$egin{aligned} \operatorname{const} \ \mathit{map} \leftarrow \operatorname{typeobject} \ \mathit{m} \ & \operatorname{operation} \ \mathit{apply}[a \colon t]
ightarrow [r \colon t] \ & \operatorname{forall} \ t \ & \operatorname{end} \ \mathit{m} \end{aligned}$

```
Here is an object that has type map:
```

example of implicit polymorphism:

 $egin{aligned} ext{const} & identity \leftarrow ext{object} & id \ & ext{operation} & apply[e:t]
ightarrow [r:t] \ & ext{forall} & t \ & r \leftarrow e \ & ext{end} & apply \ & ext{end} & id \end{aligned}$

of identity.apply[e] is res $\langle \tau \llbracket e \rrbracket, \tau \llbracket e \rrbracket \rangle = \tau \llbracket e \rrbracket$ as required.

The operation apply of identity simply returns its argument; it is the identity function. It is important that the syntactic type of the result be the same as that of the argument; this is achieved by use of the type parameter t, which is introduced by the clause **forall** t, and is bound to the syntactic type of the formal parameter a. The signature of identity.apply thus depends on the type of its argument e; we can now appreciate why signatures must be functions. Referring back to rule (9) in Section 3, we see that the argument to the signature function is $\langle \tau[e], e \rangle$. The signature of apply in map is $\lambda \langle t, v \rangle \cdot \langle t, t \rangle$; when applied to $\langle \tau[e], e \rangle$ the result is $\langle \tau[e], \tau[e] \rangle$. In the invocation identity.apply[e], the type of the argument e trivially conforms to arg $\langle \tau[e], \tau[e] \rangle = \tau[e]$, the conformity condition in the antecedent of rule (9) is always

satisfied, and the invocation is type correct whenever the other conditions are satisfied. Moreover, the type

to the second requirement: that Emerald support statically typed polymorphism. Let us first consider an