

Dependently Typed Languages in Statix

Version of September 21, 2022



Jonathan Brouwer

Chapter 1

Introduction

Spoofax is a textual language workbench: a collection of tools that enable the development of textual languages. When working with the Spoofax workbench, the Statix meta-language can be used for the specification of static semantics.

Dependently typed languages are different from other languages because they allow types to be parameterized by values. This allows more rigorous reasoning over types and the values that are inhabited by a type. This expressiveness also makes dependent type systems more complicated to implement. Especially, deciding equality of types requires evaluation of the terms they are parameterized by.

This goal of this paper is to investigate how well Statix is fit for the task of defining a simple dependently-typed language. We want to investigate whether typical features of dependently typed language can be encoded concisely in Statix. The goal is not to show that Statix can implement it, but that implementing it is easier in Statix than in a general-purpose programming language.

We will first show the base language and explain the way that Statix was used to implement this language. Next, we will explore several features and see how well they can be expressed in Statix.

Features - Base language (sec 2) - Name collision avoidance (sec 3) - Language parametric services (sec 4) - Inference (sec 5) - Data types (sec 6)

Chapter 2

Base Language

The base language that was implemented is the Calculus of Constructions [1], with a syntax somewhat similar to that of Haskell. One extra feature was added that is not present in the Calculus of Constructions, that is, let bindings.

2.1 Syntax

The syntax of the base language is defined in SDF3, the syntax definition language of Spoofax. The definition is very similar to that of a simply typed lambda calculus, except that types and expressions are a single sort.

context-free sorts

Expr

context-free syntax

Expr.Let = [let [ID] = [Expr]; [Expr]]

Expr.Type = "Type"

Expr.Var = ID

Expr.FnType = ID ":" Expr "->" Expr {right}

Expr.FnConstruct = "\\\" ID ":" Expr "." Expr

Expr.FnDestruct = Expr Expr {left}

Expr = "(" Expr ")" {bracket}

context-free priorities

Expr.Type > Expr.Var > Expr.FnType > Expr.FnDestruct

> Expr.FnConstruct > Expr.Let

2.2 Static Analysis

2.3 How scope graphs are used

To type-check the base language, we need to use Statix, and scope graphs. This section describes how scope graphs are used.

The scope graph only has a single type of edge, we call them *P* edges (parent edges). It also only has a single relation, called *name*. This *name* stores a *NameEntry*, which can be either a *NameType*, which stores the type of a name, or a *NameSubst*, which stores a substitution corresponding to a name.

signature sorts

```
    NameEntry
constructors
    NameType : Expr -> NameEntry
    NameSubst : scope * Expr -> NameEntry
relations
    name : ID -> NameEntry
name-resolution labels P
```

These are all the definitions we will need to type-check programs. We will create a name with `NameType` as entry for function parameters, and we will use `NameSubst` for let bindings and function application in beta reduction.

2.4 Garbage

- Base language is calculus of constructions with lets + type assertions (move type assertions to sec 5?) - Describe syntax of the base language? - Describe rules of base language (static syntax or mathy?) - Scope graphs for substitutions + scopes

Chapter 3

Solving Name Collisions

3.1 Garbage

Ways: - Uniquify at the start, doesn't work (example) - Rename terms using static rules (works, complex) - Using scope graphs

Bibliography

- [1] Thierry Coquand and Gérard Huet. “The calculus of constructions”. en. In: *Information and Computation* 76.2–3 (Feb. 1988), pp. 95–120. ISSN: 08905401. DOI: 10.1016/0890-5401(88)90005-3. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0890540188900053>.