

Mendler-style Recursion Schemes for Mixed-Variant Datatypes

Ki Yung Ahn



kya@cs.pdx.edu

Tim Sheard



sheard@cs.pdx.edu

Marcelo P. Fiore



Marcelo.Fiore@cl.cam.ac.uk

Outline

Mendler-style Recursion Schemes

mit (iteration)

msfit (iteration with syntactic Inverse)

Untyped HOAS (Regular Mixed-Variant Datatype)

Formatting Untyped HOAS (using msfit at kind $*$)

Simply-Typed HOAS (Indexed Mixed-Variant Datatype)

Formatting Untyped HOAS (using msfit at kind $* \rightarrow *$)

The Nax language

Need for yet another Mendler-style Recursion Scheme



(iso-) Recursive Types in Functional Languages

kinding: $(\mu\text{-form}) \frac{\Gamma \vdash F : * \rightarrow *}{\Gamma \vdash \mu F : *}$

typing: $(\mu\text{-intro}) \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : F(\mu F)}{\Gamma \vdash \text{ln } t : \mu F}$ $(\mu\text{-elim}) \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \mu F}{\Gamma \vdash \text{unln } t : F(\mu F)}$

reduction: $(\text{unln-ln}) \frac{}{\text{unln } (\text{ln } t) \rightsquigarrow t}$

already inconsistent as a logic (via Curry--Howard correspondence)
without even having to introduce any term-level recursion
since we can already define general recursion using this



Having both unrestricted formation and unrestricted elimination of μ leads to inconsistency

data T a r = C (r \rightarrow a)

$w : \mu (T a) \rightarrow a$ -- encoding of $(\lambda x. x x)$ in the untyped λ -calc

$w = \lambda v. \text{case } (\text{unIn } v) \text{ of } (C x) \rightarrow f (C x)$

-- $w (C w)$ amounts to a well-known diverging term in λ -calculus

$\text{fix} : (a \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a$ -- the Y combinator $(\lambda f. (\lambda x. f (x x)) (\lambda x. f (x x)))$

$\text{fix} = \lambda f. (\lambda x. f (w x)) (\text{In } (C (\lambda x. f (w x))))$

To recover consistency, one could

either restrict formation (conventional approach)

or restrict elimination (Mendler-style approach)



Conventional Iteration over Recursive Types

kinding: $(\mu\text{-form}^+) \frac{\Gamma \vdash F : * \rightarrow * \quad \text{positive}(F)}{\Gamma \vdash \mu F : *}$ allow formation of only positive recursive types

typing: $(\mu\text{-intro})$ and $(\mu\text{-elim})$ same as functional language

$$(\mathbf{It}) \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \mu F \quad \Gamma \vdash \varphi : F A \rightarrow A}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{It} \ \varphi \ t : A}$$

reduction: (unIn-In) same as functional language
freely eliminate (i.e. use unIn) recursive values

$$(\mathbf{It-In}) \frac{}{\mathbf{It} \ \varphi \ (\text{In } t) \rightsquigarrow \varphi \ (\text{map}_F \ (\mathbf{It} \ \varphi) \ t)}$$

Mendler-style Iteration over Recursive Types

kinding: $(\mu\text{-form})$ same as functional language
freely form ANY recursive type!!

typing: $(\mu\text{-intro})$ same as functional language note, no $(\mu\text{-elim})$ rule

$$(\mathbf{mit}) \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \mu F \quad \Gamma \vdash \varphi : \forall X. (X \rightarrow A) \rightarrow FX \rightarrow A}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{mit} \ \varphi \ t : A}$$

elimination is possible
only through mit

reduction: $(\mathbf{mit}\text{-ln}) \frac{}{\mathbf{mit} \ \varphi \ (\text{ln } t) \rightsquigarrow \varphi \ (\mathbf{mit} \ \varphi) \ t}$



Mendler-style Iteration

-- Mu at different kinds (there are many more, one at each kind)

data Mu0 (f :: * → *) = In0 (f (Mu0 f))

data Mu1 (f :: (* → *) → (* → *)) i = In1 (f (Mu1 f) i)

-- Mendler-style iterators at different kinds

mit0 :: Phi0 f a → Mu f → a

mit0 phi (In0 x) = phi (mit0 phi) x

mit1 :: Phi1 f a i → Mu f i → a i

mit1 phi (In1 x) = phi (mit1 phi) x

type Phi0 = ∀ r. (r → a) → (f r → a)

type Phi1 = ∀ r. (∀ i. r i → a i) → (∀ i. f r i → a i)

✓ Uniformly defined at different kinds (can handle non-regular datatypes quite the same way as handling regular datatypes)

✓ Terminate for ANY datatype (can embed Mu and mit into Fw. see Abel, Matthes and Uustalu TCS'04)

✓ However, not very useful for mixed-variant datatypes

eliminating In0 or In1 by pattern matching
is only allowed in Mendler-style iterators



Mendler-style Iteration with a syntactic inverse

-- Mu' at different kinds (we only use two of them in this talk)

data Mu'0 (f :: * → *) a = In'0 (f (Mu'0 f a)) | Inverse0 a

data Mu'1 (f :: (* → *) → (* → *)) a i = In'1 (f (Mu'1 f a) i) | Inverse1 (a i)

-- msfit at different kinds

msfit0 :: Phi'0 f a → Mu'0 f → a

msfit0 phi (In'0 x) = phi Inverse0 (msfit0 phi) x

✓ Terminate for ANY datatype
(can embed Mu and msfit into
Fw. see Ahn and Sheard ICFP'11)

msfit1 :: Phi'1 f a i → Mu'1 f i → a i

msfit1 phi (In'1 x) = phi Inverse1 (msfit1 phi) x

✓ msfit is quite useful for
mixed-variant datatypes

type Phi'0 f a = $\forall r. \overset{\text{inverse}}{(a \rightarrow_r a)} \rightarrow \overset{\text{recursive call}}{(r a \rightarrow a)} \rightarrow (f r a \rightarrow a)$

type Phi'1 f a = $\forall r. (\forall i. a i \rightarrow_r a i) \rightarrow (\forall i. r a i \rightarrow a i) \rightarrow (\forall i. f (r a) i \rightarrow a i)$

eliminating In'0 or In'1 by pattern matching
is only allowed in Mendler-style iterators

Untyped HOAS

(a regular mixed-variant datatype)

-- using general recursion at type level

```
data Exp = Lam (Exp → Exp) | App Exp Exp
```

-- using fixpoint (Mu'0) over non-recursive base structure (ExpF)

```
data ExpF r = Lam (r → r) | App r r
```

```
type Exp' a = Mu'0 ExpF a
```

-- (Exp' a) may contain Inverse

```
type Exp = ∀ a . Exp' a
```

-- Exp does not contain Inverse

```
lam :: (∀ a. Exp' a → Exp' a) -> Exp
```

-- it's not (Exp → Exp) → Exp

```
lam f = In'0 (Lam f)
```

-- f can handle Inverse containing values

-- but can never examine its content

```
app :: Exp → Exp → Exp
```

```
app e1 e2 = In'0 (App e1 e2)
```



Formatting Untyped HOAS using `msfit0` at kind `*`

`showExp :: Exp → String`

`showExp e = msfit0 phi e vars` where

`phi :: Phi'0 ExpF ([String] → String)`

`phi inv showE (Lam z) =`

`λ(v:vs) → "(λ"++v++"→"++ showE (z (inv (const v))) vs ++")"`

`phi inv showE (App x y) =`

`λvs → "("++ showE x vs ++" "++ showE y vs ++")"`

`type Phi0 f a = ∀ r. inverse (a → r a) recursive call -> (r a -> a) → (f r a → a)`

`vars = ["x"++show n | n<-[0..]] :: [String]`



Simply-Typed HOAS

(a non-regular mixed-variant datatype)

-- using general recursion at type level

data Exp t where
-- Exp :: * → *
Lam :: (Exp t₁ → Exp t₂) → Exp (t₁ → t₂)
App :: Exp (t₁ → t₂) → Exp t₁ → Exp t₂

-- using fixpoint (Mu'1) over non-recursive base structure (ExpF)

data ExpF r t where
-- ExpF :: (* → *) → (* → *)
Lam :: (r t₁ → r t₂) → ExpF r (t₁ → t₂)
App :: r (t₁ → t₂) → r t₁ → ExpF r t₂
type Exp' a t = Mu'1 ExpF a t
-- (Exp' a t) might contain Inverse
type Exp t = ∀ a . Exp' a t
-- (Exp t) does not contain Inverse

lam :: (forall a . Exp' a t₁ → Exp' a t₂) → Exp (t₁ → t₂)
lam f = In'1 (Lam f)
-- f can handle Inverse containing values
-- but can never examine its content

app :: Exp (t₁ → t₂) → Exp t₁ → Exp t₂
app e₁ e₂ = In'1 (App e₁ e₂)

Evaluating Simply-Typed HOAS using msfit1 at kind $* \rightarrow *$

```
newtype Id a = MkId { unId :: a }
```

```
evalHOAS :: Exp t → Id t
```

```
evalHOAS e = msfit1 phi e  where
```

```
phi :: Phi'1 ExpF Id      {- v :: t1 -}      {- f :: r Id t1 -> r Id t2 -}
```

```
phi inv ev (Lam f) = MkId(λv → unId(ev (f (inv (MkId v)))))
```

```
phi inv ev (App e1 e2) = MkId(unId(ev e1) (unId(ev e2)))
```

```
type Phi'1 f a =  $\forall r. (\overset{\text{inverse}}{\forall i. a\ i \rightarrow r\ a\ i}) \rightarrow (\overset{\text{recursive call}}{\forall i. r\ a\ i \rightarrow a\ i}) \rightarrow (\forall i. f\ (r\ a)\ i \rightarrow a\ i)$ 
```

This example is a super awesome coooooool discovery that
System Fw can express Simply-Typed HOAS evaluation!!!



The Nax language

- ✓ Built upon the idea of Mendler-style recursion schemes
- ✓ Supports an extension of Hindley--Milner type inference to make it easier to use Mendler-style recursion schemes and indexed datatypes
- ✓ Handling different notions of recursive type operators (Mu , Mu') still needs more rigorous clarification in the theory, but intuitively,


$$\text{Mu}_0 f = \forall a. \text{Mu}'_0 f a$$

$$\text{Mu}_1 f = \forall a. \text{Mu}'_1 f a i$$

...

So, we hide Mu' from users as if there is one kind of Mu and Mu' is only used during the computation of msfit

- ✓ Supports **term-indexed types** as well as type-indexed types.
Our term indexed calculus, System Fi (to appear in TLCA 2013), extends System Fw with erasable term indices.



Need for yet another Mendler-style recursion scheme

There are more recursion schemes other than `mit` and `msfit`

E.g., Mendler-style primitive recursion (`mpr`) can **cast** from abstract recursive type (`r`) to concrete recursive type (`Mu f`).

$$\text{Phi0 } f \ a = \forall r. \quad (r \rightarrow \text{Mu } f) \rightarrow (r \rightarrow a) \rightarrow (f \ r \rightarrow a)$$

$$\text{Phi1 } f \ a = \forall r. \ (\forall i. r \ i \rightarrow \text{Mu } f \ i) \rightarrow (\forall i. r \ i \rightarrow a \ i) \rightarrow (\forall i. f \ r \ i \rightarrow a \ i)$$

With `mpr`, one can write constant time predecessor for natural numbers and tail function for lists by using the cast operation.

Next example motivates an extension to `mpr` that can **uncast** from concrete recursive type (`Mu f i`) to abstract recursive type (`r i`)

$$\text{Phi1 } f \ a = \forall r. \ (\forall i. \text{Mu } f \ i \rightarrow r \ i) \rightarrow (\forall i. r \ i \rightarrow \text{Mu } f \ i) \rightarrow (\forall i. r \ i \rightarrow a \ i) \rightarrow (\forall i. f \ r \ i \rightarrow a \ i)$$

Recursion scheme with above `Phi1` type does not terminate for negative datatypes so needs some additional restriction on `uncast`.

Evaluating Simply-Typed HOAS into a user defined value domain

```
data V r t where V :: (r t1 → r t2) → V r (t1 → t2)
type Val t = Mu V t
val f = In1 (V f)
```

```
evalHOAS :: Exp t → Val t
evalHOAS e = msfit1 phi e  where
  phi :: Phi'1 ExpF (Mu1 V)      -- f :: r Val t1 -> r Val t2 ,   v :: Val t1
  phi inv ev (Lam f) = val(λv → ev (f (inv v)))
  phi inv ev (App e1 e2) = unVal (ev e1) (ev e2)
```

Only if we had $\text{unVal} :: \text{Val } (t_1 \rightarrow t_2) \rightarrow (\text{Val } t_1 \rightarrow \text{Val } t_2)$ it would be possible to write this, but unVal does not seem to be definable using any known Mendler-style recursion scheme.



New recursion scheme to write unVal

```
data V r t where V :: (r t1 → r t2) → V r (t1 → t2)
type Val t = Mu V t
val f = In1 (V f)
unVal v = unId(mprsi phi v) where
    phi :: Phi1 V Id
    phi uncast cast (V f) = Id(λv. cast (f (uncast v)))
```

```
mprsi :: Phi1 f a → Mu f i → a i
```

Preliminary idea that still need further studies for the termination proof


```
mprsi phi (In1 x) = phi id id (mrpsi phi) x
```

-- size restriction over indices over indices in both uncast and cast

```
type Phi1 f a = ∀ r j.    (∀ i. (i < j) ⇒ Mu f i → r i) →      -- uncast
                           (∀ i. (i < j) ⇒ r i → Mu f i) →      -- cast
                           (∀ i. r i → a i) → (r j → a j)
```

-- or, maybe without the size restriction over indices in cast

```
type Phi1 f a = ∀ r j.    (∀ i. (i < j) ⇒ Mu f i → r i) →      -- uncast
                           (∀ i.          r i → Mu f i) →      -- cast
                           (∀ i. r i → a i) → (f r j → a j)
```



Questions or Suggestions?

Thanks for listening.

===== < **Advertisement** > =====



Ki Yung Ahn <kya@cs.pdx.edu>
is graduating soon this summer
and openly looking for research
positions worldwide.

