

A Two-Level Linear Dependent Type Theory

QIANCHENG FU, Boston University, USA

HONGWEI XI, Boston University, USA

We present a type theory combining both linearity and dependency by stratifying typing rules into a level for logics and a level for programs. The distinction between logics and programs decouples their semantics, allowing the type system to assume tight resource bounds. A natural notion of irrelevancy is established where all proofs and types occurring inside programs are fully erasable without compromising their operational behavior. Through a heap-based operational semantics, we show that extracted programs always make computational progress and run memory clean. Additionally, programs can be freely reflected into the logical level for conducting deep proofs in the style of standard dependent type theories. This enables one to write resource safe programs and verify their correctness using a unified language.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: type theory, linear logic, computational relevancy, heap semantics

1 INTRODUCTION

Constructing programs and proving their properties are primary functions of computer science. It did not take long for researchers to realize that a deep connection exists between these activities. Proofs can be viewed as programs mapping assumptions to conclusions and programs can be viewed as proofs of the propositions induced by types. This realization led to the Curry-Howard correspondence viewpoint which identifies proofs and programs as the same mathematical objects. Dependent type theories [7, 13, 15] make this connection even more concrete by expressing proofs and programs using a single unified language.

Despite these theoretical observations, the generality of the Curry-Howard correspondence is still a contentious subject. It does not take much time to notice that the focal points of theorem proving and program construction are different. On the one hand, the value of a proof lies in its ability to assert the validity of a proposition by being assigned the type corresponding to this proposition. In other words, the reduction behavior (computation) of a proof is not as important as the fact that it is well-typed. Proofs utilizing classical axioms such as the law of excluded middle or the axiom of choice may not reduce at all. On the other hand, the value of a program lies in its ability to perform computation and transform the world around it (sometimes irreversibly). Many programming languages such as C do not have clear analogs in the proof theoretic world and yet have greatly impacted modern society solely through their computational capabilities.

As a step towards bridging the gap between proofs and programs, we introduce the dependent type theory TLL whose typing rules are stratified into a logical level and a program level. Now that proofs and programs are no longer bound together in a monolithic type system, typing rules can be refined to characterize their subjects of interest more precisely. At the logical level, the typing rules here are concerned with the formation of propositions (types) and their proofs (terms). Overall, the logical level is similar to Martin-Löf type theory [15] and enjoys many of the same meta theoretical properties. For the typing rules at the program level, they support an intrinsic notion of resources inspired by Linear Logic [10] to encode irreversible real world interactions. Due to the fact that the operational semantics of the two levels can be decoupled, we choose a call-by-value style semantics for programs as this allows the program typing rules to assume tight resource bounds. Additionally, TLL types are allowed to depend on linearly typed programs in a computationally irrelevant manner. This enables one to reason about resources hypothetically without actually consuming them.

In order to show that TLL guarantees productive programs and safe resource usage, we develop a type directed erasure procedure and a heap semantics inspired by Turner and Wadler [22]. During erasure, the syntax tree of a well-typed program is stripped of all type annotations and computationally irrelevant terms. The program extracted from erasure is then evaluated using our heap semantics. As the program evaluates, heap cells are dynamically allocated and freed when linearly typed values are constructed and consumed. We prove that our calculus is sound with regards to this erasure procedure and heap semantics, ensuring evaluation progress and safe memory usage at runtime.

All lemmas and theorems reported in this paper are formalized and proven correct in Coq [20]. We also implement a compiler in OCaml that compiles TLL programs into C. Proofs, source code and example programs are available in our git repository ¹.

In summary, we make the following contributions:

- First, we design TLL, a two-level linear dependent type system. By stratifying the typing rules into a logical level and a program level, we are able to characterize proofs and programs more precisely.
- Second, we study the meta-theoretical properties of the two levels. We show that the logical level exhibits qualities such as confluence and strong normalization that make it suitable for logical reasoning.
- Furthermore, we design an erasure procedure and heap semantics that model the behavior of programs at runtime. Using this semantics, we show programs extracted from erasure run memory clean.
- The entire calculus with its meta theories is formalized and proven correct in Coq. We also implement a compiler in OCaml with many supporting examples.

2 OVERALL STRUCTURE

The syntax of TLL is presented in Figure 2.

The typing rules of TLL are stratified into a level for logics and a level for programs. This is expressed formally through the two judgments depicted in Figure 1. The logical typing judgment $\Gamma \vdash m : A$ states that term m has type A under logical context Γ . The program typing judgment $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m : A$ states that term m has type A under logical context Γ and program context Δ .

$$\Gamma \vdash m : A \qquad \Gamma; \Delta \vdash m : A$$

Fig. 1. Logical and Program Typing

TLL utilizes two sorts L and U to distinguish between the modalities of types (linear and non-linear respectively). When an arbitrary type A is of the sort L, we say that this type is linear. If A is of sort U, we say that this type is non-linear. In order to avoid Girard’s paradox, sorts can be endowed with universe levels in the usual way, but we do not do so in this paper for the sake of presentation clarity.

From a logical typing perspective, modality has no effect. This follows the intuition that hypothetical reasoning about resources does not consume them. The type system at the logical level essentially boils down to standard dependent type theory with extra modality and relevancy annotations.

¹<https://github.com/qcfu-bu/TLL-arxiv-repo>

At the program level, the modalities of types come into effect. Computationally relevant terms of linear types must be used exactly once and terms which are computationally irrelevant or of non-linear types can be used freely. This is accomplished by carefully controlling how contraction and weakening rules are applied to the program context Δ .

For well-typed programs, a type directed erasure procedure can be carried out to remove all type annotations and sub-terms occurring in computationally irrelevant positions. The erasure soundness theorems guarantee that programs extracted by erasure always make computational progress in a manner that is compatible with their original non-erased counterparts.

sorts	s, r, t	::=	$U \mid L$
terms	m, n, A, B	::=	$x \mid s$
			$\mid \Pi_t(x : A).B \mid \Pi_t\{x : A\}.B$
			$\mid \lambda_t(x : A).m \mid \lambda_t\{x : A\}.m$
			$\mid m \ n \mid \square \mid *l$

Fig. 2. Syntax of TLL

3 LOGICAL TYPING

This section describes the typing rules in the logical level. Some of these rules will appear to be redundant as type modality and computational relevancy hold no weight at the logical level where essentially everything is computationally irrelevant. However, the importance of these rules lies in their interactions with program typing which is presented in Section 4.

$$\frac{}{\epsilon \vdash} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \quad \Gamma \vdash A : s \quad x \notin \Gamma}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash}$$

Fig. 3. Logical Context

3.1 Type Formation

The type formation rules presented in Figure 4 appear at the logical level. They determine the canonical forms of types. An obvious departure from standard formalizations of dependent type theory is the presence of two kinds of Π -types.

The first of these is the Π_0 -type of the form $\Pi_t\{x : A\}.B$. We refer to the λ -terms inhabiting Π_0 -types at the program level as λ_0 -programs. For λ_0 -programs, their arguments may only be used irrelevantly within their bodies. This is similar in spirit to the Λ -quantifier of System F where type parameterized terms behave computationally the same regardless of the choice of type instantiation. However, Π_0 -types are richer than Λ -quantifiers in the sense that they can depend on arbitrary terms and not just types.

The Π_1 -type of the form $\Pi_t(x : A).B$ is the usual function type. Similarly to the Π_0 -type case, we refer to the λ -terms inhabiting Π_1 -types at the program level as λ_1 -programs. The arguments of λ_1 -programs are allowed to be used relevantly in their bodies.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash}{\Gamma \vdash s : U} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A : s \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash B : r}{\Gamma \vdash \Pi_t\{x : A\}.B : t} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A : s \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash B : r}{\Gamma \vdash \Pi_t(x : A).B : t}$$

Fig. 4. Type Formation

One final detail that we want to emphasize about Π -types in TLL is the sort annotation t . It is clear from the typing rules here that sort s of the domain, sort r of the codomain and t are not correlated. The t annotation controls the modality of the overall Π -type intrinsically, meaning that if t is set to L, then the λ -programs inhabiting this type must be applied exactly once. In Section 4, we will see how the t annotation imposes constraints on λ -program construction.

3.2 Logical Terms

The typing rules for logical terms are presented in Figure 5. We can see from the lack of sub-structural restrictions and the symmetry between the rules concerning Π_0 -types and Π_1 -types that the terms at the logical level are just Martin-Löf terms [15] with extra annotations. The relation $A \simeq B$ asserted by the last rule is the usual definitional equality relation stating that A and B are convertible through logical reductions (Section 6.1).

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{\Gamma \vdash x : A \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : A} \qquad \frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash m : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda_t \{x : A\}.m : \Pi_t \{x : A\}.B} \qquad \frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash m : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda_t (x : A).m : \Pi_t (x : A).B} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma \vdash m : \Pi_t \{x : A\}.B \quad \Gamma \vdash n : A}{\Gamma \vdash m n : B[n/x]} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash m : \Pi_t (x : A).B \quad \Gamma \vdash n : A}{\Gamma \vdash m n : B[n/x]} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma \vdash m : A \quad \Gamma \vdash B : s \quad A \simeq B}{\Gamma \vdash m : B}
 \end{array}$$

Fig. 5. Logical Terms

4 PROGRAM TYPING

The typing of programs is where our preparation at the logical level pays off. Due to the sub-structural nature of program typing, we must first understand the formation of program contexts and the constraints that can be imposed upon them before we can progress further into the presentation.

4.1 Program Context

A program context Δ is a sequence of triples in the form $x :_s A, y :_r B, \dots$ where each triple is comprised of a fresh variable, a sort and a type. The well-formation of a program context Δ is defined under a logical context Γ as the judgment $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash$ whose rules are formally presented in Figure 6. Basically, for a well-formed program context according to $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash$, each entry $x :_s A$ in Δ must be correspondingly well-sorted at the logical level as $\Gamma \vdash A : s$. We can already see here a major role of the logical level: it provides the types that programs inhabit.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{\epsilon; \epsilon \vdash} \qquad \frac{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash \quad \Gamma \vdash A : s \quad x \notin \Gamma}{\Gamma, x : A; \Delta, x :_s A \vdash} \qquad \frac{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash \quad \Gamma \vdash A : s \quad x \notin \Gamma}{\Gamma, x : A; \Delta \vdash}
 \end{array}$$

Fig. 6. Program Context

We can see from the second and third rules in Figure 6 that given judgment $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash$, the program context Δ forms an annotated sub-context of the logical context Γ . For the sake of readability, we implicitly assume that $x \notin \Delta$ whenever the notation $\Gamma, x : A; \Delta$ is used.

4.2 Context Management

Careful context management lies at the heart of sub-structural type systems. For this purpose, we introduce context merge $\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2$ and context constraint $\Delta \triangleright s$ whose rules are listed in Figure 7 and Figure 8 respectively.

Context merge $\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2$ is a partial function that applies the contraction rule to overlapping U sorted triples in program contexts Δ_1 and Δ_2 . For L sorted triples, they must occur uniquely in either Δ_1 or Δ_2 but never both. Whenever we write $\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2$ inside typing rules, we implicitly assert that context merging is well-defined for Δ_1 and Δ_2 .

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\epsilon \cup \epsilon = \epsilon} \\
\frac{\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 = \Delta \quad x \notin \Delta}{(\Delta_1, x :_{\text{U}} A) \cup (\Delta_2, x :_{\text{U}} A) = (\Delta, x :_{\text{U}} A)} \\
\frac{\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 = \Delta \quad x \notin \Delta}{(\Delta_1, x :_{\text{L}} A) \cup \Delta_2 = (\Delta, x :_{\text{L}} A)} \\
\frac{\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 = \Delta \quad x \notin \Delta}{\Delta_1 \cup (\Delta_2, x :_{\text{L}} A) = (\Delta, x :_{\text{L}} A)}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 7. Context Merge

For the sort indexed context constraint $\Delta \triangleright s$, if $s = \text{U}$ then all triples in Δ must be U annotated. In this situation, we know from context well-formation that all types in Δ must be non-linear. On the other hand, if $s = \text{L}$ then triples in Δ may be of both sorts. This parameterized behavior allows context constraints appearing in typing rules to work for both linear and non-linear modalities.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\epsilon \triangleright s} \\
\frac{\Delta \triangleright \text{U}}{\Delta, x :_{\text{U}} A \triangleright \text{U}} \\
\frac{\Delta \triangleright \text{L}}{\Delta, x :_{\text{s}} A \triangleright \text{L}}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 8. Context Constraint

4.3 General Typing

At this point we are ready to begin the discussion on typing rules at the program level properly. An immediate difference between the program level and logical level is the lack of type formation rules at the program level. From TLL's perspective, types are hypothetical entities whose purpose is to mediate program composition. All the type formation rules for deriving the types of programs are defined at the logical level.

The first two rules at the program level are presented in Figure 9 concerning variable typing and type conversion respectively. In the variable typing rule we see that the program context Δ must contain the program variable $x :_{\text{s}} A$ of interest. Furthermore, the rest of the program context is subject to constraint $\Delta / \{x :_{\text{s}} A\} \triangleright \text{U}$ which inhibits weakening the context with variables of linear types. The conversion rule states that a program of type A can be viewed as a program of type B provided that A and B are definitionally equal and B is well-sorted at the logical level.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash \quad x :_{\text{s}} A \in \Delta \quad \Delta / \{x :_{\text{s}} A\} \triangleright \text{U}}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash x : A} \\
\frac{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m : A \quad \Gamma \vdash B : s \quad A \simeq B}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m : B}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 9. General Program Typing

4.4 Irrelevance Quantification

In Section 3.1 we introduced Π_0 -types and Π_1 -types. Figure 10 shows how λ_0 -programs inhabiting Π_0 -types are constructed along with their corresponding application rule.

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A; \Delta \vdash m : B \quad \Delta \triangleright t}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash \lambda_t\{x : A\}.m : \Pi_t\{x : A\}.B} \quad \frac{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m : \Pi_t\{x : A\}.B \quad \Gamma \vdash n : A}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m n : B[n/x]}$$

Fig. 10. Irrelevance Quantification

Observe that in the premise of the λ_0 -program construction rule, only the logical context is expanded with the parameter as $\Gamma, x : A$ whereas the program context Δ is left unchanged. The body of the λ_0 -program m does not have access to x through the program context, so according to the program variable rule x cannot be typed directly as a program in m . However, type annotations and irrelevant terms require only the presence of the logical context which is why x can still be used irrelevantly in m . The side condition $\Delta \triangleright t$ ensures that if Δ contains linear variables, they cannot be trivially duplicated by simply packing them into a non-linear λ_0 -program.

The application rule for λ_0 -programs presents an interesting situation where its premise requires that m be typed at the program level and n be typed at the logical level. If m is a λ_0 -program, then the parameter of m can only be used irrelevantly inside its body. Due to the fact that n will always land in computationally irrelevant positions after β -reduction, all of n is considered to be irrelevant as well.

4.5 Relevance Quantification

The rules governing the creation and application of λ_1 -programs are presented in Figure 11. They are similar to their irrelevance counterparts with some subtle yet important differences.

In the premise of the introduction rule for λ_1 -programs, we see that both the logical context and program context are expanded with the parameter as $\Gamma, x : A$ and $\Delta, x :_s A$ respectively. This means that m can utilize x both irrelevantly inside type annotations and also relevantly as a sub-program. Furthermore, if $s = L$, the argument x must be used exactly once inside m because linearly typed variables cannot be discarded from the program context through weakening nor duplicated through contraction. In the case that $s = U$, the argument x may be used freely inside m as the structural rules are admissible on variables with non-linear types.

Since the introduction rule establishes that the arguments of λ_1 -programs can be used relevantly inside their bodies, the application rule must account for linear resources used by the applied argument. We can see this taking place here as the argument n must be typed at the program level with program context Δ_2 . Additionally, the program context Δ_1 of m is merged together with Δ_2 as $\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2$ in the conclusion.

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A; \Delta, x :_s A \vdash m : B \quad \Delta \triangleright t}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash \lambda_t(x : A).m : \Pi_t(x : A).B} \quad \frac{\Gamma; \Delta_1 \vdash m : \Pi_t(x : A).B \quad \Gamma; \Delta_2 \vdash n : A}{\Gamma; \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 \vdash m n : B[n/x]}$$

Fig. 11. Relevance Quantification

Careful readers may have noticed the possibility for a seemingly unsound situation to arise in the typing rule for applications. Suppose that m is a λ_1 -program whose domain is of non-linear type A . This means that the parameter of m can be used freely inside its body. If n uses linear resources

in Δ_2 , then substituting n into the body of m could result in the duplication or leakage of resources. Unlike some prior works on linear dependent types which strictly forbid these applications from being well-typed [5] or require multiple copies of Δ_2 [1], we provide an alternative solution where applications of this form are sound using a single copy of Δ_2 . By leveraging the flexibility of TLL's two-level design, we decouple the operational semantics of the logical level from the program level and enforce a call-by-value style evaluation order in the program level semantics. When using call-by-value, n must first be evaluated to a value of type A . This eager evaluation strategy essentially consumes all of the necessary linear resources once before β -reduction. The final value of type A that substitutes into m is guaranteed by the value stability theorem (Theorem 7) to be resource free which allows it to be used soundly within m .

5 PROGRAM EXTRACTION

In this section, we describe the type directed procedure for erasing type annotations and irrelevant terms from TLL programs. During erasure, every term to be erased is replaced with a special constant \square with no typing information nor computational behavior. We use the judgment $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m \sim m' : A$ to formally state that a program m of type A is erased to the extracted program m' .

The following example shows the erasure of a program to a much simpler extracted form where all irrelevant terms are replaced with \square . Notice that the entire argument applied to the λ_0 -program is erased in the extracted program.

$$\begin{aligned} & (\lambda_L \{A : U\}. \lambda_L (x : A). x) (\Pi_U \{B : L\}. \Pi_U (x : B). B) \sim \\ & (\lambda_L \{A : \square\}. \lambda_L (x : \square). x) \square \end{aligned}$$

5.1 General Extraction

The erasure judgment is defined in a similar fashion to program typing. We begin by presenting the erasure rules for variables and type conversion in Figure 12.

$$\frac{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash x :_s A \in \Delta \quad \Delta / \{x :_s A\} \triangleright U}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash x \sim x : A} \qquad \frac{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m \sim m' : A \quad \Gamma \vdash B : s \quad A \simeq B}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m \sim m' : B}$$

Fig. 12. General Erasure

Program variables are considered atomic by erasure in the sense that they do not contain irrelevant sub-terms. So erasure is an identity operation when applied to program variables. The type conversion erasure rule states that if a program m of type A can be extracted to m' and A is definitionally equal to some well-sorted type B , then m can be viewed as a program of type B and still be extracted to m' .

5.2 Irrelevance Erasure

The rules for performing erasure on λ_0 -programs and their applications are presented in Figure 13, both of which mimic their program typing counterparts.

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A; \Delta \vdash m \sim m' : B \quad \Delta \triangleright t}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash \lambda_t \{x : A\}. m \sim \lambda_t \{x : \square\}. m' : \Pi_t \{x : A\}. B} \qquad \frac{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m \sim m' : \Pi_t \{x : A\}. B \quad \Gamma \vdash n : A}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m n \sim m' \square : B[n/x]}$$

Fig. 13. Irrelevance Erasure

5.3 Relevance Erasure

Erasure for λ_1 -programs and their applications can be carried out in an inductive manner as depicted in Figure 14. Both of these rules are straightforward as they simply push the erasure procedure structurally into their sub-programs.

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A; \Delta, x :_s A \vdash m \sim m' : B \quad \Delta \triangleright t}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash \lambda_t(x : A).m \sim \lambda_t(x : \square).m' : \Pi_t(x : A).B} \quad \frac{\Gamma; \Delta_1 \vdash m \sim m' : \Pi_t(x : A).B \quad \Gamma; \Delta_2 \vdash n \sim n' : A}{\Gamma; \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 \vdash m n \sim m' n' : B[n/x]}$$

Fig. 14. Relevance Erasure

6 OPERATIONAL SEMANTICS

The exposition up until this point has been solely concerned with the static aspects of TLL such as typing and erasure. We now turn our focus to TLL's dynamic behavior by endowing it with two separate operational semantics: one for the logical level and the other for the program level. We use the relation $m \rightsquigarrow n$ for logical reductions and the relation $m \rightsquigarrow n$ for program reductions.

6.1 Logical Reductions

The reductions carried out by terms in the logical level are entirely standard. Figure 15 presents an excerpt of the logical reduction rules where many of the uninteresting structural cases have been elided. Unlike the reductions at the program level which are carried out using a call-by-value style evaluation order, the reductions at the logical level are not restricted to any particular evaluation order. The confluence theorem (Theorem 1) for logic level reductions ensures that for any arbitrary term, every reduction strategy can ultimately be joined at a common term. Coupled with the fact that logical reductions are strongly normalizing (Theorem 5) for well-typed logical terms, one can check the definitional equality of two terms by comparing their normal forms.

$$\frac{m \rightsquigarrow m'}{m n \rightsquigarrow m' n} \quad \frac{n \rightsquigarrow n'}{m n \rightsquigarrow m n'} \quad \frac{}{(\lambda_t\{x : A\}.m) n \rightsquigarrow m[n/x]} \quad \frac{}{(\lambda_t(x : A).m) n \rightsquigarrow m[n/x]}$$

Fig. 15. Logical Reductions (Excerpt)

6.2 Program Reductions

As we have mentioned previously, the program level operational semantics utilizes a call-by-value style evaluation order. Figure 16 lists the various value forms. We consider program variables to be values in order to allow user assumed constants to be passed around.

$$\frac{}{x \text{ value}} \quad \frac{}{\lambda_t\{x : A\}.m \text{ value}} \quad \frac{}{\lambda_t(x : A).m \text{ value}}$$

Fig. 16. Program Values

The reduction rules at the program level are given in Figure 17. Due to the fact that types and irrelevant terms are computationally inert, there are significantly fewer reduction rules at the program level than at the logical level. Among the reductions here are the β_0 -reduction for λ_0 -programs and β_1 -reduction for λ_1 -programs.

From the program level typing rules we know that arguments applied to λ_0 -programs must be irrelevant terms. So due to its purely hypothetical nature, the irrelevant argument n here will never consume actual resources. This claim is reinforced by the fact that after erasure, n will be \square , which is completely devoid of operational behavior. Thus it is sound for the β_0 -reduction to immediately substitute n into m without evaluation.

$$\frac{m \rightsquigarrow m'}{m n \rightsquigarrow m' n} \quad \frac{n \rightsquigarrow n'}{m n \rightsquigarrow m n'} \quad \frac{}{(\lambda_t \{x : A\}.m) n \rightsquigarrow m[n/x]} \quad \frac{v \text{ value}}{(\lambda_t (x : A).m) v \rightsquigarrow m[v/x]}$$

Fig. 17. Program Reductions

In Section 4.5 we have explained that the call-by-value style operational semantics at the program level allows us to assume tight resource bounds when defining the typing rules for λ_1 -program application. This statement is realized by the β_1 -reduction rule which requires the applied argument v to be a value. Now that v is a value, the resources contained within v are upper bound by the value stability theorem (Theorem 7). So it is sound for the β_1 -reduction to substitute v into m .

7 META THEORY

In this section we study the meta-theoretic properties of TLL. We organize the presentation into three subsections which are concerned with logical level theories, program level theories and program extraction theories respectively.

7.1 Logical Theories

The first theorem of the logical level is that of confluence. As described in Section 6.1, logical reductions do not have a fixed evaluation order so confluence is necessary to join together different reduction paths. This is especially important from an implementation perspective where definitional equality is checked by reducing terms to their normal forms. If confluence is not admissible, then certain reduction strategies may lead to a loss of valid definitional equalities. To prove the confluence theorem, we use the standard technique of showing the diamond property for parallelized logical reductions.

THEOREM 1 (CONFLUENCE OF LOGICAL REDUCTIONS). *If $m \rightsquigarrow^* m_1$ and $m \rightsquigarrow^* m_2$, then there exists n such that $m_1 \rightsquigarrow^* n$ and $m_2 \rightsquigarrow^* n$.*

At the logical level, types are terms inhabiting sorts. The type validity theorem shows that the types of terms are indeed valid types according to this definition. Besides substantiating the design of TLL as a dependent type system, the type validity theorem also provides a great deal of utility when proving other theorems as it allows types to be viewed as terms. This enables various inversion lemmas to be applicable to types.

THEOREM 2 (TYPE VALIDITY). *For any logical typing $\Gamma \vdash m : A$, there exists sort s such that $\Gamma \vdash A : s$ is derivable.*

The sort of a TLL type determines its modality. A type inhabiting the L sort is linear and a type inhabiting the U sort is non-linear. With the sorts of types playing such a crucial role in the substructural type system at the program level, it is important to show that no ambiguity arises when assigning sorts to types at the logical level. The sort uniqueness theorem states that the sort of a particular type is unique thus preventing contradictory situations where a type is both L sorted

and U sorted. When viewed in conjunction with type validity, these theorems show that there always exists a unique sort for the type of a term to inhabit.

THEOREM 3 (SORT UNIQUENESS). *If there are logical typings $\Gamma \vdash A : s$ and $\Gamma \vdash A : t$, then $s = t$.*

The standard subject reduction theorem is admissible for well-typed logical terms. This means that the types of logical terms are preserved by reductions. Properties and theorems that are derived from the logical typing judgment can be propagated across reductions as well. Furthermore, subject reduction also ensures that a reduction based definitional equality checker never alters the types of its candidates.

THEOREM 4 (LOGICAL SUBJECT REDUCTION). *If there are logical typing $\Gamma \vdash m : A$ and reduction $m \rightsquigarrow n$, then $\Gamma \vdash n : A$ is derivable.*

Finally, we have the strong normalization theorem at the logical level. Assuming that sorts are always implicitly labeled with universe levels in the usual way (i.e., $s_l : U_{l+1}$), then universe inconsistencies can be ruled out by the type system. At this point, the logical level of TLL can be modeled in Martin-Löf type theory (MLTT) [15] in a straightforward manner that preserves its reduction behavior. The rules for carrying out the modeling procedure are given formally in Figure 18. Basically, an MLTT model of logical TLL collapses the two sorts into one and inductively strips terms of their modality and relevancy annotations.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket x \rrbracket &= x \\
 \llbracket U \rrbracket &= \text{Type} \\
 \llbracket L \rrbracket &= \text{Type} \\
 \llbracket \Pi_t \{x : A\}.B \rrbracket &= \Pi(x : \llbracket A \rrbracket).\llbracket B \rrbracket \\
 \llbracket \Pi_t(x : A).B \rrbracket &= \Pi(x : \llbracket A \rrbracket).\llbracket B \rrbracket \\
 \llbracket \lambda_t \{x : A\}.B \rrbracket &= \lambda(x : \llbracket A \rrbracket).\llbracket B \rrbracket \\
 \llbracket \lambda_t(x : A).B \rrbracket &= \lambda(x : \llbracket A \rrbracket).\llbracket B \rrbracket \\
 \llbracket m \ n \rrbracket &= \llbracket m \rrbracket \llbracket n \rrbracket
 \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 18. Logical TLL in Martin-Löf

After naturally extending the modeling procedure to all types appearing in TLL logical contexts, the following two lemmas can be proven. These results show that this model is indeed sound with regards to logical reduction. By virtue of the strong normalization property for MLTT [8], TLL must be strongly normalizing as well.

LEMMA 1 (LOGICAL TYPE MODEL). *Given a TLL logical typing judgment $\Gamma \vdash_{TLL} m : A$, the judgment $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \vdash_{MLTT} \llbracket m \rrbracket : \llbracket A \rrbracket$ can be derived in Martin-Löf type theory.*

LEMMA 2 (LOGICAL REDUCTION MODEL). *Given a TLL logical reduction $m \rightsquigarrow_{TLL} n$, the reduction $\llbracket m \rrbracket \rightsquigarrow_{MLTT} \llbracket n \rrbracket$ can be derived in Martin-Löf type theory.*

THEOREM 5 (LOGICAL STRONG NORMALIZATION). *For any TLL term m with logical typing $\Gamma \vdash m : A$, it is strongly normalizing.*

7.2 Program Theories

TLL prohibits weakening the program context with variables of linear types to prevent the discarding of resources. However, the logical context can be independently weakened by itself since hypothetical resources can always be assumed freely. Moreover, weakening is admissible for the program context if the weakened variable is of non-linear type. These observations are expressed formally in the following pair of weakening lemmas.

LEMMA 3 (PROGRAM 0-WEAKENING). *For valid program typing $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m : A$ and logical typing $\Gamma \vdash B : s$, the judgment $\Gamma, x : B; \Delta \vdash m : A$ is derivable for any $x \notin \Gamma$.*

LEMMA 4 (PROGRAM 1-WEAKENING). *For valid program typing $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m : A$ and logical typing $\Gamma \vdash B : U$, the judgment $\Gamma, x : B; \Delta, x :_U B \vdash m : A$ is derivable for any $x \notin \Gamma$.*

A common drawback of stratified type systems is the lack of code sharing between language fragments. Structures performing similar tasks must be implemented independently in the different layers of the language. Libraries with large amounts of redundant code can become difficult to scale and maintain so it is important to reduce code duplication to the best of our abilities. The program reflection theorem tackles the code redundancy problem by allowing us to freely reflect well-typed programs into the logical level. This essentially allows the sharing of all code written in the program level with the logical level.

THEOREM 6 (PROGRAM REFLECTION). *For any program typing $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m : A$, logical typing $\Gamma \vdash m : A$ is derivable.*

Arbitrary TLL programs may utilize linear resources to compute a final non-linear value. So despite these programs being of non-linear types, they cannot be freely duplicated without breaking the no-contraction principle. However for programs in value form, the value stability theorem gives an upper bound on the resources they are allowed to consume. For a linearly typed value, it will always be used exactly once and consequently any resource held by the value is used exactly once as well. For values of non-linear type, the context constraint $\Delta \triangleright U$ prevents resources from occurring inside the value which allows it to be duplicated soundly.

THEOREM 7 (VALUE STABILITY). *If there is value v with program typing $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash v : A$ and $\Gamma \vdash A : s$, then $\Delta \triangleright s$.*

The program level supports its own version of the subject reduction theorem that is defined on the program typing judgment and program reductions. Although there are less typing rules at the program level when compared to the logical level, the program subject reduction is more difficult to prove than its logical counterpart. This is due to the necessity of carefully tracking changes in the program context during variable substitution. The two following lemmas describe the interactions between substitution and contexts.

LEMMA 5 (PROGRAM 0-SUBSTITUTION). *If there are program typing $\Gamma, x : A; \Delta \vdash m : B$ and logical typing $\Gamma \vdash n : A$, then $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m[n/x] : B[n/x]$ is derivable.*

LEMMA 6 (PROGRAM 1-SUBSTITUTION). *If there are program typings $\Gamma, x : A; \Delta_1, x :_s A \vdash m : B$ and $\Gamma; \Delta_2 \vdash n : A$ and context constraint $\Delta_2 \triangleright s$, then $\Gamma; \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 \vdash m[n/x] : B[n/x]$ is derivable.*

THEOREM 8 (PROGRAM SUBJECT REDUCTION). *For any program typing $\epsilon; \epsilon \vdash m : A$ and reduction $m \rightsquigarrow n$, there is $\epsilon; \epsilon \vdash n : A$.*

To show that well-typed programs “cannot go wrong”, we prove the following progress theorem. When viewed together with the program subject reduction theorem, it is clear that closed TLL programs will not get stuck during evaluation.

THEOREM 9 (PROGRAM PROGRESS). *If there is program typing $\epsilon; \epsilon \vdash m : A$, then m is either a value or there exists n such that $m \rightsquigarrow n$.*

7.3 Program Extraction

Introduced in Section 5, the program erasure procedure is carried out by inductively erasing type annotations and irrelevant terms occurring inside programs. The erasure existence theorem shows that extraction is well-defined for all well-typed TLL programs.

THEOREM 10 (ERASURE EXISTENCE). *For any well typed program $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m : A$, there exists an extracted version of it m' such that the erasure relation $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m \sim m' : A$ is derivable.*

After erasure has been successfully carried out on well-type programs, the extracted results retain only the relevant parts of the original program. It is now important to show that these extracted programs still behave as expected of their original selves computationally. We accomplish this by proving instrumented subject reduction and progress theorems.

The first theorem to establish the connection between original programs and their extracted forms is the erasure subject reduction theorem. Erasure subject reduction tells us that if a program reduction $m' \rightsquigarrow n'$ can be triggered for the extracted m' of a well-typed program m , then there exists a well-type program n that extracts to n' and the reduction $m \rightsquigarrow n$ exists on the original forms.

THEOREM 11 (ERASURE SUBJECT REDUCTION). *For any erasure relation $\epsilon; \epsilon \vdash m \sim m' : A$ and reduction $m' \rightsquigarrow n'$, there exists program n such that the following diagram commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \epsilon; \epsilon \vdash m & \sim & m' : A \\ \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \\ \epsilon; \epsilon \vdash n & \sim & n' : A \end{array}$$

Through the erasure progress theorem we show that the extracted forms of well-typed programs exhibit the same property of never getting stuck during evaluation.

THEOREM 12 (ERASURE PROGRESS). *If there is erasure relation $\epsilon; \epsilon \vdash m \sim m' : A$, then m' is a value or there exists n' such that $m' \rightsquigarrow n'$.*

8 HEAP SEMANTICS

In order to realize the abstract notion of linear resource, we develop a heap semantics in the style of Turner and Wadler [22] where heap memory serves as resource to the language runtime. At the heart of the semantics is the following heap indexed reduction relation.

$$H_1; m_1 \rightsquigarrow H_2; m_2$$

The term m_1 here is an extracted program that may contain pointers to cells in heap H_1 storing values. As m_1 evaluates, new cells in the heap are allocated to store intermediate values that are generated. The effects of a single evaluation step are reflected in the updated heap H_2 and program m_2 . If evaluating m_1 requires dereferencing pointers, then depending on the modality of the pointed to cell, the heap is either unchanged for non-linear cells or deallocated for linear cells. Such a semantics closely models low level implementations of functional languages where heap memory is dynamically allocated to store closures and other various data structures. Through this heap semantics we show that linearity enforces safe memory usage and that linearly typed programs are guaranteed to run memory clean without the need for runtime garbage collection.

8.1 Heaps

Heaps H are maps from unique locations l to sort annotated values. Generally, a heap is of the following form:

$$H ::= \{l_1 \mapsto_{s_1} v_1, l_2 \mapsto_{s_2} v_2, \dots, l_k \mapsto_{s_k} v_k\}$$

Each entry $l_i \mapsto_{s_i} v_i$ denotes a mapping from location l_i to value v_i of s_i modality. In particular, if $s_i = U$ then looking up location l_i in the heap will not cause any changes. However, if $s_i = L$ then looking up location l_i in the heap will remove the mapping from the heap. Formally, we introduce the relation $lookup(H_1, l, v, H_2)$ with rules presented in Figure 19, stating that looking up location l in heap H_1 results in value v and heap H_2 . Depending on the mapping modality between l and m , the resulting heap H_2 after lookup is equal to either H_1 in the U case or $H_1 / \{l \mapsto_L v\}$ in the L case.

$$\frac{(l \mapsto_U v) \in H}{lookup(H, l, v, H)} \qquad \frac{(l \mapsto_L v) \in H}{lookup(H, l, v, H / \{l \mapsto_L v\})}$$

Fig. 19. Heap Lookup

Notice that the entries $l \mapsto_s v$ of heaps are similar to the triples $x :_s A$ of program contexts. While one maps locations to values, the other maps variables to types. Both kinds of mappings are annotated by sort s . Taking advantage of these commonalities, we overload the merge operator $H_1 \cup H_2$ and constraint $H \triangleright s$ to work for heaps as well. So instead of operating over variables in contexts, they operate over locations in heaps.

8.2 Heap Reductions

The rules of heap reductions are presented in Figure 20. These rules essentially form a modified version of the program level call-by-value semantics. When a program is evaluated to value v , a memory cell at a fresh location l in the heap is allocated to store v . For example, since λ -programs are considered values, a fresh cell with the same modality as the λ -program is allocated to store it. Now if a pointer expression $*l$ is encountered, we know that it points to a value located in the heap. The application rules utilize this fact to enforce the call-by-value evaluation order for relevant applications.

$$\frac{l \notin H}{H; \lambda_t \{x : \square\}. m \rightsquigarrow H \cup \{l \mapsto_t \lambda_t \{x : \square\}. m\}; *l} \qquad \frac{l \notin H}{H; \lambda_t (x : \square). m \rightsquigarrow H \cup \{l \mapsto_t \lambda_t (x : \square). m\}; *l}$$

$$\frac{H; m \rightsquigarrow H'; m'}{H; m \ n \rightsquigarrow H'; m' \ n} \qquad \frac{H; n \rightsquigarrow H'; n'}{H; m \ n \rightsquigarrow H'; m \ n'}$$

$$\frac{lookup(H, l, \lambda_t \{x : \square\}. m, H')}{H; *l \ n \rightsquigarrow H'; m[\square/x]} \qquad \frac{lookup(H, l_1, \lambda_t (x : \square). m, H')}{H; *l_1 \ *l_2 \rightsquigarrow m[*l_2/x]}$$

Fig. 20. Heap Reductions

Generally for redexes in the heap semantics, pointers are expected in place of values in the standard program semantics. For example, the application of two pointers $*l_1 \ *l_2$ is considered a β_1 -redex if $*l_1$ points to a relevant λ_1 -program in the heap. To reduce this redex, the argument

pointer $*l_2$ is substituted into the body of the λ_1 -program referenced by $*l_1$. Likewise, the application form $*l n$ is considered a β_0 -redex if $*l$ points to an irrelevant λ_0 -program in the heap. For extracted programs satisfying the erasure relation, the argument n here must be \square so we immediately substitute \square into the body of the λ_0 -program referenced by $*l$.

8.3 Pointer Resolution

We do not extend our typing rules or standard operational semantics to cover pointer expressions, so whenever there is $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m : A$ or $m \rightsquigarrow n$ we know that all terms involved must not contain pointers. Instead, we introduce a new judgment $H; m \sim n$ presented in Figure 21 which recursively dereferences all pointers in m using heap H until there are no pointers occurring in n .

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{H \triangleright U}{H; x \sim x} \qquad \frac{H \triangleright t \quad H; m' \sim m}{H; \lambda_t \{x : \square\}. m' \sim \lambda_t \{x : \square\}. m} \qquad \frac{H \triangleright t \quad H; m' \sim m}{H; \lambda_t (x : \square). m' \sim \lambda_t (x : \square). m} \qquad \frac{H; m' \sim m}{H; m' \square \sim m \square} \\
 \\
 \frac{H_1; m' \sim m \quad H_2; n' \sim n}{H_1 \cup H_2; m' n' \sim m n} \qquad \frac{\text{lookup}(H, l, v', H') \quad H'; v' \sim v}{H; *l \sim v}
 \end{array}$$

Fig. 21. Pointer Resolution

When defining the judgment $H; m \sim n$, care is taken to ensure that dereferencing pointers obey the no-weakening and no-contraction principles analogously to the program typing rules. In other words, pointers to linear mappings in H are dereferenced only once. This is accomplished by enforcing side conditions $H_1 \cup H_2$ and $H \triangleright s$ which basically perform the same roles as their typing counterparts. The only rule without a typing counterpart is the last rule where it initially dereferences pointer $*l$ to value v' and recursively resolves all pointers in v' using the remaining heap H' .

To reintroduce typing information back into programs containing pointer expressions, we develop the ternary relation of well-resolved programs presented in Figure 22 that unites the erasure relation of Section 5 and pointer resolution. For a valid instance of well-resolved $H \vdash a \sim b \sim c : A$ we know that a is a well-type program that extracts to b and resolving the pointers in c also gives us b . Essentially, the extracted program b serves to bridge the well-typed original program a and the pointer program c .

$$\frac{\epsilon; \epsilon \vdash a \sim b : A \quad H; c \sim b}{H \vdash a \sim b \sim c : A}$$

Fig. 22. Well-Resolved

From the definition of pointer resolution it is clear that the contents in heap H greatly influence the outcome of resolving pointer program m in judgment $H; m \sim n$. To characterize the heaps produced during heap reduction, we introduce in Figure 23 a judgment $H \text{ wr-heap}$ stating that H is of a form that could plausibly be produced by heap reduction. Basically, all locations in H map to closed values. This means that performing lookup in heaps satisfying the *wr-heap* property is guaranteed to be productive because a value is retrieved after one level of indirection. The *wr-heap* property serves as an inductive invariant in the proof of heap semantics soundness, informing us of the structure of heaps at every reduction step.

$$\frac{}{\epsilon \text{ wr-heap}} \quad \frac{FV(m)/\{x\} = \emptyset \quad H \text{ wr-heap} \quad l \notin H}{H \cup \{l \mapsto_t \lambda_t\{x : \square\}.m\} \text{ wr-heap}} \quad \frac{FV(m)/\{x\} = \emptyset \quad H \text{ wr-heap} \quad l \notin H}{H \cup \{l \mapsto_t \lambda_t(x : \square).m\} \text{ wr-heap}}$$

Fig. 23. WR-Heaps

8.4 Soundness of Heap Semantics

The soundness of heap semantics is again justified through progress-preservation style theorems. Due to the fact that these theorems must now account for program typing, erasure, pointer resolution, heap reductions and many other concepts simultaneously, their statements and proofs become significantly more involved than previous versions.

The first theorem that we present is resolution stability. It is reminiscent of the value stability theorem (Theorem 7). But instead of exploring the constraints set by the modality of values on their program contexts as in the value stability case, the resolution stability theorem derives constraints on the mappings inside heaps.

THEOREM 13 (RESOLUTION STABILITY). *Given valid instances of well-resolved $H \vdash a \sim b \sim c : A$, logical typing $\epsilon \vdash A : s$ and H wr-heap, if b is a value then heap H can be upper bound by constraint $H \triangleright s$.*

The heap subject reduction theorem propagates the well-resolved and wr-heap invariants across heap reduction, ensuring that pointer programs well-resolved in wr-heaps always reduce to programs that are well-resolved in wr-heaps. Additionally, heap reductions agree with iterated steps in the standard semantics for original programs and extracted programs.

THEOREM 14 (HEAP SUBJECT REDUCTION). *Given instances of well-resolved $H \vdash a \sim b \sim c : A$ and H wr-heap, then for heap reduction $H; c \rightsquigarrow H'; c'$ there exist a' and b' such that the following judgments $H' \vdash a' \sim b' \sim c' : A$, H' wr-heap, $a \rightsquigarrow^* a'$ and $b \rightsquigarrow^* b'$ all hold.*

Finally, the heap progress theorem shows that for any pointer program c that is well-resolved in a heap H satisfying the wr-heap condition, either there exists a heap reduction $H; c \rightsquigarrow H'; c'$ or c is a pointer. From the definition of wr-heap we know that all elements contained in the heap are values. In the case that c is a pointer, dereferencing c yields a value.

THEOREM 15 (HEAP PROGRESS). *Given valid instances of well-resolved $H \vdash a \sim b \sim c : A$ and H wr-heap, then either there exist heap H' and program c' such that there is reduction $H; c \rightsquigarrow H'; c'$ or there exists a location l such that $c = *l$.*

Starting from a well-typed closed program m and an empty heap, due to the fact that empty heaps are degenerate wr-heaps and well-typed closed programs are trivially well-resolved in empty heaps, the heap subject reduction theorem and heap progress theorem allow for heap reductions to be repeatedly generated and applied until a value referencing pointer is reached. The resolution stability theorem tells us that the heap at this point can be constrained by $H \triangleright s$ where s is the sort of the original program m 's type. In practice, if the designated starting main expression is required to be of a non-linear type, all allocated heap memory will be safely freed by the time that the program terminates.

9 EXTENSIONS

In this section, we describe some useful extensions to the core TLL language for program development and reasoning. The meta theoretic results presented in the previous sections can all be extended naturally to cover these additions. In fact, our theorems are all proven assuming the inclusion of these extensions.

9.1 Propositional Equality

The first extension that we present is propositional equality with logical typing rules given in Figure 24. This is the usual propositional equality found in intensional dependent type theories which allows one to posit equality between two terms. Equality and its proofs exist purely for reasoning purposes so they can only be derived at the logical level. However, a proof of equality constructed at the logical level can be eliminated at the program level using the rule shown in Figure 25. This allows the type-casting of programs with a proof that the target type is propositionally equal to the original type. A simple example of program level equality elimination in practice is the type-casting of a length indexed vector ls with type $\text{vec } (x + y) A$ to type $\text{vec } (y + x) A$ by appealing to the proof that addition is commutative.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{\Gamma \vdash A : s \quad \Gamma \vdash m : A \quad \Gamma \vdash n : A}{\Gamma \vdash m =_A n : U} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash m : A}{\Gamma \vdash \text{refl } m : m =_A m} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma, x : A, p : m =_A x \vdash B : s \quad \Gamma \vdash H : B[m/x, \text{refl } m/p] \quad \Gamma \vdash P : m =_A n}{\Gamma \vdash R_{[x,p]B}^{\bar{=}}(H, P) : B[n/x, P/p]}
 \end{array}$$

Fig. 24. Propositional Equality (Logical Rules)

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A, p : m =_A x \vdash B : s \quad \Gamma; \Delta \vdash H : B[m/x, \text{refl } m/p] \quad \Gamma \vdash P : m =_A n}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash R_{[x,p]B}^{\bar{=}}(H, P) : B[n/x, P/p]}$$

Fig. 25. Propositional Equality (Program Rules)

The most interesting aspect of TLL propositional equality lies in its different reduction behaviors at the logical level and at the program level, the rules of which are presented in Figure 26. Notice that in the logical reduction rule $R_{[x,p]A}^{\bar{=}}(H, \text{refl } m) \rightsquigarrow H$, the proof of equality must be of the form $\text{refl } m$ in order to trigger reduction. This is to ensure that $R_{[x,p]A}^{\bar{=}}(H, \text{refl } m)$ and H have definitionally equal types. This seems to indicate that propositional equality is computationally relevant in the sense that an equality eliminator $R_{[x,p]A}^{\bar{=}}(H, P)$ occurring at the program level ought to carry around proof P and reduce it to $\text{refl } m$. From the actual program level reduction rule $R_{[x,p]A}^{\bar{=}}(H, P) \rightsquigarrow H$ we can see that this first impression is misleading: the program level equality eliminator does not impose any restrictions on P and immediately reduces to H . The soundness of this rule is due to the fact that program reductions are not performed under context. By the time an equality eliminator is evaluated, logical strong normalization and canonicity guarantee the existence of a $\text{refl } m$ proof that P is logically reducible to. In other words, equality eliminators at the program level reduce their proofs *conceptually* but not literally.

$$R_{[x,p]A}^{\bar{=}}(H, \text{refl } m) \rightsquigarrow H \qquad R_{[x,p]A}^{\bar{=}}(H, P) \rightsquigarrow H$$

Fig. 26. Propositional Equality Reduction

After recognizing that equality proofs are computationally irrelevant at the program level, we define the erasure procedure for equality eliminators in Figure 27 that removes the equality proof P

entirely. These erased programs can be represented and evaluated much more efficiently at runtime than their compile time logical counterparts.

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A, p : m =_A x \vdash B : s \quad \Gamma; \Delta \vdash H \sim H' : B[m/x, \text{refl } m/p] \quad \Gamma \vdash P : m =_A n}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash R_{[x,p]B}^{\square}(H, P) \sim R_{\square}^{\square}(H', \square) : B[n/x, P/p]}$$

Fig. 27. Propositional Equality (Erasure Rules)

9.2 Subset Pairs

Leveraging the distinction between proofs and programs in TLL, we encode a variation of Σ -types often referred to as subset types in the verification community. For a subset type of the form $\Sigma_t\{x : A.B\}$, its canonical inhabitant will be a pair of the form $\{m, n\}_t$ where m is a relevant payload of type A and n is an irrelevant proof of the dependent type B . A common use case for subset types is to refine programs by the properties they satisfy, essentially carving out a *subset* of the original type.

The logical rules for subset types are presented in Figure 28 and the program rules are presented in Figure 29. The side condition $(t = U) \Rightarrow (s = U)$ is required by the subset type formation rule to prevent resource leakage via packing linear payloads into non-linear subset pairs. Notice how in the program rule for subset pair construction the payload m is typed at the program level whereas the term n is typed at the logical level. This indicates that m is computationally relevant and n is computationally irrelevant. From an erasure perspective, a program of the form $\{m, n\}_t$ is erased to $\{m, \square\}_t$.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : s \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash B : r \quad (t = U) \Rightarrow (s = U)}{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_t\{x : A.B\} : t}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_t\{x : A.B\} : t \quad \Gamma \vdash m : A \quad \Gamma \vdash n : B[m/x]}{\Gamma \vdash \{m, n\}_t : \Sigma_t\{x : A.B\}}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, z : \Sigma_t\{x : A.B\} \vdash C : s \quad \Gamma \vdash m : \Sigma_t\{x : A.B\} \quad \Gamma, x : A, y : B \vdash n : C[\{x, y\}_t/z]}{\Gamma \vdash R_{[z]C}^{\Sigma}(m, [x, y]n) : C[m/z]}$$

Fig. 28. Subset Pairs (Logical Rules)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_t\{x : A.B\} : t \quad \Gamma; \Delta \vdash m : A \quad \Gamma \vdash n : B[m/x]}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash \{m, n\}_t : \Sigma_t\{x : A.B\}}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, z : \Sigma_t\{x : A.B\} \vdash C : s \quad \Gamma; \Delta_1 \vdash m : \Sigma_t\{x : A.B\} \quad \Gamma, x : A, y : B; \Delta_2, x : r \vdash n : C[\{x, y\}_t/z]}{\Gamma; \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 \vdash R_{[z]C}^{\Sigma}(m, [x, y]n) : C[m/z]}$$

Fig. 29. Subset Pairs (Program Rules)

The following example shows applying erasure to a pair of type $\Sigma_{\cup}\{x : \text{nat}.x + 1 =_{\text{nat}} 2\}$. Notice that the proof component of the pair ($\text{refl } 2$) is completely removed by erasure. These subset pairs

realize the principle of computational irrelevancy for program properties.

$$\vdash \{1, \text{refl } 2\}_U \sim \{1, \square\}_U : \Sigma_U \{x : \text{nat}. x + 1 =_{\text{nat}} 2\}$$

Standard dependent pairs where both components are computationally relevant can be defined in a straightforward manner. The typing rules and semantics for relevant pairs are fully formalized in our Coq development, but for the sake of saving space we do not present them here.

9.3 Additive Pairs

To integrate the additive fragment of Linear Logic [10] into TLL, we introduce $\&$ -types as an extension. The logical rules are presented in Figure 30 and the program rules are presented in Figure 31. Intuitively, a $\&$ -type of the form $A \&_t B$ represents the pairing of two delayed computations of types A and B respectively. Canonical inhabitants of $A \&_t B$ are additive pairs of the form $(m, n)_t$.

Of the rules depicted here, the most interesting is the program typing rule governing the construction of additive pairs. Notice that in the premise, both components m and n are typed in the same program context Δ . Furthermore, the conclusion only assumes a single copy of Δ . This is a realization of the additive fragment of Linear Logic [10]. Due to the fact that m and n are delayed computations, only one of the two will ultimately be projected out and evaluated. So only a single copy of Δ is committed to the component that actually gets evaluated.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : s \quad \Gamma \vdash B : r}{\Gamma \vdash A \&_t B : t} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash m : A \quad \Gamma \vdash n : B}{\Gamma \vdash (m, n)_t : A \&_t B} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash m : A \&_t B}{\Gamma \vdash \pi_1 m : A} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash m : A \&_t B}{\Gamma \vdash \pi_2 m : B}$$

Fig. 30. Additive Pairs (Logical Rules)

$$\frac{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m : A \quad \Gamma; \Delta \vdash n : B \quad \Delta \triangleright t}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash (m, n)_t : A \&_t B} \quad \frac{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m : A \&_t B}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash \pi_1 m : A} \quad \frac{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash m : A \&_t B}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash \pi_2 m : B}$$

Fig. 31. Additive Pairs (Program Rules)

10 IMPLEMENTATION AND APPLICATION

In this section, we describe language features implemented in the TLL compiler with simple examples on how they can be used to effectively construct and verify programs.

10.1 Linear Inductive Types

The TLL compiler supports user defined inductive types in the style of CIC [18]. Figure 32 demonstrates how a linear list can be defined. In this definition, the *arity* of the `llist` type constructor ends in sort `L`. Once `llist` is fully applied to an arbitrary linear type `A`, the resulting type `llist A` will be of sort `L` which requires that the lists inhabiting this type are used exactly once. So basically, by varying the sorts of type arities and constructor arguments, we can define different combinations of linear and non-linear inductive types.

```
inductive llist (A : L) : L =
| lnil
| lcons of (hd : A) (tl : llist A)
```

Fig. 32. Linear Lists

Figure 33 defines a function ² for appending two linear lists. The usage of the toplevel keyword `program` here allows the `lappend` function to be applicable at the program level. Since types can only appear in computationally irrelevant positions at the program level, the type parameter `A` is quantified irrelevantly as a $\lambda 0$ argument. Additionally, the body of `lappend` is subject to linear type-checking because it can be used at the program level. The C code emitted for `lappend` will reclaim the memory used for representing `xs` as it is deconstructed by the `match` expression.

```

program lappend {A : L} (xs : llist A) : llist A  $\rightarrow$  llist A =
ln ys  $\Rightarrow$  match xs with
| lnil  $\Rightarrow$  ys
| lcons x xs  $\Rightarrow$  lcons x (lappend _ xs ys)
end

```

Fig. 33. Program for Appending Linear Lists

After a program has been defined, theorems regarding its properties can be proven at the logical level using the `logical` keyword. Figure 34 shows a proof ³ that the logical length of two lists appended together by `lappend` is equal to the sum of their individual lengths. Notice that the `llen` function here is a logical specification: it cannot be used at the program level for actual computations. If `llen` were to exist relevantly at the program level, the element `hd` dropped without usage in the `lcons` case would cause memory leakage. Basically, terms declared with the `logical` keyword are not subject to linear type checking and are pruned during the erasure phase of the compiler.

```

logical llen {A : L} (xs : llist A) : nat =
  match xs with
  | lnil  $\Rightarrow$  0
  | lcons hd tl  $\Rightarrow$  1 + llen _ tl
end

logical lappend_llen (A : L) (xs ys : llist A) :
  llen _ (lappend _ xs ys)  $\equiv$  (llen _ xs) + (llen _ ys) =
  match xs as xs0 in llen _ (lappend _ xs0 ys)  $\equiv$  llen _ xs0 + llen _ ys with
  | lnil  $\Rightarrow$  refl
  | lcons x xs0  $\Rightarrow$ 
    rew [ n, _  $\Rightarrow$  S (llen _ (lappend _ xs0 ys))  $\equiv$  S n ]
      lappend_llen _ xs0 ys in refl
end

```

Fig. 34. Logical Proofs Relating Append and Length

The example that was just shown is a form of *extrinsic* verification. In this style of verification, an unverified program is first written using standard programming techniques. After the program has been fully constructed, its properties are then stated and proven as theorems external to the program.

Taking advantage of dependent types, programs can also be verified in an *intrinsic* manner where data and proofs are tightly integrated. Consider length indexed linear vector defined in Figure 35. The constructors `lNil` and `lCons` of this inductive type carry irrelevant proofs that the

²Underscores can be used as implicit arguments which are inferred through unification.

³The notation `rew [x, p \Rightarrow A] P in H` is the propositional equality eliminator $R_{[x,p]A}^{\equiv}(H, P)$.

indexing natural number n accurately characterizes the length of the constructed vector. So if a vector is known to be of type $\text{lvec } n \ A$, we can trust that its length must be n .

```
inductive lvec (n : nat) (A : L) : L =
| lNil of {e : 0 ≡ n}
| lCons of {n0 : nat} {e : S n0 ≡ n} (hd : A) (tl : lvec n0 A)
```

Fig. 35. Linear Length Indexed Vectors

A program for appending linear vectors is given in Figure 36. We can see immediately from the type of the output $\text{lvec } (m + n) \ A$ that its length must be exactly the sum of the lengths of its inputs. Compared to the extrinsic approach, intrinsic verification can help to guide the process of program construction itself as the tightly integrated proofs serve as precise interfaces that rule out incorrect programs.

```
program vappend {m n : nat} {A : L} (xs : lvec m A) : lvec n A → lvec (m + n) A =
ln ys ⇒ match xs with
| lNil e ⇒ rew [ m0, _ ⇒ lvec (m0 + n) A ] e in ys
| lCons n0 e hd tl ⇒
  rew [ m0, _ ⇒ lvec (m0 + n) A ] e in
  lCons (n0 + n) refl hd (vappend _ _ _ tl ys)
end
```

Fig. 36. Program for Appending Linear Vectors

The computational relevancy mechanism of TLL allows irrelevant constructor arguments to be safely erased. For lvec in particular, constructor arguments surrounded by braces are erased. The structure of lvec after erasure is identical to lList . If lvec was defined verbatim in Coq, then the $n0$ argument of lCons would not be erased because nat is in the Set universe.

10.2 Sort-Polymorphism

In TLL, non-linear types and linear types are unambiguously grouped in sorts U and L respectively as shown through the sort uniqueness theorem (Theorem 3). This means that multiple versions of equivalent functions may need to be defined at different sorts, causing large amounts of code duplication. Consider the polymorphic identity functions shown in Figure 37. The first function idU is polymorphic over non-linear types and the second idL is polymorphic over linear types.

```
program idU {A : U} (x : A) : A = x
program idL {A : L} (x : A) : A = x
```

Fig. 37. Sort Monomorphic Identity Functions

In order to reduce code duplication, we implement sort-polymorphism in the TLL compiler. Toplevel declarations are allowed to quantify over sorts using sort variables. We refer to these sort quantified declarations as *sort-polymorphic schemes*. Figure 38 shows how a sort-polymorphic identity function can be defined. The $\text{id}\langle s \rangle$ scheme is parameterized by sort variable s which is then used by $\text{Type}\langle s \rangle$ to refer to the sort of type A generically.

```
program id<s> {A : Type<s>} (x : A) : A = x
```

Fig. 38. Sort Polymorphic Identity Function

It is important to note that schemes are not proper terms in TLL. Instead, the compiler attempts to instantiate the sort parameters of schemes with all possible combinations of U and L. The instantiated instances that pass type checking are elaborated into sort-monomorphic TLL terms. Conversely, instances that do not pass type checking are pruned. For schemes such as `id` where both instantiated instances are well-typed, the compiler will essentially derive `idU` and `idL` automatically and apply the correct version depending on the sort of its argument.

Sort-polymorphic schemes can also be used for deriving inductive types. Figure 39 defines a `list<s, t>` inductive type scheme whose elements are of sort `s` and that itself is of sort `t`. The `l1ist` type presented in Section 10.1 can be viewed as the instantiated instance `list<L, L>` where the elements of the list are linear and the list itself is also linear. An interesting instance that could be obtained from instantiating the `list<s, t>` scheme is `list<L, U>`. The `cons` constructor of `list<L, U>` is unsound as it enables the duplication of linear resources by first packing them into non-linear lists. To prevent such unsound situations from occurring, the `cons` constructor of `list<L, U>` is pruned, leaving `list<L, U>` with only `nil` as its constructor. In general, constructors of non-linear inductive types may only take arguments which are also non-linear. The constructors of scheme instances that do not satisfy this criteria are pruned.

```
inductive list<s, t> (A : Type<s>) : Type<t> =
| nil
| cons of (hd : A) (tl : list<s, t> A)
```

Fig. 39. Sort-Polymorphic Lists

Figure 40 presents a length function for sort-polymorphic lists. Notice that unlike the logical `llen` shown in Figure 34, the new `len<s, t>` function also returns back the original input list paired with its length. This makes `len<s, t>` sound for use as a computationally relevant program as the aforementioned memory leakage problem regarding `hd` is no longer possible. Furthermore, we can prove at the logical level that the list returned by `len<s, t>` is indeed equal to its input. Due to the fact that the `len_id<s, t>` theorem here is also sort-polymorphic, this single proof suffices to verify `len<s, t>` for all valid sort variations of lists.

```
program len<s, t> {A : Type<s>} (xs : list<_, t> A) : nat × list<_, t> A =
  match xs with
  | nil => (0, nil)
  | cons hd tl =>
    match len _ tl with
    | ⟨n, tl⟩ => ⟨S n, cons hd tl⟩
    end
  end

logical len_id<s, t> {A : Type<s>} (ls : list<_, t> A) : ls ≡ snd _ _ (len _ ls) =
  match ls as ls0 in ls0 ≡ snd _ _ (len _ ls0) with
  | nil => refl
  | cons x xs => ...
  end
```

Fig. 40. Sort-Polymorphic Length (Excerpt)

10.3 Dependent Session Types

The TLL compiler supports concurrency and facilitates communication between processes using dependent session types. Each channel type $\text{ch}\langle P \rangle$ is indexed with a protocol P describing the communication that is expected to be conducted over it. Channel types are linear, so the type system ensures that the only way to consume a channel is to execute its indexing protocol to completion. We have formalized and proven the soundness of these concurrency extensions in Coq, but due to space limitations we will not present the communication calculus in this paper. The examples presented here are meant to illustrate the applications of TLL to concurrent programming.

Specification of Concurrent Algorithms

The most immediate application for dependent session types is the precise specification of concurrent algorithms. Figure 41 demonstrates how a channel for conducting concurrent mergesort can be specified. The protocol $\uparrow(\text{uniq_} _ (\text{msort } xs)) \rightarrow \bullet$ indexing the channel type requires that a value of the singleton type $\text{uniq_} _ (\text{msort } xs)$ be sent on the channel before it can be closed. So any process with a channel of the type $\text{cmsort_ch}\langle t \rangle (xs)$ is expected to send a list that is logically equal to xs sorted by the sequential implementation of mergesort $\text{msort}\langle t \rangle$.

```

inductive uniq<t> (A : Type<t>) (a : A) : Type<t> =
| Uniq of (m : A) {pf : m ≡ a}

logical cmsort_ch<t> (xs : list<_,t> nat) : L =
  ch(  $\uparrow(\text{uniq\_} \_ (\text{msort } xs)) \rightarrow \bullet$  )

```

Fig. 41. Protocol Specification for Concurrent Mergesort

Figure 42 presents a worker function utilizing a channel c of type $\text{cmsort_ch}\langle t \rangle (zs_0)$. A list is expected to be sent on channel c along with a proof that it is exactly equal to zs_0 sorted by the sequential implementation. Notice in the splitting case for $\text{cmsort_worker}\langle t \rangle$, two child-processes are spawned by `fork` to carry out sorting for the list halves xs_0 and ys_0 in a concurrent manner. The results of the child-processes are communicated back to their parent-process through the channels r_1 and r_2 which are of types $\text{cmsort_ch}\langle t \rangle (xs_0)$ and $\text{cmsort_ch}\langle t \rangle (ys_0)$ respectively. This means that the lists xs_1 and ys_1 received from r_1 and r_2 come with proofs that they are logically equal to $\text{msort } xs_0$ and $\text{msort } ys_0$. Finally, the merged list zs_1 is sent on channel c with a proof that it is equal to the original input zs_0 sorted sequentially.

```

program cmsort_worker<t> (zs0 : list<_,t> nat) : cmsort_ch<t> zs0  $\multimap$  IO unit =
ln c  $\Rightarrow$ 
  ...
  let r1  $\Leftarrow$  fork (r1 : cmsort_ch xs0) in cmsort_worker xs0 r1 in
  let r2  $\Leftarrow$  fork (r2 : cmsort_ch ys0) in cmsort_worker ys0 r2 in
  let <msg1, r1>  $\Leftarrow$  recv r1 in
  let <msg2, r2>  $\Leftarrow$  recv r2 in
  match msg1 with Uniq xs1 pf1  $\Rightarrow$ 
  match msg2 with Uniq xs2 pf2  $\Rightarrow$ 
    let zs1 = merge xs1 xs2 in
    let c  $\Leftarrow$  send c (Uniq zs1 ...)
    in close r1; close r2; close c
  end end
  ...

```

Fig. 42. Verified Concurrent Mergesort (Excerpt)

Implicit Secrecy Synchronization

The dependent session types found in the TLL compiler have access to the same computational irrelevancy and erasure mechanism enjoyed by $\lambda 0$ -programs. For instance, $\uparrow\{x : A\} \rightarrow B$ is a protocol which expects to send a computationally irrelevant message x of type A then continue as protocol B . After erasure, the message sent in place of x is replaced by \square . At first glance, sending and receiving irrelevant messages seem to be meaningless as \square communicates no information between sender and receiver. However, one must remember that these irrelevant message can still be used to instantiate protocols, so a form of implicit synchronization can be achieved without actually sending messages across the channel.

```
logical DH (p g : nat) : proto =
  ↑{a : nat} → ↑(A : nat) → ↑{ A ≡ pow g a % p } →
  ↓{b : nat} → ↓(B : nat) → ↓{ B ≡ pow g b % p } → •
```

Fig. 43. Diffie-Hellman Session Protocol

Figure 43 demonstrates how computational irrelevancy can be used to encode the Diffie-Hellman key exchange [9] as a session type. The parameters p and g are public values that both parties agree on. From Alice's perspective, she first sends her secret value a as an irrelevant message to initialize her half of the protocol. Next, her public value A is sent as a relevant message to Bob along with a proof that A is correctly computed from values p , g and a . At this point, Alice has finished sending messages and waits for messages from Bob to complete the key exchange. She first receives Bob's secret b as an irrelevant message which initializes his half of the protocol. Later, Bob's public value B is received as a relevant message along with a proof that B is correctly computed from value p , g and b . Notice that between Alice and Bob, only the relevant messages A and B will be exchanged at runtime. The secret values a and b and other correctness proofs will be pruned by erasure because they are irrelevant. Basically, computational irrelevancy has allowed us to synchronize values implicitly while also maintaining their secrecy.

```
program alice (a : nat) (p g : nat) (ch : ch< DH p g )) : IO unit =
  let ch ← send ch a in
  let ch ← send ch (pow g a % p) in
  let ch ← send ch refl in
  let ⟨{b}, ch⟩ ← recv ch in
  let ⟨B, ch⟩ ← recv ch in
  let ⟨{pf}, ch⟩ ← recv ch in
  let s = pow B a % p in
  close ch

program bob (b : nat) (p g : nat) (ch : hc< DH p g )) : IO unit =
  let ⟨{a}, ch⟩ ← recv ch in
  let ⟨A, ch⟩ ← recv ch in
  let ⟨{pf}, ch⟩ ← recv ch in
  let ch ← send ch b in
  let ch ← send ch (pow g b % p) in
  let ch ← send ch refl in
  let s = pow A b % p in
  close ch
```

Fig. 44. Alice (holder of secret a) and Bob (holder of secret b)

Two simple programs `alice` and `bob` implementing the DH key exchange are presented in Figure 44. In this definition, the secret value `b` that `alice` receives from `bob` is computationally irrelevant. She can only use `b` in conjunction with `pf` of type $B \equiv \text{pow } g \ b \ \% \ p$ at the logical level for hypothetical reasoning since `b` will not actually be sent to her at runtime. Likewise, `bob` does not gain access to a computationally relevant copy of `a` either. One can even inspect the intermediate representation (and C code) generated for `alice` and `bob` by the compiler to confirm that secret values are not transmitted. In fact, the generated code simply assigns `□` to `b` and `a` for `alice` and `bob` respectively. Furthermore, the ability to type check `alice` and `bob` independently of each other enables modular and scalable software development.

The RSA encryption algorithm [19] can also be encoded as a session type in a similar manner by using computational irrelevancy to specify the relationship between public keys and private keys. We present a specification of the RSA protocol and a client-server pair implementing the protocol in the appendix.

11 RELATED WORK

11.1 Computational Relevancy

Over the years, a number of mechanisms have been proposed for specifying computational relevancy and program extraction. The Dependent ML (DML) of Xi [25] uses a stratified language where the static fragment is irrelevant and the dynamic fragment is relevant. A special class of indexed singleton types carries information between the statics and the dynamics. Miquel [17] introduces the Implicit Calculus of Constructions (ICC) which extends the standard Calculus of Constructions of Coquand [7] with intersection types. Intersection types allow implicitly quantified terms to be instantiated with hypothetical arguments that are not explicitly present in the syntax tree. ICC programs essentially never carry around irrelevant terms in the first place. Due to the fact that these instantiating arguments must be synthesized spontaneously without additional information from the syntax tree, type checking for ICC is undecidable. Barras and Bernardo [2] develop a decidable variation of ICC (ICC*) by requiring explicit instantiations for implicit quantifiers. An erasure procedure is then carried out to remove the arguments of implicit instantiations.

From a computational relevancy perspective, TLL can be viewed as an integration of DML style stratification and ICC* style implicit quantification. On the one hand, stratification distinguishes proofs from programs in a straightforward manner that enforces types and assumed axioms to always be irrelevant. Additionally, the operational semantics of the two levels can be tailored to better facilitate reasoning and computation independently of each other. On the other hand, implicit quantifications allow for Martin-Löf style dependency [15] which is more expressive than DML style dependency.

11.2 Combining Dependency and Linearity

Linear types are a class of type systems inspired by Girard's sub-structural Linear Logic [10]. Girard notices that the weakening and contraction rules of classical logic when restricted carefully, give rise to a new logical foundation for reasoning about resources. Wadler [24] applies an analogous restriction to variable usage in simple type theory, leading to the development of linear type theory where expressions respect resources. Programming languages featuring linear types [4] or affine-like types [21] have been implemented, allowing programmers to write resource safe software in practical applications.

Work has been done to enrich linear type theories with dependent types. Cervesato and Pfenning [5] extend LF [11] with linear types as LLF, being first to demonstrate that dependency and linearity can coexist within a type theory. The ATS programming language [26] extends DML style

dependent types with linear types to facilitate safe effectful programming. Vákár [23] presents a dependent linear type theory ILDTT with an underlying categorical semantics. Krishnaswami et al. [12] introduce a dependent linear type theory LNL_D based on Benton’s [3] prior work of mixed linear and non-linear calculus. Although LNL_D also employs a stratified type system, the stratification here is not used for specifying computational relevancy. Instead, the stratification of LNL_D is used for separating linear types from non-linear types and Miquel style intersection types are used for encoding computational relevancy.

The works described so far all prohibit types from depending on linear terms in order to prevent resource duplication within types. Luo and Zhang [14] are the first to describe a system where linear dependency is allowed. To accomplish this, they introduce the notion of *essential linearity* which points out that types are hypothetical entities so linear terms occurring inside types should not contribute to overall resource consumption. Our work is inspired by the idea of *essential linearity* and also supports linear dependency which allows one to prove theorems regarding linear programs.

Based on initial ideas of McBride [16], Atkey’s QTT [1] uses semi-ring annotations to track variable occurrence, simulating computational relevancy, linear types and affine types within a unified framework. The heap semantics analysis of Choudhury et al. [6] show that QTT requires a form of reference counting to garbage collect unneeded resources at runtime. The soundness theorems for our heap semantics guarantee TLL programs to be memory clean without runtime garbage collection.

12 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

TLL is a two-level dependent type theory that aims to characterize the nature of proofs and programs faithfully. Hosting a structural type system that is reminiscent of Martin-Löf type theory [15], the logical level derives hypothetical objects such as proofs and types which are computationally irrelevant. The program level uses the types and proofs derived at the logical level to realize a Linear Logic [10] inspired type system. Programs constructed using the program level rules can be freely reflected into the logical level for hypothetical reasoning. We develop an erasure procedure for removing irrelevant terms occurring inside programs and show that programs extracted this way maintain computational productivity. Through a heap semantics analysis we prove that extracted TLL programs run memory clean.

We plan to investigate what additional extensions are possible with the additional flexibility afforded to us by TLL’s stratified design. Currently, we have extended TLL with session type based concurrency and intend to present a detailed account of the calculus in the future. We are interested to see if our approach can be refined for specifying multiparty communication and conducting end-to-end verification of cryptographic protocols. Our ultimate goal is to strive towards a framework that synergistically unites theorem proving and practical programming.

REFERENCES

- [1] Robert Atkey. 2018. The Syntax and Semantics of Quantitative Type Theory. In *LICS '18: 33rd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, July 9–12, 2018, Oxford, United Kingdom*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3209108.3209189>
- [2] Bruno Barras and Bruno Bernardo. 2008. The Implicit Calculus of Constructions as a Programming Language with Dependent Types. In *Foundations of Software Science and Computational Structures*, Roberto Amadio (Ed.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 365–379.
- [3] Nick Benton. 1994. A Mixed Linear and Non-Linear Logic: Proofs, Terms and Models (Extended Abstract). In *CSL*.
- [4] Jean-Philippe Bernardy, Mathieu Boespflug, Ryan R. Newton, Simon Peyton Jones, and Arnaud Spiwack. 2017. Linear Haskell: practical linearity in a higher-order polymorphic language. *CoRR abs/1710.09756* (2017). arXiv:1710.09756 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1710.09756>

- [5] Iliano Cervesato and Frank Pfenning. 2002. A Linear Logical Framework. *Information and Computation* 179, 1 (2002), 19–75. <https://doi.org/10.1006/inco.2001.2951>
- [6] Pritam Choudhury, Harley Eades III, Richard A. Eisenberg, and Stephanie Weirich. 2021. A Graded Dependent Type System with a Usage-Aware Semantics. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 5, POPL, Article 50 (jan 2021), 32 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3434331>
- [7] Thierry Coquand and Gérard Huet. 1988. The calculus of constructions. *Information and Computation* 76, 2 (1988), 95–120. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(88\)90005-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(88)90005-3)
- [8] T. Coquand and A. Spiwack. 2006. A Proof of Strong Normalisation using Domain Theory. In *21st Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 307–316. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2006.8>
- [9] W. Diffie and M. Hellman. 1976. New directions in cryptography. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 22, 6 (1976), 644–654. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.1976.1055638>
- [10] Jean-Yves Girard. 1987. Linear logic. *Theoretical Computer Science* 50, 1 (1987), 1–101. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(87\)90045-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(87)90045-4)
- [11] Robert Harper, Furio Honsell, and Gordon Plotkin. 1993. A Framework for Defining Logics. *J. ACM* 40, 1 (Jan. 1993), 143–184. <https://doi.org/10.1145/138027.138060>
- [12] Neelakantan R. Krishnaswami, Pierre Pradic, and Nick Benton. 2015. Integrating Linear and Dependent Types. *SIGPLAN Not.* 50, 1 (Jan. 2015), 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2775051.2676969>
- [13] Zhaohui Luo. 1994. *Computation and Reasoning: A Type Theory for Computer Science*. Oxford University Press, Inc., USA.
- [14] Zhaohui Luo and Y Zhang. 2016. *A Linear Dependent Type Theory*. 69–70.
- [15] Per Martin-Löf. 1975. An Intuitionistic Theory of Types: Predicative Part. In *Logic Colloquium '73*, H.E. Rose and J.C. Shepherdson (Eds.). Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, Vol. 80. Elsevier, 73–118. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-237X\(08\)71945-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-237X(08)71945-1)
- [16] Conor McBride. 2016. I Got Plenty o' Nuttin'. In *A List of Successes That Can Change the World*.
- [17] Alexandre Miquel. 2001. The Implicit Calculus of Constructions Extending Pure Type Systems with an Intersection Type Binder and Subtyping. In *Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications*, Samson Abramsky (Ed.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 344–359.
- [18] Christine Paulin-Mohring. 1993. Inductive definitions in the system Coq rules and properties. In *Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications*, Marc Bezem and Jan Friso Groote (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 328–345.
- [19] R. L. Rivest, A. Shamir, and L. Adleman. 1978. A Method for Obtaining Digital Signatures and Public-Key Cryptosystems. *Commun. ACM* 21, 2 (feb 1978), 120–126. <https://doi.org/10.1145/359340.359342>
- [20] The Coq Development Team. 2020. *The Coq Proof Assistant, version 8.11.0*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.3744225>
- [21] The Rust teams. 2022. *Rust Programming Language*. <http://www.rust-lang.org/>
- [22] David N. Turner and Philip Wadler. 1999. Operational interpretations of linear logic. *Theoretical Computer Science* 227, 1 (1999), 231–248. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(99\)00054-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(99)00054-7)
- [23] Matthijs Vákár. 2014. Syntax and Semantics of Linear Dependent Types. *CoRR abs/1405.0033* (2014). arXiv:1405.0033 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1405.0033>
- [24] P. Wadler. 1990. Linear Types can Change the World!. In *Programming Concepts and Methods*.
- [25] Hongwei Xi. 2007. Dependent ML An approach to practical programming with dependent types. *Journal of Functional Programming* 17, 2 (2007), 215–286. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956796806006216>
- [26] Hongwei Xi. 2010. *The ATS Programming Language*. <http://www.ats-lang.org/>