

# Relational realisability model for QTT

Our aim is to build a concrete realisability model for QTT which allows for metareasoning with results derived from parametricity. To that end, a construction of a quantitative category with families (QCwF) is presented [Atkey2018]. We follow the relational approach to types introduced by Reynolds for typed lambda calculus [Ma1992] and later refined for dependent types theories [Atkey2014a].

Once and for all fix a usage semiring  $R$  and an  $R$ -linear combinatory algebra  $\mathcal{A}^1$ .

## Taking stocks

**Definition 1** (Assembly<sup>†</sup>). An assembly<sup>†</sup>  $\Gamma$  is a pair  $(|\Gamma|, e)$  where  $|\Gamma|$  is a carrier set and  $e$  is a function  $|\Gamma| \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ .

$e$  encodes realisability information - given some  $\gamma \in |\Gamma|$ ,  $e(\gamma)$  is interpreted as the set of witnesses for the existence of  $\gamma$ . To emphasize on that aspect, we write  $a \models_{\Gamma} \gamma$  to denote  $a \in e(\gamma)$ .

A morphism between two assemblies<sup>†</sup>  $(|\Gamma|, e_{\Gamma})$  and  $(|\Delta|, e_{\Delta})$  is a function  $f : |\Gamma| \rightarrow |\Delta|$  that is realizable when acting on elements with realizers - there exists  $a_f \in \mathcal{A}$ , s.t for every  $\gamma \in |\Gamma|$  and  $a_{\gamma} \in \mathcal{A}$ , the following holds:

$$a_{\gamma} \models_{\Gamma} \gamma \implies a_f.a_{\gamma} \models_{\Delta} f(\gamma)$$

$a_f$  is said to track  $f$ . Also note that multiple realizers for the same function  $f$  do not induce multiple morphisms.

Using these notions we can construct a category  $\mathcal{A}sm^{\dagger}(\mathcal{A})$ .

**Definition 2** (Reflexive graph). A reflexive graph (r.g.)  $G$  is a tuple  $(G_O, G_R, G_{refl}, G_{src}, G_{tgt})$ , where  $G_O$  and  $G_R$  are sets,  $G_{src}$  and  $G_{tgt}$  are functions  $G_R \rightarrow G_O$  and  $G_{refl}$  is a function  $G_O \rightarrow G_R$ , s.t  $G_{src} \circ G_{refl} = id_{G_O} = G_{tgt} \circ G_{refl}$ .

$G_O$  and  $G_R$  stand for a set of objects and a set of relations, respectively. In general, reflexive graphs are less structured than categories as relations need not compose.

A morphism between reflexive graphs  $G$  and  $H$  is a pair of functions  $(f_o : G_O \rightarrow H_O, f_r : G_R \rightarrow H_R)$ , s.t. all of the depicted squares commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G_O & \xrightarrow{f_o} & H_O \\ \begin{array}{c} \uparrow | \uparrow \\ G_{src} \left( \begin{array}{c} \uparrow | \uparrow \\ G_{refl} \\ \downarrow | \downarrow \end{array} \right) G_{tgt} \\ \downarrow | \downarrow \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \uparrow | \uparrow \\ H_{src} \left( \begin{array}{c} \uparrow | \uparrow \\ H_{refl} \\ \downarrow | \downarrow \end{array} \right) H_{tgt} \\ \downarrow | \downarrow \end{array} \\ G_R & \xrightarrow{f_r} & H_R \end{array}$$

Reflexive graphs equipped with r.g. morphisms form a category  $\mathcal{RGph}(\mathcal{Set})$ .

We use reflexive graphs to give a dyadic interpretation of types in the spirit of [Ma1992].

---

<sup>1</sup>In case some non-trivial properties of  $\mathcal{A}$  are required, we will tacitly assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a graph model(see [fill]) - also to fix

## Reflexive graphs of assemblies<sup>†</sup>

One could easily generalize reflexive graphs by considering object and relation components from arbitrary categories instead of  $\mathcal{Set}$ . As our purpose is to build a realisability model, we replace the set of objects with an assembly<sup>†</sup>  $\mathcal{Asm}^\dagger(\mathcal{A})$  identify two appropriate notions of reflexive graph of assemblies and a family of reflexive graphs of assemblies.

**Definition 3** (Reflexive graph of assemblies). **FNF:** It's not easy, but we should think of a good name for this — “reflexive graph of  $X$ ” usually means “reflexive graph in the category of  $X$ s”, i.e. where  $G_O$  and  $G_R$  are  $X$ s, and the maps are  $X$  morphisms. A reflexive graph of assemblies  $G$  is a tuple  $(G_O, G_R, G_{refl}, G_{src}, G_{tgt})$ , where  $G_O$  is an assembly,  $G_R$  - a set and the functions  $G_{refl} : |G_O| \rightarrow G_R$ ,  $G_{src} : |G_R| \rightarrow G_O$ ,  $G_{tgt} : |G_R| \rightarrow G_O$  are such that the identities in Definition 2 are satisfied.

With these components, we obtain a category  $\mathcal{RGph}(\mathcal{Asm}^\dagger(\mathcal{A}))$ . By considering r.g. of assemblies of shape  $(X, |X|, id_X, id_X, id_X)$ , we identify isomorphic copy of  $\mathcal{Asm}^\dagger(\mathcal{A})$  inside  $\mathcal{RGph}(\mathcal{Asm}^\dagger(\mathcal{A}))$ .

A terminal object  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{RGph}(\mathcal{Asm}^\dagger(\mathcal{A}))}$  in  $\mathcal{RGph}(\mathcal{Asm}^\dagger(\mathcal{A}))$  is a tuple  $(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Asm}^\dagger(\mathcal{A})}, \{*\}, id, id, id)$ , where  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Asm}^\dagger(\mathcal{A})}$  is the terminal assembly<sup>†</sup>  $(\{*\}, f)$ , with  $f$  defined as  $\star \mapsto \{I\}$ .

**Definition 4** (Family of reflexive graphs of assemblies). **FNF:** ditto here, namingwise Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a category with a terminal object. Given a reflexive graph  $\Gamma \in Ob(\mathcal{C})$ , a family of internal r.g. over  $\Gamma$  is a tuple  $S := (S_O, S_R, S_{refl}, S_{src}, S_{tgt})$ , where:

- $S_O : \Gamma_O \rightarrow \mathcal{Asm}^\dagger(\mathcal{A})$
- $S_R : \Gamma_R \rightarrow \mathcal{Set}$
- a  $\Gamma$ -indexed collection of functions  $S_{refl} := \{f_\gamma : |S_O(\gamma)| \rightarrow S_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma))\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma_O}$
- $S_{src} := \{f_\gamma : S_R(\gamma) \rightarrow |S_O(\Gamma_{src}(\gamma))|\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma_R}$
- $S_{tgt} := \{f_\gamma : S_R(\gamma) \rightarrow |S_O(\Gamma_{tgt}(\gamma))|\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma_R}$

such that

- each identity in the following collection is satisfied:

$$S_\sigma(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma)) \circ S_{refl}(\gamma) = id \text{ for every } \gamma \in \Gamma_O, \sigma \in \{src, tgt\}$$

We are only interested in cases when  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{Set}$  or  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{Asm}^\dagger(\mathcal{A})$ .

A morphism  $M$  between two families  $S$  and  $T$  of internal r.g. over  $\Gamma$  is a pair  $(M_O, M_R)$  of  $\Gamma$ -indexed collections of functions:

- $M_O := \{f_\gamma : |S_O(\gamma)| \rightarrow |T_O(\gamma)|\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma_O}$  **FNF:** should be tracked?
- $M_R := \{f_\gamma : |S_R(\gamma)| \rightarrow |T_R(\gamma)|\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma_O}$

such that:

- $T_{refl}(M_O(\gamma)(x)) = M_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma))(S_{refl}(\gamma)(x))$  for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma_O$ ,  $x \in S_O(\gamma)$
- $T_{src}(M_R(\gamma)(r)) = M_O(\Gamma_{src}(\gamma))(S_{src}(\gamma)(r))$  for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma_R$ ,  $r \in S_R(\gamma)$
- $T_{tgt}(M_R(\gamma)(r)) = M_O(\Gamma_{tgt}(\gamma))(S_{tgt}(\gamma)(r))$  for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma_R$ ,  $r \in S_R(\gamma)$

A terminal family of r.g. over  $\Gamma$ ,  $1_\Gamma$ , consists of two constant functions, mapping  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  to a terminal assembly<sup>†</sup>  $1$ , and three  $\Gamma$ -indexed collections with a sole element  $id_1$ .

## A CwF from families of reflexive graphs of assemblies

As a first step toward obtaining a relationally parametric realisability model of QTT, we construct a concrete CwF using families of internal graphs of assemblies.

Consider the category  $\mathcal{RGph}$  with terminal object  $1 := (\{\star\}, \{\star\}, id, id, id)$ .

Let  $\Gamma, \Delta \in Ob(\mathcal{RGph})$ , define:

- the collection of semantic types  $Ty(\Gamma)$  as the collection of families of reflexive graphs of assemblies  $\Gamma$ .
- given a type  $S \in Ty(\Gamma)$ , an element  $M \in Tm(\Gamma, S)$  is a pair of functions  $(M_O : \forall \gamma \in \Gamma_O. |S_O(\gamma)|, M_R : \forall \gamma \in \Gamma_R. S_R(\gamma))$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \gamma \in \Gamma_O. S_{refl}(M_O(\gamma)) &= M_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma)) \\ \forall \gamma \in \Gamma_R. S_{src}(M_R(\gamma)) &= M_O(\Gamma_{src}(\gamma)) \\ \forall \gamma \in \Gamma_R. S_{tgt}(M_R(\gamma)) &= M_O(\Gamma_{tgt}(\gamma)) \end{aligned}$$

- given  $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$ , substitutions in types and terms is a precomposition with  $f$  on the object and relation components of types and terms respectively. Clearly, these operations are compatible with identity and composition in  $\mathcal{RGph}$ .
- context extension: Suppose  $S \in Ty(\Gamma)$ , construct a r.g.  $\Gamma.S$  as :

$$\begin{aligned} (\Gamma.S)_O &= \{(\gamma, x) : \gamma \in \Gamma_O, x \in |S_O(\gamma)|\} \\ (\Gamma.S)_R &= \{(\gamma, r) : \gamma \in \Gamma_R, r \in S_R(\gamma)\} \\ (\Gamma.S)_{refl}(\gamma, x) &= (\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma), S_{refl}(\gamma)(x)) \\ (\Gamma.S)_\sigma(\gamma, r) &= (\Gamma_\sigma(\gamma), S_\sigma(\gamma)(r)), \quad \sigma \in \{src, tgt\} \end{aligned}$$

**Claim.**  $Hom_{\mathcal{RGph}}(\Delta, \Gamma.S) \cong \{(f, M) : f : \Delta \rightarrow \Gamma, M \in Tm(\Delta, S\{f\})\}$ , natural in  $\Delta$ .

## Upgrading to a QCwF

Recall the definition of a QCwF from [Atkey2018]. Given a usage semiring  $R$ , a  $R$ -QCwF consists of:

1. A CwF  $(\mathcal{C}, 1, Ty, Tm, -. , \langle -. \rangle)$
2. A category  $\mathcal{L}$  with a faithful functor  $U : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$

3. A functor  $(+) : \mathcal{L} \times_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ , s.t.  $U(\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2) = U(\Gamma_1) = U(\Gamma_2)$ <sup>2</sup>.  $\mathcal{L} \times_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{L}$  denotes the pullback  $\mathcal{L} \xrightarrow{U} \mathcal{C} \xleftarrow{U} \mathcal{L}$ .

Additionally, there exists an object  $\diamond \in \mathcal{L}$ , s.t.  $U\diamond = 1$ .

4. A functor  $\rho(-) : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  for each  $\rho \in R$ , s.t.  $U(\rho(-)) = U(-)$ .  
 5. A collection  $RTm(\Gamma, S)$  for each  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $S \in Ty(U\Gamma)$ , equipped with an injective function  $U_{\Gamma, S} : RTm(\Gamma, S) \rightarrow Tm(U\Gamma, S)$ .

For an  $\mathcal{L}$  morphisms  $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$  and types  $S \in Ty(U\Gamma)$ , a function  $-\{f\} : RTm(\Delta, S) \rightarrow RTm(\Gamma, S\{f\})$ , s. t.  $U(-\{f\}) = (U(-))\{Uf\}$ .

6. Given  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $\rho \in R$  and  $S \in Ty(U\Gamma)$ , an object  $\Gamma.\rho S$ , s.t.  $U(\Gamma.\rho S) = U\Gamma.S$ .

Additionally, there exist the following natural transformations:

$emp_{\pi} : \diamond \rightarrow \pi\diamond$ , s.t.  $U(emp_{\pi}) = id_1$  **FNF: since 1 terminal, this is automatic?**

$emp_{+} : \diamond \rightarrow \diamond + \diamond$ , s.t.  $U(emp_{+}) = id_1$  **FNF: ditto**

$ext_{\pi} : \pi\Gamma.(\pi\rho S) \rightarrow \pi(\Gamma.\rho S)$ , s.t.  $U(ext_{\pi}) = id$

$ext_{+} : (\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2).(\rho_1 + \rho_2)S \rightarrow \Gamma_1.\rho_1 S + \Gamma_2.\rho_2 S$ , s.t.  $U(ext_{+}) = id$

7. Given  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $S \in Ty(U\Gamma)$ , there exists:

a morphism  $p_{\Gamma, S} : \Gamma.0S \rightarrow \Gamma$ , s.t.  $U(p_{\Gamma, S}) = p_{U\Gamma, S}$

an element  $v_{\Gamma, S} \in RTm(0\Gamma.1S, S\{p_{U\Gamma, S}\})$ , s.t.  $U(v_{\Gamma, S}) = v_{U\Gamma, S}$

a morphism  $wk(f, \rho S') : \Gamma.\rho S'\{Uf\} \rightarrow \Delta.\rho S'$  for each  $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$ ,  $S' \in Ty(U\Gamma, \Delta)$

s.t.  $U(wk(f, \rho S')) = wk(Uf, S')$

let  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \in \mathcal{L}$ , s.t.  $U\Gamma_1 = U\Gamma_2$  and  $M \in RTm(\Gamma_2, S)$ . There is a morphism  $\overline{\rho M} : \Gamma_1 + \rho\Gamma_2 \rightarrow \Gamma_1.\rho S$ , s.t.  $U(\overline{\rho M}) = \overline{UM}$

a morphism  $\overline{M} : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma.0S$  for  $M \in Tm(U\Gamma, S)$ , s.t.  $U(\overline{M}) = \overline{M}$ .

Now to construct the concrete QCwF, consider the CwF from previous section as the underlying category.

Take  $\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{RGph}(\mathcal{A})$  **FNF: “half-assembled” r.g.s (yes, we also need notation for them)** and let  $U$  be the functor  $\mathcal{RGph}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{RGph}$ , sending an assembly<sup>†</sup> to its underlying set, forgetting the realisability function.

For the addition structure, let  $\Gamma', \Gamma''$  be r.g. of assemblies, s.t.  $|\Gamma'_O| = |\Gamma''_O|$  and  $|\Gamma'_R| = |\Gamma''_R|$  **FNF: no  $|\cdot|$  for  $R$  part**. Construct the r.g. of assemblies  $\Gamma := \Gamma' + \Gamma''$ , where:

- $\Gamma_O := (|\Gamma'_O|, \models_{\Gamma})$  with  $a \models_{\Gamma} \gamma$  iff there exist  $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$ , s.t.  $a = [x, y]$  and  $x \models_{\Gamma'} \gamma$  and  $y \models_{\Gamma''} \gamma$ .
- define  $\Gamma_R$  similarly as  $\Gamma_O$ . **FNF: this is just  $\Gamma_R = \Gamma'_R (= \Gamma''_R)$**
- $\Gamma_{refl}, \Gamma_{src}, \Gamma_{tgt}$  are the same as their  $\Gamma'$  counterparts (or  $\Gamma''$ ).

Define  $\diamond$  as the terminal object  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{RGph}(\mathcal{A}^{sm^{\dagger}}(\mathcal{A}))}$

Consider the scaling structure and let  $\Gamma := \rho(\Gamma')$  :

- $\Gamma_{\sigma} = (|\Gamma'_{\sigma}|, \models_{\Gamma_{\sigma}})$  with  $a \models_{\Gamma_{\sigma}} \gamma$  iff there is  $x \in \mathcal{A}$ , s.t.  $a = !_\rho x$  and  $x \models_{\Gamma'_{\sigma}} \gamma$  for  $\sigma \in \{O, R\}$

<sup>2</sup>the second equality being trivially satisfied

- again, scaling leaves unmodified  $\Gamma_\sigma$  for  $\sigma \in \{src, tgt, rfl\}$ .

Let  $RTm(\Gamma, S)$  be the collection of assembly<sup>†</sup> morphisms from the terminal object to  $S$  (note any set-theoretic function from the terminal object is realizable). Spelling this out,  $RTm(\Gamma, S)$  consists of tuples  $(M_O, M_R)$ , s.t. the conditions from Definition 4 are satisfied **FNF: would be good for clarity to spell this out (up to isomorphism, removing the unit type element)**.  $U_{\Gamma, S}$  just forgets the realisability information and is trivially injective. Substitution in terms is given by precomposition with  $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta - \{f_O\} := \lambda M_O. \forall \gamma \in \Gamma. M_O(f(\gamma))$  and similarly,  $- \{f_R\} := \lambda M_R. \forall \gamma \in \Gamma. M_R(f(\gamma))$ . The functor  $U$  interacts nicely with the so-defined  $- \{f\}$  as essentially the substitution in terms in the underlying CwF is defined in the same way.

Let  $\Gamma. \rho S := (\Gamma'_O, \Gamma'_R, \Gamma'_\sigma)$ , where

- $|\Gamma'_O| := \{(\gamma, x) : \gamma \in \Gamma_O, x \in S_O(\gamma)\}$  and  $a \Vdash_{\Gamma. \rho S} (\gamma, x)$  iff there exists  $b, c \in \mathcal{A}$ , s.t  $a = [b, !_\rho c]$ ,  $b \Vdash_\Gamma \gamma$  and  $c \Vdash_{S(\gamma)} \pi_1((\gamma, x))$ , where  $(-) : \Gamma.S \rightarrow U(\Gamma.S)$ ,  $(-) := id$  as the set-theoretic part of the extensions in the CwF and  $\mathcal{L}$  is the same by definition.
- $|\Gamma'_R|$  is defined analogously. **FNF: no realizability anymore**
- Each  $\Gamma'_\sigma$  is defined pointwise.

$emp_\pi : \Diamond \rightarrow \pi \Diamond$  is given by identity function on both the object and relational part. It is realized by  $K. !_\rho I$ . Similarly,  $emp_+$  is realized by  $K.[I, I]$ ,  
 $ext_\pi$  - by  $\lambda^* q. let [x, y] = q \text{ in } F_\pi.(F_\pi.(!_\pi \lambda^* stu.ust).x). \delta_{\pi \rho} y$  and  
 $ext_+$  - by  $\lambda^* q. let [[x, y], z] = q \text{ in } W_{\pi \rho}.(\lambda^* ab. [[x, a], [y, b]]). z$

The underlying function part of the above-defined natural transformations is given by identity, hence naturality follows trivially.

Finally, we construct the morphisms, listed in 7:

- $p_{\Gamma.S} : \Gamma.0S \rightarrow \Gamma$  is the first projection of  $(\Gamma.0S)_\sigma = \{(\gamma, s) : \gamma \in \Gamma_\sigma, s \in S(\gamma)\}$ , ( $\sigma \in \{O, R\}$ ) and is realized by  $\lambda^* t.(t.K)$ .  
The equality  $U(p_{\Gamma.S}) = p_{U\Gamma.S}$  holds trivially due to the identical structure of context extension in the underlying CwF and  $\mathcal{L}$ .
- define  $v_{\Gamma.S} \in RTm(0\Gamma.1S, S\{p_{U\Gamma.S}\})$  as the second projection.  $v_{\Gamma.S}$  is realized by  $\lambda^* t.B.t.K.D$ .
- Let  $a_f^\sigma$  realizes  $f_\sigma$ , then  $wk(f, \rho S') := \lambda(\gamma, s).(f(\gamma), s)$  is realized by  $\lambda^* q. let [x, y] = q \text{ in } [a_f^\sigma.x, y]$
- given a  $M_\sigma \in RTm(\Gamma, S) = M_\sigma : \forall \gamma \in U\Gamma_\sigma. S_\sigma(\gamma)$  with realizers  $a_m^\sigma$ , let  $\overline{\rho M}_\sigma := \lambda \gamma. (\gamma, M_\sigma(\gamma))$  realized by  $\lambda^* q. let [x, y] = q \text{ in } [x, F_\rho.(!_\rho a_m^\sigma).y]$
- given a  $M_\sigma \in Tm(U\Gamma, S) = M_\sigma : \forall \gamma \in U\Gamma_\sigma. S_\sigma(\gamma)$ , let  $\overline{M}_\sigma := \lambda \gamma. (\gamma, M_\sigma(\tilde{\gamma}))$  realized by the  $K$  combinator.

## Type formers

**Definition 5** (Dependent function types a QCwF). A QCwF supports dependent function types with usage information, if

- the underlying CwF  $\mathcal{C}$  supports them, namely, if for all  $\Gamma \in Ob(\mathcal{C}), S \in Ty(\Gamma), T \in Ty(\Gamma.S), \pi \in R$ , there exist type  $\Pi\pi ST \in Ty(\Gamma)$  and a bijection

$$\Lambda : Tm(\Gamma.S, T) \cong Tm(\Gamma, \Pi\pi ST),$$

natural in  $\Gamma$ .

- for  $\Gamma \in Ob(\mathcal{L}), S \in Ty(U\Gamma), T \in Ty(U\Gamma.S), \pi \in R$ , there exists a bijection

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}} : RTm(\Gamma.\pi S, T) \cong RTm(\Gamma, \Pi\pi ST),$$

natural in  $\Gamma$  such that  $U \circ \Lambda_{\mathcal{L}} = \Lambda \circ U$  and  $U \circ \Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} = \Lambda^{-1} \circ U$ .

To show that our model supports  $\Pi$  types, fix some  $\pi \in R$ , suppose  $\Gamma$  is a r.g in  $Ob(\mathcal{C})$ ,  $S \in Ty(\Gamma)$ ,  $T \in Ty(\Gamma.S)$ . Define the semantic type  $\Pi\pi ST$  as the family of assemblies over  $\Gamma$ , consisting of:

- $(\Pi\pi ST)_O(\gamma) := (X, \models_X)$  for  $\gamma \in \Gamma_O$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} X := \{ & (f_O, f_R) \mid \\ & f_O : \forall s \in S_O(\gamma). T_O(\gamma, s), \\ & f_R : \forall r \in S_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma)). T_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma), r), \\ & \forall s \in S_O(\gamma). T_{refl}(\gamma, s)(f_O(s)) = f_R(S_{refl}(\gamma)(s)), \\ & \forall r \in S_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma)). T_{src}(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma), r)(f_R(r)) = f_O(S_{src}(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma))(r)), \\ & \forall r \in S_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma)). T_{tgt}(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma), r)(f_R(r)) = f_O(S_{tgt}(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma))(r)) \} \end{aligned}$$

$a \models_X (f_O, f_R)$  iff

$$\forall s \in |S_O(\gamma)|, b \in \mathcal{A}. b \models_{S_O(\gamma)} s \implies a.!\rho b \models_{T_O(\gamma, s)} f_O(s)$$

Note that  $f_R$  does not contribute any realisability information to  $\models_X$ .

•

$$\begin{aligned} (\Pi\pi ST)_R(\gamma) := \{ & ((f_O^{src}, f_R^{src}), (f_O^{tgt}, f_R^{tgt}), r) \mid \\ & (f_O^{src}, f_R^{src}) \in (\Pi\pi ST)_O(\Gamma_{src}(\gamma)), \\ & (f_O^{tgt}, f_R^{tgt}) \in (\Pi\pi ST)_O(\Gamma_{tgt}(\gamma)), \\ & r : \forall s \in S_R(\gamma). T_R(\gamma, s), \\ & \forall s \in S_R(\gamma). T_{src}(\gamma, s)(r(s)) = f_O^{src}(S_{src}(\gamma)(s)), \\ & \forall s \in S_R(\gamma). T_{tgt}(\gamma, s)(r(s)) = f_O^{tgt}(S_{tgt}(\gamma)(s)) \} \end{aligned}$$

- $(\Pi\pi ST)_{refl}(\gamma) := \lambda(f_O, f_R).((f_O, f_R), (f_O, f_R), f_R)$  for  $\gamma \in \Gamma_O$ .
- $(\Pi\pi ST)_{src}(\gamma) := \lambda(f^{src}, f^{tgt}, r).f^{src}$  for  $\gamma \in \Gamma_R$ .
- $(\Pi\pi ST)_{tgt}(\gamma) := \lambda(f^{src}, f^{tgt}, r).f^{tgt}$  for  $\gamma \in \Gamma_R$ .

Unwinding Definition 5, we get

$$\{(M_O, M_R) : \forall(\gamma, s) \in (\Gamma.\pi S).T(\gamma, s)\} \cong \{(N_O, N_R) : \forall\gamma \in \Gamma.(\Pi\pi ST)(\gamma)\}$$

where the terms are of the following type structure:

$$\begin{aligned} M_O &: \forall(\gamma, s) \in (\Gamma.\pi S)_O.T_O(\gamma, s) \\ M_R &: \forall(\gamma, r) \in (\Gamma.\pi S)_R.T_R(\gamma, s) \\ N_O &: \forall\gamma \in \Gamma_O. \\ &\quad \{(f_O, f_R) \mid f_O : \Pi S(\gamma)_O.T(\gamma)_O \\ &\quad \quad f_R : \Pi S_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma).T(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma)))\} \\ N_R &: \forall\gamma \in \Gamma_R. \\ &\quad \{(f^{src}, f^{tgt}, r) \mid f^{src} \in (\Pi\pi ST)_O(\Gamma_{src}(\gamma)) \\ &\quad \quad f^{tgt} \in (\Pi\pi ST)_O(\Gamma_{tgt}(\gamma)) \\ &\quad \quad r : \Pi S_R(\gamma).T_R(\gamma)\} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can define  $\Lambda$  as  $\Lambda(M_O, M_R) = (N_O, N_R)$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} N_O &:= \lambda\gamma_o.(\lambda s.M_O(\gamma_o, s), \lambda s_r.M_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma_o), s_r)) \\ N_R &:= \lambda\gamma_r.(N_O(\Gamma_{src}(\gamma)), N_O(\Gamma_{tgt}(\gamma)), \lambda s_r.M_R(\gamma, s_r)) \end{aligned}$$

For  $\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}$ , a realizer  $a_m$  of  $M$

(that is  $\forall(\gamma, s), \forall(a_\gamma, a_s), [a_\gamma, a_s] \models_{\Gamma.\pi S} (\gamma, s) \implies a_m.[a_\gamma, a_s] \models_{T(\gamma, s)} M(\gamma, s)$ )

can be transformed to a realizer  $a_n$  of  $N$  by:

$$a_n := \lambda^* y.(\lambda^* s.(a_m.[y, s]))$$

The conditions  $U \circ \Lambda_{\mathcal{L}} = \Lambda \circ U$  and  $U \circ \Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} = \Lambda^{-1} \circ U$  follow trivially.

**Universe of small types** A plausible candidate for the universe  $U$  is the general definition in [fill]:

$U_O :=$  the set of small r.g.

$U_R := \{(A, B, R, R_{src}, R_{tgt}) : R \in \mathcal{U}, R_{src} : R \rightarrow A_O, R_{tgt} : R \rightarrow A_O, A, B \text{ are small r.g.}\}$

However, this universe turns out to be “too big” - types do not carry enough structure to model parametricity accurately. To remedy the definition, we impose restrictions laid out by the following characterization:

A family of reflexive graphs of assemblies  $S$  over  $\Gamma$  is

- small - if for all  $\gamma_\sigma \in \Gamma_\sigma$ ,  $S_R(\gamma_R) \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $|S_O(\gamma_O)| \in \mathcal{U}$ .



- discrete - if for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma_O$ , there exists  $X \in \mathcal{A}sm^\dagger(\mathcal{A})$ , s.t.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & S_O(\gamma) & \\
 S_{src}(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma)) \swarrow & \downarrow S_{refl}(\gamma) & \searrow S_{src}(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma)) \\
 & S_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma)) & \\
 \cong & & \\
 & X & \\
 id \swarrow & \downarrow id & \searrow id \\
 & |X| &
 \end{array}$$

- proof-irrelevant - if for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma_R$ , the function  $\langle S_{src}(\gamma), S_{tgt}(\gamma) \rangle : S_R(\gamma) \rightarrow |S_O(\Gamma_{src}(\gamma))| \times |S_O(\Gamma_{tgt}(\gamma))|$  is injective.

For any reflexive graph  $\Gamma$ , define the small, discrete, proof-irrelevant universe  $U \in Ty(\Gamma)$  and the type decoder  $T \in Ty(\Gamma.U)$  as:

- $|U_O(\gamma)| :=$  the set of small, discrete r.g. of assemblies  
 $a \models_{U_O(\gamma)} S$  for any  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $S \in |U_O(\gamma)|$ . **FNF:** Again maybe  $a \vdash S$  iff  $a = I$  is better for linearity reasons?

$$U_R(\gamma_O) := \{(S, T, R, R_{src}, R_{tgt}) \mid R \in \mathcal{U}\}$$

- $S, T$  are small discrete r.g. of assemblies  
 $\langle R_{src}, R_{tgt} \rangle : R \rightarrow |S_O| \times |T_O|$  is injective
- $U_{refl}(\gamma_R)(S) := (S, |S|, S_{refl}, S_{src}, S_{tgt})$
- $U_{src}(\gamma_R)(S, T, R, R_{src}, R_{tgt}) = S$
- $U_{tgt}(\gamma_R)(S, T, R, R_{src}, R_{tgt}) = T$

and  $T \in Ty(\Gamma.U)$  as:

- $T_O(\gamma_O, S) := S_O$
- $T_R(\gamma_R, (S, T, R, R_{src}, R_{tgt})) := R$
- $T_{refl}(\gamma_O, S) := S_{refl}$
- $T_{src}(\gamma_R, (S, T, R, R_{src}, R_{tgt})) := R_{src}$
- $T_{tgt}(\gamma_R, (S, T, R, R_{src}, R_{tgt})) := R_{tgt}$ .

**Claim.**  $U$  is closed under  $\Pi$  types.

Given some r.g  $\Gamma$  and  $S \in Ty(\Gamma)$ ,  $T \in Ty(\Gamma.S)$ , it suffices to show that  $\Pi\pi TS \in Ty(\Gamma)$  is a small, discrete and proof-irrelevant family of r.g. of assemblies<sup>†</sup> <sup>3</sup> For brevity, let  $V := \Pi\pi ST$ .

Smallness follows by the closure under  $\Pi$ -types in the ambient set-theoretical universe  $\mathcal{U}$ .

To show discreteness,

For proof-irrelevance, take some  $\gamma_R \in \Gamma$  and  $f, g \in V_R(\gamma_R)$ , s.t.  $\langle V_{src}(\gamma_R), V_{tgt}(\gamma_R) \rangle(f) = \langle V_{src}(\gamma_R), V_{tgt}(\gamma_R) \rangle(g)$ . WTP  $f = g$ , by def. we get immediately that  $f^{src} = g^{src}$  and  $f^{tgt} = g^{tgt}$ . Given that  $(f^{src}, f^{tgt}, r_f), (f^{src}, f^{tgt}, r_g) \in V_R(\gamma_R)$ , note that ,

$$\begin{aligned} \forall s \in S_R(\gamma_R). \langle T_{src}(\gamma_R, s), T_{src}(\gamma_R, s) \rangle(r_f(s)) &= (f_O^{src}(S_{src}(\gamma_R)(s)), f_O^{tgt}(S_{tgt}(\gamma_R)(s))) \\ \forall s \in S_R(\gamma_R). \langle T_{src}(\gamma_R, s), T_{src}(\gamma_R, s) \rangle(r_g(s)) &= (f_O^{src}(S_{src}(\gamma_R)(s)), f_O^{tgt}(S_{tgt}(\gamma_R)(s))) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $T$  is proof-irrelevant, it follows directly that  $r_f = r_g$  and thus  $f = g$ .

## A free theorem

**Theorem 6.** *If  $\Gamma \vdash M : \Pi a : \mathbf{U}. \Pi_+ : \mathbf{T}a. \mathbf{T}a$ , then for any  $\Gamma \vdash X : \mathbf{U}$ ,  $\Gamma \vdash MX = \mathbf{0} : \mathbf{T}X \rightarrow \mathbf{T}X$  is sound when interpreted in the model constructed so far.*

**Sketch** Instantiate  $M_R$  with  $\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma_O)$  and uncurry once to get:

$$M_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma_O), -) : \forall R \in \mathbf{U}_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma_O)). \Pi 0 (T_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma_O)), R). (T_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma_O)), R) \quad (1)$$

By the def. of terms in our model, we have:

$$U_{src}(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma_O)). M_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma_O)) = M_O(\gamma_O)$$

$$U_{tgt}(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma_O)). M_R(\Gamma_{refl}(\gamma_O)) = M_O(\gamma_O)$$

Expanding the def. in (1), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall A, B \in U_O(\gamma_O), \forall R \subseteq A_O \times B_O, \\ (M_O(\gamma_O)(A_O), M_O(\gamma_O)(B_O)) \in (\Pi 0 R. R)_R \end{aligned}$$

Instantiate  $B$  with  $\mathbf{0}$ .

There is no  $\Gamma \vdash M : \Pi a : \mathbf{U}. \Pi_+ : \mathbf{T}a. \mathbf{T}a$

---

<sup>3</sup>it actually does not suffice, we implicitly assume a lemma that gives an isomorphism between terms of type  $U$  and small, discrete, p.i. r.g of assemblies<sup>†</sup>