
Relational Reasoning (Relationel ræsonnement)

Mathias Pedersen, 201808137

Bachelor Report (15 ECTS) in Computer Science

Advisor: Amin Timany

Department of Computer Science, Aarhus University

November 2021

Abstract

►in English...◄

*Mathias Pedersen,
Aarhus, November 2021.*

Contents

Abstract	iii
1 Introduction	1
2 Definition of Language	3
2.1 The language	3
2.1.1 Syntax	4
2.1.2 Typing rules	5
2.1.3 Dynamics	5
2.2 Properties of the language	6
2.2.1 Evaluation Context	6
2.2.2 substitution	9
2.2.3 Normalization	9
2.2.4 Determinacy	9
3 Contextual Equivalence	11
3.1 Definition of Contextual Equivalence	11
3.2 Alternative Definition of Contextual Equivalence	13
4 Logical Relations Model for Contextual Equivalence	19
4.1 Logical Relations	19
4.2 Defining the Logical Relations Model	19
4.3 Compatibility lemmas	20
4.4 Properties of LR	26
5 Examples of Application of Contextual Equivalence	27
5.1 Identity	27
5.1.1 Identity reduction	27
5.1.2 Identity Contextual Equivalence	28
5.2 Empty type	29
5.3 Commutativity	29
5.4 Idempotency	29
5.5 Lam hoisting	30
6 Comparison to Other Work and Ideas for Future Work	31

7 Conclusion	33
Acknowledgments	35
Bibliography	37
A The Technical Details	39
A.1 Congruence Rules for Alternative Definition of Contextual Equivalence	40
A.2 Additional results	41

Chapter 1

Introduction

- motivate and explain the problem to be addressed◄
- get your bibtex entries from <https://dblp.org/>◄

Chapter 2

Definition of Language

►create draft◄

To talk about contextual equivalence of programs, we first need to define a language, which captures what programs can be. Consequently, the choice of language influences the definition of contextual equivalence. We will see specifically how this manifests when we reach chapter 3. In this chapter, we will focus on formally defining the language, and showing some facts about it, which will be useful in later chapters.

2.1 The language

We define the language in three parts: the syntax, the typing rules, and finally the dynamics (semantics). The language we will be working with is generally referred to as *System F*, and we shall do so here as well. However, the features included in this language may be different from other presentations. We note here that we will be working with a Curry-style language, as opposed to a Church-style language. This essentially just means that types are not an intrinsic part of the semantics. Instead, types become a property that programs can have. Thus, we may attempt to evaluate a program even though it has type-errors.

2.1.1 Syntax

The syntax captures exactly all programs that can be written in our language. We define it in Backus-Naur form as follows:

$e ::= ()$	(unit value)
x	(variables)
$\bar{n} \mid e + e \mid e - e \mid e \leq e \mid e < e \mid e = e$	(integers)
$\text{true} \mid \text{false} \mid \text{if } e \text{ then } e \text{ else } e$	(booleans)
$(e, e) \mid \text{fst } e \mid \text{snd } e$	(products)
$\text{inj}_1 e \mid \text{inj}_2 e \mid \text{match } e \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow e \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow e \text{ end}$	(sums)
$\lambda x. e \mid e e$	(functions)
$\Lambda e \mid e _$	(polymorphism)
$v ::= () \mid \bar{n} \mid \text{true} \mid \text{false} \mid (v, v) \mid \text{inj}_1 v \mid \text{inj}_2 v \mid \lambda x. e \mid \Lambda e$	(values)
$\tau ::= \text{Unit} \mid \mathbb{Z} \mid \mathbb{B} \mid \tau \times \tau \mid \tau + \tau \mid \tau \rightarrow \tau \mid \forall X. \tau$	(types)
$K ::= [] \mid K + e \mid v + K \mid K - e \mid v - K \mid K \leq e \mid v \leq K \mid K < e \mid v < K \mid$ $K = e \mid v = K \mid \text{if } K \text{ then } e \text{ else } e \mid (K, e) \mid (v, K) \mid \text{fst } K \mid \text{snd } K \mid$ $\text{inj}_1 K \mid \text{inj}_2 K \mid \text{match } K \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow e \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow e \text{ end} \mid K e \mid v K \mid K _$	(evaluation context)

All programs in our language can be derived using the rules above. Evaluation contexts will be used when we get to defining the dynamics. Note that programs in our language may not necessarily make "sense". For example, using the rules above, we can construct the program $\text{true} + 1$. To avert this problem, we introduce the typing rules, which will allow us to only talk about well-typed programs.

2.1.2 Typing rules

The typing rules gives us a way to derive the type of a program in our language. They are defined using inference rules as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c} \text{T-VAR} \\ \frac{(x : \tau) \in \Gamma}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash x : \tau} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{T-UNIT} \\ \frac{}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash () : \text{Unit}} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{T-INT} \\ \frac{}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \bar{n} : \mathbb{Z}} \end{array} \\[10pt]
\begin{array}{c} \text{T-ADD} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \mathbb{Z} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \mathbb{Z}}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 + e_2 : \mathbb{Z}} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{T-SUB} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \mathbb{Z} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \mathbb{Z}}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 - e_2 : \mathbb{Z}} \end{array} \\[10pt]
\begin{array}{c} \text{T-LE} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \mathbb{Z} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \mathbb{Z}}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \leq e_2 : \mathbb{B}} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{T-LT} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \mathbb{Z} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \mathbb{Z}}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 < e_2 : \mathbb{B}} \end{array} \\[10pt]
\begin{array}{c} \text{T-EQ} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \mathbb{Z} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \mathbb{Z}}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 = e_2 : \mathbb{B}} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{T-TRUE} \\ \frac{}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{true} : \mathbb{B}} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{T-FALSE} \\ \frac{}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{false} : \mathbb{B}} \end{array} \\[10pt]
\begin{array}{c} \text{T-IF} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \mathbb{B} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_3 : \tau}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3 : \tau} \end{array} \\[10pt]
\begin{array}{c} \text{T-PAIR} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau_1 \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau_2}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash (e_1, e_2) : \tau_1 \times \tau_2} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{T-FST} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau_1 \times \tau_2}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{fst } e : \tau_1} \end{array} \\[10pt]
\begin{array}{c} \text{T-SND} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau_1 \times \tau_2}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{snd } e : \tau_2} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{T-INJ1} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau_1}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{inj}_1 e : \tau_1 + \tau_2} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{T-INJ2} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau_2}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{inj}_2 e : \tau_1 + \tau_2} \end{array} \\[10pt]
\begin{array}{c} \text{T-MATCH} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau_1 + \tau_2 \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma, x : \tau_1 \vdash e_2 : \tau \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma, x : \tau_2 \vdash e_3 : \tau}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{match } e_1 \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow e_2 \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow e_3 \text{ end} : \tau} \end{array} \\[10pt]
\begin{array}{c} \text{T-LAM} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma, x : \tau_1 \vdash e : \tau_2}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \lambda x. e : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{T-APP} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau_1}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 e_2 : \tau_2} \end{array} \\[10pt]
\begin{array}{c} \text{T-TLAM} \\ \frac{\Xi, X \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \Lambda e : \forall X. \tau} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{T-TAPP} \\ \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \forall X. \tau}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e _ : \tau[\tau'/X]} \end{array}
\end{array}$$

2.1.3 Dynamics

Finally, we define the semantics of the language. We do this using a single "step" rule, and several "head-step" rules. The head-step rules govern all possible

reductions, and the "head-step-step" rule tells us where in our program we can apply these reductions.

$$\frac{\text{HEAD-STEP-STEP} \quad e \rightarrow_h e'}{K[e] \rightarrow K[e']}$$

The evaluation context, K , tells us where in our program we may apply the reduction. If we have an expression e , and we have $e = K[f]$, and $f \rightarrow_h f'$, then we may conclude that $e \rightarrow K[f']$. Now, the head-steps are as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{E-EQ} \\ \frac{n_1 = n_2}{\overline{n_1} = \overline{n_2} \rightarrow_h \text{true}} \\ \text{E-ADD} \quad \frac{}{\overline{n_1} + \overline{n_2} \rightarrow_h \overline{n_1 + n_2}} \quad \text{E-SUB} \quad \frac{}{\overline{n_1} - \overline{n_2} \rightarrow_h \overline{n_1 - n_2}} \\ \text{E-NOT-EQ} \quad \frac{n_1 \neq n_2}{\overline{n_1} = \overline{n_2} \rightarrow_h \text{false}} \quad \text{E-LE} \quad \frac{n_1 \leq n_2}{\overline{n_1} \leq \overline{n_2} \rightarrow_h \text{true}} \quad \text{E-NOT-LE} \quad \frac{n_1 \not\leq n_2}{\overline{n_1} \leq \overline{n_2} \rightarrow_h \text{false}} \\ \text{E-LT} \quad \frac{n_1 < n_2}{\overline{n_1} < \overline{n_2} \rightarrow_h \text{true}} \quad \text{E-NOT-LT} \quad \frac{n_1 \not< n_2}{\overline{n_1} < \overline{n_2} \rightarrow_h \text{false}} \quad \text{E-IF-TRUE} \quad \frac{}{\text{if true then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3 \rightarrow_h e_2} \\ \text{E-IF-FALSE} \quad \frac{}{\text{if false then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3 \rightarrow_h e_3} \quad \text{E-FST} \quad \frac{}{\text{fst}(v_1, v_2) \rightarrow_h v_1} \quad \text{E-SND} \quad \frac{}{\text{snd}(v_1, v_2) \rightarrow_h v_2} \\ \text{E-MATCH-INJ1} \quad \frac{}{\text{match } (\text{inj}_1 v) \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow e_2 \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow e_3 \text{ end} \rightarrow_h e_2[v/x]} \\ \text{E-MATCH-INJ2} \quad \frac{}{\text{match } (\text{inj}_2 v) \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow e_2 \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow e_3 \text{ end} \rightarrow_h e_3[v/x]} \\ \text{E-LAM-APP} \quad \frac{}{(\lambda x. e) v \rightarrow_h e[v/x]} \quad \text{E-TAPP-TLAM} \quad \frac{}{(\Lambda e) _ \rightarrow_h e} \end{array}$$

At this point, our language has been formally defined, so next we will note down some facts and results about it.

2.2 Properties of the language

In this section we note down some useful properties of our language, which will help us reason about the concepts in later chapters. First we show some interesting lemmas about the evaluation context.

2.2.1 Evaluation Context

Lemma 1. $K[e] \rightarrow_h e' \wedge \neg(K = []) \implies \text{Val}(e)$

Proof. This can be shown by doing case distinction on the head-step $K[e] \rightarrow_h e'$. We show it here only for case E-ADD, as all the other cases are similar.

So assume $K[e] = \overline{n_1} + \overline{n_2}$, and $e' = \overline{n_1 + n_2}$. Then there are three cases: $K = []$ and $e = \overline{n_1} + \overline{n_2}$, $K = [] + \overline{n_2}$ and $e = \overline{n_1}$, or $K = \overline{n_1} + []$ and $e = \overline{n_2}$. The first case raises a contradiction as we have assumed $\neg(K = [])$. In the remaining two cases, we may conclude $\text{Val}(e)$, as wanted. \square

Lemma 2 (Evaluation under Context). $K[e] \rightarrow^* e' \implies \exists e''. (e \rightarrow^* e'') \wedge ((\text{Val}(e'') \wedge K[e''] \rightarrow^* e') \vee (\neg \text{Val}(e'') \wedge K[e''] = e'))$

Proof. So assuming $K[e] \rightarrow^* e'$, we must show

$$\exists e''. (e \rightarrow^* e'') \wedge ((\text{Val}(e'') \wedge K[e''] \rightarrow^* e') \vee (\neg \text{Val}(e'') \wedge K[e''] = e')) \quad (2.1)$$

We proceed by induction on the number of steps in the evaluation $K[e] \rightarrow^* e'$. Let n denote the number of steps taken, so that $K[e] \rightarrow^n e'$.

- Base Case $n = 0$. In this case, we have that $K[e] \rightarrow^0 e'$, which means that $K[e] = e'$. Now use e for e'' in 2.1. We must show

$$(e \rightarrow^* e) \wedge ((\text{Val}(e) \wedge K[e] \rightarrow^* e') \vee (\neg \text{Val}(e) \wedge K[e] = e'))$$

Trivially, $e \rightarrow^* e$. For the second part, we proceed by case distinction on $\text{Val}(e)$.

- $\text{Val}(e)$. We have that $K[e] \rightarrow^0 e'$, so $K[e] \rightarrow^* e'$. Thus, we have $\text{Val}(e) \wedge K[e] \rightarrow^* e'$, which matches the left part of the " \vee ".
- $\neg \text{Val}(e)$. We know that $K[e] = e'$, so we have $\neg \text{Val}(e) \wedge K[e] = e'$, which matches the right part of the " \vee ".

- Inductive Step $n = m + 1$. Now we have $K[e] \rightarrow^{m+1} e'$. By the Induction Hypothesis, we have:

$$\forall F, f, f'. F[f] \rightarrow^m f' \implies \exists f''. (f \rightarrow^* f'') \wedge ((\text{Val}(f'') \wedge F[f''] \rightarrow^* f') \vee (\neg \text{Val}(f'') \wedge K[f''] = f')) \quad (2.2)$$

Split the evaluation, $K[e] \rightarrow^{m+1} e'$, up, so that $K[e] \rightarrow g \wedge g \rightarrow^m e'$. Looking at our dynamics, we must have that $K[e] = H[h]$, and $g = H[h']$, for some evaluation context H , and expressions h, h' , and $h \rightarrow_h h'$. There are now three possible cases. Either $e = h$, e is a superexpression of h , or e is a subexpression of h . We will consider each in turn.

- $K = H$ and $e = h$.

Then $g = H[h'] = K[h']$, and $e \rightarrow_h h'$. Furthermore, $K[h'] \rightarrow^m e'$.
Instantiate I.H. with this to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists f''. (h' \rightarrow^* f'') \wedge \\ & ((\text{Val}(f'') \wedge K[f''] \rightarrow^* e') \vee (\neg \text{Val}(f'') \wedge K[f''] = e')) \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

Call this quantified expression for f'' , and use it for e'' in 2.1. We must then show

$$(e \rightarrow^* f'') \wedge ((\text{Val}(f'') \wedge K[f''] \rightarrow^* e') \vee (\neg \text{Val}(f'') \wedge K[f''] = e'))$$

We know that $e \rightarrow h'$, as $e \rightarrow_h h'$, and by 2.3, we know that $h' \rightarrow^* f''$, so that $e \rightarrow^* f''$. The second part follows directly from 2.3.

- $K[E[]] = H$ and $e = E[h]$.

Then $g = H[h'] = K[E[]][h'] = K[E[h']]$, thus $K[E[h']] \rightarrow^m e'$.
Instantiate I.H. with this to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists f''. (E[h'] \rightarrow^* f'') \wedge \\ & ((\text{Val}(f'') \wedge K[f''] \rightarrow^* e') \vee (\neg \text{Val}(f'') \wedge K[f''] = e')) \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Call this quantified expression for f'' , and use it for e'' in 2.1. We must then show

$$(e \rightarrow^* f'') \wedge ((\text{Val}(f'') \wedge K[f''] \rightarrow^* e') \vee (\neg \text{Val}(f'') \wedge K[f''] = e'))$$

We know that $E[h] \rightarrow E[h']$, as $h \rightarrow_h h'$, and since $e = E[h]$, then $e \rightarrow E[h']$. By 2.4, we know that $E[h'] \rightarrow^* f''$, so that $e \rightarrow^* f''$. The second part follows directly from 2.4.

- $K = H[E[]]$ and $E[e] = h$. Here we have $h = E[e]$, so $E[e] \rightarrow_h h'$. Note that E is not the empty evaluation context, as otherwise, we would be in case 1. So by lemma 1, we know that $\text{Val}(e)$. Now, pick e for e'' in 2.1. We must show

$$(e \rightarrow^* e) \wedge ((\text{Val}(e) \wedge K[e] \rightarrow^* e') \vee (\neg \text{Val}(e) \wedge K[e] = e'))$$

Trivially, $e \rightarrow^* e$. We also have that $\text{Val}(e)$, and since $K[e] \rightarrow^{m+1} e'$, then $K[e] \rightarrow^* e'$.

□

Corollary 2.1. $K[e] \rightarrow^* v \implies \exists e''. (e \rightarrow^* e'') \wedge (\text{Val}(e'') \wedge K[e''] \rightarrow^* v)$

Proof. Assuming $K[e] \rightarrow^* v$, we must show $\exists e''. (e \rightarrow^* e'') \wedge (\text{Val}(e'') \wedge K[e''] \rightarrow^* v)$. By lemma 2, we know $\exists e''. (e \rightarrow^* e'') \wedge ((\text{Val}(e'') \wedge K[e''] \rightarrow^* v) \vee (\neg \text{Val}(e'') \wedge K[e''] = v))$. Now, if $\neg \text{Val}(e'')$ then $\neg \text{Val}(K[e''])$, which one may see simply by inspecting the possible evaluation contexts. Therefore, $K[e''] \neq v$, so $\neg(\neg \text{Val}(e'') \wedge K[e''] = v)$. Thus, we conclude $\exists e''. (e \rightarrow^* e'') \wedge (\text{Val}(e'') \wedge K[e''] \rightarrow^* v)$. \square

2.2.2 substitution

We define a substitution $\gamma = \{x_1 \mapsto v_1, x_2 \mapsto v_2, \dots\}$ inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\emptyset(e) &= e \\ \gamma[x \mapsto v](e) &= \gamma(e[v/x])\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3 (Substitution). $\gamma[x \mapsto v](e) = \gamma(e)[v/x]$

Proof. Similar to Lemma 10 in [1]. \square

2.2.3 Normalization

►expand a little on this topic◄

Theorem 4. *System F is a normalizing language.*

This won't be proved here.

2.2.4 Determinacy

System F is a deterministic language.

Theorem 5. $\forall e, v_1, v_2. e \Downarrow v_1 \wedge e \Downarrow v_2 \implies v_1 = v_2$

This won't be proved here.

Chapter 3

Contextual Equivalence

►draft◄

Imagine you are writing a larger program, and as part of that program, you need to use a stack. So as part of your program, you implement a stack. However, your implementation is naive, and not efficient. Thus you implement a new stack, that is more complex, but also more efficient. You would of course want to use the more efficient stack implementation in your larger program, but since it is more complex, you are not really sure whether you can justify the refactoring – the implementations might show differing behaviour.

What you want to show, then, is that your two stack implementations *behaves* the same. In other words, no matter which *context* you use your two stack implementations in, they will always behave the same as part of the context. This is intuitively what we want to define with *Contextual Equivalence*.

In this chapter we give two equivalent definitions of what it means for programs to be contextually equivalent. The first definition will be more intuitive and instructive, while the second will give a deeper insight into the theoretical underpinnings of contextual equivalence.

3.1 Definition of Contextual Equivalence

Context

$$\begin{aligned} C ::= & [\cdot] \mid C + e \mid e + C \mid C - e \mid e - C \mid C \leq e \mid e \leq C \mid C < e \mid e < C \mid C = e \mid e = C \mid \\ & \text{if } C \text{ then } e \text{ else } e \mid \text{if } e \text{ then } C \text{ else } e \mid \text{if } e \text{ then } e \text{ else } C \mid (C, e) \mid (e, C) \mid \\ & \text{fst } C \mid \text{snd } C \mid \text{inj}_1 C \mid \text{inj}_2 C \mid \text{match } C \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow e \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow e \text{ end} \mid \\ & \text{match } e \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow C \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow e \text{ end} \mid \\ & \text{match } e \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow e \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow C \text{ end} \mid \lambda x. C \mid C e \mid e C \mid \Lambda C \mid C _ \end{aligned}$$

Context Typing

$$\frac{\text{T-CTX} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \quad \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash C[e] : \tau'}{C : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau) \Rightarrow (\Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \tau')}$$

Read as: the context takes an expression of type τ under Ξ, Γ , and outputs an expression of type τ' under Ξ', Γ' .

Definition 3.1.1 (Contextual Equivalence). We define contextual equivalence of two expressions e_1 and e_2 at type τ under Ξ and Γ as

$$\begin{aligned} & \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx^{ctx} e_2 : \tau \\ & \iff \\ & \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau \quad \wedge \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau \quad \wedge \\ & \forall C : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau) \Rightarrow (\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \mathbb{B}), v. (C[e_1] \Downarrow v \iff C[e_2] \Downarrow v) \end{aligned}$$

The way we have defined contextual equivalence here means that given two programs, e_1, e_2 that are contextually equivalent, if we plug them into any context, C , which becomes closed and of type \mathbb{B} , then one program, $C[e_1]$ terminates to some value v if and only if the other program $C[e_2]$ terminates to the same value, v . Note here that that value must be a boolean, i.e. either **true** or **false**.

One may ponder why we have decided to use \mathbb{B} as the type of the plugged programs; there are plenty other types that could have been used instead such as **Unit** or \mathbb{Z} . Why not use those? In fact, we could have used some of them. The important part is that we are able to make the plugged programs elicit differing behaviour, as we will see below. We cannot do this if the plugged programs have type **Unit**; by theorem 4 we know that both plugged programs terminate, and there is only one value with type **Unit**, namely $()$, so both programs will terminate at $()$ regardless of whether or not e_1 and e_2 are behaviourally equivalent. Had we been dealing with a non-terminating language, then we could have used **Unit**, since it would then have two possible differing behaviours: terminate with $()$, or not terminate. In that case, we would define contextual equivalence as $C[e_1] \Downarrow \iff C[e_2] \Downarrow$.

Another cause for speculation is whether or not the definition is really strong enough. If both e_1 and e_2 reduce to some values, we really want the values to be behaviourally the same. If e_1 and e_2 are of integer type, for example, then this means that the two values must be the same number. And for product types, this means that the first value in each pair should be behaviourally the same, and likewise with the second value in each pair. To give an intuition as to why this definition is strong enough and ensures the above examples, consider two contextually equivalent programs e_1 and e_2 , where $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash e_1 : \tau$ and $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash e_2 : \tau$. Now consider what happens if e_1 terminates with some value v_1 . Can we then guarantee that e_2 also terminates with some value v_2 , and v_1 and v_2 behave the same? Since e_1 and e_2 are contextually equivalent, then we can put them into any context, C , and one will terminate at some value v if and only if the other one does. Let's first consider when $\tau = \mathbb{Z}$. Then consider when C has the form **if** $[\cdot] = v_1$ **then true else false**. Here $C[e_1] \Downarrow \mathbf{true}$. But what about $C[e_2]$? If $v_2 \neq v_1$, then our evaluation rules tell us that we will take the else branch, and hence $C[e_2] \Downarrow \mathbf{false}$. However, since e_1 and e_2 are contextually equivalent, and $C[e_1]$ reduces to **true**, then we know that $C[e_2]$ must reduce to

true. Hence it is not the case that $v_2 \neq v_1$, thus $v_2 = v_1$. So if our two programs of type integer are contextually equivalent, and they both don't run forever, then they must both evaluate to the same number.

It becomes a little more difficult to reason about when τ is not a base-type, like Unit , \mathbb{Z} , or \mathbb{B} . Take function type, for instance. If e_1 and e_2 both evaluate down to functions, how do we know that those functions are behaviourally equivalent? To see this, consider the following "congruence" rule:

$$\frac{\text{CNG-CTX-APP} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash f \approx^{ctx} f' : \tau \rightarrow \tau' \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash t \approx^{ctx} t' : \tau}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash f t \approx^{ctx} f' t' : \tau'}$$

This essentially gives us what we want: if we have two contextually equivalent functions, then, as long as we give them contextually equivalent inputs, the output will also be contextually equivalent. That output may be another function, but then this rule applies again to that output, and so on. In other words, we can keep on applying this rule until we at some point get a base type, like \mathbb{Z} , and at that point, we know that the two numbers will be the same, by the argument made above.

Of course, it may happen that the output is of another non-base type, such as type abstraction. But we may state similar congruence rules for all other non-base types. However proving all of them is quite tedious, so we will here only prove the congruence rule for function application.

Proof. By the two hypotheses of the rule, we know that $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash f : \tau \rightarrow \tau'$ and $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash t : \tau$. So by the T-APP rule, we may conclude $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash f t : \tau'$. Likewise for the prime variants. So all that remains to be shown is that $\forall C : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau') \Rightarrow (\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \mathbb{B}), v. (C[f t] \Downarrow v \iff C[f' t'] \Downarrow v)$. So assume some context, C , of the right type, and some value v . Consider now the context $C[[\cdot] t]$. We know that f is contextually equivalent to f' , so $\forall v'. C[f t] \Downarrow v' \iff C[f' t] \Downarrow v'$. Now consider the context $C[f' [\cdot]]$. Since t is contextually equivalent to t' , then we know $\forall v''. C[f' t] \Downarrow v'' \iff C[f' t'] \Downarrow v''$. Now it follows by instantiating both of the prior results with v . Then we have $C[f t] \Downarrow v \iff C[f' t] \Downarrow v \iff C[f' t'] \Downarrow v$, which was what we wanted. \square

The way we have defined contextual equivalence is quite instructive and intuitive. However, one may define contextual equivalence in another, equivalent way, which gives much insight into contextual equivalence, and will make working with the logical relation later more intuitive. We will explore this alternative definition in the next section.

3.2 Alternative Definition of Contextual Equivalence

Before giving the alternative definition, we first introduce a few concepts. In the following, we will be working with relations $R \subseteq \text{TENV} \times \text{VENV} \times \text{EXPR} \times \text{EXPR} \times \text{TYPE}$, and R will refer to any such relation. TENV is simply the

set of all type environments, so $\Xi \in \text{TENV}$. Likewise with the rest. We also introduce the following notation: $R(\Xi, \Gamma, e, e', \tau) \triangleq \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx e' : \tau$, and use them interchangeably.

Now we define two properties that a relation R may have.

Definition 3.2.1 (Adequacy). We say R is an adequate relation when it holds for R that $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash e \approx e' : \mathbb{B} \implies e \Downarrow v \iff e' \Downarrow v$.

Definition 3.2.2 (Congruency). We say R is a congruence relation (with respect to the typing rules) when it satisfies all the congruence rules that arises from the typing rules.

For instance, the congruence rules for T-unit and T-app would be:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{CNG-UNIT} \\ \hline \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash () \approx () : \text{Unit} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{CNG-TAPP} \\ \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx e' : \forall X. \tau \\ \hline \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e _ \approx e' _ : \tau[\tau'/X] \end{array}$$

The remaining congruence rules can be found in the appendix (A.1).

Now, we may define contextual equivalence in the following way.

Definition 3.2.3. Contextual Equivalence is a relation, $CE \subseteq \text{TENV} \times \text{VENV} \times \text{EXPR} \times \text{EXPR} \times \text{TYPE}$, such that

- all expressions in CE are well-typed
- CE is a congruence relation
- CE is an adequate relation

Finally, it is the coarsest such relation.

CE being the coarsest such relation means that if given a relation R satisfying the three properties, then $\forall \Xi, \Gamma, e, e', \tau. R(\Xi, \Gamma, e, e', \tau) \implies CE(\Xi, \Gamma, e, e', \tau)$. We of course have to show that this definition of Contextual Equivalence is actually equivalent to the one given in definition 3.1.1:

Theorem 6. $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{ctx} e' : \tau \iff CE(\Xi, \Gamma, e, e', \tau)$

We will show this in two steps, where each step essentially corresponds to one way of the double implication. Each step will be phrased as a theorem.

Theorem 7. $\cdot \mid \cdot \vdash \cdot \approx^{ctx} \cdot : \cdot \subseteq \text{TENV} \times \text{VENV} \times \text{EXPR} \times \text{EXPR} \times \text{TYPE}$ is a congruence relation, an adequate relation, and all expressions in the relation are well-typed.

Proof. First, the well-typedness follows directly from the definition of contextual equivalence.

Second, let's show that it is an adequate relation. So assuming $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash e \approx^{ctx} e' : \mathbb{B}$, we must show $e \Downarrow v \iff e' \Downarrow v$. We know that $\forall C : (\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \mathbb{B}) \Rightarrow (\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash$

$\mathbb{B}), v'.(C[e] \Downarrow v' \iff C[e'] \Downarrow v')$. So specifically for C being the empty context and v' being v , we get $e \Downarrow v \iff e' \Downarrow v$, which was what we wanted.

To show that it is a congruence relation, we must go through all the congruence rules, and show that they hold. We did the one for function application above, Cng-ctx-app. The rest will not be shown here. \square

To prove the next theorem, we will need to show two lemmas.

Lemma 8 (Reflexivity). *Let R be a congruence relation. Then $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \implies R(\Xi, \Gamma, e, e, \tau)$.*

Proof. By induction on the typing derivation of e . It follows immediately from applying the induction hypothesis and applying congruency rules. We show one case here.

case T-tlam.

Assuming $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \Lambda e : \forall X. \tau$ and $\Xi, X \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$, we must show $R(\Xi, \Gamma, \Lambda e, \Lambda e, \forall X. \tau)$. Our induction hypothesis says: $\Xi, X \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \implies R((\Xi, X), \Gamma, e, e, \tau)$. **►Just to be sure, this is what our induction hypothesis says, right?◄** From this we get $R((\Xi, X), \Gamma, e, e, \tau) \equiv \Xi, X \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx e : \tau$. By the congruency rule *Cng – tlam*, we then get $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \Lambda e \approx \Lambda e : \forall X. \tau$, which was what we wanted. \square

Lemma 9. *Let R be a congruence relation, then $R(\Xi, \Gamma, e, e', \tau) \wedge C : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \tau') \implies R(\Xi', \Gamma', C[e], C[e'], \tau')$*

Proof. By induction on C . We show here only a few interesting cases. For each non-base-case we show, the induction hypothesis will be $\forall \Xi, \Gamma, \Xi', \Gamma', e, e', \tau, \tau'. R(\Xi, \Gamma, e, e', \tau) \wedge C' : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \tau') \implies R(\Xi', \Gamma', C'[e], C'[e'], \tau')$, where C' is structurally smaller than C .

case $C = [\cdot]$.

So assuming $R(\Xi, \Gamma, e, e', \tau)$ and $C : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \tau')$, we must show $R(\Xi', \Gamma', C[e], C[e'], \tau')$. We may conclude that $\Xi = \Xi'$, $\Gamma = \Gamma'$, and $\tau = \tau'$, given that $[\cdot] : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau)$. So since $e = [\cdot][e] = C[e]$, and $e' = [\cdot][e'] = C[e']$, we get $R(\Xi', \Gamma', C[e], C[e'], \tau')$, which was what we wanted.

case $C = C' + e''$

So assuming $R(\Xi, \Gamma, e, e', \tau)$ and $C : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \tau')$, we must show $R(\Xi', \Gamma', C[e], C[e'], \tau')$. In this case, $C : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \mathbb{Z})$ and $C' : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathbb{Z})$, meaning $\tau' = \mathbb{Z}$. So we have $R(\Xi, \Gamma, e, e', \mathbb{Z})$, and our goal then is $R(\Xi', \Gamma', C[e], C[e'], \mathbb{Z})$. From the

context typing and from rule T-add, we may conclude $\Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash e'' : \mathbb{Z}$. So by lemma 8, we know that $\Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash e'' \approx e'' : \mathbb{Z}$. And by I.H. we get $R(\Xi', \Gamma', C'[e], C'[e'], \mathbb{Z}) \equiv \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash C'[e] \approx C'[e'] : \mathbb{Z}$. Finally, from the congruence rule cng-add, we get $\Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash C'[e] + e'' \approx C'[e'] + e'' : \mathbb{Z} \equiv \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash C[e] \approx C[e'] : \mathbb{Z}$, which was what we wanted.

case $C = \text{fst } C'$

Then $C : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \tau_1)$ and $C' : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \tau_1 \times \tau_2)$, so our goal is $R(\Xi', \Gamma', C[e], C[e'], \tau_1)$. By I.H. we get $\Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash C'[e] \approx C'[e'] : \tau_1 \times \tau_2$, and by cng-fst with this, we get $\Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \text{fst } C'[e] \approx \text{fst } C'[e'] : \tau_1 \equiv \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash C[e] \approx C[e'] : \tau_1$.

case $C = \lambda x. C'$

Then $C : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2)$ and $C' : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi' \mid \Gamma', x : \tau_1 \vdash \tau_2)$, so our goal is $R(\Xi', \Gamma', C[e], C[e'], \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2)$. By I.H. we get $\Xi' \mid \Gamma', x : \tau_1 \vdash C'[e] \approx C'[e'] : \tau_2$, and by cng-lam with this, we get $\Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \lambda x. C'[e] \approx \lambda x. C'[e'] : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \equiv \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash C[e] \approx C[e'] : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2$.

case $C = C' e''$

Then $C : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \tau_2)$ and $C' : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2)$, so our goal is $R(\Xi', \Gamma', C[e], C[e'], \tau_2)$. From the context-typing and T-app, we have $\Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash e'' : \tau_1$. By lemma 8, we get $\Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash e'' \approx e'' : \tau_1$. Now, by the induction hypothesis, we get $\Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash C'[e] \approx C'[e'] : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2$. And by cng-app with this, we get $\Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash C'[e] e'' \approx C'[e'] e'' : \tau_2 \equiv \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash C[e] \approx C[e'] : \tau_2$.

case $C = \Lambda C'$

Then $C : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \forall X. \tau')$ and $C' : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \Xi', X \mid \Gamma' \vdash \tau')$, so our goal is $R(\Xi', \Gamma', C[e], C[e'], \forall X. \tau')$. By I.H. we get $\Xi', X \mid \Gamma' \vdash C'[e] \approx C'[e'] : \tau'$, and by cng-tlam with this, we get $\Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash \Lambda C'[e] \approx \Lambda C'[e'] : \forall X. \tau' \equiv \Xi' \mid \Gamma' \vdash C[e] \approx C[e'] : \forall X. \tau'$.

□

With this lemma proved, we are ready to prove the next theorem.

Theorem 10. *Let R be a relation satisfying the three properties of definition 3.2.3, then $R(\Xi, \Gamma, e, e', \tau) \implies \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{ctx} e' : \tau$.*

Proof. So assuming $R(\Xi, \Gamma, e, e', \tau)$, we must show $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \wedge \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e' : \tau \wedge \forall C : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau) \Rightarrow (\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \mathbb{B}), v. (C[e] \Downarrow v \iff C[e'] \Downarrow v)$. Again, the well-typedness follows from the fact that all expressions in R are well-typed. So what remains to be shown is that $\forall C : (\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \tau) \Rightarrow (\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \mathbb{B}), v. (C[e] \Downarrow$

$v \iff C[e'] \Downarrow v$). So assume some context C of the right type and some value v . By lemma 9, we have $R(\bullet, \bullet, C[e], C[e'], \mathbb{B})$. By adequacy of R , we have that $C[e] \Downarrow v \iff C[e'] \Downarrow v$, which was what we wanted. \square

Now, the proof of the two definitions of contextual equivalence being equivalent follows easily:

Proof of theorem 6. By theorem 7 and from the fact that CE is the coarsest relation satisfying the three properties, it follows that $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{ctx} e' : \tau \implies CE(\Xi, \Gamma, e, e', \tau)$.

By theorem 10 and from the fact that CE is one such relation R , it follows that $CE(\Xi, \Gamma, e, e', \tau) \implies \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{ctx} e' : \tau$. \square

Chapter 4

Logical Relations Model for Contextual Equivalence

►draft◄

4.1 Logical Relations

►explain briefly what logical relations are◄

4.2 Defining the Logical Relations Model

well-typedness relation

$$\mathcal{W}[\![\tau]\!]_{\rho}(v_1, v_2) \triangleq \bullet \mid \bullet \vdash v_1 : \rho_1(\tau) \wedge \bullet \mid \bullet \vdash v_2 : \rho_2(\tau)$$

Value interpretation As part of all relations below, we have that $\mathcal{W}[\![\tau]\!]_{\rho}(v_1, v_2)$, which we don't write for succinctness.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}[\![\text{Unit}]\!]_{\rho}(v_1, v_2) &\triangleq (v_1, v_2) \in \{((), ())\} \\ \mathcal{V}[\![\mathbb{Z}]\!]_{\rho}(v_1, v_2) &\triangleq (v_1, v_2) \in \{(\bar{n}, \bar{n}) \mid \bar{n} \in \mathbb{Z}\} \\ \mathcal{V}[\![\mathbb{B}]\!]_{\rho}(v_1, v_2) &\triangleq (v_1, v_2) \in \{(\text{true}, \text{true}), (\text{false}, \text{false})\} \\ \mathcal{V}[\![\tau_1 \times \tau_2]\!]_{\rho}(v_1, v_2) &\triangleq (v_1, v_2) \in \{((w_{11}, w_{12}), (w_{21}, w_{22})) \mid \mathcal{V}[\![\tau_1]\!]_{\rho}(w_{11}, w_{21}) \wedge \mathcal{V}[\![\tau_2]\!]_{\rho}(w_{12}, w_{22})\} \\ \mathcal{V}[\![\tau_1 + \tau_2]\!]_{\rho}(v_1, v_2) &\triangleq (v_1, v_2) \in \{(\text{inj}_1 w_1, \text{inj}_1 w_2) \mid \mathcal{V}[\![\tau_1]\!]_{\rho}(w_1, w_2)\} \vee \\ &\quad (v_1, v_2) \in \{(\text{inj}_2 w_1, \text{inj}_2 w_2) \mid \mathcal{V}[\![\tau_2]\!]_{\rho}(w_1, w_2)\} \\ \mathcal{V}[\![\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2]\!]_{\rho}(v_1, v_2) &\triangleq (v_1, v_2) \in \{(\lambda x. e_1, \lambda x. e_2) \mid \forall w_1, w_2. \mathcal{V}[\![\tau_1]\!]_{\rho}(w_1, w_2) \implies \\ &\quad \mathcal{E}[\![\tau_2]\!]_{\rho}(e_1[w_1/x], e_2[w_2/x])\} \\ \mathcal{V}[\![\forall X. \tau]\!]_{\rho}(v_1, v_2) &\triangleq (v_1, v_2) \in \{(\Lambda e_1, \Lambda e_2) \mid \forall \tau_1, \tau_2, R \in \text{Rel}[\tau_1, \tau_2]. \\ &\quad \mathcal{E}[\![\tau]\!]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]}(e_1, e_2)\} \\ \mathcal{V}[\![X]\!]_{\rho}(v_1, v_2) &\triangleq (v_1, v_2) \in \rho_R[X] \end{aligned}$$

Relational substitution

$$Rel[\tau_1, \tau_2] \triangleq \left\{ R \left| \begin{array}{l} R \in \mathcal{P}(Val \times Val) \wedge \bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \tau_1 \wedge \bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \tau_2 \wedge \\ \forall (v_1, v_2) \in R. \bullet \mid \bullet \vdash v_1 : \tau_1 \wedge \bullet \mid \bullet \vdash v_2 : \tau_2 \end{array} \right. \right\}$$

Expression interpretation

$$\mathcal{E}[\tau]_\rho(e_1, e_2) \triangleq \bullet \mid \bullet \vdash e_1 : \rho_1(\tau) \wedge \bullet \mid \bullet \vdash e_2 : \rho_2(\tau) \wedge \\ (\exists v_1, v_2. e_1 \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge e_2 \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau]_\rho(v_1, v_2))$$

Variable environment interpretation

$$\mathcal{G}[\bullet]_\rho \triangleq \{\emptyset\} \\ \mathcal{G}[\Gamma, x : \tau]_\rho \triangleq \{\gamma[x \mapsto (v_1, v_2)] \mid \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau]_\rho(v_1, v_2)\}$$

Type environment interpretation

$$\mathcal{D}[\bullet] \triangleq \{\emptyset\} \\ \mathcal{D}[\Xi, X] \triangleq \{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)] \mid \rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi] \wedge R \in Rel[\tau_1, \tau_2]\}$$

Definition 4.2.1 (Logical relation).

$$\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{LR} e' : \tau \\ \iff \\ \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \wedge \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e' : \tau \wedge \\ \forall \rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi], \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho. \mathcal{E}[\tau]_\rho(\gamma_1(e), \gamma_2(e'))$$

4.3 Compatibility lemmas

Essentially just congruency rules as stated in appendix (but with LR being the relation). We have to prove these (and adequacy) to show that $LR \implies CE$, meaning we can state theorems in terms of LR instead of CE, and then get CE as a consequence.

Lemma 11 (Cmpt-unit). $\frac{}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash () \approx^{LR} () : \text{Unit}}$

Proof. By definition 4.2.1, we must show $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash () : \text{Unit} \wedge \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash () : \text{Unit} \wedge \forall \rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi], \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho. \mathcal{E}[\text{Unit}]_\rho(\gamma_1(()), \gamma_2(()))$. The well-typedness simply follows by the typing rule T-unit. So assume some $\rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi]$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho$, we must show $\mathcal{E}[\text{Unit}]_\rho(\gamma_1(()), \gamma_2(())) \equiv \mathcal{E}[\text{Unit}]_\rho((), ())$. Thus, we must show three things

1. $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash () : \rho_1(\text{Unit})$
2. $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash () : \rho_2(\text{Unit})$
3. $\exists v_1, v_2. () \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge () \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\text{Unit}]_\rho(v_1, v_2)$

Given that $\rho_1(\text{Unit}) = \rho_2(\text{Unit}) = \text{Unit}$, the well-typedness once again simply follows from typing rule T-unit. For (3), we choose $()$ for v_1 and v_2 . Then we must show $() \rightarrow^* () \wedge () \rightarrow^* () \wedge \mathcal{V}[\![\text{Unit}]\!]_\rho(((), ()))$. The first two holds trivially. The last part says we must show $\mathcal{W}[\![\text{Unit}]\!]_\rho(((), ())) \wedge (((), ())) \in \{(((), ()))\}$. The last part trivially holds, and the first part holds by the same argument made above: $\rho_1(\text{Unit}) = \rho_2(\text{Unit}) = \text{Unit}$, and then it follows from T-unit. \square

Lemma 12 (Cmpt-add).
$$\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx^{LR} e'_1 : \mathbb{Z} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 \approx^{LR} e'_2 : \mathbb{Z}}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 + e_2 \approx^{LR} e'_1 + e'_2 : \mathbb{Z}}$$

Proof. So assuming

$$\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx^{LR} e'_1 : \mathbb{Z} \tag{4.1}$$

$$\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 \approx^{LR} e'_2 : \mathbb{Z} \tag{4.2}$$

we must show $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 + e_2 : \mathbb{Z} \wedge \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e'_1 + e'_2 : \mathbb{Z} \wedge \forall \rho \in \mathcal{D}[\![\Xi]\!], \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\![\Gamma]\!]_\rho. \mathcal{E}[\![\mathbb{Z}]\!]_\rho(\gamma_1(e_1 + e_2), \gamma_2(e'_1 + e'_2))$. From (4.1), we have $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \mathbb{Z}$, and from (4.2) we have $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \mathbb{Z}$. So by the T-add rule, we get $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 + e_2 : \mathbb{Z}$. The well-typedness of $e'_1 + e'_2$ follows in the same way.

So let's assume some $\rho \in \mathcal{D}[\![\Xi]\!]$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\![\Gamma]\!]_\rho$. We must show $\mathcal{E}[\![\mathbb{Z}]\!]_\rho(\gamma_1(e_1 + e_2), \gamma_2(e'_1 + e'_2))$, which is equivalent to $\mathcal{E}[\![\mathbb{Z}]\!]_\rho(\gamma_1(e_1) + \gamma_1(e_2), \gamma_2(e'_1) + \gamma_2(e'_2))$. Unfolding the expression interpretation, what we need to show is the following three points

1. $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \gamma_1(e_1) + \gamma_1(e_2) : \rho_1(\mathbb{Z})$
2. $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \gamma_2(e'_1) + \gamma_2(e'_2) : \rho_2(\mathbb{Z})$
3. $\exists v_1, v_2. \gamma_1(e_1) + \gamma_1(e_2) \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge \gamma_2(e'_1) + \gamma_2(e'_2) \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\![\mathbb{Z}]\!]_\rho(v_1, v_2)$

To prove these points, we will need some more information. From the last part of (4.1) instantiated with ρ and γ , we get

$$\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \gamma_1(e_1) : \rho_1(\mathbb{Z}) \tag{4.3}$$

$$\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \gamma_2(e'_1) : \rho_2(\mathbb{Z}) \tag{4.4}$$

$$\exists v_1, v_2. \gamma_1(e_1) \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge \gamma_2(e'_1) \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\![\mathbb{Z}]\!]_\rho(v_1, v_2) \tag{4.5}$$

Likewise, from the last part of 4.2 instantiated with ρ and γ , we get

$$\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \gamma_1(e_2) : \rho_1(\mathbb{Z}) \tag{4.6}$$

$$\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \gamma_2(e'_2) : \rho_2(\mathbb{Z}) \tag{4.7}$$

$$\exists v_1, v_2. \gamma_1(e_2) \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge \gamma_2(e'_2) \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\![\mathbb{Z}]\!]_\rho(v_1, v_2) \tag{4.8}$$

Now to prove the three points above. Given that \mathbb{Z} is a closed type, $\rho_1(\mathbb{Z}) = \rho_2(\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$. Thus, point 1 follows from (4.3), (4.6), and the T-add rule. Similarly,

point 2 follows from (4.4), (4.7) and the T-add rule.

So all that remains to be shown is point 3. Let's denote the values in (4.5) v'_1 and v'_2 , and the values in (4.8) v''_1 and v''_2 . Then we know

$$\gamma_1(e_1) + \gamma_1(e_2) \rightarrow^* v'_1 + \gamma_1(e_2) \rightarrow^* v'_1 + v''_1 \quad (4.9)$$

$$\gamma_2(e'_1) + \gamma_2(e'_2) \rightarrow^* v'_2 + \gamma_2(e'_2) \rightarrow^* v'_2 + v''_2 \quad (4.10)$$

$$\mathcal{V}[\mathbb{Z}]_\rho(v'_1, v'_2) \wedge \mathcal{V}[\mathbb{Z}]_\rho(v''_1, v''_2) \quad (4.11)$$

From (4.11), we know that all our values are integers and $\overline{v'_1} = \overline{v'_2}$, and $\overline{v''_1} = \overline{v''_2}$. Furthermore $\overline{v'_1 + v''_1} \rightarrow \overline{v'_1 + v''_1}$, and $\overline{v'_2 + v''_2} \rightarrow \overline{v'_2 + v''_2}$. Thus $\gamma_1(e_1) + \gamma_1(e_2) \rightarrow^* \overline{v'_1 + v''_1}$ and $\gamma_2(e'_1) + \gamma_2(e'_2) \rightarrow^* \overline{v'_2 + v''_2}$.

What we need to show is point 3. So now use $\overline{v'_1 + v''_1}$ for v_1 , and $\overline{v'_2 + v''_2}$ for v_2 . The first two propositions hold by what we have just shown, so all that remains is to show $\mathcal{V}[\mathbb{Z}]_\rho(\overline{v'_1 + v''_1}, \overline{v'_2 + v''_2})$, which by definition means we have to show $\mathcal{W}[\mathbb{Z}]_\rho(\overline{v'_1 + v''_1}, \overline{v'_2 + v''_2})$ and $\overline{v'_1 + v''_1} = \overline{v'_2 + v''_2}$. The first part follows simply from the T-int rule. For the second part, note that we know $\overline{v'_1} = \overline{v'_2}$, and $\overline{v''_1} = \overline{v''_2}$, so it follows that $\overline{v'_1 + v''_1} = \overline{v'_2 + v''_2}$. \square

Lemma 13 (Cmpt-fst). $\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{LR} e' : \tau_1 \times \tau_2}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{fst } e \approx^{LR} \text{fst } e' : \tau_1}$

Proof. So assuming $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{LR} e' : \tau_1 \times \tau_2$, we must show (ignoring well-typedness): $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi], \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho. \mathcal{E}[\tau_1]_\rho(\gamma_1(\text{fst } e), \gamma_2(\text{fst } e'))$. So assume some $\rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi]$, and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho$, we must show $\mathcal{E}[\tau_1]_\rho(\gamma_1(\text{fst } e), \gamma_2(\text{fst } e')) \equiv \mathcal{E}[\tau_1]_\rho(\text{fst } \gamma_1(e), \text{fst } \gamma_2(e'))$. By definition of our expression interpretation, we must show

$$\exists v_1, v_2. \text{fst } \gamma_1(e) \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge \text{fst } \gamma_2(e') \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau_1]_\rho(v_1, v_2) \quad (4.12)$$

Note first that if we instantiate our initial assumption with ρ and γ , we get

$$\exists v_1, v_2. \gamma_1(e) \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge \gamma_2(e') \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau_1 \times \tau_2]_\rho(v_1, v_2) \quad (4.13)$$

Let's instantiate the values in (4.13) as v'_1 and v'_2 . Then we know

$$\text{fst } \gamma_1(e) \rightarrow^* \text{fst } v'_1 \quad (4.14)$$

$$\text{fst } \gamma_2(e') \rightarrow^* \text{fst } v'_2 \quad (4.15)$$

$$\mathcal{V}[\tau_1 \times \tau_2]_\rho(v'_1, v'_2) \quad (4.16)$$

By (4.16) we know that $v'_1 = (w_{11}, w_{12})$ and $v'_2 = (w_{21}, w_{22})$ for some values $w_{11}, w_{12}, w_{21}, w_{22}$. Further, $\mathcal{V}[\tau_1]_\rho(w_{11}, w_{21})$ and $\mathcal{V}[\tau_2]_\rho(w_{12}, w_{22})$. Now, by (4.14) and E-fst we have $\text{fst } \gamma_1(e) \rightarrow^* w_{11}$. Likewise, from (4.15) and E-fst, we get $\text{fst } \gamma_2(e') \rightarrow^* w_{21}$.

Now to prove the goal (4.12). We take w_{11} for v_1 and w_{21} for v_2 , so that we must show $\text{fst } \gamma_1(e) \rightarrow^* w_{11} \wedge \text{fst } \gamma_2(e') \rightarrow^* w_{21} \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau_1]_\rho(w_{11}, w_{21})$, all of which we have just argued holds. \square

Lemma 14 (Cmpt-match).

$$\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx^{LR} e'_1 : \tau_1 + \tau_2 \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma, x : \tau_1 \vdash e_2 \approx^{LR} e'_2 : \tau \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma, x : \tau_2 \vdash e_3 \approx^{LR} e'_3 : \tau}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{match } e_1 \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow e_2 \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow e_3 \text{ end} \approx^{LR} \text{match } e'_1 \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow e'_2 \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow e'_3 \text{ end} : \tau}$$

Proof. First, we introduce the following notation: $e = \text{match } e_1 \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow e_2 \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow e_3 \text{ end}$, and $e' = \text{match } e'_1 \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow e'_2 \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow e'_3 \text{ end}$. So we assume

$$\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx^{LR} e'_1 : \tau_1 + \tau_2 \quad (4.17)$$

$$\Xi \mid \Gamma, x : \tau_1 \vdash e_2 \approx^{LR} e'_2 : \tau \quad (4.18)$$

$$\Xi \mid \Gamma, x : \tau_2 \vdash e_3 \approx^{LR} e'_3 : \tau \quad (4.19)$$

and must show (ignoring well-typedness) $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi], \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho. \mathcal{E}[\tau]_\rho(\gamma_1(e), \gamma_2(e'))$. So assume some $\rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi]$, and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho$, then we must show $\mathcal{E}[\tau]_\rho(\gamma_1(e), \gamma_2(e'))$. We again introduce the following notation $f = \text{match } \gamma_1(e_1) \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow \gamma_1(e_2) \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow \gamma_1(e_3) \text{ end}$, and $f' = \text{match } \gamma_2(e'_1) \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow \gamma_2(e'_2) \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow \gamma_2(e'_3) \text{ end}$, and note that $\gamma_1(e) = f$ and $\gamma_2(e') = f'$. Thus, we must show: $\mathcal{E}[\tau]_\rho(f, f')$, which by definition corresponds to showing

$$\exists v_1, v_2. f \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge f' \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau]_\rho(v_1, v_2) \quad (4.20)$$

By 4.17 instantiated with ρ, γ , we get

$$\exists v_1, v_2. \gamma_1(e_1) \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge \gamma_2(e'_1) \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau_1 + \tau_2]_\rho(v_1, v_2) \quad (4.21)$$

Let's instantiate the values in (4.21) as v'_{1_1} and v'_{1_2} , so that we know $\gamma_1(e_1) \rightarrow^* v'_{1_1} \wedge \gamma_2(e'_1) \rightarrow^* v'_{1_2} \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau_1 + \tau_2]_\rho(v'_{1_1}, v'_{1_2})$. By definition of the value interpretation, this gives us

$(v'_{1_1}, v'_{1_2}) \in \{(\text{inj}_1 w_1, \text{inj}_1 w_2) \mid \mathcal{V}[\tau_1]_\rho(w_1, w_2)\} \vee (v'_{1_1}, v'_{1_2}) \in \{(\text{inj}_2 w_1, \text{inj}_2 w_2) \mid \mathcal{V}[\tau_2]_\rho(w_1, w_2)\}$. We do case distinction on the " \vee ", but show only the first case as they are similar. So assume $(v'_{1_1}, v'_{1_2}) \in \{(\text{inj}_1 w_1, \text{inj}_1 w_2) \mid \mathcal{V}[\tau_1]_\rho(w_1, w_2)\}$. This means that $v'_{1_1} = \text{inj}_1 w_1$ and $v'_{1_2} = \text{inj}_1 w_2$ for some w_1, w_2 , and $\mathcal{V}[\tau_1]_\rho(w_1, w_2)$. Now, from 4.18 instantiated with $\rho, \gamma' = \gamma[x \mapsto (w_1, w_2)]$ we get

$$\exists v_1, v_2. \gamma'_1(e_2) \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge \gamma'_2(e'_2) \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau]_\rho(v_1, v_2) \quad (4.22)$$

If we instantiate the values in (4.22) as v'_{2_1} and v'_{2_2} , then we know that $\gamma'_1(e_2) \rightarrow^* v'_{2_1} \wedge \gamma'_2(e'_2) \rightarrow^* v'_{2_2} \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau]_\rho(v'_{2_1}, v'_{2_2})$. By the substitution lemma (lemma 3), we then know:

$$\gamma_1(e_2)[w_1/x] \rightarrow^* v'_{2_1} \quad (4.23)$$

$$\gamma_2(e'_2)[w_2/x] \rightarrow^* v'_{2_2} \quad (4.24)$$

Now let us turn to proving the goal, (4.20). We use v'_{2_1} for v_1 and v'_{2_2} for v_2 . Thus, we must show $f \rightarrow^* v'_{2_1} \wedge f' \rightarrow^* v'_{2_2} \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau]_\rho(v'_{2_1}, v'_{2_2})$. We have the following derivations:

$f \rightarrow^* \text{match inj}_1 w_1 \text{ with inj}_1 x \Rightarrow \gamma_1(e_2) \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow \gamma_1(e_3) \text{ end} \rightarrow \gamma_1(e_2)[w_1/x] \rightarrow^* v'_{2_1}$, and
 $f' \rightarrow^* \text{match inj}_1 w_2 \text{ with inj}_1 x \Rightarrow \gamma_2(e'_2) \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow \gamma_2(e'_3) \text{ end} \rightarrow \gamma_2(e'_2)[w_2/x] \rightarrow^* v'_{2_2}$.

In both derivations, the first " \rightarrow^* " follows from the instantiation of (4.21), and the fact that $v'_{1_1} = \text{inj}_1 w_1$ and $v'_{1_2} = \text{inj}_1 w_2$. The next " \rightarrow " holds by E-match-inj1. And finally, the last " \rightarrow^* " holds by (4.23) and (4.24). Thus the first two parts of the goal are satisfied. The last part of the goal we get from the instantiation of (4.22). \square

Lemma 15 (Cmpt-lam).
$$\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma, x : \tau_1 \vdash e \approx^{LR} e' : \tau_2}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \lambda x. e \approx^{LR} \lambda x. e' : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}$$

Proof. So assuming

$$\Xi \mid \Gamma, x : \tau_1 \vdash e \approx^{LR} e' : \tau_2 \quad (4.25)$$

we must show (ignoring well-typedness) $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi], \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho. \mathcal{E}[\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2]_\rho(\gamma_1(\lambda x. e), \gamma_2(\lambda x. e'))$.

So assume some $\rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi]$, and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho$, then we must show $\mathcal{E}[\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2]_\rho(\gamma_1(\lambda x. e), \gamma_2(\lambda x. e')) \equiv \mathcal{E}[\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2]_\rho(\lambda x. \gamma_1(e), \lambda x. \gamma_2(e'))$, which by definition corresponds to

$$\exists v_1, v_2. \lambda x. \gamma_1(e) \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge \lambda x. \gamma_2(e') \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2]_\rho(v_1, v_2) \quad (4.26)$$

Since $\lambda x. \gamma_1(e)$ and $\lambda x. \gamma_2(e')$ are already values, we can use these for v_1 and v_2 . The first two parts are then trivially satisfied, so we only need to show $\mathcal{V}[\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2]_\rho(\lambda x. \gamma_1(e), \lambda x. \gamma_2(e'))$, which by definition means we have to show $\forall w_1, w_2. \mathcal{V}[\tau_1]_\rho(w_1, w_2) \implies \mathcal{E}[\tau_2]_\rho(\gamma_1(e)[w_1/x], \gamma_2(e')[w_2/x])$. So assume some w_1, w_2 such that $\mathcal{V}[\tau_1]_\rho(w_1, w_2)$, then we must show $\mathcal{E}[\tau_2]_\rho(\gamma_1(e)[w_1/x], \gamma_2(e')[w_2/x])$, which by definition means we have to show $\exists v_1, v_2. \gamma_1(e)[w_1/x] \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge \gamma_2(e')[w_2/x] \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau_2]_\rho(v_1, v_2)$. Now we instantiate (4.25) with $\rho, \gamma' = \gamma[x \mapsto (w_1, w_2)]$, so that we have $\exists v_1, v_2. \gamma'_1(e) \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge \gamma'_2(e') \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau_2]_\rho(v_1, v_2)$. By the substitution lemma (lemma 3), this is equivalent to our goal, so we are done. **►Prettify proof◄** \square

Lemma 16 (Cmpt-app).
$$\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx^{LR} e'_1 : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 \approx^{LR} e'_2 : \tau_1}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 e_2 \approx^{LR} e'_1 e'_2 : \tau_2}$$

Proof. So we assume

$$\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx^{LR} e'_1 : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \quad (4.27)$$

$$\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 \approx^{LR} e'_2 : \tau_1 \quad (4.28)$$

Then we must show $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi], \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho. \mathcal{E}[\tau_2]_\rho(\gamma_1(e_1 \ e_2), \gamma_2(e'_1 \ e'_2))$. So we assume some $\rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi], \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho$, and our goal now is $\mathcal{E}[\tau_2]_\rho(\gamma_1(e_1 \ e_2), \gamma_2(e'_1 \ e'_2)) \equiv \mathcal{E}[\tau_2]_\rho(\gamma_1(e_1) \ \gamma_1(e_2), \gamma_2(e'_1) \ \gamma_2(e'_2))$, which by definition means we have to show

$$\exists v_1, v_2. \gamma_1(e_1) \ \gamma_1(e_2) \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge \gamma_2(e'_1) \ \gamma_2(e'_2) \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau_2]_\rho(v_1, v_2) \quad (4.29)$$

We instantiate both (4.27) and (4.28) with ρ, γ , and expand the definitions to get

$$\exists v'_1, v'_2. \gamma_1(e_1) \rightarrow^* v'_1 \wedge \gamma_2(e'_1) \rightarrow^* v'_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2]_\rho(v'_1, v'_2) \quad (4.30)$$

$$\exists v''_1, v''_2. \gamma_1(e_2) \rightarrow^* v''_1 \wedge \gamma_2(e'_2) \rightarrow^* v''_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau_1]_\rho(v''_1, v''_2) \quad (4.31)$$

Instantiating all quantifications with the same name they quantify over, we get from the definition of the value interpretation for function-type that $v'_1 = \lambda x. e'_1$ and $v'_2 = \lambda x. e'_2$, for some e'_1 and e'_2 . Further,

$$\forall w_1, w_2. \mathcal{V}[\tau_1]_\rho(w_1, w_2) \implies \mathcal{E}[\tau_2]_\rho(e'_1[w_1/x], e'_2[w_2/x]) \quad (4.32)$$

We instantiate this with v''_1 and v''_2 . The antecedent is satisfied by the last part of (4.31), so we know $\mathcal{E}[\tau_2]_\rho(e'_1[v''_1/x], e'_2[v''_2/x])$, which by definition means

$$\exists v_{f_1}, v_{f_2}. e'_1[v''_1/x] \rightarrow^* v_{f_1} \wedge e'_2[v''_2/x] \rightarrow^* v_{f_2} \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau_2]_\rho(v_{f_1}, v_{f_2}) \quad (4.33)$$

Now we turn to showing the goal, (4.29). We use v_{f_1} for v_1 and v_{f_2} for v_2 , so that we must show: $\gamma_1(e_1) \ \gamma_1(e_2) \rightarrow^* v_{f_1} \wedge \gamma_2(e'_1) \ \gamma_2(e'_2) \rightarrow^* v_{f_2} \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau_2]_\rho(v_{f_1}, v_{f_2})$. We have the following derivations:

$$\gamma_1(e_1) \ \gamma_1(e_2) \rightarrow^* \lambda x. e'_1 \ \gamma_1(e_2) \rightarrow^* \lambda x. e'_1 \ v''_1 \rightarrow e'_1[v''_1/x] \rightarrow^* v_{f_1} \quad (4.34)$$

$$\gamma_2(e'_1) \ \gamma_2(e'_2) \rightarrow^* \lambda x. e'_2 \ \gamma_2(e'_2) \rightarrow^* \lambda x. e'_2 \ v''_2 \rightarrow e'_2[v''_2/x] \rightarrow^* v_{f_2} \quad (4.35)$$

Here, in both derivations, the first " \rightarrow^* " follows by (4.30) and the fact that $v'_1 = \lambda x. e'_1$ and $v'_2 = \lambda x. e'_2$. The second " \rightarrow^* " follows by (4.31). The next " \rightarrow " follows by rule E-lam-app, and the final " \rightarrow^* " follows from (4.33). Thus, the first two parts of what we have to show follows from (4.34) and (4.35) respectively, and the last part follows from the last part of (4.33). \square

Lemma 17 (Cmpt-Tlam). $\frac{\Xi, X \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{LR} e' : \tau}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \Lambda e \approx^{LR} \Lambda e' : \forall X. \tau}$

Proof. Assuming

$$\Xi, X \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{LR} e' : \tau \quad (4.36)$$

we must show $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi], \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho. \mathcal{E}[\forall X. \tau]_\rho(\gamma_1(\Lambda e), \gamma_2(\Lambda e'))$. So assume some $\rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi]$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho$, by the definition of expression interpretation, our goal is now to show

$$\exists v_1, v_2. \Lambda \gamma_1(e) \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge \Lambda \gamma_2(e') \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\forall X. \tau]_\rho(v_1, v_2) \quad (4.37)$$

Note here that we have pushed the variable substitution inside the Λ -abstraction. Here we can simply use $\Lambda \gamma_1(e)$ for v_1 and $\Lambda \gamma_2(e')$ for v_2 , as they are already values. Thus, we must show $\mathcal{V}[\forall X. \tau]_\rho(\Lambda \gamma_1(e), \Lambda \gamma_2(e'))$, which by definition means we have to show $\forall \tau_1, \tau_2, R \in \text{Rel}[\tau_1, \tau_2]. \mathcal{E}[\tau]_{\rho'}(\gamma_1(e), \gamma_2(e'))$, where $\rho' = \rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]$. So assume some types τ_1, τ_2 , and a relation $R \in \text{Rel}[\tau_1, \tau_2]$, then our goal is

$$\mathcal{E}[\tau]_{\rho'}(\gamma_1(e), \gamma_2(e')) \quad (4.38)$$

We now instantiate (4.36) with ρ' and γ . Note that $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_{\rho'}$ by corollary 29.1. Thus, we get $\mathcal{E}[\tau]_{\rho'}(\gamma_1(e), \gamma_2(e'))$, which is exactly what we had to show. \square

Lemma 18 (Cmpt-Tapp).
$$\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{LR} e' : \forall X. \tau}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e _ \approx^{LR} e' _ : \tau[\tau'/X]}$$

Proof. Similar to proof given in [1]. **►If space, do proof.◄** \square

4.4 Properties of LR

Lemma 19 (Adequacy of LR). $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash e \approx^{LR} e' : \mathbb{B} \implies e \Downarrow v \iff e' \Downarrow v$

Proof. Assuming $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash e \approx^{LR} e' : \mathbb{B}$, we must show $e \Downarrow v \iff e' \Downarrow v$. By the definition of LR, we have that $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{D}[\bullet], \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\bullet]_\rho. \mathcal{E}[\mathbb{B}]_\rho(\gamma_1(e), \gamma_2(e'))$. Given our definitions of \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{G} , we can only instantiate it with the empty relational type substitution and the empty variable substitution. Doing this, we get $\mathcal{E}[\mathbb{B}]_\emptyset(\emptyset(e), \emptyset(e')) \equiv \mathcal{E}[\mathbb{B}]_\emptyset(e, e')$, which by definition means we have $\exists v, v'. e \rightarrow^* v \wedge e' \rightarrow^* v' \wedge \mathcal{V}[\mathbb{B}]_\emptyset(v, v')$. Instantiating these values, we may conclude that $e \Downarrow v, e' \Downarrow v'$, and since $\mathcal{V}[\mathbb{B}]_\emptyset(v, v')$, then either $v = v' = \text{true}$, or $v = v' = \text{false}$. In any case, $v = v'$, so that we can conclude $e \Downarrow v \wedge e' \Downarrow v$. From this we get what was wanted. \square

Lemma 20 (Congruency of LR). *LR is a congruence relation*

Proof. Follows immediately from the compatibility lemmas. \square

Theorem 21. $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{LR} e' : \tau \implies \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{ctx} e' : \tau$

Proof. We now know that LR is an adequate relation (lemma 19) and a congruence relation (lemma 20). Further, it follows directly from the definition of LR, that all expressions in the relation are well-typed. Thus, by theorem 10, we may conclude $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{LR} e' : \tau \implies \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{ctx} e' : \tau$. \square

Theorem 22 (Fundamental Theorem). $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \implies \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{LR} e : \tau$

Proof. Since LR is a congruence relation (lemma 20), it follows directly from lemma 8. \square

Chapter 5

Examples of Application of Contextual Equivalence

►draft◄

5.1 Identity

5.1.1 Identity reduction

Theorem 23. $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash e : \forall X. X \rightarrow X \wedge \bullet \mid \bullet \vdash v : \tau \implies (e _) v \rightarrow^* v$

Proof. So assume

$$\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash e : \forall X. X \rightarrow X \tag{5.1}$$

$$\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash v : \tau \tag{5.2}$$

Then we must show $(e _) v \rightarrow^* v$. From 5.1 and by the fundamental theorem (theorem 22) we know $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash e \approx^{LR} e : \forall X. X \rightarrow X$ from which we get $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{D}[\bullet], \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\bullet]_\rho. \mathcal{E}[\forall X. X \rightarrow X]_\rho(\gamma_1(e), \gamma_2(e))$. By the definition of the type interpretation and value environment interpretation, we only have one choice of instantiation, so we instantiate both with the empty relational substitution, \emptyset . Thus we get $\mathcal{E}[\forall X. X \rightarrow X]_\emptyset(e, e)$. And from this, we may conclude $\exists v_1, v_2. e \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge e \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\forall X. X \rightarrow X]_\emptyset(v_1, v_2)$. By determinacy (theorem 5) these values must be the same, and from the value interpretation we further know that the value must be a type abstraction. Thus $e \rightarrow^* \lambda x. e'$ and $\forall \tau_1, \tau_2, R \in Rel[\tau_1, \tau_2]. \mathcal{E}[X \rightarrow X]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]}(e', e')$. Here we use τ for τ_1 and τ_2 , and the relation $R' = \{(v, v)\}$ for R , giving us $\mathcal{E}[X \rightarrow X]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R')]}(e', e')$, meaning $\exists v'_1, v'_2. e' \rightarrow^* v'_1 \wedge e' \rightarrow^* v'_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[X \rightarrow X]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R')]}(v'_1, v'_2)$. Thus $e' \rightarrow^* \lambda x. e''$ and $\forall w_1, w_2. \mathcal{V}[X]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R')]}(w_1, w_2) \implies \mathcal{E}[X]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R')]}(e''[w_1/x], e''[w_2/x])$. Using v for both w_1 and w_2 , we get $\mathcal{E}[X]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R')]}(e''[v/x], e''[v/x])$ which means $\exists v_{1f}, v_{2f}. e''[v/x] \rightarrow^* v_{1f} \wedge e''[v/x] \rightarrow^* v_{2f} \wedge \mathcal{V}[X]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R')]}(v_{1f}, v_{2f})$,

which again means $e''[v/x] \rightarrow^* v_f$ and $(v_f, v_f) \in R'$, but since R' is a singleton, then we must have $v_f = v$. From the above, we have the following derivation

$$(e _) v \rightarrow^* (\Lambda e' _) v \rightarrow e' v \rightarrow^* (\lambda x. e'') v \rightarrow e''[v/x] \rightarrow^* v_f = v \quad (5.3)$$

The first " \rightarrow^* " follows from $e \rightarrow^* \Lambda e'$. The following step holds by E-tapp-tlam. The next " \rightarrow^* " follows by $e' \rightarrow^* \lambda x. e''$. The next step holds by E-lam-app. and the final " \rightarrow^* " follows by $e''[v/x] \rightarrow^* v_f$. Thus we have know shown $(e _) v \rightarrow^* v$. \square

5.1.2 Identity Contextual Equivalence

Theorem 24. $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \forall X. X \rightarrow X \implies \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{ctx} \Lambda \lambda x. x : \forall X. X \rightarrow X$

Proof. The majority of this proof is simply unfolding definitions; one side of the coin will be working on the goal, and the other side will be working on the fundamental theorem. So we shall go fairly quickly through this.

So assuming $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \forall X. X \rightarrow X$, we must show $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{ctx} \Lambda \lambda x. x : \forall X. X \rightarrow X$. We shall do this by showing that the two expressions are logically related. Then contextual equivalence follows from theorem 21. So we assume some $\rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi]$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho$. Then we must show $\exists v_1, v_2. \gamma_1(e) \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge \Lambda \lambda x. x \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\forall X. X \rightarrow X]_\rho(v_1, v_2)$. By the fundamental theorem on our initial assumption and by instantiating this with ρ and γ , we may conclude $\gamma_1(e) \rightarrow^* \Lambda e_1$ and $\gamma_2(e) \rightarrow^* \Lambda e_2$ and

$$\forall \tau_1, \tau_2, R \in Rel[\tau_1, \tau_2]. \mathcal{E}[X \rightarrow X]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]}(e_1, e_2) \quad (5.4)$$

Now use Λe_1 for v_1 and $\Lambda \lambda x. x$ for v_2 in our goal. Then we must show $\mathcal{V}[\forall X. X \rightarrow X]_\rho(\Lambda e_1, \Lambda \lambda x. x)$. So assume some τ_1, τ_2 , and $R \in Rel[\tau_1, \tau_2]$, then we must show $\exists v'_1, v'_2. e_1 \rightarrow^* v'_1 \wedge \lambda x. x \rightarrow^* v'_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[X \rightarrow X]_{\rho'}(v'_1, v'_2)$, where $\rho' = \rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]$. Now instantiate (5.4) with τ_1, τ_2, R . Then we know $e_1 \rightarrow^* \lambda x. e'_1$, and $e_2 \rightarrow^* \lambda x. e'_2$, and

$$\forall w_1, w_2. \mathcal{V}[X]_{\rho'}(w_1, w_2) \implies \mathcal{E}[X]_{\rho'}(e'_1[w_1/x], e'_2[w_2/x]) \quad (5.5)$$

We then use $\lambda x. e'_1$ for v'_1 and $\lambda x. x$ for v'_2 in our goal. Then we have to show $\mathcal{V}[X \rightarrow X]_{\rho'}(\lambda x. e'_1, \lambda x. x)$. So assume some w_1 and w_2 , such that $\mathcal{V}[X]_{\rho'}(w_1, w_2)$, then it suffices to show $\exists v_{1f}, v_{2f}. e'_1[w_1/x] \rightarrow^* v_{1f} \wedge w_2 \rightarrow^* v_{2f} \wedge \mathcal{V}[X]_{\rho'}(v_{1f}, v_{2f})$. Finally, instantiate (5.5) with w_1 and w_2 . Then we know $e'_1[w_1/x] \rightarrow^* v'_{1f}$, and $e'_2[w_2/x] \rightarrow^* v'_{2f}$, and $\mathcal{V}[X]_{\rho'}(v'_{1f}, v'_{2f})$. Thus, by the definition of our value interpretation, $(v'_{1f}, v'_{2f}) \in R$. Now use v'_{1f} for v_{1f} and w_2 for v_{2f} in our goal. Then we must show $(v_{1f}, w_2) \in R$. To show this, we need to do some arguing about the reduction $(\gamma_2(e) _) w_2$. We have

$$(\gamma_2(e) _) w_2 \rightarrow^* (\Lambda e_2 _) w_2 \rightarrow e_2 w_2 \rightarrow^* (\lambda x. e'_2) w_2 \rightarrow e'_2[w_2/x] \rightarrow^* v'_{2f}$$

By lemma 30, we may conclude that $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \gamma_2(e) : \forall X. X \rightarrow X$, so by theorem 23 we may conclude $(\gamma_2(e) _) w_2 \rightarrow^* w_2$. Thus by determinacy of System F (theorem 5), we have that $v'_{2f} = w_2$. Since we know $(v'_{1f}, v'_{2f}) \in R$, then it follows that $(v'_{1f}, w_2) \in R$, which was what we had to show. \square

5.2 Empty type

►explain briefly what the empty type is◀

Theorem 25. $\nexists e. \bullet \mid \bullet \vdash e : \forall X. X$

Proof. Assume for the sake of contradiction that $\exists e. \bullet \mid \bullet \vdash e : \forall X. X$. Then, by the fundamental theorem (theorem 22), we know that $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash e \approx^{LR} e : \forall X. X$, which means that $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{D}[\bullet], \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\bullet]_\rho. \mathcal{E}[\forall X. X]_\rho(\gamma_1(e), \gamma_2(e))$. Here, pick the empty relational substitutions, so that $\mathcal{E}[\forall X. X]_\emptyset(e, e)$. Which by definition means $\exists v_1, v_2. e \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge e \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\forall X. X]_\emptyset(v_1, v_2)$. From this we may conclude that $e \rightarrow^* \Lambda e'$, and $\forall \tau_1, \tau_2, R \in \text{Rel}[\tau_1, \tau_2]. \mathcal{E}[X]_{[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]}(e', e')$. Instantiate this with any two types (for example \mathbb{Z}), and the empty relation, $R = \emptyset$. Then we have $\mathcal{E}[X]_{[X \mapsto (\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}, \emptyset)]}(e', e')$, from which we know $\exists v_1, v_2. e' \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge e' \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[X]_{[X \mapsto (\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}, \emptyset)]}(v_1, v_2)$. By the definition of the value interpretation for type variables, the last part gives us $(v_1, v_2) \in \emptyset$, which is a contradiction. \square

5.3 Commutativity

Syntactic sugar: $\text{let } x = e \text{ in } e' \triangleq (\lambda x. e') e$.

Theorem 26. *If $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau_1$ and $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau_2$ then*

$\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{let } x = e_2 \text{ in } (e_1, x) \approx^{ctx} (e_1, e_2) : \tau_1 \times \tau_2$

Proof. ►do proof◀ \square

5.4 Idempotency

Theorem 27. *If $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$ then $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{let } x = e \text{ in } (x, x) \approx^{ctx} (e, e) : \tau \times \tau$*

Proof. We will show the theorem by showing that the two expressions are logically related. Then, by theorem 21, it follows that they are also contextually equivalent. So assume $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$, then we will show $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{let } x = e \text{ in } (x, x) \approx^{LR} (e, e) : \tau \times \tau$. By definition of LR, we must show two things. First that both expressions are well-typed under Ξ and Γ . This follows fairly easily from the assumption and by applying the typing rules, so we will not explain it here. Second that, when the expressions and types are closed, they are in the expression interpretation. So assume some $\rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi]$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho$.

Then we must show $\mathcal{E}[\tau \times \tau]_\rho(\gamma_1(\text{let } x = e \text{ in } (x, x)), \gamma_2((e, e)))$, which by the definition of the expression interpretation means we have to show

$$\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \text{let } x = \gamma_1(e) \text{ in } (x, x) : \rho_1(\tau) \quad (5.6)$$

$$\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash (\gamma_2(e), \gamma_2(e)) : \rho_2(\tau) \quad (5.7)$$

$$\exists v_1, v_2. \text{let } x = \gamma_1(e) \text{ in } (x, x) \rightarrow^* v_1 \wedge (\gamma_2(e), \gamma_2(e)) \rightarrow^* v_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau \times \tau]_\rho(v_1, v_2) \quad (5.8)$$

From the initial assumption and the fundamental theorem (theorem 22) we have that $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx^{LR} e : \tau$, which, when we instantiate with ρ and γ , gives us

$$\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \gamma_1(e) : \rho_1(\tau) \quad (5.9)$$

$$\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \gamma_2(e) : \rho_2(\tau) \quad (5.10)$$

$$\exists v'_1, v'_2. \gamma_1(e) \rightarrow^* v'_1 \wedge \gamma_2(e) \rightarrow^* v'_2 \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau]_\rho(v'_1, v'_2) \quad (5.11)$$

From (5.9) and (5.10), we may prove the first two parts of the goal (5.6) and (5.7). So let's turn our attention the last part (5.8).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{let } x = \gamma_1(e) \text{ in } (x, x) &\equiv (\lambda x. (x, x)) \gamma_1(e) \rightarrow^* (\lambda x. (x, x)) v'_1 \rightarrow \\ &\quad (x, x)[v'_1/x] \equiv (v'_1, v'_1) \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

The first equivalence simply de-sugars the let expression. The next " \rightarrow^* " follows from (5.11). The next step is simply a lambda reduction, and the final equivalence is just performing the substitution.

$$(\gamma_2(e), \gamma_2(e)) \rightarrow^* (v'_2, \gamma_2(e)) \rightarrow^* (v'_2, v'_2) \quad (5.13)$$

Both " \rightarrow^* " follows from (5.11). We here use (v'_1, v'_1) for v_1 and (v'_2, v'_2) for v_2 . Then we must show

$$\mathcal{V}[\tau \times \tau]_\rho((v'_1, v'_1), (v'_2, v'_2)) \quad (5.14)$$

By the definition of the value interpretation for product type, it suffices to show well-typedness and $\mathcal{V}[\tau]_\rho(v'_1, v'_2) \wedge \mathcal{V}[\tau]_\rho(v'_1, v'_2)$. Both of which follows from the last part of (5.11) **►prettify proof◄** \square

5.5 Lam hoisting

Theorem 28. *If $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau$ and $\Xi \mid \Gamma, y : \tau, x : \tau_1 \vdash e_2 : \tau_2$ then $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{let } y = e_1 \text{ in } \lambda x. e_2 \approx^{ctx} \lambda x. \text{let } y = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2$*

Proof. **►do proof◄** \square

Chapter 6

Comparison to Other Work and Ideas for Future Work

►draft◄

Chapter 7

Conclusion

►conclude on the problem statement from the introduction◄

Acknowledgments



Bibliography

- [1] Lau Skorstengaard. An introduction to logical relations. *CoRR*, abs/1907.11133, 2019.

Appendix A

The Technical Details



A.1 Congruence Rules for Alternative Definition of Contextual Equivalence

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{CNG-VAR} \\
\frac{(x : \tau) \in \Gamma}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash x \approx x : \tau} \\
\\
\text{CNG-UNIT} \\
\frac{}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash () \approx () : \text{Unit}} \\
\\
\text{CNG-INT} \\
\frac{}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \bar{n} \approx \bar{n} : \mathbb{Z}} \\
\\
\text{CNG-ADD} \\
\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx e'_1 : \mathbb{Z} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 \approx e'_2 : \mathbb{Z}}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 + e_2 \approx e'_1 + e'_2 : \mathbb{Z}} \\
\\
\text{CNG-SUB} \\
\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx e'_1 : \mathbb{Z} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 \approx e'_2 : \mathbb{Z}}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 - e_2 \approx e'_1 - e'_2 : \mathbb{Z}} \\
\\
\text{CNG-LE} \\
\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx e'_1 : \mathbb{Z} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 \approx e'_2 : \mathbb{Z}}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \leq e_2 \approx e'_1 \leq e'_2 : \mathbb{B}} \\
\\
\text{CNG-LT} \\
\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx e'_1 : \mathbb{Z} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 \approx e'_2 : \mathbb{Z}}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 < e_2 \approx e'_1 < e'_2 : \mathbb{B}} \\
\\
\text{CNG-EQ} \\
\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx e'_1 : \mathbb{Z} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 \approx e'_2 : \mathbb{Z}}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 = e_2 \approx e'_1 = e'_2 : \mathbb{B}} \\
\\
\text{CNG-TRUE} \\
\frac{}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{true} \approx \text{true} : \mathbb{B}} \\
\\
\text{CNG-FALSE} \\
\frac{}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{false} \approx \text{false} : \mathbb{B}} \\
\\
\text{CNG-IF} \\
\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx e'_1 : \mathbb{B} \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 \approx e'_2 : \tau \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_3 \approx e'_3 : \tau}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3 \approx \text{if } e'_1 \text{ then } e'_2 \text{ else } e'_3 : \tau} \\
\\
\text{CNG-PAIR} \\
\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx e'_1 : \tau_1 \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 \approx e'_2 : \tau_2}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash (e_1, e_2) \approx (e'_1, e'_2) : \tau_1 \times \tau_2} \\
\\
\text{CNG-FST} \\
\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx e' : \tau_1 \times \tau_2}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{fst } e \approx \text{fst } e' : \tau_1} \\
\\
\text{CNG-SND} \\
\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx e' : \tau_1 \times \tau_2}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{snd } e \approx \text{snd } e' : \tau_2} \\
\\
\text{CNG-INJ1} \\
\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx e' : \tau_1}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{inj}_1 e \approx \text{inj}_1 e' : \tau_1 + \tau_2} \\
\\
\text{CNG-INJ2} \\
\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx e' : \tau_2}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{inj}_2 e \approx \text{inj}_2 e' : \tau_1 + \tau_2}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{CNG-MATCH} \\
\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx e'_1 : \tau_1 + \tau_2 \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma, x : \tau_1 \vdash e_2 \approx e'_2 : \tau \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma, x : \tau_2 \vdash e_3 \approx e'_3 : \tau}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \text{match } e_1 \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow e_2 \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow e_3 \text{ end} \approx \text{match } e'_1 \text{ with } \text{inj}_1 x \Rightarrow e'_2 \mid \text{inj}_2 x \Rightarrow e'_3 \text{ end} : \tau} \\
\\
\text{CNG-LAM} \\
\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma, x : \tau_1 \vdash e \approx e' : \tau_2}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \lambda x. e \approx \lambda x. e' : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \\
\\
\text{CNG-APP} \\
\frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 \approx e'_1 : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \quad \Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_2 \approx e'_2 : \tau_1}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e_1 e_2 \approx e'_1 e'_2 : \tau_2} \\
\\
\text{CNG-TLAM} \qquad \text{CNG-TAPP} \\
\frac{\Xi, X \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx e' : \tau}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash \Lambda e \approx \Lambda e' : \forall X. \tau} \qquad \frac{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e \approx e' : \forall X. \tau}{\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e _ \approx e' _ : \tau[\tau'/X]}
\end{array}$$

A.2 Additional results

Lemma 29. $X \notin \text{dom}(\rho) \wedge X \notin \text{free}(\tau) \implies \forall \tau_1, \tau_2, R \in \text{Rel}[\tau_1, \tau_2]. \mathcal{V}[\tau]_\rho(v_1, v_2) \iff \mathcal{V}[\tau]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]}(v_1, v_2)$

Proof. The proof won't be carried out here, but it follows by induction on τ . \square

Corollary 29.1. $X \notin \text{dom}(\rho) \wedge X \notin \text{free}(\Gamma) \implies \forall \tau_1, \tau_2, R \in \text{Rel}[\tau_1, \tau_2]. \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho = \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]}$

Proof. Assuming $X \notin \text{dom}(\rho)$, $X \notin \text{free}(\Gamma)$, and some τ_1, τ_2 , and $R \in \text{Rel}[\tau_1, \tau_2]$, we must show $\mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho = \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]}$. We proceed by induction on Γ . The base case is trivial: $\mathcal{G}[\bullet]_\rho = \mathcal{G}[\bullet]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]} = \{\emptyset\}$. So let's show the inductive step. Our induction hypothesis is $\mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho = \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]}$, and we must show $\mathcal{G}[\Gamma, x : \tau]_\rho = \mathcal{G}[\Gamma, x : \tau]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]}$, which is equivalent to showing $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma, x : \tau]_\rho \iff \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma, x : \tau]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]}$, for all γ . Both directions of the double implication are similar, so we show just the " \implies " direction. So assuming $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma, x : \tau]_\rho$, we must show $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma, x : \tau]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]}$. From $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma, x : \tau]_\rho$ we may conclude that $\gamma = \gamma'[x \mapsto (v_1, v_2)]$, and that $\gamma' \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho$ and $\mathcal{V}[\tau]_\rho(v_1, v_2)$. From this and lemma 29 we know that $\mathcal{V}[\tau]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]}(v_1, v_2)$, and from our induction hypothesis, we get $\gamma' \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]}$. So by the definition of \mathcal{G} , we may conclude $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma, x : \tau]_{\rho[X \mapsto (\tau_1, \tau_2, R)]}$. \square

Lemma 30 (Substitution lemma LR). *If $\Xi \mid \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{D}[\Xi]$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\Gamma]_\rho$, then $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \gamma_1(e) : \tau$ and $\bullet \mid \bullet \vdash \gamma_2(e) : \tau$*

Proof. ►do proof. try induction on typing derivation◄ \square