

A Mechanized Proof of Type Safety for the Polymorphic λ -Calculus with References

Michalis A. Papakyriakou Prodromos E. Gerakios
Nikolaos S. Papaspyrou



National Technical University of Athens
School of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Software Engineering Laboratory

{mpapakyr, pgerakios, nickie}@softlab.ntua.gr

6th Panhellenic Logic Symposium
Volos, Greece, 5-8 July 2007

Outline

Introduction

Type systems and type safety

Polymorphic λ -calculus

References

Mechanized proof

The language $\lambda^{\forall, \text{ref}}$

Encoding $\lambda^{\forall, \text{ref}}$ in Isabelle/HOL

A tour of the proof

Conclusions and future work

What is this paper about?

- ▶ **The language**
Polymorphic λ -calculus with references
- ▶ **The goal**
A proof of type safety
- ▶ **The method**
Mechanized proof
Using Isabelle/HOL

Type systems

- ▶ A **type system** defines:
 - ▶ how a programming language classifies values and expressions into types
 - ▶ how elements of these types can be manipulated
 - ▶ how these types can interact
- ▶ A **type** indicates a set of values that have the same generic meaning or intended purpose
- ▶ The **purpose** of type systems: to prevent certain forms of erroneous or undesirable program behaviour

Type safety

- ▶ If a program is free of **static** type errors, then its execution is free of **dynamic** type errors
- ▶ Kinds of dynamic errors that can be avoided:
 - ▶ programs can only access appropriate memory locations (memory safety)
 - ▶ programs can only transfer control to appropriate program points (control safety)

Type safety

- ▶ If a program is free of **static** type errors, then its execution is free of **dynamic** type errors
- ▶ Kinds of dynamic errors that can be avoided:
 - ▶ programs can only access appropriate memory locations (memory safety)
 - ▶ programs can only transfer control to appropriate program points (control safety)
- ▶ **The standard procedure**
 - ▶ Syntax
 - ▶ Operational semantics
 - ▶ Typing rules
 - ▶ Safety = preservation + progress

Polymorphic λ -calculus

- ▶ System F, F_2
- ▶ Girard, 1971; Reynolds, 1974
- ▶ First-class polymorphism
 - ▶ Useful for code reuse and modular type checking

Polymorphic λ -calculus

- ▶ System F, F_2
- ▶ Girard, 1971; Reynolds, 1974
- ▶ First-class polymorphism
 - ▶ Useful for code reuse and modular type checking
 - ▶ Polymorphic types and functions

$$\begin{aligned} \text{id} & : \quad \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \\ & = \quad \Lambda \alpha. \lambda x : \alpha. x \end{aligned}$$

Polymorphic λ -calculus

- ▶ System F, F_2
- ▶ Girard, 1971; Reynolds, 1974
- ▶ First-class polymorphism
 - ▶ Useful for code reuse and modular type checking
 - ▶ Polymorphic types and functions
$$\text{id} \quad : \quad \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$
$$= \quad \Lambda \alpha. \lambda x : \alpha. x$$
 - ▶ Explicit type application
$$\text{append} \quad : \quad \forall \alpha. \text{list } \alpha \rightarrow \text{list } \alpha \rightarrow \text{list } \alpha$$
$$\dots \text{append } [\text{int}] [1, 2, 3] [4, 5] \dots$$

ML-style references

Imperative programming in functional style

- ▶ Reference allocation

let $r = \text{new } \tau \dots$

$r : \text{Ref int}$

ML-style references

Imperative programming in functional style

- ▶ Reference allocation

let $r = \text{new } 7 \dots$

$r : \text{Ref int}$

- ▶ Assignment

\dots in $r := 42; \dots$

destructive update!

ML-style references

Imperative programming in functional style

- ▶ Reference allocation

let $r = \text{new } 7 \dots$

$r : \text{Ref int}$

- ▶ Assignment

\dots in $r := 42; \dots$

destructive update!

- ▶ Dereference

\dots print (deref r);

prints 42

ML-style references

Imperative programming in functional style

- ▶ Reference allocation

let $r = \text{new } 7 \dots$

$r : \text{Ref int}$

- ▶ Assignment

\dots in $r := 42; \dots$

destructive update!

- ▶ Dereference

\dots print (deref r);

prints 42

- ▶ No reference deallocation!

\dots free r

use garbage collection!

Polymorphic references

- ▶ The problem

let $r = \Lambda \alpha. \text{new } (\lambda x : \alpha. x)$ in
 $r [\text{int}] := \text{succ};$
 $\text{deref } (r [\text{bool}]) \text{ true}$

$r : \forall \alpha. \text{Ref } (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)$

dynamic type error

Polymorphic references

- ▶ The problem

let $r = \Lambda \alpha. \text{new } (\lambda x : \alpha. x)$ in $r : \forall \alpha. \text{Ref } (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)$
 $r [\text{int}] := \text{succ};$
 $\text{deref } (r [\text{bool}])$ true dynamic type error

- ▶ A solution: value restriction

In $\Lambda \alpha. v$, the term v must be a value

Mechanized proof (i)

- ▶ Why not with pencil and paper?
 - ▶ easy to make a mistake
 - ▶ easy to “fix” a mistake
 - ▶ if one is willing to spend time and effort to write a thorough proof with pencil and paper, why not use a proof assistant?

Mechanized proof (i)

- ▶ Why not with pencil and paper?
 - ▶ easy to make a mistake
 - ▶ easy to “fix” a mistake
 - ▶ if one is willing to spend time and effort to write a thorough proof with pencil and paper, why not use a proof assistant?
- ▶ Proof assistants
 - ▶ tools to develop formal proofs by man-machine collaboration
 - ▶ interactive proof editor, with which a human can guide the search for proofs
 - ▶ some steps of the proofs can be provided by the computer
 - ▶ not (necessarily) automatic theorem proving!

Mechanized proof (ii)

- ▶ Some available proof assistants:
Isabelle/HOL, Coq, Twelf, NuPRL, PVS, PhoX,
MINLOG, ...
- ▶ Isabelle/HOL
 - ▶ Larry Paulson, Cambridge University
 - ▶ Tobias Nipkow, TU München
 - ▶ <http://isabelle.in.tum.de/>

Syntax of $\lambda^{\forall, \text{ref}}$

$\tau ::= \text{Unit} \mid \alpha \mid \tau \rightarrow \tau \mid \forall \alpha. \tau \mid \text{Ref } \tau$

$e ::= \text{unit} \mid x \mid \lambda x:\tau. e \mid \Lambda \alpha. e \mid e_1 e_2 \mid e[\tau]$
 $\mid \text{new } e \mid \text{deref } e \mid e_1 := e_2 \mid \text{loc } l$

$v ::= \text{unit} \mid \lambda x:\tau. e \mid \Lambda \alpha. v \mid \text{loc } l$

Typing rules of $\lambda^{\forall, \text{ref}}$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash \text{unit} : \text{Unit} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Delta \models \tau \quad \Gamma, x : \tau; \Delta; M \vdash e : \tau'}{\Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash \lambda x : \tau. e : \tau \rightarrow \tau'} \quad \frac{\Gamma; \Delta, \alpha; M \vdash v : \tau}{\Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash \Lambda \alpha. v : \forall \alpha. \tau} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash e_1 : \tau \rightarrow \tau' \quad \Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash e_2 : \tau}{\Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash e_1 e_2 : \tau'} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash e : \forall \alpha. \tau \quad \Delta \models \tau'}{\Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash e[\tau'] : \tau\{\alpha \mapsto \tau'\}} \quad \frac{\Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash e : \tau}{\Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash \text{new } e : \text{Ref } \tau} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash e : \text{Ref } \tau}{\Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash \text{deref } e : \tau} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash e_1 : \text{Ref } \tau \quad \Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash e_2 : \tau}{\Gamma; \Delta; M \vdash e_1 := e_2 : \text{Unit}} \\
 \\
 \Gamma; \Delta; M, l : \tau \vdash \text{loc } l : \text{Ref } \tau
 \end{array}$$

Operational semantics of $\lambda^{\forall, \text{ref}}$

$$\frac{S; e_1 \longrightarrow S'; e'_1}{S; e_1 e_2 \longrightarrow S'; e'_1 e_2} \qquad \frac{S; e_2 \longrightarrow S'; e'_2}{S; v_1 e_2 \longrightarrow S'; v_1 e'_2}$$

$$\frac{S; e \longrightarrow S'; e'}{S; e [\tau] \longrightarrow S'; e' [\tau]}$$

$$\frac{S; e \longrightarrow S'; e'}{S; \text{new } e \longrightarrow S'; \text{new } e'}$$

$$\frac{S; e \longrightarrow S'; e'}{S; \text{deref } e \longrightarrow S'; \text{deref } e'}$$

$$\frac{S; e_1 \longrightarrow S'; e'_1}{S; e_1 := e_2 \longrightarrow S'; e'_1 := e_2}$$

$$\frac{S; e_2 \longrightarrow S'; e'_2}{S; v_1 := e_2 \longrightarrow S'; v_1 := e'_2}$$

$$S; (\lambda x : \tau. e) v \longrightarrow S; e \{x \mapsto v\} \quad S; (\Lambda \alpha. v) [\tau] \longrightarrow S; v \{\alpha \mapsto \tau\}$$

$$S; \text{new } v \longrightarrow S, l \mapsto v; \text{loc } l$$

$$S, l \mapsto v; \text{deref } (\text{loc } l) \longrightarrow S, l \mapsto v; v$$

$$S, l \mapsto v'; \text{loc } l := v \longrightarrow S, l \mapsto v; v$$

Encoding $\lambda^{\forall, \text{ref}}$ in Isabelle/HOL

- ▶ Main problems
 - ▶ The representation of bound variables
 - ▶ The representation of type environments
- ▶ The details are usually ignored in pencil and paper proofs

Encoding $\lambda^{\forall, \text{ref}}$ in Isabelle/HOL

- ▶ **Main problems**
 - ▶ The representation of **bound variables**
 - ▶ The representation of **type environments**
- ▶ The details are usually **ignored** in pencil and paper proofs

- ▶ We represent **type environments** as finite sets

Bound variables (i)

Proposed solutions

- ▶ Named variables
- ▶ DeBruijn indices
- ▶ Locally nameless
- ▶ Nominal
- ▶ Higher-order abstract syntax

Bound variables (ii)

Named variables

- ▶ Typical in the pencil and paper study of λ -calculus
- ▶ ... assuming fresh variable names!
- ▶ Main problem: α -equivalence
- ▶ Capture avoiding substitution may have to rename variables

Bound variables (iii)

DeBruijn indices

- ▶ Variables are **index numbers**, counting enclosing λ -abstractions
- ▶ **Idea:** $\lambda f:\tau \rightarrow \tau. \lambda x:\tau. f (f x)$
becomes: $\lambda [\tau \rightarrow \tau]. \lambda [\tau]. 1 (1 0)$
- ▶ Main problems:
 - ▶ global variables
 - ▶ substitution requires **shifting** indices

Bound variables (iv)

Locally nameless is a combination of named variables and DeBruijn indices

- ▶ “Global” variables are named
- ▶ Bound variables are indices
- ▶ Substitution only
 - ▶ of bound variables (indices), especially index 0
 - ▶ with closed terms (without indices)
- ▶ Advantages
 - ▶ no need for renaming
 - ▶ no need for shifting

A tour of the proof

We proved the type safety of $\lambda^{\forall, \text{ref}}$ incrementally

- ▶ simply typed λ -calculus

414 lines in Isabelle/HOL

A tour of the proof

We proved the type safety of $\lambda^{\forall, \text{ref}}$ incrementally

- ▶ simply typed λ -calculus

414 lines in Isabelle/HOL

- ▶ simply typed λ -calculus with references

941 lines in Isabelle/HOL

A tour of the proof

We proved the type safety of $\lambda^{\forall, \text{ref}}$ incrementally

- ▶ simply typed λ -calculus
414 lines in Isabelle/HOL
- ▶ simply typed λ -calculus with references
941 lines in Isabelle/HOL
- ▶ $\lambda^{\forall, \text{ref}}$
2,815 lines in Isabelle/HOL

Well formed environments

Environments are finite set of pairs, containing unique bindings for variables

- ▶ Type environment

$$\Delta \models \text{TY} \equiv \text{finite } \Delta$$

- ▶ Term environment

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma; \Delta \models \text{OK} &\equiv \\ &\text{finite } \Gamma \wedge \Delta \models \text{TY} \wedge \\ &(\forall x \tau_1 \tau_2. (x \triangleright \tau_1) \in \Gamma \wedge (x \triangleright \tau_2) \in \Gamma \longrightarrow \\ &\quad \tau_1 = \tau_2 \wedge \Delta \models \tau_1) \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ Store

$$\begin{aligned} S \models \text{Store} &\equiv \\ &\text{finite } S \wedge \\ &(\forall x v_1 v_2. (x \mapsto v_1) \in S \wedge (x \mapsto v_2) \in S \longrightarrow \\ &\quad v_1 = v_2 \wedge \text{value } v_1) \end{aligned}$$

Store typing

The **store** in which a **term** is evaluated must correspond to the **typing environments**

$$\begin{aligned} \models S : \Gamma; \Delta &\equiv \\ S \models \text{Store} \wedge & \\ (\forall x \tau. (x \triangleright \tau) \in \Gamma \longrightarrow (\exists v. (x \mapsto v) \in S \wedge \Gamma; \Delta \vdash v : \tau)) & \end{aligned}$$

Standard lemmata/theorems (i)

- ▶ **weakening**: the environment can be extended with fresh bindings that are not used

Standard lemmata/theorems (i)

- ▶ **weakening**: the environment can be extended with fresh bindings that are not used
- ▶ **substitution**: typing is preserved when a term of the same type is substituted for a free variable

lemma substitution:

assumes $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash e' : \tau'$

and $\Gamma, (x:\tau'); \Delta \vdash \text{vsubst_tm } (\text{TmFreeVar } x) \text{ i } e : \tau$

and $\neg x \text{ free in } e$

shows $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash \text{vsubst_tm } e' \text{ i } e : \tau$

Standard lemmata/theorems

(ii)

- ▶ **preservation**: operational semantics preserves typing

theorem preservation:

assumes $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash e : \tau$

and $S; e \hookrightarrow S'; e'$

and $\models S : \Gamma; \Delta$

shows $\exists \Gamma', \Delta'. \Gamma \subseteq \Gamma' \wedge \Delta \subseteq \Delta' \wedge \models S' : \Gamma'; \Delta' \wedge \Gamma'; \Delta' \vdash e' : \tau$

- ▶ **progress**: a well-typed term is either a computed value or the operational semantics can make one more evaluation step

theorem `progress`:

assumes $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash e : \tau$

and $\models S : \Gamma; \Delta$

shows `not_stuck e S`

Lines of code in Isabelle/HOL

file	lines
Environ.thy	46
Syntax.thy	729
Typing.thy	757
Semantics.thy	138
Metatheory.thy	1,145
total	2,815

theorem/lemma	lines
preservation	274
progress	149
weakening of term environment	23
weakening of type environment	45
substitution of terms	192
substitution of types	360

Conclusions

- ▶ Mechanized proof of type-safety for $\lambda^{\forall, \text{ref}}$ using Isabelle/HOL
- ▶ The first fully mechanized type safety proof for a language with mutable references and impredicative polymorphism

Future work

- ▶ Extend the language with explicit reference deallocation
 - ▶ Employ a substructural (linear) type system
 - ▶ This language should have a way of converting linear to unrestricted references
- ▶ Extend the linear language with a way to convert a linear reference to an unrestricted one