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Type errors

• Reasonable restrictions on operations:
  – arithmetic operators apply only to integers
  – comparisons apply only to like values
  – only integers can be input and output
  – conditions must be integers
  – only functions can be called
  – the * operator applies only to pointers
  – field lookup can only be performed on records

• Violations result in runtime errors
Type checking

• Can type errors occur during runtime?
• This is interesting, hence instantly undecidable

• Instead, we use conservative approximation
  – a program is typable if it satisfies some type constraints
  – these are systematically derived from the syntax tree
  – if typable, then no runtime errors occur
  – but some programs will be unfairly rejected (slack)

• What we shall see next is the essence of the Damas–Hindley–Milner type inference technique, which forms the basis of the type systems of e.g. ML, OCaml, and Haskell
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• Make the type checker a bit more clever:

• An eternal struggle
Fighting slack

• Make the type checker a bit more clever:

• An eternal struggle
• And a great source of publications
Be careful out there

• The type checker may be unsound:

• Example: covariant arrays in Java
  – a deliberate pragmatic choice
Generating and solving constraints

AST

constraints
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⟦p⟧ = &int
⟦q⟧ = &int
⟦alloc 0⟧ = &int
⟦x⟧ = ϕ
⟦foo⟧ = ϕ
⟦&n⟧ = &int
⟦main⟧ = () -> int
Types

- Types describe the possible values:

  \[
  \tau \rightarrow \text{int} \\
  \mid \&\tau \\
  \mid (\tau, \ldots, \tau) \rightarrow \tau \\
  \mid \{X:\tau, \ldots, X:\tau\}
  \]

- These describe integers, pointers, functions, and records

- Types are terms generated by this grammar – example: \((\text{int}, \&\text{int}) \rightarrow \&\&\text{int}\)
Type constraints

• We generate type constraints from an AST:
  – all constraints are equalities
  – they can be solved using a unification algorithm

• Type variables:
  – for each identifier declaration $X$ we have the variable $⟦X⟧$
  – for each non-identifier expression $E$ we have the variable $⟦E⟧$

• Recall that all identifiers are unique
• The expression $E$ denotes an AST node, not syntax

• (Possible extensions: polymorphism, subtyping, ...)
Generating constraints (1/3)

\[
\begin{align*}
I: & & \quad \llbracket I \rrbracket = \text{int} \\
E_1 \text{ op } E_2: & & \quad \llbracket E_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket E_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket E_1 \text{ op } E_2 \rrbracket = \text{int} \\
E_1 == E_2: & & \quad \llbracket E_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket E_2 \rrbracket \land \llbracket E_1 == E_2 \rrbracket = \text{int} \\
\text{input:} & & \quad \llbracket \text{input} \rrbracket = \text{int} \\
X = E: & & \quad \llbracket X \rrbracket = \llbracket E \rrbracket \\
\text{output } E: & & \quad \llbracket E \rrbracket = \text{int} \\
\text{if } (E) \{ S \}: & & \quad \llbracket E \rrbracket = \text{int} \\
\text{if } (E) \{ S_1 \} \text{ else } \{ S_2 \}: & & \quad \llbracket E \rrbracket = \text{int} \\
\text{while } (E) \{ S \}: & & \quad \llbracket E \rrbracket = \text{int}
\end{align*}
\]
Generating constraints (2/3)

\[
X(X_1, ..., X_n) \{ \ldots \text{return } E; \} : \\
\[X\] = ([X_1], \ldots, [X_n]) \rightarrow [E] \\
E(E_1, ..., E_n): \\
\[E\] = ([E_1], \ldots, [E_n]) \rightarrow [E(E_1, ..., E_n)] \\
\text{alloc } E: \quad \text{[alloc } E\text{]} = &\text{[E]} \\
\&X: \quad \text{[&X]} = &\text{[X]} \\
\text{null: } \quad \text{[null]} = &\alpha \quad (\text{each } \alpha \text{ is a fresh type variable}) \\
*E: \quad \text{[E]} = &\text{*[E]} \\
*X = E: \quad \text{[X]} = &\text{[E]}
\]
Generating constraints (3/3)

This is the idea, but not directly expressible in our language of types
Generating constraints (3/3)

Let \( \{f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m\} \) be the set of field names that appear in the program

\[
\{X_1 : E_1, \ldots, X_n : E_n\}: \left[\{X_1 : E_1, \ldots, X_n : E_n\}\right] = \{f_1 : \gamma_1, \ldots, f_m : \gamma_m\}
\]

where \( \gamma_i = \begin{cases} \left[E_1\right] & \text{if } f_i = X_j \text{ for some } j \\ \alpha_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \)

\(E \cdot X:\)

\[
\left[E\right] = \{f_1 : \gamma_1, \ldots, f_m : \gamma_m\}
\]

where \( \gamma_i = \begin{cases} \left[E \cdot X\right] & \text{if } f_i = X \\ \alpha_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \)
Exercise

main() {
    var x, y, z;
    x = input;
    y = alloc 8;
    *y = x;
    z = *y;
    return x;
}

• Generate and solve the constraints
• Then try with $y = \text{alloc 8}$ replaced by $y = 42$
General terms

Constructor symbols:
- 0-ary: a, b, c
- 1-ary: d, e
- 2-ary: f, g, h
- 3-ary: i, j, k

Terms:
- a
- d(a)
- h(a, g(d(a), b))

Terms with variables:
- f(X, b)
- h(X, g(Y, Z))
The unification problem

• An equality between two terms with variables:

\[ k(X,b,Y) = k(f(Y,Z),Z,d(Z)) \]

• A solution (a unifier) is an assignment from variables to closed terms that makes both sides equal:

\[ X = f(d(b),b) \]
\[ Y = d(b) \]
\[ Z = b \]

Implicit constraint for term equality:
\[ c(t_1,\ldots,t_k) = c(t'_1,\ldots,t'_k) \implies t_i = t'_i \text{ for all } i \]
Unification errors

- **Constructor error:**
  
  \[ d(X) = e(X) \]

- **Arity error:**
  
  \[ a = a(X) \]
The linear unification algorithm

- Paterson and Wegman (1978)
- In time $O(n)$:
  - finds a most general unifier
  - or decides that none exists

- Can be used as a back-end for type checking
- ... but only for finite terms
Recursive data structures

The program

```plaintext
var p;
p = alloc null;
*p = p;
```

creates these constraints

```plaintext
⟦null⟧ = &α
⟦alloc null⟧ = &⟦null⟧
⟦p⟧ = &⟦alloc null⟧
⟦p⟧ = &⟦p⟧
```

which have this “recursive solution” for p:

```plaintext
⟦p⟧ = α where α = &α
```
Regular terms

- Infinite but (eventually) repeating:
  - $e(e(e(e(e(e(...))))))$
  - $d(a,d(a,d(a, ...)))$
  - $f(f(f(f(...),f(...)),f(f(...),f(...))),f(f(f(...),f(...)),f(f(...),f(...))),f(f(...),f(...))))$

- Only finitely many different subtrees

- A non-regular term:
  - $f(a,f(d(a),f(d(d(a))),f(d(d(d(a)))),...,)))$
Regular unification

• Huet (1976)
• The unification problem for regular terms can be solved in $O(n \cdot A(n))$ using a union-find algorithm

• $A(n)$ is the inverse Ackermann function:
  – smallest $k$ such that $n \leq \text{Ack}(k,k)$
  – this is never bigger than 5 for any real value of $n$

• See the TIP implementation...
Union-Find

makeset(x) {
    x.parent := x
    x.rank := 0
}

find(x) {
    if x.parent != x
        x.parent := find(x.parent)
    return x.parent
}

union(x, y) {
    xr := find(x)
    yr := find(y)
    if xr = yr
        return
    if xr.rank < yr.rank
        xr.parent := yr
    else
        yr.parent := xr
    if xr.rank > yr.rank
        xr.rank := xr.rank + 1
}
Union-Find (simplified)

makeset(x) {
    x.parent := x
}

find(x) {
    if x.parent != x
        x.parent := find(x.parent)
    return x.parent
}

union(x, y) {
    xr := find(x)
    yr := find(y)
    if xr = yr
        return
    xr.parent := yr
}

Implement ‘unify’ procedure using union and find to unify terms...
Implementation strategy

- Representation of the different kinds of types (plus type variables)
- Map from AST nodes to types
- Union-Find
- Traverse AST, generate constraints, unify on the fly
  - report type error if unification fails
  - when unifying a type variable with e.g. a function type, it is useful to pick the function type as representative
  - for outputting solution, assign names to type variables (that are roots), and be careful about recursive types
The complicated function

```plaintext
foo(p, x) {
    var f, q;
    if (*p == 0) {
        f = 1;
    } else {
        q = alloc 0;
        *q = (*p) - 1;
        f = (*p) * (x(q, x));
    }
    return f;
}

main() {
    var n;
    n = input;
    return foo(&n, foo);
}
```
Generated constraints

```
[foo] = ([p],[x]) -> [f]
[*p] = int
[1] = int
[p] = &[*p]
[alloc 0] = &[0]
[q] = &[*q]
[f] = [(*)((q,x))]
[x(q,x)] = int
[input] = int
[n] = [input]
[foo] = ([&n],[foo]) -> [foo(&n,foo)]
```

```
[*p==0] = int
[f] = [1]
[0] = int
[q] = [alloc 0]
[q] = &[(*p)-1]
[*p] = int
[(*p)((q,x))] = int
[x] = ([q],[x]) -> [x(q,x)]
[main] = () -> [foo(&n,foo)]
[&n] = &[n]
[(*p)-1] = int
[*p] = [0]
```
Here, $\phi$ is the regular type that is the unfolding of
$$\phi = (\&\text{int}, \phi) \rightarrow \text{int}$$
which can also be written $\phi = \mu \alpha.(\&\text{int}, \alpha) \rightarrow \text{int}$
All other variables are assigned int
Infinitely many solutions

The function

```c
poly(x) {
    return *x;
}
```

has type \( (&\alpha) \rightarrow \alpha \) for any type \( \alpha \)

(which is not expressible in our current type language)
Recursive and polymorphic types

• Extra notation for recursive and polymorphic types:

\[
\begin{align*}
\tau & \rightarrow \ldots \\
| & \mu \alpha. \tau \\
| & \alpha
\end{align*}
\]

(not very useful unless we also add polymorphic expansion at calls, but that makes complexity exponential, or even undecidable...)

• Types are (finite) terms generated by this grammar
• \( \mu \alpha. \tau \) is the (potentially recursive) type \( \tau \) where occurrences of \( \alpha \) represent \( \tau \) itself
• \( \alpha \) is a type variable (implicitly universally quantified if not bound by an enclosing \( \mu \))
This never causes a type error – but is not typable:

\[ \text{int } \lbrack r \rbrack = \lbrack g \rbrack = \& \alpha \]
Other errors

• Not all errors are type errors:
  – dereference of null pointers
  – reading of uninitialized variables
  – division by zero
  – escaping stack cells
(why not?)

• Other kinds of static analysis may catch these

```plaintext
baz() {
  var x;
  return &x;
}
main() {
  var p;
  p = baz();
  *p = 1;
  return *p;
}
```