"Blame it on Bob and Ralf" or

Generic Typed Intermediate Languages for the Masses

A partially solved problem

Norman Ramsey Harvard University & Microsoft Research

Typed compilation can be tedious

Write code again and again:

- Every IL requires its own type checker
- Checker needs support functions for that IL
- Capture-avoiding substitution, which I get wrong

Ralf can make things better

My hopes:

- Write "standard" substitution once and for all
- Write new type checker only if there's a new idea

Type checking in a particular setting: 2D

Plan for this talk:

- 1. Problem: Compile to 2D
- 2. Problem: Too many ILs
- 3. Problem: Too much boring code
- 4. Solution:^a Generics!

The problem

Genesis of a particular multi-IL compiler

How I got into this mess (and why you might too):

- 1. I liked TIL
- 2. I liked "generics for the masses"
- 3. I entered the 2006 ICFP Programming Contest
- 4. I had to teach 1st-year PhD students

Fused into one idea:

Read cool papers; compile to 2D

2D = real PL content + cute hackery

An "esoteric" language for the 2006 contest:

• Classic first-order values:

v ::= () | (v, v) | Inl v | Inr v

• Computation by circuits (boxes and arrows):

- Named circuits with recursive instantiation (First-order functional language)
- Single box: 0 to 2 inedges, may do one of
 - Multiple assignment (0 to 2 outedges)
 - Function call
 - Pair elimination or sum elimination

2D list reversal w/accumulating parameter

Output from my compiler, run through dot:



2D: Fundamentals lurk beneath surface

Lots of PL here:

- Data coded by sums and products
- "Syntax" driven by introduction & elimination
- "Wires" are linear variables
- Control dependence coded via data dependence
- A circuit is a (linear!) A-normal form

"Hell is other programming languages" —Sartran

2D compiler motivates lots of good papers

Compiling 2D requires reading:

- Parsing combinators (Hutton 1992; Fokker 1995)
- Type inference (Peyton Jones et al. 2007)
- Typed defunctionalization (Pottier and Gauthier 2005)
- A-normalization (Flanagan et al. 1993)
- Linearity (Wadler 1993)

And to help with the grunt work

• Generics for the masses (Hinze 2004)

Typed intermediate languages proliferate

- Abstract syntax (partially typed)
- Target of type inference (mutable ref cells)
- Language supporting defunctionalization (need GADTs)
- First-order target language
- Language of A-normal forms (Also used for linearization)
- Boxes and arrows (dot, untyped)

Lots of commonality with System F

Much can be done generically!

Much can be done generically!

In any language, manipulate names:

freeVars	::	(Language	a)	=>	a ->	[N	ame))				
isFreeIn	::	(Language	a)	=>	Name	->	a	->	Boo	51		
substName	::	(Language	a)	=>	(Name	e,	Nan	ne)	->	a	->	8

Much can be done generically!

In any language, manipulate names:

freeVars	::	(Language	a)	=>	a ->	[N	ame)]				
isFreeIn	::	(Language	a)	=>	Name	->	a	->	Boo	51		
substName	::	(Language	a)	=>	(Name	2,	Nan	ne)	->	a	->	а

In some languages, map name to term:

subst :: (Mapable e a) => (Name, e) -> a -> a

Much can be done generically!

In any language, manipulate names:

freeVars	::	(Language	a)	=>	a ->	[N	ame	•]				
isFreeIn	::	(Language	a)	=>	Name	->	a	->	Boo	51		
substName	::	(Language	a)	=>	(Name	e, 1	Nam	le)	->	a	->	а

In some languages, map name to term:

subst :: (Mapable e a) => (Name, e) -> a -> a

Can even linearize generically:

linearize :: (Language e) => [Name] -> e -> e
-- 1st arg is list of names to be consumed

The solution

Ralf's nice idea: Encode by isomorphism

Make algebraic data type $ADT \simeq v$ where

 $v ::= () \mid (v, v) \mid \operatorname{Inl} v \mid \operatorname{Inr} v \mid (iso, ADT)$

Where *iso* is $(ADT \rightarrow \tau, \tau \rightarrow ADT)$ (*iso* supplied by client)

Ralf's nice idea: Encode by isomorphism

Make algebraic data type $ADT \simeq v$ where

v ::= () | (v, v) | Inl v | Inr v | (iso, ADT)

Where *iso* is $(ADT \rightarrow \tau, \tau \rightarrow ADT)$ (*iso* supplied by client)

My gloss: encode a language

Ralf's nice idea: Encode by isomorphism

Make algebraic data type $ADT \simeq v$ where

v ::= () | (v, v) | Inl v | Inr v | (iso, ADT) | b

Where *iso* is $(ADT \rightarrow \tau, \tau \rightarrow ADT)$ (*iso* supplied by client)

My gloss: encode a language

Encoding basics: Data

Ralf says:

- data Unit = Unit
- data Plus a b = Inl a | Inr b
- data Pair a b = Pair a b
- data Iso a b = Iso { fromData :: b -> a
 - , toData :: a -> b }

I added

data Lit a = Lit a -- no vars or subterms

N.B. Unit ~ Lit ()

Encoding free and bound variables

My contribution (so far):

(Linearity too, but not in this talk)

Defining generic functions

Definition by cases over encoding:

class Generi	c g where
unit	:: g Unit
plus	:: (Language a, Language b) =>
	g (Plus a b)
pair	:: (Language a, Language b) =>
	g (Pair a b)
binder	:: (Language a) => g (Binder a)
occurrence	:: (Language a) => g (Occurrence a)
datatype	:: (Language a) => Iso a b -> g b
lit	:: g (Lit a)

Defining generic functions

Definition by cases over encoding:

class Generi	lc g where
unit	:: g Unit
plus	:: (Language a, Language b) =>
	g (Plus a b)
pair	:: (Language a, Language b) =>
	g (Pair a b)
binder	:: (Language a) => g (Binder a)
occurrence	:: (Language a) => g (Occurrence a)
datatype	:: (Language a) => Iso a b -> g b
lit	:: g (Lit a)

Example instance (free vars):

g a ≃ Name -> a -> Bool

A generic function applies to any language

Language a holds if generic can be inferred

```
class Language a where
  generic :: (Generic g) => g a
```

Infer by grabbing the right method of class Generic

```
instance Language Unit
  where generic = unit
```

```
instance (Language a, Language b) =>
    Language (Plus a b)
    where generic = plus
```

```
instance (Language a, Language b) =>
   Language (Pair a b)
   where generic = pair
```

• • •

Example: variable free in term (removed type tags)

```
isFreeIn :: (Language a) => Name -> a -> Bool
isFreeIn = generic
```

Example: variable free in term (removed type tags)

```
isFreeIn :: (Language a) => Name -> a -> Bool
isFreeIn = generic
```

Example: variable free in term (removed type tags)

```
isFreeIn :: (Language a) => Name -> a -> Bool
isFreeIn = generic
```

Example: variable free in term (removed type tags)

```
isFreeIn :: (Language a) => Name -> a -> Bool
isFreeIn = generic
```

Capture-avoiding substitution, generically

class Mapable e a where
 subst :: (Name : |-->: e) -> a -> a

Capture-avoiding substitution, generically

class Mapable e a where
 subst :: (Name : |-->: e) -> a -> a

Interesting case is the binder

```
instance (Language a, Language e, Mapable e a) =>
Mapable e (Binder a)
```

where

```
subst s@(x : |-->: y) (Bind x' e)
| x == x' || not (x `isFreeIn` e) = Bind x' e
| x' `isFreeIn` y =
    subst s $ rename (freeVars y) (Bind x' e)
| otherwise = Bind x' (subst s e)
```

Capture-avoiding substitution, generically

class Mapable e a where
 subst :: (Name : |-->: e) -> a -> a

Interesting case is the binder

instance (Language a, Language e, Mapable e a) =>
Mapable e (Binder a)

where

```
subst s@(x : |-->: y) (Bind x' e)
| x == x' || not (x `isFreeIn` e) = Bind x' e
| x' `isFreeIn` y =
    subst s $ rename (freeVars y) (Bind x' e)
| otherwise = Bind x' (subst s e)
```

Other cases trivial, e.g.:

(Mapable e a, Mapable e b) => Mapable e (Pair a b) where subst s (Pair a b) = Pair (subst s a) (subst s b)

Works for lots of languages

Will show you Type language in a few minutes

Works for lots of languages

Will show you Type language in a few minutes

Also works for compilation to 2D:

Works for lots of languages

Will show you Type language in a few minutes

Also works for compilation to 2D:

Recursive knot tied two ways:

- **1. Full first-order function body**
- 2. A-normal form

Review: Have achieved something

Claims:

- 1. Free variables and capture-avoiding substitution can be tedious (even wrong!)
- 2. I have written them generically
- 3. All a user need do is write isomorphisms

Review: Have achieved something

Claims:

- 1. Free variables and capture-avoiding substitution can be tedious (even wrong!)
- 2. I have written them generically
- 3. All a user need do is write isomorphisms

But writing isomorphisms is not so fun :-(

The solution, continued

Writing isomorphisms can be tedious

From Ralf's paper:

data Tree a = Leaf a | Fork (Tree a) (Tree a)

fromTree :: Tree a -> Plus a (Pair (Tree a) (Tree a))
fromTree (Leaf x) = Inl x
fromTree (Fork l r) = Inr (Pair l r)

toTree :: Plus a (Pair (Tree a) (Tree a)) -> Tree a
toTree (Inl x) = Leaf x
toTree (Inr (Pair l r)) = Fork l r

This style does not scale

Real languages have more constructors

Types (Peyton Jones et al. 2007, with variation):

data Type = ForAll [TyVar] Type | Fun Type Type | TyApp TyCon [Type] | TyVar TyVar

(Real version has two more value constructors)

(Showed 2D target with eight value constructors)

Encoding uses sum-injection helpers

From Type to "Language": fromTy (ForAll [] t) = L.c1 t fromTy (ForAll (a:tvs) t) = L.c2 (L.Bind (tyName a) (ForAll tvs t)) fromTy (Fun t1 t2) = L.c3 (t1 `L.Pair` t2) fromTy (TyApp c []) = L.c4 (L.Lit c) fromTy (TyApp c (t:ts)) = L.c5 (t `L.Pair` TyApp c ts) fromTy (TyVar a) = L.c6last (L.Free (tyName a))

Helpers:

L.cl	=	Inl								
L.C2	=	Inr	•	Inl						
L.C3	=	Inr	•	Inr	•	Inl				
L.c4	=	Inr	•	Inr	•	Inr	•	Inl		
L.c5	=	Inr	•	Inr	•	Inr	•	Inr	•	Inl
L.c6last	=	Inr	•	Inr	•	Inr	•	Inr	•	Inr

Decoding uses just one helper

Decoding uses just one helper

Decoding uses just one helper

```
Helper |+| is either:
 (|+|) :: (a -> c) -> (b -> c) -> (L.Plus a b) -> c
 (|+|) f1 f2 (Inl x) = f1 x
 (|+|) f1 f2 (Inr x) = f2 x
```

Types are less scary in infix

```
type (:+:) = L.Plus
type (:*:) = L.Pair
fromType :: Type -> Type
                                  :+:
                   L.Binder Type :+:
                   (Type :*: Type) :+:
                   L.Lit TyCon :+:
                   (Type :*: Type) :+:
                   L.Occurrence Type
toType :: Type
                    :+:
         L.Binder Type :+:
          (Type :*: Type) :+:
         L.Lit TyCon :+:
          (Type :*: Type) :+:
         L.Occurrence Type
         -> Type
```

With isomorphisms in hand, all is easy

Using the isomorphisms:

instance L.Language Type where
generic = L.datatype (L.Iso fromType toType)

instance L.Mapable Type Type where
 subst s = toType . L.subst s . fromType

Voilà! Free variables, capture-avoiding substitution

The next problem

To solve (this week?)

Perhaps something similar for a type checker...

To solve (this week?)

Perhaps something similar for a type checker...

Unlike name binding, no near-universal type system

To solve (this week?)

Perhaps something similar for a type checker...

Unlike name binding, no near-universal type system

But one is promising for many applications: F_{ω} + fixed point + GADTs

First steps

New type classes and instances:

• LanguageOver e x

— Type e is a language with names x

• Useful instances:

instance LanguageOver Type TyVar -- as above
instance LanguageOver Term Var -- by analogy

First steps

New type classes and instances:

• LanguageOver e x

— Type e is a language with names x

• Useful instances:

instance LanguageOver Type TyVar -- as above instance LanguageOver Term Var -- by analogy instance LanguageOver Term TyVar -- don't overlook

The object of the exercise

Signature of a generic type checker

```
data Error a = ... -- error monad
class FwaTypeable e t x a where
  typeOf :: ( LanguageOver e x
    , LanguageOver t a
    , LanguageOver e a
    ) =>
    Map a Kind -> Map x t -> e -> Error t
```

Do join me

I've been having fun

- Results are entertaining
- Might be useful