SMLtoCoq: Automated Generation of Coq Specifications and Proof Obligations from SML Programs with Contracts

Laila El-Beheiry Giselle Reis Ammar Karkour
Carnegie Mellon University, Qatar
loe@andrew.cmu.edu, giselle@cmu.edu, akarkour@andrew.cmu.edu

Formally reasoning about functional programs is supposed to be straightforward and elegant, however, it is not typically done as a matter of course. Reasoning in a proof assistant requires "reimplementing" the code in those tools, which is far from trivial. SMLtoCoq provides an automatic translation of SML programs and function contracts into Coq. Programs are translated into Coq specifications, and function contracts into theorems, which can then be formally proved. Using the Equations plugin and other well established Coq libraries, SMLtoCoq is able to translate SML programs without side-effects containing partial functions, structures, functors, records, among others. Additionally, we provide a Coq version of many parts of SML's basis library, so that calls to these libraries are kept almost *as is*.

1 Introduction

Programming language implementations are built for programming, so the aim is to provide useful libraries and constructs to make writing *code* as easy as possible. Proof assistants, on the other hand, are built for reasoning and as such the aim is to make writing *proofs* as easy as possible. As much as functional programs look similar to (relational or functional) specifications, if one wants to prove properties about an implemented program, it is necessary to "reimplement" it in the language of a proof assistant. This requires familiarity with both the programming language and the proof assistant, since not all programs are supported by reasoning tools (e.g. non-terminating programs are typically forbidden), and not all libraries are available in both tools.

In this work we present SMLtoCoq: a tool that *automatically translates SML code into Coq specifications*. Moreover, we extend SML with *function contracts which are directly translated into Coq theorems*. By using this tool, programs can be written using all conveniences of a programming language, and their contracts (functions' pre and post conditions) can be proved using the full power of a proof assistant. Our target audience are programmers fluent in functional programming, but with little expertise in proof assistants. By having programs automatically translated into Coq code that looks as similar as possible to SML, programmers can learn quickly how program specifications look like, thus lowering the entry barrier for using the proof assistant.

Even though both tools use a functional language, representing SML programs in Coq is complicated due to their various differences. The first immediate challenge is that SML programs may be partial and have side-effects, while Coq programs/specifications need to be pure and total. Another issue is that Coq requires recursive definitions to be structurally decreasing so that termination is guaranteed. SML programs can certainly diverge, and even if they terminate, it might be because of a more complicated argument than a straightforward structural induction. Coq does have extensions – such as the `Program` command – that are used to define non-structurally-decreasing, terminating recursive functions. However, a proof of termination must be provided. On top of these more fundamental problems, we have

E. Pimentel and E. Tassi (Eds.): Logical Frameworks
and Meta-Languages: Theory and Practice (LFMTP 2021)
EPTCS 337, 2021, pp. 71–87, doi:10.4204/EPTCS.337.6

© L. El-Beheiry, G. Reis & A. Karkour
This work is licensed under the
Creative Commons Attribution License.

encountered many small mismatches between the two languages, such as how records are represented, and what type-checking can infer.

By using a number of Coq features and information available in SML's abstract syntax tree (AST), SMLtoCoq is able to translate an extensive fragment of *pure* SML (i.e. without side effects), including partial functions, records, and functors, among others. The resulting Coq specification looks very similar to the original code, so someone proving properties can easily map parts of specifications back to their program counterpart. Using the Equations library, we translate partial, mutually recursive, and recursive functions out of the box. Non-terminating functions are not accepted by Coq, but their translations type check.

Our contributions are:

- We extend HaMLet's implementation of SML to parse and type-check function contracts, written as function annotations. These are included in the SML's AST and translated into theorems.
- We design and implement a tool, SMLtoCoq, that is able to translate pure SML programs and contracts into Coq specifications and theorems completely automatically. Moreover, the translated code looks very similar to the original code.
- We implement in Coq the SML libraries[1]: `INTEGER`, `REAL`, `STRING`, `CHAR`, `Bool`, `Option`, `List`, `ListPair`, and `IEEEReal`.
- We provide many examples of translated code, including a case study where we translate non-trivial SML code and prove properties on the Coq output. This aligns with the intended workflow for the tool: translate SML code, then prove properties in Coq.

SMLtoCoq can be found at: `https://github.com/meta-logic/sml-to-coq/`

2 Infrastructure

In its core, SMLtoCoq implements a translation of SML's abstract syntax tree (AST) into Gallina's (Coq's specification language) AST – which is subsequently used to generate Gallina code. SML was chosen for being a language with an incredibly formal and precise definition, which helped in understanding precisely what fragments of the language were covered by our translation. Coq was chosen for being an established and powerful proof assistant, with many libraries and plugins available. In particular, it provides the Equations library which was crucial for efficiently automating the translation and generating correct code that looks close to SML.

SML's AST is obtained from HaMLet[2]. SML's implementation in HaMLet can be separated into three phases: *parsing*, *elaboration*, and *evaluation*. If a program's syntax is correct, *parsing* will succeed returning an AST with minimal annotation at each node, containing only their position in the source code. Other well-formedness conditions (e.g. non-exhaustive or redundant matches) and type-checking (i.e. static semantics) are computed during *elaboration*, which populates the annotations in the AST with more information. *Evaluation* will simply evaluate the program (i.e. dynamic semantics).

We use the AST after the elaboration phase, when annotations contain useful information such as inferred types and exhaustiveness of matches. Such information is crucial for the generated Coq code. We call evaluation to make sure the program executes correctly and terminates (i.e. no exceptions raised

[1] Some of these libraries are very pervasive and we needed their implementation to test the translation. This is why they were not translated using SMLtoCoq. See Section 2.3.

[2] `https://people.mpi-sws.org/~rossberg/hamlet/`

or infinite loops entered) before starting the translation, but the evaluation result is not used. SMLtoCoq is implemented in SML.

2.1 HaMLet

HaMLet is an SML implementation whose goal is to be an accurate implementation of the language definition [6] and a platform for experimentation. We chose this implementation for three main reasons:

1. It is faithful to SML's definition, and all deviations and design choices are thoroughly documented.
2. The resulting objects from each compilation step are easily accessible. Particularly, the AST after the elaboration phase could be obtained with a couple of function calls.
3. Due to the detailed documentation, HaMLet could be easily modified as per the translation needs.

HaMLet was extended with function contracts, written as code annotations in the following syntax:

```
(!! f input ==> output;
    REQUIRES: exp1;
    ENSURES:  exp2;      !!)
```

This contract must be placed immediately before `f`'s declaration. The first line includes the function name `f` followed by the variable bindings representing its `input`. These can be curried, uncurried, typed, or untyped, following the syntax of function parameters in SML. This is followed by `output`, which is one named variable, typed or not, representing the function's output. The variable names in `input` and `output` are in the scope of the contract only, and should not be confused with variables inside the function. `REQUIRES` and `ENSURES` are new keywords used for indicating the pre and post condition of the function, respectively. They are followed by SML boolean expressions `exp1` and `exp2`. The type of these expressions is enforced by the type checker. The variables used in `input` and `output` can be used in `exp1` and `exp2`. Variables in the function declaration are not available in the contract, but `exp1` and `exp2` can use functions or variables defined previously in the code.

In addition to changing HaMLet's lexer and parser, SML's AST was modified to account for functions with contracts. The node representing function declaration was augmented to hold the variable bindings and expressions from contracts. If the function has no contracts, these fields are empty.

Besides the implementation of function contracts, HaMLet needed to be modified so that the translation would be as faithful as possible. During parsing, constructs called *derived forms* are transformed into semantically equivalent code using other constructs. This makes the core language smaller. For example, `if-then-else` expressions are transformed into `case` expressions (which, in turn, are transformed into anonymous functions). As a result, the AST computed after parsing would not have nodes for `if-then-else`, and its translation would result in a different (although semantically equivalent) Coq specification. We have changed HaMLet to skip the transformation of derived forms, and added constructors to the AST to account for them. The constructors added were:

- Expressions
  - `()` and `(`e_1`, ..., `e_n`)`
  - `[`e_1`, ..., `e_n`]`
  - `case e of m`
  - `if `e_1` then `e_2` else `e_3
  - e_1 `andalso` e_2 and e_1 `orelse` e_2
  - e_1 `op` e_2 (infix expressions)
- Patterns: `()`, `(`p_1`, ..., `p_n`)`, `[`p_1`, ..., `p_n`]`, and p_1 `op` p_2 (infix patterns)
- Tuple types: t_1 `*` ... `*` t_n

- Function declarations (originally transformed into `val rec`): `fun id pats = e`
- Functor instantiation with inline specification (e.g. `FuncID (structure <strdesc>)`)
- Type definitions in signatures (e.g. `type t = s`, which was expanded to an inline signature)

SML's AST is annotated during elaboration phase. The annotation of the new constructs can happen in one of two ways: (1) its equivalent form is constructed, elaborated, and we use the resulting annotation interpreted in the context of the derived form; or (2) a new elaboration case is implemented for the construct. We have used a combination of both approaches which incurred as few changes as possible in the elaboration phase. The annotations produced by both approaches are equivalent since they are added during the elaboration phase which only considers the static semantics up to which the derived form and its equivalent form are equivalent.

2.2 Coq

Coq's core language for writing specifications is called Gallina. To be able to generate Gallina's AST, we have implemented it as a datatype in our system. The implementation follows closely the grammar of Gallina's specification[3], with a few small changes described in what follows.

Extra term and pattern constructors were added for string, real, char, tuple, list, unit, and infix. SML expressions of those types are directly translated to Gallina using these constructors, and they can be directly mapped to Coq code either using common libraries or notations (e.g. `Datatypes`, `List`), or Coq libraries that we have implemented to match SML libraries (e.g. string, real, char). New term constructors for product types, and boolean conjunction and disjunction, were implemented for the same reasons as above. To be able to generate theorems, Gallina's AST includes the `Prop` operators for conjunction, disjunction, equality, and quantification. Finally, `match` terms need to have a field indicating exhaustiveness.

Some syntactical elements of Gallina were left out since there is no corresponding SML code which generates them. For example, type coercion (`:>`) and "or" patterns (p_1 `|` $p_2 \Rightarrow$ `t`).

Equations Equations [8] is a Coq plugin which allows a richer form of pattern-matching and arbitrarily complex recursion schemes in the setting of dependent type theory. Using this plugin, SMLtoCoq can generate concise and elegant code that is visually similar to SML. The output is considerably improved when compared to one generated in pure Gallina, and the derived proof principles can be used to reason about the high-level code. Among the main advantages of using Equations, is the ability to define partial functions using dependent types. Domain restrictions identified on the original SML function can be translated to a dependent type, which is added as one of the function's arguments. The resulting code has minimal overhead compared to its SML counterpart, not needing extra default values or ad-hoc constructs to handle unmatched cases. In addition to that, Equations provides a simple interface to handle non-trivial recursion where proofs of termination must be provided by the user.

2.3 Libraries

SML's basis library is included in most of its implementations and contains some of the more popular datatypes and functions. Since most SML programs will make use of some part of the basis library, we have implemented Coq equivalents to: `INTEGER`, `REAL`, `CHAR`, `Bool`, `STRING` (and partially `StringCvt`), `Option`, `List`, `ListPair`, and `IEEEReal`. They have the same interface as their SML

[3] `https://coq.inria.fr/distrib/current/refman/language/core/index.html`

counterpart, so function calls to these libraries can be translated almost "as is" to Coq. Most of the implementations build on existing Coq libraries, such as `List`, `ZArith`, `Ascii`, `Bool`, `Floats`, `String` etc.

Several of SML's basis library functions raise **exceptions** for a given set of inputs. However, Gallina is pure and does not have side effects. In particular, it does not support exceptions. In order to handle these cases, we return an **Axiom** instead of raising an exception. For example, the function `List.hd` in SML's basis library raises the exception `Empty` if an empty list is passed to it. The equivalent implementation of `List.hd` in our libraries return the axiom `EmptyException`, defined as:

```
Axiom  EmptyException : forall{a}, a.
```

Note that this means it is not possible to *catch* the exception, and renders Coq inconsistent. We are currently investigating possible solutions for exceptions, and side-effects in general (see Section 5).

A natural question to ask is why we have not used SMLtoCoq itself to translate SML's libraries. The reason is purely of a practical matter: function translation was being developed at the same time libraries were being implemented in Coq, and one development informed the other. Moreover, a lot of SML code relies on these libraries, so we needed equivalent ones in Coq to test our translation.

3 Translation

The translation from an SML's AST $\mathcal{S}$ into a Gallina's AST $\mathcal{G}$ is defined inductively on $\mathcal{S}$. Depending on the type of construct being translated, we rely on (local or global) auxiliary contexts. We describe in this section the relevant parts of the translation, including examples for each of them. The code in all figures in this section is exactly the one used and generated by SMLtoCoq, except for some line breaks and spaces removed to fit the pages. All the Coq code was tested with the following header, which imports the libraries discussed in Section 2.3, Equations, and sets generalization of variables by default.

```
Require Import intSml.        Require Import listSml.
Require Import realSml.       Require Import stringSml.
Require Import charSml.       Require Import boolSml.
Require Import optionSml.     Require Import listPairSml.
Require Import notationsSml.

From Equations Require Import Equations.
Generalizable All Variables.
```

More involved examples can be found in the `examples` folder in the repository[4]. In particular, we would like to highlight the `tree_proof.v` file which contains the translated code for functions on trees, and proofs of non-trivial theorems about these functions.

3.1 Overloaded operators

Some comparison and arithmetic operators in SML are overloaded for multiple types. For example, the equality check works for strings and integers: `val b = "a" = "a" andalso 5 = 3.`

Boolean equality checks for string and integers in Coq, denoted by `=?`, are defined in `string_scope` and `Z_scope`, respectively. However, the last opened scope shadows the first, and trying to use both at the same time fails. For example:

```
Require Import ZArith. Open Scope Z_scope.
Require Import String. Open Scope string_scope.
```

[4] https://github.com/meta-logic/sml-to-coq/tree/sml-to-coq-with-hamlet/examples

```
Require Import Bool.

Fail Definition b := ("a" =? "a") && (5 =? 3).
```

fails because Coq expects 5 to be of type string.

Operation overload is solved using typeclasses. We have defined several typeclasses for different sets of operators and instantiated them with the types supported. We also defined notations for the operators to be the same as SML whenever possible. For example, the typeclass below is instantiated for strings and integers (among others):

```
Class eqInfixes A : Type := {
  eqb : A → A → bool;
  neq : A → A → bool
}.
Infix "="  := eqb (at level 70).
```

3.2 Records

A record is a set of named fields typed by record types, for example:

```
{name = "Bob", age = 42}: {name: string, age: int}
```

In SML, records can occur as expressions, patterns, or types. When matching a record pattern, the user can specify the names of relevant fields and omit the remaining using ellipsis, as long as SML's type checker can infer the full record type. For example:

```
fun getAge (r: {name: string, age: int }) =
  case r of {age = x, ...} => x;
```

Gallina supports record types, however these must be declared using `Record`. So the `getAge` function above could be:

```
Record rec := { name : string; age : Z }.
Definition getAge (r : rec) := match r with
  {| name := _; age := x |} ⇒ x.
```

There are three important points that must be taken into consideration when translating records:

1. Any record expression, type, or pattern in an SML declaration might require a `Record` declaration preceding the translation, and record types must be replaced by the `Record` identifier.
2. The `Record` declaration automatically generates projection functions for each of the record's fields. As a result, field names cannot be reused in the code.
3. There is no Gallina equivalent to SML's ellipsis when pattern matching records. So the translation must make all record fields explicit in patterns.

To make sure all necessary records are declared in the translation, we make use of a *record context* associated with Gallina's AST. This context is split into a local and a global part. The global record context $\mathcal{R}_g$ contains all record types that already have a declaration in the AST. The local record context $\mathcal{R}_l$ is used in the translation of SML's declarations, and starts empty. As the declaration is deconstructed, record expressions, patterns, or types may be encountered. If there exists a record type in $\mathcal{R}_g$ or $\mathcal{R}_l$ such that the fields are the same, and their types are more general, then the translation proceeds as usual. If not, the type is stored in $\mathcal{R}_l$ using a fresh name. Once the declaration translation is done, the types from $\mathcal{R}_l$ are translated into `Record`s occurring before the declaration. The content of $\mathcal{R}_l$ is then added to $\mathcal{R}_g$.

```
type r = { name : string, age : int }

fun isBob ({name = "Bob",...}: r) = true
  | isBob {...} = false
```

```
Record rid1 := { rid1_name : string; rid1_age : Z }.
Definition r := rid1.

Equations isBob (x1: r): bool :=
  isBob {| rid1_age := _; rid1_name := "Bob" |} := true;
  isBob {| rid1_age := _; rid1_name := _ |} := false.
```

Figure 1: Translation for records

To avoid name clashing, we modify the record fields' names by prefixing it with the fresh name used for the record type. Each time a record type, expression, or pattern is found, either its type is found in the record context, or a new type is created. In both situations we are able to tell what this prefix is, and rename the fields accordingly.

Ellipsis on record patterns are resolved by looking into the annotations after SML's elaboration phase. Since the record type must be able to be inferred, this information can be extracted after elaboration, and the pattern can be unfolded with all fields.

The result of translating a record type and a function on this type is shown in Figure 1.

3.3 Polymorphic Types

The treatments of polymorphic values in SML and Coq are different. For example, in SML `val L = []` declares an empty list `L` of type `'a list`, where `'a` is a type variable. This value can be safely used with instantiated lists: `L = [3]` is a well-typed boolean expression (which evaluates to `false`).

In contrast, a "polymorphic" empty list can be declared in Coq in (at least) two different ways:

```
Definition L1 := @nil.
Definition L2 {A : Type} := [] : list A.
```

The types of the terms `L1` and `L2` *as is* (i.e. without annotations) are sligthly different:

```
L1 : forall A : Type, list A
L2 : list ?A where ?A : [ |- Type]
```

The definition of `L1` looks more similar to what is written in SML. However, if we want to use `L1` in other terms with instantiated lists (such as `L = [3]`), then we need to write: `(L1 _) = [3]`[5]. To avoid adding the type parameter explicitly, we can use `L2`, which is implicitly interpreted as `L2 _` by Coq. Indeed, the (type-)check `L2 = [3]` succeeds.

As a result, type variables are made explicit when translating polymorphic SML value declarations so that these values can be used *as is* in the rest of the program, like the example of `L2`. This is done using a type variable context $\mathcal{T}$. The type variable context is always empty at the beginning of a declaration's translation and, as the declaration is traversed, "unknown" types are added to the context. An unknown type becomes "known" when it is added to $\mathcal{T}$. That is, when the translator encounters an expression `e`

[5]Here `_` represents the type variable `A` whose type is inferred by Coq.

with unknown type α, it adds α to $\mathcal{T}$. If a later expression `e'` has type α, the translator treats this as a known type, not changing the type variable context. At the end of the translation, α is added as an implicit argument of the resulting Coq definition, and the translation of the expression `e` is annotated with the type α. For example, `val L = []` is translated to:

```
Definition L {_'13405 : Type} := ([] : @list _'13405).
```

where `_'13405` is the name of the type variable determined by HaMLet.

Note that this is only needed for value declarations. Functions on polymorphic types do not need explicit type parameters since they can be automatically generalized using `Generalizable All Variables`.

3.4 Non-exhaustive Matches

A very common practice when programming in SML is to use patterns for values to deconstruct expressions. For example: `val x::l = [1,2,3]` would result on value `x` being bound to `1` and `l` bound to `[2,3]`. SML's interpreter will issue a `Warning: binding not exhaustive`, but accepts the code. The warning makes sense since it is usually not possible to tell before runtime if the expression on the right will match the pattern (for example, when it is the result of a function application). Non-exhaustiveness is indicated by a flag in the declaration's annotation after elaboration.

Such declarations cannot be directly translated into Gallina because `Definition`s cannot be patterns, only identifiers. Patterns are accepted in `let ' pat := term` expressions, but `term` can *only* resolve to `pat` (i.e. its type has only one constructor). The translation of non-exhaustive declarations is made exhaustive by adding a default case resulting in a `patternFailure` axiom: (the same strategy is used in [9]): `Local Axiom patternFailure: forall {a}, a`. We should note here that the default case will never be reached in the translated code, as this would mean there was a `Bind` exception raised when evaluating the SML code. As mentioned before, the SML code is evaluated before starting the translation, and if it terminates abnormally (with an exception, for example), SMLtoCoq terminates too.

In addition to that, top level declarations need to be split into as many definitions as there are variables being bound. This is done by recursively traversing the pattern and collecting the variables. For each of them, a new Gallina definition is created. For example, `val x::l = [1,2,3]` becomes:

```
Definition x := match [1; 2; 3] with (x :: l) ⇒ x
                                   | _ ⇒ patternFailure
                end.
Definition l := match [1; 2; 3] with (x :: l) ⇒ l
                                   | _ ⇒ patternFailure
                end.
```

Note that the structure of the match term is the same, apart from the variable returned on the non-default case. If the declaration is inside a `let` block, it is translated into multiple nested `let` blocks.

3.5 Functions

Unless a function is total and structurally decreasing at every recursive call, it cannot be translated into `Fixpoint` (or `Definition`, in case it is not recursive) directly. Most of the problems we encountered in function translation could be solved using the Equations plugin, which provides a powerful tool for defining terminating functions via pattern-matching on dependent types. Equations turned out to be more flexible and easier to use than Coq's built-in `Program` command.

```
(!! posAdd(x, y) ==> b;
    REQUIRES: x > 0 andalso y > 0;
    ENSURES: b > x andalso b > y;    !!)
fun posAdd(x, y) = x + y;
```

```
Equations posAdd (x1: (Z * Z)%type): Z :=
  posAdd (x, y) := (x + y).

Theorem posAdd_THM: forall x y b, posAdd(x, y)=b ∧ ((x > 0) && (y > 0)) = true
                                  → ((b > x) && (b > y)) = true.
Admitted.
```

Figure 2: Translation for function contracts

3.5.1 Pattern matching

Programming in SML typically makes extensive use of pattern-matching, most common among which is pattern-matching on function inputs, for example:

```
fun length [] = 0
  | length (x :: l) = 1 + length l
```

Gallina, however, does not allow pattern-matching on function parameters which means that the above function would – in the best case – be translated to the following Coq code:

```
Fixpoint length {A : Type} ( id : list A ) :=
match id with
| [] ⇒ 0
| x :: l ⇒ 1 + length l
end.
```

While this looks acceptable, the translation is complicated as the number of (curried) parameters increases since `match` only deals with one term at a time. Equations allows the definition of functions by pattern matching on the arguments without the need for an intermediary `match` expression. This enables SMLtoCoq to produce code that looks much more similar to the corresponding SML code. For example, the `length` function defined above translates to the following in Coq with Equations:

```
Equations length `(x1: @list _'14188): Z :=
  length [] := 0;
  length (x :: l) := (1 + (length l)).
```

The main limitation associated with using Equations is that the function's input and output types have to be explicit. This does not pose much of a threat since we have type information from HaMLet's elaboration, and having them explicit does not affect the semantics of the code.

3.5.2 Contracts

Deductive verification is a common way to do formal verification, which consists of generating mathematical proof obligations from the code's specifications, then discharging these obligations using proof assistants such as Coq or automated theorem provers. Generating correct proof obligations is a crucial step in this process. To aid in this task, SMLtoCoq automatically translates function contracts (added to HaMLet as explained in Section 2.1) into Coq theorems. A contract of the form:

```
datatype 'a evenList = ENil
                     | ECons of 'a * 'a oddList
and 'a oddList = OCons of 'a * 'a evenList

fun lengthE (ENil: 'a evenList): int = 0
  | lengthE (ECons (_, l)) = lengthO l
and lengthO (OCons (_, l)) = lengthE l
```

```
Inductive evenList  {_a : Type} : Type :=
  | ENil
  | ECons : (_a * @oddList _a)%type → @evenList _a
with oddList  {_a : Type} : Type :=
  | OCons : (_a * @evenList _a)%type → @oddList _a.

Equations lengthE `(x1: @evenList _a): Z :=
  lengthE ENil := 0;
  lengthE (ECons (_, l)) := (lengthO l)
with lengthO `(x1: @oddList _a): Z :=
  lengthO (OCons (_, l)) := (lengthE l).
```

Figure 3: Translation for mutually recursive type and function

```
(!! f input ==> output;
    REQUIRES: precond;
    ENSURES:  postcond;  !!)
```

is translated into:

```
Theorem f_Theorem: forall vars, (f input = output ∧ precond = true)
                              → postcond = true.
```

The theorem's `precond` and `postcond` are the translations of SML boolean expressions `precond` and `postcond`, respectively. As such, they have type `bool` and not `Prop`, hence the need to use `= true` in the theorem statement. The quantified `vars` are the set of variables used in `input` and `output`. This theorem is placed after the function definition in the Gallina code followed by `Admitted`, and the proof is left to the user. An example of the resulting translation of a function with pre and post conditions is shown in Figure 2.

3.5.3 Mutual recursion

Figure 3 shows the translation of a mutually recursive type and function. SML's `and` construct maps nicely to Coq's `with`, which can also be used for `Equations`. One interesting thing to note about this example is how the polymorphic types `evenList` and `oddList` need to be annotated in Coq. First of all, they take a type variable as an implicit type due to the treatment of polymorphism explained in Section 3.3. As a result, when this type is used and a type variable is passed explicitly to it, it must be preceded by `@`. Another thing noticeable in the translation is the presence of `%type` annotating tuple types. Depending on the context, Coq cannot distinguish whether `*` is the tuple type or `nat` multiplication, so the annotation indicates to Coq that this is indeed a type.

3.5.4 Partial functions

One of the powerful features of SMLtoCoq is its ability to handle partial functions. While it is not possible to define partial functions in Coq as is, restricting the translation to total code would be a big loss, not only because partial functions are pervasive in programming, but also: (1) many times partial functions are defined with guarantees that the function will not be called on non-valid arguments and (2) Coq's rich type system accepts preconditions on functions as part of the function inputs. To address this issue, we exploit Coq's powerful support for dependent types to constrain the function domain. That is, we generate preconditions for partial functions and add them as function inputs, which Equations can then use to accept functions that handle the subset of inputs that satisfies the generated preconditions.

A typical example is the `head` function that returns the head of the list `fun hd (x::l) = x`, which is translated to:

```
Equations hd {A} (x1: list A) {H: ∃ y1 y2, x1 = y1::y2}: A :=
  hd (x :: l) := x;
  hd _ := _.
```

Note that the implicit parameter `H` ensures the function is only called on non-empty lists, and is thus total.

In simple cases, Equations can automatically derive a contradiction between the second case and the precondition and all obligations will be discharged. In more complicated cases, Equations would not be able to derive the contradiction, and an obligation remains for the user to solve[6].

The preconditions can be generated by simply requiring that the input parameters match one of the function's cases, for example: `x = case1 ∨ x = case2 ∨ ... ∨ x = casen`. But this can lead to unnecessarily complicated preconditions in the case of multiple input arguments and/or a function with multiple branches. Instead, we use the AST's knowledge of exhaustive patterns to generate preconditions that are considerably smaller than what would be produced by this naive procedure. Our algorithm works by identifying *generic* patterns, which match any input. For example, a single identifier or a constructor for a datatype with one constructor would be generic patterns. When preconditions are generated, generic patterns are eliminated because they are not imposing restrictions on the input. Consider this example:

```
fun hd_sum ((a,b)::l) ((a',b')::l') init = init + a + b + a' + b'
  | hd_sum ((a,b)::l) l'             init = init + a + b
  | hd_sum l          ((a',b')::l') init = init + a' + b'
```

The naive search would produce the following proposition:

```
(∃ a b l, x1 = (a, b)::l ∧ ∃ a' b' l', x2 = (a', b')::l' ∧ ∃ init, x3 = init) ∨
(∃ a b l, x1 = (a, b)::l ∧ ∃ l',       x2 = l'           ∧ ∃ init, x3 = init) ∨
(∃ l,     x1 = l         ∧ ∃ a' b' l', x2 = (a', b')::l' ∧ ∃ init, x3 = init)
```

Our procedure, however, produces:

```
(∃ y1 l,  x1 = y1 :: l ∧ ∃ y2 l', x2 = y2 :: l') ∨
(∃ y1 l,  x1 = y1 :: l) ∨
(∃ y2 l', x2 = y2 :: l')
```

Note that this can be further simplified to `(∃ y1 l, x1 = y1 :: l) ∨ (∃ y2 l', x2 = y2 :: l')`. This requires the implementation of a simplification algorithm for formulas, which we leave for future work. The actual translation of the `hd_sum` function is:

```
Equations hd_sum (x1: @list (Z * Z)%type) (x2: @list (Z * Z)%type)
  {H: exists y1 y2, eq (x1) (y1 :: y2) ∧ exists y1 y2, eq (x2) (y1 :: y2) ∨
      exists y1 y2, eq (x1) (y1 :: y2) ∨ exists y1 y2, eq (x2) (y1 :: y2)}: Z :=
```

[6] Coq accepts unsolved obligations at first, and a user can optionally "admit obligations" and resolve them when needed.

```
signature PAIR =
sig
  type t1
  type t2
  type t = t1 * t2
  val default : unit -> t
end

structure IntString : PAIR =
struct
  type t1 = int
  type t2 = string
  type t = t1 * t2
  fun default () = (0, "")
end

functor Example (Pair : PAIR) =
struct
  val (a, b) = Pair.default ()
end

structure S = Example (IntString)
```

```
Module Type PAIR.
  Parameter t1 : Type.
  Parameter t2 : Type.
  Definition t := (t1 * t2)%type.
  Parameter default : unit → t.
End PAIR.

Module IntString <: PAIR.
  Definition t1 := Z.
  Definition t2 := string.
  Definition t := (t1 * t2)%type.
  Equations default (x1: unit%type):
    (Z * string)%type :=
    default tt := (0, "").
End IntString.

Module Example ( Pair : PAIR ).
  Definition a :=
    match (Pair.default tt) with
    (a, b) ⇒ a end.
  Definition b :=
    match (Pair.default tt) with
    (a, b) ⇒ b end.
End Example.

Module S := !Example IntString.
```

Figure 4: Translation for the module system

```
hd_sum ((a, b) :: l) ((a', b') :: l') := (((a + b) + a') + b');
hd_sum ((a, b) :: l) l' := (a + b);
hd_sum l ((a', b') :: l') := (a' + b');
hd_sum _ _ := _.
```

3.6 Structures, Signatures, and Functors

An SML program can be divided into structures – with each structure comprising a collection of components, (i.e. datatypes, types, and values). A structure can ascribe to a signature, which acts like an interface. In addition to structures and signatures, SML also provides *functors*, which are essentially structures parametrizes by other structures [4]. Gallina has also a module system that provides similar mechanisms for structuring programs. While Gallina's modules and module types conveniently match SML's module language, there is one major syntactical limitation: inline structures and signatures.

Structure and signature expressions in SML can be either top-level or inline. Top-level structure and signature expressions in SML have a single format, where `S` is the component's name:

```
structure S  = structure_exp
signature S  = signature_exp
```

Inline structure expressions occur as functors' parameters:

```
structure S = functor F (structure_exp)
```

and inline signature expressions can occur in any of the following ways:

```
infix F
fun op F (x, y) = x*x + y
val f = op F
val x = 5 F 2
val y = op F (2, 3)
```

```
Equations F (x1: (Z * Z)%type): Z :=
  F (x, y) := ((x * x) + y).
Definition opF := F.
Notation "x 'F' y" := (F (x, y))
         (left associativity, at level 29).
Definition x := (5 F 2).
Definition y := (opF (2, 3)).
```

Figure 5: Translation for infix functions

```
structure_exp : signature_exp
structure_exp :> signature_exp
include signature_exp
structure S : signature_exp
functor F (structure S : signature_exp) = structure_exp
```

Note that inline structures and signatures are unnamed.

In Gallina, inline modules and module types are not allowed; they must be replaced by identifiers. For example, the following attempt of instantiating a `ListOrdered` module directly in the parameter of the `Dict` module: `Module D := Dict(ListOrdered(IntOrdered))` fails. Therefore, we distinguish between the translation of top-level expressions and inline expressions. The translation of inline expressions uses a structure/signature context Σ. This context is initially empty and gets populated with ASTs for inline signature and structure declarations as they are discovered in (possibly nested) inline expressions. Each declaration in this context is assigned a new name, and this name is used for instantiating the Coq module. An example of how modules are translated is shown in Figure 4.

3.7 Infix Functions

SML allows the declaration of infix functions via the `infix` and `fun op` constructs. HaMLet keeps track of infix functions in the *infix environment*, which is returned after parsing, together with the AST. As a result, the `infix` declaration is not part of the AST. When an infix function is used as a prefix, it is preceded by `op`, and this information is available in the AST. Infix functions can be declared in Coq using `Notation` or `Infix`. For our translation we need to use `Notation` because `Infix` assumes the function to be curried, while in SML infix functions are always uncurried.

Once a function declaration of the shape `fun op f` is found in SML's AST, SMLtoCoq checks if `f` in the infix environment, in which case it was declared as an infix function[7]. If `f` is infix, it creates two additional Gallina sentences to be placed after the function definition. First, it defines `opf` as `f` to be used when `op f` is used in the SML code. Secondly, it defines the `Notation "x 'f' y"` so that `f` can be used in infix form from this point onward. See an example in Figure 5. Similar to records, SMLtoCoq uses a context to keep track of which functions have infix notations in the Gallina AST.

3.8 Typed patterns

SML supports types in patterns at any level. The same does not hold for Gallina. For example:

```
Definition f := fun '((x, y) : nat * nat) ⇒ x + y.
Fail Definition f := fun '((x: nat, y: nat)) ⇒ x + y.
Fail Definition f x := match x with | x : nat ⇒ 1 | _ ⇒ 0 end.
```

[7]Note that SML allows non-infix functions to be declared using `fun op`.

Typing the pattern in the first definition is accepted, however, types "inside" the pattern as in the second definition are rejected. Also, typing patterns in `match` expressions is not accepted at all.

If we want to retain the same explicit types as in the SML code, it is possible to extract types nested in patterns to the top level. However, this may include other types that were not explicit. Also, we would need to identify precisely when top-level patterns are not supported, and find an alternative to make the types explicit. For `match` expressions, for example, one can type the expression being matched as opposed to the pattern. Due to these conflicts, our design choice was to ignore types in patterns. Most of the times this is not problematic as Coq is able to infer the correct types. Moreover, function types are already explicit since `Equations` requires it.

4 Related Work

Closest to our approach are hs-to-coq [9], which translates Haskell code into Coq specifications, and coq-of-ocaml[8], which translates OCaml code into Coq specifications. Even if these projects look (superficially) the same, an important difference is that our main goal is to lower the entry barrier into interactive theorem proving (in particular, Coq) for those that are familiar with functional programming (in particular, in SML). As such, we aim for a translation that looks as similar as possible to the SML code, which is obtained using the Equations plugin. We note that Equations is not used in hs-to-coq or coq-of-ocaml, and getting similarly looking code does not seem to be a priority in those projects, which are more focused on the formal verification of large codebases. Another distinguishing feature is the implementation of contracts for functions, which is not available in Haskell or OCaml.

As mentioned, SMLtoCoq uses the Equations plugin, while both hs-to-coq and coq-of-ocaml translate functions to `Definition`s or `Fixpoint`s. As such, they look quite different (and less elegant) than their Haskell or OCaml counterparts. For example, definitions of mutually recursive functions in hs-to-coq require the bodies of the functions to be repeated for each definition, a problem that is solved using mutually defined `Equations` (Section 3.5.3). We find that the Equations plugin helps in obtaining more aesthetically pleasing functions. Haskell functions are defined via cases, like in SML, but this is not supported in Gallina (as explained in Section 3.5.1). Therefore, hs-to-coq must create intermediate names for the arguments to be used in `match` expressions. SMLtoCoq avoids this, again via the Equations plugin. When it comes to partial functions, both hs-to-coq and coq-of-ocaml add a default case on `match` expressions, and use an `Axiom` as its return value. In contrast, SMLtoCoq generates the domain restriction as a dependent type to be used in the `Equations` and avoids the need for a (yet another) `Axiom` (see Section 3.5.4). We find this is a particularly elegant solution, as it reduces the amount of inconsistent axioms that need to be used.

Other smaller differences include the treatment of built-in types and records. While hs-to-coq translate types such as `Int` into their own implementation `GHC.Types.Int`, SMLtoCoq tries to leverage Coq's types as much as possible, translating `int` into Coq's `Z`. Records in hs-to-coq are translated into `Inductive` types with associated projection functions. SMLtoCoq uses Coq's built-in `Records`, having no need to declare projection functions explicitly (see Section 3.2). The treatment of these constructs in coq-of-ocaml is similar to ours. It is worth noting that coq-of-ocaml curries all constructors, while SMLtoCoq and hs-to-coq retain the user defined datatypes as faithful as possible to the original definition.

CFML [1] is a tool for verifying Caml programs based on the so-called *characteristic formulae*. These formulas are derived automatically from the program (without the need for annotations), and describe its behaviour. The resulting formula can be proved using Coq. CFML's newest version uses

[8] `https://clarus.github.io/coq-of-ocaml/`

separation logic to reason about OCaml code [2]. Differently from SMLtoCoq, CFML "translates" functions into specification lemmas in Coq, in the style of Hoare triples.

The Why tool [3] encompasses WhyML, and ML-like language with support for annotations, and the verifier Why3. Why3 leverages several automated and interactive theorem provers to discharge proof obligations coming from WhyML code as automatically as possible. Even if the language resembles our use of contracts in SML, the goal is not the same. SMLtoCoq uses solely Coq for verification, and does not aim at automation.

SMLtoCoq translates SML programs into Coq specifications for reasoning. Going in the other direction, Coq has an extraction mechanism which exports specifications to OCaml, Haskell, or Scheme. Similarly, F* [10] is an OCaml-like functional language which allows the programmer to state and prove lemmas about the code. After verification, programs can be extracted in OCaml, F#, C, WASM, or ASM. To use those tools the programmer needs to have expertise with proof assistants in advance. SMLtoCoq assumes a greater fluency in programming and less in theorem proving, thus enabling the user to write programs in their comfort zone, and later experiment with proving properties in a proof assistant. We believe this direction helps beginners in Coq understanding how program specifications would look like.

5 Conclusion & Future Work

We have described SMLtoCoq, a tool for automatically generating Coq specifications from SML programs. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first tool of its kind. SMLtoCoq is able to handle a considerable fragment of SML, including constructs that are not trivially translated into Gallina, such as partial functions, structures, and records. Additionally, we have implemented contracts for functions and their translation into Coq theorems. We have also ported a big part of SML's basis library into Coq, so that the code can be translated with the minimum amount of modifications. Using the resulting translation the user is able to prove properties about their code using Coq.

We plan to improve and extend SMLtoCoq in several ways.

Simplification of automatically generated pre-conditions As mentioned in Section 3.5.4, the automatically generated preconditions for functions can be further simplified by using logical equivalences. Since the result is always a proposition in disjunctive normal form, we plan to improve our procedure by converting that to conjunctive normal form and applying SAT heuristics for simplifying propositions.

Functions inside let blocks One of the drawbacks of using the Equations library is that `Equations` is a top-level declaration. In SML, functions can be declared nested inside let blocks, for example:

```
fun f x = let fun g y = y + 1 in g x end
val n = let fun h x = x + 1 in h 7 end
```

The definitions of `f` and `g` could be declared mutually using Equations' `where` construct. However, if the nesting depth is bigger than 2, the translation would flatten the structure, which could turn out to be problematic if some functions have the same name. The definition of `h`, on the other hand, cannot be translated into `Equations`. In this case, we need to define a new translation using Coq's native `let (fix)`.

Non-trivial recursion One of the fundamental differences between SML and Coq is that Coq only accepts terminating functions. Among those, functions that are non-trivially terminating must be accompanied by a proof of termination to be accepted. At the moment, SMLtoCoq translates all functions correctly, but those that need termination proofs cannot be compiled in Coq.

For example, the `div_two` function:

```
Equations div_two (n : nat) : nat :=
div_two 0 := 0;
div_two 1 := 0;
div_two n := 1 + div_two (n / 2) .
```

is terminating, but not trivially since the recursive call is not on the predecessor of `n`, but on `n / 2`. To make Coq accept this function, we can annotate it with the well-founded inductive measure to use for the recursive calls. In this case it is the simple `lt` function:

```
Equations div_two (n : nat) : nat by wf n lt :=
div_two 0 := 0;
div_two 1 := 0;
div_two n := 1 + div_two (n / 2) .
```

This generates the proof obligation $n/2 < n$ for $n \geq 2$ that needs to be proved by the user.

Using the `by` annotation, we can also have Coq accept non-terminating functions, but at the cost of an inconsistent axiom and admitted obligations.

```
Local Axiom indMeasure: forall {a}, a → nat.

Equations loop (x1: Z): Z by wf (indMeasure x1) _ :=
  loop x := (loop1 ((x + 1))).
Admit Obligations.
```

We are investigating ways to determine termination information for SML functions, ideally analogous to Coq's termination check. It is unlikely we can automatically figure out the correct inductive measure to use in the annotation (if there is any), but we can at least have functions that compile, and leave it up to the user to remove the use of inconsistent axioms and prove the obligations when possible.

Side-effects Two language features that we have largely (and reasonably) ignored were exceptions and reference cells. These operations involve side effects and, naturally, have no easy correspondence in Coq. Fortunately, dealing with side-effects in pure functional settings is a well-studied problem [7, 11, 5] and there are different solutions, including Coq libraries, that we could adapt to translate effectful SML code.

Correctness We would like to formally prove that our translation for SML into Gallina is correct, which would ultimately guarantee that the reasoning about the code in Coq translates to its SML source. To that end, we started to formalize our translation as a derivation system. Our goal is to show a simulation theorem between the SML source and its translation, using both languages' evaluation semantics. We will start with a small, purely functional, core of both languages, and extend from there.

References

[1] Arthur Charguéraud (2010): *Program Verification through Characteristic Formulae*. In: *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming*, ICFP '10, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, p. 321–332, doi:10.1145/1863543.1863590.

[2] Arthur Charguéraud (2020): *Separation logic for sequential programs (functional pearl)*. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 4(ICFP), pp. 116:1–116:34, doi:10.1145/3408998.

[3] Jean-Christophe Filliâtre & Andrei Paskevich (2013): *Why3 — Where Programs Meet Provers*. In Matthias Felleisen & Philippa Gardner, editors: *Proceedings of the 22nd European Symposium on Programming*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, pp. 125–128, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-37036-6_8.

[4] Robert Harper (2011): *Programming in Standard ML*. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0.

[5] Thomas Letan & Yann Régis-Gianas (2020): *FreeSpec: Specifying, Verifying, and Executing Impure Computations in Coq*. In: *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs*, CPP 2020, Association for Computing Machinery, p. 32–46, doi:10.1145/3372885.3373812.

[6] Robin Milner, Mads Tofte & David Macqueen (1997): *The Definition of Standard ML*. MIT Press, doi:10.7551/mitpress/2319.001.0001.

[7] Aleksandar Nanevski, Greg Morrisett, Avraham Shinnar, Paul Govereau & Lars Birkedal (2008): *Ynot: Dependent Types for Imperative Programs*. In: *Proceedings of the 13th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming*, ICFP '08, Association for Computing Machinery, p. 229–240, doi:10.1145/1411204.1411237.

[8] Matthieu Sozeau, Cyprien Mangin, Pierre-Marie Pédrot, Emilio Jesús Gallego Arias, Gaëtan Gilbert, Robin Green, Maxime Dénès, Hugo Herbelin, Guillaume Claret, Siddharth, Enrico Tassi, Anton Trunov, Joachim Breitner, Antonio Nikishaev, SimonBoulier, Søren Nørbæk, Vincent Laporte & Yves Bertot (2020): *mattam82/Coq-Equations: Equations 1.2.3 for Coq 8.11*. doi:10.5281/zenodo.3967149.

[9] Antal Spector-Zabusky, Joachim Breitner, Christine Rizkallah & Stephanie Weirich (2018): *Total Haskell is reasonable Coq*. *Proceedings of the 7th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs - CPP 2018*, doi:10.1145/3167092.

[10] Nikhil Swamy, Catalin Hritcu, Chantal Keller, Aseem Rastogi, Antoine Delignat-Lavaud, Simon Forest, Karthikeyan Bhargavan, Cédric Fournet, Pierre-Yves Strub, Markulf Kohlweiss, Jean-Karim Zinzindohoué & Santiago Zanella-Béguelin (2016): *Dependent Types and Multi-Monadic Effects in F**. In: *43rd ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*, ACM, pp. 256–270, doi:10.1145/2837614.2837655.

[11] Li-yao Xia, Yannick Zakowski, Paul He, Chung-Kil Hur, Gregory Malecha, Benjamin C. Pierce & Steve Zdancewic (2020): *Interaction trees: representing recursive and impure programs in Coq*. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 4(POPL), p. 1–32, doi:10.1145/3371119.