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Abstract
Languages with rich type systems are beginning to employ a blend of type inference and type checking, so that the type inference engine is guided by programmer-supplied type annotations. In this paper we show, for the first time, how to combine the virtues of two well-established ideas: unification-based inference, and bidirectional propagation of type annotations. The result is a type system that conservatively extends Hindley-Milner, and yet supports both higher-rank types and impredicativity.

Categories and Subject Descriptors D.3.3 [PROGRAMMING LANGUAGES]: Language Constructs and Features—abstract data types, polymorphism

General Terms impredicativity, higher-rank types, type inference

1. Introduction
Consider the following function:

\[
f \text{get} = (\text{get}[1,2], \text{get}[\text{a}',\text{b}',\text{c}'])
\]

The argument \text{get} is applied to a list of \text{Int} and to a list of \text{Char}, so \text{get} would have to be polymorphic for this program to typecheck. The Hindley-Milner type system [13] rejects this program because it requires that function arguments have monomorphic types. However, suppose we add a type annotation:

\[
f :: (\forall a. [a] \rightarrow a) \rightarrow (\text{Int}, \text{Char})
\]

f get = (get [1,2], get ['a','b','c'])

Then it is plain as a pikestaff what polymorphic type to attribute to \text{get}! This observation leads to the following simple idea: exploit type annotations to guide a simple inference algorithm to find types for programs that would be untypeable by Hindley-Milner.

We have two particular extensions in mind. The first is higher-rank types; that is, types with \forall quantifiers nested inside function types. They have already proved to be extremely useful in practice: not many programs need them, but when they are needed they are absolutely indispensable (e.g. [8, 22]).

However, higher-rank types are not enough! Consider the following variation:

\[
g :: \text{Maybe} (\forall a. [a] \rightarrow a) \rightarrow (\text{Int}, \text{Char})
g \text{Nothing} = (0, '0')
g (\text{Just get}) = (\text{get}[1,2], \text{get}[\text{a}',\text{b}',\text{c}'])
\]

Here, the polymorphic function is wrapped in a \text{Maybe} type, an ordinary algebraic data type whose declaration looks like this:

\[
data \text{Maybe} a = \text{Nothing} | \text{Just a}
\]

In the Hindley-Milner type system, type variables range only over monotypes, but to allow function \text{g} we must allow a type variable—a, in the definition of \text{Maybe}—to be instantiated with a polytype. In the jargon, we need an impredicative type system, whereas Hindley-Milner is predicative.

In this paper we show how to support both higher-rank types and impredicativity, using programmer type annotations to guide unification-based type inference. Specifically:

- We give a type system for source programs that include type annotations, higher rank types, and impredicativity (Section 3). Its key innovation is the notion of a boxy type, which expresses the direction of information flow in an inference algorithm.
- Our type system is a conservative extension of the Hindley-Milner type system (Section 4.5). It is also expressive: any System F program can be written in our language, through the addition of type annotations (Section 4.3).
- The type system has a relatively simple inference algorithm, namely a modest extension of the well-known Damas-Milner type inference algorithm (Section 5). We have proven that this algorithm is sound and complete.
- To significantly reduce the burden of type annotations for practical programming, we present a refinement of our basic type system, in Section 6.

We believe that this paper is the first to combine the virtues of unification-based type inference with bidirectional propagation of known types. The idea of combining the two has been around in the folklore for a few years, but formalising it is tricky, and constitutes our main contribution. We discuss related work in Section 8.

We have concrete evidence that our inference algorithm is, as claimed, a modest extension of the conventional Damas-Milner algorithm: we have fully implemented it in the Glasgow Haskell Compiler (GHC), the world’s leading Haskell compiler. The changes required were modest and non-invasive, even though GHC already embodies an extremely complicated type system that includes higher-kindred type variables, multi-parameter type classes, functional dependencies, overlapping instances, implicit parameters, template meta-programming, and more. In particular, we found no difficulty in combining the boxy types of this paper with
the wobbly types of our companion paper about type inference for GADTs [18].

2. The key ideas of this paper

In this section we briefly introduce the main ideas of the type system. Section 3 follows immediately, and fills in the missing details.

Our "gold standard" for expressiveness is System F, whose types have the form:

$$\sigma ::= a | \sigma_1 \rightarrow \sigma_2 | \forall a. \sigma | [\sigma] | \text{Int}$$

Here we extend classical System F with list and integer types, the former being written with square brackets. Unlike the Hindley-Milner system, a $\forall$ quantifier can be nested inside a function type. Furthermore, in System F a polymorphic function can be called at a polymorphic type. For example, if

$$\text{length} :: \forall a. [a] \rightarrow \text{Int}$$
$$\text{id}s :: [\forall c. c \rightarrow c]$$

then the term $(\text{length} \ (\forall c. c \rightarrow c) \ \text{id} \ a)$ instantiates $\text{length}$ at the polymorphic type $\forall c. c \rightarrow c$. This, too, is not permitted by the Hindley-Milner system.

Why does Hindley-Milner prohibit these constructs? Because the System F is an explicitly-typed language, whereas Hindley-Milner is implicitly typed. Specifically, in System F $(\forall a)$ every binder is annotated with its type and $(\forall a)$ type abstractions and applications are explicit. In contrast, in the Hindley-Milner type system, binders are not required to be typed, and type abstractions and applications are simply omitted. One can regard type inference as the process of inferring the missing annotations, type abstractions and type applications.

2.1 Higher rank types

The restrictions of the Hindley-Milner system make type inference tractable. Recall the example from the Introduction:

$$f \ \text{get} = (\text{get} \ [1,2], \ \text{get} \ ['a','b','c'])$$

Without assistance, it is hard to figure out what type to attribute to $\text{get}$. Should it be $\forall a. [a] \rightarrow a$? Or $\forall a. [a] \rightarrow \text{Int}$? Or some other type? There is no most general type, so we cannot perform modular type inference; that is, we cannot infer a single type for $f$ to use throughout its scope. Choosing either of the above types for the argument is sound, but once we commit to one we cannot apply $f$ to arguments with the other type.

It is very hard to "guess" a suitable type for $f$ by looking at its occurrences. Yet, that is exactly how unification-based type inference works—but it only works because the "guessed" types, such as function arguments, are all monotypes. This observation is so important that we elevate it to a design principle:

**Principle 1 (Guessing)** Type inference can "guess" a monotype, but should not "guess" a polytype.

There are more sophisticated type-inference algorithms that can, in some cases, guess polymtypes (e.g. $[7]$). However, if we can arrange that only monotypes need to be guessed, then a relatively simple type inference algorithm might—indeed, does—suffice.

In particular, the need for "guessing" is obviated if the programmer supplies a type signature:

$$f :: (\forall a. [a] \rightarrow a) \rightarrow (\text{Int}, \text{Char})$$
$$f \ \text{get} = (\text{get} \ [1,2], \ \text{get} \ ['a','b','c'])$$

Now, the problem reduces to type checking. The programmer has, in effect, supplied the type for $\text{get}$, and that allows us to check the body of $f$ without difficulty. That suggests our first main (well-known) technique:

**Idea 1:** propagate contextual type information inwards, to give polymorphic types to binders.

The standard way to express this idea is called local type inference [19]. In local type inference there are two judgements forms instead of one: $\Gamma \vdash t : \tau$ and $\Gamma \vdash t : \tau$. The former means "infer the type of $t$", while the latter means "check that $t$ has the known type $\tau$". Operationally, we think of $\tau$ as an output of the first judgement, but as an input to the second.

The separation between checking mode and inference modes allows us to assign higher-rank types to functions while still satisfying Principle 1. The idea is that the bound variable of a lambda can be given a polytype if we are in checking mode, but only a monotype in inference mode:

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash y : \tau}{\Gamma, x : \tau \vdash y : \sigma} \text{ABS1}$$
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \check{y} : t : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \check{y} : (t : \tau)} \text{SIG}$$

Furthermore function applications are another rich source of contextual type information. For example, if

$$f : ((\forall a. a \rightarrow a) \rightarrow \text{Int}) \rightarrow \text{Int}$$

then in the application $(f \ (\forall x. t))$, we should be able to give $x$ the polytype $\forall a. a \rightarrow a$, in $t$.

2.2 Impredicativity

A similar line of reasoning applies to impredicativity. In Haskell, programmers do not write type applications, so the type arguments of a polymorphic function must be inferred. Consider again the function $\text{length} \ of \ type \ \forall a. [a] \rightarrow \text{Int}$. How can we figure out the type argument of $\text{length}$ in the application $(\text{length} \ \text{id}a)$? The conventional Damas-Milner algorithm instantiates $\text{length}$’s type with fresh type variables—these are the guessed types—and then uses unification to elaborate them. But, as we have mentioned, unification should not guess a polytype.

In this case, though, a much easier approach suggests itself. Given that $\text{id}a$ has type $\forall a. [a]$, what instantiation of $a$ will make the type $[a]$ match? Easy: instantiate $a$ to $\forall c. c \rightarrow c$! So the second idea is:

**Idea 2:** use locally known information at a function call to instantiate a polymorphic function.

2.3 Partial type information

There is a sharp tension between Idea 1 and Idea 2. The former suggested a rule for typing applications which inferred the function (instantiating it in the process) and checked the type of the argument. But Idea 2 suggests instead that we should infer the type of the argument, so that we know how to instantiate the type of the function.
—Terms—
\[ t, u ::= \nu \mid \lambda x. t \mid t u \mid \text{let } x = u \text{ in } t \]
\[ \nu ::= t \mid C \]

—Vanilla types—
\[ \tau ::= a \mid \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \mid T \pi \]
\[ \rho ::= \tau \mid \sigma \rightarrow \sigma \mid T \pi \]
\[ \sigma ::= \forall \pi. \rho \]

—Boxy types—
\[ \rho' ::= \tau \mid \sigma' \rightarrow \sigma' \mid T \pi' \mid \boxy \]
\[ \sigma' ::= \forall \pi', \rho' \]

—Environments—
\[ \Gamma ::= \tau \mid \Gamma, a \mid \Gamma, (x: \sigma) \]

Figure 1: Syntax of the source language and types

But this tension is more apparent than real. Consider again our example \(*length\, 14\). Intuitively, we would like to type check it in the following way:

1. Examine the type of \(*length : \forall a. [a] \rightarrow \text{Int}.*
2. Check the type of the argument, expecting it to have type \([\text{something}].\)
3. Use the \(*something*\) to instantiate the type of \(*length*.

This approach suggests the third main idea:

Idea 3: combine the two judgement forms, \(\vdash_u\) and \(\overset{\tau}{\rightarrow}^\rho\), into a single judgement \(\Gamma \vdash t : \tau\) where \(\tau\) is like \(\tau\) except that it may contain “holes” that correspond to the inferred part of the type.

We denote these “holes” using boxes. For example:

\[ \Gamma \vdash t : \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Int} \]

This judgement checks that \(t\) has a type of form \(*something* \rightarrow \text{Int}.* and infers that the \(*something* is \text{Bool}. The earlier inference and checking judgements are now just special cases:

\[ \Gamma \vdash a : \text{Bool} \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash t : \tau \quad \text{is written} \quad \Gamma \vdash t : \tau \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash \lambda x. t : \tau \quad \text{is written} \quad \Gamma \vdash \lambda x. t : \boxy \]

Beyond resolving the tension between Ideas 1 and 2, boxes allow us to type more programs than with bidirectional judgments—we will see an example when we discuss the application rule in Section 3.2. However, although boxes appear in the structure of types, we do not mean for them to have any logical interpretation, such as under the Curry-Howard isomorphism. Instead, their purpose is to make sure that all derivations in the specification of our type system have a corresponding algorithmic interpretation.

The idea of using the structure of a type, rather than a judgement, to describe information flow is not new. Odersky, Zenger & Zengen [16] coined the term “Colored Local Type Inference” to describe a type inference system for \(\pi_2\), that uses red and blue colours to describe which parts of the type are checked and which are inferred. Although the motivating ideas are very similar, the details are entirely different, as we discuss in Section 8.

3. Type system specification

We next present the specification of our type system. Although its design was guided by the practicalities of our type inference algorithm, and its rules are directed by the syntax of the term. It is not an algorithm and leaves details such as first-order unification implicit. We describe the inference algorithm in Section 5.

3.1 Syntax

The syntax of our source language, and of its types, is given in Figure 1. The language is just large enough to demonstrate all the interesting features of the type system. It includes type constructors, denoted with \(T\), and data constructors, denoted with \(C\). Other familiar features, such as recursive \(\text{let}\) and pattern-matching, could be easily added.

The source language allows the programmer to annotate a let binding with a type \(\sigma\). This annotation need not be closed—it may refer to type variables in the enclosing context. Thus we support a form of lexically-scoped type variables [23], an extension that is essential to the expressiveness of our language, but otherwise does not interact with our type system. We defer the details of the lexically-scoped type variables to Section 3.3.

Types come in two forms. Vanilla types are stratified into monotypes, \(\tau\), and polytypes, \(\rho\) and \(\sigma\). Monotypes have no \(\forall\)'s anywhere, whereas polytypes may have \(\forall\)'s. A \(\rho\)-type has no \(\forall\)'s at the top, but may contain polytypes. The notation \(\pi\) denotes a sequence of zero or more distinct type variables. We often implicitly coerce between sequences and sets in the usual manner.

A boxy type, written with a prime \((\rho', \sigma')\), is a type containing zero or more boxes, each box containing a vanilla type (Figure 1). Boxy types \(\rho'\) and \(\sigma'\) are stratified in exactly the same way as their vanilla counterparts. However note that inside a box is a vanilla type; that is, boxes are not nested. The intuition here is that a boxy type has an outer structure of “checked” information, which switches at the boxes to an inner structure of “inferred” information.

Boxy types also satisfy a non-syntactic invariant: in a type \(\forall \pi, \rho', \text{none of the quantified variables } \pi \text{ may appear inside a box in } \rho'.\) This invariant allows us to instantiate a polymorphic type \(\forall \pi, \rho'\) with boxy types \(\pi\), and still obtain a syntactically well-formed type \([a \rightarrow \sigma']\rho'\). In the absence of the invariant, the instantiated type might have nested boxes. This invariant is maintained by our typing rules.

The type inside a box may, nevertheless, have free type variables. For example, the rules validate the following:

\[ \Gamma \vdash u : [a \rightarrow \sigma] \quad \Gamma, x : \forall a. a \vdash t : \rho' \quad \text{LET-1} \]

Here, the type of \(u\) is \([a \rightarrow \sigma]\), in which \(a\) appears free inside the box. Intuitively, we can think of this rule as performing two steps: First, the type of \(u\) is inferred to be \(\forall a. a\). Second, the type \(a \rightarrow a\) is extracted from the box, generalized, and then placed in the context when we check \(t\). It is an invariant of our algorithm that all boxes will be filled in after type checking. Therefore, the type \(a \rightarrow a\) is known type information after looking at \(u\).

Environments \(\Gamma\) attribute vanilla types to term variables and also bind lexically-scoped type variables. We use the notation \(\text{fts()}\) to refer to the free type variables of a type (both in and out of boxes) and we extend this notation to environments, so that \(\text{fts}(\Gamma)\) refers to all the free variables appearing anywhere in the types of the environment, including the bindings for lexical type variables. We use the notation \(\text{dom}()\) for the collection of term and type variables bound in \(\Gamma\). We write \# for the binary set-disjointness operator.

The notation \(\pi\) denotes sequences of \(\tau\)-types, not necessarily distinct. We write \([a \rightarrow \sigma]\) for the capture-avoiding substitution with domain the set \(\pi\) that maps each \(u \in \pi\) to the corresponding type \(\sigma' \in \pi\). We often abbreviate \(\forall \sigma, \rho'\) as \(\rho'\) (and similarly for vanilla types).
3.2 The core rules

The main type system is given in Figure 2. The main judgement has the familiar form

\[ \Gamma \vdash t : \tau \]

However, notice that the type attributed to \( t \) is a boxy type \( \rho \). Our operational understanding of the judgement is that we type check \( t \), checking \( \rho \)’s outside boxes, and inferring inside boxes. The boxes are like `var` parameters in Pascal; they are the “holes” in which the results are returned.

Because an environment \( \Gamma \) attributes a vanilla type \( \sigma \) to each variable \( x \) that it binds, the only place that boxes may appear is in the result type of the judgement. One could also imagine allowing boxy types in \( \Gamma \), as we discuss in Section 7.

The rules for this type system are syntax-directed, with type instantiation being inferred at variable occurrences and generalisation at let bindings.\(^1\) Specifically, rule VAR deals with variable or data constructor occurrences by invoking an instantiation relation \( \vdash \sigma \equiv \rho \), which we discuss in Section 3.4. The rule for unannotated let expressions (LET-1) is completely straightforward: it infers the type of the right-hand side \( u \), generalises it in the usual Hindley-Milner way, and type checks the body \( t \).

Now consider the rules for lambda abstractions. Rule ABS1 has a familiar form, except for two points. First, we must use an auxiliary judgement \( \Gamma \vdash_{\text{poly}} t : \sigma \) (also in Figure 2) to type check the body of the abstraction because the type to the right of the arrow, \( \sigma \), is not necessarily a \( \rho \)-type. In rule GEN note that in pure inference mode — when there is a box around the complete result type — we do no generalisation. Second, in ABS1 one might be tempted to extend \( \Gamma \) with the boxy typing \( x : \sigma \), but that would invalidate our invariant that \( \Gamma \) contains only vanilla types. The premise \( \vdash \sigma \equiv \rho \)\(^1\) finds a vanilla type \( \sigma \) obtained from \( \sigma \) by filling in the boxes in \( \sigma \) with monotypes. This judgement is called `boxy matching` and we discuss it further in Section 3.5.

The second rule for lambda abstractions, ABS2, deals with the pure inference case; that is, when there is a box around the entire result type. In this case we “push down the box” and try again, thereby dispatching to ABS1. Operationally, if the result type is a hole, then we make two new holes for argument and body types, and type check the function; then read out the results from the holes, form these results into a function type, and write it into the result hole. (Incidentally, although the box is filled in with \( \vdash \sigma \equiv \rho \), these types can only be of the form \( \vdash \sigma \equiv \rho \) in all valid typing derivations.)

Turning now to application, consider rule APP. It type checks the function with the result type \( \Box \rightarrow \rho \). This type asks to `infer` the type of the function argument, while the `result` type is inferred or checked as specified by \( \rho \). Once we know the argument type, \( \sigma \), we can use \( \vdash_{\text{poly}} \) to type check the argument itself, so that information from the function’s type is pushed into the argument, just as discussed in Section 2.1. However, unlike the all-or-nothing approach of local type inference, boxy types support a mixture of inference and checking. For example, we can type the following:

\[ \vdash (\lambda x \cdot g. (\text{g True, g }3)) : (\forall a. a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow (b, b) \]
Using the APP rule, the function is typed as follows; note that the
judgement infers the argument type while checking the result type:
\[ \vdash (\lambda x. g. (g \text{ True}, g \text{ 3})) : \text{LET} 
\rightarrow (\forall a. a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow (b, b) \]

### 3.3 Type annotations and lexically scoped type variables

The rule LET-S allows the programmer to specify the type of the	right-hand side of a let binding instead of inferring that type. This
is why in LET-S there is no box around \( \rho \) when \( u \) is checked,
whereas in LET-T there is. An unusual feature is that the quantified
variables \( \pi \) of the user-specified type \( \forall \pi. \rho \) scope over other type
annotations inside \( u \) as well as over \( \rho \); this is specified in LET-
S by extending the environment \( \Gamma \) with the type variables \( \pi \).
For example, the type signature on the declaration of \( y \) below mentions
the variable \( a \) that is bound by the type signature for \( \text{id} \):

\[
\text{let id :: forall a. a -> a} \\
\text{id = \lambda x. let y :: a = x in y}
\]

Scoped type variables, such as \( a \), are “rigid”—they may not unify
with any other types\(^1\).

The side condition \( \text{fts}(\forall \pi. \rho) \subseteq \text{dom}(\Gamma) \) in LET-S ensures that the
type annotation only mentions type variables that are in scope, while \( \text{fts}(\Gamma) \) ensures that the new type variables are fresh.

Occasionally, we will use the annotation form \( (t :: \sigma) \), which
is syntactic sugar for \( \text{let } x :: \sigma = t \text{ in } x \).

### 3.4 Subsumption

The variable rule, VAR, must check the compatibility between a
vanilla type \( \sigma \) found in the environment and the boxy type \( \rho \) that
is the result of the judgement. This compatibility check, called
subsumption and generalised to two boxy polytypes, is performed
by the judgement \( \vdash \sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \) shown in Figure 3. This judgement
holds if a value of type \( \sigma_1 \) is acceptable in a context needing a \( \sigma_2 \),
that is, if \( \sigma_1 \) is at least as polymorphic as \( \sigma_2 \). Most of the action in
our type system is in the definition of subsumption, and we devote
the rest of this section to it.

A key principle guiding the design of our subsumption relation
is that if we know (a) the type of a polymorphic function \( f \), and (b)
the type of \( f \)'s instance at a call site, then we should be able to work
out the types at which \( f \) is instantiated, even if they are polytypes.

More precisely:

**Principle 2 (Arbitrary instantiation)** \( \vdash \forall \pi. \rho \leq [\pi \rightarrow \pi']\rho \) for
any boxy-free polytypes \( \sigma \).

For example, say that \( \sigma_{id} \) abbreviates the type \( \forall a. a \rightarrow a \).

It must be that \( \vdash \sigma_{id} \leq \sigma_{id} \rightarrow \sigma_{id} \), by instantiating \( a \) to \( \sigma_{id} \). Obeying Principle 2 means that the programmer can, if all else fails, specify
the instantiation of a polymorphic function by specifying the type
of the result of the instantiation.

Our definition of subsumption is based on that of the Hindley-
Milner type system. There, polytypes are of the form \( \forall \pi. \tau \) and
subsumption is specified by three rules. The first two rules cover
instantiation: guess monotypes to instantiate top-level type variables
of the left-hand side and make sure that the resulting monotypes
are equal.

\[
\frac{\vdash a \rightarrow \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \quad \text{HM-SPEC}}{\vdash \forall \pi. \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \quad \text{HM-MONO}}
\]

The final rule allows a polytype on the right-hand side by adding a
rule to “skolemise” that type variable (see for example [15]):

\[
\frac{\vdash \forall \pi. \tau \leq [\pi \rightarrow \pi']\rho \quad \text{HC}}{\vdash \forall \pi. \tau \leq [\pi \rightarrow \pi']\rho \quad \text{HM-SKOL}}
\]

In our system, we generalise this subsumption relation to support
impredicative and higher-rank polymorphism in several ways.

The key difference from HM-SPEC is that the instantiation rule,
SPEC in Figure 3, instantiates the type on the left with boxy poly-
types, rather than monotypes. Algorithmically, we are trying to in-
fer what polytypes should be used to instantiate the type variables,
so we allocate a new box for each type variable, and recursively
call the subsumption judgement to fill the boxes in. Pleasingly, the
very same mechanism that allows us to propagate type information
in support of higher-rank polymorphism (Section 3.2) is the key to
impredicativity\(^3\).

The rule for skolemisation, SKOL, is the same as HM-SKOL
except for the side condition \( \sigma' \neq \pi \) which prevents overlap with
rule SBOXY. We will discuss SBOXY shortly.

The rule for monotypes, MONO, is the same as HM-MONO.

Our relation also includes a number of rules that have no coun-
terpart in the Hindley-Milner system. These rules explain how to
deal with boxes and with polytypes that occur within function types
and as the arguments to type constructors.

The rule CON deals with data types \( T \), such as lists. We do not
perform subsumption on the type arguments; instead we require
that the argument types have compatible boxes, using the same
boxy-matching judgement (\( \vdash \sigma_1 \sim \sigma_2 \)) that we encountered in rule
ABS1. We discuss boxy matching in Section 3.5, but the idea is that
it performs no instantiation or skolemisation. Thus, \( \vdash \forall \sigma. a \rightarrow a \leq \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \). This is a design choice—allowing covariant
subsumption for some type constructors would be compatible with
our system, but not with GHC. In the GHC core language, based on
System F, performing such an instantiation would require mapping
a type application down the list, and that is hard to do for arbitrary
data types. Furthermore, such a mapping operation carries a run-
time cost; sometimes it may be eliminated by type erasure, but even
that is not true in the dictionary-passing implementation of Haskell
type classes. In short, we require invariance in the type arguments
of data types.

We allow a little more flexibility for functions, as rule F1 shows:

\[ \vdash \forall a. \text{Int} \rightarrow a \leq \text{Int} \rightarrow (\forall b. a \rightarrow b) \]

For example, \( \vdash \text{Int} \rightarrow (\forall b. b \rightarrow b) \leq \text{Int} \rightarrow (\forall b. b \rightarrow b) \).

Applying SPEC, we have \( \vdash \text{Int} \rightarrow (\forall b. b \rightarrow b) \leq \text{Int} \rightarrow (\forall b. b \rightarrow b) \).

Now consider rule SBOXY. Principle 2 requires that, for example,
\( \vdash \text{Int} \rightarrow (\forall b. b \rightarrow b) \leq \text{Int} \rightarrow (\forall b. b \rightarrow b) \). Applying SPEC, we

\[ \vdash \text{Int} \rightarrow (\forall b. b \rightarrow b) \leq \text{Int} \rightarrow (\forall b. b \rightarrow b) \].

Applying F1 we need that \( \vdash (\forall b. b \rightarrow b) \leq \forall b. b \rightarrow b \), and that motivates
rule SBOXY. It says that when the type on the left is a box, we
should simply fill in the box with type \( \sigma' \) on the right, but, just as
in ABS1, we use boxy matching to extract a vanilla type from \( \sigma' \).

Note that there is no corresponding rule that fills in a box on the
right with a polytype on the left. Instead, a box on the right can

---

\(^3\)Incidentally, by instantiating with boxy types, rule SPEC gives rise to a
boxy type on the left of the \( \leq \) which is why we must allow the judgement
to have boxy types on both sides.
only contain a monotype that appears on the left (see rule BMONO). In Section 7 we discuss why this is the case.

### 3.5 Boxy matching

Boxy matching, $\vdash \sigma_1 \sim \sigma_2$, ensures that two types have “compatible boxes”. Its rules are given in Figure 3.

The key rule is the innocuous-looking $BBEQ$. This rule says that when a box meets a box, we must fill them both in with a monotype. Alternatively, if one type or the other has structure outside a box, then that structure is “known” and can be used to fill in the other box; that is what is happening in rules MEQ1, AEQ1, CEQ1, and SEQ1. These rules together may derive $\vdash \sigma \sim \Box$ for any polytype.

The rule $SYM$ ensures that MEQ1, AEQ1 etc. also apply when the box is on the left. If both types have known structure outside the box, then matters are even more straightforward (rules MEQ2, AEQ2, CEQ2, and SEQ2.) In rule CEQ2, the notation $\vdash \sigma_1 \sim \sigma_2$ is the pointwise applicability of boxy matching to the elements of $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$. If on the other hand neither type has known structure then $BBEQ$ must simply “guess”, and simple inference can only guess a monotype.

The “box meets box” situation implies $\vdash \sigma \sim \Box$ because otherwise we need $\vdash \sigma \sim \Box$. On the other hand, $\vdash \sigma_i \sim \Box$ because the boxes are matched up against box-free types.

Algorithmically, boxy matching can be thought of as a “super-unifier” for boxy types; the two structures are unified, with the known structure of each filling the holes in the other.

### 4. Properties of the type system

Having presented the basic syntax and inference rules, we now elaborate on the properties of this type system. All the results we mention are presented with detailed proofs in an accompanying technical report [26].

#### 4.1 Reflexivity and transitivity

By design, boxy matching is not an equivalence relation. It is not reflexive, for example $\vdash \Box \sim \Box$ because this would require guessing polytype information. Likewise, it is not transitive: $\vdash \Box \sim \Box$ and $\vdash \Box \sim \Box$ but $\vdash \Box \sim \Box$. For the same reason, subsumption is not reflexive or transitive. For example, $\vdash \Box \sim \Box$. Also, $\vdash \Box \sim \Box$. However, for box-free types, both matching and subsumption are reflexive because no guessing is required. Likewise, boxy matching is also transitive for box-free types.

However, subsumption is not transitive for box-free types because the SPEC rule introduces boxes. For example, $\vdash \Box \sim \Box$ and $\vdash \Box \sim \Box$ but $\vdash \Box \sim \Box$. Intuitively, once a box has been filled in with a type, that type cannot be further instantiated.

This restriction implies, for example, that we can check that the id function has type $\sigma_i$, and $\sigma_i \sim \sigma_i$, but not $\sigma_i \sim \sigma_i$. In general it is not true that:

$\Gamma \vdash t : \rho_1$ and $\vdash \rho_1 \sim \rho_2$ implies $\Gamma \vdash t : \rho_2$

However, the loss of transitivity has no impact on type inference. The completeness of our algorithm only requires a restriction of boxy transitivity, a point we discuss further in the technical report [26].

#### 4.2 Dropping and expanding boxes

Providing additional (correct) type information should not make programs untypeable, cause subsumption not to hold, nor make types fail to match. Technically, one way to provide more information is to remove boxes from types in judgements. For example, if the derivation $\vdash \sigma \sim \sigma \leq \Box \rightarrow \sigma$ holds, we should be able to derive $\vdash \sigma \sim \sigma \leq \sigma \rightarrow \sigma$. Another way to make more type information checkable is to push a box down the syntax of a type. For example, if $\vdash \Box \rightarrow \Box \leq \sigma \rightarrow \sigma$, it should also be the case that $\vdash \Box \rightarrow \Box \leq \sigma \rightarrow \sigma$. In general, if inference succeeds with partial type information, it should succeed when some of that inferred type information becomes checkable.

To formalise this property, we define the following relation between types. We say that $\sigma_i$ is the unboxing of $\sigma_i$, written $\vdash \sigma_i \sim \sigma_i$. If $\sigma_i \sim \sigma_i$ can be constructed from $\sigma_i$ by eliminating boxes or pushing the boxes down the abstract syntax of the type. For example, $\vdash \Box \rightarrow \Box \rightarrow \sigma \sim \sigma$.

We can then prove that unboxing types preserves boxy matching, subsumption, and typability.

**Lemma 4.1 (Unboxing)**

1. If $\vdash \sigma_i \sim \sigma_i$ and $\vdash \sigma_i \sim \sigma_i$ and $\vdash \sigma_i \sim \sigma_i$ then $\vdash \sigma_i \sim \sigma_i$.
2. If $\vdash \sigma_i \leq \sigma_i$ and $\vdash \sigma_i \leq \sigma_i$ and $\vdash \sigma_i \leq \sigma_i$ then $\vdash \sigma_i \leq \sigma_i$.
3. If $\Gamma \vdash t : \rho_i$ and $\vdash \rho_i \sim \rho_i$ then $\Gamma \vdash t : \rho_i$.

Conversely, sometimes it is acceptable to box parts of types or expand boxes up the tree. For example, the judgement $\vdash \sigma_i \leq \Box \rightarrow \sigma_i \rightarrow \Box$ holds, and so $\vdash \sigma_i \leq \Box \rightarrow \Box \rightarrow \Box$ and $\sigma_i \leq \Box \rightarrow \Box \rightarrow \Box$. However, boxing and box expansion is only valid for monotype information. Recall that boxes in types represent “guessed” information, and only monotypes may be arbitrarily guessed. For example, even though $\vdash \Box \rightarrow \Box \rightarrow \Box$ is not the case that $\vdash \sigma_i \leq \Box \rightarrow \Box \rightarrow \Box$ or $\vdash \sigma_i \leq \Box \rightarrow \Box \rightarrow \Box$.

Consequently, we can add or expand boxes—as long as we do not put a box around a polytype that was not originally boxed. In this case, we define $\sigma_i$ to be the monotype boxing of $\sigma_i$, written $\vdash \sigma_i \leq \sigma_i$. We box $\sigma_i$ and the quantifiers of $\sigma_i$ appear inside a box only if the corresponding quantifiers in $\sigma_i$ do. For example, $\vdash a :\Box$ but $\vdash a :\Box$. Like boxing, monotype boxing preserves boxy matching, subsumption and typing.

**Lemma 4.2 (Monotype Boxing)**

1. If $\vdash \sigma_i \sim \sigma_i$ and $\vdash \sigma_i \sim \sigma_i$ and $\vdash \sigma_i \sim \sigma_i$ then $\vdash \sigma_i \sim \sigma_i$.
2. If $\vdash \sigma_i \leq \sigma_i$ and $\vdash \sigma_i \leq \sigma_i$ and $\vdash \sigma_i \leq \sigma_i$ then $\vdash \sigma_i \leq \sigma_i$.
3. If $\Gamma \vdash t : \rho_i$ and $\vdash \rho_i \sim \rho_i$ then $\Gamma \vdash t : \rho_i$.

**Lemma 4.1 and 4.2** confirm the intuition that boxes do not matter for monotype information. Monotypes may be arbitrarily boxed or unboxed without destroying the validity of a judgment.

### 4.3 Embedding of System F

We began by taking System F as our “gold standard”, so it is natural to ask whether every System F program can be expressed in our language. Happily, this is the case, provided that the programmer adds sufficient type annotations. The guideline for programmers to write any System F program is that it is enough to put annotations (a) on functions that take polymorphic arguments, (b) on impredicative type instantiations, and (c) on type lambdas that bind type variables that appear in other annotations. Of course, in many situations, we expect that fewer annotations will be necessary.

Figure 4 shows the type-directed embedding of System F terms. In the figure, note that the translation of type abstractions often requires a type annotation. The reason is that the bound type variable

---

1. The formal definition of this relation can be found in the technical report.
may appear inside the translated body, if for example it is part of a higher-rank annotation. The annotation merely brings that variable in scope.\(^5\) The typing relation of System F (\(\Gamma \vdash F t : \sigma\)) is standard and we omit it for reasons of space.

**Theorem 4.3 (Embedding of System F)** If \(\Gamma \vdash t : \sigma\) then \(\Gamma \vdash_{\text{poly}} [t] : \sigma\) and \(\Gamma \vdash_{\text{poly}} [t] : \Box\) where prefixe(\(\sigma\)) = \(\forall \alpha. \rho\).

The first part of the theorem states that we can check that the translated term indeed is typeable with the System F type. The second part states that we can we can infer an equivalent type.\(^6\)

### 4.4 Type Soundness

We define the dynamic semantics of this language through a straightforward translation to System F, written \(\Gamma \vdash t : \sigma' \sim t'.\) This translation—omitted due to lack of space—is essentially the identity plus type coercions whose behavior is that of the identity function. These coercion functions are induced by the translation of the subsumption judgement, \(\vdash \sigma' \leq \sigma_2 \sim \tau.\) Therefore, we prove the type soundness of our language with respect to this semantics by showing that this translation is type-preserving. Below, the function \(\text{strip}(\cdot)\) merely removes the boxes from a type.

**Lemma 4.4 (Term translation)**

1. If \(\Gamma \vdash \sigma_1' \leq \sigma_2 \sim t\) then \(\Gamma \vdash_{\text{poly}} [t] : \text{strip}(\sigma_1' \rightarrow \sigma_2').\)
2. If \(\Gamma \vdash t : \rho' \sim t'\) then \(\Gamma \vdash_{\text{poly}} t' : \text{strip}(\rho').\)
3. If \(\Gamma \vdash_{\text{poly}} t : \sigma' \sim t'\) then \(\Gamma \vdash_{\text{poly}} t' : \text{strip}(\sigma').\)

Defining the dynamic semantics through translation is convenient for two reasons. First, this translation semantics is the semantics that GHC actually implements—we would have to show that any other semantics is equivalent to this one to argue that GHC actually implements this language. Indeed, our translation demonstrates that our type system is suitable for compilers, such as GHC, that use intermediate languages based on System F. Second, this translation simplifies the proof that our type system is type sound. The standard way to show type safety with a direct semantics is to show that it satisfies the properties of subject reduction and progress. Unsurprisingly for a language that relies on type annotations, subject reduction fails with a straightforward substitution-based semantics. For example, take \(\sigma = (\forall a. a \rightarrow a)\) — (Int, Bool). We have

\(\vdash f : \sigma = (\lambda x. \text{true} \cdot (\lambda y. \text{false}) \cdot f)\) in \(f \cdot (\lambda x. \text{false}) : (\text{Int, Bool})\) but

\(\frac{\vdash (\lambda x. \text{true}\cdot (\lambda y. \text{false}) \cdot f) \cdot (\lambda x. \text{false}) : (\text{Int, Bool})\text{ since the annotation required to give } g \cdot (\lambda x. \text{false})\text{ a higher-rank type is no longer present. Instead, to prove type soundness, we would have to cleverly devise a reduction relation that preserves type annotations. Such a semantics would be useful to explain to programmers how to transform their code while retaining typability. However, we leave that as future work (see Section 9) and stick with the simpler, transformation-based semantics for now.}

### 4.5 Extension of Hindley-Milner

We have proved that the type system presented in Section 3 is a conservative extension of Hindley-Milner. In particular, if an expression type checks in Hindley-Milner with no user annotations, then our type system will infer its type. Conversely, derivations in the subset of our language that does not use annotations or higher-rank types in environments correspond to derivations in the Hindley-Milner system. The proofs of these theorems crucially rely upon the boxing and unboxing lemmas (4.2 and 4.1).

**Theorem 4.5 (Conservative extension of HM)** Assume that \(\Gamma\) contains no higher-rank types and \(t\) contains no type annotations. Then \(\Gamma \vdash_{\text{HM}} t \iff \Gamma \vdash t : \tau.\)

### 5. Type inference

The type system that we presented in Section 3 has an inference algorithm that is a modest elaboration of the classic Damas-Milner Algorithm \(\text{W} [2].\) The details of the algorithm can be found in the technical report [26].

The algorithm distinguishes between ordinary unification variables, denoted with \(\alpha, \beta\), which can range only over monotypes, and boxy unification variables, denoted with \(\zeta, \xi\) which can range over arbitrary types. Boxes appearing in the specification correspond to boxy unification variables in the algorithm. Ordinary unification variables force boxes to contain (perhaps unknown yet) monotypes. Unifiers, denoted with \(S\), are idempotent substitutions from unification variables (boxy or not) to box-free types. Additionally, the algorithm makes use of an infinite sequence of symbols, denoted \(A\), for unification variables or skolem constants.

The main algorithm is presented as a deterministic relation:

\[\text{(S_0, A_0)} \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t : \rho' \sim (S_1, A_1)\]

The judgement should be read as: “given an initial unifier \(S_0\) and symbol supply \(A_0\), check that \(t\) has the type \(\rho'\) under \(\Gamma\), returning an extended unifier \(S_1\) and remaining symbol supply \(A_1\)”. Boxy matching and subsumption can also be presented as deterministic relations:

\[\text{(S_0, A_0)} \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t : \rho' \sim (S_1, A_1)\]

The syntax of types \(\rho'\) appearing in algorithm judgements is different than the syntax of the specification—namely they are allowed to contain ordinary and boxy unification variables, but no boxes. Type variables appearing in such types correspond to skolem constants. The free type variables \(\text{fv}(\rho)\) of such a type include both unification and normal type variables.

A crucial operational invariant is this: every invocation of the inference algorithm fills in all the holes (i.e. boxy unification variables) in its input. We think of the holes as the out-parameters of the algorithm. More precisely:

**Theorem 5.1** If \((S_0, A_0) \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t : \rho' \sim (S_1, A_1)\) then the free boxy unification variables of \(\rho'\) are in \(\text{dom}(S_1)\).
It follows that, after the invocation of the algorithm, we can safely read-off the boxy variables from the returned unifier. As an example, consider the algorithm rule for let:

\[(S_0, A_0) \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash u : \zeta \Rightarrow (S_1, A_1)\]
\[\overline{\alpha \beta} = \text{fv}(S_1) - \text{fv}(S_1)\Gamma\]
\[(S_1, A_1) \Rightarrow \Gamma, x: \tau \Rightarrow (S_2, A_2)\]
\[\text{LET-I}
\]

First, a new boxy variable \(\zeta\) is extracted from the top of the initial supply \(A_0\), and \(u\) is type checked with the initial unifier. Then we can safely read off the value \(S_1\) with a generalisation of this type over \(S_1\), and check the body of the expression. Note that we do not in general apply the substitution to the environment, but rather thread it lazily through our judgements.

We have proven that the algorithm is sound and complete with respect to the specification given in Section 3. Soundness asserts that if the algorithm succeeds, then there exists a corresponding derivation in the specification.

**Theorem 5.2 (Soundness)** If \(A_0\) is a fresh symbol supply and \((\emptyset, A_0) \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t : \rho \Rightarrow (S, A_1)\) then \(\Gamma \vdash t : [\rho]\_S\).

The operation \([\_]\_S\) supplies the substitution \(S\) to an algorithmic type (which can contain unification variables, but not boxes) to obtain a specification type (which has boxes instead of boxy unification variables). Completeness asserts that if there is a derivation in the specification, then the algorithm succeeds and returns a most general unifier.

**Theorem 5.3 (Completeness)** If \(\Gamma \vdash t : \rho\_S\) and \(A_0\) is a fresh symbol supply then \((\emptyset, A_0) \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t : \rho \Rightarrow (S, A_1)\) such that \(\exists S. S = (R : S_0)\setminus A_0 \setminus A_1\).

The notation \(S = (R : S_0)\setminus A_0 \setminus A_1\) states that \(S\) and the composition of \(R\) and \(S_0\) may disagree only on meta variables coming from the set \(A_0 \setminus A_1\). Theorem 5.3 implies that in pure inference mode, that is, when \([\_]\_S\) is just a box, \(\overline{\alpha \beta}\) we can simply initialise the algorithm with a fresh boxy variable \(\zeta\).

Soundness and completeness of the algorithm give us a principal types property for our specification. The theorem below states that for a given amount of checked information there exists a "best" amount of inferred information for a given term.

**Theorem 5.4 (Principal Types)** Suppose that \(\Gamma \vdash t : \rho\_S\). Then there exists a \(\rho_0\) such that \(\vdash t : \rho_0\), and for all \(\rho_1\) that differ from \(\rho_0\) only inside boxes and \(\vdash t : \rho_1\) it is the case that \(\rho_1 = R\rho_0\) for some substitution \(R\).

6. Reducing type annotations

The type system of Section 3 is sufficient to type all programs involving impredicative and higher-rank polymorphism, but the type annotations can sometimes be tedious. In this section we describe some extensions to the type system that help eliminate some of these annotations. Except where noted, all of these extensions satisfy the properties discussed in Sections 4 and 5.

For example, consider the expression \(\text{tail} \ id\_s\), where \(\text{ids} : [\sigma_{id}]\), and \(\text{tail} \ : \forall b . \ [b] \rightarrow [b]\) (recall that \(\sigma_{id} = \forall a . a \rightarrow a\)). Even if we know the return type, we cannot produce a derivation:

\[\forall b . \ [b] \leq [\sigma_{id}] \rightarrow [\sigma_{id}]\]
\[\Gamma \vdash \text{tail} : [\sigma_{id}] \rightarrow [\sigma_{id}] \quad \Gamma \vdash \text{poly} \ id\_s : [\sigma_{id}] \quad \text{VAR} \quad \text{APP}\]
\[\Gamma \vdash \text{tail ids} : [\sigma_{id}]\]

We run into trouble at the \(\text{VAR}\) rule because no derivation exists for the instantiation of \(\text{tail}\). Rule \(\text{SPEC}\) cannot guess a polymorphic instantiation in the judgment

\[\vdash \forall b . \ [b] \leq [\sigma_{id}] \rightarrow [\sigma_{id}]\]

because that requires the derivation \(\vdash [\sigma_{arg}] \rightarrow [\sigma_{id}]\). The only way to make this example type check is to add an explicit annotation to \(\text{tail}\), forcing the impredicative instantiation:

\[\vdash \text{tail} :: [\sigma_{id}] \rightarrow [\sigma_{id}] \quad \text{id} : [\sigma_{id}]\]

The trouble arises because \(\text{APP}\) and \(\text{VAR}\) are done separately. If we combine them into a single rule, all is well:

\[\nu \forall \eta, \pi. \pi \rightarrow \eta \rightarrow \eta \quad \text{poly}
\]
\[\Gamma \vdash \nu \pi : \rho'\]

Notice that \(\text{VAR}\) is just a special case of \(\text{SMART-APP}\) with zero arguments. The type system of Figure 2 could be recast by completely dropping \(\text{VAR}\) and replacing it with rule \(\text{SMART-APP}\).

6.1 Exploiting flow in application nodes

We can do better! \(\text{SMART-APP}\) fails for \(\Gamma \vdash \text{sing} \ id\_s : [\sigma_{id}]\) where \(\Gamma = \text{sing} : \forall b . a \rightarrow [b].\id\_s : \sigma_{id}\). The reason is that type checking the argument requires \(\Gamma \vdash id\_s : [\sigma_{arg}]\) and that fails.

This failure is frustrating, because once the \(\text{result type}\) of the call to an \(\text{id}\_s\) is fixed, we know its instantiation. That suggests the following variant of \(\text{SMART-APP}\)—use knowledge about the result type of the call to fix at least part of the instantiation of the function:

\[\nu \forall \eta, \pi. \pi \rightarrow \eta \rightarrow \eta \quad \text{poly}
\]
\[\Gamma \vdash \nu \pi : \rho'\]

First we find \(\pi\), the type variables that are mentioned in the result type of the function, \(\sigma\). Then, we use the subsumption judgement to compare \(\sigma\) with the context type \(\rho\), to produce the instantiation types \(\pi\). These types can then be used, \(\text{sans-box}\), to instantiate the argument types, while the remaining instantiations \(\pi\) remain boxed. In this way we can take advantage of shape information in the result type, and push that information into the arguments. In particular, \(\text{SA-RES}\) can type \(\text{sing id}\) as:

\[\vdash [\sigma_{id}] \leq [\sigma_{id}] \quad \Gamma \vdash \text{poly} \ id\_s : [\sigma_{id}] \quad \text{SA-RES}\]

\[\Gamma \vdash \text{sing} \ id\_s : [\sigma_{id}] \quad \text{SA-RES}\]

\[\nu \forall \eta, \pi. \pi \rightarrow \eta \rightarrow \eta \quad \text{poly}
\]

\[\Gamma \vdash \nu \pi : \rho'\]

Rule \(\text{SA-RES}\) is useful, but not entirely satisfactory. For example it fails to check \(\Gamma \vdash \text{head} \ id\_s : \forall a . a \rightarrow a\). In general, because rule \(\text{GEN}\) performs skolemisation (here for the type \(\forall a . a \rightarrow a\)), the system fails to check applications where \(\nu\) has a type of the form \(\forall \pi. \pi \rightarrow a\), and \(a\) is instantiated with a polytype.

To solve this problem, we could work the other way around, so that we use the \(\text{argument types}\) to instantiate the function instead of the \(\text{result type}\), thus:

\[\nu \forall \eta, \pi. \pi \rightarrow \eta \rightarrow \eta \quad \text{poly}
\]
\[\Gamma \vdash \text{arg} : \forall a . \text{arg} \rightarrow [\sigma_{arg}] \quad \text{ARG}
\]
\[\Gamma \vdash \nu \eta : \rho'\]

This variant is incomparable to \(\text{SA-RES}\). For example, \(\text{SA-ARG}\) can type \(\Gamma \vdash \text{head} \ id\_s : [\sigma_{id}]\), which \(\text{SA-RES}\) cannot; and \(\text{SA-RES}\) can type \(\Gamma \vdash \text{cons} \ (\forall x . x) \ id\_s : [\sigma_{id}]\), that \(\text{SA-ARG}\) cannot.
6.2 Unbiased smart application

Both SA-RES and SA-ARG fail for some relatively simple programs, so it is not clear which rule to use. In this section we show how to combine their virtues. The idea is this: in a typing judgement of the form $\Gamma \vdash \nu \pi : \rho'$ we may be able to draw information about the instantiation of $\nu$’s type from the context type $\rho'$ and the types of the arguments.

This indicates our approach: As a first step, a simple matching procedure, which we call pre-substitution, draws information from the context type to be used in checking the arguments. Subsequently, the information gained from checking the arguments fills in boxes back in the context type.

However, during the first matching step, we must be careful to match type variables exclusively with the invariant parts of the context type. The reason is that covariant parts are subject to further instantiation, or skolemisation, as the following example indicates:

$$\Gamma \vdash ((\text{head ids}) \cdot \sigma_{id}) : \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}$$

The type of head is $\forall a, [a] \rightarrow a$ and we would have to match the variable $a$ with the skolemised type of $\sigma_{id}$, $b \rightarrow b$, which would yield an instantiation of $a$ to $b$, instead of the desired instantiation of $a$ to $a$.

Concretely, the rule is the following:

$$\nu : \forall \sigma, \tau \rightarrow \sigma \in \Gamma \quad \sigma \vdash \tau \leq \rho' \Rightarrow \psi_0$$

$$\psi = \psi_0 \cup \{a \mapsto \sigma\}$$

$$\psi_u = \{\text{strip}(\psi(a))\} \cup \psi$$

$$\tau_{\text{arg}} = \tau \cap \text{fv}(\tau)$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \nu: \pi : \rho'$$

This indicates our approach: As a first step, a simple matching procedure, which we call pre-substitution, draws information from the context type to be used in checking the arguments. Subsequently, the information gained from checking the arguments fills in boxes back in the context type.

Because these variables appear in the argument types we know that subsumption may provide no information about them. Next, we create a new substitution, $\psi_u$, that maps them to $\psi_0$. Finally, we perform the subsumption check $\Gamma \vdash \nu : \pi : \rho'$.

It remains to explain how the pre-substitution of Figure 5 works. The intuition behind the judgement $\Gamma \vdash \sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \Rightarrow \psi$ is that $\psi$ is a substitution for $\pi \in \text{fv}(\sigma_1)$ that maps them to "parts" of $\sigma_2$ that contain known polymorphic information—that is, polymorphic information outside boxes. For example,

$$a \vdash (a, a) \leq (\sigma_{id} \rightarrow \sigma_{id} \rightarrow \sigma_{id}) \Rightarrow [a \mapsto \sigma_{id} \rightarrow \sigma_{id}]$$

Pre-subsumption is straightforward—it traverses the structure of types, in the same manner as the subsumption judgment, identifying the invariant parts and in those places deferring to the pre-matching judgment (also in Figure 5) to create the substitution. Multiple substitutions are joined together with the operation $\psi_1 \sqcup \psi_2$ that creates a new substitution containing as much information as possible.

Pre-substitution and pre-matching are nondeterministic operations and many different substitutions may result for a given input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least boxy type $\sigma_1' \sqcup \sigma_2' = \sigma_3'$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_1 \sqcup \sigma_2 = \sigma_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_1' \sqcup \sigma_2' = \sigma_3'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_1' \sqcup \sigma_2' = \sigma_3'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_1 \sqcup \sigma_2 = \sigma_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_1' \sqcup \sigma_2' = \sigma_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_1 \sqcup \sigma_2 = \sigma_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_1' \sqcup \sigma_2' = \sigma_3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Pre-matching and Pre-substitution
For example, S-ANY shows that pre-subsumption can always return the empty substitution. However, if the program type checks, there will always be some “best” substitution that contains the most information, and that is what our algorithm uses.

Even if the program does not type check, pre-subsumption still returns a substitution, but in this case, there is no “best” substitution. For example, both judgements

\[ a \vdash (a, a) \leq (\sigma_{id}, \text{Int}) \Rightarrow [a \mapsto \sigma_{id}] \]

\[ a \vdash (a, a) \leq (\sigma_{id}, \text{Int}) \Rightarrow [a \mapsto \text{Int}] \]

are derivable. This behavior is not problematic—even though pre-subsumption does not detect the discrepancy between the types, the final subsumption check \( \vdash \psi_a(\sigma) \leq \rho' \) will fail. Specifying the system in this manner is slightly simpler than eagerly detecting type errors during pre-substitution. Furthermore, this decision simplifies the implementation of our algorithm: pre-subsumption and pre-matching can be easily implemented as pure functions that do not interfere with unification or box filling.

Concerning expressiveness, the rules SA-ARG, SA-RES and SA-UNB all are strictly better than the original smart-application rule, SMART-APP. These rules provide more checked information (through unboxing) when examining the arguments \( u \), or the result type \( \rho \). However, although SA-UNB appears more powerful SA-ARG and SA-RES, it is not a complete win—there are obscure terms that are typeable with SA-ARG or SA-RES that are not typeable with SA-UNB. But because we believe that SA-UNB behaves better in the common cases, and we find its lack of bias attractive, we have included this rule in our implementation.

6.3 Recovering completeness

Somewhat surprisingly, our algorithm extended with SA-UNB is not complete. The problem arises because, at a let-binding, the specification allows the let-bound identifier to be given its most general type, but it also allows it to be given a less general type. Unfortunately, with SA-UNB, there exist programs that will type check with the less general type (according to the subsumption relation), but not with the more general one! For example:

\[ \vdash \text{let } f = \lambda x. [] \in f \gamma \land (\lambda b. True) : (\forall a. a \rightarrow \text{Int}) \rightarrow (\text{Int}, \text{Int}) \]

If \( f \) is assigned its most general type, \( \forall b_1 b_2 . b_1 \rightarrow [b_2] \), the body of the let-binding is untypeable. On the other hand the other hand the specification can assign the type \( \forall a . a \rightarrow [a] \) to the function, match \( a \) with the polymorphic context type (via \( \psi_0 \) in SA-UNB), and succeed in checking the argument against the known type \( (\forall a. a \rightarrow \text{Int}) \rightarrow (\text{Int}, \text{Int}) \).

The cause of the completeness problem is that a less-general type may induce a different “sharing” of variables between argument and result types, leading to more possibilities for unboxing polymorphic information. Since the distinction between variables appearing in the argument and the result types appears in SA-UNB, SA-RES and SA-ARG but not in SMART-APP, the first three rules have this problem but not the last. One could, in principle, imagine a more elaborate algorithm to fix this problem, but such an algorithm would certainly be more involved than ours.

Now that we understand the problem, there is an obvious solution: modify the typing rules to specify that let generalisation must infer the most general type (in the Hindley-Milner sense). Such a solution is not new in type inference systems: similar ideas were used by Leroy and Mauny for the typing of dynamics in ML [12], and by Garrigue and Rémy in their extension of ML with semi-explicit first-class polymorphism [3]. In particular, one would replace LET-1 in Figure 2 with the following rule:

\[ \Gamma \vdash u : [\sigma_0] \quad \Gamma, x : \text{Int}(\rho) \vdash t : \rho' \quad \forall\rho_0 . \quad \text{if } \Gamma \vdash u : [\rho_0] \text{ then } \Gamma(\rho), \rho_0 \leq_{\text{uni}} \Gamma(\rho_0) \quad \text{LET-IP} \]

\[ \Gamma \vdash \text{let } x = u \text{ in } t : \rho' \]

where \( \Gamma(\rho) \) is just a shorthand for the generalisation of \( \rho \) over its free type variables that do not occur in \( \Gamma \). Rule LET-IP has the effect that all bindings in the environment have unique types for any possible typing derivation. However, we have not yet carried out proofs for this solution but we believe that our algorithm (which remains exactly the same) is complete for this specification.

7. Discussion

Contravariance and subsumption Why did we choose invariance when performing subsumption on function types (rule F1)? Suppose we had used contravariance. Now recall that Principle 2 requires that \( \vdash \forall a . a \rightarrow \text{Int} \leq \sigma \rightarrow \text{Int} \). To form this judgement, SPEC instantiates the left-hand type with \( \psi_0 \) and considers \( \vdash \psi_0 \rightarrow \text{Int} \leq \sigma \rightarrow \text{Int} \). If F1 required contravariance for the function argument, we would need \( \sigma \leq \psi_0 \) which would in turn require the following rule:

\[ \vdash \sigma' \sim \psi_0 \]

Alas, SBOXY-WRONG is incompatible with the simple inference algorithm we have in mind, because it overlaps with rule SPEC. In some situations the “right” thing is to apply SBOXY-WRONG, while in others one must apply SPEC. To see an example of the latter, consider that it must definitely be the case that \( \vdash \forall a . a \leq \text{Int} \).

In short, to obtain complete type inference with a syntax-directed, search-free algorithm, we cannot use SBOXY-WRONG, and that in turn means that we cannot have both Principle 2 and contravariance on function arguments. In practice, argument contravariance does not seem very important, whereas Principle 2 seems vital; hence our choice.

Abstraction In our system, the environment \( \Gamma \) contains only vanilla types, not boxy types. This choice means that \( \eta \)-expansion may render a typeable program untypeable. For example:

\[ f : (\text{Int} \rightarrow \sigma_{id}) \rightarrow \text{Int} \land \forall x. f x : (\text{Int} \rightarrow \sigma_{id}) \rightarrow \text{Int} \]

because it would require \( x \) to enter the environment with a boxy type. In general, boxes in the environment would allow information from the occurrences of a variable to propagate to the type of the abstraction that binds that variable.

There is no fundamental obstacle to allowing \( \Gamma \) to contain boxy types, provided that we ensure that the boxes are filled in. For example, the ABS1 rule should be replaced by two rules:

\[ x \in f_0(t) \quad \Gamma, x : \sigma'_1 \vdash t : \sigma'_2 \]

\[ \Gamma \vdash (\forall x. t) : \sigma'_1 \rightarrow \sigma'_2 \quad \text{ABS1} \]

Our \( \eta \)-expanded example is typeable with ABS1A. But, note the condition \( x \in f_0(t) \). If \( x \) occurs in \( t \) (ABS1A), then we can figure out \( x \)'s type from its occurrences in \( t \). However, if \( x \) is not mentioned in \( t \) (in rule ABS1B), then any boxes in \( x \)'s type, which represent its inferred parts, should be filled in with monotypes, as in the normal ABS1 rule.

8. Related work

Extensions to Hindley-Milner type inference This paper follows a series of papers that augment the HM type system with higher-rank and impredicative polymorphism, while remaining based on
first-order unification. Many systems [17, 15, 6] retain the stratification between monotypes \( \tau \) and polytypes \( \sigma \). They support first-class polymorphism by embedding polymorphic types inside type constructors. Constructor introductions and eliminations mark the locations where type abstraction and application is necessary. In contrast, our vanilla types are the full types of System F.

Garrigue and Rémy’s extension of ML with higher-rank polymorphism [3] embeds polytypes inside monotypes, eliminating the need to predeclare type schemes. Their types mark whether polytypes are annotated or inferred. Other than type signatures, they do not use any contextual information. Only annotated polytypes are allowed to be instantiated, at only marked locations.

The impressive ML\(^F\) language of Le Botlan and Rémy [9] supports impredicativity by extending polytypes with equality and generalization constraints. Their language of types is richer than System F or our language. Consequently, their language includes principal types for terms that have no principal type in System F. Furthermore, we are aware of some situations that require fewer annotations in ML\(^F\) than in our language. For example, ML has the property that if \( \alpha \vdash \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \) then \( \alpha \vdash \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \) type checks without annotation—but this property is not true here.

However, there are two reasons one might prefer our system to ML\(^F\). We believe that our system is easier to add to existing compilers, in particular, those that use typed intermediate languages based on System F [24]. Although Leijen and Löh [11] have developed a translation from ML\(^F\) to System F, our translation (stripping boxes) is far simpler. Furthermore, because all of our types have a simple correspondence to System F types, we believe that our system is easier for current ML and Haskell programmers to understand.

**Stratified type inference** In parallel with our efforts, Rémy designed a two-phase approach to type inference for higher-rank and impredicative polymorphism called \( F^\text{ML} \) [21]. The first phase infers the “shape” of the type of each variable in the program, where “shape” means the exact location of all quantifiers and the type variables they bind. Once shapes are known, only monotypes need be “guessed” by the second phase, which is done using ordinary unification. This division separates the mechanisms for propagating local type information (which must be done in a syntax-directed way) from the underlying first-order type inference. As a result, the two separate components of the type system may be thought about independently—but of course, both must be understood together to understand whether a program should type check.

Regarding expressivity, our system more aggressively propagates known polytype information than \( F^\text{ML} \), for two reasons. First, boxy types and the unbiased smart application rule can more precisely express the local flow of polytype information than the shape inference algorithm of \( F^\text{ML} \). Although it is possible that a more sophisticated shape inference algorithm could capture this behavior. Second, the separation between shape propagation and type inference in \( F^\text{ML} \) means that shape propagation can not take advantage of polymorphic types inferred by type inference (through generalization). In contrast, our system adds the inferred polymorphic type of the right-hand side of the let into the context as known type information before checking the body of the let (see rule LET-1). Therefore, our system includes a significant source of known polytype information that \( F^\text{ML} \) does not. As a result, Rémy proposes incremental elaboration: the type of each top level definition is completely determined before continuing to the next one. However, this strategy treats top-level definitions differently than internal binding.

Another, more subtle difference between the systems is that \( F^\text{ML} \) better supports a relation between polytypes called type containment [14]. In \( F^\text{ML} \), shape propagation infers impredicative instantiations, while the subsumption relation used during type inference is a predicative version of type containment. (Full type containment is known to be undecidable [25].) In contrast, our system must do both simultaneously, so it infers impredicative instantiation at the expense of type containment. (Recall that we use invariance instead of contravariance for the argument component of function types.) However, it is not clear how much of an advantage this is to \( F^\text{ML} \). Rémy remarks that even though ML\(^F\) does not support type containment, it has not been a problem in practice [21].

Because of these differences, there are many programs that type check in one system but not the other. We regard stratified type inference and boxy types as two alternative approaches to the question of how to exploit programmer-supplied type annotations. These two approaches feel different, but their expressive power is similar; it is too early to say which is superior, if indeed either is.

**Local type inference** Pierce and Turner [19] coined the term “Local Type Inference” to refer to a partial inference technique for a language with bounded, impredicative quantification and higher-rank types. (They attribute the original idea to John Reynolds.) They rejected unification entirely and based their type system on monotypes. Hoysoya and Pierce [4] note a few such situations. Although type argument synthesis and bidirectional propagation provide an impressive amount of type inference, the resulting language is difficult for ML and Haskell programmers to use, because the lack of unification means that many programs require type annotations. Hoysoya and Pierce [4] note a few such situations. Although there is folklore about combining bidirectional propagation with HM inference, there is relatively little published work that describes such systems [1, 10].

9. Conclusions and further work

We have presented the first type system for impredicative polymorphism that is a conservative extension of the standard Hindley-Milner system, and can be implemented using a modest extension of classical unification-based type inference. Against these advantages, there are two obvious criticisms one could make. First, the system is somewhat complex. Second, although the type system is not an algorithm, it is carefully designed with an algorithm in mind: boxy types have no logical role, and instead serve to constrain the typeable programs to ones that are also inferable.

Although the system is guided by algorithmic intuitions, it is much simpler than the algorithm itself. Furthermore, although the system can be implemented using the algorithm we give, it could perhaps also be implemented in other ways, such as constraint generation. There is a real gain from separating specification (even an algorithmically-guided one) from implementation.

The type system is arguably too complicated for Joe Programmer to understand, but that is true of many type systems, and perhaps it does not matter too much: in practice, Joe Programmer usu-
ally works by running the compiler repeatedly, treating the compiler as the specification of the type system. Indeed, a good deal of the complexity of the type system (especially Section 6) is there to accommodate programs that “ought” to work, according to our understanding of Joe’s intuitions. Nevertheless, a precise specification, such as the one we give, is very valuable because it tells compiler writers what to do. Even if Joe does not fully understand the type system, it is reasonable to expect compiler writers to do so.

We have a complete, downloadable implementation of the system described in this paper, including SA-UNB described in Section 6.2, embodied in the Glasgow Haskell Compiler. We have had no reports of unexpected behaviour, which suggests that the enhancements do not trip up programmers who do not employ them. We do not have sufficient experience to report one way or the other on the claims about programmer intuitions. However, we hope to better gauge the trade offs between the burden of user annotations and user predictability. Some users may prefer to write more annotations in exchange for a simpler specification of where they are necessary. To that end, we also hope to determine more properties of programs that do and do not need annotation.

In particular, we plan to explore how local transformations affect the typability of terms. For example, we have already discussed how η-expansion can have beneficial and detrimental effects. However, even if a local transformation causes a term to fail to type check, typability may always be recovered through annotation. The System F embedding in Section 4 provides a simple specification of annotations that are guaranteed to be sufficient. We also intend to explore variations of this type system, some of which we mentioned in Sections 6 and 7. Other variations follow from the nontrivial interaction between our system and ML-style references.

More generally, we believe that type systems will increasingly embody a blend of type inference and programmer-supplied type annotations: higher-rank types and impredicativity are examples of this trend, and there are plenty of others, such as polymorphic recursion, GADTs [18] or subtyping. Giving a precise, predictable and implementable specification of these blended type systems is a new challenge. Boxy types are a powerful tool in this respect and one that we hope to use again.
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