

Explicit CN Soundness Proof

Dhruv Makwana

July 14, 2021

1 Weakening

If $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \sqsubseteq \mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}'$ and $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash J$ then $\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}' \vdash J$.

PROOF STRATEGY: Induction over the typing judgements.

ASSUME: 1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \sqsubseteq \mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}'$.
2. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash J$.

PROVE: $\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}' \vdash J$.

2 Substitution

2.1 Weakening for Substitution

Weakening for substitution: as above, but with $J = (\sigma) : (\mathcal{C}''; \mathcal{L}''; \mathcal{R}'')$.

PROOF STRATEGY: Induction over the substitution.

ASSUME: 1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \sqsubseteq \mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}'$.
2. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma) : (\mathcal{C}''; \mathcal{L}''; \mathcal{R}'')$.

PROVE: $\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}' \vdash (\sigma) : (\mathcal{C}''; \mathcal{L}''; \mathcal{R}'')$.

2.2 Substitution Lemma

If $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma) : (\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}')$ and $\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}' \vdash J$ then $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \sigma(\Phi'); \mathcal{R} \vdash \sigma(J)$.

PROOF SKETCH: Induction over the typing judgements.

ASSUME: 1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma) : (\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}')$.
2. $\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}' \vdash J$.

PROVE: $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \sigma(\Phi'); \mathcal{R} \vdash \sigma(J)$.

(1)1. CASE: TY_PVAL_OBJ^* , $\text{TY_PVAL_}\{\text{OBJ, LOADED, UNIT, TRUE, FALSE, CTOR_NIL}\}$.
PROOF: No free variables in J so $\sigma(J) = J$ and the rules do not depend on the environment, so we are done.

- ⟨1⟩2. CASE: $\text{TY_PVAL_}\{\text{LIST}, \text{TUPLE}, \text{CTOR_CONS}, \text{CTOR_TUPLE}, \text{CTOR_ARRAY}, \text{CTOR_SPECIFIED}\}$.
 PROOF: By induction and then definition of substitution over values.
- ⟨1⟩3. CASE: TY_PVAL_VAR .
 $\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi' \vdash x \Rightarrow \beta$
- ⟨2⟩1. $x:\beta \in \mathcal{C}'$ (or $x:\beta \in \mathcal{L}'$) by inversion.
- ⟨2⟩2. So $\exists pval. \mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash pval \Rightarrow \beta$ by $\text{TY_SUBS_CONS_}\{\text{COMP}, \text{LOG}\}$.
- ⟨2⟩3. Since $pval = \sigma(x)$, we are done.
- ⟨1⟩4. CASE: TY_PVAL_ERROR .
 PROOF: We know $\text{smt}(\Phi' \Rightarrow \text{false})$ and $\text{smt}(\Phi \Rightarrow \text{term})$ for each $\text{term} \in \Phi'$ so $\text{smt}(\Phi \Rightarrow \text{false})$.
- ⟨1⟩5. CASE: TY_PVAL_STRUCT .
 $\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi' \vdash (\text{struct tag})\{\overline{\text{member}_i = pval_i}^i\} \Rightarrow \text{struct tag}$
- ⟨2⟩1. $\overline{\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash \sigma(pval_i) \Rightarrow \beta_{\tau_i}^i}$ by induction.
- ⟨2⟩2. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash (\text{struct tag})\{\overline{\text{member}_i = \sigma(pval_i)}^i\} \Rightarrow \text{struct tag}$
- ⟨1⟩6. CASE: TY_PE_VAL
 PROOF: By induction.
- ⟨1⟩7. CASE: TY_PE_ARRAY_SHIFT .
 $\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi' \vdash \text{array_shift}(pval_1, \tau, pval_2) \Rightarrow y:\text{loc}. y = pval_1 +_{\text{ptr}} (pval_2 \times \text{size_of}(\tau))$
- ⟨2⟩1. By induction,
 1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash \sigma(pval_1) \Rightarrow \text{loc}$
 2. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash \sigma(pval_2) \Rightarrow \text{integer}$
- ⟨2⟩2. So, $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash \sigma(\text{array_shift}(pval_1, \tau, pval_2)) \Rightarrow y:\text{loc}. \sigma((y = pval_1 +_{\text{ptr}} (pval_2 \times \text{size_of}(\tau))))$.
- ⟨1⟩8. CASE: $\text{TY_PE_MEMBER_SHIFT}$.
 PROOF: Similar to TY_PE_ARRAY_SHIFT .
- ⟨1⟩9. CASE: $\text{TY_PE_}\{\text{NOT}, \text{ARITH_BINOP}, \text{REL_BINOP}, \text{BOOL_BINOP}\}$.
 PROOF: By induction.
- ⟨1⟩10. CASE: TY_PE_CALL .
 See TY_SEQ_E_CCALL for more general case and proof.
- ⟨1⟩11. CASE: $\text{TY_PE_}\{\text{ASSERT_UNDEF}, \text{BOOL_TO_INTEGER}, \text{WRAP}\}$.
 PROOF: By induction.
- ⟨1⟩12. CASE: TY_TPVAL_UNDEF
 See TY_TVAL_UNDEF for a more general case and proof.
- ⟨1⟩13. CASE: TY_TPVAL_DONE

$\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi \vdash \text{done pval} \Leftarrow y:\beta. \text{term}.$

- (2)1. By induction,
 1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash \sigma(\text{pval}) \Rightarrow \beta.$
 2. $\text{smt}(\Phi \Rightarrow \sigma, \text{pval}/y, \cdot(\text{term})).$

(2)2. So $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash \sigma(\text{done pval}) \Leftarrow y:\beta. \sigma(\text{term}).$

- (1)14. CASE: $\text{TY_TPE_}\{\text{LET}, \text{LETT}\}.$
 See $\text{TY_SEQ_TE_}\{\text{LET}, \text{LETT}\}$ for a more general case and proof.

- (1)15. CASE: $\text{TY_TPE_IF}.$
 PROOF: By induction.

- (1)16. CASE: $\text{TY_TPE_CASE}.$
 $\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi \vdash \text{case pval of } \overline{|\text{pattern}_i \Rightarrow \text{texpr}_i|^i} \text{ end} \Leftarrow y_2:\beta_2. \text{term}_2.$

- (2)1. By induction,
 1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash \sigma(\text{pval}) \Rightarrow \beta_1.$
 2. $\overline{|\text{pattern}_i:\beta_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C}_i \text{ with term}_i|^i}.$
 3. $\overline{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}_i; \mathcal{L}; \Phi, \text{term}_i = \text{pval} \vdash \sigma(\text{texpr}_i) \Leftarrow y_2:\beta_2. \sigma(\text{term}_2)}^i.$

(2)2. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash \sigma(\text{case pval of } \overline{|\text{pattern}_i \Rightarrow \text{texpr}_i|^i} \text{ end}) \Leftarrow y_2:\beta_2. \sigma(\text{term}_2).$

- (1)17. CASE: $\text{TY_}\{\text{ACTION}^*, \text{MEMOP}^*\}.$
 PROOF: By induction. Rules with SMT checks still hold because the same substitution is applied to the constraint context and the consequent.

- (1)18. CASE: $\text{TY_TVAL_I}.$
 PROOF: Trivially (no free variables nor requirements on constraint context).

- (1)19. CASE: $\text{TY_TVAL_}\{\text{COMP}, \text{LOG}\}.$
 Only focusing on logical case; computational one is similar.
 $\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}' \vdash \text{done pval}, \overline{|\text{spine_elem}_i|^i} \Leftarrow \exists y:\beta. \text{ret}.$

- (2)1. By inversion and then induction,
 1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash \sigma(\text{pval}) \Rightarrow \beta$
 2. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash \sigma(\text{done } \overline{|\text{spine_elem}_i|^i}) \Leftarrow \sigma(\text{pval}/y, \cdot(\text{ret})).$

(2)2. Therefore $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash \sigma(\text{done pval}, \overline{|\text{spine_elem}_i|^i}) \Leftarrow \exists y:\beta. \sigma(\text{ret}).$

- (1)20. CASE: $\text{TY_TVAL_PHI}.$
 $\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}' \vdash \overline{x_i = \text{spine_elem}_i^i} :: \text{term} \supset \arg \gg \psi; \text{ret}.$

- (2)1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash \overline{x_i = \sigma(\text{spine_elem}_i^i)} :: \sigma(\arg) \gg \sigma(\psi); \sigma(\text{ret}).$
 PROOF: By induction.

- (2)2. $\text{smt}(\Phi' \Rightarrow \sigma(\text{term})).$
 PROOF: We $\text{smt}(\Phi' \Rightarrow \text{term})$, which means it is true for all (well-typed) instantiations of its free variables.

- (2)3. $\text{smt}(\Phi \Rightarrow \sigma(\text{term})).$
 PROOF: From $\Phi \Rightarrow \Phi'$ and (2)2.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 4.$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash \overline{x_i = \sigma(\text{spine_elem}_i)}^i :: \sigma(\text{term} \supset \text{arg}) \gg \sigma(\psi); \sigma(\text{ret})$ as required.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 21.$ CASE: `TY_TVAL_RES`
 PROOF: Similar to `TY_TVAL_PHI`, except with resource environments being split.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 22.$ CASE: `TY_TVAL_UNDEF`
 PROOF: ret can be anything, including $\sigma(\text{ret})$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 23.$ CASE: `TY_SEQ_TE_{\{\text{TVAL}, \text{IF}, \text{BOUND}\}}`.
 PROOF: By induction.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 24.$ CASE: `TY_SEQ_E_{\{\text{CCALL}, \text{PROC}, \text{RUN}\}}`.
 Only focusing on `CCall`, rest are similar.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 1.$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash \overline{x_i = \sigma(\text{spine_elem}_i)}^i :: \sigma(\text{arg}) \gg \sigma(\psi); \sigma(\text{ret})$.
 PROOF: By induction.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 2.$ $\text{ident}:\text{arg} \equiv \overline{x_i}^i \mapsto \text{texpr} \in \text{Globals}$ is unaffected by the substitution.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3.$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{ccall}(\tau, \text{ident}, \overline{\sigma(\text{spine_elem}_i)}^i) \Rightarrow \sigma, \psi(\text{ret})$ as required.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 25.$ CASE: `TY_SPINE_RES`.
 $\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}'_1, \mathcal{R}_2 \vdash x = \text{res_term}, \overline{x_i = \text{spine_elem}_i}^i :: \text{res} \multimap \text{arg} \gg \text{res_term}/x, \psi; \text{ret}$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 1.$ By inversion and then induction,
 1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1 \vdash \sigma(\text{res_term}) \Leftarrow \sigma(\text{res})$.
 2. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_2 \vdash \overline{x_i = \sigma(\text{spine_elem}_i)}^i :: \sigma(\text{res}) \multimap \sigma(\text{arg}) \gg \sigma(\psi); \sigma(\text{ret})$.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 2.$ Hence $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2 \vdash x = \sigma(\text{res_term}), \overline{x_i = \sigma(\text{spine_elem}_i)}^i :: \sigma(\text{res} \multimap \text{arg}) \gg \sigma(\text{res_term}/x, \psi); \sigma(\text{ret})$ as required.

2.3 Identity Extension

If $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma):(\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}')$ then $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma, \text{id}):(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}')$.

PROOF SKETCH: Induction over the substitution.

ASSUME: $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma):(\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}')$.

PROVE: $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma, \text{id}):(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}')$.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1.$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1 \vdash (\text{id}):(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}_1)$.
 PROOF: By induction on each of $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1$.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2.$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma, \text{id}):(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}')$
 PROOF: By induction on σ with base case as above.

2.4 Let-friendly Substitution Lemma

If $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma):(\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}')$ and $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}'; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}' \vdash J$ then $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \sigma(\Phi); \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R} \vdash \sigma(J)$.

PROOF SKETCH: Apply identity extension then substitution lemma.

ASSUME: 1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma):(\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}')$.
 2. $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}' \vdash J$.

PROVE: $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \sigma(\Phi); \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R} \vdash \sigma(J)$.

$\langle 1 \rangle 1$. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma, \text{id}):(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}')$.
 PROOF: Apply identity extension to 1.

$\langle 1 \rangle 2$. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \sigma(\Phi); \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma, \text{id})(J)$.
 PROOF: Apply substitution lemma (2.2) to $\langle 1 \rangle 1$.

$\langle 1 \rangle 3$. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \sigma(\Phi); \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R} \vdash \sigma(J)$.
 PROOF: $\text{id}(J) = J$.

3 Progress

3.1 Ty_Spine_* and Decons_Arg_* construct same substitution and return type

If $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash \overline{x_i = \text{spine_elem}_i^i} :: \text{arg} \gg \sigma; \text{ret}$ and $\overline{x_i = \text{spine_elem}_i^i} :: \text{arg} \gg \sigma'; \text{ret}'$ then $\sigma = \sigma'$ and $\text{ret} = \text{ret}'$.

PROOF SKETCH: Induction over arg .

3.2 Progress Statement and Proof

If $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash e \Leftrightarrow t$ and all pattern in e are exhaustive then either e is a value, or it is unreachable, or $\forall h : R. \exists e', h'. \langle h; e \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; e' \rangle$.

PROOF SKETCH: Induction over the typing rules.

ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash e \Leftrightarrow t$.

2. All patterns in e are exhaustive.

PROVE: Either e is a value, or it is unreachable, or $\forall h : R. \exists e', h'. \langle h; e \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; e' \rangle$.

$\langle 1 \rangle 1$. CASE: TY_PVAL_OBJ*, TY_PVAL*, TY_PE_VAL, TY_TPVAL*, TY_TVAL*, TY_SEQ_TE_TVAL.

PROOF: All these judgements/rules give types to syntactic values; and there are no operational rules corresponding to them (see Section 7).

$\langle 1 \rangle 2$. CASE: TY_PE_ARRAY_SHIFT.

PROOF: By inversion on $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash pval_1 \Rightarrow \text{loc}, pval_1$ must be a *mem_ptr* (TY_PVAL_OBJ_PTR). Similarly $pval_2$ must be a *mem_int*, so rule OP_PE_PE_ARRAYSHIFT applies.

$\langle 1 \rangle 3$. CASE: TY_PE_MEMBER_SHIFT.

PROOF: $pval$ must be a *mem_ptr* so OP_PE_PE_MEMBERSHIFT.

$\langle 1 \rangle 4$. CASE: TY_PE_NOT.

PROOF: $pval$ must be a *bool_value* so OP_PE_PE_NOT_{TRUE, FALSE}.

$\langle 1 \rangle 5$. CASE: TY_PE_{ARITH, REL}_BINOP.

PROOF: $pval_1$ and $pval_2$ must be *mem.ints* so $OP_PE_PE_ \{ARITH, REL\} _BINOP$ respectively.

<1>6. CASE: $TY_PE_BOOL_BINOP$.

PROOF: $pval_1$ and $pval_2$ must be *bool.values* so $OP_PE_PE_BOOL_BINOP$.

<1>7. CASE: TY_PE_CALL .

PROOF: By inversion we have $name: pure_arg \equiv \overline{x_i}^i \mapsto tpepr \in \mathbf{Globals}$ and $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \overline{x_i = pval_i}^i :: pure_arg \gg \sigma; \Sigma y:\beta. term \wedge I$, with the latter implying $\overline{x_i = pval_i}^i :: pure_arg \gg \sigma; \Sigma y:\beta. term \wedge I$ (lemma 3.1. Thus it can step with $OP_PE_TPE_CALL$.

<1>8. CASE: $TY_PE_ASSERT_UNDEF$.

PROOF: $pval$ must be a *bool.value* and $smt(\Phi \Rightarrow pval)$. If it is **False**, then by the latter, we have an inconsistent constraints context, meaning the code is unreachable. If it is **True**, we may step with $OP_PE_PE_ASSERT_UNDEF$.

<1>9. CASE: $TY_PE_BOOL_TO_INTEGER$.

PROOF: $pval$ must be a *bool.value* and so $OP_PE_PE_BOOL_TO_INTEGER_ \{TRUE, FALSE\}$.

<1>10. CASE: TY_PE_WRAPL .

PROOF: $pval$ must be a *mem.int* and so $OP_PE_PE_WRAPL$.

<1>11. CASE: $TY_TPE_ \{IF, LET, LETT, CASE\}$.

PROOF: See $TY_SEQ_TE_ \{IF, LET, LETT, CASE\}$ cases for more general cases and proofs.

<1>12. CASE: TY_ACTION_CREATE .

PROOF: $pval$ must be a *mem.int* and h must be \cdot , so $OP_ACTION_TVAL_CREATE$ (mem_ptr and $pval:\beta_\tau$ are free in the premises and so can be constructed to satisfy the requirements).

<1>13. CASE: TY_ACTION_LOAD .

PROOF: $pval_0$ must be a *mem.ptr* and $h = \cdot + \{pval_1 \mapsto_\tau pval_2\}$, so $OP_ACTION_TVAL_LOAD$.

<1>14. CASE: TY_ACTION_STORE .

PROOF: $pval_0$ and $pval_2$ must be the same *mem.ptr*, so $OP_ACTION_TVAL_STORE$.

<1>15. CASE: $TY_ACTION_KILL_STATIC$.

PROOF: $pval_0$ and $pval_1$ must be the same *mem.ptr*, so $OP_ACTION_TVAL_KILL_STATIC$.

<1>16. CASE: $TY_MEMOP_REL_BINOP$.

PROOF: Similar to $TY_PE_ \{ARITH, REL\} _BINOP$.

<1>17. CASE: $TY_MEMOP_INTFROMPTR$.

PROOF: $pval$ must be a *mem.ptr* so $OP_MEMOP_TVAL_REL_INTFROMPTR$.

<1>18. CASE: $TY_MEMOP_PTRFROMINT$.

PROOF: $pval$ must be a *mem.int* so $OP_MEMOP_TVAL_REL_PTRFROMINT$.

<1>19. CASE: $TY_MEMOP_PTRVALIDFORDEREF$.

PROOF: $pval$ must be a mem_ptr and h must be $\cdot + \{mem_ptr \mapsto_{\tau} \cdot\}$ so it can take a step with $OP_MEMOP_TVAL_REL_PTRVALIDFORDEREF$.

(1)20. CASE: $TY_MEMOP_PTRWELLALIGNED$.

PROOF: $pval$ must be a mem_ptr and so $OP_MEMOP_TVAL_PTRWELLALIGNED$.

(1)21. CASE: $TY_MEMOP_PTRARRAYSHIFT$.

PROOF: $pval_1$ must be a mem_ptr and $pval_2$ must be a mem_int and so $OP_MEMOP_TVAL_PTRARRAYSHIFT$.

(1)22. CASE: $TY_SEQ_E_CCALL$.

PROOF: By inversion we have $ident:arg \equiv \overline{x_i}^i \mapsto texpr \in \mathbf{Globals}$ and $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \overline{x_i = spine_elem_i}^i :: arg \gg \sigma; ret$, with the latter implying $\overline{x_i = spine_elem_i}^i :: arg \gg \sigma; ret$ (lemma 3.1. Thus it can step with $OP_SEQ_TE_CCALL$.

(1)23. CASE: $TY_SEQ_E_PROC$.

PROOF: Similar to $TY_SEQ_E_CCALL$.

(1)24. CASE: $TY_IS_E_MEMOP$.

PROOF: By induction, if mem_op is unreachable, then the whole expression is so. Memops are not values. Only stepping cases applies, so $OP_ISE_ISE_MEMOP$.

(1)25. CASE: $TY_IS_E_ \{NEG_ \} ACTION$.

PROOF: By induction, if mem_action is unreachable, then the whole expression is so. Actions are not values. Only stepping case applies, so $OP_ISE_ISE_ \{NEG_ \} ACTION$.

(1)26. CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_ \{LETP, LETPT\}$.

PROOF: See $TY_SEQ_TE_ \{LET, LETT\}$ for more general cases and proofs.

(1)27. CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_LETT$.

PROOF: By induction, since seq_expr is not value, if it is unreachable, the whole expression is so. If it takes a step, then $OP_STE_TE_LETT_LETT$.

(1)28. CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_LETT$.

PROOF: By induction, if $texpr$ is unreachable, so is the whole expression. If it takes a step, then $OP_STE_TE_LETT_SUB$. If it takes a step, then $OP_STE_TE_LETT_LETT$.

(1)29. CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_CASE$.

PROOF: By assumption that all patterns are exhaustive, there is at least one pattern against which $pval$ will match, so $OP_STE_TE_CASE$.

(1)30. CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_IF$.

PROOF: $pval$ must be a $bool_value$ and so $OP_STE_TE_IF_ \{TRUE, FALSE\}$.

(1)31. CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_RUN$.

PROOF: Similar to $TY_SEQ_E_CCALL$.

(1)32. CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_BOUND$.

PROOF: By $OP_STE_TE_BOUND$.

⟨1⟩33. CASE: TY_IS_TE_LETS.

PROOF: Similar to TY_SEQ_TE_LETT.

4 Framing

If $\langle h; e \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; e' \rangle$ and $\exists h_1, h_2. \text{disjoint}(h_1, h_2) \wedge h = h_1 + h_2 \wedge \langle h_1; e \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'_1; e' \rangle$ then $h' = h'_1 + h_2$.

ASSUME: 1. $\langle h; e \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; e' \rangle$,
 2. $h = h_1 + h_2$ where h_1, h_2 disjoint,
 3. and $\langle h_1; e \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'_1; e' \rangle$.

PROVE: $h' = h'_1 + h_2$.

PROOF SKETCH: Induction over the operational rules. Only covering ones which modify the heap; rest are trivially true.

⟨1⟩1. CASE: OP_ACTION_TVAL_CREATE

PROOF: Because *mem_ptr* is fresh.

⟨1⟩2. CASE: OP_ACTION_TVAL_{STORE, KILL}.

PROOF: By assumption of disjointness, $\text{mem_ptr} \in h_1$ implies $\text{mem_ptr} \notin h_2$.

5 Type Preservation

5.1 Pointed-to values have type β_τ

For $pt = _ \check{\mapsto}_\tau pval$, if $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash pt \Leftarrow pt$ then $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash pval \Rightarrow \beta_\tau$.

PROOF SKETCH: Induction over the typing judgements. Only TY_ACTION_STORE create such permissions, and its premise $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash pval_1 \Rightarrow \beta_\tau$ ensures the desired property. TY_ACTION_LOAD simply preserves the property.

5.2 Terms derived from patterns are “equal to” matching values

ASSUME: 1. $\text{pattern}:\beta \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C} \text{ with } term$.
 2. $\text{pattern} = pval \rightsquigarrow \sigma$.

PROVE: The constraint $term_j = pval$ holds.

PROOF SKETCH: Induction over *pattern*.

5.3 Deconstructing a pattern leads to a well-typed substitution

First, computational part.

ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash pval \Rightarrow \beta_1$.
 2. $\text{ident_or_pattern}:\beta \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C} \text{ with } term$.
 3. $\text{ident_or_pattern} = pval \rightsquigarrow \sigma$.

PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash (\sigma)(\mathcal{C}; \cdot; \cdot)$.

PROOF SKETCH: By induction over 2.

⟨1⟩1. CASE: TY_PAT_SYM_OR_PATTERN_SYM and TY_PAT_COMP_SYM_ANNOT.

$\sigma = pval/x, \cdot$ and $\mathcal{C} = \cdot, x:\beta$.

PROOF: By TY_SUBS_CONS_COMP and 1.

⟨1⟩2. CASE: TY_PAT_NO_SYM_ANNOT and TY_PAT_COMP_NIL.

σ and \mathcal{C} are empty.

PROOF: By TY_SUBS_EMPTY, we are done.

⟨1⟩3. CASE: TY_PAT_COMP_{SPECIFIED, CONS, TUPLE, ARRAY}.

PROOF: By induction (and concatenating well-typed substitutions).

Now, resource part.

ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash res_term \Leftarrow res$.

2. $res_pattern:res \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}'$.

3. $res_pattern = res_term \rightsquigarrow \sigma$.

PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma):(\cdot; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}')$.

PROOF SKETCH: By induction over 2.

⟨1⟩1. CASE: TY_PAT_RES_EMPTY.

$res_pattern = res_term = res = \mathbf{emp}$. $\sigma, \mathcal{L}, \Phi, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}'$ are all empty.

PROOF: By TY_SUBS_EMPTY, we are done.

⟨1⟩2. CASE: TY_PAT_RES_POINTS_TO.

$res_pattern = res_term = res = pt$. $\sigma = \cdot, \mathcal{L} = \cdot, \Phi = \cdot, \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}' = \cdot, pt$.

PROOF: By TY_SUBS_CONS_RES_ANON.

⟨1⟩3. CASE: TY_PAT_RES_VAR.

$res_pattern = r, \sigma = res_term/x, \cdot, \mathcal{L} = \cdot, \Phi = \cdot, \mathcal{R}' = \cdot, x:res$.

PROOF: By TY_SUBS_CONS_RES_NAMED.

⟨1⟩4. CASE: TY_PAT_RES_SEPCONJ.

PROOF: By induction (and concatenating well-typed substitutions).

⟨1⟩5. CASE: TY_PAT_RES_CONJ.

PROOF: By $\mathbf{smt}(\cdot \Rightarrow term)$ (from 1) and induction with TY_SUB_CONS_PHI.

⟨1⟩6. CASE: TY_PAT_RES_PACK.

$res_pattern = \mathbf{pack}(x, res_pattern')$, $res_term = \mathbf{pack}(pval, res_term')$, $res = \exists x:\beta. res'$.

$\sigma = pval/x, \sigma', \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}', x:\beta, \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}'$.

PROOF: By induction and TY_SUBS_CONS_LOG.

Now, full proof.

ASSUME: 1. $\overline{ret_pattern_i} = \overline{spine_elem_i}^i \rightsquigarrow \sigma$.

2. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \mathbf{done} \overline{spine_elem_i}^i \Leftarrow ret$.

3. $\overline{ret_pattern_i}^i:ret \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}'$.

PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma):(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}')$.

PROOF SKETCH: Induction on 3.

⟨1⟩1. CASE: `TY_RET_PAT_EMPTY`
 PROOF: By `TY_SUBS_EMPTY`.

⟨1⟩2. CASE: `TY_RET_PAT_{COMP, RES}`
 PROOF: By induction, well-typed computational / resource substitutions and concatenating well-typed substitutions.

⟨1⟩3. CASE: `TY_RET_PATH_LOG`.
 PROOF: By induction.

⟨1⟩4. CASE: `TY_RET_PAT_PHI`
 PROOF: By induction and inversion on 2 to conclude `smt (· ⇒ term)`
 (required by `TY_SUBS_CONS_PHI`).

5.4 Type Preservation Statement and Proof

If $·; ·; \mathcal{R} \vdash e \Leftrightarrow t$ then $\forall h : \mathcal{R}, e', h' : \mathcal{R}'. \langle h; e \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; e' \rangle \implies ·; ·; \mathcal{R}' \vdash e' \Leftrightarrow t$.

PROOF SKETCH: Induction over the typing rules.

ASSUME: 1. $·; ·; \mathcal{R} \vdash e \Leftrightarrow t$
 2. arbitrary $h : \mathcal{R}, e', h' : \mathcal{R}'$
 3. $\langle h; e \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; e' \rangle$.

PROVE: $·; ·; \mathcal{R}' \vdash e' \Leftrightarrow t$.

⟨1⟩1. CASE: `TY_PE_ARRAY_SHIFT`.

LET: $term = mem_ptr +_{ptr} (mem_int \times size_of(\tau))$.

ASSUME: 1. $·; ·; \cdot \vdash \text{array_shift}(mem_ptr, \tau, mem_int) \Rightarrow y:loc. y = term$.

2. $\langle \text{array_shift}(mem_ptr, \tau, mem_int) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle mem_ptr' \rangle$.

PROVE: $·; ·; \cdot \vdash mem_ptr' \Rightarrow y:loc. y = term$.

PROOF: By `TY_PVAL_OBJ_INT`, `TY_PVAL_OBJ`, `TY_PE_VAL` and construction of mem_ptr'
 (inversion on 2).

⟨1⟩2. CASE: `TY_PE_MEMBER_SHIFT`.

PROOF SKETCH: Similar to `TY_ARRAY_SHIFT`.

⟨1⟩3. CASE: `TY_PE_NOT`.

ASSUME: 1. $·; ·; \cdot \vdash \text{not}(bool_value) \Rightarrow y:bool. y = \neg bool_value$.

2. $\langle \text{not}(\text{True}) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{False} \rangle$ or $\langle \text{not}(\text{False}) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{True} \rangle$.

PROVE: $·; ·; \cdot \vdash bool_value' \Rightarrow y:bool. y = \neg bool_value$.

PROOF: By `TY_PVAL_{TRUE, FALSE}`, `TY_PE_VAL` and 2.

⟨1⟩4. CASE: `TY_PE_ARITH_BINOP`.

LET: $term = mem_int_1 \text{ binop}_{arith} mem_int_2$.

ASSUME: 1. $·; ·; \cdot \vdash mem_int_1 \text{ binop}_{arith} mem_int_2 \Rightarrow y:integer. y = term$.

2. $\langle mem_int_1 \text{ binop}_{arith} mem_int_2 \rangle \longrightarrow \langle mem_int \rangle$.

PROVE: $·; ·; \cdot \vdash mem_int \Rightarrow y:integer. y = term$.

PROOF: By `TY_PVAL_OBJ_INT`, `TY_PVAL_OBJ`, `TY_PE_VAL` and construction of mem_int
 (inversion on 2).

- ⟨1⟩5. CASE: $\text{TY_PE_}\{\text{REL}, \text{BOOL}\}_\text{BINOP}$.
PROOF SKETCH: Similar to TY_PE_ARITH_BINOP .
- ⟨1⟩6. CASE: TY_PE_CALL .
PROOF: See TY_SEQ_E_CALL for a more general case and proof.
- ⟨1⟩7. CASE: $\text{TY_PE_ASSERT_UNDEF}$.
ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{assert_undef}(\text{True}, UB_name) \Rightarrow y:\text{unit}. y = \text{unit}$.
2. $\langle \text{assert_undef}(\text{True}, UB_name) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{Unit} \rangle$.
PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{Unit} \Rightarrow y:\text{unit}. y = \text{unit}$.
PROOF: By TY_PVAL_UNIT and TY_PE_VAL .
- ⟨1⟩8. CASE: $\text{TY_PE_BOOL_TO_INTEGER}$.
LET: $term = \text{if } bool_value \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } 0$.
ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{bool_to_integer}(bool_value) \Rightarrow y:\text{integer}. y = term$.
2. $\langle \text{bool_to_integer}(\text{True}) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle 1 \rangle$ or $\langle \text{bool_to_integer}(\text{False}) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle 0 \rangle$.
PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash mem_int \Rightarrow y:\text{integer}. y = term$
PROOF: By cases on $bool_value$, then applying $\text{TY_PVAL_}\{\text{TRUE}, \text{FALSE}\}$ and TY_PE_VAL .
- ⟨1⟩9. CASE: TY_PE_WRAP1 .
PROOF SKETCH: Similar to $\text{TY_PE_BOOL_TO_INTEGER}$, except by cases on $abbrev_2 \leq \max_int_\tau$, then applying TY_PVAL_OBJ_INT , TY_PVAL_OBJ and TY_PE_VAL .
- ⟨1⟩10. CASE: TY_TPE_IF .
PROOF: See TY_SEQ_TE_IF for a more general case and proof.
- ⟨1⟩11. CASE: TY_TPE_LET .
PROOF: See TY_SEQ_TE_LET for a more general case and proof.
- ⟨1⟩12. CASE: TY_TPE_LETT .
PROOF: See TY_SEQ_TE_LETT for a more general case and proof.
- ⟨1⟩13. CASE: TY_TPE_CASE .
PROOF: See TY_SEQ_TE_CASE for a more general case and proof.
- ⟨1⟩14. CASE: TY_ACTION_CREATE .
LET: $pt = mem_ptr \overset{\times}{\mapsto}_\tau pval$.
 $term = \text{representable}(\tau^*, y_p) \wedge \text{alignedI}(mem_int, y_p)$.
 $ret = \Sigma y_p:\text{loc}. term \wedge \exists y:\beta_\tau. y_p \overset{\times}{\mapsto}_\tau y \otimes \text{I}$.
ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{create}(mem_int, \tau) \Rightarrow ret$.
2. $\langle \cdot; \text{create}(mem_int, \tau) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \cdot + \{pt\}; \text{done } mem_ptr, pval, pt \rangle$.
PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot, pt \vdash \text{done } mem_ptr, pval, pt \Leftarrow ret$.
- ⟨2⟩1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash mem_ptr \Rightarrow \text{loc}$ by TY_PVAL_OBJ_INT and TY_PVAL_OBJ .
- ⟨2⟩2. $\text{smt}(\cdot \Rightarrow term)$ by construction of mem_ptr .
- ⟨2⟩3. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash pval \Rightarrow \beta_\tau$ by construction of $pval$.
- ⟨2⟩4. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot, pt \vdash pt \Leftarrow pt$ by TY_RES_POINTSTO .

⟨2⟩5. By TY_TVAL_I and then ⟨2⟩4 – ⟨2⟩1 with $\text{TY_TVAL_}\{\text{RES}, \text{LOG}, \text{PHI}, \text{COMP}\}$ respectively, we are done.

⟨1⟩15. CASE: TY_ACTION_LOAD .

LET: $pt = \text{mem_ptr} \xrightarrow{\check{\tau}} pval$.

$ret = \Sigma y:\beta_\tau. y = pval \wedge pt \otimes \mathbf{I}$.

ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot, pt \vdash \text{load}(\tau, \text{mem_ptr}, _, pt) \Rightarrow ret$.

2. $\langle \cdot + \{pt\}; \text{load}(\tau, \text{mem_ptr}, _, pt) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \cdot + \{pt\}; \text{done } pval, pt \rangle$.

PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot, pt \vdash \text{done } pval, pt \Leftarrow ret$

⟨2⟩1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot, pt \vdash pt \Leftarrow pt$, by inversion on 1.

⟨2⟩2. $\text{smt}(\cdot \Rightarrow pval = pval)$ trivially.

⟨2⟩3. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash pval \Rightarrow \beta_\tau$ by ⟨2⟩1 and lemma 5.1.

⟨2⟩4. By TY_TVAL_I and then ⟨2⟩1 – ⟨2⟩3 with $\text{TY_TVAL_}\{\text{RES}, \text{PHI}, \text{COMP}\}$ respectively, we are done.

⟨1⟩16. CASE: TY_ACTION_STORE .

LET: $pt = \text{mem_ptr} \xrightarrow{\check{\tau}} _$.

$pt' = \text{mem_ptr} \xrightarrow{\check{\tau}} pval$.

$ret = \Sigma _:\text{unit}. pt' \otimes \mathbf{I}$.

ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot, pt \vdash \text{store}(_, \tau, pval_0, pval_1, _, pt) \Rightarrow ret$.

2. $\langle \cdot + \{pt\}; \text{store}(_, \tau, \text{mem_ptr}, pval, _, pt) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \cdot + \{pt'\}; \text{done Unit}, pt' \rangle$.

PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot, pt' \vdash \text{done Unit}, pt' \Leftarrow ret$.

⟨2⟩1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{Unit} \Rightarrow \text{unit}$ by TY_PVAL_UNIT .

⟨2⟩2. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot, pt' \vdash pt' \Leftarrow pt'$ by TY_RES_POINTSTO .

⟨2⟩3. By TY_TVAL_I and ⟨2⟩1 and ⟨2⟩2 with $\text{TY_TVAL_}\{\text{RES}, \text{COMP}\}$ respectively, we are done.

⟨1⟩17. CASE: $\text{TY_ACTION_KILL_STATIC}$.

LET: $pt = \text{mem_ptr} \mapsto_\tau _$.

ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot, pt \vdash \text{kill}(\text{static } \tau, pval_0, pt) \Rightarrow \Sigma _:\text{unit}. \mathbf{I}$.

2. $\langle \cdot + \{pt\}; \text{kill}(\text{static } \tau, \text{mem_ptr}, pt) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h; \text{done Unit} \rangle$.

PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{done Unit} \Leftarrow \Sigma _:\text{unit}. \mathbf{I}$

PROOF: By TY_TVAL_I , TY_PVAL_UNIT and then TY_TVAL_COMP .

⟨1⟩18. CASE: $\text{TY_MEMOP_REL_BINOP}$.

PROOF: Similar TY_PE_REL_BINOP , except with $\text{TY_TVAL_}\{\mathbf{I}, \text{PHI}, \text{COMP}\}$ at the end.

⟨1⟩19. CASE: $\text{TY_MEMOP_INTFROMPTR}$.

LET: $ret = \Sigma y:\text{integer}. y = \text{cast_ptr_to_int mem_ptr} \wedge \mathbf{I}$.

ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{intFromPtr}(\tau_1, \tau_2, \text{mem_ptr}) \Rightarrow ret$.

2. $\langle \cdot; \text{intFromPtr}(\tau_1, \tau_2, \text{mem_ptr}) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \cdot; \text{done mem_int} \rangle$.

PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{done mem_int} \Leftarrow ret$

⟨2⟩1. $\text{smt}(\cdot \Rightarrow \text{mem_int} = \text{cast_ptr_to_int mem_ptr})$ by construction of mem_int (inversion on 2).

⟨2⟩2. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{mem_int} \Rightarrow \text{integer}$ by TY_PVAL_OBJ_INT and TY_PVAL_OBJ .

- ⟨2⟩3. By TY_TVAL_I and ⟨2⟩1 and ⟨2⟩2 with $\text{TY_TVAL_}\{\text{PHI}, \text{COMP}\}$ respectively, we are done.
- ⟨1⟩20. CASE: $\text{TY_MEMOP_PTRFROMINT}$.
 PROOF: Similar to $\text{TY_MEMOP_INTFROMPTR}$, swapping base types `integer` and `loc`.
- ⟨1⟩21. CASE: $\text{TY_MEMOP_PTRVALIDFORDEREF}$.
 LET: $pt = \text{mem_ptr} \xrightarrow{\check{\tau}} _.$
 $ret = \Sigma y:\text{bool}. y = \text{aligned}(\tau, \text{mem_ptr}) \wedge pt \otimes \text{I}.$
 ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{ptrValidForDeref}(\tau, \text{mem_ptr}, pt) \Rightarrow ret.$
 2. $\langle \cdot + \{pt\}; \text{ptrValidForDeref}(\tau, \text{mem_ptr}, pt) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \cdot + \{pt\}; \text{done } \text{bool_value}, pt \rangle.$
 PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{done } \text{bool_value}, pt \Leftarrow ret.$
- ⟨2⟩1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash pt \Leftarrow pt$, by inversion on 1.
- ⟨2⟩2. $R = \cdot, pt$, by TY_RES_POINTSTO .
- ⟨2⟩3. $\text{bool_value} = \text{aligned}(\tau, \text{mem_ptr})$ by construction of bool_value (inversion on 2).
- ⟨2⟩4. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{bool_value} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ by $\text{TY_PVAL_}\{\text{TRUE}, \text{FALSE}\}$.
- ⟨2⟩5. By TY_TVAL_I , and then ⟨2⟩2 – ⟨2⟩4 with $\text{TY_TVAL_}\{\text{RES}, \text{PHI}, \text{COMP}\}$ respectively, we are done.
- ⟨1⟩22. CASE: $\text{TY_MEMOP_PTRWELLALIGNED}$.
 LET: $ret = \Sigma y:\text{bool}. y = \text{aligned}(\tau, \text{mem_ptr}) \wedge \text{I}.$
 ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{ptrWellAligned}(\tau, \text{mem_ptr}) \Rightarrow ret.$
 2. $\langle \cdot; \text{ptrWellAligned}(\tau, \text{mem_ptr}) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \cdot; \text{done } \text{bool_value} \rangle.$
 PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{done } \text{bool_value} \Rightarrow ret.$
- ⟨2⟩1. $\text{smt}(\cdot \Rightarrow \text{bool_value} = \text{aligned}(\tau, \text{mem_ptr}))$ by construction of bool_value (inversion on 2).
- ⟨2⟩2. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{bool_value} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ by $\text{TY_PVAL_}\{\text{TRUE}, \text{FALSE}\}$.
- ⟨2⟩3. By TY_TVAL_I and ⟨2⟩1 and ⟨2⟩2 with $\text{TY_TVAL_}\{\text{PHI}, \text{COMP}\}$ respectively, we are done.
- ⟨1⟩23. CASE: $\text{TY_MEMOP_PTRARRAYSHIFT}$.
 PROOF: Similiar to TY_PE_ARRAY_SHIFT , except with $\text{TY_TVAL_}\{\text{I}, \text{PHI}, \text{COMP}\}$ at the end.
- ⟨1⟩24. CASE: TY_SEQ_E_CCALL .
 ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{ccall}(\tau, \text{ident}, \overline{\text{spine_elem}_i}^i) \Rightarrow \sigma(\text{ret}).$
 2. $\langle h; \text{ccall}(\tau, \text{ident}, \overline{\text{spine_elem}_i}^i) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h; \sigma'(\text{texpr}); \sigma'(\text{ret}) \rangle.$
 PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \sigma(\text{texpr}) \Leftarrow \sigma(\text{ret})$
- ⟨2⟩1. $\text{ident}:\text{arg} \equiv \overline{x_i}^i \mapsto \text{texpr} \in \text{Globals}$ by inversion (on either assumption).
- ⟨2⟩2. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \overline{x_i = \text{spine_elem}_i}^i :: \text{arg} \gg \sigma; \text{ret}$ by inversion on 1.
- ⟨2⟩3. $\sigma = \sigma'$ and $\text{ret} = \text{ret}'$ by induction on arg .
 PROOF: Follows from lemma 3.1.

- ⟨2⟩4. LET: $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}'$ be the the type of substitution $\sigma: \cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma):(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}')$.
 PROOF: From ⟨2⟩2 we may deduce
 1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash pval_i \Rightarrow \beta_i$ for each $x_i:\beta_i \in \mathcal{C}$ or $x_i:\beta_i \in \mathcal{L}$.
 2. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}' \vdash res_term_i \Leftarrow res_i$ for each $res_i \in \mathcal{R}'$.
 3. $\text{smt}(\cdot \Rightarrow term)$ for each $term \in \Phi$.
- ⟨2⟩5. $\mathcal{C}''; \mathcal{L}''; \Phi''; \mathcal{R}'' \vdash texpr \Leftarrow ret''$ where $\overline{x_i}^i :: arg \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C}''; \mathcal{L}''; \Phi''; \mathcal{R}'' \mid ret''$ formalises the assumption that all global functions and labels are well-typed.
- ⟨2⟩6. $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}'', \Phi = \Phi'', \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}'', \mathcal{R}' = \mathcal{R}''$ and $ret = ret''$.
 PROOF: By induction on arg .
- ⟨2⟩7. Apply substitution lemma (2.2) to ⟨2⟩4 and ⟨2⟩5 to finish proof.
- ⟨1⟩25. CASE: TY_SEQ_E_PROC.
 PROOF: Similar to TY_SEQ_E_CCALL.
- ⟨1⟩26. CASE: TY_IS_E_MEMOP.
 PROOF: By induction on TY_MEMOP* cases.
- ⟨1⟩27. CASE: TY_IS_E_{NEG_}ACTION.
 PROOF: By induction on TY_ACTION* cases.
- ⟨1⟩28. CASE: TY_SEQ_TE_LETP.
 PROOF SKETCH: Only covering case $\langle pexpr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle pexpr' \rangle$ here.
 See TY_SEQ_TE_LET for a more general version and proof for the remaining $\langle pexpr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle tpepr:(y:\beta. term) \rangle$ case.
 ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{let } ident_or_pattern = pexpr \text{ in } tpepr \Leftarrow y_2:\beta_2. term_2$.
 2. $\langle \text{let } ident_or_pattern = pexpr \text{ in } tpepr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{let } ident_or_pattern = pexpr' \text{ in } tpepr \rangle$.
 PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{let } ident_or_pattern = pexpr' \text{ in } tpepr \Leftarrow y_2:\beta_2. term_2$.
- ⟨2⟩1. 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash pexpr \Rightarrow y:\beta. term$.
 2. $ident_or_pattern:\beta \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C}_1 \text{ with } term_1$.
 3. $\mathcal{C}_1; \cdot; \cdot, term_1/y, \cdot(term), \Phi_1; \mathcal{R} \vdash texpr \Leftarrow ret$.
 PROOF: Invert assumption 1.
- ⟨2⟩2. $\langle pexpr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle pexpr' \rangle$.
 PROOF: Invert assumption 2.
- ⟨2⟩3. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash pexpr' \Rightarrow y:\beta. term$.
 PROOF: By induction on ⟨2⟩1.1 and ⟨2⟩2.
- ⟨2⟩4. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{let } ident_or_pattern = pexpr' \text{ in } tpepr \Leftarrow y_2:\beta_2. term_2$.
 PROOF: By TY_SEQ_TE_LETP using ⟨2⟩1.2,3 and ⟨2⟩3.
- ⟨1⟩29. CASE: TY_SEQ_TE_LETPT.
 PROOF: See TY_SEQ_TE_LETT for a more general case and proof.
- ⟨1⟩30. CASE: TY_SEQ_TE_LET.
 ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{let } \overline{ret_pattern_i}^i = seq_expr \text{ in } texpr_2 \Leftarrow ret_2$.
 2. $\langle h; \text{let } \overline{ret_pattern_i}^i = seq_expr \text{ in } texpr_2 \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h; \text{let } \overline{ret_pattern_i}^i : ret'_1 = texpr_1 \text{ in } texpr_2 \rangle$.
 PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{let } \overline{ret_pattern_i}^i : ret_1 = texpr_1 \text{ in } texpr_2 \Leftarrow ret_2$.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 1.$ 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R}' \vdash seq_expr \Rightarrow ret_1.$
 2. $\overline{ret_pattern_i}^i : ret_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C}_1; \mathcal{L}_1; \Phi_1; \mathcal{R}_1.$
 3. $\mathcal{C}_1; \mathcal{L}_1; \Phi_1; \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}_1 \vdash texpr \Leftarrow ret_2.$
 PROOF: By inversion on 1.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 2.$ $\langle h; seq_expr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h; texpr_1 : ret'_1 \rangle.$
 PROOF: By inversion on 2.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3.$ $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R}' \vdash texpr_1 \Leftarrow ret_1.$
 PROOF: By induction on $\langle 2 \rangle 1.1$ and $\langle 2 \rangle 2.$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4.$ $ret_1 = ret'_1.$
 PROOF: By cases $TY_SEQ_E_ \{CCALL, PCALL\}.$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5.$ By $TY_SEQ_TE_LET$ with $\langle 2 \rangle 1.2, 3$ and $\langle 2 \rangle 3,$ we are done.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 31.$ CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_LETT.$
 NOTE: $h : \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{R}$ and $h : \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}.$
- ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{let } \overline{ret_pattern_i}^i : ret_1 = \text{done } \overline{spine_elem_i}^i \text{ in } texpr_2 \Leftarrow ret_2.$
 2. $\langle h; \text{let } \overline{ret_pattern_i}^i : ret_1 = \text{done } \overline{spine_elem_i}^i \text{ in } texpr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h; \sigma(texpr_2) \rangle.$
 PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{R} \vdash \sigma(texpr_2) \Leftarrow \sigma(ret_2).$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 1.$ 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R}' \vdash \text{done } \overline{spine_elem_i}^i \Leftarrow ret_1.$
 2. $\overline{ret_pattern_i}^i : ret_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C}_1; \mathcal{L}_1; \Phi_1; \mathcal{R}_1.$
 3. $\mathcal{C}_1; \mathcal{L}_1; \Phi_1; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R} \vdash texpr_2 \Leftarrow ret_2.$
 PROOF: By inversion on 1.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 2.$ $\overline{ret_pattern_i} = \overline{spine_elem_i}^i \rightsquigarrow \sigma.$
 PROOF: By inversion on 2.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3.$ $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R}' \vdash (\sigma)(\mathcal{C}_1; \mathcal{L}_1; \Phi_1; \mathcal{R}_1).$
 PROOF: By $\langle 2 \rangle 1.1, 2$ and $\langle 2 \rangle 3,$ $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ using lemma 5.3 (deconstructing a pattern produces a well-typed substitution).
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4.$ By $\langle 2 \rangle 1.3$ and $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ and the let-friendly substitution lemma 2.4, we are done.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 32.$ CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_LETT.$
 ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{let } \overline{ret_pattern_i}^i : ret_1 = texpr_1 \text{ in } texpr_2 \Leftarrow ret_2.$
 2. $\langle h; \text{let } \overline{ret_pattern_i}^i : ret = texpr_1 \text{ in } texpr_2 \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; \text{let } \overline{ret_pattern_i}^i : ret = texpr'_1 \text{ in } texpr_2 \rangle.$
 PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R}'', \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{let } \overline{ret_pattern_i}^i : ret_1 = texpr'_1 \text{ in } texpr_2 \Leftarrow ret_2.$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 1.$ 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R}' \vdash texpr_1 \Leftarrow ret_1.$
 2. $\overline{ret_pattern_i}^i : ret_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C}_1; \mathcal{L}_1; \Phi_1; \mathcal{R}_1.$
 3. $\mathcal{C}_1; \mathcal{L}_1; \Phi_1; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R} \vdash texpr_2 \Leftarrow ret_2.$
 PROOF: By inversion on 1.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 2.$ $\langle h; texpr_1 \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; texpr'_1 \rangle.$
 PROOF: By inversion on 2.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3.$ $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R}'' \vdash texpr'_1 \Leftarrow ret_1.$
 PROOF: By induction on $\langle 1 \rangle 32.1$ and $\langle 2 \rangle 2.$

$\langle 2 \rangle 4$. By $\langle 2 \rangle 3$, $\langle 1 \rangle 32.2,3$ using `TY_SEQ_TE_LETT`, we are done.

$\langle 1 \rangle 33$. CASE: `TY_SEQ_TE_CASE`.

ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{case } pval \text{ of } \overline{\text{pattern}_i \Rightarrow \text{texpr}_i}^i \text{ end} \Leftarrow ret.$

2. $\langle h; \text{case } pval \text{ of } \overline{\text{pattern}_i \Rightarrow \text{texpr}_i}^i \text{ end} \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h; \sigma_j(\text{texpr}_j) \rangle.$

PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \sigma_j(\text{texpr}_j) \Leftarrow ret.$

$\langle 2 \rangle 1$. 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash pval \Rightarrow \beta_1.$

2. $\overline{\text{pattern}_i; \beta_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C}_i \text{ with term}_i}^i.$

3. $\overline{\mathcal{C}_i; \cdot; \cdot, \text{term}_i = pval; \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{texpr}_i \Leftarrow ret}^i.$

PROOF: By inversion on 1.

$\langle 2 \rangle 2$. 1. $\text{pattern}_j = pval \rightsquigarrow \sigma_j.$

2. $\forall i < j. \text{not } (\text{pattern}_i = pval \rightsquigarrow \sigma_i).$

PROOF: By inversion on 2.

$\langle 2 \rangle 3$. $\text{term}_j = pval.$

PROOF: By $\langle 1 \rangle 32.2$ and lemma 5.2.

$\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash (\sigma_j)(\mathcal{C}_j; \cdot; \cdot, \text{term}_j = pval; \cdot).$

PROOF: By $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ and lemma 5.3 (deconstructing a pattern produces a well-typed substitution).

$\langle 2 \rangle 5$. By $\langle 2 \rangle 4$, $\langle 1 \rangle 32.3$ and 2.2, we are done.

$\langle 1 \rangle 34$. CASE: `TY_SEQ_TE_IF`.

Only covering `True` case, `False` is almost identical.

ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{if True then } \text{texpr}_1 \text{ else } \text{texpr}_2 \Leftarrow ret.$

2. $\langle h; \text{if True then } \text{texpr}_1 \text{ else } \text{texpr}_2 \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h; \text{texpr}_1 \rangle.$

PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{texpr}_1 \Leftarrow ret.$

PROOF: Invert 1, note $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash (\text{id})(\cdot; \cdot; \cdot, \text{true} = \text{true}; \mathcal{R})$ and then apply substitution lemma (2.2).

$\langle 1 \rangle 35$. CASE: `TY_SEQ_TE_RUN`.

PROOF SKETCH: Similar to case `TY_SEQ_E_{\{\text{CCALL}, \text{PCALL}\}}`.

$\langle 1 \rangle 36$. CASE: `TY_SEQ_TE_BOUND`.

PROOF: By inversion on the typing rule.

$\langle 1 \rangle 37$. CASE: `TY_IS_TE_LETS`.

PROOF SKETCH: Similar to `TY_SEQ_TE_LETT`.

6 Typing Judgements

$object_value_jtype$	$::=$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash object_value \Rightarrow \text{obj } \beta$
$pval_jtype$	$::=$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash pval \Rightarrow \beta$
res_jtype	$::=$ $\Phi \vdash res \equiv res'$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash res_term \Leftarrow res$
$spine_jtype$	$::=$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash \overline{x_i = spine_elem_i}^i :: arg \gg \sigma; ret$
$pexpr_jtype$	$::=$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash pexpr \Rightarrow ident:\beta. term$
$tpval_jtype$	$::=$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash tpval \Leftarrow ident:\beta. term$
$tpexpr_jtype$	$::=$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash tpexpr \Leftarrow ident:\beta. term$
$action_jtype$	$::=$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash mem_action \Rightarrow ret$
$memop_jtype$	$::=$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash mem_op \Rightarrow ret$
seq_expr_jtype	$::=$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash seq_expr \Rightarrow ret$
is_expr_jtype	$::=$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash is_expr \Rightarrow ret$
$tval_jtype$	$::=$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash tval \Leftarrow ret$
$texpr_jtype$	$::=$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash seq_texpr \Leftarrow ret$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash is_texpr \Leftarrow ret$ $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash texpr \Leftarrow ret$

7 Opsem Judgements

$pure_opsem_jtype \quad ::=$
 $\quad | \quad \langle pexpr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle pexpr' \rangle$
 $\quad | \quad \langle pexpr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle tpepr:(y:\beta. term) \rangle$
 $\quad | \quad \langle tpepr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle tpepr' \rangle$

$opsem_jtype \quad ::=$
 $\quad | \quad \langle h; seq_expr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; texpr:ret \rangle$
 $\quad | \quad \langle h; seq_texpr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; texpr \rangle$
 $\quad | \quad \langle h; mem_op \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; tval \rangle$
 $\quad | \quad \langle h; mem_action \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; tval \rangle$
 $\quad | \quad \langle h; is_expr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; is_expr' \rangle$
 $\quad | \quad \langle h; is_texpr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; texpr \rangle$
 $\quad | \quad \langle h; texpr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; texpr' \rangle$