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Abstract
We present the first method for reasoning about temporal logic properties of higher-order, infinite-data programs. By distinguishing between the finite traces and infinite traces in the specification, we obtain rules that permit us to reason about the temporal behavior of program parts via a type-and-effect system, which is then able to compose these facts together to prove the overall target property of the program. The type system alone is strong enough to derive many temporal safety properties using refinement types and temporal effects. We also show how existing techniques can be used as oracles to provide liveness information (e.g., termination) about program parts and that the type-and-effect system can combine this information with temporal safety information to derive nontrivial temporal properties. Our work has application toward verification of higher-order software, as well as modular strategies for procedural programs.

Categories and Subject Descriptors D.2.4 [Software Engineering]: Software/Program Verification—Model checking; Correctness proofs; Reliability; F.3.1 [Logics and Meanings of Programs]: Specifying and Verifying Reasoning about Programs; F.3.2 [Logics and Meanings of Programs]: Semantics of Programming Languages—Program analysis; F.3.3 [Logics and Meanings of Programs]: Studies of Program Constructs—Type structure

General Terms Algorithms, Languages, Theory, Verification

Keywords Higher-order programs, formal verification, temporal logic, program analysis, model checking

1. Introduction
Programming languages that use higher-order functionality (e.g., Java, C#, F#, Haskell, Ocaml, Perl, Python, Ruby) have become commonplace. Higher-order language features such as map, grep, Google’s Map/Reduce, are used widely and applauded for their simplicity and modularity.
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Meanwhile, in the past couple of decades, algorithms and tools have emerged that have enabled automatic verification of some industrial software systems. Symbolic analysis techniques such as abstraction refinement [7] and interpolation [23] have given rise to interprocedural program analysis tools for safety [2, 5], while termination argument refinement [24] has led to tools for liveness [8, 13]. Further research has led to tools and algorithms for verifying properties expressed in temporal logic: more elaborate specifications that combine safety and liveness [1, 4, 9–12].

The verification techniques discussed thus far have been mostly limited to imperative first-order software and cannot be applied to higher-order programming languages. In recent years, researchers have developed some techniques for verifying higher-order programs. Some showed how to verifying temporal properties of higher-order programs when the domain of data is finite (i.e., boolean). Others have also developed methods of verifying purely safety properties [16, 19, 25, 28] or purely termination [20, 21] of higher-order programs with infinite data (e.g., integers). Despite the efforts discussed above, at present there are no methods for verifying safety/liveness properties (i.e., temporal logic formulae) of programs written in higher-order languages.

We present the first technique for verifying temporal logic properties of higher-order, infinite-data programs. The crux of our work is to decompose the problem, not only by dividing the program up into individual expressions via a type-and-effect system, but also, for every expression, to track the behavior of finite traces separate from the behavior of infinite traces. Our type rules permit verification oracles (including the type system itself) to reason about the conditional safety and liveness (i.e., temporal) behavior of program parts, and compose these facts together to prove the overall target property of the program. Moreover, we show that existing tools can be used as oracles to introduce liveness proofs into the type system’s effects. While it is a commonly held belief that type systems cannot be used for liveness properties, we show how they can, nonetheless, be used to carry some liveness information and soundly combine reasoning about program parts together to prove overall safety and liveness.

By way of an example, consider a function application e v, where we are attempting to prove an overall temporal property “tick U boom,” which means that some event tick will occur repeatedly until the event boom occurs, and boom is inevitable. With the type-and-effect system described in this paper we can, for example, reason about the safety behavior

\[ \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \overset{\text{boom}}{\longrightarrow} \tau' \& \overset{\text{tick}^*}{\vdots} \]

that is due to the reduction of e (repeating event tick) and the latent behavior (event boom) that arises when e is applied to a value \( v : \tau \), and then separately reason about the termination of (the reduction of) e via an oracle:

\[ \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \overset{\text{term}}{\vdots} \& \text{terminates} \]
We are using shorthand in these judgments’ effects, whereas formally our type system distinguishes the behavior of finite traces from the behavior of infinite traces. The type-and-effect system in this paper combines all of this information together via refinement types, and temporal connectives (intersection, union, concatenation) to obtain an overall goal judgment

\[ \Gamma \vdash e \downarrow v : \tau' \& \text{tick} \cup \text{boom} \]

while carefully accounting for possibly divergent evaluations. Our formalism permits oracles of arbitrary temporal expressive power. Our use of termination in the example above is a special case.

Contributions. To our knowledge, this work marks the first method for reasoning about temporal logic properties of higher-order programs that have infinite data. The above is a limited example. We believe our work provides the theoretical foundation toward several areas of practical significance. To this end, we have devised general rules so there are many instantiations and applications of them, including:

1. Instatiation to a wide variety of specification logics. We are able to support any logic that is closed under intersection, union, and composition (over finite and infinite traces) such as Büchi specifications. We sometimes use LTL as a shorthand for Büchi [15].

2. Instatiation to arbitrary type environments. Often the type system alone is strong enough to derive safety properties. For example, when using refinement types in the absence of a termination oracle, our rules can be thought of as a novel extension to dependent types, where temporal behaviors are carried as effects.

3. Instatiation of oracles to any fragment of program expressions or any subset of the specification logic.

4. Instatiation to a modular reasoning system for temporal behaviors of first-order procedural programs.

We have devised our methodology to be based on local reasoning, employing a type system. This stands in contrast to many existing verification works for higher-order programs that operate by extracting a transition system and then performing standard model checking techniques. Such existing techniques suffer from the inability to refine the abstraction during the verification process and, moreover, require input programs to be given in CPS form.

Limitations. It is a commonly held belief that (ordinary) type systems cannot be used to derive liveness properties. In this paper, we do not allow the type system to derive (non-trivial) liveness properties by itself. However, when liveness information is introduced by an oracle (e.g. a termination oracle), our type system is able to soundly combine this liveness information with safety/liceness information from other oracles or the type system itself. To maintain soundness, we also have to be careful when typing recursive functions, as we will discuss in the next section. Finally, note that the temporal behavior of a program is directly related to its evaluation order. For the purposes of this paper, we assume a strict evaluation order.

Organization. We first give a high-level description of our methodology in Section 2. After preliminaries in Section 3, we present our type and effect system in Section 4. We prove type soundness (Theorem 4.1). We then examine a variety of examples, discussed in Section 5, that span a range of temporal behaviors, compositions and oracle power. We conclude with a discussion of related work in Section 6.

2. Overview

Consider the following higher-order program, written in an ML-like syntax:

```
Example 1. 1 let rec zoom _ = ev [zoom 0] 2 and shrink f = ev [shrink 0] 3 if (f () = 0) then 4 zoom () 5 else 6 shrink (λ. (f () - 1)) 7 and main() = ev [main 0] 8 let t = pos in 9 shrink (λ. t)
```

For the moment, think of the boxed expressions as skip. The function zoom calls itself recursively, looping forever. Next, shrink is a recursive function and it takes, as an argument, a function f from unit to int. If applying f returns 0, zoom is called. Otherwise, shrink is called recursively with a new partially-defined argument. Finally, main initiates with the expression shrink (λ. t) where t is bound to a nondeterministically chosen positive integer (denoted *pos*).

For this example, we may want to prove the Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) property: \( \Phi = \text{main} \land X (\text{shrink} \cup \text{zoom}) \). (We are abusing notation here and using LTL as shorthand for Büchi specification over finite and infinite executions, but we will discuss that shortly.) This property consists of the temporal operators X and U as well as atomic propositions that are events, denoted in the event font. Events are emitted by the ev [event] expression. For simplicity, in the above example we correlate events with function calls, indicating that the function with the corresponding name has been called (this correlation is also a suitable definition of events in the context of practical examples). The property \( \Phi \) specifies that the main function will be called first (event main) and then in the next step, the shrink function will be called (event shrink) repeatedly until zoom is called (event zoom). U is the strong until operator, which specifies that its second argument must hold after finitely many steps.

Intuitively, we know that \( \Phi \) holds of the above example. The property \( \Phi \) is a trace-based property and specifies that every (terminating or nonterminating) execution of this program must generate event sequences of the form:

```
main. (shrink)\(^i\). zoom....
```

where there are finitely many instances of shrink. The property holds because, when shrink is called with a function that returns a positive integer, shrink will eventually call zoom.

Proving that this property holds of this program is challenging. There are several obstacles: First it consists of both safety and liveness aspects, in the form of reachability and termination. Second, there is nondeterministic input. Third, the state space is infinite. Finally, this is a higher-order program. There are several recent related works, but all of them have restrictions that make them unsuitable to this example. Some works are restricted to finite data [18], others can reason over infinite data but are restricted to safety [28] or termination [20] properties, and still others can reason about infinite-state systems but are restricted to first-order input programs [10].

Compositional reasoning. The key idea of this paper is to decompose the problem of verifying that the entire program satisfies \( \Phi \) into pieces in two ways. The first decomposition is not surprising: we divide the program up into its individual expressions so that we can determine which events arise from a given expression. For example, the behavior of a function application \( e \downarrow v \) is determined by separately considering the behavior of the value \( v \) as it is re-
duced, the behavior of the function expression \( e \) as it is reduced and, finally, the latent behavior that arises when \( e \) is applied to \( v \).

The second form of decomposition is that, for every expression, we track the event behavior of finite traces separate from the event behavior of infinite traces. That is, for an expression \( e \) we will have two specifications: \( \Xi \) for the finite part and \( \Pi \) for the infinite part. The event behavior of \( e \) is the union of these specifications. Büchi automata provide a convenient such specification language that can be characterized separately over finite and infinite runs. (Büchi automata are also known to be closed under concatenation across the two partitions [29], which we will see to be important in Section 3.) The informed reader will note two commonly held beliefs. First, liveness is generally not composable: one cannot, in general, find a witness to non-liveness with a finite prefix of a trace. Related is the second belief that per-expression reasoning, as seen in type systems, cannot be used for liveness. However, as we will see here, type systems can be used to carry temporal safety and liveness specifications for expressions. This fact, combined with our separation of finite traces from infinite traces, allows us to soundly combine reasoning about program parts together to prove overall safety and liveness.

Our technique is best illustrated through the running example. After the main event fires and \( t \) is bound, we need to show that the body of \( \text{main}, \ shrink (\lambda_x . t) \), satisfies \( \text{shrink } U \text{ zoom} \). In this paper, we characterize the temporal behavior of program expressions via a type-and-effect system that distinguishes between finite and infinite event traces. Syntactically, judgments are of the form:

\[
\Gamma \vdash e : \tau \& (\Xi, \Pi)
\]

which denotes that, under a typing context \( \Gamma \), we deduce that expression \( e \) has (a refinement) type \( \tau \), that finite event traces of \( e \) satisfy \( \Xi \), and that infinite event traces of \( e \) satisfy \( \Pi \).

Our type system permits us to decompose our reasoning about Example 1 into separate components:

1. The latent temporal behavior arising from \( \text{shrink} \) when it is applied to an argument:

\[
\Gamma \vdash \text{shrink} : (\text{unit} \rightarrow \text{int}) \rightarrow \text{unit} \& \varepsilon
\]

The above judgment \( J_1 \) says that \( \text{shrink} \) is a function which consumes a function and returns unit (i.e., “\((\cdot)\)”). \( \text{shrink} \) itself is a function value and, as such, it generates no effects, denoted \( \varepsilon \). However, when \( \text{shrink} \) is applied, the latent behavior \“\text{shrink } \text{zoom}”\ occurs, indicating that event \( \text{shrink} \) occurs until event \text{zoom (}but not that \text{zoom will necessarily inevitably occur). Formally, as we will discuss later in the paper, the latent effects are also represented as a pair \((\Xi, \Pi)\) of finite and infinite traces (e.g., as finite and Büchi automata). But, we are abbreviating it in LTL by encoding terminating runs as self-loops, as is commonly done.

2. The conditions under which \( \text{shrink} \) terminates:

\[
\Gamma \vdash \text{shrink} : (\{i \mid i \geq 0\}) \rightarrow \text{unit} \& \varepsilon
\]

We use refinement (dependent) types [31] to say that the argument of \( \text{shrink} \) is a function that returns an integer above 0. In this judgment \( J_2 \), the latent effect is \( F \text{-shrink} \), indicating that eventually an event will occur that is not \( \text{shrink} \). For convenience, we will sometimes abbreviate such termination judgments as \“\( \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \& \text{terminates} \”\.

Notice that in the above judgment we have used a refinement type system to place the \textit{conditions} on (the function passed to) \( \text{shrink} \) under which \( \text{shrink} \) will terminate: that the passed function is returning a nonnegative number.

Our type-and-effect system combines these facts (whose origins we will next discuss) together to obtain a final judgment, using a few rules such as function application (App), the combination rule (Comb), and the subtyping rule (Sub):

\[
\begin{align*}
J_1 & \vdash (\lambda_x . t) \ldots \text{App} \quad J_2 & \vdash (\lambda_x . t) \ldots \text{App} \\
\text{Comb} & \quad \text{Sub}
\end{align*}
\]

This final judgment indicates that the expression \( (\lambda_x . t) \) has unit type and will exhibit a finite sequence of \( \text{shrink} \) events, followed by a \text{zoom} event.

Our type-and-effect system, formalized in Section 4, consists of several other rules that combine temporal information about expressions, taking care to account for possibly divergent computation. To be able to combine rich information across different oracles, we adopt and extend the refinement type system that has garnered popularity in the verification of functional programs [6, 16, 19, 25, 28, 30]. There are typing rules for all the usual higher-order features such as subtyping, intersection, etc.—however, they will now also carry the temporal effect of each (sub)expression.

In the above example, our work combined a derivation \( J_1 \), which is a \textit{safety} proof with a derivation \( J_2 \) which is a \textit{termination} proof. But one is inclined to wonder: where do these pieces come from in the first place? We will now describe how these subproofs are obtained, respectively.

### Safety via the type system

We can use our type-and-effect system to deduce that the function \( \text{shrink} \) has the latent (safety) effect \( \text{shrink } \text{W } \text{zoom} \). This arises as a fixpoint solution to the typing context in the judgments over the body of \( \text{shrink} \). Assume that we have a typing environment \( \Gamma \) that already contains a judgment:

\[
\Gamma \vdash \text{zoom} = \text{unit}\quad \text{unit } \varepsilon
\]

indicating that when \( \text{zoom} \) is applied to unit an arbitrarily long sequence of \( \text{zoom} \) events may occur. We also know that an application of \( \text{shrink} \) will generate event \( \text{shrink} \). (We assume that every named function begins with a special event statement of the same name, but this has been omitted for readability. For example, the body of \( \text{shrink} \) in Example 1 is “\((\varepsilon[\text{shrink}]; \text{if } ...)\).”)

Depending on which branch is taken in \( \text{shrink} \), either \( \text{shrink} \) will recur, generating event \( \text{shrink} \) or else the expression \( \text{zoom} \) will generate event \( \text{G zoom} \). Since we do not know \textit{a priori} whether \( f() = 0 \) returns true or false, a valid typing context will say that \( \text{shrink} \) satisfies \( \text{shrink } \text{V } \text{G zoom} \). This disjunction of event atomic propositions is valid, however, it only asserts the event currently generated. If we look for a fixpoint of

\[
\alpha = \text{shrink } \land X(\text{G zoom } \lor \alpha)
\]

there is a stronger solution:

\[
\Gamma, \text{zoom } \vdash \text{f : unit } \& \text{ shrink } \text{W } (\text{G zoom})
\]

Note that type systems typically do not distinguish fixpoints (e.g., greatest versus least) and, as such, we cannot conclude anything about the infinite traces. However, we can combine a judgement of \( \text{shrink } \text{W } (\text{G zoom}) \) over the finite traces, with an oracle judgement that \( \text{G (shrink } \lor \text{ zoom)} \) holds over the infinite traces, to obtain that \( \text{shrink } \text{W } (\text{G zoom)} \) holds over all traces\(^1\).

### Liveness via a termination oracle

Type systems themselves cannot generate liveness information. However, we show how they

---

\(^1\) We conjecture that there is a way to organize type systems so that infinite-trace behaviors of expressions can arise from fixpoint equations, but we leave this to future work.
can be used to carry liveness (or safety) information obtained from an outside source. This is accomplished via an oracle rule:

\[ \Theta \vdash e : \tau & \Phi \quad \text{Oracle} \]

(Note that an oracle \( \star \) must satisfy the Oracle property in Definition 4.1.) This rule is very general and it allows us to incorporate information from external techniques into our type-and-effect system. Let us look again at the body of shrink. If \( f \) is a function that, when applied to \( () \), returns 0, then \( \text{zoom} \) will be invoked. Otherwise, \( \text{shrink} \) is called recursively with a partial function definition \( \lambda \_ \_ . (f()) - 1 \). Intuitively we know that this recursive function terminates provided that it is applied to a function \( f \) that, when applied to \( () \), returns a positive integer. In recent work [20] we describe a technique for proving termination of higher-order programs. We can adapt this technique to prove a temporal property \( \text{F-shrink} \) that is similar to termination, under the condition that \( f() \) is non-negative. With this proof in hand, we can use the oracle rule to conclude that

\[ \Gamma \vdash \text{shrink} : \text{unit} \rightarrow \{ i \mid i \geq 0 \} \]

Of course in general, the oracle rule can be used to introduce more elaborate temporal specifications. We will see such examples in Section 5.

The example in this section provided a small illustration of how our work combines temporal reasoning over separate program pieces together to prove overall temporal properties. In Section 5 we present a variety of examples that illustrate many ways that our work can be instantiated. In addition to verification of higher-order programs, our work also suggests a local technique for verification of first-order interprocedural programs that would escape previous restrictions on the logic [1]. We now turn to a formal presentation of our work.

### 3. Preliminaries

We focus on a small functional language shown in Figure 1. A program, \( P \), is a finite set of mutually recursive function definitions. \( F \bar{x} = e \) uniquely defines a function named \( F \) with the formal parameters \( \bar{x} \) and the closed expression \( e \) as the body. Function names may appear free in a function body. The notation \( \bar{x} \) denotes a possibly empty sequence. Note that nested recursive function definitions can be supported via \( \Lambda \) lifting [17].

Expressions, \( e \), comprises constants \( c \), function names \( F \), variables \( x \), lambda abstractions \( \lambda x.e \), constant operations \( x \circledast y \), function applications \( x \ y \), event raises \( \text{ev}[a] \), conditional branches \( \text{if } x \text{ then } e_1 \text{ else } e_2 \), and let expressions \( \text{let } x = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \). In \( \text{ev}[a] \), \( a \in \Sigma \) is an event symbol. We assume that the set of event symbols \( \Sigma \) contains a special event symbol \( \text{step} \) whose role is explained below. The constants include the boolean constants true and false, the unit constant \( () \), and the integer constants. The operator \( \circledast \) include boolean and integer operators such as \( +, -, \leq \), as well as the operator \( *_{\text{int}} \) that returns a non-deterministic integer (for simplicity, we often write \( *_{\text{int}} \) for \( *_{\text{int}} \)). We write \( \text{fr}(e) \) for the free variables of \( e \).

### 3.1 Semantics

We define the call-by-value semantics of the language via big-step evaluation rules. We define terminating evaluation by the usual inductive rules \( \downarrow_P \), and define non-terminating runs by co-inductive rules \( \uparrow_P \), following the previous work on co-inductive big-step [14, 22]. Non-terminating runs need be provided as well as the usual terminating ones because we are concerned with possibly infinite sequences of events generated by the program.

The terminating judgement \( e \downarrow_P v \) wellness \( v \) expresses that the expression \( e \) evaluates to the value \( v \) producing the finite sequence of events \( \varpi \in \Sigma^* \). A value \( v \) is either a constant or a closed \( \lambda x.e \) (i.e., \( \text{fr}(e) \subseteq \{ x \} \)). The non-terminating judgement \( e \uparrow_P \) wellness \( \pi \) expresses that \( e \) diverges and produces the infinite sequence of events \( \pi \in \Sigma^\omega \). Because of non-determinism, an expression can have multiple terminating and non-terminating evaluations. We

---

**Figure 1:** The syntax of the simple functional language.

**Figure 2:** Simple type system type checking rules.
Figure 3: Semantics of the simple functional language

\[ \varepsilon[x] \downarrow \rho v' \& \varpi \]
\[ \lambda x.e \downarrow \rho v' \& \varpi \]
\[ op(c_1, c_2) = c \]
\[ c_1 op c_2 \downarrow \rho c \& \varepsilon \]
\[ F \downarrow \rho \lambda x.e \& \varepsilon \]
\[ \text{st-Val} \]
\[ \text{st-Op} \]
\[ \text{st-App} \]
\[ \text{st-Ev} \]
\[ \text{st-Fun} \]
\[ \text{st-Let} \]
\[ \text{st-If1} \]
\[ \text{st-If2} \]

Figure 4: Type syntax

\[ \Xi ::= \Sigma^* \]
\[ \Pi ::= \Sigma^\omega \]
\[ \Phi ::= (\Xi, \Pi) \]
\[ B ::= \text{int} \text{ bool} \text{ unit} \]
\[ \tau, \sigma ::= \{ u : B | \theta \} | \lambda x. \Phi \to \tau \]

the process of computing the subsequent such state. Trouble arises when it is possible for \( it \) to execute infinitely many steps.

We think that this is an important point and so, in this paper, we have given a semantics for the \( \lambda \)-calculus that ensures that there are no infinite, invisible computations. We do this by inserting \textit{step} events, as described above. We argue that future temporal verification techniques and tools for both first- and higher-order should be developed with this in mind. In the context of first-order programs, a state is typically defined to be the valuation of all program variables. This precludes the observation that there can be infinite computation over registers. We urge future semantics for first-order programs to incorporate a strategy similar to ours in order to ensure there is no hidden computation. There is, however, a caveat: user specifications may be impacted. A specification such as \( Gp \) holds regardless of how many step events occur before \( p \). A specification such as \( G \) must be written with the possibility of \textit{step} events in mind. In most cases, the intention of a \( Gp \) specification is really \( G_{\text{step}} \lor p \).

Returning to the language semantics, the rule \textit{snt-App} is also used to evaluate function applications:

\[ \varepsilon[x] \downarrow \rho \downarrow \rho \& \varpi \]
\[ \lambda x.e \downarrow \rho \downarrow \rho \& \varpi \]

This rule handles the case when the function call diverges (i.e., the evaluation of \( \varepsilon[x] \) diverges).

**Example 2.** Let \( P \) be the following four-function program:

\[ F g = e[v] \mid \text{if} \ast_{\text{int}} \text{then} g \text{ else } F (Hg) \]
\[ G x = e[b] \mid 1 \]
\[ \text{H} \ g \ x = e[v] \mid 2 \]
\[ \text{I} () = FG; \text{FG} \]

Let \( \hat{a} = \text{step} \cdot \text{a}, \hat{b} = \text{step} \cdot \text{b}, \) and \( \hat{c} = \text{step} \cdot \text{c} \). Let \( A \) be the regular language \( a^* \cdot \hat{c}^* \cdot b \). Then, \( I () \downarrow \rho \), \( \varpi \) if and only if \( \varpi e \in \Xi \) and \( v = 1 \), and \( I () \downarrow \rho \), \( \pi \) if and only if \( \pi e \in \Pi \) where

\[ \Xi = \{ v \cdot \varpi' | \varpi e A \cup \{ e \} \wedge \varpi' e A \} \]
\[ \Pi = \{ \pi \cdot \hat{a}^* | \varpi e A \cup \{ e \} \} \]

We often omit the program \( P \) from the definitions when the program is clear from the context. For example, we simply write \( \downarrow \) and \( \downarrow \) instead of \( \downarrow \rho \) and \( \downarrow \rho \).

**4. Type System**

We now formalize the type and effect system. Intuitively, our type and effect system is an orchestrating language that glues together information from the temporal property verifier oracles (termination checker, safety checker, etc.). As we described in Section 2, in order to be able to communicate rich information across the different oracles, we adopt and extend the refinement (dependent) type system that has garnered recent popularity [6, 16, 19, 25, 28, 30].

Figure 4 defines the syntax of types. Per previous work on refinement type systems, types include refinement base types \( \{ u : B | \theta \} \) that refines the base-type \( B \) by the refinement predicate \( \theta \) which is a formula in some first-order logic theory on base-type
variables. We sometimes abbreviate \( \{u:B \mid \theta \} \) as \( B \) when \( \theta \) is a tautology (e.g., \( \{u:B \mid \top \} = B \)). Intuitively, \( \{u:B \mid \theta \} \) denotes the type of some value \( u \) of the base type \( B \) satisfying the formula \( \theta \).

The type \( x : \sigma \Phi \tau \) is a dependent function type, consisting of the argument type \( \sigma \) and the return type \( \tau \) and the latent effect \( \Phi \). We extend the dependent function type from previous work by adding trace sets as a latent effect. Intuitively, \( x : \sigma \Phi \tau \) denotes the type of a function that returns a value of the type \( \tau \) and generates events represented by the effect \( \Phi \) when applied to an argument \( y \) of the type \( \sigma \). As usual, \( \Rightarrow \) associates to the right. The system is parametrized by the class of trace sets that are usable as the effects.

An effect is a pair comprising a set of finite traces \( \Xi \) (the terminating part) and a set of infinite traces \( \Psi \) (the non-terminating part). We define operations on effects component-wise as shown in Figure 5. Here, \( \Xi \cup \Psi \) denotes the concatenation of the traces in \( \Xi \) to those in \( \Psi \) and is defined as \( \{ x_1 \ldots x_n \mid x_1 \in \Xi, \ldots, x_n \in \Psi \} \).

Similarly, a concatenation of a set of finite traces \( \Xi \) to a set of infinite traces \( \Psi \) is defined as \( \Xi \cdot \Psi = \{ x_1 \ldots x_n \mid x_1 \in \Xi, \ldots, x_n \in \Psi \} \).

The type \( \{x:B \mid \theta\} \) binds \( x \) in \( \theta \). Likewise, \( x : \sigma \Phi \tau \) binds \( x \) in \( \tau \) (but not in \( \sigma \)). That is, \( \Sigma \) is \( \Pi \) replaced by \( \Sigma \cdot \Pi \).

4.1 Type Environment

A type environment \( \Gamma \) is a sequence of variable binding \( x : \tau \), function name binding \( F : \tau \), and a FOL formula \( \Theta \). The formulas \( \theta \) are used to express the branch conditions (cf. \( 25, 28 \)). We often treat \( \Gamma \) as a set and write \( x : \tau \in \Gamma \), \( \theta \in \Gamma \), etc. to access its elements.

We write \( \text{dom}(\Gamma) \) for the variables and function names that are bound in \( \Gamma \), that is, \( \text{dom}(\Gamma) = \{ \kappa \mid \kappa : \tau \in \Gamma \} \). Here, \( \kappa \) ranges over variables and function names. We assume that the (base-type) variables appearing free in the types and the formulas in \( \Gamma \) are in \( \text{dom}(\Gamma) \), that is, \( \cup_{\text{free} \theta} \cup \cup_{x:\tau} \Sigma \).

4.2 Variable-to-value Substitution

We use the meta variable \( \rho \) to denote substitutions from variables to values (\( \rho \) does not map function names). (Recall that values are closed.) We define \( \rho(\epsilon) \), \( \rho(\theta) \), and \( \rho(\tau) \) in the obvious way. We define \( \rho(\Gamma) \) to be the environment with each \( \theta \in \Gamma \) replaced by \( \rho(\theta) \) and each \( \kappa : \tau \in \Gamma \) replaced by \( \kappa : \rho(\tau) \).

We let \( \rho_{\text{base}} \) denote the restriction of \( \rho \) to base-type variables, and \( \rho_{\text{sub}} \) denote the restriction of \( \rho \) to function type variables. Note that, because the formulas and the types only have base-type variables, substitution over the formulas can be restricted to base-type variables (i.e., \( \rho(\theta) = \rho_{\text{base}}(\theta) \) and \( \rho(\tau) = \rho_{\text{base}}(\tau) \)).

4.3 Semantics of Type and Effect

We define the semantics of type and effect for the purpose of defining the notion of valid oracles that can be used in the type system and for formalizing the soundness of the type system. In formally, the type and effect semantics \( \Theta \vdash \tau \& \Phi \) is the set of expressions of the program \( P \) whose evaluation causes (finite and infinite) sequences of events in \( \Phi \), and if terminates, results in a value of the type \( \tau \), when the free variables in the expression are substituted the values of the types \( \Theta \). Figure 6 formally defines \( \Theta \vdash \tau \& \Phi \). Here, \( \rho = \rho_P \Theta \) denotes that \( 1 \) dom(\( \rho \)) = dom(\( \Theta \)), \( 2 \) \( \rho \) = \( \rho_{\text{sub}}(\( \Theta \)), \) and \( 3 \) \( \forall \epsilon \in \text{dom}(\( \rho_{\text{sub}}(\( \rho(\epsilon) \)) \) = \( \rho(\Theta(\epsilon)) \).

We note that the definition uses the auxiliary notion \( \tau \) which represents the set of values of the type. As with the evaluation relations, we omit the subscript \( P \) and write \( \Theta \vdash \tau \& \Phi \), \( \tau \), and \( \rho = \Theta \) when the program is clear from the context.

4.4 Oracle

We formalize oracle as follows.

**Definition 4.1 (Oracle).** An oracle \( \Theta \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \) is a 4-ary relation that satisfies \( \Theta \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \Rightarrow e \in \Theta \vdash \tau \& \Phi \), for any expression \( e \) of \( P \).

That is, an oracle is simply defined to be an entity that derives semantically correct judgements for the program’s expressions. In fact, by the type soundness theorem (Theorem 4.1), our type system itself is a valid oracle. As before, we write \( \Theta \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \) for \( \Theta \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \).

4.5 Typing Rules

Figure 7 shows the typing rules. A typing judgement for expressions is of the form \( \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \) expressing that the under the environment \( \Gamma \), \( e \) has type \( \tau \) with the effect \( \Phi \). We write \( \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \) when there exists some \( \Phi \) such that \( \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \). The type judgements are implicitly parameterized by the program being typed (used in the rule Program, and in Oracle for \( \Theta \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \)).

We implicitly assert that a type assigned to an expression conforms to the expression’s simple type. More formally, the simple-type shape of \( \tau \) is the simple type \( \text{stsh}(\tau) \) defined such that \( \text{stsh}(\tau) = \text{stsh}(\sigma) \rightarrow \text{stsh}(\tau) \). and \( \text{stsh}(\{u:B \mid \theta\}) = B \).
Then, we assert that any type \( \tau \) assigned to \( e \) in a type derivation satisfies \( \text{sty}(e) = \text{stsh}(\tau) \).

We describe each rule. **Oracle** allows information derived by an external oracle to be used in the typing derivation. For example, consider the function below.

\[
f_0 \colon x = \text{ev}([a]_x) ; \text{if } x = 0 \text{ then } (\) else \( f_0 (x - 1) \)
\]

A termination verifier for functional programs \([20]\) may be used as an oracle to derive \( f_0 : \tau_0 \land (\emptyset, \emptyset) \) where

\[
\tau_0 = x : \{u : \text{int} \mid u \geq 0\} \xrightarrow{(\Sigma*, \emptyset)} \text{unit}
\]

With this, **Oracle** can derive that \( f_0 : \tau_0 \vdash f_0 : \tau_0 \land (\emptyset, \emptyset) \). Note that \( \tau_0 \) states that, given a non-negative integer argument, \( f_0 \) has no non-terminating event traces (i.e., it terminates), but may have arbitrary terminating event traces (i.e., the termination oracle says nothing beyond the fact that the function terminates on non-negative inputs).

**Comb** combines information from multiple derivations. While innocuous, the rule is essential for incorporating the facts derived by an oracle or combining the facts from multiple oracles. For example, as we show below, **App** and **Sub** can be used to derive that

\[
f_0 : \tau_0, x : \{u : \text{int} \mid u \geq 0\} \vdash f_0 x : \text{unit} \land (\Sigma^*, \emptyset)
\]

in the example above. That is, the call to \( f_0 \) with a non-negative integer argument terminates. Then, a safety oracle may be used to derive via **Oracle** (alternatively, the type system can derive such a safety judgement by itself):

\[
f_0 : \tau_0, x : \{u : \text{int} \mid u \geq 0\} \vdash f_0 x : \text{unit} \land ((\text{step, } a)^*, \Sigma^*)
\]

which says that the function call only generates either \text{step} or \( a \) event, if it terminates. Note that this judgement gives no information about the non-termination behavior. Then, **Comb** may combine the two judgements to derive:

\[
f_0 : \tau_0, x : \{u : \text{int} \mid u \geq 0\} \vdash f_0 x : \text{unit} \land ((\text{step, } a)^*, \emptyset)
\]

which says that the function call only generates terminating event traces consisting of \text{step} and \( a \).

**Sub** is the subsumption rule for subtypes and sub-effects. The subtyping rules are defined in Figure 8. The rule is an extension of the one used in the previous work on refinement type systems \([6, 16, 19, 25, 28, 30]\) with the usual rule for sub-effecting that allow a larger effect to be used in place of a smaller effect.

**Const, VaF**, and **VaF** for typing constants and variables are straightforward extension of those from the previous work on refinement type systems. Here, \( \rightarrow \) denotes the set of function-type simple types. Looking up a variable generates no non-terminating effects (i.e., \( \emptyset \)) because the operation is guaranteed to terminate, whereas it generates an empty terminating event sequence (i.e., \( \{\} \)).

**Fun** looks up the type of a recursive function name in the type environment. The rule is similar to **VaF**, except that the type in the conclusion is \( e \Gamma(F) \) instead of \( \Gamma(F) \). Informally, \( e \Gamma \)
"erases" the non-terminating parts of the top-level effects of \( \tau \) by replacing them with \( \Sigma \). This prevents the type system from deriving non-trivial facts about non-terminating runs by itself (i.e., without the help of an oracle), and is needed to ensure the type system's soundness. For example, suppose \( \text{er}(\Gamma(F)) \) in the conclusion of \( \text{Fun} \) was replaced by \( \Gamma(F) \). Then, for the program \( \text{\{...\}, \text{loop } x = \text{loop } x\} \), we would be able to derive \( \Gamma \vdash * \) where \( \Gamma(\text{loop}) = x: \text{int} \rightarrow \text{unit} \), which says that a call to loop generates no infinite event traces, that is, it terminates. This is obviously incorrect as any call to loop diverges. The erasure prevents such unsound non-termination effects from occurring. We formally define \( \text{er}(\tau) \) in Figure 9.

**Op** constant operator applications. Here, \( ty(op) \) is the sound constant operator type of \( op \). Formally, a sound constant operator type of \( op \) is defined to be a closed type of the form

\[
\text{x}_1: B_1 \frac{((c), \varnothing) \rightarrow x_1: B_2 \frac{((c), \varnothing) \rightarrow \{u: B_3 \mid \theta\}}{\theta}}
\]

that satisfy the following:

- \( op \) is a binary operator from the arguments of the type \( B_1 \) and \( B_2 \) to the return type of the type \( B_3 \).
- For constants \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) of the type \( B_1 \) and \( B_2 \) and \( c_3 = [op](c_1, c_2) \), we let \( \text{er}(\{c_1/x_1\}[c_2/x_2][c_3/u]) \).

For example, \( x: \text{int} \frac{((c), \varnothing) \rightarrow y: \text{int} \frac{((c), \varnothing) \rightarrow \{u: \text{int} \mid u = x \lor y\}}{\theta}}\) is a sound type for the integer addition operator \( + \).

**Lam** types function definitions, and **App** types function applications. The rules are extensions of the ones in the previous work on refinement type systems with the usual type-and-effect approach of recording and discharging the latent effect. As remarked in Section 3, the **step** event guard is used to prevent non-productive non-terminating runs.

**If** types conditional branches. Per previous work on refinement type systems, each branch is typed with the assumption about the branch condition added to the type environment (i.e., \( x = \text{true} \) and \( x = \text{false} \)). **Unreach** allows the type system to derive that \( e \) generates no effects in an unreachable context (i.e., when \( [\Gamma]_{\text{base}} \) is unsatisfiable).

**Let** types let bindings. Note that the effect \( \theta_1 \) of \( c_1 \) is appended to the effect \( \theta_2 \) of \( c_2 \). **Event** types event raising operations and is self-explanatory. Continuing the function \( f_0 \) example from above, we may use **Let** and **Event** to derive that

\[
f_0: \text{fn}_{\tau_0}: x: \{u: \text{int} \mid u \geq 0\} \rightarrow f_0: x: e[v]\{b\} : \text{unit} \land (\Sigma_0, \varnothing)
\]

where \( \Sigma_0 = \{\text{step a} \rightarrow \{b\}\} \). That is, \( f_0: x: e[v]\{b\} \) only generates finite sequences of \( \text{step a} \) and \( \text{a} \) that end in \( b \), which is the property \( \text{step v} \rightarrow \{b\} \) that holds in \( \text{LTIL} \).

**Finally**, **Program** types the program \( P \) (implicit in the rules) by asserting that each of the recursive functions have types of their fixpoints. We state the soundness of the type system.

**Theorem 4.1** (Soundness). Suppose \( \Delta \vdash \ast \), \( \text{dom}(\Theta) = \text{fv}(e) \), and \( \Delta, \Theta \vdash e : \tau \land \Phi \). Then, \( e \in \mathbb{E}(\Theta) \land \tau \land \Phi \).

**Proof.** Please see Appendix A.

The following is immediate from **Oracle**, and states that the type system is complete relative to the oracle.

**Theorem 4.2** (Relative Completeness). Suppose \( \Theta \vdash e : \tau \land \Phi \). Then, \( \Delta, \Theta \vdash e : \tau \land \Phi \).

We note that, without **Oracle**, the type system cannot prove non-trivial liveness properties (i.e., properties about non-terminating runs) in presence of recursive functions. For example, let \( P = \{H y = \text{if } y \leq 0 \text{ then } () \text{ else } H(y - 1)\} \) and suppose that we would like to prove that the call to \( H \) with any integer argument terminates. The property can be expressed as the type \( \tau_H = x: \text{int} \frac{((c), \varnothing) \rightarrow \text{unit} \mid \text{let } y = x \text{ in } H(y)\} \), and we try to derive that \( H : \tau_H \vdash \ast \). But, this cannot be done without **Oracle** because any occurrence of \( H \) in the derivation will have its type's top-most non-terminating effect "erased". (Trivially, soundness holds even if the **Oracle** rule is removed from the type system.)

**5. Examples**

In this section we illustrate how our technique operates through a variety of instantiations on examples. Note there are no existing techniques to prove that the following properties hold over their respective programs. For illustrative purposes, some examples are first order however, of course, the power of our technique is that it applies to higher order programs. In this section we have made all events explicit.

In the **REDUCE** example in Figure 10, we rely on a termination oracle to tell us that explore terminates when it's given a certain type of \( R \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\Gamma, R : \{i: \text{int}\} \quad \text{(step 3)} &\rightarrow \{j: \text{int} \mid j < i\} \\
&\vdash \text{explore } x : R : \text{unit} \land (\tau, i)
\end{align*}
\]

We also obtain safety information from the type system:

\[
\begin{align*}
\Gamma, R : \{i: \text{int}\} \quad \text{(step 3)} &\rightarrow \{j: \text{int} \mid j < i\} \\
&\vdash \text{explore } x : R : \text{unit} \land (\text{explore } \text{step}^\dagger, \text{done}, \tau)
\end{align*}
\]

Via the **Sub** rule, we can rewrite the combination (Comb) of these two rules and conclude that the body of main has effect \( F(\text{done}) \). Note that the termination oracle here need only be used to show that explore is not called infinitely often (whole program termination reasoning is not needed).

The **Rumble** example illustrates modular reasoning. Here we again use a termination oracle to tell us that rumble terminates regardless of input, but we use it to refine the safety information differently. Our type system can conclude that the most important application in \( \text{main} \) has (finitely many) **step** events:

\[
\begin{align*}
\Gamma &\vdash \text{rumble b a : } \ldots \land (\text{(step } \text{ rumble}^\dagger), \tau)
\end{align*}
\]

We use the **Comb** rule to combine this with information from the termination oracle to obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
\Gamma &\vdash \text{rumble b a : } \ldots \land (\text{(step } \text{ rumble}^\dagger), \lambda)
\end{align*}
\]

(We have omitted the refinement typing, which is not relevant here.) We then use the **App**, **Oracle**, and **Comb** rules again to obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
\Gamma &\vdash \text{rumble a : (rumble b a) : } \ldots \land (\text{(step } \text{ rumble}^\dagger), \lambda)
\end{align*}
\]

Finally, we consider the application of print to obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
\Gamma &\vdash \text{main} : \ldots \land (\text{(step } \text{ rumble}^\dagger, \text{print}, \lambda)
\end{align*}
\]

which entails \( F(\text{print}) \). A benefit of our type system is illustrated here: information from an oracle can be reused.

**Eventually Globally** demonstrates nesting of \( G \) within \( F \). To prove this example, we combine a few facts:

1. A termination oracle tells us that bar terminates.
2. We can indicate that bar always returns a non-positive number with the dependent typing:
   \[
   \Gamma \vdash \text{bar : int } \frac{(\text{step}^\dagger)}{j : \text{int} \mid j \leq 0} \ldots
   \]
3. The type-and-effect system can conclude, with the help of a nontermination oracle that foo \( x \) does not terminate when \( x \leq 0 \) and that its infinite behavior will be \( (\text{foo} \mid \text{step}^\dagger) \) which is a fixpoint of \( @ = \text{foo} \land Xo\):
   \[
   \Gamma, x : \{j : \text{int} \mid j \leq 0\} \rightarrow \text{foo x : } \ldots \land (1, (\text{foo} \mid \text{step}^\dagger))
   \]
We combine all of this information together to show that the foo call sites in main satisfy $F(G(\text{foo} \lor \text{step})).$

For ALTERNATE INEVITABILITY, ultimately we need to show that the finite traces of life $x$ satisfies $G(p \Rightarrow X(\text{walkUha1} \lor \text{runUha2})).$ We elide detail related to step events. We begin with the inner if/else in life. In the then branch, app applies the function walk on argument $x$ and on a function that subtracts by one. An oracle can show that this terminates:

$$
\Gamma \vdash \text{walk}:
\begin{array}{l}
x : \text{int} \rightarrow f : (i : \text{int} \rightarrow (j : \text{int} | j < i)) \rightarrow \text{int}
\end{array}
$$

Similar for run. Combining this information with a safety judgment that walk generates $\text{walk}^3$, and using the App rule to append the ha1 event, we have summarized the effects of the then branch. We do the same for the else branch, and then with the semi-colon rule, we obtain $(p \Rightarrow X(\text{walkUha1} \lor \text{runUha2})))$ for the then branch of the outer if/else expression. The else branch is another call to life $x$, so we look for a fixpoint to

$$
\alpha = \alpha \lor (p \Rightarrow X(\text{walkUha1} \lor \text{runUha2}))
$$

One solution is $G(p \Rightarrow X(\text{walkUha1} \lor \text{runUha2}))).$ Something critical here was that we had complete knowledge of all instances where $p$ was generated. Because our type-and-effect system can maintain precise descriptions of the event traces, we can build this up syntactically over the body of life.

6. Related work

To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first technique that is able to prove temporal properties of higher-order, infinite-data programs. In Sections 1 and 2 we summarized previous efforts that are restricted in one way or another (e.g. only finite-data, safety-only, termination-only, or works that are restricted to first-order programs). We now discuss some other related works.

In our work we strive to achieve endogenous verification in that we are attempting to verify an overall external behavior of a program, as opposed to endogenous verification (e.g. Floyd/Hoare Logic), which is more directly connected to system internals such as program location. However, we use an endogenous type-and-effect system, combined with generalized composed effects. In their work, Barringer et al. [3] extend temporal logic with a composition operator. Their work, however, is geared toward compositional user-provided (endogenous) specifications rather than our goal of proving an overall (exogenous) specification, by composing together pieces of reasoning.

We are not the first to suggest a type-and-effect system for verifying temporal properties. Skalka et al. [26, 27] describe a type-and-effect system where event traces are effects, similar to our system. However, unlike our system, they use the type-and-effect system only to infer an over-approximation of the program’s actual event traces, which is then checked against the target temporal property by an external model checker. Their approach precludes the possibility of verifying non-trivial liveness properties, because a type-and-effect system alone is inherently “safety”, and having an up-front type-and-effect abstraction can result in losing the information needed for liveness reasoning. By contrast, our type-and-effect system allows the use of temporal property verifiers inside the type derivation as oracles, enabling compositional verification of non-trivial temporal properties.

A different approach to using a type system for temporal property verification has been proposed by Kobayashi and Ong [18]. In their approach, the type system is used internally to define a parity game (i.e. a “move” in the game is defined as a typability relation), and the verification problem is reduced to the problem of finding a winning strategy to the game. Our approach is conceptually the dual of theirs, and allows verifiers to be used as oracles inside the type system. Also, unlike our approach, their approach is limited to the verification of finite data programs (given in CPS), and it may be difficult to extend the approach to infinite data programs.

7. Conclusion

We have introduced the first technique that enables us to verify temporal properties of higher-order, infinite-data programs. Our type-and-effect system accomplishes this by decomposing the program, not only into expressions, but also based on the behavior of each expression’s finite versus infinite event behaviors. The type system itself is strong enough to derive temporal safety properties which can be combined with liveness information from oracles. We believe this work will serve as a theoretical foundation toward automatic verification of not only higher-order programs, but also provides a new route to more compositional verification of first-order programs.

---

For this reason, they use BPA as the concrete model of effects, whereas we keep the effect representation intentionally abstract.
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A. Proof of Theorem 4.1

We add to the type system an “the-all-knowing oracle” rule that can derive arbitrary semantically true judgements:

\[ e \in \Theta \vdash r \& \Phi \]

\[ \Delta \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \text{ All} \]

We state a few lemmas regarding subtyping.

Lemma A.1 (≤ Transitivity). Suppose \( \Gamma \vdash \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \) and \( \Gamma \vdash \tau_2 \leq \tau_3 \). Then, \( \Gamma \vdash \tau_1 \leq \tau_3 \).

Lemma A.2 (Substitution). Suppose \( \Delta, \Theta \vdash \tau \leq \sigma \), and \( \rho \vdash \Theta \). Then, \( \Delta, \rho(\tau) \leq \rho(\sigma) \).

Lemma A.3. Suppose \( \Gamma, x : \tau \vdash \sigma' \leq \sigma \) and \( \Gamma \vdash \tau \leq \tau' \). Then, \( \Gamma, x : \tau' \vdash \Theta \).

Lemma A.4. Suppose \( \Gamma, x : \tau \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \) and \( \Gamma \vdash \tau \leq \tau' \). Then, \( \Gamma, x : \tau' \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \).

Lemma A.5 (≤ Semantic Correspondence I). Suppose \( \Delta, \Theta \vdash \tau \leq \tau' \) and \( \rho \vdash \Theta \). Then, \( \langle \rho(\tau) \rangle \leq \langle \rho(\tau') \rangle \).

Proof. We prove by induction on the structure of \( \tau \).

Case \( \tau = \{u : B \mid \theta \} \)

By Lemma A.2, \( \Delta \vdash \rho(\tau) \leq \rho(\tau') \). By Lemma A.1 and inspection of the subtyping rules, it must be the case that \( \tau' = \{u : B \mid \theta' \} \) and \( \rho(\theta) \Rightarrow \rho(\theta') \). Therefore, \( \langle \rho(\tau) \rangle \leq \langle \rho(\tau') \rangle \).

Case \( \tau = x : \tau \rightarrow \tau_2 \)

By Lemma A.2, \( \Delta \vdash \rho(\tau) \leq \rho(\tau') \). By Lemma A.1 and inspection of the subtyping rules, it must be the case that \( \tau' = x : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \). \( \Delta \vdash \rho(\tau_1) \leq \rho(\tau_2) \) and \( \Phi \vdash \Phi' \).

Let \( \lambda x.e \in \rho(\tau) \). By definition, \( e \in [x : \rho(\tau_1) \rightarrow \rho(\tau_2) \& \Phi] \). It suffices to show that \( e \in [x : \rho(\tau_1) \rightarrow \rho(\tau_2) \& \Phi] \) (because then \( \lambda x.e \in \rho(\tau) \)). Suppose \( v \in \rho(\tau_1) \). Then, by induction hypothesis, \( v \in \rho(\tau_1) \). Therefore, if \( e[v/x] \downarrow v' \) then \( v' \in \rho(\tau_2) \). By induction hypothesis, the latter implies that \( v' \in \rho(\tau_2) \). Therefore, because \( \Phi \vdash \Phi' \), it follows that \( e \in [x : \rho(\tau_1) \rightarrow \rho(\tau_2) \& \Phi] \).

Lemma A.6 (≤ Semantic Correspondence II). Suppose \( \Delta, \Theta \vdash \tau \leq \tau_2 \) and \( \Phi \vdash \Phi_2 \). Then, \( \Theta \vdash \tau \leq \tau_2 \) and \( \Phi \vdash \Phi_2 \).

Proof. Suppose \( \rho \vdash \Theta \), \( \rho(e) \downarrow v \& \varpi \), and \( v \in \rho(\tau) \). Then, by Lemma A.5, \( v \in \rho(\tau_2) \). Therefore, the statement follows. \( \Box \)

Lemma A.7 (Substitution). Suppose \( \Delta, \Theta \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \), and \( \rho \vdash \Theta \). Then, \( \Delta, \rho \vdash e \). \( \Box \)

Proof. By induction on the derivation of \( \Delta, \Theta \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \).

Lemma A.8 (Preservation). Suppose

- \( \Delta \vdash \ast \)
- \( \Delta \vdash e : \tau \& \Theta \)
- \( e \) is closed, and
- \( e \downarrow v \& \varpi \)

Then, \( \Delta \vdash v : \tau \) and \( \varpi \in \Xi \)

Proof. By induction on the derivation of \( e \downarrow v \& \varpi \).

Lemma A.9 (Soundness Part I: Erasure). Suppose

(1) \( \Delta \vdash \ast \)
(2) \( \text{dom}(\Theta) = fv(e) \), and
(3) \( \Delta, \Theta \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \)
Then, \( e \in [\Theta \vdash \tau \& \Phi] \).

Proof. First note that the statement is equivalent to the following.

(a) Suppose (1), (2), \( \rho \vdash \Theta \), and \( \rho(e) \downarrow v \& \varpi \). Then, \( \varpi \in \Xi \) and \( v \in \rho(\Theta) \).

By Lemma A.7, \( \Delta \vdash \rho(e) : \rho(\tau) \& \Theta \), and so by Lemma A.8, \( \Delta \vdash v : \rho(\tau) \) and \( \varpi \in \Xi \). Therefore, (a) is implied by the following.

(b) Suppose (1), \( \rho \vdash \Theta \), and \( \Delta \vdash e : \rho(\tau) \). Then, \( e \in [\rho(\Theta)] \).

We prove (b) by induction on the structure of \( \tau \).

Case \( \tau = \{u : B \mid \theta \} \)

We have that \( \rho(\Theta) = \rho(\tau) = \{u : B \mid \rho(\theta) \} \). By the definition of values, \( v = e \) for some constant \( e \). Then, by Const, Sub, and Lemma A.1 and the definition of soundness constant type, \( \equiv = \equiv \Rightarrow \rho(\theta) \). Therefore, \( e \in [\rho(\theta)] \).

Case \( \tau = x : \tau' \rightarrow \tau'' \)

We have that \( \rho(\Theta) = x : \rho(\tau') \rightarrow \rho(\tau'') \). It must be case that \( x = \lambda x.e' \) for some \( e' \) and \( x \). By inspection of the typing rules, either All, Oracle, or Lam must have been applied at \( v \).

Case All or Oracle

By Sub and Lemma A.1, it must be the case that \( v \in [x : \tau' \& \Phi] \) such that \( \Delta \vdash \tau \leq \tau' \).

We have that \( v \in [\tau''] \). Therefore, by Lemma A.5, \( v \in [\rho(\tau'')] \). It is easy to see that \( \Delta \vdash \tau \leq \tau'' \). Therefore, by Lemma A.5 again, \( v \in [\rho(\Theta)] \).

Case Lam

By Sub and Lemma A.1, it must be the case that \( \Delta, x : \sigma'' \vdash \rho(\tau') \rightarrow \rho(\tau'') \) where

- \( \Delta \vdash \rho(\tau') \rightarrow \sigma'' \)
- \( \Delta, x : \rho(\tau') \rightarrow \tau'' \leq \tau' \)
- \( \Theta = \Xi' \cap \Pi' \)

By Lemma A.4 and Sub, we have \( \Delta, x : \rho(\tau') \vdash e' : \rho(\tau'') \perp \Theta \& \Xi' \). Therefore, by induction hypothesis (on \( \rho(\Theta') \)), we have that

\[ e' \in [x : \rho(\tau') \rightarrow \rho(\tau'') \perp \Theta \& \Xi'] \]

Therefore,

\[ \rho(x.e') \in [x : \rho(\tau') \rightarrow \rho(\tau'') \perp \Theta \& \Xi'] \]

We are now ready to prove the soundness theorem.

Theorem 4.1: Suppose

- \( \Delta \vdash \ast \)
- \( \text{dom}(\Theta) = fv(e) \), and
- \( \Delta, \Theta \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \)

Then, \( e \in [\Theta \vdash \tau \& \Phi] \).

Proof. We prove by induction on the derivation of \( \Delta, \Theta \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi \).

Case the last rule is Oracle

Immediate from Definition 4.1 and Oracle.

Case the last rule is Comb

It must be the case that \( \Phi = \Phi_1 \cap \Phi_2 \) where

\[ \Delta, \Theta \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi_1 \]
\[ \Delta, \Theta \vdash e : \tau \& \Phi_2 \]

By induction hypothesis, we have that
• $c \in [\Theta \vdash \tau \& \Phi_1]$
• $c \in [\Theta \vdash \tau \& \Phi_2]$
Therefore, $e \in [\Theta \vdash \tau \& \Phi_1 \& \Phi_2]$.

**Case the last rule is Sub**
We have

$\Delta, \Theta \vdash e : \tau' \& \Phi' \quad \Delta, \Theta \vdash \tau \leq \tau' \quad \Phi' \subseteq \Phi$

By induction hypothesis, we have that

$e \in [\Theta \vdash \tau' \& \Phi']$

Therefore, by Lemma A.6, $e \in [\Theta \vdash \tau \& \Phi]$.  

**Case the last rule is Const**
We have $e \equiv c$ and

$c \in B$

$\Delta, \Theta \vdash c : \{u : B \mid u = c\} \& (\{\varepsilon\}, \emptyset)$

Suppose $\rho \vdash \Theta$. Then, because $c \in B$, we have

$\rho(c) = c \in \{\{u : B \mid u = c\}\} = \rho(\{u : B \mid u = c\})$

Therefore, by st-Val, we have

$c \in [\Theta \vdash \{u : B \mid u = c\} \& (\{\varepsilon\}, \emptyset)]$

**Case the last rules is VaB**
We have $e \equiv x$ and

$sy(x) = B$

$\Delta, \Theta \vdash x : \{u : B \mid u = x\} \& (\{\varepsilon\}, \emptyset)$

Suppose $\rho \vdash \Theta$. Then, because $sy(x) \in B$, we have

$\rho(x) \in \rho(\{u : B \mid u = x\})$

Therefore, by st-Val, we have $x \in [\Theta \vdash \{u : B \mid u = x\} \& (\{\varepsilon\}, \emptyset)]$.

**Case the last rule is VaF**
We have $e \equiv x$ and

$sy(x) \equiv x$

$\Delta, \Theta \vdash x : \Theta(x) \& (\{\varepsilon\}, \emptyset)$

Suppose $\rho \vdash \Theta$. Then, because $sy(x) \equiv x$, we have

$\rho(x) \in \rho(\Theta(x))$

Therefore, by st-Val, $x \in [\Theta \vdash \Theta(x) \& (\{\varepsilon\}, \emptyset)]$.

**Case the last rule is Fun**
Immediated by Lemma A.9 and st-Fun.

**Case the last rule is Op**
We have $e \equiv x \ op \ y$ and

$ty(op) = x_1 : \tau_1 \ x_2 : \tau_2 \ x_3 : \tau_3$

$\Delta, \Theta \vdash x_1 : \tau_1 \& \Phi_1 \ x_2 : \tau_2 \& \Phi_2 \ x_3 : \tau_3 \& \Phi_3$

By the definition of the sound constant operator type, $\tau_1 = \{u : B_1 \mid \tau\}$ and $\tau_2 = \{u : B_2 \mid \tau\}$, and $\tau_3 = \{u : B_3 \mid \theta\}$ for some $B_1, B_2, B_3$, and $\theta$.

Suppose $\rho \vdash \Theta$. By simple typing of $x$ and $y$ (or by induction hypothesis), we have $\rho(x) \in B_1$ and $\rho(y) \in B_2$. By the definition of sound constant operator type, if $\rho(x) \ op \ \rho(y) \downarrow \ c \& e$, then $e \in B_3$ and $\theta \vdash p(\rho(x)/x_1)[\rho(y)/y_2] / \{c/u\}$. Because $fv(\theta) \subseteq \{u, x_1, x_2\}$, it follows that

c \in \rho(\{u : B_3 \mid \theta\} / \{x_1/y_1\} / \{y_2/x_2\})

Therefore, by st-Op, $x \ op \ y \in [\Theta \vdash \tau_3 / \{x_1/y_1\} / \{y_2/x_2\} \& (\{\varepsilon\}, \emptyset)]$.  

**Case the last rule is Lam**
We have $e = \lambda x. e'$ and $\tau = x : \tau' \rightarrow \tau''$ such that

$\Delta, \Theta \vdash e' : e : \tau' \& (\Xi, \Pi)$

$\Delta, \Theta \vdash e : \tau' \rightarrow \tau''$ and $(\Xi, \emptyset)$

Suppose $\rho \vdash \Theta$ and $v \in \rho(\sigma')$. Then, $\rho \cup \{x \mapsto v\} \vdash \Theta, x : \sigma'$. Therefore, the following holds from the induction hypothesis $e' \in [\Theta : x : \sigma' : \tau' \& (\Xi, \Pi)]$.

- If $\rho(e')(v/x) \downarrow \ v'\ & \ \tau$ then $e' \in \rho(\tau')(v/x)$ and $\varpi \in \Xi$.
- If $\rho(e')(v/x) \downarrow \bot \ & \ \tau$ then $\pi \in \Pi$.

Therefore, by st-Val,

$\lambda x. e' \in [\Theta : x : \sigma' : (\Xi, \Pi)]$

**Case the last rule is App**
We have $e \equiv x \ y$ and $\Phi = (\{\text{step}\}, \emptyset) \cdot (\Xi, \Pi)$ where

$\Delta, \Theta \vdash x : \tau_1 \ (\Xi, \Pi) \quad \Delta, \Theta \vdash y : \tau_2 \ (\Xi, \Pi)$

By induction hypothesis, we have that

- $x \in [\Theta \vdash \tau_1 \ (\Xi, \Pi)]$
- $y \in [\Theta \vdash \tau_1 \& \Phi_2]$

Suppose $\rho \vdash \Theta$. Then, $\rho(x) \in \rho(\tau_1) \ (\Xi, \emptyset)$ and $\rho(y) \in \rho(\tau_2)$. Let $\rho(x) = \lambda z. e$. Then, we have

$\rho(z) \equiv \rho(x) \ (\Xi, \emptyset)$

Therefore, the following holds.

- If $\rho'(\rho(y)/z) \downarrow \ s \ & \ \tau$ then $x \in e \rho(\tau) \ (\Xi, \emptyset)$ and $\varpi \in \Xi$.
- If $\rho'(\rho(y)/z) \downarrow \bot \ & \ \tau$ then $\pi \in \Pi$.

Therefore, by st-App, snt-App, and the definition of trace set concatenation, it follows that

$x \ y \in [\Theta \vdash \tau_{\{\text{step}\}} \ & \ (\Xi, \emptyset) \cdot \Phi']$

**Case the last rule is If**
We have $e \equiv \text{if } x \ \text{then } e_1 \ \text{else } e_2$ and $\Phi = \Phi_1 \cup \Phi_2$ where

$\Delta, \Theta \vdash x : \tau \ (\Xi, \Pi)$

$\Delta, \Theta \vdash e_1 : \tau \ & \ (\Xi, \Pi)$

$\Delta, \Theta \vdash e_2 : \tau \ & \ (\Xi, \Pi)$

$\Delta, \Theta \vdash \text{if } x \ \text{then } e_1 \ \text{else } e_2 \ (\Xi, \emptyset) \cup (\Xi, \Pi)$

By induction hypothesis, we have that

- $e_1 \in [\Theta, x : \tau \ & \ (\Xi, \Pi)]$
- $e_2 \in [\Theta, x : \tau \ & \ (\Xi, \Pi)]$

Suppose $\rho \vdash \Theta$. Then, by simple typing of $x$, either $\rho(x) = \tau$ or $\rho(x) = \bot$. Suppose $\rho(x) = \tau$. Then $\rho(x) = \bot$ is analogous. Therefore, $\rho(x) = \tau$. Therefore, the following holds from $e_1 \in [\Theta, x : \tau \ & \ (\Xi, \Pi)]$.

- If $\rho(e_1) \downarrow \ s \ & \ \tau$ then $\rho(x) \ (\Xi, \emptyset)$ and $\varpi \in \Xi_1$.
- If $\rho(e_1) \downarrow \bot \ & \ \tau$ then $\pi \in \Pi_1$.

Therefore, by st-If1, st-If2, snt-If1, and snt-If2,

if $x \ \text{then } e_1 \ \text{else } e_2 \in [\Theta \vdash \tau \ & \ (\Xi, \Pi) \cup (\Xi, \Pi)]$

**Case the last rule is Unreach**
We have

$\Delta, \Theta \vdash e \vdash \tau \& \Phi \equiv [\Delta, \Theta]_{\text{base}} \Rightarrow \bot$

$\Delta, \Theta \vdash e \vdash \tau \ & \ (\Xi, \emptyset)$

It must be the case that $\equiv [\Theta]_{\text{base}} \Rightarrow \bot$. Therefore, for all $\rho$, $\neg \rho \vdash \Theta$. Therefore, $e \in [\Theta \vdash \tau \ & \ (\Xi, \emptyset)]$ holds vacuously.

**Case the last rule is Let**
Analogous to Lam and App.
Case the last rule is Event

We have $e = ev[a]$ where

$$\Delta, \Theta \vdash ev[a] : \text{unit } \& ((a), \emptyset)$$

Suppose $\rho \models \Theta$. Then, $\rho(ev[a]) = ev[a]$ and by st-Ev, $ev[a] \Downarrow (\_ ) \& a$. Therefore, by Const and Sub, $ev[a] \in [\Theta \vdash \text{unit } \& ((a), \emptyset)]$. 

\[\square\]