

Automating Gradual Typing

or; Abstracting Abstracting Gradual Typing

Timothy Jones <tim@ecs.vuw.ac.nz>

July 17, 2016

Victoria University of Wellington

Lift a type system into its gradual form

- Abstracting Gradual Typing
- Gradualizer

Mechanisation

```
data Type : Set where  
  Int : Type  
  Bool : Type  
  _→_ : (T1 T2 : Type) → Type
```

data Term n : Set where

int : $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow$ Term n

bool : $\mathbb{B} \rightarrow$ Term n

...

$_ \cdot _$: $(t_1 t_2 : \text{Term } n) \rightarrow \text{Term } n$

...

if_then_else_ : $(t_1 t_2 t_3 : \text{Term } n) \rightarrow \text{Term } n$

Typing

```
data _⊢_:_ {n} (Γ : Vec Type n) : Term n → Type → Set where
  int : ∀ {x} → Γ ⊢ int x : Int
  bool : ∀ {x} → Γ ⊢ bool x : Bool
  ...
```

Typing

data $_ \vdash _ : _ \{n\}$ ($\Gamma : \text{Vec Type } n$) : $\text{Term } n \rightarrow \text{Type} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ where

int : $\forall \{x\} \rightarrow \Gamma \vdash \text{int } x : \text{Int}$

bool : $\forall \{x\} \rightarrow \Gamma \vdash \text{bool } x : \text{Bool}$

...

app : $\forall \{t_1 t_2 T T_1 T_2\} \rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t_1 : T \rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_1$

$\rightarrow T := T_1 \rightarrow T_2$

$\rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t_1 \cdot t_2 : T_2$

...

Typing

`data` $_ \vdash _ : _ \{n\}$ ($\Gamma : \text{Vec Type } n$) : `Term` $n \rightarrow \text{Type} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ `where`

`int` : $\forall \{x\} \rightarrow \Gamma \vdash \text{int } x : \text{Int}$

`bool` : $\forall \{x\} \rightarrow \Gamma \vdash \text{bool } x : \text{Bool}$

...

`app` : $\forall \{t_1 t_2 T T_1 T_2\} \rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t_1 : T \rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_1$

$\rightarrow T := T_1 \rightarrow T_2$

$\rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t_1 \cdot t_2 : T_2$

...

`cond` : $\forall \{t_1 t_2 t_3 T T_1 T_2\} \rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t_1 : \text{Bool}$

$\rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_1 \rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t_3 : T_2$

$\rightarrow T := T_1 \sqcap T_2$

$\rightarrow \Gamma \vdash \text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 : T$

$\text{Lift}^1 : (\text{Type} \rightarrow \text{Set}) \rightarrow \text{GType} \rightarrow \text{Set}$

$\text{Lift}^2 : (\text{Type} \rightarrow \text{Type} \rightarrow \text{Set}) \rightarrow \text{GType} \rightarrow \text{GType} \rightarrow \text{Set}$

...

$\gamma : \text{GType} \rightarrow \mathbb{P} \text{ Type}$

Concretisation

data $\gamma : \text{GType} \rightarrow \text{Type} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ where

$?: \forall \{T\} \rightarrow \gamma ? T$

$\text{Int} : \gamma \text{ Int Int}$

$\text{Bool} : \gamma \text{ Bool Bool}$

$_ \rightarrow _ : \forall \{\tilde{T}_1 \tilde{T}_2 T_1 T_2\} \rightarrow \gamma \tilde{T}_1 T_1$
 $\rightarrow \gamma \tilde{T}_2 T_2$
 $\rightarrow \gamma (\tilde{T}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{T}_2) (T_1 \rightarrow T_2)$

Lifting Relations

```
data Lift2 (_≈_ : Rel Type) (T̃1 T̃2 : GType) : Set where
  raise : ∀ {T1 T2} → T1 ≈ T2
        → T1 ∈ γ T̃1
        → T2 ∈ γ T̃2
        → Lift2 _≈_ T̃1 T̃2
```

Consistent Equality

$_ \cong _ = \text{Lift}^2 _ \equiv _$

example : Int → ? ≅ ? → Bool

example = raise {Int → Bool} refl (Int → ?) (? → Bool)

Lifting Functions

$\text{lift}^1 : (\text{Type} \rightarrow \text{Type}) \rightarrow \text{GType} \rightarrow \text{GType}$

$\text{lift}^2 : (\text{Type} \rightarrow \text{Type} \rightarrow \text{Type}) \rightarrow \text{GType} \rightarrow \text{GType} \rightarrow \text{GType}$

...

Abstraction

Not computable

$$\alpha : \mathbb{P} \text{ Type} \rightarrow \text{GType}$$

Cannot just lift equality predicates: must preserve optimality

Ad-hoc solutions?

```
data _:=_→_ : GType → GType → GType → Set where
  refl : ∀ { $\tilde{T}_1 \tilde{T}_2$ } → ( $\tilde{T}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{T}_2$ ) :=  $\tilde{T}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{T}_2$ 
  ? : ? := ? → ?
```


Automation

Gradual Typing as a library

- Describe languages in a uniform, abstract way
- Provide a mechanism to apply this abstraction
- Different type systems for different applications

GType = Maybe?

```
data Maybe A : Set where  
  ? : Maybe A  
type : A → Maybe A
```

Maybe Type not enough

Abstractly Typed Functional Language

```
data Type (F : Set → Set) : Set where
  Int : Type F
  Bool : Type F
  _→_ : (T1 T2 : F (Type F)) → Type F
```

Abstractly Typed Functional Language

```
data Type (F : Set → Set) : Set where
  Int : Type F
  Bool : Type F
  _→_ : (T1 T2 : F (Type F)) → Type F
```

Type = id (Type id)

GType = Maybe (Type Maybe)

Abstractly Typed Functional Language

```
data Type (F : Set → Set) : Set where
  Int : Type F
  Bool : Type F
  _→_ : (T1 T2 : F (Type F)) → Type F
```

Type = id (Type id)

GType = Maybe (Type Maybe)

(Not necessarily strictly positive — no way to negotiate this)

F is for Functor

Type $(F : \text{Set} \rightarrow \text{Set}) : \text{Set}$

lift : $\forall \{A B\} \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow F A \rightarrow F B$

F is for Functor

Type $(F : \text{Set} \rightarrow \text{Set}) : \text{Set}$

lift : $\forall \{A B\} \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow F A \rightarrow F B$

unit : $\forall \{A\} \rightarrow A \rightarrow F A$

Using Unit

`data _⊢_ : {n} (Γ : Vec (F (Type F)) n) : Term n → F (Type F)
→ Set where`

`int : ∀ {x} → Γ ⊢ int x : unit Int`

`bool : ∀ {x} → Γ ⊢ bool x : unit Bool`

...

`app : ∀ {t1 t2 T T1 T2} → Γ ⊢ t1 : T → Γ ⊢ t2 : T1`

`→ T := T1 → T2`

`→ Γ ⊢ t1 · t2 : T2`

...

`cond : ∀ {t1 t2 t3 T T1 T2} → Γ ⊢ t1 : unit Bool`

`→ Γ ⊢ t2 : T1 → Γ ⊢ t3 : T2`

`→ T := T1 ∩ T2`

`→ Γ ⊢ if t1 then t2 else t3 : T`

Abstracting Concretisation

Implementing γ relied on knowing the shape of Type

$\text{data } \gamma : \text{GType} \rightarrow \text{Type} \rightarrow \text{Set where}$

$? : \forall \{T\} \rightarrow \gamma ? T$

$\text{Int} : \gamma \text{ Int Int}$

$\text{Bool} : \gamma \text{ Bool Bool}$

$_ \rightarrow _ : \forall \{\tilde{T}_1 \tilde{T}_2 T_1 T_2\} \rightarrow \gamma \tilde{T}_1 T_1$
 $\rightarrow \gamma \tilde{T}_2 T_2$
 $\rightarrow \gamma (\tilde{T}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{T}_2) (T_1 \rightarrow T_2)$

Abstracting Concretisation

We need to have a single rule for all variants of **Type**

```
data  $\gamma$  : GType  $\rightarrow$  Type  $\rightarrow$  Set where
  ? :  $\forall \{T\} \rightarrow \gamma ? T$ 
  type : (T : Type  $\square$ )
          $\rightarrow \gamma$  (type T  $\rightarrow$  Type Maybe )
         (id T  $\rightarrow$  Type id )
```

Mapping Functors

Need a mechanism to transform the indexed functor

$$\begin{aligned} \text{map} : \forall \{F G\} &\rightarrow (F (\text{Type } G) \rightarrow G (\text{Type } G)) \\ &\rightarrow \text{Type } F \rightarrow \text{Type } G \end{aligned}$$

$\text{map } f \text{ Int} = \text{Int}$

$\text{map } f \text{ Bool} = \text{Bool}$

$\text{map } f (T_1 \rightarrow T_2) = f (\text{lift } (\text{map } f) T_1) \rightarrow f (\text{lift } (\text{map } f) T_2)$

`map f Int` = `Int`

`map f Bool` = `Bool`

`map f (T1 → T2)` = `f (lift (map f) T1) → f (lift (map f) T2)`

(Not guaranteed to terminate — also no way to negotiate this)

Abstracting Concretisation

Now we just need to choose the initial functor

```
data γ : GType → Type → Set where
  ? : ∀ {T} → γ ? T
type : (T : Type □)
      → γ (type (map □ → Maybe T))
          (id (map □ → id T))
```

Constant Functor

We don't care about the recursive type: ignore it

```
data  $\gamma$  : GType  $\rightarrow$  Type  $\rightarrow$  Set where
  ? :  $\forall \{T\} \rightarrow \gamma ? T$ 
type : (T : Type (const  $\circ$ ))
       $\rightarrow \gamma$  (type (map  $\circ \rightarrow$  GType T))
              (id (map  $\circ \rightarrow$  Type T))
```


Manual Recursion

Embed a pair of `GType` and `Type` at each point of recursion

```
data γ : GType → Type → Set where
  ? : ∀ {T} → γ ? T
type : (T : Type (const (GType × Type)))
      → γ (type (map proj1 T))
          (id   (map proj2 T))
```

Recursive Proof

γ ensured that matching components were recursively related

```
data  $\gamma$  : GType  $\rightarrow$  Type  $\rightarrow$  Set where
```

```
  ? :  $\forall \{T\} \rightarrow \gamma ? T$ 
```

```
  Int :  $\gamma$  Int Int
```

```
  Bool :  $\gamma$  Bool Bool
```

```
   $\_ \rightarrow \_$  :  $\forall \{\tilde{T}_1 \tilde{T}_2 T_1 T_2\} \rightarrow \gamma \tilde{T}_1 T_1$   
            $\rightarrow \gamma \tilde{T}_2 T_2$   
            $\rightarrow \gamma (\tilde{T}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{T}_2) (T_1 \rightarrow T_2)$ 
```

Recursive Proof

Also embed a proof that the elements of the pair are related

```
data  $\gamma$  : GType  $\rightarrow$  Type  $\rightarrow$  Set where
  ? :  $\forall \{T\} \rightarrow \gamma ? T$ 
  type : (T : Type (const ( $\Sigma$  (GType  $\times$  Type) (uncurry  $\gamma$ ))))
          $\rightarrow \gamma$  (type (map (proj1  $\circ$  proj1) T))
                   (id (map (proj2  $\circ$  proj1) T))
```

Abstracted Consistent Equality

$_ \cong _ = \text{Lift}^2 _ \equiv _$

example : type (type Int → ?) \cong type (? → type Bool)

example =

raise {Int → Bool} refl

Int → ?

? → Bool

Abstracted Consistent Equality

$_ \cong _ = \text{Lift}^2 _ \equiv _$

example : type (type Int \rightarrow ?) \cong type (? \rightarrow type Bool)

example =

raise {Int \rightarrow Bool} refl

(type (((type Int , Int) , type Int) \rightarrow ((? , Bool) , ?)))

(type (((? , Bool) , ?) \rightarrow ((type Bool , Bool) , type Bool)))

Abstracted Consistent Equality

$_ \cong _ = \text{Lift}^2 _ \equiv _$

example : type (type Int → ?) \cong type (? → type Bool)

example =

```
raise {Int → Bool} refl
      (type ((, type Int) → (, ?)))
      (type ((, ?) → (, type Bool)))
```

Abstraction

Other Functors = Other Type Systems

Type = id (Type id)

GType = Maybe (Type Maybe)

Other Functors = Other Type Systems

Type = id (Type id)

GType = Maybe (Type Maybe)

DType = const T (Type (const T))

Other Functors = Other Type Systems

Type = id (Type id)

GType = Maybe (Type Maybe)

DType = const T (Type (const T))

LType = List (Type List)

Other Functors = Other Type Systems

Type = id (Type id)

GType = Maybe (Type Maybe)

DType = const T (Type (const T))

LType = List (Type List)

EType = (A : Set) \rightarrow A \uplus Type λ T \rightarrow A \uplus T

Other Functors = Other Type Systems

Type = id (Type id)

GType = Maybe (Type Maybe)

DType = const T (Type (const T))

LType = List (Type List)

EType = (A : Set) → A ⊔ Type λ T → A ⊔ T

RType = (A : Set) → A → Type λ T → A → T

WType = ∏ {A} → Monoid A → A × Type λ T → A × T

Other Functors = Other Type Systems

Type = id (Type id)

GType = Maybe (Type Maybe)

DType = const T (Type (const T))

LType = List (Type List)

EType = (A : Set) → A ⊔ Type λ T → A ⊔ T

RType = (A : Set) → A → Type λ T → A → T

WType = ∀ {A} → Monoid A → A × Type λ T → A × T

SType = ∀ {A} → Monoid A → A → Type λ T → A → T × A

Abstracting Abstracting Concretisation

The definition of γ was for gradual types only

```
data  $\gamma$  : GType  $\rightarrow$  Type  $\rightarrow$  Set where
  ? :  $\forall \{T\} \rightarrow \gamma ? T$ 
type : (T : Type (const ( $\Sigma$  (GType  $\times$  Type) (uncurry  $\gamma$ ))))
       $\rightarrow \gamma$  (type (map (proj1  $\circ$  proj1) T))
              (id (map (proj2  $\circ$  proj1) T))
```

Abstracting Abstracting Concretisation

The definition of γ was for gradual types only

```
data  $\gamma$  : GType  $\rightarrow$  Type  $\rightarrow$  Set where
  ? :  $\forall \{T\} \rightarrow \gamma ? T$ 
  type : (T : Type (const ( $\Sigma$  (GType  $\times$  Type) (uncurry  $\gamma$ ))))
          $\rightarrow \gamma$  (type (map (proj1  $\circ$  proj1) T))
                   (id (map (proj2  $\circ$  proj1) T))
```

This looks suspiciously like an application of *Maybe*...

Abstracting Abstracting Concretisation

Define γ for any functor F

```
data  $\gamma$  {F} : F (Type F)  $\rightarrow$  Type  $\rightarrow$  Set where
  rel :  $\forall$  {T}
     $\rightarrow$  (x : F ( $\Sigma$  (Type (const ( $\Sigma$  (F (Type F)  $\times$  Type)
      (uncurry  $\gamma$ ))))))
      ( $\_ \equiv \_$  T  $\circ$  map (proj2  $\circ$  proj1)))
     $\rightarrow$   $\gamma$  (lift (map (proj1  $\circ$  proj1)  $\circ$  proj1) x) T
```


Abstracting Abstracting Concretisation

Define γ for any functor F

```
data  $\gamma$  {F} : F (Type F)  $\rightarrow$  Type  $\rightarrow$  Set where
  rel :  $\forall$  {T}
     $\rightarrow$  (x : F ( $\Sigma$  (Type (const ( $\Sigma$  (F (Type F)  $\times$  Type)
      (uncurry  $\gamma$ ))))))
      ( $\_ \equiv \_$  T  $\circ$  map (proj2  $\circ$  proj1))))
     $\rightarrow$   $\gamma$  (lift (map (proj1  $\circ$  proj1)  $\circ$  proj1) x) T
```

Why is Type special?

Abstracting Abstracting Concretisation

Define γ for any two functors F and G

```
data  $\gamma$  {F G} : F (Type F)  $\rightarrow$  G (Type G)  $\rightarrow$  Set where
  rel :  $\forall$  {T}
     $\rightarrow$  (x : F ( $\Sigma$  (Type (const ( $\Sigma$  (F (Type F)  $\times$  G (Type G))
      (uncurry  $\gamma$ ))))
      ( $\_ \equiv \_$  T  $\circ$  unit  $\circ$  map (proj2  $\circ$  proj1))))))
     $\rightarrow$   $\gamma$  (lift (map (proj1  $\circ$  proj1)  $\circ$  proj1) x) T
```

Abstracting Abstracting Concretisation

Define γ for any two functors F and G

```
data  $\gamma$  {F G} : F (Type F)  $\rightarrow$  G (Type G)  $\rightarrow$  Set where
  rel :  $\forall$  {T}
         $\rightarrow$  (x : F ( $\Sigma$  (Type (const ( $\Sigma$  (F (Type F)  $\times$  G (Type G))
                                         (uncurry  $\gamma$ ))))))
                ( $\_ \equiv \_$  T  $\circ$  unit  $\circ$  map (proj2  $\circ$  proj1))))))
         $\rightarrow$   $\gamma$  (lift (map (proj1  $\circ$  proj1)  $\circ$  proj1) x) T
```

If the functors are the same, then γ is the precision relation \sqsubseteq

Abstracted Abstracted Consistent Equality

$_ \cong _ = \text{Lift}^2 _ \equiv _$

example : type (type Int → ?) \cong type (? → type Bool)

example =

raise {Int → Bool} refl

(rel (type (((, rel (type (, refl))) → (, rel ?)) , refl)))

(rel (type (((, rel ?) → (, rel (type (, refl)))) , refl)))

Github: `zmthy/automating-gradual-typing`

- Apply beyond STFL
- Investigate alternative type systems
- Dynamic semantics
- Proofs