

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
SANTA CRUZ

**HYBRID TYPE CHECKING, TYPE RECONSTRUCTIONS,  
COMPOSITIONALITY, AND IMPLEMENTATION FOR  
REFINEMENT TYPES**

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the  
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

COMPUTER SCIENCE

by

**Kenneth L. Knowles**

March 2014

The Thesis of Kenneth L. Knowles  
is approved:

---

Professor Cormac Flanagan, Chair

---

Professor Luca de Alfaro

---

Professor Ranjit Jhala

---

Tyrus Miller  
Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

## Table of Contents

<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Dedication</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Organization of this dissertation . . . . .	9
<b>2 Background</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1 Types and Programming Languages . . . . .	12
2.2 Design by contract . . . . .	12
2.3 Program Verification . . . . .	14
2.4 Refinement Types . . . . .	14
2.5 Soft Typing . . . . .	15
2.6 Type Constraint Systems . . . . .	16
<b>3 Executable Refinement Types</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1 The Language $\lambda^H$ . . . . .	19
3.2 Operational Semantics of $\lambda^H$ . . . . .	23
3.3 The $\lambda^H$ Type System . . . . .	24
3.4 Type Soundness for $\lambda^H$ . . . . .	31
3.5 Related Work . . . . .	36
<b>4 Hybrid Type Checking</b>	<b>38</b>
4.1 Additional Syntax, Semantics, and Typing . . . . .	44
4.2 Hybrid Type Checking for $\lambda^H$ . . . . .	47
4.3 An Example of HTC . . . . .	53
4.4 Correctness of Cast Insertion . . . . .	58
4.5 Static Checking vs. Hybrid Checking . . . . .	72

4.6	Related Work	79
<b>5</b>	<b>Type Reconstruction</b>	<b>83</b>
5.1	Type Reconstruction for $\lambda^H$	85
5.2	Type Reconstruction is Typability-Preserving	102
5.3	Related Work	103
<b>6</b>	<b>Compositional and Decidable Checking</b>	<b>106</b>
6.1	Compositional Reasoning for Contract Types	108
6.2	The Language $\lambda^\exists$	115
6.3	The $\lambda^\exists$ Type System	119
6.4	The $\lambda^\exists$ Type System is Exact	126
6.5	Type Soundness for $\lambda^\exists$	129
6.6	Algorithmic Typing for $\lambda^\exists$	132
6.7	Example: Binary Search Trees in $\lambda^\exists$	137
6.8	Related Work	140
<b>7</b>	<b>Sage: An Implementation of Executable Refinement Types</b>	<b>146</b>
7.1	Review of Hybrid Type Checking	150
7.2	The SAGE Architecture	151
7.3	Examples of SAGE programs	153
7.3.1	Counter-Example Database	158
7.4	The SAGE Core Language	161
7.5	Operational Semantics of SAGE	166
7.6	The SAGE Type System	169
7.7	Hybrid Type Checking for SAGE	176
7.8	The SAGE Database of Counterexamples	184
7.9	Experimental Results	185
7.10	Related Work	186
7.11	Conclusions and Future Work	190
<b>8</b>	<b>Contemporaneous Related Work</b>	<b>191</b>
8.1	Higher-order contracts	192
8.2	Gradual Typing	192
8.3	Liquid Types	193
8.4	ESC/Haskell	193
8.5	Programming in Dependent Type Theory	193
8.6	Hoare Type Theory	194
<b>9</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>195</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>199</b>

## List of Figures

3.1	Syntax of $\lambda^H$	19
3.2	Example Types of Constants	21
3.3	Operational Semantics of $\lambda^H$	23
3.4	Type Rules for $\lambda^H$	25
3.5	Implication for $\lambda^H$	26
3.6	The Simply-typed lambda calculus parameterized by base types	29
4.1	Hybrid type checking on various programs.	41
4.2	Additional Syntax, Semantics, and Typing for HTC	45
4.3	Cast insertion rules on terms	48
4.4	Cast insertion rules for types and Subtyping	49
4.5	Extensional Equivalence Under Reduction	60
5.1	Constraint Generation Rules	88
5.2	Shape Reconstruction Algorithm	92
5.3	Additional Evaluation Rules	96
6.1	Syntax	116
6.2	Operational Semantics	117
6.3	Additional and Modified Type Rules for $\lambda^\exists$	120
6.4	Definition of <b>self</b>	120
6.5	Additional Subtyping for $\lambda^\exists$	121
6.6	Syntax for Algorithmic Typing	132
7.1	Sage Architecture	151
7.2	Binary Search Trees	155
7.3	Regular Expressions and Names	157
7.4	Sage Syntax	162
7.5	Constants	163
7.6	Shorthands	164
7.7	Evaluation Rules	167
7.8	Type Rules	170

7.9	Subtyping Rules . . . . .	171
7.10	Cast Insertion Rules . . . . .	175
7.11	Algorithmic Subtyping . . . . .	181

## Abstract

### Hybrid Type Checking, Type Reconstructions, Compositionality, and Implementation for Refinement Types

by

Kenneth L. Knowles

Traditional static type systems are very effective for verifying certain basic interface specifications. Dynamically checked contracts support more precise specifications, but these are not checked until run time, resulting in incomplete detection of defects. This thesis explores a system of *executable refinement types* that can express the same specifications as contracts, such as function pre- and postconditions and data structure invariants. Type checking for executable refinement types involves reasoning about implications between arbitrary executable predicates, hence is undecidable. We first introduce *hybrid type checking*, a synthesis of static and dynamic checking that addresses this undecidability by enforcing executable refinement types via static analysis where possible, but also via dynamic checks where necessary.

Owing in part to their greater expressiveness, executable refinements are more verbose than simple types, so type reconstruction is particularly valuable. Yet typeability is also undecidable because it subsumes type checking. Using a generalized notion of type reconstruction, we present the first type reconstruction algorithm for executable refinement types. Our algorithm is a *typeability-preserving* transformation and defers type checking to a subsequent phase, where a strategy such as hybrid type checking

may be employed. The algorithm generates and solves a collection of implication constraints over refinement predicates, inferring maximally precise refinement predicates in a largely syntactic manner that is reminiscent of strongest postcondition calculation. Perhaps surprisingly, our notion of type reconstruction is decidable even though type checking is not.

[EDIT/POLISH ME] We then explore the question of under what conditions the decidability of the type checking problem may be assured. We propose that the fundamental challenge to decidable type-checking is the lack of *compositionality* in dependent type systems. By restoring compositionality using standard techniques, we also restore predictability to type checking. We present a system that ensures that if all programmer-provided annotations fall within a decidable theory, then all proof obligations that occur during type-checking also fall within this same theory.

[EDIT/POLISH ME] Finally, we address implementation. In the Sage language, we include executable refinement types, but as a demonstration of the breadth of applicability of hybrid type checking techniques, we include dynamic typing as well as first-class computations over types. We focus on system-level consequences of these choices, such as a database of counterexamples to subtyping queries.

To my mother, who never gave up on my completing this document, to my father, who always said I had an academic bent, and to Meg, who is the best support anyone could ask for.

## Acknowledgments

Chapters of this dissertation are expository reorganization of work by the author and colleagues. Specifically, the substantive theoretical developments have been previously published by Gronski et al. [2006], Knowles and Flanagan [2007], Knowles and Flanagan [2008], and Knowles and Flanagan [2010] (itself an expanded and corrected version of Flanagan [2006]). In this dissertation, prior work has been updated to unify notation, provide greater detail in proofs, and survey subsequent related work.

## Summary of Metavariables

$e, d, f, g, q, p$	term of program calculus
$x, y, z$	variable
$k$	constant or primitive function
$c$	constructor supporting pattern matching
$b$	boolean constant
$m, n$	natural number or natural number constant
$\delta$	semantic function for constants and primitive functions
$S, T, U$	type
$B$	basic type
$\Gamma$	typing environment
$\Delta$	restricted typing environment
$\theta$	capture-avoiding substitution function
$\sigma, \gamma$	closing substitution
$\zeta$	approximation function to decidable refinements
$\psi$	term placeholder
$\pi$	<i>non</i> -capture-avoiding type replacement
$\rho$	<i>non</i> -capture-avoiding term placeholder replacement
$C$	term evaluation context
$\mathcal{D}$	type evaluation context
$A$	augmented type with existentials only in covariant positions
$\Delta$	typing environment with augmented types

## Summary of Notations

$\lambda x:T. e$	function term
$f e$	function application
$S \rightarrow T$	function type
$x:S \rightarrow T$	dependent function type
$\{x:B \mid e\}$	refinement type
$\exists x. ST$	existential type
$[x \mapsto e]$	substitution mapping $x$ to $e$
$\theta \cdot \psi$	delayed substitution applied to a placeholder
$e_1 \hookrightarrow e_2$	single-step redex reduction
$e_1 \rightsquigarrow e_2, S \rightsquigarrow T$	single-step term or type reduction
$e_1 \rightsquigarrow^+ e_2, S \rightsquigarrow^+ T$	transitive closure of single-step reduction
$e_1 \rightsquigarrow^* e_2, S \rightsquigarrow^* T$	reflexive-transitive closure of single-step reduction
$e_1 \rightsquigarrow\!\!\rightsquigarrow e_2$	equivalence closure of single-step reduction
$\mathcal{C}[e], \mathcal{D}[e]$	term and type evaluation context application

## Summary of Judgements

$\Gamma \vdash e : T$	typing
$\Gamma \vdash T$	type well-formedness
$\vdash \Gamma$	typing environment well-formedness
$\Gamma \vdash S <: T$	subtyping
$\vdash \sigma : \Gamma$	closing substitution typing
$\Gamma \vdash e_1 \sim e_2 T$	extensional equivalence of terms
$\Gamma \vdash e \in T$	semantic typing
$\Gamma \vdash S \subseteq T$	semantic subtyping
$\Gamma \vdash e_1 \Rightarrow e_2$	implication

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

A program is, of necessity, a completely unambiguous document. Because of this, a large program contains vastly more detail than a human is capable of comprehending simultaneously or serially, making the construction of such programs extremely difficult. A modular development strategy based on precise and trusted interface specifications both reduces the amount of detail that a programmer must maintain in working memory and enables cooperation amongst programmers over space and time[Parnas 1972a].

In practice, however, such interfaces are often only informally or partially specified. Consider the following increasingly-precise specifications for the argument to a function for inverting a matrix:

1. The argument can be any value expressible in the programming language.
2. The argument must be an array of arrays of numbers.
3. The argument must be a *matrix*, that is, a rectangular (non-ragged) array of arrays of numbers.
4. The argument must be a square matrix.
5. The argument must be a square matrix with nonzero determinant.

All of these specifications may be useful for various purposes, levels of assurance, and moments in the development of a program. Simpler specifications are common during rapid prototyping at the cost of partiality of functions, whereas more

precise specifications provide more correctness guarantees and better documentation, and simplify callers by allowing the expression of more total functions.

The first specification corresponds approximately to what are called *dynamically typed* (also *untyped* or *single-sorted*) programming languages. The second item is the a likely specification in *statically typed* languages such as Java, C++, C#, OCaml, or Haskell, which automatically distinguish sorts of program values. The last three specifications remain the stuff of research<sup>1</sup>, including this dissertation. Often such specifications, if they are checked at all, are dynamically checked by ad-hoc hand-written methods as part of a program’s execution.

*Design by contract*<sup>2</sup> is a discipline, with accompanying programming constructs, that helps to organize and compose these hand-written integrity checking routines, and to isolate the root cause of a specification failure. Many common preconditions and postconditions can be expressed as executable contracts<sup>3</sup>, such as:

- Subranges: The function `printDigit` requires an integer in the range `[0,9]`.
- Aliasing restrictions: The function `swap` requires that its arguments are distinct reference cells.
- Ordering restrictions: The function `binarySearch` requires that its argument is a

<sup>1</sup>A detailed survey of the latest related research and outlook may be found in Chapter 9, while the most closely related work is discussed at the end of each chapter.

<sup>2</sup>A full history of design by contract is beyond the scope of this dissertation, but perhaps the earliest proponent was Parnas [1972b], with important implementations and elaborations found in Holt and Cordy [1988], Luckham [1990], Meyer [1992], Stoutamire and Omohundro [1996], and Killing and Rosenberg [1996]

<sup>3</sup>Notably absent are common properties requiring (potentially) infinite quantification, such as associativity or injectivity

sorted array.

- Size specifications: The function `serializeMatrix` takes as input a matrix of size  $n$  by  $m$ , and returns a one-dimensional array of size  $n \times m$ .
- Arbitrary computable predicates: an interpreter (or code generator) for a typed language (or intermediate representation [Tarditi et al. 1996]) might naturally require that its input be well typed, *i.e.*, that it satisfies the predicate

However, dynamic checking suffers from two limitations. First, it incurs a computational cost during execution, often running checks repeatedly and redundantly, and in the worse case is expensive enough that it is feasible only during testing. More seriously, dynamic checking provides only limited coverage – specifications are only checked on data values and code paths of actual executions. Thus, dynamic checking often results in incomplete and late (possibly post-deployment) detection of defects.

Ongoing research on more powerful type systems (e.g., Freeman and Pfenning [1991], Xi and Pfenning [1999], Xi [2000], Davies and Pfenning [2000], Mandelbaum et al. [2003]) attempts to overcome some of these restrictions via advanced features such as dependent and refinement types that can express more logical aspects of interface specifications. Yet these systems are designed to be statically type safe, and so the specification language is intentionally restricted to ensure that specifications can always be checked statically.

The twin goals of *complete checking* and *expressive specifications* appear some-



what incompatible.<sup>4</sup> Static type checking focuses on complete checking of restricted specifications. Dynamic checking focuses on incomplete checking of expressive specifications. Neither approach in isolation provides an entirely satisfactory solution for enforcing precise interface specifications.

In this dissertation, we explore the space of type systems based on the language of executable contracts without the usual limitations to ensure decidability or efficiency of type checking. To illustrate the key idea common to these type systems, consider the following type rule for function application with subtyping:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash f : T \rightarrow U \quad \Gamma \vdash e : S \quad \Gamma \vdash S <: T}{\Gamma \vdash f e : U}$$

The antecedent  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  checks compatibility of the actual and formal parameter types. If the type checker can prove this subtyping relation, then this application is well-typed. Conversely, if the type checker can prove that this subtyping relation does not hold, then the program is rejected. In a conventional, decidable type system, one of these two cases always holds.

However, once we consider expressive type languages for which type checking is not statically decidable, the type checker may encounter situations where its algorithms can neither prove nor refute the subtype judgment  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  (particularly within the time bounds imposed by interactive compilation). The fundamental question we are interested in is how best to proceed when the well-typedness of a program can be

<sup>4</sup>Complete checking of expressive specifications can be achieved by requiring that each program be accompanied by a proof (perhaps expressed as type annotations) that the program satisfies its specification, but manually or interactively writing such proofs is currently rather heavyweight for widespread use.

neither proven nor refuted. To focus on this question and ensure broad applicability of the resulting techniques, we design a type system that is assured to encounter such situations by making *all* computable predicates over base types expressible in refinement types.

We will present a number of surprising and encouraging results about the decidability of important subproblems, as well as a new approach dubbed *hybrid type checking* which does not isolate a carefully delineated decidable subproblems, but rather allows parts of an individual type checking run to be decided while other are not.

## 1.1 Organization of this dissertation

The organization of this dissertation is as follows:

- In Chapter 3 we present a core calculus which will form the basis of the following theoretical chapters and establish its basic correctness properties via a novel application of simple denotational semantics into the simply-typed lambda calculus.
- In Chapter 4 we introduce *hybrid type checking* (HTC) for this calculus and compare it with static type checking, concluding that any decidable restriction always rejects an well-typed program which HTC accepts or accepts an ill-typed program which HTC rejects.
- In Chapter 5 we define the type reconstruction problem and present a (decidable!) solution for it.

- In Chapter 6 we return to the idea of trying to choose a decidable restriction of the type checking problem, uncovering and resolving a critical flaw in the unrestricted use of dependent types in this context.
- In Chapter 7 we describe SAGE, a language featuring hybrid type checking. In addition to refinement types, we include dynamic types and first-class computation over types, demonstrating the breadth of interesting undecidable type systems to which our techniques apply. We present some small empirical validation that hybrid type checking decides most type checking queries statically.
- In Chapter 9 we conclude by thoroughly familiarize the reader with the state of the art in related work, recapitulating some citations from the substantive chapters while offering a broad prospectus on the future of this and related research trends.

At the end of each substantive chapter, we will survey the most closely related work and advances since the original research was conducted, and more extended proofs will be included.

## Chapter 2

## Background

In this chapter we review relevant trends and specific research that provide the context for this dissertation. We defer discussion of ongoing research to Chapter 8

## 2.1 Types and Programming Languages

This dissertation is best enjoyed with a strong background in programming languages, especially type systems, and even most especially advanced type systems. ? provides using notation and terminology that closely match that of this dissertation. Its sequel ? covers advanced topics such as logical relations, dependent types, and pure type systems that, while not strictly necessary, will make the technical developments easier to digest. The most crucial prerequisites are also covered by ?, ?, ?.

The other fundamental aspect of programming language theory that forms the background for this dissertation is axiomatic semantics for imperative programs from Floyd [1967], Hoare [1969], and Dijkstra [1976].

## 2.2 Design by contract

Design by contract is a discipline, with accompanying programming constructs, for organizing and composing hand-written executable *contracts*, those integrity checks, preconditions, postconditions, and loop invariants which might otherwise be checked in an ad-hoc fashion as part of the main text of a program. First advocated by Parnas [1972b], it has been incorporated into many languages including Turing Holt and Cordy [1988], Luckham [1990], Eiffel Meyer [1992], Sather Stoutamire and Omohundro [1996],

Blue Killing and Rosenberg [1996], and was raised to higher-order programming by Findler and Felleisen [2002].

Many common preconditions and postconditions can be expressed as executable contracts, such as:

- Subranges: The function `printDigit` requires an integer in the range  $[0,9]$ .
- Aliasing restrictions: The function `swap` requires that its arguments are distinct reference cells.
- Ordering restrictions: The function `binarySearch` requires that its argument is a sorted array.
- Size specifications: The function `serializeMatrix` takes as input a matrix of size  $n$  by  $m$ , and returns a one-dimensional array of size  $n \times m$ .
- Arbitrary computable predicates: an interpreter (or code generator) for a typed language (or intermediate representation [Tarditi et al. 1996]) might naturally require that its input be well typed, *i.e.*, that it satisfies the predicate

Notably absent are common properties requiring (potentially) infinite quantification, such as associativity or injectivity.

Dynamic contract checking suffers from two limitations. First, it incurs a computational cost during execution, often running checks repeatedly and redundantly, and in the worse case is expensive enough that it is feasible only during testing. More seriously, dynamic checking provides only limited coverage – specifications are only

checked on data values and code paths of actual executions. Thus, dynamic checking often results in incomplete and late (possibly post-deployment) detection of defects.

## 2.3 Program Verification

Once these contracts are written in a way that is easy to separate from the main code of a program, it is also effective to try to verify them directly. The JML language [Leavens and Cheon 2006], and tools such as ESC/Java [Flanagan et al. 2002] apply the machinery of axiomatic semantics to programs containing contracts. This approach is applicable even to programs that are not equipped with precise specifications by reconstruction the necessary specifications from universal specifications such as “a null pointer should not be dereferenced”.

In practice, the number of programs which ESC/Java is unable to verify is problematically large.

## 2.4 Refinement Types

Refinement types are defined relative to a structural type system. Their defining characteristic is the expression of types that contains fewer values than the corresponding structural type. While neither refinement type nor structural type has a rigorous meaning, examples to which the label has been applied include:

- Positive integers, a *refinement* of the type of integers.
- Nonempty lists, a refinement of the type of lists (of any constituent element type).

- Balanced binary trees, a refinement of binary trees.

Works in these vein include Freeman and Pfenning [1991], Xi and Pfenning [1999], Xi [2000], Davies and Pfenning [2000], and Mandelbaum et al. [2003]. A general property that all such type systems share is that the language of types is carefully constructed and restricted to ensure that specifications can always be checked statically.

[Freeman and Pfenning 1991] introduced *datasort refinements*, which express restrictions on the recursive structure of algebraic datatypes. Type reconstruction for the finite set of programmer-specified datasort refinements is decided by abstract interpretation. Hayashi [1993] and Denney [1998] explored various logics for refinement predicates, while Davies and Pfenning [2000], and Mandelbaum et al. [2003] combined refinements with computational effects. All of these systems require type annotations, though many perform some manner of local type inference [Pierce and Turner 1998].

Dunfield and Pfenning [2004] combined index types...

Connecting the indices that are used to enforce properties of code with those properties expressed in direct style is an unsolved problem.

## 2.5 Soft Typing

On the other end of the spectrum lies a discipline with which we share some techniques.

*Soft typing* [Fagan 1991; Wright and Cartwright 1994; Aiken et al. 1994], refers to the use of type systems technology in the context of a dynamically typed language.

While static type systems reject any program that *may* violate a precondition, soft type systems only reject programs that *must* violate a precondition. The additional type information inferred during this analysis may be used to remove those precondition checks that are part of the normal functioning of the runtime of a dynamically typed language.

... optional typing ...

... complete typing ...

Soft typing is closely related to *gradual typing*, a field developed in parallel with the current work, discussed in Chapter 8.

## 2.6 Type Constraint Systems

Constraint-based type reconstruction for systems with subtyping is a tremendously broad topic, and we cannot fully review it here, nor is it necessary to be expert, but a basic familiarity with constraint-based type reconstruction will help with Chapter 5. The problem is studied in some generality by Mitchell [1984], Fuh and Mishra [1988], Lincoln and Mitchell [1992], Aiken and Wimmers [1993], and Hoang and Mitchell [1995]. Type inference systems parameterized by a subtyping constraint system are developed by Pottier [1996] and Odersky et al. [1999]. This work is complementary to generalized systems in that it focuses on the solution of our particular instantiation of subtyping constraints; we also do not investigate parametric polymorphism, which is included in the mentioned frameworks. Set-based analysis presents many similar ideas,

and we draw inspiration from the works of Heintze [1992], Cousot and Cousot [1995], Fahndrich and Aiken [1996], and Flanagan and Felleisen [1997].

## Chapter 3

### Executable Refinement Types

Figure 3.1: Syntax of  $\lambda^H$

$v ::=$	<i>Values:</i>
$k$	constant
$\lambda x : S. e$	abstraction
$e, d, f, g, q, p ::=$	<i>Terms:</i>
$v$	value
$x$	variable
$f e$	application
$S, T, U ::=$	<i>Types:</i>
$x : S \rightarrow T$	dependent function type
$\{x : B \mid e\}$	refined basic type
$\Gamma ::=$	<i>Environments:</i>
$\emptyset$	empty environment
$\Gamma, x : T$	environment extension

In this chapter, we describe a type system with the expressivity of dynamic contracts. Such precise types make type checking undecidable, but – as we shall prove – do not have any adverse effect on the usual correctness properties of the type system. Thus, we can use it as a reference point from which to explore pragmatic techniques for working with expressive types.

#### 3.1 The Language $\lambda^H$

This section introduces a variant of the simply typed  $\lambda$ -calculus extended with executable refinement types. We refer to this language as  $\lambda^H$ .

The syntax of  $\lambda^H$  is summarized in Figure 3.1. Terms are completely standard,

including variables, constants, functions, and applications, as usual. We reserve a number of metavariables for terms simply for legibility. The types of  $\lambda^H$  are the common core of this dissertation: Base types refined by executable predicates and dependent function types.

We use the notation<sup>1</sup>  $x:S \rightarrow T$  in preference to the equivalent syntax  $\Pi x:S. T$ .

Here,  $S$  is the domain type of the function and the formal parameter  $x$  may occur in the range type  $T$ . We omit  $x$  if it does not occur free in  $T$ , yielding the standard function type syntax  $S \rightarrow T$ .

We use  $B$  to range over base types, which includes at least `Bool` and `Int`. As in many languages, these base types are fairly coarse and cannot denote types of interest that are common in design-by-contract, such as integer subranges. To overcome this limitation, we introduce *executable refinement types* of the form  $\{x:B \mid p\}$ . Here, the variable  $x$  (of base type  $B$ ) can occur within the boolean term or *predicate*  $p$ . Informally, this refinement type denotes the set of constants  $c$  of type  $B$  that satisfy this predicate, *i.e.*, for which the term  $[x \mapsto c] e$  evaluates to `true`. Thus,  $\{x:B \mid p\}$  denotes a subtype of  $B$ . We write simply  $B$  as an abbreviation for the trivial refinement type  $\{x:B \mid \text{true}\}$ .

These refinement types are inspired by prior work on decidable refinement type systems [Mandelbaum et al. 2003; Freeman and Pfenning 1991; Davies and Pfenning 2000; Xi and Pfenning 1999; Xi 2000; Ou et al. 2004]. However, our refinement predicates are arbitrary boolean expressions, so every computable subset of the integers is actually a  $\lambda^H$  type. Not surprisingly, this expressive power causes type checking to become

<sup>1</sup>From Cayenne, [Augustsson 1998]

Figure 3.2: Example Types of Constants

---

```

true  : {b:Bool | b}
false : {b:Bool | not b}
 $\Leftrightarrow$  :  $b_1:\text{Bool} \rightarrow b_2:\text{Bool} \rightarrow \{b:\text{Bool} \mid b \Leftrightarrow (b_1 \Leftrightarrow b_2)\}$ 
not   :  $b:\text{Bool} \rightarrow \{b':\text{Bool} \mid b \Leftrightarrow \text{not } b\}$ 
n     : {m:Int | m = n}
+     :  $n:\text{Int} \rightarrow m:\text{Int} \rightarrow \{z:\text{Int} \mid z = n + m\}$ 
+_n   :  $m:\text{Int} \rightarrow \{z:\text{Int} \mid z = n + m\}$ 
=     :  $n:\text{Int} \rightarrow m:\text{Int} \rightarrow \{b:\text{Bool} \mid b \Leftrightarrow (n = m)\}$ 
if_T  :  $\text{Bool} \rightarrow T \rightarrow T \rightarrow T$ 
fix_T :  $(T \rightarrow T) \rightarrow T$ 

```

---

undecidable. More specifically, subtyping between two refinement types  $\{x:B \mid p\}$  and  $\{x:B \mid q\}$  reduces to checking implication between the corresponding predicates, which is clearly undecidable.

The type of each constant is defined by the function  $ty : \text{Constant} \rightarrow \text{Type}$  in Figure 3.2. The set *Constant* is implicitly defined as the domain of the mapping.

A *basic constant* is a constant whose type is a refinement type (not a function type). Each basic constant is assigned a singleton type that denotes exactly that constant. For example, the type of an integer  $n$  denotes the singleton set  $\{n\}$ . This reflects the fact that a literal constant itself, being present in the code, need not be abstracted to any larger type.

A *primitive function* is a constant of function type. For clarity, we use infix syntax for applications of some primitive functions (*e.g.*,  $+$ ,  $=$ ,  $\Leftrightarrow$ ). The types for

primitive functions are quite precise: The type

$$+ : n : \mathbf{Int} \rightarrow m : \mathbf{Int} \rightarrow \{z : \mathbf{Int} \mid z = n + m\}$$

exactly specifies that this function performs addition. That is, the term  $n + m$  has the type  $\{z : \mathbf{Int} \mid z = n + m\}$  denoting the singleton set  $\{n + m\}$ . Note that even though the type of “+” is defined in terms of “+” itself, this does not cause any problems in our technical development, since the semantics of  $+$  do not depend on its type. However, this is unsatisfying, because in the case of functions, we may hope that the type is an abstraction of the value. In Chapter 6 we explore some of the consequences of giving such precise types to functions.

The constant  $\mathbf{fix}_T$  is the fixpoint constructor of type  $T$ , and enables the definition of recursive functions. For example, the factorial function can be defined as:

```

fixInt→Int
  λf : (Int → Int).
    λn : Int.
      ifInt (n = 0)
        1
        (n * (f (n - 1)))

```

Contracts, hence these types, can express many precise specifications, such as the following (where we assume that  $\mathbf{Unit}$ ,  $\mathbf{Array}$ , and  $\mathbf{RefInt}$  are additional base types, and the primitive function  $\mathbf{sorted} : \mathbf{Array} \rightarrow \mathbf{Bool}$  identifies sorted arrays.)

```

- printDigit : {x : Int | 0 ≤ x ∧ x ≤ 9} → Unit.

```

Figure 3.3: Operational Semantics of  $\lambda^H$

Redex <u>E</u> valuation	$d \curvearrowright e$
$  \begin{array}{lcl}  (\lambda x : S. d) \ e & \curvearrowright & [x \mapsto e] \ d \\  k \ v & \curvearrowright & \delta(k, v)  \end{array}  $	$  \begin{array}{l}  [\mathbf{E}\text{-}\beta] \\  [\mathbf{E}\text{-PRIM}]  \end{array}  $
Contextual <u>E</u> valuation	$d \rightsquigarrow e$
$  \begin{array}{lcl}  \mathcal{C}[d] & \rightsquigarrow & \mathcal{C}[e] \quad \text{if } d \curvearrowright e \\  \mathcal{D}[d] & \rightsquigarrow & \mathcal{D}[e] \quad \text{if } d \curvearrowright e  \end{array}  $	$  \begin{array}{l}  [\mathbf{E}\text{-COMPAT}] \\  [\mathbf{E}\text{-TYCOMPAT}]  \end{array}  $
Evaluation Contexts	$\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$
$  \begin{array}{l}  \mathcal{C} ::= \bullet \mid \mathcal{C} \ e \mid e \ \mathcal{C} \mid \lambda x : S. \mathcal{C} \mid \lambda x : \mathcal{D}. e \\  \mathcal{D} ::= x : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow T \mid x : S \rightarrow \mathcal{D} \mid \{x : B \mid \mathcal{C}\}  \end{array}  $	

```

- swap : x : RefInt → {y : RefInt | x ≠ y} → Bool.

```

```

- binarySearch : {a : Array | sorted a} → Int → Bool.

```

## 3.2 Operational Semantics of $\lambda^H$

We next describe the run-time behavior of  $\lambda^H$  terms. The relation  $d \curvearrowright e$  expresses conversion of redexes; we close this over arbitrary contexts to generate the single-step evaluation relation  $d \rightsquigarrow e$ . We use this same notation unambiguously for conversion between type  $S \rightsquigarrow T$ , which is always by conversion of some term embedded in the type. We write  $\rightsquigarrow^*$  for the reflexive-transitive closure of  $\rightsquigarrow$ . As shown in



Figure 3.3, the rule [E- $\beta$ ] performs standard  $\beta$ -reduction of function applications.

The rule [E-PRIM] evaluates applications of primitive functions according to their external definitions, given by the partial function

$$\delta : \text{Constant} \times \text{Term} \rightarrow \text{Term}$$

For example:

$$\delta(\text{not}, \text{true}) = \text{false}$$

$$\delta(+, 3) = +_3$$

$$\delta(+_3, 4) = 7$$

$$\delta(\text{not}, 3) = \perp$$

$$\delta(\text{if}_T, \text{true}) = \lambda x:T. \lambda y:T. x$$

$$\delta(\text{if}_T, \text{false}) = \lambda x:T. \lambda y:T. y$$

$$\delta(\text{fix}_T, t) = e \text{ (fix}_T e\text{)}$$

### 3.3 The $\lambda^H$ Type System

Figure 3.4 and Figure 3.5 present the type system of  $\lambda^H$  via rules defining the following collection of judgements:

- The judgment  $\Gamma \vdash e : T$  states that the term  $e$  has type  $T$  in environment  $\Gamma$ .

(Figure 3.4)

- The judgment  $\Gamma \vdash T$  states that  $T$  is a well formed type in environment  $\Gamma$ .

(Figure 3.4)

Figure 3.4: Type Rules for  $\lambda^H$

Type rules

$$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash t : T}$$

$$\frac{(x : T) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : T} [\text{T-VAR}]$$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash k : \text{ty}(k)} [\text{T-CONST}]$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash S \quad \Gamma, x : S \vdash e : T}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x : S. e) : (x : S \rightarrow T)} [\text{T-FUN}]$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash f : (x : S \rightarrow T) \quad \Gamma \vdash e : S}{\Gamma \vdash f e : [x \mapsto e] T} [\text{T-APP}]$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : S \quad \Gamma \vdash S <: T \quad \Gamma \vdash T}{\Gamma \vdash e : T} [\text{T-SUB}]$$

Well-formed types

$$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash T}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash S \quad \Gamma, x : S \vdash T}{\Gamma \vdash x : S \rightarrow T} [\text{WT-ARROW}]$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : B \vdash e : \text{Bool}}{\Gamma \vdash \{x : B \mid e\}} [\text{WT-BASE}]$$

Well-formed environment

$$\boxed{\vdash \Gamma}$$

$$\frac{}{\vdash \emptyset} [\text{WE-EMPTY}]$$

$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma \quad \Gamma \vdash T}{\vdash \Gamma, x : T} [\text{WE-EXT}]$$

Subtyping

$$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash S <: T}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash T_1 <: S_1 \quad \Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash S_2 <: T_2}{\Gamma \vdash (x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2) <: (x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2)} [\text{S-ARROW}]$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : B \vdash p \Rightarrow q}{\Gamma \vdash \{x : B \mid p\} <: \{x : B \mid q\}} [\text{S-BASE}]$$

Figure 3.5: Implication for  $\lambda^H$

Implication	$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q}$
$\frac{\forall \sigma. \text{ if } \vdash \sigma : \Gamma \text{ and } \sigma(p) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true} \text{ then } \sigma(q) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}}{\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q} \text{ [IMP]}$	
Closing Substitution	$\boxed{\vdash \sigma : \Gamma}$
defined in Section ??	

- The judgment  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  states that  $S$  is a subtype of  $T$  in environment  $\Gamma$ . (Figure 3.4)
- The judgment  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q$  states that the predicate  $q$  is entailed by  $p$  in the environment  $\Gamma$ . (Figure 3.5)
- The judgement  $\vdash \sigma : \Gamma$  states that the *closing substitution*  $\sigma$  is consistent with environment  $\Gamma$ . Defining this appropriately is somewhat subtle and is the subject of section 3.3. (Figure 3.5)

The rules for typing and well formedness of environments and types are mostly straightforward. As usual, we assume that variables are bound at most once in an environment and implicitly utilize  $\alpha$ -renaming of bound variables to maintain this assumption and to ensure substitutions are capture-avoiding.

The novel aspects of this system arise from its support of refinement types in subtyping. A type  $\{x:B \mid p\}$  roughly denotes the set of constants  $c$  of type  $B$  for which  $[x \mapsto c]p$  is valid. Subtyping between refinement types reduces to implication between their refinement predicates (the formal details of the implication judgment  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q$  is discussed in the next section). As an example, the rule [S-BASE] states that the subtyping judgment

$$\emptyset \vdash \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid x > 0\} <: \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid x \geq 0\}$$

follows from the validity of the implication:

$$x : \mathbf{Int} \vdash (x > 0) \Rightarrow (x \geq 0)$$

Of course, checking implication between arbitrary predicates is undecidable, which motivates the development of the hybrid type checking algorithm in the following chapter.

## Semantic Typing and Closing Substitutions

We now define the closing substitution relation, deferred from Section 3.3, which lies at the heart of our type system. One approach taken by Flanagan [2006]<sup>2</sup> is to define closing substitutions in terms of the typing judgement, as follows:

$$\frac{\forall x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma), \vdash \sigma(x) : \Gamma(x)}{\vdash \sigma : \Gamma}$$

<sup>2</sup>Corrected by Knowles and Flanagan [2010] to use the technique described here.

But this approach leads to a cyclic definition between the typing, subtyping, implication, and closing substitution judgements. Moreover, the implication rule [IMP] from Figure 3.4 refers to the closing substitution relation in a negative position. Thus, standard monotonicity arguments are not sufficient to show that the resulting collection of mutually-recursive type rules are actually well-defined, and it is not obvious if there are interesting type systems that satisfy these rules.

An alternative approach to defining implication is to axiomatize its logic [Denny 1998; Ou et al. 2004; Gronski et al. 2006], but the underlying problem remains, in that it is still not obvious if there are interesting implication relations, and hence type systems, that satisfy the axioms.

To provide a solid foundation for contract types, we “bootstrap” the type system by using a denotational interpretation of contract types. A contract type has a natural interpretation as a dynamic contract on top of the simply-typed lambda calculus; here we formalize this connection. The syntax, operational semantics, and type system for the simply typed lambda calculus are recalled in Figure 3.6 for convenience and to bring them in line with our notation.

First, we define a function  $[-]$  to remove refinements and dependent type constructs throughout types and terms, to expose the “underlying” term or type of the

Figure 3.6: The Simply-typed lambda calculus parameterized by base types

STLC Typing		$E \vdash_S e : T$
$\frac{(x : T) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{STLC}} x : T}$	[STLC-VAR]	
$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{STLC}} k : [ty(k)]}$	[STLC-CONST]	
$\frac{\Gamma, x:S \vdash_{\text{STLC}} e : T}{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{STLC}} (\lambda x:S. e) : (S \rightarrow T)}$	[STLC-FUN]	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{STLC}} f : S \quad \Gamma \vdash_{\text{STLC}} e : S \rightarrow T}{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{STLC}} f e : T}$	[STLC-APP]	

simply-typed lambda calculus.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \{x:B \mid p\} \rrbracket &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B \\
\llbracket x:S \rightarrow T \rrbracket &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \llbracket S \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket T \rrbracket \\
\llbracket k \rrbracket &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} k \\
\llbracket x \rrbracket &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \\
\llbracket \lambda x:S. e \rrbracket &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda x:\llbracket S \rrbracket. \llbracket e \rrbracket \\
\llbracket f \ e \rrbracket &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \llbracket f \rrbracket \ \llbracket e \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \langle T \triangleleft S \rangle \rrbracket &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda x:\llbracket S \rrbracket. x
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we give each type  $T$  an interpretation  $\llbracket T \rrbracket$  (defined by induction on  $\llbracket T \rrbracket$ )

that is the set of terms  $e$  such that  $\llbracket t \rrbracket$  is of type  $\llbracket T \rrbracket$  and  $e$  obeys the contractual aspect of  $T$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \{x:B \mid p\} \rrbracket &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{e \mid \vdash_{\text{STLC}} \llbracket e \rrbracket : B \wedge (e \rightsquigarrow^* k \text{ implies } \llbracket x \mapsto k \rrbracket p \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true})\} \\
\llbracket x:S \rightarrow T \rrbracket &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{f \mid \vdash_{\text{STLC}} \llbracket f \rrbracket : \llbracket S \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket T \rrbracket \wedge \forall e \in \llbracket S \rrbracket, f \ e \in \llbracket \llbracket x \mapsto e \rrbracket T \rrbracket\}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we use  $\vdash_{\text{STLC}}$  to denote the standard typing relation for the simply-typed lambda calculus. A refined base type  $\{x:B \mid s\}$  is interpreted as the set of closed terms  $e$  of type  $B$  for which the predicate  $s$  holds, in the sense that whenever  $t \rightsquigarrow^* c$  for some constant  $c$ , then  $\llbracket x \mapsto c \rrbracket s \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ . Note that we cannot insist on the simpler requirement that  $\llbracket x \mapsto t \rrbracket s \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$  because that would forbid assigning types to divergent terms. For example, any type  $T$  is populated by at least the divergent term  $\text{fix}_T (\lambda x:T. x)$ . In other terminology, contract types specify *partial* correctness, not *total* correctness.

A dependent function type  $x:S \rightarrow T$  is interpreted as the set of closed terms

of simple type  $\llbracket S \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket T \rrbracket$  that give output in  $\llbracket \llbracket x \mapsto s \rrbracket T \rrbracket$  whenever their input  $s$  is in  $\llbracket S \rrbracket$ .

Based on this notion of semantic typing, we are now in a position to define closing substitutions while avoiding circularity problems. The following rule [SUBST] judges that a substitution  $\sigma : \text{Var} \rightarrow \text{Term}$  is a *closing substitution* for environment  $\Gamma$  if for all bindings  $(x:T) \in \Gamma$  we have  $\sigma(x) \in \sigma(T)$ ; in this case we write  $\vdash \sigma : \Gamma$ .

$$\frac{\forall x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma), \sigma(x) \in \llbracket \sigma(\Gamma(x)) \rrbracket}{\vdash \sigma : \Gamma} \text{ [SUBST]}$$

### 3.4 Type Soundness for $\lambda^H$

We prove soundness via usual syntactic “progress” and “preservation” lemmas.

Throughout this section, environments are assumed to be well formed, to elide many uninteresting antecedents.

As usual, a term is in *normal form* if it does not reduce to any subsequent term, and a *value*  $v$  is either a  $\lambda$ -abstraction or a constant. We assume that the function  $ty$  maps each constant to an appropriate type, in the following sense:

**Assumption 1 (Types of Constants)** *For each  $c \in \text{Constant}$ :*

1. *The type of  $c$  is closed and well-formed, i.e.  $\emptyset \vdash ty(c)$ .*

2. If  $c$  is a primitive function then it cannot get stuck and its behavior is compatible

with its type, i.e. if  $\emptyset \vdash c \ v : T$  then  $\delta(c, v)$  is defined and  $\emptyset \vdash \delta(c, v) : T$

3. If  $c$  is a basic constant then it is a member of its type, which is a singleton type,

i.e. if  $ty(c) = \{x : B \mid t\}$  then  $[x \mapsto c] t \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$  and  $\forall c' \neq c. [x \mapsto c'] t \not\rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ .

**Lemma 2 (Weakening)**

Let  $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$  and  $\Gamma' = \Gamma_1, x : U, \Gamma_2$ .

1. If  $\Gamma \vdash T$  and  $\Gamma \vdash S$  and  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  then  $\Gamma' \vdash S <: T$ .

2. If  $\Gamma \vdash e : T$  then  $\Gamma' \vdash e : T$ .

3. If  $\Gamma \vdash T$  then  $\Gamma' \vdash T$ .

PROOF:

(1) By straightforward induction on the derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$ , using Weakening of implication in the case for rule [S-BASE]

(2) and (3) By straightforward mutual induction on the derivations of  $\Gamma \vdash e : T$  and  $\Gamma \vdash T$ , using part (1) in the case of rule [T-SUB]  $\square$

**Lemma 3 (Narrowing of Subtyping)**

If  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  and  $\Gamma, x : T, \Gamma' \vdash Q <: R$  then  $\Gamma, x : S, \Gamma' \vdash Q <: R$ .

PROOF: By straightforward induction over the derivation of  $\Gamma, x : T, \Gamma' \vdash Q <: R$  using the Narrowing axiom of implication.  $\square$

**Lemma 4 (Subtyping is a Preorder)**

1. If  $\Gamma \vdash T$  then  $\Gamma \vdash T <: T$

2. If  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  and  $\Gamma \vdash T <: U$  then  $\Gamma \vdash S <: U$

PROOF:

1. By induction on the derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash T$ , using the Reflexivity axiom of implication.

2. By induction on the derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  (followed by inversion on  $\Gamma \vdash T <: U$ ) using Lemma 3 (Narrowing of Subtyping) for the bindings in function types, and the Transitivity axiom of implication.  $\square$

**Lemma 5 (Type Equivalence under Evaluation)** If  $\Gamma \vdash S$  and  $S \rightsquigarrow T$  then  $\Gamma \vdash$

$S <: T$  and  $\Gamma \vdash T <: S$ .

PROOF: By induction on the derivation of  $S$ . In the base case of [WT-BASE]

we invoke the Evaluation axiom of theorem proving.  $\square$

The central lemma for proving preservation is the so-called *substitution lemma*, which states that a variable of a certain type may be soundly replaced by any term of the same type. Because we define closing substitutions semantically, our proof of the substitution lemma is nonstandard and connects the semantic relation with our formal type system.

First, we define the *semantic subtyping* relation  $\Gamma \vdash S \subseteq T$  and the *semantic typing* relation  $\Gamma \vdash e \in T$  induced by our semantic notion of types, following Frisch

et al. [2008]:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma \vdash S \subseteq T &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall \sigma, \vdash \sigma : \Gamma \text{ implies } \llbracket \sigma(S) \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket \sigma(T) \rrbracket \\ \Gamma \vdash e \in T &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall \sigma, \vdash \sigma : \Gamma \text{ implies } \sigma(e) \in \llbracket \sigma(T) \rrbracket\end{aligned}$$

Our formal subtype system is sound with respect to this model:

**Lemma 6 (Semantic subtyping soundness)**

1. If  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  then  $\Gamma \vdash S \subseteq T$
2. If  $\Gamma \vdash t : T$  then  $\Gamma \vdash t \in T$

PROOF:

1. By induction on the derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$ . If  $S$  and  $T$  are refined base types, then semantic and formal subtyping have identical definitions. If  $S$  and  $T$  are function types, then the result follows by induction.
2. By induction on the derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash t : T$ . In the case for [T-SUB] we invoke part (1).

The formal substitution lemma now follows from the connection between the formal and semantic relations.

**Lemma 7 (Substitution)** Suppose  $\Gamma \vdash e : S$ ,

1. If  $\Gamma, x : S, \Gamma' \vdash T <: U$  then  $\Gamma, [x \mapsto e] \Gamma' \vdash [x \mapsto e] T <: [x \mapsto e] U$
2. If  $\Gamma, x : S, \Gamma' \vdash d : T$  then  $\Gamma, [x \mapsto e] \Gamma' \vdash [x \mapsto e] d : [x \mapsto e] T$

3. If  $\Gamma, x : S, \Gamma' \vdash T$  then  $\Gamma, [x \mapsto e] \Gamma' \vdash [x \mapsto e] T$

PROOF:

- (1) By induction on the derivation of  $\Gamma, x : S, \Gamma' \vdash T <: U$ . In the case of [S-BASE],  $T = \{y : B \mid p\}$  and  $U = \{y : B \mid q\}$  and we have  $\Gamma, x : S, \Gamma', y : B \vdash p \Rightarrow q$ . By Lemma 6(2),  $\Gamma \vdash s \in S$  so  $\Gamma, [x \mapsto e] \Gamma', y : B \vdash [x \mapsto e] p \Rightarrow [x \mapsto e] q$  is immediate.
- (2) and (3) By mutual induction on the derivations of  $\Gamma, x : S, \Gamma' \vdash d : T$  and  $\Gamma, x : S, \Gamma' \vdash T$ , invoking part (1) in the case of [T-SUB].

**Theorem 8 (Preservation)** If  $\vdash E$  and  $E \vdash s : T$  and  $s \rightsquigarrow t$  then  $E \vdash t : T$

PROOF: By induction on the typing derivation  $\Gamma \vdash s : T$ , invoking Lemma 7 when evaluation proceeds via [E-BETA].

The progress property of our type system includes the caveat that type casts may fail. A failed cast is one that casts a constant to a refinement type with an incompatible predicate.

**Theorem 9 (Progress)** If  $\emptyset \vdash s : T$  then either  $s$  is a value, or there exists some  $s'$  such that  $s \rightsquigarrow s'$ .

PROOF: By induction on the derivation of  $\vdash s : T$ , considering the final rule applied.

*Case* [T-VAR], [T-CONST], [T-FUN]: Then  $e$  is already a value or not closed.

*Case* [T-SUB]: Immediate from the inductive hypothesis.

*Case* [T-APP]: Then  $e = e_1 \ e_2$ . If  $e_1$  or  $e_2$  are not values, then by induction they can evaluate hence  $e$  can as well. If both are values, then there are two possible forms for  $e_1$  (given by Canonical forms):

1.  $e_1$  is a constant of appropriate type – then its meaning function is defined by assumption.
2.  $e_1$  is a lambda term, so  $\beta$ -reduction applies.  $\square$

### 3.5 Related Work

Research on advanced type systems has influenced our choice of how to express program invariants. In particular, Freeman and Pfenning [1991] extended ML with another form of refinement types. They do not support executable refinement predicates, since their system provides both decidable type checking and type inference. Xi and Pfenning have explored the practical application of dependent types in an extension of ML called Dependent ML [Xi and Pfenning 1999; Xi 2000]. Decidability of type checking is preserved by appropriately restricting which terms can appear in types. Despite these restrictions, a number of interesting examples can be expressed in Dependent ML.

Much of the work we build upon directly is discussed in Sections ??, 6.2, and 6.8, so we present only a brief survey here. Freeman and Pfenning introduced *datasort refinements*, which express restrictions on the recursive structure of algebraic datatypes [Freeman and Pfenning 1991], but our refinement types are most similar to those of Denney [1998], Ou et al. [2004] and those from the Hybrid Type Checking (HTC) work of Knowles and Flanagan [2010], Gronski et al. [2006], and Knowles and Flanagan [2007]. As for  $\lambda^H$ , type checking for  $\lambda^\exists$  is undecidable, but in HTC, run-time checks are inserted into a program when an implication condition can be neither proven

nor refuted, resulting in unpredictable coverage and run-time costs. Instead, we give a predictable type checking algorithm for a clear sublanguage of  $\lambda^\exists$ . In some sense, the present work characterizes when runtime checks (or manual proof) are unnecessary in the mentioned systems.

Another system with a similar language for expressing specifications, but an entirely different formal approach, is ESC/Haskell [Xu 2006; Xu et al. 2009]. which uses symbolic evaluation to prove that a program obeys its (dependent) contract. Since ESC/Haskell inlines functions and reasons about their body directly, rather than using their specification, it does not address issues of compositionality. However, ESC/Haskell gives a much more thorough treatment to the notion of blame, which is integral to a complete contract system.

## Chapter 4

### Hybrid Type Checking

Though ongoing research on more powerful type systems, such as those discussed in Section ??, attempts to overcome some of the restrictions discussed in Chapter 3, yet these systems are designed to be *statically type safe*, so the specification language is intentionally restricted to ensure that specifications can always be checked statically. An opposing approach is to abandon static checking entirely in favor of dynamic checking. A third option, taken by Cayenne [Augustsson 1998], is to do a best-effort type checking and reject the program if it cannot be proved to be well-typed.

In this chapter, we present a new option. We describe an approach for validating precise interface specifications using a synthesis of static and dynamic techniques. By checking correctness properties and detecting defects statically (whenever possible) and dynamically (only when necessary), this approach of *hybrid type checking* attempts to combine the benefits of prior purely-static and purely-dynamic approaches.

We illustrate the key idea of hybrid type checking by considering again this possible type rule for function application:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash f : T \rightarrow U \quad \Gamma \vdash e : S \quad \Gamma \vdash S <: T}{\Gamma \vdash f\ e : U}$$

The situation we focus on is when the antecedent  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  can be neither definitively refuted nor proven.

- *Statically rejecting* such programs would cause the compiler to reject some programs that, on deeper analysis, could be shown to be well-typed. This approach seems a little too brittle for use in practice, since it would be difficult to predict



which programs the compiler would accept.

- *Statically accepting* such programs (based on the optimistic assumption that the unproven subtype relations actually hold) may result in specifications being violated at run time, which is undesirable.

Hence, a promising approach is for the compiler to accept such programs on a provisional basis, but to insert sufficient dynamic checks to ensure that specification violations never occur at run time. Of course, checking that  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  at run time is still a difficult problem and would violate the principle of *phase distinction* [Cardelli 1988]. Instead, our hybrid type checking approach transforms the above application into the code

$$f \ (\langle T \triangleleft S \rangle \ e)$$

where the additional *typecast* or *coercion*  $\langle T \triangleleft S \rangle \ e$  dynamically checks that the value produced by  $e$  is in the domain type  $T$ . Note that hybrid type checking supports precise types, and  $T$  could in fact specify a detailed precondition of the function, for example, that it only accepts prime numbers. In this case, the run-time cast would involve performing a primality check.

The behavior of hybrid type checking on various kinds of programs is illustrated in Figure 4.1. Every program can be classified as either ill-typed or well-typed<sup>1</sup>, but expressive type systems it is not always possible to make this classification statically. However, the compiler can still identify some (hopefully many) clearly ill-typed pro-

<sup>1</sup>This is a key distinction between hybrid type checking and soft/gradual typing systems, which bear a superficial resemblance to hybrid type checking due to similarities in algorithmic machinery.

Ill-typed programs		Well-typed programs	
Clearly ill-typed		Subtle programs	Clearly well-typed
Rejected by type checker		Accepted with casts	Accepted without casts
		Casts may fail	Casts never fail

Figure 4.1: Hybrid type checking on various programs.

grams, which are rejected, and similarly can identify some clearly well-typed programs, which are accepted unchanged.

For the remaining *subtle* programs, dynamic type casts are inserted to check any unverified correctness properties at run time. If the original program is actually well-typed, these casts are redundant and will never fail. Conversely, if the original program is ill-typed in a subtle manner that cannot easily be detected at compile time, the inserted casts may fail. As static analysis technology improves, we expect that the category of subtle programs in Figure 4.1 will shrink, as more ill-typed programs are rejected and more well-typed programs are fully verified at compile time.

Hybrid type checking provides several desirable characteristics:

1. It supports precise interface specifications, which facilitate modular development of reliable software.
2. As many defects as possible and practical are detected at compile time (and we expect this set will increase as static analysis technology evolves).
3. All well-typed programs are accepted by the checker.

4. Due to decidability limitations, the hybrid type checker may statically accept some *subtly ill-typed* programs, but it will insert sufficient dynamic casts to guarantee that specification violations are always detected, either statically or dynamically.
5. The output of the hybrid type checker is always a well-typed program (and so, for example, type-directed optimizations are applicable).
6. If the source program is well-typed, then the inserted casts are guaranteed to succeed, and so the source and output programs are behaviorally equivalent.
7. If the subtyping algorithm can decide all reflexive queries, then cast insertion is idempotent.

Our proposed specifications extend traditional static types, and so we view hybrid type checking as an extension of traditional static type checking. In particular, hybrid type checking supports precise specifications while preserving a key benefit of static type systems; namely, the ability to detect simple syntactic errors at compile time.

Hybrid type checking may facilitate the evolution and adoption of advanced static analyses, by allowing software engineers to experiment with sophisticated specification strategies that cannot (yet) be verified statically or efficiently. Such experiments can then motivate and direct static analysis research.

In particular, if a hybrid type checker fails to decide (*i.e.*, verify or refute) a subtyping query, it could send that query back to the compiler writer. Similarly, if a hybrid-typed program fails an inserted cast  $\langle T \triangleleft S \rangle v$ , the value  $v$  is a witness that

refutes an undecided subtyping query  $S <: T$ , and such witnesses could also be sent back to the compiler writer. This information would provide concrete and quantifiable motivation for subsequent improvements in the type checker’s analysis. In Chapter 7 we explore the design of such an implementation.

Indeed, just as different compilers for the same language may yield object code of varying quality, we might imagine a variety of hybrid type checkers with different trade-offs between static and dynamic checks (and between static and dynamic error messages). Fast interactive hybrid compilers might perform only limited static analysis to detect obvious type errors, while production compilers could perform deeper analyses to detect more defects statically and to generate improved code with fewer dynamic checks.

Hybrid type checking is inspired by prior work on soft typing [Fagan 1991; Wright and Cartwright 1994; Aiken et al. 1994; Flanagan et al. 1996], but it extends soft typing by rejecting many ill-typed programs, in the spirit of static type checkers. The interaction between static typing and dynamic checks has also been studied in the context of type systems with the type **Dynamic** [Abadi et al. 1991; Thatte 1990], and in systems that combine dynamic checks with dependent types [Ou et al. 2004]. Hybrid type checking extends these ideas to support more precise specifications.

The general approach of hybrid type checking appears applicable to a variety of programming languages and specification languages. In this paper, we develop this approach for a fairly expressive dependent type system that is statically undecidable. Specifically, we work with an extension of the  $\lambda$ -calculus with *contract types*, that is,

with dependent function types and arbitrary refinements of base types.

In addition, this chapter develops a moderately original style of *logical relations* that provides an elegant approach for proving that cast insertion preserves the semantics of well-typed programs, introducing only cast failures in ill-typed programs.

## 4.1 Additional Syntax, Semantics, and Typing

The additional language constructs and their semantics (static and dynamic) are shown in Figure 4.2. The cast  $\langle T \triangleleft S \rangle e$  dynamically checks that the result of  $e$  is of type  $T$  (in a manner similar to coercions [Thatte 1990], contracts [Findler and Felleisen 2002], and to type casts in languages such as Java [Gosling et al. 1996]).

The operational semantics of casts to function types is somewhat involved. As described by the rule [E-CAST-F], casting a function  $t$  of type  $x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2$  to the type  $x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$  yields a new function

$$\lambda x : T_1. (\langle T_2 \triangleleft S_2 \rangle \circ t \circ \langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle) x$$

where  $\circ$  is the usual associative composition operator (in the absence of polymorphism, we actually need a family of composition operators, as for **fix** and **if**). This function is of the desired type  $x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ ; it takes an argument  $x$  of type  $T_1$ , casts it to a value of type  $S_1$ , which is passed to the original function  $t$ , and the result of that application is then cast to the desired result type  $T_2$ . Thus, higher order casts are performed a lazy fashion – the new casts  $\langle T_2 \triangleleft S_2 \rangle$  and  $\langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle$  are performed at every application of the resulting function, in a manner reminiscent of higher order contracts [Findler and

Figure 4.2: Additional Syntax, Semantics, and Typing for HTC

<hr/>	
$v ::= \dots$ $\langle T \triangleleft S \rangle$	<i>Values:</i> type cast
$e ::= \dots$ $\langle T, e, k \rangle$	<i>Terms:</i> check in progress
 Additional Redex <u>E</u> valuation <span style="float: right;"><math>\boxed{d \curvearrowright e}</math></span>	
$\langle x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \triangleleft x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \rangle v \curvearrowright \lambda x : T_1. (\langle T_2 \triangleleft S_2 \rangle \circ v \circ \langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle) x$ [E-CAST-F]	
$\langle \{x : B \mid p\} \triangleleft \{x : B \mid q\} \rangle k \curvearrowright \langle \{x : B \mid p\}, [x \mapsto k] p, k \rangle$ [E-CAST-BEGIN]	
$\langle \{x : B \mid q\}, \mathbf{true}, k \rangle \curvearrowright k$ [E-CAST-END]	
 Additional Evaluation Contexts <span style="float: right;"><math>\boxed{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}}</math></span>	
$\mathcal{C} ::= \dots \mid \langle T, \mathcal{C}, k \rangle \mid \langle \mathcal{D}, e, k \rangle \mid \langle T \triangleleft \mathcal{D} \rangle \mid \langle \mathcal{D} \triangleleft S \rangle$	
 Additional <u>T</u> ype rules <span style="float: right;"><math>\boxed{E \vdash t : T}</math></span>	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash S \quad \Gamma \vdash T \quad [S] = [T]}{\Gamma \vdash \langle T \triangleleft S \rangle^t : S \rightarrow T}$ [T-CAST]	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \{x : B \mid p\} \quad \Gamma \vdash k : B \quad \Gamma \vdash f : \mathbf{Bool} \quad \Gamma \vdash f \Rightarrow [x \mapsto k] p}{\Gamma \vdash \langle \{x : B \mid p\}, f, k \rangle : \{x : B \mid p\}}$ [T-CHECKING]	
<hr/>	

Felleisen 2002].<sup>2</sup>

The rules [E-CAST-BEGIN] and [E-CAST-END] deal with casting a basic constant  $k$  to a base refinement type  $\{x:B \mid p\}$ . Via rule [E-CAST-BEGIN] a cast application  $\langle \{x:B \mid p\} \triangleleft \{x:B \mid q\} \rangle$   $k$  evaluates to a cast-in-progress  $\langle \{x:B \mid p\}, [x \mapsto k] p, k \rangle$ . The instantiated predicate  $[x \mapsto k] t$  then evaluates via the closure rule [E-CTX], either diverging or terminating in a value  $v$ . If  $v$  is **true** then the cast-in-progress evaluates to  $c$ , as it has been dynamically verified that  $p$  has type  $\{x:B \mid p\}$ , otherwise the cast-in-progress is “stuck.”

Note that these casts involve only familiar dynamic operations: tag checks, predicate checks, and creating checking wrappers for functions. Thus, our approach adheres to the principle of phase separation [Cardelli 1988], in that there is no type checking of actual program syntax at run time.

To conclude this section, before treating the hybrid type checking algorithm, we note that the Preservation theorem holds as stated, with the implication  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow [x \mapsto k] q$  ensuring that when a cast ends, it has certainly checked the necessary property.

On the other hand, the Progress theorem holds only modulo failed casts – a term may be “justifiably” stuck because a cast has failed.

**Definition 10 (Failed Casts)** *A failed cast is a term of the form  $\langle \{x:B \mid p\}, q, k \rangle$  where  $q$  cannot evaluate further, yet  $q \neq \mathbf{true}$ .*

**Theorem 11 (Progress)** *If  $\emptyset \vdash s : T$  then either  $s$  is a value,  $s$  contains a failed cast,*

<sup>2</sup>We ignore the issue of blame assignment in the event of a run-time cast failure – see [Gronski and Flanagan 2007] for a detailed comparison

*or there is some  $s'$  such that  $s \rightsquigarrow s'$ .*

**PROOF:** By induction on the derivation of  $\emptyset \vdash s : T$  as before, except in the case for [T-CHECKING] where  $s$  may be a failed cast. In combination with the Evaluation axiom of theorem proving and specification of constants, the premise  $\Gamma \vdash q \Rightarrow [x \mapsto c] p$  ensures that casts on basic constants can only get stuck when the constant does not have the desired type. In the case for [T-APP] we know that the function position cannot be a failed cast because they occur only at base types, not function types.  $\square$

## 4.2 Hybrid Type Checking for $\lambda^H$

We now describe how to perform hybrid type checking. We work in the specific context of the language  $\lambda^H$ , but have also demonstrated that the general approach extends to other languages with similarly expressive type systems, discussed further in Chapter 7.

Hybrid type checking relies on an algorithm for conservatively approximating implication between predicates. We assume that for any conjectured implication  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q$ , this algorithm returns one of three possible results, which we denote as follows:

- The judgment  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{\vee} p \Rightarrow q$  means the algorithm finds a proof that  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q$ .
- The judgment  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{\times} p \Rightarrow q$  means the algorithm finds a proof that  $\Gamma \not\vdash p \Rightarrow q$ .
- The judgment  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^? p \Rightarrow q$  means the algorithm terminates without either discovering a proof of either  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q$  or  $\Gamma \not\vdash p \Rightarrow q$ .

Figure 4.3: Cast insertion rules on terms

<u>Cast insertion on terms</u>	$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e : T}$
$\frac{(x : T) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x \hookrightarrow x : T} \text{ [C-VAR]}$	$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash k \hookrightarrow k : ty(k)} \text{ [C-CONST]}$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash S_1 \hookrightarrow T_1 \quad \Gamma, x : T_1, \vdash d \hookrightarrow e : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x : S_1. d) \hookrightarrow (\lambda x : T_1. e) : (x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2)} \text{ [C-FUN]}$	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash f \hookrightarrow g : (x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2) \quad \Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e \downarrow T_1}{\Gamma \vdash f d \hookrightarrow g e : [x \mapsto e] T_2} \text{ [C-APP]}$	
<u>Cast insertion and checking</u>	$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e \downarrow T}$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e : S \quad \Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{\vee} S <: T}{\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e \downarrow T} \text{ [CC-OK]}$	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e : S \quad \Gamma \vdash_{alg}^2 S <: T}{\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow \langle T \triangleleft S \rangle e \downarrow T} \text{ [CC-CHK]}$	

Figure 4.4: Cast insertion rules for types and Subtyping

<u>Cast insertion on types</u>	$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash S \hookrightarrow T}$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash S_1 \hookrightarrow T_1 \quad \Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash S_2 \hookrightarrow T_2}{\Gamma \vdash (x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2) \hookrightarrow (x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2)} \text{ [C-ARROW]}$	
$\frac{\Gamma, x : B \vdash s \hookrightarrow t : \{y : \mathbf{Bool} \mid t'\}}{\Gamma \vdash \{x : B \mid s\} \hookrightarrow \{x : B \mid t\}} \text{ [C-BASE]}$	
<u>Subtyping Algorithm</u>	$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a S <: T}$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a T_1 <: S_1 \quad \Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash_{alg}^b S_2 <: T_2}{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{a \sqcap b} (x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2) <: (x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2)} \text{ [SA-ARROW]}$	
$\frac{\Gamma, x : B \vdash_{alg}^a p \Rightarrow q}{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a \{x : B \mid p\} <: \{x : B \mid q\}} \text{ [SA-BASE]}$	

We lift this 3-valued algorithmic implication judgment  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a p \Rightarrow q$  (where  $a \in \{\sqrt{ }, \times, ?\}$ ) to a 3-valued algorithmic subtyping judgment:

$$\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a S <: T$$

as shown in Figure 4.3. The subtyping judgment between base refinement types reduces to a corresponding implication judgment, via the rule [SA-BASE]. Subtyping between function types reduces to subtyping between corresponding contravariant domain and covariant range types, via the rule [SA-ARROW]. This rule uses the standard meet operation  $\sqcap$  on the three-element lattice of possible implication results:

$\sqcap$	$\sqrt{ }$	$?$	$\times$
$\sqrt{ }$	$\sqrt{ }$	$?$	$\times$
$?$	$?$	$?$	$\times$
$\times$	$\times$	$\times$	$\times$

If the appropriate subtyping relation holds between the domain and range components (*i.e.*,  $b = c = \sqrt{ }$ ), then the subtyping relation holds between the function types (*i.e.*,  $a = \sqrt{ }$ ). If the appropriate subtyping relation does not hold between either the domain or range components (*i.e.*,  $b = \times$  or  $c = \times$ ), then the subtyping relation does not hold between the function types (*i.e.*,  $a = \times$ ). Otherwise, in the uncertain case, subtyping *may* hold between the function types (*i.e.*,  $a = ?$ ). Thus, like the implication algorithm, the subtyping algorithm need not return a definite answer in all cases.

Hybrid type checking uses this subtyping algorithm to type check the source program, and to simultaneously insert dynamic casts to compensate for any indefinite

answers returned by the subtyping algorithm. We characterize this process of simultaneous type checking and cast insertion via the *cast insertion judgment*:

$$\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e : T$$

Here, the environment  $\Gamma$  provides bindings for free variables,  $d$  is the original source program,  $e$  is a modified version of the original program with additional casts, and  $T$  is the inferred type for  $e$ . Since types contain terms, we extend this cast insertion process to types via the judgment  $\Gamma \vdash S \hookrightarrow T$ . Some of the cast insertion rules rely on the auxiliary *cast insertion and checking* judgment:

$$\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e \downarrow T$$

This judgment takes as input an environment  $\Gamma$ , a source term  $d$ , and a desired result type  $T$ , and checks that  $d$  is converted by cast insertion to a term  $e$  of this type. For simplicity, we do not allow casts in source programs; they are inserted only by the cast insertion algorithm.

The rules defining these judgments are shown in Figure 4.3 and Figure 4.4. Most of the rules are straightforward. The rules [C-VAR] and [C-CONST] say that variable references and constants do not require additional casts. The rule [C-FUN] inserts casts into an abstraction  $\lambda x : S_1. s$  by first inserting casts into the type  $S_1$  to yield  $T_1$  and then processing  $s$  to yield a term  $t$  of type  $T_2$ ; the resulting abstraction  $\lambda x : T_1. t$  has type  $x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ . The rule [C-APP] for an application  $f e$  processes  $f$  to a term  $f'$  of type  $x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$  then invokes the cast insertion and checking judgement to convert  $e$  into a term  $e'$  of the appropriate argument type  $T_1$ .

The two rules defining the cast insertion and checking judgment  $\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e \downarrow$  demonstrate the key idea of hybrid type checking. Both rules start by processing  $d$  to a term  $e$  of some type  $S$ . The crucial question is then whether this type  $S$  is a subtype of the expected type  $T$ :

- If the subtyping algorithm succeeds in proving that  $S$  is a subtype of  $T$  (i.e.,  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{\vee} S <: T$ ), then  $e$  is clearly of the desired type  $T$ , and so the rule [CC-OK] returns  $e$ .
- If the subtyping algorithm can show that  $S$  is not a subtype of  $T$  (i.e.,  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{\times} S <: T$ ), then the program is rejected since no rule is applicable.
- Otherwise, in the uncertain case where  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^? S <: T$ , the rule [CC-CHK] inserts the type cast  $\langle T \triangleleft S \rangle$  to dynamically ensure that  $e$  is actually of the desired type  $T$ .

These rules for cast insertion and checking illustrate the key benefit of hybrid type checking – specific static analysis problem instances (such as  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$ ) that are undecidable or computationally intractable can be avoided in a convenient manner simply by inserting appropriate dynamic checks. Of course, we should not abuse this facility, and so ideally the subtyping algorithm should yield a precise answer in most cases. However, the critical contribution of hybrid type checking is that it avoids the very strict requirement of demanding a precise answer for *all* (arbitrarily complicated) subtyping questions.

Cast insertion on types is straightforward. The rule [C-ARROW] inserts casts in

the domain and codomain of a function type  $x:S \rightarrow T$  and reassembles the components.

The rule [C-BASE] inserts casts into the refinement  $p$  of a base type  $\{x:B \mid p\}$ , producing  $q$  (whose type should be a subtype of `Bool`), and then yielding the base refinement type  $\{x:B \mid q\}$ .

Note that checking that a type is well-formed is actually a cast insertion process that returns a well-formed type (possibly with added casts). Thus, we only perform cast insertion on types where necessary, when we encounter (possibly ill-formed) types on  $\lambda$ -abstractions in the source program. In particular, the cast insertion rules do not explicitly check that the environment is well-formed, since that would involve repeatedly processing all types in that environment. Instead, the rules assume that the environment is well-formed; this assumption is explicit in the correctness theorems later in the paper.

### 4.3 An Example of HTC

To illustrate the behavior of the cast insertion algorithm, consider a function `serializeMatrix` that serializes an  $n$  by  $m$  matrix into an array of size  $n \times m$ . We extend the language  $\lambda^H$  with two additional base types:

- **Array**, the type of one dimensional arrays containing integers.
- **Matrix**, the type of two dimensional matrices, again containing integers.

The following primitive functions return the size of an array; create a new array of the given size; and return the width and height of a matrix, respectively:

```

asize   :  $a:\text{Array} \rightarrow \text{Int}$ 

newArray :  $n:\text{Int} \rightarrow \{a:\text{Array} \mid \text{asize } a = n\}$ 

matrixWidth :  $a:\text{Matrix} \rightarrow \text{Int}$ 

matrixHeight :  $a:\text{Matrix} \rightarrow \text{Int}$ 

```

We introduce the following type abbreviations to denote arrays of size  $n$  and matrices of size  $n$  by  $m$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Array}_n &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a:\text{Array} \mid (\text{asize } a = n)\} \\ \text{Matrix}_{n,m} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a:\text{Matrix} \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{matrixWidth } a = n \\ \wedge \text{matrixHeight } a = m \end{array} \right)\} \end{aligned}$$

The shorthand  $e \text{ as}^l T$  ensures that the term  $t$  has type  $T$  by passing  $t$  as an argument to the identity function of type  $T \rightarrow T$ :

$$e \text{ as}^l T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ((\lambda x:T. x) e)^l$$

We now define the function **serializeMatrix** as:

$$\left( \begin{array}{l} \lambda n:\text{Int}. \lambda m:\text{Int}. \lambda a:\text{Matrix}_{n,m}. \\ \text{let } r = \text{newArray } e \text{ in } \dots ; r \end{array} \right) \text{ as } T$$

The elided term  $\dots$  initializes the new array  $r$  with the contents of the matrix  $a$ , and we will consider several possibilities for the size expression  $e$ . The type  $T$  is the specification of **serializeMatrix**:

$$T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (n:\text{Int} \rightarrow m:\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Matrix}_{n,m} \rightarrow \text{Array}_{n \times m})$$

For this declaration to type check, the inferred type  $\text{Array}_e$  of the function's body must be a subtype of the declared return type:

$$n:\text{Int}, m:\text{Int} \vdash \text{Array}_e <: \text{Array}_{n \times m}$$

Checking this subtype relation reduces to checking the implication:

$$\begin{aligned} n:\text{Int}, m:\text{Int}, r:\text{Array} &\vdash (\text{asize } r = e) \\ &\Rightarrow (\text{asize } r = (n \times m)) \end{aligned}$$

which in turn reduces to checking the equality:

$$\forall n, m \in \text{Int}. e = n \times m$$

The implication checking algorithm might use an automatic theorem prover (*e.g.*, [Detlefs et al. 2005]) to verify or refute such conjectured equalities.

We now consider three possibilities for the expression  $e$ .

1. If  $e$  is the expression  $n \times m$ , the equality is trivially true, and no additional casts are inserted (even when using a rather weak theorem prover).
2. If  $e$  is  $m \times n$  (*i.e.*, the order of the multiplicands is reversed), and the underlying theorem prover can verify

$$\forall n, m \in \text{Int}. m \times n = n \times m$$

then again no casts are necessary. Note that a theorem prover that is not complete for arbitrary multiplication might still have a specific axiom about the commutativity of multiplication.



If the theorem prover is too limited to verify this equality, the hybrid type checker will still accept this program. However, to compensate for the limitations of the theorem prover, the hybrid type checker will insert a redundant cast, yielding the function (where we have elided the source type of the cast):

$$\left( \langle T \triangleleft \dots \rangle \left( \lambda n:\text{Int}. \lambda m:\text{Int}. \lambda a:\text{Matrix}_{n,m}. \left( \text{let } r = \text{newArray } e \text{ in } \dots ; r \right) \right) \right) \text{ as } T$$

This term can be optimized, via [E-BETA] and [E-CAST-FN] steps and via removal of clearly redundant  $\langle \text{Int} \triangleleft \text{Int} \rangle$  casts, to:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda n:\text{Int}. \lambda m:\text{Int}. \lambda a:\text{Matrix}_{n,m}. \\ & \quad \text{let } r = \text{newArray } (m \times n) \text{ in} \\ & \quad \dots ; \\ & \quad \langle \text{Array}_{n \times m} \triangleleft \text{Array}_{m \times n} \rangle r \end{aligned}$$

The remaining cast checks that the result value  $r$  is of the declared return type  $\text{Array}_{n \times m}$ , which reduces to dynamically checking that the predicate:

$$\text{asize } r = n \times m$$

evaluates to **true**, which it does.

3. Finally, if  $e$  is erroneously  $m \times m$ , the function is ill-typed. By performing random or directed [Godefroid et al. 2005] testing of several values for  $n$  and  $m$  until it finds a counterexample, the theorem prover might reasonably refute the conjectured equality:

$$\forall n, m \in \text{Int}. m \times m = n \times m$$

In this case, the hybrid type checker reports a static type error.

Conversely, if the theorem prover is too limited to refute the conjectured equality, then the hybrid type checker will produce (after optimization) the program:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda n:\text{Int}. \lambda m:\text{Int}. \lambda a:\text{Matrix}_{n,m}. \\ & \quad \text{let } r = \text{newArray } (m \times m) \text{ in} \\ & \quad \dots ; \\ & \quad \langle \text{Array}_{n \times m} \triangleleft \text{Array}_{m \times m} \rangle r \end{aligned}$$

If this function is ever called with arguments for which  $m \times m \neq n \times m$ , then the cast will detect the type error.

Note that prior work on practical dependent types [Xi and Pfenning 1999] could not handle these cases, since the type  $T$  uses non-linear arithmetic expressions. In contrast, case 2 of this example demonstrates that even fairly partial techniques for reasoning about complex specifications (*e.g.*, commutativity of multiplication, random testing of equalities) can facilitate static detection of defects. Furthermore, even though catching errors at compile time is ideal, catching errors at run time (as in case 3) is still an improvement over not detecting these errors at all, and getting subsequent crashes or incorrect results.

## 4.4 Correctness of Cast Insertion

### Type Correctness of Cast Insertion

Since hybrid type checking relies on necessarily incomplete algorithms for subtyping and implication, we next investigate what correctness properties are guaranteed by this cast insertion process.

We assume the 3-valued algorithm for checking implication between boolean terms is sound in the following sense:

**Assumption 12 (Soundness of  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a p \Rightarrow q$ )** *Suppose  $\vdash \Gamma$ .*

1. *If  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{\vee} p \Rightarrow q$  then  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q$ .*
2. *If  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{\times} p \Rightarrow q$  then  $\Gamma \not\vdash p \Rightarrow q$ .*

Note that this algorithm does not need to be complete (indeed, an extremely naive algorithm could simply return  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^? p \Rightarrow q$  in all cases). A consequence of the soundness of the implication algorithm is that the algorithmic subtyping judgment  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg} S <: T$  is also sound.

**Lemma 13 (Soundness of  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a S <: T$ )** *Suppose  $\vdash \Gamma$ .*

1. *If  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{\vee} S <: T$  then  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$ .*
2. *If  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{\times} S <: T$  then  $\Gamma \not\vdash S <: T$ .*

PROOF: By induction on derivations using Assumption 12.

Because algorithmic subtyping is sound, the hybrid cast insertion algorithm generates only well-typed programs:

**Theorem 14 (Compilation Soundness)** *Suppose  $\vdash \Gamma$ .*

1. *If  $\Gamma \vdash e \hookrightarrow e' : T$  then  $\Gamma \vdash e' : T$ .*
2. *If  $\Gamma \vdash e \hookrightarrow e' \downarrow T$  and  $\Gamma \vdash T$  then  $\Gamma \vdash e' : T$ .*
3. *If  $\Gamma \vdash T \hookrightarrow T'$  then  $\Gamma \vdash T'$ .*

PROOF: By induction on cast insertion derivations.

Since the generated code is well-typed, standard type-directed optimization techniques are applicable. Furthermore, the generated code includes all the type specifications present in the original program, and so by the Preservation Theorem these specifications will never be violated at run time. Any attempt to violate a specification is detected via a combination of static checking (where possible) and dynamic checking (when necessary).

### Behavioral Correctness of Cast Insertion

We now prove that cast insertion does not change the behavior of well-typed programs, in the sense that the original and compiled programs are equivalent in any well-typed context. Our proof is based on the technique of *logical relations* [Statman 1985]. The logical relation we use is extensional equivalence of well-typed terms under reduction, written  $\Gamma \vdash d \sim e : T$  and defined in Figure 4.5. (As we shall see below, extensional equivalence implies the traditional notion of contextual equivalence.)

Figure 4.5: Extensional Equivalence Under Reduction

$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash e_1 \sim e_2 : T}$ (defined by induction on $[T]$ )	
$\Gamma \vdash e_1 \sim e_2 : \{x:B \mid p\}$	$\Leftrightarrow \Gamma \vdash e_1 \in \{x:B \mid p\}$
	$\Gamma \vdash e_2 \in \{x:B \mid p\}$
	$\forall \sigma \text{ such that } \vdash \sigma : \Gamma, (\sigma(e_1) \rightsquigarrow^* k) \Leftrightarrow (\sigma(e_2) \rightsquigarrow^* k)$
$\Gamma \vdash f \sim_1 f_2 : (x:S \rightarrow T)$	$\Leftrightarrow \forall e_1, e_2 \text{ such that } \Gamma \vdash e_1 \sim e_2 : S,$
	$\Gamma \vdash f_1 e_1 \sim f_2 e_2 : [x \mapsto e_1] T \wedge [x \mapsto e_2] T$
$\boxed{S \wedge T}$	
$\{x:B \mid p\} \wedge \{x:B \mid q\}$	$= \{x:B \mid p \wedge q\}$
$(x:S_1 \rightarrow S_2) \wedge (x:T_1 \rightarrow T_2)$	$= x:(S_1 \wedge T_1) \rightarrow (S_2 \wedge T_2)$

Two terms  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  of base type are (extensionally) equivalent if, for any closing substitution  $\sigma$ , whenever  $\sigma(e_1)$  evaluates to a constant  $k$  so does  $\sigma(e_2)$ , and vice versa. Two functions  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  of type  $x:S \rightarrow T$  are equivalent if they yield equivalent output when given equivalent arguments  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ .

A question that immediately arises is whether these two applications  $f_1 e_1$  and  $f_2 e_2$  should have type  $[x \mapsto e_1] T$  or  $[x \mapsto e_2] T$ . In some sense it does not matter, since  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are extensionally equivalent by assumption. However, it significantly simplifies our proof structure to require that  $f_1 e_1$  and  $f_2 e_2$  are extensionally equivalent at type

$$[x \mapsto e_1] T \wedge [x \mapsto e_2] T$$

where we combine both types via the *wedge product* ( $\wedge$ ) defined in Figure 4.5. For base types, wedge product is type intersection, *i.e.*, conjunction of refinement predicates. For function types, the wedge product is covariant in both the function domain and the range. Though this covariance may seem surprising, we only ever combine equivalent types with the wedge product, so co- or contravariance is a formality: If the wedge product were made more “intuitively” contravariant the [T-APP] case of Theorem 18 would not be possible to prove as stated.

To work fluidly with this wedge product, we note that it is a commutative and associative operator with respect to the equivalence closure of subtyping, and it distributes through subtyping.

**Lemma 15 (Wedge Product Subtyping)** *Assuming the underlying shapes of all men-*

tioned types are equal, and each type is well-formed in the environment,

$$1. \Gamma \vdash S \wedge T <: T \wedge S$$

$$2. \Gamma \vdash S \wedge (T \wedge U) <: (S \wedge T) \wedge U$$

$$3. \text{ If } \Gamma \vdash S_1 <: T_1 \text{ and } \Gamma \vdash S_2 <: T_2 \text{ then } \Gamma \vdash S_1 \wedge S_2 <: T_1 \wedge T_2$$

PROOF: By induction on the underlying shape of the types.

We assume that primitive functions do not violate extensionality, and so each primitive function  $c$  is extensionally equivalent to itself, *i.e.*,  $\emptyset \vdash c \sim c : ty(c)$ . Next, equivalence is preserved under subtyping, allowing free manipulation of  $\wedge$  in the type assigned to an equivalence.

**Lemma 16 (Extensional equivalence under subtyping)** *If  $\Gamma \vdash s \sim t : S$  and  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  then  $\Gamma \vdash s \sim t : T$*

PROOF: By induction on  $[S]$  (which equals  $[T]$ )

*Case  $S = \{x:B \mid p\}$ :* In this case,  $s$  and  $t$  are also semantically members of  $T$ , by definition of subtyping between base types, and have the same reducts.

$$\text{Case } S = x:S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \quad \text{and} \quad T = x:T_1 \rightarrow T_2.$$

By inversion,

$$\Gamma \vdash T_1 <: S_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma, x:T_1 \vdash S_2 <: T_2$$

Fix  $a$  and  $b$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash a \sim b : T_1$ . By induction,  $\Gamma \vdash a \sim b : S_1$ .

By definition,

$$\Gamma \vdash s \ a \sim t \ b : [x \mapsto a] S_2 \wedge [x \mapsto b] S_2$$

By the Substitution Lemma 7,

$$\Gamma \vdash [x \mapsto a] S_2 <: [x \mapsto a] T_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma \vdash [x \mapsto b] S_2 <: [x \mapsto b] T_2$$

By Lemma 15(3),

$$\Gamma \vdash [x \mapsto a] S_2 \wedge [x \mapsto b] S_2 <: [x \mapsto a] T_2 \wedge [x \mapsto b] T_2$$

By induction,

$$\Gamma \vdash s \ a \sim t \ b : [x \mapsto a] T_2 \wedge [x \mapsto b] T_2$$

Hence  $\Gamma \vdash s \sim t : (x:T_1 \rightarrow T_2)$

Next, we show that extensional equivalence of reducts implies extensional equivalence of the original terms.

**Lemma 17 (Extensional equivalence under reduction)** *If  $\Gamma \vdash s \sim t : T$  and  $s' \rightsquigarrow^* s$  and  $t' \rightsquigarrow^* t$  then  $\Gamma \vdash s' \sim t' : T$*

PROOF: By induction on  $[T]$ .

*Case  $T = \{x:B \mid p\}$ :* If  $s \rightsquigarrow^* c$  then  $s' \rightsquigarrow^* s \rightsquigarrow^* c$ ; likewise for  $t$  and  $t'$ .

*Case  $T = x:T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ :* Fix  $a, b$  such that

$$\Gamma \vdash a \sim b : T_1.$$

By definition

$$\Gamma \vdash s \ a \sim t \ b : [x \mapsto a] T_2 \wedge [x \mapsto b] T_2$$

By applying an evaluation context,

$$s' \ a \rightsquigarrow^* s \ a \quad \text{and} \quad t' \ b \rightsquigarrow^* t \ b$$

By induction,

$$\Gamma \vdash s' \ a \sim t' \ b : [x \mapsto a] T_2 \wedge [x \mapsto b] T_2$$

Hence,  $\Gamma \vdash s' \sim t' : (x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2)$ .

To prove the fundamental soundness theorem for extensional equivalence, we extend the notion extensional equivalence to closing substitutions.

$$\vdash \sigma \sim \gamma : \Gamma \quad \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \quad \forall x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma), \emptyset \vdash \sigma(x) \sim \gamma(x) : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(\Gamma(x))$$

For convenience, we overload the wedge product operator for closing substitutions, so  $(\sigma \wedge \gamma)$  maps a type  $T$  to the wedge product of all possible choices of which variables to use from  $\sigma$  and which from  $\gamma$ .

$$(\sigma \wedge \gamma)(T) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigwedge_{A \in \mathcal{P}(\text{dom}(\sigma))} (\sigma|_A \circ \gamma|_{\text{dom}(\sigma) \setminus A})(T)$$

**Theorem 18 (Soundness of extensional equivalence)** *If  $\Gamma \vdash t : T$  then for any closing substitutions  $\sigma$  and  $\gamma$  such that  $\vdash \sigma \sim \gamma : \Gamma$ , we have*

$$\emptyset \vdash \sigma(t) \sim \gamma(t) : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(T)$$

PROOF: By induction on the height of the derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash t : T$ .

*Case [T-VAR].* By inversion,  $(x : T) \in \Gamma$ , so by definition of equivalent substitutions  $\emptyset \vdash \sigma(x) \sim \gamma(x) : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(T)$

*Case [T-PRIM]* By the above assumption on constants.

*Case [T-APP]* By inversion,

$$t = s_1 \ s_2 \qquad T = [x \mapsto s_2] S_2$$

$$\Gamma \vdash s_1 : (x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2) \qquad \Gamma \vdash s_2 : S_1$$

Fix  $\sigma$  and  $\gamma$ . By induction,

$$\emptyset \vdash \sigma(s_1) \sim \gamma(s_1) : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2)$$

$$\emptyset \vdash \sigma(s_2) \sim \gamma(s_2) : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(S_1)$$

By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \emptyset \vdash \sigma(s_1) \ \sigma(s_2) \sim \gamma(s_1) \ \gamma(s_2) \quad &: \quad [x \mapsto \sigma(s_2)] (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(S_2) \\ &\wedge \quad [x \mapsto \gamma(s_2)] (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(S_2) \end{aligned}$$

which simplifies to

$$\emptyset \vdash \sigma(s_1 \ s_2) \sim \gamma(s_1 \ s_2) : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)([x \mapsto s_2] S_2)$$

*Case [T-LAM]* By inversion,

$$t = \lambda x : S_1. s \qquad T = x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \qquad \Gamma, x : S_1 \vdash s : S_2$$

Fix  $\sigma$  and  $\gamma$ , then fix  $a$  and  $b$  such that  $\emptyset \vdash a \sim b : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(S_1)$ . Then we have

$$\vdash (\sigma \circ [x \mapsto a]) \sim (\gamma \circ [x \mapsto b]) : (\Gamma, x : S_1)$$

By induction,

$$\emptyset \vdash (\sigma \circ [x \mapsto a]) s \sim (\gamma \circ [x \mapsto b]) s : ((\sigma \circ [x \mapsto a]) \wedge (\gamma \circ [x \mapsto b]))(S_2)$$

By Lemma 17, we perform  $\beta$ -expansion and rearrange some substitutions to

yield

$$\begin{aligned} \emptyset \vdash \sigma(\lambda x : S_1. s) a \sim \gamma(\lambda x : S_1. s) b & : [x \mapsto a](\sigma \wedge \gamma)(S_2) \\ & \wedge [x \mapsto b](\sigma \wedge \gamma)(S_2) \end{aligned}$$

which simplifies to, by definition,

$$\emptyset \vdash \sigma(\lambda x : S_1. s) \sim \gamma(\lambda x : S_1. s) : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2)$$

*Case* [T-CAST] There are two cases to consider.

$$\text{SubCase} \quad t = \langle \{x : B \mid q\} \triangleleft \{x : B \mid p\} \rangle \quad T = \{x : B \mid p\} \rightarrow \{x : B \mid q\}$$

Fix  $a$  and  $b$  such that  $\emptyset \vdash a \sim b : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(\{x : B \mid p\})$ .

By definition of equivalence at base type,  $a$  and  $b$  either diverge or both terminate

at a constant  $c$ . Since base type casts are strict in their argument, the divergent

case is trivial, so assume

$$a \rightsquigarrow^* c \quad b \rightsquigarrow^* c$$

Consider the evaluation of  $\sigma([x \mapsto c] q)$  and  $\gamma([x \mapsto c] q)$ . The typing of  $q$  is a subderivation, and  $\vdash \sigma \circ [x \mapsto c] \sim \gamma \circ [x \mapsto c] : (\Gamma, x : B)$  so by induction

$$\emptyset \vdash \sigma([x \mapsto c] q) \sim \gamma([x \mapsto c] q) : \text{Bool}$$

By definition of logical equivalence at base type, these two boolean terms evaluate to the same truth-value or diverge together. So either both casts fail (divergence) or both succeed, evaluating to  $c$ , proving this case of the lemma.

$$\text{SubCase} \quad t = \langle x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \triangleleft x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \rangle \quad T = \langle x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \rangle \rightarrow \langle x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \rangle$$

Fix  $\sigma$  and  $\gamma$  and also  $f$  and  $g$  such that  $\emptyset \vdash f \sim g : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2)$ .

We need to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \emptyset \vdash & \quad \sigma(\langle x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \triangleleft x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \rangle) g \\ & \sim \gamma(\langle x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \triangleleft x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \rangle) f : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2) \end{aligned}$$

Now fix  $a$  and  $b$  such that  $\emptyset \vdash a \sim b : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(T_1)$  and by Lemma 17 it suffices to show equivalence of the following reducts of the casts:

$$\begin{aligned} \emptyset \vdash & \quad \sigma(\langle T_2 \triangleleft [x \mapsto \langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle a] S_2 \rangle) (f (\sigma(\langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle) a)) \\ & \sim \gamma(\langle T_2 \triangleleft [x \mapsto \langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle b] S_2 \rangle) (g (\gamma(\langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle) b)) : [x \mapsto a](\sigma \wedge \gamma)(T_2) \\ & \quad \wedge [x \mapsto b](\sigma \wedge \gamma)(T_2) \end{aligned}$$

By induction (recalling that induction is over the *height* of the derivations, since

these casts were not initially subterms),

$$\emptyset \vdash \sigma(\langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle) \sim \gamma(\langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle) : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(T_1 \rightarrow S_1)$$

so (noting that the function type is non-dependent)

$$\emptyset \vdash \sigma(\langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle) a \sim \gamma(\langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle) b : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(S_1)$$

continuing, by combining substitutions

$$\begin{aligned} \emptyset \vdash f(\sigma(\langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle) a) &\sim g(\gamma(\langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle) b) \\ &: ((\sigma \circ [x \mapsto \langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle a]) \wedge (\gamma \circ [x \mapsto \langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle b])) (S_2) \end{aligned}$$

Also by induction,

$$\begin{aligned} \emptyset \vdash & (\sigma \circ [x \mapsto a])(\langle T_2 \triangleleft [x \mapsto \langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle x] S_2 \rangle) \\ & \sim (\gamma \circ [x \mapsto b])(\langle T_2 \triangleleft [x \mapsto \langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle x] S_2 \rangle) \\ & : ((\sigma \circ [x \mapsto a]) \wedge (\gamma \circ [x \mapsto b])) ([x \mapsto \langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle x] S_2 \rightarrow T_2) \end{aligned}$$

so noting these equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\sigma \circ [x \mapsto a]) \wedge (\gamma \circ [x \mapsto b])) ([x \mapsto \langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle x] S_2) \\ \equiv & ((\sigma \circ [x \mapsto \langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle a]) \wedge (\gamma \circ [x \mapsto \langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle b])) (S_2) \\ & ((\sigma \circ [x \mapsto a]) \wedge (\gamma \circ [x \mapsto b])) (T_2) \\ \equiv & [x \mapsto a] (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(T_2) \wedge [x \mapsto b] (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(T_2) \end{aligned}$$

we gain exactly the conclusion desired.

*Case [T-SUB]* By inversion,

$$\Gamma \vdash t : S \quad \Gamma \vdash S <: T$$

Fix  $\sigma$  and  $\gamma$ , and by induction,

$$\emptyset \vdash \sigma(t) \sim \gamma(t) : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(S)$$

Applying the substitution lemma and distributing  $\wedge$  through the subtyping,

$$\emptyset \vdash (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(S) <: (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(T)$$

Thus by Lemma 16 we conclude with

$$\emptyset \vdash \sigma(s) \sim \gamma(s) : (\sigma \wedge \gamma)(T)$$

As a corollary, we have contextual equivalence of related terms.

**Corollary 1** *If  $\Gamma \vdash s \sim t : T$  then for any context  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $\emptyset \vdash \mathcal{C}[s] : B$  and  $\emptyset \vdash \mathcal{C}[t] : B$ , we have that  $\mathcal{C}[s] \rightsquigarrow^* c \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}[t] \rightsquigarrow^* c$ .*

PROOF: Apply soundness of extensional equivalence to the typing  $x : T \vdash \mathcal{C}[x] : B$  with the related substitutions  $\vdash [x \mapsto s] \sim [x \mapsto t] : (x : T)$ .

To complete the proof that insertion of upcasts never changes the behavior of a program, we prove that *upcast* from a subtype  $S$  to a supertype  $T$  is extensionally (and hence contextually) equivalent to the appropriately-typed identity function.

**Theorem 19** *If  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  then  $\Gamma \vdash \langle T \triangleleft S \rangle \sim (\lambda x : S. x) : (S \rightarrow T)$*

PROOF: By induction on the height of  $S$  (which equals the height of  $T$  since they must have the same shape).

Suppose  $S = \{x : B \mid p\}$  and  $T = \{x : B \mid q\}$ . Then to test equivalence of  $\langle T \triangleleft S \rangle$  and  $(\lambda x : S. x)$ , we apply them to two terms  $d$  and  $e$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash d \sim e : S$ . For any closing substitution  $\sigma$ , we are guaranteed that  $\sigma(d) \rightsquigarrow^* k$  if and only if  $\sigma(e) \rightsquigarrow^* k$ ,

so it suffices to consider applying the cast to constants. By the semantic definition of implication and the assumption that constants are assigned appropriate types,  $\sigma([x \mapsto k] q) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$  so the cast succeeds, behaving as the identity function on  $k$ .

Now suppose  $S = x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2$  and  $T = x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ . Applying the cast  $\langle T \triangleleft S \rangle$  to a function  $f$  of type  $S$ , yields  $\lambda x : T_1. (\langle T_2 \triangleleft S_2 \rangle \circ s \circ \langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle) x$ . For an argument  $t$  of type  $T_1$ , we have by induction that  $\langle S_1 \triangleleft T_1 \rangle e$  is equivalent to  $e$  and  $\langle [x \mapsto t] T_2 \triangleleft [x \mapsto t] S_2 \rangle (s t)$  is equivalent to  $f t$ , hence the cast is behaviorally equivalent to the identity function.

Since cast insertion only inserts upcasts on well-typed programs, it follows that cast insertion preserves extensional and contextual equivalence for such programs.

### Corollary 2

1. If  $\Gamma \vdash t : T$  and  $\Gamma \vdash t \hookrightarrow t' : T$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash t \sim t' : T$
2. If  $\Gamma \vdash T$  and  $\Gamma \vdash T \hookrightarrow T'$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash T <: T'$  and  $\Gamma \vdash T' <: T$

PROOF: By mutual induction on the derivations of  $\Gamma \vdash t : T$  and  $\Gamma \vdash T$ . In each case, because algorithmic subtyping can only return  $?$  or  $\checkmark$ , the output of cast insertion is simply the input with redundant casts inserted. By Theorem 19 these are all equivalent to identity functions.

It follows that cast insertion accepts all well-typed programs. Since casts are inserted into types during this process, part (2) of Corollary 2 is crucial to ensuring that the meaning of well-formed types does not change.

**Theorem 20 ((Compilation Completeness))** Suppose  $\vdash E$  and that  $s$  and  $T$  contain no casts.

1. If  $E \vdash s : S$  then  $\exists t, T$  such that  $E \vdash s \hookrightarrow t : T$ .
2. If  $E \vdash S$  then  $\exists T$  such that  $E \vdash S \hookrightarrow T$ .

PROOF: By induction on the derivations.

### Theorem 21 (Completeness of Cast Insertion)

1. If  $\Gamma \vdash d : S$  then  $\exists e, T$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e : T$ .
2. If  $\Gamma \vdash d : S$  and  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  then  $\exists e$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e \downarrow T$ .
3. If  $\Gamma \vdash S$  then  $\exists T$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash S \hookrightarrow T$ .

PROOF: By mutual induction on the antecedent derivations.

1. *Case* [T-VAR], [T-CONST] : Immediate.

*Case* [T-SUB] : Immediate from the subderivation.

*Case* [T-APP], [T-FUN] : By induction, we can insert casts into each subterm yielding well typed terms which we reassemble. Lemmas 5 and ?? ensure that the types involved remain equivalent under cast insertion, so all the same subtyping judgements hold.

2. By part one, there exist  $e$  and  $U$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e : U$ . By Lemma 13 we know that  $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ , so a sound algorithmic subtyping relation cannot reject  $e$ , but only insert casts, yielding  $e'$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash e \hookrightarrow e' \downarrow T$ .



3. Straightforward by induction, since valid implications may not be rejected.  $\square$

**Theorem 22 (Idempotence of Cast Insertion)** *If the subtyping algorithm is reflexive, then cast insertion is idempotent. Formally:*

$$\text{If } \Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{\vee} T <: T \text{ and } \Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e \downarrow T \text{ then } \Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e \downarrow T$$

## 4.5 Static Checking vs. Hybrid Checking

Given the proven benefits of traditional, purely-static type systems, an important question that arises is how hybrid type checkers relate to static type checkers.

To study this question, suppose we are given a static type checker that targets a restricted subset of  $\lambda^H$  for which type checking is statically decidable. Specifically, suppose  $\mathcal{D}$  is a subset of  $Term$  such that for all  $p, q \in \mathcal{D}$  and for all singleton environments  $x : B$ , the judgment  $x : B \vdash p \Rightarrow q$  is decidable. We introduce a statically-decidable language  $\lambda^S$  that is obtained from  $\lambda^H$  by only permitting  $\mathcal{D}$  predicates in refinement types. We also assume all types in  $\lambda^S$  are closed, to avoid the complications of substituting arbitrary terms into refinement predicates via the rule [T-APP] (and hence the above environment  $x : B$  suffices). It then follows that subtyping and type checking for  $\lambda^S$  are decidable, and we denote this type checking judgment as  $\Gamma \vdash^S t : T$ .

As an extreme, we could take  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{true}\}$ , in which case the  $\lambda^S$  type language is essentially the simply typed  $\lambda$ -calculus:

$$T ::= B \mid T \rightarrow T$$

However, to yield a more general argument, we assume only that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a subset of  $Term$  for which implication is decidable.

Clearly, the hybrid implication algorithm can give precise answers on (decidable)  $\mathcal{D}$ -terms, and so we assume that for all  $p, q \in \mathcal{D}$  and for all environments  $x : B$ , the judgment  $x : B \vdash_{alg}^a p \Rightarrow q$  holds for some  $a \in \{\vee, \times\}$ . Under this assumption, hybrid type checking behaves identically to static type checking on (well-typed or ill-typed)  $\lambda^S$  programs.

**Theorem 23** *For all  $\lambda^S$  terms  $e$ ,  $\lambda^S$  environments  $\Gamma$ , and  $\lambda^S$  types  $T$ , the following three statements are equivalent:*

1.  $\Gamma \vdash^S e : T$
2.  $\Gamma \vdash e : T$
3.  $\Gamma \vdash e \hookrightarrow e : T$

PROOF: The hybrid implication algorithm is complete on  $\mathcal{D}$ -terms, and hence the hybrid subtyping algorithm is complete for  $\lambda^S$  types. The proof then follows by induction on typing derivations.

Thus, to a  $\lambda^S$  programmer, a hybrid type checker behaves exactly like a traditional static type checker.

We now compare static and hybrid type checking from the perspective of a  $\lambda^H$  programmer. To enable this comparison, we need to map expressive  $\lambda^H$  types into the more restrictive  $\lambda^S$  types, and in particular to map arbitrary boolean predicates into  $\mathcal{D}$

predicates. We assume the computable function

$$\zeta : \text{Term} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$$

performs this mapping. The function *erase* then maps  $\lambda^H$  refinement types to  $\lambda^S$  refinement types by using  $\zeta$  to abstract boolean terms:

$$\text{erase}(\{x:B \mid p\}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x:B \mid \zeta(p)\}$$

We extend *erase* in a compatible manner to map  $\lambda^H$  types, terms, and environments to corresponding  $\lambda^S$  types, terms, and environments. Thus, for any  $\lambda^H$  program  $P$ , this function yields the corresponding  $\lambda^S$  program  $\text{erase}(P)$ .

As might be expected, the *erase* function must lose information, and we now explore the consequences of this information loss for programs with complex specifications. As an extreme example, let  $\text{Halt}_{n,m}$  denote a closed formula that encodes “Turing machine  $m$  eventually halts on input  $n$ ”. Suppose that  $\zeta$  maps  $\text{Halt}_{n,m}$  to **false** for all  $n$  and  $m$ , and consider the collection of programs  $P_{n,m}$ , which includes both well-typed and ill-typed programs:

$$P_{n,m} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\lambda x:\{x:\text{Int} \mid \text{Halt}_{n,m}\}.x) 1$$

Decidability arguments show that the hybrid type checker will accept some ill-typed program  $P_{n,m}$  based on its inability to statically prove that  $\text{Halt}_{n,m} = \text{false}$ . In contrast, the static type checker will reject (the erased version of)  $P_{n,m}$ . Hence:

*The static type checker statically rejects (the erased version of) an ill-typed program that the hybrid type checker accepts.*

Thus, the static type checker performs better in this situation.

Conversely, this particular static type checker will also reject (the erased version of) many well-typed programs  $P_{n,m}$  that the hybrid type checker accepts. The following theorem generalizes this argument, and shows that for any computable mapping  $\zeta$  there exists some program  $P$  such that hybrid type checking of  $P$  performs better than static type checking of  $\text{erase}(P)$ .

**Theorem 24** *For any computable mapping  $\zeta$  either:*

1. *the static type checker rejects the erased version of some well-typed  $\lambda^H$  program,*  
*or*
2. *the static type checker accepts the erased version of some ill-typed  $\lambda^H$  program for which the hybrid type checker would statically detect the error.*

PROOF: Let  $\Gamma$  be the environment  $x : \text{Int}$ .

By reduction from the halting problem, the judgment  $\Gamma \vdash t \Rightarrow \text{false}$  for arbitrary boolean terms  $t$  is undecidable. However, the implication judgment  $\Gamma \vdash \zeta(t) \Rightarrow \zeta(\text{false})$  is decidable. Hence these two judgments are not equivalent, *i.e.*:

$$\{t \mid (\Gamma \vdash t \Rightarrow \text{false})\} \neq \{t \mid (\Gamma \vdash \zeta(t) \Rightarrow \zeta(\text{false}))\}$$

It follows that there must exist some *witness*  $w$  that is in one of these sets but not the other, and so one of the following two cases must hold.

1. Suppose:

$$\Gamma \vdash w \Rightarrow \mathbf{false}$$

$$\Gamma \not\vdash \zeta(w) \Rightarrow \zeta(\mathbf{false})$$

We construct as a counter-example the program  $P_1$ :

$$P_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda x:\{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid w\}. (x \text{ as } \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \mathbf{false}\})$$

From the assumption  $\Gamma \vdash w \Rightarrow \mathbf{false}$  the subtyping judgment

$$\emptyset \vdash \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid w\} <: \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \mathbf{false}\}$$

holds. Hence,  $P_1$  is well-typed, and (by Lemma 20) is accepted by the hybrid type checker. However, from the assumption  $\Gamma \not\vdash \zeta(w) \Rightarrow \zeta(\mathbf{false})$  the erased version

of the subtyping judgment does not hold:

$$\emptyset \not\vdash \text{erase}(\{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid w\}) <: \text{erase}(\{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \mathbf{false}\})$$

Hence  $\text{erase}(P_1)$  is ill-typed and rejected by the static type checker.

2. Conversely, suppose:

$$\Gamma \not\vdash w \Rightarrow \mathbf{false}$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \zeta(w) \Rightarrow \zeta(\mathbf{false})$$

From the first supposition and by the definition of the implication judgment, there

exists integers  $n$  and  $m$  such that

$$[x \mapsto n] w \rightsquigarrow^m \mathbf{true}$$

We now construct as a counter-example the program  $P_2$ :

$$P_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda x:\{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid w\}. (x \text{ as } \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \mathbf{false} \wedge (n = m)\})$$

In the program  $P_2$ , the term  $n = m$  has no semantic meaning since it is conjoined with  $\mathbf{false}$ . The purpose of this term is to serve only as a “hint” to the following rule for refuting implications (which we assume is included in the reasoning performed by the implication algorithm). In this rule, the integers  $a$  and  $b$  serve as hints, and take the place of randomly generated values for testing if  $t$  ever evaluates to  $\mathbf{true}$ .

$$\frac{[x \mapsto a] t \rightsquigarrow^b \mathbf{true}}{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^\times t \Rightarrow (\mathbf{false} \wedge a = b)}$$

This rule enables the implication algorithm to conclude that:

$$\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^\times w \Rightarrow \mathbf{false} \wedge (n = m)$$

Hence, the subtyping algorithm can conclude:

$$\vdash_{alg}^\times \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid w\} <: \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \mathbf{false} \wedge (n = m)\}$$

Therefore, the hybrid type checker rejects  $P_2$ , which by Lemma 20 is therefore ill-typed.

$$\forall P, T. \quad \not\vdash P_2 \hookrightarrow P : T$$

We next consider how the static type checker behaves on the program  $\text{erase}(P_2)$ .

We consider two cases, depending on whether the following implication judgement holds:

$$\Gamma \vdash \zeta(\mathbf{false}) \Rightarrow \zeta(\mathbf{false} \wedge (n = m))$$

(a) If this judgment holds then by the transitivity of implication and the as-

sumption  $\Gamma \vdash \zeta(w) \Rightarrow \zeta(\mathbf{false})$  we have that:

$$\Gamma \vdash \zeta(w) \Rightarrow \zeta(\mathbf{false} \wedge (n = m))$$

Hence the subtyping judgement

$$\emptyset \vdash \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \zeta(w)\} <: \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \zeta(\mathbf{false} \wedge (n = m))\}$$

holds and the program  $\text{erase}(P_2)$  is accepted by the static type checker:

$$\emptyset \vdash \text{erase}(P_2) : \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \zeta(w)\} \rightarrow \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \zeta(\mathbf{false} \wedge (n = m))\}$$

(b) If the above judgment does not hold then consider as a counter-example the

program  $P_3$ :

$$P_3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda x:\{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \mathbf{false}\}. (x \text{ as } \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \mathbf{false} \wedge (n = m)\})$$

This program is well-typed, from the subtype judgment:

$$\emptyset \vdash \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \mathbf{false}\} <: \{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \mathbf{false} \wedge (n = m)\}$$

However, the erased version of this subtype judgment does not hold:

$$\emptyset \not\vdash \text{erase}(\{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \mathbf{false}\}) <: \text{erase}(\{x:\mathbf{Int} \mid \mathbf{false} \wedge (n = m)\})$$

Hence,  $\text{erase}(P_3)$  is rejected by the static type checker:

$$\forall T. \quad \emptyset \not\vdash^s \text{erase}(P_3) : T$$

## 4.6 Related Work

The programming language Eiffel [Meyer 1988] supports a notion of hybrid specifications by providing both statically-checked types as well as dynamically-checked contracts. Having separate (static and dynamic) specification languages is somewhat awkward, since it requires the programmer to factor each specification into its static and dynamic components. Furthermore, the factoring is too rigid, since the specification needs to be manually refactored to exploit improvements in static checking technology.

The language Cayenne also has a best-effort type checking routine, but is a classic example of a pitfall we wished to avoid: A type-checking timeout is considered equivalent to type-checking failure, so many well-typed programs may be rejected.

Other authors have considered pragmatic combinations of both static and dynamic checking. Abadi, Cardelli, Pierce and Plotkin [Abadi et al. 1991] extended a static type system with a type **Dynamic** that could be explicitly cast to and from any other type (with appropriate run-time checks). Henglein characterized the *completion process* of inserting the necessary coercions, and presented a rewriting system for generating minimal completions [Henglein 1994]. Thatte developed a similar system in which the necessary casts are implicit [Thatte 1990]. These systems are intended to support looser type specifications. In contrast, our work uses similar, automatically-inserted casts to support more precise type specifications. An interesting avenue for further exploration is the combination of both approaches to support a large range of specifications, from **Dynamic** at one end to precise hybrid-checked specifications at the other.

Ou et al. [2004] developed a type system similar to ours, adding an interface between untyped code and code with refinement and dependent types. Unlike the hybrid type checking approach, their type system restricts refinement predicates to ensure decidability and it supports mutable data. In addition, whereas hybrid type checking uses dynamic checks to circumvent decidability limitations, their system uses dynamic checks to permit interoperability between precisely typed code fragments (that use refinement types) and more coarsely typed code fragments (that do not), and so it permits the introduction of refinement predicates into a large program in an incremental manner.

There has been much recent work on alternative forms of hybrid and gradual type systems. Siek and Taha independently developed a system of *gradual typing* [Siek and Taha 2006, 2007] that combines dynamic and static typing via casts similar to ours. However, they do not address refinement predicates, and so they avoid much of the complexities of hybrid type checking.

We have also developed a prototype language, described in Chapter 7 that uses hybrid checking to blend refinement types with dynamic typing, records, variants, and first-class types. Their experiments show that for many common examples, the number of inserted casts is small or none.

Wadler and Findler prove that the more precisely typed portion of a program cannot be blamed for a runtime failure [Wadler and Findler 2009]. This technique may furnish yet another proof of behavioral correctness for hybrid type checking, as it ensures that any redundant cast cannot fail at run time.

Refinement types, in addition to causing a burden in terms of challenging proof obligations, impose an annotation burden on the programmer. In the following chapter, we present a theoretical closed-form solution to the type inference problem for general refinement types. Rondon *et al* [Rondon et al. 2008] have subsequently developed an implementation for OCaml using abstract interpretation to find approximations to these closed-form solutions.

The static checking tool ESC/Java [Flanagan et al. 2002] checks expressive JML specifications [Burdy et al. 2005; Leavens and Cheon 2006] using the Simplify automatic theorem prover [Detlefs et al. 2005]. However, Simplify does not distinguish between failing to prove a theorem and finding a counter-example that refutes the theorem, and so ESC/Java’s error messages may be caused either by incorrect programs or by limitations in its theorem prover.

The limitations of purely-static and purely-dynamic approaches have also motivated other work on hybrid analyses. For example, CCured [Necula et al. 2005] is a sophisticated hybrid analysis for preventing the ubiquitous array bounds violations in the C programming language. Unlike our proposed approach, it does not detect errors statically - instead, the static analysis is used to optimize the run-time analysis. Specialized hybrid analyses have been proposed for other problems as well, such as data race condition checking [von Praun and Gross 2001; O’Callahan and Choi 2003; Agarwal and Stoller 2004].

Prior work (*e.g.* [Breazu-Tannen et al. 1991]) introduced and studied implicit coercions in type systems. Note that there are no implicit coercions in the  $\lambda^H$  type

system itself, but only in the cast insertion algorithm, and so we do not need a coherence theorem for  $\lambda^H$ , but instead reason about the connection between the type system and cast insertion algorithm.

## Chapter 5

### Type Reconstruction

We have addressed the problem of type-checking for a language like  $\lambda^H$ , given complete type annotation by the programmer, but even for small examples, writing explicitly typed terms can be tedious, and would become truly onerous for larger programs. To reduce the annotation burden, many typed languages – such as ML, Haskell, and their variants – perform type reconstruction, often stated as: *Given a program containing type variables, find a replacement for those variables such that the resulting program is well typed.* If there exists such a replacement, the program is said to be *typeable*. Under this definition, type reconstruction subsumes type checking. Hence, for expressive and undecidable type systems, such as that of  $\lambda^H$ , type reconstruction is clearly undecidable.

Instead of surrendering to undecidability, we separate type reconstruction from type checking, and define the type reconstruction problem as: *Given a program containing type variables, find a replacement for those variables such that typeability is preserved.* In a decidable type system, this definition coincides with the previous one, since the type checker can decide if the resulting explicitly typed program is well typed. The generalized definition also extends to undecidable type systems, since alternative techniques, such as hybrid type checking, can be applied to the resulting program. In particular, type reconstruction for  $\lambda^H$  is now decidable!

Our approach to inferring refinement predicates is inspired by techniques from axiomatic semantics, most notably the strongest postcondition (SP) transformation [Back 1988]. This transformation supports arbitrary predicates in some specification logic, and computes the most precise correctness predicate for each program point. It is essentially

syntactic in nature, deferring all semantic reasoning to a subsequent theorem-proving phase. For example, looping constructs in the program are expressed simply as fixpoint operations in the specification logic.

In the richer setting of  $\lambda^H$ , which includes higher order functions with dependent types, we must infer both the structural shape of types and also any refinement predicates they contain. We solve the former using traditional type reconstruction techniques, and the latter using a syntactic, SP-like, transformation. Like SP, our algorithm infers the most precise predicates possible.

The resulting, explicitly typed program can then be checked by the  $\lambda^H$  compilation algorithm [Knowles and Flanagan 2010], which reasons about local implications between refinement predicates. If the compilation algorithm cannot prove or refute a particular implication, it dynamically enforces the desired property via a run-time check. These dynamic checks are only ever necessary for user-specified predicates; inferred predicates (which may include existential quantification and fixpoint operations) are correct by construction.

## 5.1 Type Reconstruction for $\lambda^H$

For the type reconstruction problem, we consider only the basic language, ignoring casts since they add no interest to type reconstruction.

We extend the type language with type variables  $\alpha \in TyVar$ . Type reconstruction yields a function  $\pi : TyVar \rightarrow Type$ , here called a *type replacement*. Application

of a type replacement is lifted compatibly to all syntactic sorts, and is not capture avoiding.

The three phases of type reconstruction proceed as follows:

1. The input program is processed to yield a set  $C$  of subtyping constraints of the form  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  (the same as the subtyping judgement).
2. The shape reconstruction phase then reduces  $C$  into a set  $P$  of implication constraints, each of the form  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q$  (the same as the implication judgement).
3. The last phase of type reconstruction solves  $P$ .

To facilitate our development, we require that the language be closed under substitution. But a substitution cannot immediately be applied to a type variable, so each type variable  $\alpha$  has an associated delayed substitution  $\theta$  (which may be empty).

$$\begin{aligned} T &::= \dots \mid \theta \cdot \alpha \\ \theta &::= [] \mid [x \mapsto e : T], \theta \end{aligned}$$

The usual definition of capture-avoiding substitution is extended to type variables, which simply delay that substitution:

$$[x \mapsto e : T] (\theta \cdot \alpha) = ([x \mapsto e : T], \theta) \cdot \alpha$$

When a type replacement is applied to a type variable  $\alpha$  with a delayed substitution  $\theta$ , the substitution  $\pi(\theta)$  is immediately applied to  $\pi(\alpha)$ :

$$\pi(\theta \cdot \alpha) = \pi(\theta)(\pi(\alpha))$$

Notice that we have added a type annotation to these explicit substitution – this is for later syntactic processing and does not affect the semantics of substitution.

## Constraint Generation

The constraint generation judgement  $\Gamma \vdash e : T \ \& \ C$  is defined in Figure 5.1 and reads: term  $e$  has type  $T$  in environment  $\Gamma$ , subject to the constraint set  $C$ . Each rule is derived from the corresponding type rule, with subsumption distributed throughout the derivation to make the rules syntax-directed.

For a type replacement  $\pi$ , if  $\pi(C)$  contains only valid subtyping relationships, then  $\pi$  *satisfies*  $C$ . When applied to a typeable  $\lambda^H$  program, the constraint generation rules emit a satisfiable constraint set. Conversely, if the constraint set derived from a program is satisfiable, then that program is typeable.

**Lemma 25** *For any environment  $\Gamma$  and term  $e$ :*

$$\exists \pi, T. \pi(\Gamma) \vdash \pi(e) : \pi(T) \iff \exists \pi', S, C. \begin{cases} \Gamma \vdash e : S \ \& \ C \\ \pi' \text{ satisfies } C \end{cases}$$

PROOF: ( $\Rightarrow$ ): Suppose  $\pi\Gamma \vdash \pi e : \pi T$ . then  $\exists \pi', S, C. \Gamma \vdash e : S \ \& \ C$  and  $\pi'\pi$  satisfies  $C$  and  $\pi\Gamma \vdash \pi'\pi S <: \pi T$ . Proceed by induction on the derivation of  $\pi\Gamma \vdash \pi e : \pi T$ , with this strengthened hypothesis.

*Case* [T-APP]: Given:  $e = e_1 \ e_2$  and  $T = [x \mapsto e_2 : T_1] T_2$  where

$$\frac{\pi\Gamma \vdash \pi e_1 : x : \pi T_1 \rightarrow \pi T_2 \quad \pi\Gamma \vdash \pi e_2 : \pi T_1}{\pi\Gamma \vdash \pi e_1 \ \pi e_2 : [x \mapsto \pi e_2 : T_1] (\pi T_2)}$$



Figure 5.1: Constraint Generation Rules

Constraint Generation rules

$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash e : T \ \& \ C}$

$$\frac{(x : T) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : T \ \& \ \emptyset} \text{ [CG-VAR]} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash c : ty(c) \ \& \ \emptyset} \text{ [CG-CONST]}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash S \ \& \ C_1 \quad \Gamma, x : S \vdash e : T \ \& \ C_2}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x : S. e) : (x : S \rightarrow T) \ \& \ C_1 \cup C_2} \text{ [CG-FUN]}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T \ \& \ C_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : S \ \& \ C_2 \quad \alpha \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 \ e_2 : [x \mapsto e_2 : S] \cdot \alpha \ \& \ C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \{\Gamma \vdash T <: (x : S \rightarrow \alpha)\}} \text{ [CG-APP]}$$

Well-formed Type Constraint Generation

$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash T \ \& \ C}$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash S \ \& \ C_1 \quad \Gamma, x : S \vdash T \ \& \ C_2}{\Gamma \vdash x : S \rightarrow T \ \& \ C_1 \cup C_2} \text{ [WTC-ARROW]}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : B \vdash e : \text{Bool} \ \& \ C}{\Gamma \vdash \{x : B \mid e\} \ \& \ C} \text{ [WTC-BASE]} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \theta \cdot \alpha \ \& \ \emptyset} \text{ [WTC-VAR]}$$

By induction we have  $\pi_1, \pi_2, S_1, S_2, C_1, C_2$  such that

$$\begin{array}{lll} \Gamma \vdash e_1 : S_1 \ \& \ C_1 & \pi_1 \pi \text{ satisfies } C_1 & \pi \Gamma \vdash \pi_1 \pi S_1 <: x : \pi T_1 \rightarrow \pi T_2 \\ \Gamma \vdash e_2 : S_2 \ \& \ C_2 & \pi_2 \pi \text{ satisfies } C_2 & \pi \Gamma \vdash \pi_2 \pi S_2 <: \pi T_1 \end{array}$$

Hence by [CG-APP] we derive  $\Gamma \vdash e_1 \ e_2 : [x \mapsto e_2 : S_2] \ \& \ C$  where  $C = C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \{\Gamma \vdash S_1 <: x : S_2 \rightarrow \alpha\}, \alpha$  fresh. Note that  $dom(\pi_1), dom(\pi_2), \alpha$  are pairwise disjoint.

Let  $\pi'(\alpha) = [\alpha \mapsto \pi(T_2)] \circ \pi_1 \pi_2$ . Then  $\pi' \pi(C) = (\pi_1 \pi C_1) \cup (\pi_2 \pi C_2) \cup \{\pi \Gamma \vdash \pi_1 \pi S_1 <: x : \pi_2 \pi S_2 \rightarrow \pi T_2\}$  where the indicated subtyping constraint is valid (with the given data, apply [S-ARROW], reflexivity and transitivity of subtyping). Thus  $\pi' \pi$  satisfies  $C$ .

And finally,  $\pi' \pi(\alpha[x \mapsto e_2 : S_2]) = \pi(T_2[x \mapsto e_2 : S_1])$

hence  $\pi \Gamma \vdash \pi' \pi(\alpha[x \mapsto e_2 : S_2]) <: \pi(T_2[x \mapsto e_2 : T_1])$

The remaining cases and reverse direction are straightforward.  $\square$

Consider the following  $\lambda^H$  term  $e$  (the expression  $\text{let } x : T = d \text{ in } e$  is syntactic sugar for  $(\lambda x : T. e) \ d$ ).

```

let  $id : (x : \alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2) = \lambda x : \alpha_3. x$  in

let  $w : \{n : \text{Int} \mid n = 0\} = 0$  in

let  $y : \{n : \text{Int} \mid n > w\} = 3$  in

 $id \ (id \ y)$ 

```

Eliding some generated type variables for clarity, the corresponding constraint

generation judgement is

$$\emptyset \vdash e : [x \mapsto (id\ y) : \alpha_1] \cdot \alpha_2 \ \& \ C$$

where  $C$  contains the following constraints, in which  $T_{id} \equiv (x : \alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2)$  and  $T_y \equiv \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n > w\}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \emptyset &\vdash \quad x : \alpha_3 \rightarrow \alpha_3 \prec : x : \alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2 \\ id : T_{id} &\vdash \quad \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n = 0\} \prec : \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n = 0\} \\ id : T_{id}, w : \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n = 0\} &\vdash \quad \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n = 3\} \prec : \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n > w\} \\ id : T_{id}, w : \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n = 0\}, y : T_y &\vdash \quad \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n > w\} \prec : \alpha_1 \\ id : T_{id}, w : \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n = 0\}, y : T_y &\vdash \quad [x \mapsto y : \alpha_1] \cdot \alpha_2 \prec : \alpha_1 \end{aligned}$$

### Shape Reconstruction

The second step of reconstruction is to infer a type's basic shape, ignoring refinement predicates. To defer reconstruction of refinements, we introduce placeholders  $\psi \in Placeholder$  to represent unknown refinement predicates (in the same way that type variables represent unknown types) Like type variables, each placeholder has an associated delayed substitution.

$$t ::= \dots \mid \theta \cdot \psi$$

A placeholder replacement is a function  $\rho : Placeholder \rightarrow Term$  and is lifted compatibly to all syntactic structures. As with type replacements, applying placeholder

replacement allows any delayed substitutions also to be applied.

$$\begin{aligned} [x \mapsto e : T](\theta \cdot \psi) &= ([x \mapsto e : T], \theta) \cdot \psi \\ \rho(\theta \cdot \psi) &= \rho(\theta)(\rho(\psi)) \end{aligned}$$

The shape reconstruction algorithm, detailed in Figure 5.2 takes as input a subtyping constraint set  $C$  and processes the constraints in  $C$  nondeterministically according to the rules in Figure 5.2. When the conditions on the left-hand side of a rule are satisfied, the updates described on the right-hand side are performed. The set  $P$  of implication constraints, each of the form  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q$ , and the type replacement  $\pi$  are outputs of the algorithm. For a placeholder replacement  $\rho$ , if  $\rho(P)$  contains only valid implications, then  $\rho$  *satisfies*  $P$ .

Each rule in Figure 5.2 resembles a step of traditional type reconstruction. When a type variable  $\alpha$  must have the shape of a function type, it is replaced by  $x : \alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2$ , where  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  are fresh type variables. The function *occurs* checks that  $\alpha$  has a finite solution, since  $\lambda^H$  does not have recursive types. Occurences of  $\alpha$  which appear in refinement predicates or in the range of a delayed substitution are ignored – these occurences do not require a solution involving recursive types.

$$\begin{aligned} occurs(\alpha, \{x : B \mid e\}) &= false \\ occurs(\alpha, \theta \cdot \alpha') &= false \quad (\alpha \neq \alpha') \\ occurs(\alpha, \theta \cdot \alpha) &= true \\ occurs(\alpha, x : S \rightarrow T) &= occurs(\alpha, S) \vee occurs(\alpha, T) \end{aligned}$$

When a type variable must be a refinement of a base type  $B$ , the type variable is replaced by  $\{x : B \mid \psi\}$  where  $\psi$  is a fresh placeholder. A subtyping constraint between

Figure 5.2: Shape Reconstruction Algorithm

Input:  $C$

Output:  $\pi, P$

Initially:  $P = \emptyset$  and  $\pi = []$

match some constraint in  $C$  until quiescent:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \Gamma \vdash \theta \cdot \alpha <: x:T_1 \rightarrow T_2 & \implies \text{if } \text{occurs}(\alpha, x:T_1 \rightarrow T_2) \text{ then } \text{fail} \\
 \text{or } \Gamma \vdash x:T_1 \rightarrow T_2 <: \theta \cdot \alpha & \text{otherwise for fresh } \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \\
 & \pi := [\alpha \mapsto x:\alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2] \circ \pi \\
 & C := \pi(C) \\
 & P := \pi(P) \\
 \\
 \Gamma \vdash \theta \cdot \alpha <: \{x:B \mid e\} & \implies \text{for fresh } \psi \\
 \text{or } \Gamma \vdash \{x:B \mid e\} <: \theta \cdot \alpha & \pi := [\alpha \mapsto \{x:B \mid \psi\}] \circ \pi \\
 & C := \pi(C) \\
 & P := \pi(P) \\
 \\
 \Gamma \vdash (x:S_1 \rightarrow S_2) <: (x:T_1 \rightarrow T_2) & \implies C := C \cup \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Gamma \vdash T_1 <: S_1, \\ \Gamma, x:T_1 \vdash S_2 <: T_2 \end{array} \right\} \\
 \\
 \Gamma \vdash \{x:B \mid p\} <: \{x:B \mid q\} & \implies P := P \cup \{\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q\} \\
 \\
 \Gamma \vdash \{x:B \mid p\} <: x:S \rightarrow T & \implies \text{fail} \\
 \text{or } \Gamma \vdash x:S \rightarrow T <: \{x:B \mid p\} & 
 \end{array}$$

two function types induces additional constraints between the domains and codomains of the function types. When two refined base types are constrained to be subtypes, a corresponding implication constraint between their refinements is added to  $P$ .

The algorithm terminates once no more progress can be made. At this stage, any type variables remaining in  $\pi(C)$  are not constrained to be subtypes of any concrete type but may be subtypes of each other. We set these type variables equal to an arbitrary concrete type to eliminate them (the resulting subtyping judgements are trivial by reflexivity).

**Lemma 26** *For a set of subtyping constraints  $C$ , one of the following occurs:*

1. *Shape reconstruction fails, in which case  $C$  is unsatisfiable, or*
2. *Shape reconstruction succeeds, yielding  $\pi$  and  $P$ . Then  $P$  is satisfiable if and only if  $C$  is satisfiable. Furthermore, if  $\rho$  satisfies  $P$  then  $\rho \circ \pi$  satisfies  $C$ .*

PROOF:

*Case 1:* By inversion of subtyping and lack of recursive types,  $C$  is unsatisfiable.

*Case 2:* Each step of the algorithm maintains the invariant that  $C$  is satisfiable if and only if there exists some  $\pi'$  and  $\rho$  such that  $\rho\pi'C$  contains only valid subtyping relationships.

When shape reconstruction terminates,  $\pi'$  is necessarily empty since all type variables are eliminated. The aforementioned  $\rho$  also satisfies  $P$  by inversion of [S-BASE].

Then for any other  $\rho'$  which satisfies  $P$ , see that all constraints involving implication that were satisfied by  $\rho$  are also satisfied by  $\rho'$  thus  $\rho'\pi$  satisfies  $C$ .  $\square$

Returning to our example, shape reconstruction returns the type replacement

$$\pi = [ \alpha_1 := \{n:\mathbf{Int} \mid \psi_1\}, \alpha_2 := \{n:\mathbf{Int} \mid \psi_2\}, \alpha_3 := \{n:\mathbf{Int} \mid \psi_3\} ]$$

and the following implication constraint set  $P$ , in which  $T_{id} = x : \{n:\mathbf{Int} \mid \psi_2\} \rightarrow \{n:\mathbf{Int} \mid \psi_3\}$  and  $T_y = \{n:\mathbf{Int} \mid n > w\}$ :

$$n : \mathbf{Int} \vdash \psi_1 \Rightarrow \psi_3$$

$$x : \{n:\mathbf{Int} \mid \psi_1\}, n : \mathbf{Int} \vdash \psi_3 \Rightarrow \psi_2$$

$$id : T_{id}, n : \mathbf{Int} \vdash (n = 0) \Rightarrow (n = 0)$$

$$id : T_{id}, w : \{n:\mathbf{Int} \mid n = 0\}, n : \mathbf{Int} \vdash (n = 3) \Rightarrow (n > w)$$

$$id : T_{id}, w : \{n:\mathbf{Int} \mid n = 0\}, y : T_y, n : \mathbf{Int} \vdash (n > w) \Rightarrow \psi_1$$

$$id : T_{id}, w : \{n:\mathbf{Int} \mid n = 0\}, y : T_y, n : \mathbf{Int} \vdash [x \mapsto y : \{n:\mathbf{Int} \mid \psi_1\}] \cdot \psi_2 \Rightarrow \psi_1$$

## Constraint Satisfaction

The final phase of type reconstruction solves the residual implication constraint set  $P$  by finding a placeholder replacement that preserves satisfiability. To simplify the proofs, we argue assuming that environments are quantified over well typed terms, making explicit the previously abstract implication relation.

Our approach is based on the intuition that implications are essentially dataflow paths that carry the specifications of data sources (constants and function post-conditions) to the requirements of data sinks (function pre-conditions), with placeholders functioning as intermediate nodes in the dataflow graph. Thus, if a placeholder  $\psi$  appears on

the right-hand side of two implication constraints  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow \psi$  and  $\Gamma \vdash q \Rightarrow \psi$ , then our replacement for  $\psi$  is simply the disjunction  $p \vee q$  (the strongest consequence) of these two lower bounds. Our algorithm repeatedly applies this transformation until no placeholders remain, but several difficulties arise:

1.  $p$  or  $q$  may contain variables that cannot appear in a solution for  $\psi$
2.  $\psi$  may have a delayed substitution
3.  $\psi$  may appear in  $p$  or  $q$

To help resolve these issues, we extend the language with the following terms.

$$e ::= \dots \mid e \vee e \mid e \wedge e \mid \exists x : T. e$$

The parallel disjunction  $e_1 \vee e_2$  (respectively conjunction  $e_1 \wedge e_2$ ) evaluates  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  nondeterministically, reducing to **true** (resp. **false**) if either of them reduces to **true** (resp. **false**). The existential term  $\exists x : T. e$  binds  $x$  in  $e$ , and evaluates by nondeterministically replacing  $x$  with a closed term of type  $T$ . The evaluation rules are summarized in Figure 5.3. These additions are relatively unsurprising, considering their importance in computability and topology of data types [Escard 2004].

## Free Variable Elimination

In our example program, the type variable  $\alpha_1$  appeared in the empty environment and  $\pi(\alpha_1) = \{n:\mathbf{Int} \mid \psi_1\}$ , so the solution for  $\psi_1$  should be a well-formed boolean

Figure 5.3: Additional Evaluation Rules

$\mathbf{true} \vee e \leadsto \mathbf{true}$ [E-OR-L]	$\mathbf{false} \wedge e \leadsto \mathbf{false}$ [E-AND-L]
$e \vee \mathbf{true} \leadsto \mathbf{true}$ [E-OR-R]	$e \wedge \mathbf{false} \leadsto \mathbf{false}$ [E-AND-R]
$\mathbf{false} \vee \mathbf{false} \leadsto \mathbf{false}$ [E-OR-F]	$\mathbf{true} \wedge \mathbf{true} \leadsto \mathbf{true}$ [E-AND-T]
$\exists x : T. e \leadsto e[x \mapsto d : T] \quad \text{if } \emptyset \vdash d : T \quad \text{[E-EXISTS]}$	
$\mathcal{C} ::= \dots \mid e \vee \bullet \mid \bullet \vee e \mid \bullet \wedge e \mid e \wedge \bullet$	

expression in the environment  $n : \mathbf{Int}$ . The only variable that can appear in a solution for  $\psi_1$  is therefore  $n$ . But consider the following constraint over  $\psi_1$ :

$$id : T_{id}, w : \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n = 0\}, y : T_y, n : \mathbf{Int} \vdash (n > w) \Rightarrow \psi_1$$

Since  $id$ ,  $w$ , and  $y$  cannot appear in a solution for  $\psi_1$ , we rewrite this constraint as

$$n : \mathbf{Int} \vdash (\exists id : T_{id}. \exists w : \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n = 0\}. \exists y : T_y. n > w) \Rightarrow \psi_1$$

In general, each placeholder  $\psi$  introduced by shape reconstruction has an associated environment  $E_\psi$  in which it must have type  $\mathbf{Bool}$ . This gives us a reasonable definition for the free variables of a placeholder (with its associated delayed substitution):

$$fv(\theta \cdot \psi) = (dom(E_\psi) \setminus dom(\theta)) \cup fv(rng(\theta))$$

We then rewrite each implication constraint  $\Gamma, y : T \vdash p \Rightarrow q$  where  $y \notin fv(q)$  into the constraint  $\Gamma \vdash (\exists y : T. p) \Rightarrow q$ . This transformation is semantics-preserving (Lemma

27)

For the proof of this fact, let us define closing substitutions. We say  $\Gamma \models \sigma$  if for every  $x$  in  $\Gamma$ ,  $\vdash \sigma(x) : \sigma(\Gamma(x))$ . Then a predicate is valid if and only if it evaluates to  $\mathbf{true}$  for all closing substitutions.

**Lemma 27** *For  $y \notin fv(q)$ ,  $\Gamma, y : T \vdash p \Rightarrow q$  if and only if  $\Gamma \vdash (\exists y : T. p) \Rightarrow q$*

PROOF: ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose  $\Gamma, y : T \vdash p \Rightarrow q$  and  $y \notin fv(q)$  and consider any  $\sigma$  such that  $\Gamma \models \sigma$  and  $\sigma(\exists y : T. p) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ . Then there is some  $e$  such that  $\emptyset \vdash e : T$  and  $\sigma(\exists y : T. p) \rightsquigarrow \sigma([x \mapsto e : T]p) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ .

Let  $\sigma' = (\sigma, y := e)$ ; clearly  $\Gamma, y : T \models \sigma'$ . Then by assumption,  $\sigma(p) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$  implies  $\sigma(q) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ . Since  $y \notin fv(q)$ ,  $\sigma'(q) = \sigma(q)$ , and we have proved  $\Gamma \vdash \exists y : T. p \Rightarrow q$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Conversely, suppose  $\Gamma \vdash \exists y : T. p \Rightarrow q$  where  $y \notin fv(q)$  and consider  $\sigma$  such that  $\Gamma, y : T \models \sigma$  and  $\sigma(p) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ .

Clearly we can ignore  $\sigma(y)$ , so  $\Gamma \models \sigma$ , and the nondeterministic existential can replace  $y$  with  $\sigma(y)$ , so  $\sigma(\exists y : T. p) \rightsquigarrow^* \sigma(p) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ . By assumption, this implies that  $\sigma(q) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ , and we have proved  $\Gamma, y : T \vdash p \Rightarrow q$ .  $\square$

Repeatedly applying this transformation, we rewrite each implication constraint until the domain of the environment (and hence the free variables of the left-hand side) is a subset of the free variables of the right-hand side.

## Delayed Substitution Elimination

The next issue is the presence of delayed substitutions in constraints of the form  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow \theta \cdot \psi$ . To eliminate the delayed substitution  $\theta$  we first split it into an environment  $env(\theta)$  and a term  $\llbracket \theta \rrbracket$ :

$$\begin{aligned} env([\ ] ) &= \emptyset & \llbracket [\ ] \rrbracket &= \mathbf{true} \\ env([x \mapsto e : T], \theta) &= x : T, env(\theta) & \llbracket [x \mapsto e : T], \theta \rrbracket &= (x = e) \wedge \llbracket \theta \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

The environment  $env(\theta)$  binds all the variables in  $dom(\theta)$  while the term  $\llbracket \theta \rrbracket$  represents the semantic content of  $\theta$ .

We then transform the constraint  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow \theta \cdot \psi$  into  $\Gamma, env(\theta) \vdash \llbracket \theta \rrbracket \wedge p \Rightarrow \psi$ .

But we can rewrite the constraint even more cleanly:  $\Gamma$  must be some prefix of  $E_\psi$  since by the previous transformation  $dom(\Gamma) \subseteq fv(\theta \cdot \psi) \subseteq dom(E_\psi)$ . Any  $x \in dom(\theta)$  such that  $x \notin dom(E_\psi)$  can be dropped from  $\theta$  and we see that  $\Gamma, env(\theta)$  is then exactly  $E_\psi$ . So our constraint is

$$E_\psi \vdash \llbracket \theta \rrbracket \wedge p \Rightarrow \psi$$

To prove this transformation correct, we use the following well formedness judgement  $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{wf}} \theta$  which distinguishes those delayed substitutions that may actually occur in context  $\Gamma$ .

$$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{wf}} [\ ]} \text{ [WF-EMPTY]} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e : T \quad \Gamma, x : T \vdash_{\text{wf}} \theta'}{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{wf}} [x \mapsto e : T], \theta'} \text{ [WF-EXT]}$$

**Lemma 28** *If  $\Gamma \models \sigma_\Gamma$  and  $\sigma_\Gamma \models \sigma_{\Gamma'}$ , where  $dom(\sigma_\Gamma) = dom(\Gamma)$  and  $dom(\sigma_{\Gamma'}) = dom(\Gamma')$ , then  $\Gamma, \Gamma' \models \sigma_\Gamma, \sigma_{\Gamma'}$*

**PROOF:** Consider a variable  $x \in dom(\Gamma, \Gamma')$ . If  $x \in dom(\Gamma)$  then the lemma is trivial. If  $x \in dom(\Gamma')$ , then  $(\sigma_\Gamma \sigma_{\Gamma'})(x) = \sigma_{\Gamma'}(x)$  which has type  $\sigma_{\Gamma'}(\sigma_\Gamma \Gamma')(x)$  by assumption, which is  $(\sigma_\Gamma, \sigma_{\Gamma'})((\Gamma, \Gamma')(x))$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 29** *If  $\Gamma \models \sigma$  and  $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{wf}} \theta$  then  $\sigma(env(\theta)) \models \sigma(\theta)$*

**PROOF:** Consider any  $x \in dom(\theta) = dom(\Gamma)$ . By assumption,  $\vdash \sigma(x) : \sigma(\Gamma(x))$ , but because  $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{wf}} \theta$  we know (by a trivial induction) that  $\sigma(\Gamma(x)) = \sigma(env(\theta)(x))$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 30** *Suppose  $\rho$  is a placeholder replacement such that  $\rho(\Gamma) \vdash_{\text{wf}} \rho(\theta)$ . Then  $\rho$  satisfies  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow \theta \cdot \psi$  if and only if  $\rho$  satisfies  $\Gamma, env(\theta) \vdash \llbracket \theta \rrbracket \wedge p \Rightarrow \psi$*

**PROOF:** Assume throughout that  $\rho\Gamma \vdash_{\text{wf}} \rho\theta$

( $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose  $\rho$  satisfies  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow \theta \cdot \psi$ , i.e.  $\rho\Gamma \vdash \rho p \Rightarrow \rho\theta(\rho\psi)$  and consider any  $\sigma$  s.t.  $\rho\Gamma, env(\rho\theta) \models \sigma$  and  $\sigma(\rho(\llbracket \theta \rrbracket \wedge p)) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ . Then by definition of the conjunction we know that  $\sigma(\rho p) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ , hence  $\sigma(\rho(\theta \cdot \psi)) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$  by assumption, which is  $\sigma(\rho\theta(\rho\psi)) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ .

But since  $\sigma$  is a closing substitution for  $\rho(\Gamma, env(\theta))$ , we know for any  $x \in dom(\theta)$  that  $\sigma(x) = (\rho\theta)(x)$  hence  $\sigma(\rho\psi) = \sigma(\rho\theta(\rho\psi))$ , which we already know evaluates to  $\mathbf{true}$ . Hence  $\rho$  satisfies  $\Gamma, env(\theta) \vdash \llbracket \theta \rrbracket \wedge p \Rightarrow \psi$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ): Suppose  $\rho$  satisfies  $\Gamma, env(\theta) \vdash \llbracket \theta \rrbracket \wedge p \Rightarrow \psi$  i.e.  $\rho\Gamma, env(\rho\theta) \vdash \rho(\llbracket \theta \rrbracket \wedge p) \Rightarrow \rho\psi$  and consider any  $\sigma$  s.t.  $\rho\Gamma \models \sigma$  and  $\sigma(\rho p) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ . Let  $\sigma' = \sigma \circ (\rho\theta)$ ; note that  $\rho\Gamma, env(\rho\theta) \models \sigma'$  by Lemmas 28 and Lemma 29.

Obviously,  $\sigma'(\rho p) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$  since  $\text{dom}(\theta) \cap \text{fv}(p) = \emptyset$ . Furthermore, by intensional equality, we see that  $\sigma'(\llbracket \theta \rrbracket) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ . So the conjunction in our assumption evaluates to  $\mathbf{true}$ , and we infer that  $\sigma'(\rho\psi) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ .

But  $\sigma'(\rho\psi) = \sigma(\rho\theta(\rho\psi))$  which is exactly what we need to conclude that  $\rho$  satisfies  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow \theta \cdot \psi$   $\square$

### Placeholder Solution

After the previous transformations, all lower bounds of a placeholder  $\psi$  appear in constraints of the form

$$E_\psi \vdash p_i \Rightarrow \psi$$

for  $i \in \{1..n\}$ , assuming  $\psi$  has  $n$  lower bounds. We want to set  $\psi$  equal to the parallel disjunction  $p_1 \vee p_2 \vee \dots \vee p_n$  of all its lower bounds (the disjunction must be parallel because some subterms may be nonterminating). However,  $\psi$  may appear in some  $p_i$  due to recursion or self-composition of a function. In this case we use a least fixed point operator, conveniently already available in our language, to find a solution to the equation  $\psi = p_1 \vee \dots \vee p_n$ .

More formally, suppose  $E_\psi = x_1 : T_1, \dots, x_k : T_k$ . Then  $\psi$  is a predicate over  $x_1 \dots x_k$  and we can interpret it as a function  $\mathcal{F}_\gamma : T_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_k \rightarrow \mathbf{Bool}$ . We use the following notation for clarity:

$$\bar{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{Bool} \quad \equiv \quad T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_k \rightarrow \mathbf{Bool}$$

$$\lambda \bar{x} : \bar{T}. e \quad \equiv \quad \lambda x_1 : T_1. \lambda x_2 : T_2. \dots \lambda x_k : T_k. e$$

$$f \bar{x} \quad \equiv \quad f x_1 x_2 \dots x_k$$

The function  $\mathcal{F}_\psi$  can then be defined as the following least fixed point computation:

$$\mathcal{F}_\psi = \mathbf{fix}_{\bar{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{Bool}} (\lambda f : \bar{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{Bool}. \lambda \bar{x} : \bar{T}. [\psi \mapsto f \bar{x}](p_1 \vee \dots \vee p_n))$$

Our solution for  $\psi$  is  $LB(\psi) = \mathcal{F}_\psi \bar{x}$ . This is the strongest consequence that is implied by all lower bounds of  $\psi$  and is in some sense canonical, analogously to the strongest postcondition of a code block.

**Lemma 31** *If a placeholder replacement  $\rho$  satisfies  $P$ , then  $\rho$  satisfies  $E_\psi \vdash LB(\psi) \Rightarrow \psi$ .*

PROOF: Consider any  $\rho$  satisfying  $P$  and  $\sigma$  such that  $\rho E_\psi \models \sigma$  and  $\sigma \rho(LB(\psi)) \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$  minimal  $k$ . Since the possible nondeterministic evaluations of  $\sigma \rho LB(\psi)$  correspond to simultaneously evaluating all lower bounds for  $\psi$  simultaneously, one of them must eventually evaluate to  $\mathbf{true}$ . Then by the assumption that  $\rho$  satisfies  $P$ , we know that  $\sigma \rho \psi \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{true}$ .  $\square$

The result of equisatisfiability follows from the fact that we have chosen the strongest possible solution for  $\psi$ .

**Lemma 32**  *$P$  is satisfiable if and only if  $P[\psi := LB(\psi)]$  is satisfiable.*

PROOF: ( $\Rightarrow$ ): Consider any  $\rho : \text{PlaceHolders} \rightarrow \text{Terms}$  that satisfies  $P$ . By Lemma 31 if  $\rho(\psi) \Rightarrow p$  occurs in  $P$ , then  $LB(\psi) \Rightarrow \rho(\psi) \Rightarrow p$ ; covariant occurrences of  $\psi$  in environments are analogous. If  $p \Rightarrow \rho(\psi)$  occurs in  $P$ , then  $p \Rightarrow LB(\psi)$  by

construction of  $LB(\psi)$ ; contravariant occurrences of types in environments do not affect satisfiability.  $\square$

In our example, the only lower bound of  $\psi_3$  is  $\psi_1$  and the only lower bound of  $\psi_2$  is  $\psi_3$ , so let us set  $\psi_3 := \psi_1$  and  $\psi_2 := \psi_3$  in order to discuss the more interesting solution for  $\psi_1$ . The resulting unsatisfied constraints (simplified for clarity) are:

$$n : \mathbf{Int} \vdash \exists w : \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n = 0\}. (n > w) \Rightarrow \psi_1$$

$$n : \mathbf{Int} \vdash \exists w : \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n = 0\}. \exists y : \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n > w\}. [x := y] \cdot \psi_1 \Rightarrow \psi_1$$

The exact text of  $LB(\psi_1)$  is too large to print here, but it is equivalent to

$\exists w : \{n : \mathbf{Int} \mid n = 0\}. (n > w)$  and thus equivalent to  $(n > 0)$ . The resulting explicitly typed program (simplified according to the previous sentence's discussion) is:

`let id : (x : {n : Int | n > 0} → {n : Int | n > 0}) = λx : {n : Int | n > 0}. x in`

`let w : {n : Int | n = 0} = 0 in`

`let y : {n : Int | n > w} = 3 in`

`id (id y)`

## 5.2 Type Reconstruction is Typability-Preserving

The output of our algorithm is the composition of the type replacement returned by shape reconstruction and the placeholder replacement returned by the satisfiability routine. Application of this composed replacement is a typeability-preserving transformation. Moreover, for any typeable program, the algorithm succeeds in producing such a replacement.

**Theorem 33** *For any  $\lambda^H$  program  $e$ , one of the following occurs:*

1. *Type reconstruction fails, in which case  $e$  is untypeable, or*
2. *Type reconstruction returns a type replacement  $\pi$  such that  $e$  is typeable if and only if  $\pi(e)$  is well typed.*

PROOF:

*Case 1:* Only shape reconstruction can fail. If it does, then by Lemma 26 the subtyping constraints are unsatisfiable. Then by Lemma 25,  $e$  is not typeable.

*Case 2:* Type reconstruction solved constraints that were faithful, by Lemma 25. Thus by Lemma 26 we have  $\pi$  and by Lemma 32 we have  $\rho$  such that  $(\rho \circ \pi)(t)$  is typeable (well typed) if and only if  $e$  is typeable.  $\square$

## 5.3 Related Work

Freeman and Pfenning [1991] introduced *datasort refinements*, which express restrictions on the recursive structure of algebraic datatypes. Type reconstruction for the finite set of programmer-specified datasort refinements is decided by abstract interpretation. Hayashi [1993] and Denney [1998] explored various logics for refinement predicates, while Davies and Pfenning [2000], and Mandelbaum et al. [2003] combined refinements with computational effects. All of these systems require type annotations, though many perform some manner of local type inference [Pierce and Turner 1998].

Xi and Pfenning [1999] developed Dependent ML, which uses dependent types along with *index types* to express invariants for complex data structures such as red-black trees. Dependent ML solves systems of linear inequalities to infer a restricted



class of type indices. Dunfield and Pfenning [2004] combined index types and datasort refinements in a system with decidable type checking, but the programmer is required to provide sufficient type annotations to guide the type checking process.

In the system of Ou et al. [2004], a section of code may be dynamically typed in order to reduce the annotation burden of refinement types. For the static dependently typed portion of a program, they forbid recursive functions in refinement predicates to ensure decidability of type checking, and perform no type reconstruction.

Constraint-based type reconstruction for systems with subtyping is a tremendously broad topic, and we cannot fully review it here. The problem is studied in some generality by Mitchell [1984], Fuh and Mishra [1988], Lincoln and Mitchell [1992], Aiken and Wimmers [1993], and Hoang and Mitchell [1995]. Type inference systems parameterized by a subtyping constraint system are developed by Pottier [1996] and Odersky et al. [1999]. This work is complementary to generalized systems in that it focuses on the solution of our particular instantiation of subtyping constraints; we also do not investigate parametric polymorphism, which is included in the mentioned frameworks. Set-based analysis presents many similar ideas, and we draw inspiration from the works of Heintze [1992], Cousot and Cousot [1995], Fahndrich and Aiken [1996], and Flanagan and Felleisen [1997].

The precondition/postcondition discipline for imperative programs dates back to the work of ?, Hoare [1969], and Dijkstra [1976]. General refinement types apply similar ideas to functional, higher order, programs. Our transformation of predicates to infer refinements resembles and is inspired by Dijkstra’s weakest precondition calculation

but is most closely related to the related strongest postcondition defined by Back [1988].

Nanevski et al. [2006] have introduced another relationship between axiomatic semantics and type systems with their Hoare Type Theory, which adds pre- and postconditions to the types of effectful monadic computation.

DISCUSS AVIK ins and outs of gradual typing

## Chapter 6

# Compositional and Decidable Checking

Having established that executable refinement types have been effectively inferred and subsequently enforced using hybrid type checking, we return to the question of when – if ever – we can predict that the type checking question *for a particular program* will be decidable.

Unfortunately, the essence of the difference between dependent types and simple structural type systems prevents a satisfactory answer: Simple type systems perform *compositional reasoning* in that the type of a term depends only on the types of its subterms, and not on their semantics. Our dependent types offer more expressive abstractions, but violate those abstractions and base their reasoning directly upon the semantics of terms. Pragmatically, this noncompositionality makes the decidability of static checking unpredictable.

This complication lends support to the intuition that simple type systems are particularly effective *because* of their compositional reasoning. In terms of the Curry-Howard-Lambek correspondence [citation needed] this corresponds to a consequence of proof irrelevance: The particular proof of a property cannot affect how it may be invoked in proofs of other properties, since all proofs of a equivalent properties are considered definitionally equal.

This chapter first shows how compositional reasoning may be restored using standard type-theoretic techniques, namely a form of existential types and subtyping. Despite its compositional nature, our type system is *exact*, in that the type of a term can completely capture its semantics, hence demonstrating that precision and compositionality are compatible. We then address predictability of static checking for contract

types by giving a type-checking algorithm for an important class of programs with contract predicates drawn from a decidable theory. Our algorithm relies crucially on the fact that the type of a term depends only the types of its subterms (which fall into the decidable theory) and not their semantics (which will not, in general).

## 6.1 Compositional Reasoning for Contract Types

During program development, compositional reasoning separates a program into cognitively manageable pieces. During analysis and verification, compositional reasoning limits the amount of information that must be stored and processed. Consider the following illustration of how structural type systems reason compositionally. In a well-typed program such as

$$\text{let } x : T = e_1 \text{ in } e_2$$

the type  $T$  provides an abstract specification of  $e_1$  that is concise and yet sufficiently precise to verify that  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  interact properly, in that the combined program does not “go wrong”. This verification process is compositional in that the verification of  $e_2$  cannot rely on any properties of  $e_1$  other than those exposed via its type  $T$ . Consequently, replacing  $e_1$  with any equivalently-typed term does not affect the typeability of the overall program.

The goal of this paper is to extend the benefits of compositional reasoning to our executable refinement types of the form  $\{x : B \mid e\}$ , where the refinement predicate  $e$  may be an arbitrary computable boolean expression over the variable  $x$  of type  $B$ .

Executable refinement types provide a natural means to abstract a term’s behavior to a greater or lesser degree (or, in the extreme, not abstract its behavior at all). For example, the constant 1 has an infinite number of types, including  $\text{Int}$ ,  $\text{Pos}$  and the exact type  $\{y : \text{Int} \mid y = 1\}$ , and these types are related via subtyping in the expected manner:

$$\{y : \text{Int} \mid y = 1\} \quad <: \quad \text{Pos} \quad <: \quad \text{Int}$$

As demonstrated throughout this dissertation, executable refinement types cooperate in a clean and expressive manner with dependent function types. For example, the function `add1` has many types, ranging from a simple type to an exact type, with an intermediate specification describing only that `add1` is increasing. Again, subtyping appropriately relates these various specifications for `add1`:

$$\begin{aligned} x : \text{Int} &\rightarrow \{y : \text{Int} \mid y = x + 1\} \\ <: \quad x : \text{Int} &\rightarrow \{y : \text{Int} \mid y > x\} \\ <: \quad \text{Int} &\rightarrow \text{Int} \end{aligned}$$

**Non-Compositional Dependent Types** At first, it appears that a programmer has precise control, via type annotations, over the specifications that must be verified during type-checking. Unfortunately, this is not the case at all! Many dependent type systems precede these types, including Cayenne [Augustsson 1998], Epigram [McBride and McKinna 2004], Agda [Norell 2009] and Coq [The Coq development team 2012]. Such systems can express very precise specification, including full functional correctness in some cases. But considering the benefits of compositional reasoning, it is unfortunate

that dependent type systems are based, in part, on *non-compositional* reasoning. That is, in a dependently typed program  $\mathcal{C}[e]$ , the type system can reason about  $e$ 's interaction with its context  $\mathcal{C}$  using both:

- compositional reasoning based on the *type* of  $e$ ; and
- non-compositional reasoning based on the *behavior* of  $e$ .

This non-compositional nature of dependent type systems originates from the following standard type rule for dependent function application. (For simplicity, we assume an empty typing environment).

$$\frac{\vdash f : (x:S \rightarrow T) \quad \vdash e : S}{\vdash f(e) : [x \mapsto e]T}$$

The inferred type  $[x \mapsto e]T$  (denoting  $T$  with  $x$  replaced by  $e$ ) of  $f(e)$  includes the term  $e$  itself, and not just its type  $S$ .

To highlight the non-compositional nature of this rule, suppose that  $e$  is an arbitrary term of type  $\mathbf{Pos}$ , and that  $f$  is the exactly-typed identity function on integers:

$$\begin{aligned} e & : \mathbf{Pos} \\ f & : (x:\mathbf{Int} \rightarrow \{y:\mathbf{Int} \mid y = x\}) \end{aligned}$$

Using compositional reasoning, we should only be able to infer that  $f$  returns its argument, which is a  $\mathbf{Pos}$ , and so  $f(e)$  has type  $\mathbf{Pos}$ .

Under the above type rule, however, the application  $f(e)$  has the more precise type (indeed, exact) type stating that  $f(e)$  returns exactly the value of  $e$ .

$$f(e) : \{y:\mathbf{Int} \mid y = e\}$$

Thus, the abstraction  $\mathbf{Pos}$  of  $e$  has now been circumvented!

This non-compositional reasoning causes multiple difficulties. First, we now have an arbitrary program term ( $e$ ) that has leaked into a contract predicate. Since  $e$  could be a large term, the type system now needs to deal with extremely large types, that may be much larger than any of the types present in the source program. Since the types in source programs are abstract specifications carefully chosen by the programmer, it is not clear that these new, larger types generated during type checking are at all the right abstractions for performing lightweight verification.

Second, even if the contract predicates in source programs are carefully chosen from a decidable theory, the fact that program terms leak into contract predicates during type checking means that static type checking still requires deciding implications between arbitrary program terms, which is of course undecidable.

**Compositional Dependent Contract Types** Given the beautiful and precise abstractions provided by dependent and contract types, and the benefits of compositional reasoning, this chapter explores an alternative strategy for static checking of dependent contract types. Our guiding principle is:

*Compositional reasoning:* Only use the abstractions provided by types when verifying that a term interacts correctly with its context.

The key idea underlying our approach is illustrated by the following rule for function application:

$$\frac{f : (x:S \rightarrow T) \quad e : S' \quad S' <: S}{f(e) : (\exists x:S'. T)}$$

The application  $f(e)$  must return a value of type  $T$ , where  $x$  is bound appropriately, but what is the appropriate binding for  $x$ ?

Compositionality dictates that all we are permitted to know about  $e$  (and hence about  $x$ ) is that it has type  $S'$ . Thus, the inferred type of the application  $f(e)$  is the existential type

$$\exists x:S'.T$$

Roughly speaking, this type denotes the union of all types of the form  $[x \mapsto e']T$ , where  $e'$  ranges over terms of type  $S'$ . (Existential types are closely related to dependent pairs  $\Sigma x:S.T$ , as discussed in Section 6.8 below.)

For the application  $f(e)$  considered earlier, this rule infers the existential type

$$f(e) \quad : \quad (\exists x : \mathbf{Pos}. \{y : \mathbf{Int} \mid y = x\})$$

that is (informally) equivalent to the type  $\mathbf{Pos}$ , and indeed is a subtype of  $\mathbf{Pos}$ . Thus, the type rule achieves the desired goal of compositional reasoning:  $f(e)$  has type  $\mathbf{Pos}$  simply because the argument expression has type  $\mathbf{Pos}$ . All we can know about the argument is its type. Furthermore, note that the expression  $e$  itself no longer leaks into the above contract type, which provides benefits in terms of smaller inferred types and facilitates decidable type checking.

This paper develops these ideas in the context of an idealized  $\lambda$ -calculus with contract types, existential types, and various kinds of primitive data types with pattern matching. As shown above, existential types are used pervasively to maintain compositionality, and inferred types often include an outer existential “wrapper” (like

$\exists x : \mathbf{Pos}. \dots$ ). Where necessary, our system uses subtyping to relate existential and non-existential types, and to “hide” the existential wrappers, all without the need for explicit coercions. For example, as mentioned above, we have that:

$$(\exists x : \mathbf{Pos}. \{y : \mathbf{Int} \mid y = x\}) \quad <: \quad \mathbf{Pos}$$

**Expressiveness and Exactness** Given that our type system is strictly limited to compositional reasoning, and cannot, for example, include the traditional rule for dependent function application, a key question that arises is:

To what degree does the requirement for compositional reasoning limit the expressiveness of the type system?

Certainly, the contract type language itself is sufficiently expressive to describe exact types, such as the type

$$\{x : \mathbf{Int} \mid x = 1\}$$

for the constant 1. More interestingly, we show that, if every constant in the language is assigned an exact type, then for any well-typed program  $e$ , our type system will infer an exact type that exactly captures the run-time semantics of  $e$ . This result holds even if  $e$  itself includes coarse type specifications such as  $\mathbf{Int}$ . This curious result occurs because all annotations in a program are preconditions to functions, which will be made as precise as allowed by the type of the argument to the function. Thus it is the types of opaque constants that drives the precision of type checking. This is discussed at length in Section 6.4.

Assigning exact types to primitives is straightforward, via *selfification*. For example, the fixpoint primitive  $\mathbf{fix}_T$  is typically given the inexact type  $(T \rightarrow T) \rightarrow T$ . For the case where  $T = x:T' \rightarrow B$ , an exact type for  $\mathbf{fix}_T$  is:

$$f:(T \rightarrow T) \rightarrow x:T' \rightarrow \{y:B \mid y = \mathbf{fix}_T f x\}$$

In practice, of course, primitives are typically assigned somewhat coarser types. Nevertheless, this completeness result indicates that the precision of the type system is entirely parameterized by the types of these primitives; *the type system itself neither requires nor performs any additional abstraction*.

Put differently, the precision of any compositional analysis is naturally driven by the precision of the abstractions that it composes, and careful choice of abstractions is crucial for achieving precise, scalable analyses. Our type system is entirely configurable in this regard; it does not perform any abstraction itself, and instead simply propagates the abstractions inherent in the types of constants and recursive functions, with the result that the precision of the analysis is largely under the control of the programmer.

**Decidable Type Checking** A key benefit of compositional type checking is that program terms never leak into contract predicates, and so the language of contract predicates can be cleanly separated from that of program terms. In particular, if contract predicates in source programs are drawn from the decidable theory of linear inequalities, then all proof obligations generated during type checking also fall within a decidable theory, and so type checking is decidable. We use this result to develop a decidable type checking algorithm for an important and easily-identifiable subset of our target language.

This development carefully exploits that inferred types, which may contain existential bindings, only occur on the left-hand-side in subtype checks, and so fortunately we never need to “guess” a witness for these existential types.

**Outline** REPHRASE TO SOUND LESS CONFERENCE-LIKE and MORE NARRATIVE In summary, the key contributions of this chapter are:

- clarifying the non-compositionality of dependent type systems and its consequences for dependent contract types (Section ??)
- developing a compositional dependent type system for dependent contract types (Section 6.2)
- demonstrating through the exactness of this type system that precision and compositionality are both achievable (Section ??)
- providing a type checking algorithm for the important special case of programs whose contract predicates fall in a decidable theory (Section ??)

Section 6.8 discusses work with related goals and surveys other applications of similar type-theoretic techniques. Section ?? then concludes with suggestions for future work.

## 6.2 The Language $\lambda^\exists$

We present our ideas in terms of the language  $\lambda^\exists$ , which extends  $\lambda^H$  with machinery for restoring compositionality, particularly our form of existential types. The syntax

Figure 6.1: Syntax

$e ::=$	<i>Expressions:</i>
$x$	variable
$c$	constructor
$k$	primitive function
$\lambda x:T. e$	abstraction
$e e$	application
<b>case</b> $e$ <b>of</b> $c \bar{x} \triangleright e$ <b>else</b> $e$	case
$v ::=$	<i>Values:</i>
$c \bar{v}$	constructor application
$k$	primitive function
$\lambda x:T. e$	abstraction
$T ::=$	<i>Types:</i>
$\{x:B \mid e\}$	refinement type
$x:T \rightarrow T$	dependent function type
$\exists x:T. T$	existential type
$B ::=$	<i>Base types:</i>
<b>Int</b>	base type of integers
<b>Bool</b>	base type of booleans
<b>IntList</b>	base type of lists of integers
$\Gamma ::=$	<i>Typing Environments:</i>
$\emptyset$	empty environment
$\Gamma, x:T$	environment extension

Figure 6.2: Operational Semantics

<u>Evaluation</u>	$e_1 \rightsquigarrow e_2$
$(\lambda x:T. e_1) e_2 \rightsquigarrow [x \mapsto e_2] e_1$	[E- $\beta$ ]
$k e \rightsquigarrow \delta(k, e)$	[E-PRIM]
<b>case</b> $c \bar{e}$ <b>of</b> $c' \bar{x} \triangleright e_1$ <b>else</b> $e_2 \rightsquigarrow e_2$ ( $c \neq c'$ )	[E-FAIL]
<b>case</b> $c \bar{e}$ <b>of</b> $c \bar{x} \triangleright e_1$ <b>else</b> $e_2 \rightsquigarrow [\bar{x} \mapsto \bar{e}] e_1$	[E-MATCH]
<u>Contextual Evaluation</u>	$s \rightsquigarrow t$
$\mathcal{C}[e] \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C}[e']$	[E-COMPAT]
whenever $e \rightsquigarrow e'$	
<u>Contexts</u>	$\mathcal{C}$
$\mathcal{C} ::= \bullet \mid \mathcal{C} e \mid e \mathcal{C} \mid \lambda x:S. \mathcal{C} \mid \lambda x:\mathcal{D}. e$	
$\mid$ <b>case</b> $\mathcal{C}$ <b>of</b> $c \bar{x} \triangleright e$ <b>else</b> $e$	
$\mid$ <b>case</b> $e$ <b>of</b> $c \bar{x} \triangleright \mathcal{C}$ <b>else</b> $e$	
$\mid$ <b>case</b> $e$ <b>of</b> $c \bar{x} \triangleright e$ <b>else</b> $\mathcal{C}$	
$\mathcal{D} ::= x:\mathcal{D} \rightarrow T \mid x:T \rightarrow \mathcal{D} \mid \{x:B \mid \mathcal{C}\}$	
$\mid \exists x:\mathcal{D}. T \mid \exists x:T. \mathcal{D}$	

of  $\lambda^\exists$  is presented in Figure ??, and its small-step operational semantics in Figure ??. Redex evaluation  $\hookrightarrow$  is closed under arbitrary contexts (in expression or types) to yield the reduction relation  $\rightsquigarrow$ . We write  $\rightsquigarrow^*$  and  $\rightsquigarrow^*$  for the reflexive-transitive and equivalence closures of  $\rightsquigarrow$ , respectively.

As before, primitive functions  $f$  are presumed to include basic operations of the language, such as boolean and arithmetic operations, and a fixpoint operator for each type  $T$ . We define a shorthand for the infinite loop

$$\Omega_T = \text{fix}_T (\lambda x:T. x)$$

for each type  $T$ . We sometimes omit type subscripts when they can be inferred from the context.

We also now distinguish data constructors, denoted by  $c$ , which include the integer and boolean constants of the language and list constructors `nil` and `cons`. The semantics of the pattern matching construct

$$\text{case } e_1 \text{ of } c \bar{x} \triangleright e_2 \text{ else } e_3$$

are given by [E-MATCH] and [E-FAIL]. If the value produced by  $e_1$  matches the pattern  $c \bar{x}$  (the constructor  $c$  applied in a curried fashion to the sequence of variables  $\bar{x}$ ), then  $e_2$  is evaluated with appropriate bindings for  $\bar{x}$ ; otherwise  $e_3$  is evaluated. Full pattern matching may be encoded as nested `case` expressions.

The  $\lambda^\exists$  type language includes existential types of the form  $\exists x:T_1. T_2$ , which classify terms of type  $T_2$  where  $x$  represents some unknown term of type  $T_1$ . Since  $\lambda^\exists$  lacks polymorphism, in addition to `Bool` and `Int` we also assume a base type of lists

of integers `IntList` to develop our examples; adding other monomorphic data types is straightforward.

### 6.3 The $\lambda^\exists$ Type System

For clarity, we present the  $\lambda^\exists$  type system in full in Figure ??, including some repeated portions of the  $\lambda^H$  type system from Chapter 3. The core typing judgement  $\Gamma \vdash e : T$  assigns type  $T$  to expression  $e$  in typing environment  $\Gamma$ . It is complemented by a well-formedness judgement for types,  $\Gamma \vdash T$ . As is customary, we apply implicit  $\alpha$ -renaming to assure that variables are bound at most once in  $\Gamma$ .

Rules [T-CONST] and [T-PRIM] assign built-in types to constructors  $c$  and primitive functions  $f$  according to *ty*. Variables are assigned *self* types by rule [T-VAR], a key feature that we discuss in Section 6.3. Rule [T-FUN], the standard rule for  $\lambda$ -abstractions, assigns to  $\lambda x:T_1. e$  the dependent function type  $x:T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ , where the body  $e$  has type  $T_2$ .

Rule [T-APP] for typing a function application  $(e_1 \ e_2)$  is interesting, since it appears not to support dependent function types at all. We discuss this in detail in Section ?? below.

Rule [T-CASE] for `case`  $e$  of  $c \bar{x} \triangleright e_1$  `else`  $e_2$  is rather complex, because it uses only the information contained in the type of  $c$  to provide a measure of path-sensitivity while type-checking  $e_1$ . The rule first checks that the inspected term  $e$  has the appropriate type to be constructed by  $c$ . Since  $e$  may have an existential type, the rule



Figure 6.3: Additional and Modified Type Rules for  $\lambda^\exists$ 

<u>Typing</u>	$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash e : T}$
$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash c : ty(c)}$ [T-CONST]	$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash f : ty(f)}$ [T-PRIM]
	$\frac{(x : T) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : \mathbf{self}(T, x)}$ [T-VAR]
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_2 : T_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 e_2 : T_2}$ [T-APP]	
$\frac{\bar{z}, y \notin fv(e_1) \quad ty(c) = \bar{x} : \bar{T}_x \rightarrow \{y : B \mid e_c\} \quad \Gamma \vdash e : \exists \bar{z} : \bar{T}_z. \{y : B \mid e'\}}{\Gamma, \bar{x} : \bar{T}_x, y : \exists \bar{z} : \bar{T}_z. \{y : B \mid e_c \wedge e'\} \vdash e_1 : T \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T}$ $\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{case } e \text{ of } c \bar{x} \triangleright e_1 \mathbf{ else } e_2 : T$	
<u>Well-formed Types</u>	$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash T}$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash T_1 \quad \Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash T_2}{\Gamma \vdash \exists x : T_1. T_2}$ [WT-EXISTS]	

Figure 6.4: Definition of **self**

$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{self}(\{x : B \mid e'\}, e) &= \{x : B \mid e' \wedge (x =_B e)\} \\ \mathbf{self}(x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2, e) &= x : T_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{self}(T_2, e \ x) \\ \mathbf{self}(\exists x : T_1. T_2, e) &= \exists x : T_1. \mathbf{self}(T_2, e) \end{aligned}$ $\begin{aligned} \bar{x} &= x_1, \dots, x_n \\ \bar{T} &= T_1, \dots, T_n \\ \bar{x} : \bar{T} \rightarrow T' &= x_1 : T_1 \rightarrow \dots x_n : T_n \rightarrow T' \\ \exists \bar{x} : \bar{T}. T' &= \exists x_1 : T_1. \dots \exists x_n : T_n. T' \end{aligned}$
---

Figure 6.5: Additional Subtyping for  $\lambda^\exists$ 

Subtyping	$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash T_1 <: T_2}$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : T_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash T <: [x \mapsto e] T_2}{\Gamma \vdash T <: \exists x : T_1. T_2}$ [S-WITNESS]	
$\frac{\Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash T_2 <: T \quad x \notin FV(T)}{\Gamma \vdash \exists x : T_1. T_2 <: T}$ [S-BIND]	

checks that the type of  $e$  is a refinement of the same base type  $B$  as the return type of  $c$ , possibly with existentially quantified variables  $\bar{z} : \bar{T}_z$ . Then, under the assumption that the pattern matching succeeds, bound variables  $\bar{x}$  are added to the typing environment with their declared types  $\bar{T}_x$ , according to the type of  $c$ . Finally, the contract predicate  $e'$  from the type of  $e$ , and the predicate  $e_c$  from the return type of  $c$  are conjoined into the contract type  $\exists \bar{z} : \bar{T}_z. \{y : B \mid e_c \wedge e'\}$  and a fresh variable  $y$  with this type is added to the environment. Though  $y$  does not occur in  $e_1$ ,  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{z}$  may occur in  $e_c$  and  $e'$ , respectively, and the new binding captures known relationships between these variables.

In this way, the precision of [T-CASE] is determined by the types of constructors. For

example, `cons` can be assigned a range of types, including:

```

cons  :  Int → IntList → IntList

cons  :  Int → x:IntList →
        {y:IntList | length(y) = length(x) + 1}

cons  :  n:Int → x:IntList →
        {y:IntList | y = cons n x}

```

In particular, if the constructor  $c$  has the precise return type  $\{y:B \mid y = c \bar{x}\}$ , then the new binding implies  $[y \mapsto c \bar{x}]e'$ . However, if  $c$  has a more coarse type, then the naïve approach of adding an assumption such as  $e = c \bar{x}$  is reasoning noncompositionally using the exact semantics of  $c$ , ignoring its type.

Subtyping between existential types is derived from the logical interpretation of subtyping as “implication” between propositions. Our rule to introduce an existential on the left corresponds to the tautology of first-order logic  $(\forall x \in A. P(x) \Rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow (\exists x \in A. P(x)) \Rightarrow Q$  where  $x \notin \text{fv}(C)$ . To introduce an existential on the right, [S-WITNESS] requires a witness  $e$  of type  $T_1$  for the variable  $x$ . If  $T$  is a subtype of  $[x \mapsto e]T_2$ , then we can disregard the identity of the witness and retain only its specification to conclude that  $T$  is a subtype of  $\exists x:T_1. T_2$ .

Corresponding to our intuition, a combination of [S-WITNESS] and [S-BIND] shows that the following reassuringly covariant rule is admissible:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash T_1 <: T_3 \quad \Gamma, x:T_1 \vdash T_2 <: T_4}{\Gamma \vdash \exists x:T_1. T_2 <: \exists x:T_3. T_4}$$

## Non-dependent Function Application

As mentioned above, the typing rule for a function application  $(e_1 \ e_2)$  is extremely simple, and does not refer to dependent types at all. Instead, the combination of existential types and subtyping provides enough power in other areas of the type system that this straightforward rule is sufficiently expressive. In more detail, suppose  $e_1$  has a dependent function type  $x:T_1 \rightarrow T_2$  and the argument  $e_2$  has type  $T'_1$  where  $T'_1 <: T_1$ . Then, we use subtyping to specialize the function type as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (x:T_1 \rightarrow T_2) &<: (x:T'_1 \rightarrow T_2) \\ &<: (x:T'_1 \rightarrow \exists x:T'_1. T_2) \\ &\equiv (T'_1 \rightarrow \exists x:T'_1. T_2) \quad \text{since } x \notin \text{fv}(T'_1) \end{aligned}$$

The new function type  $T'_1 \rightarrow \exists x:T'_1. T_2$  is only applicable to terms of type  $T'_1$ . More interestingly, its existential return type now internalizes the assumption that  $x$  will be of type  $T'_1$ , so we have a non-dependent function type that precisely characterizes the behavior of the function  $e_1$  on arguments of type  $T'_1$ , and which does not refer to the exact semantics of the argument  $e_2$ .<sup>1</sup>

Based on the above discussion, the following rule (mentioned in the introduction) is admissible:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : x:T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T'_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash T'_1 <: T_1}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 \ e_2 : (\exists x:T'_1. T_2)}$$

<sup>1</sup>Non-dependent type rules for function application in a dependent type system are also used by Harper and Lillibridge [1994] and Dreyer et al. [2003] in ML module systems where computational effects make the standard substitution-based rule unsound. In the latter, a specialization of the technique we present allows the power of dependent function application when the argument is effect-free.

## Self Types

To motivate our non-standard rule for variable references, consider the expression  $x - x$ , where  $x$  has type  $\mathbf{Int}$ . We wish to assign this expression the exact type  $\{z:\mathbf{Int} \mid z = 0\}$ , based on the following exact type for subtraction:

$$- : (w:\mathbf{Int} \rightarrow y:\mathbf{Int} \rightarrow \{z:\mathbf{Int} \mid z = w - y\})$$

Under the standard rule, whereby a reference to  $x$  simply has type  $\mathbf{Int}$ , the type of  $x - x$  is given by the judgement

$$x:\mathbf{Int} \vdash (x - x) : (\exists w:\mathbf{Int}. \exists y:\mathbf{Int}. \{z:\mathbf{Int} \mid z = w - y\})$$

which is much too coarse. The type system has lost a key notion of *identity*, that the two variable references in  $x - x$  refer to the same variable.

To solve this problem, *selfification* is used to assign to the variable reference  $x$  the exact *self* type  $\{y:\mathbf{Int} \mid y = x\}$ , which captures the identity of  $x$ , and allows us to derive:

$$x:\mathbf{Int} \vdash (x - x) : \exists w:\{w:\mathbf{Int} \mid w = x\}.$$

$$\exists y:\{y:\mathbf{Int} \mid y = x\}.$$

$$\{z:\mathbf{Int} \mid z = w - y\}$$

which assigns to  $x - x$  a subtype of  $\{z:\mathbf{Int} \mid z = 0\}$ , as desired. In addition to this example, *self* types are also crucial for achieving path-sensitivity in pattern matching, which requires a notion of identity for the matched expression.

Selfification (or singleton types/kinds) is a powerful technique but interacts in delicate ways with our goal of compositional reasoning. For example, Ou et al. [2004],

in their declarative system, give a general selfification rule

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : T}{\Gamma \vdash e : \mathbf{self}(T, e)} \text{ [T-SELF]}$$

But this rule is non-compositional as we cannot replace the subderivation  $\Gamma \vdash e : T$  with another  $\Gamma \vdash e' : T$ . In their algorithmic presentation, they give *self* types only to constants and variables. A key point not highlighted, however, is that giving *self* types to variables *is* compositional: Since there are no subderivations, compositionality is vacuous. But this is not simply a syntactic trick, but the syntactic manifestation of the essence of compositional reasoning: We may know nothing about a variable but its type *and* we may remember from which variable we “fetch” a value. TALK ABOUT LIQUID TYPES FORCING LET BINDINGS HERE? This insight is instrumental to reconciling compositional reasoning with the precision of selfification. The restriction of selfification to variables enables us to prove the following key compositionality theorem for our system:

**Theorem 34 (Compositionality)** *Suppose  $\Gamma \vdash \mathcal{C}[e] : T$  based on a subderivation  $\Gamma' \vdash e : T'$  that corresponds to the hole in  $\mathcal{C}$ , and suppose that  $\Gamma' \vdash e' : T'$  for some  $e'$ . Then  $\Gamma \vdash \mathcal{C}[e'] : T$ .*

*Proof sketch:* By induction on the derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash \mathcal{C}[e] : T$ .  $\square$

## 6.4 The $\lambda^\exists$ Type System is Exact

The requirement for compositional reasoning restricts the kinds of type rules our system can include. For example, we have seen that it forbids both the standard rule for dependent function application and the selfification of arbitrary terms. The type system described above carefully circumvents these restrictions to achieve compositional reasoning. We now address the important question of how much precision or expressive power our type system has lost because of its restriction to compositional type rules.

We show that, in fact, our type system is *exact*: it can assign to each program term a type that completely captures the semantics of that term. This property does require that each constant  $k$  (that is, primitive functions  $k$  and constructors  $c$ ) has an exact type that completely captures its semantics, that is,  $ty(k) <: \mathbf{self}(ty(k), k)$ . For the duration of this section, we assume that  $ty$  has this property.

Exactness also requires that **case** expressions are “consistent” in a way that can be expected in a full language – the failure branch of each **case** expression is another **case** expression on the same expression, or  $\Omega$ , and all the branches are disjoint. This condition ensures that sufficient path information is recorded in the environment. Under these assumptions, the exact information provided by types of constants and the *self* types of variables is propagated losslessly by our type system.

**Theorem 35 (Exactness)** *If constants have exact types and pattern matching is consistent, then  $\Gamma \vdash e : T$  implies  $\Gamma \vdash e : \mathbf{self}(T, e)$ .*

*Proof sketch.* By induction on the typing derivation, using Lemma 38 from

Section ??.

Theorem 35 seems very strong: for an arbitrary term  $e$  of type  $T$  (where  $e$ ’s subterms may include coarse types), we can assign  $e$  the type  $\mathbf{self}(T, e)$  that *exactly* captures the semantics of  $e$ , all via compositional reasoning. In exploring the conflict upon which this paper is premised, we have developed a compositional type system as powerful as one based on substitution, but without the violation of abstraction. Rather, our type system insists that whatever precision is desired must be explicitly expressed via types.

As an illustration of Theorem 35, consider the type of the fixpoint primitive  $\mathbf{fix}_T$ , which is typically given the inexact type  $(T \rightarrow T) \rightarrow T$ . We can make this type exact via selfification. For example, if  $T = x:T' \rightarrow B$ , then an exact type for  $\mathbf{fix}_T$  is  $\mathbf{self}((T \rightarrow T) \rightarrow T, \mathbf{fix}_T) =$

$$f:(T \rightarrow T) \rightarrow x:T' \rightarrow \{y:B \mid y = \mathbf{fix}_T f x\}$$

For a more interesting example, consider Euclid’s algorithm for computing greatest common divisors, where we use **if** expressions to abbreviate pattern matching:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{gcd} &= \mathbf{fix}_T (\lambda g:T. \lambda a:\mathbf{Int}. \lambda b:\mathbf{Int}. e) \\ T &= \mathbf{Int} \rightarrow \mathbf{Int} \rightarrow \mathbf{Int} \\ e &= \mathbf{if } b = 0 \mathbf{ then } a \\ &\quad \mathbf{else if } a > b \mathbf{ then } g(a - b) b \\ &\quad \mathbf{else } g a (b - a) \end{aligned}$$

If  $\mathbf{fix}_T$  has the exact type  $\mathbf{self}((T \rightarrow T) \rightarrow T, \mathbf{fix}_T)$ , then the type system infers the

following exact type for `gcd`:

$$\begin{aligned} \exists h. (g : T \rightarrow a : \mathbf{Int} \rightarrow b : \mathbf{Int} \rightarrow \{r : \mathbf{Int} \mid r = e\}). \\ a : \mathbf{Int} \rightarrow b : \mathbf{Int} \rightarrow \{r : \mathbf{Int} \mid r = \mathbf{fix}_T h a b\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that this type includes within contract predicates both fixpoint computations and also the body  $e$  of `gcd`. Thus, the type system is essentially *translating* the entire computation into the predicate language. However, “constants” in this calculus represent terms whose semantics are unavailable. In practice, this models the use of symbols from imported modules, whose abstractions *will* be respected.

While this translation ability illustrates the expressiveness of our type system, reasoning about fixpoint computations is notoriously difficult for automated theorem provers.

In a more typical setting where constants are assigned approximate types, the theorem indicates that *the type system neither requires nor performs any abstraction itself*; instead, the degree of abstraction in its reasoning can be entirely configured by choosing appropriate types for the constants of the language.

A more practical approach is to use the simple type  $(T \rightarrow T) \rightarrow T$  for `fixT`, and for the programmer to provide an appropriately-precise specification  $T$  for the recursive function `gcd`. The specification  $T = \mathbf{Int} \rightarrow \mathbf{Int} \rightarrow \mathbf{Int}$  shown above is rather coarse; a more precise (but not exact) specification is:

$$T = a : \mathbf{Int} \rightarrow b : \mathbf{Int} \rightarrow \{r : \mathbf{Int} \mid a \bmod r = 0 \wedge b \bmod r = 0\}$$

The type system can then verify this specification for `gcd`, with simple proof obligations such as “if  $b \bmod r = 0$  and  $(a - b) \bmod r = 0$  then  $a \bmod r = 0$ .”

## 6.5 Type Soundness for $\lambda^\exists$

We now prove type safety for the exact variant of  $\lambda^\exists$ , which we will leverage to prove type safety in general. For simplicity and focus, we do not include the “bootstrap” from the simply-typed lambda calculus here, but axiomatize our implication relation as was done by (CITATIONS). For flexibility, we parameterize our type system with respect to constructors, primitive functions, and the theorem proving oracle, making only minimal assumptions necessary to ensure soundness (most instances will have many more interesting properties).

**Assumption 36** *We require of the implication relation:*

1. (Weakening) If  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash e \Rightarrow e'$  then  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma', \Gamma_2 \vdash e \Rightarrow e'$  where  $\text{dom}(\Gamma')$  is disjoint from  $\text{fv}(e)$ ,  $\text{fv}(e')$ ,  $\text{dom}(\Gamma_1)$ , and  $\text{dom}(\Gamma_2)$ .
2. (Narrowing) If  $\Gamma_1, x : T, \Gamma_2 \vdash e \Rightarrow e'$  and  $\Gamma_1 \vdash T' <: T$  then  $\Gamma_1, x : T', \Gamma_2 \vdash e \Rightarrow e'$
3. (Transitivity) If  $\Gamma \vdash e_1 \Rightarrow e_2$  and  $\Gamma \vdash e_2 \Rightarrow e_3$  then  $\Gamma \vdash e_1 \Rightarrow e_3$
4. (Reflexivity)  $\Gamma \vdash e \Rightarrow e$
5. (Faithfulness)  $\Gamma \vdash e \Rightarrow \mathbf{true}$
6. (Consistency)  $\Gamma \not\vdash \mathbf{true} \Rightarrow \mathbf{false}$
7. (Conjunction 1)  $\Gamma \vdash e_1 \wedge e_2 \Rightarrow e_1$
8. (Conjunction 2)  $\Gamma \vdash e_1 \wedge e_2 \Rightarrow e_2$

9. (Exact Quantification) If  $x : \mathbf{self}(T, e) \in \Gamma$  then  $\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow [x \mapsto e]p$
10. (Evaluation) If  $e \rightsquigarrow^* e'$  then  $\Gamma \vdash e \Rightarrow e'$
11. (Substitution) If  $\Gamma_1, x : T, \Gamma_2 \vdash e_1 \Rightarrow e_2$  and  $\Gamma_1 \vdash e_3 : T$  then  $\Gamma_1, \theta\Gamma_2 \vdash \theta e_1 \Rightarrow \theta e_2$   
and  $\Gamma, x : S, F \vdash e_1 \Rightarrow \theta e_1$  where  $\theta = [x \mapsto e_3]$

**Assumption 37** We require of each primitive function  $f$ :

1.  $f$  has a well-formed type:  $\emptyset \vdash \text{ty}(f)$
2.  $f$  cannot get stuck: if  $\emptyset \vdash f v : T$  then  $\delta(f, v)$  is defined.
3.  $f$  satisfies preservation: if  $\emptyset \vdash f e : T$  and  $\delta(f, e)$  is defined, then  $\emptyset \vdash \delta(f, e) : T$

Given exactness, an existentially quantified variable with a singleton type is equivalent to having simply performed a substitution (it is essentially an explicit substitution [Abadi et al. 1990]). This intuition is formalized in the following lemma.

**Lemma 38** For any expression  $e$  and type  $T$ , if  $\Gamma \vdash e : T_e$  and  $\Gamma, x : T_e \vdash T$  then

1.  $\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{self}(T_e, e) <: T_e$
2.  $\Gamma \vdash [x \mapsto e]T <: \exists x : \mathbf{self}(T_e, e).T$
3.  $\Gamma \vdash \exists x : \mathbf{self}(T_e, e).T <: [x \mapsto e]T$

*Proof Sketch.* By induction on the size of  $T$ , using Assumption 36 (Exact Quantification).  $\square$

The standard substitution lemma follows from Theorem 35 and Lemma 38.

**Lemma 39 (Substitution)** Suppose  $\Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 : T_1$  and  $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, x : T_1, \Gamma_2$  and  $\Gamma' = \Gamma_1, \theta\Gamma_2$  where  $\theta = [x \mapsto e]$ . Then

1. If  $\Gamma \vdash e : T$  then  $\Gamma' \vdash \theta e : \theta T$
2. If  $\Gamma \vdash T$  then  $\Gamma' \vdash \theta T$
3. If  $\Gamma \vdash T <: T'$  then  $\Gamma' \vdash \theta T <: \theta T'$

*Proof* By mutual induction on the derivations. Since variables are assigned self types, it is crucial that the substituted term also have a self type.  $\square$

Progress and preservation can now be proved for the exact variant; the proofs follow the same structure as in Knowles and Flanagan [2010].

**Theorem 40 (Progress)** If  $\emptyset \vdash e : T$  then either there exists some  $e'$  such that  $e \rightsquigarrow e'$ , or  $e$  is a value.

**Theorem 41 (Preservation)** If  $\Gamma \vdash e : T$  and  $e \rightsquigarrow e'$  then  $\Gamma \vdash e' : T$

If a term is well-typed in any variant of our system, then it is certainly well-typed in the exact variant. Hence, a well-typed term cannot “get stuck” even in those imprecise variants where the substitution lemma cannot be proved.

**Theorem 42** For any definition of  $\text{ty}$  satisfying Assumption 37, if  $\emptyset \vdash e : T$ , then  $e$  either reduces to a value or is nonterminating.

*Proof sketch:* Map the derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash e : T$  into the exact variant by induction over the derivation, then apply progress and preservation.  $\square$

Figure 6.6: Syntax for Algorithmic Typing

$l \subseteq e$	<i>Linear Inequalities</i>
$p ::=$	<i>Predicate Terms</i>
$l$	atomic inequality
$p \wedge p$	conjunction
<b>case</b> $w$ <b>of</b> $c \bar{x} \triangleright p$ <b>else</b> $p$	case
$S ::=$	<i>Restricted Types:</i>
$\{x:B \mid p\}$	refinement type
$x:S \rightarrow S$	restricted function type
$A ::=$	<i>Augmented Types:</i>
$\{x:B \mid p\}$	refinement type
$x:S \rightarrow A$	augmented function type
$\exists x:A. A$	augmented existential type
$\Delta ::=$	<i>Algorithmic Typing Environments:</i>
$\emptyset$	empty environment
$\Delta, x:A$	environment extension

There may be another syntactic approach to type soundness that applies in these systems, but it is more conceptually informative to think of those systems as coarsenings of the exact variant.

## 6.6 Algorithmic Typing for $\lambda^\exists$

We now investigate how to provide decidable compositional type checking for an interesting subset of  $\lambda^\exists$ . Type checking for  $\lambda^\exists$  is undecidable, despite the recovery of compositional reasoning, because implication remains undecidable. However, by

restricting contract predicates to a decidable theory, we can now provide a decidable, compositional, dependent type system. Note that this decidability result crucially relies on compositional reasoning: in a traditional dependent type system, even when all annotations fall within a decidable theory, substitutions made during type checking may result in proof obligations outside of that theory.

Figure 6.6 defines the type language for which we provide a type-checking algorithm. For concreteness, we suppose contracts are linear inequalities, but the approach is applicable to other decidable predicate languages. During type-checking, they will be combined with conjunction and case-splitting on variables, so those are also included in the predicate sublanguage of terms, denoted by metavariables  $p$  or  $q$ .

We distinguish two sublanguages of types. The first, ranged over by metavariable  $S$ , does not include existential quantifiers and may appear in source programs. Augmented types  $A$  generated during type checking may contain existential quantification, but only in positive positions. Thus  $S \subseteq A \subseteq T$ . Only augmented types  $A$  are bound in the environment during type checking, so we use a new metavariable  $\Delta$  to range over these  $A$ -environments.

Our algorithmic type checking judgement  $\Delta \models e : A$  is shown in Figure 6.7.

As usual for syntax directed type checking, we remove the subsumption rule and instead inline subtyping where needed. For example, in the case for applications, the existential quantifiers are introspected to discover the underlying function type  $x:S_1 \rightarrow A_1$ , and then the type  $A_2$  of the argument is checked for compatibility with  $S_1$ .

In typing a pattern matching expression, we lift the **case** syntax to types to

## Algorithmic Rules

### Algorithmic Typing

$$\boxed{\Delta \Vdash e : A}$$

$$\frac{}{\Delta \Vdash c : ty(c)} \text{ [A-CONST]}$$

$$\frac{}{\Delta \Vdash k : ty(k)} \text{ [A-PRIM]}$$

$$\frac{(x : A) \in \Delta}{\Delta \Vdash x : \mathbf{refine}(A, x)} \text{ [A-VAR-BASE]}$$

$$\frac{\Delta \Vdash S \quad \Delta, x : S \Vdash e : A}{\Delta \Vdash (\lambda x : S. e) : (x : S \rightarrow A)} \text{ [A-FUN]}$$

$$\frac{\Delta \Vdash e_1 : \exists \bar{z} : \bar{T}_z. x : S_1 \rightarrow A_1 \quad \Delta \Vdash e_2 : A_2 \quad \Delta, \bar{z} : \bar{T}_z \Vdash A_2 <: S_1}{\Delta \Vdash e_1 \ e_2 : \exists \bar{z} : \bar{T}_z. \exists x : A_2. A_1} \text{ [A-APP]}$$

$$\frac{\bar{z}, y \notin fv(e_1) \quad ty(c) = \bar{x} : \bar{S} \rightarrow \{y : B \mid p_c\} \quad \Delta \Vdash w : \exists \bar{z} : \bar{T}_z. \{y : B \mid p_y\} \quad \Delta, \bar{x} : \bar{S}, y : \exists \bar{z} : \bar{T}_z. \{y : B \mid p_c \wedge p_y\} \Vdash e_1 : A_1 \quad \Delta \Vdash e_2 : A_2}{\Delta \Vdash (\mathbf{case} \ w \ \mathbf{of} \ c \ \bar{x} \triangleright e_1 \ \mathbf{else} \ e_2) : (\mathbf{case} \ w \ \mathbf{of} \ c \ \bar{x} \triangleright A_1 \ \mathbf{else} \ A_2)} \text{ [A-CASE]}$$

### Algorithmic Well-formed Types

$$\boxed{\Delta \Vdash S}$$

$$\frac{\Delta \Vdash S_1 \quad \Delta, x : S_1 \Vdash S_2}{\Delta \Vdash x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2} \text{ [AT-ARROW]}$$

$$\frac{\Delta, x : B \Vdash p : \mathbf{Bool}}{\Delta \Vdash \{x : B \mid p\}} \text{ [AT-BASE]}$$

### Algorithmic Subtyping

$$\boxed{\Delta \Vdash A <: S}$$

$$\frac{\Delta \Vdash S_2 <: S_1 \quad \Delta, x : S_2 \Vdash A_1 <: S_3}{\Delta \Vdash (x : S_1 \rightarrow A_1) <: (x : S_2 \rightarrow S_3)} \text{ [AS-ARROW]}$$

$$\frac{\Delta, x : B \vdash q \Rightarrow p}{\Delta \Vdash \{x : B \mid q\} <: \{x : B \mid p\}} \text{ [AS-BASE]}$$

$$\frac{\Delta, x : A_1 \Vdash A_2 <: S_3}{\Delta \Vdash \exists x : A_1. A_2 <: S_3} \text{ [AS-BIND]}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{refine}(\{x : B \mid e'\}, e) &= \{x : B \mid e' \wedge (x =_B e)\} \\ \mathbf{refine}(x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2, e) &= x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \\ \mathbf{refine}(\exists x : T_1. T_2, e) &= \exists x : T_1. \mathbf{refine}(T_2, e) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{case} \ w \ \mathbf{of} \ c \ \bar{x} \triangleright \exists y : A_1. A_2 \ \mathbf{else} \ A_3 &= \exists y : A_1. (\mathbf{case} \ w \ \mathbf{of} \ c \ \bar{x} \triangleright A_2 \ \mathbf{else} \ A_3) \\ \mathbf{case} \ w \ \mathbf{of} \ c \ \bar{x} \triangleright A_1 \ \mathbf{else} \ \exists y : A_2. A_3 &= \exists y : A_2. (\mathbf{case} \ w \ \mathbf{of} \ c \ \bar{x} \triangleright A_1 \ \mathbf{else} \ A_3) \\ \mathbf{case} \ w \ \mathbf{of} \ c \ \bar{x} \triangleright \{y : B \mid p_1\} \ \mathbf{else} \ \{y : B \mid p_2\} &= \{y : B \mid \mathbf{case} \ w \ \mathbf{of} \ c \ \bar{x} \triangleright p_1 \ \mathbf{else} \ p_2\} \\ \mathbf{case} \ w \ \mathbf{of} \ c \ \bar{x} \triangleright y : S_1 \rightarrow A_1 \ \mathbf{else} \ y : S_2 \rightarrow A_2 &= y : (\mathbf{case} \ w \ \mathbf{of} \ c \ \bar{x} \triangleright S_1 \ \mathbf{else} \ S_2) \rightarrow \mathbf{case} \ w \ \mathbf{of} \ c \ \bar{x} \triangleright . \end{aligned}$$

concisely express the resulting type; intuitively, **case**  $e$  **of**  $c \ \bar{x} \triangleright A_1$  **else**  $A_2$  is equivalent to  $A_1$  if the pattern match succeeds, otherwise is equivalent to  $A_2$ . Figure 6.7 includes the exact definition. To avoid arbitrary expressions appearing in contract predicates, we require that the inspected subexpression in a **case** construct be a variable. This requirement can be satisfied by rewriting the more general form (**case**  $e$  **of**  $c \ \bar{x} \triangleright e_1$  **else**  $e_2$ ) into the semantically equivalent  $((\lambda y : S. \mathbf{case} \ y \ \mathbf{of} \ c \ \bar{x} \triangleright e_1 \ \mathbf{else} \ e_2) \ e)$ . This rewriting step introduces a type  $S$  for the variable  $y$ , and so ensures that any expression used in pattern matching will have a specification that falls in the restricted type language  $S$ .

Rule [A-VAR-BASE] uses the function **refine** to selfify variables. The function **refine** is like **self** except it avoids introducing function applications, which are no longer permitted in our contract language.

Like typing, algorithmic type checking relies on subtyping, but interestingly only for the asymmetric form  $\Delta \Vdash A <: S$ , which checks subtyping between an inferred, augmented type  $A$  and a programmer-specified, restricted type  $S$ . Since existential types never appear on the right hand side, we (fortunately!) never need to “guess” witnesses for existentials. Existentials on the left are unproblematic, because the existential quantification in a negative context transforms into a universal quantification in a positive context, which is handled algorithmically. We could add the covariant rule from the end of section ?? to allow some existential quantification on the right side of subtyping, but our syntactic conditions make that unnecessary.

Algorithmic typeability is not closed under evaluation; instead soundness is provided by mapping algorithmic derivations onto derivations in the full type system.



### Theorem 43 (Soundness of Algorithmic Typing)

If  $\Delta \models e : A$  and pattern matching is consistent, then  $\Delta \vdash e : A$

*Proof sketch:* By induction on the derivation of  $\Delta \models e : A$ .  $\square$

While the algorithm is not complete with respect to the full type system, it is complete for the class of sublanguages we have described.

### Theorem 44 (Relative Completeness)

If  $\Delta \vdash e : T$  and  $e$  is annotated with restricted types, and pattern matching is consistent and inspects only variables, then there exists an  $A$  such that  $\Delta \models e : A$  and  $\Delta \vdash A <: T$

*Proof sketch:* By induction on the derivation of  $\Delta \vdash e : T$ .  $\square$

These algorithmic rules characterize a decidable class of type systems for the core language: If all program annotations are restricted types whose contracts are expressions in some decidable theory (where this means that queries of the form  $\Delta \models q \Rightarrow p$  are decidable, such as linear inequalities with conjunction and case splits), then all implication queries also fall in this theory, and are decidable. Interestingly, because existentials only appear as assumptions in proof obligations, the theory need only support a restricted form of existential quantification that is “productive” in that each existential corresponds to positive existence of some term, and there is never any existential proof obligation.

## 6.7 Example: Binary Search Trees in $\lambda^\exists$

As an illustration of our decidable type system, we now discuss a somewhat more involved example of binary search trees. We assume an additional base type `BST` to represents binary search trees, with auxiliary functions:

`lower` : `BST`  $\rightarrow$  `Int`

`upper` : `BST`  $\rightarrow$  `Int`

that return the lower and upper bounds of integers in a BST, and return `maxInt` and `minInt`, respectively, on empty BSTs. We also assume some additional constants and primitive functions:

`minInt` : `Int`

`maxInt` : `Int`

`min` : `x:Int`  $\rightarrow$  `y:Int`  $\rightarrow$   $\{z:\text{Int} \mid z \leq x \wedge z \leq y\}$

`max` : `x:Int`  $\rightarrow$  `y:Int`  $\rightarrow$   $\{z:\text{Int} \mid z \geq x \wedge z \geq y\}$

The type of a binary search tree with integers in the range  $[lo, hi]$  is defined by the contract type:

$\text{BST}_{lo,hi} = \{x:\text{BST} \mid lo \leq \text{lower}(x) \wedge \text{upper}(x) < hi\}$

Binary search tree are created using the constructors `empty` and `node`, which are assigned the following precise types:

`empty` : `lo:Int`  $\rightarrow$  `hi:Int`  $\rightarrow$  `BSTlo,hi`

```

node  :  lo:Int → hi:Int →
        v:{v:Int | lo ≤ v < hi} →
        x:BSTlo,v → y:BSTv,hi → BSTlo,hi

```

Here, these constructors take additional “index” arguments *lo* and *hi*, and so we are using an index-type-like implementation of binary search trees. Using these constructors, we can define the **insert** operation on BSTs:

```

fixT(λf:T.
  λlo:Int. λhi:Int.
  λv:{y:Int | lo ≤ y < hi}.
  λx:BSTlo,hi.
  case x of empty lo hi ▷
    (node lo hi v (empty lo v) (empty v hi)) else
  case x of (node lo hi n l r) ▷
    (case v < n of
      true ▷ (node lo hi n (insert lo n x l) r)
      else case v < n of
        false ▷ (node lo hi n l (insert n hi x r))
        else Ω)
    else Ω)

```

where **insert** has type

```

T  =  lo:Int → hi:Int →
      v:{v:Int | lo ≤ v < hi} →
      BSTlo,hi → BSTlo,hi

```

All the proof obligations generated for this program are formulae over linear integer inequalities, and hence decidable.

In this example, the variables *lo* and *hi* are somewhat awkward, and provide an indirect specification of the behavior of **insert**. We can express this program more naturally by removing these parameters instead expressing the key data invariants directly in terms of the underlying data structure. In this formulation, the **BST** constructors have the more natural types:

```

empty  :  BSTmaxInt,minInt
node   :  v:Int →
          x:{x:BST | upper(x) < v} →
          y:{y:BST | v ≤ lower(y)} →
          BSTlower(x),upper(y)

```

The revised **insert** implementation is identical to the one shown above but elides index

variables:

```

fixT'(λf:T'. λv:Int. λx:BST.

  case x of empty ▷ (node v empty empty) else

  case x of (node n l r) ▷

    (case v < n of

      true ▷ (node n (insert x l) r)

    else case v < n of

      false ▷ (node n l (insert x r))

    else Ω)

  else Ω)

```

and has the following type  $T'$ :

$$T' = v:\text{Int} \rightarrow x:\text{BST} \rightarrow \text{BST}_{\min(\text{lower}(x),v),\max(\text{upper}(x),v)}$$

## 6.8 Related Work

First, we present a high-level comparison of contract types with indexed types, an alternative approach towards similar goals. We next survey other applications of existential quantification in type systems. Finally, we briefly outline the development of refinement and contract types which this work directly builds upon.

## Indexed Types

One solution, adopted by Dependent ML [Xi and Pfenning 1999], ATS [?], and Omega [Sheard 2005], is to distinguish compile-time from run-time data, and allow types to depend only on compile-time data. This approach makes compositionality a vacuous proposition, and indeed can sometimes be encoded in existing polymorphic type systems without use of dependent types [Zenger 1997; McBride 2002].

A concrete technique that is common in all of the above systems is the use of *indexed types*. An illustrative example is the family of types  $\text{IntList}_n$ , where  $n$  indicates the length of lists inhabiting the type. The types of list constructors and the **append** function are as follows. We use the type  $\mathbb{N}$  to distinguish the compile-time type of natural numbers.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{nil} &: \text{IntList}_0 \\
\text{cons} &: n:\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{IntList}_n \rightarrow \text{IntList}_{n+1} \\
\text{append} &: m:\mathbb{N} \rightarrow n:\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \\
&\quad \text{IntList}_m \rightarrow \text{IntList}_n \rightarrow \text{IntList}_{m+n}
\end{aligned}$$

The connection between run-time invariants and compile-time data is based essentially on injecting an abstraction of run-time data into compile-time data; for example lists indexed by their length use a compile-time copy of the natural numbers. The expressions that are reflected into indices can be carefully controlled to ensure that type compatibility remains decidable.

We can naturally express the indexed type  $\text{IntList}_n$  as the contract type

$\{x : \text{IntList} \mid \text{length}(x) = n\}$ , and the above types and all proof obligations remain equivalent. In this way, by reifying the abstraction function from a value to its associated index, arbitrary indexed types can be embedded into general contract types. The abstraction function may be treated as an uninterpreted symbol – its definition cannot be necessary in proof obligation since it is not even available to indexed types.

The above type for **append** is somewhat awkward, though, as it requires the additional index parameters  $n$  and  $m$ .<sup>2</sup> In contrast, general contract types allow a more natural expression of the same specification for **append**, that eliminates these index parameters:

$$x : \text{IntList} \rightarrow y : \text{IntList} \rightarrow \\ \{z : \text{IntList} \mid \text{length}(z) = \text{length}(x) + \text{length}(y)\}$$

More critical than the aesthetic issue of index parameters, the index of a data structure, decided by its implementor, determines which properties may be reasoned about, inhibiting reuse and composition of data structures. For example, if one is interested in verifying the ordering of a list, rather than its length, then a different index is required, specifically the minimum element (at the head of the list) to specify **cons**, and also the maximum element (at the tail) to specify **append**. We also need integers indexed by their exact values  $\text{Int}_i$ , where  $i$  is drawn from compile-time integers  $\mathbb{Z}$  (with  $\pm\infty$  for corner cases). We define the type  $\text{IntList}_{i,j}$  of lists in ascending order with minimum element  $i$  and maximum element  $j$  using the following constructors. Note that predicate subtypes are used on indices of compile-time type  $\mathbb{Z}$  but not on runtime

<sup>2</sup>Note that these index parameters can be inferred in many cases.

terms.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{nil} & : \text{IntList}_{\infty, -\infty} \\ \text{cons} & : i : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow j : \{j : \mathbb{Z} \mid j \geq i\} \rightarrow k : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \\ & \quad \text{Int}_i \rightarrow \text{IntList}_{j,k} \rightarrow \text{IntList}_{i, \max(i,k)} \\ \text{append} & : i : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow j : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow k : \{k : \mathbb{Z} \mid k \geq j\} \rightarrow l : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \\ & \quad \text{IntList}_{i,j} \rightarrow \text{IntList}_{k,l} \rightarrow \text{IntList}_{\min(i,k), l} \end{aligned}$$

In general, since the index of a data type determines the properties that may be reasoned about, more complex properties require embedding of more data as indices. In the limit, giving the precise type  $x : \text{IntList} \rightarrow \{y : \text{IntList} \mid y = x\}$  to the identity function on lists (or any type) requires embedding the entire type of lists (or any type) into the index language, which reduces the utility of the syntactic distinction of compile-time data.

In contrast general contract types, can naturally express a wide variety of refinements over the same  $\text{IntList}$  type, such as  $\{x : \text{IntList} \mid \text{minElem}(x) = i \wedge \text{maxElem}(x) = j\}$  or the most natural  $\{x : \text{IntList} \mid \text{isSorted}(x)\}$ . The proof obligations for the latter may be more problematic, and the current work is progress towards characterizing those situations where they are not difficult.

## Existential Types

Formal existential quantification in type-theory has found a variety of uses, including closure conversion [Grossman 2002], module systems [Mitchell and Plotkin 1988; Harper and Lillibridge 1994; Dreyer et al. 2003], and semantics of object orienta-

tion [?]. Most similar to the present work are ML module systems, which also combine it with subtyping and a different (formal) form of singleton types.

The standard substitution-based typing rule for function application is unsound in the presence of effects, so dependencies have to be “forgotten” [Harper and Lillibridge 1994]. Dreyer et al. [2003] ameliorate this restriction with a sophisticated effect system that restores the power of dependent application in the event that the argument to a function is effect-free.

Also similar is the need to express sharing constraints. Just as we give self types to variables, ? and subsequently Dreyer et al. [2003] assign singleton kinds (a special syntactic form) to modules in order to preserve information when applying a dependently-kinded functor. In contrast to module languages, we examine the consequences and form of existentials and selfification in the context of dependent contracts with pattern matching and automatic theorem proving. Our singletons are expressed in the existing type language rather than adding a special form, and in our setting a type of a variable  $x$  may constrain other bound variables so we maintain this information while adding the identity information to the known type of  $x$ .

Our different approaches and goals led us to emphasize compositional reasoning as a key aspect of our system, which we present in a more minimal calculus than the large and practical ML module type systems. Compositionality is obviously important in their work as well, since it affects separate (re-)compilation.

Our existential types are a limited expression of  $\Sigma$  types for dependent pairs in powerful type theories such as those underlying Coq [The Coq development team

2012], Hoare Type Theory [Nanevski et al. 2006], and Epigram [McBride and McKinna 2004]. Dependent ML, in fact, makes use of types such as  $\Sigma x : T_1. T_2$  with explicit introduction and elimination forms (i.e. without subtyping) to allow functions operating over arguments of unknown index.

With respect to  $\Sigma$  types, our work can be interpreted as a way of providing automation for a simple and common case where the full power of these type theories is not necessary.

TODO DISCUSSION LIQUID HERE A BIT. Discuss how their forced let-binding provides the same restrictions as our compositionality, or whatever.

## Chapter 7

# Sage: An Implemenation of Executable Refinement Types

This chapter explores the implementation possibilities provided by the prior chapters' variety of theoretical techniques for working with executable refinement types. Of interest are question such as:

- How long does type checking take?
- How effective are state-of-the-art theorem provers at dispatching the obligations that arise?
- Can real programs be easily written and specified in a coherent language?

To place these questions introductory context of this dissertation, consider again this variety of specifications for a function that inverts a matrix, reproduced here verbatim for reference:

1. The argument can be any (dynamically-typed) value.
2. The argument must be an array of arrays of numbers.
3. The argument must be a *matrix*, that is, a rectangular (non-ragged) array of arrays of numbers.
4. The argument must be a square matrix.
5. The argument must be a square matrix that satisfies the predicate `isInvertible`.

This chapter presents SAGE, which addresses the questions surrounding implementation with a type system supporting *all* of these specifications in a unified theory.

On a technical level, the SAGE type system can be viewed as a synthesis of three concepts: the type `Dynamic` of terms that “may be” any value expressible in the language; arbitrary refinement types; and first-class types. These features add expressive power in three orthogonal directions, yet they all cooperate neatly within SAGE’s hybrid static/dynamic checking framework.

**Type Dynamic.** The type `Dynamic` [Henglein 1994; ?; Thatte 1990] enables SAGE to support dynamically-typed programming. `Dynamic` is a supertype of all types; any value can be upcast to type `Dynamic`, and a value of declared type `Dynamic` can be implicitly downcast (via a run-time check) to a more precise type. Such downcasts are implicitly inserted when necessary, such as when the operation `add1` (which expects an `Int`) is applied to a variable of type `Dynamic`. Thus, declaring variables to have type `Dynamic` (which is the default if type annotations are omitted) leads to a dynamically-typed, Scheme-like style of programming.

These dynamically-typed programs can later be annotated with traditional type specifications like `Int` and `Bool`. One nice aspect of our system is that the programmer need not fully annotate the program with types in order to reap some benefit. Types enable SAGE to check more properties statically, but it is still able to fall back to dynamic checking whenever the type `Dynamic` is encountered.

**Refinement Types.** SAGE supports high precision specifications via executable refinement types. For example, the following code snippet defines the type of integers in the range from `lo` (inclusive) to `hi` (exclusive):

```
{ x:Int | lo <= x && x < hi }
```

SAGE extends prior chapters by allowing refinement of any type. This may result in challenges to decidability, or even trouble translating proof obligations to a language a prover can understand, but the HTC techniques are fully capable of handling this type language.

**First-Class Types.** Finally, SAGE elevates types to be first-class values, in the tradition of Pure Type Systems [?]. Thus, types can be returned from functions, which permits function abstractions to abstract over types as well as terms. For example, the following function `Range` takes two integers and returns the *type* of integers within that range:

```
let Range (lo:Int) (hi:Int) : *
  = { x:Int | lo <= x && x < hi };
```

Here, `*` is the type of types and indicates that `Range` returns a type. Similarly, we can pass types to functions, as in the following polymorphic identity function:

```
let id (T:*) (x:T) : T = x;
```

The traditional limitation of both first-class types and unrestricted refinement types is that they are not statically decidable. We are well-equipped to address this limitation. We will see that in practice, most errors detected statically, and violations of some complicated specifications detected at run time.

## 7.1 Review of Hybrid Type Checking

Hybrid type checking is described in detail in Chapter 4 but due to the intervening chapters and the new context we briefly review by considering the function application

(**factorial**  $t$ )

Suppose **factorial** has type  $\text{Pos} \rightarrow \text{Pos}$ , where  $\text{Pos} = \{x : \text{Int} \mid x > 0\}$  is the type of positive integers, and that  $t$  has some type  $T$ . If the type checker can prove (or refute) that  $T <: \text{Pos}$ , then this application is well-typed (or ill-typed, respectively). However, if  $T$  is a complex refinement type or a complex type-producing computation, SAGE may be unable to either prove or refute that  $T <: \text{Pos}$  because subtyping is undecidable.


In this situation, SAGE enforces the specification of **factorial** dynamically, by inserting the following *type cast* to ensure at run time that the result of  $e$  is a positive integer:

**factorial** ( $\langle \text{Pos} \rangle e$ )

This approach works regardless of whether  $T$  is the type **Dynamic**, a complex refinement type, or a complex type-producing computation.

Chapter 4 explored hybrid type checking in an idealized setting, that of the simply-typed lambda-calculus with refinements only on the base types **Int** and **Bool** [Knowles and Flanagan 2010]. This paper adapts hybrid type checking to the more technically challenging domain of a rich language that includes all of the features described above. We also provide an implementation and experimental validation of this approach.

Figure 7.1: Sage Architecture



## 7.2 The Sage Architecture

The overall architecture of the SAGE system is shown in Figure ?? . A key component of the SAGE system is its subtype algorithm, which attempts to prove or disprove a subtype relationship  $S <: T$  (in the context of an environment  $\Gamma$ ). To obtain adequate precision, the subtype algorithm incorporates the following two modules:

**Theorem Prover.** Testing subtyping between refinement types reduces to testing implication between refinement predicates. In order to reason about these predicates, the subtype algorithm translates each implication between SAGE predicates into a validity test of a logical formula, which can be passed to an automated theorem prover



(currently Simplify [Detlefs et al. 2005]).

**Counter-Example Database.** If a cast inserted by the hybrid type checker from type  $S$  to type  $T$  fails at run time, SAGE stores in a counter-example database the fact that  $S$  is not a subtype of  $T$ . The subtype algorithm consults this database during type checking and will subsequently reject any program that relies on  $S$  being a subtype of  $T$ . Thus, dynamic type errors actually improve the ability of the SAGE type checker to detect type errors statically.

Moreover, when such a cast fails, SAGE will report a list of known programs that contain the same (or a sufficiently similar) cast, since these programs may also fail at run time. Thus, the counter-example database functions somewhat like a regression test suite, in that it can detect errors in previously type-checked programs.

Over time, we predict that the database will grow to be a valuable repository of common but invalid subtype relationships, leading to further improvements in the checker’s precision and less reliance on inserted casts.

The combination of these features yields a subtype algorithm that is quite precise — the number of inserted casts is very small or zero on all of our benchmarks. Dynamic checks are only necessary for a few particularly complicated cases.

## Organization of this Chapter

- Section 7.3 illustrates the SAGE language through a series of examples.
- Sections 7.4 and 7.6 define the syntax, semantics, and type system for SAGE.

- Section 7.7 presents a hybrid type checking / cast insertion algorithm for the language.
- Sections 7.8 and 7.9 describe our implementation and experimental results.
- Sections 7.10 and 7.11 discuss related work and future plans.

## 7.3 Examples of Sage programs

We introduce SAGE through several examples, reintroducing hybrid type checking in this rich context, including refinement types, dependent function types, datatypes, and recursive types. We focus primarily on programs with fairly complete specifications to highlight these features. Programs could rely more on the type `Dynamic` than these, albeit with fewer static guarantees.

### Binary Search Trees

We begin with the commonly-studied example of binary search trees, whose SAGE implementation is shown in Figure ?? . The variable `Range` is of type `Int → Int → *`, where `*` is the type of types. Given two integers `lo` and `hi`, the application `Range lo hi` returns the following refinement type describing integers in the range `[lo, hi)`:

$$\{x:\text{Int} \mid \text{lo} \leq x \ \&\& \ x < \text{hi} \}$$

A binary search tree (`BST lo hi`) is an ordered tree containing integers in the range `[lo, hi)`. A tree may either be `Empty`, or a `Node` containing an integer  $v \in [\text{lo}, \text{hi})$

and two subtrees containing integers in the ranges  $[lo, v)$  and  $[v, hi)$ , respectively. Thus, the type of binary search trees explicates the requirement that these trees must be ordered.

The function `search` takes as arguments two integers `lo` and `hi`, a binary search tree of type `(BST lo hi)`, and an integer `x` in the range  $[lo, hi)$ . Note that SAGE supports dependent function types, and so the type of the third argument to `search` can depend on the values of the first and second arguments. The function `search` then checks if `x` is in the tree. The function `insert` takes similar arguments and extends the given tree with the integer `x`.

The SAGE system uses an automatic theorem prover to statically verify that the specified ordering invariants on binary search trees are satisfied by these two functions. Thus, no run-time checking is required for this example.

The precise type specifications enable SAGE to detect various common programming errors. For example, suppose we inadvertently used the wrong conditional

```
24:      if x <= v
```

For this (incorrect and ill-typed) program, SAGE will report that the specification for `insert` is violated by the first recursive call:

```
line 25: x does not have type (Range lo v)
```

Similarly, if one of the arguments to the constructor `Node` is incorrect, *e.g.*:

```
26:      else Node lo hi v r (insert v hi r x);
```

Figure 7.2: Binary Search Trees

```
1: let Range (lo:Int) (hi:Int) : * =
2:   {x:Int | lo <= x && x < hi };
3:
4: datatype BST (lo:Int) (hi:Int) =
5:   Empty
6: | Node of (v:Range lo hi)*(BST lo v)*(BST v hi);
7:
8: let rec search (lo:Int) (hi:Int) (t:BST lo hi)
9:   (x:Range lo hi) : Bool =
10:  case t of
11:    Empty -> false
12:  | Node v l r ->
13:    if x = v then true
14:    else if x < v
15:      then search lo v l x
16:      else search v hi r x;
17:
18: let rec insert (lo:Int) (hi:Int) (t:BST lo hi)
19:   (x:Range lo hi) : (BST lo hi) =
20:  case t of
21:    Empty ->
22:      Node lo hi x (Empty lo x) (Empty x hi)
23:  | Node v l r ->
24:    if x < v
25:      then Node lo hi v (insert lo v l x) r
26:    else Node lo hi v l (insert v hi r x);
```

SAGE will report the type error:

```
line 26:  r does not have type (BST lo v)
```

Notably, a traditional type system that does not support precise specifications would not detect either of these errors.

Using this BST implementation, constructing trees with specific constraints is straightforward (and verifiable). For example, the following code constructs a tree containing only positive numbers:

```
let PosBST : * = BST 1 MAXINT;
let nil : PosBST = Empty 1 MAXINT;
let add (t:PosBST) (x:Range 1 MAXINT) : PosBST =
  insert 1 MAXINT t x;
let find (t:PosBST) (x:Range 1 MAXINT) : Bool =
  search 1 MAXINT t x;

let t : PosBST = add (add (add nil 1) 3) 5;
```

Note that this fully-typed BST implementation inter-operates with dynamically-typed client code:

```
let t : Dynamic = (add nil 1) in find t 5;
```

## Regular Expressions

We now consider a more complicated specification. Figure ?? declares the `Regex` data type and the function `match`, which determines if a string matches a regular expression. The `Regex` datatype includes constructors to match any single letter (`Alpha`) or any single letter or digit (`AlphaNum`), as well as usual the Kleene

Figure 7.3: Regular Expressions and Names

```
datatype Regex =
  Alpha
| AlphaNum
| Kleene of Regex
| Concat of Regex * Regex
| Or of Regex * Regex
| Empty;

let match (r:Regex) (s:String) : Bool = ...

let Name = {s:String | match (Kleene AlphaNum) s};
```

closure, concatenation, and choice operators. As an example, the regular expression “[a-zA-Z0-9]\*” would be represented in our datatype as `(Kleene AlphaNum)`.

The code then uses `match` to define the type `Name`, which refines the type `String` to allow only alphanumeric strings. We use the type `Name` to enforce an important, security-related interface specification for the following function `authenticate`. This function performs authentication by querying a SQL database (where ‘^’ denotes string concatenation):

```
let authenticate (user:Name) (pass:Name) : Bool =
  let query : String =
    ("SELECT count(*) FROM client WHERE name =" ^
     user ^ " and pwd=" ^ pass) in
  executeSQLquery(query) > 0;
```

This code is prone to security attacks if given specially-crafted non-alphanumeric strings.

For example, calling

```
authenticate "admin --" ""
```

breaks the authentication mechanism because “--” starts a comment in SQL and consequently “comments out” the password part of the query. To prohibit this vulnerability, the type:

```
authenticate : Name → Name → Bool
```

specifies that `authenticate` should be applied only to alphanumeric strings.

Next, consider the following user-interface code:

```
let username : String = readString() in
let password : String = readString() in
authenticate username password;
```

This code is ill-typed, since it passes arbitrary user input of type `String` to `authenticate`.

However, proving that this code is ill-typed is quite difficult, since it depends on complex reasoning showing that the user-defined function `match` is not a tautology, and hence that not all `Strings` are `Names`.

In fact, SAGE cannot statically verify or refute this code. Instead, it inserts the following casts at the call site to enforce the specification for `authenticate` dynamically:

```
authenticate ((Name)username) ((Name)password);
```

At run time, these casts check that `username` and `password` are alphanumeric strings satisfying the predicate `match (Kleene AlphaNum)`. If the `username` “admin --” is ever entered, the cast `((Name)username)` will fail and halt program execution.

### 7.3.1 Counter-Example Database

Somewhat surprisingly, a dynamic cast failure actually strengthens SAGE’s ability to detect type errors statically. In particular, the string “admin --” is a witness

proving that not all `Strings` are `Names`, *i.e.*,  $\Gamma \not\vdash \text{String} <: \text{Name}$  (where  $\Gamma$  is the typing environment for the call to `authenticate`). Rather than discarding this information, and potentially observing the same error on later runs or in different programs, such refuted subtype relationships are stored in a database. If the above code is later revisited, the SAGE type checker will discover upon consulting this database that `String` is not a subtype of `Name`, and it will statically reject the call to `authenticate` as ill-typed.

Additionally, the database stores a list of other programs previously type-checked under the assumption that `String` may be a subtype of `Name`. These programs may also fail at run time and SAGE will also report that they should be revisited using the more-informed type checker. It remains to be seen how to best incorporate this feature into a development process.

## Printf

As a final example, we examine the `printf` function. The number and type of the expected arguments to `printf` depends in subtle ways on the format string (the first argument). In SAGE, we can assign to `printf` the precise type:

```
printf : (format:String) -> (Printf_Args format)
```

where the user-defined function

```
Printf_Args : String -> *
```

returns the `printf` argument types for the given format string. For example, `(Printf_Args "%d%d")` evaluates to the type `Int → Int → Unit`. Calls to `printf` are assigned precise types,

such as:

```
printf "%d%d" : Int -> Int -> Unit
```

since this term has type `(Printf.Args "%d%d")`, which in turn evaluates to `Int → Int → Unit`.

Thus, the SAGE language is sufficiently expressive to need no special support for accommodating `printf` and catching errors in `printf` clients statically. In contrast, other language implementations require special rules in the compiler or run time to ensure the type safety of calls to `printf`. For example, Scheme [?] and GHC [??] leave all type checking of arguments to the run time. OCaml [?], on the other hand, performs static checking, but it requires the format string to be constant.

SAGE can statically check many uses of `printf` with non-constant format strings, as illustrated by the following example:

```
let repeat (s:String) (n:Int) : String =
  if (n = 0) then "" else (s ^ (repeat s (n-1)));

// checked statically:
printf (repeat "%d" 2) 1 2;
```

The SAGE type checker infers that `printf (repeat "%d" 2)` has type `Printf.Args (repeat "%d" 2)`, which evaluates (at cast insertion time) to `Int → Int → Unit`, and hence this call is well-typed. Conversely, the type checker would statically reject the following ill-typed call:

```
// compile-time error:
printf (repeat "%d" 2) 1 false;
```

For efficiency, and to avoid non-termination, the type checker performs only a bounded number of evaluation steps before resorting to dynamic checking. Thus, the following

call requires a run-time check:

```
// run-time error:
printf (repeat "%d" 20) 1 2 ... 19 false;
```

As expected, the inserted dynamic cast catches the error.

Our current SAGE implementation is not yet able to statically verify that the implementation of `printf` matches its specification (`format:String → (Printf.Args format)`). As a result, the type checker inserts a single dynamic type cast into the `printf` implementation. This example illustrates the flexibility of hybrid checking — the `printf` specification is enforced dynamically on the `printf` implementation, but also enforced (primarily) statically on client code. We revisit this example in Section 7.7 to illustrate SAGE’s cast insertion algorithm.

## 7.4 The Sage Core Language

SAGE programs are desugared into a small core language shown in Figure 7.4, which includes variables, constants, functions, function applications, and let expressions. We use the same metavariable conventions from the rest of this dissertation with few differences that will be clear from context. Most importantly, the syntactic sort of types and terms is merged, so we freely use metavariables for either; the choice is for clarity only.

The SAGE type system assigns a type to each well-formed term. Since each type is simply a particular kind of term, it is also assigned a type, specifically the type “\*”, which is the type of types [?]. Thus, `Int`, `Bool`, and `Unit` all have type `*`. Also, `*`

Figure 7.4: Sage Syntax

$d, e, f, g, S, T, U ::=$	<i>Terms:</i>
$x$	variable
$k$	constant
$\text{let } x:S = e \text{ in } e$	binding
$\lambda x:S. e$	abstraction
$f e$	application
$x:S \rightarrow T$	function type
$u, v, V, W ::=$	<i>Values</i>
$\lambda x:S. e$	abstraction
$x:S \rightarrow T$	function type
$k$	constant
$k v_1 \dots v_n$	constant, $0 < n < \text{arity}(c)$
$\text{Refine } W v$	refinement
$\text{fix } W v$	recursive type

Figure 7.5: Constants

```

* : *
Unit : *
Bool : *
Int : *
Dynamic : *
Refine : X:* → (X → Bool) → *

unit : Unit
true : {b:Bool | b}
false : {b:Bool | not b}
not : b:Bool → {b':Bool | b' = not b}
n : {m:Int | m = n}
+ : n:Int → m:Int → {z:Int | z = n + m}
= : x:Dynamic → y:Dynamic → {b:Bool | b = (x = y)}

if : X:* → p:Bool →
    ({d:Unit | p} → X) →
    ({d:Unit | not p} → X) →
    X

fix : X:* → (X → X) → X
cast : X:* → Dynamic → X

```

Figure 7.6: Shorthands

$$\begin{aligned}
 S \rightarrow T &= x:S \rightarrow T \quad x \notin FV(T) \\
 \langle T \rangle &= \mathbf{cast} \ T \\
 \{x:T \mid p\} &= \mathbf{Refine} \ T \ (\lambda x:T. p) \\
 \mathbf{if} - \text{XXXXXXXXXXXX} \ p \ d \ eT &= \\
 \mathbf{if} \ T \ p \ (\lambda x:\{d:\mathbf{Unit} \mid p\}.d) \ (\lambda x:\{d:\mathbf{Unit} \mid \mathbf{not} \ p\}.e)
 \end{aligned}$$

itself has type  $*$ .

The unification of types and terms allows us to pass types to and from functions. For example, the following function `UnaryOp` is a type operator that, given a type such as `Int`, returns the type of functions from `Int` to `Int`.

$$\mathbf{UnaryOp} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda X:*. (X \rightarrow X)$$

Type-valued arguments also support the definition of polymorphic functions, such as `applyTwice`, where the application `applyTwice Int add1` returns a function that adds two to any integer. Thus, polymorphic instantiation is explicit in SAGE.<sup>1</sup>

$$\mathbf{applyTwice} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda X:*. \lambda f: (\mathbf{UnaryOp} \ X). \lambda x: X. f(f(x))$$

<sup>1</sup>We do not leverage the parametricity of these functions explicitly in our type-checking algorithms. But these guys do? CITE LIQUID

So, while the language includes dependent function types  $x : S \rightarrow T$ . However, we choose to express all other types and program constructions as built-in constants. The constant `Refine` enables precise refinements of existing types. Suppose  $f : T \rightarrow \mathbf{Bool}$  is some arbitrary predicate over type  $T$ . Then the type `Refine T f` denotes the *refinement* of  $T$  containing all values of type  $T$  that satisfy the predicate  $f$ . Following our notation established in previous chapters, we use the shorthand  $\{x:T \mid p\}$  to abbreviate `Refine T (λx:T.p)`.

We use refinement types to assign precise types to constants. For example, as shown in Figure 7.4, an integer  $n$  has the precise type  $\{m:\mathbf{Int} \mid m = n\}$  denoting the singleton set  $\{n\}$ . Similarly, the type of the operation  $+$  specifies that its result is the sum of its arguments:

$$n:\mathbf{Int} \rightarrow m:\mathbf{Int} \rightarrow \{z:\mathbf{Int} \mid z = n + m\}$$

The apparent circularity where the type of  $+$  is defined in terms of  $+$  itself does not cause any difficulties in our technical development, since the semantics of refinement types is defined in terms of the operational semantics.

In particular, the “then” parameter to `if` is a thunk of type  $(\{d:\mathbf{Unit} \mid p\} \rightarrow X)$ . That thunk can be invoked only if the domain  $\{d:\mathbf{Unit} \mid p\}$  is inhabited, *i.e.*, only if the test expression  $p$  evaluates to `true`. Thus the type of `if` precisely specifies its behavior.

The constant `fix` enables the definition of recursive functions and recursive

types. For example, the type of integer lists is defined via the least fixpoint operation:

$$\text{fix } * \ (\lambda L : *. \text{Sum Unit (Pair Int } L))$$

which (roughly speaking) returns a type  $L$  satisfying the equation:

$$L = \text{Sum Unit (Pair Int } L)$$

(Here, **Sum** and **Pair** are the usual type constructors for sums and pairs, respectively.)

The SAGE language includes two constants that are crucial for enabling hybrid type checking: **Dynamic** and **cast**. The type constant **Dynamic** [Abadi et al. 1991; Thatte 1990] can be thought of as the most general type. Every value has type **Dynamic**, and casts can be used to convert values from type **Dynamic** to other types (and of course such downcasts may fail if applied to inappropriate values).

The constant **cast** performs dynamic checks or coercions between types. It takes as arguments a type  $T$  and a value (of type **Dynamic**), and it attempts to cast that value to type  $T$ . We use the shorthand  $\langle T \rangle e$  to abbreviate **cast**  $T e$ . Thus, for example, the expression

$$\langle \{x : \text{Int} \mid x \geq 0\} \rangle y$$

casts the integer  $y$  to the refinement type of natural numbers, and fails if  $y$  is negative.

## 7.5 Operational Semantics of Sage

We formalize the execution behavior of SAGE programs with the small-step operational semantics shown in Figure 7.7. Because of the richness of SAGE's syntax,

Figure 7.7: Evaluation Rules

Evaluation	$s \rightsquigarrow t$
$\mathcal{C}[d] \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C}[e] \quad \text{if } d \rightsquigarrow e$	[E-COMPAT]
$(\lambda x : S. e) v \rightsquigarrow [x \mapsto v] e$	[E-APP]
$\text{let } x : S = v \text{ in } e \rightsquigarrow [x \mapsto v] e$	[E-LET]
$\text{if}_T \text{ true } v_1 v_2 \rightsquigarrow v_1 \text{ unit}$	[E-IF1]
$\text{if}_T \text{ false } v_1 v_2 \rightsquigarrow v_2 \text{ unit}$	[E-IF2]
$\langle \text{Bool} \rangle \text{ true} \rightsquigarrow \text{true}$	[E-CAST-BOOL1]
$\langle \text{Bool} \rangle \text{ false} \rightsquigarrow \text{false}$	[E-CAST-BOOL2]
$\langle \text{Unit} \rangle \text{ unit} \rightsquigarrow \text{unit}$	[E-CAST-UNIT]
$\langle \text{Int} \rangle n \rightsquigarrow n$	[E-CAST-INT]
$\langle \text{Dynamic} \rangle v \rightsquigarrow v$	[E-CAST-DYN]
$\langle x : S \rightarrow T \rangle v \rightsquigarrow \lambda x : S. \langle T \rangle (v (\langle D \rangle x))$ where $D = \text{domain}(v)$	[E-CAST-FN]
$\langle \text{Refine } T f \rangle v \rightsquigarrow \langle T \rangle v$ if $f (\langle T \rangle v) \rightsquigarrow^* \text{true}$	[E-REFINE]
$\langle * \rangle v \rightsquigarrow v$ if $v \in \{\text{Int}, \text{Bool}, \text{Unit}, \text{Dynamic}, x : S \rightarrow T, \text{fix } * f, *, \text{Refine } T f\}$	[E-CAST-TYPE]
$S[\text{fix } U v] \rightsquigarrow S[v (\text{fix } U v)]$	[E-FIX]
$\mathcal{E} ::= \bullet \mid \mathcal{E} e \mid v \mathcal{E}$	<i>Evaluation Contexts</i>
$S ::= \bullet v \mid \langle \bullet \rangle v$	<i>Strict Contexts</i>



much of the interesting evaluation rules can be encoded in the meaning function for constants. For clarity, we do not do this, but express the meaning of key constants such as **Cast** directly as evaluation rules. We do, however, elide standard and uninteresting semantics such as the basics of boolean and arithmetical operation.

Evaluation is performed inside evaluation contexts  $\mathcal{C}$ . Application, let expressions, and the basic integer and boolean operations behave as expected. Rule [E-EQ] uses syntactic equality ( $\equiv$ ) to test equivalence of all values, including function values<sup>2</sup>.

The most interesting reduction rules are those for casts  $\langle T \rangle v$ . Casts to one of the base types **Bool**, **Unit**, or **Int** succeed if the value  $v$  is of the appropriate type. Casts to type **Dynamic** always succeed.

Casts to function and refinement types are more complex. First, the following partial function *domain* returns the domain of a function value, and is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{domain} : \text{Value} &\rightarrow \text{Term} \\ \text{domain}(\lambda x:T. e) &= T \\ \text{domain}(\mathbf{fix} (x:T \rightarrow T') v) &= T \\ \text{domain}(k \ v_1 \dots v_{i-1}) &= \text{type of } i^{\text{th}} \text{ argument to } k \end{aligned}$$

The rule [E-CAST-FN] casts a function  $v$  to type  $x:S \rightarrow T$  by creating a new function:

$$\lambda x:S. \langle T \rangle v \ (\langle D \rangle x)$$

where  $D = \text{domain}(v)$  is the domain type of the function  $v$ . This new function takes a value  $x$  of type  $S$ , casts it to  $D$ , applies the given function  $v$ , and casts the result to the

<sup>2</sup>A semantic notion of equality for primitive types could provide additional flexibility, although such a notion would clearly be undecidable for higher-order types. In practice, syntactic equality has been sufficient.

desired result type  $T$ . Thus, casting a function to a different function type will always succeed, since the domain and range values are checked lazily, in a manner reminiscent of higher-order contracts [Findler and Felleisen 2002].

For a cast to a refinement type,  $\langle \mathbf{Refine} \ T \ f \rangle v$ , the rule [E-REFINE] first casts  $v$  to type  $T$  via the cast  $\langle T \rangle v$  and then checks if the predicate  $f$  holds on this value. If it does, the cast succeeds and returns  $\langle T \rangle v$ .

Casts to type  $*$  succeed only for special values of type  $*$ , via the rule [E-CAST-TYPE].

The operation **fix** is used to define recursive functions and types, which are considered values, and hence **fix**  $U \ v$  is also a value. However, when this construct **fix**  $U \ v$  appears in a *strict position* (i.e., in a function position or in a cast), the rule [E-FIX] performs one step of unrolling to yield  $v \ (\mathbf{fix} \ U \ v)$ .

## 7.6 The Sage Type System

The SAGE type system is defined via the type rules and judgments shown in Figure ???. Typing is performed in an environment  $\Gamma$  that binds variables to types and, in some cases, to values. We assume that variables are bound at most once in an environment and, as usual, we apply implicit  $\alpha$ -renaming of bound variables to maintain this assumption and to ensure that substitutions are capture-avoiding. In addition, we assume that the typing environment is well-formed according to the judgment  $\vdash \Gamma$ .

The SAGE type system guarantees *progress* (i.e., that well-typed programs can only get stuck due to failed casts) and *preservation* (i.e., that evaluation of a term

Figure 7.8: Type Rules

$\Gamma ::=$ $\emptyset$ $\Gamma, x : T$ $\Gamma, x = v : T$	<i>Environments:</i> empty environment environment extension environment term extension
Well-formed environment	$\boxed{\vdash \Gamma}$
$\frac{}{\vdash \emptyset} [\text{WE-EMPTY}]$	$\frac{\vdash \Gamma \quad \Gamma \vdash T : *}{\vdash \Gamma, x : T} [\text{WE-EXT1}]$
$\frac{\vdash \Gamma \quad \Gamma \vdash T : * \quad \Gamma \vdash e : T}{\vdash \Gamma, x : T = e} [\text{WE-EXT2}]$	
Type rules	$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash e : T}$
$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash k : ty(k)} [\text{T-CONST}]$	$\frac{(x : T) \in \Gamma \quad \text{or} \quad (x = v : T) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : \{y:T \mid y = x\}} [\text{T-VAR}]$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash S : * \quad \Gamma, x : S \vdash e : T}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x:S. e) : (x:S \rightarrow T)} [\text{T-FUN}]$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash S : * \quad \Gamma, x : S \vdash T : *}{\Gamma \vdash (x:S \rightarrow T) : *} [\text{T-ARROW}]$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash f : (x:S \rightarrow T) \quad \Gamma \vdash e : S}{\Gamma \vdash f e : [x \mapsto e] T} [\text{T-APP}]$	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash v : S \quad \Gamma, (x = v : S) \vdash e : T}{\Gamma \vdash \text{let } x:S = v \text{ in } e : [x \mapsto v] T} [\text{T-LET}]$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : S \quad \Gamma \vdash S <: T}{\Gamma \vdash e : T} [\text{T-SUB}]$

Figure 7.9: Subtyping Rules

Subtype rules	$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash S <: T}$
$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash T <: T} [\text{S-REFL}]$	$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash T <: \text{Dynamic}} [\text{S-DYN}]$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash T_1 <: S_1 \quad \Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash S_2 <: T_2}{\Gamma \vdash (x:S_1 \rightarrow S_2) <: (x:T_1 \rightarrow T_2)} [\text{S-FUN}]$	
$\frac{\Gamma, [x \mapsto v] F \vdash [x \mapsto v] S <: [x \mapsto v] T}{\Gamma, x = v : U, F \vdash S <: T} [\text{S-VAR}]$	$\frac{s \curvearrowright s' \quad \Gamma \vdash \mathcal{C}[s'] <: T}{\Gamma \vdash \mathcal{C}[s] <: T} [\text{S-EVAL-L}]$
$\frac{t \curvearrowright t' \quad \Gamma \vdash S <: \mathcal{C}[t']}{\Gamma \vdash S <: \mathcal{C}[t]} [\text{S-EVAL-R}]$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash S <: T}{\Gamma \vdash (\text{Refine } S f) <: T} [\text{S-REF-L}]$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash S <: T \quad \Gamma, x : S \models f x}{\Gamma \vdash S <: (\text{Refine } T f)} [\text{S-REF-R}]$	

preserves its type). The proofs appear in a companion report [?].

The main typing judgment

$$\Gamma \vdash e : T$$

assigns type  $T$  to term  $t$  in the environment  $\Gamma$ . In the rule [T-CONST], the auxiliary function  $ty$  returns the type of the constant  $c$ , as defined in Figure ???. The rule [T-VAR] for a variable  $x$  extracts the type  $T$  of  $x$  from the environment, and assigns to  $x$  the singleton refinement type<sup>3</sup>  $\{y:T \mid y = x\}$ . For a function  $\lambda x:S. e$ , the rule [T-FUN] infers the type  $T$  of  $e$  in an extended environment and returns the dependent function type  $x:S \rightarrow T$ , where  $x$  may occur free in  $T$ . The type  $x:S \rightarrow T$  is itself a term, which is assigned type  $*$  by rule [T-ARROW], provided that both  $S$  and  $T$  have type  $*$  in appropriate environments.

The rule [T-APP] for an application  $(f e)$  first checks that  $f$  has a function type  $x:S \rightarrow T$  and that  $e$  is in the domain of  $f$ . The result type is  $T$  with all occurrences of the formal parameter  $x$  replaced by the actual parameter  $e$ .

The type rule [T-LET] for  $\text{let } x:S = v \text{ in } e$  first checks that the type of the bound value  $v$  is  $S$ . Then  $e$  is typed in an environment that contains both the type and the value of  $x$ . These precise bindings are used in the subtype judgment, as described below. Subtyping is allowed at any point in a typing derivation via the rule [T-SUB].

#### WHY MUST THIS ONLY BE VALUE? SYNTAX ALLOWS EXPRESSIONS

<sup>3</sup>The necessity of this “selfification” was discovered prior to the work of Chapter 6 and was influenced more by Ou et al. [2004] but seems prescient in retrospect.

The subtype judgment

$$\Gamma \vdash S <: T$$

states that  $S$  is a subtype of  $T$  in the environment  $\Gamma$ , and it is defined as the greatest solution to the collection of subtype rules in Figure 7.9. The rules [S-REFL] and [S-DYN] allow every type to be a subtype both of itself and of the type **Dynamic**. The rule [S-FUN] for function types checks the usual contravariant/covariant subtype requirements on function domains and codomains. The rule [S-VAR] hygienically replaces a variable with the value to which it is bound.

The remaining rules are less conventional. Rules [S-EVAL-L] and [S-EVAL-R] state that the subtype relation is closed under evaluation of terms in arbitrary positions. In these rules,  $\mathcal{C}$  denotes an arbitrary context:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} ::= & \bullet \mid \mathcal{C} e \mid e \mathcal{C} \mid \lambda x:\mathcal{C}. e \mid \lambda x:T. \mathcal{C} \\ & \mid \text{let } x:S = \mathcal{C} \text{ in } e \mid \text{let } x:\mathcal{C} = e \text{ in } e \\ & \mid \text{let } x:S = e \text{ in } \mathcal{C} \end{aligned}$$

The rule [S-REF-L] states that, if  $S$  is a subtype of  $T$ , then any refinement of  $S$  is also a subtype of  $T$ . When  $S$  is a subtype of  $T$ , the rule [S-REF-R] invokes the theorem proving judgment  $\Gamma \models f x$ , discussed below, to determine if  $f x$  is valid for all values  $x$  of type  $S$ . If so, then  $S$  is a subtype of **Refine**  $T f$ .

Our type system is parameterized with respect to the theorem proving judgment

$$\Gamma \models p$$

which defines the validity of term  $p$  in an environment  $\Gamma$ . Chapter 3 demonstrates one way to construct such a judgement. Since this chapter is concerned with the implementation scenario where validity checking will be implemented by an off-the-shelf theorem prover, it is more appropriate and useful to discuss the axioms to which an implementation must adhere. In the following, all environments are assumed to be well-formed.

1. Faithfulness: If  $p \curvearrowright^* \mathbf{true}$  then  $\Gamma \models p$ . If  $p \curvearrowright^* \mathbf{false}$  then  $\Gamma \not\models p$ . EXCEPT IN CONTRADICTIONARY ENV??
2. Hypothesis: If  $(x : \{y : S \mid p\}) \in \Gamma$  then  $\Gamma \models [y \mapsto x] p$ .
3. Weakening: If  $\Gamma, \Gamma'' \models p$  then  $\Gamma, \Gamma', \Gamma'' \models p$ .
4. Substitution: If  $\Gamma, (x : S), \Gamma' \models p$  and  $\Gamma \vdash e : S$  then  $\Gamma, [x \mapsto e] F \models [x \mapsto e] p$ .
5. Exact Substitution:  $\Gamma, (x = v : S), \Gamma' \models p$  if and only if  $\Gamma, [x \mapsto v] \Gamma' \models [x \mapsto v] p$ .
6. Preservation: If  $e \curvearrowright^* e'$ , then  $\Gamma \models \mathcal{C}[e]$  if and only if  $\Gamma \models \mathcal{C}[e']$ .
7. Narrowing: If  $\Gamma, (x : T), \Gamma' \models p$  and  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  then  $\Gamma, (x : S), \Gamma' \models p$ .

A consequence of the Faithfulness axiom is that the validity judgment is undecidable. In addition, the subtype judgment may require an unbounded amount of evaluation during type checking. These decidability limitations motivate the development of the hybrid type checking techniques of the following section.

Figure 7.10: Cast Insertion Rules

Cast Insertion rules		$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash s \hookrightarrow t : T}$
$\frac{(x : T) \in \Gamma \quad \text{or} \quad (x = t : T) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x \hookrightarrow x : \{y : T \mid y = x\}} \text{ [C-VAR]}$	$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash k \hookrightarrow k : ty(k)} \text{ [C-CONST]}$	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash S \hookrightarrow S' \downarrow * \quad \Gamma, x : S' \vdash e \hookrightarrow e' : T}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x : S. e) \hookrightarrow (\lambda x : S'. e') : (x : S' \rightarrow T)} \text{ [C-FUN]}$		
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash S \hookrightarrow S' \downarrow * \quad \Gamma, x : S' \vdash T \hookrightarrow T' \downarrow *}{\Gamma \vdash (x : S \rightarrow T) \hookrightarrow (x : S' \rightarrow T') : *} \text{ [C-ARROW]}$		
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash f \hookrightarrow f' : U \quad unrefine(U) = x : S \rightarrow T \quad \Gamma \vdash e \hookrightarrow e' \downarrow S}{\Gamma \vdash f e \hookrightarrow f' e' : [x \mapsto e'] T} \text{ [C-APP1]}$		
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash f \hookrightarrow f' \downarrow (\mathbf{Dynamic} \rightarrow \mathbf{Dynamic}) \quad \Gamma \vdash e \hookrightarrow e' \downarrow \mathbf{Dynamic}}{\Gamma \vdash f e \hookrightarrow f' e' : \mathbf{Dynamic}} \text{ [C-APP2]}$		
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash S \hookrightarrow S' \downarrow * \quad \Gamma \vdash v \hookrightarrow v' \downarrow S' \quad \Gamma, (x = v' : S') \vdash e \hookrightarrow e' : T}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{let } x : S = v \mathbf{ in } e \hookrightarrow \mathbf{let } x : S' = v' \mathbf{ in } e' : [x \mapsto v'] T'} \text{ [C-LET]}$		
Compilation and Checking rules		$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e \downarrow T}$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e \hookrightarrow e' : S \quad \Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{\vee} S <: T}{\Gamma \vdash e \hookrightarrow e' \downarrow T} \text{ [CC-OK]}$		
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e \hookrightarrow e' : S \quad \Gamma \vdash_{alg}^? S <: T}{\Gamma \vdash e \hookrightarrow (\langle T \rangle e') \downarrow T} \text{ [CC-CHK]}$		

## 7.7 Hybrid Type Checking for Sage

The SAGE *cast insertion* algorithm shown in Figure ?? type checks programs and simultaneously inserts dynamic casts. These casts compensate for inevitable limitations in the SAGE subtype algorithm, which is a conservative approximation of the subtype relation.

### Algorithmic Subtyping

For any subtype query  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$ , the algorithmic subtyping judgment  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a S <: T$  returns a result  $a \in \{\sqrt{\phantom{x}}, \times, ?\}$  depending on whether the algorithm succeeds in proving ( $\sqrt{\phantom{x}}$ ) or refuting ( $\times$ ) the subtype query, or whether it cannot decide the query (?). Our algorithm conservatively approximates the subtype specification in Figure 7.8. However, special care must be taken in the treatment of **Dynamic**. Since we would like values of type **Dynamic** to be implicitly cast to other types, such as **Int**, the subtype algorithm should conclude  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^? \text{Dynamic} <: \text{Int}$  (forcing a cast from **Dynamic** to **Int**), even though clearly  $\Gamma \not\vdash \text{Dynamic} <: \text{Int}$ . We thus formalize our requirements for the subtype algorithm as the following lemma.

**Lemma 45 (Algorithmic Subtyping)**    1. If  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{\sqrt{\phantom{x}}} S <: T$  then  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$ .  
 2. If  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{\times} T_1 <: T_2$  then  $\forall F, S_1, S_2$  that are obtained from  $\Gamma, T_1, T_2$  by replacing the type **Dynamic** by any type, we have that  $F \not\vdash S_1 <: S_2$ .

Clearly, a naïve subtype algorithm could always return the result “?” and thus trivially satisfy these requirements, but more precise results enable SAGE to verify more

properties and to detect more errors statically.

This specification of the subtype algorithm is sufficient for describing the cast insertion process, and we defer presenting the full details of the algorithm until Section 7.8.

### Cast Insertion

Hybrid type checking for SAGE is expressed via the same judgements as for  $\lambda^H$  in Chapter 3:

- The cast insertion judgment  $\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e : T$  elaborates the source term  $d$ , in environment  $\Gamma$ , to a safe term  $e$  adding casts where necessary and synthesizing  $T$ .
- The cast insertion and checking judgment  $\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e \downarrow T$  takes as an input the desired type  $T$  and ensures that  $e$  has type  $T$  by adding necessary casts as determined by the conclusions from the subtyping algorithm.
- Algorithmic subtyping...
- The judgment  $\Gamma \vdash_{db}^{\times} S <: T$  represents a database of counterexamples – terms that have resulted in a cast failure during execution.
- The judgment  $\Gamma \models_{alg}^a p$  represents a theorem proving algorithm which soundly approximates the validity judgment. We describe our implementation in Section...

Many of the cast insertion rules are similar to the corresponding type rules or obvious analogues to the rules from Chapter 4, but a few have interesting new conse-

quences due to SAGE’s additional features. We will focus on the differences and their relationship with the implementation.

Rule [C-VAR] provides selfification of variables analogously to the type rule [T-VAR]; static checking is severely hampered without this. The rule [C-FUN] for a function  $\lambda x:S. e$  differs in that the input annotation  $S$  is, itself, a term, and is processed and verified to have type  $*$ . The rule [C-ARROW] handles a function type, which is just another term, by processing the two component types and checking that they both have type  $*$ . The rule [C-LET] processes the term  $\text{let } x:S = v \text{ in } e$  by recursively processing  $v$ ,  $S$  and  $e$  in appropriate environments.

The rules for function application are more interesting. The rule [C-APP1] processes an application  $f e$  by processing the function  $f$  to some term  $f'$  of some type  $U$ . The type  $U$  may be a function type embedded inside refinements. In order to extract the actual type of the parameter to the function, we use *unrefine* to remove any outer refinements of  $U$  before checking the type of the argument  $e$  against the expected type. Formally, *unrefine* is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{unrefine} : \text{Term} &\rightarrow \text{Term} \\ \text{unrefine}(x:S \rightarrow T) &= x:S \rightarrow T \\ \text{unrefine}(\text{Refine } T \ f) &= \text{unrefine}(T) \\ \text{unrefine}(S) &= \text{unrefine}(S') \quad \text{if } S \rightsquigarrow S' \end{aligned}$$

The last clause permits  $S$  to be simplified via evaluation while removing outer refinements. Given the expressiveness of the type system, this evaluation may not converge within a given time bound. Hence, to ensure that our compiler accepts all

(arbitrarily complicated) well-typed programs, the rule [C-APP2] provides a backup compilation strategy for applications that requires less static analysis, but performs more dynamic checking. This rule checks that the function expression has the most general function type  $\text{Dynamic} \rightarrow \text{Dynamic}$ , and correspondingly coerces  $e$  to type  $\text{Dynamic}$ , resulting in an application with type  $\text{Dynamic}$ .

The rules defining the cast insertion and checking judgment

$$\Gamma \vdash d \hookrightarrow e \downarrow T$$

illustrate the key ideas of hybrid type checking. The rules [CC-OK] and [CC-CHK] process the given term and check that the resulting term has the expected type  $T$  via the algorithmic subtyping judgment  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a S <: T$ . If this judgment succeeds ( $a = \sqrt{\phantom{x}}$ ), then [CC-OK] returns the term. If the subtyping judgment is undecided ( $a = ?$ ), then [CC-CHK] encloses the compiled term in the cast  $\langle T \rangle$  to preserve dynamic type safety.

The cast insertion rules guarantee that the resulting program is well-typed, and thus it can only go wrong due to failed casts. In addition, this property permits type-directed optimizations on compiled code. TALK ABOUT THIS IN THE APPROPRIATE PLACE.

## Example

To illustrate how SAGE verifies specifications statically when possible, but dynamically when necessary, we consider cast insertion for the following term:

$$t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{printf } "\%d" \ 4$$

For this term, the rule [C-APP1] will first compile the subexpression `(printf "%d")` via the following cast insertion judgment (based on the type of `printf` from Section 7.3.1):

$$\emptyset \vdash (\text{printf } \%d) \hookrightarrow (\text{printf } \%d) : (\text{Printf\_Args } \%d)$$

The rule [C-APP1] then calls the function *unrefine* to evaluate `(Printf_Args "%d")` to the normal form `Int → Unit`. Since 4 has type `Int`, the term *t* is therefore accepted as is; no casts are needed.

However, the computation for `(Printf_Args "%d")` may not terminate within a preset time limit. In this case, rule [C-APP2] applies to *t*:

$$(\langle \text{Dynamic} \rightarrow \text{Dynamic} \rangle (\text{printf } \%d)) \ 4$$

At run time, `(printf "%d")` will evaluate to some function  $(\lambda x:\text{Int}.e')$  that expects an `Int`, yielding the application:

$$(\langle \text{Dynamic} \rightarrow \text{Dynamic} \rangle (\lambda x:\text{Int}.e')) \ 4$$

The rule [E-CAST-FN] then reduces this term to:

$$(\lambda x:\text{Dynamic}.\langle \text{Dynamic} \rangle ((\lambda x:\text{Int}.e') (\langle \text{Int} \rangle x))) \ 4$$

where the nested cast  $\langle \text{Int} \rangle x$  dynamically ensures that the next argument to `printf` must be an integer.

## Algorithmic Subtyping

The SAGE subtype algorithm computes the greatest fixed point of the algorithmic rules in Figure ?? . These rules return 3-valued results as in Chapter 4, again

Figure 7.11: Algorithmic Subtyping

Algorithmic subtyping rules

$$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a S <: T}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{db}^\times S <: T}{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^\times S <: T} [\text{AS-DB}] \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^\vee T <: T} [\text{AS-REFL}]$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a T_1 <: S_1 \quad \Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash_{alg}^b S_2 <: T_2}{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{a \sqcap b} (x : S_1 \rightarrow S_2) <: (x : T_1 \rightarrow T_2)} [\text{AS-FUN}]$$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^? \text{Dynamic} <: T} [\text{AS-DYN-L}] \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^\vee S <: \text{Dynamic}} [\text{AS-DYN-R}]$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a S <: T \quad a \in \{\sqrt{\phantom{x}}, ?\}}{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a (\text{Refine } S \ f) <: T} [\text{AS-REF-L}]$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a S <: T \quad \Gamma, x : S \vdash_{alg}^b f \ x}{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^{a \sqcap b} S <: (\text{Refine } T \ f)} [\text{AS-REF-R}]$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, [x \mapsto v] F \vdash_{alg}^a [x \mapsto v] S <: [x \mapsto v] T}{\Gamma, x = v : u, F \vdash_{alg}^a S <: T} [\text{AS-VAR}]$$

$$\frac{e \curvearrowright e' \quad \Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a D[e'] <: T}{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a D[e] <: T} [\text{AS-EVAL-L}] \quad \frac{e \curvearrowright e' \quad \Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a S <: D_2[e']}{\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a S <: D_2[e]} [\text{AS-EVAL-R}]$$

$$D ::= \bullet \mid N \ D \quad \text{where } N \text{ is a normal form}$$

combined via the meet operator  $\sqcap$ .

The algorithm attempts to apply the rules in the order in which they are presented in the figure. If no rule applies, the algorithm returns  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^? S <: T$ . Most of the rules are straightforward, and we focus primarily on the most interesting rules:

[AS-DB]: Before applying any other rules, the algorithm attempts to refute that  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$  by querying the database of previously refuted subtype relationships. The judgment  $\Gamma \vdash_{db}^\times S <: T$  indicates that the database includes an entry stating that  $S$  is not a subtype of  $T$  in an environment  $\Gamma'$ , where  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma'$  are compatible in the sense that they include the same bindings for the free variables in  $S$  and  $T$ . This compatibility requirement ensures that we only re-use a refutation in a typing context in which it is meaningful.

[AS-EVAL-L] and [AS-EVAL-R]: These two rules evaluate the terms representing types.

The algorithm only applies these two rules a bounded number of times before timing out and forcing the algorithm to use a different rule or return “?”. This prevents non-terminating computation as well as infinite unrolling of recursive types.

[AS-DYN-L] and [AS-DYN-R]: These rules ensure that any type can be considered a subtype of **Dynamic** and that converting from **Dynamic** to any type requires an explicit coercion.

[AS-REF-R]: This rule for checking whether  $S$  is a subtype of a specific refinement type relies on a theorem-proving algorithm,  $\Gamma \models_{alg}^a p$ , for checking validity. This algorithm is an approximation of some validity judgment  $\Gamma \models p$  satisfying the axioms

in Section 7.6. As with subtyping, the result  $a \in \{\sqrt{\phantom{x}}, ?, \times\}$  indicates whether or not the theorem prover could prove or refute the validity of  $p$ . The algorithmic theorem proving judgment must be conservative with respect to the logic it is approximating, as captured in the following requirement:

#### Requirement 46 (Algorithmic Theorem Proving)

1. If  $\Gamma \models_{alg}^\sqrt{\phantom{x}} p$  then  $\Gamma \models p$ .
2. If  $\Gamma \models_{alg}^\times p$  then  $\forall \Gamma', p'$  obtained from  $\Gamma$  and  $p$  by replacing the type **Dynamic** by any type, we have that  $\Gamma' \not\models p'$ .

Our current implementation of this theorem-proving algorithm translates the query  $\Gamma \models_{alg}^a p$  into input for the Simplify theorem prover [Detlefs et al. 2005]. For example, the query

$$x : \{x : \mathbf{Int} \mid x \geq 0\} \models_{alg}^a x + x \geq 0$$

is translated into the Simplify query:

$$(\text{IMPLIES } (>= \text{ x } 0) \text{ } (>= (+ \text{ x } \text{ x}) 0))$$

for which Simplify returns **Valid**. Given the incompleteness of Simplify (and other theorem provers), care must be taken in how the Simplify results are interpreted. For example, on the translated version of the query

$$x : \mathbf{Int} \models_{alg}^a x * x \geq 0$$



Simplify returns `Invalid`, because it is incomplete for arbitrary multiplication. In this case, the SAGE theorem prover returns the result “?” to indicate that the validity of the query is unknown. We currently assume that the theorem prover is complete for linear integer arithmetic. Simplify has very effective heuristics for integer arithmetic, but does not fully satisfy this specification. More recent SMT provers are explicit about when they mean “maybe” instead of erroneously saying “no”.

An effective and mature HTC implementation will rely on compile-time evaluation of terms, a counterexample database, and a theorem prover that returns three-valued results.

Assuming that  $\Gamma \models_{alg}^a p$  satisfies Requirement 46 and that  $\Gamma \vdash_{db}^x S <: T$  only if  $\Gamma \not\vdash S <: T$  (meaning that the database only contains invalid subtype tests), it is straightforward to show that the subtype algorithm  $\Gamma \vdash_{alg}^a S <: T$  satisfies Lemma 45.

## 7.8 The Sage Database of Counterexamples

Our prototype SAGE implementation consists of roughly 5,000 lines of OCaml code. The run time implements the semantics from Section 7.4, with one extension for supporting the counter-example database when casts fail. Specifically, suppose SAGE inserts the cast  $\langle\langle T \rangle e\rangle$  because it cannot prove or refute some subtype test  $\Gamma \vdash S <: T$ . If that cast fails, the run time inserts an entry into the database asserting that  $\Gamma \not\vdash S <: T$ .

Function casts must be treated with care to ensure blame is assigned appro-

priately upon failure [Findler and Felleisen 2002]. In particular, if a cast inserted during the lazy evaluation of a function cast fails, an entry for the original, top-level function cast is inserted into the database rather than for the “smaller” cast on the argument or return value.

## 7.9 Experimental Results

We evaluated the SAGE language and implementation using the benchmarks listed in Figure 7.1. The program `arith.sage` defines and uses a number of mathematical functions, such as `min`, `abs`, and `mod`, where refinement types provide precise specifications. The programs `bst.sage` and `heap.sage` implement and use binary search trees and heaps, and the program `polylist.sage` defines and manipulates polymorphic lists. The types of these data structures ensure that every operation preserves key invariants. The program `stlc.sage` implements a type checker and evaluator for the simply-typed lambda calculus (STLC), where SAGE types specify that evaluating an STLC-term preserves its STLC-type. We also include the sorting algorithm `mergesort.sage`, as well as the `regexp.sage` and `printf.sage` examples discussed earlier.

Figure 7.1 characterizes the performance of the subtype algorithm on these benchmarks. We consider two configurations of this algorithm, both with and without the theorem prover. For each configuration, the figure shows the number of subtyping judgments proved (denoted by  $\checkmark$ ), refuted (denoted by  $\times$ ), and left undecided (denoted by  $?$ ). The benchmarks are all well-typed, so no subtype queries are refuted. Note that

the theorem prover enables SAGE to decide many more subtype queries. In particular, many of the benchmarks include complex refinement types that use integer arithmetic to specify ordering and structure invariants; theorem proving is particularly helpful in verifying these benchmarks.

Our subtyping algorithm performs quite well and verifies a large majority of subtype tests. Only a small number of undecided queries result in casts. For example, in **regexp.sage**, SAGE cannot statically verify subtyping relations involving regular expressions (they are checked dynamically) but it statically verifies all other subtype judgments. Some complicated tests in **stlc.sage** and **printf.sage** must also be checked dynamically.

Despite the use of a theorem prover, type-checking times for these benchmarks is quite manageable. On a 3GHz Pentium 4 Xeon processor running Linux 2.6.14, type-checking required fewer than 10 seconds for each of the benchmarks, except for **polylist.sage** which took approximately 18 seconds. We also measured the number of evaluation steps required during each subtype test. We found that 83% of the subtype tests required no evaluation, 91% required five or fewer steps, and only a handful of the tests in our benchmarks required more than 50 evaluation steps.

## 7.10 Related Work

The enforcement of complex program specifications, or *contracts*, is the subject of a large body of prior work [Meyer 1988; Findler and Felleisen 2002; Leavens and

Benchmark	Lines of code	Without Prover			With Prover		
		✓	?	×	✓	?	×
<b>arith.sage</b>	45	132	13	0	145	0	0
<b>bst.sage</b>	62	344	28	0	372	0	0
<b>heap.sage</b>	69	322	34	0	356	0	0
<b>mergesort.sage</b>	80	437	31	0	468	0	0
<b>polylist.sage</b>	397	2338	5	0	2343	0	0
<b>printf.sage</b>	228	321	1	0	321	1	0
<b>regexp.sage</b>	113	391	2	0	391	2	0
<b>stlc.sage</b>	227	677	11	0	677	11	0
Total	1221	4962	125	0	5073	14	0

Table 7.1: Subtyping Algorithm Statistics

Cheon 2006; ?; Holt and Cordy 1988; ?; ?; ?; ?; ?]. Since these contracts are typically not expressible in classical type systems, they have previously been relegated to dynamic checking, as in, for example, Eiffel [Meyer 1988]. Eiffel’s expressive contract language is strictly separated from its type system. Hybrid type checking extends contracts with the ability to check many properties at compile time. Meunier *et al* have also investigated statically verifying contracts via set-based analysis [?].

The static checking tool ESC/Java [Flanagan et al. 2002] supports expressive JML specifications [Leavens and Cheon 2006]. However, ESC/Java’s error messages may be caused either by incorrect programs or by limitations in its own analysis, and thus it may give false alarms on correct (but perhaps complicated) programs. In contrast, hybrid type checking only produces error messages for provably ill-typed programs.

The Spec# programming system extends C# with expressive specifications [?], including preconditions, postconditions, and non-null annotations. Specifications are enforced dynamically, and can be also checked statically via a separate tool. The sys-

tem is somewhat less tightly integrated than in SAGE. For example, successful static verification does not automatically remove the corresponding dynamic checks.

Recent work on advanced type systems has influenced our choice of how to express program invariants. In particular, Freeman and Pfenning [Freeman and Pfenning 1991] extended ML with another form of refinement types. Their work focuses on providing both decidable type checking and type inference, instead of on supporting arbitrary refinement predicates.

Xi and Pfenning have explored applications of dependent types in Dependent ML [Xi and Pfenning 1999; ?]. Decidability of type checking is preserved by appropriately restricting which terms can appear in types. Despite these restrictions, a number of interesting examples can be expressed in Dependent ML. Our system of dependent types extends theirs with arbitrary executable refinement predicates, and the hybrid type checking infrastructure is designed to cope with the resulting undecidability. In a complementary approach, Chen and Xi [?] address decidability limitations by providing a mechanism through which the programmer can provide proofs of subtle properties in the source code.

Recently, Ou, Tan, Mandelbaum, and Walker developed a dependent type system that leverages dynamic checks [Ou et al. 2004] in a way similar to SAGE. Unlike SAGE, their system is decidable, and they leverage dynamic checks to reduce the need for precise type annotations in explicitly labeled regions of programs. They consider mutable data, which we intend to add to SAGE in the future. We are exploring other language features, such as objects [?], as well.

Barendregt introduced the unification of types and terms, which allows types to be flexibly expressed as complex expressions, while simplifying the underlying theory [?]. The language Cayenne adopts this approach and copes with the resulting undecidability of type checking by allowing a maximum number of steps, somewhat like a timeout, before reporting to the user that typing has failed [Augustsson 1998]. Hybrid type checking differs in that instead of rejecting subtly well-typed programs outright, it provisionally accepts them and then performs dynamic checking where necessary.

Other authors have considered pragmatic combinations of both static and dynamic checking. Abadi, Cardelli, Pierce and Plotkin [Abadi et al. 1991] extended a static type system with a type `Dynamic` that could be explicitly cast to and from any other type (with appropriate run-time checks). Henglein characterized the *completion process* of inserting the necessary coercions, and presented a rewriting system for generating minimal completions [Henglein 1994]. Thatte developed a similar system in which the necessary casts are implicit [Thatte 1990]. For Scheme, soft type systems [Fagan 1991; Wright and Cartwright 1994; Aiken et al. 1994; Flanagan et al. 1996] prevent some basic type errors statically, while checking other properties at run time.

The limitations of purely-static and purely-dynamic approaches have also motivated other work on hybrid analyses. For example, CCured [Necula et al. 2005] is a sophisticated hybrid analysis for preventing the ubiquitous array bounds violations in the C programming language. Unlike our proposed approach, it does not detect errors statically. Instead, the static analysis is used to optimize the run-time analysis. Specialized hybrid analyses have been proposed for other problems as well, such as data race

condition checking [von Praun and Gross 2001; O’Callahan and Choi 2003; Agarwal and Stoller 2004].

### 7.11 Conclusions and Future Work

Program specifications are essential for modular development of reliable software. SAGE uses a synthesis of first-class types, `Dynamic`, and refinement types to enforce precise specifications in a flexible manner. Our hybrid checking algorithm extends traditional type checking with a theorem prover, a database of counter-examples, and the ability to insert dynamic checks when necessary. Experimental results show that SAGE can verify many correctness properties statically. We believe that SAGE illustrates a promising approach for reliable software development.

A number of opportunities remain for future work. The benefits of the refuted subtype database can clearly be amplified by maintaining a single repository for all local and non-local users of SAGE. We also plan to integrate randomized or directed [Godefroid et al. 2005] testing to refute additional validity queries, thereby detecting more errors at compile time.

## Chapter 8

### Contemporaneous Related Work

## 8.1 Higher-order contracts

The background for this dissertation in Findler and Felleisen [2002] has seen other advances since this research was undertaken.

sound and complete models, Hinze, other stuff, Dimoulas

## 8.2 Gradual Typing

Gradual typing [Siek and Taha 2006] is so named because it addresses the problem of mixing typed and untyped program text while being able to recover the root cause of errors.

In common with Hybrid Type Checking, gradual typing uses the machinery of cast insertion, always inserting casts at boundaries where dynamically typed code passes values to statically typed code. ? examines *blame* both as a way to isolate root causes to the untyped code that is responsible for a violation, but also as a proof tool.

... Avik ... all the different gradual papers and status

... Logical Types for untyped languages ...

SAGE can be seen as incorporating gradual typing with the expressive types of  $\lambda^H$ . Treatment of blame in SAGE, while present in the implementation, is left implicit in the theoretical development. A full-scale implementation should incorporate both, as blame is key to the functioning of the counterexample database. An examination of how blame may be leveraged to maximize the learning upon any cast failure would be very interesting.

In gradual-typed systems, blame is not interpreted as the original program being ill-typed, as dynamically typed portions are permitted to crash and it is simply a debugging aid.

## 8.3 Liquid Types

While Chapter 5 provide mostly theoretical results about a new notion of type reconstruction, the *Liquid Types* research program find closed-form solutions. Rondon et al. [2008] uses counterexample-guided predicate abstraction (an abstract interpretation techniques leveraging off-the-shelf SMT technology) to solve fixpoint constraints like those from but in a more expressive context.

... Liquid Haskell ...

## 8.4 ESC/Haskell

ESC/Haskell uses evaluation and inlining to attempt to verify or refute contracts inserted into Haskell programs.

## 8.5 Programming in Dependent Type Theory

Making dependent types easier to program in

Agda [Norell 2009], Omega, Epigram [McBride and McKinna 2004], [The Coq development team 2012]. Neal Glew, Tim Sweeney and Leaf Petersen. A Multivalued Language with a Dependent Type System. Not published yet - ICFP 2013, actually in

the dependent types workshop

[Augustsson 1998], Epigram [McBride and McKinna 2004], Agda [Norell 2009] and Coq [The Coq development team 2012].

A major challenge is that writing a program in such a system amounts to writing its proof of correctness along with the program text itself. Automated proving plays no part in any of the above systems, but instead the proof is part of the programming language itself.

In these systems, it is also mandatory that a program be completely verified statically, by the programmer or the system.

## 8.6 Hoare Type Theory

Nanevski et al. [2006] have introduced another relationship between axiomatic semantics and type systems with their Hoare Type Theory, which adds pre- and post-conditions to the types of effectful monadic computation.

## Chapter 9

## Conclusion

Executable refinement types – the integration of arbitrary boolean predicates into a type system – is feasible. This dissertation has shown:

1. The type system defined by adding executable predicates pervasively to a structural type system is well-defined and sound.
2. There are practical methods for enforcing types with executable refinements.
3. This type system supports practical type reconstruction, so that programmers may omit most type annotations.
4. When all annotations fall within a decidable theory, we can restore decidability to the type system without fundamental changes.
5. In practice, the number of casts inserted into a program is small: Hybrid type checking gives enough flexibility to express specifications that are otherwise not available, while still being statically checked.

Having established that this type system enjoys these desirable properties, theoretical and pragmatic, there are a number of interesting avenues to pursue.

Theoretically, there are connections between indexed types and refinement types to consider. Since indexed types do express some specifications well, can they be integrated with executable refinement types in a system that does not unduly tax the programmer?

Another theoretical direction to take is to thoroughly analyse the various semantics and type systems here with denotational models of contracts. (Blumens, stuff

since Hinze). Much work has been done in an untyped setting, but recent work by ... lays out desirable properties for typed contract systems. How do these properties related to static vs dynamic checking?

More generally, compositionality of the sort analyzed in Chapter 6 is a property that denotational semantics generally enjoys, and closely parallels homomorphisms between semantics (where a type system is a morphism between the syntactic identity semantics and the semantics that maps each term to its type). Especially considering this in light of abstract interpretation may yield insight into the relationship between type systems and abstract interpretation, further leading to advances in connections between syntactic and semantic approaches to programming language theory.

Compositionality provides important practical benefits in the form of predictability in the case of dependent contract types. For the important special case of programs whose contracts fall within a decidable theory, our type checking algorithm relies on compositional reasoning to achieve the key invariant that all proof obligations generated during type checking also lie within this theory. The analysis of programs whose specifications do not fall within a decidable theory remains an important open area not addressed by our work.

To evaluate on a larger scale than SAGE permitted, executable refinement types can and should be integrated into a mainstream language. Work along these lines has been begun by ESC/Haskell and Liquid Haskell but there are variations to experiment with (discussed in Chapter 8) to see which is most effective or offers the most fluid transition.

A fascinating and almost entirely unexplored area suggested by SAGE's counterexample database is empirical work involving the effectiveness of large-scale implementations. This essentially presumes the integration of hybrid type checking ideas into a mainstream language in order to reach a large enough audience with enough code.

THIS IS STILL VERBATIM... Also in terms of software deployment, an important topic is recovery methods for post-deployment cast failures; transactional roll-back mechanisms [??] may be useful in this regard. Hybrid type checking may also allow precise types to be preserved during the compilation and distribution process, via techniques such as proof-carrying code [?] and typed assembly language [?].

In SAGE, refinements of function types may often result in an inability to translate refinements to the language of the theorem prover, or otherwise prevent the theorem prover from determining the truth or falsity of a proposition. Improving our understanding of when and why this happens, along with improving the effectiveness of the algorithm, is an important avenue to investigate.

Another implementation challenge is to integrate interactive theorem proving with a hybrid type checker. Further combining this with a large database of counterexamples or proofs would multiply the power of hybrid type checking by the number and variety of programs written.

## Bibliography

- M. Abadi, L. Cardelli, P.-L. Curien, and J.-J. Levy. Explicit substitutions. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages*, POPL '90, page 3146, New York, NY, USA, 1990. ACM. ISBN 0-89791-343-4. doi: 10.1145/96709.96712. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/96709.96712>.
- M. Abadi, L. Cardelli, B. Pierce, and G. Plotkin. Dynamic typing in a statically typed language. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 13(2): 237268, Apr. 1991. ISSN 0164-0925. doi: 10.1145/103135.103138. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/103135.103138>.
- R. Agarwal and S. D. Stoller. Type inference for parameterized race-free java. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Verification, Model Checking and Abstract Interpretation*, page 149160. Springer-Verlag, 2004.
- A. Aiken and E. L. Wimmers. Type inclusion constraints and type inference. In *Proceedings of the conference on Functional programming languages and computer architecture*, FPCA '93, page 3141, New York, NY, USA, 1993. ACM. ISBN 0-89791-595-X. doi: 10.1145/165180.165188. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/165180.165188>.
- A. Aiken, E. L. Wimmers, and T. K. Lakshman. Soft typing with conditional types. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages*, POPL '94, page 163173, New York, NY,



- USA, 1994. ACM. ISBN 0-89791-636-0. doi: 10.1145/174675.177847. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/174675.177847>.
- L. Augustsson. Cayenne - a language with dependent types. In *Proceedings of the third ACM SIGPLAN international conference on Functional programming*, ICFP '98, page 239250, New York, NY, USA, 1998. ACM. ISBN 1-58113-024-4. doi: 10.1145/289423.289451. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/289423.289451>.
- R. J. R. Back. A calculus of refinements for program derivations. *Acta Inf.*, 25(6):593624, Aug. 1988. ISSN 0001-5903. doi: 10.1007/BF00291051. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00291051>.
- V. Breazu-Tannen, T. Coquand, C. A. Gunter, and A. Scedrov. Inheritance as implicit coercion. *Information and Computation*, 93(1):172221, July 1991. ISSN 0890-5401. doi: 10.1016/0890-5401(91)90055-7. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(91\)90055-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(91)90055-7).
- L. Burdy, Y. Cheon, D. R. Cok, M. D. Ernst, J. R. Kiniry, G. T. Leavens, K. R. M. Leino, and E. Poll. An overview of JML tools and applications. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.*, 7(3):212232, June 2005. ISSN 1433-2779. doi: 10.1007/s10009-004-0167-4. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10009-004-0167-4>.
- L. Cardelli. Phase distinctions in type theory. Technical report, 1988.
- P. Cousot and R. Cousot. Formal language, grammar and set-constraint-based program analysis by abstract interpretation. In *Proceedings of the seventh interna-*

- tional conference on Functional programming languages and computer architecture*, FPCA '95, page 170181, New York, NY, USA, 1995. ACM. ISBN 0-89791-719-7. doi: 10.1145/224164.224199. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/224164.224199>.
- R. Davies and F. Pfenning. Intersection types and computational effects. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 35(9):198208, Sept. 2000. ISSN 0362-1340. doi: 10.1145/357766.351259. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/357766.351259>.
- E. Denney. Refinement types for specification. In *Proceedings of the IFIP TC2/WG2.2,2.3 International Conference on Programming Concepts and Methods*, PROCOMET '98, page 148166, London, UK, UK, 1998. Chapman & Hall, Ltd. ISBN 0-412-83760-9. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=647321.721207>.
- D. Detlefs, G. Nelson, and J. B. Saxe. Simplify: a theorem prover for program checking. *J. ACM*, 52(3):365473, May 2005. ISSN 0004-5411. doi: 10.1145/1066100.1066102. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1066100.1066102>.
- E. W. Dijkstra. *A Discipline of Programming*. Prentice Hall PTR, Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 1st edition, 1976. ISBN 013215871X.
- D. Dreyer, K. Crary, and R. Harper. A type system for higher-order modules. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 38(1):236249, Jan. 2003. ISSN 0362-1340. doi: 10.1145/640128.604151. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/640128.604151>.
- J. Dunfield and F. Pfenning. Tridirectional typechecking. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 39

- (1):281292, Jan. 2004. ISSN 0362-1340. doi: 10.1145/982962.964025. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/982962.964025>.
- M. Escard. Synthetic topology of data types and classical spaces. In *Electron. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci*, page 2004. Elsevier, 2004.
- M. Fagan. *Soft typing: an approach to type checking for dynamically typed languages*. PhD thesis, Rice University, Houston, TX, USA, 1991. UMI Order No. GAX91-36021.
- M. Fahndrich and A. Aiken. Making set-constraint program analyses scale. Technical report, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA, 1996.
- R. B. Findler and M. Felleisen. Contracts for higher-order functions. In *Proceedings of the seventh ACM SIGPLAN international conference on Functional programming*, ICFP '02, page 4859, New York, NY, USA, 2002. ACM. ISBN 1-58113-487-8. doi: 10.1145/581478.581484. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/581478.581484>.
- C. Flanagan. Hybrid type checking. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 41(1):245256, Jan. 2006. ISSN 0362-1340. doi: 10.1145/1111320.1111059. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1111320.1111059>.
- C. Flanagan and M. Felleisen. Componential set-based analysis. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 1997 conference on Programming language design and implementation*, PLDI '97, page 235248, New York, NY, USA, 1997. ACM. ISBN 0-89791-907-6. doi: 10.1145/258915.258937. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/258915.258937>.
- C. Flanagan, M. Flatt, S. Krishnamurthi, S. Weirich, and M. Felleisen. Catching bugs in the web of program invariants. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 31(5):2332, May 1996. ISSN 0362-1340. doi: 10.1145/249069.231387. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/249069.231387>.
- C. Flanagan, K. R. M. Leino, M. Lillibridge, G. Nelson, J. B. Saxe, and R. Stata. Extended static checking for java. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 2002 Conference on Programming language design and implementation*, PLDI '02, page 234245, New York, NY, USA, 2002. ACM. ISBN 1-58113-463-0. doi: 10.1145/512529.512558. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/512529.512558>.
- R. Floyd. Assigning meaning to programs. In *Proceedings of the Symposium in Applied Mathematics: Mathematical Aspects of Computer Science*, pages 19–32, 1967.
- T. Freeman and F. Pfenning. Refinement types for ML. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 1991 conference on Programming language design and implementation*, PLDI '91, page 268277, New York, NY, USA, 1991. ACM. ISBN 0-89791-428-7. doi: 10.1145/113445.113468. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/113445.113468>.
- A. Frisch, G. Castagna, and V. Benzaken. Semantic subtyping: Dealing set-theoretically with function, union, intersection, and negation types. *J. ACM*, 55(4):19:119:64, Sept. 2008. ISSN 0004-5411. doi: 10.1145/1391289.1391293. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1391289.1391293>.
- Y.-C. Fu and P. Mishra. Type inference with subtypes. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 73

- (2):155175, Jan. 1988. ISSN 0304-3975. doi: 10.1016/0304-3975(90)90144-7. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(90\)90144-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(90)90144-7).
- P. Godefroid, N. Klarlund, and K. Sen. DART: directed automated random testing. In *Proceedings of the 2005 ACM SIGPLAN conference on Programming language design and implementation*, PLDI '05, page 213223, New York, NY, USA, 2005. ACM. ISBN 1-59593-056-6. doi: 10.1145/1065010.1065036. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1065010.1065036>.
- J. Gosling, B. Joy, and G. L. Steele. *The Java Language Specification*. Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., Boston, MA, USA, 1st edition, 1996. ISBN 0201634511.
- J. Gronski and C. Flanagan. Unifying hybrid types and contracts. In *In Eighth Symposium on Trends in Functional Programming*, 2007.
- J. Gronski, K. Knowles, A. Tomb, S. N. Freund, and C. Flanagan. Sage: Hybrid checking for flexible specifications. In *Proceedings of the 7th workshop on Scheme and functional programming*, Portland, OR, 2006. ACM.
- D. Grossman. Existential types for imperative languages. In *Proceedings of the 11th European Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems*, ESOP '02, page 2135, London, UK, UK, 2002. Springer-Verlag. ISBN 3-540-43363-5. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=645396.651967>.
- R. Harper and M. Lillibridge. A type-theoretic approach to higher-order mod-

- ules with sharing. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages*, POPL '94, page 123137, New York, NY, USA, 1994. ACM. ISBN 0-89791-636-0. doi: 10.1145/174675.176927. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/174675.176927>.
- S. Hayashi. Logic of refinement types. In *Proceedings of the international workshop on Types for proofs and programs*, TYPES '93, page 108126, Secaucus, NJ, USA, 1993. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc. ISBN 3-540-58085-9. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=189973.189978>.
- N. C. Heintze. *Set based program analysis*. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, 1992. UMI Order No. GAX93-22866.
- F. Henglein. Dynamic typing: syntax and proof theory. In *Selected papers of the symposium on Fourth European symposium on programming*, ESOP'92, page 197230, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, The Netherlands, 1994. Elsevier Science Publishers B. V. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=197475.190867>.
- M. Hoang and J. C. Mitchell. Lower bounds on type inference with subtypes. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages*, POPL '95, page 176185, New York, NY, USA, 1995. ACM. ISBN 0-89791-692-1. doi: 10.1145/199448.199481. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/199448.199481>.
- C. A. R. Hoare. An axiomatic basis for computer programming. *Commun. ACM*,

- 12(10):576580, Oct. 1969. ISSN 0001-0782. doi: 10.1145/363235.363259. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/363235.363259>.
- R. C. Holt and J. R. Cordy. The turing programming language. *Commun. ACM*, 31(12):14101423, Dec. 1988. ISSN 0001-0782. doi: 10.1145/53580.53581. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/53580.53581>.
- K. Knowles and C. Flanagan. Type reconstruction for general refinement types. In *Proceedings of the 16th European conference on Programming*, ESOP'07, page 505519, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007. Springer-Verlag. ISBN 978-3-540-71314-2. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1762174.1762220>.
- K. Knowles and C. Flanagan. Compositional reasoning and decidable checking for dependent contract types. In *Proceedings of the 3rd workshop on Programming languages meets program verification*, PLPV '09, page 2738, New York, NY, USA, 2008. ACM. ISBN 978-1-60558-330-3. doi: 10.1145/1481848.1481853. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1481848.1481853>.
- K. Knowles and C. Flanagan. Hybrid type checking. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 32(2):6:16:34, Feb. 2010. ISSN 0164-0925. doi: 10.1145/1667048.1667051. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1667048.1667051>.
- M. Killing and J. Rosenberg. Blue - a language for teaching object-oriented programming. *SIGCSE Bull.*, 28(1):190194, Mar. 1996. ISSN 0097-8418. doi: 10.1145/236462.236537. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/236462.236537>.

- G. T. Leavens and Y. Cheon. *Design by Contract with JML*. 2006.
- P. Lincoln and J. C. Mitchell. Algorithmic aspects of type inference with subtypes. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages*, POPL '92, page 293304, New York, NY, USA, 1992. ACM. ISBN 0-89791-453-8. doi: 10.1145/143165.143227. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/143165.143227>.
- D. C. Luckham. *Programming with Specifications: An Introduction to Anna, a Language for Specifying ADA Programs*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., Secaucus, NJ, USA, 1990. ISBN 0387972544.
- Y. Mandelbaum, D. Walker, and R. Harper. An effective theory of type refinements. In *Proceedings of the eighth ACM SIGPLAN international conference on Functional programming*, ICFP '03, page 213225, New York, NY, USA, 2003. ACM. ISBN 1-58113-756-7. doi: 10.1145/944705.944725. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/944705.944725>.
- C. McBride. Faking it simulating dependent types in haskell. *J. Funct. Program.*, 12(5):375392, July 2002. ISSN 0956-7968. doi: 10.1017/S0956796802004355. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0956796802004355>.
- C. McBride and J. McKinna. The view from the left. *J. Funct. Program.*, 14(1):69111, Jan. 2004. ISSN 0956-7968. doi: 10.1017/S0956796803004829. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0956796803004829>.

B. Meyer. *Object-Oriented Software Construction*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 1st edition, 1988. ISBN 0136290493.

B. Meyer. *Eiffel: the language*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 1992. ISBN 0-13-247925-7.

J. C. Mitchell. Coercion and type inference. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM SIGACT-SIGPLAN symposium on Principles of programming languages*, POPL '84, page 175185, New York, NY, USA, 1984. ACM. ISBN 0-89791-125-3. doi: 10.1145/800017.800529. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/800017.800529>.

J. C. Mitchell and G. D. Plotkin. Abstract types have existential type. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 10(3):470502, July 1988. ISSN 0164-0925. doi: 10.1145/44501.45065. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/44501.45065>.

A. Nanevski, G. Morrisett, and L. Birkedal. Polymorphism and separation in hoare type theory. In *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM SIGPLAN international conference on Functional programming*, ICFP '06, page 6273, New York, NY, USA, 2006. ACM. ISBN 1-59593-309-3. doi: 10.1145/1159803.1159812. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1159803.1159812>.

G. C. Necula, J. Condit, M. Harren, S. McPeak, and W. Weimer. CCured: type-safe retrofitting of legacy software. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, 27(3):477526, May 2005. ISSN 0164-0925. doi: 10.1145/1065887.1065892. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1065887.1065892>.

U. Norell. Dependently typed programming in agda. In *Proceedings of the 4th international workshop on Types in language design and implementation*, TLDI '09, page 12, New York, NY, USA, 2009. ACM. ISBN 978-1-60558-420-1. doi: 10.1145/1481861.1481862. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1481861.1481862>.

R. O'Callahan and J.-D. Choi. Hybrid dynamic data race detection. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 38(10):167178, June 2003. ISSN 0362-1340. doi: 10.1145/966049.781528. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/966049.781528>.

M. Odersky, M. Sulzmann, and M. Wehr. Type inference with constrained types. *Theor. Pract. Object Syst.*, 5(1):3555, Jan. 1999. ISSN 1074-3227. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1096-9942(199901/03)5:1;35::AID-TAPO4;3.0.CO;2-4. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1096-9942\(199901/03\)5:1<35::AID-TAPO4>3.0.CO;2-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1096-9942(199901/03)5:1<35::AID-TAPO4>3.0.CO;2-4).

X. Ou, G. Tan, Y. Mandelbaum, and D. Walker. Dynamic typing with dependent types. In J.-J. Levy, E. W. Mayr, and J. C. Mitchell, editors, *Exploring New Frontiers of Theoretical Informatics*, number 155 in IFIP International Federation for Information Processing, pages 437–450. Springer US, Jan. 2004. ISBN 978-1-4020-8140-8, 978-1-4020-8141-5.

D. L. Parnas. On the criteria to be used in decomposing systems into modules. *Commun. ACM*, 15(12):10531058, Dec. 1972a. ISSN 0001-0782. doi: 10.1145/361598.361623. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/361598.361623>.

D. L. Parnas. A technique for software module specification with examples. *Commun.*

ACM, 15(5):330336, May 1972b. ISSN 0001-0782. doi: 10.1145/355602.361309. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/355602.361309>.

B. C. Pierce and D. N. Turner. Local type inference. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages*, POPL '98, page 252265, New York, NY, USA, 1998. ACM. ISBN 0-89791-979-3. doi: 10.1145/268946.268967. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/268946.268967>.

F. Pottier. Simplifying subtyping constraints. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 31(6): 122133, June 1996. ISSN 0362-1340. doi: 10.1145/232629.232642. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/232629.232642>.

P. M. Rondon, M. Kawaguci, and R. Jhala. Liquid types. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM SIGPLAN conference on Programming language design and implementation*, PLDI '08, page 159169, New York, NY, USA, 2008. ACM. ISBN 978-1-59593-860-2. doi: 10.1145/1375581.1375602. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1375581.1375602>.

T. Sheard. Putting curry-howard to work. In *Proceedings of the 2005 ACM SIGPLAN workshop on Haskell*, Haskell '05, page 7485, New York, NY, USA, 2005. ACM. ISBN 1-59593-071-X. doi: 10.1145/1088348.1088356. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1088348.1088356>.

J. Siek and W. Taha. Gradual typing for functional languages. 2006. URL <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.61.8890>.

J. Siek and W. Taha. Gradual typing for objects. In *Proceedings of the 21st European conference on Object-Oriented Programming*, ECOOP'07, page 227, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007. Springer-Verlag. ISBN 3-540-73588-7, 978-3-540-73588-5. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2394758.2394762>.

R. Statman. Logical relations and the typed lambda-calculus. pages 85–97, 1985.

D. Stoutamire and S. Omohundro. The sather 1.1 specification. 1996. URL <http://citeseer.uark.edu:8080/citeseerx/viewdoc/versions;jsessionid=8E5DE31AE56BFD51FC>.

D. Tarditi, G. Morrisett, P. Cheng, C. Stone, R. Harper, and P. Lee. TIL: a type-directed optimizing compiler for ML. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 1996 conference on Programming language design and implementation*, PLDI '96, page 181192, New York, NY, USA, 1996. ACM. ISBN 0-89791-795-2. doi: 10.1145/231379.231414. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/231379.231414>.

S. Thatte. Quasi-static typing. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages*, POPL '90, page 367381, New York, NY, USA, 1990. ACM. ISBN 0-89791-343-4. doi: 10.1145/96709.96747. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/96709.96747>.

The Coq development team. The coq proof assistant reference manual. Technical report, 2012.

C. von Praun and T. R. Gross. Object race detection. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGPLAN conference on Object-oriented programming, sys-*

tems, languages, and applications, OOPSLA '01, page 7082, New York, NY, USA, 2001. ACM. ISBN 1-58113-335-9. doi: 10.1145/504282.504288. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/504282.504288>.

P. Wadler and R. B. Findler. Well-typed programs can't be blamed. In *Proceedings of the 18th European Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems: Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2009*, ESOP '09, page 116, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009. Springer-Verlag. ISBN 978-3-642-00589-3.

A. K. Wright and R. Cartwright. A practical soft type system for scheme. *SIGPLAN Lisp Pointers*, VII(3):250262, July 1994. ISSN 1045-3563. doi: 10.1145/182590.182485. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/182590.182485>.

H. Xi. Imperative programming with dependent types. In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS '00*, page 375, Washington, DC, USA, 2000. IEEE Computer Society. ISBN 0-7695-0725-5. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=788022.789021>.

H. Xi and F. Pfenning. Dependent types in practical programming. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages*, POPL '99, page 214227, New York, NY, USA, 1999. ACM. ISBN 1-58113-095-3. doi: 10.1145/292540.292560. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/292540.292560>.

D. N. Xu. Extended static checking for haskell. In *Proceedings of the 2006*

*ACM SIGPLAN workshop on Haskell*, Haskell '06, page 4859, New York, NY, USA, 2006. ACM. ISBN 1-59593-489-8. doi: 10.1145/1159842.1159849. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1159842.1159849>.

D. N. Xu, S. Peyton Jones, and K. Claessen. Static contract checking for haskell. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 44(1):4152, Jan. 2009. ISSN 0362-1340. doi: 10.1145/1594834.1480889. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1594834.1480889>.

C. Zenger. Indexed types. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 187(1-2):147165, Nov. 1997. ISSN 0304-3975. doi: 10.1016/S0304-3975(97)00062-5. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(97\)00062-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(97)00062-5).