

CSCI 742 - Compiler Construction

Lecture 21 Introduction to Type Checking Instructor: Hossein Hojjat

March 19, 2018

Compiler Phases



- Type theory covers a huge range of topics
- Several lectures in the courses
 - Programming Language Concepts (344)
 - Programming Language Theory (740)
- In this course we do not cover the theoretical aspects of type system design
- We are mostly interested in type checking as a major component of the semantic analysis phase

- Type: a set of values and a set of operations on those values
- Example: Integers
- int x,y; means:
 - x, y $\in [-2^{31}, 2^{31})$
 - Operations + < <= mod ... are possible on x and y
- Type errors:

improper, type-inconsistent operations during program execution

• Type safety: absence of type errors at run time

Bind (assign) types, then check types

Type binding

- Defines types for constructs in the program (e.g., variables, functions)
- Can be either explicit (boolean x) or implicit (x = false)
- Type safety: correctness with respect to the type bindings

Type checking

- Static semantic checks to enforce the type safety of the program
- Enforce a set of type-checking rules

- Operators (such as +) receive the right types of operands
- User-defined functions receive the right types of operands
- LHS of an assignment should be "assignable"
- Variables are assigned the expected kinds of values
- Return statement must agree with return type
- Class members accessed appropriately

- **Statically** typed language: types are defined and checked at compile-time, and do not change during the execution of the program
- E.g., C, Java, Pascal
- **Dynamically** typed language: types defined and checked at run-time, during program execution
- E.g., Lisp, Scheme, Smalltalk

- Efficient code: dynamic checks slow down the program
- Guarantees that all executions will be safe
- With dynamic checking, you never know when the next execution of the program will fail due to a type error

Drawbacks

- Adds an annotation burden for programmers
- Static type safety is a conservative approximation of the values that may occur during all possible executions
- It may reject some type-safe programs unfairly

- We have used the following formal notations for specifying the first two phases of compiler:
 - Regular expressions for lexical analysis
 - Context-free grammars for parsers
- We use inference systems from logic to formalize type checking
 - Similar to what we did in name analysis
- Inference systems are suitable for performing computations of form:

If the first expression is of type T and the second expression is of type T' then the third expression must be of type T''

• Example inference rule:

All great universities have smart students	Premise 1
RIT is a great university	Premise 2
RIT has smart students	Conclusion

• Example inference rule:

e_1 has type int	Premise 1
e_2 has type int	Premise 2
$e_1 + e_2$ has type int	Conclusion

- An inference system has two parts:
 - 1. Definition of Judgments
 - Judgment: statement asserting a certain fact for an object
 - 2. Finite set of Inference Rules
- An inference rule has:
 - 1. a finite number of judgments P_1 , P_2 , \cdots , P_n as premises;
 - 2. a single judgment ${\boldsymbol{C}}$ as conclusion
- If a rule has no premises, it is called an axiom

$$\frac{P_1 \qquad P_2 \qquad \cdots \qquad P_n}{C} \text{ (Rule name)} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{Premises above the line (0 or more)} \\ \text{Conclusion below the line} \end{array}$$

Example: Use an inference system to define the set of even numbers

- Judgment: Even(n) asserts that n is an even number
- Inference rules:
- Axiom:

$$\frac{1}{Even(0)}$$
(Even0)

- Successor Rule:

 $\frac{\textit{Even}(n)}{\textit{Even}(n+2)} \text{ (EvenS)}$

$$\frac{Even(n)}{Even(0)} \text{ (Even0)} \qquad \qquad \frac{Even(n)}{Even(n+2)} \text{ (EvenS)}$$

• To derive more judgments we create trees of inference rules



$$\frac{Even(n)}{Even(0)} \text{ (Even0)} \qquad \qquad \frac{Even(n)}{Even(n+2)} \text{ (EvenS)}$$

• To derive more judgments we create **trees** of inference rules



- Does *Even*(1) hold?
- No, because there exists no possible derivation



Example: Use an inference system to define the less-than relation

- Judgment: n < m asserts that n is smaller than m
- Inference rules:
- Axiom:

$$\frac{1}{n < n+1} \text{ (Suc)}$$

- Transitivity Rule:

$$\frac{k < n \qquad n < m}{k < m}$$
 (Trans)

Exercise: Prove 0 < 3.

Type Judgments and Type Rules

• e type checks to T under Γ (type environment)

 $\Gamma \vdash e:T$

- Types of constants are predefined
- Type binding: types of variables are specified in the source code
- If e is composed of sub-expressions

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1 \qquad \cdots \qquad \Gamma \vdash e_n : T_n}{\Gamma \vdash e : T}$$

Type Judgments and Type Rules

$$\Gamma \vdash e:T$$

If the (free) variables of e have types given by the type environment gamma, then e (correctly) type checks and has type T

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1: T_1 \quad \cdots \quad \Gamma \vdash e_n: T_n}{\Gamma \vdash e: T}$$

If e_1 type checks in Γ and has type T_1 and ...

and e_n type checks in Γ and has type T_n

then e type checks in Γ and has type T

Type Rules with Environment



17