\mathbf{letmono}]$$

$$\frac{\Gamma' \vdash M_1 : \tau'_1 \quad \dots \quad \Gamma' \vdash M_n : \tau'_n \quad \Gamma[x_1 : C_{M_1}(\tau'_1, \Gamma), \dots, x_n : C_{M_n}(\tau'_n, \Gamma)] \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{let} \ x_1 := M_1; \dots; x_n := M_n; \mathbf{in} \ M : \tau} [\mathbf{letpoly}]$$

$$\Gamma[x : \forall \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n. \tau] \vdash x : O(\forall \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n. \tau, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)$$

The functions $O(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $C(\cdot, \cdot)$ are the keys to polymorphism. Here is how $C(\cdot, \cdot)$ is defined:

$$C_V(\tau, \Gamma) := \forall \{ \text{FTV}(\tau) - \text{FTV}(\Gamma) \}. \tau$$

$$C_N(\tau, \Gamma) := \tau$$

where V is a syntactic value, N is an expression that is not a syntactic value, and $\text{FTV}(\alpha)$ means the “free type variables in the expression (or type environment) α ”.

When closing over a type, you must find all of the free variables in τ that are not free in any of the types in the environment Γ . Then, build a polymorphic type by quantifying τ over all of those type variables.

To open a polymorphic type

$$\forall \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n. \tau,$$

substitute *any* type terms τ_1, \dots, τ_n for the quantified type variables $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$:

$$O(\forall \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n. \tau, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) = \tau_{[\alpha_1 := \tau_1, \dots, \alpha_n := \tau_n]}$$

which creates a monomorphic type from a polymorphic type. For example,

$$O(\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha, \tau) = \tau \rightarrow \tau$$

1.3 Types of Primitives

The following table gives types for all of the primitive constants, functions, and operators. The symbol n stands for any integer constant. Programs are type checked starting with a primitive type environment consisting of this table.

true	bool	+	int × int → int
false	bool	-	int × int → int
n	int	*	int × int → int
null	$\forall \alpha. \text{list } \alpha$	/	int × int → int
cons	$\forall \alpha. \alpha \times \text{list } \alpha \rightarrow \text{list } \alpha$	<	int × int → bool
first	$\forall \alpha. \text{list } \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$	>	int × int → bool
rest	$\forall \alpha. \text{list } \alpha \rightarrow \text{list } \alpha$	<=	int × int → bool
cons?	$\forall \alpha. \text{list } \alpha \rightarrow \text{bool}$	>=	int × int → bool
null?	$\forall \alpha. \text{list } \alpha \rightarrow \text{bool}$	(unary) -	int → int
=	$\forall \alpha. \alpha \times \alpha \rightarrow \text{bool}$	(unary) +	int → int
!=	$\forall \alpha. \alpha \times \alpha \rightarrow \text{bool}$	(unary) ~	bool → bool
		<-	$\forall \alpha. \text{ref } \alpha \times \alpha \rightarrow \text{unit}$
		ref	$\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \text{ref } \alpha$
		!	$\forall \alpha. \text{ref } \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$

1.4 Typed Jam

The Typed Jam language used in Assignment 5 (absent the explicit type information embedded in program text) can be formalized as a subset of Polymorphic Jam. For the purposes of these exercises, Typed Jam is simply Polymorphic Jam less the **letpoly** inference rule which prevents it from inferring polymorphic types for program-defined functions.

2 Exercises

Task 1: Prove the following type judgements for Typed Jam or explain why they are not provable:

1. $\Gamma_0 \vdash (\text{map } x \text{ to } x(10))(\text{map } x \text{ to } x) : \text{int}$
2. $\Gamma_0 \vdash \text{let fact} := \text{map } n \text{ to if } n=0 \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } n*(\text{fact}(n-1));$
 $\text{in fact}(10)+\text{fact}(0) : \text{int}$
3. $\Gamma_0 \vdash (\text{map } x \text{ to } 1 + (1/x))(0) : \text{int}$
4. $\Gamma_0 \vdash (\text{map } x \text{ to } x) (\text{map } y \text{ to } y) : (\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int})$
5. $\Gamma_0 \vdash \text{let id} := \text{map } x \text{ to } x; \text{ in id}(\text{id}) : (\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int})$

Task 2: Are the following Polymorphic Jam programs typable? Justify your answer either by giving a proof tree (constructed using the inference rules for PolyJam) or by showing a conflict in the type constraints generated by matching the inference rules against the program text.

1.

```
let listMap := map f,l to
    if null?(l) then null
    else cons(f(first(l)), listMap(f, rest(l)))
in listMap(first,null);
```
2.

```
let length := map l to if null?(l) then 0
    else 1 + length(rest(l));
    l := cons(cons(1,null),cons(cons(2,cons(3,null)),null));
in length(1)+length(first(1))
```

Task 3: Give a simple example of an untyped Jam expression that is not typable in Typed Jam but is typable in Polymorphic Jam.

3 Solutions to Selected Exercises

Task 1 : The first four expressions are typable in Typed Jam, but the fifth is not.

1. *Tree 1:*

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma_0[f:\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}] \vdash 10:\text{int} \quad \Gamma_0[f:\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}] \vdash f:\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}}{\Gamma_0[f:\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}] \vdash f(10):\text{int}} [\text{app}]}{\Gamma_0 \vdash \text{map } f \text{ to } f(10):(\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}) \rightarrow \text{int}} [\text{abs}]$$

- Tree 2:*

$$\text{Tree 1} \quad \frac{\Gamma_0[x:\text{int}] \vdash x:\text{int}}{\Gamma_0 \vdash \text{map } x \text{ to } x:\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}} [\text{abs}]$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_0 \vdash \text{map } x \text{ to } x:\text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}}{\Gamma_0 \vdash (\text{map } f \text{ to } f(10))(\text{map } x \text{ to } x):\text{int}} [\text{app}]$$

2. Type Inference Proof Omitted.