Information-Aware Type Systems

Philippa Cowderoy

August 30, 2018

What are Information-Aware Type Systems?

An Information-Aware Type System is a type system where:

- ▶ It is clear where information is introduced and eliminated
- ▶ It is clear (or at least clearer) how information flows within the type system

This is achieved by using *information effects* to track where information is created and destroyed - or if you prefer, where the system violates *conservation of information*. We hope inferences tell us something new!

Why Bother?

Our standard notation hides things from us.

$$\Gamma \vdash Tp : \tau p
\Gamma \vdash Tp : \tau p
\Gamma \vdash Tf : \tau p \rightarrow \tau r
\Gamma \vdash Tf : \tau p \rightarrow \tau r
\Gamma \vdash Tf : \tau p \rightarrow \tau r = \tau f
\Gamma \vdash Tf : \tau p \rightarrow \tau r = \tau f
\Gamma \vdash Tf : \tau p \rightarrow \tau r = \tau f
\Gamma \vdash Tf : \tau p \rightarrow \tau r = \tau f
\Gamma \vdash Tf : \tau p \rightarrow \tau r = \tau f
\Gamma \vdash Tf : \tau p \rightarrow \tau r \rightarrow \tau r = \tau f
\Gamma \vdash Tf : \tau p \rightarrow \tau r \rightarrow$$

- ▶ While we are used to *App*1, *App*2 is easier for beginners to understand an implicit constraint is made explicit.
- Generating that constraint is an information effect.
- Information-Awareness means more syntax, but makes possibilities clearer.

How To Make A System Information-Aware

This is just one recipe, but it's pretty reliable:

- ► Linear logic variables: one +ve occurrence, one -ve
- Constraints:
 - Constraint generation is an information effect
 - Constraints give us an abstraction tool
 - Constraints help avoid overconstraining data flow
- Duplication effects: track dataflow branches and merges
- Mode analysis: keep track of which way data flows, which forms of constraints we can solve

Constraints for the Simply-Typed Lambda Calculus

```
\tau = \tau \qquad \text{Type equality} \tau - \langle \tau^I_{\tau \tau} \rangle \qquad \text{Type duplication} x : \tau \in \Gamma \qquad \text{Binding in context} \Gamma' := \Gamma \; ; \; x : \tau \qquad \text{Context extension} \Gamma - \langle \Gamma^L_{\Gamma R} \rangle \qquad \text{Context duplication}
```

Note that the context constraints encode the structural rules. An alternative interpretation could give us a minimal linear calculus.

Playing with —⟨ might lead the adventurous thinker down other paths entirely!...

Information-Aware Simply-Typed λ -Calculus (unannotated)

$$\Gamma f := \Gamma; x : \tau p$$

$$\Gamma f \vdash T : \tau r$$

$$\frac{\tau f}{\Gamma \vdash x : \tau} Var$$

$$\frac{\tau f}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x . T} : \tau f$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \lambda x . T : \tau f$$

$$\Gamma \longrightarrow \Gamma \atop \Gamma R \vdash Tp : \tau p$$

$$\frac{\tau p \to \tau r = \tau f}{\Gamma \vdash Tf Tp : \tau r} App$$

Annotations, Duplication & Bidirectionality

Let's support annotations!

- We are forced to duplicate a type
- We could duplicate the function type to check then return
- Better: send the annotation both 'in' and 'out'

$$\tau a - \frac{\tau^{ap}}{\tau^{af}}$$

$$\Gamma f := \Gamma ; x : \tau ap$$

$$\Gamma f \vdash T : \tau r$$

$$\frac{\tau f = \tau af \rightarrow \tau r}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : \tau a . T : \tau f} ALam$$

Different Modes of a Type System

Mode	Unidirectional	Bidirectional
$\Gamma^+ \vdash T^+ : \tau^+$	Type Checking	Checking
$\Gamma^+ \vdash T^+ : au^-$		Synthesis
$\Gamma^- \vdash T^+ : au^+$	Free Variable Types	Checked type
$\Gamma^- \vdash T^+ : au^-$		Synthesised Type
$\Gamma^+ \vdash T^- : au^+$	Proof search	
	Program Synthesis	

- Systems that only support checking modes may not be algorithms, but they're typecheckers and not type systems.
- I'm not aiming to actively *support* program synthesis. Without syntax direction, it's search as usual.

\rightarrow - The Other Information Effect

- The function arrow → doesn't appear in the source language, but it does appear in our types.
 - Not simply isomorphic to something in the term
 - Part of our (abstract) interpretation of a term
- Information we generate from or create about terms
- ▶ I assign two different modes to →
 - based on how the solver handles = constraints
 - Convention: LHS of = is being 'assigned to' in some form

Modes for \rightarrow - 1

- $au au 1^+ = \tau 2^- \to^+ \tau 3^$
 - ightharpoonup behaves as a *constructor* assigned to $\tau 1$
 - Variable parameters to →⁺ have -ve mode they are being consumed to construct something to match against
- $au au 1^+ \to^- au 2^- = au 3^$
 - ightharpoonup behaves as a pattern matched against au 3
 - Variable parameters with +ve mode act as variable patterns, producing something to use elsewhere
 - Variables are matched against when -ve, but generate no new local information

Modes for \rightarrow - 2

During solving:

- \rightarrow + creates or introduces information
- → destroys or eliminates information

Why mention introduction and elimination? Well, \rightarrow^+ appears in the *Lam* rule, aka \rightarrow *I*. And \rightarrow^- in *App*, aka \rightarrow *E*. The modes are telling us about introducing and eliminating connectives!

Contextual Behaviour

Context extension and binding constraints also have a relationship.

Read one way:

- $\Gamma' := \Gamma$; $x : \tau$ introduces the need for a binding
- $x: \tau \in \Gamma$ makes use of or especially in linear and affine systems eliminates a binding

This can also be read in reverse:

- Using a variable requires it to be bound
- Providing a binding meets that requirement!

Likewise, $\Gamma - \langle \Gamma_R^L \rangle$ can be read as merging ΓL and ΓR .

Information-Aware Simply-Typed λ -Calculus (moded)

Mode: $\Gamma^+ \vdash T^+ : \tau^-$ (Synthesis or 'typechecking')

$$\Gamma^{-} \leftarrow \langle \Gamma_{p^{+}}^{f^{+}} \\
\Gamma f^{-} \vdash T f^{-} : \tau f^{+} \qquad \Gamma p^{-} \vdash T p^{-} : \tau p^{+} \\
\frac{\tau p^{-} \rightarrow^{-} \tau r^{+} = \tau f^{-}}{\Gamma^{+} \vdash T f^{+} T p^{+} : \tau r^{-}} App$$

Proofs and Symmetries Undone

Conservation of information requires a symmetry which our information effects can break.

If we restrict ourselves to a linear system then we can hopefully implement our context constraints with no violations – the symmetry is between introduction and elimination.

Typings are proofs – what's the proof theoretic angle on all this?