

Explicit CN Soundness Proof

Dhruv Makwana

July 6, 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 $J = (\sigma) : (\mathcal{C}''; \mathcal{L}''; \Phi''; \mathcal{R}'')$.

PROOF STRATEGY: Induction over the substitution.

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

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

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

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

$\langle 1 \rangle$ 1. CASE: `TY_PVAL_VAR`.

$\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi' \vdash x \Rightarrow \beta$

$\langle 2 \rangle$ 1. Have $x : \beta \in \mathcal{C}'$ (or $x : \beta \in \mathcal{L}'$).

$\langle 2 \rangle$ 2. So $\exists pval. \mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash pval \Rightarrow \beta$ by `TY_SUBS_CONS_{\{COMP, LOG\}}`.

$\langle 2 \rangle$ 3. Since $pval = \sigma(x)$, we are done.

⟨1⟩2. CASE: TY_TPE_LET.

$\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi' \vdash \text{let ident_or_pattern} = pexpr \text{ in } tpepr \Leftarrow y_2:\beta_2. term_2.$

⟨2⟩1. By induction,

1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash \sigma(pexpr) \Rightarrow y_1:\beta. \sigma(term_1)$
2. $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}_1; \mathcal{L}, y_1:\beta; \Phi, term_1, \Phi' \vdash \sigma(tpepr) \Leftarrow y_2:\beta. \sigma(term_2).$

⟨2⟩2. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash \sigma(\text{let ident_or_pattern} = pexpr \text{ in } tpepr) \Leftarrow y_2:\beta_2. \sigma(term_2)$ as required.

⟨1⟩3. CASE: TY_TVAL_LOG.

$\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}' \vdash \text{done pval}, \overline{spine_elem_i}^i \Leftarrow \exists y:\beta. ret.$

⟨2⟩1. By inversion and then induction,

1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash \sigma(pval) \Rightarrow \beta$
2. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash \sigma(\text{done } \overline{spine_elem_i}^i) \Leftarrow \sigma(pval/y. \cdot (ret)).$

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

⟨1⟩4. CASE: TY_SPINE_RES.

$\mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}'; \Phi'; \mathcal{R}'_1, \mathcal{R}_2 \vdash x = res_term, \overline{x_i = spine_elem_i}^i :: res \multimap arg \gg res_term/x, \psi; ret$

⟨2⟩1. By inversion and then induction,

1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1 \vdash \sigma(res_term) \Leftarrow \sigma(res).$
2. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_2 \vdash \overline{x_i = \sigma(spine_elem_i)}^i :: \sigma(res) \multimap \sigma(arg) \gg \sigma(\psi); \sigma(ret).$

⟨2⟩2. Hence $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2 \vdash x = \sigma(res_term), \overline{x_i = \sigma(spine_elem_i)}^i :: \sigma(res \multimap arg) \gg \sigma(res_term/x, \psi); \sigma(ret)$ as required.

2.3 Identity Extension

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

PROOF SKETCH: Induction over the substitution.

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

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

⟨1⟩1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1 \vdash (id):(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1).$

PROOF: By induction on each of $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1$.

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

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

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. $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}'; \Phi, \Phi'; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}' \vdash J.$

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

⟨1⟩1. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma, \text{id}) : (\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}'; \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}'; \Phi, \Phi'; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}')$.

PROOF: Apply identity extension to 1.

⟨1⟩2. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma, \text{id})(J)$.

PROOF: Apply substitution lemma (2.2) to ⟨1⟩1.

⟨1⟩3. $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R} \vdash \sigma(J)$.

PROOF: $\text{id}(J) = J$.

3 Progress

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

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

PROOF SKETCH: Induction over arg .

3.2 Progress Statement and Proof

If $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash e \Leftrightarrow t$ then either $\text{value}(e)$, or it is unreachable, or $\forall h : R. \exists e', h'. \langle h; e \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; e' \rangle$.

PROOF STRATEGY: Induction over the typing rules.

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

PROVE: Either $\text{value}(e)$, or it is unreachable, or $\forall h : R. \exists e', h'. \langle h; e \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; e' \rangle$.

⟨1⟩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).

⟨1⟩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.

⟨1⟩3. CASE: TY_PE_MEMBER_SHIFT.

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

⟨1⟩4. CASE: TY_PE_NOT.

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

⟨1⟩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 $\text{name} : \text{pure_arg} \equiv \overline{x_i^i}^i \mapsto \text{texpr} \in \mathbf{Globals}$ and $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \overline{x_i = pval_i^i}^i :: \text{pure_arg} \gg \sigma; \Sigma y : \beta. \text{term} \wedge \mathbf{I}$, with the latter implying $\overline{x_i = pval_i^i}^i :: \text{pure_arg} \gg \sigma; \Sigma y : \beta. \text{term} \wedge \mathbf{I}$ (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 $\text{smt}(\Phi \Rightarrow pval)$. 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_ASSERT_UNDEF.
- ⟨1⟩9. CASE: TY_PE_BOOL_TO_INTEGER.
 PROOF: $pval$ must be a *bool_value* and so OP_PE_BOOL_TO_INTEGER_{TRUE,FALSE}.
- ⟨1⟩10. CASE: TY_PE_WRAPI.
 PROOF: $pval$ must be a *mem_int* and so OP_PE_WRAPI.
- ⟨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_ptr* 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 $h = \cdot + \{pval_1 \xrightarrow{\checkmark}_\tau pval_2\}$, 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 $\cdot + \{mem_ptr \xrightarrow{\checkmark}_\tau \cdot\}$ 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 $pval$ must be a *mem_ptr*, and $mem_ptr:arg \equiv \overline{x_i}^i \mapsto$

$texpr \in \mathbf{Globals}$ 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 $OP_SEQ_TE_CCALL$.

$\langle 1 \rangle 23$. CASE: $TY_SEQ_E_PROC$.

PROOF: Similar to $TY_SEQ_E_CCALL$.

$\langle 1 \rangle 24$. 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 $OP_ISE_ISE_MEMOP$.

$\langle 1 \rangle 25$. 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 $OP_ISE_ISE_ \{NEG_ \} ACTION$.

$\langle 1 \rangle 26$. CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_ \{LETP, LETPT\}$.

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

$\langle 1 \rangle 27$. CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_LET$.

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

$\langle 1 \rangle 28$. CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_LETT$.

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

$\langle 1 \rangle 29$. CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_CASE$.

PROOF: We have to show that assuming the case-expression is well-typed, then there is at least one pattern against which $pval$ will match.

$\langle 1 \rangle 30$. CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_IF$.

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

$\langle 1 \rangle 31$. CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_RUN$.

PROOF: Similar to $TY_SEQ_E_CCALL$.

$\langle 1 \rangle 32$. CASE: $TY_SEQ_TE_BOUND$.

PROOF: By $OP_STE_TE_BOUND$.

$\langle 1 \rangle 33$. 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.

$\langle 1 \rangle 1$. CASE: OP_ACTION_TVAL_CREATE

PROOF: Because mem_ptr is fresh.

$\langle 1 \rangle 2$. CASE: OP_ACTION_TVAL_{STORE, KILL}.

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

5 Type Preservation

5.1 Pointed-to values have type β_τ

For $pt = _ \mapsto_\tau pval$, 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 Deconstructing a pattern leads to a well-typed substitution

First, computational part.

ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash pval \Rightarrow \beta_1$.

2. $ident_or_pattern: \beta \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C} \text{ with term}$.

3. $ident_or_pattern = pval \rightsquigarrow \sigma$.

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

PROOF SKETCH: By induction over 2.

$\langle 1 \rangle 1$. 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 and TY_SUBS_CONS_PHI.

$\langle 1 \rangle 2$. 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.

$\langle 1 \rangle 3$. 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.

$\langle 1 \rangle 1$. 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.

$\langle 1 \rangle 2$. 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 induction and TY_SUBS_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. Base case by TY_SUBS_EMPTY. TY_RET_PAT_{COMP, RES} by induction, well-typed computational / resource substitutions and concatenating well-typed substitutions. TY_RET_PAT_{LOG, PHI} by induction and TY_SUBS_CONS_{LOG, PHI}.

5.3 Type Preservation Statement and Proof

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

PROOF SKETCH: Induction over the typing rules.

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

2. arbitrary $h : \mathcal{R}, e', h' : \mathcal{R}'$

3. $\langle h; e \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h'; e' \rangle.$

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

<1>1. CASE: TY_PE_ARRAY_SHIFT.

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

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

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

PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash mem_ptr' \Rightarrow y:\text{loc}. y = term.$

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. $\cdot;\cdot;\cdot \vdash \text{not } (bool_value) \Rightarrow y:\text{bool}. y = \neg bool_value$.
 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: $\cdot;\cdot;\cdot \vdash bool_value' \Rightarrow y:\text{bool}. y = \neg bool_value$.
 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. $\cdot;\cdot;\cdot \vdash mem_int_1 \text{ binop}_{arith} mem_int_2 \Rightarrow y:\text{integer}. y = term$.
 2. $\langle mem_int_1 \text{ binop}_{arith} mem_int_2 \rangle \longrightarrow \langle mem_int \rangle$.
 PROVE: $\cdot;\cdot;\cdot \vdash mem_int \Rightarrow y:\text{integer}. y = term$.
 PROOF: By TY_PVAL_OBJ_INT, TY_PVAL_OBJ, TY_PE_VAL and construction of mem_int (inversion on 2).
- ⟨1⟩5. CASE: TY_PE_{REL,BOOL}_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: 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: 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 TY_PVAL_{TRUE,FALSE} and TY_PE_VAL.
- ⟨1⟩9. CASE: TY_PE_WRAP1.
 PROOF SKETCH: Similar to 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: $pt = mem_ptr \xrightarrow{\tau} pval$.

$term = \text{representable}(\tau*, y_p) \wedge \text{alignedI}(mem_int, y_p)$.

$ret = \Sigma y_p:loc. term \wedge \exists y:\beta_\tau. y_p \xrightarrow{\tau} y \otimes I$.

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

$\langle 2 \rangle 1$. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash mem_ptr \Rightarrow loc$ by $TY_PVAL_OBJ_INT$ and TY_PVAL_OBJ .

$\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $\text{smt}(\cdot \Rightarrow term)$ by construction of mem_ptr .

$\langle 2 \rangle 3$. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash pval \Rightarrow \beta_\tau$ by construction of $pval$.

$\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot, pt \vdash pt \Leftarrow pt$ by $TY_RES_POINTS_TO$.

$\langle 2 \rangle 5$. By TY_TVAL_I and then $\langle 2 \rangle 4 - \langle 2 \rangle 1$ with $TY_TVAL_ \{RES, LOG, PHI, COMP\}$ respectively, we are done.

$\langle 1 \rangle 15$. CASE: TY_ACTION_LOAD .

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

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

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

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

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

$\langle 2 \rangle 1$. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot, pt \vdash pt \Leftarrow pt$, by inversion on 1.

$\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $\text{smt}(\cdot \Rightarrow pval = pval)$ trivially.

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

$\langle 2 \rangle 4$. By TY_TVAL_I and then $\langle 2 \rangle 1 - \langle 2 \rangle 3$ with $TY_TVAL_ \{RES, PHI, COMP\}$ respectively, we are done.

$\langle 1 \rangle 16$. CASE: TY_ACTION_STORE .

LET: $pt = mem_ptr \xrightarrow{\tau} -$.

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

$ret = \Sigma -:unit. pt' \otimes I$.

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

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

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

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

$\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot, pt' \vdash pt' \Leftarrow pt'$ by $TY_RES_POINTS_TO$.

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

$\langle 1 \rangle 17$. CASE: $TY_ACTION_KILL_STATIC$.

LET: $pt = mem_ptr \mapsto_\tau -$.

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

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

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

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 $\text{TY_TVAL_}\{\text{I}, \text{PHI}, \text{COMP}\}$ at the end.

(1)19. CASE: $\text{TY_MEMOP_INTFROMPTR}$.

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

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

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

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

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

(2)2. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash mem_int \Rightarrow \text{integer}$ 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: $pt = mem_ptr \check{\vdash}_{\tau} _$.

$ret = \Sigma y:\text{bool}. y = \text{aligned } (\tau, mem_ptr) \wedge pt \otimes \text{I}$.

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

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

PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{done } bool_value, pt \Leftarrow ret$.

(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. $bool_value = \text{aligned } (\tau, mem_ptr)$ by construction of $bool_value$ (inversion on 2).

(2)4. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash bool_value \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ 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: $ret = \Sigma y:\text{bool}. y = \text{aligned } (\tau, mem_ptr) \wedge \text{I}$.

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

2. $\langle \cdot; \text{ptrWellAligned } (\tau, mem_ptr) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \cdot; \text{done } bool_value \rangle$.

PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{done } bool_value \Rightarrow ret$.

(2)1. $\text{smt } (\cdot \Rightarrow bool_value = \text{aligned } (\tau, mem_ptr))$ by construction of $bool_value$ (inversion on 2).

(2)2. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash bool_value \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ 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: `TY_MEMOP_PTRARRAYSHIFT`.
 PROOF: Similiar to `TY_PE_ARRAY_SHIFT`, except with `TY_TVAL_{I,PHI,COMP}` at the end.
- ⟨1⟩24. CASE: `TY_SEQ_E_CCALL`.
 ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{ccall}(\tau, pval, \overline{\text{spine_elem}_i}^i) \Rightarrow \sigma(\text{ret})$.
 2. $\langle h; \text{ccall}(\tau, pval, \overline{\text{spine_elem}_i}^i) \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h; \sigma'(\text{texpr}); \sigma'(\text{ret}) \rangle$.
 PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \sigma(\text{texpr}) \Leftarrow \sigma(\text{ret})$
- ⟨2⟩1. $pval:arg \equiv \overline{x_i}^i \mapsto \text{texpr} \in \mathbf{Globals}$ by inversion (on either assumption).
- ⟨2⟩2. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \overline{x_i = \text{spine_elem}_i}^i :: arg \gg \sigma; \text{ret}$ 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: Constructing such a substitution requires $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi \vdash pval_i \Rightarrow \beta_i$ for each $x_i:\beta_i \in \mathcal{C}$ or $x_i:\beta_i \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{L}; \Phi; \mathcal{R}' \vdash \text{res_term}_i \Leftarrow \text{res}_i$ for each $\text{res}_i \in \mathcal{R}'$ which can be deduced from ⟨2⟩2.
- ⟨2⟩5. $\mathcal{C}''; \mathcal{L}''; \Phi''; \mathcal{R}'' \vdash \text{texpr} \Leftarrow \text{ret}''$ where $\overline{x_i}^i :: arg \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C}''; \mathcal{L}''; \Phi''; \mathcal{R}'' \mid \text{ret}''$ 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 $\text{ret} = \text{ret}''$.
 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 $\langle pexpr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle tpepr:(y:\beta. \text{term}) \rangle$ case.
 ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{let ident_or_pattern} = pexpr \text{ in } tpepr \Leftarrow y_2:\beta_2. \text{term}_2$.
 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: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{let ident_or_pattern} = pexpr' \text{ in } tpepr \Leftarrow y_2:\beta_2. \text{term}_2$.
- ⟨2⟩1. 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash pexpr \Rightarrow y:\beta. \text{term}$.
 2. $\text{ident_or_pattern}:\beta \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C}_1 \text{ with } \text{term}_1$.
 3. $\mathcal{C}_1; \cdot; \cdot, \text{term}_1/y, \cdot(\text{term}), \Phi_1; \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{texpr} \Leftarrow \text{ret}$.
 PROOF: Invert assumption 1.
- ⟨2⟩2. $\langle pexpr \rangle \longrightarrow \langle pexpr' \rangle$.
 PROOF: Invert assumption 2.

$\langle 2 \rangle 3. \cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash pexpr' \Rightarrow y:\beta. term.$

PROOF: By induction on $\langle 2 \rangle 1.1$ and $\langle 2 \rangle 2$.

$\langle 2 \rangle 4. \cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash \text{let ident_or_pattern} = pexpr' \text{ in } texpr \Leftarrow y_2:\beta_2. term_2.$

PROOF: By `TY_SEQ_TE_LETP` using $\langle 2 \rangle 1.2,3$ and $\langle 2 \rangle 3$.

$\langle 1 \rangle 29.$ CASE: `TY_SEQ_TE_LETP`.

PROOF: See `TY_SEQ_TE_LETT` for a more general case and proof.

$\langle 1 \rangle 30.$ 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.

$\langle 2 \rangle 2.$ $\overline{ret_pattern_i}^i = \overline{spine_elem_i}^i \rightsquigarrow \sigma.$

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 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ using lemma 5.2.

$\langle 2 \rangle 4.$ By $\langle 2 \rangle 1.3$ and $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ and 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: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R}'', \mathcal{R} \vdash \overline{\text{let } ret_pattern_i^i : ret_1 = texpr'_1 \text{ in } texpr_2 \Leftarrow ret_2}.$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 1.$ 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 $\langle 2 \rangle 1.1$ and $\langle 2 \rangle 2.$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4.$ By $\langle 2 \rangle 3, \langle 2 \rangle 1.2, 3$ using `TY_SEQ_TE_LET`, we are done.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 33.$ CASE: `TY_SEQ_TE_CASE`.
 ASSUME: 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{case } pval \text{ of } \overline{pattern_i \Rightarrow texpr_i^i} \text{ end} \Leftarrow ret.$
 2. $\langle h; \text{case } pval \text{ of } \overline{pattern_i \Rightarrow texpr_i^i} \text{ end} \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h; \sigma_j(texpr_j) \rangle.$
 PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \sigma_j(texpr_j) \Leftarrow ret.$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 1.$ 1. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash pval \Rightarrow \beta_1.$
 2. $\overline{pattern_i; \beta_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{C}_i \text{ with } term_i^i}.$
 3. $\overline{\mathcal{C}_i; \cdot; \cdot, term_i = pval; \mathcal{R} \vdash texpr_i \Leftarrow ret^i}.$
 PROOF: By inversion on 1.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 2.$ 1. $pattern_j = pval \rightsquigarrow \sigma_j.$
 2. $\forall i < j. \text{not } (pattern_i = pval \rightsquigarrow \sigma_i).$
 PROOF: By inversion on 2.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3.$ $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \cdot \vdash (\sigma_j)(\mathcal{C}_i; \cdot; \cdot).$
 PROOF: By lemma 5.2.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4.$ $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash (\sigma_j)(\mathcal{C}_i; \cdot; \cdot, term_j = pval_j; \mathcal{R}).$
 PROOF: By $\langle 2 \rangle 3, \text{TY_SUBS_CONS_PHI}$ and `TY_SUBS_CONS_RES*`.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5.$ By $\langle 1 \rangle 32.3$ 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. $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash \text{if True then } texpr_1 \text{ else } texpr_2 \Leftarrow ret.$
 2. $\langle h; \text{if True then } texpr_1 \text{ else } texpr_2 \rangle \longrightarrow \langle h; texpr_1 \rangle.$
 PROVE: $\cdot; \cdot; \cdot; \mathcal{R} \vdash texpr_1 \Leftarrow ret.$
 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

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

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