

1 GhostLambda: Lambda-Calculus with Ghost Code

Annotating a program with logical formulae predicting statically its dynamic behaviour is a keystone of the deductive software verification approach.

Typically, these logical formulae are assertions about program assigned variables, loop invariants, recursive function variants, etc.

However, it is often useful to annotate programs with some data that appear in program that appear in assertions but do not affect the program dynamic behaviour in any way.

When a correct-by-construction executable code is extracted from the specified program, this, called *ghost code* disappear together with specification.

In this section we describe a language where one can annotate programs with such *ghost code*. We start by formalizing *ghost λ -calculus*, a tiny language of simply typed λ -calculus enriched with ghost variables and ghost expressions. We then define ghost code *erasure*, which transforms a well-typed ghostLambda term to a term of standard λ -calculus. Finally we state and prove a few basic preservation properties of such translation.

1.1 Syntax and Semantics

The syntax and small-step operational semantics of *ghost- λ* is summarized in [Figure 1](#).

$t ::=$	TERMS:
$()$	<i>unit</i>
$x_\tau^{\mathfrak{B}}$	<i>variable</i>
$\lambda x_\tau^{\mathfrak{B}}.t$	<i>abstraction</i>
tt	<i>application</i>
$\text{ghost } t$	<i>ghost term</i>
$v ::=$	VALUES:
$()$	<i>unit</i>
$\lambda x_\tau^{\mathfrak{B}}.t$	<i>abstraction</i>
$\mathfrak{B} ::=$	GHOST STATUS :
\top (<i>*true*</i>)	<i>ghost code</i>
\perp (<i>*false*</i>)	<i>physical code</i>
$\tau ::=$	TYPES:
unit	<i>unit type</i>
$\tau^{\mathfrak{B}} \rightarrow \tau$	<i>function type</i>

Evaluation

$$(\lambda x_\tau^b.t)v \xrightarrow{\epsilon} t[x_\tau^b \leftarrow v] \quad (\text{E-APPFUN})$$

$$\text{ghost } t \xrightarrow{\epsilon} t \quad (\text{E-DEGHOST})$$

$$\frac{t \rightarrow t'}{E \ t \rightarrow E \ t'} \quad (\text{E-CONTEXT})$$

where $E ::= \square \mid E \ t \mid v \ E$

Figure 1: *ghost*- λ syntax and semantics

1.2 Typing

The typing relation of *ghost*- λ is summarized in [Figure 2](#).

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\vdash_{g\lambda} () : (unit, \perp)} \quad (T\text{-UNIT}) \\
\\
\frac{}{\vdash_{g\lambda} x_{\tau}^{\mathfrak{B}} : (\tau, \mathfrak{B})} \quad (T\text{-VAR}) \\
\\
\frac{\vdash_{g\lambda} t : (\tau, \mathfrak{B})}{\vdash_{g\lambda} \text{ghost } t : (\tau, \top)} \quad (T\text{-GHOST}) \\
\\
\frac{\vdash_{g\lambda} t : (\tau_2, \mathfrak{B}_2)}{\vdash_{g\lambda} \lambda x_{\tau_1}^{\mathfrak{B}_1}.t : (\tau_1^{\mathfrak{B}_1} \rightarrow \tau_2, \mathfrak{B}_2)} \quad (T\text{-ABS}) \\
\\
\frac{\vdash_{g\lambda} t_1 : (\tau_2^{\mathfrak{B}_2} \rightarrow \tau_1, \mathfrak{B}_1) \quad \vdash_{g\lambda} t_2 : (\tau_2, \mathfrak{B}'_2) \quad \mathfrak{B}_2 \Rightarrow \mathfrak{B}'_2}{\vdash_{g\lambda} t_1 t_2 : (\tau_1, \mathfrak{B}_1 \vee (\neg \mathfrak{B}_2 \wedge \mathfrak{B}'_2))} \quad (T\text{-APP})
\end{array}$$

Figure 2: *ghost*- λ typing relation

1.3 Ghost Code Erasure

let t be a term such that $\vdash_{g\lambda} t : (\tau, \mathfrak{B})$ holds. Then define \mathcal{E} that translate $g\lambda$ -terms and types to λ -calculus as follows.

The erasure of types in presence of ghost markers is defined by induction on the structure of type τ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}(unit, \perp) &= unit \\
\mathcal{E}(\tau_1^{\top} \rightarrow \tau_2, \perp) &= unit \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\tau_2) \\
\mathcal{E}(\tau, \top) &= unit \text{ for any type } \tau.
\end{aligned}$$

For the erasure of terms, if \mathfrak{B} is equal to \top then $\mathcal{E}(t) = ()$. Otherwise :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}() &= () \\
\mathcal{E}(x_{\tau}^{\perp}) &= x_{\mathcal{E}(\tau)} \\
\mathcal{E}(\lambda x_{\tau}^{\top}.t) &= \lambda x_{unit}. \mathcal{E}(t) \\
\mathcal{E}(\lambda x_{\tau}^{\perp}.t) &= \lambda x_{\mathcal{E}(\tau)}. \mathcal{E}(t) \\
\mathcal{E}(t_1 t_2) &= \mathcal{E}(t_1) \mathcal{E}(t_2)
\end{aligned}$$

1.4 Properties of Ghost Code Erasure

1.4.1 Typing Erasure

Lemma 1.1 [TRANSLATION OF TYPING RELATION]. If $\vdash_{g\lambda} t : (\tau, \perp)$ then $\vdash_{\lambda} \mathcal{E}(t) : \mathcal{E}(\tau)$.

Proof. By induction on a derivation of the statement $\vdash_{g\lambda} \mathcal{E}(t) : \mathcal{E}(\tau)$. For a given derivation, we proceed by case analysis on the final typing rule used in the proof.

Case T-UNIT: $\vdash_{g\lambda} () : (\text{unit}, \perp)$

As $\mathcal{E}() = ()$ and $\mathcal{E}(\text{unit}) = \text{unit}$ we have immediately $\vdash_{\lambda} () : \text{unit}$.

Case T-VAR: $\vdash_{g\lambda} x_{\tau}^{\perp} : (\tau, \perp)$

As $\mathcal{E}(x_{\tau}^{\perp}) = x_{\mathcal{E}(\tau)}$, we have immediately $\vdash_{\lambda} x_{\mathcal{E}(\tau)} : \mathcal{E}(\tau)$.

Case T-ABS: $\vdash_{g\lambda} \lambda x_{\tau_1}^{\mathfrak{B}_1}.t : (\tau_1^1 \rightarrow \tau_2, \perp)$ with $\vdash_{g\lambda} t : (\tau_2, \perp)$

By induction hypothesis $\vdash_{\lambda} \mathcal{E}(t) : \mathcal{E}(\tau_2)$. There are two cases to consider, depending on whether the parameter of the abstraction is ghost or not. If $\mathfrak{B}_1 = \top$ then $\mathcal{E}(\lambda x_{\tau_1}^{\top}.t) = \lambda().\mathcal{E}(t)$ and therefore

$$\frac{\vdash_{\lambda} \mathcal{E}(t) : \mathcal{E}(\tau_2)}{\lambda().\vdash_{\lambda} \mathcal{E}(t) : \text{unit} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\tau_2)} \quad (\text{T-ABS})$$

Otherwise $\mathfrak{B}_1 = \perp$ and again by the rule T-ABS we obtain :

$$\frac{\vdash_{\lambda} \mathcal{E}(t) : \mathcal{E}(\tau_2)}{\lambda x_{\mathcal{E}(\tau_1)}. \vdash_{\lambda} \mathcal{E}(t) : \mathcal{E}(\tau_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\tau_2)} \quad (\text{T-ABS})$$

Case T-APP: $\vdash_{g\lambda} t_1 t_2 : (\tau_1, \mathfrak{B}_1)$ with sub-derivations:

$$\begin{aligned} &\vdash_{g\lambda} t_1 : (\tau_2^{\mathfrak{B}_2} \rightarrow \tau_1, \mathfrak{B}_1) \\ &\vdash_{g\lambda} t_2 : (\tau_2, \mathfrak{B}'_2), \quad \text{and constraints:} \\ &\mathfrak{B}_1 \vee (\neg \mathfrak{B}_2 \wedge \mathfrak{B}'_2) = \perp, \mathfrak{B}_2 \Rightarrow \mathfrak{B}'_2 = \top \end{aligned}$$

By lemma's statement, $t_1 t_2$ should not be a ghost term. Therefore $\mathfrak{B}_1 \vee (\neg \mathfrak{B}_2 \wedge \mathfrak{B}'_2) = \perp$. From that and from the rule's premise condition $\mathfrak{B}_2 \Rightarrow \mathfrak{B}'_2 = \top$ we deduce that $\mathfrak{B}_1 = \perp$ and that $\mathfrak{B}_2 \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{B}'_2 = \top$, so we have to cases two consider.

If $\mathfrak{B}_2 = \mathfrak{B}'_2 = \perp$ then by induction hypotheses: $\vdash_{\lambda} \mathcal{E}(t_1) : \mathcal{E}(\tau_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\tau_1)$ and $\vdash_{\lambda} \mathcal{E}(t_2) : \mathcal{E}(\tau_2)$. Applying T-APP rule gives us $\vdash_{\lambda} \mathcal{E}(t_1 t_2) : \mathcal{E}(\tau_1)$ (where $\mathcal{E}(t_1)\mathcal{E}(t_2) = \mathcal{E}(t_1 t_2)$ as $\mathfrak{B}_1 = \perp$).

If $\mathfrak{B}_2 = \mathfrak{B}'_2 = \top$ then by induction hypothesis, $\vdash_{\lambda} \mathcal{E}(t_1) : \text{unit} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\tau_1)$. Also by definition of \mathcal{E} we have $\mathcal{E}(t_2) = ()$, and $\mathcal{E}(\tau_2, \mathfrak{B}'_2) = \text{unit}$. Applying T-APP rule gives us

$$\frac{\frac{\vdash_{\lambda} \mathcal{E}(t_1 t_2) : \mathcal{E}(\tau_1)}{\vdash_{\lambda} \mathcal{E}(t_1 t_2) : \mathcal{E}(\tau_1)} \quad \frac{}{\vdash_{\lambda} () : \text{unit}} \quad (\text{T-UNIT})}{\vdash_{\lambda} \mathcal{E}(t_1 t_2) : \mathcal{E}(\tau_1)} \quad (\text{T-APP})$$

The case (T-GHOST) as well as any other valid derivation where a typed term is marked as ghost do not satisfy lemma's requirement, so these cases are trivially verified. □

1.4.2 Evaluation Preservation

Lemma 1.2 [EVALUATION PRESERVATION UNDER ERASURE]. For any closed $g\lambda$ -term t such that $\vdash_{g\lambda} t : (\tau, \perp)$ holds, if $t \rightarrow t'$ for some term t' , then

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(t').$$

Proof. By induction on the evaluation relation of $t \rightarrow t'$.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Case E-APPABS:} & (\lambda x_{\tau_1}^{\mathfrak{B}_1}.t)v \rightarrow t[x_{\tau_1}^{\mathfrak{B}_1} \leftarrow v] \\ & \vdash_{g\lambda} (\lambda x_{\tau_1}^{\mathfrak{B}_1}.t)v : (\tau_2, \perp) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}[(\lambda x_{\tau_1}^{\perp}.t)v] \\ &= \mathcal{E}(\lambda x_{\tau_1}^{\perp}.t) \mathcal{E}(v) \\ &= \lambda x_{\text{unit}}. \mathcal{E}(t) \mathcal{E}(\perp) \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \mathcal{E}(t)[x_{\text{unit}}^{\perp} \leftarrow \perp] \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 1.3 [EVALUATION PRESERVATION UNDER ERASURE]. *For any closed $g\lambda$ -term t such that $\vdash_{g\lambda} t : (\tau, \perp)$ holds, if $t \rightarrow^* v$ for some value v , then $\mathcal{E}(t) \rightarrow^* \mathcal{E}(v)$.*

Proof.

□

References