# CS 4110

# Programming Languages & Logics

Lecture 27 Recursive Types

#### **Recursive Types**

Many languages support data types that refer to themselves:

#### Java

```
class Tree {
   Tree leftChild, rightChild;
   int data;
}
```

#### Recursive Types

Many languages support data types that refer to themselves:

#### Java

```
class Tree {
   Tree leftChild, rightChild;
   int data;
}
```

#### **OCaml**

```
type tree = Leaf | Node of tree * tree * int
```

#### **Recursive Types**

Many languages support data types that refer to themselves:

#### Java

```
class Tree {
   Tree leftChild, rightChild;
   int data;
}
```

#### **OCaml**

```
type tree = Leaf | Node of tree * tree * int
```

#### $\lambda$ -calculus?

```
tree = unit + int \times tree \times tree
```

#### Recursive Type Equations

We would like **tree** to be a solution of the equation:

$$\alpha = \mathbf{unit} + \mathbf{int} \times \alpha \times \alpha$$

However, no such solution exists with the types we have so far...

$$\alpha = \mathbf{unit} + \mathbf{int} \times \alpha \times \alpha$$

$$\begin{split} \alpha &= \mathbf{unit} + \mathbf{int} \times \alpha \times \alpha \\ &= \mathbf{unit} + \mathbf{int} \times \\ &\quad (\mathbf{unit} + \mathbf{int} \times \alpha \times \alpha) \times \\ &\quad (\mathbf{unit} + \mathbf{int} \times \alpha \times \alpha) \end{split}$$

```
\alpha = \mathsf{unit} + \mathsf{int} \times \alpha \times \alpha
   = unit + int\times
                 (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha)\times
                 (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha)
   = unit + int\times
                 (unit + int\times
                          (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha)\times
                          (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha))\times
                 (unit + int\times
                          (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha)\times
                          (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha))
```

```
\alpha = \mathsf{unit} + \mathsf{int} \times \alpha \times \alpha
   = unit + int\times
                 (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha)\times
                 (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha)
   = unit + int\times
                 (unit + int\times
                          (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha)\times
                          (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha)) \times
                 (unit + int\times
                          (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha)\times
                          (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha))
```

We could *unwind* the equation:

```
\alpha = \mathsf{unit} + \mathsf{int} \times \alpha \times \alpha
   = unit + int\times
                 (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha)\times
                 (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha)
   = unit + int\times
                 (unit + int\times
                          (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha)\times
                          (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha))\times
                 (unit + int\times
                          (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha)\times
                          (unit + int \times \alpha \times \alpha))
```

If we take the limit of this process, we have an infinite tree.

#### Infinite Types

Think of this as an infinite labeled graph whose nodes are labeled with the type constructors  $\times$ , +, **int**, and **unit**.

This infinite tree is a solution of our equation, and this is what we take as the type **tree**.

#### $\mu$ Types

We'll specify potentially-infinite solutions to type equations using a finite syntax based on the *fixed-point type constructor*  $\mu$ .

 $\mu\alpha$ .  $\tau$ 

#### $\mu$ Types

We'll specify potentially-infinite solutions to type equations using a finite syntax based on the *fixed-point type constructor*  $\mu$ .

$$\mu\alpha.\tau$$

Here's a **tree** type satisfying our original equation:

tree 
$$\triangleq \mu \alpha$$
. unit  $+$  int  $\times \alpha \times \alpha$ .

(

### Static Semantics (Equirecursive)

We'll define two treatments of recursive types. With *equirecursive types*, a recursive type is equal to its unfolding:

$$\mu\alpha$$
.  $\tau$  is a solution to  $\alpha=\tau$ , so:

$$\mu\alpha. \tau = \tau \{\mu\alpha. \tau/\alpha\}$$

### Static Semantics (Equirecursive)

We'll define two treatments of recursive types. With *equirecursive types*, a recursive type is equal to its unfolding:

 $\mu\alpha$ .  $\tau$  is a solution to  $\alpha=\tau$ , so:

$$\mu\alpha. \tau = \tau \{\mu\alpha. \tau/\alpha\}$$

Two typing rules let us switch between folded and unfolded:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \tau\{\mu\alpha.\,\tau/\alpha\}}{\Gamma \vdash e : \mu\alpha.\,\tau} \; \mu\text{-Intro}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{e} : \mu\alpha.\,\tau}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{e} : \tau\{\mu\alpha.\,\tau/\alpha\}}\;\mu\text{-ELIM}$$

### **Isorecursive Types**

Alternatively, isorecursive types avoid infinite type trees.

The type  $\mu\alpha$ .  $\tau$  is distinct but transformable to and from  $\tau\{\mu\alpha,\tau/\alpha\}$ .

#### Isorecursive Types

Alternatively, isorecursive types avoid infinite type trees.

The type  $\mu\alpha$ .  $\tau$  is distinct but transformable to and from  $\tau\{\mu\alpha$ .  $\tau/\alpha\}$ .

Converting between the two uses explicit **fold** and **unfold** operations:

$$\mathbf{unfold}_{\mu\alpha.\,\tau} : \mu\alpha.\,\tau \to \tau\{\mu\alpha.\,\tau/\alpha\}$$
$$\mathbf{fold}_{\mu\alpha.\,\tau} : \tau\{\mu\alpha.\,\tau/\alpha\} \to \mu\alpha.\,\tau$$

#### Static Semantics (Isorecursive)

The typing rules introduce and eliminate  $\mu$ -types:

$$\begin{split} \frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \tau\{\mu\alpha.\,\tau/\alpha\}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{fold}\,e : \mu\alpha.\,\tau} \; & \mu\text{-INTRO} \\ \frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \mu\alpha.\,\tau}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{unfold}\,e : \tau\{\mu\alpha.\,\tau/\alpha\}} \; & \mu\text{-ELIM} \end{split}$$

#### **Dynamic Semantics**

We also need to augment the operational semantics:

$$\overline{\operatorname{unfold}\left(\operatorname{fold}e\right)
ightarrow e}$$

Intuitively, to access data in a recursive type  $\mu\alpha$ .  $\tau$ , we need to **unfold** it first. And the only way that values of type  $\mu\alpha$ .  $\tau$  could have been created is via **fold**.

### Example

Here's a recursive type for lists of numbers:

$$\mathbf{intlist} \triangleq \mu \alpha. \, \mathbf{unit} + \mathbf{int} \times \alpha.$$

#### Example

Here's a recursive type for lists of numbers:

$$\mathbf{intlist} \triangleq \mu \alpha. \, \mathbf{unit} + \mathbf{int} \times \alpha.$$

Here's how to add up the elements of an **intlist**:

Recursive types let us encode the natural numbers!

Recursive types let us encode the natural numbers!

A natural number is either 0 or the successor of a natural number:

$$\mathsf{nat} \triangleq \mu \alpha.\,\mathsf{unit} + \alpha$$

Recursive types let us encode the natural numbers!

A natural number is either 0 or the successor of a natural number:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{nat} \triangleq \mu \alpha. \, \mathbf{unit} + \alpha \\ & \mathbf{0} \triangleq \mathbf{fold} \, \big( \mathbf{inl_{unit+nat}} \, \big( \big) \big) \end{aligned}$$

Recursive types let us encode the natural numbers!

A natural number is either 0 or the successor of a natural number:

```
\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{nat} \triangleq \mu \alpha. \, \mathbf{unit} + \alpha \\ & 0 \triangleq \mathbf{fold} \, (\mathsf{inl_{unit+nat}} \, ()) \\ & 1 \triangleq \mathbf{fold} \, (\mathsf{inr_{unit+nat}} \, 0) \\ & 2 \triangleq \mathbf{fold} \, (\mathsf{inr_{unit+nat}} \, 1), \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}
```

Recursive types let us encode the natural numbers!

A natural number is either 0 or the successor of a natural number:

```
\begin{aligned} & \text{nat} \triangleq \mu \alpha. \, \text{unit} + \alpha \\ & \text{0} \triangleq \text{fold} \, (\text{inl}_{\text{unit+nat}} \, ()) \\ & \text{1} \triangleq \text{fold} \, (\text{inr}_{\text{unit+nat}} \, 0) \\ & \text{2} \triangleq \text{fold} \, (\text{inr}_{\text{unit+nat}} \, 1), \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}
```

The successor function has type  $\mathbf{nat} \to \mathbf{nat}$ :

$$(\lambda x : \mathbf{nat.} \ \mathbf{fold} \ (\mathsf{inr}_{\mathbf{unit}+\mathbf{nat}} \ x))$$

Recall  $\Omega$  defined as:

$$\omega \triangleq \lambda x. x x$$

$$\Omega \triangleq \omega \omega$$
.

 $\Omega$  was impossible to type... until now!

Recall  $\Omega$  defined as:

$$\omega \triangleq \lambda x. x x$$

$$\Omega \triangleq \omega \ \omega$$
.

 $\Omega$  was impossible to type... until now!

*x* is a function. Let's say it has the type  $\sigma \to \tau$ .

Recall  $\Omega$  defined as:

$$\omega \triangleq \lambda x. x x$$

$$\Omega \triangleq \omega \ \omega$$
.

 $\Omega$  was impossible to type... until now!

*x* is a function. Let's say it has the type  $\sigma \to \tau$ .

x is used as the argument to this function, so it must have type  $\sigma$ .

Recall  $\Omega$  defined as:

$$\omega \triangleq \lambda x. x x$$

$$\Omega \triangleq \omega \ \omega$$
.

 $\Omega$  was impossible to type... until now!

*x* is a function. Let's say it has the type  $\sigma \to \tau$ .

x is used as the argument to this function, so it must have type  $\sigma$ .

So let's write a type equation:

$$\sigma = \sigma \to \tau$$

Putting these pieces together, the fully typed  $\omega$  term is:

$$\omega \triangleq \lambda x : \mu \alpha. (\alpha \rightarrow \tau). (\mathbf{unfold} x) x$$

Putting these pieces together, the fully typed  $\omega$  term is:

$$\omega \triangleq \lambda x : \mu \alpha. (\alpha \rightarrow \tau). (unfold x) x$$

The type of  $\omega$  is  $(\mu\alpha.(\alpha \to \tau)) \to \tau$ .

So the type of **fold**  $\omega$  is  $\mu\alpha$ . ( $\alpha \to \tau$ ).

Putting these pieces together, the fully typed  $\omega$  term is:

$$\omega \triangleq \lambda x : \mu \alpha. (\alpha \rightarrow \tau). (unfold x) x$$

The type of  $\omega$  is  $(\mu\alpha.(\alpha \to \tau)) \to \tau$ .

So the type of **fold**  $\omega$  is  $\mu\alpha$ . ( $\alpha \to \tau$ ).

Now we can define  $\Omega = \omega$  (**fold**  $\omega$ ). It has type  $\tau$ .

#### We can even write $\omega$ in OCaml:

```
# type u = Fold of (u -> u);;
type u = Fold of (u -> u)
# let omega = fun x -> match x with Fold f -> f x;;
val omega : u -> u = <fun>
# omega (Fold omega);;
...runs forever until you hit control-c
```

# Encoding $\lambda$ -Calculus

With recursive types, we can type everything in the untyped lambda calculus!

#### Encoding $\lambda$ -Calculus

With recursive types, we can type everything in the untyped lambda calculus!

Every  $\lambda$ -term can be applied as a function to any other  $\lambda$ -term. So let's define an "untyped" type:

$$U \triangleq \mu \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

### Encoding $\lambda$ -Calculus

With recursive types, we can type everything in the untyped lambda calculus!

Every  $\lambda$ -term can be applied as a function to any other  $\lambda$ -term. So let's define an "untyped" type:

$$U \triangleq \mu \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

The full translation is:

$$\llbracket x \rrbracket \triangleq x$$
 $\llbracket e_0 e_1 \rrbracket \triangleq (\mathbf{unfold} \llbracket e_0 \rrbracket) \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket$ 
 $\llbracket \lambda x. e \rrbracket \triangleq \mathbf{fold} \ \lambda x : U. \llbracket e \rrbracket$ 

Every untyped term maps to a term of type U.