13

18

19 20 21

35

36

37

38 39

29

44

45

46

47

48

49

# A Simple Abstract Interpretation Framework for Modular Analysis

JOONHYUP LEE and KWANGKEUN YI

#### 1 SYNTAX AND SEMANTICS

## 1.1 Abstract Syntax

```
Identifiers x \in \text{Var}
Expression e \to x \mid \lambda x.e \mid e \mid e \mid \lambda-calculus
\mid e \rtimes e \quad \text{linked expression}
\mid \varepsilon \quad \text{empty module}
\mid x = e \mid e \quad \text{(recursive) binding}
```

Fig. 1. Abstract syntax of the language.

# 1.2 Operational Semantics

```
Environment
                        \in
                             Env
                            Loc \triangleq \{infinite set of locations\}
     Location \ell
        Value v
                            Val \triangleq Env + Var \times Expr \times Env
                        \in WVal \triangleq Val + Loc × Val
 Weak Value w
Environment
                                                                     empty stack
                                                                     free location binding
                             (x,\ell)::\sigma
                                                                     weak value binding
                             (x, w) :: \sigma
        Value
                                                                     exported environment
                             \langle \lambda x.e, \sigma \rangle
                                                                     closure
 Weak Value w
                                                                     value
                                                                     recursive value
                             \mu\ell.v
```

Fig. 2. Definition of the semantic domains.

#### 1.3 Reconciling with Conventional Backpatching

The semantics in Figure 3 makes sense due to similarity with a conventional backpatching semantics as presented in Figure 5. We have defined a relation  $\sim$  that satisfies:

```
\sim \subseteq WVal \times (MVal \times Mem \times \mathcal{P}(Loc)) \bullet \sim (\bullet, \emptyset, \emptyset)
```

Authors' address: Joonhyup Lee; Kwangkeun Yi.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

- © 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.
- XXXX-XXXX/2024/3-ART \$15.00
- https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnnnnnnn

 $\sigma \vdash e \Downarrow v$ 

Fig. 3. The big-step operational semantics.

Fig. 4. Definition of the semantic domains with memory.

## and the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1 (Equivalence of Semantics). For all  $\sigma \in \text{Env}$ ,  $\sigma' \in \text{MEnv} \times \text{Mem} \times \mathcal{P}(\text{Loc})$ ,  $v \in \text{Val}$ ,  $v' \in \text{MVal} \times \text{Mem} \times \mathcal{P}(\text{Loc})$ , we have:

$$\sigma \sim \sigma'$$
 and  $\sigma \vdash e \Downarrow v \Rightarrow \exists v' : v \sim v'$  and  $\sigma' \vdash e \Downarrow v'$   
 $\sigma \sim \sigma'$  and  $\sigma' \vdash e \Downarrow v' \Rightarrow \exists v : v \sim v'$  and  $\sigma \vdash e \Downarrow v$ 

The actual definition for  $\sim$  can be found in the appendix.

```
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
119
122
124
126
128
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
```

```
 \begin{array}{c|c} \sigma, m, L \vdash e \Downarrow v, m', L' \\ \hline \sigma(x) = \ell & m(\ell) = v \\ \hline \sigma, m, L \vdash x \Downarrow v, m, L & \hline \sigma, m, L \vdash \lambda x.e \Downarrow \langle \lambda x.e, \sigma \rangle, m, L \\ \hline \end{array}
```

APP 
$$\sigma, m, L \vdash e_1 \Downarrow \langle \lambda x. e, \sigma_1 \rangle, m_1, L_1 \qquad \sigma, m_1, L_1 \vdash e_2 \Downarrow v_2, m_2, L_2 \qquad \ell \notin \text{dom}(m_2) \cup L_2$$
$$\underbrace{(x, \ell) :: \sigma_1, m_2[\ell \mapsto v_2], L_2 \vdash e \Downarrow v, m', L'}_{\sigma, m, L \vdash e_1 e_2 \Downarrow v, m', L'}$$

$$\frac{\text{Link}}{\sigma, \textit{m}, \textit{L} \vdash \textit{e}_1 \Downarrow \sigma_1, \textit{m}_1, \textit{L}_1 \qquad \sigma_1, \textit{m}_1, \textit{L}_1 \vdash \textit{e}_2 \Downarrow \textit{v}, \textit{m}', \textit{L}'}{\sigma, \textit{m}, \textit{L} \vdash \textit{e}_1 \rtimes \textit{e}_2 \Downarrow \textit{v}, \textit{m}', \textit{L}'} \qquad \frac{\text{Empty}}{\sigma, \textit{m}, \textit{L} \vdash \varepsilon \Downarrow \bullet, \textit{m}, \textit{L}}$$

$$\frac{\text{Bind}}{\ell \notin \text{dom}(m) \cup L} \quad (x, \ell) :: \sigma, m, L \cup \{\ell\} \vdash e_1 \Downarrow v_1, m_1, L_1 \\ \frac{(x, \ell) :: \sigma, m_1[\ell \mapsto v_1], L_1 \vdash e_2 \Downarrow \sigma_2, m', L'}{\sigma, m, L \vdash x = e_1; e_2 \Downarrow (x, \ell) :: \sigma_2, m', L'}$$

Fig. 5. The big-step operational semantics with memory.

#### 2 GENERATING AND RESOLVING EVENTS

Now we formulate the semantics for generating events.

Fig. 6. Definition of the semantic domains with events. All other semantic domains are equal to Figure 2.

We extend how to read weak values given an environment.

$$\bullet(x) \triangleq \bot \qquad \qquad ((x',\ell) :: \sigma)(x) \triangleq (x = x'?\ell : \sigma(x))$$
 
$$[E](x) \triangleq \mathsf{Read}(E,x) \qquad ((x',w) :: \sigma)(x) \triangleq (x = x'?w : \sigma(x))$$

Then we need to add only one rule to the semantics in Figure 3 for the semantics to incorporate events.

$$\frac{A\text{PPEVENT}}{\sigma \vdash e_1 \Downarrow E} \quad \sigma \vdash e_2 \Downarrow v$$
$$\frac{\sigma \vdash e_1 e_2 \Downarrow Call(E, v)}{\sigma \vdash e_1 e_2 \Downarrow Call(E, v)}$$

Now we need to formulate the *concrete linking* rules. The concrete linking rule  $\sigma_0 \propto w$ , given an answer  $\sigma_0$  to the Init event, resolves all events within w to obtain a set of final results.

Concrete linking makes sense because of the following theorem. First define:

$$\mathrm{eval}(e,\sigma) \triangleq \{v \mid \sigma \vdash e \Downarrow v\} \qquad \mathrm{eval}(e,\Sigma) \triangleq \bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \mathrm{eval}(e,\sigma) \qquad \sigma_0 \propto W \triangleq \bigcup_{w \in W} (\sigma_0 \propto w)$$

Then the following holds:

Theorem 2.1 (Soundness of concrete linking). Given  $e \in \text{Expr}$ ,  $\sigma \in \text{Env}$ ,  $v \in \text{Val}$ ,

$$\forall \sigma_0 \in \text{Env} : \text{eval}(e, \sigma_0 \times \sigma) \subseteq \sigma_0 \times \text{eval}(e, \sigma)$$

Fig. 7. Definition for concrete linking.

#### 3 TYPING

The definitions for types are in Figure 8 and the typing rules are in Figure 9.

Fig. 8. Definition of types.

$$\frac{\Gamma\text{-ID}}{\Gamma(x) = \tau} \frac{\Gamma\text{-FN}}{\Gamma \vdash x : \tau, \{x\}} \qquad \frac{T\text{-FN}}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.e : \tau_1 \xrightarrow{S} \tau_2, \emptyset} \qquad \frac{T\text{-App}}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau_1 \xrightarrow{S} \tau_2, S_1} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau_1, S_2}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 e_2 : \tau_2, S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S}$$

$$\frac{T\text{-AppEvent}}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : E^\#, S_1} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau, S_2}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau_1, S_1} \qquad \frac{T\text{-Link}}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \Gamma_1, S_1} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau_2, S_2}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau_2, S_2} \qquad \frac{T\text{-Nil}}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau_2, S_2}$$

$$\frac{T\text{-Bind}}{(x, \tau_1) :: \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau_1, S_1} \qquad x \notin S_1 \qquad (x, \tau_1) :: \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \Gamma_2, S_2$$

$$\frac{T\text{-Bind}}{\Gamma \vdash x = e_1; e_2 : (x, \tau_1) :: \Gamma_2, S_1 \cup S_2}$$

Fig. 9. The typing judgment.

#### 3.1 Type Safety

Theorem 3.1 (Type Safety). For all  $e \in \text{Expr}$ , if  $\bullet \vdash e : \tau, S$  for some  $\tau, S$ , then e runs under  $\bullet$  without error.

Sketch. We prove this through unary logical relations and induction on the typing judgment.

#### **Event Relation**

 $\mathcal{E}[\![E^{\#}]\!] \rho$ 

$$\mathcal{E}[\![\![\mathsf{Init}^{\#}]\!]\rho \triangleq \{\mathsf{Init}\}\\ \mathcal{E}[\![\![\![\mathsf{Read}^{\#}(E^{\#},x)]\!]\rho \triangleq \{\mathsf{Read}(E,x)|E \in \mathcal{E}[\![\![E^{\#}]\!]\!]\rho\}\\ \mathcal{E}[\![\![\![\![\mathsf{Call}^{\#}(E^{\#},\tau)]\!]\!]\rho \triangleq \{\mathsf{Call}(E,v)|E \in \mathcal{E}[\![\![E^{\#}]\!]\!]\rho \wedge v \in \mathcal{V}[\![\![\tau]\!]\!]\rho\}$$

# **Context Relation**

 $C[\Gamma]\rho$ 

$$C[\![\bullet]\!] \rho \triangleq \{\bullet\}$$

$$C[\![(x,\tau) :: \Gamma]\!] \rho \triangleq \{(x,w) :: \sigma | w \in W[\![\tau]\!] \rho \land \sigma \in C[\![\Gamma]\!] \rho\}$$

$$\cup \{(x,\ell) :: \sigma | \rho(\ell) = \tau \land \sigma \in C[\![\Gamma]\!] \rho\}$$

$$C[\![[E^{\#}]\!] \rho \triangleq \{[E] | E \in E[\![E^{\#}]\!] \rho\}$$

#### **Value Relation**

 $V[\tau] \rho$ 

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{V}[\![\tau_1 \xrightarrow{S} \tau_2]\!] \rho \triangleq \{\langle \lambda x.e, \sigma \rangle | \forall \rho', w \in \mathcal{W}[\![\tau_1]\!] \rho' : \rho'|_{\mathsf{FLoc}(\sigma)} = \rho|_{\mathsf{FLoc}(\sigma)} \\ \Rightarrow (e, (x, w) :: \sigma, S) \in \mathcal{X}[\![\tau_2]\!] \rho' \} \end{split}$$

#### **Weak Value Relation**

 $W[\tau] \rho$ 

$$\mathcal{W}[\![\tau]\!]\rho\triangleq\mathcal{V}[\![\tau]\!]\rho\cup\{\mu\ell.v|v\in\mathcal{V}[\![\tau]\!]\rho[\ell\mapsto\tau]\}$$

# **Expression Relation**

 $X[\![\tau]\!]\rho$ 

$$\mathcal{X}[\![\tau]\!]\rho\triangleq\{(e,\sigma,S)|\mathrm{unsafe}(\sigma)\cap S=\varnothing\Rightarrow\mathrm{eval}(e,\sigma)\subseteq\mathcal{V}[\![\tau]\!]\rho\}$$

# **Semantic Typing**

 $\Gamma \models e : \tau, S$ 

$$\Gamma \models e : \tau, S \triangleq \forall \rho, \sigma \in C \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \rho : (e, \sigma, S) \in X \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \rho$$

We prove

$$\Gamma \vdash e : \tau . S \Rightarrow \Gamma \models e : \tau . S$$

by induction on  $\vdash$ .

Note that we have to extend the big-step evaluation rules with error propagation rules for  $\operatorname{eval}(e,\sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{V}[\![\tau]\!] \rho$  to mean that  $\operatorname{eval}(e,\sigma)$  has no errors.

$$\mathrm{eval}^{\#}(e,\Gamma) \triangleq \bigcup_{S} \{\tau | \Gamma \vdash e : \tau, S\} \quad \gamma(\tau) \triangleq \{v | v \in \mathcal{V}[\![\tau]\!] \bot \land \mathrm{unsafe}(v) = \varnothing\} \quad \gamma(T) \triangleq \bigcap_{\tau \in T} \gamma(\tau)$$

$$\operatorname{eval}(e, \gamma(\Gamma)) \subseteq \gamma(\operatorname{eval}^{\#}(e, \Gamma))$$

Test compilation