## Type Safety

Alex Kavvos

Reading: PFPL, §6.

The **statics** and the **dynamics** play well together: we show that **well-typed programs do not go wrong**. **Theorem 1** (Type safety).

- 1. (Preservation) If  $\vdash e : \tau$  and  $e \longmapsto e'$  then  $\vdash e' : \tau$ .
- 2. (Progress) If  $\vdash e : \tau$  then either e val or  $e \longmapsto e'$  for some e'.

Therefore **closed**, **well-typed terms** behave well under reduction:

- 1. their type is preserved under evaluation, and
- 2. if they're not done evaluating, transitions will continue to take place.

## 1 Preservation

Preservation is the statement that types are preserved under evaluation. This is a central **safety** property of type systems: it shows that a step-by-step computation preserves the kind of value that is being computed.

**Theorem 2** (Preservation). If  $\vdash e : \tau$  and  $e \longmapsto e'$  then  $\vdash e' : \tau$ .

*Proof.* By induction on the derivation of  $e \longmapsto e'$ . We show the most difficult case, namely that of D-Let.

Case(D-Let). Suppose that the reduction  $e \longmapsto e'$  is of the form

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{let}(e_1; x. e_2) \longmapsto e_2[e_1/x]} \mathsf{ D-Let}$$

We know that  $\vdash \mathsf{let}(e_1; x. e_2) : \tau$ . By **inversion** there must exist  $\sigma$  such that  $\vdash e_1 : \sigma$  and  $x : \sigma \vdash e_2 : \tau$ . By the **substitution lemma** (Lecture 4) we obtain  $\vdash e_2[e_1/x] : \tau$ , which is what we wanted to prove.

## 2 Progress

Progress is the statement that if a well-typed program is not done computing (is a value), then there is a step of computation it may take. It is a central **liveness** property of type systems: it shows that a computation will continue to evolve until it produces a useful result (if ever!).

First, we need to characterise the values of each type. The following lemma follows 'by inspection.'

**Lemma 3** (Canonical forms). Suppose e val.

- 1. If  $\vdash e$ : Num then e = num[n] for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- 2. If  $\vdash e$ : Str then e = str[s] for some  $s \in \Sigma^*$ .

**Theorem 4** (Progress). If  $\vdash e : \tau$  then either e val or  $e \longmapsto e'$  for some e'.

*Proof.* By induction on the derivation of  $\vdash e : \tau$ . We only show the case for Plus.

Case(Plus). Suppose that the derivation is of the form

$$\frac{\vdots}{\vdash e_1 : \mathsf{Num}} \qquad \frac{\vdots}{\vdash e_2 : \mathsf{Num}} \qquad \mathsf{PLUS}$$

$$\vdash \mathsf{plus}(e_1; e_2) : \mathsf{Num}$$

 $e_1$  is a closed, well-typed term with a 'smaller' derivation, so the **induction hypothesis** applies to it. Hence, either  $e_1$  val, or there exists  $e_1'$  such that  $e_1 \longmapsto e_1'$ . We consider each case separately.

- Suppose  $e_1$  val. We then apply the **induction hypothesis** to  $e_2$ , and obtain the same two cases for  $e_2$ .
  - Suppose  $e_2$  val. Then, by the canonical forms lemma (Lemma 3) we have that  $e_1 = \operatorname{num}[n_1]$  and  $e_2 = \operatorname{num}[n_2]$  for some  $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then the reduction rule D-PLUS applies to the term  $\operatorname{plus}(e_1; e_2) = \operatorname{plus}(\operatorname{num}[n_1]; \operatorname{num}[n_2])$ , and we have  $\operatorname{plus}(\operatorname{num}[n_1]; \operatorname{num}[n_2]) \longmapsto \operatorname{num}[n_1 + n_2]$ .
  - Suppose there exists  $e_2'$  so that  $e_2 \longmapsto e_2'$ . Then we can construct a derivation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \vdots & & \vdots \\ \hline \frac{e_1 \text{ val}}{\text{plus}(e_1; e_2)} & \hline \frac{e_2 \longmapsto e_2'}{\text{plus}(e_1; e_2')} \text{ D-Plus-2} \end{array}$$

so that  $\mathsf{plus}(e_1; e_2)$  in fact steps to  $\mathsf{plus}(e_1; e_2')$  according to the dynamics.

• Suppose there exists  $e_1'$  so that  $e_1 \longmapsto e_1'$ . Then we can construct a derivation

$$\frac{\vdots}{e_1 \longmapsto e_1'}$$

$$\frac{1}{\mathsf{plus}(e_1; e_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{plus}(e_1'; e_2)} \text{ D-Plus-1}$$

so that  $plus(e_1; e_2)$  in fact steps to  $plus(e'_1; e_2)$  according to the dynamics.

In each case of this exhaustive analysis, there always exists a term to which  $plus(e_1; e_2)$  steps (if well-typed).