```
1999 CST Part II Denotational Semantics, paper 9, 9,10
       Closed PCF terms M, M': Z are contextually
    equivalent, M_1 \cong_{\mathsf{ct}_X} M_2 : \mathsf{T}, if:
        for all contexts C[-] satisfying
         E[Mi], E[M2]: Y for r = bool or r = nat
        and for all values V:\gamma, it is the case that
              C[M_1] \downarrow_{\gamma} V \iff C[M_2] \downarrow_{\gamma} V.
     Failure of full abstraction: for all PCF types T,
     and closed terms M, , M2: T, whilst one does
     nave
           [M,] = [M_2] \in [T] \implies M_1 \cong_{ct_X} M_2 : T
     the converse implication does not necessarily
     hold.
         For example, define
          Mi = fn f: bool > (bool > bool).
                       if f true \Omega then
                          if f\Omega true then
                            if ffalse false then I else Bi
                         else si
2 Where B_1 = true, B_2 = false & \Omega = fix x:bool. x.
    Then claim:
    (1) \quad \mathbb{L} M_1 \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{L} M_2 \mathbb{I} \in (\mathbb{B}_{\perp} \to (\mathbb{B}_{\perp} \to (\mathbb{B}_{\perp} \to \mathbb{B}_{\perp})) \to \mathbb{B}_{\perp}.
```

(2) M1 =ctx M2: (bool - (bool - bool)) -> bool.

```
Proof & (1)
```

We use the parallel-or function por ∈ B₁ → (B₁ → B₁), the unique continuous (indeed, unique monotone) Junction satisfying

por true 1 = true por 1 true = true por false false = false

(all the other values of porbb' can be deduced

from these by monotonicity).

By definition of M, M2 we can calculate that $\{[M_1](por) = [B_1] = true \}$ $\{[M_2](por) = [B_2] = false \}$ and hence [M] + [M]2.

Yvort of (2)

We use the following extensionality properties of =dx:

(3) for all F, E : T > T'

(∀A: T. FiA =dx EiA: T') ⇒ Fi = E: T→ T'

(4) for all B1, B2: book

(∀ V∈ {true false}. B, V book V \ B2 V book V)

 $\Rightarrow B_1 \cong d_X B_2 : book.$

So to prove (2), by (3)&(4) it suffices to

that for all A: bool - (boul - bool) and for VE {thre, false} that
(5) MIA Ibout V (\$\ightarrow M_2 A U book V This holds because in fact for all such A MiA diverges (i=1,2). tor, by definition of M; and of evaluation MiA Upon V holds only if (6) { M; true Ω V_{bool} true M; Ω true V_{bool} true M; false false V_{bool} false Apply the <u>Soundness property</u> of [] w.r.t it: to (6) to deduce [M;] true = true [M;] 1 true = true [M;] false false = false (using fact that [si] = 1 ∈ B1) So by the property uniquely defining por, we have [Mi] = por. But fact: 7 M: bool- (bool-bool) with [M] = por. Hence can't have M; A I V; SO (5) does indeed hold.

15

(20)