### CS720

Logical Foundations of Computer Science

Lecture 19: Type systems

Tiago Cogumbreiro

1/35

### What is a Type System

- 1. **Asserts that a term is well-formed:** eg, consider a fraction represented by two integers, assert that the denominator is not a zero; eg, all functions terminate;
- 2. **Asserts that a term is of a given category:** eg, an expression is numeric; eg, a filepointer is in an open state

### How does a Type System work

- Performed at compile time (a static analysis technique)
- Enforces policies to **guarantees certain properties** statically: eg, in Rust, memory is manually allocated, but no memory is leaked, no data-races errors; eg, in Java, the method of a method calls must be known at compile-time and the argument-type must match the parameter-type.



#### Limitations of IMP

One of the limitations of IMP is that our expressions can only have one type:

- Boolean expressions can only appear in loops/ifs
- Assignments only accept numeric expressions (no booleans)



## Introducing data of different types

### Let us define an expression language

```
t ::= \mathtt{true} \mid \mathtt{false} \mid \mathtt{if} \; t \; \mathtt{then} \; t \; \mathtt{else} \; t \mid 0 \mid \mathtt{succ} \; t \mid \mathtt{pred} \; t \mid \mathtt{iszero} \; t
```

```
Example:

if iszero (succ (succ(0))) then 0 else pred (succ(succ(0)))

Ill-formed example:

succ(true)
```



#### Values

$$\overline{\text{bvalue}(\texttt{true})}^{\text{(bv-true)}} \qquad \overline{\text{bvalue}(\texttt{false})}^{\text{(bv-false)}}$$

$$\overline{\text{nvalue}(0)}^{\text{(nv-zero)}} \qquad \overline{\frac{\text{nvalue}(v)}{\text{nvalue}(\text{succ}(v))}}^{\text{(nv-succ)}}$$

$$\text{value}(v) := \text{bvalue}(v) \vee \text{nvalue}(v)$$



1. succ(if true then succ(0) else 0):



- 1. succ(if true then succ(0) else 0): Not a value.
- 2. false:



- 1. succ(if true then succ(0) else 0): Not a value.
- 2. false: A value.
- 3. iszero(0):



- 1. succ(if true then succ(0) else 0): Not a value.
- 2. false: A value.
- 3. iszero(0): Not a value.
- 4. succ(0):



- 1. succ(if true then succ(0) else 0): Not a value.
- 2. false: A value.
- 3. iszero(0): Not a value.
- 4. succ(0): A value.



#### Semantics

if iszero(succ(succ(0))) then 0 else pred(succ(succ(0)))



```
if iszero(succ(succ(0))) then 0 else pred(succ(succ(0))) \Longrightarrow If, IszeroSucc if false then 0 else pred(succ(succ(0)))
```



```
if iszero(succ(succ(0))) then 0 else pred(succ(succ(0)))

⇒ If, IszeroSucc
if false then 0 else pred(succ(succ(0)))

⇒ IfFalse
pred(succ(succ(0)))
```



```
if iszero(succ(succ(0))) then 0 else pred(succ(succ(0)))

⇒ If, IszeroSucc
if false then 0 else pred(succ(succ(0)))

⇒ IfFalse
pred(succ(succ(0)))

⇒ PredSucc
succ(0)
```



pred(false)



pred(false)

How do we reduce now?



pred(false)

How do we reduce now?

Some terms are **invalid**! These are expression for which we want to consider to be malformed somehow.

Which means our language does not enjoy the process of **strong progress**.



# Stuck terms

#### Stuck terms

Let us define the notion of stuck.

$$\operatorname{stuck}(t) := \neg \operatorname{value}(t) \wedge \operatorname{nf}(t)$$

Think of it as a negation of progress (which says that a term is either a value or reduces)

Example

$$\frac{\overline{\text{nf}(\text{pred}(\text{zero}))}}{\text{stuck}(\text{pred}(\text{zero}))}$$



1. iszero(if true then succ(0) else 0)



1. iszero(if true then succ(0) else 0) Not stuck.

Is it a value or does it reduce?



1. iszero(if true then succ(0) else 0) Not stuck.

Is it a value or does it reduce?

Reduces.

What does it reduce to?



- 1. iszero(if true then succ(0) else 0) Not stuck.
- Is it a value or does it reduce?

Reduces.

What does it reduce to?

```
iszero(if true then succ(0) else 0) \Longrightarrow (IfTrue) iszero(succ(0)) \Longrightarrow (IszeroSucc) false
```

2. if succ(0) then true else false



- 1. iszero(if true then succ(0) else 0) Not stuck.
- Is it a value or does it reduce?

Reduces.

What does it reduce to?

```
iszero(if true then succ(0) else 0) \Longrightarrow (IfTrue) iszero(succ(0)) \Longrightarrow (IszeroSucc) false
```

2. if succ(0) then true else false Stuck. Why?



- 1. iszero(if true then succ(0) else 0) Not stuck.
- Is it a value or does it reduce?

Reduces.

What does it reduce to?

```
iszero(if true then succ(0) else 0) \Longrightarrow (IfTrue) iszero(succ(0)) \Longrightarrow (IszeroSucc) false
```

2. if succ(0) then true else false Stuck. Why? The if expects a boolean.



# Type system

### Type system

- A type system is a set of rules that disciplines expression composition.
- Our expressions can have different types: numerical or boolean
- A type system holds when an expression is of a given type

$$\vdash t \colon T$$

In our language our types are:

$$T ::= \mathtt{Bool} \mid \mathtt{Nat}$$



## Defining a Type System (1/2)

Boolean values:

$$\frac{}{\vdash \text{true: Bool}} \text{(t-true)} \qquad \frac{}{\vdash \text{false: Bool}} \text{(t-false)}$$



## Defining a Type System (1/2)

Boolean values:

$$\frac{}{\vdash \text{true: Bool}} \text{(t-true)} \qquad \frac{}{\vdash \text{false: Bool}} \text{(t-false)}$$

Natural values:

$$\frac{}{\vdash 0 : \mathtt{Nat}} (\mathtt{t\text{-}zero}) \qquad \frac{\vdash t : \mathtt{Nat}}{\vdash \mathtt{succ}(t) : \mathtt{Nat}} (\mathtt{t\text{-}succ})$$



## Defining a Type System (1/2)

Boolean values:

$$\frac{}{\vdash \text{true: Bool}} \text{(t-true)} \qquad \frac{}{\vdash \text{false: Bool}} \text{(t-false)}$$

Natural values:

$$\frac{}{\vdash 0 \colon \mathtt{Nat}} (\mathsf{t}\text{-}\mathsf{zero}) \qquad \frac{\vdash t \colon \mathtt{Nat}}{\vdash \mathsf{succ}(t) \colon \mathtt{Nat}} (\mathsf{t}\text{-}\mathsf{succ})$$

Composed expressions:

$$\frac{\vdash t \colon \mathtt{Nat}}{\vdash \mathtt{iszero}(\mathtt{t}) \colon \mathtt{Bool}} (\mathtt{t\text{-}iszero}) \qquad \frac{\vdash t \colon \mathtt{Nat}}{\vdash \mathtt{pred}(\mathtt{t}) \colon \mathtt{Nat}} (\mathtt{t\text{-}pred})$$



## Defining a Type System (2/2)

How do we write the rule for **if**?

```
\frac{\vdash t_1: \ref{t_1}: \ref{t_2}: \ref{t_2}: \ref{t_2}: \ref{t_3}: \ref{t_2}: \ref{t_1}: \ref{t_1} \vdash t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3: \ref{t_2}: \ref{t_3}: \ref{t_4}
```



## Defining a Type System (2/2)

How do we write the rule for **if**?

$$rac{dash t_1 \colon \mathtt{Bool} \qquad dash t_2 \colon T \qquad dash t_3 \colon T}{dash \mathtt{if} \ t_1 \ \mathtt{then} \ t_2 \ \mathtt{else} \ t_3 \colon T} (\mathtt{t ext{-}if})$$

Notice how both branches have the same type!



### Examples

#### Example 1:



### Examples

#### Example 1:

Example 2:

 $\overline{
ot\!\!/}\;\!\mathsf{succ}(\mathsf{true})$ 



# Expected results

## Expected results

**Theorem.** If  $\vdash t : T$  and  $t \Rightarrow^* t'$ , then  $\neg \text{stuck}(t')$ .

- Type soundness tells us that all well-typed programs never reach a stuck state.
  - Java and Scala's Type Systems are Unsound [OOPSLA16]
  - Scala with Explicit Nulls [ECOOP20]

remove[s] the specific source of unsoundness identified by Amin and Tate [OOPSLA16]. This class of bugs, reported in 2016 and still present in Scala and Dotty, happens due to a combination of implicit nullability and type members with arbitrary lower and upper bounds.

Other examples: Python's mypy or TypeScript



## Expected results

**Theorem.** If  $\vdash t : T$  and  $t \Rightarrow^* t'$ , then  $\neg \text{stuck}(t')$ .

- Type soundness tells us that all well-typed programs never reach a stuck state.
  - A framework to ensure the absence of an undesired behavior
  - Type system characterizes some **desired** behaviors **statically**
  - Type systems rejects some programs with desired behaviors (false positives)
  - Type soundness proves the type system rejects undesired behavior (no false negatives)
  - Type soundness is difficult to prove, because programming languages are complicated



## Type soundness at UMB-SVL

<u>Faial</u> (UMB-SVL) checks the absence of data-races in CUDA programs

- Faial is sound in theory (proved in Coq), but unsound in practice due to
  - implementation bugs
  - unsupported CUDA features
- Faial is incomplete in theory and in practice, because we do not want to say that a program is free from bugs, when it does have bugs

```
__global__
void saxpy(int n, float a, float *x, float *y)
{
  int i = blockIdx.x*blockDim.x + threadIdx.x;
  if (i < n) y[i] = a*x[i] + y[i + 1];
}</pre>
```

```
** DATA RACE ERROR ***
```

```
Array: y[1]
T1 mode: W
T2 mode: R

Locals T1 T2

threadIdx.x 1 0
```



# Progress

# Progress

**Theorem.** If  $\vdash t \colon T$ , then value $(t) \lor \exists t', t \Rightarrow t'$ .



# Progress vs Strong progress

- 1. Theorem (Strong Progress). value $(t) \vee \exists t', t \Rightarrow t'$ .
- 2. **Theorem (Progress).** If  $\vdash t : T$ , then value $(t) \lor \exists t', t \Rightarrow t'$ .

What is the relation between the *progress* property defined here and the *strong progress* from SmallStep?

- 1. No difference
- 2. Progress implies strong progress
- 3. Strong progress implies progress
- 4. They are unrelated properties



## Progress vs Strong progress

- 1. Theorem (Strong Progress). value $(t) \vee \exists t', t \Rightarrow t'$ .
- 2. **Theorem (Progress).** If  $\vdash t : T$ , then value $(t) \lor \exists t', t \Rightarrow t'$ .

What is the relation between the *progress* property defined here and the *strong progress* from SmallStep?

- 1. No difference
- 2. Progress implies strong progress
- 3. Strong progress implies progress
- 4. They are unrelated properties

Strong progress implies progress.



## Progress (proof)

**Theorem.** If  $\vdash t : T$ , then value $(t) \lor \exists t', t \Rightarrow t'$ .

The proof follows by induction on the derivation of the hypothesis. At each case we have that the simpler term is well typed and that the term is either a value or it reduces.

- In the case that the simpler term is a value, we use the canonical properties, to show that our goal is also a value.
- In the case that the simpler term can reduce, we use apply the reduction rule for the given term to reduce the goal.

```
Lemma bool_canonical : forall t,
    |- t \in TBool → value t → bvalue t.

Lemma nat_canonical : forall t,
    |- t \in TNat → value t → nvalue t.
```



Is every well-typed normal form is a value?



Is every well-typed normal form is a value?

**Yes!** A corollary of the progress theorem.

Is every value is a normal form?



Is every well-typed normal form is a value?

**Yes!** A corollary of the progress theorem.

Is every value is a normal form?

#### Yes!

Is the single-step reduction relation a **total** function?



Is every well-typed normal form is a value?

Yes! A corollary of the progress theorem.

Is every value is a normal form?

#### Yes!

Is the single-step reduction relation a **total** function?

No. Counter-example: reducing a value.



# Type preservation

# Type preservation

**Theorem.** If  $\vdash t : T$  and  $t \Rightarrow t'$ , then  $\vdash t' : T$ .

Type preservation establishes the robustness of our type system: a static (compile-time) abstraction is ensured in *all executions* of any accepted program. Otherwise, our type system could say an expression returns a number and upon executing that expression we find out it actually returns a boolean.



# Type preservation (proof)

**Theorem.** If  $\vdash t \colon T$  and  $t \Rightarrow t'$ , then  $\vdash t' \colon T$ .

The proof follows by induction on the derivation of the *first* hypothesis. At each case we must invert the hypothesis that the term reduces. The proof for each case is trivial, as we simply need to apply the typing rule for each term.



# Type soundness

# Type soundness

**Theorem.** If  $\vdash t : T$  and  $t \Rightarrow^* t'$ , then  $\neg \text{stuck}(t')$ .

Type soundness tells us that all well-typed programs never reach a stuck state.



# Deterministic step

# Deterministic step

**Theorem.** If  $x\Rightarrow y_1$  and  $x\Rightarrow y_2$ , then  $y_1=y_2$ .

Proof by induction on the derivation of the first hypothesis. At each of the 10 cases, we need to invert the second hypothesis  $x \Rightarrow y_2$ , which yields 22 cases. Use auto and solve\_by\_invert to take care of boring cases (8 cases should remain).

- At cases such as  $ST_If$  and  $ST_Succ$  we can simply use the induction hypothesis to rewrite the output term of reducing  $t_1$ .
- The remaining cases all follow the same structure: they reach a contradiction (remember to use exfalso). For instance, in the case for rule ST\_PredSucc, we have that  $t_1$  is a natvalue and that  $\operatorname{succ}(t_1) \Rightarrow t_1'$ . We conclude by inverting the latter, and using lemma nvalue\_no\_step.

