A Sound Semantics for OCaml_{light}

Scott Owens

OCaml_{light} (ESOP '08) is a formal semantics for a substantial subset of the Objective Caml core language, suitable for writing and verifying real programs. It includes:

- definitions
 - variant data types (e.g., type t = I of int | C of char),
 - record types (e.g., type $t = \{f : int; g : bool\}$),
 - parametric type constructors (e.g., type 'a t = C of 'a),
 - type abbreviations (e.g., type 'a t = 'a * int),
 - mutually recursive combinations of the above (excepting abbreviations),
 - exceptions, and values;
- expressions for type annotations, sequencing, and primitive values (functions, lists, tuples, and records);
- with (record update), if, while, for, assert, try, and raise expressions;
- let-based polymorphism with an SML-style value restriction;
- mutually-recursive function definitions via let rec;
- pattern matching, with nested patterns, as patterns, and "or" (|)patterns;
- mutable references with ref. !. and :=:
- polymorphic equality (the Objective Caml = operator);
- 31-bit word semantics for ints (using an existing HOL library); and
- IEEE-754 semantics for floats (using an existing HOL library).

OCaml_{light} key points

- Faithful to Objective Caml (very nearly)
- Type soundness proof mechanized in HOL
- Operational semantics validated on test programs
- Written in Ott
- Small-step operational semantics
 - Inductively defined relations
 - SOS-style
 - Labelled transitions for state
 - Substution-based
- Type system
 - Inductively defined relations
 - Syntactic
 - Declarative (non-algorithmic)

Proof Effort

A typical type soundness proof

- \approx 7–8 man-months (including testing)
- Specification: 3.2K lines of HOL (from 4.0K Ott)
 - 143 constructors in 42 datatypes
 - 310 rules in 46 relations
- Proof: 9.5K lines of HOL
 - 17 files
 - 653 lemmas
 - 48 definitions

Challenges

- Finding the right lemma using
 - my memory
 - lemma naming conventions
 - documentation (for library lemmas)
 - term matching on the theorem database
- Nested inductions
 - $\textit{ expr} = \ldots \mid \textit{Expr_tuple of expr list} \mid \ldots$
 - "Pointwise" reasoning vs. using separate lemmas
- Proof assistant generated names

Non-challenges:

• Managing De Bruijn indices

Testing

Executable small-step semantics (Type soundness is insufficient)

- 145 tests
- Full coverage

 $red: expr \rightarrow result$ **type** result =

TESTSTUCK

E.ND

- 540 line HOL definition of the executable semantics
- 1K line HOL proof of equivalence between declatative and executable semantics

```
Stuck | Step of expr | StepAlloc of (expr \rightarrow expr) * expr | StepLookup of (expr \rightarrow expr) * location | StepAssign of expr * location * expr match [] with ext{x::y} \rightarrow 1 | [] ext{->} 2 EXPECT 2
```

Related Work

Mechanized metatheory for real-world languages

- Standard ML
- Lee, Crary, Harper (POPL 2007) internal language
 - van Inwegen (1996)
 - Maharaj, Gunter (1994)
 - Syme (1993)
- Java
 - Java: Klein, Nipkow (TOPLAS 2006)
 - Syme (1999)
 - Nipkow, van Oheimb (POPL 1998)
- C
 - Norrish (1998)

Representing Binding (straightforward)

representing binaria (straightforward)				
User type variables	'a	concrete	let f (x : 'a) : 'a = x && true;;	f : bool -> bool
Value names	x	fully concrete (only need closed substs)	<pre>let v = function x -> x;; let x = 1;; let w = v 9;;</pre>	<pre>let x = 1;; let w = (function x -> x) 9;;</pre>
Let-bound type variables		De Bruijn	<pre>let f x = (let g x = in) in let h x = f in</pre>	
Type names	int	fully concrete + no shadowing (following OCaml)	<pre>type t = { f : int };; let v = { f = 1 };; type t = { g : bool };; let _ = v.g;;</pre>	<pre>type t = { f : int };; type t = { g : bool };; let _ = { f = 1 }.g;;</pre>
Constructor names Field names	None	fully concrete + no shadowing (a slight restriction)	<pre>type t = C of int;; let v = C 1;; type u = C of bool;; let _ = v::</pre>	<pre>type t = C of int;; type u = C of bool;; let _ = C 1;;</pre>