

Type-guided synthesis for dynamic languages

THOMAS LOGAN

ACM Reference Format:

Thomas Logan. 2022. Type-guided synthesis for dynamic languages. 1, 1 (October 2022), 2 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn>. nnnnnnn

1 INTRODUCTION

Dynamic programming languages

Dynamic programming languages can make writing programs quick and easy because they don't require specifying static bounds on behavior. Two of the most popular programming languages today, Javascript and Python, are dynamic programming languages. Javascript is the language of the web, while Python the most popular choice for data science and machine learning projects.

Synthesis

Although dynamic languages already offer ease and efficiency for writing programs, it may be possible to supplement this facility with autocompletion, or synthesis of programs from surrounding context. This article presents a theoretical system that synthesizes terms from context in a dynamic language. Synthesis of of programs for a dynamic language introduces a fundamental tension. While dynamic language programs benefit from a lack of static bounds, program synthesis must be a terminating procedure driven by static bounds representing the goals of synthesis.

Type systems

Types have become the lingua franca of formal specification of static bounds. Others have shown how various forms of specification, including examples, abstract values, pure propositions, and modal propositions, can be encoded as types. Types have been used successfully for verifying programs, guiding program synthesis in ML-family languages, and guiding humans in dependently-typed interactive theorem proving.

Type propagation

Using types, it may be possible to synthesize programs for dynamic languages. To maintain the spirit of dynamic languages, type annotations must remain optional. If type annotations are provided, they can be propagated and decomposed, as is the case in theorem proving systems, local type checking, and synthesis of ML-family programs.

Author's address: Thomas Logan.

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.

© 2022 Association for Computing Machinery.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Type expressivity

In order to efficiently guide program synthesis, types must be able to express fairly precise information. The system presented here offers types with expressivity comparable to typical decidable predicate logics.

Subtyping

Dynamically, two interfaces may have the same correctness result for some inputs, while differing on other inputs. In order to maintain some semblance of the dynamic style programming, while also adding safety with static behavior, Subtyping is used as the criteria for deciding if a term's composition is statically invalid. With subtyping it is possible to statically catch invalid compositions, without translating terms from one type to another disjoint type.

Type holes

In order to have fine-grained control over where types are utilized or avoided, types are allowed to have holes, represented by "?" to indicate that any subterm corresponding to that portion of the type will not be subject to static constraints.

Type inference

However, if type annotations are not available, then types must be inferred from context. Taking advantage of type inference techniques from ML-family languages is a good starting point, but it's not sufficient. ML-family type inference is sound, because an ML term is intrinsically associated with a static bound in accordance with ML's datatype mechanism.

TODO: type inference: when do we compose actual types and pop up

Type inference for dynamic languages

Terms in dynamic languages are not intrinsically limited to such static bounds, as that would be akin to specifying static bounds for all terms, which is antithetical to dynamic languages. Type inference for dynamic languages cannot be sound without violating the assumed definition of dynamic languages. Thus, it is necessary to devise a method of type inference that is unsound, yet still provides sufficient information to guide efficient program synthesis. Additionally, despite being unsound, it should be able to prune/reject a significant portion of bad programs. It may reject good programs, but only if it can infer static bounds.

Type widening

TODO: type widening: infer types from arguments

Type narrowing

TODO: type narrowing: infer types from parameter types

2 OVERVIEW**3 TECHNICAL DETAILS****4 EVALUATION****5 RELATED WORK**