

A Type- and Control-Flow Analysis for System F

Matthew Fluet
mtf@cs.rit.edu

Computer Science Department
Rochester Institute of Technology



August 31, 2012
IFL'12

Control-flow analysis

A compile-time approximation of the “flow” of functions in program: which functions might be bound to a given variable at run time.

- an enabling analysis for the compilation of functional languages
 - because control flow is not syntactically apparent
- typically formulated for dynamically- or simply-typed languages

- popular statically-typed functional languages are richly-typed
- System F (and extensions) are popular intermediate languages

Seek a control-flow analysis formulated for System F.
Exploit well-typedness to obtain more precise control-flow information.

Example 1

$f1 = \lambda x1. \dots$

$f2 = \lambda x2. \dots$

$id = \lambda x. x$

$res1 = id\ f1$

$res2 = id\ f2$

Example 1

$f1 = \lambda x1. \dots$

$f2 = \lambda x2. \dots$

$id = \lambda x. x$

$res1 = id\ f1$

$res2 = id\ f2$

	OCFA
$\hat{\rho}(x)$	$\{f1, f2\}$
$\hat{\rho}(res1)$	$\{f1, f2\}$
$\hat{\rho}(res2)$	$\{f1, f2\}$

Example 1

$f1: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda x1: \text{Int}. \dots$

$f2: \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool} = \lambda x2: \text{Bool}. \dots$

$\text{id}: \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha = \Lambda \alpha. \lambda x: \alpha. x$

$\text{res1}: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \text{id} [\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}] f1$

$\text{res2}: \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool} = \text{id} [\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}] f2$

	OCFA
$\hat{\rho}(x^\alpha)$	$\{ f1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f2^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}} \}$
$\hat{\rho}(\text{res1}^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}})$	$\{ f1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f2^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}} \}$
$\hat{\rho}(\text{res2}^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}})$	$\{ f1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f2^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}} \}$

Example 1

$f1: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda x1: \text{Int}. \dots$

$f2: \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool} = \lambda x2: \text{Bool}. \dots$

$\text{id}: \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha = \Lambda \alpha. \lambda x: \alpha. x$

$\text{res1}: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \text{id} [\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}] f1$

$\text{res2}: \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool} = \text{id} [\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}] f2$

	OCFA then type-filter
$\hat{\rho}(x^\alpha)$	$\{ f1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f2^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}} \}$
$\hat{\rho}(\text{res1}^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}})$	$\{ f1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}} \}$
$\hat{\rho}(\text{res2}^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}})$	$\{ f2^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool}} \}$

Example 2

```
f1: Int → Int → Int = λx1: Int. let g1: Int → Int = λy1: Int. ... in g1
f2: Int → Int → Int = λx2: Int. let g2: Int → Int = λy2: Int. ... in g2
f3: Int → Int → Int = λx3: Int. let g3: Int → Int = λy3: Int. ... in g3
```

```
id: ∀α. α → α = Λα. λx: α. x
```

```
h: ∀β. (β → Int → Int) → β → Int → Int =
  Λβ. λf: β → Int → Int. λy: β.
    let ff: β → Int → Int = id [β → Int → Int] f
        g: Int → Int = ff y
    in g
...
```

Example 2

$f1: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda x1: \text{Int}. \text{let } g1: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda y1: \text{Int}. \dots \text{ in } g1$
 $f2: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda x2: \text{Int}. \text{let } g2: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda y2: \text{Int}. \dots \text{ in } g2$
 $f3: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda x3: \text{Int}. \text{let } g3: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda y3: \text{Int}. \dots \text{ in } g3$

$\text{id}: \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha = \Lambda \alpha. \lambda x: \alpha. x$

$h: \forall \beta. (\beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} =$
 $\Lambda \beta. \lambda f: \beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}. \lambda y: \beta.$
 $\text{let } ff: \beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \text{id } [\beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}] \text{ f}$
 $\quad g: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = ff \ y$
 $\text{in } g$
 \dots

	OCFA
$\hat{\rho}(x^\alpha)$	$\{ f1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f2^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f3^{\text{Str} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}} \}$
$\hat{\rho}(f^{\beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}})$	$\{ f1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f2^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}} \}$
$\hat{\rho}(ff^{\beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}})$	$\{ f1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f2^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f3^{\text{Str} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}} \}$
$\hat{\rho}(g^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}})$	$\{ g1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, g2^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, g3^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}} \}$

Example 2

$f1: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda x1: \text{Int}. \text{let } g1: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda y1: \text{Int}. \dots \text{ in } g1$
 $f2: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda x2: \text{Int}. \text{let } g2: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda y2: \text{Int}. \dots \text{ in } g2$
 $f3: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda x3: \text{Int}. \text{let } g3: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda y3: \text{Int}. \dots \text{ in } g3$

$\text{id}: \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha = \Lambda \alpha. \lambda x: \alpha. x$

$h: \forall \beta. (\beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} =$
 $\Lambda \beta. \lambda f: \beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}. \lambda y: \beta.$
 $\text{let } ff: \beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \text{id } [\beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}] \text{ f}$
 $\quad g: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = ff \ y$
 $\text{in } g$
 \dots

	OCFA
$\hat{\rho}(x^\alpha)$	$\{ f1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f2^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f3^{\text{Str} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}} \}$
$\hat{\rho}(f^{\beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}})$	$\{ f1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f2^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}} \}$
$\hat{\rho}(ff^{\beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}})$	$\{ f1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f2^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f3^{\text{Str} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}} \}$
$\hat{\rho}(g^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}})$	$\{ g1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, g2^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, g3^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}} \}$
$\hat{\phi}(\alpha)$	$\{ \beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}, \text{Str} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \}$
$\hat{\phi}(\beta)$	$\{ \text{Int}, \text{Bool} \}$

Example 2

$f1: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda x1: \text{Int}. \text{let } g1: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda y1: \text{Int}. \dots \text{ in } g1$
 $f2: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda x2: \text{Int}. \text{let } g2: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda y2: \text{Int}. \dots \text{ in } g2$
 $f3: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda x3: \text{Int}. \text{let } g3: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \lambda y3: \text{Int}. \dots \text{ in } g3$

$\text{id}: \forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha = \Lambda \alpha. \lambda x: \alpha. x$

$h: \forall \beta. (\beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} =$
 $\Lambda \beta. \lambda f: \beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}. \lambda y: \beta.$
 $\text{let } ff: \beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = \text{id } [\beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}] \text{ f}$
 $\quad g: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} = ff \ y$
 $\text{in } g$
 \dots

	OT&CFA
$\hat{\rho}(x^\alpha)$	$\{ f1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f2^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f3^{\text{Str} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}} \}$
$\hat{\rho}(f^{\beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}})$	$\{ f1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f2^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}} \}$
$\hat{\rho}(ff^{\beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}})$	$\{ f1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, f2^{\text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}} \}$
$\hat{\rho}(g^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}})$	$\{ g1^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}}, g2^{\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}} \}$
$\hat{\phi}(\alpha)$	$\{ \beta \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int}, \text{Str} \rightarrow \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Int} \}$
$\hat{\phi}(\beta)$	$\{ \text{Int}, \text{Bool} \}$

Introduction

A type- and control-flow analysis for System F

Type-flow analysis

A compile-time approximation of the “flow” of types in program:
which types might be bound to a given type variable at run time



determines type abstractions
flowing to type applications



rejects flows incompatible
with static typing

Control-flow analysis

A compile-time approximation of the “flow” of functions in program:
which functions might be bound to a given variable at run time

System F (in Administrative Normal Form (ANF))

$Type \ni \tau ::= \tau \rightarrow \tau \mid \alpha \mid \forall \alpha. \tau$

$Exp \ni e ::= x$
| $\text{let } x:\tau_x = \mu f:\tau_f. \lambda z:\tau_z. e_b \text{ in } e$
| $\text{let } x:\tau_x = \mu f:\tau_f. \Lambda \beta. e_b \text{ in } e$
| $\text{let } x:\tau_x = x_f x_a \text{ in } e$
| $\text{let } x:\tau_x = x_f [\tau_a] \text{ in } e$

- Type system — standard
- Operational semantics — C_aEK abstract machine

Type- and Control-Flow Analysis

$A\text{Type} \ni \hat{\tau} ::= \tau$

$A\text{Value} \ni \hat{w} ::= \mu f : \tau_f . \lambda z : \tau_z . e_b \mid$
 $\mu f : \tau_f . \Lambda \beta . e_b$

$A\text{Env} \ni \hat{\phi} \in \text{TyVar} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A\text{Type})$

$A\text{Env} \ni \hat{\rho} \in \text{Var} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A\text{Value})$

$\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models e$

“ $\hat{\phi}$ and $\hat{\rho}$ are an *acceptable* type- and control-flow analysis for e ”

Type- and Control-Flow Analysis

$A\text{Type} \ni \hat{\pi} ::= \tau$

$A\text{Value} \ni \hat{w} ::= \mu f : \tau_f . \lambda z : \tau_z . e_b \mid \mu f : \tau_f . \Lambda \beta . e_b$

$A\text{Env} \ni \hat{\phi} \in \text{TyVar} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A\text{Type})$

$A\text{Env} \ni \hat{\rho} \in \text{Var} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A\text{Value})$

$\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models e$

“ $\hat{\phi}$ and $\hat{\rho}$ are an *acceptable* type- and control-flow analysis for e ”

$\overline{\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models x}$

$$\frac{\hat{\rho}(f) \supseteq \{\mu f : \tau_f . \lambda z : \tau_z . e_b\} \quad \hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models e_b \quad \hat{\rho}(x) \supseteq \{\mu f : \tau_f . \lambda z : \tau_z . e_b\} \quad \hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models e}{\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models \text{let } x : \tau_x = \mu f : \tau_f . \lambda z : \tau_z . e_b \text{ in } e}$$
$$\frac{\hat{\rho}(f) \supseteq \{\mu f : \tau_f . \Lambda \beta . e_b\} \quad \hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models e_b \quad \hat{\rho}(x) \supseteq \{\mu f : \tau_f . \Lambda \beta . e_b\} \quad \hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models e}{\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models \text{let } x : \tau_x = \mu f : \tau_f . \Lambda \beta . e_b \text{ in } e}$$

Type- and Control-Flow Analysis

$A\text{Type} \ni \hat{\pi} ::= \tau$

$A\text{Value} \ni \hat{w} ::= \mu f : \tau_f . \lambda z : \tau_z . e_b \mid$
 $\mu f : \tau_f . \Lambda \beta . e_b$

$A\text{Env} \ni \hat{\phi} \in \text{TyVar} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A\text{Type})$

$A\text{Env} \ni \hat{\rho} \in \text{Var} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A\text{Value})$

$\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models e$

“ $\hat{\phi}$ and $\hat{\rho}$ are an *acceptable* type- and control-flow analysis for e ”

$$\frac{\bigwedge_{\mu f : \tau_f . \lambda z : \tau_z . e_b \in \hat{\rho}(x_f)} \left(\begin{array}{l} \hat{\rho}(z) \supseteq \hat{\rho}(x_a) \wedge \\ \hat{\rho}(x) \supseteq \hat{\rho}(\text{last}(e_b)) \end{array} \right) \quad \hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models e}{\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models \text{let } x : \tau_x = x_f \ x_a \text{ in } e}$$

$$\frac{\bigwedge_{\mu f : \tau_f . \Lambda \beta . e_b \in \hat{\rho}(x_f)} \left(\begin{array}{l} \hat{\phi}(\beta) \supseteq \{\tau_a\} \wedge \\ \hat{\rho}(x) \supseteq \hat{\rho}(\text{last}(e_b)) \end{array} \right) \quad \hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models e}{\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models \text{let } x : \tau_x = x_f \ [\tau_a] \text{ in } e}$$

Type- and Control-Flow Analysis

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 AType \ni \hat{\pi} ::= \tau & AValue \ni \hat{w} ::= \mu f : \tau_f . \lambda z : \tau_z . e_b \mid \\
 & \mu f : \tau_f . \Lambda \beta . e_b \\
 AEnv \ni \hat{\phi} \in TyVar \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(AType) & AEnv \ni \hat{\rho} \in Var \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(AValue)
 \end{array}$$

$\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models e$ “ $\hat{\phi}$ and $\hat{\rho}$ are an *acceptable* type- and control-flow analysis for e ”

$$\frac{\bigwedge_{\mu f : \tau_f . \lambda z : \tau_z . e_b \in \hat{\rho}(x_f)} \left(\begin{array}{l} \hat{\rho}(z) \supseteq \{ \hat{w}_a \in \hat{\rho}(x_a) \mid \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \hat{w}_a \approx \tau_z \} \wedge \\ \hat{\rho}(x) \supseteq \{ \hat{w}_b \in \hat{\rho}(\text{last}(e_b)) \mid \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \hat{w}_b \approx \tau_x \} \end{array} \right) \quad \hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models e}{\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models \text{let } x : \tau_x = x_f \ x_a \text{ in } e}$$

$$\frac{\bigwedge_{\mu f : \tau_f . \Lambda \beta . e_b \in \hat{\rho}(x_f)} \left(\begin{array}{l} \hat{\phi}(\beta) \supseteq \{ \tau_a \} \wedge \\ \hat{\rho}(x) \supseteq \{ \hat{w}_b \in \hat{\rho}(\text{last}(e_b)) \mid \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \hat{w}_b \approx \tau_x \} \end{array} \right) \quad \hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models e}{\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models \text{let } x : \tau_x = x_f \ [\tau_a] \text{ in } e}$$

Type Compatibility

$\boxed{\vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \hat{w} : \approx \hat{\pi}}$ “the type of \hat{w} is *compatible* with $\hat{\pi}$ under $\hat{\phi}$ ”

$$\frac{\emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \tau_f \approx \hat{\pi}}{\vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \mu f : \tau_f . \lambda z : \tau_z . e_b : \approx \hat{\pi}}$$

$$\frac{\emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \tau_f \approx \hat{\pi}}{\vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \mu f : \tau_f . \Lambda \beta . e_b : \approx \hat{\pi}}$$

$\boxed{\Delta \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \hat{\pi}_1 \approx \hat{\pi}_2}$ “ $\hat{\pi}_1$ and $\hat{\pi}_2$ are *compatible* under $\hat{\phi}$ ”

$$\frac{\hat{\pi}'_1 \in \hat{\phi}(\alpha_1) \quad \text{FTV}(\hat{\pi}_2) \cap \text{dom}(\Delta) = \emptyset \quad \emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \hat{\pi}'_1 \approx \hat{\pi}_2}{\Delta \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \alpha_1 \approx \hat{\pi}_2}$$

$$\frac{\hat{\pi}'_2 \in \hat{\phi}(\alpha_2) \quad \text{FTV}(\hat{\pi}_1) \cap \text{dom}(\Delta) = \emptyset \quad \emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \hat{\pi}_1 \approx \hat{\pi}'_2}{\Delta \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \hat{\pi}_1 \approx \alpha_2}$$

$$\frac{\Delta \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \tau_{z1} \approx \tau_{z2} \quad \Delta \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \tau_{b1} \approx \tau_{b2}}{\Delta \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \tau_{z1} \rightarrow \tau_{b1} \approx \tau_{z2} \rightarrow \tau_{b2}}$$

$$\frac{\Delta(\alpha) = \star}{\Delta \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \alpha \approx \alpha}$$

$$\frac{\Delta, \alpha : \star \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \tau_{b1} \approx \tau_{b2}}{\Delta \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \forall \alpha . \tau_{b1} \approx \forall \alpha . \tau_{b2}}$$

Flow Soundness

Acceptable abstract environments approximate concrete environments
(for well-typed programs)

Flow Soundness

Acceptable abstract environments approximate concrete environments
(for well-typed programs)

Theorem (Flow Soundness)

If $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e : \tau$, $\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \vDash e$, and $\langle e; \emptyset; \emptyset; \bullet \rangle \longrightarrow^* \langle e'; \phi'; \rho'; \kappa' \rangle$,
then $|\phi'| \sqsubseteq \hat{\phi}$ and $|\rho'| \sqsubseteq \hat{\rho}$.

- syntactic preservation proof (with $\vdash \langle e; \phi; \rho; \kappa \rangle : \tau$ and $\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \vDash \langle e; \phi; \rho; \kappa \rangle$)

Lemma (Expansion Type Equality implies Analysis-Time Type Compatibility)

If $\vdash \langle \tau_1; \phi_1 \rangle \Rightarrow \tau$, $\vdash \langle \tau_2; \phi_2 \rangle \Rightarrow \tau$, $\hat{\phi} \vDash \phi_1$, and $\hat{\phi} \vDash \phi_2$, then $\emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \tau_1 \approx \tau_2$.

- $\vdash \langle \tau_1; \phi_1 \rangle \Rightarrow \tau$ and $\vdash \langle \tau_2; \phi_2 \rangle \Rightarrow \tau$ from well-typedness

Existence of Minimum, Finite Flows

There are “best” acceptable abstract environments

Existence of Minimum, Finite Flows

There are “best” acceptable abstract environments

Theorem (Minimum Flows Exist)

For all programs e ,

*there exist minimum abstract environments $\hat{\phi}_{\min}$ and $\hat{\rho}_{\min}$
such that $\hat{\phi}_{\min}; \hat{\rho}_{\min} \models e$.*

- acceptable abstract environments are preserved by meets

Existence of Minimum, Finite Flows

There are “best” acceptable abstract environments

Theorem (Finite Flows Exist)

For all programs e , $\hat{\phi}_\top^e; \hat{\rho}_\top^e \models e$.

- $\hat{\phi}_\top^e$ maps every Λ -bound type variable in e (a finite set) to the (finite) set of all type expressions in e
- $\hat{\rho}_\top^e$ maps every let- , μ -, and λ -bound variable in e (a finite set) to the (finite) set of all Λ - and λ -expressions in e

Computability/Decidability of Flows

Are the “best” acceptable abstract environments computable?

Computability/Decidability of Flows

Are the “best” acceptable abstract environments computable?

Is the acceptability of abstract environments decidable?

- To show $\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models e$,
must show inclusions of the form $\hat{\rho}(z) \supseteq \{\hat{w} \in \hat{\rho}(x) \mid \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \hat{w} : \approx \tau_z\}$
 - For each $\hat{w} \in \hat{\rho}(x)$ but $\hat{w} \notin \hat{\rho}(z)$,
must show $\vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \hat{w} : \approx \tau_z$ is not derivable.

Computability/Decidability of Flows

Are the “best” acceptable abstract environments computable?

Is the acceptability of abstract environments decidable?

- To show $\hat{\phi}; \hat{\rho} \models e$,
must show inclusions of the form $\hat{\rho}(z) \supseteq \{\hat{w} \in \hat{\rho}(x) \mid \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \hat{w} : \approx \tau_z\}$
 - For each $\hat{w} \in \hat{\rho}(x)$ but $\hat{w} \notin \hat{\rho}(z)$,
must show $\vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \hat{w} : \approx \tau_z$ is not derivable.

Is type compatibility decidable?

Decidability of Type Compatibility

If $\hat{\phi}^\ddagger(\alpha) = \{ \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}, \text{int} \rightarrow \alpha \}$ and $\hat{\phi}^\ddagger(\beta) = \{ \text{int} \rightarrow \text{bool}, \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \}$,
then is $\emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi}^\ddagger \Rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \approx \alpha$ derivable?

Decidability of Type Compatibility

If $\hat{\phi}^\ddagger(\alpha) = \{ \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}, \text{int} \rightarrow \alpha \}$ and $\hat{\phi}^\ddagger(\beta) = \{ \text{int} \rightarrow \text{bool}, \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \}$,
then is $\emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi}^\ddagger \Rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \approx \alpha$ derivable?

“Recursion” in abstract type environment foils exhaustive search.

Decidability of Type Compatibility

If $\hat{\phi}^\ddagger(\alpha) = \{ \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}, \text{int} \rightarrow \alpha \}$ and $\hat{\phi}^\ddagger(\beta) = \{ \text{int} \rightarrow \text{bool}, \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \}$,
 then is $\emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi}^\ddagger \Rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \approx \alpha$ derivable?

“Recursion” in abstract type environment foils exhaustive search.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \vdots \\
 \hline
 \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \in \hat{\phi}^\ddagger(\beta) \quad \emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi}^\ddagger \Rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \approx \alpha \\
 \hline
 \emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi}^\ddagger \Rightarrow \beta \approx \alpha \\
 \hline
 \emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi}^\ddagger \Rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \approx \text{int} \rightarrow \alpha \\
 \hline
 \text{int} \rightarrow \alpha \in \hat{\phi}^\ddagger(\alpha) \quad \emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi}^\ddagger \Rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \approx \alpha \\
 \hline
 \emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi}^\ddagger \Rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \approx \alpha
 \end{array}$$

Decidability of Type Compatibility

If $\hat{\phi}^\ddagger(\alpha) = \{ \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}, \text{int} \rightarrow \alpha \}$ and $\hat{\phi}^\ddagger(\beta) = \{ \text{int} \rightarrow \text{bool}, \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \}$,
then is $\emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi}^\ddagger \Rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \approx \alpha$ derivable?

Interpret abstract type environment as a regular-tree grammar.

Decidability of Type Compatibility

If $\hat{\phi}^\ddagger(\alpha) = \{ \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}, \text{int} \rightarrow \alpha \}$ and $\hat{\phi}^\ddagger(\beta) = \{ \text{int} \rightarrow \text{bool}, \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \}$,
then is $\emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi}^\ddagger \Rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \approx \alpha$ derivable?

Interpret abstract type environment as a regular-tree grammar.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\phi}^\ddagger}(\text{int} \rightarrow \beta) &= \{ \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \text{bool}, \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \text{bool}, \dots \} \\ \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\phi}^\ddagger}(\alpha) &= \{ \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}, \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}, \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \text{int}, \dots \}\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\phi}^\ddagger}(\text{int} \rightarrow \beta) \cap \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\phi}^\ddagger}(\alpha) = \emptyset$$

Intuitively, $\emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi}^\ddagger \Rightarrow \text{int} \rightarrow \beta \approx \alpha$ is not derivable because there is no closed type generated by $\hat{\phi}^\ddagger$ from both $\text{int} \rightarrow \beta$ and α .

Decidability of Type Compatibility

Type compatibility is decidable

Decidability of Type Compatibility

Type compatibility is decidable

Theorem (Analysis-Time Type Compatibility iff Languages Intersect)

$\emptyset \vdash \hat{\phi} \Rightarrow \hat{\pi}_1 \approx \hat{\pi}_2$ if and only if $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\phi}}(\hat{\pi}_1) \cap \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\phi}}(\hat{\pi}_2) \neq \emptyset$.

- regular-tree grammars are closed under intersection; $O(n^2)$
- emptiness of regular-tree grammars is decidable; $O(n^2)$

Computability of Flows

The “best” acceptable abstract environments are computable

Computability of Flows

The “best” acceptable abstract environments are computable

- Read analysis as a monotone function from abstract environments to abstract environments
- Least fixed point is the “best” acceptable abstract environments
- Least fixed point is computable using iteration

Related Work

- Need to distinguish between
 - flow analyses expressed as sophisticated type systems (many)
 - flow analyses of languages with sophisticated type systems (few)

Related Work

- Need to distinguish between
 - flow analyses expressed as sophisticated type systems (many)
 - flow analyses of languages with sophisticated type systems (few)
- Type-Directed Flow Analysis for Typed Intermediate Languages; Jagannathan, Weeks, & Wright (SAS'97)
 - limited to predicative System F with recursion
 - polyvariant analysis
 - diverges on programs using polymorphic recursion
- Type-sensitive Control-Flow Analysis; Reppy (ML'06)
 - Suggests mapping polymorphism to \top

- Efficient computation of type- and control-flow analysis
- Extend to a polyvariant type- and control-flow analysis
- Extend to richer type systems: System F + GADTs; System F_ω

Questions?