A canonical bidirectional typing discipline through polarised System L (µµ-calculus)

Zanzi Mihejevs, Glaive

Motivation

- I come from Functional Programming
- Algebras, algebraic effects, monads, applicatives
- The dual story is often incomplete, the duals are not as common
- Hot take: We are missing some key primitives of coalgebras
- Programming with dual calculi is hard, so I decided to build a typechecker

What do we mean by canonical?

- Expressivity: linear logic \otimes , \oplus , \Im , &, \neg , \sim , \forall , \exists
 - A → B := ¬A ⊗ B

 $\circ \mathsf{A} \twoheadleftarrow \mathsf{B} = \mathsf{A} \otimes \mathsf{\sim} \mathsf{B}$

- No choices each connective's check/synth discipline is fully determined by its polarity + 'chirality'
- The only annotations are on the shifts between check/synth
- Structurally recursive no unification, no extraneous syntax

What is Chirality?

- Derived from the greek 'χείρ', meaning 'hand'
- An object or a system is chiral if it is mirror image is not identical to itself
- Refers to a kind of 'assymetric duality'.
- In our case, we will talk about the chirality between producer terms and consumer terms
- Slogan: the principal Dominant chirality is Checkable, the auxilliary Sinister chirality is Synthesisable

Chirality in System L / $\mu\tilde{\mu}$

• Producer terms have a distinguished *output*:

 $\Gamma \vdash t: A | \varDelta$

• Consumer 'co-terms' have a distinguished *input*:

 $\Gamma|e:A\vdash \Delta$

• A *cut* between a producer and a consumer:

$$\frac{\varGamma \vdash t : A, \Delta \quad \varGamma', e : A \vdash \Delta'}{\langle t | e \rangle : (\varGamma, \varGamma' \vdash \Delta, \Delta')} (\mathrm{Cut})$$

Introducing System L

Core rules:

 $\begin{array}{ll} \overline{x:A \vdash x:A \mid} & VR & \overline{\mid \alpha:A \vdash \alpha:A} & VL \\ \hline c:(\Gamma \vdash \alpha:A,\Delta) \\ \overline{\Gamma \vdash \mu\alpha.c:A \mid \Delta} & AR & \frac{c:(\Gamma,x:A \vdash \Delta)}{\Gamma \mid \tilde{\mu}x.c:A \vdash \Delta} & AL \\ \hline \frac{\Gamma \vdash v:A \mid \Delta & \Gamma' \mid e:A \vdash \Delta'}{\langle v \| e \rangle:(\Gamma',\Gamma \vdash \Delta',\Delta)} & Cut \end{array}$

• Non confluent - critical pair

CBV fragment - positive types

$$\begin{array}{cccc} \frac{\Gamma \vdash v : A \mid \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \iota_{2}\left(v\right) : A \oplus B \mid \Delta} \oplus R_{1} & \frac{\Gamma \vdash v : B \mid \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \iota_{1}\left(v\right) : A \oplus B \mid \Delta} \oplus R_{2} \\ & \frac{c : (\Gamma, x : A \vdash \Delta) \quad c' : (\Gamma, y : B \vdash \Delta)}{\Gamma \mid \tilde{\mu}[\iota_{1}\left(x\right).c \mid \iota_{2}\left(y\right).c'] : A \oplus B \vdash \Delta} \oplus L \\ & \frac{\Gamma \vdash v : A \mid \Delta \quad \Gamma \vdash v' : B \mid \Delta}{\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash \left(v, v'\right) : A \otimes B \mid \Delta, \Delta'} \otimes R & \frac{c : (\Gamma, x : A, y : B \vdash \Delta)}{\Gamma \mid \tilde{\mu}[(x, y).c] : A \otimes B \vdash \Delta} \otimes L \end{array}$$

CBN fragment - negative types

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{c:(\Gamma\vdash\alpha:A,\Delta) \quad c':(\Gamma\vdash\beta:B,\Delta)}{\Gamma\vdash\mu(\pi_{1}\left[\alpha\right].c\mid\pi_{2}\left[\beta\right].c'):A\&B\mid\Delta}\&R\\ \frac{\Gamma\mid e:A\vdash\Delta}{\Gamma\mid\pi_{1}\left[e\right]:A\&B\vdash\Delta}\&L_{1} & \frac{\Gamma\mid e:B\vdash\Delta}{\Gamma\mid\pi_{2}\left[e\right]:A\&B\vdash\Delta}\&L_{2}\\ \frac{c:(\Gamma\vdash\alpha:A,\beta:B,\Delta)}{\Gamma\vdash\mu(\left[\alpha,\beta\right].c):A~\Im B\mid\Delta}~\Im R & \frac{\Gamma\mid e:A\vdash\Delta \quad \Gamma\mid e':B\vdash\Delta}{\Gamma,\Gamma'\mid \left[e,e'\right]:A~\Im B\vdash\Delta,\Delta'}~\Im L\end{aligned}$$

Full calculus - negation

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid e : A \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \sim (e) : \sim A \mid \Delta} \sim R \qquad \frac{c : (\Gamma \vdash \alpha : A, \Delta)}{\Gamma \mid \mu(\sim (\alpha).c) : \sim A \vdash \Delta} \sim L$$

$$\frac{c:(\Gamma, x:A\vdash \Delta)}{\Gamma\vdash \mu(\neg [x].c):\neg A\mid \Delta} \neg R \qquad \qquad \frac{\Gamma\vdash v:A\mid \Delta}{\Gamma\mid \neg [v]:\neg A\vdash \Delta} \neg L$$

• Adding polarity means that the identity function becomes not wellkinded

Full-calculus - shifts

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash v_{-}: A_{-} \mid \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \downarrow(v_{-}): \downarrow A_{-} \mid \Delta} \downarrow R \qquad \qquad \frac{c: (\Gamma, x^{-}: A_{-} \vdash \Delta)}{\Gamma \mid \tilde{\mu}[\downarrow(x^{-}).c]: \downarrow A_{-} \vdash \Delta} \downarrow L$$

$$\frac{c:(\Gamma \vdash \alpha^+ : A_+, \Delta)}{\Gamma \vdash \mu(\uparrow[\alpha^+].c):\uparrow A_+ \mid \Delta} \uparrow R \qquad \qquad \frac{\Gamma \mid e_+ : A_+ \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma \mid \uparrow[e_+]:\uparrow A_+ \vdash \Delta} \uparrow L$$

- Wouldn't it be nice if these shifts coincided with bidi-shifts?
- This is foreshadowing

How to type-check System L?

- The cruicial question is how to go under binders
- Pair introduction is checkable
- We expect Pair elimination to be synthesisable
- But it has binders

$$\frac{c:(\Gamma, x^+:A_+, y^+:B_+ \vdash \Delta)}{\Gamma \mid \tilde{\mu}[(x^+, y^+).c]:A_+ \otimes B_+ \vdash \Delta} \otimes L$$

• In lambda calculus, the only binding form is checkable, so going under a binder is easy

Noam's reverse bidirectional typing

instead of assuming a typing context, we *discover* the types as we go along

$$\Gamma, x_1 \Leftarrow A_1, x_2 \Leftarrow A_2 \vdash e' \Rightarrow C \qquad \Delta \vdash e \Leftarrow A_1 \otimes A_2$$

 $\Gamma, \Delta \vdash \operatorname{let} \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle = e \operatorname{in} e' \Longrightarrow C$

• Cruicially, variables become checkable rather than synthesisable

 $x \Leftarrow A \vdash x \Leftarrow A$

Generalise to cuts between positive types

• Checking positive types:

$$\Gamma \vdash ext{producer} \stackrel{check}{\Leftarrow} A \mid \Delta \quad \Gamma' \mid A \stackrel{synth}{\Leftarrow} ext{pattern} \vdash \Delta' \ \langle ext{producer} \mid ext{pattern}
angle : (\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash \Delta, \Delta') \ (ext{Cut})$$

• The causal flow is right-to-left, from the sinister (pattern) chirality to the dominant (producer) chirality

Flip the recipe for negative types

• Checking negative types:

 $\frac{\Gamma \vdash \text{co-pattern} \stackrel{synth}{\Rightarrow} A \mid \Delta \quad \Gamma' \mid A \stackrel{check}{\Rightarrow} \text{consumer} \vdash \Delta'}{\langle \text{co-pattern} \mid \text{consumer} \rangle : (\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash \Delta, \Delta')} (\text{Cut})$

• The causal flow is left-to-right, from the sinister (co-pattern) chirality to the dominant (consumer) chirality

Negation preserves the dominant chirality

Negation Left $(\neg L)$ Negation Right $(\neg R)$

$$rac{\Gammadash V_+ \stackrel{check}{\Leftarrow} A_+;\Delta}{\Gamma;
eg [V_+] \stackrel{check}{\Rightarrow}
eg A_+dash \Delta}
eg L$$

$$rac{c:(\Gamma,x^+ \stackrel{synth}{\Leftarrow} A_+dash \Delta)}{\Gammadash\mu(
eg [x^+].\,c) \stackrel{synth}{\Rightarrow}
eg A_+ \mid \Delta}
eg R$$

Tilde Negation Right ($\sim R$)

$$rac{\Gamma; E_{-} \stackrel{check}{\Rightarrow} A_{-} dash \Delta}{\Gamma dash \sim (E_{-}) \stackrel{check}{\Leftarrow} \sim A_{-}; \Delta} \ \sim R$$

$$egin{aligned} \mathbf{Tilde\ Negation\ Left\ }(\sim L)\ &c:(\Gammadashlpha^{-}\stackrel{synth}{\Rightarrow}A_{-},\Delta)\ &\overline{\Gamma\mid ilde{\mu}[\sim (lpha^{-}).\,c]}\stackrel{synth}{\Leftarrow}\sim A_{-}dash\Delta \end{aligned} \sim L$$

Shifts flip the dominant chirality

Down Shift Right $(\downarrow R)$

$$rac{\Gammadash v_{-}\overset{check}{\Rightarrow}A_{-}\mid\Delta}{\Gammadash\downarrow\left(v_{-}
ight)\overset{synth}{\Leftarrow}\downarrow A_{-};\Delta} \ \downarrow R \qquad rac{\Gamma}{\Gamma}$$

Down Shift Left $(\downarrow L)$

$$rac{c:(\Gamma,x^{-}\stackrel{synth}{\Rightarrow}A_{-}dash\Delta)}{\Gamma\mid ilde{\mu}[\downarrow(x^{-}).\,c]\stackrel{check}{\Leftarrow}\downarrow A_{-}dash\Delta} \;\;\downarrow L$$

Up Shift Right ($\uparrow R$)

Up Shift Left ($\uparrow L$)

$$rac{c: (\Gammadash lpha^+ \stackrel{synth}{\Leftarrow} A_+, \Delta)}{\Gammadash \mu (\uparrow [lpha^+].\,c) \stackrel{check}{\Rightarrow} \uparrow A_+ \mid \Delta} \ \ \uparrow R$$

Conclusion

- Typing algorithm for polymorphic substructural type theory
- The information flow goes from the sinister to the dominant chirality
- The shifts from System L coincides with the shifts from bidirectional typing

Future work

- Type operators type-level sequent calculus?
- Codebruijn recovering copying and deleting of variables
- Dependent types
- Subtyping and duotyping
- Categorical semantics is very subtle