

July 20, 2016

## 1 Effects

$R$  is a fixed set of resources. We define a resource as a language primitive with the authority to perform I/O operations.  $\Pi$  is the set of I/O operations. In this document we cannot dynamically create resources or operations on resources.

Members of  $R$  are denoted  $r$ ; members of  $\Pi$  are denoted  $\pi$ .  $r.\pi$  is syntactic sugar for  $(r, \pi)$  (for example, `FileIO.append` instead of `(FileIO, append)`). An effect is a member of the pairs  $R \times \Pi$ . A set of effects is denoted by  $\varepsilon$ .

We say a piece of code  $C$  has the runtime effect  $r.\pi$  if  $r.\pi$  is called during the execution of  $C$ .  $C$  captures  $r.\pi$  if it has the authority to call  $r.\pi$  at some point during its execution. The static effects of  $C$  is an approximation of the runtime effects by our typing system. Later on we show the static effects of  $C$  give a conservative upper-bound on the runtime effects.

Types in our system are either resources or structural. Structural types are distinguished by what method declarations they have. The type with no methods is called **Unit**; its unique instance of denoted `unit`. Although they look similar in form, operations and methods are distinct. Methods can only be invoked by objects; operations can only be invoked by resources.

We make some simplifying assumptions about methods and operations. Methods take exactly one argument. If the argument is not specified it is assumed to be `unit`. Invoking some operation  $r.\pi$  returns  $\emptyset$ . We don't model arguments to operations, so all operations are null-ary.

## 2 Static Semantics For Fully-Annotated Programs

In this first system every method in the program is explicitly annotated with its set of effects.

### 2.1 Grammar

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 e ::= & \begin{array}{l} x \\ r \\ \text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \overline{\sigma} = \overline{e} \\ e.m(e) \\ e.\pi \end{array} & \text{expressions} \\
 \tau ::= & \{\overline{\sigma}\} \mid \{\overline{r}\} & \text{types} \\
 \sigma ::= & \text{def } m(x : \tau) : \tau \text{ with } \varepsilon \text{ labeled decls.} \\
 \Gamma ::= & \begin{array}{l} \emptyset \\ \Gamma, x : \tau \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

#### Notes:

- All declarations ( $\sigma$ -terms) are annotated by what effects they have.
- All methods take exactly one argument. If a method specifies no argument the argument is assumed to be of type **Unit**.
- The type  $\{\overline{r}\}$  is a set of resources; there will only be one actual resource at run-time, and it will be one of the resources in the set. This covers the case where e.g. a conditional returns a different resource on either branch.

## 2.2 Static Semantics

$$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash e : \tau \text{ with } \varepsilon}$$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, x : \tau \vdash x : \tau \text{ with } \emptyset} (\varepsilon\text{-VAR})$$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, r : \{\bar{r}\} \vdash r : \{\bar{r}\} \text{ with } \emptyset} (\varepsilon\text{-RESOURCE})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : \{\bar{\sigma}\} \vdash \bar{\sigma} = \bar{e} \text{ OK}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{new}_{\sigma} x \Rightarrow \bar{\sigma} = \bar{e} : \{\bar{\sigma}\} \text{ with } \emptyset} (\varepsilon\text{-NEWOBJ})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \{\bar{r}\} \text{ with } \varepsilon_1}{\Gamma \vdash e_1.\pi : \text{Unit} \text{ with } \{\bar{r}.\pi\} \cup \varepsilon_1} (\varepsilon\text{-OPERCALL})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \{\bar{\sigma}\} \text{ with } \varepsilon_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau_2 \text{ with } \varepsilon_2 \quad \sigma_i = \text{def } m_i(y : \tau_2) : \tau_3 \text{ with } \varepsilon_3}{\Gamma \vdash e_1.m_i(e_2) : \tau_3 \text{ with } \varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon_2 \cup \varepsilon_3} (\varepsilon\text{-METHCALL}_{\sigma})$$

$$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash \sigma = e \text{ OK}}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, y : \tau_2 \vdash e : \tau_3 \text{ with } \varepsilon_3 \quad \sigma = \text{def } m(y : \tau_2) : \tau_3 \text{ with } \varepsilon_3}{\Gamma \vdash \sigma = e \text{ OK}} (\varepsilon\text{-VALIDIMPL}_{\sigma})$$

### Notes:

- In  $\varepsilon\text{-VAR}$ ,  $\varepsilon\text{-RESOURCE}$ , and  $\varepsilon\text{-NEWOBJ}$  the consequent has an expression typed with no effect. In these rules we may be gaining an authority for an effect but we must use it in some code for that effect to happen.
- $\varepsilon\text{-VALIDIMPL}$  says that the return type and effects of the body of a method must be exactly the same as its declaration.

## 2.3 Dynamic Semantics

$$\boxed{e \longrightarrow e \mid \varepsilon}$$

$$\frac{e_1 \longrightarrow e'_1 \mid \varepsilon}{e_1.m(e_2) \longrightarrow e'_1.m(e_2) \mid \varepsilon} (\text{E-METHCALL1}) \quad \frac{v_1 = \text{new}_{\sigma} x \Rightarrow \bar{\sigma} = \bar{e} \quad e_2 \longrightarrow e'_2 \mid \varepsilon}{v_1.m(e_2) \longrightarrow v_1.m(e'_2) \mid \varepsilon} (\text{E-METHCALL2}_{\sigma})$$

$$\frac{v_1 = \text{new}_{\sigma} x \Rightarrow \bar{\sigma} = \bar{e} \quad \text{def } m(y : \tau_1) : \tau_2 \text{ with } \varepsilon = e \in \bar{\sigma} = \bar{e}}{v_1.m(v_2) \longrightarrow [v_1/x, v_2/y]e \mid \emptyset} (\text{E-METHCALL3}_{\sigma})$$

$$\frac{e_1 \longrightarrow e'_1 \mid \varepsilon}{e_1.\pi \longrightarrow e'_1.\pi \mid \varepsilon} (\text{E-OPERCALL1}) \quad \frac{}{r.\pi \longrightarrow \text{unit} \mid \{r.\pi\}} (\text{E-OPERCALL2})$$

$$\boxed{e \longrightarrow_* e \mid \varepsilon}$$

$$\frac{}{e \longrightarrow_* e \mid \emptyset} (\text{E-MULTISTEP1}) \quad \frac{e \longrightarrow e' \mid \varepsilon}{e \longrightarrow_* e' \mid \varepsilon} (\text{E-MULTISTEP2})$$

$$\frac{e \longrightarrow_* e' \mid \varepsilon_1 \quad e' \longrightarrow_* e'' \mid \varepsilon_2}{e \longrightarrow_* e'' \mid \varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon_2} (\text{E-MULTISTEP3})$$

**Notes:**

- A multi-step involves *zero* or more applications of a small-step.
- Multi-step rules accumulate the run-time effects produced by the individual small-steps.
- The only rule which produces effects is E-OPERCALL2 (the rule for evaluating operations on resources).
- Method calls are evaluated by performing substitution on the body of the method. There is no store.

**2.4 Theorems****Lemma 2.1. (Canonical Forms)**

**Statement.** Suppose  $e$  is a value. The following are true:

- If  $\Gamma \vdash e : \{\bar{r}\} \text{ with } \varepsilon$ , then  $e = r$  for some  $r \in R$ .
- If  $\Gamma \vdash e : \{\bar{\sigma}\} \text{ with } \varepsilon$ , then  $e = \text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \bar{\sigma} \equiv \bar{e}$ .

Furthermore,  $\varepsilon = \emptyset$  in each case.

**Proof.** These typing judgements each appear exactly once in the conclusion of different rules. The result follows by inversion of  $\varepsilon$ -RESOURCE and  $\varepsilon$ -NEWOBJ respectively.  $\square$

**Definition. (Substitution)**

$[e'/z]e$  means 'substitute every free occurrence of  $z$  in  $e$  for  $e'$ '. Here's a definition over rules in the grammar.

- $[e'/z]z = e'$
- $[e'/z]r = r$
- $[e'/z](e_1.m(e_2)) = ([e'/z]e_1).m([e'/z]e_2)$
- $[e'/z](e_1.\pi) = ([e'/z]e_1).\pi$
- $[e'/z](\text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \bar{\sigma} \equiv \bar{e}) = \dots$

(But that last one—if  $z$  and  $x$  happen to be the same variables we don't want to sub out  $x$  because it's the 'this' variable. Needs a bit more thought, consult the almighty TAPL)

If we want to perform multiple substitutions we can write  $[e_1/z_1, \dots, e_n/z_n]e$ , which is shorthand for  $[e_n/z_n] \dots [e_1/z_1]e$

**Lemma 2.2. (Substitution Lemma)**

**Statement.** If  $\Gamma, z : \tau' \vdash e : \tau \text{ with } \varepsilon$ , and  $\Gamma \vdash e' : \tau' \text{ with } \varepsilon'$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash [e'/z]e : \tau \text{ with } \varepsilon$ .

**Intuition** If you substitute  $z$  for something of the same type, the type of the whole expression stays the same under substitution.

**Proof.** By structural induction on possible derivations of  $\Gamma \vdash e : \tau \text{ with } \varepsilon$ . First, if  $z$  does not appear in  $e$  then  $[e'/z]e = e$ , so the statement holds vacuously. So without loss of generality we assume  $z$  appears somewhere in  $e$  and consider the last rule used in the derivation, and then the location of  $z$ .

**Case.**  $\varepsilon$ -VAR.

Then  $[e'/z]z = e_1$ . By assumption  $\Gamma \vdash e' : \tau' \text{ with } \varepsilon$ , so  $\Gamma \vdash [e'/z]z = e$ .

**Case.**  $\varepsilon$ -RESOURCE.

Then  $e = r$ .  $\text{freevars}(r) = \emptyset$ , so the statement holds vacuously.

**Case.**  $\varepsilon$ -NEWOBJ.

Then  $e = \text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \bar{\sigma} \equiv \bar{e}$ .  $z$  appears in some method body  $e_i$ . By inversion we know  $\Gamma, x : \{\bar{\sigma}\} \vdash \bar{\sigma} \equiv \bar{e}$  OK. The only rule with this conclusion is  $\varepsilon$ -VALIDIMPL $_\sigma$ ; by inversion on that we have:

- $\Gamma, y : \tau_1 \vdash e_i : \tau_2 \text{ with } \varepsilon$

–  $\sigma = \text{def } m_i(y : \tau_1) : \tau_2 \text{ with } \varepsilon$

$\Gamma, z : \tau$  can be used to prove  $\sigma_i = e_i$  OK via the inductive assumption. By an application of  $\varepsilon\text{-VALIDIMPL}_\sigma$  we may type  $[e'/z]e$ . Then by  $\varepsilon\text{-NEWOBJ}$  we type  $[e'/z]e$  to the same as the original.

**Case.**  $\varepsilon\text{-OPERCALL}$ .

Then  $e = e_1.\pi$ . The variable  $z$  must appear in  $e_1$ . By rule inversion we have a sub-derivation for the type of both sub-expressions so applying the inductive assumption we know  $e_1$  and  $[e'/z]e_1$  have the same types. Then  $\varepsilon\text{-OPERCALL}$  types the substituted operation call to the same as the original.

**Case.**  $\varepsilon\text{-METHCALL}_\sigma$ .

Then  $e = e_1.m_i(e_2)$ . The variable  $z$  must appear in  $e_1$  or  $e_2$ . By rule inversion we have a sub-derivation for both so applying the inductive hypothesis we know the types of  $e_1$  and  $[e'/z]e_1$  are the same, and the types of  $e_2$  and  $[e'/z]e_2$  are the same. So the types of subexpressions are preserved under substitution. Then  $\varepsilon\text{-METHCALL}$  types  $[e'/z](e_1.m_i(e_2))$  to the same as  $e_1.m_i(e_2)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary.** If  $\Gamma, z_i : \tau'_i \vdash e : \tau$  with  $\varepsilon$ , and  $\Gamma \vdash e'_i : \tau'_i$  with  $\varepsilon'_i$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash [e'_1/z_1, \dots, e'_n/z_n]e : \tau$  with  $\varepsilon$ . This follows by the definition  $[e'_1/z_1, \dots, e'_n/z_n]e = [e'_n/z_n] \dots [e'_1/z_1]e$  and induction on the length  $n$ .

### Theorem 2.3. (Progress)

**Statement.** If  $\Gamma \vdash e_A : \tau_A$  with  $\varepsilon_A$ , either  $e_A$  is a value or a small-step  $e_A \longrightarrow e_B \mid \varepsilon$  can be applied.

**Proof.** By structural induction on possible derivations of  $\Gamma \vdash e_A : \tau_A$  with  $\varepsilon_A$ . We consider the last rule used.

**Case.**  $\varepsilon\text{-VAR}$ ,  $\varepsilon\text{-RESOURCE}$ ,  $\varepsilon\text{-NEWOBJ}$ ,  $\text{C-NEWOBJ}$ .

Then  $e_A$  is a value.

**Case.**  $\varepsilon\text{-METHCALL}$ .

Then  $e_A = e_1.m_i(e_2)$  and the following are known:

- $e_A : \tau_3$  with  $\varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon_2 \cup \varepsilon_3$
- $e_1 : \{\bar{\sigma}\}$  with  $\varepsilon_1$
- $e_2 : \tau_2$  with  $\varepsilon_2$
- $\sigma_i = \text{def } m_i(y : \tau_2) : \tau_3 \text{ with } \varepsilon_3$

We look at the cases for when  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are values.

Subcase.  $e_1$  is not a value. The derivation of  $e_A : \tau$  with  $\varepsilon_A$  includes the subderivation  $e_1 : \{\bar{\sigma}\}$  with  $\varepsilon_1$ . By the inductive hypothesis  $e_1 \longrightarrow e'_1 \mid \varepsilon$ . Then  $\text{E-METHCALL1}$  gives the reduction  $e_A \longrightarrow e'_1.m_i(e_2) \mid \varepsilon$ .

Subcase.  $e_2$  is not a value. Without loss of generality,  $e_1 = v_1$  is a value. Also,  $e_2 : \tau_2$  with  $\varepsilon_2$  is a subderivation. By inductive hypothesis,  $e_2 \longrightarrow e'_2 \mid \varepsilon$ . Then  $\text{E-METHCALL2}_\sigma$  gives the reduction  $e_A \longrightarrow v_1.m_i(e'_2) \mid \varepsilon$ .

Subcase.  $e_1 = v_1$  and  $e_2 = v_2$  are values. By Canonical Forms,  $e_1 = \text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \bar{\sigma} \equiv \bar{e}$ . Also,  $\text{def } m_i(y : \tau_2) : \tau_3 \text{ with } \varepsilon_3 = e_i \in \bar{\sigma} \equiv \bar{e}$ . By the assumption of the typing rule used, the receiver and argument are well-typed for the method  $m_i$ . Then  $\text{E-METHCALL3}_\sigma$  gives the reduction  $e_1.m_i(e_2) \longrightarrow [v_1/x, v_2/y]e_i \mid \emptyset$ .

**Case.**  $\varepsilon\text{-OPERCALL}$ .

Then  $e_A = e_1.\pi$  and the following are known:

- $e_A : \text{Unit}$  with  $\{r.\pi\} \cup \varepsilon_1$
- $e_1 : \{\bar{r}\}$  with  $\varepsilon_1$

We look at the cases for when  $e_1$  is a value.

Subcase.  $e_1$  is not a value. Then  $e_1 : \{\bar{r}\}$  with  $\varepsilon_1$  is a subderivation. Applying inductive assumption, we have  $e_1 \longrightarrow e'_1 \mid \varepsilon$ . Then  $\text{E-OPERCALL1}$  gives the reduction  $e_1.\pi(e_2) \longrightarrow e'_1.\pi(e_2) \mid \varepsilon$ .

Subcase.  $e_1$  is a value. By Canonical Forms,  $\exists r \in R \mid e_1 = r$ . Then E-OPERCALL3 gives the reduction  $r.\pi \longrightarrow \text{unit} \mid \{r.\pi\}$ .

□

## Theorem 2.4. (Preservation for Mini Calculus)

**Statement.** Work in the mini calculus for fully-annotated programs. Suppose the following hold:

- $\Gamma_A \vdash e_A : \tau_A \text{ with } \varepsilon_A$
- $e_A \longrightarrow e_B \mid \varepsilon$
- $\Gamma_B \vdash e_B : \tau_B \text{ with } \varepsilon_B$

Then  $\varepsilon_B \subseteq \varepsilon_A$  and  $\forall r.\pi \in \varepsilon_A \setminus \varepsilon_B \mid r.\pi \in \varepsilon$ . Furthermore, if  $e_A$  is not of the form  $e_1.\pi(e_2)$ , then  $\tau_A = \tau_B$ .

Intuitively: during reduction, effects are only lost from the static information when they are added to the runtime information, so every effect gets “accounted for”. You cannot gain static information after reducing an expression.

**Proof.** By structural induction on the derivation of  $\Gamma_A \vdash e_A : \tau_A \text{ with } \varepsilon_A$  and then on the reduction rule used.

**Case.**  $\varepsilon$ -RESOURCE,  $\varepsilon$ -VAR,  $\varepsilon$ -NEWOBJ, C-NEWOBJ.

$e_A$  is a value, so no reduction rules can be applied to it. The theorem statement is vacuously satisfied.

**Case.**  $\varepsilon$ -METHCALL $_\sigma$ .

Then  $e_A = e_1.m_i(e_2)$  and the following are true:

- $e_A : \tau \text{ with } \varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon_2 \cup \varepsilon_3$
- $e_1 : \{\bar{\sigma}\} \text{ with } \varepsilon_1$
- $e_2 : \tau_2 \text{ with } \varepsilon_2$
- $\sigma_i = \text{def } m_i(y : \tau_2) : \tau \text{ with } \varepsilon_3$

We do a case analysis on the reduction rules applicable to  $e_1.m_i(e_2)$ , for  $m_i$  an annotated method.

Subcase. E-METHCALL1 Then  $e_1 \longrightarrow e'_1 \mid \varepsilon$ . By inductive assumption  $e'_1 : \{\bar{\sigma}\} \text{ with } \varepsilon'_1$ . Then by  $\varepsilon$ -METHCALL we have  $e_B = e'_1.m_i(e_2) : \tau_3 \text{ with } \varepsilon'_1 \cup \varepsilon_2 \cup \varepsilon_3$ . Then  $\varepsilon_B = \varepsilon'_1 \cup \varepsilon_2 \cup \varepsilon_3$  and  $\varepsilon_B \setminus \varepsilon_A = \varepsilon'_1 \setminus \varepsilon_1$ . Any lost effect info is accounted for by inductive assumption.

Subcase. E-METHCALL2 $_\sigma$  Then  $e_1 = v_1 = \text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \bar{\sigma} = \bar{e}$ , and  $e_2 \longrightarrow e'_2 \mid \varepsilon$ . By inductive assumption  $e'_2 : \tau_2 \text{ with } \varepsilon_2$ . Then by  $\varepsilon$ -METHCALL we have  $e_B = v_1.m_i(e_2) : \tau_3 \text{ with } \varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon'_2 \cup \varepsilon_3$ . Then  $\varepsilon_B = \varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon'_2 \cup \varepsilon_3$  and  $\varepsilon_B \setminus \varepsilon_A = \varepsilon'_2 \setminus \varepsilon_2$ . Any lost effect info is accounted for by inductive assumption.

Subcase. E-METHCALL3 $_\sigma$  Then  $e_1 = v_1 = \text{new}_\sigma \Rightarrow \bar{\sigma} = \bar{e}$ , and  $\text{def } m_i(y : \tau_2) : \tau_3 \text{ with } \varepsilon_3 = e' \in \bar{\sigma} = \bar{e}$ , and  $e_2 = v_2$  is a value, and  $v_1.m_i(v_2) \longrightarrow [v_1/x, v_2/y]e' \mid \emptyset$ .

We already know  $e_1 : \{\bar{\sigma}\} \text{ with } \varepsilon_1$ . The only rule with this conclusion is  $\varepsilon$ -NEWOBJ. By inversion,  $\bar{\sigma} = \bar{e}$  OK. The only rule with this conclusion is  $\varepsilon$ -VALIDIMPL $_\sigma$ . By inversion,  $e' : \tau_3 \text{ with } \varepsilon_3$ .

Now  $e_B = [v_1/x, v_2/y]e'$ , since the rule E-METHCALL3 was used. We know  $v_1 = e_1$  and  $x$  have the same type, which is  $\{\bar{\sigma}\} \text{ with } \varepsilon_1$ . We also know  $v_2 = e_2$  and  $y$  have the same type, which is  $\tau_2 \text{ with } \varepsilon_2$ . By the substitution lemma, the type of  $e'$  is preserved under substitution. So  $e_B : \tau_3 \text{ with } \varepsilon_3$ .

Since  $e_1 = v_1$  and  $e_2 = v_2$  are values, by Canonical Forms  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \emptyset$ . So  $\varepsilon_A = \varepsilon_3$ . Then  $\varepsilon_B \setminus \varepsilon_A = \emptyset$  and there are no lost effects to account for.

**Case.**  $\varepsilon$ -OPERCALL $_\sigma$ .

Then  $e_A = e_1.\pi(e_2) : \text{Unit}$ , and we know:

- $e_A : \{r, \pi\} \cup \varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon_2$
- $e_1 : \{\bar{r}\} \text{ with } \varepsilon_1$
- $e_2 : \tau_2 \text{ with } \varepsilon_2$
- $\pi \in \Pi$

There are three reduction rules applicable to terms of the form  $e_1.\pi(e_2)$  for  $\pi$  an operation. We consider each.

Subcase. E-OPERCALL. Then  $e_1 \longrightarrow e'_1 \mid \varepsilon$ . By inductive assumption,  $e'_1 : \{\bar{r}\} \text{ with } \varepsilon'_1$ . From these we can apply  $\varepsilon$ -OPERCALL, giving  $e_B = e'_1.\pi(e_2) : \text{Unit with } \{r.\pi\} \cup \varepsilon'_1 \cup \varepsilon_2$ . Then  $\varepsilon_B = \{r.\pi\} \cup \varepsilon'_1 \cup \varepsilon_2$  and  $\varepsilon_A \setminus \varepsilon_B = \varepsilon'_1$ . Any lost effect info from  $\varepsilon'_1$  is accounted for by inductive hypothesis.

Subcase. E-OPERCALL2. Then  $e_1 = r$  for some  $r \in R$  and  $e_2 \longrightarrow e'_2 \mid \varepsilon$ . By inductive assumption  $e'_2 : \tau_2$  **with**  $\varepsilon'_2$ . From these we can apply  $\varepsilon$ -OPERCALL, giving  $e_B = r.\pi(e'_2)$  **with**  $\varepsilon$ . Then  $\varepsilon_B = r.\pi \cup \varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon'_2$  and  $\varepsilon_A \setminus \varepsilon_B = \varepsilon'_2$ . Any lost effect info from  $\varepsilon'_2$  is accounted for by inductive hypothesis.

Subcase. E-OPERCALL3. Then  $r.\pi(v) \longrightarrow \text{unit} \mid \{r.\pi\}$ . By Canonical Forms,  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \emptyset$ , so  $e_A : \text{Unit}$  **with**  $\{r.\pi\}$ . By a degenerate case of  $\varepsilon$ -NEWOBJ,  $\varepsilon_B = \text{unit} : \text{Unit}$  **with**  $\emptyset$ . Then  $\varepsilon_A \setminus \varepsilon_B = \{r.\pi\}$ . We can see that this is exactly the set of runtime effects  $\varepsilon$ , so we have accounted for the only lost effect.

□

## Theorem 2.5. (Small-Step Soundness For Mini Calculus)

**Statement.** Work in the mini calculus for fully-annotated programs. If  $\Gamma \vdash e_A : \tau_A$  **with**  $\varepsilon_A$  and  $e_A \longrightarrow e_B \mid \varepsilon$ , then  $\varepsilon \subseteq \varepsilon_A$ .

**Proof.** By structural induction on the rule used to derive  $\Gamma \vdash e_A : \tau$  **with**  $\varepsilon_A$ , and then on the reduction rule used.

**Case.**  $\varepsilon$ -RESOURCE,  $\varepsilon$ -VAR,  $\varepsilon$ -NEWOBJ.

$e_A$  is a value, so no reduction rules can be applied to it. The theorem statement is vacuously satisfied.

**Case.**  $\varepsilon$ -METHCALL $_{\sigma}$ .

Then  $e_A = e_1.m_i(e_2)$  and the following are known:

- $e_A : \tau_A$  **with**  $\varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon_2 \cup \varepsilon_3$
- $e_1 : \{\bar{\sigma}\}$  **with**  $\varepsilon_1$
- $e_2 : \tau_2$  **with**  $\varepsilon_2$
- $\sigma_i = \text{def } m_i(y : \tau_2) : \tau_3$  **with**  $\varepsilon_3$

Consider the possible reduction rules.

Subcase. E-METHCALL1. Then  $e_1 \longrightarrow e'_1 \mid \varepsilon$ . By inductive assumption,  $\varepsilon \subseteq \varepsilon_1 \subseteq \varepsilon_A$ .

Subcase. E-METHCALL2. Then  $e_2 \longrightarrow e'_2 \mid \varepsilon$ . By inductive assumption,  $\varepsilon \subseteq \varepsilon_2 \subseteq \varepsilon_A$ .

Subcase. E-METHCALL3. Then  $v_1.m_i(v_2) \longrightarrow [v_1/x, v_2/y]e' \mid \emptyset$ . We're done as  $\emptyset \subseteq \varepsilon_A$ .

**Case.**  $\varepsilon$ -OPERCALL.

Then  $e_A = e_1.m_i(e_2)$  and the following are known:

- $e_A : \text{unit}$  **with**  $\varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon_2 \cup \{r.\pi\}$
- $e_1 : \{\bar{r}\}$  **with**  $\varepsilon_1$
- $e_2 : \tau_2$  **with**  $\varepsilon_2$
- $\pi \in \Pi$

Consider the possible reduction rules.

Subcase. E-OPERCALL1 Then  $e_1 \longrightarrow e'_1 \mid \varepsilon$ . By induction assumption  $\varepsilon \subseteq \varepsilon_1 \subseteq \varepsilon_A$ .

Subcase. E-OPERCALL2 Then  $e_2 \longrightarrow e'_2 \mid \varepsilon$ . By induction assumption  $\varepsilon \subseteq \varepsilon_2 \subseteq \varepsilon_A$ .

Subcase. E-OPERCALL3 Then  $\exists r \mid e_1 = r$  and  $e_2 = v_2$  for some value and  $r.\pi_i(v_2) \longrightarrow \text{unit} \mid \{r.\pi\}$ . By Canonical Forms,  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \emptyset$ . Then  $\varepsilon_A = \{r.\pi\}$ . We can see this is exactly the set of runtime effects.

□

## Theorem 2.6. (Multi-Step Soundness For Mini Calculus)

**Statement.** Work in the mini calculus for fully-annotated programs. If  $\Gamma \vdash e_A : \tau_A$  **with**  $\varepsilon_A$  and  $e \longrightarrow_* e_B \mid \varepsilon$  then  $\varepsilon \subseteq \varepsilon_A$ .

**Proof.** If the multi-step involves zero steps then the theorem is vacuously satisfied. Otherwise the multi-step involves more than one step. Induct on the number of steps.

**Base Case.** The length is 1. The theorem holds by Small-Step Soundness For Mini Calculus.

Inductive Case. If there is a multi-step of length  $n+1$  then by E-MULTISTEP3 it can be decomposed into a multi-step of length  $n$ ;  $e_1 \longrightarrow_* e_n \mid \varepsilon_n$ ; and a multi-step of length 1;  $e_n \longrightarrow_* e_{n+1} \mid \varepsilon$ . Then  $e_1 \longrightarrow_* e_{n+1} \mid \varepsilon_n \cup \varepsilon$  is the entire multi-step.

Let the type derivations be  $\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau_1$  **with**  $\varepsilon_1$  and  $\Gamma \vdash e_n$  **with**  $\varepsilon_n$

By inductive assumption on the smaller multi-steps, we have that  $\varepsilon \subseteq \varepsilon_n$  and  $\varepsilon_n \subseteq \varepsilon_1$ . Then  $\varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon_n \subseteq \varepsilon_1$ .  $\varepsilon_1$  is the static effect information at the start of the multi-step, so we're done.

□

### 3 Static Semantics For Partly-Annotated Programs

In the next system we allow objects which have no effect-annotated methods. If an object has no annotations on its methods, the extra rules below can give a conservative effect inference on what it captures. If an object is fully annotated, the rules from the previous section can be used. There is no in-between; either every method of an object is annotated, or none are.

#### 3.1 Grammar

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 e ::= x & \text{expressions} \\
 \mid r & \\
 \mid \mathbf{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \overline{\sigma = e} & \\
 \mid \mathbf{new}_d x \Rightarrow \overline{d = e} & \\
 \mid e.m(e) & \\
 \mid e.\pi & \\
 \\
 \tau ::= \{\bar{\sigma}\} & \text{types} \\
 \mid \{\bar{r}\} & \\
 \mid \{\bar{d}\} & \\
 \mid \{\bar{d} \text{ captures } \varepsilon\} & \\
 \\
 \sigma ::= d \text{ with } \varepsilon & \text{labeled decls.} \\
 \\
 d ::= \mathbf{def } m(x : \tau) : \tau & \text{unlabeled decls.}
 \end{array}$$

#### Notes:

- $\sigma$  denotes a declaration with effect labels;  $d$  a declaration without effect labels.
- $\mathbf{new}_\sigma$  is for creating annotated objects;  $\mathbf{new}_d$  for unannotated objects.
- $\{\bar{\sigma}\}$  is the type of an annotated object.  $\{\bar{d}\}$  is the type of an unannotated object.
- $\{\bar{d} \text{ captures } \varepsilon\}$  is a special kind of type that doesn't appear in source programs but may be assigned by the new rules in this section. Intuitively,  $\varepsilon$  is an upper-bound on the effects captured by  $\{\bar{d}\}$ .

#### 3.2 Rules

$$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash e : \tau}$$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, x : \tau \vdash x : \tau} \text{ (T-VAR)} \qquad \frac{}{\Gamma, r : \{\bar{r}\} \vdash r : \{\bar{r}\}} \text{ (T-RESOURCE)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \{\bar{r}\}}{\Gamma \vdash e_1.\pi : \mathbf{Unit}} \text{ (T-OPERCALL)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \{\bar{\sigma}\} \quad \mathbf{def } m(y : \tau_2) : \tau_3 \text{ with } \varepsilon_3 \in \{\bar{\sigma}\} \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau_2}{\Gamma \vdash e_1.m(e_2) : \tau_3} \text{ (T-METHCALL}_\sigma\text{)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \{\bar{d}\} \quad \mathbf{def } m(y : \tau_2) : \tau_3 \in \{\bar{d}\} \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau_2}{\Gamma \vdash e_1.m(e_2) : \tau_3} \text{ (T-METHCALL}_d\text{)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \sigma_i = e_i \text{ OK}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \overline{\sigma = e} : \{\bar{\sigma}\}} \text{ (T-NEW}_\sigma\text{)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash d_i = e_i \text{ OK}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{new}_d x \Rightarrow \overline{d = e} : \{\bar{d}\}} \text{ (T-NEW}_d\text{)}$$



$$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash d = e \text{ OK}}$$

$$\frac{d = \text{def } m(y : \tau_2) : \tau_3 \quad \Gamma, y : \tau_2 \vdash e : \tau_3}{\Gamma \vdash d = e \text{ OK}} \quad (\varepsilon\text{-VALIDIMPL}_d)$$

$$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash e : \tau \text{ with } \varepsilon}$$

$$\frac{\varepsilon_c = \text{effects}(\Gamma') \quad \Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma \quad \Gamma', x : \{\bar{d} \text{ captures } \varepsilon_c\} \vdash \overline{d = e} \text{ OK}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{new}_d x \Rightarrow \overline{d = e} : \{\bar{d} \text{ captures } \varepsilon_c\} \text{ with } \emptyset} \quad (\text{C-NEWOBJ})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \{\bar{d} \text{ captures } \varepsilon_c\} \text{ with } \varepsilon_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau_2 \text{ with } \varepsilon_2 \quad d_i = \text{def } m_i(y : \tau_2) : \tau_3}{\Gamma \vdash e_1.m_i(e_2) : \tau_3 \text{ with } \varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon_2 \cup \text{effects}(\tau_2) \cup \varepsilon_c} \quad (\text{C-METHCALL})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma \quad \Gamma' \vdash e : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash e : \tau \text{ with effects}(\Gamma')} \quad (\text{C-CONSERVATIVEINFERENCE})$$

#### Notes:

- This system also includes the rules from the fully-annotated system.
- The T rules do standard typing of objects, without any effect analysis. Their sole purpose is so  $\varepsilon\text{-ValidImpl}_d$  can be applied.
- In applying C-NEWOBJ,  $\Gamma$  is the current context. The variable  $\Gamma'$  is some sensible choice of sub-context. A good choice of sub-context is  $\Gamma$  restricted to the free variables in the method-body being type-checked. This tightens the upper-bound to exclude resources never used in the program.
- To perform effect analysis on an unannotated object  $\{\bar{d}\}$ , figure out what it captures using C-NEWOBJ, yielding the type  $\{\bar{d} \text{ captures } \varepsilon\}$ . Then, when a method is called on that object, C-METHCALL can be applied.
- C-CONSERVATIVEINFERENCE is used to effect-type unannotated portions of code. It essentially says that in the absence of any effect information, you can assume its effects are  $\text{effects}(\Gamma')$ , a safe upper-bound for some relevant choice of  $\Gamma'$ .

### 3.3 Effects Function

The **effects** function returns the set of effects in a particular context.

A method  $m$  can return a resource  $r$  (directly or via some enclosing object). Returning a resource isn't an effect but it means any unannotated program using  $m$  also captures  $r$ . To account for this, when the **effects** function is operating on a type  $\tau$  it must analyse the return type of the method declarations in  $\tau$ . Since the resource might be itself enclosed by an object, we do a recursive analysis.

- $\text{effects}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$
- $\text{effects}(\Gamma, x : \tau) = \text{effects}(\Gamma) \cup \text{effects}(\tau)$
- $\text{effects}(\{\bar{r}\}) = \{(r, \pi) \mid r \in \bar{r}, \pi \in \Pi\}$
- $\text{effects}(\{\bar{\sigma}\}) = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \bar{\sigma}} \text{effects}(\sigma)$
- $\text{effects}(\{\bar{d}\}) = \bigcup_{d \in \bar{d}} \text{effects}(d)$
- $\text{effects}(d \text{ with } \varepsilon) = \varepsilon \cup \text{effects}(d)$
- $\text{effects}(\text{def } m(x : \tau_1) : \tau_2) = \text{effects}(\tau_2)$
- $\text{effects}(\{\bar{d} \text{ captures } \varepsilon\}) = \varepsilon$

#### Notes:

- In the last case, it is not necessary to recurse to sub-declarations; the type  $\{\bar{d} \textbf{ captures } \varepsilon\}$  can only result from C-NEWOBJ. In that case,  $\varepsilon$  is already an estimate of what the object captures in some context  $\Gamma_0$ ; furthermore, the current  $\Gamma$  may be bigger than  $\Gamma_0$ , in which case re-annotating the object would introduce more effects and lose precision.

## 4 Dynamic Semantics

### 4.1 Terminology

- The runtime effects are what actually happens when the program is executed; the static effect annotations are an estimate of what will happen at runtime (our eventual aim is to show the static annotations are safe).
- If  $e$  is an expression then  $[e_1/x_1]e$  is a new expression, the same as  $e$ , with every free occurrence of  $x_1$  replaced by  $e_1$ .  $[e_1/x_1, \dots, e_n/x_n]e$  is syntactic sugar for repeated one-variable substitution:  $[e_1/x_1] \dots [e_n/x_n]e$ .
- $\emptyset$  is the empty set. The empty type is denoted **Unit**. Its single instance is **unit**.

### 4.2 Grammar

$e ::= x$	<i>expressions</i>	$d ::= \text{def } m(x : \tau) : \tau \text{ unlabeled decls.}$
$e.m(e)$		$\sigma ::= d \text{ with } \varepsilon \quad \text{labeled decls.}$
$e.\pi(e)$		$\tau ::= \{\bar{\sigma}\}$
$v$		$\{\bar{r}\} \quad \text{types}$
$v ::= r$	<i>values</i>	$\Gamma ::= \emptyset$
$\text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \overline{\sigma = e}$		$\Gamma, x : \tau \quad \text{contexts}$
$\text{new}_d x \Rightarrow \overline{d = e}$		

### 4.3 Rules

$$\boxed{e \longrightarrow e \mid \varepsilon}$$

$$\frac{e_1 \longrightarrow e'_1 \mid \varepsilon}{e_1.m(e_2) \longrightarrow e'_1.m(e_2) \mid \varepsilon} \text{ (E-METHCALL1)}$$

$$\frac{v_1 = \text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \overline{\sigma = e} \quad e_2 \longrightarrow e'_2 \mid \varepsilon}{v_1.m(e_2) \longrightarrow v_1.m(e'_2) \mid \varepsilon} \text{ (E-METHCALL2}_\sigma\text{)}$$

$$\frac{v_1 = \text{new}_d x \Rightarrow \overline{d = e} \quad e_2 \longrightarrow e'_2 \mid \varepsilon}{v_1.m(e_2) \longrightarrow v_1.m(e'_2) \mid \varepsilon} \text{ (E-METHCALL2}_d\text{)}$$

$$\frac{v_1 = \text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \overline{\sigma = e} \quad \text{def } m(y : \tau_1) : \tau_2 \text{ with } \varepsilon = e \in \overline{\sigma = e}}{v_1.m(v_2) \longrightarrow [v_1/x, v_2/y]e \mid \emptyset} \text{ (E-METHCALL3}_\sigma\text{)}$$

$$\frac{v_1 = \text{new}_d x \Rightarrow \overline{d = e} \quad \text{def } m(y : \tau_1) : \tau_2 = e \in \overline{d = e}}{v_1.m(v_2) \longrightarrow [v_1/x, v_2/y]e \mid \emptyset} \text{ (E-METHCALL3}_d\text{)}$$

$$\frac{e_1 \longrightarrow e'_1 \mid \varepsilon}{e_1.\pi \longrightarrow e'_1.\pi \mid \varepsilon} \text{ (E-OPERCALL1)}$$

$$\frac{}{r.\pi \longrightarrow \text{unit} \mid \{r.\pi\}} \text{ (E-OPERCALL3)}$$

$$\boxed{e \longrightarrow_* e \mid \varepsilon}$$

$$\frac{}{e \longrightarrow_* e \mid \emptyset} \text{ (E-MULTISTEP1)}$$

$$\frac{e \longrightarrow e' \mid \varepsilon}{e \longrightarrow_* e' \mid \varepsilon} \text{ (E-MULTISTEP2)}$$

$$\frac{e \longrightarrow_* e' \mid \varepsilon_1 \quad e' \longrightarrow_* e'' \mid \varepsilon_2}{e \longrightarrow_* e'' \mid \varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon_2} \text{ (E-MULTISTEP3)}$$

**Notes:**

- A multi-step involves *zero* or more applications of a small-step.
- Multi-step rules accumulate the run-time effects produced by the individual small-steps.
- The only rule which produces effects is E-OPERCALL3 (the rule for evaluating operations on resources).
- Method calls are evaluated by performing substitution on the body of the method, and evaluating that.

## 5 Theorems

### Lemma 5.1. (Canonical Forms)

**Statement.** Suppose  $e$  is a value. The following are true:

- If  $\Gamma \vdash e : \{\bar{r}\}$  **with**  $\varepsilon$ , then  $e = r$  for some resource  $r$ .
- If  $\Gamma \vdash e : \{\bar{\sigma}\}$  **with**  $\varepsilon$ , then  $e = \text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \overline{\sigma = e}$ .
- If  $\Gamma \vdash e : \{\bar{d} \text{ captures } \varepsilon_c\}$  **with**  $\varepsilon$ , then  $e = \text{new}_d x \Rightarrow \overline{d = e}$ .

Furthermore,  $\varepsilon = \emptyset$  in each case.

**Proof.** These typing judgements each appear exactly once in the conclusion of different rules. The result follows by inversion of  $\varepsilon$ -RESOURCE,  $\varepsilon$ -NEWOBJ, and C-NEWOBJ respectively.  $\square$

### Theorem 5.7. (Single-Method Extension)

**Statement.** If the following are true:

- $v_1 = \text{new } x \Rightarrow d_i = e_i$
- $d_i = \text{def } m_i(y : \tau_2) : \tau_3$
- $\Gamma \vdash d_i = e_i$  OK
- $\Gamma \vdash v_2 : \tau_2$  **with**  $\varepsilon_2$
- $[v_1/x, v_2/y]e_i \longrightarrow_* v \mid \varepsilon$

Then  $\exists \varepsilon_i \mid \varepsilon \subseteq \varepsilon_i \subseteq \text{effects}(\Gamma)$ . Letting  $\sigma_i = d_i$  **with**  $\varepsilon_i$ , then also  $\sigma_i = e_i$  OK.

**Note.** In this theorem we only consider objects with a single method  $m_i$ . Later we generalise the result to objects with any number of methods.

**Proof.** Let  $\Gamma' = \text{freevars}(e_i) \cap \Gamma$ . Let  $\varepsilon_i = \text{effects}(\Gamma)$ . Let  $\sigma_i = d_i$  **with**  $\varepsilon_i$ .

With this choice of  $\Gamma'$  and the assumption  $\Gamma \vdash d_i = e_i$  OK we may type  $e_i$  using C-CONSERVATIVETYPING. Then  $e_i : \tau_i$  **with**  $\varepsilon_i$ , where  $\varepsilon_i = \text{effects}(\Gamma')$ . Then  $\varepsilon$ -VALIDIMPL $_\sigma$  gives  $\sigma_i = e_i$  OK.

By the substitution lemma,  $[v_1/x, v_2/y]e_i : \tau_i$  **with**  $\varepsilon_i$ . By application of multi-step soundness to the assumed multi-step reduction we have  $\varepsilon \subseteq \varepsilon_i = \text{effects}(\Gamma') \subseteq \text{effects}(\Gamma)$ .  $\square$

### Theorem 5.8. (Extension)

**Statement.** If  $v_1 = \text{new } x \Rightarrow \overline{d = e}$  and  $\forall i$  the following are true:

- $d_i = \text{def } m_i(y : \tau_2) : \tau_3$
- $\Gamma \vdash d_i = e_i$  OK
- $\Gamma \vdash v_2 : \tau_2$  **with**  $\varepsilon_2$
- $[v_1/x, v_2/y]e_i \longrightarrow_* v \mid \varepsilon$

Then  $\exists \varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n \mid \varepsilon \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \subseteq \text{effects}(\Gamma)$ . Letting  $\sigma_i = d_i$  **with**  $\varepsilon_i$  then also  $\Gamma \vdash \text{new } x \Rightarrow \overline{\sigma = e}$  **with**  $\emptyset$

**Proof.** From Single-Method Extension we know that  $\forall i \exists \varepsilon_i \mid \varepsilon \subseteq \varepsilon_i \subseteq \text{effects}(\Gamma')$ . Let  $\Gamma' = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \Gamma'_i$ . Then  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \subseteq \text{effects}(\Gamma') \subseteq \text{effects}(\Gamma)$ .

From Single-Method Extension we know  $\sigma_i = e_i$  OK, so  $\overline{\sigma = e}$  OK. Then by  $\varepsilon$ -NEWOBJ we have the claimed typing judgement.  $\square$

### Definition. (Label)

Using the results of the previous theorem we define a program-transforming function called `label`, which transforms an unannotated program into an annotated one.

- $\text{label}(r) = r$
- $\text{label}(x) = x$
- $\text{label}(e_1.m(e_2)) = \text{label}(e_1).m(\text{label}(e_2))$
- $\text{label}(e_1.\pi(e_2)) = \text{label}(e_1).\pi(\text{label}(e_2))$
- $\text{label}(\text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \overline{\sigma = e}) = \text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \text{label-helper}(\overline{\sigma = e})$
- $\text{label}(\text{new}_d x \Rightarrow \overline{d = e}) = \text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \text{label-helper}(\overline{d = e})$
- $\text{label-helper}(\sigma = e) = \sigma = \text{label}(e)$
- $\text{label-helper}(\text{def } m(y : \tau_2) : \tau_3 = e) = \text{def } m(y : \tau_2) : \tau_3 \text{ with } \Gamma \cap \text{freevars}(e) = \text{label}(e)$

**Notes:**

- **label** is defined on expressions; **label-helper** on declarations. This is just for clarity; everywhere other than this section we'll only use **label**.
- Initially it seems like **label** on a  $\text{new}_\sigma$  object should just be the identity function; but the body of the methods of such an object may instantiate unlabeled objects and/or call methods on unlabeled objects, so we must recursively label those.
- From here on out we will use  $\hat{e}$  to refer to a fully-labeled program. We may sometimes say  $\text{labels}(e) = \hat{e}$ , and from then on refer to  $\hat{e}$  as the labeled program. Likewise, we will use  $\hat{\tau}$  and  $\hat{\varepsilon}$  to refer to the type and effects of  $\hat{e}$ .

**Theorem 5.9. (Refinement)**

**Statement.** If  $\Gamma \vdash e : \tau$  with  $\varepsilon$  and  $\text{label}(e) = \hat{e}$  and  $\Gamma \vdash \hat{e} : \hat{\tau}$  with  $\hat{\varepsilon}$ , then  $\hat{\varepsilon} \subseteq \varepsilon$ .

**Proof.** We show the property holds for each case of the **label** function by inducting on the complexity of  $e$ .

**Case.**  $\text{label}(r), \text{label}(x)$ .

Then  $e = \hat{e}$  so it holds immediately.

**Case.**  $\text{label}(\text{new}_d x \Rightarrow \overline{d = e}), \text{label}(\text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \overline{\sigma = e})$ .

Typing judgements for objects only give  $\emptyset$  as the set of effects so we're done automatically. Although an object can have capabilities for effects but those are encoded in its methods (in the case of a labeled object) or in its type (in the case of an unlabeled object having type  $\{\bar{d} \text{ captures } \varepsilon_c\}$ ).

**Case.**  $e_1.m(e_2)$ .

Then  $\text{label}(e_1.m(e_2)) = \text{label}(e_1).m(\text{label}(e_2)) = \hat{e}_1.m(\hat{e}_2)$  and the inductive assumption holds for  $\hat{e}_1$  and  $\hat{e}_2$ . Since  $\hat{e}_1.m(\hat{e}_2)$  is a labeled object we may type it with  $\varepsilon\text{-METHCALL}_\sigma$  which gives us the set of effects  $\hat{\varepsilon} = \hat{\varepsilon}_1 \cup \hat{\varepsilon}_2 \cup \hat{\varepsilon}_3$ . By inductive assumption on subexpressions, each  $\hat{\varepsilon}_i \subseteq \varepsilon_i$ . Without loss of generality we assume  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  were unlabeled expressions. There are two rules that could have been used to type  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ .

**Subcase.** C-CONSERVATIVETYPING Then  $\varepsilon = \text{effects}(\Gamma')$ , for some  $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ . By the assumption that  $e_1.m(e_2)$  is closed under  $\Gamma$ , any effect  $r.\pi \in \hat{\varepsilon}$  must be contained in  $\Gamma$ . Assuming  $\Gamma'$  contains  $\text{freevars}(e_1.m(e_2))$ , then  $\hat{\varepsilon} \subseteq \varepsilon$ , then  $r \in \text{freevars}(e_1.m(e_2)) \subseteq \Gamma'$ , therefore  $r.\pi \in \text{effects}(\Gamma')$ .

**Subcase.** C-METHCALL. Then  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon_2 \cup \text{effects}(\tau_2) \cup \varepsilon_c$  for some sub-context. Furthermore,  $\varepsilon_c = \text{effects}(\Gamma')$ , for some  $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ . Since  $\hat{\varepsilon}_i \subseteq \varepsilon_i$ , we just need to show that  $\hat{\varepsilon}_3 \subseteq \varepsilon$ .

Note that  $\hat{\varepsilon}_3$  represents the effects captured by executing method  $m$ . Let  $r.\pi \in \hat{\varepsilon}_3$ . Suppose the method body is  $e'$ . If  $r.\pi$  We do a case analysis on where  $r$  came from.

By assumption,  $[y/v_2]e'$  is closed under  $\Gamma$ . Then either  $y$  has a capability for  $r$  or something in  $\text{freevars}(e') \setminus y$  has a capability for  $r$  or nothing in  $e_1.m(e_2)$  has a capability for  $r$ .

- $y$  has a capability for  $r$ . Since  $y$  is bound to  $v_2$ , then  $v_2$  has a capability for  $r$ . By assumption,  $v_2 : \tau_2 \text{ with } \varepsilon_2$ . Since  $\text{effects}(\tau_2)$  captures the set of all effects on all resources for which type  $\tau_2$  has a capability, then  $r.\pi \in \text{effects}(\tau_2) \subseteq \hat{\varepsilon}$ .

**Case.**  $e_1.\pi(e_2)$ .

Then  $\hat{e} = \hat{e}_1.\pi(\hat{e}_2)$ . By inductive assumption the labeled expressions will be  $\hat{e}_1$  and  $\hat{e}_2$ . The only rule which can be used to type  $\hat{e}$  and  $e$  is  $\varepsilon$ -OPERCALL; then the effect-set for  $e$  is  $\varepsilon = \{r.\pi\} \cup \varepsilon_1 \cup \varepsilon_2$  and for  $\hat{e}$  is  $\hat{\varepsilon} = \{r.\pi\} \cup \hat{\varepsilon}_1 \cup \hat{\varepsilon}_2$ .  $\hat{\varepsilon} \subseteq \varepsilon$  by inductive assumption on each  $\varepsilon_i$ .  $\square$

**Intuition.** This theorem says that labeling a program can only make the effect inference more precise (never less precise).

### Theorem 5.10. (Preservation Under Labeling)

**Statement.** If  $\Gamma \vdash e : \tau$  then  $\Gamma \vdash \hat{e} : \tau$ .

**Proof.** By induction on the complexity of the expression  $e$  and considering the possible forms of  $e$ . If  $e = r$  or  $e = x$  then it holds trivially. Consider the other cases.

**Case.**  $e_1.m(e_2)$ .

By induction we know  $\text{type}(e_1) = \text{type}(\hat{e}_1)$  and  $\text{type}(e_2) = \text{type}(\hat{e}_2)$ . The result holds by applying T-METHCALL $_\sigma$ .

**Case.**  $e_1.\pi(e_2)$ .

Same as above but use T-METHCALL $_r$ .

**Case.**  $\text{new}_\sigma x \Rightarrow \overline{\sigma} = \overline{e}$ .

From induction we know that since  $\Gamma \vdash \overline{\sigma} = \overline{e}$  OK then  $\Gamma \vdash \overline{\sigma} = \hat{e}$  OK. The result holds by applying T-NEWOBJ $_\sigma$ .

**Case.**  $\text{new}_d x \Rightarrow \overline{d} = \overline{e}$ .

Same as above, but  $\Gamma \vdash \overline{d} = \hat{e}$  lets us apply T-NEWOBJ $_d$ .  $\square$

### Theorem 5.11. (Small-Step Soundness Of Labeled Programs)

**Statement.** If  $e_A \longrightarrow e_B \mid \varepsilon_B$  and  $e_A : \tau_A$  then  $\hat{e}_A : \hat{\tau}$  with  $\hat{\varepsilon}$  where  $\varepsilon_B \subseteq \hat{\varepsilon}$ .

**Proof.** By induction on the evaluation rule used. In all cases, the type of  $\hat{e}_A$  is the same as  $e_A$  by the previous theorem so we omit its derivation.

**Case.** E-METHCALL1.

Then the following are known.

- $e_A = e_1.m(e_2)$
- $e_1 \rightarrow e'_1 \mid \varepsilon$
- $e_B = e'_1.m(e_2) \mid \varepsilon$

By inductive assumption  $\hat{e}_1 : \tau$  with  $\hat{\varepsilon}_1$  where  $\varepsilon \subseteq \hat{\varepsilon}_1$ . By applying the rule  $\varepsilon$ -METHCALL $_\sigma$  we type  $\hat{e}_A$  to something with the effect-set  $\hat{\varepsilon} = \hat{\varepsilon}_1 \cup \hat{\varepsilon}_2 \cup \hat{\varepsilon}_3 \supseteq \hat{\varepsilon}_1 \supseteq \varepsilon$ .

**Case.** E-OPERCALL1.

Same as previous case, but use the rule  $\varepsilon$ -OPERCALL.

**Case.** E-METHCALL2 $_\sigma$ , E-METHCALL2 $_d$ .

Then the following are known.

- $e_A = v_1.m(e_2)$
- $e_2 \longrightarrow e'_2 \mid \varepsilon$

By inductive assumption  $\hat{e}_2 : \tau$  with  $\hat{\varepsilon}_2$  where  $\varepsilon \subseteq \hat{\varepsilon}_2$ . By applying the rule  $\varepsilon$ -METHCALL $_\sigma$  we type  $\hat{e}_1.m(\hat{e}_2)$  to something with the effect-set  $\hat{\varepsilon} = \hat{\varepsilon}_1 \cup \hat{\varepsilon}_2 \cup \hat{\varepsilon}_3 \supseteq \hat{\varepsilon}_2 \supseteq \varepsilon$ .

**Case.** E-OPERCALL2.

Same as previous case, but use the rule

**Case.** E-METHCALL3 $_\sigma$ , E-METHCALL3 $_d$ .

In this case  $\varepsilon = \emptyset$  so the statement holds trivially.

**Case.** E-OPERCALL3.

Then  $e_A = r.\pi(v)$ .  $\hat{r} = r$  so  $\hat{e}_A = r.\pi(\hat{v})$ . By application of  $\varepsilon$ -OPERCALL we have  $\hat{e}_A : \mathbf{Unit\ with} \{r.\pi\} \cup \hat{\varepsilon}_1 \cup \hat{\varepsilon}_2$ , where  $\hat{\varepsilon}_2$  is the set of effects for  $\hat{v}$  and  $\hat{\varepsilon}_1 = \emptyset$  for  $\hat{r} = r$ . By inspection of the rule for E-OPERCALL3,  $\varepsilon = r.\pi \subseteq \{r.\pi\} \cup \hat{\varepsilon}_2 = \hat{e}_A$ .

□

### Theorem 5.12. (Soundness Theorem)

**Statement.** If  $\Gamma \vdash e_A : \tau_A \mathbf{with} \varepsilon_A$  and  $e_A \longrightarrow e_B \mid \varepsilon$  then  $\Gamma \vdash e_B : \tau_B \mathbf{with} \varepsilon_B$  and  $\varepsilon \subseteq \varepsilon_A$ .

**Proof.** Induct on the typing judgement for  $\Gamma \vdash e_A : \tau_A \mathbf{with} \varepsilon_A$  and then on the evaluation rule used for  $e_A \longrightarrow e_B \mid \varepsilon$ . First note that the theorem statement has already been proven for typing judgements from the calculus for fully-labeled programs. Therefore we'll only consider the extra typing rules in the calculus that allows unlabeled objects.

**Case.** C-NEWOBJ.

Then  $e_A$  is of the form  $\mathbf{new}_d$  so it is a value. Then no reduction can be applied; the theorem statement holds vacuously.

**Case.** C-METHCALL.

Then  $e_A = e_1.m(e_2)$  where  $e_1 = \mathbf{new}_d x \Rightarrow \overline{d = e} : \{\bar{d} \text{ captures } \varepsilon_c\} \mathbf{with} \emptyset$ , where  $\varepsilon_c = \mathbf{effects}(\Gamma'_A)$ , for  $\Gamma'_A \subseteq \Gamma_A$ . Consider the extension  $\hat{e}_A = \mathbf{label}(e_A)$ . Since  $\mathbf{label}$  only changes type-information, the runtime effects of  $e_A$  are invariant under the  $\mathbf{label}$  function. Furthermore,  $e_A$  is a value if and only if  $\hat{e}_A$  is a value.

Now,  $\hat{e}_A$  is not a value because  $e_A$  is not a value. Therefore we can reduce  $\hat{e}_A$ . Then  $\hat{e}_A \longrightarrow \hat{e}_B \mid \varepsilon$ , the same  $\varepsilon$  we get when reducing  $e_A$ .

By small-step soundness of labeled programs,  $\varepsilon \subseteq \hat{\varepsilon}_A$ . By refinement,  $\hat{\varepsilon}_A \subseteq \varepsilon_A$ . So  $\varepsilon \subseteq \varepsilon_A$ .

**Case.** C-CONSERVATIVETYPING.

Then  $\varepsilon_A = \mathbf{effects}(\Gamma')$  for some  $\Gamma'$ . Runtime effects must be captured by the environment; therefore  $\varepsilon \subseteq \varepsilon_A$ .

□