

A Semantics for Lazy Types

Bachelor Thesis

Georg Neis
Advisor: Andreas Rossberg
Programming Systems Lab
Saarland University

June 8, 2006

Motivation

- ▶ Open and distributed programming: dynamic loading and linking
 - ▶ Type checking at runtime
 - ▶ Laziness

Motivation

- ▶ Open and distributed programming: dynamic loading and linking
 - ▶ Type checking at runtime
 - ▶ Laziness
- ▶ Dynamic type checking: comparison of type expressions
- ▶ Reduction to normal-form
- ▶ Due to laziness: may interleave with term-level reduction!

Motivation

- ▶ Open and distributed programming: dynamic loading and linking
 - ▶ Type checking at runtime
 - ▶ Laziness
- ▶ Dynamic type checking: comparison of type expressions
- ▶ Reduction to normal-form
- ▶ Due to laziness: may interleave with term-level reduction!
- ▶ Task: develop calculus (based on $F\omega$) that models this

An example from Alice ML

```
(* A *)  
type t = int  
val x : t = 5
```

```
(* B *)  
import type t; val x : t from "A"  
type u = t  
val y : u*u = (x,x)
```

```
(* C *)  
import type u = int; val y : u*u from "B"  
type v = int  
val z = #1 y
```

Lazy evaluation in Alice ML

- ▶ Provided by **lazy futures**
- ▶ Example: $(\text{fn } f \Rightarrow f\ 1)\ (\text{lazy } (\text{fn } x \Rightarrow x)\ (\text{fn } n \Rightarrow n+41))$

Modeling lazy evaluation in the untyped lambda calculus

- ▶ $e ::= x \mid \lambda x.e \mid e_1 e_2 \mid \text{let } x = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \mid \text{lazy } x = e_1 \text{ in } e_2$

Modeling lazy evaluation in the untyped lambda calculus

- ▶ $e ::= x \mid \lambda x.e \mid e_1 e_2 \mid \text{let } x = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \mid \text{lazy } x = e_1 \text{ in } e_2$
- ▶ Translation of the previous example:
 $(\text{fn } f \Rightarrow f \ 1) (\text{lazy } (\text{fn } x \Rightarrow x) (\text{fn } n \Rightarrow n+41))$
 $\rightsquigarrow (\lambda f.f \ 1) (\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x) (\lambda n.n + 41) \text{ in } y)$

Modeling lazy evaluation in the untyped lambda calculus

Reduction:

► $(\lambda f.f\ 1)\ (\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y) \longrightarrow$

Modeling lazy evaluation in the untyped lambda calculus

Reduction:

- ▶ $(\lambda f.f\ 1)\ (\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y) \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } (\lambda f.f\ 1)\ y \longrightarrow$

Modeling lazy evaluation in the untyped lambda calculus

Reduction:

- ▶ $(\lambda f.f\ 1)\ (\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y) \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } (\lambda f.f\ 1)\ y \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y\ 1 \longrightarrow$

Modeling lazy evaluation in the untyped lambda calculus

Reduction:

- ▶ $(\lambda f.f\ 1)\ (\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y) \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } (\lambda f.f\ 1)\ y \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y\ 1 \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{let } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y\ 1 \longrightarrow$

Modeling lazy evaluation in the untyped lambda calculus

Reduction:

- ▶ $(\lambda f.f\ 1)\ (\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y) \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } (\lambda f.f\ 1)\ y \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y\ 1 \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{let } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y\ 1 \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{let } y = (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y\ 1 \longrightarrow$

Modeling lazy evaluation in the untyped lambda calculus

Reduction:

- ▶ $(\lambda f.f\ 1)\ (\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y) \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } (\lambda f.f\ 1)\ y \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y\ 1 \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{let } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y\ 1 \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{let } y = (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y\ 1 \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $(\lambda n.n + 41)\ 1 \longrightarrow$

Modeling lazy evaluation in the untyped lambda calculus

Reduction:

- ▶ $(\lambda f.f\ 1)\ (\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y) \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } (\lambda f.f\ 1)\ y \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{lazy } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y\ 1 \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{let } y = (\lambda x.x)\ (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y\ 1 \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $\text{let } y = (\lambda n.n + 41)\ \text{in } y\ 1 \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $(\lambda n.n + 41)\ 1 \longrightarrow$
- ▶ $1 + 41 \longrightarrow 42$

Modeling lazy evaluation in the untyped lambda calculus

Contexts:

- ▶ $L ::= _ \mid \text{lazy } x = e \text{ in } L$
- ▶ $E ::= _ \mid E e \mid \nu E \mid \dots$

Modeling lazy evaluation in the untyped lambda calculus

Contexts:

- ▶ $L ::= _ \mid \text{lazy } x = e \text{ in } L$
- ▶ $E ::= _ \mid E e \mid v E \mid \dots$

▶ SUSPEND:

$$LE[\text{lazy } x = e_1 \text{ in } e_2] \longrightarrow L[\text{lazy } x = e_1 \text{ in } E[e_2]]$$

Modeling lazy evaluation in the untyped lambda calculus

Contexts:

- ▶ $L ::= _ \mid \text{lazy } x = e \text{ in } L$
- ▶ $E ::= _ \mid E e \mid v E \mid \dots$

▶ SUSPEND:

$$LE[\text{lazy } x = e_1 \text{ in } e_2] \longrightarrow L[\text{lazy } x = e_1 \text{ in } E[e_2]]$$

▶ TRIGGER1:

$$L_1[\text{lazy } x = e_1 \text{ in } L_2 E[x v]] \longrightarrow L_1[\text{let } x = e_1 \text{ in } L_2 E[x v]]$$

Existential types

- ▶ To model a simple form of modules
- ▶ Example:

```
structure S = struct
  type t = bool
  val n = 42
end : sig
  type t
  val n : int
end
```

$\rightsquigarrow \langle \text{bool}, 42 \rangle : \exists \alpha. \text{int}$

Existential types

- ▶ Accessing a module: $\text{let } \langle \alpha, x \rangle = e_1 \text{ in } e_2$

Existential types

► Accessing a module: $\text{let } \langle \alpha, x \rangle = e_1 \text{ in } e_2$

► Reduction:

$$LE[\text{let } \langle \alpha, x \rangle = \langle \tau, v \rangle : \tau' \text{ in } e] \longrightarrow LE[e[\alpha := \tau][x := v]]$$

Existential types

- ▶ Accessing a module: $\text{let } \langle \alpha, x \rangle = e_1 \text{ in } e_2$
- ▶ Reduction:
$$LE[\text{let } \langle \alpha, x \rangle = \langle \tau, v \rangle : \tau' \text{ in } e] \longrightarrow LE[e[\alpha := \tau][x := v]]$$
- ▶ Lazy variant for loading a module: $\text{lazy } \langle \alpha, x \rangle = e_1 \text{ in } e_2$

Typecase

- ▶ Comparison of two types τ_1 and τ_2
- ▶ `tcase  $e:\tau_1$  of  $x:\tau_2$  then  $e_1$  else  $e_2$`

Typecase

- ▶ Comparison of two types τ_1 and τ_2
- ▶ $\text{tcase } e:\tau_1 \text{ of } x:\tau_2 \text{ then } e_1 \text{ else } e_2$
- ▶ Reduction:
 - ▶ $LE[\text{tcase } v:\nu \text{ of } x:\nu \text{ then } e_1 \text{ else } e_2] \longrightarrow LE[e_1[x := e]]$
 - ▶ $LE[\text{tcase } v:\nu \text{ of } x:\nu' \text{ then } e_1 \text{ else } e_2] \longrightarrow LE[e_2] \quad (\nu \neq \nu')$

Lazy types

- ▶ Consider: lazy $\langle \alpha, x \rangle = e$ in tcase $x:\alpha$ of $y:\text{int}$ then y else 0
- ▶ $\alpha \stackrel{?}{=} \text{int}$

Lazy types

- ▶ Consider: lazy $\langle \alpha, x \rangle = e$ in tcase $x:\alpha$ of $y:\text{int}$ then y else 0
- ▶ $\alpha \stackrel{?}{=} \text{int}$
- ▶ lazy $\langle \alpha, x \rangle = e$ in tcase $x:\alpha$ of $y:\text{int}$ then y else 0 $\longrightarrow$
let $\langle \alpha, x \rangle = e$ in tcase $x:\alpha$ of $y:\text{int}$ then y else 0

Lazy types

- ▶ Consider: lazy $\langle \alpha, x \rangle = e$ in tcase $x:\alpha$ of $y:\text{int}$ then y else 0
- ▶ $\alpha \stackrel{?}{=} \text{int}$
- ▶ lazy $\langle \alpha, x \rangle = e$ in tcase $x:\alpha$ of $y:\text{int}$ then y else 0 $\longrightarrow$
let $\langle \alpha, x \rangle = e$ in tcase $x:\alpha$ of $y:\text{int}$ then y else 0
- ▶ TRIGGER2:
 $L_1[\text{lazy } \langle \alpha, x \rangle = e \text{ in } L_2ET[\alpha]] \longrightarrow$
 $L_1[\text{let } \langle \alpha, x \rangle = e \text{ in } L_2ET[\alpha]]$

An example from Alice ML

```
(* A *)  
type t = int  
val x : t = 5
```

```
(* B *)  
import type t; val x : t from "A"  
type u = t  
val y : u*u = (x,x)
```

```
(* C *)  
import type u = int; val y : u*u from "B"  
type v = int  
val z = #1 y
```

Translation into the calculus

```
(* A *)  
type t = int  
val x : t = 5
```

$\rightsquigarrow$

$$a = \lambda _ : 1. \langle \text{int}, 5 \rangle : \exists \alpha. \alpha$$

Translation into the calculus

```
(* B *)  
import type t; val x : t from "A"  
type u = t  
val y : u*u = (x,x)
```

$\rightsquigarrow$

$$b = \lambda_{-:1}. \text{lazy } \langle t, x \rangle = a () \\ \text{in } \langle t, \langle x, x \rangle \rangle : \exists \alpha. \alpha \times \alpha$$

Translation into the calculus

(* C *)

```
import type u = int; val y : u*u from "B"  
type v = int  
val z = #1 y
```

$\rightsquigarrow$

$$\begin{aligned} c &= \lambda_{-}:1. \text{ lazy } \langle -, y \rangle = \\ &\quad \text{let } \langle u, y \rangle = b () \\ &\quad \text{in tcase } y : u \times u \text{ of } y' : \text{int} \times \text{int} \\ &\quad \quad \text{then } \langle \text{int}, y' \rangle : \exists \alpha. \text{int} \times \text{int} \\ &\quad \quad \text{else } \perp \\ &\quad \text{in } \langle \text{int}, \text{fst } y \rangle : \exists \alpha. \text{int} \end{aligned}$$

Design Space

- ▶ Three ways of type-level reduction – different degrees of laziness
- ▶ Consider: $\text{int} \times ((\lambda\beta.\nu) \alpha) \stackrel{?}{=} \text{bool} \times \text{int}$ (where α lazy)

Design Space

- ▶ Three ways of type-level reduction – different degrees of laziness
- ▶ Consider: $\text{int} \times ((\lambda\beta.\nu) \alpha) \stackrel{?}{=} \text{bool} \times \text{int}$ (where α lazy)
 1. Naive: use the trigger rule

Design Space

- ▶ Three ways of type-level reduction – different degrees of laziness
- ▶ Consider: $\text{int} \times ((\lambda\beta.\nu) \alpha) \stackrel{?}{=} \text{bool} \times \text{int}$ (where α lazy)
 1. Naive: use the trigger rule
 2. Clever: perform the application

Design Space

- ▶ Three ways of type-level reduction – different degrees of laziness
- ▶ Consider: $\text{int} \times ((\lambda\beta.\nu) \alpha) \stackrel{?}{=} \text{bool} \times \text{int}$ (where α lazy)
 1. Naive: use the trigger rule
 2. Clever: perform the application
 3. Smart: weak-head reduction

References

- ▶ Martín Abadi, Luca Cardelli, Benjamin Pierce, and Didier Rémy. Dynamic typing in polymorphic languages. *Journal of Functional Programming*, January 1995.
- ▶ John Maraist, Martin Odersky, and Philip Wadler. A call-by-need lambda calculus. *Journal of Functional Programming*, May 1998.
- ▶ Benjamin Pierce. *Types and Programming Languages*. The MIT Press, February 2002.
- ▶ Zena Ariola and Matthias Felleisen. The call-by-need lambda calculus. *Journal of Functional Programming*, 1997.
- ▶ Matthias Berg. *Polymorphic lambda calculus with dynamic types*, FoPra Thesis, October 2004.
<http://www.ps.uni-sb.de/~berg/fopra.html>
- ▶ Andreas Rossberg, Didier Le Botlan, Guido Tack, Thorsten Brunklaus, and Gert Smolka. Alice through the looking glass. *Trends in Functional Programming*, volume 5, Intellect, 2005