System F with Recursive and Existential Types

$$e ::= \lambda \alpha. e \mid e \mid \Lambda \alpha. \epsilon$$

$$\alpha, \beta ::= a$$

$$\epsilon ::= \exists \alpha. \tau$$

$$\Delta; \Gamma \vdash \epsilon : \tau$$

Goal

Understand what this interface means and why it matters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type</th>
<th>'a list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>val</td>
<td>empty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unlist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story so far:

- Recursive types to define list data structure
- Universal types to keep element type abstract in library
- Existential types to keep list type abstract in client

But, “cheated” when abstracting the list type in client: considered just intlist.

Looking back, looking forward

Have defined System F.

- Metatheory (what properties does it have)
- What (else) is it good for
- How/why ML is more restrictive and implicit
- Recursive types (also use type variables, but differently)
- Existential types (dual to universal types)

Next:

- Type operators and type-level "computations"

(Integer) List Library with $\exists$

List library is an existential package:

- $\text{pack}(\mu \xi. \text{unit} + \text{int} \star \xi, \text{list_library})$
- $\text{cons}: \text{int} \to L \to L$;
- $\text{unlist}: L \to \text{unit} + (\text{int} \star L)$;
- $\text{map}: (\text{int} \to \text{int}) \to L \to L$;
- $\ldots$

The witness type is integer lists: $\mu \xi. \text{unit} + (\text{int} \star \xi)$.

The existential type variable $L$ represents integer lists.

List operations are monomorphic in element type (int).

The map function only allows mapping integer lists to integer lists.
(Polymorphic?) List Library with ∀/∃

List library is a type abstraction that yields an existential package:

\[ \Lambda \alpha. \text{pack}(\mu \xi. \text{unit} + (\alpha \ast \xi), \text{list}_{\text{library}}) \]

as \[ \exists L. \{ \text{empty} : L; \]
\[ \text{cons} : \alpha \rightarrow L \rightarrow L; \]
\[ \text{unlist} : L \rightarrow \text{unit} + (\alpha \ast L); \]
\[ \text{map} : (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow L \rightarrow L; \]
\[ \ldots \}\]  

The witness type is \( \alpha \) lists: \( \mu \xi. \text{unit} + (\alpha \ast \xi) \).

The existential type variable \( L \) represents \( \alpha \) lists.

List operations are monomorphic in element type \( (\alpha) \).

The \text{map} function only allows mapping \( \alpha \) lists to \( \alpha \) lists.

Matthew Fluet
CS-XXX 2012, Lecture 27

Type Abbreviations and Type Operators

Reasonable enough to provide list type as a (parametric) type abbreviation:

\[ L \alpha = \mu \xi. \text{unit} + (\alpha \ast \xi) \]

▶ replace occurrences of \( L \tau \) in programs
  with \( (\mu \xi. \text{unit} + (\alpha \ast \xi))[\tau/\alpha] \)

Gives an informal notion of functions at the type-level.

But, doesn’t help with list library,
  because this exposes the definition of list type.

▶ How “modular” and “safe” are libraries built from cpp macros?
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Type Abbreviations and Type Operators

Instead, provide list type as a type operator:

▶ a function from types to types

\[ L = \lambda \alpha. \mu \xi. \text{unit} + (\alpha \ast \xi) \]

Gives a formal notion of functions at the type-level.

▶ abstraction and application at the type-level

▶ equivalence of type-level expressions

▶ well-formedness of type-level expressions

List library will be an existential package that hides a type operator,
  (rather than a type).
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Type-level Expressions

Abstraction and application at the type level
  makes it possible to write the same type with different syntax.

\[ \text{Id} = \lambda \alpha. \alpha \]

\[ \text{id} \rightarrow \text{bool} \quad \text{id} \rightarrow \text{id} \rightarrow \text{bool} \]

\[ \text{ld int} \rightarrow \text{bool} \quad \text{ld int} \rightarrow \text{ld bool} \]

\[ \text{ld (int} \rightarrow \text{bool}) \quad \text{ld (ld (int} \rightarrow \text{bool})) \]

\[ \ldots \]

Require a precise definition of when two types are the same:

\[ \tau \equiv \tau' \]

\[ \ldots \]

\[ (\lambda \alpha. \tau_0) \tau_0 \equiv \tau_0[\alpha/\tau_0] \]

\[ \ldots \]
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Type-level Expressions

Abstraction and application at the type level
  makes it possible to write the same type with different syntax.

\[ \text{Id} = \lambda \alpha. \alpha \]

\[ \text{id} \rightarrow \text{bool} \quad \text{id} \rightarrow \text{id} \rightarrow \text{bool} \]

\[ \text{ld int} \rightarrow \text{bool} \quad \text{ld int} \rightarrow \text{ld bool} \]

\[ \text{ld (int} \rightarrow \text{bool}) \quad \text{ld (ld (int} \rightarrow \text{bool})) \]

\[ \ldots \]

Require a typing rule to exploit types that are the same:

\[ \Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \]

\[ \Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau' \quad \tau \equiv \tau' \]

\[ \Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau' \]

\[ \ldots \]
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Type-level Expressions

Abstraction and application at the type level makes it possible to write the same type with different syntax.

\[ \text{Id} = \lambda \alpha. \alpha \]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{int } \rightarrow \text{ bool} \\
\text{int } \rightarrow \text{ Id} \text{ bool} \\
\text{Id int } \rightarrow \text{ bool} \\
\text{Id int } \rightarrow \text{ Id} \text{ bool} \\
\text{Id (int } \rightarrow \text{ bool)} \\
\text{Id (Id (int } \rightarrow \text{ bool)}) \\
\end{array}
\]

Admits "wrong/bad/meaningless" types:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{bool int (Id bool) int bool (Id int)} \\
\end{array}
\]

Terms, Types, and Kinds, Oh My

Terms:

\[
e ::= c | x | \lambda x : \tau. e | e e | \Lambda \alpha. e | e [\tau]
\]

- atomic values (e.g., \(c\)) and operations (e.g., \(e + e\))
- compound values (e.g., \((x, v)) and operations (e.g., \(e .1\))
- value abstraction and application
- type abstraction and application
- classified by types (but not all terms have a type)

Types:

\[
\tau ::= \text{int} | \tau \rightarrow \tau | \alpha | \forall \alpha : \tau. \tau | \lambda \alpha : \tau. \tau | \tau\tau
\]

- atomic types (e.g., \(\text{int}\)) classify the terms that evaluate to atomic values
- compound types (e.g., \(\tau * \tau\)) classify the terms that evaluate to compound values
- function types \(\tau \rightarrow \tau\) classify the terms that evaluate to value abstractions
- universal types \(\forall \alpha . \tau\) classify the terms that evaluate to type abstractions
- type abstraction and application
- type abstractions do not classify terms, but can be applied to type arguments to form types that do classify terms
- classified by kinds (but not all types have a kind)
Terms, Types, and Kinds, Oh My

Types: $\tau ::= \text{int} | \tau \to \tau | \alpha | \forall \alpha. \tau | \lambda \alpha. \tau | \tau \tau$

- atomic types (e.g., int) classify the terms that evaluate to atomic values
- compound types (e.g., $\tau \to \tau$) classify the terms that evaluate to compound values
- function types $\tau \to \tau$ classify the terms that evaluate to value abstractions
- universal types $\forall \alpha. \tau$ classify the terms that evaluate to type abstractions
- type abstraction and application
  - type abstractions do not classify terms,
    but can be applied to type arguments
    to form types that do classify terms
  - classified by kinds (but not all types have a kind)

Kinds $\kappa ::= \star | \kappa \Rightarrow \kappa$

- kind of proper types $\star$ classify the types (that are the same as the kinds) that classify terms
- arrow kinds $\kappa \Rightarrow \kappa$ classify the types (that are the same as the kinds) that are type abstractions

Kind Examples

- $\star$
  - the kind of proper types
  - $\text{Bool}$, $\text{Bool} \to \text{Bool}$, ...

Kind Examples

- $\star$
  - the kind of proper types
  - $\text{Bool}$, $\text{Bool} \to \text{Bool}$, Maybe Bool, Maybe Bool $\to$ Maybe Bool, ...
- $\star \Rightarrow \star$
  - the kind of (unary) type operators
  - $\text{List}$, Maybe, ...

Kind Examples

- $\star$
  - the kind of proper types
  - $\text{Bool}$, $\text{Bool} \to \text{Bool}$, Maybe Bool, Maybe Bool $\to$ Maybe Bool, ...
- $\star \Rightarrow \star$
  - the kind of (unary) type operators
  - $\text{List}$, Maybe, ...
- $\star \Rightarrow \star \Rightarrow \star$
  - the kind of (binary) type operators
  - $\text{Either}$, $\text{Map}$, ...
Kind Examples

- * the kind of proper types
- Bool, Bool → Bool, Maybe Bool, Maybe Bool → Maybe Bool, ...
- * ⇒ *
- the kind of (unary) type operators
- List, Maybe, Map Int, Either (List Bool), ...
- * ⇒ * * ⇒ *
- the kind of (binary) type operators
- Either, Map, ...

Kind Examples

- * the kind of proper types
- Bool, Bool → Bool, Maybe Bool, Maybe Bool → Maybe Bool, ...
- * ⇒ *
- the kind of (unary) type operators
- List, Maybe, Map Int, Either (List Bool), ...
- * ⇒ * * ⇒ *
- the kind of (binary) type operators
- Either, Map, ...
- (* ⇒ *) ⇒ *
- the kind of higher-order type operators
taking unary type operators to proper types
- ???, ...

System F<sub>ω</sub>: Syntax

\[
e ::= c \mid x \mid \lambda x : \tau. e \mid e e \mid \Lambda \alpha : \kappa. e \mid e \mid \tau
\]

\[
v ::= c \mid \lambda x : \tau. e \mid \Lambda \alpha : \kappa. e
\]

\[\Gamma ::= \cdot \mid \Gamma, x : \tau\]

\[\tau ::= \text{int} \mid \tau \rightarrow \tau \mid \alpha \mid \forall \alpha : \kappa. \tau \mid \Lambda \alpha : \kappa. \tau \mid \tau \tau\]

\[\Delta ::= \cdot \mid \Delta, \alpha : \kappa\]

\[\kappa ::= * \mid \kappa \Rightarrow \kappa\]

New things:
- Types: type abstraction and type application
- Kinds: the “types” of types
- *: kind of proper types
- \(\kappa_a \Rightarrow \kappa_a: \) kind of type operators

System F<sub>ω</sub>: Operational Semantics

Small-step, call-by-value (CBV), left-to-right operational semantics:

\[
e \rightarrow_{cbv} e_f'\]

- \((\lambda x : \tau. e_b) v_a \rightarrow_{cbv} e_b[v_a / x] \]
- \(e_f \rightarrow_{cbv} e_f' \rightarrow_{cbv} e_f' e_a\)
- \(e_f e_a \rightarrow_{cbv} e_f e_a'\)
- \(e_f e_a' \rightarrow_{cbv} e_f e_a'\)
- \((\Lambda \alpha : \kappa_a. e_b) [\tau_a] \rightarrow_{cbv} e_b[\tau_a / \alpha]\)
- \(e_f [\tau_a] \rightarrow_{cbv} e_f [\tau_a]\)

- Unchanged! All of the new action is at the type-level.
System F\_ω: Type System, part 1
In the context \( \Delta \) the type \( \tau \) has kind \( \kappa \):
\[
\Delta \vdash \tau : \kappa
\]
\[
\Delta \vdash \text{int} : \ast
\]
\[
\Delta \vdash (\alpha) = \kappa
\]
\[
\Delta \vdash \alpha : \kappa
\]
\[
\Delta, \alpha :: \kappa_0 \vdash \tau_0 : \kappa_0
\]
\[
\Delta \vdash \lambda \alpha :: \kappa_0, \tau_0 :: \kappa_0 \Rightarrow \kappa_0
\]
Should look familiar:

System F\_ω: Type System, part 2

\( \tau \equiv \tau' \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\tau & \equiv \tau \\
\tau_2 & \equiv \tau_1 \\
\tau_1 & \equiv \tau_2 \\
\tau_3 & \equiv \tau_2 \\
\tau_a \equiv \tau_2 & \\
\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 & \\
\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 & \\
\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 & \\
\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 & \\
\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 & \\
\lambda \alpha :: \kappa_0, \tau_1 \equiv \lambda \alpha :: \kappa_0, \tau_2 \\
(\lambda \alpha :: \kappa_0, \tau_1) \equiv \tau_0[\alpha/\tau_0]
\end{align*}
\]
Should look familiar:

System F\_ω: Type System, part 3
In the contexts \( \Delta \) and \( \Gamma \) the expression \( e \) has type \( \tau' \):
\[
\Delta, \Gamma \vdash e : \tau
\]
\[
\Gamma(x) = \tau
\]
\[
\Delta, \Gamma \vdash x : \tau
\]
\[
\Delta, \Gamma \vdash e : \tau
\]
\[
\Delta, \alpha :: \kappa_0 \vdash \tau_a : \kappa_0
\]
\[
\Delta, \Gamma \vdash \lambda \alpha :: \kappa_0, \tau_a :: \kappa_0 \Rightarrow \kappa_0
\]
\[
\Delta, \Gamma \vdash \lambda \alpha :: \kappa_0, \tau_a :: \kappa_0 \Rightarrow \kappa_0
\]
\[
\Delta, \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau_a
\]
\[
\Delta, \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau_a
\]
\[
\Delta, \Gamma \vdash e_3 : \tau_a
\]
\[
(\lambda \alpha :: \kappa_0, \tau_1) \equiv \tau_0[\alpha/\tau_0]
\]
Syntax and type system easily extended with recursive and existential types.
Polymorphic List Library with higher-order existential

List library is an existential package:

\[
\text{pack}(\lambda \alpha :: \star. \mu \xi :: \star. \text{unit} + (\alpha \ast \xi), \text{list}_\alpha)
\]
as \(\exists L :: \star \Rightarrow \star\).

\{\text{empty} : \forall \alpha :: \star. L \alpha;
\text{cons} : \forall \alpha :: \star. \alpha \rightarrow L \alpha \rightarrow L \alpha;
\text{unlist} : \forall \alpha :: \star. L \alpha \rightarrow \text{unit} + (\alpha \ast L \alpha);
\text{map} : \forall \alpha :: \star. \forall \beta :: \star. (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow L \alpha \rightarrow L \beta;\}

The witness type operator is poly.list: \(\lambda \alpha :: \star. \mu \xi :: \star. \text{unit} + (\alpha \ast \xi)\).

The existential type operator variable \(L\) represents poly. lists.

List operations are polymorphic in element type.

The \text{map} function only allows mapping \(\alpha\) lists to \(\beta\) lists.

Other Kinds of Kinds

Kinding systems for checking and tracking properties of type expressions:

- Record kinds
- records at the type-level; define systems of mutually recursive types
- Polymorphic kinds
- kind abstraction and application in types; System F “one level up”
- Dependent kinds
- dependent types “one level up”
- Row kinds
- describe “pieces” of record types for record polymorphism
- Power kinds
- alternative presentation of subtyping
- Singleton kinds
- formalize module systems with type sharing

Metatheory

System \(F_\omega\) is type safe.

- Preservation:
  - Induction on typing derivation, using substitution lemmas:
    - Term Substitution:
      \[
      \text{if } \Delta_1, \Delta_2; \Gamma_1, x : \tau_x, \Gamma_2 \vdash e_1 : \tau \text{ and } \Delta_1; \Gamma_1 \vdash e_2 : \tau_{\nu},
      \text{ then } \Delta_1, \Delta_2; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash e_1[e_2/x] : \tau.
      \]
    - Type Substitution:
      \[
      \text{if } \Delta_1; \alpha : \kappa, \Delta_2 \vdash \tau_1 : \kappa \text{ and } \Delta_1 \vdash \tau_2 : \kappa,\kappa,
      \text{ then } \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash \tau_1[\tau_2/\alpha] : \kappa.
      \]
    - Type Substitution:
      \[
      \text{if } \tau_1 \equiv \tau_2, \text{ then } \tau_1[\tau/\alpha] \equiv \tau_2[\tau/\alpha].
      \]
    - Type Substitution:
      \[
      \text{if } \Delta_1; \alpha : \kappa, \Delta_2; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash e_1 : \tau \text{ and } \Delta_1 \vdash \tau_2 : \kappa,
      \text{ then } \Delta_1, \Delta_2; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2[\tau_2/\alpha] \vdash e_1[\tau_2/\alpha] : \tau.
      \]
- All straightforward inductions, using various weakening and exchange lemmas.

Definitional Equivalence and Parallel Reduction

Parallel Reduction of \(\tau\) to \(\tau'\):

\[
\tau \Rightarrow \tau'
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\tau_1 \Rightarrow \tau_2 & \quad \tau_1 \Rightarrow \tau_2 \\
\tau_1 \Rightarrow \tau_1 & \quad \tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau_2 \\
\Delta_1; \tau_1 \Rightarrow \Delta_1; \tau_2 & \quad \Delta_1; \tau_2 \Rightarrow \Delta_1; \tau_1 \\
\lambda \alpha :: \kappa, \tau_1 \Rightarrow \lambda \alpha :: \kappa, \tau_2 & \quad \tau_1 \Rightarrow \tau_2 \\
\tau_1 \Rightarrow \tau_2 & \quad \tau_1 \Rightarrow \tau_2 \\
\end{align*}
\]

A more “computational” relation.
Definitional Equivalence and Parallel Reduction

Key properties:

- Transitive and symmetric closure of parallel reduction and type equivalence coincide:
  \[ \tau \rightleftharpoons^* \tau' \text{ if } \tau \equiv \tau' \]

- Parallel reduction has the Church-Rosser property:
  \[ \tau \rightleftharpoons^* \tau_1 \text{ and } \tau \rightleftharpoons^* \tau_2, \]
  then there exists \( \tau' \) such that \( \tau_1 \rightleftharpoons^* \tau' \) and \( \tau_2 \rightleftharpoons^* \tau' \)

- Equivalent types share a common reduct:
  \[ \tau_1 \equiv \tau_2, \text{ then there exists } \tau' \text{ such that } \tau_1 \rightleftharpoons^* \tau' \text{ and } \tau_2 \rightleftharpoons^* \tau' \]

- Reduction preserves shapes:
  \[ \text{If } \int \rightleftharpoons^* \tau', \text{ then } \tau' = \text{int} \]
  \[ \text{If } \tau_a \rightarrow \tau \rightleftharpoons^* \tau', \text{ then } \tau' = \tau_a' \rightarrow \tau_r' \text{ and } \tau_a \rightleftharpoons^* \tau_a' \text{ and } \tau_r \rightleftharpoons^* \tau_r' \]
  \[ \text{If } \forall \alpha : \kappa. \tau_r \rightleftharpoons^* \tau', \text{ then } \tau' = \forall \alpha : \kappa. \tau_r' \text{ and } \tau_r \rightleftharpoons^* \tau_r' \]

---

Canonical Forms

If \( \vdash v : \tau_a \rightarrow \tau_r \), then \( v = \lambda x : \tau_a. e_b \).

Proof:

By cases on the form of \( v \):
Metatheory

System $F_\omega$ is type safe.

Where was the $\Delta \vdash \tau :: \kappa$ judgement used in the proof?

In Type Substitution lemmas, but only in an inessential way.

After weeks of thinking about type systems, kinding seems natural; but kinding is not required for type safety!
System $F_w$ without Kinds / System F with Type-Level Abstraction and Application

\[ e ::= c \mid x \mid \lambda x : \tau . e \mid e \mid \Lambda \alpha . e \mid e \ [\tau] \]
\[ v ::= e \mid \lambda x : \tau . e \mid \Lambda \alpha . e \]
\[ \tau ::= \text{int} \mid \tau \rightarrow \tau \mid \alpha \mid \forall \alpha . \tau \mid \lambda \alpha . \tau \mid \tau \tau \]
\[ \Delta ::= \cdot \mid \Delta, \alpha \]
\[ \Gamma ::= \cdot \mid \Gamma, x : \tau \]
\[ \Delta \vdash \tau ::= \]

Check that free type variables of $\tau$ are in $\Delta$, but nothing else.

System $F_w$ without Kinds / System F with Type-Level Abstraction and Application

This language is type safe.

System $F_w$ without Kinds / System F with Type-Level Abstraction and Application

\[ e ::= c \mid x \mid \lambda x : \tau . e \mid e \mid \Lambda \alpha . e \mid e \ [\tau] \]
\[ v ::= e \mid \lambda x : \tau . e \mid \Lambda \alpha . e \]
\[ \tau ::= \text{int} \mid \tau \rightarrow \tau \mid \alpha \mid \forall \alpha . \tau \mid \lambda \alpha . \tau \mid \tau \tau \]
\[ \Delta ::= \cdot \mid \Delta, \alpha \]
\[ \Gamma ::= \cdot \mid \Gamma, x : \tau \]
\[ \Delta \vdash \tau ::= \]

System $F_w$ without Kinds / System F with Type-Level Abstraction and Application

\[ e \rightarrow \text{cbv} e' \]
\[ (\lambda x : \tau . e) \rightarrow \text{cbv} e[\alpha/x] \]
\[ e[f] \rightarrow \text{cbv} e'_f \]
\[ e \rightarrow \text{cbv} e \]
\[ e[f] \rightarrow \text{cbv} e'_f \]

\[ (\Lambda \alpha . e_0) \rightarrow \text{cbv} e_0[\alpha/\tau_0] \]
\[ e[f] \rightarrow \text{cbv} e'_f \]
\[ (\tau_0) \rightarrow \text{cbv} e'_f[\tau_0] \]

[Diagram showing type inference rules and type-checking conditions for System F with Type-Level Abstraction and Application]
System F\textsubscript{ω} without Kinds / System F with Type-Level Abstraction and Application

This language is type safe.

- Preservation:
  - Induction on typing derivation, using substitution lemmas:
    - Term Substitution:
      - if $\Delta_1, \Delta_2; \Gamma_1, x : \tau_x, \Gamma_2 \vdash e_1 : \tau$ and $\Delta_1, \Gamma_1 \vdash e_2 : \tau_x$, then $\Delta_1, \Delta_2; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash e_1[e_2/x] : \tau$.
    - Type Substitution:
      - if $\Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash \tau_1 :: \check{\check{\check{\phantom{\cdot}}}}$ and $\Delta_1 \vdash \tau_2 :: \check{\check{\check{\phantom{\cdot}}}}$, then $\Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash \tau_1[\tau_2/\alpha] :: \check{\check{\check{\phantom{\cdot}}}}$.
    - Type Substitution:
      - if $\tau_1 \equiv \tau_2$, then $\tau_1[\tau/\alpha] \equiv \tau_2[\tau/\alpha]$.
    - Type Substitution:
      - if $\Delta_1, \Delta_2; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash e_1 : \tau$ and $\Delta_1 \vdash \tau_2 :: \check{\check{\check{\phantom{\cdot}}}}$, then $\Delta_1, \Delta_2; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2[\tau_2/\alpha] \vdash e_1[\tau_2/\alpha] : \tau$.
  - All straightforward inductions, using various weakening and exchange lemmas.

- Progress:
  - Induction on typing derivation, using canonical form lemmas:
    - E.g., to show that the “natural” type of the function expression in an application is equivalent to an arrow type:
      
      
      
      
      
      
    - All straightforward inductions, using various weakening and exchange lemmas.
Why Kinds?

Why aren’t kinds required for type safety?
Recall statement of type safety:

If \( \cdot ; \cdot \vdash e : \tau \), then \( e \) does not get stuck.

The typing derivation \( \cdot ; \cdot \vdash e : \tau \)
includes definitional-equivalence sub-derivations \( \tau \equiv \tau' \),
which are explicit evidence that \( \tau \) and \( \tau' \) are the same.

Definitional equivalence (\( \tau \equiv \tau' \)) and parallel reduction (\( \tau \Rightarrow \tau' \))
do not require well-kinded types
(although they preserve the kinds of well-kinded types).

Type (and kind) erasure means that “wrong/bad/meaningless” types
do not affect run-time behavior.

- Ill-kinded types can’t make well-typed terms get stuck.

Why Kinds?

Kinds aren’t for type safety:
- Because a typing derivation (even with ill-kinded types),
carries enough evidence to guarantee that expressions don’t get stuck.

Kinds are for type checking:
- Because programmers write programs, not typing derivations.
- Because type checkers are algorithms.

Recall the statement of type checking:

Given \( \Delta \), \( \Gamma \), and \( e \), does there exist \( \tau \) such that \( \Delta ; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \).

Two issues:
- \( \Delta ; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \equiv \tau' \quad \Delta \vdash \tau' :: \kappa \)
is a non-syntax-directed rule
- \( \tau \equiv \tau' \) is a non-syntax-directed relation
One non-issue:
- \( \Delta \vdash \tau :: \kappa \) is a syntax-directed relation (STLC “one level up”)
Type Checking for System $F_\omega$

Remove non-syntax-directed rules and relations:

$\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$

$\Gamma(x) = \tau$

$\Delta, \Gamma \vdash x : \tau$

$\Delta ; \tau_a :: \star$

$\Delta; \Gamma; x : \tau_a \vdash e_b : \tau_r$

$\Delta; \Gamma ; \lambda x.\tau_a.\ e_b : \tau_a \rightarrow \tau_r$

$\Delta ; \alpha : \kappa_a ; \Gamma \vdash \tau_a : \tau_r$

$\Delta; \Gamma \vdash \lambda \alpha.\ \tau_a : \kappa_a ; \forall \alpha : \tau_r$

$\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e_f : \tau_f$

$\tau_f \gg \gamma$

$\tau_f' = \tau_{fa} \rightarrow \tau_{fr}'$

$\tau_{fa} = \tau_{fr}$

$\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e_f \ e_a : \tau_{fr}$

$\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e_f : \tau_f$

$\tau_f \gg \gamma$

$\tau_f' = \forall \alpha : \kappa_a \cdot \tau_{fr}$

$\Delta ; \kappa_a :: \kappa_a$

$\Delta; \Gamma \vdash \tau_a :: \kappa_a$

$\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e_f : \tau_{fa} :: \tau_{fr} / \tau_a / \alpha$

---

Type Checking for System $F_\omega$

Kinds are for type checking.

Given $\Delta$, $\Gamma$, and $e$, does there exist $\tau$ such that $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$.

Metatheory for kind system:

- Well-kinded types don’t get stuck.
  - If $\Delta \vdash \tau :: \kappa$ and $\tau \gg \gamma \tau'$, then either $\tau'$ is in (weak-head) normal form (i.e., a type-level “value”) or $\tau' \gg \gamma \tau''$.
  - Proofs by Progress and Preservation on kinding and parallel reduction derivations.
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Type Checking for System $F_\omega$

Kinds are for type checking.

Given $\Delta$, $\Gamma$, and $e$, does there exist $\tau$ such that $\Delta;\Gamma \vdash e : \tau$.

Metatheory for kind system:

- Well-kinded types don’t get stuck.
  - If $\Delta \vdash \tau :: \kappa$ and $\tau \Rightarrow^* \tau'$,
    then either $\tau'$ is in (weak-head) normal form (i.e., a type-level “value”) or $\tau' \Rightarrow \tau''$.
  - But, irrelevant for type checking of expressions.
- Well-kinded types terminate.
  - If $\Delta \vdash \tau :: \kappa$, then there exists $\tau'$ such that $\tau \Rightarrow^0 \tau'$.
  - Proof is similar to that of termination of STLC.

Type checking for System $F_\omega$ is decidable.

Going Further

This is just the tip of an iceberg.

- Pure type systems
  - Why stop at three levels of expressions (terms, types, and kinds)?
  - Allow abstraction and application at the level of kinds, and introduce sorts to classify kinds.
  - Why stop at four levels of expressions?
  - ...
  - “For programming languages, however, three levels have proved sufficient.”