

CIS 500
Software Foundations
Fall 2004

4 October, 2004

Types

Type Systems

- ◆ currently, active and successful topic in PL research
- ◆ “light-weight” formal methods
- ◆ “enabling technology” for all sorts of other things, e.g. language-based security
- ◆ the “skeleton” around which modern programming languages are often designed

Approaches to Typing

- ◆ A **strongly typed** language prevents programs from accessing private data, corrupting memory, crashing the machine, etc.
- ◆ A **weakly typed** language does not.
- ◆ A **statically typed** language performs type-consistency checks at when programs are first entered.
- ◆ A **dynamically typed** language delays these checks until programs are executed.

| | Weak | Strong |
|---------|--------|---------------------------------------|
| Dynamic | | Lisp, Scheme, Perl, Python, Smalltalk |
| Static | C, C++ | ML, ADA, Java* |

*Strictly speaking, Java should be called “mostly static”

Plan

- ◆ For today, we'll go back to the simple language of arithmetic and boolean expressions and show how to give it a (very simple) type system
- ◆ On Wednesday, we'll develop a simple type system for the lambda-calculus, following TAPL Ch.9. This lecture will not be covered on the first midterm.
- ◆ We'll spend a good part of the rest of the semester adding features to this type system

Outline

1. begin with a set of terms, a set of values, and an evaluation relation
2. define a set of **types** classifying values according to their "shapes"
3. define a **typing relation** $t : T$ that classifies terms according to the shape of the values that result from evaluating them
4. check that the typing relation is **sound** in the sense that,
 - (a) if $t : T$ and $t \longrightarrow^* v$, then $v : T$
 - (b) if $t : T$, then evaluation of t will not get stuck

(N.b.: we actually state #4a in a slightly more general way...)

Arithmetic Expressions – Syntax

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| $t ::=$ | <i>terms</i> |
| true | <i>constant true</i> |
| false | <i>constant false</i> |
| if t then t else t | <i>conditional</i> |
| 0 | <i>constant zero</i> |
| succ t | <i>successor</i> |
| pred t | <i>predecessor</i> |
| iszero t | <i>zero test</i> |
| $v ::=$ | <i>values</i> |
| true | <i>true value</i> |
| false | <i>false value</i> |
| nv | <i>numeric value</i> |
| $nv ::=$ | <i>numeric values</i> |
| 0 | <i>zero value</i> |
| succ nv | <i>successor value</i> |

Evaluation Rules

if true then t_2 else $t_3 \longrightarrow t_2$ (E-IFTRUE)

if false then t_2 else $t_3 \longrightarrow t_3$ (E-IFFALSE)

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 \longrightarrow \text{if } t'_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3} \quad (\text{E-IF})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{\text{succ } t_1 \rightarrow \text{succ } t'_1} \quad (\text{E-SUCC})$$

$$\text{pred } 0 \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{E-PREDZERO})$$

$$\text{pred } (\text{succ } nv_1) \rightarrow nv_1 \quad (\text{E-PREDSUCC})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{\text{pred } t_1 \rightarrow \text{pred } t'_1} \quad (\text{E-PRED})$$

$$\text{iszero } 0 \rightarrow \text{true} \quad (\text{E-ISZEROZERO})$$

$$\text{iszero } (\text{succ } nv_1) \rightarrow \text{false} \quad (\text{E-ISZEROSUCC})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{\text{iszero } t_1 \rightarrow \text{iszero } t'_1} \quad (\text{E-ISZERO})$$

Types

In this language, values have two possible “shapes”: they are either booleans or numbers.

$T ::=$

| | |
|---------------|-------------------------|
| Bool | <i>type of booleans</i> |
| Nat | <i>type of numbers</i> |

Typing Rules

$$\text{true} : \text{Bool} \quad (\text{T-TRUE})$$

$$\text{false} : \text{Bool} \quad (\text{T-FALSE})$$

Typing Rules

$$\text{true} : \text{Bool} \quad (\text{T-TRUE})$$

$$\text{false} : \text{Bool} \quad (\text{T-FALSE})$$

$$\frac{t_1 : \text{Bool} \quad t_2 : T \quad t_3 : T}{\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 : T} \quad (\text{T-IF})$$

Typing Rules

`true : Bool` (T-TRUE)

`false : Bool` (T-FALSE)

$$\frac{t_1 : \text{Bool} \quad t_2 : T \quad t_3 : T}{\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 : T}$$
 (T-IF)

`0 : Nat` (T-ZERO)

Typing Rules

`true : Bool` (T-TRUE)

`false : Bool` (T-FALSE)

$$\frac{t_1 : \text{Bool} \quad t_2 : T \quad t_3 : T}{\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 : T}$$
 (T-IF)

`0 : Nat` (T-ZERO)

$$\frac{t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{succ } t_1 : \text{Nat}}$$
 (T-SUCC)

$$\frac{t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{pred } t_1 : \text{Nat}}$$
 (T-PRED)

Typing Rules

`true : Bool` (T-TRUE)

`false : Bool` (T-FALSE)

$$\frac{t_1 : \text{Bool} \quad t_2 : T \quad t_3 : T}{\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 : T}$$
 (T-IF)

`0 : Nat` (T-ZERO)

$$\frac{t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{succ } t_1 : \text{Nat}}$$
 (T-SUCC)

$$\frac{t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{pred } t_1 : \text{Nat}}$$
 (T-PRED)

$$\frac{t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{iszero } t_1 : \text{Bool}}$$
 (T-ISZERO)

$$\frac{t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{iszero } t_1 : \text{Bool}}$$

(T-ISZERO)

$$\frac{t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{iszero } t_1 : \text{Bool}}$$

(T-ISZERO)

$$\frac{t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{iszero } t_1 : \text{Bool}}$$

(T-ISZERO)

$$\frac{t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{iszero } t_1 : \text{Bool}}$$

(T-ISZERO)

Imprecision of Typing

Like other static program analyses, type systems are generally **imprecise**: they do not predict exactly what kind of value will be returned by every program, but just a conservative (safe) approximation.

$$\frac{t_1 : \text{Bool} \quad t_2 : T \quad t_3 : T}{\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 : T} \quad (\text{T-IF})$$

Using this rule, we cannot assign a type to

```
if true then 0 else false
```

even though this term will certainly evaluate to a number.

Properties of the Typing Relation

Type Safety

The safety (or soundness) of this type system can be expressed by two properties:

1. **Progress**: A well-typed term is not stuck
If $t : T$, then either t is a value or else $t \longrightarrow t'$ for some t' .
2. **Preservation**: Types are preserved by one-step evaluation
If $t : T$ and $t \longrightarrow t'$, then $t' : T$.

Typing Derivations

Every pair (t, T) in the typing relation can be justified by a **derivation tree** built from instances of the inference rules.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{}{0 : \text{Nat}} \text{T-ZERO}}{\text{iszero } 0 : \text{Bool}} \text{T-ISZERO} \quad \frac{}{0 : \text{Nat}} \text{T-ZERO}}{\text{if iszero } 0 \text{ then } 0 \text{ else pred } 0 : \text{Nat}} \text{T-IF} \quad \frac{}{0 : \text{Nat}} \text{T-ZERO}}{\text{pred } 0 : \text{Nat}} \text{T-PRED}$$

Proofs of properties about the typing relation often proceed by induction on typing derivations.

Inversion

Lemma:

1. If `true` : R, then `R = Bool`.
2. If `false` : R, then `R = Bool`.
3. If `if t1 then t2 else t3` : R, then `t1 : Bool`, `t2 : R`, and `t3 : R`.
4. If `0` : R, then `R = Nat`.
5. If `succ t1` : R, then `R = Nat` and `t1 : Nat`.
6. If `pred t1` : R, then `R = Nat` and `t1 : Nat`.
7. If `iszero t1` : R, then `R = Bool` and `t1 : Nat`.

Inversion

Lemma:

1. If `true` : R, then `R = Bool`.
2. If `false` : R, then `R = Bool`.
3. If `if t1 then t2 else t3` : R, then `t1 : Bool`, `t2 : R`, and `t3 : R`.
4. If `0` : R, then `R = Nat`.
5. If `succ t1` : R, then `R = Nat` and `t1 : Nat`.
6. If `pred t1` : R, then `R = Nat` and `t1 : Nat`.
7. If `iszero t1` : R, then `R = Bool` and `t1 : Nat`.

Proof: ...

Inversion

Lemma:

1. If `true` : R, then `R = Bool`.
2. If `false` : R, then `R = Bool`.
3. If `if t1 then t2 else t3` : R, then `t1 : Bool`, `t2 : R`, and `t3 : R`.
4. If `0` : R, then `R = Nat`.
5. If `succ t1` : R, then `R = Nat` and `t1 : Nat`.
6. If `pred t1` : R, then `R = Nat` and `t1 : Nat`.
7. If `iszero t1` : R, then `R = Bool` and `t1 : Nat`.

Proof: ...

This leads directly to a recursive algorithm for calculating the type of a term...

Typechecking Algorithm

```
typeof(t) = if t = true then Bool
           else if t = false then Bool
           else if t = if t1 then t2 else t3 then
             let T1 = typeof(t1) in
             let T2 = typeof(t2) in
             let T3 = typeof(t3) in
             if T1 = Bool and T2=T3 then T2
             else "not typable"
           else if t = 0 then Nat
           else if t = succ t1 then
             let T1 = typeof(t1) in
             if T1 = Nat then Nat else "not typable"
           else if t = pred t1 then
             let T1 = typeof(t1) in
             if T1 = Nat then Nat else "not typable"
           else if t = iszero t1 then
             let T1 = typeof(t1) in
             if T1 = Nat then Bool else "not typable"
```

Canonical Forms

Lemma:

1. If v is a value of type `Bool`, then v is either `true` or `false`.
2. If v is a value of type `Nat`, then v is a numeric value

Canonical Forms

Lemma:

1. If v is a value of type `Bool`, then v is either `true` or `false`.
2. If v is a value of type `Nat`, then v is a numeric value

Proof: ...

Progress

Theorem: Suppose t is a well-typed term (that is, $t : T$ for some T). Then either t is a value or else there is some t' with $t \longrightarrow t'$.

Progress

Theorem: Suppose t is a well-typed term (that is, $t : T$ for some T). Then either t is a value or else there is some t' with $t \longrightarrow t'$.

Proof:

Progress

Theorem: Suppose t is a well-typed term (that is, $t : T$ for some T). Then either t is a value or else there is some t' with $t \longrightarrow t'$.

Proof: By induction on a derivation of $t : T$.

Progress

Theorem: Suppose t is a well-typed term (that is, $t : T$ for some T). Then either t is a value or else there is some t' with $t \longrightarrow t'$.

Proof: By induction on a derivation of $t : T$.

The T-TRUE, T-FALSE, and T-ZERO cases are immediate, since t in these cases is a value.

Progress

Theorem: Suppose t is a well-typed term (that is, $t : T$ for some T). Then either t is a value or else there is some t' with $t \longrightarrow t'$.

Proof: By induction on a derivation of $t : T$.

The T-TRUE, T-FALSE, and T-ZERO cases are immediate, since t in these cases is a value.

Case T-IF: $t = \text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3$
 $t_1 : \text{Bool} \quad t_2 : T \quad t_3 : T$

Progress

Theorem: Suppose t is a well-typed term (that is, $t : T$ for some T). Then either t is a value or else there is some t' with $t \longrightarrow t'$.

Proof: By induction on a derivation of $t : T$.

The T-TRUE, T-FALSE, and T-ZERO cases are immediate, since t in these cases is a value.

Case T-IF: $t = \text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3$
 $t_1 : \text{Bool} \quad t_2 : T \quad t_3 : T$

By the induction hypothesis, either t_1 is a value or else there is some t'_1 such that $t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1$. If t_1 is a value, then the canonical forms lemma tells us that it must be either `true` or `false`, in which case either E-IFTRUE or E-IFFALSE applies to t . On the other hand, if $t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1$, then, by E-IF,
 $t \longrightarrow \text{if } t'_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3$.

Preservation

Theorem: If $t : T$ and $t \longrightarrow t'$, then $t' : T$.

Preservation

Theorem: If $t : T$ and $t \longrightarrow t'$, then $t' : T$.

Proof: ...