Type Checking, Inference, & Elaboration

CS4410: Spring 2013

Statics

- After parsing, we have an AST.
- Critical issue:
 - not all operations are defined on all values.
 - e.g., (3 / 0), sub("foo",5), 42(x)
- Options
 - 1. don't worry about it (C, C++, etc.)
 - 2. report errors at run time (Scheme)
 - 3. rule out ill-formed expressions at compile time (ML)

Type Soundness

- Construct a model of the source language
 - i.e., interpreter
 - This tells us where operations are partial.
 - And partiality is different for different languages (e.g., "foo" + "bar" may be meaningful in some languages, but not others.)
- Construct a function TC: AST -> bool
 - when true, should ensure interpreting the AST does not result in an undefined operation.
- Prove that TC is correct.

Simple Language:

```
type tipe =
  Int t
| Fn t of tipe*tipe
| Pair t of tipe*tipe
type exp =
 Var of var | Int of int
| Plus i of exp*exp
| Lambda of var * tipe * exp
| App of exp*exp
| Pair of exp * exp
| Fst of exp | Snd of exp
```

Interpreter:

```
let rec interp (env:var->value)(e:exp) =
 match e with
  | Var x -> env x
  | Int I -> Int v i
  | Plus i(e1,e2) ->
     (match interp env e1, interp env e2 of
       | Int i, Int j -> Int v(i+j)
       | , => error())
  Lambda(x,t,e) => Closure v{env=env,code=(x,e)}
  | App(e1,e2) =>
    (match interp env e1, interp env e2 of
       | Closure v{env=cenv,code=(x,e)},v ->
             interp (extend cenv x v) e
       , -> error()
```

Type Checker:

```
let rec tc (env:var->tipe) (e:exp) =
 match e with
  | Var x -> env x
  | Int -> Int t
  | Plus i(e1,e2) ->
     (match tc env e1, tc env e with
          Int t, Int t -> Int t
       | , => error())
  | Lambda(x,t,e) \rightarrow
      Fn t(t,tc (extend env x t) e)
  | App(e1,e2) ->
    (match (tc env e1, tc env e2) with
       | Fn t(t1,t2), t ->
           if (t1 != t) then error() else t2
       | _,_ -> error())
```

Notes:

- In the interpreter, we only evaluate the body of a function when it's applied.
- In the type-checker, we always check the body of the function (even if it's never applied.)
- Because of this, we must *assume* the input has some type (say t_1) and reflect this in the type of the function $(t_1 \rightarrow t_2)$.
- Dually, at a call site (e₁ e₂), we don't know what *closure* we're going to get.
- But we can calculate e₁'s type, check that e₂ is an argument of the right type, and also determine what type e₁ will return.

Growing the language

type tipe = ... | Bool_t

```
type exp = \dots
  True | False | If of exp*exp*exp
let rec interp env e = \ldots
| True -> True v
| False -> False v
| If(e1,e2,e3) ->
  (match interp env e1 with
   True v -> interp env e2
  | False v -> interp env e3
  | => error())
```

Type-Checking

```
let rec tc (env:var->tipe) (e:exp) =
 match e with
  . . .
  | True -> Bool t
  | False -> Bool t
  | If(e1,e2,e3) ->
   (let (t1,t2,t3) = (tc env e1,tc env e2,tc env e3)
    in
       match t1 with
       | Bool t ->
           if (t2 != t3) then error() else t2
       | => error())
```

Refining Types

We can easily add new types that distinguish different subsets of values.

type tipe =

| True_t | False_t | Bool_t | Pos_t | Neg_t | Zero_t | Int_t | Any_t

Modified Type-Checker

```
let rec tc (env:var->tipe) (e:exp) =
    . . .
  | True -> True t
  | False -> False t
  | If(e1,e2,e3) ->
      (match tc env e1 with
         True t -> tc env e2
       | False t -> tc env e3
       | Bool t ->
          (let (t2,t3) = (tc env e2, tc env e3)
           in
              lub t2 t3)
       | => error())
```

Least Upper Bound

Refining Integers into Zero, Neg, Pos

```
let rec tc (env:var->tipe) (e:exp) =
  | Int 0 -> Zero t
  | Int i -> if i < 0 then Neg t else Pos t
  | Plus(e1,e2) ->
    (match tc env e1, tc env e2 with
     | Zero t,t2 -> t2
     | t1,Zero t -> t1
     | Pos t,Pos t -> Pos t
     | Neg t,Neg t -> Neg t
     | (Neg t|Pos t|Int t),Int t -> Int t
     | Int t, (Neg t|Pos t) -> Int t
     | , -> error())
```

Subtyping as Subsets

- If we think of types as *sets* of values, then a subtype corresponds to a subset and lub corresponds to union.
- e.g., Pos_t <= Int_t since every positive integer is also an integer.
- For conditionals, we want to find the *least* type of the types the two branches might return.
 - Adding "Any_t" ensures there is a type.
 - (Not always a good thing to have...)
 - Need NonPos_t, NonNeg_t and NonZero_t to get least upper bounds.

Extending Subtyping:

• What about pairs?

- But only when immutable!

- Why?

• What about functions?

Problems with Mutability:

- let f(p :ref(Pos_t)) =
 - let q :ref(Int_t) = p
 - in
 - q := 0;
 - 42 div (!p)

Another Way to See it:

 Any shared, mutable data structure can be thought of as an immutable record of pairs of methods (with hidden state):

- When is ref(T) <= ref(U)? When:
 - -unit->T <= unit->U or T <= U and
 - -T->unit <= U->unit or U <= T.

- Thus, only when T = U!

N-Tuples and Simple Records:

- $(T_1 * ... * T_n * T_{n+1}) \le (U_1 * ... * U_n)$ when $T_i \le U_i$. – Why?
- Non-Permutable Records: $\{l_1:T_1,...,l_n:T_n,l_{n+1}:T_{n+1}\} \le \{l_1:U_1,...,l_n:U_n\}$ when $T_i \le U_i$.
 - Assumes {x:int,y:int} != {y:int,x:int}
 - That is, the position of a label is independent of the rest of the labels in the type.
 - In SML (or for Java interfaces) this is not the case.

SML-Style Records:

- Compiler sorts by label.
- So if you write {y:int,z:int,x:int}, the compiler immediately rewrites it to {x:int,y:int,z:int}.
- So you need to know all of the labels to determine their positions.
- Consider: {y:int,z:int,x:int} <= {y:int,z:int}
 but {y,z,x} == {x,y,z} <≠ {y,z}

If you want both:

• If you want permutability & dropping, you need to either copy or use a dictionary:



Type Inference

```
let rec tc (env:(var*tipe) list) (e:exp) =
 match e with
  | Var x -> lookup env x
  | Lambda(x,e) \rightarrow
      (let t = quess())
       in
          Fn t(t,tc (extend env x t) e))
  | App(e1,e2) ->
    (match tc env e1, tc env e2 with
       | Fn t(t1,t2), t ->
           if t1 != t then error() else t2
       | , => error())
```

Extend Types with Guesses:

- type tipe =
 - Int_t
- | Fn_t of tipe*tipe
- | Guess of (tipe option ref)

fun guess() = Guess(ref None)

Must Handle Guesses

```
| Lambda(x,e) ->
   let t = quess()
   in
      Fn t(t,tc (extend env x t) e)
| App(e1,e2) ->
  (match tc env e1, tc env e2 with
  | Fn t(t1,t2), t ->
         if t1 != t then error() else t2
   | Guess (r as ref None), t ->
         let t^2 = quess() in
           r := Some(Fn t(t,t2)); t2
   | Guess (ref Some (Fn t(t1,t2))), t ->
         if t1 != t then error() else t2
```

Cleaner:

```
let rec tc (env: (var*tipe) list) (e:exp) =
 match e with
  | Var x -> lookup env x
  | Lambda(x,e) \rightarrow
      let t = quess()
      in
          Fn t(t,tc (extend env x t) e)
  | App(e1,e2) ->
      let (t1,t2) = (tc env e1, tc env e2) in
      let t = quess()
      in
         if unify t1 (Fn_t(t2,t)) then t
         else error()
```

Where:

```
let rec unify (t1:tipe) (t2:tipe):bool =
  if (t1 = t2) then true else
 match t1,t2 with
  | Guess(ref(Some t1')), -> unify t1' t2
  | Guess(r as (ref None)), t2 ->
         (r := t2; true)
  | , Guess() -> unify t2 t1
  | Int t, Int t -> true
  | Fn t(t1a,t1b), Fn t(t2a,t2b)) \rightarrow
     unify tla t2a && unify t1b t2b
```

Subtlety

- Consider: fun x => x x
- We guess g1 for x
 - We see App (x, x)
 - recursive calls say we have t1=g1 and t2=g1.
 - We guess g2 for the result.
 - And unify(g1,Fn_t(g1,g2))
 - $-Sowesetg1 := Some(Fn_t(g1,g2))$
 - What happens if we print the type?

Fixes:

```
• Do an "occurs" check in unify:
let rec unify (t1:tipe) )t2:tipe):bool =
if (t1 = t2) then true else
match (t1,t2) with
(Guess(r as ref None),_) =>
if occurs r t2 then error()
else (r := Some t2; true)
```

- Alternatively, be careful not to loop anywhere.
 - In particular, when comparing t1 = t2, we must code up a *graph* equality, not a tree equality.

Polymorphism:

- Consider: fun x => x
- We guess g1 for x
 - We see \mathbf{x} .
 - So g1 is the result.
 - -We return Fn_t(g1,g1)
 - g1 is unconstrained.
 - We could constraint it to Int_t or Fn_t(Int_t, Int_t) or any type.

– In fact, we could re-use this code at any type.

ML Expressions:

- type exp =
 - Var of var
- | Int of int
- | Lambda of var * exp
- | App of exp*exp
- Let of var * exp * exp

Naïve ML Type Inference:

```
let rec tc (env: (var*tipe) list) (e:exp) =
 match e with
  | Var x -> lookup env x
  | Lambda(x,e) ->
      let t = quess() in
        Fn t(t,tc (extend env x t) e) end
  | App(e1,e2) ->
      let (t1,t2) = (tc env e1, tc env e2) in
      let t = guess()
      in if unify t1 (Fn t(t2,t)) then t
         else error()
  | Let(x,e1,e2) =>
      (tc env e1; tc env (substitute(e1,x,e2))
```

```
Example:
```

let id = fn x => x
in
 (id 3, id "fred")
end



((fun x => x) 3, (fun x => x) "fred")

Better Approach (DM):

type tvar = string

type tipe =
 Int_t
 Int_t
 Fn_t of tipe*tipe
 Guess of (tipe option ref)
 Var_t of tvar

type tipe_scheme =
 Forall of (tvar list * tipe)

ML Type Inference

```
let rec tc (env:(var*tipe scheme) list) (e:exp) =
  match e with
  | Var x -> instantiate(lookup env x)
  | Int -> Int t
  | Lambda(x,e) \rightarrow
      let t = quess() in
      Fn t(t,tc (extend env x (Forall([],t)) e)
  | App(e1,e2) ->
      let (t1,t2,t) = (tc env e1,tc env e2,guess())
      in if unify(t1,Fn t(t2,t)) then t else error()
  | Let(x,e1,e2) \rightarrow
      let s = generalize(env,tc env e1) in
      tc (extend env x s) e2 end
```

Instantiation

```
let instantiate(s:tipe_scheme):tipe =
  let val Forall(vs,t) = s
    val vs_and_ts : (var*tipe) list =
        map (fn a => (a,guess()) vs
    in
        substitute(vs and ts,t)
```

end

Generalization:

```
let generalize(e:env,t:tipe):tipe scheme =
  let t gs = guesses of tipe t in
  let env list gs =
       map (fun (x,s) \rightarrow guesses of s) e in
  let env gs = foldl union empty env list gs
  let diff = minus t gs env gs in
  let qs vs =
       map (fun g -> (g,freshvar())) diff in
 let tc = subst guess(gs vs,t)
 in
      Forall (map snd gs vs, tc)
   end
```

Explanation:

• Each let-bound value is generalized.

- e.g., g->g generalizes to Forall a.a -> a.

- Each use of a let-bound variable is instantiated with fresh guesses:
 - e.g., if f:Forall a.a->a, then in f e, then the type we assign to f is g->g for some fresh guess g.
- But we can't generalize guesses that might later become constrained.
 - Sufficient to filter out guesses that occur elsewhere in the environment.
 - e.g., if the expression has type g1->g2 and y:g1, then we might later use y in a context that demands it has type int, such as y+1.

Effects:

- The algorithm given is equivalent to substituting the let-bound expression.
- But in ML, we evaluate CBV, not CBN!

```
let id = (print "Hello"; fn x => x)
in
```

```
(id 42, id "fred")
```

```
!=
```

((print "Hello";fn x=>x) 42,
 (print "Hello";fn x=>x) "fred")

Problem:

r := (fn x => x+1); (* r:ref(int->int) *)
(!r)("fred") (* r:ref(string->string) *)

"Value Restriction"

- When is let x=e1 in e2 equivalent to subst(e1,x,e2)?
- If e1 has no side effects.
 - reads/writes/allocation of refs/arrays.
 - input, output.
 - non-termination.
- So only generalize when e1 is a *value*.
 - or something easy to prove equivalent to a value.

Real Algorithm:

let rec tc (env:var->tipe_scheme) (e:exp) =
 match e with

```
Let(x,e1,e2) ->
let s =
    if may_have_effects e1 then
        Forall([],tc env e1)
        else generalize(env,tc env e1)
    in
        tc (extend env x s) e2
end
```

Checking Effects:

let rec may have effects e = match e with | Int -> false | Var -> false | Lambda -> false | Pair(e1,e2) -> may have effects e1||may have effects e2 | App -> true