Safety and Liveness; Exc

Christine Rizkallah
CSE, UNSW

Term 3; 2020

Program Properties

Consider a sequence of states, representing the evaluation of a program in a small step semantics (a trace):

Observe that some traces are finite, whereas others are infinite
we'll make all traces infinite by repeating the final state of any ter
infinitely. Such infinite sequences of states are called

A correctness *property* of a program is defined to be a set of behaviours.

Safety vs Liveness

1. A *safety* property states that something **bad** does not happen. For example:

   These are pr

2. A *liveness* property states that something **g** :

   If I start drinking now, eventually I will b

   These are properties that cannot be violated by a finite prefix of a behaviour.

Combining Properties

Safety properties we've seen before

Partial correctness (Hoare Logic)   Static semantics properties

Liveness prope

Theorem

Every property is the intersection of a safety and a liveness property.

The proof of this involves topology (specifically metric spaces).

Types

What sort of properties do types give us?

Adding types to λ-calculus eliminates terms with no normal forms.

$$\frac{(x : \tau) \quad \Gamma}{\quad} \qquad \frac{x : \tau_1, \Gamma \quad e : \tau_2}{\quad} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \quad e_1 : \tau_1 \quad \tau_2 \quad \Gamma \quad e_2 : \tau_1}{\quad}$$

Remember $(\lambda x$

$\tau_1 = \tau_1 \to \tau_2$.

Theorems

Each well typed λ-term always reduces to a normal form (*tion*). Furthermore, the normal form has the same type as the original term (*subject reduction*).

This means that all typed λ-terms terminate!

With Recursion

MinHS, unlike la

Which has no normal form or final state, despite being typed.

The liveness parts of the typing theorems can't be salvaged, but t

Type Safety

Type safety is the property that states:

By "go wrong", we mean reaching a *stuck state* — that is, a non-final state with no outgoing transitions. What are some examples of stuck states

There are many other definitions of things called "type safety" they are all incorrect.

Progress and Preservation

We want to prove that a well-typed program either goes on forever or reaches a final state. We prove this with two lemmas.

How to prove type safety

1. **Progress**, expressio e' such that $e \mapsto e'$.

2. **Preserva** , which states that evaluating one step preserves types. That is, if an expression $e : \tau$ and $e \mapsto e'$, then $e' : \tau$.

$$e_1 : \tau \overbrace{\mapsto}^{\text{progress}} \underbrace{e_2 : \tau}_{\text{preservation}} \overbrace{\mapsto}^{\text{progr}} \underbrace{e_3 : \tau}_{\text{preservation}} \overbrace{\mapsto}^{} \cdots$$

In the real world

Which of the following languages are type safe?

- C **No**
- C++ **No**
- Haskell Yes
- Java Yes
- Python Yes
- Rust Yes (except for unsafe)
- MinHS **Not type safe yet!**

Why is MinHS not type safe?

Division by Zero

We can assign a type to a division by zero:

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{}{(\texttt{Num}\ 3) : \texttt{Int}} \qquad \dfrac{}{(\texttt{Num}\ 0) : \texttt{Int}}}{}$$

But there is no outg

$\Rightarrow$ We have violated progress.

We have two options:

1. **Change the static semantics** to exclude divi halting problem, so we would be forced to overapproxi
2. **Change the dynamic semantics** so that the above state has an outgoing transition.

Our Cop-Out

Add a new state, `Error`, that is the successor state for any partial function:

$$\frac{}{(\mathtt{Div}\ v\ (\mathtt{Num}\ 0)) \mapsto_M \mathtt{Error}}$$

Any state contain

$$\frac{}{(\mathtt{Plus}\ e\ \mathtt{Error}) \mapsto_M \mathtt{Error}} \qquad \frac{}{(\mathtt{Pl}\ \ldots \mapsto}$$

$$\frac{}{(\mathtt{If}\ \mathtt{Error}\ t\ e) \mapsto}$$

(and so on – this is much easier in the C machine!)

Type Safety for Error

We've satisfied pr

should we satisfy p

$$\frac{}{\texttt{Error} : \tau}$$

That's right, we give Error any type.

Dynamic Types

Some languages (e.g. Python, JavaScript) are called *dynamically typed*. This is more accurately called *untyped* as they achieve type safety with the trivial type system containing only one type, here written $\star$, and only one typing rule[1]:

They achieve type safety by defining execution for every synta

even those that are not well typed.

Some languages make sensible decisions like evaluating to a

languages make alternative decisions like trying to perform operations on diverse kinds of data.

[1] The things these languages call types are part of values. They aren't types.

Exceptions

Error may satisfy type safety but it's not satisfying as a programming language feature — when an error occurs, we may not want to crash the program. We will add more fine grained error control – *exceptions* – to MinHS.

Example (Exce

`try/catch/th` ... `ise in Python.`

Exceptions Syntax

	Raising an Exception	Handling an Exceptio
Concrete	**raise** e	**try** e_1 $\Rightarrow$ 2
Abstract	$(\texttt{Raise}\ e)$	$(\texttt{Try}\ e_1\ (x.\ e_2))$

Informal Semantics

Example

try
  if $y \leq 0$ **then**

For an expression (**try** e_1 **handle** $x \Rightarrow e_2$) we

1. Evaluate e_1
2. If **raise** v is encountered while evaluating e_1, we bind v to x and evaluate e_2.

Note that it is possible for **try** expressions to be nested.

- The inner-most **handle** will catch exceptions.
- Handlers may re-raise exceptions.

Static Semantics

The type given to exception values is usually some specific blessed type $\tau_{\mathbf{E}}$ that is specifically intended for that purpose. For example, the `Throwable` type in Java. In dynamically typ $\star$).

Typing Rules

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \tau_{\mathbf{E}}}{\Gamma \vdash (\texttt{Raise}\ e) : \tau} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 :}{\Gamma \vdash (}$$

Dynamic Semantics

Easier to describe using the C Machine. We introduce a new type of state, $s \lll v$, that means an exception value v has been raised. The exception is bubbled up the stack s until a handler is found.

Evaluating a Try Expression

$$s \quad \mapsto$$

Returning from a

$$(\texttt{Try}\ \square\ (x.\ e_2)) \triangleright s$$

Evaluating a Raise expression

$$s \succ (\texttt{Raise}\ e) \quad \mapsto_C \quad (\texttt{Ra}$$

Raising an exception

$$(\texttt{Raise}\ \square) \triangleright s \prec v \quad \mapsto_C$$

Catching an exception

$$(\texttt{Try}\ \square\ (x.\ e_2)) \triangleright s \lll v \quad \mapsto_C \quad s \succ e_2[x := v]$$

Propagating an exception

$$f \triangleright s \lll v \quad \mapsto_C \quad s \lll v$$

Efficiency Problems

The approach described above is highly inefficient. Throwing an exception takes linear time with respect to the depth of stack frames!

Only the most simplistic implementations work this way. A much more efficient approach is to keep

Handler frames

A *handler frame* contains:

1. A copy of the control stack above the `Try`
2. **The exception handler that is given in the**

We write a handler frame that contains a control stack s and a handler $(x.\ e_2)$ as $(\texttt{Handle}\ s\ (x.\ e_2))$.

Efficient Exceptions

Evaluating a `Try` now pushes the handler onto the handler stack and a marker onto the control stack.

$$(h, s) \quad \vdash \quad) \triangleright s) \succ e_1$$

Returning with

$$(\texttt{Handle}\ s\ (x.\ e_2) \triangleright h, (\texttt{Try}\ \square) \quad \vdash$$

Raising an exception now uses the handler stack to immediately

$$(\texttt{Handle}\ s\ (x.\ e_2) \triangleright h, (\texttt{Raise}\ \square) \triangleright s') \prec v \mapsto_C (h, s) \succ e_2[x := v]$$

Exceptions in Practice

While exceptions are undoubtedly useful, they are a form of *non-local* control flow and therefore must be used carefully.

In Haskell, exceptions tend to be avoided as they make a liar out of the type system:

In Java, *checked exceptions* may be used to allow the pos

be tracked in the type system.

Monads

One of the most common uses of the Haskell *monad* construct is for a kind of error handling that is honest about what can happen in the types.