Nontermination in Type Class Inference

Fu-Peng

University of Dundee School of Computing

Introduction: Type Class Inference

Informally speaking

► Type Class Inference = Hindley-Milner + Instance Resolution

Introduction: Type Class Inference

Informally speaking

- ► Type Class Inference = Hindley-Milner + Instance Resolution
- Instance Resolution = Context Reduction + Evidence Construction

Introduction: Example

```
class Eq a where
  eq :: Eq a => a -> a -> Bool
instance Eq a, Eq b => Eq (a, b) where
  eq (x1, y1) (x2, y2) = and (eq x1 x2) (eq y1 y2)
instance => Eq Char where
  eq = primtiveCharEq
-- test :: Eq (Char, Char) => Bool
test = eq ('a', 'b') ('c', 'd')
```

Introduction: One possible translation

```
data Eq a where
  CEq :: (a \rightarrow a \rightarrow Bool) \rightarrow Eq a
eq:: Eq a \rightarrow (a \rightarrow a \rightarrow Bool)
eq (CEq m) = m
f :: Eq a, Eq b \rightarrow Eq (a, b)
f d1 d2 = CEq q
where q (x1, y1) (x2, y2) =
           and (eq d1 x1 x2) (eq d2 y1 y2)
q:: Eq Char
g = CEq primtiveCharEq
test = eq d ('a', 'b') ('c', 'd')
-- some d :: Eq (Char, Char)
```

Given

```
f :: Eq a, Eq b -> Eq (a, b)
g :: Eq Char
How to automatically construct
d :: Eq (Char, Char)?
```

Given

```
f :: Eq a, Eq b -> Eq (a, b)
g :: Eq Char
How to automatically construct
d :: Eq (Char, Char)?
```

```
 \left\{ \dots \text{Eq (a, b)} \dots \right\} \rightarrow_f \left\{ \dots \text{Eq a, Eq b...} \right\}   \left\{ \dots \text{Eq Char...} \right\} \rightarrow_g \left\{ \dots \right\}
```

Given

```
f :: Eq a, Eq b -> Eq (a, b) g :: Eq Char
```

How to automatically construct

```
d:: Eq (Char, Char)?
```

```
\{...\text{Eq (a, b)}...\} \rightarrow_f \{...\text{Eq a, Eq b...}\}
\{...\text{Eq Char...}\} \rightarrow_g \{...\}
```

Context reduction:

```
\Phi \vdash \{\text{Eq (Char, Char})\} \rightarrow_f \{\text{Eq Char, Eq Char}\} \rightarrow_g \{\text{Eq Char}\} \rightarrow_g \emptyset
```

Given

```
f :: Eq a, Eq b -> Eq (a, b) g :: Eq Char
```

How to automatically construct

```
d:: Eq (Char, Char)?
```

```
{...Eq (a, b)...} \rightarrow_f {...Eq a, Eq b...} {...Eq Char...} \rightarrow_g {...}
```

Context reduction:

```
\Phi \vdash \{ \text{Eq (Char, Char)} \} \to_f \{ \text{Eq Char, Eq Char} \} \to_g \{ \text{Eq Char} \} \to_g \emptyset
```

 \triangleright So d = f g g

Context Reduction

```
\Phi \vdash \{\text{Eq (Char, Char})\} \to_f \{\text{Eq Char}, \text{Eq Char}\} \to_g \emptyset  

    Thus d = f g g
```

- Evidence construction seems to rely on termination of context reduction
- What happen if we have a non-terminating reduction?

Context Reduction: Nontermination

Example¹:

```
instance Data SizeD t => Size t where ...
instance Sat (c Char) => Data c Char where ...
instance Size t => Sat (SizeD t) where ...
```

Corresponding rules(Φ):

```
 \begin{aligned} &\{\dots \text{Size t...}\} \rightarrow_a \{\dots \text{Data SizeD t...}\} \\ &\{\dots \text{Data c Char...}\} \rightarrow_b \{\dots \text{Sat (c Char)...}\} \\ &\{\dots \text{Sat (SizeD t)...}\} \rightarrow_c \{\dots \text{Size t...}\} \end{aligned}
```

¹from R. Lämmel & S.P. Jones's Scrap your boilerplate with class

Context Reduction: Nontermination

Example¹:

```
instance Data SizeD t => Size t where ...
instance Sat (c Char) => Data c Char where ...
instance Size t => Sat (SizeD t) where ...
```

Corresponding rules(Φ):

```
 \begin{aligned} &\{\dots \text{Size t...}\} \rightarrow_a \{\dots \text{Data SizeD t...}\} \\ &\{\dots \text{Data c Char....}\} \rightarrow_b \{\dots \text{Sat (c Char)...}\} \\ &\{\dots \text{Sat (SizeD t)....}\} \rightarrow_c \{\dots \text{Size t....}\} \end{aligned}
```

► How to construct an evidence

```
d :: Data SizeD Char?
```

¹from R. Lämmel & S.P. Jones's Scrap your boilerplate with class

Context Reduction: Nontermination

Example¹:

```
instance Data SizeD t => Size t where ...
instance Sat (c Char) => Data c Char where ...
instance Size t => Sat (SizeD t) where ...
```

▶ Corresponding rules(Φ):

```
 \begin{aligned} &\{\dots \text{Size t...}\} \rightarrow_a \{\dots \text{Data SizeD t...}\} \\ &\{\dots \text{Data c Char...}\} \rightarrow_b \{\dots \text{Sat (c Char)...}\} \\ &\{\dots \text{Sat (SizeD t)...}\} \rightarrow_c \{\dots \text{Size t...}\} \end{aligned}
```

- How to construct an evidence
 - d :: Data SizeD Char?
- ▶ Let's try to reduce Data SizeD Char: $\Phi \vdash \{ \text{Data SizeD Char} \} \rightarrow_b$

```
{Sat (SizeD Char)} \rightarrow_c {Size Char} \rightarrow_a {Data SizeD Char} \rightarrow_b \cdot \rightarrow_c \cdot \rightarrow_a ...
```

¹from R. Lämmel & S.P. Jones's Scrap your boilerplate with class

What can we do when context reduction diverge?

- What can we do when context reduction diverge?
- Cycle detection(tie the knot)

Given:

```
a :: Data SizeD t -> Size t
b :: Sat (c Char) -> Data c Char
c :: Size t -> Sat (SizeD t)
```

We have:

```
d :: Data SizeD Char
d = b (c (a d))
```

What if the context reduction is diverging without forming any cycle?

```
data Nested a where
 Nil :: Nested a
 Cons :: a -> Nested [a] -> Nested a
instance Eq a, Eq (Nested [a]) => Eq (Nested a) where
  ea Nil Nil = True
  eq (Cons a as) (Cons b bs) = eq a b && eq as bs
\{\dots \text{Eq (Nested a)}\dots\} \rightarrow \{\dots \text{Eq a, Eq (Nested [a])}\dots\}
\{\text{Eq (Nested Char)}\} \rightarrow
\{\text{Eq Char}, \text{Eq (Nested [Char])}\} \rightarrow
{Eq Char, Eq [Char], Eq (Nested [[Char]]) }...
```

What if the context reduction is diverging without forming any cycle?

- Context reduction seems too earger.
- How to have lazy context reduction?
- ► A change of perspective:

```
Rewriting on multiset:
```

```
 \begin{cases} ... \text{Eq (a, b)} ... \end{cases} \rightarrow_f \{ ... \text{Eq a, Eq b...} \}   \{ ... \text{Eq Char...} \} \rightarrow_g \{ ... \}  Rewriting on first order term: 
  \text{Eq (a, b)} \rightarrow_f (\text{Eq a) (Eq b)}   \text{Eq Char} \rightarrow_g
```

▶ Constructing d :: Eq (Char, Char) Eq (Char, Char) $\rightarrow f$ (Eq Char) (Eq Char) \rightarrow f g (Eq Char) $\rightarrow f$ g g

Summary and Further Works

- Evidence construction process is a kind of rewriting process
- Knowing termination behavior in advance, we may be able to rewrite eagerly/lazily
- Next Step Extend the current cycle detection techniques to obtain evidence(statically) for non-obvious "looping" example
- Long Term Goal Explore the connection between the evidence that gives rise to infinite rewrite process and the notion of productivity in Katya's Structural Resolution