

There is no such thing  
as a free lunch

~~theorem~~

please excuse the inflammatory title

# Parametricity

## Theorems for free!

Philip Wadler  
University of Glasgow\*

### Abstract

From the type of a polymorphic function we can derive a theorem that it satisfies. Every function of the same type satisfies the same theorem. This provides a free source of useful theorems, courtesy of Reynolds' abstraction theorem for the polymorphic lambda calculus.

### 1 Introduction

Write down the definition of a polymorphic function on a piece of paper. Tell me its type, but be careful not to let me see the function's definition. I will tell you a

rearrange such lists, independent of the values contained in them. Thus applying  $a$  to each element of a list and then rearranging yields the same result as rearranging and then applying  $a$  to each element.

For instance,  $r$  may be the function  $reverse : \forall X. X^* \rightarrow X^*$  that reverses a list, and  $a$  may be the function  $code : Char \rightarrow Int$  that converts a character to its ASCII code. Then we have

```
code* (reverseChar ['a', 'b', 'c'])  
= [99, 98, 97]  
= reverseInt (code* ['a', 'b', 'c'])
```

which satisfies the theorem. Or  $r$  may be the function

Gives us a number of free theorems about parametrically polymorphic functions in *the second order lambda calculus*

# Type Classes

Create functions which are not parametrically polymorphic so parametricity says nothing about such functions

# Unbounded Recursion

Reduces the number of theorems we can get for free  
*in a known way.*

Theorems for Free!.

Philip Wadler.

FPCA, New York, New York, USA 1989 pp. 347-359.

# Haskell's Seq

Reduces the number of theorems we can get for free  
*in a known way.*

Theorems for Free!.

Philip Wadler.

FPCA, New York, New York, USA 1989 pp. 347-359.

# Type-Indexed Functions

Functions which can make a decision based on the type of an argument.

Kill parametricity dead for the whole language

Everyone you talk to about Type Indexed Functions

# So what's with the title?

Type indexed functions are *valuable*. Thus keeping parametricity *costs us* our valuable feature. In fact, parametricity only works in systems where the type system is *very conservative with parametric polymorphism*.

# A safe but non-parametric function

Be generous with syntax  
please, squint your eyes  
and think, “what could  
this mean in a Haskell-  
ish language?”

```
incOrElse n :: Int = n + 1
```

```
incOrElse c :: Char = char ((ord c) + 1)
```

```
incOrElse o = o
```



```
incOrElse n :: Int = n + 1
```

```
incOrElse c :: Char = char ((ord c) + 1)
```

```
incOrElse o = o
```

Nothing can go wrong with `incOrElse` if we give it the type  $\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$

Except, that is, for the theorems we got from parametricity.

So a conservative type system is a *necessary cost* of parametricity

# That's it?

So I have described a problem, you hope I have more than this right?

# The solution

Give `incOrElse` some other type - not  $\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$

As long as the type I give it is *compatible* with  $\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$

# Suggestion

$$\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \equiv \forall \alpha \in \{-\}. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

The types  $\alpha$  can be

The unknown type

When a function is polymorphic over the unknown type, it is parametrically polymorphic.

# Suggestion

```
incOrElse n :: Int = n + 1
```

```
incOrElse c :: Char = char ((ord c) + 1)
```

```
incOrElse o = o
```

$$\forall \alpha \in \{-, \text{Int}, \text{Char}\}. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

When a function is polymorphic over more than the unknown type, it is not parametrically polymorphic.

# Future Work

(1) Proof it does not break parametricity in the whole language

(2) Type Inference for such a type system

# Why I think (1) is true

The set of types clearly identifies which functions are candidates to have theorems written about them

The parametric arguments are always dispatched in the theorem, e.g. `a . tail = tail . (map a)`

# Why I think (2) is true

I have drawn inference outlines and it *seems* to work

It feels like it will work