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## A domain-specific language for typecheckers

An experiment in how to write typecheckers that make (more) sense.

Similar endeavours: Andromeda [Bauer, Haselwarter and Petkovic 2020], Redex [Felleisen, Findler and Flatt 2009], Turnstyle+ [Chang, Ballantyne, Turner and Bowman], ...

However we try to minimise demands on the order in which subproblems are solved.

Conor McBride, 20 years ago implementing Epigram 1:
"[redacted] me, I'm implementing an operating system!"

Concrete motivation: implementing a type theory with rich equational theory for free monoids and free Abelian groups.
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## Why not just a shallow embedding?

Logical Framework aspects: we implement syntax with binding once, and then it Just Works.

Resumptions should be updatable: progress might have happened while a process was asleep.

Ruling out design errors by construction: a first-order representation means we can do static analysis on the typecheckers themselves.
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## Syntax descriptions

We support a Lisp-style generic syntax for terms:

- atoms 'a
$>$ cons lists $\left[\begin{array}{llll}t_{0} & t_{1} & \ldots & t_{n}\end{array}\right]$
- variables $x$ and bindings $\backslash x . t$

Simple and uniform to write and parse.
Users can restrict the shape of terms using context-free syntax descriptions. We always offer a Wildcard description allowing anything.

There is a syntax description of syntax descriptions, which we use to check syntax descriptions.
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## Judgement forms as interaction protocols

We recast the notion of judgement form as communication protocol:

- What to communicate (of what syntax description)?
- In which direction (input or output)?

A basic form of session types [Honda 1993].
For example:

```
type : ?'Type.
check : ?'Type. ?'Check.
synth : ?'Synth. !'Type.
```
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## Typing rules as actors

"A rule is a server for its conclusion, and a client for its premises."
That is: typing rules are implemented by actors, which

- must fulfill their protocol with respect to their parent;
- typically spawns children processes for all its premises.

Inspired by the actor model [Hewitt, Bishop and Steiger 1973] of concurrent programming.

Typechecking process actor with parent channel $p$ is defined by
actor@p = . . .

## Actor constructs: winning

(Victory is silent.)

## Actor constructs: failing

## \# "error message" <br> an unsuccessful, finished actor

## Actor constructs: printing

## PRINTF "message text".

printing a message before continuing
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## $s d ? X$.

generate a fresh meta $X$ of syntax description sd

Meta variables stand for unknown terms.
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## Actor constructs: matching on terms

## caset $\left\{p_{1}->a_{1} ; \ldots\right\}$

match term $t$ against patterns $p_{i}$; continue as actor $a_{i}$ when matching

Blocks if $t$ is a metavariable.
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## Actor constructs: forking

## $a \mid b$

continue as a and b in parallel

Progress in b might enable further progress in a and vice versa.

## Actor constructs: declaring constraints

## $t_{1} \sim t_{2}$

make $t_{1}$ unify with $t_{2}$

## Actor constructs: spawning children

## actor@p.

spawn a new child actor on channel $p$
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## Actor constructs: sending and receiving messages

$p!t$.<br>send term $t$ on channel $p$

$p ? t$.
receive term $t$ on channel $p$

Messages must conform to $p$ 's protocol.

## Actor constructs: binding local variables

$$
\backslash x .
$$

bring fresh object variable $x$ into scope

## Actor constructs: extending local contexts

$$
\operatorname{ctx} \mid-x \rightarrow t
$$

extend declared context ctx to map object variable $x$ to term $t$

## Actor constructs: querying local contexts

## if $x \operatorname{in} \operatorname{ctx}\{t \rightarrow a\}$ else $b$ <br> Look up variable $x$ in declared context ctx; if found, bind associated value as $t$ and continue as $a$, otherwise continue as $b$

## Actors for bidirectional type checking of STLC

```
check@p = p?ty. p?tm. case tm
    { ['Lam \x. body] -> 'Type?S. 'Type?T.
    ( ty ~ ['Arr S T]
    | \x. ctxt |- x -> S. check@q. q!T. q!body.)
    ; ['Emb e] -> synth@q. q!e. q?S. S ~ ty }
synth@p = p?tm. if tm in ctxt
    { S -> p!S. }
    else case tm
    { ['Ann t T] -> ( type@q. q!T.
                                    | check@r. r!T. r!t.
                                    | p!T. )
    ; ['App f s] -> 'Type?S. 'Type?T. p!T.
            ( synth@q. q!f. q?F. F ~ ['Arr S T]
            | check@r. r!S. r!s.) }
```
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## Executing actors

We currently run actors on a stack-based virtual machine.
We run each actor until it blocks, and then try the next one, until execution stabilises.

Metavariables are shared, which is okay, since they are updated monotonically [Kuper 2015].

We can extract a typing derivation from the final configuration of the stack.
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## Summary and future work

TypOS is an domain-specific language for writing typecheckers.
Judgements have modes (input/output protocols), typing rules are actors (spawning and communicating with children).

A wide range of typechecking, evaluation and elaboration processes can be implemented this way.

In the future: a truly concurrent runtime.
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