Refutation-based Typechecking via Symbolic Execution

1 INTRO

In this section, we will first provide the model theory definition of types in our language. However, since in real programs, we cannot effectively perform certain mathematical enumerations (such as enumeration of functions), we will need an operational-semantics-based definition of how typechecking works in actual programs. As such, we will provide a proof theory definition of types, and prove equivalence of the two systems.

2 CORE LANGUAGE

First, we'll define a small core language with basic integers, booleans, binary operations, conditionals, and functions.

```
\begin{array}{llll} e & ::= & \mathbb{Z} \mid \mathbb{B} \mid x \mid \text{fun } x \rightarrow e \mid e \; e & expressions \\ & \mid e \odot e \mid \text{if } e \; \text{then } e \; \text{else } e \mid \text{let } x = e \; \text{in } e \\ & \mid \text{pick}_i \mid \text{pick}_b \mid \text{ERROR} \\ x & ::= & (identifiers) & variables \\ v & ::= & \mathbb{Z} \mid \mathbb{B} \mid \text{fun } x \rightarrow e & values \\ \tau & ::= & \text{int} \mid \text{bool} \mid \tau \rightarrow \tau & types \end{array}
```

Fig. 1. Core language grammar

2.1 Modeling Types

The typing rules of the system is defined as following:

Definition 2.1 (Typing rules in model theory).

```
(1) \models e : \text{int iff } \forall v.e \longrightarrow^* v, v \in \mathbb{Z}.
(2) \models e : \text{bool iff } \forall v.e \longrightarrow^* v, v \in \mathbb{B}.
```

(3) $\models e : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \text{ iff } \forall v_f.e \longrightarrow^* v_f, \text{ and that } \forall v. \text{ if } \models v : \tau_1, \text{ then } \models v_f v : \tau_2.$

Note that the rules do not actually check the types of the subexpressions. In fact, we can have an expression such as Y (fun this \rightarrow fun n \rightarrow if n = 0 then 0 else this (n-1)) and assign the type int \rightarrow int to it, in spite of the fact that we cannot assign types to any of its subexpressions.

2.2 Proving Types

In this section, we will provide the proof theory definition of typechecking.

Definition 2.2 (Type Generator).

- (1) $generator(int) = pick_i$
- (2) generator(bool) = $pick_b$
- (3) generator($\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2$) = fun $x \rightarrow \text{let}$ _ = checker(τ_1, x) in generator(τ_2)

Definition 2.3 (Type Checker).

- (1) checker(int, e) = if $e \sim int$ then e else ERROR
- (2) $checker(int, e) = if e \sim bool then e else ERROR$

```
    (3) checker(τ<sub>1</sub> → τ<sub>2</sub>, e) =
    let arg = generator(τ<sub>1</sub>) in checker(τ<sub>2</sub>, (e arg))
    Definition 2.4 (Typing rules in proof theory).
        ⊢ e : τ iff ∀v. if e →* v, then checker(τ, v) →→* ERROR.
```

2.3 Completeness and Soundness

In this section, we will show that the two definitions are equivalent, by showing completeness and soundness.

```
Completeness. \forall .e \text{ if } re: \tau, \text{ then } \not\models e: \tau.
```

This is equivalent to showing: if $\exists v.e \longrightarrow^* v$ and $\mathsf{checker}(\tau,v) \longrightarrow^* \mathsf{ERROR}$, then $\not\models e : \tau$.

To prove this statement, we'll need the following lemma:

```
Lemma 2.5. \models generator(\tau) : \tau.
```

We will prove these two statements at the same time by mutual induction on the structure of τ . Base case: $\tau = \text{int}$

Since generator(int) = $pick_i$, by definition of $pick_i$, we know that $\forall v$. if $pick_i \longrightarrow^* v$, then $v \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus, we have shown that generator(int): int.

Given $\exists v.e \longrightarrow^* v$ and checker(int, e) \longrightarrow^* ERROR, we know that there are two potential sources for ERROR:

- (1) $e \longrightarrow^* ERROR$. In this case, $\not\models e$: int is trivial.
- (2) $e \longrightarrow^* v$. In this case, we know that $v \sim \text{int} \longrightarrow^* \text{false}$, which means $v \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Thus $\not\models e : \text{int}$.

Proof for the case where $\tau = bool$ is very similar, so we'll omit it here for brevity.

```
Inductive step: \tau = \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2
```

Since generator($\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2$) = fun $x \rightarrow$ let _ = checker(τ_1 , x) in generator(τ_2), by inductive hypothesis, we know that $\forall .e$ if $\models e : \tau_1$, then $\vdash e : \tau_1$, which means checker(τ_1 , e) \longrightarrow^* ERROR. By the definition of generator(τ), we also know that generator(τ) \longrightarrow^* ERROR.

Therefore, we can conclude that $\forall v$. if $\models v : \tau_1$, then (generator $(\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2)v) \longrightarrow^*$ generator (τ_2) . By inductive hypothesis, we know that generator $(\tau_2) : \tau_2$. Therefore, we have shown that generator $(\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2) : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2$.

Given checker($\tau_1 \to \tau_2, e$) \longrightarrow^* ERROR, since arg = generator(τ) is guaranteed to evaluate to a value, we know that ERROR must come from checker(τ_2 , (e arg)). This suggests that $\exists v.$ (e arg) $\longrightarrow^* v$ and $\not\vdash v:\tau_2$. By induction hypothesis, we know that $\not\models v:\tau_2$, and that \models generator(τ_1): τ_1 . Thus we have found a witness $\models v:\tau_1$ such that $\not\models (e\ v):\tau_2$, proving that $\not\models e:\tau_1\to\tau_2$.

```
Soundness. \forall .e \text{ if } \not\models e : \tau \text{, then } \not\vdash e : \tau.
```

This is equivalent to showing: if $\not\models e:\tau$, then $\exists v.e \longrightarrow^* v$ and $\mathsf{checker}(\tau,v) \longrightarrow^* \mathsf{ERROR}$.

3 LANGUAGE EXTENSIONS

Next, we will define a couple of languages extensions and their corresponding typing rules.

Definition 3.1 (More typing rules).

- (1) $\models e : \alpha \text{ iff } e \Longrightarrow a$, where $\texttt{TYPEOF}(a) = \alpha$.
- (2) $\models e : \tau_1 \cup \tau_2 \text{ iff } \models e : \tau_1 \text{ or } \models e : \tau_2.$
- (3) $\models e : \tau_1 \cap \tau_2 \text{ iff } \models e : \tau_1 \text{ and } \models e : \tau_2.$

Reinterpret Types 3

```
\begin{array}{lll} e & ::= & \cdots \mid a & expressions \\ v & ::= & \cdots \mid a & values \\ \tau & ::= & \cdots \mid \alpha \mid \tau \cup \tau \mid \tau \cap \tau \mid \{\tau \mid e\} \mid (x:\tau) \rightarrow \tau \mid \mu\alpha.\tau & types \end{array}
```

Fig. 2. Extended language grammar

- (4) $\models e : \{\tau \mid p\} \text{ iff } \models e : \tau \text{ and } p \text{ } e \Longrightarrow \mathsf{true}.$
- (5) $\models e : (x : \tau_1) \rightarrow \tau_2$ iff $\forall v$ such that $\models v : \tau_1, \models e \ v : \tau_2[v/x]$.
- (6) $\models e : \mu \alpha. \tau \text{ iff } ?.$

We will now extend the language with records.

$$\begin{array}{lll} e & ::= & \cdots \mid \{\overline{\ell = e}\}^{\{\overline{\ell}\}} \mid e.\ell & expressions \\ v & ::= & \cdots \mid \{\overline{\ell = v}\}^{\{\overline{\ell}\}} & values \\ \tau & ::= & \cdots \mid \{\overline{\ell : \tau}\} & types \end{array}$$

Fig. 3. Extended language grammar (with records)

Definition 3.2 (Record typing rules).

```
(1) \models e : \{\ell_1 : \tau_1, \dots, \ell_m : \tau_m\} iff e \Longrightarrow \{\ell_1 = v_1, \dots, \ell_m = v_m, \dots, \ell_n = v_n\}^{\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p\}} where \models v_i : \tau_i for i \in \{1, \dots, m\}, n \ge p \ge m.
```

```
\begin{array}{lll} e & ::= & \mathbb{Z} \mid \mathbb{B} \mid x \mid \text{fun } x -> e \mid e \mid e \mid e \odot e \mid a \mid \{\overline{\ell = e}\}^{\{\overline{\ell}\}} \mid e.\ell & expressions \\ \mid \text{if } e \text{ then } e \text{ else } e \mid \text{pick}_i \mid \text{pick}_b \mid \text{mzero} \mid \text{ERROR} \\ \mid \text{let } x = e \text{ in } e \mid \text{let } f \text{ } x = e \text{ in } e \mid e \sim p \\ x & ::= & (identifiers) & variables \\ p & ::= & \text{int} \mid \text{bool} \mid \text{fun} \mid \text{any} \mid a \mid \{\overline{\ell}\} & patterns \\ v & ::= & \mathbb{Z} \mid \mathbb{B} \mid \text{fun } x -> e \mid x \mid a \mid \{\overline{\ell = v}\}^{\{\overline{\ell}\}} & values \\ \tau & ::= & \text{int} \mid \text{bool} \mid \tau \rightarrow \tau \mid \alpha \mid \tau \cup \tau \mid \tau \cap \tau \mid \{\tau \mid e\} \mid (x : \tau) \rightarrow \tau \mid \mu\alpha.\tau \mid \{\overline{\ell : \tau}\} & types \\ \end{array}
```

Fig. 4. Complete language grammar

4 TYPE AS VALUES

In this section, we will demonstrate how to represent each type using a tuple of functions generator and checker.

Definition 4.1 (Semantic interpretation of types). We define the semantic interpretation of types as $[\![\tau]\!] = \{\text{gen} = \text{generator}(\tau), \text{ check} = \text{fun } e \rightarrow \text{checker}(\tau, e)\}.$

Definition 4.2 (Defining Generator in the extended language).

- (1) generator(α_i) : a_i .
- (2) generator($\tau_1 \cup \tau_2$): pick_b. if b then generator(τ_1) else generator(τ_2).
- (3) generator $(\tau_1 \cap \tau_2)$ where τ_1, τ_2 are not arrow types or record types: pick $b \in \mathbb{B}$.

```
if b then

let gend = generator(\tau_1) in

if checker(\tau_2, gend) then gend else mzero

else

let gend = generator(\tau_2) in

if checker(\tau_1, gend) then gend else mzero
```

```
(4) generator (\tau_1 \cap \tau_2) where \tau_1 = \tau_{dom1} \rightarrow \tau_{cod1}, \tau_2 = \tau_{dom2} \rightarrow \tau_{cod2}:
     fun x \rightarrow
          if checker(\tau_{dom1}, x) then generator(\tau_{cod1}) else generator(\tau_{cod2}).
(5) generator(\tau_1 \cap \tau_2) where
     \tau_1 = \{\ell_1 : \tau_1', \cdots, \ell_n : \tau_n', \cdots, \ell_{11} : \tau_{11}', \cdots, \ell_{1m} : \tau_{1m}'\},\
     \begin{split} &\tau_2 = \{\ell_1 : \tau_1'', \cdots, \ell_n : \tau_n'', \cdots, \ell_{21} : \tau_{21}'', \cdots, \ell_{2n} : \tau_{2n}''\} : \\ &\{\ell_1 = \text{generator}(\tau_1' \cap \tau_1''), \cdots, \ell_n = \text{generator}(\tau_n' \cap \tau_n''), \cdots, \ell_{11} = \tau_{11}, \cdots, \ell_{2n} = \tau_{2n}'\}. \end{split}
(6) generator(\{\tau \mid p\}):
     let gend = generator(\tau) in if (p gend) then gend else mzero.
(7) generator((x : \tau_1) \rightarrow \tau_2):
     fun x' \rightarrow if checker(\tau_1, x') then generator(\tau_2[x'/x]) else ERROR.
(8) generator(\mu\alpha.\tau) : generator(\tau[\alpha/\mu\alpha.\tau]).
(9) generator(\{\ell_1 : \tau_1, \cdots, \ell_n : \tau_n\}):
     let v_1 = \text{generator}(\tau_1) in \cdots let v_n = \text{generator}(\tau_n) in \{\ell_1 = v_1, \cdots, \ell_n = v_n\}.
Definition 4.3 (Defining Checker in the extended language).
(1) checker(\alpha_i, e) : e \sim a_i.
(2) checker(\tau_1 \cup \tau_2, e) : checker(\tau_1, e) or checker(\tau_2, e).
(3) checker(\tau_1 \cap \tau_2, e) : checker(\tau_1, e) and checker(\tau_2, e).
```

5 SELECTIVE TYPECHECKING

(4) $checker(\{\tau \mid p\}, e) : checker(\tau, e) \text{ and } eval(e) = true.$

(6) checker($\mu\alpha.\tau, e$) : checker($\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha], e$).

and checker $(\tau_1, v_1) \cdots$ and checker (τ_m, v_m) .

We allow users to declare types in their program selectively. If an expression doesn't have a type declaration, we assume that the user does not wish for us to check its type. In other words, we will only be checking explicitly declared types in the user program.

(5) checker $(x:\tau_1) \rightarrow \tau_2, e$: let arg = generator (τ_1) in checker $(\tau_2[arg/x], (e arg))$.

 $(7) \ \mathsf{checker}(\{\ell_1 : \tau_1, \cdots, \ell_m : \tau_m\}, e) : \mathsf{eval}(e) = \{\ell_1 = v_1, \cdots, \ell_m = v_m, \cdots, \ell_n = v_n\}^{\{\ell_1, \cdots, \ell_m\}} = v_n e^{-t} e^$

```
e ::= \cdots \mid \text{let f } (x : \tau) : \tau = e \text{ in } e \mid \text{let } (x : \tau) = e \text{ in } e \text{ expressions}
Fig. 5. Updated language grammar
```