

Value interpretation for universal type is defined as :

$$\mathcal{V}[\![\forall\alpha.A]\!]_k^\theta = \{\wedge\alpha.e \mid \vdash^\theta \wedge\alpha.e : \forall\alpha.A \wedge \forall T : type, \forall j \leq k \text{ s.t. } \Delta \vdash T, [T/\alpha]e \in \mathcal{C}[\![T/\alpha]A]\!]_j^\theta\}$$

This definition can be used in proof of the Downward Closure Lemma as shown below :

To Prove : if $v \in \mathcal{V}[\![\tau]\!]_k^\theta$ and $j \leq k$ then $v \in \mathcal{V}[\![\tau]\!]_j^\theta$

Proof : By induction on types :

- $\tau = \text{Unit}$
Trivial, will satisfy all j as indices are not even part of value interpretation.
- $\tau = A^{\theta'} \rightarrow B$ and $\theta = L$
Suppose $i \leq j$ and $v' \in \mathcal{V}[\![A^{\theta'}]\!]_i^L$.
Then $i \leq k$ also. Hence, By definition of $\mathcal{V}[\![A^{\theta'} \rightarrow B]\!]_k^L$,
 $[v'/x]a \in \mathcal{C}[\![B]\!]_i^L$. This is true by definition of $\mathcal{V}[\![A^{\theta'} \rightarrow B]\!]_j^L$ also. Hence proved.
- $\tau = \forall\alpha.A$
let $i \leq j$ then $i \leq k$ too. if $\wedge\alpha.e \in \mathcal{V}[\![\forall\alpha.A]\!]_k^\theta$ then by definition, $\forall T : type \text{ s.t. } \Delta \vdash T, [T/\alpha]e \in \mathcal{C}[\![T/\alpha]A]\!]_i^\theta$
Again, this is the same by definition for $\mathcal{V}[\![\forall\alpha.A]\!]_j^\theta$ also, hence proved.

Well-formed substitutions are defined as follows :

Well formed type substitutions :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}[\![\cdot]\!] &= \{\phi\} \\ \mathcal{D}[\![\Delta, \alpha]\!] &= \{\rho[\alpha \rightarrow X] \mid \rho \in \mathcal{D}[\![\Delta]\!] \wedge FTV(X) \in dom(\rho)\} \end{aligned}$$

Well formed value substitutions :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}[\![\cdot]\!] &= \{\phi\} \\ \mathcal{G}[\![\Gamma, x : \tau]\!]_k^\rho &= \{\gamma[x \rightarrow v] \mid \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\![\Gamma]\!]_k^\rho \wedge v \in \mathcal{V}[\![\rho(\tau)]\!]_k\} \end{aligned}$$

T-Univ-Lam rule:

$$\frac{\Delta, \alpha, \Gamma \vdash^\theta e : B}{\Delta \Gamma \vdash^\theta \wedge\alpha.e : \forall\alpha.B}$$

To prove the soundness theorem using T-Univ-Lam case in P fragment:

Given: $\Gamma \vdash^P \wedge\alpha.e : \forall\alpha.B, \Gamma \models_k \gamma, \Delta \models \rho$

To Prove: $\gamma(\rho(\wedge\alpha.e)) \in \mathcal{C}[\![\forall\alpha.B]\!]_k^P$

Proof: From the definition of $\mathcal{C}[\![\forall\alpha.B]\!]_k^P$, we need to prove

- $\cdot \vdash^P \gamma(\rho(\wedge \alpha.e)) : \forall \alpha.B$ - by appeal to the substitution lemma
- $\gamma(\rho(\wedge \alpha.e)) = \wedge \alpha.\gamma(\rho(e))$ if α doesn't occur in $\text{dom}(\rho)$.
 From definition of $\mathcal{C}[\![\forall \alpha.A]\!]_k^P$, if $\forall T : \text{type}, \gamma(\rho([T/\alpha]e)) \rightsquigarrow^j v$ for all $j < k$, $\Delta \vdash \rho(\alpha), \Delta \vdash \Gamma$, then it suffices to show that
 $v \in \mathcal{V}[\![\rho([T/\alpha]B)]\!]_{k-j}^P$

By Induction Hypothesis,

$$\Delta, \alpha, \Gamma \vdash^P e : B$$

$$\forall T : \text{type}, \gamma(\rho([T/\alpha]e)) \in \mathcal{C}[\![\rho([T/\alpha]B)]\!]_k^P$$

Now, we know that $\gamma(\rho([T/\alpha]e)) \rightsquigarrow^j v$ and from definition of $\mathcal{C}[\![\rho([T/\alpha]B)]\!]_k^P$, we have
 $v \in \mathcal{V}[\![\rho([T/\alpha]B)]\!]_{k-j}^P$.
 Hence we get that $v \in \mathcal{V}[\![\rho([T/\alpha]B)]\!]_{k-j}^P$.

T-Univ-App rule

$$\frac{\Delta \Gamma \vdash^\theta e : \forall \alpha.A \quad \Delta \vdash B}{\Delta \Gamma \vdash^\theta e[B] : [B/\alpha]A}$$

To prove the soundness theorem using T-Univ-App case in L fragment:

Given: $\Gamma \vdash^L e[B] : [B/\alpha]A$, $\Gamma \models_k \gamma$, $\Delta \models \rho$

To Prove: $\gamma(\rho(e[B])) \in \mathcal{C}[\![\rho(B)/\alpha]A]\!]_k^L$

Proof: From the definition of $\mathcal{C}[\![\rho(B)/\alpha]A]\!]_k^L$, we need to prove

- $\cdot \vdash^L \gamma(\rho(e[B])) : [\rho(B)/\alpha]A$ - By appeal to the substitution lemma
- if $\gamma(\rho([B/\alpha]e)) \rightsquigarrow^* v$, $\Delta \vdash B, \Delta \vdash \Gamma$, then it suffices to show that
 $v \in \mathcal{V}[\![\rho(B)/\alpha]A]\!]_k^L$

$$\gamma(\rho(e[B])) = \gamma(\rho(e))[\rho(B)] \tag{1}$$

if α doesn't occur in $\text{dom}(\rho)$.

By Induction Hypothesis,

$$\Delta \Gamma \vdash^L e : \forall \alpha.A$$

$$\gamma(\rho(e)) \in \mathcal{C}[\![\forall\alpha.A]\!]_k^L$$

By the definition of $\mathcal{C}[\![\forall\alpha.A]\!]_k^L$, $\gamma(\rho(e)) \rightsquigarrow^* v_1 \in \mathcal{V}[\![\forall\alpha.A]\!]_k^L$.

Hence $\gamma(\rho(e))[\rho(B)] \rightsquigarrow^* v_1[\rho(B)]$ from eq.1.

Now as $v_1 \in \mathcal{V}[\![\forall\alpha.A]\!]_k^L$, it will look like $\wedge\alpha.v'$ for some v' s.t. $\forall T : Type, v'[T/\alpha] \in \mathcal{C}[\![T/\alpha]A]\!]_k^L$.

Initialising $\rho(B)$ in T above, we get $v'[\rho(B)/\alpha] \in \mathcal{C}[\![\rho(B)/\alpha]A]\!]_k^L$.

By definition of $\mathcal{C}[\![\rho(B)/\alpha]A]\!]_k^L$, $v'[\rho(B)/\alpha] \rightsquigarrow^* v'' \in \mathcal{V}[\![\rho(B)/\alpha]A]\!]_k^L$.

But v'' is actually v , hence proved.