

From Program Logics to Language Logics

Matteo Cimini

University of Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell MA 01854, USA
matteo_cimini@uml.edu

Abstract. Program logics are a powerful formal method in the context of program verification. Can we develop a counterpart of program logics in the context of language verification?

This paper proposes *language logics*, which allow for statements of the form $\{P\} \mathcal{X} \{Q\}$ where \mathcal{X} , the subject of analysis, can be a language component such as a piece of grammar, a typing rule, a reduction rule or other parts of a language definition. To demonstrate our approach, we develop \mathbb{L} , a language logic that can be used to analyze language definitions on various aspects of language design.

We illustrate \mathbb{L} to the analysis of some selected aspects of a programming language. We have also implemented an automated prover for \mathbb{L} , and we confirm that the tool repeats these analyses.

Ultimately, \mathbb{L} cannot verify languages. Nonetheless, we believe that this paper provides a strong first step towards adopting the methods of program logics for the analysis of languages.

1 Introduction

Language verification is an important part of the development of programming languages. Once we have created a programming language, there are many questions that are interesting to investigate. These questions vary greatly and they concern both *all-encompassing properties* of a language such as type soundness and relational parametricity as well as *selected aspects* of operators, grammar rules, and reduction rules, for example to determine whether the behaviour of our elimination forms is defined for all the expected values, whether we have defined all the necessary evaluation contexts, or whether contravariant arguments of type constructors are handled accordingly, to make a few examples.

In the context of program verification, program logics stand out as a powerful formal method with decades of development and myriads of success stories. Various program logics have been proposed in the literature. The seminal Floyd–Hoare logic has been applied to the verification of imperative programs [15, 17, 21]. Pointer-manipulating programs are better analyzed with separation logics [25, 30, 31], while thread-based concurrent programs with concurrent separation logics [3, 26]. Literature also offers works on program logics that are specific to higher-order functional programs [5], weak memory models [33, 34], as well as many other domains [4, 6, 20, 23].

Our question: *Can we develop a counterpart of program logics for the verification of languages?*

Language Logics. We propose *language logics*. In language logics, the subject of analysis is a language definition rather than a program. Statements in language logics have the form $\{P\} \mathcal{X} \{Q\}$ where \mathcal{X} can be the entire language at hand or some of its components such as a piece of grammar, a typing rule, a reduction rule or other parts of the language definition. Analogously to program logics, P is a precondition and Q is a postcondition. To make an example, given an inference rule r , $\{P\} r \{Q\}$ can be read “when P holds, Q holds after having added the inference rule r to the language definition”.

To demonstrate our approach, we have developed \mathbb{L} , a language logic that can be used to analyze language definitions on various aspects of programming languages. Assertions of \mathbb{L} (P and Q above) can be built with formulae that are domain-specific to the context of language design. The aim of these formulae is to reason about *selected aspects*, following the distinction made at the beginning of this section. For example, \mathbb{L} can express an assertion `contravariant`($c, \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$) that means that the arguments of the type constructor c at positions i_1, \dots, i_n are contravariant. Also, \mathbb{L} can express the assertion `effectful` that means that the language is effectful, i.e., operations can modify a state. Similarly, the assertion `ctx-compliant`(rn) means that if the reduction rule with name rn needs some expressions to be values in order to fire, then the corresponding evaluation contexts are in place for those arguments to be evaluated. Section 3 will provide the full range of formulae of \mathbb{L} .

We define the proof rules of \mathbb{L} in the style of program logics. These proof rules derive statements $\{P\} \mathcal{X} \{Q\}$ where assertions P and Q involve the formulae that we have described. The proof rules of \mathbb{L} detect common syntactic patterns for deriving assertions. As we point out in §6, they may not *guarantee* a property.

Evaluation: The Language Logic \mathbb{L} at Work. To demonstrate our language logic, we embark on a journey towards debugging the definition of a faulty language. This language has a few issues, for example it duplicates effects due to a call-by-name strategy and does not take into account that the domain of function types is contravariant. Each time that we detect an issue, we show that \mathbb{L} cannot, indeed, derive the corresponding assertion. We show, then, that after we modify the language and fix the issue we now can provide such proof derivation in \mathbb{L} .

We have implemented an automated prover for \mathbb{L} called LANG-N-ASSERT [13]. Given a statement $\{P\} \mathcal{L} \{Q\}$, the tool provides a proof derivation for it or fails, if a derivation is not found. We confirm that LANG-N-ASSERT replicates the debugging journey of the faulty language, failing to derive sought for assertions and succeeding upon fixing the issues.

We acknowledge that the verification of languages is not available to language logics yet, as we lack a soundness theorem and do not capture *all-encompassing properties*. We offer a discussion of these challenges in Section 6. Nonetheless, we believe that this paper provides a strong first step towards adopting the methods of program logics for the analysis of languages.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the elements of operational semantics. Section 3 provides the syntax and proof rules of \mathbb{L} . Section 4 applies \mathbb{L} to the analysis of our running example. Section 5 offers a comparison

between program logics and language logics. Section 6 discusses the limitations of language logics. Section 7 discusses related work and Section 8 concludes the paper.

2 Operational Semantics (Review)

Fig. 1 shows the language definition of our running example $\lambda_{\text{print}}^{\dot{\cdot}}$. This is a λ -calculus with integers, floating points, subtyping, a simple `try` error handler, and a `print` operation that adds strings into a buffer.

A language has a grammar which consists of a series of *grammar rules*, each of which defines a *syntactic category*, such as `Type` and `Expression`. Each syntactic category has a metavariable, such as T and e , and *grammar productions*, such as `Int`, `Float`, and $T \rightarrow T$ of `Type`. A language also has inference rules that define relations such as a typing, a subtyping, and a reduction relation. Each inference rule has a series of formulae called *premises* and one formula called *conclusion*. For example, $\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \text{Float}$ and $\Gamma \vdash e_2 : \text{Float}$ are premises of rule [T-DIV], and $\Gamma \vdash e_1 \div e_2 : \text{Float}$ is its conclusion. Inference rules whose conclusion can derive a \vdash -formula are called *typing rules*, those that derive a $<:-$ -formula are called *subtyping rules*, and those that derive a \longrightarrow -formula are called *reduction rules*. $\lambda_{\text{print}}^{\dot{\cdot}}$ has standard typing and subtyping relations. The reduction relation of $\lambda_{\text{print}}^{\dot{\cdot}}$ is of the form $e, s \longrightarrow e', s'$ where e is the expression to be evaluated and s is the state of the computation. The state is a string buffer. The evaluation reduces e to e' and may lead to a modified state s' . The only operation that modifies the state is `print`. As typical, we use the `Unit` type for a side-effect.

Evaluation contexts declare which arguments of an expression constructor can be evaluated, and also in which order they are to be evaluated. *Error contexts* define in which contexts we are allowed to detect the occurrence of an error and fail the overall computation. This is realized with rule [ERR-CTX]. In $\lambda_{\text{print}}^{\dot{\cdot}}$, the error `error` is generated after a division by 0.

Issues with $\lambda_{\text{print}}^{\dot{\cdot}}$: The language definition of $\lambda_{\text{print}}^{\dot{\cdot}}$ contains a few issues. (None of these issues, nor their fixes in Section 4, are a novelty of this paper.) *Issue 1*: [CBN-BETA] adopts a call-by-name strategy in the presence of effects. This may lead to the unpredictable duplication of `print`-effects. *Issue 2*: The error context `try F with e` entails that the evaluator may “steal” the error from the error handler and terminate the computation rather than letting `try` handle the error. *Issue 3*: [T-APP-BAD] mistakes the direction of the subtyping relation between the domain of the function and the type of the argument. This means, for example, that we cannot pass an integer to a function that requests `Float`.

It would be desirable to reason about these issues using proof derivations in the style of program logics.

2.1 A Syntax for Language Definitions

Program logics such as Floyd–Hoare logic work with statements $\{P\} c \{Q\}$ where c is a command with a formal syntax. Language logics analyze a language \mathcal{L} with

Disclaimer: There are a few issues, highlighted, which we discuss in Section 2.

$n \in \mathbb{N}, f \in \mathbb{R}, s \in \text{STRING}$

Type $T ::= \text{Int} \mid \text{Float} \mid T \rightarrow T \mid \text{Unit}$
 Expression $e ::= n \mid f \mid e \div e \mid x \mid \lambda x : T.e \mid (e e)$
 $\mid \text{unit} \mid \text{print } s \mid e; e$
 $\mid \text{error} \mid \text{try } e \text{ with } e$
 Value $v ::= n \mid f \mid \lambda x : T.e \mid \text{unit}$
 Error $er ::= \text{error}$
 EvalCtx $E ::= \square \mid E \div e \mid v \div E \mid (E e) \mid E; e \mid \text{try } E \text{ with } e$
 ErrorCtx $F ::= \square \mid F \div e \mid v \div F \mid (F e) \mid F; e \mid \text{try } F \text{ with } e$

Type System

$\Gamma \vdash e : T$

$\Gamma \vdash n : \text{Int} \quad \Gamma \vdash f : \text{Float} \quad \frac{[\text{T-DIV}]}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \text{Float} \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \text{Float}} \Gamma \vdash e_1 \div e_2 : \text{Float}$
 $\Gamma, x : T \vdash x : T \quad \frac{\Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash e : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : T_1. e : T_1 \rightarrow T_2} \quad \frac{[\text{T-APP-BAD}]}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T_3} \frac{T_1 <: T_3}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 e_2 : T_2}$
 $\frac{\Gamma \vdash \text{unit} : \text{Unit} \quad \Gamma \vdash \text{print } s : \text{Unit}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{error} : T} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash e_1; e_2 : T_2} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{try } e_1 \text{ with } e_2 : T_j} \frac{T_1 \vee T_2 = T_j$

Subtyping

$T <: T$

$\text{Int} <: \text{Float} \quad \text{Int} <: \text{Int} \quad \text{Float} <: \text{Float} \quad \text{Unit} <: \text{Unit}$
 $\frac{[\text{S-ARROW}]}{T'_1 <: T_1 \quad T_2 <: T'_2} T_1 \rightarrow T_2 <: T'_1 \rightarrow T'_2$

Reduction Semantics

$e, s \longrightarrow e, s$

$\frac{f_1 \div f_2, s \longrightarrow f_3, s \quad (f_2 \neq 0)}{f_1 \div 0, s \longrightarrow \text{error}, s} \quad [\text{DIV}]$
 $\frac{(\lambda x : T.e_1) e_2, s \longrightarrow e_1[e_2/x], s}{\text{print } s_2, s_1 \longrightarrow \text{unit}, s_1 + \text{“}\leftarrow\text{”} + s_2} \quad [\text{CBN-BETA}]$
 $v; e, s \longrightarrow e, s \quad [\text{PRINT}]$
 $\text{try } v \text{ with } e, s \longrightarrow v, s$
 $\text{try error with } e, s \longrightarrow e, s \quad [\text{ERR}]$
 $\frac{e, s \longrightarrow e', s'}{E[e], s \longrightarrow E[e'], s'} \quad [\text{ERR-CTX}] \quad F[er], s \longrightarrow er, s$

where f_3 is the division between f_1 and f_2 , $+$ is string concatenation, and \leftarrow is the newline return symbol

Fig. 1. Language definition of $\lambda_{\text{print}}^{\dagger}$

statements $\{P\} \mathcal{L} \{Q\}$. Analogously to program logics, \mathcal{L} must be accommodated with a formal syntax. We adopt the following syntax for language definitions from prior work [9], which is simply a grammar for operational semantics definitions.

$cname \in \text{CATNAME}$, $X \in \text{METAVar}$, $pn \in \text{PREDNAME}$, $rn \in \text{RULENAME}$
 $c, op \in \text{CONSTRUCTORNAME}$ (We use op when we know it to be an operator.)

Language	$\mathcal{L} ::= (G, I)$
Grammar	$G ::= g_1 \cdots g_n$
Grammar Rule	$g ::= cname X ::= t_1 \mid \cdots \mid t_n$
Inference System	$I ::= r_1 \cdots r_n$
Rule	$r ::= rn : \frac{f_1 \cdots f_n}{f}$
Formula	$f ::= (pn t_1 \cdots t_n)$
Term	$t ::= X \mid (c t_1 \cdots t_n) \mid (X)t \mid t[t/X]$

CATNAME contains syntactic category names. METAVar contains metavariables. CONSTRUCTORNAME contains constructor names. PREDNAME contains predicate names (names of relations), and RULENAME contains names of inference rules such as [CBN-BETA]. Terms are accommodated with a uniform syntax in abstract syntax style (top-level name applied to arguments). Formulae, as well, are in abstract syntax. For readability, however, we will use familiar syntax such as $e_1 \longrightarrow e_2$, $\Gamma \vdash e : T$, $(e_1 e_2)$, $T_1 \rightarrow T_2$, and so on, in our examples. Terms can also use unary binding $(X)t$ [7] and capture-avoiding substitution $t[t/X]$.

Prior works [9, 11, 24] have shown examples of operational semantics definitions in this syntax. $\lambda_{\text{print}}^{\dot{}}$, too, can be accommodated as a language \mathcal{L} .

3 \mathbb{L} : A Language Logic for Analyzing Languages

3.1 Syntax of \mathbb{L}

The following is the syntax of our language logic \mathbb{L} . The design idea behind the assertions of \mathbb{L} is that they state a specific aspect that is of interest in the context of language design. We have selected a handful of formulae. By no means they are all that it would be interesting to detect of a language.

Assertion	$P, Q ::= \text{inductive}(X, c, \{n_1, \dots, n_k\}) \mid \text{ctx-compliant}(rn)$ $\mid \text{handles-error}(op, n) \mid \text{effectful} \mid \text{no-dupli-ef}(op)$ $\mid \text{contravariant}(c, n) \mid \text{contra-resp}(rn, c)$ $\mid \text{true} \mid P \wedge Q \mid \neg P$
Annotated Language Component	$::= \{P\} \mathcal{L} \{Q\} \mid \{P\} G \{Q\} \mid \{P\} I \{Q\} \mid \{P\} g \{Q\} \mid \{P\} r \{Q\}$

The assertion $\text{inductive}(X, c, \{n_1, \dots, n_k\})$ holds whenever c is a top-level constructor of a grammar production of the category with metavariable X and its arguments at positions n_1, \dots , and n_k are *inductive* in that they are X also. To make an example, $\text{inductive}(T, \rightarrow, \{1, 2\})$ holds because the two arguments of the function type in $\text{Type } T ::= \dots \mid T \rightarrow T$ are inductive.

The assertion `ctx-compliant`(rn) means that if the reduction rule with name rn needs some arguments to be values (or errors) in order to fire, then the corresponding evaluation contexts are in place for those arguments. To see what `ctx-compliant` tells us, let us consider rule [DIV], which requires $f_1 \div f_2$ for values f_1 and f_2 to fire. Given a division $(e_1 \div e_2)$, the existence of evaluation contexts $E \div e$ and $v \div E$ means `ctx-compliant`([DIV]) and that e_1 and e_2 may have a chance to become f_1 and f_2 for [DIV].

The assertion `handles-error`(op, n) holds whenever a reduction rule for op exists that is “ctx-compliant”, handles an error as n -th argument of op , and error contexts are unable to detect the error at that position.

The assertion `effectful` holds whenever the language has a state and has reductions that can modify the state. `no-dupli-ef`(rn) holds whenever the step of the reduction rule rn does not duplicate arguments that may produce effects.

The assertion `contravariant`($c, \{n_1, \dots, n_k\}$) holds whenever the arguments of the type constructor c at positions n_1, \dots, n_k are contravariant. For example, `contravariant`($\rightarrow, \{1\}$) holds for the function type. `contra-resp`(rn, c) holds for the typing rule rn whenever the types in the premises of rn that appear as contravariant arguments of c are not used at the left of a subtyping formula.

An *annotated language* is a language with a pre- and postcondition: $\{P\} \mathcal{L} \{Q\}$ means that “when P holds, Q holds after having analyzed the language \mathcal{L} ”. Similarly, we have an annotated grammar, grammar rule, inference system, and inference rule. The meaning of these is analogous to that of annotated languages. For example, $\{P\} r \{Q\}$ means that “when P holds, Q holds after having added the inference rule r ”. We write $\{\}$ in lieu of $\{\text{true}\}$. The typical use of our logic is to start analyzing \mathcal{L} from $\{\}$ and derive $\{\} \mathcal{L} \{Q\}$, for an assertion Q .

3.2 Proof Rules of \mathbb{L}

Fig. 2 and 3 define the proof rules of \mathbb{L} . Fig. 2 shows the proof rules that govern the traversal of languages and their components as well as the composing of assertions. Fig. 3 shows the proof rules that analyze single grammar rules g and single inference rules r in order to derive the assertions of the previous section.

We first discuss the proof rules of Fig. 2. The design principle that they follow is that they analyze a language by reading its components one after another. Each time, the assertions that are derived are “passed” to the analysis of the rest.

Proof rule (LANG) analyzes the grammar of the language and, starting from the assertions so derived, analyzes the inference system. Proof rule (GRAMMAR) analyzes the grammar rules, one by one, in the order they are encountered. Each time, the assertions derived from a grammar rule are used as preconditions in the analysis of the next grammar rule. Proof rule (INF) is analogous to (GRAMMAR) and analyzes the inference rules in the order they are encountered. Proof rule (PERM-G) allows to analyze the grammar rules in any order. Similarly, rule (PERM-R) allows to analyze the inference rules in any order.

Proof rule (\mathcal{X} -NEUTRAL) propagates the precondition as postcondition. Rule (ITERATE) analyzes a language component to derive Q . Then, it analyzes again the same language component using Q as precondition. The last proof rule of

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{(LANG)} \\
 \frac{\frac{\{P\} G \{Q\}}{\{Q\} I \{R\}}}{\{P\} (G, I) \{R\}} \\
 \\
 \text{(GRAMMAR)} \\
 \frac{\frac{\{P_0\} g_1 \{P_1\}}{\{P_1\} g_2 \{P_2\}} \quad \dots \quad \frac{\{P_{n-1}\} g_n \{P_n\}}{\{P_n\} g_{n+1} \{P_{n+1}\}}}{\{P_0\} g_1 \dots g_n \{P_n\}} \\
 \\
 \text{(INF)} \\
 \frac{\frac{\{P_0\} r_1 \{P_1\}}{\{P_1\} r_2 \{P_2\}} \quad \dots \quad \frac{\{P_{n-1}\} r_n \{P_n\}}{\{P_n\} r_{n+1} \{P_{n+1}\}}}{\{P_0\} r_1 \dots r_n \{P_n\}} \\
 \\
 \text{(PERM-G)} \quad \text{(PERM-R)} \\
 \frac{\pi \text{ is a permutation of } g_1 \dots g_n \quad \frac{\{P\} \pi \{Q\}}{\{P\} g_1 \dots g_n \{Q\}}}{\{P\} \pi \{Q\}} \quad \frac{\pi \text{ is a permutation of } r_1 \dots r_n \quad \frac{\{P\} \pi \{Q\}}{\{P\} r_1 \dots r_n \{Q\}}}{\{P\} \pi \{Q\}} \\
 \\
 \text{(\mathcal{X}-NEUTRAL)} \\
 \frac{\{P\} \mathcal{X} \{P\}}{\{P\} \mathcal{X} \{P\}} \\
 \\
 \text{(ITERATE)} \\
 \frac{\frac{\{P\} \mathcal{X} \{Q\} \quad \{Q\} \mathcal{X} \{R\}}{\{P\} \mathcal{X} \{Q\}}}{\{P\} \mathcal{X} \{R\}} \\
 \\
 \text{(CONSEQUENCE)} \\
 \frac{P \Rightarrow P' \quad \{P'\} \mathcal{X} \{Q'\} \quad Q' \Rightarrow Q}{\{P\} \mathcal{X} \{Q\}}
 \end{array}$$

Fig. 2. Main proof rules of \mathbb{L} . We have $\mathcal{X} \in \{\mathcal{L}, G, I, g, r\}$.

Fig. 2 corresponds to the standard (CONSEQUENCE) rule of program logics. This rule allows for the strengthening of preconditions and the weakening of postconditions.

The design principle of the proof rules of Fig. 3 is: For each of the assertions in the grammar of P , we provide one or more proof rules that can derive that assertion. Such derivation is based on detecting common syntactic patterns.

Proof rule (INDUCTIVE) analyzes a grammar rule and derives an assertion $\text{inductive}(X, c, I')$ where I' is a set of indices (of arguments' positions). In this rule, $t.\text{constr}$ returns the top-level constructor of t , e.g., $(\rightarrow T T).\text{constr} = \rightarrow$. Also, $t.\text{argsIdx}(X)$ returns the positions of the arguments of t that are equal to X , e.g., $(\rightarrow T T).\text{argsIdx}(T) = \{1, 2\}$. The terms t_1, \dots, t_n are the grammar productions. The rule focuses on those terms whose top-level constructor is c (with $t_i.\text{constr} = c$). The premise $\forall i \in (\{1, \dots, n\} - I), t_i.\text{constr} \neq c$ makes sure that we select all of them. For each, we extract the position of their arguments that are X with $t_i.\text{argsIdx}(X)$. These positions are combined together in I' .

Proof rule (CTX-COMPLIANT) analyzes a reduction rule of op with name rn . This rule derives an assertion $\text{ctx-compliant}(rn)$. Assertion $\text{inductive}(E, op, I)$ is the precondition and says that the arguments of op at positions I are subject to an evaluation context. For example, $\text{inductive}(E, \div, \{1, 2\})$. The rule checks whether any argument of op is required be a value or an error for the rule to fire. This is checked with the standard grammar derivation \Rightarrow_G^* to see if those arguments are derived from the metavariable of values v or errors err . For each, we check that an evaluation context has been declared for them. Notice that this

We assume that proof rules of $\{P\} r \{Q\}$ can use the grammar G of the language. In this fig., we use symbols s for the terms of reduction formulae that form the state.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{(INDUCTIVE)} \\
\frac{I \subseteq \{1 \dots n\} \quad \forall i \in I, t_i.\text{constr} = c \quad \forall i \in (\{1, \dots, n\} - I), t_i.\text{constr} \neq c \quad I' = \bigcup_{i \in I} t_i.\text{argsIdx}(X)}{\{P\} \text{cname } X ::= t_1 \mid \dots \mid t_n \{P \wedge \text{inductive}(X, c, I')\}} \\
\\
\text{(CTX-COMPLIANT)} \\
\frac{\text{inductive}(E, op, I) \in P \quad \forall i, 1 \leq i \leq n, (err \Rightarrow_G^* t_i \vee v \Rightarrow_G^* t_i) \text{ implies } i \in I}{\{P\} rn : (op \ t_1, \dots, t_n), \tilde{s} \longrightarrow t, \tilde{s}' \{P \wedge \text{ctx-compliant}(rn)\}} \\
\\
\text{(ERROR-HANDLER)} \\
\frac{\text{ctx-compliant}(rn) \in P \quad \text{inductive}(F, op, I) \in P \quad err \Rightarrow_G^* t_i \quad i \notin I}{\{P\} rn : (op \ t_1, \dots, t_n), \tilde{s} \longrightarrow t, \tilde{s}' \{P \wedge \text{handles-error}(op, i)\}} \\
\\
\text{(EFFECTFUL)} \\
\frac{s_i \neq s'_i}{\{P\} rn : (op \ \tilde{t}), s_1, \dots, s_m \longrightarrow t, s'_1, \dots, s'_m \{P \wedge \text{effectful}\}} \\
\\
\text{(EFFECTUAL-ARGS)} \\
\frac{\text{effectful} \in P \quad \forall t \in \tilde{t}, (\nexists X \in \text{INEFFECTUAL}, X \Rightarrow_G^* t) \text{ implies } (\neg(t' \text{ is of the form } C[t, t, \dots]) \wedge \neg(t' \text{ is of the form } C[t''[t/x]]))}{\{P\} rn : (op \ \tilde{t}), \tilde{s} \longrightarrow t', \tilde{s}' \{P \wedge \text{no-dupli-ef}(rn)\}} \\
\\
\text{(CONTRAVARIANT)} \\
\{P\} rn : \frac{\tilde{f}}{(c \ T_1 \ \dots \ T_n) <: (c \ T'_1 \ \dots \ T'_n)} \{P \wedge \text{contravariant}(c, \bigcup_{(T'_i <: T_i) \in \tilde{f}} \{i\})\} \\
\\
\text{(CONTRA-RESPECTING)} \\
\frac{\text{contravariant}(c, I) \in P \quad \forall f \in \tilde{f}, f = t'' \vdash t''' : (c \ t_1 \ \dots \ t_m) \text{ implies } \forall i \in I, \neg \exists f' \in \tilde{f}, f' = t_i <: t'_i}{\{P\} rn : \frac{\tilde{f}}{\Gamma \vdash t : t'} \{P \wedge \text{contra-resp}(rn, c)\}}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 3. Proof rules for $\{P\} g \{Q\}$ and $\{P\} r \{Q\}$. Notation $\tilde{\cdot}$ denotes finite sequences.

does not mean that a reduction is sure to occur using rn . For example, rule rn may require the state to unify with a state that does not occur at runtime.

Proof rule (ERROR-HANDLER) analyzes a reduction rule of op with name rn and derives $\text{handles-error}(op, i)$. The preconditions are $\text{ctx-compliant}(rn)$ and $\text{inductive}(F, op, I)$. The latter informs about the error contexts for op . If the rule requires an argument to be an error to fire, then we check that such argument is *not* subject to an error context (with $i \notin I$).

Proof rule (EFFECTFUL) analyzes a reduction rule and derives an assertion effectful whenever one of the terms in the state is modified after the step.

Proof rule (EFFECTUAL-ARGS) analyzes a reduction rule of op with name rn and derives an assertion $\text{no-dupli-ef}(rn)$. The precondition is that the language is effectful (with $\text{effectful} \in P$). We assume that the language designer knows which syntactic categories do not produce effects. We assume that the set INEFFECTUAL contains the metavariables of these categories. For $\lambda_{\text{print}}^{\ddagger}$, $\text{INEFFECTUAL} = \{v, \text{err}\}$. The rule focuses on the arguments that cannot be derived by any of the categories of INEFFECTUAL (with $\nexists X \in \text{INEFFECTUAL}, X \Rightarrow_G^* t$). (These arguments may produce effects which may be duplicated.) For each, we check that the target of the step does not replicate it nor use it in a substitution operation. (The rule makes use of context-like notation: $C[t, t, \dots]$ for a term that contains t two or more times, and $C[t''[t/x]]$ for a term that contains a substitution that involves t .)

Proof rule (CONTRAVARIANT) analyzes the subtyping rule of a type constructor c and derives an assertion $\text{contravariant}(c, \{i_1, \dots, i_n\})$. The rule computes the indices i_1, \dots, i_n from premises of the rule of form $T'_i <: T_i$.

Proof rule (CONTRA-RESPECTING) analyzes a typing rule with name rn and derives an assertion $\text{contra-resp}(rn, c)$. The precondition is the assertion that informs about the arguments of the type constructor c that are contravariant (with $\text{contravariant}(c, I) \in P$). The rule detects those typing premises whose output type is built with c as top-level constructor, i.e., formulae of the form $t'' \vdash t''' : (c \ t_1 \ \dots \ t_m)$. For each of the arguments t_1, \dots, t_m that I labels as contravariant, say t_i , we check that the rule does not contain any premise where t_i appears at the left of a subtyping formula (with $\neg \exists f' \in \tilde{f}, f' = t_i <: t'_i$).

Some Remarks on Proof Derivations. The rules in Fig. 3 are the base case of our proof system. Each of them *adds* a new assertion. However, (CONSEQUENCE) can be used to “forget” assertions due to $P \wedge Q \Rightarrow Q$. (Appendix A shows this application.) Section 4 illustrates our language logic and when some proof derivations forget assertions it will be understood that we applied (CONSEQUENCE).

Proof rules of Fig. 3 derive *one* assertion from an inference or grammar rule. To derive multiple assertions from the same inference or grammar rule, (ITERATE) can be used recursively. (Page 13 shows an example on deriving two assertions.)

There may be inference rules r for which no proof rule applies and no statement $\{P\} r \{Q\}$ can be derived. This is a problem with rule (INF), as it would get stuck while traversing all rules. Rule (\mathcal{X} -NEUTRAL) ensures that we can at least propagate the assertion so far derived. Notice that (CONSEQUENCE) does

not simulate (\mathcal{X} -NEUTRAL) by weakening when its central premise cannot be derived.

The order in which rules are analyzed may matter. For example, subtyping rules must be analyzed before typing rules in order to derive a **contravariant** assertion for **contra-resp**. This motivates the permutation rules of Fig. 2.

4 Evaluation: The Language Logic \mathbb{L} at Work

In this section, we embark on a journey to analyze $\lambda_{\text{print}}^{\dagger}$. Each time that we encounter an issue, we show that \mathbb{L} cannot indeed derive its corresponding assertion. We show then that \mathbb{L} can make such derivation after fixing the issue.

Issue 1a: Duplicating Effects. The following program makes use of a **print**-effect before passing 2 to the function, but the effect is being duplicated.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{prg}_1 &= ((\lambda x : \text{Float}. x \div x) (\text{print} \text{“Performing a parameter passing”}; 2)), \text{“} \\ \text{prg}_1 &\longrightarrow^* 2 \div 2, \begin{array}{l} \text{“Performing a parameter passing} \\ \text{Performing a parameter passing”} \end{array} \end{aligned}$$

The problem is that function application duplicates an argument that may produce effects. Let us try to derive **no-dupli-ef**([CBN-BETA]). We do so starting from the precondition **effectful**. (We assume it for now but we show its derivation shortly.) When we try to use (EFFECTUAL-ARGS), however, there are premises that we cannot satisfy. Below, the facts that do not satisfy the rule are in red color. (Recall that $\text{INEFFECTUAL} = \{v, er\}$.)

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} (\text{EFFECTUAL-ARGS}) \\ v \in \text{INEFFECTUAL} \wedge v \Rightarrow_G^* (\lambda x : T.e_1) \text{ (* “implies” vacuously satisfied *)} \\ (\nexists X \in \text{INEFFECTUAL}, X \Rightarrow_G^* e_2) \wedge e_1[e_2/x] \text{ is of the form } C[t'[e_2/x]] \end{array}}{\{\text{effectful}\} [\text{CBN-BETA}] : (\lambda x : T.e_1) e_2, s \longrightarrow e_1[e_2/x], s \{ \dots \}}$$

We cannot apply (EFFECTUAL-ARGS) because e_2 cannot be classified as ineffectual, and the target of the step does use e_2 in a substitution (which may replicate e_2). We can debug our language by replacing [CBN-BETA] with (call-by-value)¹ [BETA] : $(\lambda x : T.e) \mathbf{v}, s \longrightarrow e[\mathbf{v}/x], s$. Below is a derivation of **no-dupli-ef**([BETA]) for the whole language.

Convention: Formulae without a proof rule name are derived with (\mathcal{X} -NEUTRAL). Colored formulae are derived afterwards using the same color.

¹ An alternative way to fix this issue could be to retain [CBN-BETA], make the functional language pure, and include monads, for example. However, we did not go that way.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\{\} [\text{PRINT}] \{\text{effectful}\}}{\{\text{effectful}\} [\text{BETA}] \{\text{noDupBeta}\}} \{\text{noDupBeta}\} r_1 \{\text{noDupBeta}\} \cdots \{\text{noDupBeta}\} r_n \{\text{noDupBeta}\}}{\{\} [\text{PRINT}] [\text{BETA}] r_1 \cdots r_n \{\text{noDupBeta}\}} \text{(INF)}}{\{\} [\text{PRINT}] [\text{BETA}] r_1 \cdots r_n \{\text{noDupBeta}\}} \text{(PERM-R)}}{\{\} G \{\}} \frac{\{\} r_1 \cdots [\text{PRINT}] \cdots [\text{BETA}] \cdots r_n \{\text{noDupBeta}\}}{\{\} (G, I) \{\text{no-dupli-ef}([\text{BETA}])\}} \text{(LANG)}$$

where $\text{noDupBeta} = \text{no-dupli-ef}([\text{BETA}])$. The premises in color are derived as follows. Below, (EFFECTUAL-ARGS) satisfies the central premise of (CONSEQUENCE) and **effectful** is forgotten in the way shown in Appendix A.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{(EFFECT)} \\
\frac{s_1 \neq (s_1 + \leftarrow + s_2)}{\{\} [\text{PRINT}] : \text{print } s_2, s_1 \rightarrow \text{unit}, s_1 + \leftarrow + s_2 \{\text{effectful}\}} \\
\text{(EFFECTUAL-ARGS \& CONSEQUENCE)} \\
\frac{v \in \text{INEFFECTUAL} \wedge v \Rightarrow_G^* (\lambda x : T.e_1) \text{ (* "implies" vacuously satisfied *)}}{v \in \text{INEFFECTUAL} \wedge v \Rightarrow_G^* v \text{ (* "implies" vacuously satisfied *)}} \\
\frac{\{\text{effectful}\} [\text{BETA}] : (\lambda x : T.e) v, s \rightarrow e[v/x], s \{\text{no-dupli-ef}([\text{BETA}])\}}{}
\end{array}$$

Issue 1b: [BETA] is Not Ctx-compliant. With [BETA], we have $\text{prg}_1 \not\rightarrow$ because the argument (`print "Performing a parameter passing"; 2`) does not evaluate. Indeed, the only evaluation context for application is $(E e)$. We see that (CTX-COMPLIANT) cannot be applied for [BETA] with $\text{inductive}(E, \text{app}, \{1\})$:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{(CTX-COMPLIANT)} \\
\frac{v \Rightarrow_G^* (\lambda x : T.e) \text{ implies } 1 \in \{1\} \text{ (* first arg of } (\lambda x : T.e) v \text{ *)}}{v \Rightarrow_G^* v \wedge 2 \notin \{1\} \text{ (* second arg of } (\lambda x : T.e) v \text{ *)}} \\
\frac{\{\text{inductive}(E, \text{app}, \{1\})\} [\text{BETA}] : (\lambda x : T.e) v, s \rightarrow e[v/x], s \{\dots\}}{}
\end{array}$$

We can debug our language by adding the evaluation context $(v E)$ (and error context $(v F)$ for completeness). We can then derive the following, where $\text{ctxApp} = \text{inductive}(E, \text{app}, \{1, 2\})$ and $\text{ctxOKBeta} = \text{ctx-compliant}([\text{BETA}])$.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\{\text{ctxApp}\} [\text{BETA}] \{\text{ctxOKBeta}\}}{\{\text{ctxOKBeta}\} r_1 \{\text{ctxOKBeta}\} \cdots \{\text{ctxOKBeta}\} r_n \{\text{ctxOKBeta}\}}{\{\text{ctxApp}\} [\text{BETA}] r_1 \cdots r_n \{\text{ctxOKBeta}\}} \text{(PERM-R)}}{\{\} G \{\text{ctxApp}\}} \frac{\{\text{ctxApp}\} r_1 \cdots [\text{BETA}] \cdots r_n \{\text{ctxOKBeta}\}}{\{\} (G, I) \{\text{ctx-compliant}([\text{BETA}])\}}$$

The premises in color are derived as follows.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{(E\ e).argsIdx(E) \cup (v\ E).argsIdx(E) = \{1\} \cup \{2\} = \{1, 2\}}{\{\} \text{ (EvalCtx } E ::= \dots \mid E\ e \mid v\ E \dots) \{ctxApp\}} \text{ (INDUCTIVE)} \\
\frac{\{\} \text{ (EvalCtx } E ::= \dots) \{ctxApp\} \quad g_1 \{ctxApp\} \cdots g_n \{ctxApp\}}{\{\} \text{ (EvalCtx } E ::= \dots) \quad g_1 \cdots g_n \{ctxApp\}} \text{ (GRAMMAR)} \\
\frac{\{\} \text{ (EvalCtx } E ::= \dots) \quad g_1 \cdots g_n \{ctxApp\}}{\{\} \text{ (EvalCtx } E ::= \dots) \quad g_1 \cdots g_n \{inductive(E, app, \{1, 2\})\}} \text{ (PERM-G)} \\
\text{(CTX-COMPLIANT \& CONSEQUENCE)} \\
\frac{P = \text{inductive}(E, app, \{1, 2\}) \quad \text{inductive}(E, app, \{1, 2\}) \in P \quad v \Rightarrow_G^* (\lambda x : T.e) \text{ implies } 1 \in \{1, 2\} \quad v \Rightarrow_G^* v \text{ implies } 2 \in \{1, 2\}}{\{P\} [\text{BETA}] : (\lambda x : T.e) v, s \longrightarrow e[v/x], s \{ctx-compliant([\text{BETA}])\}}
\end{array}$$

After this fix, we have $prg_1 \longrightarrow^* 1$, “Performing a parameter passing”.

This fix does not make `no-dupli-ef`([BETA]), previously derived, invalid. However, its proof derivation needs to use the new (syntactically different) grammar. (The same is true for program logics: Innocuous changes to the program mean that previous proof derivations do not work as they are but must use the new program even if the structure of the proof does not change.)

Issue 2: Error Handler May Be Ignored. If we test `try`, we discover the following.

$$\begin{array}{l}
prg_2 = \text{try } 2 \div 0 \text{ with } (\text{print } \text{“Division by 0 occurred”}; \text{error}), \text{“”} \\
\longrightarrow^* \text{try error with } (\text{print } \text{“Division by 0 occurred”}; \text{error}), \text{“”} \\
\longrightarrow \text{error}, \text{“”}
\end{array}$$

The last step disregarded the `with`-clause of `try`. Rule [ERR-CTX] detected the error with error context `try F` with e and failed the computation. If we attempted to apply the proof rule (ERROR-HANDLER) to `try` after having derived the error contexts of `try`, i.e., $\text{inductive}(F, \text{try}, \{1\})$, and also $\text{ctx-compliant}([\text{ERR}])$, we would fail because the red premise below holds whereas we had to satisfy the condition that such argument was *not* subject to an error context.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{(ERROR-HANDLER)} \\
\frac{\text{ctx-compliant}([\text{ERR}]) \in P \quad \text{inductive}(F, \text{try}, \{1\}) \in P \quad \text{err} \Rightarrow_G^* \text{error} \quad 1 \in \{1\}}{\{P\} [\text{ERR}] : \text{try error with } e, s \longrightarrow e, s \{ \dots \}}
\end{array}$$

We can fix this by removing that error context. This leaves `try` with no error contexts declared in `ErrCtx`. We can then derive the following, where $\text{ctxTry} = \text{inductive}(E, \text{try}, \{1\})$, $\text{tryF} = \text{inductive}(F, \text{try}, \{\})$, and $\text{errhTry} = \text{handles-error}(\text{try}, 1)$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\{ctxTry \wedge \text{tryF}\} [\text{ERR}] \{errhTry\} \quad \{errhTry\} r_1 \{errhTry\} \cdots \{errhTry\} r_n \{errhTry\}}{\{ctxTry \wedge \text{tryF}\} [\text{ERR}] r_1 \cdots r_n \{errhTry\}} \text{ (INF)} \\
\frac{\{G\} \{ctxTry \wedge \text{tryF}\} \quad \{ctxTry \wedge \text{tryF}\} r_1 \cdots [\text{ERR}] \cdots r_n \{errhTry\}}{\{\} (G, I) \{handles-error(\text{try}, 1)\}} \text{ (PERM-R)} \\
\text{(LANG)}
\end{array}$$

We need $ctxTry$ to derive **ctx-compliant** for $[ERR]$, which is required by (ERROR-HANDLER). This step is not explicit above because it is within an application of (ITERATE), which we show below.

The premises in color are derived as follows. The derivation of $ctxTry$ follows the same lines as that of $ctxApp$, and we show it in Appendix B. Then, the derivation of $tryF$ begins with $ctxTry$ as an already derived precondition.

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(INDUCTIVE)} \\ \frac{\begin{array}{l} \{\} \subseteq \{1 \dots n\} \quad (* I = \{\} \text{ as } try \text{ is not in any } t_i *) \\ I' = \{\} \quad (* \text{ as } \bigcup \text{ for } j \in \{\} \text{ is vacuously } \{\} *) \end{array}}{\{ctxTry\} (ErrCtx F ::= t_1 \mid \dots \mid t_n) \{ctxTry \wedge \text{inductive}(F, try, \{\})\}} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(ITERATE)} \\ \frac{\begin{array}{l} ctxTry \quad ctxTry \\ \{ctxTry \wedge tryF\} [ERR] \{ \wedge tryF \} \quad \{ \wedge tryF \} [ERR] \{ errhTry \} \\ \wedge ctxOKTry \quad \wedge ctxOKTry \end{array}}{\{ctxTry \wedge tryF\} [ERR] \{ \text{error-handler}(try, 1) \}} \end{array}$$

where $ctxOKTry = \text{ctx-compliant}([ERR])$. The derivation of $ctxOKTry$ (first premise of (ITERATE)) follows the same lines as that of $ctxOKBeta$ for application, and we show it in Appendix C. The second premise is derived as follows.

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(ERROR-HANDLER \& CONSEQUENCE)} \\ \frac{\begin{array}{l} P = ctxTry \wedge \text{inductive}(F, try, \{\}) \wedge \text{ctx-compliant}([ERR]) \\ \text{ctx-compliant}([ERR]) \in P \quad \text{inductive}(F, try, \{\}) \in P \\ err \Rightarrow_G^* \text{error} \quad 1 \notin \{\} \end{array}}{\{P\} [ERR] : \text{try error with } e, s \longrightarrow e, s \{ \text{handles-error}(try, 1) \}} \end{array}$$

After this fix, we have $prg_2 \longrightarrow^* \text{error}$, “Division by 0 occurred”.

Issue 3: Typing Rule Does Not Respect Contravariance. Program prg_1 does not type check successfully. (To recall, $prg_1 = ((\lambda x : \text{Float}. x \div x) (\text{print } \dots; 2))$, “”, where we omitted the string for brevity.) The reason is that (T-APP-BAD) requires the type of the domain of the function to be a subtype of the type of argument, which is not consistent with the contravariance of function types. This means that we need $\text{Float} <: \text{Int}$ in our example, which does not hold. If we try to apply (CONTRA-RESPECTING) to (T-APP-BAD) after having derived that the domain of function types is contravariant ($\text{contravariant}(\rightarrow, \{1\})$), we would fail:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(CONTRA-RESPECTING)} \\ \frac{\begin{array}{l} P = \text{contravariant}(\rightarrow, \{1\}) \quad \text{contravariant}(\rightarrow, \{1\}) \in P \\ f = \Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \wedge 1 \in \{1\} \wedge \exists \text{premise } T_1 <: T_3 \end{array}}{\{P\} [\text{T-APP-BAD}] : \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T_3 \quad T_1 <: T_3}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 e_2 : T_2}} \{ \dots \}} \end{array}$$

We can fix our language by replacing [T-APP-BAD] with the correct typing rule:

$$[\text{T-APP}]: \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T_3 \quad \boxed{T_3 <: T_1}}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 e_2 : T_2}$$

After this, *prg*₁ type checks successfully. We also can derive the following, where *contra* = **contravariant**($\rightarrow, \{1\}$) and *contraOK* = **contra-resp**([T-APP], \rightarrow).

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\{\} [\text{S-ARROW}] \{\text{contra}\} \quad \{\text{contra}\} [\text{T-APP}] \{\text{contraOK}\}}{\{\text{contraOK}\} r_1 \{\text{contraOK}\} \cdots \{\text{contraOK}\} r_n \{\text{contraOK}\}} \quad (\text{INF})}{\{\} [\text{S-ARROW}] [\text{T-APP}] r_1 \cdots r_n \{\text{contraOK}\}} \quad (\text{PERM-R})}{\{\} G \{\} \quad \{\} r_1 \cdots [\text{T-APP}] \cdots [\text{SUB-ARROW}] \cdots r_n \{\text{contraOK}\}} \quad (\text{LANG})}{\{\} (G, I) \{\text{contra-resp}([\text{T-APP}], \rightarrow)\}}$$

The premises in color are derived as follows. Below, $\{1\}$ is the result of $\bigcup_{(T'_i <: T_i) \in \tilde{f}} \{i\}$ where only $T'_1 <: T_1$ contributes.

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{CONTRAVARIANT}) \\ & \{\} [\text{S-ARROW}] : \frac{T'_1 <: T_1 \quad T_2 <: T'_2}{T_1 \rightarrow T_2 <: T'_1 \rightarrow T'_2} \{\text{contravariant}(\rightarrow, \{1\})\} \\ & (\text{CONTRA-RESPECTING \& CONSEQUENCE}) \\ & \frac{P = \text{contravariant}(\rightarrow, \{1\}) \quad \text{contravariant}(\rightarrow, \{1\}) \in P \quad f = \Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \text{ implies } \neg \exists \text{premise } T_1 <: t'_i}{\{P\} [\text{T-APP}] : \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T_3 \quad T_3 <: T_1}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 e_2 : T_2} \{\text{contraOK}\}} \end{aligned}$$

Implementation. We have implemented an automated prover for the logic \mathbb{L} in OCaml. The tool is called LANG-N-ASSERT [13] and takes in input the elements of a statement: a precondition assertion, a language definition, and a postcondition. Language definitions are given in a textual representation, an example is in Appendix E. The output is a proof derivation or a no-proof-found error message.

LANG-N-ASSERT is a *forward reasoner*. It starts from the input precondition (which ordinarily is $\{\}$) and analyzes all the grammar and inference rules. For each, LANG-N-ASSERT tries all the (base case) proof rules of Fig. 3, once, to derive their assertions. These are a finite number of attempts. After having analyzed the language, LANG-N-ASSERT has accumulated all the assertions derived. To avoid non-determinism, we use (CONSEQUENCE) only at the end to single out the goal assertion, and we do not apply permutation rules except at the beginning to place subtyping rules before typing rules because (CONTRA-RESP) needs **contravariant**. Since (ERROR-HANDLER) needs **ctx-compliant** of the *same rule*, we always apply (CTX-COMPLIANT) before (ERROR-HANDLER).

We have applied LANG-N-ASSERT to the debugging of $\lambda_{\text{print}}^{\ddagger}$. We confirm that we can repeat the debugging journey of Section 4. (*Issue 1a*): LANG-N-ASSERT

fails to derive `no-dupli-ef`([CBN-BETA]) but `no-dupli-ef`([BETA]) succeeds after we use [BETA]. (*Issue 1b*): Then, `ctx-compliant`([BETA]) fails, but it succeeds after we fix the issue. (*Issue 2*): Then, `handles-error`(*try*, 1) fails, so we fix the issue and it succeeds. (*Issue 3*): Finally, `contra-resp`([T-APP-BAD], \rightarrow) fails, but with [T-APP] we have that `contra-resp`([T-APP], \rightarrow) succeeds. The tools' proofs differ from those in this paper, as they accumulate all assertions, for example.

Our tool website carefully documents all these tests and contains others [13].

5 Comparison with Program Logics

Program logics define the proof rules of $\{P\} c \{Q\}$ by induction on c . That is, there is a proof rule for `if`, assignment, `while`, and so on. These proof rules are based on the invariants that we learn after executing a command. In language logics: What do we learn from adding the inference rule $f_1 \wedge f_2 \cdots f_n \implies f$ (here in implicational notation) into a language? Akin to adding a formula into a theory, we learn the formula itself. A same approach does not seem to be helpful in language logics. Therefore, our proof rules are based on the structure of \mathcal{L} only to traverse the language and reach grammar rules g and inference rules r . For g and r , our proof rules are defined by cases on the grammar of assertions.

There are three major implications from designing the proof rules around assertions. 1) When program logics analyze a command (`op \tilde{t}`), an assertion $\{P\} (\text{op } \tilde{t}) \{Q\}$ always exists. This would not be true in language logics, therefore we added (\mathcal{X} -NEUTRAL). 2) Program logics tend to derive a postcondition that exhaustively characterizes the invariants learned from executing a command. On the contrary, language logics focus on one aspect at a time and therefore we added (ITERATE). 3) Lacking that exhaustive character for postconditions, language logics face challenges w.r.t. soundness and completeness (See Sect. 6). (Another remark is that we have not used negated assertions $\neg P$ in our examples. Appendix D provides an example of a possible proof rule that involves negation.)

6 Limitations of Language Logics

Proof rules of \mathbb{L} derive assertions based on syntactic patterns. We therefore have difficulties with soundness and completeness, which we do not offer.

Soundness Challenge: (EFFECTUAL-ARGS) only considers explicit duplication or substitution. However, if a reduction rule makes use of a term linearly but in the context of a user-defined operation that acts like substitution, the rule unsoundly derives a `no-dupli-ef` assertion. Also, we derive `effectful` based on syntactic (in)equality between two states. If two distinct constants \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} for states are handled indistinguishably by a language, a reduction rule $t, \mathbf{a} \longrightarrow t', \mathbf{b}$ unsoundly derives `effectful` for the language. Similar remarks can be made for the other assertions of \mathbb{L} . It is a challenge to design proof rules that guarantee a property while taking into account everything else that is in the language. Another challenge is in formulating a soundness statement for some aspects.

Completeness Challenge: The checks that our proof rules perform are by no means complete. To make an example, consider a typing rule with three premises $\Gamma \vdash e : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$, (*userDefinedEqual* $T_1 T_3$), and $T_1 <: T_3$. The latter two premises are unnecessary given that *userDefinedEqual* is equality (we assume), and subtyping is reflexive. (CONTRAVARIANT-RESPECTING) detects T_1 at the left of $<:$ and does not derive *contra-resp*. This is an example where a property holds but our proof system does not derive that. To address this, the proof rule would have to thoroughly understand the relation between T_1 and T_3 (but notice that *userDefinedEqual* may be complex at will, while encoding equality at the end.) Other assertions of \mathbb{L} suffer from similar issues. It is a challenge for language logics to completely characterize a property within proof rules.

Challenge w.r.t. All-encompassing Properties: Following the distinction made at the beginning of Section 1, \mathbb{L} applies to selected aspects of languages. It is unclear how to capture all-encompassing properties such as type soundness, strong normalization, and non-interference. Surely, \mathbb{L} must be extended. For the progress theorem, for example, a well-typed $(e_1 e_2)$ derives the “progress” of e_1 and e_2 by induction (as they are well-typed) before finding a reduction for all cases. Therefore, \mathbb{L} needs inductive reasoning, at least, which now is missing.

7 Related Work

We have discussed program logics in §5. We address here related work in *language-parametrized* language validation, i.e., where the language is given as input.

Much work is on testing random programs that are automatically generated from language definitions [2, 16, 22, 29]. Also, Robertson et al. [32] propose a model checking approach to testing the type soundness of a language in input. These works differ from the approach with language logics in that they do not provide a proof derivation in a formal proof system.

Some other works do establish a result by means of a proof. For example, Veritas [18] and Twelf [27] make use of automated theorem proving to establish the type soundness of a certain class of languages. Intrinsic typing leverages the meta-theoretic properties of a type theory to derive type soundness from a well-typed evaluator [1, 8, 19]. The work in [10] and [14] applies/imposes the structure of a certain type soundness proof to a limited class of languages. These works differ in that they specifically target type soundness. On the contrary, language logics can flexibly analyze various aspects. (On the other hand, it is unclear how to capture type soundness with language logics.)

LANG-SQL [12] can flexibly interrogate languages over various aspects with customizable queries. However, these queries do not provide a proof derivation.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed the idea of *language logics* as a counterpart of program logics in the context of language verification. We have developed an example of language logic, \mathbb{L} , and we have applied it to the analysis of a faulty

programming language and its debugging fixes. We have also implemented an automated prover for \mathbb{L} called LANG-N-ASSERT. We confirm that LANG-N-ASSERT replicates the analyses that we performed on the faulty language. Finally, we have provided a discussion of the limitations of language logics.

We acknowledge that language logics do not achieve language verification yet, and we have offered in Section 6 a discussion of the main challenges in this regard. Nonetheless, we believe that this paper provides a strong first step towards adopting the methods of program logics for the analysis of languages.

In the future, we would like to address the challenges described in Section 6, and hopefully elevate language logics to a full formal method for language verification. We would like to extend \mathbb{L} with assertions on other aspects of programming languages. Inspired by Software Foundations [28], we would like to formalize \mathbb{L} in Coq so that proof derivations can be certified.

LANG-N-ASSERT is publicly available and contains all our tests [13].

References

1. Nick Benton, Chung-Kil Hur, Andrew Kennedy, and Conor McBride. Strongly typed term representations in coq. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 49(2):141–159, 2012.
2. Stefan Berghofer and Tobias Nipkow. Random testing in isabelle/hol. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Software Engineering and Formal Methods*, SEFM '04, pages 230–239, USA, 2004. IEEE Computer Society.
3. Stephen Brookes. A semantics for concurrent separation logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 375(1):227–270, 2007. Festschrift for John C. Reynolds’s 70th birthday.
4. Quentin Carbonneaux, Noam Zilberstein, Christoph Klee, Peter W. O’Hearn, and Francesco Zappa Nardelli. Applying formal verification to microkernel ipc at meta. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs*, CPP 2022, page 116–129, New York, NY, USA, 2022. ACM.
5. Arthur Charguéraud. Program verification through characteristic formulae. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming*, ICFP '10, page 321–332, New York, NY, USA, 2010. ACM.
6. Haogang Chen, Daniel Ziegler, Tej Chajed, Adam Chlipala, M. Frans Kaashoek, and Nikolai Zeldovich. Using crash hoare logic for certifying the fscq file system. In *Proceedings of the 25th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, SOSP '15, page 18–37, New York, NY, USA, 2015. Association for Computing Machinery.
7. James Cheney. Toward a general theory of names: Binding and scope. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM SIGPLAN Workshop on Mechanized Reasoning about Languages with Variable Binding*, MERLIN '05, pages 33–40, New York, NY, USA, 2005. ACM.
8. A. Church. A formulation of the simple theory of types. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 5:56–68, 1940.
9. Matteo Cimini. A calculus for multi-language operational semantics. In *Software Verification: 13th International Conference, VSTTE 2021, New Haven, CT, USA, October 18–19, 2021, and 14th International Workshop, NSV 2021, Los Angeles, CA, USA, July 18–19, 2021, Revised Selected Papers*, page 25–42, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2021. Springer-Verlag.

10. Matteo Cimini. Lang-n-prove: A dsl for language proofs. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Software Language Engineering, SLE 2022*, pages 16–29, New York, NY, USA, 2022. ACM.
11. Matteo Cimini. Lang-n-send: Processes that send languages. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Programming Language Approaches to Concurrency- and Communication-cEntric Software (PLACES 2022)*, volume 356, pages 46–56, 2022.
12. Matteo Cimini. A query language for language analysis. In Bernd–Holger Schlingloff and Ming Chai, editors, *Software Engineering and Formal Methods - 20th International Conference, SEFM 2022, Berlin, Germany, September 26-30, 2022, Proceedings*, volume 13550 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 57–73, Cham, Switzerland, 2022. Springer.
13. Matteo Cimini. Lang-n-assert. <https://github.com/mcimini/lang-n-assert>, 2024.
14. Matteo Cimini, Dale Miller, and Jeremy G. Siek. Extrinsicly typed operational semantics for functional languages. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Software Language Engineering, SLE 2020, Virtual Event, USA, November 16-17, 2020*, pages 108–125, 2020.
15. Edsger W. Dijkstra. Guarded commands, nondeterminacy and formal derivation of programs. *Commun. ACM*, 18(8):453–457, aug 1975.
16. Burke Fetscher, Koen Claessen, Michał Pałka, John Hughes, and Robert Bruce Findler. Making random judgments: Automatically generating well-typed terms from the definition of a type-system. In Jan Vitek, editor, *European Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems (ESOP 2015)*, pages 383–405, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2015. Springer.
17. Robert W. Floyd. Assigning meanings to programs. *Proceedings of Symposium on Applied Mathematics*, 19:19–32, 1967.
18. Sylvia Grewe, Sebastian Erdweg, Pascal Wittmann, and Mira Mezini. Type systems for the masses: Deriving soundness proofs and efficient checkers. In *2015 ACM International Symposium on New Ideas, New Paradigms, and Reflections on Programming and Software (Onward!)*, Onward! 2015, pages 137–150, New York, NY, USA, 2015. ACM.
19. Robert Harper and Chris Stone. A type-theoretic interpretation of Standard ML. In Gordon Plotkin, Colin Stirling, and Mads Tofte, editors, *Proof, Language, and Interaction: Essays in Honor of Robin Milner*. MIT Press, 2000.
20. Jonas Kastberg Hinrichsen, Jesper Bengtson, and Robbert Krebbers. Actris: session-type based reasoning in separation logic. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 4(POPL), dec 2019.
21. C. A. R. Hoare. An axiomatic basis for computer programming. *Communications of the ACM*, 12(10):576–580, oct 1969.
22. Casey Klein and Robert Bruce Findler. Randomized testing in plt redex. In *2009 Workshop on Scheme and Functional Programming*, pages 26–36. ACM, 2009.
23. Alexandre Moine, Sam Westrick, and Stephanie Balzer. Dislog: A separation logic for disentanglement. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 8(POPL), jan 2024.
24. Benjamin Mourad and Matteo Cimini. A calculus for language transformations. In *46th International Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Informatics (SOFSEM 2020)*, pages 547–555. Springer, 2020.
25. Peter W. O’Hearn, John C. Reynolds, and Hongseok Yang. Local reasoning about programs that alter data structures. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Workshop on Computer Science Logic, CSL ’01*, page 1–19, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2001. Springer-Verlag.

26. Peter W. O’Hearn. Resources, concurrency, and local reasoning. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 375(1):271–307, 2007. Festschrift for John C. Reynolds’s 70th birthday.
27. Frank Pfenning and Carsten Schürmann. System description: Twelf - a meta-logical framework for deductive systems. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Automated Deduction: Automated Deduction, CADE-16*, pages 202–206, London, UK, UK, 1999. Springer-Verlag.
28. Benjamin C. Pierce, Arthur Azevedo de Amorim, Chris Casinghino, Marco Gaboardi, Michael Greenberg, Cătălin Hrițcu, Vilhelm Sjöberg, Andrew Tolmach, and Brent Yorgey. *Programming Language Foundations*, volume 2 of *Software Foundations*. Electronic textbook, 2018.
29. Daniel Ratiu and Markus Voelter. Automated testing of dsl implementations: Experiences from building mbeddr. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Automation of Software Test, AST ’16*, pages 15–21, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery.
30. John C Reynolds. Intuitionistic reasoning about shared mutable data structure. *Millennial perspectives in computer science*, 2(1):303–321, 2000.
31. John C. Reynolds. Separation logic: A logic for shared mutable data structures. In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS ’02*, page 55–74, USA, 2002. IEEE Computer Society.
32. Michael Roberson, Melanie Harries, Paul T. Darga, and Chandrasekhar Boyapati. Efficient software model checking of soundness of type systems. In Gail E. Harris, editor, *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Object-Oriented Programming Systems Languages and Applications, OOPSLA ’08*, pages 493–504, New York, NY, USA, 2008. ACM.
33. Kasper Svendsen, Jean Pichon-Pharabod, Marko Doko, Ori Lahav, and Viktor Vafeiadis. A separation logic for a promising semantics. In Amal Ahmed, editor, *Programming Languages and Systems*, pages 357–384, Cham, 2018. Springer International Publishing.
34. Viktor Vafeiadis and Chinmay Narayan. Relaxed separation logic: a program logic for c11 concurrency. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 48(10):867–884, oct 2013.

A Forgetting Assertions with (CONSEQUENCE)

When $\{P\} \mathcal{X} \{P \wedge Q\}$ can be derived, we can forget P with

$$\frac{\text{(CONSEQUENCE)} \quad P \Rightarrow P \quad \{P\} \mathcal{X} \{P \wedge Q\} \quad P \wedge Q \Rightarrow Q}{\{P\} \mathcal{X} \{Q\}}$$

B Derivation of $\{\} G \{ctxTry \wedge tryF\}$ and $ctxTry$

Recall $ctxTry = \text{inductive}(E, try, \{1\})$ and $tryF = \text{inductive}(F, try, \{\})$. The analysis of the whole grammar G derives $\{\} G \{ctxTry \wedge tryF\}$ as follows.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \{\} (\text{EvalCtx } E ::= \dots) \{ctxTry\} \\ \{ctxTry\} (\text{ErrCtx } F ::= \dots) \{ctxTry \wedge tryF\} \\ \{ctxTry \wedge tryF\} g_1 \{ctxTry \wedge tryF\} \\ \dots \\ \{ctxTry \wedge tryF\} g_n \{ctxTry \wedge tryF\} \end{array}}{\begin{array}{c} \{\} (\text{EvalCtx } E ::= \dots) (\text{ErrCtx } F ::= \dots) g_1 \dots g_n \{ctxTry \wedge tryF\} \\ \{\} g_1 \dots g_n (\text{EvalCtx } E ::= \dots) (\text{ErrCtx } F ::= \dots) \{ctxTry \wedge tryF\} \end{array}} \begin{array}{l} \text{(GRAM.)} \\ \text{(PERM-G)} \end{array}$$

where the statement above in blue color has been derived in Section 4, page 13, and the statement in magenta color is derived as follows.

$$\frac{\text{(INDUCTIVE)} \quad (\text{try } E \text{ with } e).argsIdx(E) = \{1\}}{\{\} (\text{EvalCtx } E ::= \dots \mid \text{try } E \text{ with } e \dots) \{\text{inductive}(E, try, \{1\})\}}$$

C Derivation of $ctxOKTry$

Recall $ctxOKTry = \text{ctx-compliant}([\text{ERR}])$, $ctxTry = \text{inductive}(E, try, \{1\})$.

$$\frac{\text{(CTX-COMPLIANT)} \quad \begin{array}{c} P = ctxTry \wedge tryF \quad \text{inductive}(E, try, \{1\}) \in P \\ er \Rightarrow_G^* \text{error implies } 1 \in \{1\} \text{ (* error is at position 1 *)} \end{array}}{\{P\} [\text{ERR}] : \text{try error with } e, s \longrightarrow e, s \{P \wedge \text{ctx-compliant}([\text{ERR}])\}}$$

D Example of a Proof Rule with Negated Assertions

As in program logics, (CONSEQUENCE) uses implication \Rightarrow . The first premise $P \Rightarrow P'$ of (CONSEQUENCE) can be the implication $\text{inductive}(F, try, \{\}) \Rightarrow \neg \text{inductive}(F, try, \{1, 2\})$. This implication holds, as it says “since no arguments of try is F , it is not the case that the arguments at positions 1 and 2 are F .” Proof rule (ERROR-HANDLER) could be equivalently written in the following way. (Notice $i \in I$ rather than $i \notin I$.)

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{(ERROR-HANDLER-WITH-NEGATION)} \\
\text{ctx-compliant}(rn) \in P \quad (\neg\text{inductive}(F, op, I)) \in P \\
\text{err} \Rightarrow_G^* t_i \quad i \in I \\
\hline
\{P\} rn : (op\ t_1, \dots, t_n), \tilde{s} \longrightarrow t, \tilde{s}' \{P \wedge \text{handles-error}(op, i)\}
\end{array}$$

This was our first design of (ERROR-HANDLER) but we ultimately decided that it was unnecessarily complicated to require a step through (CONSEQUENCE), and we simplified the proof rule. For the sake of generality, we have kept negated assertions $\neg P$ in the grammar.

E Example of Language Definition in LANG-N-ASSERT

Language definitions are text files with extension `.lan`. The following is the language definition for the λ -calculus (with booleans as base case). The “`<==`” symbol should be read as “provided that”. Rule [T-VAR] is automatically considered.

```

Expression E ::= true | false | x | (abs T (x)E) | (app E E)
Type T ::= bool | (arrow T T)
Value V ::= true | false | (abs T (x)E)
Context C ::= [] | (app C E) | (app V C)

```

```

[T-TRUE]
Gamma |- true : bool.

```

```

[T-FALSE]
Gamma |- false : bool.

```

```

[T-ABS]
Gm |- (abs T (x)E) : (arrow T T') <== Gm, x : T |- E : T'.

```

```

[T-APP]
Gamma |- (app E1 E2) : T2 <== Gamma |- E1 : (arrow T1 T2)
/\ Gamma |- E2 : T1.

```

```

[BETA]
(app (abs T (x)E) V) --> E[V/x] <== value V.

```

(This type of textual form for languages is not a novelty of LANG-N-ASSERT. It is indeed inspired by the style that the Ott tool² has adopted long ago.)

² <https://github.com/ott-lang/ott>