

- ◆ Exam solutions on web page.
- ◆ Look at your exam in Cheryl Hickey's office.
- ◆ Submit regrade request (in writing) before October 26.
- ◆ You can pick up your exam from Cheryl after October 26.

---

Midterm Exam

CIS 500  
Software Foundations  
Fall 2005  
19 October, 2005

Types

Midterm Exam

- ◆ For today, we'll go back to the simple language of arithmetic and boolean expressions and show how to give it a (very simple) type system
- ◆ Next week, we'll develop a simple type system for the lambda-calculus, following TAPL Ch.9.
- ◆ We'll spend a good part of the rest of the semester adding features to this type system

## Plan

- ◆ currently, active and successful topic in PL research
- ◆ "light-weight" formal methods
- ◆ "enabling technology" for all sorts of other things, e.g. language-based security
- ◆ the "skeleton" around which modern programming languages are often designed

## Type Systems

1. begin with a set of terms, a set of values, and an evaluation relation
2. define a set of **types** classifying values according to their "shapes"
3. define a **typing relation**  $t : T$  that classifies terms according to the shape of the values that result from evaluating them
4. check that the typing relation is **sound** in the sense that, if  $t : T$ , then evaluation of  $t$  will not get stuck

## Outline

- ◆ A **strongly typed** language prevents programs from accessing private data, corrupting memory, crashing the machine, etc.
  - ◆ A **weakly typed** language does not.
  - ◆ A **statically typed** language performs type-consistency checks at when programs are first entered.
  - ◆ A **dynamically typed** language delays these checks until programs are executed.
- |                                       |                        |  |        |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|--|--------|
| Strong                                | Weak                   | Dynamic  | Static |
| Lisp, Scheme, Perl, Python, Smalltalk | C, C++, ML, ADA, Java* | Strictly speaking, Java should be called "mostly static" |        |

## Approaches to Typing

**Arithmetic Expressions – Syntax**

---

*terms*

$t ::=$

- true
- false
- if t then t else t
- 0
- succ t
- pred t
- iszero t

*values*

- true value
- false value
- numeric value
- numeric values
- 0
- succ nv
- pred t
- iszero t

*successor value*

*zero value*

*successor value*

(E-Succ)  $\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{\text{succ } t_1 \rightarrow \text{succ } t'_1}$

(E-PREDZERO)  $\text{pred } 0 \rightarrow 0$

(E-PREDSUCC)  $\text{pred (succ } nv_1) \rightarrow nv_1$

(E-PRED)  $\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{\text{pred } t_1 \rightarrow \text{pred } t'_1}$

(E-ISZEROZERO)  $\text{iszero } 0 \rightarrow \text{true}$

(E-ISZEROSUCC)  $\text{iszero (succ } nv_1) \rightarrow \text{false}$

(E-ISZERO)  $\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{\text{iszero } t_1 \rightarrow \text{iszero } t'_1}$

**Arithmetic Expressions – Syntax**

---

*terms*

$t ::=$

- constant true
- constant false
- conditional
- constant zero
- successor
- predecessor
- zero test

*values*

- true value
- false value
- numeric value
- numeric values
- 0
- succ t
- pred t
- iszero t

*successor value*

*zero value*

*successor value*

**Types**

---

In this language, values have two possible “shapes”: they are either booleans or numbers.

$T ::=$

- Bool
- Nat

*types of booleans*

*type of numbers*

**Evaluation Rules**

---

(E-IFTRUE)  $\text{if true then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 \rightarrow t_2$

(E-IFFALSE)  $\text{if false then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 \rightarrow t_3$

(E-IF)  $\frac{\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 \rightarrow \text{if } t'_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3}{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}$

Typing Rules

---

0 : Nat

(T-ZERO)

Typing Rules

---

0 : Nat

t<sub>1</sub> : Nat

succ t<sub>1</sub> : Nat

(T-SUCC)

Typing Rules

---

true : Bool

(T-TRUE)

false : Bool

(T-FALSE)

Typing Rules

---

true : Bool

(T-TRUE)

false : Bool

(T-FALSE)

t<sub>1</sub> : Bool   t<sub>2</sub> : T   t<sub>3</sub> : T

if t<sub>1</sub> then t<sub>2</sub> else t<sub>3</sub> : T

(T-IF)

Proofs of properties about the typing relation often proceed by induction on typing derivations.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{}{\text{0 : Nat}}{\text{T-ZERO}}}{\text{T-ISZERO}}}{\text{T-PRED}} \quad \frac{}{\text{pred 0 : Nat}}}{\text{T-IF}} \quad \text{if iszero 0 then 0 else pred 0 : Nat}$$

Every pair  $(t, T)$  in the typing relation can be justified by a *derivation tree* built from instances of the inference rules.

### Typing Derivations

$$\frac{}{\text{0 : Nat}} \text{(T-ZERO)}$$

$$\frac{\text{t}_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{succ t}_1 : \text{Nat}} \text{(T-SUCC)}$$

$$\frac{\text{t}_1 : \text{Nat} \quad \text{pred t}_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{t}_1 : \text{Nat}} \text{(T-PRED)}$$

### Typing Rules

Using this rule, we cannot assign a type to

`if true then 0 else false`

$$\frac{\text{t}_1 : \text{Bool} \quad \text{t}_2 : \text{T} \quad \text{t}_3 : \text{T}}{\text{if t}_1 \text{ then t}_2 \text{ else t}_3 : \text{T}} \text{(T-IF)}$$

Like other static program analyses, type systems are generally *imprecise*: they do not predict exactly what kind of value will be returned by every program, but just a conservative (safe) approximation.

### Imprecision of Typing

$$\frac{}{\text{0 : Nat}} \text{(T-ZERO)}$$

$$\frac{\text{t}_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{succ t}_1 : \text{Nat}} \text{(T-SUCC)}$$

$$\frac{\text{t}_1 : \text{Nat} \quad \text{pred t}_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{t}_1 : \text{Nat}} \text{(T-PRED)}$$

$$\frac{\text{t}_1 : \text{Nat}}{\text{iszero t}_1 : \text{Bool}} \text{(T-ISZERO)}$$

### Typing Rules

**Inversion**

---

**Lemma:**

1. If  $\text{true} : R$ , then  $R = \text{Bool}$ .
2. If  $\text{false} : R$ , then  $R = \text{Bool}$ .
3. If  $\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 : R$ , then  $t_1 : \text{Bool}$ ,  $t_2 : R$ , and  $t_3 : R$ .
4. If  $0 : R$ , then  $R = \text{Nat}$ .
5. If  $\text{succ } t_1 : R$ , then  $R = \text{Nat}$  and  $t_1 : \text{Nat}$ .
6. If  $\text{pred } t_1 : R$ , then  $R = \text{Nat}$  and  $t_1 : \text{Nat}$ .
7. If  $\text{iszero } t_1 : R$ , then  $R = \text{Bool}$  and  $t_1 : \text{Nat}$ .

**Properties of the Typing Relation**

**Inversion**

---

**Lemma:**

1. If  $\text{true} : R$ , then  $R = \text{Bool}$ .
2. If  $\text{false} : R$ , then  $R = \text{Bool}$ .
3. If  $\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 : R$ , then  $t_1 : \text{Bool}$ ,  $t_2 : R$ , and  $t_3 : R$ .
4. If  $0 : R$ , then  $R = \text{Nat}$ .
5. If  $\text{succ } t_1 : R$ , then  $R = \text{Nat}$  and  $t_1 : \text{Nat}$ .
6. If  $\text{pred } t_1 : R$ , then  $R = \text{Nat}$  and  $t_1 : \text{Nat}$ .
7. If  $\text{iszero } t_1 : R$ , then  $R = \text{Bool}$  and  $t_1 : \text{Nat}$ .

**Proof:** ...

**Type Safety**

---

**Type Safety Theorem:** If  $t : T$  and  $t \rightarrow^* t'$  and  $t' \not\rightarrow$  then  $t'$  is a value.

We usually prove type safety by showing the following two properties:

1. **Progress:** A well-typed term is not stuck  
 If  $t : T$ , then either  $t$  is a value or else  $t \rightarrow t'$  for some  $t'$ .
2. **Preservation:** Types are preserved by one-step evaluation  
 If  $t : T$  and  $t \rightarrow t'$ , then  $t' : T$ .

### Canonical Forms

**Lemma:**

1. If  $v$  is a value of type `Bool`, then  $v$  is either `true` or `false`.
2. If  $v$  is a value of type `Nat`, then  $v$  is a numeric value

**Proof:** ...

### Canonical Forms

**Lemma:**

1. If  $v$  is a value of type `Bool`, then  $v$  is either `true` or `false`.
2. If  $v$  is a value of type `Nat`, then  $v$  is a numeric value

### Inversion

**Lemma:**

1. If `true` :  $R$ , then  $R = \text{Nat}$ .
2. If `false` :  $R$ , then  $R = \text{Bool}$ .
3. If `if`  $t_1$  then  $t_2$  else  $t_3$  :  $R$ , then  $t_1$  : `Bool`,  $t_2$  :  $R$ , and  $t_3$  :  $R$ .
4. If `0` :  $R$ , then  $R = \text{Nat}$ .
5. If `succ`  $t_1$  :  $R$ , then  $R = \text{Nat}$  and  $t_1$  : `Nat`.
6. If `pred`  $t_1$  :  $R$ , then  $R = \text{Nat}$  and  $t_1$  : `Nat`.
7. If `iszero`  $t_1$  :  $R$ , then  $R = \text{Bool}$  and  $t_1$  : `Nat`.

**Proof:** ...

This leads directly to a recursive algorithm for calculating the type of a term...

### Typechecking Algorithm

```

typecheck(t) = if t = true then Bool
              else if t = false then Bool
              else if t = if t1 then t2 else t3 then
                let T1 = typecheck(t1) in
                let T2 = typecheck(t2) in
                let T3 = typecheck(t3) in
                if T1 = Bool and T2=T3 then T2
                else "not typable"
              else if t = 0 then Nat
              else if t = succ t1 then
                let T1 = typecheck(t1) in
                if T1 = Nat then Nat else "not typable"
              else if t = pred t1 then
                let T1 = typecheck(t1) in
                if T1 = Nat then Nat else "not typable"
              else if t = iszero t1 then
                let T1 = typecheck(t1) in
                if T1 = Nat then Bool else "not typable"

```

**Progress**

---

**Theorem:** Suppose  $t$  is a well-typed term (that is,  $t : T$  for some  $T$ ). Then either  $t$  is a value or else there is some  $t'$  with  $t \rightarrow t'$ .

**Proof:** By induction on a derivation of  $t : T$ .

**Progress**

---

**Theorem:** Suppose  $t$  is a well-typed term (that is,  $t : T$  for some  $T$ ). Then either  $t$  is a value or else there is some  $t'$  with  $t \rightarrow t'$ .

**Progress**

---

**Theorem:** Suppose  $t$  is a well-typed term (that is,  $t : T$  for some  $T$ ). Then either  $t$  is a value or else there is some  $t'$  with  $t \rightarrow t'$ .

**Proof:** By induction on a derivation of  $t : T$ .

The T-TRUE, T-FALSE, and T-ZERO cases are immediate, since  $t$  in these cases is a value.

**Progress**

---

**Theorem:** Suppose  $t$  is a well-typed term (that is,  $t : T$  for some  $T$ ). Then either  $t$  is a value or else there is some  $t'$  with  $t \rightarrow t'$ .

**Proof:**



**Preservation**

---

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

**Proof:** ...

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

**Preservation**

**Theorem:** Suppose  $t$  is a well-typed term (that is,  $t : T$  for some  $T$ ). Then either  $t$  is a value or else there is some  $t'$  with  $t \rightarrow t'$ .

**Proof:** By induction on a derivation of  $t : T$ .

The T-TRUE, T-FALSE, and T-ZERO cases are immediate, since  $t$  in these cases is a value.

Case T-IF:  $t = \text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3$

$t_1 : \text{Bool} \quad t_2 : T \quad t_3 : T$

cases is a value.

**Proof:** By induction on a derivation of  $t : T$ .

**Theorem:** Suppose  $t$  is a well-typed term (that is,  $t : T$  for some  $T$ ). Then either  $t$  is a value or else there is some  $t'$  with  $t \rightarrow t'$ .

**Progress**

By the induction hypothesis, either  $t_1$  is a value or else there is some  $t'_1$  such that  $t_1 \rightarrow t'_1$ . If  $t_1$  is a value, then the canonical forms lemma tells us that it must be either **true** or **false**, in which case either E-IFTRUE or E-IFFALSE applies to  $t$ . On the other hand, if  $t_1 \rightarrow t'_1$ , then, by E-IF,

$t \rightarrow \text{if } t'_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3$ .